

XXXI. More Conjectures on Artemidorus

ROGER PACK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The following notes are an addendum to those which have appeared in *TAPA* 88 (1957) 189–96, *TAPA* 90 (1959) 180–84, and *TAPA* 91 (1960) 146–51.¹ The two manuscripts in question are L (Codex Laurentianus 87, 8, saec. xi) and V (Codex Marcianus 268, saec. xv). Occasional reference is made to the editions of Reiff (1805) and Hercher (1864).

1. *Onirocr.* 17.23–25: To dream that one is being born “signifies for a man who has a pregnant wife that a child will be born to him similar to him in all respects: for thus he would himself seem to be born anew”—οὕτω γάρ <ἄν> ἄνωθεν (sic ego, ἄνωθεν LV Reiff, ἄν Her.) αὐτὸς δόξειε γεννᾶσθαι. Syntax (*pace* Reiff) demands the particle, the adverb is very much in point, and it seems unlikely (*pace* Hercher) that the first of these was altered to the second.²

2. *Onirocr.* 93.5–6: In interpreting dreams of being struck by lightning a guiding principle is that “the poor are analogous to humble, insignificant places where dung or other worthless materials are thrown”—εἰς ἃ κόπρια ῥίπτεται κτλ. Her., εἰς ἃ ἡ κοπρία ῥίπτεται κτλ. V Reiff, εἰς δὲ κοπριαὶ ῥίπτονται κτλ. L. Hercher perceived that κοπρία, “dunghill,” would be illogical here, but the tradition further suggests that εἰς ἃ δὴ κτλ. was the archetypal reading. For δὴ following relative pronouns compare 2.13 and see Denniston, *The Greek Particles* 218–19.

3. *Onirocr.* 108.1 enumerates five species of small fish, including ἐψητοί Casaubon and Her., ψηστος L, ψεστο V. The context seems to demand a plural. I think we could justifiably cleave

¹ In this series I have tried to defend my treatment of various passages more fully than can be conveniently done in the critical apparatus of a Teubner edition which will appear (barring “höhere Gewalt”) in 1962.

² *LSJ*⁹ cites ἄνωθεν in this sense from “Artem.1.14.” This is evidently a slip for “1.13” (i.e. the present passage), as the word is not found in ch.14.

closer to the tradition by venturing *ψηστοί*, even though the form is evidenced only for modern Greek.³

4. *Onirocr.* 195.3–4: “It is impossible for the significant elements (sc. in dreams) to be at war with one another if in fact dreams foretell the whole body of occurrences that will take place”—*εἶγε τὰ πάντα ἐσόμενα οἱ ὄνειροι προαγορεύουσιν. πάντα* (LV Her.) in the attributive position would of course be admissible with the meaning indicated above, but there are other passages (203.24, 204.12, 212.13, 213.12) which strongly suggest *τὰ πάντως ἐσόμενα*, “the occurrences that will take place at all events (i.e., inevitably).” This would have point, the idea being that predestination is a guarantor of consistency even if phenomena appear to be inconsistent.

5. “Someone dreamt that his fellow members in an association to which he belonged suddenly appeared and said to him, ‘Receive us and entertain us at dinner,’ but that he replied, ‘I do not have the money nor the means to receive you,’ then drove them away. On the next day, involved in a shipwreck and facing extreme danger, he barely escaped with his life, the dream having eventuated in a natural and reasonable way . . .” (*Onirocr.* 271.3–8).

This passage is preserved in V only; the long final section of the *Onirocritica* to which it belongs is missing in the original hand of L, though a corrector of the sixteenth century supplied it on two folia at the end of the codex, either from V itself or from the Aldine edition of 1518. The explanation which follows (*ibid.*, lines 8–15) is so badly confused at some points that Hercher was content to print it as it stands in L²V, with the note “verba corruptissima” in his apparatus. The first sentence, however, has since been interpreted to mean: “For it is customary for the associates to go to the houses of the deceased members and take dinner, and the reception is said to have been given by the deceased because of the honor which his fellows paid him,” that is, in ceremoniously interring him.⁴ The text so far may well be sound, or very nearly so, even if the thought is expressed a bit obscurely. The last

³ See Dimitrakos, *Mega Lexikon tēs Hellēnikes Glōssēs*, s.v. R. Goossens, *Byzantina Metabyzantina* 1 (1946) 135–64, has discussed the utility of modern Greek for the interpretation of ancient texts.

⁴ F. Poland, *RE* 4² (1931) 1080, s.v. *Συμβίσιος*.

sentence of the explanation, too, is unobjectionable in form, if not particularly pointed: "The shipwreck, because he drove them away due to lack of money." Other allusions to shipwreck in the *Onirocritica* give no hint of its resulting from "lack of money" in a dream. Though one could assume some vague association between indigence and the loss of property at sea, the phrase may be unemphatic and the idea simply that the man deserved to suffer some danger or discomfort, though not loss of life, because of his rudeness.

In the intermediate section which remains we apparently have the *disiecta membra* of three clauses, or sentences: ‡ὁ δὲ οὐκ ὑποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς εἰκότως τὸν κίνδυνον ἐσήμαινεν. εἰ δὲ αὐτὸς οὐχ ὑπέστη τὴν διαδοχὴν (ὑποδοχὴν Reiff), εἰκότως ἐσώθη· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστάντες καὶ μύοντες αὐτῶν τὴν ὑποδοχὴν ὠθείτο‡. Theodor Gomperz proposed⁵ to read: οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπιστάντες καὶ ἀλύοντες <περὶ> αὐτῶν τὴν ὑποδοχὴν τὸν κίνδυνον ἐσήμαινον, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ὑποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς εἰκότως ἐσώθη (εἰκότως τὸν κίνδυνον ἀπεωθείτο Reiske). Reiske, in notes contributed to Reiff's edition, had treated the passage in much the same way, the most suggestive variant being the phrase supplied here in parentheses. All of this reproduces the probable meaning clearly enough, and the assumed transposition is supported by the faulty sequence δὲ . . . δὲ . . . μὲν. I cannot improve upon ἀλύοντες κτλ., which at least gives a plausible sense—"fretting with impatience for their reception." The chief objection to these conjectures is that they arbitrarily and needlessly condense the material.

I believe that the following would more closely approximate the autograph: ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς οὐχ ὑπέστη τὴν ὑποδοχὴν, εἰκότως ἐσώθη. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστάντες καὶ ‡μύοντες‡ αὐτῶν τὴν ὑποδοχὴν <τὸν κίνδυνον> ἐσήμαινον, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ὑποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς εἰκότως τὸν κίνδυνον ἀπεωθείτο. "Since he did not provide them with the reception, he naturally escaped with his life. For they, by appearing and . . . (?) . . . their reception, signified the danger, while he, by his refusal to receive them, was naturally repelling the danger." There is a useful clue in the fact that οὐχ is the wrong negative for the protasis of a condition, but not for a causal clause; for the interchange of εἰ and ἐπεὶ compare Hercher's apparatus at

⁵ *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 32 (1881) 501-13, including other emendations of Artemidorus. The referee cleverly conjectures μύοντες for ‡μύοντες‡ in this passage—"waiting for their reception."

222.5. If such, more or less, was the original form of the passage, what caused the obvious dislocation in it? I would suppose that at some point in the transmission the words ἐσήμαινον—τὸν κίνδυνον were omitted by haplography and were later copied into the margin from another MS. It was then observed that with only a slight recasting they would form an intelligible statement; so, in this revised form, they were wrongly inserted where they now stand.⁶ Perhaps it was thought logical to juxtapose two sentences of which each contained εἰκότως. This would give us the confused sequence of L²V, except that τὴν ὑποδοχὴν τὸν κίνδυνον ὠθείτο would remain at the end: τὸν κίνδυνον would finally have been expelled as being either incomprehensible or a supposedly intrusive explanation of the phrase preceding it. Of course I do not insist that such precisely was the original text and such the chronicle of the misadventures that befell it, but they must have been very like this.

⁶ F. W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* (Oxford 1913) 179, illustrates such transposition due to omission and reinsertion at the wrong point.