

XXIII.—Artemidorus and the Physiognomists

ROGER A. PACK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

That Artemidorus' strictures against the physiognomists refer to the sophist Polemon, is a thesis for which strong presumptive evidence can be adduced, although it cannot be proved with finality. The onirolgist and his rival both favored the empirical method, but Polemon emphatically affirmed what Artemidorus later denied, that physiognomy may on occasion have a mantic or prophetic value.

In an interesting chapter of his work on dream-analysis ¹ Artemidorus gives his opinion of those who represent various other sciences. Some, he says, must not be trusted when they appear in dreams, because their doctrines are false and they know nothing of the mantic art but deceive and strip those with whom they come into contact. Of certain others he approves without reserve.² This passage might well lead to a study of his relations with contemporary pseudoscience as a whole, but only one division of this larger

¹ For an introduction to this unique treatise see Professor R. M. Geer's article, "On the Theories of Dream Interpretation in Artemidorus," *CJ* 22 (1927) 663-670. I have felt the more strongly inclined to make a short comparative study of Artemidorus and Polemon because Professor Lynn Thorndike has not treated the latter specifically in his valued *History of Magic and Experimental Science*² (New York, 1929), and has given only two pages to Artemidorus, these being introductory to his remarks on medieval dream books (2.290f.). Professor George Sarton offers useful bibliographical notes but little discussion in his *Introduction to the History of Science*, 1 (Baltimore, 1927) 271 and 295.

² Artem. 2.69 (161.20-162.2 ed. Hercher [for the method of reference see note 4 below]): . . . ὅσα γὰρ ἂν λέγωσι Πυθαγορίσται φυσιογνωμονικοὶ ἀστραγαλομάντεις τυρομάντεις κοσκινομάντεις μορφοσκόποι χειροσκόποι λεκανομάντεις νεκρομάντεις, ψευδῆ πάντα καὶ ἀνυπόστατα χρῆ νομίζειν· καὶ γὰρ αἱ τέχναι αὐτῶν εἰσι τοιαῦται καὶ αὐτῆς μὲν μαντικῆς οὐδὲ βραχὺ ἴσασι, γοητεύοντες δὲ καὶ ἀπατώντες ἀποδιδύσκουσι τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας. ὑπολείπεται δὴ μόνῃ ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ ὑπὸ θυτῶν λεγόμενα καὶ οἰωνιστῶν καὶ ἀστεροσκοπῶν καὶ τερατοσκοπῶν καὶ ὄνειροκριτῶν καὶ ἡπατοσκοπῶν. περὶ δὲ μαθηματικῶν τῶν γενεθλιαλῶν ἐπισκενῶμεθα. Since Artemidorus censures the χειροσκόποι, and since chiroscopy was in some sense a specialized branch of the despised physiognomy, Suidas' statement (s.v. 'Ἀρτεμίδωρος) that he composed Χειροσκοπικά seems open to doubt, but Suidas' attribution of Οἰωνοσκοπικά is confirmed by Galen 15.444 (volume and page as edited by K. G. Kühn [Leipzig, 1821-33]): ἐδείκνυε δὲ (sc. a Greek augur) καὶ . . . 'Ἀρτεμίδωρου τοῦ Φωκᾶ ἄλλων τέ τινων οἰωνιστῶν ἐνδόξων βίβλους, κτλ. Artemidorus' relation to the astrologers is discussed by C. Blum, *Studies in the Dream Book of Artemidorus* (Uppsala, 1936) 92-101. Blum observes that in this passage, as elsewhere, Artemidorus accepts ἀστεροσκοπία, that is, "astrometeorology," but adopts a sceptical attitude towards γενεθλιαλογία, the science of casting horoscopes.

subject is to be treated in detail here: the art of the *φυσιογνωμονικοί*, whom Artemidorus classes among the cheats or charlatans.

Sir Samuel Dill held that Artemidorus was simply drawing the line between the "newer or lower forms of divination" and the "old formulated and accredited lore . . .,"³ and I fully realize that most critics will remain content not to search beyond this principle. Yet I believe that there may also have been a bit of silent personal rancor in his listing the physiognomists, and that the one who particularly incurred his dislike was Polemon, the celebrated sophist of Laodicea. Polemon belonged to the generation just preceding Artemidorus' and ranked in his day and for centuries afterward as the greatest master of the art next to Aristotle himself. His work in this field is now represented only by a citation from his original Greek; a Greek paraphrase by one Adamantiūs, who seemingly lived in the early fourth century; an anonymous Latin treatise which gives "Palemon" (i.e., Polemon) as one of its authorities along with Loxus and the Ps.-Aristotle; an Arabic translation of uncertain date; and a literal Latin version of the Arabic prepared by a German orientalist.⁴

We must bear in mind that Artemidorus was a native or citizen of Ephesus, for though he added the word *Δαλδιανός* to the title of this one composition in order to honor his mother's birthplace, the obscure Lydian town of *Δάλδης*, his writings on other subjects had been entitled "Of Artemidorus the Ephesian."⁵ Polemon, though born in Laodicea on the Lycus, was always closely associated with Smyrna, where he maintained a residence.⁶ Philostratus, his biog-

³ *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*² (London, 1920) 469.

⁴ All of these are printed in R. Förster's *Scriptores Physiognomonici* (Leipzig, 1893), which I shall cite hereafter as *Scr. Phys.*, giving references according to volume, page, and line. For the single direct quotation from Polemon, see *Scr. Phys.* 1.lxxvi. References to Artemidorus are given according to book and chapter, followed in parentheses by page and line according to R. Hercher's edition (Leipzig, 1864); and those to Philostratus' *Vitae Sophistarum* are given similarly according to Vol. 2 of C. L. Kayser's edition (Leipzig, 1871). Perhaps some readers are more familiar with the two extant declamations by Polemon (edited by H. Hinck, Leipzig, 1873) than they are with his work on physiognomy.

⁵ 3.66 (196, 18-26); cf. 2.70 (168, 2-10). See *RE s.v.* "Artemidoros," 1334. For obvious reasons "Artemidorus" is a good Ephesian name, though naturally its use was not confined to Ephesus.

⁶ Philostr. *VS* 1.25 (44, 32ff.). For a modern biography of Polemon, see H. Jüttner, "De Polemonis rhetoris vita, operibus, arte," *Breslauer philol. Abh.* 8.1 (Breslau, 1898). There is a good sketch in C. J. Cadoux's *Ancient Smyrna, a History of the City from the Earliest Times to 324 A.D.* (Oxford, 1938) 254-260, 263.

rapher, is obliged to correct an erroneous belief that he was born in Smyrna, but adds that this city had a special affection for him (*Vitae Sophistarum* 1.25 [42, 12–18]). Now ever since the time of Augustus there had been a keen rivalry between Ephesus and Smyrna,⁷ and it lasted, as we shall see, for some years afterward, but reached a climax at an uncertain date in the reign of Hadrian. On this occasion Polemon appeared as the champion of Smyrna, while Ephesus was represented by Favorinus, the noted rhetorician from Gaul;⁸ Philostratus tells us that this personal feud began in Ionia, and passed from there to Rome, where consulars and their families took sides (*ibidem* 1.8 [10, 13–19]). The dispute which he mentions in a later chapter (*ibidem* 1.25 [43, 6–12]) is commonly regarded as having been either the same or some phase of it,⁹ for here the two cities figure once more as rivals, and Polemon is said again to have pleaded the cause of Smyrna. Here, further, we learn that Hadrian was present, and that Polemon won for Smyrna a large grant of money which was used to build public granaries, a gymnasium, and a temple. According to the epitome of Dio Cassius (69.3.4–6), Hadrian made it his policy to encourage the rivals of both Favorinus and the sophist Dionysius, because he was jealous of their accomplishments; and this was also his motive for challenging at one time or another the ἀτέλεια which Favorinus enjoyed in his native Arles. But the reason given by Philostratus (*Vitae Sophistarum* 1.8 [9, 15ff.]), namely, that Favorinus had failed to meet all the terms of the grant, seems much more credible. With regard to the episode that concerns us immediately, it would seem reasonable to follow Dürre in bringing it into relation with one of Hadrian's journeys through Asia Minor,¹⁰ though scholars have

⁷ See H. Gaebler, "Zur Münzkunde Makedoniens," *ZN* 24 (1904) 245–338, esp. 262ff. The neocorate (see p. 324 below) was always one of the chief objects of contention. The literary sources include Tac. *Ann.* 4.55f.; D. C. 59.28.1; and D. Chr. 34.48 (ed. von Arnim [Berlin, 1893]).

⁸ That the animosity between them had arisen much earlier has sometimes been inferred from Philostr. *VS* 1.25 (47, 11–15), but this is by no means a necessary inference.

⁹ Jüttner (*op. cit.* [see note 6], 29f.) separates the two episodes, but I think unjustifiably.

¹⁰ I. Dürre, *Die Reisen des Kaisers Hadrian* (*Abh. archäol.-epig. Seminares der Univ. Wien* [Vienna, 1881]), 2.51, note 232; 109. Dürre connects the affair with the first stage of Hadrian's journey of the year 123–4, in which he presumably passed through Ephesus and later Smyrna en route from Halicarnassus to Pergamon. He compares *CIG* 3148 (= *IGRP* 4.1431), lines 33ff.: . . . καὶ ὅσα ἐπετύχονεν (sc. οἱ Σμυρναῖοι) παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος Ἀδριανοῦ διὰ Ἀντωνίου Πολέμωνος, κτλ. The inscription goes on to

long recognized that the chronology of the emperor's travels involves a number of difficulties, and for our present purpose there is no need to reopen this discussion. The sequel to the story became known only ten years ago, when a Vatican papyrus was published containing a large portion of Favorinus' diatribe *Περὶ φυγῆς*.¹¹ From this text we learn that the author was exiled, or rather "relegated," to Chios, evidently by the order of Hadrian and as a result of the affair mentioned in Philostratus. It is clear, however, that at some time after the accession of Antoninus he returned to Rome, where Aulus Gellius spent much time in his company.¹² In 143 or after they both paid a visit to Marcus Cornelius Fronto, who was suffering from the gout (*Noctes Atticae* 2.26.1). Now Artemidorus himself had travelled in Italy and knew about Fronto's affliction and the details of its treatment.¹³ This combination of circumstances points to the possibility that Artemidorus had also had some contact with Favorinus and his circle, and so it becomes interesting to note that his rejection of genethliology (see note 2

list a neocorate, a *ἱερὸς ἀγών*, ἀτέλεια, θεολόγοι, ὕμνωδοί, a sum of 150,000 drachmas, and a certain number of columns, of specified kinds of marble, for the ἀλειπτήριον. Ephesus was not altogether neglected either (cf. Dürr, *op. cit.* 50, note 226), but at least Smyrna won the moral victory, and probably the material advantage as well. Dürr's dating has been accepted by most scholars; see Jüttner, *op. cit.* (see note 6), 27ff.; W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leipzig, 1907) 139f.; Cadoux, *op. cit.* (see note 6) 257; and Miss Elizabeth C. Evans, "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography," *HSPh* 46 (1935) 43–85, esp. 50 (an article valuable for its bibliography as well as for its proof that the principles of physiognomy were widely known in the second century). A. von Premerstein has argued that the quarrel spread to Rome about 133: Polemon was made a member of the Museum in Alexandria (Philostr. *VS* 1.25 [44, 6ff.]), probably in 130–1, when Hadrian journeyed to Egypt; and Philostratus next mentions Hadrian and Polemon as being in Rome together (*Das Attentat der Konsulare auf Hadrian im Jahre 118 n. Chr.*, *Kl. Beiheft* 8 [1908] 50, note 2). It is of course possible that this second phase was much postponed. Von Premerstein holds further that the journey with Hadrian which Polemon describes in *Scr. Phys.* 1.138–142 is distinct from that dated by Dürr in 123 and relates rather to the attempted coup of Lusius Quietus and Avidius Nigrinus in 118 (cf. Spart. *Hadr.* 5–7); thus he comes to what he justly terms a "surprising conclusion"—"dass Polemon eine bisher nicht bekannte kleinasiatische Reise des Kaisers beschreibt."

¹¹ *PVat* 11. For a critical estimate, see P. Collart, "Favorinus d'Arles," *BAGB* 34 (1932) 23–31, and the reviews by A. Körte, *APF* 10 (1931) 64–67 and K. Prächter, *Gn* 8 (1932) 561–572. B. Häslers *Favorin über die Verbannung* (Berlin, 1935) has been inaccessible to me; and I gather from the reviews that it deals chiefly with the rhetorical side of the treatise.

¹² Cf. Gell. 2.26.1 (dated after 143 because Fronto is termed *consularis*); 3.1.1; 4.1.1; 14.1.1; 14.2.11; 16.3.1; 18.7.2; 20.1.2; 17.10.1 (in Antium); 18.1.3 (in Ostia). For Favorinus' house in Rome, willed to Herodes Atticus, see Philostr. *VS* 1.8 (10, 8).

¹³ Artem. 1.1 (2, 17); 5.1 (253, 11); 4.22 (215, 10–12).

above) agrees in the main with Favorinus' declamation *Adversus Chaldaeos seu genethliacos* (*ibidem* 14.1), though it is true enough that the mere use of a common source would serve to explain the agreement.¹⁴ Polemon himself had come to Italy by 143, for in the summer of that year we find him declaiming in Naples before young Marcus Aurelius.¹⁵ Once again the two enemies were living in proximity.

As to Artemidorus' attitude toward Polemon, I submit that the ill will which the Ephesian dream-interpreter held towards the physiognomists probably arose to a large extent from the rivalry between Ephesus and Smyrna. Artemidorus could hardly have esteemed a science whose leading advocate had brought this much-publicized rebuff to the place of his birth. And we read of another Smyrnaean, one Megistias, who was proficient in physiognomy. The source¹⁶ represents him as a *grammaticus*, teaching a class of boys in a school near the agora, so he must have practiced physiognomy only as an amateur, perhaps under Polemon's influence. In any case, he too would have fallen under Artemidorus' ban, and for a kindred reason.

Artemidorus' work seems to have been published in the last or penultimate decade of the century, and certainly much later than Polemon's treatise on physiognomy,¹⁷ but as a boy or youth (for we do not know the year of his birth) he had no doubt learned how his city had suffered, at the hands of the physiognomist, a loss of the imperial favor and some of the substantial blessings that accompanied it. He knew of a citharoede who had been expelled from a *ἱερὸς ἀγών* of Hadrian in Smyrna,¹⁸ and we recall that the Smyrnaeans had granted the presidency of their *Ἀδριάνεια* to Polemon and his descendants.¹⁹ Of course there is no reason for sup-

¹⁴ See Blum, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 84.

¹⁵ Fronto 2.5 (page 29, ed. Naber). Cf. Jüttner, *op. cit.* (see note 6) 32.

¹⁶ Philostr. *VS* 2.27 (118f.).

¹⁷ See W. Reichardt, *De Artemidoro Daldiano librorum onirocriticorum auctore* (Jena, 1893) 126f. Von Premerstein (*op. cit.* [see note 10] 50) dates Polemon's work between 118, the year of the "Attentat," and 136, when Nigrinus' kinsman, L. Ceionius Commodus, was adopted by Hadrian as L. Aelius Caesar (see *RE* 3.1830). This cannot be far wrong, although the sources do not attribute to Polemon the tact which Von Premerstein's *terminus ante quem* assumes.

¹⁸ Artem. 1.64 (58, 23ff.): οἶδα δὲ καθαφδὸν ἐν Σμύρνῃ μέλλοντα ἀγωνίζεσθαι τὸν ἱερὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ, κτλ . . . συνέβη αὐτῷ . . . ἐκβληθῆναι τοῦ ἀγῶνος, κτλ. Philostr. *VS* 1.25 (45, 21ff.) tells of a tragic actor who appealed to Antoninus when expelled by Polemon from τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ὀλύμπια, οἷς ἐπεστάται οἱ Πολεμῶν, κτλ.

¹⁹ Philostr. *VS* 1.25 (42, 22f.).

posing that these passages refer to the same performance, but at least the allusion suggests that Artemidorus must have been well acquainted with the prestige which Polemon enjoyed in Smyrna.²⁰

This bitterness between men and cities must have been intense, for there are signs that it did not soon disappear. For example, it was rumored both in Favorinus' own time and later that he was *ἀνδρόθηλος*,²¹ and Polemon, without naming him,²² subjects his physical and mental makeup to a severe scrutiny, concluding that one born to this condition must necessarily be a thorough scoundrel.²³ This case is not unique. The unknown abbreviator of the Ps.-Aristotle similarly abused the sophist Dionysius of Miletus by inserting the words *οἷος ἂν εἴη Διονύσιος ὁ σοφιστής* in the description of the typical *κίμαιδος*.²⁴ But perhaps we ought not to labor the evidence by reading too much meaning into the fact that both Favorinus and Dionysius are said to have suffered from Hadrian's enmity, and that both of them had contacts with Ephesus.²⁵

In the next reign, when Favorinus has returned to Italy, we find the cities still at odds, as evidenced by a letter which Antoninus dispatches to the Ephesians, saying he has heard that the Pergamenes have used the proper forms of address in writing to them, but that by some chance the Smyrnaeans have neglected to do so; he suggests that if the people of Ephesus will take the initiative in such courtesies, those of Smyrna will probably respond as they ought.²⁶ Evidently it was by no accident that the Smyrnaeans

²⁰ It may be that he was present at such a performance, for he had attended many festivals (cf. 1.1 (2, 16)). He reports two dreams dreamt by runners at unnamed *ιεροὶ ἀγῶνες* (5.78f. [269, 25 to 270, 19]), and he knew of the *Εὐσίβεια* which Antoninus first gave in Italy in honor of Hadrian, A.D. 139 (1.26 [27, 13-17]).

²¹ Suid., s.v. *Φαβωρίνος*; Philostr. *VS* 1.8 (8, 26ff.); Luc. *Eun.* 7; *Demon.* 12. For a jest of Polemon's on this subject, see Philostr. *VS* 1.25 (52, 13-16).

²² The anonymous treatise makes the identification; *Scr. Phys.* 2.58.2f.: *nomen quidem non posuit, intellegitur autem de Favorino eum dicere.*

²³ *Scr. Phys.* 1.160.11ff.; 164.4-6.

²⁴ *Scr. Phys.* 1.34.5f. See R. Förster, "De Aristotelis quae feruntur physiognomicorum indole ac condicione," *Philol. Abhandlungen Martin Hertz . . . dargebracht* (Berlin, 1888), 283-303, esp. 302.

²⁵ D. C. *Epit.* 69.3.4. On Dionysius' burial in Ephesus, where he had taught during the latter part of his life, see Philostr. *VS* 1.22 (38, 24-28). It seems that he admired Polemon, who replied to his criticisms with a friendly jest (*ibid.* 37, 17ff.). Another reason why Polemon cannot have been responsible for this second libel is that he used the Ps.-Aristotle in its unabridged form, as shown by Förster (*op. cit.* in note 24 above). Perhaps Megistias of Smyrna (see p. 325) would be a suitable candidate for this dubious honor.

²⁶ See *SIG*³ 2.559-561 (number 849). Cadoux (*op. cit.* [see note 6] 263) dates this inscription between 141 and 144, and suggests that the victory which Polemon's

had omitted some word, perhaps *πρώτη*, from Ephesus' proud title: *πρώτη καὶ μεγίστη μητρόπολις τῆς Ἀσίας*. To this period also belongs the address *Περὶ Ὀμονοίας ταῖς Πόλεσιν* by Aelius Aristides,²⁷ who had been a student of Polemon's²⁸ and had become the most prominent citizen of Smyrna in his generation. This speech, delivered (or written as if delivered) in the *bouleuterion* in Pergamon, must have been received as a well-meant but not entirely adequate attempt to set at rest the differences between the three cities.

We must not overlook two passages which bear upon Artemidorus' relation to Aristides, the disciple of Polemon. The first, which records the death, as foretold by a dream, of one *Ἀριστείδης ὁ νομικός*,²⁹ is usually accepted as referring to the rhetorician, although the epithet might not seem wholly apt.³⁰ On this showing Aristides must have been dead when Artemidorus published his work;³¹ and so it is less surprising to find him reviewing dispassionately a case that undoubtedly held great interest for so zealous an investigator.

The other passage may be rendered as follows: "As regards prescriptions, it is idle to investigate the claim that gods draw up courses of medical treatment for mankind; for many persons both in Pergamon and in Alexandria and elsewhere were cured by prescriptions, and some there are who even say that the art of healing was discovered as a result of such prescriptions. Yet I believe it is evident to those who have attained some degree of judgment, that the prescriptions which some folk record are full of nonsense;

posthumous speech won for Smyrna (Philostr. *VS* 1.25 [50, 11–30]) probably concerned the rival claims of the three cities. His dating, however, is inconsistent with the evidence of Marcus' letter to Fronto (cf. p. 325 above), which would indicate that Polemon was alive and in Italy in 143; on the other hand, editors have disagreed as to the interpretation of the letter (see Naber's notes, *ad loc.*).

²⁷ Aristid. *Or.* 42, ed. Dindorf (23, ed. Keil). The speech is to be dated by the reference in 73 to one of the emperors, whom Keil identifies as Marcus Aurelius.

²⁸ Suid. *s.vv.* *Ἀριστείδης, Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεωπαγίτης, Πόλεμων*; Prolegomena to Aristides' *Παναθηναϊκός* (3.737, line 18, ed. Dindorf).

²⁹ Artem. 4.2 (205, 9–12). For the identification, see Reichardt, *op. cit.* (see note 17), 126f.

³⁰ Buried in the old edition of Artemidorus by N. Rigault and J. Reiske (Leipzig, 1805) 1.445, one can find Reiff's suggestion that *νομικός* pertains to *νόμοι*, *ἁρμονία*, *ὁ ἁρμονικά*, and that therefore the allusion may be to Aristides Quintilianus, the author of *Περὶ μουσικῆς βιβλία Γ'* (on whom see *RE* 2.894ff.). But *νομικός* = *legis peritus* is well attested in the new Liddell and Scott; not so, *νομικός* = *musicus*. Further, *νομικός* applied to Aristides is not much odder than *ἄθροιστικός* as applied to Fronto (Artem. 4.22 [215, 10]). Perhaps both epithets designate what appeared most distinctive to Artemidorus: Fronto's gout and Aristides' activities of a more or less political character.

³¹ He died not long after A.D. 181; see A. Boulanger, "Chronologie de la vie du rhéteur Aelius Aristide," *RPh* 46 (1922) 26–55, and esp. 54.

for they do not record what they actually see, but rather a number of things that they themselves invent." (4.22 [213, 21–214, 1].) He proceeds to ridicule such nostrums as "Nereids' broth" and *παρθένου γάλα*. It is difficult to say whether or how far this verdict was inspired by civic rivalries, but the words imply at least a certain distrust of Pergamene physicians and their patients. Anyone who has read the *Ἱεροὶ Λόγοι* of Aristides will readily grant, I believe, that those discourses could hardly have won Artemidorus' unqualified approval, because they sometimes tell of curious treatments and medicines which Asclepius had revealed to their compiler during the years he had spent in Pergamon.³² It is conceivable, one must admit, that Galen himself was somewhere in the back of Artemidorus' mind as he wrote, though the respectful tone in which the physician mentioned the other's work on augury (see the quotation in note 2 above) suggests that any ill feeling on Artemidorus' part cannot have been strongly reciprocated. Galen, we read, had lived for a time in Smyrna and Alexandria, and had twice returned to his native Pergamon in later years.³³ Several times he recalls the dream which had led his father to give him medical training,³⁴ and his own clinical interest in dreams is well known.³⁵ Further, he reports cures effected by Asclepius,³⁶ and often recommends specifics as strange as those which amused Artemidorus.³⁷ It is noteworthy that in his short essay *Περὶ τῆς ἐξ ἐνυπνίων διαγνώσεως* (Galen 6.833f.) he rejects an interpretation of the allegorical sort which Artemidorus favored (cf. 1.50 [48, 1–3]), though he acknowledges that dreams may aid in detecting various physical conditions. Such a view might well have been a bit distasteful to a professional oniologist.

These slightly digressive remarks on Aristides and Galen close the chain of evidence. The most that can be reasonably inferred from Artemidorus' reference to Pergamon is that the feeling be-

³² E.g., for decayed teeth: an unguent made of powdered lions' teeth (evidently sympathetic magic), a mouthwash of *ὄπός* (fig-juice?), an application of pepper (*θέρμης οὖνεκα*), and an unguent of *στάχυς Ἰνδικός* (nard?) (Aristid. *Or.* 49.36, ed. B. Keil).

³³ Gal. 2.217; 13.599; 19.16.

³⁴ Gal. 10.609; 16.223; 19.59.

³⁵ References are collected by R. Herzog, "Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros," *Ph.* Supplementband 22, Heft 3 (1931) 144–146.

³⁶ Cf. Gal. 6.869; 12.315.

³⁷ E.g., a mouse's blood and a rooster's bile mixed with *γάλα γυναικείου* (cf. Artemidorus' parodic *παρθένου γάλα*) for a certain condition of the eyes (Gal. 14.498). Thorndike has collected many more examples (*op. cit.* [see note 1] 168).

tween that city and his own did not leave him wholly unmoved. But perhaps this reveals the temper of his mind enough so that we can believe him capable of cherishing toward Smyrna as well an antipathy such as has been postulated.

To recapitulate, the unquestioned facts, apart from all conjecture, are these: (1) Artemidorus was a native or resident of Ephesus, while Polemon, his older contemporary and the best known physiognomist of the time, was prominent in Smyrna; (2) current rivalries between Smyrna, Ephesus, and Pergamon are abundantly evidenced; (3) Polemon, in opposition to Favorinus, had won a notable forensic or diplomatic victory for Smyrna over Ephesus; (4) Artemidorus reports an incident of the *'Αδριάνεια* in Smyrna, of which Polemon was president; and (5) Artemidorus betrays a certain enmity toward both physiognomy and Pergamene medicine. These facts cannot be said to constitute absolute proof, but taken collectively they create a presumption in favor of my thesis, namely, that Artemidorus' dislike for the physiognomists can be traced in part to certain disaffections between three Anatolian cities.

It might seem a little surprising to find next that several of his interpretations have a physiognomical basis, in spite of the contempt which he expressed for the art. For example: "An unblemished and smooth-fleshed forehead is a good sign for everyone and indicates a liberal, manly nature, but a sore or diseased forehead reveals disgrace and injury alike." (1.23 [24, 22-24].) Removed from its context, such a statement would fit well enough into any physiognomical treatise,³⁸ but here of course it gives only the content of a dream; the next passage, on dreaming that one has a bronze, iron, or stone forehead, makes this clear. Other principles of this kind could be cited and compared with passages from Polemon, but no close parallels would be discovered.³⁹ I judge that there is no direct borrowing, but that Artemidorus' wide-ranging eclecticism permitted him to draw almost any material he wished from the common fund of scientific lore that his age afforded, and this without being hampered by his disdain for those rivals to whom such material more properly belonged. Thus he even used numerology, and particularly isopsephisms, in dream-

³⁸ Cf. Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.230.23-26: *Multa caro frontis simul paulo prominentioris cogitationem consilium et qui de rebus gerendis solliciti sunt indicat.*

³⁹ A few specious comparisons could be catalogued, but they would not carry conviction.

analysis⁴⁰ in spite of his scorn for the Pythagoreans; and in passing I should like to suggest that the Pythagoreans and the physiognomists may have been coupled in his mind because of the popular belief that Pythagoras had invented this science.⁴¹

A second point of contact between the onirocritic and the physiognomist seems worth mentioning if it is not unduly stressed, that is, the practice of comparing human beings with animals. Polemon catalogues ninety-three species, ranging from the lion to the ant,⁴² and Artemidorus lists fully as many or more.⁴³ To take a single example, a man whose features resemble those of an ichneumon is, among other things, mean, dirty, and dangerous,⁴⁴ while a dream about an ichneumon serves as a warning against a crafty schemer.⁴⁵ But here again there appears to be no question of borrowing, and since Polemon simply elaborated the zoological physiognomy which he inherited from Peripatetic science,⁴⁶ one might fairly infer that Artemidorus was doing somewhat the same thing independently. In any case, the animal kingdom had to be included as a part of the universal scheme which provided a framework for his collections.

It was chiefly in their insistence on the need of study and experience that Polemon and Artemidorus stood on common ground. Polemon claimed that his knowledge had been acquired only by *magno studio et diuturna experientia*,⁴⁷ while for Artemidorus *πείρα* was a kind of watchword:⁴⁸ he depended primarily on experience rather than written authorities, though he made careful use of all the written sources available to him.⁴⁹ He advised his son to

⁴⁰ Artem. 4.24 (216ff.). See F. Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, *Στοιχεῖα*, Heft 7 (1922) 96–104. To the examples of isopsephisms collected by Dornseiff may be added a list of seventeen, published from a papyrus text by T. C. Skeat, *Mizraim* 3 (1936) 18–25.

⁴¹ See note 2 above, and the *testimonia* collected by R. Förster in *Scr. Phys.* 1.xiiiif.

⁴² Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.170.24–190.3.

⁴³ Artem. 100–115; 171–173; 233–236.

⁴⁴ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.176.7f.: *Ichneumo malignus fugax protervus oppugnator patiens sordidus perniciosus*.

⁴⁵ Artem. 3.12 (173, 20–23): *Ἰχνεύμων καὶ ἱκτίς πανούργους σημαίνουνσιν ἀνθρώπους καὶ δολίους οὐδέ ποτε τοῖς ὀρώσιν εἰνοοῦντας διὰ τὸ ἄγριον καὶ δυστιθάσεντον, κτλ.*

⁴⁶ See Miss Geneva Misener, "Loxus, Physician and Physiognomist," *CPh* 18 (1923) 1–22, esp. 14–16.

⁴⁷ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.192.17.

⁴⁸ Artem. 1.1 (1, 11 and 16; 2, 7). Cf. 4.1 (197, 12), where he rejects conjecture in favor of experience. On his empiricism generally, see Blum, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 81ff.

⁴⁹ Artem. 2.70 (167, 7ff.); 1.1 (2, 1–12).

supplement the study of specialized treatises with travel and general reading, and he did not wish it to be forgotten that he himself had collected records of dreams in Asia, Greece, and Italy.⁵⁰

Empiricism may lead to a sort of inductive or experimental method, and one of its truest marks is the willingness to recognize complicating factors. Polemon shows that he is not blind to difficulties when he urges that the physiognomist cannot reach a decision until he has made a thorough diagnosis: *Iamque te facio certiore tibi unum signum non satis esse neve iudicium tuum certum putes, priusquam aliorum signorum testimonia petiveris*;⁵¹ complications sometimes result, for instance, from the fact that a single subject may combine the characteristics of several different animals.⁵² Artemidorus also realized that there were phenomena which almost transcended the range of his science: "And one ought to recognize that nothing is so troublesome and difficult as to gain a comprehensive view of the visual impressions which are intermingled in dreams and to render a single verdict on the basis of all the evidence, since it is often possible to have dreams that are inconsistent and quite heterogeneous"; and he proceeds to analyze *exempli gratia* the content of a complex dream (3.66 [194, 24ff.]). He well understood the logic of the inductive method: "And one must form one's judgments not from infrequent occurrences but from a majority of cases." (1.45 [43, 21ff.]) Another variable was that of individual- and sex-differences. Physiognomy, of course, was almost entirely a matter of individual differences, but even in dream-analysis, where this factor could have been ignored or minimized, we find that Artemidorus gave careful attention to it. The investigator, he says, should make tactful inquiries about the subject's character (4.59 [237, 19-22]), and must also take his age and physical condition into account.⁵³ He points out repeatedly that a dream may mean one thing for a freeman or a rich man and another for a slave, a pauper, or a prisoner, one thing for a man and another for a woman. Polemon made much of sex-differences; he classified his animal species as masculine or feminine, adopting the lion as the ideal male type and the panther as the ideal female

⁵⁰ Artem. 4.4 (207, 2ff.); 1.1 (2, 16f.); 5.1 (253, 9-11). Cf. 1.8 (14, 17ff.); 1.26 (27, 13ff.). On his visit to Cyllene, cf. 1.45 (43, 5ff.).

⁵¹ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.166.19-22.

⁵² Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.190.14-19.

⁵³ Artem. 1.9 (15, 5-9); 4.27 (219, 8-10).

type.⁵⁴ This much was of course traditional, but he also recognized, soundly enough, that masculine and feminine characteristics are usually combined in the same individual of either sex, so that it is a question of determining which is dominant.⁵⁵

Artemidorus' fourth book was addressed to his son of the same name, with the hope that he would not have it copied extensively, for it was thought that he could attain professional eminence by retaining it for his own use (4. *Prooemium* [198, 21–24]). Such advice reveals a sort of professional spirit, which, needless to say, does not coincide exactly with that of the scientist. This appears once more when he tells the younger Artemidorus to employ anagrammatical interpretations only when he would seem wiser than some other interpreter; but privately to ignore them, or else he will be deceived (4.23 [216, 19–22]). This reluctance to be perfectly candid with the laity is sometimes a mark of the professional point of view. Polemon shows little professional spirit. He seems to have pursued his studies mainly as an avocation, because we do not read of his being consulted but find him putting his skill to the test as the opportunity arises.⁵⁶ He maintained that physiognomy reveals the past and future as well as the present; so, for instance, his knowledge once enabled him to unmask a liar and hypocrite, and another time he prophesied correctly that a bride would be abducted before the ceremony by her true lover.⁵⁷ Again, he claimed (*credite, posteri!*) that he had foretold the bereavement of a woman whose attire left only her eyes and nose visible.⁵⁸ These cases are significant, for Artemidorus, it will be remembered, refused to grant that physiognomy had any mantic value.

A feature of the empirical method is the use of *exempla* taken from the writer's own times or even from his own experience. Polemon draws only two instances from the past, those of Socrates

⁵⁴ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.194ff.

⁵⁵ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.170.5–7: Itaque postquam adspexisti hominem, compara eum de eoque meditare, utrum masculinum eum putes an femininum . . .; *ibid.* 192.8–14: Neque omnem physiognomoniam quam te e signis masculini et feminini petere iussi omittes. Id igitur ex obtutu motu et voce eruas, deinceps ex iis alterum cum altero compares ut utrum eorum praevaleat certissime cognoscas. Nam in masculino femininum et in feminino masculinum est; sed quod nomen in ea cadat a potiore fit.

⁵⁶ Cf. Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.288.16: . . . physiognomoniam usurpare mihi placuit.

⁵⁷ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.290.16–20; 1.290.20ff.; 1.288.13ff. (for a somewhat similar story cf. *ibid.* 286f.).

⁵⁸ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.282f.

and Alexander. Of contemporaries, he names only Hadrian, but Favorinus can be identified, as perhaps also Lusius Quietus, the recalcitrant consular (see note 10), and several others are described so vividly as to leave no doubt that they were real persons.⁵⁹ It is clear that these sketches are fully as distorted by prejudice and suspicion as that of Favorinus. In fact, Polemon seems to have believed that his science was valuable chiefly as a weapon of defense against potential enemies.⁶⁰ Perhaps the two stories of weddings form an exception, if indeed they are not fictitious, for, as a German scholar has observed, their atmosphere recalls that of the Milesian Tales.⁶¹ Artemidorus reviews many contemporary cases in an objective manner, and as a rule he mentions no names whenever he has an adverse criticism to make;⁶² this practice gives rise to the present investigation. To be sure, Polemon follows the same practice, but the difference is that he proceeds nevertheless to denigrate his unnamed subjects so thoroughly as almost to assure their being identified; for their identity must have been more evident to his ancient readers than it is to us.

One minor point of comparison remains. For centuries the philosophers had been unable to reach a unanimous decision as to whether the soul is localized in the heart or in the head,⁶³ and here Polemon and Artemidorus also differ: the physiognomist declares for the heart,⁶⁴ as we should expect him to do in conformity with Aristotelian tradition, but the dream-interpreter's preference for the head⁶⁵ probably results from his scrapbag method rather than from any particular devotion to Plato, for in one passage he says,

⁵⁹ See J. Mesk, "Die Beispiele in Polemons Physiognomik," *WS* 50 (1932) 51-67. Note particularly the vivid and unflattering character-analyses of two Lydians in *Scr. Phys.* 1.126-132 and 1.144.4-16. These passages gain in interest if we remember that Artemidorus may have been half Lydian by birth.

⁶⁰ The same precautionary tone can be noted in Adamantius' paraphrase of Polemon, *Scr. Phys.* 1.298.9-13.

⁶¹ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.288.13ff.; 286f. Cf. Mesk, *op. cit.* (see note 59) 63.

⁶² Cf. the tantalizing reticence of Artem. 4.22 (214, 20ff.): ... οὐ ἐγὼ καίπερ εὖ εἶδὼς τὸ ὄνομα οὐκ ἐπιμνησθήσομαι.

⁶³ The various views are conveniently summarized by Miss Misener, *op. cit.* (see note 46) 4.

⁶⁴ Polem. *Scr. Phys.* 1.110.17-21: Scias autem cor, e quo animae studia oriuntur et clam initium capiunt, esse sedem cogitationis. Eodem modo oculus in locum cordis pervenit, quippe quo studia et cogitatio agitentur et cura animae transluceat.

⁶⁵ The head is "responsible for life and light" (Artem. 1.2 [6, 18f.]; cf. 1.35 [36, 4]); the "dwelling of the senses" (*ibid.* 9); and "lord of the body" (*ibid.* 26). The head is to the body as heaven to the whole universe (2.36 [137, 11-13]).

with a certain disregard for consistency, that the heart "has the whole control of the body" (1.44 [42, 15]).

To conclude, I believe that Artemidorus, with his inclination toward eclectic methods, might have held no particular grievance against the physiognomists if his civic pride had not been wounded by their most eminent representative. When Polemon made exaggerated claims for his art, there must have been further grounds for listing all of its practitioners among the false prophets. A comparative survey of the two treatises, such as appears justified by these historical considerations, reveals some of the general assumptions made by pseudoscience in this period, no less than the individual vagaries of specialists.