

ARTEMIDORIANA FROM THE ESCURIAL

ROGER A. PACK

University of Michigan

The text of Artemidorus' *Onirocritica* depends almost wholly upon two manuscripts which often vary decidedly in their readings. These are L (codex Laurentianus 87, 8, of the eleventh century) and V (codex Marcianus 268, of the fifteenth). Six other codices, MUBCHO, preserve the text in whole or in part, but they have little value because MU were derived from L and BCHO from V. The excerpts in manuscripts known hitherto are brief and of slight worth.¹ Indirect witnesses, which compensate in some measure for the lack of a third, independent manuscript, are the passages quoted in the Suda lexicon and an Arabic translation (Ar) of Books 1-3, discovered only in the last decade and possibly datable to the ninth century though preserved in a manuscript written much later.² From this much it is evident that any new witness, however modest in scope, deserves scrutiny because it may tell something new about the history of the text or offer a means of restoring it with greater certainty, if only in a few places. Such are the excerpts to which I now invite attention: they are as old as V, the second basic manuscript, or perhaps even older, so that if they were more extensive they would constitute a major witness.

One of the treasures of the Escorial at Madrid is Codex Graecus Scorialensis Φ -III-11, numbered 230 by the latest cataloger, and described as a manuscript comprising an assortment of booklets which were written separately, in some ten different hands, during the fourteenth century,³ but were later bound into a codex of 254 paper

¹ See C. Blum, *Eranos* 39 (1941) 61-63.

² See my paper, "Artemidorus and His Arabic Translator," *TAPA* 98 (1967) 313-26.

³ Miller (below, note 4) dated the components to saec. XIV-XV but Father Gregorio de Andrés (note 7) assigns them to the first fifty years of saec. XIV.

leaves. Folios 107^v–122^r consist of extracts from a variety of philosophical works, but the same writer—for a reason which will soon appear, I do not think of him as a professional “scribe”—copied into the margins, *inter alia*, some passages from Artemidorus and from Macrobius’ commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis* in a Greek translation, doubtless that by Maximus Planudes. The older catalog of the collection⁴ neglected to mention these “Excerpta Scorialensia” of Artemidorus, and their existence remained unknown to Rudolf Hercher, who edited our author in 1864, and to the late Claes Blum, who published in our generation two useful studies of the manuscript evidence.⁵ Though Richard Wünsch supplied this essential bit of information some seventy years ago when he described the codex (which he designated as S) in his edition of Ioannes Lydus,⁶ his notice failed to catch Blum’s eye and it easily eluded me in 1963 when I issued a revision of Hercher’s text: I owe my tardy acquaintance with S to the improved description which is to be found in the newer catalog of fairly recent date.⁷

Each entry, whether in the body of the page or in one of the crowded margins, is introduced by *ὅτι*. The script, though fairly neat and legible, is more straggling and irregular than most bookhands. Abbreviations are freely employed. The identity of the writer has not been ascertained and the history of the manuscript remains obscure.⁸ The presence, however, of excerpts from Artemidorus together with others from a translation by Maximus Planudes, who died in 1310, is interesting and significant. We recall that a certain Pascalis Romanus used

⁴ E. Miller, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque de l’Escorial* (Paris 1848) 172–76.

⁵ *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus* (Uppsala 1936); “Manuscript Studies in Artemidorus,” *Eranos* 39 (1941) 56–63.

⁶ *Ioannis Lydi Liber de Mensibus* (Lipsiae 1898), “Praefatio” xxxix–xlvi. Wünsch cites the codex erroneously as “Φ –III–I.”

⁷ Gregorio de Andrés, *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial* 2 (Madrid 1965) 60–64. With the kind permission of Father de Andrés, the director of this library, a microfilm of the leaves in question was provided by Don José de Prado Herranz.

⁸ The cataloger remarks only “Perteneció a Páez de Castro (?).” This would be the collector of the sixteenth century whose manuscripts were “acquired for the Escorial by Philip II and perished by fire in 1671” (F. W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* [Oxford 1913] 334). My pursuit of this lead ended in a *cul-de-sac*, not a conflagration.

the *Onirocritica* when he compiled the Latin dreambook which he published in 1165 at Constantinople; that that capital was the most likely provenance of L and of the manuscript from which Michael Apostolis copied V; and that the Arabic translation mentioned above was found in the library of the University of Istanbul.⁹ This combination of circumstances strongly suggests that the portion of S with which we are concerned was a notebook of some Byzantine scholar who copied, for his personal use, a miscellany of passages that awakened his interest in the course of his reading.¹⁰ And it would be a fair guess that he studied in one of the city's great medieval libraries.

Because he wished to save space and was indifferent to the convenience of readers other than himself, our note-taker moved backward from one margin to another. He first names Artemidorus in the upper margin of folio 111^r with the words ὅτι Ἀρτεμίδωρος ὁ Δαλδιανὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ὀνείρων κρίσεως δευτέρῳ βιβλίῳ αὐτοῦ ἐν ὀγδόῳ κεφαλαίῳ φησὶν ὅτι οὐδείς κεραυνωθείς κτλ., quoting *Onirocr.* 2.9 (112.22) ff.¹¹ At the close of his entry in the lower margin he writes an arbitrary sign and a cross-reference to 110^v (ζήτει τὸ σημεῖον ἐν τῷ πρὸ τούτου φύλλῳ). Another sign and cross-reference at the foot of 110^v (ζήτει τὰ ἐξῆς ὀπισθεν) go back to 108^v. Thus the passages of present interest are confined to the margins of 108^v–111^r, with one exception: the statement ὅτι καὶ ᾠτοῖς μικροῖς μικρὰ διδοῦσι θεοί, φησὶν ὁ Καλλίμαχος, found in the margin of 107^v, must have been paraphrased from *Onirocr.* 4.84 (300.16–17).¹²

The other passages may be listed in order as follows:

I.1 (3.13–15; 3.23–4.5; 4.5–9): 111^r, 110^v (*sic*).

I.2 (4.23–5.2; 5.9–11, 20–21): 108^v–109^r.¹³

⁹ See *TAPA* 96 (1965) 291–95.

¹⁰ Aubrey Diller, *TAPA* 87 (1956) 91, has aptly characterized this class of manuscripts.

¹¹ Citations are according to book and chapter followed parenthetically by page and line as in my edition (Leipzig 1963).

¹² This is shown by the lection μικροῖς μικρὰ (*sic* LV), which Reiff, followed by the editors of Callimachus (cf. Pfeiffer, *Fr.* 475), corrected to μικκοῖς μικκὰ from the *Etymologicum Magnum*. Though the same variant (LV) appears in Stobaeus' quotation, as given by Pfeiffer, the proximity of this notice to the other materials drawn from Artemidorus suggests that he, not Stobaeus, was the source for S.

¹³ Only a few words are carried over to the top of 109^r; the margins on this page are otherwise blank.

1.2 (5.17-18): III^r.

1.2 (6.13-18): IIO^v

2.9 (112.22-23; 111.13-15; 113.3-5, in that order): III^r.

4, Prooemium (239.9-13, 14-20): IO9^v, IO8^v (*sic*).

Interspersed with these marginal entries are Lydus, *De mensibus* 3.1 (37.12-16 Wünsch) (IO8^v), Macrobius, *Comm. in Somn. Scip.* 1.3.5 (wrongly ascribed to Artemidorus: IIO^v), 1.3.7 (IIO^v), 1.3.8-10 (IO9^v-IIO^r), and a note (IO9^v) on the indiction at Rome.¹⁴

I omit from the following collation several false variants obviously caused by paraphrasing. The preferred reading in each case is that which precedes the colon.

1.1 (3.14-4.8). διαφέρειν ἢ VS: διαφέρειν L. τῶ VS: τῶ τὸν L. σημαντικῶ VS: σημαντικὸν L. τῶν μελλόντων L: μελλόντων VS (3.14). τῶ VS: τὸ L (3.15). τῶν μελλόντων LV: μελλόντων S (3.24). ἂν VS: δ' ἂν L. ἃ μὲν L¹VS: ἄμα L (L¹ is a corrector of saec. xi). σώματος LS: σώματος μόνου L¹V, defended by Blum (see below); I would now follow LS. ἃ δὲ L¹VS: ἄμα L. ἴδια VS: καὶ L, preferred by Blum (4.1). ψυχῆς LS: τῆς ψυχῆς V. . . . ἴδοις ἂν ἃ μὲν ἴδια σώματος ἃ δὲ ἴδια ψυχῆς ἃ δὲ τοῦ συναμφοτέρου S: <ἃ δὲ κοινὰ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ> Hercher, . . . <ἃ . . . σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς> Reiske, ἃ . . . συναμφοτέρου *om.* LV (4.2). τε VS: *om.* L (4.5). ὁράται Reiske: δρᾶται LVS, wrongly (4.8).

1.2 (4.23-6.14). ἐαυτῶν VS: ἐαυτὸν L (4.23). δι' ἄλλων ἄλλα σημαίνοντες LVS: ἄλλα δι' ἄλλων ἀγορεύοντες Suda (5.9). αἰνισσομένης VS: -ιττο- L. ἐν αὐτοῖς L: ἐπ' αὐτοῖς VS. τι VS: *om.* L (5.10). [καὶ] Hercher, *om.* S: καὶ LV (5.11). κίνησις VS: κρίσις L (5.17). ἰδίων VS: ὁμοίων ἢ L (5.20). φάντασμα L, cf. Macrobius, *Comm. in Somn. Scip.* 1.3.2, 3, 7: φάσμα VS (6.14).

2.9 (111.13-113.4). περιτίθεται VS: ἐπιτίθεται L. ὥς καὶ . . . αὐτοῖς L: *om.* VS (111.13). ἐστὶν VS: *om.* L (112.23). ἂν VS: *om.* L. καταληφθῶσιν LS: καταλειφθῶσιν V (113.4).

4, Prooemium (239.12-19). [οὕτως καὶ ἡθεῖός μοι ἐνύπνιον ἦλθεν ὄνειρος]: this clause, bracketed by Hercher in LV, appears in S also (but with τὸ for θεῖός μοι) (239.12). ἀγαθῇ, an editorial correction, is confirmed by S: ἀγαθὰ LV (239.14). εὐπροαίρετῳ Reiske, confirmed by S: εὐπροαίρετος L, εὐπροαίρετα V. οὐδὲ L: οὕτε VS (239.15). πάντα LVS: πάντως was Hercher's conjecture. ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον LV: ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ S, wrongly (239.16). ἐπιθολοῦται LV: ἐπὶ πολὺ θολοῦται S, a

¹⁴ Wünsch (above, note 6) xli, prints this in full.

clear error. οὔτε φόβοις οὔτε ἐλπίσιν Reiff: οὔτε φόβῳ . . . L, οὔτε ἐν φόβοις οὔτε ἐν ἐ. VS (239.17). καὶ τῶν VS: τῶν L (239.18). [ἐν] τῷ σπουδαίῳ Hercher: ἐν τῷ σπουδαίῳ LV, ἐπὶ τῶν σπουδαίων S (239.19).

The collation shows that S agrees in obvious error once with LV (1.1 [4.8]) and twice with V against L (1.2 [6.14]; 2.9 [111.13]). These and most of the other readings of S are consistent with my belief that our excerptor read and copied from the parent of V,¹⁵ thus opposing this parent manuscript, or VS, to L as a variant-carrier. On this assumption a reading of LS may be presumed more probably authentic than a variant in V, so that the rejection of *μόνου* (1.1 [4.1]) is stemmatically justified; and V's erroneous *ἀπολειφθῶσιν* (2.9 [113.4]) may be ascribed to Michael Apostolis, the scribe of V. On similar grounds a reading of LV against S convicts S of error at several points. The fact that S confirms three editorial corrections of LV is not necessarily damaging to my theory, because S, himself a scholar, could have made these slight corrections as easily as the modern editors. On the other hand, a difficulty may seem to arise at 1.1 (4.2). Here the omission in LV of a reading presumably copied by S from the parent of V would indeed be a stemmatic anomaly unless we suppose that L and V were coincidentally tricked by the *homoiokatarkton*—yet it is well known that omissions of this kind were often made by mere coincidence. In any case, S has a special interest for this passage. Blum once suggested that there would be no need to supply anything here if one printed *ἃ μὲν ἴδια σώματος μόνου ἃ δὲ καὶ* (*sic* L: *ἴδια* VS, as above) *ψυχῆς*. "The meaning will be: Some dreams belong to the body alone, others also to the soul (that is, either alone or in connection with the body)" (*Eranos* 39 [1941] 61). This was ingenious,

¹⁵ Another small factor which relates S to the V tradition may be mentioned in passing. It was remarked above that the excerptor cites *Onirot.* 2.9 (112.22) as 2.8. Now in both L and V the text of Book 2 is preceded by a table of contents listing the numbered chapter-headings (L 42^v-43^r and V 39^v-40^v, not printed in modern editions), and there are slight differences between the chapter-divisions and their numbers as found in L, in V, and in our editions. Turning again to photographs of the manuscripts, I find that the cited passage does indeed belong to 2.8 according to the table in V but would be 2.7 according to that in L.

D. Del Corno, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 673, has offered the interesting conjecture that the lost parent of V was the source of the extracts made by Angelo Poliziano in 1483 (Coll. Dupuy 673, folios 129-30; see my edition, "Praefatio," vii-viii).

but Ar has since revealed that there was, in fact, a lacuna in LV: . . . minhâ mâ yakûnu min qibali l-badani wa-minhâ mâ yakûnu min qibali n-nafsi wa-minhâ mâ yakûnu min qibali n-nafsi wa-l-badani jamî'an, ". . . of them (sc. the dreams), that which is of the power of the body, and that which is of the power of the soul, and that which is of the power of the soul and the body together" (p. 8.10-12, ed. T. Fahd). S gives no support to *μόνον*, favors *ἴδια*, not *καὶ*, confirms the lacuna in LV, and fills it with the acceptable and, I believe, authentic phrase *ἀ δὲ τοῦ συναμφοτέρου*: the correspondence with *jamî'an* speaks for its authenticity.

In conclusion, let me summarize my present view of the relations of LVS Ar: from the archetype (Ω), Ar is descended side-by-side with α , a lost hyparchetype, and from α in turn are derived two branches, L and the lost β , the parent of the brothers VS.