

## ON ARTEMIDORUS AND HIS ARABIC TRANSLATOR

ROGER A. PACK

*University of Michigan*

In 1959, when Professor Toufic Fahd, of the University of Strasbourg, was visiting Istanbul for purposes of study, he casually asked a colleague, who was well informed about the resources of the University Library, whether he had ever chanced upon a manuscript containing an Arabic translation of Artemidorus. Much to Fahd's delight and surprise, his friend at once produced a reference which enabled attendants at the library to place his desideratum in his hands. He announced his lucky find in 1960,<sup>1</sup> and four years later published his edition.<sup>2</sup> In the foreword he identified his text with the version of Hunayn b. Ishâq, a prolific scholar of the ninth century who, as had long been known, made such a translation in his day, though Arabists had supposed it irretrievably lost. This led Fahd to observe that the Greek manuscript or recension followed by Hunayn was two centuries older than the Laurentianus, the older of the two basic manuscripts,<sup>3</sup> and he warned that it would be imprudent for anyone to re-edit the original without using this new witness. Unfortunately, my edition (Leipzig 1963) was already in proof when his discovery first became known to me, so that I could do no better than to explain the situation in an addendum.<sup>4</sup>

N.B. In preparing this paper I have been encouraged and assisted by Professor James A. Bellamy, who corrected my faltering transliterations of the Arabic.

<sup>1</sup> *Arabica* 7 (1960) 87–89.

<sup>2</sup> *Artémidore d'Éphèse: Le Livre des songes, traduit du grec en arabe par Hunayn B. Ishâq* (Damascus, Institut Français de Damas, 1964).

<sup>3</sup> See note 8, below. Of course the surviving Arabic manuscript (A 4726) was written much later: two authorities consulted by Fahd have dated it to saec. XII–XIII, while Rosenthal (below, note 6) prefers saec. XIV.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 325 of my edition. The old datum about Hunayn had been duly recorded, *ibid.*, p. xviii. By another accident of timing, Martin Kaiser's revision of F. S. Krauss' translation, *Artemidor von Daldis: Traumbuch* (Basel-Stuttgart 1965), appeared too late for me to profit by some of the excellent emendations proposed in the footnotes (see my review in *Gnomon* 38 [1966] 629–30).

Since that time, Dario Del Corno,<sup>5</sup> Franz Rosenthal,<sup>6</sup> and G. Strohmaier<sup>7</sup> have independently examined the new text and discussed a number of its readings. No doubt other writers will sooner or later feel moved to say even more about it, but meanwhile I submit the results of my own first exploration: under the special circumstances it seems pardonable for me to trespass in this field of study, and my remarks will possibly hold a certain interest even for those readers who, though indifferent to Artemidorus, concern themselves with the pathology of texts.<sup>8</sup>

The discovery of Ar raises the familiar problem of relating a new witness to two which are already known, and it is virtually a matter of routine to begin by looking for conjunctive errors which, being shared by all three witnesses, point to a common ancestor, or archetype. These can be found without difficulty: a few examples will suffice.

11.9; Ar 23.5. <χρόνω> Rigault (an essential supplement): *om.* LV Ar (as noted by Del Corno).

15.15; Ar 30.14. The context shows that two lacunae must be assumed in LV, and Ar is similarly defective.

20.6; Ar 38.11. τοῖς καταπήροις (sc. δνείροις) Hercher: τοῖς καταξήροις LV Ar Suda. Ar: *fī amri r-ru'yā'āti l-yābisati*, "in the case of the dry dreams." "Mutilated," that is "incomplete," makes sense here, but "dry" is nonsense.

114.8; Ar 209.4. ἡ Φημονόη Hercher: ἡ φήμη μόνον L, ὑφειμένον V (perhaps from a misguided correction), ἡ φήμη (?) Ar. Ar: *fa-lil-qā'ili an yaqūla*, "then one may say that . . .". The proper noun should be restored, as in 243.1; compare *TAPA* 91 (1960) 147.

This situation is common enough in the history of texts, but it needs to be stressed as a reminder that, while all LV Ar readings are archetypal, not all of them are necessarily those of Artemidorus' autograph.

<sup>5</sup> *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 669–79, a review of my edition, written in collaboration with the Arabist, Sergio Noja.

<sup>6</sup> *JAOS* 85 (1965) 139–44, a review of Fahd's edition.

<sup>7</sup> *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 62 (1967) 270–75, a review of Fahd.

<sup>8</sup> "Ar" (so Rosenthal) rather than "TA" (Fahd and Del Corno) or "a" (Strohmaier) is used in reference to the Arabic, and the Greek text is cited by page and line of my edition, the Arabic by page and line of Fahd's edition. L = cod. Laurentianus 87, 8 (sacc. xi); V = cod. Marcianus 268 (sacc. xv). Hercher's edition: Leipzig, Teubner, 1864. Many readings of Ar noted by my predecessors are reviewed in this paper, but always with some new application.

If the archetype belonged, for example, to the seventh century,<sup>9</sup> there would have been almost five centuries in which its ancestors could have accumulated corruptions. When LV Ar readings seem irreproachable, as of course most of them do, an editor will accept them trusting that they are right but not forgetting that their correctness is not guaranteed. For instance, at 155.19 (Ar 282.3) I ventured to defend,<sup>10</sup> as an otherwise unattested term for a type of gladiator, ἀρβήλας L (ὀρβήλας V). Ar gives the same word transliterated ('rbyls) and confirms the reading by showing that it is archetypal, strengthening, therefore, the possibility that it is authentically descended from the autograph; but theoretical certainty has not been attained.

The gap between autograph and archetype has yet another application. Fahd and Rosenthal have remarked that Ar does not usually omit the passages which editors, especially Hercher, have bracketed believing them to be intrusions in LV, and rarely ever fills in the lacunae which they have postulated. But much of this may be taken simply as further proof of an archetype, not as evidence weighing decisively against these editorial assumptions. It seems likely that such problems, which go back to the pre-archetypal stage in the tradition, will always prove troublesome. Perhaps some of the supposed glosses are no more than "autoglosses,"<sup>11</sup> that is, phrases which the author himself wrote into his draft as afterthoughts before it was handed to the copyists. When, however, we find an observation or anecdote introduced by an expression like "I have noticed this myself," we perceive that it cannot be the author who is speaking. Actually, it is reassuring to see that six rather long passages which Hercher deleted<sup>12</sup> do not appear in Ar, because it shows that there are some intrusions in the LV tradition after all, and that Hercher had a genuine talent for detecting them, even though he may on occasion have exercised it too

<sup>9</sup> In my edition, pp. xv-xvi, the ninth century is proposed as a *terminus ante quem* for the common ancestor of LV.

<sup>10</sup> TAPA 88 (1957) 190. This was accepted by Kaiser (above, note 4) 177, and Del Corno (above, note 5) 673.

<sup>11</sup> The term and the theory come from Antonio Garzya, *P&I* 6 (1964) 136, a review of my edition.

<sup>12</sup> 27.7-14, 35.16-20, 120.10-25, 180.24-181.5, 186.7-13, 186.26-187.13. These passages are bracketed in my edition.

freely. I shall revert later to the stemmatic interest of these passages.

Let us now consider a few more LV Ar readings.

35.7; Ar 66.4. *πληγήσεται* LV Ar (ego): *ἀλγήσει* Hercher. Ar: *tušibuhu ḏarbatun*, "an affliction will strike him." Emendation seems more than ever unnecessary.

73.14; Ar 135.7. *κίτρια* (sic LV Ar; *κινάρα* Hercher) δὲ διὰ τὸ ἀκανθῶδες καὶ ὄξυ ὀδύνας σημαίνει. Ar: *al-utrujj*, "citron" (noted by Rosenthal). Hercher's hesitation induced me to obelize, but Ar now inspires second thoughts and I find that citrons, according to Athenaeus 3.84D, are indeed thorny.

83.2; Ar 154.6. *καλοπαίζοντα* ego (TAPA 90 [1959] 181): *μᾶλλον παίζοντα* LV, *ἄλλον παίζοντα* (?) Ar, *καλοβατοῦντα* Hercher. The context calls for a rope-walker. *καλοπαίζειν* appears here for the first time, though we have the noun *καλοπαίκτης*, "trapeze-artist," in PSI 8.953. Ar: *idhâ ra'â l-insânu ka-anna ghayrahu yal'abuhu*, "when the person dreams that another than himself is playing it." Either Ar's exemplar had the reading indicated or else he misread it or tried to emend it, but in any case Ar reflects a similar archetypal reading, which needs only a slight correction.

132.6; Ar 238.1. *ἀετὸς* ("eagle-ray," a kind of fish) LV Ar: *βάτος* ("skate") Hercher, who, however, wisely repudiated this in his addenda. Ar transliterates: *ḡtws*.

Will an agreement of any two witnesses against the third yield the archetypal reading? This will of course depend upon their affiliation or stemmatic relation, which can be established, provided that the tradition is not contaminated, by following the procedure outlined in the classic treatise of Paul Maas.<sup>13</sup>

It will be recalled that for three witnesses there are twenty-two possible stemmatic types including eighteen in which any one witness is the direct exemplar of any other or (either directly or through a lost intermediary) of both the others. Many of the readings adduced here for other purposes will show, without need of a formal demonstration, that none of the witnesses which figure here is the direct exemplar of another, and it will be convenient to reserve until later the possibility that Ar's manuscript was the ancestor of a lost LV hyparchetype

<sup>13</sup> *Textual Criticism* (Oxford 1958) 45, gives the drill for the case in which there are three witnesses.

(see note 16, below). Consequently, the number of possible types is reduced to four. Since Ar enjoys priority in point of time and since, as shown above, it has the merit of not translating six passages apparently intrusive in LV, the obvious choice for testing is Maas Type III.2c, with his ABC replaced by LV Ar respectively, and showing Ar and  $\beta$ , the LV hyparchetype, in parallel descent from  $\alpha$ , the common ancestor or archetype. If this stemma proves valid, L Ar or V Ar readings will be those of the archetype, but LV readings will go back only to the hyparchetype. Errors shared by LV against Ar will tend to validate the stemma, but if it turns out that there are also conjunctive errors in L Ar against V or V Ar against L, we shall conclude that the tradition is to some degree contaminated, so that our stemma will not sanction or enforce the invariable application of the principles of agreement which it implies.

First, then, the assumed hyparchetype ( $\beta$ ) is supported by a fair number of passages in which Ar is found to agree with various slight but necessary corrections made by the editors in LV.

9.6; Ar 18.14. πατέρα Reiske Ar: μητέρα LV.

30.14; Ar 58.4. οϊκέτας Reiske Ar: οϊκέτην LV. Ar: *al-mamâlîk*, "slaves."

64.15; Ar 119.10. ἄλος Rigault Ar (cf. *Odyssey* 4.708; noted by Del Corno): ἄλλος L, ἄλλη V. Ar: *khaylu l-bahri*, "horses of the sea." Compare TAPA 91 (1960) 146.

82.9; Ar 151.9. διανεύση Reiske Ar: διανευθῇ LV. Ar: *ashâra ilayhi bi-yadihi*, "point to it with his hand."

85.16; Ar 158.11. (στέφανοι) κήρινοι Rigault Ar: κρινοί L, κρίνινοι V. Ar: *al-akâlîlu llati tuhayya'u mina-sh-sham'i*, "the crowns which are prepared from wax." Compare TAPA 91 (1960) 147.

90.9; Ar 166.2. ἢ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰς ἔχθραν (sic Hercher Ar: χώραν LV) κατασταθήσεται. Ar: *aw-yu'âdî abâhu*, "or he will antagonize his father."

107.22; Ar 198.12. ὁ κτεῖς Jacobs Ar: ὁ κτις L, τις V. Ar: *al-musht*, "comb."

120.27; Ar 220.3. πρὸς γάμον Hercher Ar: καὶ πρὸς φιλίαν LV. Ar: *li-man yurîdu an yu'risa*, "for one who wishes to marry."

127.2; Ar 230.9. Ζεὺς Σαβάζιος Rigault Ar: Ζ. σεβάσμιος LV. Ar: *zawsh wa-sb'zyws*, "Zeus and Sabazios."

156.15; Ar 283.12. δεῖν Hercher Ar: ἰδεῖν LV. Ar: *anna l-wâjiba 'alayhi*, "that the obligation was upon him."

219.13; Ar 400.12. *χρωμάτων* Hercher Ar: *χρημάτων* LV. Ar: *al-awân*, "colors."

225.5; Ar 413.9. Reiske conjectured that *καὶ μεμνημένους* is spurious, Kaiser brackets it, and it does not appear in Ar.

For all that we can tell, a few of these Ar readings may be due to correction by the translator and so may not represent the actual text of his exemplar, but Ar's blunders in translation, which Rosenthal has copiously illustrated,<sup>14</sup> cast doubt upon his ability to correct with uniform success. It seems likely that he has preserved many good and authentic readings just because he had good materials at his disposal.

With evidence of this class we may group several passages in which the readings of Ar point to corrections of LV, the necessity for, in some cases, the feasibility of which has now for the first time become apparent.

75.20; Ar 139.12. *ἥττονα δὲ καὶ βραδύτερα* Ar(?): *ἡ. δ. κ. βαρύτερα* LV. Hercher deleted the last two words, but the phrase rendered by Ar (*wa-abṭa'*, "and slower," noted by Rosenthal and Strohmaier), is less objectionable if at all.

84.4; Ar 156.3. Ar reads: "And as regards a crown of roses, if a person sees it in a time other than that in which there are roses, it is bad, and if he sees that in the time of roses, it is good for everyone." As Rosenthal remarks, this heals the Greek, about as follows: *οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ῥόδων* (sc. *στέφανοι*) *παρὰ* (sic LV Ar, *κατὰ* Reiske et al.) *μὲν τὸν καιρὸν <κακοί, κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν> πᾶσιν ἀγαθοί*. The error of LV is not in the preposition, as Reiske fancied, but in a homoioteleuton omission. The scribe of the LV hyparchetype evidently worked in haste, because he made such omissions also in 4.2 (noted by Del Corno), 108.10, 205.5 (discussed below), and 79.19 (Ar 146.13), where, as Louis Robert has observed (*Hellenica* 11-12 [1960] 602), Ar supports Hercher's conjecture *<κατὰ μὲν τὴν ὥραν>*.<sup>15</sup>

108.10; Ar 199.16-200.2. Ar: "... something similar is indicated by looking at water. If one dreams that he is looking at the earth and

<sup>14</sup> Fahd and Strohmaier maintain that Ḥunayn knew Greek well, so probably not all the errors in Ar should be laid at his door. Strohmaier suggests that Ar is not the work of Ḥunayn himself, but that one of his pupils produced it from a Syriac version by the master. Another factor that obscures the issue is the probability of scribal error in the Arabic manuscript tradition.

<sup>15</sup> Or rather, if omitted by homoioteleuton, *<κατὰ μὲν τὸν καιρὸν>*.

seeing his face, it indicates the death..." Rosenthal accordingly detects a lacuna in LV: ... ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ ἐν ὕδατι κατοπτρίζεσθαι, <τὸ δὲ ἐν γῇ κατοπτρίζεσθαι> θάνατον προαγορεύει κτλ.

163.6; Ar 293.5. καὶ τὰ τοῦ ἰδόντος ὄμματα (sc. Σελήνην σημαίνει), ὅτι τοῦ ὄραν καὶ αὐτὴ ἐστὶν αἰτία· καὶ δεσποίνας· (sic Dreikurs, apud Kaiser; ... αἰτία καὶ δέσποινα LV Hercher, ego) κοινὸν γὰρ πάντες οἱ θεοὶ λόγον ἔχουσι πρὸς δεσπότης. Ar: wa-ḡadullu aḡḡan 'alā l-mawlā, "... and it (sc. the Moon) also indicates the master," implying καὶ δεσπότην. Ar lends partial support to Dreikurs' attractive emendation.

175.22; Ar 316.3. Δινδυμίη Ar: Μήτηρ θεῶν LV. Fahd (in his edition, p. xvii, note 3) calls attention to the high interest of Ar: *dndwmy*. Does this preserve the true reading, a *lectio difficilior* trivialized, or expelled by a gloss, in the hyparchetype of LV?

At first blush the following case might seem to belong to the same class of evidence.

121.18; Ar 221.10. Βόες ἐργάται (sic LV, ἐργάταις? Ar) πᾶσιν ἀγαθοί, ἀγελαῖοι δὲ βόες ταραχὰς σημαίνουσι. Ar: li-jamī' i l-akarati, "for all plowmen." Rosenthal is sagely noncommittal about this. I think Ar erred, because the phrase βοῦς ἐργάτης, "working ox," appears elsewhere in Greek and there is a contrast with "oxen in a herd."

Though conjunctive errors suggesting possible contamination appear to be relatively few, they cannot be ignored.

19.6; Ar 37.2. οἱ παλαιοὶ V (cf. 2.9, 68.15): οἱ πολλοὶ L Ar. Ar: *kathîrun mina-n-nâsi*, "many people" (noted by G. Vajda, *Arabica* 13 [1966] 90).

68.15; Ar 126.11. Οἱ μὲν πάνυ παλαιοὶ τὸ λούεσθαι οὐ (sic V; L Ar om. οὐ) κακὸν ἐνόμιζον. The negative is essential to the logic of the passage (cf. lines 17-19).

69.9; Ar 127.17. ἔστι νῦν τὸ βαλανεῖον οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ὁδὸς ἐπὶ τρυφῇν (sic L Suda; τροφῇν V Ar). Ar: *ilâ tanâwuli t-ta'âmi*, "(a way) to the acquisition of food" (noted by Rosenthal).

115.3; Ar 210.12. οἴκοι V: τοῖχοι L Ar (and V in the margin). Ar: *hîṭâna l-bayti*, "the walls of the house" (noted by Rosenthal). The lines following (115.9-14) show clearly that οἴκοι, in the special sense of "rooms," is correct.

In my opinion, these readings do not invalidate the assumption of the stemma of Type III.2c (Maas),<sup>16</sup> but they show that the principles of agreement implicit in it cannot or need not be applied with Lachmannian rigor. To be sure, instances like these are not easy to find and perhaps some of them, if not all, could be explained as due merely to coincidental agreement in error. Even so, they illustrate the danger of using the stemma too mechanically, because it would obviously be perverse to maintain that the reading of L Ar or V Ar is in each of these cases that of the archetype. The end result is the same, that in using Ar we are not only free but obliged to exercise *iudicium* in the spirit of the late Giorgio Pasquali, who would in fact have reminded us that contamination is to be expected more often than not.

Rosenthal has spoken of the task of determining the affiliations of Ar as if it were rather formidable, to be accomplished only after the Greek and Arabic texts have been compared in their minutest details. Perhaps this would be the case if one embraced in the problem the correctors of L and the excerpts in the Suda, but the interest of these more complex relations, if they could be determined at all, would be more theoretical than practical. For the three major witnesses the possible permutations are few, as a moment's attention to Maas' *aureus libellus* will prove, and it has been shown that these few can be readily reduced to one possibility alone (and that not of rigid application) without troubling to collect every last example that might conceivably assist this operation. But of course it will be a long time before scholars extract from the new material everything of value that it is capable of yielding.

The search for a stemma has been made with the silent assumption that the translator had only one Greek manuscript before him, but of this there can be no certainty. Rosenthal properly speaks of "the manuscript (or manuscripts, we cannot tell) available to the translator."

<sup>16</sup> None of the other three types of stemma would be valid. In particular, Type III.3, which would show L, V, and Ar each in direct descent from the archetype, would suppress the evidence reviewed above and falsely impose the principle that agreement between any pair of the three witnesses would give the archetypal reading.

Much of the evidence could be interpreted as pointing to a stemma showing Ar's Greek exemplar as the actual ancestor of the lost LV hyparchetype, though variants such as those noted above in 68.15, 69.9, and 115.3, might be regarded as telling against it. In any case, a stemma of this type would not differ, in its practical application, from that which has been postulated above.



And other Arabists have reported that it was Ḥunayn's practice to make his own recension of a given Greek text before turning it into Syriac or Arabic.<sup>17</sup> If he was indeed our man, Ḥunayn may himself have slightly contaminated Ar by an eclectic use of two or more manuscripts.

Though there is reason to believe that our stemma does not speak out with unexceptionable authority, there is a set of conditions in which the next editor would be well advised to apply it in a mechanical way. When L and V differ and there is no criterion, such as the *usus scribendi* or the *lectio difficilior*, favoring the one over the other, sheer sporting odds will dictate the choice of L Ar over V or V Ar over L, as Ar unquestionably exhibits a degree of independent merit.<sup>18</sup> This would be groping in the dark but with an improved chance of success. I offer three examples.

8.24; Ar 18.2. δειπνεῖν L Ar: λέγειν V Hercher, ego. Ar: *annahu ya'kulu*, "that he is eating" (noted by Del Corno).

114.9; Ar 209.5. L, but not V, adds δοκεῖ οὖν μοι ἀληθῆ λέγειν, σαφῶς δὲ οὐδέπω. Ar translates this and it seems unobjectionable.

220.18; Ar 403.10. Θρασύβουλος V Ar (*tr'swbwls*): Θρασύμαχος L Hercher, ego.

Further, there are many places where an editor will wish to record Ar's readings as casting welcome, if not theoretically decisive, votes for readings of L or V already preferred for one reason or another. Fahd, Rosenthal, and Strohmaier are all of the opinion that Ar more frequently sides with V, but they are aware that this is only natural if, as they believe, the text of V is in general superior.<sup>19</sup> It goes without saying that agreements in presumably correct readings prove nothing whatever about affiliations or stemmata.

9.1; Ar 18.6. θακεύειν L Ar Hercher et al.: καθίζειν εἰς χρείας θακεύειν V. The first three words in V look like an intrusive gloss on the rare verb.

<sup>17</sup> R. Walzer, *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy* (Oxford 1962; "Oriental Studies" 1) 7, 34, 81.

<sup>18</sup> Our impression of Ar's quality, or rather the quality of his Greek materials, is reinforced by the fact that he supports two editorial corrections of V in a passage omitted by L: 179.3, Ar 323.6 (Reiff's correction); 179.14, Ar 324.3 (Rigault's correction).

<sup>19</sup> V is specious, but there are passages where it falsely emends while L gives readings only slightly corrupted. For examples, see *TAPA* 91 (1960) 146-48, and my edition, p. xv, note 2.

27.23; Ar 53.6. ὕλην V Ar Hercher et al.: κεφαλὴν L. Ar: *jawhar*, "substance."

64.4; Ar 118.13. ἐγκωμιογράφους V Ar Hercher et al.: κωμωδιογράφους L. Ar: *wa-aṣḥābu l-madīhi*, "panegyrists."

70.1; Ar 128.16. ἀπολέσαν τὴν ὀροφὴν L Ar Hercher et al.: ἡ ἀπολέσαντο τὴν ἀρχαίαν μορφήν V. Ar: *laysa lahu ḡildlun*, "it hasn't an awning."

139.12; Ar 250.13. ἐγκλείειν V Ar Hercher et al.: ἐκκαίειν L. Ar: *ka-annah yuhharriju (n-nahla)*, "that he was confining (the bees)."

148.24; Ar 268.16. εἰάν τι σίνηται τῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ὄντων ego Ar (?): ἀντισήνηται κτλ. L, εἰάν τι κινῆται κτλ. V, εἰάν τις πνιγῇ κτλ. Hercher. See TAPA 90 (1959) 182. L, slightly corrected, is apparently supported by Ar: *in afsada fī l-bayti shay'an*, "if it mars anything in the house."

186.22; Ar 338.13. θησαυρὸν εὕρίσκειν L Ar Hercher et al.: θ. ὀρύσσειν V. Ar: *wajada*, "found."

195.13; Ar 353.13. τυρομάντεις L Ar Hercher ego: τυρομάντεις γυρομάντεις V (*tiromantici giromantici* Pascalis Romanus; see TAPA 96 [1965] 293). Probably a unique error in the V tradition, copied by Pascalis.

229.5; Ar 422.2. κινήσεις L Ar Hercher et al.: κινδύνους V. Ar: *harakah*, "motion."

233.4; Ar 430.11. ἐπιβολὰς L Ar (?) Hercher ego: ἐπιβουλὰς V (*insidias* Pascalis Romanus; see TAPA, *loc. cit.*). Ar: *al-ibtidā'u*, "the beginnings."

In conclusion, it seems to me that Rosenthal and Strohmaier, less enthusiastic about Ar than Fahd or Del Corno, have appraised its worth more justly. Though it could hardly be expected to help with the many problems that arise in the Greek morphology and word-order, it often fails us even when we might reasonably look to it for help, as when it omits a crucial phrase or renders it in a vague or absurd fashion.<sup>20</sup> Though Ar is based on Greek materials of good quality, either the hazards of its transmission or else the translator by his

<sup>20</sup> It would be easy to draw up a long list of textual problems to whose solution Ar contributes nothing, including such major cruces as 17.13 (Ar 34.8) and 77.1 (Ar 141.10). Ar also fails to support some excellent emendations, for example, 19.1, Ar 36.7 (Kaiser); 26.9, Ar 50.2 (Gomperz); 144.14, Ar 259.12 (Bonner, accepted by Kaiser); 154.18, Ar 280.5 (Kaiser, endorsed by J. Pollard, CR, N.S. 16 [1966] 317). This is disappointing but not dismaying, as it has been shown that Ar often participates in errors which can be regarded as archetypal.

blunders has spoiled much of its potential value, even granted that his very errors sometimes reveal the Greek that he had before him (compare the eighth item below). If the next editor, however, fully exploits the resources of Ar he will be able to make a number of minor but useful improvements in Books 1-3.

The rest of this paper is devoted to a few problems that invite special attention.

(1) 11.12; Ar 23.8. γίνεται γάρ πως τοῖς εὐπόροις τὸ †ἄκουσιν† (sic V, καθακούειν L) κτλ. This sentence is meant to illustrate the principle that dreams in accordance with nature, though generally propitious, may have grave consequences for the dreamer in case the external circumstances are unfavorable. In *TAPA* 91 (1960) 149-50, I conjectured <οὐκ αἴσιον> τὸ κατακούειν, "for the rich, it is unpropitious to hear and obey," because they are naturally accustomed to command. Ar (as noted by Del Corno) reads: *mithla man kâna nahiman, idha ra'â fî manâmihi ka-annahu yatabbarazu*, "an example is he who is voracious, if he sees in his dream that he relieves himself." I think it is worth observing that Ar is translating θακεύειν, the rare verb which he encountered earlier at 9.1 (see above) and rendered with the same Arabic verb as here. This resembles the L reading and even the V reading palaeographically, particularly if written in uncials, and it would suggest some such restoration as <οὐκ αἴσιον> τὸ θακεύειν, "for the rich it is unpropitious to relieve the bowels" in a dream. This, however startling, may conceivably be right; at least a case can be made for it, because a dream recorded later (146.7-10) shows that the event in question could be construed as a dream-symbol for the loss of riches,<sup>21</sup> and without this necessary explanation the sentence at 11.12 would have been obscure and easily corrupted. Ar found it obscure, for in a manful effort to make sense of it he gave a strange meaning to εὐπόροις.

(2) 14.23; Ar 29.14. Κύκλωπα ἰδεῖν ἢ τὸ ἄντρον αὐτοῦ <ἢ> παραελύσθαι ἢ νοσεῖν κτλ. Ar: *ka-annahu dakhala maghâratahu*, "as if he had entered his cave." Rosenthal comments, "apparently *parelēlythenai* or the like; there is no trace of *ê* in Ar," and, to judge

<sup>21</sup> In later oniromancy human ordure signifies wealth dishonestly acquired. See, for example, Achmes, *Oniromancy* 105 (p. 62, 5-7, ed. Drexler), and Guillemus de Aragonia, *De pronosticatione sompniarum* 2.2 (p. 274 of my edition in *AHMA* 33 [1966] 237-93).

from his second remark, he thinks this may be right. But "to have become paralyzed" fits the context and *παρελθεῖν*, "enter," requires εἰς; when transitive, it means "pass by, outstrip."

(3) 35.16; Ar 66.12. . . . τέκνον ἐκείνου ἀναλήψεται. [ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ εὐεργεσίαν μεγάλην . . .] The rest, through line 20, was also canceled by Hercher. Rosenthal observes that Ar's exemplar included the first five words of the bracketed portion. They are, however, stylistically suspect, as their controlling verb is technical in the sense of "take up," that is, "adopt" a child, and a grating zeugma results when it receives a second object, the more so because its normal non-technical meaning is "get back, recover," not simply "get." It would be stemmatically consistent to assume that the phrase is an archetypal intrusion and that another scribbler added the rest in the LV hyparchetype.

(4) 131.9; Ar 237.3. ναύπλιος LV Tümpel, ego: ναυτίλος Ar (*nwtwls*) Jacobs, Hercher. K. Tümpel, *Philologus* 51 (1892) 388, defended LV by pointing out that Pliny, *H. N.* 9.94, applies *nauplius* to the Argonaut or Paper Nautilus,<sup>22</sup> but Ar now suggests that the other term may have been altered, if not vulgarized, in the LV hyparchetype.

(5) 135.5; Ar 243.8. "Ορνιθες ἱεροὶ LV Hercher (in his addenda), ego: "Ο. μεγάλοι Ar Hercher (in his text), "Ο. ἥέριοι Kaiser. Ar: *Al-'izāmu mina-t-ṭayri*, "Big birds." The context certainly favors "big birds" in contrast to "little, seed-gathering birds." Hercher finally decided that "sacred birds," referring to falcons (*ἱέρακες*), a big species, was defensible, but this classification precedes a catalogue of specific birds and calls for some generic term, as Kaiser has perceived. It is now tempting to return to Hercher's emendation.

(6) 161.22; Ar 290.12, referring to ominous hues of the sun. ἄμαυρος ἢ ὕφαιμος ἢ μορμυρωπός Suda (*sic* V, but *μορμύρων*) Ar (?) Hercher (but *μορμορωπός*): ἄ. ἢ ὕ. ἢ πορφυρώδης ἢ μορμυρώδης L (*sanguineus pallidus rubeus vel niger* Pascalis Romanus; see *TAPA* 96 [1965] 292, 294). Ar: *muzlimah*, "dark"; *lawnu d-dami*, "blood-colored"; *bi-manẓarin mutaghayyirin*, "of a changed aspect." This underlines L's error: I believe that his exemplar was rubbed or faded

<sup>22</sup> D. W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Fishes* (London 1947) 172, cites *nautilus* and *nauplius* as interchangeable.

and he made two guesses at its reading. *LSJ* cites *μορμυρωπός* from this passage and gives its meaning as "with fixed, lidless eye," like that of the sea-fish *Pagellus mormyrus* (mentioned, as it happens, in 132.11); but for Pascalis, and probably for Ar, it meant "pale," as if it were *μορμορωπός*, "hideous to behold," that is, "ghastly, pale." Hercher's correction is easy enough but our author may himself have erred, since *LSJ* reports further that the same two words are confused in the manuscripts of Aristophanes, *Ranae* 925. In any case, it is clear what he really meant.

(7) 205.5-6; Ar 369.8-11. If a sick man dreams that he is playing a game with counters or sees someone else playing, (Ar continues:) "that is a good indication; especially, if they (sc. the counters) are white and he is the winner in the game, it is an even better indication. It is also a good indication if he dreams that he was defeated in his game if the counters are white. That is because, if he is defeated, many counters will remain to him." Rosenthal complains that the Greek has not been correctly restored, and in fact Ar hints at previously unsuspected lacunae, more or less as follows: ... <ἴδοι, καλόν.> μάλιστα δέ, εἰ <αὐτὸς εἶ> ἢ ὁ ταῖς λευκαῖς παίζων (ἢ οταῖς λευκαῖς πέζων L, omitted by editors) <καὶ νικῶν, ἔτι κάλλιον. ἀεὶ δὲ καλόν> εἰ αὐτὸς λείποιτο <ταῖς λευκαῖς παίζων>, ἐπειδὴ πλείονας (sic LV Ar; μείονας Salmasius and editors) ἔχων ψήφους καταλείπεται ὁ νικώμενος. The last clause, which Ar turns rather freely, means "since the loser is left with more counters in his possession," but this is the precise opposite to what is known or assumed about the ancient game which resembled draughts or "checkers."<sup>23</sup> The principle that the white counters are lucky and the black unlucky seems to speak for the archetypal text, but this entails the supposition that the game is of the "give-away" variety, in which player A tries to force player B to remove A's own counters, thus leaving B, the loser, with most of his counters still on the board. Of course "checkers" can be played in this general way as a change from the ordinary way, and no doubt the

<sup>23</sup> See Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "latrunculi," 3.993; *RE*, s.v. "latrunculorum ludus," 12.980-84. The former (993, note 6) cites our text as proof that "La victoire était d'autant plus honorable qu'on avait sacrifié moins de pions pour l'obtenir." More lucid are the words of Reiff, explaining in his note (*ad loc.*) why he followed Salmasius: "vincebatur enim in hoc lusu qui cum paucioribus calculis erat relictus in tabula, immo qui omnes ad unum amittebat."

*latrunculorum ludus* could have been varied analogously: in that case A would have discomfited B by maneuvering one of his own counters between two of B's<sup>24</sup> and so forcing him to check and remove it. Yet it seems that there are no allusions elsewhere to such a reverse method of play, and one would hardly expect our author to allude, without explanation, to a presumably exceptional method. In short, it is difficult to reconcile the received lection with the game of *latrunculi*.

Could it be that scholars have hit upon the wrong game? The fact that dice, as well as counters, are mentioned in the text, may point rather to the other popular board-game of antiquity, which somewhat resembled backgammon, or the "Parcheesi" of our childhood. This was the "Twelve-Line Game" (*duodecim scripta*),<sup>25</sup> played on a board marked into spaces by twelve lines and a cross-line. Each of the two players used fifteen counters, either white or black (or red), and these were moved through the successive spaces at rates determined by alternate casts of three dice. The winner was he who first moved all his counters into his last space. This would leave the loser with most of his counters still on the board, fulfilling the conditions of our received text.<sup>26</sup>

(8) 206.6; Ar 372.3. Quail signify unpleasant news from across the sea for those dreamers "who do not keep them as pets," τοῖς μὴ φιλοτροφοῦσιν V Ar (but omitting μὴ; noted by Strohmaier), ego: . . . τροφοῦσιν L, . . . ὀρτυγοτροφοῦσιν Hercher. Ar: *li-man yuḥibbu kathrata t-tā'āmi*, "for one who loves an abundance of food," clearly a wild translation of the right word.

(9) 232.16; Ar 429.11. βρύας (?) Ar: βύας Hercher, ego, βρύαξ L, ῥύαξ V. Ar has *brws*, suggesting that βρύας, an alternative form for Eagle-Owl which appears as a variant reading in Aristotle, *H. A.* 592B9, should be printed.

<sup>24</sup> In normal play A used to checkmate B by maneuvering one of B's pieces between two of his own (A's). For this principle the authorities cite Ovid, *Ars Am.* 3.358, *Tristia* 2.478 (see S. G. Owen's note), and Martial 14.17.

<sup>25</sup> See Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "duodecim scripta," 2.414-15; RE, ditto, 5.1794-96.

<sup>26</sup> Professor Bellamy has made an interesting observation: namely, that the Greek caption for this chapter, Περὶ τοῦ κυβεύειν (V), is rendered by Ar (369.2) as "On the game of backgammon" (*al-nardu*).