

XVII. Textual Notes on Artemidorus Daldianus

ROGER PACK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The most recent study seems to show that the only reliable witnesses to the text of the *Onirocritica* are L = Codex Laurentianus 87, 8 (saec. XI) and V = Codex Marcianus 268 (saec. XV), the latter written by Michael Apostolius. These are, in fact, the two manuscripts upon which Rudolph Hercher, the latest editor (Leipzig 1864), based his text, though he occasionally quoted the readings of others which now appear to have no independent authority.¹ This paper consists of five notes on problems encountered in an attempt to prepare a modern, revised edition, followed by a few provisional remarks on the results of a new collation of LV.²

1. In *Onirocr.* 11.26–12.1, we read that κάμηλος is derived from *κάμμηρος, because the animal μέσους κάμπτει τοὺς μηρούς, and the authority cited for this curious etymology³ is Εὕηνος ἐν τοῖς εἰς Εὐνομον Ἑρωτικοῖς (Ἑρωτηματικοῖς, Reiske). L has εὕ ην ος written over an erasure in a space for eight letters, while in V a word of seven letters has been changed into Εὕηνος, that is, the original third and fourth letters have been refashioned into an eta — facts which Hercher neglected to record. Thus the name is slightly suspect paleographically, but since L and V represent two different families conservative criticism would not reject it as the archetypal reading, and in fact it derives support from Arrian, *Epict.* 4.9.6: ἀντὶ Χρυσίππου καὶ Ζήνωνος Ἀριστείδην ἀναγινώσκει καὶ Εὕηνον, a collocation of names which would render Reiske's conjecture superfluous, especially if we assume, as has been suggested (*RE* s.v. "Euenos" [7]), that the datum about the camel may have had some

¹ See Claes Blum, *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus* (Uppsala 1936) 12–22, and "Manuscript Studies in Artemidorus," *Eranos* 39 (1941) 56–63. Blum makes a good case for his contention that, of the one family, MU are derived from L and, of the other, COB offer no readings of value independently of V.

² Citations of the *Onirocritica* are in terms of page and line in Hercher. I am indebted to Dr. Berta Maracchi, Directress of the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, and Dr. Tullia Gasparini-Leporace, Directress of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, for their courtesy in enabling me to obtain photographs of L and VM, respectively.

³ As the early editors indicate, a similar etymology is given by Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* 2.100, and the *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Κάμηλος.

indecent application. Now Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 11 [1876] 300) emended the name in Arrian to Εὐβιον, because Ovid, after mentioning Aristides, adds: nec qui descripsit corrumpi semina matrum / Eubius, inpurae conditor historiae, / nec qui composuit nuper Sybaritida (*var. lect.*, Sybaritica) fugit (*Tristia* 2.415–17) — and in Byzantine pronunciation there was a difference of only one letter between the two names. Wilamowitz was not then acquainted with the passage in Artemidorus: if he had been, might he not have emended that as well, and on nearly as good grounds? As matters stand, I think it judicious to regard Evenus and Eubius as distinct personalities, and to refrain from tampering with either Arrian or Artemidorus.⁴

2. διμάχαιρος δὲ καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος μορμίλλων (*sic* Hercher, ἀρβήλας L, ὀρβήλας V) ἤτοι φαρμακὸν ἢ ἄλλως κακότροπον ἢ ἄμορφον εἶναι τὴν γυναῖκα σημαίνουνσι (*Onirocr.* 129.8–10). Is there any cogent reason for rejecting the reading of L? Although ἀρβήλας is not found elsewhere, we have ἄρβηλος, denoting a “semicircular knife” used by leather-workers (Hesychius, s.v. ἀνάρβηλα; Nicander, *Theriaca* 423 and scholium), and the *Etymologicum Magnum*, not cited in *LSJ*,⁹ adds to this definition the pertinent statement that “it is also a weapon” (ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὄπλον). ἀρβήλας, then, would be a gladiator who fights with such a weapon.⁵ For an analogous noun of agent ending in -ας and formed from a term for an implement in -ος I cite κέρνας (*Anth. Pal.* 7.709), a priest who carries a κέρνος (a special kind of earthenware dish for offerings).⁶ It should occasion no surprise to find a type of gladiator mentioned in this one passage, because the case would not be unique.⁷

3. In *Onirocr.* 213.21 — 214.16, Artemidorus ridicules the medical oniromancy practiced in Pergamon and Alexandria, especially the strange prescriptions purportedly revealed by the gods.

ὅταν γὰρ τις λέγῃ Νηρείδων ζωμὸν χειμῶνι συνταγὴν δεδοσθαι τισί, δοκεῖ

⁴ Wilamowitz’ conjecture has met with partial acceptance (see *RE* s.v. “Eubios” [6], and S. G. Owen, in his note on *Tristia* 2.416), but H. Schenkl merely prints it in the apparatus of his *editio maior* (Leipzig 1916).

⁵ A list of known types of gladiators appears in *RE* s.v. “Gladiatores,” Suppl. 3.777–78; if I am not mistaken, ἀρβήλας should be added to it. The list includes a *scissor*, known only from *CIL* IX 466; that the ἀρβήλας and the *scissor* were the same seems possible but dubious. On the shape of the ἄρβηλος, see D’Arcy W. Thompson, *CR* 56 (1942) 75–76 and J. D. Beazley, *ibid.* 116. These writers say nothing of its use as a weapon, but it would evidently have been a formidable one.

⁶ For a discussion and list of this and similar classes of nouns, see C. D. Buck and Walter Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago n.d.) 2–11.

⁷ Cf. the *scissor* (note 5 above) and the *pinnirapus*, Juv. *Sat.* 3.158 and schol. (not listed, however, in *RE* s.v. “Gladiatores,” perhaps because M. Rostowzew, *Röm. Mitt.* 15 [1900] 223–28 has held that the word signifies, more generically, a “champion gladiator”).

μοι τὰς χεῖμας¹ τῶν πελωρίδων ἀποκληρώσας² βελτίονας ἡγείσθαι³ καὶ
 †πελωρίου†⁴ ἐγκέφαλον τὸν⁵ ἀλεκτρύνονος, καὶ Ἰνδοῦς δάκνοντας πέπερι, [ὅτι⁶
 μέλαν ἐστὶ καὶ δάκνει]⁷, καὶ παρθένου γάλα <δάκνον>⁸ καὶ ἄστρον αἷμα
 δρόσον, καὶ πρόβατον Κρητικὸν μῆλον κυδώνιον καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα.

ἡρεῖδων (*sic*) — τοιαῦτα spatio relicto om. L, supplevit corrector. 1 χει- V in
 rasura. 2 ἀποληρήσας coniecit Toupius, quem Reiffius secutus est. 3 Hic
 lacunam statuit Hercherus. 4 Διὸς Valesius, Πέρσου Reiffius, πυλωροῦ vel
 κέλωρος Herch., κελωρίον ego. 5 καὶ VL³, τὸν Valesius. 6 πεπεριτι VL³, πέπερι, ὅτι
 Valesius. 7 Hanc sententiam in apparatus relegavit Herch. 8 Quod voca-
 bulum Herchero excidisse videtur.

“For whenever someone says that ‘Nereids’ broth’ has been given as a
 prescription to certain patients in the winter, it seems to me that he, by
 a random (*or* ‘absurd’) choice, regards clams as better than mussels . . . ,”
 which, by inference, they are not.⁸ That is, “Nereids’ broth” could
 signify soup made from mussels, because *πελωρίδες* are both “mussels”
 and, by a pun, “she-monsters,” that is, Nereids, but as the prescription
 is given in the winter (*χειμών*), the equivalent is rather soup made from
 clams (*χεῖμαι*, i.e. *χημαι*). This much owes its slight obscurity to our
 author’s strained facetiousness. *χείμη* is a *vox nihili*, but Artemidorus
 probably wrote it for *χημη* by itacism⁹ and for the sake of his word-play:
 naturally the scribe of V hesitated over it. *ἀποκληρώσας* fits the context
 well enough. “. . . And (*sc.* it seems to me that he regards) ‘monster’s (?)
 brain’ as that of a rooster, and ‘biting Indians’ as pepper (because pepper
 is black and bites), and ‘virgin’s milk’ as a tear (?), and ‘stars’ blood’ as
 dew, and a ‘Cretan sheep’ as a quince (i.e., a ‘Cydonian apple’,¹⁰ a play
 on *μῆλον*, ‘flock’), and all that sort of thing . . . ”

“Monster’s brain” must be corrupt. Valesius proposed *Διὸς*, because
 the phrase “Zeus’s brain” or “great king’s brain” was proverbial for a
 choice delicacy;¹¹ it is perhaps no serious objection that *cerebellum galli*
gallinacei seems to have been only a medicine¹² and not a gastronomic

⁸ Artemidorus was apparently thinking of rough-shelled clams, which were deemed
 inferior to mussels, though smooth-shelled clams were highly edible. See Xenocrates,
De alimentis ex fluviatilibus 31 (J. L. Ideler, *Physici et Medici Graeci Minores* [Berlin
 1841] 1, p. 131). In *Oniocr.* 108.23–25, the mussel and the clam are simply listed
 among the shellfish.

⁹ This was perceived by Reiff in his note *ad loc.* (*Artemidori Oneirocritica* [Lipsiae
 1805] 2.453).

¹⁰ Cf. the punning equivalent *Persica* (*sc. mala*, “peaches”) = *cultrum*, i.e., Persian
 sword, in Petron. *Sat.* 56.9 (see B. L. Ullman, *CP* 36 [1941] 355).

¹¹ *Suda* s.v. *Διὸς ἐγκέφαλος*. Valesius compared Ennius, *Hedyphagetica* ap. Apul.
Apol. 39: Quid scarum praeterii, cerebrum Iovis paene supremi?

¹² Pliny, *HN* 29.88, 30.112, 117, and certain derivative texts: Marcellus Empiricus,
De medicamentis 10.26; Serenus Sammonicus, *Liber medicinalis* 33.8.

dainty as well. Reiff's Πέρσου is at least ingenious: the connection would lie in the familiar fact that a rooster was termed a "Persian (or Median) fowl" (Ar. *Aves* 277, 483). Hercher left his conjecture κέλωρος unelucidated, but no doubt he based it upon the second meaning given by Hesychius (κέλωρ· ἔγγονος, υἱός· ἐκτομίας, γάλλος, σπάδων), so that we should have a latent play on γάλλος, "eunuch," and *gallus*, "rooster." I should prefer to read κελωρίον, the initial letter of which could have been easily altered due to the influence of πελωρίδων above. Though Hesychius glosses this word simply as παιδίον, it could obviously suggest a "little eunuch" as well as a "little boy." There would be an incidental piquancy in equating a eunuch with a notoriously libidinous fowl.

The passage as a whole calls to mind the enigmas of Symphosius and the riddling mottoes for the *apophoreta* at Trimalchio's dinner (Petron. *Sat.* 56), but these give little help in interpreting it except that they show how far the ancients indulged their fancy in this kind of trifling.

4. Σύρος ὁ τοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου δοῦλος τὰ (om. L) ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ αἶα (sic Herch., αὐτοῦ αὐτὰ τὰ πέλματα LV) ἔδοξεν ἔχειν (sic Herch., μὴ ἔχειν LV). ζῶν κατεκάη. (*Onirocr.* 217.22–24).

Hercher's editing is clever, but the older editors did less violence to the tradition by interpreting simply that Syrus dreamt he had no soles on the bottoms of his feet. αὐτὰ τὰ πέλματα might be regarded as a gloss on τὰ ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν, but the phrase seems characteristic of our author, as we have τὰ πέλματα τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ in the story (*ibid.* 270.23–271.2) of a "cyclic" or choral flutist who dreamt that the soles of his feet were eaten by worms, so that it seems best to read ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ πέλματα ἔδοξε μὴ ἔχειν. This is the text of L except that I follow Reiske and Reiff in omitting αὐτὰ, assuming that it crept in because of the preceding αὐτοῦ. μὴ as the negative in this construction is unobjectionable (cf. *ibid.* 263.26, 266.6–8; but οὐκ in 272.16).

5. In his fourth book Artemidorus includes a paragraph on dreams of an "imperial" nature. His third example (*Onirocr.* 222.12–13) appears thus in V:

Κρατῖνος ὁ ἡμέτερος ἀργυρέου ναοῦ (ἀργυροῦ νεῶ Herch.) ἐργεπιστάτης δόξας εἶναι, ἀργυρίου βασιλικοῦ ἐγένετο ἐργεπιστάτης (ταμίης Herch.).

Hercher printed this version with the two changes given in parentheses. He arbitrarily atticized ναοῦ, in keeping with his usual practice, and he drew ταμίης from L.

The reading of L differs decidedly:

[Κρατῖνος ὁ ἡμέτερος ὄναρ λαβὼν ἀργύριον εἰσοδιάσθη ναοῦ βασιλικοῦ
[ἐγένετο ἐργεπιστάτης] δόξας εἶναι Ζωῖλος ταμείας ἐγένετο ἀργυροῦ
βασιλικοῦ.

L, apparently copying a damaged manuscript, left lacunae for the two bracketed expressions, and the words were later written in by a corrector.

The presence of two proper names, the balance in thought between the adverb ὄναρ and the participle δόξας, and the repetition of ἐγένετο clearly point to two examples instead of one, as Hercher himself observed ("videtur quantum exemplum latere"). I suggest that the text can be very nearly healed by punctuation and slight corrections in orthography:

Κρατῖνος ὁ ἡμέτερος ὄναρ λαβὼν ἀργύριον †εἰσοδιάσθη† ναοῦ βασιλικοῦ
ἐγένετο. ἐργεπιστάτης δόξας εἶναι Ζωῖλος ταμίας ἐγένετο ἀργυρίου
βασιλικοῦ.

The corrupt word, as it stands, would be an aorist passive of εἰσοδιάζειν, "collect," without an internal augment, but seemingly this verb had no function as a passive deponent,¹³ and anyhow the structure of the sentence calls for a noun in its place. What would it be? Though one would naturally be reluctant to print a word not evidenced in *LSJ*,⁹ one thinks of εἰσοδιαστής, "collector," a formation which would be related to εἰσοδιασμός, "collection," as ἐξοδιαστής, "spendthrift," is related to ἐξοδιασμός, "payment" (cf. *Onirocr.* 55.8). The assumed corruption might have been facilitated by the interchange of -σθ- and -στ-, a sufficiently familiar phenomenon.¹⁴ "Collector" would square nicely with λαβὼν ἀργύριον if we take the participle in the sense of "receive" or "collect"; compare *Onirocr.* 184.20, of a creditor who collects a debt; *ibid.* 189.8, 14, of beggars who receive money. Then the meaning would be "Cratinus, our friend (or 'townsman'?; see below), who received money in a dream, became a collector for the imperial temple. Zoilus, who dreamt that he was a superintendent, became a steward of the imperial treasury." The second sentence is admittedly rather flat, though in handling material of this kind we need hardly strain after profundities. Perhaps, however, the genitive should be taken with both predicate nouns: "Zoilus, who dreamt that he was superintendent of the imperial treasury, became its steward."

¹³ In Vettius Valens 291.26–28 (ed. Kroll) we find an aorist with true passive meaning.

¹⁴ E.g., *PMich.* 3.182 (line 52) reads ἐσθω for ἐστω, and conversely 214 (line 13) gives ἀσπάσαστε for ἀσπάσασθαι.

Hercher evidently considered that Cratinus was of Ephesus, our author's own place of residence, as he proposed to read *ἡμετέρειος*. On this reasonable assumption, the "imperial treasury" would be the *fiscus Asiaticus*, and the "imperial temple," I believe, could be only that of the Augusti, called, in several inscriptions, *ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἐν ᾧ ἔθεσαν τῶν Σεβαστῶν κοινὸς τῆς Ἀσίας*.¹⁵ Temple-banks were common enough in all periods,¹⁶ and if this temple served as a bank also, a "collector," "receiver," or even "teller," would have been appropriate. Apparently no banking activity is specifically evidenced for it, but in this respect it may well have emulated the great temple of Artemis.¹⁷

A casual inspection of Hercher's critical apparatus would suffice to show that supplementary phrases or sentences sometimes appear in the one manuscript but not the other. Hercher presumably judged that the statement about Zoilus in L was such an illegitimate intrusion, but specific data concerning individuals, and not generalities about dreamlore, stem more probably from Artemidorus himself than from later supplementation, especially if they relate to a situation in Ephesus. I believe, therefore, that L here preserves the true reading, which became condensed, and manifestly corrupted, in V. Hercher has been criticized for his general tendency to rely more heavily on L, as the older witness.¹⁸ This is perhaps a case in which he erred rather in failing to do so: the moral is that L, despite its uncouth orthography, deserves the most careful consideration.

Finally, it should be noted that, if this result is acceptable, Zoilus, and not Cratinus, should have been identified as a *tamias* of the *fiscus* in *TAPA* 86 (1955) 287.

* * *

Though Hercher had the merit of being the first to construct a text from L as well as V, he did not collate L himself but used a collation made by J. Gronovius in 1680. Blum, for the purpose of his *Studies*, relied upon Gronovius-Hercher for all but the first five and the last ten leaves, of which he had photographs. For his article in *Eranos* he

¹⁵ See David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950) 2.1432-34. *Inscr. Brit. Mus.* 3.481 (lines 328-29) records a bequest of C. Vibius Salutaris to the *thesmōdois* of this temple.

¹⁶ See *RE* s.v. "Anleihen," Suppl. 4.25, and "Banken," *ibid.* 71.

¹⁷ For the Artemisium as a temple-bank, see Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 31.54-55, printed and interpreted by T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore 1938) 4.889, and, for earlier times, Plaut. *Bacch.* 306-7, Diog. Laërt. 2.6.7.

¹⁸ Blum, *Studies* 14-15; Kurt Latte, *Gnomon* 5 (1929) 156.

collated L entire, but he reported no more than the readings of the corrector L.¹ My own collation leaves me with the feeling that Blum exaggerates when he calls Gronovius' work "extremely faulty and incomplete." Faulty it is, however, probably due to haste or inadvertence, so that by mere diligence one can correct it at a number of points. Of course, only a small proportion of these corrections can be expected to yield improved readings.

Apparently neither Hercher nor Blum collated V independently — at least neither says that he did so, and its readings were available to Hercher in the Aldine edition of 1518, which was based solely upon it, or in Rigault's edition of 1603, which differed little from the Aldine. At any rate, my collation of V shows that Hercher's apparatus, apart from other errors, often records or attributes its readings inaccurately. In particular, I find that in over sixty cases Hercher either neglects entirely to note a variant from his text shared by LV or else attributes to L alone a rejected reading which is actually shared by V. Thus his alterations are either concealed or else appear to have a partial manuscript authority, namely that of V. In some nineteen of these cases I should judge that the readings of LV, obscured in this fashion, are at least unobjectionable, if not preferable to the changes made by Hercher or his predecessors.

Blum (*Studies* 17–18) has observed a number of cases in which the scribe of L has omitted one or two lines, of 21–25 letters each, due to *homoioteleuton*. I find that similarly the scribe of V has occasionally omitted lines of 31 letters each or two lines of 56–65 letters, for example:¹⁹

. . . μέλλει (*sic*) εὐπρεπείας
[οὗτοι κείρονται μέλει δὲ εὐπρεπείας,]

(*Onirocr.* 24.9–10; 31 letters; Hercher gives the extent of the omission incorrectly.) This circumstance is of only passing interest, but it suggests different antecedents for L and V, as we should expect.

Of course what has been said about Hercher's editorial practices is no sudden revelation.²⁰ His faults are mainly those of his time, while his learning and enormous industry still deserve respect. Besides making many obviously necessary corrections in Artemidorus' syntax (and some

¹⁹ The other instances occur in 46.13–14 (56 letters); 51.10–11 (31 letters); 93.24–25 (56 letters); 97.20–21 (56 letters); 100.6–8 (65 letters); 152.7–8 (61 letters). In two cases, the omissions may also be due to haplography, but it seems doubtful that they correspond to line-units: 93.23–24 (40 letters); 224.15–16 (46 letters).

²⁰ For example, in editing Chariton he used Hirschig's apparatus, though he complained of its inaccuracy. See W. E. Blake, *TAPA* 62 (1931) 68–77.

that are not; see below), he often indulged in emendations for which no real necessity is apparent, even when they result in greater smoothness, consistency, or elegance. A closer adherence to the manuscript tradition, in conformity with modern practice, would eliminate much, but far from all of the Atticism in Hercher's text, and in this matter Blum furnishes some valuable guidance. He has remarked, however (*Studies* 22–23), that treatises of a subliterate character were especially subject to vulgarization in the course of their transmission, and he admits this possibility for the *Onirocritica*, even though the work “does not seem to belong to the living literature of the Byzantine period.”²¹ There is no doubt a certain theoretical risk that less radical methods than Hercher's might produce a text more remote from Artemidorus' autograph because closer to the immediate LV archetype, but a modern editor, with only the two witnesses at his disposal, would not venture much beyond that point, but would frankly admit the limitations within which he must work.

All in all, it seems likely at this stage that the text cannot be improved so much by checking its diplomatic foundations as by reconsidering many small points for which Hercher already supplies the correct data. Here is an example. LV uniformly construe *μεμνήσθαι* with *τοῦτο*, not *τούτου*, but Hercher altered the construction at 95.13, 147.24, 167.2, and 228.7, by either omission or punctuation (e.g., 147.24: *ἔτι καὶ τοῦτο· μεμνήσθαι χρὴ ὅτι κτλ.*); at 120.8 he let it stand at first, but in his *Corrigenda ad loc.* he wished to read *τούτου* in order to avoid a “soloecismus” which is wholly imaginary, because of course the accusative is perfectly regular for neuter pronouns.²²

Finally, having freed Artemidorus from these artificial canons, a future editor can proceed to illustrate from other ancient writers the many bits of curious lore and learning that are to be found in him.

²¹ But see W. Croenert, *Berl. Philol. Woch.* 31 (1911) 137.

²² It would be gratuitous to refer to Smyth, *Greek Grammar for Colleges*, par. 1358, or Kuehner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, 1.364, Anm. 12.