

CULTURE AND COSMOS

A Journal of the History of Astrology and Cultural Astronomy

Vol. 7 no 2, Autumn/Winter 2003

Published by Culture and Cosmos
and the Sophia Centre Press,
in partnership with the University of Wales Trinity Saint David,
in association with the Sophia Centre for the Study of Cosmology
in Culture,
University of Wales Trinity Saint David,
Faculty of Humanities and the Performing Arts
Lampeter, Ceredigion, Wales, SA48 7ED, UK.

www.cultureandcosmos.org

Cite this paper as: Brockbank, James, 'Planetary Signification from the Second Century until the Present Day', *Culture and Cosmos*, Autumn/Winter 2003, Vol. 7 no 2, pp 37-62.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue card for this book is available from the British Library

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Publishers.

ISSN 1368-6534

Printed in Great Britain by Lightning Source

Copyright © 2018 Culture and Cosmos
All rights reserved

Planetary Signification from the Second Century until the Present Day

James Brockbank

Abstract

This paper surveys planetary meanings used by astrologers from the second century to the present day, and considers why those meanings have changed. It examines the rationalisation that astrologers have used to justify those meanings, and whether they have been successful. It argues that the planetary meanings used by astrologers are derived from the requirements of their practice and not from any rationalisation that might be used to justify those meanings.

Introduction

If cultural astronomy is concerned with how 'cultures perceive celestial objects and integrate them into their view of the world',¹ then it is important to understand how we determine what the planets mean or for what they are significant. This essay is concerned with what astrologers thought the planets were significant for in the second century until the modern period. The second century has been chosen as a starting point because we have a list of planetary significations from Vettius Valens (120-c175), and we have in the *Tetrabiblos*, written in the second century by Claudius Ptolemy (c100-c178), what is probably the first attempt to rationalise planetary meanings. We will first determine whether Ptolemy was successful and then survey the literature from the second century until the end of the eighteenth century in order to determine whether his model was accepted and what impact it had on planetary signification. Finally, after the scientific revolution and the demise of Aristotelian physics, the modern period will be considered to determine what, if anything, has taken the place of Ptolemy's model and how planetary signification is currently derived. This means that we will ignore planetary significations from ancient Mesopotamia, which were not always the same as Greek planetary significations,² and we will only look

James Brockbank, 'Planetary Signification from the Second Century until the Present Day', *Culture and Cosmos*, Autumn/Winter 2003, Vol. 7 no 2, pp 37-62.
www.CultureAndCosmos.org

at the Western tradition. My concern will be with primary signification, by which I mean the signification a planet has because of its own nature, and not accidental signification, the signification a planet has from its position in a horoscope or influence over the astrological houses. This essay will consider only works written in English or translated into English. There are several Greek texts, plenty of Arabic texts and a great many Latin texts which have not been translated into English which could be relevant to this subject matter as well as books written in the modern period in other languages. In addition, given that this is only a general survey little consideration is given to those books concerned with specific planetary significations such as the weather and metals.³

Planetary significance at the time of Ptolemy

Manilius, writing around 14 CE, uses the planets in a manner which may mean that the planetary significations given to us by Vettius Valens were not the only meanings in use.⁴ However, Valens gives us the most extensive list of planetary meanings from the period that we have, and it is clear that he was writing from a tradition that went back at least until the second century BCE.⁵ His lists of what the planets are significant for are too long to quote in full, but this is what he says about Jupiter:

The star of Zeus is significant for begetting children, child-birth, desire, erotic love, alliances, knowledge, friendships with great men, abundance, stipends, great gifts, plenty of fruits, justice, sovereignty, governments, opinions, mediations of disputes, preferments of priests, fidelities, inheritances, brotherhood, community, benefaction, confirmation of goods, deliverance of evils, loosing of bonds, freedom trusts, possessions, households.

Of the outer parts of the body, it has authority over the thighs, feet (whence it also pertains to running in athletic contests); of the inner parts it has authority over the seed, womb liver, the parts on the right side.

It has authority over the essence of tin.

It is the diurnal sect, grey and rather white as for colour, sweet as for taste.⁶

Valens does not explain why the planets are significant for these matters. We are told that each planet rules its own essence, but we do not know how its essence is derived, only that "The Moon is set down as ruler of foresight, the Sun of light, Kronus of ignorance and necessity, Zeus of

opinion and crowns of office and will, the star of Ares of action and troubles, the star of Aphrodite of love and desire and beauty, and the star of Hermes of law and custom and fidelity'.⁷

If we consider what Valens says about Jupiter and the other planets in more detail, we can distinguish a number of different ways in which the meanings could be derived. Myth is clearly important, so that Mars, as god of war, is significant for 'violence, wars, rapine, screams'; while Venus, as goddess of love and beauty, is significant for 'desire and erotic love' and 'beauty of form'. The benefic and malefic nature of a planet is important, so that Jupiter, the greater benefic, is significant only for good things, while Mars, the lesser malefic, is significant for mostly bad things.⁸ The movement of the planets is important, so that the Moon is significant for 'wanderings (for it does not maintain a straight line through Cancer)'.⁹ What we actually see in the sky is important, so that the Moon may be responsible for 'receipts' and 'expenditures' because of the way it wanes and waxes. The reason why it is significant for 'living abroad' and for 'city' may be because its light was used for travel and originally for trading purposes, which led to the development of cities. Mercury is presumably 'the cause of all the irregularities in our fortunes and frequently sidetrack us from our goals', because it is both frequently retrograde and difficult to see in the night sky and once seen quickly disappears from view. The colour of the planets is also important: Mars, red in the night sky, is significant for 'cuts and bloodshed, attacks of fever, ulcerations, pustules, inflammations, imprisonment...those who gain their ends through fire or iron'. One senses here that many different strands and reasons have been intermingled to produce a tradition that has more than one source; this tradition may have been added to on the basis of experience, which perhaps explains why Mars is significant both for 'adulteries' and 'sexual intercourse,' as well as 'weddings'.¹⁰

These strands are insufficient to explain everything for which Valens tells us the planets were significant.¹¹ We have not, for example, considered how Jupiter became significant for tin, nor explained why Saturn is 'given to sailing, those who work at waterside trades'. It is perhaps also worth pointing out that there was no attempt to make a particular matter the responsibility of only one planet: both Venus and Jupiter are significant for desire and erotic love. However, what is clear is that Valens does not try to justify the power of the planets in terms of the science of the day and that the meanings, whether they are derived from analogy or myth, presuppose that the planets do have power over the sub-lunar region.

For Ptolemy this was not acceptable. In the *Tetrabiblos* 'the principles of astrology were described in a secular manner without mythological or religious overtones'.¹² In it, Ptolemy tried to give a causal explanation of planetary power in terms of the Aristotelian qualities of hot, dry, cold and moist, and to show that these qualities could be assumed, in the case of the Sun, or, for the Moon and other planets, to have been derived from their physical position in the sky. He says that it is the essence of the Sun to be hot and slightly drying, as should be clear to us from the seasonal changes: it is something that we notice here on earth. The Moon is moist, because it is close to the earth and receives the earth's vapours, and slightly warm from the illumination of the Sun; Saturn is cold because of its distance from the Sun and slightly dry because of its distance from the earth; Mars is hot and dry because of the fiery nature of its colour and its proximity to the Sun; Jupiter is temperate, so that placed between cold Saturn and hot Mars it is warm and moist; Venus is slightly warm, due to its proximity to the Sun, but mostly moist like the Moon; Mercury can be dry because it is always close to the Sun, but can also be moist because it is close to earth.¹³

Some have been dismissive of the whole approach and believe it is 'arguing in a circle to make their effects upon the earth depend to such an extent upon themselves being affected by vapours from the earth'.¹⁴ However, it would seem to be a circular argument only if the vapours of the earth were created by the moisture of the Moon, which is not necessarily the case. But, even if we reject this argument and believe that it is reasonable to argue that the planets emit primary qualities, it is clear that for Mars and Jupiter Ptolemy is unsuccessful. From its position in the sky, we would expect Venus to be as hot as Mars, so an important contribution to Mars' heat is its colour. We might be able to argue that Jupiter is warm because of its position between hot Mars and cold Saturn, but we cannot argue that it is moist because it is between dry Mars and dry Saturn. If it balances these dry planets with its own moisture it can only be because the essential nature of Jupiter is to be temperate. Therefore, the essential nature of Mars is to be red, as well as hot and dry, and the essential nature of Jupiter is to be temperate, as well as warm and moist. They are unexplained essences.

According to Ptolemy, the fundamental nature of the planet cannot be changed, but it can be tempered by its position in relation to the Sun.¹⁵ The planets will then 'commingle with each other' and 'create a great variety of differences of quality in our environing atmosphere'.¹⁶ This atmosphere, through the primary qualities, will influence matters in

the sub-lunar region by changing their elemental balance.¹⁷ However, when we consider the matters which, according to Valens, Jupiter is significant for it is hard to see how they can be derived from, or influenced by, the primary qualities of warm and moist. Institutions like 'government' or concepts like 'justice' and 'sovereignty' are outside the influence of primary qualities, while for matters of a general nature like 'great gifts' or 'possessions' one would need to know what the gift or possession was, so that it could have a physical body, before one could determine the impact of the primary qualities.

There are several problems here. For the primary qualities to influence the sub-lunar region there must be a physical body for them to influence. The problem is that so much of what is on Valens' list is in the form of a category and it is not clear how the primary qualities can influence a category. In addition, even if there is a physical body, Ptolemy has to explain how we distinguish between the slightly warm and moist of the Moon, with the slightly warm and moist of Venus and the warm and moist of Jupiter. Unless they have some other essence, which would then be unexplained, we would expect them to influence the sub-lunar region in a similar manner. One argument that he might try to use is that if he can show that the primary qualities are responsible for the nature of a planet, then that planet will influence the sub-lunar region in accordance with its nature. He has argued that the Moon, Venus and Jupiter are benefic because they have a surplus of hot and wet which are productive, while Mars and Saturn are malefic because they have excess dry and cold respectively.¹⁸ The next step is to say that the Moon, Venus and Jupiter naturally create benefic matters while Mars and Saturn create malefic matters. However, this is of limited use because what he has actually shown is that the 'hot' and 'moist' of the Moon, Jupiter and Venus are productive, which is benefic, while the two malefic planets have an excess of dry and cold, which is malefic. Therefore, it will be necessary to argue that the 'productive' nature of the Moon will cause 'expenditures' and 'wanderings', while the 'productive' nature of Jupiter will cause 'deliverance of evils' or 'loosening of bonds'. This would appear a difficult argument to make. In the same way, there seems no way that the 'excessively dry' nature of Mars can cause 'weddings' or even 'adulteries.' The other argument he could use, and this is probably what he had in mind, is that the primary qualities influence the temperament of a human in the sub-lunar region and humans will naturally want to influence other matters in the sub-lunar region in accordance with their temperament. The Venusian temperament is warm and moist, which naturally wants to

be surrounded by 'beauty of form' and 'ornament' and to engage in professions of a similar nature like 'making music' and 'haircutters'.¹⁹ There is clearly no causal relationship between Venus and 'ornament', which presumably could be, and in most cases probably was, cold and dry, but he could argue that 'ornament' fits into a category of 'beautiful objects' which is attractive to the warm and moist of Venus.

It would be possible to construct a theory of planetary significance along these lines. It would be a legitimate position to hold, but the consequence of holding it is that one must attempt to reform existing planetary signification, which has been derived in an entirely different way. We might expect Ptolemy, who was prepared to change large areas of astrological tradition,²⁰ to be prepared to argue for a new approach to planetary signification. However, he does not give us a list of possible planetary significance, and when we consider how he used the planets in other parts of the *Tetrabiblos* the indications are that, rather than reforming existing meanings, he preferred to leave the impression that his model was compatible with them.²¹

We can see this when we consider how he determines the gender of a planet and which planets were significant for the father. Ptolemy tells us that the Moon and Venus are feminine because they have an excess of moisture and that Mercury is common to both genders because it can be both dry and wet.²² This would imply that the four remaining masculine planets are masculine because they are dry. However, Ptolemy does not say this; he simply says they are 'traditionally masculine'. He has to say this because Jupiter is wet, not dry, and Ptolemy was not prepared to break with tradition and say that Jupiter should be feminine. In the tradition, the Sun and Saturn were usually significant for the father, although some preferred to use Jupiter instead of Saturn.²³ According to Ptolemy, 'the Sun and the star of Kronus by nature have familiar ties with the paternal person',²⁴ However, he cannot reach this position using his model. Of the four masculine planets, he can remove Jupiter because it is moist, although we might then ask why it is masculine, but there is no way he can distinguish between the other three because they are all dry. Indeed, the two driest planets are the Sun and Mars. He cannot say that the Sun is the most comfortable planet in a diurnal chart, in which the native is born with the Sun above the horizon, and will therefore naturally rule fathers in a diurnal chart, which was what tradition usually held, because this would imply that Mars, unlike Saturn being a nocturnal planet, was significant for fathers in a nocturnal chart, in which the native was born with the Sun underneath the horizon. Unfortunately, Mars was

never significant for fathers in a nocturnal chart; Saturn was. The logic of Ptolemy's system would be to say that all three are significant for the father, but, as this would break with tradition, he was reluctant to do it; he simply ignores the problem.

The problem for Ptolemy is that Saturn was significant for the father because of myth and not because it is cold and dry. One cannot impose his model on a tradition which was developed in an entirely different way without finding areas where it does not fit. Another example is when he considers the nature of action. He lists what action Venus provides.²⁵ He does not say why this is provided by Venus and not the warm and moist of Jupiter or the warm and slightly moist of the Moon, and one doubts it would be possible to give a reason. The problem is solved by not allowing Jupiter and the Moon to have any significance for action. In this, Ptolemy is probably following tradition,²⁶ but it is hard to see how it can fit in with Ptolemy's causal model in which all the planets should have equal impact on the sub-lunar region.

We do not know how the existing tradition was developed, whether it was constructed or an accumulation of experience over the years, but it was not a tradition that could be pinned down to one rationale. Ptolemy's model was effectively just one rationale, one physical explanation for the power of the planets. A rational system, if it could show that whole process of finding what the planets were significant for in terms of contemporary physics, rather than a tradition which allowed for many different factors, was appealing. However, Ptolemy fails in his first task of showing that the primary qualities can be derived from the physical position of the planets as he is unable to derive the primary qualities of Jupiter and Mars from their physical position in the sky. He fails in his second task, of showing how matters for which the planets are significant are derived from the primary qualities of the planets, because the primary qualities do not explain the significations of the planet in use at the time of writing, and he does not attempt to reform the existing tradition.

From Ptolemy until the end of the twelfth century

I have argued that there were two parts to Ptolemy's model. There was the attempt to derive the primary qualities of the planets from their physical position in the sky which gave it a secular nature, and there was the attempt to depict the power of the planets in terms of the primary qualities of Aristotelian physics. The Greek writers immediately after Ptolemy accept the primary qualities of the planets handed down by

Ptolemy, although there is no indication in their works that they are using the planets any differently from Valens.²⁷ In other words, there is every reason to assume that they accepted both parts of the Ptolemaic model, Ptolemy was the pre-eminent scientist of the period, but there is no reason to assume that they thought it necessary to change the planetary significations that they used in practice. For the Arabic writers who followed, the secular nature of the Ptolemaic model was unacceptable. The primary qualities are adjusted so that the primary qualities of the Moon and Venus are changed from warm and moist to cold and moist. This destroys the Ptolemaic system because if Venus is cold then it is impossible to derive its primary qualities from its physical position in the sky next to the Sun. However, the Arabic writers placed God at the top of the system, so that all the primary qualities are derived from Him. Therefore, it is no longer necessary to derive them from the physical position of the planets in the sky. It was, presumably, more important that God should provide a symmetrical system, and this is probably the reason for the change to Venus, so that, excluding Mercury which remains changeable, the four qualities are evenly distributed between the six planets.²⁸ The planets still influence the sub-lunar region in exactly the same way, in accordance with Aristotelian physics, although there is no attempt to make the planetary meanings tie in with this causal theory: according to Abu Ma'shar (787-886) 'Saturn is a malefic and its nature is cold and dry...It indicates activities involving moisture, waters, rivers...'²⁹ This is contradictory if one is trying to explain the significance of the planets in terms of primary qualities.³⁰ The dry element is that 'which is easily confined within its own limits...it cannot completely fill a "container", or take another's form'.³¹ This quality can hardly be considered significant for moisture.

One of the most extensive lists of planetary indications is given by Al-Biruni (973-c1048). He uses the Ptolemaic system, with the Arabic adaptation; the planets are now spiritual forces, controlled by God, and not natural forces, but they still work on the sub-lunar sphere by altering the elemental balance.³² His lists are much more extensive than Valens', and it seems reasonable to assume that this is in response to the demands of practising astrologers.³³ It is clear that, when compiling his lists of planetary indications, he is trying to keep the essential qualities of the planets in mind, so that Venus and Jupiter indicate foods and drugs 'which are moderately hot and moist.' However, this does not explain the large increase in the number of planetary significations; if he was only deriving signification from primary qualities we would expect many

fewer significations, not more. Looking at his lists closely, it is clear that there are many arguments which do not need the primary qualities. Jupiter is now significant for religion³⁴ presumably because religion is a good thing and Jupiter as the greater benefic gives good things. From this, Jupiter becomes significant for all buildings concerned with religion, although buildings in general are of a Saturnian nature. Al-Biruni might tell us that the planets 'change the nature of bodies submitted to their influence',³⁵ but what has really happened is that Ptolemy's primary qualities have become one of several factors that can generate signification. They have been absorbed into the tradition; they have not replaced it.

We can see this process with other writers. Ibn-Ezra (1092-1167) provides an extensive description of the signification of the planets,³⁶ but when he tries to give reasons to explain why the planets are significant for these matters, Ptolemy's primary qualities are not the only explanation: Jupiter signifies children 'because warmth and moisture are essential for procreation and wealth because he is a benefic planet'.³⁷

Thirteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century

Guido Bonatti (c1210-c1295) attempted to explain the existing body of planetary signification while remaining within an Aristotelian framework by introducing accidental signification derived from the physical position of the planets in the sky. Bonatti, quoting Alchabitius (d 967), says that Saturn is cold and dry, masculine and diurnal. However, he also says that Saturn rules the body and person of the native because he naturally rules the 'first thing that happens to a human being' and the first thing we need is a body; Jupiter rules 'life', substance and 'spirit', because after a body this is what we need next.³⁸ He justifies this by saying that the planets rule periods of life in accordance with the Chaldean order: Saturn followed by Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon. This was the order of the spheres; the idea was that when the soul incarnates, it travels through the spheres in this order to life on earth.

In this way, Bonatti (and presumably Alchabitius before him) combines the qualities of a planet with the accidental signification it derives from its position in the planetary order. Unfortunately the system breaks down with the third planet, Mars. Mars has accidental significance for brothers, because a native loves 'the more among those who are to able to encounter him first';³⁹ this can hardly be the third most necessary matter for life, as we can live without siblings. Bonatti's explanation is strained, which is probably why he keeps bringing in more explanations.

Mars is significant for journeys because journeys involve many difficulties and sufferings for which Mars, presumably because it is the lesser malefic, is significant. The Sun is significant for kings because it is the middle planet and the other planets stand by his side, while his motion is the most noble, never going retrograde and hardly varying in pace.⁴⁰ This kind of approach is more likely to be successful at explaining the different matters that the planets were significant for, but Bonatti does not develop it because his rationalisation of astrology is Aristotelian,⁴¹ which led naturally to emphasis on Ptolemy's explanation of the planetary natures.

Ramon Lull (1232-1315) makes possibly the first attempt, possibly the only attempt, to fully develop a methodology which will explain how planetary meanings can be derived from the Aristotelian qualities of a planet. He says that other astrologers attribute properties to planets based on their essence or constitution and on their own experience but they do not prove them.⁴² Lull starts by explaining the signification of the planets in terms of their essence. Jupiter is the constitution of air which is moist and hot; 'it is the lord of the blood, which is naturally moist and hot. The men born under Jupiter should be happy, because the life of men subsists principally through moisture and heat;' they will 'naturally love occupations according as they pertain to the constitution of Jupiter and its other properties. This is the case with the butcher, hunter, fisher; and men at arms who let blood; and the draper, who considers the heat, colour, and nobility of the cloth'.⁴³ Lull goes on to show how the different planetary constitutions combine and the results of these combinations in terms of his own logic.⁴⁴

There are three points that should be made here. First, Lull does not think he is engaging only in arguments from analogy; those of a hot and moist temperament will want to engage in occupations of a hot and moist nature. Second, the logic of what Lull is doing takes him away from the planetary significations handed down by people like Valens and Al-Biruni. Blood is hot and moist, so naturally Jupiter is significant for it; occupations involving blood are also hot and moist, and therefore Jupiter is also significant for them. This reasoning is quite different from that of Valens. Valens considered that Mars was significant for blood, presumably because of its colour, while Mars indicated the hunter and soldier because Mars was god of war. Presumably Mars would also be significant for butchers because it has authority over cuts and bloodshed. Al-Biruni, like Lull, also found that Jupiter was significant for blood. However, Al-Biruni did not take the next logical step: for Al-Biruni Mars

remained significant for butchers. The problem for Lull was that although he was prepared to re-write the signification of the planets in accordance with his own logic, other astrologers preferred to follow tradition, so today Mars still rules butchers.⁴⁵

The third point is that Lull has become more psychological. He discusses the sanguine nature of Jupiter and, as a consequence of that sanguine nature, how those born under Jupiter would be likely to behave; his emphasis is on the temperament of the native. This is inevitable for anyone who is going to develop Ptolemy's system. It is far easier to describe someone's character in terms of hot, cold, moist and dry than it is a profession, concept, institution or object. Taken to its logical conclusion the planets would be significant for far less. The problem for Lull was that, in the fourteenth century, astrology was largely predictive. To reduce the significations and to make them more personal would not have been as useful to practising astrologers as the existing tradition, and this is probably why Lull's method never became popular.

Sixteenth to eighteenth centuries

During the seventeenth century, with the destruction of Ptolemaic astronomy and the birth of the scientific revolution, there were attempts to reform astrology in an effort to make it more acceptable to this new world. Many of these attempts were concerned with the techniques of astrology but there were new approaches to the problem of planetary signification and to the Ptolemaic model.⁴⁶

J.B. Morin (1583-1613) understood the problem that Ptolemy's model created for planetary signification. He says that the essential nature of the Sun may 'indicate persons or circumstances which are illustrious, public, and distinguished, rather than obscure and of little importance', but that it is a mistake to argue by analogy that the Sun stands for father, king, or position because the Sun's influence is universal and therefore cannot by analogy alone indicate something individual. What makes the determination of a planet individual is its position in a horoscope.⁴⁷ What is of particular importance to Morin is the house that a planet is in and the house that a planet rules. The houses are responsible for areas of life, so a planet can gain signification by being responsible for that house and as a result that area of life. Therefore, although Ptolemy says that the Sun and Saturn are significant for fathers, Morin would look at the planet ruling the fourth house, because the fourth house is significant for fathers. It is not a new idea; it goes back to Dorotheus in the first century, and we can see its importance in Bonatti's work.⁴⁸ If the planets obtain accidental

significance from their power over the houses, there is less and less need for them to mean things in their own right. Ptolemy put much less emphasis on the power of the planets over the houses than Valens or Dorotheus, and it is instructive to compare the horoscopes attributed to Palchas (sixth century),⁴⁹ who was following in the tradition of Ptolemy, with the guidance on horary astrology given by Bonatti.⁵⁰ One important difference in their technique is that Palchas relies on the planets for the signification of all matters, whereas Bonatti puts much greater emphasis on house rulership. However, although it was Ptolemy who put greater emphasis on planetary signification, as opposed to house signification, this was, as Morin realised, an inconsistent position to hold if you want to explain planetary power in terms of primary qualities. You can use analogy to argue that the Sun is significant for an individual father: the Sun is the pre-eminent planet in the sky and the father is the pre-eminent member of a family (at least in the era we are considering). However, you cannot make this argument from the essential nature of the Sun because the analogy will only be to a universal and not an individual matter on the sub-lunar region. Using the houses is a way out of this problem, although it introduces the problem of why houses are significant for topical matters; a problem outside the scope of this essay.⁵¹

According to Patrick Curry,⁵² the English astrologers of the second half of the seventeenth century were following a similar reforming path. John Gadbury (1627-1704) did this through collecting data so that he could empirically support his own practice, while John Partridge (1644-1715) followed Placidus (1603-1668) by reverting back to Ptolemy. The reason for reverting back to Ptolemy was that during the Italian Renaissance there had been a tendency to introduce occult influences,⁵³ and it was hoped that by returning to a scientific system one could eliminate these tendencies. Placidus tells us that the planets emitted a light which had the properties of colour and motion and from these properties we could derive the primary qualities. In response to the Arabic writers, he is removing God from the system and returning to the secular Ptolemaic system. However, his argument is confused, and, when considering Mars and Saturn, it appears that it is the colour which is important, but it is never clear how the different colours emit different primary qualities.⁵⁴ It was, in any event, an unsuccessful attempt and it is doubtful that it had any impact on planetary meanings. It is the same with the English reformers; their primary interest was in astrological techniques, to remove confusion and occult influences, and it appears to have had little impact on actual planetary significance. When we consider

the planetary signification in the basic text books of Gadbury and Partridge, there is little change from earlier text books.⁵⁵ For Partridge, the nature of Saturn consists of many items; its poetical name is Phaenon, it is cold and dry, has a pale lead colour, slow in motion, melancholy, masculine, diurnal, solitary, and the greater misfortune.⁵⁶ This is standard fare. The primary qualities of Saturn remain an essential part of its nature, but they sit side by side with other characteristics of Saturn's nature which had been passed down with the tradition. Indeed, during the seventeenth century the primary qualities were used not so much in generating planetary significance as in determining the temperament of a native.⁵⁷

We can see that from Ptolemy until the end of the seventeenth century variations on Ptolemy's model were used to explain planetary power. The problem that this entailed for the existing body of planetary significations was understood by some but never solved. In practice, if not in theory, the Aristotelian qualities became part of a planet's essence. In the eighteenth century, when a defence in terms of Aristotelian physics would not be accepted, the primary qualities of a planet moved from being an essential quality used to generate significance to being only a part of the body of significance. Now Saturn was cold and dry along with everything else.⁵⁸

The twentieth century

According to A.J. Pearce, 'The mythology of the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans was originally a method of handing down astrological truths, from generation to generation, before the era of letters'.⁵⁹ Whether or not this is correct, it gave a new approach to planetary significance. One no longer considered the primary qualities of a planet but what the planetary gods did in myth, and this in turn told you what the planet was significant for. In the first half of the century, when planetary significance was explained or justified, myth, along with experience, was that justification.⁶⁰ Myth could explain much of the significance handed down from the past but not everything: 'Mythology is not always a clear guide to astrological doctrine but often it throws a brilliant light upon our science'.⁶¹

However, towards the end of the century, with the popularity of psychological astrology,⁶² myth was no longer simply a way to explain significance from the past but a completely new approach to planetary signification. Myth was now used to provide psychological truth. According to Jung, 'The planets are the "gods", symbols of the power of

the unconscious'.⁶³ If myth could explain traditional significance all the better, but if not it did not matter because psychological astrology had moved away from trying to make specific event-orientated predictions about a life and was more interested in using astrology to psychoanalyse a client. One should explore the myths of the gods because 'gods connect us immediately to mythology, the richest source of knowledge we have about these archetypal forces which are present in all people'.⁶⁴

One result of this process was that the planets became humanised. Rather than being significant for matters ranging from governments to haircutters, they started to 'symbolise basic human functions, life-principles'.⁶⁵ Planets would start to have core meanings so that the primary function of Jupiter could be 'self expansion'.⁶⁶ From this core meaning, one could branch out so that Jupiter became responsible for all kinds of personal growth. Inevitably, this approach led to a break with the tradition. One cannot explain the signification of Jupiter that had been handed down through the tradition from a core meaning of 'self expansion', which will lead to a different set of matters for which Jupiter is significant.⁶⁷ Indeed, the whole idea that Jupiter is significant for a whole range of matters is challenged because Jupiter is now internalised and is depicted in terms of an individual and that individual's personal growth.

However, this misses the point. The argument is not that the traditional body of meaning is incorrect and should be replaced, which would be the logical result of using the Ptolemaic model, but that there are other truths which are more important. From a psychological perspective, it may be of little relevance that Jupiter is significant for government and sovereignty. What matters is how an individual incorporates Jupiter into his own patterns of behaviour. The traditional significations are acceptable as far as they go, but they are insufficient for what is required today. 'Traditional astrology has identified Saturn and its astrological characteristics adequately, but perhaps without much importance placed on its archetypal origins and their evolution in the collective Western psyche'.⁶⁸ The psychological approach goes deeper; it finds out what is underneath the old meanings.

If this approach does more fully explain the old body of meaning then they would sit side by side with ease. However, in practice this has not happened. One might claim that one is updating an old approach so that Saturn, the great malefic in tradition, now 'symbolises a psychic process as well as quality or kind of experience'.⁶⁹ However, one is really making a radical change. Psychic experiences, and myth in general,

combine matters which are good with matters which are bad. But for Valens myth was not the only source for planetary signification and arguably an important part of this approach was that there were two malefic planets and two benefic planets.⁷⁰ Denying the malefic and benefic nature of the planets has led to changes in planetary signification with the three outer planets taking on some of the characteristics of the malefic planets.⁷¹ This change in planetary meanings has come about because the traditional meanings are inappropriate in the consulting rooms of psychological astrologers. To say that the new meanings are in some sense deeper is simply not true; they are different. But there is often a reluctance to admit this because in the same way that Ptolemy was reluctant to break with tradition the psychological movement would prefer to be seen as working with tradition rather than changing it.

Another issue has been the merging of planetary signification with the meanings of the houses and signs, which have resulted in traditional meanings of the planets being appropriated by the signs and houses.⁷² We have argued that in Hellenistic astrology, especially after Ptolemy, the planets were the main vehicle for signification, while the houses, although important, were significant for only a few matters.⁷³ We have seen how by the time of Morin the planets took on accidental signification through the power they had over the houses which effectively transferred signification from the planets to the houses. In twentieth century psychological astrology, the planets gain very little accidental signification through their rulership of the signs or houses, while the signs have taken on the meanings of the planets that rule them. When we consider the original signification for the Sun found in Valens, we find, in some modern text books, that they are much closer to the signification for Leo than for the Sun.⁷⁴ In Hellenistic astrology, the signs received much of their significance from the planets that ruled them, but in modern astrology this signification has been appropriated by the signs leaving the planets with 'core matters'. For all these reasons there has during the modern period been considerable change in planetary signification.⁷⁵ But, of course, the old meanings have not been changed. They are still there in the old books and can still be used. All that has happened is that the new meanings have been added to the tradition while the old meanings have fallen out of fashion.

There has, as one might expect, been a reaction to this. With the recent interest in medieval and other techniques from the past there has been an attempt to resurrect significations from the past.⁷⁶ To a large extent this has been driven by the requirements of practice. If you are

answering a horary question or analysing a natal chart in a predictive manner, psychological planetary meanings are unsuitable and insufficient. There has rarely been any attempt to justify the use of these significations other than that they have the authority of tradition.⁷⁷ One attempt to give Ptolemy, or the Arabic writers, a modern gloss, has been made by John Frawley, who emphasises the essence of a planet. Venus has a certain essence; anything on the sub-lunar region which has the same essence will have the quality of Venus, so, by considering the condition of Venus, one will learn something about those things on the sub-lunar sphere with the essence of Venus. However, he does not tell us what the essence of Venus is, other than it is a planetary ray, so it is unclear how we are to determine whether something on the sub-lunar region has the essence of Venus or any other planet. If what we are meant to look for in the sub-lunar region is Venusian qualities then the argument becomes circular.⁷⁸

Finding planetary signification from myth or referring to authority is not a scientific approach and consequently those astrologers interested in justifying their practice to a wider community have tried to show that it has empirical support. One simple approach is to assume that there is a large body of empirical evidence that supports ancient planetary signification, and even modern planetary signification.⁷⁹ The problem with this view is that there is no evidence to suggest that it is true, at least not since Hellenistic times. We have argued that the planetary significations given by Valens are likely to have been derived through a number of different arguments. It is not necessary to suppose that any of it was based on empirical evidence. However, whether or not one believes there is a body of empirical evidence from the past, one can certainly believe that what matters is the experience of practising astrologers; that the traditional doctrine has changed over the years in the light of experience and culture and it should change today in accordance with the practice of astrologers.

Undoubtedly this has happened and is happening. It helps to explain the way that astrologers have determined the meaning of recently discovered planets.⁸⁰ Effectively, this process is the tradition, because how people use the planets, what they think they are significant for, becomes the new tradition of planetary signification. However, what it does not do is to justify this use in terms of modern science. The experience of a few astrologers will not be accepted by those who do not have that experience. An astrologer may keep a diary detailing his

experience of Chiron, but this is unlikely to impress anyone outside the world of astrology.⁸¹

To justify planetary signification in terms of empirical science requires empirical testing conducted in accordance with the rules of modern science. In the 1970s and 1980s this became popular when computers made empirical testing on a large scale relatively easy and many people believed that this was the way forward.⁸² By trying to explain planetary significance in terms of the science of the day, this approach follows in the tradition of Ptolemy. The best known work is that of Michel Gauquelin. He found evidence to support various personality traits for five of the planets, Jupiter, Saturn, Mars, Venus, and the Moon. Similarly, these planets in certain places in a horoscope will indicate certain professions.⁸³ It is difficult to know to what extent Gauquelin's work has influenced the way people look at planetary signification. Where he found positive results, it is likely to have reinforced existing belief or practice; where he found negative results, it has been ignored. Gauquelin proposed dropping the Sun and Mercury from a horoscope because he found no positive evidence to suggest they have an influence,⁸⁴ but astrologers still use both. It is possible that in the future more evidence will be produced to support planetary significance and some believe that it can be done.⁸⁵ However, from the reaction to Gauquelin's work, one could argue that planetary signification will be changed only by empirical evidence if it allows one to add to existing practice and tradition; if it requires anything to be taken away, it is likely to be ignored, if only because there remains the belief that one day evidence will be found.

Conclusion

In summary we can draw several conclusions

1. At the time of Ptolemy there was an existing tradition of planetary significance that was derived in several different ways. Ptolemy attempted to rationalise this tradition. His explanation did not fully work, and his new model was unable to explain the existing tradition.
2. The part of Ptolemy's model which explained planetary influence through Aristotelian physics remained the main explanatory model for planetary significance until the scientific revolution, although the secular nature of his model was dropped by the Arabic writers.
3. The logical conclusion of accepting this model, that planetary significance should be changed in accordance with it, was rarely taken up

by astrologers who continued to use the signification handed down from tradition. In practice, the primary qualities became another way of deriving significance and, rather than replacing tradition, became part of it.

4. After the scientific revolution, there has been an attempt to find empirical support for planetary significations. This approach is following in the tradition of Ptolemy. So far this approach has had limited success.

5. The body of traditional signification does not remain constant. Changes or expansions are made in accordance with the requirements of existing practice and culture.

6. The most radical changes to planetary signification have taken place during the twentieth century with the popularity of the psychological approach. However, the old meanings still exist and sit side by side, even if hidden, as is shown by the recent interest in medieval astrology.

There are several implications for cultural astronomy. Planetary significance can be seen, as Tolkien suggests is the case for myth,⁸⁶ like a pot to which meanings are added but nothing is taken away. We pull out of the pot those meanings which are most useful for our own astrological practice; a psychological astrologer will pull out one meaning for Jupiter, an astrologer answering a horary question another meaning. Therefore, to determine what the pot consists of and how it is being used, it is necessary to consider current astrological practice as well as astrological practice in history. If we want to understand why the contents of the pot have been put there, we need to consider why different astrological practices have been developed and why they have been popular. A rationalisation of planetary significance may be explained by a historical or cultural requirement to justify that practice and it may generate some meanings and end up in the pot itself, but it will not explain the use of the meanings nor will it explain the full content of the pot.

References

1. Ruggles, *The Study of Cultural Astronomy*, Ch1, p1, in *Astronomies and Cultures* (1993) ed. Ruggles C and Saunders N.J, Colarado, University Press of Colarado.
2. See Baigent, M, (1994), *From the Omens of Babylon: Astrology and Ancient Mesopotamia*, Arkana, London. Saturn, for example, was 'not a stern and cold patriarch but a conquering hero' (pp127-128), although Mars was significant for similar matters.
3. Kollerstrom, N, (1993), *The Metal-Planet Relationship*, Garberville CA, Borderland Sciences Reseach Foundation, is an interesting book on the different metals the planets are significant for, but has been ignored, as has all work on astro-meteorology.
4. See Manilius, (1977), *Astronomica*, trans. G.P.Goold, Cambridge MA and London, Harvard University Press. Manilius does not give us sufficient details to determine how he used the planets but it is clear that his tradition was not part of the generally accepted tradition of Hellenistic astrology. For example, Mercury rules Cancer while in every other textbook from this period it rules Virgo and Gemini.
5. Vettius Valens makes many references to and frequently quotes from Nchepso and Petoris who wrote an important, but now lost, book on astrology in the second century BC. For example, his discussion of the Lot of Fortune in *The Anthology Book 2, Part 1*,(1994), trans. R. Schmidt, Berkeley Springs, WV, Golden Hind Press.
6. Valens, V (1993), *The Anthology Book 1*, trans. R. Schmidt, Berkeley Springs, WV, Golden Hind Press, p3.
7. Valens, *The Anthology Book 1*, p7.
8. It is often argued, for example in Elwell, D, (1999), *Cosmic Loom*, London, The Urania Trust, p89, that the benefic nature of Jupiter and Venus and the malefic nature of Mars and Saturn were derived through empirical observation. In my view it is more likely that they are first principles derived from the order in which the planets ruled the signs. The order which was used was the Chaldean order, which is based on the speed of the planet and its proximity to earth. This puts the Moon first followed by Mercury, Venus, the Sun, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn. The signs ruled by the Sun and Moon, as the lights, were put at the centre of the system and each of the other planets were given two signs to rule, one flanking the Moon and one flanking the Sun, starting with Mercury and finishing

with Saturn. The result is that Venus rules the signs which are sextile Leo and Cancer, ruled by the Sun and Moon; the sextile was considered to be mildly beneficial, so Venus is the lesser benefic. The signs that Jupiter rules make a trine to Leo and Cancer, considered to be very beneficial so Jupiter is known as the greater benefic. The signs ruled by Mars make a square to Leo and Cancer, considered a difficult aspect, while the signs ruled by Saturn are opposite Leo and Cancer, considered the most difficult aspect. Therefore, Saturn is known as the greater malefic and Mars as the lesser malefic.

9. The Moon follows an erratic path along the ecliptic.

10. All quotes from Valens, *The Anthology Book 1*, pp. 1-6. Also see note 8 above for the question of the construction of planetary meanings on the basis of experience or first principles.

11. It is worth noting that Elwell, in *Cosmic Loom* pp. 89-90, writes that the ancients determined planetary signification in three ways. First, through experience, which as noted in footnote 8 above is questionable and does not explain everything; second, through myth which, although correct is insufficient to explain all the different significations used; and third, by placing the planets within the classical scheme of Aristotelian qualities. However, this is what Ptolemy did; Valens did not.

12. Pedersen, O, (1974), *Early Physics and Astronomy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 77.

13. Ptolemy C, (1994), *Tetrabiblos Book 1*, trans R.Schmidt, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, pp. 14-15.

14. Thorndike, L, (1923), *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol 1, New York, Columbia University Press, pp. 113-114.

15. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos Book 1*, p. 18-19.

16. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos Book 1*, p. 19.

17. All matters were made up of the elemental bodies of earth, fire, air and water, which in turn consisted of two of the four qualities; by adding a quality one could change the elemental balance. See Pedersen, *Early Physics and Astronomy*, pp. 126-128. For a discussion of the nature of the qualities in an astrological context, see Noonan, G.C. (1984), *Classical Scientific Astrology*, Tempe AZ, American Federation of Astrologers, pp. 45-48.

-
18. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos*, Book 1, p. 16.
 19. Valens, *Anthology 1*, p. 4.
 20. There are many areas in which Ptolemy moved away from standard astrological practice as detailed by Valens. The most glaring are probably dropping the lots, changing the Time Lord systems and giving little emphasis to the houses and house rulership.
 21. See Ptolemy C, (1996), *Tetrabiblos*, Book 3, trans. R. Schmidt, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, and Ptolemy C, (1998), *Tetrabiblos*, Book 4, trans. R. Schmidt, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press. Examples of the matters for which Ptolemy thought the planets were significant can be found throughout Books 3 and 4 of the *Tetrabiblos*, but, perhaps, the clearest account is in Chapter 14 of Book 3.
 22. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos*, Book 1, pp. 16-17.
 23. Valens, *Anthology*, Book 2, Part 1, pp. 62-69.
 24. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos*, Book 3, p. 13.
 25. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* Book 4, p. 11.
 26. It should be pointed out that at this time, in the second century, the accepted method for determining action, if there is one, is extremely unclear, and, by the fourth century other planets are allowed to be significant for action. See Alexandrinus, P, (1993), *Introductory Matters*, trans. R. Schmidt, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, p. 63.
 27. See Antiochus of Athens, (1993), *The Thesaurus*, trans. R. Schmidt, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, p. 10; Alexandrinus, *Introductory Matters*, p. 16, and Hephaistio, (1994), *Apotelesmatics Book 1*, trans R. Schmidt, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, p. 25.
 28. See, Abu Ma'shar, (1997), *The Abbreviation of the Introduction to Astrology*, trans. C. Burnett, Arhat, pp. 36-37, footnote 2.
 29. Abu'Ma'shar, *The Abbreviation of the Introduction to Astrology*, p. 38.
 30. One cannot argue that by being significant for moisture the dry nature of Saturn is ameliorated or that those in water trades would like to be ruled by Saturn. An argument along these lines has nothing to do with primary qualities

acting on the sub-lunar region but has something to do with planets being significant for matters which enable them to move into some kind of harmony. A more cogent argument would be to say that if the primary qualities of the planets act on the sub-lunar region, then the planets cannot be considered significant for anything. What matters is how the different planets combine to make an atmosphere that changes the sub-lunar region and that atmosphere will be created by all the planets mingling together. Therefore, all the planets will be necessary to make a change on the sub-lunar sphere, and to talk of one planet being significant for anything is meaningless.

31. Noonan, *Classical Scientific Astrology*, pp. 47-48.
32. Al-Biruni, (1934), *The Book of Instruction in the Elements of the Art of Astrology*, trans. R. Ramsay Wright, London, Luzac and Co, pp. 231-231.
33. Al-Biruni, *The Book of Instruction in the elements of the art of Astrology*, pp. 240-254. An alternative explanation might be that they are an academic exercise.
34. For the Greeks no one planet was significant for religion; Jupiter was significant only for the preferment of priests.
35. Al-Biruni, *The Book of Instruction in the Elements of the Art of Astrology*, p. 231.
36. Ibn-Ezra, A, (1998), *The Beginning of Wisdom*, trans. M.B.Epstein, Arhat pp. 91-104.
37. Ibn-Ezra, A, (1994), *The Book of Reasons*, trans. M.B.Epstein, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, pp. 34-39.
38. Bonatti, G (1995), *Liber Astronomiaiae*, Part 3, trans. R. Hand, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, pp. 1-8.
39. Bonatti, *Liber Astronomiaiae*, Part 3, p. 12.
40. For Bonatti on the planets see, *Liber Astronomiaiae*, Part 3, pp. 1-44.
41. See, Bonatti, G (1994), *Liber Astronomiaiae Part 1*, trans. R. Zoller, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, and Zoller introduction.
42. Lull, R (1994), *Treatise on Astronomy*, trans K. Shapar, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, p. 9.

-
43. Both quotes from Lull, *Treatise on Astronomy*, pp. 11-12.
44. Lull, R. (1994), *Treatise on Astronomy*, Books 2-5, trans. K. Shapar, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press.
45. See Bills, R. E. (1971), *The Rulership Book*, Tempe AZ, American Federation of Astrologers.
46. Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) was one of the reformers, although the main impact of his work was on planetary aspects. See Field, Judith, *Kepler's Geometrical Cosmology*, London: Athlone Press 1988; Kollerstrom, N., 'Kepler's Belief in Astrology' in Kitson, Annabella (ed.) *History and Astrology: Clio and Urania Confer*, London: Unwin Paperbacks 1989, pp. 152 - 170.
47. See Morinus, J.B. (1974) *Astrologia Gallica Book 21*, trans R.S.Baldwin, Washington, American Federation of Astrologers, pp. 8-15.
48. Examples can be found in Book 3 of the *Liber Astronomiae*, but also see Bonatti, G (1994), *Liber Astronomiae*, Part 2, trans. R. Zoller, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press, and Bonatti, G (1996), *Liber Astronomiae*, Part 4, trans. R. Hand, Berkeley Springs WV, Golden Hind Press. Ptolemy was less interested in houses than Dorotheus or Valens, and the Arab writers drew heavily on Dorotheus so we can already see the importance of houses for signification in their work: see Abu' Ali Abu'Ali Al-Khayyat, (1988), *The Judgements of Nativities*, trans. J. H. Holden. Tempe AZ , American Federation of Astrologers.
49. See Neugebauer, O. and Van Hoesen, H.B. (1987), *Greek Horoscopes*, Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society.
50. Bonatti, *Liber Astronomaie*, Part 4.
51. It is worth mentioning that it is clear from both Morinus and Grafton, A. (1999), *Cardano's Cosmos*, London and Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, that Cardin (1501-1576) understood this problem. However, as his works have not been translated into English they have not been considered here.
52. Curry P, (1989), *Prophecy and Power*, Cambridge, Polity Press, pp57-89.
53. For an example see Ficino M. (1980), *Book of Life*, trans. C. Boer, Spring Publications, Woodstock, CT.

54 Placidus, (1983), *Primum Mobile*, trans. J. Cooper, Bromley UK, Institute for the Study of Cycles in World Affairs, pp1-13. It is interesting to compare Placidus, who says Jupiter and Venus are a mixture of blue and white, with Noonan, G.C. (1990), *Fixed Stars and Judicial Astrology*, Tempe AZ, American Federation of Astrologers pp. 3-4, who says that Jupiter's light is blue and Venus' light is white.

55. See Lilly, W, (1985), *Christian Astrology*, London, Regulus, (first published London 1647), pp57-86; Ramesay, W, (1653), *On Astrology Restored*, London, Robert White, pp49-64; Gadbury, J, *The Doctrine of Nativities and the Doctrine of Horary Questions, Astrologically Handled*, London 1658, pp66-71; and Partridge, J, (1975) , *Mikropanastron*, Issaquah WA, JustUs + Associates, (first published London 1679) pp 10-18. However, it should be pointed out that both Gadbury and Partridge published additional work after the publication dates of these text books.

56. Partridge, *Mikropanastron*, p. 10.

57. Lilly, *Christian Astrology* pp. 532-534

58. Raphael, (1931), *Horary Astrology*, London, Foulsham, pp. 17-24.

59. Pearce, A.J. (1970), *A Text Book of Astrology*, Washington, American Federation of Astrologers, p. 87.

60. See Carter, C. E. O, (1947), *Essays on the Foundations of Astrology*, London, Theosophical Publishing House, pp. 1-49.

61. Carter, *Essays on the Foundations of Astrology*, p. 18.

62. Holden dates this to the 1980's: see Holden, J.H, (1996), *A History of Horoscopic Astrology*, Tempe AZ, The American Federation of Astrologers Holden.

63. Quoted from Barz, E, (1993), *Gods and Planets*, trans. B. Matthews, Wilmette, Chiron, p. 65.

64. Harvey, C and S, (1999), *Astrology*, London, Thorsons, p. 67.

65. Mayo, J (1964), *Teach yourself Astrology*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, p. 13.

66. Mayo, J (1972), *The Planets and Human Behaviour*, Sebastopol CA, CRCS

Mayo, p. 90.

67. Compare Hone, M. E, (1995), *The Modern Text-Book of Astrology*, Romford UK, L.N. Fowler, p. 11, with Valens on Jupiter quoted on page two above.

68. Sullivan, E, (1991), *Saturn in Transit*, London, Arkana, p. 4.

69. Greene, L, (1990), *Saturn: A New Look at an Old Devil*, London, Arkana, p. 10.

70. See footnote 8 above.

71. Lehman, J.L, (1989), *Essential Dignities*, Westchester PA, Whitford, pp. 102-108.

72. See the introduction to, Lehman, J.L, (1992), *The Book of Rulerships*, Westchester PA, Whitford.

73. P. Alexandrinus, *Introductory Matters*, pp. 50-61 details brief house meanings.

74. See Hone, *The Modern Text-Book of Astrology*, pp. 37-88; pp. 59-61 for Leo.

75. Lehman, *Essential Dignities*, pp. 102-108.

76. Lehman's *The Book of Rulerships* is an example of this. It details the significations from Al-Biruni to John Partridge.

77. It is accepted modern practice to justify the meaning of a planet in a horary question by referring to Lilly's *Christian Astrology*.

78. Frawley, J (2000), *The Real Astrology*, London, Apprentice Books, pp. 73-83.

79. One example is found in Parker, J, (2002), "The Carter Memorial Lecture: the Planet-Myth and Reality," *Astrological Journal* September/October 2002, p. 8.

80. See Champion, N, (1996), 'Planets Galore: How will astrology cope with 35,000 new planets?', *Astrological Journal* September/October 1996, pp. 299-303.

81. Elwell, *Cosmic Loom*, pp. 95-100.

82. According to Dean and Mather it was part of the philosophy of the Astrological Association and the Urania Trust to conduct experimental work on astrological principles. See Dean and Mather, (1994), "Is the Scientific Approach Relevant to Astrology?" *Correlation*, Vol. 13, No.1, p. 11.

83. Gauquelin, M, (1991), *Neo-Astrology: A Copernican Revolution*, pp. 28-29. It should be noted that forty years later the Gauquelin results are still being disputed.

84. Gauquelin, *Neo-Astrology*, pp. 22-29.

85. For an example, see Irving, K (2002), www.planetos.info.

86. Tolkein, J.R.R. (1988), 'On Fairy Stories', in *Tree and Leaf*, London, Unwin Hyman.