

Fraenkel's "lovely forerunner" of 4. 7,¹⁷ may be closely connected to the addressee. The emphatic placement of the poem at the beginning of the *Odes*, Horace's long friendship with L. Sestius, and Sestius' sudden political prominence in 23 B.C. make more understandable the likelihood that the poet would have wanted to write a poem that was personal but not offensively so, especially to the ears of Augustus, a poem that by indirection paralleled in words the idealized ambiguity of other forms of Augustan art as well as the political ambivalence of the period. Of this ambivalence both Sestius and Horace himself were very clear examples. The poem thus takes its place, along with the poems to Maecenas, Augustus, and Virgil, as an emphatic part of the introduction to Books 1–3 of the *Odes* and as a sign, however decorously indirect, that Horace's Republican ties were still strong, particularly in the context of the year 23.

ELIZABETH LYDING WILL
*University of Massachusetts,
 Amherst*

17. *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 419.

GEMINUS OF TYRE AND THE PATRON OF ARTEMIDORUS

Artemidorus *Onirocritica* 4. 22 criticizes the authors who fabricate collections of incubation cures and prescriptions uttered in dreams by Sarapis. He singles out one author for special scorn: "In the third book of his composition he makes particularly tedious use of this form; I am quite well aware of his name but shall not mention it." This unnamed author may plausibly be identified as Geminus of Tyre. There are three considerations which make Geminus a candidate and a fourth which explains why Artemidorus refuses to name him.

(1) There were three collections of incubation cures which Artemidorus knew; their authors are our three candidates. At 2. 44 he mentions Geminus of Tyre, Demetrius of Phaleron, and Artemon of Miletus. He makes no distinction among them but dismisses them as a group. Evidently they are all subject to the criticism which he makes explicit at 4. 22. The unnamed author might be a fourth person altogether, but Artemidorus' list gives the impression of being exhaustive rather than selective.¹ Is there a reason for the order of mention? Apparently not chronological, since Demetrius seems certainly to be the earliest,² but two other possibilities come to mind: length of books (3, 5, 22, respectively) or first place to

1. The opinion of F. Wehrli, *Demetrios von Phaleron* (Basel 1949), p. 65, that Artemidorus had read one of these works and knew of the others only through it is wrongheaded. Artemidorus is, by the standards of the Second Sophistic, a relatively naive author who gives every indication of being dedicated to the truth of his profession and not to a pretense of learning. It is wholly credible that, as he claims, he searched out even the rare books on his subject and that he had read everything pertinent to onirocritics (proem of Book 1, 2. 10–13 Pack). Far from being boastful about his actual reading, he ranks all manuals a poor second to actual experience in listening to dreams and following their outcomes (1. 12, 20. 12–14 P.; 4. 4, 247. 18–21 P.). Thus I take it as a simple fact that these were the three books of incubation dreams available to Artemidorus and that he had actually read them.

2. D. del Corno (ed.), *Graecorum de re onirocritica scriptorum reliquiae* (Varese–Milan, 1969), pp. 138–39.

Geminus as a small acknowledgment of honor to Tyre, the city of Artemidorus' patron.

(2) All three works named at 2. 44 are "not worthy of trust." This brief critical remark is slipped in as a secondary reason for not discussing these three books, but the primary reason given is that Artemidorus is composing a book of essential principles and basic theorems, not a collection of outcomes. This is a little odd, since he does use illustrative examples to show the connection of dream symbol and fulfillment. Geminus, Demetrius, and Artemon ought to have provided good material for this. Evidently it is also their lying, which he ridicules bitterly at 4. 22, rather than merely their irrelevance which excludes them at 2. 44, but Artemidorus makes little of this. There are two connected problems then: first, Artemidorus' refusal to name an author at 4. 22 in the course of an outspoken criticism and, second, the suppression of that criticism when he names authors at 2. 44.

There is a further oddity in the criticism itself, which is shrill and intemperate.³ Such collections of temple dreams, says Artemidorus, are ridiculous—any person of sense can tell that they are sheer fiction. "They do not transcribe visions but make them up themselves" (4. 22, 255. 15–16 Pack). Yet the examples he gives of silly riddles are much the same as the dream equivalents which Artemidorus endorses in his own analyses. Compare these two: "biting Indians" in a prescription dream signifies that black pepper is an ingredient.⁴ "'Wolf' (λύκος) signifies a year because of the name, for poets call years *λυκάβαντας* from the way wolves go—for they always cross rivers following each other in a line, just as the annual seasons follow on one another and complete the year" (2. 12, 124. 3–7 P.). I find it difficult to agree with Artemidorus that these two examples differ as fact from fiction or sober from silly. Yet his words are severe. There is something like a displacement of effect between 2. 44 and 4. 22. The former passage, which names names, is brief and impersonal. The latter is lengthy and rather heated; the reasoning with which Artemidorus tries to justify his contempt is not particularly cool or cogent; no one is named as an example of the *τινες* whom he attacks (255. 13 P.), and one in particular is expressly not named.

(3) The unnamed author was "particularly wearisome in the third book of his treatise." This could fit any of our candidates—Geminus (three books), Demetrius (five books), Artemon (twenty-two books). Would the third of three books stand out as singularly tedious more than the third of five or the third of twenty-two? The author whom Artemidorus refuses to name at 4. 22 could be, as far as the evidence goes, any of the three authors named at 2. 44. Geminus is so far merely a definite possibility. But there is a fourth consideration which I think explains the exact quality of both passages.

(4) Geminus is identified as "of Tyre"—Geminus Tyrius. The connection with Tyre may be significant, at least to Artemidorus. His first three books were written

3. Artemidorus is not customarily a polemical author. Often his new observations are set in opposition merely to "the ancients" or "some who say" (1. 64, 2. 9, 2. 12, 2. 18, 2. 65; 1. 32, 2. 58, 2. 66). Many of his criticisms of individual authors are tempered with praise (1. 67, 2. 9, 4. 23).

4. 22, 255. 20 P. This difficult passage is brilliantly discussed by I. Cazzaniga, "Animadversiones in duos Artemidori locos," *WS* 79 (1966): 230–36.

to Cassius Maximus, who is commonly and I think rightly identified as Maximus of Tyre.⁵ Of the relations between Artemidorus and Maximus we know only what this text tells us. The dedicatory comments contain the usual flowery references to the exalted mind of the patron and the friendship which author and patron bear each other. Could a criticism of a Tyrian dream-collector have been unwelcome to a Tyrian patron? We have evidence, not necessarily that Maximus would have found it so, but that Artemidorus would have felt it so. Artemidorus altered his ethnic name from Ephesius to Daldianus. He announces this at the close of Book 3 (3. 66, 235. 13–22 P.). The reason for the change is carefully explained as a mark of honor to his mother's city. Daldis has only one chance for fame and renown, the success of Artemidorus as a published author. This passage is a reminder to us not to underrate how serious were the feelings of civic pride, patriotic honor, and the public glory of one's native place. Others may have been indifferent but Artemidorus certainly was not. Such a feeling might be reason enough for suppressing criticism of a Tyrian author in a work dedicated to a Tyrian. The argument that pride in city may have influenced Artemidorus' text is employed by R. A. Pack: "Artemidorus could hardly have esteemed a science whose leading advocate had brought this much-publicized rebuff to the place of his birth."⁶

The fourth book, however, is not dedicated to Maximus. The first three make a unit of sorts and are intended to stand by themselves. The fourth is a response to criticisms and an important discussion of basic interpretive issues, all addressed privately to his own son Artemidorus, with advice to use it for his own practice and not unwisely to let many copies circulate (proem of Book 4, 238. 1 P.). Because the book is a more private composition, Artemidorus can feel freer to speak his mind and criticize the fabrication of temple cures and dreams. But the shadow of the patron still looms in the background (the first lines of the book refer to Cassius Maximus as friend and patron, the man for whom the prior three books were composed). It seems plausible that if Book 4 were to come into the hands of any person besides Artemidorus' *filis* it would be Maximus. Note that the warnings about wider publication of both Books 4 and 5 are not an absolute ban but a caution. The right of prudent decision is vested in the son, to publish or not, and the language indicates that some limited copying at least is likely (proems of Books 4 and 5, 238. 2, 301. 15 P.). In the case of both Books 4 and 5, among the persons after his son most likely to see the books must have been Cassius

5. Discussions of this identification are cited in R. A. Pack, *Artemidori Daldiani "Onirocriticon" libri V* (Leipzig, 1963), pp. xxv–xxvi. C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam, 1968), p. 182, n. 23, argues that Maximus is too late to be the dedicatee of Artemidorus. Artemidorus is certainly older than Maximus, for he began composing the *Onirocritica* after 140 A.D. (1. 26, 33. 10–12 P.) at which time he was probably at least fifty years old (4. 24, 259. 17–21 P.). Eusebius places Maximus' floruit in 152 and the Suda declares that he was in Rome under Commodus. Behr stresses the Suda testimony, but Maximus' presence in Rome after 177 is not a compelling ground on which to deny that he might have been prestigious enough already in the 140s to be the dedicatee of the *Onirocritica*. In any case, the reference at the conclusion of Book 2 (203. 10–15 P.) to a Lydian-Phoenician friendship implies that Cassius Maximus is from some city of Phoenicia, so the ethnic argument could apply even if Cassius Maximus is someone else than the famous Maximus of Tyre.

6. "Artemidorus and the Physiognomists," *TAPA* 72 (1941): 325. Pack also detects this motive in 4. 22: "It is difficult to say whether or how far this verdict [at 4. 22] was inspired by civic rivalries, but the words imply at least a certain distrust of Pergamene physicians and their patients" (p. 328).

Maximus himself. The peculiar status of Book 4 as a private work, in which Artemidorus does speak his mind more freely, but yet a work which may circulate (and evidently did since it survives) may explain both why the criticism at 4. 22 is made and why it is left anonymous. I take the refusal to name a certain name as an overflow of the suppressed feeling from the more polite passage, 2. 44.

JOHN J. WINKLER
Stanford University

A NOTE ON THE HUNTING HORN (*BUCINA*) IN THE LATIN POETRY OF LATE ANTIQUITY

The hunting horn plays a prominent part in the modern fox hunt. But the evidence for its use in classical antiquity is scant indeed. The only mention of a hunting horn in cynegetic literature (Xenophon, Grattius, Arrian, Oppian, Nemesianus) is a passage in Oppian describing the bear hunts of "those who live on the banks of the Tigris and in Armenia famed for its archery" (*Cyn.* 4. 355 *Τίγριν ὅσοι ναίουσι καὶ Ἀρμενίην κλυτότοξον*).¹ Here the trumpet is used to flush the bear from its cover and into the waiting nets (4. 397–99):

αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν κατὰ κόσμον ἐπαρτέα πάντα πέλωνται,
σάλπιγξ μὲν κελάδησε πελώριον, ἥ δέ τε λόχμης
ὀξὺ λέληκε θορούσα καὶ ὀξὺ δέδορκε λακούσα.

There can be no question here of normal Greek practice. The Mesopotamian and Armenian bear hunt is recorded by Oppian because it is so extraordinary (cf. 4. 354 *κλυτὴν περιώσιον ἄγρην*).

J. Aymard, it is true, believes the hunting horn was occasionally used in the Roman hunt to contribute to the general hue and cry.² But, as he notes, the evidence is meagre and ambiguous; he cites the passage from Oppian and three representations in art, sufficient perhaps to establish the occasional presence of the horn at a Roman hunt, but certainly not indicative of normal practice.³ The purpose of this note is to draw attention to two passages in the Latin poetry of late antiquity that present a different picture. Far from suggesting there is anything unusual in the use of the hunting horn, the poets view the horn as typical of the hunt.

The first passage is from the *Heptateuchos*, a Latin hexameter version of the first seven books of the Bible, all that survives of a larger poem that once included all the historical books of the Old Testament.⁴ It is traditionally attributed to a

1. For the passage in Oppian, see F. Orth, s.v. "Jagd," *RE* 9 (1914): 600, and D. B. Hull, *Hounds and Hunting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, 1964), p. 95.

2. *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins* (*Cynegetica*) (Paris, 1951), p. 289.

3. A. Reinach, s.v. "venatio," *Daremberg-Saglio* 5 (1919): 688, remarks, "Il est possible qu'on se servît de cors et de trompettes pour exciter ou diriger les chiens, comme dans la vénerie moderne," but the evidence he cites is unconvincing. The passage in Varro (*Ling.* 5. 99) is not relevant and the only artistic evidence he adduces is an Etruscan fresco. A. J. Butler, *Sport in Classic Times* (New York, 1930), pp. 101–3, is equally unconvincing.

4. Medieval library catalogs from Lorsch (10th century) and Cluny (12th century) for Kings, Chronicles, Esther, Judith, and Maccabees; the catalogs are quoted by R. Peiper (ed.), *Cypriani Galli Poetae*