

EOS CIII fasc. 2
2016

E O S

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTOR NACZELNY

JAKUB PIGOŃ

REDAKTORZY

KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA
JERZY AXER
MAŁGORZATA BOROWSKA

Rocznik CIII 2016

Zeszyt 2

WROCŁAW–WARSZAWA
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE
WYDZIAŁ „ARTES LIBERALES” UNIwersYTETU WARSZAWSKIEGO
2016

E O S

COMMENTARII
SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE
POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

EDITOR PRIMARIUS
IACOBUS PIGOŃ

EDITORES
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA
GEORGIUS AXER
MARGARITA BOROWSKA

Volumen CIII 2016
Fasciculus 2

WRATISLAVIAE–VARSOVIAE
SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM
FACULTATE ARTIUM LIBERALIUM IN UNIVERSITATE VARSOVIENSI CONDITA
ADIUVANTE
2016

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

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

COMMENTARII EDUNTUR ADMINISTRANTUR

PL-50-451 WROCŁAW, UL. KOMUNY PARYSKIEJ 21
INSTYTUT STUDIÓW KLASYCZNYCH, ŚRÓDZIEMNOMORSKICH I ORIENTALNYCH
UNIwersytetu WROCŁAWSKIEGO
INSCRIPTIO ELECTRONICA: eos@uni.wroc.pl

COMMENTARIORUM PAGINA DOMESTICA
www.eos.uni.wroc.pl

HUIUS FASCICULI LIBELLOS IN REBUS,
QUAE AD RECTUM LINGUARUM USUM PERTINENT, EDENDOS CURAVERUNT

ITA HILTON ANGLA
HELENA HORYZA ANGLA

EDITORUM ADIUTRIX
CATHARINA OCHMAN

Wersją pierwotną (referencyjną) czasopisma jest wersja drukowana

Wydano ze środków Ministerstwa Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego
przeznaczonych na działalność upowszechniającą naukę
w ramach umowy nr 699/P-DUN/2016



przy wsparciu finansowym Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego
we współpracy wydawniczej z Wydziałem „Artes Liberales” Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego

© Copyright by Polskie Towarzystwo Filologiczne, Wrocław–Warszawa 2016

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE

COMMENTATIONES

Marcin KURPIOS, Theophrastus' Appraisal of Thucydides and Herodotus (Cicero, <i>Orator</i> 39 = Fr. 697 FHS&G): The Character of Cicero's Testimony	207–228
Gjert VESTRHEIM, The Destruction of the Alexandrian Library	229–244
Damian PIERZAK, The Mythological <i>Exemplum</i> in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and in the Practice of Cicero	245–270
Paola GAGLIARDI, Cornelio Gallo e l'apposizione parentetica	271–285
Wojciech PIETRUSZKA, Igor WYPIJEWSKI, <i>Gens Herennuleia</i>	287–330
Przemysław WOJCIECHOWSKI, The <i>Honestiores</i> as Founders of Inscriptions Dedicated to Hercules	331–347
Przemysław MARCINIAK, The Art of Abuse: Satire and Invective in Byzantine Literature. A Preliminary Survey	349–362
Barbara BIBIK, Zygmunt Węclewski under the Influence of Nineteenth-Century Theatre and Literature	363–376

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

Luca Asmonti, <i>Athenian Democracy: A Sourcebook</i> , London 2014 (Dominika GRZESIK)....	377–378
P.J. Rhodes, <i>Thucydides</i> , London 2015 (Rafał MATUSZEWSKI)	379–380
Simon Hornblower, <i>Lycophron: Alexandra. Greek Text, Translation, Commentary, and Introduction</i> , Oxford 2015 (Emilia ŻYBERT)	381–384
Damian Caluori, <i>Plotinus on the Soul</i> , Cambridge 2015 (Mateusz STRÓŻYŃSKI)	385–386
Paul Rigby, <i>The Theology of Augustine's Confessions</i> , Cambridge 2015 (Mateusz STRÓŻYŃSKI).....	387–389
Paige E. Hochschild, <i>Memory in Augustine's Theological Anthropology</i> , Oxford 2012 (Mateusz STRÓŻYŃSKI).....	390–392
Libri anno MMXVI recepti	393–394
Conspectus materiae Eus CIII 2016 utriusque fasciculi	395–396

THEOPHRASTUS' APPRAISAL OF THUCYDIDES
AND HERODOTUS (CICERO, *ORATOR* 39 = FR. 697 FHS&G):
THE CHARACTER OF CICERO'S TESTIMONY*

by

MARCIN KURPIOS

ABSTRACT: This paper concerns a short reference to Theophrastus in Cicero's *Orator*, in which Herodotus' and Thucydides' contribution to historiography is evaluated. The focus is on the character and accuracy of the testimony, which until now have not been examined in detail. Arguments are put forward for the thesis that the sentence in question is Cicero's attempt at a translation of Theophrastus' words. Overall, the paper is a step forward in our knowledge about this fragment in particular, but also in terms of methods that can be applied to the study of historical and philosophical fragments in general.

In the *Orator* Cicero adduces Theophrastus in the context of a brief "history" of artful prose¹. It is a short account, beginning with Thrasymachus and Gorgias, going through Theodorus of Byzantium, and ending up with Isocrates (*Or.* 37–42). Cicero praises Herodotus and Thucydides for their restraint in employing excessive rhetorical devices. Then comes our reference to Theophrastus (*Or.* 39 = fr. 697 FHS&G):

* This paper is a result of my research stay at the Institute of Classical Studies in London, funded by the Polish National Science Centre (Preludium 6 Grant, no. 2013/11/N/HS3/04886). A large part of the study was also carried out during the doctoral scholarship held at the University of Vienna in 2015 and awarded by the Scholarship Foundation of the Republic of Austria. Here I wish to thank Professor Hans TAEUBER from the Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik for supporting my application, and for providing me with excellent working conditions. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to this journal's anonymous referee for his or her critical remarks on the article, which have alerted me to many mistakes. Last but not least, I am deeply indebted to Professor Han BALTUSSEN, who read the initial draft of this paper and made a lot of valuable comments on its structure and argumentation.

¹ On the *Orator* in general see: SANDYS 1885: LI–LXXVI; SCHLITTENBAUER 1903; SABBADINI 1916; YON 1958; HUBBELL 1962: 297–302; NARDUCCI 2002. The standard text of the *Orator* is WESTMAN 1980.

primisque ab his, ut ait Theophrastus, historia commota est ut auderet uberius quam superiores et ornatus dicere.

By these two forerunners, as Theophrastus put it, history was stimulated, so that it dared to speak more sumptuously and elaborately than in the case of their predecessors².

Our knowledge about the fragment remains unsatisfying in several respects³. The primary question is the accuracy of this reference: is this an exact quotation, a paraphrase, an allusion, or a summary? Over a hundred years ago, John SANDYS speculated that part of the fragment may be a direct translation of Theophrastus' words. But his suggestion, as it stands, is unfounded⁴. In the most recent examination of the passage, William FORTENBAUGH reported what SANDYS had suggested, but did not try to find any new evidence to support this hypothesis⁵. Hitherto, no conclusive study of the entire fragment has been attempted.

In this paper I argue that the fragment in question is Cicero's translation of the underlying text. I hope to make a strong case for this thesis, by adducing three types of argument: (i) a pattern in Cicero's quotations where the introductory formula "*ut ait*" occurs, (ii) Cicero's methodology in translations from the Greek, combined with modern theory of semantic calque, (iii) Cicero's and other ancient authors' use of the words that appear in the fragment.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE INTRODUCTORY WORDS *UT AIT*

In order to get a general idea of the character of the reference, I will first take a closer look at similar references in Cicero. By "similar" I understand these that are introduced by the "*ut ait* formula" (further = UAF). This is the way Cicero

² Translations, if not indicated otherwise, are my own. On the rendering of *ut ait* as "as he put it", see below, p. 212.

³ The most complete analysis of the testimony up till now has been provided in a commentary in the corpus of fragments edited within the Theophrastus Project: FORTENBAUGH 2005a: 316–320. Other contributions have not enquired into the character of this reference, and are only unsystematic remarks or comments: SANDYS 1885: 48; MAYER 1910: 29 f.; KROLL 1913: 47 f.; GRUBE 1952: 175; INNES 1985: 267.

⁴ SANDYS (1885: 48) supposed that *commota est* can be Cicero's rendering of some form of the Greek verb κινεῖν, used by Theophrastus. But his only evidence was a cluster of passages where the Greek verb "to move" is used in the sense that would fit the context of *Or.* 39. In the assessment of the adequacy of the reference, parallels by themselves are of little help. Moreover, neither SANDYS nor FORTENBAUGH examined all of them. Apart from three places adduced by SANDYS and FORTENBAUGH, I have found five more instances where κινεῖν appears in contexts that suggest a similar meaning to that in *Or.* 39 (see nn. 27–32 below). In the present paper I am taking a different approach to the problem, and the parallels constitute only a small part of my argument.

⁵ FORTENBAUGH 2005a: 318: "...it is only in the last sentence of our text that Cicero draws on Theophrastus. The Latin words *commota est* appear to translate some form of the Greek verb κινεῖν" (emphasis added).

quotes Theophrastus in our fragment (*ut ait Theophrastus*). To be sure, many such quotations in Cicero are impossible to verify as there is no control material⁶. Thus, we can only attempt a selective demonstration, which aims at finding *probable* implications of the UAF for our assessment of the fragment of Theophrastus. My goal is to show that the quotations with the UAF in Cicero indeed follow a certain pattern, which sheds some light on our fragment of Theophrastus⁷. By using this method, I am following recent studies on fragmentary authors, which investigate how particular introductory formulae, used by an intermediate author, imply a given degree of exactness of the references⁸.

There are 69 references introduced by the UAF in Cicero's extant works. They tend to occur in the letters, in the philosophical and in the rhetorical treatises⁹. Nearly half of the quotations with the UAF refer to poetry. In these, it is fairly easy to draw a line of demarcation between Cicero's words and those of the cited authors, as identification of the poetic text can be made on the grounds of metre¹⁰. The syntactic structure of these quotations is not consistent. We have

⁶ The standard study of Cicero's quotations is HOWIND 1921 (see esp. p. 8 on Cicero's use of *ait*). See also: ARMLEDER 1959b: 20 (on *ait*); SKUTSCH 1960; for philosophical works see ZAWADZKI 2011.

⁷ I must stress that I am acutely aware of the limitations of this exposition, caused by the fact that we cannot check all the references introduced by the UAF. However, the alternative is to completely ignore the information provided by selective verification, which would be unwise. Moreover, even if we had material to check all the quotations except the one of Theophrastus, we would still lack absolute certainty as to its adequacy. The study of fragments is a natural domain of probability, and I endeavour not to forget that not only in the section about the quotations with the UAF, but throughout the entire paper. This is reflected in the repeated use of expressions such as "probably", "it is plausible", "it cannot be excluded" etc.

⁸ GIOVANNELLI-JOUANNA (2007: 223–226) enquired into the implications of introductory formulae in Athenaeus. The author shows that the exactness of a given reference is marked by a specific introductory word. He found three types of words with three corresponding degrees of accuracy: (a) γράφει and οὕτως: a literal quotation, (b) ἱστορεῖ: a paraphrase or summary, (c) other, e.g. φησί: a reformulation (rarely an exact quotation). Cf. also the experiment by LENFANT 1999: 103–121. Studies on fragmentary authors have gained considerable momentum in recent times, particularly in the field of fragmentary historians. Most recent treatment of the methodological issues involved in dealing with fragments is LENFANT 2013: 289–305. A good summary of recent developments is LANZILLOTTA 2013: XIII–XXI.

⁹ I take into account solely quotations with *ut ait* in the present tense and the third person singular. References with the third person plural (*ut aiunt*) have a different nature. The first and foremost difference is that they do not indicate the author of the purportedly recounted words. The number of quotations introduced with the UAF is as follows: poets: 32; philosophers: 14 (including 5 of Theophrastus); historians: 8; others (historical figures/unspecified/unknown): 15. The most often quoted of the Latin poets are Ennius, Lucilius, and Accius, while from the Greeks Homer. Half of the references with UAF to philosophers are to Theophrastus and Aristotle.

¹⁰ To be sure, there are also more problematic cases. Note, for instance, the passage where Cicero quotes Lucilius with a Latinised Greek word, *De fin.* II 23: "...quibus vinum defusum e pleno sit chryszion, ut ait Lucilius, cui nihildum situlus et sacculus abstulerit" ["...with wine in flask, decanted from a new-broach'd cask, as Lucillus has it, wine of tang bereft, all harshness in the strainer

instances where the UAF is put before¹¹, after¹², or in between the quoted words¹³. But it is clear that in these cases the UAF marks references which purport to repeat the *exact words* of the adduced authors. Moreover, citations of Greek poets with the UAF are nearly always translations¹⁴. Their accuracy would have to be examined individually; for our purposes the very fact of the occurrence of the UAF as an introductory word in such references is essential. It makes it at least plausible that our reference to Theophrastus is a translation. However, for most of the verses of Latin poets that occur with the UAF, Cicero is our sole testimony. So we do not know to what degree he is faithful to his authors, even if the impression is of great precision.

Revealing evidence can be found in passages where Cicero cites Greek authors with the UAF, and keeps the Greek text (does not translate it, as in most cases of poetic citations). Eleven quotations introduced by the UAF occur in Cicero's letters¹⁵. Those for which we have control material preserved independently of Cicero are of particular interest. Firstly, Cicero can mix cited words with his own thoughts, as in the reference below to Thucydides in *Att.* X 8, 7 (~ Thuc. I 138, 3):

qui cum fuisset, ut ait Thucydides, τῶν μὲν παρόντων δι' ἐλαχίστης βουλῆς κράτιστος γνώμων, τῶν δὲ μελλόντων ἐς πλείστον τοῦ γενησομένου ἀριστος εἰκαστής, tamen incidit in eos casus quos vitasset si eum nihil fefellisset. qui etsi is erat, ut ait idem, qui τὸ ἄμεινον καὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἐν τῷ ἀφανεῖ ἔτι ἐώρα μάλιστα,

left"; translations from the *De fin.* are those of H. RACKHAM]. Here we have no inverted commas, no Greek, and still we are quite certain as to which word Cicero aims at conveying in its "pure" form (*chryszion*).

¹¹ *De rep.* I 49: "...multo iam id in regnis minus, quorum, ut ait Ennius, nulla [regni] sancta societas nec fides est" ["...and that such stability is less attainable by far in kingdoms, in which, as Ennius says, no sacred partnership or honour is"; transl. by C.W. KEYES].

¹² *De or.* II 39 (~ Plautus, *Trin.* 705): "non enim possum quin exclamem," ut ait ille in *Trinummo*: ita mihi vim oratoris cum exprimere subtiliter visus es, tum laudare copiosissime" ["I cannot resist shouting, as he says in *Trinummus*, you demonstrates to me the ability of the orator so precisely, at the same time praising it at great length"]. Cf. *De fin.* V 92: "At hoc in eo M. Crasso, quem semel ait in vita risisse Lucilius, non contigit, ut ea re minus ἀγέλαστος, ut ait idem, vocaretur" ["Well, the rule was not applied to Marcus Crassus, who according to Lucilius laughed but once in his life; that one exception did not prevent his being called ἀγέλαστος"]. Cf. *Lael.* 22: "vitalis, ut ait Ennius".

¹³ *De fin.* IV 69: "Ex ea difficultate illae 'fallaciloquae', ut ait Accius, 'malitiae' natae sunt" ["This is the difficulty that gave birth to those base conceits deceitful-tongued, as Accius has it"].

¹⁴ Only two quotations of poetry where the UAF occurs come in Greek: Sophocles in *Att.* II 7, 4, and Homer in *Att.* IX 15, 4.

¹⁵ For the method and accuracy of Cicero's quotations in his letters see STAHLBRECHER 1957; ARMLEDER 1957; ARMLEDER 1959a. The most recent and comprehensive treatment is BEHRENDT 2013 (an exhaustive and systematic presentation of the *status quaestionis*: 9–32). On Greek in Cicero's letters, see STEELE 1900; McCALL 1980; BALDWIN 1992. On Greek in letters to Atticus: SHACKLETON-BAILEY 1962 and 1963.

tamen non vidit nec quo modo Lacedaemoniorum nec quo modo suorum civium invidiam effugeret nec quid Artaxerxi polliceretur.

For Thucydides tells us that though Themistocles was “the best judge of current affairs on the shortest reflection, and the shrewdest to guess at what would happen in the future”, yet he fell into misfortunes, which he would have escaped, had there been no error in his calculations. Though he was, as the same writer says, “a clear-sighted judge of the better and the worse course in a doubtful crisis”, yet he failed to see how to avoid the hate of the Spartans and his own fellow-citizens, nor what promise he ought to make to Artaxerxes¹⁶.

David R. SHACKLETON-BAILEY considered this quotation as “no doubt from memory”, as it contains several inaccuracies¹⁷. Apart from that, we can see in this passage how easily Cicero blends Thucydides' expressions with his own. This fact can be gauged only because Cicero does not cite in translation and Thucydides is extant independently. Otherwise, we would probably be at a loss as to what comes from the historian and what is Cicero's addition¹⁸. We would attribute Cicero's words – “tamen incidit in eos casus quos vitasset si eum nihil fefellisset” – to Thucydides, because they are neatly inserted into the entire sentence, which begins with *ut ait*. And there are more such instances, which we may call unintentional imputations¹⁹. Furthermore, Cicero sometimes puts

¹⁶ This and other translations from the *Letters* are by E.O. WINSTEDT.

¹⁷ However, these may be due to the fact that there was no standard edition of Thucydides at this time. See SHACKLETON-BAILEY 1965: 408–410. Thucydides, with differences from Cicero's quotation underlined (translation irrelevant here): τῶν τε παραχρημα δι' ἐλαχίστης βουλῆς κράτιστος γνώμων καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἐπὶ πλείστον τοῦ γενησομένου ἄριστος εἰκαστής [...] τὸ τε ἄμεινον ἢ χεῖρον ἐν τῷ ἀφανεῖ ἔτι προεώρα μάλιστα.

¹⁸ Demarcation would be nearly impossible. The part of the sentence: “yet he fell into misfortunes, which he would have escaped, had there been no error in his calculations”, which is Cicero's thought, could be attributed to Thucydides. Similarly the second one: “yet he failed to see how to avoid the hate of the Spartans and his own fellow-citizens, nor what promise he ought to make to Artaxerxes”.

¹⁹ *Att.* VII 1, 6 (~ Thuc. I 97, 2): “sed haec fuerit, ut ait Thucydides, ἐκβολὴ λόγου non inutilis” [“This, in Thucydides' phrase, is a digression – but not pointless”]. SHACKLETON-BAILEY (1965: 277–283; on this part at p. 280) aptly remarks that *non inutilis* could be ascribed to Thucydides (if Cicero were the sole testimony for this passage), whereas no similar expression occurs in the Greek. An intelligent supposition on the part of SHACKLETON-BAILEY is that this attribution may be an effect of Cicero's reading of the implications of Thucydides' words. According to this scholar, Cicero's addition of *non inutilis* is a kind of summary of Thucydides' statement that he is filling the existing gap in historiography (which is for Cicero is, it seems, useful): ἔγραψα δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποίησάμην διὰ τόδε, ὅτι τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἅπασιν ἐκλιπέε τοῦτο ἦν τὸ χωρίον καὶ ἢ τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικὰ ξυνετίθεσαν ἢ αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ [“And I have made a digression to write of these matters for the reason that this period has been omitted by all my predecessors, who have confined their narratives either to Hellenic affairs before the Persian War or the Persian War itself”]; transl. by C.F. SMITH].

the UAF inside the quoted sentence and cuts out several words from the middle of it²⁰. In such cases, we are left with an “abridged” version of the original.

Overall, references with the UAF display several features. First, the irregularities. Such quotations vary considerably in the amount of precise words following or preceding *ut ait*, ranging from one to an entire sentence. As to the accuracy of the citations, we can see that occasionally: (i) words are excised, (ii) phrasing is altered, (iii) words are imputed.

However, we can also detect several common denominators. First and foremost – in all the verifiable examples where the UAF occurs there is at least one word reproduced *verbatim* (either in Latin or Greek) or translated from the Greek. Whenever control material is available, there seems to be no exception. Where the UAF occurs, Cicero’s primary aim is clearly to stick to the wording of his author. By “*ut ait*” Cicero seems to mean: “as he put it”, and this is the correct way to understand and translate the UAF.

Another regularity: the supposedly precise words always come *immediately* before or *immediately* after the UAF + the quoted author’s name. This observation can also be of use for the assessment of our fragment (see below, p. 218).

It is also not of little account that where the UAF occurs, Cicero refers to a sentence/passage which is traceable to one specific text²¹.

An additional aspect of Cicero’s *modus* of quoting with the UAF is that he often translates his Greek original. As mentioned above, citations of Greek poets with the UAF are, most often, translations (with two exceptions). Daniella DUECK has shown that Cicero usually prefers to translate, rather than to quote in Greek²². So, if the UAF appears in connection with a Greek author, but the entire reference is in Latin, we are most probably dealing with Cicero’s effort to translate the Greek.

All in all, it is very probable that our fragment of Theophrastus contains a word or words that reproduce his phrasing. In this case, Cicero does not cite any words in Greek, so we are dealing with a translation. Still, the above examples

²⁰ *Att.* IX 15, 4 (~ *Hom. Od.* III 26): “Sed tamen ‘ἄλλα μὲν αὐτός’, *ut ait* ille, ‘ἄλλα δὲ καὶ δαίμων ὑποθήσεται’. Quicquid egero continuo scies” [“But nevertheless as the poet has it, some things I’ll venture and some things God will prompt. Whatever I do you shall know forthwith”]. Part of the Homeric text is cut out by Cicero, and is in a way “replaced” by the UAF, cf. the Greek of *Hom. Od.* III 26, with the excised words underlined:

Τηλέμαχ’, ἄλλα μὲν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῆσι νοήσεις.
ἄλλα δὲ καὶ δαίμων ὑποθήσεται· οὐ γὰρ οἶω
οὐ σε θεῶν ἀέκητι γενέσθαι τε τραφόμεν τε.

See also the comments of SHACKLETON-BAILEY 1965: 388–391 (p. 390 on the *ut ait* sentence). BEHRENDT (2013: 259 f.) interprets the interference of *ut ait* here as an indication of the removal of the words from the specific person and circumstances, whereby it gains a more general sense.

²¹ We could imagine that Cicero refers to someone’s locution, used in an everyday conversation. But this is not the case whenever he uses the UAF.

²² DUECK 2009.

from the letters have shown that there is no rule as to how much of text Cicero reproduces in quotations with the UAF, and how much he supplies himself (by inference or otherwise). The following two parts of my argument will be an attempt to answer the question: how can we find out exactly which words are a translation?

CICERO'S METHODOLOGY OF TRANSLATIONS FROM GREEK

The problem of the translation of particular words can be approached by reference to Cicero's statements on his handling of Greek philosophical terms²³. From the *De finibus* we learn that there are three ways Cicero renders Greek concepts into Latin:

si enim Zenoni licuit, cum rem aliquam invenisset inusitatam, inauditum quoque ei rei nomen inponere, cur non liceat Catoni? nec tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesse erit ut interpretes indiserti solent, cum sit verbum, quod idem declaret, magis usitatum. equidem soleo etiam quod uno Graeci, si aliter non possum, idem pluribus verbis exponere. et tamen puto concedi nobis oportere ut Graeco verbo utamur, si quando minus occurret Latinum²⁴.

If Zeno was allowed to invent a new term to match the discovery of an unfamiliar idea, then why not Cato? None the less, there is no need for an exact word-for-word correspondence when a more familiar term already exists to convey the same meaning. That is the mark of an unskilled translator. My usual practice, where there is no alternative available, is to express a single Greek word by several Latin ones. And I still think we should be allowed to use a Greek word when there is no Latin equivalent.

(Cic. *De fin.* III 15; transl. by R. WOOLF)

Thus, Cicero has four different methods of dealing with Greek terms that he found in his sources:

(i) Etymological translation (Cicero calls it *verbum e verbo* translation) – this occurs when there is no corresponding term in Latin, and an existing Latin word is given a new sense which is unique for this word in the language into which it is transferred (*inauditum rei nomen inponere*). In modern terms, this can be understood as a semantic calque: it involves the extension of the meaning of an existing Latin word, modelled on the use of its Greek etymological counterpart.

(ii) Translation *ad sensum* – when Cicero considers a Latin word to convey the sense and connotations of a given Greek notion satisfactorily, and chooses

²³ On this question CLAVEL (1868: 315–378) is fundamental, although sometimes ignored (with the excellent, albeit not free of errors, *Ciceronianum lexicon graeco-latinum*). See also ROSE 1921 and POWELL 1995. GLUCKER (2012) is now the most comprehensive account of, and commentary on, Cicero's remarks on his translation of Greek terms. He attempted to give a contextualised analysis of all passages where Cicero expresses himself on his treatment of Greek terms.

²⁴ For an analysis of this passage, see GLUCKER 2012: 56–58.

it in spite of there being an existing etymological counterpart. Such an instance means to apply a “better” word (*verbum, quod idem declaret, magis usitatum*).

(iii) Periphrastic rendering into Latin when there is no appropriate counterpart (*quod uno Graeci pluribus verbis exponere*).

(iv) Leaving the Greek word unchanged when Cicero is unable to use any of the techniques described above (*si aliter non possum*).

From these four techniques we can establish a general rule that will be useful for our fragment of Theophrastus. If a given sense, which is drawn from the immediate context, is unique for a word in the Latin language, we can consider this word as Cicero’s attempt to render a Greek term in an etymological way²⁵. Moreover, if Cicero adduces a specified author (e.g. Theophrastus) in close vicinity, we will expect that the Greek term translated into Latin comes from that author. Lastly, to verify which Latin word Cicero tends to choose to represent a Greek one, we can look to the more or less extensive translations by Cicero that purport to be exact, where the original work survived independently of him.

THE FIRST PART OF THE FRAGMENT

I will begin with a substantiation of the hypothesis by SANDYS – that *commota est* can be a rendering of the Greek κινεῖν, used by Theophrastus in a special meaning that was sometimes assigned to this verb²⁶.

In Greek, κινεῖν meaning “innovation”, or “making changes”, should be considered a very specific sense of a very common word. This specificity consists in the object that κινεῖν can refer to: language²⁷, laws and arts²⁸, tragedy²⁹,

²⁵ The required qualification is that the sense could occur in a text by Cicero, or by another Latin author, that is not extant.

²⁶ The primary meaning of κινεῖν is “to move” or “to stir”. The following examples are, according to my research, all uses of κινεῖν in this sense in extant Greek texts. SANDYS and FORTENBAUGH cite only a few of these passages, and make no enquiry into the semantics of κινεῖν in the respective contexts.

²⁷ See Arist. *Rhet.* 1404 a, 20–28. As Aristotle claims, literary language was first “moved” by the poets. The context is the development of artful treatment of language. See LAURENTI 1987: 500 f.

²⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 1268 b, 34–38. The word is used regularly throughout the passage in the sense of the “reform” or “revision” of state laws. The whole argument indicates that κινεῖν is the second step after εὐρίσκειν. Aristotle begins with provisions “discovered” by Hippodamus, points out their weaknesses, and poses the question as to whether it would be advantageous for polis “to alter them” (*Pol.* 1267 b, 22–1269 a, 28). In Aristotle, the two ideas, of the first inventor and of the reformer, of εὐρεσις and κίνησις, are plainly distinguished (cf. *Soph. el.* 183 a, 40–183 b, 35).

²⁹ Plut. *Sol.* 29, 6. The context is Solon’s attitude towards novelties in tragedy that he, as Plutarch reports, found inappropriate.

rhetoric³⁰, ethics³¹ and certain form of philosophical argumentation (λόγος)³². The semantics that κινεῖν gains in combination with such objects are distinctive. In the instances adduced above (notes 27–32), κινεῖν as applied to an area of intellectual activity, theoretical knowledge, or practical expertise, ranges in its meaning, starting from “to modify” through “to develop”, “to transform”, and ending with “to revolutionise”. Moreover, κινεῖν denotes changes made in a given field that already existed, but at the time was in an imperfect or undeveloped state. This can be described as anthropomorphism (abstract things³³ are “stirred into action”). However, the considerable consistency and regularity in the connotation of “alteration in a previously invented field of human activity”, and the distinguishing of κινεῖν from εὐρίσκειν in Aristotle’s usage, point to something more than just a figurative use of the word. So much for the unique semantics of κινεῖν³⁴.

Let us move now to *commovere*, which appears in our fragment, and its relation to the Greek word that potentially underlies Cicero’s expression. Let us begin with an elementary question – how would Cicero translate κινεῖν if he found it in his Greek source? We have one attempt at an exact quotation by Cicero, where the Greek word in question is κινεῖν. In this passage, Cicero consistently

³⁰ Sex. Emp. *Adv. math.* VII 6 = DK 31 A19. Diogenes Laertius (VIII 56 f.) claims that Aristotle said that in the dialogue named *Sophist*, but reports Aristotle’s expression with the word εὐρίσκειν. However, the testimony of Quintilian should make us consider Sextus’ account as more faithful to the words of Aristotle, since he, referring most probably directly to the Stagirite, uses *movere* (*Inst. or.* III 1, 8). On Aristotle’s *Sophist*, see LAURENTI 1987: 495–500; FLASHAR (1983: 283) supposes the content is on famous sophists.

³¹ Sex. Emp. *Adv. math.* XI 2 = Socrates I C464 GIANNANTONI. It is a reflection of the opinion that Socrates turned philosophy from the mere study of nature to ethical problems. If this reading is correct, κινεῖν implies, in this context, that Socrates has revolutionised philosophy, beginning the process of making it what it was “meant to be”. See BETT 1997: 48 and IX–XIX; SPINELLI 1995: 133 f., 143 with n. 48.

³² Diog. Laert. IV 28 = Arcesilaus T 1a METTE, where we have an indication that Arcesilaus took “Plato’s λόγος” and made it “more eristic”; κινεῖν means “to improve” or “to innovate” something handed down by the predecessor. On this *vita*, see DORANDI 1992: 3777–3784; LONG 1986. Both tend to see Philodemus as Diogenes’ source here. Cf. Diog. Laert. IX 53, 1 on Protagoras. It is not clear whether Protagoras is meant to have initiated, or innovated, the thing in question. On the Protagoras *vita*, see SHALEV 2006. UNTERSTEINER (1967: 23) saw a Peripatetic source here. DECLIVA CAZZI (1992: 4239 with nn. 94 f.) argues for Favorinus.

³³ In the meaning of things existing in thought or as an idea, but not having a physical reality.

³⁴ I am grateful to the anonymous reader for his or her suggestions, which stimulated me to examine the problems pertaining to this section in more depth. What indeed required more attention was the unique quasi-technical sense assigned to κινεῖν in numerous (and prominent) Greek authors, as contrasted with no similar meaning of *movere* to be found in Latin (including, of course, Cicero). The implication of that semantic “gap” is, first and foremost, a greater probability that Cicero at *Or.* 39 provides us with a *verbum e verbo* translation (a semantic calque, see the line of reasoning below).

renders κινεῖν with *movere*, with no exception, thirteen times³⁵. Although this observation may seem obvious, it forms a necessary basis for further exploration.

The use of *commovere* with *historia* at *Or.* 39, read in the immediate context, leaves little doubt that we shall ascribe to it a meaning that is very close to the senses of κινεῖν delineated above. The *OLD* classified *commovere* from *Or.* 39 under the heading “to cause activity in, rouse to action, stimulate, (refl.) to take action, bestir oneself”³⁶. The historiography is said to have been revolutionised by Herodotus and Thucydides, in that it “dared” to be written in a stylistically more elaborate way. Does Cicero know and draw on such a specific sense of *movere*, apart from *Or.* 39? So far, investigations of the verbs *movere* and *commovere* in Cicero have revealed that *movere* and derivatives are *never* used by Cicero in such a sense as in *Or.* 39³⁷. Moreover, such a meaning of *movere* is, to my knowledge, not to be found in the Latin language at all³⁸. The only potential parallel comes from Quintilian. However, in this instance, the author makes it clear that he is quoting another author’s view (*Empedoclem [...] dicitur*); a view which is almost identical to the fragment from Aristotle’s *Sophist*³⁹. It is thus not an independent figurative use of *movere* by a Latin author, quite the contrary – it is an example of a Latin author that renders κινεῖν, used by a Greek author (most probably Aristotle), in its specific sense, with *movere*.

³⁵ Cic. *Tusc. disp.* I 53 f., a translation of Plat. *Phaed.* 245 C–246 A.

³⁶ *OLD* s.v. *commovere*.

³⁷ A Perseus search gives ca. 900 places in Cicero with words including *mov*. From that we can distill ca. 170 items where *movere/commovere* comes with *animus*, meaning “to stir one’s mind, emotion”. In general, Cicero uses *movere/commovere* as typical words for “stirring” in a psychological or political sense, and this basic semantic field coincides with the basic sense of the Greek κινεῖν perfectly. MERGUET (1882: 204 f., s.v. *moveo* and 1877: 583–585, s.v. *commoveo*) does not register the meaning “innovation” in the speeches. As for the philosophical writings, such a sense also does not occur (see MERGUET 1892: 594–597, s.v. *moveo* and 1887: 455 f., s.v. *commoveo*). According to ABBOTT, OLDFATHER, CANTER (1964: 189), the sense of “innovation” etc. is also completely absent from Cicero’s rhetorical works. In these, *movere* is a technical term for the act of emotional manipulation of the audience; see the definition in LAUSBERG 1990: 142 f.: “seelische Erschütterung des Publikums im Sinne einer Parteinahme für die Partei des Redners”.

³⁸ Neither LEWIS and SHORT nor *OLD* nor *ThLL* record such a meaning.

³⁹ Quint. *Inst. or.* III 1, 8: “Nam primus post eos quos poetae tradiderunt movisse aliqua circa rhetorice Empedocles dicitur” [“The first writer after those recorded by the poets who is said to have taken any steps in the direction of rhetoric is Empedocles”; this translation by H.E. BUTLER, as regards the rendering of *movisse*, seems entirely inadequate]. Here *movere* is used close to the meaning “to contribute”. The passage draws on a secondary source, as implied by the introductory *dicitur*. This source is almost certainly Aristotle, and the statement is nearly a quotation from the dialogue *The Sophist*, known from Sex. Emp. *Adv. math.* VII 6: “Εμπεδοκλέα μὲν γὰρ ὁ <Ἀριστοτέλης> φησὶ πρῶτον ῥητορικὴν κεκινηκέναι” (cf. n. 30 above). For this dialogue and Quintilian’s use of Aristotle in the passage in question, see LAURENTI 1987: 500 and 518. The author remarks that *movere* with such a meaning appears only this once in Latin (he does not take our passage from Cicero into account).

Overall, the vast amount of idiomatic uses of κινεῖν in Greek sources, confronted with no similar example in the extant Latin literature is, in my view, significant. We could, of course, allow for the possibility that Cicero uses *commovere* in the sense “to innovate” for *historia* independently from Theophrastus. Such figurative use is not beyond the range of a rhetorically trained intellectual like Cicero. But, as I tried to show above, the usage of κινεῖν in Greek in the meaning in question is more than just figurative, and it would be a considerable semantic invention on the part of Cicero to use *commovere* in precisely this sense in our passage only this once and, in addition, with reference to Theophrastus. Of course, this needs to be qualified with the possibility that such sense of *movere* appeared in a passage that is no longer extant. But, given the size of Cicero's literary output that is available to us, we can regard this as unlikely⁴⁰.

Therefore, *commota est*, as it stands in *Or.* 39, is, most probably – in modern linguistic terms – a semantic calque: an extension of a meaning of an existing Latin word modelled on its use in the Greek language. Such a case can be treated as the foremost argument for the thesis that Cicero is trying to translate a Greek notion, since he imposes on the Latin word *commovere* a semantic that is unknown to it⁴¹. In Cicero's terms, it is a *verbum e verbo* (etymological) translation.

The next thing we need to consider is that in *Or.* 39 Cicero is using the compound form *commota est*, i.e. he is adding the prefix *con-* and using the passive voice. In terms of translation, this would accordingly suggest that Theophrastus used κατακινεῖν in the passive voice. The prefix *con-* is, of course, an appropriate counterpart of the Greek κατα-, with the connotation of something being done “completely”. We have many samples of translations with prefixes, where Cicero explicitly states that his aim is to provide an etymological rendering of the Greek notion (a *verbum e verbo* translation)⁴². In these instances, Cicero imposes an entirely new philosophical meaning (semantic) on words that already exist in Latin.

However, Cicero sometimes adds the prefix in translations of Greek words that do not have one. For example, Cicero uses *commotio* in a philosophical-technical context when he renders the Stoic concept of ψυχῆς κίνησις⁴³. Besides,

⁴⁰ We can also speculate that *movere* in the sense in question occurred in another lost piece of Latin literature. However, this would also require us to assume that Cicero knew this work, and at *Or.* 39 used *commovere* in this peculiar sense only once in his extant works. This appears to be not impossible, but is still a rather implausible option.

⁴¹ ERNOUT 1954: 86 ff.; POWELL 1995: 292.

⁴² GLUCKER 2012: 52 f.: κατάληψις = *comprehensio* (*Acad. post.* 17); προάγω = *produco* (*De fin.* V 52; IV 72); cf. ROSE 1921: 103.

⁴³ CLAVEL (1868: 346) registers this solely in a very general reference “Stoic. Defin.”, with no specific passage quoted. I managed to find three passages where Cicero discusses *animi commotio*, where he most probably renders ψυχῆς κίνησις. All are from *Tusc. disp.* (III 8; IV 11 and 47).

we have to take into account that the form *κατακινεῖν* is extremely rare. It is therefore *not* necessary to expect that Theophrastus used the form *κατακινεῖν*⁴⁴. We can reasonably assume that Cicero – in our fragment – adds the prefix *con-* by himself, as he did in the above example of *kinesis*⁴⁵. Theophrastus most probably used the verb *κινεῖν*. As for the passive voice, it is not impossible that Theophrastus used it. In Aristotle, *κινεῖν* meaning “innovation” also occurs in the passive aorist (*Pol.* 1268 b, 34–38).

Is only *commota est* an exact rendering of Theophrastus’ words? The above survey of the “UAF quotations” revealed one regularity that can be used as an argument for the translation of either *primisque ab his* or *historia*. The “exact words” come always either *immediately* before or *immediately* after the UAF. The syntactic structure of this part of the sentence (“*primisque ab his, ut ait Theophrastus, historia commota est*”) and the position of the UAF indicate that *historia* is almost certainly a translation of the Greek *ἱστορία* as well. We can state this because: (i) *commota est* has already been demonstrated to be a translation, (ii) Cicero never interrupts a quotation with his own phrase if the UAF is put in between the quoted words. Thus, we have two possibilities: either (a) the entire phrase *primisque ab his historia commota est* is a translation, or (b) *primisque ab his* is Cicero’s addition. Taking the conventional usage of *κινεῖν* with *πρῶτος/πρῶτοι* into account, it is justified to think that (b) is unlikely. Rather, *primis + his* is a translation of *πρῶτοι + οὔτοι*.

To sum up, according to the above reasoning, the entire phrase *primisque ab his historia commota est* is in all probability a translation of Theophrastus’ Greek. The prefix *con-* in *commota* is rather Cicero’s addition. We can now attempt two possible reconstructions of the original phrase. The first, which is in keeping with the passive form in Latin as it stands in Cicero (*commota est*), would be as follows:

*ὑπὸ τούτων δὴ πρῶτων ἱστορία κινήθησα

The passage from Aristotle, where *κινεῖν* occurs with a similar meaning and in the passive aorist, is an important parallel which shows that such phrasing could also be expected in Theophrastus. However, we have also several examples

⁴⁴ We can, however, take into account the more common *μετακινέω*, which means “to change”, “alter”, and is found at least once in Theophrastus (*Hist. pl.* IV 11, 5). If we were to assume that *commovere* is not meant to be a literal translation, *μεταβάλλειν* would also be a likely candidate (I owe a debt of gratitude to the anonymous reader of this paper for calling my attention to these possibilities).

⁴⁵ We may only speculate as to how he understood this choice. Perhaps it was due to the meaning that *κινεῖν* has in this particular instance, e.g. it is meant that Herodotus and Thucydides made the final or most substantial adjustments in the development of historiography.

where κινεῖν with a similar meaning occurs in the active voice. The sentence would then probably read:

*οὔτοι δὲ πρῶτοι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκίνησαν

I see no way of ruling out this second alternative, but since there seems to be no substantial proof that Cicero changed the form from the active into the passive voice, I find it necessary to accept the first one.

THE SECOND PART OF THE FRAGMENT

The words that follow the clause identified above as translation are: *ut aunderet uberius quam superiores et ornatus dicere*. Is this second part of the fragment a paraphrase or a summary of Theophrastus' opinions, or does Cicero rather stick to the original phrasing, along with ἱστορία and κινεῖν⁴⁶?

The most significant words from the fragment are *uberius et ornatus*: “[Herodotus and Thucydides were the first to speak] *more fully and ornately*”. It has been shown that *ornatum* or *ornate dicere* is a Latin counterpart of one of the four Theophrastean qualities of good style (ἀρεταὶ λέξεως). There is no agreement among scholars on whether the Greek term read κατασκευή⁴⁷ or rather κεκοσμημένον⁴⁸. There is a very slight difference between them; the Greek words are used almost interchangeably⁴⁹. If we assume that Theophrastus used κατασκευή (which is more likely), its rendering with *ornatum* is plainly an etymological (*verbum e verbo*) translation⁵⁰. Importantly, *ornatum* is discussed by Cicero as an explicitly Theophrastean category (*Or.* 79).

Uberius was identified as an adaptation of the Greek rhetorical term περιττόν⁵¹. The meanings of περιττός and *uber* are only slightly similar⁵². *Uberius* is defined by Cicero as being characteristic of the middle style, between the grand

⁴⁶ I cannot say what FORTENBAUGH'S opinion on this is, as he does not express it in his commentary.

⁴⁷ STROUX 1912: 10; 18–28; KENNEDY 1963: 276; LAUSBERG (1990: 862, s.v. κατασκευή) refers us to *ornatus*; cf. *ibidem*, 769 f. on *ornatus*.

⁴⁸ SOLMSEN 1931: 241; SCHENKEVELD 1964: 73.

⁴⁹ FANTHAM (1988) consequently writes κατασκευή/κόσμος, avoiding a decisive rendering. The other three ἀρεταὶ are correct Greek (Ἐλληνισμός), clarity (σαφήνεια) and propriety (πρέπον). See STROUX 1912: 9–28; KENNEDY 1963: 273–278 and 1972: 225; INNES 1985: 252; FORTENBAUGH 2005b: 59. GRUBE (1952: 180) argues that the virtues are all to be found in Aristotle, and they are not Theophrastus' invention.

⁵⁰ The basic meaning of these words coincides perfectly: “to fit out”, “furnish”, “equip”, “supply”. See LSJ s.v. κατασκευάζω and LEWIS and SHORT s.v. *orno*.

⁵¹ KENNEDY 1957.

⁵² The primary meaning of περιττός: “beyond the regular number, size”, “prodigious”, “extraordinary”; of *uber*: “full”, “plentiful”, “copious”. Cf. ERNESTI 1795: 261.

and the plain styles (*Or.* 9). So, although Cicero does not explain this rendering anywhere, we should probably qualify it as a translation *ad sensum*. The term περιττόν is also well attested as Theophrastus' term by Dionysius, in a fragment from Theophrastus' *On Style*⁵³. That is all we can say about the two words – *uberius* and *ornatum/ornatus* – taken separately: they both are Theophrastean, and are technical terms used in descriptions of style.

In our fragment we have a compound phrase: *uberius et ornatus*. Interestingly, this locution is not unusual for Cicero, and apart from *Or.* 39 it can be traced in no less than six passages in his extant works⁵⁴. It is also striking that this compound occurs seven times in Cicero, whereas it is virtually absent from Latin literature aside from him⁵⁵. Let us firstly examine the contexts where *uberius et ornatus* appears in Cicero.

In *Orator* 46–47, where Aristotle's technique of composing θέσεις is discussed, the phrase *uberius et ornatus* is used as an epithet denoting a general fluency and copiousness of language, and it is undoubtedly Cicero's own expression (i.e. there is no suggestion that he is drawing on any other author here)⁵⁶. In *De or.* III 70, 10 *uberius et ornatus* describes Antonius' language⁵⁷, but this epithet refers not to the subject proper, and is a remark made in passing, stating that in book II Antonius had said certain things *uberius et ornatus*⁵⁸. Why Cicero would consider Antonius' speeches *ornatus* is difficult to say, but as it stands, the compound phrase looks as if it were Cicero's routine expression for “discussing something fully and ornamentally”⁵⁹. Finally, the compound *uberius*

⁵³ Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 3, 1 = fr. 691 FHS&G. See STROUX 1912: 19.

⁵⁴ Cic. *De or.* III 70; *Or.* 46; *Brut.* 198; *Acad. post.* 130; *Cat. mai.* 57; *Fam.* V 12, 2.

⁵⁵ Tac. *Dial.* 18, 2: “C. Gracchus plenior et uberior, sic Graccho politior et ornator Crassus”. Even this one time *ornatus* and *uberius* are not actually combined but rather loosely set alongside each other.

⁵⁶ This is neither a technical context nor specific use of the words: “...haec igitur quaestio a propriis personis et temporibus ad universi generis orationem traducta appellatur θέσις. In hac Aristoteles adulescentis non ad philosophorum morem tenuiter disserendi, sed ad copiam rhetorum, in utramque partem ut ornatus et uberius dici posset, exercuit...” [“...such an inquiry, removed from particular times and persons to a discussion of a general topic, is called θέσις or “thesis”. Aristotle trained young men in this, not for the philosophical manner of subtle discussion, but for the fluent style of the rhetorician, so that they might be able to uphold either side of the question in copious and elegant language”; transl. by H.M. HUBBELL].

⁵⁷ Cic. *De or.* III 70 f.: “...et, si satis esse putatis ea, quae isti scriptores artis docent, discere, quae multo tamen ornatus, quam ab illis dicuntur, et uberius explicavit Antonius...” [“...if you think it sufficient to have learned the rules which the writers on rhetoric have delivered, which however Antonius has set forth much more fully and ornately than they are treated by them...”].

⁵⁸ Cf. MANKIN 2011: 162.

⁵⁹ When we examine Antonius' discourses in book II, we see that one of them comprises parts 28–73 (oratory is no science, only forensic oratory requires some precepts, etc.), and the other 291–367, the latter being a detailed discussion of arrangement, ῥητος, panegyric speeches, and *memoria technica*. Thus, about 1/3 of book II is taken up by Antonius' arguments, and, by commenting on that

et ornatus appears in *Brutus* 198. The passage concerns qualities of the oratory of Scaevola and Crassus. The background is the division between two styles: *unum attenuate pressequ, alterum sublate ampleque dicentium* (201). Cicero imagines both a trained and an untrained critic passing judgement on Crassus' and Scaevola's abilities. Cicero says that, even though Crassus would realise all three *officia* of the orator, anyone who is *intellegens et doctus* would discern that Scaevola's *dicendi genus* is *ornatus et uberius*. Here Cicero seems to understand many and various qualities of language by these words⁶⁰.

Accordingly, we can ask whether *κατασκευή* occurs in combination with *περιττόν*, of course in Greek sources. Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses the two terms together in a description of Thucydides' *λέξις*⁶¹. This combination also appears once in his *De compositione verborum* as the quality of *φράσις*⁶². Remarkably, apart from Dionysius, the compound tends not to appear elsewhere, except in contexts not concerned with language or style. For example, the phrase occurs in descriptions of embellishment, art and food. In most instances *περιττόν* comes with derivatives of *σκευάζειν* rather than *κοσμεῖν*⁶³. The only author that explicitly uses the compound phrase in a technical sense and in the context of style is Dionysius. It is probably not a coincidence that he was well acquainted with, and undeniably influenced by, Theophrastus' linguistic and rhetorical theories⁶⁴. It is therefore not unlikely that he borrowed the phrase from the latter's technical linguistic vocabulary. We do not have any explicit evidence that Theophrastus conjoined the two words, but we have to take into account the fragmentary character of the Theophrastean corpus, especially where the rhetorical works are concerned.

in the following book, Cicero probably has the exhaustiveness of Antonius' discourse in mind, hence the epithet *uberius*. In *Acad. post.* 130 *uberius et ornatus* comes with *explicare*, cf. *Plin. Ep.* IV 17, 11, and this is a case similar to the reference to Antonius in *De oratore* – it is a remark made in no particular context or discussion of style. The same applies to the occurrence of *ornatus et uberius* in *Cat. mai.* 57 and *Fam.* V 12, 2.

⁶⁰ What does Cicero mean by *uberius et ornatus* in this context? He explains that Scaevola in his performance spoke *politius, elegantius, melius*, that he said a lot (*quid ille non dixit; multa de*) on the testamentary law and on the observance of civil law in general, and finally, that he said *omnia perite, scienter, breviter, presse, satis ornate* and *pereleganter*.

⁶¹ *Dion. Hal. Dem.* 1 *ad fin.*: ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐξηλλαγμένη καὶ *περιττὴ καὶ ἐγκατάσκευος* καὶ τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις κόσμοις ἅπασι συμπληρωμένη *λέξις*, ἧς ὄρος καὶ κανὼν ὁ Θουκυδίδης [“Style that is colourful, rich, elaborated and full of additional embroidery, the landmark and paragon of which is Thucydides”].

⁶² *De comp. verb.* 18, 81: *περιττὴν καὶ ἐγκατάσκευον* διώκη *φράσις*. Cf. *Epitome* 18, 16. See also *Schol. in Il.* XII 53 f.: *περιττὴ δὲ ἢ κατασκευὴ* τῆς ἀπαγγελίας.

⁶³ About art: *Diod. Sic.* XXXI 35, 1; food: *Athen.* IX 32, 384 A; embellishment: *Plut. De Is. et Os.* 13 (= *Mor.* 356 C; with *κεκοσμημένην*).

⁶⁴ ATKINS 1952: 132–134; PAVANO 1958: XII–XIII; RUSSELL 1981: 129–137; WOOTEN 1994: 121–130.

Neither περιττόν nor κατασκευή are habitually combined in Greek with the verbal form “to speak”, as in our fragment: *ornatius et uberius dicere*. The use of κατασκευή or περιττόν with *verba dicendi* seems only slightly attested⁶⁵. In Dionysius, where the compound περιττή καὶ ἐγκατάσκευος occurs, it is conceived as an epithet of λέξις; it is an adjectival phrase. Still, *dicere* in our fragment will rather be seen as dependent on *audere*, and we can pose the question as to whether Cicero renders Theophrastus’ wording also here. In Latin, *audere dicere* (“dare to say”) is common as early as in Plautus⁶⁶. Its Greek counterpart is τολμῶ λέγειν or θαρρεῖν λέγειν (or εἰπεῖν)⁶⁷. It seems that both Latin and Greek developed this simple expression independently. Thus, on the one hand, there is no way to prove that Cicero is copying Theophrastus in this instance, but on the other hand, this remains a possibility that we can not rule out.

To sum up, the final answer to the question posed at the opening of the present section has to be complex. Cicero uses *uberius et ornatus* as a compound in several other places in a broad, non-technical sense (but always with reference to language). He is the only Latin author to employ the expression. Dionysius also knows the Greek counterpart of the phrase, and attests to the Theophrastean technical usage (if not “source”) of both terms that constitute it. As a result, the most likely conclusion is to take *uberius et ornatus* as Cicero’s translation of what he read in Theophrastus about Herodotus’ and Thucydides’ stylistic contributions to historiography. Most probably Cicero, similarly to Dionysius, acquired the phrase as part of his rhetorical training and then used it more freely or applied it in various other contexts.

It needs to be stressed at this point that the above argument is not intended to definitely settle the question of the precise wording, forms, or sentence structure of Theophrastus’ actual expression. We can only propose a possible reconstruction, with room for alternatives as to particular words, especially in the second part of the sentence. My hypothesis is the following:

*ὕπὸ τούτων δὴ πρώτων ἱστορία κινήθησά⁶⁸, ὥστε τολμᾶν⁶⁹ λέγειν⁷⁰

⁶⁵ I managed to find one instance where a derivative περιττόν alone occurs with εἰπεῖν: Dion. Hal. *Isae*. 20: εἰπεῖν ... περιττώως, ὃ βούλεται.

⁶⁶ See e.g. *Amph.* 373; 566; *Capt.* 630; 662; *Men.* 732; *Rud.* 734; see also Ter. *Eun.* 659.

⁶⁷ LEWIS and SHORT s.v. *audeo*, with reference to Cic. *Lig.* 8: *audeam dicere*: “I dare say, venture to assert” = τολμῶ λέγειν. See e.g. Isoc. *Panath.* 149; *Antid.* 61; Plat. *Phlb.* 13 D; *Rep.* 503 B; Ar. *Plut.* 593.

⁶⁸ Alternatively: μετεκινήθη, see n. 44 above.

⁶⁹ It is equally plausible that this verb occurred in the active aorist; we would have then: ὡς ἐτόλμησε [...] λέγειν/εἰπεῖν. Alternatively: θαρρεῖν, see n. 67 above.

⁷⁰ Alternatively: εἰπεῖν, see n. 65 above.

περιττότερον ἢ πρότερον⁷¹ καὶ μείζονι κατασκευῇ⁷²

CONCLUSIONS

All things considered, several new insights emerge from the above investigation into our testimony of Theophrastus' remarks on Herodotus and Thucydides. First of all, we can say in all *probability* (not with *certainty*) that the reference to Theophrastus in *Or.* 39 is a translation.

Such a conclusion allows us to consider as plausible the idea that Cicero knew Theophrastus directly, and not only through handbook material. We do not know whether Cicero found in Theophrastus any comprehensive analysis of Herodotus' and Thucydides' style, or whether the Greek author simply made the remark in passing. It cannot be excluded that the Theophrastean assessment of Herodotus and Thucydides involved a scrutiny of the aspects of language that the two categories – κατασκευή and περιττόν – comprised. But we cannot assess the thoroughness of Theophrastus' exploration of the historians' style; conceivably it was extensive enough to be subsumed under περιττή καὶ ἐγκατάσκευος λέξις, as Dionysius expressed himself on Thucydides' style.

We can conjecture that Theophrastus made a stylistic comparison of Herodotus and Thucydides with their predecessors in the field of historiography. Such a comparison is implied in the Greek word κινεῖν, which – when used in the context of a development of any type of human activity – points to a considerable improvement in something that until that time had existed only in a basic state⁷³.

The problem of the attribution of the fragment to a particular work by Theophrastus is a stimulating issue, since what is at stake here is whether our

⁷¹ I am aware that this is a considerable alteration to the *quam superiores* from Cicero's text. I found this one the most challenging part of the reconstruction. First, οἱ πρὸ αὐτῶν could be ambiguous, as we would end up with: "historiography has been moved, so that it dared to speak more fully and elaborately than the ones before them". – To whom the word "ones" would point? Since in the first clause the occurrence of πρῶτων is nearly certain (all known instances involve it), it becomes difficult to find a proper way to render the *superiores* from the second clause. To translate it simply as τῶν προτέρων is doubtful, as it is practically an equivalent of πρῶτων, whereas Cicero distinguishes *primis* and *superiores* in the sentence in question. We can exclude παλαιός, which chiefly has the connotation of "ancient", "of old", whilst our context indicates that *superiores* are the historians (or writers in general) immediately preceding Herodotus and Thucydides; not necessarily very ancient ones. It is therefore likely that Theophrastus had written ἢ πρότερον, but Cicero changed it into the personal form *superiores*, perhaps on stylistic grounds, determined by the phraseology and line of thought of the whole section in which the reference to Theophrastus appears.

⁷² The first guess in rendering *uberius et ornatus* would be περιττότερον καὶ μείζονι κατασκευῇ. This sounds quite different to the Greek compound wherever we find it in the context of language. The form of the words is either adverbial or adjectival (see nn. 61–63 above). We can propose e.g. περιττῶς μᾶλλον καὶ ἐγκατασκευέως, but then the structure of the clause becomes problematic.

⁷³ See the passages quoted in notes 27–32 above.

testimony in Cicero could be the sole extant piece of Theophrastus' sadly lost treatise on historiography (Περὶ ἱστορίας). Up until now, the vast majority of scholars preferred the ascription to the Περὶ λέξεως⁷⁴, but the attribution to the Περὶ ἱστορίας has never been either convincingly proved nor refuted⁷⁵. If we were able to establish with absolute certainty that Theophrastus used the verb κινεῖν (not, e.g. μεταβάλλειν, which is less probable, yet not excluded), we could enquire into the implications of that use, which would be potentially relevant to the attribution of our fragment. But, as I endeavoured to make clear right from the outset, in the field of fragments certainty is the exception rather than the rule. Thus, given the current state of our knowledge about the fragment, we have to resist the temptation to put forward a new hypothesis concerning its provenance.

To sum up, I hope this study to be a significant contribution to our knowledge about the Theophrastean fragment concerning Herodotus and Thucydides. Moreover, the first part of the paper should prove valuable not only when it comes to Cicero's treatment of Theophrastus, but also to our understanding of Cicero's other quotations with the UAF. To conclude, I believe that the methods applied in this paper to the problem of Cicero's translation of Theophrastus can be further developed, perfected, and employed in other fragmentary texts.

University of Wrocław

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABBOTT, OLDFATHER, CANTER 1964: K.M. ABBOTT, W.A. OLDFATHER, H.V. CANTER, *Index verborum in Ciceronis rhetorica, necnon incerti auctoris libros ad Herennium*, Urbana 1964.
- ANNAS, WOOLF 2001: Cicero, *On Moral Ends*, ed. by J. ANNAS, transl. by R. WOOLF, Cambridge 2001.
- ARMLEDER 1957: P.J. ARMLEDER, *Quotation in Cicero's Letters*, Cincinnati 1957.
- 1959a: P.J. ARMLEDER, *Cicero's Quotation Accuracy in his Letters*, CB XXXV 1959, pp. 39 f.
- 1959b: P. J. ARMLEDER, *Cicero's Methods of Quoting*, CB XXXVI 1959, p. 20.

⁷⁴ FORTENBAUGH 2005a: 320. Similarly AVENARIUS 1956: 172; PETZOLD 1999: 263 (“vielleicht”). The only explicit references to Theophrastus' Περὶ λέξεως are two, both by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De comp. verb.* 16 = 688 FHS&G and *Lys.* 14 = 692 FHS&G. It appears in the second of Diogenes Laertius' lists at V 47. FORTENBAUGH (2002) argues that its contents referred to poetry, oratory and history. It would comprise the technicalities of Greek writing, encompassing all genres of literature. On this work, see also STROUX 1912: 1–9; KENNEDY 1963: 274–278; FORTENBAUGH 2005a: 120–124 and 2005b: 51. However, SCHENKEVELD (1998: 79 f.) rightly stresses the fact that the only authors to mention this title as a work by Theophrastus are Diogenes and Dionysius, and that without Dionysius' quotation we could even attribute a logical content to this work, as we would have to draw an analogy with Eudemus. The latter used the same title for a work on logic (cf. FORTENBAUGH 2005a: 122 f.).

⁷⁵ Admitted also by FORTENBAUGH (2005a: 320): “I see no way to rule out this alternative”. Recently MEISSNER (2010: 181 f.) treated the fragment from Cic. *Or.* 39 as if it had been derived from the Περὶ ἱστορίας, but he did not adduce any argument for such attribution.

- ATKINS 1952: J.W.H. ATKINS, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity. A Sketch of its Development*, vol. II: *Graeco-Roman*, London 1952.
- AUJAC 1978: Denys d'Halicarnasse, *Opuscules rhétoriques*, vol. I: *Les orateurs antiques*, texte établi et traduit par G. AUJAC, Paris 1978.
- 1988: Denys d'Halicarnasse, *Opuscules rhétoriques*, vol. II: *Démosthène*, texte établi et traduit par G. AUJAC, Paris 1988.
- AVENARIUS 1956: G. AVENARIUS, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*, Meisenheim am Glan 1956.
- BALDWIN 1992: B. BALDWIN, *Greek in Cicero's Letters*, AClass XXXV 1992, pp. 1–17.
- BEHRENDT 2013: A. BEHRENDT, *Mit Zitaten kommunizieren: Untersuchungen zur Zitierweise in der Korrespondenz des Marcus Tullius Cicero*, Rahden/Westf. 2013 (Litora Classica 6).
- BETT 1997: R. BETT, *Sextus Empiricus, Against the Ethicists (Adversus mathematicos XI)*. Translation, commentary, and introduction, Oxford 1997 (Clarendon Later Ancient Philosophers).
- BUTLER 1920: *The Institutio oratoria of Quintilian*, with an English translation by H.E. BUTLER, vol. I, London–New York 1920.
- CLAVEL 1868: V.-E. CLAVEL, *De M. T. Cicerone Graecorum interprete*, Paris 1868.
- COURBAUD 1927–1950: Cicéron, *De l'orateur, livres I–II*. Texte établi et traduit par E. COURBAUD, Paris 1927–1950; *Livre III*. Texte établi par H. BORNECQUE et traduit par E. COURBAUD et H. BORNECQUE, Paris 1956 (2nd edn.).
- DECLIVA CAIZZI 1992: F. DECLIVA CAIZZI, *Il libro IX delle "Vite die filosofi" di Diogene Laerzio*, *ANRW* II 36, 6 (1992), pp. 4218–4240.
- DORANDI 1992: T. DORANDI, *Il quarto libro dell "Vite" di Diogene Laerzio: l'Academia da Speusippo a Clitomaco*, *ANRW* II 36, 5 (1992), pp. 3761–3792.
- DUECK 2009: D. DUECK, *Poetic Quotations in Latin Prose Works of Philosophy*, *Hermes* CXXXVII 2009, pp. 314–334.
- ERNESTI 1795: J.C.G. ERNESTI, *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae*, Leipzig 1795 (imprint Hildesheim 1962).
- ERNOUT 1954: A. ERNOUT, *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*, Paris 1954.
- FANTHAM 1988: E. FANTHAM, *Varietas and Satietas: De oratore 3.96–103 and the Limits of Ornatus*, *Rhetorica* VI 1988, 275–290.
- FLASHAR 1983: H. FLASHAR, *Aristoteles*, in: IDEM (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*, vol. III: *Ältere Akademie, Aristoteles – Peripatos*, Basel–Stuttgart 1983, pp. 175–457.
- FORTENBAUGH 2002: W.W. FORTENBAUGH, *What was Included in a Peripatetic Treatise peri lekseos?*, in: B. AMDEN et al. (eds.), *Noctes Atticae. 34 Articles on Graeco-Roman Antiquity and its Nachleben. Studies Presented to Jørgen Mejer on his Sixtieth Birthday March 18, 2002*, Copenhagen 2002, pp. 93–102.
- 2005a: W.W. FORTENBAUGH, *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary*, vol. 8: *Sources on Rhetoric and Poetics (Texts 666–713)*, Leiden–Boston 2005 (Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy 97).
- 2005b: W.W. FORTENBAUGH, *Cicero as a Reporter of Aristotelian and Theophrastean Rhetorical Doctrine*, *Rhetorica* XXIII 2005, pp. 37–64.
- FOWLER 1913: Plato, with an English translation by H.N. FOWLER and introduction by W.R.M. LAMB, vol. I: *Eutyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*, London–New York 1913.
- FREESE 1926: Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, with an English translation by J.H. FREESE, Cambridge, MA.–London 1926.
- GIGON 1970: Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Gespräche in Tusculum*. Lateinisch-deutsch mit ausführlichen Anmerkungen herausgegeben von O. GIGON, 2nd edn., München 1970.
- GIOVANNELLI-JOUANNA 2007: P. GIOVANNELLI-JOUANNA, *Les fragments de Douris de Samos chez Athénée*, in: D. LENFANT (ed.), *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens*, Paris 2007, pp. 215–237.
- GLUCKER 2012: *Cicero's Remarks on Translating Philosophical Terms – Some General Problems*, in: idem, J. GLUCKER, C. BURNETT (eds.), *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*, London–Turin 2012, pp. 37–96 (Warburg Institute Colloquia 18).

- GRUBE 1952: G.M.A. GRUBE, *Theophrastus as a Literary Critic*, TAPhA LXXXIII 1952, pp. 172–183.
- HENDRICKSON, HUBBELL 1962: Cicero, *Brutus* with an English translation by G.L. HENDRICKSON, *Orator* with an English translation by H. M. HUBBELL, Cambridge, MA.–London 1962 (revised and reprinted from 1st edn. 1939; Loeb Classical Library 342).
- HOWIND 1921: E. HOWIND, *De ratione citandi in Ciceronis Plutarci Senecae Novi Testamenti scriptis obvia*, Marburg 1921.
- INNES 1985: D.C. INNES, *Theophrastus and the Theory of Style*, in: W.W. FORTENBAUGH *et al.* (eds.), *Theophrastus of Eresus. On His Life and Work*, New Brunswick–Oxford 1985, pp. 251–267.
- KENNEDY 1957: G.A. KENNEDY, *Theophrastus and Stylistic Distinctions*, HSCPh LXII 1957, pp. 93–104.
- 1963: G.A. KENNEDY, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, London 1963.
- 1972: G.A. KENNEDY, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.–A.D.300*, New Jersey 1972.
- KRANZ, DIELS 1937: W. KRANZ, H. DIELS (eds.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin 1937.
- KROLL 1913: M. Tullii Ciceronis *Orator*, als Ersatz der Ausgabe von O. JAHN, erklärt von W. KROLL, Berlin 1913.
- KUMANIECKI 1969: M. Tullius Cicero, *De oratore*, ed. K. KUMANIECKI, Leipzig 1969.
- LANZILLOTTA 2013: E. LANZILLOTTA, *2002-2012: Dieci anni di ricerca sulla storiografia greca frammentaria*, in: F. GAZZANO, G. OTTONE (eds.), *Le età della trasmissione. Alessandria, Roma, Bisanzio. Atti delle giornate di studio sulla storiografia greca frammentaria, Genova, 29–30 maggio 2012, Tivoli (Roma) 2013*, pp. XIII–XXI (Themata 15).
- LAURENTI 1987: R. LAURENTI (ed.), *Aristotele, I frammenti di dialoghi*, vol. I, Napoli 1987 (Filosofi Antichi 8).
- LAUSBERG 1990: H. LAUSBERG, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, 3rd edn., Stuttgart 1990.
- LENFANT 1999: D. LENFANT, *Peut-on se fier aux “fragments” d’historiens? L’exemple des citations d’Hérodote*, *Ktèma* XXIV 1999, pp. 103–121.
- 2013: D. LENFANT, *The Study of Intermediate Authors and its Role in the Interpretation of Historical Fragments*, *AncSoc* XLIII 2013, pp. 289–305.
- LONG 1986: A.A. LONG, *Diogenes Laertius, Life of Arcesilaus*, *Elenchos* VII 1986, pp. 429–449.
- MANKIN 2011: Cicero, *De oratore*, Book III, ed. by D. MANKIN, Cambridge 2011.
- MARCOVICH 1999: Diogenis Laertii *Vitae philosophorum*, vol.: *Libri I–X*, ed. M. MARCOVICH, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1999 (Bibliotheca Teubneriana).
- MAYER 1910: Theophrasti *Peri lekseos libri fragmenta collegit disposuit prolegomenis instruxit* A. MAYER, Lipsiae 1910.
- MCCALL 1980: J.F. MCCALL, *The Syntax of Cicero’s Greek in his Letters*, Albany–New York 1980.
- MEISSNER 2010: B. MEISSNER, *Peri historias: Über Probleme antiker Geschichtstheorie*, in: T. BRÜGGEMANN *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Hellenistica et Historiographica. Festschrift für Andreas Mehl*, Gutenberg 2010, pp. 179–202.
- MERGUET 1877: H. MERGUET, *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero. Mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen*, vol. I, Jena 1877.
- 1882: H. MERGUET, *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero. Mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen*, vol. III, Jena 1882.
- 1887: H. MERGUET, *Lexikon zu den Schriften Cicero’s. Mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. Zweiter Teil: Lexikon zu den philosophischen Schriften*, vol. I, Jena 1887.
- 1892: H. MERGUET, *Lexikon zu den Schriften Cicero’s. Mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. Zweiter Teil: Lexikon zu den philosophischen Schriften*, vol. II, Jena 1892.
- MURRAY 1919: Homer, *Odyssey*, vols. I–II, with an English translation by A.T. MURRAY, revised by G.E. DIMOCK, Cambridge, MA.–London 1919.
- NARDUCCI 2002: E. NARDUCCI, *Orator and the Definition of the Ideal Orator*, in: J.M. MAY (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden 2002, pp. 427–443.

- PAVANO 1958: G. PAVANO (ed.), Dionisio d'Alicarnasso, *Saggio su Tucidide*. Introduzione, testo, traduzione, commento, appendice e indici, Palermo 1958.
- PETZOLD 1999: K.-E. PETZOLD, *Cicero und Historie*, in: IDEM, *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtsschreibung. Kleine Schriften zur griechischen und römischen Geschichte*, Stuttgart 1999, pp. 86–109.
- PEZZOLI, CURNIS 2012: F. PEZZOLI, M. CURNIS (eds.), Aristotele, *La politica. Libro II*, Roma 2012.
- POWELL 1995: G.F. POWELL, *Cicero's Translations from Greek*, in: IDEM (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*, Oxford 1995, pp. 115–143.
- RACKHAM 1944: Aristotle, *Politics*, with an English translation by H. RACKHAM, Cambridge, MA.–London 1944.
- ROSE 1921: H.J. ROSE, *The Greek of Cicero*, JHS XLI 1921, pp. 91–116.
- RUSSELL 1981: D.A. RUSSELL, *Criticism in Antiquity*, London 1981.
- SABBADINI 1916: R. SABBADINI, *La composizione dell' "Orator" Ciceroniano*, RF XLIV 1916, pp. 1–22.
- SANDYS 1885: M. Tulli Ciceronis *Ad Marcum Brutum orator*, a revised text with introductory essays and critical and explanatory notes by J.E. SANDYS, Cambridge 1885.
- SCHENKEVELD 1964: D. SCHENKEVELD, *Studies in Demetrius On Style*, Amsterdam 1964.
- 1998: D.M. SCHENKEVELD, *Theophrastus' Rhetorical Works: One Rhetorical Fragment the Less, One Logical Fragment the More*, in: J.M. VAN OPHUIJSEN, M. VAN RAALTE (eds.), *Theophrastus. Reappraising the Sources*, New Brunswick–London 1998, pp. 67–80.
- SCHLITTENBAUER 1903: S. SCHLITTENBAUER, *Die Tendenz von Ciceros Orator*, Jahrbücher für Philologie, Suppl. XXVIII 1903, pp. 181–248.
- SHACKLETON-BAILEY 1962: D.R. SHACKLETON-BAILEY, *L.S.J. and Cicero's Letters*, CQ XII 1962, pp. 159–165.
- 1963: D.R. SHACKLETON-BAILEY, *L.S.J. and Cicero's Letters*, CQ XIII 1963, p. 88.
- 1965–1970: D.R. SHACKLETON-BAILEY, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, Cambridge 1965–1970 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 3–9).
- SHALEV 2006: D. SHALEV, *The Role of εὐρήματα in the "Lives" of Diogenes Laertius, and Related Literature*, Hermes CXXXIV 2006, pp. 309–337.
- SKUTSCH 1960: O. SKUTSCH, *Quotations in Cicero*, RCCM II 1960, pp. 195–198.
- SLINGS 2003: Plato, *Respublica*, edidit S.R. SLINGS, Oxford 2003 (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis).
- SOLMSEN 1931: F. SOLMSEN, *Demetrius ΤΕΠΙΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ und sein Peripatetisches Quellenmaterial*, Hermes LXVI 1931, s. 211–267.
- SPINELLI 1995: E. SPINELLI, *Sesto Empirico, Contro gli etici*, introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commento, Napoli 1995 (Elenchos XXIV).
- STAHLBRECHER 1957: W. STAHLBRECHER, *Die Dichterzitate in Ciceros Korrespondenz*, Hamburg 1957.
- STEELE 1900: R.B. STEELE, *The Greek in Cicero's Epistles*, AJPh XXI 1900, pp. 387–410.
- STROUX 1912: I. STROUX, *De Theophrasti virtutibus*, Lipsiae 1912.
- TISCHER 1884: G. TISCHER, *Tusculanarum disputationum libri quinque*, Berlin 1884.
- UNTERSTEINER 1967: M. UNTERSTEINER, *I sofisti*, Milano 1967.
- WESTMAN 1980: M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 5: *Orator*, edidit R. WESTMAN, Lipsiae 1980.
- WILKINS 1892: M. Tulli Ciceronis *de Oratore libri tres*, with introduction and notes by A.S. WILKINS, Oxford 1892.
- WOOTEN 1994: C. WOOTEN, *The Peripatetic Tradition in the Literary Essays of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, in: W.W. FORTENBAUGH, D.C. MIRHADY (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric After Aristotle*, New Brunswick–London 1994, pp. 121–130 (Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities).
- YON 1958: A. YON, *Sur la composition de l'Orator de Cicéron*, BAGB XVII 1958, pp. 70–84.
- 1964: Cicéron, *L'Orateur. Du meilleur genre d'orateurs*, texte établi et traduit par A. YON, Paris 1964.

ZAWADZKI 2011: K. ZAWADZKI, *Ciceros Zitierungstechnik in der Schrift De natura deorum. Eine exemplarische Untersuchung anhand des Abschnittes 1, 25–27*, München 2011.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE ALEXANDRIAN LIBRARY

by

GJERT VESTRHEIM

ABSTRACT: The Alexandrian library of the Ptolemies was destroyed by fire during the war with Caesar in 48 BC. No other destruction is mentioned in ancient sources and theories about later destructions must be rejected. The story about the transferral of the Pergamene library to Alexandria must also be rejected. The evidence for a second, smaller library is late and unreliable; it also should be rejected. The notion that there was a library in the Serapeum appears to be a Christian elaboration of a Jewish legend. The ephrasis of Aphthonius, which is frequently cited to support it, can more plausibly be read as a description of another sanctuary.

Ancient sources mention only one destruction of the Alexandrian library, when the palace area was damaged by fire in 48 BC, and there is no firm evidence for the continued existence of the library after this time. It has been generally assumed that the Serapeum of Alexandria also contained a library, a so-called “daughter library”, and that this may have survived into late antiquity. The idea that it was destroyed by Christians in 391 originates from Edward GIBBON, but while the destruction of the temple at this time is well attested, our sources for the event do not mention a library. A re-examination of the sources for the daughter library leads to the conclusion that this library never existed, and that the notion of the Serapeum library probably originated as a Christian elaboration of a Jewish legend. This conclusion is supported by archeological evidence: the Serapeum did not contain rooms suitable for a library.

THE FIRE OF 48 BC

The library fire of 48 BC is mentioned by several authors: Seneca (*Tranq.* 9, 4–5), Plutarch (*Caes.* 49, 6), Aulus Gellius (VII 17), Cassius Dio (XLII 38, 2), Ammianus Marcellinus (XXII 16, 13) and Orosius (VI 15, 31). Except for Ammianus, who mistakenly places the library in the Serapeum, there is no disagreement between the sources about the basic facts. Before withdrawing with his men to Pharos, Caesar set fire to the Egyptian fleet. The fire spread from the harbour and destroyed the library, which was close by. No ancient source claims

that this version of events is wrong¹, or testifies to the continued existence of the great library after this date, and the fire has been accepted as fact by most historians, including GIBBON, NIEBUHR, MOMMSEN, SUSEMIHL, BUTLER, FRASER, BLUM and EL-ABBADI².

Strabo, in his description of Alexandria, confirms the continued existence of the Museum in the 20's BC, but does not mention the library (XVII 1, 8). The Museum remained in existence until the 5th century, and this institution would surely have been pointless without some kind of library; the destruction of the library under Caesar must therefore in some way have been compensated for. Alexandria remained an intellectual centre throughout antiquity and must have held substantial libraries. Suetonius mentions an extension to the Museum in the time of Claudius (*Cl.* 42) and that, after a library fire in Rome in the time of Domitian, new copies of texts which had been lost were sought in Alexandria (*Dom.* 20)³. In the time of Caligula, Philo tells us that the sanctuary of the Caesareum, established by Cleopatra, also contained a library (*Leg.* 151; see discussion below).

Nevertheless, Strabo also confirms that the library resources in Alexandria were much reduced in his own time compared to what they once had been: in II 1, 5 he notes that Eratosthenes (d. 194 BC) had sources at his command which were now lost, and that there must have been many of them "if his library was as large as Hipparchus says it was".

Following GIBBON, many scholars have accepted that the loss of the library was compensated for by Mark Antony's gift of 200,000 scrolls from the library at Pergamon. This gift, however, is only reported by a single source, namely Plutarch (*Ant.* 58, 5–59, 1), and not as a fact but as slander which was not believed⁴. Antony's gift was clearly not known to Strabo, who wrote in Alexandria

¹ Two sources mention the fire but not the library: Caesar's *Bellum Civile* (III 111) and the poetic account by Lucan (X 485–505).

² GIBBON 1777–1788: ch. 28, n. 47; NIEBUHR 1846–1848: vol. III, 64 and NIEBUHR 1849: vol. III, 66 (these are both based on lecture notes made by his students and published after NIEBUHR's death); MOMMSEN 1854–1856: vol. III, 409 and 478; SUSEMIHL 1891–1892: vol. I, 344; BUTLER 1902: 410; BEVAN 1910–1911: vol. XIII, 239; FRASER 1972: vol. II, 335; BLUM 1991: 99; EL-ABBADI 1990: 154. CANFORA (1989: 138), on the other hand, argues that since the Museum continued to exist as an institution, its buildings (including the library) cannot have been burned down in 48 BC. Therefore, he claims, the 40,000 scrolls destroyed in the fire were only "a tiny part of the vast collection" (p. 144).

³ Furthermore, Ti. Claudius Balbillus, who was *praefectus Aegypti* 55–59 AD, is mentioned in an inscription from Ephesus as head of the Museum and library, "et supra Museum at ab Alexandrina bybliothece", *RE Suppl.* V (1931), coll. 59 f.

⁴ GIBBON 1777–1788: ch. 28, n. 47. Contrary to his usual habit, GIBBON gives no reference for the story but instead places it where the reference ought to have been, in a footnote. This suggests that he was aware of the weakness of the evidence. FRASER (1972: vol. I, 494) notes the lack of evidence, but also that the gift has been generally accepted as fact. CASSON (2001: 46) seems sceptical, but accepts the story as evidence that the library was still in existence in the time of Antony and

twenty years after it was supposedly made and who, as has already been noted, complained about the loss of many texts that had previously been there. On the contrary, in his description of Pergamon (XIII 4, 2), Strabo writes that Eumenes and his brother “expanded the town [...] with temples and libraries and made Pergamon into what it is now”. In other words he did not know of any depletion of its library, and he surely would have known if the story of Antony’s gift had been true.

THE DESTRUCTION OF AD 391

Although there is ample evidence for the destruction of the Serapeum in 391, none of the sources mention books or a library. Concerning the Christian sources⁵, this can be explained as embarrassment, but two pagan sources are equally silent: the contemporary Eunapius, whose *Life of Antoninus* includes a prophecy of the destruction of the temple which at the time of writing had been fulfilled (*VS* 471–472), and the historian Zosimus a hundred years later, whose *Historia nova* is based on the lost *History* by the same Eunapius.

Nevertheless, GIBBON claims that on this occasion “the valuable library of Alexandria was pillaged or destroyed”, and this view has since been accepted by many scholars, including DZIATZKO, who wrote the article on libraries in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie* and thereby gave it the stamp of authority for generations to come⁶, yet the only source GIBBON cites, Orosius VI 15, 31–32, does not mention the Serapeum at all⁷. Orosius’ subject is Caesar and the burning of the library in 48 BC, but he digresses to note, with regret, that he has seen temples where bookcases had been emptied by his fellow Christians in his own time. This suggests, not very surprisingly, that the closing of pagan temples could easily end in wholesale plunder, but Orosius does not say which temples he has in mind and he can hardly be speaking about the Serapeum, since a good contemporary source confirms that if there ever had been a library there, it was gone long before 391.

Cleopatra. BLANCK (1992: 147 f.) points to Plutarch’s own disbelief and rejects the story as an evil legend. HANDIS (2013: 371) rejects it, without argument, as “obviously false”.

⁵ Rufinus II 23–30; Socrates Scholasticus V 16; Sozomen VII 15; Theodoret V 22; John of Nikiou LXXVII 45 and LXXXIII 38.

⁶ DZIATZKO 1897: 411. Among its recent proponents are GRIFFIN 1996: 69; EMPEREUR 1998: 96; DELLA 1992: 1463–1465; EL-ABBADI 1990: 167 and 2008: 93. This is also the view promoted by UNESCO and the Bibliotheca Alexandrina: EL-ABBADI 1990 bears the imprint of the former, while EL-ABBADI 2008 has a foreword by the director of the latter. HANDIS (2013: 373) leaves the question open as to whether the Alexandrian library was “destroyed with the Serapeum library in 391”, i.e. he seems to take the destruction of the Serapeum library in 391 as fact. According to CANFORA (1989: 87 and 195), the great library in the palace district survived until the time of Aurelian, while the Serapeum library was destroyed in 391 (pp. 87 and 192). CANFORA also claims that the “outside” Serapeum library is mentioned by Strabo (p. 137), but it is not.

⁷ Orosius is quoted in GIBBON 1777–1788: ch. 28, n. 53.

This source is the pagan historian Ammianus Marcellinus, a major source for the period and an author whom GIBBON both knew and admired, but whose evidence on this matter he nevertheless ignores. In his account of the rule of Julian, Ammianus gives a description of Alexandria and of the Serapeum. This description apparently antedates its destruction. After praising the grandeur of its stoas and statues in the present tense, Ammianus concludes by stating that the Serapeum had once contained the library of the Ptolemies, but that this had been destroyed by fire in the time of Caesar (XXII 16, 13).

Ammianus is clearly wrong about the fire: the Serapeum was at the other end of the town from the harbour where the fire took place, and we know from archaeological evidence that the Ptolemaic buildings survived into the 2nd century AD. Yet Ammianus is a reliable witness to his own time, with first-hand knowledge of Egypt, and there seems little reason to doubt what he incidentally tells us: in the second half of the 4th century there was no library worth mentioning in the Serapeum, and if there ever had been one, it was presumably long gone, since Ammianus had no reliable information about its demise.

THE SERAPEUM LIBRARY: THE EVIDENCE FROM APHTHONIUS

On the other hand, Ammianus' mistake about the whereabouts of the library burned by Caesar might suggest that at some time there had also been a library in the Serapeum. This suspicion seems to be strengthened by other sources. One of them identifies the Serapeum library as a smaller, "daughter" library established by the Ptolemies in addition to the main library, and this has been accepted by many scholars. Nevertheless, on closer inspection the sources for this library turn out to be of little historical value.

Most of these sources are Christian, while none of them had first hand knowledge of Alexandria, and, as I will argue below, their reports about books in the Serapeum are probably elaborations on the Jewish legend about the translation of the Septuagint known from the *Letter of Aristeas*. Only one pagan source, namely Ammianus, explicitly mentions a Serapeum library, but he reports that the library was destroyed four hundred years before his time. Another pagan source from the 4th century, the rhetor Aphthonius, is apparently saying the opposite; but, as I will argue, Aphthonius is not speaking about the Serapeum at all. I shall first discuss the evidence from Aphthonius and afterwards that from the Christian authors, before turning to the archaeological evidence.

Aphthonius was a pupil of Libanius (315–393) and therefore must have been his junior, although possibly only by a few years. His *Progymnasmata* includes an ephrasis of "the acropolis of Alexandria" which also mentions a library (12):

παρωκοδόμηται δὲ σηκοὶ τῶν στοῶν ἔνδοθεν, οἱ μὲν ταμεῖα γεγεννημένοι
ταῖς βίβλοις, τοῖς φιλοπονοῦσιν ἀνεωγμένοι φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ πόλιν ἅπασαν εἰς

ἔξουσίαν τῆς σοφίας ἐπαίροντες, οἳ δὲ τοὺς πάλαι τιμᾶν ἰδρυμένοι θεούς.

Chambers are built within the colonnades. Some are repositories for the books, open to those who are diligent in philosophy and stirring up the whole city to mastery of wisdom. Others are established in honour of the ancient gods.

(transl. by M. HEATH)⁸

SANDYS, BUTLER, ROWE, FRASER and others⁹ have accepted this as evidence for the existence of a Serapeum library in the 4th century, but there are good reasons to doubt their identification of the “acropolis” as the Serapeum. This identification is by no means obvious, since no other ancient source confirms the use of this name, and although the Serapeum was built on a hill, it was not the only hill in the town¹⁰. Furthermore, important details from Aphthonius’ description do not fit the Serapeum, but instead point to another important Alexandrian sanctuary: the Caesareum.

Large parts of the Serapeum have been excavated and the plan of the sanctuary can be reliably reconstructed. It consisted of various buildings in a large oblong courtyard surrounded by colonnades. After a rebuilding around 200 AD it had one entrance on the eastern side and one in the northeastern corner, at the end of one of the city’s main north-south streets. The temple was rebuilt in its original position, in the northern part of the courtyard, facing south. It appears that two older buildings were retained; they both antedated the monumental temple and colonnades of Ptolemy III and were presumably the original cult buildings. Behind the colonnades to the west and south were rows of small rooms; these were retained after the rebuilding. In 294 Diocletian added the monumental column which still stands. This was placed immediately inside the eastern entrance to the sanctuary¹¹.

⁸ HEATH’s translation of Aphthonius’ *Progymnasmata* is accessible online at <http://www.rhetcomp.gsu.edu/~gpullman/2150/Aphthonius%20Progymnasmata.htm> (retrieved on 26 January 2016).

⁹ SANDYS 1903–1908: vol. I, 107; BUTLER 1902: 382; ROWE 1946: 26, referred by FRASER 1972: vol. II, 479. Also MCKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004: 104 f. EL-ABBADI (2008: 91, repeated from 1990: 163) oddly claims that Aphthonius “is presenting to his readers an image of the past, as it once had been and was no more at the time he wrote, hence his use of the imperfect tense and the past participle”. Consequently he translates the passage in the past tense. In fact Aphthonius uses the perfect, which in Greek does not denote past, cf. the translation by HEATH quoted above.

¹⁰ The elevated position of the Serapeum is mentioned by Strabo XVII 1, 10; Clement *Exh.* IV 42; Rufinus II 23; Ammianus XXII 16, 15; Johs. Chrys. *Adv. Iud.* VI 1; and Tertullian *Apol.* 18, 7, but none of them calls it an acropolis. EL-ABBADI (1990: 160 and 2008: 89) claims Polybius V 39 in support of this identification, but Polybius does not mention an akropolis but an *akra*, and there is a prison on this *akra*. This clearly cannot be the Serapeum. From the context it appears that this *akra* is close to the harbour and palaces, the most likely alternatives are Lochias and the later Caesareum. None of the other references given by EL-ABBADI support the identification.

¹¹ MCKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004: 95 f., with reconstruction drawings.

Aphthonius' ephrasis of the "acropolis of Alexandria" does not allow a reconstruction of its layout, but it does give a number of specific details, the most notable of which are as follows. The acropolis lies on a hill. It has two entrances, one by a carriage road and the other by a flight of a hundred steps. Inside there is a square surrounded by stoas with chambers, as quoted above. In the middle stands a tall column visible from land and sea, and on its capital is shown the origins of the world, ἀρχαὶ δὲ τῶν ὄντων. On the square there is also a building with many entrances named after the ancient gods, two obelisks and a spring (κρήνη). One the way down one passes a flat place resembling a stadium and known by this name. Aphthonius also mentions that there is a stadium of the same shape but a different size elsewhere, but he is vague about its whereabouts.

Many of the features mentioned by Aphthonius fit the Serapeum as it is known from excavations, but others do not. The entrances fit his description, as do the "spring" (excavations show a pool just inside the eastern entrance), the tall column and the stoas with chambers behind them. The word "stadium" can also mean hippodrome¹², and there was a hippodrome in the valley to the southwest of the sanctuary. Yet the expression seems odd, and since the Serapeum was surrounded by high walls with no access from the south or west, the hippodrome would at no time be visible to its visitors. This does not fit Aphthonius' description, where the visitor passes by the stadium on his way down. The description of the column as decorated with the ἀρχαὶ δὲ τῶν ὄντων is enigmatic and can hardly be made to fit the still existing monumental column: it has a Corinthian capital, and on top of this there was presumably a statue¹³. Nor is the building with many entrances confirmed by the excavations: the temple had a single cella with only one entrance, the two other buildings apparently also contained only one room each. Libraries are mentioned by other sources, but, for reasons which I will discuss below, their testimony carries little weight in this matter. On the contrary, Aphthonius' contemporary Ammianus is clear that they did not exist in his time and, as I will argue below, these libraries are not supported by the archaeological evidence either. Last but not least: the two obelisks mentioned by Aphthonius have left the archaeologists no visible traces, nor are they mentioned in any literary sources.

One might argue that Aphthonius' description is a rhetorical exercise and need not be correct in every detail, and that it is not necessarily based on first hand knowledge of the site. This is indeed true, but this objection is also valid regarding the single detail that interests us, namely the chambers with books. Another possibility is to consider whether the description fits another sanctuary better, and we do have another alternative, namely the Caesareum.

¹² McKENZIE 2007: 182, referring to Dio Chrysostom 32, 41–43 and 74.

¹³ McKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004: 99.

The Caesareum has never been excavated and today is hidden under modern buildings. However, we do know that it contained two obelisks, which in modern times were known as Cleopatra's needles and in the 19th century were removed to London and New York. These are mentioned by Pliny the Elder (XXXVI 69) and, according to an inscription, they were erected on the site in 13 BC¹⁴. Early photographs confirm that they stood on a plateau ending in a precipice towards the sea. In antiquity the shoreline may have been somewhat further out¹⁵, but Philo's description from ca. AD 40 (*Leg.* 151) confirms that seen from the harbour this plateau with its monumental buildings stood out as the dominating feature on a low seashore.

Like Aphthonius' description, Philo's does not allow a reconstruction of the sanctuary's layout. The context is rhetorical and the description is largely generic: there are porticoes, gateways and courts, pictures and statues, silver and gold. This is what one would expect to find in an important sanctuary; Philo's aim is not to highlight its peculiarities but to emphasise its grandeur. He does not even mention the obelisks, although they were certainly there at the time. Nor does he mention Aphthonius' chambers for the worship of the ancient gods, but the existence of these is confirmed by an inscription¹⁶.

On the other hand, there is nothing in Philo's description that contradicts that of Aphthonius, and the most specific details are in agreement with him: the commanding position, which fits well with Aphthonius' use of the term acropolis, and the libraries, which, unlike statues and porticoes, were not standard features of Greek sanctuaries. Aphthonius' "flat place resembling a stadium" may have belonged to the ruined palatial complex immediately to the east of the Caesareum. A possible parallel would be the "stadium of Domitian" on the Palatine.

In the absence of excavations, the further details of Aphthonius' description cannot be either verified or rejected, but there is nothing about any of them that seems improbable for the Caesareum, except the claim that the acropolis is situated on the highest point in the city. According to MAHMOUD-BEY's map from 1866, the plateau with the obelisks was merely 8 metres above sea level, compared to the Serapeum at 16 metres. However, the Serapeum is not the highest

¹⁴ The sources are discussed by FRASER 1972: vol. I, 24.

¹⁵ The difference will not have been great. MCKENZIE (2007: 2) emphasises that, contrary to a widespread impression, ancient Alexandria has not been submerged by the sea; only the port facilities and some islands are below today's sea level.

¹⁶ H. DESSAU, *ILS* 9059, referred to by MCKENZIE 2007: 177. This inscription from AD 94 states that a dismission order has been erected "in Caesareo magno, escendentium scalas secundas, sub porticum dexteriorem, secus aedem Veneris marmoreae", i.e. "in the great Caesareum, ascending the second stair in the stoa to the right, next to the shrine to the marble Venus". MCKENZIE translates *aedes* as "temple", but the word properly means "a simple edifice, without division into smaller apartments, while templum is a large and splendid structure" (LEWIS & SHORT). Here it seems to mean one of several rooms behind a stoa. This fits perfectly with Aphthonius' description as quoted above.

point either; it lies on an east-west range rising at three other points to 20 metres. In the eastern part of the town there is a large plateau of 16–20 metres, rising in one place to 30 metres. This appears to be the natural high point within the city walls, but this plateau was not a monumental area and certainly cannot be the “acropolis” of Aphthonius¹⁷.

Aphthonius’ claim that the “acropolis” is situated at the highest point of the city is therefore in any case an exaggeration. It must be taken as rhetorical hyperbole, and tellingly it occurs in a passage that is highly rhetorical, with antithesis and polyptoton¹⁸. This claim therefore cannot be used to rule out the Caesareum. On the contrary: the measured differences in height are small, and, as seen from the harbour, no other hill had a dominating position comparable to that of the Caesareum. The other hills all sloped gently towards the sea, and the buildings surrounding their summits will have reduced their visual impact even more. The Caesareum, on the other hand, was unencumbered by surrounding buildings and rose steeply from the shore, exactly as in the beginning of Aphthonius’ description: Ἄκρα τις ἐξανέχει τῆς γῆς (“A rock juts out of the ground”).

In the 350’s the Caesareum was taken over by the Church and a new cathedral was built there. Bishop Athanasius celebrated Easter there in 355, although the building was still not completed and had not yet been dedicated, an action which he afterwards had to defend in a letter to the emperor. Here he admits that the church could not be lawfully dedicated without imperial permission and that no such permission had been received, but explains that he had bowed to popular pressure on the day of the feast itself¹⁹.

Such a take-over of a major sanctuary would inevitably lead to violent clashes, and the banishment of pagan worship from the Caesareum may therefore have been postponed till after the church was completed, presumably during the episcopate of the Arian George of Cappadocia (356–361). Julian (*Ep.* 21, 379a–b) mentions an unnamed sanctuary in whose destruction George took part. This cannot be the Serapeum, which remained intact until 391; the Caesareum consequently seems the most likely alternative. If it still contained a library at the time, George would presumably have taken care to make sure that it was not destroyed, since he was a great collector of pagan books, as Julian himself testifies (*Ep.* 23).

To conclude, the acropolis described by Aphthonius is not the Serapeum but the Caesareum. Therefore his text should presumably be dated to before the Christian

¹⁷ On MAHMOUD-BEY’S map the site of the fortress Kom el-Dikka, in the middle of the ancient town, rises to 30 metres, but this has since been shown by excavations to have been an artificial hill dating from Arab times, built over regular urban blocks.

¹⁸ καλουμένη δὲ δι’ ἀμφοτέρων ἀκρόπολις, οἷς τε εἰς ἄκρον ἐπιείρεται καὶ οἷς ἐν ἄκρῳ τέτακται πόλεως [“called an acropolis on both accounts, both because it is raised up on high and because it is placed in the high-point of the city”, transl. by M. HEATH].

¹⁹ Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.* 14–17.

takeover of the 350's. This, incidentally, means that the date of Aphthonius' birth can be placed with a great degree of certainty: he cannot have been born much later than 330, and since Libanius (b. 316) was his teacher he must have been his junior by some years. As the evidence from Aphthonius must be rejected, the only reference to the Serapeum library in pagan sources is an evidently mistaken aside in Ammianus about the fire of 48 BC. This may have originated from a conflation of two different Ptolemies and their main monuments: the temple and the library. Concerning his own day, Ammianus confirms that there was no such library, and, as we have seen, this is not contradicted by Aphthonius.

THE SERAPEUM LIBRARY: THE CHRISTIAN SOURCES

The sources still to be discussed are all Christian and none of them are very reliable. The earliest (and the first to mention a Serapeum library at all) is Tertullian, who recounts the Jewish story about the translation of the Septuagint under Ptolemy II. This story first occurs in the *Letter of Aristeas* (2nd cent. BC), which Tertullian gives as his source, and it is retold by Philo (*Mos.* II 5–7) and Josephus (*Ant. Iud.* XII 1–15). They all say that the translation was made on the island of Pharos, and, according to Philo, this was still in his day celebrated by an annual feast there. In spite of many details neither Philo, Josephus nor Pseudo-Aristeas mention the Serapeum. Tertullian borrows their story, but gives it a new conclusion (*Apol.* 18, 8):

Hodie apud Serapeum Ptolemaei bibliothecae cum ipsis Hebraicis litteris exhibentur.
Sed et Iudaei palam lectitant.

To this day in the temple of Serapis, Ptolemy's library is displayed together with the Hebrew originals. Why, yes! and the Jews openly read the books.

(transl. by F.H. COLSON [Loeb])

In this context, *Ptolemaei bibliothecae* must presumably refer to the collection of scrolls with the translation made on Ptolemy's order. No books are mentioned except these and their Hebrew originals. Tertullian is thus not claiming that the temple contained a library in the common sense of the word.

Shortly before the destruction of 391, John Chrysostom claims that the translations are still in the temple (*Adv. Iud.* I 6, 1), but his evidence has hardly any independent value – it only confirms that this tradition was passed on among Christian authors. Neither John nor Tertullian had first hand knowledge of Alexandria. Furthermore, their writings are not historical or topographical, but polemical and apologetic, and in such contexts it is not unusual to include facts that have not been properly researched.

Tertullian and John only mention the Septuagint. The first sources to mention a library in the Serapeum are Ammianus, who says that it was destroyed 400

years before his time, and his contemporary Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus (ca. 315–403), who says neither that he himself has seen it nor that it is still there. Epiphanius was born in Palestine and in his youth spent some time as a monk in Egypt. He may have passed through Alexandria on his way, but as a young monk he would hardly have gone sightseeing in pagan temples.

In his book *On Weights and measures* (ch. 9–11), Epiphanius relates the story of the translation of the Septuagint. He confirms that the library established by Ptolemy II was in the Broukheion, i.e. the palace area by the harbour, and says that this part of the town is now desolate before concluding that:

ἔτι δὲ ὕστερον καὶ ἕτερα ἐγένετο βιβλιοθήκη ἐν τῷ Σεραπίῳ μικροτέρα τῆς πρώτης, ἣτις καὶ θυγάτηρ ὠνομάσθη αὐτῆς· ἐν ἣ ἀπετέθησαν αἱ τοῦ Ἀκύλα, καὶ Συμμάχου, καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἑρμηνεῖαι, μετὰ διακοσιοστὸν καὶ πεντηκοστὸν ἔτος.

But there was later also another library in the Serapeum, smaller than the first, which was called its daughter, in which were placed the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the rest, two hundred and fifty years later.

(Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 11, transl. by J.E. DEAN)

This is all rather confusing. The three names belong to translators of the Bible, dated by Epiphanius to the ages respectively of Hadrian, Severus and Commodus, i.e. four or five hundred years after Ptolemy's translation. The simplest explanation would be to date the establishment of the daughter library to 250 years before their time, but this is an odd way of dating the event since their time spans an entire century. Besides, this would place the establishment of the daughter library somewhere under the late Ptolemies, a time of intellectual decline after the expulsion of Aristarchos and others in 145 BC. No other source can confirm such an initiative at this time, and it seems highly improbable.

The place must also have seemed confusing to Epiphanius' Syriac translator, since in his version it has been changed to this (in the translation of the editor, J.E. DEAN):

And there arose in addition to this library a second up in the Serapeum, called its daughter. And the period of the ten Ptolemies and Cleopatra passed away, two hundred fifty-nine years.

The editor adds: "i.e., from the time of the translation of the LXX". This would date the event to the time of Ptolemy I, but excavations confirm that although the cult of Serapis was established by him, the monumental temple precinct with its colonnades was not built until the time of Ptolemy III (246–221), which therefore seems the earliest possible date for a temple library.

Whatever its origin, Epiphanius' information is clearly unreliable. His dating of the event is vague and improbable and is not supported by any other evidence. Presumably his Serapeum library is an elaboration of the story known

from Tertullian, the scrolls of the Septuagint having been magnified into a whole library, and there is little reason to trust Tertullian's story either. It hardly seems credible that the sacred books of the Jews should be given a place of honour in the temple of an Egyptian god, in the Egyptian part of town. It seems even less credible that they should have been given such a place of honour after the rebuilding of the temple precinct ca. AD 200. The temple had been violated during the Jewish uprising of AD 115 and for a long time after the Jews hardly played any part in the life of the town, while the Christians were a loathed and occasionally persecuted sect.

Epiphanius is our earliest source to claim that the Ptolemies established two libraries, one large and one small, but he does not claim that they still existed in his own day. The only other source mentioning two libraries is John Tzetzes (12th century), who, in his *Prolegomena to Aristophanes*, says that Ptolemy II established two libraries, an outer library of 42,800 scrolls and an inner library of 400,000 "mixed" (συνμυγείς) and 90,000 "unmixed" (ἀμυγείς) scrolls. Tzetzes also knows the story of the translation of the Septuagint, but he does not mention the Serapeum.

The story of the Septuagint in the Serapeum seems to be a Christian elaboration of Jewish traditions. It is certainly conspicuous that this story is not mentioned by Pseudo-Aristeas, Philo, Josephus or any other Jewish source. It is also absent from the Alexandrian theologians Clement and Origen. It is known only from Christian authors, and among them only from authors who (with the possible exception of Epiphanius) had not themselves been to Alexandria. Its historical basis is presumably nothing more than that the Ptolemy responsible for the Septuagint was identified with the Ptolemy who built the Serapeum and the one who established the library.

The idea that there had in fact been two libraries may have been strengthened by the widely diverging numbers given for the size of the library in different sources, some of them differing by tens of thousands (Seneca 40,000, Epiphanius 54,800, Isidore [*Etym.* VI 3, 3] 70,000), some by hundreds of thousands (Orosius 400,000, Pseudo-Aristeas 500,000, Aulus Gellius and Ammianus 700,000): two different libraries could explain two widely diverging numbers. However, the ratio of 1:10 between these numbers strongly suggests that they are better explained as scribal errors, *quadraginta* being changed to *quadringenta* etc., and such errors are in fact demonstrated by the tradition of Orosius and Gellius, where some manuscripts have the more modest numbers 40,000 and 70,000.

These numbers are all untrustworthy, but those in tens of thousands must be closer to the truth. Roger S. BAGNALL has estimated the size of the library as follows: we know by name 625 Greek authors with a presumed birthdate before 200 BC. If on average their output filled 50 scrolls (a high estimate), the total would be 31,250 scrolls. The high numbers thus would only be possible if the library contained a dozen copies of each text, or if 90% of the authors are unknown to us

even by name²⁰. Admittedly the editions of Homer and other classics demanded several copies of each text, but this only concerned a small part of the collection and therefore does not affect BAGNALL'S conclusion. The numbers in hundreds of thousands are fantastically high. In spite of this, BAGNALL notes, they have been generally accepted²¹.

The tradition about two libraries, the smaller of them in the Serapeum, has also been generally accepted and supported by authorities such as FRASER and PFEIFFER²². Nevertheless, it turns out that the evidence for this is weak and contradicted by other, better evidence. The "daughter library" was presumably invented, by Epiphanius or others, to account for the two different traditions about the location of the library (the Serapeum and the palace area). Although there were undoubtedly libraries in Alexandria other than the one burned in 48 BC, neither the "daughter library" nor the Serapeum library can be accepted as fact.

THE SERAPEUM EXCAVATIONS

This conclusion is supported by archaeological excavations which show that the Serapeum hardly contained any rooms suitable for a library. As previously mentioned, the sanctuary consisted of a large oblong courtyard surrounded on all four sides by colonnades. The colonnades were built by Ptolemy III (246–221) surrounding two earlier Ptolemaic buildings. These two, known as the T-shaped building and the South building, antedated the monumental temple and must have played an important part in the cult; the South building may have been the original temple. The two were connected by an underground passage reached by a large stairwell in the T-shaped building. Ptolemy III also built the Temple of Serapis and presumably the so-called Stoa-like Structure next to it, while Ptolemy IV added a small Temple of Harpocrates. These three buildings were destroyed in the Roman rebuilding ca. AD 200 to make way for a new and larger Temple of Serapis, while the two older buildings were apparently retained.

With the possible exception of the Stoa-like Structure, all these were cult buildings. The function of the Stoa-like Structure is uncertain, but its plan (four

²⁰ BAGNALL 2002: 353.

²¹ E.g. by PFEIFFER 1968: 102. He points out that the numbers in the manuscript tradition are frequently unreliable, but that the sources nevertheless agree that "hundreds of thousands of papyrus rolls were stored there during the first half of the third century B.C.". CASSON (2001: 36) reports Tzetzes' numbers as fact, without giving his source. So does ROLFE (1940) in his note to Ammianus XXII 16, 13; DZIATZKO 1897: 410; and SUSEMIHL 1891–1892: vol. I, 342. BAGNALL (2002: 354) names only a single doubter before himself, namely BLUM 1991: 107.

²² FRASER 1972: vol. II, 478: "Since the archaeological evidence is reconcilable with its having been there (see below) we should accept the literary evidence which states that it was at the Serapeum". PFEIFFER (1968: 101 f.) too accepts the daughter library as fact and discusses by whom it was established.

small rooms) and its place in the middle of a public and presumably noisy square would hardly be suitable for the library. The excavator Alan ROWE suggested that it was the Temple of Isis²³. In any event it was destroyed in the Roman rebuilding and not substituted by any later building.

Apart from the buildings on the square, the only closed rooms in the complex were a series of small rooms behind the colonnades to the south and west. The rooms to the south are on a lower level than the rest of the sanctuary and are marked on ROWE's map as "probably rooms for library, etc."²⁴. FRASER, more cautiously, notes that "it is not impossible that it was the 'daughter library' of the Serapeum referred to by later writers"²⁵.

In the opinion of MCKENZIE *et al.* these basement rooms would not have been used to store books in the Roman period, because of the danger from the two Roman-period fireplaces with channels for conducting heated air. Instead they reconstruct a similar row of rooms on the level above, each room with direct access from the colonnade, and suggest that these rooms contained books: "Thus, in the Roman phase books could still have been housed in the rooms along the west side of the court, and possibly in the upper rooms along the south side"²⁶.

This identification rests on no archaeological evidence, but only on the written sources which I have discussed and rejected above. To me it seems highly improbable: this structure does not resemble any other known Greek or Roman library, and it would hardly have suited the purpose. There is no sign here of the large main hall which is a standard feature of the many libraries preserved from the imperial age: the Celsus library of Ephesos, the Rogatinus library of Timgad, the Pantainos library of Athens, the Asklepieion library of Pergamon and the two libraries of Trajan's Forum in Rome, among others²⁷. Hellenistic libraries may have differed from this pattern, but a similar hall is also found in the complex presumed to be the royal library of Pergamon, the main rival of the Alexandrian library²⁸.

In the Serapeum, on the contrary, we have a long row of small rooms²⁹ with no differentiation, without any internal connection and apparently with direct access from a public space. This would be impractical: a library ought to have as few main doors as possible, since this makes it easier to keep control of who comes and goes and what they bring in and out. These rooms were presumably

²³ MCKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004: 89.

²⁴ Referred to by MCKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004: 76.

²⁵ FRASER 1972: vol. I, 269.

²⁶ MCKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004: 99.

²⁷ MAMOLI (2014) offers detailed descriptions and discussions of the structures identified as ancient libraries.

²⁸ The identification of this complex as the library has been disputed; see COQUEUGNIOT 2013.

²⁹ MAMOLI (2014: 94) gives their size as "about 4,10–4,20 m. deep and 2.20–3 m. wide".

lighted through windows or doors opening towards the colonnades, since the alternative would have been a large number of small windows in the outside wall, directly exposed to the sun and increasing the risk of fire. The colonnades could have been fenced off against the courtyard, but the noise from the courtyard would have reached the readers with the light, whether they sat in the stoa or in the chambers inside. Admittedly, some libraries of the imperial age were placed on busy thoroughfares, library silence apparently being less important than advertising the euergetism of the founder, but these buildings were also architectural showpieces. The chambers of the Serapeum, on the contrary, were architecturally undistinguished.

The plan of the Serapeum thus does not resemble any known library building, and in terms of functionality it would be ill suited to this purpose. The Serapeum is also at the wrong end of the town: why place a Greek library in the heart of the Egyptian quarter, in the temple of an Egyptian god? By contrast, the two libraries we do know about from reliable sources, the Ptolemaic library in the Broukheion and the later one in the Caesareum, were both situated in the Greek part of the town, close to the royal palaces and the harbour.

CONCLUSION

The Alexandrian library and its destiny continues to fascinate a broad audience and to play a part in popular culture. In spite of this popular interest, the question of the library's destiny has to a large extent been ignored by scholars. Students of its early Ptolemaic heyday have considered the question outside their scope, while students of intellectual life in late antiquity have quite simply ignored it since their sources have nothing to say about it³⁰. Consequently GIBBON's story about the destruction of the library has been accepted on his authority; as already noted it is even confirmed by *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie*. Nevertheless this story was invented by GIBBON himself and is only supported by the flimsiest evidence. Furthermore, GIBBON's claim that the library of Pergamon was transferred to Alexandria is supported neither by the evidence he cites nor by any other, and it is clearly contradicted by Strabo. In spite of this, this too has been accepted on GIBBON's authority and frequently repeated.

The story that there were two libraries, one large and one small, is only found in late and unreliable sources, but this too has been generally accepted. As I have argued, the tradition of a library in the Serapeum is a Christian embellishment of a Jewish legend; it is also contradicted by archaeology. The best evidence for such a library, namely Aphthonius' description of the "acropolis", should be read as a description not of the Serapeum but of the Caesareum. This solves the

³⁰ E.g. BROWN 1971; CAMERON 1993; HAAS 1997; CAMERON (2012: 220) writes in a note that the Serapeum "also seems to have housed a library", referring to MCKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004.

apparent contradiction between Aphthonius and his contemporary Ammianus, from whose text we can confidently infer that there was no Serapeum library in his time.

The library of the Ptolemies lay in the palace area by the harbour. It was accidentally destroyed by Caesar's fire in 48 BC. We do not know much about its state at that time; it may have been seriously depleted after prolonged decay. Later a library was established in the Caesareum, presumably by Cleopatra. It is mentioned by Philo ca. AD 40 and by Aphthonius in the mid 4th century, and it may have served the needs of the Museum, which was close by. We have no information about the size, relative importance or ultimate destiny of this library, but we do know that the bishop in whose time the Christian take-over of the Caesareum was presumably completed, George of Cappadocia, was an avid collector of pagan books. He would not have destroyed the books if they were still there.

We do not know how the library resources of Alexandria were organised in late antiquity, but we do know that they must have been substantial. Alexandria remained an intellectual centre with an important school until the 7th century³¹. GIBBON's story about the destruction of the library is therefore not only contradicted by our sources, it is also mistaken as a symbol of the end of classical culture.

University of Bergen

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAGNALL 2002: R.S. BAGNALL, *Alexandria: Library of Dreams*, PAPHS CXLVI 2002, pp. 348–362.
- BEVAN 1910–1911: E.R. BEVAN, *Hellenism*, in: *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th edn.
- BLANCK 1992: H. BLANCK, *Das Buch in der Antike*, München 1992.
- BLUM 1991: R. BLUM, *Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, transl. by H.H. WELLISCH, Madison 1991.
- BROWN 1971: P. BROWN, *The World of Late Antiquity: From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad*, London 1971.
- BUTLER 1902: A.J. BUTLER, *The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Last Thirty Years of the Roman Dominion*, New York 1902.
- CAMERON 1993: A. CAMERON, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity, AD 395–600*, London 1993.
- 2012: A. CAMERON, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity, AD 395–700*, 2nd edn., London 2012.
- CANFORA 1989: L. CANFORA, *The Vanished Library*, transl. by M. RYLE, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1989.
- CASSON 2001: L. CASSON, *Libraries in the Ancient World*, New Haven 2001.
- COQUEUGNIOT 2013: G. COQUEUGNIOT, *Where Was the Royal Library of Pergamum? An Institution Found and Lost Again*, in: KÖNIG 2013, pp. 109–123.
- DEAN 1935: J.E. DEAN (ed.), *Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures: The Syriac Version*, Chicago 1935.

³¹ FRASER 1993; WATTS 2006; MAJCHEREK 2010.

- DELIA 1992: D. DELIA, *From Romance to Rhetoric: The Alexandrian Library in Classical and Islamic Traditions*, AHR XCVII 1992: pp. 1449–1467.
- DZIATZKO 1897: K. DZIATZKO, *Bibliotheken*, RE III (1897), coll. 405–424.
- EL-ABBADI 1990: M. EL-ABBADI, *The Life and Fate of the Ancient Library of Alexandria*, Paris 1990.
- 2008: M. EL-ABBADI, O.M. FATHALLAH (eds.), *What Happened to the Ancient Library of Alexandria?*, Leiden 2008.
- EMPEREUR 1998: J.-Y. EMPEREUR, *Alexandria Rediscovered*, New York–London 1998.
- FRASER 1972: P.M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vols. I–III, Oxford 1972.
- 1993: P.M. FRASER, *Byzantine Alexandria, Decline and Fall*, Bulletin de Société Archéologique d'Alexandrie XLV 1993, pp. 91–105.
- GIBBON 1777–1788: E. GIBBON, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vols. I–VI, London 1777–1788 (quoted from the edition by J.B. BURY, London 1896–1900).
- GRIFFIN 1996: J. GRIFFIN, *The Library of Our Dreams*, The American Scholar LXV 1996, pp. 59–70.
- HANDIS 2013: M.W. HANDIS, *Myth and History: Galen and the Alexandrian Library*, in: KÖNIG 2013, pp. 364–376.
- HAAS 1997: C. HAAS, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*, Baltimore 1997.
- KÖNIG 2013: J. KÖNIG (ed.), *Ancient Libraries*, Cambridge 2013.
- MAHMOUD-BEY 1866: MAHMOUD-BEY, *Carte de l'antique Alexandrie et de ses faubourgs: dressée sur les ordres de S.A. le vice-roi d'Égypte à l'aide de fouilles, nivellements et autres recherches*, Paris 1866.
- MAJCHEREK 2010: G. MAJCHEREK, *The Auditoria on Kom el-Dikka: A Glimpse of Late Antique Education in Alexandria*, in: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor 2007*, Ann Arbor 2010, pp. 471–484.
- MAMOLI 2014: M. MAMOLI, *Towards a Theory of Reconstructing Ancient Libraries*, PhD dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology 2014.
- McKENZIE 2007: J. MCKENZIE, *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt: c. 300 BC to AD 700*, New Haven–London 2007.
- MCKENZIE, GIBSON, REYES 2004: J.S. MCKENZIE, S. GIBSON, A.T. REYES, *Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archaeological Evidence*, JRS XCIV 2004, pp. 73–121.
- MOMMSEN 1854–1856: T. MOMMSEN, *Römische Geschichte*, vols. I–III, Leipzig 1854–1856.
- NIEBUHR 1846–1848: B.G. NIEBUHR, *Vorträge über römische Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten*, ed. by M. ISLER, vols. I–III, Berlin 1846–1848.
- 1849: B.G. NIEBUHR, *Lectures on the History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire*, ed. by L. SCHMITZ, vols. I–III, 2nd edn., London 1849.
- PFEIFFER 1968: R. PFEIFFER, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- RODZIEWICZ 1995: M. RODZIEWICZ, *Ptolemaic Street Directions in Basilea (Alexandria)*, in: *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano. Congresso Alessandria 1992*, Roma 1995: pp. 227–235.
- ROLFE 1940: J.C. ROLFE (ed.), *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge MA.–London 1940.
- ROWE 1946: A. ROWE, *Discovery of the Famous Temple and Enclosure of Serapis at Alexandria*, Cairo 1946.
- SANDYS 1903–1908: J.E. SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vols. I–III, Cambridge 1903–1908.
- SUSEMIHL 1891–1892: F. SUSEMIHL, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, vols. I–II, Leipzig 1891–1892.
- WATTS 2006: E.J. WATTS, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*, Berkeley 2006.

THE MYTHOLOGICAL *EXEMPLUM* IN ANCIENT RHETORICAL THEORY AND IN THE PRACTICE OF CICERO

by

DAMIAN PIERZAK

ABSTRACT: The mythological *exemplum*, both in Antiquity and in the present times, has seldom been looked at independently from its historical counterpart. The most promising way of studying it, therefore, should consist of an investigation of the precepts discernible in rhetorical theory as well as their practical representations.

The mythological *exemplum*, although it forms part of the more universal notion (παράδειγμα) and at the same time displays its own different characteristics, has never been put under scrutiny as a separate entity. The only distinction upon which the majority of ancient rhetoricians depended in this respect is the one between a historical example and a fable. We cannot ascribe what is commonly understood by “a myth” to either of these¹. Nor does Cicero, in whose speeches allusions to Greek myth occur as often as approximately once per oration, subdivide *exemplum* into two separate categories². It comes as no surprise, then, that modern scholars’ attention has been focused almost exclusively on its historical counterpart³.

¹ See Quint. *Inst.* V 11, 20 followed e.g. by VOLKMANN 1885: 233–239 and LAUSBERG 1998: 197 f. (§ 413 f.). I would like to thank The Hardt Foundation for the Study of Classical Antiquity in Vandœuvre for granting me a scholarship in February 2015, without which many publications used below would have been beyond my reach. I am also grateful to Janek KUCHARSKI for making available to me the translation of Hermogenes and the latest edition of Aphthonius and Pseudo-Hermogenes, to Pietro VERZINA who kindly sent me photocopies of TRAGLIA’s edition of the Latin poets of the archaic period, and to Prof. Jakub PIGON and the anonymous Reader for “Eos” for offering many valuable suggestions that helped to improve my paper.

² See Cic. *Inv.* I 49 and *Top.* 41–45 with OPPERMAN 2000: 9 (with n. 2), and esp. 15. There are more or less forty occurrences in twenty orations, apart from the *Verrine* speeches.

³ See e.g. VOLKMANN 1885: 233–239; ALEWELL 1912: 5–35; KORNHARDT 1936; FUHRMANN 1973: 449–452; PRICE 1975; BERGER 1984: 1031–1432 (ch. “Paradeigma und Exemplum,” at pp. 1145–1148); ROBINSON 1986: 3–16 (esp. p. 15, n. 14); VON MOOS 1996; DEMOEN 1997; LAUSBERG 1998: 197 f.; STEMMLER 2000; VAN DER POEL 2009: 333–336. Cf. KLOTZ 1942; LUCARELLI 2007. See also NORDEN 1971, *passim* (e.g. pp. 276, 284 f.); LEEMAN 1963, *passim*. The scholarship on the

The ancient authors writing on the subject of rhetoric had clearly defined objectives. Their handbooks were meant to help both contemporaries and future generations to acquire the skills needed during public appearances. In ancient Greece, democracy and the art of rhetoric developed side by side as freedom of expressing ideas expanded, and the orations of the most prominent figures of the time formed the basis of the *enkheiridia*. These, in turn, were studied by subsequent generations, among whom new masters of the spoken word grew up to become an inspiration for the authors of *tekhnai rhētorikai*. Theory and practice, therefore, were mutually dependent and complemented one another⁴. This paper is an attempt to look closer at how the ancients perceived the mythological *exemplum* and to address the question of whether any clear distinction can be made between the historical and the mythological one. Since both Quintilian and Cicero are among the sources dealing with the subject, it seems justified enough to use the latter's speeches as research material on which to test the validity of the theoretical precepts discussed here. Of course, as has been recently observed⁵, the great orator did not share his best tricks readily with the public, but this is only an additional spur to take into account both his theory and practice. It would also be of importance to see if what he spoke complied with what the rhetoricians, himself included, either recommended or advised against.

ANCIENT THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS

Some modern scholars tend to regard the *exemplum*, and especially its mythological form, as a means of expression characteristic of the poets. NORTH (1952: 9) writes: "In a special category as an aid to rhetorical Invention belongs the *exemplum*, which often consists of a quotation from poetry, or, if a mythological *exemplum*, at least draws its material from poetry", and LAUSBERG (1998: 197 [§ 413]) states that "The poetical *exemplum* [...] is less effective in terms of credibility [...] than it is as a means of *ornatus* and pathos [...], if the audience

subject is listed in MASLAKOV 1984: 439 f., n. 5 and recently in BÜCHER 2006: 152, n. 1. REINHARDT 1974: 1–15 is unique as regards the mythological *exemplum*.

⁴ See Cic. *De or.* I 146: "Verum ego hanc vim intellego esse in praeceptis omnibus, non ut ea secuti oratores eloquentiae laudem sint adepti, sed, quae sua sponte homines eloquentes facerent, ea quosdam observasse et collegisse; sic esse non eloquentiam ex artificio, sed artificium ex eloquentia natum"; Quint. *Inst.* V 10, 120: "neque enim artibus editis factum est, ut argumenta inveniremus, sed dicta sunt omnia, antequam praeciperentur, mox ea scriptores observata et collecta ediderunt". Cf. GAGARIN 2007: 32–34; ALEKSANDROWICZ 1996: 16. Similarly the rules governing the mode of expression (*elocutio*) depended on the *usus* (resp. *consuetudo*, Gr. χρεία or συνήθεια). Cf. SOLMSEN 1968: 290. See also Quint. *Inst.* XII 10, 49–57.

⁵ See KLODT 2003: 100: "wo [sc. in theoretischen Schriften] er seine besten Tricks freilich nie verrät". Cf. Cic. *De or.* I 203: "Hanc vim si quis existimat aut ab eis, qui de dicendi ratione scripserunt, expositam esse aut a me posse exponi tam brevi, vehementer errat neque solum inscientiam meam sed ne rerum quidem magnitudinem perspicit" and *ibid.* II 64.

[...] has the appropriate level of education". He then quotes Quintilian and further introduces his distinction between *fabula poetica* and *fabella*, to which we shall refer later on. Alongside the confirmation that the *exemplum* is particularly effective when it comes to pathos, we learn from Aristotle about a more fundamental distinction: the one between paradigm and enthymeme. Those are the two artificial proofs from outside the case (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποδείξεων, Lat. *extra causam*, *extrinsecus*), of which the former better suits the arousing of emotions (Arist. *Rhet.* 1418a 12–13): καὶ ὅταν πάθος ποιῆς, μὴ λέγε ἐνθύμημα· ἢ γὰρ ἐκκρούσει τὸ πάθος ἢ μάτην εἰρημένον ἔσται τὸ ἐνθύμημα.

Considering ancient rhetorical *theory*, our task causes difficulties in that very little has been said on the subject, and whenever the mythological paradigm is mentioned, the discussion either lacks elaboration or has a good deal of ambiguity to it. The definition of the *exemplum* proper, on the other hand, has been relatively clear, and its most recognisable features have remained unaltered from the time of Aristotle down to at least Late Antiquity. It would therefore be a convenient point of departure. According to the *Art of Rhetoric*, we have at our disposal two sets of proofs; apart from those of official character (testimonies, letters, legal regulations, etc.) there are two kinds of logical argumentation (Arist. *Rhet.* 1356b 2–4): ἔστι γὰρ τὸ μὲν παράδειγμα ἐπαγωγὴ, τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα συλλογισμὸς [...]⁶. *Exemplum* is thus a sort of rhetorical induction (ἐπαγωγὴ, *inductio*), and enthymeme a form of syllogism. To Aristotle, it seems, *paradeigma* was a part of argumentation (πίστις), and not only of ornamentation (κόσμος)⁷. Quintilian (*Inst.* V 11, 1–3) lists the *exemplum* as the third and the last (next to *signa* and *argumenta*) instance of argumentation “from outside the case” (*extrinsecus*). The Greeks, we are told, tended to use the word to denote the *similia* altogether, and especially those relating to some historical events (*res gestae*). The author of the *Ad Herennium* (III 9) maintained that “it is useful to present examples from the past in the greatest possible number” (“conducit quam plurima rerum ante gestarum exempla proferre”, transl. by H. CAPLAN), particularly in a deliberative kind of cause. In the early stage of his theoretical reflection, Cicero (*Inv.* I 49) offered the following definition: “exemplum est, quod rem auctoritate aut casu alicuius hominis aut negotii confirmat aut infirmitat”. He ascribed it, alongside *imago* and *collatio*, to a category called *comparabilia*⁸. It is generally agreed, however, that Quintilian is the one who verbalised the idea most accurately (*Inst.*

⁶ Cf. Quint. *Inst.* I 10, 38; V 10, 6 f.; ALEWELL 1912: 12.

⁷ Cf. McCALL, JR. 1969: 61; BERGER 1984: 1146: “Das Beispiel dient so als Überzeugungsmittel, zur Bekräftigung, Aneignung und Warnung”; VON MOOS 1996: 48 f. See also LAUSBERG 1998: 196; MARX 1968: 84, 89.

⁸ Cf. Minuc. p. 341 SPENGLER: τῶν δὲ ἐπιχειρημάτων τὰ μὲν ἔστι παραδειγματικά, τὰ δὲ ἐνθυμηματικά. παραδειγματικά μὲν ὅσα ἐξ ἱστορίας καὶ ὁμοιώσεως τῶν ἤδη πεπραγμένων λαμβάνομεν.

V 11, 6): “quod proprie vocamus exemplum, id est rei gestae aut ut gestae⁹ utilis ad persuadendum id, quod intenderis, commemoratio”. At this time we must refrain from too unadvisedly ascribing the examples from myth to the *res ut gestae*. Above all, this category should remind one of the plot of comedy (*argumentum*) as understood in ancient theory as opposed to the plot of tragedy (*fabula*)¹⁰. This classification appears to trace back to Aristotle¹¹. The simplest and most transparent discussion of the tripartite division of the narrative concerning broadly conceived past events is given by the author of the *Ad Herennium*:

Id quod in negotiorum expositione positum est tres habet partes: fabulam, historiam, argumentum. Fabula est quae neque veras neque veri similes continet res, ut eae sunt quae tragoediis traditae sunt. Historia est gesta res, sed ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota. Argumentum est ficta res quae tamen fieri potuit, velut argumenta comoediarum.

The kind of narrative based on the exposition of the facts presents three forms: legendary, historical, and realistic. The legendary tale comprises events neither true nor probable, like those transmitted by tragedies. The historical narrative is an account of exploits actually performed, but removed in time from the recollection of our age. Realistic narrative recounts imaginary events, which yet could have occurred, like the plots of comedies.

(*Rhet. Her.* I 13; transl. by H. CAPLAN)

There must have been some obvious instances of these clear-cut categories, but in practice the question of where the *fabula* ends and the *historia* begins was certainly puzzling at many points. In some respects, and especially when it came to any oratorical contention, there was a thin line in Antiquity between “myth” and “history”. The way in which Cicero, in the section on laughter and jest, calls forth the exchange of insults between M. Antonius and Sex. Titius may serve as an illustration (Cic. *De or.* II 265 = *ORF*², p. 236): “Trahitur etiam aliquid ex historia, ut, cum Sex. Titius se Cassandram esse diceret, ‘multos’ inquit Antonius ‘possum tuos Aiaces Oileos nominare’”. It can be assumed, therefore, that some of the qualities belonging formally to the so-called historical example may refer to the mythological *exemplum* as well¹². The scholars, then, who would reduce

⁹ Cf. PRICE 1975: 149: “The addition of *ut gestae* to the definition enables Quintilian to subsume poetic fictions and Aesop’s fables under the rubric of historical example”; STEINER 1968: 196.

¹⁰ See STYKA 1990. Cf. Quint. *Inst.* II 4, 2: “Et quia narrationum [...] tris accipimus species, *fabulam*, quae versatur in tragoediis atque carminibus non a veritate modo, sed etiam a forma veritatis remota, *argumentum*, quod falsum, sed vero simile comoediae fingunt”.

¹¹ See Arist. *Rhet.* 1393a. Cf. Aphth. *Prog.* II 1 PATILLON: Διήγημά ἐστιν ἕκθεσις πράγματος γεγονότος ἢ ὡς γεγονότος; VOLKMANN 1885: 236 f.; SCHWEINFURTH-WALLA 1986: 61–63.

¹² Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1414a 1–4; DEMOEN 1997: 139; SCHOENBERGER 1910: 10: “Zu den geschichtlichen Beispielen gehört auch alles Material, das der *historia fabularis*, der Mythologie, entnommen ist, da deren Sagen eine allgemeine höhere Wahrheit zugrunde liegt”; REINHARDT 1974: 12: “so wird das mythologische Beispiel in vielen Fällen wo wir es in der Theorie vermissen, stillschweigend als

the *fabulae* as part of the “historical” *exemplum* to either Aesopian fables (after Aristotle) or to the unbelievable digressions of Herodotus, are at best oversimplifying the issue¹³.

It appears that Isocrates made use of examples (παραδείγματα) consciously¹⁴, and in his opinion one should employ an *exemplum* from the past while arguing for or against something that is about to take place in the future (τὰ μέλλοντα). This sort of action above all befitted political speeches (*genus deliberativum*)¹⁵. The principle underlying his advice, found in a quasi-theoretical discourse, is reinforced by a passage in Lysias, where almost the same expression occurs (*Or.* 25, 23): χρή τοίνυν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, τοῖς πρότερον γεγενημένοις παραδείγμασι χρωμένους βουλευέσθαι περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι. The examples of “what had happened before” (πρότερον γεγενημένα παραδείγματα) are useful in deciding about the future (τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι). The logographer, of course, did not mean “myth” as it is conceived of in our times, but rather in a sense close to what Cicero had called *ex omni antiquitate*. The author of the *Ad Herennium*, on the other hand, is vague in his treatment of the differences between the use of *similitudo* and of the historical *exemplum*, for both of them are aimed at while rendering the statement more embellished (*ornatiorem*), lucid (*apertiozem*), credible (*probabiliozem*), and vivid (*ante oculos ponere*)¹⁶. An apparent distinction between historical and mythological *exemplum* was introduced by the author of a handbook on the *Devising of Arguments* (Περὶ εὐρέσεως, Lat. *De inventione*), ascribed to Hermogenes. The passage, unfortunately devoid of any circumstantial discussion, runs as follows ([Hermog.] *Inv.* III 15, 60–62 RABE): ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ παραδείγματος ἢ τοῦ μυθικοῦ ἢ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ μεταβαίνοντα εἰς τὸ ἴδιον πρᾶγμα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν πολλάκις¹⁷.

Unterart des historischen Beispiels verstanden, aus dem Bereich der historia fabularis”; BREMMER, HORSFALL 1987: 5: “One would, at Rome, be most unwise to distinguish between myth and legend, between *fabula* and *historia*”; GRAF 1993a: 26: “...die Aitia waren auch für Roms Antiquare *fabulae*, fiktive Geschichten, Gründungberichte und Genealogien lagen demgegenüber irgendwo im unscharfen Grenzbereich zwischen *historia* und *fabula*”, etc. Cicero, then, may well have spoken of “the *exemplum* from the whole past” (Cic. *Cluent.* 133 f.): “Qua de re tota si unum factum ex omni antiquitate protulero, plura non dicam. Non enim mihi exemplum summi et clarissimi viri, P. Africani, praetereundum videtur”.

¹³ See ALEWELL 1912: 15, 18–24. Aristotle: STEMMER 2000, cf. ROBINSON 1986: 4. Herodotus: PETZOLT 1972: 265; FLECK 1993: 52 f.; OPPERMANN 2000: 16. Cf. GRAF 1993a: 26–31.

¹⁴ See Isoc. *Or.* 1, 51: Οἷς δεῖ παραδείγμασι χρωμένους... Cf. RACE 1978: 185: “In epideictic rhetoric digressions serve as models (παραδείγματα) which are persuasive in a illustrative way...”.

¹⁵ Cf. e.g. KENNEDY 1963: 98 f.. On the advantages of using myths in this context, see PAPILLON 1996: 387 and RACE 1978: 178.

¹⁶ Cf. *Rhet. Her.* IV 62; McCALL, JR. 1969: 78; ROBINSON 1986: 5; VAN DER POEL 2009: 335.

¹⁷ It is difficult to establish the precise meaning of the end of the sentence in that it does not take into consideration the conciseness (συντομία, *brevitas*) required within the rhetorical *narratio*.

What we can infer from this, however, is that the argument based on either mythology or history should be handled cautiously, for even if it adds to the dynamics of the speech, it involves a departure from the subject (τὸ ἴδιον πρᾶγμα). Such understanding seems to be confirmed by a section from the original *Peri ideōn*, which is worth quoting at length:

Ἔννοιαι δὲ γλυκεῖαι τε καὶ ἡδονὴν ἔχουσαι μάλιστα μὲν πᾶσαι αἱ μυθικαί, [...] καὶ παρὰ τῷ ῥήτορι τὰ ἐν τῷ Κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους εἰρημένα, οἷον «ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ τῷ δικαστηρίῳ δίκας φόνου θεοὶ καὶ δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν ἤξιωσαν παρ' ἀλλήλων» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς μέχρι τοῦ «δικάσαι δ' Εὐμενίσιν καὶ Ὀρέστη τοὺς δώδεκα θεούς». ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα μὲν, ἐπεὶ ἐν τῷ πολιτικῷ λόγῳ τὰ μυθικὰ ὑπτιότητα ποιεῖ, διὰ τῶν τῆς γοργότητος ἰδίων τὸ λίαν ὑπτίον ὁ ῥήτωρ παρεμυθήσατο τεμῶν τὰ πράγματα. [...] Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅπερ ἔφην καὶ μάλιστα γλυκύτητα καὶ ἡδονὴν ἐν λόγῳ αἱ μυθικαὶ τῶν ἐννοιῶν ποιοῦσι. [...]

Sweet thoughts and those that give pleasure are especially ones that deal with myth: [...] In Demosthenes there are examples in the speech *Against Aristocrates*: “In this court only did the gods deem it worthy to give and take justice from one another” up to “the twelve gods meted out justice to the Eumenides and Orestes” (66). But in this speech, since mythical stories are tedious and slow the pace in a practical oration, Demosthenes has used techniques that are characteristic of Rapidity and has told the story very concisely to keep it from becoming tedious. [...] First of all, to repeat my initial point, mythical elements especially create Sweetness and give pleasure in a speech.

(Hermog. *Id.* II 4, 1–19, transl. by C.W. WOOTEN)

Here we have a commentary on a passage from Demosthenes' speech *Against Aristocrates* (23, 66)¹⁸. All the mythical “notions” (ἐννοιαι) are pleasant (γλυκεῖαι) and entertain the hearers (ἡδονὴν ἔχουσαι). Given that the case belongs to the deliberative kind, however, such argumentation is very tedious (λίαν ὑπτίον)¹⁹, and therefore the speaker had told it in a very concise way (τεμῶν τὰ πράγματα).

Modern scholars have noticed that the mythological *exemplum*, notwithstanding the fact that the poets had a particular liking for it, was practically left out of rhetorical theory²⁰. One has to remember, however, that the poets availed themselves of a more broadly conceived *simile* or, as Cicero would

Cf. e.g. *Rhet. Her.* I 14: “et ne bis aut saepius idem dicamus cavendum est”; Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 34; Aphth. II 4 PATILLON: Ἄρεται δὲ διηγήματος τέσσαρες: σαφήνεια, συντομία, πιθανότης καὶ ὁ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἄλλεισμός; Cic. *Inv.* I 32: “brevitas est, cum nisi necessarium nullum assumitur verbum” and Quint. *Inst.* II 5, 7.

¹⁸ Cf. on the passage GUTE 1962: 148; SOMMERSTEIN 1999: 4 with n. 13 and recently MARTIN 2009: 121, 125, who observes (p. 126), regarding the second allusion to Orestes in the same speech (§ 74), that “the myth is adduced as precedent for the existence of justifiable homicide”.

¹⁹ On the meaning of ὑπτίος, cf. LSJ, s.v. V; Hermog. *Id.* I 11, 428–430; 2, 170–172; Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 15. See also Quint. *Inst.* XI 3, 69 and Syrian. *In Hermog.* ad loc. (pp. 75 f. RABE).

²⁰ See e.g. CANTER 1933: 203 f., n. 6; DEMOEN 1997: 140, n. 5.

put it, *comparabile* and, on the other hand, many a piece of information concerning the historical *paradeigma*, as we have shown above (e.g. n. 12), will apply to mythology as well. Some theoreticians, perhaps considering the lack of a clear distinction between the two, advised against using “too old” examples (Aps. *Rh.* p. 373 SPENGLER): χρή δὲ τὰ παραδείγματα γνώριμα εἶναι καὶ σαφῆ καὶ μὴ πάνυ ἀρχαῖα μηδὲ μυθώδη, συνάδοντα δὲ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις²¹. Others emphasised that it is necessary to create role models out of whatever ancient history may offer or even to invent one’s own or otherwise the orator would make a bad impression by only relying on plain facts (Men. *Rh.* II 4 [§ 389] WILSON–RUSSELL): οὐκοῦν ληψόμεθα πρὸς τοῦτο [τὸ] παράδειγμα ἱστορίαν ἀρχαίαν ἢ πλάσαντες αὐτοί, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶμεν αὐτοῖς γυμνοῖς τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐγχειρεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει τοῦτο ἡδονήν²². In this passage Menander Rhetor agrees with Hermogenes in highlighting the function of *exempla* as entertainment. To some degree it would also comply with an assertion occasionally found in ancient texts that mythological comparisons only serve ornamental (*κόσμος*, *ornatus*) purposes²³.

In a section of the *Education of an Orator* which was hitherto frequently referred to (*de exemplis*: V 11), Quintilian (*Inst.* V 11, 17–21) divides the “unhistorical” *exempla* into two groups: *poeticae fabulae* and *fabellae*, the latter of which, consisting of fables and stories (Gr. αἶνον, αἰσώπειοι λόγοι) does not concern us (cf. above, p. 248 f.). The former, as can be inferred from the example given in the *Institutio oratoria* (Cic. *Mil.* 8: “Itaque hoc, iudices, non sine causa etiam fictis fabulis doctissimi homines memoriae prodiderunt, eum qui patris ulciscendi causa matrem necavisset variatis hominum sententiis non solum divina sed etiam sapientissimae deae sententia liberatum”)²⁴, encompasses not only the broadly conceived myth (*ficta fabula*), but its form as preserved by the most famous poets (*doctissimi homines*). The same conclusion can be drawn from another passage of Quintilian’s monumental work, where he requires of a speaker to have at his disposal many examples derived from history or oral tradition (*sermonibus velut per manus tradita*), and not to neglect those invented by the more prominent poets: “In primis vero abundare debet orator exemplorum

²¹ Cf. ALEWELL 1912: 32.

²² Cf. [Hermog.] *Prog.* II 3 PATILLON: Εἶδη δὲ διηγήματος βούλονται εἶναι τέτταρα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἶναι μυθικόν, τὸ δὲ πλασματικόν, [...] τὸ δὲ ἱστορικόν, τὸ δὲ πολιτικόν ἢ ἰδιωτικόν. On the subdivisions *historia – plasma – mūthos*, see also RUSSELL 1981: 109, n. 28.

²³ See e.g. Hermog. *Id.* I 1, 134–136, II 4, 1–3. Cf. Quint. *Inst.* V 11, 16; *Rhet. Her.* II 46: “Quoniam exornatio constat ex similibus et exemplis et amplificationibus et ceteris rebus quae pertinent ad exaugendam et conlocupletandam argumentationem...”; KENNEDY 1963: 111 f. Modern scholars recognise no such function in Cicero. See RADIN 1911: 215: “...the literary and mythological allusions serve a strictly illustrative end and cannot be said to be elements of ornament at all”.

²⁴ Given as an example also in VOLKMANN 1885: 237; LAUSBERG 1998: 197 (§ 413) and STEMMLER 2000: 180, n. 140. Cf. ROBINSON 1986: 9.

copia cum veterum tum etiam novorum, adeo ut non ea modo quae conscripta sunt historiis aut sermonibus velut per manus tradita quaeque cotidie aguntur debeat nosse, verum ne ea quidem quae sunt a clarioribus poetis ficta negligere” (*Inst.* XII 4, 1)²⁵. Although poetical stories (*fabulae*) are being invented (*funguntur*), the fact that ancestral myths are used to shape the plot makes them appear to possess a sort of practical credibility. Moreover, brought into public speeches, now as “legends”, and not only *fictae fabulae*, they acquire symbolical value²⁶. The observations of the poets (*sententiae*) carry a peculiar authority (*auctoritas*) in rhetoric as well as in philosophical writings: “nam sententiis quidem poetarum non orationes modo sunt refertae, sed libri etiam philosophorum, qui quaquam inferiora omnia praeceptis suis ac litteris credunt, repetere tamen auctoritatem a plurimis versibus non fastidierunt” (*Quint. Inst.* V 11, 39)²⁷. Among orators, however, the *sententiae* received particular recognition, since they were introduced into a case in a similar way to which evidence was presented (*velut quibusdam testimoniis*, cf. below). The scope of their application was therefore wide, ranging from a simple embellishment (*ornatus eloquentiae*) to either the enhancing or diminishing of the credibility (*fides causae*) of participants in a trial or of politicians – as seen in the surviving speeches. In a well-known passage from his *Orator*, Cicero confirms the existence of both these functions of the *exemplum* (§ 120): “Quid enim est aetas hominis, nisi ea memoria rerum veterum cum superiorum aetate contextitur? Commemoratio autem antiquitatis exemplorumque prolatio summa cum delectatione et auctoritatem orationi adfert et fidem”²⁸. Nevertheless, it has to be stressed that when it comes to Cicero’s theory and practice, as regards the *exemplum antiquitatis* as well as in his views on many other matters, he shows a peculiar relativism. The speaker, as we are about to witness, will on one occasion deem the *fabulae* as qualified to reinforce the *fides causae*, and in different circumstances reject it as a dangerous weapon in the hands of an opponent²⁹.

²⁵ Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 145: “ita enim multa tum contra scriptum pro aequo et bono dixit [sc. L. Crassus], ut hominem acutissimum Q. Scaevolam eo in iure, in quo illa causa vertebatur, paratissimum obrueret, argumentorum exemplorumque copia”. On *Quint. Inst.* XII 4, 1, see MAYER 1991: 149.

²⁶ See e.g. Cic. *Div.* I 84; *Arat.* fr. 34, 33 SOUBIRAN. Cf. *Har. resp.* 59; *Nat. d.* III 91; *Off.* III 97; *Brut.* 149, 205; *Tusc.* I 36 f., V 115; *Fam.* VI 6, 6; *Var. Ling.* IX 17; [*Quint.*] *Decl.* IX 22. See also *Isoc. Paneg.* 9; STEINER 1968: 199; RUSSELL 1967: 135, 142; 1981: 97: “The practical and rhetorical use of mythical and historical *exempla* itself implies that the traditional stories contain as it were the potentiality of being applied in a great many ways”.

²⁷ See also *Soph. Ant.* 453–455; *Arist. Rhet.* 1368b, 1373b, 1375a.

²⁸ Cf. Cic. *De or.* I 18; I 158 f.; *Rhet. Her.* IV 2: “*exempla testimoniorum locum obtinent [...]* ut enim testimonium, sic exemplum rei confirmandae causa sumitur” (cf. IV 3, 5); ROBINSON 1986: 7; HÖLSCHER 1993: 85; OPPERMANN 2000: 16 f.

²⁹ Compare above all Cic. *Verr.* III 182: “Non me fugit, iudices, vetera exempla pro fictis fabulis iam audiri atque haberi; in his temporibus versabor miseris ac perditis” with *Part.* 40: “Maximam autem fidem facit ad similitudinem veri primum exemplum, deinde introducta rei similitudo; fabula

The persuasive force of literary allusion is indirect for, as H. NORTH has pointed out, “the audience is *unconsciously* swayed by the *auctoritas* of the poet” [emphasis mine – D.P.]³⁰. In a plain “sender–recipient” relation, myths appeal to the emotions and not to reason³¹. Another factor which would make poetry attractive to a speaker is its capacity for providing relief from the harshness of forensic proceedings: “denique credamus summis oratoribus, qui veterum poemata vel ad fidem causarum vel ad ornamentum eloquentiae adsumunt [...] non eruditionis modo gratia, sed etiam iucunditatis, cum poeticis voluptatibus aures a forense asperitate respirant. Quibus accedit non mediocris utilitas, cum sententiis eorum velut quibusdam testimoniis quae proposuere confirmit” (Quint. *Inst.* I 8, 10–12)³². Although mythological metaphors and *similia* were not restricted to any specific *genus dicendi* or type of case, we can imagine that this sort of artistic solution was more unsuitable to speeches loaded with judicial jargon and filled with *termini technici* than to others³³.

Before we set out to compare Cicero’s practice to the theoretical remarks just stated, an overview singling out the fundamental features of the *exemplum* ought to be made. Of course, as far as possible, an emphasis will be put on its mythological form.

The *exemplum* is a means of supporting a case to which it is not directly related (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποδείξεων, *extrinsecus*), thus pertaining to art and not to the proofs proper (πίστις ἐντεχνος, *probatio artificialis*). As a strategy based on “the power of suggestion”, it uses so-called induction (ἐπαγωγή) to influence the hearers. Under normal circumstances it forms a digression within the *argumentatio* but, as can be deduced from Quintilian’s remark, it can be used within

etiam non numquam, etsi sit incredibilis, tamen homines commovet; *De or.* III 205: “tum duo illa, quae maxime movent, similitudo et exemplum” (= Quint. *Inst.* IX 1, 31). Cf. ALEWELL 1912: 20; REINHARDT 1974: 6; STEMMLER 2000: 177, n. 127.

³⁰ See NORTH 1952: 8. Cf. REINHARDT 1974: 9: “...mehr oder weniger bewußt...”.

³¹ See BETTINI 2006: 199: “But, above all, myths as stories do not develop rational reasoning, but rather appeal to the emotions”; Cf. DÖRRIE 1978: 14: “Mythos ist *exemplum*. Und zu jedem *exemplum* ist zu fragen, welchem Zweck es dient”.

³² Cf. Cic. *Arch.* 12: “Quaeres a nobis, Gratti, cur tanto opere hoc homine [sc. Aulo Licinio Archia] delectemur. Quia suppeditat nobis ubi et animus ex hoc forense strepitu reficiatur et aures convicio defessae conquiescant” with H. VRETSKA, K. VRETSKA 1979: 112 and NESHOLM 2010: 486, 488 f.; Quint. *Inst.* XI 3, 164: “Egressiones fere lenes et dulces et remissae, raptus Proserpinae, Siciliae descriptio, Cn. Pompei laus: neque est mirum minus habere contentionis ea quae sunt extra quaestionem”; Liv. *Praef.* 6: “Quae ante conditam condendamve urbem poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis traduntur, ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est. Datur haec venia antiquitati, ut miscendo humana divinis primordia urbium augustiora faciat”. See also Cic. *De or.* II 22 with SCHOENBERGER 1910: 8; KLODT 2003: 35 and LEWANDOWSKI 2007: 184.

³³ Cf. FANTHAM 1972: 115; MCCALL, JR. 1969: 118: “The two last types, *ficta exempla* (nonhistorical, fictitious examples) and *hyperbole* are more explicit in that Cicero speaks of each as belonging less to jurisprudence than to oratory in general”.

the other *partes orationis* as well³⁴ and, as ROBINSON (1986: 9) notes, “it is used most often for the purposes of comparison and contrast”. The force of “historical” arguments depended on a conviction firmly rooted in Antiquity that, based on past events (πρότερον γεγενημένα παραδείγματα), one can determine how to act in the future (τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι). “Past events” here carry the meaning of the *Urzeit* as well, of anything from the past which is useful in convincing the audience (*ex omni antiquitate utile ad persuadendum*). Mythological *exemplum* (or “notion” – ἔννοια) as such additionally supplies the speech with embellishment (κόσμος, *ornatus/exornatio*) and bestows pleasure (ἡδονή, γλυκύτης) on the hearers, but as a digression unrelated to the case itself (τὸ ἴδιον πρᾶγμα) it has to be handled with caution. The best mythological examples (*facta fabula, fabula poetica*) should rest on the authority of appreciated poets from the past (*doctissimi homines, clariores poetae*) or else if they are too vague (οὐ γνώριμα), they could fail to be recognised by the audience.

MYTHOLOGICAL PARADIGM IN CICERO’S ORATIONS

In the speeches of Cicero there are plenty of uses of Greek myth that would not fit into the patterns outlined above. This is perhaps partly due to his reluctance to have the most subtle rhetorical stratagems circulate among potential opponents or, for that matter, anyone unworthy of such skill (cf. n. 5 above), and partly because the rhetoricians did not pay any special attention to it, and if they did happen to devote a sentence or two to the matter, it is always difficult to distinguish between the historical and the mythological *exemplum*. This being so, we shall only concern ourselves with two motifs from the speeches, one of which relating to the “Orestes” example quoted by Quintilian, and the other in which Cicero’s peculiar strategy is discernible in that he would advise for or against the use of mythological digressions depending on the circumstances. The questions of embellishment and pleasure resulting from the employment of *exempla* must remain unaddressed, for it is often too arbitrary to determine the audience’s response to a given paradigm³⁵ and, on the other hand, although some such instances are demonstrable, it would require of us too minute a discussion, probably transgressing the limits of the present article.

³⁴ See Quint. *Inst.* IV 3, 12: “sed hae sunt plures, ut dixi, quae per totam causam varios habent excursus, ut laus hominum locorumque, ut descriptio regionum, expositio quarundam rerum gestarum, licet etiam fabulosarum”. As an example he gives the abduction of Persephone (*raptus Proserpinae* – Cic. *Verr.* IV 106–112) on which cf. STEINER 1968: 198 and ROMANO 1980. That it sometimes forms a digression outside the *argumentatio* is evident from Cicero’s practice. There are more or less seven examples of this in his speeches, of which six can be ascribed to the *narratio*, and one to the *peroratio*.

³⁵ Cf. SCHOENBERGER 1910: 40 on Cic. *Pis.* 22 and KORNACKA 1995: 49 on *S. Rosc.* 66 f.

In school exercises, the digression on Orestes was a stock illustration of the *status iuridicialis*³⁶, and when Cicero referred to it in 52 BC, he may have also had this basic application in mind. This encourages us to consider the passage from the *Pro Milone* before that of the *Pro Sexto Roscio*. Immediately after the *exordium*, the appeal to the judges, and the account of the type of trial, the speaker defines the *status causae* (“...cum de homine occiso quaeratur, aut negari solere omnino esse factum aut recte et iure factum esse defendi...”), i.e. he distinguishes between *coniectura* and *qualitas*³⁷. Next he singles out numerous examples of historical figures, including Ti. Gracchus and the followers of Catiline, in order to prove that there is nothing unworthy about killing villains (*scelerati cives*). The poets as well, therefore, had good reasons to adhere to this rule in their literary inventions. Here Cicero resorts to *fabula* (*Mil.* 8 quoted above follows).

The dilemma of Orestes must have been fixed in the mind of anyone who had received a minimum of rhetorical training. It was certainly among the most favourite school exercises³⁸. Nevertheless, it seems more than probable that the speaker was aiming rather at associating his argument with the stage (cf. n. 41 below). It is usually assumed that his direct inspiration was Aeschylus, since Demosthenes, another possible source, apparently followed a different version of the myth³⁹. And yet a tragedy by Ennius, which after Nonius came to be known under the title *Eumenides*, may well have been a good point of reference for the audience acquainted with judicial matters. A few fragments which we possess, corresponding to the Attic drama (e.g. *Enn. Scen.* 145, 148 JOCELYN), fit into the context of Orestes’ acquittal⁴⁰. It would be too optimistic of Cicero to expect his audience to know a Greek poet rather than their own “national sage”⁴¹. From the

³⁶ See e.g. BONNER 1969: 15.

³⁷ See e.g. *Rhet. Her.* II 3–12 and 19–26; Quint. *Inst.* VII 2, 1–57 (esp. 42–44) and 5, 1–5. Cf. LAUSBERG 1998: 66–70 (§§ 150–165) and on *Mil.* 180 (pp. 75 f.); WISSE 2002: 357, n. 51. Cicero, unlike Brutus, had chosen a moderate form of the latter, see Quint. *Inst.* III 6, 93; X 1, 23. Cf. *Asc. Mil.* p. 41 CLARK = p. 37 STANGL: “respondit his unus M. Cicero: et cum quibusdam placuisset ita defendi crimen, interfici Clodium pro r. publica fuisse (quam formam M. Brutus secutus est in ea oratione quam pro Milone composuit et edidit, quasi egisset)”; VOLKMANN 1885: 373; LEWIS 2006: 246 f.

³⁸ See e.g. Cic. *Inv.* I 18: “...in facili et pervulgato exemplo...”; I 92; II 69; Quint. *Inst.* III 5, 11; VII 4, 8 and esp. III 11, 4: “et cur non utamur eodem, quo sunt uti omnes fere, exemplo?”; KOHL 1915: 12 f.; NISBET 1961: 108 f.: “he was a favourite topic of rhetorical schools”. Cf. KENNEDY 1994: 14 f.; WEISCHE 1972: 25, n. 12.

³⁹ See the works cited in n. 18 above. Elsewhere (PIERZAK 2015: 104–107) I have discussed *Mil.* 8 as an example of a possible revision made by Cicero for the published version.

⁴⁰ See e.g. RIBBECK 1875: 146; JOCELYN 1967: 284; TRAGLIA 1986: 300 with n. 80 and 302, n. 85: “l’espressione *vicisse Orestem* corrisponde ai vv. 742 seg. del modello greco”; PETACCIA 2000: 101.

⁴¹ Cf. JOCELYN 1967: 284: “Cicero does not name the title *Eumenides* or any possible variant but in referring to the trial of Orestes at *Mil.* 8 he seems to have the stage in mind”. On quotations, crypto-quotations, and paraphrases drawn from drama in Cicero’s oratory, see AXER 1989: 303 f. On

rhetorical point of view, it does not even matter which of the two the speaker originally had in mind. Either poet would doubtless count among the *clariores*. It follows, then, that Cicero met one of the requirements regarding the use of the mythological *exemplum*. This passage, however, as both a principle and its illustration, can at best mark our point of departure. The fact of Quintilian's introduction precisely of *Mil.* 8 does not mean that it is the first occurrence of the application of this "principle". In fact, as far as we know, Cicero had made use of it almost three decades earlier.

In the *Pro Sexto Roscio*, a case dealing with homicide, the counsel for the defence demanded that the prosecutors prove not only the defendant's misconduct, but also his unbalanced state of mind, indeed, his insanity (*summus furor atque amentia*). Here too, the *fabula* was preceded by a "Roman example". We hear the story of one T. Caelius (resp. Cloelius/Clodius)⁴² allegedly murdered by his own sons. In cases like this, we are told, one should above all consider the strength of the bonds of blood (*multum valet communio sanguinis*). The lads were later found sleeping in the same room, which obviously disqualifies them as suspects, for had they done it, they would not have been capable of falling asleep after just having committed such a crime (§ 62–65). Next, Cicero indulges in a relatively long digression, which he begins by referring to Greek mythological tradition:

Videtisne, quos nobis poetae tradiderunt patris ulciscendi causa supplicium de matre sumpsisse, cum praesertim deorum immortalium iussis atque oraculis id fecisse dicantur, tamen ut eos agitent Furiae neque consistere umquam patiantur, quod ne pii quidem sine scelere esse potuerunt? [...] Nolite enim putare, quemadmodum in fabulis saepenumero videtis, eos, qui aliquid impie scelerateque commiserunt, agitari et perterrerari Furiarum taedis ardentibus.

Do you not know of those sons who, according to the traditions handed down to us by the poets, slew their mother to avenge their father? Even though they are said to have acted in obedience to the commands and oracles of the immortal gods, yet you read how the Furies harass them and never allow them to rest, because they could not even fulfil their duty to their father without committing a crime. [...] For you must not think, as you often see in plays, that those who have committed any impious and criminal act are harassed and terrified by the blazing torches of the Furies.

(Cic. *S. Rosc.* 66 f., transl. by J.H. FREESE)

The speaker then picks up the thread of the bonds of blood and additionally mentions the "pollution" (*macula*, Gr. μίαισμα), which falls to the lot of *parricidae* and *matricidae*. The judges are reminded that in reality, unlike in tragic plays (*quemadmodum in fabulis*), the perpetrator is not chased by the Furies carrying

the "lineup" of the audience, see Cic. *Att.* IX 7b, 2; *Fam.* III 10, 10; *Opt. Gen.* 10; Quint. *Inst.* II 20, 8; IV 1, 20; IV 3, 16 f.; *Schol. Bob.* p. 61 HILDEBRANDT = p. 112 STANGL.

⁴² On the reading of his name, see WISEMAN 1976: 263 f.; MARSHALL 1985: 95 and DYCK 2010: 130.

flaming torches (*Furiarum taedis ardentibus*). In fact the Furies are nothing else but human conscience and one's *malae cogitationes* which under such circumstances disturb the mind.

The Roman audience could have been familiar with the story from either the *Alcmeo* by Ennius or the *Alcmeo* (and/or *Alphesiboea*) by Accius⁴³. Especially two lines ascribed to the former poet are in accord with the context (Enn. *Scen.* 26–27 JOCELYN): “ceruleae incinctae igni incedunt | circumstant cum ardentibus taedis”. The words refer to the protagonist who is escaping the Furies who symbolise his insanity, which is caused by the shedding of the *maternus sanguis*. A.R. DYCK takes⁴⁴ the *fabulae* to which the speaker alludes to be those focused around Alcmaeon, for we possess no knowledge of any corresponding scene regarding Orestes. M. PETACCIA, however, argues⁴⁵ that similar action could have taken place in the *Orestes* by Pacuvius, which can be deduced from the grammarian Diomedes' remark (vol. I, p. 490 KEIL): “ut Pacuvius tragoedias nominibus heroicis scripsit, Orestem Chrysen et his similia”. She finds additional confirmation of the possible existence of such a scene in Vergil's description of Dido's rage (*Aen.* IV 471–473): “aut Agamemnonius scaenis agitatus Orestes, | armatam facibus matrem et serpentibus atris | cum fugit ultricesque sedent in limine Dirae”⁴⁶. The flaming torches (*taedae ardentis*) could have either accompanied the Furies appearing on the stage or at least, if H.D. JOCELYN is right (cf. n. 46), could have been attributed to imaginary ones. For the public, an association with the works of any of the three major tragic poets was possible and perhaps, as we shall demonstrate below, Cicero himself had reasons not to point to any particular author or specific play. There can be little doubt, on the other hand, as to his direct inspiration. In this passage he was apparently following Aeschines' *In Timarchum* (§ 190): Μη γὰρ οἴεσθε, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, τὰς τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἀρχὰς ἀπὸ θεῶν [...] γίγνεσθαι, μηδὲ τοὺς ἡσεβηκότας, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις, Ποινὰς ἐλάυνειν καὶ κολάζειν δασίην ἡμμέναις⁴⁷. G. LANDGRAF has gone so far as to suggest that in *De or.* I 155 Cicero could have had this passage in mind from his juvenile exercise in translation⁴⁸.

⁴³ See RIBBECK 1875: 197–199, 497–505; ZILLINGER 1911: 109; BEACHAM 1991: 124; ERASMO 2004: 142, 144. Cf. NAUCK, SNELL 1964: 381 and ZIELIŃSKI 1922.

⁴⁴ See DYCK 2003: 244 with n. 68 and 2010: 132.

⁴⁵ See PETACCIA 2000: 92 with n. 29, followed by SCHIERL 2006: 6 f. Cf. MANUWALD 2011: 72.

⁴⁶ Cf. Serv. *ad loc.*: “et ‘agitatus’, quia et furuit, et multae sunt de eo tragoediae; quasi frequenter actus. [...] A Pacuvio Orestes inducitur [...] propter vitandas furias ingressus Apollinis templum”. JOCELYN (1967: 187, n. 1) thinks that in the present context the Furies did not appear on the stage. Similarly (p. 188) Cic. *Acad. post.* 88 f. and *De or.* III 218 are supposed to prove that tragic Alcmaeon only imagined them. SCHIERL 2006: 7, n. 37 accepts this view.

⁴⁷ See WEISCHE 1972: 24 f.; DYCK 2010: 133; GILDENHARD 2011: 107 f. Cf. Cic. *Verr.* V 113.

⁴⁸ See LANDGRAF 1878: 16 f. and 1914: 140 f. On the *De oratore* passage, cf. FANTHAM 2004: 87 f.

Cicero, whose goal it was to present his client as incapable of committing patricide, sets Sex. Roscius' calm and sound-minded character in contrast to the notorious *furor et amentia* of Orestes and Alcmaeon – both known from the stage. He had found a role model in one of the Attic orators, but had effectively concealed the fact by adjusting the wording to the taste and character of the Roman audience. It is highly unlikely that an average hearer would recognise his dependence on Aeschines. This is how a response to the *exemplum* might have looked like: “Oh, that must be one of those tragic plays featuring Orestes (– “or Alcmaeon” – someone would reply). Who wrote it? Was it Ennius, or Accius?” Whoever wrote this, he was among the *doctissimi homines* and some of his famous lines must have rung even in the commoners' ears. It is noticeable, however, that in neither case does the speaker refer to a specific author or quote a specific play. On other occasions, especially when a given speech was not far removed in time from the *ludi scaenici*, he did not refrain from doing so⁴⁹. The attitude of those who attended and the atmosphere surrounding the trials of Sex. Roscius and of Milo was certainly very different from that exemplified by the trial of Caelius or the speech against Piso⁵⁰. Here, the orator faced a significant restriction which he had to take into account, namely the rules of appropriateness (*decorum*). It is a far wider subject than the mythological *exemplum* itself, but it seems not out of place to make a few remarks concerning their mutual dependence.

WHERE, WHEN, AND IN FRONT OF WHOM: THE RULES OF *DECORUM*

The circumstances of a case, the status of a speaker, and above all the character of an audience were of great importance when it came not only to the means

⁴⁹ In *Flacc.* 71 he possibly alludes to the *Telephus* by Ennius or Accius (on which see RIBBECK 1875: 104–112, 345–349; BEACHAM 1991: 123 f. Cf. Hor. *Ars* 95–105; Ps. Acron. ad Hor. *Ep.* 17, 8 [p. 452 KELLER]; STEEL 2001: 64, n. 113: “Versions in Latin by Ennius and Accius would have made the story familiar to a Roman audience”); in *Sest.* 102 he quotes Accius' *Atreus* (*trag.* 178–180 W. = 214–216 RIBB.; 168 W. = 203–204 RIBB. Cf. *Planc.* 59 and *Phil.* I 34 for partially the same lines); in *Pis.* 43 we find Ennius' *Thyestes* (*Scen.* 296–298 JOCELYN = 362–364 V. = 309–311 RIBB.) on which see RIBBECK 1875: 203; NISBET 1961: 105; JOCELYN 1967: 415, 421; MACKENDRICK 1995: 314; in *Man.* 22 there is an indirect reference to a tragedy (*Trag. inc.* 165–171 R.³ = Cic. *Nat. d.* III 67) either by Ennius (*Medea exul*, so LEFÈVRE 2001: 45 f. and cautiously JOCELYN 1967: 348) or by Accius (*Medea sive Argonautae*, so RIBBECK 1875: 535; cf. more recently MANUWALD 2013: 124–126); some lines of Ennius' *Medea exul* (*Scen.* 208, 215 f. JOCELYN) appear in *Cacl.* 18. On the subject in general, see also ZILLINGER 1911; SHACKLETON BAILEY 1983; KLODT 2003.

⁵⁰ It suffices to compare Asconius' *argumenta* of the *In Pisonem* and the *Pro Milone*. See also n. 41 above on *Mil.* and on *Pis.*; Cic. *Off.* II 57; Tac. *Ann.* XIV 20; Asc. *Pis.* p. 1 CLARK = p. 11 STANGL; CIACERI 1941: 114. Cf. AXER 1989: 305: “The level of familiarity [sc. with the theatre] must have varied depending on the subject and the occasion of his speeches. It would have been higher when the subject attracted members of the intellectual elite, and lower for the crowds gathered in the Forum”.

of expression, but to the contents of a speech. Cicero himself has expounded this plainly enough:

Est autem quid deceat oratori videndum non in sentiis solum, sed etiam in verbis; non enim omnis fortuna, non omnis honos, non omnis auctoritas, non omnis aetas, nec vero locus aut tempus aut auditor omnis eodem verborum genere tractandus est aut sententiarum, semperque in omni parte orationis ut vitae quid deceat est considerandum; quod et in re de qua agitur positum est et in personis et eorum qui dicunt et eorum qui audiunt.

Moreover the orator must have an eye to propriety not only in thought but in language. For the same style and the same thoughts must not be used in portraying every condition in life, or every rank, position or age, and in fact a similar distinction must be made in respect of place, time and audience. The universal rule, in oratory as in life, is to consider propriety. This depends on the subject under discussion, and on the character of both the speaker and the audience.

(*Orat.* 71–72, transl. by H.M. HUBBELL)

As has already been hinted at, the intellectual capacities and the level of sophistication of the audience is what matters to us the most (*auditores; personae eorum, qui audiunt*). Mythological evocation itself can be adjusted either to a place (*locus*), or to a period of time (*tempus*), as long as it remains intelligible⁵¹. In this respect the orator ought to adhere to the limitations of *perspicuitas* and σαφήνεια described above (see e.g. p. 251, 254). That is why Cicero can afford to refer to a more demanding myth only when speaking to the well-educated. In any case, whenever their knowledge is a matter for dispute, he makes them believe they are prepared to enjoy a literary allusion. So, for instance, in the *Pro Archia* he claims to be defending the poet *apud lectissimum virum* and among *homines literatissimi*, and in the *Pro Murena*, just after he has employed an *exemplum* not entirely clear to us⁵², he addresses the audience in the following way: “Et quoniam non est nobis haec oratio habenda aut in imperita multitudo aut in aliquo conventu agrestium, audacius paulo de studiis humanitatis quae et mihi et vobis nota et iucunda sunt disputabo” (*Mur.* 61)⁵³.

No survey of the republican concepts of appropriateness can be taken without regard to the *mos maiorum*. The scope of our topic, however, allows us to confine ourselves to Roman attitudes toward the presence of Greek literature and myth in

⁵¹ See e.g. FANTHAM 2004: 133 f.; WISSE 2002: 333. On *decorum* see also MICHEL 1982: 120 and more recently LANGLANDS 2011: 108 (who, at 107–110, remarks on Cicero’s division of the human self into four *personae*, all of which play a significant role in one’s decision-making).

⁵² But clear enough to Quintilian (*Inst.* VIII 6, 30). VAN DER POEL (2009: 347 f.) points out that in Roman declamations the use of mythological *exempla* was always “indirect”, i.e. “given in the form of an allusion”. At pp. 352 f. he lists all such occurrences found in Seneca the Elder, Pseudo-Quintilian (*Declamationes maiores, Declamationes minores*) and Calpurnius Flaccus.

⁵³ Cf. however Cic. *Fin.* IV 74. See on the subject e.g. VON ALBRECHT 1969: 422 = 2003: 199 f.; VAN DER BLOM 2010: 120 with n. 156; FANTHAM 2013: 166 f.

the public sphere. Among the duties of a Roman statesman, as M. Aper informs us in Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus*, was to attend the Forum and to deliver speeches at the request of friends and clients. His interlocutor, we are told, falls short of this *studium* by devoting his spare time to the writing of a *Medea* or a *Thyestes* (Tac. *Dial.* 3, 4 f.)⁵⁴. Some in republican Rome wanted to pass as intellectuals, spending their *otium* on literary studies after the fashion of *Graeculi* (Cic. *Sest.* 110: "Graeculum se atque otiosum putari voluit, studio litterarum se subito dedit"), but often, as in the case of Gellius, even though exaggeratedly depicted by Cicero, their small collections (*libelli*) were being given away as security for acquiring wine⁵⁵. The former, then, is a picture of someone despising Roman customs, whereas the latter is that of a person who purchases books only to show off. Cicero must have been aware of what a bad impression either case made upon an audience, for he addresses both in his dialogue *On the Orator*. During a discussion on *decorum* and the imitation of human nature as the main source of rhetorical inspiration, Antonius, although he partially accepts Crassus' argument about the necessity of studying philosophy⁵⁶, expresses some reservations. One has not only to influence the emotions of the hearers by overemphasising (*amplificatio*) and embellishing (*ornatio*) parts of the speech, but to consider their feelings: "Neque vult [sc. orator] ita sapiens inter stultos videri, ut ei, qui audiant, aut illum ineptum et Graeculum putent, aut, etiam si valde probent ingenium, oratoris sapientiam admirentur, se esse stultos moleste ferant" (Cic. *De or.* I 222). Here we have therefore a brief account of both the abovementioned poses. The speaker must avoid doubtful wisdom because of which he could be deemed as a fool pretending to be wise (*ineptum et Graeculum*)⁵⁷, but he also has to be ever alert, lest his erudition, though genuine, render the hearers depressed by their own want of knowledge⁵⁸.

This is, I believe, what Cicero was afraid of while he delivered the speeches *Pro Sexto Roscio* and *Pro Milone* before audiences who were unpredictable in

⁵⁴ Cf. KASTER 2006: 340: "Literary studies (*studium litterarum*) are not blameworthy unless so pursued as to exclude devotion to the public interest". See also *HA Hadr.* 1, 5: "imbutusque inpenis Graecis studiis, ingenio eius sic ad ea declinante, ut a nonnullis Graeculus diceretur".

⁵⁵ Cf. Sen. *Dial.* IX 9, 5; Luc. *Ind.* passim.

⁵⁶ Cf. KNOCHÉ 1959: 64; PÖSCHL 1995: 202 f.

⁵⁷ Cf. Cic. *De or.* I 102; *Pis.* 70; *Tusc.* I 86; SCHOENBERGER 1910: 34: "Wo Cicero also die Griechen als Beispiel anführt, gebraucht er öfter den verächtlichen Ausdruck: homo Graecus, ja auch: Graeculi"; KROLL 1972: 209, 332, n. 27; DELACY 1941: 56, 58; SCHMITZ 1985: 103.

⁵⁸ See KLODT 2003: 57, n. 68; SHACKLETON BAILEY 1971: 25: "This [sc. not being an art collector] was not just a public pose, conformable to the warning in his book 'On the Orator' not to flaunt Greek culture before a Roman audience". Cf. GÜTE 1962: 148 and esp. 150: "We know that Cicero frequently felt that he had to apologize for his learning". See also Cic. *Scaur.* 4: "cum summi philosophi Platonis graviter et ornate scriptum librum de morte [sc. *Phaedonem*] legisset [sc. Cleombrotus quidam], in quo, ut opinor, Socrates illo ipso die quo erat ei moriendum permulta disputat..." and *Phil.* II 65: "Sed ut est apud poetam nescioquem..."

this respect, and that is why he preferred to use expressions such as *nobis poetae tradiderunt* or *doctissimi homines memoriae prodiderunt* than to quote directly from a play or even to point to a specific author. Similarly in *Man. 22* (cf. n. 49 above), he distances himself from the story by saying *Medea dicitur* and in *Har. Resp. 20* he refers to what the poets have reported (*quos poetae ferunt*) about the Giants. A remarkable illustration of this procedure is his handling of one of the Athenian foundation myths. In the *Pro Sestio*, after justifying his own departure (Cicero never calls his exile “exile”) and creating a syllogism out of deliberations about the mortality of the body and immortality of the soul (§ 47–48)⁵⁹, he sets a series of *exempla*, one of which is as follows:

Denique, cum omnia semper ad dignitatem rettulissem nec sine ea quicquam expetendum esse homini in vita putassem, mortem, quam etiam virgines Athenis, regis, opinor, Erechthei filiae, pro patria contempsisse dicuntur, ego vir consularis tantis rebus gestis timerem?

Lastly, as I had always made honour my rule of life, and thought that nothing in life was to be sought for by a man without it, should I, a man of consular rank, after I have accomplished such great deeds, be afraid of death, which even young Athenian maidens, the daughters, I fancy, of King Erechtheus, are said to have despised for the sake of their country?

(*Sest. 48*, transl. by R. GARDNER)

There was a tragedy of that name by Euripides whom Ennius later imitated⁶⁰, but it is hard to say whether it was ever popular among the Romans or, as H.D. JOCELYN stresses, if Cicero knew a dramatic treatment of that myth⁶¹. Anyway, the story could have been known from other sources, possibly as an *exemplum* of virtue, which is also evident from Cicero’s allusions to it in his philosophical writings⁶². At best we can suppose that by using the nominative and infinitive construction (*dicuntur*), not unlike in *Man. 22*, he has a stage performance in mind, but it certainly serves as well to distance him from the *fabula* (whether or not literally a “tragedy”). His characteristic employment of the verb *opinor* (cf. n. 58 above)⁶³, on the other hand, makes it clear that he did not wish to appear as if that obscure name came so easily to him. By pretending that he is not entirely certain, whether it was Erechtheus or maybe some other king whose daughters

⁵⁹ Cf. e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* I 117; *Schol. Bob.* p. 90 HILDEBRANDT = p. 130 STANGL.

⁶⁰ See Enn. *Scen.* 140–143 JOCELYN = 135–140 V.; Gell. VII 16, 9; Fest. 162 L.; Macr. *Sat.* VI 4, 6. Cf. e.g. RIBBECK 1875: 181–186; ERASMO 2004: 143.

⁶¹ Apart from *Sest.*, see also Cic. *Nat. d.* III 49 f.; *Fin.* V 62; *Tusc.* I 116. Cf. JOCELYN 1967: 282: “Cicero refers three times to the legend [...] without giving any sign that he knew a dramatic treatment of it”.

⁶² Cf. n. 61 above and *Schol. Bob.* p. 91 HILDEBRANDT = p. 131 STANGL; KASTER 2006: 228.

⁶³ Cf. *OLD*, s.v. 1e; KÜHNER, STEGMANN 1962: 711.

made this particular sacrifice for the sake of their homeland, Cicero identified himself with the (common) people⁶⁴.

We have seen (n. 49 above) that in the *Pro Sestio* the speaker freely and quite copiously quotes from Accius' *Atreus*. Why then did he handle so carefully what we cannot exclude completely as an allusion to Ennius' play? I think that what we are dealing with here, as far as rhetorical theory regarding the mythological *exemplum* is concerned, is not so much a sign of inconsistency on the part of the speaker as it is of flexibility, which is always essential to this kind of precepts as discussed above. The tragedies belonging to the Atreid saga were easily recognised in Rome and perhaps not infrequently restaged as it was mostly tyranny and the abuse of power that constituted their plot⁶⁵. This was not the case, apparently, with the *Erechtheus*. As a result, we may assume *clariores poetae* and/or *doctissimi homines* to be condensed expressions, in fact conveying the meaning of "famous plays of well-known poets (of the past)" which would not seem alien to either Cicero's or Quintilian's practice. So far we have learned some ways in which the great orator availed himself of the mythological *exemplum*, but the present study would doubtless benefit no less from analysing the opposite situation, as announced earlier (cf. n. 29 above).

TOWARDS THE "ANTI-EXEMPLUM"

At the beginning of our preserved text of the *Pro Scauro* we can observe both certain Roman attitudes toward *Graeculi* and the abovementioned relativity on the part of the speaker as regards mythology. Let us briefly outline the case. In the part of the speech with which what survives of it begins, Cicero, perhaps within the *refutatio*, deliberates on the nature of suicide. Apparently the prosecutor blamed the defendant for the fact that a woman from Sardinia, the wife of a certain Aris, committed suicide after her good name had been put to jeopardy by M. Aemilius⁶⁶. It has to be noted that whenever Cicero defends governors of a province he uses every possible measure to undermine the witnesses' credibility⁶⁷. So he calls forth the Roman *exempla* of virtue, of which the Greeks are not capable with one exception. Here is the relevant portion of the text:

Quid? in omnibus monumentis Graeciae, quae sunt verbis ornatiora quam rebus, quis invenitur, cum ab Aiace fabulisque discesseris, qui tamen ipse

⁶⁴ See MACKENDRICK 1995: 211; KASTER 2006: 228 f.

⁶⁵ See e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* IV 77; *De or.* III 219; *Off.* I 97; Var. *Rust.* II 1, 6; Lucr. III 72 f.; Plut. *Cic.* 5; RIBBECK 1875: 204: "Cicero's und seiner Zeitgenossen Gedächtniss war die Dichtung als eine classische gegenwärtig"; DUNKLE 1967: 184; ERASMO 2004: 102.

⁶⁶ See CIACERI 1941: 123; ALEXANDER 2002: 99, 108.

⁶⁷ See e.g. CLASSEN 1982 and 1985.

Ignominiae dolore, ut ait poeta, victor insolens se
victum non potuit pati
praeter Atheniensem Themistoclem, qui se ipse morte multavit?

Further, in all the records of Greece, richer in fine words than in fine actions, whom
can we find, apart from Ajax and the tragic plots, who, as the poet says,

In victory's haughty hour
Brooked not defeat at fell dishonour's hand
save only Themistocles the Athenian, who with his own hand wrought his death?
(Cic. *Scaur.* 3, transl. by N.H. WATTS)

In the following sections there is a description of a Greek who, after reading Plato's *Phaedo*, flung himself down the city walls. No one would believe, according to Cicero, that this woman had read philosophical treatises nor that a Roman noble of such rank would want to seduce her. She was simply old, ugly, and promiscuous (§ 4–6). Then the speaker presents two alternative, more plausible, versions of the story. Firstly – her husband cheated on her and planned to marry another woman, which she failed to endure. Secondly – her husband feigned her suicide with the help of his freedman. Both possibilities bear witness to the family's wickedness and portray the Sardinians as a nation (§ 7–13).

Ajax's suicide was one of the favourite subjects of Roman dramatists. A tragedy called *Aias* was written by both Livius Andronicus and Ennius, and a version of *Armorum iudicium* (based on Aeschylus' "Ὀπλων κρίσις") is ascribed to Accius as well as to Pacuvius. In addition, the latter is the author of a play called *Teucer*⁶⁸. The way Ovid treated Ajax's confrontation with Ulysses, moreover, proves that this might have been a key subject (ὑπόθεσις) in rhetorical schools (*Met.* XIII 1–2, 5–6): "Consedere duces et vulgi stante corona | Surgit ad hos clipei dominus septemplex Aiax; [...] 'agimus, pro Iuppiter!' inquit | 'Ante rates causam...' ", etc.⁶⁹.

We need to bear in mind that when it comes to suicide, there was a strict moral code involved in republican Rome, the altered form of which is perceptible throughout the Early Empire⁷⁰. Ajax as a mythological character, on the other hand, apart from being used as an illustration of a *status causae*, was also known from Homer and Sophocles. Especially the latter poet could have

⁶⁸ See RIBBECK 1875: 26, 213, 218–231; MALCOVATI 1943: 131; GIOMINI 1961: 330; JOCELYN 1967: 178 f.; DYCK 1996: 283, 621; 2012: 124; ERASMO 2004: 99, 142–145; MANUWALD 2011: 113, 192, 221.

⁶⁹ See also e.g. BONNER 1969: 15, 23–27, 151; HILL 2004: 123. FANTHAM (1996: 93) draws attention to Ov. *Met.* XIII 121 which was probably inspired by Latro's epigram heard by the poet in his youth. The anecdote comes from Seneca the Elder (*Contr.* II 2, 8). Cf. also Quint. *Inst.* V 10, 41.

⁷⁰ See SAPOTA 2009. For the *mors Romana* in general, see VAN HOOFF 1990: 107–120 and HILL 2004. A useful up-to-date bibliography on ancient suicide can be found in KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA 2014: 169 f.

ethically influenced the authors of Latin tragedies who followed him⁷¹. The distinction between the epic Ajax and his tragic counterpart, facing moral decisions concerning *atimia* and suicide, probably existed in Roman literary culture as a whole, and Cicero certainly saw it⁷². To a Roman, then, *Homericus Ajax* was not equivalent to what Cicero specifies as *Ajax fabulaeque* which, taken as the *hendiadys*, would mean something like “The Ajax of the tragedies”. It is this latter one whom a descendant of Remus could perceive as representing a model of the “Roman death (by suicide)”.

In the passage we are discussing the speaker introduces lines from an unknown tragedy (*Inc. trag.* 67–68 RIBB.)⁷³, illustrating a posture of which the Greeks were not capable. The only exception to this was Themistocles, if we are to accept Cicero’s account of his fate, rejected by Thucydides⁷⁴. Earlier in the text the *exempla* of P. Crassus and M’. Aquilius are put forward, the former of whom took his own life in order not to fall into the hands of the enemy, and the latter, having suffered an ignominious death at the hands of Mithridates, managed to preserve his dignity. The rhetorical question arises – who among the Greeks would possess the same amount of courage? Given the political prestige of the speech and the intellectual background of the people whom we know were present⁷⁵, it becomes clear that almost any felicitous allusion would not be out of place. Perhaps Cicero had anticipated his rival’s reply and thus prevented him from employing the paradigm of the tragic Ajax, who by his frequent presence on stage had been made an *exemplum* appealing to the Roman sense of a “good death”. The hearers are warned against accepting any proof from outside the case (*extra causam*) based on tragedy (*cum ab Aiace fabulisque discesseris*). This

⁷¹ See esp. Soph. *Aj.* 462–465, 470–472, 506–509, 848 f., 1010–1012. Cf. STRAUSS 1993: 80 f.; KNOX 1961: 20: “The dilemma of Ajax illuminates not only the metaphysical aspects of man’s life on earth, but also the political and social”.

⁷² See Cic. *Div.* II 82, *Tusc.* IV 49 with JOCELYN 1967: 178.

⁷³ Perhaps belonging to Accius’ *Philoctetes*, see GHISELLI 1972: 103, n. 26. ZILLINGER (1911: 142, n. 1), however, does not exclude Ennius’ *Telamo*, Pacuvius’ *Teucer*, nor Accius’ *Eurysaces*.

⁷⁴ See Thuc. I 138, 4: νοσήσας δὲ τελευτᾶ τὸν βίον· λέγουσι δὲ τινες καὶ ἐκούσιον φαρμάκῳ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν, ἀδύνατον νομίσαντα εἶναι ἐπιτελέσαι βασιλεῖ ἃ ὑπέσχετο. Cf. DYCK 2012: 124; VAN DER BLOM 2010: 214 with n. 144. Uncritically still SCHOENBERGER 1910: 33–35 and SAUER 1910: 6. See also HORNBLOWER 2003: 223. In *Brut.* 42 f. Cicero has Atticus point out that Clitarchus and Stratocles made up the story of Themistocles’ suicide for rhetorical effect (“hanc enim mortem rhetorice et tragice ornare potuerunt, illa mors vulgaris nullam praebebat materiem ad ornatum”). Versions of Themistocles’ death variant from the one Thucydides advocates are also mentioned by Nep. *Them.* 10, 4.

⁷⁵ See e.g. Asc. *Sc.* pp. 19–20 CLARK = pp. 22–23 STANGL: “Subscripserunt Triario in Scaurum L. Marius, L.f., M., Q. Pacuvii fratres, cognomina Claudii. [...] Defenderunt Scaurum sex patroni, cum ad id tempus raro quisquam pluribus quam quattuor uteretur”. Cf. LEWIS 2006: 221; ALEXANDER 2002: 98–101.

makes it impossible for the prosecutor to ennoble Aris' wife by comparing her to the Salaminian hero.

CONCLUSIONS

A few closing remarks can be made. Rhetorical handbooks did not draw a sharp line of demarcation between examples derived from myth and those based on historical events, nor did the ancients in general precisely separate these notions. There are two inevitable consequences of such a state of affairs. Firstly – the rhetorical theory seldom concerned the mythological *exemplum* specifically; secondly – the speakers could make use of the *fabulae* relevant to their case in the same way they employed the events that *actually* took place in the broadly conceived past. The theory and practice, it would seem, overlapped, which is well illustrated by the example of Cicero. He attached great importance to how an audience would respond to a literary allusion, and later rhetoricians, especially Greek ones, advised against using obscure and obsolete paradigms. One of the passages of the *Pro Milone* involving Orestes as an illustration of justified homicide became, through Quintilian, our most recognisable instance of the *fabula poetica* as a technical term.

Cicero himself is well-aware of the requirement imposed on the mythological *exemplum* by rhetoricians to always pick and choose from the repertoire of *doctissimi homines*. We have suggested that this frequently repeated precept was intended to recommend famous plays rather than playwrights, since it would not matter a great deal to an audience whether they hear the Ennian or the Accian Alcmaeon speaking. It was, however, crucial for an orator that whatever he alluded to should be easily comprehended. The strict rhetorical *conspicuitas* was not the only reason. Equally important was to observe the rules of *decorum* and, therefore, as D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY put it (n. 58 above), “not to flaunt Greek culture before a Roman audience”. Cicero went so far in this respect as even to pretend he did not remember the exact name of king Erechtheus, the story of whom appears to have been among his favourite anecdotes. Each time, moreover, when he knew he would speak before a crowd consisting of the lower strata of the Roman people as well, he tried to avoid literary references and, conversely, the speeches which abound with quotations are particularly those delivered in the senate or near to theatrical performances (*ludi scaenici*).

The adducing of examples certainly won support for a case and for that very reason the speaker must have sometimes diverged from the theory when appearing on the Rostra. In the *Pro Scauro*, as has been shown, Cicero dismissed the tragic Ajax as a possible *exemplum* of an honourable death precisely because he knew it would suit his opponent's case well. His reluctance towards *fabulae* displayed at the beginning of the (surviving) speech did not stop him, however, from referring to the Palladium later on (§ 48), which only proves that whether

one was entitled to resort to myth or not depended on one's ability to seize the most convenient moment. This, finally, leads us back to another often recurring instruction – to handle (mythological) *exemplum* with caution as a means not related directly to the case (*extra causam*).

*John Paul II Complex of Secondary Schools No. 3
in Ruda Śląska*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- VON ALBRECHT 1969: M. VON ALBRECHT, *Das Prooemium von Ciceros Rede pro Archia poeta und das Problem der Zweckmäßigkeit der argumentatio extra causam*, Gymnasium LXXVI 1969, pp. 419–429 (= IDEM, *Cicero's Style. A Synopsis*, Leiden–Boston 2003, pp. 198–205).
- ALEKSANDROWICZ 1996: T. ALEKSANDROWICZ, *Elita władzy a oratorstwo w schyłkowym okresie Rzeczypospolitej Rzymskiej*, Katowice 1996.
- ALEWELL 1912: K. ALEWELL, *Über das rhetorische ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ. Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendung in der Kaiserzeit*, (diss. Kiel) Leipzig 1912.
- ALEXANDER 2002: M.C. ALEXANDER, *The Case for the Prosecution in the Ciceronian Era*, Ann Arbor 2002.
- AXER 1989: J. AXER, *Tribunal–Stage–Arena. Modelling of the Communication Situation in M. Tullius Cicero's Judicial Speeches*, *Rhetorica* VII 1989, pp. 299–311.
- BEACHAM 1991: R.C. BEACHAM, *The Roman Theater and Its Audience*, Cambridge, MA 1991.
- BERGER 1984: K. BERGER, *Hellenistische Gattungen in Neuen Testament*, *ANRW* II 25, 2 (1984), pp. 1031–1432.
- BETTINI 2006: M. BETTINI, *Mythos/Fabula: Authoritative and Discredited Speech*, *History of Religions* XLV 2006, pp. 195–212.
- BONNER 1969: S.F. BONNER, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*, Liverpool 1969.
- BREMMER, HORSFALL 1987: J.N. BREMMER, N. HORSFALL, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, London 1987.
- BÜCHER 2006: F. BÜCHER, *Verargumentierte Geschichte. Exempla Romana im politischen Diskurs der späten römischen Republik*, Stuttgart 2006.
- CANTER 1933: H.V. CANTER, *The Mythological Paradigm in Greek and Latin Poetry*, *AJPh* LIV 1933, pp. 201–224.
- CIACERI 1941: E. CIACERI, *Cicerone e i suoi tempi*, vol. II, Genova 1941.
- CLASSEN 1982: C.J. CLASSEN, *Ciceros Kunst der Überredung*, in: LUDWIG 1982, pp. 149–184.
- 1985: C.J. CLASSEN, *Recht – Rhetorik – Politik. Untersuchungen zu Ciceros rhetorischer Strategie*, Darmstadt 1985.
- DE LACY 1941: P. DE LACY, *Cicero's Invective against Piso*, *TAPhA* LXXII 1941, pp. 49–58.
- DEMOEN 1997: K. DEMOEN, *A Paradigm for the Analysis of Paradigms: The Rhetorical Exemplum in Ancient and Imperial Greek Theory*, *Rhetorica* XV 1997, pp. 125–158.
- DÖRRIE 1978: H. DÖRRIE, *Sinn und Funktion des Mythos in der griechischen und römischen Dichtung*, Opladen 1978.
- DUNKLE 1967: T.R. DUNKLE, *The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective of the Late Republic*, *TAPhA* LXXXVIII 1967, pp. 151–171.
- DYCK 1996: A.R. DYCK, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*, Ann Arbor 1996.
- 2003: A.R. DYCK, *Evidence and Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Roscio Amerino: The Case against Sex. Roscius*, *CQ, NS*, LIII 2003, pp. 235–246.
- 2010: A.R. DYCK (ed.), *Cicero. Pro Sexto Roscio*, Cambridge 2010.

- 2012: A.R. DYCK (ed.), *Marcus Tullius Cicero. The Speeches on Behalf of Marcus Fonteius and Marcus Aemilius Scaurus*, Oxford 2012.
- ERASMO 2004: M. ERASMO, *Roman Tragedy. Theatre to Theatricality*, Austin 2004.
- FANTHAM 1972: E. FANTHAM, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*, Toronto–Buffalo 1972.
- 1996: *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore–London 1996.
- 2004: *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*, Oxford–New York 2004.
- 2013: (ed.), *Cicero's Pro L. Murena Oratio*, New York 2013.
- FLECK 1993: M. FLECK, *Cicero als Historiker*, (diss. Köln 1992) Stuttgart 1993.
- FUHRMANN 1973: M. FUHRMANN, *Das Exemplum in der antiken Rhetorik*, in: R. KOSELLECK (ed.), *Geschichte: Ereignis und Erzählung*, München 1973, pp. 449–452.
- GAGARIN 2007: M. GAGARIN, *Background and Origins: Oratory and Rhetoric before the Sophists*, in: I. WORTHINGTON (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Malden 2007, pp. 27–37.
- GHISELLI 1972: A. GHISELLI (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Aemilio Scauro oratio*, Bologna ³1972.
- GILDENHARD 2011: J. GILDENHARD, *Creative Eloquence. The Construction of Reality in Cicero's Speeches*, Oxford–New York 2011.
- GIOMINI 1961: R. GIOMINI, *Echi di Accio in Cicerone*, in: *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, Vol. II, Roma 1961, pp. 321–331.
- GRAF 1993a: F. GRAF, *Der Mythos bei den Römern. Forschungs- und Problemgeschichte*, in: GRAF 1993b, pp. 25–43.
- 1993b: F. GRAF (ed.) *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft. Das Paradigma Roms*, Leipzig–Stuttgart 1993.
- GUITE 1962: H. GUITE, *Cicero's Attitude to the Greeks*, G&R IX 1962, pp. 142–159.
- HILL 2004: T.D. HILL, *Ambitiosa Mors. Suicide and Self in Roman Thought and Literature*, New York–London 2004.
- HORNBLLOWER 2003: S. HORNBLLOWER, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. I, New York ²2003.
- HÖLSCHER 1993: T. HÖLSCHER, *Mythen als Exempel der Geschichte*, in: GRAF 1993b, pp. 67–87.
- JOCELYN 1967: H.D. JOCELYN (ed.), *The Tragedies of Ennius*, Cambridge 1967.
- KASTER 2006: R.A. KASTER (ed.), *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*, Oxford–New York 2006.
- KENNEDY 1963: G.A. KENNEDY, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Princeton 1963.
- 1994: G.A. KENNEDY, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton 1994.
- KLODT 2003: C. KLODT, *Prozessparteien und politische Gegner als dramatis personae. Charakterstilisierung in Ciceros Reden*, in: B.-J. SCHRÖDER, J.-P. SCHRÖDER (eds.), *Studium declamatorium. Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, München–Leipzig 2003, pp. 35–106.
- KLOTZ 1942: A. KLOTZ, *Studien zu Valerius Maximus und den Exempla*, München 1942.
- KNOCHE 1959: U. KNOCHE, *Cicero: Ein Mittler Griechischer Geisteskultur*, Hermes LXXXVII 1959, pp. 57–74.
- KNOX 1961: B.M.W. KNOX, *The Ajax of Sophocles*, HSCPh LXV 1961, pp. 1–37.
- KOHL 1915: R. KOHL, *De scholasticorum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis*, (diss.) Paderborn 1915.
- KORNACKA 1995: K. KORNACKA, *Patos i jego realizacja stylistyczna w mowie Cyceronna Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*, RHum XLIII 1995, pp. 41–70.
- KORNHARDT 1936: H. KORNHARDT, *Exemplum. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie*, Göttingen 1936.
- KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA 2014: A. KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA, *Is Ending a Wretched Life Pardonable? Attitudes toward Suicide in Greek Funerary Epigrams*, Eos CI 2014, pp. 169–185.
- KROLL 1972: W. KROLL, *Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit*, Darmstadt 1972 (= Leipzig 1933).
- KÜHNER, STEGMANN 1962: R. KÜHNER, C. STEGMANN, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre*, vols. I–II, München ⁴1962.
- LANDGRAF 1878: G. LANDGRAF, *De Ciceronis elocutione in orationibus Pro P. Quintio et Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino conspicua*, (diss.) Wirceburgi 1878.

- 1914: *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*, Leipzig–Berlin ²1914.
- LANGLANDS 2011: R. LANGLANDS, *Roman Exempla and Situation Ethics: Valerius Maximus and Cicero de Officiis*, JRS CI 2011, pp. 100–122.
- LAUSBERG 1998: H. LAUSBERG, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Studies*, transl. by M.T. BLISS, A. JANSEN, D.E. ORTON, ed. by D.E. ORTON, R.D. ANDERSON, Leiden 1998.
- LEEMAN 1963: A.D. LEEMAN, *Orationis Ratio. The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*, vols. I–II, Amsterdam 1963.
- LEFÈVRE 2001: E. LEFÈVRE, *Ennius' Medea im römisch-politischen Kontext*, in: S. FALLER (ed.), *Studien zu antiken Identitäten*, Würzburg 2001, pp. 39–51.
- LEWANDOWSKI 2007: I. LEWANDOWSKI, *Historiografia rzymska*, Poznań 2007.
- LEWIS 2006: R.G. LEWIS (ed.), *Asconius. Commentaries on Speeches of Cicero*, rev. by J. HARRIES et al., Oxford 2006.
- LUCARELLI 2007: U. LUCARELLI, *Exemplarische Vergangenheit: Valerius Maximus und die Konstruktion des sozialen Raumes in den frühen Kaiserzeit*, Göttingen 2007.
- LUDWIG 1982: W. LUDWIG (ed.), *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron*, Vandœuvres–Genève 1982.
- MACKENDRICK 1995: P. MACKENDRICK, *The Speeches of Cicero: Context, Law, Rhetoric*, London 1995.
- MALCOVATI 1943: E. MALCOVATI, *Cicerone e la poesia*, Pavia 1943.
- MANUWALD 2011: G. MANUWALD, *Roman Republican Theatre*, Cambridge 2011.
- 2013: G. MANUWALD, *Medea. Transformations of a Greek Figure in Latin Literature*, G&R LX 2013, pp. 114–135.
- MARSHALL 1985: B.A. MARSHALL, *A Historical Commentary on Asconius*, Columbia 1985.
- MARTIN 2009: G. MARTIN, *Divine Talk. Religious Argumentation in Demosthenes*, Oxford–New York 2009.
- MARX 1968: F. MARX, *Aristoteles' Rhetorik*, in: STARK 1968, pp. 36–123 (= Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kgl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Classe LII 1900, pp. 241–328).
- MASLAKOV 1984: G. MASLAKOV, *Valerius Maximus and Roman Historiography. A Study of the exempla Tradition*, ANRW II 32, 1 (1984), pp. 437–496.
- MAYER 1991: R.G. MAYER, *Roman Historical Exempla in Seneca*, in: P. GRIMAL (ed.), *Sénèque et la prose latine*, Vandœuvres–Genève 1991, pp. 141–169.
- MCCALL, JR. 1969: M. H. MCCALL, JR., *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison*, Cambridge, MA 1969.
- MICHEL 1982: A. MICHEL, *La théorie de la rhétorique chez Cicéron: éloquence et philosophie*, in: LUDWIG 1982, pp. 109–139.
- VON MOOS 1996: P. VON MOOS, *Geschichte als Topik. Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im „Policraticus“ Johanns von Salisbury*, Hildesheim 1996.
- NAUCK, SNELL 1964: A. NAUCK (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta. Supplementum continens nova fragmenta Euripidea adespota apud scriptores veteres reperta adiecit* B. SNELL, Hildesheim 1964.
- NESHOLM 2010: E.J. NESHOLM, *Language and Artistry in Cicero's Pro Archia*, CW CIII 2010, pp. 477–490.
- NISBET 1961: R.G.M. NISBET (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis In L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio*, Oxford 1961.
- NORDEN 1971: E. NORDEN, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, vols. I–II, Darmstadt ¹1971.
- NORTH 1952: H. NORTH, *The Use of Poetry in the Training of the Ancient Orator*, Traditio VIII 1952, pp. 1–33.
- OPPERMANN 2000: I. OPPERMANN, *Zur Funktion historischer Beispiele in Ciceros Briefen*, München–Leipzig 2000.
- PAPILLON 1996: T. PAPILLON, *Isocrates on Gorgias and Helen: The Unity of the Helen*, CJ XCI 1996, pp. 377–391.

- PETACCIA 2000: M.R. PETACCIA, *Der Orestes-Mythos in der lateinischen archaischen Tragödie und im politisch-religiösen Zusammenhang der römischen Republik*, in: G. MANUWALD (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie*, Würzburg 2000, pp. 87–111.
- PETZOLT 1972: K.-E. PETZOLT, *Cicero and Historie*, Chiron II 1972, pp. 253–276.
- PIERZAK 2015: D. PIERZAK, *Słowa, których Ciceron nie wygłosił w mowie Pro Milone*, *Quaestiones Oralitatis I* 2015, pp. 95–109.
- PÖSCHL 1995: V. PÖSCHL, *Ciceros Bildungsprogramm*, RhM CXXXVIII 1995, pp. 193–209.
- PRICE 1975: B.J. PRICE, *Paradeigma and exemplum in Ancient Rhetorical Theory*, (diss.) Univ. of California, Berkeley 1975.
- RACE 1978: W.H. RACE, *Panathenaicus 74–90: The Rhetoric of Isocrates' Digression on Agamemnon*, TAPhA CVIII 1978, pp. 175–185.
- RADIN 1911: M. RADIN, *Literary References in Cicero's Orations*, CJ VI 1911, pp. 209–217.
- REINHARDT 1974: U. REINHARDT, *Mythologische Beispiele in der Neuen Komödie (Menander, Plautus, Terenz)*, vol. I, (diss.) Mainz 1974.
- RIBBECK 1875: O. RIBBECK, *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*, Leipzig 1875.
- ROBINSON 1986: A.W. ROBINSON, *Cicero's Use of People as exempla in His Speeches*, (diss.) University of Indiana, Bloomington 1986.
- ROMANO 1980: D. ROMANO, *Cicerone e il ratto di Proserpina*, *Ciceroniana IV* 1980, pp. 191–202.
- RUSSELL 1967: D.A. RUSSELL, *Rhetoric and Criticism*, G&R XIV 1967, pp. 130–144.
- 1981: D.A. RUSSELL, *Criticism in Antiquity*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1981.
- SAPOTA 2009: T. SAPOTA, *Rzyska idea samobójstwa*, SPhP XIX 2009, pp. 281–287.
- SAUER 1910: F. SAUER, *Über die Verwendung der Geschichte und Altertumskunde in Ciceros Reden*, Ludwigshafen am Rhein 1910.
- SCHIERL 2006: P. SCHIERL (ed.), *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius*, Berlin–New York 2006.
- SCHMITZ 1985: D. SCHMITZ, *Zeugen des Prozeßgegners in Gerichtsreden Ciceros*, Frankfurt/M. 1985.
- SCHOENBERGER 1910: H. SCHOENBERGER, *Beispiele aus der Geschichte, ein rhetorisches Kunstmittel in Ciceros Reden*, (diss. Univ. Erlangen) Augsburg 1910.
- SCHWEINFURTH-WALLA 1986: S. SCHWEINFURTH-WALLA, *Studien zu den rhetorischen Überzeugungsmitteln bei Cicero und Aristoteles*, Tübingen 1986.
- SHACKLETON BAILEY 1971: D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Cicero*, Bristol 1971.
- 1983: *Cicero and Early Latin Poetry*, ICS VIII 1983, pp. 239–249.
- SOLMSEN 1968: F. SOLMSEN, *Demetrios Περὶ ἐρμηνείας und sein peripatetisches Quellenmaterial*, in: STARK 1968, pp. 285–312 (= Hermes LXVI 1931, pp. 241–267).
- SOMMERSTEIN 1999: A.H. SOMMERSTEIN (ed.), *Aeschylus. Eumenides*, Cambridge 1999.
- STARK 1968: R. STARK (ed.), *Rhetorika. Schriften zur aristotelischen und hellenistischen Rhetorik*, Hildesheim 1968.
- STEEL 2001: C.E.W. STEEL, *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire*, Oxford–New York 2001.
- STEINER 1968: G. STEINER, *Cicero as Mythologist*, CJ LXIII 1968, pp. 193–199.
- STEMMLER 2000: M. STEMMLER, *Auctoritas exempli. Zur Wechselwirkung von Kanonisierten Vergangenheitsbildern und gesellschaftlicher Gegenwart in der spätrepublikanischen Rhetorik*, in: B. LINKE, M. STEMMLER (eds.), *Mos maiorum. Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsstiftung und Stabilisierung in der römischen Republik*, Stuttgart 2000, pp. 141–205.
- STRAUSS 1993: B.S. STRAUSS, *Fathers and Sons in Athens. Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War*, London 1993.
- STYKA 1990: J. STYKA, *Estetyka komedii rzymskiej w pismach Cicerona*, *Meander LXV* 1990, pp. 279–292.
- TRAGLIA 1986: A. TRAGLIA (ed.), *Poeti latini arcaici*, vol. I, Torino 1986.
- VAN DER BLOM 2010: H. VAN DER BLOM, *Cicero's Role Models. The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*, New York 2010.
- VAN DER POEL 2009: M. VAN DER POEL, *The Use of exempla in Roman Declamation*, *Rhetorica XXVII* 2009, pp. 332–353.

- VAN HOOFF 1990: A.L.J. VAN HOOFF, *From Autothanasia to Suicide. Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity*, London 1990.
- VOLKMANN 1885: R. VOLKMANN, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht*, Leipzig ²1885.
- H. VRETSKA, K. VRETSKA 1979: H. VRETSKA, K. VRETSKA (eds.), *Marcus Tullius Cicero, Pro Archia poeta*, Darmstadt 1979.
- WEISCHE 1972: A. WEISCHE, *Ciceros Nachahmung der attischen Redner*, Heidelberg 1972.
- WISEMAN 1976: T.P. WISEMAN, *T. Cloelius of Tarracina*, CR XVII 1967, pp. 263 f.
- WISSE 2002: J. WISSE, *The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorical Works*, in: J.M. MAY (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden 2002, pp. 331–374.
- ZIELIŃSKI 1922: T. ZIELIŃSKI, *De Alcmeonis Corinthii fabula Euripidea*, Mnemosyne L 1922, pp. 305–327.
- ZILLINGER 1911: W. ZILLINGER, *Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter*, (diss.) Würzburg 1911.

CORNELIO GALLO E L'APPOSIZIONE PARENTETICA

di

PAOLA GAGLIARDI

ABSTRACT: The so called “inserted apposition” seems to be a typical word order of Latin poetry, which first appears in Virgil’s eclogues. Its origin has been assigned to the neoteric poetry and has been attributed to Gallus. An analysis of the verses in which it appears in the *Bucolics* seems to confirm its relationship with the first Latin elegist.

La cosiddetta “apposizione parentetica”¹, ovvero l’apposizione, spesso accompagnata da un aggettivo, posta tra un sostantivo e il suo attributo², sembra essere una peculiarità della lingua poetica latina. Gli sporadici e controversi esempi greci, infatti³, non autorizzano a cercare in quella tradizione le origini di questo costrutto, al quale viene generalmente assegnata una matrice neoterica⁴ e i cui primi esempi sicuri risalgono alle *Bucoliche virgiliane*⁵. Dalle precedenti, rare occorrenze nell’epica⁶ non è stato possibile infatti dedurne un uso regolare in poesia arcaica e in generi alti: contro questa possibilità si citano la parsimonia degli impieghi nelle *Georgiche* e nell’*Eneide* (rispettivamente 3 e 2, di gran lunga più semplici nella struttura rispetto ai 7 o 8 nelle ecloghe) e nelle *Odi* di

¹ Come la definiscono ad esempio TRAINA 1998 e SKUTSCH 1956: 199 (“parenthetische Apposition”), mentre SOLODOW (1986: 129) preferisce l’espressione più generica “inserted apposition”.

² Di questo schema esistono tuttavia molte varianti: l’apposizione può mancare dell’attributo e constare dunque di un solo termine (cfr. ad esempio “magnum, pauperies, opprobrium”, Hor. *Carm.* I 1, 29), o reggere un complemento in genitivo (“lentae, victoris praemia, palmae”, Ov. *Met.* X 102) o un avverbio (“infelix, o semper, oves, pecus”, Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 3), ma anche il sostantivo a cui essa si riferisce può essere privo del suo aggettivo (“tua cura, Lycoris”, Verg. *Ecl.* 10, 22) e trovarsi esso inserito entro l’apposizione e il suo attributo (“dirum, tiniae, genus”, Verg. *Georg.* IV 246). Per un’accurata rassegna e classificazione delle tipologie in cui si presenta lo schema cfr. SOLODOW 1986.

³ Esaminati e discussi da SOLODOW 1986: 133–135.

⁴ Cfr. SOLODOW 1986: 135 s., e, per la storia del dibattito e la bibliografia, TRAINA 1998: 13–15 e note.

⁵ SOLODOW 1986: 137.

⁶ Una, Enn. *dub.* 5, 1 (6) Sk., citata da Serv. ad *Aen.* IV 638, di incerta attribuzione (enniana per MARIOTTI 1991: 70, e per TRAINA 1998, ma interpretata diversamente da SKUTSCH 1956: 134 e 770), l’altra non in esametri, ma nei saturni di Nevio, fr. I MOR. (cfr. TRAINA 1998: 16 s.).

Orazio (solo 4 occorrenze, ma una sola negli *Epodi* e una nelle *Epistole*, che pure sono generi meno elevati) e invece l'abbondanza nella bucolica e nell'elegia (8 casi in Properzio, 19 nell'Ovidio elegiaco, inclusa la produzione dell'esilio). Sarà solo Ovidio, che ne fa un uso frequente e vario anche nelle *Metamorfosi* e nei *Fasti*⁷, a generalizzare l'uso dello schema anche in contesti più elevati, seguito in ciò dai poeti di età imperiale⁸.

Anche la presunzione di un'origine (o quanto meno di un largo impiego) in ambito neoterico è tuttavia resa problematica dalla scarsità di apposizioni parentetiche sia in Catullo⁹, sia nei resti degli altri autori del circolo¹⁰, e così solo la frequenza nelle ecloghe virgiliane, fortemente influenzate dal neoterismo, e nell'elegia, che di esso è in qualche modo l'erede, orientano in questa direzione. L'uso virgiliano del costrutto non è infatti riconducibile all'imitazione di Teocrito, né l'apposizione parentetica si trova nella tradizione bucolica greca post-teocritea, o in altri generi di poesia ellenistica riecheggianti nelle ecloghe, cosicché è inevitabile rivolgersi ai modelli latini, che per le *Bucoliche* sono soprattutto Lucrezio e – appunto – i neoterici. Questo genere di considerazioni, assommate ai confronti incrociati tra Virgilio e Properzio ha fatto ipotizzare che ad introdurre in poesia latina l'apposizione parentetica possa essere stato Cornelio Gallo¹¹: le notevoli analogie formali e contenutistiche (entrambi i passi sono riferiti alle colombe) di Virg. *Ecl.* 1, 57 (“*raucæ, tua cura, palumbæ*”) e Prop. III 3, 31 (“*volucres, mea turba, columbæ*”) e l'impiego dello stesso *tua cura* come apposizione in rapporto a Gallo ad *Ecl.* 10, 22 (“*tua cura, Lycoris*”), sono sembrati una base sufficiente per individuare nella poesia di questo autore l'origine del costrutto. La relazione con le colombe in Virgilio e Properzio potrebbe indurre a postulare qualcosa del genere anche in Gallo, dal momento che – come suggerisce Properzio, che potrebbe aver ripreso lo stesso contesto – le colombe sono sacre a Venere. Se così fosse, particolarmente raffinato

⁷ Per l'analisi e la discussione degli impieghi ovidiani cfr. SOLODOW 1986: 141–146.

⁸ Il cui ricorso alla ‘inserted apposition’ è spiegato da SOLODOW (1986: 147) principalmente con la volontà dei poeti di imitare Ovidio.

⁹ Nella cui opera le occorrenze appaiono limitate solo a due casi, entrambi discutibili: cfr. SOLODOW 1986: 136.

¹⁰ In ambito neoterico notevole appare tuttavia quella di Ticiida, fr. 103 HOLLIS (= 2, BL., C.): “*Lydia, doctorum maxima cura, liber*”, che pur con le sue particolarità (*liber* non è un attributo, ma un'altra apposizione di *Lydia*), attesta l'interesse di quei poeti per la disposizione delle parole; analogamente il famoso frammento di Furio Bibaculo su Valerio Catone (fr. 86 HOLLIS dub. = 6 BL., C.: “*Cato grammaticus, Latina Siren, / qui solus legit ac facit poetas*”) ribadisce la loro predilezione per le apposizioni. Ancora a questa temperie si possono ricondurre due casi di apposizione parentetica nell'*Appendix Vergiliana*, *Dirae* 82 (“*o male devoti, praetorum crimina, agelli*”), sulla cui corretta lezione cfr. tuttavia la discussione in SOLODOW 1986: 147, e *Lydia* 13 (“*inter varios, Veneris stipendia, flores*”): il loro possibile legame con Valerio Catone rafforza l'impressione dell'importanza che il nesso doveva avere in quell'ambiente.

¹¹ Da parte di SKUTSCH 1956: 198 s.

sarebbe il procedimento virgiliano, che recupererebbe gli animali, presentandone la menzione in uno schema di apposizione parentetica, ma adattato al tema e al contesto bucolici. Rispetto a Properzio, però, Virgilio potrebbe essere stato più fedele all'originale galliano nel mantenere il termine *cura*, del quale fa fede *Ecl.* 10, 22 e che Properzio potrebbe invece aver variato con *turba*, lasciando tuttavia le stesse sonorità e avvalorando in tal modo anch'egli, pur nella deviazione, il galliano *cura*. Non chiaro resta invece se l'ipotetica formulazione di Gallo avesse *mea*, come in Properzio, o *tua*, come in Virgilio, che potrebbe aver mutato anche ad *Ecl.* 10, 22 l'espressione elegiaca¹².

Si tratta – come sempre, in assenza di riscontri certi – di supposizioni, che non sembrano tuttavia puramente aleatorie, e che in qualche modo la scoperta del papiro di Qaṣr Ibrîm ha rafforzato, rivelando l'importanza della poesia di Gallo per la raccolta bucolica virgiliana, sia a livello concettuale, in un dialogo che oggi, appare più intenso e più esteso di quanto si potesse sospettare, sia a livello stilistico e lessicale¹³. Le *Bucoliche* appaiono dunque il punto di partenza più adatto per un'indagine sull'apposizione parentetica e sul suo rapporto con Gallo, anche perché recano i primi, accuratissimi esempi di questo costrutto, ponendosi evidentemente in relazione con testi a noi ignoti, privilegio che non appartiene a nessun altro autore, neppure a Properzio, per il quale si può sempre sospettare una dipendenza da Virgilio che indebolisce il valore della sua testimonianza.

La supposizione dello SKUTSCH si fonda – come si è detto – sul raffronto tra il nesso virgiliano di *Ecl.* 1, 57 e quello properziano di III 3, 31, con il conforto di *Ecl.* 10, 22, in cui torna il nesso *tua cura* nello stesso, inconsueto valore di 'oggetto d'amore'¹⁴, ma non in una vera apposizione parentetica. Le consonanze tra questi testi sembrano indirizzare effettivamente verso Gallo, anche perché il termine *cura* può essere posto in relazione a lui anche per un'altra via. Esso appare infatti ancora in un sorta di apposizione parentetica entro un verso attribuito da Suet. *Gramm.* 11 a Ticidea, poeta della cerchia di Valerio Catone, che proprio lodando un'opera del maestro, afferma: "Lydia, doctorum maxima cura, liber"¹⁵. Non si tratta evidentemente di una vera apposizione parentetica, in quanto *liber* non è attributo, ma anch'esso apposizione di *Lydia*: il verso colpisce tuttavia non solo per l'elaborata struttura, con l'affollarsi delle apposizioni, ma anche per la possibilità di intendere *Lydia* come nome di persona, prima che *liber* in clausola

¹² SKUTSCH (1956: 198 s.) ricostruisce un possibile nesso galliano del tipo *mea (tua) cura, columbae*.

¹³ Sulla presenza di Gallo nelle *Bucoliche*, quale si può ricostruire oggi, alla luce dei versi del papiro, cfr. una sintesi in GAGLIARDI 2015a: 198–200, con bibliografia.

¹⁴ Di questo particolare impiego del termine le *Bucoliche* danno la prima testimonianza (*ThLL*, s.v. *cura*, col. 1475, 42–57), ma per la sua fortuna nell'elegia augustea (cfr. ad esempio Tib. II 3, 31; Prop. I 1, 35 s.; II 34, 9; Ov. *Amor.* I 3, 16) non è difficile ipotizzarne l'origine nella poesia di Gallo (cfr. ROSS 1975: 68 s., e LIPKA 2001: 103, 110, 129).

¹⁵ Sul frammento e sulla figura del poeta cfr. HOLLIS 2007: 158–163.

ne precisi la vera natura; in tal modo *cura* sembra attribuito ad una donna amata (secondo l'uso consueto dei poeti d'amore di intendere con il nome dell'amata tanto la sua persona quanto il *liber* a lei dedicato), proprio come fa Virgilio, forse per imitazione di Gallo, ad *Ecl.* 10, 22. Così il termine *cura* si rivela importante nell'uso neoterico e ciò avvalorava la possibilità del suo impiego in Gallo, notoriamente legato a quell'ambiente, se si considerano i suoi rapporti con Pollione e con Partenio e con buona probabilità anche con Valerio Catone, se è lui il Gallo a cui Furio Bibaculo indirizza i suoi versi sulle difficili condizioni economiche del vecchio maestro¹⁶.

A partire da queste considerazioni, non è arbitrario attribuire a Gallo l'impiego frequente di *cura* anche in apposizione parentetica, e dedurre che il termine, e il raffinato *ordo verborum* in cui si trova, possano essere stati per tale ragione associati a lui sia da Virgilio, sia da Propertio. Anche perché, a completare la serie di indizi e riferimenti indicata dallo SKUTSCH, può contribuire ancora un altro confronto. Ai due passi analoghi di Virgilio e di Propertio si può aggiungere infatti anche *Ov. Ars* I 117 s. (“*ut fugiunt aquilas, timidissima turba, columbae*”), che non può essere considerata una vera e propria ‘inserted apposition’, poiché l'apposizione non è interposta tra aggettivo e sostantivo, ma che per la struttura complessiva e per le sonorità sembra riconducibile allo stesso filone, se non allo stesso modello. Può aver agito qui naturalmente l'imitazione properziana (anche Ovidio ha *turba*, non *cura*), nel momento in cui il poeta fa l'esempio delle colombe, ma egli certo non ignora quanto meno il riferimento a *Virg. Ecl.* 1, 57. In realtà qui gioca la suggestione anche di un altro passo virgiliano, *Ecl.* 9, 13 (“*sed carmina tantum/ nostra valent, Lycida, tela inter Martia, quantum/ Chaonias dicunt, aquila veniente, columbas*”, vv. 11–13), richiamato dalla menzione dell'aquila che spaventa le colombe: il verso virgiliano non presenta un'apposizione parentetica, ma ha comunque un elemento (l'ablativo assoluto) interposto tra un sostantivo e il suo epiteto, costituito tra l'altro da un erudito termine geografico di gusto alessandrino, come altrove accadrà per le apposizioni nelle ecloghe (*Libethrides* ad *Ecl.* 7, 21). È come se nella memoria dei poeti il richiamo alle colombe non potesse che essere associato ad un *ordo verborum* elaborato e intrecciato, che per la sua frequenza non può che rimandare ad un modello esistente. Indicarlo in Gallo non sembra azzardato: tutti i contesti in cui ricorrono gli elementi comuni (le colombe, la disposizione elaborata secondo uno schema ripetuto) possono essere per un verso o per l'altro ricondotti a lui. Se infatti non è difficile ricostruire il legame in Propertio e Ovidio, che entrambi in contesti elegiaci riprendono lo schema, forse riportandolo al suo originario ambito

¹⁶ Cfr. Bibaculo, fr. 85 HOLLIS (2, BL., C.), su cui cfr. HOLLIS 2007: 139–142. Più problematico è riconoscere il nome di Catone anche nel papiro per la possibilità di leggere in *kato* a v. 9 anche la parte finale del participio *placato*: per una sintesi del dibattito e della bibliografia recenti cfr. GAGLIARDI 2011.

erotico galliano, anche per Virgilio si può disegnare una persuasiva rete di riferimenti. Il verso in questione è infatti in un'ecloga, la 9, segnata da una presenza non esplicita, ma riconoscibile, di Gallo, come vedremo più oltre: non mancano nel testo ben due vere apposizioni parentetiche, di cui una, più elaborata, a v. 9 (“usque ad aquam et veteres, iam fracta cacumina, fagos”)¹⁷, allude chiaramente, con il richiamo alle cime dei faggi, all’“elegiaca” *Ecl.* 2, il cui rapporto diretto con Gallo è oggi attestato dal papiro di Qaṣr Ibrīm, mentre l’altra, semplificata, a v. 22, contiene un termine di evidente matrice neoterica e di ambito erotico, *delicias*, non a caso presente anch’esso, in posizione di grande rilievo, nell’*incipit* dell’*Ecl.* 2 (“*delicias domini*”, v. 2). Non solo; l’allusione alle colombe di *Ecl.* 9, 13 richiama esplicitamente l’altra menzione delle colombe ad *Ecl.* 1, 57, a sua volta collegabile a Gallo per la presenza di *tua cura*, disegnando un reticolo articolato e sfuggente, ma ineludibile, di accenni al poeta elegiaco.

A completare il quadro si può infine aggiungere un significativo passo di *Stat. Silv.* IV 4, 20 s. (“tua cura potissima, Gallus, / nec non noster amor”)¹⁸, riferito ad un Gallo contemporaneo del poeta, ma nel quale è difficile non leggere un’allusione quanto meno a *tua cura* di *Ecl.* 10, 22, nonché a *noster amor* nell’apposizione parentetica di *Ecl.* 7, 21. Ancora più probabile è però l’ipotesi che Stazio, sfruttando l’omonimia, citi una o forse contami due espressioni galliane, mantenendo loro il ruolo appositivo secondo uno schema che poteva essere nell’originale. Ciò confermerebbe l’origine dei due passi virgiliani in Gallo e riporterebbe anche per questa via a lui sia il costrutto dell’apposizione parentetica, sia l’impiego in essa di *cura* (e di *amor*).

Vale dunque la pena indagare se gli impieghi di ‘inserted apposition’ nelle ecloghe possano in qualche misura essere effettivamente ricondotti a Gallo e al dialogo di Virgilio con la sua produzione. Va premesso che non tutte le 8 occorrenze classificate dal SOLODOW (*Ecl.* 1, 57, 69 e 74; 2, 3; 3, 3; 7, 21; 9, 9 e 22) presentano le stesse caratteristiche: tra esse ad esempio *Ecl.* 9, 22 (“ad *delicias*, *Amaryllida*, *nostras*”) inverte l’ordine normale, inserendo il sostantivo *Amaryllida* (peraltro senza attributo) entro l’apposizione con attributo *delicias nostras*, mentre ad *Ecl.* 3, 3 (“*infelix* o *semper*, *oves*, *pecus*”) l’apposizione è formata dal solo sostantivo, mentre l’aggettivo è sostituito da *semper* e tutto lo schema appare una semplificazione meno elaborata e meno elegante dell’analogo “*ite meae*, *quondam felix pecus*, *ite, capellae*” di *Ecl.* 1, 74, pure riferito al gregge e caratterizzato da un avverbio entro l’apposizione, ma di ben altra finezza rispetto alla rozza invettiva di *Ecl.* 3, 3, in cui anche l’apposizione

¹⁷ A proposito di questo verso è interessante notare il fraintendimento *veteris fagi*, già antico, attestato da Quint. *Inst.* VIII 6, 46 e provocato evidentemente da una banalizzazione: esso rivela senza dubbio la difficoltà a comprendere la raffinata costruzione dell’apposizione interposta, sentita come artificiale ed estranea alla lingua: cfr. SOLODOW 1986: 138.

¹⁸ E’ un interessante notazione di CUCCHIARELLI 2012: 494.

parentetica sembra, per la sua goffaggine, destinata a sottolineare il livello basso dello stile. Problemi suscita anche *Ecl.* 1, 69 (“post aliquot mea regna videns mirabor aristas”), uno dei versi più intricati delle *Bucoliche*, in cui l’ammissione di un’apposizione parentetica è subordinata all’interpretazione (non univoca) di *aliquot* come attributo di *aristas*: la presenza di due voci verbali entro lo schema ne indebolisce in ogni caso l’efficacia, e la possibilità di separare *mea regna* da *aristas*, facendoli reggere rispettivamente da *videns* e da *mirabor* rende ancor più problematico riconoscere un’apposizione parentetica nel verso¹⁹.

Gli esempi più belli e più limpidi del costrutto nelle ecloghe restano dunque quelli di *Ecl.* 1, 57 e 74, di 2, 3, di 7, 21 e di 9, 9, tutti costituiti da un’apposizione con attributo interposta tra il sostantivo e il suo aggettivo; tra esse si segnalano per l’ulteriore preziosismo del numero diverso 1, 57 (“raucae, tua cura, palumbae”), 1, 74 (“meae quondam felix pecus [...] capellae”) e 7, 21 (“nymphae, noster amor, Libethrydes”) con l’apposizione al singolare di un termine al plurale. Altrettanto degna di nota è la frequenza con cui entro lo schema compare un aggettivo possessivo, come attributo dell’apposizione (1, 57 e 7, 21) o del sostantivo (1, 74): la suggestione di Prop. III 3, 31 e di *Ecl.* 10, 22 può indurre a pensare che sia anche questo un richiamo a Gallo, che il papiro ci rivela particolarmente attento ai pronomi personali e agli aggettivi possessivi²⁰. Non va infine trascurato il fatto che si trovino più occorrenze del costrutto solo nelle *Ecl.* 1 e 9, legate dal tema delle confische, ma forse anche dalla presenza in qualche modo riconoscibile di Gallo. Nell’*Ecl.* 9 infatti la scoperta del papiro di Qaṣr Ibrîm ha permesso di scorgere una possibile allusione a Gallo ai vv. 32–36, in cui l’evidente imitazione di Theocr. 7, 37–41 si combina con buona probabilità con i vv. 8–9 di Gallo²¹: la difficoltà di ricostruire e dare senso al distico galliano inficia ovviamente la comprensione del riferimento di Virgilio, ma nel passo si

¹⁹ Per una sintesi delle discussioni sul passo, da sempre tormentato dagli sforzi degli interpreti, cfr. CUCCHIARELLI 2012: 164–166.

²⁰ Cfr. nel papiro “Fata mihi Caesar tum erunt mea dulcia quom tu” (v. 2) oppure “...atur idem tibi non ego Visce” (v. 8) e la predilezione per pronomi personali o aggettivi possessivi in clausola di verso (*tua* a v. 1; *tu* a v. 2; *tueis* a v. 5; *mea* a v. 7); anche ad *Ecl.* 10, 46–49, che è sicuramente il punto più ‘galliano’ dell’*Ecl.* 10, come testimonia Serv. ad v. 46 (“hi versus omnes Galli sunt, ex ipsius translati carminibus”), è notevole il gioco di pronomi personali e aggettivi possessivi, posti in risalto anche dalle anastrofi: “tu procul a patria (nec sit mihi credere tantum)/ Alpinas, a! dura nives et frigora Rheni/ me sine sola vides. a, te ne frigora laedant!/ a, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!” A giudizio di LIPKA (2001: 110) a Gallo potrebbe risalire proprio il tipo di struttura con il sostantivo al plurale e l’apposizione al singolare con un possessivo, che le ecloghe attestano effettivamente per la prima volta.

²¹ La somiglianza tra i versi dell’*Ecl.* 9 e quella del papiro è stata indicata da J. VAN SICKLE agli *editores principes* (cf. PARSONS, NISBET 1979: 144) e poi studiata da HINDS 1984: 44–46, che cita ZETZEL, e da MANZONI 1995: 77–79.

intravede un discorso letterario forse in tono scherzoso verso l'amico²². Su di esso non è possibile dire di più, ma la presenza di Gallo nel componimento sembra avvalorata da altri elementi, tra cui il rapporto dell'ecloga con la 1 e con la 2, in cui Gallo gioca un ruolo ben più chiaro. In particolare è significativa in tal senso l'apposizione parentetica del v. 9 ("veteres, iam fracta cacumina, fagos"), sia per l'allusione ai faggi, come si vedrà, sia per la citazione chiara dell'*Ecl.* 2, a sua volta ampiamente riconducibile al poeta elegiaco.

Un discorso più solido consente l'*Ecl.* 1, in cui Gallo si intravede a più riprese e le apposizioni parentetiche sembrano ricondurre a lui con maggior sicurezza. Non solo infatti il nesso *tua cura* al v. 57, per i collegamenti che autorizza, potrebbe rinviare alla sua poesia; anche l'altra apposizione parentetica, a v. 74, lascia intravedere la sua figura. Il v. 74 è infatti in stretta analogia con l'ultimo dell'intero *liber*, *Ecl.* 10, 77 ("ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite, capellae"), che pur non presentando lo stesso schema, condivide con esso la ripetizione del verbo *ite* nelle stesse sedi, il vocativo *capellae* in clausola e l'inserzione di un elemento, che qui è un'intera frase (*venit Hesperus*). A questa struttura di verso il poeta sembra forse voler dare un carattere di 'formularità bucolica', in quanto la riprende anche ad *Ecl.* 7, 44 ("ite domum pasti, si quis pudor, ite, iuven- ci"), ma le affinità più significative sono indubbiamente tra *Ecl.* 1, 74 e 10, 77. Questa ripresa contribuisce infatti a consolidare quella fitta rete di legami tra le due ecloghe ricostruibili a livello di personaggi, di situazioni, di immagini e di idee: fin dai primi versi dell'*Ecl.* 1 si delinea un confronto tra due idee di poesia, l'una di matrice teocritea, rappresentata da Titiro con il suo distacco beato dalle sofferenze che lo circondano, l'altra, virgiliana, incarnata nella dolente umanità di Melibeo, che dà voce ai momenti più belli dell'ecloga. Ebbene, alla nuova concezione della poesia espressa fin dall'inizio nella raccolta potrebbe non essere estraneo l'influsso di Gallo, autore di un genere per eccellenza 'soggettivo' e incentrato sulla rappresentazione del dolore e sull'immedesimazione nei personaggi. Diversi indizi denunciano la presenza del poeta elegiaco nell'*Ecl.* 1: fin dai primi versi l'attenzione psicologica verso le sofferenze dei personaggi è espressa con un linguaggio dell'affettività in cui spiccano ad esempio a v. 3 *dulcia*, tipicamente elegiaco, e subito dopo, a v. 5, *formosam*, che pure sembra appartenere al lessico di Gallo²³. E ancora, il faggio, che fin dal v. 1 inizia a caratterizzare la nuova poesia bucolica, ha probabilmente a che fare con Gallo per le sue ascendenze

²² La supposizione di uno scambio scherzoso tra i due poeti (o di una risposta in tale tono di Virgilio a Gallo) è stata avanzata da HINDS 1984: 46. L'ambito letterario del passo si ricostruisce facilmente non solo dal modello delle *Talisie*, per eccellenza una dichiarazione di poetica, ma anche dai nomi di poeti latini chiamati in causa, Vario e Cinna, che entrambi rimandano a quell'ambiente neoterizzante da cui provenivano tanto Gallo quanto Virgilio.

²³ Cfr. LIPKA 2001: 91 e nota 287, e GAGLIARDI 2015b.

callimachee²⁴. Anche l'ombra, celebrata in apertura come protettiva e gradevole ("Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi", v. 1), è destinata a tornare sia nella chiusa dell'ecloga in una visione duplice di pace domestica ("et iam summa procul villarum culmina fumant", v. 82), ma anche di ignoto smisurato e pauroso ("maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae", v. 83), sia nell'ecloga di Gallo, che la sua immagine chiude richiamando l'apposizione parentetica di *Ecl.* 1, 74 ("Surgamus; solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra, / iuniperi gravis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae. / Ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite, capellae", vv. 75–77). E il legame che grazie a questi, ma anche a tanti altri elementi²⁵, si crea tra l'ecloga iniziale e quella finale non va spiegato solo con la volontà di sintetizzare nella chiusa temi e suggestioni dell'intera opera in una sorta di *Ringkomposition*, ma sottolinea forse anche il rapporto della nuova bucolica latina con Gallo, se non il debito di Virgilio verso di lui.

In questo disegno complesso e affascinante che unisce inizio e fine del *liber* virgiliano rientra probabilmente anche l'impiego oculato dell'apposizione parentetica, che, se risaliva in qualche modo a Gallo, appariva quanto mai adatta a trovare posto entro il confronto. Entrambi gli impieghi di essa nell'*Ecl.* 1 sembrano infatti in connessione con la poesia di Gallo, come attestano le analogie con l'*Ecl.* 10, della quale egli è protagonista: tanto il nesso *tua cura*, che in queste ecloghe presenta le due uniche occorrenze nel *liber*, e ricorre ad *Ecl.* 1, 57 in un costrutto appositivo più complesso, che trova un'eco in Properzio, a conferma dell'origine elegiaca, quanto il v. 74, riecheggiato con straordinario risalto nella chiusa dell'intera raccolta, sia pure in forma modificata, ma ugualmente caratterizzata da un'interposizione, indirizzano verso Gallo. Non solo: essi sembrano seguire una logica identica nella costruzione, che ad un'apposizione parentetica segnata, almeno per *Ecl.* 1, 57, dalla presenza di un termine tipico di Gallo (e in entrambi i casi caratterizzata da un possessivo), accosta una costruzione simile, ma non uguale nell'*Ecl.* 10, in cui forse l'impiego più diffuso di citazioni galliane rendeva superflua una ripresa letterale delle sue espressioni. Il sospetto che l'apposizione parentetica possa risalire in qualche misura a Gallo sembra così avvalorato dagli impieghi nell'*Ecl.* 1 e anche se una simile supposizione non può essere sostenuta con certezza, non si possono trascurare i precisi segnali in tal senso offerti dal confronto con l'*Ecl.* 10.

Nell'*Ecl.* 2 la presenza di Gallo si può intuire da molti elementi, come il tema erotico e la situazione di amore infelice, ma anche la caratterizzazione del protagonista, che molto ha in comune con gli amanti dell'elegia latina, e l'andamento

²⁴ Cfr. più oltre, p. 279.

²⁵ Si pensi ad esempio alla condizione di Tiro e di Gallo, entrambi distesi in uno scenario naturale, ma uno in serenità in un *locus amoenus*, l'altro nella solitudine e nel dolore, o al τόπος dei confini del mondo ad *Ecl.* 1, 61–66 e 10, 65–68, o ancora all'immagine dell'albero, protettivo e gradevole per Tiro, arso invece fin nella corteccia più interna per Gallo.

del suo monologo, continuamente oscillante tra sentimenti e toni diversi²⁶. A questi aspetti di necessità impressionistici e suscettibili di perplessità è stato dato un carattere di maggiore certezza dalla scoperta del papiro di Qaṣr Ibrîm, i cui frammentari vv. 8–9 rivelano un'insospettabile consonanza con i vv. 26–27 dell'ecloga, in un rapporto probabilmente di imitazione da parte di Virgilio, ma che indica in ogni caso il dialogo tra i due poeti²⁷. Ebbene, anche qui, nel punto strategico dell'*incipit*, spicca un'apposizione parentetica al v. 3 (“tantum inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos”), non nelle parole di Coridone, ma in quelle del narratore che lo introduce. La possibilità che anche qui l'apposizione parentetica possa essere allusiva alla scrittura di Gallo è certamente concreta, in un testo che per tanti aspetti sembra coinvolgere il poeta e il suo genere, ma è resa forse ancora più credibile da uno dei termini del costruito, quel *fagos* destinato a tornare, ancora in uno schema analogo, ad *Ecl.* 9, 9. Del *fagus*, albero simbolo della bucolica virgiliana²⁸, si è sospettato un rapporto con Gallo tramite Callimaco, che proprio sui φηγοί fa incidere al suo Aconzio il nome dell'amata²⁹ e che con grande probabilità fu imitato (o tradotto) in latino da Gallo o in ogni caso da lui introdotto in poesia latina. Se così fosse, anche questa volta Virgilio avrebbe utilizzato non solo un *ordo verborum* di Gallo, ma anche un richiamo alla sua poesia, o forse ne avrebbe imitato un passo, in cui ricorreva *fagus*, così come può aver fatto con *tua cura* ad *Ecl.* 1, 57: sembra cioè delinearci un procedimento virgiliano di duplice allusione a Gallo, attraverso l'apposizione interposta e l'impiego di termini tipicamente galliani.

D'altronde tutta la parte iniziale dell'*Ecl.* 2 rimanda ad una temperie di raffinata poesia ellenistica in cui si era formato il gusto dei giovani poeti latini, tra cui lo stesso Virgilio e sicuramente Gallo, ammiratore di Euforione, all'ombra del callimachismo di Partenio. Oltre ai φηγοί di Aconzio e al possibile influsso di Meleagro, infatti, si indovina forse anche la presenza dell'Orfeo di Fanocle nella situazione dell'amante che canta nella solitudine della natura³⁰. Il comporsi

²⁶ Sul carattere 'elegiaco' dell'*Ecl.* 2 cfr. COLEMAN 2001: 108.

²⁷ Sul rapporto tra i due testi il dibattito è aperto: la plausibilità di un'imitazione virgiliana è stata sostenuta da MORELLI, TANDOI 1984: 104–106 (seguiti da NICASTRI 1984: 93 s.; CAPASSO 2004: 72); *contra*, PARSONS, NISBET 1979: 144, e COURTNEY 1993: 275.

²⁸ Si pensi ai “densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos” di *Ecl.* 2, 3, ai “veteres fagos” di *Ecl.* 3, 12 o ai “veteres iam fracta cacumina fagos” di *Ecl.* 9, 9 (nelle apposizioni parentetiche il termine è sempre in clausola). Cfr. ROSS 1975: 72. Su *fagus* come ‘key word’ della bucolica virgiliana, capace “to denote the bucolic setting *par excellence*”, cfr. LIPKA 2001: 31; 60; 124; 167 s.; 195 (la citazione è a 168).

²⁹ Cfr. *Aet.* fr. 73 PFEIFFER. In realtà il è φηγός è una quercia, ma Virgilio gioca probabilmente sulle assonanze del nome, attuando quella che O'HARA (1996: 63 e 243) definisce “translation with paronomasia”: cfr. CUCCHIARELLI 2012: 138. Va notato che il faggio torna anche in Prop. I 18, 20, in un'elegia sicuramente condizionata da modelli galliani.

³⁰ Per Meleagro, riconosciuto, sia pure non unanimemente, all'inizio, per via del nome Alessi, cfr. HUBAUX 1927, seguito da COLEMAN 2001: 91, che cita AP XII 127; *contra*, PFEIFFER 1933: 22 s.

così di un quadro di riferimenti e di allusioni a raffinata poesia alessandrina, e la prevalenza in esso dell'elegia (Callimaco e Fanocle) e comunque di una produzione in metro elegiaco (l'epigramma) rende credibile l'ipotesi di un riferimento a Gallo e del suo ruolo importante come interlocutore e modello dell'ecloga, accanto a Teocrito, la cui menzione verrà solo successivamente, nelle parole di Coridone³¹. L'impiego, in questo insieme, dell'apposizione parentetica potrebbe essere un ulteriore tassello del mosaico, tanto più che la preferenza per le disposizioni elaborate delle parole è dichiarato fin dal verso di apertura dell'ecloga ("Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexim")³², con quell'incastro di nomi ed epiteti che, se non costituisce una vera e propria 'inserted apposition', si avvicina allo stesso gusto, del quale Gallo sembra essere stato un propugnatore, a giudicare dai suoi versi superstiti³³.

Ancora un'altra elegante apposizione parentetica, quella di *Ecl.* 7, 21 ("Nymphae, noster amor, Libethrides") sembra ricollegabile a Gallo nei termini impiegati e nella costruzione. La parola chiave in tal senso è qui il raro e dotto *Libethrides*, ἄπαξ in Virgilio, la cui probabile derivazione da Euforione, l'*auctor* di Gallo, sembra chiarire *ad abundantiam* l'ambito di riferimento del Mantovano³⁴. Ancora, dunque, un termine collegabile a Gallo è inserito in un'apposizione parentetica, e ancora in un contesto non lontano dalla figura del poeta elegiaco. L'ombra di Gallo, evocata proprio dal termine euforioneo, si intravede infatti nel corso dell'*Ecl.* 7 per più ragioni, a partire dallo stretto rapporto del testo con l'*Ecl.* 2, a sua volta fortemente segnata dalla poesia galliana: il nome di uno dei protagonisti, Coridone, ma anche l'allusione a Theocr. 6 sono infatti comuni alle due ecloghe, ma Gallo è stato visto anche nella definizione di *Arcades* dei due cantori a v. 4 (è noto che l'*Arcadia* compare sempre in ecloghe

Anche per Fanocle il collegamento, proposto da PFEIFFER, p. 20, non trova unanime consenso: vi si oppone ad esempio LA PENNA 1963: 488 (che avvalora però la presenza di Aconzio); lo sostiene invece CLAUSEN 1994: 61; 65 s.

³¹ Il suo monologo si apre infatti con una citazione di Theocr. 3, 9 al v. 6, per poi proseguire a tratti sulla falsariga dell'*Id.* 11, sia pure ampiamente rielaborato.

³² Su di esso si veda lo studio di MARCHETTA 1994: 9–88.

³³ Se già la studiata struttura dell'unico verso noto prima del papiro ("uno tellures dividit amne duas", fr. 1 MOREL) induceva a conclusioni del genere, oggi i versi di Qaṣr Ibrīm confermano la supposizione: accanto allo schema che, alla maniera del pentametro sull'Ipani, alterna sostantivi ed epiteti in isocolia ("maxima Romanae pars eris historiae", v. 3; "quae possem domina deicere digna mea", v. 7) spicca infatti la costruzione del v. 5 ("fixa legam spolieis deivitoria tueis"), definito da NISBET (1979: 149) "contorted to the point of the obscurity", sulla cui interpretazione il dibattito è ancora lontano dal giungere ad una conclusione (cfr. una sintesi in CAPASSO 2004: 53–57). Proprio quest'eccessiva attenzione all'elaborazione formale, forse dovuta anche all'imitazione di Euforione, può aver fruttato a Gallo l'epiteto di *durus* datogli da Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 93.

³⁴ Su *Libethrides* in Euforione cfr. CANETTA 2008, con bibliografia, e MAGNELLI 2010; sulla possibile mediazione galliana per le *Libethrides* di *Ecl.* 7, 21, cfr. KENNEDY 1987: 54 s.

legate a Gallo, vale a dire la metà 'elegiaca' della 8 e la 10³⁵) e nella presenza nei versi iniziali, superflua ma indicativa, di Dafni (vv. 6–13), anch'egli strettamente associato al poeta elegiaco nell'*Ecl.* 10³⁶.

La struttura dell'ecloga ricorda quella della 1, anch'essa con due protagonisti, portatori di poetiche diverse, una di tipo teocriteo (Tirsi), l'altra virgiliana (Coridone), annunciate già nei loro nomi³⁷: qui le differenze sono nella delicatezza di atteggiamento e nella dolcezza dello stile, assai maggiori in Coridone che in Tirsi, i cui toni talora apertamente sgradevoli, l'arroganza verso gli dei, il trattamento del tema d'amore sono stati più volte indicati tra le ragioni della sua (non chiarissima) sconfitta³⁸. Senza addentrarci nel complesso dibattito suscitato dall'interpretazione dell'ecloga, basti qui rilevare gli elementi tramite i quali Virgilio sembra aver ancora una volta alluso a Gallo: accanto al nome di Coridone e ai suoi inevitabili rimandi all'*Ecl.* 2, alla menzione di Dafni e dell'Arcadia, infatti, anche Codro potrebbe avere a che fare con la sua figura, come sembrano suggerire alcuni aspetti del testo. L'affettuoso *meo Codro* a v. 22, ad esempio, somiglia notevolmente a *meo Gallo* di *Ecl.* 10, 2, un'espressione di affetto inconsueta in Virgilio. Anche l'espressione *si non possumus omnes* a v. 23 ricorda un passo segnato da Gallo, *Ecl.* 8, 63, che a sua volta riecheggia per diversi aspetti i versi del papiro³⁹. Così ancora l'attribuzione a Codro di versi quasi divini (*proxima Phoebi*, vv. 22–23) non appare lontana dall'orgogliosa affermazione di Gallo sull'origine dei suoi carmi dalle Muse. Infine Codro è nominato solo in due ecloghe (la 5 e 7), entrambe caratterizzati dalla presenza di Dafni, e vi appare coinvolto in dispute letterarie che possono ben essere il riflesso di discussioni reali, entro cui – si badi – il 'virgiliano' Coridone sostiene appunto Codro⁴⁰. Un tocco di raffinatezza, ma forse anche un'allusione al linguaggio elegiaco, è anche l'impiego, nei versi di Coridone, di *cura* in ambito erotico ("si qua tui Corydonis

³⁵ Sul rapporto tra Gallo e l'Arcadia cfr. KENNEDY 1987: 51–56; FABRE, SERRIS 2008: 52–72; Gagliardi 2014.

³⁶ Basti pensare all'imitazione di Theocr. 1, 66 ss., la narrazione della morte di Dafni, ai vv. 9–30; sulla "dafnizzazione" di Gallo nell'*Ecl.* 10 cfr. CONTE 1984: 18–22 (= 2008: 223), e GAGLIARDI 2011: 56–73.

³⁷ Il nome Tirsi, chiaramente teocriteo, compare già nell'idillio proemiale; quello di Coridone, pure presente in Teocrito, appartiene ad un personaggio assai marginale, mentre nelle *Bucoliche* acquisisce risonanza con l'*Ecl.* 2, presentata ad *Ecl.* 5, 86 come un brano noto e ammirato tra i pastori, e viene confermato nella fama proprio dal finale dell'*Ecl.* 7 ("ex illo Corydon Corydon est tempore nobis", v. 70).

³⁸ Cfr. l'accurata analisi dell'ecloga condotta da PÖSCHL 1964: 93–154; FANTAZZI, QUERBACH 1985: 359 s.; WÜLFING VON MARTITZ 1970. Per una rassegna dei presunti difetti delle quartine di Tirsi cfr. SANDBACH 1933: 216 s.; CLAUSEN 1994: 210–212; BEYERS 1962: 38; KARAKASIS 2011: 55–57.

³⁹ Cfr. GAGLIARDI 2012.

⁴⁰ Cfr. sul punto CUCCHIARELLI 2012: 289.

habet te cura, venito”, v. 40), termine chiave il cui rapporto con Gallo sembra fuori discussione, anche se qui non è usato nel senso di *amica*.

Se in questa rete di indizi si prova ad includere anche l’elaborata apposizione parentetica con cui Coridone apre i versi della sua tenzone a v. 21, non solo si può trovare l’ennesimo tassello per rintracciare l’immagine di Gallo anche in un’ecloga apparentemente *paene tota Theocriti*, come afferma Serv. ad v. 1, ma si può intuire anche un messaggio poetico di grande rilevanza, lo schieramento entro un ambito di gusto improntato al più raffinato e colto callimachismo di Euforione e di Partenio, con la loro predilezione per una geografia erudita. E’ la scuola alla quale si sono formati sia Gallo, sia Virgilio, e che ora il poeta bucolico evoca forse per un atto di omaggio, ma anche per alludere ad una battaglia di gusto condivisa con Gallo, alla quale potrebbe far riferimento l’intera ecloga. La scelta delle dotte *Libethrides*, lo schema elaborato dell’apposizione parentetica fanno del verso un esempio di grande raffinatezza e lo rendono particolarmente stridente nel contesto stilistico e lessicale della dizione bucolica, proprio come ad *Ecl.* 2, 23–27 appaiono fuori luogo, sempre in bocca al *rusticus* Coridone, l’eleganza e la dottrina geografica di un probabile calco parteniano (o euforioneo)⁴¹.

Anche per quest’impiego dell’apposizione parentetica, dunque, il rapporto con Gallo sembra tutt’altro che aleatorio, e anche qui, come negli altri casi esaminati, la riconoscibilità del riferimento è affidata, oltre che al costruito in sé, all’impiego in esso di un termine chiave, *Libethrides*. Nel nesso va tuttavia notato anche *amor*, che pure può essere ricondotto a Gallo e che sembra sottolineare, accanto a quello dotto rappresentato da *Libethrides*, il tema erotico, altro aspetto fondamentale della poesia galliana. Il termine è tra l’altro accompagnato da un possessivo, secondo un procedimento anch’esso a quanto pare consueto nel trattamento virgiliano dell’apposizione parentetica. Così anche *Ecl.* 7, 21 conferma la strategia individuata nell’esame delle occorrenze del costruito e costantemente seguita da Virgilio: nelle formulazioni più significative è sempre possibile riconoscere, all’interno dello schema, almeno un termine che appare allusivo alla produzione di Gallo. Ciò pone in ulteriore risalto il nesso, già di per sé notevole per la costruzione elaborata e non frequente, e -possiamo ipotizzare- contribuisce a marcare ulteriormente il riferimento a Gallo, sicuramente già riconoscibile per i contemporanei. Tutto ciò poteva forse avere il senso di un omaggio o essere il segnale di un dialogo importante: noi non possiamo stabilirlo, ma di certo non deve sfuggire il reticolo di elementi che, pur nelle incertezze e nei limiti di una ricostruzione solo indiziaria, sembrano orientare verso Gallo.

⁴¹ Sul carattere elevato del passo cfr. GEYMONAT 1979; MORELLI, TANDOI 1984: 106–109; SOUBIRAN 1966: 636. In particolare spicca per la sua raffinata fattura e per l’erudizione geografica il v. 24 (“Amphion Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho”), generalmente ritenuto calco di un esametro di Partenio (cfr. GEYMONAT 1979) o di Euforione, notoriamente appassionato di nomi geografici (cfr. discussione e bibliografia in LIPKA 2001: 91 s.).

Le prime sicure occorrenze dell'apposizione parentetica in latino parlano dunque in favore di una matrice neoterica o elegiaca del costrutto: non si tratta certo di una vera e propria 'invenzione' di esso, né della sua introduzione nello stile poetico da parte dei poeti di quel circolo, come attestano gli impieghi precedenti, sia pure sporadici e incerti, ma le testimonianze virgiliane non possono essere ignorate e nella loro limpidezza connettono lo schema ad un ambito preciso e – sembra – alla figura ben definita di Gallo⁴²: forse nella sua poesia questo arduo *ordo verborum* aveva trovato una particolare risonanza, fino a diventare un tratto peculiare del suo stile⁴³, il che non sarebbe strano, dati l'interesse e la cura del poeta per la disposizione delle parole, spinti a quanto sembra di capire, fin quasi all'oscurità e alla *durities*⁴⁴. Ma l'attribuzione a Gallo di un ruolo cruciale nella diffusione del costrutto può autorizzare anche altre supposizioni: essa può ad esempio indurre a ripensare alla motivazione, solitamente ripetuta, che ne lega la diffusione ad un criterio di registri stilistici, assegnando l'apposizione parentetica essenzialmente a generi non elevati. La difficoltà di spiegare ad esempio le occorrenze nell'epica arcaica e l'assenza o la scarsa frequenza in generi pure stilisticamente non alti come le *Satire*, gli *Epodi* e le *Epistole* di Orazio⁴⁵, getta qualche ombra sulla ricostruzione che assegna alla 'inserted apposition' un ambito di stile limitato a generi *humiles*, almeno fino ad Ovidio. Tutto questo e, all'opposto, la frequenza nelle *Bucoliche* e negli elegiaci, nonché gli scarsi impieghi nelle *Georgiche* e nell'*Eneide* potrebbero invece trovare un senso diverso in relazione a Gallo e ai rapporti di quei poeti con la sua produzione. Così per Virgilio fino a quando dura il confronto con lui – essenzialmente nelle ecloghe – anche l'influsso di quello stile può aver pesato sul suo, per affievolirsi poi gradualmente nelle opere successive, con la fine del dialogo. Allo stesso modo per Propertio e Ovidio, continuatori ed eredi della poesia galliana, spesso impegnati

⁴² Che Gallo possa avere non inventato, ma valorizzato l'apposizione parentetica ritiene anche PAPANGELIS 1997: 147.

⁴³ Un ulteriore indizio in tal senso può essere la costruzione "Thebaide communi omn[i]um regum formidine subact[a]" alle ll. 6–7 della stele di Philae, un'anomalia nello stile epigrafico riconosciuta come un poeticismo che fa propendere per l'attribuzione a Gallo stesso almeno del testo latino dell'iscrizione (cfr. Minas-Nerpel, Pfeiffer 2010: 271; HOFFMANN, MINAS-NERPEL, PFEIFFER 2009: 173). In questo caso ricorrono un'apposizione e un elemento interposto analoghi all'apposizione parentetica, ma l'insieme è reso più complesso dalla disposizione concentrica di ben tre complementi, una raffinatezza che potrebbe facilmente risalire al poeta.

⁴⁴ In particolare se – come afferma SOLODOW 1986: 132 – l'apposizione parentetica serve ad aggiungere un effetto inatteso e sorprendente all'espressione, ovvero – come sostiene LIPKA 2001: 90 – mira ad esprimere l'incapacità del parlante di controllare il discorso e una sua forte emozione. In un caso o nell'altro il costrutto si addirebbe in modo particolare al carattere della poesia di Gallo, tesa all'originalità e al pathos, ma in realtà l'esame delle singole occorrenze di apposizione parentetica nei poeti non conferma costantemente queste pretese peculiarità.

⁴⁵ Di contro all'assenza totale nelle satire e all'unica occorrenza rispettivamente negli epodi e nelle epistole stanno infatti le ben 4 occorrenze nel linguaggio elevato delle odi.

in un confronto a distanza con essa, la ripresa di uno stilema che per la costanza in quella produzione poteva essere sentito quasi come marchio della dizione elegiaca risulterebbe una dichiarazione della continuità e della dipendenza da quel modello. L'estensione successiva di Ovidio ad altri generi, che sembra in qualche modo 'normalizzare' l'apposizione parentetica, potrebbe invece non essere che la prosecuzione di un impiego già diffuso da tempo nella poesia latina, compresa l'epica, cosicché, dopo l'appropriazione quasi esclusiva da parte degli elegiaci, nella scia di Gallo, il costruito tornerà ad essere sentito come patrimonio comune dagli autori dei generi più vari⁴⁶.

Rispetto agli sviluppi successivi la preziosa testimonianza virgiliana, in una fase cruciale del suo percorso, preserva invece – se la ricostruzione fin qui tentata ha un margine di credibilità – ancora i tratti più peculiari dell' 'inserted apposition', e la scelta di essa da parte del poeta contribuisce a definirla, accanto a Gallo, dal quale egli può aver tratto ispirazione, come elemento distintivo di un ambito poetico e più ampiamente culturale, come espressione del gusto di una generazione ancora alla ricerca, nella scia dello sperimentalismo neoterico, di una forma adeguata alle grandi novità di cui si sentiva portatrice e che cominciava ad esprimere nei suoi primi, grandi capolavori.

Università degli Studi della Basilicata, Potenza

BIBLIOGRAFIA

- ANDERSON, PARSONS, NISBET 1979: R.D. ANDERSON, P.J. PARSONS, R.G.M. NISBET, *Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm*, JRS LXIX 1979, pp. 125–155.
- BEYERS 1962: E.E. BEYERS, *Vergil, Eclogue VII. A Theory of Poetry*, AC V 1962, pp. 38–47.
- CANETTA 2008: I. CANETTA, *Muse e Ninfe nella settima ecloga di Virgilio*, Eikasmos XIX 2008, pp. 209–223.
- CAPASSO 2004: M. CAPASSO, *Il ritorno di Cornelio Gallo – Il papiro di Qaṣr Ibrîm venticinque anni dopo*, Lecce 2004.
- CLAUSEN 1994: W.V. CLAUSEN (a cura di), *Virgil, Eclogues*, with an introduction and commentary, Oxford 1994.
- COLEMAN 2001: R. COLEMAN (a cura di), *Virgil, Eclogues*, Cambridge 2001.
- CONTE 1984: G.B. CONTE, *Il genere e i suoi confini. Interpretazione della decima ecloga*, in: IDEM, *Virgilio. Il genere e i suoi confini*, Milano 1984, pp. 13–42 (= IDEM, *An Interpretation of the Tenth Eclogue*, in: K. VOLK [a cura di], *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Virgil's Eclogues*, Oxford–New York 2008, pp. 216–244).
- COURTNEY 1993: E. COURTNEY, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Edited with commentary, Oxford 1993.
- CUCCHIARELLI 2012: A. CUCCHIARELLI, *Publio Virgilio Marone, Le Bucoliche*. Introduzione e commento di... Traduzione di A. TRAINA, Roma 2012.
- FABRE-SERRIS 2008: J. FABRE-SERRIS, *Rome, l'Arcadie et la mer des Argonautes*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2008.

⁴⁶ Per TRAINA (1998: 16) anche l'impiego del nesso in Ovidio e nell'epica di età imperiale sono segni dell'origine non neoterica di esso.

- FANTAZZI, QUERBACH 1985: C. FANTAZZI, C.W. QUERBACH, *Sound and Substance: A Reading of Virgil's Seventh Eclogue*, Phoenix XXXIX 1985, pp. 355–367.
- GAGLIARDI 2011: P. GAGLIARDI, *Plakato iudice te. Per la lettura dei vv. 8–9 del papiro di Gallo*, ZPE CLXXVI 2011, pp. 82–95.
- 2012: P. GAGLIARDI, *Non omnia possumus omnes: Cornelio Gallo nell'ecl. 8 di Virgilio*, A&A LVIII 2012, pp. 52–73.
- 2014: P. GAGLIARDI, *Virgilio e l'Arcadia nell'ecl. 10*, Eirene L 2014, pp. 130–146.
- 2015a: P. GAGLIARDI, *Cornelio Gallo all'alba del terzo millennio (rassegna bibliografica per gli anni 2000–2013)*, in: F. ROHR VIO, E.M. CIAMPINI (a cura di), *La lupa sul Nilo. Gaio Cornelio Gallo tra Roma e l'Egitto*, Venezia 2015, pp. 163–211.
- 2015b: P. GAGLIARDI, *Formosus in Virgilio e dintorni*, Eirene LI 2015, pp. 45–58.
- GEYMONAT 1979: M. GEYMONAT, *Verg. Buc. II, 24*, MCf. XIII–XIV 1979, pp. 371–376.
- HINDS 1984: S. HINDS, *Carmina digna. Gallus P Qasr Ibrim 6–7 Metamorphosed*, in: F. CAIRNS (a cura di), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, vol. IV, Liverpool 1984, pp. 43–54.
- HOFFMANN, MINAS-NERPEL, PFEIFFER 2009: F. HOFFMANN, M. MINAS-NERPEL, S. PFEIFFER, *Die dreisprachige Stele des Cornelius Gallus*, Berlin–New York 2009.
- HOLLIS 2007: A.S. HOLLIS, *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c. 60 BC–AD 20*, Oxford–New York 2007.
- HUBAUX 1927: J. HUBAUX, *Le réalisme dans les Bucoliques de Virgile*, Liège–Paris 1927.
- KARAKASIS 2011: E. KARAKASIS, *Song Exchange in Roman Pastoral*, Berlin–New York 2011.
- KENNEDY 1987: D.F. KENNEDY, *Arcades ambo: Virgil, Gallus and Arcadia*, Hermathena CXLII 1987, pp. 47–59.
- LA PENNA 1963: A. LA PENNA, *La seconda ecloga e la poesia bucolica di Virgilio*, Maia XV 1963, pp. 484–492.
- LIPKA 2001: M. LIPKA, *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*, Berlin–New York 2001.
- MAGNELLI 2010: E. MAGNELLI, *Libetridi in Euforione, Virgilio e altrove*, MD LXV 2010, pp. 165–175.
- MANZONI 1995: G.E. MANZONI, *Foroiulienensis poeta. Vita e poesia di Cornelio Gallo*, Milano 1995.
- MARCHETTA 1994: A. MARCHETTA, *Due studi sulle Bucoliche di Virgilio*, Roma 1994.
- MARIOTTI 1991: S. MARIOTTI, *Lezioni su Ennio*, Urbino ²1991.
- MINAS-NERPEL, PFEIFFER 2010: M. MINAS-NERPEL, S. PFEIFFER, *Establishing Roman Rule in Egypt: The Trilingual Stela of C. Cornelius Gallus from Philae*, in: K. LEMBKE, M. MINAS-NERPEL, S. PFEIFFER (a cura di), *Tradition and Innovation: Egypt und Roman Rule*, Leiden–Boston 2010, pp. 265–298.
- MORELLI, TANDOI 1984: A.M. MORELLI, V. TANDOI, *Un probabile omaggio a Cornelio Gallo nella seconda ecloga*, in: V. TANDOI (a cura di), *Disiecti membra poetae*, vol. I, Foggia 1984, pp. 101–116.
- NICASTRI 1984: L. NICASTRI, *Cornelio Gallo e l'elegia ellenistico-romana*, Napoli 1984.
- O' HARA 1996: J.J. O' HARA, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 1996.
- PAPANGHELIS 1997: T.D. PAPANGHELIS, *Winning on Points: About the Singing Match in Virgil's Seventh Eclogue*, in: C. DEROUX (a cura di), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. VIII, Bruxelles 1997, pp. 144–157.
- PFEIFFER 1933: E. PFEIFFER, *Vergils Bukolika*, Stuttgart 1933.
- PÖSCHL 1964: V. PÖSCHL, *Die Hirtendichtung Vergils*, Heidelberg 1964.
- ROSS 1975: D.O. ROSS, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge 1975.
- SANDBACH 1933: F.H. SANDBACH, *Victum frustra contendere Thyrsim*, CR XLVII 1933, pp. 216–219.
- SKUTSCH 1956: O. SKUTSCH, *Zu Vergils Eklogen*, RhM XCIX 1956, pp. 193–200.
- SOLODOW 1986: J.B. SOLODOW, *Raucae, tua cura, palumbes: Study of a Poetic Word Order*, HSCPh XC 1986, pp. 129–153.
- SOUBIRAN 1966: J. SOUBIRAN, *L'élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966.
- TRAINA 1998: A. TRAINA, *Un probabile verso di Ennio e l'apposizione parentetica*, in: IDEM, *Poeti latini (e neolatini)*, vol. V, Bologna 1998, pp. 11–17 (= MD XXXIV 1995, pp. 187–193).
- WÜLFING VON MARTITZ 1970: P. WÜLFING VON MARTITZ, *Zum Wettgesang der Hirten in der siebenten Ekloge Vergils*, Hermes XCVIII 1970, pp. 380–382.

*GENS HERENNULEIA**

by

WOJCIECH PIETRUSZKA, IGOR WYPIJEWSKI

ABSTRACT: The aim of our article was to write, using prosopographical methods, a kind of socioeconomic collective biography. We studied the case of Auli Herennuleii – a group distinguished by a rare *nomen gentilicium* (we know around 80 people who had this name), which is documented in chronologically similar period and has a limited geographical reach. Taking into consideration the only sources that mention them – inscriptions – Auli Herennuleii were mostly active in the 1st and 2nd centuries CE in the Augustan *regio I*, more precisely in Pompeii, Rome and Ostia. We analysed the cases of all known Auli Herennuleii and we tried to date their activity and to find the connections between them. As a result we prepared the biography of the so-called “middle class” *gens* from the Principate period. It is worth noting that quite a lot of Auli Herennuleii were involved in economic activities and almost none of them made a political career. This is probably the reason why they are rarely mentioned by historians. We think that such situation cannot be justified. A small history of Auli Herennuleii becomes a good illustration of the grand socioeconomic processes that took place in central Italy in the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd centuries.

Prosopographical studies still display great potential among widely defined classical studies¹. Thanks to new technologies and methods such as database tools or social network analysis (SNA), the usefulness of prosopography is currently being redefined². However, meticulous data mining continues to form the foundation of prosopographical analysis. Alongside the unquestionable role of prosopography in administrative and social studies, researchers are increasingly frequently underlining the perspectives it could offer to studies on economic phenomena, where it has so far been used quite rarely³.

The fact that, in our opinion, the prosopographical method is highly useful (despite its limitations, of which we are aware⁴) has motivated us to attempt to create

* We would like to thank Olli SALOMIES and Wim BROEKAERT for their great help.

¹ ECK 2010.

² GRAHAM, RUFFINI 2007.

³ VERBOVEN, CARLIER, DUMOLYN 2007: 50.

⁴ Stemming primarily from source-based limitations, i.e., the laconic and standardised nature of epigraphic texts.

a kind of socioeconomic collective biography⁵. The key to developing a collective image of individuals is the use of an appropriate criterion that distinguishes a given group. Among the many existing criteria (e.g., occupational and business profile or social origin) is an important one which we adopted in our research, namely the bearing of the same *nomen gentilicium* or, more precisely, of the same patronymic group (*praenomen* and *nomen gentilicium*). However, not every name lends itself to analysis, as it needs to be, on the one hand, original and easy to establish in sources, and on the other, popular enough to enable analysis of a given group of people to be from a broad, rather than an individual or extremely narrow perspective⁶. A chronologically similar period and a limited geographical area for which sources document a particular *gentilicium* are also of significance for the research results⁷.

We selected the rather rarely documented *nomen* Herennuleius⁸. An inspection of epigraphic material, the only category of sources documenting this name, revealed about 80 Herennuleii⁹. The majority of the men bear the same *praenomen*: Aulus¹⁰. In view of the previously presented thesis that entire patronymic groups should be identical, we selected the widely defined A.A. Herennuleii as our research subject. Sources document the representatives of the *gens* from only the 1st and 2nd centuries CE, with the apex of activity (~number of individuals) occurring in the 2nd century CE. The geographical extent of the name is also fairly limited. The largest populations are mentioned only in the area of the Augustan *regio I*. It is worth noting that there are no aristocrats documented among members

⁵ VERBOVEN, CARLIER, DUMOLYN 2007: 39.

⁶ BRUUN 2015a: 482.

⁷ BRUUN 2015a: 482; 2015b: 799; DENIAUX 1979: 623 f.

⁸ SALOMIES, SOLIN 1994: 92. Based on SCHULTZE's analysis, the name is thought to have originated from the same root as the well-known *nomen gentilicium* of Herennius (SCHULTZE 1904: 82). The *-uleius* suffix, characteristic for a Latin *deminutivum*, would therefore be either a diminutive form created from a known *nomen* or a distinguishing mark confirming that the name has a unique origin after all. In the available epigraphic data, the name usually takes its proper form, i.e., Herennuleius, and while exceptions exist, i.e., Herenuleius, Hernuleius, and Ernuleius, their form shows that typical linguistic changes are involved here and, thus, the representatives are from the same patronymic group (*praenomen* Aulus).

⁹ The *nomen* Herennuleius is also mentioned in Livy (*Fragm.* 21, 8). On the other hand, its presence there is without a doubt the result of "déformation qui, sans doute, est due à la proximité de nom d'*Hirtuleius*" (HINARD 1985: 356).

¹⁰ Exceptions to this practice are very rare and are confirmed for areas outside Italy, where no proof exists of the presence of A.A. Herennuleii, i.e., *Hispania Tarraconensis*: D. Herennuleius Dorotheus (Barcino, *CIL* II 4572 = *IRBarc* 166; see also Merida, *ERAEmerita* 419 [without *praenomina*]); *Gallia Narbonensis*: L. Herennuleius L(uci) l(ibertus) Amoenus (Narbo, *CIL* XII 4851), Herennuleia P(ubli) l(iberta) Optata (Narbo, *CIL* XII 4852); *Macedonia*: C. Herennuleius Chryserotis (Philippi, *CIL* XVI 12 = *AE* 1912, 10 = *Philippi* 30). The degree of kinship between these people and the Italian A.A. Herennuleii is difficult to gauge. See also SALOMIES 2002: 143, 147; BRUUN 2015b: 800.

of the *gens*. Searching for a Herennuleius in the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* is a futile exercise.

The characteristics of the *gens Herennuleia* presented here are doubtless the reason for the low interest of historians in the fate of its representatives. The name appeared, e.g., in onomastic studies, especially in those concerning Ostia, and was treated as an example of certain phenomena¹¹. The Herennuleii were also, and equally superficially, mentioned in analyses concerning economic matters¹², as representatives of the *gens* were found among the witnesses of banking operations, traders, and *collegiati*. Due to their economic activity, the collective biography of Herennuleii could become an interesting diagnostic tool for the broader social and economic condition of the centre of Italy in the 1st and 2nd centuries CE.

Our study of A.A. Herennuleii was based on a geographical key, namely, the distribution of epigraphic material documenting the life and activity of the representatives of the *gens*. Consequently, the first Herennuleii described here are those from Pompeii, followed by those from Rome and, finally, from Ostia¹³. In our opinion, this approach to the subject matter allows a clearer reconstruction of the history of the *gens*. Moreover, due to the specifics and the uneven quantitative distribution of epigraphic sources and a different epigraphic and archaeological reality in individual cities, the proposed division enables the application of different methods of analysis depending on the area. Furthermore, the division seems to overlap to a certain extent with the history of the Herennuleii, which could have begun (at least the part which is known from available sources) in Pompeii¹⁴.

¹¹ See, e.g. SALOMIES 2002: 147.

¹² Usually single members of the *gens* were described, especially A. Herennuleius Cestus. See below, pp. 296 f., 302–304.

¹³ Towards the end of this paper (p. 316) there is a description of two representatives of the *gens* confirmed by *signacula* who are difficult to associate with any specific city.

¹⁴ Most inscriptions mentioning A.A. Herennuleii are difficult to date precisely. Nonetheless, an attempt can be made to provide the approximate chronology of the inscriptions based on a number of criteria. Faced with the difficult dilemma of whether to limit the research solely to reliably dated inscriptions or to extend it with chronologically unreliable ones, we decided to adopt the latter solution, following P. GARNSEY to some extent. When addressing the issue of the descendants of freedmen in political life, GARNSEY (1975: 168) remarked: “Anyone undertaking an investigation into social mobility will soon discover the status is not often explicitly indicated. How are the majority of the cases to be handled? If we ignore them, we will produce a study which is relatively safe from criticism but severely restricted in scope. The alternative is to attempt to formulate hypotheses of more or less limited generality, making use of all the evidence that is to hand, direct or indirect. I opt for the second procedure without apology, as both the more adventurous and the more likely to lead to positive conclusions”. For more about the dating of inscriptions, see n. 181 below.

POMPEII

During excavation works conducted in 1830 in the area of the Pompeian *regio VI, insula 7*, a wooden chest was found that held a stamp (*signaculum*) bearing the inscription¹⁵:

A·H[^]ERENV[^]L
COMM[^]VN[^]IS.

Thanks to G. FIORELLI, the artefact was associated with the *Casa di Apollo* (VI 7.23), and A. Herennuleius Communis, mentioned on the stamp, was regarded as the proprietor of the building¹⁶. This resident of Pompeii was to become better known after tablets forming the famous archives of Iucundus were discovered in the Vesuvian city in 1875 (or in the year FIORELLI published *Descrizione di Pompei*)¹⁷. The tablets document, among others, A. Herennuleius Communis. He appears there as many as three times, always as a witness (*signator*)¹⁸. It is possible that the Pompeian tablets mention the name of another representative of the *gens*, [A. Her]ennuleius Fl[---], also as a witness¹⁹. The presence of A. Herennuleius Communis both in the banking archives and on the stamp led J. ANDREAU to the thesis that he may have been engaged in commercial activity²⁰. It is precisely from this perspective that the indoor decorations of the *Casa di Apollo* were analysed²¹.

¹⁵ CIL X 8058, 39; FIORELLI 1862: 234 f.; see PAGANO, PRISICIANDARO 2006: 143.

¹⁶ FIORELLI 1875: 115 ff. For A. Herennuleius Communis as a proprietor, see also DELLA CORTE 1965: 45; ANDREAU 1974: 191; JONGMAN 1991: 360; CASO 1989: 126 f.; GARCIA Y GARCIA 2006: 76.

¹⁷ ANDREAU 1974: 13.

¹⁸ CIL IV 3340, 77 and 113. A tablet published in CIL IV 3340, 94, on which the *cognomen* Herennuleius was lost due to damage to the text, is more problematic. ANDREAU's suggestion to identify it with Communis seems attractive (ANDREAU 1974: 270; JONGMAN, quoted after ANDREAU 1991: 345), though a different *cognomen* is not out of the question.

¹⁹ CASTRÉN (1975: 175) reconstructs the partially missing *cognomen* as L. Herennuleius Florius (?), based on an attempt to associate the name with the one documented on a stamp with the inscription L HER FLO. JONGMAN (1991: 345) probably follows the same train of thought when he mentions a certain Herennuleius Florius, albeit without the *praenomen* (on the other hand, he adds a question mark after the *cognomen*). However, it seems unjustified to fill the missing texts in this manner. The text of the inscription published in CIL more likely indicates the *cognomen* Fl[accus]. Furthermore, while a representative of the *gens Herennia* with the *praenomen* Lucius, L. Herennius Rusticus (CIL X 8071, 9), was related to a Vesuvian city, there are no reliably documented L.L. Herennuleii in the whole of Italy. Thus, the stamp mentioned by CASTRÉN may have belonged to a member of this branch of the Pompeian Herennii (the scholar does not mention L. Herennius Rusticus in his *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus*).

²⁰ ANDREAU 1974: 277.

²¹ CASO 1989: 126 ff.

On the other hand, not all researchers share the views of ANDREAU. W. JONGMAN is sceptical about drawing far-reaching conclusions concerning the occupational activity of the witnesses from Lucundus' archives. He stated that the main criterion for the presence of *signatores* in the archives would more likely have been the distance from Lucundus' estate²². Furthermore, the newest analyses of the *Casa di Apollo* show that the house may have belonged not to someone engaged in trade, but rather to "an intellectual"²³. Who then was A. Herennuleius Communis and what was his actual position in the Vesuvian *civitas*?

We should begin by stating that the commonly accepted location of the *signaculum* of A. Herennuleius Communis (even in some of the newest studies) seems incorrect. The person responsible for the confusion is FIORELLI himself. In reality, the stamp came from another estate, i.e., the neighbouring *Casa dell'Argenteria* (VI 7.20–22)²⁴, which initially comprised houses nos. 20 and 21, but was expanded in the late Roman period to also include house no. 22²⁵. There are many indications that the latter building had in the same period been transformed into a workshop that perhaps produced or repaired silverware²⁶. The entire complex was inhabited at the time when Vesuvius erupted, as evidenced by, e.g., pieces of burned bread²⁷. Not only are the 199 coins found in one of the *cubicula* (with an estimated value of approx. 3,000 HS) indicative of how wealthy the residents of the estate in question were, but also the accompanying silver containers, not to mention the sheer size and luxurious character of the estate²⁸. Are we, however, able to determine the proprietor?

The answer to this question, bearing in mind the lack of sources, should be sought in the available epigraphic material. The aforementioned stamp of A. Herennuleius Communis was not the only one found in the area of the *Casa*

²² JONGMAN 1991: 264–273.

²³ For an interesting study on the subject, see ROMIZZI 2007: 386 ff.

²⁴ ESCHEBACH 1993: 180 f. The first scholar to point out the erroneous location was DÖHL in his unpublished *Habilitationsschrift* (DÖHL 1976, *non vidimus*). SAMPALO (1993: 470 f.) and ZANKER (1998: 230, n. 68) both share his objections, albeit they do not propose a new location for the stamp. A thorough reading of *Pompeianarum antiquitatum historia* (FIORELLI 1862: 234 f. and 304 f.) reveals an error made by FIORELLI in his publication from 1875.

²⁵ SCHOONHOVEN 2006: 65.

²⁶ The exact function of the house is uncertain. Some researchers suggest a workshop (ESCHEBACH 1993: 180; SCHOONHOVEN 2006: 65), while others are more reserved about its function, as we are unable to determine it reliably based on the current state of excavations (GIOVE 2006: 114 f.).

²⁷ GIOVE 2006: 116.

²⁸ FIORELLI (1875: 113–115) has already addressed the question of the wealth of the proprietor of the *Casa dell'Argenteria*. For newer analyses, see GIOVE 2006: 116 f. (who describes the proprietor as a member of *ceto medio-alto*, or the upper middle class) and SCHOONHOVEN 2006: 175, 181 (who includes the estate in Type 7, comprising the largest and most luxurious houses in the city).

*dell'Argenteria*²⁹. The *signacula* of L. Laelius Trophimus (L.LAE.TRO)³⁰ and P. Antistius Maximus (P.[A]NTIST.MAXIMI) were also discovered³¹. Because these were the only two sources associated with the *Casa dell'Argenteria* until recently, the dispute over who the proprietor was mostly concerned Trophimus and Maximus. FIORELLI rejected the possibility of resolving this dispute. His argumentation was founded on the belief that both artefacts had been found in the same area, thus making it difficult to establish who lived on the first floor and was therefore the most important resident³². In turn, M. DELLA CORTE, drawing from other findings from the estate (three inscriptions on silverware documenting Laelius and Laelius Erastus³³) and from the fact that one of L.L. Laelii had been considered a high-ranking citizen, decided that the property must have belonged to L.L. Laelii Trophimus and Erastus³⁴. At least the former of these arguments, as B. GRALFS was right to point out, is difficult to accept, because silverware with inscriptions documenting other names has also been found on the estate³⁵. Finally, H. ESCHBACH suggested that the proprietor of the entire estate was A. Herennuleius Communis (*Grundstück des A. Herennuleius Communis*), while L. Laelius Trophimus and P. Antistius Maximus were the tenants (*inquilini*)³⁶. ESCHBACH'S analysis is based on the assumption that the stamps of Laelius and Antistius were found on the first floor (*Obergeschoss*) when in fact all the publications concerning the excavations that we are aware of state that the arte-

²⁹ Determining the proprietor of a building based on the stamps found within it is controversial (see, e.g., DEGRASSI 1955: 142 f.). MOURITSEN (1988: 14–16) is very critical about using these stamps to draw overly far-reaching conclusions. Nonetheless, his argument does not seem completely justified. He shows a fairly sceptical attitude towards the *liberti* and their direct descendants owning estates, whereas the Campanian epigraphic material includes examples of probable freedmen or their children who owned the rights to the urban buildings they lived in (e.g., C. Titius Chresimus of Suessa Aurunca: *domus* [CIL X 4760 = ILS 6296]; M. Laelius Atimetus of Puteoli: *aedificium* [CIL X 1783 = ILS 5919]) or possibly suburban buildings (L. Laecanius Primitivus of Misenum: *praedia* [CIL X 1880 = ILS 6328a]). Furthermore, MOURITSEN notably uses the terms “occupant” and “house-owner”, even though the former could also denote tenants, who were hardly a rare sight in Pompeii (for more about people renting rooms in Pompeii and the scale of the phenomenon, see, e.g., WALLACE-HADRILL 1994: 103–117; PIRSON 1997: 165–181). While one may agree with him that the person appearing on the stamp did not necessarily have to be the proprietor of the building, it would be difficult to assume that the person would not have been connected to the estate in a legal or actual manner. Thus, it seems that the presence of *signacula* in individual *insulae* was not solely the result of chance (see, e.g., JONGMAN 1991: 220, 354–364).

³⁰ CIL X 8058, 44. A *signaculum* with a similar inscription can also be seen in Toulouse; see CIL XII 5690, 76 and IV 8957.

³¹ CIL X 8058, 5.

³² FIORELLI 1875: 114 f.

³³ CIL X 8071, 10–11.

³⁴ DELLA CORTE 1965: 45 f.

³⁵ GRALFS 1988: 89–91.

³⁶ ESCHBACH 1993: 181.

facts were found in rooms near the atrium in VI 7.20³⁷. Could A. Herennuleius Communis therefore have been the proprietor of the estate, and hence a person drawing income (even if indirectly) from the hypothetical workshop and belonging to the higher strata of the Pompeian “middle class”?

Attempting to answer this question involves analysing at least two criteria:

(1) the relationships of a given person with the municipal elites; and

(2) the frequency of occurrence of that person and their position as specified on the lists of witnesses from Iucundus’ archives.

Both criteria could indicate the socioeconomic status of a given person³⁸.

Out of the three potential proprietors of the VI 7.20–22 estate, P. Antistius Maximus is the one we know the least about. He does not appear in any other epigraphic sources apart from the aforementioned stamp. Researchers speculate that P.P. Antistii may have had their representatives in the Pompeian *ordo decurionum*. However, it is difficult to provide more details about the period in which they would have performed their duties, the positions they managed to attain, and their connections with Antistius Maximus³⁹. Iucundus’ archives mention two P.P. Antistii, both occupying the 5th position on the lists of witnesses⁴⁰. It is worth noting that in one case, P. Antistius [- - -] is mentioned on the same list that begins with L. Laelius Trophimus. Thus, based on the accepted criteria, P. Antistius Maximus seems to be an unlikely proprietor of the building.

The two other candidates for the proprietor of the *Casa dell’Argenteria* appear on Iucundus’ tablets among the *signatores*. Perhaps both sources should be dated to a similar period, i.e., the 50s CE⁴¹. L. Laelius Trophimus is documented in the archives more frequently (possibly 5 times), appearing in order

³⁷ QUARANTA 1837: 5 f.; FIORELLI 1875: 113 f.; see also PAGANO, PRISICIANDARO 2006: 150. Even though the estate was at least two storeys high, the published plans of the building do not show any signs of stairs or a floor at the spot where the stamps were found (BRAGANTINI 1993: 449).

³⁸ Any proposed criteria can be questioned, but the current state of research prevents the use of any other ones. JONGMAN (1991: 255–273) is critical about the latter criterion (wealth as indicated by the size of the house), and states that it had little influence on social prestige and, consequently, the position on the list of witnesses. It can hardly be denied that occupation and being born a free person were more important for one’s position in the social hierarchy, and wealth, while obligatory (if only to acquire appropriate property qualification or to be able to conduct euergetic activity), was secondary in importance. However, because most witnesses from Iucundus’ archives were most likely freedmen, as JONGMAN himself points out (1991: 338–353), the criteria of *ingenuitas* and offices held (apart those characteristic for *liberti*), cannot be taken into account. WALLACE-HADRILL (1988: 44–47, 96 f.; 1994: 143–174) draws attention to the relationship between house owners’ aspirations and their social status and the size of their houses, and to the phenomenon of copying the elites that the rich freedmen were especially able to engage in.

³⁹ CASTRÉN 1975: 136.

⁴⁰ *CIL* IV 3340, 76 and 3340, 93; JONGMAN 1991: 339.

⁴¹ One of the tablets mentioning L. Laelius Trophimus is dated to 55 CE (*CIL* IV 3340, 13). Even though no date remains on any tablet with A. Herennuleius Communis, he appears among the witnesses documented on other tablets with L. Laelius Trophimus (e.g., alongside T. Sornius

in positions nos. 4, 3, 2, 1, and 4 on the lists of witnesses⁴². A. Herennuleius Communis appears as a *signator* slightly less often, with three documented cases in positions nos. 6, 7, and 5⁴³. L. Laelius Trophimus' relationships with the local *nobilitas* also make him the favoured candidate. It is highly probable that he was a freedman of L. Laelius Fuscus, aedile and a candidate for *duumvir* during the reign of Nero or at the beginning of the rule of the Flavian dynasty⁴⁴. In fact, Trophimus and Fuscus appear together on the same tablet (the former in position no. 4 and the latter in position no. 1)⁴⁵, though Fuscus is absent from the four other tablets that mention Trophimus. Trophimus, in turn, usually occupies a position higher than 4 among the *signatores*. The fact that this was not a coincidental promotion on the lists is corroborated by the presence of another witness, T. Sornius Eutyclus, who appears together with L. Laelius Trophimus as many as three times⁴⁶. Trophimus is located below Eutyclus on only one tablet that opens with L. Laelius Fuscus; on the other two tablets, Trophimus is listed in a higher position⁴⁷. However, it is difficult to assess what caused the changes in the hierarchy of witnesses. His higher positions on the lists and a lack of information about the patrons of A. Herennuleius Communis who could be associated with the Pompeian *nobilitas* favours Trophimus as the proprietor of the *Casa dell'Argenteria*. It should be noted, however, that Communis' lower positions on the witness lists may be misleading. On one of the tablets, he appears alongside the aforementioned T. Sornius Eutyclus, placing him directly above Eutyclus⁴⁸. This may constitute proof that Communis and Trophimus had similar social positions.

Thanks to a recent paper by W. BROEKAERT entitled *Financial Experts in a Spider Web. A Social Network Analysis of the Archives of Caecilius Iucundus*

Eutyclus), and what is more, he appears once with a *duumvir quinquennalis* from 55–56 CE, Cn. Aleius Nigidius Maius (*CIL* IV 3340, 77).

⁴² *CIL* IV 3340, 13, 61, 66, 76, 108.

⁴³ *CIL* IV 3340, 77, 94, 113.

⁴⁴ CASTRÉN 1975: 181; JONGMAN 1991: 231.

⁴⁵ *CIL* IV 3340, 13.

⁴⁶ *CIL* IV 3340, 13, 61, 66.

⁴⁷ JONGMAN (1991: 333) pointed out the differences in positions held by T. Sornius Eutyclus and L. Laelius. However, he was unable to find the potential reason for this discrepancy ("possibly the Laelius Trophimus, without *praenomen*, in 61 and 66 is a different person from the L. Laelius Trophimus in 13, but it would be more honest to accept the contradiction as it stands"). In our opinion, it is not out of the question that Trophimus owed his remarkable promotion to his entrepreneurship and rapid accumulation of capital, including social capital, even though the lack of any proof renders this merely speculation. Because we know the dating of only one inscription, a reverse scenario is also possible, whereby it would be T. Sornius Eutyclus who received a promotion at the cost of, among others, Laelius Trophimus.

⁴⁸ It is worth noting that [A. Her]ennuleius FI[---] is also listed above Sornius Eutyclus (*CIL* IV 3340, 85).

and the *Sulpicii*, we are able to take the analysis of Lucundus' archives one step further⁴⁹. The Belgian historian used a method based on SNA that allows for a closer inspection of the position of people documented in the said archives⁵⁰. One of his proposed criteria should be taken into account here, namely, the degree of connection between a given node (denoting a particular person present in the network) and other nodes⁵¹. The higher the degree, the closer the business connections of that person⁵². Therefore, BROEKAERT believes (while still rightfully pointing out that the existing evidence is weak and thus rarely allows a given person from the archive to be directly associated with economic activity) that people with the highest degree of connection could have engaged in commercial and financial activity. L. Laelius Trophimus achieved this high degree of connection, being placed among the top 4% of the best-connected individuals appearing on the tablets of the Pompeian banker (degree 33)⁵³. In turn, A. Herennuleius Communis (degree 16) was placed much lower, i.e., among the top 13% of the best-connected individuals⁵⁴. While Laelius Trophimus may have owed his presence among the top ranking individuals to his relationships with his former owner⁵⁵, a high-ranking person himself, the stamp and the potential craftsman's workshop found in the *Casa dell'Argenteria* may both indicate his connections with trade and crafts.

Who, therefore, was A. Herennuleius Communis? Our analysis does not, of course, rule out the possibility that he was the proprietor of the *insula* VI.7.20–22, as ESCHEBACH suggests. In the light of the evidence obtained, however, this seems unlikely. Perhaps, then, he was merely a tenant of part of the estate, albeit the legal relationship binding him with the estate may have been different

⁴⁹ BROEKAERT 2013a.

⁵⁰ Because the method used by BROEKAERT, based on the PAJEK computer programme, is relatively complicated, we believe that describing it in this paper in detail is unnecessary. Basic information and bibliographical references to literature on SNA can be found in BROEKAERT's publications (e.g., 2013a: 471–475).

⁵¹ BROEKAERT 2013a: 484. In addition, the centrality of the nodes can be assessed using two other criteria: "closeness" and "betweenness and dyadic constraint".

⁵² This criterion comes with a certain risk, as BROEKAERT himself notes (2013a: 487), in that individuals connected mainly with their widely documented slaves may also achieve a high degree of connection (as exemplified by Egnatius Suavis from the *Sulpicii* tablets). It seems unlikely that a similar risk should affect the case of Laelius and Herennuleius.

⁵³ BROEKAERT 2013a: 486, tab. 2. He took into account only people who are reliably documented in the sources, thus A. Herennuleius Communis, who is only documented on two tablets without any doubts, was taken into account only twice.

⁵⁴ Information on the subject was taken from private correspondence between W. PIETRUSZKA and W. BROEKAERT.

⁵⁵ BROEKAERT (2013a: 484) indicates this possibility, e.g., in the case of the high rank achieved by the *Popidii*.

in character⁵⁶. Nonetheless, the presence of the stamp, his relatively high positions on the lists of witnesses (as measured using the “traditional” method), and his presence among the top 13% of the best-connected individuals on the lists from Iucundus’ archives all allow for the conclusion that he may have been a representative of the Pompeian middle class engaged in economic activity⁵⁷. The actual position of the other of the two Pompeian Herennuleii, the enigmatic [A. Her]ennuleius Fl[---], is even more difficult to assess. Taking into account his presence as a witness directly above [T.] Sornius Eutyclus⁵⁸, we may speculate that he achieved a position similar to *Communis*.

ROME

A.A. Herennuleii are also documented in sources from other cities. Let us begin with an inscription mentioning A. Herennuleius Cestus (see Appendix, Table 1, ID 29):

A(ulus) Herennuleius
 Cestus, negótiator
 vinárius a Septem
 Caesaribus idem mercatôr
 5 omnis generis mercium
 transmarinârum, lictor,
 vivós sibi fecit et libertis
 libertabusque suis
 posterisq(ue) eorum.

This unique epigraphic monument, notable for the rare mention of the *cursus honorum* of a Roman businessman, was discovered in Reate. It is highly probable that in fact the inscription came from a different place, as substantiated by two arguments⁵⁹:

1. First and foremost, the text includes the toponym *a Septem Caesaribus* (lines 3–4). Probably the most convincing findings about its location are those by R.E. PALMER, who showed that the place was located in the southern part of the district of Rome called *Transtiberim* (now Trastevere), probably immediately beyond the *Porta Portuensis*, and was, perhaps, related to the nearby

⁵⁶ For more on the subject, see WALLACE-HADRILL 1994: 91–117.

⁵⁷ It cannot, of course, be ruled out that the reason for A. Herennuleius *Communis*’ presence on the witness list were his relationships with Laelius Trophimus (if only due to them possibly living together) and the fact that the latter may have recommended him to the Pompeian banker as a trustworthy person (for more on the subject, see BROEKAERT 2013a: 507 f.). It seems, however, that the high degree of connections achieved by A. Herennuleius *Communis* contradicts this hypothesis.

⁵⁸ *CIL* IV 3340, 85.

⁵⁹ As with many monuments of its kind, it would have probably entered the antique market and travelled across the Italian Peninsula (*SupIt* XVIII, 70–71).

port infrastructure and warehouses lining the Tiber⁶⁰. Among the inscriptions known to us, the toponym is documented only three times, with each inscription confirming the commercial character of *Septem Caesares*⁶¹. The chief goods being traded were probably wines⁶².

2. The *nomen gentilicium* Herennuleius does not appear in sources from Reate, but it is fairly popular in Rome. Together with the suggested location of *Septem Caesares*, this strengthens the proposal that the inscription is Roman in origin⁶³.

A. Herennuleius Cestus the businessman introduces us to the Roman episode in the history of the *gens*. Epigraphic material proves that A.A. Herennuleii clustered particularly in the *Urbs* (about 62 people). However, due to a high number of “seemingly” unconnected inscriptions, it is difficult to find and reconstruct the relationships between individual Roman A.A. Herennuleii (Appendix, Table 1). The fact that the same *cognomina* appear in this loose epigraphic collection may serve as a starting point. Their similarity (alongside the rare *nomen gentilicium*) allows for the thesis that these are the same people documented by different sources. This situation occurs six times and concerns the following individuals: A. Herennuleius Ampliatus (Appendix, Table 1, ID 6 and 30), A. Herennuleius Dicaeus (ID 8 and 18), A. Herennuleius Epitynchanus (ID 5 and 24), A. Herennuleius Hermes (ID 9 and 10), Herennuleia Helpis (ID 9 and 30), and Herennuleia Primitiva (ID 16 and 31).

According to H. SOLIN, this non-accidental similarity could have occurred for Herennuleia Helpis⁶⁴. If his suggestion were to be accepted, it would lead to the merging of two groups within the *gens*:

ID	Source	Persons	Relationships
ID 9+30	<i>CIL</i> VI 19345; <i>CIL</i> X 601 = <i>InscrIt</i> I 1, 202	1. A. Herennuleius Ampliatus 2. Herennuleia Helpis 3. A. Herennuleius Hermes 4. Herennuleia Olympias	Clientele: 1 [<i>patronus</i>] + 2 [<i>liberta</i>] Family: 2 [<i>coniunx</i> , mother] + 3 [<i>coniunx</i> , father] + 4 [daughter]

⁶⁰ PALMER 1981.

⁶¹ PALMER 1981: 368 f.

⁶² A. Herennuleius Cestus describes himself as *negotiator vinarius a Septem Caesaribus*. The second inscription (*CIL* VI 712) mentions Q. Octavius Daphnicus, who describes himself as *negotians vinarius*. In turn, *CIL* XIV 2886 documents L. Domitius Agathemer as a local *coactor argentarius*. Financiers of this kind often occupied areas where there was an intense exchange of goods.

⁶³ *SupIt* XVIII 70 f.

⁶⁴ SOLIN 1996: 555; 2003: 1293.

The *cognomina* of two subsequent A.A. Herennuleii appearing more than twice, i.e., Ampliatus and Hermes, are given in bold in the combined groups ID 9 and 30. This could suggest the possibility of adding other source groups (ID 6 and 10), thus recreating more of the original relationships.

While attempts to identify the homonymous A.A. Herennuleii are extremely attractive, they are also accompanied by a significant risk. The danger of a wrong interpretation of the sources is directly shown by onomastic arguments. All six cases involve popular or even very popular *cognomina* or *nomina servilia*. The least popular name in Rome is Dicaeus, documented 20 times⁶⁵. In turn, Epitynchanus is mentioned 101 times⁶⁶, Helpis 479 times⁶⁷, and Hermes as many as 892 times⁶⁸. If we take into account Latin *cognomina*, for which we have only general statistics, Ampliatus is documented 202 times⁶⁹ and Primitiva 269 times⁷⁰. In addition to the popularity of the names under analysis, doubts also arise from chronological discrepancies (the dating itself is frequently imprecise). For instance, one of the A.A. Herennuleii bearing the *cognomen* Dicaeus is dated to the 1st century CE, while the next one is dated to the 2nd century CE (the same is true for the members of the *gens* in question bearing the *cognomen* Hermes)⁷¹. Taking into account the above-listed issues, we think that while the A.A. Herennuleii analysed here may have been the same person, it is most likely true that we are only dealing with homonymous individuals.

The source material presented at the end of this paper (Appendix, Table 1) shows that over half (18) of the Roman inscriptions document the smallest social groups, comprising only two people. Most numerous among these (12) are marriages and informal partnerships⁷². The remaining epigraphic sources document either people appearing on their own⁷³ or communes with a more developed structure, i.e., families with documented offspring⁷⁴ and different kinds of relationships (clientele, administrative relationships, military relationships, and

⁶⁵ SOLIN 1996: 412: 10 (19354, 2nd cent.); 2003: 788–720 (19344, 1st cent.; 19354, 2nd cent.).

⁶⁶ SOLIN 2003: 855–857.

⁶⁷ SOLIN 1996: 555–557: 141 (*CIL* X 601, 1st/2nd cent.; “vielleicht identisch mit” 19345, 1st/2nd cent.); 2003: 1292–1298: 479.

⁶⁸ SOLIN 1996: 291–295: 328 (*CIL* VI 19345, 1st/2nd cent.; see Helpis); 2003: 368–380: 892 (*CIL* VI 19346, 1st cent.; 19345, 2nd cent.).

⁶⁹ KAJANTO 1965: 349: 166 men (*CIL*) + 36 slaves/freedmen.

⁷⁰ KAJANTO 1965: 290: 254 women (*CIL*) + 14 slaves and freedmen.

⁷¹ Dicaeus: SOLIN 1996: 410: 19354, 2nd cent.; 2003: 788: 19344, 1st cent.; 19354, 2nd cent.; Hermes: SOLIN 2003: 368–380: 19346, 1st cent.; 19345, 2nd cent.

⁷² Nine of these are certain (IDs 7, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 26, 27 and 33) and three are potential (IDs 15, 21 and 30).

⁷³ IDs 22 and 29.

⁷⁴ IDs 5, 9, 14, 19, 24, 32 and 33.

unspecified)⁷⁵. The tendency for two-person relationships to dominate is mostly due to the fact that the majority of the inscriptions are sepulchral in nature, and usually only commemorate a given person's partner⁷⁶. We suspect, however, that this is not the only possible explanation, and the same state of affairs can also be the justification for the limited number of relationships that A.A. Herennuleii may have engaged in⁷⁷. The lack of highly-developed familial relationships may stem from the fact that they lived primarily in structures involving freedmen, in which familial ties were limited, if present at all⁷⁸. This hypothesis is substantiated by the scarcity of information about offspring (ID 5 [daughter], 9 [daughter], 19 [son], 25 [highly uncertain: daughter, son?], 31 [two daughters], 32 [daughter, son]) that further documents their premature death (ID 5: 7 years old, ID 9: 2 years old, ID 32: daughter 7 years old, son 5 years old). Even information about other familial ties is marked with the air of slavery. On the one hand, sources describe siblings, i.e., brothers (the inscription uses the term *frater*), but with different *nomina gentilitia*: Herennuleius and Clodius (ID 11), which may constitute evidence that they had been sold to two different houses, and consequently, that after becoming free, they adopted the *gentilitia* of two different former owners. On the other hand, the inscription documents familial ties described through the general term *cognatus* (ID 4). The fate of these kinsmen, i.e., A. Herennuleius Amandus and Abuccia Helpis, resembles the history of the aforementioned brothers. The inscription indicates that Helpis was the wife of [L. Abucci]us [---]imus, making it fairly probable that, bearing the same *nomen gentilicium* as her husband, she was either his freedwoman or both she and her husband had once been among the *servi* of an otherwise unspecified representative of the *gens* Abuccia. In turn, her kin Amandus would have been taken to the house of A.A. Herennuleii.

The lives of many Roman female partners of A.A. Herennuleii had much in common with the life of Abucia Helpis. They too bore the same *nomina gentilitia* as their husbands⁷⁹, with only a few exceptions: Iulia L.f. Latina (ID 10), Claudia

⁷⁵ IDs 2, 3, 6, 23 and 25.

⁷⁶ BORBONUS 2014: 125.

⁷⁷ It is worth noting the presence of inscriptions describing offspring who buried their parents, e.g., IDs 19 and 32.

⁷⁸ Freedmen rarely commemorated their ancestors in inscriptions. Their children were also frequently born still in slavery and were not freed together with them. Formally, a slave could not be freed under *lex Aelia Sentia* before his 30th birthday, i.e., at a relatively old age, which could prevent them from having offspring, though obviously a fairly large group of Herennuleii may have been freed much earlier in an informal manner (as Junian Latins). The probable low frequency of marriages and low number of offspring among the *liberti*, citizens and Junian Latins alike, are also indicated by demographic models developed by DE LIGHT and GARNSEY for Herculaneum during the earlier stages of the Roman Empire (DE LIGHT, GARNSEY 2012: esp. 85–88).

⁷⁹ IDs 7, 9, 14, 17, 19, 27 and 33.

Blaste (ID 24), and Precilia Fortunata (ID 32). Little is known about these three women. *Ingenua* Iulia Latina remains completely anonymous. Claudia Blaste was an enterprising freedwoman who first married her patron and after his death remarried A. Herennuleius Epitynchanus⁸⁰. Lastly, Precilia Fortunata came from a *gens* with a confirmed socioeconomic role⁸¹. The remaining relationships may have originated between patrons and former female slaves (*manumissio matrimonii causa*)⁸² or between slaves freed by the same patron who thus adopted the same *nomen gentilicium* (*colliberti*)⁸³. This hypothesis is corroborated by data showing relatively frequent relationships between the patron and the slave (of either sex, IDs 6, 8, 14, 20, 21, 27, and 30), between *colliberti* (of opposite sexes, IDs 13 and 18), and between the slave and the *dominus* (of either sex, IDs 5, 12, 26, and 28).

The hypothesis that freedmen formed a significant part of the *gens* is confirmed by the story from ID 6. The information comes from an impressive tombstone. The construction of the tomb is confirmed by the names of as many as six freedmen. It is difficult to estimate whether this was a practice among the Roman A.A. Herennuleii. Nonetheless, the so far noticeable presence of slavery in the structure of the *gens* may suggest that this was not an isolated case⁸⁴. This would indicate that the Roman representatives of the *gens* hailed from the slave environment. This hypothesis is also confirmed by onomastic data which suggests that about 60% of Herennuleii living in the *Urbs* bore Greek *cognomina*, which from the Roman perspective would indicate that they had low origins and were recruited from slaves⁸⁵.

⁸⁰ We do not know what the connection is between the history told by the inscription ID 24 and inscription ID 25, found in the same area; see PERRY 2013: 127.

⁸¹ For more on the Precilii, see MEGALE 2007.

⁸² EVANS GRUBBS 1993: 127; ID 27: an evident relationship between the patron and the freedwoman; IDs 21, 29 and 30: possible relationships.

⁸³ TREGGIARI 1981: 48; RAWSON 1974: 295 f. (Ann. 62), 301. ID 14 illustrates this well. The death of A. Herennuleius Trophimus Iunior was commemorated by two women: his patron, Herennuleia Irene, appears first in the inscription, followed by his partner, Herennuleia Germana. Note that the latter bore the same name as her partner and his patron. Consequently, it is possible that both Trophimus Iunior and Germana were former slaves of Irene, who eventually freed them. Alternatively, Trophimus Iunior may be the freedman of Irene, while Germana was his slave, whom he freed and married (perhaps freedom was granted *matrimonii causa*). – During the writing of this paper, inscription ID 33 was published, which mentions A. Herennuleius Trophimus. Thus, it is possible that the new inscription constitutes a trace of Iunior's father (brother?).

⁸⁴ The freeborn representatives of the line would most frequently constitute the subsequent generation.

⁸⁵ This concerns a total of 37 people among the 62 Roman Herennuleii. In addition to the Greek *cognomina*, the slave origins of some Herennuleii is indicated by their Latin *cognomina servilia*: Fausta, Fortunatus, Salvius, Fidelis, and perhaps Ampliatus (for more on Latin *cognomina servilia*, see GARNSEY 1975; DUTHOY 1989). Numerical data indicating the slave character of some *cognomina* can be found in KAJANTO 1965.

We assume that for a significant part of the Roman A.A. Herennuleii, becoming free and starting a family (or even the beginnings of a family) constituted the final step of their small achievement in life. This correlates with the fact that sources rather rarely provide information on any major sociopolitical aspirations among the Roman A.A. Herennuleii. The few examples of careers followed a standard route and involved public functions characteristic for the lower social strata, such as *lictor*, *vicomagister*, or *praefectus fabrum*⁸⁶. Due to the fact that among the A.A. Herennuleii there are no known people who could have belonged to the upper echelons of Roman society, it is possible that the representatives of the *gens* looked for support among “external” patrons. Inscription *CIL* VI 3527 (ID 3) most probably illustrates this very strategy:

C(aius) Rupilius Mena fecit sibi
 et A(ulo) Herennul{a}eio Hypato
 posterisque suis et C(aio) Iulio Silvano
 C(aio) Minucio A(uli) f(ilio) Quirina Herennul{a}<e>io
 Iuliano praef(ecto) fabrum et
 Ampudiae Cn(aei) f(iliae) Iuliae libertis
 libertabusq(ue) posterisq(ue) eorum

Existing sources do not enable us to reconstruct the original relationships between the people mentioned on this monument⁸⁷. In the case of A.A. Herennuleii, we may speculate that they were related, with Hypatus most likely being the biological father of C. Minucius Herennuleius Iulianus⁸⁸. The specific structure of the latter’s name shows characteristics of what is referred to as adoptive nomenclature (*praenomen* + *nomen* + *nomen* + *cognomen*⁸⁹), which, together with the *praenomen* different to his father’s *praenomen*, indicates that he was adopted by a certain C. Minucius by means of testamentary adoption⁹⁰. O. SALOMIES did not exclude the possibility that the nomenclature may also have been ultimately shaped by C. Iulius Silvanus, which would explain the *cognomen* as coined from the root of the *nomen*: *Iul* + *ianus*. This proposal leads to a fairly complicated turn of events, even involving a second adoption⁹¹. The potential relationship

⁸⁶ PURCELL 1983.

⁸⁷ See RICCI 2008: 328.

⁸⁸ SALOMIES 1992: 29.

⁸⁹ SALOMIES 1992: 21, 26: type of nomenclature: Pad + Nad + Norig + Corig.

⁹⁰ SALOMIES 1992: 29. It can be assumed that he was a fairly influential person. This assumption is not based merely on the name, but also on the fact that C. Minucius Herennuleius Iulianus was a *praefectus fabrum*. This unique post of assistant to top senatorial officials (*cum imperio*) frequently paved the road to a further equestrian career and predominantly involved support or protection on the part of an influential patron (PURCELL 1983: 156 f.). An adoption hidden in the name may have constituted a sign of and reason for such a promotion (CERVA 2000: 189).

⁹¹ SALOMIES 1992: 29.

with C. Iulius was also pointed out by M. CERVA, who underlined the existence of a group of *praefecti fabrum* hailing from the sons of freedmen⁹². According to him, the group should be especially noticeable in sources dated to the first decades of the 1st century CE. CERVA included C. Minucius Herennuleius Iulianus in the group, emphasising his likely kinship (*parentela*) with A. Herennuleius Hypatus and C. Iulius Silvanus (both of whom he considers freedmen). While SALOMIES attempted to explain the relationship between the prefect and Silvanus with a potential second adoption and the structure of the *cognomen*, CERVA fails to provide any significant arguments for the supposed kinship. It can only be assumed that his opinion stemmed either from the fact that the prefect bore the aforementioned *cognomen* or from the structure of the inscription and the juxtaposition of the names of Hypatus and Silvanus. The belief in the kinship seems, however, more justified than the second adoption. SALOMIES himself observes that the *cognomen* of the C(*ianus*) type, used in the type of adoptive nomenclature being analysed, was often created from the *nomen* of the mother, i.e., Iulia⁹³. Thus, it may be that C. Iulius Silvanus, brother (father?) of an anonymous Iulia, was related to C. Minucius Herennuleius Iulianus. However, while CERVA's opinion about the familial relationships may be correct, it would be difficult to accept his proposed early dating of the epigraphic monument, especially since he does not attempt to justify it. SOLIN believes that A. Herennuleius Hypatus should be dated to the 1st century CE⁹⁴. As a result, the dating of the inscription is based on this opinion⁹⁵. C. Minucius Herennuleius Iulianus is not mentioned in the existing lists of *praefecti fabrum* from the Julio-Claudian period, which suggests that he was active no sooner than in the Flavian period, especially taking into account the chronology of the other inscriptions with information about the Roman branch of the *gens Herennuleia*⁹⁶.

Another notable representative of the *gens* is the aforementioned A. Herennuleius Cestus. Alongside commercial activity, as indicated by his positions of *negotiator vinarius* and *mercator omnium mercium transmarinarum*, he was also a *lictor*. According to N. PURCELL, being ranked among the *apparitores* could have allowed for a degree of social mobility for the Roman *plebs*⁹⁷. Furthermore, *apparitores* engaging in economic activity were nothing out of the ordinary⁹⁸.

⁹² CERVA 2000: 189.

⁹³ SALOMIES 2014: 512.

⁹⁴ SOLIN 2003: 1092.

⁹⁵ FASSBENDER 2005: 339 f., ann. 688. Unfortunately, we do not even know which of the numerous tomb complexes found in the area of the Doria Pamphilj villa the inscription comes from; see CIANCIO ROSSETTO 2005: 22–28; BORBONUS 2014: 202 ff.

⁹⁶ DOBSON 1965; SADDINGTON 1985.

⁹⁷ PURCELL 1983.

⁹⁸ MÜNIZ COELLO 1989: 144.

A. Herennuleius Cestus belonged to those lictors who decided not to describe their function in a more precise manner⁹⁹. This category of *apparitores* is believed to have been more pragmatic in their approach and focused more on the occupational and financial prospects afforded by their function, rather than on a social career, as evidenced by the lack of exposition of the function and its laconic description¹⁰⁰. BROEKAERT presents a different hypothesis, stating that Cestus' position as a *lictor* was probably the apex of his career, preceded, of course, by him abandoning trade or transferring his duties to his agents, who were slaves by origin¹⁰¹. Can the question of the actual course of Cestus' career therefore be answered? Are we dealing here with the classic path from a parvenu to a public official, or in fact the reverse? Contrary to BROEKAERT'S view, we suspect that Cestus' position as a *lictor* could have been a turning point in, rather than the apex of his career, a turning point that opened the path to grand business in Rome¹⁰². The structure of the inscription seems to indicate that Cestus primarily emphasises his trade activity¹⁰³, while his public role is mentioned at the end of the *cursus*, with no further details. This argues against the notion of his career which was proposed by BROEKAERT¹⁰⁴. Such a career path would explain Cestus' success. The position of wine wholesaler and trader in overseas goods (presumably slaves) on the populous Roman market would have been neither easy to achieve nor easy to maintain. The inscription gives no information about Cestus' social and trade relationships. As has already been mentioned, sources do not document the rich and powerful patrons among the A.A. Herennuleii who may have enrolled Cestus into their network, providing him with a good start to a grand business career in the imperial capital. The previously used example

⁹⁹ PURCELL 1983: 148 ff. Many lictors described their functions precisely, e.g., *lictor decurialis*, *popularis*, *curialis*, or *proximus*.

¹⁰⁰ PURCELL 1983: 148 f. It was the *ingenui* who were usually successful. They held the position of *lictor curiatus* and frequently continued their careers among the ranks of *apparitores*.

¹⁰¹ BROEKAERT 2013b: 66.

¹⁰² Such an instrumental use of the function seems to have been a popular practice, as PURCELL (1983) proves numerous times.

¹⁰³ The difference between the terms concerns the scale of the practice, though the type of product should be taken into account as well as the definitions of the terms themselves (KNEISSL 1983). Cestus was a *negotiator vinarius*, because wine was a staple imported in wholesale amounts (RICO 2003: 423). At the same time, he was a *mercator*, because his second business concentrated on less common products (GIARDINA 1993: 264). It is speculated that these overseas products primarily included slaves (BODEL 2005: 185; BRADLEY 2006: 58). See also REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ 2000: 795.

¹⁰⁴ PURCELL (1983: 151) quotes a different inscription documenting a businessman and *lictor*, but in this case the *cursus honorum* is, so to say, in excellent order, and the exposed function is given with precision and is relevant to the person who set up the inscription: *CIL VI 1885*: “*Memo-riae / Caeciliae Helladis / uxoris karissimae / D(ecimus) Caecilius Abascantus / lictor curiat(i)us / diffusor olearius ex / provincia Baetica / fecit sibi et libertis / [l]ibertabusque sui[s] / posterisque eoru[m]*”.

of C. Minucius Herennuleius Iulianus proves that without adoption or an influential patron, a career of this kind would have presumably been impossible. Thus, we believe it highly probable that the laconically listed *lictor* position allowed Cestus to achieve great success in the subsequent part of his life¹⁰⁵.

The last case concerns A. Herennuleius Pharnaces, who performed a strictly local function, i.e., that of a *vicomagister* in *Transtiberim* (ID 2)¹⁰⁶. Even though his function was not immensely impressive (though it did allow him to enter the public and religious life of the *Urbs* and the empire¹⁰⁷), his role may still shed some light on the history of the *gens* in Rome. This is because we suspect that his presence in *Transtiberim*, as with the aforementioned A. Herennuleius Cestus, was not coincidental.

Thus, it is worth investigating information about the geographical distribution of the inscriptions and topographical data contained in sources documenting A.A. Herennuleii (Appendix, Table 2). We are aware that some of the areas mentioned here are only secondary deposition *loci* for the artefacts or repositories and collections. However, if the dispersed geographical values are nevertheless ascribed to a more general division into the left and right bank of Rome (with a highly uncertain initial location – *incerti* [11]), we observe that a fairly clear majority of the inscriptions are located on the right bank (14), rather than on the more developed and inhabited left bank (8). This data suggests that the right bank of Rome, especially the most developed *Transtiberim*, was an important area for A.A. Herennuleii. In the southern part of this small district (from the perspective of the *Urbs*), we observe a concentration of source material (*Septem Caesares*, Pozzo Pantaleo cemetery). However, the majority of epigraphic records are ascribed to the central and northern parts of *Transtiberim* (western part: cemeteries in the vicinity of the Doria Pamphilj villa and S. Pancratio; centre: church repositories from S. Maria Transtiberina and S. Cosma; eastern part and riverside areas of the Tiber: repositories from S. Salvatoris and S. Laurentiolo and sources from the vicinity of the *pons S. Mariae*). Thus, *via Aurelia vetus* would constitute the axis of source distribution. We believe that this layout may not have been simply the result of chance or of the artefacts being transported later, as indicated by the aforementioned *vicomagister*, A. Herennuleius [---] Pharnaces (ID 2)¹⁰⁸. Together with three other individuals, i.e., L. Valerius [---] Flavianus¹⁰⁹, Sex. Pollenius

¹⁰⁵ PURCELL 1983: 137.

¹⁰⁶ MOEDE 2011: 165 f. See BERT LOTT 2004: 12 ff.; KAISER 2011: 33 ff.

¹⁰⁷ PURCELL 1983: 133.

¹⁰⁸ RÜPKE 2005: 1031.

¹⁰⁹ It is difficult to estimate whether the inscription published in *CIL* VI 36762 documents the same individual. The popularity of the name and, consequently, the large number of sources, significantly complicate precise analyses of L. Valerius, or the Valerii in general. The representatives of this old *gens* appear very frequently as *vicomagistri* also in *regio XIV*: C. Valerius C.I. Athenaeus [*vicus*

[---]+++[.].s¹¹⁰, and L. Perperna [---A]mpliatus¹¹¹, he was responsible for *vicus Laci Restituti*¹¹². Previous topographers usually did not attempt to locate this area more precisely due to there being insufficient data¹¹³. On the other hand, C. LEGA recently attempted to prove that the aforementioned *vicus* belonged to a group of districts in the northern part of *Transtiberim*, by the border with *ager Vaticanus* (near the following *vici*: *Saufei*, *Sergi*, *Ploti*, and *Tiberini*)¹¹⁴. This would mean that Pharnaces could have been responsible for the area located somewhere between the aforementioned *via Aurelia vetus* and the northern part of *Transtiberim* delineated by the *Porta Septimana*¹¹⁵. At this point, it is also worth noting the recent publications of the source material, which expand the distribution range of sources related to Herennuleii on the right bank by the area of the Vatican (see Appendix, Table 1, ID 33).

Sulpici Ulterioris, regio I], L. Valerius L.l. Diodorus [*vicus Sulpici Citeroris, regio I*], L. Valerius L.l. Euhodus [*vicus Trium Ararum, regio I*], L. Valerius L.f. Euhelipistis [*vicus Curiarum, regio X*], L. Valerius L.l. Primitivus [*vicus Porta Naevia, regio XII*], M. Valerius M.l. Anicetus [*vicus Compiti Pastoris, regio XII*], Valerius ?l. Felix [*vicus Columnae Lignae, regio XIII*], C. Valerius L.f. Attalus [*vicus Columnae Lignae, regio XIII*], L. Valerius L.l. Hymnus [*vicus Materiarius, regio XIII*], C. Valerius C.l. [*vicus Pac(r)rae, regio XIV*], L. Valerius L.l. Callistus [*vicus Quadrati, regio XIV*], P. Valerius P.l. Epitynchanus [*vicus Rostratae, regio XIV*], and L. Valerius L.l. Eutychnus (*ILS* 3620).

¹¹⁰ RÜPKE 2005: 1215. In the Roman evidence, we recognise only the Pollenii in the aforementioned Capitoline Base and the inscription published in *CIL* VI 29101 from another location (*in ecclesia S. Ambrosii de maxima in pavimento* [Sant' Ambrogio della Massima]).

¹¹¹ RÜPKE 2005: 1196. Perperni/Perpeni/Perpenni (the most common *praenomina*: Lucius, Marcus and Sextus, rarely Titus) are documented in the capital primarily on its left bank (also L. Perperni). Only three inscriptions come from the side of the right bank. These concentrate on the marriage between Sex. Perperna Argyrus and Perperna Omphae. All three were discovered in the area of the Doria Pamphilj villa (*CIL* VI 23955, 23956 and 23936). Another monument may be associated with these epitaphs (*CIL* VI 23935). Thus, it is possible that the aforementioned marriage and L. Perpernus Ampliatus would prove the activity of this *gens* also on the right bank.

¹¹² The name *Lacus Restitutus* may be related to a reservoir or water source (or perhaps, a fountain): LEGA 1999.

¹¹³ Bibliography: LEGA 1999.

¹¹⁴ Similarly RICHARDSON 1992: 425 (*Vicus Laci Restituti*), see also: FALLOU, GUILHEMBET 2008: 185.

¹¹⁵ It also worth mentioning another type of source, i.e., a study by Pierro LIGORIO (an avid researcher of ancient Rome) and the map from 1553 by Michele TRAMEZZINO included there. It seems that LIGORIO's reconstruction of the topography of the *vici* in the northern parts of Trastevere corresponds with an opinion expressed by LEGA (1999). According to the Renaissance cartographer, the *vici* were located in an area uphill of *via Aurelia*, between the *Porta Septimana* and *Porta Ianicularis* (i.e. *Porta Aurelia*). *Vicus Laci Restituti* is located west of the *Porta Septimana* (the map is available in digital form at <http://www.oldmapsonline.org/map/cuni/1014369>, accessed on 30 July 2015). Some of the *vici* in the *Urbis Romae sciographia ex antiquis monumentis accuratissime delineata* by Étienne DU PÉRAC (1574) showed a similar arrangement. However, the similarity should not come as a surprise, since DU PÉRAC used and compiled LIGORIO's archaeological and topographical findings. In this case, the *vicus Laci Restituti* was moved slightly towards the east, directly at the *Porta Septimana*.

We suspect that the choice of the *Transtiberim* region (alongside, perhaps, the adjacent regions on the left bank, i.e., riverside areas directly next to the Saint Paul's Basilica Outside the Walls [ID 24–25] or the *Porta Ostiensis* [ID 19]) as a special place of intense activity of the *gens* was not accidental. Recent studies and reconstructions of *Forma Urbis Romae* provide a “new” image of this slightly marginalised district, which stood in the shadow of the grand world of the left bank¹¹⁶. It was found that the district's eastern border, running as far as up to Pietra Papa, constituted a significant commercial complex with port facilities that developed rapidly from the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd centuries CE¹¹⁷. The riverside was occupied by business and logistics facilities (harbours, arcades, squares, warehouses, counting room, etc.)¹¹⁸. The area had excellent access not only to the centre of Rome (through the old municipal port) but, thanks to *via Portuensis* and *via Aurelia*, to the coast (including the Portus) and the suburbs of the capital as well. Of course, the Tiber played a great role in this communication. The economic and port character of the district is accentuated by the presence of communities typical for areas of this type: the Palmyrians, Syrians, and Jews¹¹⁹. It is this world that A.A. Herennuleii chose for themselves as their motherland in Rome. The onomastic diversity visible in their names, the large share of former slaves in the structure of the *gens* together with the evidence for the economic engagement of the *gens* correlate exceptionally well with the climate of this part of Rome. It is also possible that settling in *regio XIV* had an effect on the subsequent history of A.A. Herennuleii.

OSTIA

Ostia is the last city that contains extant epigraphic material documenting the A.A. Herennuleii. The Ostian representatives of this *gens* can be divided into two categories:

- (1) people related to *collegia* operating in this *civitas*, and

¹¹⁶ TUCCI 2004. Bibliography for the district: <http://sites.duke.edu/romantrastevere/bibliography/> (accessed on 24 April 2015).

¹¹⁷ DEY 2011: 172 f.

¹¹⁸ CASTAGNOLI 1980; KEAY 2012: 39. Analysis of *FUR* fragments attributed to Line VI and, partially Line V shows that the area was highly urbanised. The streets are lined with many buildings containing numerous small rooms, probably shops, counting rooms, *tabernae*, etc. (V/17: 33a–c, 33d; V/18: 34a–c; V/19: fn23; VI/7: 27a, 27b, 27c, 27d–e, and 574a–b; VI/8: 92, 138a, 138b–e, and 138f; VI/9: 28a, 28b, and 28c). These buildings were frequently multi-storeyed (including *insulae*), as indicated by their outlines and the v-shaped character marking the entrance to the upper stories (VI/7: 27b, VI/8: 138b–e). Also noticeable are numerous porticoes (VI/7: 27b, VI/9: 28a and 28b), squares (VI/7: 27b, VI/8: 138b–e, VI/9: 28a, 28b, and 28c), warehouses (V/17: 33a–c [?], VI/8: 92 and 150, VI/9: 28a), and finally, riverside and port facilities (VI/7: 27b and 27c, VI/8: 92 and 150, VI/9: 28a, 28b).

¹¹⁹ TERPSTRA 2013: 152 f.

(2) people documented only by sepulchral inscriptions.

Some researchers do not consider Ostia a separate city, but rather a trade suburb of Rome, inhabited by individuals mainly interested in profit and not identifying themselves with the coastal *civitas*¹²⁰. While whether the idea that the citizens of this port city lacked an “Ostian soul” is disputable, the mercantile character of Ostia is not. The constantly developing city, especially thanks to its expansion supervised by Emperor Claudius and, later, Domitian and Trajan, had a huge demand for immigrants. As can be assumed, Ostia at the time offered newcomers a much better opportunity for a career than other important trade *civitates* in central and southern Italy (e.g., Puteoli)¹²¹. R. MEIGGS proposes that these ambitious and enterprising individuals, who for many reasons had been excluded from political life, could achieve their aims in *collegia* that controlled nearly all aspects of the city’s trade and crafts¹²². The presence of A.A. Herennuleii among the Ostian *collegiati* is thus especially important to an understanding of the history of their *gens*.

In the light of the extant inscriptions, the most A.A. Herennuleii could be found within the ranks of the *ordo corporatorum lenunculariorum tabulariorum auxiliari(iorum) Ostiensium*¹²³. The high rank of this *collegium* is underlined by the fact that its patrons included senators¹²⁴. Its role is unclear. Possibly the members of this *ordo* were tasked with listing incoming ships (and their cargo) and towing them with rowing boats (called *lenunculi*) to where they could anchor¹²⁵. Consequently, at least some *lenuncularii* must have had one or more boats that

¹²⁰ See, e.g., BRUUN 2009: 123–125. BRUUN himself argues with this opinion. He ultimately arrives at the conclusion that, even though Ostia shows phenomena indicating attempts at giving the city its own “character” (e.g., by organising various celebrations), the influence of the capital on local social and political life must have been considerable (2009: 141). MEIGGS (1973: 14) writes about Ostia as an autonomous city. For more about the prosperity of the *civitas* (especially in the 2nd century CE) and how profitable this was for the *collegia*, see, e.g., MEIGGS 1973: 70 f.

¹²¹ According to MEIGGS (1973: 63–65), Ostia started to develop significantly only as late as the reign of Domitian; Claudius’ construction activity had a less significant effect on the city. About the great numbers of immigrants in Ostia, especially beginning in the late Flavian period, see, e.g., BRUUN 2009: 124 f.; 2010: 109–132.

¹²² MEIGGS 1973: 312, 316 f. Historians widely discuss the role of professional *collegia* in the Roman world. The opinion that these organisations had only religious or funerary functions has been rejected. Current dispute mostly concerns the real economic and sociopolitical importance of the *collegia* (see VERBOVEN 2011).

¹²³ *CIL* XIV 250, 251, 4567, 4568.

¹²⁴ MEIGGS (1973: 317) considers the *collegium lenunculariorum* as one of the richest and most prominent in Ostia.

¹²⁵ CASSON 1965: 34 f. In turn, MEIGGS (1973: 297 f.) states that their task was to tow large ships in the crowded port, helping them manœuvre.

allowed them to make a living¹²⁶. The *collegiati* were divided into *quinquennales* (officials) and *plebs* (ordinary members)¹²⁷.

A.A. Herennuleii are documented in two lists of the *lenuncularii* dated to 152 and 192 CE and fragments of one other *album* (or possibly two) of this *collegium*¹²⁸. An inscription from 152 mentions A.A. Herennuleii only as part of the *plebs*, listing A. Herennuleius Fructus in 16th position, A. Herennuleius Proculus in 33rd, A. Herennuleius Philetianus in 82nd, and, in 87th, A. Herennuleius Vettianus¹²⁹. The position on the list of ordinary members depended on a given individual's date of admission to the *collegium* and his lifespan¹³⁰. Taking into account the importance of the *lenuncularii* in the city and the economic boom that doubtless took place in Ostia during the 2nd century CE, we believe it plausible that the position in the hierarchy also indicates how wealthy the *collegiati* were, with a higher position corresponding to a longer time available to gather wealth through services provided. The numbers and ranks of A.A. Herennuleii on the list from 152 CE were lower than those of the leading *gentes*: M.M. Cornelii (11 members, including 2 *quinquennales*)¹³¹, T.T. Cornelii (11 members), M.M. Antistii (6 members, including 1 *quinquennalis*), and M'.M'. Lolii (5 members, some of whom occupied high, i.e. 1st and 5th, positions among the *plebs*). Nonetheless, with four representatives, A.A. Herennuleii can be easily included among those who played a certain role in the *collegium* (among 56 *gentes*, only 9 have more or at least higher-ranking *collegiati*). A second, much later list confirms this observation. The plaque mentions A. Herennuleius Philetianus¹³² and A. Herennuleius

¹²⁶ According to FRANK (1934: 483 f.), each member of the *collegium* owned at least one *lenunculus*. HERZ (1994: 324) is much more sceptical. He suggests that most *collegium* families (*Familien*) owned no more than one boat.

¹²⁷ For more about the *quinquennales*, especially those in the *collegium* in question, see ROYDEN 1989: 305–312.

¹²⁸ Both extant lists were consistently supplemented in the following years (ROYDEN 1989: 305; HERZ 1994: 296). While the first list was replaced with a new one probably no later than at the beginning of the 160s, the second one could have been supplemented much longer, perhaps up to as late as 213 CE (ROYDEN 1988: 38 f.).

¹²⁹ According to ROYDEN (1988: 47), the *collegium* may have numbered approx. 100 members in 152 CE. If this was indeed the case, all A.A. Herennuleii must have been enlisted into the *lenuncularii* no later than at the time the list was compiled.

¹³⁰ MEIGGS 1973: 318; HERZ 1994: 322; TRAN 2006: 170–172.

¹³¹ Numbers provided here related to the members of individual *gentes*, and *gentes* themselves and the total numbers of *collegium* members sometimes differ from those calculated by HERZ. In contrast to his approach, our analysis of the *gentes* took into account only people with a known *praenomen* and *nomen gentilicium* (except Vitalis, the only representative of the *gens Pantuleia*). In the case of the 152 CE list, we did not take into account a group of patrons whom HERZ identifies with the *quinquennales* (e.g., T. Aurelius Aug. lib. Strenion). Also bear in mind that HERZ made several errors in his calculations (which is especially apparent on pp. 299–313).

¹³² In the second list, the *nomen* Herennuleius consistently replaces Herennuleius.

Vettianus known from the previous inscription, both of whom, thanks to their long lifespans, were able to achieve very high positions among the *plebs* (3rd and 4th, respectively). In addition, A. Herennuleius Vettianus attained the function of a *quinquennalis* (perhaps shortly before 213 CE), thus introducing the Herennuleii into the elite of the *collegium*¹³³. His promotion, contrary to TRAN's suggestion, could not have resulted solely from Vettianus' old age¹³⁴. Rather, promotion to such a prominent office must have been motivated by Vettianus' important role (from the economic and perhaps social viewpoints) within the *collegium*. A good illustration is the case of L. Valerius Daphnus, who in 192 CE was listed among the *plebs* in position no. 10 (which is lower than A. Herennuleius Vettianus), but who held the office of *quinquennalis* much earlier (as indicated by his presence among the *quinquennales perpetui*)¹³⁵. The wealth he accumulated may have helped him enter the ranks of the *equites*¹³⁶. Thus, had age been the most important factor determining the attainment of a *collegium* office, L. Valerius Daphnus would have had to wait until A. Herennuleius Vettianus, who had been in the *collegium* much longer, became a *quinquennalis*. As this did not happen, it seems reasonable to assume that some rivalry took place over prominent *collegium* offices that favoured the individuals who were the richest and most useful to the *collegium*, rather than only the most senior members of the *plebs*. It is, therefore, difficult to assess whether the career of A. Herennuleius Philetianus, who ranked higher than Vettianus, ended with his death (both members of the *gens* must have already been relatively elderly at the time the inscriptions were written) or whether others deemed him less worthy of the honourable post. The first hypothesis is corroborated by the presence of his son or perhaps grandson, A. Herennuleius Philetianus Iunior, among the members of the *plebs* (position no. 167)¹³⁷. Three other A.A. Herennuleii were also ordinary *collegiati*: Crispus is listed in 67th posi-

¹³³ The 192 CE list mentions A. Herennuleius Vettianus as the last among the *quinquennales*, making it fairly probable that this took place during the final years of the plaque's use by the *collegium*.

¹³⁴ According to TRAN (2006: 170–172), it was the old age and long membership in the *collegium*, rather than prestige (based on, e.g., wealth) achieved by A. Herennuleius Vettianus and L. Valerius Daphnus that were responsible for their promotion into the *collegium* elite.

¹³⁵ Individuals such as M. Cippius Victor (position no. 46 among the *plebs*), Sex. Sextilius Iulianus *pater* (55) or M. Curtius Victorinus (98) secured for themselves a similarly rapid promotion. According to HERZ (1994: 320), the third name indicates in fact two different people: a father (a *quinquennalis*) and his homonymous son. However, this hypothesis seems difficult to maintain (see also ROYDEN 1988: 39).

¹³⁶ According to ROYDEN (1988: 42 f.), few among the patrons from the 192 CE list were actually *equites*, and L. Valerius Daphnus, contrary to common opinion, does not rank among them.

¹³⁷ ROYDEN estimates that the college numbered 120–130 permanent members in 213 CE. Taking into account his opinion and the lack of the “Senior” part in the name of Philetianus the elder (which suggests that in 192 there was only one A. Herennuleius Philetianus in the *collegium*), it is highly probable that A. Herennuleius Philetianus Iunior was added to the list some time after its creation.

tion, Proculus (who probably should not be confused with the homonymous *lenuncularius* from 152 CE) in 78th, and Eutyches in 86th. Thus, it was not only the number of A.A. Herennuleii in the *collegium* that grew (which, taking into account the number of *collegiati* from a later list, i.e., 261, compared to 127 on the earlier one¹³⁸, should not be construed as indicative of the importance of the *gens*), but, first and foremost, it was their standing. There were only 5 *gentes* ranked higher than them (out of 93 known ones¹³⁹): M.M. Publicii (32 members, including two *quinquennales perpetui*), M.M. Cornelii (24 members, including one *quinquennalis*), M.M. Cippi (13 members, including one *quinquennalis perpetuus*), L.L. Furi (together with L.L. Furi Publicii) (13 members, none of whom managed to enter the elite), and Sex. Sex. Sextilii (6 members, including one *quinquennalis perpetuus*)¹⁴⁰. The strong position of the Ostian branch of the *gens* is also indicated by its stability within the *collegium*: while some high-ranking *gentes* disappeared from among the *lenuncularii* (e.g., T.T. Cornelii, L.L. Iulii, and C.C. Vatronii), A.A. Herennuleii climbed the *collegium* hierarchy. Perhaps, however, the second and third decades of the 3rd century CE were not as fortunate for the Herennuleii, as the only new representative of the *gens* added to the list was Philetianus Iunior, and not a single representative appears among nearly 90 later members of the *collegium*. Furthermore, the partially extant list from 213 CE contains no A.A. Herennuleii whatsoever¹⁴¹. Of course, we should not exclude the possibility that they achieved a considerable promotion at the time. Nonetheless, the remaining Ostian and Roman sources demonstrate the opposite: the 3rd century CE could simply have marked the beginning of the decline of the *gens*¹⁴².

Apart from the aforementioned lists, there are two other short extant remains of *alba* that mention Philetianus and Vettianus of the A.A. Herennuleii. Judging from the *collegiati* that are mentioned, the plaques were most likely created shortly after 152 CE (as the editor of *CIL*, L. WICKERT, also suggests). However, their fragmentary character prevents a detailed investigation of the history of the *gens*. On the other hand, the existence of these plaques seems to explain to a certain degree the large number of names added to the 192 CE inscription.

¹³⁸ This concerns all known *collegiati*.

¹³⁹ See n. 131 above.

¹⁴⁰ T.T. Flavii also had more members (7). They were not taken into account due to their low rank among the *plebs* and the fact that they were admitted to the *collegium* later.

¹⁴¹ *NSA* 1953, p. 278–282, no. 42. Bearing in mind the fact that the inscription is damaged, it is possible that A.A. Herennuleii appeared on it, but if so, they were not particularly numerous.

¹⁴² As TRAN (2006: 428) points out, M.M. Cornelii also disappeared from the *collegium* tablets at the beginning of the 3rd century CE. He attempts to explain this phenomenon though the *gens*' (or, rather, the family's) social promotion, which led to them losing interest in *collegium* activity and instead seeking a career much higher up the social ladder (membership of the *ordo decurionum* and *ordo equester*). While the hypothesis seems fairly likely in the case of M.M. Cornelii, extrapolating it to the Ostian A.A. Herennuleii seems unreasonable to us.

While early on the lists were compiled at short intervals, the tradition must have changed towards the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd centuries.

It is difficult to precisely determine the social origin of A.A. Herennuleii mentioned on both lists, as the only clues to it are the *cognomina*. Interestingly, only two of the *cognomina* are Greek (Eutyches and Philetianus) and, therefore, could have very likely belonged to slaves or their offspring¹⁴³. In turn, Philetianus Junior, perhaps a son or grandson of the homonymous Herennuleius, may have been freeborn¹⁴⁴. The other four Herennuleii bore Latin *cognomina*, and only one of those (Fructus) had slave connotations¹⁴⁵. The three remaining *cognomina*, Proculus¹⁴⁶, Crispus and Vettianus, are typical names given to freeborn Romans¹⁴⁷. The last of them, Vettianus, may suggest that we are dealing with a son of A. Herennuleius and Vettia¹⁴⁸. Little more can be said about his mother¹⁴⁹. It can be assumed that the Herennuleii mentioned on the extant *alba* had familial relationships with a varying degree of closeness. However, while, e.g., for M.M. Cornelii it is possible to establish some relationships within the *gens* with a degree of confidence, the state of affairs for the Herennuleii is much less clear. Based on the extant inscriptions, it is impossible to determine which of them played the lead role and surrounded himself with a group of freedmen and clients. Vettianus, who held the highest-ranking position in the *collegium*,

¹⁴³ ROHDE (2012: 161 f.) calculated that about 35 *cognomina* on the first *album* had “orientalischer Ursprung”, while the second one had as many as 80 Greek-oriental *cognomina*. As a result, she concludes fairly cautiously that the increase is not evidence for the existence of freedmen from the Greek East, but rather for the further expansion of Greek names in Ostia towards the 2nd century. The statistics provided by ROHDE do not imply this at all, as on both tablets the proportional share of Greek *cognomina* among all *cognomina* is similar and amounts to ca. 30%. Thus, it is difficult to speak of “die Verbreitung”.

¹⁴⁴ It is possible that he was a completely unrelated freedman who had been given an identical *cognomen*. We believe that the low popularity of the name Philetianus, documented in Rome only 10 times (SOLIN 2003: 964) and only twice in the entire *regio I*, except the Herennuleii (data obtained from the *Epigraphische Datenbank Clauss/Slaby*: http://db.edcs.eu/epigr/epi_de.php) makes it more probable that the analysed *collegiati* were related.

¹⁴⁵ KAJANTO (1965: 352) states that 115 men (*CIL*) and 34 slaves/freedmen bore this *cognomen*, which is a high number, especially taking into account the Finnish author’s method of classification (see also DUTHOY 1989).

¹⁴⁶ While a familial relationship between both Herennuleii with the *cognomen* cannot be excluded, the hypothesis is risky due to the popularity of the *cognomen* (see n. 147 below).

¹⁴⁷ KAJANTO (1965: 176, 223, 158) provides the following statistics: Proculus: 854 men (*CIL*) and 12 slaves/freedmen; Crispus: 152 men (*CIL*) and 4 slaves/freedmen; Vettianus: 17 men (*CIL*) and no slaves/freedmen. According to ROYDEN (1988: 48), Vettianus may have been a freedman, which, however, seems unlikely.

¹⁴⁸ See SALOMIES 2014: 512.

¹⁴⁹ The *gens Vettia* was fairly widespread in Ostia. Although no representatives among the *lenuncularii* are known, they can be found, e.g., among the *fabri navales (quinquennalis)* (e.g., *CIL XIV 168 = CIL X *1089*, 118 = *IMCCatania 537 = AE 1997, 252*).

certainly received the post of *quinquennalis* towards the end of his life. There is also no evidence that his promotion helped improve the importance of the *gens* (there are no representatives of the Herennuleii among the new *collegiati*). Thus, despite his position, it is difficult to consider him the most prominent member of the *gens* or the family¹⁵⁰.

The Ostian Herennuleii were also members of some *collegia*, the names of which are lost¹⁵¹. A certain A. Herennuleius Ebulides was admitted (*adlectus*), presumably as one of a lowest-ranking people (*plebs*), into a *collegium* documented in an inscription published in *CIL* XIV 258. He failed to enter the *collegium* elite (he achieved neither the post of *quinquennalis* nor *curator*), though his position among the *adlecti* was, judging from the existing part of the inscription, relatively high. This may concern one of several various *collegia*, though not enough evidence exists to support any of them¹⁵². It does, however, seem that the inscription itself can be dated to the 2nd century or the end of the 1st century CE¹⁵³. Herennuleius Ebulides' Greek *cognomen* may indicate slave origins.

Another *collegium* with an unknown name, the members of which included A. Herennuleius, is documented in an inscription published in *AE* 1940, 62. The inscription indicates that in 143 CE, the *collegium* officials were M. Antonius

¹⁵⁰ According to ROYDEN (1988: 48), he may have not have even owned a ship, though it is difficult to say what led the researcher to this conclusion.

¹⁵¹ *CIL* XIV 258; *AE* 1940, 62. In turn, we believe it is rather risky to identify a certain member of a *collegium*, [---]nuleius Abascant[us], with the *gens Herennuleia* (*CIL* XIV 4135). Even though the editor of *CIL* and some contemporary authors suggest this possibility, the lacuna could just as well, if not more easily due to the amount of free space at the relevant place in the inscription, have been complemented with [Ve] or [Mi], especially since both Venuleii and Minuleii are documented in Ostia.

¹⁵² DESSAU (the editor of *CIL*) points out that a certain M. Obe[---], who “fortasse est idem atque M(anius) Obellius Euaristus” (from an inscription published in *CIL* XIV 283), appears in the severely damaged second column of the inscription. Manius Obellius Euaristus was a member of the *collegium dendrophorum*, among whom, as indicated by another epigraphic monument (*CIL* XIV 281), were both *quinquennales* and *curatores*. However, doubts arise when the fact is taken into account that the *praenomina* of both individuals are different, while in the material from the Ostia documents (perhaps also in the *collegium album*) there is a certain M(arcus) Obell(ius) N[---] (*CIL* X 4740), who should be more likely identified with M. Obe[---]. The idea cannot be discounted, though it remains in the realm of speculation, that the *album* in question concerns the *collegium pistorum* (the *album* was found in Centumcellae together with an inscription published in *CIL* XIV 101 that mentions this *collegium*) or another *collegium*, such as the *collegium negotiatorum mari Hadriatici* with its *quinquennales* and *curatores*.

¹⁵³ This is supported by the presence of C. Servilius Orthrus among the college *adlecti*. A person with the same *tria nomina* appears (together with a homonymous son) in an inscription on a tomb published in *CIL* XIV 1609 and dated most probably to the same period, i.e., the 2nd or the end of the 1st centuries CE. The rarity of the *cognomen* Orthrus makes it highly probable (as DESSAU, the editor of *CIL*, also believes) that the same C. Servilius Orthrus is being referred to in both cases.

Ingenuus and A. Herennuleius Faustus¹⁵⁴. The latter gave *imago Antonini Aug(usti) p(ondo) II*, held in the collegium *statio*. His euergetic activity and high position in the *collegium* both indicate the wealth and importance that Faustus, who was perhaps a *libertus* or a close descendant of a freedman, acquired among members of the Ostian “middle-class”¹⁵⁵.

The remaining Ostian A.A. Herennuleii are documented in sepulchral material. A. Herennuleius Epityches built a sepulchral altar for his wife Pomponia Vitalis (*coniux*)¹⁵⁶. In our opinion, the inscription can be dated to not later than the Flavian period, probably to the last decades of the 1st century CE. The significant popularity of the *gens Pomponia* in Ostia prevents a more precise identification of Pomponia Vitalis. On the other hand, Herennuleius’ Greek *cognomen* may indicate his low social origins. Another inscription, probably from the same period, mentions Atilia Firmina, who provided her deceased friend, Ernuleia Gaza, with a burial spot (*loco concesso*)¹⁵⁷. Thus, Ernuleia’s presumed low social origins (the Greek *cognomen*) coincided with insufficient wealth to purchase a burial spot and the need to rely on the goodwill of Atilia Firmina.

A similar situation occurred for a different woman from the *gens Herennuleia*, Primilla¹⁵⁸. She was a freedwoman of Aulus who, as her brother, A. Herennuleius Speratus (a freedman himself and the founder of an inscription carved in stone) states, accepted a gift of a permanent spot in the columbarium of the *gens Cacia*, given to her by Cacia Euhodia, Gaius’ freedwoman. The chronology of the inscription is problematic. The *Epigraphic Database Roma* dates it to 1–50 CE¹⁵⁹. If the dating is accurate, this would constitute proof of one of the earliest relatively reliably dated representatives of A.A. Herennuleii, suggesting, in turn, that the members of the *gens* had very early relationships with Ostia. The columbarium in question was located by the *Porta Romana* (B 11/12)¹⁶⁰ and constructed during either the reign of Tiberius or the early years of the reign

¹⁵⁴ While the *cognomen* of the latter is missing from the third line of the inscription, it appears in line 11.

¹⁵⁵ KAJANTO (1965: 272) states that people bearing the *cognomen* Faustus comprised 707 men (*CIL*) and 238 slaves/freedmen.

¹⁵⁶ *CIL* XIV 5073. The altar was found at a former cemetery in Piana Bella. According to CALZA (*NSA* 1919, p. 76), the inscription used to mention A. Herennius Epityches. A photo of the inscription, provided courtesy of Soprintendenza Speciale per il Colosseo, il Museo Nazionale Romano e l’Area Archeologica di Roma (Sede di Ostia), leaves no doubt as to the correctness of L. WICKERT’S interpretation as found in *CIL*.

¹⁵⁷ *CIL* XIV 966.

¹⁵⁸ *CIL* XIV 1106 = *ILS* 7921.

¹⁵⁹ As of 27 April 2014, *schedae scriptor*: R. MARCHESINI.

¹⁶⁰ Numbered according to HEINZELMANN 2000: 35 f. Previous studies ascribed the numbers 20a and 20b to the columbarium (SQUARCIAPINO 1958a: 42–46).

of Claudius¹⁶¹. A number of inscriptions have been found there, one written on a stone plaque and the rest on urns. The inscription on the plaque documents Cacia Euhodia (Heuhodia)¹⁶². Apparently, a certain M. Cascellius Diadumenus *fecit col(umbaria) III ol(las) VI* for himself, his wife (Cacia Euhodia), and his offspring. Perhaps this has led some researchers to assume that he was buried together with his wife shortly after the columbarium was constructed¹⁶³. This would indicate that Herennuleia Primilla died around the same time. However, we believe that such an early dating of the inscription is difficult to support¹⁶⁴. Firstly, it is worth noting that M. Cascellius Diadumenus did not construct the entire sepulchre, but only “built” (*fecit*) three niches¹⁶⁵. Therefore, we do not know whether this fact can be associated with the beginning of the construction work. Cacia’s age at the time the inscription was carved and the time of her death are also impossible to determine. Furthermore, other extant epigraphic sources in the columbarium (including those mentioning members of the *gens Cacia*) came from the Flavian period¹⁶⁶. Finally, and most importantly, the inscriptions carved for the Herennuleii, using either the shortened form of *D(is) M(anibus)* or accent marks, which were popular only starting from the Flavian period¹⁶⁷, suggest a later, possibly (due to the presence of libertination) Flavian origin. Consequently, we find it unlikely that Herennuleia Primilla already had ties with Ostia in the Julio-Claudian period.

The sepulchral inscription commissioned by A. Herennuleius Euhemer and his wife Licinia Calliroe is also difficult to date¹⁶⁸. The tombstone was already re-used in antiquity as part of the floor, during the remodelling of the *sede degli Augustali* in Ostia, which took place towards the end of the 3rd century¹⁶⁹. Thus, it is difficult to determine where the tombstone was initially placed. Judging

¹⁶¹ HEINZELMANN 2000: 35 f., 113. However, the subject literature also has the building dated to the Augustan period (SQUARCIAPINO 1958b: 239).

¹⁶² *CIL* XIV 777.

¹⁶³ HEINZELMANN (2000: 113) is fairly enigmatic about the subject. He avoids a direct dating, underlining that two inscriptions come from columbarium B 11/12 (he doubtless means those mentioning Cacia Euhodia); those inscriptions perhaps provide the names of the initial or former owners (“ehemalige Besitzer”). Bearing in mind the dating of the structure, HEINZELMANN’S opinion may suggest the early origin of both epigraphic sources.

¹⁶⁴ Some researchers draw attention to the fact that the origin of the inscription found in the columbarium may be later than the construction of the columbarium itself (BARBIERI 1958: 139).

¹⁶⁵ The word *columbarium* used in the inscription does not relate to the entirety of the structure, but only to the niches. M. Cascellius Diadumenus “built” (*fecit*) only three niches, while the same part of the tomb contained many more of them (SQUARCIAPINO 1958a: 43–45).

¹⁶⁶ SINN 1987, nos. 315, 388, 392, 412 and 438.

¹⁶⁷ See MEIGGS 1973: 554–557.

¹⁶⁸ *NSA* 1941, p. 206.

¹⁶⁹ LAIRD 2000: 50 f.

from the *formulae*, the inscription may be dated to the 1st century CE, with the lack of libertination, filiation, and *tribus* and the predominance of Herennuleii in the later period perhaps suggesting the second half of the 1st century. The Greek *cognomina* of the tombstone's founder and his wife may indicate their low social origins, although the phrase in the heading of the *titulus*, with which they proudly announce that they financed the tomb with their own money, may be considered a sign of a certain degree of wealth and the social aspirations of the family. The popularity of the *nomen* Licinius in Ostia prevents a more precise identification of Calliroe.

The extant epigraphic pieces indicate that the Ostian A.A. Herennuleii lacked people who belonged to the local elite or even had the aspirations (and the necessary means) to achieve the position of *eques* or senator. On the other hand, they can hardly be considered as merely ordinary members of the *plebs* because of their activity in various *collegia* where they achieved high ranks on numerous occasions. As a consequence of the importance of the *collegia* in Ostia, this garnered A.A. Herennuleii considerable social status¹⁷⁰. The financial means of the members of the *gens* is indicated not only by their position, but also by the energetic activity on the part of A. Herennuleius Faustus. Familial ties of varying closeness must have existed between different representatives of the *gens*, although it is difficult to specify the most prominent individuals who would stand out above the others and organise their families (not to mention their *gens*) around themselves. In addition to those Herennuleii who were active in *collegia* (about half of whom bore Greek or Latin slavery-related *cognomina* indicative of low social origins) and were proud of the wealth they had collected and whose only trace takes the form of sepulchral inscriptions (A. Herennuleius Euhemer), the poor members of the *gens*, the majority of whom were presumably freedmen, must have been fairly numerous in Ostia. It is worth noting a completely different model of behaviour among the Herennuleii in Ostia compared with those in Rome. In the port *civitas* at the mouth of the Tiber, all epigraphic pieces documenting their private life (i.e., sepulchral inscriptions) indicate that the members of the *gens* were open to contact with other *gentes*, whether through marriage, friendship (*amicitia*), or other informal relationships¹⁷¹.

¹⁷⁰ TRAN (2006: 519–526) points out that members of *collegia* in large centres of the Roman world could have achieved a good degree of independence from the elites (though this applied to only some of them). A career in a *collegium*, while frequently slow, allowed one to gain prestige, at least among one's own group.

¹⁷¹ An excellent example of the relationships between various Ostian *gentes* (especially the branches that stood lower in the social hierarchy) is a sepulchral inscription published in *CEIaia* 103 = *AE* 1985, 249, presumably from the beginning of the empire. The inscription lists the members of four *gentes*: Vetti, Atilii, Pomponii, and Egnatii. Interestingly (though due to the very early dating of the inscription we should avoid drawing far-reaching conclusions), the extant epigraphic

An epigraphic search arrived at two more records documenting A.A. Herennuleii. Both are stamps, i.e., sources potentially related to manufacturing activity. The first artefact was found in Narni, and the other is located in the Parisian collections. It can be assumed that both stamps originated from the same area. This is suggested by the nearly identical manner in which the names of their producers are recorded¹⁷²:

[A]·HERENNV	A·H [^] ERENNV
[L]EI·ELAINI	L E I · K A R I

It also worth highlighting that the structure of the two stamps differs from that of the aforementioned A. Herennuleius Communis of Pompeii¹⁷³. The finds from Narni suggest that both artefacts come from the vicinity of the Tiber Valley, which makes them related to the area supplying the capital, e.g., with clay construction materials and wine¹⁷⁴. It is also possible that this weakly documented direction of “expansion” could correspond to the inscription of A. Herennuleius Hermes found at the end of *via Flaminia* in Rome (ID 10)¹⁷⁵.

Evidence of the presence of A.A. Herennuleii in the southern part of the Augustan *regio I* disappears with the seismic cataclysm that occurred in Campania in the 70s of the 1st century CE¹⁷⁶. ANDREAU points out the presence of sources documenting the name in Ostia, but remains cautious about associating the Pompeian branch with the Ostian one¹⁷⁷. His doubts are caused by the much later chronology of sources from the area of the Tiber. We believe that ANDREAU is unduly sceptical. While a vast majority of the inscriptions are admittedly difficult to date precisely, this does not justify not using them to reconstruct

material documents relationships between the first three of the aforementioned *gentes* with the Ostian Herennuleii.

¹⁷² A. Herennuleius Elainus: *CIL* XI 6712, 215. A drawing of the stamp may be found at G. EROLI, *Miscellanea storica narnese*, Gattamelata 1858, p. 248. A. Herennuleius Karus: *CIL* XIII 10022, 133. A drawing of the stamp may be found at C-M. GRIVAUD DE LA VINCELLE, *Recueil de monuments antiques, la plupart inédits, et découverts dans l'ancienne Gaule: ouvrage enrichi de cartes et planches en taille-douce, qui peut faire suite aux recueils du comte de Caylus, et de la Sauvagère*, Paris 1817, fig. XXXVI.IX.

¹⁷³ *CIL* X 8058, 39.

¹⁷⁴ For more about the business relationships of the aforementioned A. Herennuleius Cestus in the valley of the Tiber, see PEÑA 1999: 29 f.

¹⁷⁵ Hypothetically, the northern origin is also indicated by inscriptions in a repository referred to as the house of Prospero Boccacio (ID 8, 18).

¹⁷⁶ There exists an inscription documenting A.A. Herennuleii which is ascribed to Amalfi. However, it is considered Roman in origin (*CIL* X 601 = *InscrIt* I 1, 202; see Table ID 30; SOLIN 1989: 718). While SOLIN's argumentation may be controversial (see above, pp. 297 f.), it seems highly probable that the inscription came from Rome (many epigraphic monuments from Salerno and its vicinity are, in fact, Roman, or sometimes Ostian, in origin).

¹⁷⁷ ANDREAU 1974: 240.

the history of the *gens*. An important piece of the puzzle is the Roman thread, which we suggest helps bring order to the disconnected events in the history of the *gens*.

The eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE, preceded by an earthquake in 62 CE that burned into the memory of the inhabitants of the Gulf of Naples, forced the surviving Herennuleii to search for a new home. While it is possible that some members of the *gens* remained in Campania, sources suggest that the primary emigration destination may have been Rome, enticing the poor with a promise of free bread and the rich (who no doubt included some Herennuleii) with great profits from their economic activity. However, we are unable to answer the fundamental question about the identity of Campanian emigrants to the capital. Did their ranks include the last well-documented Pompeian representative of the *gens*, A. Herennuleius Communis, and his offspring, family, and slave clients? We do not know.

The first, albeit imprecise as stated above, mentions of the Herennuleii in Rome come from the second half of the 1st century CE, which lead to our hypothesis about the emigration of the members of this *gens* to Rome¹⁷⁸. We are unable to treat the Roman representatives of the *gens*, the majority of whom were freed *clientes* and their offspring, as a uniform community or network¹⁷⁹. Nearly every group was found to be a “single-source community”. Verification of detailed geographical data suggests the possibility of relationships between this part of A.A. Herennuleii, who mostly lived in the right bank part of the capital, i.e., in the emigrant district¹⁸⁰. The successfulness of the *regio XIV Transtiberim* and its residents was first and foremost the result of the accelerated development of Ostia, especially the expansion of the *Portus* and its connections with Transtiberim. The appearance of Herennuleii in Ostia, presumably at a time very close to the Roman period (it seems fairly likely that they appeared during the reign of Domitian, when the city entered a stage of accelerated development) was inevitable, given the economic activity of the members of the *gens*. A relatively attractive and believable hypothesis associates the economic success of the Ostian Herennuleii, documented thanks to *collegiati* lists, with the success of the Roman Herennuleii, represented in sources primarily by Cestus. In the seaside *civitas*, as with the capital, it is difficult to identify the most important member

¹⁷⁸ Some inscriptions are difficult to date due to their nature; and about others nothing can be said other than that they were probably created in the 1st century CE. Because both groups are in the minority, we believe it highly unlikely that they could constitute proof of earlier, e.g., pre-Flavian, activity of the Herennuleii in the capital.

¹⁷⁹ The considerable number of *liberti* among the Herennuleii should not come as a surprise. Coming from a demographic model based on the *album* of *augustales* from Herculaneum, DE LIGT and GARNSEY support the belief that the cities of central-western Italy during the early Principate had a very high proportion of citizens with slave origins (DE LIGT, GARNSEY 2012).

¹⁸⁰ TACOMA 2013: 136 f.

of the *gens* who would gather others around him. The ties between the local Herennuleii (in many cases, we may be dealing with a close kinship) are substantiated by the business conducted within a *collegium*, or perhaps jointly within a number of *collegia*. The business may also have been characterised by a different familial strategy. Despite the large number of *liberti* and their offspring, the local Herennuleii show a greater openness to other *gentes*, most likely resulting from the aspirations of the local Herennuleii and the particular character of Ostia. However, the small number of epigraphic sources documenting this phenomenon (compared to Rome) prevents the drawing of any far-reaching conclusions.

The Campanian emigrants adapted fairly quickly to the new, difficult situation, mingling with those who, in the busy and multi-ethnic environment of the capital and its port at the mouth of the Tiber, created the foundations for the strong economic development of both cities in the 1st and 2nd centuries CE. The personal history of A.A. Herennuleii thus becomes a good illustration of the grand socioeconomic processes that took place in central Italy at the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd centuries. In the light of the available sources, the *gens* can be considered a typical example of the ancient “middle class”. The few documented political careers (or, rather, their initial stages) were most probably the effect of previous adoptions or simply a means to an end, i.e., to economic success. At the same time, the history of the *gens* inspires questions about whether other *gentes* of the period made similar choices.

University of Wrocław

APPENDIX

TAB. 1: HERENNULEII FROM ROME¹⁸¹

ID	Source	Person	Relationships	Place	Chronology
1	<i>CIL</i> VI 608	1. Q. Vibius Capito Iunior 2. A. Herennul[ei]us Italicus	No direct information	<i>In museo Vaticano</i> (Galeria Lapidaria)	1 st –2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
2	<i>CIL</i> VI 975 = <i>CIL</i> VI 31218 = <i>ILS</i> 6073 = <i>AE</i> 1949, 187 = <i>AE</i> 1998, 43 = <i>AE</i> 2002, 181	1. A. Herennuleius [---] Pharnaces 2. L. Valerius [---] Flavianus 3. Sex. Pollenius [---]+++[---]s 4. L. Perperna [---A]mpliatus	Social and religious relationships: <i>vicomagistri</i>	Capitoline Base, <i>vicus Laci Restituti</i>	136 CE
3	<i>CIL</i> VI 3527	1. A. Herennul{a}ei]us Hypatus 2. C. Minucius A. f. Herennul{a}<e>ius Iulianus 3. C. Rupilius Mena ¹⁸² 4. C. Iulius Silvanus 5. Ampudia Cn. f. Iulia	Uncertain family relationships	<i>In villa Pamphilia</i>	1 st CE (see p. 302), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE (W.P., I.W.)
4	<i>CIL</i> VI 8168 = <i>CIL</i> VI 33708 = <i>AE</i> 2000, 132	1. [L. Abucci]us [Ones]imus? 2. Abuccia Helpis 3. A. Herennuleius Amandus	Family: 1 + 2 (<i>coniunx</i>), 3 is <i>cognatus</i> for 2	<i>Monumentum familiae Abucciorum, via Asinaria</i>	1 st CE (SOLIN 2003: 1294; BIANCHI 1993: 11), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE (?) (W.P., I.W.)

¹⁸¹ The vast majority of the inscriptions prove difficult to date. However, a number of criteria exist that allow at least an approximate time of the creation of a given epigraphic monument to be determined (with the time bracket sometimes exceeding 100 years). In all cases, we took care to use available archaeological information about the inscriptions and a number of formal criteria in the texts themselves (e.g., the presence of the expression “Dis Manibus”, filiation and libertination next to names, or the presence of the *tribus*). While it is, of course, possible that the inscriptions dated based on these criteria come from an earlier or later period, this is statistically less likely (especially when several criteria have been used at the same time). Most sources dating in our opinion from between the second half of the 1st century CE and the 2nd century CE probably come from the period of the Antonine dynasty. More information about the dating of the inscriptions can be found, e.g., in DUNCAN-JONES 1965: 303–306; ANDREAU 1987: 260–311; and COOLEY 2012: 409–412.

¹⁸² This individual does not appear in other sources. However, it is worth noting that another source documenting C. Rupilii comes from the Doria Pamphilj villa, i.e., *CIL* VI 25600, a *tabella columbarii* that mentions two individuals: C. Rupilius Hilarus and Rupilia Musa. Furthermore, an inscription documenting C. Rupilius Antiochus was found at the bottom of the Tiber by the Ponte Sisto (*CIL* VI 25598).

5	<i>CIL</i> VI 19218	1. A. Hermuleius Epitync<h>anus ¹⁸³ 2. Helpis 3. Eutyчис	Family: 1 + 2 (<i>coniunx</i>) + 3 [daughter]	<i>In coemeterio Pontiani</i>	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 856), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
6	<i>CIL</i> VI 19342	1. [A. Herennu]leius [---]ns 2. A. Herennuleius Abascantus 3. A. Herennuleius Ampliatus 4. A. Herennuleius Admetus 5. A. Herennuleius Fortunatus 6. A. Herennuleius Fidelis 7. A. Herennuleius Eunus	Clientele: 1 [<i>patronus</i>] + (2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7) [<i>liberti</i>]	<i>In S. Pancratio</i>	1 st –2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 803); 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
7	<i>CIL</i> VI 19343	1. A. Herennuleius Anoptes 2. Herennuleia Philumene	Family: 1 + 2 [<i>uxor</i>]	<i>s.l.</i>	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 1397), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
8	<i>CIL</i> VI 19344	1. A. Herennuleius Dicaeus 2. A. Herennuleius Chresimus	Clientele: 1 [<i>patronus</i>] + 2 [<i>libertus</i>]	<i>In domo domini Prosperi Boccacii civis Romani nobilissimi</i>	1 st CE (see n. 65), 1 st CE (W.P., I.W.)
9	<i>CIL</i> VI 19345 = <i>ILMN</i> I 283	1. A. Herenuleius Hermes 2. Herenuleia Helpis 3. Herenuleia Olympias	Family: 1 [husband, father] + 2 [wife, mother] + 3 [<i>filia</i>]	<i>s.l. Nunc Neapoli in museo publico</i>	1 st –2 nd (?) CE (see n. 67), 2 nd CE (<i>ILMN</i> (I 283), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.))
10	<i>CIL</i> VI 19346	1. A. Herennuleius Hermes 2. Iulia L.f. Latina	Family: 1 + 2 [<i>coniunx</i>]	<i>In hortis Bosii vel Caesarinis [via Flaminia]</i>	1 st CE (see n. 71), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE (W.P., I.W.)

¹⁸³ The reading proposed in *CIL* follows an edition by M. BOLDETTI (*Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri de' santi martiri ed antichi cristiani di Roma*, Roma 1720, vol. I, p. 445). We suspect this to be an incorrect spelling of the name on the part of the craftsman (or an incorrect reading of the name on the part of BOLDETTI, though the text had other witnesses, as shown by the *CIL* entry). As we know, the name Herennuleius was sometimes modified into Hernuleius/-a (e.g., ID 20). Furthermore, other sources do not confirm the existence of the *nomen* Hermuleius. Both the *praenomen* Aulus and the fact that the inscription was located *ad Ursum pileatum* (i.e., on the edge of *Transtiberim*; for more about this part of Rome and the history of A. Herennuleii, see pp. 304–306 and Tab. 2) strengthen the hypothesis that we are dealing with another member of the *gens Herennuleia*.

11	<i>CIL VI</i> 19347	1. A. Herennuleius Lucanus 2. M. Clodius Sossianus	Family: brothers [<i>frater</i>]	<i>In coemeterio Cyriacae</i> [San Lorenzo, via Tiburtina], <i>deinde apud abbatem Toietium</i>	2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
12	<i>CIL VI</i> 19348	1. A. Herennul[eius] Protus 2. Faustina	Family: 1 + 2 [<i>coniunx</i>]	<i>In S. Maria Trans-tiberina</i>	1 st CE (SOLIN 2003: 1121), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE (W.P., I.W.)
13	<i>CIL VI</i> 19349 = <i>AnalEpi</i> , p. 384 = <i>AE</i> 1995, 106	1. A. Herennuleius Salvius 2. Herennuleia Gr[aph]is	Clientele: freedmen [<i>col-liberti</i>]	<i>In vinea Pia via Portuensi</i> , al pozzo Pantaleo	1 st –2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 1243), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE – beginning of the 2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
14	<i>CIL VI</i> 19350	1. A. Herennuleius Trophimus Iun(ior) 2. Herennuleia Irene 3. Herennuleia Germana	Clientele: 2 [<i>patrona</i>] + 1 [<i>libertus</i>] Family: 1 + 3 [<i>coniunx</i>]	<i>Apud S. Cosmam in Transtiberi</i> (= San Cosimato); <i>apud aedem SS. Quadraginta martyrum trans Tiberim</i>	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 1050), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
15	<i>CIL VI</i> 19351	1. A. Herennuleius Glyco 2. Herennuleia [---]oe	Uncertain family relationships	<i>Ad S. Salvatoris trans pontem S. Mariae trans Tiberim</i>	2 nd half of the 1 st CE (SOLIN 2003: 946; W.P., I.W.)
16	<i>CIL VI</i> 19352	1. Herennuleia Acanthis ¹⁸⁴ 2. Herennuleia Primitiba (sic!)	No direct information	<i>In vinea Moroni ad viam Appiam</i>	2 nd –3 rd CE (SOLIN 2003: 1152), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)

¹⁸⁴ In this and a few other cases (IDs 25, 28 and 31), the inscriptions do not document the *praenomina* of Herennuleii (usually due to the exclusive presence of women in the texts). It seems safe to assume that all these people had connections with A.A. Herennuleii, as other *praenomina* of the members of the *gens* in Italy have not been found (see the discussion on ID 23).

17	<i>CIL VI</i> 19353	1. A. Herennuleius Olympicus 2. Herennuleia Benedicta	Family: 1 + 2 [<i>coniunx</i>]	<i>In S. Laurentiolo iuxta pontem S. Mariae</i>	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 689), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
18	<i>CIL VI</i> 19354	1. A. Herennuleius Dicaeus 2. Herennuleia Erotis	Clientele: freedmen [<i>colliberti</i>]	<i>In domo d. Prosperi Boccacii; in S. Antonio de Portugallo</i>	2 nd CE (see n. 65), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
19	<i>CIL VI</i> 19355	1. A. Herennuleius Felix 2. A. Herennuleius Venustus 3. Herennuleia Nice	Family: 1 [husband (<i>coniunx</i>), father] + 3 [wife, mother] + 2 [son]	<i>Extra portam S. Pauli, prope Cestii sepulcrum in limine aediculae S...</i>	1 st –2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 472), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–beginning of the 2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
20	<i>CIL VI</i> 19439	1. A. Her<en>nuleius Onesimus 2. A. Her<en>nuleius Eutyclus	Clientele: 1 [patronus] + 2 [libertus]	<i>Florentia→ Roma</i>	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 870), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
21	<i>CIL VI</i> 19440	1. A. Herenuleius Firmus 2. Herenuleia Thallusa	Clientele: 1 [patronus] + 2 [liberta]	<i>In aedibus Merolli in repositis</i>	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 740), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
22	<i>CIL VI</i> 30867 = <i>EE IV</i> 725	A. Herennuleius Sotericus	No direct information	<i>Ex alveo Tiberis prope cloacam maximam</i>	1 st –2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 453), 2 nd –3 rd CE ¹⁸⁵ , 1 st –3 rd CE (W.P., I.W.)
23	<i>CIL VI</i> 32521	M. Herennuleius Eugrammus ¹⁸⁶	No direct information	<i>In via Palestro, now in Museo Nazionale</i>	168 CE

¹⁸⁵ <http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/fortuna-panthea-goddess-of-fortune-with-attributes-of-other-divinities-152752> (accessed on 27 July 2015).

¹⁸⁶ FREIS 1967: 108 f. notes only the inscription. The *praenomen* Marcus, atypical for the line, may cause some concern. It is worth mentioning that the previous reading of the text on the part of BORSARI suggested the *praenomen* Caius (*NSA* 1885, p. 69). A revision of the inscription, made possible thanks to a photograph provided by the U.O. Musei Archeologici e Polo Grande Campidoglio for the purpose of this paper, has led us to the conclusion that the hitherto proposed

24	<i>CIL</i> VI 34890	1. Ti. Claudius Primitivus 2. Claudia Blaste 3. Claudia Secundina 4. A. Herennuleius Epytunchanus (sic!)	Clientele, family: 1 [patronus, coniunx] + 2 [liberta, coniunx] + 3 [filia] Family: 4 [coniunx] + 2 [coniunx]	<i>Pone basilicam S. Pauli</i> nei lavori di sterro pel collettore sulla sinistra del Tevere	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 856), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
25	<i>CIL</i> VI 34912	1. Claudia Blaste 2. Furia Saturnina 3. <H>er<en>n<u>leius Karicus	No direct information	<i>Pone basilicam S. Pauli</i> nei lavori di sterro pel collettore sulla sinistra del Tevere	1 st –2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 658), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE (?) (W.P., I.W.)
26	<i>CIL</i> VI 35443a	1. A. Herennuleius Ofellio 2. Epitexis	No direct information 2→1 (~ <i>carissimo</i>)	Roma (<i>ignoratur</i>)	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 1304), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
27	<i>CIL</i> VI 35444	1. A. Herennuleius Symphor 2. Herennuleia Thais	Clientele, family: 1 [patronus, coniunx] + 2 [liberta]	Roma (<i>ignoratur</i>)	2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 1000), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)

praenomen is dubious and that the inscription more likely concerns another Aulus Herennuleius. The relevant fragment reads as follows (*CIL* VI 32521, lines 21–23):

Largo et Messalino co(n)s(ulibus)
M(arcus) Herennuleius Eugrammus Roma
M(arcus) Caecilius Onesimus Puteol(is)

Damage to the plaque makes it difficult to correctly read the initial of the first name, though slight marks of carving are still visible (especially in the negative). The letter “A”, typical of *capitalis rustica*, shows an appropriate structure for nearly the entire fragment of the inscription. It is clearly visible in part of the name of the first consul in line 21: *Largus*. Importantly, the stonecutter aligned the column below, listing the names of recruits under that particular letter. Thanks to this, the shape of the initial of the first recruit’s name shows a strong similarity to the shape of the letter “a” from the consul’s name. The letter “m”, located below, is the initial of the second recruit’s name and is slightly wider and moved towards the right due to both its width and the fact that it begins in the same position as the initial of the first recruit’s name. In addition to these observations, the different reading of the initial of the first recruit’s *praenomen* is further supported by the mass popularity of the name Aulus among the *gens* and a complete lack of proof of the name Marcus being in use (not only in Rome). Therefore, we suspect that the recruit from 147 CE was more likely named Aulus Herennuleius Eugrammus.

28	<i>CIL</i> VI 35445	1. Herennuleia Acte 2. Herma	Servile: 1 [<i>domina</i>] + 2 [<i>servus</i>]	<i>In vinea</i> <i>Pia via</i> <i>Portuensi</i>	1 st –2 nd CE (SOLIN 2003: 616), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE– beginning of the 2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
29	<i>CIL</i> IX 4680 = <i>ILS</i> 7484 = <i>SupplIt</i> XVIII 70–71	A. Herennuleius Cestus	No direct information	Reate→ Rome, <i>Septem</i> <i>Caesares</i> , Trans- tiberim	2 nd CE (<i>Suplt</i> XVIII 70–71), late 1 st CE–2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
30	<i>CIL</i> X 601 = <i>InscrIt</i> I 1, 202	1. A. Herennuleius Ampliatius 2. Herennuleia Helphis (sic!)	Clientele: 1 [<i>patronus</i>] + 2 [<i>liberta</i>]	Amalfi→ Rome ¹⁸⁷	1 st –2 nd CE (see n. 68), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE (W.P., I.W.)
31	<i>Collatia</i> , p. 330 = <i>AE</i> 1974, 167	1. Herenuleia Fausta 2. Herenuleia Primitiva 3. Herenuleia Ianuaria	Family: 1 [<i>mater</i>] + (2, 3) [<i>filiae</i>]	Tor Angela Nuova, <i>via</i> <i>Praenestina</i>	31–70 CE (<i>EDR</i> 75699), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–be- ginning of the 2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)
32	PAGNONI 1978: 9, no. 1; Not. Arch. Bergo- mensi, XXI 2013, pp. 184 f., no. 4	1. A. Herennuleius Candidus 2. Precilia Fortunata 3. A. Herennuleius Candidianus 4. Herennuleia Candida	Family: 1 [husband, father] + 2 [wife, mother] + 3 [son] + 4 [daughter]	<i>via</i> <i>Portuense</i> , località Pozzo Pantaleo, necropoli di vigna Pia	51–130 CE (<i>EDR</i> 126866), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE (W.P., I.W.)
33	ZPE CXCIV 2015, p. 266, no. 12, fig. 12 (<i>non</i> <i>vidimus</i>)	1. A. Herennuleius Trophimus 2. Herenuleia Marcelliana	Family: 1 + 2 [<i>coniunx</i>]	Vatican City, S. Pietro, pavi- mento	1 st CE (<i>EDR</i> 150920), 2 nd half of the 1 st CE–be- ginning of the 2 nd CE (W.P., I.W.)

TAB. 2: GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SOURCES ATTESTING
THE HERENNULEII IN ROME

Right-bank side	Left-bank side	Inscriptions of highly uncertain initial location
<i>Vicus Laci Restituti</i> (ID 2)	<i>Monumentum familiae</i> <i>Abucciorum, via Asinaria</i> (ID 4)	<i>In museo Vaticano</i> (ID 1)

¹⁸⁷ SOLIN 1989: 718.

<i>Villa Pamphilia</i> (ID 3)	<i>In hortis Bosii vel Caesarinis, via Flaminia</i> (ID 10)	<i>In domo domini Prosperii Boccacii</i> (ID 8, 18)
<i>S. Pancratio</i> (ID 6)	<i>In coemeterio Cyriacae, via Tiburtina</i> (ID 11)	Florentia (ID 20)
<i>S. Maria Transtiberina</i> (ID 12)	<i>In vinea Moroni, via Appia</i> (ID 16)	<i>In aedibus Merolli</i> (ID 21)
<i>Vinea Pia via Portuensi</i> (ID 13, 28, 32)	<i>Extra portam S. Pauli</i> (ID 19)	<i>Ignoratur</i> (ID 26, 27)
<i>S. Cosma</i> (ID 14)	<i>Pone basilicam S. Pauli nei lavori di sterro pel collettore sulla sinistra del Tevere</i> (ID 24, 25)	<i>Salernum</i> (ID 30)
<i>S. Salvatoris</i> (ID 15)	<i>Tor Angela Nuova, via Praenestina</i> (ID 31)	<i>s.l.</i> (ID 7, 9)
<i>In coemeterio Pontiani</i> (ID 5)	---	<i>In via Palestro</i> (ID 23)
<i>S. Laurentiolo</i> (ID 17)	---	---
<i>Alveum Tiberis</i> [Ponte Rotto] (ID 22)	---	---
<i>Septem Caesares</i> (ID 29)	---	---
<i>S. Pietro</i> (ID 33)	---	---
In sum: 14	In sum: 8	In sum: 11

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

AnalEpi = H. SOLIN, *Analecta Epigraphica 1970-1997*, Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 21, Roma 1998.

CEIaia = C. BARBIERI, *La collezione epigrafica Iaia*, *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale in Roma* LXXXVIII 1982/83, pp. 105–178.

Collatia = L. QUILICI, *Collatia, Forma Italiae*. Regio I, 10, Roma 1974.

EDR = *Epigraphic Database Roma* [<http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php> (accessed 30 June 2015)].

EE = *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, Roma–Berlin.

ERAEmerita = L. GARCÍA IGLESIAS, *Epigrafía Romana de Augusta Emerita*, Univ. Complutense de Madrid 1973 (unpublished doctoral thesis).

FUR = *Forma Urbis Romae* [*FUR* is available in digital form at <http://formaurbis.stanford.edu/> (accessed: 30 April 2015)].

ILMN = G. CAMODECA *et al.* (eds.), *Le Iscrizioni Latine del Museo Nazionale di Napoli*, 1: *Roma e Latium*, Napoli 2000.

IMCCatania = K. KORHONEN, *Le iscrizioni del museo civico di Catania: storia delle collezioni, cultura epigrafica, edizione*, *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 121, Helsinki 2004.

InscrIt = *Inscriptiones Italiae*, Roma.

- IRBarc* = S. MARINER BIGORRA, *Inscripciones romanas de Barcelona (lapidarias y musivas)*, Monumenta historica barcinonensia, Serie I: inscripciones, Barcelona 1973.
- NSA* = Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità.
- Philippi* = P. Pilhofer, *Philippi*, Band 2: *Katalog der Inschriften von Philippi*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 119, 2. Aufl., Tübingen 2009.
- SupIt* = *Supplementa Italica*, Roma.
- ZPE* = Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.
- ANDREAU 1974: J. ANDREAU, *Les affaires de Monsieur Jucundus*, Rome 1974 (Collection de l'École française de Rome 19).
- 1987: J. ANDREAU, *La vie financière dans le monde romain: les métiers de manieurs d'argent (4^e siècle av. J.-C.–3^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Rome 1987 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 256).
- BARBIERI 1958: G. BARBIERI, *Le iscrizioni delle necropoli*, in: M.F. SQUARCIAPINO *et al.* (eds.), *Scavi di Ostia III. Le Necropoli. Parte I: Le tombe di età repubblicana e augustea*, Roma 1958, pp. 131–168.
- BERT LOTT 2004: J. BERT LOTT, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge 2004.
- BIANCHI 1993: A. BIANCHI, *Abuciorum monumentum (2)*, in: STEINBY 1993, pp. 10–12.
- BODEL 2005: J. BODEL, *Caveat emptor: Towards a Study of Roman Slave Traders*, *JRA* XVIII 2005, pp. 181–195.
- BORBONUS 2014: D. BORBONUS, *Columbarium Tombs and Collective Identity in Augustan Rome*, Cambridge 2014.
- BRADLEY K. 2006: *On the Roman Slave Supply and Slavebreeding*, in: M.I. FINLEY (ed.), *Classical Slavery*, Abingdon 2006, pp. 53–81.
- BRAGANTINI 1993: I. BRAGANTINI, *VI 7.20,22. Casa dell'Argenteria*, in: PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1993, p. 449.
- BROEKAERT 2013a: W. BROEKAERT, *Financial Experts in a Spider Web. A Social Network Analysis of the Archives of Caecilius Iucundus and the Sulpicii*, *Klio* XCV 2013, pp. 471–510.
- 2013b: W. BROEKAERT, *Navicularii et negotiantes. A Prosopographical Study of Roman Merchants and Shippers*, Rahden 2013 (Pharos. Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike 28).
- BRUUN 2009: C. BRUUN, *Civic Rituals in Imperial Ostia*, in: O. HEKSTER, S. SCHMIDT-HOFNER, C. WITSCHERL (eds.), *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007)*, Leiden–Boston 2009, pp. 123–141.
- 2010: C. BRUUN, *Water, Oxygen Isotopes, and Immigration to Ostia Portus*, *JRA* XXIII 2010, pp. 109–132.
- 2015a: C. BRUUN, *The City of Rome*, in: BRUUN, EDMONDSON 2015, pp. 471–494.
- 2015b: C. BRUUN, *Roman Onomastics (Appendix III)*, in: BRUUN, EDMONDSON 2015, pp. 799–805.
- BRUUN, EDMONDSON 2015: C. BRUUN, J. EDMONDSON (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*, Oxford 2015.
- CASO 1989: L. CASO, *Gli affreschi interni del cubicolo amphithalamos della Casa di Apollo*, *Rivista di Studi Pompeiani* III 1989, pp. 111–130.
- CASSON 1965: L. CASSON, *Harbour and River Boats of Ancient Rome*, *JRS* LV 1965, pp. 31–39.
- CASTAGNOLI 1980: F. CASTAGNOLI, *Installazioni portuali a Roma*, *MAAR* XXXVI 1980 (= J.H. D'ARMS, E.C. KOPFF (eds.), *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome: Studies in Archaeology and History*), pp. 35–42.
- CASTRÉN 1975: P. CASTRÉN, *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus. Polity and Society in Roman Pompeii*, Roma 1975.
- CERVA 2000: M. CERVA, *La praefectura fabrum. Un'introduzione*, in: M. CÉBEILLAC-GERVASONI (ed.), *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire de la mort de César à la mort de Domitien. Classes sociales dirigeantes et pouvoir central*, Rome 2000 (Collection de l'École française de Rome 271), pp. 177–196.

- CIANCIO ROSSETTO 2005: P. CIANCIO ROSSETTO, *Il sito della villa in età romana*, in: C. BENOCCI (ed.), *Villa Doria Pamphilj*, Roma 2005 (Municipio Roma XVI), pp. 18–28.
- COOLEY 2012: A.E. COOLEY, *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*, Cambridge 2012.
- DE LIGT, GARNSEY 2012: L. DE LIGT, P. GARNSEY, *The Album of Herculaneum and a Model of the Town's Demography*, JRA XXV 2012, pp. 69–94.
- DEGRASSI 1955: A. DEGRASSI, [review of:] *M. Della Corte, Case ed abitanti a Pompei*, Athenaeum XXXIII 1955, pp. 141–149.
- DELLA CORTE 1965: M. DELLA CORTE, *Case ed abitanti di Pompei*, 3rd edn., Napoli 1965.
- DEY 2011: H.W. DEY, *The Aurelian Wall and the Refashioning of Imperial Rome, AD 271–855*, Cambridge 2011.
- DENIAUX 1979: E. DENIAUX, *À propos des Herennii de la République et de l'époque d'Auguste*, MEFRA XCI 1979, pp. 623–650.
- DOBSON 1965: B. DOBSON, *The praefectus fabrum in the Early Principate*, in: M.G. JARRETT, B. DOBSON (eds.), *Britain and Rome. Essays Presented to Eric Birley on His Sixtieth Birthday*, Kendal 1965, pp. 61–84.
- DÖHL 1976: H. DÖHL, *Plastik aus Pompeji*, vol. I: *Katalog*, Göttingen 1967 (unpublished).
- DUNCAN-JONES 1965: R. DUNCAN-JONES, *An Epigraphic Survey of Costs in Roman Italy*, PBSR XXXIII 1965, pp. 189–306.
- DUTHOY 1989: R. DUTHOY, *Cognomen est omen? Quelques jalons pour une anthroponymie sociale du monde romain*, in: M.-M. MACTOUX, E. GENY (eds.): *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, vol. II: *Anthropologie et société*, Paris 1989, pp. 183–205.
- ECK 2010: W. ECK, *Prosopography*, in: A. BARCHIESI, W. SCHEIDEL (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, Oxford 2010, pp. 146–159.
- ESCHEBACH 1993: L. ESCHBACH (ed.), *Gebäudeverzeichniss und Stadtplan der antiken Stadt Pompeji. Unter Verwendung des Nachlasses von H. ESCHBACH*, Köln 1993.
- EVANS GRUBBS 1993: J. EVANS GRUBBS, *Marriage More Shameful than Adultery: Slave–Mistress Relationships, 'Mixed Marriages', and Late Roman Law*, Phoenix XLVII 1993, pp. 125–154.
- FALLOU, GUILHEMBET 2008: A. FALLOU, J.-P. GUILHEMBET, *Sedum regionum locorum nomina (Cicéron). La Rome antique à travers ses toponymes: les vici*, in: P. FLEURY, O. DESBORDES (eds.), *Roma illustrata*, Caen 2008, pp. 175–187.
- FASSBENDER 2005: A. FASSBENDER, *Untersuchungen zur Topographie von Grabstätten in Rom von der späten Republik bis in die Spätantike*, Köln 2005 (diss.).
- FIGURELLI 1862: G. FIGURELLI, *Pompeianarum antiquitatum historia quam ex cod. mss. et a schedis diurnisque [...] quae in publicis aut privatis bibliothecis servantur nunc primum collegit indicibusque instruxit*, vol. II, Neapoli 1862.
- 1875: G. FIGURELLI, *Descrizione di Pompei*, vol. I, Napoli 1875.
- FRANK 1934: T. FRANK, *The People of Ostia*, CJ XXIX 1934, pp. 481–493.
- FREIS 1967: H. FREIS, *Die cohortes urbanae*, Köln–Graz 1967 (Epigraphische Studien 2. Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher 21).
- GARCIA Y GARCIA 2006: L. GARCIA Y GARCIA, *Danni di guerra a Pompei. Una dolorosa vicenda quasi dimenticata. Con numerose notizie sul "Museo Pompeiano" distrutto nel 1943*, Roma 2006 (Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 15).
- GARNSEY 1975: P. GARNSEY, *Descendants of Freedmen in Local Politics. Some Criteria*, in: B. LEVICK (ed.), *The Ancient Historian and His Materials: Essays in Honour of C.E. Stevens on His Seventieth Birthday*, Westmead 1975, pp. 167–180.
- GIARDINA 1993: A. GIARDINA, *The Merchant*, in: IDEM (ed.), *The Romans*, transl. by L.G. COCHRANE, Chicago 1993, pp. 245–271.
- GIOVE 2006: T. GIOVE, *Casa dell'Argenteria (VI 7,20–22)*, in: P.G. GUZZO (ed.), *Argenti a Pompei*, Milano 2003, pp. 114–122.
- GRAHAM, RUFFINI 2007: S. GRAHAM, G. RUFFINI, *Network Analysis and Greco-Roman Prosopography*, in: KEATS-ROHAN, SETTIPANI 2007, pp. 325–336.

- GRALFS 1988: B. GRALFS, *Metallverarbeitende Produktionsstätten in Pompeji*, Oxford 1988 (BAR International Series 433).
- HEINZELMANN 2000: M. HEINZELMANN, *Die Nekropolen von Ostia: Untersuchungen zu den Gräberstraßen vor der Porta Romana und an der Via Laurentina*, München 2000 (Studien zur antiken Stadt 6).
- HERZ 1994: P. HERZ, *Kollegien in Ostia. Gedanken zu den Inschriften CIL XIV 250 und 251*, in: R. GÜNTHER, S. REBENICH (eds.), *E fontibus haurire: Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften*, Paderborn 1994, pp. 295–325.
- HINARD 1985: F. HINARD, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, Rome 1985 (Collection de l'École française de Rome 83).
- JONGMAN 1991: W. JONGMAN, *The Economy and Society of Pompeii*, 2nd impr., Amsterdam 1991.
- KAISER 2011: A. KAISER, *Roman Urban Street Networks: Streets and the Organization of Space in Four Cities*, New York–London 2011 (Routledge Studies in Archaeology 2).
- KAJANTO 1965: I. KAJANTO, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965 (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 36, 2).
- KEATS-ROHAN, SETTIPANI 2007: K.S.B. KEATS-ROHAN, C. SETTIPANI (eds.), *Prosopography Approaches and Applications: A Handbook*, Oxford 2007 (Prosopographica et Genealogica 13).
- KEAY 2012: S. KEAY, *The Port System of Imperial Rome*, in: IDEM (ed.), *Rome, Portus and Mediterranean*, London 2012, pp. 33–67 (Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome 21).
- KNEISSL 1983: P. KNEISSL, *Mercator – negotiator. Römische Geschäftsleute und die Terminologie ihrer Berufe*, Münstersche Beiträge zur Antiken Handelsgeschichte II 1983, pp. 73–90.
- LAIRD 2000: M.L. LAIRD, *Reconsidering the So-Called “Sede degli Augustali” at Ostia*, MAAR XLV 2000, pp. 41–84.
- LEGA 1999: C. LEGA, *Vicus Laci Restituti*, in: STEINBY 1999, p. 171.
- MEGALE 2007: C. MEGALE, *Un nuovo bollo laterizio da Populonia*, in: L. BOTARELLI, M. COCCOLUTO, C. MILETI (eds.), *Materiali per Populonia*, vol. VI, Pisa 2007, pp. 203–212.
- MEIGGS 1973: R. MEIGGS, *Roman Ostia*, 2nd edn., Oxford 1973.
- MOEDE 2011: K. MOEDE, *Reliefs, Public and Private*, in: J. RÜPKE (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Religion*, Malden–Oxford 2011, pp. 164–175.
- MOURITSEN 1988: H. MOURITSEN, *Elections, Magistrates, and Municipal Élite: Studies in Pompeian Epigraphy*, Roma 1988 (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. Supplementum 15).
- MÚNIZ COELLO 1989: J. MÚNIZ COELLO, *Empleados y subalternos de la administración romana. III: Los licitores*, SHHA VII 1989, pp. 133–152.
- PAGANO, PRISICIANDARO 2006: M. PAGANO, R. PRISICIANDARO, *Studio sulle provenienze degli oggetti rinvenuti negli scavi borbonici del Regno di Napoli. Una lettura integrata, coordinata e commentata della documentazione*, Roma 2006.
- PAGNONI 1978: L. PAGNONI, *Museo diocesano di Bergamo. Catalogo*, Bergamo 1978, p. 9, no. 1; *Atti Aten. Sc. Lett. Art. Bergamo LXXII 2008–2009*, pp. 597–605.
- PALMER 1981: R.E.A. PALMER, *The Topography and Social History of Rome's Trastevere (Southern Sector)*, PAPHS CXXV 1981, pp. 368–397.
- PEÑA 1999: T. PEÑA, *The Urban Economy During the Early Dominate: Pottery Evidence from the Palatine Hill*, Rome 1999 (BAR International Series 784).
- PERRY 2013: M.J. PERRY, *Gender, Manumission, and the Roman Freedwoman*, Cambridge 2013.
- PIRSON 1997: F. PIRSON, *Rented Accommodation at Pompeii: The Evidence of the Insula Arriana Polliana VI.6*, in: R. LAURENCE, A. WALLACE-HADRILL (eds.), *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*, Portsmouth 1997, pp. 165–181.
- PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1993: G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI (ed.), *Pompei. Pitture e mosaici*, vol. IV: *Regio VI, parte prima*, Roma 1993.
- PURCELL 1983: N. PURCELL, *The Apparitores: A Study in Social Mobility*, PBSR LI 1983, pp. 125–173.
- QUARANTA 1837: B. QUARANTA, *Di quatorrdici vasi di argento disotterrati in Pompei nel MDCCCXXXV ed ora messi in mostra nel Real Muso Borbonico*, Napoli 1837.

- RAWSON 1974: B. RAWSON, *Roman Concubinage and Other De Facto Marriages*, TAPhA CIV 1974, pp. 279–305.
- REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ 2000: J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, *L. Marius Phoebus mercator olei hispani ex provincia Baetica. Consideraciones en torno a los términos mercator, negotiator y diffusor olearius ex Baetica*, in: L. GASPERINI, G. PACI (eds.), *Epigraphai. Miscellanea Epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini*, Roma 2000, pp. 781–797.
- RICCI 2008: C. RICCI, *Monumentum sive columbarium libertorum et servorum: qualche riflessione su motivazioni e successo di una fisionomia edilizia*, in: M.L. CALDELLI, G.L. GREGORI, S. ORLANDI (eds.), *Epigrafia 2006. Atti della XIV^o Rencontre sur l'Épigraphie in onore di Silvio Panciera con altri contributi di colleghi, allievi e collaboratori*, Roma 2008 (Tituli 9), pp. 323–337.
- RICHARDSON 1992: L. RICHARDSON, JR., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore 1992.
- RICO 2003: C. RICO, *Mercatores, negotiatores et diffusores olearii et le commerce de l'huile de Bétique à destination de Rome aux I^{er} et II^{ème} siècles de notre ère*, REA CV 2003, pp. 413–433.
- ROHDE 2012: D. ROHDE, *Zwischen Individuum und Stadtgemeinde. Die Integration von collegia in Hafenstädten*, Mainz 2012.
- ROMIZZI 2007: L. ROMIZZI, *Il programma decorativo della casa di Apollo (VI 7,23) a Pompei*, in: S. FORTUNELLI (ed.), *Sertum Perusinum gemmae oblatum: docenti e allievi del Dottorato di Perugia in onore di Gemma Sena Chiesa*, Napoli 2007 (Quaderni di Ostraka 13), pp. 365–391.
- ROYDEN 1988: H. ROYDEN, *The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third Century A.D.*, Pisa 1988.
- 1989: H. ROYDEN, *The Tenure of Office of the Quinquennales in the Roman Professional Collegia*, AJPh CX 1989, pp. 303–315.
- RÜPKE 2005: J. RÜPKE, *Fasti sacerdotum. Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr.*, vols. I–III, Stuttgart 2005 (Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 12, 1–3).
- SADDINGTON 1985: D. SADDINGTON, *Praefecti fabrum of the Julio-Claudian Period*, in: E. WEBER, G. DOBESCH (eds.), *Römische Geschichte, Altertumskunde und Epigraphik. Festschrift für Artur Betz zur Vollendung seines 80. Lebensjahres*, Wien 1985, pp. 529–546.
- SAMPAOLO 1993: V. SAMPAOLO, *VI 7,23. Casa di Apollo*, in: PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1993, pp. 470 f.
- SALOMIES 1992: O. SALOMIES, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*, Helsinki 1992 (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 97).
- 2002: O. SALOMIES, *People in Ostia: Some Onomastic Observations*, in: C. BRUUN, A. GALLINA ZEVI (eds.), *Ostia e Portus nelle loro relazioni con Roma*, Roma 2002 (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 27), pp. 135–159.
- 2014: O. SALOMIES, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire – Some Addenda*, in: M. LETIZIA CALDELLI, G. GREGORI (eds.), *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio 30 anni dopo*, Roma 2014 (Tituli 10), pp. 511–536.
- SALOMIES, SOLIN 1994: O. SALOMIES, H. SOLIN, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*, Hildesheim 1994 (Alpha–Omega, Reihe A, vol. LXXX).
- SCHOONHOVEN 2006: A. V. SCHOONHOVEN, *Metrology and Meaning in Pompeii. The Urban Arrangement of Regio VI*, Roma 2006 (Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompeii 20).
- SCHULZE 1904: W. SCHULZE, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin 1904.
- SINN 1987: F. SINN, *Stadtrömische Marmorurnen*, Mainz 1987 (Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur).
- SOLIN 1989: H. SOLIN, *Review: Inscriptiones Italiae. Academiae Italicae consociatae ediderunt. Volumen I: Regio I, Fasciculus I: Salernum by Victorius Bracco*, Gnomon LXI 1989, pp. 708–720.
- 1996: H. SOLIN, *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen. Ein Namenbuch*, Stuttgart 1996 (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei, Beiheft 2).

- 2003: H. SOLIN, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: ein Namenbuch*, 2nd edn., Berlin 2003 (CIL Auctarium, Series Nova).
- SQUARCIAPINO 1958a: M.F. SQUARCIAPINO, *La necropoli lungo la via Ostiense*, in: SQUARCIAPINO 1958c, pp. 11–62.
- 1958b: M.F. SQUARCIAPINO, *Indice cronologico*, in: SQUARCIAPINO 1958c, pp. 239–240.
- 1958c: M.F. SQUARCIAPINO *et al.* (eds.), *Scavi di Ostia*, vol. III: *Le Necropoli*, pt. 1: *Le tombe di età repubblicana e augustea*, Roma 1958,
- STEINBY 1993/1999: E.M. STEINBY (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, vol. III, Roma 1993; vol. V, Roma 1999.
- TACOMA 2013: L.E. TACOMA, *Migrant Quarters at Rome?*, in: G. DE KLEIJN, S. BENOIST (eds.), *Integration in Rome and in the Roman World: Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Lille, June 23–25, 2011)*, Leiden 2013, pp. 127–146.
- TERPSTRA 2013: T.T. TERPSTRA, *Trading Communities in the Roman World. A Micro-Economic and Institutional Perspective*, Leiden–Boston 2013.
- TRAN 2006: N. TRAN, *Les membres des associations romaines: le rang social des collegiati en Italie et en Gaules, sous le Haut-Empire*, Rome 2006 (Collection de l'École française de Rome 367).
- TREGGIARI 1981: S. TREGGIARI, *Contubernaes in CIL VI*, Phoenix XXXV 1981, pp. 42–69.
- TUCCI 2004: P.L. TUCCI, *Eight Fragments of the Forma Urbis Shedding New Light on the Transtiberim*, PBSR LXXII 2004, pp. 185–202.
- VERBOVEN 2011: K. VERBOVEN, *Professional Collegia: Guilds or Social Clubs?*, AncSoc XLI 2011, pp. 187–195.
- VERBOVEN, CARLIER, DUMOLYN 2007: K. VERBOVEN, M. CARLIER, J. DUMOLYN, *A Short Manual to the Art of Prosopography*, in: KEATS-ROHAN, SETTIPANI 2007, pp. 35–70.
- WALLACE-HADRILL 1988: A. WALLACE-HADRILL, *The Social Structure of the Roman House*, PBSR LVI 1988, pp. 43–97.
- 1994: A. WALLACE-HADRILL, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*, Princeton 1994.
- ZANKER 1998: P. ZANKER, *Pompeii. Public and Private Life*, transl. by D.L. SCHNEIDER, Cambridge, MA.–London 1998.

THE *HONESTIORES* AS FOUNDERS OF INSCRIPTIONS DEDICATED TO HERCULES

by

PRZEMYSŁAW WOJCIECHOWSKI

ABSTRACT: In this article I analyse the epigraphic evidence for the involvement of representatives from the Roman upper classes (*honestiores*) in the cult of Hercules. The study of dedications by representatives of the two highest *ordines* leads us to the conclusion that senators and equites decided on the issue of religious inscriptions above all when the function performed by them was required. The deciding factor was in this instance the expectations of the environment in which the senatorial or equestrian official was active. Another perceptible force which could have influenced the decision concerning the issue of an inscription dedicated to Hercules was the prestigious nature of the centre of this god's cult, which gave the foundation appropriate propagandistic values. If representatives of the senatorial or equestrian ranks are featured among exhibitors of inscriptions dedicated to Hercules under circumstances different from those described above, these are standard 'new people' in the circle of the Roman social elite. It is significantly more difficult to determine the causes of epigraphic activity (or its absence) among representatives of the municipal elite. The analysis of dedications by members of this social stratum may give the impression that in some regions of the empire (above all in northern and central Italy, Africa and Dacia), there are particular factors which encouraged members of the *ordo decurionum* to exhibit inscriptions dedicated to Hercules, particularly in those centres where his cult enjoyed an especially long tradition and a significant role in local religious life. In this instance inscriptions dedicated to Hercules could have become an additional form of self-representation, especially for new members of the municipal elite.

In 1989, Werner Eck published an extensive article on the religiousness of the Roman imperial elite, which included members of the senatorial order and the *equites* performing public functions¹. The German historian tried to answer the question as to whether religious changes occurring during the early imperial period were also reflected in the religious life of this social group. Since literary

¹ Eck (1989) uses the term "soziopolitische Führungsschicht". Christ (1980: 218 f.) reads the term "Führungsschicht" in a completely different way. According to him, this group was comprised only of men who influenced Roman policies and laws; men who held the highest offices in the army and the imperial administration. Apart from the *princeps* himself and members of his *domus*, this elite group consisted, according to him, of consuls and equestrian prefects of the highest rank, senatorial and equestrian governors of provinces, members of the *consilium principis*, particularly privileged lawyers, and under some emperors (especially Claudius and Nero), the most influential imperial freedmen. On the stratification of the Roman social elite see also Wojciechowski 2005: 156.

sources are almost completely silent on the subject, sacred inscriptions funded by Roman senators and *equites* became the basis of his research. ECK found traces of the religiousness of representatives of these social groups both in the sphere of public cults and private foundations. Following in his footsteps, I would like to analyse the epigraphic activity of the Roman elite with regard to one specific cult, that of Hercules. Focusing my research on one cult will on the one hand enable me to deepen the analysis of individual foundations, and on the other will considerably broaden the social scope of the research by including also those representatives of the *ordo equester* who did not hold public offices, as well as members of local elites.

1. PUBLIC CULT

In the 15th century, eight inscriptions, funded by urban praetors (*praetores urbani*) and dedicated to Hercules, were found in the vicinity of the church of Santa Maria in Cosmedin². Even those who first published these inscriptions had no doubt that they had come from the sanctuary of Hercules at the Ara Maxima on the Forum Boarium³.

According to literary tradition, this oldest centre of the cult of Hercules in Rome was erected either by Evander or by Hercules himself⁴. Modern historians seek the genesis of the cult of Hercules at the Ara Maxima, either in the Greek tradition or in Italian, Etruscan or Phoenician beliefs⁵. Regardless of its origin, the cult of Hercules at the Ara Maxima displayed a number of specific features, including the fact that until the end of the 4th century BC it was a private cult presided over by representatives of two Roman clans – *gens Potitia* and *gens Pinaria*⁶. It was only after its maintenance was transferred to the state as a result of the reform introduced by Appius Claudius that the Hercules worshipped at the Ara Maxima was transformed into one of the deities of the Roman *civitas*⁷. Subsequently, public slaves administered the cult, and celebrations on the divine hero's day were organised by the urban praetors. Every year on the 13th of August, the urban praetor sacrificed a heifer and offered wine, using a special

² CIL VI 312–319; see WOJCIECHOWSKI, NEHRING 2004: 339–347.

³ COARELLI 1992: 61–77.

⁴ Strabo V 230; Dion. Hal. *Ant.* I 40, 2; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 90 (= Mor. 285 E); Tac. *Ann.* XV 41; Plin. *Nat.* XXXIV 33; Ov. *Fast.* I 581; Prop. IV 9, 67; Liv. IX 34, 18. See WOJCIECHOWSKI, NEHRING 2004: 339.

⁵ JACZYNOWSKA 1981: 631 f. (with further bibliographical references); RITTER 1995: 18–20.

⁶ According to Livius and Virgil, the Potitii played a leading role (Liv. I 7, 12–14; Verg. *Aen.* VIII 269 f.). See also Macr. *Sat.* III 6, 14; Fest. 237 MÜLLER (= 343 LINDSAY).

⁷ Liv. IX 29, 9; Val. Max. I 1, 17; Dion. Hal. *Ant.* I 40; Macr. *Sat.* III 6, 12.

cup (*skyphos*) kept in the sanctuary at the Ara Maxima⁸. The celebrations presented an opportunity to dedicate altars and statues to Hercules. Inscriptions found on the Forum Boarium gave us the names of several founders of such dedications. In the majority of cases, they only stated their name and noted that they held the office of urban praetor. Participating in a worship ceremony for Hercules or performing traditional sacrifices may therefore be seen as fulfilling one of the many duties of the urban praetor. Such an interpretation is in line with the opinion, popular in older literature on the subject, that performing priestly duties and membership of priestly colleges were mostly (and in some cases, solely) a token of prestige. Rituals connected with public cults were also supposedly devoid of a religious aspect. The cults, similarly to the deities in the state's pantheon, were reduced to the role of symbols connected with politics and culture rather than religion⁹.

The attractiveness of priestly offices as symbols of the highest social status of their holders is undoubted¹⁰. However, it is difficult to disagree with Werner ECK, who questions the theory that hundreds of representatives of the Roman elite performed various religious functions over a few centuries while being convinced of their "Inhaltslosigkeit"¹¹. According to the historian, such a collective schizophrenia is very unlikely, which is why ECK tries to search the sphere of public religion for traces of religiousness in the people responsible for its functioning, i.e. representatives of the Roman political elite. He cites a letter of Pliny the Younger (*Epist.* X 13), in which Pliny asks the emperor Trajan to support his efforts to become a member of one of the priestly colleges, which leads us to believe that obtaining that honour was a question of more than just prestige. This outstanding representative of the senatorial order emphasises the religious aspect of the office to which he aspires. He states that holding the office of augur or *septemvir* would enable him to do publicly what he had been doing as a private man – to ask the gods for prosperity of the emperor ("ut iure sacerdotii precari deos pro te publice possim, quod nunc precor pietate privata"). Naturally, we do not have to believe the frankness of Pliny's declaration, but we have no reason to doubt it either. In any case, it is highly unlikely that Pliny would have referred to the religious aspect of the office of augur if such offices had had a solely prestigious character in the eyes of the Roman elite (which also included the emperor).

Perhaps, after all, the inscriptions dedicated to Hercules by the urban praetors do not merely reflect their ardour as officials, but also attest to their own private

⁸ Varro, *Ling.* VI 54; Serv. *Ad Aen.* VIII 278.

⁹ See e.g. LATTE 1967: 310. On the activity of the Roman political elite in the sphere of public cult, see SCHEID 2007; VÁRHELYI 2010 (esp. 93–121).

¹⁰ On the *collegia sacerdotum*, see RÜPKE 2002: 41–67.

¹¹ ECK 1989: 31.

religious needs. As I have mentioned, the majority of the inscriptions found at the Ara Maxima are very laconic. Apart from an invocation to Hercules, they only include the praetor's name, information about his function, sometimes accompanied by the abbreviation *v(ir) c(larissimus)* and the phrase *donum dedit* (or similar). Only two founders do not match this pattern. L. Fabius Cilo formulated his inscription as a poem (in elegiac distich)¹². There is no doubt that the author of this inscription was well educated and familiar with Latin literature¹³. From our point of view, what is more important than the quite unusual form of the inscription, is the statement that Cilo performed his duties connected with the cult of Hercules properly. Such a statement can also be found in the inscription sponsored by the praetor P. Cadius Sabinus, who leaves no doubt that he is referring to the rite at the Ara Maxima¹⁴. The phrase *Euandreo saeculo*, used by Sabinus with reference to the information on entrusting the cult of Hercules to the *gens Potitia*, shows that he had knowledge of the genesis and nature of the rites of the cult in this sanctuary. It is worth noting that two of the other praetors whose inscriptions were found on the Forum Boarium stated that as well as being urban praetors they belonged to the *collegium XVvirorum sacris faciundis*¹⁵. ECK observed a similar phenomenon when analysing sacred inscriptions found in provinces on the Rhine and the Danube and funded by representatives of the senatorial order and the elite of the *ordo equester*. According to ECK, combining a priestly office with a religious act such as dedicating an altar, statue or temple shows that senators recognised the religious aspect of their priesthood. At least for some of them, it meant more than *dignitas*¹⁶. In my opinion, this is how we should also interpret the inscriptions dedicated by the urban praetors to Hercules as worshipped at the Ara Maxima. Their involvement clearly exceeds the level we would expect from officials who treated their presence during the ceremonies at the Ara Maxima solely as the performance of their official duties, and the ceremonies themselves as a political and cultural spectacle. It was not by chance that J. SCHEID pointed to one of the inscriptions dedicated to Hercules by the

¹² *CIL VI 312*: “Te precor, Alcide, sacris, / invicte, peractis / rite tuis laetus dona / ferens meritis. / Haec tibi nostra potest / tenuis perferre camena, / nam grates dignas tu / potes efficere. / Sume libens simulacra, / tuis quae munera Cilo / aris urbanus dedicat / ipse sacris”.

¹³ The invocation opening the text is taken directly from the *Aeneid* (Verg. *Aen. X 631*: “Te precor, Alcide, coeptis ingentibus adsis”). The author's reservation about his modest talent should be treated as so-called affected modesty, a popular literary phenomenon in imperial times (WOJCIECHOWSKI, NEHRING 2004: 343).

¹⁴ *CIL VI 313*: “Hercules Invicte(!) Cadius hoc tuo donu[m] libens] / numini Sancto dicavit praetor urbis [---] / cum pia sollemne mente rite fecisse[t] sacrum] / tradidisti quod Potitis Euandreo [saeculo] / administrandum quodannis hic ad a[ram maxim]am”.

¹⁵ *CIL VI 313* and 318.

¹⁶ ECK 1989: 33.

urban praetors as a perfect example of the religious activity of Roman officials, who performed a role which Christianity reserves for priests¹⁷.

2. PRIVATE CULT

2.1. The *senatores*

A common feature of senatorial dedications in Rome, Italy and the provinces is the fact that, apart from a handful of exceptions, their founders held the highest offices on the list of the *cursus honorum* designed for this order. They included: consuls¹⁸, provincial governors¹⁹, commanders of legions²⁰ and one prefect of the *annona* from the times of Eugenius' usurpation²¹.

Even at first glance, our attention is drawn to the fact that several centres are clearly favoured in terms of the presence of senators in the epigraphic material I have analysed. In the case of Italy, apart from one inscription found in Salernum²², dedications funded by senators were only discovered in Rome²³, nearby Tibur and Ostia²⁴. In terms of the provinces, Dacia is privileged with four founders²⁵; two inscriptions were found in Pannonia²⁶ and one in Germania²⁷.

¹⁷ SCHEID 2007: 126.

¹⁸ *CIL* VI 308 = GORDON 1963–1965: II 161 f., n° 253, pl. 118 = WOJCIECHOWSKI 2005: n° 51; *CIL* VI 332 = WOJCIECHOWSKI 2005: n° 52; *AE* 1916, 110; *CIL* XIV 3554.

¹⁹ *CIL* III 1564 = BĂRBULESCU 1977: 176, n° 15 = PISO 1993: 79–81, n° 20; *CIL* III 1566 = BĂRBULESCU 1977: 176, n° 17 = PISO 1993: 162–166, n° 35; *CIL* III 1573 = BĂRBULESCU 1977: 176, n° 24 = PISO 1993: 203–207, n° 46; *CIL* III 832 = BĂRBULESCU 1977: 177, n° 32 = PISO 1993: 207 f., n° 47.

²⁰ *CIL* XIII 8009; *RIU* II 392.

²¹ *AE* 1941, 66 = CHASTAGNOL 1960: 466, App. 2, n° 22.

²² *AE* 1984, 242.

²³ *CIL* VI 308, 309, 312–319, 332, 30895, 30905. The *ordo senatorius* also certainly included the Papirii, who founded a collective (family) bilingual dedication to Hercules with the epithet *Defensor* (*CIL* VI 309 = *IGUR* I 171 = SCHRAUDOLPH 1993: 145, H24). These assumptions are supported by the very high quality of the reliefs on the sides of the altar, dated to the 1st century. The patrician *gens Papiria* enjoyed prosperity in the times of the Republic (Papirii Masones); the other branches of the family are attested at the end of the Republic and the beginning of the Empire (Papirii Carbones: see e.g. C. Papirius Carbo, *PIR*² P 110), but also in the 2nd century (e.g. *PIR*² P 107 and 108).

²⁴ Tibur: *AE* 1916, 110; *CIL* XIV 3546 and 3554. Ostia: *AE* 1941, 66.

²⁵ *CIL* III 1564, 1566, 1573.

²⁶ *RIU* II 392; *CIL* III 10405 = FITZ 1962: 625, n° 10.

²⁷ *CIL* XIII 8009. This group of testimonies should, in my opinion, also include the dedication of the emperor Tiberius, discovered in Spain (*CIL* II 1660 = *CIL* II² 5, 65 = *ILS* 161). Even if we assume that the emperor was not personally involved in creating the inscription, its making was certainly overseen by an official of the highest rank. The missing last line of the inscription probably contained the name of the governor of Baetica in the years 34–35, Q. Grannius Marcianus; see ALFÖLDY 1985: 189–199; ORIA SEGURA 1996: 162.

The collection, broken down according to the geographical criterion, is internally very uniform. It seems that there are two types of senatorial foundations, both of which are clearly connected to their place of origin. What distinguishes one from the other is the relation between the act of creating the inscription accompanying senatorial foundations and the function performed by the founder. In the provinces, we observe a clear connection of the foundation with the current function of the senator, while in Italy the information about the offices held tends to appear in the context of the founder's self-presentation.

2.1.1. Rome and Italy

One typical example of a senatorial dedication in Italy is the inscription by the consul P. Plotius Romanus, found in Rome²⁸. The founder states in it that he erected *aedem cum omni aparatu* for Hercules, and takes the opportunity to present the details of his long career as senator²⁹. The mentioned *aedes* was probably a small sanctuary near the first mile of the *Via Portuensis*, where the architrave with Romanus' inscription was found³⁰. A reminder of the founder's whole *cursus honorum* was not the usual practice in sacred dedications. It seems that in this case the sacred foundation was treated as one of the methods of self-presentation of an important member of the Roman elite.

It is much more difficult to interpret another Roman inscription which names a consul – this time M. Silius Messalla³¹. The inscription, placed on the marble base of a statue, consists of two parts, which clearly differ in terms of palaeography³². The first part is an invocation to Hercules with the rare epithet *Defensor* and the word *consul* in the fifth line; the second part, in the third and fourth line, is the consul's name. There are visible signs of the removal (by means of chipping) of the text between what is the present fourth and fifth line: *Messalla / [- -] / consul*. Establishing the relations between the individual parts of the inscription is of fundamental importance for its interpretation. What is particularly significant is the chronology of the foundation and Messala's role in it. The palaeographic differences, which undoubtedly correspond with two stages of the creation of the engraving, are explained in two ways. (1) The dedication to Hercules the Defender (*Defensor*) was created in Commodus' times. After his

²⁸ *CIL* VI 332.

²⁹ On various stages of Plotius' career, see ALFÖLDY 1969: 98; M. CORBIER 1973: 667 f.; JACQUES 1983: 90–93, n° 34. ALFÖLDY (1969: 98) dates his consulship to the year 223; according to him, Plotius was descended from an *eques* from Ostia, called Q. Plotius Q. f. Quir. Romanus, who lived in the times of Hadrian.

³⁰ The temple was probably built in the first years of the rule of Severus Alexander (FRIGGIERI 1991: 71; LANCIANI 1989–2002: V 152; GREGORI 2000: 452 f.). On the character of the sanctuaries located in the region, see WOJCIECHOWSKI 2005: 28–30.

³¹ *CIL* VI 308.

³² GORDON 1963–1965: II 161 f., n° 253.

death, the consul's (first founder's) name was removed and only the word *consul* was left, which could be re-used by the "new founder" – M. Silius Messalla, a consul for the year 193, of whom we know from Cassius Dio's account³³. (2) The original founder of the inscription was *consul ordinarius* for 193 – C. Iulius Erucius Clarus Vibianus, whose name (probably in the form *Erucius Clarus*) was removed from the engraving in 197, when Clarus was executed on the orders of Septimius Severus³⁴. The name of Silius Messalla, one of the consuls for 193 (it is worth mentioning his service to Septimius Severus here), was placed on the base of the statue at the same time. Both theories are mere speculations which will probably never be verified without additional source materials. In both cases, Messalla's role in the foundation (the choice of deity) was limited. Possibly, the appearance of his name on the base of Hercules' statue coincided with some extension work in the building complex where the statue was placed, since a fragment of a floor mosaic was found on the same spot³⁵. The consul himself was not necessarily personally involved in this project or in the corrections on the base of Hercules' statue.

In the case of senatorial foundations from the late imperial period, we may assume that the presence of the officials who were involved was fully intentional. The foundations should be perceived through the prism of the religious conflicts that were flaring up at the time³⁶. The restoration of the temple of Hercules at Ostia, of which we learn from the inscription of the *praefectus annonae* Numerius Proiectus³⁷, was more than just another display of the official's care for the condition of public buildings in the city, which we could analyse in the context of the euergetic approach expected from members of the elite. In Numerius' times, a re-interpreted Hercules was one of the most important figures of paganism, which was fighting for survival³⁸. In my opinion, we should place the Roman inscription funded by Flavius Lollianus in the same context³⁹; Lollianus can likely be

³³ Cass. Dio LXXIII 17, 3. This consul received the order from Septimius Severus, who was approaching Rome, to capture the murderers of Pertinax. At the Senate assembly he summoned, Didius Iulianus was sentenced to death, Septimius was pronounced emperor, and Pertinax was deified. It cannot be ruled out that he can be identified with the senator of the same cognomen who was sentenced to death by Heliogabalus in the year 218 (Cass. Dio LXXIX 5, 1–3). See *PIR*¹ S 511; BARBIERI 1952: 1158; LEUNISSEN 1989: 133.

³⁴ *PIR*² E 97.

³⁵ Relating the circumstances of finding the inscription, CASTAGNOLI (1949: 151) states that the owner of the house in whose foundations the engraving was found claimed that there had been remains of a mosaic on the same spot.

³⁶ See BLOCH 1945: 199–241; WYTZES 1977.

³⁷ *AE* 1941, 66.

³⁸ See JACZYŃSKA 1981 (with further bibliographical references).

³⁹ *CIL* VI 30895 = WOJCIECHOWSKI 2005: n° 54.

identified with the *praefectus Urbi* in 342 of the same name⁴⁰. Previously, R. VON HÄHLING emphasised Lollianus' strong connections with the traditional cults. Lollianus was an augur and because of his activity for the old cults he was described as *religiosus* and *sanctissimus* by his son and wife⁴¹. Firmicus Maternus also praised him as a defender of the traditional cults and dedicated his work on astrology to him⁴². For Numerius Proiectus and Flavius Lollianus, sponsoring an inscription dedicated to Hercules was undoubtedly an important act, going beyond the realm of private religiousness.

2.1.2. The provinces

Unlike the case of senatorial foundations in Italy, senators in the provinces only appeared in the role of founders as incumbent provincial governors or commanders of legions. This leads us to believe that the foundations were official in nature. In the case of the legate of the *legio I Minervia*, L. Calpurnius Proculus, the impulse for dedicating an altar came from the completion of the construction of a military hospital (*peracto opere valetudinari*)⁴³. Sometimes, however, public and private spheres overlapped in such a way that it is difficult to decipher the nature of a foundation. One interesting example is the dedication of the governor of Dacia, C. Iulius Gallus⁴⁴. Together with his family (*cum suis*), he offered an *ex voto* for Hercules. On the one hand, the official aspect of the foundation is emphasised by the dedication to Septimius Severus and Caracalla which opens the inscription; on the other hand, the presence of thermal springs near the place where the inscription was found leads us to believe that Gallus' *votum* was also driven by private motives⁴⁵. It should also be noted that foundations by two other governors were created in the same context⁴⁶. Naturally, the dedications may have coincided with the building, restoration or decoration of some elements

⁴⁰ *PLRE* I 512–514, s.v. *Lollianus* 5; MERRIMAN 1975: 320, n° 20; HÄHLING 1978, 294 f., n° 16. Cf. *PIR*² L 304; see also O. SEECK, *RE* XIII 1927, s.v. *Lollianus* 10, coll. 1371–1373; CHASTAGNOL 1962: 114–121, n° 45. Some historians have expressed doubts about the identification of Lollianus with the prefect of 342 (GATTI 1889: 42 f.; BARBIERI 1952: 328, n° 1852; VITUCCI 1956: 123, n° 52); it seems, however, that their arguments (paleographic features of the inscriptions) are not strong enough to reject the interpretation proposed by JONES (*PLRE*) and HÄHLING.

⁴¹ *CIL* VI 1757 = *ILS* 1232.

⁴² Firm. Mat. *Mathesis* VIII 33, 4: “Tu verus interpres, tu fidus custos, tu religiosus antistes, tu solus virtutum tuarum merito id ornare poteris quod...”.

⁴³ *CIL* XIII 8009.

⁴⁴ *CIL* III 1564.

⁴⁵ On the healing aspects of the cult of Hercules in Dacia, see BĂRBULESCU 1978: 228 f.

⁴⁶ The cult centre at Băile Herculane must have had particular prestige, as indicated by the social structure of the founders of dedications discovered there. Apart from provincial governors and members of municipal elites, there were also representatives of the imperial fiscal system (see below).

of the cult complex. The governor in charge of the works appeared in his official capacity in such cases.

The “media” for inscriptions funded by senators both in Italy and in the provinces were, as in the times of the Republic, simple altars, votive obelisks or the bases of statues, but also architectural elements constituting parts of private cult complexes (P. Plotius Romanus’ foundation). Among the senatorial donations in imperial Rome, we shall not find one of a scale comparable to that of L. Mummius. From Augustus’ times, such acts (the construction of a public sanctuary) were the domain of members of the *domus imperatoria*⁴⁷. The relatively modest participation of the imperial elite in the group which I am analysing should therefore not come as a surprise.

It is also worth noting that the earliest of the senatorial foundations discovered in the imperial capital is dated to the last decade of the 2nd century. It may seem strange that there are no traces of the cult of Hercules in the circles of the highest imperial officials in the 1st and particularly the 2nd century, considering the importance which is attributed to this cult in the “religious policy” of the Nerva-Antonine dynasty. Perhaps, however, we overestimate the impact of the emperors’ religious preferences on this sphere of the Roman elite’s family life⁴⁸.

2.2. The *equites*

The relatively large collection of inscriptions dedicated to Hercules by representatives of the *ordo equester* includes mostly foundations of the *equites*, both military and civilian, operating in the provinces. They make up 83% of all founders from this class. The majority are of course officers during or after the *tres militiae equestres*⁴⁹. There are fewer representatives of various levels of administration: three *procuratores* and *praeses provinciae Raetiae*⁵⁰. The highest ranking *eques* in the group of founders I analysed is P. Acilius Attianus who was *praefectus praetorio* in the first years of Hadrian’s rule⁵¹. The large granite altar he funded was discovered in a quarry on Elba. It is possible that the prefect had it placed in the *sacellum* which was used by the quarry workers⁵².

⁴⁷ KOLB 1993: esp. 52.

⁴⁸ WOJCIECHOWSKI 2005: 37 f.; WOJCIECHOWSKI 2010: 49–54.

⁴⁹ *CIL* XIV 13, 3544, 3548; DEVIJVER 1976–1980: I 481, n° 111; *AE* 1963, 16 = ORIA SEGURA 1996: 182, I-39; *CIL* III 1571 = BÄRBULESCU 1977: 176, n° 22; *AE* 1956, 204 = BÄRBULESCU 1977: 175, n° 11; *CIL* III 14214; *CIL* III 10406 = FITZ 1962: 624, n° 8; *AE* 1948, 86 = FITZ 1962: n° 12; *CIL* III 3426 = FITZ 1962: 625, n° 6; *CIL* III 3427 = FITZ 1962: 625, n° 11; *CIL* III 6450; *AE* 1965, 9; *CIL* VII 924, 985, 986; *CIL* XIII 8016; *RIB* 1214.

⁵⁰ *AE* 1930, 135; *AE* 1983, 826; *CIL* VIII 1625; *CIL* III 5785.

⁵¹ *CIL* XI 7248. See PASSERINI 1939: 297, n° XXXIII (see Cass. Dio LXIX 1, 2; *HA Hadr.* 1, 4; 4, 2; 9, 3; *CIL* XI 2607 and XIV 3039).

⁵² Perhaps the prefect used an ordered block of stone which he had not used for its original purpose. This would explain the very large size of the altar combined with the rather modest decoration;

The specific structure of the founders (the dominance of army representatives) is naturally reflected in the geographical distribution of the material analysed here. The vast majority of it (80%) comes from the provinces, particularly, as can easily be guessed, from the heavily militarised areas near the Danube (especially Pannonia and Dacia, where there were seven and five founders respectively) and Britannia (three tribunes and two military prefects). Similarly to senatorial foundations in the provinces, the official aspect is clearly visible in equestrian dedications. Almost 90% of them note the office the founder held at the time of the foundation. Of course, it is not easy to establish the exact connection between creating an inscription and the office held in each individual case. M. CLAUSS is probably correct in stating that the decisions of equestrian commanders could have been considerably influenced by the expectations of the soldiers serving under their command⁵³.

In Italy, it is difficult to prove a direct connection between the office held by the founder and the inscription's dedication. The inscriptions funded by equestrian commanders (a praetorian prefect and a tribune of one of the cohorts of the *vigiles*) were created far away from the place where the units under their command were stationed. They were found on Elba and at Ostia respectively⁵⁴. We can therefore rule out any influence on the part of their subordinates (praetorians and *vigiles*) on the choice of deity and the type of foundation. The remaining *equites*, who list their military functions, do so while presenting their *cursus honorum*. Apart from positions they held, they list civilian and religious functions performed previously (*scriba quaestorius*, *viator quaestorius ab Aerario Saturni*, *curator fani Herculis Victoris*)⁵⁵. These dedications – it is worth emphasising that they both come from Tibur – have the same character as the senatorial inscriptions dedicated in this centre (see above). In turn, the altar devoted to Hercules by Hostilius Antipater was created in the last decade of the 3rd or the beginning of the 4th century AD, when Antipater held the offices of *praefectus annonae* and *curator rei publicae Ost(iensis)*⁵⁶. Thus, this inscription belongs to the new, Late Antiquity current of the cult of Hercules.

see SCHRAUDOLPH 1993: 136. Another inscription in his name was found on the island (*CIL* XI 2607); there is also an inscription found on a fragment of a lead pipe from Praeneste (*CIL* XIV 3039); see *PIR*² A 45.

⁵³ CLAUSS 1992: 265.

⁵⁴ *CIL* XI 7248; *CIL* XIV 13.

⁵⁵ *CIL* XIV 3544 and 3548; see DEVIJVER 1976–1980: 869, V 104; 481, I 111. Both belonged to the group of higher offices in the category of the *apparitores*; the *equites* were the elite of this group of officials; see PURCELL 1983: passim, esp. 153.

⁵⁶ *PLRE* I 73, s.v. *Hostilius Antipater*; KUHOFF 1983: 46. On the prefecture of the *annona*, see PAVISD'ESCURAC 1976; on the *curatores rei publicae*, see CAMODECA 1980 (on Antipater, see p. 496); ŁOŚ 1996: 179 f.

There are very few dedications, either in Italy or in the provinces, whose founders make their equestrian status known without listing their current or previous offices. We know of only six such testimonies in the whole Empire. One of them was Aurelius Sabinus *equus Romanus*, who co-funded the dedication to Hercules discovered in Rome, in *castra peregrina*⁵⁷. The cases of Tullius Romulus from Gabii and Mascarpus Festus from Laus Pompeia are similar⁵⁸. Interestingly, the Italian inscriptions repeat the following pattern three times: a father, who does not belong to the *ordo equester*, funds an inscription on behalf of himself and his son, who achieved the status of *equus*. The son's social promotion was a source of pride for a Roman centurion (Aurelius Bassinus, the father of Sabinus)⁵⁹, a veteran from Gabii, and a *sevir* from Laus Pompeia. M. Aurelius Decimus from Numidia was another new *equus* who mentioned his previously held office of *princeps peregrinorum*⁶⁰. The Greek, typically slave *cognomen* leads us to believe that Q. Magnius Eutyches was another newcomer to the equestrian order⁶¹. In all these cases it may be assumed that we are dealing with *equites* whose social activity did not go beyond the municipal boundaries, which placed them in the category described as the "local elite".

The analysis of foundations by representatives of the highest *ordines* leads to the conclusion that they created sacred inscriptions mainly when the office they held demanded it (it was a way to meet the expectations of their environment) or when the prestige of the sanctuary gave their foundation proper propaganda values (the honorific and euergetic aspect). If members of the highest *ordines* appear among the founders of sacred inscriptions in other circumstances, they are usually "new people" in the Roman social elite. The inscriptions from the sanctuary at Tibur, or the centre of the cult of Hercules at Băile Herculane in Dacia, or the late foundations of *praefectus Urbi* and *praefectus annonae*, prove that only exceptional circumstances saw an increased involvement of representatives of the imperial elite in the sphere of epigraphy in question.

2.3. The municipal elite

2.3.1. Italy

The first observation about dedications by members of the Italian municipal elites concerns their very uneven distribution on the peninsula. Almost all of them are from Transpadana; moreover, apart from a few exceptions, they are

⁵⁷ *CIL* VI 273 = SPEIDEL 1994: 66, n° 34. For more information on the context of this foundation, see WOJCIECHOWSKI 2005: 158.

⁵⁸ *CIL* XIV 2789 = *CIL* VI 341; GRANINO CECERE 1987: 137; *CIL* V 6349.

⁵⁹ Their inscription is one of the earliest testimonies of the promotion of centurions' sons to the equestrian order; see DOBSON 1993: 206.

⁶⁰ *CIL* VIII 4578.

⁶¹ *CIL* VIII 12000.

clustered around Milan. As many as five inscriptions by members of the *ordo decurionum* or their relatives were found in Milan and its surrounding area⁶². The local elite also included the *pontifex* Blandius Priscus, who erected an altar to Hercules together with his father (C. Blandius Secundinus) and brother (Blandius Agricola); they referred to themselves as inhabitants of Mediolanum⁶³. It may be surprising that the majority of the Milan decurions who dedicated inscriptions to Hercules belonged to the *seviri* corporation. In Milan it was more common than in other Italian cities to find free born men (*ingenui*) among the *seviri*, and the above examples show that members of the *ordo decurionum* also sometimes happened to be among them⁶⁴. It is difficult to say exactly why there were so many members of Milan elites in the group of founders of inscriptions dedicated to Hercules. I do not believe that the divine hero's strong position in the local pantheon is a sufficient explanation⁶⁵. Local tradition could have been very influential as well; perhaps it was customary to combine the receiving of municipal offices with foundations dedicated to Hercules⁶⁶. It is easier to explain why C. Domitius (an official, probably *duumvir*, from Pola on the Adriatic coast) became involved in the building or restoration of the temple of Hercules⁶⁷. The inscription with the information about the foundation is severely damaged, but it seems to have been about the building or restoration of the temple of Hercules, conducted on the orders of the city council and supervised by Domitius: [--- *aedem*] *Herculis d(e) d(ecurionum) s(ententia) c(uravit)*. The participation of the city authorities in the restoration of a sanctuary of Hercules is completely understandable in this case: Hercules was the official patron of the city, whose full name was *Colonia Iulia Pola Herculanea*.

Apart from Cisalpine Gaul, epigraphic traces of the involvement of representatives of the municipal elites in the cult of Hercules were only found at Interamna Lirenas. The founder of two altars devoted to the deity, M. Procilius Augustalis, probably did not belong to the *ordo decurionum*, but there is no doubt that he belonged to the elite, since one of the above-mentioned altars was put up by Augustalis on behalf of his son, M. Procilius Maximianus, who held

⁶² *CIL* V 5768, 6345, 6347 = 6349. See PETRACCIA LUCERNONI 1988: 276–278, n° 444 and 447.

⁶³ *CIL* V 6345.

⁶⁴ On the legal and social status of the *Augustales* in Italy, see ABRAMENKO 1993; ŁOŚ 1996: 251–267.

⁶⁵ In fact the conviction about the popularity of the cult of Hercules in *regio* XI is largely due to the fact that numerous inscriptions dedicated to the divine hero by members of the social elite have been found there.

⁶⁶ A suggestion put forward by PASCAL (1964: 161).

⁶⁷ *I.It.* X 1, 5.

the office of *quattuorvir iuri dicundo* at Interamna Lirenas⁶⁸. No other traces of the cult of Hercules have been found at Interamna, which might seem to blur the clear picture of epigraphic activity of members of the local elites, who have so far appeared among the founders of dedications to Hercules in such centres where the cult of the divine hero was popular and also functioned in the public sphere. However, there are reasons to believe that Hercules also occupied a prominent place in the pantheon of Interamna. According to local accounts, the oldest church in the city (present-day Ausonia) was constructed on the spot where a sanctuary of Hercules had stood. The existence of a sanctuary of Hercules in the region is further supported by the fact that the Roman road connecting Interamna with the *via Appia* was called the *Herculanea*⁶⁹. Epigraphic testimonies connected with the cult of the divine hero have been found in nearby Aquinum, where there used to be a *collegium cultorum Herculis*⁷⁰.

2.3.2. The Provinces

Outside Italy, the presence of the municipal elites among the founders of inscriptions dedicated to Hercules is best attested to in Africa and Dacia (see below). Epigraphic material from the other provinces contributes very few and scattered traces of the involvement of the local elites in the cult of Hercules⁷¹.

We know the names of as many as ten members of elites from African cities who decided to fund inscriptions dedicated to Hercules. This relatively high number is mostly composed of the foundations of the African *flamines* and *sacerdotes*⁷². Two altars dedicated to Hercules funded by the *decuriones* have also been found there⁷³. Scant knowledge about the cult of Hercules in Africa makes it impossible to determine whether the number of dedications by members of the municipal elites is in any way related to Hercules' position in the local pantheon. The information provided by the epigraphic evidence from the city of Calama in Numidia can certainly be treated as a sign of such a link. The coincidence is as follows: the cult of Hercules in the city was public, and the

⁶⁸ *CIL* X 5366; KAJAVA 1996: 191, n° 23. The second inscription contained information about the restoration and dedication of a monument founded earlier by one Q. Turranius Fonteianus (*AE* 1996, 334); see KAJAVA 1996: 192 f., n° 24.

⁶⁹ KAJAVA 1996: 193.

⁷⁰ *CIL* X 5386 (BRANCATO 1993: 66).

⁷¹ The *decuriones* also appear in Pannonia (*CIL* III 10836 = MROZEWICZ 1989: 71, n° 69; *AE* 1972, 409 = FITZ 1962: 629, n° 30 = MROZEWICZ 1989: 69, n° 51; *CIL* III 4388 = JACZYNSKA 1978: 102, n° 207 = MROZEWICZ 1989: 78 f., n° 71 = GINESTET 1991: 261, n° 225), Dalmatia (*AE* 1983, 740) and Germania (*AE* 1929, 107 = MROZEWICZ 1989: 34, n° 8).

⁷² *CIL* VIII 5291, 8246, 8247, 8807, 20145; *ILAlg.* I 2049; *AE* 1975, 886.

⁷³ *CIL* VIII 5292, 8807.

founders of inscriptions dedicated to him included only representatives of the local aristocracy (*sacerdos* C. Iulius C. f. Quir. [---]us and *quattuorvir* L. Vibius Saturninus)⁷⁴.

Members of the municipal elites were also attracted to the centre of the cult of Hercules at Ad Mediam in Dacia (Băile Herculane), where, as we remember, dedications funded by provincial governors and equestrian officials have also been found. If we accept MOMMSEN's reading of the inscription *CIL* III 1570, P. Claudius Iulius was a member of the *ordo decurionum* at Drobeta; his dedication was found in Băile Herculane⁷⁵. An altar erected by Q. Vibius Amillus, who came to the sanctuary of Hercules from the capital of the province, Sarmizegetuza, where he was an *Augustalis*⁷⁶, was also found there. The collection of Dacian dedications by members of the local elites is completed by inscriptions by the *sacerdotes* from Apulum and Potaissa⁷⁷.

Unfortunately, so far the activity of the local elites related to sacred epigraphy has not been the subject of a separate study. Historians who come across this issue in the course of their research on cults usually merely state briefly that the municipal elites rarely participated in sacred foundations⁷⁸. It would be difficult not to agree with this statement. Unfortunately, this is just as often the basis for bizarre conclusions about the "folk" character of a given cult. Based on the analysis of source data quoted above, we cannot draw definite conclusions concerning the reasons for the presence or absence of the municipal elites among the founders of inscriptions dedicated to Hercules in various regions of the empire. At most, we can come away with the impression that in some regions (mainly Northern and Central Italy, Africa and Dacia) there were factors contributing

⁷⁴ The same city was the place where an inscription was found in which the sons of a local *eques*, Julius Q. f. Rusticianus, give information about the restoration of a statue of Hercules, among other things (the inscription is not sacred and it is not dedicated to Hercules Augustus, according to P. CORBIER 1974: 98); see *CIL* VIII 5367.

⁷⁵ *CIL* III 1570: P. Claudius Iulius, *dec(urio) col(oniae) Drub(etae)*. Such a reading is also accepted by BĂRBULESCU (1977: 176, n° 21). *IDR* III 1, 62 differs (does not find the letters *dec.*, which MOMMSEN saw). The founder of this dedication will also not be found on the list of members of the Drobeta aristocracy compiled by MROZEWICZ (1989: 119 f.).

⁷⁶ *CIL* III 1572.

⁷⁷ *CIL* III 7681 = MROZEWICZ 1989: 124, n° 146 and 147; *CIL* III 7751 = MROZEWICZ 1989: 116, n° 77. Dacia (Aqua) was also the place where the dedication by M. Opellius Maximus from Moesia was found. He was a *decurio* of Montana, a quasi-municipium in Moesia Inferior (*IDR* II 142; see MROZEWICZ 1989: 103, n° 89). DEVIJVER (1976–1980: 67, A47) identifies P. Aelius Maximus *a mil(itii)s*, the founder of the Herculean inscription *AE* 1977, 702, with a *duumvir* of Napoca of the same name (also *a militiis*: *AE* 1969–1970, 548); see also MROZEWICZ 1989: 120, n° 104. It seems, however, that drawing such definite conclusions solely on the basis of the founder's onomastics is unfounded; all the parts of his name were very popular in the period to which the inscription of the *duumvir* of Napoca is dated (after 222).

⁷⁸ See for example DORCEY 1992: 115, discussing the cult of Silvanus: "Without question, the upper class had little interest in Silvanus".

to the increased interest of members of municipal elites in the cult of Hercules (the case of the Numidian city of Calama is particularly convincing). It would certainly be interesting to establish whether there is observable increased epigraphic activity among the elites in these territories (the natural consequence of which would be greater participation of members of this group among the founders of inscriptions devoted to Hercules) or whether specific features of the cult in a given area were decisive⁷⁹. As an illustration, M. CLAUSS' studies on the social structure of the *cultores Mithrae* in Africa do not confirm an increase in the activity of the local aristocracy with regard to sacred epigraphy. On the contrary, not even one representative of the local elite can be found among the founders of African inscriptions dedicated to Mithras. In my opinion, this supports the theory that the decisive factor influencing epigraphic activity of the (not only municipal) elites was the character of the cult of Hercules in a given centre. The cult's strong roots in the local tradition and the divine hero's leading role in the official city pantheon attracted members of the elite⁸⁰, who reached for sacred inscriptions as one of the means of social communication and self-presentation.

Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAMENKO 1993: A. ABRAMENKO, *Die munizipale Mittelschicht im kaiserlichen Italien: zu einem neuen Verständnis von Sevirat und Augustalität*, Frankfurt 1993.
- ALFÖLDY 1969: G. ALFÖLDY, *Fasti Hispanienses. Senatorische Reichsbeamte und Offiziere in den spanischen Provinzen des Römischen Reiches von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Wiesbaden 1969.
- 1985: G. ALFÖLDY, *Eine kaiserliche Widmung in der Stadt Tucci*, ZPE LIX 1985, pp. 189–199.
- BARBIERI 1952: G. BARBIERI, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193–285)*, Roma 1952.
- BĂRBULESCU 1977: M. BĂRBULESCU, *Cultul lui Hercules in Dacia Romana I*, Acta Musei Napocensis XIV 1977, pp. 173–199.
- 1978: M. BĂRBULESCU, *Cultul lui Hercules in Dacia Romana II*, Acta Musei Napocensis XV 1978, pp. 219–233.
- BLOCH 1945: H. BLOCH, *A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West*, HThR XXXVIII 1945, pp. 199–241.
- BRANCATO 1993: N.G. BRANCATO, *I sodalizi in onore di Ercole*, Roma 1993.
- CAMODECA 1980: G. CAMODECA, *Ricerche sui curatores rei publicae*, ANRW II 13 (1980), pp. 453–534.
- CASTAGNOLI 1949: F. CASTAGNOLI, *Documenti di scavi eseguiti in Roma negli anni 1860–1970*, BCAR LXXIII 1949–1950, pp. 125–187.
- CHASTAGNOL 1960: A. CHASTAGNOL, *La préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire*, Paris 1960 (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines d'Alger 24).

⁷⁹ CLAUSS 1992: 266.

⁸⁰ See for example the participation of the municipal elite of Aquileia in the cult of Belenus, the patron of the city (WOJCIECHOWSKI 2001: 45–50).

- 1962: A. CHASTAGNOL, *Les fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1962.
- CHRIST 1980: K. CHRIST, *Grundfragen der römischen Sozialstruktur*, in: W. ECK, H. GALSTERER, H. WOLFF (eds.), *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte. Festschrift Friedrich Vittinghoff*, Köln-Wien 1980, pp. 197–229.
- CLAUSS 1992: M. CLAUSS, *Cultores Mithrae. Die Anhängerschaft des Mithras-Kultes*, Stuttgart 1992.
- COARELLI 1992: F. COARELLI, *Il Foro Boario. Dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica*, Roma 1992.
- M. CORBIER 1973: M. CORBIER, *Les circonscriptions judiciaires de l'Italie de Marc-Aurèle à Aurélien*, MEFRA LXXXV 1973, pp. 609–690.
- P. CORBIER 1974: P. CORBIER, *Hercule africain, divinité indigène?*, DHA I 1974, pp. 95–104.
- DEVIJVER 1976–1980: H. DEVIJVER, *Prosopographia militarium equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum*, vols. I–III, Leuven 1976–1980, Suppl. 1987, 1993.
- DOBSON 1993: B. DOBSON, *The Centurionate and Social Mobility during the Principate*, in: D.J. BREEZE, B. DOBSON (eds.), *Roman Officers and Frontiers*, Stuttgart 1993, pp. 201–217 (Mavors 10).
- DORCEY 1992: P.F. DORCEY, *The Cult of Silvanus. A Study in Roman Folk Religion*, Leiden 1992.
- ECK 1989: W. ECK, *Religion und Religiosität in der soziopolitischen Führungsschicht der Hohen Kaiserzeit*, in: IDEM (ed.), *Religion und Gesellschaft in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Kolloquium zu Ehren von Friedrich Vittinghoff*, Köln-Wien 1993, pp. 15–51.
- FITZ 1962: J. FITZ, *Sanctuaires d'Hercule en Pannonie*, in: *Hommages à Albert Granier*, vol. II, Bruxelles 1962, pp. 623–638 (Collection Latomus 58).
- FRIGGIERI 1991: R. FRIGGIERI, *Are dedicate da L. Domitius Permissus*, in: L. NISTA (ed.), *Sacellum Herculis. Le structure del tempio di Ercole a Trastevere*, Roma 1991, pp. 69–72.
- GATTI 1889: G. GATTI, *Trovamenti riguardanti la topografia e la epigrafia urbana*, BCAR XVII 1889, pp. 35–49, 84–97.
- GINESTET 1991: P. GINESTET, *Les organisations de la jeunesse dans l'Occident Romain*, Bruxelles 1991 (Collection Latomus 213).
- GORDON 1963–1965: A.E. GORDON, *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions. Rome and the Neighborhood*, vols. I–III, Berkeley 1963–1965.
- GRANINO CECERE 1987: M.G. GRANINO CECERE, *Una dedica ad Ercole dall'Ager Gabinus*, MGR XII 1987, pp. 137–148.
- GREGORI 2000: G.L. GREGORI, *Iscrizioni e topografia religiosa di Roma: il sacello di Hercules Invictus Hesychianus*, in: G. PACI (ed.), *ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΑΙ. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini*, Tivoli (Roma) 2000, pp. 445–454.
- HÄHLING 1978: R. VON HÄHLING, *Die Religionszugehörigkeit hohen Amtsträger des Römischen Reiches seit Constantins I. Alleinherrschaft bis zum Ende der Theodosianischen Dynastie (324–450 bzw. 455 n. Ch.)*, Bonn 1978.
- JACQUES 1983: F. JACQUES, *Les curateurs des cités dans l'Occident romain de Trajan à Gallien. Étude prosopographique*, Paris 1983.
- JACZYNOWSKA 1978: M. JACZYNOWSKA, *Les associations de la jeunesse romaine sous le Haut-Empire*, Wrocław 1978.
- 1981: M. JACZYNOWSKA, *Le culte de l'Hercule romain au temps du Haut-Empire*, ANRW II 17, 2 (1981), pp. 631–661.
- KAJAVA 1996: M. KAJAVA, *Nuove iscrizioni dal Lazio meridionale*, in: H. SOLIN (ed.), *Studi storico-epigrafici sul Lazio antico*, Roma 1996, pp. 187–220.
- KOLB 1993: A. KOLB, *Die kaiserliche Bauverwaltung in der Stadt Rom. Geschichte und Aufbau der cura operum publicorum unter dem Prinzipat*, Stuttgart 1993.
- KUHOFF 1983: W. KUHOFF, *Studien zur zivilen senatorischen Laufbahn im 4. Jahrhundert n. Ch. Ämter und Amtsinhaber in Clarissimät und Spektabilität*, Frankfurt/M.–Bern 1983.
- LANCIANI 1989–2002: R. LANCIANI, *Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno le collezioni romane di antichità*, Roma 1989–2002.
- LATTE 1967: K. LATTE, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, München 1967 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft V 4).

- LEUNISSEN 1989: P.M. LEUNISSEN, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.)*, Amsterdam 1989.
- ŁOŚ 1996: A. ŁOŚ, “Dobrze urodzeni” i “dorobkiewiczze”. *Studium socjologiczne elit miast kampanijskich od Augusta do Domicjana*, Wrocław 1996.
- MROZEWICZ 1989: L. MROZEWICZ, *Arystokracja municypalna w rzymskich prowincjach nad Renem i Dunajem w okresie Wczesnego Cesarstwa*, Poznań 1989.
- MERRIMAN 1975: J.F. MERRIMAN, *Aristocratic and Imperial Patronage of the Decorative Arts in Rome and Constantinople, A.D. 337–395: The Role of Sculpture, Painting, Mosaics, and the Minor Arts in Fourth Century Society*, Ann Arbor–London 1975.
- ORIA SEGURA 1996: M. ORIA SEGURA, *Hércules en Hispania: una aproximación*, Barcelona 1996.
- PASCAL 1964: C.B. PASCAL, *The Cults of Cisalpine Gaul*, Bruxelles 1965 (Collection Latomus 75).
- PASSERINI 1939: A. PASSERINI, *Le coorti pretorie*, Roma 1939.
- PAVIS D’ESCURAC 1976: H. PAVIS D’ESCURAC, *La préfecture de l’annone. Service administratif impérial d’Auguste à Constantin*, Paris–Roma 1976 (BEFAR 226).
- PETRACCIA LUCERNONI 1988: M.F. PETRACCIA LUCERNONI, *I questori municipali dell’Italia antica*, Roma 1988.
- PISO 1993: I. PISO, *Fasti provinciae Daciae*, vol. I: *Die senatorischen Amtsträger*, Bonn 1993 (Antiquitas. Reihe I: Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte 43).
- PURCELL 1983: N. PURCELL, *The apparitores: A Study in Social Mobility*, PBSR LI 1983, pp. 125–173.
- RITTER 1995: S. RITTER, *Hercules in der römischen Kunst. Von den Anfängen bis Augustus*, Heidelberg 1995 (Archäologie und Geschichte 5).
- RÜPKE 2002: J. RÜPKE, *Collegia sacerdotum. Religiöse Vereine in der Oberschicht*, in: U. EGELHAAF-GAISER, A. SCHÄFER (eds.), *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike. Untersuchungen zu Organisation, Ritual und Raumordnung*, Tübingen 2002, pp. 41–67.
- SCHEID 2007: J. SCHEID, *Les activités religieuses des magistrats romains*, in: R. HAENSCH, J. HEINRICH (eds.), *Herrschen und Verwalten. Der Alltag der römischen Administration in der Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Köln 2007, pp. 126–144.
- SCHRAUDOLPH 1993: E. SCHRAUDOLPH, *Römische Götterweihungen mit Reliefschmuck aus Italien. Altäre, Basen und Reliefs*, Heidelberg 1993 (Archäologie und Geschichte 2).
- SPEIDEL 1994: M. SPEIDEL, *Die Denkmäler der Kaiserreiter. Equites singulares Augusti*, Köln 1994.
- VÁRHELYI 2010: Z. VÁRHELYI, *The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire. Power and the Beyond*, Cambridge 2010.
- VITUCCI 1956: G. VITUCCI, *Ricerche sulla praefectura Urbi in età imperiale*, Roma 1956.
- WOJCIECHOWSKI 2001: P. WOJCIECHOWSKI, *Untersuchungen zu den Lokalkulten im römischen Aquileia. Herkunft, Charakter und Anhängerschaft*, Toruń 2001.
- 2005: P. WOJCIECHOWSKI, *Czyciele Herkulesa w Rzymie: studium epigraficzno-antroponomastyczne (I–IV w. n.e.)*, Toruń 2005.
- 2010: P. WOJCIECHOWSKI, “Hercules domus Ulpiorum”, in: D. MUSIAL (ed.), *Society and Religions: Studies in Greek and Roman History*, vol. III, Toruń 2010, pp. 49–54.
- WOJCIECHOWSKI, NEHRING 2004: P. WOJCIECHOWSKI, P. NEHRING, *Inskrypcje pretorskie dedykowane Herkulesowi przy Ara Maxima*, in: I. MIKOŁAJCZYK (ed.), *Sapere aude. Księga pamiątkowa ofiarowana profesorowi Marianowi Szarmachowi z okazji 65 rocznicy urodzin*, Toruń 2004, pp. 339–347.
- WYTZES 1977: J. WYTZES, *Der letzte Kampf des Heidentums in Rom*, Leiden 1977 (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’Empire romain 56).

THE ART OF ABUSE: SATIRE AND INVECTIVE
IN BYZANTINE LITERATURE
A PRELIMINARY SURVEY*

by

PRZEMYSŁAW MARCINIAK

ABSTRACT: This article discusses the Byzantine understanding of “satire” and “invective”. It argues that it is unwise to impose modern expectations and definitions on what we call Byzantine satire. It also shows that to find a clear-cut definition is simply impossible since Byzantine satire and invective are often interwoven and inseparable. Therefore, the main focus of the paper is on finding a theoretical framework for Byzantine satire and invective which is rooted in Byzantine writings rather than in modern definitions. There does not seem to be one designation which could be used as an “umbrella term” for Byzantine satirical production. Satire could be seen rather as a set of rhetorical strategies regulating tone, making satire more a mode than a firmly defined genre.

WHAT IS SATIRE? MODERN DEFINITIONS
AND A BYZANTINE VARIANT

As defined by the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, satire is an “artistic form, chiefly literary and dramatic, in which human or individual vices, follies, abuses, or shortcomings are held up to censure by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque, irony, parody, caricature, or other methods, sometimes with an intent to inspire social reform”¹. This definition summarises well the intent of texts described as “satirical” – they may mock an individual with a purpose, not just to amuse the audience or to destroy someone’s reputation. Their purpose should be to teach somebody a lesson and ultimately to reform his/her ways. As Ronald PAULSON says: “[Satire] must at the same time make the reader aware of a pointing finger, of an ought or ought not, that refers beyond the page to his own life, or – and this is not always the same thing – take a moral stand, make a judgment, and place or distribute blame”². However, as I will argue, such a moral standpoint is not

* This paper is part of research project no. UMO-2011/03/B/HS2/03618, financed by the Polish National Science Centre (NCN).

¹ <http://www.britannica.com/art/satire>, accessed on 29 May 2016.

² R. PAULSON, *The Fictions of Satire*, Baltimore 1967, p. 4.

always present in Byzantine “satirical texts”, making them, therefore, difficult to set apart from the related genre of invective³. The authors of the entry in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* seem to recognise this difficulty when they emphasise the criticism (that is, the means) but fail to discuss the ultimate aim of satire (that is, moral improvement):

[Satire] critical treatment in verse or prose, often by way of exaggeration or caricature, of the foibles of individuals, institutions, or society as a whole. Important in classical antiquity, satire was revived in Byz[antine] literature and rhetoric in the 11th C., but remained a minor genre, which could take many forms, including parody and allegory. Intentionality and not literary form determine what is satire⁴.

Therefore, according to the above definition, intentionality is the key factor in labelling a text a satire. However, whether or not texts were classified as “satirical” depended to a great extent on tradition, convention and, above all, interpretation. To give but one example, the *Katomyomachia* by Theodore Prodromos consistently appears on every list of Byzantine satires, and this has been the case since the seminal edition by Herbert HUNGER, who proposed the text was political satire⁵. However, this is a very doubtful interpretation. One of the main characters, Kreillos, is not a demagogue, as HUNGER describes him – his speech uses the traditional *topoi* of Byzantine rhetoric and makes fun of ancient tradition. The *Katomyomachia* is, thus, it seems, a mock-heroic text that was supposed to be a Byzantine continuation of *Batrachomyomachia*⁶. If intention determines what satire is, then the reader who cannot or will not determine the original author’s intention cannot be certain that judgments about what is and is not satirical are Byzantine or modern interpretations.

³ In recent years these texts have begun to be studied more intensely, yet until now there has been very little written about satire as a literary genre; see for instance M. KYRIAKIS, *Satire and Slapstick in Seventh and Twelfth Century Byzantium*, Byzantina V 1973, pp. 289–306. Late Byzantine vernacular satires enjoyed considerably more popularity in scholarly literature, see for instance *An Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds*, ed. and transl. by N. NICHOLAS, G. BALOGLOU, New York 2003. For a recent French translation of vernacular satires with some commentary see *Satires et parodies du moyen âge*, textes traduits et présentés par R. BOUCHET, Paris 2012.

⁴ ODB, s.v. Satire (authors: E.M. JEFFREYS and R. BROWNING). The author of the first scholarly article on Byzantine satire, H.F. TOZER (*Byzantine Satire*, JHS II 1881, pp. 233–270), was not concerned with methodological issues at all. TOZER discusses two works, the *Timarion* and the *Journey of Mazaris to Hades*. His choice was dictated mostly by the accessibility of material (p. 234). Vangos PAPAIOANNOU, the author of the only monograph on Byzantine satire (*Η Σάτιρα στη βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία*, Thessalonike 2000), is similarly uninterested in establishing a clear definition.

⁵ H. HUNGER, *Der byzantinische Katz-Mäuse-Krieg. Theodore Prodromus, Katomyomachia*, Graz 1968.

⁶ See the detailed analysis in K. WARCABA, *Imitatio et aemulatio Homeri w dwunastowiecznym Bizancjum. Studium „Katomyomachii” Teodora Prodromosa [“Imitatio et aemulatio Homeri in Twelfth-Century Byzantium. A Case-Study of the Katomyomachia by Theodore Prodromos”]*, Katowice 2016, unpublished PhD dissertation.

The authors of the *ODB* definition rightly recognise that it is equally unhelpful to define what satire is using generic markers (“[that is] not literary form [that] determine[s] what is satire”). As Matthew HODGART noted, satire, as opposed to other ancient literary genres, is not an effect of social developments and circumstances; it is not codified, described and equipped with literary and linguistic conventions⁷. In other words, it was not tied to certain events in the same way as, for instance, epinikion or drama. Therefore, an exact position of satire amongst the more “conventional” texts (that is, those equipped with certain conventions) is unclear⁸. Satire is the most protean of all literary genres – if the term “genre” can indeed be applied to a satirical text. Satire can perhaps better be thought of as a mode rather than a genre, identified as a certain irreverent treatment of other literary genres⁹. In other words, any literary genre could become satire or be partially satirical. Satire then is understood as a modal category rather than a clearly defined genre. Therefore, students of Byzantine literature counted among satirical texts genres including poems, dialogues modelled on Lucian, parodies of liturgical offices (*Spanos*)¹⁰, works which structurally resemble ancient dramas (e.g. *Dramation* by Michael Hapluchair), and finally satirical elements in texts that are principally serious (such as historiography)¹¹.

In what follows I intend to argue that it is unwise to impose modern expectations and definitions on what we call Byzantine satire. I will show that to find a clear-cut definition is simply impossible since Byzantine satire and invective are often interwoven and inseparable.

ANCIENT AND BYZANTINE TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

In ancient Greek literature there was no precise term to describe texts which today we label as satirical¹². Perhaps the closest designation would be the word

⁷ M. HODGART, *Satire: Origins and Principles*, New Brunswick, NJ 2010, p. 12.

⁸ J. WEISGERBER, *Satire as Means of Communication*, *Comparative Literature Studies* X 1973, p. 158: “[it is debated] whether satire is a literary genre *sui generis*, a *Zwischengattung*, or just a turn of mind; under what circumstances it is comic or serious; what relations it entertains with such traditional genres as the novel, poetry, or the theatre”.

⁹ L. SCHWARTZ LERNER, *Golden Age Satire: Transformations of Genre*, *Modern Language Notes* CV 1990, p. 260.

¹⁰ H. EIDENEIER (ed.), *Spanos: Eine byzantinische Satire in der Form einer Parodie*, Berlin–New York 1977 (*Supplementa Byzantina: Texte und Untersuchungen*).

¹¹ For a similar situation in medieval Latin satire, see J. SZÖVÉRFY, *Secular Latin Lyrics and Minor Poetic Forms of the Middle Ages. A Historical Survey and Literary Repertory from the Tenth to the Late Fifteenth Century*, Concord, NH 1992, p. 347: “The term satire was rather loosely employed in the Middle Ages”. On medieval commentaries on ancient satires, see B. BISCHOFF, *Living with the Satirists*, in: R.R. BOLGAR (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 500–1500*, Cambridge 1971, pp. 83–94.

¹² The term “Menippean satire” was employed in modern times in the 16th c. when in 1594 *La Satyre Ménippée de la vertu du Catholicon d’Espagne* was published, see J. RELIHAN, *Ancient*

σίλλοι. This was the title of the poem (three books in hexameter) authored by Timon of Phlius (fl. ca. 250 BC) which ridiculed philosophical doctrines and schools¹³. Byzantine writers themselves were aware of the existence of such a genre: Michael Italikos enumerates *silloi*, along with epinikion and enkomion, as one of the literary genres (*Epist.* 32, 206, 6)¹⁴, while Eustathios of Thessalonike defines it as a type of comic poetry (*Comm. Il.* I 311: ποιήσεως εἶδος κωμικῆς). Eustathios links the word σιλλαίνειν with the Silens, probably drawing on the analogy between satire (in the ancient meaning of this word) and Satyrs¹⁵. Interestingly enough, Eustathios adds, using some unidentified ancient scholia, that the first author of *silloi* was not Xenophanes (who is credited with writing the first *silloi*) but Homer, who mocks Thersites, who in turn ridiculed the kings in the *Iliad* (*ibid.*: ἐν οἷς αὐτός τε τὸν Θερσίτην σιλλαίνει καὶ ὁ Θερσίτης τοὺς βασιλεῖς)¹⁶.

Bishop Eustathios' remark shows that the Byzantines understood *silloi* as a form of the invective¹⁷. This word is defined in such a way in Byzantine lexica¹⁸.

Menippean Satire, Baltimore 1993; H.D. WEINBROT, *Menippean Satire Reconsidered. From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*, Baltimore 2005, p. 4. See also E. COURTNEY, *Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire*, *Philologus* CVI 1962, pp. 86–100, who discusses the tradition of this genre.

¹³ *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton 1993, s.v. *silloi* (author: T.V.F. Brogan). Ancient *iambos* defined as “a poem of abuse intended to entertain an audience and/or embarrass a victim” is closer to the definition of invective than satire. See G. AGOSTI, *Late Antique Iambics and Iambikè Idea*, in: A. CAVARZERE, A. ALONI, A. BARCHIESI (eds.), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, Oxford 2001, pp. 219–255, here at 220: “Iambic therefore referred to a type of composition characterized by λοιδορία and αἰσχρολογία and by invective against a personal or ‘common’ enemy”. Formally *silloi* belong to the genre of *parodia* (which is not identical to modern parody), see D.L. CLAYMAN, *Timon of Phlius*, Berlin–New York 2009, p. 117.

¹⁴ Italikos lists poetic genres dedicated to people. His source is the list of Proclus' works from cod. 238 in the *Bibliotheca* by Photios.

¹⁵ See *Comm. Il.* I 311: Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ σίλλοι ποιήσεως εἶδος κωμικῆς καὶ οἱ ταύτην μετιόντες σιλλογράφοι ἐλέγοντο καὶ τὸ οὕτω παίζειν σιλλαίνειν ἐκαλεῖτο καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου ῥήματος καὶ οἱ Σιληνοί, δαίμονες τινες κομψοὶ τὰ εἰς ὄρχησιν καὶ εἰς Διουύσου τελετάς.

¹⁶ See also J.H. LESHER, *Xenophanes of Colophon. Fragments. A Text and Translation with a Commentary*, Toronto 2001, p. 203, A23.

¹⁷ It was described in a similar way by Diogenes Laertios (IX 111–112): “There are three silli in which, from his point of view as a Sceptic, he abuses everyone and lampoons (ὧν πάντας λοιδορεῖ καὶ σιλλαίνει) the dogmatic philosophers, using the form of parody. In the first he speaks in the first person throughout, the second and third are in the form of dialogues” (transl. by R.D. Hicks).

¹⁸ *Etymologicum magnum* 713 (12th c.): Σίλλοι: Ἐπισκώμματα, [...] τὸ σκώπτειν, ὡς λέγει Ἀνακρέων, Τίλλει τοὺς κυάμους ἀσπιδιώτης. Οἷον σκώπτει καὶ χλευάζει. Δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ χλευαστικὸν ποίημα: [...] ὁ γὰρ σίλλος λοιδορίας καὶ διασυρμούς πεφεισμένους ἀνθρώπων ἔχει. *Silloi* are jests which contain the element of abuse and mockery.

This was, however, antiquarian knowledge. Amongst the extant Byzantine texts there is no single piece of work identified by the term *silloi*.

The word σατυρικός in Byzantine literature usually means an author of satyr plays (Tzetzes, *Scholias in Lyc.* 70 about Pratinas), while σατυρικά denotes the satyr plays themselves¹⁹. Michael Italikos penned a letter to Theophanes where he lists texts which formed the *curriculum studiorum* he offered to his students. Among the various poetic genres he mentions is satiric poetry (γένος σατυρικόν)²⁰. Listing this genre after tragic and comic poetry suggests that Italikos means satyr drama. There are a few exceptions where *satyrikos* refers to satire rather than to satyr drama, but they do not contribute much to our understanding of Byzantine satire²¹. John Lydos (490–after 560) mentions Persius and calls him “a satirist” (*De mag.* 50, 2: Πέρσιος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος σατυρικός). Lydos knew the Latin satirical tradition (later completely forgotten and ignored in Byzantium) and accurately identifies Persius as a representative of it. Interestingly enough, the *Suda* (10th cent.), a later source, while discussing the Roman writer Juvenal, describes him only as a “poet” and not as a “satirist”²². Regardless of the etymology of the word “satire” (traditionally thought to derive from *satura lanx*), Lydos most likely uses the Latin word when he cannot find a proper Greek counterpart²³. The only other example (of which I am aware) in which the term *satyrika* is used to denote comic writings rather than satyr plays is in the *Prologue* of the twelfth century writer Nikephoros Basilakes. Basilakes uses this word while explaining that he destroyed his own satirical/comic writings²⁴ and describes his works as τῶν ἐμῶν σατυρικῶν (*Prologos* 5). The exact nature of these works

¹⁹ On various descriptions of satire, see N. BRUMMACK, *Zu Begriff und Theorie der Satire*, Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte XLV 1971, p. 276.

²⁰ P. GAUTIER (ed.), *Michel Italikos. Lettres et discours*, Paris 1972, *Epist.* 18, 158, 18–19: ἅπαν γένος βαρβίτων ἀνάπτωμαι, ἐποποιητικόν, τραγικόν, κωμικόν, σατυρικόν, καὶ οὔτε ἡ λύρα Ὀρφείως ἄπεστι τῆς εὐχαρίας, οὔτε ἡ Πινδαρική ᾠδή, οὔτε ἡ Σαπφική χάρις.

²¹ On the use of σατυρίζω to mean “parody”, “travesty”, see Clem. Al. *Protr.* IV 58, 4: Σκηνὴν πεποιήκατε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸ θεῖον ὑμῖν δράμα γεγένηται καὶ τὸ ἅγιον προσωπεῖοις δαιμονίων κεκωμωδήκατε, τὴν ἀληθῆ θεοσέβειαν δεισιδαιμονία σατυρίσαντες [“You have turned heaven into a stage. You look upon the divine nature as a subject for drama. Under the masks of daemons you have made comedy of that which is holy. For the true worship of God you have substituted a travesty, the fear of daemons”, transl. by G.W. BUTTERWORTH].

²² *Suidae Lexicon* (ed. A. ADLER, vols. 1–5, Lipsiae 1928–1938) s.v.: Ἰουβενάλιος, ποιητὴς Ῥωμαῖος. οὗτος ἦν ἐπὶ Δομετιανοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων. ὁ δὲ Δομετιανὸς ἐφίλει τὸν ὀρχηστὴν τοῦ πρασίνου μέρους, τὸν λεγόμενον Πάριν, περὶ οὗ καὶ ἐλοιδορεῖτο ἀπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου καὶ Ἰουβενάλιου τοῦ ποιητοῦ. ὅστις βασιλεὺς ἐξώρισε τὸν Ἰουβενάλιον ἐν Πενταπόλει ἐπὶ τὴν Λιβύην, τὸν δὲ ὀρχηστὴν πλουτίσας ἔπεμψεν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ: ὅς κτίσας οἶκον καὶ λουτρὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἐκεῖ τελευτᾷ. The source of this information was the chronicle by John Malalas (Ioann. Mal. 263).

²³ On the difference between the term “satire” and the Latin word *satura* see G.L. HENDRICKSON, *Satura tota nostra est*, CPh XXII 1927, pp. 56 ff.

²⁴ A. GARZYA (ed.), *Nicephori Basilacae orationes et epistolae*, Leipzig 1984, A, p. 5, 5.

remains unknown, but they certainly had nothing in common with satyr plays. It would, however, be extremely tempting to see Basilakes' use of the word satire as proof that the Byzantines understood the word *satyrikos/satyrika* as having a wider meaning, one etymologically closer to the modern word "satire"²⁵.

We should also remember that none of the terms which were used in connection with satire and invective were defined exhaustingly; this equally applies also to rhetorical tools which were described in Antiquity. Theodore Prodromos speaks in one of his poems (59, 3–8) about a related literary term, *psogos*:

χωροῦμεν εἰς ἄμυναν ἐχθροῦ Βαρέος
ἢ καρτεροῦμεν τὴν παροιμίαν πάλιν;
τηροῦμεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἐνόρκους ἐγγύσας
μὴ κάλαμον ξέοντες εἰς γράμμα **ψόγου**
ἢ λύσομεν τὸν ὄρκον εὐόρκῳ λόγῳ
καὶ τὴν πονηρὰν στηλιτεύσομεν φύσιν.

Whether to take revenge on my enemy Barys
or to suffer yet another slander patiently?
Should I keep my own oath
not to write even a letter of invective (*psogos*)?
Or should I break the oath with a poem which keeps the oath
and publicly scorn his malicious nature?

In this text, *psogos* seems to be understood as a device powered by the fact that it is directed against a real person either named or easily identified by the intended audience. In his letter to Alexios Aristenos, Prodromos refers to Julian the Apostate's *Misopogon* as being written under the pretence of *psogos* (ἐν προσχήματι ψόγου)²⁶. It is uncertain if Prodromos applies the term *psogos* to the entire text or only to the specific passage in which Julian describes his unkempt (philosophical) beard. The former is not impossible (modern interpreters also tend to classify the entire text as an example of *psogos*)²⁷ and Julian creatively uses *psogos* for his own purpose (that is ridiculing the people of Antioch)²⁸. It thus seems that *psogos* could have been applied "both in general and to a particular", as Aphthonius says in his definition of invective, and

²⁵ On *satyrikos/satiricus* meaning "scriptor saturarum", see HENDRICKSON, *op. cit.* (n. 23), p. 59.

²⁶ PG CXXXIII, col. 1253. The newest (as yet unpublished) edition: M. OP DE COUL, *Théodore Prodrome. Lettres et discours: édition, traduction, commentaire*, PhD thesis Paris 2007, pp. 89–91 (letter no. 4): καίτοι καὶ Συνέσιον οἶδα τὴν φαλάκραν καλλωπισάμενον καὶ Ἰουλιανόν γε οὐκ ἄγνωῶ τὸν οἰκεῖον, ὡς ἐν προσχήματι ψόγου, σεμνύμαντα πώγωνα ["Furthermore I do know that Synesios boasted of baldness and it is not unknown to me that Julian, under the pretence of *psogos*, praised his own beard"].

²⁷ A. QUIROGA, *Julian's Misopogon and the Subversion of Rhetoric*, *Antiquité Tardive* XVII 2009, pp. 128 f.

²⁸ *Misopogon* is a peculiar text since Julian, author/narrator, is both the subject and the object of his own invective.

could be used to ridicule a specific person and a more general subject²⁹. I would argue that, especially for the Byzantines, the definition of *psogos* included in the *Progymnasmata* is a general guide rather than a strict rule. *Psogos* is the most important codified “exercise” which could be used (partially or wholly) while writing satires and invectives. There were, however, other terms which were used by Byzantine writers to describe texts whose primary function was to ridicule.

Semantically close to terms such as *psogos* and *loidoria* is the word *comedy* (κωμωδία). In a short treatise conventionally known as *Tractatus Coislinianus* (10th cent.?)³⁰, the following definition of *comedy* as opposed to *loidoria* can be found:

διαφέρει ἡ κωμωδία τῆς λοιδορίας, ἐπεὶ ἡ μὲν λοιδορία ἀπαρακαλύπτως τὰ πρόσωπα κακὰ διέξεισιν, ἡ δὲ δεῖται τῆς καλουμένης ἐμφάσεως³¹.

Comedy differs from abuse since abuse rehearses without concealment the bad (actions and qualities) attaching (to people) but (comedy) requires so-called innuendo.

This definition is undoubtedly of ancient origin but what is important is the juxtaposition of comedy and abuse. Their ends are similar but their means vary. JANKO translates ἐμφάσις as “innuendo” or “fantasy” while SANTORO assumes that the anonymous author rather means *elocutio*³². What these definitions suggests is that invective is direct while comedy (and, by extension, satire) requires what FRYE called “a token fantasy”³³.

The word κωμωδία widens its traditional meaning to also signify mockery/satire, and it loses its genetic relationship with a precisely defined literary genre³⁴. In his *Bibliotheca* (cod. 128), Photios says about Lucian: καὶ ἀπλῶς, ὡς ἔφημεν, κωμωδία τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐστὶν αὐτῷ ἡ σπουδὴ ἐν λόγῳ πεζῷ [“and simply, as I said, his effort is [writing] comedy of the Hellenes in prose”]³⁵. Photios interprets Lucian as a comedy writer; his satires, which mock the pagans and their gods, are effectively comedies written in prose. There are examples of such comedies (which can also be seen as elaborate *psogoi*) in Byzantine

²⁹ *Progymnasmata* 111.

³⁰ F. SANTORO, *Tratado Coisliniano*, Letras Clásicas VII 2003, pp. 275–281; R. JANKO, *Aristotle on Comedy. Towards a Reconstruction of Poetics II*, London 1984.

³¹ JANKO, *op. cit.* (n. 30), p. 36.

³² *Ibidem*, p. 37; SANTORO, *op. cit.* (n. 30), p. 37.

³³ N. FRYE, *Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays*, Princeton 1957, p. 224.

³⁴ On the meaning of the word “comedy” as satire, see W. PUCHNER, *Zur Geschichte der antiken Theaterterminologie im nachantiken Griechisch*, WSt CXIX 2006, p. 86. See also P. ROILLOS, *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Greek Novel*, Washington 2005, p. 229.

³⁵ R. HENRY (ed.), *Photius: Bibliothèque*, vol. 2, Paris 1960, pp. 102 f.

literature – the famous *Comedy of (S)Katablattas* and another satirical piece written by Theodore II Laskaris³⁶. Both texts are in fact personal invectives. The *Comedy of (S)Katablattas* is, moreover, a reworking of Aristophanic comedies that reinforces the Byzantine meaning of the word “comedy” as satire/invective by referring to its ancient master³⁷.

The term κωμωδία is also used by Michael Psellos in his poem *Against the Monk Sabbaita* (line 310) to describe his text, which is in fact a vitriolic invective directed against a monk who had apparently slandered Psellos³⁸. In the codex Vaticanus Palat. gr. 386 (siglum Sp. 16th cent.) it is titled (regardless of whether if it was the author’s choice or the title was given later by a scribe) in the following way: Τοῦ φιλοσοφωτάτου κυροῦ Μιχαήλου τοῦ Ψελλοῦ· στίχοι ἰαμβικοί πρὸς τὸν μοναχὸν Σαββαίτην· σκοπτικοί (I. σκωπτικοί)³⁹. Στίχοι σκωπτικοί (“mocking verses”) refer to an old tradition which, once again, can be traced to the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, in which fragment VIII reads: ὁ σκώπτων ἐλέγχειν θέλει ἀμαρλήματα τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος [“the joker aims to expose the faults of mind and body”, transl. by R. JANKO]⁴⁰. What is more, Psellos twice (lines 306 and 314) uses the word ἴαμβος to inscribe the text within the traditional discourses of both invective and satire⁴¹. Psellos’ poem is especially interesting because it shows how many different words were used to describe invective.

However, it is difficult to see a pattern in the use of these descriptors. The opposition prose–verse does not seem to play a major role here. The agonistic exchange of invectives in dodecasyllable between John Geometres and Stylianos ends with Geometres telling Stylianos to „keep away from mockery (comedy)”⁴². Moreover, the terms described above refer rather to what we call invective, not satire. However, the demarcation line is not so obvious and perhaps should be

³⁶ J. ARGYROPOULOS, *La comédie de Katablattas: Invective byzantine du XV^e siècle*, Diptycha III 1982–1983, pp. 5–97; L. TARTAGLIA (ed.), *Teodoro II Duca Lascari: Satira del pedagogo*, Napoli 1992, p. 17: κυροῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δούκα κωμωδία.

³⁷ P. MARCINIAK, *Greek Drama in Byzantine Times*, Katowice 2003, pp. 86 f.

³⁸ See F. CONCA, *La lingua e lo stile dei carmi satirici di Psello (Contro il Sabbaita; Contro il Monaco Iacopo)*, Eikasmos XII 2001, pp. 187–196; E. V. MALTESE, *Osservazioni sul carne Contro il Sabbaita di Michele Psello*, in: A. M. TARAGNA (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale: Atti del II Convegno Internazionale di Studi*, Alessandria 2004, pp. 207–214. A thorough analysis of the poem can be found in F. BERNARD, *Writing and Reading. Byzantine Secular Poetry 1025–1081*, Oxford 2014, pp. 280–290.

³⁹ On this title, see A. RHOBY, *Labelling Poetry in the Middle and Late Byzantine Period*, Byzantion LXXXV 2015, pp. 19 f.

⁴⁰ RHOBY (*op. cit.* [n. 39], p. 20) points also to the ninth book of the *Anthologia Graeca* (Συμποτικά καὶ σκωπτικά).

⁴¹ BERNARD, *op. cit.* (n. 38), p. 50.

⁴² E. VAN OPSTALL, *The pleasure of mudslinging: an invective dialogue in verse from 10th century Byzantium*, ByzZ CVIII 2015, p. 776, v. 35.

looked for somewhere else. In a letter to a friend, the fourteenth century writer Constantine Acropolites criticises the twelfth-century satire *Timarion* as a pagan text which ridicules the Christians⁴³. Acropolites, who openly dislikes both the book and its author, describes the text as *lerodia* (ληρωδίαν μάλλον εἰπεῖν⁴⁴). He also employs a term which is not emotionally charged – δρᾶμα.

The term δρᾶμα acquired a new and much wider range of meanings than it had in Antiquity⁴⁵. In the Byzantine period, both ancient and twelfth-century novels were described as dramas⁴⁶. In his study of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, WALDEN also discusses Byzantine testimonies, concluding:

The δρᾶμα as thus understood, then, would be a narrative or description of any sort that told about happenings, adventures, whether those happenings were within the bounds of possibility and probability or not; whether they (and the πρόσωπα) were pure inventions of the author or not⁴⁷.

Drama was thus understood not as a term referring to a particular genre but rather as a signal that the *Timarion* was categorised as belonging to fictitious narratives; texts which can be described as πεπλασμένοι. The same term was used by Alexios Makrembolites, who, while allegorically interpreting the satire *Loukios e onos*, also described it as *drama*⁴⁸. Similarly, the satire *Porikologos* ("Fruit-Book") is described in one manuscript (Vind. theol. gr. 244) as διήγησις, therefore also highlighting its narrative form. I would thus suggest that if we were to attempt to define or categorise the satirical texts that have been handed down to us, it would be safer to separate narratives (such as the *Timarion*, *Mazaris* and the vernacular satires) from non-narrative texts rather than divide them into invectives and satires.

⁴³ R. ROMANO (ed.), *Pseudo-Luciano: Timarione. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione, commentario e lessico*, Napoli 1974, pp. 42–45. First edition in M. TREU, *Ein Kritiker des Timarion*, ByzZ I 1892, pp. 361–365.

⁴⁴ "F frivolous talk". See μυθικὰς ληρωδίας in Prodromos' *Rhodante and Dosikles* III 396, "mythological nonsense". Perhaps Akropolites means this kind of nonsense, especially taking into consideration the contents of the *Timarion*.

⁴⁵ B. PERRY, *The Ancient Romances. A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1967, p. 74: "When ancient writers speak of tragedy, comedy or drama, they are as likely to be thinking of the nature and quality of a composition as of its structural pattern, which may be that of prose narrative or bucolic poetry or of some other sort of writing, as well as what we call in a narrower and more formal sense tragedy, comedy or drama".

⁴⁶ PUCHNER, *op. cit.* (n. 34), pp. 79–81.

⁴⁷ J.W.H. WALDEN, *Stage-Terms in Heliodorus's Aethiopica*, HSCPh V 1894, p. 22.

⁴⁸ A. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, *Ἀλεξίου τοῦ Μακρεμβολίτου ἀλληγορία εἰς τὸν Λούκιον ἢ ὄνον*, *Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveščeniija* 1899, p. 20: Αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ τοῦ δράματος ὑπόθεσις.

SATIRE VS. INVECTIVE?

What complicates the picture of Byzantine satire even further is the fact that the texts classified as satirical in fact form a very heterogeneous group. It is often very difficult to make a clear distinction between satire and invective – if, as I argue, such a distinction was important for Byzantine writers in the first place. While the constitutive feature of satire is to mock and highlight human faults, to make the reader aware of evil or ugliness in the Aristotelian sense, the main aim of invective is to destroy someone's reputation or to attack them personally⁴⁹. Invective, and especially personal invective, is in Byzantium a form of social and personal rivalry⁵⁰. Only very rarely do we find in the sources admonitions directed against the idea of ridiculing and mocking people⁵¹. Invective often employs similar tools and mechanisms to satire. It may also share its sense of humour with satirical texts⁵². Both invective and satire, may, however, make fun of someone, but do not necessarily have to be funny themselves⁵³. The “culture of invectives” is a significant feature of Byzantine literary discourse⁵⁴, and its integral, perhaps its most basic, element, *psogos*, was part of the standard *curriculum*

⁴⁹ For the definition of invective, see S. KOSTER, *Die Invective in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Meisenheim an Glan 1980, p. 39: “Die Invective ist eine strukturierte literarische Form, deren Ziel es ist, mit allen geeigneten Mitteln eine namentlich genannte Person öffentlich vor dem Hintergrund der jeweils geltenden Werte und Normen als Persönlichkeit herabzusetzen”.

⁵⁰ BERNARD, *op. cit.* (n. 38), pp. 269–275.

⁵¹ Constantine Manasses in the so-called *Carmen morale* points to the fact that it is better to laugh at yourself than mock your neighbour, see E. MILLER (ed.), *Poème moral de Constantin Manassès*, Annuaire de l'Association pour l'encouragement des études grecs en France IX 1875, p. 72, lines 838 ff. Certainly, as Gustav SOYTER has already noticed (*Humor und Satire in der Byzantinischen Literatur*, Bayerische Blätter für das Gymnasialschulwesen LXII 1928, pp. 147–162), the Byzantines did not really observe such a Christian-oriented policy on laughing: “Wenn die christlichen Grundsätze, wie sie Konstantin Manasses (um. 1100 bis 1150) in diesem Epigramm über ‘Das Lachen’ einschärft, in Byzanz stets befolgt worden wären, dann hatten die Byzantiner nur über die Vergänglichkeit alles Irdischen und über ihre eigenen Schwächen, nie aber über die Fehler oder das Mißgeschick eines Mitmenschen gelacht” (p. 147).

⁵² AS BERNARD, *op. cit.* (n. 38), p. 266 has noted, “[h]umour often has an aggressive purpose in Byzantium”.

⁵³ P. MAGDALINO, *Tourner en dérision à Byzance*, in: É. CROUZET-PAVAN, J. VERGER (eds.), *La dérision au Moyen Âge. De la pratique sociale au rituel politique*, Paris 2007, p. 55: “Dans ce sens, on peut tourner en dérision sans faire rire”.

⁵⁴ This feature of Byzantine literary discourse was also indirectly discussed by B. BALDWIN, *The Church Fathers and Lucian*, in: IDEM, *Roman and Byzantine Papers*, Amsterdam 1989 (London Studies in Classical Philology 21), p. 351.

*studiorum*⁵⁵. As Lynda GARLAND has noted, “a taste for abuse was an innate part of the Byzantine *mentalité* and a constituent of most Byzantine humour”⁵⁶.

It is, however, not always clear if a certain text is a personal attack against a real person or rather a piece of work where the object of attack is just a literary construct built upon literary clichés and traditions. To give just one example: when Constantine Rhodios (10th cent.) attacks Leo Choirosphaktes in his sophisticated poems, where one accusation is exactly one verse (one dodecasyllable)⁵⁷, it is obvious that we are dealing with a refined invective against an identifiable person⁵⁸. On the contrary, two Prodromic satires (12th cent.), *Against a Lustful Old Woman* and *Against an Old Man with a Long Beard*⁵⁹, which I have analysed elsewhere⁶⁰, provide an example of a much more confusing situation. They are both violent attacks, full of the (seemingly) unsophisticated abuse usually associated with personal invective⁶¹. Nonetheless, while *Against a Lustful Old Woman* is a literary play, which uses the traditional methods of depicting an old woman to discuss the issue of “hypocrisy” and “mimicry”⁶², the other text is most likely directed against Prodromos’ contemporaries – his fellow *grammatikoi* (teachers). In other words, these are not personal invectives but satires directed against human vices (*Against a Lustful Old Woman*) and against a group of people rather

⁵⁵ G.A. KENNEDY, *Progymnasmata. Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric. Translated with Introduction and Notes*, Atlanta 2003, pp. 111–113.

⁵⁶ L. GARLAND, *Mazaris’s Journey to Hades: Further Reflections and Reappraisal*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* LXI 2007, p. 184. See also the title of the paper by B. BALDWIN, *A Talent to Abuse: Some Aspects of Byzantine Satire*, *Byzantinische Forschungen* VIII 1982, pp. 19–28.

⁵⁷ See for instance ἑλληνοθηρησκοχριστοβλασφημοτρόπε (you who offend Christ with Hellenic idols?). Constantine also describes Leo’s activities: καὶ νεκροτυμβοκλεπτολωποεκδυτα (robbing the dead of their clothes). A. KAZHDAN (*A History of Byzantine Literature*, ed. by C. ANGELIDI, Athens 2006, p. 81) suggests that Constantine drew his inspiration from Aristophanic comedies.

⁵⁸ P. MATRANGA (ed.), *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. I, Romae 1850, p. 39, line 1. Constantine starts by calling Leo a butcher and a pig murderer (μακελλεὺς καὶ σφαγεὺς χοίρων πέλων).

⁵⁹ For a new edition and commentary, see T. MIGLIORINI, *Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commenti*, Pisa 2010 (unpublished PhD dissertation).

⁶⁰ J. KUCHARSKI, P. MARCINIAK, *Beard and its Philosopher. Theodore Prodromos on Philosophic Beards in Byzantium*, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* XLI 2017, pp. 45–54.

⁶¹ HODGART, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 11: “The criticism of the world is abstracted from its ordinary setting, the setting of, say, political oratory and journalism, and transformed into a high form of ‘play’, which gives us both the recognition of our responsibilities and the irresponsible joy of make-believe. So with more personal satire: the tension and bitterness evoked by unpleasant personal relationship are transmuted into delight at the creation of a beautifully absurd figure, which is both like and unlike of the subject”. What HODGART describes as transmutation into delight at the creation of a beautifully absurd figure is clearly visible in the pleasure with which Byzantine authors ridicule their opponents, transforming them into objects of mockery.

⁶² P. MARCINIAK, *It Is not what it Appears to Be: A Note on Theodore Prodromos’ Against a Lustful Old Woman*, *Eos* CIII 2016, pp. 109–115.

than one individual (similarly to Julian's *Misopogon*, which attacks not one person, but the inhabitants of Antioch in general). Their tone, however, is much closer to that of invective.

What is more, to a modern reader, even if the original context remains unclear, in many cases it will be obvious that the text is meant to mock someone or something. Yet, as stated earlier, the reader may find it difficult to determine whether the ridicule constitutes a literary topos, or has as its object a real person – or perhaps combines these two, with the real object of mockery hidden behind a veil constructed from literary clichés and ancient allusions. The desire to find a real person behind the ridicule has sometimes led scholars astray. BOISSONADE in his edition of the poem *Against the Old Man with a Long Beard* suggested that satire is directed against a man named Thucritus, one of Prodromos' contemporaries, since the narrator twice calls the (anti)hero of the text by this name. This is a somewhat naïve attempt at finding the real addressee of the poem, completely ignoring the fact that Thucritus is a character from Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead* (no. 16); the name itself thus provides a clear allusion to the Lucianic tradition of writing satires.

As previously discussed, Eustathios of Thessalonike makes the Homeric Thersites a precursor and the first embodiment of satire/personal invective. Such an interpretation of this character is further reinforced in the *Commentaries to the Iliad* when Thersites accuses Agamemnon (B 222):

Ὅρα δὲ ὅπως ἡ αὐτὴ λέξις καὶ ἐπὶ ἐπαίνου λαμβάνεται καὶ ἐπὶ σκώμματος.
ὧδε μὲν γὰρ ὁ Θερσίτης λιγύς ἀγορητὴς σκωπτικῶς καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ εἰρωνείαν.

Now, look how one and the same word can be used both for praise and for derision. At this point, Thersites is called "a clear-voiced speaker" in a deriding and particularly ironic manner (*skōptikōs kai kat' eirōneian*)⁶³.

(transl. by E. BRAOUNOU)

Thersites is associated here with ridicule, he both abuses and is being abused as Homer represents him in a derisory manner (σκωπτικῶς)⁶⁴. The author/narrator of the fifteenth-century *Mazaris* writes in his dedication to the satire that he was ordered to dance in the role of Thersites (εἶ με καὶ κατὰ τὸν Θερσίτην ἐκεῖνον ὀρχήσασθαι προσέττατες, *Mazaris* 98, 4–5). The limping Thersites becomes the avatar of the narrator of the story not only because of his hobbling – the narrator in *Mazaris* often complains about his gout – but also because Thersites seems to be the embodiment of the invective and abuse which is the

⁶³ See E. BRAOUNOU, *Eirōn-Terms in Greek Classical and Byzantine Texts: A Preliminary Analysis for Understanding Irony in Byzantium*, Millenium XI 2014, p. 323.

⁶⁴ On the image of Thersites in ancient and Byzantine literature, see C. JOUANNO, *Thersite, une figure de démesure?*, Kentron XXI 2005, pp. 181–223.

core of Byzantine satire. Byzantine satire, to use the ancient terms, is rather *psogós* than *koinos topos*⁶⁵ and from this point of view it was the lawful heir to the ancient iambographic tradition.

Byzantine satirical texts mirror complicated and often agonistic social conditions, especially in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when they served as a means of communication among the Byzantine literati who fought for the attention of patrons and prospective students. They were, therefore, an effect of rivalry between teachers and rhetors⁶⁶. Byzantine satires thus channelled both social emotions and, perhaps, also some political issues. The anonymous twelfth-century satire against Stephanos Hagiochristophorites, a minister of Andronikos I Komnenos, is undoubtedly political (though also very personal)⁶⁷. Vitriolic abuse could be responses to earlier texts; this was most likely the case of Psellos' previously mentioned satire *Against the Monk Sabbaites*, which is a furious and personal attack triggered by a text written by a monk called Sabbaites. The Prodromic text against Barys was most likely a response to accusations of heresy – whether Barys is a real person or rather a symbol of those who slandered Prodromos is impossible to say.

The following conclusions could thus be suggested. Firstly, there does not seem to be one designation which could be used as an “umbrella term” for Byzantine satirical production. This is, however, understandable. Satire could be seen rather as a set of rhetorical strategies regulating tone, making satire more a mode than a firmly defined genre. Secondly, the traditional division between satire and invective seems somewhat misleading in Byzantine literature or, to put it differently, this division is not always clear-cut. Before the introduction of the so-called animal-vegetable satires written in the vernacular, invective was much more prevalent in Byzantine literature; even Prodromic satires, which are

⁶⁵ KENNEDY, *op. cit.* (n. 55), p. 111: “It [*psogós*] differs from common-place in that the latter aims at punishment, while invective contains only bald attack”.

⁶⁶ On the examples of such poems which can illustrate the agonistic and antagonistic relations in the milieu of Constantinopolitan teachers, see BERNARD, *op. cit.* (n. 38), pp. 269–275. As Floris BERNARD showed recently (*ibidem*, p. 276), at least part of the satires, mostly personal invectives, could have been performed/read aloud in Byzantine theatre – perhaps without a ridiculed person, but surely in the presence of others who might have known the targeted individual.

⁶⁷ On this text see K. MANAFIS, *Ανέκδοτος νεκρικός διάλογος ύπαινισσόμενος πρόσωπα καί γεγονότα τής βασιλείας Ανδρονίκου Α' του Κομνηνού*, Athena LXXVI 1976–1977, pp. 308–322; L. GARLAND, *A Treasury Minister in Hell – a Little Known Dialogue of the Dead of the Late Twelfth Century*, *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook XVII 2000–2001*, pp. 481–489. Other texts such as the *Timarion* and *Pulologos* (a 700 verse text from the 14th c. which tells the story of the bird assembly) are sometimes interpreted as political satires. On the *Timarion*, see M. ALEXIOU, *Literary Subversion and the Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: A Stylistic Analysis of the Timarion* (ch. 6–10), *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies VIII 1982–1983*, pp. 29–45; more recently D. KRALLIS, *Harmless Satire, Stinging Critique: Notes and Suggestions for Reading the Timarion*, in: D. ANGELOV, M. SAXBY (eds.), *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*, Farnham 2013, pp. 221–245.

not directed against identifiable targets, employ tools associated rather with invective.

University of Silesia in Katowice

ZYGMUNT WĘCLEWSKI UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY THEATRE AND LITERATURE

by

BARBARA BIBIK

ABSTRACT: Zygmunt Węcłowski was the first Polish translator of all extant Greek tragedies. He did not win renown as a good translator, but his priority was to be faithful to the original, not beautiful in translating it. And it appears that not only was he faithful, but he was also greatly influenced by the literature and theatre of the 19th century.

Zygmunt Węcłowski (1824–1887) was not the first translator of Greek tragedy into Polish. As we know, as early as the 16th century Jan Kochanowski translated the prologue of Euripides' *Alcestis*, a passage that is often considered one of the most beautiful translations into Polish, and Walenty Jakubowski¹ translated Sophocles' *Antigone*, but in prose. But after that the Polish public had to wait until the 19th century to read any translation of Greek tragedy. Until 1856, when Węcłowski started to publish his translations, the list of Polish translations of Greek tragedies is not as limited as we may think. It includes a dozen or so translations, mentioned in the literary journals of that time, among which we find *The Phoenician Women* and *Orestes* by Jan Mihanowicz², *Antigone* and *Medea* by Alfons Walicki³, Sophocles' *Antigone*⁴ and *Electra*⁵ by Antoni Małecki, *Oedipus the King* by Franciszek Wężyk⁶, *Prometheus Bound* by J.G. Biernacki⁷, *The*

¹ Mentioned in P. CHMIEŁOWSKI, [review of:] *Tragedye Sofoklesa. Przekład Z. Węcłowskiego, Poznań. Nakładem Biblioteki Kórnickiej 1875, str. XXVII, 589, Ateneum 1876, vol. III, no. 9, p. 659.*

² Mentioned in Euripides, *Tragedie*, transl. by J. ŁANOWSKI, vol. 3, Warszawa 2007, pp. 105, 182.

³ Mentioned in K. ESTREICHER, *Bibliografia polska XIX stulecia*, vol. 5, Kraków 1880, p. 10.

⁴ Mentioned in R. ZAWILIŃSKI, *O polskich przekładach tragedyi Sofoklesowych*, Biblioteka Warszawska 1881, vol. III, p. 378.

⁵ Mentioned in CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Sofoklesa...* (n. 1), p. 662.

⁶ Mentioned in CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Sofoklesa...* (n. 1), p. 660; R. ZAWILIŃSKI, *O polskich przekładach tragedyi Sofoklesowych*, Biblioteka Warszawska 1881, vol. IV, p. 105 (Wężyk's translation was published in 1878).

⁷ Mentioned in AISCHYLOS, *Prometeusz skowany*, transl. by J. KASPROWICZ, introduction by S. WITKOWSKI, Kraków [1921], p. 155.

Women of Trachis and *Oedipus at Colonus* by Tadeusz Eliaszewicz⁸, *Antigone* by Wincenty Smaczniński⁹, part of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* by Lucjan Siemieński¹⁰, *Antigone*, *Oedipus at Colonus* and *Oedipus the King* by Kazimierz Kaszewski¹¹. Some of them were never published. And it is possible that there were even more, but to discover those would require reading many of the literary journals from the early 19th century. Still, the list is quite ample. But there were translations of only single tragedies. When Zygmunt Węclewski first published his works there were also translations of only two tragedies, Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and *The Libation Bearers* (published in 1856 and 1857 respectively). Before he published his translations of all seven of Aeschylus' tragedies in 1873, the Polish public might have read other Polish translations of *The Women of Trachis*¹², *Ajax*¹³ and *Hecuba*¹⁴ by Zygmunt Węclewski, *Agamemnon* and *Prometheus Bound* by Józef Szujski¹⁵, *The Women of Trachis* by Kazimierz Kaszewski¹⁶, Sophocles' *Electra* by Hugo Wróblewski¹⁷. Two years later, in 1875, Węclewski published his translations of all of Sophocles' extant tragedies. In 1880 selected tragedies of Euripides appeared in Węclewski's translation and then, starting from 1881, in three volumes (published respectively in 1881, 1882 and again in 1882), all of Euripides' extant tragedies. All Węclewski's translations were published by the Kórnik Library (Biblioteka Kórnicka) in Poznań. By that time the following Polish translations had appeared: *Oedipus at Colonus*¹⁸, *Oedipus the King*¹⁹ and *Antigone*²⁰ by Jan Czubek, *Philoctetes*²¹ and *Seven against Thebes*²² by Kazimierz Kaszewski, *The Persians* by Józef Szujski²³ and *Medea* by Stanisław

⁸ Mentioned in CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Sofoklesa...* (n. 1), p. 660.

⁹ Ibidem, p. 661.

¹⁰ Biblioteka Warszawska 1851, vol. III, pp. 254–267.

¹¹ Biblioteka Warszawska 1853, vol. I, pp. 423–472; 1853, vol. IV, pp. 94–170; 1855, vol. III, pp. 250–285 and 426–456.

¹² Mentioned in CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Sofoklesa...* (n. 1), p. 663.

¹³ Biblioteka Warszawska 1865, vol. I, pp. 23–54 and 400–423.

¹⁴ Biblioteka Warszawska 1863, vol. I, pp. 59–97.

¹⁵ Mentioned in P. CHMIEŁOWSKI, [introduction to:] *Tragedye Eschilosa*, transl. by K. KASZEWSKI, Warszawa 1895, pp. X f.

¹⁶ Biblioteka Warszawska 1865, vol. II, pp. 1–50.

¹⁷ Mentioned in CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Sofoklesa...* (n. 1), p. 662.

¹⁸ Mentioned in ZAWILIŃSKI, *O polskich...* (n. 4), p. 103.

¹⁹ Mentioned in Sofokles, *Antygona*, transl. by K. MORAWSKI, Kraków [s.a.], p. 17.

²⁰ Kraków 1881.

²¹ Ateneum 1877, vol. II, nos. 5–7, pp. 247–299.

²² Ateneum 1879, vol. IV, nos. 11–15, pp. 193–227.

²³ Mentioned in CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Eschilosa...* (n. 15), pp. X f.

Grabowski²⁴. But there were still only single translations of particular tragedies. After Węclewski's translation of Euripides' tragedies, the first one of the whole extant corpus of one of the playwrights was the translation by Kazimierz Kaszewski which was published in 1888 and contained translations of Sophocles' plays²⁵. Except for Zygmunt Węclewski, up until today, no one has translated all the extant plays by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. From that perspective he might not be the first translator of Greek tragedy, but he was definitely the first and the only one to translate all the Greek plays. Moreover, he may be considered as one of the most important translators, the one who began the Polish series of Greek tragedy translation. That is why his translations became a type of matrix, often an impulse for subsequent translations, whose authors engaged with Węclewski's interpretation or the language he used in translating. But language is changing, and that is why his translations were replaced by newer ones. However, Węclewski knew he was not a poet, and while translating he had an aim which was different from beautiful poetic language itself. In the preface to his translation of *The Libation Bearers* by Aeschylus he wrote:

Nec tamen, quamvis non ignorem, reprehendi, si quis veritatem, probari, si aures consuluerit, deterreri potui, quin pro mea parte verum me et fidum in Aeschylo interpretando praestarem et servus versificator quam falsus interpres haberi mallem²⁶.

The opinion that he was a severe judge of the faithfulness towards the original plays was repeated in many reviews of his translations²⁷.

Nowadays his translations are depreciated. They are hard to read, they are difficult to understand. When they appeared they received different reviews and some of them I would like to quote:

²⁴ Rewieed in Biblioteka Warszawska 1880, vol. I, pp. 504–512.

²⁵ *Tragedye Sofoklesa*, transl. by K. KASZEWSKI, Warszawa 1888 (Biblioteka najcenniejszych utworów literatury europejskiej).

²⁶ Z. WĘCLEWSKI, *Choephoris ex Graeco translatis de studio, quod proximis quattuor superioribus saeculis in Graecis legendis consumpserunt Poloni et de tragoediis in linguam polonicam conversis brevissimam disputatiunculam praemisit*, in: *Program Królewskiego Gimnazjum św. Marii Magdaleny w Poznaniu za rok szk. 1856/57* (quoted after B. BRZUSKA, *Filologia klasyczna w Szkole Głównej Warszawskiej*, Wrocław 1992, p. 117). In the paper *Studia w Polsce nad literaturą grecką w czterech przeszłych wiekach i przekłady tragików na język polski* (Biblioteka Warszawska 1861, vol. IV, pp. 189 f.) WĘCLEWSKI wrote "Not being a poet and having no claims to such a name, I was afraid that while following the rhyme I may desist from the truth and faithfulness to the original text. That is why in dialogues for, as I believe, justified reasons I resigned from rhyming but I translated chorus songs in verses, and I made that effort for I wanted to do something for the audience's ear as well [...]. I am fully aware that the public in general prefer the flowing and harmonious verses than those faithful ones. However I preferred to appear the faithful and accurate verse-maker than the false translator" (my translation from the original Polish).

²⁷ Cf. CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Sofoklesa...* (n. 1), p. 662; ZAWILIŃSKI, *O polskich...* (n. 6), p. 98.

Beauty is a thing that should not be denied to Węclewski's translations. And one thing, for certain, must be highlighted – his deep understanding of the original plays and the faithful translations of them into Polish language²⁸.

Generally Węclewski's translations did not gain the appreciation they fully deserve²⁹.

Węclewski's translations may not be poetical, but no one will deny that they are written in good, correct and racy language. And everyone has to admire their faithfulness to and proper understanding of the original³⁰.

Someone who cannot read the original Greek play, while reading Węclewski's translations will learn precisely not only the general idea but also every detail and intricacy of that play. [...] The deep understanding of the original and the faithfulness in translation are the values of Węclewski's works³¹.

Although Węclewski's translations have great philological value, they could not stand the poetical requirements³².

One thing should be said here. Some of the reviewers, as quoted above, highlighted the fact that Węclewski's translations were faithful, if not too faithful, to the original plays, that the language he used was not poetic and hard to read, and that he was not a good poet. But we have to take into account what the public of that time expected when reading any translation of a foreign piece of literature and especially a piece of poetry. One of the most ambiguous requirements of any translation was the idea that it should be faithful to the spirit of the original work (but behind this idea of the spirit of the original work there were so many different, sometimes even contradictory, things posited by scholars, poets or critics that no one knew what it really meant and thus modern theoreticians of translation studies gave up both the idea of faithfulness and the spirit of the original work). The second priority was that translation should be written in good poetry (and when talking about Greek tragedy we talk about poetry). But good poetry at that time meant that the verses should rhyme. And now we come to the point where we can find the answer to why Węclewski's translations were not much

²⁸ J. SMEREKA, *Pierwszy filolog-Polak na Uniwersytecie Jana Kazimierza*, Eos XXXIX 1938, p. 229.

²⁹ F. MAJCHROWICZ, *O życiu i pracach Zygmunta Węclewskiego*, Eos I 1894, p. 122.

³⁰ S. HAMMER, *Historia filologii klasycznej w Polsce*, Kraków 1948, p. 17.

³¹ CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Eschilosa...* (n. 15), pp. IX f. Cf. J. UZDOWSKI's opinion, presented in his review of Kaszewski's translation of Aeschylus' tragedies (*Tragedye Eschilosa w przekładzie K. Kaszewskiego*, Ateneum 1896, vol. I, no. 1, pp. 140–183), that Węclewski's translations cannot give any sense of the original because the aesthetic side of the Greek plays is lost in his translations.

³² E. GRABOWSKI, *Najnowszy przekład Sofoklesa*, Ateneum 1889, vol. I, no. 3, p. 522.

appreciated³³: because there are rhymes only in *stasima* (the choral songs). We learn from Piotr CHMIEŁOWSKI³⁴ that under the pressure of the reviewers criticising Węclewski for not rhyming his translations of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and *The Libation Bearers*, while translating Sophocles' *The Women of Trachis* and *Ajax* (in 1859 and 1865 respectively) he produced fully rhyming versions of those tragedies. However, before publishing the translations of all Sophocles' plays in 1875, he resigned from rhyming *epeisodia* again and the only parts that remained rhymed were *stasima* (as it was the case in the translation of Aeschylus). Węclewski's attitude in this presents him as an author who was aware of his skills (and as I mentioned above, he was aware that he was not a poet), but also as an author who was independent in a way (he knew what the public expected of him but had the courage to translate in a way that went against the common public expectations, in a way which he decided was the best, even if he exposed himself to criticism). Alicja SZASTYŃSKA-SIEMION, in her analyses of the translations of Greek choral odes into Polish, wrote that Węclewski in his translations of the choral songs used many different metres that were known in Polish poetry at that time, and he was indeed very skilful and good at this, although some subsequent scholars criticised him. In her opinion, the failure of Węclewski's translations in the eyes of the general public should be ascribed not to the way in which he used Polish metres and verses, but to the syntax and vocabulary of his translations³⁵.

It is worth mentioning here that in Węclewski's translations of the choral songs we do not find any information about the dance or any movement of the chorus. Nowadays we know that *stasima* combined music, dance and singing. Some of the scholars of the 19th century also knew this, but generally up to the 20th century and even later we usually hear and read of a static chorus which stands singing in the orchestra during the performance. We even see such a chorus in pictures of early 20th century stagings; we also gain an image of such a chorus from Polish translations. While reading Węclewski's translations we may assume that singing occurred, but we cannot assume any movement. And such an attitude was compatible with 19th century (and even later) opinions about the role of the chorus in ancient plays. Therefore this is another thing we have to take into account while considering Węclewski's translations of ancient tragedies – the influence of 19th century ways of translating (especially translating poetry)

³³ It is significant that the first translation of *Richard II* by Józef Korzeniowski (published in Biblioteka Warszawska 1860, vol. 1, pp. 505–528) was also criticised by reviewers for its lack of rhyme, especially as it was considered a necessary and characteristic ornament of any piece of poetry at that time. According to one of these reviewers, when poetry is written without rhymes it is hard to distinguish it from any piece of prose (M. ROWIŃSKI, *Uwagi o wersyfikacji polskiej jako przyczynek do metryki porównawczej*, Warszawa 1891, p. 149).

³⁴ CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Sofoklesa...* (n. 1), pp. 663, 671.

³⁵ A. SZASTYŃSKA-SIEMION, *Chóry tragedii greckich w przekładach polskich*, Eos LXX 1982, pp. 27–29.

and staging dramas, 19th century knowledge about the Greek theatre and Greek playwrights, as well as 19th century theatre stage and its technical possibilities. Zygmunt Węclewski definitely was the 19th century scholar who was influenced by his times and all those factors already mentioned. In what follows I will discuss this issue in more detail as far as the theatrical perspective of his translations is concerned (on the basis of his translation of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*).

I would also like to mention that in the first half of the 19th century Aeschylus was not very popular in Polish culture in the way that Sophocles and Euripides were. And it was Węclewski who made the greatest impact in making Aeschylus better known and understood at that time, as CHMIEŁOWSKI wrote³⁶. Not only did he translate Aeschylus' tragedies, but he also published many papers dedicated both to Aeschylus and Greek theatre that stimulated other scholars and poets to become interested in this first ancient playwright. And for Węclewski³⁷, as for many other scholars and translators, the *Oresteia* was the greatest and most valuable set of tragedies written by Aeschylus.

Born in 1824, Zygmunt Węclewski³⁸ was one of the most respected Polish classical scholars of the 19th century. He was also considered one of the most influential and multi-talented expert on antiquity. His studies concerned lexicography, translations, studies on Polish humanist authors and works for the general public as well. He was esteemed by his academic colleagues and students, but also by partitioned Poland's Russian, Prussian and Austrian authorities. He was remembered as a very hard-working scholar who was always thoroughly prepared for his classes, which he led speaking beautiful Polish. From January 1873, when he became a member of the John II Casimir University in Lwów, he was the first Polish classicist there who was allowed to speak Polish to his students (he was also the Dean of the Faculty of History and Languages in 1876/1877 and even the Rector of the University in 1877/1878). Before that he was professor of Classics at the Warsaw College (Szkoła Główna Warszawska) from 1863 until 1869. He died in Lwów in 1887 and was buried there. After his death the following words were written:

³⁶ CHMIEŁOWSKI, *Tragedye Eschilosa...* (n. 15), pp. VIII f.

³⁷ Z. WĘCLEWSKI, *O dziełach Eschylosa*, in: *Tragedye Eschylosa*, transl. by Z. WĘCLEWSKI, Poznań 1873, pp. 6–13.

³⁸ Cf. *Dawni pisarze polscy. Od początków piśmiennictwa do Młodej Polski. Przewodnik biograficzny i bibliograficzny*, vol. V, Warszawa 2004; SMEREKA, *op. cit.* (n. 28), pp. 217–238; MAJCHROWICZ, *op. cit.* (n. 29), pp. 113–126; L. SŁOWIŃSKI, *Stanisław (1820–1893) i Zygmunt (1824–1887) Węclewscy*, in: IDEM, *...Nie damy pogrześć mowy. Wizerunki pedagogów poznańskich XIX wieku*, Poznań 1982, pp. 257–274; HAMMER, *op. cit.* (n. 30), pp. 15–17; M. PLEZIA, *Z dziejów filologii klasycznej w Polsce*, Warszawa 1993, p. 138; BRZUSKA, *op. cit.* (n. 26); W. KOROTYŃSKI, *Zygmunt Węclewski*, *Tygodnik Ilustrowany* 1887, no. 243, pp. 133 f.; H. KRĘPSKA, *Sylwetki filologów klasycznych w Polsce. Zygmunt Węclewski*, *Meander* IX 1954, pp. 193–196.

If a death of one person can bring mourning to the whole national literature, certainly the death of the translator of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides brought one³⁹.

Ancient plays were written to be performed on stage. But the stage of the 5th century BC looked different from that to which Węclewski was accustomed. Although ancient tragedies were not performed on public theatre stages (apart from school stages) during the whole of the 19th century, Węclewski seemed to be quite aware that they were applied to a theatre stage. Thus, in his book containing translations of all of Aeschylus' tragedies, he included a chapter on ancient Greek theatre⁴⁰, where he stated precisely (on the grounds of the academic literature up to that time) how he imagined this theatre had looked in the 5th century BC. In his translations he also included stage directions to the individual plays, which give us more information about how he imagined those plays to be performed on stage. Especially as we know that there were no stage directions included by the ancient playwrights themselves, so all such pieces of information come from translators (or sometimes editors of the original plays).

While reading this chapter we notice things that may look strange from our modern perspective. However, this description of ancient Greek theatre gives us a good insight into the state of the studies of antiquity, and Greek theatre in particular, at that time, because scholars and also the general public shared the view about 5th century Greek theatre which Węclewski presented in this chapter. They shared it until very late in the 19th century, when, starting from the paper written by Julius HÖPKEN (1884) and excavations made by Wilhelm DÖRPFELD (the results of which were later published in his book⁴¹), knowledge about Athenian (and Greek) ancient theatre started to change⁴². So, in Węclewski's description the orchestra had the shape of a greater part of a circle that was surrounded by the audience's seating from one side and closed by the stage (*proskēnion*) from another. In the middle of the orchestra stood an altar (*thymele*) and the whole orchestra lay beneath both the level of the audience's seating and the stage. When the staging was supposed to be performed on stage, the part of the *orchestra* between *thymele* and *proskēnion* was raised up (but still the difference of a few steps between those two levels was preserved) to allow the actors and the chorus to communicate with each other in a more or less direct contact. But I would like to draw the reader's attention to the fact that in such an organisation of the space there was not much place left for the chorus on this raised platform.

³⁹ KOROTYŃSKI, *op. cit.* (n. 38), p. 133.

⁴⁰ Z. WĘCLEWSKI, *Rzecz o teatrze greckim*, in: *Tragedye Eschylosa*, transl. by..., Poznań 1873, pp. IX–XV. Cf. IDEM, *Teatr grecki*, Biblioteka Warszawska 1859, vol. III, pp. 379–398.

⁴¹ W. DÖRPFELD, E. REISCH, *Das griechische Theater. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Dionysos-Theaters in Athen und anderer griechischer Theater*, Athen 1896.

⁴² Cf. P. ARNOTT, *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1962, p. 3.

Behind the orchestra, according to Węclewski's description, there was a *skene* that was as wide as the whole theatre building. On both sides of the *skene* there were *paraskenia* and the front part of it, attached to the *orchestra*, was called the *proskenion*. Węclewski assumed that the stage design formed from *pinakes* presented, generally, a building of two floors with three doors (the great main one in the middle and then the smaller right one which led to the guests' rooms and left one that led to the servants' rooms), frontage, porticos and ample courtyard. Importantly, the stage design was painted.

It is also interesting how Węclewski assumed the way the inside of the stage building was shown on the ancient stage. Nowadays we know that the Ancients used the device called the *ekkyklema*, a platform that was rolled out of the main door and the scene presented on this platform symbolically meant the presentation of an event that had happened inside the building. But Węclewski did not assume the use of any stage device. In his opinion, when a scene requested showing an inner place in the building, the stage wall, wholly or partly, drew aside to present the inside of the building. And such a stage design he called the *ekkyklema*.

It is also worth mentioning that, in contradiction to modern scholars' views on the Greek stage and especially to the idea that the staging of Aeschylean drama used rather modest and basic devices, Węclewski assumed that staging in Aeschylus' times was characterised by great theatricality and spectacular qualities.

After having read Węclewski's description of ancient Greek theatre, we recognise, without much difficulty, the similarities of that theatre to that presented by Vitruvius in his book on ancient architecture and to Roman theatre as well. We should not be surprised by this statement, because until the late years of the 19th century scholars were quite sure that Greek theatre was more or less similar to the Roman one they knew and the remnants of which they could see. And it was Vitruvius who shaped scholars' imagination about ancient theatre for centuries (at least until the late years of the 19th century, as I have already mentioned, when the discussion about ancient Greek theatre broke out).

I devoted this much space to presenting Węclewski's description of that theatre because there are many points which connect 5th century theatre (as presented by Węclewski) to that of the 19th century and thus made it possible for the ancient play to be performed on stage in Węclewski's times. It is also possible that the way he imagined ancient plays on stage was a type of mixture of his academic knowledge as a classical scholar and the theatre (and its technical possibilities) of his own times. I would like to discuss these points now.

The first thing we should notice is the theatrical space. The one presented by Węclewski as the space of the 5th century BC ancient theatre looks similar to that one he could encounter in any theatre in his own times. And it was a raised stage (but much deeper than the Greek one) with the orchestra pit beneath its level. In pictures of 19th century theatre we can see that sometimes a few steps joined

the orchestra pit with the stage and that orchestra pit has its entries on both sides (often hidden under the proscenium galleries)⁴³. We know that in ancient theatre both actors and members of the chorus entered the stage (*orchestra* and *proskenion*) through *eisodoi*. In 19th century theatre actors usually appeared on the main stage, but knowing that there were such entries leading directly into the orchestra pit, we may assume that, when necessary, the chorus and actors might have entered through those entrances. It seems that Węclewski designed, in his stage directions⁴⁴, such entries for the chorus in all three plays of the *Oresteia* and for Orestes and Pylades in *The Libation Bearers*. Moreover, Węclewski in the stage directions included in his translation of the *Oresteia* states quite clearly that the chorus' place during the play is in the *orchestra* only and that it is placed below the level of the main stage. For example, when the chorus first enters the stage it seems that it enters from one of the wings symbolically leading to town, but it has to go down to the *orchestra* where it stands during the whole play. Such a description is of course compatible with 19th century knowledge of ancient theatre, but it is also consistent with what theatre stages looked like in those times.

When Węclewski in his translation introduces the scenery of the play, he writes in the opening stage directions that the scene presents a royal castle with two wings on each sides. In the right wing there are rooms for the servants while in the left one there are rooms for the guests⁴⁵. In front of the castle there are altars and statues of Zeus, Hermes and Apollo. On the roof of the right wing that serves as a watchtower, because it gives a good view of the mountains,

⁴³ Like the Grand Theatre in Warsaw at that time, which was considered the most modern and best-equipped theatre in this part of Europe, cf. Z. RASZEWSKI, *Krótką historia teatru polskiego*, Warszawa 1990, pp. 59–156; A. NICOLL, *The Development of the Theatre: A Study of Theatrical Art from the Beginnings to the Present Day*, London 1948, pp. 185–195; B. KRÓL-KACZOROWSKA, *Teatr dawnej Polski. Budynki. Dekoracje. Kostiumy*, Warszawa 1971; EADEM, *Budynek teatru. Rozwój funkcji i form do roku 1833*, Wrocław 1975; EADEM, *Teatry Warszawy. Budynki i sale w latach 1748–1975*, Warszawa 1986; M.R. BOOTH, *Nineteenth-Century Theatre*, in: J.R. BROWN (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Theatre*, Oxford 2001, pp. 299–340; E. SZWANKOWSKI, *Teatry Warszawy 1765–1918*, Warszawa 1979.

⁴⁴ It should be noticed that Węclewski while he was translating Aeschylus' *Oresteia* used the edition of the Greek original prepared by Johann Gottfried HERMANN (*Aeschyli Tragoediae*, Lipsiae 1852), but there were no stage directions included. He also used German translation of the *Oresteia* made by Johann Gustav DROYSEN (*Des Aischylos Werke*, Berlin 1842), in which we can find stage directions included by the translator. But although he knew those directions and although there are some similarities between the directions inserted by him and by DROYSEN (but we have to remember that both these scholars were working in roughly the same period, that they probably shared similar knowledge about ancient Greek theatre and, most importantly, similar theatrical experiences, because theatre in the whole of Europe looked very similar at that time), still Węclewski reveals himself very often as an independent scholar and "stage designer" of an ancient piece of theatre.

⁴⁵ The careful reader may notice that this description presents the turned image of the one that was included in the introductory chapter. But it should be remarked here that in this chapter Węclewski presents the scene and directions from the perspective of the spectator, while in the stage directions from the perspective of an actor.

the sea and the neighbourhood, we see a watchman who rises from his bed. In his introductory chapter, entitled *Rzecz o teatrze greckim* ("An Essay on Greek Theatre"), Węclewski states that the ancient *skene* was painted and represented a building of two floors with three doors, frontage, porticos and ample courtyard, in front of which the action took place. It is interesting that Węclewski imagined the ancient *skene* to be painted (we know now that in the 5th century BC it was architectural); his notion of a painted *skene* corresponds to what the stage of 19th century theatre looked like. In 19th century theatre the stage consisted of a system of wings and painted backdrops. This system allowed the director of a play to change the set design without using curtains⁴⁶. The backdrops in the theatre may have easily featured the mountains, the sea or the neighbourhood, as we read in Węclewski's stage directions. When we read how the stage design of a tragedy based on a mythological story looked in 19th century theatres, we may notice that not only did Węclewski's description correspond with 19th century knowledge about ancient Greek theatre, but it was also consistent with the stage designs of tragedies in the theatres of those times⁴⁷.

19th century theatres, especially those in the first half and around the middle of the century, had at their disposal many mechanical devices that made the performances on their stages spectacular and very attractive for the audience, as we learn both from the literature concerning 19th century theatres and the novels written during those times (as, for instance, Bolesław Prus' novels entitled *The Doll* and *The New Women*). According to Zbigniew RASZEWSKI⁴⁸, the theatre of those times created for its audience magnificent worlds where all dreams might have come true on that stage full of illusion and magic⁴⁹. And it seems that all stage directions included by Węclewski in his translation of the *Oresteia* are consistent with those tendencies to illusion⁵⁰.

⁴⁶ The system of the painted stage designs lost its value in the second half of the century, when it was successively replaced by the three-dimensional settings, because of the increasing tendency towards naturalism (cf. BOOTH, *op. cit.* [n. 43], pp. 301 f.; RASZEWSKI, *Krótko...* [n. 43], p. 142).

⁴⁷ Cf. A. OKOŃSKA, *Scenografia Wyspiańskiego*, Wrocław 1961, p. 12; A. KRAJEWSKA-WIECZOREK, *Powrót tragedii greckiej*, Pamiętnik Teatralny XXII 1973, pp. 67 f.

⁴⁸ Z. RASZEWSKI, *Słowacki i Mickiewicz wobec teatru romantycznego*, Pamiętnik Teatralny VIII 1959, p. 37. Cf. Z. STRZELECKI, *Polska plastyka teatralna*, vol. I, Warszawa 1963, pp. 14 f. In this passage the author describes the stage design of that time, which featured the sky, the sea or the mountains, with many technical devices that made possible for the theatre stage designers to present e.g. fire in a town, a storm on the sea, the rising sun, an earthquake, flying angels or the appearance of devils from underground, etc. The stage design of 19th century theatres is a design that was supposed to give the illusion of a real wood, cathedral or castle; it was supposed to give the audience the illusion of reality.

⁴⁹ M.A. ALLÉVY-VIALA, *Teatr idealny*, in: EADEM, *Inscenizacja romantyczna we Francji*, transl. by W. NATANSON, Warszawa 1958, p. 186 (originally published as *Mise en scène en France dans la première moitié du dix-neuvième siècle* [thèse], Paris 1938).

⁵⁰ Cf. O. TAPLIN, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*, Oxford 1977, pp. 31 f.: "The generation of Wilamowitz and that of his teachers

Apart from Węclewski's presentation of the stage with a possible painted backdrop featuring the mountains, the sea and the neighbourhood, as mentioned above, we may notice another example of such a congruence in the prologue of *Agamemnon*. Before the Watchman shouts that he sees the flame of a burning pile that was supposed to inform the house of Atreus about the sack of Troy, we read in the stage directions included by Węclewski that at that very moment the flame appears on the slide at the back of the stage. Of course in ancient theatre no electric devices were possible, but since electricity was introduced into the theatre (in the 19th century), all types of magnificent effects imitating the rising or setting sun or the moon, flames, etc. were possible and were used to increase the theatricality of any staging and to make it even more spectacular⁵¹.

Another point, also in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, at which we can see those illusory tendencies I have just mentioned, is the moment when Agamemnon appears on stage after the ten year war at Troy. Although we learn from the Herald (who precedes the appearance of Agamemnon himself) that during the voyage of the Greek troops back home their ships were surprised by a huge storm and they lost many of their companions and ships, when Agamemnon enters the stage, in Węclewski's translation, it seems that nothing bad has happened, at least to his ships. In the stage directions included in the translation Węclewski writes that Agamemnon appears on stage on a huge triumphant chariot with Cassandra at his side. Behind his chariot other carts carrying Trojan slave women enter the stage, then the procession of dispatch riders, warriors and the cattle carrying the spoils. Such a description is consistent with those spectacular performances that, as we know, took place on the theatre stages of Węclewski's times. Besides, the theatre stages were then deep enough to give room to an even greater crowd on the stage.

One of the most spectacular moments in the *Oresteia* is the appearance of Clytemnestra's ghost in *Eumenides*. As Mirosław KOCUR⁵² notices, such scenes must have been well considered by the audience, but unfortunately those types of scenes are still one of the unsolved problems of 5th century Greek theatre. There are remains of the so-called Charon's steps, underground steps and corridors under the *orchestra*, from the 4th century BC, but none from the 5th century BC and none in Athens⁵³. That is why we are still not sure how ghosts entered the stage in Athens, as found in Aeschylus' *The Persians* and *Oresteia* or

tended to assume that in stage presentation the Greek theatre aimed at realism and illusion in all possible respects. In 1886 A. Müller was able to claim, for instance, 'it is indubitable that the Greeks strove for illusion, and tried to achieve this through scenic resources'. This assurance was based in contemporary theatrical and operatic stage practice (though it also rested, no doubt, on an entire vision of the Golden Age in Athens)".

⁵¹ NICOLL, *op. cit.* (n. 43), p. 195.

⁵² M. KOCUR, *Teatr antycznej Grecji*, Wrocław 2001, p. 193.

⁵³ Cf. D. WILES, *Tragedy in Athens. Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning*, Cambridge 1997, p. 176.

in Euripides' *Hecuba*, for example. Thus this scene in the *Oresteia* is one of the most controversial⁵⁴. Węclewski, in his introductory chapter already referred to, assumes that there were Charon's steps in the Athenian theatre. Therefore in his stage directions to this scene he writes that Clytemnestra's ghost appears on stage through the Styx gate turning its face to the Erinyes (and we may assume that the Styx gate and Charon's steps are two names for one and the same place). And at once I have to say that the realisation of such stage directions included in the translation was possible in 19th century theatre. We know that many of those theatres had trapdoors under the main stage that allowed an actor or actress to appear on the stage as if he or she was appearing from underground. While considering this passage in Węclewski's translation it is worthwhile to compare it with that in Jan Kasprowicz's translation. The translation of the *Oresteia* by Kasprowicz was published in 1908⁵⁵. Apart from being a poet and translator he was also a reviewer and theatre critic. He was a collaborator of Tadeusz Pawlikowski, one of the most important and significant theatre directors at the turn of the century. Kasprowicz also wrote dramas. It means then that he must have known how the theatre worked. But in the late 19th century, as we know from many reviews of that time, all those theatrical devices that had given such spectacular and attractive performances earlier were now usually too old, too used to give such magnificent impressions. Moreover, at that time, drama was considered to belong to the realm of literature rather than theatre. That is why the whole theatre arrangements were not usually considered important. Therefore Clytemnestra in the translation of Kasprowicz enters the stage on foot from one of the wings. There is also a much smaller crowd proposed by Kasprowicz when Agamemnon enters the stage. Athena also runs onto the stage (and does not appear on any vehicle from the air). It seems as though the translation of Kasprowicz is less spectacular than Węclewski's, and it is thus because of the influence of the theatre in the translators' times.

In *Eumenides*, the third part of the *Oresteia*, we may also find another scene whose projection in Węclewski's translation is highly consistent with theatrical possibilities in the translator's times. I mean the scene in which Orestes, after having fled from Delphi, appears in Athens in front of the goddess' statue and summons her. And some time later the goddess Athena enters the stage. The manner of her entry is part of an ongoing debate on the *Oresteia*, concerning whether or not Aeschylus used a device called the *mechane*. The opinions of both scholars and translators vary. Węclewski in his stage directions to this point in the play writes that Athena, armed with a shield and spear, appears in

⁵⁴ Cf. TAPLIN, *op. cit.* (n. 50), pp. 365–369; R.C. FLICKINGER, *The Greek Theater and its Drama*, Chicago 1918, p. 287; ARNOTT, *op. cit.* (n. 42), Oxford 1962, p. 82; A.E. HAIGH, *The Attic Theatre*, Oxford 1907, p. 218.

⁵⁵ Ajschylos, *Dzieje Orestesa*, transl. by J. KASPROWICZ, LWÓW 1908.

the air standing in a chariot with horses harnessed to it⁵⁶. Thinking about ancient Greek theatre, he had in mind a special crane, called the *mechane*, that was used to imitate flight, as he stated explicitly in the introductory chapter. Although the usage of the *mechane* in Aeschylus' times is still disputed and the possibility that it could have carried the whole chariot is doubtful, the realisation of such stage directions was quite possible in 19th century theatre. We know that in theatres of that period a special device called *flug* was used during musical performances to imitate flight, but it usually carried one person. But since the beginning of the 19th century special wooden elements constructed behind the stage (and thus unseen to the audience) were raised to differentiate the levels of a drama onstage. And as Zbigniew RASZEWSKI⁵⁷ writes, they were stable and wide enough to carry both a single person or a group of people. Thus the stage directions included by Węclewski were applicable on a theatre stage of the 19th century.

One of the most significant moments of the *Oresteia* which illustrates how Węclewski was influenced by the theatre (and its devices) of his times is the scene in which Clytemnestra appears on the stage standing over the dead bodies of Agamemnon and Cassandra. Usually scholars agree that at the time of the original performance the device called the *ekkyklema* was used and it is agreed that this device was a special platform that was rolled out of the *skene* through the main door to present, symbolically, an event that had taken place inside the building. But as we might have noticed, Węclewski considered this device to work differently from how it is now accepted. And therefore when he inserts stage directions at the moment when Clytemnestra is about to appear, he writes that the view of the inside rooms of the palace is shown to the audience. Considering both those stage directions and the information included in the introductory chapter we may conclude that he assumes that the stage wall draws aside to present the inside of the palace. And as it was, we assume, impossible to present this scene this way in ancient theatre, it was fully possible to present it this way in the 19th century, thanks to the system of moved wings and the back-drop (which might have pictured the inside rooms of the palace).

Węclewski was convinced that Aeschylus, because of many extraordinary scenes included in his tragedies, used many mechanical devices on stage while presenting his tragedies. Therefore he assumed the usage of many props on stage, crowds, the appearances of ghosts (from underground) or gods (who flew from heaven), or the usage of devices imitating lightnings and thunder, etc.⁵⁸ All

⁵⁶ I have to admit that Węclewski's stage directions at this point in the play are confirmed by the words of Athena while she appears on stage. And it is worth mentioning that those words are often omitted both in the editions of the *Oresteia* in ancient Greek or in translations (e.g. in the Polish translations by Jan Kasprówicz and Stefan Srebrny).

⁵⁷ RASZEWSKI, *Krótko...* (n. 43), pp. 90, 122.

⁵⁸ WĘCLEWSKI, *op. cit.* (n. 40), pp. XIII f.

those devices were invented, in his opinion, to impress the public watching the plays and to give the impression of illusion. But as we now know⁵⁹, the theatre in Aeschylus' times was probably much simpler than Węclewski supposed and his imagination was influenced by the tendencies towards illusion characteristic of the stage designs of 19th century theatres⁶⁰.

The thesis of this paper may sound quite obvious: that the translator is always influenced by different factors: history, language, some rules of translating, standards of writing poetry during his or her times. It is also his or her personality that should be taken into account, his or her knowledge, skills and preferences. All those factors constitute the horizon of a translator as Antoine BERMAN⁶¹ defined it. But there is also one more factor we are obliged to take into account while discussing any translation of a drama, as I have tried to present in this paper, and it is the theatre of the translator's times, because it may influence and shape his or her imagination and the way he/she designs the future potential staging of that play. In this way, 19th century theatre definitely shaped Węclewski's imagination and made his translations potentially performative onstage during those times (although, unfortunately, there was no staging of the *Oresteia* until 1910, and no staging of this trilogy in Węclewski's translation ever occurred).

Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

⁵⁹ ARNOTT, *op. cit.* (n. 42), pp. 107–122; A.W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*, Oxford 1946, pp. 42–47; A.E. HAIGH, *The Attic Theatre*, Oxford 1907; E. DUGDALE, *Greek Theatre in Context*, Cambridge 2008, p. 64; R. CHODKOWSKI, *Funkcja obrazów scenicznych w tragediach Ajschylosa*, Wrocław 1975, p. 16.

⁶⁰ Cf. TAPLIN, *op. cit.* (n. 50), pp. 39 f.: “But one thing is generally agreed: Aeschylus was by far the most spectacular dramatist. Aeschylus is supposed to have astounded his spectators with exotic crowds and to have stunned them with huge and complex machines [...] but my own observation on Aeschylus' stagecraft have led me to conclude that the orthodox view of his monstrously alarming spectacle is to a large extent unfounded, and that it seriously hinders the full appreciation of Aeschylus as an artist. The usual view would have us believe that the spectacle is there in order to cover over weak content, and so to dazzle the audience that it neglects the failings. I maintain, on the contrary, that the visual in Aeschylus is integrally bound up with the content and indivisible from it, so that if one is weak then so is the other. Moreover, I hope to show that a notable aspect of Aeschylus' quality as a dramatic artist lies in his use of ‘life-sized’ actions, like entrances and exits, which do real work within their plays. [...] The spectacles which I hope to obliterate from our vision of Aeschylus' stagecraft are inessential visual effects – particularly crowds, machines, and massive ‘happenings’ – which are not founded in the plays, and which are, I maintain, the additions of later producers and scholars, both ancient and modern. They are nothing to do with the authentic Aeschylus”.

⁶¹ Cf. R. NIZIOLEK, *Cztery razy Don Juan: polskie dwudziestowieczne przekłady dramatu Moliera*, Kraków 2014, pp. 38–48.

Luca Asmonti, *Athenian Democracy: A Sourcebook*, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014 (Bloomsbury Sources in Ancient History), XIV + 246 pp., ISBN 978-1-4411-1371-9, £25.99 (pb).

LUCA ASMONTI'S [= A.] new book was supposed to be a comprehensive sourcebook on Athenian democratic culture, intended primarily for "undergraduate students in classics and ancient history" (p. 1). Unfortunately, it is another, and rather badly edited, volume focused on the history of Athenian democracy in the fifth century BC, despite the author's assurance that the book will go beyond the classical period and will cover the evolution of the Athenian democratic system in Hellenistic and Roman times (back cover).

The volume consists of thirteen chapters preceded by a preface, a list of abbreviations and an introduction which presents a short sketch of Athenian democracy, stressing what exactly it was, what was so exceptional about it, and what were its characteristic features (pp. 1–12). A. begins in mythical times, going from Ion, through Theseus, to the battle of Crannon (322 BC), when the Macedonian army took over Greece (pp. 4–6).

All the chapters are composed in a similar way. Each section comprises a short discussion regarding the relevant period of time and the problems associated with it. Then the reader is provided with several selected sources translated into English. Unfortunately, the ancient texts are left with no commentary at all, which is extremely unhelpful for inexperienced students, who are supposed to be the main readers of this volume. Moreover, as could be expected, well known literary evidence (e.g. Pericles' funeral speech, passages from *The Athenian Constitution* and Aristotle's *Politics*) dominates over the epigraphic sources. Although A. assured us that "[s]ources include material by Aristotle, Homer, Aristophanes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Cicero, Tacitus and many other authors" (back cover), the reader will not find any passages included from Cicero or Tacitus.

Chapters 1 and 2 are rather introductory. They deal with the definition and origin of the *polis* (ch. 1), with the birth of Athens and the roots of democracy (ch. 2). The next eleven chapters (chs. 3–13) present the history of Athenian democracy in chronological order. Chapter 3 discusses Draco and Solon, and the subject of chapter 4 is the tyranny of Pisistratus. Surprisingly, A. devotes only 2 pages to Cleisthenes (ch. 5; pp. 81 f. contain a brief history of Cleisthenes' reforms, whilst pp. 83–89 refer to the sources), even though the section is entitled "Cleisthenes and the Birth of Democracy", and should really provide the reader with much more information. The procedure of ostracism is not mentioned at all, nor the council of 500. The times of the Persian wars and Athenian maritime expansion cover the next twenty two pages (ch. 6). The development of democracy under Ephialtes and Pericles is discussed in chapters 7 and 8. Chapter 9 focuses on the next phase of the Peloponnesian war, when Alcibiades and Cleon became the main politicians in Athens. Chapter 10 emphasises Athenian imperialism and the idea of spreading the democratic system beyond Athens. Chapters 11 and 12 deal with the crisis of democracy caused by the Sicilian expedition and the Arginusae failure, the anti-democratic voices and oligarchic experiments. The last chapter (13) is in fact the only part in which Athenian democracy in the fourth century BC is discussed. The book ends with a section entitled "Further Reading" (pp. 221–240). This is a well-presented section with references to up-to-date literature, enabling those less familiar with ancient history to gain insight into further studies. Two Indexes, an Index of Passages (pp. 241 f.) and an Index of Names (pp. 243–246) close the volume.

There is no doubt that A.'s sourcebook on Athenian democracy is a long needed publication; however its many defects and faults diminish its value. The large number of editing mistakes

include many misspellings, for example “Pyhtia” instead of Pythia (p. 38) and “Psisitratids” instead of Pisistratids (p. 91). The lack of consistency in using topographical names and abbreviating ancient authors, such as using both “Sicyone” and “Sicyon” and “Hyp.” then “Hyperides” (p. 217) are just two of examples of the many mistakes. It seems that the author did not achieve everything he wanted with the book, as on the back cover we are informed that there should be an A–Z of key terms, which there is not. The biggest disappointment, however, is the chronological time-frames. A.’s narration mainly revolves around Athens in the fifth century BC (chs. 6–12) with several references to earlier centuries, and only one chapter devoted to the fourth century BC. There is no other book so far on Athenian democracy beyond the classical period and A.’s work could have been a welcome contribution, but unfortunately, it is not¹. Moreover, if we compare A.’s sourcebook with ROISMAN’S collection of evidence dated from Homer to Alexander the Great, published in 2011, where at least fifteen chapters are devoted to Athens and democracy (chs. 9–11, 17–21, 23, 27–29, 34–35, 38), then the book under review looks rather poor². ROISMAN provides his readers with a proper historical narration, primary sources with commentary, and additionally with online references to various databases.

In general, before the publication of the next edition A.’s book should be better edited to avoid all spelling errors. Also, it would be far more useful if the author supplemented any references to Hellenistic and Roman times with the proper evidence and at least provided some basic comments on the cited sources. Additional maps or timelines would also be an improvement. After such improvements, both students and the general public would be able to benefit more from it.

Dominika Grzesik
University of Wrocław
dominika.grzesik@uwr.edu.pl

¹ E.W. ROBINSON, *Democracy beyond Athens*, Cambridge 2015, is a recent publication on democracy beyond Athens in the classical period.

² J. ROISMAN, *Ancient Greece from Homer to Alexander: The Evidence*. Translations by J.C. YARDLEY, Malden 2011 (Blackwell Sourcebooks in Ancient History).

P.J. Rhodes, *Thucydides*, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015 (Ancients in Action), XI + 92 S., ISBN 978-1-4725-2399-0, £18.99.

Über Thukydides, den Sohn des Oloros, und sein Werk ist schon unendlich viel Tinte vergossen worden. Diese an sich erfreuliche Tatsache hat jedoch auch eine Kehrseite: Konfrontiert mit tausenden Seiten von Kommentaren und Dutzenden von wissenschaftlichen Monographien, die alle Aspekte im Werk des größten athenischen Geschichtsschreibers aus möglichst allen Perspektiven behandeln, kann jeder Student oder interessierte Laie in Entsetzen geraten und gegebenenfalls sogar entmutigt werden, sich mit Thukydides näher auseinanderzusetzen. Eben aus diesem Grunde ist jede konzise Darstellung, welche die Person des Verfassers, sein Œuvre und dessen historischen Entstehungskontext in einer nachvollziehbaren, gut lesbaren Prosa näherbringt, mehr als willkommen. Ein solches, für interessierte Laien gedachtes, Buch zu Thukydides aus der Feder des eminenten britischen Althistorikers und Thukydides-Experten Peter J. RHODES [= RH.] ist 2015 in der Buchreihe „Ancients in Action“ bei Bloomsbury erschienen.

Die in dieser Buchreihe erscheinenden Bände seien – dem Klappentext des Buches zufolge – „short and accessible introductions to major figures of the ancient world, depicting the essentials of each subject’s life and significance for later western civilization“. Es sei schon vorweg gesagt, dass das Buch von RH. den Zielen dieser Reihe nur in Teilen entspricht: Es ist in der Tat kurz und meist leicht verständlich, es bietet auch eine knappe Darlegung der Bedeutung des thukydideischen Werkes, seiner Struktur und Rezeption. Was dagegen schmerzlich fehlt, sind nähere Angaben zur Person des Thukydides. Auch wenn unser Wissen darüber höchst begrenzt ist, so ist zur Biographie des Thukydides wohl mehr bekannt als das, was man aus vier Sätzen auf S. 8 des Buches von RH. erfährt. Der Leser lernt sogar nicht einmal, welchem *demos* Thukydides angehörte oder wo er sein Exil verbrachte (man erfährt nur auf einer der letzten Seiten, was Johannes Tzetzes im 12. Jh. darüber wusste). Trotz dieser Lücken in der Darstellung des tatsächlich rätselhaften Lebens des athenischen Historikers, bietet RH. etliche spannende und meist klar präsentierte Einblicke in und Überblicke über dessen Werk.

Nach einer Liste der wichtigsten Daten und einer Karte der „Welt von Thukydides“ folgt das erste Kapitel, das auf insgesamt zehn Seiten bündig die absolut grundlegenden Fakten zur griechischen Welt darlegt. Im Fokus des zweiten und längsten Kapitels steht Thukydides als Historiker. Dabei bespricht RH. etwa die Struktur des thukydideischen Werkes, die Chronologie, die Informationsquellen des Historikers, die Schilderungsweisen und Grundsätze seiner Methode. Veranschaulicht wird dies durch die Betrachtung einiger Beispiele, was wurde von Thukydides berücksichtigt und in seine Schilderung aufgenommen, was überraschenderweise verschwiegen und zu welchen Angelegenheiten gibt es im thukydideischen Werke widersprüchliche Angaben. Im dritten Kapitel begegnen wir Thukydides dem „Denker“. Hierbei versucht RH. aus Thukydides’ Geschichtswerk zu eruieren, welche Ansichten der griechische Historiker hatte und von welchen Einflüssen sie abhängen konnten. Knapp beschreibt er daher die ein wenig opaken politischen Einstellungen dieses konservativen Aristokraten qua Geburt, der die perikleische Demokratie und *arche* nichtsdestotrotz bewundert hat. Darüber hinaus geht RH. zum einen auf die Einstellung des Thukydides zur traditionellen Religion ein und auf seine wohl erstaunliche Ignoranz gegenüber religiösen Diagnosen und Problemen, zum anderen auf den Einfluss der zeitgenössischen Philosophen auf den Historiker. Zwar lassen sich in seinem Werk Ansätze der in den Kreisen der Sophisten stattfindenden Diskussionen erkennen (Logos-Ergon- und Nomos-Physis-Antithese), aber Thukydides selbst zeigt kein größeres Interesse an der Philosophie. Als ein unerbittlicher, rationaler und objektiver Wahrheitssuchender wurde Thukydides oft von den älteren Generationen von Lesern und Gelehrten gesehen, wohingegen in den neueren Zeiten von einigen Forschern ein konträres Bild lanciert wurde; wie Nicole LORAUX pointiert feststellte „Thucydide n’est pas un

collège“ (s. Quaderni di Storia XII 1980, S. 55–81). Das Nachleben des Thukydides skizziert RH. im letzten, vierten Kapitel, wobei er in aller Kürze die Rezeption des thukydideischen Werkes bereits in der Antike, dann in Byzanz und der Renaissance sowie der näheren Vergangenheit beleuchtet. Notwendigerweise handelt sich dabei um eine recht willkürliche und selektive Darstellung. Dieses schmale Buch schließt mit bibliographischen Hinweisen und einem Register.

Peter J. RHODES hat folglich ein kompaktes und allgemeinverständliches Bild des Geschichtswerkes des Thukydides vorgelegt, das sich dem interessierten Leserpublikum – trotz seiner Lücken, notwendigen Verallgemeinerungen und eines relativ hohen Preises – als nützlich erweisen mag.

Rafał Matuszewski
Universität Heidelberg

Simon Hornblower, *Lycophron: Alexandra. Greek Text, Translation, Commentary, and Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, 656 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-957670-8, £120.00.

Simon HORNBLOWER'S [= H.] 2015 work, the third volume on Hellenistic poetry published by the Oxford University Press since 2012, following Callimachus' *Aetia* (ed. Anette HARDER, 2012) and Callimachus' *Hymns* (ed. Susan STEPHENS 2015; see Eos CIII 2016, pp. 163 f.), is a very broad yet comprehensive single-volume text featuring both an introduction and commentary to the text.

The book includes maps, illustrations and a prose translation. Unlike the Oxford editions mentioned above, H.'s commentary is provided under the main text and arranged into two columns, probably as a result of the extraordinary character of the *Alexandra*, known in ancient times as τὸ σκοτεινὸν ποίημα, "an obscure poem" (Suda s.v. Λυκόφρων) – a very complicated work in terms of language (neologisms, *hapax legomena*), subject matter (rare versions of myths) and style (numerous allusions, enigmatic style). In order to comprehend the poem, one has to constantly refer to the footnotes; therefore, two columns of explanatory text at the bottom of the page substantially improve the experience of reading.

Another point is that commentaries of such length sometimes take the form of an essay or polemic with other researchers of the *Alexandra*; sometimes a whole page is devoted to just a few lines, and at other times the commentary is spread over several pages (e.g. pp. 406–411). In such cases, the poem is completely lost from the reader's sight and replaced by a scholarly disquisition – this to the benefit of acquiring knowledge, but at the cost of impaired contact with the text itself.

The extensive introduction consisting of 120 pages refers mainly to the historical background but also tackles literary and philological issues. There are three problems that seem to come to the fore: (1) the sources and influences that shaped the *Alexandra* (pp. 7–38); (2) the issue of the authorship and place of the poem's origin (pp. 39–49; 114); and (3) the comparison of the epigraphic material with cult epithets in the poem, which greatly promotes understanding of the poem's historical and religious background (pp. 62–94).

The most controversial issue is the work's authorship. The *Alexandra* is not only "an obscure poem" but it also presents a continued challenge for researchers as regards its author. Consequently, their opinions concerning the problem appear to take three standpoints: (1) the author was Lycophron of Chalcis, a member of the Alexandrian Pleiad, belonging to the same literary environment as Callimachus, Theocritus, Apollonius, and Alexander Aetolus; (2) the author was Lycophron of Chalcis, but the text of the *Alexandra* was interpolated after some time; (3) the author was not Lycophron of Chalcis but someone who lived after him. The doubts about the authorship of the *Alexandra* stem from two passages on Rome (Rome's future grandeur at sea and on land: 1226–1230; an avenger who in the sixth generation after the death of Alexander will take revenge on the Greeks for the destruction of Troy: 1446–1450). Many researchers believe that the poet could not have foreseen the emerging power of Rome back in the mid 3rd century BC. H. supports the third option, claiming that the author is anonymous and the latest episode to which the poet refers in his work concerns T. Quinctius Flamininus, the alleged "avenger", defeating the ruler of Macedonia, Philip V, in 197 BC. This is not a new hypothesis. It had been promoted earlier, as the editor mentions (p. 37), by, among others, BELOCH, WILHELM, ZIEGLER, and also FRASER (who in 1979 changed his mind and came to the conclusion that Lycophron of Chalcis could not have been the author of the *Alexandra*). On the other hand, the contrary view was held by WILAMOWITZ, HOLZINGER and MOMIGLIANO, and the theory of interpolation was proposed by Stephanie WEST.

The main problem lies in the fact that while none of the parties is capable of providing a decisive argument for or against their position, certain hypotheses are presented which researchers of different views try to refute. Certain assumptions, however, made by H. do not seem to be fully convincing. Firstly, the issue of Hellenistic intertextuality, and especially that of the Alexandrian

poetry, is far more complex than it is assumed by the editor. Especially complex seems to be the problem of “synchronic allusiveness” or the situation where the poets created their works more or less at the same time, as it is practically impossible to precisely determine who was the original creator and who creatively transformed the motifs and scenes devised by the other (see e.g. episodes from the *Argonautica* by Apollonius of Rhodes [I 1207–1239; II 1–97] which should be compared with Theocritus’ *Idylls* 13 [*Hylas*] and 22 [*Dioskouroi*], respectively). Therefore, one may not say with all confidence, as the editor does (pp. 25 f.; 33–36), that the author of the *Alexandra* was inspired by, among others, the poetry of Eratosthenes, Moschus or Nicander of Colophon who lived a little later than Lycophron of Chalcis. It could have been quite the other way round: it could have been they who referred to his works.

Moreover, does not the opinion (shared by H.) about the poet’s extraordinary literary erudition, noticeable on the stylistic, thematic and lexical layer of the text (pp. 7–38), indirectly point at the person who, on the one hand, had full access to all kinds of literary sources, and, on the other, was active in the period of the most intense intellectual ferment, when the mere environment as comprised of outstanding individuals generated additional artistic impetus? Both of these conditions would rather point at Alexandria (and the first decades of the 3rd century) as the place housing the greatest library and home to a group of restless poets who every day simultaneously worked on editing many literary works; all the more that the intertextual game between the author of the *Alexandra* and other poets was not only played on the thematic layer or in the jugglery of motifs and episodes, but also in the deepest lexical layer¹, which we now manage to read with the help of computer databases and search engines. Would it not, therefore, be tempting to assert that a poem that is so densely sown with references to other Alexandrian poets was the effect of everyday contact with other artists living in the mid 3rd century BC, with whom new ideas and new philological findings were shared *ad hoc*? It is worth mentioning that Lycophron of Chalcis worked “desk against desk” with Alexander Aetolus, who in his elegy, the *Apollo*, used prophecy as the way to transfer narration into the future tense. The same method of narration was applied by the author of the *Alexandra*.

Moreover, the argument that the date to which the poet refers to in his famous lines 1447–1450 is the year 197, when the Romans defeated Philip V at Cynoscephalae, does not seem to be fully convincing. H. assumes that the sixth generation after Alexander the Great mentioned in these lines could more or less live at that time, which makes the victorious commander, T. Quinctius Flaminus, the “wrestler-avenger”. It is, however, not clear why the author of the *Alexandra* should assume that human generation is 25 years, as H. does (p. 496), since ancient sources also suggest several other values: 40, 33, 30, or even 100 years.

Also the concept of the poem’s author being born in Locri (as supported by many references to this Italic city) does not seem to be convincing, as during that time the West was still attractive for the Alexandrian poets (mainly thanks to the historians Timaeus and Lycus) as a new and unexplored theme in poetry. For example, Callimachus devotes a relatively large portion of the *Aetia* to issues taken from the broadly understood Italic tradition (e.g. a long passage on Sicilian cities [frgs. 43–43a HARDER], a story of a Roman named Gaius [frgs. 106–107a HARDER] and a story of the tyrant Phalaris [frgs. 45–46 HARDER]). Apollonius, naturally, also describes the western *oikumene* in book 4 of the *Argonautica*, not to mention Theocritus, who placed his imagined bucolical world on Sicily. Certainly, Locri is often mentioned, but if H. himself claims that there is no evidence to support this hypothesis (p. 49), it has to remain in the realm of speculation. On the other hand, one may deliberate if the poet’s interest in Locri does not indirectly point to Lycophron of Chalcis as the author. Ancient sources indicate that the adoptive father of the poet (Suda s.v. Λυκόφρων), the

¹ See e.g. A.S. HOLLIS, *Some Poetic Connections of Lykophron’s Alexandra*, in: P.J. FINGLASS, C. COLLARD, N.J. RICHARDSON (eds), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M.L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*, Oxford 2007, pp. 276–293.

historian Lycus, was born in Rhegium, a town situated not far from Locri. It is therefore possible that Lycophron stayed in Italy for some time with Lycus, maybe also in Locri, as it was, as H. puts it, “a cultured place in the Hellenistic period” (p. 48), attractive for Lycus and Lycophron, both men of letters. Having let our imagination run wild, we may also assume that it was exactly during that time when Lycophron had the chance to observe the Roman army growing in power, as in 282, just before the Pyrrhic War, the Romans established their garrisons both in Locri and in Rhegium and sent their warships to Thurii. Arguably, the growing threat posed by Rome to the Greek cities in Italy inspired the poet to insert the aforementioned passages into the text of the *Alexandra*, thus giving rise to so many doubts among scholars. Again, there is no irrefutable evidence to support this view, but there is also no argument that would definitely repudiate it.

When it comes to the text itself, H. often follows the edition by SCHEER (1881, ²1908) and HOLZINGER (1895), also in terms of punctuation. HURST/KOLDE’s book (2008) is far more economical in the use of commas and full stops when compared to H.’s edition (and also that by SCHEER and HOLZINGER), who try to introduce some sort of order to the chaotic flow of Cassandra’s talk. The proposition of HURST/KOLDE, on the other hand, is to imitate the heroine’s “stream of consciousness”, which brings the text closer to the original as well as to the modernist narrative techniques. It may not make the poem any easier to read, but in the abundance of other difficulties, this seems to be a minute problem.

H. maintains that “the text provided in this book is intended as no more than a companion to the commentary. The app. crit. is far from registering all variant readings (for these see Mascialino or Hurst/Kolde)” (p. 113). At this point the editor indicates in a footnote four “obvious slips” which were found in the edition by A. HURST and A. KOLDE and adds by means of *praeteritio*: “my app. crit. silently corrects these” (p. 113, n. 322). Also, H. seems not to agree with the lessons selected by HURST, who often preferred a *lectio difficilior*.

The text of the *Alexandra* as edited by H. also requires some corrections. Below is the version of the latest edition followed by a correct variant:

at 20 for χερνάδος read χερμάδος // at 25 for φαινοῦσαι read φαίνουσαι // at 49 for οὐδαίαν θεάν read οὐδαίαν θεόν (about Persephone; H.’s version seems to be acceptable as the gender of the noun is consistent with the gender of the adjective, however, firstly, the form of θεόν was retained in Mss.; secondly, a female deity may be described in Greek in the masculine with a feminine article [ἡ θεός]; and thirdly, at this point Lycophron engages in a dialogue with Apollonius of Rhodes and Theocritus who use similar forms to describe the chthonic goddesses who were equally as dangerous as Persephone and, importantly, were identified with her: Rhea and Hecate [see A.R. I 1102: δεινὴν θεόν; A.R. III 1213 δεινὴ θεός; Theoc. *Id.* 2, 36: ἅ θεός]) // at 62 for ξυνευνετοῦ read ξυνευνέτου // at 77 the situation is quite contrary, as H. follows HOLZINGER and not Mss. and LSJ, and uses the form of κυνοσφάγου instead of κυνοσφαγούς (dictionary form: κυνοσφαγής) // at 80 κακλάζων read καχλάζων // at 125 λίτας read λιτάς // at 146 δαίσασθαί read δαίσασθαι // at 147 δοίω read δοιῶ // at 150 βλάστοντα read βλαστόντα // at 227 μοίρα read μοίρα // at 328 ράϊσει read ράισει // at 340 πύρσον read πυρσόν // at 349 λαίνου read λαίνου // at 361 ἦ read ἦ // at 387 στενου read στενοῦ // at 536 πρευμένης read πρευμένης // at 545 ὠκριώμενοι read ὠκριωμένοι // at 556 πλευρ’ read πλευρ’ // at 618 ἐκβάλλων read ἐκβαλών // at 657 φίλον read φίλων // at 676 φόρβαδες read φορβάδες // at 679 Κταρός read Κτάρος // at 818 πλάσταισι read πλασταῖσι // at 855 εὐμαρίδας read εὐμαρίδας (an exception, see Herodianus, *De prosodia catholica* I 99) // at 1027 νήσον read νῆσον // at 1074 Ἄμφισσαν τε read Ἄμφισσάν τε // at 1152 Γυγαῖα read Γυγαίᾳ // at 1161 Σίθωνος read Σιθῶνος // at 1177 κλάγγαισι read κλαγγαῖσι // at 1192 Ὀφίονος read Ὀφίωνος // at 1372 στρωφωμένη read στρωφωμένη // at 1385 κόρη read κόρη. The lapses mentioned above are usually correctly written if cited in the commentary.

H. brightens the darkness designed by the author of the *Alexandra* to obscure his poem. This is achieved by a very extensive commentary to the text, relating to the subject matter, history, religion

as well as literary structure. An indispensable value of the introduction and commentary is that they confront the text with epigraphical material, which proves that the religious reality depicted in the *Alexandra* was close to that of a cult reality. However, a more inquisitive reader should also refer to other editions, e.g. that of MASCIALINO (1964) or HURST/KOLDE (2008), due to the very limited critical apparatus offered by H. The same two editions or some of the editions published earlier, e.g. by HOLZINGER (1881) or SCHEER (1881, ²1908) would be recommended to read the text itself.

Emilia Żybert
University of Wrocław

Damian Caluori, *Plotinus on the Soul*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, 222 pp., ISBN 978-1-10-710595-9, £67.00.

Damian CALUORI's [= C.] book *Plotinus on the Soul* is a work concerning one of the most interesting, but, at the same time, most difficult, controversial and complex issues in Plotinus' philosophy. In the "Introduction" the author gives a short account of the problems pertaining to the soul within the Platonic tradition, presents the structure of his book and touches upon what he calls "systematic equivocity" in Plotinus' thinking (the use of one term for different, but connected objects). There is no discussion of the abundant secondary literature on the subject and the *status quaestionis*.

In the first chapter ("Unity and Creation: Why Plotinus Introduced the Hypostasis Soul"), C. gives some historical context for the problem of the nature of the soul, starting from Plato's *Timaeus*, but also points out other theories, both Platonic and from other schools (Pythagoreans, Stoics, etc.). The author states his preliminary views of the subject: all souls are one by virtue of the existence of Soul as hypostasis, which is not to be found in the realm of Intellect, but rather constitutes a distinct realm itself. Soul as such is to be distinguished not only from individual souls, but also from the World Soul. C. presents two reasons for introducing the hypostasis Soul, explaining individual agency and the existence of providence (found already in *Tim.* 39e).

In chapter two ("The Hypostasis Soul") those preliminary views are developed in more detail. The hypostasis Soul is identified with Plato's Craftsman (δημιουργός), responsible both for the creation of the world and the existence of providence. C. distinguishes between propositional and non-propositional thinking (the first belongs to the soul, the second, to the intellect) and insists that we also need to distinguish between discursive thinking (διάνοια) and discursive reasoning (λογισμός). Only the latter is a process in time, which we usually call "thinking", the first one is an atemporal but propositional grasp of the world of Forms. Another important dichotomy introduced by the author is that of theoretical vs. practical thinking. The first one is the intellectual contemplation of the Forms, the second one is divine providence, inclined to the material world.

Chapter three ("The Hypostasis Soul and its Relation to Individual Souls") deals with the question of the unity and multiplicity both in the realm of Intellect and of Soul. The author shows in what sense Intellect in Plotinus is one and there are also many individual intellects. Later, in a similar way he shows how the hypostasis Soul is one and there are also individual souls. The principle of multiplicity in those realms is what he calls "focus" – either on a particular Form in Intellect, or on a particular part of the material creation on the level of Soul.

In chapter four ("The Individual Soul in the Intelligible and in the Sensible World") C. concentrates on the twofold life of the each soul: contemplation of intelligible objects and its concern with the material realm. This is convincingly tied to Plotinian theory of the primary and secondary activity of each real being. Both in chapter three and in this chapter the historical context for the problems discussed is given.

Chapter five ("Divine Individual Souls") describes the nature and life of particular souls, such as the World Soul, the souls of the stars, planets and the earth. They also have to take care of some part of the material world, but their life is undisturbed and so they are not inclined to fall. The fall of the soul is the subject of the next chapter ("The Human Soul: Its Descent and its Confusion in the Sensible World"), where this phenomenon is called by the author the "descent of the soul". This descent is, C. argues, not an objective process or state, but only a subjective experience of the human soul. The reason for it is the fact that taking care of human bodies requires more attention to the senses and emotions than in the case of the divine souls. This amounts to the disastrous fall of human souls and the need for their purification.

Chapter seven ("The Human Soul: The Higher and the Lower Soul") deals with the activity of the human soul in the sensible, material world. C. explains what Plotinus calls the lower soul

(this part that is involved with the body) in terms not of a part of the soul, but of its power, projected into the material realm, without leaving the intelligible. The essence of this lower soul is the “faculty of presentation” (φανταστικόν) and it can be identified with the Stoic “ruling part” (ἡγεμονικόν). The relations of this lower soul to the World Soul is also discussed here.

The last chapter (“The Soul and the Body”) concerns the problem of mutual relationships between the soul and the body. C. explains what Plotinus means by his famous statement that the soul is not in the body, but the body is in the soul. He also discusses the part or rather the power of the soul that is called “nature”, its role and relation to the bodies. The book ends with a short section on the activity of the soul in animals and plants. There is no conclusion at the end.

C.’s book is an invaluable contribution to our understanding of Plotinus’ theory of the soul. Since BLUMENTHAL’S monograph¹ there has been no attempt to write a single work about the soul, even though there have been numerous highly significant papers on the issue. The author decided to leave aside problems of “the self” in Plotinus, hotly debated in recent years, as well as the problem of the purification of the soul and spiritual exercises. The result of his effort is a book of impressive clarity and order of thought. It reads very well and is almost austere in its focus. C. places the topics he discusses within their historical contexts, extending not only to classical schools of ancient thought, but also, for example, to Galen.

What seems to be lacking (although only from a certain perspective) is the author’s discussion of the secondary literature. The number of works is somehow overwhelming, but C.’s decision to leave aside scholarly debates is especially questionable when he deals with controversial problems of Plotinian scholarship, such as discursive vs. non-discursive thinking, descent vs. fall of the soul or the “double activity” of the soul in the intelligible and the sensible realm; or the concept of “presentation” (awareness, consciousness). C. gives his reasons, based on the analysis of Plotinian thought-structure (less on the analysis of actual texts), which are solid, but sometimes the reader who is not aware of the range of the debates on given issues might have the impression that C.’s views are natural interpretations of Plotinus’ texts. They are not, despite the quality of his scholarly skills and his erudition. There are, however, exceptions to this strategy, when the author identifies other interpretations and argues (more or less successfully) against them.

Mateusz Stróżyński
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

¹ H.J. BLUMENTHAL, *Plotinus’ Psychology: His Doctrines of the Embodied Soul*, The Hague 1971.

Paul Rigby, *The Theology of Augustine's Confessions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, 340 pp., ISBN 978-1-10-709492-5, £67.00.

Paul RIGBY [= R.] in his new book on Augustine's *Confessions* has a bold objective of providing us with a fresh look at this "magic book", as he calls it in the opening sentence of the "Preface" (p. IX). Even though it may be a "magic book" not only for R., but for many other scholars and amateurs, the Canadian theologian claims that we all, in our post-Enlightenment or late modern outlook, have lost the ability to experience what he calls the "shocking freshness" of the *Confessions* (p. 2).

In an attempt to bring back some of this freshness, R. invokes several modern thinkers. His main framework is the thought of Paul RICOEUR, but he also cites, to a greater or lesser extent, KANT, HEGEL, NIETZSCHE, FREUD, HEIDEGGER and BENJAMIN. R. assumes that in order to hear and understand what Augustine has to say to us, we have to "cross-examine" him first, in the light of modern thought, which is so radically different from the bishop of Hippo's experience and view of the world.

R. identifies "five sets of problems where Augustine's testimony has become incredible for the modern reader" (p. 4). Those are: (1) the genre of the *Confessions*, the idea of *confessio* and of testimony in general; (2) a Freudian suspicion that Augustine's (as anyone else's, for that matter) belief in God is a sign of psychological immaturity and an unresolved Oedipus complex; (3) a similar suspicion of psychohistorians from the school of Heinz KOHUT, who understand Augustine's personality and his work in terms of his alleged narcissism; (4) the ideas of original sin, election, predestination and theodicy as largely rejected Augustinian legacy; and (5) celibate, marriage, and (male) community seen in the context of the Christian hope for resurrection. The largest space is given to the fourth set of problems (chapters 4–9), while others are dealt with within the scope of one or two chapters each.

In the first chapter ("*Confessio*") R. considers the meaning of *confessio* in terms of Jean NABERT's (via Paul RICOEUR) idea of a testimony as investing "a moment in history with an absolute character" (p. 15). The author tries to connect Augustine's mystical experiences, his notion of the Platonic, absolute and immutable Being, with the Christian view of history, the Scriptures and the intersection between the eternal and the temporal.

The problem of testimony (*scil.* God revealed in a personal history) becomes a starting point for examining a Freudian claim that Augustine's religious experience was an expression of unresolved, unconscious Oedipal conflicts (Chapter Two: "Fatherhood: From Neurotic Phantasm to Compassionate Symbol"). Here R. uses his work from the 1980s¹ to argue (against the view of many scholars, including, to mention at least one, Eric R. DODDS²) that Augustine did resolve the Oedipus complex in the *Confessions*. R. shows rather convincingly that the ending of the so called "autobiographical" part of the *Confessions* in Book Nine appears to be a successful working through his relationships with his mother and father. Both are seen positively, but realistically, and feelings towards them are sublimated in the context of Christian faith (the symbols of motherhood and fatherhood are displaced on the Church and God).

In the next chapter ("Narcissism and Narrative's Vital Lie") R. discusses Augustine's personality and work in terms of KOHUT's view of narcissism, particularly the need for "self-objects", that

¹ E.g. P. RIGBY, *Paul Ricoeur, Freudianism, and Augustine's "Confessions"*, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* LIII 1985, pp. 93–114.

² E.R. DODDS, *Augustine's "Confessions": A Study of Spiritual Maladjustment*, *Hibbert Journal* XXVI 1927–1928, pp. 459–473.

is, for people who are viewed not as independent agents, but as mere instruments of maintaining the cohesion of the self. R. claims that neither God, nor the reader of the *Confessions* is a mere self-object to Augustine's fragmented self, but that his work intends in fact to build a Christian community and mature relationships between him and God, him and other Christians, in this way transcending his narcissistic needs. The author goes beyond the *Confessions*, discussing also Augustine's ordination in the year 391 and his conversion from the Platonic idealised, solitary life of seeking for timeless wisdom, towards a Christian, communal and self-giving life. Augustine's confessional narrative escapes from a naïve search for easy consolations.

Chapters Four to Nine focus on the original sin and predestination, and thus on the problem of evil and suffering in a good world created by a good God³. In Chapter Four ("Evil, Suffering, and Dualistic Wisdom") R. deals with the problem of evil and shows Augustine's way through Manichaeism and Platonism towards the "confessional Christianity", where the bishop of Hippo found out that "the involuntary and inscrutable nature of the origin of evil cannot be resolved theoretically in terms of ethical monotheism" (p. 91). In Chapter Five ("Original Sin: An Ineluctable Triple Hatred") the author discusses RICOEUR's critique of Augustine's position on the original sin and predestination (as anti-Gnosticism which becomes a form of Gnosticism) and presents the original sin as fundamental self-hatred or a triple hatred of God, truth and the self. In the next chapter ("Original Sin and the Human Tragic") R. tries to use hermeneutics to formulate Augustine's concept of the transmission of sin in terms of a transmission of "malevolence" through language and culture. He also argues that the bishop of Hippo is not trying to explain the beginning of evil, but rather to understand, ontologically, how evil exists in a good world. Ultimately, since evil is nothingness, it is impossible to see into its nature (it is similar to trying to see darkness or to hear silence). The chapter ends with an interesting discussion of the sad fate of unbaptised infants who, for Augustine, become inexplicable but "heartrending" figures of suffering itself.

In Chapter Seven ("The Platitudes of Ethical Monotheism") R. tries to show an inner tension in Augustine's theology, namely, the apparent inability to reconcile God's justice and mercy. The author is convinced that Augustine did manage to resolve the tension, but not within the scope of "ethical discourse". In the next chapter ("Inscrutable Wisdom") R. suggests that the solution lies in Augustine's confessional narrative, which contains three conversions. The result of the first one is "moral freedom", with its ethical realisation that God is just and we are responsible for our sins. The result of the second one is the "freedom of inscrutable wisdom", with a tragic sense of living in a world where we have to let go of our narcissistic demands. The result of the third and the last one is the "freedom to serve" and suffer for the sake of the community.

Chapter Nine ("The Lyrical Voice") pictures Augustine's "lyrical discourse" or his "economy of gift", the view of life as God's calling "Love me!". Here R. argues that Augustine transcended the tension of his theology of sin, justice, and grace, by building a narrative in which Christ's life is a paradigm for the life of the whole Christian community, and thus everyone's life can be told as a story of mercy, gift, and love. The next chapter ("The Life of a Bishop: Reinventing Plato's Celestial Clock, *Confessions* 11–13") deals with the idea that the *Confessions* as a literary work is intended to become a "world" for Augustine's community, which by its poetics "can enlarge and augment the horizon of their existence" (p. 201). R. emphasises the bishop of Hippo's transition from Platonic salvation in the present, immutable moment towards a Christian view of history, time, and narrative.

The final chapter of the book ("Resurrection and the Restless Heart") discusses the concepts of community and friendship. The "communitarian" (p. 215) aspect of the *Confessions* is highlighted, the bond of friendship representing the Church. R. also discusses Augustine's choice of celibacy and points out that, in his time, marriage did not give him the opportunity to seek the "loving participation in ideas" (p. 225). The bishop of Hippo did not flee from marriage, he fled from lust,

³ Cf. his earlier work: *Original Sin in Augustine's "Confessions"*, Ottawa 1987.

so, despite his critics, he did not despise women, sex or marriage itself. R. shows how Augustine reconciles the finite with the infinite in the context of resurrection and Christian hope. He concludes with emphasising that a kenotic self-giving, the gift of salvation, opens the way to lyrical freedom and the image of God, who does not manipulate our freedom, but is totally gracious, free and self-giving for all.

R.'s book is an interesting and valuable contribution to our understanding of many dimensions of the *Confessions* and of Augustine's thought in general. His project of showing Augustine in the light of his time and culture and, at the same time, of making his "voice" understandable to the later modern audience, has proved a successful one. But the book seems to be slightly "uneven", although R. tries to make a coherent whole of the psychohistorical studies in Augustine's alleged neurosis or narcissism, of the theological treatment of the original sin and predestination, and of his discussion of theological dimensions of narrative and literary genre. Occasionally, it seems that R.'s references to contemporary thinkers are somewhat redundant and they, at times at least, give an impression of being mere intellectual ornaments, distracting from his main argument.

The most interesting part of this study is R.'s attempt to show that Augustine develops three distinct ways of thinking about evil and God. The first one is a moral view of a just God and an evil humanity deserving to be justly punished. The second one is a tragic view of the mystery of God's decisions and the necessity to accept evil, suffering, and punishment without understanding why. The third one is a lyrical view of gracious and self-giving God who in Jesus Christ offers universal salvation. R. does not try to prove that the bishop of Hippo found a way to reconcile those different, even contradictory views. He also does not argue that Augustine lost his intellectual acumen in his old age and gave up in the face of unresolved issues of justice and mercy.

Instead, he makes an original and illuminating suggestion that those three views can be seen in a temporal sequence, as parts of a confessional narrative. The legalistic, moral position (associated with the Jews) and the tragic position (associated with the Greeks) are, within the narrative, like past epochs which were transcended and transformed by the newness of the Gospel, with its lyrical, gift-centred, kenotic message of Christ incarnated, dead, and resurrected.

I am not sure if the book in its entirety and the whole sophisticated methodological machinery is actually needed to present R.'s invaluable contribution. So, provocatively, it may be said: "it all could have been done in a more simple way". But perhaps R., in this very book, is quite like Augustine himself. He has time, he like to tell stories and imaginary dialogues, he is fond of digressions. It may not be to everyone's taste, but it is not unjustified and, certainly, not unpleasant.

Mateusz Stróżyński
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

Paige E. Hochschild, *Memory in Augustine's Theological Anthropology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012 (Oxford Early Christian Studies), 251 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-964302-8, £75.00.

Paige E. HOCHSCHILD's [= H.] book is divided into three parts. The first one ("Philosophical Tradition") deals with how the three greatest ancient philosophers – Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus – understood the human faculty of memory. The second part ("Augustine's Early Writings") consists of three chapters, devoted to several works written by Augustine during the last decade of the 4th century. The third part of the book ("*Confessiones* and *De Trinitate*") discusses his mature philosophical works in four chapters.

In the "Introduction" H. presents the main thesis of her study. Memory in Augustine is a factor mediating between the external, sensible world and the internal, spiritual one. It also mediates between what is changing and what is immutable. It is the image of God in us, but also something that makes us fully human. The author claims that Augustine's view of memory is strikingly original, especially because of its incarnational meaning. She also suggests that existing studies seem "abstract" and "not attentive to the context of Augustine's own writing" (p. 4). Her methodology, on the contrary, intends to be "appropriately historical, and largely exegetical" (*ibidem*).

In the first chapter ("Plato") H. discusses several of Plato's dialogues (the *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, *Timaeus*, *Meno*, *Theaetetus* and others), beginning with a suggestion that Augustine probably read at least some of them in Latin translation. In the second chapter ("Aristotle") she deals with the Stagirite's views, mostly in the *De memoria et reminscientia* and *De anima*. The chapter ends with a suggestion that Aristotelian thinking "charts out precisely the direction in which Augustine moves in his early writings" (p. 44). In the third chapter ("Plotinus"), H. writes about Plotinus, who as "it is generally thought, brings us closer to the spirit and teaching of Augustine" (p. 45).

Chapter Four ("The Cassiciacum Dialogues: *Contra Academicos*, *Beata vita*, and *De ordine*") opens the second part of the book, devoted to the earliest works of Augustine. Here H. discusses the three Cassiciacum dialogues, and her general conclusion seems to be that any definite treatment of memory in this period of Augustine's thought is "deferred". There is, curiously, virtually no discussion of Plotinus' influence on those early texts, and H.'s expression "Augustine allies himself with what he calls 'Platonism'" suggests some doubts as to whether Augustine was a real Platonist then (or ever?).

In Chapter Five ("The 'Middle Early' Dialogues: *Soliloquia*, *De immortalitate animae*, and *De animae quantitate*") H. deals with later dialogues and moves gradually towards her general thesis that Augustine understood memory as a faculty mediating between the sensible and the spiritual. The author claims that, since the soul is "not at home" with the sensible world, it is memory which makes possible its "habituation" here. In Chapter Six ("Recollection and Virtue: *De magistro* and *De musica*") she discusses (more briefly) *De magistro* and (in more detail) *De musica*. The focus is on the nature of numbers and their connection with the order of the whole creation. The conclusion is that even though "Augustine assumes the ontological superiority of intelligible reality" (p. 132), this Platonic conviction is transformed, in such a way that a more positive view of the sensible realm is proposed. H. claims both that memory (unlike in Plotinus?) is what links us to the sensible reality and that Augustine develops, already in this early period, an idea of a human person as a unity of the soul and the body.

Part Three begins with a discussion of Book Ten of the *Confessions* (Chapter Seven: "Introduction to Memory: *Confessiones* 10"). H. tries to show here that memory not only links us with the sensible, but also with God, yet she does not see any clear teaching of Augustine concerning how this can be. The next chapter ("The 'Problem' of Temporality: *Confessiones* 11") is focused on Book Eleven and the problem of time. The author argues that Augustine simultaneously emphasises the discrepancy between the human and the divine and introduces memory as

a solution to this. In Chapter Nine (“Time, Matter, and a *Scientia* of Scripture: *Confessiones* 12 and 13”) H. claims that for Augustine the solution to the problem of unity and multiplicity lies in the ideas of the Trinity and the Incarnation and of the conversion as *formatio*.

The last chapter of the book (“Perfection of Memory in the Vision of God: *De Trinitate*”) discusses the ultimate solution to the oppositions mentioned in the previous chapters through some elaboration on the subjects of the Incarnation and the Trinity. H. claims that, for Augustine, healing of the sinful soul is achieved through the experience of temporal things and in that sense it is incarnational. The author maintains that in early works memory functions as a factor unifying the sensible with the intelligible, while in the later work this unifying (of temporal and eternal) is completed by the concepts of Incarnation and the Triune God. Ultimately, however, memory proves not to be sufficient, so it “cannot have the final word” (p. 233), because the intellect and the will also have to play their role in the “triune soul”.

H.’s book is a curious attempt to think of Augustine with virtually no reference to his Platonism. She finishes her book by invoking the authority of Goulven MADEC and pointing out that “a great deal of scholarship imports questions and problems foreign to Augustine’s texts and ‘esprit’”. This is manifestly true, and this book takes its methodological cue from this observation” (p. 225). In the footnote H. adds that there is “excessive preoccupation with Augustine’s ‘sources’, the *libri Platoniorum* in particular, and the resulting ideological commitments [...]”.

Of course, it is a matter of a debate to what extent the bishop of Hippo was influenced by Plotinus and to what extent he was original in his synthesis of Christian revelation with the philosophical, Pagan wisdom. But H. mostly ignores Neoplatonic aspects of Augustine’s writings. She indulges in a broad presentation of the three greatest ancient philosophers before Augustine in Part One and calls it a “history of ideas”, but she also suggests that their thinking influenced Augustine directly or indirectly. Her goal is to show “Augustine’s place within this philosophical trajectory” (p. 63). But it is far from clear what the purpose of the author really is here. Is she merely trying to give a context for Augustine’s thought (if so, is it necessary to devote so much room to it?) or is she trying to show the influence of those philosophers on Augustine? If so (it is unclear to me), then there is absolutely no sense in presenting those three philosophers in an equal manner, since Augustine probably read little of Plato and Aristotle, and did not give much thought to them, but he did read several important treatises of Plotinus and thought them through in a very profound way.

Another weakness of the book is that it is difficult to find links between H.’s analyses of the texts (in which she often just summarises portions of those texts, for reasons unclear) and her conclusions, which are always a repetition of her main thesis from the “Introduction”. She sees everywhere in Augustine the Incarnation or the Trinity (even if sometimes they are hardly mentioned), but she fails to show that those issues are actually always as important for Augustine’s argument as they are for her own argument. For a scholar who believes that her viewpoint is “manifestly true”, H. is not convincing enough in terms of textual analysis and she does not take opposing views seriously enough at least to discuss them.

H. declares that the majority of the secondary literature discusses “problems foreign to Augustine’s texts and ‘esprit’”, and yet she does at times ignore what is inconvenient for her argument. For instance, on p. 109 she states boldly that “there is no suggestion of a cosmic world-soul in these texts” (*scil.* In the *Soliloquia*, *De immortalitate animae*, *De animae quantitate*). Augustine himself, however, writes precisely in one of those texts: “The body subsists through the soul and exists by the very fact that it is ensouled (*animatur*), whether *universally*, as is the world [*italics mine*], or individually, as is each and every living thing (*animal*) within the world” (*Imm. an.* 24)¹. If this is not a “suggestion of a cosmic world-soul” for H., I do not know what is.

¹ English translation according to: Saint Augustine, *The Immortality of the Soul; The Magnitude of the Soul; On Music; The Advantage of Believing; On Faith in Things Unseen*, transl. by L. SCHOPP, New York 1946 (slightly modified).

Another example is that H. omits completely a broad discussion of the happy life (*beata vita*) in Book Ten of the *Confessions*, where Augustine wonders whether we were once happy and that is why we remember this and long for it. Yet there was nothing on this topic in the chapter devoted to Book Ten. Augustine himself, in *Conf.* X 20, 29, writes that “if it [happy life] is there [in our memory], we had happiness once. I do not now ask whether we were all happy individually or only corporately in that man who first sinned [...]. My question is whether the happy life is in the memory”. And a couple of chapters below: “Where and when, then, have I experienced the happy life for myself, so that I can remember and love and long for it? The desire for happiness is not in myself alone or in a few friends, but is found in everybody” (*Conf.* X 21, 31)².

To ignore this issue, as H. does, is incomprehensible in a study of memory in Augustine. Of course, it would force the author to deal with the Neoplatonic influence on the bishop of Hippo, which she conveniently reduced to something “foreign to Augustine’s ‘esprit’ ” and, strangely enough, to some vague “ideological commitments”. Her view of the Plotinian concept of memory as “negative” to the senses and Augustine’s as more “positive” to them is simply false³. Unfortunately, it is H.’s study that turns out to be, at least in several aspects, foreign to Augustinian “esprit” and selective in an analysis of the text, because of initial assumptions and resulting attempts to find in those texts only what is looked for.

Mateusz Stróżyński
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

² English translation according to: Augustine, *Confessions*, transl. by H. CHADWICK, Oxford 2008.

³ See e.g. recently published: R. MORTLEY, *Plotinus, Self, and the World*, Cambridge 2013, reviewed by me in *Eos* CII 2015, pp. 385–388. She could not have read MORTLEY’s study, but a similar understanding of Plotinus’ attitude towards the sensible world was, of course, expressed much earlier.

LIBRI ANNO MMXVI RECEPTI

- BAILEY, Lisa Kaaren, *The Religious Worlds of the Laity in Late Antique Gaul*, London: Bloomsbury, 2016 (Bloomsbury Classical Studies Monographs).
- BARRIOS-LECH, Peter, *Linguistic Interaction in Roman Comedy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- BONELLI, Maddalena (a cura di), *Aristotele e Alessandro di Afrodisia (Questioni etiche e Mantissa). Metodo e oggetto dell'etica peripatetica*, Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2015 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico, 62).
- CLAUSS, James J., CUYPERS, Martine, KAHANE, Ahuvia (eds.), *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry. From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016 (Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge, 56).
- DE TEMMERMAN, Koen, DEMOEN, Kristoffel (eds.), *Writing Biography in Greece and Rome. Narrative Technique and Fictionalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- DICKEY, Eleanor, *Learning Latin the Ancient Way. Latin Textbooks from the Ancient World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- FALCON, Andrea (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aristotle in Antiquity*, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2016 (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception, 7).
- FULKERSON, Laurel, *Ovid: A Poet on the Margins*, London: Bloomsbury, 2016 (Classical World).
- GAMMER, Mosha (ed.), *Written Culture in Daghestan*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 2015 (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Humaniora, 369).
- HUNT, Steven, *Starting to Teach Latin*, London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- KRAPINGER, Gernot, STRAMAGLIA, Antonio, [*Quintilian*], *Der Blinde auf der Türschwelle (Größere Deklamationen, 2)*, Cassino: Edizioni Università di Cassino, 2015 (Collana di Studi Umanistici, 8).
- MARCINIAK, Katarzyna (ed.), *Our Mythical Childhood... The Classics and Literature for Children and Young Adults*, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2016 (Metaforms. Studies in the Reception of Classical Antiquity, 8).
- NORTH, Richard, ALLARD, Joe (eds.), *Beowulf & Other Stories. A New Introduction to Old English, Old Icelandic and Anglo-Norman Literatures*, 2nd edn., Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2012.
- RENSHAW, James, *In Search of the Greeks*, 2nd edn., London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- RUSSELL, Amy, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- SANTANGELO, Federico, *Marius*, London: Bloomsbury, 2016 (Ancients in Action).
- SARASTI-WILENIUS, Raija, *Dear Brother; Gracious Maecenas. Latin Letters of the Gyldentolpe Brothers (1661–1680)*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 2015 (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Humaniora, 374).
- STÖCKINGER, Martin, *Vergils Gaben. Materialität, Reziprozität und Poetik in den Eklogen und der Aeneis*, Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter, 2016 (Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften. Neue Folge, 2. Reihe, 148).
- Ágora. Estudios Clásicos em Debate: vol. XVIII 2016.
- Ancient Society: vol. XLV 2015.
- Archaeological Reports: vol. LXI 2014–2015.
- Athenaeum. Studi di Letteratura e Storia dell'Antichità pubblicati sotto gli auspici dell'Università di Pavia: vol. CIV 2016, fasc. 1.
- Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission: vol. CXIV 2013.

Classical Review: vol. LXVI 2016, fasc. 1.

Elenchos. Rivista di studi sul pensiero antico: vol. XXXVI 2015, fasc. 1.

Euphrosyne. Revista de Filologia Clássica. Nova série: vol. XLIII 2015.

Hyperboreus. Studia Classica: vol. XXI 2015, fasc. 1; fasc. 2 [= *The Golden Age and Crisis of Classical Scholarship in Europe and Russia – People, Institutions, Ideas (ca. 1870–ca. 1930)*].

The Journal of Hellenic Studies: vol. CXXXV 2015.

Listy Filologické – Folia Philologica: vol. CXXXVIII 2015, fasc. 3–4; CXXXIX 2016, fasc. 1–2.

Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica. Nuova serie: vol. CVIII 3/2014; CIX 1/2015; CX 2/2015.

Symbolae Osloenses. Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies: vol. LXXXIX 2015.

Vetera Christianorum: vol. LII 2015.

Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie, Patristik und lateinische Tradition: vol. CXXIX 2016.

Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Folge: vol. XXXIX 2015.

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE EUS CIII 2016
UTRIUSQUE FASCICULI

COMMENTATIONES

Aleksandra ARNDT, L'épyllion de Virgile sur Orphée et Eurydice (<i>Géorgiques</i> IV 454–527). Problème de l'équivalence dans quelques traductions européennes contemporaines.....	57–74
Barbara BIBIK, Zygmunt Węclewski under the Influence of Nineteenth Century Theatre and Literature	363–376
Paola GAGLIARDI, Cornelio Gallo e l'apposizione parentetica.....	271–286
Joanna KOMOROWSKA, Defining Philosophy (I): An Inquiry into the Internal Dynamics of Ammonius' <i>Prooimion</i> to his Commentary on the <i>Isagoge</i> of Porphyry (<i>In Isag.</i> 1 1–17 Busse).....	75–87
Marcin KURPIOS, Theophrastus' Appraisal of Thucydides and Herodotus (Cicero, <i>Orator</i> 39 = Fr. 697 FHS&G): The Character of Cicero's Testimony	207–228
Adam ŁUKASZEWICZ, César et Cléopâtre sur le Nil.....	49–56
Przemysław MARCINIAK, It Is not what it Appears to Be: A Note on Theodore Prodromos' <i>Against a Lustful Old Woman</i>	109–115
Przemysław MARCINIAK, The Art of Abuse: Satire and Invective in Byzantine Literature. A Preliminary Survey.....	349–362
Kazimierz PAWŁOWSKI, The Problem of Human Happiness in Plato's <i>Gorgias</i> (Platonic "Care for the Soul")	31–47
Damian PIERZAK, The Mythological <i>Exemplum</i> in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and in the Practice of Cicero.....	245–270
Wojciech PIETRUSZKA, Igor WYPIJEWSKI <i>Gens Herennuleia</i>	287–330
Richard STONEMAN, The Trees of the Sun and Moon in the <i>Alexander Romance</i> (III 17): Genuine Indian Detail?	89–98
Gjert VESTRHEIM, The Destruction of the Alexandrian Library.....	229–244
Jacek WIEWIORSKI, Aurelius Valerius Tullianus Symmachus: Proconsul of Achaea?	99–108
Iwona WIEZEL, Natural Narratology and the Oral Structure of Narrative Genres in Ancient Greece.....	7–30
Przemysław WOJCIECHOWSKI, The <i>Honestiores</i> as Founders of Inscriptions Dedicated to Hercules.....	331–347

MISCELLANEA

Federico BIDDAU, Le lettere aggiunte da Palamede e Simonide e l'alfabeto latino. Nota a Plin. <i>HN</i> VII 192 (e Max. Victorin. <i>GL</i> VI 194, 11–16 + Audax <i>GL</i> VII 325, 1–6).....	131–136
Jerzy DANIELEWICZ, The Metrical Aspects of the Paean Cry in Callimachus' <i>Hymn to Apollo</i>	123–125
Carlo LUCARINI, Coniectanea III	127–129
Gjert VESTRHEIM, Fawns and Gender. A Note on Sappho's Tithonus Poem	117–121

SUMMARIA DISSERTATIONUM INAUGURALIUM

Dominika GRZESIK, Delphi throughout the Hellenistic and Roman Periods: Honours and Privileges in Delphic Decrees	137–142
Olga KUBICA, Greek Literature and Cultural Life East of the Euphrates. The Greeks and Buddhism.....	143–147
Damian PIERZAK, Greek Myth in Cicero's Orations.....	149–157

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

Dominika GRZESIK, Luca Asmonti, <i>Athenian Democracy: A Sourcebook</i> , London 2014 ..	377–378
Jan KUCHARSKI, Fabian Meinel, <i>Pollution and Crisis in Greek Tragedy</i> , Cambridge 2015	159–162
Katarzyna MARCINIAK, Caterina Mordeglì (a cura di), <i>Lupus in fabula. Fedro e la favola latina tra Antichità e Medioevo. Studi offerti a Ferruccio Bertini</i> , Bologna 2014.....	166–168
Rafał MATUSZEWSKI, P.J. Rhodes, <i>Thucydides</i> , London 2015	379–380
Mateusz STRÓŻYŃSKI, Damian Caluori, <i>Plotinus on the Soul</i> , Cambridge 2015	385–386
Mateusz STRÓŻYŃSKI, Paul Rigby, <i>The Theology of Augustine's Confessions</i> , Cambridge 2015	387–389
Mateusz STRÓŻYŃSKI, Paige E. Hochschild, <i>Memory in Augustine's Theological Anthropology</i> , Oxford 2012	390–392
Emilia ŻYBERT, Callimachus, <i>The Hymns</i> , Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by Susan A. Stephens, Oxford 2015	163–165
Emilia ŻYBERT, Simon Hornblower, <i>Lycophron: Alexandra. Greek Text, Translation, Commentary, and Introduction</i> , Oxford 2015	381–384

COMMENTARII

Protokoły z CVII Zjazdu Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego (24–26 września 2015)...	169–172
Sprawozdanie z działalności Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego w okresie 28 września 2013–23 września 2015	173–175
Sprawozdania z działalności oddziałów terenowych Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego w okresie 28 września 2013–23 września 2015	176–197
Libri anno MMXVI recepti	393–394