

EOS XCVIII fasc. 1
2011

E O S

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTOR NACZELNY

JAKUB PIGOŃ

REDAKTORZY

KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA
JERZY AXER
MAŁGORZATA BOROWSKA

Rocznik XCVIII 2011

Zeszyt 1

WROCŁAW–LUBLIN–WARSZAWA
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE
INSTYTUT BADAŃ INTERDYSCYPLINARNYCH „ARTES LIBERALES”
2011

EOS

COMMENTARII
SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE
POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

EDITOR PRIMARIUS
IACOBUS PIGOŃ

EDITORES
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA
GEORGIUS AXER
MARGARITA BOROWSKA

Volumen XCVIII 2011
Fasciculus 1

WRATISLAVIAE–LUBLINI–VARSOVIAE
SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM
INSTITUTO STUDIIS INTERDISCIPLINARIBUS EXCOLENDIS “ARTES LIBERALES”
ADIUVANTE
2011

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

ANDREAS BUDZISZ, LUBLINI
SILVESTER DWORACKI, POSNANIAE
SOPHIA GŁOMBIOWSKA, GEDANI
CASIMIRUS KORUS, CRACOVIAE
LESCUS MROZEWICZ, POSNANIAE
HENRICUS PODBIELSKI, LUBLINI
GEORGIUS STYKA, CRACOVIAE
MARIANUS SZARMACH, TORUNII

COMMENTARII EDUNTUR ADMINISTRANTUR

PL-50-139 WROCLAW, UL. SZEWSKA 49
INSTYTUT STUDIÓW KLASYCZNYCH, ŚRÓDZIEMNOMORSKICH I ORIENTALNYCH
UNIwersytetu WROCLAWSKIEGO
INSCRIPTIO ELECTRONICA: eos@uni.wroc.pl

COMMENTARIORUM PAGINA DOMESTICA
www.eos.az.pl

EDITORUM ADIUTRIX

CATHARINA OCHMAN

Wydano ze środków Ministerstwa Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego
przy wsparciu finansowym Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego
we współpracy wydawniczej z Instytutem Badań Interdyscyplinarnych „Artes Liberales”

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE

COMMENTATIONES

ALEKSANDRA SZALC, <i>Alexander's Dialogue with Indian Philosophers: Riddle in Greek and Indian Tradition</i>	7–25
KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA, <i>How to Handle a King: Miletus and the Successors</i>	27–42
RADOSŁAW PIĘTKA, <i>Paulus Maximus and Ovid in Horace Carm. IV 1</i>	43–49
MARIUSZ PLAGO, <i>Concordia Discors or Pompey Like Caesar: Lucan's Apostrophes V 472–475, VI 278–332 and their Context</i>	51–67
JOANNA KOMOROWSKA, <i>Theory Applied: The Proem and the Contents of Tetrabiblos II</i>	69–85
NEIL ADKIN, <i>Two Etymological Clusters in Apuleius</i>	87–92
MARIA ŁUKASZEWICZ-CHANTRY, <i>Wanda, Amazone sarmate dans la poésie latine de la Renaissance en Pologne</i>	93–110

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

A.B. Lloyd (ed.), <i>A Companion to Ancient Egypt</i> , Chichester–Malden, MA 2010 (AGNIESZKA WOJCIECHOWSKA).....	111–113
A. Missiou, <i>Literacy and Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens</i> , Cambridge 2011 (KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA).....	114–115
S. Dillon, <i>The Female Portrait Statue in the Greek World</i> , Cambridge 2010 (LECHOSŁAW OLSZEWSKI).....	116–119
Á. Martínez Fernández (ed.), <i>Estudios de epigrafía griega</i> , La Laguna 2009 (ANDREW BREEZE).....	120–122
A. Dębiński, J. Misztal-Konecka, M. Wójcik, <i>Prawo rzymskie publiczne</i> , Warszawa 2010 (ALDONA JUREWICZ).....	123–126
M. Maślanka-Soro, <i>Tragizm w «Komedii» Dantego</i> , Kraków 2010 (JUSTYNA ŁUKASZEWICZ, MARIA ŁUKASZEWICZ-CHANTRY).....	127–128

ALEXANDER'S DIALOGUE WITH INDIAN PHILOSOPHERS:
RIDDLE IN GREEK AND INDIAN TRADITION*

By

ALEKSANDRA SZALC

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this paper is to reconsider the Cynic origin of Alexander and gymnosophists' dialogue and to suggest Indian sources of this episode, as well as to solve the problem by giving examples of similar questions or riddles in the ancient Greek literature as well as in the *Vedas*, *Upanishads* and Indian epic.

Alexander's encounter with naked philosophers is one of the most popular motifs in his legend. This story has been frequently rewritten throughout Late Antiquity and Middle Ages probably because of its oriental undertone and anecdotal character. The meeting is described in some versions of the *Alexander Romance*, as well as in *Papyrus Berolinensis* 13044; Plutarch, *Alexander* 64; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* VI 4, 38; *Epitome Mettensis* 78–84 ff.; *Anecdota Graeca* I 145 f. ed. BOISSONADE; and Julius Valerius III 11.

There are two traditional stories of Alexander's encounter with the Indian sages. According to the most popular of them, Onesicritus when sent by Alexander, has met a group of fifteen philosophers – among them Mandanis (later called Dindimus) and Calanus¹ (accounts of Onesicritus², Aristobulus³ and Nearchus⁴ in Strabo, also in Plutarch and Arrian). The other one shows Alexander asking questions to a group of *gymnosophistai*, in order to punish them for their revolt against him (Plut. *Alex.* 64). Alexander gives them a series of *aporiai* – questions with difficult and ambiguous answers. The earliest record documenting

* This paper has been completed during a research stay in London in September 2011 financed by the De Brzezie Lanckoroński Foundation.

¹ See PEARSON 1960: 96–98; WINIARCZYK 2009.

² JACOBY 1929: 732–736 (F 134).

³ JACOBY 1929: 769–799 (F 139).

⁴ JACOBY 1929: 677–723 (F 133).

Alexander's meeting with the Indian philosophers is a "fragmentary papyrus (Pap. Berol. 13044) containing series of questions asked by Alexander to the philosophers, the content which appears as part of a more substantial narrative in the *Alexander Romance* (III.6) and Plutarch's *Alexander* (64). The further development of the encounter, where the leader of the philosophers lectures Alexander at length on their way of life, appears in the later part of the *Alexander Romance*, but at much length in a work partially preserved on a papyrus of the mid-second century AD, in which it appears as one of a collection of Cynic diatribes"⁵ (*P. Genév. Inv.* 271).

The riddle-dialogue between Alexander and gymnosophists is usually considered to be the Cynic diatribe, mostly because of some similarities between Indian gymnosophists and Cynic philosophers pointed out by U. WILCKEN in his influential paper *Alexander der Grosse und die indischen Gymnosophisten*⁶. That point of view is no longer unconditionally accepted. Some authors⁷ point out that perhaps this encounter is not simply a Cynic in origin but that it may also contain some Indian material.

The purpose of this paper is to reconsider this "Cynic" point of view and present some Indian dialogues which may have inspired the original account of the famous encounter between Alexander and Indian philosophers.

1. VERSIONS OF THE DIALOGUE/VARIANTS OF QUESTIONS

As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, there are seven basic versions of Alexander's dialogue with the philosophers⁸.

Plut. *Alex.* 64, 1

[Alexander] captured ten of the Gymnosophists who had done most to get Sabbas to revolt, and had made the most trouble for the Macedonians. These philosophers were reputed to be clever and concise in answering questions, and Alexander therefore put difficult questions to them, declaring that he would put to death him who first made an incorrect answer, and then the rest, in an order determined in like manner; and he commanded one of them, the oldest, to be judge in the contest.

⁵ STONEMAN 2003: 334.

⁶ WILCKEN 1923.

⁷ SAYRE 1938; DUMÉZIL 1976; STONEMAN 1995 and 2008; MAGNONE 2001; BOSMAN 2010.

⁸ The translations below follow those by STONEMAN 1991; PERRIN 1919; ROBERTS, DONALDSON 1883. The *Pap. Berol.* 13044, *Metz Epitome*, *Anecdota Graeca* and Iulius Valerius versions of the dialogue are quoted in the author's translations. All translations are based on the original texts as given in BRELOER, BÖMER 1939.

I

Plut. *Alex.* 64

The first one, accordingly, being asked which, in his opinion, were more numerous, the living or the dead, said that the living were, since the dead no longer existed.

Pap. Berol. 13044

Which is the most numerous, the living or the dead? "The living, for it is not correct to claim that those who are not would be more than those who are".

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

The first, then, being asked, whether he thought that the living were more in number than the dead, said, "The living; for that the dead were not".

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked which were more numerous, the living or the dead. The Indian replied, "The living for the others are nothing and nothing cannot be counted".

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the first one, whether he thought that the living were more numerous or the dead, he said, "It is necessary that those who are, are more numerous than those who are not".

Hist. Alex. Magni

He asked then: "Do you have no graves?" They replied: "Here is the place where we dwell..." [corrupted].

Iul. Val.

The Macedonian decided to talk to them, so he [asked] where these human beings had their graves. And their response was that they had their homes in the same place as their graves; there they have a place to stay, to sleep, to peacefully await their death, because they find it to be their place to live as well as to die.

II

Plut. *Alex.*

The second, being asked whether the earth or the sea produced larger animals, said the earth did, since the sea was but a part of the earth.

Pap. Berol. 13044

After that, he asked which was larger, the land or the sea: "The land (he answered), because the sea lies on the land".

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

The second, on being asked whether the sea or the land maintained larger beasts, said, "The land; for the sea was part of it".

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked whether there were more creatures on land or in the sea. The Indian replied, "On the land, for the land contains the very sea itself".

Anecd. Graec.

[He asked] the second whether the land or the sea maintain more beasts? He said: "The land, because the land lays over the sea".

Hist. Alex. Magni

“Who are greater in number” he asked next, “the living or the dead?”. “The dead are more numerous” they replied, “but because they no longer exist, they cannot be counted. The visible are more numerous than the invisible”.

Iul. Val.

He asked the next which, in his opinion, were more numerous: the living or the dead. And his answer was that the dead were more numerous, because they could not be counted, because they did not exist; it can be said that, for certain, those who cannot be seen, cannot be considered either.

III

Plut. *Alex.*

The third, being asked what animal was most cunning, said: “That which up to this time man has not discovered”.

Pap. Berol. 13044

He asked the third: who was the most cunning of all the creatures? He replied “I don’t know [a creature] more cunning than a man”.

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

And the third being asked which was the most cunning of animals?, [answered] “The one which has not hitherto been known, man”.

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked, which was the wisest of the animals. The Indian replied, “That which no man has ever discovered”.

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the third: “Who is the most cunning of all living creatures”. He replied, “I don’t know any but a man”.

Hist. Alex. Magni

He asked the next: “Which is stronger, death or life?” “Life” he replied, “because the sun as it rises has strong, bright rays, but when it sets, appears to be weaker”.

Iul. Val.

Then he asked the next which, in his opinion, was stronger: life or death? The answer was “Life, because the power of sun grows in the East, and fades away on the way to the West; the same is among people, those who live are more powerful than those who are dying”.

IV

Plut. *Alex.*

The fourth, when asked why he had induced Sabbas to revolt, replied: “Because I wished him either to live nobly or to die nobly”.

Pap. Berol. 13044

He asked the fourth why they had decided to fight with Sabbas against him; he answered: “for that, he has noble life or noble death”.

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

[When asked] for what reason they had made Sabbas, who was their king, revolt, [they] answered, "Because they wished him to live well rather than die ill".

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked, "For what reason did you advise king Sambus to wage war against me?" The Indian replied, "That he might live honourably or die honourably".

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the fourth why they had persuaded Samos to fight with him; he answered: "for that, he has noble life or noble death".

Hist. Alex. Magni

"Which is greater, the earth or the sea?" "The earth. The sea is itself surrounded by the earth".

Iul. Val.

And he asked "Which is larger, the land or the sea?" "The land, which holds the sea in it".

V

Plut. *Alex.*

The fifth, being asked which, in his opinion, was older, day or night, replied: "Day, by one day"; and he added, upon the king expressing amazement, that hard questions must have hard answers.

Pap. Berol. 13044

The fifth being asked which had become first: the day or the night, replied, "Day, by one night".

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

And the fifth being asked whether he thought that day or night was first, said "Day ['night' in other editions] by one day".

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked, "Which came first: the night or the day?" The Indian replied, "Night was born first by one day". Then when Alexander hesitated over what to ask, the Indian noticed that and said, "Hesitant questions lead to hesitant answers".

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the fifth which was first: the night or the day? "The night", he replied, "by one day".

Hist. Alex. Magni

Which is the most wicked of all creatures? "Man" they replied. "Answer this question to yourself. You are a wild beast, and see how many other wild beasts you have with you, to help you tear away the lives of other beasts".

Iul. Val.

He asked then which beast of all is the most cunning. He answered with a smile that it is the man.

VI

Plut. *Alex.*

Passing on, then, to the sixth, Alexander asked how a man could be most loved; “If”, said the philosopher, “he is most powerful, and yet does not inspire fear”.

Pap. Berol. 13044

He asked the sixth “How shall one be loved most?”. He said, “By being the most powerful and not seeming terrifying to anyone”.

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

And the sixth being posed with the query “How shall one be loved most?” “By being most powerful; in order that he may not be timid”.

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked, “What should a man do to seem pleasing to everyone?” The Indian replied, “If he should be powerful to apply himself to not seeming vicious”.

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the sixth “How shall one be loved most?”. He replied “By being the most powerful and not seeming terrifying to anyone”.

Hist. Alex. Magni

What is king [Arm.]/kingship [Syr.]? “Unjust power used to disadvantage of others; insolence supported by opportunity; a golden burden”.

Iul. Val.

Then he asked what they thought power was; they answered that this was a power over deception, that time was always favourable, and if one would prefer – unjust audacity.

VII

Plut. *Alex.*

Of the three remaining, he who was asked how one might become a god instead of man, replied: “By doing something which a man cannot do”.

Pap. Berol. 13044

He asked the seventh, “What one must do in order to become a God?”. He replied, “It is impossible for a man to do so”.

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

And the seventh being asked, “How any one of men could become God?” said, “If he did what it is impossible for a man to do”.

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked, how a man might be thought a God. The Indian replied, “By doing something no mortal can”.

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the seventh “What one must do in order to become a God?”, he replied, “It is impossible for a man to do so”.

Hist. Alex. Magni

[Arm.] "Which came first, day or night?" "Night. What is born grows first in the darkness at the mother's womb, and at birth it encounters the light of the day".

Iul. Val.

He asked then whether, in their opinion, the day was first or the night? Without any doubt "The night" – they answered, "because all that is conceived to live begins in the darkness and when is born, wanders through the light".

VIII

Plut. *Alex.*

The one who was asked which was the stronger, life or death, answered: "Life, since it supports so many ills".

Pap. Berol. 13044

He asked the eighth "Which is stronger, life or death?". He replied, "Life".

Clem. Al. *Strom.*

And the eighth being asked, "Which is stronger, life or death?" said "Life, which bears such miseries".

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked which was stronger, life or death. The Indian replied, "Life, for life makes something out of nothing whereas death makes what is into nothing".

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the eighth "Which is stronger – life or death?" "Life" – he replied.

Hist. Alex. Magni

He asked the next "Who cannot be lied to, so we tell him only the truth?" "The god, because we cannot lie to someone who sees everything".

Iul. Val.

He continued asking: "To whom a human being cannot lie?" The answer was, "To God, because he sees everything and knows everything".

IX

Plut. *Alex.*

And the last, asked how long it were well for a man to live, answered: "Until he does not regard death as better than life".

Pap. Berol. 13044

He asked the last one "How much time is there to live in a good way?" [corrupted].

Clem. *Strom.*

And the ninth being interrogated, "Up to what point it is good for a man to live?" said, "Till he does not think that to die is better than to live".

Epit. Mett.

Alexander asked, "How long may a man usefully live?" The Indian replied, "Until such time as he reckons himself more useful dead than alive".

Anecd. Graec.

He asked the ninth “How long is the life of a man pleasant for him?” He answered, “As long as he decides to die nobly”.

Hist. Alex. Magni.

[Arm., Syr., Iul. Val.] “Which side is better, the left or the right?” “The right. The sun rises and then makes its way to the left-hand side of sky. And a woman gives suck first with her right breast”.

Iul. Val.

He asked then, which side of the human body they consider to be estimable. The response was “The left, because even the sun wanders from the left to the right. Furthermore, what was mixed from left part of a man and a woman is considered to be the best, and a mother has her nourishment first in the left breast. Also, the Gods prefer to receive the religious gifts from the left arm and the kings prefer to hold the symbols of their dignity in the left hand”.

In most cases, the questions are the same, although sometimes in changed sequence. Only the *Alexander Romance* and Iulius Valerius’ questions differ a little from other versions (questions about graves (I), kingship or power (VI), lies (VIII) and sides (IX)). There is much speculation about the order of the questions, and their interaction. The most popular point of view in this case is that of U. WILCKEN. He suggests that the *Romance* version is created separately from other versions, though it contains elements close to the Berlin papyrus. He also states that Plutarch has rewritten the source, and that the *anecdutum* goes back to the source earlier than the papyrus. Furthermore, the *Metz Epitome* version, where it differs from Plutarch, goes back to the Greek version, which is older than *Alexander’s* version. According to WILCKEN, the story is taken from an unknown earlier version of the *Alexander Romance*; this opinion, however, has been treated sceptically by F. JACOBY and H. VAN THIEL⁹. As it can be observed, the concurrence of the questions is significant; this fact can suggest that there was one tradition, derived from a source written shortly after the encounter.

Alexander’s meeting with the naked philosophers, is without any doubt, a historical fact. He certainly met them during his Indian campaign. He probably also spoke to them, with a help of interpreters¹⁰.

It is difficult to state that this is a philosophical dialogue, or even a diatribe. Alexander is simply interrogating the philosophers by asking them some witty questions. According to the definition, the diatribe (considered to be shaped by the pupil of Crates of Thebes, Bion of Borysthenes¹¹) is a literary genre which originates in the speeches of wandering philosophers teaching in the streets,

⁹ See BOSMAN 2010: 179.

¹⁰ WILCKEN 1967: 181; SEDLAR 1980: 68 f.; PEARSON 1983: 99; KARTTUNEN 1997: 60 f., STONE-MAN 1995: 103 f.; POWERS 1998: 81; NAWOTKA: 2010a: 311, 320; 2010b: 283 f.

¹¹ DESMOND 2008: 34.

praising poverty, good manners and speaking about morality. W. DESMOND writes about the transformation of the diatribe: "In the hands of successors of Bion, the diatribe style seems to have been a way of talking aloud in writing: the speaker 'shadow-boxes' with an imaginary interlocutor, throwing out punchy questions or objections on the interlocutor's behalf, and then moving in to answer them himself"¹² and "Eventually it came to mean a feigned conversation in which the (e.g. Cynic) philosopher does all of the talking, asking and answering questions on behalf of an overawed or imaginary interlocutor. Owing perhaps to Bion's works, it became one of the main literary styles of Cynicism"¹³. According to D.R. DUDLEY, the characteristic of the diatribe are "the use of allegory, anecdote, and quotation, its appeals to an imaginary adversary [...]. Diatribe is a moral exposition of some brief topic"¹⁴.

It can be clearly observed that Alexander's dialogue with naked philosophers cannot be called a diatribe, due to its different character. Neither Alexander nor the gymnosophists are preaching, nor is there a specific theme of their encounter, and this is not a philosophical debate either. This dialogue is called Cynic because of the fact that the most popular testimony of Alexander's meeting with Indian philosophers (Calanus and Dandamis) was transmitted by Onesicritus, and, automatically, the dialogue with Indian sages preserved on the papyrus is also claimed to be a Cynic text, created for the purpose of glorifying the Cynic model of life¹⁵. Furthermore, the Indian philosophers who take part in the conversations are also very similar in appearance to the Cynics. They are naked, they practice the asceticism and they claim to own nothing, except for the part of the ground they are standing on. However, there are also differences between the Indian and the Cynic attitudes towards asceticism. The Cynics wanted to puzzle people and take them by surprise, while their eccentric behaviour was intended to show their negation of social standards. Indian ascetics, on the other hand, performed mortifications in order to gain the liberation from earthly life and unite with a god. As J.W SEDLAR writes: "Onesikritos' own philosophical interests appear in his tendency to regard the Indian ascetics as prime examples of the recommended Cynic mode of life – albeit the Cynics' motivations had nothing at all to do with the pursuit of holiness"¹⁶. Also, the way of conducting the conversation is being associated by many scholars with Greek philosophical dialogues. In my opinion, it is not a usual debate on philosophical matters, but a kind of a riddle contest. Alexander asks the gymnosophists a series of difficult questions

¹² DESMOND 2008: 34.

¹³ DESMOND 2008: 243.

¹⁴ DUDLEY 1937: 111.

¹⁵ WILCKEN 1923: 173–180; BROWN 1949: 47; KARTTUNEN 1989: 91; POWERS 1998: 84.

¹⁶ SEDLAR 1980: 69.

and in the case of them not knowing the answer, the punishment is death. This dialogue can be treated as a classic example of a *neck-riddle*. The king asks ten Brahmins to answer his questions, and the one whose answer will be the worst will die first. Orientalists point out that this sort of conversation is familiar not only to the Greek literature but also very widely to the Oriental.

2. GREEK RIDDLES

There exists a vast tradition of riddles in Greece. There can also be observed a tradition of “cryptic speech” – *ainos* or *ainigma* (riddle). The term *ainigma* occurs for the first time in Pindar F 177d SNELL–MAEHLER¹⁷. In Hesiod’s *Melampodeia*, there can be found an enigmatic question in the brief discussion of Calchas and Mopsus. Calchas is told that when he finds a better seer than he is, he will die¹⁸. The discussion is as follows:

“I am filled with wonder at the quantity of figs this wild fig-tree bears though it is so small. Can you tell their number?”
 And Mopsus answered: “Ten thousands is their number and their measure is a bushel: one fig is left over, which you will not be able to put into the measure”.
 So said he; and they found the reckoning of the measure true. Then did the end of death shroud Calchas¹⁹.

This example proves that the enigmatic and witty questions asked in order to surprise or confuse are not characteristic only for Cynic philosophers.

Another well-known example of a *neck-riddle* is a story of Oedipus and the Sphinx. It is interesting that a similar riddle, as well as the Sphinx-like creature *pu-rushamriga* or *narahimsa* (which means “human-beast” in Sanskrit), were known in India. In the Rigveda we can find a variant of the sphinx riddle (hymn 10.117):

One-foot surpasses Two-foot. And Two-foot leaves Three-foot behind. Four-foot comes at the call of Two-foot, watching over his herds and serving him²⁰.

The sphinx riddle is also known in Bihar:

Miḍō setārē dō upuniākātātē seneā
 Tārā singi do bāriākātātē seneā
 Āubtānrē dō āpeākātātē seneā

A creature in the morning with four legs walks
 At noon with two legs walks
 in the evening with three legs walks.

¹⁷ GARTNER 2001: 756.

¹⁸ HUIZINGA 2007: 174.

¹⁹ EVELYN-WHITE 1914: 266.

²⁰ DONIGER O’FLAHERTY 2000: 69.

Answer – *Ho* (a man)²¹.

Similar kind also:

Hōnrē Lijā
Mārāngrē toto
Barē jatō
Bitar uṇḍū

When young [it is] clothed,
When adult [it is] naked,
On the head [it has] matted hair,
Hollow within.

Answer – *Mat* (Bamboo)²².

The Greek riddles mentioned above are ancient. However, at the time of the creation of the dialogue, the riddles became much more rare. A similar method of posing questions was familiar to the Cynics, Pythagoreans and Megarian philosophers²³. STONEMAN points out that a question similar in character was asked to Anacharsis (according to Diogenes Laertios I 104). The question was “Who are more numerous, the living or the dead?”, and Anacharsis’ reply was: “In which class do you put those who travel on the sea?”²⁴.

3. THE OLDEST RIDDLE IN INDIA

A vivid example of the *neck-riddle* is given in one of the *Upanishads* (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka* III 9, 26). When Vidagdha Sakalya cannot answer Yajnavalkya’s question, his head “shatters apart”²⁵. The Sanskrit riddle is one of the oldest riddles known to scholars. To quote D. BHAGAWAT, the author of the monograph on the Indian riddle, “The Indian tradition of riddles is very ancient, as ancient as that of the earliest myths and liturgies and also closely connected with them. The custom of using riddles in the sacrificial rites, in marriage and death-ceremonies belongs no doubt to an age even earlier than the *Vedas*”²⁶.

BHAGAWAT divides Indian riddles into three types: “The study of the riddle from the earliest Vedic times to the present day shows that three classes of riddles, viz. the ritualistic, the literary and the popular or recreative, are fairly interconnected

²¹ SARKAR 1919: 353.

²² SARKAR 1916: 353.

²³ See FESTUGIÈRE 1971: 161–165; STONEMAN 1995: 99–114.

²⁴ STONEMAN 1995: 111.

²⁵ OLIVELLE 1998: 101.

²⁶ BHAGAWAT 1965: 3.

and their tradition though varied is continuous²⁷. The recreative riddle is primarily cosmological, theological or speculative. The non-ritualistic riddle is chiefly literary or at times didactic²⁸. Cosmological riddles appear in Vedas, and they make up an important part of a Sanskrit ritual more than two thousands years old²⁹. That type of riddles occur in the *Rigveda*, *Atharvaveda* and *Yajurveda*, as well as in the epic; in the *Mahābhārata* there are two famous episodes of that kind.

The first text I would like to present is the *Rigveda*. The most important of Indian religious writings, as well as a literary masterpiece, it is usually ascribed by scholars to a time not far from beginning of the first millennium BC. It is a collection of Sanskrit religious hymns, part of which contains riddles, most of them on philosophical and cosmological subjects. One of the greatest examples of Vedic riddles appears in hymn I 164. It begins with such riddles:

Of this benignant Priest, with eld grey-coloured, the brother midmost of the three is lightning.

The third is he whose back with oil is sprinkled. Here I behold the Chief with seven male children³⁰.

And the proposed answer is: The priest is Sun, his next brother is lightning, another form of fire, and the third brother is the sacred fire perpetually maintained by each householder, and fed with oblations of clarified butter. The seven children are probably the priests³¹.

Another riddle:

Seven to the one-wheeled chariot yoke the Courser; bearing seven names the single Courser draws it.

Three-naved the wheel is, sound and undecaying, whereon are resting all these worlds of being³².

M. WINTERNITZ suggests such an answer: “The seven priests of the sacrifice harness (by means of the sacrifice) the sun-chariot, which is drawn by seven horses or one horse with seven forms: this immortal sun-wheel has three naves, namely, the three seasons (summer, rainy season and winter), in which the life of all mankind is passed. However, other solutions of the riddle are possible³³.”

In the *Rigveda* there also appears the following sequence of riddles: “Who moves the air? Who makes a noise on seeing a thief? Who is the enemy of

²⁷ BHAGAWAT 1965: X.

²⁸ BHAGAWAT 1965: 4.

²⁹ TAYLOR 1948: 11.

³⁰ GRIFFITH 1896: I 164.

³¹ BHAGAWAT 1965: XII.

³² BHAGAWAT 1965: 2.

³³ WINTERNITZ 1927: 117.

lotuses? Who is the climax of fury?" The answers to the first three, when combined, give the answer to the fourth. The first answer is "bird" (*vi*), the second "dog" (*cva*), the third "sun" (*mitra*) and the whole is Viśvamitra, Rama's first teacher and counsellor, and a man noted for his temper³⁴.

Also in the *Yajurveda* one can find several theological riddles constituting a part of a riddle game performed by priests during sacrifice, which was part of the cult. An example of this riddle game occurs, *Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā* section XXIII:

The Hotar:

"Who wanders lonely on his way?
Who is constantly born anew?
What is the remedy for cold?
What is the great corn-vessel called?"

The Adhvaryu:

"The sun wanders lonely on its way.
The moon is constantly born anew,
Fire is the remedy for cold,
The earth is the great corn-vessel".

The Adhvaryu:

"What is the sun-like light?
What is the ocean-like flood?
And what is greater than the earth?
What is that of which no measure is known?"

The Hotar:

"Brahman is the sun-like light,
The sky is the ocean-like flood,
And greater than earth is God Indra,
But it is cow, of which no measure is known".

The Udgatar:

"Into what things has the Purusa penetrated?
And what things are contained in the Purusa?
This riddle, Brahman, I give thee to solve
What answer hast thou now to make?"

The Brahman:

"The five, it is, into which the Purusa has penetrated.
And these are they which are contained in the Purusa [human being, also spirit]
That is the answer I have thought out for thee;
In the magic strength of knowledge thou art not above me"³⁵.

³⁴ BLAUNER 1967: 50.

³⁵ WINTERNITZ 1927: 183.

In fact, two questions that appear in this passage are rather similar to those that Alexander asks the gymnosophists: “And what is greater than the earth? What is that of which no measure is known?” In the oldest version of the dialogue (*Pap. Berol.* 13044), the second question is: “After that, he asked which was larger, the land or the sea: ‘The land (he answered), because the sea lies on the land’. It is not exactly the same, but it encapsulates a very similar idea.

The same can also be said about the second of the quoted questions. In the dialogue, there is also a question referring to the idea of something that cannot be counted, so it is immeasurable (“which is more numerous, the living or the dead?”). The answers are:

- The living, for the others are nothing and nothing cannot be counted (*Epit. Mett.*).
- The dead are more numerous, but because they no longer exist they cannot be counted. The visible are more numerous than the invisible (*Hist. Alex. Magni*).
- The dead are more numerous, because they cannot be counted, because they do not exist. It can be said that, for sure, that those who cannot be seen, cannot be considered either (*Iul. Val.*).

This Vedic type of riddle games during the sacrifice was designed to provide a god with some entertainment and make him pleased. This sort of entertainment is called *brahmodya*, which means “rivalry in sacred knowledge, playful discussion of theological questions or problems”³⁶. Another example of such riddle game appears during the horse sacrifice when the contestants ask questions such as: “Who roams alone?” (“The sun”), and “What is the furthest limit of the earth?” (“This *vedī* [sacrificial altar]”). The purpose is to affirm understanding of the hidden connections between the sacrifice and the cosmos. This format of brahmins riddle competition is also used in Upanishadic debates, such as that beginning at *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* III 1,1³⁷. R. STONEMAN even suggests the idea that “it seems likely that Onesicritus, on discovering some important Vedic text of this kind, recognized its susceptibility to the sort of questions he was familiar with from discussions at home, and created a composite”³⁸.

4. RIDDLES IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

The *Mahābhārata*, the great Indian epic whose date most scholars set in the period from the fourth century BC to the fourth century AD, has also several stories containing the dialogue similar to that found in Alexander’s dialogue. The most important examples of such debates can be found in the *Vanaparvan*.

³⁶ MONIER-WILLIAMS 2002, THOMPSON 1997.

³⁷ OLIVELLE 1998: 75.

³⁸ STONEMAN 2008: 96.

First, the verbal contest between Bandī and Aṣṭāvakra. “In these discussions the element of competition was so strong, that the winner in order to celebrate his victory fully saw that his opponent lost his life”³⁹. An opposite situation can be observed in the dialogue between Yudhiṣṭhira and Yakṣa (*Yakṣapraśna*). This discussion has very similar questions to those from Alexander’s dialogue with the gymnosophists. Yudhiṣṭhira is frequently involved in such dialogues, because he is considered the wisest of all Pāṇḍavaḥ brothers.

The Pāṇḍavaḥ brothers are in the woods, searching for sticks for the sacrifice. They become thirsty and Yudhiṣṭhira orders the youngest Nakūla to find water. Nakūla finds a beautiful lake. He drinks and suddenly hears an invisible spirit (Yakṣa) that speaks out of the air and warns him that before drinking he must answer questions that Yakṣa would ask him. Nakūla ignores that, drinks the water and falls lifeless onto the ground. Yudhiṣṭhira sends another brother, Sahadeva, but he follows the same pattern. When Yudhiṣṭhira is finally left alone, he arrives at the lake and sees all his brothers lying lifeless on the ground. He approaches the lake and hears the same voice of Yakṣa who desires him to answer all the questions. Yakṣa asks Yudhiṣṭhira over a hundred of brief and difficult questions in order to bring his brothers back to life. If he had not answered these questions, his brothers would have remained dead. Here are several of the questions:

Yakṣa then said, “What is it that maketh the Sun rise? Who keeps him company? Who causeth him to set? And in whom is he established?” Yudhiṣṭhira answered, “Brahma maketh the Sun rise: the gods keep him company: Dharma causeth him to set: and he is established in truth”.

The Yakṣa asked, “*What is weightier than the earth itself? What is higher than the heavens? What is fleeter than the wind? And what is more numerous than grass?*” Yudhiṣṭhira answered, “The mother is weightier than the earth; the father is higher than the heaven; the mind is fleeter than the wind; and our thoughts are more numerous than grass”. The Yakṣa asked, “What is that which doth not close its eyes while asleep? What is that which doth not move after birth? What is that which is without heart? And what is that which swells with its own impetus?” Yudhiṣṭhira answered, “A fish doth not close its eyes while asleep: an egg doth not move after birth: a stone is without heart: and a river swelleth with its own impetus”.

The Yakṣa asked, “*Who is the guest of all creatures? What is eternal duty? What, O foremost of kings, is Amrita? And what is the entire Universe?*” Yudhiṣṭhira answered, “Agni is the guest of all creatures; the milk of kine is Amrita, Homa (therewith) is the eternal duty, and the Universe consist of air alone”.

The Yakṣa asked, “What is that which sojourneth alone? What is that which is re-born after its birth? What is the remedy against cold? And what is the largest field?” Yudhiṣṭhira answered, “The sun sojourneth alone; the moon takes birth

³⁹ BHAGAWAT 1965: 10.

anew: fire is the remedy against cold: and the Earth is the largest field”. The Yakṣa asked, “What is the highest refuge of virtue? What of fame? What of heaven? And what, of happiness?” Yudhiṣṭhira answered, “Liberality is the highest refuge of virtue: gift, of fame: truth, of heaven: and good behaviour, of happiness”.

The Yakṣa asked, “*With what is world enveloped?*” – The world is enveloped with darkness. “*What sort of a man is called honest and what dishonest?*” – He is honest who desires the weal of all creatures, and he is dishonest who is unmerciful.

The Yakṣa asked, “*What doth one gain that speaketh agreeable words? What doth he gain that always acteth with judgement? What doth he gain that hath many friends? And what he, that is devoted to virtue?*” Yudhiṣṭhira answered, “He that speaketh agreeable words becometh agreeable to all. He that acteth with judgement obtaineth whatever he seeketh. He that hath many friends liveth happily. And he that is devoted to virtue obtaineth a happy state (in the next world)”⁴⁰.

As it can be observed, these questions are not only similar in character to those of Alexander’s meeting with philosophers but also contain some of the same ideas. The first three italicised questions (“What is weightier than the earth itself?”, “What is more numerous than grass?”, “Who is the guest of all creatures?”) are qualitative ones, the same as those from the Alexander dialogue: Plut. *Alex* 64, *Pap. Berol.* 13044, Clem. Al. *Strom.*, *Epit. Mett.*, *Anecd. Graec.* (I) and *Hist. Alex. Magni*, Iul. Val. (II), and, in the same order, questions II, III, V as well as *Pap. Berol.* 13044, Clem. Al. *Strom.*, *Epit. Mett.*, *Anecd. Graec.* versions in VIII. Further, the question: “With what is world enveloped?” corresponds to the questions concerning the problem which is greater, the land or the sea – in *Pap. Berol.* 13044, *Epit. Mett.*, *Anecd. Graec.* (II) and *Hist. Alex. Magni*, Iul. Val. (III). Finally, the last group of questions, concerning the quality of a man (“What sort of a man is called honest and what dishonest?”, “What doth one gain that speaketh agreeable words? What doth he gain that always acteth with judgement? What doth he gain that hath many friends? And what he, that is devoted to virtue?”) corresponds to the questions from Plut. *Alex.*, *Pap. Berol.* 13044, Clem. Al. *Strom.*, *Epit. Mett.*, *Anecd. Graec.* (VI) and Plut. *Alex.* (VII).

There is another conversation similar to that of Yudhiṣṭhira and Yakṣa in the *Mahābhārata*. One of the brothers, the strongest, Bhīma is roaming in the woods and meets a great king of the snakes, Nahuṣa. The snake hurls itself at him and clings to him so tightly that Bhīma cannot extricate himself. His brother, Yudhiṣṭhira, finds him and discovers that the huge snake is actually the king Nahuṣa, who had turned into this creature as a result of the curse of wise man Agastya. He is not to be released from this curse until he finds somebody who can answer all philosophical questions which he asks. The questions given by the snake are more philosophical and the whole dialogue is more like a debate,

⁴⁰ ROY 1889–1896: III 662–677.

however, once again, there can be found the situation of saving life of someone by giving the correct answer, the same as in the dialogue of Alexander and the naked philosophers.

3. INDIAN DOCTRINE?

G. DUMÉZIL in his brief paper *Alexandre et les sages de l'Inde* pointed out that the answers of Indian sages are closely attached to the Indian doctrine. In his remarks, he notes that the answers of the naked philosophers are actually close to the Indian thought. Firstly, as regards question VIII (“What is stronger: life or death?” – “Life is stronger than death, because it supports so many miseries”) he indicates that the belief that human life is filled with misery and pain is fundamental for almost all of Indian doctrines. One can be released by acting increasingly wise and being more and more religious as well as doing no harm to any living creature. The way the Indian ascetics behave is to liberate themselves from that misery by overcoming the weakness of the human body, along with its needs and desires. When one achieves the state of “liberation”, he is reborn, and that may be the reason why the first of the philosophers answers to the king that the living are more numerous than the dead. The fifth question also appears to have some Indian spirit. The question is: “Which was eldest, night or day?” The philosopher replied, “Day was eldest, by one day at least”. G. DUMÉZIL explains that for Indians the night has a good aspect – it is time to rest. The night is not the same as darkness or nothingness. He concludes that in result the day was first, and cites the part of Rigvedic hymn I 123:

She before all the living world hath wakened, the Lofty One who wins and gathers treasure. Revived and ever young on high she glances. Dawn hath come first unto our morning worship⁴¹.

The Aurora is also called in Sanskrit *apūrvya* – “without the first one before her”.

CONCLUSION

The Indian sages are frequently placed among the Persian magi, Chaldeans, Assyrians, Babylonians, Druids, Celts, Etruscan diviners, hence the placing of the wise men somewhere far, at the edges of the known world is a literary convention. Still, it does not deny the historical authenticity of Alexander's encounter with the naked philosophers of India. In all probability, the meeting took place in Taxila in the spring of 326 BC. The only point of controversy is the content of their conversation. As I tried to argue, this dialogue cannot be called

⁴¹ GRIFFITH 1896: I 123.

Cynic. Onesicritus is frequently claimed to be the dialogue's author, because he is regarded to be the philosopher close to the king. However, was he the only one? Moreover, the riddling-tradition is significantly older than Cynic philosophy, both in Greece and in India.

Although the encounter of Alexander and Indian philosophers is a fact, the contents of their dialogue as we know it appears to be literary fiction. The concurrence of the questions is probably not accidental and, most likely, all surviving versions of the dialogue originate from one source, perhaps the work of a companion of Alexander the Great unknown to us. The form of this dialogue – short and witty questions asked to surprise and, as a result, to defeat the adversary – was very popular in India since ancient times. Also, the meaning of the questions and their character are also similar to the Indian examples. It seems to me that the author of this story had quite advanced knowledge of India and its literature. This is not surprising, considering that Alexander spent almost two years in India and much of that time in Taxila, the ancient centre of learning. This dialogue seems to be inspired by or even stylized to be Indian, in order to give the reader the sense of Indian civilization.

University of Wrocław

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BHAGAWAT 1965: D. BHAGAWAT, *The Riddle in Indian Life, Lore and Literature*, Bombay 1965.
- BLAUNER 1967: D.G. BLAUNER, *An Early Literary Riddle*, *Folklore LXXVIII* 1967, pp. 49–58.
- BOSMAN 2010: P.R. BOSMAN, *The Gymnosophist Riddle Contest (Berol. P. 13044): A Cynic Text?*, *GRBS L* 2010, pp. 175–192.
- BRELOER, BÖMER 1939: *Fontes historiae religionum Indicarum*, collegerunt B. BRELOER et F. BÖMER, Bonnæ 1939.
- BROWN 1949: T.S. BROWN, *Onesicritus. A Study in Hellenistic Historiography*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1949.
- DESMOND 2008: W. DESMOND, *Cynics*, Berkeley 2008.
- DUDLEY 1937: D.R. DUDLEY, *A History of Cynicism – From Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.*, London 1937.
- DUMÉZIL 1976: G. DUMÉZIL, *Alexandre et le sages de l'Inde*, in: *Scritti in onore di Giuliano Bonfante*, Brescia 1976, vol. II, pp. 555–560.
- FESTUGIÈRE 1971: A.J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Trois rencontres entre la Grèce et l'Inde*, in: *Études de philosophie grecque*, Paris 1971, pp. 157–195 (= *RHR CXXV* 1942/1943, pp. 32–57).
- EVELYN-WHITE 1914: *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica*, with an English translation by H.G. EVELYN-WHITE, London–New York 1914.
- GÄRTNER 2001: H.A. GÄRTNER, *Rätsel*, *DNP X* (2001), coll. 754–758.
- GRIFFITH 1896: *The Hymns of the Rigveda*, trans. by R.T.H. GRIFFITH, Kotagiri (Nilgiri) ²1896.
- HUIZINGA 2010: J. HUIZINGA, *Homo ludens. Zabawa jako źródło kultury [Homo ludens : proeve eener bepaling van het spel-element der cultuur]*, Polish trans. by M. KURECKA, W. WIRPSZA, Warszawa 2010.
- JACOBY 1929: F. JACOBY, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, II B, Leiden 1929.
- KARTTUNEN 1989: K. KARTTUNEN, *India in Early Greek Literature*, Helsinki 1989 (*Studia Orientalia LXV*).

- 1997: *India and the Hellenistic World*, Helsinki 1997 (Studia Orientalia LXXXIII).
- MAGNONE 2001: P. MAGNONE, *La risposta di un gimnosofista al quesito di Alessandro sull'origine del tempo: dottrina indiana?*, in: I. PIOVANO, V. AGOSTINI, O. BOTTO (eds.), *Atti dell'Ottavo Convegno Nazionale di Studi Sanscriti (Torino, 20–21 ottobre 1995)*, Torino 2001, pp. 59–67.
- MONIER-WILLIAMS 2002: M. MONIER-WILLIAMS, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Delhi 2002.
- NAWOTKA 2010a: K. NAWOTKA, *Alexander the Great*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2010.
- 2010b: Pseudo-Callisthenes, *Historia Alexandri Magni = Romans o Aleksandrze*, Polish trans. and commentary by K. NAWOTKA, Poznań 2010 (Fontes Historiae Antiquae XIV).
- DONIGER O'FLAHERTY 2000: W. DONIGER O'FLAHERTY, *The Rig Veda. An Anthology. One hundred and eight hymns selected, translated and annotated by...*, Penguin Books India, 2000.
- OLIVELLE 1998: P. OLIVELLE, *The Early Upanisads. Annotated Text and Translation*, Oxford 1998.
- PEARSON 1960: L. PEARSON, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, Chico, CA 1960.
- PERRIN 1919: Plutarch, *Lives*, with an English translation by B. PERRIN, Cambridge, MA–London 1919.
- POWERS 1998: N. POWERS, *Onesicritus, Naked Wise Men, and the Cynic's Alexander*, SyllClass IX 1998, pp. 70–85.
- ROBERTS, DONALDSON 1883: A. ROBERTS, J. DONALDSON (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, vol. 2, Edinburgh 1883.
- ROY 1889–1896: *The Mahābhārata of Krishna-Dwaipayana Vyasa*, trans. by P.C. ROY, Calcutta 1889–1896.
- SARKAR 1916: G.N. SARKAR, *Ho Riddles*, Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society II 1916, p. 353.
- 1919: *Ho Riddles*, Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society V 1919, pp. 257 f.
- SAYRE 1938: F. SAYRE, *Diogenes of Sinope. A study of Greek cynicism*, Baltimore 1938.
- SEDLAR 1980: J.W. SEDLAR, *India and the Greek World: A Study in the Transmission of Culture*, Totowa, NJ 1980.
- STONEMAN 1991: R. STONEMAN, *The Greek Alexander Romance*, Harmondsworth 1991.
- 1995: *Naked Philosophers: The Brahmans in the Alexander Historians and the Alexander Romance*, JHS CXV 1995, pp. 99–114.
- 2003: *The Legacy of Alexander in Ancient Philosophy*, in: J. ROISMAN (ed.), *The Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden 2003, pp. 325–346.
- 2008: *Alexander the Great. A Life in Legend*, Yale 2008.
- TAYLOR 1948: A. TAYLOR, *The Literary Riddle before 1600*, Berkeley 1948.
- THOMPSON 1997: G. THOMPSON, *The Brahmodya and Vedic Discourse*, JAOS CXVII 1997, pp. 13–37.
- WILCKEN 1923: U. WILCKEN, *Alexander der Grosse und die indischen Gymnosophisten*, SPAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. XXIII 1923, pp. 150–183.
- 1967: *Alexander the Great*, trans. by E.N. BORZA, New York 1967.
- WINIARCZYK 2009: M. WINIARCZYK, *Die indischen Weisen bei den Alexanderhistorikern*, Eos XCVI 2009, pp. 29–77.
- WINTERNITZ 1927: M. WINTERNITZ, *A History of Indian Literature*, trans. by S. KETKAR, Calcutta 1927.

HOW TO HANDLE A KING: MILETUS AND THE SUCCESSORS*

By

KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA

In their trend to classify and neatly package antiquity, modern history books are often inclined to present the classical epoch as a period dominated by polis and the Hellenistic age as the times of kings in Greek history¹. To a degree we owe this mental scheme to the ancient literary sources. Few as they are, they tend to concentrate on the exploits of monarchs in describing the period aptly called “the Macedonian times” or “the times of the Macedonian kings”². Even if the battlefields of Chaeronea in 338³ and Amorgos in 322 marked the end of the polis’ prominence in power politics of the day, the Hellenistic age did not bring the demise of the Greek city-state. Quite the opposite, the sheer number of poleis increased markedly, to reach the high point in the early Roman Empire, and in fact the Hellenistic age produced all the largest Greek cities: Alexandria in Egypt, Antioch on the Orontes, Seleukeia on the Tigris. For the dearth of literary sources, the Hellenistic age produced an astounding number of epigraphic evidence, in that the most informative of them, the decrees of Greek states. Therefore, opposite to the classical epoch, not only Athens but plethora of poleis can be studied in the light of sources generated by them. What is important from the point of view of this paper, is that in the Hellenistic times the polis continued to be the basic form of Greek statehood and the focus of Greek self-definition while questions pertaining to relations between the polis and the king are among

* The earlier versions of this paper were read at the 17th Conference of the Polish Historical Association in Olsztyn in 2009 and at a conference in Halle in 2010. I would like to acknowledge the critical contribution of participants of these conferences thanks to whom I have been able to modify (hopefully to improve) this paper, in particular: Prof. R. KULESZA, Prof. W. LENGAUER, Prof. A. MEHL, Dr. M. KHOLOD, Dr. O. GABELKO.

¹ OGDEN 2002b: X f.

² Μακεδονικοί χρόνοι, e.g.: Ath. VI 15 (referring to Juba II); Euseb. *Comm. in Isaiam* I 72; Procopius, *Comm. in Isaiam*, p. 2121; Sopater, *Scholia ad Hermogenis Status*, vol. V, p. 22; Epiph. *Panarion*, vol. I, p. 182. Clem. Al. *Strom.* I 21, 128, 3: τῶν Μακεδονικῶν βασιλέων οἱ χρόνοι.

³ All dates are BC, unless marked otherwise.

the most important issues for a historian of this period⁴. Opinions of the modern scholarship have ebbed between extreme positions of HEUSS and ORTH⁵ and their respective followers, i.e. of those who subscribe to the notion of the total independence of Hellenistic poleis and those who see them as absolutely defenseless and at best only enjoying a limited internal autonomy. With a spate of recent books on Hellenistic democracies, there seems to be growing consent in the modern scholarship that independent foreign policy continued to be played by at least some Hellenistic poleis⁶. Among the questions raised in the study of relations between the king and a polis are the issues of sovereignty / political dependence, economic relations both in terms of taxes and royal euergetism, as well as the self-presentation of both sides⁷. Epigraphic evidence purports that the royal euergetism meant acts of selfless munificence towards friendly poleis or all Greeks at the extreme. Modern scholarship prefers to think more of a dialogue between monarchs and poleis in which ideological recognition was traded for material gains⁸. In the research of the Greek world of Hellenistic and Roman times Miletus is often selected for a case study⁹ due to its sources, principally inscriptions: with new corpora *Milet* VI.2 and VI.3 and editions of new finds from Didyma we have now ca. 2300 inscriptions from Miletus and Didyma, many of them dated to a year thanks to the lists of Milesian eponymous *stephanephoroi* extant for most of the Hellenistic age¹⁰. It is also known as one of the pioneers in the path of dialogue with Macedonian monarchs, beginning with Alexander the Great¹¹. In this paper I shall focus on contacts between a polis and Macedonian rulers rather than to allow myself to get bogged into the prolonged, so far largely inconclusive discussion aiming at establishing what was the legal status of Hellenistic poleis within or with regard to Hellenistic monarchies. I must admit that I do not believe that one legal formula defining relations between poleis and kings can be found, at least at the present state of evidence¹².

⁴ WILL 1979; WILL 1988; MA 2002: 10; DAVIES 2002; BILLOWS 2003: 196–199.

⁵ HEUSS 1937; ORTH 1977.

⁶ E.g. GRIEB 2008; CARLSSON 2010. See a concise review of scholarship in CARLSSON 2010: 61–65.

⁷ WILL 1979; SHIPLEY 2000: 59–83.

⁸ GAUTHIER 1993: 211–216; BILLOWS 1994: 73–80.

⁹ Directly: GRIEB 2008; CARLSSON 2010; in fact if not in name: DMITRIEV 2005.

¹⁰ In this paper I adhere to the traditional dating of the Milesian *stephanephoroi* which uses Alexander's the Great term of office calculated to 334/3 as the fixed point for the lists 1–3 (*Milet* I 3, 122–124). There is, however, serious argument for shifting the lists by one year forward, thus calculating the *stephanephoria* of Alexander to 333/2, see CAVAIGNAC 1924: 311–314; RHODES 2006. Accepting this dating system would not affect the basic line of argument in this paper.

¹¹ NAWOTKA 2010a.

¹² I share the scepticism of MA (2002: 179–242) and CAPDETREY (2007: 191–218) as to the feasibility of establishing a legal formula of relations between kings and poleis once attempted by HEUSS (1937) and ORTH (1977).

Milesian inscriptions convey information on numerous acts of royal munificence benefitting Miletus and Didyma. Among the *euergetai* were both the kings in whose political designs was to rule the western Asia Minor, as the Ptolemies and the Attalids, and those who either did not attempt to garrison and subject Miletus, like the Seleucids, or the minor monarchs of Galatia or the Bosphoran Kingdom who could not aim at subjugating a major polis in Ionia. The Seleucid euergetism stands out both in the sheer size of their acts of munificence and in their regularity: almost all kings from Seleucus I until Antiochus IV were *euergetai* of Miletus and/or Didyma¹³. Obviously Miletus was of particular importance to this mightiest of the Hellenistic dynasties and *vice versa*; hence I shall devote much space in this paper to the Seleucid presence in Miletus.

The unique feature of Milesian epigraphic evidence are seven lists of eponymous *stephanephoroi* or *aisymnetai* of the singing guild of Molpoi covering, with some lacunae, the period between 525/4 BC and AD 31/2¹⁴. Apart from listing names of *stephanephoroi* they uniquely refer to the historical events deemed most important in Miletus, both by naming them directly and through the very construction of a list. Three are early Hellenistic: the first was regaining freedom of Miletus entered under the year 313/2; then was a land grant of Ptolemy II recorded for the year 279/8; then was the abolishing of the tyranny of Timarchos marked by starting the third list of *stephanephoroi* in 259/8, done on purpose leaving uninscribed space in the list number two¹⁵. The next event worthy of record was restoring the status of *civitas libera* in 39/8¹⁶, lost some fifty years earlier for siding with Mithridates VI against Rome. All commemorate the deeds of external powers, be it Hellenistic kings or rulers of Rome, while three are concerned with regaining liberty and one with the restoration of rural territories of Miletus. By selecting these and only these events for their over half a millennium long list of eponymous magistrates, the Milesians symbolically showed their fundamental priorities: land, essential for supporting the large population of the polis, and freedom, the cornerstone of the Milesian foreign policy.

In the period of Alexander the Great and the Successors, Miletus, in the broadest outline, shared fortunes of western Asia Minor, in the Summer of 334 having been conquered or liberated, depending on the point of view, by Alexander the Great¹⁷. Upon the death of Alexander in 323, the satrapy of Caria was assigned to Asander, later confirmed in this position at the conference of Triparadeisos in

¹³ MARCELLESI 2004a: 172–174.

¹⁴ *Milet* I 3, 122–128.

¹⁵ *Milet* I 3, 123, ll. 1–4, 38–40; *Milet* I 3, 124. Athens furnish a later parallel by starting a new archons list (*IG* II² 1706) in 230/29 marking the restoration of *eleutheria* having got rid of the Macedonian garrison. HABICHT 1982: 79 f.; GRIEB 2008: 99–102, 243.

¹⁶ *Milet* I 3, 126, ll. 20–25.

¹⁷ NAWOTKA 2010a.

320¹⁸. Asander garrisoned Miletus apparently treating it as subject not an ally and deprived it of the right to produce its autonomous coinage¹⁹. Although the Milesians made Asander eponymous *stephanephoros* for the year 314/3²⁰, he was much disliked in the city and the end of his rule counted as one of the most celebrated years in Milesian history. The first entry in the second list of the Milesian *stephanephoroi* reads: οἶδε μολπῶν ἡισύμνησαν· Ἰππόμαχος Θήρωνος ἐπὶ τοῦτου ἢ πόλις/ ἔλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ/ Ἀντιγόνου καὶ ἡ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη (“The following presided over the Molpoi:/ Hippomachos, son of Theron. In this year the city/ became free (*eleuthera*) and sovereign (*autonomos*) through/ Antigonus and democracy was restored”)²¹.

Not going into the detailed meaning of each of these words: *eleutheria*, *autonomia*, *demokratia*, it suffices to say that the three elements combined denoted the unrestricted freedom of the polis of Miletus to mold its foreign and internal policy as it pleased²². On the internal level, democracy was the obvious choice. Interestingly enough, no similar information was recorded next to the name of the *stephanephoros* of the year 334/3 conspicuous for freeing the city from the Persian garrison by Alexander the Great. The importance of that year did not escape the Milesians: the list of *stephanephoroi*, the first of the six surviving, was inscribed in stone in 334/3 with the eponymous magistrate for the year entered simply as Alexander son of Philip. In the fourth century and in early Hellenistic times everybody was recorded in the same way by name and patronymics, including satraps, kings, even gods (Ἀπόλλων Διός), demonstrating the superiority of the epigraphic custom of the city and, by the same token, the dignity of Miletus above the rest of the world²³. Presumably, the memory of the Macedonian storming of Miletus in 334 made for the Milesians recognizing the year of proclamation of freedom of the Greek of Asia by Alexander as the date of restoration of freedom to their polis too difficult to swallow. No such negative publicity surrounded expelling the garrison of Asander on order of Antigonus in 312. Almost two years earlier, while besieging Tyre, he made a famous if much discussed proclamation of the freedom of Greeks: εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἅπαντας ἔλευθέρους, ἀφρουρήτους, αὐτονόμους (“It was also stated that all

¹⁸ Diod. Sic. XVIII 3, 1; XVIII 39, 6; Arr. *Succ.* I 6; I 37 (in Diodorus and Arrian the name misspelled as Kasandros); Dexipp. *FGrH* 110 F 8, 1a. HECKEL 2006: 56 f., s.v. Asander [2].

¹⁹ DEPERT-LIEPPITZ 1984: 52 f.

²⁰ *Milet* I 3, 122, l. 100. BERTRAND 2001: 21.

²¹ *Milet* I 3, 123, ll. 1–4, translation of S.M. BURSTEIN with one notable change: I translate αὐτονόμους as “sovereign”, not “autonomous”. GRIEB 2008: 238 f.

²² FERRARY 1988: 186; MA 2002: 161; GRIEB 2008: 238–240, 364 f.

²³ BERTRAND 2001: 21.

the Greeks were free, not subject to foreign garrisons, and sovereign”)²⁴. In the modern scholarship it is often cast to the realm of grandstanding without much substance in the political practice of Antigonus allegedly no different in its treatment of Greek cities from other Successors²⁵. The events at Miletus seem to paint a different picture. They are known mostly from a short passage in Diodorus describing the campaign in Asia Minor fought by generals of Antigonus Medios and Dokimos: οὔτοι δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τῶν Μιλησίων τοὺς τε πολίτας ἐκάλουν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν φρουρουμένην ἄκραν ἐκπολιορκήσαντες εἰς αὐτονομίαν ἀποκατέστησαν τὸ πολίτευμα (“These men, coming to the city of the Milesians, encouraged the citizens to assert their freedom; and, after taking by siege the citadel, which was held by a garrison, they restored the independence of the government”)²⁶. Probably this “encouragement to assert their freedom” is a reference to a joint military effort of Antigonid soldiers and the Milesians in defeating the garrison left in the city by Asander²⁷. In his relation of the events of 312 in Asia Minor, only in the case of Miletus Diodorus expressly speaks about the restoration of freedom to a polis, in this case employing an idiom similar to that of the stephanephoric list of Miletus with emphasis on the *eleutheria* and *autonomia*. Thus the proclamation of Tyre had a practical meaning: removal of the garrison imposed by the satrap, sovereignty and democracy²⁸. A positive sentiment generated by these events is reflected in a fragmentary Athenian inscription referring to the restoration in Miletus of “the constitution inherited from the ancestors” (πάτριον πολ[ιτεία]), i.e., in the political idiom of the late fourth century, democracy²⁹. In the same mood, in 307/6 Miletus and other poleis of Asia Minor sent golden wreaths to Athens congratulating the demos of the Athenians regaining of freedom³⁰.

A similar terminology employed by Antigonus and by the Milesians restored to freedom on his orders, as well as their manifest satisfaction with the *status quo* after 312, point to the significance of the proclamation of Tyre for winning over the Greek public opinion to the side of Antigonus³¹. This is not to say that the policy of Antigonus with regard to Greek cities was unitary and absolutely self-

²⁴ Diod. Sic. XIX 61, 3, translation of C.H. OLDFATHER with one notable change: I translate, as above (n. 21), αὐτόνομος as “sovereign”, not “autonomous”.

²⁵ E.g. BURSTEIN 1986: 133 f.; LUND 1992: 115; BRAUND 2003: 25 f. For a balanced view see SIMPSON 1955.

²⁶ Diod. Sic. XIX 75, 4, translation of C.H. OLDFATHER.

²⁷ GRIEB 2008: 238.

²⁸ Diod. Sic. XIX 75, 3 f. (removal of Asander’s garrison); *Milet* I 3, 123, ll. 1–4.

²⁹ *IG* II² 1129, ll. 9–11. BILLOWS 1990: 120 f., 210; GAUTHIER 1993: 218; MARCELLESI 2004b: 76.

³⁰ *IG* II² 1485, 1486. BILLOWS 1990: 210 f.

³¹ BILLOWS 1990: 189–236.

less³², although it certainly engendered more acceptance than most of his fellow Successors. Antigonus kept his garrisons in some Greek cities (e.g. Ephesus, Sardis, Iasus), not refraining from meddling in their internal affairs either³³. In this context ungarrisoned and manifestly independent Miletus, undisturbed in its contacts with cities and other dynasts, Seleucus in the first place³⁴, seems to have enjoyed a privileged position in its relations with Antigonus. There is no direct evidence to elucidate circumstances and underlying reasons. Indirect evidence points to a prominent Milesian citizen Aristodemos, one of the closest associates of Antigonus, general and diplomat, instrumental in the royal proclamation of Antigonus and Demetrius Poliorcetes in 306³⁵. He earned praises for his assistance rendered to Ephesus in its efforts to get released from a tribute paid to Antigonus and for some unknown services to Athens³⁶. Although his career evolved in the court of Antigonus and on military and diplomatic assignments, Aristodemos is known to maintain ties with his native city which he served as *stephanephoros* in 306/5³⁷. For all his involvement in matters vital to other cities and for his obvious influence on Antigonus, it is hardly imaginable that he stayed impervious to the plight of Miletus in times of Asander, especially when Antigonid forces were dispatched to Caria.

After the battle of Ipsos, Miletus kept close ties to Demetrius Poliorcetes at least until 295/4 when he is listed as a *stephanephoros*. The precise nature of their relations is unknown but for a while Miletus was certainly an Antigonid redoubt in Asia Minor and a place where Demetrius coined his tetradrachms³⁸. The period of 294 to 281 brought to Miletus changing subordination to / alliance with Lysimachus and Demetrius but sources are too patchy to give precise dates of all shifts of sovereignty at this time. Two Milesians, brothers Hippistratos and Hippodamas are attested as *strategoï* of Ionia in Lysimachus' time with some sort of control of Greek cities. Epigraphic evidence shows that in 289/8 Miletus, alongside other cities of Ionia reported to these *strategoï* of Lysimachus³⁹. Not much is known about Hippistratos and Hippodamas, either of any magistracy held by them in Miletus or of their influence on the policy of Lysimachus to their native polis. Some attribute to them making Miletus change sides from

³² See BRAUND 2003: 26 on the somewhat forced expression of jubilation known from an inscription (*OGIS* 6) of Skepsis in the Troad containing a letter of Antigonus and provisions for celebrating him and the restored freedom.

³³ Diod. Sic. XX 19, 3. SIMPSON 1955: 393, 400 f., 404–409; LUND 1992: 116 f.

³⁴ GRIEB 2008: 240.

³⁵ BILLOWS 1990: 371–374.

³⁶ *JOAI* LIII 1982, 130–132; *IG* II² 459.

³⁷ *Milet* I 3, 123, l. 11.

³⁸ *Milet* I 123, l. 22. FRANCO 1993: 106; MARCELLESI 2004b: 71 f.

³⁹ *Milet* I 2, 10; *SEG* XXXV 926. BURSTEIN 1986; MARCELLESI 2004b: 77.

Demetrius to Lysimachus in 294⁴⁰. Some try to explain the allegedly privileged position of Miletus in the beginning of Lysimachus' rule in Ionia to their influence. A token of it allegedly was the permission granted by Lysimachus to Miletus to accept gifts of Seleucus to Didyma in 288/7⁴¹. Even if there is any substance in these hypotheses, Miletus certainly fell out of graces with Lysimachus following its taking side of Demetrius Poliorcetes during his expedition to Asia Minor in 287–6. Miletus had to submit to Lysimachus a large amount of money, as a war contribution or fine, and to be able to do that it had to borrow heavily in Knidos in 283/2. A further testimony of financial problems in Miletus in his time is the taking up of the office of *stephanephoros* by Apollo in the following year⁴². If indeed the land grant of Ptolemy II in 279 meant restoring to Miletus all of its original *chora*, the most likely moment when its rural territory was reduced is the later part of the reign of Lysimachus who presumably confiscated some land from Miletus punishing it for its siding with Poliorcetes⁴³. Although this reconstruction of Lysimachus' harsh treatment of Miletus does not enjoy full support of evidence, there is, at any rate, no place here for any attested positive influence of Hippostratos and Hippodamas. The end of the rule of Lysimachus in western Asia Minor came with the battle of Korupedion which brought Miletus to the side of Seleucus I whose son and successor became *stephanephoros* for the year 280/79⁴⁴.

Many would agree, explicitly or implicitly, with Edouard WILL that the source of the comparative importance of Hellenistic Miletus was the “rayonnement du Didemeion”⁴⁵. In the archaic age, the prestige and importance of the great temple and oracle of Apollo in Didyma was second to none, with the exception, perhaps, of Delphi. In Hellenistic times, it was no longer controlled by the priestly clan of Branchidae but by the polis of Miletus for whom it meant both prestige and the proverbially high costs of building a new shrine⁴⁶ in the place of the archaic one which had sustained some damage on the order of Xerxes in 479⁴⁷. The rebuilding of the Didyma temple and many new construction projects of the Hellenistic age, including the new *bouleuterion* of Miletus, in practical terms were possible

⁴⁰ GATTINONI 1992: 63–65.

⁴¹ Gifts of Seleucus: *Didyma* 424 = *Schenkungen* 280. BURSTEIN 1980.

⁴² Loan from Knidos: *Milet* I 3, 138. Apollo *stephanephoros*: *Milet* I 3, 123, l. 35. BURSTEIN 1984: 62; BURSTEIN 1986; GATTINONI 1992: 236 f.; FRANCO 1993: 111–113.

⁴³ *Milet* I 3, 123, ll. 38–40. BURSTEIN 1984: 61–63.

⁴⁴ *Milet* I 3, 123, l. 37. MARCELLESI 2004a: 165.

⁴⁵ WILL 1979; FRANCO 1993: 110.

⁴⁶ Suet. *Calig.* 21, l. 1. For the greatness of the temple see: Str. XIV 1, 5; Vit. VII 16 f.; Cass. Dio LIX 28.

⁴⁷ Limited damage to Didyma incurred by the Persians: TUCHELT 1988. The date: NAWOTKA 2010a: 144 f.

only thanks to euergetic gestures of Hellenistic monarchs, the Seleucids in particular⁴⁸. Securing funds to pay for construction work at Didyma was a central issue of the Milesian policy after 334 and thus an important theme in the dialogue conducted by Miletus with Macedonian monarchs.

The first shot was fired in the Spring of 331 when a Milesian embassy conveyed to Alexander the Great the news of the sacred spring in Didyma flowing again and of the first oracles issued after one and a half century hiatus. Through his oracle Apollo proclaimed Alexander the son of Zeus and prophesized his pending victories. There is a general presumption in scholarship that the Milesians were counting on Alexander's generosity in supporting their planned construction project at Didyma⁴⁹, yet for all this effort neither at that time nor later any funds were provided. No sources directly support this hypothesis, but there is a shred of evidence as to the hopes harboured by the Milesians surviving in a bogus last will of Alexander known as *Liber de Morte Testamentoque Alexandri Magni*, attached to the *Metz Epitome* (87–123) and to the *Alexander Romance* (III 31–33). It is not a genuine document but a political pamphlet, variously dated between 322 and 305⁵⁰, reflecting not so much the wishes of Alexander but the ambitions and aspirations of various Macedonian nobles and Greek poleis of the era immediately following the death of Alexander. It reads: δοθήτω δὲ καὶ Μιλησίοις εἰς ἐπισκευὴν τῆς πόλεως χρυσοῦ νενομισμένου τάλαντα ρν' ("Let the Milesians be granted 150 talents of coined gold for the rebuilding of the city") or in the Latin rendition "Milesiis argenti talanta CL"⁵¹. Miletus, therefore, was hoping for a construction related subsidy from some earthly power and tried to suggest that this had been the will of Alexander expressed in his lifetime; odd thing, had there not been some conversation with the king concerning this project. The rebuilding of Didyma was the most likely subject of these supposed entreaties of the Milesians. Alexander's indifference can be easily contrasted with his gifts and promises to other poleis in western Asia Minor: funding the temples of Athena in Priene and Troy, converting tribute paid by Ephesus to offset the construction costs of the temple of Artemis, granting a fish-bearing bay to Iasus, a promise given to Erythrai to dig a channel through the isthmus separating its two ports, a decision to erect the temple of Zeus in Sardis⁵². The Milesians paid back in a similar way by refraining from

⁴⁸ NAWOTKA 1999: 153–157; SCHMIDT-DOUNAS 2000: 270 f.

⁴⁹ HAUSSOULIER 1902: 4; GÜNTHER 1971: 22; PARKE 1985: 42 f.; FONTENROSE 1988: 16; NAWOTKA 2010b: 211 f.

⁵⁰ MERKELBACH, TRUMPF 1977: 75–77, 164–192; HECKEL 1988; SEIBERT 1984; SEIBERT 1990; BAYNHAM 1995; BAYNHAM 2000; BOSWORTH 2000; ZAMBRINI 2007.

⁵¹ Ps.-Callisth. III 33, 18; *LDM* 120.

⁵² Troy: Str. XIII 1, 26. Priene: *IPriene* 156. Ephesus: Arr. *Anab.* I 17, 10–18, 2; Str. XIV 1, 22 f. Erythrai: Paus. II 1, 5; Plin. *HN* V 116. Iasus: *Syll.*³ 307. Sardis: Arr. *Anab.* I 17, 5.

activities attested in other poleis: unlike in Kolophon 334 did not mark the beginning of a new civic era⁵³, nor is the divine cult of Alexander attested in Miletus, opposite to many cities in Asia Minor, including Apollonia Mordiaion, Troy, Ephesus, Priene, Erythrai, Theos, Bargylia, Magnesia on the Meander, as well as the Ionian League and the islands of Rhodes and Thasos⁵⁴. Alexander's inattention to entreaties of the Milesians can be explained by bad blood lingering between them because of the resistance offered by Miletus to the Macedonians in 334. Moreover, no particular importance of Apollo among the gods venerated by Alexander is attested in our sources. And, what is perhaps most important, there is no indication of an elevated prestige of Didyma, outside Miletus, most likely all but forgotten after one and a half century of silence.

Then there is a seemingly ample literary evidence on early contacts between Didyma, Apollo and Seleucus, a Macedonian officer, satrap and pretender. Various stories passed by Diodorus, Appian, Justin and Libanius can be summarized as follows: Laodice married to Antiochus, the mortal father of Seleucus I, conceived Seleucus with Apollo; next morning she discovered in her bed an iron ring with an anchor engraved on it, a child was born (Seleucus) with an anchor sign on his thigh, at an unspecified date there was an unexplainable outburst of fire on the hearth in Seleucus' (or his parents') home; in 334, Laodice handed over the iron ring to her son, Seleucus received a prophecy of kingship at Didyma; Alexander predicted to Seleucus the great future in a dream; Seleucus lost the iron ring on the Euphrates (the preceding three events happened between the beginning of Alexander's Persian expedition and Seleucus' expedition to Babylon in spring of 311); in 311 Seleucus stumbled upon a stone anchor in Babylon; Seleucus put the image of anchor on his signet-ring; Seleucus honoured his two fathers by founding Antioch on the Orontes and consecrating the adjacent plain (Daphne) to Apollo, the place to be consecrated to Apollo was revealed to the king by Apollo through signs of his arrow and by that of a snake; Seleucus received also an oracle from Miletus (i.e. Didyma) concerning Daphne; Seleucus' descendents bore the remarkable anchor-shaped mark on their thighs⁵⁵. As I have shown elsewhere, the story or stories were largely made up, some of them by Seleucus himself. After all he could not consult the oracle of Didyma in 334 because, on authority of a contemporary witness and historian, Callisthenes, it started operating again three years later⁵⁶.

⁵³ MERITT 1935: 361.

⁵⁴ HABICHT 1970: 17–22, 26–28; STEWART 1993: 98–102, 419–420; BADIAN 1996: 24 f.; NAWOTKA 2003: 33; DREYER 2009: 222–228.

⁵⁵ Diod. Sic. XIX 90, 1–4; App. *Syr.* 283–287; Iustin. *Epit.* XV 4; Lib. XI 84–99 (largely the same story is in *The Chronicle* of John Malalas, 199–202).

⁵⁶ Callisth. *FGrH*, 124 F 14. NAWOTKA 2008.

In fact Didyma surfaces up in the sources no earlier than 299. In that year envoys of Seleucus I paid a visit to Miletus, his son Antiochus established an endowment in the form of a stoa, profits of which were to be devoted to construction works at Didyma. Soon, a sculpture of Apollo, once robbed by Persian soldiers and later recovered by Macedonians in Ecbatana, was returned to Miletus. A set of gifts of Seleucus I to Didyma followed suit⁵⁷. A recent hypothesis tries to explain this unprecedented concentration of euergetic gestures of Seleucus and his family by his alleged quest for legitimacy and corroboration of his Hellenic credentials soon after he became a *de facto* heir to the Achaemenids by taking over most of their realm. These were to be gained by providing a generous compensation to Miletus, the former leader of the Ionian uprising and a victim of Persian atrocities⁵⁸. Attractive as it sounds, this hypothesis is pure fantasy without a shred of evidence to support it. A more established hypothesis links the early Seleucid euergetism to the benefit of Didyma with the alleged personal devotion of Seleucus I to Apollo⁵⁹. However, there are neither literary nor epigraphic sources which would securely attest to Seleucus' particular devotion to Apollo prior to 301. The evidence of his coinage is even more telling if only because of its massive quantity and the significant number of attested series, certainly not markedly lower than what was originally put into circulation. Counting both reverse and obverse images on ca. 300 series of Seleucus' coins Apollo with 13 attested cases is no match to Nike (40), Athena (61), not to mention Heracles (144) or Zeus (165)⁶⁰. In fact Seleucus' initial preference may have been for Zeus, much in keeping with a generally pronounced position of Zeus in the pantheon of the Macedonians and the Argead dynasty⁶¹. Apollo is absent from the numismatic iconography of Seleucid coins prior to 300, to appear first soon after 300, beginning with bronze coinage of Antioch on the Orontes⁶². A sudden rise in signs of attested devotion of Seleucus and his family to Apollo coincides with the moment of their first euergetism benefitting Didyma. More or less at the same time Seleucus established the great temple of Apollo at Daphne, while at the end of his rule a pillar of Seleucid royal ideology came into being: Seleucus was hailed in an inscription of Erythrai as a son of Apollo. From Antiochus I, Apollo

⁵⁷ *Didyma* 479 (= *OGIS* 213), 480, 424 (= *Schenkungen* I 280); *Milet* I 7, 193; Paus. I 16, 3, VIII 46, 3. NAWOTKA 2008.

⁵⁸ MARCELLESI 2004a: 169.

⁵⁹ BURSTEIN 1980: 76 f.; GRAINGER 1990: 164; SHERWIN-WHITE, KUHRIT 1993: 27; CAPDETREY 2007: 169.

⁶⁰ Apollo: HOUGHTON, LORBER, KRITT 2002: nos 15–20, 112, 113, 148–150, 163, 257. See also JENKINS 1972: 223 f.

⁶¹ LE BOHEC-BOUHET 2002.

⁶² HOUGHTON, LORBER, KRITT 2002: nos 15–17, 18 f.

was proclaimed the founder of the Seleucid dynasty (ἀρχηγῆτης / ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ γένους) and his image was canonically represented on Seleucid coins⁶³.

From among the Seleucid inner circle of power of the late 300s there is one person to whose inspiration one might admit this sudden advancement of Apollo, Demodamas son of Aristeides. This distinguished citizen of Miletus made his name as general in the service of Seleucus I waging wars in Central Asia and possibly in India and as one of the seven attested *philoï* of the king. At a later date, from the beginning of the second century, *philos* became simply an elevated rank within the Seleucid court; earlier, under Seleucus I in particular, *philos* was much more of a personal friend and companion of the king⁶⁴. Pliny's testimony shows Demodamas as a promoter of the uniquely Milesian cult of Apollo *Didymaeus* in Central Asia. Milesian inscriptions on the other hand attest his key role in contacts between Miletus and the house of Seleucus: Demodamas was the author of motions of Milesian decrees, served as an *epistates* and *epimeletes* in charge of putting up statues of Seleucus and Apame in whose native Bactria he led Seleucid troops, Milesians in their number as well⁶⁵.

Demodamas was certainly instrumental ca. 300 in calling to the attention of Seleucus Didyma with its somewhat dilapidated temple and oracle of Apollo where no archaeologically detectable traces of construction works precede the beginning of the third century⁶⁶. Seleucus no doubt approved the large outlay of the endowment of his son and heir Antiochus, aimed at financing the planned construction works in Didyma⁶⁷. The next step on the side of Seleucus was a gift of a grand lamp stand, golden and silver vessels, frankincense delivered to Didyma in 288/7⁶⁸. These deeds were reciprocated by Miletus in form of honorific inscriptions, statues and honours voted for Seleucus I, his wife Apame and their son Antiochus⁶⁹. But the exceptional magnanimity of the house of Seleucus, uniquely benefitting a temple outside his realm, certainly called for something exceeding this standard set of civic decorations. Since we know that Demodamas promoted the cult of Apollo in the Seleucid empire and that Seleucus indeed consulted Didyma on the occasion of laying foundation to Antioch on the Orontes, there may have been an extra effort of the oracle to win over the king. As in 331 it had proclaimed Alexander the son of Zeus, at one point after Ipsos Didyma might as well provide the welcome recognition of the son of Apollo in Seleucus.

⁶³ *IErythrai* 205; *OGIS* 212, 219, 237. NAWOTKA 2008.

⁶⁴ SAVALLI-LESTRADE 1998: 378; CAPDETREY 2007: 384 f.

⁶⁵ Plin. *HN* VI 49. CAPDETREY 2007: 82 f., 102 f., 233; NAWOTKA 2008.

⁶⁶ SCHÄDLER 1991: 238.

⁶⁷ TUCHELT 1988.

⁶⁸ *Didyma* 424 = *Schenkungen* I 280. MARCELLESI 2004a: 167 f.

⁶⁹ *Didyma* 479, 480, 481; *Milet* I 3, 158.

It caught up, not without hesitation, in his lifetime, since an inscription from Erythrai cut in 281 proclaims Seleucus “the child of dark-haired Apollo”⁷⁰. With Antiochus I, from 299 a great *euergetes* of Didyma, Apollo became unquestioned patron deity of the Seleucid dynasty.

Thus, acting through Demodamas or, at the very least rendering him all assistance he might have needed, Miletus was a pioneer of the dialogue between Greek poleis and Hellenistic kings through which poleis traded recognition and legitimacy of monarchy in the Greek world for material gains. Miletus presented Seleucus with a story of his divine ancestry in the person of Apollo, the tutelary deity of Miletus and Didyma. His successors received an additional token of legitimacy in the world of polis through the idea of kinship (συγγένεια) with Miletus through Apollo⁷¹. Seleucus, in the 300/299 the most powerful of Hellenistic kings, was induced to this dialogue through the services of his friend and general Demodamas of Miletus.

Dialogue between poleis and Hellenistic kings cannot be reduced to the abstract level of impersonal communication between two legal entities – states, acting through their respective bureaucratic machinery. Far from that, it was conducted by prominent citizens, known and trusted by kings. Such was Gorgos of Iasus, royal *hoplophylax* (overseer of the royal armory), whose influence with Alexander the Great brought a disputed sea bay to Iasus, helped Samian exiles recover their island and brought some gains to Epidauros⁷². I tried to show that Miletus did not fare well with Alexander in whose entourage no Milesian is to be found. In Hellenistic times, Attalid and Ptolemaic *euergetism* benefitting Miletus pales in comparison to the Seleucid one and is limited to the periods of Attalid and Ptolemaic protectorate over Miletus⁷³. The most remarkable early Hellenistic *euergetai* of Miletus were Antigonos, Seleucus I and Antiochus I, in whose company sources attest noble Milesians Aristodemos and Demodamas. This trend continued through the Hellenistic age. Although Miletus was never garrisoned by Seleucid soldiers nor did it submit tribute to Seleucid kings, Milesians featured prominently at Seleucid courts: of Seleucus I and Antiochus I (Demodamas), Antiochus II (Hippomachos), Antiochus III (Apollonios and his sons Apollonios, Lachares, Menestheus, Meleagros), Antiochus IV, Antiochus V, Alexander Balasa and Demetrius I (brothers Herakleides and Timarchos), Seleucus II (unnamed

⁷⁰ *Ierythrai* 205: ὑμνεῖτ<ε> ἐπὶ σπονδαῖς Ἀπόλλωνος κυανοπλοκάμου παῖδα Σέλευκον, ὃν αὐτὸς γείνατο χρυ[σ]ολύρας. NAWOTKA 2008.

⁷¹ Ancestry: *OGIS* 212, 237, 219 with ROBERT, *BÉ* 1955, 122. Kinship: *Didyma* 493 (= *OGIS* 227). MUSTI 1963: 230 f.

⁷² HECKEL 2006: 127, s.v. Gorgus [1]. See also DAVIES 2002, p. 11; NAWOTKA 2010b: 357 f.

⁷³ MARCELLESI 2004a: 173 f.

Milesian *philoï* known from his letter)⁷⁴. The best known from this group is Timarchos, the viceroy of upper satrapies of the Seleucid Kingdom and short lived king in Media, remembered in Miletus well into second century AD⁷⁵. Our somewhat patchy sources allow for a hypothetical reconstruction of the mechanism of trust and friendship between Miletus and the Seleucids: the ideological bonds forged under Seleucus I thanks to the services of his friend Demodamas of Miletus made Miletus the favoured recipient of the royal munificence on the one hand and the place to recruit royal *philoï* in next generations on the other⁷⁶. Prominent Milesians, active at the Seleucid courts almost without interruption until the mid-second century helped to perpetuate ideological and political ties between Miletus and the Seleucids, successfully lobbying the kings for welcome euergetic gestures towards their native polis.

To sum up: how to handle a king? Do have some unique asset, tangible or better still imponderable. Have your men among the king's friends or courtiers. Foster your relations with them but do not be pushy. Employ your men to convince the king that the only thing he does not have yet is your intangible assets. Use little flattery to exchange your assets for realistic material gains, security or peace of mind. Foster good relations with the successors of your original benefactors trading your intangible assets for other material gains using your other men in their retinue, knowing that the kings can trust them and show benevolence to you.

University of Wrocław

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BADIAN 1996: E. BADIAN, *Alexander the Great between Two Thrones and Heaven: Variations on an Old Theme*, in: A.M. SMALL (ed.), *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity. Papers Presented at a Conference Held in the University of Alberta on April 13–15, 1994, to Celebrate the 65th Anniversary of Duncan Fishwick*, Ann Arbor 1996, pp. 11–26.
- BAYNHAM 1995: E.J. BAYNHAM, *An Introduction to the Metz Epitome: Its Tradition and Value*, *Antichthon* XXIX 1995, pp. 60–77.
- 2000: *A Baleful Birth in Babylonia: The Significance of the Prodigy in the Liber de Morte – An Investigation of Genre*, in: BOSWORTH, BAYNHAM 2000, pp. 242–262.
- BERTRAND 2001: J.-M. BERTRAND, *La revendication de liberté, réflexions sur les modalités du discours politique dans les cités grecques*, in: M. MOLIN (ed.), *Images et représentations du pouvoir*

⁷⁴ SAVALLI-LESTRADE 1998, the catalogue of *philoï*: nos 3, 19, 42, 48, 55, 57, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 76. The letter of Seleucus II: *Didyma* 493 (= *OGIS* 227), l. 9. CARSAÑA 1996: 63–65; CAPDETREY 2007: 384–389.

⁷⁵ *Milet* VI 3, 1242. HOMMEL 1976; HERRMANN 1987: 171–173; GRAINGER 1997: 68, s.v. Timarchos; GRIEB 2008: 231–233.

⁷⁶ CAPDETREY 2007: 384 f.

- et de l'ordre social dans l'Antiquité: actes du colloque, Angers, 28–29 mai 1999*, Perpignan 2001, pp. 11–25.
- BILLOWS 1990: R.A. BILLOWS, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley 1990.
- 1994: *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1994.
- 2003: *Cities*, in: ERSKINE 2003, pp. 196–215.
- LE BOHEC-BOUHET 2002: S. LE BOHEC-BOUHET, *The Kings of Macedon and the Cult of Zeus in the Hellenistic Period*, in: OGDEN 2002a, pp. 41–57.
- BOSWORTH 2000: A.B. BOSWORTH, *Ptolemy and the Will of Alexander*, in: BOSWORTH, BAYNHAM 2000, pp. 207–241.
- BOSWORTH, BAYNHAM 2000: A.B. BOSWORTH, E.J. BAYNHAM (eds.), *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Oxford 2000.
- BRAUND 2003: D. BRAUND, *After Alexander: the Emergence of the Hellenistic World*, in: ERSKINE 2003, pp. 19–34.
- BURSTEIN 1980: S.M. BURSTEIN, *Lysimachus and the Greek Cities of Asia: The Case of Miletus*, *AncW* III, pp. 73–79.
- 1984: *Lysimachus the Gazophylax: A Modern Scholarly Myth*, in: W. HECKEL, R. SULLIVAN (eds.), *Ancient Coins of the Graeco-Roman World: The Nickle Numismatic Papers*, Waterloo 1984, pp. 57–68.
- 1986: *Lysimachus and the Greek Cities: A Problem in Interpretation*, in: *Ancient Macedonia*, vol. IV: *Papers Read at the Fourth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, September 21–25, 1983*, Thessaloniki 1986, pp. 133–138.
- CAPDETREY 2007: L. CAPDETREY, *Le pouvoir séleucide. Territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique (312–129 avant J.-C.)*, Rennes 2007.
- CARLSSON 2010: S. CARLSSON, *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States*, Stuttgart 2010 (*Historia Einzelschriften* 206).
- CARSANA 1996: C. CARSANA, *Le dirigenze cittadine nello stato seleucidico*, Como 1996.
- CAVAIGNAC 1924: E. CAVAIGNAC, *Les dékarchies de Lysandre*, *REH* XC 1924, pp. 285–316.
- DAVIES 2002: J.K. DAVIES, *The Interpretation of Hellenistic Sovereignties*, in: OGDEN 2002a, pp. 1–21.
- DEPPERT-LIEPPITZ 1984: L. DEPPERT-LIEPPITZ, *Die Münzprägung Milets vom vierten bis ersten Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Aarau 1984.
- DMITRIEV 2005: S. DMITRIEV, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2005.
- DREYER 2009: B. DREYER, *Heroes, Cults, and Divinity*, in: W. HECKEL, L.A. TRITTLE (eds.), *Alexander the Great: A New History*, Chichester–Oxford 2009, pp. 218–234.
- ERSKINE 2003: A. ERSKINE (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Oxford 2003.
- FERRARY 1988: J.-L. FERRARY, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Rome 1988.
- FONTENROSE 1988: J.E. FONTENROSE, *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*, Berkeley–London 1988.
- FRANCO 1993: C. FRANCO, *Il regno di Lisimaco. Strutture amministrative e rapporti con le città*, Pisa 1993.
- GATTINONI 1992: F.L. GATTINONI, *Lisimaco di Tracia. Un sovrano nella prospettiva del primo ellenismo*, Milano 1992.
- GAUTHIER 1993: P. GAUTHIER, *Les cités hellénistiques*, in: M.H. HANSEN (ed.), *The Ancient Greek City-State: Symposium on the Occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, July 1–4 1992*, Copenhagen 1993, pp. 211–231.
- GRAINGER 1990: J.D. GRAINGER, *Seleukos Nikator: Constructing a Hellenistic Kingdom*, London–New York 1990.
- 1997: *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*, Leiden 1997.

- GRIEB 2008: V. GRIEB, *Hellenistische Demokratie. Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Großen*, Stuttgart 2008 (Historia Einzelschriften 199).
- GÜNTHER 1971: W. GÜNTHER, *Das Orakel von Didyma in hellenistischer Zeit. Eine Interpretation von Stein-Urkunden*, Tübingen 1971.
- HABICHT 1970: C. HABICHT, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, München ²1970.
- 1982: *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen 1982.
- HAUSSOULIER 1902: B. HAUSSOULIER, *Études sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didymeion*, Paris 1902.
- HECKEL 1988: W. HECKEL, *The Last Days and Testament of Alexander the Great: A Prosopographic Study*, Stuttgart 1988.
- 2006: *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great: Prosopography of Alexander's Empire*, Oxford 2006.
- HERRMANN 1987: P. HERRMANN, *Milesier am Seleukidenhof. Prosopographische Beiträge zur Geschichte Milets in 2. Jhd. v. Chr.*, Chiron XVII 1987, pp. 171–192.
- HEUSS 1937: A. HEUSS, *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus in ihren staats- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen*, Berlin 1937.
- HOMMEL 1976: H. HOMMEL, *Ein König aus Milet. Fragment einer milesischer Weihinschrift*, Chiron VI 1976, pp. 319–327.
- HOUGHTON, LORBER, KRITT 2002: A. HOUGHTON, C. LORBER, B. KRITT, *Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue, Part I, vols. I–II: Seleucus I through Antiochus III*, Lancaster, PA–London 2002.
- JENKINS 1972: G.K. JENKINS, *Ancient Greek Coins*, London 1972.
- LUND 1992: H.S. LUND, *Lysimachus: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*, London–New York 1992.
- MA 2002: J. MA, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford ²2002.
- MARCELLESI 2004a: M.-C. MARCELLESI, *Milet et les Séleucides. Aspects économiques de l'évergétisme royal*, in: V. CHANKOWSKI, F. DUYPAT (eds.), *Le roi et l'économie. Autonomies locales et structures royales dans l'économie de l'empire séleucide. Actes des rencontres de Lille (23 juin 2003) et d'Orléans (29–30 janvier 2004)*, Paris 2004 (Topoi. Suppl. 6), pp. 165–188.
- 2004b: *Milet des Hécatomnides à la domination romains. Pratiques monétaires et histoire de la cité du IV^e au II^e siècle av. J.-C.*, Mainz 2004 (Milesische Forschungen 3).
- MERRITT 1935: B.D. MERRITT, *Inscriptions of Colophon*, AJPh LVI 1935, pp. 358–397.
- MERKELBACH, TRUMPF 1977: R. MERKELBACH, *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans. Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage unter Mitwirkung von J. TRUMPF*, München 1977.
- MUSTI 1963: D. MUSTI, *Sull'idea di suggeneia in iscrizioni greche*, ASHP XXXII 1963, pp. 225–239.
- NAWOTKA 1999: K. NAWOTKA, *Boule and Demos in Miletus and its Pontic Colonies from Classical Age until Third Century A.D.*, Wrocław 1999.
- 2003: *Freedom of Greek Cities in Asia Minor in the Age of Alexander the Great*, Klio LXXXV 2003, pp. 15–41.
- 2008: *Narodziny kultu dynastycznego Seleukidów*, in: P. BERDOWSKI, B. BLAHACZEK (eds.), *Haec Mihi in Animis Vestris Templa. Studia Classica in Memory of Professor Lesław Morawiecki*, Rzeszów 2007 [2008], pp. 97–105.
- 2010a: *Miletus and Alexander the Great*, in: E. DĄBROWA et al. (eds.), *Hortus Historiae. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci profesora Józefa Wolskiego w setną rocznicę urodzin*, Kraków 2010, pp. 143–163.
- 2010b: *Alexander the Great*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2010.
- OGDEN 2002a: D. OGDEN (ed.), *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives*, London 2002.
- 2002b: *Introduction*, in: OGDEN 2002a, pp. IV–XXV.
- ORTH 1977: W. ORTH, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit. Untersuchungen zu den politischen Beziehungen zwischen den ersten Seleukidenherrschern (Seleukos I., Antiochos I., Antiochos II.) und den Städten des westlichen Kleinasien*, München 1977.
- PARKE 1985: H.W. PARKE, *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, London 1985.
- RHODES 2006: P.J. RHODES, *Milesian Stephanephoroi: Applying Cavaignac Correctly*, ZPE CLVII 2006, p. 116.

- SAVALLI-LESTRADE 1998 : I. SAVALLI-LESTRADE, *Les 'philoï' royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique*, Genève 1998.
- SCHÄDLER 1991: U. SCHÄDLER, *Attizismen an ionischen Tempeln Kleinasiens*, MDAI(I) XLI 1991, pp. 265–324.
- SCHMIDT-DOUNAS 2000: B. SCHMIDT-DOUNAS, *Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft. Politik und Selbstdarstellung im Spiegel der Monumente*, Berlin 2000.
- SEIBERT 1984: J. SEIBERT, *Das Testament Alexanders. Ein Pamphlet aus der Frühzeit der Diadochenkämpfe*, in: A. KRAUS (ed.), *Land und Reich, Sturm und Nation. Festgabe für Max Spindler*, München 1984, pp. 247–260.
- 1990: [review of:] HECKEL 1988, *Gnomon* LXII 1990, pp. 562–564.
- SHERWIN-WHITE, KUHRT 1993: S. SHERWIN-WHITE, A. KUHRT, *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, London 1993.
- SHIPLEY 2000: G. SHIPLEY, *The Greek World after Alexander 323–30 B.C.*, London–New York 2000.
- SIMPSON 1955: R.H. SIMPSON, *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Greeks*, *Historia* VIII 1955, pp. 385–409.
- STEWART 1993: A. STEWART, *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*, Berkeley 1993.
- TUCHELT 1988: K. TUCHELT, *Die Perserzerstörung von Branchidai-Didyma und ihre Folgen – archäologisch betrachtet*, *AA* 1988, pp. 427–438.
- WILL 1979: E. WILL, [review of:] ORTH 1977, *RPh* LIII 1979, pp. 319–322.
- 1988: *Poleis hellénistiques*, *EMC* XXXII 1988, pp. 329–352.
- ZAMBRINI 2007: A. ZAMBRINI, *The Historians of Alexander the Great*, in: J. MARINCOLA (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Oxford 2007, pp. 210–220.

PAULUS MAXIMUS AND OVID IN HORACE *CARM.* IV 1

By

RADOSŁAW PIĘTKA

Piis manibus Andreae Wójcik

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the paper is to argue that some inconsistencies in the portrayal of the main character from the Horatian ode IV 1 may be seen as deliberate and can be explained by assuming that the poet created some kind of “dual portrait”, which consists of features representative of both Paulus Maximus and Ovid.

The first ode in the fourth book of Horace’s poems (*Intermissa, Venus, diu...*) is one which, in the words of one of its interpreters, while “deceptively simple”¹ amazes with the ambiguity and multiplicity of the subjects raised. Pomponius Porphyrio and Pseudo-Acro², Horace’s ancient commentators, observed that ode IV 1 is “allegorical”. In other words, it must be read “indirectly”, as the key terms and names have their double meanings. Porphyrio’s allegorising is a simple observation that the “war” mentioned in the second line of the ode refers to “love” (“In superiore libro ostendimus allegoricos bella et militiam Veneris Horatium pro amoribus dicere”), while Pseudo-Acro went a bit further, observing that the phrase *rursus bella moves* means “I am again forced to write, even if I renounced this work earlier” (“Iterum scribere cogor, cum iam desierim”), and thus the subject matter of the first phrase of the ode is the resumption of writing love poems.

The ambiguity from the beginning of the work, i.e. the interpretation of the word *bella* as synonymous with both love and literary endeavours, encourages the reader to apply a similar double reading to the other words of the poem. The entire text of ode IV 1 may then be seen as a construct composed of two closely interrelated strata: a thematic and a metatextual one. They are interrelated in that

¹ Cf. BRADSHAW 1970: 142. We need to admit, however, that nearly a quarter of a century later Horace’s work was openly classified as “a complex poem” (NAGY 1994: 420, n. 16).

² Quotations from the scholia to *Carm.* IV 1 after: *Scholia Horatiana quae feruntur Acronis et Porphyrii*, ed. F. PAULY, vol. I: *Scholia in quattuor carminum libros et carmen saeculare continens*, Praegae 1858.

the most significant elements of the “surface” structure, i.e. the characters and events described, were in a way used also in the “deep” structure.

To demonstrate that this covert metaliterary meaning really applies to other sections of the text calls for some interpretative effort, which should first of all address the names appearing in the poem. We can assume that, with the exception of the protagonist Paulus Maximus who is a separate character in Horace’s poetry (appearing only once), the three other names (Venus, Cinara, Ligurinus) indicate respectively three concentric circles of references in the text. “Venus”, in line with her appearance at the onset, assumes pride of place in these meta-textual considerations. She sets in motion a whole set of literary allusions by referring firstly to texts by other authors (a clear and easily recognisable allusion to Sapphic poetry), secondly to many of Horace’s earlier works, and thirdly to some of the author’s more recent publications of the fourth book of the odes (e.g. *Carm.* IV 10, 1; IV 11, 15; IV 15, 32). The name Venus appears both in the first and the last line of the book but in two different incarnations. On the first occasion she is “cruel” (*saeva*), the other time “benevolent” (*alma*)³. In turn, “Cinara” establishes a link between Horace’s old and new poetry (as it appears in his earlier *Epist.* I 7 and I 14 and in *Carm.* IV 13), while “Ligurinus” foreshadows merely the new ode IV 10, whose fifth line contains this very name.

Of special significance here is the protagonist of the ode, Paulus Fabius Maximus⁴. His home, advertised as the ideal abode for Venus, houses a whole set of instruments regarded as traditional attributes of lyrical poetry: *lyra* (22), *Berecynthia tibia* (22 f.) and *fistula* (24). Moreover, Paulus himself is endowed with features that far surpass the stereotypical image of a lover of Venus; not only is he *nobilis et decens* (13) but also, as a *centum puer artium* (15), he shows a keen interest in the arts (20) and does not shun from making statements in just causes during court trials (“pro sollicitis non tacitus reis”, 14). Such a description is naturally a panegyric, and besides belongs to the surface, “informative” layer of the work treated as a prologue, suggesting certain topics related to the other odes of a new selection. The portrait of Paulus Fabius Maximus, a representative of young Roman aristocracy, perfect in every respect, prefigures other variations on this subject, constituting the bulk of the fourth book of the odes⁵.

³ See GRIFFIN 2006: 330.

⁴ Paulus and the literary works dedicated to him are analysed by SYME 1978: 135–155 (chapter entitled “Paullus Fabius Maximus”).

⁵ See FRAENKEL 1957: 413; PUTNAM 1986: 43. The fourth book of Horace’s *Odes* as a series related to renowned personages from the circle of Augustus was once analysed by BENARIO 1960: 339–352; more recently this subject has been addressed by JOHNSON 2004: 40–93 (chapter “*Encomia Nobilium* and Horace’s Panegyric Praxis”).

Certain incongruities in the image of this young noble have been at times indicated⁶. First of all, the information about Paulus obtained from other sources differs substantially from his image provided in Horace's poem. A relatively level-headed politician from a patrician family, soon to become a consul (in 11 BC; some believe that *carmen* IV 1 was written for this very occasion), whose biography includes no practical interest in poetry, does not resemble the frolicsome and youthful poet and worshipper of Venus. Naturally, the author of the ode was under no obligation to pose as a meticulous biographer; the overarching aim, i.e. reflection on his own poetry rather than an account of actual events, convincingly justifies Horace's limited care for actual fact.

It must be pointed out, however, that at this point the two layers of the poem cease to interrelate closely, revealing a lacuna that clearly separates the panegyric and biographic element from the metapoetic one. Perhaps this textual lacuna is meant to attract the attention of the reader and encourage him or her to fill out the gap with a credible hypothesis. It is hard not to notice that in reality we deal here with a double portrait; in all likelihood one name refers to two people: "a promising politician" and "a young poet penning love poetry". The name of the former person is known to us as it is mentioned in the text. Who, then, is the other person of this double portrait? Careful analysis of the traces scattered throughout the text allows us to conclude that the other person must have been Ovid. Exceptionally talented, Horace's junior colleague, at that time Ovid was already a renowned author of love elegies⁷, where he relished the presentation of the *topos* of love as struggle (the famous: *militat omnis amans* from *Am.* I 9, 1 f.)⁸. Moreover, a matter of special importance in this situation, he was a close if slightly younger friend of Paulus Fabius Maximus⁹. If this hypothesis is correct, then on a self-reflexive level the name of Ovid's friend served as a cryptonym for the author of the *Amores*.

It cannot be ruled out that a similar poetic encryption was used, if for other reasons, underpinned by political considerations, by other poets of the time. To

⁶ See e.g. FRAENKEL 1957: 414; BRADSHAW 1970: 142; HABINEK 1986: 407–409; JOHNSON 2004: 44 f.

⁷ The first edition of the *Amores* (provided it did exist and was not a figment of the poet's imagination) would have come out around 15 BC, but even 10 years previously Ovid had had a chance to publicly recite selected elegies from this collection. There are conjectures that the first book of the first edition of the *Amores* was published as early as 25 BC; see CAMERON 1968: 333. On a precise chronology of penning and publishing works from the *Amores*, spanning the period from 25 BC to 1 BC, see HOLZBERG 2002: 31–34, 39.

⁸ For more on this subject, see e.g. SPIES 1930; THOMAS 1964: 151–165; MURGATROYD 1975: 77–79; CAHOON 1988: 293–307.

⁹ See HARRIES 1991: 159. It is hard to determine the date when this friendship started; Ovid refers to it *expressis verbis* only in his works written in exile (see e.g. *Pont.* I 2; III 3), but this friendly relationship might have begun in their youth, when Ovid and Paulus were to attend a school of rhetoric together. This hypothesis was advanced by DELLA CORTE 1991: 254.

use the most vivid and best known example, we can cut short the incessant arguments about the identity of the person referred to as *Caesar* in *Aen.* I 286 by assuming that the name is simultaneously used to denote Julius Caesar and Octavian Augustus¹⁰.

Interestingly, many years after Horace the same onomastic tactics were used by Ovid in the *Fasti*, also in reference to Paulus Fabius Maximus, as if invoking Horace's poem with Paulus as the protagonist. It has been observed that lines 239–242 from the second book of *Fasti* (“nam puer impubes et adhuc non utilis armis/ unus de Fabia gente relictus erat:/ scilicet ut posses olim tu, Maxime, nasci,/ cui res cunctando restituenda foret”), about the only representative of the Fabius family still alive (defined here as a *puer*, just like Paulus Fabius Maximus in Horace), may be read as indicating both the famous commander Quintus Fabius Maximus known as *Cunctator* and his descendant Paulus Fabius Maximus. The latter used equally well the delaying tactics with respect to his marriage, to ultimately wed a woman worthy of his noble family (Marcia, related to none other than Octavian)¹¹. The *otium* accompanying this waiting is evidently the most comprehensive theme of the descriptive part of Horace's ode IV 1. The passage from the *Fasti* quoted above can be thus seen as some kind of homage not only to the Fabius family but also to Horace, at that time already deceased, who had created in his poem a double portrait that represented not so much the two Fabii, but Fabius and his younger friend, the poet Ovid.

Certain reservations may be raised, however. Horace's aversion to the works of the Roman elegists, evident mainly in his persistent ignoring them, is well known¹²; it is even sometimes believed that in his *Epistles* Horace attempted to create a new kind of quasi-autobiographic poetry, competing against Roman subjective elegy¹³. It has to be mentioned, though, that this matter is ambiguous

¹⁰ More recently a discussion concerning this excerpt in the *Aeneid* was accounted for by DOBBIN 1995: 6 f. See also a reference to this debate in a later text by HARRISON 1996: 127. Of the authors mentioned by DOBBIN, the hypothesis of the ambiguity of the name *Caesar* is adhered to also by e.g. BISHOP 1988: 13–16 and O'HARA 1990: 155–163. See also GALINSKY 1996: 251.

¹¹ See SYME 1978: 144; HARRIES 1991: 160.

¹² This has frequently been indicated. Concise scrutiny of this topic can be found in CLARK 1983: 1–5. It is very much telling, for example, that the *Ars Poetica* is silent about Roman amatory elegies. On this subject see also GRIMAL 1968: 104, where the author implies that this was an instance of Horace's professional envy. According to PERRET 1959: 77, Horace himself did not write elegies because of the genre's characteristic monotony of subject matter. As observed once by OTIS 1945: 177–190, Horace's aversion to the elegiac poets was on both literary and ideological grounds. COMMAGER 1995: 32 believes, in turn, that the discrepancies between the political views of Horace and those of the elegists were of secondary importance and were exaggerated; of more significance here were aesthetic considerations and the question of a “lifestyle”. On the relation between Horace and the elegists see also WÓJCIK 1978: 82–88; ZARZYCKA-STANČZAK 1995: 90 and 1999: 22 f.

¹³ See MCGANN 1969: 96–100.

as not all scholars subscribe to the opinions of Horace's anti-elegiac attitude¹⁴; moreover, there were exceptions to the rule of "leaving unsaid". In fact, in his work Horace does mention names of three Roman elegists. However, they are not the ones that we would expect; apart from Tibullus, a poet-friend and a probable addressee of two poems (*Carm.* I 33 and *Epist.* I 4), these are the lesser known Valgius and Cassius of Parma¹⁵. With regard to Propertius, it is commonly assumed that he appears in a poem by Horace (*Epist.* II 2), but anonymously¹⁶. Nothing prevented, then, an allusive reference to one more elegist. This is moreover in line with the general principle that elegiac poets should never be mentioned by name, an indication of a distance to their *œuvre*¹⁷. There is evidence to show that Horace's perception of the literary output of Ovid, the youngest elegiac poet, was ambiguous. Apart from the alleged distance to the elegiac form he was ready to emulate some ideas. One proof for this readiness can be found precisely in the poem under consideration. It was observed a long time ago that Horace's line "late signa feret militiae tuae" (*Carm.* IV 1, 16) imitates Ovid's style and the theme of *militia amoris* taken over from a collection of elegies by Ovid¹⁸. A phrase that resembles as to its lexis and metre a line of ode IV 1 appears twice in the *Amores* (II 12, 28; I 2, 12) and the chronology of events indicates that in this instance it was Horace who was the imitator¹⁹.

It is also a fact that, as follows from the examples I quoted, the practice of a double coding of a character's name applied in principle to representatives of the same family, the ambiguity resulting from an identical family name shared by two people. In fact, Ovid became related to the Fabius family (naturally this did not involve the change of the family name!), but this occurred only because of the poet's third marriage, concluded most probably around 5 BC, after Horace's death²⁰. These doubts may be partly dispelled by the recognition that a widespread Roman custom allowed calling close friends as "family members" (*familiares*). Furthermore, we learn for instance from Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* IX 1169b 6 f. and

¹⁴ See e.g. McDERMOTT 1981: 1657–1660 (subsection "Horace and the Elegists"); ÁLVAREZ HERNÁNDEZ 1995: 43–62.

¹⁵ On the friendship between Horace and Tibullus (as well as on Cassius as an elegist) see PUTNAM 1972: 81–88; BALL 1994: 409–414.

¹⁶ See WÓJCIK 1978: 40, 85.

¹⁷ It seems that a similar case applies also to Catullus, another love poet, and occasionally elegiac, whose "simultaneous presence and absence in Horace's *Odes*" was analysed recently by HUBBARD 2000 (the quotation is from p. 26).

¹⁸ See RAND 1904: 138 (on records concerning the relationship between Horace and Ovid in general, see pp. 136–147).

¹⁹ See RAND 1904: 138–142. RAND proves that Horace, wanting to disambiguate the allusion, used a term most characteristic of Ovid's youthful poems.

²⁰ Ovid writes about the family ties of his third wife in *Pont.* I 2, 136. See DELLA CORTE 1991: 253.

1170b 6 f.) or Cicero's treatise on friendship that a true friend may be considered as more important and closer than regular relatives, as a double, an *alter ego* ("verus amicus [...] est enim is, qui est tamquam alter idem", *Lael.* 80). A couple of friends is none other than a "twofold" man and then there is no reason not to assume that in this way Horace presented both friends as one person in ode IV 1.

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

WORKS CITED

- ÁLVAREZ HERNÁNDEZ 1995: A.R. ÁLVAREZ HERNÁNDEZ, *Horacio, la elegía, los elegíacos*, Euphrosyne XXIII 1995, pp. 43–62.
- BALL 1994: R.J. BALL, "Albi, ne doleas": *Horace and Tibullus*, CW LXXXVII 1994, pp. 409–414.
- BENARIO 1960: J.M. BENARIO, *Book 4 of Horace's Odes: Augustan Propaganda*, TAPhA XCI 1960, pp. 339–352.
- BISHOP 1988: J.H. BISHOP, *The Cost of Power. Studies in the Aeneid of Vergil*, Armidale 1988.
- BRADSHAW 1970: A.T. VON S. BRADSHAW, *Horace, Odes 4.1*, CQ LXIV 1970, pp. 142–153.
- CAHOON 1988: L. CAHOON, *The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's Amores*, TAPhA CXVIII 1988, pp. 293–307.
- CAMERON 1968: A. CAMERON, *The First Edition of Ovid's Amores*, CQ XVIII 1968, pp. 320–333.
- CLARK 1983: M.E. CLARK, *Horace, Ars Poetica 75–78: The Origin and Worth of Elegy*, CW LXXXVII 1983, pp. 1–5.
- COMMAGER 1995: S. COMMAGER, *The Odes of Horace. A Critical Study*, Norman–London 1995.
- DELLA CORTE 1991: F. DELLA CORTE, *Le tre moglie di Ovidio*, in: G. CAPONETTI (ed.), *Ovidio – Poeta della memoria. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Sulmona, 18–21 ottobre 1989*, Roma 1991, pp. 247–258.
- DOBBIN 1995: R.F. DOBBIN, *Julius Caesar in Jupiter's Prophecy, Aeneid, Book I*, ClAnt XIV 1995, pp. 5–40.
- FRAENKEL 1957: E. FRAENKEL, *Horace*, Oxford 1957.
- GALINSKY 1996: K. GALINSKY, *Augustan Culture: An Interpretative Introduction*, Princeton 1996.
- GRIFFIN 2006: J. GRIFFIN, *Look Your Last on Lyric: Horace, Odes 4.15*, in: T.P. WISEMAN (ed.), *Classics in Progress. Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford 2006, pp. 311–332.
- GRIMAL 1968: P. GRIMAL, *Essai sur l'art poétique d'Horace*, Paris 1968.
- HABINEK 1986: Th.N. HABINEK, *The Marriageability of Maximus: Horace, Ode 4.1.13–20*, AJPh CVII 1986, pp. 407–416.
- HARRIES 1991: B. HARRIES, *Ovid and the Fabii: Fasti 2.193–474*, CQ XLI 1991, pp. 150–168.
- HARRISON 1996: S.J. HARRISON, *Aeneid 1.286: Julius Caesar or Augustus?*, Leeds International Latin Seminar XI 1996, pp. 127–133.
- HOLZBERG 2002: N. HOLZBERG, *Ovid. The Poet and His Work*, transl. by G.M. GOSHGARIAN, Ithaca–London 2002.
- HUBBARD 2000: Th.K. HUBBARD, *Horace and Catullus: The Case of the Suppressed Precursor in Odes 1.22 and 1.32*, CW XCIV 2000, pp. 25–37.
- JOHNSON 2004: T.S. JOHNSON, *A Symposium of Praise. Horace Returns to Lyric in Odes IV*, Madison 2004.
- MCDERMOTT 1981: E.A. MCDERMOTT, *Greek and Roman Elements in Horace's Lyric Program*, ANRW II 31, 3 (1981), pp. 1640–1673.
- MCGANN 1969: M.J. MCGANN, *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles*, Bruxelles 1969.
- MURGATROYD 1975: P. MURGATROYD, *Militia amoris and the Roman Elegists*, Latomus XXIV 1975, pp. 59–79.

- NAGY 1994: G. NAGY, *Copies and Models in Horace Odes 4.1 and 4.2*, CW LXXXVII 1994, pp. 415–426.
- O'HARA 1990: J.J. O'HARA, *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*, Princeton 1990.
- OTIS 1945: B. OTIS, *Horace and the Elegists*, TAPhA LXXXVI 1945, pp. 177–190.
- PERRET 1959: J. PERRET, *Horace*, Paris 1959.
- PUTNAM 1972: M.C.J. PUTNAM, *Horace and Tibullus*, CPh LXVII 1972, pp. 81–88.
- 1986: *Artifices of Eternity. Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*, Ithaca–London 1986.
- RAND 1904: E.K. RAND, *Notes on Ovid*, TAPhA XXXV 1904, pp. 128–147.
- SPIES 1930: A. SPIES, *Militat omnis amans. Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik*, Tübingen 1930.
- SYME 1978: R. SYME, *History in Ovid*, Oxford 1978.
- THOMAS 1964: E. THOMAS, *Variations on a Military Theme in Ovid's Amores*, G&R XI 1964, pp. 151–165.
- WÓJCIK 1978: A. WÓJCIK, *Problematyka literacka w twórczości Horacego*, Poznań 1978.
- ZARZYCKA-STANČZAK 1995: K. ZARZYCKA-STANČZAK, *Non minor illis – Owidiusz wobec wieszczów augustowskich*, in: I. LEWANDOWSKI (ed.), *Elegia poprzez wieki*, Poznań 1995, pp. 81–91.
- 1999: *Idem aliter. Przybliżenia owidiańskie*, Lublin 1999.

CONCORDIA DISCORDS OR POMPEY LIKE CAESAR:
LUCAN'S APOSTROPHES V 472–475, VI 278–332 AND THEIR CONTEXT

By

MARIUSZ PLAGO

In her important book, *Ideology in Cold Blood*, Shadi BARTSCH analyses Lucan's apostrophes and states that in the first two books of the poem "there are only small touches of narratorial favor on Pompey among general doom, but as the epic progresses their frequency and intensity increase". The narrator, especially in the apostrophes, seems to forget about his own previous portrait of Pompey, the events in the story and the actions and words of his character (BARTSCH 1997: 78). This view slightly oversimplifies the problem of the narrator's voice. By briefly analysing two passages from Book V and VI, I shall try to supplement the observations made by BARTSCH.

One of the most important features of Lucan's poem is the degree of the perceptibility of the narrator. He does not attempt to hide behind the narrated events, as in a typical epic narration, usually referred to as a third-person, authorial narration (in STANZEL's typology) or an extradiegetic and heterodiegetic narration (GENETTE's terminology). In comparison with his predecessors, Homer, Apollonius, Virgil or Ovid, Lucan's narrator frequently becomes visible as "I". The primary means through which the "I" is revealed is the apostrophe¹, i.e. turning away from the proper audience ("auersus quoque a iudice sermo...", Quint. IX 2, 38). The establishing of "you" is also the establishing of "I". The narrator addresses not only his characters, but also other elements of the presented world – almost everything². He often uses the apostrophe as a direct commentary on the events of the story, becoming intrusive and invasive. Nearly every significant segment of the narration is closed with this figure of speech³. In this way, the

¹ With only slight exaggeration we might say that the apostrophes are discussed in nearly every monograph and paper about Lucan's poem. Most recently, see. e.g. FABER 2005; D'ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007; ASSO 2008.

² FABER (2005: 338): "This range of uses and contexts lends complexity to the narrator's voice".

³ On this structural function of apostrophe, see FABER 2005: 338 f.

basic communication between the narrator and the narratee is undermined. Yet, the apostrophe always has two addressees; the one invoked directly, and, as an element of a larger structure, the addressee or addressees of the entire poem⁴. The narrator assumes the role of a poet from the times of Nero and describes the events from this perspective. He emphasizes their significance, the results they produce for himself and his audience⁵. Due to the metaleptic⁶ nature of the apostrophe, the presented world is closely connected with the world of the narrator and his narratee⁷. Through the apostrophes, both worlds create a continuum, an indissoluble whole, where the past the narrator addresses also becomes a present.

The apostrophes listed in the title, which delimitate the segments of the poem (V 461–475 and VI 263–332), constitute an explicit narratorial interpretation of the characters and events. However, we may also find other evaluative and commentative elements in these passages. An important role is played by verbal echoes and internal references (which has been stressed by BARTSCH too⁸). Poetic imagery is of great significance as well, especially similes and metaphors, which form implicit commentary and model the narrator's portrait of Pompey. This layer of the text is ignored by BARTSCH and many other scholars, who mainly focus on the apostrophes themselves. When we take into account all these components of the interpretative activity, the voice of the narrator and thus the image of Pompey become more complex. The narrator (a partisan narrator according to BARTSCH), praising and whitening his hero on the surface of the text, in the background makes an effort to remind his audience of Pompey who was introduced in the arena of struggle at the beginning of the poem, especially in the *synkrisis* of both leaders. This is Pompey seen through the eyes of Cato and the Romans in book two, Pompey whose goals are the same as Caesar's.

APOSTROPHE V 472–475

Book V opens with an assembly of senators on Pompey's side, during which he was officially elected leader. In this book the narrator also describes Caesar's

⁴ For more details about this phenomenon see KORTE 1987; KACANDES 1994: 330 f.; on Lucan, see ASSO 2008: 162 f.

⁵ This function is particularly emphasized by ROCHE 2009: 112 (discussing the apostrophe to Rome at I 8–32).

⁶ Metalepsis is a term coined by GENETTE (1988: 234 f.): "The transition from one narrative level to another can in principle be achieved only by the narrating, the act that consists precisely of introducing into one situation, by means of discourse, the knowledge of another situation. Any other form of transit is, if not always impossible, at any rate always transgressive. [...] We will extend the term *narrative metalepsis* to all this transgression". On metalepsis in ancient Greek literature, see DE JONG 2009.

⁷ DE JONG 2009: 96 (esp. Homer); WILLIAMS 1983: 186 (Virgil); FABER 2005: 341 f.

⁸ BARTSCH (1997: 82) on the apostrophe VII 207–213. Cf. VII 212 f. with II 320 ff. (Cato's words) and VIII 322: "Roma, faue coeptis" (Pompey's words which repeat Caesar's I 200; it has been noted by AHL 1976: 171 f.).

departure from Italy to Greece. Both rivals stood opposite each other for the first time since Pompey's escape from Brundisium. Giving information that the camps were pitched in close proximity to each other, the narrator does not refrain, as usually, from making a comment in the form of an apostrophe, and in this way he closes the passage about Caesar's arrival in Greece (V 403–475). He addresses Pompey. This is only the third apostrophe directly addressed to this hero – following the apostrophes in the *synkrisis* (I 121–123) and at the end of Book II (725–736):

hoc fortuna loco tantae duo nomina famae
 conposuit, miserique fuit spes inrita mundi
 posse duces parua campi statione diremptos
 admotum damnare nefas; nam cernere uoltus
 et uoces audire datur, multosque per annos
 dilectus tibi, Magne, socer post pignora tanta,
 sanguinis infausti subolem mortemque nepotum,
 te nisi Niliaca propius non uidit harena. (V 468–475)

The interpretation of these lines is usually pro-Pompeian. For instance McROBERTS⁹ analyzes them as an example in which the winner of the battle of Pharsalus is attacked implicitly. According to this view, the narrator underscores Pompey's feelings (*pietas*) for Caesar over many years and highlights Caesar's lack of proper love for his son-in-law¹⁰. Only Caesar's murderous greed of power will shatter the chance for any reconciliation or peace. Anyway, the next section of narration begins with clear accusation:

Caesaris attonitam miscenda ad proelia mentem
 ferre moras scelerum partes iussere relictæ. (V 476 f.)

He cannot stand forced inactivity and he is impatient for the crime to happen – it is a leitmotiv introduced in Book I, in the *synkrisis* of Pompey and Caesar¹¹.

The narrator, after going back to the times when the leaders were a family, suddenly jumps into the future, articulating his sadness at the death of Pompey. Despite the fact that the armies have come head-to-head, Caesar will see his son-in-law in Egypt. The narrator deftly expresses grief for Pompey's eventual doom and subtly prepares the readers for Caesar's false show of tears upon the

⁹ McROBERTS 2005: 40 f. ("the sympathetic apostrophe of Pompey..."). See also BARTSCH 1997: 97; D'ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007: 83 f.

¹⁰ The concept of *pietas* in the *Civil War* in the context of the war between Caesar and Pompey, his son-in-law, is discussed by BANNON 1997: 151–153. For the '*socer – gener*' theme, see esp. VIANINO 1974: 9–15.

¹¹ E.g. I 183 f.; I 392 ff.; II 439 ff.; II 650 ff., etc. For this leitmotiv, see esp. ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983.

presentation of Pompey's head, as his false tears will in fact be a sign of joy (IX 1035–1043). It is Caesar who bears responsibility for the continuity of the war.

Such interpretation is generally correct. However, it takes into consideration only one, literal level of the text taken out of context, while completely ignoring the narrator's references to his previous statements in the apostrophe itself and in the immediately preceding lines. When we take these into account, the apostrophe gains a new dimension. It is difficult to undermine the narrator's negative attitude towards Caesar, which is very clear, although not directly expressed. But his bias in favour of Pompey is rather illusory. The figure of Pompey in this passage, as in the whole poem, is very ambiguous.

The passage between the landing of Caesar in Epirus (“[classis] iam uento fluctuque secundo/ lapsa Palaestinas uncis confixit harenas”, 459 f.) and his actions (476 ff.) consists of the description of the place, *ekphrasis topou* (V 461–467), where the two camps were very close together so that their leaders could hear and see each other, the portrayal of the world's reaction to this situation and the narrator's explicit commentary ending with our apostrophe, which is also an internal narrative prolepsis. The first part of this passage is limited to the description of two rivers. Using aquatic symbolism¹², the narrator, as elsewhere in the poem, transforms this *ekphrasis* also into an implicit commentary not only on the actions of the adversaries, but also on the leaders' personalities and their goals. Geography reflects a situation which exists in the human world:

prima duces iunctis uidit consistere castris
 tellus, quam uolucer Genusus, quam mollior Hapsus
 circumeunt ripis. Hapso gestare carinas
 causa palus, leni quam fallens egerit unda;
 at Genusum nunc sole niues nunc imbre solutae
 praecipitant. neuter longo se gurgite lassat,
 sed minimum terrae uicino litore nouit. (V 461–467)

Genusus is swift (*uolucer*), Hapsus slower (*mollior*); the phrase “quam uolucer Genusus, quam mollior Hapsus” is then elaborated (in a chiasmic structure): one moves lazily (*leni unda*), flowing from a swamp and carrying ships; and the other rushes down (*praecipitant*)¹³, swollen with melting snow. The forces are in the camps now, but this description, as I pointed out earlier, foreshadows

¹² For this symbolism, see esp. MASTERS 1992: 51–53 (the analysis of the description of Ilerda, IV 11 ff.), 169–172.

¹³ For a discussion of these lines, see ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983: 173. Cf. the beginning of the narrative of the action of Caesar in Brundisium: “Caesar in omnia praeceps” (II 656); *praeceps* also appears in the account of Caesar's march to Dyrrachium: “Dyrrachii praeceps rapiendas tendit ad arcis” (VI 14). This epithet occurs with reference to Caesar also in II 489; III 50 f.; IX 47 f.; see NEWMYER 1983: 238 f. For the opposition “fast – slow” which characterizes Caesar and Pompey, see SCHÖNBERGER 1960: 87; 1961: 50 f.; NEWMYER 1983: 229 f. (the analysis of the *synkrisis*) and passim; ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983.

their future actions and at the same time refers to the image of our two leaders which emerges from the famous *synkrisis* in Book I, both to the characterization of inactive Pompey, ending with his comparison to an aged decaying oak laden with trophies and gifts (we may even liken “gestare carinas” to “exuuias ueteris populi sacrataque gestans/ dona ducum”, I 137 f.), and to the portrait of Caesar, as quick and unstoppable as lightning which allows nothing to stand in the way of its progress. In this way, the narrator invokes the whole symbolism of those lines, which is clearly negative towards Caesar, but as far as Pompey is concerned, it is equivocal. On the one hand he is the shade of Aeneas (who is also compared to an oak tree, but he is a deep-rooted tree resisting the full force of the Alpine winds, IV 441–446)¹⁴ and the old and dying Republic, and on the other he has the same goal as Caesar, the same unlimited desire of power. It is worth remembering the opening lines of the *synkrisis*:

nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarue priorem
 Pompeiusue parem. quis iustius induit arma
 scire nefas... (I 125–127)

However, Pompey is doomed to be defeated because his glory is a thing of the past.

The following lines (the information about the shortness of the rivers caused by of the proximity of the sea) form a frame with the opening sentence of *ekphrasis*. Due to the process of anthropomorphization (*lassat, nouit*), they are a smooth transition from geography to the human world, the here and now in the story, that is the camps separated from each other with a small space. The phrase “minimum terrae nouit” gains additional meaning in this context – at the human level the two leaders are fully aware of the ensuing situation. The geographical symbolism and references to the *synkrisis* affect also the meaning of the phrase “tantae duo nomina famae” (468), and remind the audience on what Pompey’s and Caesar’s fame relies (“famae petitor”, I 131, “magni nominis umbra”, I 135 ~ “sed non in Caesare tantum/ nomen erat nec fama ducis”, I 143 f.). Again, the man, the old oak of the great past versus the lightning which strikes terror into men’s hearts, real *fama* versus just *nomen*¹⁵.

Next, the narrator introduces a motif of recognition. A typical scene of recognition appears in Book IV (169–182)¹⁶. The proximity of the camps gives the

¹⁴ For Pompey as Aeneas see esp. ROSSI 2000.

¹⁵ For Pompey as *nomen*, see esp. FEENEY 1986b (discussion of the lines from the *synkrisis*: “... his name is ‘Magnus’, so that he is the shadow of his own name”, p. 239). Various readings of “non [...] tantum” are analyzed by ROCHE 2009: ad 143–144).

¹⁶ Cf. III 326–329; IV 24–28; 158–180; VII 460–469 (before the battle of Pharsalus); see BAN-
 NON 1997: 152 f. (on the lines from Book VII); LEIGH 1997: 46–48; SCHLONSKI 1995: 29 f. (on IV
 169 ff.).

soldiers of Afranius and Petreius an opportunity to see and hear each other. They understood the crime (“deprensus est ciuile nefas”, 172), and love makes them to cross the ramparts (“rupit amor leges, audet transcendere uallum/ miles”, 175 f.) bringing about a reconciliation between the two conflicting sides: “hospitis ille ciet nomen, uocat ille propinquum” (177). Once more, such scene occurs just before the battle of Pharsalus (VII 460–469). The emphasis is put on family ties – a brother looks at his brother, the sons at their father (“uidere parentum/ frontibus aduersis fraternaue comminus arma”, VII 464 f.), and *pietas* prevents them from slaughter (“gelidusque in uiscera sanguis/ percussa pietate coit”, 467 f.).

Here, in Book V, the narrator plays with this conventional theme and with the expectations of his audience. All conditions for reconciliation have been met – the two leaders stand almost face to face and are bound by family ties¹⁷. First of all, the narrator returns to the sin of the civil war, introduced at the very beginning of the poem (“commune nefas”, I 6). The World had futile hopes that the rivals, who then could see and hear each other, would abandon the war (“damnare nefas” ~ IV 172, quoted above). This does not happen. Neither of them, this fact needs to be underlined, decides to stop fighting. The *nefas* motif is an accusation of both leaders. In the eyes of the World Caesar and Pompey are very much the same – both *duces* are now committing crimes (*nefas*). Moreover, the depiction of vain hopes of the people undoubtedly refers the audience to Book II, to the passage presenting the reaction of the Romans, soldiers, women and old men, to the war; they all sense a tyranny approaching and for them both leaders are alike.

The narrator now enters with an apostrophe and reminds the audience of their family bonds, which should induce them to end the conflict (as in Book IV and VII *amor* and *pietas* compel their soldiers to stop the fighting for a moment). The narrator’s defence of Pompey is strange – it incriminates both leaders even more at the same time. If these lines blame Caesar, they also blame his son-in-law. After Crassus’ death the only person who was stopping them when they wanted to fight was Julia. In the same apostrophe the narrator mentions her and by verbal echoes (V 473 f. ~ I 111 f.), withdraws outside the *synkrisis* to the description of the alliance, a short peace destroyed finally by the death of Caesar’s daughter. The leaders could openly stand against each other:

nam pignora iuncti
sanguinis et diro ferales omine taedas
abstulit ad manes Parcarum Iulia saeua
intercepta manu. quod si tibi fata dedissent
maiores in luce moras, tu sola furentem
inde uirum poteras atque hinc retinere parentem
armatasque manus excusso iungere ferro. (I 111–117)

¹⁷ SCHLONSKI (1995: 29 f., n. 24.) gives the outline of these scenes.

In this apostrophe to Julia, which precedes the *synkrisis*, there is not a single word concerning any love felt by Pompey to his father-in-law. Furthermore, Pompey and Caesar are described with the adjective *furens*. Even in this way, Pompey is equated with Caesar, whose essential feature is precisely *furor*, introduced in the *synkrisis* by “in sua templa furit” (I 155)¹⁸. The phrase “multos per annos dilectus” (V 472) does not necessarily have to mean that Pompey still feels affection to his father-in-law. It becomes a threat directed also at Caesar’s son-in-law. Pompey himself, ending his speech to the army, states: “quod socero bellum praeter ciuile reliqui” (II 595). In this speech it would be very hard to observe any *pietas* towards the rival. None of the leaders is going to quit the war. By mentioning Book I, the narrator also points out that hope of the world is naive and futile, since the alliance of the leaders became exactly the cause of the war (“feralia foedera regni”, I 86).

It is noteworthy that the word *uidit*, which appears both at the beginning of the *ekphrasis* (in the present tense) and at the end of the apostrophe (in the past tense), frames the whole passage (461 ~ 475). It is not without significance that *prima* (461) can be read in two ways, as an adjective – *prima tellus*, “the first earth”, and adverbially, as is sometimes used in poetry – “first time earth...”. Earth (*tellus* understood more generally) sees the leaders in the camps separated by a small space and this introduces a theme which is then developed and continued by *spes mundi* (469). The whole World – not only the soldiers of both leaders (and the narrator’s audience, primary narratees) – sees the generals standing close together; they have the opportunity not only to see their faces but also to hear their voices (compare the scenes of recognition in Books IV and VII). Yet, the fierceness of both leaders causes that the “meeting” occurs when the struggle has already been resolved – Caesar will be able to see the severed head of Pompey. The World thus becomes the internal audience, an element of the spectacle, that looks at the leaders who still play their parts and do not want to look at each other. In a typical scene of recognition such a look results in abandoning his role and rejecting the sword¹⁹.

APOSTROPHE VI 301–313

Caesar and Pompey appear together also in the apostrophe from Book IV (301–313). The first part of this book is devoted to the battle of Dyrrachium, the

¹⁸ ROCHE (2009: ad 115 f.): “the zeugma of the epithet *furentem* with *uirum* and *parentem*”. Commenting on *furit* (ad 155) ROCHE also observes: “used of both the living triumvirs at 115; after that, *furere* is applied nowhere else to Pompey, but repeatedly to Caesar”. However, this is true only if we take into account the epithets directly linked with Pompey (see below, on the comparison VI 272 ff.).

¹⁹ For Lucan’s narrative technique as a spectacle, see LEIGH 1997.

only victory of Pompey in his war against Caesar. The apostrophe delimits this long story; the unused victory is commented upon. The narrator focuses on the effects of Pompey's decision, who stopped his soldiers from slaughtering their enemies ("ipse furentis/ dux tenuit gladios", VI 301 f.). This decision is the basis for the commentary where, at the very beginning, the opposition *libertas* – *regnum* appears:

felix ac libera regum,
 Roma, fores iurisque tui, uicisset in illo
 si tibi Sulla loco. dolet, heu, semperque dolebit
 quod scelerum, Caesar, prodest tibi summa tuorum,
 cum genero pugnassee pio. pro tristia fata!
 non Uticae Libye clades, Hispania Mundae
 flesset et infando pollutus sanguine Nilus
 nobilius Phario gestasset rege cadauer,
 nec Iuba Marmaricas nudus pressisset harenas
 Poenorumque umbras placasset sanguine fuso
 Scipio, nec sancto caruisset uita Catone.
 ultimus esse dies potuit tibi Roma malorum,
 exire e mediis potuit Pharsalia fatis. (VI 301–313)

The apostrophe has two direct addressees. The address to Rome²⁰ embraces a statement directed to Caesar and an emotive exclamation, later developed into a short story of the civil war and a catalogue of its victims.

This apostrophe is interpreted in two ways: firstly, as Pompeian and anti-Caesarian²¹. In the first part the narrator compares Sulla, Pompey and Caesar. Rome would have been free and fortunate (*felix*), if it were Sulla who gave it a victory. This statement is surprising. Comparing Pompey to Sulla and his cruelty is an invective against Pompey in the mouth of Caesar, found in Book I (330; 326; 335), in his speech to the troops. In Book II Pompey, haranguing his soldiers, names himself *Sulla felicior* when he reminds them, or rather Caesar himself²², of his victories (583)²³, and, on the other hand, he compares Caesar to Marius and Cinna ("ad Cinnas Mariosque uenis", 546). In Book VI, the narrator seems to enter into a dialogue with his characters. For him, Pompey, ceasing the massacre at Dyrrachium, proves that both of them are mistaken. Pompey lacks *saevitia*, cruelty of the leader of the *optimates*, which in that particular moment

²⁰ Nb. according to SAYLOR (1978: 253 ff.) in Book VI Dyrrachium represents Rome.

²¹ E.g. McROBERTS 2005: 41 f.; RAMBAUD 1955: 279 f.

²² FANTHAM (1992: ad 526–609, p. 179): "...his [*scil.* Pompey's] almost obsessive apostrophe to the absent Caesar shows an inability to relate to his audience...".

²³ After the battle of Pharsalus, the narrator, characterizing Pompey's state of mind, states: "actaque lauriferae damnat Sullana iuuentae", VIII 25.

could have liberated Rome²⁴. Pompey is described as *pius* (which makes him resemble Aeneas²⁵), so the narrator interprets the holding of swords as a result of *pietas* of a son-in-law towards his father-in-law²⁶. Thus, the only one to blame for everything is the father-in-law. The leaders are contrasted with each other: *pietas* against Caesar's *scelera*.

The other way to interpret the apostrophe is less favourable to Pompey. Even the mention of family bonds (*socer* – *gener*) is ambivalent, as we have seen in the apostrophe from Book V. What has been emphasized mainly is the irony of these lines²⁷. But once more, as in the case of the apostrophe analyzed before, it is worth looking at a wider context of these lines. The statement that Pompey (and Caesar as well) is not like Sulla²⁸, has already appeared. In Book II there is a long story concerning Sulla and Marius, put in the mouth of *parentes*, who perfectly remember that bloody chapter in the history of Rome. It ends with the following observation:

exulibus Mariis bellorum maxima merces
 Roma recepta fuit, nec plus uictoria Sullae
 praestitit inuisas penitus quam tollere partes:
 hos alio, Fortuna, uocas, olimque potentes
 concurrunt. neuter ciuilia bella moueret
 contentus quo Sulla fuit. (II 227–232)

Indeed, Sulla was victorious and destroyed his opponents, but then he resigned from power. Pompey, however, is not Sulla – he has other goals that are different from those for which the Senate chose him, that is to fight for *libertas*. These are, of course, the words of the character, with which the narrator does not have to agree, but the addressee of the narration knows them. The speech of the *parentes* is the last in the passage that reflects the voice of the Romans and

²⁴ For instance AHL (1976: 144 f.); on lines 301–303: “This remark, if meant seriously, suggests that Lucan’s attitude to Sulla has undergone a change since book 2. Lucan seems to be wishing that Pompey really had a touch of Sullan *saevitia* in him” (p. 145).

²⁵ For the relation between Book VI of the *Civil War* and the *Aeneid* see e.g. TARTARI CHERSONI 1979.

²⁶ See MARTI 1945: 370; THOMPSON 1984: 212; NARDUCCI 2002: 96 f.; 298 f. NARDUCCI cites this apostrophe as an example to prove that the apology of Pompey, which according to RAMBAUD 1955 takes place in Book VII, starts earlier. LOUNSBURY 1976 also interprets Book VII as an “exoneration and glorification” of Pompey and the Senate.

²⁷ For the irony of lines 301–303 see CASAMENTO 2005: 178 (whose book is wholly devoted to Marius and Sulla in the *Civil War*) and the scholars cited in note 20 above; the adjective *felix* was a cognomen of Sulla, the first “republican monarch” (LEIGH [1997: 289]: “the first Republican king at Rome”).

²⁸ For Sulla in Lucan’s poem see esp. CASAMENTO 2005: 24–50; also BARTSCH 1997: 88 f.; MALCOVATI 1953. In the interpretation of the comparison between Pompey and Sulla I follow TESORIERO 2004: 211 f.

their reaction to the war²⁹. This series of statements ends in a similar way, as I mentioned before, with the announcement of a tyranny. They are preceded by the narrator's prayer to Jupiter:

cur hanc tibi, rector Olympi,
sollicitis uisum mortalibus addere curam,
noscant uenturas ut dira per omina clades?
.....
sit subitum quodcumque paras; sit caeca futuri
mens hominum fati; liceat sperare timenti. (II 4–6; 14 f.)

The prayer, which joins the first and the second book, confirms both the previous predictions (I 584–695) and the following fears of the people. The question directed to Jupiter signals that they are right. Sulla is an ambivalent figure. On the one hand, he is a paradigm of cruelty, and he would have allowed for bloodshed if he were Pompey; on the other hand – he sided with the Senate. In the prophecy of the reanimated corpse (VI 783–792) we find Sulla among the shades of the Republican heroes: Decii, Curii, Camillus, Scipio, Cato and Brutus, the first consul³⁰. In fact, in his speech to soldiers Caesar himself cries, addressing Pompey:

quis scelerum modus est? ex hoc iam te, inprobe, regno
ille tuus saltem doceat descendere Sulla. (I 334 f.)

In the context of the preceding words concerning Sulla, the statement from the apostrophe under discussion (“felix ac libera regum...”) does not necessarily mean that Pompey lacks *saevitia*, but that his ambitions are too high. The narrator reminds the reader that the aims of both Pompey and Caesar are the same. Slaughtering the retreating opponents would not have given him such a glory as an open, decisive battle. Pompey's *pietas* is then challenged and in fact it can be

²⁹ For a detailed discussion of this passage (II 67–233), see CONTE 1968; also CASAMENTO 2005 passim.

³⁰ AHL (1976: 139): “Would Lucan have us believe that all Sulla's vices are pardonable [...], because he was an *optimatus*, a supporter of the senatorial regime? The answer, I suspect, is yes”; see also KORENIAK 1996: ad 787. Usually scholars draw attention to Lucan's intertextual play with a description of the underground in Book VI of the *Aeneid* (for extended bibliography see TESORIERO 2004: 212, n. 89); FEENEY (1986a: 17 f.) notices that Lucan corrects Virgil and ambiguities of the *Aeneid*, placing Drusus and Gracchi beside Catiline (“...placing them where they should ‘really’ have been in Virgil...”; Lucan VI 793–796: “abruptis Catilina minax fractisque catenis/ exultat Mariique truces nudique Cethegi/ uidi ego laetantis, popularia nomina, Drusus/ legibus inmodicos ausosque ingentia Gracchos” ~ *Aen.* VI 824 f.; but cf. also lines II 167–172 from the *Georgics*, the catalogue of Italic *gentes* within the *laudes Italiae*; there, Virgil mentions: *Decios, Marios, Camillos, Scipiadas, Caesar*. So Lucan corrects also this passage of his predecessor. For the ambiguity of these lines from the *Georgics* see THOMAS 1982: 45–49; the relationship between the passages of Virgil and Lucan is thoroughly discussed by CASAMENTO 2005: 202–209.

interpreted as irony³¹. Such manner of evoking (through verbal repetitions) a less favourable image of Pompey, which appears in the statements of the characters from the represented world, has been noted by scholars. BARTSCH (1997) stresses its importance, but omits it when discussing these lines. Writing about Sulla, she comes to the following conclusion (89):

Lucan repeated in his poem the anti-Pompeian criticism of his predecessors, but chose to reject them only in his voice as partisan narrator, thus reminding us of their existence and dissociating himself from them as narrator simultaneously. *We are not allowed to forget the Pompey of the early books* [her emphasis].

In her discussion on Sulla, BARTSCH seems to be separating, to a certain extent rightly, two different participants of the literary communication: the implied or real author³² and the narrator. Unfortunately, BARTSCH does not refer to the specific terminology and narrative theory, and uses the terms ‘Lucan’, ‘poet’, ‘narrator’ with a certain nonchalance, which makes the discussion unclear. In the *Civil War* the anti-Pompeian criticism appears in the statements made by the characters. Naturally, we cannot assign their judgments directly to the narrator. The narrator has no influence on the words of the characters; he does not interfere in what they say, but quotes instead. However, remember that he can omit their words, provide them as *oratio obliqua* and distort or paraphrase them to skip the inconvenient parts. Yet, he does not do that. BARTSCH (1997: 85) poses a question: “Lucan has proved himself perfectly capable of historical distortion [...]. Why invent the Parthian episode [...]?” Nevertheless, we should remember that the narrator tells about it and quotes Pompey’s speech in *oratio recta*. Therefore, it is not Lucan as an implied or real author who undermines the authority of the narrator, but the narrator himself. In this way he suggests that his apostrophes can be read in a completely different manner. In the apostrophe from book VI the narrator indeed appears to be negating the statements made by his characters and the criticism of Pompey as a cruel successor of Sulla. Yet, in case of this exclamation, a clear distinction between the narrator’s view and that

³¹ TESORIERO (2004: 211): “...a decisive advance upon Rome by Pompey [...] would have saved the lands and people listed at lines 306–313 [...]. *Genero ... pio* is highly ironic indeed!” Similarly ROLLER (1996: 325): “...the adjective *pious* here is also ironic [...]: for thanks to Pompey’s current *pietas*, the mutual communal slaughter will continue...”.

³² CHATMAN (1978: 148) defines the implied author, which is the “superior” participant in the literary communication, in the following way: “Unlike the narrator, the implied author can *tell* us nothing. He, or better, it has no voice, no direct means of communicating. It instructs us silently, through the design of the whole, with all the voices, by all the means it has chosen to let us learn”. But RIMMON-KENAN (2002: 90) discussing CHATMAN’S definition states that “...the implied author must be seen as a construct inferred and assembled by the reader from all the components of the text”. Furthermore (91), “...the notion of the implied author must be de-personified, and is best considered as a set of implicit norms rather than as a speaker or a voice (i.e. a subject). It follows, therefore, that the implied author cannot literally be a participant in the narrative communication situation”.

of the implied author is too strong, since it is the narrator himself who brings to mind the complaints of the Romans.

The apostrophe summarizes the passage depicting the last stage of the battle of Dyrrachium (after a long *aristeia* of the centurion Scaeva, which is also closed by this rhetorical figure, ll. 227–262). The nearest context of the apostrophe, which often seems to be forgotten by scholars, once more affects its meaning, enhancing the ambiguity of the comparison with Sulla. When the narrator begins to describe Pompey's actions, he uses elaborate aquatic metaphors in his similes. Pompey is compared to a stormy sea and the swollen Po river. Both leaders seem to have been equated by a way of imaging typical for the narrator:

nec magis hac Magnus castrorum parte repulsus
 intra claustra piger dilato Marte quieuit,
 quam mare lassatur, cum se tollentibus Euris
 frangentem fluctus scopulum ferit aut latus alti
 montis adest seramque sibi parat unda ruinam.
 hinc uicina petens placido castella profundo
 incursu gemini Martis rapit, armaque late
 spargit et effuso laxat tentoria campo,
 mutandaeque iuuat permissa licentia terrae.
 sic pleno Padus ore tumens super aggere tutas
 excurrit ripas et totos concutit agros;
 succubuit siqua tellus cumuloque furentem
 undarum non passa ruit, tum flumine toto
 transit et ignotos operit sibi gurgite campos:
 illos terra fugit dominos, his rura colonis
 accedunt donante Pado. (VI 263–278)

This towering but decaying oak from Book I, destined to fall at the first blast of the Eurus (“*primo nutet casura sub Euro*”, I 141), now during the combat behaves like the father-in-law, like a sea agitated by the winds (the same winds!); he is not waiting indolently, but he acts quickly and effectively (“*nec [...] piger*” ~ “*rapit agmina ductor [Caesar]/ inpiger*”, I 228 f.), and wreaks havoc (“*sibi parat unda ruinam*” ~ “[Caesar] *gaudensque uiam fecisse ruina*”, I 150). This imagined, stormy sea is contrasted with the nearby calm seashore, to which Pompey makes his way. It is worth recalling that in the first book, before the *synkrisis*, in the passage presenting the triumvirate (i.e. the short period of peace that prevailed, though without the will of the leaders) Crassus is compared to Isthmus (I 100–103) that divides the Ionian and Aegean seas: “*nec patitur conferre fretum, si terra recedat, / Ionium Aegaeo frangat mare*” (102 f.). *Hic et nunc*, in the story, Pompey breaks through the fortifications and attacks Caesar's soldiers. However, there is irony in this simile too: the wave strikes against the mountain and “*seramque sibi parat [...] ruinam*”, “preparing collapse on to itself in time to come” (transl. by BRAUND 1992). Yet, this phrase may be read as a proleptic expression foreshadowing, despite the momentary success, the defeat of Pompey:

the wave prepares his own destruction in the future³³. When, after breaking the rampart, Pompey occupies a fortified area, he is again compared to the swollen Po, to which the earth yields if it was unable to resist the raging mass of water. *Ruina* (“tellus [...] ruit”) is now caused by the flood, by the *furor* of the river (“siqua tellus cumuloque furentem/ undarum non passa ruit”, 274 f.). *Furor*, as mentioned above, usually characterizes Caesar, but here again by means of the simile it refers to Pompey as in the apostrophe to Julia.

At the end of this passage we slowly pass from the nature to the human world and the effects of the flood of this scale are presented. The land changes its owners because of the river’s rage: “illos terra fugit dominos, his rura colonis/ accedunt donante Pado” (277 f.). The episode of Scaeva finishes with the following exclamation (262): “infelix, quanta dominum uirtute parasti!” In the context of the comparisons that equate Caesar and Pompey it is no coincidence that the word *dominus* is repeated. In this way, the narrator seems to suggest that Pompey’s successes lead to the same thing as the victory of Caesar. This is nothing new: this topic runs throughout Books I and II in the mouth of the characters, as well as of the narrator who wants us to remember about such a leader of the Republican cause. At this point, as the narrator moves on to the reaction of Caesar, who sees the effects of the actions of Pompey – *ruina* appears again. Caesar looks at what he usually leaves behind (“deprendit signa ruinae”, 281). Now he explodes with anger (*furor*), caused by thoughts about the peaceful sleep of the victor (“mouitque furorem/ Pompeiana quies et uicto Caesare somnus”, 282 f.), and attacks Torquatus who retreats behind the walls, compared by the narrator to a sailor lowering the sails before storm:

Torquato ruit inde minax, qui Caesaris arma
segnius haud uidit, quam malo nauta tremente
omnia subducit Circaeae uela procellae. (VI 285–287)

Caesar, a thunderbolt of the *synkrisis*, still remains himself (*procella*)³⁴. Both leaders are alike. The aquatic similes link the two generals.

The matter becomes more complicated just before the apostrophe. The panic of Caesar’s troops is compared to the plight of people fleeing from flows of lava emerging from Etna. In the simile the narrator refers to the battle of the Giants:

non sic Hennaeis habitans in uallibus horret
Enceladum spirante Noto, cum tota caernas
egerit et torrens in campos defluit Aetna,
Caesaris ut miles... (VI 293–296)

³³ MORFORD (1967: 52): “The simile itself is undistinguished and the second part, the future collapse of the undermined cliff, not very apposite”.

³⁴ Cf. VIII 203 f. (on Pompey’s troops fleeing from Pharsalus): “sparsus ab Emathia fugit quicumque procella,/ assequitur Magnum”.

The motif of the gigantomachy is scattered throughout the poem. It appears for the first time in the eulogy of Nero: “caelumque suo seruire Tonanti/ non nisi saeuorum potuit post bella gigantum”, I 35 f.)³⁵. In the previous books it was Caesar whose actions were depicted as gigantomachic, according to MASTERS (1992: 30), especially in the Massalia episode³⁶. But so far, apart from the lines quoted above, the narrator did not juxtapose either Caesar or Pompey with the Giant in such a direct manner. Later in Book VII, before the battle of Pharsalus, Pompey’s soldiers will be associated with the Olympian gods preparing to fight against the Giants (144–150). Now, Pompey, after he has achieved his only victory (unused), is compared with Enceladus. Throughout the poem Caesar figures as a storm, a thunderbolt, Jupiter Tonans (here in this passage he is *procella*) and at the same time as a Giant, the force of Chaos. This ambivalence is present already in the *synkrisis*, where we read that lightning strikes in its own shrine (“in sua templa furit”, I 155)³⁷. Enceladus, however, did not try to liberate Olympus from the power of Jupiter and he was not governed by *pietas*. The winners of this war are polluted, now Pompey wins and assumes the role of his father-in-law. This momentary change can be observed in one more passage, immediately after the apostrophe: “arma secuturum soceri, quacumque fugasset” (VI 316). Pompey, who flees Italy and Brundisium, follows his father-in-law, now fleeing from Dyrrachium. So once more, through changing the roles, the narrator challenges Pompey’s *pietas*, which has been mentioned in the apostrophe. This last simile attracts the audience’s attention to the future, the momentary Pompey’s advantage and, what is more important, the results of Pompey’s decision to stop his soldiers. In the world of the comparison Enceladus has already been buried beneath the Mount Etna (the narrator has come full circle and has returned to the first simile: “latus alti/ montis adest seramque sibi parat unda ruinam”, VI 266 f.). The final victory will be achieved by Caesar (storm, *procella* in our simile). After all, it was Jupiter Tonans launching his thunderbolts who defeated the Giant and trapped him underneath this Mount. Just before the apostrophe the narrator states:

totus mitti ciuilibus armis
usque uel in pacem potuit cruor: ipse furentis dux tenuit gladios. (VI 299–301)

This narrative sentence, spiced up by a commentary, constitutes an introduction, a point of departure for the apostrophe³⁸. Pompey stops the swords (*furentis gladios*). First of all, the similes employed and the way in which they depict

³⁵ See ROCHE 2009: ad I 36.

³⁶ For the barricade at Brundisium, see BACHOFEN 1972: 82.

³⁷ For Cesar as Jupiter, see NIX 2008.

³⁸ The relation of IV 299 with Virg. *Aen.* IX 757–761 (and thus the association of Pompey with Turnus and Aeneas) is discussed by THOMPSON 1984: 211 f.

Pompey provoke the question concerning the kind of peace that would come. In the apostrophe to Scaeva, the narrator exclaims that Scaeva was preparing the ground for the tyrant (*dominum*). The victory of Pompey is just a change of ruler (“*illos terra fugit dominos*”) because Rome lost her freedom at the outbreak of the war. The narrator seems to suggest the words of the astrologer from Book I implicitly to the audience:

scelerique nefando
nomen erit uirtus, multosque exhibit in annos
hic furor. et superos quid prodest poscere finem?
cum domino pax ista uenit. duc, Roma, malorum
continuum seriem clademque in tempora multa
extrahe ciuili tantum iam libera bello. (I 667–672)

Rome would be lucky and free from the rulers; yet, this is not Sulla who is fighting, but Pompey and Caesar.

The lines surrounding the discussed apostrophe – that is an attack on Caesar – equate Pompey with him. They seem to oppose the apostrophe, but, at the same time, together they form something that can be called *concordia discors*. Such scholars as McROBERTS draw attention to only one aspect of the text, the external one, overlooking the whole system of references which constitute the complexity of the narrator’s voice. It is the narrator’s voice (this partisan narrator according to BARTSCH) in the four similes discussed above (VI 263–271; 272–278; 285–287; 293–296) that creates the meaning of the whole passage and builds the image of Pompey. The narrator – just like Cato – seems to be on Pompey’s side in this war. However, he presents his actions in two ways: by attacking the winner, he justifies the loser, but at the same time he reminds us that in his attempts Pompey does not differ from Caesar at all, although he should fight for others. On the one hand, Pompey is *pius gener* and a protector of *libertas*, chosen by the senate to fight with Caesar; and on the other hand, it is him, a son-in-law (*gener*), together with the father-in-law (*socer*) who started the war (*nefas*) to seize the power which even Sulla himself had not possessed.

University of Wrocław

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHL 1976: F.M. AHL, *Lucan: An Introduction*, Ithaca–London 1976 (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 39).
 ASSO 2008: P. ASSO, *The Intrusive Trope – Apostrophe in Lucan*, MD LXI 2008, pp. 161–173.
 BACHOFEN 1972: A. BACHOFEN, *Cäsars und Lucans Bellum Civile: Ein Inhaltsvergleich*, Diss. Zürich 1972.
 BANNON 1997: C.J. BANNON, *The Brothers of Romulus: Fraternal Pietas in Roman Law, Literature, and Society*, Princeton, NJ 1997.

- BARTSCH 1997: S. BARTSCH, *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*, Cambridge, MA–London 1997.
- BRAUND 1992: Lucan, *Civil War*, transl. with an introduction and notes by S.H. BRAUND, Oxford 1992.
- CASAMENTO 2005: A. CASAMENTO, *La parola e la guerra. Rappresentazioni letterarie del Bellum civile in Lucano*, Bologna 2005.
- CHATMAN 1978: S. CHATMAN, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Ithaca–London 1978.
- CONTE 1968: G.B. CONTE, *La guerra civile nella rievocazione del popolo. Lucano II 67-233: Stile e forma della Pharsalia*, Maia XX 1968, pp. 224–253.
- D'ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007: F. D'ALESSANDRO BEHR, *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion*, Columbus, OH 2007.
- DE JONG 2009: I. DE JONG, *Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature*, in: J. GRETHLEIN, A. RENGAKOS (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin–New York 2009, pp. 87–115.
- FABER 2005: R.A. FABER, *The Adaptation of Apostrophe in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, in: C. DEROUX (ed.), *Studies in Roman History and Latin Literature XII*, Bruxelles 2005 (Collection Latomus 287), pp. 334–343.
- FANTHAM 1992: Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, *De bello civili. Book II*, ed. by E. FANTHAM, Cambridge 1992.
- FEENEY 1986a: D.C. FEENEY, *History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld*, PCPhS XXXII 1986, pp. 1–24.
- 1986b: "Stat magni nominis umbra". *Lucan on the Greatness of Pompeius Magnus*, CQ XXXVI 1986, pp. 239–243.
- GENETTE 1988: G. GENETTE, *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, transl. by J.E. LEWIN, Ithaca–New York 1988.
- KACANDES 1994: I. KACANDES, *Narrative Apostrophe: Reading, Rhetoric, Resistance in Michel Butor's La modification and Julio Cortázar's Graffiti*, Style XXVIII 1994, pp. 329–349.
- KORENJAK 1996: M. KORENJAK, *Die Ericthoszene in Lukans Pharsalia: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Bern–Frankfurt a.M. 1996 (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 101).
- KORTE 1987: B. KORTE, *Das Du im Erzähltext. Kommunikationsorientierte Betrachtungen zu einer vielgebrauchten Form*, Poetica XIX 1987, pp. 169–189.
- LEIGH 1997: M. LEIGH, *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*, Oxford–New York 1997.
- LOUNSBURY 1976: R.C. LOUNSBURY, *History and Motive in Book Seven of Lucan's Pharsalia*, Hermes CIV 1976, pp. 210–239.
- MALCOVATI 1953: E. MALCOVATI, *Lucano e Cicerone*, Athenaeum XXXI 31 1953, pp. 288–297.
- MARTI 1945: B.M. MARTI, *The Meaning of Pharsalia*, AJPh LXVI 1945, pp. 352–376.
- MASTERS 1992: J. MASTERS, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, Cambridge 1992.
- MCRBERTS 2005: S.S. MCRBERTS, *Lucan's War on Caesar*, Diss. University of Wisconsin–Madison 2005.
- MORFORD 1967: M.P.O. MORFORD, *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*, Oxford 1967.
- NARDUCCI 2002: E. NARDUCCI, *Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero. Interpretazione della "Pharsalia"*, Roma–Bari 2002 (Percorsi 34).
- NEWMYER 1983: S. NEWMYER, *Imagery as a Means of Character Portrayal in Lucan*, in: C. DEROUX (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. III, Bruxelles 1983, pp. 226–252 (Collection Latomus 153).
- NIX 2008: S.A. NIX, *Caesar as Jupiter in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, CJ CIII 2008, pp. 281–194.
- RAMBAUD 1955: M. RAMBAUD, *L'apologie de Pompée par Lucain au Livre VII de la Pharsale*, REL XXXIII 1955, pp. 258–296.
- RIMMON-KENAN 2002: S. RIMMON-KENAN, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, London–New York 2002.
- ROCHE 2009: Lucan, *De Bello Ciuili I: A Commentary*, ed., with introduction and commentary by P. ROCHE, Oxford 2009.

- ROLLER 1996: M.B. ROLLER, *Ethical Contradiction and the Fractured Community in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, *ClAnt* XV 1996, pp. 319–347.
- ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983: J.A. ROSNER-SIEGEL, *The Oak and the Lightning. Lucan, Bellum Civile 1.135–157*, *Athenaeum* LXI 1983, pp. 165–177.
- ROSSI 2000: A. ROSSI, *The Aeneid Revisited: The Journey of Pompey in Lucan's Pharsalia*, *AJPh* CXXI 2000, pp. 571–591.
- SAYLOR 1978; Ch.F. SAYLOR, *Belli Spes Inproba: The Theme of Walls in Lucan, Pharsalia VI*, *TAPhA* CVIII 1978, pp. 243–257.
- SCHLONSKI 1995: F. SCHLONSKI, *Studien zum Erzählerstandort bei Lucan*, Bochum 1995.
- SCHÖNBERGER 1960: O. SCHÖNBERGER, *Leitmotivisch wiederholte Bilder bei Lucan*, *RhM* CIII 1960, pp. 81–90.
- 1961: *Untersuchungen zur Wiederholungstechnik Lucans*, Heidelberg 1961.
- TARTARI CHERSONI 1979: M. TARTARI CHERSONI, *Lucano e la tradizione epica virgiliana: ripresa e contrapposizione nel libro VI del Bellum civile*, *BollStudLat* IX 1979, pp. 25–39.
- TESORIERO 2004: C. TESORIERO, *The Middle of Lucan*, in: *Middles in Latin Poetry*, ed. by S. KYRIAKIDIS and F. DE MARTINO, Bari 2004, pp. 183–216 (Le Rane. Collana di Studi e Testi. Testi 38).
- THOMAS 1982: R.F. THOMAS, *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition*, Cambridge 1982 (PCPhS, Supplementary Volume 7).
- THOMPSON 1984: L. THOMPSON, *A Lucanian Contradiction of Virgilian "pietas": Pompey's "amor"*, *CJ* LXXIX 1984, pp. 207–215.
- VIANINO 1974: G. VIANINO, *Studi sul Bellum civile di Lucano*, Salerno 1974.
- WILLIAMS 1983: G. WILLIAMS, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*, New Haven–London 1983.

THEORY APPLIED: THE PROEM AND THE CONTENTS
OF *TETRABIBLOS* II*

By

JOANNA KOMOROWSKA

A cynical reader could observe that the elemental theory of planetary influence that Ptolemy had so carefully (and yet so partially) described in the opening book of his *Tetrabiblos* comes to the test in the following one: it is here, in the discussion of what we know as *astrologia universalis* that he will have to implement his tenets, to demonstrate the actual effects of heavenly influence, and thus to demonstrate the advantages of astrology. The sequence (from theory to the universal prognostic) seems interesting in itself: effectively, it reflects the author's idea of orderly progression from the generalities and regularity of theoretical knowledge to the particularities and peculiarities of actual practice. Indeed, from the lore dealing with the astronomical objects (or rather from mathematical astronomy) he passed to the principles concerning physical elements (and hence, matter): now, he turns his attention to the considerations concerning terrestrial *to katholou*. Hence, he repeatedly emphasizes that it is always the general that precedes the individual – the assumption reflects his preoccupation with the accepted rules of scientific exposition, but becomes in itself reflected in his exposition, which passes from the immutable and the stable to that which remains in constant contact with the *endechomena*. The structure of his argument in the *Tetrabiblos* II 1 is all the more interesting, for it both follows the paradigm set by the introductory remarks, and – strikingly – introduces several issues that will be of consequence in the later discussion concerning the nativity chart.

In FAZZO's study, the discussion of *universalis* or mundane astrology becomes a clever trick, a step in the development of the rather shaky argument in favour of genethliology: for her, the whole chapter is introduced for the double purpose. First, it foils the traditional weapon of sceptics, bent upon pointing out that ethnic

* Throughout the text, the quotations from the *Tetrabiblos* follow Simonetta Feraboli's edition (Claudio Tolomeo, *Le previsioni astrologiche*, a cura di S. Feraboli, Vincenza 1985); the English translation quoted is that of F. E. Robbins (Ptolemy: *Tetrabiblos*, Cambridge, MA 1940).

similarities invalidate the very foundations of individual horoscope¹; second, one may guess, it is intended to inspire the reader with faith sufficient to carry him throughout the exposition forthcoming in Books Three and Four, an exposition possibly far less ‘scientific’ than the Alexandrian would want astrology to sound². It is certainly not that the scholar is wrong: yet, it may be argued that much more than a simple polemical issue is at stake in this part of the *Tetrabiblos*. If we are, as I strongly suspect, dealing with a work intended to be read as a supplement to the *Syntaxis*, the issue of universal influence would naturally be something of a priority in Ptolemy’s exposition of universal arrangement of the world. The *Syntaxis*, intended to show that a human mind may uncover the organizing principle of the heaven, manifested the presence of the universal regularity³: astrology, and its universal branch in particular, demonstrates that the sublunary world is organized along much parallel lines. The difference between this view and the one formulated by FAZZO seems to lie in the definition of the focal point: for the Italian scholar, the primary object of Ptolemy’s (re)construction of astrology is polemical, aimed at invalidating the “Carneadean” arguments as known from Cicero and Sextus⁴. For me, instead, the primary aim is cosmological: the description of the existing world in a manner that would manifest the orderliness of the world arrangement and, simultaneously, link the presence of this order to the basic rationality of the universe as supported in both *Syntaxis* and *Harmonica*⁵.

Let us however begin with the construction of the proem and the manner in which Ptolemy moves from the description of the celestial (as concerning the celestial objects) to the description of its connection with the sublunary world. Having dealt with the part of astrology that is most similar to the mathematical astronomy (essentially, it seeks to establish the physical/elemental nature of what the *Syntaxis* considers the possible objects of mathematical research) he moves on, passing to the one that concerns all humans, and indeed, the sublunary as a sphere in general. In describing the influences and affinities existing between the Zodiacal signs, planets, and *kenra* with the sublunary, he will pass from the sky, into the world of change, yet he will be nevertheless dealing with nations,

¹ To quote: “è presumibilmente in vista di una simile obiezione, in fatti, che Tolomeo fa precedere la trattazione dell’ oroscopo individuale (libri III e IV) da un’ ampia sezione di geografia ed etnografia astrologica” (FAZZO 1991: 233).

² Still, one wonders whether the faith inspired would carry the reader through the inadequacies of Book Three where certain technical and highly controversial matters such as determining the Ascendant point are concerned (the lack of respective discussion being aptly noted by FAZZO 1991: 234).

³ Cf. TAUB 1993: 19–38.

⁴ This is particularly evident in FAZZO 1991: 227 ff. For the doubts surrounding the authorship of the polemic cf. GIANNANTONI 1994.

⁵ Cf. TAUB 1993: 105–134 and BARKER 2000: 259–269 respectively. Still, some insightful comments on this particular unity of Ptolemy’s design can be found already in BOLL’s *Studien* (1894).

people, countries, regions etc. rather than with individual beings. The order of progression may seem obvious, and certainly it is attested in other astrological works, yet there seems to be more to this order in Ptolemy: in his rendition of astrology there is an additional consciousness of downward progression, a consciousness quite absent from the works of others⁶. For Hephaestio, to refer to the most Ptolemy-like example, the progression from the universal to the individual would be a matter of natural attitude rather than reflection⁷: meanwhile, as it should be apparent from this essay, for Ptolemy the progression is essential should one want to explain the workings and the possible uses of astrology as an instrument in the human quest for knowledge⁸.

THE SEQUENCE

As it could be observed in the introductory proem (*Tetr.* I 1), Ptolemy begins his exposition in Book Two with a brief summary of issues already discussed: strikingly, he notes right at the beginning that it is only now that he may turn to the particulars of the trade or to the practical application of what has been previously discussed, and he assures his reader that in no way will he depart from the scientific manner of exposition. The phrase employed in the context is (in contrast with I 1, 2) κατὰ τὸ φυσικὸν τρόπον ὑφηγήσεως, which may have been intentional given the fact that Ptolemy is at the moment moving from the discussion of the sky to the discussion of sublunary phenomena, which is the explicit subject of physical research as he himself defined the lore in the *Syntaxis*⁹.

⁶ Though Manilius is known for extreme attention he paid to the actual composition of his poem, there is no sense of the general-individuum focus shift in his work: should it be related to the Stoic component in the *Astronomica*, one might suspect that the difference stems from the Platonic/Aristotelian perspective which made the sublunary a realm of accidental movement (though not dominant, it would be present in the sphere according to the tenets of Aristotle espoused in *Metaphysics* XII) and the Stoic theory calling for the equal orderliness of the cosmos, pervaded as it was by the omnipresent rational and divine principle. Further, it would be difficult to detect in the *Astronomica* a *descensus* as structured as the one we encounter in Ptolemy's work – the prominence of the fixed stars and the *paranatellonta* theory in Book Five, as well as the lack of references to the planetary astrology complicate the comparison. For the *descensus* as organizing principle in Manilius' poem compare HÜBNER 1984: 242–268.

⁷ Compare Hephaestio Theb. *Apotelesmatica* I 21; additionally, the issue is complicated by the author's close reliance on Ptolemy's work – still, noticeably, his abbreviations tend to obscure the orderliness of the exposition (for the discussion cf. KOMOROWSKA 2003).

⁸ At this point one may refer to the concept frequently invoked in the *Tetrabiblos*, namely that of *akolouthia*; the notion receives due prominence in the contribution of FAZZO, even though the scholar concentrates on its "rhetorical" or persuasive importance, relating it to Ptolemy's apologetic purpose rather than more general conceptual scheme (FAZZO 1991: 220–222).

⁹ To quote the relevant passage: "The division [of theoretical philosophy] which investigates material and ever moving nature, and which concerns itself with 'white', 'hot', 'sweet', 'soft' and suchlike qualities one may call 'physics'; such an order of being is situated (for the most part) amongst corruptible bodies and below the lunar sphere" (trans. by G.J. TOOMER, *Syntaxis* I 1, p. 5 H.).

The transition from the basic principles that organize the stellar influence to the study of the effects they provoke in the sublunary world is marked by yet another step: Ptolemy introduces the fundamental division of astrology into the *universalis* and the *genethliaca*. This early mention of this differentiation allows him to develop the theme of progression, for what he subsequently does it to emphasise the precedence that should be given to that former. There is an important reason for this precedence and Ptolemy is quite explicit in invoking it:

[...] προσήκειν ἡγούμεθα περὶ τοῦ καθολικοῦ πρῶτον ποιήσασθαι τὸν λόγον, ἐπειδὴ περ ταῦτα μὲν κατὰ μείζους καὶ ἰσχυροτέρας αἰτίας τρέπεσθαι πέφυκε μᾶλλον τῶν μερικῶς ἀποτελουμένων. (II 1, 2)

we believe it fitting to treat first of the general division, because such matters are naturally swayed by greater and more powerful causes than are particular events.

The fact that the division of astrology comprises the issue of causes and their power is of particular importance at this point, for it will be forcefully reflected in the discussion of genethliological problems, where it will provide effective means to invalidate one of traditional anti-astrological arguments, i.e. the dangerous *naufragium* example¹⁰. As for now, it is the careful disposition that needs to draw the eye, particularly as Ptolemy follows with a differentiation within the *universalis* itself, introducing several distinctions concerning the level of generality (as related to the territory affected) and, possibly most importantly, drawing a line between the application of astrology to uncover the forces that shape the character of a given region (what I would call a descriptive function) and its employment for pure prognostication purposes, i.e. the investigation of events to come (what could be termed prognostic function). The phrase in question, skillfully blended into the exposition, runs as follows:

πρὸς δε τὴν τούτων ἐπίσκεψιν μάλιστα παραλαμβανομένων δύο τούτων (τῆς τε τῶν δωδεκατημορίων τοῦ ζῳδιακοῦ καὶ ἔτι τῆς τῶν ἀστέρων πρὸς ἕκαστα τῶν κλιμάτων συνοικειώσεως καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις μέρεσι κατὰ καιροῦς γινομένων ἐπισημεσιῶν...) (II 1, 5)

The possible importance of the references to physics is noted in FAZZO 1991, though she seems to dismiss the lore too easily as prone to failures and imperfect: while this agrees with the general description of the *Syntaxis*, the point is that regardless of its limitations physics supplements mathematical sciences where the study of the material world is concerned. In fact, Ptolemy's claim in *Tetrabiblos* I 1 seems to be that the changes within the realm of sublunary may be indicative (the word employed is *symptoma*) of the permanence of the upper spheres.

¹⁰ The argument is employed e.g. in Favorinus' tirade against astrology as quoted by Gellius (*NA* XIV 1, 27). As for the manner in which this argument could be dealt with without references to the subordination of causes, cf. Valens, *Anthologiae* VII 6 (I addressed the issue in KOMOROWSKA 2004: 352–360).

And since in the examination of these questions these two things particularly are taken into consideration, the familiarity of the signs of the zodiac and also of the stars with the several climes, and the signification of heavenly bodies in their own proper regions at a given time...

Suggested differences do not only concern the range of territories affected by a modification of the celestial influence: an additional problem is related to Ptolemy developing a theory which is an object of a separate study within this book, namely the theory of *synoikeiosis*. The assumption governing this theory is simple enough, for it presupposes that some elements of the sublunary world are possessed of traits that link them, irretrievably, with celestial objects possessed of the same traits. Now, while these latter seem to possess the very traits permanently (after all, they are immutable, only their influence being modified through the overlapping of *aporrhoi*), those former remain linked to them as a result of their influence. In short, while the features of the celestial objects are stable because of their being removed from the world of change, the features of the sublunary objects are what they are because of the influence from the spheres above. However, uncovering these latter traits, constant as they might be where sought with respect to the whole region (e.g. the major part of the inhabitants of Arabia Felix will be necessarily honest and just owing to the affinity the region has with Jupiter as the ruler of Sagittarius), represents the descriptive function: it describes what is (though what is results from the steady influence of the skies). By contrast, the investigation of eclipses, of major conjunctions, and of new moon results in our possibility to infer what can change in the sublunary world, what region might be affected, and what will be the nature of affecting influence. This is what I named the prognostic function: it relies on the former, as it is forced to employ its data (one may be reminded of the way in which astrology employs the achievements of mathematical astronomy). To emphasise: both do refer to the results of stellar influence yet the stability and permanence of one is hardly matched in the occasional application of the other. The differentiation will be further developed in the following chapters of the *Tetrabiblos*, gaining considerable importance and proving of fundamental importance in the development of Ptolemy's argument on genethliology.

Symptomatically, the structure of the proem is to a large extent mirrored in the distribution of contents comprised in Book Two. The discussion starts with the description of *klimata* (in which it may seem to allude to the exposition of the proem), and follows through the presentation of astrological geography (one can add at this point that Ptolemy's division displays marked differences with all others that survive from antiquity), to the consideration of various celestial events that may possibly affect a sublunary region. Thus the extent-related issue is present right from the start (beginning with the most general description of the inhabited world according to the world directions, Ptolemy passes to the description of differences manifesting themselves within any given quadrant,

and then considers some issues related to single kingdoms or even cities), yet so is also the permanent/occasional opposition. Moreover, one can detect certain sequence to the exposition: while the general (or that of wider scope) precedes the singular (or that of narrow scope), the permanent precedes the occasional (i.e. what is prevailing, the *epi to poly* comes before that which is accidental i.e. *to kata symbebekos*, the object of scientific study preceding the irregular movement¹¹). As an effect, should we want to look at the disposition of matters in the *Tetrabiblos* II, we would come up with a following table:

1. Division (diaeresis) of matters	
2. Climates	Astrological geography
3. Regions	
4. Table of subordination	
5. Eclipses	Prognosis from an eclipse
6. Regions affected	
7. Time of verification	
8. Those affected by the event	
9. Sort of event	
10. On the colour of <i>ekleipsis</i>	Transitory chapters dealing with the colouring of the sky at the time of critical event
11. On the first new moon of the year	<i>Kata meros</i> observations
12. On weather effect of the Zodiacal signs	
13. On the particular observations	
14. On the meteorological signs	

While it may appear obscure and accidental, Ptolemy's sequence is quite logical: first, he deals with the reasons explaining ethnic characteristics, differentiation of customs, certain visible features of the land. Then, he turns to the sort of celestial event that is credited (as indeed it should due to the effective power of the Sun and the Moon) with a *dynamis* sufficient to cause significant changes in what we may call "routine": the occultation of the Sun (or of the Moon) implies a decisive impingement of the respective influence and therefore is bound to affect the influence exercised according to the principle of *synoikeiosis*. In making this step, he also turns from the portrayal of the inhabited world as mirroring the

¹¹ On the status of *epi to poly* within the Aristotelian conception of science cf. MIGNUCCI 1981.

arrangement and characteristics of the Zodiacal circle to the description of the planetary movement as effectively and temporarily affecting particular regions, zones and territories: it is the occasional, even if calculable, nature of these periods (or moments) of intensified influence that should be noted at this point. We are dealing with the opposition of stable, constant affinity with the momentary influence actively modifying some element of the region.

Indeed, it is noteworthy that Book III includes the major part of data necessary for the reconstruction of Ptolemy's development and use of the *synoikeiosis* idea: the description of the stable, existing affinities between the sublunary and the celestial bodies, an affinity which, when taken to its natural consequences, shall be of principal importance to the concept of *sympatheia* as presented in the *Tetrabiblos*¹². In this sense, it is, one may observe, symptomatic that the word *synoikeiousthai* is employed with highest frequency in the description of the human world in II 3, where Ptolemy is laying out the foundations of astrological geography which, in considerable contrast with his other theories, were to remain relatively unknown and for the better part unique, the complexity of his method unparalleled in other existing sources. Effectively, and very much in vein of his promise of "physical" explanation formulated in II 1, Ptolemy will give the effective explanation for the changes brought about by the motion of certain celestial bodies, by the appearance of unusual celestial events, etc. Thus, for example, once we accept that an elemental affinity connects given region with a Zodiacal Constellation, it seems obvious enough that the conjunction of Mars and Saturn (one dry and hot, the other dry and cold) will necessarily influence the sign's natural temperament¹³, drying what was humid and increasing the dryness already in existence. And once we remember that regions were, in Ptolemy's handbook at least, connected to the sections of the respective celestial vault not through a simple authoritativeness but much rather by a careful observation of their position and characteristics, it seems natural that a change in the influence of the respective sign will be paralleled in a similar change occurring in the underlying terrestrial region (this would effectively be what is implied under the term *sympatheia*, as the experiences of one would be reflected in something similar happening to the other). In this way, the idea seems to be attuned to the practical necessities caused by the agent/signifier ambiguity, or, to put it in more adapt terms, to the twine employment of the discipline, aimed at both description and prognostication. Certainly, the main import is that any change in the influence is necessarily reflected in the sublunary world, a tenet very much in accordance with the foundations of astrology laid in I 2, but it might be significant that

¹² It would be hard even to outline the importance of *synoikeiosis* theory for the Ptolemaic exposition in this place – the question will be discussed in detail in my study of Book Two of the *Tetrabiblos*.

¹³ Described in *Tetrabiblos* I 9, their effects on the *meteora* is discussed in II 12.

Ptolemy devotes considerable energy to the explanation of this particular rule according to something that we may consider rational principles. His explanation seems to exploit the physical research of *kraseis*, mixtures, and he is at pains to demonstrate that the occasional exceptions are in fact divergences from a stable, predominant pattern, which rules the *epi to poly* regularities.

The individual, isolated nature of the critical event becomes even more manifest in the later chapters, partly dealing with *ad tempus* prognostication, partly devoted to the phenomena manifesting within the sphere of *meteora*. The prognostication discussed at this point is limited in time, scope, and, in the case of meteorological changes, relies on the principle of signification: the halo does not provoke any changes but rather precedes them. At the same time, Ptolemy's arrangement marks the transition from the fixed stars sphere to the realm of the sublunary, thus conforming to the overall principles laid in the proem.

Next, some attention should be paid to the appearance of the sublunary phenomena at the end of *Tetrabiblos* II. In fact, the very principle according to which the *meteora* such as haloes etc. may be employed as "signs" of the weather to come is in a way indicative of the physical focus of Ptolemy's research: the halo manifests the prevalence of the humid element in the sublunary sphere, thereby being indicative of a period of bad weather: it does not cause the rain, but is indicative of its arrival, and thereby worthy of consideration – it may be said that such halo reflects the nature of *aporrhoi* reaching the region at that precise moment. Still, there is no causal relationship between the halo and the rain: in contrast, there is something of causality in the relationship between the constellations, the planets, and the sublunary: these do influence our regions, actively contributing to the changes that we may be able to observe. Thus one may ask, why include the *meteora*? The answer, strange as it sounds, involves the notion of completeness: in describing the workings and regularities of the inhabited world, our world, it would be dangerous to leave aside signs which albeit not operating on level with those visible on the celestial vault, still do indicate possible changes in the *periechonta*. The cosmological image of *Tetrabiblos* III would hardly be complete had it not accounted for this particular (and highly individual when considered against the immenseness of the world) character.

Still, there is another aspect of *Tetrabiblos* II that may draw our attention: constituting the first part of the work to deal with actual interpretation of a celestial constellation (first, and most importantly, that of the *ekleipsis*) it introduces several concepts that will play an important part in the forthcoming books. First, a fact discussed below, the recognition of the effects the stellar influence has on the psychic *indoles* provides a foundation for the more detailed genethliological interpretation. Second, the chapters devoted to the actual meaning of the prognostic event further the notion of prognostic containing within itself even the events remote in time and space, affecting various spheres of human activity – these ideas will also be of immense importance in the forthcoming exposition.

As a result the book which is a self-contained, perfectly organized entity which employs the theoretical concepts grounded in age-long observations of nature to both the descriptive and the prognosticatory effect, becomes also a kind of *eisagoge* into the concept of individual chart, the concepts it presents rebounding in the later books. The description of nation it provides in what constitutes a major chorographic attempt will be discussed elsewhere: at this point it is the methodological choice made by Ptolemy that needs to be considered.

THE PIVOTAL POINT: *TETRABIBLOS* II 2

Strikingly, it is here, in the middle of the discussion concerning the universal aspect of astrology, that Ptolemy introduces a concept that remains so un-scientific to the modern eye, namely the influence exercised by the planetary spheres on the ethical and moral formation of man. The assumption that the influence of the stars whose *arche* is the twine opposition of hot–cold, dry–humid could be translated into the actual tendencies, proclivities and features of a human character has often been ridiculed as totally unbased and improbable: still, one cannot help but note that the research in the developmental psychology or, for the matter, genetics, brings forward some tenets which should, at the very least, make us hesitate to make similar pronouncements. Certainly, and this is an important point to have in mind, the principle Ptolemy invokes was hardly of his own invention – it relies on the centuries long tradition attested in both the philosophical and the medical writings of the earlier periods, the tradition linking the development of the human character (or more precisely, of temperament) to the humoural constitution of the man, which in effect equated express allegation that the character may be dependent on the elemental *krasis*¹⁴. Ironically, the famous assertion that what we know as neurological disorder (namely epilepsy) may in fact be dependent on the overabundance of phlegm¹⁵, a claim that effectively related what was conceived as an affliction of the soul to the condition of the body, is nowadays considered one of the major achievements of the Hippocratic medicine: meanwhile, the argument of Ptolemy, although invoking very similar principle, is considered insufficient and ridiculous. Also interestingly, we know that *De aere* figured among the principal sources of Galen's *Quod animi mores*, and that its theory of seasonal influence was simplified into the notion of elemental *krasis* that lies at the heart of the concept espoused in the treatise.

¹⁴ Heraclitus stands out as the possibly eldest representative of this approach in the history of philosophy and he is duly quoted on the issue in Galen's *QAM* 4, p. 45, 8 sq. M. Another promising source was Plato, whose *Timaeus* admits a possibility of bodily condition affecting the soul (*Tim.* 86b–e). For a list of possible authorities cf. LLOYD 1988.

¹⁵ In *De morbo sacro*, possibly most succinctly in ch. 6.

Let us consider the premises, assumptions and possible consequences of Ptolemy's argument. First, he develops his exposition as if it followed naturally upon the theories explained in *Tetrabiblos* I. There is no separate chapter on the relationship between body and character (ethical dispositions) – nevertheless it may be argued that the contents of II 2, the chapter devoted mostly to the climatic differentiation of human *indoles*, is intended, for all use it makes of the traditional notions, to further the idea that dispositions of the soul may be related to the predominance of one or more of four elements: the basic opposition is that of heat and cold, the two being linked to South and North respectively, the additional is that of humid and dry, linked by association with the solar movement to East and West¹⁶. The elements that are predominant in each make for certain particularities in the look, behaviour, and customs of the remote tribes, and essentially, the chapter demonstrates polarized picture intended, in all likelihood, to support the general principle and to highlight the special privileges granted to those inhabiting the central region. Essentially, it is a paean to *eukrasia* of those elements, the need for balanced *indoles* emphasized throughout the passage: and significantly, the theory that any inequilibrium results in a serious disturbance, whether physical or mental, is deeply entrenched in the Hippocratic humoral medicine which has had a profound impact on the ancient imagination¹⁷. At the same moment, it establishes the basic principles: thus, it links the presence of heat to the acuteness of senses and of the mind, it indicates that obstinacy and perseverance do often accompany the presence of cold¹⁸: it provides explanations for the effects of humidity and dryness. Indeed, while the chapter is often said to have no bearing on the exposition of Ptolemy's grand scheme in II 3, to disregard its input seems at best risky; in fact, such an approach may cause us to miss, by and large, Ptolemy's intent. What the chapter aims at providing is the foundation allowing to relate the *psyche* to the corporeal and, at the same moment, to emphasise the general principle according to which the actual influence occurs. The chapter sketches the principles that will be employed, afterwards, to compose the image of the inhabited world as a realm affected by a combined influence of the stars, the author passing, significantly, from the general outline to the actual application of the basic principles. Meanwhile, he keeps his argument

¹⁶ On the Hippocratic flavour of this particular kind of determinism cf. STASZAK 1995: 175–190.

¹⁷ The *De aere, aquis et locis* remains the main source for the Hippocratic teaching on the matter. It seems advisable to remember that the treatise was heavily employed in the composition of Galen's *Quod animi mores* (JOUANNA 1996: 131); symptomatically, Galen is known to have composed a separate commentary on the work, mentioned in the *De libris propriis* and well known to the Arabs (for the discussion cf. JOUANNA 1996: 133–148).

¹⁸ A passage in Galen's *Quod animi mores* ch. 5 implies much similar link, thus furnishing support for the assumption that Ptolemy refers to "facts" well established in the general imagination (QAM 5, p. 787 K.).

very much in the area of what would be taken for certain: after all, the fact that the four directions will be associated with the two elementary oppositions, dating back to Hippocrates, relies on the very notion of common knowledge that was so successfully employed in the preceding Book One (I 1–3).

To ascertain the validity of such an argument for the contemporary mind, some comparisons would be in order: what we are dealing with is the assumption that the environment at the birth-moment retains a power to influence the formation and the later development of human body, and, on the similar principle, of the human soul. Thus, it is tacitly assumed that the temperament and therefore the inborn character qualities (the *physis*) follow the physical qualities bestowed upon what comes-to-be by the immediate environment, which in effect means that the constitution of the body does to some extent project (define) the qualities of the soul. This, characteristically, is not something unheard of: relying upon the age-long Aristotelian theory, a close contemporary of Ptolemy, also a man of science, Galen, would make much similar claim in several passages of his massive works, most prominently in the treatise *Quod animi mores* (intended as a matter of fact to illustrate the theory that the illness of the soul is in fact an illness of the body)¹⁹. Interestingly, however, as it is indeed stressed by GARCÍA-BALLESTER, he never seems to offer a proof (in the ontological sense) or even a more advanced consideration of what exactly is the relationship between the two, or how would such a relationship be possible and explainable in metaphysical terms²⁰. Instead, he seems to take his point very much for granted²¹, though it is hard to measure the exact extent to which he would support the theory that actual ethical *choices* may be dependent on the physical formation of the body (i.e. to what extent is a human responsible for the moral choices he or she makes): still, that the dependency would be relatively far reaching seems beyond doubt when we consider his claim that the customs and behaviour, as well as intellectual capacities can be influenced by the diet²². His ethical writings certainly do not emphasize this aspect of his thought, yet this reticence does not make the inference itself invalid. For all

¹⁹ When considering the Aristotelian contribution to the development and spread of physiognomics, BOYS-STONES (2007: 45) notes: “it is also the case that most later theoretical discussions of physiognomy in the Classical world in particular *depend more or less directly on a reading of Aristotle for their account on how body and soul interact* [emphasis mine] in such a way that physiognomy becomes possible in the first place” (see also his n. 69 for a fascinating list of testimonies).

²⁰ For the complexity of the issue cf. e.g. BOYS-STONES’ (2007: 47–55) discussion of the possible basis of physiognomics as derived from the Aristotelian concept of the soul as form of the body.

²¹ To quote: “For Galen, the psychic life (*dynamis tes psyches*) and the moral life of man (*aretē te psyche*) have some connection with the *krasis* of his body, even if he does not exactly state what this connection actually consists of” (GARCÍA BALLESTER 1988: 129).

²² To quote GARCÍA BALLESTER’S commentary (1972: 101): “Hizo depender la vida moral y todas las manifestaciones psíquicas del hombre del estado del cuerpo, visto este desde los esquemas fisiológicos de la doctrina humoral”; for LLOYD (1988: 28, 40 f.), the dietary claim marks the extent

we know, the dependence of psychic qualities on the physical constitution of the man contributed in the Galenic system to the status of medicine, of which he conceived in terms of the supreme (even if stochastic) science²³. As a consequence, his explanation of soul-maladies was essentially materialistic – the disturbances in the psychic life follow the imbalance of fluids (humours): in fact, as DE LACY rightly stresses, Galen views the rational soul as enslaved to the body. The nature of the body being determined by the mixture of humours, the soul has to deal with the limitations imposed by the *krasis*; moreover, the *ethe* being irrational, they are also related to the specific traits of the three bodily organs, liver, heart and brain, thus being intrinsically connected to the elemental constitution of an individual man²⁴. Yet, he did not feel constrained to give an explanatory account of this happening, delimiting himself to demonstrative proof that once the imbalance was removed, the *psyche* would return to its “sane” state, or that certain dietary regimes were known to provoke defined changes in the behaviour or capacities. The point of particular interest for the present enquiry comes early in the *Quod animi mores* treatise, for Galen begins his exposition by stating that most philosophers agree that diet is capable of influencing human behaviour (Pythagoras and Plato are expressly mentioned in this context²⁵), and continues with what can be easily observed that is, with the differences in the individual preferences of the children, a fact he takes as a proof of the existence of the basic differentiations between the lower sorts of soul (i.e. the two irrational parts of the *psyche*)²⁶. In relating the said differences to the material nature of these two parts of the soul Galen is able to maintain a strict relation between the nature of food, drink and other external influences and the performance of the psychic element: still, what he also maintains, is that the quality of incoming influence would be necessarily reflected on the intellectual qualities of an individual, thereby allowing for the interference with what by Plato’s authority is immortal²⁷.

Yet, the part of major impact for the present purposes, a part allowing for an express link between the soul and the four elements, is the passage occurring in the context of the discussion concerning the Aristotelian doctrine of the soul as the form of the body. It is here that Galen states:

of Galen’s distance from true Aristotelianism, but are also indicative of the true purpose of the work, which is the promotion of medical science.

²³ Cf. GARCÍA-BALLESTER 1988: 129.

²⁴ DE LACY 1988: 56–61.

²⁵ *QAM* 1, p. 768 K.

²⁶ *QAM* 2, pp. 768 f. K.

²⁷ For the record, Galen’s view concerning Plato’s idea of the immortality of the soul in *Quod animi mores* 3, p. 773 K. is hardly different from that expressed in the Middle Platonic work of Alcinous (*Didasc.* 23, p. 176 H.).

καὶ μὴν εἶπερ ἔξ ὕλης τε καὶ εἶδους ἅπαντα συνέστηκε τὰ τοιαῦτα σώματα, δοκεῖ δ' αὐτῷ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει τῶν τεττάρων ποιοτήτων ἐγγιγνομένων τῇ ὕλῃ τὸ φυσικὸν γίγνεσθαι σῶμα, τὴν ἐκ τούτων κρᾶσιν ἀναγκαῖον αὐτοῦ τίθεσθαι τὸ εἶδος, ὥστε πως καὶ ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς οὐσία κρᾶσις τις ἔσται τῶν τεττάρων εἴτε ποιοτήτων ἐθέλεις λέγειν, θερμότητός τε καὶ ψυχρότητος ξηρότητός τε καὶ ὑγρότητος, εἴτε σωμάτων, θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ ξηροῦ τε καὶ ὑγροῦ [τῇ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς οὐσίᾳ τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτῆς δεικνύναι ἐπομένας, εἴ γε καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας]. (*QAM* 3, p. 774 K. = p. 37, 16–26 M.)²⁸

One certainly recognizes here the two oppositions so prominent in Ptolemy's astrology: now, starting from these premises Galen shall argue that the mixture of the four above mentioned qualities is decisive in the formation of psychic characteristics of the individual, including the rational soul as material and physically located in the *encephalum*, possibly identical with the "humoural complexion":

εἰ μὲν οὖν τὸ λογιζόμενον εἶδος τῆς ψυχῆς ἔστι, θνητὸν ἔσται, <καὶ γὰρ> αὐτὸ || κρᾶσις τις ἐγκεφάλου (*QAM* 3, p. 774 f. K. = p. 37, 26 f. M.)²⁹

While this admission locates him in radical opposition to Plato, who – at least for the Middle Platonists – maintained the strict immateriality of rational soul, Galen refuses to enter ontological polemics with the doctrine of either the *Phaedrus* or the *Phaedo*³⁰: instead, he advances several common-sense and observation-derived arguments intended to weaken "immortality" thesis – namely, he stresses that elemental (qualitative) changes in the body may result in the removal of the soul (death) – should there be no interference, the soul would remain within the body even should the loss of liquid (blood) make it dry, or the surplus of heat (fever) too hot. What he also notes, is that the performance of intellectual faculties may be in fact dependent on the state of the body: thus, excess of heat is manifestly damaging to the human intelligence, being productive of *delirium*, while sadness and other afflictions of the soul may easily be

²⁸ "Todos los cuerpos están constituídos por la materia y la forma; (ahora bien) el mismo Aristóteles enseña que la complexión corporal se origina de las cuatro cualidades que se encuentran en la materia de los (cuerpos) naturales, necesariamente también la forma; *de modo que la mezcla, bien de las cuatro cualidades, humedad, sequedad, frialdad y calor; bien de los cuatro cuerpos (o elementos), lo húmedo, lo cálido, lo frío y lo seco*" (trans. by GARCÍA BALLESTER 1972: 37 f., emphasis mine).

²⁹ "Ya hemos visto que las facultades de alma así como también los actos, son consecuencia de la substancia del alma. Si (el alma) racional es una especie del alma, será mortal. Será una cierta complexión humoral del encéfalo" (trans. by GARCÍA BALLESTER 1972: 38).

³⁰ The *Phaedrus*, a dialogue of considerable influence in Middle Platonic thought (one may invoke the fairly frequent references in Alcinoüs' *Didascalicus*), contains the famous exposition of the nature of the soul as the self-moving, and thereby immortal and immaterial element. Meanwhile, the central argument of the *Phaedo* relies on the incorporeal state as the natural status of the soul. It seems noteworthy that Galen himself had employed the *Phaedrus* in *De plac. Hipp. et Plat.* IX (cf. Rocca 2006) which makes it exceedingly unlikely he would remain unaware of the complexity of philosophical issue related to the issue of corporeality of the soul.

assuaged by wine³¹. In fact, the humoural imbalance results in afflictions that can only be described as psychic, a regularity Galen could note on basis of repeated observations:

πολλὰ ζητήσας οὐχ εὔρον ὥσπερ γ' οὐδὲ διὰ τί χολῆς μὲν ξανθῆς || ἐν ἐγκεφάλου πλεοναζούσης εἰς παραφροσύνην ἐλκόμεθα, διὰ τί δὲ τῆς μελαίνης εἰς μελαγχολίαν, διὰ τί δὲ τὸ φλέγμα καὶ ὅλως τὰ ψυκτικὰ παραίτια ληθάργων, ἐξ ὧν καὶ μνήμης καὶ συνέσεως βλάβαις ἀλισκόμεθα, καὶ μέντοι καὶ διὰ τί μωρίαν [αὐτήν] ἐργάζεται κώνειον ποθέν κτλ. (*QAM* 3, p. 776 f. K. = p. 39, 12–18 M.)

It is worth stressing that the deadliness of poison relies in its being endowed with the quality of cold – it affects the body (causing paralysis) and then, proceeds to destroy the abilities that make an individual a member of humankind, that is memory and understanding.

Thus, two points are to be noted in Galen's approach: first, he does regard the interrelation self-evident and therefore, second, he does not support his theory with explanatory proof, except for one that stems from observation and experience – this is hardly the logical proof similar to Plato's analysis in the *Phaedrus* and repeated in the Middle Platonic sources as an example of dialectical proof³². This is very much what Ptolemy does: he gives the account of certain regularities observable in the world and then, without extensive investigation of the ontological complexities (such as the possible corporeality of the soul, the possibility of the soul being both incorporeal and affected by the material/physical circumstances), assumes that these are causally connected; in other words, he produces a description rather than apodeictic proof.

Apart from the psychological writings of the second century medicine (the writings that were to prove quite influential in the further development of Aristotelian and Platonic doctrine³³), there is yet another lore that would make Ptolemy's theory even more acceptable for his contemporaries, namely physiognomy. As it may be inferred from the sources, the second century witnessed considerable development of this particular *technē*, which gained several influential supporters, among others the sophist Polemo, whose work on the subject was to have considerable impact on its survival and success³⁴. Among the basic premises of the lore he numbers the assumption that the qualities of the soul are reflected in the

³¹ Interestingly, Galen relies on the Homeric reference for this argument (*QAM* 3, p. 777 f.).

³² Cf. Alcinous, *Didasc.* 5, p. 157 H.

³³ Cf. DONINI 1970/1971 or TODD 1977. For the overlapping nature of the Platonic and the Aristotelian notions cf. CORRIGAN 2007.

³⁴ The physiognomy manual survives under his name in two versions (the so called *Leiden* and *Istanbul Polemos*), both published in SWAIN 2007, by R. HOYLAND (pp. 329 ff.) and A. GHERSETTI (pp. 465 ff.) respectively. Interestingly, it is through his contribution to physiognomics that Polemo is recognized in the Islamic culture, cf. GHERSETTI, SWAIN 2007: 309.

form of the body and thereby the internal can be inferred from external features. The principal focus would necessarily be on the head, yet the evaluation, as it can be inferred from the surviving fragments, would take into account also the more general characteristics, such as height, bone structure, colouring, etc.³⁵. And, certainly, a fact witnessed not only by Polemo's interest, but also by some fascinating remarks made by Artemidorus in his *Onirocritica*³⁶, the lore (and hence, by implication, its principles) would not be alien to the educated strata of Graeco-Roman society. Had it been like this, Ptolemy's assumption that the elements which, as it was proven, influence the formation of body, do also shape the soul endowing it with what for lack of more precise term may be termed *hexeis*, dispositions or proclivities, would sound perfectly reasonable to a considerable part of his contemporaries. It is quite symptomatic that the example of an adequate i.e. true prognosis which is rendered invalid by the practice of philosophy as employed by Alexander of Aphrodisias is the story of the physiognomist Zopyrus³⁷: in this story, Socrates is an exception from the otherwise predominant rule. Hence, the inborn nature, the *physis* given, at least to some extent *a priori*, would be considered – even by the Peripatetics – decisive in the ethical development of man. This *physis*, understood in the terms of the positive exposition of *De fato* 2–6, implies, among other things, certain consistency and, hence, continuity, being also equated with *heimarmene*. The point is that by treating the human *ethos* as something given, even (at least to some extent) inborn, the theory facilitates the assumption that the psychic characteristics would be in a way inborn and thereby (in virtue of the teleological character of universal nature) related to the body structure³⁸.

Thus, in Galenic medicine and the fundamental principles of the lore of physiognomics we encounter the same underlying assumption: the soul is closely related to the body, its qualities being appropriately linked to the qualities of the body it inhabits. Whether we conceive of the body as reflecting or as influencing the soul, the connection would be indisputable: and it is upon this basic principle, a concept entrenched in the common imagination that Ptolemy will rely in his

³⁵ It is neither the place nor the moment to discuss the more advanced tenets of physiognomics, its development or influence: for the historical account cf. BOYS-STONES 2007: 19–124, which largely improves on the older study of EVANS (1969).

³⁶ Far from supporting Polemo with his ambitions for the town of Smyrna, Artemidorus, an Ephesene, ridiculed physiognomy claiming that a prophecy received in dream from a representative of this particular profession was untrustworthy and necessarily fallible, as the whole race of physiognomists; by contrast, true prophecies would be given by gods, animals and dead people or young children (on the polemic cf. PACK 1941).

³⁷ For his rendition of the story, see *De fato* 6, p. 171, 9–17. The story in all likelihood originates with the Socratic writer Phaedo (of Elis), for whom cf. ROSETTI 1973 and 1980.

³⁸ Relations between the *Tetrabiblos* and Alexander of Aphrodisias were studied by FAZZO 1988; while one may hesitate to accept her conclusions as they are formulated in the work, there remains a detectable link between two authors, certain community of concepts that allows us to invoke the peripatetic example at this point.

exposition, his point being manifest to the contemporaries even without making recourse to intricate metaphysical debates: and strikingly, this is hardly the only place where Ptolemy makes a recourse to a common notion. What can be noted, though, is his apparent lack of concern for the proof, which may actually be taken to provide some additional support for the immediacy and popularity of the underlying principle: what Ptolemy does instead of entering the extensive discussion on the influence, its mechanics and extent, is to remind his reader of the basic associations and then, to move to the description of the inhabited world (human universe) as this latter can be produced on the terms of astrology. Yet, characteristically, in basing his argument on theory that qualities of the soul are in some manner dependent on the physical *krasis*, he does not stray from the scientific research of his time: instead, his theories display strikingly close parallels with both medicine and physiognomy, each of these having a profound claim for scientific status (even should we claim that in the case of physiognomics this claim would rest upon the authority of Aristotle alone³⁹).

To summarize: it is highly likely that the first chorographical chapter of the *Tetrabiblos*, the II 2, far from being superfluous, is introduced with a precise purpose of introducing the idea of stellar bodies influencing the soul dispositions. That Ptolemy starts with the investigation of groups rather than individuals is easily understandable in light of his expository sequence, and the importance of the book is certainly not to be forgotten in the forthcoming parts of the work. The “Hippocratic” frame will be seen as a background against which is to be considered the individual birth, with its complex and overlapping planetary and stellar influences. But the principle remains the same, being grounded in the assumption that the soul acquires its properties from the outside world in the manner much similar to that of the body.

Pedagogical University, Kraków

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARKER 2000: A. BARKER, *Scientific Method in Ptolemy's Harmonics*, Cambridge 2000.
 BOLL 1894: F. BOLL, *Studien über Claudius Ptolemäus*, Leipzig 1894.
 BOYS-STONES 2007: G.R. BOYS-STONES, *Physiognomy and Ancient Philosophical Theory*, in: SWAIN 2007, pp. 19–124.
 CORRIGAN 2007: K. CORRIGAN, *The Organization of the Soul: Some Overlooked Aspects of Interpretation from Plato to Late Antiquity*, in: S. STERN-GILLET, K. CORRIGAN (eds.) *Reading Ancient Texts. Essays in Honour of Denys O'Brien*, vol. II: *Aristotle and Neoplatonism*, Leiden 2007, pp. 99–113.
 DE LACY 1988: Ph. DE LACY, *The Third Part of the Soul*, in: MANULI, VEGETTI 1988, pp. 43–63.

³⁹ Cf. for medicine FAZZO 1991. For physiognomics compare BOYS-STONES 2007: 44–75.

- DONINI 1970/1971: P.L. DONINI, *L'anima e gli elementi nel de anima di Alessandro di Afrodisia*, AAT CV 1970/1971, pp. 67–107.
- EVANS 1969: E.C. EVANS, *Physiognomics in the Ancient World*, Philadelphia 1969 (TAPhS 59/5).
- FAZZO 1988: S. FAZZO, *Alessandro di Afrodisia e Tolomeo: Aristotelismo e astrologia fra il II e il III secolo d.C.*, RSF XLIII 1988, pp. 627–649.
- 1991: *Un arte inconfutabile: la difesa dell'astrologia nella "Tetrabiblos" di Tolomeo*, RSF XLVI 1991, pp. 213–244.
- GARCÍA-BALLESTER 1972: A. GARCÍA-BALLESTER, *Alma y enfermedad en la obra de Galeno. Traducción y comentario del escrito "Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequuntur"*, Cuadernos hispánicos de historia de la medicina y de la ciencia, XII ser. A, 1972.
- 1988: *Soul and Body, Disease of the Soul and Disease of the Body in Galen's Medical Thought*, in: MANULI, VEGETTI 1988, pp. 115–152.
- GHERSETTI, SWAIN 2007: A. GHERSETTI, S. SWAIN, *Polemon's "Physiology" in the Arabic Tradition*, in: SWAIN 2007, pp. 309–325.
- GIANNANTONI 1994: G. GIANNANTONI, *Criticò Carneade l'astrologia stoica?*, Elenchos XV 1994, pp. 201–218.
- HÜBNER 1984: W. HÜBNER, *Manilius als Astrologe und Dichter*, ANRW II 32.1 (1984), pp. 126–320.
- JOUANNA 1996: F. JOUANNA, *Hippocrate: Airs, eaux, lieux*, Paris 1996.
- KOMOROWSKA 2003: J. KOMOROWSKA, *Hephaestio of Thebes and the Proems of Apotelesmatica*, Mene III 2003, pp. 163–183.
- 2004: *Vettius Valens of Antioch: an Intellectual Monography*, Kraków 2004.
- LLOYD 1988: G.E.R. LLOYD, *Scholarship, Authority and Argument in Galen's "Quod Animi Mores"*, in: MANULI, VEGETTI 1988, pp. 11–42.
- MANULI, VEGETTI 1988: P. MANULI, M. VEGETTI (eds.), *Le opere psicologiche di Galeno*, Napoli 1988.
- MIGNUCCI 1981: M. MIGNUCCI, *Ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ et nécessaire dans la conception aristotélicienne de la science*, in: E. BERTI (ed.), *Aristotle on Science: The Posterior Analytics. Proceedings of the Eighth Symposium Aristotelicum Held in Padua from September 7 to 15, 1978*, Padova 1981, pp. 173–203.
- PACK 1941: R.A. PACK, *Artemidorus and the Physiognomists*, TAPhA LXXII 1941, pp. 321–334.
- ROCCA 2006: J. ROCCA, *Plato Will Tell You: Galen's Use of the "Phaedrus" in "De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis" IX*, in: H. TARRANT, D. BALTZLY (eds.), *Reading Plato in Antiquity*, London 2006, pp. 49–60.
- ROSETTI 1973: L. ROSETTI, *"Socratica" in Fedone di Elide*, Studi Urbinati di Storia, Filosofia e Letteratura XLVII 1973, pp. 364–381.
- 1980: *Ricerche sui "Dialoghi socratici" di Fedone e di Euclide*, Hermes CVIII 1980, pp. 183–200.
- STASZAK 1995: J.F. STASZAK, *Géographie avant de la géographie: le climat chez Aristote et Hippocrate*, Paris 1995.
- SWAIN 2007: S. SWAIN (ed.), *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul. Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, Oxford 2007.
- TAUB 1993: L. TAUB, *Ptolemy's Universe. The natural Philosophical and Ethical Foundations of Ptolemy's Astronomy*, Chicago 1993.
- TODD 1977: R.B. TODD, *Galenic Medical Ideas in Greek Aristotelian Commentators*, SO LII 1977, pp. 117–134.

TWO ETYMOLOGICAL CLUSTERS IN APULEIUS

By

NEIL ADKIN

ABSTRACT: The present article endeavours to show that Apuleius' use of etymology in the *Metamorphoses* is more sophisticated than NICOLINI's recent study of the subject would lead one to believe.

At the very beginning of his *chef-d'œuvre* Apuleius presents the following tricolon of *adynata*: “*amnes agiles reverti, mare pigrum conligari, ventos inanimis exspirare*” (*Met.* I 3, 1)¹. This text has recently been the object of much attention in the fine study devoted by Lara NICOLINI to etymological wordplay in Apuleius². NICOLINI gives particular consideration to the third and final element of the triad: “*ventos inanimis exspirare*”. Here the new and amplitudinous commentary by Wytse KEULEN explains *inanimis* as *non flans*³. This interpretation of *inanimis* as simply *non flans* is however inadequate. NICOLINI rightly maintains that here the meaning of *inanimis* is in fact *non ventus*. The argument may be set out more fully than is done in her study. The Greek equivalent of *ventus* was ἄνεμος⁴, which was regarded as the etymon of *animus* and *anima*⁵, from which in turn *inanimus(-is)* was derived⁶. Apuleius' *ventos inanimis* accordingly entails a species of etymological oxymoron⁷.

¹ Citation follows *OCD*³ (pp. XXIX–LIV: “Authors and Books”); material not found there is cited according to *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum*, Leipzig² 1990, and its online *Addenda* at <http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/pdf/addenda.pdf> (updated Dec. 2010).

² NICOLINI 2011: 73–77. For the book's merits cf. the review by ADKIN forthcoming (a).

³ KEULEN 2007: 118. This explanation goes back to a Latinist as distinguished as Otto PRINZ, founder and *langjähriger Generalredaktor* of *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*; cf. his article on *inanimus(-is)* in *ThLL* VII 1, col. 820, 8 f.

⁴ Cf. LOEWE, GOETZ 1901: 401.

⁵ Cf. MALTBY 1991: 36 f. For additions to his documentation cf. ADKIN 2005: 76; ADKIN 2008b: 262; ADKIN 2009a: 174.

⁶ Cf. ADKIN 2005: 83.

⁷ For similar but subtler etymological play on the Greek equivalent of a Latin word cf. ADKIN 2010a: 9 f., where it is argued that in *Ecl.* 1, 59 (“ante leves ergo pascentur in aethere cervi”) *levis* is

The first element in this Apuleian tricolon is likewise regarded by NICOLINI as involving a *jeu étymologique*: “*amnes agiles reverti*”. Here she maintains that *agilis* is being employed in an etymological sense: the epithet is accordingly taken to signify “che si lascia (re)spingere”. It may however be remarked that Apuleius’ noun *amnis* was etymologized from *ambitus*⁸. The implication of *ambitus* is an unhurried circuitousness⁹. It would accordingly appear that this “unhurriedness” is here being glossed antiphrastically by the deliberate use of *agilis*, which bears the opposing sense of “energetic”¹⁰: these rambling rivers make a beeline back. Numerous synonyms for *amnis* were available¹¹. Similarly Apuleius could easily have employed an adjective that just meant “fast”: significantly he does not¹². *Agilis* is not applied to *amnis* elsewhere¹³. It would seem therefore that here Apuleius’ choice of language evinces an etymological sensibility that is finer than NICOLINI supposes.

If then the first as well as the third and last item in this tricolon involves etymology, it would not be surprising if the second and central one were to exhibit the same feature: “*mare pigrum conligari*”. *Mare* was etymologized *a meando*¹⁴. Here “movement”¹⁵ is evidently being glossed antiphrastically by ensuing *piger*, which again means the opposite: “motionless”¹⁶. Here the “moving” sea accordingly lacks its etymological *raison d’être*: motion. A final point may be made about this tricolon. If in its first two units the etymon of the noun itself is at issue (*amnis*, *mare*), such is likewise to be expected with the third noun: *ventus*. This noun was etymologized from *vis*¹⁷, which was in turn the etymon of *vita*¹⁸: *vita privatus* is the gloss of NICOLINI herself on ensuing *inanimes*¹⁹. In all three units

being used as the equivalent of ἐλαφρός, which in turn serves as the etymon of ἔλαφος, which is in turn the Greek equivalent of *cervus*.

⁸ Cf. MALTBY 1991: 30. For additional documentation cf. ADKIN 2005: 76; ADKIN 2010b: 34.

⁹ Cf. ADKIN 2010c: 208.

¹⁰ So OLD, p. 84 s.v. *agilis* (sect. 3).

¹¹ Cf. *ThLL* I, col. 1951, 18 f. s.v. *amnis*.

¹² Two recent translations accordingly turn out to be wrong: KEULEN 2007: 115 (“currents are swiftly reversed”); SERS 2007: 3 (“on fait couler les torrents à l’envers”).

¹³ Cf. *ThLL* I, col. 1946, 77 s.v. *amnis*.

¹⁴ Cf. MALTBY 1991: 368.

¹⁵ So OLD, p. 1087 s.v. *meatus* (sect. 1).

¹⁶ So OLD, p. 1378 s.v. *piger* (sect. 2b). Cf. also MALTBY 1991: 474, where *piger* itself is etymologized as *pedibus aeger*.

¹⁷ Cf. MALTBY 1991: 635.

¹⁸ Cf. MALTBY 1991: 649.

¹⁹ Here a negative adjective derived from *vita* itself was unavailable. Since Apuleius’ readers were taught to linger over such prose (cf. Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 19), they will have picked up the allusion to “suppressed” *vita* as well as the learned play on the Greek equivalent of *ventus* in this polyvalent text. On such “suppression” as an etymological technique cf. O’HARA 1996: 79–82.

of this tricolon the epithet accordingly provides an antiphrastic gloss on the etymon of the foregoing noun. Such triple antiphrasis enhances the triple *adynaton* considerably. The use of etymology in this tricolon to determine both *lexis* and *exempla* would accordingly seem to reveal Apuleius as a more adventurous and accomplished *artiste étymologique* than NICOLINI's recent study suggests. The result is also a very fine specimen of an etymological "cluster"²⁰.

A second such etymological cluster would also seem to occur in the passage which NICOLINI proceeds to discuss next²¹. Here Psyche is addressed by a reed, whose speech is introduced as follows: "musicae suavis nutricula leni crepitu dulcis aurae divinitus inspirata sic vaticinatur harundo viridis" (*Met.* VI 12, 1). This time the only word to engage NICOLINI's interest is the participle *inspirata*, in which she duly finds wordplay on the "ispirazione del dio" and the "spirare del vento". It would seem however that both the verb and the adjective which are placed immediately after this participle and which qualify the reed call for comment as well: *vaticinatur* and *viridis*. Since *viridis* is located in emphatically final position in this sentence, the word is given considerable prominence. It is therefore noteworthy that the big new Groningen commentary on this passage should characterize the use of *viridis* here as "superfluous"²². In its note on *vaticinatur* the same commentary qualifies this verb as "rare"²³. In the same connection the Groningen commentators are moreover forced to acknowledge that what the reed says is "not [...] a proper prophecy". They accordingly surmise that here Apuleius' choice of *vaticinor* is due to this verb's "etymological connection with *cano*". It would however seem possible to show that in this passage Apuleius' use of etymology is rather more subtle.

Vis was not only held to be the etymon of *ventus*²⁴. Both *vates* and *viridis* were likewise etymologized from *vis*²⁵. Though Apuleius is here talking specifically about "wind" (cf. *inspirata*), the term *ventus* itself is nonetheless conspicuous by its total absence from this clause²⁶. In the present text of Apuleius on the other hand *ventus* is replaced by a studied circumlocution that occupies the first half

²⁰ For the term cf. O'HARA 1996: 92.

²¹ NICOLINI 2011: 78 f.

²² ZIMMERMAN *et al.* 2004: 455. No further instance of the application of *viridis* to *harundo* is provided by *ThLL* VI 3, col. 2544, 47 s.v. *harundo*.

²³ ZIMMERMAN *et al.* 2004: 455. A substantial list of available alternatives to *vaticinor* is conveniently assembled in *ThLL* V 1, 2, col. 1618, 37 f. s.v. *divino*. For additions cf. *ThLL* X 2, col. 569, 40–56 s.v. *praedico*.

²⁴ Cf. n. 17 above.

²⁵ Cf. MALTBY 1991: 631; 648. For supplementary evidence of *vates* as a derivative of *vis* cf. ADKIN 2010d: 491. For Virgilian exploitation of *vis* as etymon of *viridis* cf. ADKIN forthcoming (b).

²⁶ The article on *inspiro* in *ThLL* (VII 1, col. 1962, 31–33) cites only one other example of this particular use of the verb in connection with a reed. It is therefore significant that in the passage at issue (Auson. 416, 20 p. 283 PEIPER) *ventus* does find employment: "inspirata [...] vento".

of the clause²⁷: here a symmetrical sequence of three epithets separated by two intervenient nouns all stress the notion of “gentleness”, which is diametrically opposed to *vis*. This adjectival trio opens with *suavis*, which is exactly homophonic with *sua vis*: hence this epithet naturally invites etymologization as “its own strength”²⁸. It might accordingly seem that here Apuleius wishes to imply that this reed which is surprisingly qualified as both *vates* and *viridis* thereby possesses a *vis* “of its own”: hence it does not need the *vis* of *ventus*²⁹.

Vis as etymon is again at issue in the very next sentence, which is the first one of the reed’s speech. Here the subject is sheep: “nec vero istud horae contra formidabiles oves feras aditum, quoad de solis flagrantia mutuatae calorem truci rabie solent efferi” (*Met.* VI 12, 2 f.). Recently it has been argued that *ovis* was etymologized as ο(ῦ) (Ϝ)ίς, i.e. *non vis*³⁰. Apuleius’ own use of *ovis* in conjunction with *formidabilis* is accordingly another case of etymological oxymoron: *formidabiles oves*. The oxymoronic effect is increased by ensuing *feras*: “formidabiles oves feras”. Here *feras* is ambiguous. At first the word appears to be a further synonymous epithet qualifying *oves*. In fact however *feras* is here a verb going with the *aditum* that comes next. This ambiguity is evidently deliberate. *Feras aditum* is an oddly periphrastic locution, in which the verb might moreover have been expected to follow the noun, if only to avoid the ambiguity³¹. Such ambiguity was however regarded as clever³². Here the “cleverness” is all the greater, since *ferus* was etymologized from *ferre*³³. This Apuleian ambiguity between *ferus* and *ferre* would seem furthermore to shed light on a textual problem at the end of the

²⁷ Such treatment of *ventus* accordingly constitutes a species of “suppression”; cf. n. 19 above.

²⁸ On indifference to vocalic quantity in classical etymologizing cf. O’HARA 1996: 61 f. Besides morphology (*sua vis*) such an etymology is also semantically apt. *Suavis* is used “oft. as a vague adj. of commendation, ‘nice’” (so *OLD*, p. 1833 s.v. [sect. 5]). Such “strength of one’s own” is naturally “nice”.

²⁹ A large number of synonymous alternatives to *suavis* was at Apuleius’ disposal; cf. (e.g.) *Synon. Cic.* p. 418, 4–6 BARWICK; p. 426, 33 B.; p. 435, 11 f. B.

³⁰ Cf. ADKIN 2009b, where particular reference is made to the *infirmas ovis* of Hor. *Epod.* 2, 16. This notorious crux would seem to be remedied by the etymology.

³¹ On the desirability of putting a verb at the end cf. (e.g.) Quint. *Inst.* IX 4, 26. In the present passage clausal considerations are not at issue; cf. BERNHARD 1927: 250 f.

³² Cf. Cic. *De or.* II 253: “ambigua sunt in primis acuta”.

³³ Cf. MALTBY 1991: 230. For additional evidence cf. ADKIN 2010d: 479. It will be argued elsewhere that Virgil himself is evoking this etymology at *Aen.* IX 551–553 (“ut fera, quae [...] / [...] / [...] saltu supra venabula fertur”), where DINGEL 1997: 208 is troubled by the unspecificness of *fera* and by the death-doomed creature’s apparent escape: both are however explained by the etymological *jeu*. In *Aen.* XI 594 (*inspoliata feram*) Virgil would moreover appear to be exploiting the same ambiguity between *ferus* and *ferre* that is found in the present passage of Apuleius; cf. ADKIN forthcoming (c), where it is argued that *inspoliata feram* means both “I shall bear (the body) unspoiled” and “(the body) unspoiled with respect to the animal-skin”.

sentence quoted at the start of this paragraph. Here some editors change *efferrī* to *efferrī*³⁴. The emendation would seem however to be unwarranted: since a clever *ambiguū* has just qualified these sheep as *ferae*, it would be pointless to add that they “become *ferae*”. The Apuleian *efferrī* would seem on the contrary to be meant as a subtle gloss on the particular sense in which *ferre* serves as etymon of *fera*. Hence *efferrī* should certainly not be emended away as “colourless”³⁵.

One final passage would seem to merit scrutiny in connection with *vis* as etymon. Just as the first text to be examined in the present article came from the very beginning of the *Metamorphoses*, so this one comes from the very end. Like the first passage, it too concerns *ventus*. The antepenultimate paragraph of the entire work contains the phrase “*spiritu faventis Eventus*” (*Met.* XI 28, 6). In this use of *spiritus* NICOLINI detects the same play on “*afflato divino*” and “*soffio del vento*” as in the employment of *inspirata* with reference to the reed in the passage discussed above³⁶. In *Eventus* NICOLINI also finds a “paronomastic” allusion to *ventus*. Here it is possible to be more precise: *eventus* and *ventus* are in fact linked by etymology. *Eventus* was etymologized from *venio*³⁷, while *venio* was in turn regarded as an alternative to *vis* as etymon of *ventus*³⁸.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADKIN 2005: N. ADKIN, *Some Additions to Maltby's Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, in: C. DEROUX (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XII*, Bruxelles 2005 (Collection Latomus 288), pp. 74–96.
- 2008a: *Supplements to Marangoni's Supplementum Etymologicum: The Commentators on Terence*, *Eos* XCV 2008, pp. 183–200.
- 2008b: *Further Supplements to Marangoni's Supplementum Etymologicum: The Commentators on Horace*, *InvLuc* XXX 2008, pp. 261–277.
- 2009a: *Further Supplements to Marangoni's Supplementum Etymologicum: The Scholia to Persius and Juvenal*, *BStudLat* XXXIX 2009, pp. 173–182.
- 2009b: *Horace's Weak Sheep: Etymologizing in Epode 2, 16*, *InvLuc* XXXI 2009, pp. 7 f.
- 2010a: *Harts and Hedges: Further Etymologizing in Virgil's First Eclogue*, *Arctos* XLIV 2010, pp. 9–23.

³⁴ For a conspectus cf. ZIMMERMAN *et al.* 2004: 456 f.

³⁵ So KENNEY 1990: 206.

³⁶ NICOLINI 2011: 122.

³⁷ Cf. ADKIN 2005: 80; ADKIN 2008a: 188.

³⁸ Cf. ADKIN forthcoming (d), where it is argued that attempts to eliminate *venistis* at *Aen.* II 117 are proved wrong by the etymology of *ventus* from *venio*. The point is also made that Virgil is evidently poking fun at *vis* as the etymon of *ventus* in *Aen.* I 69 (*incute vim ventis*), since here what is supposed etymologically to be an intrinsic attribute of the winds (*vis*) has to be specially knocked into them.

- 2010b: *More Additions to Maltby's Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies and Marangoni's Supplementum Etymologicum: The Scholia to Lucan*, *Classica et Christiana* V 1, 2010, pp. 31–76.
- 2010c: *The Etymology of amnis in Horace's Ars Poetica*, *AClass* LIII 2010, pp. 207–209.
- 2010d: *Further Supplements to Marangoni's Supplementum Etymologicum: Servius and Servius Auctus on Virgil*, in: C. DEROUX (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* XV, Bruxelles 2010 (Collection Latomus 323), pp. 473–491.
- forthcoming (a): [review of:] NICOLINI 2011, forthcoming in *Latomus*.
- forthcoming (b): *Further Virgilian Etymologizing: Privernum and Privernus*, forthcoming in *InvLuc*.
- forthcoming (c): *Virgil and the Etymology of "Tiger"*, forthcoming in: C. DEROUX (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* XVI.
- forthcoming (d): *Virgil, Aeneid II 116–121: An Etymological "Cluster"*, forthcoming in *BStudLat*.
- BERNHARD 1927: M. BERNHARD, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura*, Stuttgart 1927, repr. Amsterdam 1965 (*Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 2).
- DINGEL 1997: J. DINGEL, *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils*, Heidelberg 1997.
- KENNEY 1990: E.J. KENNEY, *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche*, Cambridge 1990, repr. 2001.
- KEULEN 2007: W.H. KEULEN, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses, Book I*, Groningen 2007.
- LOEWE, GOETZ 1901: G. LOEWE, G. GOETZ, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* VII, Leipzig 1901, repr. Amsterdam 1985.
- MALTBY 1991: R. MALTBY, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991, repr. Cambridge 2006 (ARCA 25).
- NICOLINI 2011: L. NICOLINI, *Ad (I)usum lectoris: Etimologia e giochi di parole in Apuleio*, Bologna 2011 (*Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del Latino*, N.S. 117).
- O'HARA 1996: J.J. O'HARA, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 1996.
- SERS 2007: O. SERS, *Apulée: Les Métamorphoses ou l'Âne d'or*, Paris 2007.
- ZIMMERMAN *et al.* 2004: M. ZIMMERMAN, S. PANAYOTAKIS, V.C. HUNINK, W.H. KEULEN, S.J. HARRISON, T.D. MCCREIGHT, B. WESSELING, D. VAN MAL-MAEDER, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses, Books IV 28–35, V and VI 1–24, The Tale of Cupid and Psyche*, Groningen 2004.

WANDA, AMAZONE SARMATE DANS LA POÉSIE LATINE
DE LA RENAISSANCE EN POLOGNE

Par

MARIA ŁUKASZEWICZ-CHANTRY

On trouve parmi les anciens monarques polonais une femme, Wanda, fille de Cracus, valeureuse vierge «roi» et Amazone sarmate. Comme le veut la légende, Wanda refusa de prendre en mariage un prince allemand, et quand celui-ci envahit le royaume de Pologne, elle le vainquit en un combat acharné, puis, étonnamment, se jeta dans les eaux de la Vistule. Dans les siècles suivants, son personnage a inspiré les poètes et écrivains, mais aussi les compositeurs et les peintres¹.

Les chroniques les plus anciennes parlent déjà de Wanda. Le premier à la mentionner est Vincent Kadłubek, à la charnière des XII^e et XIII^e s.². Selon lui, Wanda régna sur les Lechites après la mort de Cracus, lorsque son frère fut écarté du pouvoir pour fratricide. Elle endossa donc des responsabilités masculines à un moment où il manquait d'hommes pour les assumer, et s'en sortit très bien. Pendant son règne, elle fit preuve de justice et de sagesse. Attaquée par un *quidam Lemanorum tyrannus*, elle commanda elle-même son armée. Comme un soleil, sa majesté éblouit ses ennemis et les força à se replier. Ainsi, selon Kadłubek, sa force ne reposait-elle pas sur ses armes et son combat, mais sur l'apparence même de sa personne. On ne trouve pas mention chez cet auteur de l'amour ni du suicide de Wanda dont les autres chroniqueurs parleront par la suite. La version la plus connue de sa légende nous a été transmise dans les *Annales* de Jean Długosz, qui signale également le nom du prince allemand, Rithogarus³.

¹ Cf. MORTKOWICZÓWNA 1927. MAŚLANKA 1984: passim.

² W. Kadłubek, *Chronica Polonorum* I 7, 2–5.

³ J. Długosz, *Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloni. Liber I–II*, éd. J. DĄBROWSKI, Warszawa 1964, p. 129 suiv. – Diverses versions de la légende de Wanda racontée dans les chroniques sont présentées entre autres par ULEWICZ 2006: 35–38; PLEZIA 2001: 348–352; KUMANIECKI 1925/1926: 46–55.

Wanda apparaît aussi comme héroïne dans la poésie néo-latine de la Renaissance. Quatre poètes polonais ont parlé d'elle: Jean de Wiślica, dans son *Bellum Prutenum*, Clément Janicki dans les *Vitae Polonorum principum*, Jean Kochanowski dans les *Elegiarum libri IV*, et Joachim Bielski dans l'*Istulae convivium. In nuptiis Stephani Primi Regis Poloniae et Principis Annae*, ainsi que deux auteurs étrangers liés à la Pologne: l'Allemand Georgius Sabinus dans *De nuptiis Sigismundi Augusti et Elissae*, et l'Espagnol Petrus Roysius dans deux poèmes, *Hedvigis* et *Ad proceres Polonos de matrimonio regio carmen*⁴. Ces poètes présentent différemment le personnage de Wanda en fonction du genre et des destinataires de leurs œuvres.

Le premier à parler de Wanda est donc Jean de Wiślica, dans son épopée historique *Bellum Prutenum* publiée en 1516 pour commémorer la victoire sur les chevaliers teutoniques à la bataille de Grunwald. Dans le livre premier, il présente l'histoire ancienne de la Pologne et de ses premiers rois, parmi lesquels Wanda (I 168–216). Celle-ci monte sur le trône après la mort de son père Cracus, et par la sagesse de son gouvernement, perpétue sa gloire parmi son peuple. Elle mène aussi une guerre de conquête contre des peuples voisins:

Clarus in omnigeno mundi qui climate nata
 Exstitit, egregius post effera fata superstes,
 Haec quia virgineo moderamine patria rexit
 Iugera, centenos celebris regina per annos,
 Finitimos domitans populos crudelibus armis
 Et iuga celsa vagoque errantia flumine cursu,
 Optima Vanda virago, maris virtute decora,
 Martia Volscorum virgo velut ipsa Camilla,
 Quae Latiis Anchisiaden certamine in arvis
 Pugnantem bello turbabat saepe cruento,
 Aut Tomyris Scythici moderatrix bellica mundi,
 Milia quae Cyri prostravit multa tyranni. (I 168–179)

Conformément à la poétique de l'épopée, Wanda apparaît comme «la meilleure» et se distingue par sa «mâle bravoure». Le narrateur souligne en effet cette bravoure et la considère comme le plus grand attrait de Wanda: il ne dit rien de son apparence. Le mot *virago* employé ici désigne une femme dotée d'un caractère masculin. Rappelons l'explication que Servius donne de ce terme dans son commentaire de l'*Énéide*: «VIRAGO dicitur mulier, quae virile implet officium, id est mulier, quae viri animum habet: has antiqui viras dicebant» (Serv. *ad Aen.* XII 468). Dans l'*Énéide*, dont Jean de Wiślica s'inspire largement, *virago*

⁴ Bartosz Paprocki cite dans *Herby rycerstwa polskiego* (1584) une épitaphe anonyme de Wanda qui se trouvait sur son tertre. Cette épitaphe est en vers léonins, ce qui tendrait à indiquer son origine médiévale (ou une stylisation postérieure), et ses deux premiers vers sont empruntés à l'épitaphe de Rosamund Clifford, maîtresse d'Henri II décédée en 1177: «Hic jacet in tumba rosa mundi, non rosa munda,/ Non redolet sed olet, quae redolere solebat» (dans l'original: *solet*).

n'apparaît qu'une seule fois et se rapporte à Juturne. Cette déesse est ainsi désignée lorsqu'elle prend les rênes du char de Turnus après en avoir éjecté son conducteur Metiscus et pris l'apparence et les armes de ce dernier. Virgile décrit la bravoure avec laquelle Juturne manœuvra le char au milieu des ennemis, au cœur même du combat, pour finalement conduire Turnus en lieu sûr (*Aen.* XII 468–499). Or la *virago* Juturne se présente non seulement comme très courageuse, mais aussi sous la forme d'un homme et agissant comme tel. Rappelons encore que les Anciens employaient le mot *virago* surtout par référence à Minerve et Diane, déesses aux comportements très masculins. Le terme s'est popularisé en Italie pendant la Renaissance, et pour les femmes de cette époque, avait valeur de compliment⁵.

Dans les vers suivants du *Bellum Prutenum*, Wanda est comparée à deux autres personnages épiques de femmes valeureuses, Camille et Tomyris. Wanda se rattache à Camille, héroïne de l'*Énéide*, non seulement par sa bravoure, mais aussi par son origine royale et son souhait de préserver sa virginité. Mais Jean de Wiślica se concentre seulement sur les succès militaires des deux femmes, laissant de côté leurs autres traits communs. Le narrateur évoque le combat acharné de Camille contre les Troyens, que représente ici Énée, même si l'on sait que dans l'*Énéide*, il n'est pas question d'affrontement direct entre Camille et le chef des Troyens. Wanda est donc présentée comme aussi valeureuse que Camille, et l'on pourrait même dire qu'elle surpasse la reine des Volsques, car celle-ci meurt au combat, tandis que la reine des Sarmates demeurera invaincue.

La deuxième femme courageuse à laquelle Wanda est comparée est la fameuse Tomyris, reine des Massagètes qui vainquit Cyrus, roi des Perses. Tomyris fait partie des femmes valeureuses souvent évoquées dans la poésie néo-latine. Mais Wanda, si elle est restée invaincue, s'est malgré tout suicidée. Les raisons de cette mort tragique sont expliquées dans les vers suivants de l'épopée. Wanda s'était résolue à demeurer vierge, mais un prince allemand la poursuivait de ses assiduités. Il finit par la menacer de guerre si elle persistait dans son refus. Wanda se met alors en colère et passe à l'attaque:

Aspernata virum taedasque perosa iugales
Indicat arma proco, pro taedis illa sagittas
Dirigit, indignata viro movet horrida bella. (I 190–192)

Aux torches nuptiales, elle répond par des flèches, se comportant en véritable Amazone. Elle vainc son prétendant et, après la victoire, reçoit une couronne de laurier. Pourtant, au lieu de continuer à régner et à mener ses guerres victorieuses, elle se jette dans les flots de la Vistule. Cette mort tragique est comparée au suicide de Sappho. Le narrateur essaie de comprendre son acte désespéré:

⁵ BURCKHARDT 1991: 240 suiv.

Sed nimium infelix virgo, e certamine tanto
 Dementata truci quoniam vel religione
 Numine vel seducta dei, velut impia Sappho,
 Leucadio cuius recubant submersa profundo
 Pectora. Taenarium secum passura calorem
 Nam sua flucticolis simili praecordia nymphis
 Morte dedit saliens animosa mente sub undas,
 [...]
 Sic misero occubuit regina miserrima leto. (I 196-202, 205)

Après son combat difficile et sanglant, il se peut que Wanda ait perdu la raison, qu'elle se soit laissée saisir par une sorte de crainte superstitieuse, qu'elle se soit laissée entraîner par une divinité. La comparaison à Sappho souligne le caractère tragique de sa mort, mais on peut s'en étonner malgré tout, car cette dernière s'est jetée dans la mer par désespoir amoureux. Il est difficile de croire que Wanda ait pu au dernier moment ressentir de l'amour pour son ennemi, tel Achille pour Penthésilée mourante. Dans cette comparaison à Sappho, on voit aussi une différence importante dans le jugement porté sur l'acte des deux femmes; il se manifeste dans les épithètes: Sappho est *impia*, Wanda est *nimum infelix*, *miserrima*. Alors que le suicide de Sappho est un acte condamnable, celui de Wanda suscite la pitié⁶. Le narrateur ajoute encore qu'après sa mort, Wanda est glorifiée. Son peuple repêche son corps dans la Vistule et élève un gigantesque tumulus comme tombeau pour sa reine. On peut encore évoquer ici Camille: Diane promet de ramasser son corps sur le champ de bataille et de l'inhumer dans sa terre natale (*Aen.* XI 593 suiv.).

Les épithètes *miserrima*, *nimum infelix*, marquant la pitié et employés pour qualifier Wanda, femme valeureuse et extraordinaire, évoquent encore une autre héroïne de l'*Énéide*, Didon. La reine de Carthage se suicide après avoir été abandonnée par Énée. Mais ce faisant, elle maudit le Troyen et annonce qu'un vengeur naîtra de ses os pour venger le mal qu'il lui a fait. La prophétie de Didon se réalisera pendant les Guerres puniques, lorsqu'Hannibal menacera Rome. De même, on peut interpréter le sort de Wanda comme point de départ de l'hostilité entre Polonais et Allemands. Jean de Wiślica insiste sur le fait que les ambitions matrimoniales et les menaces du chevalier allemand ont finalement poussé la reine au suicide. La guerre contre les chevaliers teutoniques se termine par la victoire de Grunwald qui venge le tort fait à Wanda.

Clément Janicki (Janicius) consacre également à Wanda une épigramme de ses *Vitae Polonorum Principum*⁷:

⁶ GŁOMBIOWSKA (1972: 28) analyse cette différence d'épithètes (*impia* – *infelix*) et de jugements portés sur les suicides de Sappho et de Wanda dans le *Bellum Prutenum*.

⁷ Les *Vitae Polonorum Principum* ont été imprimées en 1563, peu après la mort de Janicius, mais étaient probablement connues précédemment sous la forme de manuscrits.

Conubii ob crebram virgo formosa repulsam
 Teutonici bello Vanda petita ducis
 Hosti concreditur, vincit. Magno ille pudore
 Incumbit gladio se perimitque suo.
 At victrix «mea virginitas sit victima vobis,
 O superi, per quos est mihi sospes» ait.
 «Rotogari effugi thalamos». Sic fata sub alti
 Se fluvii rapidas praecipitavit aquas.
 Bactra Semiramidem, Tomyrin Scythaque ornet, utrique
 Quam meus anteferat laude Polonus habet.
 Aequentur regnis, aequentur Marte licebit,
 Aequare Vandae quae, rogo, morte potest? (*Epigr.* VI)

Wanda est cette fois présentée comme *virgo formosa*. Janicki s'intéresse donc à ses charmes, ce qui n'était pas le cas pour Jean de Wiślica.

Dans le *Bellum Prutenum*, Wanda était comparée à des personnages féminins héroïques de l'Antiquité. Janicki considère cependant que la reine de Pologne les surpasse: Sémiramis et Tomyris lui sont comparables par leur règne et leur courage⁸, mais pas par leur mort. Janicki voit donc le suicide de Wanda comme une manifestation d'héroïsme, et l'interprète autrement que Jean de Wiślica. Les auteurs ont eu du mal à porter un jugement sur ce suicide: fidèles à la pensée chrétienne, ils se sont efforcés de trouver une justification à cet acte désespéré. Dans ses *Annales*, Jean Długosz s'empresse de préciser que Wanda était une païenne et que le suicide était conforme à ses croyances, entachées de l'«erreur» dans laquelle son époque vivait: «errore illius saeculi lapsa, quo tale quid gratum diis arduumque et heroicum facinus putabatur»⁹. Janicki réagit de la même façon, jugeant le suicide de l'héroïne comme une décision conforme à ses croyances.

Rotogarus également se suicide, ce en quoi il se montre semblable aux guerriers romains. Il a été vaincu par une femme, chose que son honneur d'homme et de chevalier ne peut admettre. Comme beaucoup d'autres avant lui, blessé dans son orgueil masculin, il se jette sur son glaive. Le suicide en cas de déshonneur était hautement apprécié dans le monde romain. Ici, on peut encore une fois citer Servius, qui explique que le nom de «Didon» signifie *virago* en langue punique et correspond au courage masculin dont elle a fait preuve en mettant fin à ses jours¹⁰.

⁸ MARCINIAK (2008a: 94) rapporte par erreur à Wanda la phrase «aequentur Marte licebit» et en la traduisant «elle égalait au combat Mars, le dieu de la guerre».

⁹ Długosz, *o.c.* (n. 3), p. 131 suiv.

¹⁰ «DIDO vero nomine Elissa ante dicta est, sed post interitum a Poenis Dido appellata, id est virago Punica lingua, quod cum a suis sociis cogeretur cuicumque de Afris regibus nubere et prioris mariti caritate teneretur, forti se animo et interfecerit et in pyram iecerit, quam se ad expiandos prioris mariti manes extruxisse fingebat» (Serv. *ad Aen* I 340); «et exaedificata pyra se in ignem praecipitavit: ob quam rem Dido, id est virago, quae virile aliquid fecit, appellata est; nam Elissa proprie dicta est» (Serv. *ad Aen* IV 36).

Didon se suicide parce qu'elle est malheureuse après avoir été abandonnée par Énée, mais son acte a été perçu comme viril parce qu'elle a ainsi sauvé son honneur. Wanda est dans une autre situation: elle a vaincu son ennemi. Toutefois, elle est consciente d'avoir remporté sa victoire grâce à l'aide des dieux. C'est grâce à cette victoire qu'elle a préservé sa virginité, ce qu'elle avait de plus précieux, et voilà pourquoi elle s'offre en sacrifice à ses dieux. De la sorte, elle manifeste non seulement sa virilité, mais aussi une fervente piété comparable à celle des martyres chrétiennes qui préféreraient mourir plutôt que de renoncer à leur vœu de chasteté. Cette mort l'élève certainement au dessus de Sémiramis, que Boccace, dans son œuvre célèbre à la Renaissance, présente comme ayant été assassinée par son fils avec qui elle avait eu un rapport incestueux¹¹.

Wanda apparaît encore dans deux épithalames royaux. Le premier a été composé par Georgius Sabinus pour le mariage de Sigismond Auguste et Élisabeth de Habsbourg (1543); le second, beaucoup plus tard, par Joachim Bielski pour le mariage d'Étienne Batory et Anne Jagellon (1576).

De nuptiis Sigismundi Augusti et Elissae est un long épithalame épique. Son action commence dans les flots de la Vistule: Fama se présente à la grotte subaquatique d'Istula, le dieu de la Vistule, pour lui annoncer le mariage royal. Istula convoque les nymphes et les naïades et leur ordonne de préparer comme cadeau pour les époux une somptueuse tapisserie représentant l'histoire de Pologne. La description de cette tapisserie occupe la majeure partie de l'épithalame, tout comme dans l'épyllion de Catulle pour les noces de Thétis et Pélée (*Carm.* 64). Dans l'ekphrasis de Sabinus, conformément à la convention épique et étant donné le haut rang des destinataires de l'œuvre, l'auteur présente tout le long cortège des rois de Pologne depuis Lech jusque Sigismond Auguste. Parmi les rois, on trouve Wanda, fille de Cracus, appelé ici Gracchus. Comme le prétendait déjà le chroniqueur Kadłubek, c'était un Romain d'origine qui avait dû fuir son pays et se réfugier au Nord. Sabinus rattache Cracus à la haute histoire de Rome, au règne du quatrième roi Ancus Martius. Comme au Moyen Âge, pendant la Renaissance encore, on s'efforçait de donner du panache à son histoire nationale en lui trouvant des ancêtres dans l'Antiquité¹². Wanda y gagne ainsi une lignée prestigieuse.

Wanda monte sur le trône après Lech II qui s'est discrédité par un fratricide:

... Subit scelerato Wanda tyranno,
 Quae cum mille procis, quod erat formosa, placeret.
 Innuba virgo tamen casti sine labe pudoris
 Mansit et aetatis ver intemerata peregit.
 At non femineis calathis, non dedita molli
 Illa fuit lanae, duris assueta sed armis:

¹¹ G. Boccaccio, *De mulieribus claris* II 18.

¹² Ronsard fait de même dans *Les quatre premiers livres de la Franciade* où il attribue aux Français des ancêtres troyens.

Figere terribilem longis palearibus ursum,
 Freudentemque suis excire cubilibus ursam.
 Martia si quando fremuerunt classica, belli
 Laudibus insignes aequavit et heroinas. (72–81)

Dès le début du portrait, l'auteur souligne le charme de l'héroïne et son succès auprès de l'autre sexe, c'est-à-dire sa beauté féminine, en contraste avec son comportement masculin. Même si le nom de Camille n'est pas mentionné dans l'épithalame de Sabinus, les manières de Wanda sont très semblables à celles de la reine des Volsques telles qu'on les trouve décrites dans l'*Énéide*:

Hos super advenit Volscia de gente Camilla
 agmen agens equitum et florentis aere catervas,
 bellatrix, non illa colo calathisque Minervae
 femineas adsueta manus, sed proelia virgo
 dura pati cursuque pedum praevertere ventos. (*Aen.* VII 803–807)

Camille et Wanda dédaignent toutes deux cette occupation féminine caractéristique qu'est le filage. Les femmes ont filé pendant toute l'Antiquité, et n'ont pas encore renoncé à cette occupation dans l'Europe de la Renaissance. Le filage est ainsi devenu le symbole de l'existence féminine vertueuse consistant à demeurer dans la paix du foyer pour y veiller sur sa famille. On le retrouve souvent dans les éloges de femmes, habituellement après leur mort, comme par exemple dans les inscriptions funéraires des matrones romaines: *lanam fecit*. Or Wanda comme avant elle Camille ont échangé leur quenouille contre une arme de chasse et de combat. Ce passage de l'attribut féminin au masculin est caractéristique des Amazones et des femmes valeureuses, et Sabinus le souligne encore davantage par un contraste d'épithètes: *molli lanae – duris armis*.

Dans le passage cité ci-dessus, Wanda est qualifiée de l'épithète *intemerata*. Virgile a employé le même adjectif pour Camille, lorsqu'il présente la vierge adepte de Diane:

Multae illam frustra Tyrrhena per oppida matres
 optavere nurum; sola contenta Diana
 aeternum telorum et virginittatis amorem
 intemerata colit. (*Aen.* XI 581–584)

Les vers cités ci-dessus indiquent encore une autre caractéristique commune aux deux femmes: elles ont décidé de garder leur virginité tout en étant par ailleurs considérées comme de beaux partis matrimoniaux. Plusieurs matrones voyaient d'un bon œil en Camille leur future bru. Chez Sabinus, on apprend que les charmes de Wanda lui attiraient de nombreux prétendants. C'est d'ailleurs à cause de ces charmes qu'Istula, le dieu du fleuve, tomba amoureux d'elle alors qu'elle se baignait dans la Vistule et parvint à l'attirer dans son royaume sub-aquatique pour en faire son épouse:

Corniger ardebat victricis amore puellae
 Istula, cumque suo vidisset in amne lavantem,
 Mollibus excipiens amplexibus abstulit illam.
 In vitreas sedes, thalamicque in honore locavit. (84–87)

La fin de cette histoire peut paraître surprenante si l'on tient compte de la résolution qu'avait prise Wanda de rester vierge, de sa combativité et de sa comparaison à Camille, même s'il y a eu avant elle de fières Amazones qui ont fini par se marier, comme Hippolyte. L'enlèvement de Wanda par une divinité et sa transformation en nymphe évoquent l'univers des *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide, mais aussi la poésie d'humanistes italiens tels que Giovanni Pontano (ex.: *Tumuli, Eclogae, Urania*). Les poètes italiens néo-latins ont créé de nouvelles légendes et rempli de beaux paysages de nymphes et de divinités tutélaires. On peut notamment mentionner un poème populaire de la Renaissance, *Sarca*, de Pietro Bembo, qui présente les noces subaquatiques du dieu du fleuve Sarca et de la nymphe Garda.

Cette fin de l'histoire de Wanda doit certainement beaucoup à la convention du genre: dans un épithalame royal, il fallait garder de la réserve sur la valeur guerrière de l'héroïne et lui trouver un partenaire à sa hauteur. Étant elle-même de sang royal, elle devient l'épouse d'un roi tout en étant divinisée. Elle régnera désormais sur les nymphes du fleuve et habitera un palais subaquatique. Son inclination à la virginité en a fait une fiancée pure et sans tache, digne de devenir l'élue d'un roi. Wanda préfigure ainsi Élisabeth que l'épithalame glorifie comme fleur de la virginité. Istula le montre bien lorsqu'il s'adresse à la royale fiancée en lui remettant son cadeau:

Salve, virginei decus inclita Nympha pudoris,
 Sarmatici consors, Romani filia regis! (461 suiv.)

Ici aussi, Élisabeth, fille d'un empereur, et Wanda sont liées par leur «origine romaine». Sabinus fait donc de la légende de Wanda un conte qui finit bien, et le destin de Wanda est présenté habilement comme un *exemplum* dans cet épithalame destiné à un couple royal.

Avant de passer à l'épithalame suivant, arrêtons-nous sur les œuvres antérieures de Roysius. L'histoire de Wanda est présentée dans une composition singulière intitulée *Ad proceres Polonos de matrimonio regio carmen* (1553). Lorsqu'il l'écrit, Roysius est inquiet du comportement peu responsable du roi Sigismond Auguste: il porte trop longtemps le deuil de sa chère épouse Barbara sans penser à une nouvelle union, alors que son royaume attend du roi qu'il ait un successeur. Roysius a déjà abordé la question quelque temps plus tôt en adressant directement à Sigismond une autre de ses œuvres, *Ad Sigismundum Augustum, Sarmatiae regem, carmen consolatorium* (1553). Cette fois, il s'adresse aux dignitaires polonais, leur demandant de faire pression sur le roi pour qu'il se

remarie. Roysius les met en garde contre le désordre qui peut résulter d'une absence de successeur. Il tire des exemples de l'histoire: l'empire d'Alexandre le Grand est tombé une fois celui-ci disparu sans laisser de descendants. Rappelant l'histoire des premiers temps de la Pologne, Roysius évoque Lech qui n'a pas eu de descendance, ce qui exposa son royaume à de nombreux dangers, surtout à des attaques d'ennemis cherchant à profiter de la situation. Heureusement, un nouveau roi, Gracchus, fut élu et vainquit les ennemis, sauvant ainsi son pays. L'histoire se répéta cependant: après sa mort, c'est sa fille Wanda qui régna avant de se suicider:

Hanc iterum rerum faciem et crudelia fata
 Sauromatae videre atque ingemuere videntes,
 Ultima Gracchorum cum diis placitura profanis
 Vanda, suo laetum referens ex hoste triumphum,
 Vim quondam thalamis sceleratam inferre parato,
 Victima caeruleas praeceps ivisset in undas,
 Et, quem servasset verorum ignara Deorum
 Udis sacrauit diis, virginitatis honorem,
 Neptunoque patri. (276–284)

Roysius rappelle l'histoire de Wanda: son refus du mariage, sa victoire sur l'ennemi et son suicide, qu'il interprète comme une conséquence de ses croyances en des dieux païens auxquels elle s'est offerte en sacrifice. Indépendamment de la noblesse des motifs qui ont poussé Wanda à mettre fin à ses jours, le fait est qu'elle a laissé son pays sans maître et sans succession. Ceci a de nouveau mis le royaume dans une situation critique. C'est pourquoi Roysius rappelle à la noblesse, et à travers elle à Sigismond Auguste leur responsabilité envers le pays: il ne faut pas que l'histoire tragique se reproduise¹³. Wanda est donc cette fois présentée sous un jour défavorable, comme une monarque qui a oublié que sa vie ne lui appartenait pas, qu'elle se devait à son pays et que le sort de son royaume en dépendait. Roysius présente à Sigismond le comportement de Wanda comme un exemple dissuasif: c'était un comportement irresponsable parce que concentré sur sa propre personne, et il a eu des conséquences néfastes.

Roysius a également évoqué Wanda dans un poème inachevé, *Hedvigis*. Hedwige fut après Wanda la deuxième femme à s'asseoir sur le trône de Pologne:

Altera post Vandam moderata est femina regnum;
 Vestras, Sauromatae, femina rexit opes. (5 suiv.)

Pourtant, Hedwige et Wanda sont aussi différentes l'une de l'autre que l'eau et le feu:

¹³ MALINOWSKA (2001: 150 suiv.) signale également que Roysius mentionne l'histoire de Wanda comme avertissement pour le roi.

Sed tamen haud similis, nisi finxit vana vetustas:
 Illa pudica nimis, ista pudica minus.
 Vanda sui nimium, o nimium studiosa pudoris
 In medias praeceps fluminis ivit aquas.
 Vanda volens, eheu, perit alto in gurgite; Vandae est
 Virginitas falsis victima facta deis.
 Haec placitas duxit flammas, ardentior aequo,
 Matris Acidaliae sive, Cupido tuas. (7–14)

Roysius fait vraisemblablement ici allusion à la chronique de Cromer qui présente l'histoire d'amour d'Hedwige et du prince Guillaume d'Autriche à qui elle a été promise en mariage conditionnel dès son enfance. Roysius pense cependant que la fugue désespérée d'Hedwige, qui s'enfuit de Wawel pour suivre Guillaume, n'est pas motivée par un désir de tenir la promesse de mariage, mais par les sentiments excessifs que la princesse a manifestés. C'est pourquoi il souligne le contraste entre les deux femmes qui sont comme l'eau et le feu: Hedwige était trop amoureuse et trop peu pudique, Wanda n'a pas cédé à ses sentiments et a été trop pudique. Hedwige brûlait d'un feu intérieur, Wanda s'est jetée à l'eau et a péri dans la Vistule. Roysius reproche ainsi aux deux princesses leur manque de modération qui les a poussées à des actes inconsiderés.

Wanda apparaît encore comme reine des nymphes et épouse du roi Istula dans un épithalame de Joachim Bielski, composé cette fois pour le mariage d'Étienne Batory et Anne Jagellon en 1576. Ici également, le dieu de la Vistule se réjouit du mariage royal et offre aux époux une tapisserie représentant l'histoire de Pologne. L'œuvre fait ainsi clairement référence à celle de Sabinus. Mais leurs proportions sont différentes. Bielski réduit son ekphrasis et développe l'action, modelant le royaume aquatique d'Istula sur la réalité terrestre, et plus particulièrement polonaise.

L'action de l'épithalame commence au fond de la Vistule. Dans le splendide palais du dieu roi du fleuve, Istula, se tient un banquet en l'honneur de Batory et d'Anne Jagellon. C'est là qu'on voit apparaître une première fois Wanda, qui arrive au banquet entourée de néréides et de naïades:

Ipsae ubi Nereides aderant ac Naiades udae
 Puniceis omnes redimitae tempora sertis
 Ipsaque fluminei coniunx pulcherrima regis
 Vanda, peregrino collucens omnis in ostro. (105–108)

Rex prior, hic amnes alii iuxtaque puellae
 Naiades et centum Nereo genitore sorores,
 Quas inter mediam sese regina locavit
 Scintillans gemmis interlucentibus auro,
 Non minus ac certo dispersis ordine stellis
 Scintillans solet nocturnis ignibus aether
 Cum penitus pulchro facies innubila caelo est. (112–118)

Wanda est donc extraordinairement belle, parée de ses atours royaux, toute brillante de pourpre d'outre-mer et de bijoux scintillant comme des étoiles dans un ciel clair. Plus tard, pendant le banquet, elle prend la parole d'une belle voix, puis chante un chant à la gloire de Batory, accompagnée d'un chœur de naïades. On trouve donc dans cet épithalame de Bielski une sorte de continuation de l'histoire de Wanda racontée par Sabinus. On la voit dans son nouveau rôle glorieux de reine et épouse d'une divinité. C'est cette fois sa féminité qui est soulignée: elle retient les regards par son charme, sa toilette et ses parures.

Pendant la fête au palais subaquatique, un aède chante l'histoire ancienne de la Pologne et en arrive à Sigismond Auguste, mort sans descendance. Il ne reste que sa sœur Anne, dernière de la lignée des Jagellon. L'histoire d'Anne présente quelques similitudes avec celle de Wanda. Dans la légende, Wanda commence à régner lorsque le pays est privé de roi. Anne Jagellon, après la fuite en France d'Henri de Valois, est acclamée «roi» de Pologne par la noblesse pendant l'interrègne (1575). Comme précédemment dans le cas d'Hedwige, certains, pour Anne, évoquent le personnage de Wanda comme argument pour justifier qu'une femme peut prendre le pouvoir. Après Hedwige d'Anjou, Anne est la deuxième femme de l'histoire de Pologne à avoir été sacrée «roi» (*in regem Poloniae coronata*). Mais il faut préciser qu'Anne, si elle a été proclamée «roi», ne sera sacrée que le jour de son mariage avec Batory, et en second lieu après son mari¹⁴.

Pendant le banquet dans les profondeurs de la Vistule, la reine Wanda ordonne de déployer la tapisserie pour que tous puissent y admirer le cortège des rois sarmates, depuis Lech jusque Batory et Anne. L'histoire de Wanda y est également représentée: après la mort de Gracchus, dont l'origine romaine est ici soulignée, et après que son fils Lech ait assassiné son propre frère, c'est sa sœur Wanda qui monte sur le trône:

Huic soror in regno successit Wanda paterno,
 Quam cum Germanis caesis prope litora Marti
 Sacra suo faceret, rapuit pater Istula nec non
 Consortem thalami regnorum in parte locavit. (210–213)

L'histoire de la jeunesse de Wanda n'est esquissée que dans les grandes lignes, rappelant son accession au trône après son père et sa victoire sur les Allemands. En revanche, on ne parle pas de Ritogarus et de ses assiduités. Wanda est enlevée par Istula alors qu'elle est en train d'offrir un sacrifice d'action de grâces au dieu Mars sur la rive du fleuve. Istula en fait son épouse et la reine du fleuve et des divinités des eaux. Comme avant lui Sabinus, Bielski présente donc une version de la légende adaptée à l'épithalame et à la bienséance requise à l'occasion d'un mariage royal.

¹⁴ Cf. BOGUCKA 2009: 138.

Jean Kochanowski consacre une de ses élégies latines à Wanda (I 15), à la fin du livre premier de ses *Elegiarum libri IV* imprimés en 1584. C'est une élégie étiologique expliquant l'origine du tumulus de Wanda, à Mogiła, sur les bords de la Vistule¹⁵. Le poète réalise ainsi son programme annoncé dans l'élégie qui ouvre tout le recueil: il suivra les traces de Properce, le Callimaque romain¹⁶. Bien que l'élégie I 15 ne soit pas la seule du recueil à avoir un caractère épique, elle seule commence par une invocation aux muses qui annonce la grandeur des événements qui vont y être présentés. L'exorde d'invocation présente l'héroïne principale:

Nunc age, quo pacto bellatrix Vanda Polonis
Praefuerit, solito carmine, Musa, refer. (1 suiv.)

Dès le début, Wanda apparaît donc comme une femme vaillante, comme l'indique l'épithète *bellatrix*. Ce rare adjectif qualifie deux femmes dans l'*Énéide*: Penthésilée, représentée sur une image dans un temple (*Aen.* I 493), et Camille (*Aen.* VII 805).

Après l'invocation et l'annonce du thème de l'élégie, l'histoire de Cracus et de ses fils est racontée en quelques lignes. De sa lignée, il ne reste plus que la princesse Wanda:

Unica restabat Craci de sanguine Vanda,
Vanda potens forma, Vanda potens animo. (9 suiv.)

Elle est bien sûr dotée des attributs physiques et moraux de l'héroïne épique. Le comportement de Wanda est ensuite décrit, et comme précédemment dans l'épithalame de Sabinus, elle mène la vie des Amazones et autres vierges compagnes de Diane¹⁷. Elle ne s'adonne donc pas aux travaux féminins, au filage et au tissage, mais à la chasse, et elle éprouve de l'aversion pour le mariage:

Non illa aut lanae, radiisve assueta Minervae,
Filo aut ducendis versicolore notis;
Sed iaculis armata citae comes ire Dianae,
Sternereque adversas per nemora alta feras.
Hinc odium taedae, hinc mentio nulla hymenaei,
Et constans placitae virginitatis amor. (11–16)

¹⁵ Jean Długosz est le premier à parler du tumulus de Wanda, érigé par ses sujets non loin de Cracovie. Il s'agit du tertre de Wanda à Mogiła, un village autrefois situé près de la ville qui l'a aujourd'hui englobé. Il s'agit d'un kourgane dont la fonction demeure incertaine, datant probablement du VIII^{ème} siècle ap. J.-C., mais que certains historiens attribuent à un culte celte antérieur. FRANZAK, note 16 sur l'élégie I 15 de Kochanowski accessible à l'adresse: <http://neolatina.bj.uj.edu.pl/comment/show/id/1234.html> (consulté le 25 mai 2011).

¹⁶ Cf. GŁOMBIOWSKA 1972: 5–28.

¹⁷ Par exemple Callisto, Daphné dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide (*Met.* II 411; I 475). Cf. GŁOMBIOWSKA 1981: 137.

Comme chez Sabinus, et bien que le nom de Camille ne soit pas cité textuellement, la vie que mène Wanda correspond à celle de la valeureuse héroïne de l'*Énéide*¹⁸. Elle refuse de se marier alors que son peuple attend d'elle qu'elle le fasse. Tous, en effet, espèrent que la plus belle des Sarmates (*nympharum pulcherrima Sarmatidarum*) épouse un homme digne de son rang. En l'absence de roi, le peuple et les pères confient à Wanda le gouvernement du royaume. Celle-ci se défend d'abord, craignant de ne pas être assez forte, mais elle finit par céder aux demandes et accepter le pouvoir. Chez Kochanowski, Wanda accepte donc une fois encore, comme d'autres femmes courageuses avant elle, de jouer un rôle masculin lorsqu'il manque d'hommes, et s'efforce de l'accomplir le mieux possible:

Illa reluctari primum, neque credere vires
 Posse suas tanto sufficere imperio.
 Instantis precibus vix tandem victa senatus,
 In solio sedit pulchra virago patris.
 Atque ita commissum curavit sedula munus,
 Conferri magnis possit ut illa viris. (23–28)

La femme-roi est ici appelée *virago*, comme dans le *Bellum Prutenum*, mais avec un épithète en plus: *pulchra*. L'héroïne de l'élégie réunit ainsi le caractère masculin et la beauté féminine. Rien d'étonnant donc à ce que de nombreux prétendants essaient d'obtenir sa main. Il y a parmi eux l'Allemand Ritogarus. Mais Wanda souhaite rester vierge et rejette ses avances. Lorsque Ritogarus, blessé par son refus, lui déclare la guerre, elle combat courageusement, telle une Amazone:

Huic acie instructa pharetrata occurrit Amazon, (51)

comme autrefois Camille a pris la tête des Volsques, munie d'un carquois:

At medias inter caedes exsultat Amazon
 Unum exserta latus pugnae pharetrata Camilla. (*Aen.* XI 648 suiv.)

C'est la seule et unique mention de combats de Wanda dans cette élégie qui ne parle pas de ses succès militaires antérieurs. On ne sait donc pas si elle était une guerrière expérimentée, comme le signalait par exemple le *Bellum Prutenum* ou l'épithalame de Sabinus. Ici, c'est peut-être parce qu'elle ne se sent pas sûre de ses forces qu'elle fait un vœu à Jupiter avant le combat:

Votum sublatis tale vovens manibus:
 «Quod pretio dignor summo, atque ante omnia carum,
 Aestimo, si vinco, Iuppiter, esto tuum». (52–54)

¹⁸ Cf. *Aen.* VII 803–811; XI 535–584.

Cette prière que Jupiter accueille favorablement par un éclair de bon augure rappelle le fameux rite romain de la *devotio*¹⁹. Les chefs romains déposaient leur propre vie entre les mains des dieux en échange de la sauvegarde de l'état. Après ce vœu, ils se portaient seuls à la rencontre de l'ennemi (habituellement à cheval) et trouvaient généralement la mort²⁰. C'est également à cheval que Wanda se jette sur l'ennemi, laissant sa troupe derrière elle:

Omne laeta cani signa imperat, ipsaque in hostem
 Ante alios rapido concita fertur equo.
 Reginam insequitur densis exercitus hastis. (57–59)

Mais malgré la témérité de cet assaut, elle ne périt pas au combat. Comme Camille, elle est appelée Amazone et combat à cheval, avec des flèches. Après une âpre lutte, elle remporte la victoire et Ritogarus est tué sur le champ de bataille. La reine des Sarmates n'est pas vindicative: elle fait preuve de miséricorde envers ses prisonniers et leur rend la liberté. Elle fait également preuve de respect envers Ritogarus qu'elle enterre. Wanda ordonne aussi de ramasser les armes et de les entasser pour former un monument, à l'endroit de la bataille sur les bords de la Vistule. Puis elle-même se jette dans le fleuve:

Vistula dives aquae, fluviorum Vistula ocella,
 Quoscunque Arctoo despicit Ursa polo,
 Quae tibi certa prius floresque offerre solebam,
 Illa ego Vanda tuis cognita fluminibus
 Nunc pro pallenti viola, croceoque hyacintho,
 Haec spolia in ripis figo cruenta tuis,
 Devicti monumentum hostis, temeraria qui in me
 Demens invitis moverat arma diis. (71–78)

Ce monologue lyrique, *ultima morientis verba*, adressé à la Vistule, fleuve chéri de Wanda, rend compte de son histoire tragique. Autrefois, jeune-fille innocente, elle y jetait des couronnes tressées; désormais *victrix regina*, comme un chevalier, elle y apporte ses trophées guerriers. Sa transformation dramatique est soulignée par le contraste entre ses dons: au lieu des pâles violettes et des jacinthes jaunes, elle apporte maintenant des dépouilles sanglantes. Son innocence de jeune-fille a dû laisser la place aux choses de la guerre²¹. On voit aussi que Wanda

¹⁹ KUMANIECKI 1925/1926: 49. Z. GŁOMBIEWSKA, dans son commentaire de cette élégie, parle aussi de la *devotio* de Wanda. Je tiens ici à la remercier de m'avoir communiqué ce commentaire avant sa publication: Jean Kochanowski, *Carmina Latina. Poezja łacińska. Pars III* (sous presse).

²⁰ Cf. *devotio* de Publius Decius Mus, puis de son fils (Tite-Live VIII 9; X 28).

²¹ PIGOŃ remarque le même changement chez Camille, également exprimé par un contraste entre le récit de son enfance dans un décor bucolique et, par la suite, son sanglant combat. J. PIGOŃ, *Camilla and Asbyte: Two Female Warriors in Roman Epic* (sous presse). Je le remercie ici de m'avoir communiqué son article.

est devenue un chef responsable et courageux qui n'hésite pas à prendre la tête de ses troupes et à combattre pour défendre son royaume. Une fois encore, on montre qu'elle accomplit bien son devoir et qu'elle a réussi à mûrir dans son rôle de reine²². Tout son comportement de monarque et de chef est digne de la chevalerie. Lorsque l'ennemi gît vaincu, elle peut donc jouir de sa gloire méritée:

Et nunc ille ferox iacet acri vulnere victus
At me fama alti tollit in astra poli. (81 suiv.)

Mais Wanda n'a pas oublié le vœu qu'elle a fait aux dieux avant la bataille. Elle n'est pas morte au combat, elle doit donc accomplir son vœu autrement. Tout comme les chefs romains qui, après leur *devotio*, ne pouvaient plus rester en vie, même s'ils n'avaient pas péri dans la bataille, Wanda offre donc sa vie aux dieux en reconnaissance pour sa victoire:

«Estne anima quidquam pretiosius? Hanc ego vobis
Vestro servatam munere dono libens».
Haec ait, extremaeque ut stabat margine ripae,
Ultro se in rapidas praecipitavit aquas. (89–92)

La Vistule l'accueille dans ses flots et la métamorphose en naïade. Mais les sujets de Wanda ne sont pas conscients de cette apothéose et veulent lui faire de dignes funérailles. Comme ils ne peuvent retrouver son corps, ils lui élèvent un monument, au dessus d'une tombe vide, sur la rive de la Vistule. Telle est l'origine du tertre de Wanda, à Mogiła.

On peut également évoquer ici une ode polonaise de Jean Kochanowski, *Kto mi dał skrzydła* [«Qui m'a donné des ailes»] (I 10) où le poète s'envole tel un oiseau et aperçoit les rois de Pologne parmi les étoiles, dans un palais céleste. Il y a là les rois polonais de Lech à Sigismond I^{er} qui ont su régner avec sagesse et justice, et qui méritent donc leur récompense dans le ciel. On trouve aussi parmi eux Cracus et Wanda. Comme dans le fameux songe de Scipion l'Africain, le *stellatum* est accessible après la mort à ceux qui se sont sacrifiés pour leur patrie²³. Wanda, comme héroïne de l'élégie, a fait preuve de virilité, de justice, de miséricorde et de piété, vertus caractéristique d'un bon roi. C'est pourquoi, comme héroïne de l'ode, elle se trouve parmi les étoiles. L'élégie latine de Kochanowski vient ainsi justifier la certitude que le poète exprime dans son ode polonaise.

Cette élégie de Kochanowski est le plus long texte de la poésie latine de la Renaissance à reprendre la légende de Wanda. Rassemblant des éléments

²² GŁOMBIOWSKA (1981: 138) remarque cette évolution de Wanda, qui devient un chef responsable.

²³ «Omnibus qui patriam conservarint, adiuverint, auxerint, certum esse in caelo definitum locum, ubi beati aevio sempiterno fruuntur» (Cic. *Somnium Scipionis* 13). Kochanowski paraphrase cette idée dans son ode polonaise II 12, 17 suiv.

épiques, dramatiques et lyriques, elle est considérée comme l'une des plus belles de Kochanowski. On peut tirer d'intéressantes conclusions d'une mise en parallèle de l'épique de Wanda et de celle qu'écrivit Properce à propos de Tarpeia (IV 4). Kochanowski, un émule de Properce, se livre à un subtil jeu littéraire. Voyons la suite des événements présentés dans ces deux élégies:

Tarpeia est vestale: elle est donc obligée de rester vierge; Wanda par contre a choisi la virginité. L'ennemi paraît: Tarpeia, follement amoureuse de Tatius, rompt son vœu de chasteté; Wanda rejette par contre les avances de Ritogarus et veut à tout prix rester vierge. Tarpeia proclame ouvertement son désir de s'unir à Tatius, ce qui indispose Jupiter; Wanda par contre prie Jupiter de lui donner la victoire sur l'ennemi et lui offre sa vie en échange, gagnant ainsi la faveur du dieu. Les deux femmes vont au bord de l'eau: Tarpeia profite de l'occasion pour rencontrer Tatius et tresse des couronnes de fleurs pour les nymphes en pensant à Tatius; Wanda jette ses fleurs à la Vistule. Tarpeia trahit sa patrie en montrant un passage secret à l'ennemi; Wanda par contre prend la tête de son armée pour combattre l'ennemi. Toutes deux sont comparées aux Amazones: Tarpeia court comme une Amazone, c'est-à-dire vite et le sein nu; Wanda par contre combat comme une Amazone. Les Romains trahis par Tarpeia subissent une défaite, alors que les Polonais commandés par Wanda remportent la victoire. Tatius est victorieux et vivant; Ritogarus est vaincu et meurt au combat. Tarpeia meurt honteusement, tuée par Tatius. Wanda offre sa vie en sacrifice pour accomplir son vœu, et les dieux l'honorent en faisant d'elle une naïade immortelle. Et après elles, il reste pour Tarpeia la roche Tarpéienne et une misérable tombe (*turpe sepulcrum*), et pour Wanda le Tertre de Mogiła, un glorieux monument (*monumentum nobile*).

Si l'on compare les deux élégies, on s'aperçoit que l'histoire de Wanda est le contraire de l'histoire de Tarpeia. Kochanowski avait un matériau de base, la légende de Wanda, dont il a dû respecter le cadre général, c'est-à-dire les faits et les personnages; mais par le développement de sa narration, le choix des épisodes et l'introduction de nouveaux éléments (les fleurs jetées à l'eau, la prière à Jupiter), et surtout par leur composition, il ouvre un remarquable dialogue intertextuel avec l'épique de Properce. Dans la perspective de cette émulation, Wanda apparaît comme un contraire de Tarpeia.

Le personnage de Wanda est donc pour les auteurs de la Renaissance une occasion de montrer leur savoir-faire poétique, de rattacher habilement l'histoire de la Pologne ancienne à la tradition des héros antiques, une légende nationale à l'héritage de la poésie romaine, et ainsi, de se livrer à une *aemulatio* avec les auteurs anciens. Le personnage de la reine sarmate est différemment façonné en fonction du genre et des destinataires des œuvres. On trouve d'une part la Wanda virile et hardie, livrant un âpre et sanglant combat dans l'épopée du *Bellum Prutenum*, mais aussi, d'autre part, dans les épithalames, l'épouse raffinée et très féminine du roi de la Vistule.

Dans l'épopée de Jean de Wiślica, l'épigramme de Janicki ou l'élégie de Kochanowski, les traits héroïques de Wanda sont mis en relief: elle est un monarque idéal, un excellent chef guerrier. Le fait qu'elle soit considérée comme roi et chef modèle alors qu'elle est une femme mérite d'être particulièrement souligné, car l'exercice du pouvoir et le commandement au combat appartiennent aux hommes et non aux femmes²⁴. Wanda dépasse donc les limites de la nature féminine, abandonne ses obligations féminines pour adopter celles des hommes. Elle rejoint ainsi le glorieux cortège des femmes valeureuses qui se sont distinguées dans l'Antiquité, et dépasse même ces dernières par son héroïsme. Mais malgré sa bravoure et sa transgression des limites imposées à son sexe, elle demeure une femme séduisante, comme on peut l'observer surtout dans les épithalames où Wanda est présentée comme un modèle de beauté, mais aussi et avant tout de chasteté de la fiancée. En revanche, Roysius la présente dans une approche critique, et ce, tant dans son rôle de monarque que dans son rôle de femme. Mais cette approche de la reine légendaire est exceptionnelle parmi les auteurs de la Renaissance. Dans la littérature des siècles suivants, d'ailleurs, Wanda l'Amazone sarmate sera généralement présentée comme un exemple de patriotisme et d'héroïsme²⁵.

Université de Wrocław

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- BOGUCKA 2009: M. BOGUCKA, *Anna Jagiellonka*, Wrocław 2009.
- BURCKHARDT 1991: J. BURCKHARDT, *Kultura odrodzenia we Włoszech. Próba ujęcia* [«Kultur der Renaissance in Italien»], trad. M. KRECKOWSKA, Warszawa 1991.
- GŁOMBIOWSKA 1972: Z. GŁOMBIOWSKA, *Inspiracje propercjańskie w elegiach Jan Kochanowskiego*, Pamiętnik Literacki LXIII 1972, fasc. 3, pp. 5–28.
- 1981: *Elegie łacińskie Jana Kochanowskiego. Dwie wersje*, Warszawa 1981.
- FRANZAK s.d.: G. FRANZAK, [notes sur *El. I 15*], dans: J. Kochanowski, *Elegiarum libri IV*, dans: *Biblioteka literatury staropolskiej i nowolacińskiej*, <http://neolatina.bj.uj.edu.pl/comment/show/id/1234.html> (consulté le 25 mai 2011).
- KUMANIECKI 1925/1926: K. KUMANIECKI, *Podanie o Wandzie w świetle źródeł starożytnych*, Pamiętnik Literacki XXII/XXIII 1925/1926, pp. 46–55.
- MALINOWSKA 2001: J. MALINOWSKA, *Twórczość poetycka Piotra Roizjusza 1506–1571. Studium literackie*, Lublin 2001.
- MAŚLANKA 1984: J. MAŚLANKA, *Literatura a dzieje bajeczne*, Warszawa 1984.
- MARCINIAK 2007: K. MARCINIAK, *Legenda o Wandzie, czyli jak wychować Wandala*, Horyzonty Wychowania 6/2007 (12), pp. 185–198.
- 2008a: *Królowna Wanda – pierwsza polska „feministka”?*, dans: I. MACIEJEWSKA, K. STASIEWICZ (éds.), *Kobieta epok dawnych w literaturze, kulturze i społeczeństwie*, Olsztyn 2008, pp. 89–98.

²⁴ Cf. Arist. *Polit. I, passim*. Długosz également écrit que le règne des femmes suscite habituellement du dégoût (*fastidium*) chez leurs sujets, *o.c.* (n. 3), p. 127.

²⁵ Cf. MORTKOWICZÓWNA 1927; MAŚLANKA 1984: *passim*; MARCINIAK 2007; 2008b.

- 2008b: *Die Legende von Königin Wanda als Spiegel des deutsch-polnischen Verhältnisses*, dans: *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* XLIII 2008, pp. 393–411.
- MORTKOWICZÓWNA 1927: H. MORTKOWICZÓWNA, *Podanie o Wandzie. Dzieje wątku literackiego*, Warszawa 1927.
- PELC 1987: J. PELC, *Jan Kochanowski. Szczyt renesansu w literaturze polskiej*, Warszawa 1987.
- PLEZIA 2001: M. PLEZIA, *Scripta minora. Łacina średniowieczna i Wincenty Kadłubek*, Kraków 2001.
- STARNAWSKI 1991: J. STARNAWSKI, *Odrodzenie. Czasy – ludzie – książki*, Łódź 1991.
- ULEWICZ 2006: T. ULEWICZ, *Kochanowski. Świadomość słowiańska. Oddziaływanie europejskie*, Kraków 2006.

Alan B. LLOYD (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*, Chichester–Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell, 2010 (The Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), XLVI+1276 pp., 2 maps, 34 plates, 217 illustrations, 4 tables, £ 250.00, ISBN 978-1-4051-5598-4.

Ancient Egypt, its history, culture, religion and art for many years have fascinated scholars: historians, Egyptologists, archaeologists and others. In the series *Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World* a book was published which puts together all subjects concerning Egypt. The book's editor, Alan B. LLOYD, made his name by numerous books and articles on ancient Egypt, especially on history of Late and Greco-Roman Period, ancient warfare and Egyptian epigraphy.

A Companion to Ancient Egypt consists of two volumes. The first volume is divided into four parts: "The Land of Egypt", "Historical Narratives", "State and Economic Structures" and "The Social Order". The second volume is composed of three parts: "Language and Literature", "The Visual Arts" and "The Reception of Egyptian Culture". At the beginning of the first volume, just before the main text, readers will find the list of illustrations, notes on contributions, preface, acknowledgments, list of abbreviations, chronology and maps. The bibliography is at the end of the second volume, but after each chapter there are selected books or articles for further reading. Another advantage of the *Companion*... are plates, figures, maps and tables placed between text.

After the preface, the first volume gives a concise chronology of Egypt from the earliest times to the Byzantine period with the names of rulers and the dates of their reign. Chronology relies on the *Aigyptiaka* of Manetho who divided Egyptian kings into thirty dynasties. The chronology of the Late Period in the *Companion* (pp. XXXVIII–XXXIX) is surprisingly conservative. We read (p. XXXIX) that the last king of the XXX dynasty Nectanebo II ruled from 360 BC until 343 BC and the Persian conquest of Egypt began in 343 BC. Hence it does not take into consideration recent research of L. DEPUYDT (one of the authors of the *Companion*!) who, based on careful reading of Greek, Egyptian and Babylonian records, proves that the Second Persian Domination in Egypt started in 340/339 BC.

The first part of the *Companion* concerns physical aspects of Egypt like landscape archaeology from the Napoleonic expedition of 1798–1801 until the newest archaeological excavations across Egypt. It draws on a great variety of sources. Readers will appreciate data on climate and landscape change in ancient and modern times. Satellite images included in this volume help to locate ancient buildings, foundations and much more.

History of Egypt from the prehistory until Roman period was introduced in the second part of the first volume. Authors discuss history of each dynasty and reign. Except for historical information there are quite a lot of archaeological data on prehistoric settlements, graves, pottery decorations, tools and weapons, stone objects and art. A very helpful clear layout of the Egyptian structure of administration of the early period is presented on p. 54. It helps us to understand connections and relationships between the pharaohs, high officials and the rest of administrative organs. The chapters about history of Egypt enclose basic information about Egyptian kings, foreign policy, culture and art, sometimes in a very concise way as in the case of the First Persian Period in Egypt (pp. 150–153). O. PERDU ("Saites and Persians (664–332 BC)") presents times of Cambyses in Egypt on one and a half page (pp. 149 f.), not going much beyond Herodotus. The Second Persian Period receives only half a page (p. 157) and the date of the conquest of Egypt by Artaxerxes III given by PERDU (342 BC) differs both from the stance of the current research and from that given in the chronology section of the *Companion*. In this section there is much reference to the First Persian Period and concentration on Persian atrocities which seem to run against the image of

stability which can be inferred from a few Egyptian sources we have for this period. The last native pharaoh Khababash is mentioned only in a very short and not very informative paragraph.

Part III of the first volume contains information about state and economic structures arranged by pharaonic and Greco-Roman offices, administration, law, priests and temples, economy, settlements, transport, science, technology, military institutions and warfare. Part IV “The Social Order” with social structure, daily life, religion in society in pharaonic and Greco-Roman period is as if a continuation of the previous chapter. Authors explain these disciplines on historical, archaeological and iconographic examples with ample reference to sources. These two parts of the *Companion* help readers to understand daily life of inhabitants of Egypt. The important chapters 21 and 22 “Science and Technology” allow the reader to discover Egyptian knowledge about mathematics and counting system, metrology and geometry, astronomy, biology and much more.

The second volume of the *Companion* starts with part V “Language and Literature” covering language, scripts, and literacy, the literature of the Middle Kingdom, New Kingdom, Late Period, Coptic literature and Greek literature in Egypt. It is a short, but good introduction to phonology, vocabulary and morphology of the Egyptian language with useful facts about grammar, language changes through history, connections with Coptic and Arabic. All phases of Egyptian language are explicated in next three subsections (pp. 646–655). The whole text is comprehensible and based on numerous examples, including a comparison of hieroglyphic, demotic and Coptic writing (pp. 655–660).

Chapters 30–32 cover Egyptian literature: from tales, teachings, discourses, hymns, songs through royal and non-royal monumental inscriptions up to prophecies and scientific, medical, magical texts and much more. Even if no translations of texts are provided, the reader can find references to the best or most often used translations and publications. The rendition of the Late Period literature presents lesser genre: prophecies, legal and scientific literature (astrological, horoscope, dream interpretations, oneiromancy) (pp. 718–722). Another group concerns medicine and its disciplines (gynaecology, internal diseases and others). There are also quite a few examples of cult, ritual and magical texts. Chapter 33 helps us to understand relations between Coptic and Egyptian literature. First there is a short history of these texts, where they come from, what are their similarities, what texts and manuscripts survive to our times. Then there is information about Coptic language and its grammar, Greek loan words and Coptic dialects. The next chapter presents a rather basic introduction to the Greek writing on Egypt.

Part VI of the second volume “The Visual Arts” again is divided both into chapters covering periods of ancient Egyptian art to Late Antiquity and those concerned with select topics, like temple architecture, decorative systems, early dynastic art and iconography, sculpture from the Old Kingdom until Roman Period, pharaonic painting of the New Kingdom, mosaics and painting in Greco-Roman Egypt and Egyptian art of Late Antiquity. Beginning students of Egypt will find there convenient figures explaining Egyptian reliefs (p. 797) and a good explanation on what and why Egyptian inscribed or painted on the walls or statues. An advantage of this part are figures showing schemes of temples, mastabas, private tombs (e.g. pp. 789, 810, 812, 816). One might prefer, however, to have the account of the predynastic art concentrated in one place and dispersed between volumes one and two. A part of chapter 44 portrays Egyptian mosaics (pp. 1017–1022) found mostly in Alexandria and its surroundings. Important as they are, they are usually given less attention than Egyptian reliefs and paintings and hence they might perhaps receive a more ample treatment here.

The last part of the second volume “The Reception of Pharaonic Egypt in Classical Antiquity” starting from chapter 47 “The Reception of Egypt in Europe” is partly a continuation of chapter 45 “Egyptian Art of Late Antiquity”, while chapter 46 “The Reception of Pharaonic Egypt in Classical Antiquity” is somewhat repetitive of what was said in earlier parts of the book. Chapter 47 presents the rediscovery of Egypt by the Europeans from the middle ages to the Napoleon’s expedition which resulted in the much used *Description de l’Égypte* (pp. 1088 f.) to later archaeological works by British, French, German and other scholars. Chapter 48 (“The Reception of Pharaonic Egypt in

Islamic Egypt”) deals with Islamic scholars interested in ancient history of Egypt like 15th century al-Maqrīzī, al-Mas‘ūdī and al-Ma’mūn (pp. 1109–1122). The last chapter 49 (“Ancient Egypt in the Museum: Concepts and Constructions”) is partly a continuation of chapter 47. Readers will find there information about the greatest museums (e.g. British Museum, Petrie’s Museum, Louvre and much more), their beginnings and collections.

On general it is a well written and well researched book. Unlike many books about Egypt whose authors or editors use transliterated hieroglyphics without adequate translation and explanation of terminology in its proper cultural context, the *Companion* makes a real effort to bring ancient Egyptian terms to the reader in exemplary clarity. Each volume of the *Companion* is appended with a select bibliography. Every reader will appreciate a good index at the end of the second volume. The index, a good bibliography, sensible endnotes and many good quality figures and plates will certainly contribute to promoting the usage of this books by scholars, students and interested public alike. For many it will rightfully be a reference book for ancient Egypt. Very high scholarly standards, the most up-to-date knowledge and a very good narrative mark this book as a very good monograph of ancient Egypt.

Agnieszka Wojciechowska
University of Wrocław

Anna Missiou, *Literacy and Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, XVI+211 pp., £ 50.00 (hb.) / 17.99 (pb.), ISBN 978-052-1111-409.

Anna MISSIOU (further M.), a professor in Crete, has made her name principally through her book on Andocides (*The Subversive Oratory of Andocides: Politics, Ideology and Decision-Making in Democratic Athens*, 1992). *Literacy and Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens* is the latest in a long series of books and articles on the issue of literacy in antiquity, hotly debated by scholars mostly undeterred by lack of direct evidence. Classical age Athens have always been on the forefront of the debate as the purveyor of quite ample, chronologically neatly packed evidence and as the cradle of democracy, since the issues of working of the democratic government and that of literacy of Athenian citizens have often been studied in conjunction. For over half a century two views have been expressed, challenged and reasserted in modern historiography: that the bulk of Athenian citizens could read and write and thus access plentiful documents often inscribed with formulae like ἵνα πάντες οἱ βουλόμενοι εἰδῶσιν (“so that all who desire may know”) or that the socio-economic conditions made Athens a society with “restricted literacy” in which no more than 5-10% people could read and write (HARRIS, HEDRICK, THOMAS). In recent years this last view seems to be winning the debate with much discussion focusing on comparative history which suggest that pre-industrial, mostly agricultural ancient society could not support enough schooling to result in anything approaching the universal literacy.

M. takes the opposite stance. She distances herself from the comparative methodology. She disbelieves its arguments precluding high literacy rates in the mostly rural society with no state-subsidized schooling, as, in her belief, children could learn how to read and write at home (pp. 130–133). In her view even less literate fellows would fast acquire proper writing skills while sitting on the Athenian council thanks to its non-elitist cooperative environment (pp. 135–137).

In her book M. undertakes to study literacy of citizens and not of all inhabitants of fifth c. BC Attica in reference to working of the Athenian polis. There is much to speak for her choice: this is the period of the triumph of democracy and the one which furnishes massive evidence, in particular some 11,000 *ostraka* written by politically active Athenian citizens. The underlying idea of M.’s book is that democracy with the popular participation of citizens in the decision making process fostered a very high literacy rate in fifth c. BC Athens. M. contends that the Cleisthenic reform which created artificial non-contiguous tribal units necessitated communication between demes’ leaders in various public matters. Since often demes belonging to one tribe were at a distance of as much as 40 or more kilometers, the traditional oral communication was, M. believes, not practical and therefore the Athenian polis had to move from the face-to-face society to the one based upon communication in writing (ch. I: “The geography of literacy”). However attractive this hypothesis might be, it is not only unsupported by any direct evidence but also it supposes an elaborate exchange of written communication between Athenian officials even in urgent matters of mobilizing troops.

In M.’s book ostracism is a case for a widespread literacy among Athenian citizens. She discusses at length (pp. 58–84, 15–159) the widely-held theory of specialized writers allegedly inscribing *ostraka* for illiterate Athenians, the support for which comes from a lot of 191 *ostraka* found on the North Slope of the Acropolis and inscribed mostly with the name of Themistocles. Oscar BRONEER’s (*Hesperia* VII 1938) identification of fourteen hands who inscribed almost all of them has been considered by many a decisive argument against the universal literacy in Athens. M. assails BRONEER’s arguments based on similarity on letterforms and attempts to show that differing spatial arrangements of letters speaks for much more individual writers than BRONEER suggested. Mistakes, variant readings, additional comments on some *ostraka* prove, in M.’s mind, that individual Athenians as a rule prepared their own *ostraka*.

M. gathers the direct evidence for the steady growth of the number of public documents in stone (ch. 4: "Literacy through intermediaries: II. Stone inscriptions") produced after Cleisthenes while pointing out to a much greater output in perishable media which could not survive. She successfully shows widespread use of written documents in various facets of public life. What follows is, in this chapter and in the next one (ch. 5: "Athenian literacy in its sociopolitical context"), that the widespread use of written records in Athens implies an almost universal literacy of people involved in running the state. In M.'s reconstruction the fabric of the Athenian polis required reading and writing skills from almost all involved. She thinks that all members of the *boule* had to be literate because among their duties was to supervise accounts and exchange written notices with other Athenian boards (pp. 118–120). This is the crucial point in M.'s discussion of the literacy in fifth c. Athens because she sides with the minority opinion that all classes of the Athenian society were eligible to sit on the *boule* (pp. 120–130) which, by the same token, represented a cross-section of Athenians. Various Athenian boards had secretaries quite obviously responsible for written documents. In ancient sources they are commonly called *demosioi*, that is by the word normally applied to slaves; hence, in universal opinion of the scholarship, these clerks were public slaves. M. rejects this interpretation (pp. 112–117), believing that slaves were (by definition) illiterate and therefore could not discharge clerical duties. This, in M.'s opinion, makes numerous Athenian clerks paid Athenian citizens, further enhancing the literacy rate in fifth c. Athens.

Much of M.'s consideration is compelling, e.g. she convincingly makes the case that there was hardly any financial barrier for spreading literacy in Athens, as the most common writing materials, *ostraka*, did not incur any expense at all and wooden tablets covered with wax or white-washed were not very expensive and reusable many times over. She succeeds as well in presenting the widespread use of writing within Athenian political system both in the central administration and within demes. But the principal aim of her book is to prove that Athens of the fifth c. BC enjoyed the state of mass literacy, i.e. that most of its citizens were functionally literate (pp. 109 f.). This hinges upon a number of assumptions, the most important being the right of the majority *thetes* to stand for office and for this there is no evidence. Without a clear evidence to support this claim, M.'s painstaking reconstruction of the working of the Athenian polis in the fifth c. BC should be perceived only as a model of an exceptional ancient society which might operate more smoothly with a high proportion of literate men among the politically active better-off minority of Athenians than without it. As to the paramount importance of the evidence of *ostraka* for the universal literacy in fifth c. Athens one can only quote what John K. DAVIES once said: "For example, the Athenian institution of ostracism assumed that at least 6,000 out of estimated adult male citizen population conventionally estimated at 30,000 could scratch a name legibly on a potsherd [...]. In other respects a literate assembly secretary could do most of what was needed" (in: *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions. Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World*, ed. by M. BROSIUS, Oxford 2003, pp. 323 f., n. 3).

Krzysztof Nawotka
University of Wrocław

Sheila DILLON, *The Female Portrait Statue in the Greek World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 254 S., £ 77.00, ISBN 978-052-1854-986.

Das Frauenporträt nahm bisher in der griechischen Kunstgeschichte keinen wesentlichen Platz ein. Ähnlich wie in der allgemeinen Geschichte, in der die Geschichte der Frauen nur mühsam Anerkennung fand, ist dies auch in der antiken Kunst kein schnell und ohne Hindernisse voranschreitender Prozess. Und obwohl in der letzten Zeit einige interessante Arbeiten über das antike Frauenporträt entstanden sind, konzentrierten sie sich jedoch vor allem auf die offizielle Darstellung der herrschenden Familie, insbesondere auf die Darstellung römischer Kaiserinnen¹. Sie haben die Lücke, die bisher in der Forschung der griechischen Kunst stark sichtbar war, nicht gefüllt². Zwar fügte R.R.R. SMITH schon zu Beginn der 90-er Jahre des 20. Jahrhunderts seiner Synthese über die hellenistische Skulptur ein interessantes Kapitel über die Darstellungen der Göttinnen und griechischen Sterblichen an, jedoch hatte dieses einen sehr begrenzten Umfang³. Obwohl seit diesem ersten Versuch der Einbringung des Frauenbildes in die allgemeine Erzählung über die griechische Skulptur viele Jahre vergangen sind, hat sich die Reflexion in diesem Problembereich kaum vorwärts bewegt, insbesondere im Bereich des privaten Porträts.

Diese Situation beginnt sich erst in den letzten Jahren zu ändern. Die Schlüsselrolle spielte bei dieser Änderung die Veröffentlichung der Doktorarbeit von J.C. EULE über statuarische Darstellungen der Frauen aus Kleinasien⁴, das in einen umfangreichen sozialen und religiösen Kontext eingebaute Studium von J. CONNELLY über Darstellungen griechischer Priesterinnen⁵ und eine den „Herkulanerinnen“ gewidmete Artikelsammlung als Resultat der Zusammenarbeit des Jean-Paul-Getty-Museums und der Dresdener Skulpturensammlung⁶. Ihren Beitrag zu diesem Prozess leistete auch die Autorin der rezensierten Arbeit, S. DILLON [=D.], die nach der Veröffentlichung der dem griechischen Porträt gewidmeten Arbeit⁷, mit diesem wichtigen Artikel ihren neuen Interessenkreis ankündigte⁸.

¹ Ich bespreche sie in den Rezensionen: L. OLSZEWSKI, [Rez. von:] *S.E. Wood, Imperial Women. A Study in Public Images, 40 BC–AD 68*, Leiden 1999, Eos XC 2003, S. 370–372; [Rez. von:] E. BARTMAN, *Portraits of Livia. Imaging the Imperial Women in Augustan Rome*, Cambridge 1999, Eos LXXXIX 2002, S. 393–396; [Rez. von:] D. BOSCHUNG, *Gens Augusta. Untersuchungen zu Aufstellung, Wirkung und Bedeutung der Statuengruppen des julisch-claudischen Kaiserhauses*, Mainz 2002, Eos XCI 2004, S. 443–447; vgl. auch: A. ALEXANDRIS, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses. Eine Untersuchung ihrer bildlichen Darstellung von Livia bis Iulia Domna*, Mainz 2004.

² Beachtenswert sind in diesem Kontext: A. FILGES, *Standbilder jugendlicher Göttinnen. Klassische und frühhellenistische Gewandstatuen mit Brustwulst und ihre kaiserzeitliche Rezeption*, Wien 1997.

³ R.R.R. SMITH, *Hellenistic Sculpture: A Handbook*, London 1991, S. 83–86.

⁴ J.C. EULE, *Hellenistische Bürgerinnen aus Kleinasien. Weibliche Gewandstatuen in ihrem antiken Kontext*, Istanbul 2001.

⁵ J.B. CONNELLY, *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Princeton 2007.

⁶ J. DAEHNER (hrsg.), *Die Herkulanerinnen. Geschichte, Kontext und Wirkung der antiken Statuen in Dresden*, München 2008 (englische Ausgabe: Los Angeles 2007); besonders der Aufsatz von Ch. VORSTER, *Griechische Ursprünge: Die Vorbilder der Herkulanerinnen*, S. 129–158.

⁷ *Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture. Context, Subjects, and Styles*, Cambridge 2006.

⁸ *Portraits of Women in the Early Hellenistic Period*, in: P. SCHULTZ, R. VAN DEN HOFF (hrsg.), *Early Hellenistic Portraiture. Image, Style, Context*, Cambridge 2007, S. 63–83.

Bereits dieser sehr lakonischen Einleitung kann entnommen werden, welche wichtige Frage D. aufgegriffen hat. Ihre Arbeit besteht aus vier Kapiteln und der Einleitung. Am Ende gibt es ein Schlusswort, vier Anhänge, ausgewählte Bibliographien und Indexe. In der Einleitung („Introduction“) unterstreicht die Autorin, dass ihr Ziel nicht nur die Rekonstruktion der Geschichte des statuarischen Porträts der Frauen, sondern vor allem die Schaffung eines neuen theoretischen Rahmens für dieses Porträt ist, eines anderen Rahmens als der, der sich auf das Stil-Kriterium stützt und für das Porträt der Männer gilt. Ihre Analyse, obwohl sie vor allem auf dem Material aus Athen, Priene, Pergamon und Delos beruht, bezieht sich in der Situation, wenn sie zusätzliche Informationen zu gewinnen und zu nützen ermöglicht, auch auf Denkmäler aus anderen Orten (z. B. Lindos, Messena, Delphi und Thassos) ab der klassischen Periode bis hin zum 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus.

Im Kapitel I („Portrait Honors for Women in Late Classical and Hellenistic Greece“) rekonstruiert D. die Anfänge der Entstehung der Frauenstatuen (Votiv- und Ehrenstatuen) in Athen im 4. Jahrhundert vor Christus⁹ und analysiert die zur Verfügung stehenden epigraphischen und archäologischen Quellen. Obwohl die Praxis der Aufstellung, als Votivgabe, der Männer- und Frauenstatuen in den Tempeln zwar in die archaische Periode zurückreicht, wurde die öffentliche Aufstellung einer berühmten Persönlichkeit erst im 4. Jahrhundert zur größten Auszeichnung. Leider stehen uns, in Bezug auf Frauenstatuen, aus der frühesten Periode vor allem Statuenbasen und nur drei datierte Skulpturen (erste Hälfte des 4. Jahrhunderts) zur Verfügung. Ihre Anzahl müsste viel größer gewesen sein, da Frauenstatuen von berühmtesten griechischen Bildhauern angefertigt wurden (u. a. Demetrios, Praxiteles, Leochares, Kephisodot, Nikomachos, Pandios und Timarchos).

In der hellenistischen Periode wurde diese Praxis nicht nur in Athen, sondern auch an anderen Orten fortgesetzt (z. B. in Priene, Pergamon, auf Lindos und Delos). Die Frauen wurden einzeln als Priesterinnen, in Paaren als Ehefrauen und in größeren statuarischen Gruppen als Mitglieder bekannter Familien dargestellt. Mit dem Ende des 3. Jahrhunderts verringerte sich die Aktivität in Athen und die Bildhauer begannen ihre Erfahrungen an anderen Orten umzusetzen (u. a. auf Rhodos und Delos und in Pergamon).

Im Kapitel II („Clothes and the Women: Statue Formats and Portrait Costumes“) konzentriert sich D. auf das Aussehen der Frauenstatuen, vor allem auf ihre Körperdarstellung und drapierten Kleider. Die Gesichtsphysiognomien und die Frisuren der Frauendarstellungen blieben nämlich sowohl in der spätklassischen als auch in der hellenistischen Periode fast unverändert. Am Anfang hatten die Frauenstatuen nicht viele Vorbilder, daher wurden die Göttinnen und die normal sterblichen Frauen auf die gleiche Weise dargestellt. Erst in der hellenistischen Periode entstand ein breiteres Spektrum der Möglichkeiten und man begann bei den Darstellungen der Griechinnen z. B. Elemente der Alltagskleidung wiederzugeben, was sie wesentlich von den Darstellungen der Göttinnen unterschieden hat. Die Festlegung der Chronologie dieser Veränderungen ist äußerst schwierig. Die Einführung neuer Typen bedeutete nämlich nicht, dass alte aufgegeben wurden. Unter den populärsten Darstellungen unterscheidet man sieben Formate (*formats*) in zwei Grundtypen: aktiv und passiv. In der ersten stehen die Arme der bildhauerischen Darstellungen vom Korpus ab, bei den anderen liegen sie am Körper an. Die Pose, Kleidung und ihre Drapierung und nicht die Porträts haben den Darstellungen Individualität verliehen und konnotierten ein entsprechendes Bezugsspektrum.

Im Kapitel III („The Female Portrait Face“) konzentriert sich D. auf die Analyse des Frauenporträts. Sie bemerkt, dass sich beim römischen Frauenbildnis die Frisurmode sehr schnell änderte, in Griechenland gab es hingegen nur einige Varianten, die an eine bestimmte Kleidung angepasst wurden. Die differenzierenden Merkmale (z. B. Alter oder Status) waren aus diesem

⁹ Wenn nichts anderes angegeben, beziehen sich sämtliche Daten auf den Zeitraum, der üblich als „vor Christi Geburt“ genannt wird.

Grund verschiedene Kleidungsstücke (z. B. Schleier), diverser Schmuck oder unterschiedliche Gesichtsproportionen. Meistens wurden zwei Modelle, bekannt als Artemis und Aphrodite, verwendet. Trotz der bestehenden Unterschiede scheinen die Frauendarstellungen jedoch wenig differenziert zu sein, insbesondere wenn sie mit den Darstellungen der Männer verglichen werden. Während in der zweiten Hälfte des 4. Jahrhunderts die wachsende Anzahl der Männerdarstellungen und die Entwicklung der Fertigungstechniken zum Herausheben physiognomischer Unterschiede zwischen den einzelnen Darstellungen beigetragen haben, betraf ein ähnlicher Prozess die Frauendarstellungen nicht. Dies ist sowohl auf soziale (die Frauen haben nicht posiert, sie waren beim Bildhauen nicht anwesend) als auch auf ideologische Gründe, die noch bedeutsamer waren, zurückzuführen. Bezugspunkte für Frauendarstellungen waren nicht Merkmale ihrer individuellen Physiognomien, sondern ihre metaphysische Schönheit. Sie waren als homogene soziale Gruppe mit konkret festgelegten Rollen gesehen: als Töchter, Ehefrauen, Mütter und Priesterinnen, weshalb auch das Verleihen individueller Merkmale und die persönliche Erkennbarkeit ihrer Darstellungen kein erstrangiges Ziel war. Die Identifikation konkreter Personen garantierten jedoch die Inschriften mit der Beschreibung familiärer Beziehungen.

Im Kapitel IV („The ‚Not Portrait‘ Style of Female Portraiture in the Roman Period“) begründet D. die Dauerhaftigkeit des Stils der Frauendarstellung „ohne individuelle Merkmale“ („*not portrait style*“) in der römischen Periode. Obwohl die Römer zwei wesentliche Innovationen, nämlich den empathischen Realismus und das Kopieren früherer griechischer Vorbilder, eingeführt haben, die sowohl auf die Männer- als auch auf die Frauendarstellung Einfluss hatten, haben sie die lokalen Traditionen nicht ausgelöscht. Obwohl um die Wende des 2. und 1. Jahrhunderts auf Delos die erste „realistische“ Frauendarstellung im Altertum auftauchte, wurde der traditionelle Stil fortgesetzt, z. B. auf Thasos, in Aphrodisias oder in Perge. Dort, ähnlich wie an anderen Orten, wurden die Römer nach ihrer Ankunft so wie bisherige Wohltäter geehrt, d. h. – bei Frauen – unter Anwendung des im 4. Jahrhundert entstandenen Darstellungsstils „ohne individuelle Merkmale“. Zu diesem Zweck wurden erneut vorhandene Statuen verwendet oder neue in einem Stil ausgearbeitet, der zum sozialen Kontext am besten passt und für die lokale Gesellschaft verständlich ist. Auch dann, wenn die Darstellungen gemäß den römischen Grundsätzen angefertigt wurden, war die „ideale“ Ikonographie immer noch eine attraktive Art des Ausdrucks sozialer Inhalte.

Obwohl sich die Arbeit von D. nicht auf feministische Traditionen bezieht, beweist sie zur Gänze, dass die Grundpostulate der einmal durch Feministinnen formulierten Kritik weiter aktuell bleiben. Sowohl die Rekonstruktion des weiblichen Kulturerbes, als auch die Integration der „Geschichte der Frauen“ in die allgemeine Geschichte sind Aufgaben, die bisher nicht durchgeführt wurden. Die Arbeit von D. füllt nicht nur diese empfindliche Lücke aus¹⁰, sondern tut dies vor allem auf eine besonders interessante und inspirierende Weise. Sie verbindet mit Leichtigkeit den Diskurs der Kunstgeschichte, Archäologie, Epigraphik und Geschichte und außerdem nutzt sie zur Gänze die Möglichkeit der Präsentation der Kunstdenkmäler in ihrem architektonischen, sozialen und historischen Kontext. Obwohl D. einige Behauptungen zu rasch oder unpräzise aufstellt¹¹, ist es ihr gelungen einen innovativen Zugang mit ausführlicher Analyse des Materials, bei

¹⁰ D. befasste sich auch mit anderen mit der Darstellung der Frauen verbundenen Fragen; siehe z. B.: *Women on the Columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius and the Visual Language of Roman Victory*, in: S. DILLON, K. WELCH (Hrsg.), *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge 2006, S. 244–271.

¹¹ Z. B. der Bezug auf klassische griechische Vorbilder war gar keine römische Innovation und stand im Zusammenhang vor allem mit ihrer Umgestaltung und mit der Verleihung den Statuen einer neuen Bedeutung; vgl. E. PERRY, *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome*, Cambridge 2005, S. 122–149; R.M. KOUSSER, *Hellenistic and Roman Ideal Sculpture. The Allure of the Classical*, Cambridge 2008, S. 45–80 und M. MARVIN, *The Language of the Muses: The Dialogue Between Greek and Roman Sculpture*, Los Angeles 2008, S. 168–217.

dessen Bearbeitung sie viele Jahre arbeitete¹², zu verbinden. Der Versuch einen neuen theoretischen Rahmen für die Interpretation des Frauenporträts zu schaffen muss zweifelsohne als sehr erfolgreich anerkannt werden und es bleibt zu hoffen, dass dies eine Inspiration für weitere Forschungen sein wird.

Lechosław Olszewski
(Poznań)

¹² In den Jahren 1992–2004 führte D. Forschungen in Aphrodisias durch; vgl. *Aphrodisias II. Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias*, hrsg. von R.R.R. SMITH unter Mitwirkung von S. DILLON, C.H. HALLETT, J. LENAGHAN, J. VAN VOORHIS, Mainz 2006.

Ángel MARTÍNEZ FERNÁNDEZ (ed.), *Estudios de epigrafía griega*, La Laguna: Universidad de La Laguna, 2009, 532 pp., € 22.00, ISBN 978-84-7756-786-8.

Although a volume on Greek epigraphy published in the Canaries is something of a rare bibliographical bird, this collection is important and deserves attention also beyond Spain. Hence this review.

Estudios de epigrafía griega is capacious. It has 42 contributions, most of them in Spanish, but with seven in English, five in French, one in German, two in Italian, and five in Modern Greek (= 22 in Spanish, 20 in other languages). These essays appear in sixteen sections, nine of them with one paper only. Their grouping is: editions of corpora; revisions of texts; palaeography, alphabets, and scripts; linguistic and lexicographical studies (this has seven items); onomastics; epigrams; literary relations; economics; society; politics; religion (the largest section, with nine items); magic; mythology; epitaphs; archaeology; and recent discoveries (seven items). All have summaries in English and are together illustrated with over 70 photographs. So there should be something for everyone.

In the first section, Josep CORELL and Xavier GÓMEZ FONT describe the seven Greek inscriptions from the Valencia region. Though few and brief, they are varied. Phrases in a fourth-century mosaic from an ancient church at Elche contrast with graffiti on an amphora fragment (later than AD 100) from Valencia, where Sambatis is asked for “marital relations” (she complies), and which are perhaps from a brothel. J.L. RAMÍREZ SÁDABA ranges wider with a survey of Greek inscriptions from Spain and Portugal. Even if texts are sparse compared with those in Latin, they date from the sixth century BC to at least AD 500, and thus tell us much on trade, buildings, religion, the honouring of the living and the dead, and Greek itself, spoken at Emporion (near Gerona) for a thousand years up to the Visigothic invasions. These scholars are followed by Adalberto MAGNELLI, who gives a revisionist account (using photographic enhancement) of the statues (from the sixth century BC) of Cleobis and Biton at Delphi, arguing that they merely represent two athletes at the Pythian Games. On the history of graphemes, María Luisa DEL BARRIO VEGA scrutinizes forms for “e” in Corinthian script, Enrique NIETO IZQUIERDO refines the dating and provenance of an archaic inscription from near Argos (*IG IV 507*). Stephen V. TRACY issues a caveat on the dating of inscriptions on palaeographical grounds alone, though suggesting that the identifying of hands (with computer assistance) should bring more precision here.

The seven pieces dealing with linguistic and lexicographical matters are as follows. Alcorac ALONSO DÉNIZ proposes that an epithet for Aphrodite on a mirror (*SEG XLVIII 560*) of the fifth century BC from Achaëa means not “blowing one”, but alludes instead to her gift of calming storms. Monique BILE discusses rare or new dialectisms in recently-published inscriptions. Inés CALERO SECALL contrasts the words *epikarpia* and *karpós* in the Gortyn Code. Emilio CRESPO notes that two diplomatic texts (*IG V 2, 1* and *IV 556*; originals now lost) of about 365 BC from the Peloponnese are in Attic, and hence go against C.D. BUCK’s rule on the use of local dialect in such matters. Antonio LILLO proposes that the first epiphany of the Chronicle of Lindos was written in Ionian, its Dorian traits being a later colouring. Juan RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS lists 29 words (all starting with *alpha*) from recently-published inscriptions that are unrecorded by standard dictionaries. Rosa-Araceli SANTIAGO ÁLVAREZ closes this part with an account of juridical texts of 500–450 BC from Crete and Arcadia, where she notes Homeric and Mycenaean linguistic traits.

As a contribution to onomastics, Anna PANAYOTOU outlines (in Greek) the nature of pre-Christian Greek personal names from Cyprus. Two writers deal with epigrams. Esteban CALDERÓN DORDA offers a statistical account of hexameters in second- and third-century epitaphs, noting archaisms in them despite their lateness. Manuel SÁNCHEZ ORTIZ DE LANDALUCE comments on the rareness of allusions to myth in the most ancient votive and funerary verse-inscriptions, in contrast to later examples, where they become commoner with increased space or subjectivity (or both).

Literary relations provide three contributions. Manuela GARCÍA VALDÉS looks in detail at two hexameters (from the sanctuary of Didyma in Caria) known only from Aelian, who thought they proved that tritons (or mermen) existed. José Guillermo MONTES CALA considers the language and style of fictitious inscriptions included by Nonnus of Panopolis in his *Dionysiaca*. After considering its debt to hymns and other literary sources, José B. TORRES decides the merits of the Epidaurian hymn to the Mother of the Gods (*JG* IV² 1, 131), known from an inscription of AD 200 to 400 (and discovered in 1929), but itself perhaps dating from the fourth century BC.

On economics, Léopold MIGEOTTE offers data on city finances from Hellenistic inscriptions, variously informing us on sanctuaries, farming, taxation, building projects, grain imports, festivals, athletics, or payment of tribute. As regards society, Liborio HERNÁNDEZ GUERRA attends to Latin epigraphic references to freed slavewomen in Iberia. Although they had “the same restlessnesses and perspectives that you liberate the rest of the womanly” (whatever that means), those with a “Greek Oriental cognomen” often improved their status not just by juridical means but by marriage. (The author refrains from conjecture on what these women had that their sisters lacked.) Under politics, Marc MAYER I OLIVÉ provides a substantial paper on the ideology of honours paid to the imperial family in the eastern Mediterranean during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, as with the Exedra of Herodes Atticus in Olympia.

The long section on religion begins with Rosa María AGUILAR on Commagene (now in south-east Turkey), where tombs of Antiochus I and his line enlighten us on Greek dialect and Greek-Persian syncretism, as well as that monarch’s pretentiousness. Alexandru AVRAM writes on the cult of Leto the Titaness in five texts (of the sixth to fourth centuries BC), all from cities founded by Milesians on the Black Sea. Martha BALDWIN BOWSKY draws attention to a brief first- or second-century Latin inscription (now part of a church in Crete), taken as an indication of imperial benefactions to nearby Aptaera. Alberto BERNABÉ argues that the text on a recently-found fourth- or third-century gold tablet from Pherai (in Thessaly) had an Orphic function. Its two lines of verse addressed Persephone, seeking a better life in the Underworld for a deceased initiate. Fritz GRAF relates ten recently-discovered lines of Hellenic verse from Halicarnassus to Anatolian cults and myths of Zeus. Catherine KEESLING compares names on fifth-century Athenian *ostraka* with those of dedications on stone, and lists the 133 complete names on Acropolis dedications of 600 to 300 BC. María PAZ DE HOZ brings out the confessional aspect in addresses (of Roman imperial date) from Phrygia and Lydia to Anatolian gods. Julián MÉNDEZ DOSUNA proposes an emendation to mean ‘goat’ and not ‘at once’ on an Orphic gold tablet (of the fourth century BC and discovered in 1985) from Thessaly. Georg PETZL discusses a fragmentary petition of about AD 221 discovered in 2001 at Sardis, Lydia. Members of a cult had asked the proconsul of Asia to confirm their right to practice their rituals (he agreed), apparently following reluctance of the city authorities to honour financial obligations to the devotees. The author notes that ancient municipalities often tried to default on payments to religious associations, who would then protest, loudly.

There follow four sections (on magic, mythology, epitaphs, and archaeology) each with one item. Manuel GARCÍA TEJEIRO comments in the first on three polished black stones, of the third century after Christ, from Pergamon. He thinks they “formed part of a magician’s kit”. María del Henar VELASCO LÓPEZ (whose copious annotation tends to swallow up her text) comments on myths of Cadmus, Proteus, and Palamedes by which the Greeks sought explanations for the origins of writing. Elena MARTÍN GONZÁLEZ gives careful attention to the style of archaic Greek prose epitaphs. Giulia BARATTA itemizes a small group of second- and third-century lead mirrors and the chosen words with which they flattered their beholders.

Although several of the above papers concern discoveries, the last section is devoted exclusively to the subject. Four of its seven papers are in Modern Greek. V. APOSTOLAKOU edits the verse epitaph (discovered in 2005 at the Hellenistic and Roman town of Kamara, Crete) of Charo daughter of Enipas. She died in childbirth, and the editor stresses the power of the lines in her memory. Angelos CHANIOTIS edits a verse epitaph of about 100 BC from Aphrodisias, Caria. It mourns Epicrates, who (like the subject of Housman’s poem) was an athlete who died young. Ángel

MARTÍNEZ FERNÁNDEZ edits a brief text (which gives the name of Soterios, who commissioned it) from a funerary monument of about 200 BC from Abdera, Thrace. With Vanna NINIΟΥ-KINDELI, he thereafter edits five other brief texts from Hellenistic *stelae* at Abdera. Nike TSATSAKI publishes a fragmentary graffito from a jug of about 100 BC found in 2003 at Pyrgi, Crete. V. APOSTOLAKOU and V. ZOGRAFAKI present eight new texts, dating from the third century BC to after AD 100, from the cemetery at Olus in eastern Crete. Yannis TZIFOPOULOS closes the volume with two short inscriptions of 100 BC to AD 200 from north-west Crete.

The volume, of assured technical quality, deserves what we now call impact. It should be bought by every library and individual concerned with Greek inscriptions, not least given its exceedingly reasonable price. Those concerned in a more general way with history, literature, law, or religion in the ancient world will also find much to interest them, if they can overcome any prejudice they might have against a book written (for the most part) in Spanish.

Andrew Breeze
University of Navarre, Pamplona

Antoni DEBIŃSKI, Joanna MISZTAŁ-KONECKA, Monika WÓJCIK, *Prawo rzymskie publiczne* [„Das römisches Staatsrecht“], Warszawa: C.H. Beck, 2010, XXI+217 S.

Die Bildungstradition im römischen Staatsrechts wie auch die wissenschaftliche Forschung auf diesem Gebiet ist in Polen relativ jung. Im Gegenteil zu den Italienern haben sich die polnischen Romanisten bisher wenig mit der Geschichte und der Dogmatik der römischen Verfassung beschäftigt¹. Auf dem didaktischen Gebiet findet das römische Staatsrecht oft als fakultatives Fachgebiet im Bereich der Verwaltungswissenschaften seinen Platz. Die ersten Vorlesungen hat Professor Jan ZABŁOCKI im Oktober 2002 für die Studenten der Verwaltungswissenschaften an der Kardinal-Stefan-Wyszyński-Universität Warschau gehalten. Kurz danach wurde der Kurs für römisches Staatsrecht im Verwaltungswissenschaftsbereich von Professor Bronisław SITEK und Doktor Adam ŚWIĘTOŃ an der Universität Warmińsko-Mazurski in Olsztyn eröffnet. Das Resultat ist, dass im Jahr 2004 das erste Skript unter dem Titel *Rzymskie prawo publiczne* („Das römische Staatsrecht“)² herausgegeben wurde, und einen Monat später (Januar 2005) das zweite unter dem gleichen Titel³. Die beiden Schriften sind aber mehr als ein Vorlesungsskripts. Im Jahre 2006 hat dann Doktor Tomasz PALMIRSKI, Mitarbeiter an der Jagiellonen-Universität, sein Vorlesungsheft *Publiczne prawo rzymskie. Zarys wykładu. Skrypt dla studentów prawa i administracji* („Das römische Staatsrecht. Eine Darstellung. Heft für Studenten der Rechts- und Verwaltungswissenschaften“) publiziert⁴.

Die neue Veröffentlichung des C.H. Beck Verlags ist das erste Lehrbuch, das in Polen dem römischen Staatsrecht gewidmet ist. Die Autoren sind erfahrene Wissenschaftler der Katholischen Universität Lublin Johannes Paul II.: Professor Antoni DEBIŃSKI, Doktor Joanna MISZTAŁ-KONECKA und Doktor Monika WÓJCIK. Das Material ist in 10 Kapiteln chronologisch und sachlich angelegt⁵. So werden in den ersten vier Kapiteln die einzelnen römischen Staatsformen wie Monarchie, Republik, Prinzipat und Dominat betrachtet. Weitere Themen sind die Quellen des römischen Rechts; die Organisation der territorialen Verwaltung, die Armee, die Finanzverwaltung sowie die Religion und das Strafrecht mit seinen Strafverfahren.

Die ersten vier Kapitel sind überwiegend nach einem bestimmten Schema aufgebaut. Sie fangen immer mit einer kurzen Einführung in die politische und soziale Geschichte der einzelnen Staatsformen an. So findet man in Kapitel 1⁶ eine kurze Betrachtung über den etruskischen Ursprung und die Herrschaft über die italienische Halbinsel, insbesondere kulturelle und strukturelle Verwandtschaften zwischen etruskischen und römischem Staaten (als eine Nachfolge der

¹ Wissenschaftler, die sich für das römische Staatsrecht interessieren sind z. B. Professor Marek KURYŁOWICZ und Professor Krzysztof AMIELAŃCZYK von der Maria-Curie-Skłodowska-Universität in Lublin sowie Professor Antoni DEBIŃSKI und Doktor Maciej JOŃCA von der KUL. Mit dem kommunalen Recht beschäftigt sich Professor Bronisław SITEK von der UWM in Olsztyn. Als Wissenschaftler, die sich für das allgemeine Staatsrecht interessieren, sollen Professor Jan ZABŁOCKI mit seinem Lehrstuhl an der katholischen UKSW in Warschau und Doktor Adam ŚWIĘTOŃ von der UWM genannt werden.

² P. KRAJEWSKI, B. SITEK (hrsg.), *Rzymskie prawo publiczne*, Olsztyn 2004.

³ A. TARWACKA, J. ZABŁOCKI, *Rzymskie prawo publiczne*, Warszawa 2005.

⁴ T. PALMIRSKI, *Publiczne prawo rzymskie. Zarys wykładu. Skrypt dla studentów prawa i administracji*, Kraków 2006.

⁵ Ähnlich dem ersten Skript von P. KRAJEWSKI und B. SITEK (hrsg.). Das Werk von A. TARWACKA und J. ZABŁOCKI folgt der chronologischen Entwicklung der Staatsformen, das letzte (5.) Kapitel dient der Veröffentlichung ausgewählter Quellen, so auch das letzte Schulbuch, von T. PALMIRSKI.

⁶ *Ustrój polityczny i społeczny Rzymu królewskiego* („Die Staatsform und die Gesellschaft des Roms während des Königtums“, S. 1–10).

etruskischen Herrschaft). Dann folgt ein kritischer Blick auf die Staatsgründung mit der Tradition der sieben Könige. Das 2. Kapitel⁷ zeigt die Entstehung der Republik aufgrund des patrizisch-plebejischen Konflikts auf. Die Beschreibung des Prinzipats (Kap. 3⁸) sowie des Dominats (Kap. 4⁹) beginnt mit der politischen Genese. Im zweiten Teil dieser vier Kapitel werden die politischen Strukturen analysiert. Im Kapitel 1 wurde kurz die Struktur des Königtums mit seinen Grundinstituten erläutert, wie etwa *rex*, *senatus*, *pontifices* und *comitia*. Der zweite Teil des 2. Kapitels wurde gemäß der üblichen Tripartition verfasst (Magistrate, Senat und Volksversammlungen). Dies gilt auch für die Kapitel 3 und 4, wo in den einzelnen Paragraphen die politische Struktur und die Kompetenzen der Organe im Prinzipat und im spätrömischen Reich geschildert werden.

Die römischen Rechtsquellen werden in Kapitel 5 (S. 73–86) bearbeitet. Die Autoren entwickeln ihre Darlegung von der Chronologie der Rechtssysteme aus, weiter besprechen sie die wichtigsten Begriffe (wie *ius*, *iusiuria* sowie *fontes iuris*) und letztendlich präsentieren sie die einzelnen Rechtsquellen in einer systematischen Darstellung¹⁰. Der letzte Paragraph dient zur Beschreibung der justinianischen Rechtskompilation.

Die territoriale und administrative Organisation Roms (Kap. 6, S. 87–101) hat als Ausgangspunkte die Reform des Servius Tullius und die Zeit der römischen Eroberung in Italien übernommen. So kommen wir zur Entstehung und Organisation der römischen Provinzen in der Republik. Im Prinzipat zeigen die Autoren die Entwicklung der verschiedenen Verwaltungsbereiche der Stadt Rom, Italiens und der römischen Provinzen auf, die in senatorische und kaiserliche Verwaltungsbereiche geteilt worden sind. Es gibt auch eine allgemeine Darstellung der Organisation der Selbstverwaltung in Kolonien und Munizipien. Die Verwaltungsreform von Diokletian eröffnet die Betrachtung der Staatsverwaltung im Dominat, außerdem findet der Leser noch einige Informationen über den Status der zwei Hauptstädte, d. h. Rom und Konstantinopel, sowie über die Stellung der Munizipien.

Die Darstellung der Geschichte der römischen Armee, der Kapitel 7 gewidmet worden ist (S. 103–120), besteht in einer kurzen chronologischen Erörterung der Entwicklung und der in den einzelnen Staatsformen vorgenommenen Reformen. Zusätzlich geben die Autoren eine kurze Erklärung über andere Militäreinheiten, wie etwa *cohortes praetoriae*, *urbanae* oder *vigilum*. Dies gibt den Studenten einen Einblick, wie die innere Ordnung in Rom und in anderen Städten organisiert war. Insbesondere, dass es im Rom keinen Polizeidienst im heutigen Sinne gab.

In einer chronologischen Darstellung der Finanzverwaltung werden uns die wichtigsten Einkommen des Staats und die Steuererhebung präsentiert (Kap. 8, S. 121–137). Die Autoren haben sich bemüht, die Struktur der Besteuerung in Rom im Wandel der Zeit zu schildern. Durch die Vermittlung des Zusammenhangs von Staatseinkommen und -ausgaben bekommt der Leser eine Erklärung dafür, warum sich die Römer dazu entschieden haben, erst im Prinzipat direkte Steuern einzuführen. Es wird auch darauf hingewiesen, dass die Balance zwischen staatlicher und bürgerlicher Finanzierung, die vom Jahre 167 v. Chr. an relativ gut funktionierte, mit dem Kaiserreich allmählich zu Ende ging.

Im 9. Kapitel (S. 137–160) werden die religiösen Fragen betrachtet. Dazu gehören eine allgemeine Charakteristik der römischen Religion, die mit staatlichen Göttern und bedeutenden orientalischen Kulturen zu tun hat. Zudem bekommen die Studenten ein Bild, das von römischen Götterdienst, den Priesterschaften und dem Festkalender zusammenfasst wurde. Die wichtigsten

⁷ *Organizacja polityczna i społeczna republiki* („Die politische und gesellschaftliche Gestaltung der Republik“, S. 11–37).

⁸ *Rzym w okresie pryncypatu* („Rom in der Prinzipatszeit“, S. 39–58).

⁹ *Cesarstwo rzymskie okresu dominatu* („Römisches Reich in der Dominatszeit“, S. 59–71).

¹⁰ Gewohnheitsrecht, Gesetze und Plebisziten, Senatsbeschlüsse, Edikte, Jurisprudenz, kaiserliche Konstitutionen.

Neuheiten der Kaiserzeit, d. h. der Kaiserkult, die Orientalisierung der römischen Religiosität (z. B. der Mithras-Kult) und das aufkommende Christentum wurden im zweiten Teil dieses Kapitels beschrieben (insbesondere der letzte Fragenkomplex).

Im Kapitel 10 wird das Prozessrecht und seine Gestaltung besprochen. Es wird jedoch mit dem Strafverfahren abgeschlossen (S. 161–203). Diese Entscheidung wurde wahrscheinlich getroffen, weil sich die Autoren streng auf den Begriff Staatsrecht halten wollten¹¹, zu dem der Straf- aber nicht Privatprozess im antiken Rom gehörte. Es scheint aber zu knapp und zu unausführlich zu sein, weil meines Erachtens eine kurze Betrachtung der Organisation der privatrechtlichen Rechtssprechung, die auch zu den staatlichen Aufgaben zählte, angebracht wäre. In dem Kapitel wird nur ein Überblick über die fortschreitenden Eingriffe der Staatsorgane in privatrechtliche Prozeduren vermittelt, Aspekte über die Entwicklung der einzelnen Prozessformen fehlen jedoch. Den Autoren gelingt es aber hervorragend, kurz die feste Trennung zwischen privatrechtlichen und öffentlichen Vergehen darzulegen, was es ihnen erlaubt, die Veränderungen des Verlaufs der Strafprozeduren aufzuzeigen. Das Strafverfahren wird in administrativen und materiellen (d. h. die Auswahl der wichtigsten Straftaten¹² und Strafen¹³) Zusammenhängen betrachtet und erläutert.

Zusammenfassend kann gesagt werden, dass das Buch einen fundierten und gut lesbaren Überblick über das römische Staatsrecht bietet. Die anhängenden Tabellen und Diagramme sind eine dienliche Ergänzung der Texte und helfen bei der Wiederholung des Materials¹⁴. Zu diesem Zweck dienen ebenso der Index der Fachbegriffe (S. 205–217) und die lateinischen Sentenzen (S. XV f.). Hervorzuheben ist auch der enge Kontakt zu den Quellen, die in reicher Auswahl (mit Übersetzung) am Ende der Kapitel angeführt werden. So bekommt der Leser Hinweise auf weitere Literatur, auf die er zurückgreifen kann, wenn er seine Kenntnisse vertiefen möchte (S. XIX–XXI).

Wichtig ist auch der erfolgreiche Versuch der Autoren, dem Leser den Wandel der gesellschaftlichen Bedingungen näher zu bringen. Aber sie haben sich hauptsächlich auf die römischen Bürger beschränkt, so dass die Rolle der anderen Mitglieder des Staates fast unbeachtet bleibt. Ich bin der Ansicht, es wäre auch wichtig darauf hinzuweisen, welche Bedeutung die *Latinitas* (daneben die *Civitas Romana*) in der Politik der Staatsherren hatte, was im festen Zusammenhang z. B. mit den Munizipalreformen der flavischen Dynastie stand. Die Autoren geben zwar eine knappe Charakteristik der drei Formen der *Latinitas* an, aber es wäre auch erforderlich sich die Frage zu stellen, warum die Römer einmal die *civitas Romana*, ein andermal aber die *Latinitas* anwendeten.

Am Ende möchte ich noch kurz die Aufmerksamkeit auf einige andere Punkten lenken. Es ist natürlich eine subjektive Empfindung, aber es wäre vielleicht sinnvoll in der nächsten Auflage das 5. Kapitel als das 1. einzusetzen, weil es logisch zu sein scheint, die einzelne Quellenarten und ihre Bedeutung als eine Einführung in die Geschichte der s. g. *fontes iuris oriundi* anzugeben. Bei der

¹¹ Ulpian, *Dig.* I 1, 1, 2.

¹² Die Tötung (*homicidium, parricidium*), Straftaten gegen den Staat (*crimen laesae maiestatis, perduellio, falsum, crimen annonae, repetundae, peculatus, res residua, sacrilegium, ambitus*), sexuelle Straftaten (*lenocinium, adulterium, incestum*), Entführung (*plagium*), Diebstahl (*furtum, iniuria*), Straftaten gegen die Religion (*Bacchanalia*), Christentum und danach *apostasia, haeresis*, die Juden als Religionsgruppe, die Manichäismus).

¹³ Todesstrafe, Zwangsexil.

¹⁴ Kap. 1: Struktur des Königtums in Rom (S. 7); Kap. 2: die politischen Berechtigungen der Bewohner des Roms im 2. Jh. n. Ch. (S. 20), die Magistraturen in der römischen Republik (S. 28 f.); Kap. 3: die Herrscher Roms (mit Ausnahme der Usurpatoren, S. 42 f.); Kap. 4: die Herrscher Roms (mit Ausnahme der Usurpatoren, S. 62); Kap. 6: die römische Provinzen unter der Regierung des Oktavian Augustus (S. 98); Kap. 7: die Militärpflichten der römischen Bevölkerung seit Servius Tullius (S. 104 f.); Kap. 8: römische Währungseinheit am Ende des 1. Jh. v. Ch. (S. 123); Kap. 9: die ökumenischen Konzilien bis zum Tod Justinians I. (S. 154).

von den Autoren vorgeschlagenen Struktur kann der Leser nach der umfangreichen Erörterung der Staatsformen die auf das Verwaltungsrecht orientierte Perspektive aus den Augen verlieren¹⁵. Was auch eine wichtige Frage für Studenten des Verwaltungsrechts darstellt, sind die Verantwortlichkeit der Beamten und die Kontrollkompetenzen in verschiedenen Perioden. Zwar haben die Autoren einige Bemerkungen dazu gemacht (wie z. B. über *defensor civitatis*) und aus ihren Betrachtungen der gesellschaftlichen Struktur ist zu entnehmen, dass der politische Interessenwiderspruch eine große Rolle im Aufbau der Staatsverwaltung und ihrer effektiven Kontrolle spielte, aber wie es genau funktioniert hat, wird nicht besonders deutlich erklärt. In Zusammenhang mit *cognitio* z. B. schrieben die Autoren, dass sich im Dominat die ‚Pflicht‘ der *Sportulae* weiter verbreitet hätte. Wenn aber eine solche Behauptung streng im Kontext mit einem bestimmten Prozessverfahren steht, so könnte man annehmen, dass sie vielleicht nur in der Rechtspflege bestanden hat.

Es soll aber betont werden, dass den drei polnischen Romanisten: Antoni DĘBIŃSKI, Joanna MISZTAŁ-KONECKA und Monika WÓJCIK gelungen ist, mit ihrem Lehrbuch *Prawo rzymskie publiczne* das Wesentliche zu umfassen und gleichzeitig ein interessantes Bild des antiken Rom zu skizzieren. Das Werk vermittelt nicht nur Studenten aufschlussreiche Kenntnisse, sondern auch denjenigen, die sich für römische Geschichte interessieren.

Aldona Jurewicz
Universität Ermland-Masuren in Olsztyn

¹⁵ Auch im Lehrbuch von P. KRAJEWSKI und B. SITEK (hrsg.) werden die Rechtsquellen nach der Geschichte der Staatsformen erörtert. Dafür könnte sprechen, dass die Absicht bestand, zuerst die staatlichen Organe mit ihren Kompetenzen anschaulich darzustellen.

Maria MAŚLANKA-SORO, *Tragizm w «Komedii» Dantego*, Kraków: Universitas, 2010, 2^e éd. modifiée, 384 pp.

La monographie de la spécialiste en lettres classiques et italiennes de l'Université Jagellonne se recommande d'elle-même par le fait qu'il s'agit d'une deuxième édition, modifiée par rapport à la première publiée en 2005. Tout au long du livre, les deux spécialités de l'auteure sont admirablement mises en œuvre.

Les lecteurs potentiels intéressés par le chef-d'œuvre de Dante seront également attirés par l'oxymoron du titre: *Le tragique dans la «Comédie» de Dante*. Le début de la première des deux parties du livre («La poétique du tragique dans la *Comédie*»), de caractère théorique, apporte les explications nécessaires. Pourquoi intituler *comédie* une œuvre qui «fait éclater les cadres de toutes les classifications et de tous les genres par sa thématique, sa structure stylistique, linguistique et celle de sa pensée, ainsi que par la grande diversité de son expression poétique» (p. 19)? Or, c'est Dante lui-même qui, dans *L'Enfer*, appelle son œuvre *comédie*, alors qu'il réserve le terme de *tragédie* à l'*Énéide* de Virgile. Parmi les arguments rappelés et discutés dans le livre, il y a notamment l'opinion de Gianfranco CONTINI qui affirme que «du point de vue thématique, *L'Enfer* est la partie tragique de la *Comédie*» (p. 25). En effet, d'après les poétiques de l'époque, le cours des événements représentés dans la comédie part d'un début plein d'amertume pour arriver à une fin heureuse (qui est ici *Le Paradis*).

Toujours dans la partie théorique, l'auteure se penche sur deux catégories fondamentales: la *mimesis* et la *katharsis*, en introduisant les distinctions et les notions qui seront utilisées dans l'analyse menée dans la deuxième partie du livre. La *mimesis* est définie comme «représentation créative d'un modèle du monde imaginé, dans laquelle la transposition en signes linguistiques des signes appartenant à une réalité (qui, en l'occurrence, existe dans la conscience de l'auteur de l'œuvre) s'opère grâce à l'analogie, comprise comme une technique donnée qui permet la construction d'un lien entre deux plans différents» (p. 11). La référence à l'analogie est ici très significative, car elle était, au Moyen Âge, un moyen d'interprétation de la réalité et elle permettait de découvrir le monde sursensible à travers celui que l'on perçoit avec les sens. Maria MAŚLANKA-SORO (= M.-S.) montre de quelle manière la compréhension de la figure de la réalité permet d'expliquer le phénomène du tragique de *L'Enfer*: la vie terrestre des damnés, qui existe dans leur mémoire, est une figure, tandis que leur sort dans l'Enfer, observé par Dante-personnage, est la réalisation de cette figure. Ainsi, le conflit tragique le plus important, celui dont tous les autres découlent, est celui qui naît entre la figure et sa réalisation.

La conclusion de la première partie, à la fin du chapitre «La *katharsis* classique et la *katharsis* dantesque», est la suivante: contrairement à la *katharsis* aristotélicienne qui concerne l'état d'esprit et mène au sentiment de pitié, «la *katharsis* de Dante-pèlerin mène, en fait, au rejet des valeurs et des attitudes sur lesquelles les personnages rencontrés avaient fondé leur vie» (p. 96). Cette constatation est développée et illustrée dans la deuxième partie du livre, la partie analytique, intitulée «La sémantique du tragique dans *L'Enfer*». On y assiste, entre autres, à l'analyse du destin tragique des *magnanimi* (chapitre II), dont Ulysse, et de celui des *coupables «innocents»* (chapitre III), dont Francesca da Rimini, classée dans cette catégorie avec, notamment, Pier della Vigna («ingiusto fece me contra me giusto», *If XIII 72*).

La subtile analyse à laquelle M.-S. soumet le personnage d'Ulysse – qui joue dans la *Comédie* un rôle important aussi du fait des échos autobiographiques, en tant que symbole de la crise intellectuelle de Dante-auteur – la mène à des conclusions intéressantes. Le héros grec, placé au huitième cercle, huitième bolge, parmi les conseillers perfides, est sévèrement puni non seulement pour la fraude du cheval de Troie, mais aussi à cause de son désir de connaissance («ardore della conoscenza») sans bornes qui l'a conduit à des situations conflictuelles et, au bout du compte, à la

soumission de la morale à l'intellect. En effet, les pérégrinations d'Ulysse sont interprétées par Dante-auteur comme une manifestation d'orgueil intellectuel, de désir d'égaliser le Créateur dans son savoir. Le héros grec, enfermé dans l'abîme infernal, est encerclé d'une langue de feu qui est autant l'instrument de la punition que l'image des péchés commis: le désir ardent de connaissance et la fausse langue. Ulysse mérite la damnation du point de vue des deux religions, la grecque et la chrétienne, car il a outrepassé les limites de la nature humaine, en commettant l'*hybris*, c'est-à-dire en péchant par orgueil. Pour M.-S., ce personnage est également un exemple de confusion de signes appartenant aux deux cultures, l'antique et païenne d'un côté, la chrétienne de l'autre, qui forment, dans la *Comédie*, «un grand palimpseste de la mémoire».

Un autre chapitre explique quel est le vrai drame de Francesca, la fameuse représentante des *lussuriosi*, et quelle est la vraie nature de la pitié (*pietà*) éprouvée par Dante-pèlerin. Francesca, qui se présente comme une héroïne tragique, est «une héritière inconsciente de l'éthique païenne»: telle la Phèdre de Sénèque, elle perçoit l'amour comme une nécessité objective, un sentiment irrationnel, une fatalité (p. 221). Dante-pèlerin, qui s'émeut de son histoire, acquiert cependant d'épisode en épisode davantage de maturité morale, fruit de son combat intérieur contre la pitié (*guerra de la pietate*). Dante-auteur suggère à ses lecteurs qu'il n'était pas nécessaire que la tragédie s'accomplisse et que ce qui est le plus tragique, c'est que Francesca, comme d'ailleurs les autres damnées, continue à ne pas savoir distinguer le vrai du faux. Ainsi, *Tragizm w «Komedi» Dantego* est une brillante démonstration de l'opération conduite par Dante-auteur, humaniste admirateur de l'Antiquité, capable d'un regard critique fondé sur la vision chrétienne et sa doctrine du libre arbitre: une opération de déconstruction du tragique qu'il met lui-même en scène.

Le chapitre dédié à Pier della Vigna et sa métamorphose tragique fournit de nombreux exemples de l'heureuse rencontre entre les sources antiques du texte analysé par la chercheuse et ses vastes connaissances dans ce domaine. Elle y montre notamment la réalisation de la règle classique du lien «iconique» entre le sens et le nom («Nomina sunt consequentia rerum»), compare la finalité des métamorphoses chez Ovide et chez Dante, ou rappelle la différence de jugement porté sur le suicide *ob metum dedecoris* dans la culture antique et dans la culture chrétienne.

M.-S., qui – à l'intention d'un public international – a judicieusement ajouté à son livre une version italienne de la table des matières et un résumé en italien, puise ses citations du texte original de l'édition suivante: Dante Alighieri, *La Commedia secondo l'antica vulgata* (Edizione Nazionale a cura della Società Dantesca Italiana, Milano: Mondadori, 1966–1967). Pour le confort des lecteurs polonais, les citations italiennes sont systématiquement accompagnées de traductions. Quant aux versions polonaises de la *Comédie*, dont il existe une bonne dizaine¹, la chercheuse privilégie celle d'Edward PORĘBOWICZ (publiée pour la première fois en 1899 et restée la plus connue), mais au besoin elle se sert aussi de celle d'Alina ŚWIDERSKA (publiée pour la première fois au milieu du XX^e siècle) et de la plus récente, celle d'Agnieszka KUCIAK (son *Enfer* a été publié en 2002). Pour rendre le sens de certaines expressions, il lui arrive aussi de recourir à la traduction littérale, comme dans l'analyse lexicale et stylistique du chant XIII.

Traduire Dante est toujours un projet audacieux, comme le rappelle le titre du livre consacré par Andrzej LITWORNIA à la réception de la *Comédie* en Pologne et publié la même année que la première édition de la monographie de M.-S.² S'imposer au sein des études dantesques n'est pas moins ambitieux, cependant la «petite brique» que l'auteur du livre présenté a apportée à «l'imposant édifice» de la dantologie mondiale (p. 13) est loin d'être négligeable.

Justyna Łukaszewicz, Maria Łukaszewicz-Chantry
Université de Wrocław

¹ On attend la parution de la toute dernière, œuvre de Jarosław MIKOŁAJEWSKI.

² A. LITWORNIA, «*Dantego któż się odważy tłumaczyć?*» *Studia o recepcji Dantego w Polsce* [«Qui osera traduire Dante?» Études sur la réception de Dante en Pologne], Warszawa 2005.