no new meaningful content (since departing from a note is necessarily entailed by ascending from it), but the emendation makes more sense than σύστασιν does and does not steer the final clause towards pertaining to *parhypatê*, which would sit poorly with its characterization as ἐλαφρόν. The resulting interpretation of passage does leave implicit why it is harder to ascend from *parhypatê*; considering, however, that the continuation of problem four devolves into an extremely corrupted state, it is entirely possible that the original explanation pertaining to *parhypatê* has been lost.

Emending σύστασιν to ἀπόστασιν obviates the temptation to follow Jan and edit an ascent (τὸ ἄνω βάλλειν) into a descent (τὸ ἀναχαλᾶν). It also better accounts for τὸ ἄνω βάλλειν than Ruelle's emendation does. Furthermore, my emendation is supported by the Latin tradition. It seems likely that Bartholomew of Messina consulted a Greek manuscript that read ἀπόστασιν when he prepared his Latin translation, the oldest extant translation of the text:

propter quid secundum hanc difficulter ypaten facile etiam diuisio alterius? aut quia cum remissione ypate et simul post dimissionem leue sursum proicere?[11]

Of the fifty-two extant manuscripts of Bartholomew's translation, eighteen, including all those from what Coucke calls the 'Independent Tradition' (which he identifies as 'a superior branch of the tradition') read *dimissionem*.[12] In sum, not only does my newly proposed emendation lead to a stronger interpretation of the text, it also is supported by the evidence of the Latin manuscript tradition.

Max Planck Institute for Empirical Aesthetics CALEB MUTCH
caleb.mutch@ae.mpg.de
doi:10.1017/S0009838824000843

ORPHICA FR. 779D, V. 5 BERNABÉ*

ABSTRACT

This note argues for the restoration of the MS reading ἀέξει *in Orph. fr. 779d v. 5 Bernabé (= 287 Kern), which transmits verses from the poem* Περὶ ἐπεμβάσεων *(*On Planetary Entrances*)* attributed to Orpheus.

Keywords: Orpheus; Orphica; textual criticism; Greek manuscripts; Greek poetry

[11] This text of Bartholomew's translation derives from a critical edition of his translation of section 19 that is in preparation by the present author. Theodore of Gaza's later Latin translation, *Problematum Aristotelis sectiones duaedequadraginta Theodoro Gaza interprete* (Venice, 1504), fol. 232v reads *constitutione* where Bartholomew has *dimissionem*, doubtless rendering σύστασιν.

[12] G. Coucke, 'Philosophy between text and tradition. The reception of Aristotle's *Problemata* in the Middle Ages: Peter of Abano's *Expositio Problematum*' (Diss., KU Leuven, 2008), vol. 1, lx. Coucke's work provides an edition only of section IV of the *Problêmata*. It appears that Bartholomew wondered whether ἀπότασιν, meaning a temporal prolongation, was a better reading: since five manuscripts contain both *dimissionem* and various words derived from *duro* (viz. *duratio*, *durationem* and *durat*), I hypothesize that he indicated *durationem* or the like as a potential alternative. Many later scribes evidently preferred that alternative, since twenty extant manuscripts read simply *durationem*.

* This note was written during my fellowship at the Hamburg Institute for Advanced Study. I am grateful to Dr Vanessa Monteventi, who encouraged me to publish these thoughts.

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882400096X Published online by Cambridge University Press

The purpose of this note is to argue for the restoration of the MS reading ἀέξει in Orph. fr. 779d v. 5 Bernabé (= 287 Kern), which transmits verses from the poem Περὶ ἐπεμβάσεων (*On Planetary Entrances*) attributed to Orpheus. I reproduce the text of the entire fragment from the Teubner edition by A. Bernabé, who prints ἀνέξει, which I translate, leaving ἀνέξει aside for the moment:

εἰς δὲ Κρόνου Πυρόεις τόπον αἴσιός ἐστιν ἀμείβων.
ἔνθα γὰρ ἠμαύρωσε Κρόνου θυμαλγέα πάντα.
καὶ κακὸς εἰς ἀγαθὸν τρέπεται· πάσας γὰρ ἀνίας
καὶ νούσους κατέπαυσεν· ἄγει δ᾽ ὄλβον τε δόμοισι
νίκην τ᾽ εὐφροσύνην τε φέρει <καὶ> **κῦδος ἀνέξει**. 5

When the Fiery one (= Mars) passes into the territory of Saturn, he is auspicious; for there he weakens all heart-grieving effects of Saturn. And a wretched man turns into a noble one; for he (*sc*. Mars) puts an end to all troubles and illnesses. And he leads wealth into one's household and brings victory and merriment and **ἀνέξει** glory.

ἀνέξει is out of place. The tenses in this fragment are either present (ἐστίν, τρέπεται, ἄγει, φέρει) or (gnomic) aorist (ἠμαύρωσε, κατέπαυσεν), indicating what tends to happen when an ἐπέμβασις occurs. The same is true of the other parts of fr. 799. A future ἀνέξει is thus grammatically unexpected and does not correspond to the formula as usually found in hexameter verse. The phrase as it stands should mean 'and he will lift up/support glory'. The first editor of this fragment, Heeg[1] printed ἀέξει, a present tense, which is paralleled as a formula in hexameter poetry from the Hellenistic times onwards: cf. Ap. Rhod. 1.206 κῦδος ἀέξων (same *sedes*); Samus, *Anth. Pal.* 6.116.5 (κ. ἀέξοι); Philemon, *Anth. Pal.* 9.464.2 (same phrase as here); further occurrences in Quintus of Smyrna and Gregory of Nazianzus.[2] A variant with ἀνέξειν does not exist. As a matter of fact, ἀέξει is the reading of the fourteenth-century codex Vaticanus gr. 1056, fol. 156v, line 11 which transmits these lines.[3] Moreover, the prose paraphrase that follows these lines offers πλοῦτον δὲ καὶ νίκην εὐφροσύνην τε καὶ δόξαν **αὔξει**. How ἀνέξει came into existence is a matter of speculation, but Kern printed ἀνέξει in his edition (fr. 287) without any explanation for the change, which raises the possibility that it may have occurred through an error which found its way into the modern edition.

Therefore, I propose restoring the MS reading in v. 5 (κῦδος ἀέξει, 'increases glory'), the form that the first editor had in fact printed.

Newcastle University ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS
athanassios.vergados@ncl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S000983882400096X

[1] J. Heeg, *Die angeblichen orphischen Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι* (Munich, 1907), 59.
[2] Quint. Smyrn. 2.77, 6.451 (same *sedes*), 13.248; Greg. Naz. Περὶ διαθηκῶν καὶ ἐπιφανείας Χριστοῦ 83 (*PG* 37.463), Θρῆνος περὶ τῶν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς παθῶν 311 *(PG* 37.1375); also Anon. *Anth. Pal.* 1.10.11 (Byzantine).
[3] See https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1056.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882400096X Published online by Cambridge University Press