

ANTIOCHUS AND RHETORIUS

DAVID PINGREE

IN THE year 1934 F. Cumont added to his numerous contributions to the history of ancient astrology an important article entitled "Antiochus d'Athènes et Porphyre."¹ On the basis of Antiochus' nomenclature of the planets, the order in which he discusses them, his alleged "théologie solaire," and his reference to the octatopos, Cumont claims that Antiochus must have written between about 100 B.C. and A.D. 50. He further suggests that he may be identical with Antiochus of Ascalon, who headed the Academy at Athens and numbered Cicero among his students,² though he admits that this hypothesis encounters some serious difficulties, in particular the fact that Cicero and others who discuss Antiochus of Ascalon never mention his belief, or even interest, in astrology.

Antiochus apparently wrote two major works on astrology: an *Εἰσαγωγικά* known to us from Epitome I (see the discussion on pp. 205-6) and from the (unacknowledged) plagiarisms in Porphyrius' *Εἰσαγωγή*, and a *Θησαυροί* which was one of the sources of Epitome II, from which are derived Epitome IIa and the first part of Epitome III. From Epitome III are derived Epitomes IIb, IIIa, IIIb, and IIIc; and Epitome IV drew upon the same source that was used in the latter half of Epitome III. Of all these epitomes only Epitome IIb bears the name of Rhetorius, but scholars have generally associated his name with all of the works mentioned above except for Epitome I.³ The object of this paper is to eliminate the confusion that has been created regarding Antiochus and Rhetorius, and to establish a program for editing Rhetorius that may seem unusual to a classicist, but that is necessary in the editing of Greek astrological texts.

The manuscripts cannot be relied on to preserve the original compositions of ancient authors; Ptolemy's *Ἀποτελεσματικά*⁴ is virtually the only such text that seems to have survived relatively unscathed by the "improvements" of scribes, though the variant readings of Hephaestio of Thebes⁵ and of "Proclus"⁶ indicate that even its text is not completely pure. It is of the utmost importance for understanding the history of the transmission of the texts and the history of Byzantine scholarship in astrology that the various epitomes of each work be carefully distinguished and separately edited.

1. *AIPH* 2 (1934): 135-56. An extremely untrustworthy discussion of Antiochus is found in W. and H. G. Gundel, *Astrologumena* (Wiesbaden, 1966), pp. 115-17.

2. F. H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 70.

3. Most recently Gundel and Gundel, *Astrologumena*, pp. 249-51.

4. Ed. F. Boll and E. Boer (Leipzig, 1954). Their class γ is a fourteenth-century revision produced in the school of John Abramius, and it is of no value in establishing the text; see D. Pingree, "The Astrological School of John Abramius," *DOP* 25 (1971): 189-215.

5. *Ἀποτελεσματικά*, ed. D. Pingree, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1973-74).

6. *Παράφρασις*, ed. P. Melanchthon (Basel, [1554]), and L. Allatius (Leyden, 1635).

But before turning to the epitomes of Antiochus, we should consider the independent evidence for that astrologer. A very large percentage of Porphyrius' *Εἰσαγωγή* is derived from Antiochus' *Εἰσαγωγικά*, as was noted by Cumont and is detailed below (pp. 205–6). Porphyrius, however, refers to Antiochus by name only once, in chapter 38 (cf. Epitome I. 20), where he reports that the latter described two methods of determining the position of the Moon at a native's conception: his own method and that of Petosiris. The same two methods ascribed to the same two authorities but in reverse order (this must be the original order, as Antiochus would have given Petosiris' opinion before his own) are quoted by Hephaestio of Thebes (II. 1. 2–6), who calls Antiochus an Athenian. At two places in his chapter on natives who die in infancy (II. 10. 9 and 29 = Heph. Ep.⁴ 24. 3 and 21), wherein he is citing a commentary (apparently by Porphyrius; see II. 2. 23–26 = Heph. Ep.⁴ 24. 16–19) on Ptolemy's *Ἀποτελεσματικά* III. 10, Hephaestio states that Antiochus and Apollinarius agree essentially with Ptolemy. This suggests, though it does not prove, that Antiochus wrote after Ptolemy and before Apollinarius, who in turn preceded Porphyrius. The astrologer named Apollinarius is also cited by Porphyrius (*Εἰσαγωγή* 41) as opposing Ptolemy in the arrangement of the terms. The so-called *Anonymus anni 379*, whose work is preserved as chapter 135⁷ of pseudo-Palchus (i.e., Eleutherius Elius or Zebelenus),⁸ cites Antiochus together with Valens, Antigonus, and Heraïscus as having written on the power of the fixed stars (cf. Epitome II. 11 = Porphyrius *Εἰσαγωγή* 48). Valens and Antigonus at least wrote in the late second century after Christ.⁹ Furthermore, Firmicus Maternus (*Mathesis* II. 29. 2) cites Ptolemy and Antiochus with regard to the doctrine of the antiscia. All of these associations, then, indicate that Antiochus wrote in the latter half of the second century.

This conclusion is not contradicted by the authorities whom Antiochus himself cites in the *Εἰσαγωγικά*; they are Hermes, Timaeus, and Nechepso–Petosiris. The citations from Hermes regarding the various Lots of the father, the mother, the brothers, the husband, the wife, the children, the friends, and the slaves (Epitome I. 26) are reminiscent of Dorotheus of Sidon's treatment of the same Lots in the last half of the first century after Christ,¹⁰ and the citations from Nechepso–Petosiris come from the genethliological work attributed to those authorities, which was probably written at about the beginning of the Christian era.¹¹

Antiochus became an authority on genethliology and interrogations among

7. Ed. F. Cumont, *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum* (henceforth *CCAG*), 5.1: 194–206. The fragmentary poem on the influences of the planets in the astrological places preserved in pseudo-Palchus 134 and edited by A. Olivieri, *CCAG*, 1: 108–113, is almost certainly not by Antiochus.

8. See D. Pingree, "Horoscope of Constantinople," to appear in the *Festschrift* for Willy Hartner (Frankfurt, forthcoming).

9. On Valens' date see O. Neugebauer, "The Chronology of Vettius Valens' *Anthologiae*," *HTR* 47 (1954): 65–67; on Antigonus' see Hephaestio II. 18. 21–70 (= Heph. Ep.⁴ 26. 11–60).

10. *Dorothei Sidonii "Carmen astrologicum"*, ed. D. Pingree (Leipzig, 1976).

11. See D. Pingree, "Petosiris," in *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, vol. 10 (New York, 1974), pp. 547–49.

early Arabic astrologers. Al-Şaymarī¹² in the ninth century cites him as well as Dorotheus and others with frequency, while later in the same century al-Qaşrānī¹³ quotes a method of interrogations as from Duruthīyūs (Dorotheus) and Anṭīqūs (Antiochus).¹⁴ Both al-Şaymarī and al-Qaşrānī also preserve many quotations from Valens; this collocation of Antiochus, Dorotheus, and Valens is also found in the sixth-century source used in the latter part of Epitome III. That source and perhaps another, apparently derived from the seventh-century compendium which I hypothesize later in this paper (pp. 221–22) to have been compiled by Rhetorius, were used in Epitome IV. This suggests an Arabic translation of that sixth-century source; such a translation would also help to explain the existence in Arabic of many fifth-century horoscopes, including the one in Epitome IV. 12. The precise relationship of these Arabic citations to our Greek material remains to be investigated.

Epitome I

The *Εἰσαγωγικά* of Antiochus is known to us through a text, here entitled Epitome I, preserved as chapter <62> of Book 6 on folia 232v–237v of Parisinus graecus 2425, an invaluable codex of 285 folia copied in the fifteenth century;¹⁵ folia 257–284 contain an astronomical work composed at the end of the eleventh century,¹⁶ and the parts of the codex that interest us also probably go back to the tenth or eleventh century. Epitome I, which is incomplete in this unique manuscript, is entitled *Τῶν Ἀντιόχου Εἰσαγωγικῶν βιβλίου α' συγκεφαλαίωσις*, and was edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 8.3: 111–18. In the following I indicate the contents of Epitome I and its relation to the *Εἰσαγωγή* of Porphyrius¹⁷ as edited by E. Boer and S. Weinstock in *CCAG*, 5.4: 185–228.

1. On the seven planets (Porphyrius 45: 217. 16–219. 21).
On the planetary sects (Porphyrius 4: 196. 2–10).
2. On the zodiacal signs.
3. On the houses, exaltations, dejections, and terms of the planets.
On the four configurations in the depth of the zodiacal signs (Porphyrius 3: 195. 14–21).
4. On the zodiacal melothesia (Porphyrius 44: 216. 26–27).
On the planetary melothesia (Porphyrius 45: 217. 7–9).
5. On the co-lords of houses (Porphyrius 7: 197. 11–13).
On the royalty of the luminaries (Porphyrius 7: 197. 18–19).

12. M. Ullmann, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam* (Leyden, 1972), pp. 325–26.

13. W. Madelung and D. Pingree, "Political Horoscopes Relating to Late Ninth Century 'Alids,'" *JNES* (forthcoming).

14. He is identified with Antigonos by M. Ullmann, *Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften*, pp. 279–80, but this seems very doubtful to me.

15. *CCAG*, 8.4: 22–42.

16. O. Neugebauer, *A Commentary on the Astronomical Treatise Parisinus Graecus 2425* (Brussels, 1969).

17. Comparisons with the 1559 edition by H. Wolf are given by F. Cumont, "Antiochus d'Athènes et Porphyre," p. 137, n. 1.

6. On aspect (Porphyrius 8: 197. 24–198. 11).
7. On right and left aspect (Porphyrius 9: 198. 13–14).
8. On παραλλαγή (Porphyrius 10: 198. 23–24).
On συναφή (Porphyrius 11: 198. 27–199. 2).
9. On κόλλησις (Porphyrius 11: 199. 2–4).
10. On command (Porphyrius 20: 201. 8–9).
11. On όμορόησις (Porphyrius 22: 202. 2–4).
On κενοδορομία (Porphyrius 23: 202. 6–9).
12. On έμπερίσχεσις (Porphyrius 15: 200. 7–13).
13. On the casting of rays (Porphyrius 24: 202. 11–17).
14. On being έν λαμπήναις ιδίαις (Porphyrius 25: 203. 17–22).
15. On the elongation of 15° necessary for heliacal rising and setting.
16. On μετοχή (Porphyrius 26: 204. 4–6).
On άντανάλυσις (Porphyrius 27: 204. 8–12).
17. On δορυφορία (Porphyrius 29: 204. 19–205. 28).
On injury (Porphyrius 28: 204. 14–17).
- 18.¹⁸ On the potent places according to Timaeus (Porphyrius 36: 209. 19–24).
On the cadents, succedents, and cardines as described by Hermes according to Timaeus (Porphyrius 35: 209. 12–13).
On the potent places according to the king (i.e., Nechepso).¹⁹
19. On the eastern and the western clime (Porphyrius 35: 209. 13–17).
20. On the conception-place of the Sun (Porphyrius 37: 210. 2–4).
On the conception-place of the Moon (Porphyrius 38: 210. 6–15). Antiochus is here quoted as giving two opinions, of which the second is that of Petosiris;²⁰ the first is also ascribed to Antiochus by Hephaestio.²¹
21. On the conception-ascendent (Porphyrius 38: 210. 15–21).
22. On the δωδεκατημόριον of the Moon (Porphyrius 39: 210. 23–24).
On the zodiacal signs which rise straight and crooked (cf. Porphyrius 41).
23. On the names and indications of the twelve places.
24. On the octatopos.
25. On the Lot of Fortune.
26. On the Lots indicating youth, middle age, and the end of life according to Hermes.
On the Lots indicating the father, the mother, the brothers, the husband, the wife, the children, the friends, and the slaves according to Hermes.
27. On other Lots.
28. On the difference between the lord of the house, the lord of the nativity, and the έπικρατήτωρ (Porphyrius 30: 206. 3–(208. 5)).
This chapter is incomplete in the συγκεφαλαίωσις; further chapters may have followed before the epitome of the second book. That second book probably belongs to a work other than Antiochus' Εισαγωγικά.

Epitome II

The fundamental epitome of the *Θησανυροί* of Antiochus, here entitled Epitome II, is preserved on folia 84–93v of Laurentianus 28, 34, a manuscript

18. The remaining chapters are misnumbered 19–29 in Cumont's edition.

19. E. Riess, "Nechepsonis et Petosiridis fragmenta magica," *Philologus*, suppl. 6 (1892): 327–94, and Pingree, "Petosiris."

20. Frag. 14a Riess; cf. Hephaestio II. 1. 2 = frag. 14b Riess and III. 10. 5 = frag. 14c Riess.

21. II. 1. 5–6.

of 170 folia written in the eleventh century.²² Epitome II is entitled 'Εκ τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν ἐπίλυσις καὶ διήγησις πάσης ἀστρονομικῆς τέχνης. Though some chapters cover topics dealt with in the *Εἰσαγωγικά*, a number of others are taken directly from Porphyrius, and one cites Paulus of Alexandria, who composed the second edition of his *Εἰσαγωγικά* in 378. Epitome II, then, was probably written in the fifth or sixth century; it is unclear how much of it is really based on Antiochus. It was edited, with variants from manuscripts containing Epitomes IIa, IIb, and IIIc, by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 1:140–64; following Epitome IIb he attributed it to Rhetorius. The contents of Epitome II are indicated here.

Preface. On why the zodiac begins with Aries. Οἱ παλαιοί (Nechepso and Petosiris?) are cited.

1. On the masculine and feminine zodiacal signs, and on the places and planets made masculine and feminine (cf. Porphyrius 40). Ptolemy is cited erroneously.²³
2. On the sects of the planets (cf. Epitome I. 1). Dorotheus is cited.²⁴
3. On the elemental characters of the zodiacal signs (cf. Epitome I. 2). Οἱ παλαιοί are cited.
4. On the zodiacal signs causing leprosy (cf. Epitome I. 2).
5. On the zodiacal signs causing lechery (cf. Epitome I. 2).
6. On the zodiacal signs harming the eyes (cf. Epitome I. 2).
7. On exaltations and dejections (cf. Epitome I. 3).
8. On the oppositions of the planets (cf. Epitome I. 3). This is also found on folia 143r–143v of Laurentianus 28, 34.
9. On the sect of the lords of the triplicities (cf. Epitome I. 3).
10. On the thirty-six decans, the stars that rise simultaneously with them, and their masks. This is Porphyrius 47.
11. On the powers of the bright fixed stars and of the stars rising simultaneously with them. This is Porphyrius 48.
12. On the terms according to the Egyptians and Ptolemy, and on the bright and shadowy degrees. This is Porphyrius 49.
13. On the rising-times in the seven climes. The beginning is based on Porphyrius 41, but the Epitome also cites the Egyptians and Valens.²⁵
14. On the zodiacal melothesia. This is Porphyrius 50.
15. On trine, quartile, and opposite signs, and unconnected signs that influence each other as in the case of opposites. This is Porphyrius 51.
16. On unconnected signs that have mutual sympathy (cf. Porphyrius 34).
17. On sympathetic and unsympathetic signs in quartile.
18. On the *δωδεκατημόρια* of the planets. Οἱ παλαιοί, Paulus in his *Εἰσαγωγή*,²⁶ Dorotheus,²⁷ and, erroneously, Ptolemy I. 26²⁸ are cited.
19. On the signs that hear and see each other (cf. Porphyrius 31 and 33).
20. On aspect (cf. Epitome I. 6).

22. *CCAG*, 1:60–72.

23. It is stated that Ptolemy calls a planet's conjunction with the Sun the *συνοδική φάσις*, but does not describe its power; in fact he confines the words *συνοδεύω*, *συνοδικός*, and *σύννοδος* to conjunctions of the Sun and the Moon, and he does describe their power.

24. *Frag.* I. 6. 2–5 Pingree.

25. Probably *Ἀνθολογία* I. 7 is meant.

26. *Εἰσαγωγικά* 22.

27. *Frag.* I. 8. 7 Pingree.

28. Actually the reference should be to I. 22; Epitome III reads I. 25.

21. On the casting of rays (cf. Epitome I. 13).
22. On the right and left sides (cf. Epitome I. 7).
23. On the *δορυφορία* of the planets (cf. Epitome I. 17).
24. On the *δορυφορία* of planets of the opposite sect (cf. Epitome I. 17).
25. On symphony.
26. On command (cf. Epitome I. 10).
27. On injury and the impotent places (cf. Epitome I. 17).
28. On the potent places (cf. Epitome I. 18).
29. On *ιδιοπροσωπία*.
30. On *μετοχή* (cf. Epitome I. 16).
31. On *ἀντανάλυσις* (cf. Epitome I. 16).
32. On mutual lordship (cf. Epitome I. 5).
33. On the lord of the house.
34. On *κόλλησις* (cf. Epitome I. 9).
35. On *συναφή* (cf. Epitome I. 9).
36. On *μεσεμβόλησις* (cf. Porphyrius 36).
37. On *παραλλαγή* (cf. Epitome I. 8).
38. On *σύνδεσμος*.
39. On *κενοδρομία* (cf. Epitome I. 11).
40. On *ὁμορόησις* (cf. Epitome I. 11).
41. On *ἐμπερίσχεσις* (cf. Epitome I. 12).
42. On the powerful planets.
43. On being *ἐν λαμπήναις ἰδίαις* (cf. Epitome I. 14).
44. On how the planets rejoice.
45. On the planets under the Sun's rays.
46. On the years of the cardines, the succedents, and the cadents. This is Porphyrius 52.
47. On the significance of the Lots.
48. The influences of the Lots. Dorotheus²⁹ is cited.
49. On the perfect and least years.
50. On how to know the linear differences (in rising-times) of the zodiacal signs and the hours of the climes.
51. On the greatest years and the complete revolutions of the seven planets. This is also found on folium 143v of Laurentianus 28, 34.
52. On the planets unconnected to the luminaries.
53. Influences of the *δορυφορίαι* of the Sun.

Epitome IIa

An extensive rewriting of selected chapters of Epitome II was produced by the School of John Abramius in about 1375,³⁰ and added, without title, to the collection which includes Epitome IV of Hephaestio.³¹ Epitome IIa utilizes chapters 1–12, 15–48, and 52–53 of Epitome II. It is preserved in eleven manuscripts, of which five were produced in the School of John Abramius.

Folia 127v–132 of Marcianus graecus 324, a manuscript of 324 folia copied in about 1380.³² This is Boll's manuscript o.

29. Frag. I. 15. 1 Pingree.

30. D. Pingree, "The Astrological School of John Abramius."

31. Hephaestio, vol. 2, pp. 135–347 in Pingree's edition.

32. *CCAG*, 2:4–16; Hephaestio, 2: xvi.

Folia 123–130 of Laurentianus 28, 14, a manuscript of 321 folia copied (with corrections) from Marcianus graecus 324 in the late fourteenth century.³³

Folia 190v–197 of Laurentianus 28, 13, a manuscript of 247 folia copied in the late fourteenth century.³⁴

Folia 204v–211 of Laurentianus 28, 16, a manuscript of 297 folia copied (with corrections) from Laurentianus 28, 13 by John Abramius in 1382.³⁵

Folia 37v–39v of Taurinensis C VII 10, a manuscript of 73 folia of which folia 1–51 were copied by Eleutherius Elius at Mytilene in 1389.³⁶ This manuscript, which apparently did not contain all of *Epitome IIa*, was destroyed in the fire at the Biblioteca Nazionale of Turin in 1904.

The remaining six manuscripts are derivative and need not be considered for a critical edition. They are:

Parisinus graecus 2501, a manuscript of 235 folia copied from Laurentianus 28, 13 in the fifteenth century.³⁷

Marcianus graecus 336, a manuscript of 332 folia copied from Laurentianus 28, 14 in the fifteenth century.³⁸ This is Boll's manuscript n.

Vaticanus Barbarinianus graecus 127, a manuscript of 337 folia copied from Laurentianus 28, 16 by Isidore of Kiev in the fifteenth century.³⁹

Parisinus graecus 2419, a manuscript of 342 folia which was, for the most part, copied from Marcianus graecus 324 by George Midiates in about 1461.⁴⁰ *Epitome IIa* is not complete in this manuscript.

Vindobonensis phil. gr. 287, a manuscript of 191 folia of which the part containing *Epitome IIa* was copied from Marcianus graecus 324 at the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century.⁴¹

Vindobonensis phil. gr. 108, a manuscript of 371 folia copied in the sixteenth century.⁴² It contains chapters 23–31 from *Epitome IIa* on folia 281v–282v.

Epitome IIb

Also based on the material in *Epitome II* is a selection of chapters—namely, the preface and 1, 3, 4, 7–10, 16, 17, 21, 23–44, 46, and 47—that is entitled *Ῥητορίου Ἐκθεσις καὶ ἐπίλυσις περὶ τε τῶν προειρημένων δώδεκα ζῳδίων καὶ περὶ ἐτέρων διαφόρων ἐκ τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν*. It ends *τέλος τῶν τοῦ Ῥητορίου*.

This is the only text in the whole complex of epitomes of Antiochus with which the name Rhetorius is connected, though he does appear in *Epitome IV*; the other evidence regarding this elusive author is assembled at

33. *CCAG*, 1: 20–37; Hephaestio, 2: xv.

34. *CCAG*, 1: 6–20; Hephaestio, 2: xiv.

35. *CCAG*, 1: 38–39; Hephaestio, 2: xv.

36. *CCAG*, 4: 5–15; Hephaestio, 2: xii.

37. *CCAG*, 8.2: 11–25; Hephaestio, 2: xii.

38. *CCAG*, 2: 70–73; Hephaestio, 2: xv.

39. *CCAG*, 5.4: 36–58; Hephaestio, 2: xv–xvi.

40. *CCAG*, 8.1: 20–63; Hephaestio, 2: xvi–xvii.

41. *CCAG*, 6: 51–53; Hephaestio, 2: xvii–xviii.

42. *CCAG*, 6: 1–16; Hephaestio, 1: xvii and 2: xx.

the end of this paper (pp. 220–23). *Epitome IIb* is preserved in nine manuscripts, of which the earliest was written in the fourteenth century.

Folia 170–174v of Laurentianus 28, 7, a manuscript of 176 folia copied in the fourteenth century.⁴³ This is Boll's manuscript a.

Folia 249v–252 of Marcianus graecus 335, a manuscript of 434 folia copied in the fifteenth century.⁴⁴ This is Boll's manuscript m; it contains only chapters 3, 4, 7 (incomplete), 8 (incomplete), 17, 21, 23–44, 46, and 47.

Folia 34–40v of Monacensis graecus 105, a manuscript of 345 folia copied in the sixteenth century.⁴⁵ This is Boll's manuscript q; it omits the preface and chapter 3.

Pages 75–84 of Monacensis graecus 170, a manuscript of 258 pages copied in the sixteenth century.⁴⁶ This is Boll's manuscript p.

Folia 207–212v of Vaticanus graecus 1444, a manuscript of 287 folia copied in the sixteenth century.⁴⁷ This is Boll's manuscript f.

Folia 115–120v of Parisinus graecus 1991, a manuscript of 142 folia copied in the fifteenth century.⁴⁸

Folia 1–7 of Vindobonensis phil. gr. 15, a manuscript of 212 folia copied in the fifteenth century.⁴⁹

Folia 36–43v of Ambrosianus R. 103. Sup., a manuscript of 339 folia copied in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁵⁰

Folia 1–28 of Parisinus graecus 2416, a manuscript of 33 folia copied in the seventeenth century.⁵¹

Epitome III

This epitome consists of all of *Epitome II* and excerpts from a text that was also used by the author of *Epitome IV*. Parts of this second text go back to the fifth, sixth, and early seventh centuries, while other parts were used by Theophilus of Edessa, who died in 785, in his (᾽Αποτελεσματικά). The original, then, was probably composed in the seventh century. It is preserved as Book 5 on folia 76–141 of Parisinus graecus 2425, the manuscript which contains *Epitome I*. Book 5 is entitled Ἐκ τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν ἐπίλυσις καὶ διήγησις πάσης ἀστρονομικῆς τέχνης. The general title of the first five books in this manuscript, on folium 8, is Τετράβιβλος καὶ ἕτερον βιβλίον τοῦ Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν; Books 1–4 consist of the Τετράβιβλος or Ἀποτελεσματικά of Ptolemy. The beginning of Book 6 in this manuscript, on folia 141v–165 and folia 1r–1v, contains some anonymous chapters that are, erroneously, attributed to Antiochus in *Epitome IIIc*. This and other features indicate that Books 5 and 6 form a unity, whose significance will become apparent.

The first part of *Epitome III* should be used in a critical edition of *Epitome II*; the second part contains the following chapters, many of which

43. *CCAG*, 1:3.

44. *CCAG*, 2:37–70; Hephaestio, 2:xiii–xiv.

45. *CCAG*, 7:5–7.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 7–8.

47. *CCAG*, 5.1:81–82.

48. *CCAG*, 8.1:3–7.

49. *CCAG*, 6:48.

50. *CCAG*, 3:20–21.

51. *CCAG*, 8.1:9.

(i.e., 54–98, 104, and 113–17) are edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 8.4:115–224.

54. Tabular inspection. Cites the Egyptians and Ptolemy.⁵² Cf. Theophilus 23.
 55. On childbirth. This is derived from Dorotheus.⁵³
 56. On the natives from the rulers of the day and of the hour.
 57. Influences in tabular form. A late conflation of material from Valens, Firmicus (or his source), Paulus, and others.⁵⁴ Uses Dorotheus⁵⁵ and Critodemus.
 58. On the power of the fixed stars. The longitudes of the stars are for A.D. 505. Cf. Epitome II. 11 = Porphyrius 48, and “Palchus” 135 edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 5.1:194–206; cf. also Theophilus 17 edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 5.1: 214–17.
 59. On the general configurations of the Moon.
 60. On the *δωδεκατημόρια*. Cf. Epitome II. 18; cf. also Theophilus 19.
 61. General configurations regarding injuries and diseases. Uses Dorotheus.⁵⁶
 62. On degrees injuring the eyes. Cf. “Palchus” 137 edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 5.1:208–211.
 63. On the bald.
 64. On the gouty.
 65. On madmen and epileptics. Cf. Theophilus 20.
 66. On lechers, drunkards, and homosexuals. Uses Dorotheus.⁵⁷
 67. On the places and degrees that produce lechers and homosexuals. Cf. “Palchus” 136 edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 5.1:206–7.
 68. On the decans that produce lechers.
 69. On the Sun.
 70. On the Moon.
 71. On Saturn.
 72. On Jupiter.
 73. On Mars.
 74. On Mercury.
 75. On the ascendant.
 76. On the lecherous zodiacal signs. Cf. Epitome II. 5.
 77. General configurations of those who die violently. Cf. Theophilus 22.
 78. General configurations of the banished. Uses Valens;⁵⁸ cf. Theophilus 23.
 79. On the phases of the Moon. Uses Valens.⁵⁹
 80. On the ascending and the descending node.
 81. General configurations of the fortunate.
 82. On profession and business. Uses Ptolemy.⁶⁰
 83. On the three planets indicating professions. Uses Ptolemy.⁶¹
 84. On crafts.
 85. On orators and teachers.
 86. On astrologers or diviners.
 87. On bath-attendants.
 88. On corpse-bearers.
52. 'Αποτελεσματικά III. 11. 6.
 53. Frag. I. 3. 1–7 Pingree.
 54. The interpretations proposed by F. Cumont, “Écrits hermétiques, 1: Sur les douze lieux de la sphère,” *RPh* 42 (1918): 63–79, appear untenable to me.
 55. Frag. I. 27. 5–24 Pingree.
 56. Frag. IV. 1. 66–111 Pingree.
 57. Frag. II. 7. 2–6 Pingree.
 58. 'Ανθολογίαι V. 1.
 59. 'Ανθολογίαι II. 34–35.
 60. 'Αποτελεσματικά IV. 4. 9–12.
 61. 'Αποτελεσματικά IV. 4. 2–8.

89. On architects or potters.
90. On drunkards, homosexuals, and magicians.
91. On carpenters, tanners, stonemasons, and gem-engravers.
92. On hound-leaders, falconers, bird-raisers, and painters.
93. On sailors and pilots.
94. On clothes-menders.
95. On engineers and jugglers.
96. On mimes.
97. On parents. Uses Dorotheus.
98. On parents of different origins.⁶²
99. On parricides, matricides, enemies of their parents, and outcasts.
100. On the longevity of the parents. Uses Ptolemy.⁶³
101. On the parents from conjunctions and full Moons.
102. On which of the parents dies first.
103. The number of children born previously. Uses Dorotheus.⁶⁴
104. On brothers, their friendship, and their numbers.
105. On the friendship of brothers. Uses Dorotheus.
106. On the third from the ascendent. Uses Dorotheus.
107. On older and younger brothers. Uses Dorotheus.
108. On the number of brothers. Uses Dorotheus.⁶⁵
109. On *συναφαί* and *ἀπόρροιαι*. Cf. Theophilus 24.
110. Example. Contains a horoscope that can be dated 24 February 601.⁶⁶
111. On *σύνδεσμος*. Cf. Epitome II. 38.
112. On *κενοδρομία*. Cf. Epitome II. 39 and Epitome I. 11 = Porphyrius 23.
113. Nativity of a grammarian. Contains a horoscope that can be dated 29 September 440, and refers to events that occurred as late as 488.⁶⁷
114. On his being a grammarian.
115. On his being a traitor. Cites Dorotheus.⁶⁸
116. On his lechery.
117. On the ascendancy of his fortune.

Epitome IIIa

A summary of Epitome III is preserved on folia 229v–232v of Parisinus graecus 2425; it is chapter 61 of Book 6, just preceding Epitome I. It is entitled *Συγκεφαλαίωσις τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν οἵτινες ἐπιλύσεις καὶ διηγήσεις τῆς ἀστρονομικῆς ἐπαγγέλλονται τέχνης*. It was edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 8.3: 104–110, and corresponds to Epitome III as indicated in table 1.

Epitome IIIb

Based on Epitome III, though with some additional material from Book 6 in Parisinus graecus 2425 and elsewhere, is Epitome IIIb, entitled *Ἐκ τῶν*

62. Epitome III. 97–98 = frag. I. 12. 15–I. 14. 6 Pingree.

63. *Ἀποτέλεσματικά* III. 5. 5–7.

64. Frag. I. 17. 1–11 Pingree.

65. Epitome III. 105–8 = frag. I. 18. 3–I. 21. 20 Pingree.

66. Dorotheus, p. xii of Pingree's edition.

67. Epitome III. 113–17 is edited in D. Pingree, "Political Horoscopes from the Reign of Zeno," *DOP* 30 (1977).

68. Frag. II. 15. 28 Pingree.

TABLE 1

EPITOME IIIA	EPITOME III
1	preface
2-34	1-33
35	34-35
35-66	36-66
67	68
68	69-75
69-76	76-83
77	84-96
78-84	97-103
85	104-8
86	109
87-88	111-12
89	113-17
90	omitted*

* Conjectured by Cumont to be the horoscope following Epitome IV. 28.

Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν ἐπίλυσις καὶ διήγησις πάσης ἀστρονομικῆς τέχνης. It is to be found in four manuscripts, of which the earliest is dated to the late fourteenth century.

- A: folia 107-125 of Monacensis graecus 287, a manuscript of 164 folia copied in the late fourteenth century.⁶⁹ This is Boll's manuscript r.
 B: folia 41-54, of Vindobonensis phil. gr. 179, a manuscript of 135 folia copied at the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century.⁷⁰
 C: folia 42-55 of Mutinensis graecus 85, a manuscript of 100 folia copied from the same original as B by Michael Suliardus in the fifteenth century.⁷¹
 Oxoniensis Holkhamicus 292, a manuscript of 235 folia copied from A in 1428.⁷²

Epitome IIIb bears the following relations to Epitome III, in so far as can be determined at present.

- IIIb. 1-3 corresponds to III. preface and 1-2.
 IIIb. 4 corresponds to III. 4-6.
 IIIb. 5-7 corresponds to III. 7-9.
 IIIb. 8 corresponds to III. 10 with an addition from Heliodorus.⁷³ Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 1:150-51.
 IIIb. 9-10 corresponds to III. 11-12.
 IIIb. 11 corresponds to III. 15.
 IIIb. 12 corresponds to III. 16-17.
 IIIb. 13 corresponds to III. 19 and 22.
 IIIb. 14 corresponds to III. 23.
 IIIb. 15 corresponds to III. 29 with an addition.
 IIIb. 16 corresponds to III. 48 abbreviated.
 IIIb. 17 corresponds to III. 47 abbreviated and with an addition.

69. *CCAG*, 7:8-24.

70. *CCAG*, 6:28-35.

71. *CCAG*, 4:28-33.

72. *CCAG*, 9.2:65-77.

73. Heliodorus 5 on B folia 66v-68, edited by D. Bassi and E. Martini in *CCAG*, 4:152-54.

IIIb. 18 corresponds to III. 53.

IIIb. 19 corresponds to III. 62. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:111–12.

IIIb. 20 corresponds to III. 63–67. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:112–13.

IIIb. 21 corresponds to III. 56 and 59 with an addition from Heliodorus.⁷⁴ Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:113–15.

IIIb. 22 corresponds to III. 68–76. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:115–16.

IIIb. 23 corresponds to III. 79–80. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:116–17.

IIIb. 24 corresponds to III. 85–96. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:117–18.

The remainder of Epitome IIIb consists of material derived from Book 6 in Parisinus graecus 2425, which we will hereafter call R, and from elsewhere.⁷⁵ Of the three manuscripts, B is the closest to R, while Epitome IIIb. xii dates the version in A and C to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. Although it has previously been considered to contain genuine fragments of Antiochus—even by the author of Epitome IIIc—in fact there is no reason to assume his authorship except in the case of Epitome IIIb. xvi.

IIIb. i. On the motion of the Sun from sign to sign. A folium 117, C folia 55r–55v. This corresponds to 6. 1 in R, folium 141v. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:118. Uses Paulus of Alexandria⁷⁶ and Ptolemy.⁷⁷

IIIb. ii. On the phases of the five planets with respect to the Sun. A folia 117r–117v, C folia 55v–56. Cf. the title of 6. 2 in R. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:118–19. It is Paulus of Alexandria 14.

IIIb. iii. On the degrees and minutes for the phases and stations of the five planets. A folia 117v–119v, C folia 56–58. This corresponds to 6. 2 in R, folia 141v–144. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:119–22.⁷⁸ It is closely related to Scholium XIV of the *Scholia to the "Handy Tables"* compiled in the late fifth or early sixth century.⁷⁹

IIIb. iv. Different scholia on astrological treatises. A folium 119v, C folia 58r–58v; cf. Heliodorus 4 in B folia 66r–66v. This corresponds to 6. 3 in R, folia 144r–144v. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:122.

IIIb. v. On the obliquity of the Sun and the Moon. A folia 120–121, C folium 59. This corresponds to 6. 3 in R, folia 145v and 151.

IIIb. vi. On solar and lunar eclipses. A folia 121–125, B folia 55–57v and 118r–118v, C folia 59v–66. This corresponds to 6. 3 in R, folia 151v–155. Cites Ptolemy's *Almagest*.

IIIb. vii. Figures illustrating the heavens with explanatory texts. A folia 125v and 126v–127v, B folia 58–60, C folia 66–67 and 68r–68v. Partly this corresponds to 6. 6 in R, folia 155v and 1.

IIIb. viii. On the suffering from a solar eclipse. A folia 126r–126v, C folia 67–68. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:123–24. Cites Ammon.

IIIb. ix. Table of the four winds and the twenty-four steps. A folium 125v, B folium 60v. This corresponds to 6. 6 in R, folium 1v. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:128.

74. Heliodorus 8 on B folia 68v–69.

75. I use lower case roman numerals for the chapters in this part of Epitome IIIb and for the chapters of Epitome IIIc as a convenient way of indicating that they are unlike the chapters to which arabic numerals are given in two respects. The roman-numbered chapters are not numbered at all in the manuscripts; and they are not presented in the same order from one manuscript to another.

76. *Εἰσαγωγικά* 28.

77. *Ἀποτέλεσματικά* I. 4. 1.

78. See O. Neugebauer, "On a Fragment of Heliodorus (?) on Planetary Motion," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 42 (1958): 237–44.

79. A. Tihon, "Les scolies des *Tables Faciles* de Ptolémée," *BIBR* 43 (1973): 49–110.

Falsely ascribed to Antiochus in Epitome IIIc. vii. It is also found on folium 81v of Vindobonensis phil. gr. 190, a manuscript of 307 folia copied in the fifteenth century.⁸⁰

- IIIb. x. On the stars rising and setting heliacally in the twelve months of the year. The first part of a larger chapter in A, folia 127v–132; B chapter 41 (now lost); the first part of a larger chapter in C, folia 68v–74v. This corresponds to the second part of 6. 7 in R, folia 162v–165v. It is ascribed without solid foundation to Antiochus in Epitome IIIc. viii, and in the edition by F. Boll, *Griechische Kalender*, 1: *Das Kalendarium des Antiochus* (Heidelberg, 1910). It is also found, anonymously, on folia 29–30v of Vaticanus graecus 1056, a manuscript of 244 folia copied from a twelfth-century exemplar in the fourteenth century.⁸¹
- IIIb. xi. On the stars rising simultaneously with the twelve zodiacal signs. The second part of the chapter in A, folia 127v–132; B chapter 40 (now lost); the second part of the chapter in C, folia 68v–74v. Edited by F. Boll, *Sphaera* (Leipzig, 1903), pages 57–58. It is also found on folia 28–29 of Vaticanus graecus 1056.
- IIIb. xii. A version, beginning with January, of the *Verses for the Twelve Months* written by Theodore Prodromus in the twelfth century and edited by B. Keil, “Die Monatscylen der byzantinischen Kunst in spätgriechischer Literatur,” *WS* 11 (1889): 94–142, esp. 110–15. The third part of the chapter in A, folia 127v–132; the third part of the chapter in C, folia 68v–74v.
- IIIb. xiii. On the calends. A folia 132–133, B folium 123 (ascribed to Antiochus), C folium 74v. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7: 126. The ascription of this text, at least in its present form, to Antiochus is rendered extremely doubtful by the fact that it calls Saturday *σάββατον*.
- IIIb. xiv. On the heliacal rising of Sirius. A folium 133, B chapter 42 (now lost), C folia 74v–75. This is ascribed to Zoroaster in the *Geoponica*,⁸² falsely to Antiochus in Epitome IIIc. ix.
- IIIb. xv. On the Moon’s contacts with the seven planets. A folia 100–102, B folia 61v–64, C folia 33–35v. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7: 107–111. This is falsely ascribed to Antiochus in Epitome IIIc. x. It is also found, anonymously, on folia 132v–133v of Parisinus graecus 2506;⁸³ on folia 76v–78v of Vaticanus graecus 1290, a manuscript of 94 folia copied from A or C in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century;⁸⁴ and on folia 82–83 of Vindobonensis phil. gr. 190.
- IIIb. xvi. On the seven planets in an epitome from the writings of Antiochus. B folia 64–65. Edited by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7: 127–28. This is identical with Epitome I. 1, from which it is directly derived; see F. Cumont, “Antiochus d’Athènes et Porphyre,” pages 149–54. It is also found on folium 83 of Vindobonensis phil. gr. 190.

Epitome IIIc

Closely related to Epitome III, and especially to Epitome IIIb, is a series of excerpts preserved in three manuscripts.

T: Oxoniensis Seldenianus 16, a manuscript of 212 folia copied in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.⁸⁵

80. *CCAG*, 6: 50–51.

81. *CCAG*, 5.3: 7–64; Hephaestio, 1: xvi–xvii and 2: xxi–xxiii.

82. *Geoponica* I. 8, which equals Zoroaster fragment O 40 in J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, 2 vols. (Paris 1938), 2: 178–81.

83. See p. 216, on Epitome IV.

84. *CCAG*, 5.1: 79–81.

85. *CCAG*, 9.1: 62–74.

S: Neapolitanus II C 33, a manuscript of 530 folia copied by John Xerocaltus in 1495.⁸⁶

Cantabrigiensis Collegii Sanctae Trinitatis O. 7. 39, a manuscript of 97 folia copied by E(dward?) B(ernard?) for Thomas Gale from various manuscripts, including T, in the seventeenth century.⁸⁷

The compilation in S and T, part of which goes back to the middle of the twelfth century,⁸⁸ is notorious for its false ascriptions. Unfortunately its attributions to Antiochus of the last five chapters listed here (IIIc. vi–x) have been taken seriously by modern scholars.

IIIc. i corresponds to III. 2; cf. IIIb. 3. T folium 145v, S folium 433. Ascribed to Antiochus.

IIIc. ii corresponds to III. 7; cf. IIIb. 5. T folium 143 (cf. folium 115v), S folia 432r–432v. Ascribed to Antiochus.

IIIc. iii corresponds to III. 8; cf. IIIb. 6. T folium 143v.

IIIc. iv corresponds to III. 10; cf. IIIb. 8. T folium 144.

IIIc. v corresponds to III. 52. T folium 106, S folium 388v.

IIIc. vi corresponds to IIIb. 22. T folium 154v. Ascribed to Antiochus.

IIIc. vii corresponds to IIIb. ix. S folium 379. Ascribed to Antiochus.

IIIc. viii corresponds to IIIb. x. T folia 147–149. Ascribed to Antiochus.

IIIc. ix corresponds to IIIb. xiv. T folium 149, S folium 433v. Ascribed to Antiochus.

Edited by D. Bassi and E. Martini in *CCAG*, 4:154–55.

IIIc. x corresponds to IIIb. xv. T folia 146–146v. Ascribed to Antiochus.

Epitome IV

Chapters 1–11 and 24–28 of this epitome are based on the same seventh-century source that was utilized in the second part of Epitome III and in the (᾿Αποτελεσματικά) of Theophilus. In chapter 2 it refers to the year 600 of the era of Diocletian, which is A.D. 884, when an initial version of Epitome IV must have been written. Other material in the Paris manuscript is from the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, transmitted through the intermediary of a late eleventh-century compiler.⁸⁹ The astrologer of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries is perhaps identical with the Demophilus who cast the horoscope of Constantinople in about 990 and who was familiar with the works of Dorotheus, Ptolemy, Valens, and Porphyrius.⁹⁰ They are also among the sources of Epitome IV. It was perhaps Demophilus who inserted the references to chapters and books of Valens' Ἀρθολογίαι which reflect the confused state of that text as it is preserved in the extant manuscripts.

Epitome IV is preserved in four manuscripts.

Folia 1–24v of Parisinus graecus 2506, a manuscript of 216 folia copied at the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁹¹

86. *CCAG*, 4:49–63.

87. *CCAG*, 9.2:45–48.

88. Hephaestio, 2:xix–xx.

89. D. Pingree, *Albumasaris* “*De revolutionibus nativitatum*” (Leipzig, 1968), p. ix; Hephaestio, 2:v–viii; Dorotheus, pp. xiii–xiv.

90. D. Pingree, “The Horoscope of Constantinople.”

91. *CCAG*, 8.1:74–115 and the references in n. 89.

Folia 100–115 of Marcianus graecus 335, a manuscript of 434 folia copied in the fifteenth century.⁹² This omits chapter 1, though it appears elsewhere in the manuscript.

Parisinus graecus 2424, a manuscript of 241 folia, in great part copied from Parisinus graecus 2506 at the end of the fourteenth century.⁹³

Parisinus graecus 2420, a manuscript of 259 folia, copied from Parisinus graecus 2424 by Christopher Auer in 1550.⁹⁴

The relation of Epitome IV to Epitome III is here summarized.

IV. 1 corresponds to III. 57. This is falsely ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus on folia 28–40 of Marcianus graecus 335; on folia 159–175 of Erlangensis 1227, a manuscript of 283 folia copied in the fifteenth century;⁹⁵ and on folia 48–49v of Berolinensis graecus 173, a manuscript of 204 folia copied in the fifteenth century.⁹⁶

IV. 2 corresponds to III. 58. Written in A.D. 884. Edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 5.1:219–26.

IV. 3 corresponds to III. 59–60. This is repeated on folia 142v–145 of Parisinus graecus 2506.

IV. 4 corresponds to III. 61–62. Cites Valens.⁹⁷

IV. 5 corresponds to III. 64.

IV. 6 corresponds to III. 65.

IV. 7 corresponds to III. 66–76.

IV. 8 corresponds to III. 77.

IV. 9 corresponds to III. 78.

IV. 10 corresponds to III. 79–80.

IV. 11 corresponds to III. 81. Cites Valens.⁹⁸

Chapters 12–22 form a group that does not appear in Epitome III, but which does contain fifth- and sixth-century horoscopes (and is therefore probably based on a lost sixth-century source), and is followed by the only reference to Rhetorius (in chapter 23) that is found in any of our epitomes other than Epitome IIb. Chapters 12–22 are edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 8.1:220–48. The technical terms are frequently in error.

IV. 12. How to find the centers of the twelve places in degrees. Cites Ptolemy⁹⁹ and mentions the Egyptians and Valens. Contains a horoscope dated 8 September 428.¹⁰⁰

IV. 13. On the years of life according to all the rulers and lords of the houses. Cites (Ptolemy).¹⁰¹

92. *CCAG*, 2:37–70, and Hephaestio, 2:xiii–xiv.

93. *CCAG*, 8.1:69–74.

94. *Ibid.*, pp. 63–64.

95. *CCAG*, 7:73–76; Hephaestio, 2:xvi.

96. *CCAG*, 7:48–63.

97. *Ἀνθολογίαι* II. 36 and I. 2.

98. *Ἀνθολογίαι* IX. 1.

99. *Ἀποτελεσματικά* III. 11. 3.

100. O. Neugebauer and H. B. Van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes* (Philadelphia, 1959), pp. 138–40. This horoscope was known in Arabic in the late eighth century; see E. S. Kennedy and D. Pingree, *The Astrological History of Māshā'allāh* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 172–73.

101. *Ἀποτελεσματικά* III. 11. 12.

- IV. 14. How to find the ninety time-degrees between the midheaven and the ascendant on one side, the descendant on the other. Contains a horoscope dated 1 May 516.¹⁰²
- IV. 15. On transit. Contains a horoscope dated December 400/January 401¹⁰³ and another dated 2 April 488.¹⁰⁴
- IV. 16. How to investigate the years of life. Cites Valens¹⁰⁶ and mentions Ptolemy, the Egyptians, and Phnaes the Egyptian. The last name Demophilus would have known from Porphyrius 51.
- IV. 17. On the lord of a house. Mentions Valens.
- IV. 18. On the ἀναιρέτης. Cites Valens.¹⁰⁶
- IV. 19. On nativities without an οἰκοδεσπότης according to Valens. Contains a horoscope dated 21 March 482.¹⁰⁷
- IV. 20. On the ἐπικρατήτωρ. Cites Dorotheus.¹⁰⁸
- IV. 21. On the divisions of the years. Cites Dorotheus,¹⁰⁹ Valens,¹¹⁰ and Antigonus; the latter's name Demophilus would have found with Phnaes' in Porphyrius 51. Mentions Ptolemy and the Egyptians.
- IV. 22. How to cast horoscopes. Mentions Dorotheus, Valens, Ptolemy, the Egyptians, and Teucer the Babylonian; the latter's name Demophilus would have found in Porphyrius 47. This chapter is also found on folium 73v of Parisinus graecus 2506; on folium 170 of Marcianus graecus 335; on folia 240v–242v of Vaticanus graecus 191, a manuscript of 397 folia written in about 1300;¹¹¹ on folium 103 of Parisinus graecus 2507, a manuscript of 206 folia copied, in large part from Vaticanus graecus 191, by Isidore of Kiev in the fifteenth century;¹¹² and on folia 26v–30 of the second part of Scorialensis II-Ψ-17, a manuscript of 65 folia copied in the fifteenth century.¹¹³
- IV. 23. On conception. From the writings of Rhetorius. Edited by A. Olivieri in *CCAG*, 2:186–87. It is also found on folium 103v of Parisinus graecus 2507.

The remainder of Epitome IV seems again to be derived from the same seventh-century text that is the source of the second part of Epitome III. These chapters are edited by A. Olivieri in *CCAG*, 2:187–92.

- IV. 24 corresponds to III. 97 and 99–101. Mentions Valens IV and Antigonus.
- IV. 25 corresponds to III. 102.
- IV. 26 corresponds to III. 104–5. The first part, corresponding to III. 104, is also edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 8.4:220–21.
- IV. 27 corresponds to III. 82–83. Cites Anubio and Ptolemy.
- IV. 28 corresponds to III. 53 with the addition of a quotation from Dorotheus.¹¹⁴

102. Neugebauer–Van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes*, pp. 157–58.

103. *Ibid.*, pp. 132–35.

104. *Ibid.*, pp. 150–52.

105. 'Ανθολογίαι "VI. 2, VII. 4–6, and III. 5 and 8" are the references in the text of Epitome IV; these are VI. 1, VII. 3–5, and III. 3 and 11 in Kroll.

106. 'Ανθολογίαι "VI. 10," which is VI. 8 Kroll.

107. Neugebauer–Van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes*, p. 146.

108. *Frag.* III. 2. 5–7 Pingree.

109. *Frag.* IV. 1. 1–7 Pingree.

110. 'Ανθολογίαι "VII. 6 and IV," which are VII. 5 and IV. 25 Kroll.

111. *CCAG*, 5.2:3–23; A. Turyn, *Codices Graeci Vaticani saeculis XIII et XIV scripti* (Vatican City, 1964), pp. 89–97; and Pingree, *Albumasar*, pp. ix–x.

112. *CCAG*, 8.4:45–65, and Pingree, *Albumasar*, pp. xi–xii.

113. *CCAG*, 11.2:27–35.

114. *Frag.* I. 27. 43 Pingree.

There follows on folium 25 of Parisinus graecus 2506, between Epitome IV and Epitome I of Hephaestio,¹¹⁵ a horoscope which is dated 25 April 464.¹¹⁶ Edited by F. Cumont in *CCAG*, 8.4:224–25, who suggests that it corresponds to Epitome IIIa. 90.

Epitome V

A final compendium of material derived from Valens, from the seventh-century source of Epitomes III and IV, and from other sources, is the lost Greek original of the *Liber Hermetis*,¹¹⁷ which was probably put together in the ninth or tenth century and translated into Latin in the thirteenth. The text contains the following chapters.

- V. 1. On the thirty-six decans of the twelve signs, their forms, and their climates, and the faces which the planets have in them. This is the only “Hermetic” chapter in the *Liber Hermetis*; cf. the *Ἱερὰ βιβλος* edited by C.-E. Ruelle, “Hermès Trismégiste: Le livre sacré sur les décans,” *RPh* 32 (1908): 247–77.
- V. 2. On masculine and feminine degrees of the signs. Cf. 6. 18 in R, folium 173.
- V. 3. On the bright stars in each of the signs. Cf. 6. 17 in R, folium 173.
- V. 4 corresponds to Valens V. 1.
- V. 5–7 correspond to Valens V. 2.
- V. 8. Cf. Valens V. 6 and IV. 28.
- V. 9. Cf. Valens V. 7 and IV. 29.
- V. 10–13 corresponds to Valens V. 5–8.
- V. 14. On the twelve places. Originally in Valens.
- V. 15 corresponds to Valens V. 12.
- V. 16 corresponds to Epitome III. 54.
- V. 17. Cf. Valens II. 38. Cites Dorotheus.¹¹⁸
- V. 18. Judgment concerning marriage. This is a fragment of the interpretation of a horoscope which has not yet been identified.
- V. 19–20 corresponds to Epitome III. 97–98.
- V. 21. Cf. Epitome III. 101. Cites Dorotheus.¹¹⁹
- V. 22 corresponds to Valens II. 30.
- V. 23 corresponds to Valens IV. 6.
- V. 24 corresponds to Paulus of Alexandria 7.
- V. 25. On the fixed stars, in which degrees of the signs they rise. Cf. Epitome III. 58. Cites Ptolemy, the *Sphaera barbarica*, and Dorotheus.¹²⁰
- V. 26. On the twelve places and the significance of the planets when they are found in them at nativities. Cf. Epitome III. 57.
- V. 27. On the ἀπόρροιαί of the Moon. Cf. Firmicus IV. 9–15.
- V. 28. On the συναφαί of the Moon. Cf. Valens I. 22.
- V. 29 corresponds to Epitome III. 59.
- V. 30 corresponds to Epitome III. 103.

115. Hephaestio, 2:1–46.

116. Neugebauer–Van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes*, pp. 141–42; D. Pingree, “Political Horoscopes from the Reign of Zeno.”

117. Edited by W. Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Hermes Trismegistos* (Munich, 1936). On the question of the date, see D. Pingree, “The Indian Iconography of the Decans and Horās,” *JWI* 26 (1963): 227, n. 31.

118. Frag. II. 1–II. 4 Pingree.

119. Frag. App. II. E. 1 Pingree (p. 433).

120. Frag. IV. 109 Pingree. On this chapter of the *Liber Hermetis*, see W. Hübner, “Die Paranatelonten im *Liber Hermetis*,” *Sudhoffs Archiv* 59 (1975): 387–414.

- V. 31. On the mutual separation and conjunction of the five planets and the Sun. Cf. Firmicus VI. 22–27 and Dorotheus II. 18–19.
 V. 32. On the signs in which the planets are located. Cf. Firmicus V. 5–6 and Dorotheus II. 28–33.
 V. 33. On the ἀπόρροιαί and κenoδρομία of the Moon. Cf. Firmicus IV. 15.
 V. 34. On the terms of the planets. Cf. Firmicus V. 2.
 V. 35. On the power of the triplicities and the years of life.
 V. 36. On those who die violently. Cf. Firmicus VII. 23.
 V. 37 equals V. 30 with the addition of a translation of the end of Epitome III. 48.

The Fragments of Rhetorius

Aside from his apparently unwarranted association with Epitome IIb and his authorship of Epitome IV. 23, Rhetorius is an exceedingly shadowy figure. Berolinensis graecus 173, which preserves Epitome IV. 1 on folia 48–49v, contains the following texts on folia 139–146v:

Folia 139–144v: Ῥητορίου Θεσαυρὸς συνέχων τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἀστρονομίας.

Folia 144v–145v: Περὶ τῆς τῶν πλανωμένων ἀστέρων φύσεως καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ ὧν κυριεῖται μελῶν ἕκαστος καὶ τί σημαίνει.

Folia 145v–146v: Ἐπίλυσις καὶ διήγησις πάντων τῶν προειρημένων.

The third of these is Epitome IIIb. 1 (it is Boll's manuscript s); the first two were published as Rhetorius' excerpts from Teucer of Babylon by F. Boll in *CCAG*, 7:192–224. His reason for asserting this is that variant versions are also included on folia 249–258 of Vindobonensis phil. gr. 108, immediately following a version of Epitome II. 1 but with the first chapter ascribed to Teucer of Babylon. But they are anonymous on folia 232v–239 of Vaticanus graecus 191, from which the second chapter was excerpted by Isidore of Kiev,¹²¹ and on folia 133v–135 of Oxoniensis Seldenianus 16. It was demonstrated by Boll¹²² that the first chapter was one of the sources of John Camaterus in his *Εἰσαγωγή*¹²³ dedicated to the emperor Manuel I (1143–80), in his lists of stars rising simultaneously with the zodiacal signs (verses 156–1724); Camaterus cites as one of his sources (verses 92–96)

σοφὸς τις ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν βήτωρ πεπυκνωμένος,
 Ῥητόριος Αἰγύπτιος οὕτως ὠνομασμένος,
 πρὸς ἐπιστήμην ἔμπειρος τῆς τῶν ἀστρων πορείας,
 ἐνέγραψεν ἐπίσημα (ἐν τῷ) προχείρῳ λόγῳ
 πρῶτον περὶ τὴν κίνησιν τῶν δώδεκα ζῳδίων.

Cf. also line 1287. It appears, then, that chapter 1 at least was already ascribed to Rhetorius “the Egyptian” in the twelfth century, when he was regarded as “one of the ancients.” The version of the text in the Berlin manuscript, which often differs considerably from the conflated text published by Boll, is probably from the pen of Rhetorius. That he is called an

121. Pingree, *Albumasar*, pp. 245–73.

122. *Sphaera*, pp. 11–30.

123. L. Weigl (ed.), *Johannes Kamateros* (Würzburg, 1907).

Egyptian and one of the ancients would, if it is true, support the hypothesis that he flourished in the sixth or seventh century.

The two manuscripts which preserve Epitome IV, Parisinus graecus 2506 on folium 77 and Marcianus graecus 335 on folium 174, contain an excerpt from the end of Epitome III. 100 that is ascribed to Rhetorius (the first part of Epitome III. 100 is derived from Ptolemy 'Αποτελεσματικά III. 5. 5–7). This excerpt, entitled 'Ρητορίου πόθεν δέει ἐκβάλλειν τὰ ἔτη ἐπὶ τῆς (περὶ) γονέων σκέψεως, is edited by A. Olivieri in *CCAG*, 2:212–13. If Rhetorius was able to make an excerpt from the source of the second part of Epitome III, then he must be dated in the seventh century or later. The inclusion of a chapter by him in Epitome IV (IV. 23) would indicate a *terminus ante quem* of either the late ninth (IV. 2) or the late tenth (Demophilus) century; but his odd name (it is entirely absent from Pauly-Wissowa, and would scarcely be expected in the middle Byzantine period) and his being an Egyptian, if that nationality is correctly applied to him, would be more plausible if he flourished in the middle of the seventh century rather than in the ninth or tenth.

In Book 6 of Parisinus graecus 2425 several other works of Rhetorius are to be found. Chapters 17 and 18 on folium 173 are:

Περὶ λαμπρῶν καὶ σκιερῶν μοιρῶν κατὰ 'Ρητόριον.

A tabular form of the latter half of Epitome III. 12; cf. also Epitome V. 3.

'Αρσενικῶν καὶ θηλυκῶν μοιρῶν τῶν ζφθίων κατὰ 'Ρητόριον.

A tabular form of, probably, part of Epitome III. 1; cf. also Epitome V. 2. Both of these chapters are found on folia 135–135v of Oxoniensis Seldenianus 16.

The latter part of chapter 23 of Book 6 on folia 180–181 is "Ἀλλως περὶ καταρχῆς κατὰ 'Ρητόριον. Like much of Book 6 (e.g., chapters 5, 8, 14–16, the first part of 23, 42–48, and 50), this also was used by Eleutherius Elius *alias* Zebelenus when he composed the compendium falsely ascribed to "Palchus" in the 1380s. Many of the same chapters of "Palchus" along with others are found in the compendium on folia 1–148 of Parisinus graecus 2506 and folia 100 sqq. of Marcianus graecus 335, the manuscripts which preserve Epitome IV. This leads one to suspect that there was a common ancestor of Books 5 and 6 in Parisinus graecus 2425 and of the material on folia 1–148 of Parisinus graecus 2506, though into the latter an early eleventh century redactor (perhaps Demophilus) has inserted such things as Epitome I of Hephaestio.

If this much be granted, it becomes plausible further to suggest that this common ancestor (larger than either descendent) was compiled by Rhetorius in the early seventh century, and that he was the caster of the horoscope of 601 in Epitome III. 110. If this hypothesis be accepted, one can more easily understand how Rhetorius' name became associated with Epitome IIb, which could have been derived from the first part of Epitome III as easily as from Epitome II, and how Epitome IV came to contain chapter 23, which is ascribed to Rhetorius, and chapter 28, which is from the first part of Epitome III.

The existence of Epitome II as an independent text indicates that the Ἐκ τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν was in existence before the seventh century (it was written after ca. 400) and was incorporated bodily into his compendium by Rhetorius. Rhetorius' other sources include the early sixth-century compendium that appears as chapters 54–117 of Epitome III; the astronomical compendium in chapters 1–7 of Book 6 (cf. Epitome IIIb. i–xvi), which utilizes the late fifth- or early sixth-century *Scholia to the "Handy Tables"*; Paulus of Alexandria (378); and Eutocius' Ἀστρολογούμενα, which contains a horoscope dated 28 October 497.¹²⁴

The compendium on folia 1–148 of Parisinus graecus 2506, which I suspect to be the work of Demophilus, utilizes a ninth-century redaction of Rhetorius' compendium, to which has been added (perhaps already by Rhetorius) the fifth-century material in Epitome IV. 12–22. The early eleventh-century compiler, who may be Demophilus, has also intermixed in his earlier source Epitome I of Hephaestio and chapters derived from Theophilus of Edessa, Leo the Philosopher, and Abū Ma'shar.

Another manuscript which contains a compendium in part derived from the one here ascribed to Rhetorius is Vaticanus graecus 1056. This contains Epitome III. 55, ascribed to Dorotheus, and Epitome IIIb. x and IIIb. xi. It also preserves Epitome II of Hephaestio,¹²⁵ Theophilus, and Abū Ma'shar, which link it with Parisinus graecus 2506. And it presents, on folia 155v–156v, a collection of excerpts headed Παρεξεβλήθησαν κεφάλαια διάφορα σοφῶν πολλῶν ἀπὸ διαφόρων βιβλίων ἀποδεικνύοντα τὸ εἶναι καλὴν καὶ μὴ ἐναντίαν τὴν σύνοδον τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τοῦ Κρόνου. Of these, one that is ascribed to Rhetorius and derived by him from Dorotheus¹²⁶ is edited by J. Heeg in *CCAG*, 5.3: 124–25 (note that lines 3–16 on page 125 are *not* from Rhetorius, but directly from Dorotheus).¹²⁷ Otherwise this manuscript, though filled with fascinating material (in large part translated from Arabic), overlaps only in scattered chapters with the contents of Parisinus graecus 2506.

Conclusions

The edition of Rhetorius, then, that I am preparing will consist of the following compendia:

1. Books 5 (Epitome III) and 6 on folia 76–238 and folium 1 of Parisinus graecus 2425 (Books 1–4, which correspond to the Ἀποτελεσματικά of Ptolemy, constitute a unique recension of that text whose readings are recorded in the edition by Boll and Boer).¹²⁸
- 1a. Epitome IIb.
- 1b. Epitome IIIb.
- 1c. Epitome IIIc.

124. Neugebauer–Van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes*, pp. 152–57.

125. Hephaestio, 2:47–125.

126. *Frag.* II. 14. 4 Pingree.

127. *Frag.* II. 18. 2–3 and IV. 213 Pingree.

128. Ἀποτελεσματικά, pp. x–xi.

2. The material on folia 1–25 (Epitome IV) and 26–148 of Parisinus graecus 2506, excluding the chapters from Epitome I of Hephaestio which have already been edited.
3. The chapters of the *Liber Hermetis* that are derived from Rhetorius.
4. Fragments from other sources.¹²⁹

In all cases, of course, variant readings from other relevant manuscripts should be included. It is necessary, however, to distinguish carefully the three main epitomes and three secondary epitomes outlined above, in order to maintain a correct view of the history of the text. The mixed texts that have hitherto been published are the creations of modern editors, and never existed previously. We cannot get back to Rhetorius' original, but we will have a better chance of discussing that original intelligently if we are provided with the texts that, either partially or wholly, are derived from it.

An edition of Antiochus need include only Epitomes I, II, and IIa, together with the fragments in Arabic.

Brown University

129. I do not believe that the Old Slavic text discussed by W. Benešević, "Spuren der Werke des Ägypters Rhetorios, des Livius Andronicus und des Ovidius in altslawischer Übersetzung," *BZ* 25 (1925): 310–12, has anything to do with our Rhetorius. Despite its title, the fragment does not bear any similarity to IIIb. xiii. The identity of the rhetor of Antioch who was familiar with some Latin authors (perhaps in Greek translation) remains obscure.