

EOS XCIX fasc. 2
2012

E O S

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTOR NACZELNY

JAKUB PIGOŃ

REDAKTORZY

KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA
JERZY AXER
MAŁGORZATA BOROWSKA

Rocznik XCIX 2012

Zeszyt 2

WROCŁAW–LUBLIN–WARSZAWA
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE
INSTYTUT BADAŃ INTERDYSCYPLINARNYCH „ARTES LIBERALES”
2012

E O S

COMMENTARII SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

EDITOR PRIMARIUS
IACOBUS PIGOŃ

EDITORES
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA
GEORGIUS AXER
MARGARITA BOROWSKA

Volumen XCIX 2012
Fasciculus 2

WRATISLAVIAE–LUBLINI–VARSOVIAE
SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM
INSTITUTO STUDIIS INTERDISCIPLINARIBUS EXCOLENDIS “ARTES LIBERALES”
ADIUVANTE
2012

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.uni.wroc.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

| | |
|--|---------|
| BENEDETTO BRAVO, Per la storia del testo di Erodoto e di quello di Tuciddide nell'antichità. Parte seconda: Le testimonianze di Dionigi di Alicarnasso e di altri autori antichi... 201–241 | 201–241 |
| AGNIESZKA FULIŃSKA, <i>Divae Potentes Cyprī?</i> Remarks on the Cult of the Ptolemaic Queens as Aphrodite | 243–269 |
| GEORGE C. PARASKEVIOTIS, Vergil's <i>Eclogue 9: Idyll 7 and Eclogue 1 in Reverse</i> | 271–278 |
| SEBASTIAN RUCIŃSKI, Arruntius Stella, l'organisateur des jeux de Néron..... | 279–292 |
| ANDRZEJ ŁOŚ, Remarques sur l'origine géographique et statut socio-juridique des négociants d'huile et de saumure hispaniques..... | 293–308 |
| MALGORZATA CIEŚLUK, The Reader in the "Comedy of Errors" of the Ancient Greek Novel | 309–335 |
| MICHAŁ BZINKOWSKI, Bird Imagery in Eschatological Landscape of Modern Greek Funeral Laments..... | 337–358 |

MISCELLANEA

| | |
|---|---------|
| ROBERT SUSKI, Emperor Aurelian and the Solar Eclipse of 272..... | 359–363 |
| WŁODZIMIERZ OLSZANIEC, <i>Platonis Gorgias Leonardo Aretino interprete: osservazioni critiche</i> | 365–367 |
| CAROLUS MARTINUS LUCARINI, <i>Correctio</i> | 369 |

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

| | |
|---|---------|
| R. Scott Garner, <i>Traditional Elegy: The Interplay of Meter, Tradition, and Context in Early Greek Poetry</i> , New York–Oxford 2011 (KRYSZYNA BARTOL)..... | 371–374 |
| J. Silva Barris, <i>Metre and Rhythm in Greek Verse</i> , Wien 2011 (PIOTR STEPIEŃ)..... | 375–378 |
| P. Roche, <i>Lucan: De Bello Civili, Book 1</i> . Edited with Introduction, Text, and Commentary, Oxford 2009 (MARIUSZ PLAGO)..... | 379–381 |
| P. Taormina, R.M. Piccione (a cura di), Giamblico: <i>I frammenti dalle epistole</i> . Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento, Napoli 2010 (JOANNA KOMOROWSKA) ... | 382–383 |
| A.M. Lasek, <i>Nonnos' Spiel mit den Gattungen in den "Dionysiaka"</i> , Poznań 2009 (JOANNA KOMOROWSKA)..... | 384–387 |
| Libri anno MMXII recepti..... | 389–390 |

PER LA STORIA DEL TESTO DI ERODOTO E DI QUELLO
DI TUCIDIDE NELL'ANTICHITÀ.PARTE SECONDA: LE TESTIMONIANZE DI DIONIGI
DI ALICARNASSO E DI ALTRI AUTORI ANTICHI¹

di

BENEDETTO BRAVO

ABSTRACT: Several of the very many literal quotations from Thucydides in the *opuscula rhetorica* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus are evidence for a text significantly different from, and better than, what is offered by the direct tradition, while none of the demonstrably interpolated passages of our Thucydides appears to have been known to Dionysius. A quotation from Herodotus I 57, 3 in Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae* I 29, 3 gives the authentic reading in a passage that the direct tradition presents in an arbitrarily altered form. There is no evidence that any author of the first century BC knew passages of Herodotus or Thucydides which must result from deliberate interpolation. On the other hand some of the interpolated passages in our Herodotus and Thucydides are quoted or paraphrased or alluded to by Plutarch and subsequent authors. Apparently between the time of Dionysius and that of Plutarch (probably in the first quarter of the first century AD) somebody produced interpolated texts of Herodotus and Thucydides, which became the vulgate of these two authors.

I. IL TESTO DI TUCIDIDE QUALE ERA LETTO DA DIONIGI DI ALICARNASSO

In parecchi dei suoi opuscoli retorici, trattando di vari aspetti della prosa di Tucidide, Dionigi riporta numerosissimi pezzi tucididei, più o meno estesi².

¹ La Parte prima di questo studio è stata pubblicata nel fascicolo precedente di questa annata di Eos, pp. 23–65.

² Mi riferisco agli opuscoli seguenti: *De Thucydide* (detto anche *De Thucydide iudicium*); *Epistula ad Ammaeum*; *De Thucydidis proprietatibus* (detto anche *De Thucydidis idiomatibus*, oppure *Altera epistula ad Ammaeum*); *Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum*; *De compositione verborum*; *De Demosthenis dictione*. Mi sono fondato su due edizioni: quella di H. USENER e di L. RADERMACHER, vol. I, Lipsiae 1899; vol. II, Lipsiae 1904–1929; e quella di Germaine AUJAC, vol. IV, Paris 1991; vol. V, Paris 1992. Citando passi di questi opuscoli, darò dapprima l'indicazione moderna del capitolo e del paragrafo, e poi, tra parentesi, la paginazione che nell'edizione USENER–RADERMACHER è segnata in margine e che è quella della vecchia edizione di J.J. REISKE.

A volte li cita approssimativamente, dunque a memoria³ (forse ricordando ciò che aveva letto un momento prima, o forse ricordando una vecchia lettura), secondo un modo di citare ammesso nell'antichità. Questi casi però sono piuttosto rari. Se il pezzo citato è lungo e se la citazione concorda interamente o in gran parte con ciò che si legge in tutti i principali manoscritti dell'opera tucididea o in qualcuno di essi, possiamo esser sicuri che egli aveva una copia di Tucidide davanti agli occhi e voleva riprodurre fedelmente ciò che in essa leggeva. È importante tener presente che molte delle sue citazioni hanno lo scopo di mostrare concretamente le particolarità lessicali, sintattiche, stilistiche dell'opera tucididea: questa circostanza aumenta grandemente la probabilità che quelle citazioni siano testimonianze fedeli dello stato del testo.

Là dove la tradizione medievale di Tucidide dà una lezione unica, il testo citato da Dionigi dà per lo più la stessa lezione; e là dove essa presenta due o più varianti, il testo da lui citato dà per lo più una di queste, senza che sia possibile aggregarlo a un ramo particolare della tradizione. (È tuttavia degno di nota che esso abbia alcune varianti in comune con manoscritti che conservano lezioni provenienti da un ipotetico manoscritto tardo-antico⁴ che gli studiosi designano con la sigla Λ.) Non mi occuperò di situazioni né dell'uno, né dell'altro tipo; mi occuperò invece di situazioni meno frequenti, e cioè, da un lato, di quelle citazioni che contengono lezioni non attestate dalla tradizione diretta di Tucidide, e dall'altro, di quelle citazioni che permettono di concludere *e silentio* che la copia che Dionigi aveva davanti agli occhi non conteneva dei passi che si trovano in tutti i manoscritti medievali.

Di tali divergenze del testo citato rispetto a quello della tradizione diretta, gli studiosi moderni di Tucidide – editori, commentatori, critici del testo, storici – si sono occupati troppo poco; quasi sempre hanno dato la preferenza alla tradizione diretta senza discutere le testimonianze di Dionigi, non di rado senza menzionarle. Queste testimonianze (però non tutte quelle di carattere negativo) sono registrate da Karl HUDE nella sua edizione 'maxima' di Tucidide⁵, ma sono

³ Tale è il caso della citazione di una indimenticabile frase della fine del prologo dell'opera di Tucidide, I 23, 6, in *De Thucydidis proprietatibus* 6, 1 (796): in questa citazione, fatta evidentemente a memoria, il testo differisce in molti particolari importanti da quello che si legge nell'ampia citazione di Thuc. I 23, 4–24, 1 in *De Thucydide* 10, 3 (833), dove Dionigi aveva evidentemente il testo davanti agli occhi (il che è confermato dalle parole κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως γράφω, "scrivendo letteralmente così").

⁴ Si veda A. KLEINLOGEL, *Geschichte des Thukydidestextes im Mittelalter*, Berlin 1963, pp. 158–161, 167–171. A questo proposito devo dire che alcuni dei casi che KLEINLOGEL enumera a p. 160 trattandoli come casi di consenso in errore, mi sembrano essere piuttosto dei casi di consenso in lezione genuina, e dunque meno adatti a dimostrare rapporti di parentela: II 36, 4 ἦλθον (già altri, tra cui G.B. ALBERTI, hanno considerato giusta questa lezione); II 39, 4 ἐθέλοιμεν; III 82, 3 ἐπιπύσσει (che propongo di leggere come ἐπι πύσσει, affine a ἀποπύσσει dei mss. FM; VII 71, 4 omissione di αὐτῶι. Anche le due lezioni indicate da Kleinlogel a pp. 160 seg. come lezioni comuni al testo citato da Dionigi e al ms. E sono lezioni genuine.

⁵ *Thucydides Historiae*, [...] recensuit C. HUDE, I–II, Lipsiae 1898 e 1901.

relegate tra i *testimonia*, non compaiono nell'apparato critico propriamente detto. Altri editori hanno dedicato ad esse ancora meno attenzione⁶.

A disinteressarsi delle testimonianze di Dionigi gli studiosi moderni sono stati incoraggiati da una dissertazione di Leonhard SADÉE (1878)⁷ – un lavoro diligente e solido. Nella prefazione della sua edizione ‘maxima’⁸, K. HUDE scrisse che la dissertazione di L. SADÉE aveva chiarito che “*exemplar quo Dionysius usus est eiusdem recensiois fuit ex qua omnes nostri codices Thucydidei fluxerunt*”. Questo giudizio, con parole solo leggermente diverse, L. SADÉE lo aveva enunciato come una delle conclusioni della “Pars prior” del capitolo III della sua dissertazione⁹ – capitolo dedicato alle citazioni di passi di Tucidide. Ma secondo me, le osservazioni fatte nella “Pars prior” e che tendono a scoprire errori commessi da Dionigi stesso nel citare o nati nel corso della trasmissione dei suoi opuscoli, non giustificano affatto tale giudizio. Questo si mostra poi ancora più ingiustificato se si tiene conto della “Pars posterior”. Verso la fine di questa, SADÉE scrive¹⁰: “*Postquam Dionysii exemplar, quantum superest, vitiis et librariorum et Dionysii ipsius et grammaticorum, quatenus cum probabilitate fieri potuit, liberavimus, qui restant loci discrepantes aut veriores lectiones praestabunt, aut certe digni erunt, qui ceterorum turbae eximantur*”. Dunque SADÉE stesso riconosceva che l'*exemplar* usato da Dionigi poteva avere delle lezioni rispettabili, non attestate dai nostri manoscritti tucididei. Inoltre io sono convinto che molti dei *loci discrepantes* che SADÉE ha creduto di poter scartare come dovuti a “*vitia et librariorum et Dionysii ipsius et grammaticorum*”, sono in realtà delle lezioni che si trovavano nel suo *exemplar*. Infine – e questo è il punto più importante – osservo che SADÉE non si è preoccupato del fatto che in certe citazioni dionisiane mancano delle sequenze di parole o anche lunghi pezzi di testo che Dionigi avrebbe dovuto riportare, se li avesse conosciuti.

Un nuovo confronto tra le citazioni da Tucidide che si trovano in Dionigi e i nostri manoscritti di Tucidide fu fatto da Maximilian PEHLE in una dissertazione presentata all'Università di Greifswald nel 1906 e pubblicata a Berlino nel 1907¹¹. Lo scopo di questa nuova ricerca era di rifare il lavoro di SADÉE sulla base dell'edizione degli opuscoli di Dionigi pubblicata da USENER e RADERMACHER

⁶ Nell'edizione pubblicata da G.B. ALBERTI molte delle varianti dionisiane – tra cui alcune importanti – non sono segnalate affatto. Molto scrupoloso nello studio della tradizione diretta, questo editore non si è occupato con altrettanto impegno della tradizione indiretta.

⁷ L. SADÉE, *De Dionysii Halicarnassensis scriptis rhetoricis quaestiones criticae*, Argentorati 1878.

⁸ Vol. I, pp. X seg.

⁹ L. SADÉE, *o.c.*, p. 140.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 163–166. Il passo citato è a p. 163.

¹¹ Maximilianus PEHLE, *Thucydidis exemplar Dionysianum cum nostrorum codicum memoria confertur*, dissert. Greifswald, Berlin 1907.

e dell'edizione di Tucidide pubblicata da HUDE. Su parecchi punti particolari PEHLE espresse giudizi diversi da quelli di SADÉE, senza però fare dei progressi importanti. La sua conclusione generale è la seguente¹²: “Ex omnibus, quas proposuimus lectionibus, iam demonstravisse nobis videmur Dionysium exemplari Thucydidis usum esse, quod multo melius fuit quam quivis nostrorum codicum”. Che la copia di Tucidide di cui Dionigi si serviva fosse molto migliore di ciascuno dei nostri codici, mi sembra verissimo, ma i dati su cui PEHLE ha fondato questa conclusione non sono sufficienti per giustificarla. Egli non ha potuto trovare dati sufficientemente numerosi e significativi, perché tutta la sua ricerca è rimasta dentro i limiti tracciati da quella di SADÉE (seguendone da vicino lo schema).

Dopo quelle di SADÉE e di PEHLE, nessun'altra ricerca sistematica – che io sappia – è stata fatta in questo campo. L'eccellente e coraggiosa dissertazione di David M. LEWIS¹³, che mirava a stabilire come autori antichi leggessero certi passi di Tucidide che sono importanti per gli studiosi di storia politica dei Greci antichi, lasciò da parte deliberatamente Dionigi di Alicarnasso.

Ritengo possibile e necessario andare decisamente al di là dei limiti delle ricerche fatte da L. SADÉE e M. PEHLE, studiando le testimonianze di Dionigi dal punto di vista del problema che mi interessa: quello delle possibili interpolazioni nel testo tucidideo.

È vero che una buona parte delle varianti dionisiane sono manifestamente errori di copisti, che potevano trovarsi già nella copia di Tucidide usata da Dionigi, o che furono commessi più tardi nel corso della trasmissione degli opuscoli di quest'ultimo¹⁴; è vero che in alcuni casi è possibile o addirittura molto probabile che Dionigi abbia citato a memoria e perciò in modo approssimativo; è vero che anche quando citava avendo il testo davanti agli occhi, può a volte aver saltato

¹² Ibidem, p. 55.

¹³ David M. LEWIS, *Towards a Historian's Text of Thucydides*, dissert. dell'Università di Princeton, 1952, inedita, accessibile in University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

¹⁴ Un caso importante che, a mio parere, appartiene a quelli in cui abbiamo a che fare con errori della tradizione degli opuscoli di Dionigi, è la citazione di Thuc. V 103, 2 in *De Thucydide* 40, 2 (913): là dove la tradizione diretta di Tucidide dà ὁ ὑμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς τε καὶ ἐπὶ ῥοπῆς μῖα ὄντες μὴ βούλεσθε παθεῖν, la citazione nel *De Thucydide*, secondo i manoscritti, dà ὁ ὑμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς τε καὶ ἐπὶ σκοπῆς μῖα ὄντες οὐ βούλεσθε παθεῖν. Sotto questa forma il passo è assurdo. Sono convinto che Dionigi non abbia copiato (né, tanto meno, citato a memoria) un testo così assurdo. Gli editori correggono οὐ in μὴ, giustamente; ma, a mio parere, è necessario anche correggere σκοπῆς in ῥοπῆς. (La mia convinzione è rafforzata dal fatto che in due passi delle *Antiquitates Romanae*, VIII 52, 1 e XII 14, 2, Dionigi usa l'espressione ἐπὶ μικρᾶς αἰωρεῖσθαι ῥοπῆς.) Vedo una difficoltà: in uno dei manoscritti di Tucidide, *M*, c'è ἐπὶ σκοπῆς, e in una parte degli *scholia* a Tucidide relativi a questo passo c'è ἐπὶ κοπῆς, il che può far pensare che l'errore nella citazione dionisiana sia molto antico. Immagino che un errore che consistesse nello scrivere ΕΠΙΚΟΠΗC invece di ΕΠΙΡΟΠΗC sia stato fatto sia nella tradizione del testo di Tucidide, sia (indipendentemente) in quella del testo di Dionigi, sebbene io non veda perché; in quest'ultima tradizione, poi, ΕΠΙΚΟΠΗC si sarebbe cambiato in ΕΠΙΚΚΟΠΗC. Mi rimane però una certa perplessità.

inavvertitamente parole o frasi, o aver omesso consapevolmente una o due parole, giudicandole non importanti per il suo assunto o prive di senso in una citazione che le privava del loro contesto, può inoltre aver fatto inconsapevolmente qualche piccolo cambiamento (riguardante per esempio l'ordine delle parole o l'uso dell'articolo o la ripetizione di una preposizione), può infine aver corretto congettzionalmente ciò che leggeva, credendo di eliminare un errore di copista. Tutte queste possibilità vanno tenute presenti; ma nonostante tutto, le differenze che si constatano tra ciò che egli cita e ciò che ci hanno trasmesso i manoscritti medievali, meritano di esser prese in considerazione seriamente.

Altrettanto importante è il fatto che Dionigi menziona delle espressioni che, secondo lui, sarebbero usate da Tucidide, ma che non compaiono nel testo di Tucidide quale ci è stato trasmesso.

Cominciamo l'esame da questi ultimi casi. In *De Thucydidis proprietatibus* 10, 1 (799), Dionigi afferma che una delle singolarità di Tucidide consiste nell'“invertire” i generi grammaticali allontanandosi dall'uso corrente: Tucidide – egli dice – sostituisce a volte il maschile o il neutro al femminile, scrivendo per esempio τάραχος invece di ταραχή, ὄχλος invece di ὄχλησις, τὸ βουλόμενον invece di ἡ βούλησις, come per esempio nella frase οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ μὲν βουλόμενον οὐκ ἀφηιρέθησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀχλώδους τῆς παρασκευῆς, e τὸ δυνάμενον invece di ἡ δύναμις, infine scrivendo εἰ μὴ δυναστεία μᾶλλον ἢ ἰσονομία ἐχρῶντο τῶι ἐπιχωρίω οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ invece di scrivere εἰ μὴ δυναστεία μᾶλλον ἢ ἰσονομία ἐχρῶντο τῆι ἐπιχωρίω οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ. Ora, non tutte le parole che Dionigi menziona come esempi si ritrovano nel testo tucidideo tramandato dai manoscritti medievali, e le due frasi che cita non si ritrovano tali e quali. L. SADÉE ha sostenuto¹⁵ che qui Dionigi si è affidato alla sua memoria e che questa lo ha ingannato. Questa opinione non mi persuade. Può darsi che in qualcuno di questi casi le cose siano andate come diceva SADÉE¹⁶, ma certamente non in tutti i casi. Vediamo le singole parole o frasi menzionate da Dionigi.

Le parole τάραχος e τὸ δυνάμενον non compaiono in nessun luogo del nostro Tucidide, ed è impossibile stabilire dove si trovassero nel Tucidide che Dionigi leggeva¹⁷. ὄχλος nel senso di ὄχλησις compare in I 73, 2, e τὸ βουλόμενον nel senso di ἡ βούλησις compare in I 90, 2 (τὸ μὲν βουλόμενον καὶ ὑποπτον τῆς

¹⁵ SADÉE, *o.c.* (n. 7), pp. 145, 147.

¹⁶ Testimonianze errate di altri autori su parole o frasi che si troverebbero in Tucidide sono state elencate da Karl HUDE nella sua ‘editio maxima’ di Tucidide, vol. II, pp. 324 seg. (“Testimonia Pseudothucydidea”).

¹⁷ Nella stessa edizione dei *Testimonia Pseudothucydidea* una nota dell'editore dice: “fort. τὸ δυνάμενον Thuc II 97 legebatur”. Suppongo che l'editore si riferisse a II 97, 4 κατὰ τὸ δύνασθαι; ma io sono convinto, per ragioni che ho esposto altrove (ASNSP, s. IV, vol. V (fasc. 1) 2000, pp. 108–111), che questo passo non esistesse nel testo che Dionigi leggeva.

γνώμης)¹⁸. Tuttavia, per ciò che riguarda τὸ βουλόμενον, Dionigi non si riferiva soltanto a I 90, 2: infatti, dopo aver menzionato questa espressione, egli cita, come abbiamo visto, un'intera frase, e questa frase egli deve averla letta in Thuc. VI 24, 2, dove la tradizione diretta dà οἱ δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦν τοῦ πλοῦ οὐκ ἐξηιρέθησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀχλώδους τῆς παρασκευῆς. Mi pare molto probabile che τὸ μὲν βουλόμενον ("il desiderio", "l'intenzione") sia la lezione autentica¹⁹; τὸ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦν τοῦ πλοῦ potrebbe forse essere una glossa interlineare, che un copista avrebbe sostituito alla lezione tramandata, ma mi sembra di gran lunga più probabile che essa sia una correzione pedantesca, banalizzante, fatta da un editore, più precisamente da quell'editore-falsario di cui sto cercando le tracce. Ciò mi sembra tanto più probabile, in quanto un po' prima (VI 24, 1, da νομίζων τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ... fino a οὕτως ἀσφαλῶς ἐκπλεῦσαι) e un po' più avanti (VI 24, 3, da καὶ ἔρωσ ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πᾶσιν ὁμοίως ἐκπλεῦσαι ... fino a ὅθεν ἀίδιον μισθοφορὰν ὑπάρξειν) si trovano due pezzi di testo che, a mio parere, sono da attribuire appunto a quell'editore. Trascrivo tutto il passo VI 24, 1–3 chiudendo tra parentesi {} ciò che ritengo spurio:

ὁ μὲν Νικίας τοσαῦτα εἶπε, {νομίζων τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τῶι πλήθει τῶν πραγμάτων ἢ ἀποτρέφειν ἢ, εἰ ἀναγκάζοιτο στρατεύεσθαι, μάλιστα <ἀν> οὕτως ἀσφαλῶς ἐκπλεῦσαι.} οἱ δὲ {τὸ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦν τοῦ πλοῦ} (*leggi τὸ μὲν βουλόμενον, lezione attestata da Dionigi*) οὐκ ἐξηιρέθησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀχλώδους τῆς παρασκευῆς, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον ὥρμητο, καὶ τούναντίον περιέστη αὐτῶν· εὐ τε γὰρ παραινέσαι ἔδοξε καὶ ἀσφάλεια νῦν δὴ καὶ πολλὴ ἔσσεσθαι. {καὶ ἔρωσ ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πᾶσιν ὁμοίως ἐκπλεῦσαι · τοῖς μὲν γὰρ πρεσβυτέροις ὡς ἢ καταστρεφόμενοις ἐφ' ἃ ἔπλεον ἢ οὐδὲν ἂν σφαλῆσαν μεγάλην δύναμιν, τοῖς δ' ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τῆς τε ἀπουσίας πόθῳ ὄψεως καὶ θεωρίας, καὶ εὐέλπιδες ὄντες σωθήσεσθαι· ὁ δὲ πολὺς ὄμιλος καὶ στρατιώτης ἔν τε τῶι παρόντι ἀργύριον οἴσειν καὶ προσκτήσεσθαι (*lezione di G "ante correctionem [ut videtur]"; il resto della tradizione dà προσκτήσεσθαι*) δύναμιν ὅθεν ἀίδιον μισθοφορὰν ὑπάρξειν.} ὥστε διὰ τὴν ἄγαν τῶν πλεόνων ἐπιθυμίαν, εἴ τῶι ἄρα καὶ μὴ ἦρσκε, δεδιὼς μὴ ἀντιχειροτονῶν κακόνους δόξειεν εἶναι τῇ πόλει ἡσυχίαν ἦγεν.

¹⁸ Nell'edizione di USENER e RADERMACHER, una nota dell'editore (sopra l'apparato critico) dice: "τὸ βουλόμενον Thuc I 90 VII 49"; ma nel secondo di questi due passi (più esattamente VII 49, 1) τὸ βουλόμενον non significa "la volontà", bensì "coloro (dei cittadini) che volevano".

¹⁹ Tale uso del participio presente neutro sostantivato compare anche in altri passi di Tucidide: cfr. I 142, 8 ἐν τῶι μὴ μελετῶντι, e V 9, 6 τοῦ μένοντος. Penso che in Thuc. V 7, 2 οὐ βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς διὰ τὸ ἐν τῶι αὐτῶι καθημένους βαρύνεσθαι sia necessario correggere καθημένους in καθημένον: una volta fatta questa correzione, la frase significa "non volendo che essi fossero scontenti a causa della permanenza nello stesso luogo". – Lo stesso uso compare anche in versi di un contemporaneo di Tucidide, Euripide: vd. per esempio *Iph. A.* 1270 οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὸ κείνου βουλόμενον ἐλήλυθα. *Hec.* 299–300 Ἐκάβη, διδάσκου, μηδὲ τῶι θυμουμένῳ | τὸν εὐ λέγοντα δυσμενῆ ποιῶ φρενί, "Hekabe, lasciati istruire; non fare, per effetto dell'ira, in modo che uno che parla bene ti diventi ostile nella sua mente". G. MURRAY (così come l'anonimo grammatico da cui deriva, in uno *scholion*, la parafrasi τῶι θυμουμένῳ μέρει τῆς ψυχῆς) ha capito male τῶι θυμουμένῳ e di conseguenza ha cambiato φρενί in φρενός (congettura accolta da J. DIGGLE). Il testo è perfetto, non ha bisogno di correzioni congetturali.

Il pezzo da νομίζων τοὺς Ἀθηναίους fino a οὕτως ἀσφαλῶς ἐκπλεῦσαι è incompatibile con ciò che è detto poche righe più avanti, τὸναντίον περιέστη αὐτῶι· εὔτε γὰρ παραινέσαι ἔδοξε καὶ ἀσφάλεια νῦν δὴ καὶ πολλὴ ἔσεσθαι: da queste ultime parole infatti risulta chiaramente che Nicia, col suo discorso, non si era proposto di ottenere o l'abbandono del progetto di una spedizione, o l'aumento delle forze e dei mezzi per realizzarlo, bensì aveva tentato di ottenere la prima cosa fingendo di chiedere la seconda; τὸναντίον, “il contrario”, va messo in rapporto con ciò che è detto in VI 19, 2, dove il narratore introduce il discorso di Nicia e indica l'intenzione dell'oratore.

Quanto al passo che comincia con καὶ ἔρωσ ἐνέπεσε e termina con μισθοφορὰν ὑπάρξειν, molte sono le ragioni che mi inducono ad atezizzarlo.

(a) Se con τοῖς πᾶσιν ὁμοίως (“su tutti egualmente”) l'autore ha voluto dire “sulla totalità dei cittadini riuniti in assemblea”, ciò è contraddetto da εἴ τωι ἄρα καὶ μὴ ἤρεσκε, δεδιῶσ μὴ ἀντιχειροτονῶν κακόνους δόξειεν εἶναι τῆι πόλει ἡσυχίαν ἦγεν.

(b) Se invece ha voluto dire “su tutti i gruppi componenti l'assemblea”, l'enumerazione dei gruppi è strana. A prima vista, la distinzione tra οἱ πρεσβύτεροι e οἱ ἐν τῆι ἡλικίαι sembrerebbe separare i cittadini che sono nel fiore dell'età dai cittadini che sono troppo vecchi per partecipare a una eventuale spedizione; ma così non è: infatti il testo dice che anche οἱ πρεσβύτεροι furono presi dalla bramosia di ἐκπλεῦσαι, e spiega che essi speravano di “assoggettare gli stati contro i quali facevano la spedizione”. Questa distinzione tra οἱ πρεσβύτεροι e οἱ ἐν τῆι ἡλικίαι è probabilmente nata da una deformazione di un'idea che compare nel discorso di Nicia, VI 12, 2 – 13, 1, cioè dell'idea di contrapporre οἱ πρεσβύτεροι al giovane politico Alcibiade (νεώτερος ὢν ἔτι ἐς τὸ ἄρχειν) e ai giovani che lo appoggiano. Quanto al gruppo detto ὁ πολὺς ὄμιλος καὶ στρατιώτης, esso evidentemente non è determinato secondo il criterio dell'età, bensì secondo il criterio della posizione sociale (comprende dunque sia cittadini che appartengono al gruppo di οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, sia cittadini che appartengono al gruppo di οἱ ἐν τῆι ἡλικίαι); ma nulla è detto dei cittadini la cui posizione sociale è diversa da quella di ὁ πολὺς ὄμιλος καὶ στρατιώτης.

(c) Nonostante gli sforzi di molti commentatori, non si capisce bene che cosa significhi καὶ στρατιώτης. La mia impressione è che colui che ha scritto questo abbia immaginato che la massa dei cittadini ateniesi non ricchi assomigliasse in qualche modo agli στρατιῶται di mestiere, ai μισθοφόροι, la cui principale aspirazione era una αἰδῖος μισθοφορά.

(d) Le parole τῆς τε ἀπούσης πόθωι ὄψεως καὶ θεωρίας deformano e banalizzano l'idea espressa efficacemente nel discorso di Nicia, VI 13, δυσέρωτας εἶναι τῶν ἀπόντων, “essere insensatamente bramosi delle cose lontane”. Mentre Nicia accennava al desiderio insensato di assoggettare terre lontane, nel passo in questione si parla del desiderio di esperienze turistiche in terre lontane.

(e) In questo passo c'è una accumulazione straordinaria di duri anacoluti. Certo, Tucidide ama gli anacoluti; ma il troppo stroppia: qui abbiamo una cattiva imitazione dello stile tucidideo.

Scegliere tra οὐκ ἀφηρέθησαν, attestato da Dionigi, e οὐκ ἐξηρέθησαν della tradizione diretta, non è facile: entrambe le lezioni mi sembrano ammissibili. Ma a me basta aver mostrato che la lezione dionisiana τὸ μὲν βουλόμενον è migliore della lezione della tradizione diretta τὸ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦν τοῦ πλοῦ, e che quest'ultima è probabilmente un'innovazione banalizzante, dovuta allo stesso editore che ha inserito, poche righe prima e poche righe dopo questo passo, due pezzi di sua fabbricazione.

Anche la collocazione della frase εἰ μὴ δυναστεία μαλλον ἢ ἰσονομία ἐχρῶντο τῶι ἐπιχωρίω οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ si può stabilire: Dionigi deve onvviamente averla letta in IV 78, 3; ma qui la tradizione diretta dà εἰ μὴ δυναστεία μαλλον ἢ ἰσονομία ἐχρῶντο τὸ ἐγχώριον οἱ Θεσσαλοί²⁰. La frase che Dionigi aveva davanti agli occhi e che gli sembrava strana non è facilissima da capire, ma è corretta e sensata; essa significa letteralmente: “se i Tessali non avessero praticato, come regime usuale nel loro paese, la *dynasteia*, anziché l'*isonomia*”; in altre parole: se τὸ ἐπιχώριον dei Tessali, il tipo di governo praticato nel paese dei Tessali, fosse stato, non la *dynasteia*, ma l'*isonomia*²¹. Dionigi non ha capito bene ciò che leggeva: ha creduto che Tucidide avesse voluto dire “se i Tessali avessero praticato, non la *dynasteia*, ma l'*isonomia* caratteristica del loro paese”. Ma è evidente che Tucidide non può aver pensato che l'*isonomia* fosse il regime tradizionale in Tessaglia (egli conosceva bene le cose della Tessaglia; del resto, il contesto esclude tale interpretazione), ed è altrettanto evidente che egli non può aver trattato ἰσονομία come un sostantivo di genere neutro. Consideriamo ora la lezione della tradizione diretta, τὸ ἐγχώριον. È chiaro, sebbene non esistano altre attestazioni, che l'espressione τὸ ἐγχώριον è usata qui nel senso di ἐγχωρίως, come spiega uno *scholion* relativo a questo passo (ὅτι μαλλον δυναστεία ἢ ἰσονομία ἐγχωρίως ἐχρῶντο οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ). La frase che leggiamo nel testo della tradizione diretta significa dunque “se i Tessali non avessero praticato, conformemente all'usanza del loro paese,

²⁰ Qualche riga prima di questa frase, in IV 78, 2, c'è una frase manifestamente interpolata: {καὶ τοῖς πᾶσι γε ὁμοίως Ἕλλησιν ὑποπτον καθειστήκει τὴν τῶν πέλας μὴ πείσαντας διέναι}. Mi pare impossibile credere che Tucidide abbia scritto che l'attraversare il territorio di uno stato straniero senza aver ottenuto il permesso dalle autorità di questo, “era, per tutti i Greci indifferente, una cosa sospetta”: la considerazione qui enunciata è sciocca, tanto più che usando il piuccheperfetto καθειστήκει, l'autore la presenta, non come valida per tutti i tempi, ma come riferita al passato. Per καθειστήκει, si confronti un'altra frase spuria, IV 80, 3 {αἰεὶ γὰρ τὰ πολλὰ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις πρὸς τοὺς Εἰλωτας τῆς φυλακῆς πέρι μάλιστα καθειστήκει}: scrivendo καθειστήκει, e non καθέστηκε, l'autore di quest'ultima frase presenta le usanze spartane riguardanti gli iloti come cose appartenenti esclusivamente al passato.

²¹ Il commento di POPPO e di STAHL dà la traduzione seguente: “nisi domesticus quo Thessali utebantur rerum status magis principum dominatio quam legum aequabilitas fuisse”. L'interpretazione di ἰσονομία come “legum aequabilitas” è discutibile; per il resto la traduzione è giusta.

la *dynasteia* piuttosto che l'*isonomia*". Essa è certamente sensata, ma, a mio parere, è meno soddisfacente di quella che Dionigi ha letto nel suo Tucidide e che non ha capito bene. Inoltre, come ha osservato J.M. STAHL nel commento *ad loc.*, non si conoscono altri esempi dell'uso avverbale di τὸ ἐγχώριον (mentre si incontra spesso τὸ ἀρχαῖον οὐ τὸ παλαιόν, "anticamente"). Penso perciò che sia ragionevole scegliere la lezione attestata da Dionigi, τῶι ἐπιχωρίωι, come ha fatto J.M. STAHL. Questa conclusione è confermata da altre considerazioni. Né la lezione τὸ ἐγχώριον, né la lezione τῶι ἐπιχωρίωι può essere nata da un errore commesso da un copista: entrambe, infatti, sono tutt'altro che banali. O l'una o l'altra deve essere un'innovazione prodotta deliberatamente da un editore antico. Ora, mi pare inverosimile che un editore abbia avuto l'idea di trasformare τὸ ἐγχώριον, che, per quanto strano, si capisce facilmente, in τῶι ἐπιχωρίωι, producendo una costruzione che è corretta e sensata, ma difficile, tanto difficile che Dionigi l'ha capita male. È più verosimile che un editore abbia inteso τῶι ἐπιχωρίωι diversamente da come l'aveva inteso Dionigi, ma altrettanto male, e l'abbia cambiato in τὸ ἐγχώριον, prendendo come modello le espressioni τὸ ἀρχαῖον e τὸ παλαιόν.

Ancora nel *De Thucydidis proprietatibus*, in 5, 2 (795–796), parlando delle singolarità di Tucidide, Dionigi cita come esempio l'espressione ἡ οὐκ ἀποτείχισις τοῦ Πλημμυρίου, la quale si troverebbe ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ βύβλωι. Stando al testo di Tucidide che ci è stato tramandato, questa espressione non compare né nel libro VII, né altrove. L'unico luogo in cui il testo tucidideo noto a Dionigi possa averla contenuta è VII 24, 3, dove i nostri manoscritti danno (con varianti di poco conto, che non segnalo) μέγιστόν τε καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρώτων ἐκάκωσε τὸ στράτευμα τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἢ τοῦ Πλημμυρίου λῆψις. Dionigi deve aver letto qui ἡ τοῦ Πλημμυρίου οὐκ ἀποτείχισις. Se conosciamo ciò che Tucidide racconta in VII 4, 4–5 e 22–23, il senso dell'insolita espressione ἡ οὐκ ἀποτείχισις τοῦ Πλημμυρίου e di tutta la prima frase che la conteneva non può essere dubbio; bisogna intendere: "ciò che più di ogni altra cosa e prima di tutto indebolì l'esercito degli Ateniesi fu il fatto che esso non era riuscito a bloccare il Plemmyrion per mezzo delle fortificazioni" (cioè dei tre forti – τείχη οὐ φρούρια – fatti costruire da Nicia). Mi pare chiaro che οὐκ ἀποτείχισις è la lezione autentica (cfr. Thuc. III 95, 2 διὰ τῆς Λευκάδος τὴν οὐ περιτείχισιν, e I 137, 4 τὴν τῶν γεφυρῶν [...] τότε δι' αὐτὸν οὐ διάλυσιν), e che ἡ τοῦ Πλημμυρίου λῆψις ("la presa del Plemmyrion [*da parte dei Siracusani*]") è una correzione banalizzante²², analoga a quella che abbiamo visto in VI 24, 2 (τὸ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦν τοῦ πλοῦ).

²² Di altro parere era L. SADÉE: a p. 145 della sua dissertazione (vd. *supra*, n. 7) egli scriveva: "Re vera opusculum [*cioè il De Thucydidis proprietatibus*] exiguum est, singulaque idiomata paucis exemplis neque aptis plerumque illustrantur; rhetor cum brevis esse vellet, negligens factus est, idque complura probant. Nam verba, quae Thucydidis non sunt, ei tribuit: 793₁₅ ὁ ἐπιλογισμός, 799₅ ὁ τάραχος, quodque legitur 795₁₅ ἡ τε οὐκ ἀποτείχισις τοῦ Πλημμυρίου ex confusis τὴν τοῦ Πλημμυρίου λῆψιν VII 25 sive ἄλωσιν c. 32, cum τῆς Λευκάδος οὐ περιτείχισι III 952 originem duxisse haud improbabilis Popponis est coniectura (prolegg. ad Thuc. p. 166)".

In *De Thucydidis proprietatibus* 3, 1 (793–794), Dionigi menziona alcuni esempi di “espressioni rare e arcaiche e difficili da capire per la maggior parte dei lettori” (γλωσσηματικά μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀπηρχαιωμένα καὶ δυσεϊκάστα τοῖς πολλοῖς), che sarebbero state usate da Tucidide. Uno degli esempi menzionati è, secondo i principali manoscritti dell’opuscolo di Dionigi, la parola ἐπιλογισμός, o, secondo un manoscritto, la parola περιλογισμός. Né l’una, né l’altra parola compare in alcun luogo del nostro testo di Tucidide. L’apparato critico dell’edizione di USENER e RADERMACHER dà: “ἐπιλογισμός P περιλογισμός a. uox corrupta, fuit fort. ἐπηλύτης (Thuc. I 9 cf. Marcellinus 52)”. Può darsi che si tratti effettivamente di una *uox corrupta*. In questo caso, invece di pensare a ἐπηλύτης (che è del tutto improbabile), si potrebbe supporre che Dionigi abbia scritto ἀναλογισμός: questa parola è usata in modo un po’ inconsueto da Tucidide III 36, 4. Ma può darsi anche che in quest’ultimo passo di Tucidide Dionigi leggesse ἐπιλογισμός, e non ἀναλογισμός, e in questo caso sarebbe opportuno correggere il testo tramandato, scrivendo appunto ἐπιλογισμός. Polluce (II 120) leggeva qui ἀναλογισμός, ma in parecchi passi del suo lessico constatato che il suo Tucidide era quello adulterato dall’editore-falsario.

Passiamo ora alle citazioni di interi passi. In *De Thucydide* 10, 4 (834), Dionigi cita Thuc. I 88–89, 1. Qui compare una variante non priva di interesse: in Dionigi c’è ἐψηφίσαντο δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰς σπονδὰς λελύσθαι καὶ πολεμεῖν Ἀθηναίοις, mentre la tradizione diretta di Tucidide I 88 dà ἐψηφίσαντο δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰς σπονδὰς λελύσθαι καὶ πολεμητέα εἶναι. Entrambe le lezioni sono grammaticalmente corrette e sensate, ma la prima è più difficile, perché in questa il verbo ἐψηφίσαντο regge due diverse costruzioni; questo è uno di quei casi in cui è lecito e opportuno applicare il criterio della *lectio difficilior*. Inoltre in favore di questa lezione è l’analogia con I 125, 1: qui infatti è detto che la maggioranza dei rappresentanti degli alleati, riuniti a Sparta, ἐψηφίσαντο πολεμεῖν. L’altra lezione (quella della tradizione diretta) è probabilmente una innovazione dovuta a qualcuno che avrà voluto rendere la costruzione sintattica conforme a quella di un passo precedente, non molto lontano, e cioè di I 79 καὶ τῶν μὲν πλεόνων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ αἰ γινῶμαι ἔφερον, ἀδικεῖν τε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἤδη καὶ πολεμητέα εἶναι ἐν τάχει. Questo ignoto (un correttore o più probabilmente l’editore-falsario) non ha visto che in I 79 si tratta di pareri espressi nel corso di una seduta dell’assemblea lacedemonia, mentre in I 88 si tratta di un decreto dell’assemblea.

Ancora nel *De Thucydide*, in 10, 5 (834–835), la citazione di un lungo pezzo di Tucidide, I 118, 1–2, diverge dal testo della tradizione diretta in alcuni punti importanti. La tradizione diretta dà (118, 2): ...οὔτε ἐκώλυον εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ βραχύ, ἡσύχαζόν τε τὸ πλεόν του χρόνου, ὄντες μὲν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μὴ ταχεῖς ἰέναι ἐς τοὺς πολέμους, ἦν μὴ ἀναγκάζωνται²³, τὸ δὲ τι καὶ πολέμοις

²³ ἀναγκάζωνται si legge nei manoscritti CG; gli altri manoscritti danno ἀναγκάζοιτο.

οικείους ἐξειργόμενοι, πρὶν δὴ ἡ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ἦιρετο καὶ τῆς συμμαχίας αὐτῶν ἦπτοντο. τότε δὲ οὐκέτι ἀνασχετόν ἐποιοῦντο, ἀλλ' ἐπιχειρητέα ἐδόκει εἶναι πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ καὶ καθαιρετέα ἢ ἰσχύς, ἣν δύνωνται, ἀραμένοις τόνδε τὸν πόλεμον. Dionigi cita lo stesso passo nel modo seguente (sottolineo le divergenze): ...οὔτε ἐκώλυον εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ βραχύ, ἡσύχαζόν τε τὸ πλέον τοῦ χρόνου, ὄντες μὲν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μὴ ταχεῖς ἐς τοὺς πολέμους, ἦν μὴ ἀναγκάζωνται, τότε δ' ἔτι²⁴ καὶ πολέμοις οικείοις ἐξειργόμενοι. πλὴν ἡ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ἦιρετο καὶ τῆς συμμαχίας αὐτῶν ἦπτετο: τότε δὲ οὐκέτι ἐποιοῦντο ἀνασχετόν... etc. (il resto senza varianti).

Gli studiosi moderni hanno accettato il testo della tradizione diretta per tutto questo pezzo. A me sembra che il testo fornito da Dionigi sia migliore. Esaminiamo i singoli punti di divergenza:

(a) Per ciò che riguarda le due lezioni *μὴ ταχεῖς ἐς τοὺς πολέμους* (“non rapidi nel decidersi a fare le guerre”) e *μὴ ταχεῖς ἰέναι ἐς τοὺς πολέμους* (“non rapidi nell’andare alle guerre”), entrambe sono possibili²⁵, esito quale scegliere, ma ho l’impressione che la prima abbia un senso migliore.

(b) Nella citazione dionisiana il rapporto tra il *kōlon* *τότε δ' ἔτι* καὶ πολέμοις οικείοις ἐξειργόμενοι (“...e perché in quel tempo erano, per di più, anche ostacolati da guerre interne”) e il *kōlon* che lo precede, ὄντες μὲν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μὴ ταχεῖς ἐς τοὺς πολέμους (“perché anche prima non erano stati rapidi nel decidersi a fare le guerre”), è del tutto chiaro e soddisfacente: *τότε* (“in quel tempo”, cioè negli anni che sono stati oggetto della digressione che ora si è chiusa, capitoli 89–117), fa riscontro con *καὶ πρὸ τοῦ* (“anche prima”). Invece nel testo della tradizione diretta non c’è nulla che faccia riscontro con *καὶ πρὸ τοῦ*: le parole *τὸ δέ τι* significano infatti “e d’altra parte in una certa misura” (κατὰ τι, come spiega uno *scholion*); manca una distinzione esplicita tra il prima e il poi, manca un rapporto chiaro con il *kōlon* precedente. Mi pare evidente che la lezione dionisiana *τότε δ' ἔτι* è la lezione autentica. La lezione della tradizione diretta può essere un banale lapsus di copista: *ΤΟΔΕΤΙ* invece di *ΤΟΤΕΔΕΤΙ*; ma può anche essere un’innovazione consapevole, dovuta a qualcuno che avesse voluto migliorare il testo eliminando la ripetizione di *τότε δέ* (poco più avanti c’è infatti *τότε δέ οὐκέτι...*). Si noti che l’espressione *τὸ δέ τι* compare in Tucidide

²⁴ Dionigi ha scritto naturalmente *ΤΟΤΕΔΕΤΙ*. Nei manoscritti medievali dell’operetta di Dionigi questa sequenza di lettere è divisa in *τότε δέ τι* (e così hanno diviso gli editori moderni), ma la divisione delle parole è questione di interpretazione, e non di tradizione. J. REISKE ha sostenuto, certamente a ragione, che bisognava dividere diversamente: *τότε δ' ἔτι*. SADÉE (*o.c.* [n. 7], p. 163) ha accettato l’opinione di REISKE, e PEHLE (*o.c.* [n. 11], p. 28) ha seguito il suo esempio.

²⁵ In favore della prima, vd. un uso parzialmente analogo di *ταχύς* in Strabone XIII 3, 3 (C. 621): *πολύπλανον δὲ καὶ ταχύ τὸ ἔθνος πρὸς ἀπαναστάσεις*, e in Plutarco, *Cato Minor* 1, 5 *πρὸς ὀργὴν οὐ ταχύς οὐδ' ὀλισθηρός*. In favore della seconda, vd. un passo di Tucidide I 132, 5: (è costume dei Lacedemonii) *μὴ ταχεῖς εἶναι περὶ ἀνδρὸς Σπαρτιατίου [...]* βουλευσάτι ἀνήκεστον.

solo in alcuni passi che per varie ragioni mi sembrano sospetti, probabilmente interpolati: I 107, 4; III 68, 4; IV 83, 4; VII 48, 2.

(c) ἤπτετο (lezione di Dionigi) è eccellente; ἤπτοντο, pur essendo sensato, è meno buono, perché più banale. Certo, a prima vista si potrebbe pensare che il plurale ἤπτοντο sia la *lectio difficilior*, perché prima c'è un verbo alla terza persona del singolare, ἤρετο: la vicinanza di ἤρετο potrebbe aver causato il cambiamento (consapevole o inconsapevole) di ἤπτοντο in ἤπτετο. Ma a guardar bene, è la lezione ἤπτετο che bisogna considerare più difficile. Se leggiamo ἡ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ἤρετο καὶ τῆς συμμαχίας αὐτῶν ἤπτετο, possiamo riconoscere in questa frase un'audace personificazione della potenza degli Ateniesi. Questa potenza è concepita come un individuo che, trascinata dal successo, "si innalza troppo" (cioè oltrepassa la linea fino alla quale è lecito a un uomo arrivare nella sua aspirazione al potere e agli onori), rendendosi colpevole di ὕβρις. Il verbo αἴρεσθαι è qui carico di un significato morale²⁶, come in Thuc. I 130, 1, dove è detto che Pausania πολλῶι τότε μάλλον ἤρτο καὶ οὐκέτι ἐδύνατο ἐν τῶι καθεστῶτι τρόπῳ βιοτεύειν. Ciò è tanto più interessante, in quanto qui abbiamo a che fare con un giudizio espresso dal narratore a nome suo, sebbene esso coincida con il pensiero da lui attribuito ai Lacedemonii. L'αἴρεσθαι della potenza ateniese, secondo Tucidide, si sarebbe manifestato chiaramente (σαφῶς) agli occhi dei Lacedemonii proprio nel fatto di "mettere la mano" su *poleis* che erano in vari modi legate ai Corinzi, Epidamnos e Poteidaia. Il verbo ἄπτεσθαι è usato metaforicamente: esso presenta l'azione ateniese come se fosse il gesto rituale con cui uno si impossessa di una persona o di una cosa proclamando di aver diritto su di essa²⁷. Se leggessimo ἤπτοντο, conformemente alla tradizione diretta, questa rappresentazione personificante sarebbe indebolita e, soprattutto, scomparirebbe lo stretto rapporto tra lo ἄπτεσθαι e il σαφῶς αἴρεσθαι. La lezione ἤπτοντο è probabilmente una innovazione consapevole, fatta da qualcuno che non aveva capito che con le parole καὶ τῆς συμμαχίας αὐτῶν ἤπτετο l'autore non aveva voluto aggiungere una nuova informazione, bensì indicare esplicitamente in che cosa l'αἴρεσθαι della potenza ateniese si fosse manifestato agli occhi dei Lacedemonii. Questo qualcuno avrà attribuito alle parole ἡ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ἤρετο il senso seguente: "la potenza degli Ateniesi cominciò a crescere manifestamente". Ma non è verosimile che Tucidide abbia voluto dire questo, perché nelle righe precedenti è detto che durante il periodo di "circa cinquant'anni" tra la ritirata di Xerxes e l'inizio di "questa guerra" gli Ateniesi "resero più saldo il loro dominio

²⁶ Più spesso, in questa accezione, è usato il composto ἐπαίρεσθαι.

²⁷ Dell'uso di ἄπτεσθαι o ἐπάπτεσθαι come termine giuridico ho avuto occasione di trattare nel mio studio *Sulân. Représailles et justice privée contre des étrangers dans les cités grecques. (Étude du vocabulaire et des institutions)*, ASNSP, s. III, vol. X (fasc. 1) 1980, pp. 771-773, 837-840.

e giunsero essi stessi a un alto livello di potenza” (τὴν τε ἀρχὴν ἐγκρατεστέραν κατεστήσαντο καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ μέγα ἐχώρησαν δυνάμειως), e questa è l'idea principale del racconto precedente, I 89–117: secondo Tuciddide, durante tutto quel tempo la potenza ateniese, nonostante alcuni gravi insuccessi e cadute, non avrebbe fatto altro che crescere. Del resto, la lezione ἤπτοντο è meno buona anche per un'altra ragione: subito dopo c'è la frase τότε δὲ οὐκέτι ἀνασχετὸν ἐποιοῦντο (oppure τότε δὲ οὐκέτι ἐποιοῦντο ἀνασχετὸν), soggetto della quale sono i Lacedemonii; il passaggio da un soggetto a un altro diventa più chiaro se leggiamo ἤπτετο, e non ἤπτοντο.

(d) Resta – se lasciamo da parte la variante ἐποιοῦντο ἀνασχετόν, che riguarda soltanto l'ordine delle parole e sulla quale non ho opinione – da considerare la variante πλήν, alternativa rispetto a πρὶν δὴ.

La lezione della tradizione diretta è certamente ammissibile²⁸, ma anche la lezione attestata da Dionigi lo è.

Quest'ultima ha un vantaggio molto importante: rende possibile riconoscere un'articolazione ben equilibrata all'interno del lungo pezzo che si apre con le parole ταῦτα δὲ ξύμπαντα ὄσα... e va fino alla fine del § 2, abbracciando l'insieme degli avvenimenti dei “circa cinquant'anni”. E cioè, essa rende possibile distinguere nettamente una prima parte, che comincia con le parole ἐν οἷς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν τε ἀρχὴν ἐγκρατεστέραν κατεστήσαντο e termina con le parole τότε δ' ἔτι καὶ πολέμοις οἰκείοις ἐξειργόμενοι, e una seconda parte, che comincia con le parole πλήν ἢ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ἤριετο e termina alla fine del § 2. La prima parte, che costituisce un periodo sintattico chiuso, offre uno sguardo d'insieme sui fatti posteriori alla ritirata dell'esercito di Xerxes, ma anteriori a quelli narrati in I 24–88 (vd. τὰ προειρημένα in I 118, 1), anteriori cioè a quelli che provocarono la rottura delle σπονδαί. Dopo questo periodo sintattico comincia un nuovo periodo, che offre uno sguardo d'insieme sugli avvenimenti narrati prima della digressione: “Ma la potenza degli Ateniesi cominciò a innalzarsi manifestamente troppo e a mettere la mano sulla loro [*cioè dei Lacedemonii*] alleanza [= *sui loro alleati*]; e allora essi [*i Lacedemonii*] cominciarono a trovare la situazione non più tollerabile e a pensare che fosse

²⁸ L'imperetto ἤριετο e ἤπτοντο dopo πρὶν è ammissibile. Si veda per esempio l'uso di πρὶν + infinito del presente nella legge citata in [Demostene] 46 (*Contra Stephanum* 2), 24 ἐὰν ἀποθάνωσιν οἱ υἱεῖς πρὶν ἐπὶ διετὲς ἡβᾶν, “per il caso in cui i figli siano morti prima di aver cominciato a essere nel periodo di ἡβη biennale” (cioè prima dell'inizio dell'εφηβεία). Analogamente, troviamo più volte in Tuciddide l'imperetto in una proposizione introdotta da ἐπειδὴ: I 13, 5 ἐπειδὴ τε οἱ Ἕλληνες μᾶλλον ἔπλωιζον, “dopo che i Greci ebbero cominciato a navigare più frequentemente”; VI 2, 6 ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ Ἕλληνες πολλοὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἐπεσέπλεον, “dopo che i Greci ebbero cominciato ad arrivare per mare in gran numero”; VIII 68, 2 ἐπειδὴ τὰ τῶν τετρακοσίων [...] ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἑκακοῦτο, “dopo che i Quattrocento [...] cominciarono a essere perseguitati dal popolo”.

necessario attaccare²⁹ col massimo ardore e abbattere, se possibile, la forza, suscitando questa guerra³⁰. Queste parole formulano ancora una volta, in un nuovo modo, il pensiero enunciato in I 88, passo che, a sua volta, rinvia a I 23, 5–6. Si noti l'espressione sorprendente, e destinata a sorprendere, καθαιρετέα ἢ ἰσχύς: Tucidide non dice “la forza degli Ateniesi”, bensì semplicemente “la forza”, e con ciò suggerisce che la paura di una ulteriore crescita della forza ateniese (cfr. I 23, 6 μεγάλους γιγνομένους καὶ φόβον παρέχοντας τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις, e I 88 φοβούμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μὴ ἐπὶ μεῖζον δυνηθῶσιν) occupava allora ossessivamente le menti dei Lacedemonii. Il periodo che comincia con πλὴν ἢ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ἤριετο prepara il passaggio alla ripresa della narrazione in I 118, 3: αὐτοῖς μὲν οὖν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις διέγνωστο... etc.

Se invece si accettasse la lezione della tradizione diretta, πρὶν δὴ, la sequenza sintattico-logica che comincia con le parole ἐν οἷς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι arriverebbe fino alla fine della frase πρὶν δὴ ἢ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ἤριετο καὶ τῆς ξυμμαχίας αὐτῶν ἤπτοντο, e da quest'ultima frase si passerebbe immediatamente, senza una forte pausa, alla nuova sequenza τότε δὲ οὐκέτι... etc. La struttura sintattica, meno articolata, rispecchierebbe meno chiaramente la distinzione tra l'insieme degli avvenimenti narrati nella digressione (I 89–117) e l'insieme degli avvenimenti narrati in I 24–88.

Suppongo perciò che πλὴν sia la lezione autentica e che πρὶν δὴ sia una innovazione fatta deliberatamente da un editore. Immagino che l'ipotetico editore abbia voluto rendere più esplicito il riferimento contenuto in τότε δὲ οὐκέτι. Immagino inoltre che egli fosse influenzato – consciamente o inconsciamente – dallo schema sintattico di altri passi di Tucidide: I 51, 2 καὶ ἐθαύμαζον τοὺς Κορινθίους πρῦμναν κρουομένους, πρὶν τινες ἰδόντες εἶπον ὅτι νῆες ἐκεῖναι ἐπιπλεύουσι. τότε δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνεχώρουν. I 132, 5–133, 1 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς [...] ἠξίωσαν νεώτερόν τι ποιεῖν ἐς αὐτόν [...], πρὶν γε δὴ αὐτοῖς, ὡς λέγεται, ὁ μέλλων τὰς τελευταίας βασιλεῖ ἐπιστολὰς πρὸς Ἀρτάβαζον κομιεῖν [...] μηνυτῆς γίγνεται [...] τότε δὴ οἱ ἔφοροι... etc.

C'è una difficoltà: πλὴν nel senso di “solo che”, “se non che” “ma”, “tuttavia”, non compare mai in Tucidide. Non compare nemmeno in Senofonte, se ho visto bene. È invece normale in scritti di prosa più tardi: per esempio in Polibio, nelle *Antiquitates Romanae* di Dionigi di Alicarnasso, in Plutarco; si trova più volte anche in Aristotele (per esempio in *Phys.* III 203 a 6; *De part. animal.* 639 a 8). L'obiezione però non mi pare decisiva. Tale uso di πλὴν si trova in Erodoto, VI 31, 2; VII 32; 84 (e si trovava anche in II 100, 4, se la

²⁹ Per l'espressione ἐπιχειρητέα ἐδόκει εἶναι, cfr. II 3, 3 ἐδόκει οὖν ἐπιχειρητέα εἶναι.

³⁰ Per la traduzione che propongo dei quattro verbi all'imperfetto, vd. la nota 38. Vd. inoltre un altro passo di Tucidide VI 1, 1 τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ χειμῶνος Ἀθηναῖοι ἐβούλοντο αὐθις [...] ἐπὶ Σικελίαν πλεύσαντες καταστρέψασθαι, εἰ δύναιτο, “nello stesso inverno gli Ateniesi cominciarono di nuovo a desiderare di fare una spedizione in Sicilia e, se possibile, di assoggettarla”.

mia ricostruzione della lezione del *P. Oxy.* 3376 è giusta³¹), inoltre in alcuni passi di poeti ateniesi del V secolo: Eschilo, *Prom.* 63 πλὴν τοῦδ' ἂν οὐδεὶς ἐνδίκως μέμψαιτό μοι. Sofocle, *Oed. Col.* 1643–1644 ἀλλ' ἔρπεθ' ὡς τάχιστα· πλὴν ὁ κύριος | Θησεὺς παρέστω μανθάνειν τὰ δρώμενα. Euripide, *Bacchae* 1039–1040 συγγνωστὰ μὲν σοι, πλὴν ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις | κακοῖσι χαίρειν, ὦ γυναῖκες, οὐ καλόν. Aristofane, *Eq.* 749 ναὶ ναί, διάκρινον δῆτα, πλὴν μὴ ἔν τῇ Πυκνί. A mio parere, nulla impedisce di supporre che Tucidide, in un passo estremamente elaborato e a cui egli deve certamente aver attribuito grande importanza, abbia usato un mezzo sintattico di cui abitualmente non si serviva, ma che era usato da autori del suo tempo.

Certo, è possibile che Tucidide abbia scritto πρὶν δὴ, che un correttore abbia giudicato irregolare l'uso dell'imperfetto (ἦετο e ἦπτετο) e perciò abbia sostituito πρὶν δὴ con πλὴν, e che questa congettura, presente nella copia che Dionigi leggeva, non si sia propagata all'insieme della tradizione del testo tucidideo. Ma pur riconoscendo che tale ipotesi è ammissibile, preferisco decisamente accogliere la lezione dionisiana πλὴν, per la ragione che ho detto.

In *De Thucydidis proprietatibus* 16, 1 (807) Dionigi cita un lungo passo, Thuc. II 42, 4, come esempio di pensiero e di forma “tortuosi, complicati e difficili da districare”. Nella citazione compare una variante degna di nota: là dove i manoscritti di Tucidide danno καὶ ἐν αὐτῶι τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι καὶ παθεῖν μᾶλλον ἡγησάμενοι ἢ τὸ ἐνδόντες σώζεσθαι... (però al posto di τὸ, il ms. *G* dà tutt'e due le volte τῶ; il ms. *C* dà τῶ la prima volta, τὸ la seconda volta, poi la mano *C*³ ha scritto τῶ anche qui), la citazione in Dionigi dà ἐν τῶι ἀμύνεσθαι παθεῖν μᾶλλον ἡγησάμενοι ἢ ἐνδόντες σώζεσθαι..., cioè “avendo ritenuto doveroso morire difendendosi piuttosto che cercare di salvarsi dopo aver ceduto...”. La lezione dionisiana è ineccepibile da qualsiasi punto di vista; quella della tradizione diretta è strana. Penso che quest'ultima sia il risultato di un intervento di un editore, e che il testo citato da Dionigi sia quello autentico. Può darsi che prima di ἐν τῶι ἀμύνεσθαι sia stato ommesso per errore un καὶ, come supponeva H. USENER (vd. l'apparato della sua edizione) – errore che sarebbe un lapsus spiegabile, perché la parola precedente, πεποιθέναι, termina in ΑΙ. Ma non ne sono sicuro: Tucidide può aver cominciato il periodo asindeticamente³².

In *De Thucydide* 46, 1 (928), Dionigi cita Thuc. II 62, 3–5 (a partire da ἰέναι δέ...) come un esempio di “puerili abbellimenti della dizione” (μειρακιώδη καλλωπίσματα τῆς λέξεως) e di “complicate configurazioni delle idee” (πολύπλοκα τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων σχήματα). Il testo citato presenta una variante rispetto a quello della tradizione diretta di Tucidide. Quest'ultima dà: ...ἰέναι δέ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὁμοσε μὴ φρονήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι. αὐχημα

³¹ Vd. *Eos* XCIX 2012/1, pp. 41–42 (vd. però anche pp. 64–65).

³² Non soddisfacente è ciò che PEHLE, *o.c.* (n. 11), p. 28, scrive su questa citazione (che egli considera come un “locus valde dubius”).

μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀπὸ ἀμαθίας εὐτυχοῦς καὶ δειλῶι τιμι ἐγγίγνεται, καταφρόνησις δὲ ὅς ἂν καὶ γνώμη πιστεῦη τῶν ἐναντίων προῦχειν. Al posto di αὔχημα in Dionigi c'è φρόνημα. La scelta tra le due lezioni mi pare difficile, ma sono incline a supporre che αὔχημα – parola che non compare in nessun altro luogo dell'opera tucididea – sia una innovazione deliberata, dovuta a qualcuno che abbia voluto aggiungere alla “dizione” di questo passo ancora un altro καλλώπισμα, abbia cioè voluto evitare la ripetizione della parola φρόνημα sostituendo questa con un sinonimo.

In *De Demosthenis dictione* 1 (953–955), Dionigi cita un ampio pezzo, Thuc. III 82, 3–7; questa citazione solleva vari problemi, che discuterò più avanti; per adesso intendo trattare soltanto di una variante. Nel § 6 del capitolo 82, secondo la tradizione diretta, Tucidide dice: καὶ τὰς ἐς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς πίστεις οὐ τῶι θεῶι νόμωι μᾶλλον ἐκρατύνοντο ἢ τῶι κοινῇ τι παρανομησαι, e cioè “e rafforzavano le garanzie reciproche non con il diritto divino, ma con il commettere insieme una violazione del diritto”. Nel passo corrispondente Dionigi (955) non dà τῶι θεῶι νόμωι, bensì τῶι θεῶι καὶ νομίμωι, che significa press'a poco “con ciò che è stabilito dagli dèi e dai costumi” – il che, suppongo, va inteso come una endiadi (ἐν διὰ δυοῖν): “con ciò che è stabilito da quei costumi che sono (o sono considerati come) leggi di origine divina”. Scelgo decisamente la lezione data da Dionigi. Osservo infatti, anzitutto, che Tucidide ha tendenza a esprimere nozioni astratte con aggettivi sostantivati al singolare, quali sono appunto τὸ θεῖον καὶ νόμιμον. In secondo luogo, non mi pare che al tempo di Tucidide si potesse dire ὁ θεῖος νόμος (al singolare!) per parlare non di una norma particolare, ma dell'insieme delle norme (dell'insieme dei νόμια) di origine divina, contrapposto all'insieme delle leggi istituite da una polis. Nell'*Antigone* Sofocle mette in bocca ad Antigone (vv. 454–455) l'espressione ἄγραπτα κάσφαλῆ θεῶν νόμια, e penso che un equivalente di questa si debba riconoscere in τῶι θεῶι καὶ νομίμωι del passo tucidideo, quale è citato da Dionigi. È vero che Eraclito sostiene (fr. 114 DIELS–KRANZ) che chi vuole parlare ξὺν νόωι deve fondarsi su τῶι ξυνῶι πάντων, ὄκωσπερ νόμωι πόλις, καὶ πολὺ ἰσχυροτέρως. τρέφονται γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἀνθρώπειοι νόμοι ὑπὸ ἐνὸς τοῦ θεῖου. Tuttavia questo νόμος divino di cui si nutrono tutti i νόμοι umani è il divino λόγος: abbiamo a che fare con la raffinata e personalissima concezione filosofica di Eraclito, non con una credenza comune.

Fondandosi sull'espressione ὄσια καὶ νόμια, che compare in Aristofane e in Platone (si vedano gli esempi citati nel dizionario LSJ, s.v. ὄσιος), Peter Paul DOBREE propose di correggere τῶι θεῶι καὶ νομίμωι del passo citato da Dionigi in τῶι ὀσίωι καὶ νομίμωι³³. Questa brillante congettura non mi pare necessaria né opportuna; tuttavia è utile tener conto dell'esistenza dell'espressione ὄσια καὶ

³³ Ho trovato questa informazione in SADÉE, *o.c.* (n. 7), p. 165. Immagino che la congettura sia stata pubblicata negli *Adversaria* di P.P. DOBREE, usciti dopo la sua morte (due volumi, 1831 e 1833;

νόμιμα³⁴: può darsi che scrivendo τῶι θείῳι καὶ νομίμῳι, Tucidide abbia voluto modificare l'espressione τὸ ὄσιον καὶ νόμιμον introducendo l'idea dell'origine divina.

Dobbiamo ora chiederci se la sostituzione di τῶι θείῳι νόμῳι a τῶι θείῳι καὶ νομίμῳι sia stata un errore di copista o un'innovazione deliberata. Entrambe le ipotesi sono ammissibili, ma inclino a supporre che la seconda sia quella giusta, e che l'autore dell'innovazione sia stato il saccente editore-falsario.

In *De Thucydide* 47, 2 (931) Dionigi afferma che alcuni passi del discorso che Tucidide fa pronunciare a Pericle in un momento in cui l'opinione pubblica ateniese chiedeva la cessazione della guerra, sono scritti eccellentemente, e cita dei passi di II 61 e 63. Per ciò che riguarda II 61, 4, i manoscritti medievali danno ὅμως δὲ πόλιν μεγάλην οἰκοῦντας καὶ ἐν ἤθεσι ἀντιπάλοις αὐτῆι τεθραμμένους χρεῶν ξυμφοραῖς ταῖς μεγίσταις ἐθέλειν ὑφίστασθαι, mentre Dionigi, al posto di ξυμφοραῖς ταῖς μεγίσταις, dà τὰς συμφορὰς. La parafrasi che egli fa dello stesso passo poche righe più sopra, in 47, 1 (930) (παρακαλῶν τὰς συμφορὰς γενναίως ὑφίστασθαι), conferma che egli leggeva nel suo esemplare di Tucidide τὰς συμφορὰς (o, forse, τὰς ξυμφορὰς)³⁵. Come i commentatori moderni hanno osservato, altrove Tucidide non usa mai il verbo ὑφίστασθαι (all'aoristo ὑποστῆναι) col dativo, mentre lo usa più volte con l'accusativo: I 144, 4 ὑποστάντες Μήδους. II 61, 1 ὁ φυγῶν τὸν κίνδυνον τοῦ ὑποστάντος μεμπτότερος. III 57, 3 δύο ἀγῶνας τοὺς μεγίστους ὑπέστημεν. IV 59, 2 τοὺς κινδύνους ἐθέλουσιν ὑφίστασθαι. 127, 2 ἐπικειμένους ὑφίστατο. VII 66, 2 ἀρχὴν τὴν μεγίστην [...] ὑποστάντες τῶι ναυτικῶι. (Questi passi, tranne IV 127, 2, fanno parte di discorsi; II 61, 1 fa parte dello stesso discorso a cui appartiene il passo in questione). Tuttavia entrambe le costruzioni sono attestate presso altri autori. C'è differenza di senso tra ὑφίστασθαι col dativo e ὑφίστασθαι con l'accusativo? Mi pare di sì, sebbene non possa trattarsi che di una sfumatura. Un passo di Euripide è istruttivo, *Herc.* 1349–1350, dove Herakles dice ταῖς συμφοραῖς γὰρ ὅστις οὐχ ὑφίσταται | οὐδ' ἀνδρὸς ἄν δύναιθ' ὑποστῆναι βέλος: qui abbiamo le due costruzioni una accanto all'altra. Intendo i due versi in questo modo: “chi non tiene duro di fronte alle disgrazie non sarebbe nemmeno capace di accettare lo scontro con l'arma di un uomo”. Direi che ὑφίστασθαι + dativo vuol dire resistere a una forza ostile, e che ὑφίστασθαι + accusativo (accusativo che esprime la nozione di movimento verso qualcosa) vuol dire

non vidi). SADÉE ha approvato questa congettura, invece PEHLE, *o.c.* (n. 11), pp. 29 seg., l'ha giudicata inutile.

³⁴ Sulla nozione di τὸ ὄσιον vd. specialmente É. BENVENISTE, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, vol. 2: *Pouvoir, droit, religion*, Paris 1969, pp. 198–202.

³⁵ La sostituzione di συμ- a ξυμ- può essere stata fatta o prima del tempo di Dionigi, o nel corso della trasmissione dell'opera di Dionigi, ma può anche essere stata fatta da Dionigi stesso.

esporsi volontariamente a una forza ostile e resistere ad essa³⁶. Ora, nel passo di Tucidide che ci interessa, ὑφίστασθαι dipende dal verbo ἐθέλειν, “essere disposti a...”, esattamente come in IV 59, 2 (τοὺς κινδύνους ἐθέλουσιν ὑφίστασθαι, “sono disposti ad affrontare i pericoli”). Questa circostanza mi induce a pensare che la lezione autentica sia quella attestata da Dionigi (a parte la scrittura συμφορὰς invece di ξυμφορὰς): τὰς ξυμφορὰς ἐθέλειν ὑφίστασθαι, e cioè “essere disposti ad affrontare i casi sfortunati (*che possono accadere nel corso di qualsiasi guerra*)”³⁷. Il Pericle tucidideo qui fa una considerazione generale, come è confermato dal fatto che usa il presente ὑφίστασθαι, e non l’aoristo ὑποστῆναι (inoltre, subito dopo, dice μὴ ἀφανίζειν e ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, e non μὴ ἀφανίσει, né ἀντιλαβέσθαι). L’espressione αἱ ξυμφοραί, senza alcun aggettivo, è usata più volte da Tucidide per designare o i casi sfortunati che sono accaduti nel corso di determinati avvenimenti, o quelli che possono in generale accadere nel corso di una guerra: II 59, 2; 60, 1; 64, 3; 64, 6; IV 18, 4; 98, 6; VII 61, 2; 63, 3; 77, 1; 77, 3³⁸. Si noti che, tranne la prima, queste attestazioni compaiono in discorsi (nel caso di IV 98, 6 si tratta del discorso di un araldo, riferito in *oratio obliqua*), e che la seconda, la terza e la quarta appartengono allo stesso discorso di Pericle di cui fa parte il passo in questione.

Suppongo che la sostituzione di ξυμφοραῖς ταῖς μεγίσταις a τὰς συμφορὰς sia stata fatta da un editore che avesse in mente il passo sentenzioso (e probabilmente molto noto) di Euripide sopra citato: il fatto che qui, quando si tratta delle συμφοραί, il verbo ὑφίστασθαι regga il dativo, e non l’accusativo, come quando si tratta del βέλος dei nemici, lo avrà indotto a pensare che l’espressione τὰς ξυμφορὰς ὑφίστασθαι del testo tucidideo tradizionale fosse inappropriata. Ma perché non si è accontentato di cambiare le desinenze? Perché ha scritto ξυμφοραῖς ταῖς μεγίσταις, e non ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς? Suppongo che egli abbia voluto far capire che Pericle qui non parla di casi sfortunati in generale, bensì si riferisce concretamente alle terribili disgrazie di cui soffrono gli Ateniesi nel momento dato: all’invasione nemica e soprattutto all’epidemia. Quell’editore superficiale e intraprendente sarà stato l’editore-falsario.

³⁶ Particolarmente istruttiva è l’attestazione in IV 127, 2: l’esercito di Brasidas, eseguendo un piano del comandante, si stava ritirando ordinatamente; i barbari, credendo che esso stesse fuggendo, lo attaccavano tumultuosamente; dei gruppi di soldati facevano delle sortite per affrontare i barbari, “e lui stesso (*Brasidas*) insieme con i soldati scelti si opponeva agli attaccanti (ἐπικειμένους ὑφίστατο)”.

³⁷ J.S. RUSTEN, nel suo pregevole commento al libro II (*Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, Book II*, Cambridge 1989) sostiene (*ad loc.*, p. 200) che il dativo ξυμφοραῖς ταῖς μεγίσταις non va insieme con ὑφίστασθαι, bensì con la preposizione ἐν che si trova poco prima, in ἐν ἧθει ἀντιπάλοις αὐτῆι τεθραμμένους. Questa interpretazione mi sembra estremamente sforzata, poco plausibile.

³⁸ Lascio fuori da questa lista V 17, 1 e 28, 3, perché queste due attestazioni fanno parte di passi che, per varie ragioni, giudico spuri.

Questa supposizione mi pare confermata da un'altra divergenza tra la citazione in Dionigi e il testo della tradizione diretta di Tucidide. Secondo quest'ultima, la frase ora discussa è preceduta dalle parole seguenti, II 61, 3: δουλοῖ γὰρ φρόνημα τὸ αἰφνίδιον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ τὸ πλείστῳ παραλόγῳ ξυμβαῖνον· ὃ ὑμῖν πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐχ ἤκιστα καὶ κατὰ τὴν νόσον γεγένηται, e cioè "...perché ciò che è improvviso e inaspettato e che accade nel modo più contrario al calcolo, umilia la fiducia che uno ha in sé stesso: il che vi è capitato, oltre al resto, soprattutto anche in relazione alla pestilenza". Dionigi riporta la prima parte di questo passo, non riporta la seconda, da ὃ ὑμῖν in poi. Ora, questa seconda parte, a mio parere, rovina la sapiente costruzione dell'argomentazione dell'oratore: fa sì che l'argomentazione non si chiuda con una osservazione di carattere generale, con la sentenza δουλοῖ γὰρ φρόνημα τὸ αἰφνίδιον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ τὸ πλείστῳ παραλόγῳ ξυμβαῖνον, bensì piattamente, con un superfluo richiamo alle disgrazie di cui gli uditori stanno soffrendo. In secondo luogo, la frase che Dionigi non riporta presuppone che, secondo l'oratore, gli Ateniesi abbiano subito recentemente più di una disgrazia del tutto imprevedibile; ma dal racconto tucidideo risulta che fino a quel momento della guerra, una sola disgrazia imprevedibile aveva colpito gli Ateniesi, la pestilenza; tutto il resto era accaduto secondo le previsioni. Infine, l'espressione κατὰ τὴν νόσον, "relativamente alla malattia", mi sembra maldestra. Per tutte queste ragioni penso che abbiamo a che fare con un'interpolazione e che questa non fosse presente nel testo che Dionigi leggeva³⁹. Suppongo inoltre che essa sia stata fatta dallo stesso editore che, poche righe più avanti, ha cambiato τὰς ξυμφορὰς in ξυμφοραῖς ταῖς μεγίσταις: questo cambiamento infatti, come abbiamo visto, aveva lo scopo di far capire che Pericle parlava delle ξυμφοραὶ concrete del momento presente, e non di ξυμφοραὶ in generale. (L'interpolatore si sarà forse ricordato di Thuc. I 23, 3 ...καὶ ἡ οὐχ ἤκιστα βλάβασσα καὶ μέρος τι φθείρασσα ἢ λοιμώδης νόσος.)

Si obietterà che citando da Thuc. II 61, 3–4, Dionigi ha ommesso l'ultima frase, ἀπαλγήσαντας δὲ τὰ ἴδια τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, sebbene questa fosse certamente presente nel suo testo di Tucidide, come risulta dal fatto che egli l'aveva riprodotta testualmente poco prima (*De Thucydide* 47, 1) all'interno della sua parafrasi del discorso di Pericle. Ma proprio quest'ultimo fatto giustifica l'omissione nella citazione: è chiaro che Dionigi non ha voluto riprodurre quelle parole una seconda volta, a poca distanza.

³⁹ Nella sua dissertazione (citata *supra*, n. 11), PEHLE dapprima (p. 16) ha menzionato l'omissione di questo passo come una delle prove della negligenza di Dionigi nel citare, poi invece (p. 21) l'ha menzionata come uno dei casi in cui sarebbe impossibile dire se l'omissione sia dovuta a Dionigi o ai copisti dell'opera di Dionigi o alla copia di Tucidide di cui Dionigi si serviva.

Come nel caso della citazione da Thuc. II 61, 3, così in alcuni altri casi il confronto tra il testo che Dionigi cita e il testo corrispondente della tradizione diretta rivela che quest'ultimo contiene qualcosa (poco o molto) in più.

Il caso più interessante riguarda Thuc. III 82–84, la digressione sulle guerre civili che lacerarono le *poleis* nel corso della guerra peloponnesiaca. In *De Thucydide*, 28–33 (883–895), Dionigi sostiene che tutta questa celebrata digressione è scritta male. Dice che finché racconta gli avvenimenti della *stasis* a Kerkyra, Tucidide si serve del modo di espressione “comune e abituale” e rappresenta tutto “chiaramente, brevemente, vigorosamente”, ma che, “quando comincia a descrivere al modo tragico le disgrazie comuni dei Greci e a far deviare il senso (τὴν διάνοιαν) da ciò che è abituale, diventa molto inferiore a sé stesso”, usa un linguaggio contorto, eccessivamente complicato e, a volte, scorretto. Per giustificare questo giudizio, Dionigi riferisce anzitutto il pezzo che, secondo lui, è scritto bene, da III 81, 2 Κερκυραῖοι δὲ αἰσθόμενοι fino a III 82, 1 καὶ τοῖς ὀλίγοις τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, e poi afferma: “Le cose che egli fa seguire a queste (ἃ δὲ τούτοις ἐπιφέρει) sono tortuose e difficili da capire e contengono intrecci di figure che hanno l'aspetto di solecismi (τὰς τῶν σχηματισμῶν πλοκάς σολοικοφανεῖς ἔχοντα) – sono cose che non furono praticate né dai suoi contemporanei, né da quelli che vissero più tardi, al tempo in cui l'eloquenza politica raggiunse il colmo. Ora le citerò”. A questo punto Dionigi comincia a citare, commentare e criticare singoli pezzetti, uno dopo l'altro, da III 82, 3 fino alla fine del § 7, omettendo soltanto una breve frase del § 4 e un pezzetto che comprende l'ultima frase del § 6 e le prime due del § 7; poi afferma che questo tipo di linguaggio “oscuro e aggrovigliato” si estende per “cento righe” (33, 1)⁴⁰, e dopo aver espresso questo giudizio generale, cita “il séguito” (τὰ ἐξῆς) senza interruzioni, senza aggiungere commenti, da III 82, 8 alla fine di III 83. Al capitolo III 84, che nel testo della tradizione diretta chiude la digressione sulle *staseis*, Dionigi non fa alcun accenno.

Il primo dei pezzetti che egli commenta e critica è il § 3 del capitolo 82: ἐστασίαζέ τε οὖν τὰ τῶν πόλεων... fino a καὶ τῶν τιμωριῶν ἀτοπίαι. Questo è dunque, secondo lui, l'inizio della parte che tratta delle “disgrazie comuni dei Greci” alla maniera “tragica” e in un linguaggio contorto e difficile da capire. È molto probabile – come già J. CLASSEN ha visto⁴¹ – che nel suo esemplare di Tucidide non ci fosse il pezzo che comincia a metà del § 1 e termina alla fine del § 2 del capitolo 82, più precisamente il pezzo che va da καὶ ἐν μὲν εἰρήνηι οὐκ ἂν ἔχόντων πρόφασιν fino a καὶ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ. Anch'esso infatti riguarda le “disgrazie comuni dei Greci”, inoltre

⁴⁰ Naturalmente questa è un'indicazione approssimativa. Può darsi che Dionigi abbia constatato che la parte scritta male occupava press'a poco tre colonne di scrittura.

⁴¹ Vd. l'appendice al commento al libro III, a proposito di III 84, nella terza edizione rifatta da J. STEUP, Berlin 1892, p. 275, nota.

è veramente molto strano, lontano dal modo di esprimersi “abituale”: Dionigi avrebbe dunque dovuto citarlo. Mi pare inverosimile che egli si sia sbagliato nel cercare l’inizio della parte “tragica”, e altrettanto inverosimile che abbia letto questo pezzo, ma abbia deciso di saltarlo, commettendo una inesattezza (alludo alle parole ἄ δὲ τούτοις ἐπιφέρει) e privandosi della possibilità di mostrare al lettore qualcosa che è molto più “tortuoso” e più “difficile da capire” di tutto quello che egli cita e critica.

Mi piacerebbe poter trovare una conferma di questo ragionamento in un altro opuscolo di Dionigi, *De Demosthenis dictione* 1 (953–955), dove è citata una parte dello stesso capitolo di Tucidide, dal § 3 fino alla metà del § 7 (cioè fino a οὐκ ἔχόντων ἄλλοθεν δύναμιν), e dove lo scopo della citazione è di mostrare un esempio estremo di λέξις “deviante dall’espressione normale”, più precisamente di λέξις “strana, elaborata, riempita di tutti gli ornamenti artificiali”. Purtroppo la citazione è incompleta all’inizio, a causa di un guasto materiale avvenuto nella tradizione del testo di Dionigi: il testo conservato dai manoscritti di questo opuscolo comincia con]ων καὶ τὰ ἀφυστερίζοντα⁴². Perciò non si può sapere con certezza da dove Dionigi abbia cominciato a citare. Tuttavia il ragionamento mi sembra poter stare in piedi anche senza una conferma.

Ora, il pezzo che va da καὶ ἐν μὲν εἰρήνῃ οὐκ ἂν ἔχόντων πρόφασιν a καὶ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ ha vari tratti caratteristici che mi inducono ad affermare senza esitazioni che esso è stato scritto dall’editore-falsario.

Anzitutto, il modo in cui esso si lega (καὶ) al periodo che lo precede immediatamente, cioè all’inizio (sicuramente autentico) della digressione, è assurdo. Vediamo questo inizio, che ha bisogno di un commento (III 82, 1):

οὕτως ὠμὴ <ή> στάσις προυχώρησε, καὶ ἔδοξε μᾶλλον, διότι ἐν τοῖς πρώτῃ ἐγένετο, ἐπεὶ ὕστερόν γε καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἶπεῖν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκινήθη, διαφορῶν οὐσῶν ... (*breve lacuna*) ἕκασταχοῦ τοῖς τε δήμων προστάταις τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπάγεσθαι καὶ τοῖς ὀλίγοις τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους. In questo testo la funzione dell’infinito ἐπάγεσθαι è inspiegabile. Il commento di CLASSEN e di STEUP tenta di spiegarla: “Der Infinitiv ἐπάγεσθαι [...], wenn nicht nach ἕκασταχοῦ einige W[orte] (etwa καὶ εὐπορίας ὑπαρχούσης) ausgefallen sind, in freierem Anschluss an διαφορῶν οὐσῶν zum Ausdruck der daraus hervorgehenden Folge: vgl. 1, 57, 5. 128, 3”. Ma l’idea che l’infinito ἐπάγεσθαι sia “connesso liberamente” a διαφορῶν οὐσῶν, è arbitraria; i due *loci paralleli* invocati non sono affatto paralleli. Ragionevole invece mi sembra l’ipotesi che ci sia una lacuna; la congettura διαφορῶν οὐσῶν ἕκασταχοῦ <καὶ εὐπορίας ὑπαρχούσης> che CLASSEN e STEUP propongono come una soluzione approssimativa (“etwa”), va forse nella direzione giusta. Può darsi che la lacuna sia molto antica: il testo fornito

⁴² Il pezzo che precede questo nell’edizione di USENER e RADERMACHER (e che contiene una citazione da un’orazione di Gorgia) è stato conservato da una citazione in un’opera di Syrianos.

dalla citazione in Dionigi ha διαφορῶν ἑκασταχοῦ τοῖς τε δήμων προστάταις etc., il che è ancora più incomprensibile. Traduco sulla base della correzione ora menzionata (in mancanza di meglio):

“Così atroce si rivelò la *stasis*, e sembrò ancora più atroce perché fu la primissima. Più tardi quasi tutto il mondo greco fu sconvolto, perché in ogni luogo c’erano liti <e la possibilità> per i capi del popolo di far venire (in loro aiuto) gli Ateniesi, e per gli oligarchici di far venire i Lacedemonii”.

E ora vediamo il primo periodo della parte che considero spuria:

καὶ ἐν μὲν εἰρήνῃ οὐκ ἂν ἐχόντων πρόφασιν οὐδ’ ἔτοιμῶν † (*leggi* ἐτόλμων, *congettura di J. CLASSEN*)⁴³ παρακαλεῖν αὐτούς, πολεμουμένων δὲ καὶ ξυμμαχίας ἅμα ἑκατέροις τῆι τῶν ἐναντίων κακῶσει καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προσποιήσει ραϊδίως αἱ ἐπαγωγαὶ τοῖς νεωτερίζειν τι βουλομένοις ἐπορίζοντο.

La sintassi è talmente maldestra e anomala, e il lessico è talmente improprio, che gli studiosi che si sono occupati di questo passo lo hanno inteso in modi molto diversi. Io lo intendo come segue, senza esser sicuro di intenderlo bene: “E nella pace, poiché essi (= *gli Ateniesi e i Lacedemonii*) non avrebbero avuto una ragione (*per intervenire*), essi (= *i capi del popolo e gli oligarchici*) non avevano nemmeno il coraggio di chiamarli; ma poiché essi (= *gli Ateniesi e i Lacedemonii*) erano in guerra tra di loro, e allo scopo, sia nel caso degli uni (= *degli Ateniesi*), sia nel caso degli altri (= *dei Lacedemonii*), di danneggiare il sistema di alleanze degli avversari e contemporaneamente, con ciò stesso, di appropriarselo, gli interventi erano forniti facilmente a coloro che volevano fare una rivoluzione”.

Nel periodo che viene dopo questo (§ 2: καὶ ἐπέπεσε... etc.), troviamo una sentenza espressa in un modo improprio e maldestro: γιγνώμενα μὲν καὶ αἰεὶ ἐσόμενα ἕως ἂν ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις ἀνθρώπων ᾗ, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἡσυχαιτέρα καὶ τοῖς εἴδεσι διηλλαγμένα, ὡς ἂν ἑκάστῃς (*congettura di K. Hude, al posto di ἑκασταὶ ο ἑκαστα della tradizione*) αἱ μεταβολαὶ τῶν ξυντυχιῶν ἐφιστῶνται, “cose che accadono e sempre saranno fintantoché ci sarà la stessa natura degli uomini, ma maggiormente e più blandamente e diverse per la forma a seconda di come alle singole *poleis* accadano i cambiamenti delle situazioni”. Probabilmente l’autore ha voluto dire “...ma a volte violentemente, altre volte blandamente, e in diverse forme”, come i commentatori moderni hanno capito. Tuttavia μᾶλλον non va bene insieme con γιγνώμενα, né con ἐσόμενα.

⁴³ A.W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. II, Oxford 1956, p. 372, ha giudicato insoddisfacente questa congettura; secondo lui, se si volesse leggere ἐτόλμων, bisognerebbe anche cambiare οὐδ’ in οὐκ. Non sono d’accordo. Cfr. per esempio Thuc. VII 72, 2 οὐδὲ ἐπενόουν αἰτῆσαι ἀναίρειν. Cfr. anche V 7, 5 καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἐφαίνετο οὐτ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ τείχους οὐδεὶς οὔτε κατὰ πύλας ἐξήκει. (Lascio stare l’espressione οὐδὲ ἤλπισεν del § 3 dello stesso capitolo, perché questo paragrafo mi sembra interpolato.)

Segue un'altra sentenza, che è stata giudicata profonda da molti commentatori, ma che secondo me è piatta, inadatta come introduzione a ciò che è detto più avanti, e scritta in modo goffo:

ἐν μὲν γὰρ εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀγαθοῖς πράγμασιν αἴ τε πόλεις καὶ οἱ ἰδιῶται ἀμείνους τὰς γνώμας ἔχουσι διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ἀκουσίους ἀνάγκας πίπτειν· ὁ δὲ πόλεμος ὑφελῶν τὴν εὐπορίαν τοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν βίαιος διδάσκαλος καὶ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ.

Traduco il più fedelmente possibile: “Infatti nella pace e in situazioni buone (ἐν [...] ἀγαθοῖς πράγμασιν: *espressione non attestata altrove, come osservano CLASSEN e STEUP*), sia le *poleis*, sia i singoli individui hanno una disposizione degli animi migliore, perché non cadono in costrizioni involontarie (*sic!*); invece la guerra, avendo tolto via la facilità di ottenere ciò che occorre alla vita quotidiana, è un maestro violento (βίαιος διδάσκαλος: *non “un maestro di violenza”, come molti hanno voluto intendere!*) e rende gli stati d'animo della maggior parte della gente simili alle situazioni date”.

Oltre ad essere goffo, contorto e, nonostante l'apparenza, piatto, tutto il pezzo in questione ha ancora un altro difetto: interrompe inopportuna la linea del pensiero di Tucidide. Vediamo ciò che viene subito dopo, e cioè III 82, 3, passo certamente autentico e che Dionigi cita (*De Thucydide* 29, 1)⁴⁴:

ἐστασίαζέ τε οὖν τὰ τῶν πόλεων, καὶ τὰ ἐφυστερίζοντά που ἐπὶ πύστει⁴⁵ τῶν προγενομένων πολὺ ἐπέφερε τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ καινοῦσθαι⁴⁶ τὰς διανοίας τῶν τ' ἐπιχειρήσεων περιτεχνήσει καὶ τῶν τιμωριῶν ἀτοπία,

le *poleis* dunque erano lacerate da *staseis*, e quelle che erano in ritardo, dopo aver sentito dire che cosa fosse accaduto prima, aumentavano di molto l'eccesso nell'innovare le escogitazioni-invenzioni, sia con la raffinatezza degli attacchi, sia con la mostruosità delle vendette.

⁴⁴ Lo cita anche (però l'inizio della citazione è perduto) in *De Demosthenis dictione* 1, 2 (953).

⁴⁵ ἐπὶ πύστει è la lezione attestata dalla citazione nel *De Thucydide*, e mi sembra preferibile a πύστει che è dato dalla maggior parte della tradizione diretta di Tucidide e dalla citazione nel *De Demosthenis dictione*; i mss. *F* e *M* di Tucidide danno ἀποπύστει, che è ovviamente una deformazione di ἐπιπύστει. Nella parafrasi che fa seguire alla citazione in *De Thucydide* 29, 3, Dionigi scrive οἱ δὲ ὑστερίζοντες ἐπιπυθανόμενοι (= quando apprendevano) τὰ γεγενημένα παρ' ἑτέροις ἐλάβανον ὑπερβολὴν ἐπὶ τὸ διανοεῖσθαι τι καινότερον: ciò conferma che egli leggeva ΕΠΙΠΥΣΤΕΙ; mi pare probabile che egli intendesse questo come due parole, ἐπὶ πύστει, “dopo aver avuto notizia”. J. REISKE invece ha pensato – a torto, secondo me – che egli lo intendesse come una sola parola, ἐπιπύστει. Gli editori posteriori hanno seguito REISKE. La lezione πύστει nel *De Demosthenis dictione* può essere un errore di Dionigi o della tradizione manoscritta del suo opuscolo.

⁴⁶ Nella citazione in *De Demosthenis dictione* 1, 2 si legge ἐς τὸ καινοῦσθαι. Forse un errore di Dionigi?

La prima frase di questo periodo si lega strettamente, per mezzo di οὖν⁴⁷, alle ultime considerazioni del primo periodo di III 82, 1 (citato e commentato qui sopra). Essa mostra quali fossero le conseguenze del fatto che “in ogni luogo c’erano liti <e la possibilità> per i capi del popolo di far venire (in loro aiuto) gli Ateniesi, e per gli oligarchici di far venire i Lacedemonii”: le liti (διαφοραί) degeneravano in guerra civile (στάσις). Ciò che, nel testo della tradizione diretta, sta in mezzo tra questi due passi, oscura il legame tra l’uno e l’altro: il che è un ulteriore indizio di interpolazione.

Da tutte queste osservazioni concludo che il pezzo in questione è interpolato e che la ragione per cui Dionigi non l’ha citato è che egli non lo conosceva.

Diversa è la situazione nel caso dei due passi di III 82, 4 e 6–7 che mancano nel *De Thucydide* di Dionigi, ma che sono presenti nel suo *De Demosthenis dictione* 1 (953–955) e la cui autenticità non suscita dubbi.

Per ciò che riguarda il primo di essi, si tratta dell’omissione di poche parole. Tucidide scrive: τὸ δ’ ἐμπλήκτως ὄξὺ ἀνδρὸς μοίραι προσετέθη, ἀσφαλείαι⁴⁸ δὲ τὸ ἐπιβουλεύσασθαι ἀποτροπῆς πρόφασις εὐλογος, il che vuol dire, a mio parere⁴⁹, “la sconiderata prontezza fu attribuita a virilità, il prender tempo per pensarci su in modo sicuro (fu considerato) un buon pretesto per ritirarsi”. Nel *De Thucydide* Dionigi cita, secondo la tradizione manoscritta, ἀσφάλεια δὲ τὸ ἐπιβουλεύσασθαι ἀποτροπῆς πρόφασις εὐλογος, ma probabilmente bisogna correggere ἀσφάλεια in ἀσφαλείαι. Se ha letto così, ciò vuol dire che ha visto male. Ma può darsi che abbiamo a che fare con una svista di un copista del *De Thucydide*. Può darsi anche che l’esemplare di Tucidide che Dionigi aveva davanti agli occhi mentre scriveva il *De Thucydide* fosse diverso da quello che egli ha usato quando scriveva il *De Demosthenis dictione*⁵⁰.

Per ciò che riguarda il secondo passo (da καὶ τὰς ἐς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς πίστεις fino a ἢ αὐτὸν μὴ προπαθεῖν), è un po’ più difficile supporre che l’omissione sia dovuta a una svista di Dionigi o di un copista del *De Thucydide*: si tratta infatti di parecchie righe. Tuttavia l’ipotesi non è impossibile, tanto più se teniamo presente che sia il passo omissso, sia quello che lo segue e che Dionigi ha citato (καὶ ὄρκοι εἶ που ἄρα γένοιοντο ξυναλλαγῆς... etc.) cominciano con καὶ, e che tra il contenuto del primo e quello del secondo c’è una certa affinità (nel primo si parla di πίστεις, nel secondo di ὄρκοι)⁵¹.

⁴⁷ CLASSEN e STEUP affermano che questo οὖν serve a riprendere ciò che è stato detto prima. Non credo. Secondo me, esso serve a indicare la conseguenza di ciò che è stato detto.

⁴⁸ Una parte dei mss. di Tucidide, come il ms. del *De Demosthenis dictione* di Dionigi, danno ἀσφάλεια, ma il dativo ἀσφαλείαι è indispensabile.

⁴⁹ Questo passo è stato interpretato variamente dai commentatori.

⁵⁰ Si vedano le varianti indicate qui sopra, note 45 e 46.

⁵¹ Nel passo omissso c’è una frase che ha creato difficoltà ai commentatori moderni e che Dionigi avrebbe potuto benissimo criticare come poco chiara: τὰ τε ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων καλῶς

Quanto al capitolo III 84, che è manifestamente spurio, non c'è dubbio che Dionigi non lo leggeva. Che esso fosse spurio, lo capirono già alcuni commentatori antichi, come risulta da uno *scholion* che ho citato e commentato nella Parte prima di questo studio⁵².

Le stranezze che si possono notare nel capitolo III 84 dal punto di vista della sintassi e del pensiero sono così mostruose che non c'è da stupirsi che alcuni commentatori antichi lo abbiano atetizzato. Anche la maggior parte degli studiosi moderni (non tutti: tanto è forte l'orrore per l'atetizzazione) lo hanno considerato spurio. Quelli che lo hanno fatto hanno giustamente osservato, oltre alle stranezze della sintassi e del pensiero, anche l'assurdità della posizione del capitolo III 84 rispetto ai capitoli 81–83, il fatto cioè che esso rovina la composizione dell'insieme. Bisogna aggiungere però che quegli studiosi moderni hanno trattato lo *scholion* ora menzionato come un argomento decisivo, il che non mi sembra del tutto giustificato: non siamo infatti del tutto sicuri che quei commentatori antichi conoscessero delle copie del testo in cui questo pezzo non c'era. Decisivo è invece un altro degli argomenti addotti da quegli studiosi moderni per atetizzare questo pezzo: il silenzio di Dionigi.

Non starò a enumerare i tratti aberranti del capitolo III 84: qui non c'è niente che sia sensato e sintatticamente corretto. Basterà osservare che tutto il primo periodo (§ 1) è completamente sconclusionato. Citerò inoltre il § 2, correggendo il testo in un luogo:

Ξυνταραχθέντος τε τοῦ βίου ἐς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον τῆι πόλει καὶ τῶν νόμων κρατήσασα ἢ ἀνθρωπεία φύσις, εἰωθὺς καὶ <πρὸ τοῦ>⁵³ παρὰ τοὺς νόμους ἀδικεῖν, ἀσμένη ἐδήλωσεν ἀκρατῆς μὲν οὔσα ὀργῆς, κρείσσων δὲ τοῦ δικαίου, πολεμία δὲ τοῦ προύχοντος· οὐ γὰρ ἂν τοῦ τε ὀσίου τὸ τιμωρεῖσθαι προυτίθεισαν τοῦ τε μὴ ἀδικεῖν τὸ κερδαίνειν, ἐν ᾧ μὴ βλάπτουσαν ἰσχὺν εἶχε τὸ φθονεῖν.

Traduco fedelmente, senza cercar di mascherare i difetti del testo: “e poiché in questo tempo la vita sociale per la *polis* era stata sconvolta e poiché la natura umana, che <anche prima> era stata solita commettere azioni ingiuste infrangendo le leggi, aveva preso il sopravvento sulle leggi, essa mostrò con piacere di essere incapace di dominare l'impulso, di essere invece più forte della giustizia e nemica di ciò che è eccellente; infatti (*se non fosse stato così*), essi non avrebbero anteposto la vendetta al lecito e il guadagno al commettere

λεγόμενα ἐνεδέχοντο ἔργων φυλακῆι, εἰ προὔχοιεν, καὶ οὐ γενναιότητι. Io la intendo così: “e i discorsi ragionevoli degli avversari, essi li accoglievano con un'osservazione guardinga delle loro azioni, cercando di prevenirle (anticiparle), e non con un atteggiamento nobile”.

⁵² Eos XCIX 2012/1, pp. 60–61.

⁵³ Congettura mia, che modifica la congettura di J. CLASSEN καὶ <πρὶν>. Se si suppone che immediatamente prima di παρὰ τοὺς ci fosse πρὸ τοῦ, si capisce facilmente perché πρὸ τοῦ sia stato omissa da un copista.

ingiustizia, in quanto l'invidia non avrebbe avuto una forza nociva". L'anacoluto (ξυνταραχθέντος τε τοῦ βίου [...] καὶ τῶν νόμων κρατήσασα ἢ ἀνθρωπεΐα φύσις [...] ἀσμένη ἐδήλωσεν...) è evidente e intollerabile. Esso si potrebbe eliminare espungendo il καὶ prima di τῶν νόμων κρατήσασα, ma non sono sicuro che questo καὶ sia da attribuire a un copista distratto. In ogni modo, anche se si elimina l'anacoluto, il livello del pensiero e dello stile resta scandalosamente basso. Osservo inoltre che il sintagma ἐς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον è usato qui certamente in un senso che esso non poteva avere nel greco dell'età di Tucide: equivale a ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, secondo un uso di εἰς che è frequente nell'età dell'impero romano⁵⁴.

Per ciò che riguarda il silenzio di Dionigi, mi si obietterà, forse, che questo capitolo tratta della *stasis* a Kerkyra, e non delle *staseis* che afflissero "quasi tutto il mondo greco", e che dunque il silenzio di Dionigi non prova che egli non lo conoscesse. Ma questa sarebbe un'obiezione debolissima. È inverosimile che conoscendo questo pezzo, Dionigi abbia rinunciato non solo a citarlo, ma anche a dire che dopo il pezzo da lui citato, ne veniva uno ancora più contorto, più strano, e in certi punti decisamente scorretto.

In *De Thucydide* 14, 1 (842), Dionigi cita il racconto di Tucide in IV 54, 2, sulle operazioni con cui gli Ateniesi si impadronirono dell'isola di Kythera, presentandolo come un esempio di eccessiva brevità (οὕτως εἶρηκεν ἐπιτροχάδην, περὶ μὲν τῶν ἐν Κυθήροις πραγμάτων... – segue la citazione, da καὶ μάχης γενομένης fino a πλὴν θανάτου). Nel nostro testo di Tucide, a questo racconto fanno séguito alcune informazioni supplementari, che occupano tutto il § 3 dello stesso capitolo. Esse hanno l'aspetto di un'aggiunta fatta dall'editore-falsario⁵⁵: {ἦσαν δὲ τινες καὶ γενόμενοι τῷ Νικίαι λόγοι πρότερον πρὸς τινὰς τῶν Κυθηρίων, δι' ὃ καὶ θᾶσσον καὶ ἐπιτηδεϊότερον τό τε παραυτίκα καὶ τὸ ἔπειτα τὰ τῆς ὁμολογίας ἐπράχθη αὐτοῖς· ἀνέστησαν γὰρ <ἄν>⁵⁶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι Κυθηρίους, Λακεδαιμονίους τε ὄντας καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Λακωνικῇ τῆς νήσου οὕτως ἐπικειμένης}, e cioè: "e prima erano state condotte da Nicia alcune trattative con alcuni dei cittadini di Kythera, per la quale ragione l'accordo fu fatto da loro (= *dai cittadini di Kythera*) più rapidamente e più vantaggiosamente sia per ciò che riguarda il momento presente, sia per ciò che riguarda il tempo posteriore; infatti (*se non fosse stato così*,) gli Ateniesi avrebbero cacciato i cittadini di Kythera, dato che questi erano dei Lacedemonii e dato che l'isola era situata così, vicino alla Laconia". Queste informazioni sono stranamente

⁵⁴ Anche in altri passi l'editore-falsario ha usato ἐς in questo modo: vd. Palamedes IV 2009, pp. 72 seg. Per una questione in parte simile, vd. Palamedes III 2008, pp. 132 seg.

⁵⁵ È stato Aleksander WOLICKI ad attirare la mia attenzione sul carattere sospetto di questo passo.

⁵⁶ <ἄν> è una congettura di J.D. HEILMANN, certamente giusta: essa è resa necessaria da ciò che Tucide scrive in IV 57, 4.

indeterminate, prive di concretezza (τὸ ἔπειτα forse si riferisce a ciò che è raccontato in IV 57, 4, ma l'espressione è vaga); il loro legame con ciò che precede è espresso in una maniera poco chiara (le particelle ... δέ ... καὶ servono probabilmente a introdurre una spiegazione di come i cittadini di Kythera si fossero decisi ad arrendersi; ma il nesso sintattico, ripeto, è poco chiaro); inoltre, l'ultima frase è stranamente ellittica. Dionigi non cita questo passo. Suppongo che esso non fosse presente nel testo che egli leggeva⁵⁷. Sospetto inoltre che proprio l'osservazione di Dionigi sopra riferita abbia indotto l'editore-falsario a fare questa aggiunta: egli avrà concepito l'idea di mostrare che l'accordo si era fatto rapidamente (vd. θᾶσσον), e che per questo la brevità del racconto di Tucidide era giustificata. Probabilmente egli non disponeva di alcuna fonte per fabbricare questa aggiunta: avrà lavorato di fantasia, partendo da ciò che Tucidide diceva in IV 57, 4.

Diversa, probabilmente, è la situazione in *De Thucydide* 10, 3 (834), dove Dionigi cita (dichiarendo di citare "letteralmente", κατὰ λέξιν) Thuc. I 23, 4–24, 1. In questa citazione, dopo αἱ δὲ ἐς τὸ φανερόν λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι αἴδ' ἦσαν, mancano le parole ἐκατέρων, ἀφ' ὧν λύσαντες τὰς σπονδὰς ἐς τὸν πόλεμον κατέστησαν, che si leggono nel testo della tradizione diretta di Tucidide (I 23, 6). Questa breve sequenza di parole non contiene niente di sospetto (l'uso di ἀπό nel senso di "a causa di..." è attestato altrove in Tucidide: I 12, 2; III 64, 2; VII 79, 3); è vero che essa ripete sostanzialmente ciò che era detto poche righe prima (I 23, 4–5), ma ciò non è necessariamente un difetto. È probabile che queste parole siano state omesse per inavvertenza o da Dionigi stesso⁵⁸, o da un copista nel corso della tradizione dell'opuscolo dionisiano: in un caso come nell'altro, l'errore si spiegherebbe facilmente, basta infatti supporre che nell'esemplare che stava davanti agli occhi della persona che copiava, le righe avessero ca. 25–27 lettere: ρὸν λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι αἴδ' ἦσαν | ἐκατέρων, ἀφ' ὧν λύσαντες τὰς σπον| δὰς ἐς τὸν πόλεμον κατέστησαν – come si vede, la prima e la terza di queste righe sarebbero terminate nello stesso modo, ΗΣΑΝ⁵⁹.

⁵⁷ Si obietterà che Dionigi, subito dopo (*De Thucydide*, 14, 2 [842]), cita il brevissimo racconto di Tucidide su come gli Ateniesi abbiano fatto prigionieri gli Egineti che erano a Thyrea (IV 57, 3), ma non dice che un po' più avanti (IV 57, 4) Tucidide scrive che gli Ateniesi decisero di uccidere quei prigionieri. Forse Dionigi avrà pensato che questo non riguardava il modo in cui gli Ateniesi avevano catturato gli Egineti (περὶ τῆς Αἰγινητῶν ἀλώσεως τῶν ἐν Θυρέαι); ma confesso che tale soluzione non mi soddisfa interamente.

⁵⁸ PEHLE, *o.c.* (n. 11), p. 16, considera questa omissioni come uno dei casi che proverebbero che anche nell'opuscolo *De Thucydide* (e non solo in quello *De Thucydidis proprietatibus*) Dionigi a volte citava in modo negligente.

⁵⁹ Non è però del tutto da escludere un'altra possibilità: può darsi che le parole in questione siano un'aggiunta spuria e non si trovassero nell'esemplare che Dionigi leggeva. In questo caso bisognerebbe supporre che l'autore di questa aggiunta abbia giudicato che, come fine di un periodo e di una sezione del discorso, la frase αἱ δ' ἐς τὸ φανερόν λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι αἴδ' ἦσαν fosse troppo

Una situazione analoga è da constatare in *De Thucydide* 48, 5 (936), dove è citato Thuc. VI 78, 1: alla fine di questo passo, dopo τὸν τε Ἀθηναῖον μὴ τὴν τοῦ Συρακοσίου ἔχθραν κολάσασθαι, manca la frase τῆι δ' ἐμῆι προφάσει τὴν ἐκείνου φιλίαν οὐχ ἦσσον βεβαιώσασθαι βούλεσθαι, senza la quale la frase precedente non ha senso. È evidente che la frase mancante è stata omessa per errore nel corso della tradizione dell'opuscolo di Dionigi, ed è molto probabile che l'errore sia stato causato da un omeoteleuto. La frase mancante contiene 60 lettere; è lecito supporre che nel manoscritto che era davanti agli occhi della persona che ha commesso l'errore, le righe avessero in media 20 lettere: κοσίου ἔχθραν κολάσασθαι | τῆι δ' ἐμῆι προφάσει τὴν | ἐκείνου φιλίαν οὐχ ἦσσον | βεβαιώσασθαι βούλεσθαι – come si vede, la prima e la quarta di tali ipotetiche righe sarebbero terminate in -σθαι.

Abbiamo fin qui passato in rassegna le citazioni in cui (se lasciamo stare gli ultimi due casi) si constata la mancanza di parole o frasi del nostro testo tucidideo che o sono certamente, o possono essere, delle aggiunte fatte da un editore-falsario. A questo punto vale la pena fare un'osservazione generale. Tra tutte le aggiunte spurie che credo di poter riconoscere nel testo tucidideo tramandato dai manoscritti medievali, non ce n'è nemmeno una che compaia nelle citazioni da Tucidide in Dionigi⁶⁰; e poiché sia quelle interpolazioni, sia le citazioni dionisiane sono molto numerose, la completa mancanza di coincidenze tra l'una e l'altra serie difficilmente può essere fortuita. Essa è un ulteriore argomento in favore della tesi che sostengo: essa prova che il testo di Tucidide che Dionigi leggeva non era passato per le mani di un editore-falsario.

Che questo ragionamento sia ammissibile, mi pare confermato da un confronto con ciò che osservo in un'operetta di Plutarco, *De Herodoti malignitate*, che contiene parecchi riferimenti a, e citazioni di, passi di Erodoto (vd. *infra*, pp. 236 seg.): cinque dei passi menzionati o citati da Plutarco fanno parte di quelli che io considero spuri.

Certo, in un passo dell'*Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum* 3, 12 (772), Dionigi menziona la digressione di Tucidide sulle cause per cui l'ἀρχή degli Odrysai divenne grande (δι' ἅς αἰτίας ἐγένετο μεγάλη), dicendo che questo è uno dei "due o tre" casi in cui Tucidide ha mostrato di capire che le digressioni servono a introdurre un po' di piacevole varietà nel racconto storico⁶¹; e io ho sostenuto, anni fa⁶², che questa digressione, quale ci è stata tramandata, è deturpata da in-

brusca e/o foneticamente insoddisfacente, e abbia voluto ampliarla con parole che formassero una bella clausola ritmica (- ~ - - ×).

⁶⁰ Purtroppo la citazione da Thuc. I 2 in *De Thucydide* 25, 3 (872–873) è interrotta da un'ampia lacuna (dovuta alla perdita di parecchi fogli), sicché non c'è modo di sapere se Dionigi conoscesse le parole che io ritengo spurie in I 2, 6.

⁶¹ L'altro caso che egli menziona è la digressione sulle *poleis* di Sicilia all'inizio del libro VI.

⁶² ASNSP, s. IV, vol. V (fasc. 1) 2000, pp. 107–111.

terpolazioni estese e scandalose. Però ho sostenuto anche che è ragionevole pensare che se fosse stata nota a Dionigi in questa forma, essa non avrebbe potuto sembrargli un esempio di digressione degno di essere menzionato e lodato. Oggi vedo che le interpolazioni in questa digressione sono meno estese che io non pensassi una volta. Mantengo interamente ciò che ho scritto sui §§ 4–6 del capitolo II 97⁶³, invece ciò che ho scritto sui §§ 1–2⁶⁴ mi pare in parte sbagliato. Penso che la prima frase della digressione, ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ Ὀδρυσῶν μέγεθος ἐπὶ μὲν θάλασσαν καθήκουσα ἀπὸ Ἀβδήρων πόλεως ἐς τὸν Εὐξείνιον πόντον μέχρι Ἰστροῦ ποταμοῦ, sia guasta a causa di un lapsus di copista, e che questo si possa correggere inserendo congetturalmente la parola μεγάλη dopo la parola μέγεθος⁶⁵. In questo modo si raddrizza la sintassi e si ottiene il senso seguente: “L’impero degli Odrysai divenne grande <per ciò che riguarda le dimensioni>, estendendosi, dalla parte sul mare, dalla città di Abdera al Ponto Eussino, fino al fiume Istros...” etc. Per il resto del testo fino alla fine del § 2 non so quanto si debba espungere; forse è giusto salvare soltanto una breve frase; ecco ciò che propongo esitantemente:

{ αὕτη περίπλους ἐστὶν ἡ γῆ τὰ ξυνομώτατα, ἦν αἰεὶ κατὰ πρύμναν ἰσθῆται τὸ πνεῦμα, νηὶ στρογγύλῃ τεσσάρων ἡμερῶν καὶ ἴσων νυκτῶν· ὁδῶι δὲ τὰ ξυνομώτατα ἐξ Ἀβδήρων ἐς Ἰστρον ἀνὴρ εὐζωνος ἑνδεκαταῖος τελεῖ. τὰ μὲν πρὸς θάλασσαν τοσαύτη ἦν}, ἐς ἡπειρον δὲ ἀπὸ Βυζαντίου ἐς Λαιαίους καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Στρυμόνα (ταύτη γὰρ διὰ πλείστου ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἄνω ἐγίγνετο) {ἡμερῶν ἀνδρὶ εὐζώνωι τριῶν καὶ δέκα ἀνύσαι}.

Comunque è chiaro che nei §§ 1–2 Tucidide descrive la grandezza dell’ἀρχὴ degli Odrysai per ciò che riguarda l’estensione (μέγεθος); poi, a cominciare dal § 3, descrive la sua grandezza per ciò che riguarda la ricchezza (μεγίστη ἐγένετο χρημάτων προσόδωι καὶ τῆι ἄλλῃι εὐδαιμονίαι). Continuo a pensare che il § 4 fino a μὴ διδόντα δῶρα, la fine del § 5 (a cominciare da ἰσχύι δὲ μάχης) e tutto il § 6 (in cui Tucidide sembrerebbe polemizzare con Erodoto V 3, 1) siano spuri e scritti molto male.

Dall’insieme delle osservazioni fatte qui sopra traggo le seguenti conclusioni:

(a) Il testo di Tucidide che Dionigi leggeva era in molti passi migliore di quello che ci è dato dai manoscritti medievali.

⁶³ Ibidem, pp. 108–111.

⁶⁴ Ibidem, pp. 107 seg.

⁶⁵ Questa congettura può appoggiarsi su alcuni *loci paralleli* presso altri autori: Hdt. I 51, 1 κρητῆρας δύο μεγάθυοι; Pseudo-Skymnos, *Periegesis*, 535–536 Κρήτη δὲ νῆσος τῆς Πελοποννήσου πέραν κεῖται, | μεγάλη τὸ μέγεθος εὐδαιμόνων τ’ ἄγαν, da confrontare con ciò che Pausania dice della Sardegna, X 17, 1: quest’isola può essere classificata tra le isole che sono degne di lode sia per il loro μέγεθος, sia per la loro εὐδαιμονία; Pausania VIII 16, 4 μέγεθος δὲ οὕτω δὴ τί ἐστὶ μέγας, inoltre V 20, 1 μέγεθος οὐ μεγάλη, e VII 25, 7 μέγεθος εἰσὶν οὐ μεγάλοι. Una congettura alternativa potrebbe essere ἀξιόχρεως, però, dopo μέγεθος, si capirebbe più facilmente la caduta di μεγάλη che quella di ἀξιόχρεως.

(b) In alcuni dei casi qui sopra esaminati non c'è modo di stabilire come sia nata la differenza tra l'uno e l'altro testo, ma in molti altri casi il testo della tradizione diretta tradisce la mano di quell'editore-falsario di cui credo di avere, in lavori precedenti, dimostrato l'esistenza e delineato il carattere.

(c) Sospetto che in qualche caso l'editore-falsario abbia tenuto conto delle osservazioni di Dionigi sullo stile e sul lessico di Tucidide.

II. TESTIMONIANZE DI ALTRI AUTORI DEL I SECOLO A.C. SUL TESTO DI TUCIDIDE

A questo punto dobbiamo chiederci: è possibile che al tempo di Dionigi esistessero parallelamente due linee di tradizione del testo di Tucidide, una adulterata, l'altra non adulterata?

A mio parere, questo è inverosimile. Se al tempo di Dionigi fosse esistito un Tucidide adulterato, sensibilmente diverso da quello che egli usava, egli lo avrebbe certamente conosciuto, e poiché esaminava e valutava attentamente molti pezzi dell'opera di Tucidide, alcuni dei quali si rivelano diversi dai pezzi corrispondenti che leggiamo nel nostro Tucidide, sarebbe stato naturale che in qualche occasione (per esempio nel corso del suo dettagliato esame della digressione tucididea sulle $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ – esame che non prende in considerazione due lunghi passi spuri del nostro testo) egli avvertisse i lettori che il testo da lui citato e discusso era quello genuino, e non quello adulterato. Non vedo quale interesse egli avrebbe avuto a non menzionare l'esistenza di un testo diverso.

Certo, non posso addurre argomenti positivi e sicuri che provino che un'edizione gravemente adulterata di Tucidide non esisteva ancora al tempo di Dionigi. Non conosco tuttavia nemmeno fatti che provino il contrario.

David M. LEWIS ha mostrato che, se non si vuole credere che Tucidide abbia collocato l'assedio ateniese di Naxos alcuni anni troppo tardi, è necessario supporre che in I 137, 2 egli non abbia scritto Νάξον , che è la lezione attestata da tutti i manoscritti tucididei, bensì Θάσον , che sembra essere ciò che Plutarco ha letto in Tucidide, a giudicare dal fatto che nel suo *Themistocles*, 25, 2, il manoscritto più antico, il codice S, dà Θάσον , contrariamente a tutti gli altri manoscritti, che danno Νάξον ⁶⁶. LEWIS ha sostenuto convincentemente che nel testo tucidideo Νάξον deve essere stato sostituito a Θάσον da qualcuno che volesse correggere Tucidide sulla base di Eforo. Ora, se attribuissimo questo cambiamento all'editore-falsario che io sto smascherando da parecchi anni, bisognerebbe riconoscere che questo falsario deve aver agito prima del tempo in cui Cornelio Nepote scrisse la sua biografia di Temistocle: infatti questo autore, che nel capitolo 8 e nei primi quattro paragrafi

⁶⁶ LEWIS, *o.c.* (n. 13), pp. 25–27, 66 seg., 160–162. La questione cronologica era stata trattata ampiamente da A.W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. I, Oxford 1945, pp. 389–413, specialmente 397–401.

del capitolo 9 segue abbastanza da vicino Tucidide I 135, 2–138, 2, e che dichiara espressamente (9, 1) di respingere la versione “dei più” e di accettare la versione di Tucidide secondo cui Temistocle si sarebbe rifugiato presso Artaxerxes, e non presso Xerxes, scrive in 8, 6 “*quae (scil. nauis) cum tempestate maxima Naxum ferretur, ubi tum Atheniensium erat exercitus...*”. Tuttavia mi pare lecito supporre che la sostituzione di Νάξον a Θάσον sia stata fatta non dal mio editore-falsario, ma da qualche altro editore, più antico, che non volesse alterare arbitrariamente il testo di Tucidide, bensì correggerlo. Può darsi che la lezione genuina Θάσον abbia continuato a lungo a esistere in una parte minoritaria della tradizione del testo tucidideo, vuoi nel testo stesso, vuoi come variante. È possibile anche che Plutarco l'abbia conosciuta grazie a un commento dotto che prendesse in considerazione opere cronografiche: questa possibilità mi è suggerita dal fatto che Plutarco, in *Themistocles* 27, 1–2, allude a τὰ χρονικά.

Ho cercato di capire se due autori di poco più vecchi di Dionigi e che hanno usato l'opera di Tucidide, Diodoro e Lucrezio, leggessero o non leggessero passi di Tucidide che ritengo interpolati. (Come è noto, per il racconto della guerra peloponnesiaca Diodoro si basa non solo su Eforo, ma anche su Tucidide. Quanto a Lucrezio, il pezzo finale del suo libro VI, e cioè la sua descrizione della pestilenza che colpì Atene poco dopo l'inizio della guerra peloponnesiaca, è in gran parte una parafrasi poetica della descrizione tucididea.) Ma in quei due autori non ho trovato indizi sufficientemente sicuri.

Potrei sostenere che quando scrisse XII 40, 2–4 (riferendo ciò che Pericle avrebbe detto in un discorso per incoraggiare gli Ateniesi), Diodoro probabilmente non conosceva due pezzi del testo tucidideo che considero interpolati: II 13, 3 τὰ γὰρ πλεῖστα τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα μύρια ἐγένετο, ἀφ' ὧν ἕς τε τὰ προπύλαια τῆς ἀκροπόλεως καὶ τᾶλλα οἰκοδομήματα καὶ ἕς Ποτειδαιαν ἀπανηλώθη, insieme con le parole ἔτι τότε, che si trovano poco prima (questo pezzo è stato denunciato come spurio già da David M. LEWIS⁶⁷), e II 13, 6–9, da ὀπλίτας δὲ τρισχιλίουσ καὶ μυρίουσ εἶναι... fino a ταῦτα γὰρ ὑπῆρχεν Ἀθηναίοις καὶ οὐχ ἔλασσον ἕκαστα τούτων, ὅτε ἡ ἐσβολὴ τὸ πρῶτον ἔμελλε Πελοποννησίων ἔσσεσθαι καὶ ἕς τὸν πόλεμον καθίσταντο⁶⁸. Ma mi si potrebbe obiettare che nel

⁶⁷ LEWIS, *o.c.* (n. 13), pp. 49–53, 57, 160, 162.

⁶⁸ Sulle differenze tra Thuc. II 13 e Diod. XII 40 per ciò che riguarda il numero degli opliti LEWIS, *o.c.* (n. 13), p. 52, ha scritto: “The hoplite-figures have been deliberately varied; we can imagine 13,000 being corrupted into 12,000, but that both numbers should have been corrupted in such a way that the total remains the same is highly improbable, though we cannot guess what was behind the change”. Io credo di poter spiegare queste differenze attribuendo tutto questo pezzo all'editore-falsario. Suppongo che per fabbricarlo, l'editore-falsario abbia usato Eforo, ma abbia cambiato arbitrariamente i dati numerici riguardanti gli opliti, quali dovevano trovarsi in Eforo, allo scopo di creare un contrasto interessante tra questo storico e Tucidide. Là dove Diodoro, seguendo molto probabilmente Eforo, dà 12.000 + 17.000, lo Pseudo-Tucidide dà 13.000 + 16.000: due cambiamenti ovviamente interdipendenti. Ho mostrato altrove che l'editore-falsario di Erodoto e di Tucidide amava creare, con le sue interpolazioni, dei contrasti tra Erodoto e Tucidide: si veda Palamedes IV

riferire il contenuto di un discorso di Pericle (che egli, del resto, colloca in un momento diverso da quello di cui parla Tucidide), Diodoro ha seguito semplicemente Eforo senza preoccuparsi delle informazioni divergenti date da Tucidide.

Analogamente, potrei mostrare che nella descrizione tucididea della pestilenza c'è almeno un passo spurio, II 51, 3 (scritto in un modo stranamente contorto: σῶμά τε αὐταρκές ὄν οὐδέν διεφάνη πρὸς αὐτὸ ἰσχύος πέρι ἢ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ πάντα ξυνήρει καὶ τὰ πάσῃ διαίτηι θεραπευόμενα), e che nella descrizione lucreziana non c'è nulla che corrisponda a questo passo; ma Lucrezio era libero di usare Tucidide a modo suo, dunque dal suo silenzio non si possono trarre conclusioni certe⁶⁹.

Un indizio più attendibile l'ho trovato in Cicerone, *Brutus* 47. Qui Cicerone riassume o parafrasa (usando la costruzione *accusativus cum infinitivo*) ciò che Aristotele aveva scritto sulle vicende della retorica in quanto oggetto di teoria e di insegnamento (in quanto *ars*). Dopo aver menzionato opere di Gorgia, egli scrive: “huic Antiphontem Rhamnusium similia quaedam habuisse conscripta”. A questo punto egli interrompe il riassunto o la parafrasi per riferire un giudizio che Tucidide avrebbe espresso su Antifonte: “quo neminem umquam melius ullam orauisse capitis causam cum se ipse defenderet se audiente, locuples auctor scripsit Thucydides”, e cioè “Tucidide, un autore serio, ha scritto che non aveva mai ascoltato nessuno che avesse parlato meglio di questo (= *di Antifonte*) nel difendere sé stesso da un'accusa comportante la pena capitale”. Dopo queste parole, che costituiscono un'osservazione incidentale e non hanno niente a che fare con Aristotele (come risulta dal fatto che la proposizione principale è all'indicativo: “locuples auctor scripsit Thucydides”)⁷⁰, Cicerone torna a riassumere o parafrasare Aristotele, di nuovo usando la costruzione *accusativus cum infinitivo*. È evidente che accennando a Tucidide, Cicerone aveva in mente il giudizio

(2009), pp. 68 seg. (dove rinvio anche ad altri miei articoli). Manifestamente, egli sapeva che tra il pubblico del suo tempo c'erano dei lettori capaci di notare delle divergenze tra il racconto di Tucidide e quello di Erodoto, o tra quello di Eforo e quello di Tucidide, e di trovarle interessanti.

⁶⁹ Colgo l'occasione per correggere, per mezzo di Tucidide, un passo corrotto del *De rerum natura* VI. Il verso 1225, “incomitata rapi certabant funera uasta”, contiene, come alcuni editori moderni hanno visto, una parola assurda, *rapi*, e non è al suo posto. Propongo di cambiare *rapi* in *sequi* (ricordiamo che nella minuscola insulare le lettere *s* e *r* si assomigliano molto) e di trasferire questo verso (che, così corretto, significa “si affannavano a seguire funerali privi di accompagnamento, solitari”) dopo il v. 1244 (al posto occupato a torto dal v. 1245, che R. BENTLEY ha giustamente trasferito dopo il v. 1236). La sequenza di versi 1242, 1243, 1244, 1225, 1246, ricostituita in questo modo, è una libera parafrasi poetica di ciò che Tucidide scrive in II 51, 5: εἶτε προσίοιεν, διεφθείροντο, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ ἀρετῆς τι μεταποιούμενοι (vd. “optimus [...] quisque” in Lucrezio, VI 1246) · αἰσχύνῃ γὰρ ἠφείδουν σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐσιόντες παρὰ τοὺς φίλους· ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰς ὀλοφύρσεις τῶν ἀπογιγνομένων τελευτῶντες καὶ οἱ οἰκεῖοι ἐξέκαμνον ὑπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ κακοῦ κικῶμενοι. Lucrezio ha capito bene che le ὀλοφύρσεις qui sono i lamenti funebri che i famigliari (οἱ οἰκεῖοι) dei defunti avevano il dovere di fare, ma non facevano.

⁷⁰ Di questo non si è accorto L. CANFORA, *Tucidide. L'oligarca imperfetto*, Roma 1988, pp. 68, 77, 82–88, 93–95.

su Antifonte espresso in VIII 68, 2; però, o ricordava male, o aveva interpretato male le parole di Tucidide: infatti il processo in cui Antifonte fu condannato a morte ebbe luogo ἐπὶ Θεοπόμπου ἄρχοντος, come è attestato da un documento che l'anonimo autore delle *Decem oratorum vitae* (Plut. *Moralia* 833D–F) riporta da uno scritto di Cecilio di Kale Akte – dunque in un anno in cui Tucidide non era presente ad Atene. La tradizione medievale di tutto il passo tucidideo su Antifonte (VIII 68, 1–2) porta chiari segni di interpolazioni; ne parlerò in altra occasione. Per ora mi basta discutere la frase ἄριστα φαίνεται τῶν μέχρι ἐμοῦ [...] θανάτου δίκην ἀπολογησάμενος. Poiché, nell'opera di Tucidide, φαίνεται o φαίνονται con un participio non serve mai a comunicare un'impressione soggettiva, bensì significa sempre “si può constatare che...”, “risulta che...”, “appare manifesto che...”, dobbiamo intendere questa frase così: “appare manifesto che egli (*Antifonte*) fece il miglior discorso di autodifesa che sia mai stato fatto fino al mio tempo in un processo in cui si rischiasse la pena capitale”. Ma come può Tucidide aver confrontato tra di loro tutti i discorsi di questo genere pronunciati “fino al suo tempo”? Prima del suo tempo, quasi certamente, non era esistita l'usanza di pubblicare testi di discorsi pronunciati in tribunale, né di discorsi in generale. Antony ANDREWES⁷¹ ha cercato di risolvere la difficoltà nel modo seguente: “what Thucydides heard in Athenian lawcourts before 424 will have given him adequate material for comparison, and τῶν μέχρι ἐμοῦ throws in for good measure speeches from earlier generations which could be known only by general repute”. Può darsi che questa soluzione sia giusta, ma ne dubito molto. Tucidide è uno scrittore che pesa attentamente le parole e non ha l'abitudine di esagerare. Inoltre, se Cicerone avesse letto in questo passo τῶν μέχρι ἐμοῦ, sarebbe difficile capire come abbia potuto fare l'errore che ha fatto. Contrariamente a ciò che pensava ANDREWES, questo non è “a very natural error”: Cicerone ha creduto infatti che Tucidide intendesse fare un confronto tra il discorso di Antifonte e tutti gli altri discorsi analoghi che egli stesso aveva ascoltato (discorsi di autodifesa di uomini accusati di crimini punibili di morte). Il soggetto di “cum se ipse defenderet” non è Antifonte, ma si ricava da “quo neminem umquam melius orauisse capitis causam”; l'ablativo assoluto “se audiente” va insieme con “orauisse capitis causam”, e la proposizione “cum se ipse defenderet” serve a precisare “orauisse”. (In latino non c'è un verbo che corrisponda a ἀπολογεῖσθαι; Cicerone ha dovuto dunque usare una perifrasi.) Di fronte a questa situazione, mi pare ragionevole supporre che nel passo in questione Tucidide, confrontando l'autodifesa di Antifonte, di cui aveva letto il

⁷¹ A. ANDREWES in: A.W. GOMME, A. ANDREWES, K.J. DOVER, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. V: *Book VIII*, Oxford 1981, pp. 170–177; questa mi pare la migliore trattazione che sia stata fatta finora dei problemi riguardanti questo passo. Meno buone mi membrano le considerazioni di K. MAURER, *Interpolation in Thucydides*, Leiden 1995 (Mnemosyne, Suppl. 150), pp. 38–41, e quelle di S. HORNBLLOWER, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. III: *Books 5.25–8.109*, Oxford 2008, pp. 954–958.

testo pubblicato, con altri discorsi analoghi che egli stesso aveva ascoltato, abbia scritto ἄριστα [...] τῶν ἐπ' ἐμοῦ, oppure ἄριστα [...] τῶν κατ' ἐμὲ, “meglio di chiunque altro dei miei contemporanei”, e che l'editore-falsario, per rendere più enfatico l'elogio, abbia cambiato il testo scrivendo ἄριστα [...] τῶν μέχρι ἐμοῦ. Se supponiamo che Cicerone abbia letto nella sua copia di Tucidide ἄριστα [...] τῶν ἐπ' ἐμοῦ oppure ἄριστα [...] τῶν κατ' ἐμὲ, diventa possibile immaginare che egli abbia creduto (erroneamente) che Tucidide si riferisse esclusivamente a discorsi da lui ascoltati, e non anche a un discorso da lui letto. È vero che nel *De oratore* II 56 Cicerone scrive che Tucidide “hos ipsos libros tum scripsisse dicitur, cum a re publica remotus atque [...] in exilium pulsus esset”; ma è possibile che egli abbia letto quel passo di Tucidide in un momento in cui non ricordava ciò che “si diceva” sulle circostanze in cui Tucidide aveva scritto la sua opera, né ciò che Tucidide stesso⁷² affermava in V 26, 5.

Rendendo possibile capire come sia nato l'errore di Cicerone, l'ipotesi riceve da ciò stesso una conferma.

III. UNA TESTIMONIANZA DI DIONIGI DI ALICARNASSO SU UN PASSO DI ERODOTO

Contrariamente a ciò che ha fatto con Tucidide, Dionigi di Alicarnasso non ha discusso dettagliatamente lo stile di Erodoto e non ha citato se non poche volte passi dell'opera del suo illustre compatriota⁷³, che pure egli conosceva bene e ammirava. Ciò si capisce: al tempo di Dionigi Erodoto non era oggetto di imitazione. (Soltanto un po' più tardi lo diventò, senza però acquistare mai un ruolo comparabile a quello di Tucidide. Il numero dei papiri erodotei, nettamente inferiore a quello dei papiri tucididei, lo conferma.)

Tuttavia una delle rare citazioni è importantissima per la presente ricerca. Mi riferisco a *Antiquitates Romanae*, I 29, 3, dove Dionigi cita (cambiando in parte le forme ioniche in forme attiche) un pezzetto di Erodoto I 57, 3, nel modo seguente⁷⁴:

καὶ γὰρ δὴ οὔτε Κροτωνιῆται, ὡς φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος, οὐδαμοῖς τῶν νῦν σφεας

⁷² Non ignoro che secondo L. CANFORA l'“io” che parla in Thuc. V 26, 5 non sarebbe Tucidide, ma Senofonte; tuttavia questa ipotesi mi sembra del tutto inaccettabile.

⁷³ In *De Demosthenis dictione* 41 (1084–1086), Dionigi cita (sostituendo le forme ioniche con forme attiche) il discorso che Erodoto mette in bocca a Xerxes in VII 8. In *De compositione verborum* 3 (18–19), cita (anche qui sostituendo le forme ioniche con forme attiche) un lungo passo del racconto su Gyges e la moglie di Kandaules, I 8, 2–9, 3 (sulla lezione ἐς κοίτην, vd. Eos XCIX 2012/1, p. 63). Nello stesso opuscolo, 4 (26), Dionigi cita (di nuovo sostituendo le forme ioniche con forme attiche) l'inizio del racconto su Kroisos, I 6, 1. Nella *Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum* 3, 3 (767), cita alcune parole dell'inizio dell'opera di Erodoto. Nelle *Antiquitates Romanae* I 29, 3, cita un passo della digressione sui Pelasgi e sui Dori, I 57, 3 (vd. le mie osservazioni qui sotto).

⁷⁴ Accetto le correzioni congetturali accolte da C. JACOBY nella sua edizione, tranne che per la desinenza di οὐδαμοῖς (per la quale seguo REISKE).

περιοικεόντων εἰσὶν ὁμόγλωσσοι οὔτε Πλακιηνοί, σφίσι δ' ὁμόγλωσσοι, δηλοῦσι δὲ ὅτι ὄν ἠνείκαντο γλώσσης χαρακτῆρα μεταβαίνοντες ἐς ταῦτα τὰ χωρία, τοῦτον ἔχουσιν ἐν φυλακῇ.

A parte alcune divergenze di poco conto, il testo riportato da Dionigi differisce da quello dei manoscritti medievali in quanto dà Κροτωνιῆται (o Κροτωνιάται) al posto di Κρηστωνιῆται. La differenza è importante: i Κροτωνιῆται (cioè i cittadini di Cortona) erano in Etruria, i Κρηστωνιῆται, se veramente esistevano, erano in Tracia. Ho mostrato altrove, per mezzo di lunghi ragionamenti che qui non posso ripetere⁷⁵, che è inevitabile pensare – seguendo B.G. NIEBUHR, Eduard MEYER e altri studiosi – che in I 57, 1–3 Erodoto abbia scritto Κρότωνα e Κροτωνιῆται, come leggeva Dionigi, e non Κρηστῶνα e Κρηστωνιῆται, come si legge nei manoscritti medievali. Se si ammette questo, mi pare necessario supporre che la sostituzione di Κρηστῶνα e Κρηστωνιῆται a Κρότωνα e Κροτωνιῆται non sia stata fatta da un dotto antico, come supponeva E. MEYER, ma da un uomo semi-dotto, da quell'editore-falsario – uomo intraprendente, saccente e superficiale – di cui mi sono occupato più volte. Non so se egli abbia creduto di correggere con ciò un errore dovuto a copisti o un errore di Erodoto, ma la seconda delle due ipotesi mi sembra la più verosimile; in ogni modo egli ha alterato consapevolmente e temerariamente il testo della tradizione⁷⁶.

Questa testimonianza di Dionigi mi pare sufficientemente sicura e significativa per provare che il testo di Erodoto che egli leggeva non era passato per le mani dell'editore-falsario.

Presso scrittori contemporanei di Dionigi o anteriori a lui, non vedo testimonianze sicure che gettino luce sullo stato del testo di Erodoto. Diodoro, come è noto, non si interessava di questo autore, non lo usava come fonte di informazioni.

Per la sua discussione del problema della causa delle inondazioni del Nilo (I 38–41), Diodoro non si è fondato su Erodoto, bensì, come è facile capire, ha riassunto Agatharchides. Quest'ultimo – un ricercatore originale, non un compilatore – sicuramente ha letto Erodoto con attenzione. Ora, sulla base del riassunto fatto da Diodoro, è interessante constatare che Agatharchides non sembra aver letto un lungo pezzo di ciò che noi leggiamo nella parte del nostro Erodoto che riguarda le inondazioni del Nilo – un pezzo che, per le ragioni che ho indicato

⁷⁵ Palamedes IV 2009, pp. 40–45.

⁷⁶ È peccato che in un papiro erodoteo databile alla fine del II o all'inizio del III secolo d.C., *P. Oxy.* XLVIII 3374, fr. 1, proprio la riga in cui ci doveva essere o la lezione spuria Κρηστωνιῆται, o la lezione autentica Κροτωνιῆται (la l. 5), sia interamente scomparsa. Nel primo caso la riga avrebbe avuto 21 lettere, nel secondo 20. In tutto ciò che resta di questo papiro, soltanto due righe hanno certamente 21 lettere, e soltanto due righe ne hanno 20; tutte le altre (alcune decine) ne hanno da 14 a 19. Statisticamente, Κροτωνιῆται è più probabile (tanto più che in questa scrittura l'*eta* è molto largo, l'*omega* no), ma non ci si può fidare di questo debole indizio.

altrove, è da considerare opera dell'editore-falsario⁷⁷. Riconosco che il riassunto diodoreo non è una base del tutto sicura per sapere che cosa Agatharchides abbia letto e che cosa non abbia letto nel suo Erodoto. Tuttavia la conclusione che ne ho tratto mi sembra un'ipotesi abbastanza probabile.

IV. DOPO DIONIGI DI ALICARNASSO

Contrariamente a Dionigi di Alicarnasso, che leggeva e citava Erodoto e Tuciddide secondo un testo immune da interpolazioni fraudolente, Plutarco li leggeva e citava secondo un testo che tali interpolazioni conteneva. È probabile che egli conoscesse anche un testo diverso, perché al suo tempo, come risulta dai papiri, erano in circolazione sia copie contenenti un testo guastato dagli abbellimenti e dagli ampliamenti dell'editore-falsario, sia copie immuni da essi. Ma si vede che la versione adulterata era per lui più interessante o – quando si trattava di accusare Erodoto di κακοήθεια – più comoda per i suoi scopi polemici, di quella non adulterata.

In *De Herodoti malignitate* Plutarco si riferisce esplicitamente a molti passi di Erodoto. Cinque di questi sono a mio parere spuri, sono aggiunte fatte dall'editore-falsario. Li elenco qui sotto, rinviando, per ciò che riguarda i primi quattro, a osservazioni che ho fatto in articoli precedenti:

– in *De Herodoti malignitate* 13 (= *Mor.* 857D) Plutarco allude a Hdt. II 145, 4–146, su cui vd. ASNSP, s. V, vol. I (fasc. 2) 2009, pp. 642–647;

– in 14 (= 857E) allude a Hdt. VI 53–55, su cui vd. Palamedes IV 2009, pp. 75–78;

– in 23 (= 860D) allude alla frase {τὸν δὲ Κλεομένεα εἶχε αἰτίη φοιτᾶν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰσαγόρεω τὴν γυναῖκα} in Hdt. V 70, 1, su cui vd. Palamedes III 2008, p. 109;

– in 27 (= 863B) allude a Hdt. VI 122, su cui vd. Palamedes III 2008, pp. 112–114;

– in 28 (= 863D) cita letteralmente Hdt. VII 152, 3, comprese alcune righe che ritengo spurie. Riferisco qui la citazione tutta intera, indicando la parte del testo citato che atetizzo: ἐγὼ δε λέγειν ὀφείλω <τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαι γε μὴν οὐ παντάπασι ὀφείλω>⁷⁸, καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα τὸν λόγον⁷⁹. {ἐπεὶ καὶ ταῦτα λέγεται, ὡς ἄρα Ἀργεῖοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τὸν Πέρσην ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐπειδὴ σφιν πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους κακῶς

⁷⁷ ASNSP, s. IV, vol. V 2000, pp. 33–35.

⁷⁸ Nella tradizione dell'operetta di Plutarco queste parole sono state omesse per errore: lapsus dovuto all'omeoteleuto.

⁷⁹ La tradizione diretta di Erodoto dà ἐς πάντα λόγον. In un passo analogo di Erodoto, II 123, 1, la maggior parte dei manoscritti dà ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πάντα τὸν λόγον ὑπόκειται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' ἐκάστων ἀκοῆι γράφω, ma il ms. A dà ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πάντα λόγον... etc. In altri passi di Erodoto compare l'espressione τὸν πάντα λόγον.

ἢ αἰχμὴ ἐστήκεε, <πᾶν>⁸⁰ δὴ βουλόμενοι σφίσι προσεῖναι τῆς παρεούσης λύπης⁸¹}. Ecco le ragioni per cui atetizzo le ultime righe di questo passo. La frase καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα τὸν λόγον va benissimo come fine del pezzo in cui Erodoto riferisce varie versioni del comportamento di Argos e dichiara di riferirle senza farle sue; sarebbe strano se subito dopo questa frase Erodoto avesse aggiunto che esiste ancora un'altra versione. Altrettanto mi stupisce la forma dell'ultimo pezzetto di testo. Cerchiamo di tradurre fedelmente: “furono gli Argivi a chiedere ai Persiani di venire in Grecia, poiché per loro la lancia (= *la battaglia*) contro i Lacedemonii si era trovata male, preferendo che qualsiasi cosa esistesse per loro piuttosto che il dolore presente”. Suppongo che l'autore abbia voluto dire press'a poco questo: “furono gli Argivi a chiedere ai Persiani di venire in Grecia, e lo fecero perché avevano subito una sconfitta disastrosa nella battaglia contro i Lacedemonii e preferivano qualsiasi cosa piuttosto che la loro miserevole situazione presente”. Ma questo pensiero è espresso in una maniera stranamente ricercata, che pretende di essere poetica. Si osservi infine che la frase ὡς ἄρα Ἀργεῖοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τὸν Πέρσην ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα presuppone che nel testo che la precede il problema discusso sia quello di sapere chi sia stato a ἐπικαλέσασθαι τὸν Πέρσην: in realtà questo problema compare solo in questo momento.

Che Plutarco conoscesse non solo il testo adulterato che cita, ma anche un testo diverso, è verosimile non soltanto a causa di ciò che ho osservato studiando i papiri erodotei⁸², ma anche a causa della sua nota testimonianza sull'*incipit* dell'opera di Erodoto. In *De exilio* 13 (= *Mor.* 604F), Plutarco scrive: τὸ δ' «Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνασσεῶς ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἦδε» πολλοὶ μεταγράφουσιν «Ἡροδότου Θουρίου»· μετώκησε γὰρ εἰς Θουρίους καὶ τῆς ἀποικίας ἐκείνης μετέσχε. Da questa affermazione, a cui si aggiunge ciò che Plutarco scrive in *De Herodoti malignitate* 35 (= 868A) (...Θούριον μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων νομιζόμενον, αὐτὸν δὲ Ἀλικαρνασσεῶν περιεχόμενον)⁸³, risulta che al suo tempo esistevano copie in cui l'opera di Erodoto si apriva con le parole Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησσεῶς, e altre copie in cui essa si apriva con le parole Ἡροδότου Θουρίου. La prima delle due lezioni – l'unica che compaia nei nostri manoscritti medievali – è sembrata a Plutarco autentica, la seconda

⁸⁰ I mss. di Plutarco danno ἔστηκεν εἰ ... *lacuna* (3 o 5 lettere) δὴ βουλόμενοι.

⁸¹ Wyttenbach ha cambiato προσεῖναι in προεῖναι, ma questa congettura non può appoggiarsi su alcun *locus parallelus*. I manoscritti di Erodoto danno σφί εἶναι πρὸ τῆς παρεούσης λύπης, ma, a parte σφί, questo è probabilmente una congettura introdotta da un correttore per correggere lo strano testo che noi leggiamo nella citazione fatta da Plutarco. Non ho trovato analogie per βούλομαι + genitivo nel senso di “preferire a...”. Questa costruzione dev'essere un'invenzione dell'editore-falsario, fatta sulla base della costruzione βούλομαι ἦ...

⁸² Vd. la Parte prima del presente studio, *Eos* XCIX 2012/1, pp. 26–46.

⁸³ Per l'interpretazione di quest'ultimo passo, vd. F. JACOBY, *Herodotos*, *RE* Suppl. II (1913), col. 205.

gli è sembrata una innovazione arbitraria. È vero l'inverso. La seconda lezione infatti compare in una citazione che si legge in un passo della *Retorica* di Aristotele (III, 1409 a 29); inoltre, un poemetto tardo-antico in trimetri giambici, il *De ora maritima* di Avieno (v. 49), menziona *Herodotus ipse Thurius* come una delle fonti delle sue informazioni. Se i ragionamenti che ho fatto altrove sono validi⁸⁴, in questo passo Avieno parafrasa il Περὶ γῆς dello Pseudo-Apollodoro, un'opera in trimetri giambici, per noi perduta, che dev'essere stata scritta intorno al 100 a.C.; non posso però escludere che l'informazione sull'etnico di Erodoto, Avieno l'abbia attinta all'erudizione tardo-antica: si tenga presente che l'imperatore Giuliano in due lettere (*Epist.* 152; 155) chiama Erodoto ὁ λογοποιὸς ὁ Θούριος, ὁ Θούριος λογοποιός.

Del resto, per una ragione intrinseca è chiaro che la lezione Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος è una innovazione: poiché nessuno che avesse avuto un'educazione letteraria, sia pur modesta, poteva pensare che Erodoto fosse nato a Thourioi, e poiché molti indubbiamente sapevano dove egli fosse nato, è impossibile immaginare che qualcuno abbia sostituito Ἡροδότου Θουρίου a Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος, e che questa innovazione abbia avuto successo. L'inverso, invece, si può immaginare facilmente. Mi sembra lecito anche sospettare che un'innovazione così violenta, così vistosa e così capace di imporsi e di vincere, sia stata fatta dall'editore-falsario, tanto più che essa non sembra essere molto antica. Nulla prova che la lezione Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος esistesse già al tempo di Dionigi di Alicarnasso. Il suo contemporaneo Strabone dice (XIV 2, 16 [C. 656]) che Erodoto nacque ad Alicarnasso, ma "più tardi" fu detto Erodoto di Thourioi, perché aveva partecipato alla fondazione di Thourioi. Questa informazione non suggerisce affatto che Strabone conoscesse due versioni dell'*incipit* dell'opera erodotea; suggerisce piuttosto che egli conoscesse soltanto l'*incipit* Ἡροδότου Θουρίου.

Anche per la lettura di Tucideide mi pare molto probabile che Plutarco si servisse del testo adulterato. Ho trovato finora soltanto pochi casi pertinenti, ma questi mi sembrano probanti.

In *An seni res publica gerenda sit* 27 (= *Mor.* 797B–C), Plutarco cita (indicando esplicitamente l'autore) gran parte di un passo di Thuc. V 65, 2, che racconta che un soldato anziano, essendosi reso conto che Agis stava guidando le truppe all'attacco di un luogo inespugnabile, gli gridò: "hai intenzione di guarire un male con un male". In questo passo le parole di quel soldato – un detto proverbiale la cui applicazione è chiarissima per qualsiasi lettore che abbia letto il racconto precedente (V 59, 5–60; 63) – vengono spiegate inutilmente con una frase sintatticamente contorta, che non esito ad attribuire all'editore-falsario,

⁸⁴ Vd. il mio libro *La Chronique d'Apollodore et le Pseudo-Skymnos. Érudition antiquaire et littérature géographique dans la seconde moitié du II^e siècle av. J.-C.*, Leuven 2009 (*Studia Hellenistica*, 46), pp. 19, 20–25, 37–39.

tanto più che la tendenza di questo a dare spiegazioni inutili è evidente in molti dei suoi interventi: {δηλῶν τῆς ἐξ Ἄργους ἐπαιτίου ἀναχωρήσεως τὴν παροῦσαν ἄκαιρον προθυμίαν ἀνάληψιν βουλόμενον⁸⁵ εἶναι}, “intendendo dire che egli voleva che il presente zelo inopportuno fosse una guarigione della biasimevole ritirata da Argos”⁸⁶. Plutarco riporta questa frase interamente.

In *Nicias* 10, 8 Plutarco scrive: οἱ γὰρ ἐκ Πύλου κομισθέντες ἦσαν ἐξ οἴκων τε πρώτων τῆς Σπάρτης καὶ φίλους καὶ συγγενεῖς τοὺς δυνατωτάτους ἔχοντες. Quasi certamente si fonda su Tucidide V 15, 1 ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ Σπαρτιᾶται αὐτῶν πρώτοί τε καὶ † ὁμοίως † (*leggere* ὁμοίως, *congettura* di REISKE, *op-pure* ὁμοίως) σφίσι συγγενεῖς. Ora, J. STEUP ha dimostrato, con argomenti a mio parere decisivi, la non-autenticità di alcuni passi dei capitoli di Tucidide V 13–14 e di tutto il lungo pezzo che va da 15, 1 καὶ οὐχ ἦσσαν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις fino a 17, 1 προθυμήθη τὴν ξύμβασιν⁸⁷. Di quest’ultimo fa parte il passo su cui Plutarco si è fondato.

Dello stesso pezzo spurio fa parte la frase (V 16, 2) Διὸς υἱοῦ τὸ σπέρμα ἐκ τῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἐς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀναφέρειν, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀργυρέα εὐλάκαι εὐλαξεῖν, che Plutarco ha parafrasato in *De Pythiae oraculis* 19 (= *Moralia* 403B). Qui egli dichiara espressamente che la sua fonte è Tucidide.

Può darsi che una frase di uno storico nato una decina di anni prima di Plutarco sia un’imitazione di una frase di un pezzo tucidideo sicuramente spurio (su cui vd. *supra*, pp. 225 seg.): in *Antiq. Iud.* XVII 8, 1, Flavio Giuseppe scrive ὄργῆς μὲν ἦσσαν, κρείσσω δὲ τοῦ δικαίου, il che può far pensare che egli abbia preso come modello Thuc. III 84, 2 ἀκρατῆς μὲν ὄργῆς οὔσα, κρείσσω δὲ τοῦ δικαίου. Questa sarebbe dunque la più antica attestazione dell’esistenza

⁸⁵ Questa è la lezione dei manoscritti di Plutarco. I manoscritti di Tucidide danno βουλομένην, molto probabilmente un errore dovuto alla vicinanza di ἀνάληψιν. G.B. ALBERTI ha scelto la lezione della tradizione indiretta, βουλόμενον: giustamente.

⁸⁶ Questa frase è paragonabile a Thuc. IV 40, 2, δήλωσιν ποιούμενος ὅτι ὁ ἐντυγχάνων τοῖς τε λίθοις καὶ τοξεύμασι διεφθείρετο, frase altrettanto certamente spuria; del resto tutto il capitolo IV 40 mi sembra spurio.

⁸⁷ J. STEUP, nell’edizione commentata di J. CLASSEN e J. STEUP, vol. V, Berlin ³1912, appendice, pp. 247–253. Io sono d’accordo con quasi tutte le osservazioni che STEUP fa su questi capitoli. Segnalo due punti di disaccordo, poco importanti: in V 14, 4 la frase ὥστ’ ἀδύνατα εἶναι ἐφαίνετο Ἀργείοις καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ἅμα πολεμεῖν mi sembra decisamente spuria; STEUP tenta di salvarla cambiando ἀδύνατα in δυνατὰ, ma questo non dà un senso plausibile. Spuria mi sembra inoltre una frase in cui STEUP non trova niente di sospetto: V 14, 1 καὶ οὐκ ἔχοντες τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ῥώμης πιστὴν ἔτι, ἥτις οὐ προσεδέχοντο πρότερον τὰς σπονδὰς, δοκοῦντες τῇ παρουσίᾳ εὐτυχία καθυπέρτεροι γενήσεσθαι. La conclusione che STEUP trae dalle sue osservazioni è giusta, sebbene egli si sbaglia nel datare l’interpolazione: “Die Erweiterungen, welche die Thukidydeische Darstellung in den Kapiteln 13 bis 17 meiner Ansicht nach erfahren hat, gehen aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach auf einen einzigen Urheber zurück [...]. Der Interpolator, der wohl noch in die voralexandrinische Zeit zu setzen ist [...], fand vermutlich den Bericht, welchen der Historiker über den Friedensschluß gegeben hatte, zu knapp”. Secondo me, non l’interpolatore, bensì la fonte da lui usata per allargare questo racconto è da datare alla “voralexandrinische Zeit”: suppongo che si tratti di Eforo.

del testo adulterato di Tucidide. Tuttavia mi pare possibile che l'editore-falsario e Flavio Giuseppe abbiano imitato – ciascuno per conto suo – un'espressione celebre, appartenente a un'opera che noi non conosciamo⁸⁸.

Dopo Plutarco, parecchi testi contengono citazioni o parafrasi di, o riferimenti a, passi di Erodoto o di Tucidide che ritengo spuri: mi basterà menzionare Pausania⁸⁹, Aulo Gellio⁹⁰, Polluce⁹¹, Arpocrazione⁹², Ateneo⁹³.

Quanto agli autori greci o latini del periodo intermedio tra l'età di Dionigi e quella di Plutarco, non ho trovato in essi testimonianze o indizi utili sullo stato del testo di Erodoto e di quello di Tucidide. Anni fa, ho creduto di poter dire che l'anonimo autore del trattato *Del sublime* e Pomponio Mela probabilmente leggevano un Erodoto non adulterato⁹⁴, ma oggi riconosco che l'indizio che vedevo allora nello Pseudo-Longino non è così forte come pensavo, e che quelli che vedevo in Pomponio Mela sono illusorii. In ogni modo, anche se si riuscisse a dimostrare che lo Pseudo-Longino e Pomponio Mela leggevano un Erodoto non adulterato, ciò non escluderebbe la possibilità che al loro tempo copie derivate dall'edizione fraudolenta esistessero accanto a copie che da essa non erano derivate.

Che l'editore-falsario abbia lavorato nel I secolo d.C., mi pare molto probabile, ma bisogna cercare di restringere un po' i limiti cronologici. Poiché l'uso che Plutarco fa dell'Erodoto e del Tucidide adulterati presuppone che al suo tempo questi circolassero già molto largamente, suppongo che l'editore-falsario abbia lavorato nella prima metà, forse nel primo quarto (e non, come supponevo una volta, verso la metà) del I secolo d.C.

In ogni modo, anche se ammettiamo che le due edizioni in questione siano state fatte all'inizio di quel secolo, o addirittura un po' prima, pochi anni dopo la pubblicazione degli opuscoli di Dionigi di Alicarnasso, rimane vero che il loro

⁸⁸ Già A. W. GOMME, che attribuiva Thuc. III 84 a un interpolatore, scriveva (*o.c.* [n. 43], p. 383) che la frase in questione fu forse imitata da Flavio Giuseppe, "though it is by no means certain that what he imitated he found in his text of *Thucydides*".

⁸⁹ Vd. il mio articolo in C. AMPOLO (ed.), *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby*, Pisa 2006, pp. 109–131, dove sostengo che un passo di Thuc. II 34, 5, usato da Pausania I 29, 4, è opera dell'editore-falsario; vd. inoltre la Parte prima del presente studio, *Eos* XCIX 2012/1, p. 56–59, sulla lezione spuria di Thuc. I 13, 6, usata da Pausania X 8, 6. In VIII 37, 6 Pausania mostra di conoscere Hdt. II 156, 5–6, e in IX 2, 2 mostra di conoscere Hdt. IX 83 – due passi, a mio parere, spuri.

⁹⁰ Aulo Gellio XVI 8, 16 parafrasa Hdt. IV 28, 1, su cui vd. ASNSP, s. IV, vol. V (fasc. 1) 2000, pp. 70–79.

⁹¹ Polluce VI 100 presuppone Hdt. V 87–88, su cui vd. Palamedes III 2008, pp. 114–117; II 37 presuppone Hdt. IX 83; I 26 presuppone Thuc. I 126, 6, su cui vd. ASNSP, s. IV, vol. V (fasc. 1) 2000, pp. 45–46 e n. 27.

⁹² Harpocr. s. v. ναυκραρικά presuppone Hdt. V 71, su cui vd. Palamedes III 2008, pp. 109–111.

⁹³ Athen. XI 502 C presuppone Hdt. V 87–88.

⁹⁴ ASNSP, s. IV, vol. V (fasc. 1) 2000, pp. 35 seg.

successo fu rapido, visto che tra la fine del I e l'inizio del II secolo d.C. il testo adulterato di Erodoto e il testo non meno adulterato (anzi, come oggi mi sembra, ancora più gravemente adulterato) di Tucidide erano ormai dominanti, come risulta dalle testimonianze di Plutarco e dei papiri egiziani.

La rapidità della loro diffusione e la loro vittoria finale sono una manifestazione importante – poco rallegrante, riconosco – del carattere della cultura retorica e filologica dei primi secoli della nostra era.

*Istituto Storico,
Università di Varsavia
b.bravo@uw.edu.pl*

DIVAE POTENTES CYPRI?
REMARKS ON THE CULT OF THE PTOLEMAIC QUEENS
AS APHRODITE

by

AGNIESZKA FULIŃSKA

Κύπριδος ἄδ' εἰκῶν· φέρ' ἰδῶμεθα μὴ Βερενίκας·
διστάζω ποτέρᾳ φῆ τις ὁμοιοτέραν.
(*Anth. Plan.* XVI 68)

The Hellenistic rule over Cyprus shifted over the three hundred years from the Antigonids to the Ptolemies and Romans, and was also actively sought by the Seleucids (HÖLBL 2001: 17 f.), but it was the Lagid dynasty that held power for most of the time here, and left the strongest imprint on the island. Also the presence of royal women of this family dates to very early time; according to Athenaios (XIII 576e), among the children that the hetaera Thais bore to Ptolemy Soter was “a daughter, Eirene, who was married to Eunostos, king of the Cypriot city of Soli”, the latter identified with the ruler of that name testified by one coin issue attributed to him (*BMC Cyprus*, pp. CXVI–CXVIII, Pl. XXV 2, cf. BAGNALL 1976: 187; the coin has the head of Aphrodite crowned with myrtle on its reverse, and Apollo on the obverse). The material in Athenaios is largely anecdotic, and we do not really know what was the status of Thais and her children, even though the verb used in the context (ἐγαμήθε) would suggest marriage; possibly research into local epigraphic sources or new finds connected with Eirene’s marriage could reveal more about this claim. It is certain, though, that Cleopatra III, one of the most influential 2nd century queens, spent her years of exile from Alexandria here (WHITEHORNE 1994: 117), and it was during her stay in Cyprus that she was proclaimed the living incarnation of Isis (Ἴσις μεγάλη μήτηρ θεῶν¹), and bestowed with an honour that none of her predecessors had ever achieved: her divine cult was performed by a male priest

¹ DUNAND 1973 a: 42 and n. 2, observes that the epithet “mother of gods” was not originally present in the cult descriptions of Isis, and might therefore point at the assimilation with Cybele, for which Cyprus would be a natural intermediary.

instead of a priestess, which was a particular privilege of Isis among the goddesses (WHITEHORNE 1994: 128; ALBERSMEIER 2002: 6). Also her divine nomenclature became that of Isis alone, not Cleopatra Isis (CARNEY 2000 b: 34).

Complying with the general dynastic policy, which included the sacral legitimization of the Ptolemies as pharaohs², the royal consorts needed to find their proper place within the Egyptian sacred and symbolic dimension of kingship, and Isis, as the sister-wife of Osiris, was the primary and natural association for them, especially in her Throne and Ma-at aspects (BERGMAN 1980: 186–188; TROY 1986: 60–64). The growing popularity of Isis in the Egyptian religion may be a relatively late invention³, especially when compared to Hathor in the earlier times, but the goddess who eventually combined the aspects of motherhood and fertility with erotic love made a perfect object of a complex syncretism and model for the queens. In Ptolemaic Egypt Isis could easily be identified with a number of Greek goddesses, and indeed had been since at least the 5th century BC, in a combination of what LÉVÊQUE (1973: 186) proposes to call “syncretism-henotheism” and what DUNAND (1975: 160) names “synchrétisme-amalgame”: Hera (*hieros gamos* of the supreme deities; cf. Theocr. *Id.* 17, 131–134, commentary on the sibling marriage of the Philadelphoi), Artemis and Selene (lunar associations and iconography, developed in the Late Period), Demeter (Hdt. II 156; the *mater dolorosa* aspect: see Plut. *Mor.* 356E–367D [= *De Is. et Os.* 14–41]; fertility aspect: Isis “crowned with grain” in monetary iconography, e.g. SVOR. 1232–1238), Athena (Plut. *Mor.* 376B [= *De Is. et Os.* 62], allegedly after Manetho), and last but not least Aphrodite (“great of love, mistress of women” in temple inscriptions, goddess of love and beauty in hieroglyphic hymns, likewise in Greek hymns and aretalogies, see KOCKELMANN 2008: 68; cf. WITT 1997: 126 f.)⁴.

² A notion crucial to all foreign rulers in Egypt, and a source of either acceptance or rejection thereof by the native inhabitants and clergy, which resulted in the success or failure of the dynasties or conquerors. For various aspects of this notion see e.g. ATKINSON 1956. On the endeavours of the Ptolemies towards including syncretic religion in this major legitimization programme see QUAEGBEUR 1971: 244: “Serapis, that creation of Hellenism that was to unite Greeks and Egyptians in one and the same national worship”; DUNAND 1975: 174: “Sous les Lagides, l’utilisation politique du syncrétisme est évidente [...] même s’il est assez douteux que Soter, puis Philadelphie aient réellement cherché à opérer une fusion, sur le plan religieux, des populations grecque et indigène par l’intermédiaire du culte de Sarapis, il n’est pas moins vrai qu’il ont dû comprendre, eux-mêmes et leurs successeurs, l’intérêt, voire la nécessité d’une ‘coexistence pacifique’ entre Grecs et indigènes; et il est certain que le développement de processus syncrétistes favorisait cette coexistence, en facilitant l’adoption par les Grecs de dieux égyptiens hellénisés et en amenant les Égyptiens à reconnaître leurs dieux dans ceux des vainqueurs”; see also HÖLBL 2001: 98–112.

³ The name is attested as early as the 5th Dynasty, and indirect cult testimonies date even to the 1st Dynasty (BERGMAN 1980: 188), but the rise to prominence can be observed in the Late Period, i.e. the middle of the 1st millennium BC (BONNEFOY 1992: 245).

⁴ For further details on the associations with Demeter, together with the argument concerning the direction of influences and bibliography, see SOLMSEN 1979: 27 and VERSNEL 1990: 42, also DUNAND 1973 a: 85–92; for the lunar associations with Artemis/Selene, but also Hecate, see DUNAND

With the associations taken one step further – from the Greek, but not necessarily Egyptian point of view⁵ – i.e. to the inclusion of the rulers in the syncretic image and idea of divinity, this case agrees both with LÉVÊQUE's (1973: 185) condition of central power's will to introduce a syncretic religion in order to assimilate various ethnic groups, and with a description given by SFAMENI (2010: 463): "Syncretism is not a confused mixture of dissimilar elements; rather it means the use of materials from different cultural contexts that are interpreted in a new and original way". DUNAND (1975: 174) places the identification of rulers with gods and goddesses within the general practice of syncretisation, stating that the assimilation of the Macedonian rulers with Egyptian deities is "an act of syncretism" (*un fait de syncrétisme*), and the actual situation is probably best described by PAKKANEN (1996: 87–92), who proposes to apply terms of process instead of a state of being to Hellenistic syncretism. Concerning the peculiarities of the situation in Macedonian Egypt, PFEIFFER (2008 b: 388) makes an important observation, in noting that it was the Ptolemies who introduced actual ruler worship in Egypt:

In the course of Ptolemaic propaganda, and based on Greek ideas, the monarch developed into a god king, who together with his consort was accorded a divine cult. Ptolemy II did thus not in any way stop at the religious expression of the Egyptian cult of the Pharaoh – before Ptolemy II, the Pharaoh was never a god; only his office was divine; the traditional Pharaoh himself never became the object of a deity cult.

1973 a: 80 and 85; BONNEFOY 1992: 252; for a discussion on the topic of Aphrodite and detailed bibliography of the subject see CARNEY 2000 a: 322, n. 85; for Tyche see DUNAND 1973 a: 94; for various types of syncretism in the context of Aphrodite and her eastern counterparts see BUDIN 2004: 100 f. For late Hellenistic testimonies see DUNAND 1973 b.

⁵ Apart from the obvious fact of the sacral status of the pharaoh (O'CONNOR 1995: 265: "The king was simultaneously human and divine, servant and delegate of the gods on the one hand, but himself the embodiment of divine kingship on the other"), which had to be taken into consideration by the new rulers, it is worth noting that religious "amalgam" syncretism was an intrinsic trait of the Egyptian frame of mind (for a concise discussion of this topic see LECLANT 1975), just as in a number of variants it was apparently a formative element of the Mediterranean civilisation in general, judging by a large corpus of textual and iconographic examples, as well as the development of the various *interpretationes*. Also of importance may be the fact that the Egyptians apparently had hardly any reservations concerning the ethnic background of their rulers, as long as they maintained the traditions of the land, which is shown both by the easy acceptance of for instance Libyan or Kushite rulers during the Third Intermediate and Late Periods (BAINES 1995: 35) and the conflict with the Persian kings, epitomized by the killing of the Apis bull (Hdt. III 27; DEPUYDT 1995) and the removal of divine images from Egypt to Persia as well as the propagandistic exploitation of the restoration thereof in Egypt under the Ptolemies (BAINES 1995: 39; HÖLBL 2001: 81). GREEN'S (1990: 405) argument that the Egyptian clergy "regarded them [the Ptolemies], privately, as foreign interlopers, another Hyksos dynasty, to be expelled when the time was right", unsupported in the passage by any evidence (one may expect the *Potter's Oracle* to be the basis of the suggestion, though, whose origin, meaning and dating is disputable; see HUSS 1994: 165–180), seems partisan and poorly grounded.

One should add that the Greek ideas in this case comprise first of all the relatively new tradition which in later times became epitomized first and foremost by the 4th/3rd century Euhemerus, while in fact it had been developed by the 5th century sophists, in particular Prodicus, and in the Hellenistic age propagated by Hecataeus of Abdera, the latter working at the court of Ptolemy Soter (see MURRAY 1970; HENRICHs 1984), that tradition being the heroization and deification of outstanding mortals, especially those who were perceived as benefactors (for early textual testimonies of such practice see WINIARCZYK 1998: 135–139). Moreover, if one accepts HENRICHs' (1984: 156; cf. BURTON 1972: 62 f.) view on Prodician influence on Isis aretalogies (“her status as a deity is predicated upon her role as cultural heroine and former queen of Egypt”), the identification of Ptolemaic queens with the goddess appears as a reverse movement and a replication of the earlier theological process at the same time.

In this paper I would like to present a brief outline of the textual, iconographic and archaeological evidence that allows one to ask the question to what extent the Cypriot forms of cult and imagery of Aphrodite may have influenced the imagery of the Lagid queens within the wide notion of divinity.

LITERARY BACKGROUND

The cult association of Lagid queens with Aphrodite is well testified in poetry, especially for the early period⁶. In the description of the royal festival and tableau in Theocritus' *Adoniazusai* (the Singer's “Dirge”, *Id.* 15, 100–144) two queens are mentioned: Berenice I, wife of Ptolemy I Soter, and Arsinoe II Philadelphus, wife and sister of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who organized the celebrations (15, 23 f.). Since according to the text it was Aphrodite who bestowed immortality upon Berenice (107 f.), and her worship was included in the Adonia, it is obvious that the primary identification of the deified queen was Aphrodite, or rather, already the Hellenistic Aphrodite/Isis. In lines 110 f. (“Berenica's daughter Arsinoe, lovely as Helen, | cossets Adonis with all things good”, transl. by A.S.F. Gow), her daughter is first compared to Helen, which stresses the connection to the goddess of love, and as for her relation to Adonis, it was suggested that “Theocritus allows us to imagine that it might be Arsinoe herself in the guise of Aphrodite who is lying in the arms of her lover” (HAVELOCK 1995: 127). The present author would be inclined to see here the full identification, not just donning the guise of a deity: a mortal woman who has become one with the goddess, and partakes in her divine love union, just as her mother partakes in immortality.

⁶ SOLMSEN 1979: 57: “in the third century BC there is at the very least one Arsinoe (II), wife of the second Ptolemy, and one Berenice (II), wife of the third Ptolemy, who regarded themselves as Aphrodite, yet of course also in good Egyptian tradition as Isis”. It is worth noting, as JOHNSON (2002: 112–114) pointed out, that no divine titlature is present in the inscriptions concerning living kings or queens before the time of Ptolemy V Epiphanes.

What is, however, of particular importance in the present context, is the invocation to Aphrodite as lady of Golgoi and Idalion: two old and important, but not obvious in poetry, Cypriot cult centres of the goddess; the latter, according to archaeological evidence, being also one of the main sites where the goddess was worshipped together with her consort, usually identified as Adonis or a deity associated with him, mostly Apollo (*vide infra*). It is noteworthy that *Golgia*, apart from *Paphia*, had been one of the most important toponymic names of the Cypriot goddess before she adopted her Greek name. The main meaning of this particular and erudite invocation is clear: “The opening invocation to a specifically Cyprian Aphrodite evokes [...] Ptolemaic influence on the island” (HUNTER 1996: 131), but since it was Arsinoe herself who organized the celebrations, as Theocritus keeps reminding us throughout the text, it may also indicate particular significance given to the Cypriot forms of the cult of Aphrodite and Adonis by the queen.

Theocritus mentions Aphrodite in connection to Berenice also in his *Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (*Id.* 17, 34–50), where the late queen is presented as the favourite of the goddess, first blessed with incomparable erotic allure (“The controller of Cyprus, the powerful daughter of Dione, pressed her delicate hands upon Berenice’s fragrant breast; thus they say that no woman has ever yet so pleased her husband as Ptolemy loved his wife”, transl. by R. HUNTER), and later saved from death and chosen to share in her immortality and glory. Towards the end of the same poem (17, 121–125) Theocritus alludes to a temple erected by Philadelphus to his parents, with chryselephantine statues (χρυσῶν περικαλλέας ἠδ’ ἐλέφαντι) of the deceased royal couple, which is another testimony of their deification but provides no information about the cult association or sharing in other cults within the practice of the *theoi synnaoi*⁷. It is, however, likely that Berenice was compared and/or identified with Aphrodite in Theocritus’ largely lost poem dedicated to the late queen (FRASER 1972: 667).

Let us consider briefly the consequences of the description of the statues of the Soteres. The prevailing opinion in scholarship (LAPATIN 2001: 5; CARNEY 2007: 35, n. 32; ARAFAT 1996: 120, n. 42) is that chryselephantine technique was reserved for the gods’ statues – not necessarily cult statues, as the example of Phidias’ Athena Parthenos shows, but nevertheless not suitable for the representations of mortals. A former case of possible use of the technique for portraying individuals (moreover: during their lifetime), is the Philippaeum erected by Philip of Macedon in Olympia to commemorate the victory at Chaeronea, which allegedly contained chryselephantine statues of the royal Macedonian family (Paus. V 17, 4 and 20, 10), although a line from Theocritus (*Id.* 17, 121) suggests that Philadelphus’ foundation was the first such monument dedicated to deified

⁷ For the practice itself see e.g. NOCK 1930; ASSMAN 2001: 37 f.; HÖLBL 2001: 101.

parents⁸. An architectural allusion to Philip's monument can be found among Ptolemaic foundations: "the Philippeion had been imitated by Ptolemy II for purposes of ruler-worship in the Heroon at Limyra" in Lycia (ARAFAT 1996: 125, n. 69), which adds to the present argument. In the light of Theocritus' remark and Ptolemaic ruler cult one may, however, doubt another statement by ARAFAT (1996: 174): "since the use of chryselephantine statues of the Macedonian royal family in the Philippeion (pointedly, in the Altis at Olympia), the exclusivity of the medium had ceased, and with it (it may be assumed) its hitherto inherent aura of sanctity" – regardless of the Roman context discussed in the cited work, in the Hellenistic age chryselephantine seems to still have belonged to the sacral topics. The Philippaeum was first and foremost an *agalma*, dedication from the victorious king to Zeus, and therefore contained no cult statues, which would comply with ARAFAT's statement, but nevertheless in the design of the placement of his family's statues, Philip possibly intended to imitate the generations of the gods (beginning with Kronos), and Alexander continued with this design after his father's death (HUWENDIEK 1996: 157). This arrangement may have been a step towards deification (cf. CARNEY 2007: 36: "these chryselephantine images hinted at the divinity of Philip's family, but did not proclaim it in an uncompromising way"), away from the traditional forms of ancestor heroic cults, but not yet in its fully fledged Hellenistic form. Moreover, the inclusion of women among the statues in Olympia shows that the Hellenistic monarchies were ready for the cult of both kings and queens, which would be of particular importance in Ptolemaic Egypt.

Concerning Berenice I and early association of the queens with Aphrodite, we should also consider an epigram from the Greek Anthology (*Anth. Plan.* XVI 68 = 39 *HE*), tentatively ascribed in scholarship to either Asclepiades (ZANKER 2004: 114) or Posidippus (GUTZWILLER 2005: 49 as *141), which employs an elaborate ekphrastic concept: "This is a statue of Cypris. But come let us see if it be not Berenice's. I am in doubt of which one should say it is the better likeness" (transl. by W.R. PATTON)⁹. ZANKER (2004: 141 f.) argues that this apparent description of a work of art has a deeper meaning, touching on theological changes, at least as far as representations in art and literature go: the merging of

⁸ The phrase in question: "This man, alone of men of the past and of those whose still warm footprints mark the trodden dust, has established fragrant shrines to his loving mother and father; within, he has set them glorious in gold and ivory to bring aid to all upon the earth" (transl. by R. HUNTER), may be an encomiastic exaggeration, but may also contain information on subtle theological changes between the Philippaeum and the temple of the Soter. HUNTER (2003: 188 f.) states that the *μοῦνος*, together with the whole passage about gold and ivory "symbolizes Philadelphus's control of the gold mines and elephant-hunting grounds to the south and southeast of Egypt". However this suggestion might hold some truth to it, it hardly satisfies the interpretation of the passage, but further discussion lies beyond the scope of the present paper.

⁹ The Greek text is in the motto of the present paper.

agalmatopoiia ('making of objects for the gods') and *andriantopoiia* ('making of statues of men') in art and in case of ruler cult, and the abandoning of the distinction "hymns for gods and encomia for good men" in literature. He concludes that even though the word of the poet's choice, *eikōn*, had neutral meaning, "a statue of Aphrodite was her *agalma*. And yet the subject of this *agalma* can be mistaken for a human, which is a clever way of complimenting the Ptolemaic queen's human beauty and elevating her to at least near-divine status". Actually, this poetic concept fits perfectly in the broad programme of apotheosis of the rulers in the syncretic model introduced by Ptolemy Philadelphus, and complies with the Egyptian frame of mind: the queen becomes a true representation of the goddess.

The most important woman of the dynasty, as far as propaganda and divine cult go, was Arsinoe Philadelphus, who among her numerous associations (as indicated e.g. by monetary iconography, *vide infra*) was worshipped as Aphrodite. In Ptolemaic Egypt one particular aspect of the goddess, hardly of major importance in earlier Greece, rose to prominence: Aphrodite Pontia or Euploia¹⁰, in later times identified with Isis Pelagia and Isis Pharia, and "replaced" by her in the role of the protectress of sailors¹¹ (TRAN TAM TINH 1990: 794; see also VERSNEL 1990: 45, n. 16); in Roman times this cult together with iconography – Isis advancing, holding a billowing sail – spread outside Egypt and former Ptolemaic territories (BRICAULT 2007: 264). MALAISE (2000: 10; cf. VERSLUYS 2007: 9) believes that the prominence of Arsinoe's worship is at least partly responsible for the development and dissemination of the marine aspect of Isis. Another of the sea-related epithets of Aphrodite, *Akraia*, has strong connections with the *Ourania* aspect of the Cypriot goddess, and queen Arsinoe is mentioned in such a context in an inscription (SEG VIII 361: Ἀφροδίτη Ἀκραία Ἀρσινόη Φιλοκράτης καὶ Ἑλλάγιον), but this notion is not exploited in literary sources. Neither does the epiklesis *Ourania* appear in poetry, even though this concept of the Cypriot divinity corresponds perfectly with the theological

¹⁰ A type not unknown in art; see DELIVORRIAS 1984: cat. 554–568: *Venus marina*, which appeared in early 4th century BC or in its first half, and cat. 599–604: *Pontia-Euploia*, whose origin dates to the 4th century BC and is connected with Praxiteles.

¹¹ WITT (1997: 126) sees in this evolution a further syncretic movement, by including in the figure of Isis the traits and domains associated by the Greeks to Poseidon, for whom Herodotus and early writers would not find a proper equivalent in Egyptian religion. Since seafaring had not played a major role in Egyptian culture, such cult had not developed, but Hathor was one of the few deities who were associated with the protection of boats, and this function seems to have passed to Isis when the two goddesses became increasingly assimilated; see DUNAND 1973 a: 94 f. Iconographic evidence seems to corroborate this notion implicitly: on some of the coins struck by Philadelphus in the name of deified Arsinoe and later on the coins of Berenice II the *pilei* of the Dioscuri (the protectors of seafarers, whom WITT, *loc.cit.* calls "agents" of Isis) appear (e.g. MØRKHOLM 1991: Pl. XIX 308, for Arsinoe II; e.g. SVOR. 988 for Berenice II).

notions underlying the association of the queens with Aphrodite/Isis and their apotheosis, and indeed seems to provide a foundation for it¹².

Arsinoe was worshipped in this aspect of Aphrodite in a *naiskos* on the Zephyrion promontory, dedicated by the commander of the Egyptian fleet, Callicrates (whose career was allegedly promoted by Arsinoe; cf. MITFORD 1971: 115) around 268, therefore either in the year of the queen's death or up to two years following it¹³. In his study on Arsinoe's political activity HAUBEN (1983: 111–114) presents arguments for the queen's involvement in the Ptolemaic struggle for naval supremacy, in which Cyprus and Rhodos were of particular importance, and perceives the Zephyrion temple as a memorial to this commitment. The character of the cult at Zephyrion is a subject of scholarly discussion, unlikely to be solved without further textual or archaeological evidence coming to light: STEPHENS (2005: 247) suggests that “there was only one cult statue, not two, as we find in other shrines, and [...] Arsinoe was entirely identified with the goddess” (which reminds us of the iconographic identification of Berenice with Aphrodite, as described in the aforementioned epigram), while HAVELOCK (1995: 128), argues that “as far as we know [Arsinoe] was never represented as Aphrodite [...] in statuary”¹⁴.

Posidippus mentions the Zephyrion temple and cult in three epigrams (39; 116; 119); in 116 he gives Arsinoe the epithet *Kypris*, long established for Aphrodite in literary tradition (PIRENNE-DELFORGE 1994: 310–318), in 119 he calls her “Arsinoe Aphrodite Philadelphus”, and in 39 employs the sea-related epithet *Euploia*. The names *Zephyritis* and *Kypris* in association with deified Arsinoe appear in Callimachus' *Epigram* 6, being a description of a nautilus shell offered to the deified queen by a girl from Smyrna named Selenaea. Apparently also Berenice II was associated with the sea, if we accept the very plausible identification of the 2nd century BC Thmuis mosaics (DASZEWSKI 1985: 146–158; KUTTNER 1999: 111–113; MÜLLER 2009: 224), showing the queen in what one might call “marine crown” of a ship's prow (cf. later the Actian *corona rostrata* on the coins of Augustus of ca. 19–4 BC, presenting M. Agrippa), and

¹² For a discussion on the relationship between the *Zephyritis* and the *Ourania*, as well as other associations and detailed sources, see ABEL 1972: esp. 233 f. In the light of Arsinoe's first marriage to Lysimachus of Thrace, of particular interest is the remark on a possible Thracian connection (232).

¹³ On the controversy see CADELL 1998; the author proposes twofold deification of the queen, regardless of the actual date of her death (between 270 and 268 as suggested by various scholars): one royal during her lifetime (the *theoi adelphoi* cult), and the other posthumous. The latter would be as *thea synnaos* of the Egyptian divinities but also within the syncretic Hellenistic pantheon, as the Zephyrion case indicates. LONGEGA (1968: 107) suggests that the use of the title *basilissa* in Posidippus 116 indicates that the dedication of the temple took place during the queen's lifetime.

¹⁴ The only evidence of a sculpture representing Arsinoe in non-epigraphic textual sources seems to be given in the so-called *Livre d'écolier*, a handbook dated to the 3rd century BC, in which a statue standing in a fountain is mentioned in one of the poems (THOMPSON 2005: 271).

with a mast bound with the *tainiai* of the royal *diadema* in her hand. POLLITT (1987: 221) and STEPHENS (2004: 68) interpret this figure as a personification of Alexandria, but both the facial features, especially the bulging eyes, and the attributes point at a queen's representation rather than that.

One more text should be taken into account here, a Hellenistic *Hymn to Aphrodite* (*P. Lit. Goodsp.* 2), which stresses the marine aspect of the goddess (III 2: κρατοῦσα σὺ πόντου) as well as her role of the patron of marriage, possibly with particular emphasis given to the *hieros gamos* aspect of the latter (BARBANTANI 2005: 141–143; Arsinoe together with Aphrodite in a probably marital context is also mentioned in a very poorly preserved poem, attributed to Posidippus, *114, but the surviving text allows only tentative identification as an epithalamium; see NISSETICH 2005: 60). Since Arsinoe is mentioned in the preserved fragment, FRASER (1972: 667 f.) links it with the consecration of the Zephyrion temple, and BARBANTANI (2005: 152–159) suggests performance of the hymn in connection with the posthumous cult of Arsinoe and Aphrodite in Cyprus.

The Zephyrion temple of Aphrodite/Arsinoe appears in the famous poem by Callimachus, the *Coma Berenices*: it is in the temple of her symbolic mother/mother-in-law (in fact Ptolemy III was the son of Arsinoe I, the first wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus, but Arsinoe II probably formally adopted her children; see BEVAN 1968: 60, and LONGEGA 1968: 75 f.) that the queen makes the offering of her plait. HAUBEN (1983: 120) maintains that it is Arsinoe II who dominates the whole poem, and GUTZWILLER (1992: esp. 362–369) in her in-depth analysis of the *Coma* states that Berenice's choice of the temple in which to make the offering was “lying the groundwork for her own identification with Aphrodite”, to argue further very convincingly that the Ptolemaic Aphrodite was a goddess of marriage “based upon mutual desire” (cf. the aforementioned passage from Theocr. *Id.* 17, concerning the first Berenice's erotic allure). The conclusion proposed by GUTZWILLER is, therefore, that the identification with Aphrodite served “justification for the sharing of monarchic power by husband and wife, a condition of royalty customary for the native Egyptians but radically new for the Greeks”. To support this thesis the scholar quotes a line of “romantic lives of Ptolemaic queens [...] celebrated in order to legitimize their joint rule with their husbands”: the aforementioned Berenice I (whose “position as queen of Egypt came about not through arrangements made by her male relatives, but through her own erotic attraction” – Berenice came to Egypt in the entourage of Eurydice, Antipater's daughter, the official wife of Ptolemy Soter), Arsinoe II and Berenice II; also Arsinoe III who accompanied her husband at the battle of Raphia (Polyb. V 83 f.) could possibly fit the pattern.

Finally, in the story of Cleopatra VII we find close associations not only with Isis (the dynastic name *Nea Isis*) but also with her Greek counterpart, Aphrodite, first of all in the description of her meeting with Antony in Tarsus in 41 BC:

She herself reclined beneath a canopy spangled with gold, adorned like Venus in a painting, while boys like Loves in paintings stood on either side and fanned her. Likewise also the fairest of her serving-maidens, attired like Nereids and Graces, were stationed, some at the rudder-sweeps, and others at the reefing-ropes. Wondrous odours from countless incense-offerings diffused themselves along the river-banks. [...] And a rumour spread on every hand that Venus was come to revel with Bacchus for the good of Asia.

(Plut. *Ant.* 26, 2 f., transl. by B. PERRIN)

Dio Cassius (L 4) relates that later, during Cleopatra's co-rule with Antony, the two would pose "for portrait paintings and statues, he representing Osiris or Dionysus and she Selene or Isis". As for Cleopatra's dynastic names, DUNAND (1973 a: 43 f.) makes a very interesting case, proposing that the *Nea Isis* title expresses the queen's ambition of ultimate epiphany as the goddess, while the *Thea Neotera* epithet refers to the Aphrodite/Hathor aspect of the complex deity.

It is also worth noting that in the literary works addressed to the Lagid queens only the epithet *Kypris* appears out of the birth-related epithets of Aphrodite, while in Hellenistic poetry also *Cytherea* is encountered; however, one must also bear in mind that these epithets may have by the time become formulaic and lost their direct relation to the place of birth of the goddess or the sequence of events from her life (even in Hes. *Theog.* 192 f. and 198 f., the goddess is in turn said to be born in Cythera and have arrived to Cyprus or the other way round), since we encounter also a combined form ἡ Παφίη Κυθήρεια in one of the epigrams (*Anth. Plan.* XVI 160).

ICONOGRAPHIC CONTEXT¹⁵

Given that within the religious frame of mind of the Hellenistic people Isis was identified with Aphrodite, as well as with the other Greek (and Middle-Eastern) goddesses and the deified queens too, one may safely assume that this "theocrasia" (ANGUS 1928: 19; cf. FRASER 1972: 192) influenced representations in art, and therefore from the iconographic point of view whether a deified queen was portrayed as Isis or Aphrodite (i.e. with attributes or in the manner of traditional representations of these two goddesses), depended mainly on the environment of a given work of art, and syncretic images, combining the traits of both types of representation, are also attested (TRAN TAM TINH 1990: 793, cat. 249–259 for Isis-Aphrodite, with the provision that only images with the *basileion* head-dress are taken into account, but almost all of the important Late Classical and

¹⁵ For a general outline of Ptolemaic portraiture, without, however, much emphasis given to divine imagery, see in the first place KYRIELEIS 1975 for Greek style art, ASHTON 2001 and STANWICK 2002 for Egyptian and Egyptianizing styles.

Hellenistic types are represented; MALAISE 2000: 8 f.)¹⁶. Several examples of Egyptian and Greek but strongly Egyptianizing sculptures and reliefs representing Ptolemaic queens with the traits of Isis – of which the “corkscrew locks” hairstyle and the dress tied at the breasts by the “Isis knot” are the most distinguishable characteristics – are known and prevail in the 2nd century, in the portraiture of the first three Cleopatras (e.g. a marble head in the Louvre, inv. Ma 3546; engraved gem in Nicosia, inv. J 745) but they are absent from the iconography of Cleopatra VII (SCHWENTZEL 2000: 23–25) despite her profound identification with the goddess. Also on coins – which both functionally and stylistically are a purely Greek medium – representations of Isis which can be connected with the iconography of both the goddess herself (as Isis/Demeter) and queens in her likeness are encountered (e.g. SVOR. 1382, and *passim*).

Aphrodite appeared on Ptolemaic coins struck in Cyprus as early as the satrapal years of Ptolemy Soter, and her images varied considerably, in particular as far as the headdresses are concerned (SVOR. 73: AV with a turreted Aphrodite head on the obverse and a diademed head on the reverse; SVOR. 74: AE with Aphrodite in a polos; SVOR. 79: Aphrodite in a *stephanē*; SVOR. 81: Aphrodite with a “plain taenia”). In all these cases we may be certain that the image represents the goddess only. The images of “Isis” or “Isis/Demeter” on the obverses of bronzes date from the reign of Ptolemy IV onwards (e.g. SVOR. 1154 for Ptolemy IV; SVOR. 1235 for Ptolemy V; SVOR. 1384 for Cleopatra I as regent), and make a disputable case, but they seem too generic, too alike in the whole series, and too much drawing on the depictions of the so-called Libya (e.g. on the reverse of the coins of Cyrenaica under Magas as governor, dated ca. 285–283, SVOR. 854 ff.; SCHWENTZEL 2000: 22 f.) to be interpreted as representations of individual people apart from the goddess. There is, however, a long series of large, even luxurious issues, which were certainly designed to bear the portraits of the queens.

The most important of these is the ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ type of large gold and silver denominations that very often possess the quality of commemorative medals rather than ordinary coinage, even though they fit in the metric

¹⁶ Much as WITT (1997: 126) has it right when he states that Hathor’s imagery with the bovine traits was unacceptable for the Greek Aphrodite, his description and evaluation of the syncretic images seem awkward: Isis/Aphrodite is rarely portrayed as “a completely nude young woman” in the Egyptianizing style (DUNAND 1973 a: 83, cites two British Museum objects showing a goddess in a *naos*, reg. 1885, 1010.29 and reg. 1885, 1010.28, both of them, however, very schematic as far as the representation of the figure goes, and moreover of uncertain dating, possibly pre-Ptolemaic; the other three examples given were unavailable for me to check but they seem roughly of the same kind as far as stylistic traits go), and the “Egyptian tokens revealed on her head” do not seem to have a purely decorative function, as the analysis presented would suggest, but should be regarded within the broader scope of the multifaceted conception of the goddess, including “the sorrowful sister-wife of Osiris”, even if possibly from the Adonis and Dionysus myths rather than from the *Pyramid Texts* solely. Actually, further information given by the same scholar (*loc. cit.*), concerning the grave contexts of the Ptolemaic Isis figurines finds, only strengthens the Osyriac/Dionysiac connotations.

system, issued originally by Ptolemy Philadelphus in Alexandria, Phoenicia and Cyprus¹⁷ after the death of his sister/wife, within the broad programme of her deification and the dynastic propaganda (see MØRKHOLM 1991: 102–104). The obverses of these coins present the deceased queen with a range of divine attributes, e.g. the ram of Ammon associated with the deification of Alexander in Egypt, but also two insignia that can be connected with Aphrodite: the *stephanē* crown and the lotus sceptre. HAVELOCK (1995: 128) rejects the identification of the queen with Aphrodite on these coins on the grounds of the manifold iconography and wide range of attributes, but this opinion seems to overlook the complexity of divine associations of the Hellenistic rulers, due partly to the syncretic perception of the deities themselves; it also seems to disregard the “epitomic” character of visual arts, especially in the age of erudition, which would combine a number of symbolic elements in one representation in order to include sophisticated meanings in one image.

The ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ type was continued with stylistic modifications until the time of Ptolemy XII Auletes, and the consecutive variants were probably minted in the name of other queens; its programme was also imitated with further alterations on more “individualized” issues of Arsinoe III Philopator (SVOR. 1159) and Cleopatra I Syra (British Museum, reg. 1978-10-21-1). The gold octodrachm of Arsinoe III Philopator is possibly the most beautiful coin of the Ptolemies, and the divine character of the queen’s image is emphasized by the lack of veil (like in the case of Aphrodite’s monetary imagery) and very detailed and careful rendering of the jewellery, which had been an important element of Aphrodite’s appearance both in literature and art ever since the archaic period (for detailed description see *Hym. Hom. Ven.* 6, 6–13; note that the *stephanē* is listed as one of the pieces of jewellery with which the goddess is adorned, also in the invocation of the same text she is called *chrysōstephanos* and connected with Cyprus; in Hesiod (*Theog.* 196) she is given the epithet *eustephanos*; for the Near Eastern contexts and possible influences of this imagery see PENGLASE 1994: 141 f.). Moreover, the only association possible here is that with Aphrodite, because the queen is portrayed without the ram horn. Similarly Cleopatra I Syra is portrayed only with the attributes of Aphrodite, even though she wears the veil like Arsinoe Philadelphus and the legend on her coin alludes to her royal status rather than to a dynastic or cult name¹⁸.

¹⁷ For Salamis, Kition, Karpasia, Paphos and unidentified Cypriote mints e.g. SVOR. 520 ff.; under Ptolemy IV Philopator: SVOR. 1163 ff.; under Ptolemy V Epiphanes: SVOR. 1306 and *passim*; under Ptolemy VI Philometor: SVOR. 1442 and *passim*; under Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II: 1576.

¹⁸ Interestingly enough, one of her predecessors, Berenice II, who issued coins as a ruling queen – or regent in the name of her absent husband – did not include any allusions to divinity in her image.

The *stephanē* is a (usually) high crown decorated with geometric or floral ornament, present also in other Greek media portraying the queens, e.g. the cult *oinochoai*, and is otherwise known from the Classical time as the headdress of goddesses, primarily Aphrodite, as testified for instance on a Cypriot coin attributed to king Stasioikos II (*BMC Cyprus* Pl. XX 10), the last ruler of Marion (the city that was to be later renamed Arsinoe), deposed in 312 by Ptolemy Soter. The so-called Aphrodite of Capua (Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 251), a Roman copy of a Late Classical original attributed to Lysippus, makes a good example of the *stephanē* in sculpted representations of the goddess, and, as has been mentioned above, also literary sources make it her traditional adornment. Scholars argue whether in art the *stephanē* belongs specifically to Aphrodite (POMEROY 1984: 24), or whether it is a generic attribute of various goddesses (SMITH 1988: 43). It seems that the truth lies in between: the *stephanē* is first of all associated with Aphrodite (statistically it is most frequently encountered in the context of this goddess) but occasionally can be seen in the images of other deities, and is also mentioned in texts as worn by a number of goddesses (SAGLIO 1900: 1508, enumerates Hera, Athena, Artemis and Aphrodite, as well as “autres déesses et aussi des mortelles”; the latter most likely being the Hellenistic queens in the first place, and the Roman empresses in later times). Therefore one may assume that the attribute primarily belonged to Aphrodite, and its appearance in the queens’ imagery points at the identification with this particular goddess. The alleged oriental origin of the attribute in question may be one of the reasons why it was so easily adopted in Aphrodite’s iconography, given the Middle Eastern influence on her character in Greek art and culture, via Cyprus.

The lotus sceptre appears to be one of the two attributes designed specifically for the cult and divine iconography of Arsinoe Philadelphus¹⁹, since this particular shape is absent from Egyptian divine and royal imagery of the pharaonic times²⁰, and in its full shape is also unknown in the Greek world. It is styled after the Egyptian sceptres (such as the papyrus sceptre of Isis and Hathor, both goddesses associated with Aphrodite in the Hellenistic times, while in Cyprus the Hathoric aspects of the cult of the Goddess/Aphrodite date as early as the 9th–8th century, in consistence with the pre-eminence of the goddess in early Egyptian history; cf. KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 99 f.), but the tip is shaped as a stylized lotus bud, very much like the images of this flower on the 5th century Idalion coins, where it is connected with the iconography of Aphrodite (LORBER 2001: 39).

¹⁹ The other being the *dikeras*, double cornucopia, present on the reverses of the coins of Arsinoe herself, and later on their continuations in the names of other queens up to Cleopatra Tryphaena, as well as in other representations. It is mentioned by Athenaeus (XI 497B–C) in the context of the posthumous deification of Arsinoe.

²⁰ KAPLONY 1986: 1376, mentions the lotus only as the “plant meaning” of the *mks*-sceptre, with the name of *nḥbt*, which in turn relates to lotus bud or lettuce sceptre.

The choice of lotus seems to have both the Greek and Egyptian audiences in mind, since the symbolism of this flower is also connected with the Egyptian concept of rebirth and solar aspects of divinities, including Harpocrates, the Late Period and Hellenistic son of Isis (MEEKS 1977: 1004; BRUNNER-TRAUT 1980: 1092–1094; TEISSIER 1996: 89 f., 184; cf. lotus as the Hellenizing symbol of rebirth, for instance in the Antinoeum of the Hadrian's villa in Tibur/Tivoli, the image of young Osiris-Apis emerging from the lotus flower, resembling a similar one from the tomb of Tutankhamun with the king's head as the young sun god: Cairo, inv. 8). It has even been suggested (MAIER, KARAGEORGHIS 1984: 242) that Cypriot imagery of the Goddess/Aphrodite owes the lotus to Egyptian Isis, whose cult had been present on the island "as early as the Geometric period" (ANASTASSIADES 2000: 191).

Possibly the most interesting specimen of Aphrodite-related Ptolemaic coins is a bronze issue of Cleopatra VII, minted in Paphos, dated to ca. 47 BC (SVOR. 1874). It presents the queen/goddess in the *stephanē* and with a sceptre, very much in style of the Arsinoe Philopator Cypriot type, but with one important modification: the woman portrayed here holds a small child in her arms. The image on this coin requires double identification: with Cleopatra holding her son Ptolemy Caesarion, and with Aphrodite/Isis holding Eros/Horus²¹. Additionally, the double cornucopia on the reverse is a clear allusion to Arsinoe II, therefore also to Aphrodite. The style of this coin is of course Greek, but the composition is related to the Egyptian style of suckling Isis rather than to any popular representation of Aphrodite; also the political meaning of this image is far more important for Egypt than Greece, although placing the alleged son of Caesar on a Cypriot coin may as well allude to the presenting (returning) of Cyprus, which had been lost to the Romans in 58, to Cleopatra by her lover in 48 (Caesarion was born the following year). Analogies in bas-relief, showing Cleopatra as suckling Isis, were known in Egyptian art: DUNAND (1973 a: 42) mentions a scene from the destroyed *mammisi* in Hermonthis, showing Cleopatra as the "divine mother of Re", presenting Caesarion/Horus to other goddesses; HIGGS (2000: 147; cf. ASHTON 2008: 142; see KLEINER 2005: 153, for discussion) suggests after an earlier identification that a head in the Vatican Museums (inv. 38511), believed to be a copy of the sculpture that Julius Caesar placed next to the statue of Venus Genetrix in her temple (App. *BCiv.* II 102), bears traces of having been

²¹ The identification as such is sometimes questioned; among the scholars who accept it, apart from SVORONOS as quoted, are POOLE (1883: pl. 30, 6), BRUNELLE (1976: 104–108) and HAVELOCK (1995: 129); ASHTON 2008: 145 f., seems less convinced, stating that "In front of the queen is a small blob, thought to represent her son, Ptolemy Caesar"; KISS (2005: 83) takes a careful stance: "De toute manière, l'accent est mis sur Cléopâtre et l'enfant est bien plutôt une suggestion de Césarion que son image".

a representation of the queen with little Ptolemy Caesarion²²; also, the queen in the pharaoh's attire, worshipping suckling Isis, appears on a stele from the Louvre Museum (inv. E 27113). An interesting case of a possible earlier analogy, but one which would fit perfectly in the identification of the Lagid queens with Isis/Hathor/Aphrodite in her motherly aspect, is a figurine from ancient Athribis in Lower Egypt, showing an Isis-like figure with two children, one of them held in her arms and the other held by the hand. MYŚLIWIEC (2001: 273–275) suggests the interpretation of the female figure as Cleopatra I Syra, mother of two reigning Ptolemies, one of whom (Ptolemy VI) used the dynastic name Philometor.

It has been pointed out that due to Phoenician trade as well as Cypriot–Egyptian commercial connections the images of both the suckling goddess and other variants of the *kourophoros* had not been unknown to Greeks before Alexander's conquest of Egypt (TRAN TAM TINH, LABRECQUE 1973: 9 f.). However, they apparently did not influence the imagery of Greek Aphrodite on a major scale, and the Greek style terracottas both from mainland Greece and Cyprus remain generic and in most cases differ from the Cypriot types, as well as from the *Isis lactans* type, in composition (*vide supra*, n. 19).

CYPRIOT ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Ptolemy Soter gained rule over Cyprus still in his satrapal years, therefore the connections between the court and political centre in Alexandria and the island of Aphrodite must have been very strong from the very beginning. The importance of the local cult of the goddess for the new rulers is attested by the first series of bronze coins of Cypriot mint in the name of Ptolemy I Soter as king, depicting the head of Aphrodite (SVOR. 1005–1009; cf. the aforementioned satrapal mints). Also Ptolemy III Euergetes portrayed the *diva potens Cypri*, as Horace would call her three centuries later, on his bronze coins of Cyprus, this time placing on the die the archaistic cult statue of Aphrodite, possibly in the form of the ancient *xoanon* from Paphos (LICHOCKA 1986: 316 f.; LORBER 2001: 39).

Ptolemaic presence in Cyprus is well documented in epigraphic and archaeological sources²³, and as for the most important testimonies pertaining to the

²² HIGGS 2000: 147: “Curtius propose di vedere in questa statua la regina con Cesarione nelle vesti di Venere che tiene in braccio Eros. Per avanzare quest’affermazione, si basava sulla piccolo protuberanza visibile sulla guancia sinistra che interpretò come il frammento del dito del bambino: un tempo Eros poteva essere seduto sulla spalla della madre, e accarezzarle amorevolmente la guancia”. The source of the original identification, not provided by HIGGS or ASHTON (2008: 142) is CURTIUS 1933.

²³ The most important corpus of documents on Cypriot archaeology are the *RDAC* annual publications and monographs. For current archaeological scholarship on Cypriot cult of Aphrodite see PIRENNE-DELFORGE 1994: 309–369; KARAGEORGHIS 2005: *passim*; the latter cites extensive detailed literature concerning publication of objects and artefacts, including epigraphic testimonies, related to the various facets of the goddess's presence in Cyprus.

cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus we have evidence that among numerous dedicatory monuments erected by the governors, officers and priests in the sacred precinct of Aphrodite in Palaipaphos fifteen statues represented Lagid rulers; also three altars dedicated to Arsinoe/Aphrodite were found here (KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 39). In the 2nd century BC control over the sanctuary passed to the hands of the governors, terminating the traditional royal line of the Kinyrades as high priests, and the cult of the rulers was formally overseen by the governors themselves and the *Koinon Kypriou*. According to Strabo (XIV 6, 3, 683C), one of the three cities named Arsinoe was founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus in the vicinity of old Paphos (MAIER, KARAGEORGHIS 1984: 242).

Arsinoe's cult within the *temenos* dedicated to Aphrodite is also attested in Amathus (HERMARY 1988: 102; AUPERT 2000: 33), a city associated in legend with the mother of Kinyras. The only Ptolemaic epigraphic evidence from the site alludes to the introduction of syncretic cults of Sarapis and Isis/Aphrodite in the sanctuary. Also from Amathus comes a large group of Hellenistic votive figurines of the goddess: most of them show Aphrodite in typical poses wearing *stephanē*, but among the less numerous types one represents the goddess with Eros resting on her arm (KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 105), which makes a possible analogy to the representation of Isis/Aphrodite in her maternity aspect. As it has already been signalled, the *kourotrophos* type was not very popular in mainland Greece or other Greek centres²⁴ – apparently this “maternal” aspect of the goddess never won much popularity – it can be, however, linked to the Bronze and Iron Age Cypriot representations (BUDIN 2011: 221–268), and remains popular throughout Cypriot history (cf. HADZISTELIOU PRICE 1978: 90 f., for a survey of finds from various sanctuaries and cities). One must bear in mind, however, that there is an ongoing discussion concerning the interpretation of such figurines, which may as well represent a generic type of a woman with child in her arms (mildly popular also in the Greek terracottas); for instance ULBRICH (2008: 78) distinguishes between standing figures of women with children as images of mortal women, while interpreting the seated ones as images of the goddess.

At Idalion an Arsinoeion was erected by Ptolemy II Philadelphus or Ptolemy III Euergetes (MITFORD 1971: 115), and in several other places altars consecrated to the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus were found (see LICHOCKA 1986: 318 with nn.

²⁴ The DELIVORRIAS 1984 “Aphrodite and Eros” entries list a number of varieties, very few of them, however, showing compositional (and even thematic) similarity to the type in question; only cat. 581–586, 614 and to some extent cat. 1118 f. show Aphrodite (or rather: female figure identified as Aphrodite) with a child in her arms or seated on one of them in a manner resembling the Cypriot figurines. Cat. 1237–1239 are the only ones listed that conform with the *lactans* type, two of them being Italian vase paintings and one a ring scarab from Kerch. Cf. PIRENNE-DELFORGE 1994: 368 f. (and n. 326 for detailed bibliography): “elle préside à la sexualité humaine, mais les aspects procréateurs de son action sont nettement accentués et elle possède des qualités de courotrophe plus clairement affirmées que sur le continent”.

47–50; PILIDES 2007: 134); the queen's cult is attested as late as the 2nd century AD. A marble head from the Idalion excavations (British Museum, reg. 1872, 0816.47) is tentatively identified as Arsinoe II (PRYCE, SMITH 1892: cat. C347; cf. BURR THOMPSON 1955: 205).

Among archaeological evidence the small objects that are interpreted as bearing the image of the queen should also be mentioned, such as the figural terracotta vases found in several graves in Hellenistic/Roman necropoleis, mostly around modern Larnaca, and dated to the first half of the 3rd century BC (YON 1985; for other small finds see ANASTASSIADES 1998: 132–140).

Even this short and far from complete enumeration of places and forms of worship of Arsinoe gives the general notion of how widespread and eagerly promoted her cult was. The other queens' divine presence is not as well attested, but this should not be a surprise, since it was Philadelphus who became the iconic dynastic deity.

CYPRIOI PERSPECTIVES

As it has been noted before, from the Egyptian point of view the association of deified queens with Isis was entirely natural. Not so, however, if one looks at it from the Macedonian perspective (putting aside the discussion on ruler cult in Argead Macedonia and possible Alexander's innovations in this matter): despite the fact that the cults of several female deities which could be associated with Aphrodite are attested in Macedonia, in particular Eukleia and the Mother of Gods (DROUGOU, SAATSOGLU-PALIADELI 2006: 146), and that the statuettes of the goddess were found in all major cities of the kingdom, Aphrodite played a not entirely clear role in Macedonian religion and cult: she shared the temple with the Mother of Gods in Pella and is widely attested in female burials²⁵, but otherwise her cult seems to have been less prominent than in other regions of mainland Greece. Of consequence, however, might be the appearance of the divine

²⁵ One of the boards at the exhibition *Au royaume d'Alexandre le Grand: la Macédoine antique* (Musée du Louvre, Oct. 30, 2011–Jan. 16, 2012) stated that “At Pella Aphrodite played a particularly important role as protector of the deceased”, but there is no mention of this notion in the exhibition catalogue (DESCAMPS-LEQUIME, CHARATZOPOULOU 2011; E. VOUTIRAS, personal communication 2012, put this hypothesis in doubt). Apuleius (*Met.* XI 5) names Proserpine (i.e. either the Italian/Etruscan goddess or the Greek Persephone, in any case a goddess of the underworld) as the Sicilian identification of Aphrodite but does not mention Macedonia. However, Cyprus provides us with interesting, if mysterious, archaeological material to support the affinity of Aphrodite and Persephone. Firstly, an inscription from Palaipaphos (modern Kouklia) mentions in the same passage Aphrodite Akraia and Kore as *theai hemeterai* (HERMARY 1982: 164–167). Then, excavations in Nea Paphos have uncovered a pair of goddesses, almost twin-like but sculpted in white and dark marble respectively. These have not been properly published as yet, let alone identified, but their interpretations range from Demeter and Persephone to the double-faced Aphrodite, “perhaps an earthly and underworld Aphrodite, whose infernal aspect should not be ignored” (KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 62). Also Isis possessed the aspect of the lady of the underworld (SFAMENI GASPARRO 2007: 67).

worship bestowed on the women from the Antigonid dynasty at an early stage of the Hellenistic era, and their connection to the cult of Aphrodite (CARNEY 2000 a: 219). Nonetheless, it would be probably too far-fetching to link the definitely Greek features of the Isidiac ruler cult with the Macedonian heritage; Cyprus, on the other hand, provides a very good ground to look for possible inspirations.

Let us turn to the textual evidence once more. Among the *Anathematika* from the “new” Posidippus several poems are more or less directly dedicated to Arsinoe II. Of these, two should draw our attention. In *Epigram 37* a dolphin brings Arion’s lyre to Arsinoe, which calls upon Apollinian connotations in the first place, but one needs to remember that dolphins were also associated with Aphrodite, for instance in later literary accounts of her birth. According to Nonnus (*Dion.* XIII 436–443) Cyprus was supposed to have a dolphin’s shape, and the “Aphrodite with a dolphin” type is attested in Cypriot art of the Hellenistic period (KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 70), being also one of the subtypes of the visual representation of the marine aspect of the goddess²⁶, so important for the divine cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus.

Of even more importance, however, is the perplexing *Epigram 36*. The present author gives detailed analysis of this poem in the context of Arsinoe’s assimilation with Cypriot Aphrodite elsewhere (FULIŃSKA 2012), therefore only a summary of conclusions will be presented here. Of particular importance is the image of armed Arsinoe in lines 5–6 (“I see you still, Philadelphus, the sharp spear in your hand, the hollow shield on your arm”, transl. by K. GUTZWILLER), which seems to be incompatible with the image that we know both from prevailing types of Aphrodite’s representations in Greek art, and from Ptolemaic monetary evidence. Despite established tradition of belligerent women in Macedonia (CARNEY 2000 a: esp. ch. 5; STEPHENS 2005: 240; MÜLLER 2009: 220–223; see also Polyaeus, *Strat.* VIII 57 for Arsinoe Philadelphus), Lagid queens never appear in art with attributes alluding at war or battle. Most scholars (e.g. MÜLLER 2009: 218 f.; see FULIŃSKA 2012: 143 f. for detailed bibliography) connect this poetic image with Alexander landing at Hellespont, Athena Promachos, or the Spartan Athena Chalkioikos, but the association of Ptolemaic queens with Athena is extremely rare (TONDRIAU 1948: 18), while a particular aspect of Aphrodite makes a much more probable model for the image of Arsinoe in the poem in question.

The military aspect of oriental goddesses who influenced the Greek persona of Aphrodite was quickly forgotten in favour of her association with beauty and love

²⁶ DELIVORRIAS 1984 does not list the type as such as a separate category or include it among the marine aspects of the goddess, the typology being based on the pose and dress rather than attributes. Only the type “Aphrodite riding a dolphin” is described separately (cat. 977–986), due to its popularity mostly in Hellenistic terracottas.

(BUDIN 2004: 110; cf. Quint. *Inst.* II 4, 26)²⁷. Similarly the Aphrodite *Hoplismene* sculptural type was not widespread in Classical Greek art²⁸, while in Cyprus it seems to have persevered to a greater extent. Ancient authors would link the origins of such sculptural types with Cyprus (Hesychios, s.v. Ἐγγύειος; *Anth. Plan.* XVI 173), which in turn was influenced by Levantine cults (SERWINT 2002: 343; BUDIN 2004: 99 and 2011: 171). The ekphrases of armed Aphrodite in the Greek Anthology (XVI 171, 173–177) give evidence of the topic's popularity in the Hellenistic age.

The Cypriot testimonies of the perseverance of the armed Aphrodite type in sculpture and other arts, which most likely reflect the sculptural models, include four fragmentarily preserved marble statues from Nea Paphos and Soli, a terracotta statuette from Salamis (being the earliest of the artefacts, dated to the 4th century BC, but presenting Archaistic traits), a Roman mosaic and a bronze mirror, both from Nea Paphos (see FULIŃSKA 2012: 146 f. for detailed reference). Out of these the Nea Paphos Roman copy of a Hellenistic original (Paphos District Museum, inv. FR 67/73; DASZEWSKI 1982: 195 ff. and Pl. XLIV) is the most interesting specimen from the point of view of the present paper, due to its model's dating and her atypical pose, reconstructed as holding the sword above her head, and described in scholarship in terms of “threatening” or “menacing” the enemies (DASZEWSKI 1982: 200; KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 62). By presenting the goddess naked, similar to the famous Late Classical and Hellenistic nude Aphrodites, this image also combines the erotic and military aspects, so important for the divine model of the Ptolemaic queens.

It appears that the Greek style Cypriot armed Aphrodite preserved the earlier oriental traits of the local goddess, who was associated for instance with the Phoenician Astarte in the Iron Age (BUDIN 2002: 243–271). Upon the coming of the Greeks to Cyprus their Aphrodite underwent identification with various deities worshipped on the island including the unnamed goddess attested by the Mycenaean name *wanassa* (later *anassa*), the female counterpart of *wanax/anax*. These titles had also been in use for Cypriot kings and royal women until the 4th century (Harpocration, s.v. Ἄνακτες; PIRENNE-DELFORGE 1994: 346 f.). It was suggested therefore that the king played the role of the symbolic spouse of the *thea* (YOUNG 2005: 29); a notion supported by epigraphic testimonies (see KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 40–42 for further reference), which name the kings of the Kinyrades dynasty *priests of the anassa*. Noteworthy, the most erudite of the Hellenistic poets, Callimachus (*Aet.* fr. 4, 1), chose the word *anassa* when

²⁷ The main centres in which the cult of armed Aphrodite, originating from the Archaic age, is attested are, apart from Sparta (PIRENNE-DELFORGE 1994: 200–207), Cythera (Paus. III 23, 1) and Corinth (Paus. III 15, 10), both known for large populations of Phoenicians.

²⁸ See DELIVORRIAS 1984: cat. 243–245 and cat. 456–461 for the two main types and their preserved occurrences; see FLEMBERG 1991 for detailed discussion thereof.

speaking of Berenice II, and much as this choice may have been dictated by aesthetic reasons, its political aspect should not be discarded. The affinity of the Cypriot royal rituals, together with perplexing cults of the consorts of the goddess²⁹, with the *hieros gamos* aspect of Ptolemaic dynastic policies and propaganda, strengthen the hypothesis about Cypriot influence on the dynastic cult and propaganda, especially if we recall the passages from Theocritus, mentioning the sacred marriage of the Philadelphoi on one hand, and the inclusion of Arsinoe in the celebration of the Adonia on the other.

Ancient authors (e.g. Lucian *Syr. D.* 7; Plut. *Mor.* 357A–C [= *De Is. et Os.* 15]) noticed the similarities between Adonis and Osiris and the cults thereof in Byblos and Egypt respectively, and even tried to reconcile the two mythical accounts by pointing out Byblos as the place where mourning Isis found her husband's body. It may be also worth noting that in Byblos Adonis was worshipped under the generic name of Adon, which means simply “lord”, just as the great goddess of the city was named Baalat – “Mistress” (HARMON 1961: 343, n. 3). This generic appellation is also found in texts concerning Isis (BERGMAN 1980: 192). Of interest for the subject may be a late Ptolemaic ostrakon CORTEGIANNI D1, containing a fragment of a hymn to an unnamed “Great Goddess”, interpreted most commonly as Isis-Hathor (KOCKELMANN 2008: 85). Lucian's *De Dea Syria* brings about yet another interesting context, which should be mentioned here, even if its further discussion lies beyond the scope of the present paper: the identification of Aphrodite/Venus with the Syrian Goddess herself, as Aphrodite Derceto, or with the mother thereof (for primary sources see VAN BERG 1972 a: 24 f., 28; 1972 b: 76–86). Aphrodite with the epithets Syria and Ourania was worshipped in Piraeus, in a temple founded by merchants from Cypriot Kition (DÜMMLER 1894: 2736). Moreover, a shrine of “The Syrian Goddess and Aphrodite Berenike” is mentioned in a 3rd century BC papyrus (*P. Ent.* 13; HUSS 1994: 20; PFEIFFER 2008 a: 75).

Despite the fact that Byblos and later Alexandria were the most important centres of Adonis cult, its Cypriot facet must not be neglected. ROBERTSON argues convincingly that there is a link between the archaic Levantine rituals and Cypriot iconography of the “lady in the window” whom he regards as an “avatar of the Cypriot Aphrodite which survived from the Late Bronze Age down to the Hellenistic period”, and a Hellenistic aetiological account of the Adonis rite (preserved i.a. in Ovid, *Met.* XIV 696–761 and Plut. *Mor.* 766C [= *Amat.* 20]; for discussion and bibliography see ROBERTSON 1982: 315 f.; similarly WASHBOURNE 1999). KARAGEORGHIS (2005: 70) describes a sanctuary in Soli, where “the cult

²⁹ See KARAGEORGHIS 2005: 48 f. and 107 f. for the cult of Adonis, and YOUNG 2005: 29–34 for the unnamed consort. Of particular importance can be the variants of the legend of Adonis that connect his conception and birth with Cyprus, and the mythical founder of the dynasty, Kinyras (e.g. Apollod. *Bibl.* III 14, 4; for further reference see FULIŃSKA 2012: 149 f.; KLEČZAR 2012).

of Isis and Serapis could very possibly have coexisted with the cult of Aphrodite and Adonis” due to the similarities of both the stories and the worship. Also the possible double-aspected representations of Cypriot Aphrodite (*vide supra*, n. 25) might be a reflection of the Adonis myth, connecting the god’s two lovers, Aphrodite and Persephone.

* * *

In order to legitimise their power in Egypt the Ptolemies needed a consistent kingship theology that would be comprehensible and accessible for both the Egyptians and the Greeks/Macedonians. Moreover, this theology needed to include the royal consort: if a Ptolemy wanted to represent Osiris, he needed a proper Isis at his side (in time the roles in actual politics and power would even reverse, and several Cleopatras would become dynastic Isides with male consorts at their side). The introduction of the main syncretic god, Sarapis, is well documented in historical narrative, which forms a basis for the interpretations from the perspective of religious or cultural studies as well as art history etc., but as for his spouse, a reconstruction from a number of fragmentary sources is necessary even at the basic historical level.

In this respect the Cypriot context of some of the aspects of the identification of the queens with Isis/Aphrodite appears to have formed a coherent part of the broader theological and propagandistic programme. It provided a number of required elements, beginning with an established meeting point of the Near Eastern, Egyptian and Greek cultural traditions, which together with the local elements resulted in a highly original variant of Mediterranean religion and culture. In Cyprus, the cult of the Goddess merged firstly with Levantine and Egyptian beliefs and cult practices, and later with Greek concepts of divinity, hence forming a perfect female counterpart for the Ptolemaic Osiris/Sarapis, who received traits of Egyptian, Middle Eastern and Hellenic deities. The great goddess of Cyprus retained the complex face of the archaic vegetation deity, at the same time governing erotic love and protecting her followers in battle, thus becoming an ideal model for the Ptolemaic, Hellenized Isis/Aphrodite. Moreover, the sacred marriage of Aphrodite and Adonis/Apollo in many ways seems closer to the *hieros gamos* of Isis and Osiris than the union between Zeus and Hera, thus providing an acceptable, while well rooted in Greek tradition model for the incestuous relationships of the royals, and in this respect the *Adoniasusai* possibly make a more important literary testimony of the Ptolemaic royal theology than *Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, providing a better model, especially in the Hellenistic age, for what SFAMENI GASPARRO (2007: 43) calls “couple-henotheism”.

The Ptolemies to a greater extent than any other Hellenistic dynasty had to bear in mind that in their official representations they needed to address two different audiences, and they seem to have succeeded in it perfectly. It is not hard to trace the Egyptian elements in this public image, the Greek ones, however,

are clearly far more elusive and far more sophisticated than they appear, partly because there is no tradition of *basileia* in Greece, the tradition of apotheosis of rulers is scarce and largely limited to ancestral heroes, and the strongly military character of Macedonian monarchy was not sufficient for the Hellenistic needs. It seems, therefore, possible that the Ptolemies exploited a model which was presented to them by the other land which, apart from Egypt, fell into their hands in the process of partitioning of Alexander's empire: Cyprus. Ptolemy Philadelphus' political and religious programme surrounding the death and almost immediate deification of his sister and wife was apparently so carefully designed that the inclusion of so many elements which correspond with the Cypriot tradition – or oriental traditions filtered through Cyprus – rather than Greek/Macedonian customs, bears all the traits of purposeful planning.

Jagiellonian University, Kraków

REFERENCES

- ABEL 1972: K. ABEL, *Zephyritis*, *RE X A*, 19 (1972), coll. 230–234.
- ALBERSMEIER 2002: S. ALBERSMEIER, *Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis der königlichen und privaten Frauenstatuen der Ptolemäerzeit*, in: H. MELAERTS, L. MOOREN (eds.), *Le rôle et le statut de la femme en Égypte hellénistique, romaine et byzantine. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles–Leuven 27–29 Novembre 1997*, Leuven 2002, pp. 1–19.
- ANASTASSIADES 1998: A. ANASTASSIADES, *Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου. Aspects of a Specific Cult in Cyprus*, *RDAC* 1988, pp. 129–140.
- 2000: A. ANASTASSIADES, *Isis in Hellenistic and Roman Cyprus*, *RDAC* 2000, pp. 191–196.
- ANGUS 1928: S. ANGUS, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, New York 1928.
- ARAFAT 1996: K.W. ARAFAT, *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*, Oxford 1996.
- ASHTON 2001: S.A. ASHTON, *Ptolemaic Royal Sculpture from Egypt. The Interaction between Greek and Egyptian Traditions*, Oxford 2001 (BAR International Series 923).
- 2008: S.A. ASHTON, *Cleopatra and Egypt*. Malden, MA 2008 (Blackwell Ancient Lives).
- ASSMAN 2001: J. ASSMAN, *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*, transl. by D. LORTON, Ithaca, NY 2001 [1st German edn. 1984].
- ATKINSON 1956: K.M.T. ATKINSON, *The Legitimacy of Cambyses and Darius as Kings of Egypt*, *JAOS LXXVI* 1956, 3, pp. 167–177.
- AUPERT 2000: P. AUPERT (*et al.*), *Guide to Amathus*, Nicosia 2000.
- BAGNALL 1976: R.S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, New York 1976.
- BAINES 1995: J. BAINES, *Kingship, Definition of Culture, and Legitimation*, in: O'CONNOR, SILVERMAN 1995, pp. 3–48.
- BARBANTANI 2005: S. BARBANTANI, *Goddess of Love and Mistress of the Sea. Notes on a Hellenistic Hymn to Arsinoe-Aphrodite (P. Lit. Goodsp. 2.I–IV)*, *Anc. Soc.* XXXV 2005, pp. 135–165.
- VAN BERG 1972 a: P.-L. VAN BERG, *Corpus Cultus Deae Syriae 1. Les sources littéraires. Première partie: Répertoire des sources grecques et latines*, Leiden 1972 (EPRO 28).
- 1972 b: *Corpus Cultus Deae Syriae 2. Les sources littéraires. Deuxième partie: Étude critique des sources mythographiques grecques et latines (sauf le De Dea Syria)*, Leiden (EPRO 28).

- BERGMAN 1980: J. BERGMAN, *Isis*, *LdÄ* III (1980), pp. 186–203.
- BEVAN 1968: E.R. BEVAN, *The House of Ptolemy: A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, Chicago 1968.
- BONNEFOY 1992: Y. BONNEFOY, *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies*, transl. by W. DONIGER, Chicago 1992 [1st French edn. 1981].
- BRICAULT 2000: L. BRICAULT (ed.), *De Memphis à Rome. Actes du 1^{er} Colloque international sur les études isiaques. Poitiers–Futuroscope, 8–10 avril 1999*, Leiden 2000 (RGRW 140).
- 2007: *La diffusion isiaque en Mésie Inférieure et en Thrace: Politique, commerce et religion*, in: BRICAULT, VERSLUYS, MEYBOOM 2007, pp. 245–266.
- BRICAULT, VERSLUYS, MEYBOOM 2007: L. BRICAULT, M.J. VERSLUYS, P.G.P. MEYBOOM (eds.), *Nile into Tiber. Egypt in the Roman World. Proceedings of the IIIrd International Conference of Isis Studies, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University, May 11–14 2005*, Leiden 2007 (RGRW 159).
- BRUNELLE 1976: E. BRUNELLE, *Die Bildnisse der Ptolemäerinnen*, Frankfurt a. M. 1976.
- BRUNNER-TRAUT 1980: E. BRUNNER-TRAUT, *Lotos*, *LdÄ* III (1980), pp. 1901–1096.
- BUDIN 2002: S.L. BUDIN, *The Origin of Aphrodite*, Bethesda, MD 2002.
- 2004: *A Reconsideration of the Aphrodite-Ashtart Syncretism*, *Numen* LI 2004, pp. 95–145.
- 2011: *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age: Reconsidering Fertility, Maternity, and Gender in the Ancient World*, Cambridge 2011.
- BURR THOMPSON 1955: D. BURR THOMPSON, *A Portrait of Arsinoe Philadelphos*, *AJA* LIX 1955, pp. 199–206.
- 1973: *Ptolemaic Oinochoai and Portraits in Faience. Aspects of the Ruler Cult*, Oxford 1973 (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology).
- BURTON 1972: A. BURTON, *Diodorus Siculus, Book I. A Commentary*, Leiden 1972 (EPRO 29).
- CADELL 1998: H. CADELL, *A quelle date Arsinoé II Philadelphe est-elle décédée?*, in: H. MELAERTS (ed.), *Le culte du souverain dans l'Égypte Ptolémaïque au III^e siècle avant notre ère. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles 10 mai 1995*, Leuven 1998, pp. 1–3.
- CARNEY 2000 a: E.D. CARNEY, *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman, OK 2000.
- 2000 b: *The Initiation of Cult for Royal Macedonian Women*, *CPh* XCV 2000, pp. 21–43.
- 2007: *The Philippeum, Women and Dynastic Image*, in: W. HECKEL, L. TRITLE, P. WHEATLEY (eds.), *Alexander's Empire. Formulation to Decay*, Claremont 2007, pp. 27–60.
- CURTIUS 1933: L. CURTIUS, *Ikongraphische Beiträge zum Porträt der römischen Republik und der julisch-claudischen Familie. IV: Kleopatra VII Philopator*, *MDAI(R)* XLVIII 1933, pp. 182–192.
- DASZEWSKI 1982: W.A. DASZEWSKI, *Aphrodite Hoplismene from Nea Paphos*, *RDAC* 1982, pp. 195–201.
- 1985: A.W. DASZEWSKI, *Corpus of Mosaics from Egypt*, vol. 1, Mainz 1985.
- DELIVORRIAS 1984: A. DELIVORRIAS, *Aphrodite*, *LIMC* II (1984), coll. 2–151.
- DEPUYDT 1995: L. DEPUYDT, *Murder in Memphis: The Story of Cambyses's Mortal Wounding of the Apis Bull (ca. 523 B.C.E.)*, *JNES* LIV 1995, pp. 119–126.
- DESCAMPS-LEQUIME, CHARATZOPOULOU 2011: S. DESCAMPS-LEQUIME, K. CHARATZOPOULOU, *Au royaume d'Alexandre le Grand: la Macédoine antique*, Paris 2011.
- DROUGOU, SAATSOGLOU-PALIADELI 2006: S. DROUGOU, C. SAATSOGLOU-PALIADELI, *Vergina. The Land and Its History*, Athens 2006.
- DÜMLER 1894: F. DÜMLER, *Aphrodite*, *RE* I 1–2 (1894), coll. 2729–2787.
- DUNAND 1973 a: F. DUNAND, *Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée*, vol. I: *Le culte d'Isis et les Ptolémées*, Leiden 1973 (EPRO 26).
- 1973 b: *Le syncrétisme isiaque à la fin de l'époque hellénistique*, in: *Les Syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine. Colloque de Strasbourg (9–11 juin 1971)*, Paris 1973 (Bibliothèque des Centres d'Études Supérieures Spécialisés), pp. 79–93.
- 1975: *Les syncrétismes dans la religion de l'Égypte romaine*, in: DUNAND, LÉVÊQUE 1975, pp. 152–184.
- DUNAND, LÉVÊQUE 1975: F. DUNAND, P. LÉVÊQUE (eds.), *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité*, Leiden 1975 (EPRO 46).

- FLEMBERG 1991: J. FLEMBERG, *Venus armata. Studien zur bewaffneten Aphrodite in der griechisch-römischen Kunst*, Stockholm 1991.
- FRASER 1972: P.M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vol. 1, Oxford 1972.
- FULIŃSKA 2012: A. FULIŃSKA, *Arsinoe Hoplismene. Poseidippos 36, Arsinoe Philadelphos and the Cypriot Cult of Aphrodite*, SAAC XVI 2012, pp. 141–156.
- GREEN 1990: P. GREEN, *Alexander to Actium: An Essay on the Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1990.
- GUTZWILLER 1992: K. GUTZWILLER, *Callimachus' Lock of Berenice: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda*, AJPh CXIII 1992, pp. 359–385.
- 2005: K. GUTZWILLER (ed.), *The New Posidippus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford 2005.
- HADZISTELIOU PRICE 1978: T. HADZISTELIOU PRICE, *Kourotrophos. Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities*, Leiden 1978 (Studies of the Dutch Archaeological & Historical Society).
- HARMON 1961: A.M. HARMON, *Lucian with an English Translation*, vol. 4, London–Cambridge, MA 1961 (LCL) [1st edn. 1925].
- HAUBEN 1983: H. HAUBEN, *Arsinoë II et la politique extérieure*, in: E. van 't Dack, P. van Dessel, W. van Gucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven 24–26 May 1982*, Leuven 1983, pp. 99–127.
- HAVELOCK 1995: *The Aphrodite of Knidos and Her Successors. A Historical Review of the Female Nude in Greek Art*, Ann Arbor 1995.
- HENRICHS 1984: A. HENRICHS, *The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: Prodicus as the Spiritual Father of the Isis Aretologies*, HSCPh LXXXVIII 1984, pp. 139–158.
- HERMARY 1982: A. HERMARY, *Divinités Chypriotes I*, RDAC 1982, pp. 164–173.
- 1988: A. HERMARY, *Le culte d'Aphrodite à Amathonte*, RDAC 1988, pp. 101–109.
- HIGGS 2000: P. HIGGS, *Alla ricerca dell'immagine di Cleopatra: ritratti classici in marmo*, in S. WALKER, P. HIGGS (eds.), *Cleopatra, regina d'Egitto*, Roma 2000.
- HILL 1904: G.F. HILL, *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum*, vol. 24: *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyprus*, London 1904.
- HÖLBL 2001: G. HÖLBL, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, transl. by T. SAAVEDRA, London–New York 2001 [1st German edn. 1994].
- HUNTER 1996: R. HUNTER, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge 1996.
- 2003: *Theocritus. Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Berkeley 2003 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 39).
- HUSS 1994: W. HUSS, *Der Makedonische König und die Ägyptischen Priester. Studien zur Geschichte des Ptolemäischen Ägypten*, Stuttgart 1994.
- HUWENDIEK 1996: J. HUWENDIEK, *Zur Interpretation des Philippeion in Olympia*, Boreas XIX 1996, pp. 155–159.
- JOHNSON 2002: C.G. JOHNSON, *OGIS 98 and the Divinization of the Ptolemies*, Historia LI 2002, pp. 112–116.
- KAPLONY 1986: P. KAPLONY, *Zepter, LdÄ VI* (1986), pp. 1373–1389.
- KARAGEORGHIS 2003: J. KARAGEORGHIS, *The Goddess of Cyprus between the Orient and the Occident*, in: N.C. STAMPOLIDIS, V. KARAGEORGHIS (eds.), *Sea Routes. Interconnections in the Mediterranean 16th–6th c. B.C. Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th–October 2nd, 2002*, Athens 2003, pp. 353–362.
- 2005: *Kypris. The Aphrodite of Cyprus. Ancient Sources and Archaeological Evidence*, Nicosia 2005.
- KISS 2005: Z. KISS, *En marge des sceaux de Nea Paphos: l'iconographie de Césarion*, Études et Travaux XX 2002, pp. 82–86.
- KLEINER 2005: D.E.E. KLEINER, *Cleopatra and Rome*, London–Cambridge, MA 2005.
- KŁĘCZAR 2012: A. KŁĘCZAR, *'Who Lives and Must Not Die'. The Myth of Adonis in Hellenistic Poetry*, SAAC XVI 2012, pp. 157–165.
- KOCKELMANN 2008: H. KOCKELMANN, *Praising the Goddess. A Comparative and Annotated Re-Edition of Six Demotic Hymns and Praises Addressed to Isis*, Berlin–New York 2008.

- KUTTNER 1999: A. KUTTNER, *Hellenistic Images of Spectacle from Alexander to Augustus*, in: B. BERGMANN, C. KONDOLEON (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, Washington, DC 1999 (Studies in the History of Art 56), pp. 97–123.
- KYRIELEIS 1975: H. KYRIELEIS, *Bildnisse der Ptolemäer*, Berlin 1975 (Archäologische Forschungen).
- LAPATIN 2001: K.D.S. LAPATIN, *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Oxford 2001.
- LECLANT 1975: J. LECLANT, *Points de vue récents sur le syncrétisme dans la religion de l'Égypte pharaonique*, in: DUNAND, LÉVÊQUE 1975, pp. 1–18.
- LÉVÊQUE 1973: P. LÉVÊQUE, *Essai de typologie des syncrétismes*, in: *Les Syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine. Colloque de Strasbourg (9–11 juin 1971)*, Paris 1973 (Bibliothèque des Centres d'Études Supérieures Spécialisés).
- LICHOCKA 1986: B. LICHOCKA, *La statue d'Aphrodite sur les monnaies de Ptolémée III*, in: *Iconographie classique et identités régionales*, Paris 1986 (BCH Suppléments 14) pp. 311–330.
- LONGEGA 1968: G. LONGEGA, *Arsinoe II*, Roma 1968.
- LORBER 2001: C.C. LORBER, *The Lotus of Aphrodite on Ptolemaic Bronzes*, SNR LXXX 2001, pp. 39–57.
- MAIER, KARAGEORGHIS 1984: F.G. MAIER, V. KARAGEORGHIS, *Paphos. History and Archaeology*, Nicosia 1984.
- MALAISE 2000: M. MALAISE, *Le problème de l'hellénisation d'Isis*, in: BRICAULT 2000, pp. 1–19.
- MEEKS 1977: D. MEEKS, *Harpokrates, LdÄ II* (1977), pp. 1003–1011.
- MITFORD 1971: T.B. MITFORD, *The Inscriptions of Kourion*, Philadelphia 1971.
- MØRKHOLM 1991: O. MØRKHOLM, *Early Hellenistic Coinage. From the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–188 B.C.)*, ed. by P. GRIERSON, U. WESTERMARK, Cambridge 1991.
- MÜLLER 2009: S. MÜLLER, *Das hellenistische Königspaar in der medialen Repräsentation. Ptolemaios II und Arsinoe II*, Berlin–New York 2009 (Beiträge zum Altertumskunde 263).
- MURRAY 1970: O. MURRAY, *Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship*, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* LVI 1970, pp. 141–171.
- MYŚLIWIEC 2001: K. MYŚLIWIEC, *Isis, Hathor ou Cléopâtre? – à propos d'une figurine trouvée à Tell Atrib*, *Études et Travaux* XIX 2001, pp. 264–275.
- NISETICH 2005: F. NISETICH, *The Poems of Posidippus*, translated by..., in: GUTZWILLER 2005, pp. 17–64.
- NOCK 1930: A.D. NOCK, *Synnaos theos*, HSCPh XLI 1930, pp. 1–62.
- O'CONNOR 1995: D.B. O'CONNOR, *Beloved of Maat, the Horizon of Re: The Royal Palace in New Kingdom Egypt*, in: O'CONNOR, SILVERMAN 1995, pp. 263–300.
- O'CONNOR, SILVERMAN 1995: D.B. O'CONNOR, D.P. SILVERMAN (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Kingship*, Leiden 1995.
- PAKKANEN 1996: P. PAKKANEN, *Interpreting Early Hellenistic Religions. A Study Based on the Mystery Cult of Demeter and the Cult of Isis*, Helsinki 1996.
- PENGLASE 1994: C. PENGLASE, *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia. Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod*, London 1994.
- PFEIFFER 2008 a: S. PFEIFFER, *Herrscher- und Dynastiekulte im Ptolemäerreich. Systematik und Einordnung der Kultformen*, München 2008 (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 98).
- 2008 b: *The God Serapis, His Cult and the Beginnings of the Ruler Cult in Ptolemaic Egypt*, in: P. McKECHNIE, P. GUILLAUME (eds.), *Ptolemy II and His World*, Leiden 2008 (Mnemosyne Supplements 300), pp. 387–408.
- PILIDES 2007: D. PILIDES, *The Hill of Agios Giorgios, Nicosia: from Ledroi to Levkoton?*, in: P. FLOURENTZOS (ed.), *From Evagoras I to the Ptolemies: The Transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic Period in Cyprus. Proceedings of the International Archaeological Conference, Nicosia, 29–30 November 2002*, Nicosia 2007, pp. 131–144.
- PIRENNE-DELFORGE 1994: V. PIRENNE-DELFORGE, *L'Aphrodite grecque*, Athènes–Liège 1994 (Kernos Suppléments 4).
- POLLITT 1987: J.J. POLLITT, *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge 1987.

- POMEROY 1984: S.B. POMEROY, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, Detroit 1984.
- POOLE 1883: R. S. POOLE, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum. The Ptolemies, Kings of Egypt*, London 1883 (BMC Ptolemies).
- PRYCE, SMITH 1892: F.N. PRYCE, A.H. SMITH, *Catalogue of Greek Sculpture in the British Museum*, vols. I–III, London 1892.
- QUAEGEBEUR 1971: J. QUAEGEBEUR, *Documents Concerning a Cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos at Memphis*, JNES XXX 1971, pp. 239–270.
- ROBERTSON 1982: N. ROBERTSON, *The Ritual Background of the Dying God in Cyprus and Syro-Palestine*, HThR LXXV 1982, pp. 313–359.
- SAGLIO 1900: E. SAGLIO, *Siéphanè*, DAGR IV 2 (1900), p. 1508.
- SCHWENTZEL 2000: C.G. SCHWENTZEL, *Les boucles d'Isis. Isidos plokamoi*, in: BRICAULT 2000, pp. 21–33.
- SERWINT 2002: N. SERWINT, *Aphrodite and Her Near Eastern Sisters: Spheres of Influence*, in: D. BOLGER, N. SERWINT (eds.), *Engendering Aphrodite. Women and Society in Ancient Egypt*, Boston 2002, pp. 325–350.
- SFAMENI 2010: C. SFAMENI, *Magic in Late Antiquity: The Evidence of Magical Gems*, in: D.M. GWYNN, S. BANGERT (eds.), *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity*, Leiden 2010, pp. 435–473.
- SFAMENI GASPARRO 2007: G. SFAMENI GASPARRO, *The Hellenistic Face of Isis: Cosmic and Saviour Goddess*, in: BRICAULT, VERSLUYS, MEYBOOM 2007, pp. 40–72.
- SMITH 1988: R.R.R. SMITH, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988 (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology).
- SOLMSEN 1979: F. SOLMSEN, *Isis among the Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge, MA 1979.
- STANWICK 2002: P.E. STANWICK, *Portraits of the Ptolemies: Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs*, Austin 2002.
- STEPHENS 2004: *Posidippus's Poetry Book: Where Macedon Meets Egypt*, in: W.V. HARRIS, G. RUFFINI (eds.), *Ancient Alexandria between Egypt and Greece*, Leiden–Boston 2004 (Columbia Studies in the Ancient Tradition 26), pp. 63–86.
- 2005: *Battle of the Books*, in: GUTZWILLER 2005, pp. 229–248.
- SVORONOS 1904–1908: J.N. SVORONOS, *Ta Nomismata tou Kratous ton Ptolemaion*, Athinai 1904–1908.
- TEISSIER 1996: B. TEISSIER, *Egyptian Iconography on Syro-Palestinian Cylinder Seals of the Middle Bronze Age*, Fribourg–Göttingen 1996 (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 11).
- THOMPSON 2005: D.J. THOMPSON, *Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies*, in: GUTZWILLER 2005, pp. 269–283.
- TONDRIAU 1948: J.L. TONDRIAU, *Princesses ptolémaïques comparées ou identifiées à des déesses (III^e–I^{er} siècles avant J. C.)*, Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie XXXVII 1948, pp. 12–33.
- TRAN TAM TINH, LABRECQUE 1973: V. TRAN TAM TINH, Y. LABRECQUE, *Isis Lactans. Corpus des monuments greco-romains d'Isis allaitant Harpocrate*, Leiden 1973 (EPRO 37).
- TRAN TAM TINH 1990: V. TRAN TAM TINH, *Isis*, LIMC V (1990), pp. 761–796.
- TROY 1986: L. TROY, *Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myth and History*, Uppsala 1986.
- ULBRICH 2008: A. ULBRICH, *Kypris: Heiligtümer und Kulte weiblicher Gottheiten auf Zypern in der kyproarchaischen und kyproklassischen Epoche (Königszeit)*, Münster 2008.
- VERSLUYS 2007: M.J. VERSLUYS, *Aegyptiaca Romana: A Widening Debate*, in: BRICAULT, VERSLUYS, MEYBOOM 2007, pp. 1–14.
- VERSNEL 1990: H.S. VERSNEL, *Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: Three Studies in Henotheism*, Leiden 1990 (Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religions I).
- WASHBOURNE 1999: R. WASHBOURNE, *Aphrodite Parakypousa 'the Woman at the Window'. The Cypriot Astarte-Aphrodite Fertility Role in Sacred Prostitution and Rebirth*, RDAC 1999, pp. 163–177.
- WHITEHORNE 1994: J. WHITEHORNE, *Cleopatras*, London 1994.

- WINIARCZYK 1998: M. WINIARCZYK, *Początki kultu wódzów i władców w świecie greckim (do ok. 270 r. przed Chr.)*, *Meander* LIII 1998, pp. 135–152.
- WITT 1997: R.E. WITT, *Isis in the Ancient World*, Baltimore 1997 [1st edn. 1971].
- YON 1985: M. YON, *Portraits Lagides en Chypre*, *RDAC* 1985, pp. 242–248.
- YOUNG 2005: P.H. YOUNG, *The Cypriot Aphrodite Cult: Paphos, Rantidi, and Saint Barnabas*, *JNES* LXIV 2005, pp. 23–44.
- ZANKER 2004: G. ZANKER, *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*, Madison 2004 (Wisconsin Studies in Classics).

AJA = American Journal of Archaeology.

BMC Cyprus = HILL 1904.

DAGR = C. DAREMBERG, E. SAGLIO (eds.), *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*, Paris 1877–1919.

EPRO = Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain.

JNES = Journal of Near Eastern Studies.

LdÄ = *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Wiesbaden 1975–.

LIMC = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zürich–München 1981–.

RDAC = Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus.

RGRW = Religions in the Graeco-Roman World.

SAAC = Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization.

SVOR. = SVORONOS 1904–1908.

VERGIL'S *ECLOGUE* 9: *IDYLL* 7 AND *ECLOGUE* 1 IN REVERSE

by

GEORGE C. PARASKEVIOTIS

ABSTRACT: *Eclogue* 9 has long been considered by William BERG a reversed *Thalysia* (i.e. *Idyll* 7). The following article intends to move BERG's view one step further suggesting that *Eclogue* 9 is not only *Idyll* 7 in reverse but also *Eclogue* 1 in reverse, given that it combines both reversed Theocritean and Vergilian elements by using the *oppositio in imitando* technique.

Vergil's *Eclogues* continue to receive a great deal of scholarly and critical attention¹ which has clearly culminated during the late twentieth and early twenty-first century². These years have seen the publication of numerous books and articles which have advanced and developed the literary studies concerning Vergilian pastoral poetry. One of the many issues which these books and articles covered and still continue to cover is Vergil's relationship with his literary sources and above all with Theocritus³. Nonetheless, very little have been written concerning *Eclogue* 9⁴ and more specifically concerning its relationship with Vergil's main literary source Theocritus⁵. Moreover, while scholars offered satisfactory explanations for each *Eclogue* in the collection⁶, they in fact failed to offer a convincing explanation for *Eclogue* 9. William BERG is the only scholar, as far as I know, who offered a satisfactory explanation for *Eclogue* 9 suggesting that it is a reversed *Thalysia* (i.e. *Idyll* 7)⁷. The aim of this article is to move

¹ See e.g. COLEIRO 1979: 103–105 who offers a brief summary of the scholarly approaches to Vergil's collection, which ranges from the period of its composition to the 19th century.

² For a detailed and extensive bibliographical catalogue of Vergil's *Eclogues*, see e.g. DONLAN 1978 and BRIGGS 1981, along with the bibliography which is annually published in *Vergilius*. Furthermore, see the more recent bibliography compiled by Niklas HOLZBERG, available online in <http://www.klassphil.uni-muenchen.de/worddokumente/vergbucbibl.doc>.

³ Cf. e.g. BRIGGS 1981: 1297–1301 and esp. 1298–1299.

⁴ See e.g. BRIGGS 1981: 1333 f.

⁵ Cf. e.g. BRIGGS 1981: 1333 f.

⁶ Outstanding examples are *Eclogues* 3 and 7 which constitute conventional rustic singing contests or *Eclogue* 1 which has long been considered programmatic.

⁷ Cf. BERG 1974: 139–142 and esp. 140.

BERG's suggestion one step further by suggesting that *Eclogue* 9 is not only *Idyll* 7 in reverse, but also *Eclogue* 1 in reverse. Detailed examination of key passages from *Eclogue* 9 will show, firstly, that Vergil by using the *oppositio in imitando* technique⁸ creates an *Eclogue* which is largely based on reversed Theocritean (i.e. *Idyll* 7) and Vergilian (i.e. *Eclogue* 1) elements; secondly, it will enable us to appreciate more thoroughly the Vergilian "internal" self-reference and its role in the composition of the *Eclogues*⁹.

Vergil's dependence on *Idyll* 7 is evident from the character opening the *Eclogue*. Lycidas offers an allusion to the mysterious character of the quasi-divine poetic initiator who has already been found in the Theocritean corpus (Λυκίδα, *Id.* 7, 13)¹⁰. More crucial, however, is the opening line of the *Eclogue*, since it is designed to recall Lycidas' similar question to Simichidas in *Idyll* 7:

"Quo te, Moeri, pedes? an, quo via ducit, in urbem?"

(*Ecl.* 9, 1)

"Σιμιχίδα, πᾶ δὴ τὸ μεσσημέριον πόδας ἔλκεις;"

"Whither now, Simichidas, art thou footing it in the noontide?"¹¹

(*Id.* 7, 21)

This relationship is also confirmed by the structural correspondences of the successive questions ("Quo ... pedes?" and "an ... urbem?" ~ Σιμιχίδα ... ἡλαίνοντι; and ἦ μετὰ δαῖτ' ... θρώσκεις;) along with the verbal correspondences *quo te* ~ πᾶ τὸ and *pedes* ~ πόδας. The Theocritean line under discussion was not unknown to Vergil, given that it was the literary model on which the image of Corydon's erotic wandering was based¹². Here, however, what surprises the speaker is not the meeting time (midday) but the destination (town), which explains the omission of the temporal detail μεσσημέριον. Moreover, the general situation which is described by both authors is very different. Moeris leaves the

⁸ For the *oppositio in imitando* technique or "correction", see respectively GIANGRANDE 1967 and THOMAS 1986.

⁹ For the "internal" self-reference, see THOMAS 1986: 184 f.

¹⁰ For the mysterious identity of Lycidas, see DOVER 2000: 148–150 who suggests that Lycidas is (i) a real Coan goatherd with a genius for poetry, (ii) a real poet who amused himself (or dropped out of urban life) by dressing and behaving like a goatherd, (iii) a real poet whom Theocritus has chosen to portray as a goatherd, and (iv) a wholly imaginary character. Furthermore, Lycidas' character has long been considered a disguised divine being, identified with the figure of a satyr (cf. LAWALL 1967: 79–82), Apollo (cf. WILLIAMS 1971) and the rustic divinity Pan (cf. BROWN 1981). Finally, see also BOWIE 1985, esp. 68–80 who sees a link with Philetas.

¹¹ The Greek translations which follow come respectively from Gow 1952 (vol. I) and SEATON 1912.

¹² Cf. *Ecl.* 2, 8 f.: "nunc etiam pecudes umbras et frigora captant,/ nunc uiridis etiam occultant spineta lacertos". See also CLAUSEN 1994: 66.

country for the city (*in urbem*) in sharp contrast to Simichidas who travels from the urban setting to countryside:

“Quo te, Moeri, pedes? an, quo via ducit *in urbem*?”

(*Ecl.* 7, 1)

Ἦς χρόνος ἀνίκ' ἐγών τε καὶ Εὐκριτος εἰς τὸν Ἄλεντα
εἶροπομες ἐκ πόλιος, σὺν καὶ τρίτος ἄμμιν Ἀμύντας.

Time was when Eucritus and I were going *from the town* to the Haleis,
and Amyntas made a third with us.

(*Id.* 7, 1 f.)

Further support for this antithesis is found in the verbal formulation, since Moeris' course is actually compulsory, enforced by his own feet (“Quo te, Moeri, pedes”)¹³, while, by contrast, Simichidas' journey is a personal choice (τὸ πόδας ἔλκεις)¹⁴. Nonetheless, the specific treatment of the Theocritean material is not accidental. Vergil intentionally reverses the Theocritean concept to create the reversed result, namely to replace Simichidas' joy for visiting countryside with Moeris' misery for leaving countryside.

The next scene, where the Theocritean concept is reversed, deals with Moeris and Lycidas' singing place and more specifically with the location of Bianor's tomb. Memorials and votive shrines have long been considered a conventional feature in Greek and Roman landscape¹⁵, but Bianor's grave is clearly borrowed from *Idyll* 7; since there, Theocritus likewise refers to travelling characters who approach a tomb, although the Vergilian name Bianor, while reflects the Theocritean name Brasilas, is certainly not Theocritean¹⁶:

“hinc adeo media est nobis via; namque sepulcrum
incipit apparere Bianoris”

(*Ecl.* 9, 59 f.)

κοῦπω τὰν μεσάταν ὁδὸν ἄνυμες, οὐδὲ τὸ σᾶμα
ἀμῖν τὸ Βρασίλα κατεφαίνετο

and yet had we accomplished half the journey, nor had the tomb
of Brasilas come in sight.

(*Id.* 7, 10 f.)

¹³ Cf. e.g. Ap. Rhod. IV 66: Ἦως ἄρ' ἔφη. τὴν δ' αἶψα πόδες φέρον ἐγκονέουσαν (“Thus spake the goddess; but swiftly the maiden's feet bore her, hasting on”) with VIAN 1981: III 73 f. with n. 2. Moreover, see PUTNAM 1970: 294 with n. 1 who observes that the phrase *via ducit* and the omission of the main verb in Lycidas' question show that Moeris is unwillingly undertaking this journey since the herdsman's feet are leading him and not his desire. See also CONINGTON 2009: 91.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. GOW 1952: II 137 who remarks that the use of this verb denotes vigorous rather than laboured movement.

¹⁵ Cf. e.g. COLEMAN 1977: 270.

¹⁶ For the obscurity of Brasilas' name, see e.g. GOW 1952: II 135 and HUNTER 1999: 155.

Both passages underline that the grave is the halfway point on the herdsmen's trip¹⁷, a suggestion which is further reinforced through a series of significant verbal echoes. More specifically, the expression "media est nobis via" clearly recalls τὴν μεσάταν ὁδὸν and most characteristically "sepulcrum incipit apparere Bianoris" finds its equivalent in the sentence οὐδὲ τὸ σᾶμα ἀμῖν τὸ Βρασίλα κατεφαίνετο. Nevertheless, while Simichidas along with his friends have not yet covered the half of their course and have not yet reached Brasilas' grave, Moeris has already covered the half of his journey and Bianor's burial place has already begun coming into view¹⁸. Vergil speeds up Moeris' course, because his journey is not merely a joyful visit to a harvest festival which enables herdsmen to break off the trip for the sake of singing¹⁹. Instead, Moeris' course is a violent and enforced eviction and consequently his journey should not be interrupted for any reason²⁰, something that explains Moeris' failure to recall the songs and his final decision to suspend singing at least for now ("Desine plura, puer, et quod *nunc* instat agamus;/ carmina tum melius, cum venerit ipse, canemus", *Ecl.* 9, 66 f.).

The last reversed Theocritean concept is traced in the concluding lines of the *Eclogue*. There, Moeris requests his colleague to refrain from further invitations for singing; and the literary model for this reply is once again found in *Idyll* 7 where Simichidas invites Lycidas to an exchange of bucolic songs:

"desine plura, puer, et quod nunc instat agamus;
carmina tum melius, cum venerit ipse, canemus"

(*Ecl.* 9, 66 f.)

"ἀλλ' ἄγε δῆ, ξυνὰ γὰρ ὁδὸς ξυνὰ δὲ καὶ ἰώσ,
βουκολιασδῶμεσθα"
but come; the way and the day are thine and mine to share;
let us make country song.

(*Id.* 7, 35 f.)

¹⁷ The halfway location was a typical temporal feature in journeys and is usually accompanied with an external object (e.g. here a grave). Cf. *Id.* 2, 76.: ἤδη δ' εὔσα μέσαν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν, ἅ τὰ Λύκωνος ("and when I come already midway on the road, where Lycon is"). See also CAMERON 1963: 299 with n. 30 and more recently HATZIKOSTA 2005: 238 f.

¹⁸ It should be noticed that the temporal period is also different, given that the Vergilian episode occurs late in the day (cf. "aut si *nox* pluuiam ne colligat ante ueremur", *Ecl.* 9, 63), whereas the Theocritean incident takes place during the midday (cf. Σιμιχίδα, πᾶ δῆ τὴ μεσομέριον πόδας ἔλκεις, *Id.* 7, 21).

¹⁹ Cf. *Id.* 7, 35 f.: ἀλλ' ἄγε δῆ, ξυνὰ γὰρ ὁδὸς ξυνὰ δὲ καὶ ἰώσ,/ βουκολιασδῶμεσθα· τᾶχ' ὦτερος ἄλλον ὄνασει ("but come; the way and the day are thine and mine to share;/ let us make country song, and each, maybe, shall profit the other").

²⁰ Moeris' course is actually a typical visit to the new landowner in order to pay his rent in kind. Nevertheless, it is the result of a violent and enforced confiscation which was entirely responsible for the loss of his farm and for his current social status (i.e. *colonus*, namely a tenant farmer in his old farm). See also CLAUSEN 1994: 266 with n. 2.

Here, Vergil's dependence on Theocritus is exclusively based on the direct way in which Moeris requests Lycidas that they should stop singing (*desine*), reflecting the way in which Simichidas suggests Lycidas to begin singing (βουκολιασδώμεσθα)²¹. Nonetheless, Vergil alters the situation by reversing the invitation, which is no longer an invitation for singing, but an immediate order to end the singing performance²². The Greek pastoral world is carefree, peaceful and immune to any external threat and consequently it enables its herdsmen to spend unlimited time in music and song²³. Instead, the Roman pastoral world is now threatened by historical reality and for that reason Moeris is obliged to focus on other issues and leave aside music and singing²⁴. In other words, the historical reality does or does not ensure herdsmen the authority for singing; and this, in turn, shows not only the antithetical situation in which Theocritean and Vergilian characters are engaged, but also the antithesis between Theocritean and Vergilian pastoral.

It should be clear enough by now that the introductory lines, the lines which deal with Moeris' halfway location along with the concluding lines of the *Eclogue* are entirely based on *Idyll* 7, which Vergil recalls through the *oppositio in imitando* technique. More specifically, Moeris' destination (i.e. town), the halfway location on Moeris' journey and Moeris' refusal for singing are all based on reversed Theocritean subjects. In other words, the central subjects in *Eclogue* 9 are based on reversed subjects from *Idyll* 7 and in view of that *Eclogue* 9 can actually be considered a reversed *Idyll* 7 or a reversed *Thalysia*²⁵.

Yet, even a reversed *Idyll* 7 can hardly describe the gloomy atmosphere in Italian country which is associated with the hard historical reality (i.e. land-confiscations). Instead, *Eclogue* 1 whose subject is also associated with the land-confiscations constitutes a more suitable source for Vergil who draws on it by reversing its elements²⁶.

Eclogue 1 opens with the evicted Meliboeus who is surprised watching the secure Tityrus lying carefree while the land-confiscations are ongoing (*Ecl.* 1, 1–4) in contrast to *Eclogue* 9 where the secure herdsman Lycidas is surprised

²¹ For the term βουκολιασδώμεσθα and its meaning, see e.g. HUNTER 1999: 5–12 and esp. 7.

²² It is worth mentioning that *Ecl.* 9, 66 f.: “desine plura, puer, et quod nunc instat agamus;/ carmina tum melius, cum venerit ipse, canemus” also reverses *Ecl.* 5, 19: “sed tu desine plura, puer: successimus antro”, where Mopsus' counter-suggestion for singing in a cave is eventually accepted by Menalcas before the singing begins (cf. COLEMAN 1977: 272), reinforcing in that way the suggestion that *Eclogue* 9 is largely based on the *oppositio in imitando* technique.

²³ Cf. *Id.* 7, 35: ξυνὰ γὰρ ὁδοῦς ξυνὰ δὲ καὶ ἄωϋς (“the way and the day are thine and mine to share”).

²⁴ Cf. *Ecl.* 9, 66 f.: “et quod nunc instat agamus/ carmina tum melius, cum venerit ipse, canemus”.

²⁵ Cf. BERG 1974: 139–142 and esp. 140.

²⁶ For Vergil's self-reference and “internal” self-reference, see THOMAS 1986: 182–185. See also above n. 9.

encountering the expelled Moeris, who is forced to leave Roman country and travel in town (*Ecl.* 9, 1)²⁷. The *deus*' order which secures Tityrus' land enabling him to compose pastoral music in *Eclogue* 1 ("pascite ut ante boves, pueri; summittite tauros", *Ecl.* 1, 45)²⁸ contrasts with the new owner's order in *Eclogue* 9, which is the veteran's order to Roman herdsmen for leaving their land ("haec mea sunt; ueteres migrate coloni", *Ecl.* 9, 4)²⁹. The *fagus* under which Tityrus is reclined in *Eclogue* 1 ("Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi/ silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena", *Ecl.* 1, 1 f.) contrasts with the old and broken *fagi* in *Eclogue* 9 ("veteres, iam fracta cacumina, fagos", *Ecl.* 9, 9)³⁰; and finally, Meliboeus' unconfident and pessimistic comment on the herdsmen's fate ("his nos consevimus agros!/ insere nunc, Meliboe, piros, pone ordine vitis", *Ecl.* 1, 72 f.) is in contrast to Lycidas' confident and optimistic comment about the herdsmen's future ("insere, Daphni, piros: carpent tua poma nepotes", *Ecl.* 9, 50)³¹. These antitheses show that the disaster, which the land-confiscations have caused in the Italian countryside and its herdsmen in *Eclogue* 1, continues throughout *Eclogue* 9 with the notable difference that there are now some optimistic sings given that there is no chaos, no hopeless flight and unhappy peace has returned to the country³². In other words, the less optimistic atmosphere which runs through *Eclogue* 1 is actually reversed in the less pessimistic atmosphere which runs through *Eclogue* 9³³ and in that sense *Eclogue* 9 can be considered a reversed *Eclogue* 1.

To sum up, *Eclogue* 9 is a poem whose creation is largely based on the *oppositio in imitando* technique and specifically on reversed Theocritean and Vergilian elements. Vergil originally draws on *Idyll* 7 by reversing its joyful character to create the gloomy atmosphere which runs through *Eclogue* 9 because of the land-confiscations. Nonetheless, even the reversed *Idyll* 7 can hardly describe the disorder which land-confiscations caused in the Italian countryside and for

²⁷ See also SEGAL 1981: 278 who observes that the secure herdsman Lycidas tries to console his expelled friend Moeris in emphatic contrast to the self-centred Tityrus, who does not care for Meliboeus' fate.

²⁸ Cf. e.g. WRIGHT 1983: 114. See also COLEMAN 1977: 81.

²⁹ Cf. HUBBARD 1998: 119. See also *Ecl.* 1, 46: "ergo tua rura manebunt" where Meliboeus observes that Tityrus will be able to keep his own land in contrast to *Ecl.* 9, 4: "haec mea sunt" where the herdsman recalls the veteran's order which stresses that Moeris' land is now lost.

³⁰ Cf. HUBBARD 1998: 119 f.

³¹ It is generally accepted that the Vergilian texts can receive either optimistic or pessimistic readings as well as some between those polarities. See e.g. JOHNSON 1976: IX and ZIOLKOWSKI 1993: 238 f. For the optimistic and pessimistic atmosphere which runs through the *Eclogue*, see e.g. HARDY 1990 and more recently PERKELL 2001.

³² Cf. CLAUSEN 1994: 266 who also considers Moeris' journey to the city in order to offer his goats to the new landowner slavish and embittered by memory.

³³ Cf. e.g. SEGAL 1981: 293. For an optimistic reading of *Eclogue* 9 see e.g. ALPERS 1996: 170 f.

that reason Vergil further draws on *Eclogue* 1, whose elements which are also used in *Eclogue* 9 are again reversed. The result is a less negative *Eclogue* in the collection about the land-confiscations, where in emphatic contrast to *Eclogue* 1 the historical reality (*negotium*) has already fulfilled its attack on the Roman pastoral world and its idyllic existence (*otium*). In conclusion, *Eclogue* 9 is not only a reversed *Idyll* 7 but also a reversed *Eclogue* 1 which in turn reinforces further the suggestion that *Eclogue* 1 was first written³⁴. Furthermore, the Vergilian self-reference is not only a mere literary instrument for highly allusive statement especially when it operates within a single literary text³⁵; but, it is also a crucial literary device whose role and function along with the *oppositio in imitando* technique significantly contribute to the composition of the *Eclogue*³⁶. Finally, the *oppositio in imitando* technique lays emphasis on the Vergilian *doctrina*, while its use obliquely reflects Vergil's intention to rival Theocritus by creating the Roman *Thalysia* (i.e. *Eclogue* 9) which rivals and surpasses the Greek *Thalysia* (i.e. *Idyll* 7)³⁷.

University of Cyprus, Nicosia

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALPERS 1996: P. ALPERS, *What Is Pastoral?*, Chicago 1996.
 BECKER 1999: A.S. BECKER, *Poetry as Equipment for Living: A Gradual Reading of Vergil's Ninth Eclogue*, *Classics Ireland* VI 1999, pp. 1–22.
 BERG 1974: W. BERG, *Early Virgil*, London 1974.
 BOWIE 1985: E.L. BOWIE, *Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus*, *CQ* XXXV 1985, pp. 67–91.
 BRIGGS 1981: W.W. BRIGGS, JR., *A Bibliography of Virgil's 'Eclogues' (1927–1977)*, *ANRW* II 31, 2 (1981), pp. 1267–1357.
 BROWN 1981: E.L. BROWN, *The Lycidas of Theocritus' Idyll 7*, *HSCPh* LXXXV 1981, pp. 59–100.
 CAMERON 1963: A. CAMERON, *The Form of the Thalysia*, in: *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*, Torino 1963, pp. 291–307.
 GIPOLLA 1962: G. GIPOLLA, *Political Audacity and Esotericism in the Ninth Eclogue*, *AClass* V 1962, pp. 48–57.
 CLAUSEN 1994: W.V. CLAUSEN, *Virgil. Eclogues with an Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1994.

³⁴ It should be noticed that there were many attempts to establish the chronological relation between *Eclogues* 1 and 9 without any of them being entirely satisfactory and convincing (cf. e.g. RUDD 1976), even though there is also a strong tendency which clearly favours the priority of *Eclogue* 9. For a detailed discussion of the relationship and chronology between *Eclogues* 1 and 9 see e.g. WALTZ 1927; OPPERMAN 1932; HANSLIK 1955; OTIS 1964: 131–134; and SEGAL 1981, esp. 292–297.

³⁵ Cf. THOMAS 1986: 182 f.

³⁶ See also e.g. *Ecl.* 5, 85–87: “Hac te nos fragili donabimus ante cicuta;/ haec nos ‘formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin’/ haec eadem docuit ‘cuium pecus? an Meliboei?’”, where Vergil quotes the opening lines of *Eclogues* 2 and 3.

³⁷ For the suggestion that *Eclogue* 9 is a Roman *Thalysia*, see PARASKEVIOTIS 2009: 254–267.

- COLEIRO 1979: E. COLEIRO, *An Introduction to Vergil's Bucolics with a Critical Edition of the Text*, Amsterdam 1979.
- COLEMAN 1977: R. COLEMAN, *Vergil. Eclogues*, Cambridge 1977.
- CONINGTON 2009: J. CONINGTON, P. *Vergili Maronis Opera with a Commentary*, vol. I: *The Eclogues and Georgics*, Cambridge 2009 [first edn. 1857].
- DONLAN 1978: W. DONLAN, *The Classical World Bibliography of Vergil*, New York 1978.
- DOVER 2000: K.J. DOVER, *Theocritus. Select Poems Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Bristol 2000.
- GIANGRANDE 1967: G. GIANGRANDE, 'Arte allusiva' and Alexandrian Poetry, CQ XVII 1967, pp. 85–97.
- GOW 1952: A.S.F. GOW, *Theocritus. Edited with a Translation and Commentary*, vols. I–II, Cambridge 1952.
- HANSLIK 1955: R. HANSLIK, *Nachlese zu Vergils Eclogen I und IX*, WS LXVIII 1955, pp. 5–19.
- HARDY 1990: R.B. HARDY, *Vergil's Epitaph for Pastoral. Remembering and Forgetting in Eclogue 9*, SyllClass II 1990, pp. 29–38.
- HATZIKOSTA 2005: S.G. HATZIKOSTA, *Θεοκρίτου Ειδύλλια. Ειδύλλια I-VII: Εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια*, Athens 2005.
- HENDERSON 1998: J. HENDERSON, *Virgil, Eclogue 9: Valleydiction*, PVS XXIII 1998, pp. 149–176.
- HUBBARD 1998: T.K. HUBBARD, *The Pipes of Pan. Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*, Michigan 1998.
- HUNTER 1999: R.L. HUNTER, *Theocritus, a Selection. Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*, Cambridge 1999.
- JOHNSON 1976: W.R. JOHNSON, *Darkness Visible: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*, Berkeley 1976.
- LAWALL 1967: G. LAWALL, *Theocritus' Coan Pastoral. A Poetry Book*, Washington 1967.
- NEUMEISTER 1975: C. NEUMEISTER, *Vergils 9. Ekloge im Vergleich zu Theokrits 7. Idyll*, in: H. PATZER (et al.) (eds.), *Dialogos. Für Harald Patzer zum 65. Geburtstag von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, Wiesbaden 1975, pp. 177–185.
- OPPERMANN 1932: H. OPPERMANN, *Vergil und Octavian: zur Deutung der ersten und neunten Ekloge*, Hermes LXVII 1932, pp. 197–219.
- OTIS 1964: B. OTIS, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*, Oklahoma 1964.
- PAPANGHELIS 1995: T.D. PAPANGHELIS, *Από τη βουκολική εντοπία στην πολιτική ουστοπία*, Athens 1995.
- PARASKEVIOTIS 2009: G.C. PARASKEVIOTIS, *Vergil's Use of Greek and Roman Sources in the Eclogues*, Ph.D. Diss., Leeds 2009.
- PERKELL 2001: C.G. PERKELL, *Vergil Reading His Twentieth-Century Readers: A Study of Eclogue 9*, Vergilius XLVII 2001, pp. 64–88.
- PUTNAM 1970: M.C.J. PUTNAM, *Vergil's Pastoral Art. Studies in the Eclogues*, Princeton 1970.
- RUDD 1976: N. RUDD, *Architecture. Theories about Virgil's Eclogues*, in: IDEM, *Lines of Enquiry. Studies in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge 1976, pp. 119–144.
- SEATON 1912: R.C. SEATON, *Apollonius Rhodius. The Argonautica with an English Translation*, London 1912.
- SEGAL 1981: C.P. SEGAL, *Tamen Cantabitis, Arcades: Exile and Arcadia in Eclogues One and Nine*, in: IDEM, *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral. Essays on Theocritus and Vergil*, Princeton 1981, pp. 271–300.
- THOMAS 1986: R.F. THOMAS, *Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference*, HSCPh XC 1986, pp. 171–198.
- VIAN 1974–1981: F. VIAN, *Apollonios de Rhodes. Argonautiques. Texte établi et commenté*, vols. I–III, Paris 1974–1981.
- WALTZ 1927: R. WALTZ, *La I^e et la IX^e Bucolique*, RBPh VI 1927, pp. 31–58.
- WILLIAMS 1971: F. WILLIAMS, *A Theophany in Theocritus*, CQ XXI 1971, pp. 137–145.
- WRIGHT 1983: J.R.G. WRIGHT, *Vergil's Pastoral Programme: Theocritus, Callimachus and Eclogue 1*, PCPhS XXIX 1983, pp. 107–160.
- ZIOLKOWSKI 1993: T. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Virgil and the Moderns*, Princeton 1993.

ARRUNTIUS STELLA, L'ORGANISATEUR DES JEUX DE NÉRON

par

SEBASTIAN RUCIŃSKI

Le protagoniste de cet article faisait partie d'une élite du pouvoir largement entendue sous le règne de la dynastie julio-claudienne et ses descendants ont au moins gardé ce statut. Sous Néron, il joua un certain rôle politique collaborant activement avec l'empereur à l'organisation des jeux. Ces derniers, déjà sous la République étaient un élément important de la vie publique romaine et gagnaient en importance chaque décade. La politique accompagnait toujours de près ces rassemblements de masses aussi bien sous la République où elles regroupaient les électeurs potentiels que sous le principat où les empereurs romains légitimaient leur pouvoir face à la foule réunie¹. Le règne de Néron est un exemple particulier parce que cet empereur tenait à obtenir le soutien des masses à travers les jeux et les spectacles théâtraux. Le rôle d'organisateur des jeux impériaux qui devaient éblouir les spectateurs par leurs richesses et splendeur, frapper par leur ingéniosité technique et témoigner de la générosité impériale était donc particulièrement important du point de vue politique².

LE TÉMOIGNAGE DE TACITE

Les informations de base dont nous disposons au sujet d'Arruntius Stella nous sont fournies par Tacite qui dans le treizième livre de ses *Annales* mentionne les nominations faites en 55 : «Praefectura annonae Faenio Rufo, cura ludorum, qui a Caesare parabantur, Arruntio Stellae, Aegyptus C<laudio> Balbillo

¹ A. CAMERON, *Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*, Oxford 1976, pp. 157–192 et 271–296; T. WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*, London–New York 1992; A. FUTREL, *Blood in the Arena. The Spectacle of Roman Power*, Austin 1997, pp. 44–51, cf. 79–93; R.C. BEACHAM, *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*, New Haven–London 1999, pp. 45–196; C. RICCI, *Gladiatori e attori nella Roma giulio-claudia. Studi sul senatusconsulto di Larino*, Milano 2006, pp. 77–87.

² BEACHAM, *Spectacle...* (n. 1), pp. 197–254; cf. J. KOLENDO, *À la recherche de l'ambre baltique. L'expédition d'un chevalier romain sous Néron*, Warszawa 1981, pp. 30–41.

permittuntur»³. Nous pouvons nous douter que la nomination d'Arruntius Stella était liée aux célébrations spéciales de la victoire de l'armée romaine en Arménie, commandée par Cn. Domitius Corbulon⁴. La preuve en est peut-être une *tessera spectaculorum*, c'est-à-dire le jeton qui autorisait l'entrée aux jeux. Sur le revers, il y a une courte légende *V.A.* qui peut être interprétée de la sorte: *V(ictoria) A(rmeniaca)* ou *A(ugusti)* et la représentation de la déesse Victoire vue de profil gauche⁵. Les circonstances de la nomination restent assez mystérieuses et s'inscrivent dans le contexte du conflit grandissant entre Néron et sa mère Agrippine la Jeune qui dans la rivalité entre les coteries impériales a été accusée de complicité dans le complot contre son fils. Au lendemain d'une nuit tragique quand Néron réfléchissait à l'assassiner, elle a récupéré pour un certain temps son influence et a fait nommer aux postes importants des gens unis à elle⁶. L'extrait de Tacite cité ci-dessus mentionne justement ces nominations.

Bien que l'historien romain le suggère, il ne nous donne pourtant pas de réponse à deux questions concernant l'organisateur des jeux impériaux. Il ne résulte pas de l'extrait cité quelle position formelle il occupait dans le système

³ Tac. Ann. XIII 22, 1. Voir M. ROSTOWZEW, *Tessere di piombo inedite e notevoli della collezione Francesco Gnechchi a Milano e la cura munerum*, Rivista italiana di numismatica e scienze affini XV 1902, p. 160; IDEM, *Römische Bleitesserae. Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig 1905 (Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte 3), p. 46; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR² A 1150*; G.W. HOUSTON, *Roman Imperial Administrative Personnel during the Principates of Vespasian and Titus (A.D. 69–81)*, Chapel Hill 1971 (Diss. Univ. of North Carolina), p. 544, n° 530; B.W. JONES, *Domitian and the Senatorial Order. A Prosopographical Study of Domitian's Relationship with the Senate, A.D. 81–96*, Philadelphia 1979, p. 136, n° 545; G. ALFÖLDY, *Senatoren aus Norditalien*, dans: *Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIEGL su Epigrafia e ordine senatorio. Roma, 14–20 maggio 1981*, Roma 1982, vol. II, p. 337, n° 5; IDEM, *Städte, Eliten und Gesellschaft in der Gallia Cisalpina. Epigraphisch-historische Untersuchungen*, Stuttgart 1999, pp. 294–295, n° 5; M.A. CAVALLARO, *Spece e spettacoli. Aspetti economici-strutturali degli spettacoli nella Roma giulio-claudia*, Bonn 1984, pp. 117 suiv.; S. DEMOUGIN, *Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens (43 av. J.-C.–70 ap. J.-C.)*, Rome 1992, p. 433, n° 521; S. PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti Stellae sub officio ad calcem*, dans: G. PACI (ed.), *Ἐπιγραφαί. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini*, Tivoli 2000, vol. II, pp. 679 suiv. = IDEM, *Epigrafi, Epigrafia, Epigrafisti. Scritti vari editi e inediti (1956–2005) con note complementari e indici*, Roma 2006, vol. II, pp. 1171 suiv.; S. RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores ludorum à la base de tesserae spectaculis*, dans: S. RUCIŃSKI, C. BALBUZA, Ch. KRÓLCZYK (éds), *Studia Lesco Mrozewicz ab amicis et discipulis dedicata*, Poznań 2011, pp. 347 et 355 suiv.

⁴ Cf. Tac. Ann. XIII 7–9.

⁵ *Tesserarum urbis Romae et suburbi plumbeorum sylloge*, edidit M. ROSTOWZEW, St-Petersbourg 1903 [= *Tess. Syll.*], n° 527; ROSTOWZEW, *Tessere di piombo...* (n. 3), p. 161; IDEM, *Römische Bleitesserae...* (n. 3), pp. 49 suiv.; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR² A 1150*.

⁶ Pour plus d'informations sur ces événements, voir: H. PAVIS D'ESCURAC, *La Préfecture de l'annone. Service administratif impérial d'Auguste à Constantin*, Rome 1976, p. 322, n. 2; R.A. BAUMAN, *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*, London–New York 1992, pp. 194–198; V. RUDICH, *Political Dissidence under Nero. The Price of Dissimulation*, London–New York 1993, pp. 263 suiv.; M. GRIFFIN, *Seneca. A Philosopher in Politics*, Oxford 2003, p. 85; EADEM, *Nero. The End of Dynasty*, London–New York 2000, p. 113.

du pouvoir romain, et surtout quel était son titre officiel. Tacite nous parle seulement de la surveillance de l'un des aspects de l'administration romaine qu'était la *cura ludorum* qui incluait les devoirs liés à l'organisation des jeux. Puisque cette question n'est pas tranchée, malgré des affirmations souvent univoques dans la littérature sur ce sujet, la question de l'appartenance sociale d'Arruntius Stella reste aussi ouverte. La première des questions traitée, c'est-à-dire les bases formelles du rôle qu'Arruntius Stella jouait auprès de Néron, suscite des controverses parmi les chercheurs⁷. Nous pouvons envisager trois possibilités différentes – Arruntius Stella en 55 pouvait exercer la *cura ludorum* en tant que :

- a) *curator ludorum*⁸;
- b) *procurator ludorum*⁹;
- c) mandataire extraordinaire de l'empereur sans un titre officiel¹⁰.

CURATOR LUDORUM, LA CURA LUDORUM EXTRAORDINAIRE OU PROCURATOR LUDI

Le texte de Tacite ne résout pas ce problème, d'après qui, toutes les trois possibilités sont plausibles. L'indication qui permettrait de résoudre ce dilemme était cherchée déjà sur l'une des *tesserae spectaculorum* mentionnées ci-dessus,

⁷ Prenant en main presque chaque ouvrage dans lequel une attention plus au moins grande était consacrée au personnage en question, le lecteur peut trouver des affirmations assez univoques. Personne pourtant n'a essayé d'avertir que la thèse présentée avait des alternatives. Cette situation fait naître aussi des paradoxes sous forme de changements brusques et infondés d'avis de certains chercheurs – voir S. DEMOUGIN, *L'Ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens*, Rome 1988, pp. 618 suiv., n. 181 et EADEM, *Prosopographie...* (n. 3), p. 433, n° 521.

⁸ T. MOMMSEN, *Römische Staatsrecht*, Leipzig 1887–1888, vol. II, p. 951, n. 3 = IDEM, *Le Droit public romain*, Paris 1984–1985, vol. V, p. 238, n. 3; ROSTOWZEW, *Tessere di piombo...* (n. 3), pp. 160–162; IDEM, *Römische Bleitesserae...* (n. 3), pp. 49 suiv.; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR*² A 1150; H. HILL, *Nobilitas in the Imperial Period*, *Historia* XVIII 1969, p. 248; HOUSTON, *o. c.* (n. 3), p. 544, n° 530, cf. pp. 343–345, n° 237; ALFÖLDY, *Senatoren...* (n. 3), p. 337, n° 5; IDEM, *Städte...* (n. 3), pp. 294 suiv., n° 5; CAVALLARÒ, *o. c.* (n. 3), pp. 117 suiv. avec n. 283; F. COARELLI, *Il Foro Boario. Dalle origini alla fine della repubblica*, Roma 1987, p. 151; IDEM, *Aemiliana*, dans: E.M. STEINBY (éd.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae [= LTUR]*, Roma 1993, vol. I, p. 19; PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), pp. 674 et 679 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1168 et 1171; Ch. BRUUN, *Der Kaiser und die stadtrömischen curae: Geschichte und Bedeutung*, dans: A. KOLB (éd.), *Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis. Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich. Akten der Tagung an der Universität Zürich, 18.–20.10.2004*, Berlin 2006, p. 111; cf. E. KORNMANN, *Curatores*, *RE* IV 2 (1901), col. 1798.

⁹ H.-G. PFLAUM, *Les Procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, Paris 1950, pp. 42 et 51; DEMOUGIN, *L'Ordre...* (n. 7), pp. 618 suiv., n. 181; cf. RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* (n. 3), pp. 347 suiv.

¹⁰ O. HIRSCHFELD, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, Berlin ²1905, p. 287, n. 3; E. GROAG, *Prosopographische Einzelheiten*, *WSt* XXV 1903, p. 321; DEMOUGIN, *Prosopographie...* (n. 3), p. 433, n° 521; R.R. NAUTA, *Poetry for Patrons. Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*, Leiden 2002 (*Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 206), p. 212; cf. KORNMANN, *o. c.* (n. 8), col. 1798.

laquelle sur l'avers représente sans doute le génie d'une rivière et une légende en partie abîmée: *ARR(vntivs?)*. Sur le revers, nous retrouvons la Victoire et l'abréviation *CVR(ator)*. Selon Michel ROSTOWZEW, il faudrait admettre que cette *tessera* a été frappée pour les besoins des jeux organisés par Arruntius Stella qui conformément à la légende citée plus haut exerçait sa fonction pourvu du titre de curateur¹¹.

Une telle conclusion éveille pourtant des doutes essentiels parce que la charge de curateur responsable de l'organisation des jeux nous est connu uniquement par la mention de Suétone se rapportant au règne de Caligula et par quelques *tesserae spectaculorum* sur lesquelles apparaissent les noms des curateurs avec diverses représentations et une abréviation identique *CVR*. ROSTOWZEW est d'avis que ces dernières prouvent que la fonction existait déjà auparavant, sans doute sous Auguste et certainement sous Tibère. En plus, tous les curateurs dont nous connaissons bien l'appartenance sociale, appartenaient à l'ordre sénatorial¹². Est-ce que Arruntius Stella y appartenait aussi? Tous les chercheurs rejettent en pratique une telle possibilité et admettent qu'unir le titre de curateur à l'appartenance à l'ordre équestre était une exception caractéristique seulement du règne de Néron¹³. Cette conclusion est basée en fait sur une observation uniquement. Tacite mentionnant la nomination, place Stella en compagnie strictement équestre de Faenius Rufus, nommé préfet de l'annone d'alors et le préfet du prétoire plus tard ainsi qu'en compagnie de Tiberius Claudius Balbillus, nommé préfet de l'Égypte¹⁴. Otto HIRSCHFELD propose une solution semblable et suit littéralement le message de Tacite. Hirschfeld formule une thèse sur la fonction extraordinaire d'Arruntius Stella, ce qui n'est pas du tout contradictoire avec l'opinion selon laquelle celui-ci était chevalier¹⁵.

Tandis que sous Auguste et Tibère les curateurs sénatoriaux s'occupaient de l'organisation des jeux au nom de l'empereur, au plus tard sous Claude ce

¹¹ *Tess. Syll.* n° 526 = R. GARRUCCI, *Dissertationi archeologiche di vario argomento*, Roma 1864, p. 103; ROSTOWZEW, *Tessere di piombo...* (n. 3), p. 161; IDEM, *Römische Bleitesserae...* (n. 3), pp. 49 suiv.; *PIR*¹ A 946; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR*² A 1150; P. VON ROHDEN, *Arruntius 25, RE* II 1 (1895), col. 1265; HOUSTON, *o. c.* (n. 3), p. 544, n° 530, n. 5; CAVALLARO, *o. c.* (n. 3), p. 117; cf. n. 8.

¹² M. Antistius Labeo (*Tess. Syll.* n° 513); C. Annius Pollio (*Tess. Syll.* n° 514); T. Cornelius Paetus (*Tesserarum urbis Romae et suburbii plumbeorum sylloge. Supplementum* I^o, edidit M. ROSTOWZEW, St.-Petersbourg 1903 [= *Tess. Syll. Suppl.*], n° 514c); Herennius Rufus (*Tess. Syll.* n° 516); P. Tettius Rufus (*Tess. Syll.* n° 517); A. Vitellius (K. REGLING, ad H. DRESSSEL, *Römische Bleimarken*, *ZfN* XXXIII 1922, pp. 125 suiv.); cf. *Tess. Syll.* n°s 521–523, 525–526; *Tess. Syll. Suppl.* n°s 514a–b; voir ROSTOWZEW, *Tessere di piombo...* (n. 3), pp. 161–164; IDEM, *Römische Bleitesserae...* (n. 3), pp. 47–52; CAVALLARO, *o. c.* (n. 3), pp. 118 suiv.; RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* (n. 3), pp. 345–356.

¹³ Voir n. 8.

¹⁴ ROSTOWZEW, *Tessere di piombo...* (n. 3), p. 160; GROAG, *Prosopographische...* (n. 10), p. 322; DEMOUGIN, *Prosopographie...* (n. 3), p. 433, n° 521, cf. p. 478 suiv., n° 577; p. 447–449, n° 538; cf. RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* (n. 3), pp. 347 et 355.

¹⁵ Voir n. 10; cf. GRIFFIN, *Seneca...* (n. 6), p. 85; EADEM, *Nero...* (n. 6), p. 113.

rôle appartenait en partie aux affranchis impériaux pourvus du titre de procureur, pour passer encore sous le même règne dans les mains des chevaliers. Ces changements nous sont connus grâce aux légendes de quelques *tesserae spectaculorum* mentionnant quelques-uns de ces procureurs. L'un d'entre eux était certainement affranchi impérial¹⁶. De ce règne, nous connaissons aussi Sulpicius Rufus, *procurator ludi*. Il appartenait à l'ordre équestre et fut victime des épurations qui avaient lieu après la mort de Messaline¹⁷. C'est pourquoi, Hans-Georg PFLAUM a contesté la valeur du témoignage qu'est la *tessera* attribuée à Arruntius Stella et portant une légende concise voire d'interprétation incertaine et a avancé une hypothèse que celui-ci exerçait en qualité de *procurator ludi*. Cet office aurait appartenu au *cursus honorum* équestre inclus à la catégorie des *sexagenarii*¹⁸. La tradition liée à ce titre restait vivante parce qu'au moins jusqu'aux temps du règne de l'empereur Domitien où l'*Amphitheatrum Flavium* a été construit, le rôle des organisateurs des jeux était finalement confié aux chevaliers portant le titre de *procurator ludi magni et ludi matutini*¹⁹. Nous pouvons nous douter que le titre de procureur indiquait un lien avec l'empereur au nom duquel était exercée la *cura ludorum*.

AUTRES ORGANISATEURS DES JEUX DE NÉRON

Les tentatives de vérifier les théories ci-dessus s'appuyant sur l'analyse d'autres personnes connues, lesquelles, mis à part Arruntius Stella, organisaient les jeux sous Néron, ne donnent pas de résultats satisfaisants. Man(lius?) For(tunatus?) est connu uniquement par la légende se trouvant sur le revers d'une *tessera*. Nous connaissons sa datation exacte grâce à l'avvers portant le nom de l'empereur d'alors: *NERO CAESAR*²⁰. Ce n'était sans doute pas l'unique jeton parce que s'est conservé jusqu'à nos jours un certain nombre de jetons semblables contenant les noms des officiers mais l'impossibilité de les identifier et dater les exclut de nos considérations. Le deuxième personnage est un Iulianus, sous le patronage duquel s'est tenue une expédition à la mer Baltique entreprise par un chevalier romain dont le but consistait à récolter de l'ambre,

¹⁶ *Tess. Syll.* n^{os} 530, 532, 534–548; cf. 524 et 531; ROSTOWZEW, *Tessere di piombo...* (n. 3), pp. 159 suiv.; IDEM, *Römische Bleitesserae...* (n. 3), pp. 50–52; RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* (n. 3), pp. 347 et 351.

¹⁷ *Tac. Ann.* XI 35, 3; PFLAUM, *Les Procurateurs...* (n. 9), pp. 42 et 51; RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* (n. 3), p. 347.

¹⁸ Voir n. 9.

¹⁹ P. ex. *CIL* XI 5213 = *ILS* 1338 (Fulginae); *CIL* VIII 7039 = *ILS* 1437 (Cirta); PFLAUM, *Les Procurateurs...* (n. 9), p. 51; IDEM, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, Paris 1960–1961, vol. III, pp. 1027 suiv.; RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* (n. 3), p. 348.

²⁰ *Tess. Syll.* n^o 531; cf. RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores ludorum* (n. 3), p. 356.

très populaire à Rome et destiné à donner les jeux plus de magnificence²¹. Les chercheurs l'identifient avec Claudius Iulianus qui après la mort de Néron a été promu à la fonction de commandant de la flotte de Misène et prit part à la guerre civile de 69 en tant que commandant des gladiateurs²². Si cette identification est juste, l'organisateur des jeux de Néron appartenait certainement à l'ordre équestre et PFLAUM est d'avis qu'il occupait aussi le poste de *procurator ludi*²³.

L. ARRUNTIUS STELLA, CONSUL EN 101 (?)

Des perspectives de recherches différentes apparaissent quand nous prenons en considération le fait qu'au I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C., il y avait plusieurs personnages portant le nom d'Arruntius Stella et leurs relations réciproques sont l'objet des conjectures et des spéculations des chercheurs modernes. Le plus célèbre parmi eux était L. Arruntius Stella, poète et consul suffect plutôt en 101 qu'en 102. Il est connu par de nombreuses mentions chez Stace et chez Martial – des poètes romains d'alors avec lesquels il maintenait de vives relations jouant le rôle de leur ami et patron influent²⁴. Il était originaire de Padoue²⁵ mais possédait une maison à Rome, dans le quartier de Subure²⁶, et enrichit son patrimoine se fiançant à Violentilla – une riche veuve originaire de Naples qui était elle aussi la propriétaire d'un grand immeuble

²¹ Plin. *Nat.* XXXVII 45; KOLENDO, *À la recherche...* (n. 2), pp. 13–17 et 59–105; RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores ludorum* (n. 3), pp. 347 suiv.

²² Tac. *Hist.* III 57, 2; 76, 1; cf. 77, 3; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR*² C 893; PFLAUM, *Les Carrières...* (n. 19), vol. I, pp. 91 suiv., n° 38; vol. III, p. 1027; KOLENDO, *À la recherche...* (n. 2), pp. 18–20; CAVALLARO, *o. c.* (n. 3), p. 120; RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* (n. 3), pp. 347 suiv.

²³ PFLAUM, *Les Carrières...* (n. 19), vol. III, p. 1027; cf. KOLENDO, *À la recherche...* (n. 2), pp. 18 suiv., cf. 34 suiv.

²⁴ Voir *PIR*¹ A 947; P. VON ROHDEN, *Arruntius 26*, *RE* II 1 (1895), coll. 1265 suiv.; E. GROAG, dans: *PIR*² A 1151; R. SYME, *People in Pliny*, *JRS* LVIII 1968, p. 144 = IDEM, *Roman Papers* [= *RP*], vol. II, Oxford 1979, p. 709; IDEM, *Eight Consuls from Patavium*, *PBSR* LI 1983, pp. 102 et 114 = IDEM, *RP*, vol. IV, Oxford 1988, pp. 373 et 385 suiv.; HILL, *o. c.* (n. 8), pp. 248 suiv.; HOUSTON, *o. c.* (n. 3), pp. 343–345, n° 237; D. VESSEY, *Aspects of Statius' Epithalamion*, *Mnemosyne* XXV 1972, pp. 172–187; IDEM, *Statius and the Thebaid*, Cambridge 1973, pp. 17–20; IDEM, *Pliny, Martial and Silius Italicus*, *Hermes* CII 1974, p. 110; P. WHITE, *The Friends of Martial, Statius, and Pliny, and the Dispersal of Patronage*, *HSCPh* LXXIX 1975, pp. 267–272; JONES, *Domitian...* (n. 3), p. 98, n° 31; ALFÖLDY, *Senatoren...* (n. 3), p. 338, n° 16; IDEM, *Städte...* (n. 3), p. 297, n° 17; R.P. SALLER, *Martial on Patronage and Literature*, *CQ* XXXIII 1983, p. 247; L. DURET, *Dans l'ombre des plus grands: II. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de la latinité d'argent*, *ANRW* II 32, 5 (1986), pp. 3237–3240; E. RODRÍGUEZ-ALMEIDA, *Il Ludus de morte Claudii (Apocolocyntosis), un rebus storico-letterario*, *MEFRA* CVIII 1996, p. 257, n. 54; PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), pp. 677–679 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1170 suiv.; NAUTA, *Poetry...* (n. 10), pp. 211 suiv.; IDEM, *Statius in the Silvae*, dans J.J.L. SMOLENAARS, H.-J. VAN DAM, R.R. NAUTA (éds.), *The Poetry of Statius*, Leiden–Boston 2008 (*Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 306), p. 153–155; J. LEBERL, *Domitian und die Dichter. Poesie als Medium der Herrschaftsdarstellung*, Göttingen 2004 (*Hypomnemata* 154), p. 101.

²⁵ Mart. I 61, 3 suiv.

²⁶ Ibid. XII 2 (3), 9–12.

romain²⁷. À la même époque, il assumait la fonction de *XVvir sacris faciundis*²⁸, pour obtenir le consulat en 101(?)²⁹. Grâce aux mentions de Stace et de Martial, nous savons que L. Arruntius Stella organisa lui aussi des jeux, et ceci – semble-t-il – deux fois. Stace mentionne les premiers d'entre eux, organisés en 89 alors que Domitien célébrait son triomphe sur les Daces. Martial parle de ceux de 93 qui étaient liés au retour de l'empereur de la campagne contre les Sarmates et étaient financés par L. Arruntius Stella lui-même³⁰. Stace mentionne parmi les nombreuses qualités de son ami son excellente origine et son appartenance à une famille patricienne («*patriciis maioribus ortum/ nobilitas gavisa tulit*»³¹). Cette information peut être importante pour nous si nous admettons suivant les opinions de plusieurs chercheurs que ce consul aurait pu être le fils ou plutôt le petit-fils de l'Arruntius Stella des temps de Néron. Cette supposition suggère l'appartenance à l'*ordo senatorius* du plus ancien de ces deux personnages, contestant ainsi les avis de nombreux chercheurs qui optaient pour l'ordre équestre de l'organisateur des jeux de 55³². Évidemment, comme les liens de famille des personnages qui nous intéressent ne sont qu'une conjecture basée sur la coïncidence de leurs noms, il est possible qu'ils aient été des parents éloignés (il y avait deux branches distinctes de la même famille)³³. La solution à ce

²⁷ Stat. *Silv.* I 2, 145–160. Cf. F. SARTORI, *Le ricchezze di Stella e Violentilla*, Index XIII 1985, pp. 201–221; A. CANOBBIO, *Sulla cronologia del V libro di Marziale*, Athenaeum LXXXII 1994, pp. 545 suiv.; P. WATSON, *Martial on the Wedding of Stella and Violntilla*, Latomus LVIII 1999, pp. 348–356.

²⁸ Stat. *Silv.* I 2, 176 suiv.

²⁹ Mart. XII 2 (3), 10; *CIL* VI 1492 = *ILS* 6106 (Roma). Voir HOUSTON, *o. c.* (n. 3), pp. 343 suiv., n° 237; SYME, *People...* (n. 24), p. 144 = IDEM, *RP* (n. 24), vol. II, p. 709; IDEM, *Eight...* (n. 24), pp. 102 et 114 = IDEM, *RP* (n. 24), vol. IV, pp. 373 et 385 suiv.; W. ECK, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian. Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluß der Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter*, München 1970, pp. 148 suiv., n. 152; F. Zevi, *Un frammento dei Fasti Ostienses e i consolati dei primi anni di Trajano*, *PP XXXVII* 1979, pp. 196 suiv.; ALFOLDY, *Senatoren...* (n. 3), p. 338, n° 16; IDEM, *Städte...* (n. 3), p. 297, n° 17; cf. H. HALFMANN, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Göttingen 1979, p. 118, n° 23.

³⁰ Stat. *Silv.* I 2, 178–181; Mart. VIII 78; NAUTA, *Poetry...* (n. 10), pp. 211 suiv.; PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), pp. 678 suiv. = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1170 suiv.; LEBERL, *o. c.* (n. 24), pp. 268 suiv.; de triomphe de Domitien voir B. W. JONES, *The Emperor Domitian*, London–New York 2002, pp. 150–153; P. SOUTHERN, *Domitian. Tragic Tyrant*, London–New York 1997, pp. 98 et 108.

³¹ Stat. *Silv.* I 2, 70–72; voir aussi 172. Cf. S. MRATSCHEK-HALFMANN, *Divites et praepotentes. Reichtum und soziale Stellung in der Literatur der Prinzipatszeit*, Stuttgart 1993, p. 359, n° 282. R. SYME (*The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, p. 52, n. 21; cf. IDEM, *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958, vol. II, p. 666; IDEM, *Eight...* [n. 24], p. 113 = IDEM, *RP* [n. 24], vol. IV, p. 385; GROAG, *Prosopographische...* [n. 10], p. 322) doute de la valeur de ce témoignage pour pouvoir établir l'appartenance d'Arruntius Stella aux patriciens à l'époque de Domitien, ce qui s'applique encore plus à ses ancêtres.

³² GROAG, *Prosopographische...* (n. 10), p. 322; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR*² A 1150; SYME, *Eight...* (n. 24), p. 113 = IDEM, *RP* (n. 24), vol. IV, p. 385; DEMOUGIN, *Prosopographie...* (n. 3), p. 433, n° 521; GRIFFIN, *Seneca...* (n. 6), p. 85, n. 2.

³³ Il faut souligner qu'ici le *cognomen* «Stella» est très rare – voir I. KAJANTO, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, p. 338; HOUSTON, *o. c.* (n. 3), p. 544, n° 530, n. 6.

problème peut être de supposer que la famille avançait dans la structure sociale sur la vague de décisions des Flaviens qui créaient une nouvelle élite du pouvoir³⁴. Une promotion sociale pouvait se rapporter aussi bien au consul de 101 qu'à son père mais déjà sous le règne de la nouvelle dynastie³⁵.

L. ARRUNTIUS STELLA ET DEUX PLAQUETTES BRUNES

Les mentions se trouvant sur deux plaquettes brunes se rapportent sans doute à l'un des personnages ci-dessus. La première d'entre elles, s'est conservée seulement dans des copies faites à la Renaissance parce que son original a disparu. La deuxième, retrouvée il y a relativement peu de temps, a été publiée par Silvio PANCIERA, ce qui est devenu pour ce chercheur le prétexte pour réexaminer les deux textes :

Sub L. Arruntio Stella | navis harenaria quae | servit in Aemilianis | redemptore |
L. Mucio Felice³⁶.

L. Arrunti | Stellae | sub officio | ad calcem³⁷.

Les deux inscriptions sont liées entre elles non seulement par un nom identique qui apparaît dans les deux textes mais aussi par le fait qu'elles sont gravées dans le même matériau. D'autre part toutes deux ont été retrouvées dans des rivières; la première venait sans doute du Tibre, la deuxième a été repêchée dans un fleuve aux alentours de Naples³⁸. La première plaquette est devenue pour les chercheurs l'objet d'une discussion initiée par H. DRESSSEL, éditeur du texte dans le *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* qui a avancé la thèse selon laquelle L. Arruntius Stella mentionné dans l'inscription doit être identifié au consul de 101 qui selon le témoignage de Stace et de Martial organisait les jeux à Rome en

³⁴ Voir Tac. *Hist.* II 82, 2; Suet. *Vesp.* 9, 2; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 9, 9.

³⁵ GROAG, *Prosopographische...* (n. 10), p. 322; HILL, *o. c.* (n. 8), pp. 248 suiv.; SYME, *Tacitus* (n. 31), vol. II, p. 666; IDEM, *Eight...* (n. 24), p. 113 = IDEM, *RP* (n. 24), vol. IV, p. 385 (admet l'idée que la promotion à l'ordre sénatorial pouvait avoir lieu déjà sous Claude); HOUSTON, *o. c.* (n. 3), pp. 544, n° 530 et 343 suiv., n° 237; ECK, *o. c.* (n. 29), pp. 33, n. 14 et 108, n. 87; ALFÖLDY, *Städte...* (n. 3), p. 297, n° 17, cf. pp. 294 suiv., n° 5; DEMOUGIN, *L'Ordre...* (n. 7), pp. 611, 618 suiv. avec n. 181; EADEM, *Prosopographie...* (n. 3), p. 433, n° 521; J. HENDERSON, *A Roman Life. Rutilius Gallicus on Paper and in Stone*, Exeter 1998, pp. 108 et 140, n. 241; cf. PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), p. 677 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, p. 1170.

³⁶ *CIL* XV 7150 (Roma); cf. GROAG, *Prosopographische...* (n. 10), pp. 321 suiv.; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR*² A 1150; E. GROAG, *Arruntius 25*, *RE* Suppl. I (1903), col. 141; DEMOUGIN, *Prosopographie...* (n. 3), p. 433, n° 521.

³⁷ *AE* 2000, 348 = PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), pp. 671–684 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1167–1175.

³⁸ IDEM, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), pp. 671–674 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1167 suiv.

89 et en 93³⁹. Edmund GROAG s'étend plus longuement sur cette question optant pour l'identification du personnage de l'inscription à l'Arruntius Stella des temps de Néron⁴⁰. Il s'est référé à la phrase *sub L. Arruntio Stella*, laquelle selon lui indiquait que le dépositaire du pouvoir ne disposait d'aucun titre officiel et que son rôle avait un caractère extraordinaire. GROAG se référait ainsi à la conception d'Otto HIRSCHFELD⁴¹. Il croyait aussi que la *navis harenaria* mentionnée dans l'inscription était utilisée pour transporter avant tout du sable et des matériaux nécessaires à la construction d'une installation destinée aux jeux des gladiateurs. Cette barque naviguait sur le Tibre, et c'est ce à quoi se rapporte l'expression *in Aemilianis*, toponyme localisé de diverses manières par les chercheurs contemporains⁴². L'inscription elle-même devait sûrement témoigner de l'usage officiel aussi bien de la barque que de sa charge et grâce à cela, elle appartenait à la catégorie des *tabellae immunitatis*⁴³. Le texte de l'inscription récemment publiée s'inscrit dans le contexte d'une construction – le bateau servait à transporter de la chaux (*ad calcem*), extraite peut-être aux alentours de Naples. Le caractère officiel de son activité indique l'expression *sub officio*⁴⁴.

Les thèses de GROAG ont été soumises à l'examen de Silvio PANCIERA. D'un côté, il a soutenu la thèse selon laquelle il était difficile d'identifier les personnages de l'inscription au consul de 101 par le fait qu'il aurait organisé les jeux de 89 et de 93. Pourtant, il ne l'a pas fait au nom de l'empereur mais dans le cadre d'une carrière sénatoriale typique, à la quelle sa haute origine patricienne le prédestinait. Il remarque aussi que la signification du témoignage surtout de celui de Stace est très confuse et il n'est pas sûr que L. Arruntius Stella organisait officiellement les jeux de 89 ou participait seulement à cette entreprise. Par contre, en 93, le consul de 101 aurait pu être préteur, ce qui expliquerait l'organisation des jeux dans le cadre d'une carrière sénatoriale⁴⁵. D'un autre côté, analysant

³⁹ H. DRESSEL ad *CIL* XV 7150; cf. n. 30. J. LE GALL (*Il Tevere. Fiume di Roma nell'antichità*, a cura di C.M. CARPANO e G. PISANI SARTORIO, Roma 2005 [éd. fr. 1953], p. 324, n. 176) a attribué à H. DRESSEL l'idée selon laquelle le consul de 101 était C. Mucius Felix.

⁴⁰ GROAG, *Prosopographische...* (n. 10), pp. 321 suiv.; cf. CAVALLARO, *o. c.* (n. 3), pp. 117 suiv.

⁴¹ Voir n. 10.

⁴² L. QUILICI, *Il Tevere e l'Aniene come vie d'acqua a monte di Roma in età imperiale*, dans: *Il Tevere e le altre vie d'acqua del Lazio Antico*, Roma 1986, p. 212; COARELLI, *Il Foro...* (n. 8), pp. 147–155; IDEM, *Aemiliana...* (n. 8), pp. 18 suiv.; E. RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA, *Aemiliana*, dans: *LTUR* (n. 8), vol. I, pp. 19 suiv.; LE GALL, *o. c.* (n. 38), p. 324; PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), p. 675 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1168 suiv.

⁴³ COARELLI, *Il Foro...* (n. 8), p. 151; PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), p. 675 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, p. 1169.

⁴⁴ IDEM, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), pp. 676 suiv. = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1169 suiv.; cf. BRUUN, *o. c.* (n. 8), p. 111.

⁴⁵ PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), p. 679 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, p. 1171. Voir aussi J. TOUTAIN, *Ludi*, dans: Ch. DAREMBERG, E. SAGLIO (éds.), *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, vol. III 2, Paris 1904, p. 1374; G. VILLE, *La Gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de*

le texte qu'il a publié lui-même, il a indiqué que ni les aspects techniques ou paléographiques du texte, ni l'expression *sub officio*, ni enfin l'usage du bateau (*ad calcem*) ne permettaient de trancher la question de savoir si les travaux de construction menés sous le contrôle de L. Arruntius Stella dataient de l'époque de Néron ou de celle de Domitien. De plus, les travaux menés et le transport des matériaux de construction pourraient aussi bien se rapporter à d'autres services de l'administration romaine que celui de *cura ludorum* (*cura aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque publicorum, cura alvei Tiberis et cloacarum Urbis, cura aquarum*)⁴⁶. Il est significatif que toutes les fonctions qu'il a énumérées appartiennent au *cursus honorum* sénatorial et peuvent témoigner d'étapes inconnues de la carrière du consul de 101. Une telle identification est aussi suggérée par la coïncidence du nom (L. Arruntius Stella) alors que le *praenomen* de l'organisateur des jeux impériaux de 55 reste inconnu.

ARRUNTIUS STELLA (?) DE 41

Un autre Arruntius Stella qui peut être identique à l'organisateur des jeux de Néron ou à son parent proche est un personnage mentionné par Flavius Josèphe dans la description des événements de 41. Cet auteur dit que peu après l'assassinat de l'empereur Caligula qui fut victime d'un complot tramé dans les cercles de la garde prétorienne, se passèrent des événements dangereux. Des membres d'un régiment spécial de soldats germanis (les *Germani corporis custodes*) avaient envers l'empereur une attitude différente. Ne sachant pas que l'empereur était

Domitien, Rome 1981, p. 164; HENDERSON, *o. c.* (n. 34), p. 140, n. 242; LEBERL, *o. c.* (n. 24), p. 269; R.R. NAUTA, *Die mächtigen Freunde des Spötters Martials und seine Patrone*, dans: W. ECK, M. HEIL (éds.), *Senatores populi Romani. Realität und mediale Präsentation einer Führungsschicht. Kolloquium der Prosopographia Imperii Romani vom 11.–13. Juni 2004*, Stuttgart 2005, p. 219, n. 27; cf. A. STEIN, dans: *PIR*² A 278; VESSEY, *Statius...* (n. 24), p. 20; MRATSCHEK-HALFMANN, *o. c.* (n. 31), p. 359, n° 282. Il faut ajouter que l'opinion autoritaire de PANCIERA: «In considerazione della sua distinta posizione sociale, sembra escluso che egli sia stato chiamato a curare *ludi* dell'imperatore e non suoi propri» – n'est pas largement acceptée, surtout en ce qui concerne les jeux de 89. SYME (*Eight Consuls* [n. 24], p. 114 = IDEM, *RP* [n. 24], vol. IV, p. 385; cf. JONES, *The Emperor...* [n. 30], p. 151) considérait que l'activité d'Arruntius Stella sous Néron et celle du consul de 101 avaient un caractère semblable: «Stella assumed the charge of the games that celebrated Domitian's Sarmatian victory (Martial VIII 78). In a similar function in 55 Arruntius Stella was put on record by the careful historian (*Ann.* XIII 22, 1): Stella's father – or better, the grandfather». L'unique argument pour la thèse de PANCIERA était la haute origine patricienne du consul de 101. Comme il le souligne lui-même, même si Stace ne s'était pas servi d'une exagération poétique, le statut patricien devait être de très fraîche date (voir plus haut). De plus, l'argument contre la thèse du chercheur italien peut être la pratique sous Auguste et Tibère selon laquelle les sénateurs, dont l'un portait le titre de *praetor designatus* (C. Asinius Pollio – voir *Tess. Syll.* 513; cf. RUCIŃSKI, *Curatores...* [n. 3], pp. 348–351), organisaient les jeux au nom de l'empereur ou des personnes de la maison au pouvoir. Domitien pouvait renouer à cette tradition, très commode pour lui parce qu'elle le plaçait au-dessus de l'élite sénatoriale.

⁴⁶ PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), pp. 680–684 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, pp. 1172–1174.

déjà mort, ils voulaient verser jusqu'à la dernière goutte de sang pour le protéger, massacrant tous ses ennemis présumés. Soudainement, ils sont devenus dangereux pour les spectateurs réunis au théâtre. Ils auraient été calmés par un certain Arruntius Stella, qui était venu en compagnie des tribuns de la garde prétorienne et les a informés que poursuivre les combats n'avait plus de sens parce que Caligula était déjà mort⁴⁷. Ce passage de Flavius Josèphe suggère qu'il était d'origine équestre et lié au milieu militaire qui nous est mal connu.

Cette simple information a été développée par T.P. WISEMAN qui voit justement dans cet Arruntius Stella le commandant de la garde prétorienne de cette époque-là, collègue de M. Arrecinus Clemens dont le nom était inconnu jusqu'alors⁴⁸. C'est une thèse importante parce que son acceptation ou son rejet change considérablement notre perspective. L'importance de la thèse de WISEMAN résulte aussi du fait que bien qu'elle ne soit pas encore trop répandue dans la littérature scientifique, elle est pourtant largement diffusée dans les textes de vulgarisation scientifique publiés sur Internet. Il faut dire que Flavius Josèphe n'étant pas expert de la terminologie militaire et administrative des Romains le fait qu'il ne donne pas le titre officiel d'Arruntius Stella ne veut rien dire. Il résulte pourtant de sa narration que le protagoniste de la description jouissait d'une autorité qui suggère une supériorité hiérarchique non seulement sur les Germains mais aussi sur les tribuns de la garde prétorienne. WISEMAN ne tranche pas quelle était la relation entre le préfet du prétoire présumé et l'organisateur des jeux. Il admet l'identification des deux personnages⁴⁹.

LES INTERPRÉTATIONS POSSIBLES

Je pense que la dernière thèse de WISEMAN est inacceptable. Si une seule et même personne était le protagoniste des événements de 41 et de 55, il serait difficile d'expliquer pourquoi Tacite mentionnant les nominations de 55 n'aurait

⁴⁷ Ioseph. *Ant. Iud.* XIX 148. Il faut dire que le nom de ce personnage est le résultat d'une reconstruction moderne parce que les manuscrits apportent des leçons différentes; d'après l'édition de B. NIESE qui a opté dans le texte principal pour la leçon Στήλας Ἀρούντιος il faut noter que le Codex bibliothecae Ambrosianae F 128 donne σύλας; codex Mediceus bibliothecae Laurentianae plut. 69 cod. 10: στείλας; codex Busbekianus: στίλλας; l'édition de W. DINDORF: Παῦλος; par contre le codex Mediceus bibliothecae Laurentianae plut. 69 cod. 10 et le codex Vaticanus gr. n° 984: ἀρούντιος; cf. GROAG, *Prosopographische...* (n. 10), pp. 321 suiv.; P. VON ROHDEN, *Arruntius 24*, *RE II 1* (1895), col. 1265; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR² A 1149*; PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), p. 680 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, p. 1172 avec n. 25.

⁴⁸ T.P. WISEMAN (éd.), Flavius Josephus, *Death of an Emperor*. Translated with an Introduction and Commentary, Exeter 1991, pp. 52 et 69; HENDERSON, *o. c.* (n. 34), p. 140, n. 24; I.A. LUCÉ, *The Praefecti Praetorio of the Julio-Claudian Dynasty*, *Res Historica XXIX* 2010, p. 102, n. 42. Au sujet d'Arrecinus Clemens, voir A. STEIN, dans: *PIR² A 1073*; cf. DEMOUGIN, *Prosopographie...* (n. 3), pp. 345 suiv., n° 422; M. ABSIL, *Les Préfets du prétoire d'Auguste à Commode. 2 avant Jésus-Christ – 192 après Jésus-Christ*, Paris 1997, pp. 129 suiv., n° 7.

⁴⁹ Cf. PANCIERA, *L. Arrunti...* (n. 3), p. 680 = IDEM, *Epigrafi...* (n. 3), vol. II, p. 1172.

dit pas un mot à propos d'un poste antérieur très honorable de l'un des nommés? C'est étrange, surtout si nous prenons en considération le fait qu'à l'égard de son collègue présumé qui commandait la garde et de son fils, tous les deux membres de *gens Arrecina*, il n'a pas manqué de le faire⁵⁰. C'est d'ailleurs l'argument le plus important pour le rejet de la théorie de WISEMAN dans sa totalité. Le deuxième élément qui conteste cette version des événements est une succession assez surprenante des fonctions. La *cura ludorum* pour ce commandant de la garde, même compromis par des soupçons d'un complot contre la vie de son empereur, serait de toute façon une dégradation. Même sous le règne de Néron, le préfet du prétoire pouvait obtenir la préfecture de l'Égypte ou être introduit dans l'ordre sénatorial.

Les contre-arguments ci-dessus disparaissent ou diminuent si nous admettons qu'en 41 et 55 nous avons affaire à deux hommes différents. Le premier d'entre eux pouvait être le père ou l'oncle paternel du second. Nous devrions alors réfléchir à une promotion assez typique dans le cas de l'ordre équestre à celui sénatorial et il faudrait constater que l'histoire déjà mentionnée de la *gens Arrecina* nous fournit une analogie convaincante. Arruntius Stella aurait donc pu devenir en 55 *curator ludorum* en tant que sénateur, conformément aux principes d'octroi de cette charge sous Auguste et Tibère. Ensuite, au début du règne de Vespasien, il aurait pu obtenir le patriciat, ce qui a garanti une brillante carrière à son fils. Ici, apparaît pourtant un problème, à savoir comment réconcilier le statut sénatorial de l'organisateur des jeux sous Néron avec le contexte sans aucun doute équestre dans lequel le place Tacite dans sa narration? Une autre possibilité admet que sous Caligula et Néron, ces individus étaient frères ou bien cousins. L'un d'eux, commandant de la garde sous le règne de Caligula obtint l'accès à l'*ordo senatorius* et a ainsi commencé une prospérité antérieure de la famille étant l'ancêtre du consul de 101 (?). Par contre, Arruntius Stella qui vivait avant l'époque de Néron était représentant de la branche équestre de la famille et ne peut pas être l'ancêtre du consul mentionné ci-dessus.

Il faudrait réfléchir à la version selon laquelle la thèse de WISEMAN est infondée et Arruntius Stella est apparu comme le protagoniste des événements de 41 non pas grâce à la fonction qu'il occupait mais plutôt comme le patron d'Arruntius Evarestus qui dans la narration de Flavius Josèphe aurait annoncé le premier la mort de Caligula⁵¹. La coïncidence qui sans doute n'était pas accidentelle, du gentilice peut en témoigner. Arruntius Stella aurait seulement confirmé l'information obtenue de son affranchi qui pouvait paraître peu crédible aux masses réunies au théâtre et surtout aux Germains courroucés. Les tribuns qui entouraient Arruntius devaient uniquement rendre ses paroles plus convaincantes bien

⁵⁰ Tac. *Hist.* IV 68, 2; cf. S. RUCIŃSKI, *Trois préfets de la Ville de l'empereur Domitien*, Eos XC 2003, pp. 86–92 et 99–102.

⁵¹ Ioseph. *Ant. Iud.* XIX 145–147; A. STEIN, dans: *PIR*² A 1142.

qu'il ne faille pas rejeter la thèse selon laquelle il était l'un des officiers de la garde et faisait sa carrière militaire à la fin de la vie de Caligula⁵². Il n'y a donc plus d'obstacles pour identifier Arruntius de 41 à celui de 55. Confier alors l'organisation des jeux à l'ancien tribun est donc une étape successive naturelle dans la carrière équestre d'autant plus qu'au II^e siècle les *procuratores ludi* étaient issus aussi du cercle des anciens officiers. La reconnaissance des liens existant entre ce chevalier et le sénateur de la fin du I^{er} et du début du II^e siècles est alors possible surtout si nous admettons que le premier d'entre eux était le grand-père du deuxième.

Il reste encore à résoudre le problème de l'interprétation de la *tessera*, laquelle d'après Michel ROSTOWZEW confirme l'exercice de la charge de curateur⁵³. Est-ce qu'Arruntius Stella serait l'unique curateur équestre⁵⁴? Pas forcément. La légende du jeton déjà cité permet de faire de nombreuses identifications. Par exemple, nous connaissons sous le règne d'Auguste deux consuls portant les noms identiques L. Arruntius L. f. L. n. de 22 av. J.-C. et de 6 ap. J.-C. et L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus, consul de 32 ap. J.-C., et aussi préteur appartenant à la *gens Arruntia* du début du principat⁵⁵. C'est pourquoi le personnage mentionné sur la *tessera* pourrait avoir occupé son poste au cours du règne des trois premiers empereurs, sans avoir aucun lien à Arruntius Stella de l'époque de Néron. Les possibilités ne finissent pas ici si l'on prend en considération le fait que l'inscription sur la *tessera* peut être l'abréviation créée selon des règles qui nous sont inconnues mais qui étaient compréhensibles pour les contemporains. Il existe une possibilité que la *tessera* en question se rapporte au consul de 101 qui organisant les jeux liés au triomphe de Domitien pouvait porter le titre de *curator ludorum*⁵⁶

⁵² GROAG, *Prosopographische...* (n. 10), p. 322.

⁵³ Voir n. 5.

⁵⁴ Une conclusion semblable concernant C. Caecilius Oinogenus, connu d'un autre jeton, a été tirée par W.V. HARRIS, *A Julio-Claudian Business Family?*, ZPE CXXX 2000, pp. 263 suiv.; différemment ROSTOWZEW, *Römische Bleitesserae...* (n. 3), p. 48; M. GIOCOLI, G.L. GREGORI, dans: G.L. GREGORI, *Alcune iscrizioni imperiali, senatorie ed equestri nel'Antiquarium Comunale del Celio*, ZPE CXVI 1997, pp. 161–175; P. LE ROUX, *Les sénateurs originaires d'Espagne citérienne (2) : un bilan 1982–2006*, dans : M. L. CALDELLI, G.L. GREGORI, S. ORLANDI (éds.), *Epigrafia 2006. Atti della XIV^e Rencontre sur l'épigraphie in onore di Silvio Panciera con altri contributi di colleghi, allievi e collaboratori*, Roma 2008 (Tituli 9), vol. III, p. 1009; S. RUCIŃSKI, K. ANTCZAK, *Q. Caecilii Oinogeni (Syll. Suppl. 514b, BGU IV 1114, CIL VI 41083-41084)* (à paraître).

⁵⁵ E. GROAG, dans: *PIR*² A 1025–1027, 1029, 1030, 1140 (cf. 1147); cf. R.S. ROGERS, *Lucius Arruntius*, CPh XXVI 1931, pp. 31–45; SYME, *People...* (n. 24), p. 144 = IDEM, *RP* (n. 24), vol. II, p. 709; IDEM, *Eight...* (n. 24), pp. 113–115 = IDEM, *RP* (n. 24), vol. IV, pp. 384–386; Ch. LE ROY, *Timbres amphoriques provenant de Tanis*, BCH XCIX 1975, pp. 245 suiv.; HOUSTON, *o. c.* (n. 3), p. 344, n° 237; GRIFFIN, *Seneca...* (n. 6), p. 85, n. 2.

⁵⁶ RODRÍGUEZ-ALMEIDA, *o. c.* (n. 24), p. 257, n. 54; COARELLI, *Il Foro...* (n. 8), p. 151.

ou *curator triumphii* à l'instar T. Flavius Germanus sous Commode⁵⁷. Par contre, sous le règne de Néron, tenant certainement compte des solutions introduites encore par Claude, l'organisation des jeux appartenait aux procurateurs équestres. Cette conclusion est tout à fait conforme au sens du récit de Tacite.

Université de Casimir le Grand, Bydgoszcz
sebiruc@ukw.edu.pl

⁵⁷ *CIL* XIV 2922 = *ILS* 1420 (Praeneste); PFLAUM, *Les Carrières...* (n. 19), vol. I, pp. 495–500, n° 183.

REMARQUES SUR L'ORIGINE GÉOGRAPHIQUE
ET STATUT SOCIO-JURIDIQUE DES NÉGOCIANTS D'HUILE
ET DE SAUMURE HISPANIQUES

par

ANDRZEJ ŁOŚ

Il est inutile de souligner la contribution des recherches sur le matériel amphorique à notre connaissance de l'histoire économique du monde romain. Elles révèlent d'abord les grands courants commerciaux de l'Empire. Les données récoltées par de nombreux auteurs de travaux sur les amphores autorisent également à écrire l'histoire des divers produits italiens et provinciaux, notamment du vin, de l'huile et des sauces de poisson. A côté des récipients italiens et gaulois, les amphores hispaniques ont fait elles aussi, dans les décennies récentes, l'objet d'études innombrables. Ces études permettent de déterminer les centres de production, la chronologie des circuits commerciaux, les conditions économiques et sociales de production et de diffusion des produits.

L'un des points les plus controversés concerne l'origine géographique et le statut social des commerçants exportant les produits hispaniques dont les noms sont connus par l'épigraphie amphorique. On les retrouve d'abord dans les inscriptions peintes sur les amphores à huile et à saumure de Bétique; par contre, ils n'apparaissent guère dans les *tituli* des récipients hispaniques à vin¹. Il est donc raisonnable de concentrer la recherche sur les négociants d'huile et de saumure.

Depuis la parution de l'article célèbre de F. Zevi sur les amphores romaines², on reconnaît dans les noms de personnes peints sur les récipients à huile et à saumure de Bétique, ceux de *mercatores* originaires d'une façon générale des villes hispaniques. Parmi les chercheurs qui ont réagi à cette interprétation de l'origine géographique des commerçants des produits hispaniques, celui qui a fourni les arguments les plus concrets est G. CAMODECA. Il s'est efforcé de démontrer qu'un certain nombre de *mercatores* mentionnés dans les *tituli* des amphores hispaniques découvertes dans les cités vésuviennes étaient en fait des habitants de

¹ Voir à ce propos ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2000: 247 suiv.

² Zevi 1966.

Pouzzoles. Les noms de certains d'entre eux sont attestés dans la célèbre archive des Sulpicii³.

R. ÉTIENNE et F. MAYET ont affirmé il y a une quinzaine d'années que le monde des marchands de saumure ibérique, souvent originaires d'une ville hispanique, illustre «le dynamisme social autant qu'économique de la société hispano-romaine»⁴. Mais après quelques années, ils ont modifié leur avis: dans leur livre sur les salaisons et sauces de poisson hispaniques publié en 2002, les chercheurs français ont supposé «la présence prépondérante des Italiens dans ce commerce, aux alentours de 80% des individus»⁵. Quant aux marchands d'huile, ÉTIENNE et MAYET ont jugé, au début de la décennie précédente, que les Italiens y occupaient vraisemblablement «une position dominante» et n'avaient laissé «qu'un faible espace à la concurrence provinciale»⁶. Mais ils sont moins clairs dans leur ouvrage sur l'huile hispanique paru en 2004, soulignant que «par rapport à la République, il y a eu certes évolution: le commerce provincial profitant essentiellement à la Bétique reste cosmopolite»⁷.

B. LIOU et A. TCHERNIA ont consacré un article très approfondi à l'interprétation des inscriptions des amphores à huile de Bétique (Dressel 20)⁸. Ils ont étudié d'une manière magistrale aussi bien les estampilles que les *tituli* écrits à l'encre noire. Selon ces chercheurs, les noms plus ou moins abrégés, le plus souvent aux initiales, des estampilles sont ceux des propriétaires des fabriques d'amphores, des *figlinae* qui faisaient partie d'un domaine foncier; ils ont aussi démontré que les noms notés dans les textes δ des inscriptions peintes sur les amphores Dressel 20 se rapportent aux propriétaires/intendants/tenanciers des domaines où l'huile était produite. LIOU et TCHERNIA ont également réussi à prouver qu'il y avait certains points de contact ou même des liens familiaux entre les producteurs d'huile, les fabricants d'amphores et les commerçants exportateurs d'huile dont les noms apparaissent dans les textes β des inscriptions peintes sur les amphores Dressel 20⁹, bien qu'ils s'étonnent de trouver ces points si peu nombreux. Ils sont parvenus à la conclusion que les groupes envisagés auraient formé des milieux distincts, sans doute, «mais non pas vraiment socialement distincts»¹⁰. Les arguments en faveur de cette thèse sont fournis par l'analyse prosopographique des timbres et des inscriptions peintes sur les amphores Dr. 20: il en découle qu'il y avait des propriétaires fonciers,

³ CAMODECA 1992 a: 213, n. 25; 235, n. 85; 1992 b: 144–146; 1993: 38 suiv. Voir aussi PANCIERA 1980: 238 et CHIC GARCÍA 1987: 249.

⁴ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 1998 a: 162 suiv.

⁵ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002: 219. Voir aussi ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2001: 97.

⁶ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2001: 97.

⁷ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 189.

⁸ LIOU, TCHERNIA 1994.

⁹ *Ibidem*. Voir aussi CABALLOS RUFINO 2001: 76–86.

¹⁰ LIOU, TCHERNIA 1994: 138.

c'est-à-dire des représentants des élites de Bétique, à qui il arrivait d'exporter la production aussi bien de leurs propres domaines que d'autres *fundi*. D'après les chercheurs français, le petit nombre de preuves des rapports entre les producteurs et les marchands révèle d'une part une répartition des tâches parmi ceux qui s'occupent de la production, fabrication des amphores et commercialisation de l'huile, et d'autre part une déconcentration de la production et du commerce¹¹.

L'opinion de R. ÉTIENNE et F. MAYET sur «les points de contact» entre les producteurs et les commerçants exportateurs d'huile hispanique est bien différente de celle de LIOU et TCHERNIA. D'après les chercheurs bordelais, «il est aisé de faire des marchands d'huile des affranchis des notables»¹². On doit cependant souligner qu'en insistant sur la prépondérance des anciens esclaves parmi les négociants en huile, ils les classent dans une catégorie sociale plus élevée que celle des marchands de saumure, qui, selon eux, appartenaient d'une façon générale à un milieu social médiocre¹³.

La reconstruction du milieu social des négociants des produits hispaniques proposée par les chercheurs bordelais est assez problématique. L'analyse approfondie de la documentation disponible révèle que les commerçants d'origine servile aussi bien d'huile que de saumure hispanique n'avaient ni le même statut socio-économique ni le même niveau de richesse ni le même niveau de dépendance de leurs patrons. En plus, certains négociants d'huile et de saumure de Bétique, au moins au I^{er} siècle après J.-C., étaient, semble-t-il, de naissance libre. Ainsi, il est difficile de suivre l'avis de R. ÉTIENNE et F. MAYET que les commerçants de produits hispaniques appartenaient, sauf exception, à la catégorie sociale des affranchis¹⁴.

Les cartes de diffusion des amphores de Bétique montrent bien que l'huile et la saumure hispaniques étaient consommées d'abord dans la ville de Rome, les provinces gallo-germaniques et en Bretagne¹⁵. Il faut cependant noter qu'on a découvert un nombre important de récipients à saumure à Pompéi et Herculanium¹⁶. Les amphores portant des inscriptions qui signalent des noms de négociants exportant les produits hispaniques sont fournies d'abord par les fouilles de Rome (Castro Pretorio, Monte Testaccio), des cités vésuviennes (Pompéi, Herculanium), ainsi que par les explorations sous-marines. Ailleurs, on ne les trouve que rarement¹⁷.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 152 suiv.

¹² ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 185.

¹³ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 1998: 156 suiv.; 2001: 90 suiv.; 2002: 219 suiv.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 94.

¹⁵ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002: 181–202; 2004: 197–213.

¹⁶ Sur les amphores de Bétique fouillées dans les villes vésuviennes, voir TCHERNIA 1964 et MANACORDA 1977.

¹⁷ Sur les *mercatores* dont les noms apparaissent sur les amphores découvertes dans les provinces nord-occidentales, voir HELLY, LE BOT-HELLY, LIOU 1986; DESBAT, LEQUÉMENT, LIOU 1987; MARTIN-KILCHER 1994 et 2001; EHMIG 1996 et 2003: 243–268; EHMIG, LIOU, LONG 2004.

À partir des données des *tituli* amphoriques, on a dressé plusieurs listes de marchands d'huile et de saumure de Bétique. Le «*corpus*» le plus exhaustif de négociants exportant l'huile hispanique a été établi par R. ÉTIENNE et F. MAYET¹⁸. C'est aussi aux chercheurs bordelais que nous devons le catalogue des *mercatores* de saumure hispanique¹⁹. Les listes d'ÉTIENNE et MAYET sont le point de départ de mon analyse.

* * *

Comme on l'a constaté ci-dessus, la position des négociants hispaniques dans le commerce de l'huile et de la saumure de Bétique n'est pas claire. Parmi les *mercatores* exportant des produits ibériques, on retrouve, bien sûr, un certain nombre d'Italiens; on insiste aussi sur la position importante des marchands gaulois, notamment ceux de Narbonne, dans le commerce de l'huile et de la saumure de Bétique²⁰. L'hypothèse de la présence massive de négociants italiens et gaulois parmi les exportateurs des produits hispaniques permettrait de comprendre pourquoi les liens recherchés par B. LIOU et A. TCHERNIA sont si peu nombreux entre les propriétaires des domaines où l'on produisait l'huile hispanique et d'une part, ceux des *figlinae* où l'on fabriquait les amphores et d'autre part les commerçants en huile. Mais le problème est plus complexe. Bien qu'il soit évident que les marchands hispaniques ont certainement joué un rôle moins important qu'on ne l'affirme souvent, il ne faut pas d'autre part surestimer la position des Italiens.

La recherche de l'origine géographique des commerçants de produits hispaniques n'a pas suscité, à mon avis, toutes les réflexions qu'il était possible de formuler. On devrait d'abord analyser la répartition des origines des marchands par siècle²¹. C'est à ouvrir sous de nouvelles formes un dossier qui semblait suffisamment parcouru que je voudrais engager ces remarques.

Il y a à dire un certain nombre de choses simples et fondamentales sur les inscriptions des amphores hispaniques, qui sont maintenant des certitudes, et sur lesquelles l'accord doit être général. Je n'ai pas l'intention de les aborder ici par le

¹⁸ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 164–175. Les auteurs de *L'huile hispanique* ont complété le catalogue des marchands, publié par RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA dans son ouvrage sur le Mont Testaccio (RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA 1984). Sur les inscriptions peintes des amphores Dr. 20, publiées après la parution de RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA 1984, voir HELLY, LE BOT-HELLY, LIOU 1986; LIOU 1987; RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA 1994; MARTIN-KILCHER 1994; REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, AGUILERA MARTÍN 2001, 2003, 2007 et 2010.

¹⁹ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002, 215–219.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 96 suiv.; ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 184 suiv., 188; voir aussi CHRISTOL 2002.

²¹ Je ne partage pas le scepticisme d'ÉTIENNE ET MAYET (2004: 185) à l'égard de la possibilité d'une telle recherche sans fouille exhaustive du Mont Testaccio. Je ne comprends pas pourquoi les négociants notés dans les inscriptions peintes sur les amphores des couches du Mont Testaccio datées du I^{er} siècle auraient été originaires d'autres parties de l'Empire que les marchands dont les noms apparaissent dans les documents du Castro Pretorio et récoltés sur des épaves sous-marines.

détail. Mais il est nécessaire, avant d'analyser plus méthodiquement le problème de l'origine géographique et du statut social des commerçants d'huile et de saumure hispaniques, de faire un bref résumé des résultats des recherches menées sur la signification des inscriptions des récipients à huile et à saumure de Bétique.

Les inscriptions des récipients à huile hispaniques (Dressel 20), provenant essentiellement de Bétique, sont les plus nombreux et les plus étudiés des textes amphoriques datés de l'époque impériale. Les récipients Dressel 20 portent deux types d'inscriptions: (a) des estampilles imprimées dans l'argile avant la cuisson, le plus souvent sur l'anse de l'amphore, ou à la base de l'anse, ou sur la panse, qui donne le nom des *figlinae* et celui de leur propriétaire; (b) des *tituli* écrits à l'encre noire et en assez petits caractères sur le col et sur la panse de l'amphore. Ceux-ci comportent quatre registres superposés: α , sur le col, est composé de signes numériques qui désignent le poids, en livres romaines, de l'amphore vide; β , en haut de la panse, porte un nom au génitif en lettres capitales, souvent développé, avec *duo* ou *tria nomina*: il est aujourd'hui évident qu'il s'agit du nom du négociant exportant le produit contenu dans l'amphore; γ , vers le centre de la panse de l'amphore, donne le poids de l'huile qu'elle contient; δ , est un texte à part, oblique, le long de l'anse droite, écrit en toutes petites lettres cursives – il donne le nom d'un domaine et de son propriétaire/intendant/tenancier. Les *tituli* des amphores à huile hispaniques concernaient donc le produit, les producteurs et les commerçants.

Les amphores à saumure de Bétique (il s'agit essentiellement des formes Dressel 7/11, Dressel 12, Beltrán IIA et IIB) portent des inscriptions qu'on peut diviser en deux catégories. Les premières sont très proches des *tituli* des récipients à huile hispaniques: comme ceux-ci, elles sont écrites en petits caractères à l'encre noire et comprennent quatre éléments. Les inscriptions de la seconde catégorie – on les retrouve d'abord sur les amphores à saumure hispaniques découvertes dans les cités vésuviennes²² – sont en plus grandes lettres que les précédentes, le plus souvent à l'encre rouge, mais parfois au charbon. On les plaçait en dessous des *tituli* de la première catégorie, à la base du col et sur le haut de la panse, ou sur le côté opposé du col, ou bien encore par dessus les textes à l'encre noire. Elles comprennent des noms écrits habituellement au datif, souvent réduits à leurs initiales. La plupart des personnes nommées dans les inscriptions des amphores découvertes dans les villes vésuviennes portent des noms caractéristiques de l'anthroponymie pompéienne. Il semble que les noms au datif se rapportent aux destinataires des produits contenus dans les amphores, qui étaient soit des consommateurs soit des commerçants de détail²³. Dans

²² Mais voir aussi les observations de MARTIN-KILCHER (2002: 345–349) sur les inscriptions des amphores hispaniques à saumure découvertes à Mayence.

²³ Voir CURTIS 1988: 38. On retrouve un exemple de tels commerçants dans une scholie pseudo-acronienne d'Horace. Ils achètent les olives à des grossistes installés au forum de la ville où se passe l'achat, et ensuite les vendent au détail, aux alentours: Ps.-Acr. *ad Hor. Sat.* I 6, 86.

certains cas, il pourrait aussi s'agir de marchands en gros²⁴, mais toujours à l'échelle locale ou régionale. Les *mercatores* qui s'occupaient du commerce méditerranéen de grande envergure ne sont pas attestés dans les inscriptions de cette catégorie, au moins dans le cas de celles des amphores découvertes à Pompéi et Herculaneum. Il faut les chercher parmi les personnes notées dans les textes β des inscriptions écrites à l'encre noire.

Comme on l'a signalé ci-dessus, selon R. ÉTIENNE et F. MAYET, les commerçants de saumure hispanique appartenaient à un milieu social inférieur²⁵. C'est d'abord une présence massive d'affranchis parmi ces *mercatores*, déduite de la coloration sociale de leurs surnoms, qui a amené les chercheurs bordelais à une telle conclusion²⁶. ÉTIENNE et MAYET ont ajouté, il est vrai, un autre argument en faveur de leur opinion: les commerçants de saumure d'une façon générale ne faisaient pas partie du collège des sévirs augustaux; ils n'appartenaient donc pas à l'élite des affranchis. À mon avis, il faudrait nuancer les conclusions d'ÉTIENNE et MAYET sur le statut social des commerçants de sauces de poisson et de *salsamenta* hispaniques. D'abord la proportion d'affranchis parmi les *mercatores* de saumure est moins importante que ne l'ont jugé les chercheurs français. Ils ont déterminé que 32% d'entre eux portaient des surnoms non-latins²⁷, en principe helléniques, qui renvoient à un statut servile primitif²⁸. Contrairement à eux, je pense que ce chiffre est plutôt bas. La preuve est fournie en comparant le résultat établi par ÉTIENNE et MAYET à des statistiques relatives à l'ensemble des habitants connus de Pompéi, au personnel de l'archive des Sulpicii de Pouzzoles et aux négociants notés dans les textes β des inscriptions des amphores à huile de Bétique et datées du I^{er} et du II^e siècle après J.-C. On n'a pas besoin d'expliquer en détail pourquoi il est utile de se servir de l'ensemble des habitants connus de Pompéi comme point de référence dans une recherche socio-onomastique: Pompéi est l'une des villes du monde romain dont les habitants sont le mieux connus. Quant à l'archive des Sulpicii, elle nous révèle les usages onomastiques

²⁴ PANELLA (1974–1975: 156, n. 32) est la première à avoir émis cette idée, mais elle n'a avancé aucun argument en faveur de sa théorie. Il est cependant possible que son intuition ne l'ait pas trompée: voir ŁOŚ 2001: 87 suiv.

²⁵ Voir ci-dessus, p. 295.

²⁶ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002: 215–218.

²⁷ On parvient à une proportion plus élevée (36,4%) si on laisse de côté les personnes dont les surnoms sont illisibles ou ne sont pas marqués et si on complète la liste des commerçants de saumure, établie par ÉTIENNE ET MAYET, des noms qui apparaissent soit dans les inscriptions publiées après la parution ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002 (les inscriptions des amphores de Mayence: EHMIG 2003: 257, n. 49; 261, n. 59; 263, n. 66; 265, n. 73) soit dans les textes omis par les chercheurs bordelais.

²⁸ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002: 219. Sur la valeur sociale des surnoms grecs, voir SOLIN 1971: 121–137 et DUTHOY 1989.

dans le milieu des hommes d'affaires de Pouzzoles sous les Julio-Claudiens²⁹, donc à l'époque où la ville flegréenne était le vrai centre des *negotia* à l'échelle méditerranéenne³⁰. En ce temps-là, la plupart des grands «affairistes» actifs dans le port campanien étaient encore d'origine italienne. C'est ainsi qu'il m'a paru particulièrement intéressant de confronter la proportion de personnes portant un surnom non-latin – c'est-à-dire avant tout un surnom de langue grecque – rencontrées dans les tablettes des *Sulpicii* à des statistiques fondées sur les listes des marchands notés dans les inscriptions peintes sur les amphores hispaniques.

Les noms des marchands de saumure de Bétique apparaissent sur les amphores datées, sauf exception, du I^{er} siècle après J.-C.³¹ Par contre, la plupart des négociants en huile connus appartiennent au II^e siècle après J.-C.³² La répartition de la documentation du commerce d'huile par siècle s'explique par l'état des fouilles du Mont Testaccio qui fournissent le plus grand nombre de noms de marchands d'*oleum Hispanum* – ni les sondages de H. DRESSEL de la fin du XIX^e siècle, ni les travaux menés par les archéologues espagnols depuis les années 1980 n'ont atteint les niveaux préantoniniens du Mont Testaccio. R. ÉTIENNE et F. MAYET ont établi que 48 marchands d'huile hispanique connus appartenaient au I^{er} siècle et 260 au siècle suivant³³. Il est à noter que la proportion des *mercatores* d'huile portant des surnoms non-latins est beaucoup plus élevée au II^e qu'au I^{er} siècle. D'où vient cette différence? Reflète-t-elle un changement de la composition sociale du milieu des *negotiatores olearii*? Pour répondre à cette question, on devrait analyser séparément les données du I^{er} et du II^e siècle.

Pour obtenir les résultats les plus clairs, je limiterai mes calculs à des personnes qui portent le gentilice, donc à des citoyens romains³⁴. Je suis parvenu ainsi au tableau suivant³⁵:

²⁹ Sur les hommes d'affaires de Pouzzoles, voir CAMODECA 1979; 1992 b; 1993; 1996: 93–98; D'ARMS 1981: *passim*; PURCELL 1984: 328–330.

³⁰ CAMODECA 1979, 1992 et 1993.

³¹ Voir ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002: 215–219.

³² RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA 1984: 223–232; REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, AGUILERA MARTÍN 2003: 298–308; ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 164–175.

³³ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 185.

³⁴ Ainsi, je ne tiens pas compte d'assez nombreux *peregrini* et esclaves rencontrés dans les tablettes des *Sulpicii*, l'ensemble des inscriptions pompéiennes et les textes des amphores hispaniques. J'ai écarté aussi les citoyens romains dont les *cognomina* ne sont pas marqués ou sont illisibles.

³⁵ J'ai établi les chiffres cités ci-dessous sur la base : (a) du «corpus des *mercatores* de saumure hispanique» d'ÉTIENNE, MAYET (2002: 215–219), complété des noms notés dans *CIL* IV 9375; GIORDANO, CASALE 1990: 342, n. 331; EHMIG 2003: 252–266; (b) de la liste de négociants d'huile hispanique qui a été établie elle aussi par les chercheurs bordelais (ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 164–175); (c) des statistiques de CAMODECA (1999: 28) à partir de la liste de personnes présentes dans les tablettes des *Sulpicii*; (d) de la «cognomen list» de l'ensemble des Pompéiens connus de CASTRÉN (1983: 247–267).

| | Nombre d'individus portant un surnom non-latin | Ensemble des porteurs de surnom |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <i>Mercatores</i> de saumure hispanique du I ^{er} siècle | 24 = 36,4% | 66 |
| <i>Mercatores</i> d'huile hispanique du I ^{er} siècle | 4 = 15,4% | 26 |
| <i>Mercatores</i> d'huile hispanique du II ^e siècle | 73 = 41,2% | 177 |
| Personnel de l'archive des Sulpicii | 106 = 50,9% | 208 |
| Ensemble des Pompéiens connus | 407 = 34,9% | 1165 |

Ces dépouillements statistiques amènent à penser que le pourcentage de porteurs d'un surnom non-latin, et par conséquent d'affranchis, est le plus bas parmi les *mercatores* d'huile hispanique du I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. C'est d'autant plus étonnant qu'au II^e siècle, la proportion de ceux qui portaient des surnoms non-latins avoisine les 41,2%. Peut-on expliquer cette différence importante par un accroissement du rôle des affranchis dans le commerce de l'huile de Bétique au II^e siècle par rapport au siècle précédent³⁶? Mais pourquoi ne pas admettre que leur faible proportion au I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. ne provienne plutôt d'un matériau épigraphique peu représentatif de son époque? La liste de marchands d'huile du I^{er} siècle ne comprend que 26 noms; le chiffre n'autorise pas à tirer de conclusions trop catégoriques³⁷. On ne manquera cependant pas de remarquer que, même si le nombre total de *mercatores* de saumure hispanique connus du I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. est deux fois et demi plus élevé que celui des négociants d'huile de la même période, la proportion de personnes portant des surnoms non-latins dans cette catégorie de commerçants reste inférieure à celle du «corpus» des marchands d'huile du II^e siècle ap. J.-C. Il est à noter qu'elle ne dépasse guère le chiffre relevé parmi l'ensemble des habitants de Pompéi.

Dans le cas de l'archive des Sulpicii, qui se rapporte principalement à des hommes d'affaires, y compris les commerçants, de Pouzzoles sous les Julio-Claudiens, le nombre correspondant s'élève jusqu'à 50,9%. Les renseignements des tablettes des Sulpicii montrent clairement qu'au I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C., le milieu des marchands italiens était dominé par les affranchis: à côté des porteurs de surnoms non-latins, il faudrait compter parmi les anciens esclaves aussi des clients des Sulpicii portant des *cognomina Latina* à coloration servile tels qu'Ampliatius, Faustus, Felicio, Felix, Fortunatus, Iucundus, Primigenius, Primus, Suavis³⁸.

Comme je l'ai déjà mentionné, selon ÉTIENNE et MAYET, le monde des *mercatores* aussi bien d'huile que de sauces de poisson et de salaisons était peuplé

³⁶ Cf. RICO 2003.

³⁷ Cf. ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 185.

³⁸ Cf. CAMODECA 1999: 29.

d'affranchis, mais les premiers appartenait d'une façon générale à un milieu social supérieur à celui des seconds³⁹. Les auteurs de *Trois clés de l'économie de l'Hispanie romaine* n'ont pas commenté le fait que la proportion des porteurs de surnoms non-latins soit beaucoup plus élevée parmi les marchands de saumure du I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. que parmi les négociants en huile de la même période. Ils ont pourtant insisté sur la présence prépondérante des Italiens (aux alentours de 80% des individus) dans le commerce de saumure hispanique⁴⁰. Bien que je pense qu'il soit impossible de définir précisément la proportion des Italiens parmi les marchands de sauces de poisson et de salaisons hispaniques, j'accepte, en principe, l'opinion des chercheurs bordelais sur la domination des Italiens dans ce milieu⁴¹. ÉTIENNE et MAYET ont également calculé que les Hispaniques constituaient 48,39% du total des marchands d'huile de Bétique connus⁴². Aussi, dans ce cas, leurs dénombrements semblent-ils être aléatoires, étant donné l'extrême fréquence des noms de nombreux commerçants d'huile hispanique (p. ex. Aemilii, Attii, Caecilii, Cornelii, Fabii, Pompeii, Valerii) – leurs porteurs pouvaient aussi bien être originaires de Bétique que d'Italie ou même de Narbonnaise⁴³.

En restant dans les limites de la prudence, je suis enclin à présumer que les usages onomastiques reflètent la composition sociale distincte des groupes envisagés. Le nombre négligeable d'individus portant un surnom non-latin parmi les négociants en huile du I^{er} siècle révélerait que, sous les Julio-Claudiens et Flaviens, la proportion d'affranchis était sensiblement moins importante dans le milieu des *negotiatores olearii* qu'entre les marchands de saumure et d'abord entre les hommes d'affaires de Pouzzoles de la même période. La vraie question qui se pose ici est de savoir d'où vient la différence sur le plan onomastique, et par conséquent social, entre les négociants en huile du I^{er} siècle, les marchands de sauces de poisson et de salaisons, le personnel de l'archive des Sulpicii d'une part et les commerçants d'huile de la période antoninienne d'autre part. J'admets, à titre d'hypothèse, qu'en Bétique, contrairement à l'Italie, il y avait encore au I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. de nombreux *mercatores* ingénus. Les commerçants de naissance libre sont bien attestés en Italie au II^e et même au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C. On ne les y rencontre que rarement sous le Haut-Empire. Dès la fin de la République, le monde des négociants

³⁹ Voir ci-dessus, p. 298. On doit cependant noter qu'il y a des chercheurs qui s'efforcent de prouver l'existence des rapports étroits entre les élites hispaniques et les marchands de saumure – voir par exemple GARCÍA VARGAS, MARTÍNEZ MAGANTO 2009: 144–149.

⁴⁰ ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002: 219.

⁴¹ Dans mon article publié il y a quelques années, j'ai souligné l'origine campanienne de plusieurs *mercatores* de saumure hispanique – voir ŁOŚ 2005: 96–101.

⁴² ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2004: 185.

⁴³ En ce qui concerne les marchands d'huile d'Italie et de Narbonnaise, ÉTIENNE et MAYET (*ibidem*) ont établi les chiffres de 26,17% et 20,24%.

du centre de l'Empire est peuplé d'affranchis⁴⁴. Mais il se peut que, dans les provinces hispaniques, sous les Julio-Claudiens et les Flaviens, les *mercatores* ingénus aient joué un rôle plus important qu'en Italie dans la même période. J'ai constaté il y a presque vingt ans que la «montée» des anciens esclaves en Italie à la fin de l'époque républicaine a eu pour cause la croissance des tendances oligarchiques qui s'est déclenchée au sein de la société romaine après la transformation de la *polis* en empire mondial⁴⁵. Il me semble que le processus d'oligarchisation du système social dans les provinces occidentales, y compris hispaniques, a dû s'accomplir moins vite qu'en Italie. Contrairement à l'Italie où, au I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C., presque tous les nouveaux citoyens romains se recrutaient parmi les affranchis, dans les provinces hispaniques on rencontre en même temps parmi ceux-là de nombreux autochtones de naissance libre. Il n'est pas aventureux d'admettre que pour ces autochtones, les activités commerciales étaient un moyen de s'enrichir pour accéder ensuite aux élites locales. Sur ce plan, ils avaient un comportement identique aux affranchis et à leurs descendants⁴⁶. E. GARCÍA VARGAS et J. MARTÍNEZ MAGANTO ont insisté, avec raison à mon avis, sur la contribution des succès des opérations commerciales à la promotion sociale des habitants indigènes de la Bétique:

Muchas de éstas familias dominantes se remontarían a los años finales de la República y habrían logrado un ascenso fulgurante a lo largo del siglo I d. C. gracias, entre otros, a los negocios marítimos. Dicho ascenso fue, en no pocas ocasiones, incluso anterior a la promoción municipal de sus ciudades de origen⁴⁷.

Les immigrants italiens de niveau moyen, qui s'établissaient dans les régions surtout côtières et méridionales, contribuèrent sans doute eux aussi à la mobilité de la société hispano-romaine⁴⁸. Rien n'interdit de penser qu'ils cherchaient, de même que les affranchis et les habitants indigènes de la Bétique, à s'enrichir par les *negotia* et, grâce à des manifestations évergétiques, à s'intégrer à des élites

⁴⁴ ANDREAU (1997: 16 = 1985: 390) a remarqué qu'au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C., les banquiers de métier (les *argentarii*) avaient subi «une incontestable baisse de statut». Elle s'était perçue à travers leur condition juridique. Selon le chercheur français, à l'époque de Cicéron, une bonne moitié des *argentarii* connus étaient des ingénus. La proportion de ceux-ci a diminué considérablement à partir du principat d'Auguste. Désormais, les *argentarii* furent presque tous des affranchis. Je suis convaincu que les conclusions d'ANDREAU sont valables aussi pour le milieu des commerçants italiens.

⁴⁵ ŁOŚ 1995: 1029–1033.

⁴⁶ Voir à ce propos, MELCHOR GIL 2001: 170: «Como ya señalamos anteriormente, las personas libres enriquecidas y los libertos con dinero encontraron en el evergetismo un medio para alcanzar prestigio y *status*, buscando así su propia integración o la de sus descendientes en el *ordo decurionum*».

⁴⁷ GARCÍA VARGAS, MARTÍNEZ MAGANTO 2009: 146. Il est vrai que les historiens espagnoles n'ont analysé que les «carrières» des marchands de saumure, mais, à mon avis, leurs conclusions sont valables aussi pour les négociants en huile.

⁴⁸ Sur l'immigration de l'Italie vers les provinces hispaniques, voir LE ROUX 1995.

locales. Ainsi, au I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C., le profil social des commerçants originaires d'Espagne aurait été bien différent de celui des marchands italiens.

Mais pourquoi la proportion des porteurs de surnoms non-latins parmi les commerçants de saumure du I^{er} siècle est-elle fortement plus élevée qu'entre les négociants en huile de la même période? L'opinion d'ÉTIENNE et MAYET, citée ci-dessus, que les *mercatores* de sauces de poisson et de salaisons appartenaient d'une façon générale à un milieu social inférieur à celui des marchands d'huile me paraît assez vague. Il est à noter que les chercheurs bordelais ont insisté à la fois sur la domination des Italiens parmi les commerçants de saumure et sur le caractère cosmopolite du milieu des négociants en huile. Je pense qu'ils ont bien interprété le cas des *mercatores* de sauces de poisson et de salaisons⁴⁹. Quant aux *negotiatores olearii*, je présume que la présence des Hispaniques fut encore plus importante que ne le jugent ÉTIENNE et MAYET⁵⁰, bien que, contrairement à eux, je ne risquerais pas de la chiffrer. Je ne veux pas dire ainsi que les Italiens ne jouèrent aucun rôle dans la commercialisation de l'huile de Bétique; on peut certainement identifier parmi les *negotiatores olearii* un certain nombre d'individus originaires des villes italiennes⁵¹, de même que de Narbonnaise. Les uns et les autres, même ensemble, auraient été moins nombreux que les Hispaniques.

Comment, alors, expliquer la domination des Italiens parmi les marchands de saumure et leur présence relativement faible parmi les négociants en huile? Il n'est pas facile de donner une réponse convaincante à cette question. Le commerce des saumures hispaniques a eu une longue tradition. Avant la conquête romaine, il a été aux mains des Phéniciens puis des Puniques. Selon ÉTIENNE et MAYET, au II^e siècle av. J.-C., les marchands originaires de l'Italie du sud ont pris la place des marchands puniques et à partir de ce moment-là, ils ont exercé un monopole jaloux⁵². Contrairement au commerce des sauces de poisson et salaisons, les exportations massives d'huile de provenance hispanique n'ont commencé qu'à l'époque augustéenne. À cette époque, la Bétique est déjà bien intégrée à l'Empire romain, ce que révèle la promotion d'habitants de cette province

⁴⁹ J'ai trouvé un nombre élevé de marchands de saumure originaires des villes campaniennes (ŁOŚ 2005: 96–100). On peut l'interpréter en tant qu'indication de la domination des Italiens dans le commerce des salaisons.

⁵⁰ Je dois avouer que j'ai changé d'avis sur la présence des Hispaniques parmi les marchands d'huile – dans mon article paru il y a quelques années (ŁOŚ 2005), j'ai défendu la thèse de la prépondérance des Italiens aussi bien dans le milieu de *negotiatores olearii* que parmi les marchands de saumure. Je pense maintenant qu'on peut mieux expliquer les usages onomastiques dans les différents groupes de commerçants envisagés dans ce texte, si on admet la domination des Hispaniques parmi les négociants en huile. Plusieurs chercheurs ont récemment abordé le problème de l'origine géographique des négociants d'huile hispanique: voir par ex. MORALES MUÑOZ 2005; ROVIRA GUARDIOLA 2007.

⁵¹ Voir les exemples cités dans mon article mentionné dans la note précédente (ŁOŚ 2005: 98–100).

⁵² ÉTIENNE, MAYET 2002: 218 suiv.

à l'ordre équestre et au Sénat⁵³. Étant donné que sous le Haut-Empire, l'huile hispanique a fait l'objet d'un commerce libre, rien n'autorise à supposer que les propriétaires fonciers de Bétique aient pu préférer vendre l'huile produite dans leurs domaines aux négociants originaires de l'Italie plutôt qu'aux marchands hispaniques, d'autant plus qu'un certain nombre d'entre eux-ci étaient leurs clients. Le début des exportations d'huile ibérique sous Auguste a ouvert une longue période de prospérité économique pour la Bétique. Il est sûr que les élites et les couches moyennes de la société hispano-romaine ont su profiter de l'essor de l'olivier ibérique. L'exportation d'huile était un «*new business*» par rapport au commerce des saumures de Bétique. Il est alors possible que sous le Principat, les commerçants italiens aient été capables de maintenir leur domination dans le commerce des sauces de poisson et des salaisons sans toutefois occuper une position prépondérante dans l'exportation d'huile. L'évolution socio-économique et politique de la Bétique dans les premières décennies de l'Empire a privilégié les marchands d'huile originaires de cette province.

Je suis conscient que cette interprétation est fort spéculative. Mais je ne trouve pas d'autre explication au faible pourcentage de porteurs de surnoms non-latins parmi les négociants d'huile par rapport aux marchands de saumures. On peut bien sûr mettre en doute n'importe quelle interprétation des usages onomastiques des commerçants de produits hispaniques, étant donné le nombre limité de négociants en huile connus pour le I^{er} siècle, mais je pense qu'il est plus fécond, en tout état de cause, d'avancer une hypothèse et de la modifier ensuite si de nouvelles sources sont découvertes.

* * *

Il est probable que la fin de l'immigration d'Italie et la romanisation profonde du Sud de la péninsule Ibérique à l'époque flavienne ont abouti à un ralentissement du dynamisme de la société hispano-romaine sous les Antonins. Au II^e siècle ap. J.-C., les citoyens romains nouveaux en Bétique étaient d'abord des affranchis. Ainsi, les structures sociales de cette province devinrent semblables à celles de l'Italie sous le Haut-Empire⁵⁴. Je pense que la «*montée*» des anciens esclaves, aussi bien en Bétique qu'en Italie, ne révèle pas la mobilité sociale, ce qu'on dit souvent, mais par contre, qu'elle reflète le processus d'oligarchisation du système social. Ce processus a favorisé dans la vie économique les affranchis aux dépens des ingénus n'appartenant pas aux élites⁵⁵. En effet, les commerçants

⁵³ DARDAINE 2001.

⁵⁴ DEMOUGIN (2001: 257) affirme qu'«on peut [...] dire qu'avec l'accession de Trajan au pouvoir suprême triomphait la parfaite assimilation des Hispaniques».

⁵⁵ Le problème a été saisi d'une manière très claire par TCHERNIA (2011: 182 = 1985) dans sa démonstration sur le rôle des prêts de patrons dans les succès économiques des affranchis. Il vaut la

de naissance libre se sont raréfiés, ce qu'on peut déduire, dans le cas de la Bétique, de l'augmentation considérable (de 15,4% à 41,2%) de la proportion de personnes portant un surnom non-latin parmi les marchands d'huile entre le I^{er} et le II^e siècle ap. J.-C.⁵⁶; elle est maintenant assez proche de celle qu'on a établie pour l'arche des Sulpicii de la période julio-claudienne (50,9%).

Ces remarques, vu le nombre limité des négociants en huile connus pour le I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. ainsi que l'insuffisance des recherches sur les usages onomastiques et l'évolution des structures sociales en Bétique au cours des deux premiers siècles de l'Empire, sont condamnées à n'être que des hypothèses à vérifier. Il faudra d'abord que la fouille du Mont Testaccio atteigne les niveaux préantoniniens pour que l'on parvienne à des conclusions plus fiables. Pour l'instant, il faut se contenter de suppositions formulées sur la base des données actuellement disponibles.

Université de la Basse Silésie, Wrocław

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- ANDREAU 1985: J. ANDREAU, *Modernité économique et statut de manieurs d'argent*, MEFRA LIX 1985, pp. 373–410.
- 1997: *Patrimoines, échanges et prêts d'argents : l'économie romaine*, Roma 1997.
- BERNI MILLET 2008: P. BERNI MILLET, *Epigrafía anfórica de la Bética. Nuevas formas de análisis*, Barcelona 2008.
- BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ 1999: J.M. BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ (éd.), *Estudios sobre el Monte Testaccio (Roma)*, vol. I, Barcelona 1999.
- 2001: *Estudios sobre el Monte Testaccio (Roma)*, vol. II, Barcelona 2001.
- 2003: *Estudios sobre el Monte Testaccio (Roma)*, vol. III, Barcelona 2003.
- 2007: *Estudios sobre el Monte Testaccio (Roma)*, vol. IV, Barcelona 2007.
- 2010: *Estudios sobre el Monte Testaccio (Roma)*, vol. V, Barcelona 2010.
- CABALLOS RUFINO 2001: A. CABALLOS RUFINO, *Los recursos económicos de los notables de la Bética*, dans: NAVARRO CABALLERO, DEMOUGIN 2001, pp. 69–87.

peine de la citer *in extenso*: «Mais, bien entendu, on ne prêtait pas à n'importe qui et tout le monde ne trouvait pas de garant. Le plus dur est de commencer: c'est un lieu commun, qu'on retrouve chez Sénèque (*De brev. vitae*, 20, 2 ; *Ep.*, 101, 2) et chez Plutarque (*Moralia*, 787a), de dire qu'il est plus difficile de sortir de la pauvreté que de devenir très riche, et cela n'a rien d'étonnant. Mais il est aussi probable que, pour ces prêts, les liens de clientèle et d'«amicitia» ont joué à plein; l'individu isolé avait sans doute peu de chances d'en obtenir. *Les affranchis étaient au contraire favorisés*» [mes italiques, A. L.]. Voici les vraies raisons de la prédominance économique des anciens esclaves sur les plébéiens de naissance libre! Étant donné que les patrons héritaient au moins une partie des fortunes de leurs affranchis enrichis et parfois tous les biens des anciens esclaves (dans le cas des *liberti* qu'on appelle les Latins Juniens – sur cette catégorie d'affranchis, voir SIRKS 1983), le mécanisme, décrit par le chercheur axois contribuait au renforcement des tendances oligarchiques de la société romaine. Sous la République, le rôle politique de la *plebs ingenua* a favorisé la conservation de sa position économique.

⁵⁶ Voir ci-dessus, p. 300.

- CAMODECA 1979: G. CAMODECA, *La «gens Annia» puteolana in età giulio-claudia: potere politico e interessi commerciali*, Puteoli III 1979, pp. 17–34.
- 1992 a: *L'archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii*, vol. I, Napoli 1992.
- 1992 b: *Per una storia economica e sociale di Puteoli fra Augusto e i Severi*, dans: M. GIGANTE (éd.), *Atti del Convegno Internazionale sulla 'Civiltà dei Campi Flegrei'. Pozzuoli 18–21 ottobre 1990*, Napoli 1992, pp. 137–172.
- 1993: *La società e le attività produttive*, dans: F. ZEVI (éd.), *Puteoli*, Napoli 1993, pp. 31–47.
- 1996: *L'élite municipale di Puteoli fra la tarda repubblica e Nerone*, dans: M. CÉBEILLAC-GERVASONI (éd.), *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire des Gracques à Néron, Actes du colloque international de Clermont-Ferrand, 28–30 novembre 1991*, Napoli 1996, pp. 91–110.
- 1999: *Tabulae Pompeianae Sulpiciorum (TPSulp.)*. Edizione critica dell'archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii, vol. I–II, Roma 1999.
- 2001: *Nuove testimonianze sul commercio marittimo puteolano*, dans: P.A. GIANFROTTA, F. MANISCALCO (éd.), *Forma Maris. Atti Forum di Archeologia Subacquea, Pozzuoli 22–24 settembre 1998*, Napoli 2001, pp. 85–94.
- CARANDINI 1977: A. CARANDINI (éd.), *L'«instrumentum domesticum» di Ercolano e Pompei nella prima età imperiale*, Roma 1977.
- CASTRÉN 1983: P. CASTRÉN, *Ordo populusque Pompeianus. Polity and Society in Roman Pompeii*, Rome 1983.
- CHIC GARCÍA 1987: G. CHIC GARCÍA, *El comercio del aceite de la Astigi romana*, Habis XVII 1987, pp. 243–264.
- 1993: *Los Aelii en la producción y difusión del aceite bético*, MBAH XI 1993, 2, pp. 1–22.
- 2009: *El comercio y el Mediterráneo antiguo*, Madrid 2009.
- CHRISTOL 2002: M. CHRISTOL, *Marchand gaulois et grand commerce de l'huile de Bétique dans l'Occident romain. Quelques données provenant des amphores*, dans: RIVET, SCIALLANO 2002, pp. 325–334.
- CURTIS 1988: R.I. CURTIS, *A. Umbricius Scaurus of Pompeii*, dans: CURTIS 1988–1989, vol. I, pp. 19–50.
- 1988–1989: R.I. CURTIS (éd.): *Studia Pompeiana et Classica in Honour of Wilhelmina F. Jashemski*, vol. I–II, New Rochelle 1988–1989.
- DARDAINE 2001: S. DARDAINE, *La naissance des élites en Bétique*, dans: NAVARRO CABALLERO, DEMOUGIN 2001, pp. 23–44.
- D'ARMS 1981: J.H. D'ARMS, *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge, MA–London 1981.
- DEMOUGIN 2001: S. DEMOUGIN 2001, *Conclusions*, dans: NAVARRO CABALLERO, DEMOUGIN 2001, pp. 251–258.
- DESBAT, LEQUÉMENT, LIOU 1987: A. DESBAT, R. LEQUÉMENT, B. LIOU, *Inscriptions peintes sur amphores: Lyon et Saint-Romain-en-Gal*, Archæonautica VII 1987, pp. 141–166.
- DES BOSCS-PLATEAUX 2001: F. DES BOSCS-PLATEAUX, *Les sénateurs hispaniques et le pouvoir d'Auguste à Trajan*, dans: NAVARRO CABALLERO, DEMOUGIN 2001, pp. 203–211.
- DUTHOY 1989: R. DUTHOY, *Cognomen est omen? Quelques jalons pour une anthroponymie sociale du monde romain*, dans: M.-M. MACTAUX, E. GENY (éd.), *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque: Religion, anthropologie et société*, vol. 2: *Anthropologie et société*, Besançon–Paris 1989, pp. 183–205.
- EHMIG 1996: U. EHMIG, *«Garum» für den Statthalter – Eine Saucenamphore mit Besitzeraufschrift aus Mainz*, MAZ III 1996, pp. 25–56.
- 2003: *Die römischen Amphoren im Umland aus Mainz*, vol. I–II, Mönchsee 2003.
- EHMIG, LIOU, LONG 2004: U. EHMIG, B. LIOU, L. LONG, *Le «garum» de Caius Saturius Secundus, gouverneur de la province romaine de Rétië*, REA CVI 2004, pp. 123–131.
- ÉTIENNE, MAYET 1998 a: R. ÉTIENNE, F. MAYET, *Les mercatores de saumure hispanique*, MEFRA CX 1998, pp. 147–165.
- 1998 b: *Le garum à Pompéi. Production et commerce*, REA C 1998, pp. 199–215.

- 2000: *Trois clés pour l'économie de l'Hispanie romaine*, vol. I: *Le vin hispanique*, Paris 2000.
- 2001: *Les élites marchands de la péninsule Ibérique*, dans: NAVARRO CABALLERO, DEMOUGIN 2001, pp. 89–104.
- 2002: *Trois clés pour l'économie de l'Hispanie romaine*, vol. II: *Salaisons et sauces de poisson hispaniques*, Paris 2002.
- 2004: *Trois clés pour l'économie de l'Hispanie romaine*, vol. III: *L'huile hispanique*, Paris 2004.
- GARCÍA VARGAS, MARTÍNEZ MAGANTO 2009: E. GARCÍA VARGAS, J. MARTÍNEZ MAGANTO, *Fuentes de riqueza y promoción social de los negociantes «salsarii» béticos durante el Alto Imperio romano. Una aproximación diacrónica*, Archivo Español de Arqueología LXXXII 2009, pp. 133–152.
- GIORDANO, CASALE 1990: C. GIORDANO, A. CASALE, *Iscrizioni pompeiane inedite scoperte tra gli anni 1954–1978*, AAP XXXIX 1990, pp. 273–378.
- HELLY, LE BOT-HELLY, LIOU 1986: B. HELLY, B. LE BOT-HELLY, B. LIOU, *Un dépôt d'amphores Dressel 20 à inscriptions peintes découvert à Sainte-Colombe (Rhône)*, Archæonautica VI 1986, pp. 121–145.
- LE ROUX 1995: P. LE ROUX, *Romains d'Espagne. Cités et politique dans les provinces*, Paris 1995.
- LIOU, TCHERNIA 1994: B. LIOU, A. TCHERNIA, *L'interprétation des inscriptions sur les amphores Dressel 20*, dans: *Epigrafia della produzione e della distribuzione. Actes de la VI^e Rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain*, Rome 1994, pp. 133–156.
- ŁOŚ 1995: A. ŁOŚ, *La condition sociale des affranchis privés au I^{er} siècle après J.-C.*, Annales (HSS) L/5 1995, pp. 1011–1043.
- 2001: A. ŁOŚ, *Les affaires commerciales des notables municipaux en Campanie sous les julio-claudiens et flaviens*, Antiquitas (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis) XXV 2001, pp. 78–102.
- 2005: *Les affaires commerciales des notables municipaux. Remarques sur les mercatores notés dans les inscriptions amphoriques du I^{er} siècle après J.-C.*, Antiquitas (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis) XXVIII 2005, pp. 81–109.
- MANACORDA 1977: D. MANACORDA, *Anfore spagnole a Pompei*, dans: CARANDINI 1977, pp. 121–133.
- MARTIN-KILCHER 1994: S. MARTIN-KILCHER, *Die römischen Amphoren aus Augst und Kaiseraugst. Ein Beitrag zur römischen Handels- und Kulturgeschichte*, vol. 2: *Die Amphoren für Wein, Fischsauce, Südfrüchte (Gruppen 2–24) und Gesamtauswertung*, Augst 1994.
- 2001: *Amphores à sauces de poissons du sud de la Péninsule Ibérique dans les provinces septentrionales*, dans: *Ex Baetica Amphorae. Conservas, aceite y vino de la Bética en el Imperio Romano. Actas Congreso Internacional*, vol. III, Ecija 2001, pp. 759–786.
- 2002: *Lucius Uritius Verecundus, négociant à la fin du I^{er} s., et sa marchandise découverte à Mayence*, dans: RIVET, SCIALLANO 2002, pp. 343–353.
- MELCHOR GIL 2001: E. MELCHOR GIL, *Consideraciones sobre la munificencia cívica en la Bética romana*, dans: NAVARRO CABALLERO, DEMOUGIN 2001, pp. 157–171.
- MORALES MUÑOZ 2005: Ct.-M. MORALES MUÑOZ, *La relación entre el registro β della epigrafía anfórica bética y la onomastica de las inscripciones gaditanas altoimperiales*, Gerion XXIII 2005, pp. 251–269.
- NAVARRO CABALLERO, DEMOUGIN 2001: M. NAVARRO CABALLERO, S. DEMOUGIN (éd.), *Élites hispaniques*, Bordeaux 2001.
- PANELLA 1974–1975: C. PANELLA, *Per uno studio delle anfore di Pompei, le forme VIII e X della tipologia di R. Schoene*, Stud. Misc. XXII 1974–1975, pp. 151–165.
- PANCIERA 1980: S. PANCIERA, *Olearii*, dans: J.H. D'ARMS, E.Ch. KOPFF (éd.), *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome: Studies in Archaeology and History*, Rome 1980, pp. 235–250.
- PURCELL 1984: N. PURCELL, *Puteoli*, dans: M.W. FREDERIKSEN, *Campania*, éd. par N. PURCELL, Oxford 1984, pp. 319–349.
- REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, AGUILERA MARTÍN 2001: J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, A. AGUILERA MARTÍN: *Los «tituli picti»*, dans: BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ 2001, pp. 45–203.

- 2003: *Los «tituli picti»*, dans: BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ 2003, pp. 31–308.
- 2007: *Los «tituli picti» sobre ánforas olearias béticas Dressel 20*, dans: BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ 2007, pp. 27–158.
- 2010: *Los «tituli picti»*, dans: BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ 2010, pp. 41–166.
- RICO 2003: C. RICO, *Mercatores, negotiatores et diffusores olearii et le commerce de l'huile de la Bétique aux I^{er} et II^e siècles de notre ère*, REA CV 2003, pp. 413–433.
- RIVET, SCIALLANO 2002: L. RIVET, M. SCIALLANO (éd.), *Vivre, produire et échanger: reflets méditerranéens: mélanges offerts à Bernard Liou*, Montagnac 2002.
- RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA 1984: E. RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA, *Il monte Testaccio. Ambiente, storia, materiali*, Roma 1984.
- 1994: *Scavi sul Monte Testaccio: novità dei Tituli Picti*, dans: *Epigrafia della produzione e della distribuzione. Actes de la VI^e Rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain. Rome 5–6 juin 1992*, Rome 1994, pp. 111–131.
- ROVIRA GUARDIOLA 2007: R. ROVIRA GUARDIOLA, *El archivo sulpicio y los «tituli picti β»: circulación de comerciantes en el Mediterráneo*, dans: M. MAYER Y OLIVÉ, G. BARATTA, A. GUZMÁN ALMAGRO, (éd.), *Provinciae Imperii Romani inscriptionibus descriptae. Acta XII Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae, Barcelona, 3–8 Septembris 2002*, Barcelona 2007, pp. 1263–1268 (CD-ROM).
- SIRKS 1983: A.J.B. SIRKS, *The «Lex Iunia» and the Effects of Informal Manumission*, RIDA XXX 1983, pp. 211–292.
- SOLIN 1971: H. SOLIN, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom*, Helsinki 1971.
- 2003: *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch*, vol. I–III, Berlin 2003.
- TCHERNIA 1964: A. TCHERNIA, *Amphores et marques d'amphores de Bétique à Pompéi et à Stabies*, MEFRA LXXVI 1964, pp. 419–449.
- 1986: *Rêves de richesse, emprunts et commerce maritime*, dans: *L'exploitation de la mer de l'Antiquité à nos jours. VI^e Rencontres internationales d'archéologie et d'histoire d'Antibes, 24–28 octobre 1985*, Valbonne 1986, pp. 123–129.
- 2011: *Les Romains et le commerce*, Naples 2011.
- VERBOVEN 2007: K. VERBOVEN, *The Associative Order: Status and Ethos of Roman Businessmen in Late Republic and Early Empire*, Athenaeum XCV 2007, pp. 861–893.
- ZEVI 1966: F. ZEVI, *Appunti sulle anfore romane. I: La tavola tipologica del Dressel*, AC XVIII 1966, pp. 208–247.

THE READER IN THE “COMEDY OF ERRORS” OF THE ANCIENT GREEK NOVEL

by

MAŁGORZATA CIEŚLUK

ABSTRACT: In my study I focus on a problem of the comedy of errors created via the *qui pro quo* technique which is also treated as a prism through which we can observe the relations between particular texts of ancient Greek novels and their implied audience. The conducted analyses of the ways in which the *qui pro quo* can be used in this kind of texts allow us to observe the phenomenon of a surprising broadening and diversifying of its functions, from the element serving the complication of a plot within individual stages of the novel's action in early romances to the multifunction instrument in later works. The discussed motif seems to be one of the most tangible mechanisms organizing the world of a novel in all of its aspects in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* and Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*. One can even state that with this instrument the authors provoke their reader to an aesthetic reflection on the work, the convention and, finally, the reader's own position towards the world of the novel and it seems that this effect comprises the author's basic creative idea.

The perspective of this paper has been shaped by two closely related aspects. One of them is the comedy of errors created via the *qui pro quo* technique whose application in the texts of ancient Greek novels has not been thoroughly analysed yet. The problem seems worthy of attention, the more so that it allows for characterizing the relations between particular texts of ancient Greek novels and their implied audience¹.

Treating the *qui pro quo* as a prism through which we observe the inner communication structure of the texts of interest to us is conducive to emphasizing in some of them the characteristics typical, according to critics, for innovation-oriented, contemporary literature. These works are written with the use of the literary devices which seem to invite the reader to taking up a sophisticated game with text. In this game it is the audience which has a more active role, must be ready to both decode more or less direct references to literary tradition and reflect constantly upon the form of the text. A literary work therefore reveals the dual

¹ The question of the audience of the ancient Greek novel is one of the most frequently discussed issues in the literature on the subject. See e.g. WESSELING 1988; HÄGG 2004.

character of its own codes which inscribe it in the system of literary tradition and genre conventions. On the other hand, however, such a work used the literary tradition and convention as a springboard to creative provocations and thus hinges on the notions of transformation and experiment². The existence of them is signalled usually by the presence in a work of innovative formal and stylistic solutions.

By analogy, such a concept implies the duality of a model reader. A work remains open for a less sophisticated, when it comes to literature, audience, interested mainly in the plot and characters' adventures even though such audience can feel discouraged by the unconventional avant-garde solutions. In order to "decipher" these other codes a reader is necessary who has erudition and literary sensibility at his/her disposal, one whom Eco depicts as a second degree- or semiotic, aesthetic reader³. It is to this reader that the author's game with convention has been addressed; it is them who are capable of both decoding the system of metatextual references and seeing and appreciating the mechanisms of intertextual irony.

With reference to the Greek novel, formal innovativeness directs our attention towards the possibilities of using in these works the "double coding" strategy. This innovativeness, while implying the dual character of the model reader, concerns first and foremost the experiment-oriented narrative forms⁴ such as those of *Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius and Heliodor's *Aithiopika*. Certain traditional solutions concerning the way the story unfolds such as *qui pro quo* are of similarly innovative character.

The motif of *qui pro quo* has been present in Greek literature since its origins⁵. Yet, since the term itself is of a quasi-colloquial character, it thus remains on the margin of the theoretical-literary reflection. In view of the lack of explicit definitions, this discussion will assume that *qui pro quo* concerns the situation when the protagonist mistakes the identity of another person, or else mistakenly interprets the state of this identity, for example taking a living person for a dead

² Umberto Eco comments on the omnipresence of "double coding" in the contemporary culture beginning with architecture through literature, popular music and commercials emphasizing at the same time that each *époque* in the history of arts and literature brings forth examples of well-known and appreciated literary works which rest on the coexistence of the elite and mass culture patterns. See Eco 2003: 199 f.

³ According to Eco 2003: 207, the reader concentrated on the literal level of meaning is a first degree, or semantic reader.

⁴ Selected issues of narration are discussed e.g. by: HEFTI 1950; EFFE 1975; FUTRE PINHEIRO 1988.

⁵ For example, in *Iliad* Hector, having been misled by the goddess Athena, takes her for his brother Deiphobus and resolves, tragically for him and Troy, to commence a direct fight with Achilles (Hom. *Il.* XXII 221–242); it must be added that the duel itself results from another *qui pro quo* in which Hector mistakes Patroclus for Achilles and kills him in the course of the fights performed near the Greek ships.

one. Such solutions function primarily as complications and hence as methods of building tension in a story. When it comes to the genre of comedy, they also create an effect of hilarity. It needs to be emphasized that in the majority of works the comedy of errors is of internal character and concerns nearly exclusively the protagonists, whereas the reader has a far broader information scope at their disposal⁶. The position of a well-informed witness to other people's mistakes enables the reader to both understand the sense of events and keep their distance towards dramatic complications of action and protagonists' violent emotions.

Ancient story writers are eager to use the *qui pro quo*, not so much for comic effect but rather to maximally complicate the plot. In the dénouement part of this plot the *qui pro quo* serves to withhold a happy end and to keep the reader's attention until the story finishes. The most spectacular form of the *qui pro quo* occurs when it becomes external and the author limits the information provided for the reader to the level available for protagonists of the world of the novel only. Then, a new level of relation between the text and the reader is created: the erstwhile observer is invited to participate actively in the world of appearance and illusions thus joining in the ignorance of the story's characters. This in turn seems to encourage them to take up a metaliterary game with convention and tradition. In return the reader is silently promised the aesthetic pleasure of discovering the rules according to which the text was orchestrated.

Although the following discussion will mostly concentrate on the latter of the *qui pro quo* types mentioned above, a short demonstration of the situations in which the device in question surfaces as internal and realizes traditional tasks seems necessary.

GORDIAN KNOT OF COMPLICATIONS

The *qui pro quo* device can be treated as a stereotypical instrument serving both the prolongation of action and the construction of possibly the most complicated and surprising plot. One good example of this are two oldest novels by Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus in which the *qui pro quo* mechanism is used moderately, for only parts of the two novels' respective actions are organized with the use of it. In *Callirhoe* the mechanism of *qui pro quo* appears only in its last, eighth book at the moment when the protagonist mistakenly assumes that a veiled captive woman is not his long lost, as he thought, wife, but a stranger. Still, this error delays the protagonists' eventual reunion only for a while. It needs to be stressed that the narrator is aware of this situation's unrealized potential that could have complicated the protagonists' lots for even longer than it did. According to his auctorial relation, the goddess Tyche intended to make the

⁶ With reference to the Roman comedy, SKWARA 2001: 90 highlights this principle.

couple's recognition impossible so that they could experience more adventure (VIII 1, 2). It is only owing to the intervention of Aphrodite who eventually became reconciled with the protagonist that the parting of Chaereas and Callirhoe is soon brought to an end (VIII 1, 2 f.). Also, the author's metaliterary reflection which he shares with the reader at the same time justifies his giving up the use of a possibility of *qui pro quo* as presented in this paper. This is because the last book of the novel should be a pleasant reading so that love and marriage, values concordant with law and custom, can triumph⁷.

If we assume that the motif of an apparent death of the protagonist is a specific type of *qui pro quo*, then we can point to its double use by Chariton. Callirhoe, hit by a jealous husband, falls into lethargy, is considered dead and buried in a family tomb only to recover consciousness and fall prey to cemetery plunderers. The mistaken treatment of the living heroine as dead functions as a significant way of initiating both the separation of the protagonists and the novel's action. Analogically, later Callirhoe is misled, too, and considers Chaereas dead (III 10, 3). Although her mistake does not influence the story's action directly, it nevertheless deepens the situation's dramatic nature at the moment when the desperate search conducted by the hero lead him very close to his nearly lost wife.

Also Xenophon of Ephesus utilizes the motif of the protagonist's apparent death. He introduces the *qui pro quo* device mostly in Book Three of his novel. However, Xenophon uses the possibilities inherent in the device to much better ends than Chariton does in his novel. Xenophon's *qui pro quo* activates the chain of events which do not initiate the protagonists' adventures (Habrokomes and Anthia have already been separated), but which cause such a radical worsening of their situation that the chances for their happy end seem to be ruined. Anthia's apparent death results from an attempted suicide which the heroine undertakes having heard about her beloved's alleged death and facing necessity to be married to a man she does not love. On the other hand, the hero, having been informed about Anthia's alleged death, decides to go on in search of her body and finds himself in terrible trouble. Namely, he gets entangled into a murder, is tried and does not defend himself before court, and finally is sentenced to death. Thus, the *qui pro quo* resulting from the fact that the protagonists both consider dead one another leads the two of them into a situation of deep crisis. On the other hand, the situation of the reader does not seem to be critical at all; owing to the

⁷ Νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἡδίστον γενήσεσθαι καθάρσιον γὰρ ἔστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν. Οὐκέτι ληστεία καὶ δουλεία καὶ δίκη καὶ μάχη καὶ ἀποκαρτέρησις καὶ πόλεμος καὶ ἄλωσις, ἀλλὰ ἔρωτες δίκαιοι ἐν τοῦτω καὶ νόμιμοι γάμοι (VIII 1, 4 f.). [And I think that this last chapter will prove very agreeable to its readers: it cleanses away the grim events of the earlier ones. There will be no more pirates or slavery or lawsuits or fighting or suicide or wars or conquests; now there will be lawful love and sanctioned marriage (transl. by B.P. REARDON)]. This frequently quoted passage is one of a very few instances of ancient statements directly relating to the genre's convention.

auctorial narration formula they are aware of the *status quo* – that the lovers are alive and are thus not surprised by the way the plot unfolds. The tension which they feel results from the emotional balance created between a possibility of the protagonists' soon-to-happen reunion (for a short time both stay within the same region – Cilicia) and the *qui pro quo*'s dramatic effects.

All in all, with reference to *qui pro quo* and its function in the above presented part of Xenophon's novel we can state that he develops its potential significantly, whereas Chariton only signals it. Such a handling of *qui pro quo* allows for the clever extension of the protagonists' adventures for it worsens and deepens the dangers hanging over them. From the point of view of the relation existing between the text and its reader, the method sustains the latter's interest taken in the further development of action.

Xenophon's Book Four brings about a new quality with regard to the use of the *qui pro quo*. This time it is the female protagonist and the leader of the band of robbers, Hippotoos, who are involved in the *qui pro quo* situation. Of importance to us is the fact that Hippotoos has been acquainted with both Anthia and the male protagonist. Therefore he knows well the story of their unhappy love and of the search undertaken by the despaired Habrokomes. From the point of view of the reader the meeting of Anthia with the robber seems to bring forth the hope for the couple's quick reunion, for Hippotoos has sufficient knowledge of Habrokomes at his disposal. Yet, this time also the reader is surprised and manoeuvred into the game by the author as, against all odds, the girl and the robber do not recognize each other. She even gives the robber her false name, a fact which eliminates any possibilities whatsoever of associating her with Habrokomes. Instead of finding expected (from the reader's perspective) care, Anthia gets into an even bigger trouble (she kills her harasser, a member of Hippotoos' band who attempts to rape her and is punished for this by being cast into a pit full of wild hungry dogs). The dénouement of this *qui pro quo* occurs a little later, in the course of the female protagonist and Hippotoos' yet another meeting when our heroine is put up for slave auction in Tarent. This time Hippotoos recognizes the girl and she reveals her true identity to him (V 9). At this moment the chain of ill fate is broken: from an erstwhile oppressor, Hippotoos transforms into a friend who, together with Anthia, tries to find Habrokomes. This is a real turn in the action of the novel suggesting its incoming happy end.

Thus, *qui pro quo*'s function in this novel is that of both a traditional plot-complicating device and a significant element constructing the action's climax. In turn, its innovative character reveals itself within the text-and-reader plane. The author does not stray away from the *qui pro quo*'s internal character – the reader is being informed of all the events taking place in the novel. Yet, the author successfully misinforms the reader about Hippotoos' suggested function: introduced as Habrokomes', and hence also Anthia's, ally, due to the existence of the above depicted *qui pro quo*, he becomes temporarily the heroine's chief

opponent. We can therefore state that the author manages to transgress the limits of the world of the story and directly engage the reader in the *qui pro quo* concerning one of the protagonists. From this moment on, the function of this protagonist in the story thus ceases to be obvious for the reader.

Daphnis and Chloe by Longus does not sustain the tendency suggested in *An Ephesian Tale* to develop possibilities resulting from the *qui pro quo*. The author uses this stratagem only once in the final part of the text in order to create a temporary threat for the marriage of Daphnis and Chloe. On the other hand, however, he uses the trick so as to arrange the scene of recognizing the protagonist by his biological parents. Treating the hero as a simple though extremely handsome peasant effected almost in him being given away to take service – also that of passion – with Gnaton, an intermediary for the estate owner's son. This complication is solved almost immediately for it motivates the boy's caretakers to reveal the truth of his origin. Consequently, it allows for both the confirmation of his noble birth and finding his parents. The lack of interest in *qui pro quo* we can therefore add to the list of characteristics confirming this work by Longus to be entirely different from other preserved novels.

ENTERTAINMENT

As we have already mentioned, the texts of interest to us bring about few examples of situations directly generating the effect of entertainment. Nevertheless in some cases we can notice a tendency to present the hero in a comic perspective. This happens when he undertakes actions on the basis of false assumptions due to which the reader can follow the resulting hilarious or at least ironic situations. *Qui pro quo* comprises one of the methods that facilitate this effect, a fact used by both Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus.

In *Leucippe and Clitophon* the characters of the protagonist⁸ and the allegedly widowed Melite who is in love with him are to a degree comical. Both characters thus become victims of *qui pro quo* a result of which is that they respectively consider dead: Kleitophon his beloved Leukippe, and Melite – her husband. The protagonist seems to be the master of incompetence when it comes to assessing the events relating to his fiancée. For several times he falls prey to the appearance of Leukippe's arranged "death" and when he eventually comes across her he cannot recognize Leukippe who is dressed up as a field hand. Paradoxically, even though he remains faithful to Leukippe's memory, he cheats on Leukippe herself with Melite to whose sexual charm he succumbs out of "mercy". It needs to be emphasized, however, that the majority of the depicted situations does not

⁸ The comic perspective is suggested in the story by both ego-narrative and non-heroic, realistic portrait of the protagonist. See e.g. PERRY 1967: 87, 325 f.; REARDON 1991: 44; REARDON 1999: 243–258 f.; HOLZBERG 2003: 130, CIEŚLUK 2010: 39 f.

complicate the plot permanently and hence does not serve to put off the happy end in time⁹. What serves this aim is, rather, the difficulties which come to the fore with the appearance of the very much alive Melite's husband and his assistant. Therefore we can assume that one of the functions the two above mentioned situations play in the story is that of imbuing the image of the protagonist with ironic and antiheroic undertones. On the other hand, not only does the alleged widow believe the gossip of her husband's death but she also becomes a victim of yet another *qui pro quo*. This happens when, unaware that the field hand working on her estate is Leukippe, Melite asks her biggest rival to help her win Kleitophon's heart. Also in this particular situation the events do not influence significantly the unfolding of the action; neither do they generate negative results, for any of the two protagonists. Thus, the said events merely deepen the realistic-dramatic tone of the heroine's character.

Several examples of the effect of hilariousness resulting from *qui pro quo* can also be found in the *Ethiopian Story* by Heliodorus. They mainly concern the protagonist's foil, an Athenian youth named Knemon who accompanies Heliodorus' heroes in the first part of their adventures. The scene at the house of merchant Nausikles, when Knemon takes the female protagonist Charikleia for the dead slave Thisbe whose scheming deeply negatively affected the youth and his family's fate, is of a genuinely comic character. Thus Heliodorus masterfully twists the principle by which *qui pro quo* operates: where the heroes usually treat the living as the dead, he allows Knemon who personally buried the daggered slave to believe, against all logic, that she is still alive. The very sound of her name makes him petrified: "Knemon, however, had been stunned to hear Thisbe's name; he racked his brains in bewilderment and despair to make sense of it; sigh after heavy sigh he sighed, and the rest of the night was a torment to him, [...] that he seemed for all the world like a madman" (V 2, 1)¹⁰.

Further on the narrator delightfully presents the entire spectrum of reactions of the protagonist who attempted to verify the identity of the alleged female slave locked in the chamber. Accordingly, Knemon is afraid at first that he will fall down right before the chamber door. Then, stumbling, hitting his head against the doorframe and the walls, he returns to the bedroom, his teeth chattering and he himself shivering all over to the point of dropping dead, after which Knemon comes round for a moment and confirms that the mysterious woman is Thisbe indeed only to lose conscience again (V 3, 1–30). He thus convincingly demonstrates his cowardice which the audience may have noticed earlier, on the occasion of yet another *qui pro quo* located in a cave within the area occupied by

⁹ One exception is the second attempt to (allegedly) murder Leukippe (V 7), which eliminates this female protagonist from the story's action for long and almost results in a love affair between Kleitophon and Melite.

¹⁰ This and the following quotations from Heliodorus are given in J.R. MORGAN's translation.

Egyptian brigands – the Herdsmen. It is also at this moment that Charikleia and Thisbe are misidentified and both Knemon and Theagenes fall prey to the misidentification.

When the young men realize that the woman murdered in the cave to whose body Theagenes held tight was not Charikleia but Thisbe, they react in different ways. While the protagonist (Theagenes) is happy, the Athenian seems to be terrified for he “stood shivering in dumb amazement” (II 5, 4) and it is only after a while that he regains the control of himself. Knemon’s reaction is mocked in a friendly way by Theagenes later on: “it is time for you to be reminded of your own remarkable display of bravery: you wept for my griefs before I did, and when you found that the dead woman was who you least expected it to be, you took to your heels as if she were some evil spirit in a play; though you were armed and had a sword in your hand, you fled from a woman, and a dead one at that! The intrepid Athenian warrior turned tail and ran!” (II 7, 3). We will return to the possible functions of the cave-located *qui pro quo* in the context of the protagonists’ story later on; for the time being and with reference to Knemon we can conclude that the said *qui pro quo* undoubtedly allows us to deepen the comic aspects of this character.

MISLEADING

Apart from the above presented comic aspects of the *qui pro quo* device the novels of both Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus may also be seen as successful attempts at treating the audience as a direct participant in the comedy of errors. Similarly to the protagonist, the audience receives limited information on a given situation and is provoked to draw false conclusions¹¹. With regard to the first degree reader who concentrates mainly on following the plot, the practice is entirely unconscious although it intensifies the power the texts exert on emotions generating tension and provoking profound sensations analogical to those experienced by the protagonist only to give fruits in the form of cathartic sympathy and joy of the happy end¹². On the other hand, the second degree reading experience allows the audience to accept an invitation to the literary play formulated as a genre convention and narrative strategies manipulation. Thus a distance is established between the emotions of protagonists of the literary world and the awareness of the audience, which allows for a reflection of aesthetical nature. Realizing the role played in the literary *qui pro quo*, drifting among misinforming signals, the audience eventually becomes aware of the ironic, even comic,

¹¹ For the ways of controlling of the reader’s expectations by Heliodorus see MORGAN 1989 a.

¹² ECO 2003: 208 notices the relation existing between the concepts of the first and second degree reader and the Aristotelian homeopathic and allopathic interpretation of the *catharsis*.

character of its own situation. In the further part of this discussion this second reader will become our main focus.

Leucippe and Clitophon seems to be a model example of the above characterized strategy. The signal which gives the experienced reader second thoughts, and at the very beginning of the novel at that, is the first person narration formula which, at some points in the story, bears all the traces of personal narration. *Qui pro quo* appears for the first time in Book Two of *Leucippe and Clitophon* where the adventure motif of the romance commences. Similarly to the way the story is told, this *qui pro quo* is a surprise to its audience. Only indirectly is the *qui pro quo* in question related to the protagonists of the story; what is more, it never initiates, nor does it complicate their adventures. The eponymous hero, Kleitophon, is about to marry his half sister Kalligone yet in the meantime he falls in love with his cousin Leukippe arriving in Tyre from Byzantium. Kleitophon and Kalligone's marriage seems inevitable be it not for a *qui pro quo* which reverses the course of the story's action. A young man from Byzantium named Kallisthenes is infatuated with Leukippe, too. His, however, is a premature love, for up till this moment he has never seen the girl. Still, he has heard stories about her beauty which impressed him immensely and influenced his passion for Leukippe. Therefore Kallisthenes resolves to kidnap Leukippe but he mistakes Kalligone for her and consequently ends up with Kleitophon's beautiful sister.

Thus the reader's awareness of dealing with a literary convention is put to test as soon as the introductory level of the story. The adventure motif begins when the betrothed are separated, yet their betrothal is not a result of love but of devotion and obedience towards the father's will. Instead of difficulties and pain, the separation is a relief for the protagonist, for it removes the obstacle – the fiancée – from real passion's way. Consequently, it also enables the protagonist to solve his chief problem – the unwanted marriage. It needs emphasizing that the *qui pro quo* functions at this point of the story in an untraditional way: it allows avoiding complications and improving (temporarily) the lovers' situation. The fact that along with the appearance of passion the motif of Kleitophon and Leukippe's marriage is not introduced, and that the protagonist's entire activity is concentrated on yielding to desire as quickly as possible is even more surprising. Therefore the reader can assume, more or less surely, that so organized events are actually of comic character. The figure of Kallisthenes, a restless and careless youth, is presented in a comic-ironic light, his tendency to fall in love at first sight seems to be valorized negatively, too. Also, Kleitophon is presented as a happy-go-lucky man who will satisfy his sexual appetite anytime he feels like doing this and without giving a single thought to the idea of marriage.

So initiated, the comedy of errors is resolved only as late as Book Eight which closes the novel and provides a frame for the entire story. The book's plot goes in a surprising direction though effectuating in a complete reversal of action development. With reference to the protagonists this means that the conditions which

they considered advantageous for their love turn out to be a long adventurous and dangerous journey and separation. In the end both this journey and separation deprive the protagonists of all hopes for reuniting and cherishing a happy end. On the other hand, the incorrigible and licentious Kallisthenes is transformed into a good man in the course of the story. This is due to the fact that, once realizing he committed a mistake, Kallisthenes quickly changes the object of his affection into Kalligone, Kleitophon's sister. Having met her in person¹³, Kallisthenes can appreciate her virtues and desperately falls in love with Kalligone. This in turn prompts a profound change in his character, for now he can control his dissoluteness and never again harasses the girl. Thus, owing to the nobility of his actions and his generosity Kallisthenes eventually wins the girl's heart, her approval, and the community's respect. In the end he also becomes the best friend of the protagonist and receives Kalligone's father's agreement to marry his daughter.

From the vantage point of the ending of Tatius' story we must therefore state that the audience was given a literary "meal" different from the presupposed one. Instead of two amorally-oriented stories, the reader has been "served" two conventionally happy endings. Love is present there but it is marital love, one which is identified with one's control over desire. Similarly to Kallisthenes, also the protagonists go through metamorphoses. At first eager to invite Kleitophon to her bedroom, Leukippe having escaped death by the skin of her teeth restrains her lover's endeavours by quoting the words which the goddess Artemis revealed to her while sleeping: "Do not be sad, you shall not die, for I will stand by you and help you. You will remain a virgin until I myself give you away as a bride. No one but Kleitophon will marry you" (IV 1, 4). From this moment on and until the end of the novel the heroine presents herself as a morally upright person who indeed "watches her virginity" regardless of how much it is jeopardized.

When it comes to Kleitophon, the transformation is of less obvious nature. Even though he succumbs to his lover's request, and, convinced of her death, he remains faithful to her memory, then, later on, he eventually falls prey to Melite's desire and agrees to have an erotic "encounter" with her. It would seem therefore that the hero's betrayal suggests the coherence of his image which, very consistently, highlights his comic-realistic characteristics. Still, a close look casts a slightly different light on the circumstances of the couple's sexual fulfillment. While Melite acts from desire, Kleitophon seems to be in total control of his emotions. He agrees to fulfill the desire of the woman in love with him not because

¹³ The circumstances in which this desire surfaces are not irrelevant for its ethical valorization. Based on his personal contact and close relationship with Kalligone, Kallisthenes' affection crops up as an element of his positive metamorphosis. Contrary to this, his desire for Leukippe, activated solely by the gossips about her beauty, is a sign of negative valorization: "Such is the insolence of men with no restraints on them! They can fall in love with a rumour and suffer with their ears the agonies usually experienced by the soul from love's wounds in the eye" (II 13, 1). This and the following quotations from Achilles Tatius are given in J.J. WINKLER's translation.

he feels the same desire, too, but because her rational reasoning convinces him as well as he is afraid the refusal might make Eros angry. His actions are thus an effect of his conscious decisions based on the thesis that "the act could no longer be considered precisely a marital one but was rather a remedy for an ailing soul" (V 27, 2). However manipulative this argumentation might seem it remains without doubt that the protagonist does not act out of love but understands and controls his state and situation. We can therefore assume that such an attitude suggests a person's succumbing to the obligation of keeping self- and emotional control, so typical for the manners and mores of the late Empire.

It is in this context that the analyzed situation surfaces as a *novum* as regards literary portraying of the protagonist. Acting at first entirely out of desire and encouraging his beloved to share sexual closeness with him, Kleitophon learnt to both control this desire and subordinate it to the voice of reason. Even though by the end of the story he assesses his succumbing to Melite as "disgraceful" – τῆν αἰδῶ (VIII 5, 3) and omits it while depicting his adventures, this part of his story does not bring him any negative consequences, neither does it prevent him from getting married to Leukippe. This confirms the well known thesis that, with regard to ancient men, the ethics of control always took an upper hand over any other ethical aspects, remaining faithful to their spouses included¹⁴.

After finishing the novel, the reader can be sure that the task undertaken by the first two books was misleading them as to the kind of a literary form with which s/he deals. The reader can recognize the mystification has the form of a literary *qui pro quo* which slowly but surely reveals its principles in the course of the novel's action. Yet the full understanding of the fact that the comic character of the novel was only a camouflage and that *Leucippe and Clitophon* is actually an ideological text which functions in a similar way to its predecessors, that is, novels by Chariton, Xenophon, and Longos, reveals itself to the reader as late as the final part of the story.

The mystification strategy, constructive for the story's frame, also indicates the course of the novel's plot. The *qui pro quo* engaging the reader's attention leads them into a jungle of mistaken suggestions and provokes reflections of aesthetic nature. The *qui pro quo* organized around the female protagonist's alleged death is of utmost importance. It is interesting and significant that the same motif – of Leukippe's death – recurs three times and that in the two of these situations it is presented to us in a very theatrical perspective. Deprived of any influence

¹⁴ A similar situation occurs in Longos' novel: also here the protagonist does not remain faithful to his beloved and succumbs to the desire of a mature married woman named Lykainion. Yet, this experience results in few negative consequences for the relationship of Daphnis and Chloe and it seems that even in this case what is important is not so much the fact of having a sexual intercourse but rather its motivation. Daphnis did not desire Lykainion and did not lose control over his emotions. Contrary to him, Theagenes, the hero of Heliodorus' novel, rejects any possibility of having an erotic contact with a woman different than his beloved, regardless of the jeopardy which results from such a rejection.

to change the course of things, Kleitophon behaves like a spectator and only observes how his beloved is being “murdered”. On the first of these occasions he can see that the robbers make an offering of Leukippe to Ares, cut through her abdomen and devour her intestines (III 15, 2–7) and then he watches the pirates beheading her (V 7, 4). It is also extremely significant that at this point the narration works in such a way that it limits the reader’s point of view to the hero’s state of knowledge at a given moment. Although Kleitophon as the narrator of the story frequently uses the *ex post* perspective, commenting on the events and suggesting the way to interpret them which is concordant with the narrator’s present, he never uses this possibility with regard to the above discussed parts of the story. Along with the hero, the reader thus becomes an eye witness of the female protagonist’s death and, like Kleitophon, s/he has to accept this fact.

These circumstances push the reader towards a critical reflection and realization of a fundamental contradiction existing in the story. The reader is aware that there exist few factors which would enable him/her to suspect that another course of action is taken, different from that related to us by Kleitophon. On the other hand, s/he is also aware of the convention according to which the female protagonist of the novel cannot simply die. The depicted dissonance seems to be particularly visible in the first of the above mentioned scenes in which the act of Leukippe’s murder has been described in such detail and so realistically that it must deprive the reader of any illusions whatsoever as to the possibilities of rescuing the girl. Thus, the necessity to accept both the female protagonist’s death and lack of happy ending and hence to question the principles of the genre seems inevitable.

Fortunately, the audience need not wait for the *dénouement* of such a dramatic *qui pro quo* until the end of the novel. It soon turns out that the girl lived through this macabre offering, owing to both her friends, miraculously rescued from a wrecked ship, and the entire arsenal of theatrical props. The explanations of this situation offered by Kleitophon’s servant and friend Satyros are as detailed as the former description of Leukippe being offered in sacrifice. Satyros pays particular attention to the depiction of the knife with a movable blade which enabled the suggestive performance of cutting through Leukippe’s abdomen thus misleading all the external and internal spectators of the world of the novel. The clever servant sums up the effects of using this theatrical prop in the following way: “...and again misleads the spectators” (τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τοὺς ὀρῶντας ἀπατά, III 21, 4). His commentary seems to refer to both of the perspectives in question. Within the world of the novel it allows for a full understanding of the events, yet we can also read it as pertaining to the external world and treat as a metaliterary hint for the reader. The verb ἀπατάω which appears in the commentary reveals the text’s strategy: the audience will be constantly put to test, mislead and manoeuvred out of the story by being offered illusory premises¹⁵.

¹⁵ BARTSCH 1989: 129, when analyzing the above mentioned scene, notices that “Achilles Tatius, as we have seen, is interested in surprise and trickery, in shaking the readers up; [...] the author’s

Equipped with this knowledge, the reader will be able to follow the circumstances of Leukippe's another "murder" with more ease. This time the scene is very dynamic: a pirate ship is being chased aboard which there is the kidnapped female protagonist. The audience observes the situation from the point of view of Kleitophon. He hastily hired another ship so as to catch up with the kidnappers and save his beloved even though his direct participation in these actions remains symbolic – wounded earlier, Kleitophon is lying on the stretcher and similarly to the offering scene, he only witnesses the horrifying events. As in the earlier part of the story, this scene is organized in a very theatrical way: its action takes place on a pirate ship and the chaser ship plays the role of the audience with the sea as a clear-cut and impassable border between these two spaces¹⁶. Both the reader and the hero are treated equally as spectators of a dramatic show in which the robbers take the girl to the board of the ship, behead her and cast her body to the sea.

Again, owing to limiting the perspective of the presented events to Kleitophon's point of view, the reader is deprived of any direct signals regarding the actuality of the depicted scene and consequently s/he is not certain if and how to accept the concept of the female protagonist's death. However, the second degree reader has several hints at his/her disposal to cope with this uncertainty. Both the theatrical character of space organization and the reading experience suggest that the reader should reject literalism and realize that s/he might be a subject to theatrical ἀπάτη who one more time has been offered a role of a *qui pro quo* participant by the protagonist's side. The suspicion that also this time the heroine survived seems entirely justified and constitutes a basis for creating the distance between the reader's feelings and the hero's sensations which, for a short moment, were situated on the same plane. The audience's attention is thus directed exclusively at resolving the mystery how the "murdered" Leukippe simultaneously stayed alive.

Yet, the text does not give the audience ready-made answers even to so construed questions and the audience's curiosity is not easily satisfied. Moreover, contrary to the above presented discussion, the development of action seems to conform to the tragic fact of the female protagonist's death. After the six-month mourning period has been over, Kleitophon's sadness "slowly began to wane" (V 8, 2) and Melite, the young widow from Ephesus appeared in his life.

The introduction into the story's action of the female protagonist's rival who is blindly in love with the hero is hardly a surprise. Such colourful female characters appear in the works of both Xenophon of Ephesus and Longos, as well

purpose in removing an omniscient viewpoint from the narrative is to make possible and complement the play on the readers' expectations that constitutes his strategy on a larger scale".

¹⁶ In the previously analysed offering scene the space has been arranged analogically: a water ditch separates the place of theatrical action (the space occupied by the robbers where the clay altar is situated) from the audience (the area occupied by the soldiers, Kleitophon among them).

as Heliodorus¹⁷. Yet the picture of the rival created by Tattius seems sufficiently original to be discussed here in detail. Not only is Melite beautiful and rich but, contrary to heroines of other novels, she is unmarried (a widow). Also, her intentions concerning Kleitophon seem to be pure for she has been courting him for three months now and wishes to give herself and all her possessions away to him as his lawful wife (V 11, 5 f.). This fundamentally positive description of Melite is confirmed by Kleitophon's friends' opinion of her. They try to convince the reluctant and mourning Kleitophon to marry Melite. Also, Melite's own demeanour is compatible with this opinion. Despite the fact that she suffers from her love for Kleitophon, the woman agrees to all his requests and conditions, one of which is the postponement of their erotic closeness¹⁸.

Such positive valorization of the heroine's character as well as concentrating the attention on the love relation crystallizing between her and the protagonist with the simultaneous lack of any information about Leukippe suggest an action development entirely different from the conventional one. It is gradually becoming more and more probable for a conscious and experienced reader to acknowledge that Leukippe is dead and Melite is the novel's new protagonist¹⁹. For the second time then the work suggests that the traditional formula has been broken and that the reader confronts a literary experiment of sorts. That this kind of thinking is another mystification and an attempt to engage the audience in a *qui pro quo* created on the level of aesthetic reflection turns out at the moment when the attention has been eventually redirected from the question of possibilities of saving Leukippe to the question of when Kleitophon will ultimately succumb to Melite's desire. For the time being, when it seems that no obstacle stands in the way of their marriage, the former protagonist returns to the stage as a maltreated and overworked field hand on Melite's estate. Subsequently the mystery of the girl's decapitation will also be solved: it happened indeed, only to a different woman, a fact which, due to the distance from the scene of decapitation, the hero – and also the reader who is deprived of a broader perspective – could not see.

The audience therefore learns both that they were right when, counting on their experience, they assumed that the heroine would be saved and that they were at the same time in the wrong if they doubted this assumption due to the cleverly misleading hints the novel offered them in its course. This time the *qui pro quo* in the world of the novel has found its counterpart within the plane of the dynamically shaped relation of the text and its reader. The brilliantly prepared strategy of the

¹⁷ Apart from the already mentioned Lykainion from Longos' novel, there are also Arsake from *Aithiopika* and Manto and Kyno from *An Ephesian Tale*.

¹⁸ The analogical heroines of Xenophon of Ephesus and Heliodorus accept such a delay only reluctantly, are driven almost crazy by it and eventually aim at punishing the object of their passion.

¹⁹ HAYNES 2003: 104 says that "the narrative pointers that Achilles Tattius lays down for the interpretation of Melite seem more deliberately engineered to engender confusion".

text results in that although the motif of Leukippe's apparent death is multiplied, it nevertheless manages to successfully mislead the reader once more.

The last *qui pro quo* related to the death of the heroine has a traditional formula according to which the well-informed reader can follow the lot of the ill-convinced protagonist. The imprisoned Kleitophon is misinformed that Leukippe has been murdered on the jealous Melite's order. The protagonist wrongly succumbs to these false suggestions and is overcome with desperation paying little attention to the arguments of his friend Kleinias who analyses the situation in a way resembling a text scrutiny performed by a second degree reader: " 'who knows, perhaps she will be alive again?' – he said. 'Hasn't she died many times before? Hasn't she often been resurrected?'" (VII 6, 2). Still, the protagonist's obstinately naive attitude allows to complicate the story action and escalate its tension, for he gives up a possibility of defending himself before court and blames Melite and himself for the apparent murder. For the sake of our analysis it is significant that a clear-cut border has been restored on the level of the text–audience relation, a border owing to which the reader regains their traditional privileged position of an observer of the story events from the outside.

Even though the genre convention triumphs in Achilles Tatius' novel, both in the way all threads are disentangled and with reference to the reader, it is nevertheless difficult to disregard the theatre of errors arranged in the text. One can even state that the text strategy concentrates mainly on provoking its reader to an aesthetic reflection on the work, the convention and, finally, people's own position towards the world of the novel. The readers can also see themselves as similar to the comic characters from the novel who, like Kleitophon or Knemon, wrongly interpret situations but are happy that these situations all come to happy endings eventually. As such the reader succumbs to the power of the metaliterary *qui pro quo* compelling them to wander along the labyrinth of misleading hints and making their literary awareness an element of the game which, as such, is frequently used against them. This awareness at once constitutes a foundation for creating an effect called, by analogy with the aesthetic reader, "aesthetic comedy". This effect is understood as a peculiar kind of pleasure available for the aesthetic reader who can self-ironically play with the fact that despite their experience, they can succumb to the power of the text even for a while.

In *Aithiopika* by Heliodorus we can identify an analogical concurrence between a tendency to organize action with the use of the *qui pro quo* and the formal innovation expressed as a multitude of internal narrators, switching freely from the personal ego-narrative into the auctorial narration, using the point of view technique, or retrospective presentation of particular stages of the plot. Similarly to Achilles Tatius' novel, all these devices inspire the second degree reader to reflect on an aesthetic plane. On this plane the reader's literary awareness becomes engaged in resolving a kind of the comedy of errors only to eventually confront the question of possibly hermeneutic implications.

The reader must face the challenge as soon as the opening scene of the novel (I 1). Instead of a typical introductory narration comprising the profiles of the protagonists and the novel's subject matter, a detailed – and strikingly theatrical – description of the setting appears. This manoeuvre is visible in both the way space is organized into a clearly marked scene part (a beach at one of the River Nile's estuaries) and the audience part (the hills nearby) and linguistic layer via the introduction of theatrical terminology²⁰. At the same time the spectator of this theatre is well-defined – it is an accidental group of robbers who have little knowledge at their disposal except observation. It is their point of view that becomes a lens through which the reader begins their own observations and thus collects information²¹. A striking feature of so presented a world is ambiguity: the beach is covered with dead bodies left there after some unidentified battle even though all the remaining elements of the setting resemble a feast. For example, tables were used as either fighting weapons or defence, chalices superseded missiles. There are more hints which seem to have double meaning: there are people, for instance, who were defeated in the battle but few of them are winners, the triumphant ones never appropriated any loot, either, the anchored ship is safe and yet there is no crew aboard it.

Analyzing the above scene from the point of view of the way the text–audience relation is built we can state that this scene exposes all the aspects fundamental for this relation at present and further on in Heliodorus' entire novel. On the one hand, both the theatricalization of space and the paradoxical character of particular elements constitutive for its ornamentation signal a tendency to maximally implicate the reader in it. On the other hand, however, with reference to the aesthetic audience, they also point to the pretence hiding the unknown *status quo*. From the beginning the motif is emphasized of the lack of the knowledge of basic information, one which characterizes the situation of both sets of heroes – the robbers and the reader. The only initial assumptions to which the latter can resort concern their literary experience and possible awareness of the genre convention.

In so created atmosphere of mystery a *qui pro quo* is inscribed in which the robbers mistakenly take the girl sitting on the rock nearby as a goddess. The association is justified by the girl's unusual beauty and figure²² which give the impression of her suffering and “an air of courage and nobility” (I 2, 1), as well as causativity, for a bow can be seen lying at her feet and the majority of people

²⁰ The narrator uses here such terms as “spectacle” (θέατρον), “spectators” (θεωροί), and “scene” (σκηνή) (I 1, 6 f.); Heliodorus uses theatrical vocabulary throughout the novel. More on this latter subject in BARTSCH 1989: 130 f.; PAULSEN 1992: 21 f.; DWORACKI 1996: 355 f.

²¹ BARTSCH concludes (1989:120 f.) that in the analysed scene the robbers function as “proleptic models for the extratextual viewers”.

²² At the moment the girl stands up the impression of her divinity even deepens, mainly because she is very tall (I 2, 5).

who died in the battle were killed with this particular weapon. This allows for associating the girl with a goddess – a possible author of the mysterious events which occurred on the beach and of which the narrator says that “the deity had contrived an infinitely varied spectacle, defiling wine with blood and unleashing war at the party, combining wining and dying, pouring of drink and spilling of blood.” (I 1, 6). The robbers are not sure if they see the goddess Isis, the goddess Artemis, or a god-possessed priestess, yet, their reaction resembles a religious sensation, for they are terrified and have a feeling of confronting mystery. The *qui pro quo* is exposed when an apparent goddess casts herself crying on a young man who has been lying on her lap and who has just regained consciousness. Regardless of the unclear character of these circumstances the robbers understand that such a reaction confirms the human nature of the girl. It is at once a point in which the aesthetic reader can identify the girl and the young man as the two lovers-protagonists and thus accept that in such an unconventional way they have been introduced into the *medias res* of the world of the novel.

The question of identification seems fundamental in this scene, both on the plane of the world of the novel and with regard to the reader’s perspective. On the level of action, identification directly influences the protagonists’ lots for the robbers, having recognized ordinary humans in the apparent goddess and her companion, do not have scruples about taking them captive²³. The reader, on the other hand, must confront the question of the actual status of the characters of the girl and the young man. This question concerns both the significance of the depicted above religious connotations and the possibility to specify their status as the novel’s protagonists. In both of these two scopes the exceptional character of the opening scene of *Aithiopika* can be noticed, particularly in comparison with other preserved novels of the period in question.

The highlighting of the protagonists’ beauty via comparing their appearances to those of deities seems to be an inherent element of literary practice of all novelists. One of the devices which is used for the purpose of this practice is focusing the point of view on the perspective of foils who nevertheless have contact with the protagonists²⁴. Much as the “spectator’s” reactions in other works are limited to expressing admiration, Heliodorus highlighting awe and respect seems to introduce a new quality: not only are the protagonists as beautiful as gods, certain divine aspects are also inscribed in their nature.

The texts of the four remaining novels are also coherent when it comes to the way the basic information on the protagonists is conveyed. Chariton’s auctorial narrator presents this information already in the first sentences of *Callirhoe*, commencing from the formulation of the protagonists’ profiles and the plans

²³ A possibility of identifying Charikleia with a goddess is highlighted again in the scene in which the protagonists are taken to the robbers camp (I 7, 2).

²⁴ See Xen. Ephes. I 12, 1.

which the god Eros has for them. Similarly to this, the first two paragraphs of *An Ephesian Tale* present nearly complete data on Habrokomes and Anthia and their love. Book One of *Daphnis and Chloe* begins with an explanation of how the children – then the novel’s protagonists – have been found next to the nymphs’ cave and points to the divine inspiration which influenced the fact that they have met. Achilles Tatius construes the beginning of his novel in a slightly different way, yet even he presents both the identity of his protagonist (who introduces himself within the frames of his own narration) and his subject matter: dramatic adventures in consequence of love, as obvious. Thus, in each of the above mentioned examples the reader is quickly and unambiguously informed on who the main heroes are and of love as the story’s leitmotif. On the aesthetic level such information allows the reader to immediately identify the said texts generically as novels. Even if, as is the case with *Leucippe and Clitophon*, the strategy of the text brings justified doubts as to the meaning of its comic aspects, the dynamic and bond with the generic convention is visible all the way through.

Contrary to this, Heliodorus seems to push as much forward as he can the moment in which any information on the protagonists is revealed so that the question of who the mysterious couple met on the beach of the River Nile is lingers over the novel’s events for long. For long, too, does the audience have difficulties with guessing the names of the protagonists, for Charikleia and Theagenes introduce themselves only in I 8, 3 f., the circumstances of their encounter and love, their origin and their profiles, traditionally presented as soon as the introduction to a novel, are also saved for later (we learn about it gradually, mainly in the course of the vast, covering the entirety of Books Three and Four, narration of the Egyptian priest Kalasiris). The suggestion that we deal with a couple very much in love with one another who are simultaneously the novel’s protagonists is sustained solely by Charikleia’s lament. The latter is of so general a nature that we can consider it a summary of a formula of an action typical for a literary genre of interest to us: “Apollo, you punish us too much and too harshly for our sins! Do you think we have not already suffered punishment enough – separation from our families, capture by pirates, a thousand dangers at sea, now a second capture by bandits on land, and a future even bitterer than the past?” (I 8, 2). These very same words could be uttered by the protagonists of both *An Ephesian Tale* and *Leucippe and Clitophon*, therefore we can assume that they are of metaliterary character. The convention-conscious author directs such words to an equally conscious reader.

It seems then that certain hints allow us at this stage of the novel development to identify Charikleia and Theagenes as its protagonists; on the other hand, however, a tendency is visible to direct the reader’s attention to unconventional solutions adopted for the purpose of creating their characters. The above mentioned divine aspects of their natures and slow uncovering of their identities serve this aim. Also, one cannot remain indifferent towards the person of the protagonists’ divine protector – the god Apollo, for traditionally, the gods responsible in the

novel for the protagonists' fates are Eros and Aphrodite²⁵. Had it not been for the fact that he continues the strategy in question in the further part of the text, we could treat these practices as Heliodorus' attempts at emphasizing his originality.

The ambiguity of the protagonists' identities finds its parallel in the diversification of the degree of their involvement in the novel's action. This involvement becomes fully visible as late as Book Six of the novel (with the exception of Book Nine), whereas in the first five books they are oftentimes made a part of the background to the advantage of internal narrations which the novel's other characters lead and where the narrators function as protagonists. Their accumulation and vastness²⁶ distinguish Heliodorus' novel from other similar stories and may suggest that also other heroes should be treated as leading characters. This concerns mainly the Egyptian priest Kalasiris and the young Athenian Knemon. This latter man seems particularly predestined to be the novel's protagonist.

Knemon and his story appears in the same scene in which the names of Charikleia and Theagenes are introduced (I 8). These two people become listeners of Knemon's long and full of dramatic twists story. Consequently, instead of following the expected adventures of the protagonists, the reader follows the lot of the young Athenian whose role seems to transgress the frames traditionally reserved for foils, too²⁷. Instead, he resembles the protagonists of the Latin realistic-comic novel: much like in the stories by Petronius and Apuleius, in Knemon's story one can find a volatile and amoral flirt which entangles the hero in the web of schemes and dangers, organized with the use of the *qui pro quo*²⁸. A clever servant appears to play the role of the action's "engine" and, with regard

²⁵ In *Daphnis and Chloe* by Longus the god Pan and his nymphs play a significant role, too.

²⁶ Internal narrations comprise about 55% of the text of Books I–V.

²⁷ Although Knemon depicts his role in the protagonists' story as episodic ("This is no time to introduce a new theme into your own tragedy in the form of my misfortunes", I 8, 7), the vastness of his story and the detailed, novel-like character of its plot indirectly suggest that its function is far more significant than that of an element of the background necessary for the protagonists' adventures. The question of the significance of Knemon's story for interpretational possibilities of *Aithiopika* has been formulated by MORGAN 1989 b: 99 f. and 1991: 95 f.

²⁸ Rejected by her stepson, Knemon's stepmother Demaineta plots the plan of vengeance: the cheated young man takes his own father for his stepmother's alleged lover and tries to fight him with a sword. The father does not want to listen to any explanations and puts his son before court where he accuses him of an attempted patricide. As a result, Knemon is banished (I 12). Demaineta's subsequent punishment (death by committing suicide) effects from an analogical situation organized with the use of the *qui pro quo* principle. Namely, Knemon's father who suspects his wife of betraying him comes across her in a house of a different person (she is lying on a bed) and unconditionally accepts the servant's explanation that Demaineta's alleged lover has just managed to escape (I 16 f.). Much as in the first situation Knemon takes his own father for his stepmother's lover, in the second situation the person of Demaineta's alleged lover is a projection resulting from the circumstances the effect of which is the woman's having been punished for amoral passion and scheming against Knemon.

to the novel's formal layer, the ego-narrative convention is highlighted²⁹; moreover, Knemon appears as an individual hero (in a Greek novel we have to do with two protagonists). One fact significant for the reader's perspective is that at this point of the action Knemon is, unlike Charikleia and Theagenes, a character of a well-known identity and history.

The difficulties associated with the interpretation of the role played in the novel by a couple of characters of interest to us become more profound when the motif of the girl's apparent death is introduced while the reader's perspective is limited to the state of the knowledge typical for a direct action participant. Analogical as it is with the above presented solutions from Achilles Tatius' novel, this practice has its own individual character. The events are presented to us from the vantage point of Charikleia's "murderer" rather than from that of an observer who, understandably, could succumb to the illusory theatrical power of *apate*. In the course of the fights on the Herdsmen's island, Thyamis, the leader of the band of robbers, resolves to kill the girl so that she is not taken captive by the victorious party. The reader follows the situation exclusively from the point of view of Thyamis when he enters the cave, wanders about in the darkness, and finds and kills a woman who managed to say a few words in Greek before she died (I 30 f.). Thus similarly to *Leucippe and Clitophon*, the text leads the reader into the illusion of the *qui pro quo* forcing them to believe for a while that the potential protagonist has been killed³⁰.

The effect of this situation seems to be even more multidimensional than in the case of Heliodorus' predecessor. In Tatius' novel the *qui pro quo* served to create the plane for a literary play between the text and the generic convention (according to which the novel's protagonist cannot die), what in turn allowed for engaging the reader's consciousness on a deeper, aesthetic level of a giver-receiver relation. In *Aithiopika*, on the other hand, the trick of interest to us appears in a situation when Charikleia's position of the heroine of the story has not been specified yet. Therefore her death can seem a probable solution although it would at the same time question the possibility of her being the leading character of the novel. Such a solution undoubtedly multiplies the sensation of vagueness of the question of fundamental importance to the reader, namely, who actually the protagonists of this story are (Charikleia and Theagenes, Knemon, or maybe the lot of all the three characters create the plot's axis). At this point of the story the text does not bring any solutions which would pertain to the scene opening the *qui pro quo*, but rather maximally complicates the action's picture.

²⁹ Ego-narrative seems typical for the comic perspective for it appears both in the novels of Petronius and Apuleius and in Lucian's *A True Story*. See PERRY 1967: 325 f.

³⁰ The possibility of the protagonist's death is made probable by the narrator's words who, commenting on a talk Knemon and Theagenes have in the next scene on the cave as Charikleia's shelter, states: "Little did he know what sorrow awaited him there!" (II 2, 2).

It seems therefore that this tendency can be considered a sign of a consciously used misinformation strategy within the frames of which making the identification of protagonists or even generic qualification of the work difficult for the reader provokes an aesthetic and hermeneutic reflection: who is who in this theatre of errors and what meanings have been hidden in this way. The story's hermeneutic direction finds its symbolic patterning in the picture of the cave: its inside turns out to be a labyrinth of corridors in which it is easy to succumb to the power of illusion and appearance much in the same way as it happened to Thyamis who wrongly assumed, judging from the Greek language that he had heard, that the woman he came across is the one he was looking for. The same holds true with regard to the Knemon and Theagenes who did not hesitate to recognize the dead body lying in the cave to be the body of Charikleia (II 3)³¹. In the meantime it turned out that the truth is hidden deeper: when the torch was lit, it lighted the heroine hidden safely in a distant part of the cave. Analogically, manoeuvring the reader into the meanders of the misleading suggestions concerning our protagonists in the first books of *Aithiopika* can be considered a hint, or a provocation both to assume the existence of a hidden level of meanings and make an attempt at finding them.

Before we consider the information about the protagonists complete, the reader will have to get acquainted with the history of Kalasiris' lot and thus, with that of the Greek priest Charikles³². An answer to the question who Charikleia and Theagenes are remains open until the end of Kalasiris' story in Book Five. Only then can one consider the majority of doubts which arose in the course of the beach scene which opened the work explained. This means, however, that a half of the novel's text has been devoted to specifying the protagonists' status via gradual restoring their histories from the narrative labyrinth.

The three subsequent books (VI–VIII) of *Aithiopika* seem to eventually bring about the ordered and stabilized image of the protagonists. The action focuses almost exclusively around the deeds of Charikleia and Theagenes with Knemon and Kalasiris, up to this moment put to the foreground, being gradually withdrawn to

³¹ Theagenes' lament over the body of the alleged Chariclea increases the feeling of uncertainty as regards the heroine's identity. It emphasizes, much in the same way as it happens in the opening scene, the relation of Charikleia with gods (her strikingly beautiful, glittering eyes; her function as the gods' servant and fire-bearer) while at the same time revealing the unclear character of the girl's relation with the young man: his bride? – she has not been one yet; his wife? – she has not experienced marriage yet (II 4, 3).

³² The *qui pro quo* technique is also of major significance within the frames of Kalasiris' narration. This is because due to his origin he was considered a specialist in the Egyptian magic by Charikles who subsequently asks him to aid, firstly, in winning Charikleia's favour for her adoptive father's marital plans (II 3) and, secondly, in relieving him from an alleged spell (III 9). This wrong identification has brought results different than assumed by Charikleia's adoptive father, for it allowed Kalasiris to realize the plan of uniting Charikleia and Theagenes against the will of Charikles thus fulfilling the gods' will revealed by the Delphic oracle.

the background, whereas all the remaining characters do not exceed the frames of foils. The nature of the protagonists' adventures also seems similar to the plot scheme typical for the genre: they have to confront other, love- and life-threatening dangers resulting from the passion felt for Theagenes by Arsake, a wife of the Persian satrap in Egypt. Also, the way the narration is conducted changes from the complicated set of internal narrations into the auctorial narrative.

This "come back" of the convention turns out to be momentary and partly apparent. The protagonists' primary status is preserved only in the three mentioned books, whereas they do not play any role in the events depicted in Book Nine in which the leading figure is the Ethiopian monarch Hydaspes. Previously stimulated to reflect on the problem of the protagonists' identity, the reader cannot miss the whole bunch of unconventional solutions and new questions which have cropped up on the basis of the *status quo* established in the first part of the novel. These observations can be made into a long list, therefore let us enumerate only those connected to the identity problem of interest to us. The protagonists do not come from the same polis³³, what is more, it turns out that the heroine is not Greek at all but an Ethiopian princess. They meet in the religious heart of the Greek world, in Delphi rather than in a hometown of any of them and it is from Delphi that their journey begins. The journey means coming home for Charikleia but it also means, for Theagenes, breaking all ties with his motherland Phthia, although returning home "safe and sound" is a constant element of other novels. Also, it is certainly difficult to consider these characters as private persons, for Charikleia, as it was previously mentioned, is of royal origin, Theagenes comes from Achilles' family line and the lots and actions of both of them bring about significant changes within the entire world of the novel³⁴.

These solutions are so far away from the typical generic solutions that from the vantage point of an aesthetic reader it seems justified to further treat the identity question as a leading problem. Another reason for which this is advisable is the constant evoking of the situation in which individual characters struggle against the problem with identifying other action participants in the course of the novel. With regard to the protagonists two scenes organized on the *qui pro quo* principle can be pointed to. In these scenes Theagenes misinterprets the identity of his beloved. Apart from the cave scene discussed above where he mistakenly took the body of a strange woman for Charikleia, the events taking place within the walls of Memphis seem significant (VII 7, 5 f.). After he had split with his

³³ Chariton's protagonists come from Syracuse, Xenophon's from Ephesus and Longus' from Mytilene. In Tatius' novel the hero comes from Tyre and his beloved from Byzantium, yet the young people meet in Kleitophon's house where members of their both families are staying.

³⁴ The private character of the protagonists as one of the indicators of the genre has been pointed out by BACHTIN 1982: 307 f.; see also HÄGG 1987: 17 and JOHNE 2003: 175. The autonomy of Heliodorus' protagonists' characters in this context has not been sufficiently discussed so far by scholars.

companion a few days before, Theagenes could not recognize her disguised as a beggar thus forcing her to resort to the system of signs they agreed on using earlier.

Literally perceived, the motif offends with its artificiality and can suggest the author's rigid following his predecessors, a reading which in turn seems difficult to accept in the light of the entire text, with its frequent manipulations of generic conventions. Therefore it is justifiable to search for a different reason for introducing the recognition scene in question. Recently enlightened as to the question of the protagonists' identities, the reader can treat this scene as a suggestion that the established images of Charikleia and Theagenes as the main characters of the novel should be approached as merely a disguise, a mask for other coded meanings. The conclusion seems the more justified since the scene of recognition of Charikleia by Theagenes closes the entire sequence of the situations dominated by the problems with the correct identity reading.

In Book Two Knemon falls prey to appearance, too, for on the basis of dress and figure he decides that Kalasiris is Greek only to be put straight to the recognition of him as Egyptian (II 21). It soon turns out that the people treated by Knemon as strangers are in fact related: the accidentally encountered Kalasiris comes about as Charikleia's and Theagenes' adoptive father (II 23) and the real father of Thyamis, the leader of the band of the Herdsmen who is actually a priest in the shrine of Isis (II 25). The hospitable merchant Nausikles in whose house the young man and the old priest found shelter in Egypt appears to be the long searched for lover of Thisbe, the woman who caused all the problems of the young man (II 24). Almost nobody in the theatre of errors of the first five books of *Aithiopika* are who they seemed to be when encountered for the first time. From the perspective of the relation between the text and its reader, Knemon and Theagenes, both entangled in the game of appearances, function in such circumstances as the reader's *alter ego*. On the one hand they are constantly misled, on the other they are encouraged to incessantly perform a critical reflection on the condition of individual characters.

The suggested hermeneutic direction of our reflections finds its further inspiration in the way the action is organized in the last two books of the novel in which the primary status of the protagonists becomes weakened again. Cut off entirely from the involvement in the events of Book Nine, the protagonists give way to Hydaspes, the king of the Ethiopians and Charikleia's father, only to return as potential offerings on the god Helios' altar in Meroe in Book Ten. Their lot will be resolved as a result of an argument between Hydaspes and the gymnosophist Sisimitres.

The action of the entire Book Ten is organized around the motifs of the *qui pro quo* and *anagnorismos* – the ultimate recognition of the female protagonist's identity. This time Hydaspes turns out to be a victim of appearance, for, judging solely from appearance, he treats Charikleia and Theagenes as mere

war hostages sufficiently beautiful to become offerings sacrificed to gods in the course of the feast given to celebrate the favourable result of the Persian war. At the same time he rejects the implication that Charikleia could be his daughter even though both his dreams in which she is coming back home³⁵ and, later on, the girl's own words suggest otherwise. The aim of the *qui pro quo* in the plot is therefore to arrange for a situation in which the black king of the Ethiopians rejects appearance and recognizes his own daughter and successor, a white girl who looks like a Greek³⁶ and travels from Greece but became a captive woman in Ethiopia. It needs to be emphasized with reference to this contradiction that the puzzle is not there to misinform the reader. On the contrary, the puzzle's form serves to maximize the clarity of the information: the reader's situation is that of a well-informed observer³⁷ and the action is presented from the perspective of the auctorial narrator who has the knowledge of deeds and motivations of individual characters. All the mentioned aspects seem to point to the necessity of paying attention to the content presented in the novel's finale and ascribing the greatest significance to it. Both the emphasis on the religious motif, so tightly knit with the protagonists' history that their lot seems equally dependent on ritual procedures, and the character of the feast itself are also good reasons to do this.

The scene in which Charikleia, out of her own will, jumps into the burning stake (X 9) must be considered decisive for the question of the protagonists' identity. This is because this scene constitutes a nearly mirror image of the opening scene of the novel (I 1). In this latter scene the heroine, dressed in a priestess' robe embroidered with gold, with her hair let loose, is standing on a hill, well visible for the inhabitants of Meroe assembled at the feast but not recognized since she resembles more a statue of a goddess than a mortal. We can therefore assume that the image closes the frames of Charikleia's story dominated by the incessant, lingering question of the heroine's actual identity. In the case of the majority of the unknowns the reader, up to this moment, could find answers while the action developed. The possibly religious connotations of the female protagonist remained the only unclear question concerning her. Much as the robbers in the introduction to Book One on having seen Charikleia experienced typically religious, it seemed, feelings, in the finale the gymnosophist Sisimithras as the Ethiopians' highest religious authority confirms that the girl and her male

³⁵ Both Hydaspes (IX 25) and Persinna (X 3) are dreaming about the unexpected appearance of their daughter, now mature enough to become a married woman.

³⁶ Pondering over the identity of the female offering (Charikleia), Persinna states that the girl does have the face of an Egyptian (X 7, 5).

³⁷ It seems that the words of the gymnosophist Sisimithras which he utters at the beginning of Book Ten can be treated as a metaliterary remark directed at the reader, warning them about the dramatic plot to come and foreshadowing the positive, for the protagonists, finale: "the divine power warns that the sacrifices will be disrupted by some commotion or disturbance, the outcome of which, however, will be good and joyful" (ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ ἡδὺ τὸ τέλος; X 4, 2); cf. Chariton VIII 1, 4 f.

companion cast the light which suggests divine protection. Eventually both the gods' interest and the actual identity of the female protagonist are confirmed as soon as her figure has been compared to the image of Andromeda in the picture (it has been revealed that already at the moment of her conception, Charikleia became assimilated to Andromeda; X 15, 10). Thus the female protagonist's status became fuller: inscribing Charikleia in the mythical story of an Ethiopian princess and her Greek rescuer Perseus eventually allows for demarcating her as a heroic figure and thus entirely different from the conventional characters of the earlier novels. As such she is an ideal complement of Theagenes who, like his ancestor Achilles, has all the heroic attributes: handsomeness, bravery, straightforwardness and emotionality. She is undoubtedly related to Andromeda for she has characteristics of an immortal: she is strikingly beautiful, ethically perfect and intelligent far above average³⁸.

It turns out, however, that the solution of the problem of the female protagonist's status (who now becomes an almost heroic figure) does not exhaust interpretational possibilities of the theatre of errors created in Heliodorus' novel. The return of the heroine home is associated, typically for the heroic myth, with the profound change of values owing to which order becomes reestablished in the world of our heroes. By the end of Book Ten the ultimate clarification of the protagonist's identity unexpectedly leads to the emphasis of another *anagnorismos* – the recognition of the actual nature of the main Ethiopian god – Helios. This nature also emerges as different from the local opinions on the subject of identity. The primeval, even barbarian elements of the cult of Helios – human sacrifice – are considered foreign to the god's nature and only an effect of a wrong human opinion (X 9, 6 f.). After rejecting them a real image of the Hellenic god crops up who is represented from then on by a new couple of priests: Theagenes, a descendant of the greatest Hellenic hero and Charikleia, formed in the spirit of the Hellenic religion and philosophy, the successor to the Ethiopian throne.

The interpretative potential of possible extraliterary, religious-ideological, or even political implications of the above formulated conclusion is broad and thematically exceeds the frames of the present discussion³⁹. The above analyses of the ways of using and functioning of the *qui pro quo* motif in *Aithiopika* allow us to consider this device to be one of the most tangible mechanisms organizing the world of the novel in all of its aspects. Within the frame of action the device regulates the plot with regard to all protagonists and foils. On an aesthetic plane, the use of the *qui pro quo* is even more elaborated: it serves to engage the reader's attention via alleviating the cognitive distance existing between the protagonists and the reader. First of all, however, the *qui pro quo* provokes formal reflections on the nature of the protagonists who eventually reveal their heroic

³⁸ Cf. WHITMARSH 2011: 125 f.

³⁹ E.g. ALTHEIM 1942; SANDY 1982; DOWDEN 1996; WHITMARSH 1998.

nature. It also comprises an element of the general misinformation strategy realized within both planes to which succumbs both the reader (primarily in the first part of the novel) and the protagonists. Their state in the finale is summed up by the narrator in the following way: “Nobody could restrain himself now: there was pandemonium” (X 37, 3).

The reflection on the *qui pro quo* also explicitly indicates that both of the levels in question, that is, the semantic and aesthetic level, are subordinated to the hermeneutic plane. This is because the question of the female protagonist’s identity emerges as closely related to the problem of recognizing the real identity of the god Helios⁴⁰. The narrator directly indicates the actual intention of the text: all that has happened with regard to Charikleia’s return and recognition is a manifestation of the will of the divine director, for “the same divine force that had staged this whole drama [...], and finally the offering of human blood, which all had expected to see, was transformed into a sacrifice free of all stain” (X 38, 3 f.). The reflection on the “comedy of errors” of Heliodorus’ novel thus leads the reader to the transgressing of the conventional religious reflection.

All in all it needs to be emphasized that the above conducted analyses of the ways in which the *qui pro quo* can be used in ancient Greek texts allow us to observe the phenomenon of a surprising broadening and diversifying of its functions, from the element serving the complication of a plot within individual stages of the novel’s action in early romances to the multifunction mechanism in later works. Similarly to complicated narrative strategies the device functions as an important instrument for shaping the relation between the text and its audience. It is with this instrument that the author programmes the first degree reader’s emotions and expectations as well as directs the aesthetic reader’s reflection and it seems that this effect comprises the author’s basic creative idea. This latter aspect in particular compels us to look at the ancient Greek novel as not so much a schematic genre but rather a dynamic one. This dynamic genre is exactly what is of interest and value to us, specifically in the context of the discussion of the nature of the relationship between the work and its reader.

University of Szczecin

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALTHEIM 1942: F. ALTHEIM, *Helios und Heliodor von Emesa*, Amsterdam–Leipzig 1942.
 BACHTIN 1982: M. BACHTIN, *Problemy literatury i estetyki*, transl. by W. GRAJEWSKI, Warszawa 1982.
 BARTSCH 1989: S. BARTSCH, *Decoding the Ancient Novel. The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton 1989.

⁴⁰ More on this subject in CIEŚLUK 2008: 161 f.

- CIEŚLUK 2008: M. CIEŚLUK, *Bohater i gra przeznaczenia w „Opowieści etiopskiej” Heliodora*, Szczecin 2008.
- 2010: *Komizm w teorii i praktyce antycznej powieści greckiej*, Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium XX 2010, 2, pp. 39–53.
- DOWDEN 1996: K. DOWDEN, *Heliodorus: Serious Intentions*, CQ XLVI 1996, pp. 267–285.
- DWORACKI 1996: S. DWORACKI, *Theatre and Drama in Heliodorus’ “Aethiopica”*, Eos LXXXIV 1966, pp. 355–361.
- ECO 2003: U. ECO, *O literaturze*, transl. by J. UGNIĘWSKA, A. WASILEWSKA, Warszawa 2003.
- EFFE 1975, B. EFFE, *Entstehung und Funktion „personaler“ Erzählweisen in der Erzählliteratur der Antike*, Poetica VII 1975, pp. 135–157.
- FUTRE PINHEIRO 1988: M.P. FUTRE PINHEIRO, *Time and Narrative Technique in Heliodorus’ “Aethiopica”*, ANRW II 34, 4 (1988), pp. 3148–3173.
- HAYNES 2003: K. HAYNES, *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, London–New York 2003.
- HÄGG 1987: Th. HÄGG, *Eros und Tyche. Der Roman in der antiken Welt*, Mainz am Rhein 1987.
- 2004: *Orality, Literacy, and the “Readership” of the Early Greek Novel*, in: L.B. MORTENSEN, T. EIDE (eds.) *Parthenope. Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969–2004)*, Copenhagen 2004, pp. 109–140.
- HEFTI 1950: V. HEFTI, *Zur Erzählungstechnik in Heliodors „Aethiopica”*, Wien 1950.
- HOLZBERG 2003: N. HOLZBERG, *Powieść antyczna*, transl. by M. WÓJCİK, Kraków 2003.
- JOHNE 2003: R. JOHNE, *Women in the Ancient Novel*, in: G. SCHMELING (ed.) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Boston–Leiden 2003, pp. 151–207.
- MORGAN 1989 a: J.R. MORGAN, *A Sense of the Ending: The Conclusion of Heliodoros’ Aithiopika*, TAPhA CXIX 1989, pp. 299–320.
- 1989 b: *The Story of Knemon in Heliodoros “Aithiopika”*, JHS CIX 1989, pp. 99–113.
- 1991: *Reader and Audiences in the “Aithiopika” of Heliodoros*, in: H. HOFMANN (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, vol. IV, Groningen 1991, pp. 85–103.
- PAULSEN 1992: T. PAULSEN, *Inszenierung des Schicksals. Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor*, Trier 1992.
- PERRY 1967: B.E. PERRY, *The Ancient Romances. A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1967.
- REARDON 1991: B.P. REARDON, *The Form of Greek Romance*, Princeton, NJ 1991.
- 1999: *Achilles Tatios and Ego-Narrative*, in: S. SWAIN (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, New York 1999, pp. 243–258.
- SANDY 1982: G.N. SANDY, *Characterization and Philosophical Décor in Heliodorus’ “Aethiopica”*, TAPhA CXII 1982, pp. 141–167.
- SKWARA 2001: E. SKWARA, *Historia komedii rzymskiej*, Warszawa 2001.
- WESSELING 1988: B. WESSELING, *The Audience of the Ancient Novels*, in: H. HOFMANN (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, vol. I, Groningen 1988, pp. 67–79.
- WHITMARSH 1998: T. WHITMARSH, *The Birth of a Prodigy: Heliodorus and the Genealogy of Hellenism*, in: R. HUNTER (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, Cambridge 1998, pp. 93–124.
- 2011: *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Cambridge 2011.

BIRD IMAGERY IN ESCHATOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE OF MODERN GREEK FUNERAL LAMENTS

by

MICHAŁ BZINKOWSKI

The belief that the outside world is not only what it seems to be and what is visible and touchable but refers to another reality through the language of symbols has been characteristic of human thinking from the beginning of mankind. Man constantly and cautiously looked around him trying to guess the meaning of sudden, mostly unexpected, signs the physical world sent to him. This way of conceiving the world has slowly disappeared in West European civilization dominated by the rationalistic mind neglectful of premonitions based on feelings. Only folk culture, hardly susceptible to invasive influence of philosophical and religious systems being currently in force, preserved the most archaic ideas regarding the perception of the world. Especially worth researching is the vitality of precognitive abilities of foreseeing death based on the observation of nature.

According to folk beliefs, there is a variety of portents of approaching death, namely the signs seen by a man and read as potential prognosis of imminent danger threatening himself or someone else. The folk imagination abounds in images of such signs that could be visible all around and have predictable and determinable effect on human efforts. Mostly, these omens have physical properties coming indirectly from the world of animals, plants and natural phenomena. The other ones could appear in dreams or on important days of the liturgical year, especially on Easter and Christmas, regarded unequivocally in popular beliefs as a time of a sudden change and opening for the powers that stay hidden during the rest part of the year.

Apart from the ethnographic research that obviously tells us through the stories of the respondents about the vitality of such a divination in rural Greece, the other valuable source of studying of evil omens in folk tradition are Greek demotic songs (τα δημοτικά τραγούδια) preserved and transmitted in oral tradition from antiquity. Especially, the folksongs belonging to the group of so

called laments or funeral songs *moirologia* (μοιρολόγια)¹ and the songs of the Underworld and Charos/Death (Του Κάτω Κόσμου και του Χάρου)² are of great significance for the investigation of eschatological beliefs and the presence of portents according to folk worldview. The collections of songs gathered mainly in the 19th century by ethnographers³ and still sung and played nowadays in various versions throughout Greece as well as edited in countless modern anthologies that I use in the present paper⁴, reveal the abundance of comparative material for researching the question of folk eschatology.

In the present article I will try to shed some light on the fragment of the eschatological beliefs preserved in Greek lament songs⁵ concerning the presence of ornithological imagery that, in my opinion, deserves a special attention and is almost completely neglected by scholars dealing with the problem. For instance, ANAGNOSTOPOULOS gives in his study a short survey of examples of the portents of death in Greek folk songs⁶, among which he considers dreams as the most persuasive for those who see them and for the others who are dreamt of⁷. He also briefly mentions other surprising omens that could appear to the protagonists of demotic songs, such as a failure in cooking the sweets and painting the eggs red during the Easter preparations and a sudden drying of the flowers in the yard⁸. As for the animals foretelling death, the author, who – it should be

¹ ALEXIOU 1974 (second, revised edition 2002), shows clearly that the continuity of the dirges in Greek tradition from antiquity until now is unquestionable, although not easily tangible, which is confirmed not only by the rites over the body of the dead still in use in today's rural Greece but also by the scheme of lament songs as well as the motifs that they contain, deeply rooted in Hellenic culture.

² In broad outline the image of the Underworld in Modern Greek folksongs is very close to the most ancient representations we come across in Homeric poems. The world of the dead is ruled by Charos, Modern Greek personification of Death as well as the Angel of Death fulfilling God's orders. It was partly a subject of my recent paper *Charos Psychopompos? Tracing the Continuity of the Idea of a Ferryman of the Dead in Greek Culture*, *Classica Cracoviensia* XIII 2009, pp. 17–33. See above all: ALEXIOU 1978; MAVROGORDATO 1955; ANAGNOSTOPOULOS 1984.

³ Among others: C. FAURIEL, *Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne*, 2 vols., Paris 1824, 1825; A. PASSOW, *Popularia carmina Graeciae recentioris*, Lipsiae 1860; N. POLITIS, *Εκλογαί από τα τραγούδια του ελληνικού λαού*, Athinai 1925.

⁴ I use the following anthologies: EDT 1947; PASAYANIS 1928; KOUGEAS 2000; KORIDIS 2002 (see the first part of bibliography for full references).

⁵ Obviously, the eschatological folk beliefs are not confined to funeral laments and songs of Charos but are present also in other groups of Greek demotic songs, especially *της ξενιτιάς* (a foreign land songs). However, due to the multitude of material I shall restrict myself in the present paper to the songs mentioned above, although in some cases I will use a phrase or a passage from different category to illustrate or underline something.

⁶ ANAGNOSTOPOULOS 1984: 108 f.

⁷ For instance, according to the Kashubians, dreams play the most important role in foretelling death and the belief in the reality of the information received during dreaming is still widespread and common among the elder generation. See PERSZON 1999: 114 f.

⁸ ANAGNOSTOPOULOS 1984: 109 f.; 77 f.

clearly underlined – thoroughly deals with the problems of folk eschatology in demotic songs, is surprisingly taciturn, confining himself to the few examples of birds presaging death of those who they speak to and death of others as well as a horse whinny⁹.

The problem of the close relation of birds to the eschatological beliefs of Greek demotic songs also seems to be rather absent in the key work on the Greek lament songs by ALEXIOU. In this study we come across some hints about the role birds play in folksongs as messengers of bad news, weeping over the capture of the Greek cities by the Turks, especially Constantinople and Adrianople¹⁰. Usually in this group of songs birds appearing in formulaic structures of lament songs are nightingales, swallows, cuckoos or just simply “black birds” (μαύρο πουλί) that speak in a human voice and are invited to join the lamentation or in other cases not to lament at all¹¹.

In his well-known and in many respects still up-to-date monograph, LAWSON reminds us that the ornithological divination has been a characteristic feature of folk belief from ancient times onwards¹². He enumerates many ominous birds in Greek antiquity as well as those that were gods’ messengers¹³, attempting to show possible links between classical and modern Greece, what in many cases seems oversimplified without taking into account the obvious differences nor other influences that could have gathered through centuries. Firstly, the omission of the medieval Byzantine context that in some cases turns out to be very helpful in determining the role birds played in some funeral songs together with the passion of the Byzantines to the world of nature, in which birds are one of the most significant elements¹⁴, may seem a serious shortcoming of LAWSON’S monograph.

⁹ In traditional village society horses played one of the most important roles, they were treated with care and had a strong relation with their owners. It is said they had the gift of seeing the souls of the dead and generally saw more than a human being could see. They could also foresee their owner’s death. See PERSZON 1999: 118. On no account should they be used during their master’s funeral (*ibidem*, p. 217).

¹⁰ ALEXIOU 1974: 93. In her translation: “The nightingales (Τ’σηδόνια) of the East and the birds (τα πουλιά) of the West/ weep late, weep early, weep at mid-day,/ they weep for Adrianopole, sacked so many times,/ sacked upon the three festivals of the year”.

¹¹ ALEXIOU 1974: 97. In her translation: “Nightingales, do not sing; cuckoos be silent” (σηδόνια, μη λαλήσετε, κούκοι να βουβαθήτε).

¹² LAWSON 1910: 308 ff.

¹³ LAWSON 1910: 308 ff. The most significant: the eagle, the messenger of Zeus; the other ones not always easily identified: the vulture, the raven, the hawk, the heron, the wren, the woodpecker and finally the owl in classical times symbolizing wisdom rather than something ominous.

¹⁴ It is worth mentioning here a 14th century poem written in vernacular Greek *Πουλολόγος* telling the story of the wedding of King Eagle’s son, to which all kinds of birds were invited. The whole poem is a satire on Byzantine society, including the Church and the politics. One can also observe many critical comments on the strangers, the Franks, Bulgars, Valachs, Tatars and others. The debates between the animals show that an agreement between them is not possible, because of

Secondly, none of the monographs and papers mentioned above deals with possible influences of the Slavonic peoples on Modern Greek folk songs, a problem that – it is worth underlining – seems to be completely absent not only in Greek but also in West European scholarship. Thorough investigation shows clearly that one should very carefully research on the Modern Greek folklore without taking into account the obvious fact that it belongs inseparably to the broadly conceived Balkan folklore. In my paper I shall try to give some intriguing solutions to the problems of birds, in some cases taking into account to some extent the Byzantine as well as the Slavonic influences.

To begin with, let me state very clearly that in Greek folksongs birds are not confined to the bringers of bad news and play a much more significant role. They not only constitute an integral part of eschatological folk beliefs of Modern Greeks but also, more importantly, evoke the archaic way of thinking about the afterlife of an individual that has many parallels in other folk European traditions to which I shall allude subsequently trying to give a new and possibly holistic approach to the question. In order to do this, first of all I will focus on the description of the behaviour of particular birds, namely the way they used to appear, placing it in the context of the analyzed song. If a particular motif recurs and is usually introduced by a sort of a formula, I will show different variations of it. Descriptive parts following the introduction of the bird motif will be necessary to comprehend the usage of it and see the narrative scheme repeated in different versions of the same story. Short folksongs, devoid of the context, will be naturally examined in another way.

Firstly, let me draw attention to ethnographic material coming from different Greek villages that enables us to outline the context of folk tradition in which the Greek funeral laments are rooted, though, as we shall see, only to a certain degree. In the accounts given by villagers to ethnographers the bird of ill omen that recurs quite often is the owl (η κουκουβάγια), widely known in many folk cultures in connection with death¹⁵. The mention of the owl's hooting can be perceived as a curse and means that someone in the household is about to die soon: Κουκουβάγιες να λαλήσουνε! (“Let the owls hoot!”)¹⁶. Among different species

the diversity of their customs and place of living (the wild and the domestic ones). See ΚΝΟΣ 1962: 153. The similar motif of the birds' assembly discussing the serious problems while deciding whom to elect for their king, was used earlier by a Persian poet Farid ud-Din Attar (1145/46–1221) in his *The Conference of the Birds*.

¹⁵ FISCHER 1921: 22–27; PERSZON 1999: 119.

¹⁶ ABBOT 1903: 107; PSYCHOGIOU 2008: 295, according to the account of Eleni Psychogiou, age 80. Unless indicated otherwise, the translations into English are by the author of this paper. See also PSYCHOGIOU 2008: 324: ‘Όταν λαλήσει η κουκουβάγια στο σπίτι, κάποιος θα πεθάνει (“When the owl howls at home, someone will die”), the account of Nasos Lagos, age 62; 348: ‘Όταν λαλήσ’ κουκουβάγια κοντά στο σπίτι’ το ‘χούνε για κακό, κάποιος θα πεθάνει (“When the owl howls in the vicinity of home, it means ill-omen, someone will die”), according to Paraskevi Filou, age

of owls there is one unambiguously related to death due to its significant name in which the name of Charos is echoed, the Modern Greek personification of death: χαροπούλι, namely “the bird of Charos”¹⁷. In comparison with the κουκουβάγια – that could undoubtedly bring death but, as LAWSON remarks¹⁸, also just presage unexpected arrival – the hooting of Charos’ bird foretells without exception a sudden death. The sinister-looking owl arousing associations with Death itself alternates in different ethnographical accounts with στριγγλοπούλι¹⁹ and κλαφοπούλι (the weeping bird)²⁰.

Unexpected sounds produced by a hen that sometimes crows like a cock, as well as the cock’s crow are – just like the owl’s hoot – regarded as an ominous sign. In such a case the housekeeper should immediately slaughter it with an axe at the threshold²¹. Lastly, another ill-omened bird regarded as a harbinger

55, Euanthia Agorou, age 66, Sofia Balatsouka age 64. See also ZADROZYŃSKA, VRAŽINOVSKI 2002: 126, who describe the same folk belief in the Polish region of Podlasie, where the owl called *puszcz* or *puśćka* (*puszczyk* in standard Polish) is believed to bring death to the household. FISCHER (1921: 22 f.) describes at length the beliefs connected with the owl in Poland and among Slavonic peoples. He also mentions the Czech owl called *smrtonoška* (bringer of death) that sits on the windowsill of someone sick presaging his death.

¹⁷ In my above-mentioned paper (n. 2) I gave the possible Latin and English equivalents to χαροπούλι, identifying it as *Aegolius funereus*, Eng. Tengmalm’s Owl (p. 24). LAWSON (1910: 312) gives χαροπούλι the name “tawny owl”, namely Latin *Strix aluco*, which in Polish is called *puszczyk* (see the preceding note). Both attempts at identification have as a common denominator the owl’s family *Strigidae* which encompasses a lot of owls that in folk culture could be associated with death. LAWSON suggests that it is possible, though doubtful, to derive the name of this owl not from Charos but χαρά, “joy”.

¹⁸ LAWSON 1910: 311. According to him it depends on the way the owl sits upon the roof of a house: when inert it foretells death whereas alert and vigilant, flying off swiftly, it forebodes the coming of someone unexpected and his sojourn in the household.

¹⁹ PSYCHOGIOU 2008: 307, according to Pigi Angelopoulou, age 72: Ἦρθε το στριγγλοπούλι, κάποιος θα πεθάνει (“The tawny owl has come, someone will die”).

²⁰ PSYCHOGIOU 2008: 322, according to Popi Nikolakopoulou, age 72, and Loula Georgopoulou, age 59: Όταν κράξει κοντά το κλαφοπούλι, λένε ότι κάποιος θα πεθάνει (“When the weeping bird cries, it is said that someone will die”). *Ibidem*, p. 363, according to the group of men in *kafeneio*: Το κλαφοπούλι, άμα λαλήσει κοντά στο σπίτι, κάποιος θα πεθάνει (“The weeping bird, if it cries close to home, someone will die”).

²¹ ABBOT 1903: 106; LAWSON 1910: 311; PSYCHOGIOU 2008: 322, according to Popi Nikolakopoulou, age 72. See also PSYCHOGIOU 2008: 324: Κι άμα λαλήσει η κότα τη νυχτά είναι κακό (“When the hen crows at night that is a bad sign”) and *ibidem*, pp. 352 f., according to Spyros Zalokostas, age 77. See also ZADROZYŃSKA, VRAŽINOVSKI 2002: 54: the inhabitants of the village of Jablanica in Macedonia share the same belief about the unusual “crowing” of hens which should be killed at once in order to avoid disaster. The same conviction, as ZADROZYŃSKA writes (*ibidem*, p. 126), we can find in the Polish region of Podlasie. See also VLAHOVIĆ 1991: 141, where we come across the same elements in Serbian folk tradition. PERSZON (1999: 119) notices the same conviction about hens regarding the Kashubians. See also FISCHER 1921: 34–39.

of unavoidable death is in folk beliefs the raven that has funeral connotations in various mythological Indo-European traditions still alive in traditional village societies²².

Modern Greek folklore as well as the whole Balkan area inhabited by Slavonic peoples share common beliefs about the signs of approaching death. Thus, we could assume without doubt that the elements appearing in the above accounts of the people in connection with imminent death should find their reflection in the folk songs that are the quintessence of the folk perception of the world. However, such an assumption is doomed to failure, because, as I shall demonstrate, the Greek demotic poetry, although created and widespread in traditional societies, not only seems to differ markedly from the cited narratives of the villagers but also reaches deeper in time in exploitation of a bird motif in eschatological beliefs.

The most common way ominous birds come out in front of the protagonists of demotic songs is their sudden and unexpected appearance introduced by a formula varying slightly in different versions²³: firstly we have to do with the indication of the place where the bird sits, followed by a remark about its odd behavior not suitable either to a bird nor to a species and the formula ends with a statement about the human language the bird is able to speak (*EDT* 1947: 135, 136). Let me analyze two examples of such a situation paying attention to the eschatological imagery the bird evokes with its appearance²⁴.

²² See SZYJEWSKI 1991: 87 ff. According to the folk beliefs, the raven was always strongly connected with the sphere of evil, death and destruction. In Slavonic beliefs it is a creature of the Devil that was created from the chips of wood that had been used by him to chop out a wolf. That way the colour of the raven is black – as a result of the Devil’s creation or the act of God who, painting all the birds, excluded the raven who had offended him and dipped him in the carrion – see SZYJEWSKI 1991: 86 f. Interestingly, SZYJEWSKI (p. 88) finds in E. MAJEWSKI (*Rodzina kruków w mowie, pojęciach i praktykach ludu polskiego*, Wisła XIV 1900, pp. 28–41, 152–179) a conviction supported by ethnographic material from Biecz that a raven circling over the household cries “trup, trup!” (“dead, dead!”) thus bringing death to the house over which it is visible. According to the residents of the Macedonian village of Jablanica, the raven circling above the household means that one of the family member would die and the first one who notices it should cry aloud “Pust ostanal što gračiš, zar malu lude dosega zede?” (“Curse on you! Haven’t you taken a few people so far?”). See ZADROŻYŃSKA, VRAŽINOVSKI 2002: 54. Instead of the raven it is the crow that often appears in the same context, see PERŠON 1999: 119; FISCHER 1921: 27–30. The 11th century Byzantine historian and philosopher Michael Psellos distinguishes various ways of influencing human life by crows and ravens depending on the side from where they appear. Moreover, the one who would like to read the signs should discern between different species of owls: *κουκουβάγια* and *χαρπούλι*, see LAWSON 1910: 310.

²³ BEATON 2004: 54 ff. analyzes different patterns of formulas with a bird motif.

²⁴ Sudden and unexpected appearance of different kinds of birds is a common motif in folk-songs of Slavonic origins in the Balkan area. Interestingly, birds sometimes play the opposite role than in Modern Greek songs, they appear in emergency to help someone who is in need. Thus, when a brave young man (junaк) Janko falls asleep and is not able to wake up while the mountains are burning, a chick nightingale (едно славеј пиле) appears to save him. Significantly, Janko wants to

Little Constantine (Ο Μικροκωνσταντίνος), after many years of futile searching for a girl suitable to become his wife, finally finds one. When he is on his way to the wedding with the musicians and the guests invited for the ceremony, suddenly a strange bird sits on his saddle:

πουλάκι πήγε κι' έκατσε στου Κωσταντή τη σέλλα,
μήδε λαλούσε σαν πουλί μήδε σα χελιδόνι,
παρά λαλούσε κι' έλεγε ανθρωπίνη κουβέντα.

(EDT 1947: 135)

A bird came and sat on Constantine's saddle,
it didn't speak like a bird nor like a swallow,
but spoke and talked in a human voice.

The bird announces to Constantine that although he is about to marry, he will inevitably die soon²⁵ claiming that the day before yesterday it was with the angels in heavens and heard Constantine's name being read aloud (κ' άκουσα που σ' ανάγνωναν με τους αποθαμένους). The man's reaction does not reveal any astonishment, with humility he accepts his lot and immediately heads for his mother and sisters in order to be dressed to the funeral (να με νεκροστολίσουν). In the meantime his bride relates her mother a dream in which she had seen the black smoke in her father-in-law's household (Στου πεθερού μου την αυλή μαύρος καπνός που βγαίνει) and she does not know whose death that sign portends – her husband's or her father-in-law's. The song of Constantine is replete with hidden eschatological imagery in which the appearance of a bird apparently looking like a swallow plays the main role. The heavenly messenger who, according to the folk beliefs, has the opportunity to stay with angels foretells the

burn himself because all his brothers had already died. See ΚΙΤΕVSKI 2007: 137 (72. Заспал Јанко, заспал јунак). Different situation is depicted in another song from that collection. A wounded young man suddenly sees a black she-eagle (црна орлица) on the tree and he hears or it seems to him that she is waiting until he dies. He threatens her with his gun and she speaks in a different way, stating that she was sent by his Voivode with a cure to heal him (лек да донесам да те лекувам). See ΚΙΤΕVSKI 2007: 132 f. (67. Ранет јунак и црна орлица). Another variant of the same motif reveals in turn the ominous nature of the raven (гарван). In this case, the raven has been waiting until the young man dies so that it could “drink his black eyes,/ his black eyes and blood/ to eat your meat” (црни очи да ти пијам,/ црни очи и крвите, / да ти јадам и месото). See ΚΙΤΕVSKI 2007: 133 (68. Ранет јунак и гарван).

²⁵ The swallow, unequivocally connected in folk culture with the beginning of spring, light and warmth and thus having rather positive connotations (АВВ0Т 1903: 18), plays here a somewhat inverted and ambiguous role, which moreover is underlined by its strange behaviour, namely, it becomes a bringer of death of a young man going to his wedding. It is, however, explained partly by a mention that it was only similar to a swallow but “didn't speak like a swallow”. Cf. different versions of a song starting with a formula: Πούλάκια μου, αηδονάκια μου, το Μάη να μη λαλήσετε/ αν ίσως και λαλήσετε στίτι μου να μη ρθειτε (“My birds, my nightingales do not sing in May/ and even if you sing, do not enter my home”, ΚΟΥΓΕΑΣ 2000: 82). See also: ΚΟΥΓΕΑΣ 2000: 5, 18, 94; ΠΑΣΑΥΑΝΙΣ 1928: 72).

protagonist's death which is simultaneously also dreamt of by his fiancée in her prophetic dream about the black smoke.

The second example of a bird as a harbinger of bad news we find in a song that starts with a narrative similar to the previous one. Giannis who for twelve years struggled to find a good wife at last got married and rejoices his hard life as a farmer (*EDT* 1947: 136). While ploughing he is taken by surprise by a bird that in this case suddenly sits on the right side²⁶ of his yoke (δεξιά μεριά στη ζεύγλα). The oddity of its characteristics is in this song expressed similarly to the above-mentioned folksong, the difference being that here it communicates its message differently from other birds. Thus it says ironically to Giannis that he would not eat anything from the crops from the field he has been cultivating. However, the bird did not hear this prophecy from the angels like the swallow above but learnt about it during its night fly through the cemetery when it heard his name being read aloud (ανάφεραν και σένα). Giannis reacts in a completely different manner than Constantine: he disbelieves the news and expresses a deep despair wishing that his wife and children be killed if it is going to turn out to be the truth.

Interestingly, in both cases we have to do with two attitudes of a man towards his impending death – the former full of acceptance and awareness of its inevitability, the latter balancing from disbelief to the sort of dissent. What is remarkable for our considerations about folk eschatological beliefs it is the image of a bird that has a knowledge of human lot and could fly between the upper and the lower world.

The third example of a sudden appearance of a bird messenger we encounter in another variation of the story mentioned above in the first example – a young Giannas goes to his beloved to marry her (*EDT* 1947: 144). The situation known from the previous songs is in this case preceded by a sort of an introduction in which we get to know that in the neighborhood where the girl lives Death/Charos does not enter and does not loot (εκεί Χάρος δεν έμπαινε και Χάρος δεν πραιδέυει). However, once, apparently during the Easter Sunday, he chose the young fiancée to die. Traditionally, Giannas is informed about the fact by the bird looking like a swallow but behaving in an unusual way, namely speaking in a human voice. The formula mentioned above slightly differs here: instead of σέλλα (saddle) we have στράτα (road), λαλούσε (spoke) is replaced with εκελάιδα (sang). The dialogue with the bird reveals the truth: Giannas' fiancée is about to die soon, which the messenger describes in a metaphorical way, somewhat odd at a first glance: “The river has taken your destiny” (το δικό σ' το ριζικό το

²⁶ This is at variance with a remark by LAWSON (1910: 312 f.) about the position of the observer in reference to the bird that is being observed. Generally, since antiquity the right side has been associated with good signs whereas the left one indicated something bad and ominous. Also important was the movement of birds – one from right to left means a loss of fortune, the opposite direction indicates something successful and positive. Equally complicated is the number of cries that one should count precisely so that he could evaluate the danger.

πήρε το ποτάμι). Despairing Giannas finally arrives to the house of his in-laws to discover that his Maroudia has already died and now she is being prepared for the funeral. He heads at once for the church and asks grave-diggers to enlarge the grave so that it could contain two persons – the one already deceased and himself (he immediately commits suicide with his dagger). The story ends with an image extending the perspective into mythological dimensions that seem to stem from ancient Greek sources resembling well-known metamorphoses myths: after death the couple turned into plants, the girl became a cypress and Giannas a reed. Moreover, the mention of a cypress metaphorically closes the unfortunate love story – the tree connected since ancient times with the other world and the funeral symbolically hints at the fatal end of the couple.

Another variation of the same motif, this time coming from Cyprus, telling the story of the unfortunate love of Constantine and Eugenulla, in its most features corresponds with the narrative scheme we have dealt so far. The most important difference in the plot lies in the usage of a bird imagery motif, as we have seen rather unaltered in three versions above. In the Cypriot version it is Charos indignant at the boastfulness of the young girl that turns into a black bird to shoot her precisely in the finger with the engagement ring:

Μαύρο πουλλίν εγίνηκε, στους ουρανούς εξέην
 τσ' εβγήκε τσ' εσαίτεψε την μονασήν την κόρην
 μέσ' στο λιανόν το δάχτυλον, που 'σε την αρραβώναν.

EDT 1947: 145

He turned into the black bird, flew into the skies,
 he found and shot with an arrow the only one daughter
 into her delicate finger where she had the wedding ring.

Here we also come across another characteristic theme recurring in many demotic songs and constituting one of the components of folk eschatological beliefs, namely the motif of marriage to Death/Charos²⁷ with which I do not intend to deal in this paper because of its complexity. Nevertheless, instead of the wedding with Constantine, Eugenulla orders her mother to dress her like a bride for loved one because she “is getting married, she marries Charos” (ωσάν τσ' εω παντρεύομαι, παίρνω τον Χάρον άντρα), which in symbolical language means that she is about to die soon.

Bird messengers could appear also in a somewhat perverse way, reversing the role they played in the above mentioned songs. Interestingly, they turn out to be deceitful for those whom they had once foretold the future and who seem to have believed them. We come across such a concept in two poems in the collection by KORIDIS, where the protagonists in both cases at the beginning of a song, in

²⁷ If the dead is a man not a woman, he marries “The Black Earth” (Μαυρηγή) like for instance in PASAYANIS 1928: 116.

a formula, altered in the second verse, confess the same disappointment with birds' news:

Με γελασάνε τα πουλιά, της άνοιξης τ' αηδόνια,
με γέλασαν και μούπανε ο Χάρος δε με παίρνει.

(KORIDIS 2002: 27)

Με γέλασαν κι μού 'πανε, πώς φέτος δεν πεθαίνω.

(KORIDIS 2002: 35)

Birds deceived me, nightingales of spring,
They deceived me and told me, Charos would not take me.
They deceived me and told me that this year I would not die.

However, Charos does not forget about them, he arrives on his black horse, dressed in black. In the first song he appears to the protagonist – who rests on the windowsill – while dragging the dead behind him (KORIDIS 2002: 27), while in the second one as a messenger of God he comes to take his soul (μ' έστειλε ο Θεός να πάρω την ψυχή σου, KORIDIS 2002: 35). Thus, the news that had been announced by birds appears to be an illusion – Death is inevitable even if the birds of spring may delude somebody with false promises.

In Modern Greek folk poetry the bird imagery is not confined to the motif of birds as messengers of bad news, heralds of somebody's inescapable death that will happen rather soon, nor is a bird just a disguise of Charos aiming at someone whose life he is going to take. Thorough reading of the demotic songs reveals many other subtle folk ideas, sometimes expressed implicitly, concerning the ornithological themes. Some of them extend the eschatological perspective in which birds appear in connection with a sudden death that we have observed so far. As it turns out, they do not only have the knowledge of someone's lot and know the hour of his death but are a kind of a link between the world of the dead and the living²⁸, which to some extent we have already observed in the songs cited above.

²⁸ I have found an interesting example of a visualized representation of the special place birds had in Byzantine imagination. A pair of enameled temple pendants from 11th or 12th century found in Kiev and kept in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York show addorsed birds and sirens apparently flanking the Tree of Life, which supposedly alluded to their fertility symbolism but also may have underlined their ability to travel throughout the layers of the cosmic reality. See MATHEWS 1998: 82 f. Such a representation of two addorsed birds is also common in church decorations. There are plenty of marble closure panels with images of peacocks and the tree in the middle of them dating from 9th to 12th century (inv. no. X314, A249 and A246 kept in the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities in Chalkis), which probably has the same symbolic meaning. One of these marble closures (inv. no. A246) is extremely interesting in connection with eschatology. Apart from the motif of two birds on the both sides of the tree in the lower part there is a nestling and below it another adult peacock catching the snake, the motif strongly suggesting death and rebirth, which I shall show in the following part of the present paper. For reproductions of the panels see CORMACK, VASSILAKI 2008: 214–217.

We can see it clearly in the following song, where a bird flew out of Hades (Πουλάκι εβγήκε από τη γη κι' εβγήκε από τον Άδη, PASAYANIS 1928: 71; EDT 1947: 158) to bring to the living the news from their deceased relatives. The miserable people who had suffered grief gather to ask him about the after-life existence, namely what the underworld looks like, whether the young ones go with their weapons, the young girls with their ornaments (Τάχα είν' οι νιοι με τ' άρματα κι' οι νιες με τα στολίδια;) and children with their games (Τάχα είν' και τα μικρά παιδιά με τα πολλά παιγνίδια;). The bird's answer gives the living no hope as to the conditions of the afterlife existence: there are neither ornaments there nor a multitude of games and the poor children ask constantly for their mothers (και τα καημένα τα παιδιά τη μάνα τους ζητούνε).

In another song we read a touching confession of a young man saying good-bye to all he had been closely connected to during his life (EDT 1947: 161). He has a special request to his mother, obliging her to ask the grave-diggers to make his coffin more spacious (φαρδύ κεβούρ' να κάμη) and leave a little window at the right side. He hopes that birds and especially the swallows would fly to and fro bringing greetings for his parents and relating them how he is doing over there in the black earth:

να φέρουν χαιρετήματα σένα και τον πατέρα,
πως είμαι, μάνα, πως περνώ στη μαύρη γη 'κει πέρα.

so that they could bring greetings for you and father,
to say how I fare, mother, how I fare in the black earth over there.

In a song from Mytilene (EDT 1947: 168) we come across a somehow inverted variation of the motif. Here we have a mother's grief over a dead daughter to whom she did not manage to say farewell and kiss her before she went away. She addresses her daughter, sending her greetings and reminding her to feed birds so that they could bring the news from her (για να ταΐσεις τα πουλιά, να φέρνουν το χαμπάρι). The mother's lament turns into a wish in which she would like to become a swallow and could sit sometimes on the gravestone and sing sorrowfully so that she could wake her daughter up:

Χελιδονάκι να γενώ, στην πλάκα σ' θ' ακουμπήσω,
να κελαηδώ λυπητερά, ίσως και σε ξυπνήσω.

Let me become a swallow to sit on the gravestone,
to sing sorrowfully and maybe wake you up.

In another lament song from KORIDIS' collection there is an interesting conversation between two persons where one interlocutor tells another, who is supposedly about to die (αυτού στα ξένα που θα πας, αυτού στον άλλο κόσμο, KORIDIS 2002: 31), that the promises of the news from there given by those who had already gone, failed to materialize even though many years have passed. He

adds that he had the opportunity to hear birds that sang and spoke in a human voice clearly assuring: “do not wait for the mortals to come” (μην περιμένετε, θνητούς να ξαναρθούνε). Thus, once more birds appear to be links between the worlds, travelling to and fro and knowing the rules of the other world.

This could be also confirmed by another song coming from the same collection of *moirologia*. It starts with an image of a bird that has just come out of the earth and is still covered with soil (χωματισμένο) and could not find a place to sit and finally perched on the church door²⁹ where it was noticed by women. They rushed at once to ask what it had seen in the underworld. The answer disillusioned them as to the lot of the deceased:

Εκεί είν' οι νιοι ξαρμάτωτοι κ' οι νιες ξεστολισμένες
και τα μικρούλια τα παιδιά σα μήλα ραβδισμένα.

(KORIDIS 2002: 34)

There young men are disarmed, young girls without their ornaments
and little children are like apples beaten down.

Birds not only link the other world with this world, bringing for the living gloomy images of the afterlife existence. They are also summoned by those who would like to go to heavens in order to efface their name from the register of the scribe (Γραμματικός) writing down the lot of every man or to disturb him from his work. There is a group of songs that start with a formula consisting of two verses where different kind of birds appear that are called to take someone up into the sky:

Πάρτε με, αητοί, στα νύχια σας, περδίτες, στα φτερά σας,
πάρτε με και ανεβάστε με στους ουρανούς επάνω.

(KOUGEAS 2000: 4α')

Take me, eagles, with your claws, partridges, with your wings,
take me and lift me up to the heavens above.

In the first verse the eagle is invariable whereas the second kind could be substituted by: nightingales (αηδόνη, KOUGEAS 2000: 34), peregrines (πετρίτες, KOUGEAS 2000: 48; PASAYANIS 1928: 87 with a slight change in the second verse) or just “birds” (πουλιά, KOUGEAS 2000: 50). In each case the wish is unfulfilled – what has been written is not effaceable, the lot engraved on the marble remains unchanged and no one has the power to avert it.

In this group of songs birds obviously play different role from the one mentioned before. In symbolical terms eagles are celestial creatures, symbols of

²⁹ Cf. KOUGEAS 2000: 89: Ένας αητός καθότανε εις της Παναγιάς την πόρτα (“An eagle sat on Saint Mary’s door”).

good and divinity that have an access to the highest parts of the sky³⁰, in Greek folk songs called more precisely “the third part of the sky” (το τρίτον του ουρανού³¹, KOUGEAS 2000: 4α³), the edge of the sky (η άκρη του ουρανού, KOUGEAS 2000: 34; 50; 107) or “the middle of the sky” (η μέση του ουρανού, KOUGEAS 2000: 48). The Modern Greek folksongs that I cited above echo with the memory of the majestic eagle, a special bird in Indo-European mythologies. Its extraordinary abilities to reach the highest levels of the sky undoubtedly established its role of a divine bird that represents the domain under the rule of celestial gods. The reflection of this belief we could find, among other things, in the ancient Greek association of the eagle with Zeus, as one of his attributes³², the representations of which we can see for instance on red-figured vases from the 5th century BC. However, what is extremely significant for our considerations of the folk eschatology, in Indo-European myths the eagle usually appears with its counterpart, the other aspect of the same divine reality (the two completing one another) – the snake³³. These two animals constitute the holistic view of the divinity transcending the human experience. Usually they both appear in myths as a *coincidentia oppositorum*, two poles that influence each other and coexist in seemingly excluding spheres of activity: the divine domain of heaven and the world of the dead³⁴.

The motif of the eagle catching the snake or the hare was extremely popular in Byzantine art, in mosaics as well as sculptures; suffice it to mention here the 6th century mosaics from the peristyle of the Great Palace built during the reign of Emperor Justinian I in Constantinople³⁵. The representation of the fight probably symbolized the victory of Good over Evil and, by extension, Christ conquering the Devil. The eagle with its prey was also linked by early Church writers

³⁰ LURKER 1990: 184 f.

³¹ The phrase echoes the New Testamental “third heaven” (2 Corinthians 12, 2): οίδα ανθρώπων έν Χριστώ πρό έτών δεκατεσσάρων – είτε έν σώματι ούκ οίδα, είτε έκτός του σώματος ούκ οίδα, ό θεός οίδεν – άρπαγέντα τον τοιοϋτον έως τρίτου ούρανού [“I know a man in Christ, fourteen years ago (whether in the body I do not know, or outside the body I do not know; God knows) such a one was caught away to the third heaven”].

³² Pausanias writes about the altar of Zeus on the Lycaeon where there were two pillars with golden eagles (Paus. VIII 38, 5). Ganymedes, according to some mythological traditions, was carried to heaven by Zeus in a form of the eagle or sent the bird to fetch him to heaven (Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* III 141; Pseudo-Hyginus, *Astronomica* II 16; Virgil, *Aeneid* V 252 ff.). See GRIMAL 1963: 110 f.

³³ LURKER 1990: 179 ff.

³⁴ LURKER 1990: 181 f.

³⁵ Niketas Choniates (1155–1215/1216) in his *Historia* (651 f.) describes a bronze statue of the eagle catching the snake as a magic device of Apollonios of Tyana who in this way gave the Byzantines relief from the plague of the snakes' bites. See Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium: Annals*, transl. by H.J. MAGOULIAS, Detroit 1984, pp. 359 f.

with the Eucharist and baptism³⁶. In symbolic meaning it can also be interpreted as symbol of Resurrection which has its origin in ancient beliefs according to which the eagle was the only bird able to renew its plumage and come back to its youth when it flew near the sun and later plunged into the water³⁷. However, in Byzantine context the eagle gains not only a sacred but also a secular meaning – it is used as a military emblem and as an aspect of imperial symbolism it was set on the top of the sceptre carried by the consuls until the reign of Emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–713) and thus might have symbolized the emperor himself³⁸. We must not forget also about the one of the most recognizable Byzantine emblems that survived among others in the imperial banner of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation as well as in the Russian coat of arms – the double-headed eagle that was already used by the 10th century. Thus, the wish expressed in the abovementioned folksong seems to be justifiable – is there any other bird that could be able to do the unfulfillable...^{39?}

As far as the snakes are concerned, the folk poetry of Modern Greece abounds in images of them in connection with the underworld and the afterlife existence of an individual⁴⁰. Obviously, due to its complexity, the subject demands a separate study. Here I restrict myself to give merely some characteristic features of the presence of snakes in order to shed some light on the issue of the present paper. In one of the folksongs a mother asks her dead child how he/she was

³⁶ MAGUIRE 2012: 32. As it turns out, the eagle with prey might have also had a magical meaning. On the silken sleeve bands we come across this motif accompanying each of the dragon slayers and thus transferring the hero's action into the bird imagery. Supposedly, it might have had apotropaic powers. See MAGUIRE 1995: 64.

³⁷ FERGUSON 1966: 17.

³⁸ KAZHDAN 1991: 669.

³⁹ Undoubtedly the only bird that was more significant in Christian art was the dove as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, whose symbolic meaning manifests itself firstly during Christ's baptism when the dove descends upon him (Matthew 3, 16). However, the origins of the dove imagery could be traced further in time. We come across it in story about Noe and the Flood, where he sends the dove to see if the earth is yet visible and it returns bearing an olive branch in its beak. The Biblical motif has its antecedences in the ancient Greek myth about Deucalion, son of Prometheus, and in the Mesopotamian story about Utnapishtim. Remarkably, the dove with an olive branch appears on sarcophagi and funeral monuments and epitaphs. The complexity of the symbolic meaning of the dove as well as its ancient origin and common usage in many cultures is beyond the scope of this paper. Significantly, the fact that, besides one mention of περιστέρακι – little dove/ little pigeon in a song cited below (KORIDIS 2002: 64), I have not found in Modern Greek funeral songs any trace of the dove may suggest that its imagery was strictly reserved to the official orthodox religion and completely absent in folk eschatological beliefs. I realize that the subject needs more thorough research to determine definitely the complex role of the dove imagery.

⁴⁰ The motif of the snake is very common also in the folklore of the Balkan Slavs. There are various songs telling the story about a girl or a boy meeting a viper on their way. The conversation with the snake usually presages their death and later decomposition of their bodies by it. See, for example, the songs: *Мома и змиа, Девојка и змија, Пила Неда нојна вода, Девојче је смил по гори брала, Овчар Димо* in the collection of folks songs by КИТЕВСКИ 2007: 125–131.

received by Charos in his kingdom of the dead. Answering, the child warns her mother that if she learns about it, her heart will burn (θενά καή η καρδιά σου, PASAYANIS 1928: 47; EDT 1947: 164) and goes on with the thrilling description of snakes – Charos' gift:

Μικρά φιδάκια μού δωσε, για να του τα αναστήσω.
Στα γόνατά μου γεύονται, στα στήθια μου κοιμούνται
και στα ξανθά μου τα μαλλιά φτιάνουνε τη φωλιά τους.

Small snakes he gave me so that I would feed them
They eat on my knees, sleep on my breast
And among my blond hair they have built their nests.

The second and the third verse reappear as a formula in other versions of this song with a replacement of some words or phrases but without a change in a gloomy vision of afterlife existence (EDT 1947: 169; PASAYANIS 1928: 109). The images of snakes tormenting the dead are widespread throughout demotic poetry, always deeply rooted in eschatological folk beliefs (PASAYANIS 1928: 110). Significantly, it is the dead that speak about them, describing their miserable lot in Hades. The living, as I mentioned above, turn their wishes to eagles as if they knew that these birds are the only one creatures able to establish contact with the divine presence and to postpone their journey to the humid Hades waiting for them together with snakes.

The exceptionality of the eagle is underlined in one of the folksongs (PASAYANIS 1928: 111) in a very interesting way in connection with the folk eschatology. We come across the image of the eagle sitting on the marble grave (σε μαρμαρένια πλάκα), with golden claws and silver feathers (τα νύχια μάλαμα, τα πούπυλ' ασημένια) and with a precious stone on its head (το ατίμητο πετράδι) – a symbolic representation of the dead. The eagle is said to have flown away somewhere to Western Europe (στη Φραγκιά) in order to have it estimated by the jewellers, however, they stated it is inestimable. Interestingly, we come across almost the same formula in a short song noted by PASAYANIS (1928: 6, where, instead of the eagle, there appears, somehow unexpectedly, a peacock (το παγόφι). Its plumage and characteristic features slightly differ from the above depiction of a divine bird but the main difference lies in the way the bird is introduced – here it is addressed to whereas in the song above it was a subject of narration. Anyhow, the peacock has golden feathers and silver legs (χρυσά φτερά και μ' ασημένια πόδια), gold claws like the eagle above (νύχια μάλαμα) and a jewel on its head (στην κορυφή λογάρι) which is reminiscent of a precious stone from the picture above; moreover, it has in its heart a vessel full of pearls (κούπα μαργαριτάρι).

Due to the shortness of the folksong it is hard to determine the possible usage of the motif. However, the presence of the peacock in connection with the folk eschatology will not seem to be unexpected and difficult to explain if we take

into account the role the bird played during Byzantine times. This magnificent bird, due to its well recognizable plumage was associated since antiquity with the imperial splendour of rulers as heavenly kings. The Christianity adopted the symbolism of the peacock to the idea of immortality and eternity of the Church and Christ⁴¹. Consequently, they were often used in symbolic meaning, especially since the 4th century, to represent paradise and salvation, renewal and resurrection which was associated with their ability to shed the plumage in winter and recover it in spring and, on the other hand, with the belief of ancient origin that their flesh does not decay⁴². It was also a consequence of an extension of the concept of the Byzantine vision of earthly paradise⁴³. Besides, as Juno's bird it was especially linked to the empresses whose soul it was regarded to carry to heaven just like the eagles carried the kings' souls⁴⁴. Moreover, they were used in early Christian funerary art, adorning the tombs⁴⁵ and thus, it seems natural, they also must have been present in folk eschatological beliefs. It is also known that in popular beliefs peacock's scream was one of the ominous signs foreboding death⁴⁶. The reflection of such a conviction we can detect in one of the folksongs, where Charos/Death is described as: που 'χε του ρίσου τα πλουμιά, του παγονιού τα κάλλη (who had the lynx's fur, the peacock's beauty)⁴⁷.

⁴¹ We often come across descriptions of the peacock in Byzantine *ekphraseis*, where their splendour reflects the glory of the Creator. See MAGUIRE 2012: 52 f. Another bird intimately connected with the Christian symbolism is the pelican that we encounter very often in Christian art. According to the ancient legend, recorded by Pliny the Elder, it is devoted to its offspring like no other bird, piercing its breast and feeding them with its own blood where there is such a need and thus being able to die for them eventually. As a consequence, it gave an assumption to correlate it with Christ's sacrifice and his love for all mankind, symbolizing the Eucharist. See FERGUSON 1966: 23. Significantly, the image of Christ-pelican we can find in Dante's *Paradise* (XXV 113), where he is called *il nostro pellicano*.

⁴² FERGUSON 1966: 23.

⁴³ In the representations of angels in Byzantine art we can notice the eye of the peacock's feather in the wings of angels as well as of the seraphims and cherubims. See HERRIN 2006: 3. The eyes in the peacock's feathers were also used to symbolize the "all-seeing" Church. See FERGUSON 1966: 23. It is noteworthy that the peacock motif was widespread in mosaic and other kinds of decoration. See MANGO 1994: 254, 258. It is also known that wealthy citizens kept peacocks to walk around the flowers and trees of their gardens. See KAZHDAN 1991: 1611 f.

⁴⁴ HERRIN 2006: 3.

⁴⁵ KAZHDAN 1991: 1611.

⁴⁶ Interestingly, William Butler Yeats uses the motif of the peacock's scream as a symbol of the end of the civilization in his *Meditations in Time of Civil War*: "Had such an aching heart/ That he, although a country's talk/ For silken clothes and stately walk./ Had waking wits; it seemed/ Juno's peacock screamed".

⁴⁷ ANAGNOSTOPOULOS 1984: 74. The quoted line appears as a formula in which both parts are variable. In other versions it turns into: πώχει του ρίτσου τα πλουμιά, της αστραπής τα μάτια ("who has the lynx's fur, the eyes of the lightning") or φορεί του ήλιου τα πλουμιά, της αστραπής τα μάτια ("who has the sun's plumage, the eyes of the lightning"). *Ibidem*.

However, coming back to the conjecture made above that the bird constitutes in some cases a symbolic representation of the dead, there are some songs that allow us to assume it more clearly. In the collection of *moirologia* gathered by PASAYANNIS (1928: 1) we find an interesting usage of bird imagery in connection with the eschatological images. The folksong is composed as a dialogue between birds that takes place in Hades, which transfers us immediately into the symbolic level of reference: these are indeed the dead speaking. The conversation is evoked by the grief-stricken eagle sitting “in the garden of Hades” (στον Άδη το περβόλι). The other birds ask him about the reason of his sadness and he confesses that he longed for his home and wished to see those who mourn him and he realized that except for his mother there was nobody lamenting (κανέννας δε με κλαίει).

The motif of the dead compared to a bird appears in an unusual way in another demotic song. It is composed in a kind of confession of a living one over the loss of someone very close to him (PASAYANNIS 1928: 68; KOUGEAS 2000: 29)⁴⁸. He had fed the bird with sugar and with musk, but the bird that turns out to be the nightingale, had gone away (μου φύγε τ’ αηδόνη). Such a way of addressing the dead by the living by means of a metaphor of a bird is not unusual in lament songs, we come across different bird species, to mention only a few: eagle (Νικόλα μου, αφέντι μου, / αητέ μου και λεβέντι μου, PASAYANNIS 1928: 66; repeated in 67 with slight changes), goose and “stone swallow” – πετροχελιδόνι⁴⁹ (Νικόλενα, χηνίτσα μου, / πετροχελιδονίτσα μου, PASAYANNIS 1928: 70) or just “birds” – πουλιά (ξύπνα πουλί μου, KORIDIS 2002: 15), little pigeon/ little dove – περιστεράκι (πού πας, περιστεράκι μου, KORIDIS 2002: 64).

However, the most convincing parallels between the dead and birds are visible in the ritual of exhumation related by DANFORTH⁵⁰ from the village Potamia where the custom of the second burial that is widespread throughout the Balkans is still alive⁵¹. The rite is often regarded as the opportunity for the deceased to come back for a while to the upper world and to communicate with the living.

⁴⁸ It is rather difficult to state without any doubts that the image of a bird in the cage always alludes to a lost child, see BOROWSKA 2004: 204. In fact, the second part of the song quoted by PASAYANNIS refers to an aged man that left his wife and all his children and grandchildren: Άκου το, μπαρμπά-Σταυριανέ, / σκλάβωσες τη γυναίκα σου / και όλα τα παιδόγγονα. BOROWSKA (2004: 204–206) cites other songs from different collections of folksongs with the motif of a bird in a cage where the identification with a child becomes more evident.

⁴⁹ Probably the name πετροχελιδόνι has connection with a kind of a swallow widespread in Eurasia, called in English crag martin (*Ptyonoprogne rupestris*).

⁵⁰ DANFORTH 1982.

⁵¹ ABBOT (1903: 210 f.; 213 f.) writes that three years after the burial the body is taken out of the grave, the bones – on the base of which one could read the lot of the dead – are cleaned by wine and put into a box. Just then the remains are brought to a charnel house called *κομητήριο* whereas the “burial ground” (*νεκροταφείο*) continues to be the graveyard.

In the lament songs performed during the exhumation of a girl Eleni, she is described as a small bird (ένα πουλάκι) welcomed by all her relatives who would like to hear the news from the world below (Τι χαμπέρια ν-ήφερες από τον Κάτω κόσμος);⁵². The next lament reveals the name of a bird that was used by her mother during the period of mourning: πέρδικα (partridge). She confesses to the relatives that she had argued yesterday with her mother and had struggled with Charos whom she asked to let her go to her mother (Ν' αφ'ησες με, Χάρε μ', ν' αφ'ησες με/ να πάω στη μανούλα μου).

In the next lament she asks her brothers who greet her skull to help her in her fight with Charos (άπ' το Χάρο να με αρπάξετε) and thus enable her to return home⁵³. Once more she is called by the bird's name, partridge (πέρδικα). After the final taking out of her skull from the grave it appears clear that the exhumation is for the living a real, although sad, return, which is expressed by Eleni's words in lament:

Εψές ήμαν στη μαύρη γης.
Απόψ' ήρθα στη μάνα μου,
ν-ήρθα και στον πατέρα μου,
και στα καλά 'δερφούλα μου.

Last night I slept in the black earth,
but tonight I have come to my mother.
I have come to my father
and to my dear brother and sisters⁵⁴.

Another lament sung over Eleni's bones places the dead girl metaphorically between three partridges singing by the river Dafnos – here probably the symbolic frontier river between the upper and the lower world – among dense rosebush. One of the birds, namely Eleni, is not singing, which makes other partridges question her about it. Her answer reveals not only regret and grief but a deep certainty about the human lot:

Η τύχη μας το έγγραψε,
μάννα μ', να χωριστούμε.

Our fate has written
that we must be parted⁵⁵.

The motif of the dead person symbolized by a bird could be also illustrated by a remarkable passage of a folksong from KORIDIS' collection belonging to the group called *Songs from a foreign land* (της ξενιτιάς). Without going into

⁵² DANFORTH 1982: 62.

⁵³ DANFORTH (1982: 63 f.) notices here a very interesting parallel between this song and the well-known ballad widespread throughout Greece *Song of the Dead Brother* (Του νεκρού αδελφού) with a motif of a girl returning home with a dead brother.

⁵⁴ Translated by DANFORTH (1982: 64). The return of Eleni turns out to be illusory for the conscience of her mother who subsequently confesses dramatically: "Look what I put in and what I put out! I put in a partridge, and I took out bones" (*ibidem*, p. 65).

⁵⁵ Translated by DANFORTH (1982: 77) who sees in this place another common motif of Greek funeral songs, death as a marriage, which resounds in many folksongs and has a confirmation also in wedding rites of rural Greece. In these terms Eleni is in the quoted passage among her relatives and friends who wait for the groom to take her from them.

details, the plot that follows revolves around the mother seeking her son who went to a foreign land. She asks a passerby if he has seen her son anywhere and receives a horrible answer – his corpse is lying somewhere in the fields eaten by black birds and circled by white ones (μαύρα πουλιά τον έτρωγαν, άσπρα τον τριγυρίσαν, KORIDIS 2002: 80). Unexpectedly, one of the birds stays alone without trying to eat the corpse but weeping. The encouragement to join the company and try good food evokes its answer:

Όλον, πουλιά μου, φάτε με κι όλον κατάλυσέ με,
αφήτε μόν' την πλάτη μου και το δεξί μου χέρι
να γράψω τρία γράμματα, πικρά φαρμακωμένα,
να στείλω 'να της μάνας μου, τ' άλλο της αδερφής μου,
το τρίτο το πικρότερο να στείλω της καλής μου.

My whole body, birds, you eat and disrupt me,
leave only my back and my right hand
so I could write three letters, bitter, poisoned
and send one to my mother, another one to my sister
the third one the most bitter to my beloved.

The bird plainly turns out to be the dead son looking over his wretched body plucked by other birds. His request sounds paradoxical for he is undoubtedly a bird-soul at the moment that separated from his earthly vessel.

All the remarks made above relating to birds in association with eschatological beliefs of Modern Greek funeral songs allow us to clearly assume that the function of the ornithological element should not be overestimated. Whereas in folk beliefs birds appear mainly as ominous signs foreseeing death, which we are able to conclude from the above cited relations of peasants, the funeral songs reveal different and more profound imagery. Comparing various versions of the bird motives that we come across in demotic songs we can conclude that the presence of birds is not only deeply justified but constitutes an integral part of multidimensional image of Modern Greek folk afterlife beliefs.

Firstly, birds are harbingers of death of the one who they speak to or someone the speaker heads for, usually waiting for his or her marriage. Thus, they convey the inevitability of someone's lot, delivering the news that they had heard somewhere – in cases mentioned above these were the angels and the cemetery. It seems they play a somehow extended role in comparison with traditional folk beliefs where they usually just presage death. Secondly, the Greek personification of Death, Charos, appears metamorphosed into a black bird or just a swallow, killing his victim that he is going to take to Hades. Thirdly, birds – particularly eagles – are regarded to have an access to the highest parts of the sky, the other ones are said to fly beyond the world of the living reaching out even to the underworld, in consequence constituting a link between the men and either the heaven or the darkness of Hades. Lastly, birds are symbolic representations of

the deceased whom the living address, longing for news from them or just to see them in birds' disguise.

The last way in which birds appear in Modern Greek funeral songs conveys the echo of an idea of theriomorphic representation of the soul of the dead that was uncommon for ancient Greeks⁵⁶. However, this disguise of the soul – the soul imagined in the shape of a bird – is present in other mythological European traditions. For instance, in Irish folk tradition it is believed that the soul could turn into a material being becoming either a fly or a butterfly⁵⁷. Similarly, in Slavonic countries we find the traces of old folk beliefs in which the souls of the dead in the form of birds perch on the trees under which the deceased were often buried⁵⁸. Moreover, this bird-soul, according to the Slavs, flies away to Iriy⁵⁹ where it dwells for some time until at last it comes back to earth once more entering the womb. The soul is carried by birds coming back from Iriy where they spend the wintertime. Hence, in the folklore of the Slavonic peoples these are birds, mainly nightjars and storks, that are believed to bring children⁶⁰. Therefore, through birds the cycle of life and death closes with the image, well-known to all of us, of a stork bringing a child in its beak.

The Modern Greek funeral laments with all the ornithological imagery that I have presented here confirm not only its significance in folk eschatological beliefs of rural Greece but also cast some light on possible influences that throughout history other peoples could have exerted on it. They might also reveal the universality of the folk view of the world that regardless of place and time shape the landscape of death in an astonishingly similar way.

Jagiellonian University, Kraków

⁵⁶ BREMMER 1983: 80 f. The only animal that in Ancient Greece could be connected with the soul of the dead was the snake especially related to a grave of a hero; the subject, however, is still uncertain and needs further elaboration. The same concerns the representation of the soul of the dead as a butterfly because of the identification of the name of this amazing insect with the soul by Aristotle (*Historia Animalium* 551 A).

⁵⁷ VOVELLE 1983: 70.

⁵⁸ VOVELLE 1983: 70. The ancient practice of Slavonic peoples of burying the dead in different places closely connected with the homeland, for instance under the trees associated with the magical rites with reference to woods, was eradicated both by the Catholic and Protestant Church. However, the custom prevailed in some places until the 17th century and in Ukraine more or less until 1770. See VOVELLE 1983: 63. Quite interesting is also VOVELLE's remark (p. 70) about folk beliefs in Brittany where the souls of old maids are believed to become owls.

⁵⁹ SACHA-PIEKŁO 1999: 239. The term *Iriy* (Ирий, Вирий, Вырий, Вірій, Вирай, Вурай) in Slavonic languages is a paradise land of the dead and birds and it is probably derived from Persian *rayi* in the meaning of wealth or happiness, although the etymology is still rather uncertain.

⁶⁰ SACHA-PIEKŁO 1999: 239.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Collections of folk songs

- EDT 1947: *Ελληνικά Δημοτικά Τραγούδια*, vol. I, Athinai 1947.
- KORIDIS 2002: G. KORIDIS, *Τα ωραιότερα δημοτικά τραγούδια. Δ' Τόμος. Μοιρολόγια-Της Ξενιτιάς-Παραλογές*, Athinai 2002.
- KOUGEAS 2000: S. KOUGEAS, *Τραγούδια του κάτω κόσμου. Μοιρολόγια της Μεσσηνιακής Μάνης, συλλογή του ακαδημαϊκού Σωκράτη Κουγέα, κατά τα έτη 1901–1904*, Athinai 2000.
- PASAYANIS 1928: K. PASAYANIS, *Μανιάτικα μοιρολόγια και τραγούδια*, Athinai 1928.

Secondary literature

- ABBOT 1903: G.F. ABBOT, *Macedonian Folklore*, Cambridge 1903.
- ALEXIOU 1978: M. ALEXIOU, *Modern Greek Folklore and its Relations to the Past. The Evolution of Charos in Greek Tradition*, in: *Proceedings of the 1975 Symposium of Modern Greek Studies*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1978, pp. 211–236.
- 2002, *Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, revised by D. YATROMANOLAKIS, P. ROILOS, Cambridge 2002 [first edn. 1974].
- ANAGNOSTOPOULOS 1984: I.Sp. ANAGNOSTOPOULOS, *Ο θάνατος και ο κάτω κόσμος στη δημοτική ποίηση. Εσχολογία της δημοτικής ποίησης*, Athinai 1984.
- BEATON 2004: R. BEATON, *Folk Poetry of Modern Greece*, Cambridge 2004.
- BOROWSKA 2004: M. BOROWSKA, *Arcydziela literatury nowogreckiej*, vol. II: *Gminna pieśń Greków. Antologia*, Warszawa 2004.
- BREMMER 1983: J. BREMMER, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton 1983.
- CORMACK, VASSILAKI 2008: R. CORMACK, M. VASSILAKI (eds.), *Byzantium 330–1453*, London 2008.
- DANFORTH 1982: L. DANFORTH, *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece*, Princeton 1982.
- FERGUSON 1966: G. FERGUSON, *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art: With Illustrations from Paintings from the Renaissance*, Oxford 1966.
- FISCHER 1921: A. FISCHER, *Zwyczaje pogrzebowe ludu polskiego*, Lwów 1921.
- GRIMAL 1963: P. GRIMAL, *Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et romaine*, Paris 1963.
- HERRIN 2006: J. HERRIN, *Byzantine Studies on Display*, in: *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, London 2006, pp. 3–12.
- KAZHDAN 1991: A.P. KAZHDAN (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Oxford 1991.
- KITEVSKI 2007: M. KITEVSKI, *Μυθολογικι и обредни песни*, Skopje 2007.
- KNÖS 1962: B. KNÖS, *L'histoire de la littérature néo-grecque*, Stockholm 1962.
- LAWSON 1910: J.C. LAWSON, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, Cambridge 1910.
- LURKER 1990: M. LURKER, *Die Botschaft der Symbole in Mythen, Kulturen und Religionen*, München 1990.
- MAGUIRE 1995: H. MAGUIRE, *Byzantine Magic*, Cambridge, MA 1995.
- 2012: *Nectar and Illusion: Nature in Byzantine Art and Literature*, Oxford 2012.
- MANGO 1994: C. MANGO, *Byzantium: The Empire of the New Rome*, London 1994.
- MATHEWS 1998: T.F. MATHEWS, *Byzantium from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, New York 1998.
- MAVROGORDATO 1955: J. MAVROGORDATO, *Modern Greek Folksongs of the Dead*, JHS LXXV 1955, pp. 42–53.
- PERSZON 1999: J. PERSZON, *Na brzegu życia i śmierci. Zwyczaje, obrzędy oraz wierzenia pogrzebowe i zaduszkowe na Kaszubach*, Lublin 1999.
- PSYCHOGIU 2008: E. PSYCHOGIU, «Μαυρηγή» και Ελένη. *Τελετουργίες θανάτου και αναγέννησης*, Athinai 2008.
- SACHA-PIEKŁO 1999: M. SACHA-PIEKŁO (ed.), *Zaświaty i krainy mityczne*, Kraków 1999.
- SZYJEWSKI 1991: A. SZYJEWSKI, *Symbolika kruka. Między mitem a rzeczywistością*, Kraków 1991.

VLAHOVIČ 1991: P. VLAHOVIČ, *Kultura ludowa w Serbii*, Kraków 1991.

VOVELLE 1983: M. VOVELLE, *La mort et l'Occident de 1300 à nos jours*, Paris 1983.

ZADROŻYŃSKA, VRAŽINOVSKI 2002: A. ZADROŻYŃSKA, T. VRAŽINOVSKI, *Ludowe obrzędy i podania. Etnograficzne i folklorystyczne studia porównawcze wsi polskiej i macedońskiej*, Warszawa 2002.

EMPEROR AURELIAN AND THE SOLAR ECLIPSE OF 272

by

ROBERT SUSKI

The Emperor Aurelian's peculiar coinage has been the subject of scholarly interest for a long time. In the latter half of his reign, references to the Sun god, often accompanied with the designation "Invincible" (*Sol Invictus*) definitely came into prominence. The reasons for the issue of the coins dedicated to the Sun god have been a matter of some controversy among historians. It is not even quite certain which solar deity was the object of Aurelian's fervent worship. Most recently, a brand-new view of this question has been proposed by Luigi PEDRONI. He links the issue of Aurelian's coins (in particular, of *RIC* V 319) with the solar eclipse of 8 November 272. In the scholar's opinion, this eclipse was interpreted as a sign of the Sun god's protection over the Emperor during his confrontation with Queen Zenobia, who had ruled the Eastern part of the Roman Empire on behalf of her juvenile son Vaballathus. PEDRONI argues for the date of the decisive battle of Emesa in early November 272¹. This is an interesting, yet completely implausible, hypothesis.

First of all, Roman historians do not say anything about the solar eclipse of 272; nor is it mentioned in the two principal sources on the conflict between Aurelian and Zenobia and the Battle of Emesa: the *Historia Augusta* and

¹ L. PEDRONI, *The Sun without Rays and the Eclipse of 272*, *Journal of Late Antiquity* IV 2011, pp. 116–123. For the most significant modern studies of the conflict between Aurelian and Zenobia, see: R. T. SAUNDERS, *A Biography of the Emperor Aurelian A.D. 270–275*, Ann Arbor 1992, pp. 204–243; E. E. SCHNEIDER, *Septimia Zenobia Sebaste*, Roma 1993, pp. 79 f.; R. STONEMAN, *Palmyra and its Empire. Zenobia's Revolt against Rome*, Ann Arbor 1993, pp. 165–179; E. CIZEK, *L'Empereur Aurélien et son temps*, Paris 1994, pp. 103–122; A. WATSON, *Aurelian and the Third Century*, London–New York 1999, pp. 70–88; U. HARTMANN, *Das Palmyrenische Teilreich*, Stuttgart 2001, pp. 364–394; IDEM, *Das Palmyrenische Teilreich*, in: K. P. JOHNE (ed.), *Die Zeit der Soldaten-Kaiser. Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235–284)*, vol. 1, Berlin 2008, pp. 368–371; R. SUSKI, *Konsolidacja Cesarstwa Rzymskiego za panowania Aureliana 270–275*, Kraków 2008, pp. 102–135; P. SOUTHERN, *Empress Zenobia. Palmyra's Rebel Queen*, London–New York 2008, pp. 131–146.

Zosimus. If Aurelian had associated his victory with a solar eclipse, the omission of that phenomenon in the sources would have been incomprehensible indeed. The fourth- and fifth-century literature provides a number of accounts of various exceptional natural phenomena, which were reported by both pagan (breviarists)² and Christian authors³. In late antiquity, the great interest in such unusual natural phenomena was possibly employed as an argument in disputes between Christians and pagans⁴. The most famous of such phenomena was the hurricane that had reportedly contributed significantly to the victory of Theodosius I over Eugenius' forces in the battle of the Frigidus. The Christian historians had seen it as an act of intervention of their God⁵. In any attempt to identify the relation between extraordinary natural phenomena and their perception as divine interventions, scholars must find out why sources pass over such an event.

In fact, it is true that there is no mention of any astronomical phenomena in Zosimus' *Historia Nova* (Book 1)⁶. Nonetheless, this fact cannot be considered as a valid argument in support of L. PEDRONI's hypothesis. In his account of Zenobia's fall, Zosimus makes reference to some supernatural omens foreboding her defeat. He mentions the oracle of Apollo Sarpedonius of Seleucia in Cilicia, which had foretold Aurelian's victory⁷. The end of Zenobia's rule was also predicted by Aphrodite, through her temple at Apeca⁸. As we can see, Zosimus reckoned that Aurelian's victory over Zenobia had been foretold by the gods. If Aurelian had perceived a solar eclipse as a godsend to help him win the battle, Zosimus' omission of the fact would have been simply incomprehensible⁹. In addition, according to Zosimus' account, such a phenomenon had reputedly occurred during the battle of the Frigidus¹⁰. It is clear to see that in the cases where

² P. JANISZEWSKI, *Natura w służbie propagandy. Kataklizmy i rzadkie fenomeny w łacińskich brewiarach historycznych i w Historia Augusta*, in: T. DERDA, E. WIPSYCYKA (eds.), *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności*, vol. 2, Kraków 1999, pp. 9–108.

³ JANISZEWSKI, *Natura...* (n. 2), pp. 11–19.

⁴ The scientific explanation of solar eclipses had been known to Roman historians in late antiquity (see Amm. XX 3, 1–3), but some of them interpreted the phenomena as evil omens (see Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41, 7).

⁵ Rufinus, *HE* II 33; Socrates, *HE* V 25; Sosomenus, *HE* VII 24.

⁶ Zosimus gives many accounts of natural phenomena of supernatural provenance, e.g., a fire in Rome that may have descended from above (*Zos. Hist.* II 13, 1); after Valentinian's death, a lightning bolt at Sirmium caused the burning down of the imperial palace and the forum (*Zos. Hist.* IV 18, 1).

⁷ *Zos. Hist.* I 57, 1–4.

⁸ *Zos. Hist.* I 58, 1–4. On the temples of Apollo Sarpedonios and Aphrodite at Apeca, see F. PASCHOUD, *Zosime: Histoire nouvelle*, vol. 1, Paris 1971, pp. 166–168.

⁹ Zosimus realized that his digression on the gods' predictions of Zenobia's defeat was a lengthy one and thus he attempted to justify the fact before the reader (*Zos. Hist.* I 59, 1).

¹⁰ *Zos. Hist.* IV 58, 1. The information on a solar eclipse during the battle of the Frigidus is derived from Eunapios of Sardes' lost work. Most probably, the eclipse in question was an invention of the author, who had made use of his account of a solar eclipse during the battle in order to

the contemporaries of the events had noticed a connection between the outcome of a given battle and the accompanying phenomena observed in the sky, Zosimus has taken note of the fact. The evidence found in Zosimus' work (or, precisely, the lack thereof) calls PEDRONI's hypothesis into question.

In another source dealing with the Emperor's campaign in the East, the *Historia Augusta*, there are several references to solar eclipses (of course, not in the context of Aurelian's reign), which are always perceived as ominous signs¹¹. They forebode the deaths of Commodus¹² and Pertinax¹³, as well as Gordian III's brief reign¹⁴. Moreover, the *Historia Augusta* mentions a star in proximity to the Sun, which was observed from Severus Alexander's birthplace. Although stars can be visible in daytime only during a total solar eclipse, in this particular case it is most probably a passage modelled on the New Testament narrative of Jesus Christ's birth¹⁵. The *Historia Augusta* does not evade describing rare astronomical phenomena, imparting a higher sense to such events. However, the source does not make a mention of any solar eclipse in the Emperor Aurelian's reign, either in Aurelian's or Zenobia's biographies. Even if the author had wished to avoid mentioning the occurrence of a solar eclipse during the battle of Emesa in Aurelian's biography (on account of his own negative associations with such phenomena), he could have made some reference thereto in his depiction of the fates of Zenobia and Vaballathus. However, such an event is not mentioned at all. Besides, the author considers Aurelian as one of the most outstanding rulers¹⁶ and notes that the

explain and justify the defeat of the party he had himself regarded as the right one; see P. JANISZEWSKI, *Eunapius of Sardes and the Solar Eclipse during the Battle on the River Frigidus*, in: T. DERDA, J. URBANIK, M. WĘCOWSKI (eds.), *Euergesias charin. Studies Presented to Benedetto Bravo and Ewa Wipszycka by their Disciples*, Warsaw 2002, pp. 71–85.

¹¹ Our discussion of the instances of solar eclipses in the *Historia Augusta* makes no mention of one particular passage dealing with a dark spell that had lingered over a number of days (*HA Gal.* 5, 2). For obvious reasons, it cannot refer to a solar eclipse, which is a short-lived phenomenon. Most probably, the author of the *Historia Augusta* makes use of the term *tenebrae* to express a dire situation of the Empire; see JANISZEWSKI, *Natura...* (n. 2), p. 92.

¹² *HA Comm.* 16, 3.

¹³ *HA Per.* 14, 3. See B. MOUCHOVÁ, *Omina mortis in der Historia Augusta*, in: A. ALFÖLDI (ed.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1968/1969*, Bonn 1970, p. 131.

¹⁴ *HA Gord.* 23, 2. See C.E.V. NIXON, *An Historiographical Study of the Caesares of Sextus Aurelius Victor*, Michigan 1971, pp. 264 f.; H.W. BIRD, *Aurelius Victor: De Caesaribus*, Liverpool 1984, p. 121.

¹⁵ F. PASCHOUD, *Raisonnements providentialistes dans l'Histoire Auguste*, in: A. ALFÖLDI (ed.) *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1977/1978*, Bonn 1980, p. 166; JANISZEWSKI, *Natura...* (n. 2), pp. 88–90; F. PASCHOUD, *L'auteur de l'Histoire Auguste est-il un apostat?* in: F. CHAUSSON, É. WOLFF (eds.) *Consuetudinis amor. Fragments d'histoire romaine [II^e–VI^e siècles] offerts à Jean-Pierre Calu*, Roma 2007, pp. 357–369.

¹⁶ *HA Aurel.* 1, 5; 37, 1; 37, 3 f.; 42, 4; 50, 5.

Emperor's mother had been a priestess of the Sun god¹⁷. The latter record cannot be verified; in all probability, it was invented by the author of the *Historia Augusta* in order to explain the Emperor's ardent worship of Sol¹⁸. Furthermore, the author does not mention any solar eclipse in his depiction of the Emperor's votive gifts of gold and precious stones given to the temple of Sol in Rome¹⁹. If Aurelian had regarded such a phenomenon as instrumental in his victory, the absence of any mention of the fact in the *Historia Augusta* would have been odd indeed.

Secondly, there are no grounds for L. PEDRONI's date of the battle of Emesa. With certainty, it took place in the summer of 272. The date of the battle can be determined on the basis of a certain honorific inscription dedicated to Septimius Haddudan. It was made in March of 273 and refers to the services rendered to the Roman forces by that Palmyra-born senator in August of 272 (*PAT*, 2812)²⁰. It means that in August of 272 Palmyra was captured and Queen Zenobia taken captive by Aurelian. Of course, the battle of Emesa must have taken place shortly beforehand, most probably in July or early August of 272. Thus, setting the date at the beginning of November 272 is completely contrary to what the sources tell us and the entire hypothesis of the Italian scholar should be rejected.

While the dedication to Haddudan has been partially reconstructed, another inscription leaves no room for speculation. In November of 272, Aurelian had been far away from Palmyra, Emesa, and Syria. After his victory over Zenobia, Aurelian and his army headed north and carried on a campaign against the Carpi in the Balkans. Following the defeat of the Carpi, he returned to Syria to suppress a rebellion against the Roman garrison left at Palmyra²¹. The date of the Emperor's victory over the Carpi can be determined with much certainty thanks to the extant epigraphic evidence. The title *Carpicus Maximus* can be found among the Emperor's other *cognomina* on an inscription discovered in Moesia²². It is the earliest evidence of this particular *cognomen* of Aurelian. The inscription was engraved during Aurelian's third *tribunicia potestas*, which points to its origin between 10 December 271 and 9 December 272²³. The Emperor's victory

¹⁷ *HA Aurel.* 4, 2.

¹⁸ On this passage, see F. PASCHOUD, *Histoire Auguste*, vol. V 1: *Vies d'Aurélien, Tacite*, Paris 1996, pp. 72 f.

¹⁹ *HA Aurel.* 39, 6.

²⁰ A French rendering of the inscription can be found in M. GAWLIKOWSKI, *Inscriptions de Palmyre*, Syria LVIII 1971, p. 420. The inscription was discovered in the northern section of Palmyra, at the site of the temple of Bel.

²¹ *HA Aurel.* 30, 4 f.; *Zos. Hist.* I 59, 1–60, 1.

²² *CIL* III 7586 = *ILS* 8925.

²³ Aurelian's assumption of *tribunicia potestas* had been a matter of controversy for a long time. It is now generally believed that the Emperor renewed his *tribunicia potestas* on December 10 (like an overwhelming majority of the Roman emperors); see M. PEACHIN, *Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, AD 235–284*, Amsterdam 1990, p. 89.

over the Carpi must have taken place between August 272 (the victory over Zenobia in Syria) and December 272. Considering the fact that the distance between Palmyra and the Danubian frontier is more than 1,400 km, and the Roman army could walk a daily distance of no more than 30 km, Aurelian reached the Balkan Peninsula after a period of 1.5–2 months, i.e., in September or October of 272. Thereafter, he carried on his swift and successful campaign against the Carpi. It means that on 8 November 272 (the date of the solar eclipse), Aurelian had been present in the Balkans, where the phenomenon was not seen at all. This allows us to draw a fairly clear and simple conclusion. The Emperor had not witnessed a solar eclipse in 272; nor could he have associated the phenomenon with his victory several months before. Let us also add that Aurelian's Syrian campaign of 272 had been waged north of the territories where the eclipse was visible.

There are also several minor errors in PEDRONI's article. For instance, the connection between the Emperor's coinage and the establishment of the *Dies Natalis Solis* in Rome (25 December)²⁴ is a very controversial thesis. Aurelian established the *agon* dedicated to Sol, but the evidence does not point to 25 December as the date of the games. According to the *Fasti Philocali*, there were two games dedicated to Sol: on 19–22 October²⁵ and on 25 December²⁶. Julian mentions two festivals devoted to Sol: one of them was celebrated at a new date²⁷, the other towards the year's end²⁸. While the former celebration was indeed established by Aurelian (i.e., the new one), the latter should be dated to 25 December. In his discussion of the connection between the festival of 25 December and Aurelian, PEDRONI reiterates the old misconceptions contradictory to the evidence found in the sources²⁹.

It is evident therefore that PEDRONI's intriguing hypothesis stands in complete contradiction to the sources. The epigraphic evidence and the absence of any mention in the sources relating to a solar eclipse in Aurelian's reign do not provide any justification for the scholar's assertion.

University of Białystok

²⁴ PEDRONI, *o. c.* (n. 1), p. 117.

²⁵ *CIL* I² 274.

²⁶ *CIL* I² 278.

²⁷ Julian, *Or.* 4, 155B.

²⁸ Julian, *Or.* 4, 156B–C.

²⁹ On the *agon* introduced by Aurelian, see G.H. HALSBERGHE, *The Cult of Sol Invictus*, Leiden 1972, p. 144; S.E. HIJMANS, *Sol. The Sun in the Art and Religions of Rome*, Groningen 2009, pp. 2–3.

PLATONIS GORGIAS LEONARDO ARETINO INTERPRETE:
OSSERVAZIONI CRITICHE

di

WŁODZIMIERZ OLSZANIEC

La recente edizione del *Gorgia* latino di Leonardo Bruni Aretino, curata da Matteo VENIER¹, ci offre per la prima volta il testo critico di questa traduzione. Ho già potuto esprimere in altra sede un giudizio sull'alto valore scientifico del lavoro di VENIER². Lo scopo della presente nota è invece di suggerire una serie di integrazioni e commenti a proposito di alcune soluzioni testuali accettate dall'editore. Ecco i passi che, a mio avviso, meritano un'ulteriore discussione.

(1) *Grg.* 480e: “Contra autem reputando: si alicui male facere oportet...” (Τούναντίον δέ γε αὖ μεταβαλόντα, εἰ ἄρα δεῖ τινα κακῶς ποιεῖν...). Nell'apparato l'editore considera la correzione di *reputando* in *reputandum* (“Contra autem reputandum: fortasse corrigendum”). Tale correzione peggiorerebbe il testo, introducendo l'aspetto della necessità, assente nell'originale. L'ablativo del gerundio rende bene il senso del greco e Bruni usa questa forma in maniera analoga anche nella traduzione di *Grg.* 500c: “illa agendo, quae sunt viri”, dove *agendo* traduce l'accusativo del participio πράττοντα (τὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς δὴ ταῦτα πράττοντα). Il testo dei codici, dunque, è perfettamente congruo e non necessita una correzione. Sugerirei invece un ritocco nella interpunzione: “Contra autem reputando, si alicui male facere oportet...”.

(2) *Grg.* 482c: “O Socrates, vide<n>tur haec tua quaedam iactantia verborum...” (ὦ Σώκρατες, δοκεῖς νεανιεύεσθαι ἐν τοῖς λόγοις...). L'editore accetta la correzione di Ernesto Berti – *vide<n>tur* – che è superflua, perchè il singolare *videtur* non infrange le norme sintattiche del latino³.

¹ *Platonis Gorgias Leonardo Aretino interprete*, a cura di Matteo VENIER, Firenze 2011 (Traduzioni dei testi greci in età umanistica e rinascimentale VII).

² Włodzimierz OLSZANIEC, [recensione di] *Platonis Gorgias Leonardo Aretino interprete*, a cura di Matteo VENIER, *Renaissance Quarterly* LXV 2012, pp. 1167–1169.

³ Cf. Alfred ERNOUT, François THOMAS, *Syntaxe latine*, Paris ²1964, p. 131, dove si cita Cic. *Div.* II 90: “non omnis error stultitia dicenda est”.

(3) *Grg.* 499e–500a: “Gratia enim bonorum omnia nobis facienda visa sunt, mihi et Polo: an meministi? Et tibi idem videtur hic esse finis omnium actionum eiusque gratia cetera fieri omnia, non autem ille gratia aliorum. Eiusdem sententiae es una nobiscum vel non?” (“Ἐνεκα γάρ που τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἅπαντα ἡμῖν ἔδοξεν πρακτέον εἶναι, εἰ μνημονεύεις, ἐμοί τε καὶ Πώλῳ. ἄρα καὶ σοὶ συνδοκεῖ οὕτω, τέλος εἶναι ἀπασῶν τῶν πράξεων τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ἐκείνου ἔνεκα δεῖν πάντα τᾶλλα πράττεσθαι ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐκεῖνο τῶν ἄλλων; σύμψηφος ἡμῖν εἶ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τρίτων;). Nell’apparato troviamo il seguente commento: “an meministi] *expectes* si meministi”. La lezione dei manoscritti *an meministi* nella posizione finale è comprensibile e valida (anche se non ricalca il greco εἶ), non peggiore di *si meministi* considerato da VENIER: non dovrebbe perciò suscitare dubbi. Sugerirei anche in questo caso un cambiamento nell’interpunzione: dopo *aliorum* andrebbe messo il punto interrogativo: “Et tibi idem videtur [...] non autem ille gratia aliorum?”

(4) *Grg.* 503c–d: “Quod, si non est hoc, sed (quemadmodum postea in disputando coacti sumus fateri) cupiditates illas quae meliorem faciunt virum explere oportet, illas vero quae deteriolem non oportet, et haec est ars quaedam, nescio quomodo possint dicere aliquem istorum virorum talem fuisse” (εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο, ἀλλ’ ὅπερ ἐν τῷ ὑστέρῳ λόγῳ ἠναγκάσθημεν ἡμεῖς ὁμολογεῖν – ὅτι αἱ μὲν τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν πληρούμεναι βελτίῳ ποιοῦσι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ταύτας μὲν ἀποτελεῖν, αἱ δὲ χεῖρω, μὴ, τοῦτο δὲ τέχνη τις εἴη – τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα τούτων τινὰ γεγενῆσθαι οὐκ ἔχω ἔγωγε πῶς εἶπω). Anche qui bisogna correggere l’interpunzione, eliminando la virgola dopo l’iniziale *Quod* (“Quod si non est hoc...”). Un problema più grave è offerto dalla parola *possint*: non è chiaro, infatti, chi ne sia il soggetto. Il testo greco tradotto qui è: εἶπω – la lezione dei manoscritti va dunque cambiata in *possim*. La corruzione è facilmente spiegabile dal punto di vista paleografico.

(5) *Grg.* 506a: “Prosequor igitur sermonem ego ipse. Qui<n> si forte ea concedere videbor, quae vera non sunt, vestrum erit resistere atque redargue-re” (δίειμι μὲν οὖν τῷ λόγῳ ἐγὼ ὡς ἂν μοι δοκῆ ἔχειν· ἐὰν δὲ τῷ ὑμῶν μὴ τὰ ὄντα δοκῶ ὁμολογεῖν ἐμαυτῷ, χρὴ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ ἐλέγχειν). È difficile indovinare il senso di *Qui<n>* congetturato qui dall’editore. Bruni traduce l’espressione ἐὰν δέ, il testo va dunque emendato in “Quod si forte...”. A sostegno di tale emendamento si possono citare numerose analogie nella traduzione di Bruni: *Grg.* 457b: ἐὰν δὲ οἶμαι ῥητορικὸς γενόμενός τις = “Quod si quispiam dicendi facultatem adeptus”; *Grg.* 484a: ἐὰν δὲ γε οἶμαι φύσιν ἰκανὴν γένηται ἔχων ἀνήρ = “Quod si vir aliquis praestantis naturae insurgat”, e anche *Grg.* 503c: εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο = “Quod si non est hoc”; *Grg.* 511c: εἰ δ’ αὕτη σοὶ δοκεῖ σμικρὰ εἶναι = “Quod si haec tibi parva videtur”⁴; *Grg.* 514c: εἰ δὲ μήτε

⁴ Correggo la punteggiatura dell’edizione, eliminando la virgola dopo *Quod*.

διδάσκαλον εἶχομεν = “Quod si neque magistrum habuimus”; *Grg.* 521c: εἰ δὲ ἀδίκως, αἰσχυρῶς = “quod si iniuste, turpiter”.

(6) *Grg.* 516e: “...cum vero curaverint equos, et ipsi meliores aurigae facti sunt, tunc excidunt” (ἐπειδὴν δὲ θεραπεύσωσιν τοὺς ἵππους καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀμείνους γένωνται ἡνίοχοι, τότ’ ἐκπίπτουσιν). L’editore commenta giustamente nell’apparato: „sint *expectes*”, e pare opportuno che questa correzione sia introdotta nel testo.

(7) *Grg.* 523a: “Audi igitur, ut aiunt, pulcherrimum sermonem. Quam tu quidem, ut arbitror, fabulam existimabis...” (“Ἀκουε δὴ, φασί, μάλα καλοῦ λόγου, ὃν σὺ μὲν ἠγήση μῦθον...”). Una parte dei codici (tra cui Sc, che occupa la posizione autorevole fra tutti i testimoni) tramanda la lezione *quem* [sc. *sermonem*] invece di *quam*. Nell’apparato l’editore ammette la possibilità che Bruni abbia scritto *quem*. Questo mi sembra molto probabile e credo che tale lezione meriti di essere introdotta nel testo.

(8) *Grg.* 524b: “Cum ergo dissolutae sunt, non multum deest quin utrumque ipsorum illum habitum servet, quem homo dum erat in vita habebat: corpus ἴενιμ† naturam cultus et affectus.” (ἐπειδὴν δὲ διαλυθῆτον ἄρα ἀπ’ ἀλλήλοιν, οὐ πολὺ ἤττον ἐκάτερον αὐτοῖν ἔχει τὴν ἕξιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἥνπερ καὶ ὅτε ἔζη ὁ ἄνθρωπος, τό τε σῶμα τὴν φύσιν τὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θεραπεύματα καὶ τὰ παθήματα ἔνδηλα πάντα.). L’editore segna la parola *enim* con *cruces desperationis* e – vista anche la mancata resa delle parole ἔνδηλα πάντα – sospetta un danno più grave. A mio avviso la lezione dei testimoni non ha bisogno di un emendamento (come *scilicet* suggerito dall’editore). *Enim* è congruo perchè questa frase è un’esegesi della frase precedente (con *habet* o *servat* sottinteso – com’è sottinteso nel testo greco). L’espressione ἔνδηλα πάντα è usata da Platone ben quattro volte nell’ambito di un passo molto breve e fu probabilmente questa la causa per cui Bruni non la tradusse qui e poco sotto, a 524d (ἐνὶ δὲ λόγῳ, οἷος εἶναι παρεσκευάστο τὸ σῶμα ζῶν, ἔνδηλα ταῦτα καὶ τελευτήσαντος = “Ac ut breviter comprehendam, quaecumque erat corpus viventis, talia ipsius mortui sunt omnia”).

Università di Varsavia

CORRECTIO

In “Eos” XCVII 2010, p. 290, legitur: “Lege mecum ἐὰν δὲ νῦν καταληφθῆσ<ομαι, ἧ> ἀποθανῶ<ν> ἀνόσια ὄνειδη κ. τ. λ.”.

Erat autem scribendum: “Lege mecum ἐὰν δὲ νῦν καταληφθῶ ἢ ἀποθανῶ<ν> ἀνόσια ὄνειδη κ. τ. λ.”, ut me admonuit vir doctissimus R. KASSEL, qui, separato accepto, qua est doctrina et humanitate, statim me de laspu certiore fecit.

Carolus Martinus Lucarini
Romae

R. Scott GARNER, *Traditional Elegy: The Interplay of Meter, Tradition, and Context in Early Greek Poetry*, New York–Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011 (American Classical Studies 56), X, 152 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-97572-3, £ 60.00.

Forty-two years ago Albrecht DIEHLE wrote: “Weil bisher keine anderen als statistische Möglichkeiten gefunden worden sind, die Charakteristika homerischen Formelgebrauchs zu bestimmen, ist es auch ausgeschlossen, auf dem von Parry gewiesenen Wege [...] die Bruchstücke des Archilochos als Reste oraler Dichtung zu erweisen. Derlei Versuche aber werden bis zum heutigen Tage immer wieder unternommen”¹. This *immer wieder* remains fittingly adequate also in 2012, after the publication of GARNER’s (hereafter G.) book. The author, indeed, argues that Archilochus was an oral poet, and extends this judgment to all Greek archaic elegists, saying that the production of elegy in the archaic epoch was an oral-formulaic process. He seeks to restate and significantly amplify theories propounded in the 1960s by Denys PAGE and James NOTOPOULOS², using PARRY’S and LORD’S paradigms in the field of Oral Theory as the point of reference for his investigation. On the basis of a complex of formulaic features detectable in the surviving output of such poets as Archilochus, Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Xenophanes and others, G. finds elegiac poetry an important facet of the oral atlas of early Greek poetry and argues for treating it as a part of archaic cultural reference system based on the priorities of the oral mode of composition, communication and representation. In the course of his explanation of methodology, G. acknowledges the impact of John Miles FOLEY’S seminal works devoted to the theory and practice of oral composition on his own way of re-searching issues. Although FOLEY is, quite naturally – one may say – the book’s honoree in respect of methodology, a responsible treatment of the views of other methodological models would also be a welcome feature of the book (to the uneven way of consulting previous writing and thinking on the subject, offered throughout the book, I return below).

The author promises, on the basis of the formulaic examination of extant elegiac pieces, to open up new vistas on the nature of early Greek elegy. One may ask, whether he has fulfilled the promise. The answer encounters difficulties and depends on (1) the confidence level one is prone to accept for quantitative arguments on which the book’s central claims rest, and (2) determining whether G.’s understanding of the formula itself proves satisfactory. As to the first point, personally I am sympathetic to R.L. FOWLER’S opinion, expressed in 1987 (by the way, the neglect of his valuable book, *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*, Toronto–London 1987, by G. is hardly conceivable) that “not nearly enough poetry of [...] any early lyric poet survives to allow the detection of the formula-systems which are an essential part of oral improvisation” (p. 14), and not to G.’s conclusive statement that “statistics do indeed provide overwhelming justification for understanding early Greek elegy as heavily indebted to oral and traditional compositional techniques” (p. IX). Nevertheless, what G. offers the readers is, I am glad to say, interesting and stimulating. So FOWLER’S further uncompromising treatment of all search for lyric poets’ orality as wasted effort on that which “can never be proven” (*The Nature...*, p. 14), and, consequently, his

¹ A. DIEHL, *Homer-Probleme*, Opladen 1970, p. 49.

² D.A. PAGE, *Archilochus and the Oral Tradition*, in: *Archiloque*, Genève 1964 (Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique X), pp. 117–163; J.A. NOTOPOULOS, *Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry*, HSCPh LXVIII 1964, pp. 1–77; IDEM, *Archilochus, the Aoidos*, TAPhA XCVII 1967, pp. 311–315.

provocative suggestion that such investigation “should be called to a halt before it has even begun” is entirely unconvincing.

As for the definition of formula, G. advances a separate definition of it, limited in scope, based on the concept of the group of phraseological integers, called by G. ‘lexical formulas’. The outstanding feature of a ‘lexical formula’ is the regular appearance of a group of two or more lexemes together, filling out a colon or cola by themselves or in conjunction with prepositive or postpositive words (see p. 21). G. is aware of the limitations of analysis created by such a definition (on p. 22 he says: “lexical formulas represent only a small subset of the possible phrases that a poet could produce, even within an entirely traditional compositional scenario”), but promotes the investigation of the process of ‘elegiac composing’ through the usage of lexical formulas as effective enough in revealing the existence of the oral elegiac verse-making. He agrees that HAINSWORTH’S concept of the ‘flexible formula’ might also be applied to elegiac poetry, but, unfortunately, postpones the possibility of – as he says (p. 22) – “more nuanced investigations into the flexibility of elegiac formulas” for some future date. This decision is not entirely convincing, the more so because HAINSWORTH’S theory serves the purpose of identifying what is ‘traditional’ in orality³, and the understanding of the oral traditional nature of early Greek elegy is the main purpose of G.’s volume (see p. 50).

The book deserves careful reading. The author’s discourse is very precise and concise, without even temporarily diverging from the main track, which provides a clear organization to the whole work.

In the first chapter, “Elegy and Its Traditional Possibilities” (pp. 3–17), after having briefly delineated the manner and places of performing elegiac pieces as well as the cultural context of early elegy, G. deals with the question of phraseological partitioning in elegy. He takes FRAENKEL’S colon system (together with the caesura system that helps define *cola*), modified by FOLEY, to exhibit the existence of phraseological structuring in elegy. The presentation of caesura employment percentages for early elegiac hexameters and within elegiac pentameters as well as the report of the punctuation distribution in elegiac pentameters leads G. to the conclusion that “early Greek elegy did indeed possess a metrical partitioning scheme that would have allowed for the possibility of employing formulaic phraseology” (p. 17).

Chapter 2, “Formulas in Early Greek Elegy” (pp. 19–38), brings a useful review of the scholarship on the concept of formula, but its core issue is to show the repeated occurrence of internal lexical formulas within the stichic hexameter, elegiac hexameter, and elegiac pentameter. The chapter must be read together with Appendix I (pp. 95–108), which lists 83 lexical formulas shared by these three types of lines. The examples collected in the chapter and in the appendix make clear, in G.’s opinion, that “the elegiac couplet had syntactical structuring proprieties that would allow it to share phraseology with epic in traditional ways” (p. 38), and that “the poets actually took advantage of such possibilities and employed formulaic phrases that could be adapted to fit either metrical context” (p. 38). G.’s exploration of the material is deep and interesting, but an objection against some supposed traditional formulas immediately emerges. G. does not take into consideration the phenomenon of the so-called ‘pseudo-formulae’, found e.g. in the *Theognidea*, and treats all verbal pattering recurring in the same position as true formulas belonging to a traditional oral repertoire. On the subject of such ‘pseudo-formulae’ FOWLER’S discussion (*The Nature...*, pp. 43–45) appears very instructive and convincing. So it would be desirable that G. takes a stance to his view.

³ See Mario CANTILENA’S right diagnosis, *Primato del significato o identità metrica? La formula come indizio di oralità* in: B. GENTILI, G. PAIONI (eds.), *Oralità. Cultura, letteratura, discorso*, Roma 1985, p. 287: “La formula di Parry serve a individuare l’oralità. Quella di Hainsworth serve a individuare la tradizionalità”.

Chapter 3, “Epic Correption or ‘Traditional’ Correption?” (pp. 39–77), centres its focus on the origin of the phenomenon of the shortening of a long vowel or diphthong at the end of the word before an initial vowel or diphthong in the following word, and on the function of this feature. Independently of whether G. has succeeded in showing that the correption is “a feature that demonstrates that the composers of archaic elegy were actively engaging with traditional processes rather than just mimicking them as a stylistic norm inherited from the past” (p. 39), his studies in the origins and nature of this metrical anomaly are one of the most valuable parts of the book. G. views the correption not as accidental or residual archaism, but as “a variation in metrical practice that worked hand in hand with traditional phraseology as a dynamic enabler of poetic flexibility within an oral-formulaic system” (p. 54). His analyses of the correption, aimed at showing its dynamic role in modifying traditional phraseology in Homer, are detailed, precise and persuasive. The results of the investigations are presented in the form of tables within the chapter and in six appendices (II: correption percentages by line position in the *Iliad*, III: correption percentages by line position in the *Odyssey*, IV: long-vowel correption percentages by line position in the *Iliad*, V: long-vowel correption percentages by line position in the *Odyssey*, VI: long-vowel epic correption categorization for Homer, including instances at boundaries between cola, coinciding with phrase contraction, and coinciding with shift in colon position, instances at intracolonic juncture points, and those not at inter- or intracolonic boundaries, VII: short-vowel epic correption in *Iliad* I and *Odyssey* I). What has been argued with great force by G. in this respect with reference to elegy, i.e. the similarity of the scenario for the use of correption in elegy and epic, suggesting the correption in both cases being an active enabler of oral formulaic phraseology, bases on statistics (presented again in tables within the chapter and in appendices, VIII: long-vowel epic correption in early elegy, and IX: short-vowel epic correption in early elegy) and involves the supposition that in all (also nowadays lost) archaic elegies the same tendency must have been present, which weakens the strength of G.’s argumentation.

G.’s judgments on the role of the correption as a device of oral compositional technique are supported in Appendix X (pp. 133–140), where correption frequencies in early Greek epic other than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are presented. The appendix ends with a passage dealing with the correption in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius, in which G. shows that Apollonius attempts to mirror the verse position of the early epic’s correption. The intention of this consideration is, of course, to stress the impact of the traditional oral model of composing poems in the archaic period on the purely literate poetic techniques in later times. The question of the extent of later poets’ mimetic attitude towards the oral means of composing poetry is a vast and difficult problem, demanding careful and detailed investigation. Such an Apollonian *Stichprobe* seems slightly unreasonable in a book totally focused on the archaic mechanisms of creating poems.

Chapter 4, “Further Considerations” (pp. 79–94), brings the recapitulation of the main results of G.’s investigations. The author also attempts to “indicate briefly a few of the productive areas in which research might build upon the paradigm shift suggested by the findings of earlier chapters” (p. 81). These are, in G.’s opinion, three, namely the questions of the evolution of Greek metre, the problem of traditional compositional methods in early poetry other than epic and elegy, and finally the consequences of elegiac formulaic compositional practices for creating meaningful messages by the early elegists.

The book is intended for readers who are not unfamiliar with the ‘polyphony’ of modern academic debates on the formulaic style and the possibilities of its operation in early Greek poetry. They surely will appreciate G.’s maintaining a synoptic control over the area of orality studies, but may find some of G.’s approaches to the subject of formulaic elements and their ‘elegiac implications’ troubling. Being a Foleyian, G. has the right to cause FOLEY’S contributions to be overrepresented in the book, but a number of bibliographical omissions he commits and the little attention received by some works of individual scholars in his book may suggest a limited familiarity with a body of scholarship outside the confines of ‘hard-line Foleyism’. I have already mentioned the neglect of Robert FOWLER’S book and his general reservations referring to the validity of research

oriented towards giving archaic lyric the status of oral poetry. It also seems upsetting not to find enough references to some modern leading figures in the study of orality in countries other than the United States and Britain: my key complaint in this respect is that G. failed to appreciate inspiring insights into the question of formulaic design of early Greek verses presented by Bruno GENTILI⁴, JOACHIM LATACZ and Edzard VISSER in their texts devoted to orality, and totally omitted their important scholarly texts on the subject⁵.

Although the oral composition of archaic elegiac poetry is its main focus, G.'s book deals with much else besides. It studies a number of general matters pertaining to various metrical characteristics of Greek poetry and offers some new explanation for the core questions, in particular the origin of the phenomenon of epic (or "traditional", as G. calls it) correption. All in all the individual analyses of several associated topics rather than the tantalising suggestions concerning the alleged oral character of archaic elegy appear, in my opinion, to be the greatest advantage of the book.

In sum, the conclusions drawn by G. are, in the light of the insufficiency of evidence, wholly unprovable, but there is no question about his book's overall merit.

Krystyna Bartol
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

⁴ Although G. extensively quotes and positively estimates (p. 92) the passage concerning the gradual nature of literacy's permeation of Greek culture and the persistence of traditional forms from the English version of GENTILI's book *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*, transl. by A.Th. COLE, Baltimore 1988, he totally neglects his views on the origin of hexameter, B. GENTILI, P. GIANNINI, *Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro*, QUCC XXVI 1977, pp. 7–51.

⁵ I mean B. GENTILI, *Die pragmatischen Aspekte der archaischen griechischen Dichtung*, A&A XXXVI 1990, pp. 1–17; J. LATACZ (ed.), *Homer. Tradition und Neuerung*, Darmstadt 1979; IDEM, *Neuere Erkenntnisse zur epischen Versifikationstechnik*, SIFC X 1992, pp. 807–826 (= IDEM, *Erschließung der Antike. Kleine Schriften zur Literatur der Griechen und Römer*, Stuttgart 1994, pp. 235–255); E. VISSER, *Formulae or Single Words? Towards a New Theory on Homeric Verse-Making*, WJA XIV 1988, pp. 21–37 (= I.J.F. DE JONG [ed.], *Homer. Critical Assesments*, vol. 1, London–New York 1999, pp. 364–381). The latter is called by J. LATACZ, *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar*, München–Leipzig 2000, p. 56, "ein wesentlicher Schritt über die [...] Beschränktheit der Parryschen Zielsetzung hinaus".

Joan SILVA BARRIS, *Metre and Rhythm in Greek Verse*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2011 (Wiener Studien, Beiheft 35), 177 pp., ISBN 978-3-7001-6902-4, € 39.20.

The book *Metre and Rhythm in Greek Verse* by J. SILVA BARRIS (hereinafter JSB) is devoted to a subject that because of its difficulty and hypothetical nature is not particularly popular among classical scholars.

An advantage of this book is its disposition¹. The division into parts, chapters, and subchapters is so detailed that it successfully compensates for the lack of indices *locorum* and *rerum*. On the other hand, the author should have been more careful and avoided a weird situation where a title of one of the subchapters is not much shorter than its text (p. 40). His book is divided into three main Parts. In the “First Part: Relative Basic Durations and Syllabic Equivalences” he discusses some of the most important concepts and phenomena related to metre and rhythm. These are e.g. πρώτος χρόνος, πούς, responsion, κατάλεξις etc. In the “Second Part: Rhythmic Value of Traditional Poetic-Musical Genres” the individual types of rhythms are discussed and in the final “Third Part: Rhythmic Proposals for Some Metrically Compound Passages” the author tests his views on selected poetic passages. The Parts are preceded by a prologue in which JSB describes the method and purpose of his investigations. The discussion in his book abruptly ends in a sequence of notes followed by no epilogue. I believe that any reader would be glad to be reminded not only of the most important conclusions formulated in the book but also of the author’s tribute to his subject matter and the perspectives presented by his research. Such an epilogue would be all the more useful as it is extremely difficult to reach conclusions about the above-mentioned issues from studying the individual chapters of his book.

I have managed to identify at least three main obstacles that make it hard or even impossible to follow JSB’s discussion. The first one is of a linguistic nature. I wonder why, on the one hand, the author has been so reckless as to decide to publish the text of his book without apparently having consulted a native speaker’s opinion on it and, on the other, why OAW referees and copy-editors have let him do it. As a non-native user of English I do not mind if the text of his book is riddled with slips and mistakes. What worries me is JSB’s frequent inability to express his thoughts in a precise and transparent way despite the fact that precision and transparency are, at least in my opinion, the most needed features of a discussion on the complicated topics that cover the metre and rhythm of Greek poetry.

Another difficulty that does not allow me to become fully familiar with the author’s views is his lack of consistency and sometimes even ignorance in making proper use of the scholarly nomenclature. I hope that I do not have to emphasise the importance of its strict observance in the field of ancient Greek music. JSB however does not seem to care much about strictness and precision in this regard. He usually does not respect the difference between two basic concepts, that is, between metrical position and syllable². Such a distinction is crucial for anyone who investigates metre and rhythm and it is likely to make it unnecessary for them to coin or borrow from others such strange terms as “a metrically³ long syllable” (p. 31), or “a double-short syllable”⁴ (p. 50). His

¹ I will not discuss it here in detail as the contents of the book are available after login on OAW’s site: <http://hw.oeaw.ac.at/6902-4>.

² The difference is explained e.g. by T. COLE, *Epiploke: Rhythmical Continuity and Poetic Structure in Greek Lyric*, Cambridge, Mass.–London 1988, p. 18.

³ All underlinings are mine.

⁴ This term can be found in B.H. MCLEAN, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods...*, Ann Arbor 2002, p. 365.

inconsistency is glaring on p. 144, where in one sentence he writes about a “syllabic sequence” and in the next one the term “position” is used: “The lyric genre in question is based upon a rather free combination of the syllabic sequences (–) – ∼ – and (–) – ∼ ∼ – ∼ ∼ – (–). Within the synaphy, one of the positions in brackets...”. Note also the term “lyric genre” referring to a metrical type called dactylo-epitrites (at the beginning of the chapter he calls them “This type of lyric”) and “synaphy” which, as it seems, stands for “synapheia”. On p. 79 he discusses a metrical pattern of the iambic trimeter calling it “The syllabic model of non-comic stichic iambic trimeter”. On p. 47 there appears an odd term “an unequal metric duration” while on p. 85 I find “rhythmic duration of the *positio anceps*”. If the distinction between “metric” and “rhythmic” durations has any sense, the author should have defined it. Generally, in order to avoid complaints, the author should have precisely defined the following terms and expressions: “catalectic increase” (p. 47), “prosodic synaphy” (p. 55), “phonic synaphy” (p. 135, n. 453), “syllabic groups with an inferior metric value” (p. 25), “catalectic value” (p. 69), “poetic *continuum*” (p. 140), “synaphy between *metra*” (p. 139), “metric level” (p. 136), “rhythmic level” (p. 45), “verbal level” (p. 45), “syllabic level” (p. 48) and many others no less confusing. Without those explanations and definitions his perhaps valuable views will remain obscure and inaccessible even for a specialist.

The third obstacle that makes it hard to follow the author’s reasoning is his negligence. It can be seen e.g. in the way JSB refers to the text and apparatus of some of the Greek authors; he does not care to inform his readers which editions he means, see e.g. p. 34, n. 106; p. 35, n. 110. On p. 52, n. 174 he is no less negligent when he refers to “the Teubnerian edition of E. *Ba.*” without giving any further information about the edition. Besides, JSB incessantly uses expressions like “as we have had occasion to observe”, “as we have observed further above”, or “taking into account the information compiled thus far” etc. I did not manage to find a single instance in which this referring back would be accompanied with a page number, or at least a title of a chapter. Only at the end of the book, on p. 147, he is apparently more specific when referring back to its beginning in the following words: “according to what has been established in the first part of this book...”. And that is all; no page number follows. Moreover, on p. 135 he refers to “all that has been stated thus far”. I sometimes have the impression that it is the author’s intention to make it impossible for the reader to see what in fact has been established or stated. One can doubt if anything, since JSB’s purpose, in his own words, is “to formulate certain conclusions or hypotheses” that “serve as a starting point for the formulation of new hypotheses, and so on.” (p. 12). In my opinion, this cannot lead anyone to state anything certain or significant because in the process of generating hypotheses from other hypotheses every successive hypothesis is weaker and weaker till one reaches the point where there is no room for scholarly methods and no scholarly way of thinking is possible anymore.

Numerous quotations from the works of ancient theorists are a valuable feature of his book. The Greek texts are provided with English translations which could be of use for novices in ancient Greek language and music. Unfortunately, a good impression of the author’s erudition is destroyed by his negative approach towards intellectual property. That is what can be concluded from the fact that most translations lack their author’s or authors’ names. Moreover, the quotations often lack a commentary and JSB leaves their interpretations to his readers, see for example p. 38. Earlier, on p. 17 he quotes Aristox. *Rhyth.* 4 and 14 and sees in these passages an information about χρόνος being embodied “in one of the two constituent parts of the foot”. But in *Rhyth.* 4 and 14 Aristoxenus does not say anything about foot or its parts. On p. 45 JSB quotes Heph. IV 2 who says that in dactyls catalexis can be a matter of taking off two συλλαβαί from the full dactylic foot – ∼ ∼ (it is the so-called catalexis *in syllabam*). This results in a blunt close: ... ∼ ∼ – and certainly not in a pendant one: ... – – as JSB concludes – probably misled by the English “a disyllabic catalexis” (p. 46) that renders Hephæstion’s παρὰ δύο συλλαβὰς τὸ καταλεκτικόν (the translator’s name is unknown). On p. 45, when commenting on Aristid. Quint. *De mus.* I 23, the author offers an explanation of the expression μακροτέρα κατάλεξις. He suggests that “the words of Aristides Quintilianus refer to different levels within the poem”. One of those levels is verbal: “On a verbal

level, it is true that there is a missing syllable". He does not explain how the term "verbal level" should be perceived even though it actually implies words with missing syllables, which would be an absurd interpretation of Aristides Quintilianus' views.

In general, his relation to ancient theorists is somehow complicated. On p. 10 he is optimistic enough to say: "we will also have the opportunity to realize that the majority of the ancient Greek theory – especially Aristoxenian theory – is, in the main, coherently applicable to the metrics of archaic and classical texts". Moreover, on p. 14 JSB makes an apt remark concerning the ancient theorists who applied "analogous assumptions and methods" to "all rhythmic genres, whether recited or sung". Therefore, he says, "it seems acceptable, *a priori*, to approach those rhythms which were normally sung and those which were normally recited using similar methods". Surprisingly enough, without giving any reasons or arguments, he seems to reject the ancient theorists' practice in the very next sentence: "However, one must always take into account whether or not a particular work belongs to one type or another when it comes to its analysis".

Regretfully, JSB's way of presenting arguments and formulating conclusions is sometimes unacceptable. I will not dwell on the logic of such statements as the one on p. 51: "There are virtually no exceptions to this tendency" (if there are no exceptions, it is a rule or law – not a tendency) since there are some other and more serious points in his book at which he has obviously deviated from sound scholarly practice. Thus, on p. 26 he refers to irregular response maintaining that it is a matter of *substitution* of one syllabic group by another. In fact, the phenomenon called 'response' is, as its very name indicates, a metrical, rhythmical and probably melodic *correspondence* between strophes⁵. Considering the passages from Bacchylides that he referred to in note 72, I suppose that JSB discusses a rare phenomenon of correspondence between a long syllable and three short syllables. However, he maintains that it happens "often", even though he is able to find only four examples (followed by "etc.") of such responses (p. 26, n. 72). On pp. 59–63 JSB extensively comments on DH *Comp.* 108–109 and 142–144. Here is the course that his discussion takes. First, he argues that DH excludes the spondee from his remarks on dactyls and focuses on the full form – ∪ ∪ (pp. 59–61). Next, on p. 62, he maintains that (1) "the words of the Greek scholar on the long irrational syllable affect only the dactyl (– ∪ ∪)" and (2) "there are certain details in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' text which lead us to doubt even that the scholar took the term irrational to mean the long syllables of all the – ∪ ∪ feet in heroic verse". On the same page he asks "would it be wise to apply this passage from *De compositione verborum* to homeric or hesiodic dactyls?" and suggests that the right answer is 'no' because "it would be still the only testimony which would refer to a systematically ἄλογος internal proportion in the dactyl". Besides, even if in fact the proportion between – and ∪ ∪ in – ∪ ∪ is not 1:1 and even if "it is not beyond the realms of possibility that some, or even the majority, of the – ∪ ∪ feet of the epic verses of Homer, Hesiod, etc., might possess, in the performance, an initial syllable of a lesser duration than the sum of the two short syllables", then "the difference would have to be minimal and virtually imperceptible". Therefore, "the wisest approach would be to consider that his words pertain to observations carried out in relation to *certain* dactyls (– ∪ ∪) of recited verses in post-classical period" (p. 63). The arguments of (1) the uniqueness of Dionysius' testimony and (2) the imperceptibility of the quantitative difference between syllables in question would have been sound enough in other circumstances. However, in the context of JSB's book the argument as to the uniqueness seriously weakens his own hypotheses, as many or most of them are based on a unique ancient testimony, namely that of Aristoxenus. The argument related to imperceptibility is even worse, since almost the whole discussion in his book focuses on such small, hypothetical and most probably imperceptible irrational differences between syllables. One of the more grotesque examples of this approach can be found in the chapter devoted to dactylo-epitrites: "For these reasons, we are allowed to assume that

⁵ For evidence supporting the possibility of melodic responses between strophes in tragedy see my *Towards the Strophic Grammar of Greek Tragedy*, Poznań 2010, pp. 71 ff.

the internal proportion of the epitritic (-)...(-) is to be found between 1:1 and an indeterminate proportion closer to 1:2 but still relatively far from this ratio" (p. 145).

In "Prologue: Justification and Method" the author says that "it is possible to study Greek poetic-musical rhythm in a rigorous manner" (p. 10). Unfortunately, his own study, in my opinion, is a contradiction to the scholarly rigor and precision that are so needed in this kind of investigation. In general, I would not recommend this work to anyone seriously interested in the subject.

Piotr Stepień
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Paul ROCHE, *Lucan: De Bello Civili, Book I. Edited with Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, XI + 418 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-955699-1, £ 79.00.

GETTY published his commentary on book I in 1940¹, so we had to wait almost 70 years for a new, more extensive analysis. The short remarks by WUILLEUMIER and LE BONNIEC (as footnotes, 1962)² and more comprehensive commentary by GAGLIARDI (1989)³ filled the gap only partially (VIANSINO provided the whole poem with notes mainly by collecting comparandas, 1995; however, ROCHE [= R.] did not list this edition in the bibliography⁴). Lucan studies have flourished astonishingly, especially in the last two decades. Apart from numerous papers scattered throughout various journals we have been given new monographs, collective works, and commentaries. Justifying the need for a new commentary to book I is therefore redundant.

The work consists of an extensive introduction (pp. 1–64), text (with short critical apparatus, pp. 65–87), commentary (pp. 91–390), and comprehensive bibliography (pp. 391–406). It ends with helpful indices (*index verborum, locorum, nominum et rerum*, pp. 407–418). Defining in the preface the goals of his commentary, R. speaks “of respectfully preserving what is good, of reworking, correcting, or extending what seems now less relevant in GETTY’s 1940 commentary...” (p. VII). These aims have most certainly been achieved. In his introduction, GETTY discussed in turn Lucan’s life and work, problem of the hero of the poem, Lucan’s historical authorities, geographical knowledge, and rhetoric. R. omits three issues brought up by GETTY, namely biography, geography and the problem of the hero, but supplements and updates considerably the last two matters, and expands the introduction with issues overlooked by his predecessor. He therefore discusses the structure of book I, its significance for the whole poem and connections between the book and the other parts; moreover, he analyses not only the historical sources but also relationships between Lucan and Homer, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Manilius, and Seneca. R. examines Stoic elements as well, and brings up matters of narration – the problem of apostrophe in particular (he bases himself on CULLER’s statements⁵). One of more important issues discussed in the first part of the introduction is the change of the narrator’s attitude in the poem – his relation to the principate, pp. 5–10 (some scholars, recognizing this change, divide the poem into books I–III and following). R. opts for consistency⁶ and on pp. 7–10 discusses in more detail two crucial passages which are used as arguments for the narrator’s change (the invocation of Nero, ll. 33–66 – here, he emphasizes the conventional nature of the panegyric; the positive portrayal of Domitius, ll. 478–534). However, it is not only Lucan’s attitude towards Caesar and the principate that fits into discussion about the “unity” of the poem, but also the narrator’s relation to Pompey. We may, to put it simply,

¹ M. Annaei Lucani *De bello civili liber I*, ed. by R.J. GETTY, Cambridge 1940.

² M. Annaeus Lucanus, *Bellum Ciuile, Liber I*, édition, introduction et commentaire de P. WUILLEUMIER, H. Le BONNIEC, Paris 1962 (Erasmie. Collection de textes latins commentés 8).

³ M. Annaei Lucani *Belli civilis liber primus*, testo critico, introd. e comm. a cura di D. GAGLIARDI, Napoli 1989.

⁴ M. Annaeus Lucanus, *La Guerra civile (Farsaglia)*, 2 vols., testo critico, trad. e comm. a cura di G. VIANSINO, Milano 1995 (Classici greci e latini 89–90).

⁵ J. CULLER, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*, London 1981 (quoted by R. on p. 61).

⁶ Summing up the discussion, R. writes (p. 7): “Nothing in books one to three reaches the same fever pitch of the invective against empire in book seven, but it is in the nature of a climax, such as Pharsalus, that more emphatic statements of thematic preoccupations come to the fore”.

distinguish three standpoints (adopting BARTSCH's words, who analyses this problem): "...there is no change, there is change [...]. Others are more forthright in declaring the narrator's stance as simply ambivalent throughout the poem, with no detectable change in one direction or another"⁷. She herself writes about the narrator's increasing adoration towards Pompey⁸. I would like to know R.'s opinion on this matter. Moreover, the book introduces and characterizes main protagonists (when interpreting *synkrisis* R. stresses that it is equally unfavourable for both, p. 6). A few sentences devoted to the central characters of the poem would be valid. The issue of the consistency of the poem is also connected to the biographical aspect. R. rightly omitted Lucan's life – for it is difficult to say anything new here – but a short presentation of the problem of Lucan as a Neronian poet would be much welcome, all the more because we also know such extreme opinions as the one delivered by MASTERS, according to whom the poem should be treated as "propaganda *qua* propaganda"⁹. GETTY devotes a detailed chapter to Lucan's geographical sources, whereas R. skips this aspect altogether. Discussion regarding Lucan's knowledge of geography is indeed unnecessary, although touching up on another issue, namely the use of geographical imagery as a vehicle of constructing the meaning of the poem, would be worthwhile. I should, however, do the author justice, as he directs his attention to this topic in the commentary itself (ad 100–103, 392–465).

The text is based on HOUSMAN's edition (1926), from which R. departs in five places. The differences between the texts of R., HOUSMAN, GETTY and SHACKLETON BAILEY are listed in the table on pp. 62 f.

The book's most crucial part is obviously the commentary. It is difficult to reproach R. for any serious shortcomings here. He divided the text into smaller sections, and preceded each with an introduction, where he collectively discusses the most important interpretational problems of the passage, places it in a wider context of the first book as well as the whole poem, and usually analyses its structure. They are then followed by comments line by line, word by word. In every aspect, R. is more scrupulous, more meticulous than his predecessors. He makes comments about passages which GETTY, GAGLIARDI and WUILLEUMIER / LE BONNIC complete dismissed, and quotes more of comparative material. He also pays attention to intertextual, narrative, and structural matters of both longer and shorter passages. For example, apart from well-known and frequently discussed lines of intertextual character, he comments very well ll. 466–522 – Romans' escape from the city in the context of books II and III of the *Aeneid*; the remarks about the proleptic aspect of the vision of the matron (external prolepses) are accurate, too (ad 673–695); see also the detailed structural analysis of ll. 67–97 (the causes of war). R. splendidly used the literature, which has grown since the times of GETTY – some parts of the commentary, especially these which deal with debatable issues, can also serve as an introduction to the subject literature. The quality of R.'s commentary comes to the fore when we compare any of his notes with those of his predecessors – e.g. both GAGLIARDI and WUILLEUMIER / LE BONNIC omit the epithet *ferox* in their remarks ad 30. GETTY only notes how it should be understood ('proud', 'spirited' as Achilles, and quotes Ovid *Her.* 8, 1: *Pyrrhus Achillides*), while R. points out its inconsistency with our historical sources (it is a pity, however, that he did not list them), and widely discusses its origin in Lucan's poem in order to, finally, relate it to Caesar ("Pyrrhus' epithet, *ferox*, recalls the text presentation of Caesar").

Some comments ad locc.

35 f.: I would expect more on the relationship between these two lines. R. notes ad 35 that "the *princeps* is equated with Jupiter". In line 36, however, Caesar and Pompey are juxtaposed with giants. In the mythology the sons of Earth fought with Jupiter and the Olympian gods. Here the war

⁷ Sh. BARTSCH, *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*, Cambridge, Mass.–London 1997, p. 85.

⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 78 ff.

⁹ J. MASTERS, *Deceiving the Reader: The Political Mission of Lucan's Bellum Civile*, in: J. ELSNER, J. MASTERS (eds.), *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History, and Representation*, Chapel Hill 1994, p. 163.

seems to be fought only between the giants (to which group belong not only Caesar and Pompey, but also their “successors”: Antony and Octavian – the list of battles at 38–43 reaches as far as to the fight between Octavian with Sextus Pompey, and is summed up by the following statement: “multum Roma tamen debet ciuilibus armis/ quod tibi res acta est”, 44 f. Thus, a question emerges: who in fact is Neron, the heir of the giants, ascending to heaven and supposed to be the new lord of the world; perhaps another giant.

24–32, 33–66, 67–80: in these three passages, there are references to the Golden Age of Augustus. Lucan plays with this motif (see R.’s notes ad 28 *inarata*, 60–62 [~ *Aen.* I 291–296, VII 607–610, 620–623, the closing of the ‘gate of war’], 67: “Lucan’s inversion of the *Metamorphoses*’ epic trajectory”). The passages are divided into individual sections, although considering this specific reference to the Golden Age they can be tied more closely, and read together. The invocation to Nero itself does not indeed have to be ironic, but the direct context of lines 24 ff. and 67 ff. (not only the content of the whole poem) seems to be making it such.

115 f.: I would move here the note which appears ad 155 *furit* – that it is the last place where *furor/furere* refers directly to the both leaders, and after that only to Caesar.

111–120: Lucan will refer to this passage (the death of Julia) in book V (by verbal echoes: V 473 f. ~ I 111 f.), in a distinctive point of the poem where the camps of the commanders will be very close to one another for the first time during the war.

140: R. accentuates the proleptic nature of the noun *truncus* (the death of Pompey) but refers us to note ad 685 for details. Notwithstanding, it can be stressed here that it is one of the most significant words in book VIII (see 436, 674, 698, 722, 753, 774).

228–230: lines about Caesar’s speed are the typical beginning delimiter, when the narrator proceeds to describe the actions of the leader. It has to be stressed, however, that military comparisons are meaningful in such delimiter. In spite of their Augustan poetic tradition (R. ad 229 f.), they fit the context well – capturing Ariminum, Caesar is equated with alien and hostile nations with whom Rome was fighting (the Balearic slingers served in Hannibal’s army, see e.g. App. VIII 40, Liv. XXX 33; on Caesar as Hannibal see Lucan. I 31, 303–305 with R.’s commentary ad locc.).

392–465: commenting on the apostrophes in this passage, R. notes that they serve *variatio* (ad 447). This list of Caesar’s armies is at the end dominated by apostrophes (441 ff.). This concentration of apostrophes can be also interpreted as a narrative device directed at the audience of the poem – vast troops seem to be marching before the narrator’s (and thus the audience’s) eyes.

504–507: R. observes ad 508 f. that the crowd fleeing Rome acts completely different than Pompey himself (III 4–6). The same is also worth noting regarding lines 504 ff., especially because R. ends his comment by quoting a passage from *Aeneid* (III 11 f.) to which Lucan will refer in the ending of book II. The meaning of these lines is enhanced also by II. 353 ff. depicting the objections of soldiers going along with Caesar.

522–544: when discussing the meteorological omens we can also bring the Amyclas’s speech from book V (539–559), in which he reads weather signs predicting metaphorical storm. Lucan refers to Virgil’s *Georgics* (I 351–392, 424–464) there, again initiating an intertextual play with his predecessor (on Lucan’s polemic with Virgil *Georg.* I 464–488 and Ovid *Met.* XV 783–798, see R. ad 522–583). These passages are closely connected.

In sum, this is an impressive commentary which makes a great contribution to Lucan scholarship. It is valuable to students and scholars at all levels and it will be an excellent assistance on this book for decades.

Mariusz Plago
University of Wrocław

Patrizia TAORMINA, Rosa Maria PICCIONE (a cura di), Giamblico: *I frammenti dalle epistole. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*, Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2010 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico 56), 680 pp., ISBN 978-88-7088-600-9, € 60.00.

This review has been long in coming. But then, the work is somewhat demanding, the volume constituting much more than a straightforward edition of the fragments of Jamblichean letters surviving in the Stobaeian anthology. It is an exhaustive study into the surviving fragments of the epistles and the relevant philosophical issues, supplemented with textual comments, a study distinguished by immense attention to detail and impressive sensitivity to the intricacies of Neoplatonic thought.

The introductory part of the volume, extending for 273 pages, comprises two monographic studies of considerable scholarly value – one devoted to the Jamblichus in Stobaeus issue, the other dedicated to the study of Jamblichus' philosophy as it appears in his letters. The first, by PICCIONE (= P.), presents the problems related to the way of transmission: after all, the passages, extrapolated from original writings, come to us in a form of *doxai*, dispersed in the anthological opus of Johannes of Stobi. This complicates matters: though some passages are introduced by a heading attesting to the (more or less) precise origin, others are introduced in a more general manner, sometimes leading the reader to wonder what was the actual context of a given fragment, while at other times, even knowing the point of origin leaves us at loss: what was the original content of a letter in question, was it devoted to the problem of fatality alone or is the excerpt on fate taken from a treatise of far more general scope? P.'s work exemplifies possible complications providing the reader not only with a multifaceted and fascinating investigation of the Jamblichean presence in Stobaeus' work, but also, with a valuable lesson in reading the latter.

The second part of the introduction, authored by TAORMINA (= T.), considers the place of the material contained in the letters in Jamblichus' philosophy. Notably longer than the first, it is divided into four sections, dealing with the general character of philosophy in the letters (pp. 89–134), and then, with the more specific questions of individual soul (pp. 134–180), fate/providence (pp. 181–226) and the classification of virtues (pp. 227–271). The task faced by the author was hardly a simple one: to consider the letters of Jamblichus against the background of his surviving works, detect the possible divergences and then to reconcile the respective teachings, hence furnishing the reader with a coherent account of Jamblichus the philosophic epistolographer. Of the four, the last is possibly the easiest read – dealing with the well known sequencing of virtues (which led to very detailed rules concerning the philosophical curriculum), it stays notably free from more intricate metaphysical or logical considerations which may prove daunting to less experienced readers in the previous sections. By contrast, the section devoted to the individual soul, dealing with the important issue of Jamblichus' rejection of the Plotinian notion according to which a part of our soul remains undescended into generation, puts considerable demands on the reader: nevertheless, it remains particularly clear and convincing in its presentation of Jamblichean (but also Porphyrean) *ousia homoiomeres*, the unified entity, cognizing as a unified whole. The section of fate, finally, presents a plausible reconstruction of Jamblichus' opinion of the providence vs. fate problem as once discussed in the (now lost) *De providentia et fato*. I confess, this is the only part where I felt some dissatisfaction: I wonder whether a reference to the hierarchical arrangement of providences/fates in certain Middle Platonic writers would not be of use in the exposition¹. Yet, the

¹ On the issue compare R.W. SHARPLES, *Threefold Providence: History and Background of the Doctrine*, in: R.W. SHARPLES, A. SHEPPARD (eds.), *Ancient Approaches to Plato's "Timaeus"*, London 2003 (BICS Suppl. 78), pp. 107–128.

omission (if we could call it thus) is only too understandable – T. focuses on reconstruction from vastly fragmentary testimonies, not on detailed discussion of a complete and surviving doctrine.

The actual edition, accompanied by translation and basic apparatus, comprises pp. 282–331 (less than 8% of the volume), all textual discussions having been relegated to the commentary. It is not the most practical of solutions given the bulk of the volume: having to track the commentary (and it is certainly worth tracking) while at the same time controlling the often complex text may well prove unnerving. Certainly, the editorial choice has a merit of presenting a clear vision of Jamblichean text in its relative scarcity: nevertheless, I would have preferred the solution taken in MANSFELD'S and RUNIA'S edition of *Placita* or in BRISSON'S edition of *Sententiae* – it is far easier on the reader.

Comprising nearly two hundred pages (333–517), the commentary deserves the reader's particular attention: far more than providing a list of *loci paralleli* or bibliographic references, it discusses the structure of respective fragments, the meaning of actual choice of arguments and their arrangement, the status of related discussion in the philosophical debates of late antiquity, and even more importantly, its place in the Platonic tradition. It is an erudite and impressive work bearing comparison to that produced by Luc BRISSON'S team when preparing the Paris edition of Porphyry's *Sententiae*. It seems a pity that smaller font makes the pages so hard to read – the commentary abounds in insightful critical remarks and explanations of textual emendations and editorial decisions of considerable philosophical importance: in his own review², Peter LAUTNER has stressed the importance of the choice of *to prōtōs on* over *to prōton on* in I 5, 17; 80, 13 W. – the emendation is carefully justified on pp. 338–341 and one nearly deplores the fact that it was relegated to the endnotes. It is, however, only one of the many examples of T.'s and P.'s careful revisions of the text, each editorial choice and its philosophical implications being meticulously discussed in the endnotes. To provide an illustrative example of the authors' critical method one may invoke note 256, where the choice between the manuscripts' *en eisi* and the more likely *eneisi* in III 9, 35 (358, 6 H.) is discussed – though the mechanical error is given as the most likely reason of the assumed corruption, P. nevertheless describes the more remote possibility of the transmitted *en eisi* being an intentional allusion to *Prot.* 329c2–d1. Just to provide the glimpse of this commentary's character: the two excerpts from the letter to Anatolius (III 9, 35 f.), devoted as this latter is to the issue of justice, are equipped with a sort of introduction (it is hard to dismiss the text as a simple endnote given that it extends over seven pages, pp. 468–475) covering their textual tradition, actual Stobaeian context, possible *loci paralleli*; the ideas contained therewith being carefully traced back to their possible origin, the possible philosophical implications intimated.

The work is supplemented by two short appendices, indexes (*verborum Graecorum* and *locorum*) and extensive bibliography. Of the appendices, one, by P., deals with the problem posed by the presence of distinctly un-Jamblichean gnome in IV 5, 71, while the other, by T., comprises the text (*cum interpretatione Italica*) of two testimonies concerning the existence of Jamblichus' letters, coming respectively from Olympiodorus (*in Gorg.* 46, 9) and Damascius (*in Phd.* I 549 W).

On the whole, this is a praiseworthy effort. The volume manages to convey to the reader the magnificence and pull of Jamblichean philosophy, while at the same time displaying laudable lucidity and overall methodological cohesiveness. Admittedly, an inexperienced reader may occasionally be baffled – but this is mostly due to the intricacies of Neoplatonic/Neopythagorean lore. This work is not for a beginner – occasionally taxing, it demands more than casual or passing acquaintance with the Neoplatonic thought.

Joanna Komorowska
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, Warszawa

² BMCR 2012.08.56 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2012/2012-08-56.html>).

Anna Maria LASEK, *Nonnos' Spiel mit den Gattungen in den "Dionysiaka"*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 2009, 163 pp., ISBN 978-83-7654-025-2.

Steadily gaining momentum in the twentieth century, Nonnian studies seem to have blossomed with the beginning of twenty-first: serial conferences, volumes of commentaries and studies – it seems that never before has the academic world had so much appreciation and interest in the late imperial poet. Polish works on his *Dionysiaka*, despite the contribution of Henryk Wójtowicz, remain rare, which adds to the importance of the present volume (additionally, it was published in German, thus rendering it potentially influential beyond the Polish-speaking milieu). The study, based on carefully selected passages of the poem, falls into three sections, devoted respectively to hymnic, epigrammatic and bucolic passages. The author pays detailed attention to the verses in question, considering their ‘generic purity’ (i.e. the conformity to the convention), immanent poetics, language, style, and discussing their context (this is particularly important when considering passages which are not what they might seem to be). The longest section is devoted to ‘hymnic’ passages, from prayer-hymns (Athene, Herakles Astrochiton, Selene), through imprecations (Zeus to Cadmus, imprecation to Eros), and concluding with *Lobgesänge* directed at Tyros and Beroe. All these are considered in light of their autonomy, language and presence of generic constants, and then classified as either ‘hymns’, or ‘hymnic passages’, the categorization ultimately dependent on the context. With the epigrams, there is a further complication: after all, these have to be categorized in accordance with the widely known generic divisions into the *epitymbia*, *erotika*, *epideiktika* and then, hardly surprisingly, we are left with the *incerta*, the epigrams that do not fall into any of the known subcategory. The third genre to be considered is the bucolic – in Book I, aiming to deceive Typho, Cadmus creates a false pastoral scene the description of which discernibly relies on the earlier literary tradition, while Book XV includes the story of Hymnos’ love for the huntress Nikaia (discussed on pp. 118–130), with the haunting image of the impotence of the bucolic song and the laments over the death of the young shepherd (it seems however striking that the analysis of the relevant passage makes almost no reference to the well-established tradition of bucolic lament), the story offering particularly interesting interpretation possibilities, duly sketched by the scholar: her argument for the intended literary polemic, built upon the respective theses of GONELLI and HARRIES, is interesting and deserves closer attention (it would, however, benefit from certain elaboration). This having been said, it must be noted that the analyses have somewhat chaotic appearance, and sometimes the reader is left to wonder what exactly forms the subject of inquiry in a given chapter: for example, the discussion of the actual meaning of the adjective *nekyssoos* (p. 41) seems better suited to appear in the footnotes than in the main text of the study, devoted as this latter is to the generic or compositional issues.

Yet, the book disappoints. Most of this disappointment is due to methodological mistakes made right at the beginning, when the principles of research are defined. This makes it a reviewer’s nightmare: regardless of possible appreciation of care and diligence employed, of the understanding of the ambitions of the project, regardless of the possible detailedness and sensitivity of analyses, one is left with a sad duty of saying: this is not right. Once the wrong choice of crucial premises has been made, it compromises the work. Nothing can save it. Some pages, some observations may be treasured and praised, subchapters may be rescued, but not the whole. It simply falls apart.

Should we consider its title, the monograph, developed from A.M. LASEK’s (hereafter L.) doctoral dissertation, purports to analyze the play of literary genres in Nonnos’ immense poem: expectation not unreasonable in the light of the fact that the *Spiel mit den Gattungen* is a phrase well known to the students of *Literaturwissenschaften* (it is hard not to think of it other than within the framework of literary theory). Now, such a project would be ambitious, even if unrealistic (from the genealogical point of view, the *Dionysiaka* are and remain an epic, the genre being notorious

for its noncompetitiveness¹), demanding expertise in at least two areas of study: that of ancient literature and that of modern theory of literature. Yet, the introductory chapter serves to steer one right: the work is an inquiry into composition, the *Spiel mit den Gattungen* phrase being thus used *kata metaphoran* (which, as a matter of fact, remains a predominant tendency in the Classical scholarship²): it aims at studying (elements of) other genres as they appear in the poem (this does not prevent occasional forays into the area of genology pure and simple, witness discussion of genres' elasticity, p. 10). It is at this point that the reader realizes that the difference between change of genre and widely understood intertextuality has escaped the author. This is not a minor detail: this is a difference between saying that genre of the work is affected if within an epic poem a character addresses formal prayer/formal hymn to the gods and saying that pattern of prayer in the epic poem conforms to the traditional and looks back to that attested e.g. in Homer. To complicate matters even further, L. seems unable to differentiate between the various phases (and levels) of literary composition: it is not invocation (compositional element working at the stylistic level) that displays affinity with hymnic genre, but hymnic genre that makes a prominent use of invocations (to confuse the two is paramount to confusing – in terms of rhetorical theory – the *inventio* and the *elocutio*, i.e. to confuse the use of *locus* with particular instance of its actualization)³. Hence, what L. classifies as 'hymnenartige Götteranrufung' is in fact an invocation to Athene; and yes, it displays very distinct stylistic and linguistic similarities to the surviving hymns to Athene – still, these similarities are simple result of hymns' tendency to employ the device known as *invocatio*, a direct, often kletic, address to the god. This, in fact, is why SIMON employs quotation marks when describing the 'hymnic' character of the address to Selene, a circumstance noted but never appreciated in the present work⁴: though frequently described as a hymn on basis of its dimensions and similarity to later Homeric and Orphic hymns, this long passage remains – from the formal point of view – an invocation.

Finally, there remains the issue of definition. Namely, the definition of *Spiel* which L. imports from HUIZINGA's masterwork. Let me be clear: I venerate HUIZINGA. But he was not writing of composition of actual, existing literary work. He was writing of an act of composition and (re) creation, of the exploration of possible, yet different, sets of (game-) rules. He was not thinking of learned poetry, of the enjoyment derived from an ability to recognize crypto-quotations, uncovering falsified or misused generic characteristics etc. He was operating on the far more subtle and general level⁵. Invoking a strongly philosophical definition when discussing technicalities necessarily results in confusion: hardly surprisingly, the reader never gets to know how this Huizingan

¹ This characteristic falsifies L.'s observation that the tag *epos* is insufficient in the case of *Dionysiaka*, as they contain elements of other genres (pp. 10 f.).

² It seems however significant that M.A. HARDER chooses to put the term in quotation marks in the title of her influential article '*Generic Games*' in *Callimachus Aetia* (in: M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER (eds.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, Groningen 1998, pp. 95–113; hence: HARDER 1998). Additionally, her article demonstrates particular sensitivity to narrative patterns in the analyzed poem, a feature sadly missing from L.'s work.

³ The misunderstanding affects major part of the book, though I employed the example of 'hymn to Athene' for which see pp. 19–23.

⁴ See p. 43. Additionally, one may note that the discussion of this particular address would have benefited from consulting Prudence JONES' article '*Aspects*' of *Deity*, in: N. CAMPION, M. YORK (eds.), *Astrology and Academy*, Bristol 2004, pp. 25–48, while any discussion of Hekate's persona seems incomplete without a reference to S.I. JOHNSTON masterly work (*Hekate Soteira: A Study of Hekate's Roles in the Chaldaean Oracles and Related Literature*, Atlanta 1990).

⁵ The basis invoked is HUIZINGA's classification of *Poesis* as *Spielfunktion* – one however wonders whether L. appreciates the difference of functional levels existing between Huizingan definition and the level of her own inquiries. One suspects definitions in terms of HAMBURGER, HIRSCH JR., not

definition of play translates onto the phrase play of generic conventions. Even more surprisingly, the focus on the enjoyment derived by the reader seems forgotten by the first chapter of the work.

Once one accepted the metaphoric use of *Spiel mit den Gattungen* and disregarded the Huizingan problem, another one appears: what precisely is the ‘play of genres’ in this particular study? The classification formulated in the concluding part of the work (in itself taken from HARDER and transplanted onto the Nonnian poem⁶) draws a division between passages that may be defined as examples of one genre appearing within the context of another genre pure and simple, the passages displaying formal characteristics of some genre appearing within different generic context and having their content affected by this ‘external’ conditions, and, finally, passages displaying some affinity with genres other than epic (these are not discussed in the work, and hence are summarily dismissed in the closing discussion). Now, my problem, as matter of fact, is that in the *Dionysiaka* only the two latter qualify as a (*sensu lato*) ‘play of genres’ (or, rather, ‘play of conventions’) under the terms of modern literary theory – and one is absent from the study. As for the first group, the notion of *Spiel* is complicated by the peculiarities of epic genre itself – as I have already mentioned, we expect elements of prayer, hymnic composition or, for that matter, rhetorical structures in an epic poem. In a way, these are indispensable in its composition and have immediate relationship to the actual development of the plot – thus, we may easily regard them as woven into the very nature of epic poem as such. Certainly, they attest to the poet’s way of thinking, or to his intellectual formation (witness the prominence of rhetorical elements in Statius’ *Thebaid*) but they do not classify as *sensu lato* ‘play of genres’ unless it can be proven that they were intended to (this can be achieved through self-referential remarks, authorial/narrator’s comments etc.): this is why the category of ‘play’ figures so prominently in HARDER’s analysis of Callimachean *Aetia* (additionally, it may be mentioned that HARDER’s examples strain against the generic boundaries, which is hardly the case with L.’s first group). Yet, the hymn to Astrochiton, separated from the narrative by introductory formula and displaying in-depth knowledge of the hymnic literature, constitutes a hymnic element within epic context, but one wonders whether it qualifies as *Spiel* – after all, it fulfills the role associated with a hymnic prayer in a manner befitting a hymn, and being endowed with a structure typical of a hymn – and it fulfills this expectations without affecting overall epic character of the work.

At the other end of the story, there is the issue of generic classification of the *Dionysiaka* themselves: and again, from the point of view of modern genology, the nominal classification of the *Dionysiaka* as an epic poem describing deeds of Dionysus or as a hymnic poem to Dionysus’ glory (in the tradition of Homeric hymns) is of no real importance, given that the two share generic constants (the only possible difference being dimension). It is symptomatic that *Gerusalemme liberata* would also be known (at least in Polish history of literature) as *Gofred*, or that we have a very epic genre named *chanson de geste*. What is, however, of possible importance is the ideological dimension: if Nonnus chooses to portray his work as a *hymnos*, this choice is of paramount importance in the hermeneutic and exegetical work (particularly if we consider the Hymnos-story of book XV). In this context, it seems somewhat disappointing to find the question discussed only briefly, with major part of the debate concentrated in the closing remarks (pp. 135–143).

To summarize: the work may have been worth reading due to its careful and occasionally sensitive analyses of the relevant passages, to its detailedness and the insight into Nonnus’ compositional technique that it provides. As it stands, it may be of some use to those studying Nonnian poetics, epic composition, or endeavouring an inquiry into the poet’s intellectual formation. Sadly,

to mention GUILLÉN would be of considerably more use in the present context – at least from the methodological point of view.

⁶ HARDER, *o.c.* (n. 2). The transplantation itself is a dangerous move: endowed with no fabular continuity, the *Aetia* are a poem unique in its characteristics and the narrative devices employed: Nonnus’ poem, by contrast, has an underlying plot and comparatively simplified narrative pattern.

and it brings me no pleasure to write this, it is weighted down by terminological indifference, insensitivity to the levels of critical discourse, and – as mentioned above – by methodological mistakes committed right in the opening phase of research.

Joanna Komorowska

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, Warszawa

(with collaboration of Aneta Kliszczyk, Jesuit University Ignatianum, Kraków)

LIBRI ANNO MMXII RECEPTI

- ALEXANDRE JÚNIOR, Manuel (coordenação), *Filon de Alexandria nas Origens da Cultura Ocidental*, Lisboa: Centro de Estudos Clássicos, 2011.
- ALEXANDRE JÚNIOR, Manuel (coordenação), *O Grego, Língua Universal de Cultura: Semântica e Léxico*, Lisboa: Centro de Estudos Clássicos, 2011.
- ASH, Rhiannon (ed.), *Tacitus*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012 (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies).
- Autor desconocido, *Retórica a Herenio*. Introducción, traducción y notas de Bulmaro REYES CORIA, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2010 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Mexicana).
- CARRIÈRE, Jean, *Estilística griega*. Adaptación y traducciones Paola VIANELLO DE CÓRDOVA (coord.), Silvia AQUINO LÓPEZ, Mariateresa GALAZ, Gerardo RAMÍREZ VIDAL, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2009.
- GALLIA, Andrew B., *Remembering the Roman Republic. Culture, Politics, and History under the Principate*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- GARNER, R. Scott, *Traditional Elegy: The Interplay of Meter, Tradition, and Context in Early Greek Poetry*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011 (American Philological Association. American Classical Studies 56).
- KARDOS, Marie-José (éd.), *Habiter en ville au temps de Vespasien. Actes de la table ronde de Nancy, 17 octobre 2008*, Nancy: Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche sur l'Antiquité, 2011 (Études d'archéologie classique XIV).
- KLOTZ, Frieda, OIKONOMOPOULOU, Katerina (eds.), *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- KRYJITSKI, Sergueï D., LEIPOUNSKAIA, Nina A., *Olbia. Fouilles, histoire, culture. Un État antique sur le littoral septentrional de la Mer Noire (second quart du VI^e siècle avant notre ère – troisième quart du IV^e siècle de notre ère)*. Traduit du russe par Arlette FRAYSSE sous le direction de Jean-Paul MOREL, Nancy: Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche sur l'Antiquité, 2011 (Études d'archéologie classique XV).
- KORPISAARI, Antti, PARSSINEN, Martti, *Pariti. The Ceremonial Tiwanaku Pottery of an Island in Lake Titicaca*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 2011 (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Humaniora 364).
- LIEBESCHUETZ, J.H.W.G., *Ambrose and John Chrysostom. Clerics between Desert and Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- LONGO, Angela (ed.), *Argument from Hypothesis in Ancient Philosophy*. With the collaboration of Davide DEL FORNO, Roma: Bibliopolis, 2011 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico LIX).
- MADANI, Tariq, *L'hydraulique dans le monde musulman médiéval*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 2012 (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Humaniora 363).
- MORELLI, Alfredo Mario (a cura di), *Lepos e mores. Una giornata su Catullo. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Cassino, 27 maggio 2010*, Cassino: Edizioni Università di Cassino, 2012 (Collana di studi umanistici 2).
- MOSCOSO GARCÍA, Francisco, *Aproximación al cuento narrado en árabe marroquí*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 2012 (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Humaniora 362).
- NERRI, Camillo, *Lirici greci. Età arcaica e classica*. Introduzione, edizione, traduzione, e commento, Roma: Carocci editore, 2011 (Classici 9).
- OVIDIO NASÓN, Publio, *Epístolas desde el Ponto. Cuatro libros*. Introducción, versión rítmica y notas de José QUINONES MELGOZA, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2009 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Mexicana).
- PAPAZARKADAS, Nikolaos, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011 (Oxford Classical Monographs).

- STEINMANN, Marc, *Alexander der Große und die "nackten Weisen" Indiens. Der fiktive Briefwechsel zwischen Alexander und dem Brahmanenkönig Dindimus*, Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2012 (Klassische Philologie 4).
- TUNBERG, Terentius, *De rationibus quibus homines docti artem Latine colloquendi et ex tempore dicendi saeculis XVI et XVII coluerunt*, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2012 (Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia XXXI).
- VARVARO, Mario, *Le Istituzioni di Gaio e il Glücksstern die Niebuhr*, Torino: G. Giappichelli Editore, 2012 (Dipartimento Iura, Sezione di Storia del Diritto, Università degli Studi di Palermo, Monografie 11).
- Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debrecensis XLVII 2011; XLVIII 2012.
- Ágora. Estudos Clássicos em Debate XIV 2012.
- Archaeological Reports LVIII 2011–2012.
- Athenaeum. Studi di Letteratura e Storia dell'Antichità pubblicati sotto gli auspici dell'Università di Pavia C 2012.
- Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission XCI 2010.
- Chiron. Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts XLII 2012.
- Classical Review. New Series LXII 2012, fasc. 1 et 2.
- Elenchos. Rivista di studi sul pensiero antico XXXII 2011, fasc. 1 et 2.
- Euphrosyne. Revista de Filologia Clássica. Nova série XL 2012.
- Exemplaria Classica. Journal of Classical Philology XV 2011.
- The Journal of Hellenic Studies CXXXII 2012.
- Journal of Roman Archaeology XXV 2012, fasc. * et **.
- Listy Filologické – Folia Philologica CXXXIV 2011, fasc. 3–4; CXXXV 2012, fasc. 1–2.
- Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité CXXII 2010, fasc. 2.
- Nova Tellus. Anuario del Centro de Estudios Clásicos XXVIII 2010, fasc. 2; XXIX 2011, fasc. 1.
- Novensia XXII 2011.
- Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica. Nuova serie XCVIII 2/2011; XCIX 3/2011.
- Scholia. Studies in Classical Antiquity XIX 2010.
- Symbolae Osloenses. Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies LXXXVI 2012.
- Vetera Christianorum XLVIII 2011, fasc. 1.
- Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie, Patristik und lateinische Tradition CXXIV 2011; CXXV 2012.
- Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Folge XXXV 2011.

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE EUS XCIX 2012
UTRIUSQUE FASCICULI

COMMENTATIONES

| | |
|--|---------|
| BENEDETTO BRAVO, Per la storia del testo di Erodoto e di quello di Tuciddide nell'antichità. Parte prima: le testimonianze dei papiri | 23–65 |
| BENEDETTO BRAVO, Per la storia del testo di Erodoto e di quello di Tuciddide nell'antichità. Parte seconda: Le testimonianze di Dionigi di Alicarnasso e di altri autori antichi... | 201–241 |
| MICHAŁ BZINKOWSKI, Bird Imagery in Eschatological Landscape of Modern Greek Funeral Laments | 337–358 |
| MALGORZATA CIEŚLUK, The Reader in the “Comedy of Errors” of the Ancient Greek Novel | 309–335 |
| AGNIESZKA FULIŃSKA, <i>Divae Potentes Cypri?</i> Remarks on the Cult of the Ptolemaic Queens as Aphrodite | 243–269 |
| HANNA GOŁĄB, Bacchylides' Spartan Dithyramb in the Light of Choral Projection | 15–22 |
| JERZY KOLEŃDO, Der Stamm der Harier in der <i>Germania</i> des Tacitus als Gefolgschaft..... | 153–163 |
| ANDRZEJ ŁOŚ, Remarques sur l'origine géographique et statut socio-juridique des négociants d'huile et de saumure hispaniques..... | 293–308 |
| MARIA MARCINKOWSKA-ROSÓŁ, Zu Aristoteles' Rezeption der vorsokratischen Prinzipien- lehren (<i>Ph.</i> I 4, 187 a 12–26). Teil 2 (Themistios, Philoponos, Simplikios) | 67–89 |
| ADAM PAŁUCHOWSKI, La progression de la citoyenneté romaine parmi les notables crétois..... | 91–151 |
| GEORGE C. PARASKEVIOTIS, Vergil's <i>Eclogue</i> 9: <i>Idyll</i> 7 and <i>Eclogue</i> 1 in Reverse..... | 271–278 |
| SEBASTIAN RUCIŃSKI, Arruntius Stella, l'organisateur des jeux de Néron..... | 279–292 |

MISCELLANEA

| | |
|---|---------|
| WŁODZIMIERZ OLSZANIEC, <i>Platonis Gorgias Leonardo Aretino interprete: osservazioni critiche</i> | 365–367 |
| ROBERT SUSKI, Emperor Aurelian and the Solar Eclipse of 272..... | 359–363 |
| ANNA SZCZEPANIAK, Corrections to the Latest Maehler's Editions of Bacchylides..... | 165–170 |
| CAROLUS MARTINUS LUCARINI, Correctio | 369 |

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

| | |
|--|---------|
| KRYSZYNA BARTOL, R. Scott Garner, <i>Traditional Elegy: The Interplay of Meter, Tradition, and Context in Early Greek Poetry</i> , New York–Oxford 2011 | 371–374 |
| DARIUSZ BRODKA, P. Riedlberger, <i>Philologischer, historischer und liturgischer Kommentar zum 8. Buch der „Johannis“ des Goripp: nebst kritischer Edition und Übersetzung, Groningen 2010</i> | 190–192 |
| JOANNA KOMOROWSKA, P. Kyriakou, <i>The Past in Aeschylus and Sophocles</i> , Berlin–New York 2011 | 171–175 |

| | |
|---|---------|
| JOANNA KOMOROWSKA, A.M. Lasek, <i>Nonnos' Spiel mit den Gattungen in den "Dionysiaka"</i> , Poznań 2009 | 384–387 |
| JOANNA KOMOROWSKA, D.J. Mastronarde, <i>The Art of Euripides: Dramatic Technique and Social Context</i> , Cambridge 2010 | 176–178 |
| JOANNA KOMOROWSKA, P. Taormina, R.M. Piccione (a cura di), <i>Giamblico: I frammenti dalle epistole</i> . Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento, Napoli 2010 | 382–383 |
| LECHOSŁAW OLSZEWSKI, Z. Várhelyi, <i>The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire. Power and the Beyond</i> , Cambridge 2010 | 186–189 |
| MARIUSZ PLAGO, M. Matthews (ed.), <i>Caesar and the Storm: A Commentary on Lucan, De Bello Civili, Book 5 lines 476–721</i> , Frankfurt/M. 2008 | 179–185 |
| MARIUSZ PLAGO, P. Roche, <i>Lucan: De Bello Civili, Book 1</i> . Edited with Introduction, Text, and Commentary, Oxford 2009 | 379–381 |
| PIOTR STĘPIEŃ, J. Silva Barris, <i>Metre and Rhythm in Greek Verse</i> , Wien 2011 | 375–378 |
| | |
| Libri anno MMXII recepti | 389–390 |