

XI. Further Notes on Artemidorus

ROGER PACK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1. *A question of editorial policy.* Any prospective editor of the *Onirocritica** must reach a decision on a basic issue, namely, the relative value to be assigned to the two manuscripts upon which the text depends, L (Codex Laurentianus 87, 8, saec. XI) and V (Codex Marcianus 268, saec. XV). Hercher, who first used L in his edition of 1864, rated it generally higher than V, not because of its greater age but because, in his opinion, it presents an honest, if illiterate transcription unmarred by scribal caprices, presumably, that is, by conjectural emendation.¹ Though he did not say so, he may have meant to imply that V suffers in some measure from this defect. In our generation Latte and Blum have challenged this estimate, suggesting that a modern edition should be built chiefly upon V.² But Hercher, had he thought it necessary to do so, could have readily supported his judgment by adducing passages in which it appears that L has mechanically or conscientiously reproduced archetypal errors close to the true readings, while V, whether Michael Apostolius, the scribe, or one or more of his predecessors, has speciously but falsely corrected them.

Onirocr. 54.10: "The poet (*sc.* Homer) says that ships are 'steeds of the brine' (ἄλος Rigault and Hercher from *Odyssey* 4.708, ἄλλος L, ἄλλη V)." L garbles the word a bit but V wrongly alters it, evidently understanding "Elsewhere (ἄλλη) the poet says that ships are steeds."

* The following notes form a sequel to those which appeared in *TAPA* 88 (1957) 189-96 and *TAPA* 90 (1959) 180-84.

¹ See his Praefatio, p. ix: "ego primus Laurentianum adhibui . . . scriptum ab homine indocto, sed a cuius manibus librariorum quam toties exsecramur libido abesset."

² K. Latte, *Gnomon* 5 (1929) 156: "Herchers Text leidet, abgesehen von seinen zahlreichen Athetesen, an der irrigen Bewertung der Handschriften; seine Bevorzugung von L gegenüber V lässt sich nicht aufrecht erhalten." C. Blum, *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus* (Uppsala 1936) 14-15: "His text is . . . marred by two mistakes: he has preferred the oldest manuscript and he has atticized the style of Artemidorus." The other criticisms seem fair enough.

In 71.15–17 dreams about certain crowns or garlands (*στέφανοι κήρινοι* Rigault and Hercher, *κρινοι* L, *κρίνινοι* V) are interpreted as of ill omen because poets use the word *κήρ* for “death.” L honestly copies a blunder, but V, ignoring the word-play in the context, mistakenly converts the crowns of wax to crowns of lilies.

In 102.20–21³ Artemidorus says he has often observed that a dream about a lioness signifies rich men who have been “slandered for immorality” (*διαβεβλημένους ἐπὶ κιναιδίᾳ* Hercher, *δ. ἐπὶ κιναιδιαία* L, *δ. ἐπεὶ κιναιδιαία ἐστὶ* V and Reiff in his ed. of 1805). The archetypal error, faithfully reproduced by L, is a slight and natural one. Hercher’s correction gives acceptable sense and syntax (cf. Herodian 2.6.6, *τῶν ἐπὶ βίῳ μὴ σώφρονι διαβεβλημένων*). The reading of V is suspect because the lexica do not cite an adjective *κιναιδιαῖος* from any other source: the revisers of Stephanus inserted it from this passage, but the compilers of *LSJ*⁹ prudently excluded it.⁴

“Custom, as Phemonoë (*ἡ Φημονόη* Hercher, *ηφημονῇ* L, *ἡ φήμη* V and Reiff) says, is unwritten law” (203.7–8). Here V has abruptly cut the knot. Without L, Hercher could scarcely have restored the true reading. Phemonoë was reputed to have been the first Delphic priestess and a collection of oracles once circulated under her name.⁵ Another dictum of the Ps.-Phemonoë is quoted in 96.5–6, also corrupted (*ἡ Φημονόη* Hercher, *ἡ φήμη μόνον* L and Reiff from M, a derivative of L, *ἡ ὑφειμένον* V). Here, to be sure, the situation is a bit different. “Report alone says this is a blessing” (L) and “This I say (*λέγω*) is a diminished (?) blessing” (V) both arose from corruption and misinterpretation, but L at least points to the proper restoration. Phemonoë was entirely lost to readers of Reiff’s edition.

Oniocr. 249.2–8 tells how Paulus, an attorney who was due to plead a case before the emperor, dreamt that a certain Nikon assisted him. He took this lucky name as a presage of victory, ignoring the fact that Nikon had once lost such a case. The dream clearly pointed to an adverse judgment “because Nikon had been defeated (*ἦν . . . λελειμμένος* Reiske and Hercher,

³ This sentence should follow line 24, but the printer transposed it, as noted in Hercher’s *Corrigenda*.

⁴ I doubt that Artemidorus was thinking of Leæna the notorious meretrix, as Rigault and Reiff maintained.

⁵ See *RE* 19 (1938) 1957, s.v. “Phemonoe,” where, however, Artemidorus does not appear among the testimonia.

λελιμμένος L, λελυμένος V).” Our author is fond of *λείπεσθαι* in this sense (11.15, 125.7 and 9, 170.4, 223.17, 227.1, 246.13, 262.14, 264.3, 269.12). L approximates the true reading but V introduces a different participle and, it would seem, a mistaken interpretation.

I subjoin without comment a few readings which I think could be analyzed in the same general way and with the same conclusion: *νεκροῖς* Reiff and Hercher, *νευροῖς* L, *ιεροῖς* V (70.20); *δ’ώραία* Reiff and Hercher, *δωρεα* L, *δ’ῶρα* V (75.20); *εάν τι σίνηται* ego, *άντισινηται* L, *εάν τι κινῆται* V, *εάν τις πινυῇ* Hercher *perperam* (123.7); *ἔχον* Suda and Hercher, *ἔχων* L, *ἔχοντα* V (199.17); *ὑπαρ ἦν* Hercher, *υπαρην* L, *παρῆν* V and Reiff (254.22); *ἡθμοῦ* Suda and Hercher, *ἡομου* L, *ισθμόν* V (255.10); *μισθωτής* Reiske and Hercher, *μισθῶ τῆς* L, *μισθῶν τῆς* V (259.25).

See also the passages discussed in paragraphs 3 and 5, below.

It is clear that sometimes only a respectful attention to L enabled Hercher and others to recover what Artemidorus most probably wrote. I would not deny that V is an indispensable supplement to L and that this rash emendation detected in it may have been merely sporadic. Yet such instances at least arouse suspicion and warn against accepting V uncritically as in every way the better witness. An editor should follow an eclectic procedure, as in fact Hercher did to a considerable extent, weighing each pair of variants on its merits while regretting that the lack of a third witness to a third tradition often prevents him from making speedier and easier choices.

2. In 206.4–8 Artemidorus advises his son, a professional dream-interpreter of the same name, to scorn those who, as it were, enact laws for the gods, saying in their prayers such things as, “Must I do this?” (*εἴ μοι πρακτέον τόδε* LV), “Shall I have this?” (*εἴ μοι ἔσται τόδε* LV), “May I now see the fruit of Demeter (*εἰ νῦν ἴδοιμι Δήμητρος καρπὸν . . .* LV); otherwise, that of Dionysus,” and “If it is advantageous and profitable for me, let me get something; if not, let me give it.” Hercher removed the *εἰ* from each of the first three quotations, printing respectively *ἐμοὶ πρακτέον τόδε*, *ἐμοὶ ἑατέον τόδε*, *νῦν ἴδοιμι . . .* This is quite unnecessary. Asseverations, it is true, might seem more consistent than questions with the idea of dictating to the gods, but Artemidorus refers to this style of prayer a bit later (line 12) as “questioning” (*ἐπερώτησις*). The syntax, whether

the questions are to be regarded as direct or indirect,⁶ is of course well attested though non-classical (cf. Matthew 12.10, Acts 21.37, etc.). It is interesting to note that the questions to be answered in Ps.-Astrampsychus, *Oraculorum decades CIII* (edited in 1863 by Hercher himself), are all in this form, e.g., *εἰ προκόψω ἐν τιμῇ*; The only other quoted question in Artemidorus is at 268.9, where an invalid dreams that he asks Zeus, *ῥάων ἔσομαι; ζήσω*; It may be that he would ordinarily have avoided the use of *εἰ* but that here he ridicules popular turns of expression as well as popular religious attitudes.

3. *Oniocr.* 9.18–10.2: “Further, the experts in these matters say that one must judge as propitious everything that is in accord with nature, law, custom, occupation, names, and time,”—the six “elements” (*στοιχεῖα*) of interpretation—“but they have not reflected that dreams which are in accord with nature have more serious consequences for the dreamers than those which are not, in case they are inopportune because of the attendant circumstances.” Latte rightly observes (*Gnomon* 5 [1929] 155–56) that the next sentence is incomprehensible as Hercher printed it: *γίνεται γάρ πως τοῖς εὐπόροις τὸ ἄκουσιν* (thus V and Hercher, *καθακούειν* L, *ἀκούσιον* Rigault, *οὐκ αἴσιον* Latte, assuming a lacuna after *τὸ*) *καὶ τοῖς τὰ πάνν μυστικώτερα πράττουσιν ἡμέραι καθαραὶ καὶ νυκτὸς εὖσημος ἀστέρων χορὸς⁷ ἡλίου τε καὶ σελήνης ἐπιτολαὶ καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια*. Latte renders: “So ist für die Reichen das . . . nicht günstig und für die in Heimlichkeit Wirkenden klare Tage, sternenhelle Nächte, Aufgang von Sonne und Mond usw.” I suspect that the emendators have too lightly disregarded L. Correcting the faulty aspiration, of which L offers other examples (e.g. *καθόναρ* 66.2, *ἐφόπττην* 168.2), we should have something like *〈οὐκ αἴσιον〉 τὸ κατακούειν*, “. . . for the rich, it is unpropitious to hear and obey.” V (*pace* Latte) probably miscopied *-ακούειν* rather than *αἴσιον*. It is natural

⁶ On this point the grammarians differ. For example, A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar* (London 1897) par. 2055, holds that the questions are direct, *εἰ* being an itacistic misspelling of the colloquial particle *ἦ*; A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*⁴ (New York 1923) 916, explains them as either indirect questions or conditions with their apodoses left unexpressed; and Kühner and Gerth, *Griechische Grammatik* 2, par. 589 (page 534), Anm. 14, briefly refer to them as direct.

⁷ Perhaps this is a tag of verse, as Latte indicates by punctuating *Ἐϋσημος ἀστέρων χορὸς*.

that some men should obey others but a special circumstance arises when the rich must obey, for of course they are accustomed to command. From a later discussion of the "elements" (204.6–13) we learn that the concept of "nature" is not restricted to physical phenomena but embraces such abstractions as joy and sorrow, enmity and friendship: then why not obedience?

In the same sentence τοῖς τὰ πάνυ μυστικώτερα πράττουσιν has troubled nobody and might possibly be allowed to stand, since late writers sometimes use πάνυ with the superlative (see *LSJ*,⁹ s.v.) and Artemidorus has comparatives for superlatives in at least one passage and perhaps two (261.25–27 and 121.15, discussed by Blum [above, note 2] 43–44). Or else it might be in point to compare the solecism "very minor." Let us note, however, that V omits τὰ and L omits πάνυ (a fact overlooked and not recorded by Hercher). The original word order is therefore uncertain, and actually there is good evidence for τοῖς πάνυ <τοῖς> τὰ κτλ., "those worthies who engage in rather secret activities." This is what I should prefer to read, assuming that L, by haplography, omitted τοῖς πάνυ and V similarly omitted τοῖς τὰ.

There are other cases in which variants can perhaps be explained by supposing that L omitted one of a pair of adjacent words and V the other, e.g. οὐ . . . γάλα ἄν (omitted by V) ποτε (omitted by L and Hercher) σχοίη (20.17), and φροντίδος ὑπερβαλλούσης (omitted by V and Hercher) ἀπαλλαγῆναι (omitted by L) προαγορεύει τὸ ὄναρ (172.1).

4. *Onirocr.* 15.25: περὶ ἀφροδισίων συνουσίας LV, περὶ συνουσίας Hercher; 72.9: περὶ συνουσίας ἀφροδισίων V, περὶ συνουσίας καὶ ἀφροδισίων L, περὶ συνουσίας Hercher; 20.16–17: ἄνευ συνουσίας ἀφροδισίου V and Hercher, ἄνευ οὐσίας ἀφροδισίων L. The phrase ἢ τῶν ἀφροδισίων συνουσία appears without variants in Plato, *Symposium* 192c. This suggests that we need not imagine intrusive glosses and so delete, as Hercher did, in the first two passages, that in the second V has the better reading, and that in the third we should read ἄνευ συνουσίας ἀφροδισίων.

5. In *Onirocr.* 228.26–27 read: ὅσαι (ὅσα LV and Hercher) τῶν ἱστοριῶν (thus L, ἱστορικῶν V and Hercher) διπλοῦν ἔχουσι (thus L, ἔχει V and Hercher) λόγον, τῶν μὲν ὡς οὕτως ἔχουσι (thus LV, ἔχει Hercher) λεγόντων, τῶν δὲ ὡς ἄλλως κτλ. The fact that elsewhere Artemidorus always refers to αἱ ἱστορίαι (227.4, 229.19, 230.1, 239.16, 241.16) and not τὰ ἱστορικά

tells strongly in favor of the lections in L but necessitates my slight correction, ὅσαι. I regard ὅσα as an archetypal error which L characteristically ignored but which led V to make two mistaken alterations. On this view, Hercher's emendation of LV becomes unnecessary, as the subject of the second ἔχουσι is *ἱστορίαι* just as it is the logical subject of the first one. *λεγόντων* of course refers to the individuals who variously interpret the stories. In sum, the clause can be healed in a way consistent with Artemidorean usage simply by supplying one letter and keeping the readings of L.