EOS CV fasc. 1
2018

EOS

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTORZY

JAKUB PIGOŃ (REDAKTOR NACZELNY)
KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA

Rocznik CV 2018
Zeszyt 1

WROCŁAW
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE
I UNIWERSYTET WROCŁAWSKI
2018

EOS

COMMENTARII SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

COMMENTARIOS EDENDOS CURAVERUNT

IACOBUS PIGOŃ (EDITOR PRINCIPALIS)
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA

Volumen CV 2018
Fasciculus 1

WRATISLAVIAE
SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM
ET UNIVERSITATIS WRATISLAVIENSIS
2018

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

GEORGIUS AXER, VARSOVIAE
MARGARITA BOROWSKA, VARSOVIAE
SILVESTER DWORACKI, POSNANIAE
SOPHIA GŁOMBIOWSKA, GEDANI
CASIMIRUS KORUS, CRACOVIAE
LESCUS MROZEWICZ, POSNANIAE
CATHARINA OCHMAN, WRATISLAVIAE (EX OFFICIO)
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

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 749/P-DUN/2018

przy wsparciu finansowym Wydziału Filologicznego
i Wydziału Historyczno-Pedagogicznego
Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego

© Copyright by Polskie Towarzystwo Filologiczne, Wrocław 2018

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE

COMMENTATIONES

Gerson SCHADE, Virgil's Non-Linear Narrative and his *Aeneid*'s Two Voices 7–41
Aleksandr KOPTEV, The Development of the Consulship in the Early Republic: Evidence for an Alternative Version in Livy 43–76
Krystyna STEBNICKA, Greek Grammarians in the Light of Epigraphic Evidence 77–117

MISCELLANEA

Conradus KOKOSZKIEWICZ, *Hymni Homerici*: fragmenta *Hymni in Bacchum* 13–16 119–121
Boris KAYACHEV, *Ciris* 118: An Emendation 123–126

SUMMARIA DISSERTATIONUM INAUGURALIUM

Edyta GRYKSA, Florus' Vision of Rome.. 127–129

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

Xenophon redivivus: A Review Article. M.A. Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon,* Cambridge 2017 (Bogdan BURLIGA).. 131–135
Conversing with the Ancients: A Review Article. K. Riley, A.J.L. Blanshard, I. Manny (edd.), *Oscar Wilde and Classical Antiquity*, Oxford 2018 (Anna BUDZIAK)............. 136–144
A. Konstantinou, *Female Mobility and Gendered Space in Ancient Greek Myth*, London 2018 (Bartłomiej BEDNAREK)... 145–148
Arystoksenos z Tarentu, *Harmonika*, przekład, wstęp i komentarz Anna Maciejewska [Aristoxenus of Tarent, *Harmonics*, translated with an introduction and commentary by Anna Maciejewska], Łódź 2015 (Kamila WYSŁUCHA)... 149–151
M. Baumbach, P. von Möllendorff, *Ein literarischer Prometheus. Lukian aus Samosata und die Zweite Sophistik*, Heidelberg 2017 (Katarzyna JAŻDŻEWSKA)........................ 152–153
M. Bonelli (ed.), *Aristotele e Alessandro di Afrodisia ("Questioni etiche" e "Mantissa"). Metodo e oggetto dell' etica peripatetica*, Napoli 2015 (Joanna KOMOROWSKA) 154–156
R. Wyles, E. Hall (eds.), *Women Classical Scholars. Unsealing the Fountain from the Renaissance to Jacqueline de Romilly*, Oxford 2016 (Joanna USAKIEWICZ)............... 157–158

COMMENTARII

Mieczysław MEJOR, Gli studi sulla letteratura polono-latina presso l'Istituto di Filologia Classica dell'Università di Varsavia dopo il 1945.. 159–165
Markiyan DOMBROVSKYI, In Honour of Professor Andrii Sodomora for his 80th Birthday 166–173

C O M M E N T A T I O N E S

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

VIRGIL'S NON-LINEAR NARRATIVE AND HIS *AENEID*'S TWO VOICES*

by

GERSON SCHADE

A still small voice spake unto me,
"Thou art so full of misery,
Were it not better not to be?"

Then to the still small voice I said:
"Let me not cast in endless shade
What is so wonderfully made".

Alfred Tennyson, *The Two Voices* (1833)

ABSTRACT: Half a century ago American scholars thought to discern two voices while reading the *Aeneid*, a private one of regret and doubt, a public one of triumph and glory. Since the *Aeneid*'s narrative is defined by two parallels, however, one looking backward, between Aeneas and Achilles, and another looking forward, between Aeneas and Augustus, one may ask various questions. Did Augustus enjoy being portrayed as such a double-bind hero as Aeneas? Or, did he let it pass only because Virgil was close to him? Friendship, indeed, plays a major role in the *Aeneid*. Moreover, it may determine one's survival, as the case of Virgil's friend Gallus, who held a very special place in Virgil's poetry before his *Aeneid*, shows. Actually, what is his new type of poetry, which attracted T.S. Eliot? What is so new in it, and is it really a "Christianised" reading as the detractors of Eliot claim which still makes the *Aeneid* such an inspiring text? Is it not the feeling that we no longer, or not only, hear about superhuman heroes from bygone eras but actually, or also, listen to human beings, see how their conflicts develop and how they are partially but only unsatisfactorily solved? The starting point is "Actium", shorthand for Octavian's war with Antony and Cleopatra, which establishes the *Aeneid*'s crucial parallel between Aeneas and Augustus.

* I wish to thank the editor of this journal and the anonymous referee. Both suggested improvements that made the text more precise, and both gave inspiring comments. They also pointed out some recent secondary literature to me, putting the argument developed here into perspective.

PROLOGUE

On 2 September 31 BC Gaius Julius Octavianus, adopted son and heir of the assassinated and deified Julius Caesar, defeats Mark Antony and Cleopatra VII at the battle of Actium. The last remaining (and by far the most prestigious and wealthy) Diadochian part of the Alexandrian empire becomes a Roman province. Henceforth the master of Egypt, Octavian receives the name of Augustus on 16 January 27 BC. Written around that time at his request, Virgil's *Aeneid* refers four times to Actium, though twice not by name, yet always at decisive moments.

At the start of the work Jupiter alludes to Actium, as does Aeneas' father Anchises in the middle of the work, both of them using geographical *antonomasia*[1]: Jupiter predicts that Octavian will be welcomed by Venus as "weighted with the Orient's wealth" (I 289: "spoliis Orientis onustum"), which clearly denotes the pharaonic wealth of Egypt, and Anchises sees "the seven mouths of the Nile tremble in terror" at Octavian's approach (VI 800: "septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili"), which clearly refers to Egypt as well. Finally, we not only hear of Actium which is explicitly named, but also see it when Aeneas receives his new shield for his final battle from his mother, just before the last third of the text begins (VIII 675: *Actia bella*).

Each being a crowning achievement of their respective passages, these anticipatory references to Actium do not simply introduce a synchronic event into the *Aeneid*'s diachronic narrative. What is more, they establish the *Aeneid*'s crucial parallel between Aeneas and Augustus. Another (and our final) passage, in which Actium is spoken of suggests this parallel even more. In the *Aeneid*'s book III, Actium is one of the Trojans' stops while journeying to Italy (278–293). Having landed, the Trojans make offerings and celebrate solemn games (III 280: "Actiaque Iliacis celebramus litora ludis"). They stay for some time, winter comes and goes, an icy wind ruffles the water (III 284 f.: "interea magnum sol circumvolvitur annum / et glacialis hiems Aquilonibus asperat undas"). After dedicating a shield to Apollo and marking the event with a verse (III 288: "Aeneas haec de Danais victoribus arma"), they set sail northwards along the coast of Epirus[2].

The shrine of Apollo there, of which the Trojans catch sight (III 275), was restored and enlarged by Augustus, who "instituted at Nicopolis, the site of his camp, a large-scale festival called the Actian games"[3]. The games were celebrated

---

[1] A poetic device which became fashionable among Hellenistic poets in Alexandria, later to be copied by Callimachean poets in Rome: Farrell 1991: 42–59. The three passages from the *Aeneid*'s books I, VI, and VII are discussed more fully below, in section IV.

[2] R.D. Williams (1962: 114 = 1972: 293) pointed to the inscription's irony, "with *victoribus* where *victis* would be expected". Surely, however, who would think this to be ironic except Augustus? Aeneas would hardly have perceived himself as a victor, but Augustus might have felt free to do so; perhaps, not without irony (*pour être grand il faut avoir été petit*).

[3] R.D. Williams 1972: 292.

for the first time in 28 BC, and subsequently every four years. Virgil furnishes an ancient precedent for these games, which Augustus had instituted at Actium in memory of his great victory over Antony and Cleopatra, creating a pleasing parallel which links Augustus to Aeneas. In his *Aeneid*, the games foreshadow the much larger and more prestigious ones described in book V of the *Aeneid* book, held in honour of Anchises[4]. They conclude with an equestrian display (V 545–603), which played a prominent part in Augustus' organisations for the training of the young in Rome and Italy. Thus, Virgil again associates contemporary social events with the Homeric precedent, "and in the course of it Virgil could link the past with the present (as he very often does in the *Aeneid*)"[5]. He has already done so in the just mentioned short passage in book III of the *Aeneid*.

Choosing to pay tribute to Augustus' victory (whether voluntarily or not we cannot say), Virgil actually associated different places, confusing the real geographical situation and incorporating several places "into a single stop at Actium"[6]. In other words, by combining "Leucas and Actium into a single stage apparently without reconciling the geographical facts"[7], Virgil created one imaginary memory place out of several real places. Such looking forward to Augustan practices and achievements while interpreting events of the legendary past "is entirely Vergilian"[8].

The sequence of Actium – first alluded to by Jupiter, then by Anchises, finally to be seen on the shield, and in between to be literally passed by Aeneas and his comrades – establishes a storyline. Its major event, however, does not belong to the life of Aeneas. He just passes the place whose importance he ignores, yet somehow feels, honouring it by an inscription. Instead, the reader's attention is aimed directly at Augustus, and the author zeroes in on a major event in the Emperor's recent biography. Even when eventually receiving the shield, Aeneas could not have understood what is depicted. Virgil states his hero's unawareness in a prominent place. The closure of book VIII of the *Aeneid* shows Aeneas shouldering the shield (729–731): "such sights he admired on Vulcan's shield, his mother's gift, […] uplifting on his shoulder the fame and fortune of his children's children" ("talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis, […] attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum").

---

[4] The games are not only spectacular but also modern, and "no attentive reader can fail to notice that the whole energetic culture of Augustan athleticism is replicated in the *Aeneid*" (Horsfall 2016: 139). Thus, the games establish "a major point of contact" between Aeneas and Augustus: "Nel campo atletico, il punto principale di contatto tra Enea ed Augusto è evidentemente il *lusus Troiae*: Virgilio sottolinea la continuità da Enea ad Augustso (5. 596–603)" (Horsfall 1991: 139).

[5] R.D. Williams 1960: XI.

[6] Lloyd 1957: 391.

[7] R.D. Williams 1962: 111.

[8] Lloyd 1954: 294.

The line in between (730) calls Aeneas *ignarus*, i.e. 'not knowing', 'unaware', yet "miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet" can be translated either as "all unaware Aeneas takes pleasure in the pictures of things to come" or as "though ignorant of the events Aeneas takes pleasure in their representation"; the translation depends on whether *ignarus* is taken with *rerum* or is taken absolutely (for both usages we have parallels in Virgil). Apparently, there is an ambiguity here, a different perception aimed at by Virgil: "for Aeneas historical events are merely pictures while for the reader the pictures are descriptions of historical events"[9]. In other words, Aeneas did not get the message (how could he), but Augustus very much did; he knew the place well: a beautiful contrast.

If Virgil also read parts of book VIII to Augustus – we know that he did read parts of the *Aeneid*'s books II, IV, and VI – Augustus may have heard of it in retrospect during Virgil's reading sessions, listening to Virgil's promisingly sweet voice softly whispering into the Emperor's ear. While Aeneas could not know what was meant by *Actia bella* (VIII 675) Augustus would have understood clearly what Virgil was driving at. Virgil did not only identify a place "off which Octavian (Augustus) won a naval victory over Antony and Cleopatra [...] which secured him the supremacy of the Roman world"[10], but also depicted Aeneas and Augustus, both being founders of Rome, when they "need to resort to violence as they go about their careers"[11].

Aeneas, however, regrets violence. And even more intriguing than that is the observation that Virgil too is openly sympathetic to the effects of loneliness,

---

[9] Gransden 1976: 185. Aeneas, however, seems to be somewhat aware of what is to come. At the opening of *Aeneid* VI, the Trojans land at Cumae. Aeneas goes straight to Apollo's temple to seek a prophecy from the Sibyl. At the entrance of a vast cavern from which the oracles issue, Aeneas prays. The Sibyl inside the cavern struggles with the god who possesses her. Finally, the entrances open mysteriously and she is heard in prophecy. Aeneas entreats her to enable him to visit his father in the Underworld, declaring that he is prepared for the ordeal of going if the Sibyl will be his guide (VI 105): "omnia praecepi atque animo mecum ante peregi" – "I have taken thought for all beforehand, and worked it out in my inmost heart", as Austin (1977: 74) translates. This line indicates apprehensiveness in its double meaning. Aeneas does anticipate things adverse, being fearful as to what may be coming, in the Stoic sense of a *praemeditatio malorum*: "he has counted the cost and is prepared" (Fletcher 1941: 39): a definition of "heroism" in a way, "the deliberate facing of danger 'grasped and gone through in the mind beforehand'" (Page 1894: 453). However, and this is the second layer so to speak, his apprehensiveness is indicative of his intelligence, perceptiveness, and discernment – which must reckon with something important that is to come. Since he is sent on a mission, what is to come in the future must have to do with his project, i.e. the founding of Rome. Or, as Jacques Perret put it (1952: 134 f.): "Cette attente de l'avenir, cette tension permanente a pour effet de vider de sa réalité l'action présente elle-même, anticipée, révolue, dévorée, avant d'être vécue: Énée n'écoutera que d'une oreille indifférente les avertissements de la Sibylle: *omnia praecepi atque animo mecum ante peregi* 'Je sais déjà tout cela; j'ai tout vécu à l'avance' (*Aen*. VI, 105)". This may sound as if the ubiquitous Aeneas lives in various time zones (like Marcel Proust while describing his protagonist Marcel in *Recherche*), which he does not – he simply, and miraculously, knows what is to come. He is gifted.

[10] Page 1900: 245.

[11] Putnam 2011: 15.

suffering and defeat. He does interfere critically in the narrative as well as making his protagonist comment on it melancholically. Virgil may have used all the right words in describing his protagonist's accomplishment, how thrillingly grand Aeneas is, but was there not a different story in the tone of his voice?

I.

Actually, Actium may lend support to one major issue, or rather a trend, in Virgilian scholarship, i.e. the so-called two voices theory (or "Harvard school"). Indebted to their contemporary intellectual environment[12], though not defined by it[13], a group of North-American Latinists in the 1950s and 60s claimed to hear in Virgil's *Aeneid* not only a public voice of triumph, but also a private voice of regret: "a characteristic Virgilian note of melancholy and nostalgia"[14]. Many a line in the *Aeneid* may hail the coming of a new age – nevertheless, a distressing tone can be discerned throughout. And Actium may well have provoked some second thoughts which were not necessarily heroic ones. Let us briefly look at some examples.

Under the cloud of such overwhelming sorrow which blots out all joy from his life, Aeneas even longs for death. While looking at the engravings of the Trojan War in the temple of Juno in Carthage, for instance, Aeneas is overcome with emotion, and speaks famously of "tears for passing things, things mortal that touch the mind" (I 462: "sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt"). Indicative of the hero's lingering conflict between faith and scepticism, this happens at the beginning of Aeneas' story, when he appears in the narrative for the first time. It happens again the last time he turns up in the *Aeneid*'s narrative, where Aeneas is again overcome with emotions, this time grief and anger. Something emotional determines his mind. By no means is he a weakling, but a constant wavering characterises him, a change that does not go away. Despite "the melancholy that seems to predominate"[15], however, at this point in the narrative, though acknowledging something sad, Aeneas is not overwhelmed by sorrow (and neither is he at the very end of the *Aeneid*), because he believes – not quite rightly, as it turns out – that the inhabitants of the land to which he is driven by the storm feel sympathy for the Trojans' sufferings: "he dared to hope for safety", we hear, "for the first time while beneath the mighty temple in a grove", and "here he put surer trust in his shattered fortunes" (I 450–452):

---

[12] Harrison 1990b: 5.

[13] Clausen 1995: 313. In retrospect, one may call this an attempt to 'de-Augustanise' the *Aeneid*, as Stahl (2015: 454) puts it. He, however, regards Virgil as "the trail-blazing, loyal supporter, the unconditional defender of Aeneas' latest descendant", i.e. Augustus (p. 458).

[14] Parry 1963: 69.

[15] Austin 1971: 157.

> hoc primum in luco nova res oblata timorem
> leniit, hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem
> ausus et adflictis melius confidere rebus.

At the opening of *Aeneid* II, however, when asked by Dido to talk about his past, he makes a show of reluctance to begin his story, his "mind, remembering, recoils in grief, and trembles" (II 12: "animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit"). At this point in the narrative, he fears the grip of powerful emotions, shying away from recollecting his past and from going through its horrors. His "spirit 'has started back', and 'is shivering'"[16]. A refugee, however, can hardly refuse to tell what a queen wants to know. Instead, he should be delighted to have been asked at all. Unstable Aeneas is even more than that; he falls in love with her.

Another example may illustrate our argument. When Pallas is killed by Turnus – a decisive event that anticipates the outcome of the poem, when Aeneas, suddenly and unexpectedly reminded of Pallas' death, kills Turnus in the poem's very last lines – it is the narrator's voice who alienates the reader's sympathy from Turnus, commenting and interrupting the narrative by interventions (X 501 f., 503–505). Foreshadowing the day when Turnus will bitterly regret this deed, he highlights the great grief and the great glory that accompany Pallas' corpse (and anticipates the end of the *Aeneid*). Most movingly, Virgil addresses the dead hero as if he were still alive and returning home (X 507): "o dolor atque decus magnum rediture parenti" – "O you who will return (*rediture*) as a great grief and glory to your father"[17]. A few lines earlier Virgil broke into the narrative with his comment on the behaviour of people – like Turnus – when swept away by success: if there is *double entendre* intended, this could be interpreted as a warning to Augustus.

In fact, the figure of Pallas is a structuring element of the *Aeneid* in more than one sense. He establishes a second defining parallel for Aeneas, who eventually, more to his own than to the reader's surprise, avenges his death. After Pallas' death Aeneas launches a furious offensive, raging in mad anger, slaying a host of enemies (X 510–605), "matching that of Achilles after the death of Patroclus"[18]. In the following, the crazed Achilles kills many Trojans, including Hector's brothers Polydoros (*Il.* XX 353–418) and Lykaon (XXI 34–138)[19].

The death of Lykaon, however, is of such a heightened intensity that it could not have escaped Virgil. Lykaon, whom he had previously captured and sold, supplicates (thoroughly and perpetually) the frenzied Achilles, who kills him,

---

[16] Austin 1964: 32.

[17] Jordan 1990: 61.

[18] Harrison 1991: 201.

[19] Ironically, Achilles rages all the more since he could not kill Aineias, who is protected by the gods. Aineias is supernaturally rescued, fated to survive the war, as Poseidon points out to him twice (*Il.* XX 336, 339). Achilles, however, is doomed (*Il.* XX 337).

throws him into the river, and makes a contemptuous speech over him, taking offence at him. In the *Aeneid*, eventually, it is the killing of Pallas, i.e. the remembrance of it which makes (suddenly and transitorily) the frenzied Aeneas slaughter Turnus, which marks the very end of the work, a speechless woe[20].

By killing Turnus, not only does Aeneas do as Virgil anticipated, but also the *Aeneid*'s second crucial complementarity is established, i.e. the one between Aeneas and Achilles. Both Aeneas and Achilles may regret their madness to a different extent, perhaps even feeling remorse, but both cannot rest until the enemy is dead – or as Achilles puts it, "until all of you have paid for the killing of Patroclus and the Achaeans, while I was not with them" (*Il.* XXI 133–135).

Not only Actium, which established the parallel between Aeneas and Augustus, but also this second crucial parallel of the *Aeneid* again lends support to the two voices theorists. Like Aeneas, Achilles was very much aware of the costs of war, and certainly, his life was defined by friendship, the loss of *it*, and the immense sorrow about *it*. Eventually, a transformed Achilles renounces his peer group's heroic code, the result of which is endless sorrow, which Aeneas much abhors, too. At least in those meditative moments he is not himself maniacally indulging in senseless killing.

Still, both heroes have more in common, not only a goddess as mother. At his first appearance, Achilles weeps, gazing out over the sea, alone calling for her (*Il.* I 349 and 357). Similarly, Aeneas at his first appearance does not much resemble a glorious hero either. He suffers, his limbs weaken with chilling dread, and he groans and cries to heaven, stretching both hands to the stars (*Aen.* I 92–94)[21].

Continuing the Achillean path of narrative, Aeneas has to go far: "the Augustan hero has to develop (to be 'Augustanised', so to speak) from the rage of a Homeric (i.e., barbaric) fighter to civilized self-control and piety"[22]. This was not given to Achilles, a doubting zealot, immoderate, and fanatical[23]. Augustus'

---

[20] To some readers, the *Aeneid*'s gloomy end may reflect the *Iliad*'s finale, and one may think of a parallel: "as no Greek rejoiced over the end of the *Iliad*" it may well be that never "any Roman was meant to rejoice over the end of the *Aeneid*" (Newman 2015: 398). To support this observation, one may point at a parallel in the *Aeneid*, since Virgil seems to have anticipated this sad end, concluding the "Odyssean" half of the poem with the bitter death of Marcellus.

[21] The last time Achilles is to meet his dead friend Patroclus, Achilles weeps again (*Il.* XXIII 105 f.). This happens in a dream, and Patroclus' soul returns, a faint material effluence from the man, his *eidolon*, a phantom: "all night long the ghost of poor Patroklos has stood over me weeping and lamenting". Though never indulging in such "subjective and emotional outbursts as […] Virgil" (Griffin 1980: 103), Homer surely offered a model, i.e. a mentally unstable Achilles, heavily depending on his mother, as was Aeneas relying on his.

[22] Stahl 1981: 159.

[23] Such doubting is an experience not unknown to modern military men either. Having returned from the colonial war in Angola, António Lobo Antunes, for example, spoke of himself as "Sou um SS com dúvidas, sou um seminarista em crise de consciência" (*Conhecimento do Inferno*, Lisboa 2004 [*Obras completas*, vol. III], p. 58, first publ. 1980). While intensely detailing his horrific

supposed ancestor Aeneas, however, could not remain like him. The Roman audience would not conclude in his favour.

II.

Somewhat surprisingly, in an earlier text of his Virgil skipped Actium while referring to the military exploits of Octavian, as his name was then. After Actium, Octavian went to Alexandria and later passed in triumph through Palestine and Syria. At the end of the "Praises of Italy" (*Georg*. II 136–176)[24], one of the best-known among the many Virgilian purple passages, Virgil refers to these most recent events (170–173): "maxime Caesar,/ qui nunc extremis Asiae iam victor in oris/ imbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum" ("O Caesar, who, already victorious in Asia's farthest bounds, now you drive the craven Indian from our hills of Rome"). Apparently, the context is the Alexander-like conquest of the East, considered to be such a highly prestigious event that it may eclipse the Civil War, the end of which was marked by Actium.

Ending the Praises, Virgil turns to himself, stating something poetological about what he wanted to achieve. He tried to introduce a Hesiodic-sounding work to Rome, Virgil claims (II 176). He does so in a "golden" line, defined by chiastic

experience in an earlier novel (*Os cus de Judas*, Lisboa 2004 [*Obras completas*, vol. II], first publ. 1979), Antunes, alluding to the same events, chose a mild tone in his letters to his wife, though (*D'este viver qui neste papel descripto: Cartas da guerra*, Lisboa 2005, edited by their daughters and published a quarter of a century later than the novels). The fact that they were supposed to be read by the army security service explains Antunes' reserve, and a more intimate tone is to be expected in private letters, the more so as they were not intended for publication. To a reader of his novels, however, the illusory feeling of having previously read the same resembles the Virgilian "two voices".

[24] Such praises of a particular place were a set-piece, made to show off, more indicative of its author's technical abilities than of his personal, let alone intimate view. On the one hand, Virgil's patriotic swagger (*Georg*. II 148, 161–164), as well as the unusual absence of any mythological element, suggest a more personal touch. Moreover, as "past, present, and future are fused" (Mynors 1990: 119), this may reflect Virgil's "deep personal feeling". Finally, it is the text's closure that may reveal a personal involvement more than usual in what has been stated in the Praises. On the other hand, being "not a poet accustomed to reproducing rhetorical topoi for use in the classroom", Virgil characterises Italy with detail "which is hardly laudatory" (Thomas 1988: I 180). Thus, in view of the "two voices" theory, which is concerned with the *Aeneid*, it may be worth pointing out that the "Praises of Italy" in his *Georgics* may serve as another example of Virgilian ambivalence, i.e. his distinguishing between a public and a private voice. Actually, the "Praises of Italy" are "obvious fiction, demonstrably in conflict with the reality of Italy" (*ibidem*). It would be unwise to acknowledge a happy cooperation between man and nature expressed by Virgil, who effortlessly combines the Golden Age and Italy, in other words, a misreading of his. Instead, "by creating ambiguities […] and by departing from the tradition […] Virgil has subtly expressed severe reservations about his own national environment" with which he is dealing (Thomas 1982: 39). Given that perspective, it seems as if Virgil trained earlier on a small scale what he later developed much more largely, i.e. speaking with two voices.

and non-chiastic word-order. In this case, the adjectives precede the nouns, "with balancing references to the Greek tradition […] and to the Roman application"[25]: "Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen".

Virgil, however, would not be Virgil if he were not expressing himself ambivalently, "leaving it to his readers to interpret his two-way lines as they wished"[26]. For, at the same time as he refers to the topic of the *Georgics* which resembles that of one poem by Hesiod, he also alludes to the Hesiodic poetic technique as opposed to the Homeric one. At first sight, Virgil seems to speak of his work's content as archaic, or authentic. On second thoughts, however, he does allude to his work's literary form as young, or artificial, in short, Callimachean. There are two Hesiods in the *Georgics*, indeed[27].

Then in his *Georgics*, Virgil refers to Caesar as the greatest of all, who was already victorious in Asia's farthest bounds. Virgil continues with a hyperbolic expression, stating that now Augustus is to drive all the easterners, derogatorily conceived of as by nature unwarlike, away from the Roman hills. We are to hear of this for a second time in the *Georgics*. Again put in a prominent place – and again effortlessly intertwining his poetic craft with Augustus' warfare, linking both their lives' fates in a Pindaric fashion, assuming both to be victors in their respective area – a similar allusion to Augustus' eastern exploits closes the *Georgics* as a whole. While Octavian is depicted as thundering in war by the deep Euphrates, Virgil speaks of himself as having enjoyed unheroic leisure in Naples, singing of the care of fields, of cattle, and of trees, lavishing "all the golden day" while making his lines "wealthier in his reader's eyes", as Tennyson put it (IV 559–564):

> Caesar dum magnus ad altum
> fulminat Euphraten […]
> illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
> Parthenope…[28]

[25] THOMAS 1988: I 190 (and cf. p. 86 for the definition of the golden line).

[26] AUSTIN 1971: 110.

[27] Cf. FARRELL 1991: 27–33. As a writer's writer, fascinated by words and phrases as such, appealing to readers interested in points of technique, Virgil surely was attracted by Callimachus, a congenial spirit. Virgil's poetological *closure* to the hymnic Praises, for example, is reminiscent of a similarly poetological closure of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (F. WILLIAMS 1978: 85–89). The poetological statement by Callimachus, however, was imitated by Virgil even before, again prominently, at the *opening* of his sixth eclogue (CLAUSEN 1987: 1–3). Thus, Virgil turns out to be reminiscent of himself again, reminding his reader of an earlier work of his.

[28] Since after entering Alexandria formally in August 30 BC, Octavian remained in the East and did not return to Rome until the autumn of 29, both passages are of the same apparent date (MYNORS 1990: 124).

Again, a beautiful contrast: this time between a slightly self-depreciating Virgil and the bold hero. Finally, the *paralipsis* of Actium in the *Georgics* – a *praeteritio* which makes conspicuous the absence – suggests its being reserved exclusively for the *Aeneid*'s poetic purpose of highlighting Augustus, as his name is now.

III.

Well-read Virgil created texts defined by a high level of intra- and inter-textuality[29]. On the whole, his works give the impression of circular rather than linear movement. Concepts return and structure the text, while not following a straightforward narrative. The chronological order is suspended, when contemporary historical events (such as Actium) are anticipated by mythical figures (such as Jupiter, Anchises, and Vulcan, who put it on Aeneas' shield). Since Latin sentences need not develop their argument in a linear way either, they may well present a circular argument, too. Virgil's so-called golden lines, a chiastic sequence of words belonging to, though put surprisingly far away from, each other, perfectly illustrate this. They show the order in which things are said to be of rhetorical rather than sequential significance. It may seem as if Virgil transformed a rhetorical microstructure into his narrative's macrostructure[30].

The circular effect achieved resembles overwhelming dizziness. Reading Virgil, you only seem to be on a straight stretch of road, but what you see blends into something else; it becomes blurred like a remembrance, and you can only see clearly what is far ahead, and moving towards you. Suddenly, however, while, for instance, vaguely remembering Achilles and some such Greek texts Virgil seemingly cannot do without, you are literally brought down to earth. As is the case with Actium, reality will kick in, anchoring some of the poem's passages to an actual place. This process prompts different memories, this time neither blurred nor literary ones, but those that are reminders of the brute facts, such as the crushing defeat of Cleopatra and Antony by Octavian, later to be called Augustus. How is Actium actually dealt with?

---

[29] Much material has gone into the seminal work by Horsfall (1991), an English version of which has been published recently (Horsfall 2016). Horsfall uses the term "voice(s)" differently, though. To him, "voice(s)" mean(s) the "spheres of knowledge upon which the poet drew, amply, seriously, or casually and in passing" (2016: 145), or rather, the "riferimenti sottintesi a lunghi passi di altri autori, sovrapponendo […] al testo virgiliano un nesso complicatissimo di allusioni" (1991: 145).

[30] A perfect golden line, however, "is not often used by Virgil, who apparently adopts it only where he evidently wishes his style to be particularly ornate and elaborate" (Winboldt 1903: 220). Instead, he "often uses lines which are very nearly golden, and many which have similar rhythm" (*ibidem*, 221). Ovid uses it more frequently, and Catullus "somewhat too freely" (*ibidem*).

IV.

First: In times to come, Venus, no longer troubled, shall welcome to heaven a Julius, descended from the great Julus, laden with Eastern spoils, weighed down with the Orient's wealth, as Jupiter says to her (*Aen.* I 254–296), with a smile kissing his daughter (I 289 f.): "hunc tu olim caelo, spoliis Orientis onustum,/ accipies secura". Then, the gruesome gates of war, grim with iron and close-fitting bars, shall be shut fast, he continues (I 293 f.): "dirae ferro et compagibus artis/ claudentur Belli portae", an expression not only metaphorically referring to the end of the civil war, but also literally to the gates of war that were in Janus' temple, which were closed by Augustus in 29 BC[31].

Inside impious rage shall sit on his savage arms, Jupiter anticipates, with fury's hands bound by a hundred knots, groaning horribly with bloody lips (I 294–296):

> furor impius intus
> saeva sedens super arma et centum vinctus aenis
> post tergum nodis fremet horridus ore cruento.

The intense image symbolises the difficult recovery of Roman standards. The blessings of universal peace are restored to a troubled world, and this was done by Venus' great descendant, Caesar Augustus[32].

Second: In the underworld Aeneas meets his father Anchises (VI 679–751). Having explained the transmigration of souls to his son (724–751), Anchises introduces the pageant of Roman history (756–787), a showy parade that deals with the legendary three centuries between the arrival of Aeneas in Italy and the founding of Rome in 753 BC. Finally, Augustus as the second founder of Rome is introduced (792): he shall again set up the Golden Age in Latium, Anchises continues, "he shall spread his empire to a land that lies beyond the stars,/ beyond the paths of the year and the sun" (795 f.): "proferet imperium, iacet extra sidera tellus,/ extra anni solisque vias". In the following lines, Anchises alludes to the victory over Cleopatra and Antony at Actium, claiming that "the mouths

---

[31] R.D. Williams 1972: 182.

[32] A few moments later in the first book, without the least prevarication, Aeneas introduces himself to his mother. She is disguised as a huntress, while he presents himself in his real character, the same in which he is often and invariably presented to the reader by Virgil, "too careful an antiquarian and scholar to ignore this traditional side of his hero's character" (Moseley 1925: 398). In his words (I 378 f.), "sum pius Aeneas […]/ […] fama super aethera notus" ("I am Aeneas the good […] my fame is known in the heavens above"), there is "none of this paltry double-dealing, of this vile compound of ours, of verbal humility and real pride, of this our so fashionable seasoning of insolence with compliment", cant badly suffered by some Victorians (Henry 1873: 651). Revealing her deity, Venus disappears, but renders Aeneas and his comrade Achates invisible. They reach Carthage, where they admire Juno's temple. Aeneas gazes with tears in his eyes at the various Trojan pictures (I 441–493).

of the sevenfold Nile are against Augustus' coming, in tumult of terror" (798 and 800): "huius in adventum […] et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili".

Surprising for many reasons, Anchises' survey shows how thoroughly Virgil reworked the models from which he started, turning for sure his *Aeneid* into the *argumentum varium ac multiplex* as it is known to Virgil's biographer (§ 21). At first sight being clearly modelled on Odysseus' meeting with his mother[33], the passage talks about the judgement of souls. This is absent from Homer, but not unknown to him, for he mentions the Elysian plain as a place where Menelaos is to be sent to[34], and "where life is easiest for men" (*Od.* IV 565). In any case, it contradicts what Antikleia has to say about the dead soul (XI 219–222). The body's sinews no longer hold flesh to the bone, and as soon as life (*thymos*) leaves the white bones, the spirit (*psyche*) flies away like a dream[35].

Relating to matters Roman, the compellingly patchwork-like passage surprises again. It includes not only a glimpse of the kings of Rome (808–825), but also a list of republican heroes. Suddenly, the protagonists of the civil wars turn up, Julius Caesar and Pompey (826–835) – both having been assassinated quite recently (in 48 and 44, respectively). Something similar happens in Dante's *Divina Commedia*. A certain Ciacco, known also to Boccaccio, recognises Dante accompanied by Virgil, reminding them of the fact that Dante was born before he, Ciacco, died (*Inferno* VI 41 f.): "riconoscimi, se sai,/ tu fosti, prima ch'io disfatto, fatto". Furthermore, some popes are expected to arrive soon, among them Dante's contemporary Bonifacio VIII. A separate cave is reserved for them, situated much deeper down in Hell (XIX 54–57). The damned in Dante, as in Virgil, know the future.

Eventually, the list of heroes is resumed to glorify the family of Marcellus. A descendant of the famous Claudius Marcellus who repelled the Gauls in 222

---

33 Knauer 1964: 124–126.

34 Willcock 1995: 169.

35 Rohde 1898: I 55. Virgil draws largely on Pythagorean ideas, as does Pindar, for example, in his Olympian ode 2, 56–83 (Burkert 1977: 446 f.), and to a much larger extent, Plato in his *Phaedo* 111 C–114 C (Robin 1983: LXXIV–LXXXII) and *Republic* 613 E–621 D (Fletcher 1941: XII–XXIII). They were brought to Rome in a modified way by Cicero. Luckily for us, his *Somnium Scipionis* later became the beneficiary of a Neoplatonic commentary by Macrobius, in the fifth century. Thus, the text was preserved thereafter in conjunction with Macrobius' work. The *Somnium* is the only substantial extant portion of the second half of Cicero's *Republic*, published in the spring of 51 BC. The *Somnium* clearly echoes the Myth of Er which concludes Plato's *Republic*, but there are important differences. While the myth of Er refers only metaphorically to the physical nature of the universe, for Cicero, geography and astronomy are crucial. What the two works have most in common is a shared concern with justice and moral behaviour, "but Plato is interested in individual morality, while for Cicero the justice of an individual has no meaning apart from the state to which he belongs" (Zetzel 1995: 15). And while Er's story is "deliberately fantastic and set in a far-off land" (*ibidem*, 223), Scipio's is the report of his own dream – which may have made it more attractive in the eyes of Virgil. Opinions vary, of course, regarding which source he draws on most (Lamacchia 1964: 262).

BC, married Octavia, sister of Augustus. The son of this marriage had been adopted by Augustus in 25 BC and married to his daughter Julia. Marcellus, however, died in his 20th year, 23 BC. Then his death – which now forms the upshot of the argument in Virgil – made a profound impression on Rome because Marcellus had been regarded hopefully as Augustus' successor. It was at this point that Octavia is said to have fainted, when Virgil read this passage to her and Augustus (from the biography, § 32). This need not be true, although Virgil's way of introducing Marcellus may well have had this result (*se non è vero, è ben trovato*). In fact, Virgil uses equivocal language, as he often does.

Expressing a wish, Anchises instantly realises its hopelessness: if only Marcellus could escape the early death to which he was doomed, he would be a true Marcellus, a worthy descendant of his great ancestor; if only the Fates would allow him to live long enough, Anchises says, which they will not, as he knows but does not say (VI 882 f.): "heu! Miserande puer, si qua fata aspera rumpas,/ tu Marcellus eris". The subjunctive in the *protasis* expresses the hypothesis, the indicative in the *apodosis* indicates the certainty. Since "fate and 'foreknowledge' are associated"[36], what has to happen becomes identical with what can be known. Or, we assume *aposiopesis*, and imagine the speaker as having come to a sudden halt, unable or unwilling to proceed: "it is possible to regard the sentence as broken at *rumpas* and finished on a slightly different note from its beginning"[37]. The *protasis* would then be left without any real *apodosis*. One would translate it as Rolfe Humphries did: "Poor boy,/ If you should break the cruel fates – if only/ You are to be Marcellus"[38].

In any event, in the end, Anchises' blurred and drugged-up vision leaves the reader in doubt about Rome's future. Although Marcellus seems to prefigure other of the *Aeneid*'s dying heroes, of which there are many, one cannot say whether Rome may finally be doomed, or whether Rome is saved, because a new Marcellus is already around, or is to come soon.

On the one hand, the passage created a sad moment. Since Marcellus was the designated heir to the throne, "his death pointedly symbolizes the death of the future"[39]. On the other hand, Augustus "was by no means consumed with grief", rather "exploited the death of his nephew for propaganda purposes". Soon after an appropriate period of time, "Augustus married off his daughter Julia again", and as early as 20 BC the first grandchild was born. Virgil was still alive and

---

[36] Fletcher 1941: 100.

[37] *Ibidem*.

[38] Humphries' translation cited from Shackleton Bailey 1986: 205. A few lines earlier, at VI 861: "egregium […] iuvenem", "the contemporary reader will already have reached this identification, quite without difficulty" (Horsfall 2013: II 605); now the reader is informed explicitly by the poet, along with Aeneas.

[39] Tracy 1975: 38.

may have witnessed how the role that had been held by Marcellus was gradually assumed by someone else[40].

Third: When Venus brings the new armour for Aeneas, he cannot gaze on it enough (VIII 608–625). The ensuing *ekphrasis* of the subjects represented on the shield (626–731) begins with Romulus and Remus suckled by the she-wolf. In the central place (675–713), Caesar drives Cleopatra in flight at Actium (675 f.): "in medio […] Actia bella/ cernere erat", etc. Other eastern operations are mentioned, too, such as India and all the Arabians, who turned to flee at that terror (705 f.): "omnis eo terrore Aegyptus et Indi,/ omnis Arabs, omnes vertebant terga Sabaei". After the events, the Euphrates moved with more submissive waves (726): "Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis". Vulcan had sculpted all these things, and "we must visualize simultaneously Vulcan's representation, the actual river, and its image being carried in the triumphal procession" after Augustus' return[41].

To sum up: the three passages presented above are not isolated from each other. Instead, they form the *Aeneid*'s central organising principal. Jupiter in his first speech reassures Venus that Aeneas will reach Italy safely, which he indeed does. It is Aeneas who is to inaugurate Rome's future, and "no contemporary could fail to detect in Aeneas a foreshadowing of Augustus"[42]. When Actium returns again, we discern a structural parallel. While the description in book VI, the *Aeneid*'s turning point, makes Aeneas merely see the future of Rome, "in the form of souls awaiting rebirth in Elysium identified by Anchises for Aeneas"[43], in book VIII, with the scenes from Rome's history, from Romulus to Augustus, Aeneas "takes the future (depicted on the shield) on his shoulders"[44].

Once one of the "Harvard school" Latinists, Adam Parry, asked "what was Augustus giving Virgil all those gold-pieces for?"[45] Well, it was Actium, was it not, or to be more precise, its inclusion in the *Aeneid*. This is the more obvious since, in the end, it is not Jupiter nor Vulcan let alone Anchises, but Virgil who imparts everlasting glory on his chosen subject – as he would render Augustus

[40] Glei 1998: 121. Virgil, however, dared to remind Augustus of Marcellus, and Marcellus indeed prefigures other dying heroes. Unlike Propertius, who wrote an elegiac epicedium on Marcellus (III 18), Virgil reminded Augustus without ironic innuendo (Richardson 1976: 391). Instead, "the pathetic beauty of Virgil's lines is a glowing tribute to his memory" (Fletcher 1941: 97). A friend would have done so, but also someone who only wished to ingratiate himself ever more, for whatever reason.

[41] Gransden 1976: 184.

[42] Syme 1939: 463. Cf. Syme's ch. XXX, on "the organization of opinion" (*ibidem*, 459–475). Even the fact that Mussolini and his gangsters pretended to have understood that, lavishly celebrating Augustus in the 1930s, does not prove it to be a misreading of the *Aeneid*. They carried it quite far: a sculpture of Aeneas in Mantova, Virgil's birth-place, shows Mussolini's features. Syme's condemnatory view of Augustus is not independent of such contemporary political movements.

[43] Gransden 1990: 44.

[44] Otis 1964: 218.

[45] Parry 1963: 70.

immortal by means of his *Aeneid*. For, "as long as the house of Aeneas dwells on the Capitol, and the imperial line holds sway", he writes, "no day shall ever erase you", i.e. "you" as an example of something noble and heroic, he says, "from the memory of time, if there be any power within my poetry" (IX 446–449):

> si quid mea carmina possunt,
> nulla dies umquam memori vos eximet aevo
> dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
> accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.

Virgil reserves this "most emphatic authorial intervention […] and the only explicit reference to the power of his own poetry"[46] for a young couple of friends, Nisus and Euryalus, the "happy pair" (IX 446: *fortunati ambo*). Put at the close of their story (314–449), the statement is a prominent singularity. If it is not meaningless – and given Virgil's distinction this is highly unlikely – the fact may suggest that there is something else at the centre of the *Aeneid*. This suspicion is shared by the two voices theorists. *It* might be called friendship, or, rather, sympathy and compassion. Something congenial, indeed, defines the relationship both between Aeneas and Augustus as well as between Aeneas and Achilles, and why not assume it, also the one between Virgil and Augustus.

Nisus and Euryalus, as well as Lausus or Pallas, form a group of dying heroes of the *Aeneid*, whom Marcellus prefigured and Virgil much deplores – who were they?

V.

Having operated successfully in enemy territory, Nisus and Euryalus are finally discovered. The light flashing on the helmet which Euryalus has taken as part of the spoils reveals their presence to a band of Latin cavalry. Nisus gets away, Euryalus is caught. Nisus returns but cannot save him; when Euryalus is killed Nisus rushes in to revenge him; killing his friend's assassin, Nisus meets his death. Virgil expresses an intense feeling of futility and waste, describing Euryalus' death in a heightened, perhaps Stesichorean tone[47], comparing him to "a purple flower that, severed by the plough, falls slack in death", or to "poppies that bow their heads, when weighted down by sudden rain" (IX 435–437):

> purpureus veluti cum flos succisus aratro
> languescit moriens, lassove papavera collo
> demisere caput, pluvia cum forte gravantur.

---

[46] Hardie 1994: 153.

[47] Herakles kills Geryon, and Geryon "bent his neck over to one side, like a poppy which spoiling its tender beauty suddenly sheds its petals", or "like a poppy that spoils its delicate shape, shedding its petals all at once", etc. The text comes from papyrus fragments, combined and edited by Barrett and Page (1973).

Another youth who dies for a loved one, Lausus, who was so "devoted to his unlovable father"[48], is commemorated in a similar way by Virgil, as is Euander's son Pallas. Both young heroes die in the tenth book (X 507–509 and 791–793, respectively). Lausus, the son of the impious Mezentius, killed by *pius Aeneas* (783), is to be praised by the poet so that "ancient days may win credence for such prowess" as his (792)[49]: "si qua fidem tanto est operi latura vetustas", i.e. "if some antiquity (*si qua vetustas)* is going to confer (*est latura*) credibility (*fidem*) to so great an exploit"[50]. On Nisus and Euryalus Virgil was more elaborate, exemplifying the major theme of his *Aeneid*, which "as a whole tells of suffering and heroism in the remote past whose fruits endure to the present"[51].

At the very end of the *Aeneid*, Pallas' fate is revenged by Aeneas. Having "perpetual guidance lavished upon", this "slave of duty […] as he stamps himself", who "throughout all hazards of his high mission" always appeared "sober, steadfast and tenacious", "neither splendid nor striking"[52], finally Aeneas is driven by his own strong emotions. For a split second they become too much to bear. Acting accordingly while being perfectly aware of it, he slaughters his arch-enemy Turnus, turning out to be anything but an unemotional and infuriatingly matter-of-fact hero, though paradoxically not losing control[53].

It took Virgil and his protagonist some time to get there. Aeneas' mental voyage, however, is different from that of Achilles in the *Iliad*. Achilles was transformed by the events: on the one hand betrayed by his peer-group, on the other feeling guilty of, or at least responsible for his best friend's death. Aeneas, however, only reveals the other facet of his character: while he may well pass as pious and inclined to the angelic, he is also a savage brute. Indeed, the bipolar Aeneas has another frame of mind than Achilles. Achilles' erratic behaviour, his extravagant narcissism wedded to a lack of discipline, and a pattern of an arguably stubborn disposition made him an outcast – in the eyes of his fellows. However, it was he alone who kept up the standards of decency and compassion – which is what Aeneas shares with him. In the end, returning Hector's corpse to his father, with whom he cries, Achilles was moderate and showed sorrow for the suffering of others[54], which Aeneas does too. Finally, Achilles is brave and adult, while Agamemnon remains excessive and selfish, an example

---

[48] R.D. Williams 1973: 373.

[49] Harrison 1991: 261 f.

[50] Jordan 1990: 74.

[51] Hardie 1994: 153.

[52] Syme 1939: 462.

[53] Thus, Virgil foreshadowed what was to become the basic proposition of the modern novel, i.e. "the expression of diametrically opposed attitudes within human beings" (Stokes 1995: 102, citing Yukio Mishima).

[54] See Jasper Griffin's ch. 4 on "death, pathos, and objectivity" (Griffin 1980: 103–143).

of vulgarity and egoism – a childish coward of the first order. The worst qualified to become a leader, on his return savagely slaughtered by his monstrously clever and abysmally heartless wife, a well-matched, brutish character if ever there is one.

Virgil's civilised poetry may differ greatly from Homer's. Nevertheless, Virgil's Aeneas seems to continue the path taken by Homer's Achilles, i.e. their rejection of the heroic code and their shying away from brutishness for its own sake. Both Homer and Virgil may leave their readers fascinated and bewildered. Virgilian Aeneas, however, is distinguished by always mirroring Augustus. At least to some of the *Aeneid*'s early readers it must have appeared so. It cannot be otherwise for, in the *Aeneid*, a "mythical" figure (the legendary Aeneas) not only relates to a "historical" person (the contemporary Augustus), but also defines him, prefiguring him. Both may belong to different worlds, but they come close to each other, neither of them being what he seems to be – a characteristic trait both have in common. Neither was Aeneas always sober, steadfast and tenacious, and nor is Augustus. Both, however, were splendid and striking, and still are, because of Virgil's *Aeneid*.

After Actium, Augustus was divested of all he had been, as Aeneas was, when arriving at Rome. Both their origins have become remote, as was their destiny. They needed friends, desperately, and acted upon that need. Where are we now, exactly?

VI.

Ruling over many subordinate truths, Virgil's imagination combined myth and history, past and present. The case of Actium gave him the unique chance to establish such a special relationship between myth and history, past and present, linking Aeneas and Augustus inextricably together, making them reflect each other. Actium helped him to do so, and Actium illustrates how the structure of the *Aeneid* "is simultaneously diachronic (moving through narrative time) and synchronic (a stasis in which a Homeric hero, Augustus and events and characters in between, are presented in the simultaneity of a single discourse)"[55]. A moment of stasis is created, interrupting the narrative's motion, which implies a state of contemplation, detached from the *kinesis* of life.

The war of Actium had been fought and won, "the menace to Italy's life and soul averted"[56]. At this decisive moment in history, poets, historians, and artists were at Octavian's side, helping to establish the glorious image of Octavian as peace-bringer and defender of Roman tradition. Among them were Virgil, and also Horace. Octavian's trusted friend and diplomatic agent Maecenas was on

---

[55] Gransden 1990: 46.

[56] Syme 1939: 304.

the watch for talent and gathered an assortment of poets, "offering protection, counsel and subsidy"[57]. Horace is to dedicate to him his first collection of *Odes* (*Carm*. I 1, 1 f.): "Maecenas atavis edite regibus,/ o et praesidium et dulce decus meum" ("Maecenas, sprung from royal stock,/ my bulwark and my glory dearly cherished")[58]. After Maecenas, the second poem of Horace's first collection is dedicated to Augustus, and the third to Virgil, setting out for Greece[59].

About a year after the victory at Actium, around 29 BC, Virgil, then aged forty, began work on the *Aeneid*. Whether he was a naive idealist, or a fanatical propagandist, whether he believed in Augustus' mission or whether he was just ordered to do so and to put *it* into words, we do not know. We cannot even say what *it* might have been, or by whom and how exactly Virgil was approached because of *it*. It is more likely than not that there was a mix of feelings about *it* on his side. Virgil may well have entertained contradictory emotions, in the same way as Aeneas, acting on sometimes one, sometimes the other of two opposites, or even the extremes.

Since, however, playing in the team is always more important than the game, provided that you play together with men like yourself, Virgil did not refuse. Once, as a young man, he wrote a poetic refusal (*Ecl.* 6), as did Horace (*Carm*. I 6 and II 12), and it later became fashionable with Propertius (III 3) and Ovid – again something Alexandrian, inaugurated by Callimachus (*Aetia* fr. I 1, 17 f.). Now, nothing prevents us from assuming that "his strong patriotism and natural piety caused him to accept, with a sense of religious devotion, the task to which the Emperor Augustus now invited him"[60].

Or was the truth – like so many truths – not any of the envisaged possibilities?

---

[57] *Ibidem*, 253.

[58] Published in 23 BC, Horace's collection contains poems written from 31 onwards. Curiously enough, the first poem is not only characterised by a catalogue of different ways of life – as if they were at Maecenas' disposal (as in fact, they were), but also ends with a confession – Horace wants to be ranked among the lyric bards (I 1, 29–36), a claim he repeats in the collection's last poem as a wish fulfilled (III 30, 1 f.): "exegi monumentum aere perennius/ regalique situ pyramidum altius" ("I have finished a monument more lasting than bronze and loftier than the Pyramids' royal pile"). Somehow forced after his father's farm was confiscated after Philippi (42 BC) – a fate he was to share with Virgil – Horace made the right choice indeed. After his victory poem hailing Augustus' triumph at Actium (I 37), he hints at Actium again. Alluding to the Pyramids at the opening of the collection's closing poem, he subtly compares his achievement to that of Augustus, who won Egypt.

[59] This *propempticon* for Virgil contains the ambiguous "nothing is too arduous for man" (I 3. 37: "nil mortalibus ardui est" – the Horatian curse, needed by tradition for a *propempticon* (Commager 1962: 119 f.), and, at the same time, an allusion to what is to be expected by Virgil: an over-determined statement, giving expression to more than one desire.

[60] Dunlop 1949: 6.

VII.

What we can surely state is that Virgil somewhat reluctantly worked on the text[61]. Despite being or perhaps because he was at his zenith, he rather frustrated the whole enterprise by delaying it, having or simulating a serious writer's block. Though urged by Augustus, who even threatened Virgil in jest, to send to him the work's outline or whatever passage of it he had at hand – "supplicibus atque etiam minacibus per iocum litteris", etc. (from the biography, § 31), Virgil would not be moved. A friend might behave in this way, while others would have had to die for it. However, since words went unpunished, as Tacitus writes, and only actions were prosecuted (*Ann*. I 72, 2: "facta arguebantur, dicta impune erant")[62], and since Virgil would certainly not have dreamed of any kind of defamation or treason – why did not he write what he was asked to do?

Other well-known facts may be adduced to corroborate the impression he must have made. To begin with, the *Aeneid*'s text is complete but unrevised. Virgil left some sixty lines incomplete, to which supplements were forged quite early; ten such lines occur in the *Aeneid* II, "more than in any other book"[63] – which is somewhat odd, because Virgil chose this book for recitation, which might imply that he regarded it as finished. Since some of these half-lines appear quite effective in themselves, they may indeed be deliberate innovations. Such inconsistencies "might be a part of Vergil's poetic technique rather than a result of his failure to polish the poem before his death"[64]. They may result as well, however, "from Virgil's method of composition and from the lack of final revision"[65].

In fact, tradition has it that Virgil did not want to have the manuscript published (from the biography, § 39–41). Being terminally ill, he wanted to burn the manuscript: "igitur in extrema valetudine assidue scrinia desideravit, crematurus ipse". Nevertheless, after the author's unexpected death, two friends of his published the poem on Augustus' instructions. Virgil fell ill on a trip in Greece, where he wanted to stay for three years; Horace's prayer in his *propempticon* (*Carm*. I 3, 5–8) that "the ship may preserve the half of my own soul" ("navis, […] precor, […] et serves animae dimidium meae") was of no use; for

---

[61] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, writing a Roman history from the beginnings to the First Punic War, was far more prolific. Twenty books are filled with his elaborate rhetorical composition. He taught at Rome (30–8 BC), where he was the leading spirit of a literary circle. It is likely that he was somehow approached by Maecenas too (who died 8 BC).

[62] The famous words come from a passage in which Tacitus deals with the Tiberian treason-trials in AD 15. Regarded as "broadly true" (Goodyear 1981: 150), they may characterise the conditions prevailing throughout the lifetime of Virgil too.

[63] Dunlop 1949: 5.

[64] O'Hara 2010: 102.

[65] Austin 1971: 175.

chronological reasons, however, this poem cannot refer to the voyage in question. Apparently, Augustus was not unsatisfied with Virgil's work, rather being in desperate need of it, perhaps even liking being portrayed as *Aeneas redivivus*. In any event, the unfinished state is due to Virgil's way of writing, composing hesitatingly and working intermittently.

At least, we are told so by the author of an ancient biography of his. First Virgil wrote a draft, then he began to compose verses in blocks, not necessarily in order, leaving certain lines unfinished so as not to hold up the flow of composition (§§ 22–24). Thus, some portions of the earlier books may well have been written after some of the later sections. It is to be observed, however, that nothing from the second half of the poem is recorded as having been read to Augustus, while parts of the first half surely were. Virgil himself selected book VI, the poem's keystone, book IV, the tragedy of Dido (highly characteristic of the whole epic's tone), and book II, in which Aeneas tells of the Wooden Horse and his escape from Troy, losing his wife, yet rescuing his father and son (from the biography, § 32).

When Augustus had returned after his victory at Actium, Virgil already read the *Georgics* to him. Augustus was relaxing after the earlier events, and Virgil read over four consecutive days. Whenever Virgil's voice failed, Maecenas took up reading in turn (from the biography, § 27): "Georgica […] reverso post Actiacam victoriam Augusto […] per continuum quadriduum legit suscipiente Maecenate legendi vicem, quotiens interpellaretur ipse vocis offensione". Virgil was gifted with a beautiful voice, we hear in the following (§ 29): "pronuntiabat autem cum suavitate, cum lenociniis miris": an allurement, a sweetness for sure, perhaps also a blandishment[66]. From this biography of Virgil we hear that the canon of Virgil's authentic works consists of three books: the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid*. This is somewhat confirmed by in the inscription on his tomb, "known early and widely"[67]: "cecini pascua rura duces" – "Shepherds inspired my song, farmers, and princes at war"[68].

The *Eclogues* as well as the *Georgics* were indeed inspired by Greek models, as is the *Aeneid*[69]. Yet the difference between the *Aeneid* and the other two

---

[66] Looking back on his life, Ovid regrets very much not having heard it (*Trist.* IV 10, 4): "Vergilium vidi tantum" – "Virgil I only saw" (Green 2005: 269 f.). A subtle spirit, Ovid may well have been implying that the sound of Virgil's works, i.e. their poetic technique, seemed to him more satisfactory than their themes. Ovid's statement, however, has two parallel values because Ovid is also alluding to his own poetry. He was forced into exile by Augustus because of the theme of one of his poem's, or rather, more because of its theme than its manner (*Trist.* II 207): "two crimes have brought me ruin, a poem and a blunder" – "perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error", as he states in his ironic plea for mercy (Green 2005: 221).

[67] Horsfall 1995b: 21.

[68] Dunlop 1949: 4.

[69] For the general picture, see Knauer 1964: pl. 5; for a case study, Cairns 1989: 215–248.

works is that the *Aeneid* "is a narrative of human actions whereas *Eclogues* and *Georgics* are not narratives in this sense at all"[70]. Virgil bid farewell to them by a curious, innovative device, uniting both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*. The last line of the latter echoes the first line of the former.

Signing off the *Georgics*, Virgil looks back on the boldness of his youth (*audaxque iuventa*), his days of inglorious leisure (*ignobilis oti*), when he played his youthful shepherd songs, and sang to Tityrus, under the spreading beech, when Naples nourished him (*Georg.* IV 563–566):

> illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
> Parthenope, studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
> carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,
> Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

The *Georgics*'s closure only slightly and necessarily alters the beginning of the *Eclogues*, the opening lines of which present Tityrus "in the complete pastoral setting"[71], where he lies in the shade of the spreading beech tree, practising his pastoral Muse on a slender pipe (*Ecl.* 1, 1 f.): "Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi/ silvestrem tenui musam meditaris avena".

Virgil's boldness consisted in being the first to attempt bucolic poetry in Latin after the model of Theocritus. He had already prominently claimed to have done so at the opening of *Eclogues* 6, thus in the *Georgics* reminding his reader of his own earlier *Eclogues*, not only of the first but also of the sixth poem, which prominently opens the second half of the collection of ten. Both the first and the sixth poem are related by *tenuis*, which refers to the Callimachean concept of poetry "on a small scale" (from the poetological opening of his *Aetia*, fr. I 1, 11), developed in conscious reaction against full-scale epic writing[72]. Quite obviously, *Ecl.* 6, 8: "agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam" (a perfect golden line) echoes *Ecl.* 1, 2, signifying a concept of poetry as conceived by Callimachus: "His pastoral poetry, Virgil implies, though ostensibly Theocritean, is essentially Callimachean"[73].

Virgil unified his (early) work retrospectively in the *Georgics*, imagining himself as the person who performed (*lusi ... cecini*, "I played and sang"), while then, in the *Eclogues*, he was addressed as such a performer (*meditaris*, "you work over a song in performance"). Nevertheless, despite being unified, the two poems or the collection of them can hardly be more different. Regarding their

---

[70] Otis 1963: 218.

[71] R.D. Williams 1979: 91.

[72] Half a century ago, Wendell Clausen exposed how the Romans received Callimachean poetics (Clausen 1964a). An enormous amount of studies followed; for a Hellenist's point of view Gregory Hutchinson's chapter on Roman poetry may serve as a starting point (Hutchinson 1988: 277–354).

[73] Clausen 1994: 175.

form and content, “the eclogues are art for art’s sake, self-referential worlds depicting […] young poets at play, in love with love and art, […] creating a private world”[74], while the *Georgics* are deeply moral, dedicated to man at work, collective and social[75].

Already to an anonymous author in antiquity Virgil appeared as a poet who self-consciously moved on. He composed the four lines which precede the *Aeneid*.

Was it Virgil himself?

VIII.

Whoever wrote them shared the feeling that the end of the *Georgics* is an auto-referential self-mirroring, forming part of a larger work in progress, in the course of which Virgil may return to something already visible or discernible, or may enlarge on something already having been or still being the subject of a poetic work of his.

The unknown connoisseur composed an intriguing new proem to the *Aeneid*[76], on which the poem’s genuine opening lines follow, about the arms and the man, “arma virumque cano”, etc.:

> Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
> carmen et egressus silvis vicina coegi,
> ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,
> gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis
> arma virumque cano…
>
> I the man who once versified on my slender pastoral pipe and then, abandoning the woods, taught my native fields to obey the farmer’s eager demands, and the poem pleased them, now bristling arms and the man I sing…

It is tempting to think of Virgil as the author of these four lines – and already in antiquity some considered these lines to be genuine (from the biography, § 42). The fact that Virgil does speak twice himself about his new project, thus announcing the *Aeneid*, speaks in their favour. He does so for the first time in the

[74] Gransden 1990: 19.

[75] Yet in the *Eclogues*, taking the bucolic form, characters, and language from Theocritus – *Ecl.* 5 and Theocritus’ first poem, for instance, come quite close (Clausen 1994: 152 f.) – Virgil had already moved on. So far as true pastoral is concerned, there is a parting of the ways, when he “proceeded to write, for example, the history of his personal misfortunes” (Dunlop 1949: 2). He does so in *Ecl.* 1 and 9, texts that speak about “the harsh reality of land-confiscations” (Clausen 1994: 29 f., 266), a dark, deep, underhanded plotting. His father’s farm (like the one owned by Horace’s father) was among those confiscated after the battle of Philippi (42 BC), to be distributed to the veterans of Octavian and Antonius for services rendered in the civil war.

[76] Gransden 1990: 21.

work preceding the *Aeneid*; he then repeats the announcement in the text of the *Aeneid* itself, in a performative present tense, i.e. at the same time announcing and fulfilling, declaring and realising.

Virgil does so prominently and not the least in a recondite or obscure way. He does so in two places which mirror each other, i.e. in the two second prefaces[77], holding the same place in their respective works, opening its second half (as it was already in the *Eclogues*, where eclogue 6 announced something poetological). They may illustrate how much Virgil has woven into the texture of his verses. The second proem to the *Georgics* mentions a proposed poem, described allegorically as a temple, in which Caesar is to be the deity (*Georg.* III 16): "in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit", a Pindaric expression carrying Ennian overtones[78]. The second proem to the *Aeneid* promises that the story now to come will be greater, according to the greater task Virgil undertakes (*Aen.* VII 44 f.): "maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo,/ maius opus moveo". Employed to enhance the dignity of the subject, both lines envisage and speak of the same – the glory of Augustan Rome; again, an achievement largely dependent on the poet's involvement.

However, these lines from the *Aeneid* reflect an earlier Virgilian poem from the *Eclogues*, this time one that differs remarkably from the rest of the collection. Again it can be observed that Virgil's texts not only refer to, but also highlight each other, shedding further light on each of them, bringing them into an

---

[77] Such proems in the middle are considered to "point […] towards the Alexandrian character of this technique" (CONTE 1992: 157).

[78] The metaphorical language, its heightened and solemn tone, is indebted to Pindar, who conceived his texts to be architectural works. Using a performative future tense (as Virgil does with *erit*), Pindar admonishes himself "let us like builders construct a palace for men to wonder at" (*Olymp.* 6, 1–3). Pindar's typical "intertwining of the victor's and the poet's achievement" (KIRKWOOD 1982: 85) is copied by Virgil too. Virgil, however, need not have read Pindar extensively, for he might have got this architectural simile from Callimachus. It is likely that he used such an expression in an epinician and somewhat Pindaric context, situated at the same relative point of his *Aetia*, opening its third book (THOMAS 1983: 97–99). While such observations may appeal to a Hellenist, a Latinist may well point out that the language of the immediately preceding lines (9–15) is reminiscent of Ennius, Virgil's most important forerunner in the field of Epic poetry. Speaking of a "winner" (*victor*), Virgil apparently combined epinician language (*Georg.* III 8 f.: "temptanda via est, qua me quoque possim/ tollere humo victorque virum volitare per ora" – "I must essay a path whereby I, too, may rise from earth and fly victorious on the lips of men") with an image developed from Ennius (*Epigr.* 18: "Nemo me lacrumis decoret nec funera fletu/ faxit. Cur? volito vivus per ora virum" – "Let no one honour me with tears or on my ashes weep./ For why? Alive from lips to lips of men I go a-winging"): "an echo of Ennius' epitaph upon himself" (MYNORS 1990: 180; a collection of *similia* both Greek and Latin in THOMAS 1988: II 39–42). Cicero discusses Ennius' epitaph (*Tusc.* I 34), citing Ennius as an example of those poets who demand the reward of fame from those whose fathers he had rendered famous ("mercedem gloriae flagitat ab iis, quorum patres adfecerat gloria"). Already Virgilian scholars in antiquity noted how much Virgil "borrowed" from Ennius. In fact, Virgil took over many lines or parts from Ennius, "but never a whole line without changing at least one word" (SKUTSCH 1985: 13), as he did in the case considered here too.

ever-changing perspective, a labyrinth intricate and puzzling, forbidding linear movements. The expression used in *Aeneid* VII 44 is reminiscent of *Ecl.* 4, 5 which announces that the great line of the centuries is beginning anew: "magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo". The fourth eclogue, which can be dated to 40 BC[79], deserves special mention because it is a political and philosophical prophecy, describing the imminent birth of a divine child, in whose lifetime the golden age will return. In this eclogue there is no dialogue, there are no characters, but the poet speaks in his own voice, announcing in the first line, in a performative Pindaric self-appeal[80], that he is about to sing something on a bigger scale, a somewhat loftier strain (*Ecl.* 4, 1): "paulo maiora canamus". This line from the "messianic eclogue" as it is sometimes known[81], again confirms the proposed theme – the glory of Augustan Rome[82].

As does *Ecl*. 4, so *Ecl.* 6 also extends the normal boundaries of the pastoral, introducing a contemporary of his. Apparently, Virgil's mixture of diachronic and synchronic story-telling had been present since his youth. Covering an astonishing span of subjects, Virgil introduces the contemporary statesman and poet Cornelius Gallus (*Ecl.* 6, 64–73). He introduces him again in the final eclogue 10, with which the sixth is closely linked: the real Gallus comes into the pastoral, literary world (*Ecl.* 10, 2), a man who composed bucolic poetry. Gallus speaks of it (*Ecl.* 10, 51: "modulabor avena") as if he had read Virgil (*Ecl.* 1, 2: "meditaris avena"), though he renounces bucolic poetry, bidding farewell to it, succumbing instead to the power of love (10, 69): "omnia vincit Amor, et nos cedamus Amori"[83].

There are other such glimpses of the real world in these two and other poems from the *Eclogues*, and we hear of fellow-poets such as Varius and Pollio. The former co-edited Virgil's *Aeneid* (tampered with the text, exchanged the *Aeneid*'s book II and III, condemned the four opening lines); *Ecl.* 4 was addressed to the latter (before Maecenas started to do so, Pollio was helping Virgil, suggesting he write bucolic poetry, and also enjoying Horace's friendship). Concluding the collection of *Eclogues*, Virgil, however, chose Gallus, who is at the focus of "the most original and in many ways strangest of all the *Eclogues*"[84]. Rejecting

---

[79] R.D. Williams 1979: 105.

[80] Gerber 1982: 42 f.

[81] Mayor 1907.

[82] Galinsky 1996: 91–93.

[83] Eventually, Virgil confesses his love for Gallus, which is growing hour by hour, "as fast as in the dawn of spring shoots up the green alder" (*Ecl.* 10, 73 f.): "Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas,/ quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus". At the end of the *Georgics* (IV 453–527), the verses of a song about Orpheus and Eurydice, a Callimachean epyllion *par excellence* (Morgan 1999), "strongly suggest" that Virgil was still looking to Gallus' poetry (Thomas 1988: II 226).

[84] R.D. Williams 1979: 129.

Arcadian escapism, Virgil portrays Gallus' disillusionment with Arcadian consolation – and since he identifies with Gallus, Virgil cannot but mean himself: "Whatever view we take of this, it is a despondent note that Vergil chooses to sound his farewell to the genre"[85]. Again it can be observed that Virgil's farewell to his youth, by unifying the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* in the latter work's *sphragis*, was preceded by himself, when he bid farewell to his bucolic beginnings at the end of his *Eclogues*[86].

Now that the poet had not only left his past behind but also was aiming at something extraordinary, what are we going to get from him in his *Aeneid*? Could he deliver?

IX.

On a hitherto unprecedented grand scale among Virgil's works, the *Aeneid* is divided into twelve books, each of between 700 and 1,000 lines. The first half, books I–VI, describes Aeneas' journey from Troy to his new home in Italy, "the predominantly individual experience of the man". They contrast with "the predominantly social experience of arms"[87] as narrated in books VII–XII, which describe action in Italy, including his killing of Turnus, a rival suitor to the Italian princess Lavinia. In the final duel Aeneas has Turnus at his mercy, and might have spared him. But he recognises a sword-belt which Turnus had stripped from a young hero's body after he had slain him (X 439–509). Aeneas remembers how the hero's father, Euander, prayed, asking Aeneas to take vengeance on Turnus (XI 176–181), and he plunges the sword in. As he had already done earlier, upon learning of the death of Pallas, Virgil gives way to reckless frenzy: "However reluctantly (and he *is* reluctant), Aeneas must eventually discharge this debt of honour"[88].

---

[85] Coleman 1977: 297.

[86] In addition, one may read one of the *Georgics*' crucial lines, often made to say what they do not, as a reference to this farewell. However, that brutish work and grim toil may overcome all difficulties, is only one reading of *Georgics* I 145 "labor omnia vincit": only if we assume that *labor* was meant quite literally, referring to the field's labour, the peasant's toil, denoting in a kind of *pars pro toto* the *Georgics*' major theme as a whole, i.e. the glorification of hard work – which it need not (Thomas 1988: I 92 f., and Mynors 1990: 29 f., exceptionally agree on that). For, a poet who produces such densely interrelated texts as the collection of the *Eclogues* is (Davis 2012), such a poet cannot be reduced to any one-dimensional statement. Rather, a translation consonant with the poem may render the line as meaning "insatiable toil occupied all areas of existence" (Thomas 1988: I 93), a sentiment expressed by Theocritus, who makes one of his shepherds state that "it is poverty alone that awakes the arts" (21, 1). Already before him, it is a commonplace set out at length by Greek classical poets (Gow 1952: II 370).

[87] Both quotations from Brooks 1953: 260.

[88] Gransden 1991: 87.

This flash-like memory is reported at the very end of the *Aeneid*, where quite literally "the belt flashed with its well-known studs", i.e. young Pallas' belt (XII 942 f,): "notis fulserunt cingula bullis/ Pallantis pueri" – as the flashing on Euryalus' helmet revealed him to the enemy (IX 373 f.): "et galea Euryalum sublustri noctis in umbra/ prodidit immemorem radiisque adversa refulsit" ("and in the glimmering shadows of night his helm/ betrayed the thoughtless Euryalus, as it flashed back in the light"). The dying Turnus is said to have had his limbs relaxed with chilling terror (XII 951): "solvuntur frigore membra". This phrase – used only twice in the poem – links Turnus with Aeneas, for it was used earlier of him, describing Aeneas at his first appearance in the poem (I 92). Then, it was Aeneas' limbs that fell slack with chill, and were numbed in cold fear: a reaction that indicated Aeneas' human frailty then, which contrasts strongly with his ruthless determination now. A long way, even for a gifted man, or should we call it rather a sudden reversal?

Pallas' father, Euander, provides another example of this particularly Virgilian mixture of time, or his "deliberate use of anachronism, intended to emphasise the antiquity and continuity"[89] of Roman history, from Aeneas to Augustus. Euander, too, was led by destiny to Rome, a fact that parallels as well as prefigures that of Aeneas. It is Euander who was used by the Romans to supply a legendary connexion between Greece and Rome, giving an aetiological explanation of place-names, showing Aeneas around in contemporary Rome, as it is known to Virgil and Augustus. Euander takes Aeneas on a tour to places destined to become famous in Roman history. The tour is conducted through a city not yet built (VIII 306–369), and Virgil quite often speaks in his own person, adding comments and information which Euander could not have known, thus "linking the legendary past with the Rome of history and the age of Augustus"[90]. Having walked with Aeneas from the Ara Maxima to the Porta Carmentalis (306–336), Euander points out notable landmarks inside the city (337–369), which is the city of Virgil's own time[91].

---

[89] Gransden 1976: 123.

[90] R.D. Williams 1973: 245.

[91] Eventually, Euander leads Aeneas to his own house, welcoming him with words that became proverbial since (VIII 364 f.): "aude, hospes, comtemnere opes et te quoque dignum/ finge deo, rebusque veni non asper egenis" ("my guest, dare to despise riches and try to deserve/ divinity, and come not disdainful of our poverty"). Words seemingly addressed to the Augustan hearer of the poem, words that make "the speaker a mouthpiece of the poet" (Gransden 1976: 132). Unfortunately, Virgil does not say where Euander's quarters are, though the text seems to point to a site on the slope of the Palatine. If that were the case "there is another foreshadowing of the future: for in his own time […] that was the position of Augustus' house" (Fordyce 1977: 246). The whole passage is thoroughly examined by Stahl (2015: 251–345, concluding with a map). It turns out that three areas are visited which, "in the years Vergil worked on his *Aeneid*, were major construction sites", where Augustus "completed the program of Julianizing the cityscape, which his adoptive father, C. Julius Caesar, had begun" (Stahl 2015: IX).

The repeated use of "solvuntur frigore membra", however, not only connects the two decisive heroes, but also "is a marker of Aeneas' transformation"[92]. A terrified victim has become an angered avenger. Then, he wished he had met death in battle (I 94–101), in comparison with which "death by drowning […] was death lost and thrown away – death redounding neither to one's own honour, nor to the advantage of one's country or the world"[93]. Then, Aeneas praised those who died "before their fathers' eyes at Troy" as "three or four times blessed" (I 94–96): "o terque quaterque beati,/ quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis/ contigit oppetere". Now, he kills as if he were in battle, going berserk, annihilating Turnus' blazing intensity:

> When the epic opened it was Aeneas' turn to shudder with cold as the winds […] threatened imminent death (*solvuntur frigore membra*: I, 92). Now, as the poem reaches its climax, it is one of Virgil's most bitter and cogent ironies that he uses this very phrase at the exact moment Aeneas becomes the personification of avenging wrath and brings death to Turnus. The wheel has come to full circle[94].

As it was then (I 92), now again there is a ring of bewilderment and sorrow attached to the line, in which the soul of Turnus passes with a resentful moan to the shades below, and "the emphasis centres not on the triumphs of Aeneas but on the tragedy of Turnus' death"[95]. In the end there is no sense of triumph at all: "The poem ends with an outburst of savage sorrow and a death"[96]. At least, for those who hear two voices. Similar to his final appearance, already when he first turned up and delivered his strange speech on his unfulfilled death-wish, Aeneas seems profoundly melancholic[97]. He appears to be a tragic hero, doubting the mission he has to carry out while being tragically bound to do it, as was Achilles. But he also shows himself to be a multi-faceted character, just as a tragedy portrays its protagonists, evolving and revealing their frame of mind, making them confront events or people that make them doubt.

X.

Virgil is reticent in revealing his hero completely though, and "Aeneas we only see in half-glances, half-revelations"[98]. That Virgil was much concerned with tragic themes did not escape his fellow-writers, one of whom called him

92 Tarrant 2012: 341.

93 Henry 1873: 330.

94 Putnam 1965: 200 f.

95 R.D. Williams 1973: 509.

96 Clausen 1964b: 145.

97 *Ibidem*, 140, 142.

98 Austin 1951: 14.

cothurnatus, as if he were wearing buskins like the actors on a stage; and on the famous Roman mosaic found at Hadrumetum in North Africa, produced a century after his death, there are two Muses behind Virgil: on his right the Muse of History, Clio, but on his left Melpomene, the Muse of Tragedy. Clio reads to him while Melpomene listens, holding in her left hand her tragic mask.

The story of Dido and Aeneas is imbued with such a sense of drama[99]. Aeneas is to see Dido again in the sixth book, meeting with her shadow, her wound still fresh (VI 450), her silence being modelled on that of Ajax in Odysseus' Nekyia (*Od.* XI 463 f.). Dido – who killed herself after Aeneas left for Italy, bound on his mission, cursing "the changeful thing called woman" (IV 569 f.) and obeying a god's command, "whoever he may be", surrounded by cheerful comrades (IV 576 f.)[100] – Dido is unforgiving. Instead of railing at him, however, she merely snubs him: "perhaps the most telling snub in poetry"[101]. This encounter again reveals Aeneas' frailty, telling us about his attitude. Aeneas does not forgive himself, although all that he has done has been in compliance with destiny[102].

Another famous incident confirms Aeneas' fragile frame of mind. Setting sail for Italy, he is caught by a storm and swept away south, to the coast of Africa near Carthage. Telling him where he is (I 335–371), his mother Venus comforts him. Having revealed herself in all her beauty, she floats away (402–417). From a hilltop, Aeneas and his companion Achates marvel at the sight of the Carthaginians building their city. They find a grove in the heart of the city, where a temple to Juno is built (441–493). On its walls they see depicted many scenes from the Trojan War[103]. Awaiting queen Dido, Aeneas scans each object, marvelling at the city's wealth. Seeing in due order the Trojan battles, he stopped and, weeping, cried (I 459 f): "constitit et lacrimans, 'quis iam locus', inquit, 'Achate,/ quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris'" ("what land, Achates, what tract on earth is now not full of our sorrow"), and he continues with a line that sounds like the *Aeneid*'s leit-motif (I 462): "sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt" ("there are tears for passing things, things mortal touch the heart")[104].

---

[99] König 1970: 164–232.

[100] They are cheerful "as they do the god's bidding" (Austin 1955: 170).

[101] Eliot 1945: 21. Cf. Thomas 2001: 18: "Eliot's chief focus on the text of Virgil […] a passage whose interpretation is far from closed".

[102] Derivative T.S. Eliot, whose writing on Virgil is not entirely free from an "autobiographical undercurrent" (Reeves 1989: 158), considered this "to testify to civilised consciousness and conscience" (*ibidem*), as opposed to some purely local or tribal code of manners; in short, to provincial, parochial, primitive custom.

[103] Cf. R.D. Williams 1990.

[104] Decidedly, the readers' sympathies lie with those who suffer, the lonely, the defeated (Clausen 1964b: 143), to whom there is but one comfort, as Aeneas puts it (II 354): "una salus victis, nullam sperare salutem" ("the lost have only one safety, to hope for none"), "i.e. to fight with the courage of despair, and to sell one's life as dearly as possible" (Dunlop 1949: 72).

Two points connected by the narrative, however, deserve to be indicated. The first time we meet him, why does Aeneas fear a storm so much as to become despondent? A storm that would not have scared a "thousand young Englishmen, and as much Dutch women", as SAINTE-BEUVE put it, citing Saint-Évremond: "car il y a mille jeunes garçons en Angleterre, et autant de femmes en Hollande, qui s'étonnent à peine où le héros témoigne son désespoir"[105]. And the last time we meet him, why does he hesitate in the very last moment before killing Turnus?

Both moments exhibit an un-heroic, perhaps even an anti-heroic attitude[106]. Seemingly, Homer is not the matrix, the all-pervasive sub-text of the *Aeneid*, which turns out to be something else, or something more, than a thorough re-working of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Nevertheless, the *Aeneid*'s meaning depends on these two texts, which it absorbs and transforms: a Virgilian paradox, or rather a true Virgilianism that can be observed in his *Eclogues* and *Georgics* as well[107]. As much as Aeneas corresponds to Odysseus, when they both address themselves (*Aen.* I 94b–101 and *Od.* V 299–312 show even verbal parallels in I 94b–96 and V 306 respectively), Virgil makes the focus shift decidedly. Then Odysseus laments the loss of glory from death in battle if he drowns, "while Aeneas thinks of the brave men who are dead when he lives"[108]. Thus, Virgil makes his readers move on from Odysseus' vainglorious selfishness to Aeneas' compassionate disposition – which may well be called a process of civilisation. We, as secondary readers, can observe Virgil doing so, as already his Roman, and primary, readers might already have done right from the beginning of the *Aeneid*, in Aeneas' first speech.

Assuming that Aeneas' words at his first appearance were not spoken out of momentary despair, but instead believing that "Aeneas' words are true for all his life"[109], one cannot but think that they reveal a self-conscious personality up to this point not known to epic poetry. He is neither the sulking Achilles of

---

105 SAINTE-BEUVE 1857: 239.

106 Before Brooks OTIS' introductory chapter "From Homer to Virgil: The Obsolescence of Epic" (OTIS 1963: 5–40), Jacques PERRET seems to have been the first modern scholar to have discussed this concept, in his brief sketch "Le caractère d'Enée" (PERRET 1952: 133–140). As PERRET indicates, though, it is well known to earlier French literary criticism; on the term's "archaeology" briefly STAHL 1981: 160.

107 It is this Virgilian insistence on tradition that attracted ELIOT. He called it "maturity of mind" (ELIOT 1945: 19), with which he associated "maturity of manners and absence of provinciality", and eventually also "maturity of language and style" (*ibidem*, 20 f.). At around the same time as ELIOT lectured on Virgil, he was for the first time considered to be a Virgilian poet himself. ELIOT's friend W.F. JACKSON KNIGHT, at that time an important figure in the Virgil Society, did so in his *Roman Vergil* (JACKSON KNIGHT 1966: 111, 300 f. and 318, for instance). First published in 1944, the book was accepted for publication due to ELIOT's influence. Both ELIOT and JACKSON KNIGHT "evidently found in each other a sympathetic spirit" (REEVES 1989: 2).

108 AUSTIN 1971: 56.

109 PARRY 1963: 76.

the *Iliad*, nor the embittered Odysseus of the *Odyssey*. Accordingly, the *Aeneid* cannot be regarded as being full of dissent and anguish, because the work shows signs of a "mild-minded pessimism"[110]. Seemingly, two voices are indeed to be heard: on the one hand, "the public voice of Roman success", and one the other, "a personal voice which comes to us as if it were Virgil's own"[111].

Two final examples, however, illustrate how problematic such a statement is, convincing as it may sound.

The first: having held funeral games, parting from their refuge in a Sicilian harbour under Mount Eryx, near the tomb of Anchises, Aeneas and his fellows set sail with a following breeze on a calm sea. Yet, just before the Trojans reach Italy, during the night Aeneas' steersman falls overboard, overcome by the god of sleep. The last lines of the fifth book describe the drowning of this good pilot Palinurus in dark and forgetful waters, and "the pathos of this episode is greatly enhanced by the stress laid on Palinurus' loyalty […], his sense of duty to the trust placed in him"[112]. The book closes with Aeneas' few words of lamentation for his lost comrade (V 870 f.), reminiscent of an epigrammatic epitaph[113]: "o nimium caelo et pelago confise sereno,/ nudus in ignota, Palinure, iacebis harena" ("too trustful of the tranquil sky and sea,/ o Palinurus, you will lie naked on an unknown strand").

However, an elegiac note uncalled for in a panegyric of Roman greatness: was that what Augustus wanted to hear? Even if we no longer regard him as a "sinister *Übermensch*", being more inclined to think of him as a man who "both responded to and influenced various cultural, social, and artistic tendencies of the time"[114]: would he appreciate being moved to tears?

One may push the argument even further, finally introducing a second example: when Aeneas started crying while admiring the paintings of the Trojan war in the new temple at Carthage, "he can look back on his own losses and see them as made beautiful […] because human art has transfigured them"[115]. But is this still Aeneas looking at a fresco or rather Augustus listening to Virgil, whose *Aeneid* similarly confers a bright image and a most pleasurable vision that "consoles for the pain of what it represents"[116]?

---

[110] Clausen 1995: 313.

[111] Parry 1963: 69. The two voices have often been reduced to an optimistic and a pessimistic one, but "there are dangers to easy dichotomies like this" (Kallendorf 2007: VII).

[112] R.D. Williams 1960: 205.

[113] The scarcity of a "similar use of the language of sepulchral epigram" in the *Aeneid*, hinted at by Fratantuono and Smith (2015: 728), attests the lines' singularly heightened tone.

[114] Nappa 2005: 21.

[115] Parry 1963: 79.

[116] *Ibidem*.

A modern reader might be much tempted by the idea of a Virgilian self-mirroring[117]; whether a hypothetical Roman reader could conceive the same we are unable to say[118]. Instead, it might well be that he "clapped his hands when Aeneas abandons the overemotional Dido, and approved […] the steady march of the Roman state to world dominion"[119]. And departing from Dido, Aeneas is not moved at all – "feeling the thrill of grief, steadfast stands his will; the tears fall in vain" (IV 448 f.): "et magno persentit pectore curas;/ mens immota manet, lacrimae volvuntur inanes"; like an obsessional personality he is controlled, inhibited, and rigid in his ideas.

Whose exactly are the tears? Formally, *mens* and *lacrimae* are not likely to refer to different people, and "these tears could not be denied to Aeneas: but in the changing moods that repeated reading of Virgil always brings, few could withhold them for ever from Dido"[120].

EPILOGUE

Eventually, Dido and Cleopatra link Aeneas to Augustus[121]. Both women strongly resemble each other in their respective deaths – the moment when Aeneas leaves Carthage for Rome on his mission, and the moment after Actium when Augustus parts for his mission, again founding Rome by ending the civil war. When she is about to die, Dido is said to be pale with imminent death (IV 644): "pallida morte futura". Quite similarly, Cleopatra is paling before her imminent death (VIII 709): "pallentem morte futura". The line comes from the description of Aeneas' new shield (VIII 608–731), a passage in which we hear of Actium for the very last time in the *Aeneid*. The pictures on the shield are described: scenes from early Roman history around the outside, and in the centre the battle of Actium, Augustus' triumph over the forces of the East.

Dido's "tragedy" changed Aeneas, as did the story of Pallas, the *Aeneid*'s second great tragedy. Cleopatra's death may make Augustus change, too, and henceforth he shall sacrifice all emotion to *pietas*, as Aeneas did. Now it might

---

[117] A modern reader might also note that since the *gubernator* of Aeneas' flagship has died, the course of poetry is likely to change from now on. In fact, one may consider the *Aeneid*'s fifth book as such a "'kind of close-but-not-quite' turning point" in Virgil's narrative, and not only "in Aeneas' physical journey", as is suggested by Fratantuono and Smith (2015: 14); they consider "the eerie circumstances of the sacrificial loss of Palinurus" even to be a foreshadowing of the death of Caesar (*ibidem*, 730 f.).

[118] There is self-mirroring in Greek poetry right from its beginning, though. Demodokos performing his songs at the Phaeacians' court, for instance, might be seen as a Homeric self-portrait. However, not everyone reading the *Aeneid* may have felt that.

[119] Parry 1963: 70.

[120] Austin 1955: 135.

[121] Parry 1963: 73.

be the same with Augustus as it was then with Aeneas. Once, tears for the nature of things moved him, and his heart was touched by human transience. Virgil subliminally suggested such a parallelism to Augustus. If Augustus really wishes to be at the centre of such a great story, he must suffer the impact of its narrative, as Aeneas did. Did Augustus match up to the expectations of the *Aeneid*'s readers? Was he great?

It would have helped considerably if Virgil were on good terms with Augustus. It would have avoided misunderstandings. Perhaps, only a friend could dare to allude to such a parallel, as only a friend could make friendship the theme of a literary work dedicated to, and inspired by, a friend. Since loyalty among friends and mutual commitment play such a role in the *Aeneid* – Pallas, who goes with Aeneas, gets killed, and makes Aeneas change his mind; Nisus and Euryalus, who die for each other, and who are singled out by Virgil's singular statement – it is not absurd to entertain the idea that Augustus and Virgil were indeed friends.

Friendship, however, is treacherous, as the case of Gallus shows. He also was a friend of Augustus', and he perished ignominiously, compelled to commit suicide in 27, or possibly 26 BC. Gallus occupies centre stage not only at the end of Virgil's *Eclogues* (*Ecl.* 10), but also at the end of his *Georgics* (IV 453–527), in the song of Proteus. It is about Orpheus and Eurydice. The choice of subject, a mythological exemplum, as well as its being treated like an epyllion, suggest a literary homage to Gallus[122].

Since Virgil largely acknowledges how much Gallus meant to him – was it for that reason that Virgil became ever more cautious and reluctant, resembling Aeneas, who hesitated until the very last moment? Was Virgil biding his time, scared of what may happen to him, once the spectacularly innovative *Aeneid* was published? Did he fear failure and disgrace, such as Ovid later suffered, once also being admitted to court but then thrown out? Or, rather perversely, did Virgil hope to remember even these adversities with pleasure, "a joy to recall", as Aeneas puts it in his second speech, addressing his comrades (*Aen.* I 203): "forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit", not necessarily convinced by what he says, always doubting?

Be that as it may, Virgil started something new that was for sure up to that point unheard of, as did Aeneas. As Walt Whitman's "Song of Myself" opens his *Leaves of Grass* and sets the tone, at the same time representing the core of his poetic vision as well as liberating American poetry from tradition once and for all, so does Virgil's song of himself in the *Aeneid* set the tone for the Europeans. Assimilating the great Greek tradition, while at the same time transcending it, he prefigures many other such songs, such as that of Dante, for example. Accompanied by Virgil, the Christian poet "took him as his sibylline

---

[122] Thomas 1988: I 15 f.

guide through Hell and Purgatory"[123], but left him, and his work's pagan darkness, as Virgil left behind Homer.

Freie Universität Berlin

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AUSTIN 1951: R.G. AUSTIN, *The Fourth Book of the Aeneid. A Lecture Delivered to the Virgil Society on 24 February 1951*, Oxford 1951.

———— 1955: R.G. AUSTIN, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*, Oxford 1955.

———— 1964: R.G. AUSTIN, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*, Oxford 1964.

———— 1971: R.G. AUSTIN, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus*, Oxford 1971.

———— 1977: R.G. AUSTIN, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus*, Oxford 1977.

BARRETT, PAGE 1973: S. BARRETT, D. PAGE, *Stesichorus: The Geryoneïs*, JHS XCIII 1973, pp. 138–154.

BROOKS 1953: R.W. BROOKS, *Discolor Aura: Reflections on the Golden Bough*, AJPh LXXIV 1953, pp. 260–280.

BURKERT 1977: W. BURKERT, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, Stuttgart 1977.

CAIRNS 1989: F. CAIRNS, *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge 1989.

CLAUSEN 1964a: W. CLAUSEN, *Callimachus and Latin Poetry*, GRBS V 1964, pp. 181–196.

———— 1964b: W. CLAUSEN, *An Interpretation of the Aeneid*, HSCPh LXVIII 1964, pp. 139–147.

———— 1987: W. CLAUSEN, *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*, Berkeley 1987.

———— 1994: W. CLAUSEN, *A Commentary on Virgil Eclogues*, Oxford 1994.

———— 1995: W.V. CLAUSEN, *Appendix*, in: HORSFALL 1995a, pp. 313 f.

COLEMAN 1977: R. COLEMAN, *Vergil Eclogues*, Cambridge 1977.

COMMAGER 1962: S. COMMAGER, *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*, New Haven 1962.

CONTE 1992: G.B. CONTE, *Proems in the Middle*, YClSt XXIX 1992, pp. 147–159.

DAVIS 2012: G. DAVIS, *Parthenope: The Interplay of Ideas in Vergilian Bucolics*, Leiden 2012.

DUNLOP 1949: J.E. DUNLOP, *Vergil's Aeneid Book II*, London 1949.

ELIOT 1945: T.S. ELIOT, *What is a Classic? An Address Delivered before the Virgil Society on 16 October 1944*, London 1945.

FARRELL 1991: J. FARRELL, *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*, New York 1991.

FARRELL, PUTNAM 2010: J. FARRELL, M.C.J. PUTNAM (edd.), *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*, Malden 2010.

FLETCHER 1941: F. FLETCHER, *Virgil Aeneid VI*, Oxford 1941.

FORDYCE 1977: C.J. FORDYCE, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri VII–VIII*, Oxford 1977.

FRATANTUONO, SMITH 2015: L.M. FRATANTUONO, R.A. SMITH, *Virgil, Aeneid 5*, Leiden–Boston 2015.

GALINSKY 1996: K. GALINSKY, *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton 1996.

GERBER 1982: D.E. GERBER, *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*, Toronto 1982.

GLEI 1998: R.F. GLEI, *The Show Must Go On: The Death of Marcellus and the Future of the Augustan Prinicipate (Aeneid 6. 860–86)*, in: H.-P. STAHL (ed.), *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, London 1998, pp. 119–134.

GOODYEAR 1981: F.R.D. GOODYEAR, *The Annals of Tacitus, Books 1–6*, vol. II: *Annals 1.55–81 and Annals 2*, Cambridge 1981.

[123] NEWMAN 2015: 399. Quite literally, both Aeneas and Dante have the starting-point of their voyage in common (*ibidem*). Both places are in dark wood, where the straight path is confused, and Dante's *selva oscura*, the opening of his *Inferno*, echoes Virgil's *in silvis* (*Aen.* VI 271): "suddenly, as in a dream, we find ourselves, we know not how, moving in the dim mysterious world of the dead" (FLETCHER 1941: 53). This can be said of Dante as well as of Virgil.

Gow 1952: A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus*, Cambridge ²1952.
Gransden 1976: K.W. Gransden, *Virgil Aeneid Book VIII*, Cambridge 1976.
——— 1990: K.W. Gransden, *Virgil: The Aeneid*, Cambridge 1990.
——— 1991: K.W. Gransden, *Virgil Aeneid Book XI*, Cambridge 1991.
Green 2005: P. Green, *Ovid: The Poems of Exile*, Berkeley 2005 [originally publ. London 1994].
Griffin 1980: J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford 1980.
Hardie 1994: P. Hardie, *Virgil Aeneid Book IX*, Cambridge 1994.
Harrison 1990a: S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford 1990.
——— 1990b: S.J. Harrison, *Some Views of the Aeneid in the Twentieth Century*, in: Harrison 1990a, pp. 1–20.
——— 1991: S.J. Harrison, *Vergil Aeneid 10*, Oxford 1991.
Henry 1873: J. Henry, *Aeneidea I*, London 1873.
Horsfall 1991: N. Horsfall, *Virgilio: l'epopea in alambicco*, Napoli 1991.
——— 1995a: N. Horsfall (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, Leiden 1995.
——— 1995b: N. Horsfall, *Virgil: His Life and Times*, in: Horsfall 1995a, pp. 1–25.
——— 2013: N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 6: A Commentary*, Berlin–Boston 2013.
——— 2016: N. Horsfall, *The Epic Distilled: Studies in the Composition of the Aeneid*, Oxford 2016.
Hutchinson 1988: G. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic poetry*, Oxford 1988.
Jordan 1990: R.H. Jordan, *Virgil Aeneid X*, Bristol 1990.
Kallendorf 2007: C. Kallendorf, *The Other Virgil: "Pessimistic" Readings of the Aeneid in Early Modern Culture*, Oxford 2007.
Kirkwood 1982: G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar*, Chico 1982.
Knauer 1964: G.N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer: Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis*, Göttingen 1964.
Knight 1966: W.F. Jackson Knight, *Roman Vergil*, Harmondsworth 1966 [first edn. London 1944].
König 1970: A. König, *Die Aeneis und die griechische Tragödie: Studien zur imitatio-Technik Vergils*, Berlin 1970.
Lamacchia 1964: R. Lamacchia, *Ciceros Somnium Scipionis and das sechste Buch der Aeneis*, RhM CVII 1964, pp. 261–278.
Lloyd 1954: R.B. Lloyd, *On Aeneid, III, 270-280*, AJPh LXXV 1954, pp. 288–299.
——— 1957: R.B. Lloyd, *Aeneid III and the Aeneas Legend*, AJPh LXXVIII 1957, pp. 382–400.
Mayor 1907: J.B. Mayor (*et al.*), *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue: Its Meaning, Occasion, & Sources*, London 1907.
Morgan 1999: L. Morgan, *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's Georgics*, Cambridge 1999.
Moseley 1925: N. Moseley, *Pius Aeneas*, CJ XX 1925, pp. 387–400.
Mynors 1990: R.A.B. Mynors, *Virgil: Georgics*, Oxford 1990.
Nappa 2005: C. Nappa, *Reading after Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian, and Rome*, Ann Arbor 2005.
Newman 2015: J.K. Newman, *Virgil's Iliad: Reflections on a Secondary Epic*, in: P. Fedeli (ed.), *Virgilian Studies: A Miscellany Dedicated to the Memory of Mario Geymonat*, Nordhausen 2015, pp. 343–401.
O'Hara 2010: J.J. O'Hara, *The Unfinished Aeneid?*, in: Farrell, Putnam 2010, pp. 96–106.
Otis 1963: B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*, Oxford 1963.
Page 1894: T.E. Page, *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I–VI*, London 1894.
——— 1900: T.E. Page, *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books VII–XII*, London 1900.
Parry 1963: A. Parry, *The Two Voices of Virgil's Aeneid*, Arion II 1963, pp. 66–80.
Perret 1952: J. Perret, *Virgile: L'homme et l'œuvre*, Paris 1952.
Putnam 1965: M.C.J. Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid: Four Studies in Imaginative Unity and Design*, Cambridge, MA 1965.
——— 2011: M.C.J. Putnam, *The Humanness of Heroes: Studies in the Conclusion of Virgil's Aeneid*, Amsterdam 2011.

Reeves 1989: G. Reeves, *T.S. Eliot: A Virgilian Poet*, Houndmills 1989.
Richardson 1976: L. Richardson, Jr., *Propertius: Elegies I–IV*, Norman 1976.
Robin 1983: L. Robin, *Platon: Phédon*, Paris 1983.
Rohde 1898: E. Rohde, *Psyche: Seelenkult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, 2nd edn., Freiburg 1898.
Sainte-Beuve 1857: C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, *Étude sur Virgile*, Paris 1857.
Shackleton Bailey 1986: D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Tu Marcellus Eris*, HSCPh XC 1986, pp. 199–205.
Stahl 1981: H.-P. Stahl, *Aeneas – An 'Unheroic' Hero?*, Arethusa XIV 1981, pp. 157–177.
——— 2015: H.-P. Stahl, *Poetry Underpinning Power – Vergil's Aeneid: The Epic for Emperor Augustus. A Recovery Study*, Swansea 2015.
Stok 2010: F. Stok, *The Life of Vergil before Donatus*, in: Farrell, Putnam 2010, pp. 107–120.
Stokes 1995: H.S. Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, New York 1995 [first edn. 1974].
Syme 1939: R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939.
Tarrant 2012: R. Tarrant, *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII*, Cambridge 2012.
Thomas 1982: R.F. Thomas, *Land and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition*, Cambridge 1982.
——— 1983: R.F. Thomas, *Callimachus, The Victoria Berenices, and Roman Poetry*, CQ XXXIII 1983, pp. 92–113.
——— 1988: R.F. Thomas, *Virgil: Georgics*, vols. I–II, Cambridge 1988.
——— 2001: R.F. Thomas, *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, Cambridge 2001.
Tracy 1975: S.V. Tracy, *The Marcellus Passage (Aeneid 6. 860–886) and Aeneid 9–12*, CJ LXX 1975, pp. 37–42.
Willcock 1995: M.M. Willcock, *Pindar: Victory Odes*, Cambridge 1995.
F. Williams 1978: F. Williams, *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo. A Commentary*, Oxford 1978.
R.D. Williams 1960: R.D. Williams, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quintus*, Oxford 1960.
——— 1962: R.D. Williams, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber tertius*, Oxford.
——— 1972: R.D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 1–6*, Basingstoke 1972.
——— 1973: R.D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 7–12*, Basingstoke 1973.
——— 1979: R.D. Williams, *Virgil: The Eclogues & Georgics*, New York 1979.
——— 1990: R.D. Williams, *The Pictures on Dido's Temple (Aeneid 1. 450–93)*, in: Harrison 1990a, pp. 37–45 [first publ. 1960].
Winboldt 1903: S.E. Winboldt, *Latin Hexameter Verse: An Aid to Composition*, London 1903.
Zetzel 1995: J.E.G. Zetzel, *Cicero: De re publica. Selections*, Cambridge 1990.

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONSULSHIP IN THE EARLY REPUBLIC: EVIDENCE FOR AN ALTERNATIVE VERSION IN LIVY

by

ALEKSANDR KOPTEV

ABSTRACT: The traditional version of the establishment of the consulship in 509 BC and its restoration in 449 and 367 BC was a product of a long period of historiographical development. A great problem is inconsistencies in early republican chronology due to later annalistic historians combining earlier versions. In pre-Fabian oral tradition, it was the capture of Veii that inspired the creation of a new legion with its own praetor to protect new Roman tribes on the Etruscan bank of the Tiber. Early Roman historiography shaped two possible versions of the establishment of the (patrician) consulship after the Veientine war, dating it to 483–474 and 406–396 BC. According to one version, the original title of the early magistracy was changed from 'praetor' to 'consul' in 449 BC. The other version synchronised the restoration of the consulship with the admission of the plebeians to this magistracy in 367 BC. The Gallic Sack of 387 BC was followed with the creation of the garrison service in Rome, the *milites seniorum*, whose commander was the *praetor urbanus*. An analysis of Livy's account in Books VI, VII, and VIII shows that the plebeians, who received one consular office in 367 BC and were admitted to the praetorship in 342 BC, were mostly members of those communities that were given Roman citizenship after the abolition of the Latin League.

Modern scholarly research into the republican consulship has heightened interest in the genesis of the chief magistracy in early Rome[1]. Testimonies for the initial patrician consulship without *provocatio* motivated Th. MOMMSEN to suggest that the consular *imperium* and *potestas* had originated from the absolute authority of ancient kings[2]. Most historians and specialists in Roman law in the twentieth century accepted MOMMSEN's theses on the origins and nature of the consulship after the expulsion of the last king of Rome. However, the ancient tradition about the immediate shift from a monarchic to a consular system has often been judged unreliable[3]. Some scholars assume that the powers of *rex* were

---

[1] VALDITARA 1989; STEWART 1998; BUNSE 1998; BRENNAN 2000; URSO 2005; RICHARDSON 2008; PINA POLO 2011; BECK *et al.* 2011; VERVAET 2014; DROGULA 2015.

[2] MOMMSEN 1887–1888: I, 8–24; II, 74–140.

[3] MAZZARINO 1945: 83–97; STAVELEY 1956: 90–101; DE MARTINO 1972: 233–239; RICHARD 1978: 555–572; VALDITARA 1989: 318–322.

limited to the religious sphere and a chief magistracy was given to the *praetor maximus*, assisted by one or several *praetores minores*[4]. Others believe that the place of *rex* was immediately taken by a dictator (*magister populi*, who is sometimes identified with the *praetor maximus*), with the *magister equitum* subordinated to him[5]. After the *par potestas* gradually established itself, the dictatorship became an extraordinary magistracy. The *magister populi* with the same powers of *rex* ruled in Rome until the decemvirate and was replaced by two praetors (*maximus* and *minor*), both subjected to *provocatio*[6]. Lack of information about the early dictatorship and praetorship forced modern scholarship to search for another explanation for the transitional period from the beginning of the Republic to the decemvirate[7]. The development of the early consulship has recently been discussed as the opposition between a centripetal force embodied by the republican state and the centrifugal forces represented by powerful clans (*gentes*). We have evidence that testifies to the existence of gentile armies in the sixth and fifth centuries, the period to which literary tradition attributes the development of the Servian centuriate system[8]. On this basis F. Drogula has reconsidered the traditional concept of the origin of the consulship, separating military command and civilian authority, which the Romans believed had been linked since the foundation of the City[9]. Actually, he has revived the theory of A. Heuss, according to which military authority only gradually came to be monopolised by the state and its holders were invested with civilian powers to convert their chieftainship into the magistracy of consulship not earlier than 367 (BC, as hereafter)[10]. This approach corresponds to the current scholarly trend which suggests that the consulship was not restored in 367, as stated in all our sources, but was in fact created then for the first time[11].

The intention of this article is not to describe the functioning of the private leadership of the clanish chieftains, but to examine how later Romans remembered the formation of the state magistracy and how their reconstruction changed with the development of Roman historiography. Livy, our main source, accumulated

---

[4] Hanell 1946: 179–180; Werner 1963: 219–239, 254; Gjerstad 1967: 22–27; Bleicken 1975: 42, 77; Bunse 1998: 48 and references in n. 18.

[5] Beloch 1926: 231–236; Mazzarino 1945: 169–191; De Martino 1972–1990: II, 191 f.; 1972: 234 and references in n. 60; Valditara 1989: 182–185, 307–365; Bunse 1998: 47 and references in n. 17.

[6] De Martino 1972: 234 f.; Magdelain 1969.

[7] See Cornell 1995: 228.

[8] Richard 1988; Welwei 1993; Armstrong 2008; 2013.

[9] Drogula 2015: 13–45.

[10] Cf. Heuss 1944: 125–133; 1982: 434–454.

[11] Bernardi 1952: 12; De Martino 1972–1990: I, 191–193, 322–333; Bleicken 1975: 76–78; 1981: 24 f.; Wiseman 1995: 106 f.; 2008: 298 and 304; Bunse 1998: 46; Welwei 2000: 49 f.; Richardson 2008: 338; Humm 2012; Drogula 2015: 37 f.

readings by his numerous predecessors, and the discrepancy between his view and earlier concepts of the past, as preserved in his narrative, will be my guiding thread. Examining the Roman method of historical thinking, J.H. Richardson has recently argued that their interpretations of the origins of the consulship are unreliable[12]. His approach is founded on the assumption that the Roman perception of history was different from ours[13]. Furthermore, it is probable that the Romans thought of their past differently at the time of Fabius Pictor than they did two centuries later at the time of Livy. Oral tradition and Greek writings on early Rome laid the foundation for the story of the banishment of the kings and the establishment of the consulship. The original story (stories) was revised by the first Roman historians at the time when Rome was fighting wars against the autocratic regimes of Sicily, Carthage, Macedonia and Asia Minor. W. Kunkel and P.-M. Martin emphasise the strong impact of the Hellenistic monarchical regimes on the early portrayal of Rome's archaic royalty[14]. The establishment of the elective consulship after the banishment of the tyrannical kings was envisaged by Roman historians on the model of the establishment of the democratic regime in Athens[15].

By the mid-second century, an increase in the financial and military burden on individual citizens gave birth to a struggle between soldier-plebeians and the nobility who controlled governmental institutions. New generations of republican historians, after Gracchi and especially after Sulla, made the concept of the Struggle of the Orders a recurring theme in republican history[16]. The idea of ensuring the rights of the plebeians became even more significant in the public conscience when a number of Italic peoples were given Roman citizenship after the Social War of 91–88. Like other historians of the Augustan age, Livy was preoccupied with the Conflict of the Orders as a feature of the early Republic and this idea overshadowed the relationship between Rome and other communities of Latium. In his work Livy combined earlier testimonies of various authors, and I have endeavoured to find evidence for the development of the consulship going back to the earlier versions.

Although the origin of the consulship is rooted in archaic patrician Rome, the first known testimony of the consular powers belongs to Polybius (VI 12), who refers to the consulship as being similar to Spartan dual monarchy[17]. Cicero also argued that the consuls had inherited most of the authority of the ancient Roman

[12] Richardson 2008.

[13] Richardson 2012: 17–55.

[14] Kunkel 1974: 464; Martin 1994: 71–78.

[15] Mastrocinque 1983–1984; 1988; Scapini 2011.

[16] For the political conflict of the orders as an extraneous idea for early Rome, see Mitchell 2005; 1990: 1–30.

[17] Polyb. VI 10, 1–4; 11, 11–12, 10. Cf. Sandberg 2005: 155 f.; Drogula 2015: 14.

kings[18]. For Livy, consular power did not differ from royal power in terms of degree, but became subject to annual renewal and was transferred to two people instead of one[19]. He assumes that it was essentially only the title that differentiated the power of consuls from that of kings, apart from the engagement in religious ceremonies inherited by the *rex sacrorum*[20]. Livy refers to two attempts at the restriction of consular power by the patrician consul P. Valerius Poplicola in 509[21] and the plebeian tribune C. Terentilius Harsa in 462 (Liv. III 9, 2; 15, 1–3). The Terentilian rogation shows that the Valerian laws of 509 were not known to an unknown early historian who invented the idea of the restriction of the consulship in 462. Terentilius' proposal was to appoint a commission of five to draw up in writing the laws that regulated the power of the consuls (*quinque viri legibus de imperio consulari scribendis*, cf. Liv. III 9, 5)[22]. In Livy (III 31, 7), the idea of Terentilius was changed in 454 and the reform of the consulship was replaced by the issue of the Twelve Tables[23]. Dionysius of Halicarnassus simplifies the situation for his Greek readers, stating that the original aim of Terentilius Harsa was the issue of the civil laws (X 1, 2–5; 2, 1; 3, 4 f.). There are, however, some remnants of the earlier version in the traditional descriptions of the first decemvirate of 451 and the Valerian-Horatian laws of 449.

The *decemviri* resemble the board of ten *interreges* who possessed the regal insignia and absolute authority in case of the death or disability of both consuls[24]. The interregnum was used to prepare the electoral assembly and the decemvirate had to be ended with the election of new consuls after creating restrictions on their *imperia*. The *interreges* were chosen only from among the patricians and the first decemvirate was a board of ten patricians[25]. Each *decemvir* was equal in power to the others and was also an *interrex* to his colleagues[26]. At the same time, the outstanding role of Ap. Claudius (ὁ τῆς δεκαδαρχίας ἡγεμών)[27] in

---

[18] Cic. *Rep*. II 56; *Leg*. III 8; Liv. VIII 32, 3; Aug. *Civ. Dei* V 12; *Dig*. I 2, 16.

[19] Liv. II 7, 8; cf. Cic. *Leg*. III 8; Cass. Dio III 12.

[20] Liv. II 2, 1 f. For the similarity between the consular power and the *potestas regia*, see Henderson 1957; Urso 2005: 17, n. 4.

[21] Liv. II 8, 1 f.; X 9, 3–6; Cic. *Rep*. I 62; II 53; *Harusp*. 16; *Mil.* 7; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. V 19, 4; 70, 2; Plut. *Poplic*. 11 f.

[22] Mommsen (1887–1888: II, 702 f., n. 2) and Ogilvie (1965: 412) suggest correcting Livy's text for "quinque viri consulari imperio de legibus scribendis".

[23] For the suggestion that the idea of the XII Tables as a turning point in Roman history was given rise to by S. Aelius Paetus' *Tripertita* in the early second sentury, see Urso 2005: 118; 2011: 59 f.

[24] Cic. *Leg*. III 9; Liv. IV 7, 7; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. XI 62.

[25] Cf. Cic. *Dom.* 38; *Ad Brut*. I 5, 4 and Liv. III 31, 8; 33, 6.

[26] For the decemvirs, see Liv. III 41, 10; cf. Urso 2005: 109 f.; 2011: 55 f.

[27] Dion. Hal. *Ant*. XI 28, 3; cf. X 57, 3; 58, 3; XI 4, 3; 9, 2; 22, 4. Liv. III 33, 7: "regimen totius magistratus penes Appium erat".

both decemvirates resembles the leader of the board of *interreges* in Livy: "ten men exercised authority, [but] only one had its insignia and lictors"[28]. Like the *interreges* who managed the auspices *privatim*, the decemvirs obeyed laws as private individuals[29]. While the *interreges* ruled for five days as part of the board, each *decemvir* succeeded to the leadership of the board for ten days, during which he possessed the twelve lictors[30]. The decisions of the decemvirs and the *interreges* were not subject to appeal (*sine provocatione*)[31]. The first decemvirate ended with voting for the Ten Tables of laws in the centuriate assembly, although the latter was not responsible for private law[32]. It was the interregnum that enabled the voting for new consuls in the centuriate assembly. The first decemvirate strongly resembles the annual interregnum after the death of Romulus[33]. All this allows us to suggest that there was an early version of the modification or establishment of the consulship according to the decision of the decemvirate, whose rule had the form of a special interregnum.

Because the issue of the Twelve (Ten) Tables was later attributed to the decemvirate, the authorship of the law on the consulship was relegated to L. Valerius Potitus and M. Horatius Barbatus (*coss*. 449). Two institutions of the *leges Valeriae Horatiae*, the *provocatio ad populum* and the tribunician *intercessio*, were established to restrict the absolute *imperium* of high magistrates. Their establishment went back to the original version of the Terentilian rogation, whose adherents most likely suggested that the reformed magistracy changed its name. Cicero and other ancient sources tell us that the title 'praetor' preceeded 'consul'[34]. Zonaras (VII 19, 1) preserved the information from Cassius Dio (V 19) that the term '*consules*' (ὕπατοι) for highest officers replaced the former *praetores* (στρατηγοί) in the consulship of Valerius and Horatius (*coss*. 449). The testimony somehow relates to Livy, who mentions under the year 449 that the consuls were earlier called praetors[35]. The evidence provides two different dates for the introduction of the praetorship: two early praetors in 509 and the city praetor in 367[36]. If the former date is

[28] Liv. I 17, 5 f.: "decem imperitabant: unus cum insignibus imperii et lictoribus erat".

[29] Cf. Liv. III 33, 8–10 and VI 41, 5 f.

[30] Cf. Liv. I 17, 5 f.; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. II 57, 1 f.; App. *BCiv* I 98 and Liv. III 33, 8.

[31] Liv. III 32, 6; 33, 9; 34, 1; Cic. *Rep*. II 54; 61; Pompon. in *Dig*. I 2, 2, 4.

[32] Liv. III 34, 6; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant*. X 55, 5; 57, 6 f.

[33] Liv. I 17, 5 f.; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. I 57, 1 f.; Plut. *Numa* 2, 7; *HA Tac.* 1, 1–6.

[34] Cic. *Leg*. III 8; Ps.-Ascon. *Verr*. II 36 p. 234 Stangl; Liv. III 55, 11 f.; VII 3, 5; Plin. *NH* XVIII 12; Fest. p. 249 L s.v. *praetoria porta*; Gell. XI 18, 6–8.

[35] Liv. III 55, 12. See Oakley 1998: II, 78 f.; Urso 2005: 20–25; 2011: 50 f. and n. 55; Drogula 2015: 35 f.

[36] For the controversy, see Oakley 1998: II, 77–80; Holloway 2009: 71–73; Urso 2011: 49–54; Drogula 2015: 15–19, 35 f.

accepted, the title was changed to consulship in 449, and a new *praetor urbanus* was added to these consuls in 367.

The traditional identification of early republican officers as consuls from the beginning of the Republic is more than a mere problem of terminology. Varro's etymological derivation of *praetor* from *praeire*, 'to precede, to go ahead' in law and war, is the basis of the assumption that the term was applied to a leader, especially in a military capacity[37]. Because the etymology shows the military origins of the earliest magistracy, the intention of the laws of Valerius Poplicola and Terentilius Harsa is likely to have been to adapt the military *imperium* of the consuls to use on Roman territory (*domi*), like their magisterial powers. The traditional view of the consulship identifies it as the elective office of the Roman people from the beginning and omits its period of development from purely military leadership to a magistracy with both military and civil authority. The providing of the tribunes with the *ius intercessionis* in the city of Rome and the citizens on the *ager Romanus* with the *ius provocationis* became significant steps in the formation of the magisterial powers. The measures restricted the absolute authority of the holders of *imperium* in the City and in the surrounding territory inhabited by Roman citizens, whose number increased together with the creation of new tribes.

According to the traditional version, however, the reformed consulship was abandoned by the Romans in favour of the so-called consular tribunate. Colleges of three or four military tribunes competed with the consular pairs from 444 to 409, and the board of six consular tribunes became the only high office from 408 to 367 (except in 393–392). Then, however, a plebiscite of C. Licinius Stolo and L. Sextius Lateranus restored the consulship in 367. The updated office was based on the equal representation of both orders, the patricians and the plebeians, who were admitted to the consulship from the beginning in 366. The idea that the collegiality of the consuls (*par potestas*) was endorsed by the maintenance of justice in the Roman community has recently become popular in scholarship[38]. In this article I endeavour to examine the scholarly suggestion that the consulship was not restored, but was created in 367, in the context of Livy's portrayal of fourth-century history.

TWO CONSULS AND ONE PRAETOR SINCE 367

According to Livy (VI 42, 9–11), the Licinian-Sextian laws of 367 envisaged two consuls for annual election, one patrician and one plebeian, and to

---

[37] Varro *LL* V 80; 87; Non. p. 35 L. For the military etymology of the noun '*praetor*', see van Leijenhorst 1986; Valditara 1989: 336–338, n. 149; Oakley 1998: II, 77–80; Brennan 2000: 58–78.

[38] Giovannini 1984: 26–29; cf. Giovannini 1993: 92; Bunse 2002: 30.

compensate the patricians for the loss of one consular position, a new patrician office of praetor was established "to hold court in the city"[39]. Recently, however, T.C. Brennan and A. Bergk have argued that the praetorship remained mainly a military office from the fourth to the third century[40]. When the *praetor peregrinus* was established in 242, it also had a military purpose[41]. The further increase in the number of praetors from two to six was determined by the need to increase Rome's military capacity between 227 and 197[42]. It is obvious that the first praetor had the same power as that invested in his colleagues, established later. Legal proceedings, which from the beginning were in the hands of the pontiffs, were hardly likely to have been removed from their control before the mid-third century[43]. In other words, jurisdiction was not among the main tasks of the praetor in the fourth and early third centuries. Thus, from 366 onward, the Romans elected three magistrates with virtually equal military powers (*imperium*), and, scholars suggest, they held the common title of *praetores*[44].

At the same time the offices of two of them, as consuls, gradually became distinct from the third, because his responsibilities (the future *provincia*) were different. If the shared consulship was established in 367, before this date the title *praetor* was applied to the only patrician officer[45]. The original holder of the title 'praetor' was a leader of the Roman army rather than an urban magistrate: the election of republican consuls and praetors in the centuriate (military) assembly outside the *pomerium* is proof of this. They possessed the military *imperium,* which was given to them in times of war and the authority of which ceased inside the *pomerium*. Authors who wrote under the later Republic and the Empire assumed that the consular *imperium* was a legacy of the ancient kingship. However, the reverse is the case: the supposed absolute authority of ancient kings is a projection of the consular military *imperium* into the archaic past. As A. Heuss suggests, the military chieftains (praetors) became civil magistrates when they were allowed to use their powers (*imperium*) *domi*, in the City and on the *ager Romanus*[46]. The seasonal character of archaic military activity made the

[39] For modern criticism of Livy's reference to the law of 367, see von Fritz 1950; De Martino 1972–1990: I, 406–415; Oakley 1997: I, 645–652; Bunse 1998: 182–201; Smith 2011; Drogula 2015: 37–44.

[40] Brennan 2000: 58–78; Bergk 2011.

[41] Gilbert 1939; Serrati 2000.

[42] Bunse 2002: 33.

[43] Mitchell 1990: 170–179, 184–186; Tellegen-Couperus 2006; Valgaeren 2012; Drogula 2015: 60–68.

[44] See Stewart 1998: 95–126; Bunse 2002; Beck 2005: 63–70.

[45] Staveley 1954: 210; Stewart 1998: 95–136.

[46] For the idea that early military commanders were not chief civilian magistrates, see Heuss 1944: 125–133; 1982: 434–454; Mitchell 1990: 135 f., 150; Sandberg 2000: 121–140; 2001: 97–113; Forsythe 2005: 176; Drogula 2015: 13–37.

office annual (newly begun each year for one year), although in a very ancient epoch the praetorship was possibly limited to the time of a military campaign and therefore he could be elected not every year. We do not exactly know when annual magistracies became standard. In contrast to the title '*dictator*', the holder of which was originally appointed by the king (later, a consul) for a certain task, the title '*praetor*' (as well as *magister populi*) stresses the connection of the chieftain with his warriors.

There are several indications that the consulship and praetorship were originally closely linked[47]. The holders of both were elected under the same auspices and the praetor was considered a *collega consulis*, even at the end of the Republic[48]. Both consuls and praetors were the only regular magistrates who had the right to celebrate a triumph (*ius triumphandi*)[49]. Their military *imperia* were of the same quality as absolute power, but the hierarchy between them allowed M. Valerius Messala Rufus (*cos*. 53) to state that the praetor had a limited *imperium*, while the consular *imperium* was full (Gell. XIII 15, 4: "imperium minus praetor, maius habet consul"). Unlike the consuls, whose *imperium* was unlimited, the praetors were invested with their *imperia* to manage a certain province. The city praetor was responsible for the garrison unit guarding the city of Rome, although the Senate could also invest him with an additional task. In other words, the original discrepancy between the consular and praetorian *imperia* was quantitative rather than qualitative. The Roman *cursus honorum* had been formed by the year 180, when the *lex Villia annalis* reiterated and fixed the qualitative superiority of the consulship over the praetorship[50].

In 367, however, it seems that three high offices possessed equal military powers, although two of them were separated from the third one in being consuls. Scholars suggest that all of them held the same title of praetor. R. Stewart emphasises that Livy (VII 1, 6) described the three officials as colleagues based on an election *iisdem auspiciis*[51]. Ancient sources testify that two of these magistrates were patricians and one was elected from the plebeians. Two were those who later held the title of consuls, while the third preserved the title of praetor in the future. The patrician *praetor urbanus* was certainly the officer who supervised the defence of the City rather than the urban court. His colleagues who received the new title of consul, a patrician and a plebeian, obviously commanded the campaigning (field) army. The literary tradition, which saw early history in the light of the concept of the Struggle of the Orders, emphasises the admission

---

[47] See Richard 1982; 1983: 651–664.

[48] Liv. III 55, 11; VII 1, 6; VIII 32, 3; Cic. *Ad Att*. IX 9, 3; Gell. XIII 15, 4 and 6.

[49] Bunse 2002: 33, n. 23.

[50] See Billows 1989.

[51] Stewart 1998: 95.

of the plebeians to the consulship and the patrician character of the praetorship. However, if the plebeians were admitted to the consulship in 367, the office already existed before that. This discrepancy is invisible in the traditional version of the restoration of the consulship in 367. Otherwise the plebeian consul would have been created alongisde a patrician colleague who alone headed the field army before that (with the help of military tribunes). An additional commander of the mobile forces was most likely required because of a significant increase in the Roman citizenship, the new members being plebeians who formed their own legion.

The Roman community began to grow significantly after the victory over the Etruscan city of Veii in 396. This success opened the way for Roman colonisation of the conquered territory. According to Livy (VI 4, 4), those of the Veientes, the Capenans, and the Faliscans who had supported the Romans during the war were given Roman citizenship, and these new citizens received land from the government in 388. In 387, the newly acquired territory of Veii was organised into four new Roman tribes: the Sabatina, Stellatina, Tromentina, and Arnensis, composed of the new citizens (Liv. VI 5, 8). The social status of these citizens over the Tiber is uncertain. The local people who received Roman citizenship belonged neither to the Latin nation nor to the Roman clannish organisation of the patricians and their clients. They were combined with a great number of Roman colonists, the majority of whom were plebeians receiving land in the conquered territory. As a result, some later Roman historians would qualify all of them as plebeians, although it seems possible that the local nobility was included in the patriciate (perhaps as the *gentes minores*), which would explain the enormous Etruscan influence on Roman mythology, potestary culture and symbols of sovereignty.

The Gallic invasion of 390 (387) aggravated the problem of solidarity within the Roman community and the defence of the four ‘Veientine’ tribes, which was likely organised on the model of the Latin tribes on the left bank of the Tiber. The office of the third praetor was probably established as military rather than political, so that he should be elected by the local citizens of the four tribes. He headed a new, second legion of the field army, which was recruited from right-bank citizens to protect the *ager Romanus* from the north. Because the Romans were concerned with defending the new tribes after the Gallic Sack, they hardly would have waited twenty years to create a new legion. Livy mentions three parts (legions) of the Roman army under the years 388, 386, and 377[52]. Does this mean that the second praetor of mobile forces was established earlier than 367 and that the (patrician) double consulate already existed by this date?

The traditional version of the establishment of the consulship has its background in the *Fasti Consulares*, according to which two consuls were annually

[52] Liv. VI 2, 7 f.; 6, 12–14; 32, 4 f.

elected from 509 to 451 and in 449–439, 437–434, 431–427, 423, 421, 413–409, and 393–392. If the double consulship was created in 367, why are names of consuls known from the beginning of the Republic until the decemvirate of 451 and why do they alternate with names of consular tribunes from 449 to 409? Why do Livy and Zonaras (Cassius Dio) state that the title 'consul' appeared in 449, if the consulship was established only in 367?

Livy (VI 1, 1–3) refers to Rome's early history as being divided into two periods, before and after the Gallic invasion of 390. M. Furius Camillus, who defeated the Gauls, was the new (second after Romulus) founder of Rome[53]. C. Kraus points out that Livy, in the opening of his sixth book, stresses that only after the Gallic Sack does Rome's real history begin[54]. Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, whom Livy used as a major source from Book VI onwards, is known to have started his history after the Gallic invasion (Plut. *Numa* 1). The idea that the Gallic Fire was the great turning-point in Roman history was most likely devised by Fabius Pictor. Early Roman historiography bestowed the role of a so-called 'eschatological battle' upon the Gallic Sack because the event seemed especially significant during the Roman conquest of Cisalpine Gaul in the third century[55]. At the same time, the Greek world was struggling against the Gallic invasion, and the Battle of Thermopylae and the Gallic attack on Delphi in 279 inspired Roman historians to portray the Battle of Allia and the Gallic Sack of Rome a century earlier on the basis of Greek literature rather than native tradition[56].

In the oral (priestly) tradition before Fabius Pictor, the role of the historical watershed belonged to the Veientine War. Livy's narrative retained evidence for the replacement of the Veientine War by the Gallic Sack. First, being defeated by the Gauls in the battle of Allia, the Romans fled to Veii, not to Rome (V 38, 5; 9). Diodorus (XIV 114) places the battle on the right bank of the Tiber. Second, Camillus was the hero of the Veientine War, and to explain his absence in the battle on the Allia River Roman historians had to invent the story of his exile to Ardea (V 49). As a result, Livy combines two different victories: Camillus with the Ardeate warriors attacked the departed Gauls and at the same time the Roman refuges defeated the Etruscans in Veii (V 45, 1–3 and 4–8). Third, although Camillus arrived from Ardea, his attack against the Gauls began from Veii (V 46, 11; 48, 7). Fourth, the Roman plebs twice discussed the idea of resettlement from Rome to Veii, after the Veientine War in 395 and 393 (V 24, 5–8; 30, 1–6) and after the Gallic Sack in 389 (V 51–55). Fifth, the distribution of the Veientine land was discussed in 393 (V 30, 8), but the four tribes over the Tiber were established in 388–387 (VI 4, 4; 5, 8). In other words, the events originally

---

[53] Miles 1995: 75–109; Mineo 2006: 210–241.

[54] See Kraus 1994: 269, 283 f.

[55] See Briquel 2008: 110–112 and *passim*.

[56] See Williams 2001: 100–184.

related to the Veientine War were reassigned to the Gallic Sack in post-Fabian historiography.

In oral tradition, the Veientine War had no exact date and marked the turning point between mythological times and a new historical period. The annalistic writers attempted to specify a date for it as a Roman counterpart of the ten-year Trojan War. The traditional date of the Veientine War is based on the chronological calculation which synchronised it with Syracuse's war against Carthage in 406–396 (Diod. XIV 53–76). Livy (II 42, 9–54, 1) refers to another ten-year Veientine War in 483–474, the description of which somehow related to Fabius Pictor, as his Fabian clan was honoured in the battle of Cremera on the model of the 300 Spartans who perished at Thermopylae[57]. The war ended with a forty-year peace treaty, to harmonise the Roman victory in 474 with the traditional date of the capture of Veii in 396, and the defeated Veientes were ordered to furnish corn and pay for the troops[58]. If both wars were versions of the same (mythological) Veientine War, the four tribes *trans Tiberim* could be attributed to 457 in the same way as to 387. According to Livy (III 30, 5–7), ten plebeian tribunes were established in 457. Although Livy states that they were elected from five classes of the centuriate system, their title shows that they represented tribes (Varro *LL* V 81; 88). In the same way, six consular tribunes represented (six tribes of) the Roman community until 367. The establishment of four new tribes of 387 (Liv. VI 5, 8) suggest an addition of the number of tribunes until ten. The early version, according to which the Roman community was a union of ten tribes from 457 to 381, seems more logical than the traditional one, in which this period is shortened to 387–381. In this case, Rome had two legions headed by two (patrician) praetors from the middle of the fifth century. Their title of praetors was replaced by consuls after the Terentilian rogation of 462 was realised as the law of consulship in 449.

THE EARLY CITY PRAETORSHIP

The patrician office of the *praetor urbanus* was established to manage the defence of the city of Rome. It seems obvious that this praetor was needed as the commander of a new garrison unit in the Roman army. The early armed forces are traditionally said to have been organised by king Servius Tullius and included people of two ages, senior men (*seniores*) and younger men (*iuniores*)[59].

---

[57] The Romans memorised *dies Alliensis* in the same day as *dies Cremerensis*, on July 18. See Liv. VI 1, 11; cf. II 50, 5–11 (battle of Cremera); V 37 f. (battle of Allia).

[58] Liv. II 53, 2: "tamquam Veiis captis, ita pavidi Veientes ad arma currunt"; 54, 1: "indutiae in annos quadraginta petentibus datae frumento stipendioque imperato".

[59] For the age criterion for the discrepancy between the *hastati* and the *principes*, see Mitchell 1990: 236–242.

According to Polybius and Q. Aelius Tubero, the *iuniores* were soldiers from 17 to 46 years old, while those who were older belonged to the *seniores*[60]. The age at which social activity ended in Republican Rome (*legitima aetas*) was 60 years, when citizens were exempted from public duties and military service[61]. Cicero (*Sen.* 60) cites Cato the Elder, who said that in ancient times old age began after the age of 46. He presumably meant that soldiers stopped campaigning after this age, that is, only *iuniores* made up the field forces. Thus, the centuriate army consisted of two types of soldiers with different tasks. The *iuniores*, aged from 17 to 46, being more numerous and physically stronger, formed the field army, while the elders from 46 to 60 were employed to guard Rome, free from military campaigns further afield. Under the year 387, Livy writes of "a third army [...] enrolled from among the seniors and those who were excused from service on grounds of health, to garrison the defences of the City"[62]. From a military point of view, the involvement of the *seniores* in the army may have been related to a new design of the city of Rome, incorporating a defensive wall enclosing the urban space, which needed to be patrolled and defended.

Being responsible for the protection of the City, the *praetor urbanus* controlled the construction and maintenance of the city fortifications. Livy's reference under the year 378 to the building of the city wall shows that some fortifications were newly built or restored after the Gallic invasion (VI 32, 1). The Romans ascribed the building of the wall of Rome to king Servius Tullius[63]. However, the preserved remains of the city wall are of volcanic *tufo giallo* from the Grotta Oscura near the Etruscan city of Veii, conquered by Rome in 396. This discrepancy generated a long discussion in scholarship[64]. Many historians were favourably disposed toward a fourth-century date for the Servian wall[65], but the traditional date of the sixth century retains its popularity among archaeologists[66]. In these circumstances the establishment of the office of the city praetor, which was certainly somehow connected with a significant step in the construction of Rome's fortifications, cannot be determined more accurately than between the

---

[60] Polyb. VI 19, 2; Gell. X 28, 1 f.

[61] Varro apud Non. XII 523 M; Aug. *Quaest. Evan. Matth.* I 9 = *PL* XXXV 1326; *Div. quaest.* 58, 2 = *PL* XL 43: "nam cum a sexagesimo anno senectus dicatur incipere". For more details, see Néraudau 1979: 114–121.

[62] Liv. VI 6, 14: "tertius exercitus ex causariis senioribusque […] scribatur, qui urbi moenibusque praesidio sit".

[63] The city wall of the regal period is mentioned in Cic. *Rep.* II 11; Liv. I 36, 1; 44, 3; Flor. I 4; Dion. Hal. *Ant.* III 67, 4; IV 14, 1; 54, 2; IX 68, 3; Strabo V 3, 7; Plin. *NH* III 67. *POxy* 2088, line 15; [Aur. Vict.] *Vir. ill.* 5, 2.

[64] Cf. Coarelli 1995; Fabbri 2008; Fulminante 2014: 100–102; Ziółkowski 2016.

[65] Holloway 1994: 91–102; Cornell 1995: 198–202; 2000: 217 f.; Smith 1996: 151–154; Gabba 1998; Forsythe 2005: 107 f.; Bernard 2012: 9–38.

[66] Carafa 1996: 14 f.; Cifani 2008: 255–264; 2012; 2013: 204 f.; Ziółkowski 2016: 164–170.

mid-sixth and early-fourth centuries. Nevertheless, the Gallic invasion in 390 (387) would have been a likely motivation for the Romans both to establish a new office of consul (field praetor) and to employ the city praetor for new duties. The latter change was enough (perhaps for Q. Claudius Quadrigarius) to state that the office of the city praetor was established in 367.

The literary tradition attributes the establishment of the two types of troops, the mobile forces and the garrison unit, to the Servian reform of the mid-sixth century, while the praetors for them were only created in 367. The discrepancy could go back to the fact that military institutions developed only gradually during the early Republic. The centuries for protecting Rome were at first needed only when enemies approached the city, and they were converted into the regular garrison service with the city praetor at the head at the time of the significant reform of republican governance. The garrison guard of Rome was institualised as such and received its own praetor when the older men between 46 and 60 were obliged to do military service. Before the *seniores* were included in the *classis*, there had only been praetors (later consuls), who led the *iuniores* in external wars. These praetors (consuls) differed in age from the city praetor, who was invariably older than his colleagues. As a leader of men older than 46, he was the *praetor seniorum* and himself belonged to the *patres*. For that reason, holders of this office were probably chosen from among the senators, which gave the senior praetor more authority than his colleague. The title of *praetor urbanus* perhaps shows that, in addition to his military power, the city praetor also possessed the *auspicia urbana*. It is possible that originally every age group had elected its own praetor from among their peers and that only later was the electoral assembly of all centuries customised to vote for the consuls and the praetor.

Although the early *praetor iuniorum* was elected from the patricians, the military power he received from the soldiers outside the *pomerium* did not provide him with any authority in the *urbs*[67]. The original *urbs* was a sacred space encircled by the *pomerium*, rather than an inhabited space surrounded by the defensive wall[68]. A vestige of this ancient situation was the custom according to which the consul and praetor abdicated their military *imperia* upon entering the City, and their absolute power was removed until the next campaign. Because the military *imperium* had no force within the sacred boundary of the *pomerium*, the praetors, elected as military leaders outside the *urbs*, were not true magistrates until they received the *auspicia urbana*. The military powers of a warlord over his soldiers could be used against alien hostile people, but not in relation to one's

[67] For the *pomerium* in general, see Liou-Gille 1993; Andreussi 1999; Simonelli 2001; De Sanctis 2007.

[68] On the sacred nature of the *pomerium*, see Cic. *Leg*. II 58; Varro *LL* V 143; Liv. I 44, 3 f.; Gell. X 15, 4; XIII 14, 1–15, 4; Plut. *Rom*. 11, 4; *Quest. Rom*. 27; Paul. Fest. p. 295 L. Cf. Drogula 2015: 50; De Sanctis 2015: 153–164.

own citizens. We cannot be sure that the office of the early praetor was annual from the beginning: plausibly the military commander was invested with an *imperium* for a certain campaign and deprived of the office after returning to Rome. He relinquished his military *imperium* when entering the *urbs*, but preserved those powers until he crossed the *pomerium*. When a holder of the *imperium* was on Roman territory (*domi*), his power was restricted by the *ius provocationis* given to the citizens. The idea of a magisterial *potestas* seems to have developed gradually in the City, following the analogy of the *potestas* of the *patres*. The board of ten tribunes watched over the magistrates in the City in order that they did not identify their civil *potestas* with the absolute military *imperium*.

After the 'Servian system' was completed with the addition of the senior combatants, the citizenry became identical with the army, and the electoral act (*designatio*) made the praetors/consuls representatives of the entire civil community (magistrates). To have a valid *imperium* and a magisterial *potestas*, the *consul* (*praetor*) *designatus* had to perform the rites of the investiture (*lex curiata*, auspices, and the approval of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and Jupiter Latiaris). The augur M. Valerius Messala Rufus (*cos*. 53) testified that the investiture legitimised the consular power as *imperium iustum*[69]. The two-step adoption of the office shows that the consulship (and praetorship) developed from a military leadership to a civil magistracy rather than inheriting the powers of archaic kingship.

The two *praetores iuniorum* who led the Roman field army from 386/366 (or 457/444), were equal in function and had every reason to be called consuls, unlike the urban praetor. For a time, their military leadership outside the *pomerium* gave them only a subordinate authority to the Senate, which alone managed Roman politics during the early Republic. The *praetor urbanus*, who was elected from the aged patricians until 337 and probably had senatorial status, perhaps held the title of *praetor maximus*.

The title *praetor maximus* is known from Livy's account of Roman attempts to avert a persistent plague by driving a nail into the wall of the Capitoline temple during the years 364–363. According to the recollection of the elders, a plague had once been alleviated by this means. On this occasion, Livy (VII 3, 5–7) refers to a variant of this custom of driving in the nail, which related to the counting of years:

> There was an ancient law, inscribed in antique letters and words, that whoever was the *praetor maximus* on September 13 should drive the nail. The chamber of Jupiter Optimus Maximus was nailed on the right side next to the shrine of Minerva. They say that this nail was a marker for the number of years because writing was scarce in those times, and that the law was devoted to the shrine of Minerva because counting was Minerva's invention.
>
> (transl. after Forsythe 2005: 151)

[69] According to Livy (XXII 1, 6), when C. Flaminius, a *consul designatus* for 217, departed from Rome without performing the rites of the investiture, the senators stated that his *imperium* was illegitimate.

Livy quotes a certain Cincius, who asserted that nails were fastened in the temple of the goddess Nortia at Volsinii, which indicates that the custom might have been borrowed from Etruria[70]. These nails were indicators of the number of years. A similar driving of a nail-like object into the side of a sacred building to mark the passage of a year is depicted on an Etruscan mirror dating to c. 320[71]. According to Livy, the consul Horatius dedicated the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in accordance with this ancient law, but later the consuls transferred the rite of driving in a nail to count years to the dictator. However, there is no evidence that such a custom was retained in the later Republic, and we can only agree with those scholars who conclude that Livy's mention of the *praetor maximus* in this passage refers to the chief magistrate amongst several[72].

By the time of the Punic Wars, when Roman historiography began as far as we know, the office of dictator became obsolete and the consulship was the highest magistracy. Roman historians believed that the early consuls had the same role in governing Rome as their late republican colleagues. The development of the consulship from military leadership to civil magistracy was beyond their perception. To them, the *praetor maximus* was one of the three magistrates who held the common title of praetor, being a consul, because two of the three praetors became consuls. From Festus' explanation, one can conclude that initially the praetor had been called *maximus* because of his senior age, and only later did the augurs issue a decree that distinguished him by "the power of his *imperium*"[73]. At the same time, Festus' concept of the early praetorship was undoubtedly influenced by the prominent position of the *praetor urbanus* in comparison with the provincial praetors, who had no powers in the city of Rome[74].

The custom of counting years by driving nails into the wall of the Capitoline temple had disappeared by the time of the Second Punic War. It is perhaps no accident that Livy refers to it in relation to the 360s. G. Forsythe suggests that the source of this information must have been someone who himself read the document that contained a consular date in the Capitoline temple[75]. If so, the term *praetor maximus* should be related to the historical context of the reform in 367 (Varro = 363 Fabius) and may not have any relevance to the initial period

---

[70] Perhaps, L. Cincius, an Augustan antiquarian and the author of the book *De fastis*, cited by Festus (p. 276 L s.v. *praetor*). See Wiseman 1979: 45 f.; Rawson 1985: 247 f. Drogula 2015: 29–31, sees in this author an early historian L. Cincius Alimentus (*pr*. 209). Also see Urso 2005: 21, n. 14.

[71] See Thomson 2006: 96–100.

[72] Brennan 2000: 22 f.; Smith 2011: 32–34.

[73] Fest. p. 152, 28 L: "Maximum praetorem dici putant ali eum, qui maximi imperii sit, ali, quia aetatis maximae. Pro collegio quidem augurum decretum est, quod in salutis augurio praetors maiores et minores appellantur, non ad aetatem, sed ad vim imperii pertinere".

[74] Fest. p. 154 L: "praetorem autem maiorem, urbanum: minores ceteros".

[75] Forsythe 2005: 152 f.

before this major reorganisation of the Roman government[76]. FORSYTHE accepts MOMMSEN's idea that the superlative *maximus* was used to distinguish the consul who held the fasces from his consular colleague and the praetor. A significant argument in favour of this interpretation is considered the Greek translation of the Latin *praetor* as στρατηγός and *consul* as στρατηγὸς ὕπατος (highest praetor), which appears to be an exact equivalent of the Roman *praetor maximus*[77]. However, this title στρατηγὸς ὕπατος was applied to both consuls, not only one of them. The title *praetor maximus* belonged to a transitional period from the (380s) 360s to the 330s, when the city praetor was the holder of supreme power (*imperium auspiciumque*), whereas the powers of the field praetors (consuls) in the City were still in the process of formation.

The temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, into the wall of which the *praetor maximus* drove a nail, was regarded as dedicated by M. Horatius Pulvillus (*cos*. 509). Every year the Romans celebrated the anniversary of the dedication as the Roman Games (*ludi Romani*) on September 13. Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus connect the establishment of the games to the significant victory over the Latins at Lake Regillus[78]. Roman writers portray the Capitoline cult as unchanged from the beginning to the late Republic, but the divine triad of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno Regina and Minerva, imitating the Greek triad of Zeus, Hera and Athena, replaced the earlier triad of Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus[79]. There is no evidence for when the new Capitoline triad was established, but one can suggest that it was related to a momentous change in the divine power in Latium. Such a moment is associated with the dissolution of the Latin League in 340, which probably accompanied the transition of the highest sovereignty from Jupiter Latiaris to Jupiter Capitolinus. The Capitoline cult of Jupiter received a powerful boost after the sacred Alban Mount was (possibly together with Tusculum) added to the territory of the Roman *tribus Papiria* in 381 and the *feriae Latinae* in honour of Jupiter Latiaris occurred under Roman control. Thus, the second Capitoline triad was probably legitimated in the period from 381 to 367, when the city of Rome was reestablished after the Gallic Sack[80]. According to Livy (VI 42, 14), the office of the curule aediles was established in 367. Because the origin of the term *aedilis* relates to the temple (*aedes*), the establishment of the aedileship was certainly connected with the dedication of the temple

---

[76] For the *praetor maximus* as the chief magistrate after the fall of the kings, see BUNSE 1998: 44–61.

[77] HUMM 2015: 349. Cf. MAGDELAIN 1969; RICHARD 1978: 455–472; BUNSE 1998: 48–57.

[78] Dion. Hal. *Ant*. VII 71; Cic. *Div.* I 55. Livy (I 35, 9) ascribes the establishment of the festival to Tarquinius Priscus on the occasion of his conquest of the Latin Apiolae.

[79] See WOODARD 2006: 6–26.

[80] ALFÖLDI 1965: 323–329. Cf. PENA 1981; ARATA 2010: 609.

of the main Roman divinity. This allows A. Alföldi to identify M. Horatius, who dedicated the Capitoline temple, with a consular tribune of 378[81].

THE ADMISSION OF THE PLEBEIANS TO THE CONSULSHIP

Fabius Pictor stated that one of the consuls was first elected from the plebeians in the twenty-second year (*duovicesimo anno*) after the Gauls had captured Rome (Gell. V 4, 3). Since the first Roman historian wrote in Greek (Dion. Hal. *Ant*. I 6, 1 f.), either the statement belonged to a translation of his history into Latin, or the Latin-writing author was one of his second-century descendants[82]. Although the law of 367 decreed that one of the consuls be elected from the plebeians, the patricians filled both positions in 355, 354, 353, 351, 349, 345 and 343[83]. K. von Fritz therefore suggests that the law of 367 did not actually contain a provision that one consul each year must be plebeian[84]. J. Pinsent assumes that the evidence in Livy went back to two different chronological versions of familiarising the plebeians with the consulship[85]. According to him, Fabius Pictor dated this event to 366, while Cincius Alimentus followed an earlier consular list, in which the first plebeian consul was dated to 342[86].

Confusions in the Roman chronology of the fourth century have already been discussed in scholarship[87]. Livy combines several historical versions based on various chronological schemes, and traces of this are visible in the multiplicity of Gallic raids on Latium, which Livy refers to under the years 390, 367–366, 361, 360, 358, 350–348, and 329. Polybius (II 18 f.) reports only two Gallic incursions in addition to the first one of 387. He does not propose an absolute chronology of them, but only mentions an interval of 30 years between the first Gallic Sack and the second incursion in 358 and 12 years between the second and the third incursion of 346. M. Sordi argues that Livy did provide a more penetrating narrative, alluding to alliances between Latins and Gauls coming from southern regions against the Romans[88]. This suggests an intervention by the

---

[81] Alföldi 1965: 327–328. Following J. Richardson's idea that ancient heroes were depicted by the Romans on the model of their later tribesmen, one can suggest that the figure of the dedicator of 509 inherited the features of his later prototype.

[82] See Verbrugghe 2008: 444, n. 23. Pinsent (1975: 17) suggests Licinius Macer as a possible translator. Cf. Cornell 2013: III, 47 f.

[83] Liv. VII 17, 12–18, 1; 18, 10; 19, 6; 22, 1–3; 24, 11–25, 2; 28, 10. Cf. Hölkeskamp 1987: 64–74; Stewart 1998: 151–155.

[84] Richard 1979; Billows 1989; Cornell 1995: 334–340; Oakley 1997: I, 652–654.

[85] Pinsent 1975: 13–14, 16, 62–69.

[86] Pinsent 1975: 12, 67.

[87] See Sordi 1965; Pinsent 1975: 10–19, 62–69; Oakley 1997: I, 104–106.

[88] Sordi 1960: 62–72, 154–165.

tyrants of Sicily, who wanted to halt the Roman advance down the Tyrrhenian coast and used Gauls as mercenaries. Polybius (or rather Fabius Pictor, his possible source) was influenced by the Gallic wars of the third century, when the threat came from the north and related to Roman interventions in Etruria. If the evidence in Polybius were reliable, some of the Gallic incursions in Livy could be duplications, which confused the chronology.

According to Livy, when a Gallic army invaded Latium and an enormous Greek fleet appeared off the coast in 348, the Romans appealed for help to the Latins but were refused (VII 25, 5 f.). Their refusal could only have happened if the threat was to Rome alone and not to the whole of Latium. Livy refers to the situation when the Gauls invaded Latium having been invited by the people of Tibur and Praeneste to attack Rome in 361 and 358[89]. For 348, Livy refers to an unprecedented army of ten legions recruited by the Romans[90]. However, they had only four legions at that period[91]. The army of ten legions could apparently combine the troops of the Latin League with the four Roman legions, but Livy stresses that Rome had to fight alone against the enemies that flooded Latium and the seashore, that is, the army consisted only of Romans. Therefore, it seems possible that Livy's source mistakenly understood the military forces of the ten tribes that formed the Roman community at that time as ten legions. The Roman army's appearance on the coast forced the Greek fleet to leave Latium. Livy suggests that the ships belonged to the Sicilian tyrants (VII 26, 15). No Greek source mentions sending an unusually large fleet to the shores of Latium in 348[92]. Instead, there is evidence of the naval expedition of the Syracusan tyrant Dionysius the Elder that resulted in the plundering of the Etruscan port of Pyrgi in 384[93]. The huge haul of booty taken by the Greeks made a great impression in the western Mediterranean. The Roman army (unprecedently combining the forces of all ten tribes) may have been assembled to resist any possible attack by the same fleet on Latium, and Livy is probably incorrect in his chronology of the event, which related to the year 384 rather than 348.

In the same year, the assembly of the Latin communities in the grove of Ferentina (*lucus Ferentinae*) refused Rome's request to help in the war against the Gauls and the Volsci, expressing dissatisfaction with previous unreasonable demands made by the Romans (VII 25, 5 f.). Nevertheless, the Romans entered Volscan territory and captured Satricum in 346. This victory gave them access

---

[89] Liv. VII 9, 2–6; 11, 1–6; 12, 8–15, 8.

[90] Liv. VII 26, 15, cf. II 30, 7 about ten legions in 494.

[91] Liv. VII 23, 3; VIII 8, 14; IX 30, 3. Two consuls led four legions in X 26, 14 f.

[92] Howarth (2006: 154) connects the appearance of the Greek fleet off the coast of Latium with Syracuse's expansion. According to Diodorus (XVI 45, 9), Syracuse captured Rhegium from Carthage just before 348.

[93] Diod. XV 14, 3 f.; Strabo V 2, 8.

to the country of the Aurunci and Campania beyond. By claiming the fertile Campanian land, Rome embarked on the struggle against the Samnites. Both consuls of 343, M. Valerius Corvus and A. Cornelius Cossus celebrated triumphs due of their successes in Samnium, and the Romans began to discuss how to colonise Campania. The discussion resulted in a disaster, which Livy describes as a mutiny of the Roman army followed by a secession to the Alban Mount and the issuing of a series of laws in 342. In this situation, the Volsci attempted to recover the land lost to Rome, including Satricum, but were defeated. The Campanians, who were discontented with Roman claims to their land, entered into a treaty with the Latins, the Sidicines and some other nations against the Samnites and the Romans. Roman forces were insufficient to confront this coalition, and to avoid the collapse of their policy in Campania the Romans had to make concessions to the Latins. In 340, the Senate invited ten Latin elders (*decem principes Latinorum*) and two praetors to Rome for negotiations (VIII 3, 8 f.).

At a general meeting before these ambassadors were sent, one of the Latin leaders, Annius of Setia, had formulated the requirements of the Latins to Rome. He suggested that the Latins and the Romans should become a single nation and a single state; the power should reside in Rome, and all the Latin peoples should be called 'Romans', and one of the consuls with a part of the Senate should be elected from the Latins (VIII 4, 1–5, 6). In his speech, Annius mentions the refusal of the Latins to help the Romans in their war (VIII 4, 7). This means that the Roman invitation in 340 directly followed the Latin refusal of 348. The Roman Senate had rejected the claims of the Latins, but after a two-year war the victorious Romans had to satisfy their requirements and many communities were given Roman citizenship[94]. The Latin claim for Roman consulship resembles the demand of the plebeians to admit them to the same magistracy in 376–367.

If Livy incorrectly attributed some events to the year 348 instead of 384, when the Greek fleet visited Latium, he could also have wrongly dated the war against the Gauls and the Volsci which forced Rome to seek help from the Latins (VII 25, 5 f.). Livy refers to the fact that the Romans demanded satisfaction from the Latins and Hernici after the Gallic Sack in 387 (VI 10, 6). They were asked why they had not for the previous few years furnished a contingent in accordance with the treaty. According to the chronology of Fabius Pictor, the Gallic Sack occurred in 384[95]. Why would Livy or his annalistic source change the date of Rome's conflict with the Latins? Keeping in mind the parallelism between Roman and Athenian early histories, one can suggest that in their dating of the Latin War, Roman annalists followed the analogy of the war of Philip II of Macedonia against the Greek alliance in 340–338. Both wars ended with the establishment of a new political reality, in Greece and in Latium, with the

---

[94] Liv. VIII 14; cf. Oakley 1998: II, 538–571.

[95] See Sordi 1960: 173–176; Cornell 2013: III, 47 f.

hegemony of Macedonia and Rome respectively. At the same time, Livy's portrayal of the Latin War was influenced in many details by his knowledge of the Social War of 91–88. The real conflict of Rome with the Latin League may have taken place over a more extended period between 384 and 367. Thus, two chronological versions competed in Roman historiography: some events after 384 were moved to the period after 348 in order to separate the conflict with the Latins and the Struggle of the Orders. Livy's combination of these two versions gave birth to a number of duplications[96].

(1) The struggle for the admission of the plebeians to the consulship took place in 376–367 and 342/340–338, and the sharing of the consulship was allowed from 366, but became regular after 342.

(2) The plebeians were admitted to the censorship by the law of Publilius Philo in 339, while the first plebeian who achieved the censorship was C. Marcius Rutilus in 350[97].

(3) L. Furius Camillus (*cos*. 349) led the war against the Gauls who invaded the Alban area and the legendary M. Furius Camillus defeated the Gauls in the same region in 367[98]. Both held the office of dictator, although the victory over the Gauls in 350 was ascribed to M. Popillius Laenas. Aristotle referred to the saviour of Rome at the time of the Gallic Sack as Lucius (Plut. *Cam*. 22), while Diodorus knew of M. Aemilius instead of L. Furius as a consul in 349.

(4) The victory of T. Manlius Torquatus in a duel with a Gaul in 367 (or 361) was duplicated in the similar combat of M. Valerius Corvus in 348[99]. Livy borrowed Manlius' story from the account of Claudius Quadrigarius, while the heroic exploit of Valerius Corvus was obviously a product of Valerius Antias. According to Livy (VII 26, 11 f.), it was T. Manlius Torquatus who, as a dictator, proclaimed M. Valerius Corvus as a consul in 348. In both cases, the defeated Gauls departed to the south (VII 11, 1; 26, 9).

(5) Livy similarly describes the destruction and burning of Satricum by the Latins in 379 and the Romans in 346[100].

(6) T. Quinctius Cincinnatus was dictator in 380 and a certain T. Quinctius headed the rebellious soldiers as their *imperator* in 342. To explain these duplications, J. Pinsent suggests that the first historians, Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus, followed two different chronological schemes. However, the combination of the dates could be a product of the post-Sullan annalistic writers[101].

---

[96] Pinsent 1975: 10–12, 30 f., 66 f.

[97] Cf. Liv. VIII 12, 16 and VII 22, 7; 10.

[98] Cf. Liv. VII 24, 10 f. and VI 42, 5–8.

[99] Liv. VI 42, 5; VII 9, 8–11, 1 and 26, 1–10; Gell. IX 11, 5.

[100] Liv. VI 33, 4 f.; VII 27, 6–9.

[101] Pinsent 1975: 10–12, 30 f., 66 f.

The growth of the Roman community after the addition of four new tribes beyond the Tiber strengthened the position of Rome in Latium. Livy (VI 5, 2) writes that Rome acquired the Pomptine region with its fertile land as its own possession after Camillus' victory over the Volsci in 388. The capture of this land became the reason for the conflict with the Latins and the Hernici, who had been faithful allies of Rome for a long time (Livy VI 2, 4). Their relationships were established by the *foedus Cassianum*, which unified the three nations after 493 and 486[102]. Livy writes that Sp. Cassius concluded a treaty with the Hernici in which two thirds of their territory had been taken from them, half being given to the Latins and half to the Roman plebs. In these circumstances the Hernici who inhabited the valley behind the Mons Algidus were hardly likely to have been faithful to Rome for a hundred years. It is much more likely that they had equal rights with the Latins in the League around the Mons Albanus. The treaty with the Latins was necessary to the Hernici because they were oppressed by the Aequi and the Volsci who inhabited the mountains around their part of the Sacco valley. According to the antiquarian L. Cincius, Rome acknowledged the primacy of the Latin League up to the consulship of P. Decius Mus (*cos*. 340)[103]. The Latin people had a custom of gathering at the fountain of Ferentina (*caput Ferentinae*) at the foot of the Alban Mount to determine the command of the allied troops, and the Romans had their turn on an equal footing with the other communities. Rome, which consisted of a few tribes, was hardly an ordinary community among the members of the Latin League. The Latins, the Romans and the Hernici acted as equal subjects of the Cassian treaty.

In the second half of the fifth century, when Rome waged wars against Fidenae, the Aequi and the Volsci intensified their onslaught on the lands of the Latins and the Hernici around Algidus. The Roman advance to the Pomptine region had further upset the balance of power in Latium, and at the beginning of 386 a body of fugitives arrived in Rome from the Pomptine territory because the Volsci of Antium were in arms and the Latin communities had also sent their fighting men to assist them (Liv. VI 6, 4). Livy refers to Camillus' successful campaign against the Volsci, during which the Roman army did not destroy Antium only because Camillus was sent to the war against the Etruscans. The next year the joint army of the Volsci, the Latins, and the Hernici, also supported by the colonists of Circei and Velitrae, set off to attack Rome, so the Romans had to appoint A. Cornelius Cossus as a dictator, who managed to defeat the enemy (VI 13). From then on, Livy refers to permanent conflicts between Rome and the Latins, which perhaps were the background to the mass movement headed by M. Manlius Capitolinus in 385–384. M. Manlius was traditionally regarded as

[102] Liv. II 33, 4; 41, 1; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. VIII 69, 2.

[103] Fest. p. 276 L s.v. *praetor*. For a discussion on Festus' text, see Sánchez 2014; Drogula 2015: 29–31.

the defender of the plebeian debtors, although the original reason for his opposition to Camillus and the Senate may have been their politics, which upset traditional relations of Rome and the Latins. The Roman actions, intended to break up the Latin League, resulted in the falling away of Lavinium and Praeneste from the union with Rome in 383. A new war for the Pomptine field was waged by Rome against Praeneste, Velitrae, and Tusculum in alliance with the Volsci in 382. After the victory of Camillus in 381, the Romans granted citizenship to the population of Tusculum, which was situated near the sanctuary of Jupiter Latiaris on the Alban Mount (Monte Cavo)[104]. Having been included in the *tribus Papiria*, Tusculum became part of the *ager Romanus*[105]. The annexation of Tusculum gave the Romans control over the Latin shrines around the Alban Lake[106]. This was where the *feriae Latinae* ware celebrated as the obligatory rituals for consular investiture, which cannot, therefore, have been designed in the later standard way earlier than 381[107].

Thus, in the period from 386 to 367, the Roman community occupied a sizable portion of Latium. In Livy, after a Praenestine army had appeared before the Colline Gate in 380, T. Quinctius Cincinnatus, having been nominated as dictator, forced Praeneste and eight allied towns to surrender. He carried the image of Jupiter Imperator from Praeneste in his triumphal procession up to the Capitol, setting it up in a recess between the shrines of Jupiter and Minerva (VI 28 f.). Tusculum, Praeneste and the eight towns can be identified with the ten Latin communities whose *principes*, according to Livy, were invited to Rome in 340, and which finally received Roman citizenship. The Temple of Concordia, traditionally associated with the agreement between the patricians and the plebeians in 367, may have originally symbolised an arrangement of the relationship with the new citizens, who supplemented the plebeian order[108]. The investment of the Latins with Roman citizenship doubled the size of the Roman army, for which four legions were recruited in 350, 340 and 311[109]. In other words, in 367 the Romans added two new legions to the two existing from 387 (or 457); however, there is no evidence for an addition of two new consuls. The Latin claim for the Roman consulship did not result in the establishment of one or more praetorian offices, as had happened in 387. After five years (in Livy) or one year (in Diodorus) of anarchy, the Latins who obtained Roman citizenship

---

[104] Liv. VII 26, 8; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. XIV 6, 3. For Tusculum as the first *municipium optimo iure*, see Martínez-Pinna 2004: 95–200.

[105] Cf. Liv. VIII 37, 12; XXVI 9, 12; Cic. *Agr*. II 96; Fest. p. 262–264 L.

[106] For the incorporation of Tusculum into Roman society, see Martínez-Pinna 2004: 147–170.

[107] For the *feriae Latinae*, see Stewart 1998: 35 f.; Simón 2011; Smith 2012.

[108] Plut. *Cam*. 42; Ov. *Fasti* I 641–644; cf. Liv. VI 42, 9–14. See Howarth 2006: 148–150; Humm 2015: 356 f.

[109] Liv. VII 23, 3; VIII 8, 14; IX 30, 3; cf. Howarth 2006: 210.

as plebeians received the right to elect one of the two field praetors (consuls), a dual office which most likely existed from 387 (or 457). Possibly this was why the former praetors received the new title of consuls after 367. In other words, within the traditional chronology only from 366 did the plebeian consul become a magistrate of the entire estate of the plebeians regardless of origin, while from 387 (457) to 367 the holder of the office was a representative of the tribes from over the Tiber.

Diodorus Siculus preserved a fragment of the version according to which the decemviral board of 443 promised the people the election of two consuls equally from the patricians and plebeians (XII 25, 2). Plebeian consuls were indeed elected in 441 (T. Stertinius), 439 and 438 (M. Geganius). In 437, for the first time, the consuls were replaced by three military tribunes, after which the idea of the plebeian consulship was forgotten. According to Livy (IV 1, 1 f.), the tribune C. Canuleius made two proposals in 445 – to allow marriages between patricians and plebeians and to admit plebeians to the consulship. Although the two proposals were associated, the Romans accepted only one of them, and the consulship was replaced by the consular tribunate from 444. Following Licinius Macer (*pr.* 68), who used the *libri lintei*, Livy lists A. Sempronius Atratinus among the consular tribunes and his brother L. Sempronius Atratinus among the consuls of 444[110]. Although scholars see the Sempronii Atratini as patricians, the *gens Sempronia* is known as plebeian. Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers to a speech by C. Claudius, an uncle of the decemvir, who argued against Canuleius' proposal in 445 that a consul should be elected from the plebeians (IX 56, 1–5; 60, 1 f.). Livy attributes a similar speech to Ap. Claudius Crassus, a grandson of the decemvir, under 367 (VI 40, 1–41, 7). Livy's main argument against the plebeian consulship is the hereditary tie between the patricians and the auspices; that is, the auspices would be at risk in the case of marriages between patricians and plebeians, which were allowed by the Canuleian law in 445. Livy explains both the establishment of the consular tribunate in 444 and the reappearance of the consulship from 366 as showing a concern for equality between the patricians and the plebeians (IV 6, 1–8 and VI 42, 9–12). The evidence allows us to suggest that the so-called 'consular tribunate' was inserted in the list of consuls for a chronological reason (see Conclusion) and this insertion separated the events under 445 from their former place in 367.

The version, according to which the early title 'praetor' was replaced by 'consul' in 449 (445) was probably upheld by the historians of plebeian origin

---

[110] According to Livy (IV 7, 1–12), three tribunes were elected instead of consuls for 444, but because of improperly performed auspices they were replaced by a pair of consuls, L. Papirius Mugillanus and L. Sempronius Atratinus. He adds that the consuls' names for this year were found neither in the ancient annals nor in the official list of magistrates and only Licinius Macer disclosed them in the *libri lintei*. Cf. Frier 1975: 79–97.

L. Cincius Alimentus (*pr*. 209) and Licinius Macer (*pr*. 68). The custom to elect consuls from both orders gave rise to the idea that the early praetors were only patricians and the title was changed after the higher magistracy was shared between the patricians and the plebeians. Therefore, the admission of the plebeians to the consulship was associated with the change of the title. G. Urso argues that this idea goes back to a book *de magistratibus*, written by an *interpres iuris* in the 50s or the 40s, perhaps Q. Aelius Tubero[111]. The author of this association could also be Valerius Antias[112]. Antias was engaged in the theme and probably responsible for the invention of the laws of P. Valerius Poplicola of 509 and the figure of L. Valerius Potitus as a consul in 449[113].

THE ADMISSION OF THE PLEBEIANS TO THE CITY PRAETORSHIP

Patrician-plebeian pairs became regular in the *Fasti Consulares* after 342, when a Genucian law permitted the plebeians to hold the second consular office (Liv. VII 42, 2). J.-Cl. Richard emphasises that the law of 342 marked a significant date in the development of the consulship[114]. J. Pinsent interprets the Genucian law as a duplication of the Licinian law of 367 for the plebeian consulship[115]. E. Ferenczy sees in it a measure comparable to the Licinian-Sextian law that allowed the plebeians to restore the position forfeited by theim in 355 to 343[116]. Ferenczy identifies the tribune L. Genucius, the author of the law of 342, with the consul of the same name who held the office in 365 and 362. Pinsent assumes that the consul L. Genucius was the first plebeian who held this office in an early version of the consular list, but that he was replaced with L. Sextius in Gracchan historiography.

Livy's reference to the Genucian law is preceded by an account of a rebellion in the Roman army[117]. Discontented with the strategy of the Roman Senate a part of the Campanian army moved "into the Alban lands and encamped at the foot of Alba Longa"[118]. Here the soldiers called T. Quinctius back from retirement at

---

[111] Urso 2005: 175, 188–193.

[112] For Valerius Antias, see Rich 2005.

[113] Livy (III 55, 11) defines the Valerian-Horatian law as *lex Horatia*, which could be a remnant of the former version without the name of Valerius among the reformers.

[114] Richard 1979: 70–75.

[115] Pinsent 1975: 13–14, 16, 65, 69.

[116] Ferenczy 1976: 50–53. Cf. Forsythe 2005: 273 f.

[117] Liv. VII 38, 5–41, 8; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. XV 3, 1–15; App. *Samn*. I 1 f. For discussions of the mutiny of 342, see Hölkeskamp 1987: 102–109; Poma 1990: 139–157; Oakley 1998: II, 361–365, 383–388; Forsythe 2005: 272–275.

[118] Liv. VII 39, 8. Livy defines the leaving of the position by the soldiers as *secessio* (VII 40, 2; 41, 2 f.).

his Tusculan farm to be the leader (*imperator*) of their revolt. The negotiations of Quinctius with the Roman government resulted in a set of provisions in favour of the soldiers (VII 41, 2–8). Livy's narrative of the mutiny is certainly inspired by Sulla's march from Nola to Rome in 88 and an event in 83 involving the armies of Sulla and the consul L. Cornelius Scipio[119]. The revolt was pacified by the dictator M. Valerius Corvus, a tribesman of Valerius Antias who was most likely responsible for the arrangement of the event[120]. According to an alternative annalistic version in Livy, C. Marcius Rutilus and Q. Servilius Ahala (*coss*. 342) acted instead of the dictator Valerius (VII 42, 3–7). All the action took place in Rome and seems to have involved the civilian population. It was C. Manlius rather than T. Quinctius who was forced by the rebellious multitude to leave his house in the city and lead the secession. His name recalls M. Manlius Capitolinus (*cos*. 392), and the people's assembly to vote for the proposed laws was gathered in the Peteline Grove, the same place where M. Manlius was condemned by a vote of the people in 384 (Liv. VI 20, 11).

The secession resulted in the set of Genucian laws: (1) that it be illegal to charge interest on a loan; (2) that no one should hold the same office again within ten years; (3) that no one should hold two offices in the same year; (4) that it be permitted for both consuls to be plebeian (VII 42, 1–2). This curious combination of debt and electoral reforms has encouraged scholars to argue that politically ambitious plebeians from among the upper class used debt reform to attract the support of other plebeians, and their combined political strength was further employed to pass other measures important for the public careers of politically aspiring plebeians[121]. But a more cautious suggestion would be that it was Roman historians who, influenced by the debt problems of their own time, stereotypically used indebtness to embellish every period of social crisis that was described. Three other provisions of L. Genucius closely resemble the rules that were introduced by the *lex Villia annalis* of 180 and legalised by the election of a plebeian pair of consuls in 172[122]. Livy's account conveys a common message of the rules for the magistrates that were associated with this year; the rules were known to him from later regulations[123]. An anonymous author from whom Livy borrowed the statement "utique liceret consules ambos plebeios creari", probably attempted to create a historical precedent for the second-century election of two plebeians as consular colleagues.

---

[119] App. *BCiv.* I 85; Plut. *Sulla* 28, 2 f.

[120] Forsythe 2005: 273.

[121] See Hölkeskamp 1987: 107; Forsythe 2005: 273.

[122] Liv. VII 42, 1 f. and XLII 10, 7–9. Cf. Pinsent 1975: 64 f.

[123] Cf. De Martino 1972: I, 328; for an opposing view, see Ferenczy 1976: 50 f.

The tale of T. Quinctius being forced to lead the rebellious army from his Tusculan farm is likely to have derived from (or perhaps was a source for) the narrative of L. Quinctius Cincinnatus being summoned from the plow to rescue a Roman army besieged by the Aequi near Tusculum in 458. The *gens Quinctia* was considered to be of Alban origin and this explains their link with Tusculum[124]. The investment of Quinctius with an *imperium* recalls the legendary Latin dictators of Tusculum, whom Livy mentions under the year 499 and 460[125]. Traditional tales of patriotic heroism were possibly fashioned from a historical war after Tusculum received Roman citizenship, in which the dictator T. Quinctius Cincinnatus defeated Praeneste and a coalition of nine towns opposed to Rome in 380 (Liv. VI 28, 3–29, 10). The situation in 342 appears to have involved the Tusculan dictator conducting negotiations with the Roman consuls, after which the claims of the Latins were satisfied by a military *lex sacrata* on the Alban Mount (VII 41, 4) to which was added a tribunician *lex Genucia* in Rome (VII 42, 2).

S. Staveley, and more recently R. Stewart, interpret the Genucian law, which Livy refers to as the admission of the plebeians to both consular positions, in the sense that the plebeians were admitted to two high offices from the three existing praetorships[126]. Between 366 and 342, the shared consulship was not yet fully established, and all three high magistrates were titled praetors. All of them were elected at the same meeting of the centuriate assembly and the way in which they differed from one another was not the same as in the late Republic. One of the three praetorian offices had been available to the plebeians since 367, and, according to the Genucian law of 342, they were admitted to the second of the three. This was the office of consul in 367 and the city praetor in 342. Livy (VIII 15, 9) informs us that Q. Publilius Philo (*cos*. 339) became the first plebeian praetor (*urbanus*) in 337. The holding of the consular office before the praetorian one reveals the prestige of the early urban praetorship. The later historical tradition, written at a time when the consular and praetorian elections were two separate proceedings, apparently misconstrued the Genucian law as meaning that both consuls could be plebeian, something that was not realised until 170 years later. Since the Romans henceforth consistently elected one patrician and one plebeian to the consulship down to 172, the Genucian law must have specified unequivocally that one consular position had to be filled by a plebeian, and by allowing a second plebeian to be chosen at the consular-praetorian elections, the law permitted the praetorship to be filled by either a patrician or a plebeian.

If there were annual records between 366 and 342, it is possible that in them the Roman pontiffs did not always list the plebeian consul with his patrician

---

[124] For a hypothesis of the Tusculan origin of T. Quinctius, see Piganiol 1920.

[125] Liv. I 49, 9; II 15, 7; 18, 3; 19, 7; III 18, 1 f.; 19, 8; 29, 6.

[126] See Staveley 1954: 208–211; Stewart 1998: 95–136.

colleague, but instead indicated the names of both patrician officers (consul and praetor). After 342, when the plebeians were admitted to the office of the city praetor, the pontiffs had to show the equality of the eponyms, one patrician and one plebeian, in their records. If the elections in the centuriate assembly between 367 and 337 gave high magistracy to two patricians and one plebeian, after 337 they could be two plebeians and one patrician or two patricians and one plebeian.

The dissolution of the Latin League entirely changed the situation in public law in Latium. The sovereignty was moved from the Alban Mount to the Capitoline Hill, and the authority of Jupiter Latiaris was superseded by Jupiter Optimus Maximus. Most of the Latin communities were incorporated into the Roman tribes and the legislative role of the Ferentine Grove was replaced by the assemblies of Roman citizens. Nevertheless, the Roman consuls continued to celebrate their unity with Latin communities on the Alban Mount as a part of their annual ceremony of investiture. During the *feriae Latinae* the Roman citizens of all tribes swore to Jupiter to give their fidelity to new consuls, so that the festival on the Alban Mount legitimised the authority of the Roman consulship. This means that, unlike the city praetor, the consuls were closely tied to the population of all Latium and the significant increase in Roman citizenship on account of the incorporation of the Latin communities gave priority to the consulship rather than the praetorship. The admission of the plebeians to the office of urban praetor can be understood in the sense that they had been permitted to take part in governing the city of Rome. The unification of the consulship and praetorship in the *lex Genucia* seems to mean that it gave the consuls some power inside the City in addition to their former military leadership.

CONCLUSION

The above analysis of Livy's historical tradition shows that the early Roman army consisted of men not older than 45 years, whose military leader was elected (*praetor*) or appointed (*dictator*) for campaigning. After the last Veientine War, the Romans established a new legion to protect new tribes on the right side of the Tiber and, thus, the second office of elective praetor was added. The enlarged Roman army of two legions demonstrated its superiority in Latium by conquering the Pomptine valley and defeating the Latins and the Volsci. Ten Latin communities were attached to Rome (Roman historiography portrayed this fact as their voluntary claim for Roman citizenship on the model of the Italians' demand in the Social War of 91–88) and new Roman tribes were established on their territory. The doubling in size of the Roman community provoked the reform of 367, which shared two praetorian offices (consulship) between the former citizens and the newly received Roman citizenship, most of whom (if not all) were of plebeian status.

After a new ('Servian') city wall was built, the Roman army was added to with men between 45 and 60 years old, who were exempted from military campaigns

but could defend the city of Rome. In 367, these older men received their own praetor, whose office was called *praetor urbanus* and perhaps *praetor maximus*. At first, the city praetor was chosen from the patricians, but a new reform in 342 to 339 also admitted plebeians to the office. The reform was provoked by the dissolution of the Latin League and the transition of political and religious sovereignty in Latium to Rome. The former age discrepancy between the city praetor (*praetor seniorum*) and the consuls (*praetores iuniorum*) was abolished and the consulship became the supreme magistracy with powers (*potestas*) in the city of Rome in addition to the former military *imperium*. The majority of the population in Latium became Roman citizens of plebeian origin and the new plebeian nobility was admitted to the city praetorship. In exchange for that, they had to agree that one of two consuls would be elected from the patricians from now onward. Otherwise, if consuls were to be elected regardless of the patrician or plebeian origin of candidates, the patricians would inevitably lose the elections because of the plebeian multiplicity.

Roman historiography was born at the time when two consuls, from the patricians and the plebeians respectively, were annually elected. The Romans believed that consular pairs had been elected from the beginning of the Republic. We usually assume that it was Fabius Pictor who first dated the establishment of the Republic simultaneously with the democracy in Athens in 507 (503) and that it was he who stated that the plebeians were admitted to the consulship from 366/362 (the twenty-second year after the Gallic Sack of 387/384). In pre-Fabian oral tradition, however, the annual consulship was rather dated to the middle of the fifth century. The first plebeian *pontifex maximus* Ti. Coruncanius organised the Saecular Games in 249 (246) to celebrate an anniversary (*saeculum*) from a certain date, perhaps the dissolution of the Latin League and the beginning of the patrician-plebeian consular eponymies from 348 (344 or 342). Following the calculation by *saecula*, one can suggest that for the hundred years before this date, Rome only had patrician eponymies, that is, the consular list began from 448/447 or 444/443. A remnant of this version is the 'first decemvirate', which originally was the annual interregnum invested with extraordinary authority to elaborate a new law of consulship. Diodorus Siculus preserved a version according to which the first decemvirate was appointed in 444 (XII 23, 1). This version associated the establishment of the Republic with Pericles' leadership in Athens and the foundation of Thurii in 444.

I suggest that the early (Coruncanian) list of consuls (two patricians from 444 and a patrician with a plebeian from 344) was preceded with colleges of three, four and six military tribunes, who led soldiers of separate tribes, while their joint army was headed by a praetor, an office which was neither annual nor collegial until 449 (444). According to this version, Junius Brutus and Tarquinius Collatinus were *tribunus celerum* and *rex sacrorum* rather than consuls of the first year of the Republic. The Veientine War of 483–474 increased the number

of Roman tribes and military tribunes to ten in 457 and created conditions for establishing the second legion and its praetor. In 449 (444), the second praetor was established, and the military leaders received the title of consuls.

Brutus became the first consul after the second-century historians equalled the beginning of the Republic with the establishment the consulship in 508/7. To represent the early consulship as annual, the annalistic writers moved a part of the consular list from its former place between 449 (444) and 367 to a new place between 509 and 450. The gap which appeared in the list of consuls between 444 and 367 was filled by the list of military tribunes, moved from their former place between 509 and 450. The former analogy between the Veientine War and the victorious battles of the Syracusan tyrants, Gelo at Himera in 480 and Hiero I at Cumae in 474, was replaced by the war of Dionysius the Elder against the Carthaginians in 406–396. Livy (II 34, 1–7) and Dionysius (VII 1 f.) narrate that, in searching for cereal crops used as food at the time of the first *secessio plebis*, the senate sent an embassy to Sicily. Their annalistic sources – Licinius Macer, Cn. Gellius and others – surprisingly referred to the ambassadors as having been sent to Dionysius, who was the tyrant of Syracuse in 396–367. Livy passed over the chronological problem, but Dionysius assumed that, in the original story, only an anonymous 'tyrant' was mentioned, and Roman historians mistakenly identified him as Dionysius instead of Gelo (491–478). In the light of the suggestions above, however, it seems possible to see the 'mistake' as a remnant of the earlier version, which mentioned the embassy to Dionysius, whose name was preserved, when the whole block of information was moved to the beginning of the fifth century. The rearrangement of the list of consuls was explained by Roman annalistic writers as the replacement of consuls by 'consular tribunes' from 444 as a result of the Struggle of the Orders. The list of consuls, with the temporary invention of the consular tribunes, was fastened in the *Annales Maximi*, published by P. Mucius Scaevola (*cos*. 133), the ponrifex maximus from 130 to 115, and became the basis for subsequent chronological calculations.

University of Tampere

REFERENCES

Alföldi 1965: A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, Ann Arbor 1965.

Andreussi 1999: M. Andreussi, *Pomerium*, *LTUR* IV (1999), pp. 96–105.

Arata 2010: F.P. Arata, *Nuove considerazioni a proposito del Tempio di Giove Capitolino*, MEFRA CXXII 2010, pp. 585–624.

Armstrong 2008: J. Armstrong, *Breaking the Rules: Recruitment in the Early Roman Army (509–450 BC)*, in: E. Bragg *et al*. (edd.), *Beyond the Battlefields: Interdisciplinary Studies of Warfare and Society in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 47–66.

———— 2013: J. Armstrong, *"Bands of Brothers": Warfare and Fraternity in Early Rome*, Journal of Ancient History I 2013, pp. 53–69.

Beck 2005: H. Beck, *Karriere und Hierarchie: Die römische Aristokratie und die Anfänge des cursus honorum in der mittleren Republik*, Berlin 2005.
Beck *et al.* 2011: H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne, Fr. Pina Polo (edd.), *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2011.
Beloch 1926: K.J. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege*, Berlin 1926.
Bergk 2011: A. Bergk, *The Development of the Praetorship in the Third Century BC*, in: Beck *et al.* 2011, pp. 61–74.
Bernard 2012: C.G. Bernard, *Continuing the Debate on Rome's Earliest Circuit Walls*, PBSR LXXX 2012, pp. 1–44.
Bernardi 1952: A. Bernardi, *Dagli ausiliari del 'Rex' ai magistrati della 'Respublica'*, Athenaeum XXX 1952, pp. 3–58.
Billows 1989: R. Billows, *Legal Fiction and Political Reform at Rome in the Early Second Century B.C.*, Phoenix XLIII 1989, pp. 118–127.
Bleicken 1975: J. Bleicken, *Die Verfassung der römischen Republik: Grundlagen und Entwicklung*, Paderborn 1975.
———— 1981: J. Bleicken, *Zum Begriff der römischen Amtsgewalt. Auspicium – potestas – imperium*, Göttingen 1981 (Nachrichten d. Akad. d. Wissen. in Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1981, 9, pp. 257–300).
Brennan 2000: T.C. Brennan, *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, Oxford 2000.
Briquel 2008: D. Briquel, *La prise de Rome par les Gaulois. Lecture mythique d'un événement historique*, Paris 2008.
Bunse 1998: R. Bunse, *Das römische Oberamt in der frühen Republik und das Problem der "Konsulartribunen"*, Trier 1998.
———— 2002: R. Bunse, *Die klassische Prätur und die Kollegialität* (*par potestas*), ZRG CXIX 2002, pp. 29–43.
Carafa 1996: P. Carafa, *La "grande Roma dei Tarquini" e la città romuleo-numana*, Bullettino della commissione archeologica comunale di Roma XCVII 1996, pp. 7–34.
Cifani 2008: G. Cifani, *Architettura romana arcaica. Edilizia e società tra Monarchia e Repubblica*, Roma 2008.
———— 2012: G. Cifani, *Le mura serviane*, in: A. Carandini (ed.), *Atlante di Roma antica*, Milano 2012, pp. 81–84.
———— 2013: G. Cifani, *Considerazioni sulle mura arcaiche e repubblicane a Roma*, Scienze dell'antichità XIX 2013, pp. 204–207.
Coarelli 1995: F. Coarelli, *Le mura regie e repubblicane*, in: Br. Brizzi (ed.), *Mura e porte di Roma antica*, Roma 1995, pp. 10–22.
Cornell 1995: T.J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars*, London 1995.
———— 2000: T.J. Cornell, *The City–State in Latium*, in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *A Comparative Study of Thirty City–State Cultures*, Copenhagen 2000, pp. 209–228.
———— 2013: T.J. Cornell *et al.* (edd.), *Fragments of the Roman Historians*, vols. I–III, Oxford 2013.
De Martino 1972: F. De Martino, *Intorno all'origine della repubblica romana e della magistrature*, *ANRW* I 1 (1972), pp. 217–249.
———— 1972–1990: F. De Martino, *Storia della costituzione romana*, 2nd edn., vols. I–VI, Napoli 1972–1990.
De Sanctis 2007: G. De Sanctis, *Solco, muro, pomerio*, MEFRA CXIX 2007, pp. 503–526.
———— 2015: G. De Sanctis, *La logica del confine. Per un'antropologia dello spazio nel mondo romano*, 2015.
Drogula 2015: F. Drogula, *Commanders and Command in the Roman Republic and Early Empire*, Chapel Hill 2015.
Eder 1990: W. Eder (ed.), *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik,* Stuttgart 1990.

Fabbri 2008: M. Fabbri, *Le mura serviane dalle fonti letterarie alla documentazione archeologica*, in: *Le perle e il filo. A Mario Torelli per i suoi settanta anni*, Venosa 2008, pp. 83–100.

Ferenczy 1976: E. Ferenczy, *From the Patrician State to the Patricio-Plebeian State*, Budapest 1976.

Forsythe 2005: G. Forsythe, *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*, Berkeley 2005.

Frier 1975: B.W. Frier, *Licinius Macer and the Consules Suffecti of 444 B.C.*, TAPhA CV 1975, pp. 79–97.

von Fritz 1950: K. von Fritz, *The Reorganization of the Roman Government in 366 B.C. and the So-Called Licinio-Sextian Laws*, Historia I 1950, pp. 3–44.

Fulminante 2014: F. Fulminante, *The Urbanisation of Rome and Latium Vetus: From the Bronze Age to the Archaic Era*, Cambridge 2014.

Gabba 1998: E. Gabba, *La Roma dei Tarquini*, Athenaeum LXXXVI 1998, pp. 5–12.

Gjerstad 1967: E. Gjerstad, *The Origins of the Roman Republic*, in: *Les origines de la république romaine*, Vandœuvres–Genève 1967 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 13), pp. 1–43.

Gilbert 1939: R.L. Gilbert, *The Origin and History of the Peregrine Praetorship, 242–166 B.C.*, Res Judicatae II 1939, pp. 50–58.

Giovannini 1984: A. Giovannini, *Les origines des magistratures romaines*, MH XLI 1984, pp. 15–30.

———— 1993: A. Giovannini, *Il passagio dalle istituzioni monarchiche alle istituzioni repubblicane*, in: *Bilancio critico su Roma arcaica fra monarchia e repubblica. In memoria di F. Castagnoli*, Roma 1993, pp. 75–96.

Hanell 1946: K. Hanell, *Das Altrömische eponyme Amt*, Lund 1946.

Henderson 1957: M.I. Henderson, *Potestas Regia*, JRS XLVII 1957, pp. 82–87.

Heuss 1944: A. Heuss, *Zur Entwicklung des Imperiums der römischen Oberbeamten*, ZRG LXIV 1944, pp. 57–133 (= idem, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Stuttgart 1995, pp. 831–907).

———— 1982: A. Heuss, *Gedanken und Vermutungen zur frühen römischen Regierungsgewalt*, Göttingen 1982 (Nachrichten d. Akad. d. Wissen. in Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1982, 10, pp. 377–454).

Hölkeskamp 1987: K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Die Entstehung der Nobilität*, Stutgart 1987.

Holloway 1994: R.R. Holloway, *The Archaeology of Early Rome and Latium*, London–New York 1994.

———— 2009: R.R. Holloway, *Praetor Maximus and Consul*, in: C. Marangio, G. Laudizi (edd.), *Palaia philia: studi di topografia antica in onore di Giovanni Uggeri*, Galatina 2009, pp. 71–75.

Howarth 2006: R.S. Howarth, *The Origins of the Roman Citizenship*, Lampeter 2006.

Humm 2012: M. Humm, *Hiérarchie de pouvoirs et hiérarchie des magistratures dans la Rome républicaine*, in: A. Bérenger, F. Lachaud (edd.), *Hiérarchie des pouvoirs, délégation de pouvoir et responsabilité des administrateurs dans l'Antiquité et au Moyen Age (Université de Metz, 16–18 juin 2011)*, Metz 2012, pp. 105–134.

———— 2015: M. Humm, *From 390 BC to Sentinum: Political and Ideological Aspects*, in: B. Mineo (ed.), *A Companion to Livy*, Oxford 2015, pp. 342–366.

Kraus 1994: C.S. Kraus, *"No Second Troy": Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V*, TAPhA CXXIV 1994, pp. 267–289.

Kunkel 1974: W. Kunkel, *Kleine Schriften zum römischen Strafverfahren und zur römischen Verfassungsgeschichte*, Weimar 1974.

van Leijenhorst 1986: C.J. van Leijenhorst, *Beiträge aus der Thesaurus-Arbeit XXIII*, MH XLIII 1986, pp. 176–183.

Liou-Gille 1993 : B. Liou-Gille, *Le «pomerium»*, MH L 1993, pp. 94–106.

Magdelain 1969: A. Magdelain, *Praetor Maximus et Comitiatus Maximus*, Iura XX 1969, pp. 257–286 (= idem, *Jus imperium auctoritas. Études de droit romain*, Rome 1990, pp. 313–339).

Martin 1994: P.-M. Martin, *L'idée de royauté à Rome*, vol. II: *Haine de la royauté et séductions monarchiques* (*du IVe siècle av. J.-C. au principat augustéen*), Clermont-Ferrand 1994.

Martínez-Pinna 2004: J. Martínez-Pinna, *Tusculum latina. Aproximación histórica a una ciudad del antiguo Lacio* (*siglos VI–IV a.C.*), Roma 2004.

Mastrocinque 1983–1984: A. Mastrocinque, *La cacciata di Tarquinio Superbo. Tradizione romana e letteratura greca*, Athenaeum LXI 1983, pp. 457–480; LXII 1984, pp. 210–229.

———— 1988: A. Mastrocinque, *Lucio Giunio Bruto. Recherche di storia, religione e diritto sulle origine della republica romana*, Este 1988.

Mazzarino 1945: S. Mazzarino, *Dalla monarchia allo stato repubblicano*, Catania 1945.

Miles 1995: G.B. Miles, *Livy. Reconstructing Early Rome*, Ithaca–London 1995.

Mineo 2006: B. Mineo, *Tite-Live et l'histoire de Rome*, Paris 2006.

Mitchell 1990: R.E. Mitchell, *Patricians and Plebeians. The Origin of the Roman State*, Ithaca 1990.

———— 2005: R.E. Mitchell, *The Definition of patres and plebs: An End to the Struggle of the Orders*, in: K.A. Raaflaub (ed.), *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders*, 2nd edn., Malden 2005, pp. 128–167 [1st edn. 1986].

Mommsen 1887–1888: Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, vols. I–III, Leipzig 1887–1888.

Néraudau 1979: J.P. Néraudau, *La jeunesse dans la littérature et les institutions de la Rome républicaine*, Paris 1979.

Oakley 1997–2005: S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy, Book VI–X*, vols. I–IV, Oxford 1997–2005.

Ogilvie 1965: R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5*, Oxford 1965.

Pena 1981: M.J. Pena, *La dedicación y el dedicante del templo de Júpiter Capitolino*, Faventia III 1981, pp. 162–168.

Piganiol 1920: A. Piganiol, *Romains et Latins. La légende de Quinctii*, MEFR XXXVIII 1920, pp. 285–316.

Pina Polo 2011: Fr. Pina Polo, *The Consul at Rome: The Civil Functions of the Consuls in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2011.

Pinsent 1975: J. Pinsent, *Military Tribunes and Plebeian Consuls: The Fasti from 444V to 342V*, Stuttgart 1975.

Poma 1990: G. Poma, *Considerazioni sul processo di formazione della tradizione annalistica. Il caso della sedizione militare del 342 a.C.*, in: Eder 1990, pp. 139–157.

Rawson 1985: E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London 1985.

Rich 2005: J. Rich, *Valerius Antias and the Construction of the Roman Past*, BICS XLVIII 2005, pp. 137–161.

Richard 1978: J.-Cl. Richard, *Les origines de la plèbe romaine. Essai sur la formation du dualisme patricio-plébéien*, Rome 1978.

———— 1979: J.-Cl. Richard, *Sur le plebiscite ut liceret consules ambos plebeios creari* (*Tite-Live VII, 42, 2*), Historia XXVIII 1979, pp. 65–75.

———— 1982: J.-Cl. Richard, *Praetor collega consulis est: contribution à l'histoire de la préture*, RPh LVI 1982, pp. 19–31.

———— 1983: J.-Cl. Richard, *Praetor collega consulis est. II: La lex Licinia de sodaliciis et l'exil de M. Valerius Messalla Rufus*, MEFRA XCV 1983, pp. 651–664.

———— 1988: J.-Cl. Richard, *Historiographie et histoire: l'expédition des Fabii à la Crémère*, Latomus XLVII 1988, pp. 526–553 (= Eder 1990, pp. 174–199).

Richardson 2008: J.H. Richardson, *Ancient Historical Thought and the Development of the Consulship*, Latomus LXVII 2008, pp. 327–341, 627–633.

———— 2012: J.H. Richardson, *The Fabii and the Gauls: Studies in Historical Thought and Historiography in Republican Rome*, Stuttgart 2012.

Sánchez 2014: P. Sánchez, *Le fragment de L. Cincius (Festus p. 276 L) et le commandement des armées du Latium*, CCGG XXV 2014, pp. 7–48.

Sandberg 2000: K. Sandberg, *Tribunician and Non-Tribunician Legislation in Mid-Republican Rome*, in: C. Bruun (ed.), *Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400–133 BC*, Rome 2000, pp. 121–140.

———— 2001: K. Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies. A Study of Legislative Practice in Republican Rome*, Rome 2001.

———— 2005: K. Sandberg, *Re-Constructing the Political System of Republican Rome. A Re-Construction of Approach and Methodology*, Arctos XXXIX 2005, pp. 137–157.

Scapini 2011: M. Scapini, *Temi greci e citazioni da Erodoto nelle storie di Roma arcaica*, Nordhausen 2011.

Serrati 2000: J. Serrati, *Garrisons and Grain: Sicily between the Punic Wars*, in: C.J. Smith, J. Serrati (edd.), *Sicily from Aeneas to Augustus: New Approaches in Archaeology and History*, Edinburgh 2000, pp. 115–133.

Simón 2011: F.M. Simón, *The Feriae Latinae as Religious Legitimation of the Consuls' Imperium*, in: Beck *et al.* 2011, 116–132.

Simonelli 2001: A. Simonelli, *Considerazioni sull'origine, la natura e l'evoluzione del pomerium*, Aevum LXXV 2001, pp. 119–162.

Smith 1996: C. Smith, *Early Rome and Latium. Economy and Society c. 1000–500 BC*, Oxford 1996.

———— 2011: C. Smith, *The Magistrates of the Early Roman Republic*, in: Beck *et al.* 2011, pp. 19–40.

———— 2012: C. Smith, *Feriae Latinae*, in: J.R. Brandt, J.W. Iddeng (edd.), *Greek and Roman Festival: Content, Meaning and Practice*, Oxford 2012, pp. 267–288.

Sordi 1960: M. Sordi, *I rapporti romano-ceriti e l'origine della ciuitas sine suffragio*, Roma 1960.

———— 1965: M. Sordi, *Sulla cronologia liviana del IV secolo*, Helikon V 1965, pp. 3–44 (= eadem, *Scritti di storia romana*, Milano 2002, pp. 107–151).

Staveley 1954: E.S. Staveley, *The Conduct of Elections During an Interregnum*, Historia III 1954, pp. 193–211.

———— 1956: E.S. Staveley, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, Historia V 1956, pp. 74–122.

Stewart 1998: R. Stewart, *Public Office in Early Rome: Ritual Procedure and Political Practice*, Ann Arbor 1998.

Tellegen-Couperus 2006: O. Tellegen-Couperus, *Pontiff, praetor, and iurisdictio in the Roman Republic*, Legal History Review LXXIV 2006, pp. 31–44.

Thomson 2006: N. Thomson de Grummond, *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend*, Philadelphia 2006.

Urso 2005: G. Urso, *Cassio Dione e i magistrati: le origini della repubblica nei frammenti della Storia romana*, Milano 2005.

———— 2011: G. Urso, *The Origin of the Consulship in Cassius Dio's Roman History*, in: Beck *et al.* 2011, pp. 41–60.

Valditara 1989: G. Valditara, *Studi sul magister populi: dagli ausiliari militari del rex ai primi magistrati repubblicani*, Milano 1989.

Valgaeren 2012: J.H. Valgaeren, *The Iurisdiction of the Pontiffs at the End of the Fourth Century BC*, in: O. Tellegen-Couperius (ed.), *Law and Religion in the Roman Republic*, Leiden 2012, pp. 107–118.

Verbrugghe 2008: G.P. Verbrugghe, *Eighteenth (duodevicesimus) or Twenty-Second (duoetvicesimus)? Twenty-Second but duovicesimus (Gel. 5.4.1–5 and Non. s.v. duodevicesimo p. 100M*), Mnemosyne LXI 2008, pp. 436–450.

Vervaet 2014: F.J. Vervaet, *The High Command in the Roman Republic. The Principle of the summum imperium auspiciumque from 509 to 19 BCE*, Stuttgart 2014.

Welwei 1993: K.-W. Welwei, *Gefolgschaftsverband oder Gentilaufgebot? Zum Problem eines frührömischen familiare bellum (Liv. II 48, 9)*, ZRG CX 1993, pp. 60–76.

———— 2000: K.-W. Welwei, *Lucius Iunius Brutus – ein fiktiver Revolutionsheld*, in: K.-J. Hölkeskamp, E. Stein-Hölkeskamp (edd.), *Von Romulus zu Augustus. Große Gestalten der römischen Republik*, München 2000, pp. 48–57.

Werner 1963: R. Werner, *Der Beginn der römischen Republik. Historisch-chronologische Untersuchungen über die Anfangszeit der libera res publica*, München–Wien 1963.

Williams 2001: J.H.C. Williams, *Beyond the Rubicon: Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy*, Oxford 2001.
Wiseman 1979: T.P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics. Three Studies in Graeco-Roman Literature*, Leicester 1979.
———— 1995: T.P. Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth*, London 1995.
———— 2008: T.P. Wiseman, *Unwritten Rome*, Exeter 2008.
Woodard 2006: R.D. Woodard, *Indo-European Sacred Space: Vedic and Roman Cult*, Champaign 2006.
Ziółkowski 2016: A. Ziółkowski, *The Servian Enceinte: Should the Debate Continue?*, Palamedes XI 2016, pp. 151–170.

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

GREEK GRAMMARIANS IN THE LIGHT OF EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE*

by

KRYSTYNA STEBNICKA

ABSTRACT: This article offers the most complete and up-to-date catalogue of Greek inscriptions attesting grammarians ("Annex"). It includes several inscriptions more than the otherwise excellent collection by S. Agusta-Boularot. The first part of this contribution consists of a commentary on the collected sources: epigraphic evidence confirms the picture of grammarians as experts on poetry and teachers at different levels of education in gymnasia and schools. The inscriptions depict grammarians as people of low social status and their virtual absence from the public life of the *poleis* (none of them held any important municipal or Imperial office), in contrast to rhetors and sophists.

The Greek grammatical art as practiced by scholars and teachers known under the name of grammarians (*grammatikoi*) is an intellectual discipline that included both grammar and philology as it concerned itself with the study of both language and literature[1]. The scholarly discipline was born in Alexandria in the third century BCE. Eratosthenes of Kyrene, who headed the Library under Ptolemy III Eurgetes (after arriving in Alexandria c. 245) and authored the lost treatise *Ta Grammatika*, was the first to give a definition of the field, surviving in the scholia to the treatise by Dionysios Thrax (2nd cent. BCE): Γραμματικὴ ἐστιν ἕξις παντελὴς ἐν γράμμασι ("Grammar is a system of study based on written texts", with *grammata* according to Eratosthenes being synonymous with *syngrammata*). According to the definition of the famous Dionysios Thrax, on the other hand, grammar is the empirical study (*empeireia*) of what poets and writers are used to saying. This would include reading texts out loud to students (*anagnosis*), the exegesis of poetical texts (*poetikoi tropoi*), *glossai* – that is the explanation of difficult words, *historiai* – the study of the context and historical realities of the text, as well as the etymology of the words, of analogies and

* The following article was prepared thanks to a grant from the De Brzezie Lanckoroński Foundation. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable suggestions, especially for turning my attention to a funerary epigram from Africa.

[1] On detailed aspects of grammar, see Matthaios, Montanari, Rengakos 2011; Montanari, Pagani 2011; Matthaios 2009; articles collected in Matthaios, Montanari, Rengakos 2015.

of repetition in its linguistic system[2]. In Dionysios Thrax's textbook it is primarily poetry that comes under the critical scrutiny of grammarians. The term *grammatikos* replaces *kritikos* (Eratosthenes of Kyrene would still have called himself a critic), while *philologos* took on the meaning of a "learned person" and was not identical in meaning to *grammatikos*[3]. Sextus Empiricus (2nd cent. CE), the author of partially preserved treatises against rhetors, grammarians, geometricians, mathematicians, astrologers and musicians (that is the teachers of *enkyklios paideia*) wrote that the famous grammarian Krates of Mallos, active in Pergamon in the second century BCE, differentiated between "grammarian" and "critic" with the reservation that the critic should have a greater philosophical knowledge of language, while the grammarian should explain words and prosody: the critic would thus be the architect (*architekton*) and the grammarian – the labourer (*hyperetes*)[4].

A systematic theory of language developed over the following centuries with orthography as an important part of grammarian studies starting from the second century BCE[5]. In Rome, *ars grammatica* made its debut in the second century BCE. According to Suetonius its beginnings are associated with Krates of Mallos, sent to Rome by Attalos II, who was forced to extend his stay in the Eternal City after breaking his leg in a Palatine gutter and ended up giving a series of lectures[6]. The first theoretical treatise in Latin was written, however, only in the first century BCE – by Quintilian's master, Remmius Palaemon, under Emperor Claudius. It was this work that served Quintilian when he set out his ideal for the teaching of grammar[7], which had become part of the Roman educational system in the late Republican period. Just as in the Greek system, it was the second stage of education (after elementary education conducted by teachers known in Greek as *grammatistai* or *grammatodidaskaloi*), before rhetorical or specialist training. The study included Greek language and grammar (e.g. the classification and definitions of parts of speech, morphology and also punctuation) as well as the critical analysis of poetry[8].

The intellectual milieu of grammarians is well known from texts in the field of *Techne grammatike* which have survived to this day or were quoted by later

---

[2] On the ancient definition of grammar, see Matthaios 2011; Lallot 2012: 1–20; Wouters, Swiggers 2015.

[3] See Montana 2015: 149.

[4] *Adv. math*. I 79.

[5] Valente 2015.

[6] Suet. *De gramm*. 2, 1 f.

[7] See Ax 2011: 340 f.

[8] On the teaching of grammar in the Graeco-Roman world, see Marrou 1956: 160–175; Bonner 1977: 189–249; Kaster 1988: 12–14; Viljamaa 1993; Cribiore 1996: 52–53; Vössing 1997: 563–574 (on the three stages of education); Wouters 1999: 51–68; Cribiore 2001a: 53–56 and 185–188; Strubbe, Laes 2014: 70–72; Cribiore 2001b.

authors. The grammarians included ancient scholiasts, authors of commentaries on poetry, of lexicons and texbooks on the Greek sentence, on parts of speech, inflection (among surviving treatises are e.g. those on *personalium dualis*, adverbs, cases and the declension of nouns). The field of ancient philology has been well studied (see below). The edition of Greek theoretical treatises on grammar, published at the end of the 19th century, remains fundamental in this field[9]. Alfons Wouters in turn edited all the theoretical grammatical treatises preserved on papyri (dating from the early Empire to late antiquity)[10], and in 2007 published a new papyrus fragment containing parts of a treatise on conjunctions[11]. Robert Kaster's widely-known *Guardians of Language. The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* analyses Latin and Greek grammatical art from the mid-third to the sixth century CE, looking at the practitioners of *ars grammatica* from a socio-cultural perspective, while the second part of the book (pp. 236–440) contains a prosopography of late ancient grammarians. Raffaella Cribiore produced a brief list of grammarians known from papyri[12], but most (aside from Hermione who lived in the first century CE and Asklepiades active in the following century) remain known to Kaster's proposopography. The Brill publishing house has made available on the internet the *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi / Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* (*LGGA*), a source database created and maintained by Franco Montanari, with more than two hundred names of ancient grammarians[13] known from literary sources: it provides biographical information on each Greek scholar in alphabetical order, a bibliography with any editions of works and literature on the subject as well as a set of sources: testimonia and surviving fragments.

It must be emphasised that the *LGGA* database does not include grammarians known exclusively from epigraphic evidence. This information has been partially compiled by Johannes Christes, who collected mentions of Greek grammarians active in the West[14]. A separate article on Latin and Greek grammarians known from inscriptions has been published by Sandrine Agusta-Boularot[15], although her catalogue contains the names of only 18 Greek grammarians, a mere half of the number collected in the Annex below.

The catalogue of Greek grammarians known from Greek epigraphic sources presented below includes 38 names (two of whom were students) from 40

---

[9] G. Uhlig *et al*. (edd.), *Grammatici Graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi*, vols. I–IV, Lipsiae 1867–1910 (reprint Hildesheim 1965).

[10] Wouters 1979.

[11] Swiggers, Wouters 2007.

[12] See Cribiore 1996: 167–169.

[13] The state of the database on 3 July 2018.

[14] Christes 1979: 141–160.

[15] Agusta-Boularot 1994: 653–746; see also Paz de Hoz 2007.

inscriptions (two texts talk of one Euarestos of Oinoanda). Most of the preserved texts are funerary inscriptions (20 examples), with only three honorific inscriptions awarded by municipal institutions and six public honorific inscriptions (one erected *post mortem*). The other inscriptions are of a different type: three are grafitti found in the pharaonic graves of Egyptian Thebes, made by grammarians on tourist trips; grammarians' names are also mentioned on the Ephesian list of *neopoioi*, in ephebic texts and in funerary inscriptions for other individuals.

Two inscriptions come from the second century BCE (**12**; **20**)[16]. One text alone (from Syria) invokes Christianity (**32**; Kaster's prosopography does not include this character), which allows for a dating to late antiquity. The largest number of texts dates of course to the early Empire. The table below sets out the geographical and chronological distribution of the inscriptions:

Territory	Total	2nd cent. BCE or earlier	1st cent. BCE	Roman period (1st–3rd cent. CE)	Later than 3rd cent. CE	Undated
Central Greece	6	-	1	5	-	-
Macedon	2	-	-	2	-	-
Thrace	2	-	-	1	-	1
Islands	5	1	2	2	-	-
West	5	-	-	5	-	-
Asia Minor	12	1	1	8	-	2
Syria	1	-	-	-	1?	-
Egypt and Kyrenaika	5	-	-	2	-	3
Total	38	2	4	25	1	6

Even this small number of preserved inscriptions serves to demonstrate that grammarians (in contrast to rhetors and sophists of the Roman period) were not among the official elites of Greek cities or among the *euergetai*, who would spend their own money on various good deeds for their *poleis*, claiming special honours in return – most often statues erected in the public space, public honorific inscriptions or funerals at the municipal expense – as signs of civic gratitude. None of the grammarians known to us was a priest of the imperial cult, headed the *koinon* of a province or held any important municipal office. Among those mentioned on the collected inscriptions, only Isidoros Nikon (**21**) was in the second or third century CE a member of the Ephesian council and

[16] Numbers in parentheses refer to entries in the catalogue of the inscriptions (see Annex).

belonged to the prestigious collegium of the *neopoioi*, who looked after the sanctuary of Artemis. At Oinoanda, Lucius Iulius Pilius Euarestos (**24**), referred to as φιλόπατρις, funded a sporting agon for all Lycians, *Severeia Euaresteia*, at the beginning of the third century CE, presumably in fully conscious imitation of his forerunner Demosthenes, who in the days of Hadrian also funded an agon at Oinoanda, albeit with artistic disciplines alone[17]. Euarestos, an agonothete for life, added non-sporting competitions (*agon thymelikos*) only when the agon was held for the fifth time (most likely in 242 CE), that is when the games had been held for 16 years. The winner of the Euaresteia received a monetary prize and was honoured with a statue (unfortunately, surviving inscriptions only talk of the winners in sports).

The most important field of grammarian activity as seen in the cities was not then their political and financial engagement in the life of the *poleis*. In decrees and honorific inscriptions (see **1**, **4**, **12**, **27**) it is their teaching and lecturing that is emphasised[18]. The grammarian Serapion (**31**) taught at Tyana in Cappadocia (ll. 1 f.: παιδευτῶν ὄχ' ἄριστος). The funerary inscription in memory of Magnus of Miletoupolis (**28**) says he was "the first to give our children a taste of literature". Hermes (**38)** "explained the letters" – elements of reading and writing – in Thugga in Africa. Some funerary inscriptions show a close relationship between a grammarian and his students. The deceased Myrsinion (**10**) is called the beloved student of Chrestos (ll. 3 f.: θρέμμα ποθεινότατον), presumably a famous teacher at Philippopolis. Dioskourides (**12**) sent his student, the poet Myrinos to Knossos (l. 7: τὸν αὐτοσαυτῶ μαθετάν) to perform a poem by Dioskourides. The grammarian Lysandros who died at Ios (**15**), is called "the grammarian and teacher of Agis" (διδάσκαλος). It may have been Agis who erected the inscription, or it may be that Agis was so well known and respected that teaching him would have brought honour.

The mobility of this circle, clearly visible in the inscriptions and comparable to the mobility of rhetors and sophists of the Second Sophistic, is worthy of close attention. The grammarian Naevianus came to lecture at Delphi all the way from Anazarbos (**6**); it is also at Delphi that we encounter grammarians from Macedon (**5**), Athens (**4**) and Acarnania (**1**). Theodoros of Bithynia (**11**) was educated at Athens but spent his working life teaching at Byzantion, where he died. Magnus of Miletoupolis (**28**) probably travelled to other cities, since his funerary inscription points out that he was admired both by aliens and in the city (l. 4: θαῦμα μέγα ξείνων, θαῦμα μέγα πτόλιος). Publius Tattius Rufus of Tarsos taught in the early Empire in the mountainous region of Zela in the Pontos (**29**). Hermes of Laodikeia (probably in Syria) taught in Africa

[17] Wörrle 1988; see also reviews: Mitchell 1990; Jones 1990.

[18] I disagree with the opinion expressed by Paz de Hoz (2007: 315): "La inscripción de Labraunda [see 27] es *una de las pocas* [my emphasis] en las que se habla de la labor educative".

(**38**). Asklepiodotos of Nikomedia visited the pharaonic tombs at Thebes and may have lectured somewhere in Egypt. The same picture emerges from literary sources – the Alexandrian grammarian Apion (1st cent. CE), known for his anti-Jewish prejudice, took his lectures on Homer all over the Greek East[19].

Epigraphic material also attests to the teaching of grammar spreading across all of the Greek East in the early Empire, as grammar schools were also found outside the major urban centres (see the geographical catalogue in the Annex). Grammar teachers were to be found in small places such as in the region of Zela (**29**), in Thugga (**38**), and in the Cappadocian Tyana (**31**), where Serapion was active in the second-third century CE (his name is suggestive of his Egyptian origins). Of course, starting with the first century CE, the greatest centres of Greek grammarian art were located at Alexandria (which remained the main centre all the way through to the sixth century) and in Rome, which strengthened its position in CE 135 with the foundation by Emperor Hadrian of Athenaeum in imitation of the Alexandrian Museion. In the first century CE we may talk of a great Alexandrian school of grammar, whose leaders at the Museion were, in chronological order, Theon, Apion, Chairemon, Dionysios, Pamphilos and Vestinus. Rhodes was another important centre of the teaching of Greek grammar (inscriptions attest to just two grammarians [**13**; **14**], see for commentary on other famous grammarians of the early Empire). Grammar schools were also known at Athens, but their reputation was overshadowed by the splendour of the local schools of rhetoric and philosophy.

In the East of the early Empire there were also Latin grammarians, *grammatikoi Rhomaikoi*, who in practice simply taught Latin. The only epigraphic text to confirm such teaching is the bilingual funerary inscription from Thyateira – Valerius, son of Valerius (**25**), perhaps an arrival from Italy, was a teacher of Latin grammar. In the Roman system of education, the teacher of Greek operated at the same time as the teacher of Latin (*grammatici Latini* / *grammatici Graeci* are also attested in numerous inscriptions from the West[20]). The teaching of Latin was not, however, very common in the East and did not, in the early imperial period, enter the *curriculum*. Valerius was probably a private teacher (he was buried in a grave with two boys, possibly his students, see commentary). In the West, on the other hand, Greek grammarians tended to be Hellenophonic slaves or freedmen[21]. Five Greek inscriptions document the activities of Greek grammarians in the West (see **15–18**; **38**): in Rome, Massalia, Nuceria (near Salerno) and in Thugga. The grammarian Athenades, son of Dioskourides (both father and son bearing Greek names) taught Latin grammar at Massalia (**19**: γραμματικὸς Ῥωμαικός), the others being teachers of Greek grammar. Didius Taxiarches (**17**;

[19] Sen. *Epist*. 88, 40 = *FGrHist* 616 T 7. On Apion, see van der Horst 2002.

[20] See inscriptions collected in Agusta-Boularot 1994: 661–690.

[21] See Christes 1979 and Agusta-Boularot 1994.

latter half of the first century) was a freedman (possibly of Aulus Didius Gallus), who taught in the home of his students (he taught παῖδες εὐγενεῖς, or "well-born" children of his master). A citizen of Laodikeia served as a Greek teacher for the local community in Thugga (**38**).

It is well known that starting with the Hellenistic period gymnasia would host lectures/ performances (*akroaseis*) by invited guests – musicians, poets, doctors, astronomers and philosophers – frequently held in *akroateria* (auditoria), that is special lecture rooms in gymnasia (such lecture rooms are well known from archaeology e.g. at Pergamon, where a semicircular auditorium with 14 rows was built, or at Ephesos)[22]. Literary and musical education is very well attested in the epigraphic evidence from the Hellenistic period[23], though it is perhaps least illuminating in the case of the education of ephebes[24]. Although in the imperial period intellectual education at the gymnasium is less and less evident from the epigraphic material[25], this fact does not necessarily imply that it was less frequent[26]. The pride of place in the gymnasium of the era was taken by sports, as

[22] Robert 1938: 13–16 and 76; Robert 1937: 79–81.

[23] On education in gymnasia, see Nilsson 1955; Scholz 2004: 103–128; Del Corso 2006: 249–280; Del Corso 2015; Laes, Strubbe 2014: 74 f.; D'Amore 2007: 171–173.

[24] Hin (2007: 155–158) demonstrated that we have few sources attesting to the intellectual formation of this category of youths.

[25] In the epigraphic material from the Roman period, the number of attestations of cultural education at gymnasia drops drastically. Many cities show signs of the continued activity of *paidonomoi*: at Oinoanda in the second century CE, see Wörrle 1988: 4–14; at Mylasa (*paidonomos* Tiberius Tullus, *I. Mylasa* 418); at Termessos, where athletic agons were held (*TAM* III 1, 204); *paidonomos* Dokimos at Iasos (*I. Iasos* 100), c. CE 16?; *paidonomos* Gaius Iulius Capito (*I. Iasos* 99); *paidonomoi* at Miletos: *I. Did.* 94 in the early Roman period; *I. Did.* 296; *I. Did.* 258; *I. Did.* 263; *Milet* I 7, 204: *Milet* I 7, 265; at Ephesos: *SEG* XXXIV 1103. Other attestations of cultural education at gymnasia: at Delphi the Latin rhetor Decimus Iunius performed at the gymnasium, *BCH* LXIII 1939, 168, 696; at Arykanda in the first and second centuries there were the agons of *Hermaia* and *Herakleia* (on the connections of Hermes and Heracles to the gymnasium, see Aneziri, Damaskos 2004: 248–251; the existing literature places too little emphasis on the role of Hermes as the patron of *logoi*, speeches and literature); on Chios in the first century a gymnasium bore the name of *Homereion* (*SEG* XXVI 1021, l. 10: ἐν Ὁμηρείωι γυμνασίωι), which contained a lecture room, *akroaterion* (McCabe, Chios 15, l. 14: τοῦ ἀκροατηρίου τόπωι); at Knidos in the late Hellenistic period we find the teaching of calligraphy, drawing and singing (*SEG* XLIV 902, ll. 7–9); at Dionysopolis in Moesia *hymnodoi neoteroi* honoured Emperor Caracalla (*IGBulg* I 17); at Tabai the *didaskalos* Titus Flavius Sotas taught in the gymnasium under the Empire (J. Robert, L. Robert, *La Carie*, no. 192, l. 15–160); at Herakleia Salbake in the first and second centuries there were boy *hymnodoi*, οἱ ὑμνήσαντες παῖδες (J. Robert, L. Robert, *La Carie*, no. 132, l. 7; no. 135–138, also 143–146 and 194–196); at Laodikeia on the Lykos there were boy *hymnodoi* (*IGR* IV 1587); there was a priest of the Muses at the Kos gymnasium (Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* 178, ll. 2–4: Σῶσος Ἀπολλοθέμιος ἱερα̣τεύσας [Μ]οισᾶν); at Tokra in the first century encomiastic, possibly poetic agons took place at the gymnasium (Reynolds 1996, no. 4, pp. 41 f. – a winner list). See also the catalogue of gymnasium-related terms: Kennell 2006.

[26] On non-athletic education at gymnasia, see Plut. *Qaest. conv.* IX 1, 736 D (geometry, music, rhetoric) and Xen. *Ephes.* I 1, 1 (music); grammar schools were active at the gymnasium of Athens,

confirmed by thousands of Greek inscriptions found all over the East that talk of the athletic training of the young (outside of Athens we have very few epigraphic sources for the military training of ephebes, which does not, however, mean that Greek cities of the Roman period gave up on it[27]). The architecture of the Greek gymnasium in this period also serves to confirm the continuation of its traditional role in education and culture, as seen from the continued existence of lecture rooms – the biggest modification tended to be the modernisation of bathing installations[28].

The activity of grammarians at municipal gymnasia is well attested in the epigraphy[29]. The best-known inscription from Ephesos (**20**) from the second century BCE shows a grammarian teaching at the local gymnasium – Alexandros won a competition for teachers of grammar (see commentary *ad loc.*). Menandros (**1**) came to Delphi from Akarnania to give lectures at the gymnasium in the first century BCE (l. 6: διατιθέμενος σχολάς). An anonymous grammarian was employed by the gymnasiarch Zosimos to teach ephebes (**23**) at Priene in the first century BCE.

The situation in the Roman period was no different: in the first/second century CE the Athenian Lucius Licinius Eukleides taught at the gymnasium at Delphi (**4**). In the first half of the second century CE, a grammarian from Macedon gave lectures at the Delphic gymnasium (**5**), though his name has been lost. Tiberius Claudius Anteros (**27**) taught a group of second-century *neoi* at the gymnasium in Labraunda, and his lectures were also attended by arrivals from other cities. Myrsilos taught grammar at the gymnasium in Tokra in the second/third century CE (**37),** while Demokritos was a musically gifted student of grammar (**9**) at the Lychnidos gymnasium in Macedon in the second century CE.

Grammatical education at gymnasium consisted primarily of the study of Greek poetry and the learning of the Greek language[30]. Inscriptions show that grammarians also taught at the elementary level (*grammatodidaskaloi*) and lectured in other fields. Eukleides (**4**) initially taught a group of *paides* before taking over the education of the *neoi*: "Lucius Licinius Eukleides [---], also Athenian, a grammarian, while residing in our city, previously taught so well and so enthu-

---

see e.g. inscriptions of CE 155–268 mentioning *didaskalaoi*: *IG* II^2 2068, 2097, 2113, 2130, 2193, 2203, 2207, 2208, 2223, 2237, 2239, 2243, 2245, 3751.

[27] Kennell 2010: 184–186.

[28] See Chaniotis 2015; Trümper 2015: 167–221.

[29] The annex does not include the decree of Oropos (*I.Oropos* no. 218; *SEG* XLVII 496), dated to 150–100 BCE, which grants *proxenia* to an intellectual active in the city (the state of the inscription does not allow us to say whether he was a poet, grammarian or philosopher) who was a wonderful teacher of the young; ll. 3–9 indicate that his instruction at the gymnasium applied to both ephebes and *neoteroi*.

[30] It is worth bearing in mind the interpretation of the grafitto of Kyrene by Kaster (1984): the words ζήτημα: τῶν Πριάμου παίδων τίς πατήρ; are interpreted by him as a parody by the students of a grammarian's questions on Homer (e.g. τίς ἦν ὁ τοῦ Ἕκτορος πατήρ;).

siastically the children of the local citizens and in all circumstaces showed similar goodwill, taking over the helm of teaching of young boys (*neoi*)". Tiberius Claudius Anteros (**27**) educated a group of *neoi* "in many different branches of knowledge" (l. 7: ποικίλαι ἐπιστῆμαι): perhaps he conducted preliminary rhetorical instruction (*progymnasmata*), although he may have taught subjects unconnected to the art of a grammarian, e.g. sciences.

An example of the wide intellectual horizons of some grammarians is Mnaseas (**7**) of Korkyra, included among grammarians as an expert on Homer. Mnaseas was also a scholar of astronomy and geometry, his funerary inscription stating that he won great fame (he certainly authored some commentaries and scientific works) without mentioning him as a teacher.

Sometimes it seems to have been up to the gymnasiarch whether he would invite and finance teachers. The aforementioned gymnasiarch Zosimos at Priene paid for a (probably foreign) teacher out of his own coffers (**23**). It is, however, worth noting that the lectures at the gymnasium by Menandros (**1**) were to be financed by the *polis* before he declined his fee (l. 7: διδομένου τε αὐτῶι καὶ ἐράνου ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλιος οὐκ ἐδέξατο). It is worth recalling the petition to the emperors Valerian and Galien (253–260 CE) from the grammarian Lollianos *alias* Homoaios, found at Oxyrhynchos[31]. Lollianos, who refers to himself as a "public grammarian", *demosios grammatikos* (A ll. 5 f.: δημοσίου [γρ]αμ/ματικοῦ τῆς Ὀξυρυγχειτῶν πόλεως), sent his elegant and exceedingly literary complaint – using the optative, no less – (A ll. 8 f.: the emperors are familiar with the Muses and Paideia sits alongside them on the throne), because although he had been appointed to his post by the city council (B ll. 28 f.: ψεφισθεὶς γ(ὰρ) ἐνταῦθα ὑπὸ τ(ῆς) βουλ(ῆς) / δημόσιος γραμματικός), he did not receive any money, only cheap wine and bad grain (A l. 30), leaving him unable to support his family. The grammarian asked for the city to gift him a walled-in grove (B 31, C 61–63), which would apparently give him some income[32]. In parallel to this, Parsons, who first edited the text, invokes *Speech* 31 by Libanios, in which the best-known of the fourth-century rhetors speaks of the financial troubles of his assistants who receive an insufficient stipend from the city and collect only small fees from their students[33]. Libanios asks the council of Antiochia to give them land to help them support themselves.

It is not known whether Lollianos was a teacher at the gymnasium of Oxyrhynchos or at a separate municipal school supported by the city. The former seems more likely, as Lollianos makes no mention of any fees collected from his students as a possible supplement to his (obviously unsatisfactory) income.

---

[31] Parsons 1976 = *P. Oxy*. XLVII 3366.

[32] Parsons (1976: 412 f.) assumes Lollianos's stipend would have been 2,000 drachmas *per annum* and the grove would have brought in c. 2,400 drachmas.

[33] Parsons 1976: 413.

It is certain that grammarians – in common with rhetors and sophists – would have their own schools[34]. In the tax privileges granted by emperors to intellectuals, grammarians would feature alongside rhetors. The teachers of both rhetoric and grammar were relieved of municipal liturgies, additional duties or levies. Vespasian was the first to issue a decree to that effect, and he was also the first emperor to create chairs financed by the state[35] (Quintilian was the head of the imperial chair of Latin rhetoric created by Vespasian). The privileges for philosophers, rhetors, grammarians and doctors were confirmed by Emperor Hadrian, while Antoninus Pius sent a letter to the provincial *koinon* of Asia limiting the numbers of these professionals entitled to such relief: five doctors, three rhetors and three grammarians in small cities; seven doctors, four rhetors and four grammarians in midsized ones and ten doctors, five rhetors and five grammarians in larger cities (philosophers had apparently dropped from the ranks of the privileged)[36]. In Hadrian's time the Alexandrian Museion and the Athenaeum of Rome had publicly financed chairs in grammar. Marcus Aurelius created four chairs in philosophy at Athens (for Platonists, Peripatetics, Stoics and Epicureans) and a chair in rhetoric, but there is no mention of an imperial chair in grammarian studies in the city.

Two grammarians known solely from the epigraphic record enjoyed a release from municipal liturgies. The Ephesian grammarian and council member, Isidoros Nikon (**21**), is referred to as ἀλειτούργητος in the inscription on his swithing of phylai. Similarly relieved from liturgies is the sponsor of an agon, Euarestos of Oinoanda (**24**), γραμματικὸς ἀλειτούργητος.

Inscriptions thus show the grammarians as teachers at gymnasia, guest lecturers and doubtless as school proprietors, just as was the case with rhetors and sophists. It is, however, worth pointing out that these texts also demonstrate the intimate relationship of grammarians with poetry, the branch of literature recognised by grammarians as their special field of study from the Hellenistic period. Rhetors of the period were interested in classical prose, Attic orators and historians in particular, leaving poetry to grammarians. Thus, both for the great theorist

[34] Grammarians would work at private schools of rhetoric as assistants to the rhetor or to the teachers of introductory material. Cribiore (2007: 32–36) rightly questioned the seasoned opinion by Petit that Libanios employed grammarians (refered to by him as *grammatistai*) at his famous school of rhetoric at Antiochia.

[35] See Suet. *Vesp*. 18: only rhetors are mentioned: "primus e fisco Latinis Graecisque rhetoribus annua centena constituit"; see regulation of 75 CE (an inscription found at Pergamon, see McCrum, Woodhead, no. 458), in which Vespasian gave privileges to grammarians, rhetors and doctors (no mention of philosophers) in the cities where they were professionally active: τὸ μὲν τῶν γραμματικῶν καὶ ῥητόρων, / οἳ τὰς τῶν νέων ψυχὰς πρὸς ἡμερότητα καὶ πολιτικὴν / ἀρετὴν παιδεύουσιν, Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Μουσῶν, ... κελεύω μήτε ἐπισταθμεύεσθαι / [αὐτοὺς μήτε εἰ]σορὰς ἀπαιτεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ τρόπωι; a breach of these privileges was to be punished by a fine of 40,000 sesterces.

[36] *Dig*. L 4, 18, 30; *Dig*. XXVII 1, 6, 1 and 8; on the subject, see also Herzog 1935; Parsons 1976: 441–446 (Appendix II: "Imperial Policy and Municipal Education").

Quintilian and for Damaskios the grammarian's proper field of study is language and the explication of poetry[37].

As is known from literary sources, the great grammarians of the early Empire wrote commentaries on poets, not just on Homer and the classical authors, but also on later, Hellenistic poets. To name only the best known of these, Theon of Alexandria authored commentaries on the *Odyssey*, Pindar and Sophocles[38]; and Ptolemaios, active in Augustan Rome, wrote a commentary on Homer[39]. The best known among the grammarians of the period was the aforementioned Apion, the writer of the partially preserved *Homeric Glosses*, who also worked on the poetry of Alkaios[40]. Heraklides the Younger of Pontos (active under Claudius and Nero) wrote Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas of academic dialogues entitled Λέσχαι, as well as a number of epic poems[41]. Soteridas of Epidauros (1st cent. CE) authored commentaries on Menander and Euripides and composed the *Homeric Questions*[42]. Herakleon, active in the Augustan period, wrote commentaries on every book of the Homeric poems as well as a treatise on Homer's use of the imperative[43]. Epaphroditos was a commentator on Homer, also on the *Shield* by Pseudo-Hesiod and on Kallimachos[44]; Lucillus commented on the work of Apollonios of Rhodes[45]; Telephos, the biographer of tragic and comic writers, composed a piece on the rhetoric in Homer and many others[46]. Also worth mentioning is Palamedes, the second-century commentator on Pindar[47]; his contemporary Sophokleios (Sophokles), who wrote on Apollonios of Rhodes[48]; Sporos of Nikaia (c. 200 CE) with his commentary on the *Phainomena* by Aratos[49]; or the commentators on Kallimachos and tragedians, the grammarians Archibios[50]

---

[37] Quint. I 4, 2: "recte loquendi scientiam et poetarum enarrationem"; Phot. 60 (*V. Isid.*) = *Vitae Isidori*, ed. C. Zintzen, Hildesheim 1967, fr. 111: ἡ ἐπὶ ποητῶν ἐξηγήσι καὶ διορθώσει τῆς Ἑλλενικῆς λέξεως καθημένη τέχνη.

[38] Matthaios 2015: 213–215; C. Meliadò, *Theon [1]*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[39] Matthaios 2015: 220; A. Boatti, *Ptolemaeus [3] Aristonici pater (?)*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[40] Matthaios 2015: 221–223.

[41] Matthaios 2015: 224 f.

[42] Matthaios 2015: 226 f.; A. Ippolito, *Soteridas (Soteras)*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[43] Matthaios 2015: 229; A. Ippolito, *Heracleon [1]*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[44] Matthaios 2015: 230.

[45] Matthaios 2015: 232 f.

[46] Matthaios 2015: 237; L. Pagani, *Telephus*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[47] Matthaios 2015: 241.

[48] L. Pagani, *Sophocleus (Sophocles)*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[49] A. Gudeman, *Sporos*, *RE* III A, 2 (1929), coll. 1879–1881.

[50] A. Ippolito, *Archibius [1]*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

and Salustios[51]; and Proteas, a commentator on Homer, originating from the Syrian city of Zeugma (c. 2nd cent. CE)[52].

The epigraphic material thus chimes in with the literary portrayal of the grammarians as poetry cognoscenti. The grammarian's relationship to poetry is underlined by constant references to the Muses. In the student Myrtilos' funerary inscription (**37**), he is named as the "worshipper of the Muses" and a "companion of Herakles", corresponding to grammatical studies and athletic practice at the gymnasium. Serapion (**31**) at the Cappadocian Tyana "taught for the Muses" (παιδεύσας Μούσαις). Nereus (**25**) of Hadrianoi was another, being "the best among the Muses" (τὸν ἐν Μουσαῖσιν ἄριστον). Euarestos (**24**), when adding artistic competitions to the agon he had funded, said that since "he owed his life to the Muses, he should offer gifts to the Muses" (ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐγ Μουσῶν σφέτερον βίον ἀθρύσαντα / ἐχρῆν καὶ Μούσαις δῶρα πορεῖν ἰδίαις), while calling the added non-athletic competitions (including, certainly, poetry) "pleasing to the Muses" (μουσοχαρεῖς). Theodoros (**11**), who died at Byzantion, was "once [*scil.* in life] famous thanks to the Muses" (l. 5: σὺ πάρος Μούσησιν ἐνιπρέψας).

Grammarians could be poets themselves: the gramarian Dioskourides (**12**) wrote an *enkomion* based on Homer (presumably Book XIX of the *Odyssey)*, in praise of Knossos, while his disciple was also described as a poet. Naevianus (**6**) too was both a poet and a grammarian. Well-known poets and grammarians are of course also known from later antiquity[53].

Two people in the catalogue below have been recognised as grammarians (in the literature) on the basis of their knowledge of poetry. Magnus (**28**) of Miletoupolis was "great among the Muses" (τὸν μέγαν ἐν Μούσαισι), a "wonderful expert in the works of Homer" (ἔξοχα ὁμηρείων ἁψάμενον σελίδων) and a teacher – there can be no doubt about including him among grammarians. The inscription for the freedman, Didius Taxiarches, says that this preceptor of well-born children would in life "commune with the Muses" (ζωὸς ἐὼν [Μούσαισιν ὁ]μείλεον); hence his place in the catalogue of grammarians. It is likely that another grammarian (though his name is marked with an asterisk as a sign of uncertainty*) was Mnaseas (**7**) who had an exquisite knowledge of Homeric poetry and probably wrote commentaries on it, while also working in the fields of astronomy and geometry.

It is also worth noting that the relatively modest epigraphic material on grammarians includes many funerary inscriptions in verse (see **7**, **9**, **10**, **11**, **13**, **15**, **17**, **25**, **26**, **28**, **30**, **32**, **37**, **38**; also **6**, the honorific inscription for Naevianus in Delphi). It is also in verse (albeit composed by his brother-in-law) that the grammarian

---

[51] Matthaios 2015: 243 f.; G. Ucciardello, *Sal(l)ustius [2]*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[52] G. Ucciardello, *Proteas*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

[53] See Cribiore 2001a: 55 f.

Euarestos speaks from the base of his bronze statue (**24**), announcing proudly his funding of the addition of artistic competitions to a pre-existing sporting agon.

An exceptionally interesting grammarian is Tiberius Claudius Anteros (**27**). The inscription implies that he had been honoured before (l. 16 mentions ψηφίσματα), by Athens among others. Anteros wrote the local history of his native city, most likely Mylasa (l. 22 f.: διὰ τῶ̣ν / ἐπιχωρίων ἱστοριῶ[ν]). His activity is perhaps to be connected with the creation of the Panhellenion (the inscription was erected after 127 CE), though nothing attests Mylasa's membership of that league of Greek cities (if Louis Robert is right to take Mylasa for Anteros' native city, see commentary). Other grammarians acted only sporadically as local historians. Asklepiades of Myrlea (Apameia) in Bithynia (latter half of the second century – first half of the first century BCE) was not only the author of the works *On Nestor's Cup* and *On Grammarians*, but also of the local history of Bithynia (*FGrHist* 697). The aforementioned Apion of Alexandria won fame as the author of the *Aigyptiaka*, which presented the history and literature of Egypt while also telling the history of the Jews (*FGrHis*t 616). Herennnius Philo of Byblos wrote the *Phoinikika* (*FGrHist* 790 F 9–*11) and the work *On Cities and their Famous Citizens* (*FGrHist* 790 F 15–51), while Seleukos Homerikos – Σύμμικτα, or *Miscellanea* (*FGrHist* 341).

At the end it is fitting to mention the single woman to merit the designation of *grammatikos*: it is unclear whether Hermione (**35**) of Arsinoe (1st cent. CE) was merely an educated woman with a knowledge of literature or actually practiced the art of grammar, e.g. giving lectures at the local gymnasion. The latter possibility cannot be ruled out as public performance by women is well attested elsewhere, e.g. an anonymous female poet adapted Old Comedy pieces and won prizes at agons in numerous cities[54] while Aufria (early 2nd cent. CE) was a rhetor performing at the Pythian games and honoured at Delphi[55].

ANNEX: GREEK GRAMMARIANS IN THE INSCRIPTIONS[56]

Delphi

1. Menandros 1st cent. bce

FD III 3.338; Robert 1938: 42; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 31; *Choix d'inscriptions de Delphes*, no. 191.

---

54 Bosnakis 2004: 99–108; SEG LIV 787; *IG* XII 4, 2, 845, l. 4–7: νεικάσασαν τὰ [--- Σε]/βαστὰ Ὀλύμπια καὶ τὸν ἐν [Περγά]/μωι κοινὸν Ἀσίας καὶ ἄλλους ἱ[ε]/ροὺς ἀγῶνας.

55 *FD* III 4, 79; see *PGRS* no.199.

56 The teachers called *kathegetai* or *didaskaloi* are excluded because of the broad meaning of these terms, including other professionals such as rhetors, philosophers or doctors, see L. Robert, *Collection Froehner*, vol. I: *Inscriptions grecques*, Paris 1936, pp. 56 f.

Honorific decree on the basis of the so-called “prince de Pergame”.

Δελφοὶ ἔδωκαν Μενάνδρωι Δαιδάλου Ἀκαρνᾶνι ἀπὸ Θυρρείου, κατὰ δὲ χρηματισμὸν Κασσωπαίωι, τῶι γραμματικῶι, αὐτῶι καὶ ἐγγόνοις προξενίαν, προμαντείαν, προδικίαν, ἀσυλίαν, ἀτέλειαν, προεδρίαν ἐν πάντοις {τοις} τοῖς ἀγώνοις οἷς ἁ πόλις τίθητι καὶ τἄλλα τίμια πάντα ὅσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις προξένοις καὶ εὐεργέταις τᾶς πόλιος ὑπάρχει· ἐπεὶ παραγενόμενος
5 ἐν Δελφοὺς ἀπαρχὰν ἐποήσατο ἀπὸ τοῦ μαθήματος τῶι θεοῖ καὶ τᾶι πόλει, ἀποκαθήμενος ἐν τῶι γυμνασίωι καὶ διατιθέμενος σχολὰς ἐν αἷς καὶ εὐδοκίμησε, διδομένου τε αὐτῶι καὶ ἐράνου ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλιος οὐκ ἐδέξατο, φάμενος ἐπιδεδαμήκειν ἐν Δελφοὺς τᾶς τε τοῦ θεοῦ τιμᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ τᾶς Δελφῶν καταλογᾶς, ὃν καὶ ἐπὶ πάντοις τούτοις ἔδοξε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰν κοινὰν ἑστίαν καλέσαι· ἐδόθη τε αὐτῷ τὰ προ-
10 γεγραμμένα τίμια. ἄρχοντος Αἰακίδα τοῦ Βαβύλου, βουλευόντων Ὀρθαίου, Θεοξένου, Ἀντιγένεος, Φιλάγρου.

The Delphians granted to Menandros, the son of Daidalos, an Acarnanian of Thyrreion, according to decree a citizen of Kassope, a grammarian, to himself and his descendants, *proxenia*, *promanteia*, *prodike*, *asylia*, *poedria* in all agons organised by the city and all the other honours enjoyed by the *proxenoi* and *euergetai* of our *polis*. Since having come to Delphi he sacrificed his knowledge to the god and the *polis*, settling down at the gymnasium and organising lectures that brought him recognition, and when the city offered him pay, he declined, saying that he had come to Delphi out of worship for the god and respect for the city – for all these reasons it was decided to invite him to the communal feast. He was also awarded the aforementioned honours. When the archon was Aiakides, son of Babylos, the council members were Orthaios, Theoxenos, Antigenes and Philagros.

On artists, rhetors and scholars at Delphi, see BOUVIER 1978 and VAN LIEFFERINGE 2000.

2. ANONYMOUS 1st CENT. CE

FD III 4.61; A. JACQUEMIN, D. LAROCH, *Notes sur trois piliers delphiques*, BCH CVI 1982, p. 214; *SEG* XXXII 545.

Inscription on the column of Paulus Aemilius, CE 1–25.

γραμμ[ι]-
[κός], ἐπιδήμησας

Grammarian came to stay (here)…

The letters γραμμ visible in the first line may, the editors believe, be an abbreviation of γραμματικός. This abbreviation is not attested anywhere else, while the second line does not contain enough space to spell the word in full. Hence JACQUEMIN and LAROCH propose the solution above, while noting the possibility of a reading of [προ]επιδήμησας in the second line. The word γραμμικός is, however, not only unattested, but is also impossible as a form of γραμματικός on linguistic grounds. Hence the best reading is:

γραμμ[α?]
[παρ]επιδήμησας

Grammarian sojourned (here)…

3. ANONYMOUS 2nd–3rd CENT. CE
FD III 2.115; AGUSTA-BOULAROT 1994: no. 32.
Honorific inscription on the architrave of the Treasury of the Athenians.

[----]γραμματ[ικόν, Ἀθηναῖον καὶ ---],
Δελφοὶ πολ[ίτην αὐτῶν καὶ βουλευτὴν]
[ἐποιήσαντο].

The Delphians granted citizenship and council membership [---] to the grammarian, citizen of Athens and [----]

BOUVIER (1985:128) dates this inscription to the early centuries of the Roman Empire.

4. LUCIUS LICINIUS EUKLEIDES 1st–2nd CENT. CE
FD III 4.1, 61; AGUSTA-BOULAROT 1994: no. 33.
Honorific decree on the statue of Paulus Aemilius.

[ἔδοξ]ε τῆι Δελφῶ[ν πόλ]ει, ἐν [προσκλή]τωι ἐ[κ]κλησίαι
[ἐπεὶ Λ]εύκιος Λικί[νιος Εὐ]κλείδ[ης, …….] ὁ καὶ Ἀθηναῖος, γραμμ[ατι]-
[κός, ἐπιδ]ημήσα[ς] <ἐν> τῆ[ι πόλει ἡ]μῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις τῶν ἐ[ν]-
[δ]ημο[ύντων πο]λειτῶν τ[οὺ]ς [παῖδας γράμματα γ]νησίως καὶ προθύμως ἐδί-
5 [δ]αξεν, [καὶ ἐ]ν [πᾶσι και]ροῖς τὴν ὁμ[οίαν αἵρεσιν ἀποδείκ]νυται, προεστὼς
[τῆ]ς τε τῶ[ν ν]έων [προπ]αιδε[ίας, ἄξιον τ]ῆς πρ[ὸς] ἅπαντας καλοκἀγαθίας
[παρέ]χετα[ι ἑαυτὸν καὶ] τῆ[ς πρὸς τὸ]ν θε[ὸν] εὐσεβείας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τ[ὴν]
[πόλιν εὐνοίας· δ]εδό[σθα]ι α[ὐτῶ]ι π[αρὰ τῆς πόλεως]
[πολειτείαν, π]ροδικία[ν], πρ[οεδρί]αν, π[ρομα]ντεί[αν],
10 [ἀτέ]λε[ιαν, ἔνκ]τησ[ιν γῆς καὶ οἰ]κίας, ἀνδριάντο[ς ἀνάσ]-
[τα]σιν, κ[αὶ] τἆλ[λα τείμια πάντα] ὅσα τοῖς καλ[οῖς ἀνδρά]-
[σι] ἔ[θ]ο[ς ἐστὶ δίδοσθαι . ἄρχ]οντος Ἀσ[τοξένου],
[β]ουλευ[όντων …………… καὶ Ἀριστοβ]ούλου.

The *polis* of the Delphians has voted at a special assembly. Lucius Licinius Eukleides [---], also Athenian, a grammarian, while residing in our city, he taught so well and so enthusiastically the children of the local citizens and in all circumstaces showed similar goodwill, taking over the helm of teaching of young boys (*neoi*), showed the greatest goodness in relation to all, piety to the god, and goodwill to the city. It has been decreed by the city to grant him citizenship, *prodike*, *proedria*, *promanteia*, *ateleia*, the right to buy land and a house, the erection of a statue and all the other honours that are due to all good men. Under archon Astoxenos, the council members were [---] and Aristobulos.

Eukleides held the citizenship of an unidentified city and Athens (l. 2).

5. ANONYMOUS EARLY 3rd CENT. CE

FD III 1.465; ROBERT 1938: 17; AGUSTA-BOULAROT 1994: no. 34.

Honorific inscription on a damaged block of stone, 0.36 m x 0.54 m x 0.65 m, the inscription is complete only on the right side, written c. 119 CE.

[------------Δελφοὶ]ὸν σεμνό[τα]-
[τον -- Μακ]εδόνα γραμματικὸν,
[-- ποιή]σαντα παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπι-
[δείξεις καλῶς] καὶ ἀμέμπτως πολεί-
5 [την κα]ὶ βουλευτήν ἐποίησαν
[καὶ αὐτὸν] καὶ ἐκγόνους αὐτοῦ,
[καὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἄ]λλαις τιμαῖς ἐ[τίμη]-
[σαν].

ROBERT l. 3 [ἐπιδημή]σαντα; ll. 3–4: ἐπι/[εικῶς]

The Delphians granted citizenship and council membership to the distinguished [---] of Macedon, the grammarian, who gave them beautiful and unforgettable lectures (ROBERT: who came to live among them fairly, tolerably, moderately and irresistibly), a man of modesty and no flaws, to him and all his descendants all the honours are granted.

6. NAEVIANUS EARLY 3rd CENT. CE

FD III 1.206; AGUSTA-BOULAROT 1994: no. 35.

Honorific inscription found near the eastern part of the Treasury of the Siphnians, 0.45 m x 0.82 m x 0.33 m.

[πο]ιητὴν καὶ γραμματικὸν πολυ[γράμματον ὄντα]
Ναιουιανὸν Δελφοὶ Δελφὸν ἔθεντο [νόμῳ],
πατρίδα Ἀναζαρβὸν δὶς νηοκόρον με ἔχοντα,
σύμμαχον Αὐσονίων, μητρόπολιν Κιλίκων.

The Delphians made a citizen by law me, Naevianus, poet and learned grammarian; my fatherland is Anazarbos, the city twice awarded the title of *neokoros*, ally of the Romans, metropolis of Cilicia.

KASTER (1981) moved the proposed dating of this text from the second to the early third century CE: the city's titles in 199/200 include only νηοκόρος, not νηοκόρος β'; the permission to build the second temple of the imperial cult was granted only in the first decade of the third century.

See also KASTER 1988: 4–7.

Korkyra

7. *MNASEAS 2nd HALF OF I BCE?

IG IX 1, 880.

Funerary inscription in iambic trimeter found in Korkyra (no description).

ὁδῖτα, βαιὸν σάματι σταθεὶς πάρα
μάθοις κεν ἀτρέκειαν. ἴσθι δ’ ὡς πατρὸς
Ἀθηνίωνος ούν ταφῆσι κλῄζεται
καὶ Μνασέαν αὔδασον οὔνομ’ ἄφθιτο[ν],
5 καὶ γνῶθι μύθους οἷς σοφῶς ἐτέρπετο
ἃι μὲν τὰ κόσμου σεμνὰ καὶ δι’ ἀστέρων
δι[ῆλθ]ε τὰν πυρωπὸν αἰθεροδρόμω[ν]
[κέλευθον, ᾇ δὲ] καὶ γεωμόρον τέχναν
γραμμαῖσιν ἰχνεύτειραν· εὖ [δ’ ἀ]είν[α]ọν
10 κατεῖδ’ Ὁμήρου δέλτον, ἃς ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς
ὁ [τρ]ιπλανάτας ἐστὶ Λαρτίου γόνος
καὶ μῆνις ἁ [β]αρ[ε]ῖα· τῶν ἐπ’ ἀτρεκὲς
δα[εὶς] ἁπάντων ἐσθλὸν ἄρατο κλέος·
νέ[ο]ν δ’ ἐν ἀκμᾶι κοῦρον, ὧι πόρεν τέχναν
15 [σ]υνευν[έτιν τ’ ἔλειψε. τε]τρώκοντα δὴ
ὑπ’ ἀλίωι πλειῶνας εἰσιδὼν φάος
ποθεινὸς ἀστοῖς τάνδ’ ὑπήλυθε χθόνα.

Passer-by, stop for a moment by my grave and learn the honest truth. Know that buried here is one known as the son of Athenion, address him by the immortal name of Mnaseas and learn the tales in which he had the wisdom to take pleasure. He contemplated on the one hand the august matters of the universe and on the fiery path that stars tread through the ether; on the other, the art of ground measurement using geometric figures. He knew perfectly the tablets of Homer whose verses contain the wondering Laertid and great anger. After gaining detailed knowledge of all this, he acquired great fame. He left a young son of a good age, whom he left with a great deal of knowledge and a wife. He saw sunlight for a full 40 years, then descended to the underworld mourned by the people of the city.

Mnases, as his poetic funerary inscription shows, worked on astronomy, geometry and commentaries to the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*; he certainly authored works in those fields. It seems he taught these subjects at a grammar school (thus Marrou 1956: 185). On the verb δαείς (l. 13) in the inscription, see Petrain 2014: 58 f. Marcotte (1988) identified the Mnaseas of this inscription with the geometrician of the latter half of the first century BCE, known to Varro and Columella as one of two followers of the Carthaginian Mago, the “father” of the Roman *agrimensores* (cf. Varro *Rust*. I 1, 10; Collum. I 1, 13; XII 4, 2).

Philippi

8. *A. Platorius Hegemonikos 1st–2nd cent. ce

S. Doukata, *Ar. Deltion* LX 2005 [2013], B2, pp. 897 f.; *SEG* LXII 431.

Funerary inscription on a marble plaque, whose upper part was found at Krenides, the nekropolis of Philippi; lines 1 and 4 were written in bigger letters, with a height of 0.135 and 0.105 m.

Α. Πλατώριος Ἡγεμονι-
<κ>ός, Ἐφέσιος σοφιστὴς γραμματικῶν λ[ό]-
γων *vv*. ἐτ(ῶν) *vv*. ΞΕ, *vv*. ἐνθ(άδε) κεῖτ(αι)
Α. Πλατώριος Μύρων ἰδίῳ
π̣ά̣τ̣ρ̣ω̣ν̣ι̣ μ̣ν̣ή̣μ̣η̣ς̣ χ̣ά̣ρ̣ι̣ν̣

Here lies A(ulus) Platorius Hegemonikos of Ephesos, learned in literature (?) / a sophist to make speeches on literature (?). (Died aged) 65 years. A(ulus) Platorius Myron (erected the gravestone) in memory of his patron.

The expression σοφιστὴς γραμματικῶν λόγων could be compared to Sokrates Scholastikos' Ἑλληνικῶν/ Ῥωμαικῶν λόγων διδάσκαλος (*HE* II 46, 2; III 1, 10; IV 9, 4; V 25, 1; see Kaster 1988: 444, no. 116); it seems that the word *sophistes* does not denote a speaker here, but one learned in literature, a grammarian (*SEG*: "Epitaph of the sophist and grammarian"). The tombstone was erected by a freedman of Hegemonikos.

Lychnidos

9. Demokritos 2nd cent. CE

IG X 2, 2, 1, 386; Peek, *GVI* 1901.

Funerary metric inscription on white marble 0.56 m x 0.57 m, written on three sides.

A

[---]ς̣ τρῖς πεντάδας
[---] ❧ | πρόσθε φίλον
[--------Δ]ημόκριτος ❧
[--- δό]μου Δημόκριτος ἐν-
[θάδε κεῖται] Σ γραμματικῆς, ἐμπέ-
[ραμος] δὲ λύρης ❧ |
[……c.14……]ΔΕ[.c.4.]ΙΛ̣Λ̣ΛΙ[---]
[……c.14……]Δ[.c.5.] Ἀννια[---]

B

Ἀννία ὀλβίστη τὸ [πά]-
ρος, τὰ δὲ νῦν ἐλεε[ινὴ] |
μήτηρ Δημοκρίτου πρ̣[ό]-
σθε καταφθιμένου

D

[ἐτ]ῶ̣ν ζʹ(?).

[---] three five-year periods [---] before friend [---] Demokritos [---] of house, Demokritos here lies, [---] in grammar, talented in music [----]. Annia [---]
B. Once happy Annia, now deep in mourning, the mother of Demokritos, who died before her.

Demokritos, deceased at 15, was a student of the grammatical arts. The inscription was erected by his mother, Annia (the father of Demokritos may have been deceased at this point).

Philippopolis

10. CHRESTOS ?

IGBulg III 1, 1021; AGUSTA-BOULAROT 1994: no. 39; PEEK, *GVI* 614; N. SHARANKOV, *Notes on Greek Inscriptions from Bulgaria*, in: *Monuments and Texts in Antiquity and Beyond. Essays for the Centenary of Georgi Mihailov (1915–1991)*, Sofia 2016 (Studia Classica Serdicensia V), pp. 316 f.

Metric funerary inscription on a marble slab 0.53 m x 0.46 m, Thracian equestrian carved in anaglyph.

Μικκὸς Μυρσινίων παῖς
Μυρσίνου, Ἀστακίδου δὲ ❦ |
Χρηστοῦ γραμματικοῦ
ποθεινότατον. ❦

Little Myrsinion, son of Myrsinos, mourned disciple of the grammarian Chrestos of Nikomedia.

AGUSTA-BOULAROT (1994: 697) perversely treated the word Μικκός as a name and παῖς as a "slave", hence her translation: "Mikkos, esclave des Mursinioi, fils le plus désiré du dévoué γραμματικός Astakidès, (esclave?) du Mursinos".

As demonstrated by SHARANKOV, Astakides in l. 2 is not a name but the synonym of Νικομεδεύς (Astakia = Nikomedia), since the latter *ethnikon* could not be used on metrical grounds; the grammarian's name is Chrestos (as already noted by KASTER 1988: 20, n. 25).

The prematurely deceased boy was thus a student at the school of Chrestos of Nicomedia. See also SHARANKOV 2011: 141.

Byzantion

11. THEODOROS II CE

I.Byzantion 120; PEEK, *GVI* 1479; AGUSTA-BOULAROT 1994: no. 47.

Funerary inscription on a marble stele, 1.12 m x 0.91 m, decorated with a relief of a bearded man in a cloak; in his left hand there is presumably a scroll, while in the right corner there is a small servant holding a diptychon.

Θεόδωρος Δομιτίου, φύσι
δὲ Ἐπικράτους, γραμμα-
τικός, ζήσας
ἔτη λϛʹ

Relief
5 καὶ σὺ πάρος Μούσησιν ἐνιπρέψας, Θεόδωρε,
τὴν κοινὴν πάντων ἦλθες ἀταρπ{ιτ}ὸν ἔπι,
πάτρη σοι γένεος Βειθύνιον, ἐν δ᾽ἄρ Ἀθήναις
γραμματικῆς τέχνης οὔνομ᾽ἔδεξο μέγα,
Βύζαντος δὲ πόλει κλέος ἤραο, καί σε θανόντα
10 μήτηρ ὡς λαγόσι θήκατο δεξαμένη.
Λούκουλλος φιλίας τάδε σοι μνημήι ἔγραψεν,
Σῆς γλυκερῆς ψύχης κέντρον ἄπαυστον ἔχων.

Theodoros, son of Domitiusa, natural son of Epikrates, grammarian, lived 36 years. And you, Theodoros, once famous for the Muses, you walked the road common to all. Your native city was Bithynion, you acquired a great name thanks to the grammarian's art in Athens, you won fame in the city of Byzas, and the mother accepted you, as if holding you to her womb. Lucullus in memory of your friendship composed this (poem), holding (in his heart) forever the sweet sting of your soul.

Theodoros came from Klaudiopolis, was educated and perhaps also started his career at Athens, and was then active and headed a school at Byzantion.

Delos

12. Dioskourides — end of 3rd cent. BCE–2nd cent. BCE

Inscriptions de Délos IV 1512; Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae* I 8, Cnossos 12*.

A honorific decree from Knossos found at the temple of the Delphic Apollo, carved on a stele of white marble, 0.6 m x 0.3 m.

ἔδοξεν Κνωσίων τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ τᾶι πόλι. ἐπειδὴ
Διοσκουρίδης Διοσκουρίδου, καθ᾽ ὑοθεσίαν δὲ Ἀσκλη-
πιοδώρου, Ταρσεύς, γραμματικός, διὰ τὴν εὔνοιαν ἅν
ἔχει πορτὶ τὰν ἁμὰν πόλιν συνταξάμενος ἐγκώ-
5 μιον κατὰ τὸν ποιητὰν ὑπὲρ τῶ ἁμῶ ἔθνιος ἀπήστελ-
κε Μυρῖνον Διονυσίου Ἀμισηνόν, ποιητὰν ἐπῶν καὶ με-
λῶν, τὸν αὐτοσαυτῶ μαθετάν, διαθησιόμενον τὰ
πεπραγματευμένα ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶ· ὑπὲρ ὧμ Μυρῖνος πα-
ραγενόμενος παρ᾽ ἁμὲ καὶ ἐπελθὼν ἐπί τε τὸς κόσμος
10 καὶ τὰν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐμφανία κατέστασε διὰ τᾶν ἀκρο-
α[σίω]ν τὰν τῶ ἀνδρὸς φιλοπονίαν τάν τε περὶ τὸ
ἐπιτάδουμα εὐεξίαν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰν εὔνοιαν ἅν
ἔχει πορτὶ τὰν πόλιν, ἀνανεώμενος αὐτ<ὸ>ς τὰν προγο-
νικὰν ἀρετάν, δι᾽ ἐγγράφω ἐπ[έδει]ξε καὶ τοῦτο [πε-]
15 δὰ πλίονος σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτ[ιμί]ας τὸν ἀπολογισ-
μὸν πο{ι}ιόμενος καθὼς ἐπέβαλλ[ε] ὑπὲρ ἰδίω παιδε[υ]-
τᾶ· ἐφ᾽ ὧν καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτᾶν ἀκούσαντεν
τὰ πεπραγματευμένα καὶ τὰν [ὅ]λαν αἵρεσιν τῶ ἀν-
δρὸς ἅν ἔχων τυγχάνει εἰς τὰν ἁμὰν πόλιν ἀπεδέ-
20 ξατο μεγάλως· *vacat* ὁπᾶι ὦν καὶ ἁ πόλις τῶν Κνωσίων
φαίνηται εὐχάριστος ἴονσα καὶ τὸς καλὸς κἀγα-

θὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν *vacat* ἀποδεχομένα καὶ τιμίονσα,
τάς τε καταξίανς χάριτανς ἀποδιδόνσα τοῖς
εὐεργετῆν αὐτὰν προαιριομένοις καὶ φανερὰν
25 καθιστάνσα ἐς πάντας ἀνθρώπος {ος} ἃν ἔχει διά-
λαμψιν ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐνόως διακειμένων πορ
τ' αὐτάν· δεδόχθαι τᾶι πόλει ἐπαινέσαι Διοσκουρί-
δην Διοσκουρίδου, καθ' ὑοθεσίαν δὲ Ἀσκληπι-
οδώρου ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραγματευμένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶ
30 καὶ τᾶι προαιρέσει ἂν ἔχων τυγχάνει ἐς τὰν
ἁμὰν πόλιν· ἦμεν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ πρόξενον
καὶ πολίταν τᾶς ἁμᾶς πόλεος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐσγό-
νος καὶ πεδέχεν θίνων *vacat* καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων
πάντων ὧν καὶ αὐτοὶ Κνώσιοι πεδέχοντι·
35 ἦμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔγκτησιν γᾶς καὶ ο<ἰ>κίας καὶ
ἀσφάλειαν πολέμω καὶ εἰρήνας καὶ καταπλέον-
σι ἐς τὸς Κνωσίων λιμένας καὶ ἐκπλέονσι αὐ-
τοῖς καὶ χρήμασι τοῖς τούτων ἀσυλεὶ καὶ ἀσπον-
δεί· ὁπᾶι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις ἀείμνασ-
40 τος ὑπάρχηι ἁ τᾶς πόλεος ἐκτενὴς προαίρεσις
καὶ φανερὰ ἦι ἁ εὔνοια τοῖς γνησίως καὶ ἐνδόξως
τῶν καλλίστων ἐπιταδουμάτων προεστακόσι
καὶ τ<ὰν> πορτ' αὐτὰν εὔνοιαν αὔξεν προαιριο-
μένοις *vacat* ἀναγράψαι τόδε τὸ ψάφισμα ἐς στάλαν
45 λιθίναν καὶ ἀνθέμεν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τῶ Ἀπέλ-
λωνος τῶ Δελφιδίω· *vacat* αἰτήσαθθαι δὲ καὶ τόπον
Ἀθηναίων τὸνς ἐν Δάλωι κατοικιόντας καὶ θέ-
μεν ἐν τῶι ἱερῶ<ι> τῶ Ἀπέλλωνος λαβόντας τὸν
ἐπιφανέστατον τόπον· γράψαι δὲ περὶ τούτων
50 τὰμ πόλιν πορτὶ Ἀθηναίος τὸς ἐν Δάλοι κατοι-
κιόντας καὶ πορτὶ τὸν Ταρσέ<ω>ν δᾶμον ὑποτά-
ξάντας τὸ ἀντίγραφον τῶδε τῶ ψαφίσματος
αἱρέθη ἐπὶ τᾶς ἀναθέσιος τᾶς στάλας
Μακκιάδων Θαρυμάχω καὶ Λεόντιος Κλυμενίδα.

The officials and the *polis* of the Knossians have voted. Dioskourides, the son of Dioskourides, adopted son of Asklepiodoros, of Tarsos, a grammarian, thanks to his good attitude to our city, having composed an encomion after the Poet on our *ethnos* sent his disciple, Myrsinos, son of Dionysios, of Amisos, an epic and lyrical poet, to recite his compositions. For that reason Myrsinos on his arrival in our city went to the officials [10] and the assembly to demonstrate through his performance his diligence and the perfection of his conduct; similarly on restoring the inherited virtue he showed through writing a good attitude to the city with great assiduity and love for honour, thus demonstrating his teacher's achievements. When the people of the city heard of these deeds, they greatly approved of the man's attitude towards our city.
In order then for the city of the Knossians to show its gratitude by accepting and honouring beautiful and good men, granting them honours worthy of men distinguished as *euergetai* of the city, and making public [**25**] among all men its acceptance of the men who treat the city well, the *polis* voted to praise Dioskurides, son of Dioskourides, by adoption son of Asklepiodoros, for the works he has composed. He and his descendants shall be *proxenoi* and citizens of our *polis*,

and shall partake of all the human and divine matters pertaining to the citizens of Knossos. They shall have the right to buy land and a house, and shall have safe passage of entry and exit through the ports of Knossos in times of peace and of war; they and their property shall be untouchable without a formal treaty.
In order for the next generations [40] to preserve this friendly attitude of the city and to make clear its goodwill towards those who truly and permanently occupy themselves with beautiful things and to those who choose to increase their goodwill towards the city, this decree shall be written on a stone stele and displayed in the temple of the Delphic Apollo. Let the Athenians resident in Delos search for a place and display it in the temple of Apollo, and let it be the most splendid place. The city shall write on this matter to the Athenians resident in Delos and to the people of Tarsos; they shall receive copies of this decree. Makkiadon, son of Tharymachos and Leontios, son of Klymenidas were chosen to erect the stele.

The grammarian Dioskourides, a citizen of Tarsos, composed a poetic encomium on the *ethnos* of Knossos and the city's mythological past κατὰ τὸν ποιητάν (l. 5) – that is using and no doubt developing motifs known from Homer (*Od*. XIX 172 ff.). The epic encomium was performed by his disciple, the poet Myrinos. The text on the stele was displayed at Delos, in the most frequented temple. It cannot be excluded that Myrinos visited Delos.

See also: *FGrHist* 594 T 3; Chaniotis 1988, E 59; Thompson 2007: 124 f.; Clarke 2008: 350–352, Del Corso 2012: 316 f.

Rhodes

13. Anonymous 1st cent. BCE

IG XII 1, 141; Peek, *GVI* 1916.

Epigrammatic inscription on a base of black marble, 0.28 m x 0.475 m.

[γ]ράμ̣μ̣ατ̣᾽ ἐδίδαξεν ἔτεα πεν[τήκ]ον[θ᾽ ὅδε]
δύο τ᾽ ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ εὐσεβῶν [χ]ῶρός [σφ᾽ ἔχει].
Πλούτων γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ Κόρη κα[τ]ώικισ[αν],
Ἑ̣ρμῆς τε καὶ δαιδοῦχος Ἑκάτη̣ προσφ[ιλῆ]
5 [ἅ]πασιν εἶναι μυστικῶν τε [ἐ]πιστά̣[την]
ἔταξαν αὐτὸν πίστεως πά[σ]ης χά̣[ριν].
vacat
αὐτὸς ἐσελθὼν ξεῖνε σαφῶς μά̣θε [πόσσα μαθητῶν]
[π]λήθη τοὺς πολιοὺς στέψαν ἐμοὺ[ς] κ[ροτάφους].

He taught letters for fifty years and another two years, and the land of pious ones (now) holds him back. Pluto and Kore settled him there, Hermes and Hekate the torch-bearer made him – a man beloved by all people – the president of the mysteries due to his honesty in everything. Stranger, once you have visited, learn what a large crowd of students crowned my grey temples.

This anonymous teacher was a schoolmaster and probably taught basic education; his students erected this tombstone for him and composed an epigrammatic inscription. It may be safely assumed that he was a grammarian.

14. Stasilas 1st cent. BCE–1st cent. CE
IG XII 1, 356; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 37.
Round altar decorated with four bucrania, h. 0.57 m x dm 0.49 m.

Στασίλα Ἀφροδεισίου
υἱο[ῦ]
γραμματικοῦ ἀρίστου.

(Grave of) Stasilas, son of Aphrodeisios, the best grammarian.

B. Mygind included both grammarians (**13**; **14**) in the catalogue of Rhodian intellectuals (see Mygind 1999: 265, no. 40; 1999: 266, no. 41). He also suggested that the poet Philonikos (Peek, *GVI* 1001) might have been a grammarian (Mygind 1999: 292, "Index of individuals", p. 292), but this remains at least doubtful. Philonikos, in a poem from around 100 BCE, presents himself as a "trustworthy assessor of laws" selected by his native city (l. 5), a speaker before the people (l. 6), a scholar and worshipper of the Muses (ll. 7 f.). Most probably he was a rhetor.

The city of Rhodes has a long tradition of grammarian schools starting in the Hellenistic period. Dionysios Thrax taught here in the second century BCE (Strab. XIV 2, 13), in the following century it was Aristodemos, son of the grammarian Menekrates of Nysa in Caria, the disciple of Aristarchos of Samos; see P. Ascheri, *Aristodemus [3]*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018). His brother, Sostratos, was also a grammarian, the probable author of the poem on Teiresias's sex changes. Their cousin, Aristodemos, yet another grammarian, was the master of Cn. Pompeius' sons at Rome before returning in his old age to Nysa, where Strabo heard his lectures (XIV 1, 48), see P. Ascheri, *Aristodemus [2]*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

On grammarians by the name of Aristodemos see also Heath 1998: 23–56, in particular pp. 23 f. and 33–36.

Strabo also speaks of his contemporary grammarian Aristokles, identified with Aristokles of Rhodes; see M. Corradi, *Aristocles*, in: *LGGA* (consulted online on 3 July 2018).

The list of Rhodian grammarians includes Timachidas of Rhodes (2nd/1st cent. BCE), a commentator on Aristophanes and Menander, the author of *Deipna* and a collection of *Glossai* (on Timachidas, see F. Montana, *Timachidas*, in: *LGGA*, consulted online on 3 July 2018). He is to be identified with Timachidas, son of Agesitimos, known from the so-called *Chronicle of the Temple of Lindos* (*FGrHist* 532; Higbie 2003; col. I, l. 12). Timachidas and Tharsagoras were selected in 99 BCE "to inscribe from the letters and from the public records and from other evidence whatever may be fitting about the offerings and the visible presence of the goddess" (col. I, ll. 6–8; transl. by Higbie 2003: 19).

Ios

15. Lysandros 2nd/3rd cent. CE

IG XII 5, 20; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 36.

Funerary inscription (description of material missing).

Λύσανδρος
Ξένωνος
γραμματικός.
διδάσκαλε
Ἄγιδος
χαῖρε.

Lysandros, son of Xenon, grammarian. Farewell, teacher of Agis!

At Naxos an inscription was found with a similar formula: Θεοδότη, Θαργηλίδος διδάσκαλε, χαῖρε (*IG* XII 5, 20). It seems that Theodotos was a teacher at an elementary level.

Rome

16. Lupus 2nd–3rd cent. CE

IGUR III 1261; Christes 1979: 151; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 13.

Funerary inscription on a marble stele, 1.63 m x 0.81 m.

Λούπῳ γραμ-
ματικῷ πατρί,
Διονυσίᾳ μητρί,
Βήρῳ υἱῷ.
πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητρὶ
καὶ υἱεῖ χώσατο τύμβον
Ῥουφεῖνα στυγερῷ
μεμψαμένη Θ̣α̣[ν]ά̣τῳ.

For father Lupus the grammarian, for mother Dionysia, for son Verus. For (her) beloved father, mother and son Rufina erected this grave, blaming hateful death.

The deceased grammarian's wife bore a Greek name, while the rest of the family had Latin names.

Lupus was presumably a teacher of Greek grammar (it is not said that he was a Latin grammarian), which is perhaps why his daughter decided on an inscription in Greek.

17. Didius Taxiarches 2nd half of 1st cent. CE

CIL VI 16843; *IG* XIV 1537; *IGUR* III 1189; Peek, *GVI* 1326; Christes 1979: 154.

Funerary epitaph on a column found near Rome.

D(is) M(anibus).
Didio · Taxiarche · lib(erto) · fidelissimo
τυτθὸν ἐμὸν παρὰ τύμβον · ἐπεὶ · μόλες, ὦ ξένε, βαιὸν
  στῆσον ἴχνος · παύροις γράμμασιν εἰσορόων ·
ζωὸς ἐὼν [Μούσαισιν ὁ]μείλεον, ἐν δέ τε παίδων
  εὐγενέων ἱερῆς ·ἦρξα · διδασκαλίης ·
καὶ δὴ καλεύμην Ταξιάρχης ἐν βροτοῖς ·
  οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἑξαμέτροις {ιν} ἥρμοσε {ν} τοὔνομ' · ἐμόν.

To Di Manes.
For Didius Taxiarches, the most loyal freedman.
Stranger, as you walk by my little grave, stop to look at the small letters: in life I communed with the Muses, I would start the divine education of well-born children. Among mortals I was known as Taxiarches, my name does not fit the hexameter.

The teaching and stress on his relationship with the Muses indicated that he was a grammarian, a Greek freedman who worked as a private teacher at the house of the Didii rather than at a public school. It cannot be ruled out that Taxiarches was the preceptor at the house of Aulus Didius Gallus, the best known representative of the family, who in 45/46 attacked Mithridates, the king of the Pontos, fought under Claudius in Britain and served as the proconsul of Asia or Africa in 49–52 CE (*PIR*² III 70).

Nuceria (Italia)

18. [---]OMACHOS 2nd CENT. CE

M. KAJAVA, M. MAGALHAES, *Un' iscrizione greca inedita di Nuceria*, Apollo XX 2004, pp. 3–10; *SEG* LIV 960.

Funerary inscription on a damaged marble slab, c. 0.31 m x 0.3–0.37 m.

[---]όμαχος · γραμματ[ικός - (?) -]
[-- -]ωνι τῶι θε[ί]ῳι συνέζησεν [- (?) -]
[---] ἐν δὲ Νο[υκ]ερίαι θεοκτίστ[ωι - (?) -]
[---]Η ἐπαίδε[υε?] ἐπαίδε[υσε?]· νῦν δ' ἀπὸ βί[ου - (?) -]
5 [- οὐδὲ]ν ἐνθάδ' ὕ[στερ]ον ἀλλὰ γῆ κ[αὶ - (?) -]
[---]CEΩN ἵδρ[υτα]ι γὰρ ὁ πρέσβ[υς - (?) -]
[---]. · χρηστή, χαῖρε

[---]omachos grammarian, [---]lived with his uncle [---] in Nuceria founded by the god [----] taught, now [departed ---?] this life nothing here afterwards but the earth and [---]has his place an old man [---] farewell, good [man]!

The proposed reading γραμματ[ικός in line 1 (instead of γραμματ[εύς) seems certainly right on account of ἐπαίδε[υσε in line 4. Line 2 may be understood as "lived with his uncle" meaning he was adopted by his uncle (as suggested by *SEG*);

maybe, however, the lacuna after συνέζησεν contained the name of the deceased grammarian's wife. Lines 5 and 6 refer to human fate after death. The grammarian known solely from this inscription bore a Greek name and undoubtedly taught Greek grammar (as indicated by absence of the word Ῥωμαικός).

Massalia

19. Athenades — Roman period

IG XIV 2434; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 30, undated.

Funerary inscription on a marble slab, 0.18 m x 0.21 m.

Ἀθηνάδης
Διοσκουρίδου
γραμματικὸς
Ῥωμαικός.

Athenades, son of Dioskourides, Latin grammarian.

Marseille, a centre of culture and education which was also famous in the west for its Greek learning, had grammar schools (on Massalia as an educational centre, see Tac. *Agr.* 4, 2). It is interesting that Athenades, a Greek, taught Latin grammar.

Ephesos

20. Alexandros — 188–160 BCE

I.Ephesos 1101

Prefaced by a dedication to Hermes, Heracles and Eumenes II, then a list of winners of competitions at the gymnasium; a block of bluish marble, 0.25 m x 0.5 m, ll. 5–8.

[--------τοῖς]
5 [ν]εικήσασι τῶν παιδευτῶν τεῖ ἀποδείξει καὶ τῶ[ν παίδων τοῖς]
[ἀθλ]ήμασιν· παιδοτρίβων Θεόδοτος Ἀπολλωνίδο[υ, γραμματικῶν]
[Ἀλέ]ξανδρος Ἐπικράτου, ζωγράφων Σωτικὸς Ἱερο[---]
[μου]σικῶν Τιμόστρατος Μενεστράτου
(A list of winners in the group of neoi and presbyteroi in athletic competitions follows.)

To the winners in the performance of the teachers and the competition among the boys: among sport teachers Theodotos, son of Apollonides, among [grammarians] Alexandros, son of Epikrates, among painters Sotikos son of Hiero[---], among musicians Timostratos son of Menestratos.

The reading γραμματικῶν in line 6 seems certain, although it is impossible to completely rule out μαθηματικῶν. In my opinion *apodeixis ton paideuton*

refers to the employment of the teachers at the gymnasium: before being hired, the candidates would present their skills during a public performance, with the winner finding employment. Other texts make no mention of competitions among teachers.

21. Isidoros Nikon 2nd half of 2nd cent. ce–early 3rd cent. ce

I.Ephesos 956A; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 44.

A list of *neopoioi*, a marble slab with two inscriptions, found on the so-called Curetes Street.

Εἰσίδωρος Εἰσιδώρου τοῦ [---]
μου Νείκων χι(λιαστὺν) Ἰουλιεὺς [γραμ]-
ματικὸς ἀλειτούργητος [βουλευ]-
τής· οὗτος ὢν ἐκ τῆς Εὐ[ωνύμων]
φυλῆς εἰς ταύτην [μετέβη.]

Isidoros, son of Isidoros, grandson of [---], Nikon *chiliastys* Ioulieus, a grammarian with immunity from liturgies, a council member; he belonged to the *phyle* of the Euonymes and [switched] to this one.

The *phylai* of Ephesos (of the Bembianoi, Epheseis, Euonymoi, Karenaioi, Tekoi, and the *phylai* of the Sebaste, Hadriane and Antoniane) were further subdivided (see Engelman 1996 with detailed tables of the division of *phylai* into smaller units). Engelman (1996: 100) suggests that Isidoros may have belonged to the *phyle* of the Sebaste, then joined the *phyle* of the Euonymes, only to return to the former.

Neopoioi in the imperial period were a body elected by the assembly to look after the property of the temple of Artemis at Ephesos. *Neopoioi* also took part in the granting of citizenship of the city, see Rogers 1997: 47.

The grammarian Isidoros ran a school and was thus released from liturgies.

Smyrna

22. Gaius Iulius Mousonios 1st cent. ce

I.Smyrna 652; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 40; Ph.A. Harland, *Greco-Roman Associations. Texts, Translations and Commentary*, vol. II: *North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*, Berlin 2014, no. 137, pp. 302–308.

Honorific inscription on a marble base, 1.04 m x 0.34 m.

ἀγαθῆι τύχη[ι·]
ἡ ἱερὰ σύνοδο̣[ς]
τῶν Βρεισέω̣[ν]
ἐτείμησεν
5 Γ(άϊον) Ἰούλ(ιον)
Χειρίσοφο[ν]

Γ(αΐου) Ἰουλ(ίου) Μουσω[νίου]
γραμματικ[οῦ]
υἱόν,
10 ἀγωνοθετή[σαντα]
φιλοτείμ[ως.]

To good fortune! The sacred association of the Breisians [those who worship Dionysos Breisos] has honoured Gaius Iulius Cheirisophos, who had generously performed *agonothesia*, the son of the grammarian Gaius Iulius Mousonios.

The inscription is among the earliest sources for the existence of the association of Dionysos Breisos (also known as Breseus, Bresaios, Bresagenes) at Smyrna (on this epithet of Dionysos, see Harland).

S. Agusta-Boularot holds an unfounded view that the grammarian mentioned in the text was a freedman or a descendant of a freedman, but it is likely that an ancestor of Mousonios received Roman citizenship. The family held a significant fortune since the grammarian's son as *agonothetes* was able to cover the costs of a festival.

Priene

23. Anonymous 1st cent. BCE
I.Priene I 68.
Honorific inscription for gymnasiarch Aulus Aemilius Zosimos, after 84 BCE.
Col. XXIV, ll. 74 f.:

ἔτι δὲ σφαίρας καὶ ὅπλα καὶ τὸν ἐπιστά[την τὸ]ν̣ τῶ̣ν̣ ἐφήβω̣ν̣
τοῖς ἐκ φιλολογίας γραμματικόν

And (he provided) also boxing gloves and armour, and a grammarian, the overseer of the ephebes for studies (flowing) from philology.

Aulus Aemilius Zosimos (see eg. Quass 1993: 294; Schmitz 1997: 108 f.) was honoured in three inscriptions for changes in the organisation of the gymnasium and numerous acts of his *euergesia*: he made bathing free, provided oil and hired teachers. He hired a grammarian at his own expense, presumably an outsider, to take care of the literary education of the ephebes, as well as organising literary agons (*I.Priene* 70, 27–29: ἔθηκεν δὲ καὶ ἁμίλλης ἀγῶνας τῶν τε ἐκ φιλολ[ο]γί/ας μαθημάτων καὶ γυμνικῆς ἐνεργείας).

Oinoanda (Lycia)

24. Lucius Iulius Pilius Euarestos Severan period

a) A. Hall, N. Milner, *Education and Athletics. Documents Illustrating the Festivals of Oenoanda*, in: D. French (ed.), *Studies in the History and Topography of Lycia and Pisidia in Memoriam A.S. Hall*, Ankara 1994, no. 18(a).

Honorific inscription on the base of a statue, 0.46 m x 0.65 m.

Ἰούλιον Λούκιον Πείλιον Εὐάρεσ-
τον, φιλόπατριν γραμματικὸν ἀ-
λειτούργητον καὶ μεγαλόφρονα ἀ-
γωνοθέτην διὰ βίου ἰδίας δωρεᾶς ἧς
5 αὐτὸς συνεστήσατο ἐξ ἰδίων χρη-
μάτων εἰς πάντα τὸν αἰῶνα, πανηγύ-
ρεως πέμπτης κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αὐ-
τοῦ διαταγὴν καὶ τὴν τῆς βουλῆς καὶ
τοῦ δήμου κρίσιν, ἡ πατρίς.

The fatherland (honoured) Iulius Pilius Euarestos, a patriotic grammarian with immunity from liturgies and generous *agonothetes* for life of his own foundation which he funded out of his own money forever, during the fifth festival, in accord with his instruction and by decree of the council and the people.

(b) HALL, MILNER, *op. cit.*, no. 10.
Post-mortem honorific inscription (epigram in ll. 16–19) on the base of a statue, 1.26 m x 0.68.

[Λ. Πειλ]ίου Εὐαρέ[στου].
[Ἰού]λιον Λούκιον Πείλιον Εὐ-
[άρε]στον, γραμματικὸν ἀλει-
[τ]ούργητον, ἐπὶ ἤθει καὶ κοσ-
5 [μ]ιότητι βίου ἐπαινετόν, φιλό-
[πα]τριν, ἐξ ἰδίας δωρεᾶς καὶ φι-
[λ]οτειμίας πρῶτον τῶν ἐν
τῇ πατρίδι συνστησάμενον
ἀγῶνα κοινὸν Λυκίων θέμι-
10 δος πενταετηρικῆς ἔκ τε ἀν-
δριάντων καὶ θεμάτων, ποιη-
σάμενον δὲ καὶ ἐπιδόσεις
χρημάτων εἴς τε νομὰς καὶ
τέρψεις πανηγυριακὰς ἡ πα-
15 τρὶς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου κρίσει.
ὣς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανὼν ἀπολεῖς
⟦ΣΕΙΣ⟧ κλέος, ἀλλὰ μέγ' οἴσεις / ἄ-
φθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων
ὄνομα. /

(Statue) of Lucius Pilius Euarestos.
The fatherland by decree of the council and the people (honoured) Lucius Pilius Euarestos the grammarian with immunity from liturgies, praiseworthy on account of his habits and righteous life, loving his fatherland, who was the first in his native city to establish a pentaeteric agon for all Lycians out of his own generosity with the prize being money and statues; he also gave money for distribution at the agon and for the pleasures of the festival.
Your fame shall not pass even after death, your name shall forever be known among men.

Pilius Euarestos funded an agon at his native Oinoanda, *Severeia Euaresteia*, open to all Lycians, of which he was the agonothete for life. The first agon was probably held in 222, then in 226, 230, 234, 238 and 242. When the agon was held for the sixth time, Euarestos was dead. A long poem is preserved on the base of Euarestos's statue, written by his brother-in-law, Fronton, presumably the same person as P. Sthenius Fronton, the winner at pankration (Hall, Milner, *op. cit*., no. 18[b]; Merkelbach, Stauber, *SGO* IV 17/06/02). In the poem Euarestos proclaimes that he "earned his living from the Muses" (l. 4: [ἀ]λλὰ τὸν ἐγ Μουσῶν σφέτερον βίον ἀθρύς<α>ντ[α], i.e. he was a professional grammarian who taught most probably in the local gymnasium) and that he added non-athletic competitions to his foundation because it was necessary "to give the presents for his own Muses" (l. 5: [ἐ̣]χρῆν καὶ Μούσαις δῶρα πορεῖν ἰδίαις). When the agon was held for the fifth time, it included both athletic (*gymnikos*) and artistic (*thymelikos*) competitions.

In addition to the inscriptons above, Euarestos is mentioned as the agonothete and founder of his agon in inscriptions erected by the winners of the athletic competitions, pankration and boxing, both boys and men (see Hall, Milner, *op. cit*., nos. 1, 2, 3, 5–7, 11–15).

See also van Nijf 2004: 203–208.

Hadrianoi

25. Nereus ?

I. von Hadrianoi und Hadrianeia 173; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 41.

Funerary epigram on a stele 0.5 m x 0.4 m.

[γρ]αμματικὸν Νη-
[ρ]ῆ̣α τὸν ἐν Μουσαῖ-
[σ]ιν ἄριστον | Νηρηῒς
θυγάτηρ καὶ Πασικρά-
5 τεια σύνẹυνος | ἔθα-
ψαν ἐνὶ πατρῇ πολ-
λὰ ὀλοφυρόμεναι

The best in (the realm of) the Muses, the grammarian Nereus was buried in his fatherland by his daughter Nereis and wife Pasikrateia shedding tears and lamenting.

Thyateira

26. Valerius ?

TAM V 2, 1119; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 43; Merkelbach, Stauber, *SGO* I 04/05/08.

Bilingual funerary inscription, from l. 7 Latin hexameter, description of material missing.

Ξένωνι ἐτ(ῶν) [.]ʹ
καὶ Πρείμῳ ἐτ(ῶν) εʹ
τοῖς τέκνοις
καὶ Οὐαλερίῳ Οὐα-
5 λερίου γραμματικῷ
Ῥωμαϊκῷ ἐτ(ῶν) κγ̣ʹ.
vota supervacua fletusque et numina divum
naturae leges fatorumque ar<g>uit ordo.
sprevisti patrem matremque, miserrime nate,
Elysios campos habitans et prata veatum.

For Xenon, aged [--] and Primus, aged 5, the children, and Valerius, son of Valerius, the Latin grammarian, (who lived) 23 years.
(Lat.) The will of gods, the laws of nature and the course of fortune have overcome superfluous begging and laments. Miserable son, you have left behind your mother and father, you are now living in the Elysian fields and meadows of the blessed.

This bilingual inscription presents a difficulty in interpreting the familial connections of the people mentioned: the poem talks of a child who died leaving both parents alive, which rules Valerius out as the father of the deceased children, of whom one bears a Greek and the other a Latin name (Agusta-Boularot thinks that Valerius was the preceptor of the boys, *magister litterarum Romanarum*, brought up in a Romanised Greek family). It is worth adding that the poem may express a generalised reflection about death.

Valerius is the only teacher of Latin grammar in the east of the Roman empire known from Greek epigraphy.

Labraunda

27. Tiberius Claudius Anteros 2nd cent. CE

J. Crampa, *Labraunda: Swedish Excavations and Researches*, vol. III: *The Greek Inscriptions*, Lund 1969, no. 66; *BE* 1973, 414; Chaniotis 1988: no. 25; August-Boularot 1994: no. 42.

Honorific inscription on a stele found to the north-east of the temple of Zeus Labruandos, 1.115 m x 0.35 m.

[….c.12…. δ]ῆ̣μος κ[αὶ]
ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγ]ου βουλὴ κ[αὶ]
[ἡ βουλὴ τ]ῶ̣ν φʹ καὶ ὁ δῆμ[ος]
ὁ τῶ]ν̣ Ἀθηναίων Τι(βέριον) Κ[λ(αύδιον)]
Ἀν̣τέρωτα γραμματικὸν̣
5 ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ παι-
δεύσεως νέων ἐπὶ

ποικίλας ἐπιστήμας̣
εἰς μέγα τῶν πολλῶ[ν]
ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ προαχθέ[ν]-
10 των πολιτῶν [τε]
καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς
ξένης πολλα[χό]-
[[θ]]εν αὐτῶι σχο-
λασάντων, ὡς
15 καὶ τὰ παρ’ ἕκαστ̣[α]
ψηφίσματα κατὰ̣
τὴν ἀξίαν αὐτῶ[ι]
μεμαρτύρηκεν,
καὶ ὅτι τὰ τῆς πα-
20 τρίδος καλὰ εἰς μ[έ]-
σους τοὺς Ἕλληνα̣[ς]
προήγαγεν διὰ τῶν̣
ἐπιχωρίων ἱστοριῶ[ν]
[ἐ]ν̣δοξότερα ε<ἶ>ναι

Robert l. 1: [Μυλασέων ὁ δ]ῆμος]

[---] the people and the Areopagos council and the council of 500 and the people of Athens have honoured Tiberius Claudius Anteros, the grammarian, on account of his virtue and education of the young (*neoi*) in many disciplines of knowledge, to a great extent because numerous citizens were taught by him and foreigners were coming from everywhere to listen to his lectures, and every decree for him brings testimony to his reputation. (He was also honoured) because he made the greatness of his fatherland known to the Greeks thanks to (his) local history, so that it became even more admirable.

The inscription was carved after CE 127 when Athens reinstituted the Council of 500. Ti. Claudius Anteros was honoured multiple times by various cities in Asia Minor and by Athens. The preserved stele was most likely erected by Mylasa and it is the history of this *polis*, Hellenised from only the fourth century BCE, that the grammarian Anteros published. Chaniotis believes Anteros wrote his work in connection with the city’s efforts to win admission to the Panhellenion (and thus possibly with an increase in interest in the city’s history in the second century CE). Anteros is described as the man responsible for the formation of the local elite (προαχθέντων πολιτῶν), who was able to attract foreigners to the city with his lectures and who taught the youth at the gymnasium. It seems that in addition to grammar he may have taught the basics of rhetoric or of science since ποικίλαι ἐπιστῆμαι is referenced (l. 7).

Miletoupolis

28. Magnus — 2nd cent. CE

I.Kyzikos 515; Peek, *GVI* 1182.

Funerary relief (0.61 m x 0.69 m) of two busts above a metric inscription, currently damaged. In the middle of the inscription there is a relief of the deceased man with a servant and a woman, his wife, sitting opposite.

τὸν μέγαν ἐν Μούσαισι, τὸν ἐν σοφίῃ κλυτὸν ἄνδρα |
ἔξοχα ὁμηρείων ἁψάμενον σελίδων, |
μηνύω παριοῦσι σοφὴ λίθος, εὐκλέα Μάγνον, |
θαῦμα μέγα ξείνων, θαῦμα μέγα πτόλιος, |

5	εὐσεβίης μέγα	**R**		ἀλλά, φίλοι
	τέκμαρ Ἰωνίδος	**E**		μνήσασθε
	ἥ μ’ ἐφ’ ὁμεύνου |	**L**		καὶ ἐν φθιμέ-
	σήματι σὺν κού-	**I**		ν[οι]σι γεραιοῦ, |
	ρῳ θήκατο Μη-	**E**	15	πρῶτος ὃς ὑμε-
10	τροβίωι· |	**F**		τέρους υἷας
				γεῦσε λόγων. |

I, a wise stone, tell the passers-by of the famous Magnus, great in (the realm of) the Muses, a man known for wisdom, an exquisite expert on the works of Homer, greatly admired both by foreigners and in the city. [I am] a sign of the piety of Ionis, who erected me with her son Metrobios on the grave of her husband. But, friends, remember the old man even among the dead, as he was the first to give your sons a taste for literature (*logoi*).

Magnus was a teacher at Miletoupolis who led a school, perhaps the first in the city (see ll. 15–17). Kaster (1988: 445, 3a) notes that Magnus’ expertise in poetry and the Homeric poems points to a grammarian.

Pontos: Zela

29. Publius Tattius Rufus — Imperial Period

Studia Pontica III 276; Agusta-Boularot 1994: no. 45.
A stele of white marble, 0.75 m x 0.42 m.

Πόπλιος Τάττιος Ῥοῦφος
Ταρσεὺς γραμματικὸς
χαῖρε.

Publius Tattius Rufus, of Tarsos, grammarian. Farewell!

The inscription was found in the mountaineous area between Zel and Tokat. A grammarian of Tarsos probably had a school in this remote area and taught basic education.

Pontos: Sebastopolis

30. Maximus — 2nd–3rd cent. CE

PEEK, *GVI* 1184; B. Le GUEN-POLLET, *Sébastopolis du Pont*, EA XIII 1989, no. 13; T.B. MITFORD, *Inscriptiones Ponticae – Sebastopolis*, ZPE LXXXVII 1991, no. 27; AGUSTA-BOULAROT 1994: no. 46.

Metric funerary inscription on a limestone stele, 1.40 m x 0.4 m.

γαῖά με τίκτεν ἄφω[ν]-
ον ἐν οὔρεσιν παρθέν[ο]-
ν ἁγνήν, / ἡσύχιον τ[ὸ π]-
άροιθεν, νῦν αὖ λαλέ[ου]-
5 σαν ἅπασιν, / σμιλιγλ[ύ]-
[φ]οις τέχνῃσιν κῆρ’ ε[ἰ]-
[π]οῦσα θανόντος·/
ἐνθάδε Μάξιμον γραμ-
ματικῆς ἐπιίστορα τέχν-
10 ης, / ἀνέρα σεμνόν, γῆ [μ]-
ήτηρ ἐκάλυψε θανόντ[α] /
[χαίρετε δ’ ὦ πάροδοι],
γνόντος δὴ τέρμα β[ίοιο].

PEEK l. 13: γνόντες

I, an immaculate virgin, was born mute by the earth in the mountains, previously quiet, but now speaking to all, I pronounce by the art of the chisel the fate of the deceased: here mother earth has hidden the deceased Maximos, a venerable man practiced in the grammarian’s art. [Farewell, passers-by], knowing the end of life.

MITFORD assumes that Maximus taught grammar at the local gymnasium.

Tyana

31. SERAPION 2nd–3rd CENT. CE

G. JACOPI, *Esplorazioni e studi in Paflagonia e Cappadocia. Relazione sulla seconda campagna esplorativa, Agosto–Ottobre 1936*, Roma 1937, no. 22 (*non vidi*); PEEK, *GVI* 381.

Funerary epigram.

παιδευτῶν
ὄχ’ ἄριστος Σε-
ραπίων ἐνθά-
δε κεῖμαι, /
παιδεύσας Μού-
σαις τοὺς Τυα-
νῶν λογίους. /

I rest here, Serapion, not the best of teachers; for the Muses I taught the learned Tyaneans.

Serapion was a teacher of grammar, as shown by the reference to the Muses (see J. ROBERT, L. ROBERT, *BE* 1939, 447; KASTER 1988: 445, 3b). He bore a name

popular in Egypt, and perhaps he came to Tyana with lectures on poetry. It is worth noting the expression παιδεύσας τοὺς Τυανῶν λογίους, meaning he did not teach at the gymnasium, but spoke to people described as *logioi*, that is people of a certain intellectual standing.

Syria: Murduk

32. ALEXANDROS 4th CENT. CE?

W. EWING, *Greek and Other Inscriptions Collected in the Hauran*, Palestine Exploration Quarterly XXVII 1895, p. 269, no. 129; SARTRE-FAURIAT (2001: II 162, n. 325) advertises the publication of the inscription in the forthcoming volume of *IGLS* XVI 1, no. 12.

"Cartouche à queues d'aronde", found in the linteaux on the façade of the grave, metric inscription.

τοῦτον Ἀλέξανδρ[ος Θεοδώρου τύμβον ἔτευξεν]
γραμματικός τε μέγα[ς καὶ ---]
οὐκ ἔθελων κεῖσθα[ι χωρὶς πατρίδος τε φίλων τε]
οἱ Χριστὸν σωτῆρ[α γενέσθαι --------]

Alexandros, son [of Theodoros, erected] this [grave], great grammarian [and ---], not wanting to rest [without his country and friends], who Christ the saviour [---]

EWING's restorations seem problematic. It is certain the grammarian's name was Alexandros and that he was a Christian scholar. KASTER makes no mention of Alexandros in his proposopography of late ancient grammarians.

SARTRE-FAURIAT (1998 and 2001: II 199–203) emphasises the attraction of the Hellenic culture at the Hauran (funerary texts feature strong reference to Homer, but also to Kallimachos and Pindar; there are also clear analogies to the poems of the Palatine Anthology). It is thus unsurprising to find a grammarian teaching Greek literature in this area.

Generally on Greek culture and grammar in Roman Syria, see REY-COQUAIS 1997.

Egypt

33. ASKLEPIODOTOS ?

BAILLET 1926: no. 1739, undated text.

Grafitto in the royal graves at Thebes, letters 1 cm high, text 23 cm wide.

εἶδον Ἀσκληπιόδοτος
Νικομηδεὺς, γραμμα-
τικός, καὶ ἐθαύμασα.

I saw (it), Asklepiodotos of Nikomedia, a grammarian, and I admired.

We know a six-verse epigram signed by Asklepiodotos, a poet and procurator (l. 1: Ἀσκληπιοδότου, l. 8: ποιητοῦ · ἐπιτρόπου), carved on the statue of Memnon (see A. Bernand, E. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon*, Le Caire 1960, no. 62, text undated). The identification of the individuals is, however, uncertain.

34. Diokles ?

Baillet 1926: no. 1187, undated text.

Grafitto in the royal graves at Thebes, letters 1.5 cm high, text 6 cm wide.

Διοκ[λῆς]
γραμ|μα|τι|κὸς
ἔ|θαύ|μα|σα

I, Diokles, grammarian, admired (it).

In other graffiti from the royal tombs at Thebes (nos. 1542, 1611, 1721, 1735) a Cynic philosopher by the same name appears (Διοκλῆς κύων); his identification with the grammarian is doubtful.

35. Hermione 1st half of 1st cent. CE

SB I 5753; inscription by the face of the portrait on flax, wrapped around the mummy of a young woman, aged c. 25, found at Fayum at the cemetery at Hawar, currently at Girton College, Cambridge.

Ἑρμιόνη γραμματική

Hermione, she-grammarian.

Hermione probably lived at Arsinoe (given that the tomb was found in the Arsinoe nome). It is unknown whether γραμματική describes her profession as a teacher or her education; see e.g. Morgan 1998: 155, n. 11; Montserrat 1997: 223–226; Cribiore 2001a: 79 (see also her chapter on "Women Teachers", pp. 78–82). Dated to the second–fourth century CE, a Latin inscription from Africa (see Agusta-Boularos, Bousbaa 1994) erected for a "grammarian" Volusia Tertullina, who died aged 43 years, 3 months and 5 days ("Volusiae Tertullinae maritae castae et incomparabili grammat(icae)") suggests women undertook the profession of grammarian. Editors of the inscription from Africa point out that the family included "Volusius Iunior gramaticus Latinus" (*CIL* VIII 21107).

36. Paniskos ?

Baillet 1926: no. 426, undated text.

Grafitto in the royal graves at Thebes, letters 3 cm high, text 23 cm wide.

Πανίσκος
γραμματικὸς
ἱστόρησεν

I, Paniskos, grammarian, saw (it).

The name of Paniskos was popular in Egypt, so the grammarian most likely came to admire the royal tombs from another part of Egypt.

Kyrenaika: Tocra

37. Myrtilos 2nd/3rd cent. ce

J.M. Reynolds, *Ephebic Inscriptions at Tocra and Tolmeita in Cyrenaica*, Libya Antiqua II 1996, no. 2, p. 40.

Funerary metric inscription on a limestone slab, found at the local gymnasium, 1.65 m x 0.45 m x 0.08 m.

Μουσάων θεράποντα καὶ Ἡρακλῆος ἑταῖρον
Μυρτίλον ἡδ᾽εὐνὴ λαινέη κατέχει
ὧι κανόνες τε πόδες τε διηνεκέως ἐμέλησαν
πενταέθλων μελέτης γραμματικῆ[ς---]

This stone bed conceals Myrtilos, a worshipper of the Muses and companion of Herakles, who ceaselessly occupied himself with the rules and feet of pentathlon, with grammar? […]

Chamoux (2000) restores in l. 4 γράμ[μ]ατι κη[δομένῳ] instead of γραμματικῆ[ς---] and translates ll. 3 and 4 as follows: "Il n'a pas cessé de donner tous ses soins aux règles et aux pieds en consacrant un poème à la pratique du pentathle". Chamoux assumed that Myrtilos was a gymnastic teacher who composed this refined epitaph. Since in l. 1 there is a clear reference to the Muses and Herakles corresponding to grammatical studies and athletic training in gymnasia, the interpretation that Mytrtilos was a student is certainly more probable.

Africa: Thugga

38. Hermes 2nd–3rd cent. ce?

M. de Vos, C. Pepe, *A New Funerary Epigram of a Syrian Migrant Near Thugga (Africa Proconsularis), Tunisian Tell*, ZPE CXCIV 2015, pp. 73–79.

Funerary metric inscription on a limestone altar, 0.9 m x 0.34 m x 0.32 m, found near Thugga (Tokai/Toukka) 100 km to the south-east of Carthage.

Ἑρμῆς ἦα πάρος, ὅτ᾽ ἐπὶ χθονὸς ἦα μετ᾽ ἀνδρῶν.
Λαοδικεὺς μὲν ἔφυν, Θουγγῇ δ᾽ ἐνὶ γράμματ᾽ ἔδειξα.

νῦν δέ με τεθνιῶτα χυτὴ περὶ γαῖα ἐκάλυψεν.
ἡμίσεας γενεὰς πέντη' εἶδον φωτὸς ὑπ' αὐγαῖς.

I was Hermes when I was once on earth among the people. I was born at Laodicea, at Thugga I explained the letters. But now being dead the heaped-up earth has covered me. I saw five half generations under the rays of the sun.

(transl. by the editors)

The editors assume that Hermes probably came from Laodikeia in Syria because "the Syrian migrants in Northern Africa outnumber by far the Asian ones" (p. 76). As the editors emphasise, the language of this epigram echoes the Homeric tradition (l. 1: ἦα πάρος; l. 3 is reminiscent of *Il*. VI 464; l. 4: φωτὸς ὑπ' αὐγαῖς, is inspired by *Od*. XI 498; *Il*. XVIII 61; *Od*. IV 540). The epitaph could have been composed by the deceased in his lifetime. It is very probable that Hermes was a grammarian who in a small village in Africa "explained the letters" i.e. his teaching was limited to elementary reading and writing in Greek (cf. 13, l. 1: γράμ̣μ̣ατ' ἐδίδαξεν). However, maybe the expression γράμματ' ἔδειξα means "I explained the books (= literature)"?

One cannot exclude the possibility that public schools existed at Thugga, but it is also possible that Hermes instructed private students (on teaching activities in the city, see the commentary of the editors, pp. 76 f.; on teaching Greek in Africa, see Vössing 1997: 176–178).

University of Warsaw

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LGGA: F. Montanari, F. Montana, L. Pagani (edd.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, BrillOnline.

PGRS: P. Janiszewski, K. Stebnicka, E. Szabat, *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 2015.

Agusta-Boularot 1994: S. Agusta-Boularot, *Les références épigraphiques aux grammatici et γραμματικοὶ de l'Empire romain (Ier siècle av. J.-C. – IVe siècle ap. J.-C)*, MEFRA CVI 1994, pp. 653–746.

Agusta-Boularot, Bousbaa 1994: S. Agusta-Boularot, M. Bousbaa, *Une inscription inédite de Cherchell (Algérie): Volusia Tertullina grammat(ica)*, L'Africa Romana XI 1994, pp. 162–181.

Aneziri, Damaskos 2014: S. Aneziri, D. Damaskos, *Städtische Kulte im hellenistischen Gymnasium*, in: Kah, Scholz 2004, pp. 247–271.

Ax 2011: W. Ax, *Quintilian's "Grammar" (Inst. 1.4–8)*, in: Matthaios, Montanari, Rengakos 2011, pp. 331–346.

Baillet 1926: J. Baillet, *Inscriptions grecques et latines des tombeaux des rois ou Syringes à Thèbes*, Le Caire 1926.

Bonner 1977: S. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, London 1977.

Bosnakis 2004: D. Bosnakis, *Zwei Dichterinnen aus Kos*, in: K. Höghmar (ed.), *The Hellenistic Polis of Kos. State, Economy, Culture*, Uppsala 2004, pp. 99–108.

Bouvier 1978: H. Bouvier, *Honneurs et récompenses* à *Delphes*, ZPE XXX 1978, pp. 101–118.

CHAMOUX 2000: F. CHAMOUX, *Sur une épigramme de Tocra*, in: L. DUBOIS, E. MASSON (edd.), *Philokypros. Mélanges de philologie et d'antiquités grecques et proche-orientales dédiés à la mémoire d'Olivier Masson*, Salamanca 2000 (Suplementos a Minos 16), pp. 109–114.

CHANIOTIS 1988: A. CHANIOTIS, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften*: *Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie*, Stuttgart 1988 (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 4).

———— 2015: A. CHANIOTIS, *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasion in Aphrodisias*, in: SCHOLZ, WIEGAND 2015, pp. 111–132.

CHRISTES 1979: J. CHRISTES, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom*, Wiesbaden 1979.

CLARKE 2008: K. CLARKE, *Making Time for the Past. Local History and the Polis*, Oxford 2008.

CRIBIORE 1996: R. CRIBIORE, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta 1996.

———— 2001a: R. CRIBIORE, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton 2001.

———— 2001b: R. CRIBIORE, *The Grammarian's Choice: The Popularity of Euripides' Phoenissa in Hellenistic and Roman Education*, in: Y. LEE TOO (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden 2001, pp. 241–259.

———— 2007: R. CRIBIORE, *The School of Libanius in Antique Antioch*, Princeton 2007.

D'AMORE 2007: L. D'AMORE, *Ginnasio e difesa civica nella poleis d'Asia Minore (IV–I sec. a.C.)*, REA CIX 2007, pp. 147–173.

DEL CORSO 2006: L. DEL CORSO, *Scuola e società nel mondo greco in età ellenistica: la testimonianza delle iscrizioni*, QS LXIII 2006, pp. 249–280.

———— 2007: L. DEL CORSO, *Le pratiche scolastiche nelle testimonianze epigrafiche di età ellenistica*, in: FERNÁNDEZ DELGADO, PORDOMINGO, STRAMAGLIA 2007, pp. 141–190.

——— 2012: L. DEL CORSO, *Philologoi e grammatikoi nelle testimonianze epigrafiche di età ellenistica. Appunti sparsi*, in: P. FIORETTI (ed.), *Storie di cultura scritta*, Spoleto 2012, pp. 311–324.

DIGNAS 2002: B. DIGNAS, *"Inventories" or "Offering Lists"?*, ZPE CXXXVIII 2002, pp. 234–244.

ENGELMAN 1996: H. ENGELMAN, *Phylen und Chyliasten von Ephesos*, ZPE CXIII 1996, pp. 94–100.

FERNÁNDEZ DELGADO, PORDOMINGO, STRAMAGLIA 2007: J.A. FERNÁNDEZ DELGADO, F. PORDOMINGO, A. STRAMAGLIA (edd.), *Escuela y literatura en Grecia Antiqua: actas del simposio internacional Universidad de Salamanca, 17–19 noviembre de 2004*, Casino 2007.

HEATH 1998: M. HEATH, *Was Homer a Roman?*, PLLS X 1998, pp. 23–56.

HIGBIE 2003: C. HIGBIE, *Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past*, Oxford 2003.

HERZOG 1935: R. HERZOG, *Urkunden zur Hochschulpolitik der römischen Kaiser*, Berlin 1935 (Sitzungsber. der Preuss. Akad. der Wissen., Phil.-hist. Klasse 1935, 32).

HIN 2007: S. HIN, *Class and Society in the Cities of the Greek East. Education during the Ephebeia*, AncSoc XXXVII 2007, pp. 141–166.

VAN DER HORST 2002: P.W. VAN DER HORST, *Who was Apion?*, in: IDEM, *Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Studies on Jewish Hellenism in Antiquity*, Leuven 2002, pp. 207–221.

JONES 1990: C.P. JONES, *A New Lycian Dossier Establishing an Artistic Contest and Festival in the Reign of Hadrian*, JRA III 1990, pp. 484–488.

KAH, SCHOLZ 2004: G. KAH, P. SCHOLZ (edd.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin–New York 2004.

KASTER 1981: R. KASTER, *The Date of FD III 1.206*, ZPE LI 1981, pp. 131 f.

———— 1984: R. KASTER, *A Schoolboy's Burlesque from Cyrene?*, Mnemosyne XXXVII 1984, pp. 457 f.

———— 1988: R. KASTER, *Guardians of Language. The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkley–London 1988.

KENNELL 2006: N.M. KENNEL, *Ephebeia. A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Hildesheim 2006 (Nikephoros Beihefte 12).

———— 2010: N.M. KENNEL, *The Greek Ephebate in Roman Period*, in: Z. PAPAKONSTANTINOU (ed.), *Sport in the Cultures of the Ancient World*, London–New York 2010, pp. 175–194.

LAES 2007: Ch. LAES, *School-teachers in the Roman Empire: A Survey of the Epigraphical Evidence*, AClass L 2007, pp. 109–127.

LAES, STRUBBE 2014: Ch. LAES, J. STRUBBE, *Youth in the Roman Empire. The Young and the Restless Years?*, Cambridge 2014 [originally published in Dutch, Amsterdam 2007].

LALLOT 2012: J. LALLOT, *Études sur la grammaire alexandrine*, Paris 2012.

VAN LIEFFERINGE 2000: C. VAN LIEFFERINGE, *Auditions et conférences à Delphes*, AntClass LXIX 2000, pp. 149–164.

MARCOTTE 1988: D. MARCOTTE, *Origines punique de la topographie romaine*, in: E. LIPIŃSKI (ed.), *Studia Phoenicia VI. Carthago*, Leuven 1988, pp. 239–244.

MARROU 1956: H.I. MARROU, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, transl. by G. LAMB, New York 1956.

MATTHAIOS 2009: S. MATTHAIOS, *Aristarch, Dionysios Thrax und die Τέχνη γραμματική*, in: E. KARAMALENGOU, E. MAKRYGIANNI (edd.), *Ἀντιφίλησις. Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Literature and Culture in Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou*, Stuttgart 2009, pp. 386–400.

———— 2011: S. MATTHAIOS, *Eratosthenes of Cyrene: Readings of his "Grammar" Definition*, in: MATTHAIOS, MONTANARI, RENGAKOS 2011, pp. 55–85.

———— 2015: S. MATTHAIOS, *Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity*, in: MATTHAIOS, MONTANARI, RENGAKOS 2015, vol. I, pp. 184–296.

MATTHAIOS, MONTANARI, RENGAKOS 2011: S. MATTHAIOS, F. MONTANARI, A. RENGAKOS (edd.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, Berlin–New York 2011.

———— 2015: S. MATTHAIOS, F. MONTANARI, A. RENGAKOS (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Scholarship*, vols. I–II, Leiden–Boston 2015.

MCCRUM, WOODHEAD 1961: M. MCCRUM, A.G. WOODHEAD, *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperor Including the Year of Revolution, A.D. 68–96*, Cambridge 1961.

MITCHELL 1990: S. MITCHELL, *Festivals, Games and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor*, JRS LXXX 1990, pp. 183–193.

MONTANARI, PAGANI 2011: F. MONTANARI, L. PAGANI (edd.), *From Scholars to Scholia. Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Berlin–New York 2011.

MONTSERRAT 1997: D. MONTSERRAT, *Heron "Bearer of Philosophia" and Hermione "Grammatike"*, JEA XXXIII 1997, pp. 223–226.

MORGAN 1998: T. MORGAN, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge 1998.

MYGIND 1999: B. MYGIND, *Intellectuals in Rhodes*, in: V. GABRIELSEN *et al.* (edd.), *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, Aarhus 1999, pp. 247–293.

VAN NIJF 2004: O. VAN NIJF, *Athletics and Paideia: Festivals and Physical Education in the World of the Second Sophistic*, in: B.E. BORG, *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin–New York 2004, pp. 203–227.

NILSSON 1955: M.P. NILSSON, *Die hellenistische Schule*, München 1955.

PARSONS 1976: P.J. Parsons, *The Grammarians' Complaint*, in: A.E. HANSON (ed.), *Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts Published in Honor of H.C. Youtie*, Bonn 1976, vol. II, pp. 409–446.

PAZ DE HOZ 2007: M. PAZ DE HOZ, *Testimonios epigráficos sobre la educación griega de época imperial*, in: FERNÁNDEZ DELGADO, PORDOMINGO, STRAMAGLIA 2007, pp. 307–332.

PETRAIN 2014: D. PETRAIN, *Homer in Stone: The "Tabulae Iliacae" in their Roman Context*, Cambridge 2014.

QUASS 1993: F. QUASS, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart 1993.

REY-COQUAIS 1997: J.P. REY-COQUAIS, *La culture en Syrie à l'époque romaine*, Electrum I 1997, pp. 139–160.

ROBERT 1937: L. ROBERT, *Études anatolienes*, Paris 1937.

———— 1938: L. ROBERT, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris 1938.

Rogers 1997: G. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City*, London 1997.

Sartre-Fauriat 1998: A. Sartre-Fauriat, *Culture et societé dans le Hauran (Syrie du sud) du IIIe au Ve siècles d'après les épitaphes métriques*, Syria LXXV 1998, pp. 213–224.

———— 2001: A. Sartre-Fauriat, *Des tombeaux et des morts: monuments funéraires, société et culture en Syrie du Sud du Ier s. av. J.-C. au VIIe s. apr. J.-C.*, Beyrouth 2001, vols. I–II.

Schmitz 1997: Th. Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht: zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik*, München 1997.

Scholz 2004: P. Scholz, *Elementarunterricht und intellektuelle Bildung im hellenistischen Gymnasion*, in: Kah, Scholz 2004, pp. 103–128.

Scholz, Wiegand 2015: P. Scholz, D. Wiegand (edd.), *Das kaisarzeitliche Gymnasion*, Berlin 2015.

Sharankov 2011: N. Sharankov, *Language and Society in Roman Thrace*, in: I.P. Haynes (ed.), *Early Roman Thrace. New Evidence from Bulgaria*, Portsmouth 2011 (Journal of Roman Archaeology, Suppl. 82), pp. 135–155.

Swiggers, Wouters 2007: P. Swiggers, A. Wouters, *El gramático en acción: una aproximación a la labor didáctica del γραμματικός, a partir de un testimonio inédito (P. Berol. Inv. 9917)*, in: Fernández Delgado, Pordomingo, Stramaglia 2007, pp. 191–204.

Thompson 2007: D.J. Thompson, *Education and Culture in Hellenistic Egypt and Beyond*, in: Fernández Delgado, Pordomingo, Stramaglia 2007, pp. 121–140.

Trümper 2015: M. Trümper, *Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period: Case Studies Pergamon, Miletus, and Priene*, in: Scholz, Wiegand 2015, pp. 167–221.

Valente 2015: S. Valente, *Ortography*, in: Matthaios, Montanari, Rengakos 2015, vol. II, pp. 949–977.

Viljamaa 1993: T. Viljamaa, *The Grammarian and his Authority in the Society of the Roman Empire*, in: S. Jäkel (ed.), *Power and Spirit*, Turku 1993 (Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, B 199), pp. 87–97.

Vössing 1997: K. Vössing, *Schule und Bildung im Nordafrika der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Bruxelles 1997 (Collection Latomus 238).

Wörrle 1988: M. Wörrle**,** *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*, München 1988.

Wouters 1979: A. Wouters, *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman. Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the "Ars Grammatica" in Antiquity*, Brussel 1979.

———— 1999: A. Wouters, *La grammaire grecque dans l'école antique d'après les papirus*, in: L. Basset, F. Biville (edd.), *Actes du XXXIe Congrès International de l 'A.P.L.A.E.S.*, Lyon 1999, pp. 51–68.

Wouters, Swiggers 2015: A. Wouters, P. Swiggers, *Definitions of Grammar*, in: Matthaios, Montanari, Rengakos 2015, vol. I, pp. 513–544.

M I S C E L L A N E A

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

HYMNI HOMERICI: FRAGMENTA *HYMNI IN BACCHUM* 13–16

scripsit

CONRADUS KOKOSZKIEWICZ

In *Hymnorum Homericorum* editione Appeliana (W. Appel, *Hymny homeryckie*, Toruń 2001, p. 32) versus 13–16 hymni in Bacchum (*fr. h. Bacch.* 13–16) sic impressi sunt:

ἦ καὶ κυανέῃσιν ἐπ᾽ ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων·
ἀμβρόσιαι δ᾽ ἄρα χαῖται ἐπερρώσαντο ἄνακτος
15 κρατὸς ἀπ᾽ ἀθανάτοιο, μέγαν δ᾽ ἐλέλιξεν Ὄλυμπον.
[ὣς εἰπὼν ἐκέλευσε καρήατι μητίετα Ζεύς.]

In nota in versum 16 (p. 320) scriptum sic est: „Zachowany w rękopisach w. 16 jest najwyraźniej alternatywny w stosunku do ww. 13–15" (quod est: "Versus 16, libris manu scriptis traditus, locum versuum 13–15 videlicet tenere potest"). Nec quicquam inibi amplius, sed hanc esse causam eum versum e textu Appeliano expellendi facilis est coniectura.

Interpretes Oxonienses, qui alioquin nihil in textu delent, haec scripserunt in commentario ad locum (*Hymni Homerici*, edd. T.W. Allen, W.R. Halliday, E.E. Sikes, Oxford 1936, p. 106):

> Alternatives, 13–15 and 16, have been proposed, but the similarity largely depends on the alteration of ἐκέλευσε (16) into ἐπένευσε. For the dative with κελεύειν cf. Ψ642 Ω326 μάστιγι κέλευεν. In ἐπ᾽ ὀφρύσι νεῦσε we have a tmesis for ἐπένευσεν ὀφρύσι.

Quod est ferme:

> Versus 13–15 et versum 16 esse inter se disiunctivos erat propositum, sed utrorumque similitudo pendet plerumque a reposito verbo ἐπένευσε pro illo ἐκέλευσε (16). De dativo ad κελεύειν confer [Homeri *Iliados*] Ψ642 Ω326 μάστιγι κέλευεν. In illo ἐπ᾽ ὀφρύσι νεῦσε habemus tmesin pro ἐπένευσεν ὀφρύσι.

In his hoc imprimis videtur animadvertendum mutuam horum versuum similitudinem ab illo ἐπένευσε pendere re vera, ut scriptum est, "plerumque"; quia non solum. Non est enim praetereundum illo ἦ καὶ (quod est "dixit et") in versu 13 illoque ὣς εἰπὼν (quod est "sic locutus") in versu 16 cum iis, quae utrubique sequantur, eadem comprehendi, scil. Iovem dixisse et annuisse. Quod procul dubio bis est in his quattuor versibus dictum.

Nunc ad illud ἐκέλευσε. Versus utrosque, si pro illo librorum ἐκέλευσε reposuerimus ἐπένευσε, inter se etiam similiores futuros verum est. Nec tamen haec RUHNKENII coniectura facta videtur sine quadam ratione: nempe illud ἐκέλευσε καρήατι (quod est "imperavit vertice" sive "capite") mirum ante omnia videtur genus loquendi. Interpretes Oxonienses attulerunt quidem nonnihil, et in commentario suo et in apparatu critico ad locum, ex *Iliados* vicesimo tertio et vicesimo quarto, in quibus exemplis verbum illud quod est κελεύειν dativum gubernat instrumentalem; sed, ut ipsi advertunt, quae in loco utroque legimus haec sunt: μάστιγι κέλευε(ν), quod est "imperabat flagello", scil. iumentis. Sic vero dici omnino videtur naturale, nam flagellum illud nil est aliud nisi instrumentum gubernandi; longe aliter vertex sive caput, proinde illo ἐκέλευσε καρήατι viso et lecto nescio quid miramur, nam non capite imperari exspectamus, sed saltem capitis nutu. Nil ergo locus uterque ex *Iliade* allatus proficit ad lectionem libri, quae est ἐκέλευσε, defendendam. Atque ubi sic dicatur, ut quis imperet non nutu capitis sed capite ipso, omnino non invenio.

E contrario illud quod RUHNKENIUS coniecit, scil. ἐπένευσε καρήατι ("annuit capite"), praeterquam quod omni videtur vitio carere, etiam in aliis locis legi potest, scil. *Iliados* quinto decimo (Hom. *Il.* XV 75): ὥς οἱ ὑπέστην πρῶτον, ἐμῷ δ' ἐπένευσα κάρητι, et in *Hymno in Cererem* bis (169 et 466): ἐπένευσε καρή(α)τι. Et ILGEN (*Hymni Homerici cum reliquis carminibus minoribus Homero tribui solitis...*, ed. C.D. ILGEN, Halis Saxonum 1796, p. 668) verbum a scriba mutatum esse sentit orationis variandae causa post illud ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε in versu 13. Nec talis error, ut librarius pro eo quod est ἐπένευσε sive calami sive mentis lapsu scripserit ἐκέλευσε, omnino excidere non posse videtur etiam nolenti verbis ambobus tam consimilibus. Quam ob rem coniecturam RUHNKENII non puto esse e vestigio abiciendam.

His, credo, rebus adductus WEST (M.L. WEST, *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*, Cambridge, MA 2003 [Loeb Classical Library], pp. 30 sq.), non iam videlicet dubitans hos versus esse disiunctivos, legit ἐπένευσε et sic ait: "The text in M incorporates two alternative endings to the hymn; the first looks the more authentic". Hoc est: "Textus libri M continet hymni clausulas disiunctivas duas, quarum prior magis genuina videtur" (haec, de qua res est, clausula prior, quam WEST recipit in textum, constat apud eum ex versibus D.4–6 et D.8–10, qui sunt versus 13–15 et 17–19 in editionibus et Oxoniensi et Appeliana; alteram faciunt versus D.7 et D.11 sq. apud WEST, qui sunt versus 16 et 20 sq. in reliquis).

Ad haec omnia etiam illud accedit, quod versus illi 13–15 etiam alibi leguntur, scilicet in *Iliados* primo; iidem enim sunt versus Hom. *Il.* I 528–530. Quod editiones et Oxoniensis et Appeliana miro prorsus praetereunt silentio. West solus cum Ilgenio indicat eorum versuum originem in p. 31, sed nihil ex hac re colligit, quamquam vel ex ipsius apparatu facile colligi possit tres versus ex *Iliade* ad litteram transcriptos raritatem esse in *Hymnis Homericis* haudquaquam praetermittendam. Et, quod apparet ex adnotatione, quam in eadem pagina impressit, quodque iam egreditur omnem modum admirationis, "magis genuinum" ("more authentic") putat, cuius magna pars aperte genuina non est: tres scilicet illos versus 13–15 (aut D.4–6 apud eum), quorum originem ipse in apparatu scribit esse *Iliadem*.

Cum haec ita sint, per naturam oboritur suspicio hos quidem tres esse in hac hymni parte spurios, versum autem 16, qui, si scio, nusquam praeterea legatur, esse genuinum. Quam ob rem Graeca sic potius crediderim cum Ilgenio imprimenda:

[ἦ καὶ κυανέῃσιν ἐπ’ ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων·
ἀμβρόσιαι δ’ ἄρα χαῖται ἐπερρώσαντο ἄνακτος
15 κρατὸς ἀπ’ ἀθανάτοιο, μέγαν δ’ ἐλέλιξεν Ὄλυμπον.]
ὣς εἰπὼν ἐπένευσε καρήατι μητίετα Ζεύς.

Et originem horum trium versuum in commentariis necessario indicandam puto, ut res hunc hymnum interpretaturis inculcetur neve iterum veniat in oblivionem. Quomodo autem huc sint hi versus translati, Ilgen sic explicat (p. 668): "Hi tres versus ex Il. α, 528 huc illati sunt. Grammaticus ἐπένευσε versus 7 [hoc est, versus 16 in Oxoniensi et Appeliana] illustrare illis voluit, et in margine ascripsit. Scriba deinde in textum recepit". Quod utrum verum sit necne, ad vivum non reseco, id tantum mihi videtur adiciendum multum hic proficere potuisse etiam meram eorum non tam formae quam sententiae et tenoris similitudinem.

Universitas Varsoviensis / University of Warsaw

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

CIRIS 118: AN EMENDATION

by

BORIS KAYACHEV

ABSTRACT: The paper argues that *Ciris* 118 should be restored as "reicere [Heinsius: *dicere* HAR: *ducere* ρ: *deicere* Vollmer] et indomita [ρ: *indomitas* HAR] uirtute retundere Minon [scripsi: *mentes* HARρ]".

Minos lays siege to Megara, but, trusting in Nisus' magical lock of purple hair, the Megarians are confident of their own safety (116–118):

> sed neque tum ciues neque tum rex ipse ueretur
> infesto ad muros uolitantis agmine turmas
> deicere et indomitas uirtute retundere mentes.

Although there are some uncertainties up until, and in fact including, 118 *deicere*, Lyne's text (as printed) is plausible enough[1]: the Megarians are not afraid "to repel the squadrons rushing towards the walls in hostile ranks". The rest of 118, however, seems more problematic. First, *retundere mentes*, "to neutralise the minds (of the Cretans)", is too vague, especially after the concrete *turmas*, 'squadrons', of 117. Second, the adjective *indomitus*, 'untamed', ought surely

[1] R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil*, Cambridge 1978, p. 74, with commentary on pp. 149 f. My only disagreement is that, for HAR *dicere*, ρ *ducere* at the beginning of 118, we must restore *reicere* rather than *deicere* (*reicere* is Heinsius' conjecture, see C.G. Heyne, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera*, vol. IV, Lipsiae [2]1789, p. 114, though it was first published in H. Frieseman, *Collectanea critica*, Amstelodami 1786, p. 9, where it was misattributed to Schrader; *deicere* is a conjecture by F. Vollmer, *Poetae Latini minores*, vol. I, Lipsiae 1910, p. 100), since the latter does not mean 'to beat off' (the sense we need), but 'to cast down' (cavalry cannot scale walls). The technical military sense 'to drive out or dislodge (from a position)' (*OLD* s.v. *deicio* 8a) is likewise inappropriate, since the Cretans are attacking, not holding a position (in particular, *ad muros* should clearly be taken to denote direction, 'towards/against the walls', rather than place, 'at/near the walls'; cf. Verg. *Aen*. XI 906 f.: "sic ambo ad muros rapidi totoque feruntur | agmine"; XII 555: "iret ut ad muros urbique aduerteret agmen"; 575: "densaque ad muros mole feruntur"; 689 f.: "disiecta per agmina Turnus | sic urbis ruit ad muros"; Liv. V 21, 7: "uelut repentino icti furore improuidi currerent ad muros").

to characterise not the besiegers, but the besieged who refuse to capitulate[2]. In fact, *indomitas* is the reading of only one branch of the tradition, represented by three fifteenth-century manuscripts (HAR), whereas the *editio princeps* (ρ), which forms an independent branch, reads *indomita*. It seems clear that LYNE prints *indomitas* only because the bare *mentes* is virtually unintelligible; on its own, however, *indomita uirtute retundere*, "to rebut (the attackers) with untamed bravery", is patently far superior in sense. We are therefore justified in suspecting *mentes*.

What can it be concealing? One option is to change *mentes* to *mentis*[3] and to connect *retundere* with the same direct object as *deicere* (or rather *reicere*: see n. 1), namely *turmas*: the Megarians are not afraid "to repel and neutralise the hostile squadrons with untamed courage of mind" (*indomitae* would I think be preferable: "with the bravery of their unsubdued spirit"). At first glance, this might seem an attractive solution, as it produces meaningful Latin with minimal changes. Yet, on closer inspection, we cannot but see that the resulting text says too little with too many words. For one thing, *reicere turmas* is a perfectly self-sufficient expression, and the metaphorical *retundere* adds nothing to the concrete *reicere*. For another, there is no reason to say *indomita uirtute mentis* or *uirtute indomitae mentis*, where a mere *indomita uirtute* would be quite enough. It seems clear that what we need in place of *mentes* is rather a separate direct object for *retundere*, referring to the besiegers[4].

The earliest proposal along these lines is HEINSIUS' *Martem*[5]. A bare *Martem*, however, is patently too vague: since *retundere* implies resistance against an attack, *Martem* should refer not to the fighting between the Cretans and the Megarians in general, but specifically to the Cretans' aggression; in order to

---

[2] 117 *infesto … agmine* does not support taking *indomita*(*s*) with *mentes* (or whatever it conceals), since *indomitus* does not parallel, but rather mirrors, *infestus*, as it denotes a passive as opposed to an active quality: while the latter is appropriate in reference to the attacker ('hostile, aggressive'), the former makes far better sense in reference to the attacked ('unconquered, unsubdued'). When *indomitus* is used of the aggressor (e.g. Stat. *Theb*. IV 672: "indomitae bellum ciet ira nouercae"), it does not refer to his determination or valour or fierceness, but specifies his psychologically unbalanced state (cf. *OLD* s.v. 3: "(of persons) That is not (or cannot be) held in control, unrestrained, violent, unbridled"): this would hardly be appropriate here in reference to the Cretans.

[3] The form *mentis* appears in some earlier editions (N. HEINSIUS, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera*, Amstelodami 1676, p. 369 is the earliest I could find), but apparently it is taken as an accusative plural. As far as I can see, HEYNE, *op. cit*. (n. 1), p. 114 was the first to construe *mentis* as a genitive singular.

[4] For the sake of completeness, I mention the proposal by J. MÄHLY, [Review of O. RIBBECK, *Appendix Vergiliana*, Leipzig 1868,] Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur LXIII 1870, pp. 769–796 and 801–839, at p. 807 to read *mens est*, 'their plan is', taking both *reicere* and *retundere* as dependent on it and governing *turmas*: "they plan with untamed bravery to repel and neutralise the hostile squadrons". While this proposal avoids the fairly pointless *mentis*, it still makes *reicere* and *retundere* go together in a rather redundant way, as well as introducing a somewhat harsh asyndeton after 116.

[5] First in FRIESEMAN, *op. cit*. (n. 1), p. 9, erroneously ascribed to SCHRADER; but see HEYNE, *op. cit*. (n. 1), p. 114.

do so, however, it must be qualified by an epithet that would bring this out[6]. BAEHRENS felt this and proposed *indomitum*, comparing it with 117 *infesto … agmine* (used of the Cretan cavalry) and, I assume, intending the line to mean something like “courageously to quell (the Cretans’) unrestrained aggression”[7]. In support of his conjecture, BAEHRENS adduced Verg. *Aen*. II 440 f.: “sic Martem indomitum Danaosque ad tecta ruentis | cernimus”, which he apparently took as a sort of hendiadys: “we see the Greeks rushing to the palace in their unbridled bellicosity”. Yet this is wrong: *Martem indomitum* refers back to 338 *ingentem pugnam*[8], and accordingly must cover both sides of the battle: “we see violent fighting, as the Greeks rush to the palace”. A further objection is that the expression *indomitum retundere* is somewhat self-contradictory: if *Martem* (in whatever way we take it) is ‘untamed’ and, by implication, ‘indomitable’, how can it be restrained? Finally, as already pointed out, it makes far better sense to refer *indomitus* to the Megarians than to the Cretans[9].

Another option is HEINRICH’s *gentes*[10]. But *gentes*, ‘nations’, whether with or without *indomitas*, can hardly refer to the Cretan army since the word is not used of troops.

I suggest that we should restore *Minon*: “to rebut Minos with unsubdued courage”. For *retundere* with an animate object, we may compare Cic. *Att*. XVI 15, 3 *retundit Antonium* and Tac. *Ann*. V 11 *rettudit collegam*. This will produce a more balanced text: just as 116 mentions both the Megarians (*ciues*) and their king (*rex*), so 117 f. would first refer to the Cretan army (*turmas*) and then to its leader (*Minon*). If my suggestion is right, there may be a pointed echo here of Call. *Aet*. fr. 4 καὶ νήσων ἐπέτεινε βαρὺν ζυγὸν αὐχένι Μίνως, “and Minos stretched his heavy yoke over the islands’ neck”[11]: Minos has already subdued the islands of the Aegean (note 111 *populator remige Minos*, alluding to Minos’ thalassocracy), but Megara succeeds, at least for the time being, in resisting his yoke (*indomita uirtute*). It is true that the accusative *Minon* is not securely attested elsewhere in Latin (the attested forms are *Minoa* or *Minoem*), but BUECHELER is probably right to restore it at 132 for the transmitted *si non*, rather than ac-

---

[6] Cf. e.g. Enn. *Ann*. 14 SK.: “occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo”; Hor. *Carm*. III 5, 23 f. “arua | Marte […] populata nostro”; [Tib.] III 7, 149: “inuictus Romano Marte Britannus”.

[7] A. [E.] BAEHRENS, *Emendationes in Cirin*, Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik CV 1872, pp. 833–849, at p. 837.

[8] Cf. N. HORSFALL, *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*, Leiden 2008, p. 340.

[9] See n. 2 above, where I observe that, when characterising the attacker, *indomitus* does not mean ‘irresistible, unstoppable, unbeatable’, but ‘violent, passionate, frenzied’, which would be unmotivated in reference to the Cretans.

[10] C.F. HEINRICH, *Animaduersiones in Virgilii Cirin*, Bibliothek der alten Litteratur und Kunst X 1794, pp. 44–48, at p. 46. W. LUPPE, *Textvorschläge zur pseudo-vergilianischen ‚Ciris‘*, Philologus CLII 2008, pp. 161–165, at p. 162 repeated the suggestion.

[11] Translation by A. HARDER, *Callimachus, Aetia*, Oxford 2012, vol. I, p. 135.

cepting LACHMANN's *Minoa*; and if the *Ciris* did read *Minon* at 132, BUECHELER is probably right to also restore it at 367 for *Minoa*[12]. The corruption may be due to misreading *mīō* (*Minon*) as *m̄tē* (*mentem*), which would be very easy, especially as the scribe seems to have been unfamiliar with the form *Minon*[13]. It is telling that H, which is known for its conservatism, actually uses this abbreviation here (*m̄teſ*, cf. 162 and 327 *m̄te* for *mente*). In a similar way, at 169 HA's *sıc oīa* (= *sic omnia*) for *Sicyonia* (restored by FANENSIS) points to *sıcıoīa* in an ancestor[14].

Trinity College, Dublin

[12] F. BUECHELER, *Coniectanea,* RhM LVII 1902, pp. 321–327, at pp. 321 f. For a more detailed argument for accepting the form *Minon* as a possible Latin accusative, see B. KAYACHEV, *Narrative Focalization and the Historical Present in Catullus 64*, CQ LXVII 2017, pp. 522–527, at pp. 526 f., where I also argue that *Minon* should be restored in Catull. 64, 85: "magnanimum ad Minoa uenit sedesque superbas".

[13] It might perhaps be doubted whether the scribe would use the abbreviation twice in such a short and unfamiliar word, but H features comparable (if less striking) examples: 76 *pōtū* (*pontum*), 227 *mōtē* (*mortem*), 294 *gē9* (*genus*). Alternatively, we could assume that it was written as *mīon*: the scribe will have misread it as *m̄ten* and then adjusted the ending.

[14] This paper was produced during the term of a Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowship funded by the Irish Research Council (project ID: GOIPD/2016/ 549).

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

FLORUS' VISION OF ROME*

by

EDYTA GRYKSA

The main purpose of the doctoral thesis entitled "Florus' Vision of Rome" is to present the picture of Rome that was described in the *Epitome de Tito Livio* by Lucius Annaeus Florus, a Roman historian active in the second century AD. There are still ongoing disputes concerning the author's full name, origins, life and literary legacy, which remain unsolved. Furthermore, our evidence shows that in the times of Trajan and Hadrian there were at least three authors named Florus: a historian, a rhetor and a poet. Also disputed is the time of the composition of the work, which has been dated from the Augustan up to Antonine period. However, on the grounds of its literary style and vocabulary, the text is most frequently thought to have been written during the reign of Hadrian.

In the preface to his work, by means of a short *expositio*, Florus reveals his aim:

> I intend to follow the example of those who describe the geography of the earth, and include a complete representation of my subject as it were in a small picture. I shall thus, I hope, contribute something to the admiration in which this illustrious people is held by displaying their greatness all at once in a single view.
>
> (Florus, *praef.* 3, transl. by J. Rolfe [Loeb])

The historiographical task is handled quite differently by Livy in his work *Ab Urbe Condita*, which is the major source for Florus. By undertaking the task of writing down the history of Rome, Livy is especially trying to find hope. His history aims to be a compendium of knowledge for contemporary people as well as for their

* This paper is a summary of my PhD dissertation written under the supervision of Professor Anna Kucz (with Dr Patrycja Matusiak as auxiliary supervisor) and submitted to the Faculty of Philology of the University of Silesia in Katowice. The dissertation was reviewed by Professor Bogdan Burliga (University of Gdańsk) and Professor Marian Szarmach (Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń). The defence took place on 10 October 2016. The dissertation was published in Polish as: Edyta Gryksa, *Obraz Rzymu u Florusa*, Tarnów 2017.

descendants who will be able to find in it patterns to follow and threats to avoid. An analysis of the two texts allows us to notice differences which lead us to question the assessment of Florus as Livy's epitomator. Florus replaces an annalistic order of listing of events with a geographic scheme, presents a different attitude towards Augustus and concentrates on the Roman nation as a whole, while Livy focused on outstanding Roman individuals. It has been proved that there are elements common to both texts, such as the use of the same historiographical concepts taken from Stoic philosophy, the role of supernatural signs and the notion of the moral decline of the Roman nation. However, Florus also based his work on other sources such as the works of Sallust, Caesar and Velleius Paterculus.

The *Epitome de Tito Livio* gives accounts of the most important events in Roman history, from the foundation of the city up until the battle of the Teutoburg Forest. A periodisation of events based on the analogy of human development is also a characteristic feature of this work. Florus distinguishes four stages in the history of Rome: childhood (*infantia*), covering the royal period; youth (*adulescentia*), from the times of Brutus and Collatinus to the conquest of the whole of Italy; adulthood (*iuventas*), from the first Punic War until the Augustan period; and senility (*senectus*). The flow of events is conditioned by numerous factors, such as *virtus Romana* and its various aspects: *fides*, *concordia*, *iustitia*, *felicitas*, *dignitas* and *pietas.* At every stage of the growth of the city there is a visible struggle between *virtus* and *fortuna*. *Virtus*, the reflection of Roman ideals, became the foundation of Roman supremacy over the Mediterranean world. *Fortuna*, competing with *virtus*, was perceived as transcendent power which led to the creation of the common state. The idea of the common state is drawn in the very beginning of Florus' history and seems to constitute its centre and doctrinal core. The author expresses enthusiasm for the epic greatness of Rome on numerous occasions. He remains loyal to the picture of Roman community that was described by Polybius and regards keeping the country at peace as a value and something beneficial for the whole society. Polybius in the *Histories* argued that the core of Roman hegemony consists not in the *tyche* (fortune) but in the *arete* (virtue) of its inhabitants. It is a clearly visible pattern that a gradual decline of *fortuna*'s favour goes along with the decline of morality. The turning point is the *invidia fortunae* – fortune's hatred towards the Roman nation, illustrated by the conflict between Caesar and Pompey.

In the thesis it is maintained that the framework of the *Epitome de Tito Livio* was constructed on the basis of an ethical scheme of dichotomy between external (just) and internal (murderous) wars. *Bella iusta* can include defensive wars, conducted against savage tribes which posed a threat to Rome. They were actions taken both in defence of aliens and aimed at gaining new territories and wealth. Civil wars were disapproved of by the author as they destroyed the peace of the country and led to the collapse of politics, the economy, ethics and morality. After a period that was characterised by devotion, generosity and sanctity, the

nation turned against itself through tremendous and brutal civil wars. The trigger for these negative changes was considered by Florus to be the fall of Carthage after it had been surrounded by the army of Scipio the Younger for three years. Along with the disappearance of *metus hostilis*, there was a gradual decline of Roman morality, which was criticised by the author. His idea of showing the Roman state of affairs in a negative light, highlighting the spreading rottenness of the nation's spirit and indicating economic causes for wars may lead to the conclusion that Florus' beliefs are pragmatic and objective. The historian passes a negative judgement on wars conducted against the code of morals and divine order. It should be mentioned that Florus seems to objectively assess the attitude and behaviour of Rome's enemies – he praises the wives of the barbarians and even compares some enemies to Roman heroes. This occurs in the comparison of Scipio and Hannibal. Florus' honesty is evident in his criticism of the immoral actions of the Romans and his description of their flaws. This honesty gives him credit in the eyes of his readers. Nevertheless, some scholars evaluate Florus' work negatively, accusing him e.g. of ignorance of historical facts and the art of war. The *Epitome* is, on the other hand, highly rated for its style. Chiasm, hyperbole, metaphor, personification and alliteration are only a few examples of the numerous figures and rhetorical devices which can be found in the text. Florus' style is characterised by synonyms added in order to highlight parts of a sentence, the repetition of words, and the use of exclamations or moralistic interjections like *o pudor!*, *nefas!*, *incredibile dictu!* or *mira res dictu!* By means of such exclamations he expresses his opinion and assessment of the events. Florus sympathises with the republican times and his political aim is to calm the society, which was made restless by Hadrian's peace policy, and to convince the citizens of Rome that the reign of indolent rulers finished with the kings' exile. Florus praises the times when there was peace, stability, order and freedom in the country, when religion was preeminent. The Romans believed that if they followed the rules strenuously while conducting religious rituals, their country would gain wealth and expand. All failures and misdeeds led to misfortune and disaster. Florus was sure about divine interference in human affairs, as was Livy. The gods as moral guardians rewarded good deeds and punished misbehaviour. Their will, approving or disapproving, was revealed in extraordinary signs, the weather and behavioural anomalies. It has to be emphasised, though, that Florus did not mention any interpretation of *prodigium*.

The doctoral thesis does not lay claim to a comprehensive treatment of the problem being examined, but rather shows the mentality of Rome on the basis of a comparative analysis of ancient works. The work is a result of the examination of numerous texts, taking into account studies on language, literature, history, culture, religion and moral philosophy.

University of Silesia in Katowice

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

XENOPHON REDIVIVUS: A REVIEW ARTICLE

Michael A. Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, XX + 520 pp., ISBN 978-11-070-5006-8, £83.99 (hb.) / ISBN 978-11-076-5215-6, £27.99 (pb.).

The (continuing) wave carrying the venerable series of ancient *Cambridge Companions to*… is showing no sign of abating. The tide is still high, bringing new titles, with *Xenophon* already published and *Thucydides* on the horizon (as one may discern from the bibliography of the book under review). After *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika*[1] and the present volume, one may soon expect other multi-authored studies on this writer, in partiuclar looking forward to *The Oxford Handbook to Xenophon* and possibly *Brill's Companion to Xenophon* (the latter following on from the 2012 volume edited by F. Hobden and C. Tuplin[2]).

The first (as the Editor of the book under review rightly reminds us) *Companion to Xenophon* – a volume pleasantly produced and packed with insightful contributions by a team of acknowledged experts in the field – will undoubtedly be welcomed by many as "a must-read" classic. The Editor's noble ambition was to offer comprehensive treatment of Xenophon and his legacy, so the essays have been grouped, reasonably, under five analytical categories : (I) "Contexts", (II) "Individual Works", (III) "Techniques", (IV) "Major Subjects" (here, however, the theme of war in Xenophons' works is curiously omitted), (V) "Reception and Influence". Each of these parts contains four or five essays, and taken together, they all aim to touch upon almost every aspect of Xenophon's literary output – an ambitious and valiant task, and, let us repeat, a successful venture.

The reader's odyssey with the Cambridge Xenophon starts from the Editor's "Introduction" (pp. 1–12), which I found useful and inspiring, partly dealing with the issues discussed at length by T. Rood (ch. 25, pp. 435–448) and E. Hall ("Epilogue", pp. 449–458). Stressing Xenophon's literary versatility, Professor Flower reminds us (p. 2) of the "changing fortunes" (the title of Rood's study) of this great literary "experimentator" – a fascinating tale in itself, especially in the second half of the 20th century (an industrial age, when gentlemen did not spend time on hunting, philosophising, wine drinking and *dolce far niente*), when the adventures of an old-fashioned Greek failed to attract the reader's attention, so Xenophon simply fell from grace, and the shadow already cast on him by Thucydides on the one hand and Plato on the other became the longest ever (cf. excellent remarks by Hall, p. 458). But we are reminded that a great scholarly *anabasis* to Xenophon has taken place over the last twenty years or more (p. 3; see Rood, p. 447, on Xenophon's "rehabilitation"), and this was realised in all aspects: so we are witnessing a second, more sophisticated Xenophontic "Renaissance" now, and you may choose as you wish: Xenophon "the Philosopher" (mainly in ethics, and political studies as reflecting on politics was in antiquity a part of philosophy), Xenophon "The Master of Prose", Xenophon "Witness to-, and the Man of His Times", and so on. On p. 5 Flower suggests that Xenophon's vision of politics between states ("international" or "foreign" policy) differred from that of Thucydides the realist: this is disputable and doubtful. Moreover there is also nothing revealing in the claim that comes as the most important lesson the

[1] *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika*, ed. by R.B. Strassler, a New Translation by J. Marincola, Introduction by D. Thomas, New York 2009.

[2] F. Hobden, C. Tuplin (edd.), *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Inquiry*, Leiden–Boston 2012 (Mnemosyne Suppl. 348).

volume advocates, namely the conviction that one must read Xenophon "across genres" (p. 6), avoiding reading them in isolation. Perhaps a far more fundamental question FLOWER is asking (p. 10) is why Xenophon wrote at all, and his answer is that he did so "for practical ethics", which in turn is the occasion to formulate a programmatic comment on the whole Cambridge Xenophon project, viz. that the ideas of the Athenian writer still have the potential to engage and influence a wider audience; their enduring allure is the truth of the messages they contain.

FLOWER's emphasis on the eternal values of Xenophon's "teaching" leads our attention to the last part of the *Companion* – Xenophon's *Nachleben*, the subject of four essays which are also interesting in that each of the scholars approaches the theme of the reception of Xenophon's writings in Western culture from a somewhat different angle. Alongside the informative studies of ROOD and HALL, there are articles by E. BOWIE and N. HUMBLE. BOWIE (ch. 20, pp. 403–415) confines his analysis to the times of Greece under the Roman Empire, focusing essentially on three examples of Xenophon's prominence: Dio Chrysostomus' speech 18, Chariton's charming novel *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, and the writings by Arrian of Nicomedia. BOWIE begins with a long quotation from Dio's diatribe, then he analyses the novel, ending with Arrian, that famous "new" Xenophon (on Arrian and Xenophon see also LURAGHI, p. 99). BOWIE's reconstruction of Arrian's way of imitating Xenophon is disputable in its details, particulary his argument that Arrian's famous statement at *Anab*. I 12, 5 proves the relatively late date of the work's composition – since this statement may rather be taken as Arrian's later addition. It is also difficult to concur with BOWIE's claim that Arrian's *Cynegeticus* "updates" Xenophon' manual: Arrian's aim was, rather, to replace it totally. Nor is also entirely right to say (p. 414) that Arrian "has had no recent monograph": in addition to STADTER's book[3] there is an equally important Duke University dissertation by E.L. WHEELER[4] as well as H. TONNET's book[5] (remarkably, none of them figure in the bibliography). In N. HUMBLE's chapter (21, pp. 416–434) the usefulness of Xenophon for European rulers (princes, kings, statesmen) in the early modern era is espoused. Paying closer attention to the popularity mainly of the *Cyropaedia* (but the *Hiero* and the *Oeconomicus* too), the chapter may be read together with M. TAMIOLAKI's study (ch. 9, pp. 174–194). The merit of HUMBLE's learned piece is a point which all the scholars of Xenophon are perfectly aware of but which, nevertheless, is always worth repeating and emphasising, namely how influential Xenophon's advice was in the period from Poggio and Valla, through Pontano and Machiavelli, to Erasmus. There is also an open question whether even modern "managers" could benefit significantly from reading Xenophon (pp. 432 f.; cf. FLOWER, p. 5; see BUXTON, pp. 330–332); indeed, you might imagine "the suits" as – between finalising business deals or eating lunch – frequently delving on their iPads or Kindles into an e-pub of ancient wisdom as guide for the advanced: the *Oeconomicus*. Why not?

But to return to the beginning of the book: the first part of the essays deals with "Contexts" – in order to describe the background against which Xenophon wrote, both historical and intellectual. Here J.W.I. LEE offers (pp. 15–36) a mini-biography of Xenophon, plausibly placing it in the wider history of the Greek world between 430–350 BC (on which cf. also LURAGHI's remarks, p. 84). The narrative is good, and what merits attention is LEE's final fair confession of how personal his own perception of Xenophon is. In his chapter (2, pp. 37–56), L.A. DORION reads Xenophon as a philosopher by adducing those plassages from which one may realise what he knew of both earlier (the Presocratics) and contemporary philosophers (the Sophists), as well as what was later known of him in philosophical circles, e.g. his influence on Zeno of Citium and his popularity in Stoic thought, including Arrian (here again one reads an erroneous claim about the updating of Xenophon's *Cynegeticus* by Arrian, p. 55). Especially revealing here is the subsection on

[3] P.A. STADTER, *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill 1980.

[4] E.L. WHEELER, *Favius Arrianus: A Political and Military Biography*, Duke University 1977.

[5] H. TONNET, *Recherches sur Arrien, sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes*, vols. I–II, Amsterdam 1988.

Aristotle's possible knowledge of Xenophon's works (pp. 49–53): the author argues that at least the *Memorabilia* were known to Aristotle. S.B. Ferrario's contribution is on "Xenophon and Greek Political Thought" (ch. 3., pp. 57–83) and it may be counted as one of the best sections in the whole volume. The essay is rich and thoughtful. Having noted the difference between ancient and modern concepts of "the political" (the former being just an equivalent of "human relationships", p. 57), the author goes on to characterise Xenophon's attitude as well as his focus on particular aspects of *tà politiká*, such as his favourite theme of successful leadership (cf. pp. 74–79). Democracy occupies an important place for Xenophon too, in the *Memorabilia* as well as the *Hellenica* and the *Ways and Means*. Addressing the everlasting dilemma as to whether Xenophon was "an anti-democrat" (p. 70), Ferrario does not give a simple "Yes" to it, as has been done previously. Her interpretation points to a more nuanced reading of Xenophon's thought, although there is no doubt that the question of the moral quality of leaders (that is to say, their character; see too the studies by Maricola, pp. 108–113, Tamiolaki, pp. 189–193, and especially Buxton, pp. 323–337) was far more important to Xenophon than a controversy over which "constitution" is the best. Less clear in this part of the volume is the presence of the contribution written by N. Luraghi – his chapter seems to have been misplaced in this section, instead of being included in the part dealing with "Major Subjects", next to Flower's study on "Xenophon as a Historian" (pp. 301–322). Luraghi sees Xenophon's historical production in the world of (as he recalls) the *Trikaranos*, or the "Three-Headed Monster" (as runs the title of a pamphlet ascribed to Anaximenes of Lampsacus), a reality dominated by the struggle of the then most influential *poleis*. The author elucidates in this way both how political rivalry and competition for hegemony in fourth-century Greece influenced themes of historiography and what Xenophon's own contribution was in this respect.

Moving to Part II provides an encounter with "Individual Works", beginning with Marincola's study on the *Anabasis* and the *Hellenica* (which links this chapter thematically both with that of Luraghi as with that of Flower in Part IV, pp. 301–322). The author emphasises (p. 106) that the two works "represent new developments in Greek historiography", and, more importantly, that "Xenophon bends the genre to his own needs and interests" (*ibid.*), a procedure leading to "[a]n openness to the generic innovation present in Xenophon's historical works" (p. 107). In addition, there is a valuable explanation of the motivations for Xenophon to write history at all. The two Socratic writings (*logoi*) are the subject of D. Johnson's analysis ("Xenophon's *Apology* and *Memorabilia*", pp. 119–131). G. Danzig's comprehensive chapter on "Xenophon's *Symposium*", pp. 132–151) is packed with many insightful remarks, including his analysis of "an elaborate ring composition" of the dialogue (p. 135). In her extensive essay on the *Oeconomicus* (pp. 152–173) F. Hobden discusses various problems, first the date of the work's composition, then the meaning and place of "economics" in Greek discourse, ending with the dilemma of "Isomachus' Wife" (pp. 168–173). M. Tamiolaki's interesting contention in her chapter on the *Cyropaedia* (pp. 174–194) is that it is a more historical work than is usually assumed (p. 182): while acknowledging the timeless problem of genre which in this case constitutes "a puzzling issue", she proposes looking at Cyrus' life-long odyssey towards *iustum imperium* in terms of Xenophon's intertextual engagement with traditional historical issues (here, e.g., a comparison of similar motifs in Thucydides' *epitaphios logos*, II 36, 4, with the prologue to the *Cyropaedia*, I 1, 6, is revealing; cf. also Flower, p. 302). Finally, there is J. Dillery's chapter on "the Small Works" (pp. 195–219) in which the three technical handbooks, the two treatises on Sparta, the *Hiero* and the *Ways and Means* are all included. However, gathering together works which are very different in character is a little strange (as an encomium, the *Agesilaus* has little in common with, say, the *Ways and Means*, and their unmasked didacticism is of quite different nature; the *Hiero*, in turn, is much closer to the *Cyropaedia*), and the criterion that their common feature is their supposedly "small" volume seems to be artificial at best. On the other hand, such a decision is understandable, for it reveals, as Dillery himself admits in his discussion of 'pamphlet' and 'royal literature', the modern difficulties in classifying Xenophon's *œuvre*. *On Hunting* may be singled out as a typical example of such difficulties – a technical manual *and* a study in ethics in one.

Xenophon "the writer"/"the artist" is the subject of Part III, and deservedly so, as his fame as a master of prose goes back to antiquity (cf. Bowie's essay). Opening, V. Gray deals with "Xenophon's Language and Expression" (pp. 223–240) which embraces "vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure" (p. 224). C. Pelling's "Xenophon's Authorial Voice" (pp. 241–262) traces "the textual I-Xenophon" utterances (p. 261) in individual works, distinguishing between the "authorial voice" in the texts and "the flesh-and-blood author" (pp. 260 f.). In the last two studies in this Part, T. Rood devotes his chapter to a careful analysis of Xenophon's narrative style in which he distinguishes three tracts: "immediacy", "inscrutability" and "variety" (the last visible especially, according to Rood, pp. 268–272, in the *Hellenica*), while the multidimensional character of Xenophon's speeches is discussed thoroughly by E. Baragwanath (pp. 279–297).

"Major Subjects" that interest the scholars who contribute to Part IV include items like M. Flower's "Xenophon as a Historian" (pp. 301 f.), leadership in Xenophon (R.F. Buxton, pp. 323–337), then Xenophon's attitude towards the states that are dear, to some extent, to his heart: Athens (C. Tuplin, pp. 338–359), Persia (K. Vlassopoulos, pp. 360–375), and Sparta (P. Christesen, pp. 376–399). Flower is especially valuable when it comes to the topic of the omissions in the *Hellenica*; his position regarding Xenophon's bias is in fact nuanced. And particularly astute here is his reminder that we should not apply modern criteria of what an ancient historian should include and what not since Xenophon did not compose for posterity but "for contemporary readers who knew the basic outline of events well enough" (p. 306). Equally worthwhile is Flower's subsection "Why Things Happen", a profound analysis of Xenophon's manner of explanation of historical process. As regards the intriguing question of what Xenophon's attitude toward his native Athens was (which should be read alongside Christesen's chapter), Professor Tuplin's final conclusion is (p. 358) that, overall, "he remained a loyal Athenian" – a verdict which agrees with E. Badian's 2004 proposal[6]. It appears that Xenophon was like Alcibiades in Thucydides: he did not dislike Athens, but was no admirer of democracy. Another dilemma and enigma, unresolved so far, is Xenophon's Persia: here Vlassopoulos tends to reiterate how complicated things are in this regard, and how the picture of the Persian Empire in Xenophon depends on what aspect is discussed and which work of Xenophon is examined.

There is always some uneasiness in the case of these companions: rooted in the fact that every modern reader carries in mind her/his own author (cf. Lee, p. 35), so we may inevitably wonder: why such a topic and not another; why these themes when similar ones were not raised; why were some points overemphasised while others received marginal notes; and so on. But selectivity, as it happens in other cases too, is of course a *condicio sine qua non* in such venerable undertakings; so, understandably enough, this should not be taken as complaint on my part. One minor perplexity, however, needs to be raised: the bibliography.

I have some trouble with the politics of compiling bibliographies which the Cambridge Companion series adopts. Bibliographies in the series are simply a consolidation of the secondary works cited in individual chapters, as is also the case here. When reading the chapters separately, all seems to be fine – we know the choice of secondary books is subjective and reflects the author's line of argument. Yet, when all the cited secondary literature is amassed in one place, in one continuous register, a somewhat strange impression emerges: are many of these contributions in such a bibliography really so important for Xenophon's studies as to figure prominently in this place? Of course, we bear in mind that the aim here is not to give a comprehensive list of modern works and selectivity is inevitable, yet this does not remove an impression of arbitrarity. This is particularly true in the cases where Xenophon is not the main subject. One may thus wonder why Bonsal, Boswel, Callender, Fantazzi, Hutson, Sommerville, M.G. Spencer, or Wiffen are given priority in occupying the list, rather than, e.g., Eduard Delebecque's Budé editions (with commentaries)

[6] E. Badian, *Xenophon the Athenian*, in: C. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and His World: Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Stuttgart 2004, pp. 33–53.

of the *Cynegeticus* and the *De re equestri*, which are missing from the list? Naturally, for studying Xenophon they certainly cannot be omitted, as many would agree, yet since Delebecque's editions are not mentioned by any of the contributors, they just failed to appear in the closing list – a major fault, I think. On this occasion, I was also surprised by the absence of Ludwig Breitenbach's 1869 Teubner edition of the *Cyropaedia* containing a still valuable commentary: was the reason for this that it was "für den Schulgebrauch"? In Part V there is no mention of Xenophon's fate in the Eastern Roman Empire during the Middle Ages (e.g., A. Kaldellis' works on the classical Greek historians in Byzantium[7] are omitted); no reference is made to A. Keaveney's paper on the trial of Orontas[8]; the important contribution by P. Stadter[9] is not cited by anyone, either. Amongst other minor faults of the bibliography: on p. 469 Dorion's paper "Xenophon's Socrates" is listed twice, while on p. 476 Godfrey Hutchinson (the author of *Xenophon and the Art of Command*) is erroneously conflated with Gregory (G.O.) Hutchinson, the current Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, whose name, additionally, is misprinted as "Hutchison".

Yet, despite these minor reservations, considering the book as a whole, its merits are indisputable. One can only feel great admiration and congratulate the Cambridge University Press on the enterprise.

Bogdan Burliga
University of Gdańsk

[7] See A. Kaldellis, *The Byzantine Role in the Making of the Corpus of Classical Greek Historiography: A Preliminary Investigation*, JHS CXXXII 2012, pp. 71–85; idem, *Byzantine Readings of Ancient Historians: Texts in Translation, with Introductions and Notes*, London–New York 2015.

[8] A. Keaveney, *The Trial of Orontas: Xenophon, Anabasis I, 6*, AC LXXXI 2012, pp. 31–41.

[9] P. Stadter, *"Staying Up Late": Plutarch's Reading of Xenophon*, in: Hobden, Tuplin, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 43–62.

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

CONVERSING WITH THE ANCIENTS: A REVIEW ARTICLE

Kathleen Riley, Alastair J.L. Blanshard, Iarla Manny (edd.), *Oscar Wilde and Classical Antiquity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018, XVIII + 382 pp., ISBN 978-0198789260, £75.00.

This is one of those books concerned with the relevance of the past to the present. It shows how history acquires a synchronic dimension – how Oscar Wilde's adaptations of classical antiquity speak of the ways in which he himself was engaged with his time. For Wilde, classical antiquity and the Victorian age seem to be set side by side, as they had been for Walter Pater – his master in Aestheticism – for whom the two types of sensibility, classicism and romanticism, would be connected in this realm which he called the *House Beautiful*. In the *House Beautiful*, as Pater believed, "the creative minds of all generations […] are always building together"[1]. This idea of a timeless co-existence of ideas and arts is uniquely reflected in the eclecticism of Victorian architecture, and most spectacularly in the design of the Albert Memorial – the fact highlighted by Richard Jenkyns. While tracing classical antiquity's encroachments on Victorian romantic medievalism, Jenkyns in his *Dignity and Decadence* – a book providing an illuminative cultural context for the volume on Wilde's response to the legacy of the ancients – asks his readers to both look at this stupendous shrine from afar and take a close-up look. The long view leaves one with the impression of the neo-Gothic ciborium and spires. A closer look, however, focusing on the ornamentation of the classical pedestal, takes one further back in time. Its center is occupied by Homer, with Shakespeare, his hand cusped over his ear, seated a little beneath and listening to the Greek[2]. Wilde followed this good example; and this volume reveals *how* he followed suit.

The results of the close attention he paid to what the ancients had to say are organised by the editors into five parts: the book closes with a section discussing the presence of the Roman world in Wilde's work; the preceding four sections are oriented mainly towards the legacy of Greece (with exceptions made for Suetonius and Ovid). These sections explore the impact of Wilde's classical education, engaging with him as a playwright and a prose writer – a reviewer, an essayist and the author of one memorable novel. Though references are made to his poetic works, by the editors' choice, this volume does not concern Wilde's poems. His fairy tales are not included either, though one can find their echoes. Save for brief references, Wilde's "The Portrait of Mr. W. H." is omitted too. Possibly, this is because the story has already been masterly discussed by several critics. Nevertheless, the two Greek contexts introduced in this collection – Greece of the Classical and the Hellenistic periods – make one wish for a chapter that would match the high quality of those others which it includes and refer in more detail also to this story, with its allusions to Plato's *Symposium* and to Hermeticism.

From the political to the social, the cultural, and the aesthetic, the range of themes in this volume is broad. If, at first glance, several of them seem familiar, this is because of the persistence of the classical world in Wilde, which has been noted in numerous journal articles cited in this collection, and in books, including those authored by the volume's contributors. This sense of familiarity may be also due to the fact that Wilde, even if he was born out of his time, was nevertheless a child of his age. He was not unique in his admiration for the ancients. His Hellenism followed the Classicism of Shelley, whose features are indeed reflected in the face of Wilde's imaginary Mr. W. H. (the story invoking Diotima's discussion of love). It also came after the

---

[1] W. Pater, *Postscript*, in: *Appreciations: With an Essay on Style* [1889], Evanston, IL 1987, p. 241.

[2] See R. Jenkyns, *Dignity and Decadence: Victorian Art and the Classical Inheritance*, London 1991, pp. 2–6.

Romantic Keats, who adhered to the model of Hellenism as established in the eighteenth century by its pioneer Johann Joachim Winckelmann – as did Goethe, Schiller and Hegel in Germany, and as did Walter Pater, Wilde's admired teacher in Decadent Aestheticism, in Britain. The train of Hellenic influences comes full circle. The Roman inspiration, however, was no less potent; Keats, for instance, before dealing with the fall of Titans in his *Hyperion* (1819), read Edward Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776–1789)[3]. The trope of collapse was powerful. At the end of the nineteenth century, Rome acquired a very special status, providing an analogy to the British Empire, which inspired pride, but which also created anxiety – the fear of decline. It was Rome as imagined by Wilde's corrupted Dorian Gray (1891) and as depicted in Alma-Tadema's *The Roses of Heliogabalus* (1888) and, much earlier, in Thomas Couture's *The Romans of the Decadence* (1847) – the picture of the patricians' self-indulgence watched with sadness by the great sculpted figures of the past, a painting close to archetypal. For the Decadents, ancient Rome set a model for excess, a contrast to the Augustan ideal (which, for instance, was invoked through the classical, urbane and elegant wit of Max Beerbohm). Wilde's Hellenism, Epicureanism, and his allusions to degenerate Rome constitute an inseparable part of the Hellenism in Britain[4] and of the British *fin de siècle*.

But, if by looking at the contents, one may occasionally experience a sense of familiarity, this impression is misleading. It is dispelled on reading the essays, and is replaced by a sense of discovery. The volume engages with texts by Wilde which have not yet received full recognition or those which are regarded as marginal, including his annotations, reviews and notebooks; and when it regards the texts which are well-known, it provides new perspectives. The five thematic categories into which the essays are divided overlap at some points. But how can one easily decide, for instance, whether to allocate *Dorian Gray* to the category of Greek or Roman adaptations? The recurrence of motifs does not mar the structure, either. On the contrary. For, rather than a constant narrative, this volume proposes a continuous discourse – not a tale, but a conversation involving nineteen voices (the Foreword included), its topics re-emerging in the changing contexts. It is a modern symposium.

The themes of particular chapters are briefly indicated in the Introduction. However, since the Introduction is an essay in its own right (it gives a biographical background), the chapter summaries it provides are succinct. This, and the fact that the book does not include abstracts, makes it useful to try to relate its content and highlight the ways in which its authors converse with each other so as to explain the ways in which Wilde conversed with the ancients. In outlining these discussions, I will stress the collection's unity not only as demonstrated through the book's overall theme but also through its arrangement, attempting to show how each essay begins where the one immediately preceding it has ended. For, if there is not an obvious narrative in this volume, there is a potent underlying argument that can be exposed.

The background for these considerations is provided in the Introduction, wherein Kathleen Riley points out three gateways through which the love of antiquity entered Wilde's life: first, his family home; second, his education at Portora, amidst the mist-wrapped lakes of Fermanagh; and third, his studies at Trinity College Dublin, subsequently completed at Magdalen College, Oxford. Riley observes that the classical education which Wilde received, rather than merely focusing on memory training, involved an evocation of the ancients' lives, literature, and values. As such, it shaped not only his literary taste but also the course of his life; and poignantly, it led to discord between the bourgeois Victorian mentality and Wilde's attempt at the imaginative recreation of the Hellenic mood through his own lifestyle. But, if the love of classics – and the ancient ideal of the love between men – put Wilde at odds with the Victorian world, it was also his excellence in

---

[3] See M. Ashe, *Keats and Hellenism: An Essay*, Cambridge 1985, p. 75.

[4] See, for example, D.J. DeLaura, *Hebrew and Hellene in Victorian England: Newman, Arnold and Pater*, Austin, TX 1969.

classical scholarship – the epitome of intellectual discipline – that, as RILEY observes, was recalled by his defence at the point of his fall from grace in the eyes of the Victorian public, at the trial following a suit filed against him, which ended in his imprisonment. Sensuous appraisal and intellectual discipline – these two threads in Wilde's approach to the ancients are interwoven in this volume.

Part I of this book regards the factors immediately related to Wilde's classical learning. Alastair J.L. BLANSHARD looks closely at an important aspect of his studies at Trinity College – his acquaintance with John Pentland Mahaffy, Wilde's most influential guide into the ancient world. He presents a history of the intellectual disagreements between the disciple and the educator: Mahaffy offering a point and Wilde taking it on, only to draw a conclusion strikingly opposite to his teacher's. For instance, BLANSHARD demonstrates that, while Mahaffy offers an apology for homosexual love, Wilde eulogises it; if Mahaffy sees the Greek spirit as opposite to Catholic faith, Wilde attempts to reconcile the two; and, as regards the question of the education of the labouring class, Wilde's democratic ideas oppose Mahaffy's entrenched elitism. Significantly, BLANSHARD argues that their ancient preferences corresponded to their views on politics. Thus, Mahaffy's pride in the British empire connects with his admiration for the Ptolemaic Egypt of the Hellenistic period, an epoch recalled by him in support of British imperialism and in opposition to Home Rule for Ireland. Wilde's ideal, in contrast, is located in the Classical period – his admiration is for the independent Greek states – and it chimes with his mother's support for Home Rule and for Irish nationalism. What emerges is the political relevance of classical studies, the fact that they provided political analogies for current affairs. This point is of importance not only for readers of Wilde, but also for those of Walter Pater and of T.S. Eliot (their intellectual adversary, and also a follower), providing an illuminating context for their ideas of history, tradition, and Classicism as concerning not only the pastness of the past, but also its presence.

While BLANCHARD examines the inspiration which was personal and direct, Gideon NISBET focuses on the influence mediated through literature. He casts light on Wilde as an annotator – a promising classical scholar engaged with John Addington Symonds's *Studies of the Greek Poets*. The Wilde from NISBET's essay is a young classicist who, eventually, instead of continuing to work on Symonds's *Studies*, decided to imitate Symonds's style. Considering a lesser known aspect of Wilde's work – such as his remarks on Symonds's "The Women of Homer" – this essay reveals Wilde's independence and perceptiveness in judgment, noting his claim that Penelope, on Odysseus' return, actually lost the goal in her life. NISBET's essay also indicates Wilde's early interest in Euripides and Aristophanes. The annotations by Wilde are also examined by Iain ROSS, who looks at Wilde's copy of Herodotus. In ROSS's "'Very Fine & Semitic': Wilde's Herodotus", the annotations provide a context for ROSS's own very fine focus on Wilde's poem. ROSS starts with Wilde's single mention of Herodotus in "Humanitad", regarding this poetic reference in the context of Wilde's comments. The annotations and comments, in turn, are viewed in the light of the intellectual rivalry between two nineteenth-century approaches to Herodotus: George Rawlinson's criticism of Herodotus' historical unreliability and romanticism and Joseph Williams Blakesley's praise for these very same qualities. ROSS's essay outlines a change in Wilde's position: from that influenced by Rawlinson, as manifested in Wilde's annotations, to that reflecting Blakesley's admiration for Herodotus' imaginative powers, as visible in Wilde's "The Decay of Lying", where Wilde praises the artist's ability to tell stories artfully rather than to supply verifiable facts, thus using Herodotus to engage with a contemporary issue – a critique of literary realism.

Concluding the section on Wilde's education, Joseph BRISTOW directs readers' attention to notebooks and the influence of Literae Humaniores, the course known as "Greats", in Oxford. Reading excerpts from Wilde's 'Philosophy' notebook – Wilde's commentaries on the questions of philosophy and legislature; on Bacon and John Elliott Cairnes; and on John Austin's and Henry Maine's conclusions about the abstract meaning of sovereignty – BRISTOW explores the ways in which Wilde handles the question of abstraction, indicating the formative impact of Greats. From Wilde's use of the Greek high dot – to separate the steps taken in reasoning – to his dialectical

method of comparing and juxtaposing ancient and moderns, BRISTOW explains how Wilde's methods reveal the intellectual discipline of Greats. It is the same essential quality which, as RILEY notes in her Introduction, was stressed at the Old Bailey by Wilde's legal advisor in his (futile) attempt to save his client's reputation in the eyes of Victorians.

Part II moves from university rooms to playhouses, if some of the reconstructed Greek-theatre productions were staged on university premises. John STOKES discusses Wilde's engagement with plays performed in Greek by undergraduates and with the classical plays by British authors, their imitative spirit culminating in John Todhunter's *Helena in Troas*, noting that Wilde's attitude to the Greek productions was one of both interest and critical reserve. STOKES also views the astounding variety of Wilde's own theatrical output – comprising melodrama, verse drama, a symbolist play, and society comedies – as linked to his interest in the "synaesthetic" effect of the Greek drama, with poetry, sculpture, architecture and music inextricably combined in a Greek performance. While Wilde was interested in diverse aspects of a stage production – including space and architecture, thus, also plastic arts (sculpture and ceramics) – STOKES explains that his dominant interest was with psychology rather than with "plasticity". Significantly, he argues that Wilde's approach to the ancient plays anticipates an experimental modernist approach to classical models even if, admittedly, Wilde stopped short of the modernist experimentation to create his society comedies. Wilde's prioritising of "psychology" over "plasticity" is also confirmed by Clare L.E. FOSTER, who observes that it is psychological realism, rather than "plasticity" (or, a concern with the accuracy of the set) that prevails in Wilde's society plays. Characteristically, Wilde's social comedies satirise the audience. This satirical target, FOSTER explains, appeared as the effect of a shift taking place in the theatre: from the concept of the audience as an elite society coming to watch a play to that of the audience as the Victorian *beau monde* critically reflected on the stage. Wilde participated in this general shift from the audience-centered to the text-centered theatre, or from the concept of drama as a performance for a specific audience to that of drama as a text to be interpreted. In the 1880s, FOSTER says, the very special audience for which the play was staged was constituted by the "Greek club", who could understand the ancient play performed in the original language. The effect of the audience's gathering was, thus, self-complimentary self-recognition. They were in the limelight. Reading Wilde's reviews of the Greek plays – and noting their semi-parodic tone and the fact that Wilde talks a lot about architecture and costume to avoid talking about the text delivered in Greek – FOSTER reveals Wilde's ambivalent attitude to these classical performances. She shows that, on the one hand, Wilde found their exclusivist nature rather embarrassing. On the other hand, however, due to the relative unintelligibility of the ancient language, these Greek performances foregrounded formal and structural qualities of the Greek plays, such as would be reflected in Wilde's society comedies in later years.

It is with the comedies that the interest stays in the following essay by Isobel HURST, showing in Wilde an ideal playwright who could combine the comic with the tragic, and also one who restored Euripides to recognition after his literary reputation had been destroyed through the criticism of August W. Schlegel. HURST traces the interweaving of the comic and the tragic in Wilde's plays back to Menander's bitter New Comedy and to Euripides' tragedy with a happy ending. She also explains the two reasons behind Wilde's preference for Euripides. The first is the psychological realism of Euripides' plays (a point addressed in the papers by STOKES and FOSTER). The second is of a more personal nature: it is due to Euripides' "belatedness" – the fact that his coming at the end of an era made him a figure of that era's decadence, which also turned him into an ancient foil to Wilde, coming at the end of the Victorian epoch. Narrowing HURST's Euripidean focus, Kostas BOYIOPOULOS regards the influence of Euripides on Wilde's *Salome* as a representation of a new type of drama (a symbolist passion play) which, he claims, arose as the inversion of the Aristotelian tragedy. He finds the model for this inversion in Euripides' *Hippolytus* and shows that the theoretical justification for the new genre is delivered by Wilde's mouthpiece, Gilbert in *The Decay of Lying*. The imaginary Gilbert, BOYIOPOULOS explains, provides readjustments to Aristotle's theory of tragedy by replacing fear with awe, the spiritual with the sensuous, and

catharsis with the cold emotion of art – all of these being trademarks of the Decadent Aestheticist sensibility. These three deviations from Aristotle are supplemented with yet another shift, apparent both in ancient *Hippolytus* and in Decadent Aestheticist *Salome*: it is a move from the Aristotelian emphasis on the tragedy's serious theme, considered as *spoudaios*, to the theme of unrequited love, or *himeros*, trivial if viewed from the perspective of a *polis*. Also, in *Salome* the emphasis is put on a single theatrical effect rather than on the Aristotelian integrity of plot; this device is epitomised, Boyiopoulos observes, by the episode in which the love-smitten Narraboth drops dead in front of Salome, simply unseen by her. A similar effect, he notes, appears in Wilde's fairy tales. On the force of this essay's argument, Euripides' *Hippolytus* becomes the archetype of a Decadent symbolist play.

With Part III the interest moves from Wilde as challenging Victorian sensibility – repairing the reputation of Euripides and distancing himself from the elitism of the Greek performances – to Wilde as inspired by the ancients in his thoughts on the empire (the impact of Plato) and on the self and art (the influences of Euripides and Heraclitus). Part III closes with Wilde fascinated by France and Paris, which to him epitomised the elegant charm of Parnassianism, as well as the allure of Hellenistic decadence.

In the chapter opening this section, Leanne Grech, exploring Wilde's engagement with Plato (rather than, as is frequent in the criticism, with Wilde's neo-Platonism as a code for homosexual love), highlights the political aspect of this interest. She presents Wilde's polemic with Benjamin Jowett's project of Greats – Plato's *Republic* featuring prominently in the course – as employed in the service of the British Empire. She argues that Jowett, while following in Matthew Arnold's steps by insisting on classical education, viewed it as indispensable in the training of civil servants who would scrupulously execute rules and protocols without questioning their economic aim to exploit colonies. Grech explains that the Victorian idea of Hellenism was used for the entrenchment of the ruling class, the "Greek club" (the point raised earlier, in the theatrical context, by Foster). Wilde, however, used Plato for different ends. Instead of approaching the *Republic* as an apologia for the empire, or regarding it as a practical tool in the training of its officials, as Grech indicates, he used it as an inspiration for proposing his own version of Utopia and to urge an alternative educational project – one that would foreground individual experience. The educational import of classical studies in Wilde's personal life, in turn, is explored by Riley in an essay demonstrating how his classical education at Oxford – in particular his familiarity with Euripides – served to deepen his self-reflection in prison. As viewed in this chapter, the influence of Euripides goes beyond the shaping of the literary form (the aspect stressed in Chapters 7 and 8). In his later years, as Riley claims, Euripides provided Wilde with ancient analogies for the Christian notions of self-sacrifice and the redemptive power of love, the Euripidean autarkic *philia* seen as prefiguring Christian *caritas*. Regarding Euripides' *The Madness of Heracles*, Riley claims that, to Wilde, Theseus anticipates Christ, and the redeeming love in the ancient play becomes reflected in the redemptive suffering as portrayed in the New Testament. Those analogies, Riley indicates, provided Wilde with the patterns for creating his own self-narrative in the prison letter, which he wrote *De Profundis*.

While Euripides demonstrated to Wilde the potential of redemptive love, Heraclitus instructed him, Kate Hext explains, in the evanescent nature of life. Hext focuses on Heraclitus' idea of flux and on Wilde's Heraclitan imagery, examining their meanings in Wilde's essay "The Critic as Artist", in his only novel, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, and in his poignant literary letter, *De Profundis*. Benjamin Jowett's lectures and Pater's *Renaissance* – exposing the views of the famous classicist and the renowned Hegelian, respectively – provide the context for these explorations. Hext indicates four different kinds of implications which are yielded in Wilde's work by the Heraclitan echoes. First, there is the sense of the fleeting nature of a moment (as it was stressed in Pater's radically Heraclitan vision of life) and its intellectual consequence – the idea of the radically anti-essentialist self, or of the selfhood without a stable core. Wilde embraced Pater's philosophy, and Hext notes how he was deeply disappointed by Pater's censored and expurgated version of *The Renaissance*. Second, there is a reflection of the Heraclitan flux in Wilde's practice

of art criticism, his criticism having never been limited to any ideology, ever open to contradiction, interspersed with passages in which Wilde cheerily negates his earlier statements. Third, there is the Heraclitan idea of impermanence carried to its radical conclusion in Cyrenaicism as espoused by Dorian Gray and his intellectual guide, Lord Henry (though neither of them a mouthpiece for Pater or for Wilde). And finally, Hext demonstrates that, in *De Profundis*, there is a sense of alienation from the flux of life, and that this sense of imposed stillness is traumatic.

It must be said that "flux" seems also the word that can be applied as a description of Wilde's changing intellectual allegiances to antiquity. But even though antiquity's influence is multi-faceted, in the most general terms it can be organised as coming in two stages. In the 1870s and 1880s Wilde's initial commitment was to Classical Greece; his later allegiance, more typical of the 1890s, was to the Greece of the Hellenistic period, as influenced by Rome. These two imaginary homelands are presented by Stefano Evangelista as overlapping in Wilde's ambivalent experience of Paris. To Wilde, France was synonymous with artistic freedom, the opposite of the Victorian England. Paris itself, as Evangelista explains, had for him two meanings. Wilde's first interest was with the Parnassian movement, connected with his admiration of the classical Greek ideal. His later fascination, incited by Huysmans's *Against Nature* (Chapter 11 of *Dorian Gray* being what Evangelista terms "a mini *À rebours*"), led to a darker Decadent phase in his art. Evangelista captures this shift in interests and sensibility as the moment of transition from Paris as the imaginary Athens of the Classical period to Paris as Hellenic Alexandria, cosmopolitan and decadent.

In this last essay of Part III, concerned with Paris as an aesthetic equivalent of the ancient cities, Evangelista takes his reader from Athens to Alexandria. The next stop – in Part IV of the book – is transitional: it is *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, its legacy both to Greece, through Plato and Socrates, and to Rome, through Suetonius, Petronius, and Ovid.

The novel's plot is read by Marylu Hill as juxtaposed with Socrates' account of a young man's moral decline following an intellectual seduction by a supremely intelligent older man, "the drone" who awakens in the youth wayward impulses (a desire for democracy that flips into tyranny). The novel is regarded in the context of Socrates' warning against the corruption which occurs when passions replace reason; but it is also considered in the light of the Socratic understanding of *eros* as a glimpse of desire aroused by beauty, which ultimately becomes a thirst for wisdom. Yet Hill states that Dorian and his tutor fall short of the Socratic ideal, that neither Wotton nor Dorian – the Alcibiades kind of youth, a young man unfit to become a philosopher – merit sympathy, both of them having forfeited philosophy for philandering. In this sense, the novel is a criticism rather than endorsement of the New Hedonism. Whilst Hill stresses the novel's critical vein in its presentation of hedonistic excess, Nikolai Endres claims that the inspiration for Dorian's excess – the guarantee of impunity afforded by his deceptively fresh looks – came from Suetonius' *Lives* and Petronius' *Satyricon*. The two works were taught in Greats and provided a more direct inspiration for Dorian Gray's sexual adventures, as Endres argues, than the Greek model in *Symposium*. The essays by Hill and Endres seemingly contradict each other in that Hill views *The Picture of Dorian Gray* as a (Socratic) critique of brute sensualising while Endres, in contrast, sees in it a reflection of lugubrious lasciviousness (coming from Roman models). But this contradiction is only apparent if one assumes that Wilde's novel critiques what its plot reflects. In the following chapter, Iarla Manny extends the scope of Roman references in *Dorian Gray* to Ovid: in particular, to Ovid's version of the myth of Orpheus and Euridice, which, if compared with Vergil's rendering of it, significantly shortens the time of Orpheus' mourning for his wife. Manny proposes that there arises a parallel between Orpheus' curtailed period of grief and Dorian's bewailing Sybil only for an instant. Further, he proposes that Orpheus' subsequent misogyny creates a resonance for Oscar Wilde's deep-set fear of women. By moving beyond the Ovidian context, Manny also indicates an earlier Greek parallel: the one arising between the theme of a woman's death as treated in *Dorian Gray* and as used in Euripides's *Alcestis*.

The last part of this volume focuses exclusively on Wilde's Roman inspirations: his deployment of the sensational and the transgressive and his use of Plautus' theme of mistaken identity,

with both Plautus and Wilde exploiting the scandalous. In the chapter opening this section, Philip E. SMITH II, while admitting that Wilde's preference was for Greece, speaks of Wilde's thorough knowledge of Roman history and familiarity with ancient historians as manifested in his criticism of Tacitus and Livy. He demonstrates that if Wilde was critical of Tacitus' and Livy's insistence on the representation of the criminal and the scandalous, it was the very essence of the sensational that he himself foregrounded in what is now considered as his darker Decadent period. The related theme of Wilde's decadent fascination with transgressive Rome is developed by Shushma MALIK. Epitomised by the lives of Tiberius, Nero, and Elagabalus, such decadence is discussed as inspiring an interest which Wilde shared with Huysmans and George Moore, and as pursued in the tradition established by Thomas De Quincey. The essay traces a transition in Wilde's attitude: from a fascination with cruel aestheticism to a critique of it. Thus, MALIK draws attention to Wilde's eulogising of the poisoning as artful murder in "Pen, Pencil and Poison", contrasting it with De Quincey's view of this form of killing as totally unglamorous. In *Dorian Gray*, she indicates the references to the degenerate tyrants – from Tiberius, to Nero, to Caligula, to Elagabalus – but she points out that now, in Wilde's only novel, the crimes are committed for pragmatic rather than artistic reasons. Finally, in Wilde's "Epistola", as she shows, the emperors are significant by their absence. While the moments recalled in Wilde's prison letter as shared with Bosie reflect an indulgence that could almost match the profligacy of Nero and Elagabalus, in the reflective missive *De Profundis,* Wilde decidedly refutes this kind of decadent excess. Finally, Serena S. WITZKE probes the meanings behind the excesses of the brothers in Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest* and behind the cruelties perpetrated by the twins in Plautus' *Menaechmi*. She argues that *The Importance of Being Earnest* not only reflects the ancient play but also provides a Decadent reading of Plautus. In Wilde's re-writing, *Menaechmi* is not only a comedy on the theme of a sibling's mistaken identity, but as WITZKE explains, also a comedy about the two siblings being tragically robbed of their identities. Once the true identity is restored to each of them, they stop behaving scandalously. By meticulously cross-examining the plots of the plays, WITZKE reveals numerous analogies, noting that Wilde became familiar with the convention of the New Comedy (set by Menander) through Plautus and Terence. Closing this volume, her essay also further substantiates STOKES's observation that, by adapting ancient models, Wilde indeed anticipated the modernists.

The above summaries emphasise the underlying argument shared by the essays in this volume if their point, their common denominator, is construed not only as Wilde's uses of classical antiquity, but also as the contemporaneity of the past. The logic revealed in their arrangement is not linear. Rather, two general groups of effects – political and aesthetic – of Wilde's classical education can be seen to emerge and to crisscross. First, the Greats course is shown to have encouraged Wilde to think of the past and the present as intimately related. His classical education is shown to have furnished him with analogies to contemporary political and social issues and inspired his own attempt at utopia. While this volume probes the influence of classical models on his theatrical output – and his juxtaposition of "plasticity" and "psychological realism" – it also indicates the socially exclusivist effect of the Victorian classics course, of which he disapproved.

Second, Wilde's classical learning is discussed by the contributors as providing him with literary and quasi-literary models to interpret, transvalue and re-adapt. The book makes one realise the breadth of his Greek and Roman references. It shows how he engages with ancient historians – by calling on Herodotus to prioritise the imaginative over the factual, or by deriving from Livy, Suetonius and Tacitus inspirations for the sensational in *Dorian Gray*. It also explains how he adapts the literary Roman models, including Petronius's *Satyricon*, Ovid's rendering of Orpheus and Euridice's story, and Plautus' *Menaechmi*. But if Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest* goes back to Roman Plautus, as is demonstrated here, then no ancient dramatist, as this volume reveals, can match the Greek Euripides in his scope of influence on Wilde – both literary and personal, both aesthetic and ethical. Finally, the reflection of the Classical Greek and Hellenic worlds in Wilde's work is made complete through the essays pointing to his reading of Homer, the influence of Menander, his literary adoption of the Socratic pattern of seduction,

his transvaluation of Plato and his manifold adaptation of Heraclitus' idea of the impermanence of things.

This volume is highly informative. It is also inspiring. Its conclusions and observations can serve as starting points for wide-ranging literary explorations. Eliot scholars, for instance, are provided with an illuminating context for Eliot's use of Seneca's *Hercules Furens*, rather than Euripides' *The Madness of Heracles*, in the epigraph to *Marina*. This is a poem in which Eliot decided not to reveal the source beneath the motto, explaining later that it did not matter whether the epigraph were attributed to the Roman or the Greek author[5]. And he joked that he used Seneca instead of Euripides to tease the cognoscenti, the "classical men", for the Roman drama would be less known than the Greek to those who received a formal education in classics[6]. But was his intention also to avoid citing Euripides – a trademark of Wilde's Aestheticism, as this volume shows – as a motto to a modernist poem? Would he actually want to stamp a Decadent Aestheticist mark on a modernist work? Scholars of Wilde, in turn, will find the considerations regarding Wilde's interest in the idea of the "plastic" nature of Greek art and his, eventual, prioritising of psychology over plasticity an enlightening context for "The Sphinx Without a Secret", where the beauty of Lady Alroy, the eponymous Sphinx (an allusion also to Pater's Gioconda), is described as "psychological, not plastic"[7]. It will also be an indispensable reference for exploring Wilde's satiric uses of the decadent motifs – Wilde's poking fun at the society of "The Tired Hedonists" inclined to profess "a sort of cult for Domitian"[8] – though one recalls that Wilde mocked not only the decadent Roman poses but also the language inspired by Pater's Apuleian euphemism. This latter direction has been indicated, for instance, in Linda Dowling's discussion of the motif of "the fatal book" in her *Language and Decadence in the Victorian Fin De Siècle* (Princeton 1989). Notably, these two points, while concerning Wilde, involve a consideration of Pater. But that is hardly surprising if one remembers that "Wilde had boldly and publicly trumpeted what Pater whispered"[9]. Those readers who will want to hear the Paterian whisper behind Oscar Wilde's statements should be satisfied, because *Oscar Wilde and Classical Antiquity* has its older twin: *Pater the Classicist: Classical Scholarship, Reception, and Aestheticism* (Oxford 2017), edited by Charles Martindale, Elizabeth Prettejohn, and Stefano Evangelista, the last of whom has also contributed to the present collection.

Wilde attempted to live a Greek lifestyle in a Victorian setting, which left him with an exorbitant price to pay. But it also left his audience with classical tradition rendered contemporary again. The Foreword to this volume, by writer and actor Edward Petherbridge, uniquely honours Wilde by doing what Wilde strived to do – showing that the past is present. It poetically evokes a sense of the contemporaneity of both the classical world and of Wilde himself. It speaks of Wilde's personal presence in his work, of the Wilde analogies as valid references to an individual life – of the classically trained actor, a profession which Wilde celebrated – and of the ancient spirit recalled during Classical Greek Dance Festival at the beginning of the twenty-first century, just as it had been recalled at the end of the nineteenth century by the plays performed in Greek (though, this latter, to a different, exclusivist effect). Importantly, the Foreword speaks not only of the antiquity's

---

[5] Eliot to John Hayward, 30 October 1930, in: V. Eliot, J. Haffenden (edd.), *The Letters of T.S. Eliot*, vol. V: *1930–31*, London 2014, p. 369.

[6] See W. Empson, *Argufying*, ed. by J. Haffenden, London 1987, p. 365. See also as quoted in: C. Ricks, J. McCue (edd.), *The Poems of T.S. Eliot*, vol. I: *Collected and Uncollected Poems*, London 2015, p. 776.

[7] O. Wilde, *The Sphinx Without a Secret*, in: *Collins Complete Works of Oscar Wilde: Centenary Edition*, Glasgow 1999, p. 205.

[8] O. Wilde, *The Decay of Lying*, in: *Collins*… (n. 7), p. 1073.

[9] M. Levey, *The Case of Walter Pater*, London 1978, p. 21.

current relevance but also about its lasting capacity to stir enjoyment. This last feature should not be forgotten when praise for this volume is rendered in academic terms, describing it as innovative, informative, carefully edited, equipped with a comprehensive, meticulously crafted thematic index, a requisite book for both a scholar in literary Aestheticism and a classicist.

Anna Budziak
University of Wrocław

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

Ariadne Konstantinou, *Female Mobility and Gendered Space in Ancient Greek Myth*, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018, 208 pp., ISBN 978-14-725-677-3, £81.00.

For several reasons, the book under review seems to be an extremely appetising piece of scholarly work. First of all, over the past fifty years or so, the subject matter of female (im-)mobility in ancient Greece has become one of the most widely discussed issues of ancient culture. Most of the classical formulations of the problem, which originate from the 1970s and 1980s, were informed by traditional positivist scholarship with its obvious pitfalls which resulted from paying little or no attention to the distinction between the social reality, ideological statements and outward fiction. Given the ideological bias that is evident in the case of at least some of the authors (suffice to mention Eva Keuls[1]), the temptation to turn scholarly work into a moralising story about how men always oppressed women was clearly too strong to resist (not that I am arguing against such a view – I only think that it does not necessarily belong to scholarship *sensu stricto*). The decades that followed brought some works (e.g. by Cohen or Goff[2]) whose authors advocated a much more balanced interpretation based on a radically different use of sources which resulted from the integration of some contemporary anthropological devices into classical scholarship (especially Bourdieu[3]) that help distinguish between what we are told by our ancient "informers" and their actual daily experience.

Konstantionou's (= K.) book begins with a personal statement ("A few years ago, I happened to see from the balcony of our apartment at the heart of cosmopolitan Tel Aviv people dancing in the streets during the festivity of Simchat Torah…"), which seems to locate it in the same strand of thought strongly influenced by post-modern anthropology, which, far from confusing an experience of an individual with supra-individual abstract entities, nevertheless, tends to pay as much attention to the former as it happens to be suspicious about the latter. Further on in the introductory chapter, K. makes her theoretical position more explicit, drawing attention to several difficulties of which historians of ancient Greek culture are becoming gradually more and more aware: our sources are excerptive, biased by the fact that they usually represent the point of view of a single gender (male), social (citizen or at least free individual) and economic (better off) group. Moreover, the vast majority of them come from a single place (Athens). Having all this in mind, the author sets out to navigate these challenges through a close-reading of individual texts and by focusing on their meaning within the relatively narrow context of their original time and place of creation/performance, but without the goal of drawing a perfectly consistent (and thus necessarily forced) image of the ancient cultural system or its evolution. What is also important is that K. declares that she is interested in mythology as such, rather than in the way in which it reflects/refracts the social reality. This means that the scope of the book was intended to be narrow, which should be taken as a definite advantage, had the author been as disciplined as she clearly desired to be. However, for some reasons which are described below the book turns out to fulfil only part of what it promises.

The first part of the book ("Goddesses on the move") is well organised along lines that result from K.'s modification of an already classical analysis of the figure of Hestia proposed by Vernant[4].

---

[1] E.C. Keuls, *The Reign of the Phallus. Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*, New York 1985.

[2] D. Cohen, *Law, Sexuality, and Society. The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1991; B. Goff, *Citizen Bacchae. Women's Ritual Practice in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley 2004.

[3] P. Bourdieu, *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique: précédé de Trois études d'ethnologie kabyle*, Genève 1972.

[4] J.-P. Vernant, *Hestia-Hermès. Sur l'expression religieuse de l'espace et du mouvement chez les Grecs*, L'Homme III 1963, pp. 12–50.

According to the French scholar, the notion of Hestia's immobility and her eternal fixity at the centre of the household (esp. *Hymn. Hom. Ven*. 21–32) are related to her mythical virginity and reflect some of the ideas on real-life virgins, who were ideally not expected to leave the paternal hearth before marriage. K. rightly observes that this is not as simple as it might seem (it is important to emphasise that it was not that simple for VERNANT either) and she devotes a chapter (1) to a presentation of virgin goddesses, only one of whom was represented in the poetic tradition as immobile (Hestia), whereas some others were constantly on the move (Homeric Athena, Artemis). The chapter (2) that follows presents two non-virgin goddesses: Aphrodite and Demeter, who are described as travelling, and Hera, who is almost completely stationary. Although the Homeric Hera sometimes travels, most notably to meet Zeus on Mount Ida (the official destination of her journey is even more remote, as she claimed to be going to the limits of the world), K. convincingly argues that these peregrinations are different from those of the goddesses who mingled with mortals. Unlike them, Hera works through intermediaries, most of the time being confined to her golden throne in Olympus or to some other location restricted only to the gods. Thus, an interesting map of goddesses' (im-)mobility starts emerging from the material gathered by K.: stationary Hestia, man-like Athena, wild Artemis, lustful Aphrodite who visits her lovers, Demeter who assumes the likeness of a post-menopausal woman in order to travel among mortals, and hieratic Hera. These goddesses are distinguished by various modes of movement and the spaces they are associated with. The discussion of this fascinating material, however, is often limited to the presentation of poetic passages with only a few words of commentary, which may leave a feeling of dissatisfaction.

The second part of the book, "Heroines on the move", is organised according to a "descending" principle. Having discussed the issue of the mobility of Olympian goddesses (chapters 1 and 2 in part 1), the author focuses on tragic heroines (chapter 3). Then she devotes a chapter (4) to the mobility involved in ritual. Thus, we gradually pass from the celestial sphere towards the human level. In spite of the presence of this seemingly clear principle, the second part of the book seems much more poorly organised than the first, and it gives the impression of something that is unfinished.

Chapter 3 begins with an observation that the wedding, one of the most important moments in an ancient Greek woman's life, involved her transfer from the paternal to the marital house. K. introduces an interesting and perhaps useful distinction between "small-scale centrifugal movement" and "the large-scale journey". The peregrinations of girls married abroad (e.g. Procne who married Thracian Tereus) and of those who were expelled by their fathers once they had lost their virginity as a result of an extramarital affair (e.g. Danae) belonged to the latter category. Quite interestingly, the author does not distinguish between these two related, but strikingly different, categories of girls leaving their paternal household.

In the section that follows ("Mobile heroines in Greek tragedy"), K. makes some introductory remarks that are generally true, if obvious, about the way in which tragedy as performed in the theatre might have distorted the general rules of conduct (e.g. speakers, male or female, are always outside the palace). What is surprising here are the speculations about the reason why female choruses "do not need a justification […] when they first enter the stage". A specific example of the chorus in Euripides' *Medea* is given to substantiate this claim. Yet, the first lines of the parodos (131–133) read: ἔκλυον φωνάν, ἔκλυον δὲ βοὰν/ τᾶς δυστάνου/ Κολχίδος. This is precisely a justification of the presence of someone who goes out of the house in order to help/comfort a person outside. Indeed, as EASTERLING[5] argued, each of the female choruses in extant tragedy provides an explicit explanation (even if not always a satisfactory one) of their presence in the public space.

The rest of the chapter presents two tragic stories about women on the move: the wanderings of Io in fantastic lands (*Prometheus vinctus*) and the journey of the Danaids (*Supplices*). Admittedly, both myths are fascinating, and so is the chapter in K.'s book. Nevertheless (in spite of the justification on p. 85), I do not understand why the author decided to focus on them, given that they do

[5] P.E. EASTERLING, *Women in Tragic Space*, BICS XXXIV 1987, pp. 15–26.

not seem to exemplify anything that might be called a typical case of female mobility in tragedy (if anything like this exists). I do not understand either why K. claims that the wanderings of Io did not evoke the liminal phase of "the passage of young woman into adulthood and motherhood". Instead, she states that she prefers the reading that "focuses on the geographical details of the myth and interprets it as an attempt to map geo-political identities and delineate spatial constructs such as centre and periphery". Admittedly, these are two different but hardly mutually exclusive perspectives; on the contrary, the former (to a substantial degree) presupposes the latter. What is more, having made this declaration, K. turns to what she calls the "small-scale mobility" of Io – her passage from paternal to marital household that signifies the period of becoming an adult woman. *Mutatis paucis mutandis*, this is exactly the interpretation that the author rejected. As for the section on the Danaids myth, I found the observations on the heroines' "manipulative rhetoric" fascinating. Nevertheless, I keep asking myself why this interesting essay was included in a book about female mobility.

The chapter (4) that follows is devoted to the relationship between the mythical stories and the experience of real-life women through ritual. In the introduction, the author declares that she is not going to discuss the complex issue of the priority of ritual over myth or the opposite way around. This suggests that she assumes that myths can usually be expected to have had direct counterparts in apposite rituals. This assumption is at best problematic, however common it used to be in the scholarship, especially in the early twentieth century. Perhaps this is the main reason why the whole chapter seems to attack a straw-man.

In the section that follows, "Maenads at the mountain", K. introduces a distinction between "named" mythological maenads (Cadmus' daughters and their *thiasoi*) and "anonymous" ones, whose fate in the *Bacchae* (unlike Agaue, they returned home) is supposed to reflect an experience of real women who participated in the rituals. This is an interesting reformulation of a distinction already introduced by Diodorus of Sicily (IV 3) that is well represented in the scholarly literature[6] between the mythological and historical maenads. The only problem is that such a distinction cannot be read back to the text of Euripides. In spite of K.'s claims, lines 35–38, 680–682 and 694 do not suggest that the *thiasoi* led by Cadmus' daughters were separate from the crowd of ordinary Theban maenads. Apart from this, the section is very interesting, but some further elaboration would be welcome. As it stands, it gives the impression of being a series of loose observations about how Dionysiac experience makes the concept/perception of space shift. Given the nature of the subject matter (chaos), a more robust conceptual frame is needed in order to save the description from becoming similar to what is being described. Unfortunately (to give one example), K. does not make explicit the distinctions between descriptive categories when she writes about dissolving physical boundaries by means of tearing down the walls of a palace and dissolving conceptual boundaries by means of speaking metaphorically about a city as if it was a person. I understand that it is a mental shortcut, but it is certainly a risky one.

The section that follows is entitled "The space of the hunt in the huntress myths and the *arkteia* at Brauron". It contains some interesting remarks about the difference between Artemis and her mortal followers (the main difference is that Artemis was immortal, which had far-reaching consequences) and between the male "black hunter" and his female counterpart. Here the main problem is that the figure of the "black hunter" seems to have more to do with the history of scholarly paradigms than with Greek culture itself[7]. Subsequently, K. addresses the problem of the

---

[6] E.g. A. Rapp, *Die Mänade im griechischen Cultus, in der Kunst und Poesie*, RhM XXVII 1872, pp. 1–22, 562–611; A. Henrichs, *Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina*, HSCPh XC 1978, pp. 121–160.

[7] See e.g. J. Ma, *Black Hunter Variations*, PCPhS XL 1994, pp. 49–80; D.B. Dodd, *Adolescent Initiation in Myth and Tragedy. Rethinking the Black Hunter*, in: D.B. Dodd, C.A. Faraone (edd.), *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives*, London–New York 2003, pp. 71–84.

relationship between the myths of huntresses and the rituals at Brauron, only to conclude that it is doubtful. Again, the question arises as to whether this passage is really necessary in a book about female mobility.

The last chapter, although included in the second part of the book, clearly stands out from it. It contains general conclusions and some brief remarks (e.g. contrasting the spatial mobility of women in myth and in comedy). Subsequently, on the last three pages, the author introduces another valuable pair of terms, “glass ceiling” and “glass walls”, in reference to the limits of mobility of real and imaginary ancient women.

All in all, given its hyperbolically excerptive character and the fact that the material has been chosen in an arbitrary way, the book under review cannot be read as a monograph. It is rather a selection of essays directly or indirectly related to the central subject matter specified in the title. Yet, it cannot be denied that, in spite of its all weaknesses, it is an interesting and thought-provoking piece of scholarly literature on an extremely difficult and important subject. Like a preliminary archaeological survey, it offers some glimpses of the enormous mass of data regarding female mobility and gendered space in the ancient Greek imagination. There is still much to be done…

Bartłomiej Bednarek
University of Warsaw

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

Arystoksenos z Tarentu, *Harmonika*, przekład, wstęp i komentarz Anna Maciejewska [Aristoxenus of Tarent, *Harmonics*, Translated with an Introduction and Commentary by Anna Maciejewska], Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2015, L + 61 pp., ISBN 978-83-7969-920-9.

Given the scarcity of publications on ancient Greek music in Polish[1], a translation of the most significant treatise on Greek harmonic theory by one of the few experts in this discipline affords the Polish readership a rare treat. In order to illustrate the importance of Aristoxenus' *Harmonics* and its unparalleled impact on ancient musical thought, a brief introduction to the work is, perhaps, called for.

Music, unlike other arts, especially the visual ones, defies all attempts at description and codification through easily obtainable means; nonetheless, the fifth and fourth centuries BCE saw an increasing interest in elucidating some of the puzzling phenomena provided by this elusive art form. One of the two most prominent approaches, for the sake of convenience often designated the Pythagorean school, sought to represent music in terms of numerical ratios, as part of the larger scheme of an organised and harmonious universe. Its theorists rarely adopted music as their principal object of enquiry; rather, they discerned celestial order in perfect consonances obtained by applying mathematical formulae to the division of a string, and strove to describe the realm of sounds by these minutely calculated, albeit unrealistic measurements. On the other hand, Aristoxenus chose to rely on the judgement of the ear. His approach revolutionised the discipline and left such a lasting mark on harmonic science that, apart from Ptolemy, no further original contribution was put forward in the field for the rest of antiquity. It should be noted, however, that Aristoxenus did not invent empirical harmonics himself, as it had apparently been fostered beforehand by the much criticised *harmonikoi*, whose work left no traces in the preserved sources. Nevertheless, Aristoxenus' theories were expressed in such a powerful and influential fashion that his successors hardly dared question his authority. At this point I will halt my brief outline of Greek endeavours to force melodious sounds into orderly patterns, and will refer readers to Anna Maciejewska's [= M.] work.

M. performs a twofold task: parallel to employing her translation skills, the author displays her outstanding proficiency in Greek harmonics in the first half of the book, which encompasses an ample introduction aimed at acquainting readers with the elementary ideas underpinning ancient harmonic science. This certainly works to the advantage of the book, especially in view of the generally limited number of scholars seasoned in ancient music. In the first part of the introduction M. discusses the presence of music in ancient Greece, the sources of our knowledge on the musical sciences, and the prevalent acoustic theories. The first chapter, comprising a brief characterisation of Greek musical culture, begins with valuable remarks on the problems encountered by ancient (as well as, to a certain degree, modern) scholarship in defining and describing music. At the very outset of her consideration, the author observes that a musical piece in fact exists only during its performance, and, unless recorded, escapes exact codification. What is more, the bulk of the technical terms coined to describe it is incomprehensible to a lay audience. Since effective recording techniques date back to the beginning of the 20th century, the musical output of preceding eras is irretrievably lost. Notation proves to be of some help in its reconstruction. Yet

[1] Polish readers may acquaint themselves with ancient Greek music thanks to translations of the books by M.L. West (*Ancient Greek Music*) and J. Landels (*Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*). From among ancient musical treatises, two have been translated into Polish, namely *De Musica* ascribed to Plutarch and a short work of the same title by Philodemus.

pieces of ancient musical notation have come down to us in such scarcity and fragmentation that, despite having the tools, we lack the material on which they could be used. The author holds this lack responsible, and rightly so, for the general tendency of classical studies to envisage antiquity without music. She then goes on to contrast this conviction with the actual significance of music's presence in Greek culture. Two subsequent chapters, "The Sources of Evidence" and "The Two Approaches in Ancient Greek Study of Music"[2], summarise Greek musical writing and briefly introduce the main paths of Greek musical thought. In the longest chapter in this part, M. elucidates Greek scalar systems alongside their key terminology, encompassing *genos*, *pyknon*, *diesis*, *eidos*, *harmoniai*, *tonos*, and *metabole*. In order to help her readers visualise the harmonic structures she is evoking, M. provides her own schematic drawings of tetrachords, the "unmodulating" system, octave species and modulations to a contiguous *tonos*. M.'s illustrations also feature in other parts of the introduction, as well as in the text of the treatise, constituting an invaluable point of reference. In the final chapter of this part, the author focuses on the psychagogic influence of music and the so-called ethos theory, a popular idea frequently referred to in literary texts, although largely disregarded by Aristoxenus, and commonly refuted by other "serious" theorists.

The following part is entirely devoted to Aristoxenus' biography and to an overview of his scientific output. Unfortunately, very little information on both survives, most of which is compiled in the sole attempt at a biography of the philosopher undertaken by Visconti[3].

In the third part of the introduction, M. examines the subject matter and scope of the *Harmonics*, beginning with the manuscript tradition in which the treatise was handed down to us. She then proceeds to present the structure and content of the work (chapters "The Parallel Composition of Books I and II", "The 'Thesis and Proof' Composition of Book III"). There has been much scholarly debate regarding the interdependence of Books I and II, which include a considerable amount of overlapping material. M. brings out these analogies by juxtaposing the content of the two books in a chart. In the subsequent chapter, "The Discussion on the Original Arrangement of the Text", the author evokes well-established arguments for and against the unity of the treatise, and takes her own stand in accordance with Laloy, Barker and Gibson, who consider book I the first edition of the work, which was later revised and elaborated into books II and III. The next chapter presents the *Harmonica* as a series of lectures deriving from the Aristotelean tradition, assembled into a handbook addressed to readers with a certain degree of experience in harmonic matters. Subsequently, M. specifies the subject and purpose of the treatise. Her remarks on the modern significance of the term harmony (a diastematic, simultaneous concurrence of pitches), as opposed to the Greek counterpart of the term which is understood as the concordant horizontal arrangement of tones in a melody, draw attention to the problem that often perplexes musicologists acquainted only with modern harmonic theory. Although polyphony, heterophony and other forms of harmony were widely employed in antiquity, they left no traces in musical treatises and extant fragments of notation. Greek harmonic science deals with the "harmonious" structure of melody, which, in a nutshell, denotes the admissible succession of tones deployed in accordance with a set of rules. With reference to this definition, M. observes that in his work Aristoxenus proposed delineating the nature of melody by means of rules which ensured that certain combinations of tones sound harmonious and consonant to our ears. The following chapter ("The Scientific and Aristotelean Character of the *Harmonics*"), highlights traits of Aristotelean methodology in the treatise and states the main principles of Aristoxenus' programme, naming aural perception as the ultimate criterion for determining the aesthetic quality of a melody. M. then turns to one of the most intriguing harmonic concepts, the *dynamis*. Brought up within the virtually omnipresent major-minor system, we often tend to take functional harmony for granted. Indeed, it appears that

---

[2] I am citing the titles of the chapters after the English version of the table of contents provided by the author.

[3] A. Visconti, *Aristosseno di Taranto. Biografia e formazione spirituale*, Napoli 1999.

tone-functions dependent on scalar context rather than pitch were known long before the development of our tonal music. Similarly to our functional system, Greek *tonoi* also made use of a tonal centre (*mese*) and other functions related to each scale step. However, as M. points out, according to Aristoxenus the notion of functionality referred not only to the position of a tone in a scale, but it also defined an interval, based on its place between scale steps more often than on its actual size. The distance *mese-lichanos*, for instance, was perceived as an interval function in its own right, although in each *genos* it was in fact filled in with an interval of a different magnitude. In the next chapter, M. analyses two concepts that formed the foundations of Aristoxenus' project: melody perceived as a natural phenomenon, and congruence between harmonic precepts and musical practice. M. advises the exertion of due caution with regard to the former point. Confined to a single musical style, Aristoxenus could not have predicted that melody was actually a product of culture or, at best, coincidence.

Despite his innovative approach, Aristoxenus was indebted to his predecessors at least for the groundwork of his studies, a fact which he admitted reluctantly. M. gives an account of his debt and his zealous critique of co-existing musical conceptions in the chapters "Dispute against the Predecessors: The Pythagoreans and the *Harmonikoi*" and "The Eristic Manipulation of Aristoxenus". The last chapter of the introduction enumerates modern editions and translations of the *Harmonics*.

M.'s work benefits greatly from its didactic character. An instructive introduction, illustrations, explanatory footnotes accompanying the translation, and a glossary of Greek harmonic terminology are aimed at ushering in as smoothly as possible all those who are unfamiliar with Greek music theory. It should be kept in mind that the task is challenging indeed. Greek harmonic precepts not only significantly differ from our contemporary systems, but, with ancient music almost lost, they pose many puzzles. Being a skilled translator well-versed in the arcane harmonic science, M. steers clear of the potential traps with exemplary ease. Moreover, her keen rendition of Aristoxenus' caustic style, especially his stinging remarks against the *harmonikoi*, encourages a vivid portrayal of the philosopher's character. In doing so, M. clearly diverges from the usual course taken by other translators, who envisage Aristoxenus' disquisition in much more elevated terms. The language of the translation is clear and informative throughout, employing easily-graspable phrases to elucidate even the most obscure technical details[4]. This, as well as other efforts to make the treatise highly accessible, is an obvious virtue of M.'s work. Although no doubt well-acquainted with other translations, the author remains independent, and offers her own, quite compelling vision of Aristoxenus' discourse.

Unlike Barker, who provides Greek versions of the key terms (such as *systēma, tonoi, phthongos*, etc.)[5], M. translates even problematic terminology to Polish, which has both advantages and disadvantages; while it ensures painless reading for a less proficient audience, it sends off more inquisitive readers to the Greek original or other translations. Nevertheless, I find M.'s work highly recommended to both musicologists and classicists at all levels of advancement in music theory. M. does not merely perform her duties as a translator; she also goes to great lengths in order to promote ancient music among Polish scholars.

Kamila Wysłucha

[4] Naturally, explication of some conundra (for instance, Aristoxenus' remarks on musical notation, [*Harm*. 49 Da Rios]), which baffle the most eminent scholars of the field, goes far beyond the scope of translator's duties, cf. pp. 24 f., n. 75.

[5] A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings*, vol. II: *Harmonic and Acoustic Theory*, Cambridge 1989, pp. 126 ff.

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

Manuel Baumbach, Peter von Möllendorff, ***Ein literarischer Prometheus. Lukian aus Samosata und die Zweite Sophistik***, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2017, 269 pp., ISBN 978-3-8253-6460-1, €26.00.

This handy volume appears in the series "Heidelberger Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft", which aims to provide students, teachers, and scholars of related disciplines with introductions to assorted authors and subjects that are both concise and well-grounded in current scholarship. The series seems to lean mostly towards Latin authors (with several volumes authored by Michael von Albrecht), which makes this book on a Greek writer a particularly welcome addition.

In the opening section, the authors make their purpose explicit: to provide readers of Lucian with an aid to support them in interpreting this entertaining, yet complex author. The book is not a comprehensive scholarly treatment of Lucian, but aims to illuminate essential problems encountered by a non-specialist audience, though one most likely familiar with ancient literature. The book is therefore resolutely selective and focuses on several well-chosen themes. The format, likewise, has been determined with this intended audience in mind: representative, frequently long passages from Lucian are quoted with an accompanying translation, the scholarly apparatus is limited, and suggestions for further reading are placed at the end of chapters. The book begins, pleasantly, with, "statt eines Vorworts", a Lucian-style dialogue between Charon, Lucian, Hermes, and Menippos. It is followed by five chapters discussing Lucian's biography, cultural and intellectual environment, and his works, including their genres, formats, and reception.

The first chapter, "Masken und Wahre Geschichten: Lukians Biographie", focuses on Lucian's biography. After discussing the limited external evidence we have (Eunapios, Suda, Galen), the authors focus first on autobiographical aspects of his works and then on Lucian's self-presentation ("masks") and the multiplicity of his literary alter egos. In a useful and detailed exposition, they go over the *personae* ("auktorial konnotierten Figuren") of Loukianos, Tychiades, Parrhesiades, Syrus, Lykinos, Menippos, comparing them, pointing out differences, and clearly laying out the elusiveness of the authorial figure.

Chapter 2, "Ein *Traum* von Bildung: *paideia*-Diskurse in der Zweiten Sophistik", contextualises Lucian's literary activity, presenting it against the cultural, social, and literary backdrop of the Second Sophistic. After discussing the provenance of the term "Second Sophistic", borrowed by scholars from Philostratos, the authors focus on the key significance of the cultural notion of *paideia.* They elucidate this crucial concept by placing a spotlight on figures in Lucian's works whose identity is based on their specific relation to *paideia*: a teacher of orators, a student of philosophy, an uneducated person, an educated reader, a charlatan, etc. Mimetic literary practices characteristic of Greek literature of the period are discussed, as well as the complex issue of Greek identity at the fringes of the empire and the figures of "foreigners".

Chapter 3, "Λουκιανὸς τάδ' ἔγραψα… Eine Werkschau", contains a discussion of Lucian's literary art, and his use of various formats that were in popular use in the imperial period (declamation, diatribe, treatise, polemic, prolalia, letter; the authors duly note that Lucian treats existing formats freely, and that a comprehensive generic typology of his works is not possible), as well as typical literary strategies a reader encounters in them (such as personification, allegory, ekphrasis, anecdote…). What is perhaps missing from the chapter is some acknowledgement of the problematic nature of some generic labels (diatribe in particular); still, this part of the book offers a very accessible introduction to the diversity and fluidity of the formats in the *corpus*. The chapter is supplemented with a nice overview of recurrent Lucianic *Leitmotifs* such as the trial, the journey, and the dream, as well as metaphorically applied medical images of illness and healing.

The absence of the dialogue-genre in chapter 3 is due to it being the focus of the subsequent section ("*Der doppelt Angeklagte* und seine Hippokentauren"), which is wholly devoted to the

comic dialogue, a genre that Lucian claimed to have invented. Comic dialogue is considered as an example of generic hybridity which provided readers with a new aesthetic experience. The authors focus on the inherent fluidity of this format, paralleled by a shifting authorial voice. The comic dialogue is characterised as an unstable generic mixture of philosophical dialogue and comedy, with some recurrent features such as a philosophical theme, a laughter-orientation, a plot and other elements characteristic of drama, and a setting in public space. Such a definition allows one to identify a segment of related works that best fit the definition, including texts such as the *Double Accused*, the *Fisherman*, and *Philosophies for Sale*, as well as *Icaromenippus*, *Menippus or Descent to Hades*, and the *Runaways*. On the other hand, the definition permits one to more clearly articulate differences between these texts and other works in the dialogue-format, such as *Dialogues of the Dead*, which lack a plot and a philosophical component. The latter collection of miniature dialogues, together with three related writings – *Dialogues of the Gods, Dialogues of the Sea-Gods,* and *Dialogues of the Courtesans* – are characterised as a "diluted mixture of ingredients of the philosophical dialogue and comedy", in some cases, with mere traces left of the constitutive elements of the dialogue and the comedy. The question of whether Lucian's dialogues could have been staged is also discussed, with the authors arguing in the affirmative.

The last section ("Bücher sammeln: Lukians Überlieferung") asks difficult questions about the relationship between the oral presentation and written publication of Lucian's works, as well as about their circulation and transmission. The formation of the Lucianic *corpus* is also discussed, including the question of the inauthenticity of some works included in it. A useful appendix provides short summaries of all of Lucian's works.

This well-designed and thoughtful book provides a rich and enjoyable introduction to the Lucianic *corpus*. It reflects the preoccupations of recent scholarship, discusses a considerable range of problems and a wide array of texts, and illuminates Lucian's literary practices in an ingenious, accessible way without oversimplifying the subject. While it is necessarily selective in its treatment – the historical reality of the Roman Empire is given little treatment, as is Lucian's creative use of earlier Greek literature – the material covered is well chosen and well organised. One particular merit of the book is its detailed readings: substantial excerpts of Lucian's texts are quoted and then used to exemplify interpretative techniques. While the book may be somewhat challenging for a reader not well versed in Lucian's extensive *corpus* because of its ambitious inclusion of numerous texts in its discussion, the reader's efforts will certainly pay off not only in terms of a better understanding of Lucian, but also in terms of developing reading strategies expedient for any reader of imperial period prose.

Katarzyna Jażdżewska
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

Maddalena Bonelli (ed.), ***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), 190 pp., ISBN 978-88-7088-639-9, €30.00.

Dedicated to the memory of an eminent scholar of imperial philosophy, the much lamented Paolo Accattino, the volume edited by Maddalena Bonelli comprises six essays, preceded by a brief introduction by the editor. Despite its unimpressive size, the volume forms a comprehensive and highly inspiring overview of issues related both to the study of exegetical literature as such and to the study of Alexander's teachings in particular. By focusing on two texts of an apparently "non-advanced", school-oriented character, i.e. the *Mantissa* and the *Problemata ethica*, the six authors are able to highlight the importance of the context, of the distance separating the Aristotle of today's Aristotelian scholars from the Aristotle known and discussed by Alexander.

The first essay in the collection is Laura Castelli's study of the relationship between Alexander's theoretical exploration of the *Topics* and the practical application of the thus explored principles in the *Ethical Problems* (pp. 19–42). In a nutshell, it emphasises the intimate connection between two seemingly different areas of philosophical inquiry, i.e. the study of logic and the exploration of ethical problems. The *Problemata* are thus studied as an example of a practical exercise of the argumentative principles well known from the *Topics* (as explained in Alexander's *Commentary*[1]) and, hence, as an illustrative example of Aristotelian dialectics at work. Through a careful reading of the source material, Castelli is able to demonstrate the practical consequences of Alexander's exploration of the *Topics,* to highlight the fundamental importance of logical exegesis in philosophical practice – the *Commentary on the Topics* is thus revealed as a true sourcebook of dialectical methodology. Meanwhile, the apparent focus of the *Problemata* on matters of ethics becomes relegated to the background – instead the focal point of the debate lies in the method, the practical exercise of logical principles.

Paolo Accattino's exploration of *Mantissa* 19 (pp. 43–57) bears all the hallmarks of the late scholar's erudition and brilliance: in exploring Alexander's understanding of the *dikaion* as manifest in the essay, the scholar emphasises the characteristics of the exegete's concept of what is naturally just as set against the contemporary debate against the Epicureans. His analysis highlights the radicalisation of the original, far less specific intimations of Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* V 10 (1134 b, 18–1135 a, 5). This radicalisation, as Accattino makes clear, is due to the very different philosophical context of Alexander's treatise: effectively, the past centuries of ethical debates are reflected in the Aphrodisian's considerations. Of necessity, they affect the understanding of various seemingly self-explanatory terms, thus modifying the essence of the teaching.

Next comes Carlo Natali's detailed study of the various versions of seemingly purely ethical issue of pleasure being opposed to virtue (pp. 59–86). Tracing the beginnings of the Aristotelian discussion to *EN* 1152 b, 8–12 and the debate nowadays recognised as a controversy between Speusippus and that attributed to Philebus in the eponymous dialogue of Plato (63 E–64 A), Natali turns to the two imperial commentators and their respective contributions to the issue. He begins by analysing Aspasius[2]: here, he notes the massive divergence from what is known as the standard attribution. Then, he turns his attention to the surviving writings of Alexander (i.e. *Problemata* 5, 6,

[1] To be precise, Castelli's focus lies with *Topics* I 11 (Alexander's *Commentary* 94, 25–95, 16).

[2] It is important to note that inquiries into Aspasius' work remain excessively rare; the collection of essays edited by Antonina Alberti and Bob Sharples (*Aspasius. The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics*, Berlin 2013) furnishes the most exhaustive study to date.

7 and 16): while highlighting the difference of approach (the subject is treated as purely theoretical, scientific inquiry, a fact manifested by the appearance of causal *dioti*), he also emphasises the importance of another move, i.e. the elimination of philosophical context (no mention of possible controversy appears, the subject being considered in complete abstraction of the original Aristotelian context of contemporary debate). Now, the essay aims primarily at demonstrating the importance of ethical matters in philosophical training as employed in the school of Alexander, thus supplementing the existing literature on the subject[3], as well as at showcasing the idea of *Aristotelem ex Aristotele* by making manifest the close reliance of the discussed *Problemata* and the Aristotelian *Ethics* and *Analytics*. Nevertheless, there is much more as the essay may also be considered an important addition to the study of the vagaries of *Überlieferungstradizion*. In the essence, this relatively short study both reveals the dangers of taking an imperial author at his word and manifests the many ways in which more or less rigorous and purely theoretical arguments may be developed from far less strict pronouncements of an ancient author.

In his relatively brief essay on Alexander's *Problemata ethica* 22 ("That the Virtues Reciprocate") Jonathan Barnes highlights the complexity of problems related to the study of ancient commentators (pp. 87–114). The text under consideration being written in impressively convoluted Greek, it also seems to be at odds with its own heading: within the argument itself the reciprocity of virtues is mentioned as if in passing, never making it to its conclusion. Still, as Barnes rightly stresses, an interpretation involves the necessity of dealing with a phenomenon of extreme rarity in the surviving corpus of Alexander's writings, namely with the presence of a verbatim quote from Aristotle (*EE* 1145 a, 2–6, to be precise) and, subsequently, with major syntactical problems. Even more importantly, a reader (or a translator) is effectively forced to choose between the indeterminate and the determinate article: after all, the "mixed" formula (one in possession of any virtue is also in possession of all virtues) lies at the heart of the argument for reciprocity. As for the solutions suggested by the scholar: noting the rarity of verbatim quotations in Alexander's philosophical output, Barnes makes a convincing case for an emendation, which – at least partly – improves the continuity of the argument (or, for that matter, its consistency with respect to the purposed subject of the piece). He also provides a detailed, careful study of major interpretative possibilities, thus highlighting the importance of a correct reconstruction of the surviving text. For all Barnes' protestations about his *métier*, his essay remains highly persuasive; additionally, its very detailedness makes it a perfect practical guide to the study of philosophical prose.

The *phronesis* related controversy between Aristotelians and Platonists comes to the fore in Jean-Baptiste Gourinat's contribution (pp. 115–141): starting with Aristotle's own pronouncements in *EE* V 13 (or *EN* VI 13), the scholar moves on to the detailed discussion of Alexander's approach as manifested in both *Problemata* 15 and *Mantissa* (155, 32–156, 6). As a result of his analyses, he pinpoints the fundamental theoretical difference which separates the Aphrodisian (and his school) from the Aristotelian original: in considering *phronesis* as *gnosis ton poieteon*, the exegete departs from the Stagirite (and hence, from what nowadays would be considered Aristotelian orthodoxy). Moreover, as Gourinat is quick to note, such a definition of *phronesis* reflects the Stoic way of thinking. Effectively, Alexander's analysis comes to be characterised not only by a major departure from Aristotle himself, but also by an absorption of an inherently Stoic tenet. The empirical dimension of prudence becomes eclipsed by its scientific aspect, which in turn collapses the difference between *phronesis* and intellectual virtues.

Finally, the Stoic context of Alexander's philosophical activity comes to the fore in Cristina Viano's study of several minor essays of the Aphrodisian related to the problem of *mixis* of virtues (pp. 143–169). As the concept of *mixis* itself belongs to the realm of physical inquiry (in his *Peri*

---

[3] Bob Sharples' *The School of Alexander?* (in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed. The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence*, London 1990, pp. 83–111) remains the main study of the subject.

kraseos Alexander himself expended considerable effort in the exploration of the notion so deeply ingrained in the Stoic concept of being), its appearance within the ethical context, most particularly within the context of the debate of *anakolouthia*, opens a vast spectrum of complications.

To summarise: this is an extremely useful volume. Significantly, this usefulness is not limited to the study of specific subjects related to the *Problemata ethica* or the *Mantissa*: the volume discusses a number of issues of a more general character, highlighting the inherent complexity of any research directed at reconstructing the late imperial philosophy: in fact, through a careful inquiry into individual works, it brings into focus the major issues at the heart of the philosophy of Alexander or its study. Thus, in studying the relationship between his various works, it emphasises the "totality" of Alexander's philosophical endeavour, the mutual relevance of his exegetical and non-exegetical works. A careful study of the argument formulated in a single, relatively brief text pinpoints the problems resulting from accidents of textual transmission. Then, philosophical context is discussed and demonstrated as an element of considerable importance in the shaping of an argument (not to mention of the vocabulary). All in all, what the reader gets far exceeds a simple study of Alexander's methodology: instead, s/he gets a glimpse of the very mindset that created the *De fato* or the *De anima*, of the sophisticated conceptual and logical system at play, a sense of lively philosophical debate, of wide ranging complexities inherent in the study of this so long neglected period in the history of ancient philosophy. In this sense, the volume is of considerable worth not only to scholars interested in Aristotelian thought, but also to those interested in the intellectual climate of the early third century AD.

Joanna Komorowska
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

Rosie Wyles, Edith Hall (eds.), ***Women Classical Scholars. Unsealing the Fountain from the Renaissance to Jacqueline de Romilly***, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, XVIII + 465 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-872520-6, £80.00.

If potential readers of the book *Women Classical Scholars. Unsealing the Fountain from the Rennaisance to Jacqueline de Romilly* expect some kind of a dictionary or encyclopedia because of its title, they could be disappointed. In fact, it records the results of the international conference "Women as Classical Scholars", organised on 23rd and 24th March 2013 by the Department of Classics at F.D. Maurice's college, King's College London. The volume consists of nineteen essays that differ methodologically and compositionally. The essays are, as is usual in this type of publication, preceded by a list of contributors and an introduction, and followed by an afterword, a bibliography and an index. The volume contains illustrations. Some of the essays are general. Their authors simply chronicle either a defined period of time or a college or university. Others present the life and works of a chosen woman classical scholar in detail, even with information about their sexual preferences. In a few texts from the anthology we can find personal and rather emotional commentaries. It should also be emphasised that most of the women whose activities as classical scholars are discussed in this book worked in Western Europe (especially in England) and in the United States.

The very important part of this book is the introduction (and the afterword too). Obviously, announcing (and concluding) the content of the collection, the editors, R. Wyles and E. Hall, are obliged to stress the main but general idea of its publication. Nonetheless, they do not forget to point out detailed but essential issues: reasons why women were marginalised in classical studies, their social and intellectual background or factors that influenced women's education. The editors pay special attention to accurately defining a woman who was, and still is, a classical scholar. She could be a philologist, a person just studying and learning Greek and Latin, an editor and translator of texts, or simply a woman writing in classical languages. They also notice in an appendix to the introduction that many significant names, for example from Central and Eastern Europe, were omitted from the anthology.

The first six essays concern the period of time when women could not receive an institutional education. The first, "Learned Women of the Renaissance and Early Modern Period in Italy and England: The Relevance of their Scholarship" by C. McCallum-Barry, describes classical learning in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in Italy and England, using examples of Isotta Nogarola (1418–1466), Cassandra Fedele (1470–1558), Margaret More (1504–1544), Mildred Cooke (1526–1589), or Jane Lumley (1537–1578). In the next chapter, "*Hic sita Sigea est: satis hoc*: Luisa Sigea and the Role of D. Maria, Infanta of Portugal, in Female Scholarship", its author, S. Frade, presents the life and works of Luisa Sigea (c. 1520–1566), an educated woman born in Spain, who in 1522 moved to Portugal, where she was in the court of *Infanta* D. Maria (1521–1577). Anne Dacier (1647–1720), the renowned French editor and translator of classical authors, is one of heroines depicted in the two following essays. R. Wyles in "Ménage's Learned Ladies: Anne Dacier (1647–1720) and Anna Maria van Schurman (1607–1678)" shows the figures of these two women in the light of Gilles Ménage's *Historia Mulierum Philosopharum*. Then, in the study entitled "Anne Dacier (1681), Renée Vivien (1903): Or What Does it Mean for a Woman to Translate Sappho?", J. Fabre-Serris analyses Dacier's and Viven's translations of Sappho. The next two articles (E. Hall, "Intellectual Pleasure and the Woman Translator in 17th and 18th-Century England", and J. Wallace, "Confined and Exposed: Elizabeth Carter's Classical Translations") concentrate on women as translators, portraying several important personages: Lucy Hutchinson (1620–1681; the translation from Latin into English of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*), Sarah Fielding (1710–1768; the translation of Xenophon) and Elizabeth Carter (1717–1806; she translated Anacreon,

Horace and Epictetus). E. Hall also presents the achievements of Bathusa Makin (c.1600–c. 1675) known as the author of *An Essay to Revive the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen*.

The next essay, "This is Not a Chapter About Jane Harrison: Teaching Classics at Newnham College, 1882–1922" by L. Gloyn, is the first one in this publication that covers the history of women classical scholars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when they already had access to formal education in schools, colleges and at universities. Gloyn describes their situation in Newnham College, while M.V. Ronnick presents the classical education of African American women ("Classical Education and the Advancement of African American Women in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries") and J.P. Hallett is concerned with women studying Classics at Yale ("Eli's Daughters: Female Classics Graduate Students at Yale, 1892–1941").

Eight essays from the collection comprise detailed portraits of women whose names were included in the titles of these chapters. They are devoted to the following classical scholars: Grace Harriet Macurdy (1866–1946), an American classicist studying the history of women in ancient Macedonia; Edith Hamilton (1867–1963), also an American, the author of books on ancient Greek and Roman civilisations, first of all *Mythology* (1942); Margaret Alford (1868–1951), an Englishwoman specialising in Latin prose (Livy, Tacitus, Cicero); Ada Sara Adler (1878–1946), a Danish classical scholar, known as the author of the critical edition of the *Suda* (1928–1938); Olga Freidenberg (1890–1955), a Russian classical philologist and a cousin of Boris Pasternak; Kathleen Freeman (1897–1961), a British scholar and lecturer in Greek; Amy Marjorie Dale (1901–1967), a British classicist researching Greek tragedy (especially Euripides); and Betty Radice (1912–1985), an editor of Penguin Classics and a translator of classical and medieval Latin texts (for example, Pliny the Younger's *Letters*).

In the last but one essay in the anthology entitled "Simone Weil: Receiving the *Iliad*", B.K. Gold presents the portrait of S. Weil (1909–1943) and her work *The Iliad, or the Poem of Force*. She discusses this study as an interpretation of Homer's epic.

The collection ends with a text written by R. Webb. It presents the life and work of Jacqueline de Romilly (1913–2010), the first female member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, the first female professor at the Collège de France and the second woman in the Académie Française.

The book *Women Classical Scholars. Unsealing the Fountain from the Rennaisance to Jacqueline de Romilly* helps its readers to discover intriguing biographies of several women who were active as classical scholars and their contribution to classical studies. It also shows how they had to deal with prejudices and educational disadvantages. Despite the imperfections mentioned above, this publication is another important step on the way to revealing the history of female classical scholars.

Joanna Usakiewicz
University of Białystok

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

GLI STUDI SULLA LETTERATURA POLONO-LATINA PRESSO L'ISTITUTO DI FILOLOGIA CLASSICA DELL' UNIVERSITÀ DI VARSAVIA DOPO IL 1945

L'inizio della neolatinistica moderna in Polonia è riconducibile al 1884 – trecentesimo anniversario della nascita dello straordinario poeta rinascimentale Jan Kochanowski, nonché anno di pubblicazione della prima raccolta completa delle sue opere a cura degli studiosi dell'epoca[1]. In quell'occasione si svolse il primo convegno degli storici di letteratura polacca e dei linguisti, nel corso del quale – tra le varie tematiche – si discusse un piano di sviluppo dell'editoria neolatina in Polonia, in un orizzonte temporale pluriennale[2]. Vennero stabiliti i metodi e l'obiettivo di pubblicazione degli antichi testi, con una particolare attenzione al problema, sempre vivo, delle regole di trascrizione del testo latino[3]. Tutte le conclusioni e le tesi espresse nel corso della discussione, con riferimento alle relazioni presentate, influirono sul contenuto e sulla forma dei tomi pubblicati nell'ambito della serie "Corpus antiquissimorum poetarum Poloniae Latinorum

[1] Tomo contenente gli scritti latini del poeta: *Jana Kochanowskiego Dzieła wszystkie. Wydanie pomnikowe*, vol. III, Warszawa 1884 (una nota della censura russa indica una data di pubblicazione successiva al 12 marzo 1886). Zofia Głombiowska sposta l'anno di nascita della neolatinistica al 1857, corrispondente alla pubblicazione, da parte di Józef Przyborowski, della monografia su Kochanowski; v. Z. Głombiowska, *Józef Przyborowski jako badacz i wydawca dzieł Jana Kochanowskiego*, Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Litteraria XVI 1986, pp. 47–67.

[2] *Pamiętnik Zjazdu Historyczno-Literackiego imienia Jana Kochanowskiego*, Kraków 1886 (Archiwum do Dziejów Literatury i Oświaty w Polsce, vol. V). Per informazioni sulle discussioni dell'epoca, v. M. Mejor, *Początki nowoczesnej filologii w Polsce (1884–1918) i wielkie edycje w okresie międzywojennym do 1939 r.*, in: A. Karpiński (a cura di), *Humanizm i filologia*, Warszawa 2011, pp. 459–489.

[3] Cfr. J. Ćwikliński, *W jaki sposób wydawać należy poetów polsko-łacińskich XVI i XVII w.*, in: *Pamiętnik Zjazdu*... (n. 2), pp. 200–216; R. Pilat, *Jak wydawać dzieła polskich poetów XVI i XVII w.*, in: *ibidem*, pp. 97–111, e le voci della dissertazione di Kazimierz Morawski *et al*. Cfr. T. Ulewicz, *Sto lat badań filologicznych nad łacińską twórczością humanistyczno-renesansową w Polsce*, in: M. Garbaczowa (a cura di), *Wokół Kochanowskiego i jego czasów. Materiały sesji naukowej poświęconej kulturze literackiej Małopolski w dobie renesansu, Kielce, 10–11 października 1992*, Kielce 1994, pp. 19 s.

usque ad Ioannem Cochanovium", voluta dall'Accademia della Conoscenza di Cracovia[4]. L'intenzione era quella di pubblicare gli autori che avevano scritto in latino nel periodo compreso tra il XV secolo e il 1580, ossia l'anno di stampa del tomo *Lyrica* di Jan Kochanowski. Per l'editoria neolatina si trattava di un programma innovativo, tale da anticipare lo sviluppo dell'interesse per questo tipo di pubblicazioni a livello europeo. Fu in questo momento, tra l'altro, che la materia della letteratura polono-latina divenne appannaggio dei filologi classici.

Soltanto il recupero dell'indipendenza, avvenuto nel 1918, rese possibile la realizzazione degli ambiziosi piani di studio e diffusione delle più importanti opere della produzione polono-latina. All'Università di Varsavia, allora rinata, le ricerche sulla tradizione antica nella cultura, e in particolare nella prima letteratura polacca, furono avviate dal padre fondatore della facoltà di filologia classica locale – il prof. Gustaw Przychocki, direttore, per molti anni, dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica, nonché rettore dell'Università di Varsavia[5]. La sua opera neolatinista fu la dissertazione intitolata *La tomba di Ovidio in Polonia*, relativa alla leggenda letteraria secondo cui Ovidio venne sepolto presso un angolo remoto dei territori facenti capo alla Repubblica di Polonia[6].

La neolatinistica, intesa in Polonia come storia della letteratura polacca antica in lingua latina, tuttavia, non è mai divenuta una materia accademica autonoma, né nell'ambito della filologia polacca, né in quello della filologia classica. Secondo la pratica avviata in passato e a tutt'oggi adottata, sono i filologi classici – nell'ambito della ricerca sulla tradizione antica nella cultura polacca (materia facente parte del programma degli studi di filologia classica) – a occuparsi della letteratura polono-latina. Ciò è dovuto, soprattutto, al metodo di ricerca adottato a partire dal XIX secolo, concentrato sull'identificazione dei legami intertestuali (*similia*) con la letteratura[7].

La cesura nella storia della cultura polacca costituita dalla Seconda Guerra Mondiale non apportò particolari modifiche in questo campo. Come da tradizione, la pubblicazione degli autori polono-latini e lo studio dei motivi antichi nella prima letteratura polacca sono attività svolte dai filologi classici (nonché dai filologi polacchi). In relazione a ciò, la maggior parte dei filologi classici, non solo latinisti ma anche grecisti, e persino bizantinisti, ha avuto, nella propria carriera, la possibilità di cimentarsi con la neolatinistica.

---

[4] Sulla storia dell'editoria v. K. Weyssenhoff-Brożkowa, *Dzieje wydawnictwa "Corpus Antiquissimorum Poetarum Poloniae Latinorum"*, Eos LXIII 1975, pp. 377–388.

[5] V. W. Strzelecki, *Gustaw Przychocki 14 II 1884 – 4 II 1947*, Eos XLII 1947, fasc. 2, pp. 66–113 (con bibliografia).

[6] Pubblicato in: Prace Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego, Wydział I – Językoznawstwa i Literatury, no. 8, Warszawa 1920. In seguito ha descritto l'influenza dei motivi plautini sulle opere del miglior commediografo polacco del XIX secolo – Aleksander Fredro.

[7] V. note di P. Wilczek, *Pisarze łacińscy w dawnej Polsce – rekonensans*, in: idem, *Polonice et Latine. Studia o literaturze staropolskiej*, Katowice 2007, pp. 31–46.

L'Istituto di Filologia Classica inaugurato presso l'Università di Varsavia dopo la guerra, trasformatosi in Cattedra di Filologia Classica con due Seminari – latino e greco, ebbe modo di svilupparsi, nei primi tempi, grazie al contributo di personaggi straordinari quali: Kazmierz KUMANIECKI[8] – direttore di lunga carriera, Lidia WINNICZUK[9], nonché, qualche anno più tardi, Maria CYTOWSKA. Nella loro attività di ricerca, la neolatinistica rappresentò un tema importante, o addirittura principale, come nel caso di Maria CYTOWSKA[10]. La neolatinistica, tra gli anni Cinquanta e gli anni Settanta, incontrò il suo maggior sviluppo nella città di Varsavia, dove videro la luce le più importanti pubblicazioni, accompagnate da una riflessione metodologica avente come obiettivo dello studio sulla letteratura latina moderna. Un importante evento, a metà degli anni Cinquanta, fu la pubblicazione, in più tomi, dell'opera completa di Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski (1503–1572), umanista, teologo e riformatore polacco. I suoi scritti vennero pubblicati in due serie: una in latino e una tradotta in polacco. L'esecutore della parte latina fu Kazimierz KUMANIECKI[11]. In questo periodo venne elaborato un nuovo modello editoriale per le pubblicazioni neolatine. La Cattedra di Filologia Classica assunse il ruolo di centro principale delle attività editoriali e scientifiche, in collaborazione con le case editrici Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy [Istituto Statale per l'Editoria] (red. Irmina LICHOŃSKA, Janina JELICZ) e Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe [Casa Editrice Scientifica Statale], grazie anche al lavoro dei filologi classici laureati presso il già citato ateneo e assunti presso l'Istituto di Studi Letterari dell'Accademia Polacca delle Scienze, la Biblioteca Nazionale, la Biblioteca dell'Università di Varsavia e altre istituzioni. La rivista "Meander", nata nel 1946 (e tuttora pubblicata), ha dedicato sempre molto spazio alle problematiche della letteratura polonolatina. Negli elenchi bibliografici preparati da Gabriela PIANKO, Lidia WINNICZUK, Zdzisław PISZCZEK, Barbara DREWNIEWSKA, e successivamente da Mieczysław GRZESIOWSKI e altri, non mancarono mai le opere polono-latine.

L'Istituto per lo Studio della Cultura Antica dell'Accademia Polacca delle Scienza (rinominato in seguito Comitato per gli Studi Antichi PAN) iniziò, nel

---

[8] Kazimierz KUMANIECKI (1905–1977), v. bibliografia in: O. JUREWICZ, *Kazimierz Feliks Kumaniecki: filolog – humanista – nauczyciel – organizator nauki (18 V 1905 – 8 VI 1977)*, Przegląd Humanistyczny XXVIII 1984, fasc. 1, pp. 75–102.

[9] Lidia WINNICZUK (1904–1993), v. bibliografia in: L. WINNICZUK, *Od starożytności do współczesności*, Warszawa 1981, pp. 263–278.

[10] Maria CYTOWSKA (1922–2007), v. bibliografia in: M. MEJOR, B. MILEWSKA-WAŻBIŃSKA (a cura di), *Studia Neolatina. Rozprawy i szkice dedykowane profesor Marii Cytowskiej*, Warszawa 2003, pp. 7–24.

[11] A. Frycz Modrzewski, *Opera omnia*, vol. I: *Commentariorum de Republica emendanda libri quinque*, ed. C. KUMANIECKI, Warszawa 1953; vol. II: *Orationes*, ed. C. KUMANIECKI, Warszawa 1954; vol. III: *De ecclesia liber secundus*, ed. C. KUMANIECKI, Warszawa 1955; vol. IV: *Opuscula annis 1560–1562 conscripta*, ed. C. KUMANIECKI, Warszawa1958; vol. V: *Sylvae*, ed. C. KUMANIECKI, Warszawa 1960.

1963, la pubblicazione della preziosissima serie “Bibliotheca Latina Medii et Recentioris Aevi”, a cura di KUMANIECKI, edita dalla Casa Editrice Scientifica Statale PWN. Tra i responsabili della preparazione dei testi vi furono molti dipendenti dell’Istituto: KUMANIECKI, WINNICZUK, CYTOWSKA, Jerzy AXER, Barbara MILEWSKA, nonché altre persone legate all’Istituto: Stanisław BOJARSKI, Andrzej KEMPFI, Tadeusz BIEŃKOWSKI, Elżbieta SARNOWSKA-TEMERIUSZ, Irmina LICHOŃSKA, Ewa Jolanta GŁĘBICKA.

In questo periodo vennero pubblicate le opere di Filippo Callimaco (Filippo Buonaccorsi, 1437–1496), umanista italiano. Nell’ambito di questa serie furono stampate le sue poesie, gli epigrammi e una raccolta di lettere. La *Retorica*, invece, era già stata pubblicata nel 1950 da KUMANIECKI, sulla base del manoscritto[12].

Questi anni videro anche la nascita di una fruttuosa collaborazione internazionale. Kazimierz KUMANIECKI, e dopo di lui Juliusz DOMAŃSKI e Maria CYTOWSKA, furono invitati a partecipare al comitato editoriale della preziosa pubblicazione dell’opera omnia di Erasmo da Rotterdam (Editio Amstelodamensis (ASD)[13]. Vennero pubblicati l’*Antibarbarorum liber* a cura di KUMANIECKI, l’*Encomium medicinae*, *Enchiridion militis Christiani* a cura di DOMAŃSKI, il *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione*, *Libellus de constructione octo partium orationis*, *Vidua Christiana*, *Christiani matrimonii institutio*, *Adagia* (501–1000) a cura di CYTOWSKA. La produzione letteraria dell’umanista olandese divenne tema di numerosi articoli e dissertazioni pubblicati da CYTOWSKA e da DOMAŃSKI. L’istituto divenne la sede principale degli studi su Erasmo in Polonia. Le collaborazioni che ebbero inizio in quegli anni ancora i loro frutti. Mikołaj SZYMAŃSKI, infatti, sta proseguendo i lavori sulla parte restante degli *Adagia* (1001–1500)[14]. Il seminario magistrale tenuto da CYTOWSKA, iniziatrice, oltre che degli studi su Erasmo, dell’analisi della poesia del primo Rinascimento, e del metodo d’esposizione della grammatica latina nel XVI sec., nonché responsabile della riscoperta del dimenticato poeta polono-latino del XVI sec. Sebastian Fabian Klonowic (Acernus), fu portato a compimento dai neolatinisti: Barbara MILEWSKA-WAŹBIŃSKA e dal sottoscritto (Klonowic), Cyprian MIELCZARSKI (poetica di Walenty Eck).

Soltanto l’ampliamento dell’Istituto di Filologia Classica, sotto la direzione del recentemente scomparso prof. Oktawiusz JUREWICZ, avvenuta nel 1983, permise di nominare una cattedra autonoma di neolatinistica, diretta dalla prof.ssa Maria CYTOWSKA (dipendenti: Barbara MILEWSKA-WAŹBIŃSKA, Mieczysław MEJOR). Si trattò di una delle prime cattedre di neolatinistica in Polonia. Con il tempo, anche

---

[12] Ph. Callimachus, *Rhetorica*, ed. C.F. KUMANIECKI, Warszawa 1950 (Auctarium Meandreum, vol. I).

[13] *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instructa notisque illustrata*, pubblicate dal 1969.

[14] *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi*, vol. II 3, Amsterdam 2005.

presso altre università polacche, nell'ambito del corso di studi in filologia classica, vennero nominati istituti di neolatinistica.

Gli allievi di Kazimierz KUMANIECKI, Lidia WINNICZUK e Maria CYTOWSKA, tra cui spiccano Jerzy MAŃKOWSKI, Jerzy AXER, Mikołaj SZYMAŃSKI, Barbara MILEWSKA-WAŹBIŃSKA, grazie alle proprie ricerche sulla produzione letteraria latina di Jan Kochanowski e di altri autori, fecero della neolatinistica l'argomento di studio principale presso la facoltà di filologia classica della capitale polacca[15]. A questo stato di cose contribuì, tra l'altro, il progetto dell'edizione completa dell'*opera omnia* di Jan Kochanowski, sorto nel 1984, in occasione dei 400 anni dalla morte del poeta. Quest'obiettivo richiese l'impegno di vari dipendenti dell'Istituto: Maria CYTOWSKA, Jerzy MAŃKOWSKI, Jerzy AXER, Mikołaj SZYMAŃSKI ed Elżbieta SARNOWSKA-TEMERIUSZ, proveniente dagli ambienti dei filologi varsaviani. Anche se i lavori finalizzati alla pubblicazione dei tomi, con il tempo, hanno perso fervore, il comitato editoriale recentemente nominato, guidato dal prof. Mikołaj SZYMAŃSKI, garantisce la conclusione del progetto entro il termine previsto.

I lavori iniziati da Lidia WINNICZUK[16] sull'epistolografia latina moderna (tema allora innovativo), trovarono una continuazione, molti anni dopo, nella raccolta a cura di Jerzy AXER e Jerzy MAŃKOWSKI, intitolata *Listowne Polaków rozmowy: list łacińskojęzyczny jako dokument polskiej kultury XVI i XVII wieku* ["Conversazioni epistolari dei polacchi: la lettera in lingua latina come documento della cultura polacca del XVI e XVII secolo"] (Varsavia 1992). In collaborazione con Lech SZCZUCKI e Katarzyna KOTOŃSKA dell'Accademia Polacca delle Scienze fu pubblicata un'edizione delle lettere di Andrzej Dudycz. Il volume venne preparato da un gruppo di lavoro guidato da Jerzy AXER (Małgorzata BOROWSKA, Mikołaj SZYMAŃSKI, Jerzy MAŃKOWSKI, Mieczysław MEJOR, Cyprian MIELCZARSKI, Barbara MILEWSKA-WAŹBIŃSKA, Katarzyna RÓŻYCKA-TOMASZUK, Joanna ZIABICKA, Iwona ŻÓŁTOWSKA). Quest'edizione fu un preludio ai lavori di organizzazione del laboratorio (ZIABICKA, MEJOR) per la pubblicazione della ricca corrispondenza di Jan Dantyszek (Dantiscus) (1485–1548). Il progetto viene continuato da Anna SKOLIMOWSKA, presso il Laboratorio per l'Editoria dei Materiali Originali della Facoltà di Artes Liberales dell'Università di Varsavia.

Anche i lavori avviati da Lidia WINNICZUK, aventi come oggetto la pubblicazione dei manoscritti dei drammi scolastici gesuiti, portarono a una serie di edizioni e articoli su questo genere letterario, soprattutto ad opera di Jerzy AXER.

---

[15] J. AXER, *Neolatynistyka w systemie nauk humanistycznych – specyfika polska*, in: MEJOR, MILEWSKA-WAŹBIŃSKA, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 37–45; IDEM, *Neolatin Studies and National Identity. East-Central Europe Case Example*, Eos LXXXIX 2002, pp. 333–342.

[16] L. WINNICZUK, *Epistolografia: łacińskie podręczniki epistolograficzne w Polsce w XV–XVI wieku*, Warszawa 1952; Jan Ursyn, *Modus epistolandi, cum epistolis exemplaribus et orationibus annexis*, ed. L. WINNICZUK, Wrocław 1957; L. WINNICZUK, *Pliniusz Młodszy w świetle swoich listów i mów*, Warszawa 1987.

Nei programmi di ricerca da lui diretti, denominati “Latino in Polonia. Testi letterari e documenti sull’Europa Centro-Orienatale (1993–2000) e “Il latino come lingua delle élite. Respublica Polonorum e Respublica Litteraria Europaea (1997–2000)” presero parte anche i dipendenti dell’Istituto.

Negli ultimi anni, da quando la Cattedra di Neolatinistica si è trasformata nella Cattedra per gli Studi sul Rinascimento, le ricerche sulla letteratura neolatina si articolano su due binari differenti. La titolare della Cattedra prof.ssa Barbara Milewska-Waźbińska si occupa della letteratura polono-latina, con particolare riferimento a quella del XVI e XVII secolo: poema epico barocco, epitaffi e iscrizioni, poesia artificiosa, produzione letteraria degli autori polono-latini (ultimamente dello storico e studioso di araldica Szymon Okolski). Al suo seminario ha partecipato Barłomiej Czarski – autore di un lavoro significativo, dedicato ai motti poetici riportati sugli araldi[17].

Anche le lezioni, i seminari magistrali e i seminari di dottorato tenuti da Juliusz Domański e dedicati alla letteratura rinascimentale e alla riflessione filosofica hanno avuto un’importante influenza sugli interessi degli studenti e, successivamente, dei laureati e dei dipendenti dell’Istituto. Grazie a Domański, gli studi neolatinistici dell’ambiente di Varsavia, oltre ai temi tradizionali della letteratura polono-latina, sono stati estesi all’approfondimento dell’umanesimo italiano, toccato solo marginalmente fino a quel momento (Kumaniecki, Cytowska, Szymański). Da anni, quest’indirizzo di studio è sviluppato da Włodzimierz Olszaniec, autore di numerose opere e pubblicazioni dedicate, tra gli altri, a Francesco Petrarca, Giovanni Boccaccio, Leonardo Bruni, Marsilio Ficino, Lorenzo Valla[18].

Riepilogando, le ricerche svoltesi presso l’Istituto di Filologia Classica dell’Università di Varsavia, negli ultimi decenni, si sono concentrate attorno alle seguenti tematiche e ai seguenti progetti editoriali:

– studi su Erasmo da Rotterdam;
– dramma scolastico gesuita;
– poeti polono-latini del XVI–XVII secolo;
– epistolografia neolatina;
– umanesimo italiano;
– poetica rinascimentale e teoria della traduzione.

Il campo dei temi affrontati, pertanto, è ampio. Nel corso degli anni si è esteso all’umanesimo italiano. Questo approccio permette di uscire dai confini della neolatinistica intesa come studio degli autori polono-latini e di dare vita a una nuova materia di studi storico-letterari a livello polacco. I pregevoli e importanti

---

[17] Edizione ampliata: B. Czarski, *Stemmaty w staropolskich książkach, czyli o rzecz o poezji heraldycznej*, Warszawa 2012.

[18] A cura del medesimo e di Krzysztof Rzepkowki la seria bilingue “Biblioteka Renesansowa”, il primo volume nel 2008.

traguardi dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica dell'Università di Varsavia contribuiscono notevolmente allo sviluppo di quest'area di studio e determinano il prestigio internazionale delle scienze umanistiche polacche[19].

Mieczysław Mejor
Istituto di Studi Letterari dell'Accademia Polacca delle Scienze

[19] Cfr. note sulla neolatinistica polacca: T. Sinko, *Literatura polsko-łacińska. Problemy i zadania*, Eos XLV 1951, fasc. 2, pp. 3–11; J. Krókowski, *Studia nad literaturą polsko-łacińską w dziesięcioleciu 1945–1954*, Eos XLVII 1954/55, fasc. 2, pp. 293–327; M. Cytowska, *Neolatynistyka w Polsce*, in: eadem, *Studia neolatina. Pięć odczytów*, Wrocław 1983 (Classica Wratislaviensia, vol. X), pp. 22–28; S. Zabłocki, *Wybrane problemy edycji autorów polsko-łacińskich*, Meander XXXI 1976, pp. 425–442, ristampato in tedesco in: idem, *Studien zur neulateinischen Literatur und zur Rezeption der antiken Dichtung im europäischen Schrifttum*, a cura di P. Urbański, Frankfurt/M. 2009, pp. 163–177; A. Gorzkowski, *Neolatinitas caduca. Piśmiennictwo nowołacińskie polskiego renesansu w perspektywie historycznoliterackiej*, Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce XLII 1998, pp. 153–162; idem, *Paweł z Krosna. Humanistyczne peregrynacje krakowskiego profesora*, Kraków 2000, pp. 7–28; Wilczek, *op. cit*. (n. 7); P. Urbański, *Polskie badania nad humanizmem – główne orientacje*, in: A. Nowicka-Jeżowa, M. Cieński (a cura di), *Humanizm polski. Długie trwanie – tradycje – współczesność (wstęp do badań)*, Warszawa 2008–2009, pp. 21–41; cfr. anche n. 15.

Eos CV 2018
ISSN 0012-7825

IN HONOUR OF PROFESSOR ANDRII SODOMORA FOR HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

1. In December 2017, the Ukrainian philological community celebrated the 80th anniversary of the famous philologist, translator and writer Andrii Sodomora.

Andrii Sodomora was born in the village of Vyriv, in the Lviv region, on December 1, 1937. He was the youngest of four children in the family of Oleksandr Sodomora, the local priest. He spent his childhood and went to school in his home village.

In 1953, A. Sodomora entered Lviv University (now the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv), where he studied classical philology until 1959 (his teachers being Salomo Luria, Mykhaylo Bilyk, Yurii Mushak and others). Ten years later, in 1969, he was awarded his candidate of science degree (PhD equivalent) at the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.

After graduating from the university, he worked as an archivist in the Lviv Regional Archive (1959–1960) and the Lviv Historical Archives (1960–1964). From 1964 to 2000 he was a lecturer in the Latin Language Department of Lviv Medical Institute (now Danylo Halytskyi Lviv National Medical University). Since 2002 he has been a member of staff in the Department of Classical Philology of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv (since 2006 as a professor).

2. As a translator, Andrii Sodomora made his début having translated the *Dyskolos* by Menander into Ukrainian. Published in 1962, it became one of the world's first translations of this newly discovered comedy[1]. Beginning with Menander and Greek poetry[2], A. Sodomora gradually expanded his translation repertoire: he is the author of the Ukrainian translations of the most important

[1] For the history of this translation together with the new translation, see A. Sodomora, *Історія одного перекладу, або Моя перша книжка* [*A Story of One Translation, or My First Book*], Lviv 2017.

[2] Numerous publications of selected poetry in journals during the 1960s and 1970s, and full translations in the 2010s: Theognis (2012), Sappho (2012), Alcaeus (2013), Archilochus (2014), Hesiod (2018); also an anthology of the Greek epigram (2017).

texts of both classical[3] and late[4] Latin poetry, as well as of the translations of Latin epistolary and philosophical prose[5], Greek comedy and tragedy[6].

The contribution that Andrii SODOMORA has made by translating European Neo-Latin heritage[7], in particular that related to Ukraine[8], is significant. Being for many years a faculty member of the Department of Latin Language at Lviv Medical University, he also published a number of translations of Latin medical works, in particular, *Instructio de Chirurgia* by N. Bidloo, translated into Russian in 1979[9].

Andrii SODOMORA's translation work is not limited to the classical languages. He also used to translate from Romance and Slavic languages and from German (among others, the *Struwwelpeter* by Heinrich Hoffmann published as a separate book in 2007, as well as highly insightful and subtle translations from P. Verlaine, F. García Lorca, M. Lermontov, done mostly as examples in his works in the area of translation studies).

It is worth noting that in recent years Andrii SODOMORA has not only continued translating with the same level of productivity as earlier, but he has also revisited his earlier works – he reconsiders, re-edits, and (most often) makes totally new translations of texts previously translated by him in the peeriod 1960 to the 1980s (e.g. Menander, the Greek lyric poets, Arnaldus de Villa Nova, some poems by Horace, etc). A unique illustration of this can be found in the book *A Story of One Translation* (2017), in which the author not only published his own two translations of the *Dyskolos*, between which there is more than half a century (1962 and 2016). He also reflected on his approaches to translation

---

[3] Horace (1982), Lucretius (1988), Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 1985; *Amores*, *Tristia*, and *Ars Amatoria* 1999), Vergil (2011: all the works apart from the *Aeneid*, already translated by M. BILYK), the full corpus of the classical Roman love elegy, including the fragment of Gallus discovered in the 1970s (2009).

[4] The anthology of late Latin poetry *Відлуння золотого віку* [*Echoes of the Golden Age*] (2011), the Riddles of Symphosius (2013).

[5] Seneca (*Moral Letters to Lucilius* 1996, *Dialogues* 2016), Pliny the Younger (2018), and Boethius (*The Consolation of Philosophy* 2002).

[6] Menander's *Dyskolos* (1962, newly translated in 2017), some comedies by Aristophanes (1980), a number of the tragedies by Aeschylus (1990), Sophocles (1989), and Euripides (1993).

[7] Arnaldus de Villa Nova (1975; newly translated in 2011), the poems of *vagantes* (together with M. BORETSKYI, 2007).

[8] The *Journey* of William of Rubruck (in the "Vsesvit" journal, 1976; as a separate book in 2018), *The Song about Bison* by Nicolaus Hussovianus (2007), numerous translations in the anthologies of old Ukrainian literature (Paulus Crosnensis Ruthenus, etc). It is also worth mentioning here that A. SODOMORA prepared the collection of Latin inscriptions of Lviv with translation and commentaries, in collaboration with M. DOMBROVSKYI (*Anno Domini: Латинські написи Львова* [*The Latin Inscriptions of Lviv*], Lviv 2008; 2016).

[9] N. BIDLOO, *Наставление для изучающих хирургию в анатомическом театре* [*Instruction for the Students of Surgery in the Anatomic Theatre*], Moscow 1979.

then and now, and, of course, told the very story of how that first translation was created and published.

In total, Andrii Sodomora is the author of translations of works by more than a hundred authors and over a hundred thousand verses. His translations are known for their high poetic culture, philological accuracy, subtle feeling of ancient poetics and masterly rendering of it in his native language. Continuing the translation traditions of Mykola Zerov, Borys Ten, Hryhorii Kochur, A. Sodomora himself inscribed his own name onto the list of the most prominent Ukrainian translators.

3. Andrii Sodomora's works in the field of translation studies and literary criticism are inseparably linked with – and to a great extent derive from – his work as a translator. In his translations it is always clear that he is a professional philologist as well as in his scholarly texts it is clear that he is an experienced practicing translator.

Analysing the peculiarities of reproducing an artistic text by means of another language Andrii Sodomora focuses first of all on the problem of the inevitable loss, on the impossibility of an "adequate" reproduction of the original text; he consistently defends and argues the thesis of untranslatability as an inevitable property of any artistic text.

It is notable in Andrii Sodomora's translation studies that he never confines himself simply to translation issues. On the contrary, his research is aimed, first of all, at the deepest comprehension of the original text. The recording of the losses helps to reveal crucial – though invisible at first sight – elements of the original text: they are noticed only when lost. Research into the mechanisms resulting in the losses makes it possible to see more clearly the mechanisms of the formation of the elements of the artistry in the original which are lost in translation. One can say that by analysing the artistic structure of the original by means of translation, Andrii Sodomora is using his own original method of translation deconstruction (especially if we take into account the fact that he frequently uses his own translations, often made *ad hoc*, for a particular text study: in such cases, the translation becomes one of the operations in the analysis of the original text).

Being a professional classical philologist, Andrii Sodomora always pays special attention to the micro-level, to small units of a text. In his studies, he focuses on little poems, or even single verses, phrases, or aphorisms. Analysing the imagery of a text, he is particularly sensitive to the structure of the phrase, to the phonics and metrics as being important factors in image building. The most concentrated representation of Andrii Sodomora's philological method can be seen in his book *The Studies of One Verse* (2006)[10].

[10] A. Sodomora started his literary studies with the Greek lyric poets (articles in academic journals in the 1960s and his PhD thesis *Художественное мастерство лесбийских лириков и проблемы поэтического перевода их песен* [*The Poetic Art of the Lesbian Lyric Poets and the*

Such a contrastive approach to a text, a deep knowledge of ancient literature and a subtle sense of his native language, resulted inevitably in expanding the range of A. SODOMORA's scholarly interests and led him to studies on Ukrainian poetry. In Ukrainian texts, in addition to the same issues of poetics, Andrii SODOMORA specifically focuses on typological and genetic echoes which tie the Ukrainian poets with classical literature: in forms, ideas, images, figures of speech, and in the ways of poetic expression. This Ukrainian line of studies is best represented in the above-mentioned book *The Studies of One Verse*, and in the book *Shevchenko's Garden and Franko's Field* (2015).

The actual problems of the linguistic culture of the Ukrainian language are also a part of Andrii SODOMORA's interests. He is active in commenting on disturbing language trends and he participates in discussions on orthography. In addition to numerous interviews and articles in newspapers and journals, his linguistic views are summarised in the book *From Word to Heart, From Heart to Word* (2012).

4. As a researcher and thinker, Andrii SODOMORA has a broad view of philological and humanities issues. With remarkable skill, he combines a thorough analysis of the smallest units of a text with the broadest culturological horizons to which this analysis leads. This breadth of approach is best seen in his original commentaries on *Disticha Catonis* (2009) and *Aenigmata Symphosii* (2013), and especially, in his *Aphoristic Études* (2016). The same approach can be seen in Andrii SODOMORA's numerous public lectures (among the most recent, we can mention the cycle of lectures "Word and Voice" read in the Natalka Polovynka's theatre centre in Lviv in 2017/2018).

Andrii SODOMORA is an excellent lecturer. His public lectures, numerous appearances on TV and radio, articles and interviews, meetings with students and schoolchildren, not to mention his books[11], contribute significantly to the popularisation of antiquity and philology.

5. Everything Andrii SODOMORA does is imbued with warmth and deep respect for the past. The sense of duty to preserve the memory of teachers, colleagues and other people with whom fate brought him together helped A. SODOMORA to reveal one of the most remarkable facets of his talent: Andrii SODOMORA is a brilliant memoirist. In his numerous memoirs, he not only preserved the memory

---

Problem of the Poetic Translation of Their Poetry], Kyiv 1968; in the 1970s, he focused mainly on Horace, and then the number of Latin and later again Greek poets he studied increased all the time. Andrii SODOMORA has published his literary and translation observations in numerous works, in particular in his profound introductory chapters to his own translations.

[11] Among such books, one should name *The Live Antiquity* first of all. This popular book has already had four editions (1983, 2003, 2009, 2016).

of the people who were dear to him, but also created a wonderful gallery of impressionistic literary portraits, and eventually managed to capture the atmosphere in which the whole past generation of intellectuals lived and worked. The heroes of these portraits are not only well-known scholars (such as Salomo Luria, Ivan Andreychuk, Mykhaylo Bilyk, Yosyp Kobiv, Yurii Mushak, Volodymyr Vuytsyk), but also ordinary workers who, without having left a noticeable trace in the history of academia, were still people who created the era, preserved and passed on the cultural and professional tradition. The brightest of these portraits became the chapters of the book *By the Lines of Destiny* (2003), which belongs to the best Ukrainian publications recreating the lively atmosphere of the past of an academic community.

A special place among Andrii Sodomora's works belongs to his unique philological novel *Sub Aliena Umbra – Under Someone Else's Shadow* (2000). In this book the author created a marvellously atmospheric image of a philologist in his private life and professional work. Andrii Sodomora looks over his entire life, its individual periods and events, through the prism of reflections on the word, and fills these reflections with personal, intimate experiences. This book is an excellent example of intellectual biography, a beautiful fusion of philology and life.

6. Sometimes it is hard to draw a clear line between Andrii Sodomora's atmospheric memoirs and his fictional prose, which is also highly biographical, full of nostalgia, of tender images from the past, and of philology.

Apart from *Sub Aliena Umbra*, as a writer Andrii Sodomora works mostly in small genres: essays, sketches, études, or brilliant stories in the traditions of Vasyl Stefanyk or Katria Hrynevycheva. But most of his texts do not fit within the limits of conventional genres.

A. Sodomora's prose is full of subtle lyricism; he is a poet of the borderland, of transitional, hardly perceptible states and small, close, private spaces, of pastel colours and shades of grey, of details and things, of cosiness and simplicity, of transience and passing, of autumn sadness and loneliness alone with nature and word. His prose is a unique and original phenomenon in contemporary Ukrainian literature.

As a writer, Andrii Sodomora debuted on the pages of the "Zhovten" journal (now "Dzvin") with a story of Horace (1982). His books appeared later: *Alone with Word* (1999), *Sub Aliena Umbra* (2000), *Grey Wind* (2002), a sort of diptych *Tears of Things* (2010) and *Smile of Things* (2017).

Andrii Sodomora writes poetry as well: he has published two collections – *Alone with Lviv* (2005) and *A Handful of Minutes* (2007, 2012). Ancient topics, allusions, images, philological reflections, classical verse forms (among others, sonnets and poetry in the traditions of the Greek epigram) are signs of the style of the classical *poeta doctus*, which bring together the poetry of Andrii Sodomora with the poetics of Ukrainian "neoclassics" of the 1920–1930s.

7. Professor A. Sodomora is a member of National Union of Writers of Ukraine (1981), a full member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, a member of the editorial boards of literary and academic journals, a laureate of numerous literary and translation prizes (among others, the Maksym Rylskyi [1986] and the Hryhorii Kochur [2010] prizes); he is an honorary citizen of Lviv (from 2012).

On his anniversary, we wish Andrii Sodomora much health, happiness, and inspiration. We hope that he will continue his important work for many years to come.

THE MAIN WORKS BY ANDRII SODOMORA[12]

A. Translations

1) Менандр, *Відлюдник* [Menander, “Dyskolos”], Lviv 1962.
2) Н. Бидлоо, *Наставление для изучающих хирургию в анатомическом театре* [N. Bidloo, *Instruction for the Students of Surgery in the Anatomic Theatre*], Moscow 1979.
3) Арістофан, *Комедії* [Aristophanes, *The Comedies*], Kyiv 1980; Kharkiv 2002 – translated by A. Sodomora and others.
4) Горацій, *Твори* [Horace, *The Works*], Kyiv 1982.
5) Овідій, *Метаморфози* [Ovid, *Metamorphoses*], Kyiv 1985; 2008.
6) Лукрецій, *Про природу речей* [Lucretius, *On the Nature of Things*], Kyiv 1988.
7) Софокл, *Трагедії* [Sophocles, *The Tragedies*], Kyiv 1989 – translated by A. Sodomora and Borys Ten.
8) Есхіл, *Трагедії* [Aeschylus, *The Tragedies*], Kyiv 1990 – most of the tragedies are translated by A. Sodomora.
9) Евріпід, *Трагедії* [Euripides, *The Tragedies*], Kyiv 1993 – most of the tragedies are translated by A. Sodomora.
10) Сенека, *Моральні листи до Луцілія* [Seneca, *Moral Letters to Lucilius*], Kyiv 1996; 2005; Lviv 2017.
11) Овідій, *Любовні елегії; Мистецтво кохання; Скорботні елегії* [Ovid, *The Loves; The Art of Love; The Sorrows*], Kyiv 1999.
12) Боецій, *Розрада від філософії* [Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*], Kyiv 2002.
13) Г. Гоффман, *Петер-Нечесаха* [H. Hoffmann, *Struwwelpeter*], Kyiv 2007.
14) М. Гусовський, *Пісня про зубра* [Nicolaus Hussovianus, *The Song about Bison*], Rivne 2007.
15) *Поезія вагантів* [*The Poems of Vagantes*], Lviv 2007 – translated together with M. Boretskyi.

---

[12] For the detailed bibliography covering the years 1961–2012, see M. Kryvenko, *Андрій Содомора: біобібліографічний покажчик* [“Andrii Sodomora: A Bio-Bibliographical Index”] Lviv 2013.

16) А. Содомора, М. Домбровський, А. Кісь, *Anno Domini: Латинські написи Львова* [A. Sodomora, M. Dombrovskyi, A. Kis', *Anno Domini: The Latin Inscriptions of Lviv*], Lviv 2008; 2016 – collected, commented and translated together with M. Dombrovskyi; with photos by A. Kis'.
17) *Дистихи Катона* [*Distichs of Cato*], Kyiv 2009.
18) *Римська елегія* [*The Roman Elegy*, Lviv 2009.
19) Арнольд де Вілланова, *Салернський кодекс здоров'я* [Arnaldus de Villa Nova, *The Salernian Code of Health*], Lviv 2011.
20) Вергілій, *Буколіки. Георгіки. Малі поеми* [Vergil, *The Bucolics. The Georgics. The Minor Poems*], Lviv 2011.
21) *Відлуння золотого віку: антологія пізньої латинської поезії* [*Echoes of the Golden Age: The Anthology of the Late Latin Poetry*], Lviv 2011 – compiled by M. Dombrovskyi.
22) Теогнід, *Елегії вигнанця* [Theognis, *The Elegies of the Exile*], Lviv 2012.
23) Сапфо, *Пісні з Лесбосу* [Sappho, *The Songs from Lesbos*], Lviv 2012.
24) Алкей, *Пісні застольні і повстанські* [Alcaeus, *The Drinking and Rebel Songs*], Lviv 2013.
25) Сто загадок Симфосія [*The Hundred Riddles of Symphosius*], Lviv 2013.
26) Архілох, *Хліб на списі* [Archilochus, *Bread on Spear*], Lviv 2014 – with the Ukrainian translation of a tale about Archilochus by S. Luria included in appendix, see the item below.
27) С. Лур'є, Невгамовний, in: Архілох, *Хліб на списі* [S. Luria, *The Restless*, in: Archilochus, *Bread on Spear*], Lviv 2014, pp. 65–174.
28) Сенека, *Діалоги* [Seneca, *Dialogues*], Lviv 2016.
29) *Грецька епіграма* [*The Greek Epigram*], Lviv 2017 – compiled by M. Dombrovskyi.
30) *Історія одного перекладу, або Моя перша книжка* [*A Story of One Translation, or My First Book*], Lviv 2017 – with two translations of Menander's *Dyskolos* included (1962 and 2016).
31) Пліній Молодший, *Вибрані листи* [Pliny the Younger, *Selected Letters*], Lviv 2018.
32) В. Рубрук, *Подорож у східні краї* [W. Rubruck, *The Journey to the East*] Lviv 2018, first published in the "Vsesvit" journal in 1976.

B. Philological Works

33) Гесіод, Походження богів. Роботи і дні. Щит Геракла [Hesiod, Theogony. Works and Days. Shield of Heracles], Lviv 2018.
34) *Художественное мастерство лесбийских лириков и проблемы поэтического перевода их песен* [*The Poetic Art of the Lesbian Lyric Poets and the Problem of the Poetic Translation of Their Poetry*], Kyiv 1968 – the candidate of science (PhD) thesis.

35) *Жива античність* [*The Live Antiquity*], Lviv 1983; 2003; 2009; 2016.
36) *Студії одного вірша* [*The Studies of One Verse*], Lviv 2006.
37) *Від слова до серця, від серця до слова* [*From Word to Heart, From Heart to Word*], Lviv 2012.
38) *Шевченків садок і Франкове поле* [*Shevchenko's Garden and Franko's Field*], Lviv 2015.
39) *Афористичні етюди* [*The Aphoristic Études*], Lviv 2016.
40) *Історія одного перекладу, або Моя перша книжка* [*A Story of One Translation, or My First Book*], Lviv 2017.

C. Belles-Lettres

41) *Наодинці зі словом* [*Alone with Word*], Lviv 1999.
42) *Sub Aliena Umbra = Під чужою тінню* [*Under the Someone Else's Shadow*], Lviv 2000.
43) *Сивий вітер* [*Grey Wind*], Lviv 2002.
44) *Лініями долі* [*By the Fate Lines*], Lviv 2003.
45) *Наодинці зі Львовом* [*Alone with Lviv*], Lviv 2005.
46) *Пригорща хвилин* [*A Handful of Minutes*], Lviv 2007; 2012.
47) *Сльози речей* [*Tears of Things*], Lviv 2010.
48) *Поезія. Проза* [*Poetry. Prose*], Lviv 2012.
49) *Усміх речей* [*Smile of Things*], Lviv 2017.
50) *Поезія* [*Poetry*], Lviv 2017.

Markiyan Dombrovskyi
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv