

φαίη: D. Mort. 24.3 (= 30.3 Teub.) ἔχοι: ibid. 25.2 (= 12.2 Teub.) ἐνέγκαιτο: D. Deor. 9.5 (= 6.5 Teub.) τάχα . . . φήσκειν.

These examples would seem to prove beyond reasonable doubt that Lucian occasionally omitted his *άν* with the potential optative in apodosis; it will be noted that the usage is common in rhetorical questions, but the five examples of *φημί* and four of *δύναμαι* are not significant, as these are such common verbs.

Artemidorus of Daldis on the Pronunciation of Greek

By I. AVOTINS, London (Canada)

Although most of our knowledge of the pronunciation of Greek in the Roman imperial period is inferred from inscriptions and the papyri, some information can be found in authors preserved only, or mainly, in manuscripts. One of these authors is the dream interpreter Artemidorus of Daldis¹). In this article I have collected all the hints regarding the pronunciation of Greek noticed by me in his work.

The Pronunciation of the Spelling ει

In 1. 68, 74. 18 P.²) we read: τῶν ὀσπρίων (= pulse) πάντα μοχθηρὰ πλὴν πίσου (= the pea) διὰ τὸ ὄνομα. ἔστι γὰρ πειθοῦς σημαντικόν. The words of Artemidorus clearly assert a similarity between *πίσου* and *πειθοῦς*. Since there is no connection in meaning, the similarity must be one of pronunciation. Kaiser³), Festugière⁴), and Del Corno⁵) reasonably assume that we are here in the presence of an iotacist pronunciation of the *ει* in *πειθοῦς*. It is not easy to determine whether Artemidorus would have pronounced this *ει* as a long or a short *ι*. That the original quantity of the *ι* in *πίσος*

¹) His exact years are not known, but several indications in his work point to a date in the second century A.D. The data have been collected by A. S. Osley, "Notes on Artemidorus' Oneirocritica", *Classical Journal* 59 (1963–1964) 65–69.

²) The text used here is that of R. A. Pack, *Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon Libri V* (Leipzig, 1963). In references Pack has been abbreviated to P.

³) Artemidor von Daldis, *Traumbuch*. Übertragung von F. S. Krauss, bearbeitet und ergänzt von M. Kaiser (Basel u. Stuttgart, 1965) 98, n. 2.

⁴) Artémidore. *La clef des songes. Onirocriticon*. Traduit et annoté par A. J. Festugière (Paris, 1975) 74, n. 14.

⁵) Artemidoro. *Il libro dei sogni*. A cura di Dario Del Corno (Milan, 1975) 310, n. 101.

(also encountered under the form *πίσον*) was short is metrically assured, e.g., from Aristophanes, Fr. 22: *ἔπειτ' ἔρειξον ἐπιβαλοῦς' ὀμοῦ πίσους*⁶). If, to be effective in the interpretation of dreams, the *πι-* and *πει-* had to be completely homophonous, then in the speech of Artemidorus (or his possible source) *ει* was pronounced as a short *ι*, i.e., his speech had lost the opposition of long and short *ι*. We do not know, however, how complete a degree of homophony was required by the onirocritic. Attic epigraphy and the papyri indicate that the equalization of vowel lengths had widely taken place before the second century A.D., the probable date of Artemidorus. According to Teodorsson, the equalization in Attic may already have been accomplished by about 350 B.C.⁷) In the Egyptian papyri quantitative distinction was lost, according to Gignac, by the beginning of the Roman period⁸). Examples of the equalization of a long and a short *ι* can be observed in the papyri already in the third century B.C.⁹) Kaiser¹⁰), followed by Festugière¹¹), appears to assume that the homophony of *πίσος* and *πειθῶ* extended even to the consonants, i.e., in our passage the *θ* in *πειθῶ* was pronounced as the *σ* in *πίσος*. This seems unlikely, because these phonemes, with the possible exception of some dialects, do not as a rule merge either in ancient or modern Greek¹²). It is safer to assume that the homophony in these two words was meant to include only the first syllables.

Another example of a possible homophony of the spellings *ει* and *ι* in Artemidorus is found in 1.70, 76.7 P.: *Κρεῶν τὰ . . . χιμαίρεια . . . τοῖς ἐν χιμῶνι διάγουσιν ἀγαθὰ τετήρηται . . . ὅτι χιμῶνι ὁμώνυμα ὄντα τὰ ζῶα ἀνήρηται*. Homonymy can only be found in *χιμ-* and *χιμ-*, i.e., the *ει* in *χιμῶνι* must have been considered by Artemidorus to be homophonous with the short *ι* in the first syllable of *χιμαίρεια*.

⁶) *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, ed. J. M. Edmonds, I (Leiden, 1957) 578.

⁷) S.-T. Teodorsson, "The Phonemic System of the Attic Dialect", *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* XXXII (Lund, 1974) 219.

⁸) F. T. Gignac, "A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods", *Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell'Antichità* LV (Milan, 1976) 325.

⁹) E. Mayser and H. Schmoll, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*², Band I, 1. Teil (Berlin, 1970) 118.

¹⁰) Above, n. 3.

¹¹) Above, n. 4.

¹²) For modern Greek see A. Mirambel, *La langue grecque moderne. Description et analyse*. (Paris, 1959) 22.

In 2.12, 119.13 P. κριός (= wether) is said to pertain to masters and to kings because, says Artemidorus, κρείειν . . . τὸ ἄρχειν ἔλεγον οἱ παλαιοί. Both Festugière¹³⁾ and Del Corno¹⁴⁾ would detect here another example of iotacism. However, the *mss.* read κρίνειν, κρείειν being an emendation of Rigault (Pack, p. 119, app. crit.).

The Pronunciation of the Spelling υι

In 5.15, 305.14ff. P. we read: Ἐδοξέ τις σιδήρεον αἰδοῖον ἔχειν. ἐγένετο αὐτῷ υἱός, ὑφ' οὗ ἀνηρέθη. καὶ γὰρ ὁ σίδηρος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενομένου ἰοῦ φθείρεται. The analogy appears to be: just as iron is destroyed by a substance created out of itself (i.e., rust), so is that man who is destroyed by his son. It seems to me that homophony of υἱός and ἰός is essential to the effectiveness of this comparison. If, e.g., the word παῖς is substituted for υἱός the effectiveness of the example is lost. In consequence, it is possible that Artemidorus pronounced the spellings υῖ and ἰ alike. If so, the iotacism and loss of aspiration characteristic of modern Greek were both already present in the speech of Artemidorus. Caution is necessary, however, because, as mentioned above, we do not know whether or not complete homophony was required in the business of onirocrisy.

The exact date of the change from υι to ῥ to ι is still in dispute. Teodorsson believes that the evidence of Attic inscriptions indicates that the spellings υι and υ had, in Attic, merged with the sound of ι by 350 B.C.¹⁵⁾ Alfageme comes to the conclusion that the vowel system of modern Greek became established already in the second century B.C.¹⁶⁾, i.e., the pronunciation of υι and ι was identical at that time. Gignac, on the other hand, states that the papyri studied by him (30 B.C. to ca. A.D. 735) indicate that the prevailing pronunciation for the spelling υι was ῥ¹⁷⁾. Allen writes that after the monophthongization to ῥ of the phoneme represented by the spelling υι, the phoneme ῥ did not universally merge with the sound of the spelling ι before the end of the millenium¹⁸⁾. Lejeune, too, states that the sounds of the spellings υι (pronounced ῥ) and ι

¹³⁾ Above, n. 4, p. 112, n. 5.

¹⁴⁾ Above, n. 5, p. 316, n. 27.

¹⁵⁾ Above, n. 7, 295 and 299.

¹⁶⁾ I. R. Alfageme, "Notas sobre la evolución del sistema vocálico en la koiné", *Cuadernos de filología clásica* 9 (1975) 377.

¹⁷⁾ Above, n. 8, 207.

¹⁸⁾ W. Sidney Allen, *Vox Graeca*² (Cambridge, 1974) 65.

did not merge until the 9th century A.D.¹⁹⁾ All of these datings can be defended by some evidence. Clearly, a finer weighing of the various types of evidence must be attempted.

The Spellings ει and υ

In 1.24, 31.4 P., to dream that ants (*μύρμηκες*) are crawling into one's ears is good only for sophists because ants are *ὄμοιοι . . . τοῖς φοιτῶσι μειρακίοις*. It is possible that we have here another example of first-syllable homophony (*μυρ-* and *μειρ-*). In the papyri the first examples of the merged pronunciation of the spellings *ει* and *υ* are attested in the first century A.D.²⁰⁾ Of course, it is not certain that Artemidorus brought together the words *μύρμηκες* and *μειράκια* because of similarity of sound. He may have felt that ants, being small, incessantly in motion, and numerous, were eminently similar to children. A school is associated with an antheap in Hesychius: *μυρμηκιά· τάσσεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ διδασκαλείου καὶ συμφοιτήσεως*²¹⁾.

Herodian über die Etymologie von ἴφθιμος

Von A. R. DΥCK, Los Angeles (U S A)

*Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἱμοῦ παράγωγα ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς συνεσταλμένον ἔχει τὸ ἰ, κύδιμος, ὠφέλιμος, ὠκιμος· τὸ μέντοι ἄτιμος ἐκτεῖνον τὸ ἰ σύνθετόν ἐστιν. οὕτως δὲ ἀξιοῦται καὶ τὸ βούλιμος ἐκτείνεσθαι κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν συλλαβὴν συνθέτου ὑπάρχοντος τοῦ ὀνόματος· ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ ὀ μέγας λιμός. καὶ τὸ ἴφθιμος δὲ ἐκτείνει τὸ πρὸ τέλους ἰ (Herodian, *περὶ διχρόνων* 293, 18–23).*

Aus dieser Stelle zieht Lehrs den Schluß „separat igitur ἴφθιμος a compositis“¹⁾. Ein entgegenstehendes Zeugnis wird von Lehrs als Scheinzeugnis abgetan; davon wird gleich zu handeln sein. Lentz ist, ohne über neue Argumente zu verfügen, über seinen Lehrer noch einen Schritt hinausgegangen und hat behauptet, Herodian habe die verschiedenen Möglichkeiten gegeneinander abgewogen und sich schließlich für Seleukos' Lösung entschieden: er habe

¹⁹⁾ M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien* (Paris, 1972) 237, § 252.

²⁰⁾ Above, n. 8, 272–273.

²¹⁾ *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte, II (Copenhagen, 1966) 686.

¹⁾ *Herodiani scripta tria emendatiora*, ed. Karl Lehrs (Regiomonti Prusorum, 1848), S. 362, Anm. 90.