

Syntactical Variation in Lucian

By M. D. MACLEOD, Southampton (England)

Collation of the MSS. of Lucian for the published and unpublished volumes of the Oxford Classical Text shows that he occasionally varies the syntax of verbs connected by *καί* etc. and so seemingly parallel, linking optatives with subjunctives or indicatives in oratio obliqua, final clauses, apodoses, protases etc.; he varies tenses of infinitives and links infinitives with other constructions. 29 passages are adduced in many of which editors may wrongly have emended the text to restore syntactical consistency.

S. Chabert, *L'Atticisme de Lucien*, Paris 1897, is often referred to as the standard work on Lucianic syntax, but it is superficial and the best treatment for the subject remains Du Mesnil, *Grammatica, quam Lucianus in scriptis suis secutus est, ratio cum antiquorum Atticorum ratione comparatur*, Stolp, 1867, although W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*, Stuttgart, 1887–96, gives useful supplementary information. Both Schmid and Du Mesnil, however, require modification because of the occasional shortcomings of the texts of Lucian available to them; in particular Jacobitz in his major and minor Teubner editions overestimated the worth of A, the then Gorlicensis 12, now recognised as a codex deterior, cf. K. Mraz, *Die Überlieferung Lucians*, Vienna, 1911, pp. 234–5. Usually these modifications involve details only, though I have already indicated, *Classical Quarterly* 1956, 102 seq., that *ἄν* with the future is Lucianic.

Another feature of Lucian's prose style which has escaped notice is his occasional tendency to vary the syntax of two (or more) parallel verbs, e.g. verbs connected by *καί* or *ἀλλά* or a *μὲν . . . δέ* antithesis. In such cases Lucian occasionally uses two different constructions which, though both within his normal syntactical repertoire, seem strange when found in combination. As a result editors have often removed the lack of syntactical consistency by emendation or by rejecting the reading of reliable MSS. for that of *dett.*, where the inconsistency is absent presumably because it has been removed by conjecture. The evidence which follows is based on the readings of the MSS. to be regarded as best according to the criteria explained in the Preface to my Oxford Text of Lucian (by and large those suggested by Mraz, *op. cit.*), and I hope these remarks will go some way towards explaining why in my text of Lucian I have retained syntactical variation even in passages where it may seem unnatural.

Let us start with a syntactical variation which has good classical precedents, the juxtaposition in oratio obliqua of the optative normal in past sequence and the more vivid or graphic indicative form. (1) Scyth. 4 ἤκουσα ὡς . . . οἴχοιτο ἐς Ἀθήνας καὶ νῦν διατρίβει κείθι κτλ. διατρίβει Γ^1 : διατρίβοι Γ^2 vel Γ^a , E^2 vel E^a , edd. (sigla as in O.C.T.) Read διατρίβει, consulting Kühner-Gerth, 551.3 for precedents in Classical Greek, cf. also Goodwin, Moods and Tenses 670 a and 690. It would be easy here for the indicative to be assimilated to the preceding optative. Similarly in indirect questions we find (2) in Gall. 25 Οὐδέπω ἔφησα . . . τοὺς γόμφους . . . οἴτινες εἶεν τῆς ἀρχῆς οὐδὲ τὴν ἀμορφίαν . . . ἦτις ἐστίν. For the variation εἶεν . . . ἐστίν K.-G. 590.2, Anmerk. 2 gives a precedent in Thuc. 3.113.3, noting however that in indirect question the indicative usually comes before the optative. Similarly (3) in Harm. 3 we have ἐσκοπούμην ὅστις ὁ ἄριστος εἶη . . . καὶ ὅτω πιστεύσουσιν . . . καὶ ὅς ἀντὶ πάντων ἀρκέσειεν ἄν. Note two further variations in this passage, firstly ὅστις and ὅτω followed by ὅς, and secondly the switch from the future indicative to the potential optative with ἄν, a usage to be discussed later.

A strange variation, perhaps to be explained as a switch from the optative to a graphic alternative in virtual oratio obliqua is (4) Herc. 7 ἐδεδίεν μὴ . . . δόξαιμι . . . μειρακιώδη . . . ποιεῖν . . . , κατὰ τις ἐπιπλήξει μοι κτλ. ἐπιπλήξει $\Gamma B \Omega^1$: ἐπιπλήξη $S \Omega^x$ ἐπιπλήξειε Rothstein. *Mή* with the future indicative after a verb of fearing is Attic enough, cf. K.-G. 553 b 6, Goodwin 367. The natural graphic variation for the optative would be the subjunctive, e.g. Xen. Hell. 2.1.1 where σχοῖεν is followed by ὄσιν, see K.-G. 553 b 3. I should perhaps have given the reading ἐπιπλήξη in my apparatus as it has this precedent and may have been corrupted by itacism, but it should be noted that this reading almost certainly comes not from the manuscript tradition but from conjecture.

Classical Greek also allows the alternation of the optative and the vivid subjunctive in historic sequence in the virtual oratio obliqua of final clauses, e.g. Thuc. 3.22.8 παρανίσχον . . . ὅπως ἦ καὶ μὴ βοηθοῖεν, vide K.-G. 553.6. So Lucian writes (5) in Fug. 7 πολλοὺς . . . ἐώρων ἀπιόντας ὡς λουδορήσαιντο . . . καὶ βοῆς τὸν ὀπισθόδομον ἐμπλήσωσιν ὕλακτοῦντες. More surprising is (6) Merc. Cond. 3 ὡς τό γε ἡμέτερον . . . ἀναίτιον ἦ μὴδὲ ἔχοις λέγειν . . . , ἄκουσον. In my O.C.T., following Fritzsche, I have assumed itacism and written ἔχης, but I now see that ἔχοις can be explained as a Lucianic syntactical variation. This is of course present sequence and the opta-

tive is strictly incorrect, but Lucian is prone to use the optative in primary final clauses cf. Du Mesnil 16–7, B. J. Sims, *Classical Quarterly* 1952. 63 seq., e.g. *Musc. Enc. 5 (bis) ἀλίσκοιτο, ἐμπέσοι, Prom. 1 ἐπαμύνοιεν, ibid. 21 εἶη*. Here therefore Lucian is combining two usages within his repertoire, the normal subjunctive and his own peculiar optative in primary final clauses.

Now for some examples of syntactical variation in Lucian which have less classical precedent. Several times, in apodoses (real or virtual), Lucian uses ἄν with the optative and the future indicative (without ἄν) as parallels, e.g. (7) *Dom. 2 ὅστις . . . ὄρᾳ, οὐκ ἄν, οἶμαι, ἀγαπήσειεν . . . πειράσεται δὲ κτλ.* (8) *Anach. 18 μάθημα . . . ἐγένετο ἐπίστασθαι ὅπως ἄν ἄριστα πόλις οἰκοῖτο καὶ οἴστισιν νόμοις χρωμένη εὐδαιμονήσει (εὐδαιμονήσειε recc.)* (9) *Rhet. Pr. 1. ἐρωτᾷς . . . ὅπως ἄν ῥήτωρ γένοιτο καὶ . . . σοφιστῆς εἶναι δόξεις. δόξεις β: δόξης γ,* a clear itacism. (10) *Dips. 4 οὐδ' ἄν σβέσειάς ποτε τὸ δίψος ἀλλὰ προσεκαύσεις κτλ. προσεκαύσειας* L. A. Post, Kilburn. In passages 7–10 the optative comes first, but the order is reversed (11) in *Somn. 9 ἅπαντες ἐπαινέσονται, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ὅστις . . . εὖξαιτ' ἄν σοὶ ὁμοιος γενέσθαι*, where I regard the variation as of the same type, taking *οὐκ ἔστι* as stereotyped and invariable. Similarly in (3), *Harm. 3*, we had the order *πιστεύουσιν . . . ἀσκέσειεν ἄν*. Basically similar in type is (12) *Somn. 8 εἰ δὴ τούτων εἰς γένοιτο, πῶς μὲν οὐ κλεινὸς αὐτὸς . . . γένοιτο, ζηλωτὸν δὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἀποδείξεις*; Here editors have emended the first apodosis either by adding an ἄν or by reading the *δόξεις* of *dett.* for *γένειο*, but the optative in apodosis without ἄν is common in Lucian; see the appendix to this article.

The variation of passages 7–12 is easily explained by the realisation that Lucian didn't bother much about the distinction between open and remote conditions or about making protasis and apodosis correspond; Schmid. *op. cit.* 243. quotes 80 examples from genuine works of Lucian where *εἰ* with the optative is combined with a present indicative protasis and usually serves for *εἰάν* with the subjunctive and, more pertinently to our discussion, he lists, p. 244, 28 examples of *εἰ* with the optative combined with a future indicative apodosis e.g. *Conviv. 13, Jup. Trag. 18, 30, Tim. 56*, examples in other words of syntactical variation between protasis and apodosis. An excellent example of Lucian's insouciance in conditions is (13) *Par. 12 εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἔχει, . . . οὐδὲ ζήσεται, εἰ δὲ ἔχει εἴτε παρ' ἑαυτοῦ εἴτε παρ' ἄλλου, εἰ μὲν οὐκ . . . ἔχοι (recapitulating εἰ δὲ ἔχει), παράσιτός ἐστι*, followed in the next speech of the same speaker by, *εἰ γὰρ ἔχοι, πολλὰ ἄτοπα . . . παρακολουθεῖν ἀνάγκη*. Another example of

Lucian's cavalier attitude to conditionals is provided by the strange syntactical variation in a protasis (14) found in Hes. 7 *ἦν μὴ καλόψης τὰ σπέρματα καὶ θεράπων . . . ἐπιφοροίη τῆς γῆς αὐτοῖς, καταπτῆσεται τὰ ὄρνεα*, where editors have restored the correspondence by reading either *καλόψαις* or *ἐπιφορῆ*. Here Lucian has combined the normal subjunctive with an occasional idiosyncrasy of his own, *ἦν* (or *ἐάν*) with the optative, examples of which occur in Astr. 10 *ἦν . . . γνοίης*, Hist. Conscr. 5 *ἦν . . . συντιθείη*, and as the lectio potior in V. H. 2.29 and Nec. 12; Du Mesnil 19–20 also lists examples of the optative with *ἐπὶ*, *ἐπειδάν*, *ἔστ' ἂν*, *ὁπόταν* and *κἄν*.

Next I refer to two possible examples of variations between the future and the optative in relative clauses implying purpose. We find (15) in Peregr. 20 *οὐδὲν ἔτι καινουργεῖν ἐδύνατο ἐφ' ὅτῳ ἐκπλήξειε* (sic *Γ*; *ἐκπλήξει* M, edd.) *τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας καὶ θαυμάζειν . . . ποιήσει* and (16) in Parasitus 12 *οὔτε μάγειρός ἐστιν ᾧ χαλεπήνη* (sic *β*: *χαλεπηνεῖ γ*: *χαλεπήναι* Jacobitz) *οὔτε ἀργύρια ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπολομένων ἀχθεσθείη*. Jacobitz's emendation is unlikely as the shorter form of the aorist optative is rare in Lucian; R. J. Deferrari, *Lucian's Atticism*, p. 24 says there are 9 instances of *-αι* as opposed to 171 of *-ειε*. The reading of *γ* looks like an honest attempt to transmit an original future and leads me to suggest the emendation to *χαλεπανεῖ*, the form found in Pl. Tht. 161a and Men. Sam. 549 (Sandbach). In any case, whether one reads a subjunctive or a future, there follows a syntactical switch to the optative *ἀχθεσθείη*. Another syntactical variation in a final relative clause (unless it be regarded as indirect question) occurs (17) in Gall. 13, where we have the optative first without and then with *ἂν*. *ἠράσθη τῆς Ἀργολικῆς ἐκείνης μείρακος, οὐκ ἔχων εἰς ὃ τι ἐρασιμώτερον αὐτὸν μεταβάλοι οὐδὲ ὅπως ἂν διαφθείρειε τοῦ Ἀκρισίου τὴν φρουράν*.

Another variation (18) involving *ὅστις*, this time = *εἴ τις*, is supported by the weight of the MSS. evidence in Anach. 34 *πρόστιμόν γ' ἐστίν, ὅστις ἐν ἄστει σιδηροφοροίη μηδὲν δέον ἢ ὄπλα ἐξενέγκοι εἰς τὸ δημόσιον. ἐξενέγκοι* L: *ἐξενέγκη ΓΕΩ*. Here I have assumed itacism and printed the optative in my text, but note that, though L is a good MS., it hardly bears comparison with *Γ* and *E*. Had I dared to print the subjunctive, as probably I should have done, here we have a combination of *ὅστις* with the optative in present sequence, (cf. *καθίστανται, εἰ ποτε ἀφίκοντο* Anach. 24, *κολάζομεν, εἴ τις παράνομα γράψειεν* Tox. 24, etc., and *εἴ* with the optative passim in Lucian for *ἦν* with the subjunctive, vide Schmid 1.243) and the

subjunctive in an indefinite subordinate clause without the usual *ἄν* (for which Lucianic parallels are (with *ὁπόσον*) Fug. 21, (with *πρίν*) V. H. 2.18 and Salt. 3 (*λάθης*), (with *ἕως*) Asin. 30, (with *εἰ* for *ἦν*, *ἄν* or *ἐάν*) Nigr. 12, Tim. 57 (*παράσχης γ*, which I regret not printing), Bis Acc. 2, Pisc. 5, Merc. Cond. 35, Pro Imag. 27 (*λέγεται*), Tox. 7 (*ἀντιπνεύση*), *ibid.* 40 (*λάβη*), Sat. 25 (*ἔχωσιν*), *ibid.* 32 (*ἐθελήσητε*), Hes. 5 (*λάθῃ*), D. Mort 10,2 (= 3.2 Teubner, *παρέλθω*). (Note that this list modifies and supplements that given by Du Mesnil 23–4.)

Next let us consider syntactical variations involving the infinitive. Sometimes the variation is so natural that it hardly needs comment. Take for example (19) Demon. 7: *ἠγεῖτο γὰρ ἀνθρώπου μὲν εἶναι τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν, θεοῦ δὲ . . . τὰ πταισθέντα ἐπανορθοῦν. τὰ codd.: τὸ E. Schwartz: τὸ τὰ K. Schwartz.* As Lucian uses the substantival infinitive both with and without the article, there seems to me no need to interfere with the reading of the MSS. in this passage.

Let us continue with examples involving the tense of the infinitive: (20) *ἔμελλεν . . . ἔσσεσθαι . . . ἀλλὰ . . . ἐκφαίνειν.* Demon. 1. Cobet's *ἐκφανεῖν* is rightly rejected by editors because both the present and the future infinitive with *μέλλω* are too common to cause the slightest offence. (21) *ἠγεῖτο γὰρ χρῆναι . . . τοῦτο . . . κατασκευάσαι, καὶ τὸν ἄριστα παιδεύειν ἀνθρώπους προαιρούμενον . . . ψυχῆς . . . ἐστοχάσθαι* Nigr. 28. Although *στοχάζεσθαι* would be more natural, *χρή* with the perfect infinitive is paralleled by Prom. 11 and 17, Pseudolog. 21 and D. Mar. 14.3; for similar instances of the perfect infinitive with other verbs see Du Mesnil, 12–13. (22) *ἴμοσον ἢ μὴν φυλάξειν τὰς συνθήκας μηδὲ ἀπαρνήσασθαι* Tox. 50. *ἀπαρνήσασθαι* GBΦ: *ἀπαρνήσεσθαι* Γ^c, recc., edd. The aorist infinitive for the normal future infinitive with verbs of hoping, expecting, promising and swearing is found in Classical Greek, cf. Goodwin, 136, K.-G., 389 Anm. 7 and there is an example with *ἄμνημι* in Demosth., or. 23.170; I can't quote any parallels with *ἄμνημι* in Lucian, but cf. the aorist infinitive with *ἀπειλῶ* in Phal. 1.4 and Sat. 31 (Passage 25 quoted below) and with *ἐλπίζω* in Elektr. 1, Symp. 37 and Pr. Im. 20.

Sometimes the variation of the tense of the infinitive is so natural that comment is hardly necessary as e.g. (23) in Prom. 8 *τὰς γε ἀπάτας . . . οὐ χρὴ ἀπομνημονεύειν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τι ἡμάρτηται . . . , παιδιὰν ἠγεῖσθαι καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ καταλιπεῖν* (sic γ: καταλείπειν β) *τὴν ὀργήν.* The γ reading could be due to itacism, but I prefer it, as the transition from the continuous present *ἠγεῖσθαι* to the clear-cut, instantaneous aorist *καταλιπεῖν* suits the passage admirably.

Two examples seem to involve a strange switch into an infinitive in oratio obliqua. In *Demon.* 11 we find (23) *ταύτην ἔφη ἔχειν αἰτίαν τοῦ μὴ κοινωνῆσαι σφίσι τῆς τελετῆς, ὅτι, ἂν τε φαῦλα ἦ τὰ μυστήρια, σὺ σιωπήσεται πρὸς τοὺς μηδέπω μεμνημένους . . . , ἂν τε καλά (sc. ἦ), πᾶσιν αὐτὰ ἐξαγορεύσειν. ἐξαγορεύσειν ΓΒΩΙ: ἐξαγορεύσει Ω^d. Although the assimilation into the infinitive of the verb of a dependent clause in oratio obliqua is Attic, cf. *Plat. Rep.* 614b and other examples listed in Goodwin, 304, to find an infinitive paralleling a future indicative is distinctly odd. But *Sat.* 31 is even stranger (25) *εἰ γὰρ ταῦτα, φασί, ποιήσετε, μηδὲ (μήτε codd.: corr. Jacobitz) ἀμφισβητεῖν ὑμῖν . . . , εἰ δὲ μή, ἀπειλοῦσι προσκαλέσασθαι . . .* If we assume the MSS. tradition to be substantially correct (though perhaps something has been lost between *ποιήσετε* and *μήτε* e.g. *ὁμολογοῦμεν προσήκειν μήτε βαρέως φέρειν* or, deleting *φασί, ὁμολογοῦσι κτλ.*), we have two difficult switches by way of variation, firstly that by which *ἀμφισβητεῖν* becomes infinitive as though it were in oratio obliqua, and secondly when we have *ἀπειλοῦσι* instead of part of the quotation introduced by *φασί*; we would have expected *ἀπαιλοῦμεν* (or even *ἀπειλεῖν* if we condone the infinitive *ἀμφισβητεῖν* and continue with the same construction).*

Let us now consider some syntactical variations in combination with the infinitive for imperative. The infinitive for imperative (including *μή* with the infinitive for a prohibition) is Lucianic enough; clear examples occur in *Ind.* 7 and *Sat.* 21 (we needn't worry about its occurrence in *Sol.* 4 because it need not be a deliberate solecism there and in any case many usages criticised in *Sol.* do occur in Lucian; see my article in *Classical Quarterly* 1956, 102 seq. and my notes on *Sol.* in the eighth vol. of the *Loeb Lucian*). Let us start with two examples of syntactical variation involving the infinitive for imperative so natural that one hardly notices them: (26) *σὺ δὲ μήτε πείθεσθαι μήτε προσέχειν . . . ἀλλὰ ἴθι . . . χαίρειν λέγε Rhet. Pr. 10*, and (27) *φέρε δὴ . . . ἀπολογήσομαι (ἀπολογήσομαι Γ^c) . . . , σὺ δὲ προσέχειν Pseudolog. 16*. Both examples are essentially similar, even if editors print a full stop before *ἀλλὰ* in the first passage as opposed to a comma before *σὺ δὲ* in the second. A more complicated example occurs (28) in *Pisc.* 46 *προθεῖς χρυσίον . . . ὃν μὲν ἂν . . . ἴδης ὑπερορῶντα . . . , οὗτος ἔστω ὁ . . . στεφόμενος, ὃν δ' ἂν . . . (sc. ἴδης) ἀποβλέποντα . . . , ἀπάγειν κτλ.*, where the infinitive for imperative *ἀπάγειν* corresponds to the third person imperative *οὗτος ἔστω ὁ στεφόμενος*. Although the meaning of the first half of the antithesis is clear enough, it should be noted that

it involves anacolouthon, as after *προθεις* one would logically have expected *τοῦτον στέφε* (or *στέφειν*). The same combination of third person imperative and infinitive for imperative is found (29) in Sat. 13: *μηδεις . . . ἐξεταζέτω μηδὲ ἀναγραφέτω . . . μηδὲ γυμνάζεσθαι (γυμναζέσθω recc.) . . . μηδὲ ἀσκειν ἢ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι πλὴν εἴ τινες ἀστεῖοι κτλ.*, where again the meaning is clear but the grammar dubious; with the introduction of the infinitive one would expect a change to the accusative for the third person subject, cf. *μηδένα μηδὲν . . . πράττειν* at the beginning of this chapter, although the continuation with the nominative *πλὴν εἴ τινες* seems to rule this out; one could argue that there is a switch to a second person infinitive, viz. *μηδὲ (sc. ὑμεῖς) γυμνάζεσθαι . . . πλὴν εἴ τινες (sc. ὑμῶν)* but this seems unnaturally difficult.

In conclusion, although this article has concentrated on passages and problems involving the choice of text and does not claim to be an exhaustive study of all forms of syntactical variation in Lucian, its evidence suggests that variation of syntax is an occasional feature of Lucian's style. It is perhaps to be explained not so much as a deliberate literary effect of the written word but as in keeping with the less formal approach of a sophistic entertainer and performer who set more store by the effect of his works, or more properly his words, on an audience than on a reading public.

APPENDIX

Lucian's use of the optative without *ἄν* in apodosis.

Although Jacobitz sometimes accepted the optative in apodosis without *ἄν* in his text and Du Mesnil, 20–1 quotes a few examples, editors continually attempt to rewrite Lucian by adding an *ἄν*. However the evidence that Lucian periodically used the optative without *ἄν* in apodosis is quite conclusive. It may therefore be of some value if I list the passages where absence of the *ἄν* is confirmed by the MSS.

Patr. Enc. 10 *μάθοι*: Cal. 22 *γένοιτο*: (Jud. Voc. 10 *τίς ἄν τούτων ἀνάσχοιτο; ἢ τίς ἐξαρκέσειε δίκη κτλ.*; is not a true example; cf. Goodwin 226 K.-G. 398.9; so too Par. 12, *οὐκ ἄν γένοιτο οὐδὲ ἐφίκοιτο* should be discounted): Symp. 40 *εὐρίσκοιμεν*: Icar. 2 *δυναίμην*: Tim. 38 *ἐγκαλέσαιμι*: Pisc. 15 *δύναιο*: *ibid.* 37 *ἔχοιμι*: Ind. 5 *ἐκφέροι*: Som. 8 *γένοιο* (pro *δόξεις*): Par. 22 *εὐροις*: *ibid.* 28 *παρέλθοι*: *ibid.* 31 *εὐροις*: *ibid.* 42 *πρίατο*: Rhet. Pr. 12 *φαίη (γ)*, which I probably ought to have printed in my text: Lex. 14 *ἦδιον ἀκούοιμι*: *ibid.* 25 *ἀγνοήσειεν sine ἄν*: (Am. 31 *εὐξάμην*: *ibid.* 46 *εὔξαιτο*): Pr. Im. 19 *μάλιστα κρινέοιτο*: (*ibid.* 23 *τάχα ὃ νῦν φαίης vett., τάχ' ὄν φαίης recc.*): Peregr. 26 *ἐργάσαιτο*: Fug. 19 *εὐροις*: Tox. 6 *τοῦνομα . . . ἐπιλάθοιτο*: *ibid.* 36 *οὐδ' ἐν γαλήνῃ μάθοις*: *ibid.* 62 *εἴη sine ἄν*: (Dem. Enc. 1 *τάχα . . . ἐπισταίνο*): Hist. 8 *ἀπεργάσαιτο*: Sat. 28 *τίνα αὐτῶν . . . δύναιο*: Hes. 6 *ἐν τῷ βίῳ νομίζοιτο*: Herm. 71 *δύνατο*: *ibid.* 79 *φαίη*: (Halc. 3 *ἐπέλθοι*): Prom. in Verb. 2 *λέγοις*: *ibid.* 3

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

These examples would seem to prove beyond reasonable doubt that Lucian occasionally omitted his ἄν 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 δύναιμι 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.