

EOS CVIII fasc. 1-2
2021

E O S

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTORZY

JAKUB PIGOŃ (REDAKTOR NACZELNY)
KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA

Rocznik CVIII 2021
Zeszyt 1–2

WROCŁAW
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE
I UNIWERSYTET WROCŁAWSKI
2021

E O S

COMMENTARII
SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE
POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

COMMENTARIOS EDENDOS CURAVERUNT

IACOBUS PIGOŃ (EDITOR PRINCIPALIS)
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA

Volumen CVIII 2021
Fasciculus 1–2

WRATISLAVIAE
SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM
ET UNIVERSITATIS WRATISLAVIENSIS
2021

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

GEORGIUS AXER, VARSOVIAE
MARGARITA BOROWSKA, VARSOVIAE
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@ptf.edu.pl

COMMENTARIORUM PAGINA DOMESTICA
www.ptf.edu.pl/eos

EDITORUM ADIUTOR

PETRUS GŁOGOWSKI

Wersją pierwotną (referencyjną) czasopisma jest wersja drukowana

Wydano przy wsparciu finansowym Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego
(Rada Dyscypliny Literaturoznawstwa; Instytut Studiów
Klasycznych, Śródziemnomorskich i Orientalnych)



Uniwersytet
Wrocławski

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE

COMMENTATIONES

Mieszek JAGIELLO, Das Mythem der verlorenen Sonnenstrahlen und das Motiv des Rinderdiebstahls	9–30
Dorota ZYGMUNTOWICZ, Plato's Critique of Democracy and his Conception of Education for Democracy	31–54
Giuseppe BOCCHI, Le geometrie del disfacimento umano nel <i>Bellum civile</i> di Lucano: per una lettura della battaglia di Marsiglia	55–79
Krystyna BARTOL, Bridegroom Nile and Bride Egypt (PSI VII 845 ^r = XXXIX 1–11 HEITSCH = 43(A) PERALE)	81–90
Danuta OKOŃ, Military Tribunate in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part 3: Higher Military Command (<i>Legatus Legionis</i> , <i>Praepositus</i> , <i>Dux</i>)	91–114
Gábor TAKÁCS, Towards the African Etymology of Greek ἔβερος	115–166

MISCELLANEA

Heiko ULLRICH, Eine Konjektur zu Lucr. I 703	167–172
Karolina EKES e Mikołaj SZYMAŃSKI, La relazione tra <i>mentha</i> e <i>mentula</i> ed altri problemi nel testo del <i>De honesta voluptate</i> di Bartolomeo Platina	173–179

SUMMARIA DISSERTATIONUM INAUGURALIUM

Michał HALAMUS, The Bosporan Kingdom and Rome	181–193
---	---------

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

Richard Rawles, <i>Callimachus</i> , London 2019 (Emilia ŻYBERT)	195–196
Bernd Lorenz, <i>Griechische Grabgedichte Thessaliens. Beispiele für poetische Kleinkunst der Antike</i> , Heidelberg 2019 (Andrzej WYPUSTEK)	197–198
Tobias Boll, <i>Ciceros Rede cum senatui gratias egit. Ein Kommentar</i> , Berlin–Boston 2019 (Damian PIERZAK)	199–202
Joanna Kenty, <i>Cicero's Political Personae</i> , Cambridge 2020 (Damian PIERZAK)	203–207
Orange Four, Green and Yellow Fifteen: Two Commentaries on Tacitus' <i>Annals</i> from Cambridge. A review of A.J. Woodman, <i>The Annals of Tacitus, Book 4</i> , Cambridge 2018, and Tacitus, <i>Annals, Book XV</i> , ed. by R. Ash, Cambridge 2018 (Jakub PIŁOŃ) ..	208–218
Paul J. Burton, <i>Roman Imperialism</i> , Leiden–Boston 2019 (Katarzyna BALBUZA)	219–221
Francesco Berardi, <i>La retorica degli esercizi preparatori: glossario ragionato dei Progymnasmata</i> , Hildesheim 2017 (Bartosz AWIANOWICZ)	222–224
Peter Franz Mittag, <i>Römische Medaillons</i> , vol. II: <i>Antoninus Pius</i> , Stuttgart 2019 (Bartosz AWIANOWICZ)	225–226
Reconstructing the Ancient Latin Classroom. A review of E. Dickey, <i>Learning Latin the Ancient Way. Latin Textbooks from the Ancient World</i> , Cambridge 2016, and E. Dickey, <i>Learn Latin from the Romans. A Complete Introductory Course Using Textbooks from the Roman Empire</i> , Cambridge 2018 (Katarzyna OCHMAN)	227–233

Tino Licht (ed.), Walahfrid Strabo: <i>De imagine Tetrici. Das Standbild des Russigen Dietrich</i> , Heidelberg 2020 (Beata SPIERALSKA-KASPRZYK).....	234–235
Regine May, Stephen J. Harrison (eds.), <i>Cupid and Psyche. The Reception of Apuleius' Love Story since 1600</i> , Berlin–Boston 2020 (Mateusz STRÓŻYŃSKI)	236–238

COMMENTARII

CIX Zjazd Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego (Poznań, 16–18 września 2021).....	239–241
Protokół z CVII Walnego Zgromadzenia Delegatów Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego (18 września 2021).....	242–246
Sprawozdanie z działalności Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego za okres od 13 września 2019 do 18 września 2021	247–250
Sprawozdania z działalności oddziałów terenowych Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego za okres od 13 września 2019 do 18 września 2021	251–258
Sprawozdanie Fundacji <i>Traditio Europae</i> za okres od 11 września 2019 do 15 września 2021	259–260
Libri commentariiique periodici anno MMXXI recepti.....	261

GRAVI NOS LUCTU ADFECIT NUNTIUS DE MORTE
VIRI LINGVAE LATINAE INTER PAUCOS PERITI
RERUM ROMANARUM STUDIOSSIMI
MIRA HUMANITATE BENEVOLENTIAQUE PRAEDITI

ECCE CRACOVIAE DIE XI MENSIS SEPTEMBRIS ANNO MMXXI
VITA FUNCTUS EST

IOSEPHUS KORPANTY

ACADEMIAE POLONAE LITTERARUM ET SCIENTIARUM SOCIUS ACTIVUS
SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM TOT PER ANNOS SODALIS

QUI EADEM IN URBE ANTE HOS LXXX ANNOS NATUS
IN CELEBERRIMA ILLA UNIVERSITATE IAGELLONICA CRACOVIENSI
PRIMUM LITTERIS GRAECIS LATINISQUE EST IMBUTUS
DEINDE DOCTORIS LAUREAM OBTINUIT
MOX PROFESSORIS MUNIA SEDULO OBIIT
INSTITUTUMQUE PHILOLOGIAE CLASSICAE DIU REXIT

QUI IN SCRIPTORUM ROMANORUM, LUCRETII IMPRIMIS
SALLUSTIQUE AC VERGILII, OPERIBUS INTELLIGENDIS CALLIDUS
NOTIONUM AD ROMANORUM REM PUBLICAM PERTINENTIUM
NEC NON ET ARTIS ILLIUS AB AUCTORIBUS LATINIS EXCULTAE
QUAE IN SONIS CERTUM AD MODUM ITERANDIS VERSATUR
INVESTIGATOR SUBTILIS EXTITIT

QUI DUORUM VOLUMINUM LEXICON LATINO-POLONUM
MAGNA EX PARTE A SEMET COMPOSITUM
SINGULARI INDUSTRIA IN LUCEM PROTULIT

EGREGIA EIUS ERGA DOCTRINAS MERITA SUSPICIENTES
HOMINEM VERE HUMANISSIMUM
PIA PROSEQUIMUR MEMORIA

*SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM PRAESIDES
COMMENTARIORUM Q.I. "EOS" EDITORES*

DAS MYTHEM DER VERLORENEN SONNENSTRAHLEN UND DAS MOTIV DES RINDERDIEBSTAHLS

von

MIESZEK JAGIEŁŁO

ABSTRACT: This paper explores the relations between the mythological figures of the Rigvedic Saramā, Greek Hermes, Odysseus and Herakles. Core features of their respective mythological and literary narratives seem to suggest a common origin. Most intriguing is the fact that all four appear in connection to the “cattle of the sun” motif. In order to compare the relevant myths, an approach is chosen that allows to differentiate between the relevant mytheme and the motif.

EINFÜHRUNG

Das literarische Motiv der gestohlenen Rinderherde ist weit anerkannt. Es ist ein Motiv, dass aus der griechischen Kultur bekannt ist, aber auch schon bei den Alten Indern – und das wohl weitaus früher als in der Ägäis – im Umlauf gewesen ist. So liegt es auf rein literarischer Ebene nahe, Saramā, die Botin Indras, die für ihn die verlorenen Kühe wiedergewinnt, mit dem Botengott Hermes, dem Rinderdieb der Herde des Apollo, zu verbinden. Doch dieser Vergleich bereitet gewisse Probleme, die in dieser Arbeit thematisiert werden.

Das Theonym „Hermes“ ist bereits aus dem Mykenischen (myk. *e-ma-a₂*) bekannt¹. Schon seit dem 19. Jahrhundert wurde stets über eine Ähnlichkeit von Saramā und Hermes spekuliert, und auf diesen Spekulationen basierend, eine Ableitung des Theonyms „Hermes“ aus dem Indischen „Saramā“ vorgeschlagen²; heutzutage müsse man diese Etymologie für „Hermes“ wohl der üblichen,

¹ J. GULIZIO, *Hermes and e-ma-a₂: The Continuity of His Cult from the Bronze Age to the Historical Period*, *Živa Antika* L 2015, S. 105–116.

² Max MÜLLER hatte wohl als erster westlicher Forscher darauf hingewiesen, dass der Name „Saramā“ von der Wurzel sanskr. *sar-* für ‚gehen, laufen, schwimmen‘ (M. MÜLLER, *Lectures on the Science of Language*, Bd. 2, New York 1865, S. 481–543) und somit PIE **ser-* abzuleiten sei. Das Vedische birgt auch ein anderes Wort, welches von dieser Wurzel abstammt, nämlich ved. *sarma* für ‚das Schwimmen, Gehen, Laufen‘, vgl. J. SKARBK-KAZANECKI, *Grecki bóg Hermes i bogini wedyjska Saramā w aspekcie porównawczym*, *Collectanea Philologica* XX 2017, S. 22. Semantisch ist diese Etymologie mit der literarischen Funktion Saramās vereinbar. Trotz dessen

jedoch ganz und gar unbefriedigenden sowie kaum vertretbaren Herleitung von ἔρμα³, vorziehen – doch eher zugunsten eines gemeinsamen PIE Stammes **serh₃-*, (in feindlicher Absicht) losgehen auf⁴, als einer direkten Entwicklung Saramā → Hermes⁴. Saramā als Etymon des Hermes wäre nur schwierig zu beweisen. Schon die unterschiedlichen Genera beider Namen bereiten kaum zu überwindende Probleme.

Des Weiteren scheinen – obgleich ausschließlich auf literarischer Ebene – Herakles und Odysseus⁵ als Rinderdiebe in gewissem Sinne Pendants des Hermes und der Saramā zu sein. Im Falle Herakles⁶ erstreckt sich der Zusammenhang mit Hermes auf die griechischen Ephebenkulte in Böotien und in die damit verbundenen Palästren der Alten Griechen; außerdem lassen sich in Herakles sylvanische Aspekte erblicken, die auf eine frühere Facette dessen Kultes schließen lassen⁶, in der er Hermes ähnelte. Im Falle Odysseus⁶ ist die Sache einfacher: Odysseus ist, wenn man Apollodor glaubt, direkter Nachfahre des Hermes durch Autolykos (Apollod. I 9,

besteht eine geringe Ungereimtheit, denn es ist bisher nicht vollkommen geklärt worden, wie das Wort „Saramā“ letztendlich zu deuten und zu übersetzen sei; dabei dürfe man auch das problematische Suffix *-mā* nämlich nicht umgehen.

³ Die Etymologie des Theonyms „Hermes“ (Ἑρμῆς) bereitet hingegen größere Probleme. Lange Zeit hatte man der Hypothese, das griechische Wort ἔρμα für ‚Stele, Steinhaufen‘ diene als dessen Urform, vertraut, doch diese Erklärung weist erhebliche Mängel auf (R. ROSÓŁ, *Wschodnie korzenie kultu Apollona*, Kraków 2010, S. 16). Abgesehen von den phonetischen Problemen, die sich bei ἔρμα > Ἑρμῆς ergäben, widerspricht dieser Idee auch der religionsgeschichtliche Standpunkt bezüglich des Hermes Kultes. Bereits auf Linear B-Tafeln ist das Theonym *e-ma-a₂* (gr. *Hermāhās*) lesbar. Zwar sind Tempel, die ausschließlich Hermes geweiht waren, weder auf dem griechischen Festland, noch auf den Inseln gefunden worden, so erscheint aber die Tatsache, dass dessen Kult nur ein Nebenkult in Kultstätten anderer Gottheiten gewesen ist, nicht derart relevant zu sein, als dass Hermes seinen Namen von den ihm geweihten Stelai nehmen müsse. Eher sollte man den Schluss ziehen, der Hermes Kult war in seiner Natur zu einer gewissen Beiläufigkeit bestimmt. Hermes habe als Götterbote fungiert und hätte keinesfalls Bedarf für eigene Kultstätten gehabt. Ein solches Bild ergibt sich zumindest aus den Tempeln anderer Gottheiten, in denen die eben erwähnten Hermesstelai entdeckt, obgleich diese Funde allesamt nicht in der Heimat des Hermes, Arkadien, gemacht worden sind.

⁴ s.v. **serh₃-*, H. RIX, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden 2001, S. 535. Das hermetische Theonym ist damit mit dem altindischen Namen „Saramā“ etymologisch verbunden. Zu dieser Etymologie von Saramā, vgl. M. MAYRHOFER, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Bd. 3: *Y–H*, Heidelberg 1976, S. 442–443. Darüber hinaus wurden interessante Bemerkungen zu dem phrygischen Theonym „Hermos“ (siehe A. CARNOY, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la mythologie gréco-romaine*, Paris 1957, S. 70), sowie zu dem vedischen Adjektiv *sārameya-* in Bezug auf die Alternativform Ἑρμείας (obwohl von M. MAYRHOFER verworfen) gemacht. Zudem ist wohl auch ὀρμή ‚Bewegung, Schlag, Geschwindigkeit‘ analog zu ved. *sarma-* herzuleiten, dazu siehe SKARBEK-KAZANECKI, *op. cit.* (Anm. 2), S. 21–25.

⁵ Die Beteiligung des Odysseus am Vergehen an den Rindern des Helios ist strittig. Hinsichtlich der Prophezeiung des Teiresias in Hom. *Od.* XI 101–118, die sich später bekanntlich erfüllt, halte ich Odysseus generell für die Tat seiner Gefährten mitverantwortlich.

⁶ M. JAGIELLO, *Vom Waldheros zum Sonnenheros. Die Entwicklung der Erzählungen von Samson und Herakles*, Eos CV 2018, S. 181–199.

16), daher spielte man wohl in der *Odyssee* mit den Charakteristiken des Hermes, als man den Irrfahrer literarisch entstehen lies. Doch auch Odysseus und Herakles haben Gemeinsamkeiten, wie den Bogen als Attribut und den Wettstreit um ihre Braut mit anschließendem Gemetzel⁷. So – aus alledem – entsteht schließlich das Bedürfnis, diese Parallelen abzuwägen. Das vorliegende Studium nimmt sich dies vor, nämlich eine Auseinandersetzung mit einem Teil jener aufgezählten Ähnlichkeiten sowie den Versuch sie in einer Ordnung zu vereinbaren. Aber wie so oft in der komparatistischen Mythologie ist Obacht geboten, der Verlockung nicht zu erliegen, zufälligen Begebenheiten, derer im Laufe der Jahrhunderte mehrerer hatte eintreten können, einen zu hohen Stellenwert zuzuschreiben. Damit sei also vorab bestimmt, dass die hier vorgeschlagenen Schlussfolgerungen eine Anregung zur weiteren Forschung bieten, nichtsdestotrotz aber suggestiv und überzeugend sein sollen.

Um das Verständnis der Arbeit zu vereinfachen, werden zunächst einige methodologische Anmerkungen gemacht.

1. METHODOLOGIE

Die folgenden Absätze werden mehrere mythische Erzählungen miteinander vergleichen, aber gleichzeitig keine traditionelle komparatistische Analyse anstreben. Die Ergebnisse dieser Studie sollen vor allem die mythische Ebene der

⁷ Eines Tages wirbt Herakles um die Hand der Tochter des Eurytos, welcher ihn an einem Schützenwettbewerb teilnehmen lässt, um sich zu beweisen (mit der Hoffnung und übermütig glaubend, Herakles versage ohnehin). Herakles, geschickt mit Pfeil und Bogen wie kein anderer, gewinnt, doch Eurytos verweigert ihm seinen Preis. Daraufhin metzelt der Heros Iphitos, Eurytos' Sohn (vgl. Hom. *Od.* XXI 22–30), sowie Eurytos und seine verbliebenen Söhne nieder. Dies ist eine der Varianten der Geschichte, die so von Pherekydes überliefert wurde und uns in einem Scholion (*Schol. ad Od.* XXI 22 V) zugänglich ist. Verblüffenderweise wiederholt sich dieses Motiv in der *Odyssee*, als Penelope ihre Freier vor die Aufgabe stellt, den Bogen ihres Gatten zu spannen und durch zwölf Axtringe hindurch zu schießen (Hom. *Od.* XXI 414–423). Tobend, erlegt sie Odysseus allesamt (Hom. *Od.* XXII). Diese Parallele zwischen Odysseus und Herakles wurde bereits 1997 von Katherine CRISSY bemerkt und in einem Aufsatz veröffentlicht (K. CRISSY, *Herakles, Odysseus, and the Bow: "Odyssey" 21.11–41*, *Classical Journal* XCIII 1997, S. 41–53). Doch das Motiv lässt sich auch bis ins 5./4. Jahrhundert (bzw. dessen Entstehungszeit im 9./8. Jahrhundert) v. u. Z., zum altindischen *Mahābhārata*, zurückverfolgen (dazu auch bereits M.L. WEST, *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*, Oxford 2007, S. 432–436). Im Sanskrit heißt der Wettbewerb, in dem eine ledige Frau ihren zukünftigen Gatten auswählt, *svayamvara*. Das *Mahābhārata* erzählt von dem Helden Arjuna, der allen Widrigkeiten zum Trotz den Bogen spannt und fünf Pfeile ins Ziel schießt, um Prinzessin Drūpadīs Bräutigam zu werden (*MBh.* I 190). Ein weiteres Swayamwara beschreibt das Epos *Rāmāyaṇa*. Darin (über)spannt Rama Shivas Bogen um Prinzessin Sītā heiraten zu dürfen (*Rm.* I 67) – eine Aufgabe, die auch Odysseus erfüllt (Hom. *Od.* XXI 406–410). Dem altindischen Helden Karna wiederfährt jedoch das Schicksal, dass auch Herakles erleidet: trotz gewonnenen Swayamwara wird er nicht mit Drūpadīs Hand belohnt. Schließlich, setzt er zum Töten an – analog zum Freiermord aus Buch XXII der *Odyssee*. Aus den Erwägungen von Beth COHEN wird außerdem deutlich, dass Herakles in der Tat zu Anfang Bogenschütze gewesen ist und Odysseus auch nur aus diesem Fakt heraus an seinen Bogen gelangt (B. COHEN, *From Bowman to Clubman: Herakles and Olympia*, *Art Bulletin* LXXVI 1994, S. 695–715).

besprochenen Werke betreffen. Literarische Untersuchungen werden daher nur als Mittel zum Zweck fungieren. Somit ist es bei einem Vorhaben, das sich wie hier keine greifbare Erörterung von Parallelen zum Ziel nimmt, von außerordentlicher Wichtigkeit, die grundlegenden Begriffe, von denen Gebrauch gemacht wird, zu erklären. Dabei handelt sich um (1) das STRAUSS'sche *Mythem*⁸ (auch *Mythologem* genannt) und (2) das *literarische Motiv*. Diese Termini sind schwierig zu unterscheiden, weil sie oftmals in einander übergehen.

Der hier vertretenen Auffassung nach ist das Mythem generell nicht an das Medium der Literatur gebunden, wird aber doch überwiegend in schriftlicher oder mündlicher Form literarisch wiedergegeben und kann somit zu einem literarischen Motiv werden⁹. Andersherum, kann ein literarisches Motiv, wenn es sich im menschlichen Bewusstsein niederlässt, weitaus mehr sein, als ein deutlich definierter literarischer Rahmen eines Handlungsstranges, denn es genügt dem literarischen Motiv einen übersinnlichen Aspekt zu verleihen, um es zu mythologisieren. So dürfte man wohl den literarisierten Mythos als „hierophan“¹⁰, wie gemäß der Definition Mircea ELIADES, verstehen. Ein solcher Mythos setzt aber auch das Verständnis der Symbole voraus, die in der mündlichen oder schriftlichen Überlieferung Verwendung finden, um die entsprechende mythische Vorstellung auszudrücken. Das literarische Motiv sieht man dagegen als den „plastischen“ Aspekt einer Erzählung, der die Bewegungen der Figuren im Verhältnis zu einander und zu ihrer Welt beschreibt – sozusagen als Skelett oder Vernetzung einer fiktiven, literarischen Welt. Somit sei das Mythem der Sinn dieser Bewegungen, d.h. die Bedeutung der Abläufe, die das gegebene Motiv umschreibt. Wenn auch in dem hier angewandten Verständnis der Beziehung zwischen Mythos und Literatur der JUNG'sche Archetyp¹¹ eine zentrale Rolle einnimmt, wird davon abgesehen, von diesem Begriff Gebrauch zu machen, um nicht näher auf die Genealogie der Mytheme bzw. Motive einzugehen zu müssen, sondern lediglich aus Mythos und Literatur stammende Parallelen zu erklären.

⁸ C. LÉVI-STRAUSS, *Die Struktur der Mythen*, in: IDEM, *Strukturelle Anthropologie I*, übers. von H. NEUMANN, Frankfurt/M. 1967, S. 226–254.

⁹ An dieser Stelle möchte ich mich bei den anonymen Rezensenten dieser Arbeit bedanken. Einer ihrer konstruktiven Kritikpunkte bemängelt das Fehlen einer klaren Definition des Begriffs „Literatur“. Diese sei nun geboten: Als literarisches Werk verstehe ich hier eine mündliche oder schriftliche, sprachliche Komposition, die einem Publikum als Kulturgut bereitgestellt wird. Auch das Adjektiv „literarisch“ wird gemäß dieser Definition verwendet. Die Werke von Homer erkenne ich als Literatur an; zu der sog. Homerischen Frage beziehe ich in dieser Arbeit zu keinem Zeitpunkt Stellung.

¹⁰ M. ELIADE, *Das Heilige und das Profane: Vom Wesen des Religiösen*, übers. von E. MOLDENHAUER, Frankfurt/M.–Leipzig 1998; bereits S. 13–15 und ff.

¹¹ C.G. JUNG, *Archetypen: Urbilder und Wirkkräfte des Kollektiven Unbewussten*, Ostfildern 2018.

Mit jenen Definitionen vertraut, ist es in dieser komparatistischen Studie also essenziell beide Begriffe zu unterscheiden, zumal sie sich auf die Auswertung der Parallelen auswirken. Es ist richtig, dass es für Motive sehr viel wahrscheinlicher ist mehrmals in demselben literarischen Ambiente (damit seien Handlungsverlauf und Protagonisten gemeint) aufzutreten, als in einem ganz und gar ungewohnten Umfeld aufzutauchen. So ist *Draupadī auf den Mauern zu Troja* ein prominentes Beispiel für einander parallele Motive zweier geraubter Gemahlinnen, Draupadī und Helena (aus jeweils dem *Mahābhārata* und der *Ilias*)¹²; so ist auch die Sintflut stets eine göttliche Strafe, die dem Großteil der Menschen zum Verhängnis wird (Atrahasis-Epos, Noah-Geschichte, Deukalion-Mythos etc.). Diese literarischen Motive weisen sowohl auf erzählerischer, als auch auf sprachlicher Ebene erhebliche Ähnlichkeiten miteinander auf. Anders wiederum hat es sich mit der Adaption der Reise auf der Suche nach Unsterblichkeit, auf die sich Gilgamesch begibt und die in die homerische *Odyssee* mit eingebunden worden ist, ohne die passenden Beweggründe des Protagonisten aus dem *Gilgamesch-Epos* zu übernehmen oder ein ähnliches Ambiente geschaffen zu haben. Odysseus reist nicht zur Insel Ogygia um von Kalypso Unsterblichkeit zu erwerben, und doch schreitet er Schritt für Schritt auf dem Pfade des Gilgamesch bis hin zur Auseinandersetzung mit der Sterblichkeit des Menschen¹³. Die jeweiligen Reisen nach Dilmun bzw. Ogygia werden von verschiedenen Protagonisten mit unterschiedlichen Beweggründen in anderen Umständen und mit nicht übereinstimmenden Enden beschrieben. Hier haben wir es also keinesfalls mit einem Motiv zu tun, da die Beweggründe und Verhältnisse der Figuren nicht übereinstimmen. Es gibt zwar Parallelen zwischen Siduri und Kalypso, nicht aber zwischen Kalypso und Utnapischtim. Damit kann hier von keinen vergleichbaren literarischen Motiven die Rede sein. Odysseus wird die Unsterblichkeit angeboten, doch er lehnt sie ab. Gilgamesch sucht die Unsterblichkeit, sie wird ihm aber verwehrt. Es ist nämlich das Ziel der Reise, das *Ende der Welt, wo Unsterblichkeit möglich ist*, nach Dilmun bzw. Ogygia, das die Parallele darstellt – in diesem Fall also kein literarisches Motiv, sondern ein Mythem, das weltanschauliche Bedeutung besitzt¹⁴.

¹² S.W. JAMISON, *Draupadi on the Walls of Troy: „Iliad“ 3 from an Indic Perspective*, *Classical Antiquity* XIII 1994, S. 5–16.

¹³ J.M. KOZŁOWSKI, *Gilgamesh's Quest for Immortality (Gilg. IX–XI) as a Narratological Pattern for Odysseus's Nostos (Od. V, I–XIII, 187)*, *Eirene. Studia Graeca et Latina* LIV 2018, S. 11–31.

¹⁴ Die Erzählabfolge, die KOZŁOWSKI (Anm. 13) erörtert hat, scheint nicht auf gleichem Weg wie das hier besprochene Mythem in die *Odyssee* gelangt zu sein. Aus Gründen, die ich in einer kommenden Arbeit vorstellen werde, vermute ich eine Verbindung der Insel Ogygia zum thebanischen Sintflutmythos des Ogyges. Dieser Sintflutmythos steht jedoch auch mit dem *Gilgamesch-Epos* und insbesondere dessen 11. Tafel in Verbindung. Demnach habe sich die *Odyssee* zu einem an der Struktur der Reise im *Gilgamesch-Epos* orientiert, zum anderen Elemente aus einem Sintflutmythos adaptiert.

Literatur ermöglicht es Mytheme auf verschiedene Arten zu umschreiben und in verschiedene Motive mitaufzunehmen. Der literarische Schöpfungsprozess besitzt also gewisse Freiräume bei der Adaption von Mythen und Mythen. Unterschiedliche Motive sind auf literarischer Ebene nicht vergleichbar, können aber in bestimmten Fällen auf mythologischer Ebene trotz dessen gleichgesetzt werden.

2. RINDERDIEBSTAHL – GÖTTERBOTEN SARAMĀ UND HERMES

Boten der Götter gibt es in vielerlei Mythologien. Der altindische Rigveda kennt mitunter die Gottheit Saramā (सरमा) als Boten des Indra. Sie spielt im Rigveda zwar nur eine untergeordnete Rolle, wird in späteren Werken aber nach und nach mehr thematisiert. Des Öfteren wurden bereits Vergleiche zwischen der indischen Saramā und dem griechischen Hermes erwogen. Im Folgenden sollen diese kurz zusammengefasst werden.

2.1. Saramā

Im Rigveda wird Saramā von Indra zum Eintreiben dessen heiliger Kühe, die von den Panis-Dämonen gestohlen worden sind (RV X 108), entsendet¹⁵. Sie stellt sich den Panis selbstständig vor:

Als Indra's Botin komme ich abgesandt, eure großen Schätze suchend, ihr Panis.
Aus Furcht vor dem Überspringen half sie uns dabei. So kam ich durch die Fluten
der Rasa...

(RV X 108, 2; übers. von K.F. GELDNER)

Die Dämonen hingegen erwidern mit Skepsis, sie werfen der Eintreiberin vor, die Kühe selbst gestohlen zu haben und eine List anwenden zu wollen, um den Panis ihre Tiere abzuluchsen. Es scheint sich herauszustellen, dass Indra die List vorbereitet hatte und dass sowohl Saramā, als auch die Panis einem heimtückischen Plan des Indra zum Opfer fielen¹⁶.

2.2. Hermes

Hermes taucht dagegen in der frühgriechischen Epik zum ersten Mal literarisch in Erscheinung. Jedoch soll hier ein späteres Werk, die *Homerischen Hymne*

¹⁵ Die Panis mögen ihren Namen von sanskr. *pañate* für ‚verhandeln, kaufen‘ nehmen. Siehe S.G. TALAGERI, *The Rigveda. A Historical Analysis*, New Delhi 2000 [E-Book], S. 574–575. Hier nennt er auch lat. *merx* (Handel, Geschäft) und lat. *mercari* (handeln, verhandeln) als Belege für die Panis als indische Varianten von Mercurius und Hermes.

¹⁶ Eine schwer einzuordnende Hymne des Rigveda, RV IV 30, erzählt wie Indra die Sonne verjagte und Uśās besiegte (vgl. auch RV I 175, 4). Es könnte sein, dass dieses Geschehnis mit dem Standpunkt der Panis in RV X 108 zusammenhängt. Ob dem so ist, ist klar; und dennoch scheint Indra mehreren Hymnen zufolge, u.a. (RV I 51, 4) über die Sonne zu herrschen. Der solare Aspekt des Indra wird in den folgenden Absätzen noch bedeutsam, siehe Punkte 5 und 5.1.

an Hermes erörtert werden. Diese beschreibt u.a. Hermes' Rinderdiebstahl an seinem Geschwist Apollo (*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 17–18), den er begeht, um sich auf diese Weise die Gunst seines Vaters Zeus und den nötigen Respekt, um in den Olymp aufgenommen zu werden, zu erzwingen¹⁷. Seine Figur ist zu der Entstehungszeit der Hymne schon sehr ausgebaut, so besitzt er bereits die Attribute eines Tricksters und Diebes. Als Apollo schließlich das Abhandenkommen seines Viehs erkennt, kommt er auch schnell dank eines Greises aus Onchestos, der ihm Hermes als Dieb preisgibt, dem jungen Botengott auf die Schliche (*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 88–90, 190). Aus anderen Überlieferungen ist dieser Mann unter dem Namen Battos bekannt (vgl. die *Metamorphosen* des Antonius Liberalis als Scholion zu Hesiods *Megaloi Ehoiai*)¹⁸. Die gängigen Varianten dieser Erzählung sind u.a. bei Hesiod (*Megaloi Ehoiai*, dh. fr. 256), Alkaios (*An Hermes*¹⁹, fr. 308), Sophokles (*Ichneutae*, *P.Oxy.* 1174), Aratus, Nikander (*Hetereoumena*), Kallimachos und in einem Zitat der *Hermeshymne* (Z. 51) bei Antigonos Karystos überliefert²⁰. Dadurch ist es schwierig, eine kanonische oder gar älteste Fassung des Mythos zu erschließen.

2.3. Gemeinsame Epitheta

Die obigen Erzählstränge um Hermes bzw. Saramā und einen Rinderdiebstahl kann man generell und doch vorsichtig als einander ähnlich einstufen. Darüber hinaus fällt auf, dass in der jeweiligen frühgriechischen bzw. altindischen Epik, in der Saramā und Hermes beschrieben werden, beide eine Vielfalt an Gemeinsamkeiten besitzen. Eine präzise Synthese dieser erstellte zuletzt Jan SKARBK-KAZANECKI, wobei er besonders auf die Ähnlichkeit der Beschreibung Saramās durch sanskr. *supadi* („schnellfüßige“)²¹ und Hermes' durch ἐπειγόμενος („eilig, schnell“)²² oder ἔσσυμένως („eilend, fliehend; heftig“)²³ sowie Saramās

¹⁷ J. LARSON, *Hermes and Heracles*, in: J.F. MILLER, J. STRAUSS CLAY (Hgg.), *Tracking Hermes, Pursuing Mercury*, Oxford 2019, S. 51.

¹⁸ R. MERKELBACH, M.L. WEST (Hgg.), *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, Oxford 1967, S. 125.

¹⁹ Siehe zum Beispiel die Übersetzung von Max TREU in *Alkaios: Griechisch und Deutsch*, München 1980, S. 25.

²⁰ N. RICHARDSON (Hg.), *Three Homeric Hymns: to Apollo, Hermes and Aphrodite*, Cambridge 2010, S. 25–26; T.W. ALLEN, W.R. HALLIDAY, E.E. SIKES (Hgg.), *The Homeric Hymns*, Oxford 1936, S. 270–277.

²¹ *RV* III 31, 6: „Wenn die Sarama die Bresche im Felsen findet, so wird sie ihren früheren großen Schutz vollständig machen. Die Leichtfüßige (*supadi*) führt die Spitze der Kühe. Sich auskennend ging sie als erste auf den Schall zu...“ (übers. von K.F. GELDNER).

²² *Hymn. Hom.* 4, 86: „Wie zu dem eiligen (ἐπειγόμενος) Gang, um weit in die Ferne zu reisen“ (übers. von K. SCHWEND).

²³ *Hymn. Hom.* 4, 150: „Hurtig (ἔσσυμένως) stieg nun der ruhmvolle Hermes hinein in die Schwinge“. *Hymn. Hom.* 4, 320: „...nun schritt er eilig (ἔσσυμένως) im Sande voraus...“ (übers. von A. WEIHER).

durch sanskr. *subhagā* („Glück bringende“)²⁴ und Hermes‘ durch χαριδῶτα („Glückvergebender“) oder δῶτορ ἐάων („des Guten Geber“)²⁵ aufmerksam machte²⁶. Hiermit skizzierte sich bereits ein gewisses Gleichnis der beiden Gottheiten, wobei es auch kaum einer weitreichenden Beweisführung bedarf, dass Hermes der olympischen Götter Bote ist. Als solcher tritt er bei Homer (*Od.* V 29: ἄγγελος) und Hesiod (*Th.* 938–939: Ἑρμῆν κήρυκ’ ἀθανάτων) auf, wird fortan an als solcher porträtiert. Zudem geben der *RV* und die *Hymn. Hom.* 4 der Überlieferung über die Götterboten Saramā und Hermes jeweils den Aspekt listig zu sein hinzu.

3. RINDERDIEBSTÄHLE DER EPHEBEN HERMES UND HERAKLES

Eine Besonderheit des Hermeskultes in Böotien sind dessen unerwartete Parallelen zum böotischen Herakles²⁷. Beide sind dort *kandaui* und *charopes*, Rinderdiebe, Söhne des Zeus, stets hungrig, Epheben, die sich beweisen müssen, und Patronen der Athleten²⁸. Als Epheben konkurrieren beide mit Apollo. Für Hermes wird dies in der *Homerischen Hymne an Hermes* sehr deutlich. Nicholas RICHARDSON zählt mehrere Gründe auf, weshalb man die *Hymne* als Vorläufer einer komödiantischen Komposition handeln könne²⁹. Täte man dies, würden die Späße zu Ungunsten Apollos in *Hymn. Hom.* 4, 176–181³⁰, 294–298³¹

²⁴ *RV* X 108, 5: „Diese Kühe, die du suchtest, die Grenzen des Himmels überfliegend, o holde (*subhagā*) Sarama, wer möchte die ohne Kampf herausgeben? Und unser sind scharfe Waffen“ (übers. von K.F. GELDNER).

²⁵ Vgl. auch „Pūṣan als Gönner“ (sansk. *pūsaratayah*) in *RV* I 23, 8 und II 41, 15; auch III 63, 9; außerdem als Bringer von Glück, Gewinn u.Ä. *RV* I 42, 6; I 89, 5–6; I 181, 9; V 49, 3; V 51, 11; VI 58; VII 35, 9; IX 67, 10.

²⁶ SKARBEK-KAZANECKI, *op. cit.* (Anm. 2), S. 29–32.

²⁷ Herakles ist in der griechischen Epik gebürtiger Thebaner (*Hom. Il.* XIV 323–324; *Hes. Th.* 530–531) und Homer als ein früher Eroberer Trojas bekannt (*Hom. Il.* V 638–642).

²⁸ Zu Hermes siehe H.S. VERSNELS Kapitel „Why is Hermes so Hungry?“ (*IDEM, Coping With the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*, Leiden–Boston 2011, S. 309–377), zu Herakles siehe JAGIELLO, *op. cit.* (Anm. 6), S. 181–199. Es noch besteht eine weitere Parallele. Die *Homerische Hymne an Hermes* kennt ihren Protagonisten als denjenigen, der als Erster den Olympischen Zwölf ein Opfer machte (*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 110–138). Man versuchte zu argumentieren, Hermes sei somit der Gründer des Kultes der Olympischen Zwölf (VERSNEL, *op. cit.*, S. 309–377). Doch er ist nicht der Einzige, dem dies nachgesagt wird, auch Herakles wird eine Ätiologie diesen Kultes angerechnet. Grund dafür ist, ein Zeugnis Pindars (RICHARDSON, *op. cit.* [Anm. 2], S. 172 und 175–176).

²⁹ RICHARDSON, *op. cit.* (Anm. 21), S. 19–20.

³⁰ *Hymn. Hom.* 4, 176–181: „Sollte nun aber der Sohn der gepriesenen Leto mich suchen, / Wird ihm ein anderes dann, und mir dünft’s, ärgres begegnen. / Denn nach Pytho geh’ ich, und bring in das mächtige Haus ihm / Wo ich genug Dreifüße, der herrlichen, so wie der Becken / Ihm und des Golds entwend’, und des blinkenden Stahle die Menge“ (übers. von K. SCHWEND).

³¹ *Hymn. Hom.* 4, 294–298: „Aber der Schimmernde, Starke nahm jetzt die Gedanken zusammen, / Als auf den Händen er schwebte und lies den künenden Vogel / Fahren, des Bauches geduldigen

und 330–335³² umso verständlicher. Ein solcher ephebischer, vielleicht pubertärer Streich, mit dem der junge Hermes die Erwachsenenwelt (vertreten durch Apollo) herausfordert, könnte auch im Rinderdiebstahl erkannt werden.

In einer sehr ähnlichen Beziehung zu Apollo steht auch Herakles. Jennifer LARSON stellte bereits die Mythen um Herakles und Hermes zusammen, in denen beide jeweils in einen Wettstreit mit ihrem Halbbruder Apollo geraten, um ihm – mit dem Ziel von den Olympischen Göttern anerkannt zu werden – Tripode, Halfter und Rinder (Hermes) bzw. Hirsche (Herakles) zu stehlen³³. Diese Gemeinsamkeiten des Hermes und Herakles sind leider auf ihren Ursprung hin kaum datierbar, doch LARSON zufolge kann man eine Verbindung bereits zwischen dem 8. und 7. Jahrhundert v. u. Z. (anhand Zeitspanne zwischen der Entstehung der *Homerischen Hymne an Hermes* und dem Etablieren des Orakels zu Delphi) ausmachen.

Des Weiteren enthalten die *Dodekathlos* des Herakles einen Rinderdiebstahl, dessen Geschädigter Geyron war, der das Land Erytheia jenseits des Okeanos bewohnte (Hes. *Th.* 287–294, 979–983). Außerdem begegnete Herakles auch Augias, der ihm einen Anteil seines Viehs versprach, dieses Versprechen aber nicht einhielt (Pind. *O.* 10, 23–30). Jener Augias ist derselbe, dessen Rinder Nestor nachts stahl, die Beute aber zum Morgengrauen von Herolden wiederfortgetragen worden ist (Hom. *Il.* XI 670–705).

Diese Parallelen im 8./7. Jahrhundert v. u. Z. vorausgesetzt, ergibt sich ein fundiertes Argument, um einen gemeinsamen Ursprung dieser Episoden der Mythen vom Rinderdiebstahl, besonders für Hermes bzw. Herakles, zu vermuten.

4. DIE RINDER DES HELIOS IN DER *ODYSSEE*³⁴

Gesänge I, XI und XII der *Odyssee* erzählen jeweils Teile der Geschehnisse, die Odysseus und dessen Mannschaft auf der Insel Thrinakia widerfahren. In Hom. *Od.* I 6–9 wird berichtet, dass es Odysseus nicht gelungen ist seine Kameraden davon abzubringen, die auf Thrinakia weidenden Rinder des Helios

Knecht, als verwegenen Boten. / Gleich hinterher dann niest er erschütternd; Apollon vernahm es / Und aus den Händen zu Boten entglitt ihm der ruhvolle Hermes“ (übers. von A. WEIHER).

³² *Hymn. Hom.*, 4, 330–335: „Phöbos, woher doch hast du die artige Beute gebracht da, / Dies unmündige Kind, das dem Herold gleicht von Ansehen? / Wahrlich ein ernstes Geschäft kam dies vor die Götterversammlung. / Ihm doch sagte dagegen der Fürst, Ferntreffer Apollon: / Vater, fürwahr gleich sollst du gewichtige Worte vernehmen, / Der du mich höhnt als wär ich allein nach Beute gelüstend“ (übers. von K. SCHWEND).

³³ LARSON, *op. cit.* (Anm. 18), S. 49–63. Für eine Besprechung des Motivs eines jungen Gottes, der sich beweisen muss, siehe C.A. SOWA, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymnes*, Chicago 1984, S. 145–198.

³⁴ Den Anreiz diese Thematik hier genauer zu besprechen, verdanke ich einem/r anonymen Rezensenten/in, dessen/deren Kommentare zu diesem Text eine besonders große Hilfe gewesen sind.

zu entführen und zu verspeisen, was ihnen letzten Endes die Heimkehr verwehrte. Als nächstes wird jedoch nahegelegt, dass wohl auch Odysseus an diesem Akt des Frevels seinen Anteil hatte. So prophezeite ihm doch Teiresias das folgende Los:

Heimkehr, Strahlender, suchst du, honigsüße, Odysseus!
 Schrecklich wird sie ein Gott dir gestalten: dem Erderschütterer
 Wirst du ja schwerlich entgehen, der Wut und Groll im Gemüte
 Gegen dich nährt, da den lieben Sohn du zum Leid ihm geblendet.
 Aber ihr fändet, freilich nach Leiden, auch so noch die Heimat,
 Zähmst du nur selber dein eignes Gemüt und das der Gefährten:
 Bist du dem Meer, das wie Veilchen gefärbt ist, endlich entronnen,
 Bringst du der Insel Thrinakia nahe dein treffliches Fahrzeug,
 Dann werdet weidende Kühe ihr finden und kräftiges Kleinvieh.
 Helios sind sie zu eigen, der alles vernimmt und betrachtet.
 Tastest du diese nicht an und bedenkst du mit Sorge die Heimfahrt,
 Dann könnt Ithaka, freilich nach Leiden, ihr doch noch erreichen.
Tastest du sie aber an, dann trifft dich, trifft auch dein Fahrzeug,
Trifft die Gefährten Vernichtung; das künd ich. Entrinnst du auch selber
 Dann kommst spät du und elend heim, ohne alle Gefährten,
 Nicht auf deinem eigenen Schiff und **im Hause noch findest du Unheil**:
Männer voll zuchtlosen Stolzes; sie prassen in deinem Besitztum,
 Bieten Geschenke als Freier der göttlichen Gemahlin.
Kommst du dann heim, dann wirst du gewiss ihre Frevel bestrafen.

(Hom. *Od.* XI 101–118; übers. von A. WEIHER)

Eine kürzere Version derselben Worte hört Odysseus auch von Kirke (Hom. *Od.* XII 127–141) und gibt sie anschließend an seine Gefährten weiter (Hom. *Od.* XII 271–276). Nichtsdestotrotz erfüllt sich diese Prophezeiung im Laufe der *Odyssee*: die Warnungen nicht ernst nehmend, beschließt die Mannschaft samt Odysseus auf Thrinakia an Land zu gehen; nachdem einige Zeit verstrichen war und Odysseus gerade in Abgelegenheit zu den Olympischen Göttern betete, trieben die übrigen Männer die Tiere des Helios in ihr Lager, um unter der Begründung nicht verhungern zu wollen, das Vieh töteten, den Göttern ein angemessenes Opfer brachten und das restliche Fleisch verzehrten; von Lampetia über diese Tat in Kenntnis gesetzt, drohte Helios (wörtl. ‚Sonne‘) zur Strafe fortan nur noch den Toten im Hades Licht zu geben, doch Zeus gelang es dessen Zorn zu bändigen, indem er die Übeltäter anschließend um ihr Leben brachte (Hom. *Od.* XII 260–419). Gemäß der Voraussagen von Teiresias und Kirke, ist nur Odysseus allein dem Tod noch einmal entronnen (Hom. *Od.* XII 420–425)³⁵.

³⁵ Odysseus Beteiligung am Vergehen an den Rindern des Helios ist durch zwei unterschiedliche Fassungen des Verses Hom. *Od.* XII 375 nicht vollkommen durchsichtig: die eine gibt Odysseus die Mitschuld, die andere bezieht ihn nicht mit ein. Teiresias scheint aber in allen Punkten recht zu behalten: „Tastest du sie an, dann trifft dich, trifft auch dein Fahrzeug, / Trifft die Gefährten Vernichtung; das künd ich Entrinnst du auch selber / Dann kommst spät du und elend heim, ohne alle Gefährten, / Nicht auf deinem eigenen Schiff und im Hause noch findest du

Als Odysseus seine Irrfahrt schließlich beendet und nach Ithaka zurückkehrt, erfährt er, dass die Freier sich an seinem eigenen Vieh mästeten (besonders in Hom. *Od.* XX 209–221; vgl. auch XVII 170–183, XXIII 300–305). Der Heimkehrer beschließt die verschiedenen Verbrecher der Freier zu bestrafen, doch deren Anführer, Eurylochos, versucht Odysseus von seinem Vorhaben abzubringen, indem er ihm anbietet ihn für die verspeisten Tiere zu entschädigen (Hom. *Od.* XII 45–59)³⁶. In dieser Szene beginnt sich nicht nur die Prophezeiung des Teiresias zu erfüllen, es wird auch ersichtlich, dass das Vergehen an den Tieren des Helios eine Parallele zu den Missetaten der Freier darstellt. Die Freier werden also um ihr Leben gebracht, genauso wie es zuvor mit der Mannschaft des Odysseus geschehen war³⁷.

5. MYTHEM UND MOTIV – SONNENSTRAHLEN UND RINDERDIEBSTAHL

Aus den angeführten Rinderdiebstählen ergibt sich ein besonders interessantes Motiv. Es besteht im Grunde aus einer Entführung des Viehs eines mit der Sonne zu identifizierenden Besitzers. Am auffälligsten ist dies in der *Odyssee*: der Besitzer der Rinderherde ist hier Helios, die Sonne selbst. Augias ist dagegen ‚der Strahlende‘. Das Etymon des Eigennamens „Geryon“ ist nicht bekannt, doch wird die Figur von Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf und Douglas Frame als Unterweltgott erwogen³⁸. Dazu berichtet Hesiod von Geryons „neb-

Unheil“. Daher ist anzunehmen, dass obwohl Odysseus nicht vor Ort war als die Rinder entführt wurden, er letztendlich doch auch deren Fleisch gekostet haben konnte.

³⁶ Einige ausgebaute Versionen der Saramā-Erzählung dichten den Panis Verhandlungsgeschick bei. Listig bestechen sie Saramā im *Brhaddevatā* (8, 24–36), wo eine Variante überliefert ist, die von jener *rigved*’schen abweicht. Die Hündin gehe mit den Panis einen Pakt ein. Sie werde bestochen und nehme als Schweigegehalt Nahrung (sanskrit. *dhāsi*) an (B. Debroy, *Sarama and her Children: The Dog in Indian Myth*, New Delhi 2008, S. 76), was *RV* I 62, 3 teils zu bestätigen scheint: „Als Indra und die Angiras auf der Suche waren, fand Sarama Nahrung (sanskrit. *dhāsi*) für ihre Nachkommenschaft...“ (*RV* I 62, 3; übers. von K.F. Geldner). Vergleichbar mit diesem Akt der Bestechung ist wohl die Bestechung des Battos in der Hesiod’schen Version des Hermetischen Viehdiebstahls (siehe oben). Oftmals wird jener *dhāsi* als Milch interpretiert. Doch Indra kommt hinter diese Arglist Saramās und zwingt sie die Milch zu erbrechen. Dies erinnert wahrlich an Lykophrons (3. Jahrhundert v. u. Z.) Erzählung von der Entstehung der Milchstraße aus des säugenden Herakles’ Mund und dem entrisenen Busen der Hera, was ein weiterer Streich des Hermes’ gewesen ist (Lycophr. 1328).

³⁷ Ein weiteres Mal kommt das Thema der Bestrafung für einen Rinderdiebstahl auf, als Odysseus mit Amphimedon spricht, während Hermes die Seelen der toten Freier in die Unterwelt führt. Odysseus fragt Amphimedon, was ihm zugestoßen sei: „Haben euch Feinde Schaden getan auf dem Festland weil ihr / Scharen von Rindern euch holtet und herrliche Herden von Schafen?“ (Hom. *Od.* XIV 111–112).

³⁸ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, Bd. I, Berlin 1931, S. 276; D. Frame, *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic*, New Heaven–London 1978, S. 30–50 und 86–95.

ligen (d.h. lichtlosen) Ställen“ (Hes. *Th.* 294). Deswegen gibt Apollodor dem Heros Herakles die Zustimmung des Helios, als er sich aufmacht Geryons Rinder zu rauben (Apollod. II 5, 10), womit – selbst wenn im Rahmen seiner zehnten Arbeit – vielleicht auch ein Eintreiben der Rinder des Helios gemeint sein könnte. Ferner werden auch Indra³⁹ und Phöbus Apollo⁴⁰ als Sonnengötter gehandhabt. Es bietet sich also an, die wichtigsten Bestandteile der verschiedenen Fassungen des Motivs tabellarisch darzustellen, um Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede deutlich zu machen:

Quelltext	Besitzer	Vieh	Entführer	Eintreiber	Zeitpunkt	Hintergrund
<i>RV</i> <i>RV</i>	Indra Bṛihaspati	Kühe Kühe	Paṇis Vala	Saramā Navagvas	Abend- dämmerung	-
<i>Hymn.</i> <i>Hom.</i> 4	Apollo	βοῦς	Hermes	Battos/ Satyre	vor dem Morgengrauen	Reifeprüfung
Hom. <i>Od.</i>	Helios	βοῦς	Odysseus & Co.	-	abends/nachts (?)	Hunger
Hom. <i>Il.</i>	Augias	βοῦς	Nestor	Herolde	nachts	Schulden
Hes. <i>Th.</i> Apollod.	Geryon Helios (?)	βοῦς βοῦς	Herakles Geryon (?)	- Herakles (?)	-	Dodekathlos
Fazit	<i>kohärent</i>	<i>kohärent</i>	<u>unstimmig</u>	<u>unstimmig</u>	<i>kohärent</i>	<u>unstimmig</u>

Was nun ersichtlich wird, ist die stetige Kohärenz der Sonne als Besitzer und der Rinder als Besitztum sowie der Akt des Raubes. Unterschiedlich sind hingegen die Eintreiber sowie die Entführer, die mal alleine, mal als Gruppe agieren sowie ihre jeweilige Motivation den Raub zu begehen.

5.1. Gemeinsamkeiten

In erster Linie gebührt den Gemeinsamkeiten Aufmerksamkeit. Dabei stellt sich berechtigterweise die Frage nach der Bedeutung der dem Sonnengott geweihten Rinder. Einen Einblick in diese Symbolik bietet erneut die *Odyssee*. Helios verkündet im Götterrat, er sei über die Tat der Mannschaft des Odysseus erzürnt und gibt auch den Grund dafür preis:

³⁹ Indra ist wörtl. ‚der Entfacher‘, der laut des Śatapatha-Brāhmana die von der Sonne abstammende Lebenskraft *prāṇa* initiiert (ŚB VI 1, 1, 2; siehe A. WILKE, O. MOEBUS, *Sound and Communication: An Aesthetic Cultural History of Sanskrit Hinduism*, Berlin–New York 2011, S. 468).

⁴⁰ Gr. Φοῖβος, wörtl. ‚der Leuchtende‘.

Strafe die Leute des Sohns des Laertes, Odysseus! Sie haben
 Meine Rinder gewaltsam getötet. Die machten mir Freude,
 Jedesmal, wenn immer zum Himmel mit allen Gestirnen ich aufstieg,
 Taten es wieder, wenn immer ich immer von Himmel zur Erde ich kehrte.
 Zählen sie nicht für die Rinder an mich die gebührende Buße,
 Geh ich hinab in den Hades und scheine dort für die Toten!

(Hom. *Od.* XII 378–383; übers. von A. WEIHER)

Der tägliche Sonnenweg ist somit mit den Rindern verbunden, wobei bei Verschwinden der Rinder auch die Sonne nicht mehr vom Himmel auf die Erde strahlen will, sondern sich im Hades verstecken möchte. Dies würde eine ständige Dunkelheit auf der Welt wie zur Nachtzeit bedeuten. Das die Rinder mit der Strahlkraft der Sonne einhergehen, machen auch ihre Hüterinnen Phaetusa (wörtl. ‚die Leuchtende‘) und Lampetia (wörtl. ‚die Scheinende‘) deutlich. Somit wären die beiden Nymphen als das Licht und der Schein, der von den Rinder ausgeht, zu verstehen.

Die altindische Variante des Motivs lässt Ähnliches vermuten. Indras Rinder werden nämlich in einer Höhle fernab, wo kein Licht scheint, versteckt gehalten. Hier ist eine Parallele zu dem Aufenthaltsort der Rinder, die Herakles Geryon wegstiehlt, nicht ausgeschlossen. Es wird gelegentlich interpretiert, dass erst als Saramā die Tiere wiederzurückbringt, Uṣās, die Morgenröte, aufkommt – und diese Deutung ist insofern nicht völlig verkehrt, dass Indra in der *rigved*’schen Tradition die Sonne zu kontrollieren scheint, wobei Saramā als seine Botin ihm stets voraus ist⁴¹. Analog gibt der homerische Dichter der *Hermeshymne* bekannt, dass auch die Rinder des Apollo in einer Höhle verschwinden (*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 234, 401). Gar wird klar, dass diese jenseits des Okeanos-Flusses liegt – dessen *rigved*’schen Verwandten, dem Rasa-Fluss nahezu identisch⁴² – und dass sich die ganze Handlung um die Zeit des Morgengrauens und der Abenddämmerung abspielt:

Eos die frühe Licht bringend den sterblichen Menschen,
 hub sich empor von dem tiefen Okeanos; aber Apollon
 kam gen Onchestos...⁴³

(*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 184–186; übers. von K. SCHWEND)

Wie bereits erwähnt wurde, findet auch Nestors Rinderdiebstahl nachts statt, wobei morgens die Rinder erneut den Besitzer wechseln. Weil Teiresias Helios

⁴¹ So z.B. in *RV* IV 16, 8. Siehe auch Anm. 17 für Indras Verbindung zur Sonne. Vgl. DEBROY, *op. cit.* (Anm. 38), S.74, bezüglich Saramā als Uṣās.

⁴² So auch DEBROY, der den Rasa-Fluss mit dem Styx gleichsetzt (*op. cit.* [Anm. 38], S. 75, Anm. 15).

⁴³ In der *Ilias*, zwar dort in einem anderen Kontext, schreitet Hermes über den Okeanos hinweg: „...die schönen Sandalen, unverhängliche, goldene, die schnell ihn über die Fluten [...] entführten“ (Hom. *Il.* XXIV 340–341, übers. von H. RUPÉ).

als denjenigen beschreibt, der „alles vernimmt und betrachtet“, es aber Lampetia ist, die den Sonnengott über den Rinderdiebstahl informiert, kann auch hier eine nächtliche oder abendliche Abwesenheit des Geschädigten vermutet werden, als der Raub an Helios begangen wird. Es erschließt sich also die Interpretation, dass die Rinder die Strahlkraft der Sonne symbolisieren, deren der Himmelskörper zur Nacht hin enteignet wird.

5.2 Unterschiede

Ob und inwiefern es sich aber bei all diesen Erzählungen um dasselbe Motiv handelt kann nur erschlossen werden, indem auch deren Unterschiede erörtert werden. Diese sind abgesehen von den offensichtlichen sprachlichen Variationen, nur in der Anzahl der Entführer bzw. Eintreiber und deren Motivation zu finden. Die Panis sowie Odysseus' Mannschaft stellen hier eine Mehrzahl an Dieben dar, wobei Hermes, Nestor und Herakles/Geryon alleine gehandelt haben. Die entsprechenden Eintreiber/Boten sind dann jeweils in Opposition zu den Übeltätern entweder erneut eine Gruppe oder einzelne Figuren. Das Muster wird lediglich durch Battos in der Hermessage gebrochen.

In Sophokles' Werk *Ichneutai* engagierte Apollo Silen und seine Satyren, um dem diebischen Hermes auf die Schliche zu kommen. Darin stehen Apollo und die Satyren dem Rinderdieb gegenüber, wobei alle drei Seiten des Konfliktes zwar in einer anderen Konstellation, aber doch quantitativ ebenso wie im rigved'schen Saramā-Mythos (Indra, Saramā, Panis) vertreten sind. Eine alt-indische Hymne aus dem Rigveda besagt analog dazu, dass der Dämon Vala dem Sonnen-Äquivalent Indra (hier unter dem Namen Brihaspati)⁴⁴ die Rinder entführt. Die Hymne erweckt zwar den Anschein eine Alternativfassung darzustellen, gibt aber in Wahrheit nur zusätzliche Details und Hintergründe der Geschehnisse in *RV* X 108 preis. Beim Auffinden der gestohlenen Tiere durch Indra wird der Gottheit von einer Gruppe an Navagvas assistiert. Das Geschehen begleitet ein Geschrei:

...Brihaspati spaltete den Fels, fand die Rinder. Die Männer stimmten in das Gebrüll der Kühe mit ein. Du sprengtest mit der schmetternden Schar, du unter schmetterndem Tone mit den sieben Redegewaltigen, laut mit leiser Stimme zusammen mit den Navagva's den Fels, mit den Saranyu's den Phaliga, o mächtiger Indra, unter Geschrei den Vala im Bunde mit den Dasagva's.

(*RV* I 62, 3–4; übers. von K.F. GELDNER)

Und so heulen auch die Satyren als Apollo-Helfer der sophoklesischen Hermes-Mutter Kyllene gegenüberstehend:

⁴⁴ So auch in *RV* X 108, 11. DEBROY (*op. cit.* [Anm. 38], S. 69–74) gibt an, Brihaspati sei Indra und dessen Gehilfe bei der Wiederbeschaffung der Rinder sei Sarma, d.h. Saramā. Siehe auch MÜLLER, *op. cit.* (Anm. 2), S. 482.

θῆρες, τί [τό]νδε χλοερὸν ὑλῶδη πάγον
 ἐν[θ]ηρον ὠρμήθητε σὺν πολλῇ βοῇ;
 τίς ἦδε τέχνη;

Gesindel, wer kommt kreischend und plärend hierher, zu diesem Berg, der grün
 bewaldet und voll von Tieren; was soll der Unfug?⁴⁵

(Soph. *Ich.* 221–223)

Somit könnten die sich unterscheidenden Beschreibungen der Rinderdiebstähle in *RV* X 108 und *Hymn. Hom.* 4 durch die Fassungen aus *RV* IV 16 und IV 62 sowie Soph. *Ich.* auf einander zurückgeführt und in Einklang gebracht werden. Die Unstimmigkeiten zwischen *RV* X 108 und *Hymn. Hom.* 4 blieben aber auf literarischer Ebene weiterhin bestehen.

5.3. *Besprechung*

Literarisch betrachtet ist die Motivation der Protagonisten der jeweiligen Erzählungen bedeutsam. Die Beweggründe der einzelnen Figuren verleihen den Narrationen die Möglichkeit die Abfolge der Ereignisse logisch zu entwickeln, zu begründen und damit an die Umstände der Entstehung der Komposition anzupassen. Angesichts dessen, dass der Rinderdiebstahl in den angeführten Beispielen unterschiedlich motiviert ist, können wir von keinem Motiv gemäß einer derartigen Definition sprechen. Als Beispiel eines traditionellen, umfangreichen Motivs eignet sich das im Altertum weitverbreitete Motiv der Sintflut, dessen Hintergrund stets derselbe ist – die göttliche Bestrafung der Menschheit. Nichtsdestotrotz treibt auch der (obwohl unterschiedlich motivierte) Rinderdiebstahl immer die jeweiligen Erzählungen voran. Deswegen kann der Rinderdiebstahl (ohne die Gründe für den Raub) nicht mit der Sintflut an sich verglichen werden, sondern eher mit dem Grund für die Bestrafung. In diesem Fall könne das Motiv des Rinderdiebstahls zwar Einfluss auf die Geschehnisse nehmen, müsse aber nicht zwangsläufig ein Schlüsselereignis der gegebenen Erzählung darstellen. Der Rinderdiebstahl ist also weniger Motiv, er ist ein Motor, der die jeweilige Handlung antreibt. Wie zu Beginn angeführt, versteht man das literarische Motiv als einen solchen Motor, der plastisch betrachtet ein Gerüst bildet, das die gegebene literarische Welt vernetzt. So hätte der Raub der Rinder die Funktion eines Bindeglieds zwischen Beschädigtem und Übeltäter, dessen Tat eine Reaktion auslöst, die die Handlung vorantreibt. Identität des Übeltäters (ob Einzeltäter oder Gruppe), Gründe des Vergehens und Reaktion des Geschädigten spielen hierbei nur eine untergeordnete Rolle. Das Motiv als Gerüst kann nach Belieben

⁴⁵ Übers. von dem Verfasser. Diese Übersetzung ist recht lose. Merke: θῆρες (Pl.), wörtl. ‚Tiere, Getier‘; gemeint sind die Satyren; πάγον: ‚Berg, Hügel, Gebirge‘; gemeint ist Kyllene; hier ist πάγον vergleichbar mit sanskr. *adri* (‚Fels‘), weil die Handlung nicht jenseits des Okeanos stattfindet, sondern auf Kyllene.

verziert und ausgebaut werden. Der Raub, ein derartiges Motiv, gibt aber keine Berechtigung allen Rinderdiebstählen denselben Ursprung zuzuschreiben.

Anders verhält es sich mit dem zugrundeliegenden Mythem. Obgleich Paṇis oder Nestor, aus Hunger oder zum Trotz, es handelt sich stets um Rinder, Raub und eine personifizierte Sonne. Auf mythologischer Ebene scheinen die Unstimmigkeiten keine Bedeutung zu haben. Eine Auslegung wie diese erlaubt die Vermutung, das besprochene Motiv, der Rinderdiebstahl, entstamme einem literarisierten Mythem. Die Deutung der Sonne als Besitzer der Rinder sowie des Raubes als Ursache für den Verlust ihrer Strahlkraft verwiesen dabei auf einen Bezug zu dem Phänomen *des Sonnenweges und der Nacht*. Damit gewährt eine entsprechende Interpretation zum einen, den Sonnengott, der sein Vieh vermisst, als eigentlichen Protagonisten erkennen zulassen, zum anderen hingegen, die verlorenen Tiere, die vorübergehend am Ende der Welt, in einer Höhle jenseits des Okeanos hausen, als zweites Schlüsselement zu enttarnen. Jedes Rind sei damit ein Sonnenstrahl, der abends abhandenkommt, dorthin, woher kein Licht scheint⁴⁶. Doch zur Morgenröte muss die Sonne wieder leuchten und somit müssen auch die Sonnenstrahlen wieder zu ihrem Besitzer zurückkehren. Die Mythen über Saramā und Hermes führen dabei zur Erklärung des zugrundeliegenden Mythems – zwar auf unterschiedliche Art und Weise, aber immerhin – beide ihre jeweiligen Götterboten ein. Weniger explizit sind die solaren Aspekte womöglich auch in den Erzählungen um Nestor und Augias sowie Herakles und Geryon erhalten geblieben. Zusammenfassend lässt sich aber sagen, dass hier nur marginale Bedeutung zu haben scheint, wer Eintreiber (z.B. Saramā) und wer Dieb (z.B. Hermes) ist; die Hauptsache ist, die Sonnenstrahlen kehren zu ihrem Besitzer zurück und dies ist bekanntlich in beiden Mythen der Fall.

Einen guten Einblick in die zugrundeliegende Symbolik gibt ein Vergleich von *RV* IV 1, 13 und *Hymn. Hom.* 4, 401–402. Das Rigveda beschreibt die Rückkehr der Sonnenstrahlen direkt nach der Spaltung der Felsen, hinter dem die Rinder von Vala versteckt gehalten worden sind, so:

...Die im Fels eingepferchten gutmilchenden Kühe in der Höhle trieben sie heraus,
die Morgenröten anrufend⁴⁷.

(*RV* IV 1, 13; übers. von K.F. GELDNER)

Gänzlich identisch befreit letztendlich auch Hermes die Kühe des Apollo aus seiner Höhle und damit aus der Nacht heraus (νυκτὸς ἐν ὥρῃ) und ins Tageslicht (ἐς φῶς) hinaus (*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 401–402).

Die Präsenz dieses Mythems in den Mythologien der Alten Inder und Griechen nährt den Verdacht, es könne sich um ein im Ursprung indoeuropäisches

⁴⁶ Vgl. P. JACKSON, *A Song Worth Fifty Cows: Graeco-Indo-Iranian Variations on the Etiology of Sacrifice*, Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft LXVIII 2014, S. 107–108.

⁴⁷ Hier ist gemäß *RV* IV 16, 8 auch Saramā mit im Bunde.

Kulturgut handeln. Dieses dürfte ein *Mythem der verlorenen Sonnenstrahlen* sein, das sich der besprochenen Rindermetapher bedient und konsequent als *Motiv des Rinderdiebstahls* in verschiedenen Erzählungen auftritt. Das Motiv müsse dabei auf literarischer Ebene als Abwandlung eines einfachen Raubes betrachtet werden, die ihre Einzigartigkeit dem Umstand verdankt, dass sie das vorgestellte Mythem und die entsprechende Metapher beinhaltet.

EXKURS: GÖTTERBOTEN IN DER UNTERWELT

Am Rande der Erzählungen von den Rinderdiebstählen um Saramā, Hermes, Herakles und Odysseus, kommt ein weiterer mythologischer Aspekt zum Vorschein. Man erfährt von der mythischen Geographie der Welten, in denen sich die Vorkommnisse abspielen, und gewinnt ein Blick in die jeweiligen eschatologischen Vorstellungen.

Die Höhle der Paṇis ist am Ende der Welt, fernab von Licht und nur schwer erreichbar. Die Kühe des Indra von dort zu ihm zurückzubringen interpretiert Shrikant TALAGERI deswegen ursprünglich eine zyklische Handlung gewesen zu sein, die im Nachhinein zu einem einzelnen Vorkommnis mythologisiert worden sei⁴⁸. Saramā stieg demnach einst zyklisch zu den Paṇis hinab, um Indras Kühe einzutreiben. Eine Berechtigung erhält diese Interpretation durch die beiden Nachkommen Saramās, die Sārameya, die in *RV* VII 55 konsequent im Dienste des Yama und als Hunde an den Pforten des Totenreiches Wache (*RV* X 14, 10–11) beschrieben werden⁴⁹.

Als bekannter Bezwiner solcher Hunde ist in der griechischen Mythologie Herakles bekannt. Bei dem Rinderdiebstahl der Geryon-Episode muss er dessen zweiköpfigen Hund Orthos bekämpfen (Hes. *Th.* 287–294)⁵⁰, schließlich auch

⁴⁸ TALAGERI, *op. cit.* (Anm. 15), S. 565.

⁴⁹ Saramā war in der altindischen Vorstellung eine Hündin (auch wenn dies nicht von Beginn an wörtlich zu verstehen war, dafür siehe W. RADICE, *Myths and Legends of India*, New Delhi 2001, S. 92). Gelegentlich scheint diese Feststellung Forschern eine nur sehr späte und fälschliche Interpretation zu sein; siehe bereits MÜLLER, *op. cit.* (Anm. 2), S. 486–487. Zudem wurde auch Pan in der Antike gelegentlich als Hund bezeichnet, vgl. J.A. HALDANE, *Pindar and Pan: frs. 95-100 Snell*, Phoenix XXII 1968, S. 30, wo er erklärt: „Pan is called a ‚hound of manyfold shape‘ because there is none of the different aspects of a hound – hunting-dog, watchdog, companion, and the rest – which he cannot, metaphorically, assume“. Sowohl Pan, als auch Hermes sind Hirten, deren Arbeit oftmals – bereits seit der Antike – von Hunden unterstützt worden ist. Der Hund ist daher ein Symbol des Hirten. Es besteht auch eine direkte Verbindung durch ein Epitheton des Hermes, das er mit Herakles teilt: Kandaulos, der Hundewürger (κάνδαυλος; laut Tzetzes lyd. *kandaules* [κάνδαύλης]) – hier vielleicht mehr Jäger oder Psychopompos, der den Höllenhund bezwingt, als Hirte; doch fungierte das Epitheton auch als Name einiger Tyrannen und Könige in Kleinasien, deshalb liegt es laut Mary R. BACHVAROVA nahe, gr. *kandaulos/es* als einen traditionellen Titel aus dem Luwischen (luw. *ḫantawata/i-*) für ‚König‘ stammend zu verstehen, dafür siehe M.R. BACHVAROVA, *From Hittite to Homer. The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic*, Cambridge 2016, S. 374.

⁵⁰ DEBROY identifiziert Orth(r)os mit Vritra (*op. cit.* [Anm. 38], S. 78).

Kerberos (Κέρβερος) aus dem Hades ins Diesseits führen (Hom. *Od.* XI 624–626). Orthos und Kerberos treten hier in der *rigved*’schen Funktion der Sārameyas auf. So steigt Herakles, wie auch Saramā, zu den Höllenhunden ins Totenreich. Somit muss auch er an einer Hundewache vorbei, um Geryons Rinder zu entführen. Orthos (sozusagen die Sārameyas aus der altindischen Fassung) ist in der Geryon-Episode des Heraklesmythos Gehilfe des Unterweltgottes Geryon⁵¹, dagegen ist das griechische κέρβερος allem Anschein nach ein mit dem vedischen Sanskrit verwandtes indoeuropäisches Wort. Dieses ist im Sanskrit als *śarvara*-, auch *karvara*- geschrieben, belegt und der Name eines der Sārameya⁵². Eine etymologische Entwicklung aus einem gemeinsamen urindoeuropäischen Stamm und in Verbindung mit dem Übergang aus sanskr. *śarvar*- (‘Nacht’) zu sanskr. *karvara*- sowie (unabhängig davon?) zu κέρβερος ist zwar möglich⁵³, aber nicht (ausreichend) belegt⁵⁴. Die Bedeutung ‘Nacht’ kommt hier in Verbindung mit dem *Schwinden der Sonnenstrahlen zur Abenddämmerung* im zuvor besprochenen Mythem nichtsdestotrotz sehr gelegen⁵⁵. Beim Heraufbringen des

⁵¹ Für Geyron als Hypostase des Sonnengottes (Helios), siehe FRAME, *op. cit.* (Anm. 39), S. 30–50 und 86–95. Auch Augias (‘der Strahlende’), dessen Rinderställe Herakles im Rahmen seiner zwölf Arbeiten ausmistete, fügt sich in das Bild einer Helios-Hypostase. Für die Verbindung von Geryon zum Sonnenkult, siehe M. DAVIES, *Stesichorus’ Geryoneis and Its Folk-Tale Origins*, *Classical Quarterly* XXXVIII 1988, S. 277–290. Vgl. auch P. CURTIS, *Stesichorus’s Geryoneis*, Leiden 2011, S. 1–68, bes. 38–45. Für Stesichorus’ *Geryoneis* siehe auch D. PAGE, *Stesichorus: The Geryoneis*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* XCIII 1973, S. 138–154. Für eine ganz andere Idee, siehe A. SANTOS, *Atlantis: The Lost Continent Finally Found*, 2011, S. 137 und 328–331.

⁵² Vgl. D.W. ANTHONY, *The Horse, the Wheel and Language. How Bronze Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*, Oxford 2007, S. 56. Andererseits ist sankr. *śabala* eine Eigenschaft der Sārameyas in *RV* X 14, 10.

⁵³ Vgl. s.v. *śarvarī*, MAYRHOFER, *op. cit.* (Anm. 4), S. 311–312.

⁵⁴ Für eine Besprechung der verschiedenen Aspekte des Hundes (dort auch zu den Höllenhunden des Yama und zu Kerberos) in der indoeuropäischen Kultur, siehe B. SCHLERATH, *Der Hund bei den Indogermanen*, Paideuma: Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde VI 1954, S. 25–40. Für eine Besprechung der Herleitung von Κέρβερος aus dem Indischen, siehe R. RONZITTI, *Śabalā and Sibilja: A Journey from India to Iceland*, *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* IV 2007, S. 135–157.

⁵⁵ Die Deutung der Figur des Kerberos bereitet durch die nahöstliche Gottheit des „Nergal mit den Hunden“ Interpretationsschwierigkeiten. Dieser Nergal wurde als Herr dreier bzw. eines dreiköpfigen Hunde/s verehrt (vgl. L. DRIVEN, *My Lord with his Dogs. Continuity and Change in the Cult of Nergal in Parthian Mesopotamia*, in: L. GREISIGER et al. (Hgg.), *Edessa in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Religion, Kultur und Politik zwischen Ost und West. Beiträge des internationalen Edessa-Symposiums in Halle an der Saale, 14.–17. Juli 2005*, Beirut 2009, S. 47–68). Darüber hinaus könnte Herakles’ Namen als die attestierte, mittelbabylonische Lesung des Götternamens „Nergal“, *Erragal*, zu verstehen sein. Dadurch könne man das *-a-* in Herakles, anstelle des üblichen *-o-* (wie z.B. in Her-o-dot), erklären, um auch endlich die umstrittene griechische Volksetymologie von einem Kompositum aus dem Theonym Hera und κλέος ‘Ruhm’ beiseitezulassen. Die Keilschriftzeichen für „Nergal“ verblieben im Mittelbabylonischen gleich und wurden bis auf Sum. GĪR bzw. Akk. *en* und UNUG bzw. *eri*, welche fortan „Erra“ infolge des zeitgenössischen Nergal-Erra-Synkretismus gelesen wurden, weiterhin traditionsgemäß ausgesprochen. Der Name

Kerberos durch Herakles war auch Hermes beteiligt (Hom. *Od.* XI 625–626), womöglich fortan nur als Zeuge oder Begleiter, primär vielleicht gar selbständiger Bändiger des Höllenhundes⁵⁶.

Die durch den Höllenhund verkörperte Nacht zu bezwingen oder ins Diesseits zu führen entspricht womöglich dem Wiederauffinden der Sonnenrinder. Es erschließe sich also ein weiteres Mythem in den Mythen um die Sonnenrinder, Saramā, Hermes etc., das einen Einblick in die indoeuropäische Vorstellung des Totenreiches gibt. Diese mythischen Erzählungen würden anscheinend mehrere Mytheme auf natürliche Weise verflochten, sodass aus der Höhle der Paṇis die von Hunden behütete Unterwelt wird, wo sich die verlorenen Rinder über Nacht aufhielten. In Saramā wäre also ein Bindeglied zwischen Abenddämmerung und Morgengrauen zu erblicken. Sie bringt die Sonne aus der Unterwelt, wo sie sich nachts aufhält – ein Aspekt des Götterbotenmotivs, den wir auch in Hermes wiederfinden.

Interessanterweise besitzt Hermes in Böotien den Beinamen Charops (Χάρωψ, wörtlich ‚mit hell aufleuchtenden Augen‘) und wird an mutmaßlichen Eingängen zur Unterwelt verehrt. Der Beiname Charops könnte bei Homer als Umschreibung in Form von εὔσκοπος (Hom. *Od.* VII 137), sowie νυκτὸς ὁπωπητῆρα (*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 15) und μελαίνης νυκτὸς ἑταῖρε (*Hymn. Hom.* 4, 290) zu finden sein. Ebenso ist der Name des Fährmanns Charon (Χάρων) zu verstehen. Außerdem besaß Herakles in einigen böotischen Kultstätten diesen Beinamen und fand Verehrung an den Orten, an denen er mit Kerberos aus dem Hades gestiegen sein soll⁵⁷.

Die Gemeinsamkeiten sind beachtlich und könnten sich potentiell zu einen unbestimmten Zeitpunkt auf die Entstehung ausgebauter Erzählungen, die mythologische Vorstellungen wie Sonnenweg, Rinderdiebstahl, Götterboten, Katabasis und Hundewacht in der Unterwelt zusammengeführt hatten, ausgewirkt haben.

„Herakles“ entstammte somit einer gräzisierten, im Griechischen dann initial aspirierten Form **Errakales* (*Errakal-ῆς*) des mittelbabylonischen Theonyms „Errakal“. Diese Gräzisierung hätte damit in Anlehnung an beliebte griechische Namen mit der Endung „-kles“, wie z.B. Damokles, Sophokles etc., stattgefunden. Für orientalische Motive im Heraklesmythos, siehe M.L. WEST, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, Oxford 1997, S. 458–472, und G.R. LEVY, *The Oriental Origin of Herakles*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* LIV 1934, S. 40–53. Ein früher Herakles könnte somit vermutlich zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt mit Nergal, dem Herren mit den Hunden, im Rahmen griechisch-nahöstlicher Kontakte synkretisiert worden sein.

⁵⁶ Der Totenführer Hermes ist bereits Homer bekannt. Er geleitet die *psychai* der Verstorbenen in das Totenreich, oftmals durch die *katavotrai* des arkadischen Styx-Flusses. Das mythische Bild eines Hades bewacht durch den zweiköpfigen Höllenhund (bei Hesiod in *Th.* 312 fünfzigköpfig, auf den frühesten Darstellungen, zum Beispiel um 600 v. u. Z. auf einer attischen Vase, stets zweiköpfig), approachiert durch den Seelenführer, kennen wir bereits aus dem Rigveda und ist somit als Parallele zu identifizieren.

⁵⁷ A. SCHACHTER, *Cult of Boiotia*, Bd. 2: *Herakles to Poseidon*, London 1986, S. 3–10.

FAZIT

Um die obige Auseinandersetzung mit allen erwogenen Mythenen, literarischen Motiven und Figuren zu systematisieren, wird nun der Versuch einer Rationalisierung vorgenommen, sodass die Entwicklung des ursprünglichen Mythems eine zeitlich akkurate, historisch vertretbare und literarisch kohärente Abfolge (auch hinsichtlich des Überganges in ein literarisches Motiv) nehme.

Die indoeuropäische Kultur gearbete eine Vorstellung des täglichen Sonnenlaufes, die ein nächtliches Abhandenkommen der Sonnenstrahlen und deren morgendliche Wiederkehr vorsah. In den altindischen Texten ist das literarisierte Mythem zu dem sog. „Cattle of the Sun“-Motiv geworden, das Kühe als Sonnenstrahlen metaphorisiert, um ihren Diebstahl und ihr Verstecken in einer Höhle am Ende der Welt zu ermöglichen, sodass das Eintreten der Nacht und anschließende Morgengrauen zu erklären ist. Die Metapher der Rinder als wichtigstes Besitztum des Sonnengottes zu deuten und als Sonnenstrahlen zu interpretieren könne insofern richtig sein, als dass das Viehhüten den Auslauf der Tiere zur Morgenröte geradezu verlangt, wobei diese zur Abenddämmerung von ihren Weiden wieder eingetrieben werden. So entliefen sie quasi der Sonne zur Abendzeit, wohingegen sie ihr des Morgens wieder entgegenkämen. Dies ist nicht bei allen Tieren, wie z.B. beim Schafehüten, gängige Praxis.

Gewiss ist, dass das Rigveda dieses Muster in der Geschichte um Indra, Saramā und die Paṇis festhält. Indra, die Sonne, verliert seine Kühe, die Sonnenstrahlen, an die Paṇis, deren Versteck samt den Kühen durch Saramā aufgesucht wird. Sie bringt die Morgenröte, Uṣās. Daher wird Saramā auch oftmals mit Uṣās identifiziert⁵⁸. Weil aber Saramā als Botin und Begleiterin der Götter zyklisch der Rinder wegen zur Höhle der Paṇis eilte, wird sie als Hündin umschrieben. Denn als die Höhle mit dem Totenreich identifiziert worden ist, wurde klar, dass Saramā mit den Wachhunden des Yama zu tun haben musste. So – als *devaśunī* ‚Hündin der Götter‘ – erfährt sie im Verständnis der Alten Inder fortan die Fiktion eines Hundedaseins.

Auch den Vorfahren der Griechen war das Mythem der verlorenen Sonnenstrahlen bzw. das Motiv des Rinderdiebstahls bekannt und etablierte sich schließlich in der griechischen Literatur. Sogar auf vielerlei Weise, denn sowohl Nestor, Odysseus‘ Mannschaft, Herakles, als auch Hermes stahlen jeweils Augias, dem Gott Helios, Geryon und Apollo ihre Rinder. Auffällig sind hierbei natürlich die stets bewahrte Kohärenz der solaren Beschädigten. Verdacht gebührt hingegen der offensichtlichen Tatsache, dass in den ägäischen Mythen, das angeblich Saramā-Äquivalent Hermes nicht als Bote des Sonnengottes fungiert, sondern als Übeltäter. Wie schon die diversen Varianten, die Eintreiber und Entführer verschiedenartig beschrieben oder unterschiedliche Gründe für die

⁵⁸ DEBROY, *op. cit.* (Anm. 38), S. 74.

Diebstähleangaben, sind auch die Unterschiede zwischen Saramā und Hermes eher literarischer Natur und nicht mythologisch. Die Gleichsetzung von Saramā und Hermes kann grundsätzlich nicht nachgewiesen werden, da etymologische Nachforschungen es nicht erlauben, diesbezüglich klare Schlüsse zu ziehen, obwohl die Gemeinsamkeiten beider Figuren frappierend sind. Die Unstimmigkeit der jeweiligen Rolle der beiden Figuren, des Diebes Hermes und der Eintreiberin Saramā im *RV* bzw. in der *Hymn. Hom. 4*, ließe sich jedoch durch die Annahme erklären, die eine Erzählung thematisiere die Morgenstunde (Eintreiben der Rinder), wohingegen die andere das abendliche Dämmern (Rinderdiebstahl) zum Mittelpunkt der Handlung machte.

Das Mythem der verlorenen Sonnenstrahlen basiert auf dem Symbol, das Sonnenstrahlen durch Rinder metaphoriert. Ihr Abhandenkommen verweist auf den Verlust der Strahlkraft der Sonne. In literarischen Adaptionen kann ein solches Mythem auf verschiedene Art und Weise aufgegriffen und verwendet werden, um Motive, wie die Reifeprobe (Hermes, Herakles) oder Beleidigung der Götter (Mannschaft des Odysseus), zu bereichern. Deswegen können sich Anzahl der Protagonisten, Motivation, Umstände etc. in diesen Erzählungen erheblich voneinander unterscheiden. Dennoch bleibt die Metapher mit mythologischer Bedeutung, das Mythem, bestehen. Deswegen konnte sich im indischen Raum ein Mythos mit weiblicher Saramā (Eintreiberin), in Griechenland dagegen mit männlichem Hermes (Dieb) entwickeln. Die griechische Kultur gebär dabei auch die Geryon-Episode des Heraklesmythos, die Episode über die Hybris der Gefährten des Odysseus sowie die Heldentat des Nestor, die allesamt auf den Raub der Sonnenrinder zurückgehen.

Des Weiteren scheint in dem frühen (ur-)indoeuropäischen Mythem auch eine belegbare indoeuropäische Vorstellung der Unterwelt enthalten gewesen zu sein, die mindestens auf literarischer Ebene auf die Bedeutung von Hunden und Totenführern hinwies.

Durch die Unterscheidung der Bedeutung (Mythem) einer mythischen Erzählung von der Bewegung (Motiv) innerhalb einer literarischen Welt ist es möglich sowohl indoeuropäische Ideen, als nahöstliche Inspiration zu erschließen und zu vereinen. Deswegen sind orientalische Inspirationen (u.a. aus dem *Gilgamesch-Epos*) in der *Odyssee* auch kein Kontraargument für die indoeuropäische Charakteristik eines Odysseus⁵⁹. Die Präsenz eines indoeuropäischen Mythems ist damit auch in ursprünglich nahöstlichen literarischen Strukturen, die ihren Weg in die griechische Kultur gefunden haben, vollkommen natürlich. Selbst Jennifer LARSON schrieb bereits in ihrer komparatistischen Analyse der *Hymn. Hom. 4*, 1–150 mit Bezug auf die sumerische Komposition *Lugalbanda in der Berghöhle*, dass zwar das gesamte Thema der Reifeprüfung eines jungen

⁵⁹ Ähnlich womöglich auch im Fall der Orientalisierung des frühen Herakles durch die Einflüsse der nahöstlichen Nergal-Tradition. Vgl. Anm. 55.

Gottes, samt einer durch ihn vorbereiteten Opfergabe in der *Hymn. Hom.* 4 ein eindeutig nahöstliches Vorbild hat, aber der Rinderdiebstahl des Hermes trotz alledem ursprünglich griechisch sei:

[T]here can be little doubt that the theme of cattle theft in the *Hymn* derives from older Greek models such as the cattle raids described in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*⁶⁰.

Das dem Rinderdiebstahl zugrunde liegende Mythem ist hingegen nicht erst griechisch, sonder vermutlich indoeuropäisch und dem nach weitaus älter als die Kompositionen, die den Verfasser der *Homerischen Hymne an Hermes* beeinflusst haben konnten.

Adam-Mickiewicz-Universität, Poznań
mjl7669@amu.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0003-1536-3990

⁶⁰ J. LARSON, *Lugalbanda and Hermes*, *Classical Philology* C 2005, S. 5.

PLATO'S CRITIQUE OF DEMOCRACY AND HIS CONCEPTION OF EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY*

by

DOROTA ZYGMUNTOWICZ

ABSTRACT: In the history of the interpretation of Plato's political thought, the topic of Plato's criticism of democracy has dominated over his proposal of general and obligatory education (especially literacy) of the *demos*. Why should we think that the critical aspect is more important than the constructive one? The following paper seeks to demonstrate that these two themes of Plato's political philosophy are complementary and that awareness of their close interconnection is conducive to our understanding of the reason for, and aims of, Plato's criticism of democracy as exercised in Athens in the 4th century BC. These arguments are constituted by such main questions as: What does the word *demokratia* mean to Plato? Why is the quality of laws essential to his description of a "correct regime" (*orthē politeia*)? Why does a citizen of the law-abiding city of Magnesia in the *Laws* have to be a reader? Why did Aristotle associate Plato's name with the utopian ideas presented in the *Republic*, not with the idea of general education as expressed in the *Laws*?

INTRODUCTION

Criticism of democracy and education for democracy may be, but not necessarily are, mutually exclusive. The criticism may be a constructive element of the so-called deliberative democracy which derives its theoretical inspiration mainly from Jürgen HABERMAS' concept of "critical rationality"¹. It is beyond doubt that good civic education, that is one which stimulates the citizens' sense of civic and political responsibility, is a *condicio sine qua non* of such a democracy. But it remains a question as to whether without citizens who understand their rights and duties democracy exists at all. It is even more difficult to ascertain whether Plato criticised his contemporary democracy as a concerned beneficiary of a democratic element and democratic culture, or – as Karl POPPER recognised, with

* I am very grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their useful critical comments on an earlier version of this paper.

¹ More in SCHOFIELD 2006: 55–59, with a discussion of Peter EUBEN's position that Socratic dialogues reflect the "Habermasian dimension" (EUBEN 1994, 1996). Cf. WALLACH 2001: 400–410, for continuity and discontinuity between RAWLS' and HABERMAS' "deliberative democracy" and Plato's political art.

many other scholars concurring with him or following him – he did it because of his hostility towards it².

Contemporary reality gave us an answer to the first question: civic education is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for democracy. The examples of Iraq or the countries of the Maghreb have shown that it is hard to instil democracy in a place where authoritarian tradition is strong, social ties have been weakened by factional strife and civic war, and where not all citizens have access to education; that is, a place where the appropriate educational, social and self-governmental structures are unstable. On the other hand, the current crisis of democracy in countries with a longer democratic tradition which allows them to fulfil that *condicio sine qua non* demonstrates that knowledge regarding universal civic rights and duties that constitute a just system cannot be conveyed on the level of general education, because there is no general consensus as to what those rights and duties are and whether they exist at all. As Thomas N. MITCHELL remarks in his introduction to the history of Athenian democracy,

[there] is a lack of agreement about what constitutes a genuine democracy. This leaves scope for regimes with scant respect for the rule of law or the rights of citizens to lay claim to the title in an attempt to legitimise their rule, creating a danger that the term may become so elastic as to be meaningless. Even among political scientists there is limited agreement about the essence of democracy³.

Even though the matter concerns current affairs, such lessons change our viewpoint regarding the past and deepen our understanding of it. Presumably this is why there is some parallelism between the more nuanced analyses of Plato's approach to democracy which have arisen in specialist literature from the middle of the 20th century onwards⁴ and the crisis of contemporary democracy – a democracy that tends to assume various guises; there are, for instance, the democracies of the Congo, the Philippines, the USA or even Poland, which differ radically when exercised by various "chosen men" or self-appointed representatives of the *demos*. There is no doubt that the majority of these governments deserve critical reflection; according to survey data analysed by the Economist Intelligence Unit (*Democracy Index 2020*), most of the states declare themselves to have a republican or democratic system, but only 8.4 percent of the world population live

² POPPER 1945. On "the stubborn endurance of the view of Plato as a proto-totalitarian thinker", see MONOSON 2000: 13, n. 29.

³ MITCHELL 2015: 2.

⁴ Analyses of Plato's dialogues which reveal them as an expression of the democratic culture in 4th-century Athens and read them against the broad context of problems are characteristic for current scholarship. See e.g. WALLACH 2001 (for the new approaches to Plato's critical political thought, see p. 9, n. 12); KASTELY 2015 (for scholarship demonstrating the importance of seeing Plato as a thinker concerned with the crisis of Athenian democracy, see p. XIV); SØRENSEN 2016 (for recent trends in the study of Plato's relation to democracy, see p. 6, n. 17).

in so-called full democracies with the rest living in flawed democracies, hybrid systems and totalitarian systems⁵. The reasons for those flaws naturally vary from state to state. It seems natural, therefore, that Plato had his reasons to criticise democracy in Athens as well; but it is less clear what those reasons, and, even more pertinently, what the aims of his criticism, may have been.

Regardless of the above, the label of a “critic of democracy” that seems to be permanently attached to Plato’s name is, in fact, deserved. That he was critical of it is beyond doubt, and this regardless of whether he was referring to a social system that promotes individual freedom and equality of all the citizens or to a political system that gives power to the people⁶. This label has shaped the common perception of his political thought to a large extent, perhaps causing many of his readers to ignore the question whether criticising a democracy from the perspective of its 4th-century citizen he was truly criticising those values that define the ideals of today’s democracy: the rule of law and social justice; in other words, what democracy exactly he may have criticised. Surely far fewer readers associate Plato with the earliest project of obligatory and general civil education of a properly governed *polis* confirmed in the sources. And yet, the *Laws*, Plato’s last dialogue, is the earliest known text to recommend the erection of schools, the recruitment of competent teachers, the establishment of a special office (a ministry, as we would say today) to deal with the matters of education, and the introduction of obligatory primary education (including literacy) for the children of all citizens, to be paid for by the *polis*⁷. Thus, in the history of the interpretation of Platonism, not only have Plato’s criticism of democracy and the project of general education (especially literacy) of the *demos* been separated, but also the latter has been treated as an issue of secondary importance⁸.

In this paper, I attempt to demonstrate that these two aspects of Plato’s political thought are complementary and that awareness of their close interconnection is conducive to our understanding of the reasons for, and aims of, Plato’s criticism of democracy as exercised in Athens in the 4th century BC. The recurring

⁵ <https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2020/>, where 60 indicators of “full democracy” are set out (I quote the main ones on p. 36 below).

⁶ For the former situation, see *Alc.* I, 123a1–4; *Grg.* 452d–e, 502e, 513a–b; *R.* 405a9, 431c2, 557b–c, 558c5–6, 561d6–e1, 562b12–564a8; *Th.* 175e7; *Plt.* 298b6–300a, 300e; *L.* 684c, 698a10–b2, 699e–700a, 701a–b; for the latter, see *Plt.* 303a4–b1.

⁷ On school buildings, see *L.* 779d, 804c; on teachers paid by the *polis*: 804c–d, 813e; on the general and obligatory character of education: 804d, 808d–e, 812e; on the minister (head official) of education: 765d–766b, 801d, 809a–b, 811d–812a, 813a–d, 829d, 835a, 936a; on literacy: 809c, 809e, 810a–b, 951e, 953d.

⁸ The current popularity of gender studies may be one of the factors causing Plato’s proposal to educate women to be more widely discussed than the revolutionary political significance of the general and obligatory character of education (compare HOBBS 2015 on women with SCOLNICOV 2015 on education). The few scholars to focus on the latter are, e.g., NIGHTINGALE 1999: 102; BOBONICH 2002: 106–119; CLEARY 2003: 167; MICHELS 2004: 522.

question is: are there any reasons to perceive Plato more as a critic of democracy – who, in the *Republic*, presented a programme of educating only, or in the forefront, a relatively small group of “guardians” (the rulers/philosophers and soldiers, i.e., the intellectual and moral elite), rather than as an educator – who, in the *Laws*, wanted to prepare the *demos* for democracy⁹.

1. THE TERMINOLOGICAL COMMON DENOMINATOR: LAWFULNESS

The admirable phrase “education for democracy”, which may perhaps seem overly enthusiastic when used in reference to Plato’s thought, necessitates a remark concerning terminology. To Plato and his contemporaries, the word *demokratia* meant a different thing than it does to us. Ancient social and cultural elites perceived it as a not necessarily pleasant-sounding term for one of several methods of governing a *polis*, derived from the term for the men who exercised power in this method: the *demos*¹⁰. In Plato’s view, the matter of who governs at a given moment does not define the political regime (*polis/politeia*), but it defines “city administrations (πόλεων δὲ οἰκῆσεις) where the city is under the sway of despots, with some parts enslaved to other parts of itself” (*L.* 713a)¹¹. Thus, when a regime is called a monarchy, an aristocracy/oligarchy or a democracy, all that is defined in each case is the power (*kratos*) of the despot (*despotes*).

⁹ Regardless of the interpretations demonstrating that education in the *Republic* encompasses also the producer class (e.g. BROWN 2017, with references to 414d, 415c, 423d) and that the curriculum of the guardians does not materially diverge from the curriculum of the so-called Nocturnal Council in the *Laws* (e.g. KLOSKO 2006; see n. 24 below), it is hard to dispute that Kallipolis is founded on the proper upbringing of its guardians (*R.* 415c7–8: “there is an oracle that the city will be destroyed when an iron or bronze man is its guardian”; cf. 546d), and Magnesia in the *Laws* is founded on the general and obligatory education of the *demos*, even though it is non-obligatory at the stage of higher-level education (*L.* 804d6: every citizen “must of necessity become educated”). I do not examine here the issue that is widely discussed in literature, namely whether these two educational proposals are compatible (see e.g. WALLACH 2001: 360–387; KRAUT 2010: 57–70), but only whether Plato had democracy in mind when he proposed general literacy for the *demos* in the *Laws*. Here and henceforward I cite the *Laws* from PANGLE 1980 and the *Republic* from BLOOM 1968.

¹⁰ So in the earliest definition of *demokratia* in Thucydides II 37, 1; similar use of the term in Herodotus VI 43 (see MITCHELL 2015: 48). The value of the word *demokratia*, attested to in the sources from the second half of the 5th century BC onwards, was not constant, depending on the political and military situation on the one hand (after the Persian Wars, the proud Athenian democracy was contrasted to the tyrannies of the barbarians, including the Persians), and on the other, on the political orientation of those using the word (the democrats perceived the word *demos* as meaning “all the people, the citizen body as a whole”, while the aristocrats as meaning “the masses, the poor”; see CARTLEDGE 2009: 74). For more on the fluctuating connotations of the word *demokratia* in the 5th and 4th century, see KONSTAN 2004: 108–113.

¹¹ Plato makes this point also in the *Statesman* 303c: the criterion for governing bodies defines “not statesmen but seditionaries” (οὐκ ὄντας πολιτικούς ἀλλὰ στασιαστικούς). Here and henceforward I cite the *Statesman* from BENARDETE 1984.

Whether the despot is a single man, or several, or a majority (the *demos*), this is no more than a matter of quantity. Yet if any reasonable and free man wished to retain this traditional and generally applied criterion of defining regimes¹², the regime in which he would like to live – undoubtedly a reasonable one as well – should be called from the name “of the god who truly rules as despot over those who possess intellect” (L. 713a). This subtly ironic piece of advice suggests that those who do not possess intellect are ruled by some other god. This is exactly the meaning perceived in it by its addressee, who immediately asks: “Who is this god [who rules over those who possess intellect]?”, since he himself has his god, Zeus, and was quite correct in guessing that it was not this god that had been meant¹³. He receives an indirect answer, conveyed by means of the myth about Kronos’ former rule over the human race; according to the etymology in the *Cratylus*, Kronos was “pure reason” (ἀκήρατον τοῦ νοῦ, 396b). He is the one and only able to understand “that [...] human nature is not at all capable of regulating the human things, when it possesses autocratic authority over everything, without becoming swollen with insolence and injustice”; hence he placed “demons, members of a more divine and better species” as guardians above the human race (L. 713c–d). Those times were long gone, however, the gods passed away, only the animals and the humans remained. The animals can still be looked after by beings more perfect than themselves (it is a man that is a goatherd, after all, not a goat), but men must rely on other men to govern them¹⁴. If they wish to be governed well, they may only “imitate by every device the way of life that is said to have existed under Kronos” (L. 713e). On the private level, this act of imitation is performed when we obey the faculty which “within us partakes of immortality”, that is, our own reason; on the political level, it is performed when we obey “the common opinion of the city” (δόγμα πόλεως κοινόν) agreed upon through the method of reasoning. This opinion is called the law (L. 644d–645a, 714a). In 875c–d, Plato will state this more succinctly and explicitly:

For no law or order is stronger than knowledge, nor is it right for intelligence to be subordinate, or a slave, to anyone, but it should be ruler over everything, if indeed

¹² Application of the criterion of quality requires knowledge, experience, and time. It is certainly easier to ascertain *who* is governing than *how* that government is exercised. No wonder, therefore, that the classification of government systems according to the type of governance, dating back to Pindar (*Pyth.* 2, 86), has permanently entered political language. To characterise regimes according to the quality of governance (the level of lawfulness) has been standard practice since 2006, when the first Democracy Index was published.

¹³ In the *Laws*, even the gods have their god: reason (*nous*) is “god, in the correct sense, for the gods” (897b).

¹⁴ According to the version of this myth given in the *Statesman*, when Kronos ruled over the human race, there were no state systems (*politeiai*, 272a) or families. Political and family life came into being at the point of the god’s departure, when people were left to their own devices and with a decreasing memory of the former order (273b, 274d).

it is true and really free according to nature. But now, in fact, it is so nowhere or in any way, except to a small extent. That is why one must choose what comes second, order and law – which see and look to most things, but are incapable of seeing everything¹⁵.

Therefore, the quality of laws is essential to description of the type of political regime. This includes the way the governing entity governs the state, that is whether this is done by means of good/reasonable laws or not; what laws are good/reasonable; whether the laws cover both the governors and the governed; whether there exist institutions that control those who exercise any kind of power; whether the election procedures are overt and just. In the twelve books of the *Laws*, Plato discusses these criteria in detail, explaining why they are decisive to the “correct regime” (*orthe politeia*, 701e) and why this regime can come into being only in a mixed system, that is, one combining monarchic and democratic elements¹⁶.

To us, the word “democracy” has become synonymous with “the only correct regime”, where the indicator of “correctness” is not the declared constitution but, as it was for Plato, the actualisation of the ideal of the rule of law by means of appropriate political and social structures. As the *Democracy Index* reports¹⁷, there are sixty indicators by which states are assessed as full or flawed democracies and it is quite impossible to reduce them to the assertion that “the people hold power”, or even to the method by which they select and confer power on their rulers¹⁸. What is assessed in Plato’s manner, however, is the way power is exercised and divided, and this assessment covers also constitutional monarchies. Elements taken into consideration in assessing this are, primarily, justness of the election process, functioning of public administration, citizens’ participation in political life, and political culture. A regime where these indicators are high is nowadays called a “full democracy”¹⁹; testimonies found in the *Statesman* and

¹⁵ This imperative is strikingly reminiscent of what Plato highlights in the *Statesman* 293a–297e, 300a–301e.

¹⁶ A history lesson given in Book III indicates that “they shouldn’t have legislated great ruling offices, or unmixed authority” (οὐδ’ αὖ ἀμείκτους νομοθετεῖν, 693b2–5), “no city will ever have a fine political life if it lacks a share in either of these” (ἀμφοῖν τούτοις, 693d8). This is because a correct regime is characterised by “freedom, friendship, together with prudence”, that is, qualities which require moderation in freedom (i.e., the democratic element) and reasonable obedience/authority (the monarchic element, 693d–701e). See also 757a–e: equality consistent with human nature can be achieved only in a regime that strikes a balance between a monarchy and a democracy.

¹⁷ See n. 5 above.

¹⁸ See MITCHELL 2015: 3, for a criticism of Joseph Schumpeter’s view that the electoral method is “the essential defining characteristic of democracy”.

¹⁹ The highest level of democracy is today evinced by two constitutional monarchies, Norway and Sweden, whereas the lowest by North Korea, which calls itself, in a pleonastic augmentation, a Democratic People’s Republic.

the *Laws* are enough for us to assume that Plato would have called it a “correct regime” (*orthē politeia*), with the proviso that to him, any law-abiding regime, one that is “free and prudent and a friend to itself” (*L.* 693b), is a “correct regime” regardless of the number of entities that exercise power²⁰.

Thus, in Plato's language, the term *demokratia* is not synonymous with the rule of law but with the rule (*kratos*) of the *demos*; but if democracy is understood in a contemporary broad sense as a rule of law as actualised also in constitutional monarchies, then an equivalent to the contemporary phrase “education for democracy” would be, in his thought, “education for lawfulness”, which is achievable in a democratic monarchical system.

Let us now recall the initial state of our problem once more, arising from the fact that Plato is ascribed the label of a “critic of democracy”, and let us consider whether there are any reasons to suppose that the critical aspect of his thought is separate from, and more important than its positive, that is, educational aspect.

2. THE GENERAL FORMS AND GENERAL EDUCATION

The question why the critical aspect dominates over the constructive one in interpretations of Plato's political thought could find a facile answer that takes into consideration two factors which are independent from us. The first of them is a certain psychological mechanism, skilfully exploited by the mass media, according to which the negative aspect of reality draws more attention than the positive one. The second is the fact that the *Laws*, Plato's last work, is relatively difficult to read, until the 20th century lying on the margin of the *Corpus Platonicum*; even today hardly anyone manages to reach that far in their Platonic curriculum, let alone making it a starting point of their analysis²¹.

But there are also more complex reasons for this state of affairs, ones arising from conceptual approaches. In view of William V. HARRIS' remark that “no classical city is in fact known to have required all free-born boys, let alone girls, to attend school or to learn to read or write; nor is any city of this era known to have subsidised elementary education in any way”²², Plato's recommendation that any free-born resident of the city of Magnesia as postulated in the *Laws* – that is, girls as much as boys – be subject to mandatory state-funded education is

²⁰ See *Plt.* 293d–303c: a regime is “correct” when, and to the extent that, its legislation imitates a reasonable king who continually analyses the ever-changing reality. Plato's appreciation of change and innovation constitutes “a novelty in ancient legislative thought” (HORN, MÜLLER, SÖDER 2009: 174).

²¹ Until a few years ago, BOBONICH (2010: 4) was justified in saying: “Although there has been much more scholarship on the *Laws* since the beginning of the 1990s than in the preceding decades, we are still at the very early stages of reflecting philosophically on the *Laws* in connection with Plato's other dialogues”.

²² HARRIS 1989: 99, n. 1.

certainly significant and worth investigating²³. But the nature of Plato's proposal appears far less extraordinary when it is read against the background of his earlier work, the *Republic*. This is the case of the two leading monographs concerning the Greek *paideia*, those by Henri-Irène MARROU and by Werner JAEGER – both works monumental even today – where Plato's proposal is mentioned in connection with the “utopian”, as it is put by MARROU, or “ideal”, as preferred by JAEGER, concept of a political regime as expounded in the *Republic*, completed with the vision of “general Forms”²⁴. Regardless of whether this mandatory education pertains mainly to the ruling elite or involves also the producer class, the project of state-conducted general education is so suitable for the totalitarian Kallipolis that to enquire as to its proper goal seems superfluous²⁵.

This utopian, idealising vision chimes with the bitter assessment of the real advantages that a civilisation derives from acquiring the ability to write, as proposed by Claude LÉVI-STRAUSS and shared by many anthropologists from the school of Bronisław MALINOWSKI. This assessment is as follows: before it becomes a tool for enlightenment, writing bolsters authority and facilitates control, making people obey the governing entity; an effort to end illiteracy is associated with the state's increased control over its citizens: in a literate society, no person

²³ This is emphasised by MORROW 1960: 322; NIGHTINGALE 1999: 102; SCHÖPSDAU 2003: 553.

²⁴ MARROU (1982) states this in Chapter VI, titled “Utopia and the Future”. JAEGER (1986: 246), in turn, emphasises that in the *Laws* Plato ascribes the same importance to the general education exercised by the state as he ascribes, in the *Republic*, to the education of rulers. For a similar point, see KŁOSKO (2006: 221), according to whom the system of general education as presented in the *Laws* “is similar to that of the *Republic* though it is more rigorous and described in greater detail”. However, similarity between educational programmes is not tantamount to their having an identical aim. In both programmes the function of education is to uphold the system, but the systems' divergent requirements change the aims of education. In the aristocratic Kallipolis some are being prepared to govern and the rest to be governed, following the oft-repeated principle that “each one must do his own/one work” (*ta hautou prattein*, e.g. 370b5, c4, 374a6, b9, 394e3, 397e2, 400e6, 433a6, 435b6, 453b5, 550a2 and so on); this aim is served by “the noble lie” (*gennaion pseudos*, 414b–416b), inculcated in the rulers themselves “in particular” (*malista*). In the democratic monarchy of Magnesia, in turn, every citizen is to be able to govern as well as be governed, following the principle that “a perfect citizen [...] knows how to rule and be ruled with justice” (643e5–6, 942c7–8); this aim is served by the generally taught reading, especially preludes to laws (*prooimia*) that explain the reasonable rules underlying concrete laws (720a–723a, 811d–e). It must be noted that the first principle chimes with the definition of moderation (*sophrosyne*) by Critias the Tyrant (DK B 41a; Plato, *Chrm.* 161b6), the other is democratic in its tone (cf. *Mx.* 239a1–2; see n. 40 below).

²⁵ The process of founding Kallipolis – which is totalitarian in the sense that it subjects the lives of all its citizens to the supervision of the guardians, all unanimously sharing a common goal, that is the good of the *polis* – does not, of course, exhaust the contents of the *Republic*. However, the critical assessment of Kallipolis or the interpretation of the results of this intellectual experiment as presented in the latter part of the dialogue by Plato's Socrates (427c ff.) lie outside the scope of this essay. This aspect of *Republic*'s self-reference is discussed by, among others, EUBEN 1990; ROOCHNIK 2004: 2009; HOWLAND 2018.

can cite as an excuse their unfamiliarity with the law²⁶. Ascribing such an intention to Plato may find justification in the *Phaidros*, where Plato, anxious about the individual's soul rather than political unanimity, famously subjected writing to criticism²⁷. Thus, the question of why he wished to fight illiteracy on political grounds finds a ready and obvious answer.

If, however, we view Plato's thought from the perspective of the lesson provided us by modern history, which reveals that the condition of democracy is closely connected with the condition of education and the level of social and legal culture, it will be justified to assume that this particular mechanism of well-ordered state evinces historical continuity and that Plato's dialogues confirm his awareness of it. This is because the precept that the condition of the rulers determines the condition of the state, which is made evident in the Kallipolis, lies at the foundation of both the critique of democracy and the constructive proposal of educating the *demos*. As we will see in the following sections, there are reasons to assume that, firstly, while criticising his contemporary democracy, Plato was, actually, laying bare the fact that the Athenian *demos* – i.e. the ruler in democracy – was not ready for self-determination, as well as bemoaning the absence of institutions that might teach future citizens how to fulfil their roles. Secondly, this criticism was followed by practical reflection: presenting, in his *Laws*, the lawful regime of Magnesia – which in its mixed constitutional structure evinces many features of Athenian democracy of the 5th and 4th century BC – he proposed a detailed and multi-levelled programme of education of law-abiding citizens based on the general and obligatory education (including literacy) funded by the *polis*. In order for us to capture the essentially democratic aim of this education, it will be helpful to outline the social and political realities that stimulated Plato's thinking, that is, the realities of Athens as they were in his lifetime.

3. WHEN PLATO CRITICISES DEMOCRACY, WHAT DOES HE CRITICISE?

Democratic reforms in Athens, initiated by Cleisthenes (508/507), were confirmed as effective primarily by the victories over the Persians at Marathon and Plataea (490 and 479) and consequently were continued, in building an empire, by Ephialtes (462) and Pericles (450)²⁸. It is tempting to suppose that it was their politically and socially integrating effect that caused these reforms to be introduced faster than the reforms in education – if it is possible to speak of any

²⁶ LÉVI-STRAUSS 1973: 296–300. More in HARRIS 1989: 38–39.

²⁷ *Phdr.* 274e–278b; see also *Prt.* 329a; *Ep.* VII 344c–e.

²⁸ This point was made clear by MITCHELL (2015: 39–59): the political reorganisation of Attica by Cleisthenes served as the basis for “a military organisation that fully exploited the national manpower and drew together in its main units soldiers from different areas and backgrounds and placed them under an elected commander” (p. 42).

consistent and well-considered education programme tailored to the needs of the Athenian democracy, that is, to the citizens' general, tenured access to various forms of governmental power²⁹. From the latter half of the 5th century onwards, the Athenian *demos* was in full possession of a legally defined citizenship, which also means codified political rights and duties. What it did not have were equally codified educational structures. Throughout the entire Classical period, like in the "olden days", children's access to education depended on the individual decisions of their more or less affluent parents³⁰.

The activity of the sophists and Isocrates' school of rhetoric provide a partial answer to the educational needs of a democracy. Despite the differences in their approach to the educational potential and the aim of rhetoric, the addressee to whom the services of these competing paid institutions are directed is the same: an ambitious or politically gifted individual. The sophists, in all their variety, educated an equally varied range of candidates to numerous administrative and official positions, thus awakening the craving for personal social or political success; Isocrates, in turn, aimed to educate a conscientious ruler or politician, a man attentive to the state's affairs and mindful of the common good of Athens and, in fact, of all Greeks³¹. The extent to which Isocrates was careful to maintain his school's aristocratic profile is indicated by the fact that his pupils were described as *synontes* or *plesiazontes*, these terms marking them as different from *mathetai*, pupils learning a craft and coming from lower social classes³². Neither

²⁹ The existence of laws regulating the functioning of gymnasia and, clearly stated as different from them, schools of *mousike* is confirmed in the sources from the beginning of the 5th century onward. However, this constitutes heritage and a continuation of the archaic, aristocratic education while the source references have an occasional rather than systematic character. A list of sources in T. MORGAN 1998: 47–49; cf. also MORROW 1960: 319–322; on the doubts regarding Solon's law on the mandatory education of all boys, see BECK 1964: 92–94. In the late 5th and early 4th century, as writing entered an increasing number of fields of public life, *mousike* and *gymnastike* were complemented with a third educational element, *grammata*; changes in the relationship between these elements as confirmed by the texts still do not evince features of a systemic education but seem to result from grass-roots, functional and spontaneous fluctuations in trends resulting from social, not political, pressure. See PATTERSON 2013: 373.

³⁰ In view of the testimonies confirming the existence of public, most probably non-mandatory, schools outside Athens (cited in BECK 1964: 77; HARRIS 1989: 57–58), and in Athens, the existence of public funds (*merismos*, HANSEN 1999: 149, 158, 173) and community doctors (Plato, *Plt.* 259a), the absence of any mention of public (state) schools or mandatory education is significant. Thuc. II 46, 1 confirms only the fact of the state's protection of war orphans.

³¹ For more on the differences between the sophists' and Isocrates' educational programmes, see POULAKOS 2004: 74–78. The image of Isocrates as the educator of the elites is discussed in a more nuanced manner by K. MORGAN 2004: 134–146, pointing to the features of "civic education" in his rhetorical programme. But the fact remains that Isocrates' concern with the education of the entire civic community is mediated through, or perhaps limited to, the education of the elite circle centred on his school.

³² LIVINGSTONE (1998: 264, n. 8) mentions that young aristocrats from Isocrates' circle treated with contempt the students of craft.

of these programmes reveals an interest in granting general access to education, but perceives it as contingent on the individual's social status and his desire to rise above the *demos*. Educating the *demos* was not perceived as a political requisite of a democracy.

Yet, at the grass-roots level, a natural and spontaneous process was occurring: the *demos* made use not only of its political rights as guaranteed by political equality (*isonomia*) and equal freedom of speech (*isegoria*), but also selectively used those achievements of the aristocratic culture which it found attractive. This varied process of the democratisation of culture encompassed many factors shaping its educational contents; and there are four main factors of which Plato was highly critical, as can be inferred from the three dialogues with openly political titles (*Republic*, *Statesman* and *Laws*) which are complementary in this respect:

I. Some elements of an aristocratic upbringing became popular all but automatically. The non-aristocrats (*plethos*), the mass (*demos*) gradually acquired a taste for activities formerly available only to aristocrats, especially those in the fields of gymnastics and music. The fashion for horse riding among the descendants of the *Marathonomachoi* was ridiculed by Aristophanes³³. Plato, in turn, warned against the detrimental effects of teatrocracy, whereby the uncouth crowd, convinced that the quality of a theatrical work was determined by the pleasure of a beholder regardless of "whether he be better or worse" (*L.* 700e3), used their clapping or whistling to decide what was superior or beautiful onstage:

the opinion that everyone is wise in everything, together with lawlessness, originated in our music, and freedom followed. People became fearless, as if they were knowers, and the absence of fear engendered shamelessness. For to be so bold as not to fear the opinion of someone who is better, this is almost the same as vile shamelessness, and springs from an excessively brazen freedom.

(*L.* 701a5–b3)

Plato perceives the artistic freedom of democracy as having the same potential for self-destruction as the one he perceived in the Persians' despotism. The anarchy of the people, originating in the theatre as the audience rejects the existence of laws in music – which takes it just a step away from rejecting the customary and political laws – is just as destructive to a good regime as any subjugation of citizens by a despot³⁴. In the former case, the people do not want to obey laws, in the latter, they do not have them; in the former, they do not have the internal capability, in the latter, the external possibility. This act of equating Athens with

³³ *Nubes* 14–32, 63–77, 107–125, 243.

³⁴ *L.* 699e, 701b–c; see also *R.* 564a7–8, 569c2–4. The connection between anarchy in music and the shamelessness of young men, the sons of the *Marathonomachoi* generation, is a motif evident in the discourse of Just Cause in Aristophanes' *Nubes* (961–999).

their enemy, the Persians, the victory over whom had justified and accelerated democratic reforms, is in itself provocative. The victors did little to avoid slowly growing similar to enemies, who were, after all, barbarians; they did not learn to perceive the presence of the laws within the real world or to respect them in the name of their freedom and rationality. Aristoxenos, two generations younger than Plato, will call this creeping democratisation of theatres their “barbarisation”, as reported by Athenaeus, who shared this view³⁵.

II. The uncontrolled process of the democratisation of culture and education attests to the vitality and power of the aristocratic poetic tradition. Old models of upbringing based on heroic virtues as derived from Homer and Hesiod were still valid in the 4th century; they were complemented by the encomia and epinicia by Simonides, which, despite their “enlightened” nature, still presupposed the old ethical dualism of friend vs. enemy³⁶. This dualism was justified by the patriotic memory of the victorious wars against the Persians; yet after the Peloponnesian War, which was a fratricidal struggle rather than a war against an external enemy and which caused a re-evaluation of traditional values, the friend vs. enemy dualism lost its clarity in favour of the opposition of the democrats vs. the aristocrats. In these circumstances, the very question of what justice is required rethinking.

Thus, in the *Republic*, Plato focuses on the issue of justice as existing outside the friend vs. enemy relationship. He points to the obsolescence of Simonides’ black-and-white reality and the inapplicability of Homer’s feudal ethics and theology to the new political and social conditions³⁷. These deficiencies are revealed by the realistic diagnoses delivered by intellectuals from the circle of the sophists: Antiphon, Critias, Thrasymachus, the Old Oligarch and others, asserting that the reality in which the Peloponnesian War generation had to exist was by no means Homeric; moreover, Thucydides confirms that it had been a demoralising war during which justice lost its morally uplifting quality. Plato is this generation’s heir and thus he succeeds to its problems, which continue to be persistent. Thus, he will replace the binary friend vs. enemy, aristocrat vs. democrat relations with the vision of an individual man’s complex soul, of which the *polis* is an enlarged image, and will seek justice in internal relations between the faculties of a single soul, some of which are aristocratic (reason), some democratic (emotions). Finding justice to be present in such a psychological and political structure, in which power is held by the faculty of reason, he will present a programme for educating the elite, the reasoning section of the *polis*, and will test the model of a political structure assuming the hegemony of a reasonable authority, which

³⁵ *Deipn.* XIV 632b; Athenaeus approvingly refers to the old view that a play’s popularity among the populace meant it was an inferior work (631f).

³⁶ This ethical principle is examined through the plays of Sophocles in BLUNDELL 1989.

³⁷ A critique of Simonides: *R.* 331e–335e; a critique of moral models in the entire earlier poetic and literary tradition: 362e–367a; a critique of Homer and the poetic tradition referring to him: 378c–394a.

he called “a pattern [...] laid up for the man who wants to see and found a city within himself on the basis of what he sees” (*R.* 592a–b). The tale of Er, which concludes the dialogue, indicates that this intellectual simulation was conducted in order to better explicate a person’s spiritual condition as depending on the regime in which they would prefer to live. Tell me in what state you would prefer to live, Plato seems to say, and I will tell you who you are³⁸.

In the *Laws*, he tests another structure, this time one in which every person could live in the best possible manner³⁹. In this structure, reason is not identified with any distinct and homogeneous social group; it is the law, called “the common opinion of the city”, that is considered to be an expression of the reason for the entire community; hence the constructive quality is, in this case, the justice of a citizen who is able to both rule and submit himself to the rule of law (*L.* 643e)⁴⁰.

III. In the realities of the 4th-century Athenian democracy, the question of how to shape such a political culture and how to introduce the *demos* into it was a pressing one, at least for Plato. Considering the absence of testimonies confirming that the democratic politicians of classical Athens took an interest in general education⁴¹, Plato’s definition of “an art of politics truly in keeping with nature” (ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἀληθῶς οὖσα [...] πολιτική) as one that educates citizens (*Plt.* 308d–309b) constitutes an answer to the deficiency of the *status quo* he really felt. Characteristic of those realities was the fact that writing was being introduced into increasing areas of everyday and public life, yet the essential educational content was still being drawn from models provided by Homer, Hesiod and Simonides, who had shaped the oral culture. But even this model of *paideia*, one that according to Plato was anachronistic, was not available to all the citizens who theoretically had access to power, be it at the *ekklesia* or at the people’s courts. Although it is assumed that the introduction of ostracism in Athens in 508 must have been accompanied by organised instruction in reading and writing (which is confirmed by an increased number of remarks concerning schools), this schooling did not extend beyond the private sphere, even though the latter was responsive to greater or lesser social pressure, and

³⁸ *R.* 544e ff.; 618b–c: ultimately, Er asserts that a human being’s greatest talent is to perceive the interconnected advantages and disadvantages of various psychological and political structures in order to select the life / the regime that shall improve their soul, with the awareness that living in a good regime does not guarantee making a correct choice; this requires a philosophical approach (619c).

³⁹ Most probably the best manner, Plato hastens to add, since the assessment requires this structure to be tried out (*elenchos*) in practice (*L.* 702b1–3).

⁴⁰ Cf. *L.* 701a5–b3. As MITCHELL (2005: 43) notes, Aristotle presents the principle of rule and be ruled “as a primary characteristic of democratic equality”. SCHÖPSSDAU (1994: 226–227) makes a similar point (with reference to *Pol.* 1277a25 ff., 1332b41 ff.).

⁴¹ HARRIS 1989: 30, 62.

did not encompass all the strata of the civic community⁴². The general situation in the early 4th century was that less than a half of the population of the entire Attica could read and write⁴³. This minority originated from the upper social classes and from affluent backgrounds, the group able to educate themselves, and their children, at private schools which promoted aristocratic culture or the culture of rhetoric⁴⁴. In practice, it was this minority that constituted the decision-making majority in the democratic regime. The expansion of writing into courts, offices and many spheres of public life, which is confirmed by the sources from the middle of the 5th century onward, is accompanied by silence on the subject of public (state) schools, that is, on the democratisation of literacy. The proud statement made by Pericles in the funeral oration (Thuc. II 37) about Athens being a majority-governed democracy was most probably “pure theory”⁴⁵, an expression of the idealistic conviction, common in the Classical period, that the public, social and religious life of the Athenian *polis* itself educated its citizens in the proper manner (Thuc. II 41).

But the cave in the *Republic* – “an image of our nature in its education and want of education” (514a) – is the image of the demagogic upbringing conducted by the *polis* availing itself of the agora, the theatres, the holy places and other public assembly spaces where the majority is meant to look and listen without any preparation for a critical reception of the conveyed contents. The prisoners in the cave see and consider real things that are shown to them by others⁴⁶. Only a few were to meet Socrates and were equal to the challenge of his individualistic education.

IV. In view of the democratic leaders’ reliance on the educating power of the *polis* itself and, as a result, of the lack of interest in general education and the level of political culture within the *demos*, this void can be easily filled with the next available model: the aristocratic/military model of Sparta. In fact, Sparta

⁴² See HARRIS 1989: 101, 161.

⁴³ Any figures are approximate and debatable. HARRIS (1989: 114) is pessimistic in his assessment of 5–10% of the population as literate, in contrast to many optimistic conjectures made on the basis of scattered but, from the beginning of the 5th century, increasingly numerous references to writing in texts and vase painting (similarly T. MORGAN 1999: 48, n. 9).

⁴⁴ Plato, *Prt.* 326c.

⁴⁵ HARRIS (1989: 79) argues that the democratic phrase *skopein toi boulomenoi*, denoting every citizen’s right to see officials’ letters or registers, did not translate into every citizen’s participation in the privileges granted by democracy; this is contrary to the image of the literate Greeks of the Classical period which is dominant in specialist literature (pp. 74–88, 94).

⁴⁶ The image of the cave is recognisable as the actual mechanism by which the moral sensibility of the young Athenians was shaped “from youth onwards” (ἐκ νέων, *R.* 367a2) by means of a cohesive cultural system in which their fathers, poets, writers and priests immersed them. This system was bitterly described by Plato’s brother, Adeimantus, in the *Republic* 363a–367a. The process of spiritual subjugation of the Athenian citizens by poets and theatres was equally bitterly described by an anonymous Athenian in the *Laws* 700d–701c.

was the first *polis* to introduce, in the middle of the 6th century, an institutionalised system of mandatory education for citizens⁴⁷. But the Athenian Laconophiles were not interested in this particular model; it would have been strange if they were, since Athens had a broader civic base – educating its members would have endangered the oligarchic/aristocratic factions, who were very careful to maintain their unique character. But precisely the aspects which these Laconophiles disregarded were a point of interest to Plato, who, in turn, rejected the elements they were concerned with.

Plato's admiration for Sparta's system is selective: he criticises its main content and accepts its form, that is, the mandatory character of education and a well-considered control of the state over it, because an uneducated or badly educated man "is the most savage of the things that the earth makes grow" (*L.* 766a). The flaw in the Spartan educational content is shown very clearly in Books I and II of the *Laws*: Sparta educates rank-and-file soldiers who stand firm in battle⁴⁸, hoplites loyal to the *polis*, brought up on the models derived from Tyrtaios: "dare to look on bloody death, and staying near assail the foe" (629e). It is easy to display national valour, Plato argues, if one considers other people to be enemies of one's own family and fatherland. Moreover, very many mercenaries, most of whom are "rash, unjust, insolent, and very imprudent, with only a very few who are not" (630b), are also prepared to die. It is much more difficult to display the sense of justice, self-control and wise judgement, that is, virtues the voice of which may be heard only when the din of battle valour dies down.

The fact that Sparta's lawgivers were not concerned with "quiet virtues" corresponds with the remark made by the author of *Dissoi logoi* from ca. 400 (most probably a Dorian, a disciple of Protagoras)⁴⁹: "The Lacedaemonians hold the view that it is fitting that their children learn neither music nor literature"; some sixty years later this state of affairs is confirmed by Isocrates⁵⁰. This approach is certainly alien to Plato. The hoplite mentality is detrimental to a system that considers peace the healthy state of affairs and war the unhealthy one (*L.* 628d). The implementation of unconditional obedience to the leader, as well as the perception that only those things that serve the interests of the state/the ruling elite are just, are destructive to the citizens' sense of happiness and mutual friendship.

⁴⁷ SCHÖPSDAU 2003: 553. PATTERSON (2013: 373–374) is sceptical about this "common knowledge", pointing to "the lack of contemporary evidence (especially of Xenophon) for compulsory education, as opposed to military training, in Sparta" (p. 373). If, however, we reject PATTERSON's differentiation between education (understood, in the Athenian manner, as taking care of the body and the soul) and training (Spartan physical exercise) and, following Plato (*L.* 666e), reduce the Spartan education to "military training", we may speak of a mandatory form of Spartan education.

⁴⁸ MARROU 1982: 15–16.

⁴⁹ As suggested by the fact that the text is written in the Doric dialect. See SILVERMINTZ 2008: 147 (therein an outline of positions on the dating).

⁵⁰ *Dissoi Logoi* II 10; Isocr. *Panath.* 209.

They should be predisposed to abandon or destroy their *polis* if it turns out that the regime changes “into one whose nature is to make human beings worse” (L. 770e5–6).

The question of how to make the citizens perceive that the *polis* makes them inferior is a fundamental political and educational problem for Plato. A variety of the philosophical and individual aspects of this problem are discussed in almost all dialogues focusing on ethical, political and pedagogical issues⁵¹. In its practical and social aspect, this is a long-term process that extends over more than one generation. In keeping with the meandering narration of the *Laws*, it requires each generation to reflect anew on the hierarchy of values that is in keeping with human nature, and to stimulate the love of beauty and goodness from the earliest age, so that, in the end, a citizen would possess the ability to notice the moment – dangerous to the community as much as to the individual – when it is not beauty and goodness, but ugliness and wickedness that begin to bring pleasure⁵². The fundamental and infallible tool for inculcating this harmony of reason and feeling in each generation is provided by *choreia* (the tri-unity of movement, word and melody), grammar and arithmetic. All these disciplines make a person sensitive to the matters of law: *choreia* to the laws/rules of harmony and rhythm (the ambiguity of the term *nomos*, meaning “song” and “law”, is utilised several times in the *Laws*)⁵³; arithmetic reveals the laws/necessities of mathematics (in the *Republic*, the prisoners are led out of the cave through learning mathematics)⁵⁴; grammar grants access to the message of the lawgivers who – in a written culture – write down the laws, as well as access to the verse or prose works (to Plato’s *Laws* in particular) of writers who bequeath to later generations models for education and debate⁵⁵.

Writing makes it possible to repeatedly return to difficult issues, eliminating the danger that they would become distorted in fallible memory; this is what Plato asserts not in the *Phaidros*, but in the *Laws* (891a). In the *Phaidros* he criticised writing, which cannot be engraved in the soul, for being an illusory medicine (*pharmakon*) to grant wisdom and memory⁵⁶; in the *Laws* he perfected

⁵¹ See esp. *R.* 546d–547a: in time, even the beautiful *polis* (*Kallipolis*) disintegrates from within, convinced of its own beauty. See n. 38 above.

⁵² On the restating of fundamental questions, to which answers had already been given, see *L.* 632d, 701c–d, 742c–d, 829e; on completing, testing and amending laws, see 769c–771a, 957a–b, 957d; on the harmony of reason and feeling as the goal of education, see 653a–653d, 654c–656b, 689a–c; on the deformation of the effects of *paideia* and the need for a recurring correction of one’s emotional and intellectual stance (*epanorthosis*), which shows some aspects of the Dionysian trial, see esp. 644b, 648b–650b, 653d, 671a–672a, 735a, 831a, 946c, 961a.

⁵³ *L.* 700b, 722d–e, 734e, 775b, 799e, 800a, d, 870e–871a.

⁵⁴ *L.* 818a–822d; *R.* 524b ff.

⁵⁵ *L.* 811c–e, 891a, 957d.

⁵⁶ See n. 27 above.

the recipe for this medicine, namely, he preceded a legal text with persuasive introductions (*prooimia*), which help the citizens understand the reasoning underlying the written laws and thus help the laws to become engraved in the citizens' souls. Through this, he turned a legal text that has undergone the process of social deliberation into an antidote (*alexipharmakon*) to all other texts that silently (since their contents had not been subjected to critique and was accepted without reflection) circulate around the *polis* (L. 957d)⁵⁷.

4. PLATO'S EDUCATIONAL PROPOSAL

Thus, Plato's lawgiver expects the citizens to understand the intentions of particular laws or, if a person's mind is not broad enough for understanding, to obey them. In both cases, the aim is for everyone to exercise their own rights and to respect the rights of others, always in a just manner. To reach this aim, education must be "from childhood in virtue, that makes one desire and love to become a perfect citizen who knows how to rule and be ruled with justice" (L. 643e)⁵⁸.

In the *Laws*, Plato discusses numerous official and political (electoral) functions fulfilled by all the residents of Magnesia who possess full rights and are elected for a term of office by means of transparent procedures of selection by vote or by lot. The realities assumed in his discussion are those of the 4th-century Athenian democracy, when writing was already well established in the official context, even though most Athenians were still illiterate. Since, in practice, the ability to read and understand the judiciary, official and legal texts is a condition for the full use of civic rights, a citizen of the law-abiding city of Magnesia had to be a reader⁵⁹. Considering the practice in Athens of the era, where an illiterate judge would listen to writings being read out to him, it can be added: he or she

⁵⁷ The deliberative nature of Plato's laws: L. 718c, 719e–720e, 788c, 857c–e, 859a; on the innovative, in Plato's view, function of the introductions to laws: 722e–723b. General availability and potential intelligibility of principles that lie at the foundation of legal norms furthers the process of their social internalisation (this aspect of the laws is considered innovative and fundamental in the *Laws* by, e.g., NIGHTINGALE 1999: 103–104; BOBONICH 1996: 269. Differently T. MORGAN 1999: 58 and K. MORGAN 2004: 126.

⁵⁸ See n. 40 above.

⁵⁹ See L. 680a: in the development of political life, the phase of lawgiving is conditioned by the introduction of writing; 721e–720a, 858c, 891a, 922a, 934c, 957d: introduction of the 5th and 4th-century terminology, according to which *grammata*, *graphe* (writings, writ) denotes the decrees and laws proclaimed and ratified by organs of democratic authority (the *boule*, the lawgiving committee of the *nomothetai*, the *ekklesia*); 788b, 793b, 822e: the laws of Magnesia are written down, but are protected and shaped into a coherent whole by unwritten customs; 858c–859a, 890c, 957c: a lawgiver is a writer whose writings the citizens are obliged to know; 754d: the duty to submit personal property declarations in writing; 754e, 845e, 919e, 948a: the written form of court petition; 762c, 811e, 871a, 920c, 923e–924a, 943d, 953e, 955d: other applications of writing in law-abiding public life.

had to be a self-reliant reader who could return several times to the passages that were difficult to comprehend and “examine them often” (891a).

One of the tasks of such a state is, therefore, to subject all the children of the citizens to mandatory education in the rudiments of music, grammar and mathematics. Plato emphasises the obligatory character of this education:

And it will not be left up to the father’s wish to decide who shall attend and whose education shall be neglected, but rather, as the saying goes, “every man and child insofar as he is able” [...]. Indeed, my law would say all the very same things about females that it says about males.

(804d)

By establishing this law, Plato, while being critical of democracy, does for it precisely what it needs in order, firstly, not to become an ochlocracy, secondly, not to come into conflict with aristocrats, but to co-govern with them, united in obedience to sensible law. In his critical assessment of the condition of Athenian democracy, he does not assume the position of an external, rival ideologue, but that of a participant in, and the beneficiary of, the intellectual ferment of the 5th- and 4th-century democratic culture weakened by the internal struggle with the aristocratic faction.

His pedagogical proposals derive also from the observations and educational experience of contemporary intellectuals, the so-called sophists. The few surviving testimonies enable us to mention, first of all, Protagoras, whose draft for a constitution for Thurioi – which had been commissioned from him by the ardent supporter of democracy, Pericles – is in some points parallel with Plato’s project of Magnesia⁶⁰. However, we do not have source materials that would permit us to establish any actual inspirations in this respect. Diodorus reports approvingly (without mentioning Plato) that Charondas of Catania in Sicily was the first lawgiver to decree that all sons of citizens learn *grammatike* and that teachers be paid by the state, since the ability to read and write offers the noblest knowledge⁶¹; yet he commits a strange chronological error, most probably resulting from confusing or combining some testimonies. Namely, he associates Charondas, who lived in the 6th century, with the colony of Thurioi, established in 443 and currently associated, following Heraclides of Pontus, with the lawgiving

⁶⁰ Diog. Laert. IX 50; Plato, *Prt.* 317b; *Tht.* 167c. Similarities concern the colonists originating from many parts of Greece, a circumstance that was not typical of earlier colonies (Diod. XII 11, 3; *L.* 707a–d); the geometric layout of the city (the layout of Thurioi was designed by Hippodamas of Miletus, who had already proved himself during extension works at Piraeus; Diod. XII 10, 7; Plato, *L.* 778c–779b). On Protagoras’ notion of general education, see MUIR 1982: 21–23, with the hypothesis that the popularity of this idea lessened as the influence of Athens on Thurioi grew weaker.

⁶¹ The eulogy of literacy by Diodorus brings to mind the words of Euripides (fr. 578 N) which, in turn, may be taken from Protagoras (Diod. I 8, 1–7, cf. Plato, *Prt.* 320c–322d; after MUIR 1982: 22, n. 33).

endeavours of Protagoras⁶². It is thus not clear whether Plato revived Charondas' old law directly or whether he was inspired by Protagoras, who selected a variety of old laws by Italic and Sicilian lawgivers (especially Charondas and Zaleucus of Locri). Yet we mainly associate Protagoras as a teacher with demanding the payment of a considerable lump fee from his pupils (a notion probably influenced by Plato); all we can say is that sometimes Plato is also associated not with the things he should be.

Aristotle's report in the *Politics* is also significant in this context; enumerating innovations in the laws, among others those made by Charondas and Plato, he does not mention this law (1274b). Instead, he oddly combines political ideas offered in the *Republic* and the *Laws*, as if both dialogues, which he actually remembers as conducted by Socrates (1264b), had the same aim and evinced the same philosophical strategy, and writes that Plato's law-giving efforts stipulate a "community of wives and children and of property, and the common meals for the women [...], and the regulation for military training to make men ambidextrous during drill" (1274b)⁶³. The first law comes from the *Republic* and frequently appears in pre-Platonic sources in the context of mockery; in the *Laws*, it is not so much neglected as deliberately rejected⁶⁴. Although the remainder of the laws are derived solely from the *Laws*, Aristotle fails to mention Plato's concept of general education. Yet it is Aristotle's report that helped to shape the commonly held image of Plato's regime: this is usually associated with the community of wives, children and property, and not with general education.

It is possible that the reason why Aristotle, who looked for innovations in the lawgiving processes, did not mention that law in the context of either Charondas or Plato was that he ascribed it to a third party, namely Phaleas of Chalcedon. This rather mysterious lawgiver wished to equalise the level of affluence and education of all citizens, but failed to mention what exactly such an education was supposed to be like; he was criticised by Aristotle for this omission (*Pol.* 1266b). It is surprising, however, that Aristotle, in turn, did not mention that this topic was discussed in detail by Plato.

It would be easy to distort Plato's thought here, however, by assuming that he had modelled his views on those of Phaleas and ascribing to him not only the idea of general education, but also the desire to equalise the level of education of all citizens. Book II of the *Laws*, which tells us about the Chorus of Dionysus, which exceeds the mandatory and egalitarian – "herd-like", as it is ambiguously termed by Plato (666e) – education of children and young people, and Book XII,

⁶² Diod. XII 12–13 (see HARRIS 1989: 21, 98; MUIR 1982: 19).

⁶³ Transl. by H. RACKHMAN.

⁶⁴ R. 457c–458d; L. 739c–739e: shared possession of all goods is possible only in a *polis* of the gods or children of gods. But a human being is only "a divine puppet, put together either for their play or for some serious purpose – which, we don't know" (L. 644d).

relating the issue of the elitist Nocturnal Council, make it possible to assume that this monolithic nature of the *polis* is destructive, as it damages its sense of reason, whereas it is, ultimately, a reasonableness for which lawfulness has to work out well. In a reasonable regime, also such individuals should be brought up who would be able to face a conflict that, with the progress of time, arises in every community, namely the one between the freedom of thought which, in search of the truth, poses questions and seeks answers, and the ready-made truths embedded in the law and identified with the truth, implemented and cemented by the all-encompassing system of education and religious belief. Therefore, *akribestera paideia*, higher education, is intended for those intellectually and morally superior individuals (ones above 30 years of age)⁶⁵. In the last pages of his *Laws*, Plato declares such individuals to be members of the Nocturnal Council, which was announced from the beginning of the dialogue and subsequently as the Chorus of Dionysus. Having the elitist, highest, continually verified and raised level of education, those individuals comprise the constitutional tribunal that controls the uncertain balance between the laws of reason and the laws expressed in the decrees issued by officials or by any authority.

Thus, a system of lawful education encompasses two principal levels dependant on the pupils' age and predispositions⁶⁶. The first, rudimentary level, which is general and mandatory, provides the state with citizens; the second, a safety valve of a kind, protects the citizens against the officials' desire to appropriate the laws in order to remain in power, which is inherent in any human authority⁶⁷. General education financed for by the *polis*, adjusted to the process of the implementation of writing in political culture, which unfolded in 4th-century Athens, is the element that joins these two pillars of lawful education.

Aristotle does not mention these pillars, even though he discusses the issue of education. When, in Book VIII of his *Politics*, he presents his views on the *paideia*, he summarises Plato's opinions on general education as expressed in the *Laws* as his own, but he fails to mention Plato's name (1337a). To say that it was solely Aristotle's fault that Plato's name became associated with the utopian idea of the community of wives and children, not with the idea of general education rooted in the needs of 4th-century democracy, would be an exaggeration. Yet it is a fact that Aristotle contributed to Plato's name being associated with a utopia, and in the areas where his own thinking coincided with Plato's, he failed to mention his name. Regardless of his reasons for such a one-sided presentation of Plato's thought, which are difficult to ascertain, this image as presented by Aristotle chimes with our equally one-sided image of Plato as a critic of

⁶⁵ L. 670e, 965b. Cf. R. 503d: men of a steady, "not easily changeable" and trustworthy character are not very studious.

⁶⁶ See L. 735a, 809c–810b, 818d–e, 965b.

⁶⁷ L. 714d.

democracy, not an educator for democracy. The reasons that shaped this depiction may be as complex, and as difficult, to ascertain as in the case of Aristotle. Yet the elementary fact that remains is that Plato's *Laws* is the only surviving text of Greek Antiquity where the need for a general and mandatory education in a lawful regime is justified from the psychological, ethical and political perspective, and where a detailed programme is proposed for such education.

CONCLUSION

In the light of HARRIS' remark that the existence of primary schools subsidised by the *poleis* is first attested in the Hellenistic period⁶⁸, that is in a system no longer democratic, the starting point of this essay – the issue of a balance between Plato's criticism of democracy and his idea of education for democracy – turns out, on the basis of actual political and cultural processes, to be secondary to the question whether, introducing an obligatory education of all citizens in the *Laws*, Plato meant its benefits for democracy. This is because, as it turns out, not only democracy needs an educated *demos*.

The answer must take into consideration two meanings of the word "democracy" as contained in the first question. When Plato criticises democracy, he refers to a political phenomenon (i.e. to one of three main government systems classed according to the simplest criterion of the subject that exercises power), in which the sovereign is the *demos*. This traditional classification, which dates back to Pindar, clearly points to a certain regularity: the type of the system is determined by the type of the element that exercises power. This narrow meaning of the word *demo-kratia* is contained in almost all the passages in which Plato uses it⁶⁹. This usage is not only in keeping with the linguistic practice of his era, but also extracts a more complex mechanism from the regularity assumed therein: the condition of any political system depends on the condition of those who exercise power. The pivot of Plato's criticism of democracy is thus the *demos*' lack of real preparation for the fulfilment of its function. The beautiful and noble ideals of equality and liberty cannot replace *technē politike*; without it, they turn into their opposites.

The diagnosis of the unsatisfactory condition of the Athenian *demos* starts with its grotesquely exaggerated depiction given in the *Republic* (where they are like sailors with no knowledge of sailing, who "are quarrelling with one another about the piloting", 488b), and in the *Statesman* transforms into a reflection on the requirements of *technē politike*, which on the philosophical level becomes a condition for the correctness of the regime (*orthē politeia*) in general.

⁶⁸ HARRIS 1989: 101.

⁶⁹ *Mx.* 238d3–4; *R.* 338d8–339a4; *Plt.* 291d7, e10, 301c7, 302d4; *L.* 710d–e, 712d6–713a2, 714a3, 832c; 757d3: *kratos demou*; except for *R.* 557b–c, 561d6–e1, 562b16–564a8, where *demokratia* is associated with abuse of freedom.

It was not because of a paradoxical concurrence of historical conditions that the rule of law, which in Plato's political considerations is the *definiens* of *orthe politeia*, in Western political thought became a synonym for democracy in its broad sense. On the contrary, this semantic condition is a result of reflection on *techne politike* that has been carried out for over 2,300 years, initiated by Plato in the *Republic* and continued by Aristotle, who cites Plato's name when he criticises him and fails to mention him when he concurs with him. This art – stimulated and perfected by Roman statesmen as interdependent with the practice of government and then tested in Europe for the longest period in its monarchic version, in existence until the 17th century – made it possible to presently see the rule of law as an ideal that defines the just system actualised in the Western culture in various types of democracy. As the *Laws* suggests, Plato would have called them “mixed regimes”. The history lesson which he summarised in Book III of the *Laws* served him to draw the conclusion that since there was no human government that would not eventually make law subordinate to its own rule, it was the mixed regime that allowed to maintain the rule of law for the longest period; and this was the condition for the actualisation of the ideal of social and political justice.

To Plato, this seemingly simple mechanism – that the condition of the rulers determines the condition of the state – is not only a rhetorical device to use as a starting point. Since a lawful regime (*orthe politeia*) can be actualised in a mixed regime, where the power is shared by the *demos* (the civic body) and the aristocracy (because, by definition, those who are the best, also morally and intellectually, are always fewer) who exercise mutual control and exist in a dual state of governing and being governed, the general and obligatory education of the *demos* – on the basic level that ensures, through literacy, access to the writings of the lawgiver and, on the higher level, for the selected cadre (the so-called Nocturnal Council) – is pro-democratic in its intention. This is because education makes the *demos* able not only to co-govern with the aristocracy, but also to verify the naturally unstable level of its “superiority”. And it is only together that they can constitute a healthy political organism, comparable to a man having a sensible head and, as it is said in the *Republic*, a human torso (*R.* 588c–589d, 591c), and in the *Laws* – an agile torso (*L.* 964e–965a). The head without the body and the body without the head would be monsters that would terrify the world.

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences
 dzymunt@ifispan.edu.pl
 ORCID: 0000-0002-7336-5751

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BECK 1964: F.A.G. BECK, *Greek Education 450–350 BC*, London 1964.
- BENARDETE 1984: S. BENARDETE (transl.), *Plato's Statesman*, Chicago–London 1984.
- BLOOM 1968: A. BLOOM (transl.), *The Republic of Plato*, New York–London 1968.
- BLUNDELL 1989: M.W. BLUNDELL, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies. A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*, Cambridge 1989.
- BOBONICH 1996: Ch. BOBONICH, *Reading the Laws*, in: Ch. GILL, M.M. MCCABE (eds.), *Form and Argument in Late Plato*, Oxford 1996, pp. 248–282.
- 2002: Ch. BOBONICH, *Plato's Utopia Recast*, Oxford 2002.
- 2010: Ch. BOBONICH 2010 (ed.), *Plato's Laws. A Critical Guide*, Cambridge 2010.
- BROWN 2004: E. BROWN, *Minding the Gap in Plato's Republic*, Philosophical Studies CXVII 2004, pp. 275–302.
- 2017: E. BROWN, *Plato's Ethics and Politics in The Republic*, in: E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/plato-ethics-politics/>
- CARTLEDGE 2009: P. CARTLEDGE, *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice*, Cambridge 2009.
- CLEARY 2003: J.J. CLEARY, *Paideia in Plato's Laws*, in: S. SCOLNICOV, L. BRISSON (eds.), *Plato's Laws: From Theory into Practice*, Sankt Augustin 2003, pp. 167–173.
- EUBEN 1990: J.P. EUBEN, *The Tragedy of Political Theory: The Road Not Taken*, Princeton 1990.
- 1994: J.P. EUBEN, *Democracy and Political Theory*, in: J.P. EUBEN, J.R. WALLACH, J. OBER (eds.), *Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction of American Democracy*, Ithaca, NY 1994, pp. 198–226.
- 1996: J.P. EUBEN, *Reading Democracy: "Socratic" Dialogues and the Political Education of Democratic Citizens*, in: J. OBER, C. HEDRICK (eds.), *Demokratia*, Princeton 1996, pp. 327–359.
- HANSEN 1999: M.H. HANSEN, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, London 1999.
- HARRIS 1989: W.V. HARRIS, *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge, MA 1989.
- HOBBS 2015: A. HOBBS, *Women*, in: PRESS 2015, pp. 255–257.
- HORN, MÜLLER, SÖDER 2009: Ch. HORN, J. MÜLLER, J. SÖDER (eds.), *Platon-Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung*, Stuttgart 2009.
- HOWLAND 2018: J. HOWLAND, *Glaucon's Fate. History, Myth, and Character in Plato's Republic*, Philadelphia 2018.
- JAEGER 1986: W. JAEGER, *Paideia. The Ideals of Greek Culture*, transl. by G. HIGHET, New York–Oxford 1986.
- KASTELY 2015: J.L. KASTELY, *The Rhetoric of Plato's Republic. Democracy and the Philosophical Problem of Persuasion*, Chicago–London 2015.
- KLOSKO 2006: G. KLOSKO, *The Development of Plato's Political Theory*, Oxford 2006.
- KONSTAN 2004: D. KONSTAN, *Isocrates' "Republic"*, in: J. POULAKOS, D. DEPEW (eds.), *Isocrates and Civic Education*, Austin 2004, pp. 107–124.
- KRAUT 2010: R. KRAUT, *Ordinary Virtue from the Phaedo to the Laws*, in: BOBONICH 2010, pp. 51–70.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS 1973: C. LÉVI-STRAUSS, *Tristes Tropiques*, transl. by J. and D. WEIGHTMAN, London 1973.
- LIVINGSTONE 1998: N. LIVINGSTONE, *The Voice of Isocrates and the Dissemination of Cultural Power*, in: Y.L. TOO, N. LIVINGSTONE (eds.), *Paedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*, Cambridge 1998, pp. 263–281.
- MARROU 1982: H.I. MARROU, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, transl. by G. LAMB, Madison 1982.
- MICHEL 2004: S. MICHEL, *Democracy in Plato's Laws*, Journal of Social Philosophy XXXV 2004, pp. 517–528.
- MITCHELL 2015: T.N. MITCHELL, *Democracy's Beginnings. The Athenian Story*, New Haven–London 2015.

- MONOSON 2000: S.S. MONOSON, *Plato's Democratic Entanglements*, Princeton 2000.
- K. MORGAN 2004: K. MORGAN, *The Education of Athens: Politics and Rhetoric in Isocrates and Plato*, in: POULAKOS, DEPEW 2004, pp. 134–146.
- T. MORGAN 1998: T. MORGAN, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge 1998.
- 1999: T. MORGAN, *Literate Education in Classical Athens*, CQ XLIX 1999, pp. 46–61.
- MORROW 1960: G.R. MORROW, *Plato's Cretan City: A Historical Interpretation of the Laws*, Princeton 1960.
- MUIR 1982: J.V. MUIR, *Protagoras and Education at Thourioi*, G&R XXIX 1982, pp. 17–24.
- NIGHTINGALE 1999: A.W. NIGHTINGALE, *Plato's Lawcode in Context: Rule by Written Law in Athens and Magnesia*, CQ XLIX 1999, pp. 100–122.
- PANGLE 1980: Th.L. PANGLE (transl.), *The Laws of Plato*, Chicago–London 1980.
- PATTERSON 2013: C.B. PATTERSON, *Education in Plato's Laws*, in: J.E. GRUBBS, Y. PARKIN (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, Oxford 2013, pp. 365–380.
- POPPER 1945: K. POPPER, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, vol. I: *The Spell of Plato*, Princeton 1945.
- POULAKOS 2004: J. POULAKOS, *Rhetoric and Civic Education: From the Sophists to Isocrates*, in: POULAKOS, DEPEW 2004, pp. 69–83.
- POULAKOS, DEPEW 2004: T. POULAKOS, D. DEPEW (eds.), *Isocrates and Civic Education*, Austin 2004.
- PRESS 2015: G.A. PRESS (ed.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Plato*, London 2015.
- ROOCHNIK 2004: D. ROOCHNIK, *Beautiful City: The Dialectical Character of Plato's Republic*, Ithaca, NY 2004.
- 2009: D. ROOCHNIK, *The Political Drama of Plato's Republic*, in: S. SALKEVER (ed.), *Ancient Greek Political Thought*, Cambridge 2009, pp. 156–177.
- SCHOFIELD 2006: M. SCHOFIELD, *Plato: Political Philosophy*, Oxford 2006.
- SCHÖPSDAU 1994: K. SCHÖPSDAU 1994, *Platon: Nomoi (Gesetze), Buch I–III. Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Göttingen 1994.
- 2003: K. SCHÖPSDAU, *Platon: Nomoi (Gesetze), Buch IV–VII. Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Göttingen 2003.
- SCOLNICOV 2015: S. SCOLNICOV, *Education (Paideia)*, in: PRESS 2015, pp. 12–13.
- SILVERMINTZ 2008: D. SILVERMINTZ, *The Double Arguments*, in: P. O'GRADY (ed.), *The Sophists. An Introduction*, London 2008, pp. 147–151.
- SØRENSEN 2016: A.D. SØRENSEN, *Plato on Democracy and Political Techne*, Leiden–Boston 2016.
- WALLACH 2001: J.R. WALLACH, *The Platonic Political Art. A Study of Critical Reason and Democracy*, University Park, PA 2001.

LE GEOMETRIE DEL DISFACIMENTO UMANO
NEL *BELLUM CIVILE* DI LUCANO:
PER UNA LETTURA DELLA BATTAGLIA DI MARSIGLIA

di

GIUSEPPE BOCCHI

ABSTRACT: Lucan describes the naval battle of Massilia in *Bellum Civile* III 538–762 through sequences which only apparently seem to have no structure: indeed, the poet combines scenes where the soldiers (or groups of soldiers) are either transixed or amputee or drown into the sea (and more than one situation sometimes occurs to a single victim or group), and every sequence reworks this pattern in a terrifying *crescendo* of gruesome pictures. In doing so, this poet who has such a contentious relationship with Stoic philosophy identifies the bodies' dismemberment with Rome's general fall, corresponding to the crush of the universal *logos* from which all the calamities derive. Moreover, the destruction of both bodies and Roman civilisation is expressed through the intelligent use of rhetorical figures such as *hyperbaton*, enjambment, and chiasmus (or better, chiasmic *nuance*). Separating the words and modifying the logical train of thought underscore that the *world* and the *word* undergo the same law of crumbling.

Il *Bellum civile* lucaneo si presta, tra le molteplici interpretazioni, ad essere considerato come un saggio 'plastico' della rottura dei *foedera mundi* che il poeta vede attuarsi nella sciagurata lotta tra Cesare e Pompeo¹. Tale conflitto trascende la semplice contingenza storica per farsi segno tangibile di una sovversione, fisica e soprattutto etica, dell'ordine cosmico, perfettamente ipostatizzata nello sgretolamento della civiltà romana e dei valori del *mos maiorum* che Cesare in

¹ Cfr. *Phars.* I 4–6: «et rupto foedere regni / certatum totis concussi viribus orbis / in comune nefas»; vv. 79–80: «totaque discors / machina divolsi turbabit foedera mundi». Analogamente all'inizio del secondo libro leggiamo dello sconvolgimento dei *foedera rerum* (v. 2). Non è questa la sede per effettuare una puntuale indagine sull'influsso esercitato in proposito su Lucano dalle tragedie di Seneca. La complessità del tema nel filosofo di Cordova è ben illustrata nello *status quaestionis* proposto da SCHMITZ (1993: 4–13). STADELMAIER (2013) rileva una certa identità tematica tra i primi due libri del poema e il secondo e terzo coro della *Medea*: a proposito del viaggio della nave Argo come violazione dell'ordine naturale, leggiamo in Seneca «Bene dissaepi foedera mundi / traxit in unum Thessala pinus» (vv. 335–336), cui si ricollega l'invito dei vv. 605–606: « rumpe nec sacro violente sancta / foedera mundi ». Per occorrenze simili di questo concetto cfr. SCHMITZ (1993: 55, n. 139). Cfr. anche CANOBBIO (2013) sul rapporto tra il proemio lucaneo e le *Phoenissae*. Sull'ipotesi che tra Seneca prosatore e Lucano vi siano state influenze reciproche circa il giudizio sulle guerre civili, cfr. ZEHNACKER 1988 (in particolare pp. 462 ss.).

tutto il poema calpesta con arroganza per affermare la propria tirannica volontà di potenza².

Attorno allo scontro tra i due condottieri, pertanto, vediamo svolgersi scenari di disfacimento che, considerati in una prospettiva stoica (con tutte le cautele da impiegare a proposito di Lucano, cfr. *infra*), sono ‘simpatetici’ con le linee di distruzione che sembrano interessare tutto l’universo³: nel macro- come nel micro- cosmo nulla riesce a mantenere più alcuna saldezza⁴, i legami *tra* e *dentro* le cose si spezzano⁵.

Se quindi ci si concentra sulle grandi battaglie del poema (o su singoli episodi di violenza efferata), si nota che le descrizioni lucanee abbondano in misura decisamente maggiore rispetto ai predecessori di dettagli inerenti alle mutilazioni dei corpi⁶. La qual cosa, oltre a spiegarsi con la ben nota, sebbene un po’ frusta, categoria interpretativa del ‘barocco’ imperiale⁷, caratterizzato dal gusto del macabro e dell’orrido, ben si accorda coll’idea che anche un singolo corpo umano, nell’essere fatto a pezzi, riproduce in piccolo l’auto-mutilazione che Roma si sta infliggendo con le guerre civili⁸.

² Tra gli ultimi contributi dedicati al Cesare lucaneo, cfr. almeno LEIGH 2010.

³ Cfr. LAPIDGE 1979, p. 359: «Lucan alludes at once to the universal aspect of the disaster: when the bound of government has been shattered, the entire world is involved in the impact [...]. The destruction of Rome [...] is tantamount to the destruction of the world»; SALEMME 2002: 13: «[I]l poema stesso si apre con immagini di distruzione, e la guerra civile viene inserita, in una lunga comparazione, in un contesto di rovina universale». Da ultimo, DAY (2013: 193) osserva che gli episodi marsigliesi offrono «a literal illustration of the idea of civil war as suicide».

⁴ Cfr. BARTSCH 1997: 17. Sui debiti di Lucano con la cosmologia stoica, rinvio almeno a LAPIDGE 1979 e NARDUCCI 2002: 42 ss. Chiaramente l’idea che scelleratezze umane e catastrofi cosmiche siano interrelate fornisce al poeta neroniano la base per giustificare l’abbondanza quasi grottesca di un terzo elemento di dissoluzione, ovvero il disfacimento dei corpi dei soldati. Segnalo inoltre un’interessante lettura del poema lucaneo come opera letteraria ‘post-traumatica’ in WALDE 2011 (in particolare pp. 293 ss.).

⁵ In termini stoici, dovremmo dire che il λόγος perde la propria forza coesiva. Le dottrine stoiche sul πνεῦμα come elemento strutturante e coesivo del cosmo sono rintracciabili, tra gli altri, in *SVF* I 135–138, 151, 521, 523; II 368, 439–441, 543, 550–553, 719.

⁶ Si pensi, giusto per citare i casi più noti, al supplizio inflitto a Mario Gratidiano (cfr. *Phars.* II 177–193), al corpo orribilmente ferito di Sceva (VI 138 ss.) o alla morte di Pompeo stesso (VIII 671–673).

⁷ Cui fa riferimento UTARD 2016: 186.

⁸ Su questo tema, cfr. almeno HENDERSON 1987, in particolare pp. 140–141; MASTERS 1992: 34 ss.; QUINT 1993: 140 ss.; BARTSCH 1997 (in particolare pp. 10 ss.); DINTER 2012: 9 ss.; MEBANE 2016: 191–193. Emblematica è evidentemente la metafora dei vv. 2–3 del proemio («populumque potentem / in sua victrici **conversum viscera dextra**») che anticipa i fattivi orrori che il lettore troverà descritti nel poema, tutti ipostasi della disgregazione della romanità stessa (cfr. BARTSCH 1997 16: «The state in civil war becomes **a mutilated body** parallel to those of its citizens»; DINTER 2012: 9: «...Lucan forms **an epic body with disturbingly many parts** that from the moment of its birth confronts the reader with its (self)destruction» [grassetti miei]). L’ipotesi è confortata anche da alcuni dati statistici: MOST (1992: 398 ss.), confrontando i poemi di Omero, Virgilio,

A fronte di risultati già significativi raggiunti dagli studi precedenti, vorrei quindi riprendere uno degli episodi più celebri del poema, ovvero la battaglia di Marsiglia che occupa la seconda metà del terzo libro, per indagare più a fondo la partitura del disfaccimento somatico che Lucano organizza nel descrivere lo scontro.

1. PREMESSA FILOSOFICA

La battaglia di Marsiglia⁹, trattata da Lucano con le tinte spettacolari dei *na-valia proelia* che grandissimo successo riscossero soprattutto in età imperiale¹⁰,

Lucano, Silio Italico e Stazio, osserva che solo nel *Bellum Civile* accade che le ferite da taglio siano presenti in misura identica rispetto a quelle da trafittura e che esse si concludano sempre con un'amputazione, venendo peraltro sapientemente collocate o all'inizio o alla fine di una sequenza narrativa («[they] provide a suitably impressive opening to an *aristeia* or a climax after which a pause or shift in perspective is all the more welcome»). Altrettanto utili i dati esposti in CHIESA (2005: 4 ss.): studiando le occorrenze lessicali inerenti al corpo nell'*Eneide* e nel *Bellum Civile*, l'autore osserva, tra le altre cose, che in Virgilio prevale l'uso del termine *corpus*, in riferimento al corpo umano nella sua unità, laddove il nipote di Seneca predilige l'uso dei termini *membra* e *artus*, in ciò mostrando di riferirsi più spesso al corpo come somma di parti. Così commenta CHIESA (p. 5): «Si tratta inoltre di un'**aggregazione** che subisce sovente il processo opposto della **divisione**: il poema lucaneo presenta un ampio repertorio di corpi mutilati e smembrati, come attesta anche l'uso di *truncus*, termine che, in proporzione, quadruplica le sue attestazioni rispetto all'*Eneide*» [grassetti miei]. Di qui, in effetti, può prendere le mosse la comprensione profonda del navale di Marsiglia: i guerrieri trafitti e fatti a pezzi sono la forma stessa dello smembramento di Roma (cfr. BARTSCH 1997: 17 e CHIESA 2005: 23). A sua volta significativa è la presenza in Lucano del termine *cadaver*, che indica un corpo vergognosamente abbandonato o addirittura volutamente dilaniato, anche se vien fatto di pensare più estesamente al *cadaver* di Roma, ovvero alla fine ingloriosa del *corpus* civile della città per effetto dell'ignominiosa guerra fratricida (cfr. CALONNE 2010). Già ROWLAND (1969: 204) voleva dimostrare che «Massilia is, in fact, paradigmatic of Rome, and that Massilia's sufferings and fate are the analogue of Rome's». Discorsi analoghi possono essere applicati agli episodi di decollazione presenti nel poema (cfr. ESTÈVES 2010b) o all'episodio di Sceva citato alla n. 6: «La capacidad analógica del cuerpo sugiere la unidad orgánica del Estado y su vulnerabilidad refiere a la posibilidad de desmembramiento de ese otro "cuerpo" político cuya integridad socio-cultural también puede verse amenazada. Lo corporal en tanto materia concreta permite así designar, a través de la expresión metafórica, la estabilidad o alteración de otros cuerpos menos palpables» (TOLA 2011: 68).

⁹ Un puntuale commento a tutto l'episodio è in HUNINK 1992: 211 ss. Si vedano anche ESPOSITO 1987: 20 ss.; MOST 1992: 397 ss.; GORMAN 2001: 272–277, molto utile per il quadro sinottico delle tipologie di morte durante la battaglia; ESTÈVES 2010: 71–75; UTARD 2016. Per quanto grandiosa nella sua bizzarra originalità, la descrizione della battaglia di Marsiglia affonda le sue radici in un *pattern* narrativo ben anteriore a Lucano, il quale certamente ne ha recepito la forza espressiva e l'ha portata a conseguenze estreme, ma del tutto coerenti con l'idea creativa che informa il suo poema. Non a caso, infatti, sia ESTÈVES (2010: 70) che JOLIVET (2013: 155), esaminando le riprese lucanee di cruenti scene belliche ereditate dalla storiografia e dall'epica, parlano di *amplificatio* dei modelli. AMBÜHL (2015: 256–257) vede invece dipendere l'episodio «weniger auf historiographische als vielmehr auf dichterische Modelle», e dal momento che la prospettiva narrativa lucanea, particolarmente incline alla spettacolarità, «verleiht der Seeschlacht an sich bereits eine tragisch-theatralische Qualität», sarebbe lecito sospettare l'influsso dei *Persiani* di Eschilo.

¹⁰ Idea già espressa da OPELT 1957: 443. Cfr. ad esempio la descrizione tacitiana del *proelium* allestito da Claudio nella piana del Fucino nel 52 d. C. (*Ann.* XII 56). UTARD (2016: 185)

vede scontrarsi gli eserciti focesi e la composita flotta cesariana¹¹. L'episodio permette al poeta di dispiegare una vivace fantasia narrativa, fatta di scontri panoramici e singoli episodi di vario eroismo, per quanto quest'ultimo termine assuma una risonanza del tutto particolare in ragione del modo in cui Lucano organizza la narrazione: è un fatto che alcune scene di morte, in particolare quelle che vedono i soldati gravemente trafitti o irrimediabilmente mutilati di qualche parte del corpo, assumano spesso connotazioni più prossime alla paradossalità che alla *grandeur* dell'impresa epica¹², per quanto Lucano certamente abbia attinto ad esempi assolutamente seri¹³.

retrocede fino alle naumachie organizzate già a partire dal 46 a. C., pur ammettendo l'influenza delle tragedie senecane. Rispetto a LEIGH (1997: 257–258), che si allinea alle posizioni della critica precedente nel riconoscere l'influsso di questo tipo di *spectaculum* su Lucano, JOLIVET (2013: 151) è più prudente, vedendo piuttosto la volontà da parte del poeta di proporre un episodio alternativo rispetto al modello di scene di tempesta ereditato da Virgilio e Ovidio: esso, in ogni caso, offre un nuovo τόπος all'interno della narrazione epica *standard*, le battaglie navali non essendo mai state descritte né in Omero né in Virgilio. Al poeta di Mantova Lucano potrebbe semmai essere remotamente debitore per lo spunto della regata presente nei giochi funebri in onore di Anchise in *Aen.* V 137–150 (cfr. HUNINK 1992: 212). Bene ESTÈVES 2010a, p. 72: «En effet, la bataille navale se signale dès l'abord par sa nouveauté dans le paysage de la topique épique [...]. Est évoquée une atmosphère de fureur et de sang, dont les motifs macabres sont mis en exergue, ainsi que le prouve l'enchaînement sur un nombre réduit de vers des syntagmes *cruur altus, concreto sanguine, conferta cadavera*». I contributi più recenti (PERILLI 2019 per la battaglia di Marsiglia, ma anche EADEM 2018 in riferimento all'episodio di Sceva) riprendono e approfondiscono in modo convincente un altro percorso ermeneutico che prende in considerazione l'influsso delle battaglie 'straordinarie' descritte da Ovidio nelle *Metamorfosi*, là dove il poeta di Sulmona decide di deviare rispetto al modello delle sezioni epiche dell'*Eneide* (per cui cfr. anche BRIGUGLIO 2019: 115–117) dando forma a scontri caratterizzati dall'elemento paradossale e dal particolare macabro: si tratta dello lotta tra Perseo e Fineo (*Met.* V 1 ss.) e della battaglia tra Centauri e Lapiti (XII 210 ss.).

¹¹ Sul riutilizzo da parte di Lucano dei materiali storici cesariani, cfr. MASTERS 1992: 13 ss. e l'utilissima sinossi di pp. 20–21. Cfr. anche JOLIVET 2013: 148–152 (il quale riconsidera la narrazione dell'episodio come cosciente riscrittura del resoconto cesariano di *BCiv.* I 34, 6; 56, 8; II 1–16).

¹² Cfr. NARDUCCI 1979: 81–83: a più riprese lo studioso, ammessa la dipendenza dai modelli virgiliani, individua in Lucano una «tendenza allo straordinario ad ogni costo» che si esplicita in particolare nell'episodio di Cato e Licida, laddove in quelli del gemello anonimo e di Tirreno si arriva a suo giudizio a sfiorare il ridicolo. BARTSCH (1997: 38) osserva: «All these episodes are described without any hint at pain or suffering; the protagonists are simple machines for mutilation, comically pursuing their ends as various body parts fall off around them – again, another factor contributing to the reader's emotional distance from the events».

¹³ Presenterò qui esempi che per la ricerca del macabro possono aver genericamente ispirato Lucano. Episodi che invece costituiscano modelli precisi e corrispondenti a quanto leggiamo nel poema saranno discussi singolarmente più avanti. Possiamo partire dall'epica arcaica, nella quale le amputazioni, almeno a giudicare dai frammenti enniani a nostra disposizione, non mancano. Giustamente ESPOSITO (1987: 39–40) ricorda i fr. 483–486 SKUTSCH («oscitat in campis caput a cervice revulsum / semianimesque micant oculi lucemque requirunt / cumque caput caderet, carmen tuba sola peregit / et pereunte viro raucum sonus aere cucurrit»). Non meno efficace è peraltro l'ispirazione lucreziana, se si considera ad esempio la scena del carro da guerra falcato che fa strage dei corpi dei nemici (*De rer. nat.* III 642 ss., per il cui influsso su Lucano rimando almeno

Per spiegare questo compiacimento descrittivo, solo apparentemente fine a sé stesso, è necessario preliminarmente tornare sulla complessa questione dello ‘stoicismo’ lucaneo, sul quale è difficile, alla luce di quanto leggiamo nel poema, dire una parola definitiva. Ammettendo che il forte pessimismo del poeta¹⁴ prevalga nettamente sull’idea di un cosmo razionalmente ordinato¹⁵, è fuori discussione la familiarità di Lucano con le dottrine di questa scuola¹⁶. Ora, possiamo immaginare che questo artista giovane e desideroso di stupire i lettori abbia deciso di attingere ad un serbatoio di conoscenze condiviso da un pubblico di un certo livello per rovesciarne i termini di fondo, così da creare situazioni volutamente abnormi e stupefacenti (in ciò seguendo i canoni di un’estetica della *Verkehrung* tipica di quest’epoca)¹⁷. A questo punto, una filosofia tutta incentrata sull’ordine razionale del cosmo, che si traduce a livello umano nella tenuta stessa dei nostri corpi per effetto del πνεῦμα coibente, poteva fornire a Lucano spunti notevolissimi da rielaborare a livello artistico in scene di disfacimento somatico dal forte valore simbolico.

Si consideri, come accennato poc’anzi, la fisiologia stoica: nell’uomo è presente un flusso ininterrotto di energia che dal centro (il cuore) si spinge lungo

a MORETTI 1985: 140 ed ESPOSITO 1987: 43). Un episodio erodoteo dalle tinte piuttosto grottesche, che in certo modo potrebbe aver stimolato la fantasia di Lucano, riguarda il massacro degli abitanti di Egina (VI 91, 2): in particolare uno di essi, fuggito presso il tempio di Demetra, si aggrappa con tutte le forze alle maniglie del portale per non farsi portar via dai persiani, i quali risolvono il problema tagliandogli le mani, che rimangono strette al portale e ancora guizzanti. Autori latini posteriori a Lucano ci parlano poi di Acilio, che combatté proprio a Marsiglia e si ridusse a menar fendenti con una mano sola, situazione che suggerisce un parallelo col greco Cinegiri (per il quale vedi meglio *infra*): «Acilius navali ad Massiliam proelio iniecta in puppem hostium dextera et abscisa memorabile illud apud Graecos Cynegiri exemplum imitatus transiluit in navem umbone obvios agens» (Suet. *Iul.* 68; identico parallelo è istituito da Val. Max. III 2, 22). Plutarco (*Caes.* 16, 1) cita Acilio e Cassio Sceva il quale, a Durazzo, subì una triplice trafittura all’occhio, alla schiena e al fianco: la conoscenza di quest’eroe potrebbe essere derivata a Lucano da Livio, dal quale dipenderebbero tutte le altre testimonianze (cfr. RADICKE 2004: 261–262). Un certo gusto del macabro è del resto evidente anche nello storico patavino: si pensi alla scena del campo di battaglia di Canne dopo la disfatta romana (XXII 51, 5–9), tra i cui dettagli più ributtanti figurano soldati ancora vivi *succisis feminibus poplitibusque* e un numida trovato anche lui vivo, ma con il naso e la bocca dilaniati dai morsi di un soldato romano che aveva tentato un’estrema forma di difesa contro costui, non riuscendo più a reggere le armi con le mani (cfr. il medesimo episodio in Val. Max. III 2, 11). E certamente anche gli esercizi declamatori tipici delle scuole retoriche, incentrati su esempi di *crudelitas* e su scene patetiche in genere, hanno avuto il loro influsso sul giovane poeta (cfr. RADICKE 2004: 262 e CHIESA 2005: 12).

¹⁴ Cfr. DUE 1970: 214: «Le masque que porte Lucaïn dans la *Pharsale* est celui d’un stoïcien qui a perdu la foi».

¹⁵ Cfr. JOHNSON 1987: 13–19; SKLENÁŘ 1990: 281–296; IDEM 2003: 1–12; LÉVI 2006; MYERS 2011: 404 ss.

¹⁶ Cfr. almeno SCHOTES 1969; COLISH 1985: 252 ss. e relativa bibliografia; D’ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007: 76 ss.

¹⁷ Sulla tematica in generale rimando almeno a CASTAGNA, VOGT-SPIRA 2002.

i tessuti e gli organi (galenicamente diremmo gli ὁμοιόμερα) verso tutte le regioni del corpo, per poi fare ritorno per la stessa via al punto di partenza¹⁸. Ebbene, la battaglia di Marsiglia ci fornisce un documento eloquente del cedimento di questa tenuta, poiché Lucano ricorre ad una serie impressionante di scene nelle quali all'unità subentra continuamente la divisione, con flotte, singole navi e corpi umani che si scontrano, si intrecciano, ma poi finiscono tutti irrimediabilmente in pezzi¹⁹. Non stupisce, pertanto, che anche la modalità narrativa lucanea risulti 'frantumata' in trapassi improvvisi ed ellissi fulminanti da scena a scena, sì che, come già da tempo gli studiosi hanno rilevato, la battaglia di Marsiglia, soprattutto all'inizio, non è mai semplice da seguire, ed in certi momenti della narrazione non è nemmeno chiaro se il poeta stia descrivendo le operazioni belliche romane o quelle focesi (la cosa vale sia per le scene collettive che per gli episodi con protagonisti singoli guerrieri)²⁰. La situazione non cambia nella successiva parata

¹⁸ Cfr. BOCCHI 2011: 68 ss. Ci sono elementi ulteriori che inducono a pensare che Lucano abbia presenti queste teorie: CHIESA (2005: 6–8) rileva che nel *Bellum Civile* alcune parti del corpo sono citate in modo proporzionalmente enorme rispetto al poema virgiliano. Orbene, non può essere un caso che tra queste parti spicchino il collo, la gola, la nuca, i nervi e le vene: tutte zone deputate, secondo la fisiologia stoico-pneumatica, proprio al passaggio del πνεῦμα coibente, e quindi oggetto necessario di attenzione da parte del poeta. Altre volte, poi, Lucano ama impiegare il termine *vitalia*, che fa così il suo ingresso nel lessico poetico, essendo stato prima adoperato piuttosto in senso tecnico non a caso da Seneca: in *De ira* II 1, 2 leggiamo infatti «nam et in corpore nostro ossa nervique et articuli, firmamenta totius et vitalia, minime speciosa visu, prius ordinantur...»: il Cordovano sta qui alludendo tradizionale metafora stoica che equipara le parti dell'essere vivente (sangue e carne, ossa e nervi, animo) alle tre branche della filosofia (fisica, logica, etica, cfr. FILLION-LAHILLE 1984: 164 e 319, n. 7). L'allusione senecana è però di fatto circostanziata a ossa, nervi e articolazioni, di nuovo a mio giudizio in riferimento specifico al πνεῦμα che essi devono far scorrere al proprio interno per garantire la tenuta fisica del corpo: l'endiadi *firmamenta et vitalia* richiama proprio il concetto di πνεῦμα συνεκτικόν il quale, consentendo la stabile coesione di tutte le parti del corpo, permette che in esso si diffonda l'energia vitale. Di contro il sangue rappresenta un fluido vitale diverso dal πνεῦμα, benché del pari necessario, laddove la carne è elemento troppo generico ai fini di un discorso di marca stoica. Di qui il motivo per cui Seneca non cita questi due elementi. Credo pertanto che l'impiego di *vitalia* in Lucano possa derivare da suggestioni mediche pneumatiche.

¹⁹ Basti solo leggere i vv. 544–552, 563–566, 576–582, oltre a tutti gli episodi che verranno presi in considerazione analiticamente nel corso del presente lavoro. Per questa lettura pneumatica degli episodi lucanei, cfr. VIZZOTTI 2010 (in particolare le pp. 101–110). Questa esigenza di 'pieno' nella descrizione distanzia il racconto lucaneo da quello cesariano (forse per influenza di Livio, cfr. RADICKE 2004: 261). In ciò dunque si dimostra che la situazione descritta da Lucano è eccessiva e 'innaturale' dall'inizio alla fine: si parte con navi talmente incastrate tra loro da coprire il mare come se fosse diventato un campo di battaglia terrestre (v. 566: «*tecto stetit aequore bellum*», cfr. le pertinenti osservazioni di UTARD 2016: 183–184, anche in rapporto al modello eschileo) per giungere a scene in cui nulla, uomo o imbarcazione che sia, riesce a mantenere la propria integrità, il mare ridottosi a questo punto ad un infernale calderone schiumante di legni divelti, vele stracciate e membra umane disperse.

²⁰ HUNINK (1992: 212), in riferimento alle manovre precedenti lo scontro tra le due flotte, dice appunto che esse sono descritte «in such a **fragmentary** and abstract manner that we can hardly gain a good impression of what actually happens» [grassetto mio].

di disperanti scene di disgregazione, con una congestione quasi soffocante di episodi che vedono la lotta e la morte di gruppi di persone seguiti da inquadrature in cui singoli corpi si sfaldano (cfr. *infra*).

Vorrò tuttavia analizzare più nello specifico le sequenze di morte della battaglia di Marsiglia per rilevare il criterio strutturale ad esse soggiacente.

2. ARCHITETTURA DELLA DISTRUZIONE

Ciò che accade nella seconda metà del terzo libro in tema di frantumazioni reali e metaforiche può essere anticipato dall'episodio del taglio del bosco sacro per la costruzione delle torri d'assedio (vv. 399–452): la portata simbolica della scena deriva non solo dall'empio gesto di Cesare di fare a pezzi gli alberi di un luogo consacrato²¹, ma anche dal fatto che il luogo in questione è descritto coi tipici caratteri del *locus horridus*²² in cui non si venerano divinità tradizionali, ma oscuri dèi barbarici, raffigurati in deformi statue di legno²³ e celebrati su altari sinistri, laddove gli alberi vengono purificati con sangue umano²⁴. Tutto **contribuisce insomma a consolidare** il binomio distruzione/empietà che si sostanzierà successivamente²⁵. Fallito infatti l'assalto a Marsiglia con le torri d'assedio, i cesariani decidono di passare alla battaglia navale (vv. 509–537): dopo la descrizione delle prime fasi di ingaggio, nelle quali gli scafi delle navi focesi si sono incastrati nei fianchi di quelle romane, ci si offre una prima veduta panoramica degli scontri corpo a corpo, come se la battaglia navale si fosse di fatto trasformata in uno scontro terrestre (vv. 562–572)²⁶. Già a quest'altezza il poeta ci anticipa con brevi tocchi descrittivi le situazioni estreme che successivamente verranno descritte più in dettaglio²⁷. Si passa poi a singoli episodi di combattimento, tutti

²¹ Cfr., tra i più significativi, v. 426: «Hanc iubet inmisso silvam procumbere ferro»; v. 434: «ausus est aeriam ferro proscindere quercum»; v. 450: «Utque satis caesi nemoris...». Per un commento all'episodio, con particolare riguardo ai possibili modelli, cfr. PHILLIPS 1968.

²² Cfr. in particolare i vv. 402–425.

²³ Cfr. vv. 412–413: «simulacraque maesta deorum / arte carent caesisque extant informia truncis».

²⁴ Cfr. vv. 403–405: «[hunc tenent] barbara ritu / sacra deum; structae diris altaribus arae / omnisque humanis lustrata cruoribus arbor».

²⁵ Cfr. TOLA 2016: 200–201: «[L]es images de chute e de rupture qui traversent la déforestation [...] complètent le sens de la description du bois et annoncent, également, les axes majeurs du récit de combat suivant [...]. L'image des troncs coupés qui “habitent” le bois et l'abattage sacrilège de ses arbres reviennent, en variation symbolique, dans les scènes de mutilation et “chute” des corps au cours de l'affrontement. De ce fait, l'horreur propre à cet espace sacré et sa profanation par les césariens établissent une *responsio* avec la déchirure et le décès des soldats lors du combat des corps».

²⁶ Cfr. JOLIVET 2013: 151. Per i parallelismi con la descrizione cesariana e i rimandi tematici ai *Persiani* eschilei, cfr. AMBÜHL 2015: 257–258.

²⁷ Cfr. vv. 572–577: «**cruor altus in unda / spumat, et obducti concreto sanguine fluctus.** / et, quas inmissi traxerunt vincula ferri, / has prohibent iungi **conferta cadavera** puppes. / semi-animes alii vastum subiere profundum / **hauseruntque suo permixtum sanguine pontum**».

conclusi con la morte per trafittura del soldato: il cesariano Cato, ucciso da dardi che lo trapassano nel petto e nella schiena (vv. 585–591)²⁸, quindi il greco Telone (vv. 592–599) e infine Ghiareo, a cui tocca una sorte ancora più macabra poiché, nell'atto di arrampicarsi sulla poppa di una nave alleata, viene infilzato ai fianchi e rimane inchiodato penzolante allo scafo (vv. 600–602)²⁹. Si prosegue con due anonimi gemelli (vv. 603–626), uno dei quali destinato a miserevole fine per proteggere l'altro³⁰: egli si aggrappa ad una nave romana, ma i soldati avversari gli troncano la mano destra; non domo, il giovane combatte con la sinistra, ma i romani gli troncano anche questa insieme a tutto il braccio. A questo punto, il soldato protegge il fratello dai dardi nemici facendogli semplicemente scudo col corpo per poi gettarsi, come proiettile umano, sulla nave avversaria³¹. Il culmine

²⁸ Un precedente significativo di questa scena può trovarsi nelle fonti storiche: Cinegiro, fratello del tragediografo Eschilo, combattente a Maratona, perse una mano (o forse addirittura entrambe) nel tentativo di agganciare gli aplustri nemici (cfr. Hdt. VI 114: Κυνέγειρος [...] τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκοπεῖς πελέκει πίπτει; sul medesimo episodio, è quasi 'lucaneo' Iust. II 9, 18: «tunc quoque amputata dextera, navem sinistra comprehendit, quam et ipsam cum amisisset, ad postremum morsu navem detinuit»); certo la traccia di questo modello risulta ancora influente in età imperiale, se si considera che Seneca padre, in *Controv.* I 4, fa parlare i suoi interlocutori fittizi circa il tema del *vir fortis sine manibus*; HUNINK (1992: 225–226) osserva che anche le scene di morte in Omero e Virgilio contemplano ferite al petto e alla schiena, quest'ultima essendo in genere fatale al soldato, ma non accade mai che esse siano subite *contemporaneamente*. Pertanto, «Catus' strange wounds reflect a literary innovation rather than a reality of war». I due avverbi presenti al v. 587, «terga **simul pariter** missis et pectora telis», già significativi di per sé e in più accostati, rendono benissimo «the simultaneity of the injuries», per quanto l'immagine della doppia trafittura, nel suo complesso, risulti «almost absurd» (*ibidem*). Su questa stessa scena ESTEVES (2010a: 74–75) osserva che Lucano mette in atto tutta una serie di attenti parallelismi «pour donner à voir le spectacle inouï d'une métamorphose charnelle [...] [L]'hyperbole de l'horreur repose sur l'exacerbation du réalisme macabre et de l'étrangeté hallucinatoire».

²⁹ Lucano gioca anche in questo caso con l'orizzonte di attesa dei suoi lettori, poiché il participio *suspensa* del v. 601 riferito ai fianchi di Ghiareo resta enigmatico e solo la lettura del verso successivo «adfixusque rati telo retinente pendit» svela completamente la terribile situazione (HUNINK 1992: 229). Per l'influsso ovidiano su questa scena, cfr. PERILLI 2019: 96 ss.

³⁰ Per questa scena, quella di Tirreno e quella di Licida, cfr. anche CHIESA 2005: 19–20.

³¹ La qual cosa, seguendo la lettura di LEIGH (1997: 253), è indice di una tendenza all'eccesso che spoglia la scena dei tratti eroici tradizionali: «Roman heroes bear scars on their chests with great pride, but do not actively seek them [...]. Lucan's hero-twin pursues a hypallagous relationship with his brother, his *pectus* protecting the other's armour, and the impression is of an excessive, an insane *virtus*». Così pure VIZZOTTI 2010: 106: significativo è «cómo algo que parece necesariamente virtuoso, el valor en la adversidad sólo conduce en este universo a actos furiosos de inmolación». Anche in questo caso vediamo sullo sfondo le gesta dei maratonomachi: sappiamo infatti del polemarcho Callimaco, che restò in piedi anche dopo essere stato trafitto da un nugolo di frecce persiane. Per quanto le notizie che abbiamo su costui siano tutte posteriori a Lucano (*Suid.* I 545 ADLER s.v. *Hippias*: ἐν τούτοις Καλλιμαχος ἐπὶ δοράτων εἰστήκει νεκρός...; Ps.-Plut. *Paral. Min.* I 305b–c: Καλλιμαχος δὲ πολλοῖς περιπεπαρμένος δόρασι καὶ νεκρὸς ἐστάθη; Polemo I 7 e 27; II 1) è fuor di dubbio che un episodio così eclatante potesse essere ben noto al poeta erneriano (per un regesto completo delle fonti letterarie e iconografiche sui maratonomachi, cfr. HARRISON 1972: 370 ss.) il quale da par suo lo amplifica e lo incrocia con quello di Cinegiro in un *crescendo* iperbolico (cfr. JOLIVET 2013: 156–157: «After imitating Cynaegirus, Lucan's

dell'orrore è tuttavia nella sequenza successiva (vv. 635–646): Licida viene aganciato da un arpione e rischia di finire sommerso. I compagni, nel disperato tentativo di salvarlo, lo afferrano saldamente per le gambe, ma l'unico risultato è che il corpo dello sventurato si spezza in due³².

Questo *crescendo* orripilante di menomazioni fisiche ai danni di singoli è interrotto da una scena collettiva, allorché Lucano indugia sullo spettacolo di una nave che si rovescia a causa del peso dei soldati che si erano concentrati in un sol punto di essa per combattere: inevitabile è che tutto l'equipaggio anneghi (vv. 647–652a). Ciò prepara in realtà ad una nuova sequenza, dei cui protagonisti non viene fornito il nome. Il poeta ha tuttavia cura di inserire elementi di variazione per movimentare ulteriormente la descrizione degli eventi rispetto al blocco precedente: vediamo infatti un altro soldato trafitto sia davanti che dietro, stavolta però non dalle frecce nemiche, bensì, ancora più spettacolarmente, dai rostri di due navi che si incrociano (vv. 652b–661a)³³; segue poi una ciurma di naufraghi che tentano di salvarsi salendo a bordo di una nave alleata i cui occupanti, timorosi che lo scafo si rovesci, trancano loro le braccia, sì che i poveri corpi mutilati sprofondano nei gorgi (vv. 661b–669).

A questo punto la confusione cresce a dismisura, così come la disperazione dei combattenti, visto che i soldati proseguono la lotta strappando pezzi dalle navi per usarli come armi³⁴ oppure estraendo i dardi dai propri corpi o da quelli di chi è già morto per scagliarli nuovamente (vv. 670–679). A peggiorare il tutto si aggiunge un incendio che scoppia all'improvviso (vv. 680–688), dopodiché Lucano ritorna sulle operazioni di recupero delle armi (vv. 690–693) e sulle scene di annegamento: vediamo soldati anonimi che trascinano con sé in fondo al

anonymous Massilian behaves like Callimachos, and [...] clearly surpasses his Cesarean rival Acilius [...] and it is his incredible will power that allows him to jump onto the enemy ship»). Per quanto riguarda la traccia virgiliana (già evidenziata da METZGER 1957: 48–63), viene ovviamente da pensare all'episodio eneadico di Eurialo e Niso o a quello di Laride e Timbro: se i primi due eroi vengono decapitati e le teste esposte come macabro trofeo (IX 465–467), gli altri due, peraltro gemelli e quindi probabile modello degli omologhi lucanei, subiscono rispettivamente in battaglia la perdita della mano (X 395–396) e la decollazione del capo (X 394). Lucano, vedremo, si spinge ben oltre, poiché in lui «[l']alliance du spectaculaire, du macabre et de l'étrangeté hyperboliques confère de fait son originalité à l'esthétique de l'horreur guerrière [...], en distinguant ses *mortes insolitae* de la *plurima mortis imago* virgilienne» (ESTÈVES 2010a, p. 73). Anche in questo caso è presente poi la traccia ovidiana (*Met.* V 140–143, episodio dei fratelli Clizio e Ciani; 182–186, 208–209, 232–233, descrizione delle vittime dello sguardo di Medusa, cfr. PERILLI 2019: 100 ss.).

³² ESPOSITO (1987: 46) vede nella scena di Licida il «gusto dell'eccezionale e del sorprendente» con «la tendenza, evidentissima, a dilatare i tempi dell'azione».

³³ Per i precedenti poetici di questa scena lucanea, cfr. CHIESA 2005: 32, n. 106. Sull'assurdità della medesima, scevra però da risvolti ironici nell'intenzione dell'autore, condivido l'osservazione di VIZZOTTI 2010: 101.

³⁴ Per l'uso di queste 'armi improprie' Lucano ha trovato ispirazione in Eschilo (*Pers.* 424–426), in Virgilio (*Aen.* I 148–150; VII 505–508), oltre che nella *Centauiromachia* ovidiana (*Met.* XII 242 ss.), cfr. PERILLI 2019: 105 ss.

mare i nemici (vv. 693–696a) e un non meglio identificato focese, esperto di nuoto in apnea e per questo in grado di sorprendere e affogare gli avversari, che nel riemergere non si avvede della chiglia di una nave e ne viene travolto (vv. 696b–704). Altri ancora, ormai dispersi in mare, immolano i loro stessi corpi feriti per attutire l’urto dei rostri nemici e poi, si deduce, annegano orribilmente (706b–708).

Riprendono quindi episodi singoli, i cui protagonisti sono di nuovo forniti di nome proprio: il fromboliere Ligdamo colpisce con un proiettile Tirreno e gli sfonda il cranio (vv. 709–714); Tirreno però non cessa di combattere, ma anzi, anche qui con scelta autoriale incline alla bizzarria, chiede ai compagni che lo usino come macchina di guerra mantenendolo dritto, così che possa sferrare colpi anche senza vedere (vv. 716–721a)³⁵: l’idea si rivela efficace, perché uno dei dardi scagliati da Tirreno colpisce Argo al basso ventre³⁶ e costui, cadendo sul ponte, aiuta il ferro a penetrargli nel corpo, di fatto auto-conficcandosi sulla nave (vv. 722–725). Il padre di Argo accorre in soccorso del figlio ma, constatata la situazione irrimediabile, decide di trafiggersi le viscere e si getta in mare (vv. 748–751).

Il resoconto sin qui fornito mi pare evidenziare come Lucano intenda mantenere sempre vigile l’attenzione del lettore tramite il susseguirsi di episodi tutti

³⁵ Lo spunto per questa scena è virgiliano (*Aen.* IX 586–589, Mezenzio uccide con la fionda il figlio di Arcente, cfr. NARDUCCI 1979: 82), ma viene rielaborato seguendo anche in questo caso la traccia della battaglia tra Centauri e Lapiti in Ovidio (cfr. PERILLI 2019: 109 ss.). Il testo ovidiano può aver influenzato anche la costruzione dei singoli versi lucanei, ma per questo aspetto cfr. *infra*. VIZZOTTI (2010: 107) rileva «una furiosa obsesión por producir el mayor daño posible al enemigo al mismo tiempo que el cuerpo se cosifica». Si tratta insomma di mettere in dubbio l’umanità stessa dei protagonisti, sia che i loro corpi si sfaldino, sia che diventino essi stessi armi da guerra. Cfr. BARTSCH 1997: 28: «Person and corpse are so confused that we start to approach a state in which the former can put to use the latter even when the corpse is his own. The link between self and body is put into turmoil; the two merge into each other». Da ultimo RIPOLL (2016: 265) a proposito dell’accecamento di Tirreno e del fatto che egli stesso si definisca quasi cadavere (cfr. 720: «ex magna parte defunctum cadaver»), osserva come ciò contribuisca ad esprimere la «déshumanisation des combattants de la guerre civile» resi di fatto «une parfaite machine à tuer» (osservazione pertanto complementare a quella di HENDERSON (1987: 140), che rileva in tutto il poema la presenza di una «mass of personified weapons»). GORMAN (2001: 273 e 276) vede in questa scena la prova che Lucano «is consciously manipulating the features associated with the epic *aristeia*» e «seems to be describing a traditional epic scene of military accomplishment, but in fact he has transformed the attacker from a man into an inanimate thing». A Maratona, peraltro, partecipò un certo Polizelo che combatté anche dopo aver perso l’uso degli occhi: cfr. Hdt. VI 117, 2 ove leggiamo, a proposito di Ἐπίζηλος, ma si tratta evidentemente della stessa persona, τῶν ὁμμάτων στερηθῆναι, laddove Suida I 545 ADLER ci offre qualche dettaglio che di fatto avvicina maggiormente costui a Tirreno: Πολύζηλος δὲ πηρωθεὶς [...] ἐμάχετο ὥς ὀρών καὶ διέκρινε τῇ φωνῇ τοὺς ἰδίους καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους. Assieme a Cinegiro, Polizelo è ricordato anche da Seneca retore, cfr. *Suas.* 5, 2: «quid Cynaegiron referam et te, Polyzele?» La *praeteritio* in riferimento ai due guerrieri mi pare evidenziare ulteriormente la fama degli episodi dei maratonomachi ancora età imperiale. RIPOLL (2016: 263 ss.) vede in Tirreno un’anticipazione dell’aristia di Sceva (cfr. VI 168–263).

³⁶ LEIGH (1997: 254) arriva a dire, forse con una certa forzatura, che «[t]he chance success of the blinded Thyrrenus in striking a character called Argus is amusing enough in itself», in riferimento evidentemente al guardiano dai cento occhi.

volti a stupire e orripilare³⁷. Non può inoltre sfuggire una certa ricorsività di temi per quanto concerne la tipologia di morte cui soggiacciono i soldati. Credo sia possibile individuare una struttura generale dell'episodio di tipo simmetrico, il cui perno è il momento dell'incendio:

SEQUENZA I: MORTI DI SINGOLI SOLDATI
vv. 585–591: Cato trafitto sul petto e sul dorso.
vv. 592–599: Telone trafitto al timone.
vv. 600–602: Ghiareo trafitto e conficcato sul fianco della nave.
vv. 603–626: Gemello anonimo mutilato e trafitto.
vv. 635–646: Licida trafitto e spezzato in due.
SEQUENZA II: ANNEGAMENTI
vv. 647–652a: Annegamento della ciurma anonima.
vv. 652b–661a: Anonimo naufrago trafitto da due rostri contrapposti.
vv. 661b–669: Anonimi mutilati e annegati.
SEQUENZA III: RECUPERO ARMI
vv. 670–674a: Navi private dei loro pezzi impiegati come armi.
vv. 674b–679: Dardi strappati a soldati morti o moribondi per essere lanciati di nuovo.
INCENDIO (vv. 680–688)
SEQUENZA IV: RECUPERO ARMI
vv. 690–693: I naufraghi restituiscono ai compagni le armi cadute in mare.
SEQUENZA V: ANNEGAMENTI
vv. 693–696a: Soldati annegano avvinghiati.
vv. 696b–704: Il soldato focese viene colpito dalla chiglia e annega.
vv. 706b–708: Soldati in mare trafitti dai rostri.
SEQUENZA VI: MORTI DI SINGOLI SOLDATI
vv. 709–714: Ligdamo sfonda il cranio a Tirreno e lo priva degli occhi.
vv. 722–725: Argo trafitto e conficcato.
vv. 748–751: Il padre di Argo si trafigge e si getta in mare.

³⁷ La frenesia è anche nelle diverse azioni dei soldati, mai del tutto identiche tra loro: Cato, dalla sua poppa, tenta di toccare una poppa *nemica*, Ghiareo *si arrampica* su una poppa *alleata*, mentre Licida è arpionato mentre si trova *fermo* a poppa. Dopo Cato, che si trova *a poppa*, abbiamo Telone che invece sperona la nave nemico col rostro *di prua*; del gemello, invece, sappiamo che pure lui si sporge da poppa, ma tocca genericamente la *carina* della nave nemica: tuttavia si suppone che il fendente che gli taglia la mano arrivi da un soldato che si trova sul fianco. Nella sequenza conclusiva abbiamo azioni tutte interlacciate: Ligdamo colpisce Tirreno che si trova *a prua*, Tirreno colpisce Argo che si trova *a poppa* e il padre di quest'ultimo accorre *da prua* per poi gettarsi giù dalla nave. L'effetto, in entrambe le serie, è quindi quello di una mobilità ininterrotta, ma soprattutto di un continuo passaggio dell'occhio del lettore dalla poppa alla prua ai fianchi delle diverse navi, con l'effetto di moltiplicare e complicare le linee dell'azione, in ciò sottolineandosi il carattere furibondo ed esagitato dello scontro marsigliese.

Ad un livello generalissimo, si può dire che Lucano passi da scene di primo piano con protagonisti singoli (dei quali uno solo anonimo) nella sequenza I a un grande quadro centrale di scene di morte collettiva, nel quale peraltro ad un certo punto sembra non ci sia più distinzione tra esseri animati ed inanimati (sequenze II–V), per poi tornare a scene di morte singola (con due personaggi denominati oltre all’anonimo padre di Argo) nella sequenza VI. Più nello specifico, la ricostruzione proposta permette agevolmente di individuare una rispondenza simmetrica tra le sequenze I ~ VI, II ~ V, III ~ IV, queste ultime separate appunto dall’episodio dell’incendio che fa da asse di simmetria tra i due gruppi. Lucano organizza la materia secondo una raffinata strategia di richiami e di variazioni in forza dei quali la solida architettura compositiva permette la realizzazione di un *crescendo* patetico di sicuro effetto.

Ad esempio, il ‘ritorno’ in (VI) di quanto già visto in (I) è in realtà debitamente potenziato: le morti in (I) avvengono tutte separatamente, laddove in (VI) assistiamo ad una serie di danneggiamenti a catena (Ligdamo colpisce Tirreno, il quale colpisce Argo, la cui morte ‘colpisce’ il padre e lo spinge al suicidio). Anche le note raccapriccianti e assurde delle descrizioni soggiacciono a questo principio. Consideriamo il *crescendo* orrorifico delle tipologie di morte: si passa da una serie di soldati trafitti (Cato, Telone, Ghiareo) ad uno amputato e trafitto (il gemello anonimo), per culminare con Licida addirittura divelto in due parti dopo essere stato agganciato (che è come dire trafitto) dall’arpione nemico. La narrazione, in questo caso, sposta il *focus* drammatico dalla trafittura all’amputazione fino ad un vero e proprio ‘strappo’. Lo strazio del corpo del solo Licida, poi, si raddoppia per così dire nella morte di Argo e del padre; inoltre, a differenza del gemello anonimo, che perlomeno si ‘separa’ dall’altro gettandosi sui nemici per difenderlo, il padre di Argo abbandona il figlio morente con un gesto che neppure serve a proteggerlo, quanto semmai a dichiarare la propria sterile ribellione nei confronti del destino³⁸. Si noti inoltre che i protagonisti di (I) sono personaggi di fatto ‘muti’, laddove solo in (VI) abbiamo due brevi allocuzioni (da parte di Tirreno e del padre di Argo): questo elemento caratterizzante della narrazione epica, qui applicato a personaggi prossimi alla morte nelle modalità

³⁸ VIZZOTTI (2010: 108–109), parlando esplicitamente di Barocco, concepisce piuttosto il dispiegarsi di una serie di scene così articolate: preparazione della battaglia, battaglia panoramica corpo a corpo, morti in primo piano (da Cato all’anonimo trafitto da due rostri), morti caratterizzate dalla disperazione e dal *furor* e morti individuali (dal focese urtato dalla chiglia ad Argo e il padre). Lo studioso vede nel complesso un discorso che «se organiza en masas molares pero a su vez interconectadas» sì che l’apparente *collage* di episodi di morte «forma parte de una visión de conjunto, de un entramado significativo y coherente» e «cada turbulencia discursiva compone una muerte particular y abre las puertas para el despliegue de la que le sigue»: dalla microstruttura delle singole scene si genera la macrostruttura di tutto l’episodio. Non sono del tutto convinto sulla distinzione tra morti in primo piano e morti individuali, laddove la presenza di scene che si ripetono con studiate variazioni mi pare più solidamente dimostrabile.

bizzarre che sappiamo, certifica ulteriormente l'operazione destrutturante compiuta da Lucano.

Altri elementi dimostrano poi la ripresa variata di quanto già narrato in precedenza: il tema della trafittura, già portato ad un cospicuo grado di assurdità in (I), si approfondisce in (VI) nei suoi tratti macabri se si pensa al cranio di Tirreno, che viene non semplicemente *trafitto*, bensì *attraversato* e *sfondato* dal proiettile di Ligdamo, così che dalle orbite schizzano fuori gli occhi (il che di fatto equivale ad un'amputazione). Si tratta di una scena mostruosa, che gareggia ampiamente con la progressiva mutilazione dell'anonimo gemello: più ancora, la perdita di connotati umani di entrambi i soldati (senza più arti uno, senza più metà del capo l'altro) conduce alla loro reificazione in macchine da guerra, dato che il gemello si butta come proiettile vivente sui nemici e Tirreno diventa una sorta di balestra umana. A sua volta Argo replica la situazione di Ghiareo, contribuendo però col proprio peso a conficcarsi sul ponte. In più il padre, trafiggendosi le viscere e gettandosi in mare, concentra di fatto in un unico individuo due delle modalità di disfaccimento sin qui descritte. Questo suicidio in due atti non crea però alcun alone di dignità eroica attorno al genitore: egli pare mosso più che altro dal desiderio di evitare l'innaturale situazione di un padre che vede morire il figlio, ma questo intento dalle sfumature quasi tragiche o addirittura 'catoniane' (cfr. vv. 742–743: «Non perdam tempora [...] a saevis permissa deis») si traduce nella non meno disumana negazione degli ultimi atti d'affetto nei confronti di Argo (vv. 744–745: «Veniam misero concede parenti, / Arge, quod amplexus, extrema quod oscula fugi»), negazione dovuta in fin dei conti alla frettolosa ricerca di una fine che preceda di pochissimo quella del figlio ormai moribondo (v. 747: «semianimisque iaces et adhuc potes esse superstes»). Se quindi è difficile dire che ci troviamo di fronte ad un nobile suicidio stoico, dobbiamo semmai registrare la folle disperazione soggiacente a quest'atto³⁹, simile a quella degli anonimi naufraghi e di Tirreno sopra esaminata. Le situazioni di (I) si trovano insomma amplificate: in quella sequenza, a parte il gemello anonimo che decide di farsi scudo per il fratello e proiettile umano contro i nemici, tutti gli altri protagonisti subiscono il proprio orrendo fato restando del tutto impotenti, laddove in (VI), anche qui con studiata inversione, l'unica vittima autenticamente passiva degli scontri è Argo, mentre il padre (come Tirreno) reagisce in modo

³⁹ Per i caratteri volutamente paradossali della scena, anche in rapporto ad omologhi episodi virgiliani, cfr. HUNINK 1992: 257 e 260 (la guerra civile distrugge tutti i più tradizionali legami familiari); LEIGH 1997: 254–257. Anche CHIESA (2005: 42–43), pur riconoscendo che il lamento del vecchio padre riecheggia molteplici precedenti letterari, conviene che il suicidio ristabilisce sì la 'naturale' sopravvivenza dei figli ai padri, ma l'effetto finale del gesto è di fatto un ἀπροσδόκητον che perde qualsiasi spessore genuinamente epico. Cfr. pure VIZZOTTI 2010: 108: già Erodoto (I 87, 4) osservava come la guerra inverta l'ordine naturale della sepoltura padre-figlio, pertanto «Lucano [...] da otra vuelta de tuerca invirtiendo la inversión, pero de ninguna manera esto redime la situación sino que la hace aún más absurda y desesperada».

‘eccentrico’ ma con piena coscienza delle proprie azioni al rovescio drammatico della situazione⁴⁰. Questo *crescendo* di assurdità, sempre a partire da Cato, si trova poi sviluppato secondo un percorso parallelo a quello ora esposto, avente per marchio distintivo ancora il tema della trafittura. Se infatti Cato è trafitto da due dardi, in (II) c’è un naufrago trafitto addirittura da due rostri, laddove in (V) l’elemento scioccante è dato dal fatto che i soldati, a differenza degli altri due casi, si offrono *volontariamente* alla trafittura, illudendosi follemente di frenare l’avanzata delle navi nemiche.

Per quanto riguarda le sequenze II–V esse ci propongono episodi che coinvolgono soldati anonimi e accrescono la disperata insensatezza verso cui declina lo scontro, perché vediamo non solo corpi, ma anche navi fatte a pezzi e soldati non più uccisi sul ponte o sui fianchi delle imbarcazioni, ma orribilmente annegati e in più di un’occasione smembrati. Sia in (II) che in (V) abbiamo tre momenti, dei quali quello centrale vede il *focus* narrativo concentrato su un solo soldato, mentre gli altri due riguardano più soldati o intere ciurme: più precisamente, in (II) passiamo da una ciurma che naufraga per il peso eccessivo concentratosi su un lato della nave ad una ciurma orribilmente mutilata da altri soldati, per giunta alleati, laddove in (V) abbiamo soldati che si annegano a vicenda avvinghiandosi e poi soldati che decidono di offrire (vana) resistenza all’avanzata dei rostri nemici. Nelle scene collettive di (II), pertanto, prevalgono comportamenti irrazionali dettati dalla confusione o dalla paura: i soldati dei vv. 647–652 rovesciano la nave dopo che l’impeto della lotta (*nimum pugnax* è definito quest’equipaggio al v. 647) li ha portati ad ammassarsi incautamente su un fianco, concentrando quindi il peso in un unico punto⁴¹, mentre quelli dei vv. 662 ss., proprio per la paura che la nave affondi, impediscono in modo risoluto ma senza dubbio efferato⁴² ai compagni di salire a bordo. In (V) prevale nettamente la disperazione: i soldati non hanno altro che se stessi come puro oggetto da impiegare contro i nemici (come peso che trascina sul fondo o inutile ostacolo ai rostri), in ciò confermando la reificazione progressiva a cui soggiacciono gli esseri umani coinvolti nel conflitto. Nell’episodio centrale di entrambe, sia il naufrago trafitto dai due rostri che il focese esperto subacqueo sono più che altro vittime di circostanze casuali quando non beffarde (evidentemente i piloti delle navi non si avvedono del naufrago in rotta di collisione, mentre il focese, abile nel far annegare i nemici, è travolto da una chiglia giusto al momento di risalire in superficie).

⁴⁰ Per i naufraghi «non perdere letum / maxima cura fuit» (706–707); Tirreno è indubitabilmente assertivo coi compagni quando ordina «me quoque mittendis rectum componite telis» (717); il padre di Argo «festinantem animam morti non credidit uni» (751). Tutte le espressioni verbali indicano una solida volontà nella scelta operata.

⁴¹ Cfr. 648–649: «incumbit prono lateri vacuumque relinquit, / qua caret hoste, ratem...».

⁴² È il commento di Lucano stesso al v. 666: «*inpia turba super medios ferit ense lacertos*».

Nella sequenza III vediamo navi trasformate in riserve di proiettili (remi, aplustri, pezzi interi delle fiancate)⁴³, ma tale destino tocca anche ai soldati (ancora vivi o già morti) da cui si recuperano i dardi, con una sovrapposizione funzionale tra animato e inanimato volutamente paradossale: se in (I) e (II) abbiamo visto corpi mutilati, in (III) la mutilazione di fatto riguarda nel navi stesse, laddove i soldati diventano improvvisate rastrelliere a cui ricorrere per trovare nuovi dardi da scagliare⁴⁴. Appena più realistica, per quanto ugualmente umiliante per i protagonisti, è l'immagine in (IV) dei naufraghi, ormai impossibilitati a combattere, che si sbracciano per recuperare i dardi dall'acqua e lanciarli ai compagni. Si tratta di nuovo di azioni dettate dalla pura disperazione, poiché siamo autorizzati a chiederci se uomini allo stremo delle forze riusciranno davvero a rilanciare ai compagni le armi o se le armi scagliate da combattenti moribondi potranno centrare un bersaglio in modo efficace (restando inteso che la destrezza nel divellere giavellotti da corpi che colano a picco o la capacità di frenare le proprie emorragie fino a lancio avvenuto mantengono accesi i toni di paradossalità anche in questa sezione).

Si può pertanto concludere che, anche nelle scene individuali e collettive aventi come protagonisti soldati anonimi, il modulo descrittivo trafittura–mutilazione–annegamento si ripropone con modalità senza dubbio variegata: il poeta riesce quindi a dispiegare un animato e terrificante campionario di *außergewöhnliche Todesfälle*⁴⁵.

3. SINTASSI DELLA DISTRUZIONE

Nella descrizione di questa battaglia, anche le scelte nella collocazione dei vocaboli sono funzionali alla resa plastica degli orrendi smembramenti in corso. Si tratta, evidentemente, di procedimenti stilistici applicati in tutto il poema, ma che in questa sezione specifica trovano a mio parere una funzionalità ancor più marcata proprio in ragione dell'elevatissimo numero di immagini di distruzione somatica che Lucano concentra nei suoi versi. Senza quindi giustificare l'impiego massiccio di iperbati, chiasmi ed *enjambements* come mero *ornatus* retorico, né tuttavia volendo cercare valori espressivi equipollenti tra loro in tutti i casi in cui questi costrutti compaiono, mi limito ad osservare che, nei momenti culminanti della mattanza marsigliese, anche i legami tra le parole, in certo modo, si 'rompono' e le parole stesse si rimescolano, con la più ampia

⁴³ Cfr. 671b–674a: «...remum contorsit in hostem / alter, at hi totum validis aplustre lacertis / avolsasque rotant expulso remige sedes. / In pugnam fregere rates...».

⁴⁴ Cfr. 674b–677a: «...sidentia pessum / corpora caesa tenent spoliantque cadavera ferro / multi inopes teli iaculum letale revolsum / volneribus traxere suis...».

⁴⁵ Cfr. AMBÜHL 2015: 257.

varietà di esiti⁴⁶. Si consideri del resto che le tre figure retoriche di posizione ora citate hanno, nella propria struttura, un'interessante e produttiva ambiguità: l'iperbato *rompe* l'ordine logico delle parole e allo stesso tempo può creare 'anelli' in forza dei quali una parola si trova per così dire conficcata in mezzo ad altre due tra loro correlate, traendo nuova carica semantica proprio da questo incastro; il chiasmo (anche se in sede di passi analizzati preferirò parlare di 'coloritura' chiastica, ma cfr. *infra*) allo stesso tempo *allontana* tra loro i termini ai propri estremi e *avvicina* i termini medi; l'*enjambement* separa (o se si vuole *spezza*) visivamente un verso dall'altro con svariati effetti di tensione, ma proprio perché il senso logico del primo verso resta sospeso senza il secondo, chi legge è obbligato a *legarli* concettualmente⁴⁷. Tutte queste caratteristiche tornano utili a Lucano nella narrazione della carneficina marsigliese: in alcuni episodi, una volta accertato che non è la mera necessità metrica a generare le figure retoriche anzidette, si può verificare come la frantumazione dei sintagmi ricalchi la frantumazione somatica che viene descritta. È del resto il λόγος-parola che riproduce il disordine del λόγος-mondo: come i corpi si smembrano e si confondono, così la voce del poeta rompe e/o rimescola l'ordine dei vocaboli per farli aderire alla materialità della situazione in oggetto⁴⁸.

Sulla base dell'analisi da me condotta, credo possano isolarsi alcuni casi degni di attenzione⁴⁹. Va da sé che Lucano non si limita all'impiego di una sola tipologia di figura retorica nelle singole scene, la qual cosa, all'atto dell'analisi,

⁴⁶ Cfr. BARTSCH 1997: 25: «[B]ut to destroy normative syntax is in some measure to enact the abjection that pervades civil war, to show oneself as corrupted by chaos as the world one describes».

⁴⁷ Non entro del merito di ulteriori distinzioni all'interno delle figure retoriche citate e rimando a CONRAD 1965 (iperbato ed *enjambement*), LAUSBERG 1998: 318–319 (iperbato), 354–357 (*commutatio* i.e. chiasmo) e KOLLMANN 1982 (*enjambement*). Sull'uso dell'*enjambement* in Lucano è poi imprescindibile il contributo di HOLGADO REDONDO 1977, che offre una panoramica esaustiva sull'impiego di questa figura retorica e conferma in Lucano essa presenti «la perfecta correspondencia [...] entre forma y contenido» (p. 220). La grande duttilità dell'*enjambement* è dimostrata dallo studioso attraverso il ricorso a varie categorie classificatorie ('encabalgamientos convulsivos', 'disruptivos', 'ingentivos' ecc.) che dimostrano come la medesima figura retorica possa prestarsi a più curvature semantiche (cfr. in particolare le riflessioni di pp. 232–233 e 255–256). Le ricognizioni toccano spesso la battaglia di Marsiglia, a proposito della quale si osserva tra l'altro che è «orlada de abundantes encabalgamientos para la descripción de luchas, choques, convulsiones violentas» (p. 225) e che «los encabalgamientos van subrayando los puntos de mayor patetismo y más sangrientos en las muertes de Cato, Telón, Giareo, Lícidas, Tirreno, Argo» (p. 226).

⁴⁸ MOST (1992: 407–408) opportunamente nota che in greco antico e in latino ci si serve degli stessi termini sia per definire le parti del corpo che singoli elementi retorici, grammaticali e metrici: coerentemente con ciò, pertanto, vediamo in Lucano che l'amputazione fisica si accompagna allo smembramento delle parti del discorso.

⁴⁹ I limiti del presente lavoro non mi consentono di indagare se e in che misura, quantitativa e qualitativa, queste figure retoriche prevalgano nella naumachia marsigliese rispetto ad altri episodi bellici del poema come la rievocazione delle guerre tra Mario e Silla (libro II) o la battaglia di Farsalo (libro VII): si tratta certamente di un'ipotesi di lavoro meritevole di futuri sviluppi.

rischierebbe di spezzettare eccessivamente le scene medesime sotto lemmi diversi. Per tal motivo, ho deciso di raggruppare i passi esaminati in base a due tipi di occorrenza (iperbato/chiasmo da una parte, *enjambement* dall'altra) con l'avviso che, solo per esigenze di completezza, potrà accadere che si segnalino anche *enjambements* nel primo gruppo o iperbati nel secondo.

3.1. *Iperbato con foro d'entrata (o punto di rottura) e 'coloritura' chiastica*

La definizione proposta, a sua volta metaforica, si riferisce a casi in cui i componenti del sintagma finiscono disposti attorno ad una preposizione che sembra costituire la trasposizione sulla pagina del foro d'entrata dell'arma responsabile della morte del soldato⁵⁰.

Se prendiamo ad esempio la morte di Cato, possiamo osservare quanto segue (vv. 585–590):

cuius dum pugnat ab alta
puppe Catus Graiumque audax aplustre retentat,
terga simul pariter missis et pectora telis
transigitur: medio concurrat pectore ferrum,
et stetit incertus, fluere quo vulnere, sanguis,
donec utrasque simul largus cruor expulit hastas

Se già potremmo ritenere significativo, ai fini della resa del corpo trafitto, l'iperbato *medio [...] pectore* che viene 'attraversato' da *concurrat* (v. 588), ancora più interessante è il fenomeno che si verifica nel verso successivo, dove il sintagma *incertus sanguis* si 'apre' per ospitare al suo interno un'interrogativa indiretta, la quale a sua volta presenta l'iperbato *fluere quo vulnere*, in forza del quale la parola monosillabica funziona come 'foro d'entrata' degli iperbati concentrici, trovandosi esattamente al centro del gruppo di cinque parole⁵¹. Invertendo la prospettiva di lettura, è come se a partire da *quo* si allargassero i margini di una ferita⁵².

⁵⁰ Si tratta evidentemente di una linea di tendenza, giacché al v. 620 c'è un ben più lungo participio a rompere il sintagma con cui si trova inserito: l'anonimo gemello offre il corpo indifeso ai dardi nemici e «crebra confixus cuspidē perstat». Al di là dell'efficace allitterazione della consonante, il participio *confixus* va esattamente a 'trafiggere' l'ablativo *crebra cuspidē* in modo che la disposizione stessa delle parole vada a significare l'azione che esse esprimono. Al v. 725, allorché Argo viene colpito da Tirreno, vediamo che il corpo del giovane si conficca sul ponte della nave: «adiuvitque suo procumbens pondere ferrum». In questo caso il participio *procumbens*, inserito nel sintagma *suo [...] pondere* e collocato esattamente al centro dell'esametro, mi pare portare all'occhio del lettore il momento dell'incastarsi definitivo e senza rimedio del corpo di Argo.

⁵¹ Il fatto che l'aggettivo interrogativo sia posposto rispetto al verbo di pertinenza può inoltre intensificare la sequenza quasi al rallentatore del sangue che indugia nel suo sgorgare, per la quale Lucano è debitore a plurime scene senecane (cfr. HUNINK 1992: 276).

⁵² E pur in assenza del 'punto di rottura', anche l'ordine delle parole di «utrasque [...] largus cruor [...] hastas» risulta significativo: propriamente ci troviamo in presenza di un ulteriore forte iperbato che, mimando l'azione del fiotto di sangue che spinge ambo i dardi fuori dal corpo di

Una situazione analoga si verifica nel caso della morte di Ghiareo (vv. 600–602):

dum cupit in sociam Gyareus erepere puppem,
excipit inmissum suspensa per ilia ferrum
adfixusque rati telo retinente pendit.

Come il soldato ‘invade’ il sintagma riferito alla nave alleata (v. 600, *in sociam Gyareus [...] puppem*)⁵³, così la sintassi riferita alla sua orribile morte presenta un ricercato smembramento: l’oggetto contundente sta agli estremi (v. 601, *inmissum [...] ferrum*), mentre la parte del corpo offesa si trova al centro (*suspensa [...] ilia*). Questo nuovo iperbato con coloritura chiasmica⁵⁴ avvisa anzitutto il lettore dell’improvvisa immobilità cui è costretto Ghiareo (*inmissum, suspensa*), e grazie all’anastrofe *suspensa per*, la preposizione si trova al centro della serie di vocaboli, rendendo anche in questo caso più ‘visibile’ il foro d’entrata del proiettile che ha trafitto il giovane⁵⁵, laddove il vocabolo *telo* esattamente al centro del verso successivo sembra davvero ‘inchiodare’ su di sé le parole *adfixus* e *pendit*,

Cato, ‘espelle’ le parole agli estremi del verso. Vedrei tuttavia anche una sorta di coloritura chiasmica nel momento in cui, pur senza corrispondenza simmetrica tra coppie aggettivo-sostantivo, è comunque presente una simmetria accusativo-nominativo / nominativo-accusativo. In tal modo credo si sottolinei ulteriormente l’idea di un insieme coeso che viene spezzato proprio al centro e vede le sue parti crollare in tutte le direzioni: sangue e dardi sono espulsi dalla parte del petto e della schiena (AB-BA).

⁵³ La scena sarebbe evocata ancor più incisivamente accettando *erumpere* al posto di *erepere*, poiché il verbo indicherebbe proprio l’intromissione violenta di Ghiareo (sulla lezione accolta a testo cfr. HUNINK 1992: 229).

⁵⁴ Così intendo la simmetria tra le coppie di neutri.

⁵⁵ Le suggestioni ovidiane già pertinentemente evidenziate da PERILLI (2019) possono pertanto approfondirsi ulteriormente alla luce di quest’uso peculiare delle figure di posizione da parte di Lucano: in *Met.* XII 331, durante la battaglia tra Centauri e Lapiti, Piritoo trafugge alle costole Petreo che è sul punto di sradicare una quercia: «pectora cum duro luctantia robore fixit»: l’iperbato *pectora [...] luctantia* che si incrocia con *cum duro [...] robore* esprime bene l’avvinghiarsi del corpo di Petreo al tronco, e il verbo *fixit* a chiudere il verso evoca efficacemente il colpo che blocca il personaggio nell’azione appena descritta. Un esempio di monosillabo che funziona come ‘foro d’entrata’ potrebbe poi forse rinvenirsi al v. 387, dove è il narratore stesso della battaglia, Nestore, a ricordare di aver scagliato una lancia contro Dorila il quale, per proteggersi la fronte, si era fatto schermo con la mano che era stata perciò trafitta: «adfixa est cum fronte manus». La preposizione è proprio al centro dell’emistichio e sembra indicare il punto di trafittura della *adfixa manus*, sintagma che occupa gli estremi, a ricordo evidentemente della mano completamente aperta di Dorila nell’atto di difendersi. Notevole è poi il caso di *Met.* III 67, che ispira a Lucano ben due immagini: nella scena del giavellotto di Cadmo che trafugge il serpente leggiamo: «constitit et totum descendit in ilia ferrum». Rispetto a Ghiareo, il ‘foro d’entrata’ è forse meno perspicuo perché l’iperbato *totum [...] ferrum* accoglie al suo interno una sequenza regolare senza anastrofe; su questo verso è tuttavia modellato anche il dettaglio del dardo di Tirreno che trafugge Argo al basso ventre (cfr. III 725: «qua iam non medius descendit in ilia venter»). In questo caso la sequenza *descendit in ilia* è ripetuta in modo identico, mentre *ferrum* è sostituito da *venter*, verificandosi in ogni caso l’iperbato con l’aggettivo *medius*.

riproducendo l'esatta successione di quanto avviene al soldato⁵⁶. Questo addensamento di figure di posizione giocate sulla sovversione dell'ordine logico è, come si vede, del tutto coerente con le scene oggetto della narrazione.

Anche la lunga sequenza del sacrificio del gemello anonimo accoglie al suo interno questo espediente: quando il giovane perde la mano destra, lotta disperatamente con la sinistra pur tentando di recuperare l'altra caduta in mare. Alla fine, tuttavia, anche la sinistra è perduta irrimediabilmente: «haec quoque cum toto manus est abscisa lacerto» (v. 617). Si noti pure in questo caso l'iperbato *toto [...] lacerto* che presenta al suo interno l'anastrofe che colloca il verbo *est* al centro, non proprio come foro d'entrata, ma certamente come punto di taglio della lama che stacca definitivamente la mano e il braccio dal corpo (come del resto *manus* si trova al di qua di *est*, mentre *abscisa lacerto* chiude l'esametro).

L'agghiacciante morte di Licida, nella quale si susseguono trafittura e amputazione, mi pare interessante per l'espansione progressiva dei sintagmi che produce una sorta di sinergia tra chiasmo ed *enjambement* e travalica la misura del verso con studiati effetti espressivi (vv. 639–641):

(sanguis) lentus ruptis cadit undique venis,
discursusque animae diversa in membra meantis
interceptus aquis.

Se un primo iperbato, di efficacia a questo punto intuitiva come *ruptis [...] venis*, riproduce esattamente lo spezzarsi dei vasi sanguigni del giovane, la situazione si arricchisce appena sotto: nell'anastrofe *diversa in membra* l'inversione dell'ordine dei vocaboli equivale all'innaturale divellersi del corpo di Licida, mentre la conseguente diffusione del sangue in mare viene suggerita da *animae meantis*, che va a formare un iperbato a coloritura chiasmica⁵⁷ con *diversa membra*: il fluido vitale 'si allarga' sulla pagina lucanea e la preposizione *in* sembra qui evocare il punto di rottura del corpo del giovane. A rafforzare il tutto, Lucano colloca fa terminare la proposizione nel verso successivo (*discursusque [...] interceptus*), cosicché anche il 'dilagare' della frase corrisponde al disperdersi del fluido vitale del marinaio.

Per quanto concerne l'anonimo trafitto da due rostri, gli espedienti retorici non sono meno eloquenti (vv. 652–657a):

tunc unica diri
conspecta est leti facies, cum forte natantem
diversae rostris iuvenem fixere carinae.
Discessit medium tam vastos pectus ad ictus,
nec prohibere valent obtritis ossibus artus
quo minus aera sonent;

⁵⁶ Il quale rimane appeso alla nave come macabro trofeo di guerra (cfr. PERILLI 2019: 99) in ciò anticipando le successive reificazioni dei soldati coinvolti nella battaglia.

⁵⁷ Genitivo-accusativo / accusativo-genitivo.

Già i forti *enjambements*, con una distanza piuttosto marcata dei loro elementi costitutivi (652–653: *diri* [...] *leti*; 653–654: *natantem* [...] *iuvenem*)⁵⁸, mi paiono anticipare lo squartamento che inizia subito dopo; l'iperbato *diversae* [...] *carinae* colloca i termini agli estremi di un verso al centro del quale sta proprio il termine *iuvenem*, a rappresentare esattamente la rotta di collisione delle navi che convergono verso lo sventurato naufrago; trattandosi poi di una situazione estrema, per non dire inverosimile (un corpo trafitto e squartato da *due* rostri provenienti da direzioni diverse), la disposizione delle parole del v. 655 ne risente di conseguenza: gli iperbatì presenti nel testo sono infatti due (*medium* [...] *pectus*, *vastos* [...] *ad ictus*) e per giunta si incrociano tra loro, cosicché *medium* [...] *pectus* e di fatto 'aperto' dall'aggettivo *vastos*, situazione che poi si rovescia, pur non mutando di segno, poiché nel secondo emistichio è il *pectus* del giovane che va a squarciare il sintagma *vastos ad ictus*. In tal modo, inoltre, la preposizione *ad* finisce per costituire un nuovo foro d'entrata, ma tra termini appartenenti a sintagmi diversi, rendendo ancora più stringente il rapporto tra la smisurata potenza del colpo dei rostri e il corpo devastato del giovane⁵⁹.

3.2. *Enjambement di taglio/amputazione*

Detto che l'uso insistito dell'*enjambement* in Lucano è segno di una ribollente volontà espressiva tale da esondare spesso oltre la misura dell'esametro, ci sono alcuni casi in cui la separazione di un sintagma tra la fine di un verso e l'inizio del successivo corrisponde esattamente al momento dell'amputazione delle membra dei soldati impegnati in battaglia o allo sgorgare del sangue che erompe da una ferita aperta.

Possiamo verificare il fenomeno considerando l'entrata in azione del gemello anonimo (vv. 609–612):

quorum alter mixtis obliquo pectine remis
ausus Romanae Graia de puppe carinae
iniectare manum; sed eam gravis insuper ictus
amputat.

L'azione del gemello, per essere compresa, obbliga il lettore a 'legare' *ausus* del v. 610 con *iniectare* del verso successivo, ma subito dopo interviene la circostanza esattamente inversa, poiché l'amputazione della mano è resa ancora più

⁵⁸ Sorge poi in questo caso a mio giudizio l'impressione di una situazione mista iperbato / *enjambement*, a riprova che il rimescolamento di posizione dei termini *dentro* e *tra* i versi esplicita ulteriormente la crisi del λόγος a tutti i livelli.

⁵⁹ Il prolungarsi di questo strazio è inoltre ben espresso dagli omoteleuti e dal σιγματισμός del verso successivo («obtritis ossibus artus») che fanno riecheggiare in qualche modo la cupa sonorità del precedente.

perspicua dall'*enjambement* dei vv. 611–612 (*ictus / amputat*), con l'uso peraltro di un verbo più frequente in prosa che in poesia⁶⁰.

Altri momenti della disperata impresa del giovane presentano questo procedimento: ai vv. 622–625 il gemello ormai allo stremo delle forze decide di gettarsi sul ponte nemico:

...tum volnere multo
effugientem animam lassos collegit in artus
membraque contendit toto, quicumque manebat,
sanguine...

Tra i vv. 622 e 623 l'*enjambement* mi pare esprimere efficacemente la fuoriuscita ormai inarrestabile del sangue dalle innumerevoli ferite del corpo del soldato, grazie in particolare all'arco creato tra l'ablativo di allontanamento/separazione *multo*, che non lascia più dubbi sull'entità delle emorragie, e il participio *effugientem*, nel quale il preverbo *ex-* conferma lo svuotamento di energia vitale di cui il soldato è vittima⁶¹.

L'episodio di Licida visto poco sopra consente ulteriori osservazioni sull'impiego dell'*enjambement* (vv. 636–643):

Mersus foret ille profundo,
sed prohibent socii suspensaue crura retentant.
Scinditur avolsus, nec, sicut volnere, sanguis
emicuit...
...nullius vita perempti
est tanta dimissa via. Pars ultima trunci
tradidit in letum vacuos vitalibus artus

⁶⁰ HUNINK (1992: 232) parla di una «striking, harsh word». Coerente con questo dettaglio della descrizione è l'iperbato al v. 616: «rapturusque **suam** procumbit in aequora **dextram**»: lo sforzo disperato di tentare il recupero della mano caduta in mare è ben reso dalla distanza tra il possessivo e il sostantivo.

⁶¹ In merito a questa sequenza, vorrei vedere peraltro una sorta di campo oppositivo costituito dall'iperbato «lassos collegit in artus» e dall'*enjambement* «toto, quicumque manebat, / sanguine»: in questi due casi, se da un lato i termini distanziati *lassos* [...] *artus* e *toto* [...] *sanguine* vanno a ribadire la disgregazione fisica del guerriero, dall'altro Lucano inserisce negli spazi così creati altre parole che indicano al contrario tutto lo sforzo compiuto da giovane per restare in vita, come se alla forza centrifuga delle due figure retoriche se ne opponesse una centripeta. Ecco quindi che il verbo *collegit*, in forza anche del preverbo *cum-*, portatore dell'idea di un'azione compiuta nel modo più completo possibile, ci dice del tentativo del gemello di trattenere la forza vitale entro un corpo ormai condannato; allo stesso modo, l'arco sintattico che separa *toto* e *sanguine* potrebbe ribadire l'immagine dell'anima *effugiens* dei versi precedenti, ma la presenza della relativa infinita *quicumque manebat* stavolta evidenzia che il gemello sta cercando ovunque dentro di sé la forza sufficiente per vivere ancora quel tanto da poter nuocere ai nemici come proiettile umano, idea a mio parere confermata dall'allitterazione di *contendit* in cesura con *toto* subito dopo (cfr. HUNINK 1992: 232: «[T]he fighter strains his weakened limbs by contracting all that is left of his blood into them»).

A parte l'espressivo iperbato⁶² del v. 637 («prohibent [...] suspensaque crura retentant») in cui vediamo i verbi agli estremi che 'tirano' i *crura* di Licida, a significare uno sforzo disperato dei compagni per trattenere in qualche modo il giovane sulla nave, la violenza dello strappo mi pare evidenziata anzitutto da *sanguis / emicuit*, che realizza una sorta di primo piano sul punto esatto di rottura del corpo, laddove lo sguardo appena più allargato su entrambi i tronconi abbandonati ai flutti mostra un altro *enjambement* («pars ultima trunci / tradidit»): in entrambi i casi vediamo realizzata anche sulla pagina l'idea macabra e spettacolare di una frantumazione somatica con successiva caduta dello sventurato cadavere (il tutto certamente rafforzato anche dalla collocazione del sintagma *vita est dimissa* su due versi separati, con studiato allontanamento reciproco di tutti e tre i vocaboli)⁶³.

Anche la sequenza dell'anonimo trafitto può essere riconsiderata alla luce dell'impiego dell'*enjambement* (vv. 657–661):

eliso ventre per ora
eiecat saniem permixtus viscere sanguis.
Postquam inhihent remis puppes ac rostra reducunt,
deiectum in pelagus perfosso pectore corpus
volneribus transmisit aquas...

L'espulsione delle viscere e del fluido vitale dal ventre è ben espressa dalla spezzatura tra 657 e 658 (*per ora [...] eiecat*), mentre il *corpus* ormai abbandonato ai flutti⁶⁴ 'pende' alla fine del verso per completare la propria azione con *volneribus trasmisit* al verso successivo.

Per quanto riguarda il proiettile di Ligdamo che colpisce al capo Tirreno, possiamo osservare quanto segue (vv. 712–714):

sedibus expulsi, postquam cruor omnia rupit
vincula, procurrunt oculi; stat lumine raptō
attonitus mortisque illas putat esse tenebras.

Per sottolineare il macabro *frame* degli occhi che schizzano via dalla testa, il poeta ricorre al fortissimo *enjambement* su due versi «expulsi [...] procurrunt oculi», nonché a *rupit / vincula*, grazie al quale vediamo meglio l'esatto momento di separazione degli occhi dai nervi e dalle vene⁶⁵. L'improvvisa sparizione

⁶² Anche in questo caso con coloritura chiastica: collocando al centro gli accusativi *suspensa crura* non si evidenzia solo l'azione dei verbi, ma si evoca anche l'immagine del corpo che viene tirato in due direzioni.

⁶³ Cfr. HUNINK (1992: 238) per i problemi di punteggiatura di questo verso.

⁶⁴ Si noti la coloritura chiastica «deiectum [...] perfosso pectore corpus», in forza del quale è stavolta l'intero ablativo assoluto centrale a trafiggere il sintagma posto ai lati (del resto *due* rostri e non uno solo hanno colpito il marinaio).

⁶⁵ Seguo RIPOLL (2016: 260) nel breve richiamo a Ovidio, sempre in merito alla battaglia tra Centauri e Lapiti di *Met.* XII, dove l'immagine degli occhi che schizzano fuori dalle orbite è nel

della luce (quindi l'interruzione della facoltà visiva) è evidenziata dall'altro *en-jambement* «stat lumine raptō / attonitus» in cui la pausa (nonché, direi, la caduta) tra il participio e l'aggettivo rende inequivocabile l'immobilità improvvisa e stupefatta del personaggio.

L'analisi sin qui condotta mi pare pertanto evidenziare come l'episodio marsigliense serva a Lucano per spettacolarizzare tutta la negatività che egli rileva nelle guerre civili: la dignità del guerriero epico si disperde in una serie di sequenze che arrivano al limite di ridicolizzare l'eroismo dei soldati, vittime di un disfaccimento storico e cosmico che travolge i piani narrativi e quelli sintattici della descrizione. Sotto la spinta del *furor*, ogni aspetto del reale è destinato a collassare.

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano

giuseppe.bocchi@unicatt.it

ORCID:0000-0002-8476-0722

BIBLIOGRAFIA

- AMBÜHL 2015: A. AMBÜHL, *Krieg und Bürgerkrieg bei Lucan und in der griechischen Literatur. Studien zur Rezeption der attischen Tragödie und der hellenistischen Dichtung im Bellum Civile*, Berlin 2015.
- ASSO 2011: P. ASSO (a cura di), *Brill's Companion to Lucan*, Leiden 2011.
- BARTSCH 1997: S. BARTSCH, *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*, Cambridge, MA–London 1997.
- BATTISTELLA, FUCECCHI 2019: C. BATTISTELLA, M. FUCECCHI (a cura di), *Dopo Ovidio. Aspetti dell'evoluzione del sistema letterario nella Roma imperiale (e oltre)*, Milano–Udine 2019.
- BOCCHI 2011: G. BOCCHI, *Philosophia medica e medicina rhetorica in Seneca: la scuola Pneumatica, l'ira, la melancolia*, Milano 2011.
- BRIGUGLIO 2019: S. BRIGUGLIO, *Mira loquor: lo spettacolo (ovidiano) della guerra e l'estetica della morte nella Tebaide di Stazio*, in: BATTISTELLA, FUCECCHI 2019, pp. 115–131.
- CALONNE 2010: N. CALONNE, *Cadaver dans le Bellum Civile*, in: DEVILLERS, FRANCHET D'ESPÉREY 2010, pp. 215–223.
- CANOBBIO 2013: A. CANOBBIO, *Rupto foedere regni: il proemio di Lucano e le Phoenissae di Seneca*, *Athenaeum* CI 2013, pp. 555–567.
- CASTAGNA, VOGT-SPIRA 2002: L. CASTAGNA, G. VOGT-SPIRA (a cura di), *Pervertere: Ästhetik der Verkehrung. Literatur und Kultur neronischer Zeit und ihre Rezeption*, München–Leipzig 2002.
- CHIESA 2005: G. CHIESA, *La rappresentazione del corpo nel 'Bellum Civile' di Lucano*, *ACME* LVIII 2005, pp. 3–43.

Sulmonese ripresa due volte a breve distanza: ai vv. 245 ss. Amico fracassa la testa a Celadonte e nel testo leggiamo espressamente *exsiluere oculi* (252). Poco sotto, Essadio trafigge Grineo con delle corna di cervo appese come dono votivo ad un pino e di nuovo il poeta si sofferma sul dettaglio degli occhi cavati fuori (269: *eruitur oculos*). Va poi osservato che in entrambe queste sequenze le armi impiegate sono non convenzionali (Amico si serve di un candelabro, Essadio addirittura di un manufatto di origine animale). Se quindi è acclarato che Lucano sia debitore a Ovidio per queste bizzarrie che caratterizzano lo scontro armato, il poeta augusteo in nessuno dei due casi citati ricorre all'iperbato per significare ulteriormente il distacco degli occhi dalla testa.

- COLISH 1985: M.L. COLISH, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, vol. I: *Stoicism in Classical Latin Literature*, Leiden 1985.
- CONRAD 1965: C. CONRAD, *Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil*, HSCPh LXIX 1965, pp. 195–258.
- D'ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007: F. D'ALESSANDRO BEHR, *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion*, Columbus 2007.
- DAY 2013: H.J.M. DAY, *Lucan and the Sublime*, Cambridge 2013.
- DEVILLERS, FRANCHET D'ESPÉREY 2010: O. DEVILLERS, S. FRANCHET D'ESPÉREY (a cura di), *Lucaïn en débat. Rhétorique, Poétique et Histoire. Actes du Colloque international, Institut Ausonius (Pessac, 12–14 juin 2008)*, Bordeaux 2010.
- DINTER 2012: M. DINTER, *Anatomizing Civil War: Studies in Lucan's Epic Technique*, Ann Arbor 2012.
- DUE 1970: O.S. DUE, *Lucaïn et la philosophie*, in: M. DURRY (a cura di), *Lucaïn. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, Vandœuvres–Genève 1970 (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 15), pp. 203–232.
- ESPOSITO 1987: P. ESPOSITO, *Il racconto della strage. Le battaglie nella Pharsalia*, Napoli 1987.
- ESTÈVES 2010a: A. ESTÈVES, *Horrida bella de l'Énéide, mortes insolitae de la Pharsale: des ébauches virgiliennes à la débauche lucanienne, étude d'une filiation poétique dans l'écriture de l'horreur guerrière*, Mosaïque III 2010, pp. 67–86, URL https://revuemosaïque.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/3-4_esteves.pdf (ultima consultazione in data 7/7/2020).
- 2010b: A. ESTÈVES, *Les têtes coupées dans le Bellum ciuile de Lucaïn: des guerres civiles placées sous l'emblème de Méduse*, in: DEVILLERS, FRANCHET D'ESPÉREY 2010, pp. 203–213.
- FILLION-LAHILLE 1984: J. FILLION-LAHILLE, *Le De ira de Sénèque et la théorie stoïcienne des passions*, Paris 1984.
- GALTIER, POIGNAULT 2016: F. GALTIER, R. POIGNAULT (a cura di), *Présence de Lucaïn*, Clermont-Ferrand 2016.
- GORMAN 2001: V.B. GORMAN, *Lucan's Epic 'Aristeia' and the Hero of the 'Bellum Civile'*, CJ XCVI 2001, pp. 263–290.
- HARRISON 1972: E.B. HARRISON, *The South Frieze of the Nike Temple and the Marathon Painting in the Painted Stoa*, AJA LXXVI 1972, pp. 353–378.
- HENDERSON 1987: J. HENDERSON, *Lucan: The Word at War*, Ramus XVI 1987, pp. 122–164.
- HOLGADO REDONDO 1977: A. HOLGADO REDONDO, *El encabalgamiento versal y su tipología en la Farsalia de Lucano*, Cuadernos de Filología Clásica XIII 1977, pp. 213–267.
- HUNINK 1992: V. HUNINK, *M. Annaeus Lucanus: Bellum Civile Book III. A Commentary*, Amsterdam 1992.
- JOHNSON 1987: W.R. JOHNSON, *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes*, Ithaca–London 1987.
- JOLIVET 2013: J.-C. JOLIVET, *Caesar, Lucan and the Massilian Marathonomachia*, in: J. FARRELL, D.P. NELIS (a cura di), *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, Oxford 2013, pp. 146–160.
- KOLLMANN 1982: E.D. KOLLMANN, *Zum Enjambement in der lateinischer Hexameterdichtung*, RhM CXXV 1982, pp. 117–134.
- LAPIDGE 1979: M. LAPIDGE, *Lucan's Imagery of Cosmic Dissolution*, Hermes CVII 1979, pp. 344–370.
- LAUSBERG 1998: H. LAUSBERG, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, München² 1973 [trad. inglese a cura di D.E. ORTON, R.D. ANDERSON: *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, Leiden 1998].
- LEIGH 1997: M. LEIGH, *Lucan. Spectacle and Engagement*, Oxford 1997.
- 2010: M. LEIGH, *'César coup de foudre': la signification d'un symbole chez Lucaïn*, in: DEVILLERS, FRANCHET D'ESPÉREY 2010, pp. 159–165.
- LÉVI 2006: N. LÉVI, *La Pharsale de Lucaïn: un monde sans providence?*, BAGB 2006, fasc. 2, pp. 70–91.
- MASTERS 1992: J. MASTERS, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, Cambridge 1992.
- MEBANE 2016: J. MEBANE, *Pompey's Head and the Body Politic in Lucan's De bello civili*, TAPhA CXLVI 2016, pp. 191–215.

- METZGER 1957: W. METZGER, *Kampf und Tod in Lucans Pharsalia*, Kiel 1957 [= RUTZ 1970, pp. 423–438].
- MORETTI 1985: G. MORETTI, *Truncus ed altro: appunti sull'immaginario filosofico e scientifico-didascalico nella Pharsalia*, Maia XXXVII 1985, pp. 135–144.
- MOST 1992: G.W. MOST, *Disiecti membra poetae: The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry*, in: R. HEXTER, D. SELDEN (a cura di), *Innovations of Antiquity*, New York–London 1992, pp. 391–419.
- MYERS 2011: M.Y. MYERS, *Lucan's Poetic Geographies: Center and Periphery in Civil War Epic*, in: Asso 2011, pp. 399–415.
- NARDUCCI 1979: E. NARDUCCI, *La provvidenza crudele. Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei*, Pisa 1979.
- 2002: E. NARDUCCI, *Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero*, Roma–Bari 2002.
- OPELT 1957: I. OPELT, *Die Seeschlacht vor Massilia bei Lucan*, Hermes LXXXV 1957, pp. 435–445.
- PERILLI 2018: M.M. PERILLI, *Le armi improprie di Sceva. Suggestioni dalla Centauromachia ovidiana in Lucano (VI 169–179)*, Maia LXX 2018, pp. 300–311.
- 2019: M.M. PERILLI, *Le armi e la morte: elementi ovidiani nella battaglia di Marsiglia (Lucan. 3, 509 ss.)*, in: BATTISTELLA, FUCECCHI 2019, pp. 95–113.
- PHILLIPS 1968: O.C. PHILLIPS, *Lucan's Grove*, CPh LXIII 1968, pp. 296–300.
- QUINT 1993: D. QUINT, *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*, Princeton 1993.
- RADICKE 2004: J. RADICKE, *Lucans poetische Technik. Studien zum historischen Epos*, Leiden 2004.
- RIPOLL 2016: F. RIPOLL, *La mutilation oculaire: formes et sens d'un motif guerrier de la Pharsale aux épopées flaviennes*, in: GALTIER, POIGNAULT 2016, pp. 259–280.
- ROWLAND 1969: R.J. ROWLAND, JR., *The Significance of Massilia in Lucan*, Hermes XCVII 1969, pp. 204–208.
- RUTZ 1970: W. RUTZ (a cura di), *Lucan*, Darmstadt 1970 (Wege der Forschung 235).
- SALEMME 2002: C. SALEMME, *Lucano: la storia verso la rovina*, Napoli 2002.
- SCHOTES 1969: H.-A. SCHOTES, *Stoische Physik, Psychologie und Theologie bei Lucan*, Bonn 1969.
- SKLENÁŘ 1999: R. SKLENÁŘ, *Nihilistic Cosmology and Catonian Ethics in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, AJPh CXX 1999, pp. 281–296.
- 2003: R. SKLENÁŘ, *The Taste for Nothingness: A Study of Virtus and Related Themes in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, Ann Arbor 2003.
- SCHMITZ 1993: C. SCHMITZ, *Die kosmische Dimension in den Tragödien Senecas*, Berlin–New York 1993.
- STADELMAIER 2013: F. STADELMAIER, *Die Grenze des Wachstums. Endzeit in Senecas Medea und Lucans Pharsalia*, Appunti Romani di Filologia XV 2013, pp. 127–143.
- TOLA 2011: E. TOLA, *El cuerpo de Esceva y el cuerpo del texto en Lucano (B.C. 6.118–262): manifestaciones retórico-poéticas de la desintegración de la república*, in: A. SCHNIEBS (a cura di), *Discursos del cuerpo en Roma*, Buenos Aires 2011, pp. 67–87.
- 2016: E. TOLA, *Écrire l'histoire, redéfinir un genre: la déforestation du bois sacré au livre III, 399–452 du 'Bellum civile' de Lucain*, in: GALTIER, POIGNAULT 2016, pp. 197–209.
- UTARD 2016: R. UTARD, *Le combat naval devant Marseille au livre III du Bellum Civile de Lucain: écriture d'une scène entre tradition épique et innovation*, in: GALTIER, POIGNAULT 2016, pp. 179–195.
- VIZZOTTI 2010: M. VIZZOTTI, *Disolución universal y aglutinación discursiva en Lucano: corrupción y dispersión del cuerpo social e individual*, Myrtia XXV 2010, pp. 99–129.
- WALDE 2011: Ch. WALDE, *Lucan's Bellum Civile: A Specimen of a Roman 'Literature of Trauma'*, in: Asso 2011, pp. 283–302.
- ZEHNACKER 1988: H. ZEHNACKER, *Quelques méditations sur la guerre civile chez Sénèque et chez Lucain*, in: D. PORTE, J.-P. NÉRAUDAU (a cura di), *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec. Res Sacrae*, Bruxelles 1988, pp. 454–464.

BRIDEGROOM NILE AND BRIDE EGYPT
(PSI VII 845^r = XXXIX 1–11 HEITSCH = 43(A) PERALE)*

by

KRYSTYNA BARTOL

ABSTRACT: The article discusses some questions related to the interpretation of the hexametric poem preserved on the recto of PSI VII 845. An important issue here is the relationship between the fragment on the papyrus and the epithalamic literary tradition.

Αἰγύπτῳ Ζεῦ Νεῖλ'
(SH 604A = POWELL, CA, p. 237)

The theme of “the currents of the Nile, who floods the flats of Egypt” – to quote the famous beginning of Euripides’ *Helen*¹ – often appearing in Greek literature of all periods², has also its epithalamic treatment. The theme can be found in Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca*³ and in the anonymous hymn to the Nile⁴. A reference to the marriage of the Nile and Egypt occurs also in an epigram on Augustus’ victory at Actium⁵. There is one more text that expands our view of this motif’s employment in late Greek poetry, underestimated by scholars, as it seems. In what follows I will discuss this text and attempt to define the genre and the function of the hexametric composition.

In 1925 Medea NORSÄ published in the seventh volume of PSI⁶ the remnants of hexametric lines preserved on the recto and the verso of a sheet of a papyrus

* I would like to express my gratitude to Jakub PIŁOŃ for his comments that improved this paper in many ways.

¹ Eur. *Hel.* 1–3: Νείλου [...] ῥοαί, / ὅς [...] Αἰγύπτου πέδον / [...] ὑγραίνει.

² See the wide-ranging study by Helen TOD devoted to this subject, *Rewriting the Egyptian River: The Nile in Hellenistic and Imperial Greek Literature*, Oxford 2014 (<https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:ed3c2d53-f7d6-4208-8a4c-cb84b5c27854>).

³ XXVI 235.

⁴ See the Louvre hymn to the Nile (esp. lines 7–8) with a commentary by Raffaella CRIBIORE, *A Hymn to the Nile*, ZPE CVI 1995, pp. 97–106, esp. p. 102, and TOD, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 172–180.

⁵ SH 982, 9–10.

⁶ M. NORSÄ, *Frammenti di poemetti epici*, Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto. Papiri Greci e Latini VII 1925, pp. 149–150. See also <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/psi;7;845>. The papyrus is also recorded in MP³ as 01835.000 and in LDAB as 566.

codex⁷. The place of its acquisition is Hermoupolis Magna⁸ and one can assume that it is also the codex's origin. Dating of the codex and the text is 5th/6th century CE. The text must be later than Nonnus and Colluthus with whom it shares metrical and stylistic features⁹. Judging from what has survived NORSÄ expresses her unfavourable opinion about the anonymous composer of hexametric lines calling him a "poetastro"¹⁰. KÖRTE shares her opinion naming these literary fragments hopeless¹¹, and KEYDELL speaks of the clumsiness of linguistic expression¹². Indeed, it is not a composition of good quality. But this text, preserved on the small piece of a papyrus sheet, currently located in the Laurentian Library in Florence¹³, deserves – in spite of its mediocrity – a closer look and deeper examination¹⁴. It could reveal an interesting way of exploiting the theme

⁷ The dimension of the piece is 15 x 5 cm. E.G. TURNER, *The Typology of the Early Codex*, Philadelphia 1977, p. 116, notes the codex under number 314 on the list of codices consulted and estimates that there was only one column per page consisting of at least 19 lines. Overall page dimension and the dimension of the written area of the codex remain unknown. See A. KÖRTE, *Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen*, APF VIII 1927, p. 255. R. KEYDELL, *Zwei Stücke griechisch-ägyptischer Poesie*, Hermes IX 1934, p. 420: "Nach der vorliegenden Resten scheint dieses Buch kleinere Gedichte in der Art der Carmina minora Claudians erhalten zu haben".

⁸ See R. PINTAUDI, *Le venti cassette di papiri del secondo scavo di Ashmunên*, *Analecta Papyrologica* VII/VIII 1996–1997, p. 242, who enumerates PSI VII 845 among the papyri "di sicura provenienza ermopolitana". See also D. MORELLI, R. PINTAUDI (eds.), *Cinquant'anni di papirologia in Italia. Carteggi Breccia – Comparetti – Norsa – Vitelli*, Napoli 1983, vol. I, p. 27, where "materiale per un volume VII di PSI" is defined as "i resti dei primi scavi della Società ad Hermoupolis Magna".

⁹ NORSÄ, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 149: "Non sarebbe difficile citare a confronto lessicale e ritmico, quasi di ciascun verso, molti luoghi di Nonno e dei Nonniani". KEYDELL, *op. cit.* (n. 7), pp. 420–421, takes into consideration not only a poet from among "Hexameter der Nonnianischen Schule" or "die Nähe von Kolluthos", but the authorship of Colluthus himself ("so daß er ganz gut selbst der Verfasser sein könnte"). Orsolina MONTEVECCHI, *La papirologia*, Milano 2008³, p. 393, takes into consideration Colluthus' authorship: "Di Colluto è forse un frammento epico trovato in un papiro della raccolta fiorentina (PSI VII, 845)". For the characterisation of Nonnus' school, see Laura MIGUÉLEZ CAVERO, *Poems in Context. Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD*, Berlin–New York 2008, esp. pp. 1–105.

¹⁰ NORSÄ, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 149.

¹¹ KÖRTE, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 251, characterises the seventh volume of PSI as "Band" including "nur eine Anzahl ganz kleiner, meist hoffnungsloser literarischer Bruchstücke".

¹² KEYDELL, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 421: "die Unbeholfenheit des sprachlichen Ausdrucks, die man besonders an den Versen des Verso spürt, weist ihn [i.e. den Verfasser] in die Nähe von Kolluthos".

¹³ Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (BML), inv. 18766. The photograph of the papyrus is stored in the photographic archives of the CEDOPAL (Centre de Documentation de Papyrologie Littéraire). My great debt is to Prof. Marie-Hélène MARGANNE, Director of the CEDOPAL, who sent me the scan of the photo of PSI VII 845. I have relied on it, since the inspection of the papyrus was not possible.

¹⁴ Helen TOD in her recent work, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 171, dedicates to the poem only one sentence, including obvious information about its content: "In these verses the Nile is invoked as the bridegroom of Egypt and the inundation is envisaged as the wedding of the two".

“water/land union”, relatively popular in Greek literature with reference to the Nile and Egypt¹⁵.

Not counting the *editrix princeps*, three scholars have so far offered editions of the text. Denys PAGE’s edition of 1950¹⁶ contains lines 1–6 of the verso¹⁷ and lines 2–4 of the recto (in that order) with the title *Address to the Nile*. Ernst HEITSCH’s edition, which appeared in 1961¹⁸, provides us with all the readable lines of both sides of the sheet, i.e. 11 lines of the recto and 8 lines of the verso (in that order). The editor calls the piece *carmen in Nilum crescentem*. In Marco PERALE’s recent edition the text is entitled *Address to the Nile, Bridegroom of Egyptian Land*¹⁹.

Apart from the difficulties in reading and restoring the text itself (readings of some bits of it are particularly uncertain and very few lines are entirely preserved), there are two other, not less problematic, issues concerning these hexametric lines. The first one is the number of compositions we are dealing with here. The second one regards its/their genre and function. In this place I shall only briefly mention some points that concern the first question, which seem important for our further considerations.

Medea NORSÄ in her edition places the text from the reverse side of the papyrus first and suspects – judging from some expressions visible on the recto – that it is the beginning of a short epithalamic poem²⁰, but adds that it is difficult to restore the lines and the sense, especially of the text on the recto²¹. She

¹⁵ It is rooted not only in the Greek representations of geographic phenomena as personifications (the earliest attestation of the Nile personified in Greek literature is Hesiod’s *Theogony* 337–338, who says that Tethys bore the river to Ocean), but also in early Egyptians’ beliefs who regarded, as Plutarch attests (*De Is. et Os.* 38–39 = *Mor.* 366C), the Egyptian land as the body of Isis and the Nile as the effusion of Osiris who, uniting with it, covers and fertilises it. For the place of the Nile in the Egyptian religious imagination, see J. LEBOVITCH, *Gods in Agriculture and Welfare in Ancient Egypt*, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* XII 1953, pp. 77, 105–110. For the Nile and Egypt as bridegroom and bride, see also Heliod. *Aeth.* IX 9.

¹⁶ D.L. PAGE, *Select Papyri*, vol. III: *Poetry*, London–New York 1950, pp. 604–607.

¹⁷ See *ibid.*, p. 606: δεῦρο λύρη μ[ὲν] ἄ|ειδε παρ’ ἡ|όνεσσ[ι] θαλάσσης, / δεῦρο μὲν [ἡ|όν]εσσιν ἀείσομεν ἄ[σθ]ματα μολπῆς· / κ|υδαίν[ει]ν ἐδ[άη]ν τῇν οὐ δεδάσαι γυναῖκες. / θηλυτέρης δὲ νόος χαλεπώτερός ἐστ[ι] θ|αλάσ[σης]· / Ὀρφεῖνι καὶ πρόσθεν ὑπέεικαθε πόντ[ος] αἰοιδῇ / καὶ θῆρες θέλγοντο καὶ οὐ θέλγοντο [γυναῖκες].

¹⁸ E. HEITSCH, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Göttingen 1961, pp. 125–126.

¹⁹ M. PERALE, *Adespota Papyracea Hexametra Graeca. Hexameters of Unknown or Uncertain Authorship from Graeco-Roman Egypt*, vol. I, Berlin–Boston 2020, pp. 385. Marco PERALE generously let me see his unpublished work on PSI VII 845. I wish to express my gratitude for his kindness here. I am also grateful for his having noted some of my proposals to supplement the text, which I shared with him (by correspondence), in the apparatus.

²⁰ NORSÄ, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 149: “con l’attuale r. 1 cominciava un poemetto (epitalamico?, a giudicare dai rr. 11sq)”.

²¹ *Ibid.*: “difficile è, almeno a noi, restituire versi o senso, principalmente nel *recto*”.

consequently treats the texts preserved on both sides of the sheet as belonging to a single poem, although the text eludes interpretation. HEITSCH proposes putting both fragments in the order: recto + verso, and regards them as parts of two separate poems²². According to KÖRTE, we are dealing here with one epithalamic poem dedicated to a nobleman, which seems to begin on the verso²³. KEYDELL assigns the texts on both sides of the papyrus to two separate poems: in his opinion the verso contains the beginning of a poem on the sea, the recto consists of lines belonging not to an epithalamium, but to a hymnic poem on the rise of the Nile sung during a celebration of the Nile's overflowing²⁴. Toivo VILJAMAA in turn, based on the mentions of Dionysus' falling in love with Ariadne (*r*) and of the "persuading of women" (*v*), puts a clear diagnosis in favour of both preserved pieces as being fragments of the same epithalamic poem²⁵. Finally, Laura CAVERO, giving different titles to the remains of the text on the recto (*Bridegroom Nile and Bride Egypt*) and the verso (*Song of the Sea*), seems to think of two separate, perhaps both epithalamic, poems, declaring, however, her dependence on previous research on this occasion²⁶. The thought of two poems has also been preferred by PERALE who stresses "the anthological character of the manuscript"²⁷. I think that the verso and the recto might be two parts of the same composition. In this paper I must, however, limit myself to discussing some problems concerning the interpretation of the text preserved on the recto only. The detailed analysis of the verso and an attempt to make the interpretation of the whole composition will be made in a separate article.

Here is the text preserved on the recto²⁸:

²² HEITSCH, *op. cit.* (n. 18), p. 126: "*verso* alieni carminis esse videtur".

²³ KÖRTE, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 255: "Das Gedicht scheint auf dem verso zu beginnen und die Hochzeit eines vornehmen Mannes in nonnianischer Technik zu feiern".

²⁴ KEYDELL, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 420: "Auf dem Verso beginnt ein Gedicht auf das Meer", and – about the recto – "Das ist kein Epithalamium, sondern ein Gedicht auf die Nilschwelle".

²⁵ T. VILJAMAA, *Studies in Greek Encomiastic Poetry of the Early Byzantine Period*, Helsinki 1968, p. 130: "PSI 845 [...] contains part of a poem written by some imitator of Nonnus", p. 131: "since persuading of women (of a bride?) is spoken about on the *verso*, and a bridegroom is urged to embrace his bride on the *r*, the most natural assumption is that the papyrus [...] contains part of a wedding poem. [...] Dionysus' falling in love with Ariadne is undoubtedly meant here; mentioning of this popular love story proves most clearly that the poem is an *epithalamium*".

²⁶ CAVERO, *op. cit.* (n. 9), pp. 70–71.

²⁷ PERALE, *op. cit.* (n. 19), p. 383, gives the title „Address to the Nile, Bridegroom of Egyptian Land" to the text of the recto, and "Hymn to the Muse / Orpheus?" to that preserved on the verso.

²⁸ Verbal forms in the apparatus are in the plural. I want to mark in this way Jerzy DANIELEWICZ's contribution to supplementing and interpreting selected lines of the text. I would like to thank him most sincerely in this place for his helpful feedback on the first draft of this paper. Some supplements (where even the number of missing letters is not certain) are exemplary and intend to reflect the general sense of the text.

recto

καὶ θυεν οἰσ.[
 νυμφίε μὴ δῆθυνε, τεὸν δ' ἐπ[
 ἄνθει κυμα[τ]όεντι φερέσταχ[υν] ἄμφεπε νύμφην,
 ὑμετέρων [δ' ἄ]πὸνάιο πολυρροθ[ίων] ὑμεναίων.
 ..]ραπὸ[.] ἐννοσίγαιος ἐπ' Αἰγυπτ[. . . .] . ἦσα 5
] . . . υσειεν ἀγάρροον ον . [.] . . . [.] . . ν
] Διόνυσσον εὐσταφύλω ἐνὶ Νάξω.
] . . μενος γλυκερὴν τε . ε χαιρεῖ
] . . . εχει καὶ ἀπόπροθι μοῦνος ἐρύκει
 ἵ]να μὴ διαίστῶσαις ὀπώρην 10
]εναῖσιν ἀναθρῶσκων πο[

2 δε π *Norsa* : ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐπείγου *supplevimus* || 3 *suppl. Norsa* || 4 . [..]πο-
 νηο? *Norsa* : δ' ἀπὸνάιο *Keydell* || 5 .. ραπο[.] *Norsa* : ἀτ]ραπὸ[ς] *Keydell* :
 ἐκτ]ράπο[ν] *malumus* | Αἰγύπτ[ω ὑδά]τη σά *coniecimus* || 6 *possis* ἡ δὲ λα-
 βεῖν σπε]ύσειεν ἀγάρροον ὄντ' [ύ]μέν[α]ιον *vel* ἡ δὲ λαβεῖν σπε]ύσειεν ἀγάρρο-
 ον ὄντ[α] σύν[ευ]νον *vel* ἡ δὲ λαβεῖν σπε]ύσειεν ἀγάρροον ὕγρον ἀκοίτην (*vide*
comm. infra) || 7 *fort.* Κρησσ' ὥς τὸν || 8 'Αβρὴν θ' εὐ]ρόμενος *e.g. supplevimus*
 | τε . ε χαιρεῖ *Norsa, Heitsch* : *fort.* τ' ἐπ' ἔρωτι χαιρεῖν, cf. Theoc. *Id.* 18, 57:
 γάμω ἐπὶ τῷδε χαιρεῖς || 9 *e.g.* νυμφίος

Wedding imagery is conspicuous in the text: such terms as νυμφίος (line 2), νύμφην (line 3), ὑμεναίων (line 4) directly confirm the nuptial setting, and μὴ δῆθυνε (line 2), ἄμφεπε (line 3) as well as the remains of the optative forms in lines 6 and 8 (-υσειεν, χαιρεῖ). They refer to their marriage, a motif which was conventional in the epithalamic genre²⁹. The significant number of elements in the surviving text makes us suspect that the well-known epic motif: ὕγρὸς ἀκοίτης – διψᾶς νύμφη was developed here. The Nile as watery consort and Egypt as thirsty bride in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* is a very good example of it in late poetry³⁰. It may be that the exhortation (“do not dally”) is developed in the second part of line 2. It is tempting to suggest supplementing the line with an expression

²⁹ See the large number of imperatives in Catullus' epithalamic poems (61, 62, 64). Claudian's panegyric epithalamia provide us with splendid examples of such a stylistic matrix, i.e. using imperative or hortatory expressions (e.g. *Fesc.* 4, 5: “ne cessa, iuvenis, comminus adgredi”), see pseudo-Claudian's *Epithalamium Laurentii*: “surge age iam, iuvenis” (64), “tuque, puella [...] non cunctante gradu gressum comitare mariti” (65–66), “ite pares tandemque toro recubate potito” (79).

³⁰ Nonn. *Dion.* III 27 and VI 342. In XXVI 231–232 the inundation of the river Indos is compared to a watery husband who rejoices a thirsty bride with his moist kisses (“so Nile in Egypt, and the eastern Hydaspes in India”, adds Nonnus in XXVI 235). See also XL 324–326 with the comparison of Poseidon holding the city “in a firm bond” to a watery bridegroom (νυμφίος ὕδατόεις) embracing the neck of his bride; 562 with an example of ἵμερος ὕδατόεις (the river Alpheios who embraces Arethusa with watery hands). Cf. XLI 30–31 where Poseidon is mentioned as ὕγρὸς ἀκοίτης putting moist kisses on the bride's (i.e. Beroe's) lips. See also the anonymous epigrammatic treatment of this theme, *Anth. Pal.* IX 362 (νυμφίος Alpheus as a watery bed-fellow of νύμφη Arethusa).

like ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐπείγου. The expression ἐπὶ ἔργον appears in the same metrical *sedes* in Homer (*Od.* XIV 65), Hesiod (*Op.* 20) and Aratus (*Phaen.* 6); see also Gregory of Nazianzus (*MPG* 37, line 8): “Ὡς γὰρ θεσφατόν ἐστι· λόγος δ’ ἐπὶ ἔργον ὁδεύει. For the verb ἐπείγεσθαι with the reference to eagerness to take or support erotic action, see Nonn. *Dion.* III 105: δηθύνει σέο Κάδμος ἐπειγομένης Ἀφροδίτης, *Anth. Pal.* IX 362, 6: ἐπείγει ἀκοίτης; in exhortation cf. *Anth. Graec.* XI 25: ἀλλ’ ἄγ’ ἐπείγου. Cf. also the parallel expression τῷ ἐπειγομένῳ ἐπὶ ἔργον in Porph. (*ad Il.* X, section 252–253, line 176). Moreover, the play with the Greek double meaning of ἔργον – ‘deed’ and ‘cropland’ (present also in the shortened title of Hesiod’s poem, Ἔργα) seems very suitable here. For ἔργα as tilled lands, see e.g. *Il.* XII 283, *Od.* II 22.

The wedding references are made explicit in lines 3–4. Line 5 raises serious difficulties since neither the beginning of the line nor its end are preserved. KEYDELL restores ἀτ]ραπὸ[ς] at the line-beginning and claims that any other supplement is hardly possible³¹. In his opinion ἀτ]ραπὸ[ς] ἐννοσίγαιος (earth-shaking path) means a furrow. HEITSCH shares his opinion translating ἀτ]ραπὸ[ς] with Latin *sulcus*³² and points, following KEYDELL, at line 18 of Book III of Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca* where ἐννοσίγαιος is the attributive of ἐχέτλη, the plow-handle. Here ἀτ]ραπὸ[ς] must, as it seems, have meant Egyptian furrowed earth waiting for the Nile’s water³³. One may, however, imagine another possibility. If we take ἐννοσίγαιος visible on the papyrus as a predicate adjective referring to the Nile (treated as the νυμφίος encouraged *supra* with the imperatives μὴ δήθυνε and, perhaps, ἐπείγου), we may read the first word in the line as ἐκτ]ράπο[υ] and complete it with e.g. ἐπ’ Αἰγύπτ[ω] ὕδα]τῃ σά. The dynamic or intensive middle voice imperative of the Ionic form ἐκτρέπω (for ἐκτρέπω) – with the direct object like ὕδα]τῃ σά would form the continuation of a series of commands. The verb ἐκτρέπω appears in conjunction with river currents: in Hdt. (II 11, 14) with reference to the Nile (εἰ [...] ἐθελήσει ἐκτρέψαι τὸ ῥέεθρον ὁ Νεῖλος ἐς τοῦτον τὸν Ἀράβιον κόλπον)³⁴ or in Thuc. (V 65, 4) about ...καὶ ἀφικόμενος πρὸς τὴν Τεγεᾶτιν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐξέτρεπεν ἐς τὴν Μαντινικὴν. Evidence for placing possessive pronouns of the second person at the end of the hexameter can be found in *App. Anth.* 120, 5 and 127, 4 (Euripides’ dramas also provide

³¹ KEYDELL, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 421: “eine andere Ergänzung als ἀτ]ραπὸ[ς] [ist] kaum möglich”. PERALE, *op. cit.* (n. 19), p. 386, calls KEYDELL’s restoration ingenious.

³² HEITSCH, *op. cit.* (n. 18), p. 126.

³³ Let me say that originally I was more positive towards KEYDELL’s proposal; however, since there is no reason to understand ησα at the line-end as the remains of the aorist form in 1st pers. sg., and none of adjectives attested elsewhere may be – because of metrical reasons – put here (in the nominative feminine singular) as the alternative, I took into consideration scribal error (ησα for correct ηρα) and tried to restore e.g. ἐπ’ Αἰγύπτ[ω] καὶ ξηρά (cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1152: ξηράν δ’ ἔδευον γαῖαν αἵματος ῥοαῖς).

³⁴ Cf. also Hdt. I 186, 10.

significant examples of that order of words, e.g. *Tr.* 890; *Andr.* 460, 542, 668; *Cyc.* 102; *Antiope*. fr. 48, 60; *Phaëth.* 170, but not in hexameter)³⁵. The expression ἐπ' Αἰγύπτῳ presents the typical epic locative use of ἐπί, meaning 'upon', with the dative after words of motion. For τὰ ὕδάτη of the Nile's water, see *Adesp.* 32, 4 POWELL. So the sense of the line would be: "you, the bridegroom (i.e. Nile), conduct the streams of your water towards Egypt". The allusion to the Nile's inundation and the river's flooding the country is clear.

Line 6 must introduce a new subject. The occurrence of an optative in the third-person singular suggests that the exhortation to the νυμφίος reached its end in line 5. Now the subject must be different. A reference to the νύμφη is the obvious possibility here. It is likely that ἡ δὲ λαβεῖν σπεύσειεν or something like that is missing at the beginning of the line. Cf. Nonn. *Dion.* IV 97: σπεύσειεν ἔχειν ὑμέναιον; see also II 321 in the nuptial context. The verb λαμβάνω meaning 'receive hospitably' with the anticipation of uniting in love occurs as early as Homer (see *Od.* VII 255–256 where λαβοῦσα ἐνδυκέως, referring to Calypso, means more than simply "she took Odysseus home with kindly welcome")³⁶. Space and syntax would in turn allow something like ὄντ'³⁷ [ὑ]μέν[α]ιον at the end of the line. The weakness of this supplement is first of all the repetition of the word [ὑ]μέν[α]ιος, used here with a different meaning from that in line 4. More promising seems ἡ δὲ λαβεῖν σπεύσειεν ἀγάρροον ὄντ[α] σύν[ευ]νον³⁸, although this supplement demands an extra letter, which does not seem impossible. However, in this situation it would not perhaps be unreasonable to assume that ον after the ἀγάρροον is the result of the scribe's error: he could, rather mechanically, repeat the two last letters of the preceding word and, at the same time, omit the initial letters of the word which ends with -ον. So we could propose: ἡ δὲ λαβεῖν σπεύσειεν ἀγάρροον ὕγρον ἀκοίτην, which would perfectly fit the epithalamic context (the identical metrical *sedes* of this expression is proved by Nonnus' hexameters).

Too little remains in line 7 to be sure how the poet continues the thought in this song. The mention of Dionysus would fit in the frame of an *exemplum mythologicum*³⁹. Its presence in epithalamic poetry is widely attested in surviving

³⁵ There is another piece of evidence for this word order in late epic (Quint. Smyrn. III 357), but there the third person is used.

³⁶ For λαμβάνω with reference to marriage, see LSJ s.v. II 2 c.

³⁷ This participle (in form ἔοντα) as a predicate, see Nonn. *Dion.* IX 160, XXXVI 255.

³⁸ For σύννευος of the husband, see LSJ s.v. Cf. also *Carm. Anacr.* 11, 13 W., Aristaenet. I 9.

³⁹ For a different opinion, see M. HOSE, *Poesie aus der Schule. Überlegungen zur spätgriechischen Dichtung*, München 2004, p. 13, n. 32, who says: "Mir scheint, daß man versuchsweise auch das anonyme Fragment über den Nil (nr. XXXIX recto Heitsch) wegen der Erwähnung von Dionysos in V. 7 einem Text über Dionysos zuordnen könnte". (I would like to thank Jan KWAPISZ for helping me to get a copy of this book.)

Greek and Latin poems⁴⁰. Also the authors of late rhetorical treatises advise incorporating mythical allusions into epithalamic speeches⁴¹. The union of Dionysus with Ariadne on Naxos is, then, a parallel to that of the divine river Nile⁴² with an earthy maiden. Also in other passages of late Greek encomiastic and epithalamic poetry Dionysus and the Nile are mentioned at the same time, as is the case in the encomium on Duke Callinicus by Dioscurus of Aphroditō⁴³ or in his epithalamium for Isacius⁴⁴. So we expect something like Κρῆσος ὥς τὸν] at the beginning of the line, but it cannot of course be verified. A flattering or complimentary comparison of the bridegroom to Dionysus appears in the epithalamium for Athanasius by Dioscurus (25, 6 HEITSCH): ὥς νέον ἄλλον ἴδον Διονύσιον⁴⁵. And the likening of the bride Theophile to Ariadne is present in the same author's epithalamium for Callinicus (21, 1–3 HEITSCH): νυμφίε, [...] νύμφης λέκτρα φέρεις παναριζήλης Ἀριάδνης⁴⁶.

Line 8 is again a very difficult place. It seems that a new sentence starts with this line which continues the image of Dionysus. The τε . ε χαιρεῖ at the end might be read as τ' ἐπ' ἔρωτι χαιρεῖ, cf. Theoc. *Id.* 18, 57: γάμω ἐπὶ τῷδε χαιρεῖς. At the beginning of the line I suggest restoring an adjective followed by τε (to be combined with the second τε in the line) and a participle, for example: Ἀβρὴν θ' εὐ]ρόμενος. The use of the adjective ἄβρός with reference to bride / bridegroom

⁴⁰ Epithalamium was a poetical genre in which myth “was almost de rigueur”, as F. GRAF aptly put it, *Myth in Christian Authors*, in: K. DOWDEN, N. LIVINGSTONE (eds.), *A Companion to Greek Mythology*, London 2011, p. 329. For late poetry, see M. ROBERTS, *The Use of Myth in Latin Epithalamia from Statius to Venantius Fortunatus*, TAPA CXIX 1989, pp. 321–348.

⁴¹ Cf. Menander Rhetor 401, 27–402, 20. See also a review of CAVERO's book by K. SPANOUDAKIS, *Gnomon LXXXI* 2009, p. 696, who rightly stresses the influence of the epideictic rhetorical tradition on Greek poets of late antiquity: “It is a common error to discuss late antique poetry with the preconceptions of the Classical or Hellenistic heritage in mind. But these times are different. This is an era, after all, in which the precepts contained in Theon's *Progymnasmata* or in the handbook of Menander the Rhetor eclipsed Aristotle's word”.

⁴² For the Nile-θεός, see Danielle BONNEAU, *Continuité et discontinuité notionale dans la terminologie religieuse du Nil d'après la documentation grecque*, in: N. FICK, J.-C. CARRIÈRE (eds.), *Mélanges Étienne Bernand*, Paris 1991, pp. 25–28.

⁴³ *Encomium Callinici* (5, 25–27 HEITSCH): ἐπέδραμε πείρατα γαίης / Νεῖλος ἀρουροβάτης. φιλοπάρθενος [...] χορεύει [...] καὶ Διόνυσος εὐστέφανος. See J.-L. FOURNET's remark on these lines, *Hellénisme dans l'Égypte du VI^e siècle. La bibliothèque et l'oeuvre de Dioscore d'Aphrodité*, Le Caire 1999, pp. 586–587: “Parce qu'associé au mariage [...], Dionysos est lié à la fécondité comme le Nil, dont la crue est considérée comme une noce de l'eau et de la terre”.

⁴⁴ *Epithalamium for Isakios* (23, 11–12 MACCOULL): Διόνυσον ἐνὶ στεφέεσσι καὶ Νεῖλον [...] πολύτεκνον. For imagery of both Dionysus and the Nile as protectors, see Leslie S.B. MACCOULL, *Dioscurus of Aphroditō: His Work and his World*, Berkeley 1988, pp. 111–112.

⁴⁵ In line 11 of this poem the Nile is mentioned as being called upon. See MACCOULL, *op. cit.* (n. 44), pp. 87–88.

⁴⁶ For a commentary, see FOURNET, *op. cit.* (n. 43), p. 435–436; MACCOULL, *op. cit.* (n. 44), pp. 88–90.

and wedding is a close Nonnian inspiration, cf. XII 357 (of Harmonia, Cadmus' bride): ἀβροτέρη [...] νύμφη, XLII 41 (of Beroe desired by Dionysus): ἀβρόν [...] δέμας νύμφης, L 365 (of the naiad Drosera): ἀβρόν [...] νυμφήιον ὕδωρ, see also ἀβρός ἀκοίτης (XXXII 89, XXXV 146, XLIV 285); cf. XLVII 323: ἀβρός ἔην ὑμέναιος [...] Ἀριάδνης. ἀβρά as an epithet of the bride is very popular in early Greek epithalamic tradition, cf. Sapph. 44, 7 V. (about Andromache, at the beginning of the line), Alc. 42, 8 (about Thetys). For the middle participle εὐ]ρόμενος, see Hes. fr 235, 2–3 MERKELBACH–WEST (= 176, 2–3 MOST): νύμφην εὐρόμενος⁴⁷.

At first glance we would imagine μοῦνος in line 9 to have reference to Dionysus, but other words, associated with abstention and distance (ἐρύκω, ἀπόπροθι) complicate the picture. There is no way of guessing the content. Even if we assume that ὀπώρην in line 10 should be considered as conflating the idea of ripeness (with reference to fruits and yields of land as well as, metaphorically, to the bloom of a marriageable girl's virginity⁴⁸) and that of giving wedding gifts⁴⁹, any attempts to restore the text and make sense of this difficult passage are doomed to failure.

The obvious identification of the bridegroom with the Nile and the bride with Egypt in the poem analysed above justifies the hypothetical link between the song and local religious festivals celebrating the beginning of the Nile's swelling⁵⁰, proposed by some scholars⁵¹. It is not, however, certain that the poem was really intended to be performed on this occasion⁵². It might have been a hexametric piece, a part of which was the epithalamium, cited in the form of independent speech, which evokes traditional hymeneal motifs. These motifs are used to present metaphorically the inundation of the Nile, the hydrological phenomenon on which the prosperity of the country depended. The presentation of the Nile flooding the Egyptian plains as a marriage of two primordial elements, water

⁴⁷ For the verb εὐρίσκω with reference to finding a spouse, see anonymous epithalamion (4th cent. CE) 25, 3–4 HEITSCH (= 139, 3–4 PAGE): ἄξιον εὐρες νυμφίον, / ἄξιον εὐρες. It is also “a wretched composition” in PAGE's opinion, PAGE, *op. cit.* (n. 16), p. 560.

⁴⁸ Cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 998, 1015.

⁴⁹ Cf. Dioscurus' epithalamium for Callinicus (42, 10 HEITSCH): ἐκ σεθεν ἀμφεκόμισσε γάμων Διόνυσος ὀπώρην, differently understood by FOURNET, *op. cit.* (n. 43), p. 567 (“En ton honneur Dionysos a apporté le fruit destiné aux nocés”) and MACCOULL, *op. cit.* (n. 44), p. 89 (“Dionysus attends the summer of your wedding”).

⁵⁰ Starting in the middle of July, it reaches its high level early in September. On this issue, see S. SEIDLMAYER, *Nile*, BNP IX (2006), coll. 758–760.

⁵¹ See KEYDELL, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 421: “Der Beginn der Nilschwelle wurde in Ägypten durch das Nilfest, die Νειλῶα oder Νειλαῖα, gefeiert. [...] An einem solchen Nilfest mag das Gedicht vorgetragen sein”.

⁵² See objections expressed by KEYDELL himself, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 421: “Zwar nicht von ἔπη, aber von Chorliedern, die bei dieser Gelegenheit dem Nil zu Ehren gesungen wurden, sprechen die Scholien zu Gregor von Nazianz”. See also VILJAMAA, *op. cit.* (n. 25), p. 131: “That explanation is plausible although no quite similar epic hymns to the Nile have been preserved”.

and earth, or the fertile union of their two qualities, wetness and dryness, is an expression of the deep cultural adaptation of the continually observed natural phenomenon to purely human, understandable, behaviour. Our poem, which utilises the conventions of traditional wedding song as well as the rules established by the late rhetorical tradition⁵³, might be just a part of a piece composed as a literary exercise, like many others in Upper Egypt in this period⁵⁴.

ADDENDUM

By way of conclusion I would like to draw readers' attention to two beautiful visual representations of the Nile and the (Egyptian) Earth which fit in with the view presented within our hexametric piece. I mean the personified Nile and Earth (ΝΕΙΛΟΣ, ΓΗ) on two Coptic woven patches (*orbiculi*), dating back to the 3rd/4th centuries CE, originally decorating the tunic (sewn below the neck notch on the front and back of the tunic). Although the two characters are not presented as a wedding couple, the message must have been clear: the Nile and the Earth are closely related. Their fruitful relationship was a remarkably stable feature in the Greek as well as in the early Christian tradition. So there is no cause for surprise that it remained a prominent source of imagery in such a late poem as that preserved on the recto on the papyrus from Hermoupolis Magna⁵⁵.



Fig. 1: The Nile and the Earth. Coptic *orbiculi*, 3rd/4th century CE.

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań
 krbartol@amu.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-5810-1128

⁵³ See Menander Rhetor, II 399, 11–405, 13. He recommends praising the bridal pair in the form of a comparison and suggests to precede this part of encomium with a prooemium explaining the reason for the speaker's / singer's coming forward to speak or sing. It is tempting to treat the text of the verso as such a proem.

⁵⁴ For the influence of school practice on composing epithalamia, see CAVERO, *op. cit.* (n. 9), pp. 350–353.

⁵⁵ The *orbiculi* are currently located in the State Hermitage Museum in Saint Petersburg. They were exhibited at the exhibition of Coptic Art in Essen in 1963. I am grateful to Adam ŁAJTAR for having brought them to my attention and his generously finding the photos of them (the catalogue of the exhibition held at the Villa Hügel, *Koptische Kunst. Christentum am Nil*, Essen 1963, no. 265).

MILITARY TRIBUNATE IN THE CAREERS OF ROMAN
SENATORS OF THE SEVERAN PERIOD. PART 3:
HIGHER MILITARY COMMAND (*LEGATUS LEGIONIS*,
PRAEPOSITUS, *DUX*)

by

DANUTA OKOŃ

ABSTRACT: During the 42 years of the rule of the Severan dynasty (193–235), several thousand people with the title of military tribune probably served in the army of the Roman Empire. Some of them then entered the Roman Senate, starting a public career (which was often a long-term career) and forming the core of the State government. The aim of this paper is to answer the following questions: how many military tribunes took up higher military functions in their careers: *legatus legionis*, *praepositus*, *dux*; what were the rules for assuming these functions and the competences required to perform them; whether any of the senators who held the military tribunate in the Severan period can be defined as *vir militaris* and whether the Roman army was commanded by dilettantes.

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

This paper is the third in a series of publications devoted to the military tribunes of the Severan period. In the previous papers (also published in “Eos”)¹, I discussed the following findings:

- The following terms were generally used to describe the office of the military tribune in epigraphic and literary material: *tribunus militum*, *tribunus legionis*, *tribunus laticlavius*.
- The title of *tribunus angusticlavii* is not found in the epigraphic material, but only in literary sources.
- The decision to appoint tribunes was formally made by the emperor, following the recommendations of people from his entourage and staff from the provinces (governors).
- The average term of office of a military tribune was two years.
- Approximately 588 *tribuni laticlavii* (from the senatorial order) and five times as many *angusticlavii* (from the equestrian order) served in the legions in the Severan period; service in one legion was the standard, but 13 of them served in two legions.

¹ OKOŃ 2019 and 2020.

- Out of the 123 tribunes known to us who subsequently became senators, 62 were from the senatorial order (including 23 descendants of consuls) and 12 were from the equestrian order; the social status of the others remains unclear.
- Comparisons of the *origo* and *ordo* of tribunes show the dominant role of favouritism in their efforts to be appointed to this office. This is explicitly mentioned in literary sources, while other sources document this phenomenon indirectly.
- Special awards (*dona militaria*, *adlectio*, *commendatio Augusti*) were granted to 49 (approx. 40%) of the military tribunes known to us.
- *Dona militaria* were granted to 8 military tribunes; most of them were *homines novi* and provincials.
- *Dona militaria* did not have any great impact on the subsequent *adlectio* or *commendatio*; they did not become a part of the senatorial mode of promotion.
- We know of 23 former tribunes who were adlected among the former magistrates; *homines novi* and provincials were the most numerous among them.
- We know of 28 former tribunes who became *candidati Augusti* for magistracies; representatives of *gentes senatoriae* and residents of Italy were most numerous among them.
- *Candidati Augusti* were people from the senatorial order, whereas *adlecti* were people from various orders.
- In the group of senators with special distinctions, those distinguished once and twice dominate.

The above conclusions result from the analysis of the *cursus honorum* of senators (former military tribunes – *laticlavii* and *angusticlavii*)² at the stage of the praetorship. It is worth emphasising that the (numerically) dominant pattern in the group under discussion was the senatorial path: vigintivir (optional) – military tribune – quaestor – plebeian tribune/aedile – praetor. The equestrian path (*tres/quattuor militiae*: *praefectus cohortis* – *tribunus militum* – *praefectus alae* – *praefectus alae milliariae*)³ – and (optionally) the procuratorial path) was subject to a merger with the senatorial path at the time of *adlectio* to the senatorial order. Depending on when *adlectio* occurred, equestrians had already performed fewer or more military functions, but at the praetorian stage their careers coincided

² For full biographical entries of these senators see *PIR*² (for some of them); OKOŃ 2017 (for all of them).

³ One should bear in mind that *quarta militia*, that is the post of *praefectus alae milliariae*, was quite rare, as there were only 10–12 *alae milliariae* in the Empire as a whole. See E. BIRLEY 1988: 106. *Quarta militia* could be replaced by an office other than the prefecture of *ala milliaria*; e.g. in the career of Tib. Claudius Subatianus Proculus it was the post of *subpraefectus classis praetoriae Misenatium*. There were also more significant departures from the canon of *quattuor militiae*; e.g. P. Valerius Maximianus who after his *secunda militia* (military tribunate) became *praepositus orae gentium Ponti Polemoniani*, *missus in procinctu Germaniae expeditionis*, *praepositus vexillationum classium Misenatis et Ravennatis item classis Britanniae item equitum Afrorum et Maurorum*, *praefectus alae I Aravacorum* – and only later became *praefectus alae contariorum* (*quarta militia*). On Maximianus' career, see MROZEWICZ 1989: 192–193.

with those of senators. They held the same offices (legionary commands, provincial governorships, curatorships, etc.) and the differences were only quantitative. My research to date has shown that representatives of old *gentes* held up to four offices of the praetorian rank (with patricians holding the smallest number of offices), whereas *homines novi* held five or even more. The higher the social position of a senator, the smaller the number of praetorian offices in his *cursus honorum*⁴. These regularities, resulting from the individual's initial social status, determined who, at what age and under what circumstances could reach another office – the consulship. For the majority of senators (regardless of their origin), the consulship was the culmination of their public career. Holding this office was the confirmation of high social status, not only for the man distinguished in this way, but also for all of his *gens*. Patricians assumed the consulship at the age of 32 at the earliest, while other representatives of *gentes senatoriae* received it around the age of 35 and *homines novi* obviously later, usually after the age of 40. It should also be added that the consulship was attained by ¼ of senators, something which excluded the rest from post-consular career options. There was no reason to increase the number of consulships as there were relatively few consular offices. Two ordinary consuls and ten suffect consuls per year were sufficient to completely fulfill the needs of the imperial administration.

In this article, I will answer the question of how many military tribunes took up higher military functions in their subsequent careers – those of *legatus legionis*, *praepositus* and *dux* – and what the rules for assuming these functions and the competences required to perform them were. I will also refer to issues which are prominent in the literature on the subject: whether any of the senators who had held the military tribunate in the Severan period can be defined as *vir militaris* and whether the Roman army was commanded by dilettantes.

II. *LEGATUS LEGIONIS*, *PRAEPOSITUS*, *DUX* – RULES AND CONDITIONS⁵

The *cursus honorum* of Roman senators featured various military offices, such as *legatus legionis*, *praepositus vexillationum*, *dux vexillationum* and *dux exercitus*⁶. They could already be assumed at the praetorian stage. They are attested both for the careers of representatives of *gentes senatoriae* and for those of *homines novi*.

⁴ Obviously, this does not apply to people who were *adlecti inter consulares*, e.g. Aelius Antipater, Aelius (Decius?) Tricciianus, Claudius Aelius Pollio, Marcius Claudius Agrippa, [L. Ant...?]. None of them had been a military tribune before, so they are not considered in this paper.

⁵ Those interested in the topic may consult the bibliography of the Roman army compiled by Y. LE BOHEC: <https://www.orient-mediterranee.com/spip.php?rubrique609&lang=fr>.

⁶ *Legatus* (commander, envoy, representative), *praepositus* (superior), *dux* (chief). Among the senators of the Severan period, we also find a few with the title of *comes* (*Augusti*, *Imperatoris*, *domini nostri*). This title meant a companion in an expedition. Due to the fact that being among the emperor's retinue (even during a military expedition) was not tantamount to the exercise of military functions, *comites* are not considered in my discussion.

Due to their military experience, military tribunes, whether *laticlavii* or *angusticlavii*, had greater competence than others to assume these offices. It should be remembered, however, that the interval between the tribunate and a higher command of the praetorian rank was about 10 years. Former *tribuni laticlavii* spent this time holding municipal magistracies. These functions added value to their administrative skills and were a *sine qua non* condition for nominations to praetorian offices, including a military command (*legatus legionis*, *praepositus*, *dux*). Former *tribuni angusticlavii*, depending on the time of their promotion, could also have had *tertia* and *quarta militia* in their *cursus*, which significantly increased their military experience.

At the next stage, namely the consular one, we (understandably) do not find the praetorian legionary command, while the military functions found earlier – *praepositus* and *dux* – do appear. Only a very good knowledge of the career of a specific senator (with the date of his consulship) makes it possible to determine the rank (praetorian or consular) of the command⁷. Inscriptions do not make it possible to specify the differences within the scope of *praepositus* and *dux*, and they also fail to show the boundaries between the same offices of a different rank (praetorian or consular).

Bearing these conditions in mind, I have presented the military elements of the *cursus honorum* of tribunes in tabular form below (separately for the *laticlavii* and *angusticlavii* groups).

Table 1: Military posts (praetorian and consular) of former *tribuni laticlavii*⁸

No	Nomen Origo	Tribunus Provincia	Legatus/Praepositus/Dux Provincia	Inscriptiones selectae
1.	[...]us L. f. Fab. Annian[us] Italia/Oriens	[...? et XIII ge]min(a)? Pannonia superior <i>aut</i> [...? et I] Min(ervia) Gordianarum Germania inferior	(1) missus adv(ersus) hostes publicos in re[gionem Transp] ad(anam) tir(onibus) legend(is) et arm(is) fabri(candis) in [Me]diol(ano) Italia (2) legatus legionis XXII primigeniae piaae fidelis Gordianae Germania superior	CIL XIII 6763 = ILS 1188 = ALFÖLDY 1967: 61–62

⁷ The best example was the career of Tib. Claudius Candidus, who served as *dux exercitus Illyrici* prior to his consulship (in two campaigns – *Asiana* and *Parthica*) and after his consulship (in one campaign – *Gallica*). He held the consulship probably around 196, i.e. before *Gallica expeditio* – the war with Clodius Albinus. See ALFÖLDY 1968: 139.

⁸ The names of representatives of *gentes senatoriae* are marked in bold type in the Nomen || Origo column. Posts of the consular rank are separated by a dashed line and entered in italics in the Legatus/Praepositus/Dux || Provincia column. The location of provinces where troops were stationed is indicated only in the case of tribunes and legionary legates (that is those serving in or commanding regular troops).

2.	L. Aurelius Gallus Sardinia	legio II adiutrix Pannonia inferior	legatus legionis I adiutricis Pannonia superior	<i>AE</i> 1990, 820 = <i>AE</i> 1993, 1308 = <i>TitAq</i> 251; <i>RIU</i> 709; <i>CIL</i> VI 1356 = <i>ILS</i> 1109
3.	M. Caecilius Rufinus Marianus Africa	legio IV Flavia Moesia superior	legatus legionis XIII geminae Dacia	<i>CIL</i> III 3463 = <i>ILS</i> 3638 = <i>TitAq</i> 38; <i>CIL</i> III 1142 = <i>IDR</i> III 5, 322
4.	C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus Italia	legio I adiutrix Pannonia superior	legatus legionis VII Claudiae Moesia superior	<i>CIL</i> XIV 3900 = <i>ILS</i> 1182 = <i>Insr. It.</i> IV 1, No. 102
5.	T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus Italia	legio XIV gemina Martia victrix Pannonia superior legio X gemina pia fidelis Pannonia superior	iuridicus [provinciae Hispaniae ci]terioris vice (legatus) legionis Hispania	<i>AE</i> 1957, 161 = <i>AE</i> 1961, 58 = <i>I. Eph.</i> III 817
6.	M. Domitius Valerianus Bithynia	legio III Gallica Syria Phoenice	(1) legatus Augusti legionis XII fulminatae certae constantis Cappadocia (2) legatus Augusti legionis VII Claudiae Moesia superior	<i>AE</i> 1957, 44; <i>SEG</i> XX 28 = THOMASSON 1975: 36
7.	L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus Hispania Tarraconensis	legio XI Claudia pia fidelis Moesia inferior	(1) legatus Augusti legionis XVI Flaviae firmae Syria Coele ----- (2) <i>praepositus vexillationibus Illyricianis Perinthe tendentibus</i> (3) <i>dux vexillationum per Italiam exercitus Imp. Severi Pii Pertinacis Aug. et M. Aureli Antonini Aug.</i>	<i>CIL</i> VI 1408 = <i>ILS</i> 1141; <i>CIL</i> VI 1409 = <i>ILS</i> 1142; <i>AE</i> 1926, 79; <i>CIL</i> VI 31798 = 41182a
8.	M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus Latine loquens pars Imperii Romani	legio XI Claudia pia fidelis Moesia inferior	legatus Augg. legionis I Italicae Moesia inferior	<i>CIL</i> XI 2106 = <i>ILS</i> 1138
9.	T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus Oriens	legio VII gemina Hispania Tarraconensis	(1) legatus legionis I Minerviae Germania inferior (2) legatus legionis XIII geminae Pannonia superior	<i>CIL</i> XIII 1673 = <i>ILS</i> 1152 = <i>AE</i> 2006, 818

10.	M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior Italia	legio IV Flavia Moesia superior	legatus legionis X geminae Pannonia superior	<i>AE</i> 1975, 795 = <i>SEG</i> XXVI 1253 + inv. 3579, 3641, 3619 = <i>I.Eph.</i> III 682; <i>CIL</i> XIV 4238 = <i>Inscr. It.</i> IV 1, 141; <i>CIL</i> VI 1556a + <i>CIL</i> X 6663a + 6665b + 8292c
11.	Q. Hedius Lollianus Plautius Avitus Italia	legio XIII gemina Dacia	legatus legionis VII geminae Hispania Tarraconensis	<i>CIL</i> VI 32412 = <i>ILS</i> 1155
12.	Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus Italia	legio VII gemina pia felix Hispania Tarraconensis	legatus legionis X[X] II primigeniae Germania superior	<i>CIL</i> II 4121 = <i>ILS</i> 1145 = <i>RIT</i> 139 = <i>CIL</i> II ² /14, 984; <i>CIL</i> II 4122 = <i>RIT</i> 140 = <i>CIL</i> II ² /14, 985
13.	M. Herennius Faustus [...] Iulius Clemens Tadius Flaccus Italia	legio III Augusta Numidia	legatus Augusti legionis XII[I] geminae Dacia	<i>CIL</i> III 52 et add. p. 968
14.	[Iasdius] Italia	I[egio ...] ?	[leg(atus) le]g(ionis) XIII gem(inae) [et leg(ionis) ...] Pannonia superior	<i>CIL</i> VI 1428a-c = 31651 + 31805 = 39742 = 41225
15.	L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus Oriens	legio X gemina Pannonia superior	(1) legatus legionis I adiutricis Pannonia superior (2) legatus legionis III Augustae Severianae et provinciae Numidiae Numidia	<i>CIL</i> VIII 18270 = <i>ILS</i> 1196; <i>AE</i> 1917–1918, 51
16.	C. Iulius Septimius Castinus Africa	legio I adiutrix Pannonia superior legio V Macedonica Dacia	(1) legatus legionis I Minerviae Germania inferior (2) dux vexillationum quattuor legionum Germaniae VIII Augustae, XXII primigeniae, I Minerviae, XXX Ulpiae “adversus defectores et rebelles” Germania superior et Germania inferior	<i>CIL</i> III 10471 = <i>AE</i> 1890, 82 = <i>AE</i> 1977, 378; <i>CIL</i> III 10472 = <i>AE</i> 1972, 378 = <i>TitAq</i> 20; <i>CIL</i> III 10473 = <i>ILS</i> 1153 = <i>AE</i> 1972, 378 = <i>TitAq</i> 21
17.	C. Iulius (Scapula?) Lepidus Tertullus Italia/Africa/Hispania	legio II adiutrix Pannonia inferior	legatus Augusti pro praetore legionis tertiae Augustae Numidia	<i>AE</i> 1990, 817; <i>AE</i> 1955, 137; <i>AE</i> 1917–1918, 70 = <i>ILAlg</i> II 3, 7803

18.	C. Luxilius Sabinus Egnatius Proculus/ Italia	legio IIII Flavia/ Moesia superior	legatus legionis X geminae Gordianae/ Pannonia superior	<i>CIL</i> XI 6338 = <i>ILS</i> 1187
19.	L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus Africa	legio XXII primigenia Germania superior legio III Italica Raetia	(1) legatus legionis I Italicae Moesia inferior (2) dux exercitus Moesiaci apud Byzantium (3) dux exercitus Moesiaci apud Lugdunum	<i>CIL</i> VI 1450 = <i>ILS</i> 2935; <i>CIL</i> VI 1452 = 31658 = <i>ILS</i> 2936
20.	L. Marius Perpetuus (cos. suff. ca a. 203) Africa	legio IV Scythica Syria Coele	legatus Augustorum legionis XVI Flaviae firmae fidelis Syria Coele	<i>CIL</i> III 1178 = <i>ILS</i> 1165 = <i>IDR</i> III 5, 436
21.	L. Marius Perpetuus (cos. ord. a. 237) Africa	[leg(io) ...]trici p. f. ?	legatus legionis VII [geminae aut Claudiae aut -I Augustae] Hispania Tarraconensis aut Moesia superior aut Germania superior	<i>AE</i> 1909, 22 = <i>ILS</i> 8980 = <i>IL Afr.</i> 324 = THOMASSON 1975, 94 = BADEL 2010
22.	M. Marius Titus Rufinus Italia	legio I adiutrix pia fidelis Pannonia superior	legatus legionis I Minerviae piae fidelis Germania inferior	<i>CIL</i> IX 1584; <i>CIL</i> XIII 8017 = <i>AE</i> 1899, 7
23.	C. Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius Africa	legio II Augusta Britannia inferior	legatus Augusti legionis VII Claudiae Moesia superior	<i>CIL</i> VIII 25527 = <i>ILTun</i> 1244 = <i>AE</i> 1907, 12; <i>CIL</i> VIII 12442 = <i>ILS</i> 1110; <i>AE</i> 1953, 83
24.	Q. Petronius Melior Italia	legio I Minervia Germania inferior	(1) legatus legionis VIII Augustae Germania superior (2) legatus legionis XXX Ulpiae Germania inferior	<i>CIL</i> XI 3367 = <i>ILS</i> 1180
25.	[Rubrenus] Italia	legio II Augusta Britannia inferior	[praeses Syriae Coele aut legatus legionis in Syria (?)] Syria Coele	<i>AE</i> 1938, 177 = <i>IGLS</i> 3, 762 = <i>AE</i> 1997, 1540
26.	P. Septimius Geta Africa	legio II Augusta Britannia inferior	legatus legionis I Italicae Moesia inferior	<i>CIL</i> III 905; <i>CIL</i> III 7794; <i>AE</i> 1946, 131 = <i>IRT</i> 541, <i>IGR</i> I 970
27.	T. Statilius Barbarus incerta	[legio ...] ?	[legatus legionis (?)] aut donatus donis militaribus b]ello Parth(ico) Mesop(otameno)	<i>CIL</i> VI 1522 = <i>ILS</i> 1144 = <i>CIL</i> VI 41197
28.	M. Annaeus Saturninus Clodianus Aelianus Africa	legio III Italica Augusta Raetia	legatus legionis XI Claudiae Moesia inferior	<i>CIL</i> VI 1337 = p. 3141 = 41204

29.	M. Aureli[us ...] Numidia	[legio ...]o ?	legatus legio[nis ...] ?	<i>CIL</i> VIII 7033 = <i>ILAlg</i> II 617
30.	L. Calpurnius Proculus Galatia	legio XIII gemina Dacia	legatus legionis I Minerviae Germania inferior	<i>CIL</i> XIII 8009 = <i>ILS</i> 2458; <i>AE</i> 1930, 27
31.	L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis Italia	legio VIII Augusta Germania superior	legatus Augustorum legionis XX Valeriae victricis Britannia superior	<i>CIL</i> X 3722
32.	[...] Egr[ilius Plarianus Larcus Lep]idus [Flavius ...?] Italia	[legio ...]a ?	[leg(atus) le]gionis XXX Ulpia[e ...] Germania inferior	<i>AE</i> 1969–1970, 87
33.	(Fabius?)? Achaia	legio [...] ?	[legatus legionis XXX] Ul[piae?] Germania inferior?	<i>IG</i> II/3 ² 3646a
34.	P. Flavonius Paulinus Pisidia	legio X Fretensis Syria Palaestina legio XII fulminata Cappadocia	legatus legionis I adiutricis Pannonia superior	<i>SEG</i> VI 555
35.	Tib. Iulius Frugi Asia	[?]	legatus legionis VII [...] ?	<i>CIL</i> VI 31717 = <i>AE</i> 1973, 15
36.	P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus Africa	legio X Fretensis Syria Palaestina legio IV Scythica Syria Coele	(1) legatus Augusti legionis X geminae Pannonia superior (2) legatus Augustorum super vexillationes in Cappadocia	<i>CIL</i> VIII 7050 = <i>ILS</i> 1102 = <i>ILAlg</i> II 634
37.	Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...] atus Laevillus Berenicianus Italia/Africa	legio XII fulminata Cappadocia legio XV Apollinaris Cappadocia	(1) legatus Augusti legionis XIII geminae Dacia (2) legatus Augusti legionis IV Flaviae Moesia superior (3) praepositus legionibus I Italicae et IV Flaviae Moesia inferior et Moesia superior (4) legatus Augg. pro praetore legionis III Augustae Numidia	<i>CIL</i> VIII 2582 = 18090 = <i>ILS</i> 1111; <i>CIL</i> VIII 2744 = 18272; <i>CIL</i> VIII 2745 = <i>AE</i> 1980, 952
38.	[...]anus S[...] incerta	legio VI [victrix] Britannia inferior legio XXII primigen[ia] Germania superior	(1) [...] / leg(ionis) [XIII] geminae Mar[τιαe victricis ...] Pannonia superior (2) praepo]/s[itus vexi]llation[ibus ...] / [...] G]allica [...] ?	<i>AE</i> 2003, 1189 = <i>AE</i> 2004, 930 = <i>AE</i> 2011, 764

39.	Anonymus (<i>AE</i> 1950, 91 = <i>AE</i> 1974, 344) Italia	legio IIII [Flavia aut Scythica] Moesia superior aut Syria Coele	[leg. Aug. aut Augg. leg]ion. XI Cl. p. f. Moesia inferior	<i>AE</i> 1950, 91 = <i>AE</i> 1974, 344
-----	--	--	---	--

Table 2: Military posts (praetorian and consular) of former *tribuni angusticlavii*⁹

No	Nomen Origo	Tribunus Provincia	Legatus/Praepositus/Dux Provincia	Inscriptiones selectae
1.	Tib. Claudius Candidus Africa	legio II Augusta Britannia inferior	(1) dux exercitus Illyrici expeditione Asiana (2) item Parthica ----- (3) <i>item Gallica</i> (4) <i>legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Hispaniae citerioris, et in ea dux terra marique adversus rebelles Hispaniae hostes populi Romani item Asiae item Noricae</i>	<i>CIL</i> II 4114 = <i>ILS</i> 1140 = <i>RIT</i> 130 = <i>CIL</i> II ² 14, 2, 975
2.	Tib. Claudius Claudianus Africa	legio XIII gemina? Pannonia superior	(1) legatus legionis XIII geminae et V Macedonicae Dacia (2) praepositus vexillationum Daciiscarum (3) legatus Auggg. pro praetore provinciarum et exercituum Pannoniae inferioris et superioris	<i>AE</i> 1982, 798; <i>CIL</i> VIII 5349 = <i>ILAlg</i> I 279 = <i>AE</i> 1977, 858 = <i>AE</i> 1982, 950; <i>CIL</i> VIII 7978 = <i>ILS</i> 1147 = <i>ILAlg</i> II 29
3.	Tib. Claudius Subatianus Proculus Africa	cohors VI civium Romanorum Britannia?	(1) legatus legionis VI ferratae f. c. Syria Palaestina (2) legatus Auggg. pro pr. leg. III Augustae Numidia	<i>CIL</i> VIII 4323 = 18528; <i>AE</i> 1911, 107 = <i>ILS</i> 9488
4.	C. Domitius Antigonus Macedonia	tribunus militum ?	(1) legatus legionis V Macedonicae Antoninianae Dacia (2) legatus legionis XXII primigeniae piaae fidelis Antoninianae Germania superior	Cass. Dio LXXVII 8, 1– 2; <i>AE</i> 1965, 242 = <i>AE</i> 1966, 262

⁹ Posts of the consular rank are separated by a dashed line and entered in italics in the Legatus/Praepositus/Dux || Provincia column. The location of provinces where troops were stationed is indicated only in the case of tribunes and legionary legates (that is those serving in or commanding regular troops).

5.	C. Iulius Avitus Syria	[leg(io) ...] ?	(1) leg(atus) leg(ionis) III[...] ?	AE 1921, 64 = AE 1963, 42 = AE 1979, 450
6.	M. Valerius Maximianus Pannonia	cohors I Hamiorum civium Romanorum Syria	(1) legatus legionis I adiutricis Pannonia superior (2) legatus legionis II adiutricis Pannonia inferior (3) praepositus vexillationum Laugaricione hiemantium (4) legatus legionis V Macedonicae Dacia (5) legatus legionis I Italicae Moesia inferior (6) legatus legionis XIII geminae Dacia (7) legatus Augusti pro praetore legionis III Augustae Numidia	AE 1956, 124
7.	C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes Italia/Africa/Gallia	legio I Italica Moesia inferior	(1) legatus legionis III Italicae Raetia (2) legatus legionis XIII geminae cum iurisdicatu Pannoniae superioris Pannonia superior (3) praepositus vexillationibus ex Illyrico missis ab imperatore divo M. Antonino ad tutelam Urbis	AE 1920, 45 = ILAfr. 281

In total, the tables feature 46 people (39 *laticlavii*¹⁰ and 7 *angusticlavii*), which is just over 37% of the entire group of 123 confirmed military tribunes¹¹.

From among the *laticlavii* at the praetorian stage, 29 held only one higher military command, eight – two, one – three and one – four, so the standard was to serve one commanding function. Different tendencies prevailed among the *angusticlavii*. At the praetorian stage, one had served seven command functions, two – three, three – two and one – one. As can be seen, the standard there was to have held multiple commands, and the average number of military functions held by the more militarily experienced *angusticlavii* was higher than among the *laticlavii*.

¹⁰ M. Roscius Lupus Murena, who was *praepositus legionis* (προστάτης λεγεῶνος) IV *Flaviae*, that is the vice legate of the legion (IGR I 909 = ILS 8834a = I. Cret. IV 296), has not been included in the table because he held this position before the quaestorship, thus not yet being a senator.

¹¹ About 35% in the group of *tribuni laticlavii* (39 out of 111), about 58% in the group of *angusticlavii* (7 out of 12).

The differences between the two groups result from their different starting position. As mentioned previously, descendants of *gentes senatoriae* had to hold fewer praetorian offices in order to attain the consulship than *homines novi* did. It is no accident that in the group of *tribuni laticlavii* out of 13 representatives of old *gentes* as many as 12 held only one military command¹², whereas out of 26 *homines novi* over half (17) took one military command after the praetorship and the rest (9) took more. The more modest the origin, the more pronounced the tendency to assume military functions.

After attaining the consulship, only two senators continued their military careers: these were, from among the *laticlavii*, L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus (*praepositus* and *dux*), and from among the *angusticlavii*, Tib. Claudius Candidus (*dux* twice). In their cases, it was not the quantity, but the quality of the offices they held and their high position in the emperor's entourage that were important. However, it is worth emphasising that Cilo, who started his career as *laticlavius*, was twice consul (193 *suffectus*, 204 *ordinarius*), while Candidus, starting as *angusticlavius*, attained only one consulship (around 195), which was a *suffect* position. It can be concluded that a given senator's social background influenced his entire career and (his various merits notwithstanding) was a criterion that could not be ignored in promotions.

*Legatus legionis*¹³

After the praetorship, the office of *legatus legionis* was held by 44 senators listed in the tables above (38 *laticlavii*, 6 *angusticlavii*), so it was by far the most common office in higher military command¹⁴. The following people did not have it in their *cursus*: T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus and Tib. Claudius Candidus; inscriptions confirm that the former held the post of a vice legate of a legion, i.e. a substitute legate (for reasons unknown to us).

Given the collected data (see tables 1 and 2) and my analysis, it can be concluded that former tribunes' appointments to legionary legateships were governed by the following rules:

¹² The only case of multiple command among representatives of *gentes senatoriae* is Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, a tribune in two legions, and a legate of four legions. The number of military functions he held proves that his career path was due to his own personal preferences (he did not serve any civil functions at the praetorian stage).

¹³ Among the senators listed in table 1, there are also *legatus Augustorum super vexillationes* (P. Iulius Geminus Marcianus) and *missus adv(ersus) hostes publicos* ([...]us L. f. Fab. Annian[us]), who due to the scope of their duties are not considered by me to have been regular legates and are not analysed together with legionary legates. My statistics also do not include M. Roscius Lupus Murena, who became *praepositus legionis* before the quaestorship (see note 10 above).

¹⁴ The following names of this post are found in inscriptions: *leg(atus) leg(ionis)*, *leg(atus) Aug(usti) leg(ionis)*, *leg(atus) Augg(ustorum) leg(ionis)* or *leg(atus) Auggg(ustorum) leg(ionis)*. All of them refer to the same office; the differences in notation result from different numbers of rulers at a given time (AUG: one *augustus*; AVGG: two *augusti*; AVGGG: three *augusti*).

1. The correlation between the location of a legionary legateship on the one hand and the legate's *origo* combined with the type of the tribunate he had previously held (*laticlavius*, *angusticlavius*) on the other.

None of the former *tribuni laticlavii* served as legates of legions in their home province (see table 1)¹⁵. However, the analysis of the data reveals that such a thing was possible in the case of the former *angusticlavii*. We know of three *tribuni angusticlavii* who, after being promoted to the senate, commanded legions in their home provinces: Tib. Claudius Subatianus Proculus (Numidia), M. Valerius Maximianus (Pannonia superior) and probably C. Iulius Avitus (Syria)¹⁶. It is evident that the differences between the two categories of tribunes stem from their different social status while holding the office. Senators, especially those from *gentes senatoriae*, as representatives of the elite had greater opportunities to exert influence in their home region than *equites*, so they were potentially a greater threat to the ruler¹⁷.

2. The avoidance of assigning a legate to the legion in which he had served as a tribune.

None of the former tribunes returned as a legate to a legion in which they had previously served (see tables 1 and 2). This was the way to avoid situations in which a commander would meet soldiers who remembered him as a junior officer, which could weaken his authority¹⁸. However, sometimes it happened that legates returned to the province in which they had served as tribunes, but took over the command of another legion¹⁹. There are four such cases in table 1 (*laticla-*

¹⁵ I also provide the *origo* of tribunes in the first part of my discussion: OKOŃ 2019. Let me provide a general reminder that we know the territorial origin of 89 (out of 123) tribunes: 35 came from Italy, 24 from the East, 22 from Africa and 8 from the West.

¹⁶ If we supplement the inscription containing the *cursus* of Avitus (AE 1921, 64 = AE 1963, 42 = AE 1979, 450), inserting *Gallica* or *Parthica* (both legions were stationed in Syria) in the gap *leg(atus) leg(ionis) III[...]*. Until now, researchers (e.g. PFLAUM 1960; BARBIERI 1952: n. 281; LEUNISSEN 1989: 339; Th. FRANKE, *Iulius* [II 22], DNP VI 1999, coll. 27–28) assumed that Avitus' legion was Legio IV Flavia (on the principle of avoiding additions that would suggest a command held in the legate's home province). My suggestion takes a different approach to this issue.

¹⁷ During the reign of Septimius Severus, the following legions were created: I, II and III Parthica (commanded by equestrian *praefecti*), of which Legio II was stationed in Alba near Rome. On the one hand, appointing equestrians as legates was safer for the emperor; on the other (as emphasised by LE BOHEC 2002: 211) it gave the emperor more opportunities to appoint commanders of these legions, as there were more volunteers for military service among equestrians than among senators. Additionally, it should be mentioned that both commanders of the Praetorian Guard were (usually) equestrians, which theoretically protected the emperor against their usurpation.

¹⁸ One should pay attention to other conditions – we know of two legionary legates who returned to the province of their legionary command as provincial governors: P. Septimius Geta (Moesia inferior) and C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes (Pannonia superior). In these cases, a good knowledge of the province was seen as the governors' asset.

¹⁹ In some provinces, only one legion was stationed (Hispania Tarraconensis, Raetia, Noricum, Pannonia inferior, Syria, Phoenicia, Arabia, Numidia), so the tribune did not have an

vii only)²⁰: M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus (Moesia inferior), L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus (Pannonia inferior), L. Marius Perpetuus (*cos. suff. ca a. 203*) (Syria Coele) and Q. Petronius Melior (Germania inferior).

3. The avoidance of assigning a legate to a legion stationed in a province governed by his close relative.

One should bear in mind that a similar possibility was allowed for military tribunes who often served in a province governed by people from their immediate family (see OKOŃ 2019). These differences resulted from the principle of direct sovereignty: the legion's tribune was subject to the legion's legate, the legion's legate was subject to the governor of the province, hence the prohibition of close relatives taking over these functions. A tribune of a legion was not directly subject to the legate of the province in which this legion was stationed, so this option was admissible.

These rules resulted in migrations of representatives of elites (sometimes to locations very far from their own *civitas*), providing them with experience in service at the central level. These rules also helped to block the increasing significance of senators in their native provinces, preventing the strengthening of regional particularisms and the emergence of local factions (tribune – legionary legate – provincial legate), while forming desirable bonds across the Empire.

There remains the question concerning the mechanisms of the appointment of legionary legates. They were appointed by the emperor from a group of former praetors (18 per year) who were awaiting the consulship and who declared their will to go to a legionary camp for a longer period of time. The group was theoretically quite large, as representatives of *gentes senatoriae*, as mentioned previously, held up to 4 praetorian posts before the consulship, while *homines novi* held at least 5 such posts. However, analyses show that the majority held one military command (the other offices were of a civilian nature), which means that the emperor had to fill the vacancies of those who were willing (or able) to hold the office through the *adlectio* of experienced equestrians.

An analysis of the *cursus* of legionary commanders shows that this post was an important milestone on the path to the consulship. From among the former

opportunity to return to such a province as a legionary legate.

²⁰ Mention should be made of the tribunes who held two tribunates in succession in different legions of the same province: T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus in Pannonia superior and Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus in Cappadocia. The epigraphic material does not specify what the reason for this situation was, but it seems reasonable to assume that it was a result of an emergency situation in which they had to take over a post in a neighbouring legion which lost its tribune; alternatively, it might be simply caused by their wish for an extended military service.

tribunes who rose to the consulship (52), 34 were legionary commanders²¹, while 18 did not hold this office²².

Praepositus

Six former tribunes (three *laticlavii* and three *angusticlavii*) in the tables above held the post of *praepositus* at the praetorian or consular stage²³. Depending

²¹ L. Aurelius Gallus, *cos. ord.* 198; C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 197–198; T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 223; M. Domitius Valerianus, *cos. suff.* 238/239; L. Fabius Cilo Septiminius Catianus Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus, *cos. suff.* 193, *cos. II ord.* 204; M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 180; M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior, *cos. suff. ante a.* 200; Q. Hedius Lollianus Plautius Avitus, *cos. ord.* 209; Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, *cos. suff. ante a.* 193; M. Herennius Faustus [...] Iulius Clemens Tadius Flaccus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 205; [Iasdius], *cos. suff. sub Severis*; L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, *cos. suff.* 226 aut 227; C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 212–213; C. Iulius (Scapula?) Lepidus Tertullus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 195–197; L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 199, *cos. II ord.* 223; L. Marius Perpetuus, *cos. suff. ante a.* 203–205; L. Marius Perpetuus, *cos. ord.* 237; M. Marius Titius Rufinus, *cos. suff. post a.* 231; C. Memmius Fides Iulius Albius, *cos. suff.* 191 aut 192; Q. Petronius Melior, *cos. suff. post a.* 240; P. Septimius Geta, *cos. suff. ante a.* 191, *cos. II ord.* 203; T. Statilius Barbarus, *cos. suff.* 198 aut 199; M. Aureli[us ...], *cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo?*; L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis, *cos. suff. saec. II/III*; [...] Egr[ilius] Plarianus Larcius Lep[idi]us [Flavius ...?], *cos. suff. sub Commod?*; Tib. Iulius Frugi, *cos. suff. sub Severis?*; P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 165–167; Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...] Iatus Laevillus Berenicianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 178; Tib. Claudius Claudianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 199; Tib. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, *cos. suff.* 210 aut 211; C. Domitius Antigonos, *cos. suff. ca a.* 225; C. Iulius Avitus, *cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo*; M. Valerius Maximianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 185; C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes, *cos. suff. ca a.* 175–176.

²² C. Aemilius Berenicianus, *cos. suff. aetate Severi Alexandri*; (M.?) Antonius Memmius Hiero, *cos. suff. ca a.* 244; C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus, *cos. suff. aetate Gordiani III*; P. Cadius Sabinus, *cos. suff. ante a.* 210, *cos. II ord.* 216; Tib. Claudius Candidus, *cos. suff. post a.* 195; T. Cuspidius Flaminius Severus, *cos. suff. ante a.* 238; Q. Flavius Balbus, *cos. suff. sub Severis*; M. Iuventius Secundus Rixa Postumius Pansa Valerianus[s ...] Severus, *cos. suff. sub Severo Alexandro*; P. Plotius Romanus Cassianus Neo, *cos. suff. ante Alexandrum Severum*; Tib. Pontius Pontianus, *cos. suff. sub Antonino (Elagabalo)*; L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis, *cos. ord.* 196; C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus, *cos. ord.* 221; M. Umbrius Primus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 185–190; L. Iunius Rufinus Proculianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 180; Anonymus, consul (*PIR*¹ III, incerti 24; BARBIERI 1952: no. 439; OKOŃ 2017: no. 1076), *cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo?*; Anonymus, senator et consul? (BARBIERI 1952: no. 895a; OKOŃ 2017: no. 1077), *cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo?*; Anonymus (BARBIERI 1952: no. 550a; OKOŃ 2017: no. 1119), *cos. suff. sub Septimio Severo?*; Anonymus (BARBIERI 1952: no. 1771; OKOŃ 2017: no. 1606), *cos. suff. saec. II exeunte aut saec. III ineunte*.

²³ The phrase *legatus Augustorum super vexillationes*, which is found in the *cursus* of P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus, may be synonymous with *praepositus vexillationum*. The premise for this assumption is the fact that, just as in the case of *praepositi*, Marcianus was in command of a legion (X gemina) not long before he was put in charge of *vexillationes*. It is possible that his legion constituted the core of these *vexillationes*, to which detachments from other legions were added. For methods of forming *vexillatio*, see SAXER 1967: 118–119. – However, the difference in the titulature of Marcianus is significant, and this is why he has not been taken into account with other *praepositi*. M. Roscius Lupus Murena, *praepositus legionis* (προστάτης λεγεῶνος) *IV Flaviae* at the pre-quaestor stage (see note 10 above) has not been taken into account either.

on the context (i.e. in practice starting with the second, complementary part of the title) the term might refer either to a superior of auxiliary troops – *praepositus vexillationum* (L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus, [...]anus S[...], Tib. Claudius Claudianus, M. Valerius Maximianus, C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes) or to a legate of two legions – *praepositus legionibus* (Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus). In some inscriptions, the names of the units forming *vexillatio* were given while in others only the area in which they operated was mentioned; we also know inscriptions that contained both of these pieces of information.

It should be noted that *praepositus vexillationum* is a function that appeared in the *cursus honorum* of senators both after the praetorship ([...]anus S[...], Claudianus, Maximianus, Hospes) and after the consulship (Cilo), while *praepositus legionibus* only appeared after the praetorship (Berenicianus)²⁴. *Praepositi* of the praetorian rank commanded *vexillationes* from the region in which they had held legionary command²⁵, while those of the consular rank did not have such direct links with their subordinate troops. Inscriptions do not specify whether there was a difference in the number and size of units commanded by *praepositi* of different ranks. It is worth noting that each of them performed their function only once (for details see tables 1 and 2).

The senators under discussion had various types of relationship with the emperor: Cilo and Claudianus can be considered as the emperor's *amici* and colleagues, while the others were simply reliable commanders. It should be emphasised that among the *praepositi* under discussion only [...]anus S[...] is not attested as having risen to the consulship, while the others became suffect consuls; Cilo, who attained the second consulship, served as *consul ordinarius* (204).

Dux

The tables above feature four former tribunes (three *laticlavii*, one *angusticlavus*) with the epigraphically attested title of *dux*. More specifically, the title referred (depending on the addition) to a commander of the auxiliary troops – *vexillatio* (L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus,

²⁴ In addition to the above, we also know of other *praepositi* (but without the military tribunate in their careers): Claudius (Catulus?) Gallus, *praepositus vexillationum secunda Parthica expeditione*; C. Octavius Appius Suetrius Sabinus, *praepositus vexillariis Germanicae expeditionis*; [I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us], *praepositus vexillationum [legionum trium Brita?]nnicarum*; Anonymus (CIL VI 31813 = 37057), *[praepositus vexil]lation(um) leg[(atus) ..., comes Imp. in expedit]ione ...*; Severianus, ἡγεμονεύοντος [τῆς Θρα]κῶν ἐπαρχείας, probably *praepositus* or *dux*. See ΟΚΟΨ 2017.

²⁵ The knowledge of these regularities helps in supplementing incompletely preserved honorary inscriptions. If a given senator was a *praepositus* of the praetorian rank, it is highly probable that he was *legatus legionis* prior to holding this post.

C. Iulius Septimius Castinus) or generally to a commander of the army – *exercitus* (Tib. Claudius Candidus, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus).

Inscriptions also provide additional information – about the types of troops being commanded, their location and the front lines where they operated. However, there are doubts regarding the scope of the tasks performed by *duces vexillationum* and *duces exercitus*, due to the fact that these titles (although sporadically found earlier) were not commonly used until the rule of Septimius Severus and we can see them, in a way, *in statu nascendi*²⁶.

A detailed analysis of biographic entries provides tips for resolving the problem with *duces*²⁷. In the case of the commanders of *vexillationes*, we know that Cilo commanded the armies in Italy during the war with Albinus, while Castinus commanded detachments from four German legions during the pacification of some unknown rebellions. In the case of the commanders of *exercitus*, Aurelianus commanded *exercitus Moesiacus* at Byzantium and Lugdunum, while Candidus was *dux exercitus Illyrici* in three campaigns (*expeditio Asiana*, *Parthica* and *Gallica*). Probably each of them did not command the entire army of the region, but a part of it, because with the threat of war looming, it was not possible for the emperor to deprive any province of all of its garrison troops. In this context, I consider the terms *dux vexillationum* and *dux exercitus* as being similar in meaning.

It is worth noting that in the case of the commanders of *vexillationes*, Castinus held the office after the praetorship, while Cilo was a consular. As far as the commanders of *exercitus* are concerned, Aurelianus served the function after the praetorship, while Candidus commenced it as a praetorian and completed it as a consular (with the consulship held *in absentia*). Thus it may be assumed that the rank (praetorian or consular) did not affect the scope of activities assigned to the function of *dux*.

It should only be added that in the *cursus* of Candidus the title of *dux* is listed four times, in that of Aurelianus twice and in those of Castinus and Cilo only once. The title of *dux vexillationum* was awarded only once, probably due to the fact that it was interchangeable with the more popular *praepositus vexillationum*²⁸, whereas

²⁶ However, I cannot agree with SMITH (1979: 263–278) who believes that *duces* emerged as late as the Severan period. This is contradicted (for instance) by C. Velius Rufus from the Flavian period, who was *dux exercitus Africi et Mauretanici* (AE 1903, 368 = IGLS VI 2796).

²⁷ See L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus (PIR² F 27; BARBIERI 1952: no. 213; OKOŃ 2017: no. 424), C. Iulius Septimius Castinus (PIR² I 566; BARBIERI 1952: no. 308 et 1075; OKOŃ 2017: no. 604), Tib. Claudius Candidus (PIR² C 823; BARBIERI 1952: no. 143; OKOŃ 2017: no. 291), L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus (PIR² M 308; BARBIERI 1952: no. 356 et 1100; OKOŃ 2017: no. 699).

²⁸ This is evidenced by inscriptions containing the *cursus* of C. Octavius Appius Suetrius Sabinus. In CIL X 5178 and CIL X 5398 = ILS 1159 he is described as *praepositus vexillariis Germanicae expeditionis*, while in AE 1982, 121 as *dux vex[illationis ... leg(ionis)] XI Claudia*,

the title of *dux exercitus*, which did not have such a substitute, was awarded frequently. It is possible that the latter was more prestigious.

All of the aforementioned *duces* were closely associated with Septimius Severus: Candidus was a compatriot and friend of Severus and his brother Geta, Aurelianus was a compatriot and former subordinate of Geta, Cilo was a friend of Severus and his sons and Castinus was a cousin. All of them became consuls, and Cilo and Aurelianus held this office twice (for the second time as *ordinarii*). It is worth noting that, without exception, they commanded armies fighting in internal struggles.

Summing up: a young representative of the Roman imperial elite who planned to follow a public career could expect to perform standard military functions: those of military tribune and legionary legate. The manner of promotion, the position and the scope of duties of these officers did not go beyond the generally applicable rules and were widely known.

The remaining functions of officers that are discussed in this paper, namely those of *praepositus* and *dux*, were governed by separate principles. What they had in common was that *praepositi* and *duces* were of the same rank, either praetorian or consular; they could also have commanded groups of troops of a similar (or even identical) size (e.g. *praepositus vexillationum* and *dux vexillationum*). The *praepositi* who are known to us performed this function only once, while *duces* could be appointed many times. All of the *duces* were the emperor's close associates, but only a few from the group of *praepositi* were. Thus it can be assumed that the title of *dux* was generally more highly valued than that of *praepositus*. However, this was not the case because of the scope of duties, but because of the connections with the emperor²⁹. It also seems likely that the actual borderline was delimited not between *duces* and *praepositi*, but between praetorians and consulars and that it had an honourable rather than a real significance.

but these titles must be considered synonymous, as they are found in the same place of the *cursus* (after the legateship of Legio XXII Primigenia, and before the legateship of the province of Raetia). For the view that the anonymous inscription AE 1982, 121 can be ascribed to Sabinus, see Eck 1985: 249, n. 25.

²⁹ In my opinion, this was not, in principle, a title of higher rank. An analysis of the epigraphic material does not allow me to accept the view that *dux* commanded an army or a group within the army, while *praepositus* commanded a separate group of soldiers, thus making *dux* a higher rank than *praepositus* (SMITH 1979; LE BOHEC 2002: 40). In the Severan period, the scope of activities prescribed for *duces* varied; e.g. C. Iulius Septimius Castinus was *dux vexillationis* of the praetorian rank and it would certainly be difficult to claim that he commanded the army. We know, however, that L. Fabius Cilo Septiminus Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus was *praepositus* after the consulship and that he commanded troops from the entire region of Illyria. A comparison of these two careers shows that the distinction between *praepositi* and *duces* was not yet entirely clear under the Severans. It seems that the view that *duces* stood higher in rank than *praepositi* is undoubtedly correct, but that this was the case for the period after Gallienus' reform (which is also assumed by LE BOHEC [2002: 216], who describes this reform in detail).

An analysis of the *cursus honorum* of senior military commanders shows that the posts of *legatus legionis*, *praepositus* and *dux* were essential for the consular promotion. Out of 46 former tribunes listed in the tables above, 35 rose to the consulship³⁰.

III. *VIRI MILITARES* IN THE SEVERAN PERIOD

Bearing in mind all of the aforementioned calculations, the problem of *virii militares* should be addressed once again. The concept itself is a modern construct³¹ – it is not found in senatorial inscriptions³². It is only ancient authors who wrote about some people as being particularly experienced in the field of the military (using terms such as *vir militaris*, *homo militaris*, *peritus rei militaris*, *rei militaris scientia vir* etc.)³³. In their works, the word *militaris* was generally used in a technical sense and meant simply someone serving in the army. Therefore, the word was applied to various social groups: senators, equestrians and soldiers (especially centurions), which means that there were different types of “military men”.

Modern scholars write about *virii militares* holistically, interpreting this term as referring to a person pursuing a part of his career in the army. However, it is debatable how long this part had to be in order for someone to be qualified as *vir militaris*. In addition, researchers apply this term to people of different ranks and social status (especially senators with a specific career path³⁴ and *equites* with

³⁰ In note 21 above, 34 of them (former legionary legates) are mentioned. This number should be supplemented with Tib. Claudius Candidus, *cos. suff. post a.* 195, who attained the consulship as *dux*.

³¹ The term *vir militaris* may be found in works of many scholars, including E. BIRLEY 1953: 133–135 and 1954, 197–214; SYME 1957 and 1958 (passim); CAMPBELL 1975; A.R. BIRLEY 1991; CORNELL 1993: 165–166; DOBSON 1993: 113–128; DEVIJVER 1995; ALFÖLDY 2000; BRIZZI 2012; ASSORATI 2018: 11–20.

³² There are not many instances of the use of the term *vir militaris* in inscriptions relating to people from other orders. An inscription of an equestrian Flavius Nepotianus (from 350–360, found in Leptis Magna; *AE* 1952, 173 = *IRT* 565) honours him as “v(iro) p(erfectissimo) com(iti) et praesidi (...) etiam militaris peritissimo armis consili(i)sq(ue) incomparabili” (!). A damaged and undated inscription from Bou Aftan (*CIL* VIII 16910 = *ILAlg* I 562) contains the words “virii militaris n[e]poti”, which in this case may refer to a descendant of a soldier.

³³ The model text is Sallust’s description of M. Petreius (*Cat.* 59, 6): “Homo militaris, quod amplius annos triginta tribunus aut praefectus aut legatus aut praetor cum magna gloria in exercitu fuerat, plerosque ipsos factaque eorum fortia noverat; ea commemorando militum animos accendebat”. For similar formulations, see Caes. *BCiv.* I 85, 6 about Petreius and Afranius; Sall. *Cat.* 45, 1–2 about L. Valerius Flaccus and C. Pomptunus; Liv. XXX 15, 13 about Laelius; Tac. *Agr.* 9, 2 and 40, 4 about Iulius Agricola; *Hist.* III 44 about Vespasian; *Ann.* IV 26, 3 about Corbulo; Herod. IV 12, 2 and V 2, 5 about Caracalla; *HA Max. et Balb.* 2, 7 about Balbinus; *Gall.* 20, 3 and *Tr. Tyr.* 19, 1 about Valens, 33 about Censorinus. The above examples relating to people from the imperial elite may be supplemented with instances of *virii militares* from the lower social strata: see e.g. Tac. *Hist.* III 73, 2; *Ann.* IV 42, 2; XV 10, 1 and 67, 3. More examples have been collected by A.R. BIRLEY 2000: 98 ff.

³⁴ E. BIRLEY (1954) states (with reference to senators) that *vir militaris* is a person who started his career from the vigintivirate and legionary tribunate and through standard magistracies and two

a standard career³⁵), which makes it difficult to specify the scope of experience necessary to be referred to in this way. In this situation, it should be stated that there are almost as many definitions of the term *vir militaris* as there are authors using it, although common elements of these definitions are military posts and promotions obtained through service in the army.

I am in general agreement with those who emphasise the importance of these two criteria. I have already presented the promotion paths of former military tribunes, both *laticlavii* and *angusticlavii* (in this and the preceding papers), but I believe that the criterion for holding military posts should be more precise. In the case of those whose *cursus* featured the military tribunate, the distinguishing element should be that they performed the function of a legionary commander and/or a commander of *exercitus* or *vexillationes*, that is *praepositus* and *dux*. Given such a definition of military posts, a large number of senators would be *virii militares*. However, the key to resolving the problem of who should be included in this category is to answer

praetorian offices quickly attained the consulship and consular governorship of a province with legions. According to SYME (1957), particularly privileged *virii militares* were those who attained the consulship having held two posts: a legionary command and the governorship of a praetorian province. In another study (SYME 1958: 50), he states that *virii militares* was a “paramount oligarchy” governing the most important provinces of the Empire – consular legates, especially those whose *cursus* included legionary legateship and the governorship of an imperial province. According to A.R. BIRLEY (1991: 38), *virii militares* were officers who during their career commanded more than one legion. He cites the example of Tib. Claudius Claudianus for such a career during the Severan period. The tables given in this paper list the following senators who commanded two or more legions: M. Domitius Valerianus, T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus, L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, Q. Petronius Melior, Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, Tib. Claudius Claudianus, Tib. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, C. Domitius Antigonus, M. Valerius Maximianus, C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes. CORNELL (1993: 165–166) states that *virii militares* were those who had military experience and commanded armies; it is difficult to disagree with this view.

³⁵ According to E. BIRLEY (1953: 133–135), *virii militares* were an extremely important group of equestrian officers who followed the path of the centurionate and primipilate. DEVIJVER (1995: 184) shows that during the Severan period the professionalisation of equestrian officers was advanced; this was particularly the case for those who attained this rank as legionary veterans (*evocati* from *cohortes praetoriae*, *ex beneficiariis*, *ex decurionibus alae*). DOBSON (1993: 113–128) points to a similar professionalisation. According to BRIZZI (2012: 251 and 288), *virii militares* were a group of civilian officers who substituted increasingly less experienced senators: “...posti da tempo di fronte al problema di una professionalità militare che andava facendosi sempre più scarsa proprio all’interno di quel ceto i cui esponenti erano invece, per tradizione e diritto, i soli abilitati a comandare le legioni, forse fino dall’età di Vespasiano gli imperatori avevano cercato di ovviare all’inconveniente facendo largo uso dell’adlectio, della cooptazione in senato [...]. Persone senza dubbio comunque grate al sovrano [...], gli adlecti si connotavano però di solito per la loro eccellenza [...], e, per questa particolare bisogna, dovevano essere scelti di solito tra i migliori soldati di origine equestre”. This path was followed by ASSORATI (2018: 11–20), who adopted the following distinguishing features for *virii militares*: *adlectio* to the senatorial order, the consulship, the continuation of a career after the consulship or a promotion connected with wars fought by the Empire. It is not difficult to notice that, according to this view, *virii militares* would only include promoted equestrians and, moreover, only those who attained the consulship; this is not justified, at least for the Severan period.

the question regarding the number of military posts held (beyond the standard). I am inclined to accept the view that two higher military functions provided grounds for qualifying a given person as *vir militaris*, as one function was a standard in the group of *laticlavii*. Assuming an average of 2–4 praetorian posts held before the consulship, exercising two commands meant that at least half of the praetorian career was spent in the army. The inclusion of additional post-consular commands (*praepositus*, *dux*) expands the group of potential *viri militares*. By taking this approach, we can assess a given person's willingness and inclination for military activity. If someone held the tribunate (+ *militiae* in the case of equestrians) and two commands, such a willingness may be assumed. Thus the determining factor for the inclusion of former tribunes in the group of *viri militares* was the way they were promoted to higher military commands and the number of commands they held. Analyses show that *viri militares* functioned as part of the social elite, although they formed a small group. I include the following in this group: [...]us L. f. Fab. Annian[us], M. Domitius Valerianus, L. Fabius Cilo Septimius Catinius Acilianus Lepidus Fulcinianus, T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus, L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, P. Iulius Geminus Marcianus, Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, Q. Petronius Melior, [...]anus S[...], Tib. Claudius Candidus, Tib. Claudius Claudianus, Tib. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, C. Domitius Antigonus, M. Valerius Maximianus, C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes.

When one tries to deny the existence of *viri militares*, one faces the question of how to classify those with careers featuring several military posts between the praetorship and the consulship (bearing in mind that these were the only offices held by these men). The careers of such senators as Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, a son of a consul, who commanded four legions, and, in the group of promoted equestrians, that of M. Valerius Maximianus, a commander of six legions, performing numerous military functions even before his *adlectio*, are good examples of this situation³⁶.

However, I do not consider it incorrect to use the term *vir militaris* in modern research in the sense of “military” (serving in the army), as ancient authors did.

IV. WERE DILETTANTES IN COMMAND OF THE ROMAN ARMY?

The discussion concerning *viri militares* indirectly raises the question of whether the Roman army was commanded by dilettantes. Some researchers give a positive answer to this question³⁷, depreciating the importance of the

³⁶ Therefore, I do not agree with CAMPBELL (1975: 11 ff.), who denies the existence of a “group of specialist ‘viri militares’ with a distinctive career and special promotion”.

³⁷ See e.g. JONES 1970: 115; GAGÉ 1971: 87; SYME 1988: 31; DOBSON 1993: 113–128; CAMPBELL 1975: 11 ff. and 2002: 152; ZIÓŁKOWSKI 2009: 827–828, with the reservations voiced by HANDY 2009: 194–195.

military tribunate in the preparation of legionary commanders and underlining the lack of military training, the appointment of people without military experience to senior commands and the lack of a strictly military promotion path in the Empire.

Their opponents, giving a negative answer to the question raised in the title of this section³⁸, assume that every member of the Roman social elite was well qualified to take up military commands due to their upbringing and home training, the instruction they were offered by private teachers (e.g. former legionaries as teachers of fencing) and access to adequate books (military treatises or diaries of commanders).

I would like to address the above question through an analysis of the careers of senators who were former tribunes from the Severan period. In my opinion, the problem should be viewed from a different perspective. When a threat emerged at the borders, the emperor sent *vexillationes* or *exercitus* to help the legions and their commanders. The *duces* and *praepositi* who commanded them were chosen from among the most talented members of the elite (of the praetorian or consular rank). It is also worth noting that the governors of the provinces on the Limes (often of the consular rank) were experienced officials, most of whom had held legionary commands in their earlier careers. It can be assumed that when the borderland was under attack, they were able to organise the defence of the province and even a retaliatory expedition. In the case of a conquest expedition, in addition to meticulous logistical preparations, the staff was selected from among those who had previously demonstrated military talents.

As a matter of fact, the army was commanded by the best of the best with the widest possible competence and experience. It may be a matter of debate whether the military tribunate and legionary legateship were necessary for senators to gain this experience, but logical consideration leads one to answer this question in the affirmative, as there were no other regular posts directly related to the military. It should be noted that people who failed to prove themselves as tribunes and legionary legates were shifted to perform civil functions. Reliable people with an above-standard number of commands constituted a fully qualified military personnel.

One should also address the common claim that there was no need to professionalise military personnel in the Roman Empire due to the absence of an opponent threatening the existence of the state. In the Severan period, the external threat was great – both on the Rhine-Danube line as well as in Britain and in the East. This period also abounded in internal conflicts, so the number of people

³⁸ See e.g. E. BIRLEY 1988: 93–115; LE BOHEC 2002: 37–38; FRÉZOULS 1995: 157–166; A.R. BIRLEY 2003: 1–18. To quote LE BOHEC (2002: 38): “Chaque fils de sénateur ou de chevalier possédait dans sa bibliothèque des traits consacrés à l’art de la guerre, et s’addonnait régulièrement à l’exercice: ces lectures et cette pratique faisaient partie de l’éducation normalement dispensée à jeune homme de bonne famille. Comme la technique militaire du temps ne présentait pas une bien grande complexité, quelques semaines de commandement effectif suffisaient pour en assimiler l’essentiel...”.

with military experience was constantly on the rise. In this situation, the professionalisation of the army progressed (even in partly unintended ways) and ultimately resulted in Gallienus' reforms.

The answer to the question of whether the Roman army during the Severan period was commanded by dilettantes must be negative. The issue of making emperors qualified for the position of commander-in-chief is a topic for another, completely different paper.

CONCLUSIONS

- 46 former tribunes (approx. 37%) held higher military commands – *legatus legionis*, *praepositus*, *dux*.
- For former *tribuni laticlavii* the standard was one higher command, while for former *tribuni angusticlavii* – at least two.
- The most frequently assumed command was legionary legateship (44 former tribunes: 38 *laticlavii* and 6 *angusticlavii*).
- Appointments of former tribunes to legionary legateships were governed by the following principles:
 1. The correlation between the location of their legionary legateship on the one hand and the legate's *origo* combined with the type of the tribunate he had previously held (*laticlavius*, *angusticlavius*) on the other.
 2. The avoidance of assigning a legate to the legion in which he had served as a tribune.
 3. The avoidance of assigning a legate to a legion stationed in the province of his close relative.
- Only few of the former tribunes became *praepositi* (6: 3 *laticlavii* and 3 *angusticlavii*) and *duces* (4: 3 *laticlavii* and 1 *angusticlavius*).
- *Legati legionis*, *praepositi* and *duces* were of the praetorian rank, *praepositi* and *duces* were also of the consular rank.
- All of the *duces*, and only some of the *praepositi* were close associates of the emperor.
- Out of 46 senior commanders who had held the military tribunate (39 *laticlavii*, 7 *angusticlavii*), 35 rose to the consulship.
- A former military tribune may be defined as *vir militaris* if during his subsequent career he held at least two higher military commands.
- The Roman army was commanded by well qualified military staff that cannot be considered as a group of dilettantes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALFÖLDY 1967: G. ALFÖLDY, *Die Legionslegaten der römischen Rheinarmeen*, Köln 1967.
- 1968: G. ALFÖLDY, *Septimius Severus und der Senat*, BJ CLXVIII 1968, pp. 112–160.
- 2000: G. ALFÖLDY, *Das Heer in der Sozialstruktur des Römischen Kaiserreiches*, in: ALFÖLDY, DOBSON, ECK 2000, pp. 33–57.
- ALFÖLDY, DOBSON, ECK 2000: G. ALFÖLDY, B. DOBSON, W. ECK (eds.), *Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley*, Stuttgart 2000.
- ASSORATI 2018: G. ASSORATI, *Ancora sui viri militares: l'incidenza della carriera militare negli adlecti in senato degli imperatori tra I e II secolo d. C.*, in: S. MAGNANI (ed.), *Domi forisque. Omaggio a Giovanni Brizzi*, Bologna 2018, pp. 11–20.
- BADEL 2010: Ch. BADEL, *Le cursus acéphale de Vinea et la patrie de Marius Maximus*, in: M. SILVESTRINI (ed.), *Le tribù romane. Atti della XVIe Rencontre sur l'épigraphie (Bari, 8–10 ottobre 2009)*, Bari 2010, pp. 395–400.
- BARBIERI 1952: G. BARBIERI, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193–285)*, Roma 1952.
- A.R. BIRLEY 1991: A.R. BIRLEY, *Locus virtutibus patefactus? Zum Beförderungssystem in der Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Opladen 1991.
- 2000: A.R. BIRLEY, *Senators as Generals*, in: ALFÖLDY, DOBSON, ECK 2000, pp. 97–119.
- 2003: A.R. BIRLEY, *The Commissioning of Equestrian Officers*, in: J.J. WILKES (ed.), *Documenting the Roman Army. Essays in Honour of Margaret Roxan*, London 2003, pp. 1–18.
- E. BIRLEY 1953: E. BIRLEY, *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Army*, in: IDEM, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army. Collected Papers*, Kendal 1953, pp. 122–153.
- 1954: E. BIRLEY, *Senators in the Emperor's Service*, PBA XXXIX 1954, pp. 197–214.
- 1988: E. BIRLEY, *Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army: Senatorial and Equestrian Officers*, in: IDEM, *The Roman Army Papers 1929–1985*, Amsterdam 1988, pp. 93–114 [originally published in 1958].
- BRIZZI 2012: G. BRIZZI, *Roma. Potere e identità dalle origini alla nascita dell'impero cristiano*, Bologna 2012.
- CAMPBELL 1975: B. CAMPBELL, *Who Were the "Viri Militares"?*, JRS LXV 1975, pp. 11–31.
- 2002: B. CAMPBELL, *War and Society in Imperial Rome 31B.C.–A.D.284*, London–New York 2002.
- CORNELL 1993: T.J. CORNELL, *The End of Roman Imperial Expansion*, in: J. RICH, G. SHIPLEY (eds.), *War and Society in the Roman World*, London 1993, pp. 139–170.
- DEVILVER 1995: H. DEVILVER, *Les milices équestres et la hiérarchie militaire*, in: LE BOHEC 1995, pp. 175–191.
- DOBSON 1993: B. DOBSON, *The Roman Army: Wartime or Peacetime Army?*, in: D.J. BREEZE, B. DOBSON, *Roman Officers and Frontiers*, Stuttgart 1993, pp. 113–128.
- ECK 1985: W. ECK, *Die Statthalter der germanischen Provinzen vom 1.–3. Jahrhundert*, Köln 1985.
- FRÉZOULS 1995: E. FRÉZOULS, *Le commandement et ses problèmes*, in: LE BOHEC 1995, pp. 157–166.
- GAGÉ 1971: J. GAGÉ, *Les classes sociales dans l'Empire romain*, 2nd edn., Paris 1971.
- HANDY 2009: M. HANDY, *Die Severer und das Heer*, Berlin 2009.
- JONES 1970: A.H.M. JONES, *Augustus*, London 1970.
- LE BOHEC 1995: Y. LE BOHEC (ed.), *La hiérarchie (Randordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire. Actes du colloque de Lyon, 15–18 septembre 1994*, Paris 1995.
- 2002: Y. LE BOHEC, *L'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 2002.
- 2018: Y. LE BOHEC, *Forces et faiblesses de l'armée romaine du Haut-Empire*, in: M. POPESCU, I. ACHIM, F. MATEI-POPESCU (eds.), *La Dacie et l'Empire romain. Mélanges d'épigraphie et d'archéologie offerts à Constantin C. Petolescu*, Bucarest 2018, pp. 53–65.
- LEUNISSEN 1989: P.M.M. LEUNISSEN, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.). Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Elite im römischen Kaiserreich*, Amsterdam 1989.

- MROZEWICZ 1989: L. MROZEWICZ, *Arystokracja municypalna w rzymskich prowincjach nad Renem i Dunajem w okresie wczesnego Cesarstwa*, Poznań 1989.
- OKOŃ 2017: D. OKOŃ, *Album senatorum*, vol. I: *Senatores ab Septimii Severi aetate usque ad Alexandrum Severum (193–235 AD)*, Szczecin 2017.
- 2018: D. OKOŃ, *Album senatorum*, vol. II: *Senators of the Severan Period (193–235 AD). A Prosopographic Study*, Szczecin 2018.
- 2019: D. OKOŃ, *Military Tribune in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part 1: Introductory Issues*, *Eos* CVI 2019, pp. 59–76.
- 2020: D. OKOŃ, *Military Tribune in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part 2: Special Distinctions (dona militaria, adlectiones, commendatio Augusti)*, *Eos* CVII 2020, pp. 127–152.
- PFLAUM 1960: H.-G. PFLAUM, *Sur une carrière sénatoriale au début du III^e siècle, d'après une inscriptions découverte à Salone*, *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de France* 1960 [1962], pp. 118–119.
- SAXER 1967: R. SAXER, *Untersuchungen zu den Vexillationen des römischen Kaiserheeres von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Köln–Graz 1967.
- SMITH 1979: R.E. SMITH, *Dux, praepositus*, *ZPE* XXXVI 1979, pp. 263–278.
- SYME 1957: R. SYME, *The Friend of Tacitus*, *JRS* XLVII 1957, pp. 131–135 [= IDEM, *Ten Studies in Tacitus*, Oxford 1970, pp. 110–118].
- 1958: R. SYME, *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958.
- 1988: R. SYME, *The Career of Arrian*, in: IDEM, *Roman Papers*, vol. IV, Oxford 1988, pp. 21–49 [= *HSCPh* LXXXVI 1982, pp. 171–211].
- THOMASSON 1975: B. THOMASSON, *SPQR. Senatores procuratoresque Romani nonnulli, quorum cursus honorum munerumve post volumina Prosopographiae Imperii Romani edita aut innotuerunt aut melius noti sunt, quomodo rei publicae operam dederint breviter illustravit...*, Göteborg 1975.
- ZIÓLKOWSKI 2009: A. ZIÓLKOWSKI, *Historia powszechna. Starożytność* [“Universal History. Antiquity”] Warszawa 2009.

TOWARDS THE AFRICAN ETYMOLOGY OF GREEK ἔβενος*

by

GÁBOR TAKÁCS

*Dedicated to my dear Mother's¹
Mediterranean ebony-black hair*

ABSTRACT: This paper seeks the ultimate origin of our European term for ebony. The line of a number of borrowed forms has long been well known down to Egyptian, but all the problems surrounding the source of this term itself have so far not been subject to a careful investigation. First, we try to locate the Coptic reflex of Eg. hbnj in order to verify its supposed vocalisation. Secondly, all the diverse approaches to resolving its puzzling origin are critically evaluated. Thirdly, we present abundant linguistic evidence for an entirely new derivation from the ancestral Common Afro-Asiatic root stock itself with unavoidable implications on the mid-Holocene past of this oldest neolithic macrofamily.

* I am greatly indebted to Prof. Krzysztof Tomasz WITCZAK (Department of Classical Philology, University of Łódź) for his encouragement and support enabling me to have successfully applied for the ARR grant of his home university, in the frames of which this study has been completed, as well as for drawing my attention to a possible outlet for it in this issue of the journal "Eos". He also supplied me with some more recent literature in classical philology on the Greek term. I owe much to Dr. Aleksandr ILLIN-TOMIĆ (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Institut für Altertumswissenschaften, Studiengang "Ägyptologie/Altorientalistik") for his valuable insights into the recent research over ancient Egyptian ebony remnants imported from Punt and help in accessing several pieces of otherwise unavailable egyptological literature on the question. Naturally, any of the shortcomings in this paper are solely my fault. My true thanks go to Mr. Zsolt MÁRKUS, my childhood playmate from the 1980s (Székesfehérvár, Hungary) and Mr. Richard TOTTH (B. Ederics-Külsőhegy, Hungary) for their unselfish technical support and assistance, esp. in late Jan. and early Feb. of 2021, without which this paper could not have been completed on time. I owe sincere gratitude to Dr. W.G.E. WATSON (Morpeth, UK) and Prof. em. G. HUDSON (Ann Arbor, USA) for their unselfish and enormous efforts with correcting the English of the manuscript.

¹ Boós Erzsébet *ἔβενοτρίχη, a lady of a strange southerly beauty, the only link in my family to Classical studies. It is here that I have a modest opportunity to recollect her Latin studies (1959–1963) in the famous Leőwey Klára College at Pécs (= Sopianae of Pannonia province with the catacombs of the earliest local Christians), whose unusual sub-Mediterranean climate and atmosphere she has recently re-discovered in her present home in the fabulous Balaton uphills, on whose southern slopes above this unique lake (Pelso), several Roman *villae rusticae* were and are scattered all along the ca. 70 km long coastline.

1. THE CLASSICAL TERMS

Our term in the European languages for the wood of ebony², as is well known from the standard works, have their immediate roots in the Classical antiquity, cf. Greek ἔβεος (m/f, first attested *apud* Herodotus III 97) vs. fem. ἔβην (first attested *apud* Theophrastus, *Hist. plant.* IV 4, 6) ‘Ebenholz’ [LEWY 1895: 35] = ‘ébénier’ [BOISACQ 1916: 211] = ‘ébène’ [CHANTRAINE 1999: 309], borrowed into Latin *ebenus* ~ *hebenus* (first attested since Vergil and Ovid) ‘Ebenholzbaum’ [LEW I 387] and into several Semitic languages³. The Greek term, in turn, has long been commonly known as a loanword from a late variety of Eg. *hbnj* ‘das Ebenholz: 1. als Baum und als Rohstoff (aus den südlichen Ländern eingeführt), 2. als Material für Geräte aller Art, 3. in offizieller Verwendung in der Augenheilkunde’ (*PT-*, *Wb* II 487, 7–12)⁴. The weakening of Eg. *h-* into Greek *spiritus lenis* is attested⁵. The i-class vowel in Greek and Latin made B.J. NOONAN (2019: 90) assume the date of borrowing from Egyptian after the shift of **ú* > **ě* in the Late Period. My investigation about the Coptic reflex has, however, convinced me a bit otherwise (cf. §5.6).

2. EBONY IN CANAANITE

Substantially earlier than Classical Antiquity, the ancient Canaanite term for ‘ebony’ was borrowed from one common (?) Egyptian source⁶. Ugaritic *hbn*

² Cf. e.g. English ebony, German Ebenholz, French ébène, Spanish, Italian, Portugese ébano, whose origin is Latin (h)ebenus/m. P. BANCEL (1989: 21, n. 1) derived English ebony directly from Latin, without an Old French mediation, “avec une lecture fautive de l’adjectif latin dérivé *ebeninus* en **ebenivus*, d’où v.-angl. *ebenif*, ebonif, puis *ebony*”.

³ Greek ἔβεος has been borrowed Ar. *ʔabnus-*, Syriac *ʔabnūsō*, Geez *ʔabnu/os* ‘ebony’ (Sem.: *DRS* 360; *LESLAU* 1987: 4), cf. BEEKES 2010: 368. The Arabic form passed further into the Romance languages, cf. e.g. Provençal *avenuts*, Spanish *abenuz* ‘Ebenholzbaum, *Diospyrus ebenus*’ (cf. LOKOTSCH 1927/1975: 1, #3).

⁴ Cf. e.g. LORET 1883: 126–127; SCHRÄDER in *RL* I 148; LEWY 1895: 35–36; SPIEGELBERG 1907: 131 (regarded by ERNSTEDT 1953: 10 to be the only convincing case in his list); BOISACQ 1916: 211; LEW I 387; NENCIONI 1939: 11–12; LAMBDIN 1953: 149; FOURNET 1989, 59, #4; CHANTRAINE 1999: 309; BEEKES 2010: 368. In the older literature (on which cf. LEWY 1895: 35), some authors (e.g. J.E. RENAN) were disposed to derive the Greek word directly from Hebrew (!), which was rightly disproved by H. LEWY (1895: 35–36).

⁵ Cf. e.g. Eg. *hbj* ‘Ibis’ > Greek ἵβις (on the question in general, see also SETHE 1925: 51–52, 56; FOURNET 1989: 59, #4, n. 12; CHANTRAINE 1999: 309).

⁶ Only few authors (LAMBDIN 1953: 149; G. DEL OLMO LETE and J. SANMARTÍN in *DUL loc. cit.*; NOONAN 2019: 90–91) were aware of the Canaanite borrowing to be about a millennium older than Hebrew due to the Ugaritic record. Others, like R. BEEKES (2010: 368) even most recently, have restricted their NW Semitic data purely to OT Hebrew.

‘ebony’ [DUL 333]⁷ occurs amidst imported woods in a Late Bronze economic text (KTU 4.402.6). Discussing the mentions of Eg. *hbnj* obtained from Western Asia in the form of finished objects from the middle of Dyn. XVIII (Thotmes III) on, D.M. DIXON (1961: 179–181) has vacillated regarding their source(s)⁸.

In the Old Testament (OT), the word is only known as a Hebrew pl. *hapax* (Ezek 27, 15) *hābnīm* or *hābnīm*⁹ (LORET 1883: 126: sg. **hābən*) ‘Ebenholz’ [GB 173a] = ‘ebony, *Diospyros mespiliformis*’ [KB 237] = ‘Egyptian ebony, African blackwood (as a traded commodity)’ [NOONAN] in a passage about the trade connection of Tyre (6th cent. BC) where ebony and ivory were delivered by the Dedanites, i.e., *dādān* people¹⁰. This term, rightly, did not appear already for A. MÜLLER (1877: 288, quoted *apud* LEWY *loc. cit.*) as being Semitic at all. For B.J. NOONAN (2019: 90–91) too, its mention amidst various imported items along with its atypical vocalisation pattern¹¹ *a priori* indicated a foreign

⁷ Not listed in the Ugaritic lexicons by C.H. GORDON (1955) and J. AISTLEITNER (*WUS*), but later, the former author (GORDON 1965, 389, #743) mentioned this as an item in a list of commodities following “oxen” and preceding “barley”.

⁸ He writes: “some of the items in question may have been heirlooms made from African wood, which had been handed down to the Syrian Chieftains by ancestors who had been on better terms with Pharaoh, who may have presented the objects, or the wood, to them as gifts. [...] On the other and, [...] it is very difficult to say whether *hbnj*-trees ever grew in Syria itself or Palestine. On sites in both countries objects stated, rightly or wrongly, to be of ‘ebony’ are very rare. No plant resembling any modern ebony-producing species appears among the flora of Syria depicted in Thutmosis III’s so-called ‘botanical gardens’ at Karnak [...] or in any other scene of Syrian vegetation. [...] It seems therefore that the wood from which had been manufactured the *hbnj* objects plundered by the Egyptians from the Syrian chiefs had been obtained by the latter from elsewhere than their own country, but from whence it is not easy to say”.

⁹ V.V. IVANOV (1981: 176; 1984: 71; GI 1984: 524–525) used the old reading *šenhabbīm* in this OT place rendered ‘ivory’, sufficient for them to prove a loan from Eg. 3b.w ‘1. elephant, 2. ivory’ (OK–, *FD* 2). The OHebrew has, however, been recently emended to **šen(wə)hābnīm* and rendered ‘ivory and ebony’ (cf. e.g. BLAŽEK 2001: 154, #f).

¹⁰ In the view of V. LORET (1883: 125), “On doit placer Dédan, d’après plusieurs autres passages de la Bible, à l’extrémité sud de l’Arabie”. Dedan was placed by E. RENAN (quoted *apud* LEWY 1895: 35) in the Persian Gulf. D.M. DIXON (1961: 180) too, *ex cathedra* mentioned “Dedanites of Southern Arabia” without referring to literature on this localisation.

¹¹ Its reference (BAUER, LEANDER 1922: 571, §72.u) on its atypical vocalisation pattern, however, only states that “Einige Plurale zeigen die ursprüngliche Form (ohne den Svarabhaktivokal, oben s)”, but the rest of exx. listed therein having different vocalisation patterns (BAUER, LEANDER 1922, 571, §72u = n. 4 to §72q) are not at all usable for this case with the only exception of OT *bāṭnīm* ‘Pistazien’ [*loc. cit.*] < sg. **bāṭnā* ‘pistachio, the oval nut of the *Pistacia terebinthus*’ [KB 121], which indeed can be driven back to a Sem. basic form **buṭm-*. In his Hebrew historical morphonology, A.B. DOLGOPOLSKY (1999: 99, §f) has Masoretic Hbr. *CōCēC* (DLG.: **CōCēC*), pl. *CāCāC-īm* ~ *CāCāC-īm* (DLG.: *CāCāC-īm* ~ *CāCāC-īm*, resp.) reflecting PSem. **CūC[Ū/Ū]C-*, where “it is impossible to identify the posttonic vowel. [...] The regular reflex of **u* of the second syllable has been probably preserved in” Hbr. *bāṭnīm* (DLG.: *boṭ’n-īm*) ‘fruits of *Pistacia vera*’, “which represents a rare **CuCuC*-type of segolate nouns (cf. Akk. *buṭnu*, *buṭumtu*)”. His chart of the reflexes of the PSem. nominal structures lists, besides, **lu2u3-* > Hbr. st. abs. **lo2ē3*, pl. *lo2’3-īm/ōt* among others (p. 89, §9.1). L. KOGAN and S. LJOZOV (2009: 323, §2.3.3.)

loanword. Relying upon Strabo's (XVI 4, 9, cf. Periplus §7) mention of Arabs crossing the straits of Bab el-Mandeb in his day (1st cent. BC) "in skin boats to obtain aromatics from 'Ethiopia' which they then sent up the west coast of Arabia to Syria-Palestine and Egypt", D.M. DIXON (1961: 182) assumed this practice to go back to much earlier¹², whence he assumed that "it is possibly in this way that the *Habnī(m)* used in Tyre reached that city". But he did not exclude its ultimate Yemenite or even Ceylonese-Indian origin via the trade routes of the Arabian peninsula¹³.

3. THE EGYPTIAN TERM

The common direct source of the ancient Mediterranean terms dealt with above was (in)directly and eventually¹⁴, as is well-known, Eg. hbnj '*Dalbergia melanoxydon* G.P.R., ébenacées' (LORET 1892: 60, §96; BEAUVISAGE 1897: 78) = 'das Ebenholz: 1. als Baum und als Rohstoff (aus den südlichen Ländern eingeführt), 2. als Material für Geräte aller Art (gern zusammen mit Elfenbein, auch mit Gold)' (*Wb* II 487, 7–12) = '1. *Dalbergia melanoxydon* Guillem. and Perrott., Papilionaceae (known commercially under various names such as African Blackwood, African Ebony, etc.), 2. *Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst. ex A.DC., Ebenaceae (known commercially as Zanzibar Ebony, in West Africa as swamp ebony or monkey guava, one of the trees producing 'gum' of hbnj)' (DIXON 1961: 61, 80, 208) = '1. Afrikanischer Ebenholzbaum, afrikanisches Grenadill(eholz) (*Dahlbergia melanoxydon* Guill. et Perr., Familie: Hülsenfrüchte, *Leguminosae*), 2. Ebenholz' (OK: *ÄWb* I 748c; MK: *ÄWb* II 1562b < GERMER 1979: 49, 373; 1985: 97–98; 2002: 108; STÖRK in *LÄ* I 1162ab, n. 2 *pace* LORET in RT VI

are equally puzzled about our pl. form not following the "broken" apophonic *-a- pattern: "По неясной причине вставка *-a- не наблюдается в формах множественного числа некоторых ботанических терминов (*boṭn-im* 'фисташки', *pišt-im* 'лён', *šikm-im* 'сикоморы')..."

¹² "There is no reason why the inhabitants of Southern Arabia should not have been doing this centuries earlier and have included, in addition to aromatics, other commodities, such as ornamental woods".

¹³ "However, insofar as *hbnj* may in part have been derived from one of the modern ebony-producing species, viz. *Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst., there may have been no necessity even to cross the straits of Bab el Mandeb for it, for this species occurs in the Yemen and probably did so too in ancient times. It does not follow, however, that any hbnj which may have come to the Syrians from the Red Sea region would all have been derived from species growing in the Yemen or Africa. The occasional cargo from India, Ceylon, or possibly from even further east, could have arrived at the southern end of the Red Sea in coasting vessels, and some of this may have made its way up to Arabia and Syria".

¹⁴ This careful formulation is necessary as the Greek and Latin terms do not reflect the metathetic -j- "*furtivum*" of Demotic hbnj 'das Ebenholz' (Ptolemaic, Roman, *DG* 273), whence these presumably might have sprung directly. In other words, a Late Egyptian or pre-Ptolemaic Demotic (prior to the late 4th cent. BC) source is well conceivable, where the shift of -nj > -jn had not yet completed.

1885, p. 130; LUCAS, HARRIS 1962: 435) = ‘afrikanisches Ebenholz’ (*FÄW* 278) = ‘(semble s’appliquer principalement aux) faux ébénier (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*) qui croît en Afrique, (désigne vraisemblablement) tout bois de couleur sombre ou noir: *Diospyros mespiliformis* (Afrique, Yémén)¹⁵, l’ébène vrai (*Diospyros ebenum*, originaire de Ceylan)¹⁶ (MEEKS 2002: 280, cf. also SERVAJEAN 2019: 92, n. 18) = ‘Egyptian ebony (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*), i.e., African blackwood’ (NOONAN 2019: 91) = ‘African Blackwood (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*) and also perhaps jackalberry tree (*Diospyros mespiliformis*)’ (COOPER 2020: 289–290).

Although V. LORET (*loc. cit. supra*) and then the grand Berlin *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache* ed. by A. ERMAN and H. GRAPOW (*loc. cit. supra*) dates occurrence of the word only from the PT on, its earliest record is known from Dyn III (cf. *FÄW loc. cit.*), namely from the tomb of Khabauzeker (ḥꜥ-b3.w-zkr) at Saqqara where diverse items (e.g., ḥnd.w ‘stool’ and ḥrt-ꜥ ‘pen and ink container’) made of this wood are listed¹⁷.

The word, attested at the dawn of the Old Kingdom in the Saqqara mastabas, appears in its earliest records as hbn without the final -j, which fits in the OK trend of defective orthography of the so-called weak consonants, among others, that of the “Weglassung des *j* in der Schrift” (*AÄG* 61, §138). P. BANCEL (1989: 23) deduced how to exclude the double yod (appearing in the word after the OK) to stand for the masc. dual ending -wj¹⁸.

Already Th. LAMBDIN (1953: 149) vocalised our word as *ḥūbněj on the basis of the Hebrew loan, providing in his view a clear example of the shift *ū > *ē in the Late Period. Unfortunately, he failed to demonstrate parallel instances of Eg. *C1ūC2- reflected by game[-atup of the Hebrew loan, which B.J. NOONAN (2019: 90) too, regarded as a reflex permitting to reconstruct Eg. *ū in the 1st syllable. In his logically argued view (*ibidem*, p. 91), the word was borrowed by Hebrew from Egyptian after the loss of the final -j (beginning with the NK), but prior

¹⁵ Of which two arrows were excavated, as pointed out by D. MEEKS (2002: 280, n. 75), in proto-dynastic Abydos. For its recent presence “dans les forêts résiduelles subsistant au Yémen à proximité des contreforts montagneux de la Tihama”, cf. also SERVAJEAN 2019: 92, n. 18 with literature.

¹⁶ Identified in the fragments found in the funerary temple king Neferirkare of Dyn V (cf. MEEKS 2002: 280, n. 76).

¹⁷ See the thesis by D.M. DIXON (1961: 27 and n. 1) with further references.

¹⁸ As he stated, “dans les attestations relevées par Erman et Grapow (1971, Belegstellen, II, 2te Hälfte, p. 739s), il s’en trouve autant à présenter le hiéroglyphe marquant le duel (soit *y) qu’à l’omettre (15 contre 14 respectivement). Ceci semble par ailleurs laisser un doute sur l’appartenance de ce phonème à la racine, puisque les attestations où il manque sont trop nombreuses pour être attribuées à des erreurs accidentelles. A l’inverse, cependant, celles où il apparaît le sont également trop pour qu’il s’agisse à chaque fois du morphème du duel, d’autant qu’au moins l’une d’entre elles comporte en outre la marque du pluriel collectif (trois barres verticales parallèles)”.

to the shift *ǔ > *é (ca. 700 BC)¹⁹. The only problem is that he too has failed to adduce a convincing number of parallel instances²⁰. The use of an i-class vowel in Greek and Latin, in turn, indicated for NOONAN (2019: 90) a borrowing from Egyptian after its *ǔ > *é change in the Late Period, which is evident. The supposed Coptic reflex, however, points to an *-a- in the stressed 2nd syllable (cf. §5.6).

4. EBONY IN AND SOUTH OF ANCIENT EGYPT

Already the author of the most fundamental monograph on Pharaonic ebony, D.M. DIXON (1961: 58) surmised that Eg. hbnj “though did comprise mostly black or blackish woods, it probably had a wider range [...] and embraced in addition other woods differing widely in colour and probably structure, and possibly belonging to different botanical families”. He has concluded his researches by stating that Eg. hbnj “does not appear to have been the name of a particular species, but a general term for a number species probably belonging to various genera and families. Not all of these would at the present time be regarded as ebony-producers, and despite the linguistic relationship, of the names ‘hbnj’ and ‘ebony’, botanically the two do not correspond exactly. In colour hbnj was usually black or blackish, often streaked with lighter colours, and rarely all red or yellow” (p. 208).

DIXON (p. 80) surveyed in detail the characteristic features of both the *Dalbergia melanoxylon* Guillem. et Perrott.²¹ and the *Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst.²² (p. 81). He also thoroughly scanned the current habitats of both the

¹⁹ For some sample of the most recent literature on both sound changes in Egyptian (*ǔ > *é and the lenition of final -j), see NOONAN 2019: 90, n. 189.

²⁰ Having checked NOONAN’s work (I do not possess it in whole), W.G.W. WATSON (p.c. on 3 March 2021) informs me of not having further instances of this alleged Egyptian > Hebrew isophone.

²¹ Described by him (*ibidem*) as “a much-branched, usually multi-stemmed deciduous tree or shrub from ten to twenty-five feet high, but occasionally as much as fifty feet. The trunk is short, seldom cylindrical, more or less crooked or irregular, and rarely over one foot in diameter. The branchlets are spinose, the sharp, woody spines being the hardened tips of short branches and often bearing leave and flowers. The bark is pale grey to grey-brown, thin, smooth, and flakes off irregularly. The sapwood is yellow and usually from a quarter to half an inch wide. The heartwood, which is very hard and heavy (up to 78–82 lbs. per cubic foot), is purplish-black. [...] The wood is difficult to work, but takes a beautiful polish, is very durable and resistant to insect pests. The tree is slow-growing”.

²² This species “is a large tree up to fifty feet in height. The bark is black with small regular scales; the narrow sapwood is white and the heartwood dark-brown to black. It takes a fine polish and is used by natives in the Sudan for making clubs. According to Unwin, it is termite-proof, though Eggeling only says that it is ‘fairly resistant to fungi, almost termite-proof’ [...] this species is very slow-growing. Dalziel states that ‘it seems clear that the freshly-cut stem of a tree in sound condition shows no black wood. The wood is, in fact, white or light reddish or often

former²³ and the latter²⁴ species, both of which he ended up to regard as basically the species *Eg. hbnj* must have certainly covered (among others). Regarding the usually smaller size of the “ebony” logs, DIXON (p. 99) suggestively concluded that “the average size of the unworked logs, as deduced from the representations [...], was not very much less than that of the logs of *Dalbergia melanoxylon* at present exported from Mozambique, West Africa, and Uganda”. He then projected the present situation back to the Pharaonic times: “In general, [...] the evidence afforded by the Classical writers, the Egyptian texts, and archaeological research indicates that there has been no basic change in the climate of Nubia after the Neolithic. The same conclusion was reached by the Committee appointed by the Sudan Government to consider the question of soil conservation: ‘The history of the Northern Sudan [...] covers a period of 5,000 years and there

greyish or greenish-white, and, although darkening to dark-brown, it may never, even in a thick stem, develop a black centre. According to Wernecke, the tree in Togo yields a whitish wood and is therefore called, *jeti-jigi*, whereas the true ebony tree is called *jeti ibo*, also *ati-ibo* [...] which is probably *Dalbergia melanoxylon*. Metzger describes the heartwood as dark brown to black giving a fine polish, not the balack uniform colour of commercial ebony, but brown watered markings on a black background [...]. The darkening occurs not only in the fresh state, but after cutting and exposure, as in the case of the redwood *Baphia*. Chevalier suggests that ebony-black portions in the heartwood are pathological” (*ibidem*).

²³ “Eggeling and Harris give as the general area of distribution of *Dalbergia melanoxylon* ‘Sudan and Abyssinia southward through Uganda and Kenya Colony to Mosambique, Rhodesia, and the Northern Transvaal, and westward to Angola. Extends through Northern Nigeria and Togoland to the French Sudan and Senegal’. Chevalier states that it also occurs ‘dans toute la zone sahélienne de l’Afrique Occidentale et du Lac Tchad: région de Kaye, nord du Mossi, Monts Hombori, Niger français jusqu’au sud de l’Aïr, Baguirmi et Kanem. [...] il croît çà et là dans les endroits rocaillieux de la zone des épineux comprise entre le Soudan et le Sahara et qui s’étendait autrefois bien plus au N[ord] (région sahélienne). La plante existe encore en pleine Mauritanie dans l’Adrar’. [...] Engler describes *Dalbergia melanoxylon* as ‘ein Bewohner lichter Wälder, parkartiger Gehölze und verschiedener Arten von Steppen, wie der Baumsteppen, der Dornbuschsteppen und der Akaziensteppen, weit verbreitet im tropischen Afrika [...]. In Deutsch-Ostafrikas Steppen und Trockenwäldern ist er stellenweise häufig, und zwar auf Ebenen sowohl wie Hügeln und Berghängen’. In Uganda it is found in Bunyoro, West Nile, Madi, Acholi, Karamoje, and Mbale, ‘in dry savanna, at elevations below 3000 ft.’. It is stated to grow ‘on very dry, often extremely rocky sites’” (DIXON 1961: 81–82). Elsewhere, he speculated that because of “the fact that *Dalbergia melanoxylon* is still found on the other side of Africa as far north as the Adrar of Mauretania i.e. roughly in the same latitude as Dongola, I am inclined to provisionally place the northern limit of these species west of the Nile at least as far north as the latitude 20° N. in the Middle and Old Kingdoms. The determination of their northern limit east towards the Red Sea is problematical, but they probably occurred further north than near the Valley, as they do at present, perhaps rather north of the latitude of Port Sudan, with possibly a pocket Jebel Elba” (pp. 155–156).

²⁴ “*Diospyros mespiliformis* has a very similar range, extending, according to Gilg, ‘von Yemen bis Senegambien, vom Sambesi bis Angola, auch in der Aequatorialprovinz und in Deutsch-Ostafrika’ [Tanganyika]. [...] The distribution [...] is very similar [i.e. to that of *Dalbergia melanoxylon*, GT], viz Mengo, Bunyoro, West Nile, Madi, Acholi, Teso, Karamoja, and Mbale. It occurs usually ‘in scrub forest in rocky gullies on hillsides, also common in open savanna, in the Northern and Eastern provinces’” (DIXON 1961: 82).

is nothing [...] to suggest that the climate was essentially different from that of to-day”’. Having discussed the history of soil erosion processes in these areas, DIXON (p. 142) regarded this factor insignificant: “Despite the impact of erosion on vegetation of what is now the Sudan, *Diospyros mespiliformis* and *Dalbergia melanoxylon* do grow even in badly eroded areas”.

The identification of the ancient Egyptian ebony plant species by R. GERMER (1979: 49) has since then become commonly accepted: “Ebenholz ist nicht der in Süd-Indien und Ceylon heimische echte Ebenholzbaum *Diospyrum ebenum*, sondern der im tropischen Afrika vorkommende Baum *Dalbergia melanoxylon*, dessen Kernholz purpur bis fast blauschwarz sein kann”, which, as she states, also “in den lichten Wäldern und des Steppen des Sudan und Äthiopiens wächst, bis 10 m hoch wird, dornige Zweige” (GERMER 1985: 97–98; also 2002: 108). The species *Dahlbergia melanoxylon* that is today commonly believed to have been named by ancient Egyptians as ebony, was a species substantially different from modern ebony species like *Diospyros ebenum* (native to South India and Ceylon) as well as *Diospyros dendo* (known from West Africa)²⁵. *Dahlbergia melanoxylon* is now only native to (the drier parts of) tropical Africa, i.e. considerably south of Egypt, i.e., in the Sudan²⁶, as north as Kordofan-Erythrea²⁷. But in ancient times, the *Dahlbergia* plant was accustomed to the drier parts of tropical Africa also²⁸ and even further north (Meroe)²⁹. D.M. DIXON (1961:

²⁵ In their description, A. LUCAS and J.R. HARRIS (1962: 435) recalled that ordinarily “up to about 40 years ago” (in their day, i.e., up to ca. 1920), the species *Diospyros ebenum* of Southern India and of Ceylon was called by the word ebony, but “at the present time” (i.e., the middle of the past century) “true ebony” was *Diospyros dendo* from West Africa.

²⁶ Today, “die Heimat des Afrikanischen Ebenholzbaumes ist der Sudan, Mozambique, Rhodesien, Togo und Senegal” (GERMER 1979: 50). Cf. also NOONAN 2019: 91 and n. 191 with further references.

²⁷ STÖRK in *LÄ I* 1162ab, n. 3 (*pace* BEAUVISAGE in RT XIX 1897, pp. 77–83). Or, as stated by D.M. DIXON (1961: 208), “*Dalbergia melanoxylon* G. & P. [...] even at the present time is found as far north as the Adrar of Mauretania, in approximate latitude 20° N. In the Sudan Republic its northernmost occurrence seems to be near seasonal watercourses at the southern limit of the Acacia Short-Grass Scrub Region, as an outlier of the Acacia Tall Grass Forest Region”.

²⁸ For D.M. DIXON (1961: 208), “Its distribution in Pharaonic times is uncertain but during the New Kingdom it probably occurred west of the Nile Valley at least as far north as latitude 20° N., and possibly even further north on the Red Sea coast”. In the view of P. BANCEL (1989: 24), “La distribution de *Dalbergia melanoxylon*, une des rares espèces fournissant le bois d’ébène à ne pas être inféodée à la forêt pluviale, mais à croître en climat tropical sec, rend très probable qu’il se soit agi ici de cette espèce, et que c’était aussi le cas des importations égyptiennes les plus anciennes”. According to the most recent survey of the research on Egyptian ebony (with further references on its archaeological literature q.v.) by J.Ch. COOPER (2020: 289), “the distribution of these woods in Africa show that the closest stands were probably in the Eritrean lowlands, with Dixon reporting stands of *D. mespiliformis* at Erkowit. However, with changing ecological conditions and the possibility of over-exploitation in antiquity it is dangerous to assume that ebony was not more widespread in the second millennium BCE than it is today”.

²⁹ See STÖRK in *LÄ I* 1162ab, n. 4 *pace* Strabo XVII 2.

208) was more careful in reconstructing the possible habitat zones of Eg. hbnj: “it has not proved possible to determine the identity and distribution of other hbny-producing trees, some of which may have occurred even further north than *D. melanoxydon*”. Moreover, as he assumed (DIXON 1961: 159–160), judging by “the evidence as far back as the Predynastic period, we find that while climatologically Nubia has undergone no basic change, it has suffered very considerably from soil erosion caused by over-concentration of livestock [...] and though *Diospyros mespiliformis* and *Dalbergia melanoxydon* do grow on badly eroded sites, we are probably justified in inferring that earlier they occurred further north than they do at present. *D. melanoxydon* still occurs in Mauretania in approximately the same latitude as Dongola [...] provisionally it may be placed roughly in the latitude of Dongola, i.e. within the province of Kush, in the New Kingdom and possibly further north earlier. The identity and distribution of other possible hbny-producing spp. cannot be determined, but some of them may well have occurred at one time near the First Cataract”. Besides, he (DIXON 1961: 52) followed J.W.B. BARNES in a suggestive comparison of “the use of the ‘gum of the hbny-tree’ as an adhesive in the ritual of embalming. On the Gold Coast the dark-coloured which exudes from the bark of *Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst, the other species ebony at present found in the Sudan, is used as an adhesive to mend broken pots. It would be premature, however, to conclude, without further evidence, that it was this species which yielded the ‘gum of the hbny-tree’”.

Already in the Egyptian tombs from Dyn. I, small ebony objects (e.g., tablets, part of cylinder seals) were placed, whereas, from the Middle Kingdom, are found ebony arrow-heads (Dyn. XI) and caskets (Illahun treasure, Dyn. XII) and so forth³⁰. The dendronym is first attested at the dawn of the Old Kingdom (from Dyn. III) in the inventory of an offering list as a label of material common to several pieces of furniture³¹.

For the ancient Egyptians, where ebony did not grow, it was only available as a southern import³². When they first became acquainted with ebony, whose

³⁰ Cf. LUCAS, HARRIS (1962: 435) with references. What kind of products, furniture etc. were made later on by the ancient Egyptians, was dealt with in detail *ibidem* (pp. 435–436).

³¹ Like Eg. ʿnd.w ‘throne’ (FD 195), gs3 ‘Art Ruhebett’ (Wb V 206, 1) = ‘Liegestuhl in schiefer Form’ (GHwB 908), tnn ‘ein Möbel aus Ebenholz’ (Wb V 312, 16), ḥr.t-ʿw ‘writing materials’ (FD 204) = ‘ein Behälter für Schreibzeug und Akten (aus Holz)’ (Wb III 394, 1; FÄW 374), wtz ‘Tragsessel’ (FÄW 126). See also KAHL, KLOTH, ZIMMERMANN 1995, D3/Sa/11.

³² R. GERMER (1979: 49): “Als Lieferanten dieses Holzes dienten im Alten Ägypten die ‘Südländer’ (Nubien, Punt)”, which later she reformulated: ebony was an “Importartikel aus Nubien, Kusch und Punt” (1985: 97–98; also 2002: 108). P. BANCEL (1989: 23–24): “Les Égyptiens étaient donc susceptibles de s’en procurer d’origines aussi bien asiatique qu’africaine. Il ressort en tout cas de façon certaine des inscriptions qu’au moins une partie de leurs importations était de cette dernière origine, puisque plusieurs d’entre elles font mention de l’ébène comme d’un tribut versé lors d’expéditions militaires au Sud de l’Égypte, et notamment au ‘pays de Kush’”. African ebony (*Diospyros* sp.) was brought to the Middle Kingdom Red Sea harbour at Wadi Gawasis

presence is not evident from predynastic times, is obscure. Ebony was already in the OK imported from Nubia³³, while in the Egyptian texts from the empire of the 18th Dyn., there are abundant records of the wood imported from diverse southern countries³⁴.

Classical authors³⁵ agree in the abundance of ebony in “Ethiopia”, i.e., the territories lying south of Pharaonic Egypt. Herodotus (III 97) described ebony as an item of tribute from “Ethiopia”, where there was “abundance of elephants, and all woodland trees, and ebony”. But in his comments (*NH* XII 8), Pliny the Elder doubted Herodotus’ accuracy and in another book (XXIV 52) even claimed that ebony trees did not grow in Egypt (in which he included Ethiopia also), while elsewhere (XXXV 196) he speaks of “flourishing forests, mostly of ‘ebony’-trees” in what he meant as “Ethiopia”. Lucan (*Civil War* X 303–304) wrote of “Meroë [...] rich in the foliage of the ebony-tree” and the lavish use of “ebony of Meroë” in the palace of Cleopatra VII at Alexandria (X 117–119). Diodorus Siculus (I 33) spoke of “much ebony” growing in the Island of Meroë. Strabo (XVII 2, 2) claims the island of Meroë to abound in ebony.

5. A COPTIC DERIVATIVE OF EG. hbnj?

5.1. Although in the standard lexical tools, no Coptic reflex is known³⁶, the *hapax* (S) hboine (f), attested in the unguent recipe of general ophthalmological

(Mersa) from the northwestern slopes, according to K. BARD and R. FATTOVICH (2011: 128, cf. also n. 178 for references). Further, A. LUCAS and J.R. HARRIS (1962: 434) reported that, even in the early 19th century, “small logs of ebony (about a foot in length) were articles of trade at Shendi (little north of Khartoum)”.

³³ Brought by the expedition of Horchuf under Merenre I (Dyn. VI) in Jam, Wawat, jrt.t in the late OK (*Urk.* I 127, 1).

³⁴ A. LUCAS and J.R. HARRIS (1962: 434, nn. 4–9) listed (with text references) the Gnb.tj.w, Kush, Negro Lands (*sic*), Nubia, Punt and the South Countries where ebony was imported from. W. HELCK (*MWNR* 907–908), then L. STÖRK (*LÄ* I 1162ab, nn. 5–9) precisely enumerated the following early NK sources ebony arrived from: in Hatshepsut’s reign from Punt (*Urk.* IV 326, 17 [skipped by HELCK]; 329, 5; 335, 7), whereas under Thotmes III first of all from Kush (*Urk.* IV 695, 16; 702, 16; 709, 1; 715, 16; 720, 15), but twice also Wawat (*Urk.* IV 728, 16; 1237, 3). In the latter source (= Gebel Barkal stela) “wird allerdings ausdrücklich Wawat als Herkunftsland von Elfenbein und Ebenholz genannt” as W. HELCK (*loc. cit.*) states, for whom “es ist sicherlich nicht zufällig, daß in den Annalen Tutmosis’ III. in stereotyper Weise die Anlieferung von Schiffen voll Elfenbein und Ebenholz fast nur aus Kusch angegeben wird”. He then quoted further texts from this period where “als Hauptprodukt Nubiens neben Gold und Elfenbein erscheint Ebenholz” (*Urk.* IV 524, 8; 983, 16; 950, 7; 1375, 17; 1442). L. STÖRK (*loc. cit.*, n. 9) quoted a further text (an inscription of the Sinai) attesting to Wetenet (wtn.t) as the source of ebony.

³⁵ Most of their words on ebony were best summed up and evaluated by D.M. DIXON (1961: 152 ff.), whose translations are quoted here too.

³⁶ E.g. *CD, KHW*. V. LORET (1883: 126) was also puzzled: “Je ne sais si le mot égyptien s’est conservé en copte; en tous cas, le nom copte de l’ébène ne s’est pas encore retrouvé”.

purposes of a Coptic medical papyrus³⁷, published by E. CHASSINAT (1921: 207, entry XCVI) with disputed rendering, deserves our attention: **Ⲭⲓ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲟϥⲧⲓⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲕⲉⲛⲟⲕ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲟϥⲭⲏⲗⲗⲟⲕ** (χυλός) **ⲛⲙⲉⲧⲙⲟϥⲧⲉ ⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲕ̅** (i.e., kollion, κολλύριον) **ⲡⲓⲣⲓⲭⲉ ⲡⲃⲁⲗ ⲕⲏⲁⲗⲟ** “Prends de la crasse (?) de peigne et du suc de pourpier, fais-en un collyre; étale autour de l’oeil, le mal cessera”. This purely speculative guess on **ⲟϥⲧⲓⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ**³⁸ was, however, not adapted in the Coptic lexicography without reservations: “(meaning unknown: ...to be pounded with **ⲭⲏⲗⲗⲟⲕ** (χυλός) of purslane, for anointing eyes)” (CD 656b) = “Ingredienz eines Augenheilmittels (CD), nach Chassinat ‘mit Schmutz gemischtes Fett, das sich am Kamm ansetzt’ (Till)” (KHW 354 with reference to TILL 1951: 175c, 18.). A sticky substance like greasy filth on a comb can hardly be “pounded” with purslane sap as W.E. CRUM (*loc. cit.*) figured, although the verb is just an imperative **ⲁⲁϥ̅** (**ⲛ̅**-) ‘make these (into)’, let alone that **ⲛⲟϥⲧⲓⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲕⲉⲛⲟⲕ** is not a genitive, but an attributive construction suggesting something like ‘some **ⲧⲓⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ** from/belonging/similar to a comb’. All the more conceivable would be in this context a powdery stuff gained (by rubbing?) from a (worn-out?) comb, which, mixed with a vegetal juice, might more likely yield an unguent.

5.2. To the best of my knowledge, no better³⁹ idea has been suggested since then. Neither has anyone so far pointed out the parallelism in the use of the Coptic *hapax* with that of Eg. hbnj two millennia earlier “3. in offizieller Verwendung in der Augenheilkunde” (*Wb* II 487, 12), namely in pap. Ebers 345 (57, 2–4)⁴⁰,

³⁷ This recipe is the third item of the chapter entitled as **ⲟϥⲕⲟⲗⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟϥⲕ ⲉϥⲱⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲧⲛ̅ ⲛⲃⲁⲗ** “Bon collyre pour toutes les maladies des yeux” (CHASSINAT 1921: 206–207, §XCIV).

³⁸ E. CHASSINAT (1921: 208): “Je traduis ce mot conjecturalement. Associé à **ⲕⲉⲛⲟⲕ**, il ne semble pas qu’il puisse désigner autre chose que la crasse qui se dépose sur les peignes. La crasse humaine était communément employée en médecine”.

³⁹ As confirmed also by Drs. K. HEVESI, my former apprentice in Egyptian and Coptic grammar a decade ago (ELTE, Hungary), now PhD fellow at Heidelberg and then Berlin, working on the unpublished Coptic magical papyri of the greater Western European collections (Strasbourg, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung of Berlin, also Papyrussammlung of Heidelberg), who has kindly informed me (p.c., 26 Feb. 2021) that, up to now, she has not seen any theory on connecting this *hapax* with Eg. hbnj, neither has she any record of ebony in her Coptic materials. All the more is she convinced, since a PhD fellow of hers in Berlin (Miss Anne GRONS), a specialist on Coptic medical texts (excluding magic as much as possible), responsible for uploading these materials in the DDGLC project also, has even most recently only adopted E. CHASSINAT’s (*loc. cit.*) translation with a question-mark and no comments on it. A data-base like this – my pupil maintains – would certainly have contained such a piece of information if anything new had been suggested recently. Having inquired about the problem with a number of specialists on Coptic magical-medical literature, my pupil could only reaffirm (p.c., 3 and 4 March 2021) that she can now take (S) **ⲧⲓⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ** as granted not to have been dealt with in connection with ebony.

⁴⁰ “Ein anderes (Heilmittel) für das Zusammenziehen der Iris (mit Pupille) des Auges: *hp3*-Teil (Schuppen?)* vom Ebenholz 1, oberägyptisches *sj3*-Material 1, werde zerstoßen in Wasser, werde an die beiden Augen gegeben, sehr oft” (*HAM* 611).

pap. Ebers 404 (62, 6)⁴¹, Ebers 415 (62, 18–22)⁴², which all recommend mixing, among others, *hp3*-parts of *ebony*⁴³ in some fluid to get an unguent or “a pom-made to be used in the treatment of the eye-disease called *h3ty*, identified as ciliary blepharitis” (DIXON 1961: 49), which is more than striking in this context.

5.3. In the entry for *ebony* in his *Materia Medica* (MM I 129), Dioscorides⁴⁴ also recorded its use in ancient Greece for healing the pupil of the eye. Observing

⁴¹ “Ein anderes (Heilmittel) [pace Ebers 402 = 62: 4–5 für das Beseitigen der weißen Stellen (Albugines), die in den beiden Augen entstanden sind]: {*hp3*-Teil (Schuppen?)* vom} Ebenholz; Bleiglanz; Wasser; ebenso [pace Ebers *ibidem*: werde fein gerieben, werde in die beiden Augen gegeben]” (HAM 620).

⁴² “Ein anderes (Heilmittel) für das Beseitigen von Verschleierung, Dunkelheit, Schwach-sichtigkeit (und) Einwirkungen, die in den beiden Augen entstanden sind: feuliges/versteinertes Holz [...] 1, Malachit 1, Mehl/Brei der Johannisbrotfrucht (*g3rt*) 1, Blatt der Dornakazie 1, *hp3*-Teil (Schuppen?)* vom Ebenholz 1, Wasser (Saft/Extrakt) der *qbw*-Pflanze/Frucht 1, werde zu einer Masse gemacht, werde zu einem Teig gemacht, werde getrocknet, werde zerstoßen in Wasser, werde an die Außenseite der beiden Augen gegeben” (HAM 622).

⁴³ Rendered as ‘écorce’ (LORET in RT I 1879, p. 132) = ‘Feilspäne’ (HIRSCHBERG and LIPPERT in: AL-KAHHAL 1904: 295) = ‘chip’ (EBBELL 1937a: 58, 69, 75, 82, 92 etc.) = ‘resinbead’ (BARNES 1956: 18 *pace* DAWSON) = ‘écaille’ (LEFÉBVRE 1956: 70, 80, 81) = ‘Späne oder Sägemehl’ (HERMANN in RAC IV, col. 481) = ‘Perle oder Kügelchen (des Ebenholzes)’ (GERMER 1979: 50–51 with long discussion) = ‘*Harzperle’ (GHWB 633; *AWb* II 1977a *pace* DAWSON) = ‘Harzperlen (?) oder Schuppen (?)’ (HAM 843) = ‘*Ebenholzkügelchen (*Astlochinhalt)’ (*AWb* II 1562b). For D.M. DIXON (1961: 50), “most of these renderings appear to be little more than guesses. That of Hermann is apparently based on Theophrastus (IX, xx, 4), Pliny (N.H. XXIV, lii, 89), and Dioscorides (I, 129), all of whom refer to the use of dust or scrapings of ‘ebony’-wood in the treatment of eye-diseases. Pliny in addition says the root applied in water was employed to dispel white specks on the eyes (cf. Ebers 404 = 62, 6)”, whereas “Dawson’s suggestion [...] takes no account of the application of the word to *hbny*-trees, green eye-paint, and *3h*-loaves” in the opinion of DIXON (p. 51), so he himself turned back to Eg. *hp3* ‘umbilical cord’, whereof he concluded to *hp3* denoting in the ophthalmological contexts “the heartwood which, seen in a cross-section of trunk or branch surrounded by lighter coloured sapwood, might have suggested the idea of a navel. The weakness of this suggestion, however, as far as the modern Sudan ebony ssp. are concerned, is that the proportion of sapwood to heartwood is not usually such as to suggest the resemblance of the latter to the navel”. The true sense of this compound was left even most recently untouched by J.Ch. COOPER (2020: 290): “the *hp3* ‘navel’ of *hbny* is used for an ailment of the eye”, which is simply *nichtssagend*. Curiously, R. GERMER (1979: 51) objected, however, that “auch dieses Wort kann nicht ganz richtig sein, da *Dahlbergia melanoxydon* kein Harz absondert, man könnte aber doch wohl Perle oder Kügelchen festhalten”. What about then the gum of ebony: *qmj*.(t) n *hbnj* ‘Harz des Ebenholzbaumes’ used in the embalming ritual (LP, *Wb* V 39, 5; HARRIS 1961: 158 and n. 20)? The legs are anointed with the juice of the gum of the ebony tree. Embalming substances in the text from pap. Boulaq 3 directed for use on the corpse are dealt with in detail by S.L. CHAPMAN (2016: 59, Table 10). Dioscorides (I 129), by the way, mentions Ethiopian ebony having the best gum (Eg. *qmj*.t)!

⁴⁴ Quoted in the translation by T.A. OSBALDESTON and P. WOOD (2000: 129): “Ebenus cleans away things which darken the pupils of the eyes, and it is good for old discharges and pustules. If anyone makes a grinding pad of it, and uses it to rub eye salves or suppositories on they will work better. It is made into eye medicines: the scrapings or dust from it steeped in Chian [from Scios in the Aegean sea] wine for a day and a night, then carefully pounded and converted into eye salves or suppositories. Some beat it first, then sift it and proceed in the same way. Some use water

the overlapping components in the ancient Greek and Egyptian ophthalmological unguents in general, including ebony also⁴⁵, I. ANDORLINI⁴⁶ (2018: 17–18, §II 2–4) too has reported the use of ebony in further recipes of the Greek medical papyri (p. 18, §II 3)⁴⁷ elucidating their match among the above quoted cases of the Egyptian medical papyri⁴⁸.

5.4. The celebrated authority on mediaeval Arabic medicine, al-Kahhal Ali Ibn Isa (see MITTWOCH, HIRSCHBERG, LIPPERT 1904: 295) recorded the same knowledge as to the ophthalmological application of ebony: “Jetzt muss ich die Arzneien aufzählen, welche wir bei der Behandlung des Auges anwenden und ihre Wirkung am Auge, da mein Buch für das Auge spezialisiert ist. Ich sage also das folgende. 1. (Abanūs.) Ebenholz wirkt abwischend (reinigend) Verdunklung und Bedeckung der Pupille und alte Geschwüre”⁴⁹. In their commentary to this Arabic text, HIRSCHBERG and LIPPERT make a comparison with the same ancient Egyptian background quoted above: “Im Papyrus Ebers (1500 v. Chr.) werden Feilspäne von Ebenholz (chpe n hebnē) gegen Pupillensperre und Weissfleck empfohlen”.

instead of wine. It is also burnt in a new ceramic jar until it becomes coals, and is then washed like burnt lead [5–96]. This is good for itching eyes and dry inflammation of the eyes”. My thanks are due to Dr. H. GYÖRY for this quotation (p.c. on 26 Feb. 2021).

⁴⁵ “L’unguento oftalmico descritto prevede l’uso di ‘schiuma di nitro’, un naturale antisettico e disinfettante, cf. PSI X 1180, 34 e Gal. *Comp. med. loc.* IV 8 (XII 801 K.), λευκώματα δὲ ταχέως ἴσται νίτρον μετ’ ἐλαίου παλαιοῦ λεανθὲν ἐπιμελῶς. Questo composto del carbonato di sodio era comune in Egitto e impiegato in molti settori, anche in qualità diverse da quello locale, vedi P.Genova I 62, nota 11. Al sodio si aggiungono ‘mirra’, una droga ottenuta dal ‘legno d’ebano’ e ‘miele attico’”.

⁴⁶ I express my gratitude to Mr. P. GABODA (Museum of Fine Arts, capital of Hungary, p.c. on 25 Feb. 2021) for making me acquainted with this work.

⁴⁷ Cf. “*Ricettario medico*” (PSICongr. XXI 3): “ἔβενου: l’uso medicinale di una droga ricavata dal legno d’ebano è peculiare e trova riscontro, nei papiri medici a noi noti, solo in un collirio riportato da SB VIII 9860 c, 11 ἀπόξεμα, σποδοῦ ἔβενου e d, 12 ἐ[β]ένου κατεξυσμένης (δρ.) β. [...] Anche nella medicina greca veniva utilizzato, ridotto in polvere sottile e sciolto in un eccipiente, come mezzo erosivo in grado di asportare le macchie corneali: Dsc. *MM* I 98 (I 89, 18–19), δύναμιν δὲ ἔχει σηκτικὴν τῶν ἐπισκοτούντων ταῖς κόραις, ἀνδρικῶς δὲ ποιεῖ καὶ πρὸς τὰ παλαιὰ ρεύματα καὶ φλυκτίδας, Gal. *Simpl.* VI 5 (XI 867, 14–16 K.). ἔβενος τῶν εἰς χυλὸν ἀναλυόμενον ἐστὶ ξύλων εἰ παρατρίβοιτο μεθ’ ὕδατος ὥσπερ ἔνιοι τῶν λίθων. Si tratta tuttavia di un metodo terapeutico assai rudimentale, fortemente erosivo (Plin. NH XXIV 89: ...hebenum medici et inter erodentia adsumunt). Procedimenti del genere vennero però ridimensionati dai medici più tardi, cf. Aet. VII 39 (p. 290,31 ss.)”.

⁴⁸ “Il prodotto era invece impiegato per uso oftalmico nella medicina egiziana (*hp3* [sic: h- in place of ḥ, GT] *n hbnj*, vd. Deines – Grapow 1959, 329, 413; pEbers 58, in Ebbell 1937, 69); la qualità migliore si identifica col *Diospyros Ebenum*, la cui polvere contiene acido umico e un pigmento nero adatto per le *tincturae albuginum*”.

⁴⁹ My true thanks go to Mr. P. GABODA for calling my attention to this quotation (p.c. on 25 Feb. 2021).

5.5. If the ancient Egyptian means of healing the pupil of eye by unguent containing some ebony product survived in ancient Greek and Arabic medicine 1-2 millennia later, why could this not have been the case also with Coptic medicine, where ophthalmology, as is well-known, had an overwhelming role? To the best of my knowledge, in this text corpus, such an association has so far not emerged. In my impression at the moment⁵⁰, the examples from the pap. Ebers cited above, corroborated by the Greek and Arabic evidence of an ancient Egyptian knowledge about the pupil healing effect of ebony, may lead to resolving the puzzle of the *hapax* of CHASSINAT and to establishing a new Coptic gloss and its ancient Egyptian etymology: (S) **Ⲫⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ** (f) ‘(some product of?) ebony wood’ (TG) < an unattested OEg. *hbnj.t (fem.) ‘(sg. from) ebony wood (?)’. What kind component of the unguent is denoted by our attributive construction **ⲟⲩⲪⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲕⲟⲉⲛⲟⲥ** has to be subject to further philological investigation⁵¹.

5.6. Finally, our hopeful new Coptic gloss with an apparent stressed second syllable (S) -o- < *-ǎ- and the -j- *furtivum* (epenthesis of the final weak consonant into the stem)⁵² perfectly reflects the same etymon as Demotic hbnj ‘das Ebenholz’ (both Ptolemaic and Roman, *DG* 273). If our theory is valid, the pharaonic etymon of the Coptic fem. *hapax* may have been vocalised *hǎbǎnj.ăt (OK–MK)⁵³ > *hǎbǎjn.ă (NK–3rd IMP) > *hěbǒjn.ě (LP). The regular metathesis of the weak consonant in the *Auslaut* (sort of *yod furtivum*) appears to have only been facilitated by the proximity of a preceding stressed vowel as in our case, which *vice versa* corroborates the stress on the second syllable. This is opposed by the Egyptian etymon reflected by the Hebrew masc. pl. *hapax* with the long vowel in the first syllable and the reduced second one (even if its Hebrew pl. ending was grammatically stressed), along with the equally masc. Greek loan

⁵⁰ We plan to examine this Coptic *hapax* from diverse aspects of philology in a separate study.

⁵¹ Inversely, one might of course easily render it “a comb from ebony-wood”, but one can hardly figure how it could fit as such (without being further processed, e.g., abraded or ground?) into preparing an unguent by being mixed (!) with a vegetal sap. This being apparently out of the question, more realistic sounds a plain attributive construction: “some ebony-wood (stuff) from a comb”. Difficult is to resist the temptation of recalling here Eg. *hp3 n hbnj* ‘Schuppen (?) vom Ebenholz’ used two or perhaps three times in the pap. Ebers for making an ophthalmological unguent, which seems to represent a suspicious parallel or, at least, evoke strange associations to (S) **ⲟⲩⲪⲃⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲕⲟⲉⲛⲟⲥ**, whose signification has to be further examined.

⁵² V. LORET (1883: 126) is mistaken vocalising Eg. *habīn on the basis of Dem. hbnj, since its -j- was due to a late metathesis if the the final weak -j which had originally nothing to do with the stem vowels.

⁵³ Quite close to the *sǎdǎm type (*NBA* 42–48, §2), if we count with an added affix -j, but perhaps all the closer to the naturally *Vrad.* inf. stem pattern implying in our case a naturally *IVae infirmae* OEg. root √hbnj, cf. (S) **ⲱⲧⲟⲩⲧⲣ̄** ‘aufrütteln’ < MEg. *hātārtār or (S) **ⲥⲕⲟⲣⲕⲣ̄** < MEg. *sǎqǎrqǎr (*pace* TILL 1955: 137, §275) and (S) **Ⲫⲗⲟⲉⲓⲗⲉ, Ⲫⲣⲟⲉⲓⲣⲉ** ‘schwimmen, auf dem Wasser schweben’ < MEg. *hǎrǎjrǎj (*KHW* 365 and n. 6 *pace NBA*), less probably also (S) **Ⲫⲓⲟⲙⲉ** (pl. to C-**Ⲫⲓⲙⲉ** ‘Ehefrau’, *KHW* 358) < MEg. *hǎjǎm.ăt (TG).

with an accent on the first syllable (above), which would imply either a masc. OEg. (1) *hábn(ǎj) or better (2) *hábn(ǎj) or perhaps (3) *hábn(j.ǎw). In any case, in both loanwords we find a perfect agreement between the stressed first syllable and fully regular zero reflection of the older final -j which was not subject to metathesis here. The decision about *-ǎ/*-ǎ- in the OEg. 1st syllable is hardly at this moment possible regarding the anomaly of Hebrew qameṣ-ḥatup and Greek ě-. To sum up, the Demotic-Coptic evidence may only lead us to assuming a LEg. *hěbǒjně (be it masc./fem. with an eroded final *-w/*-t, resp.), although the Hebrew and Greek forms suggest something like LEg. *hg/ób(ě) n(ěj). In principle, for the time being, the *-a- vocalism of (S) hboine (f) can only be suspected to have substantially differed from that of its masc. counterpart (the source of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin) whose Coptic reflex we do not know as yet. The background of this anomaly can only be elucidated in the light of new facts.

6. OUT-DATED SPECULATIONS ON THE NATIVE AND “NUBIAN” ORIGINS OF EGYPTIAN hbnj

The only native Egyptian etymology of the term I know is due to V. LORET (1892: 61, §96): “La forme primitive du mot *Habni* est *Hab*, dont je connais trois exemples [...]; cette racine signifie ‘être aigu, pointu’, et fait allusion aux épines de l’Ébénier”. Such an ancient Egyptian verbal root has, however, not been attested according to our standard lexicographical sources, let alone that, as pointed out by D.M. DIXON (1961: 48), “the examples regarded as exhibiting ‘la forme primitive’ are merely defective or late writings [...] of [...] the fuller form *hbn*”. Later, to the best of my knowledge, no researcher has seriously considered the chances of an inner Egyptian derivation for this import item.

Until now, whenever the question of its etymology has been raised at all in Egyptology or Greek philology, the authors unambiguously supposed Eg. hbnj to be a Nubian word for some obscure reason without presenting, however, any single piece of real lexical evidence of it from Nubian ever, in fact. All this may originate from W. SPIEGELBERG’s (1907: 131) apparently purely *ex cathedra* guess, who, in his *Koptisches Handwörterbuch* (1921, *loc. cit.*), wondered “ob das äg. Wort seinerseits ein altes nubisches Lehnwort ist”, which was uncritically followed, e.g., by G. NENCIONI (1939: 11–12) and J.-L. FOURNET (1989: 59, #4), and has until now so stubbornly survived over more than a whole century that this has even penetrated the most recent Greek etymological lexicons by P. CHANTRAINE (1999: 309) and by R. BEEKES (2010: 368) regarding the word as “ultimately perhaps Nubian” (!) without any other reference but SPIEGELBERG 1907. W. VYČIHL (*DELC* 39) was, too, convinced that Eg. hbnj “est certainement un mot africain puisque l’ébène venait de Nubie, de Kouch et Punt”. Following him and ignoring P. BANCEL’s (1989) suggestion (below), both

R. EL-SAYED (2011: 231) and ZIBELIUS-CHEN (2011: 179) surmised an African loanword in general, although no source term has been named by them either⁵⁴. Even the most recent research, like that by B.J. NOONAN (2019: 90–91), is merely speculating about Eg. hbnj as “probably a loan from some African language, perhaps Nubian”. Most recently, V. BLAŽEK (unpublished) seems to have found some noteworthy dendronyms in Nubian⁵⁵.

7. BANCEL’S SUGGESTION ON A NIGER-KORDOFANIAN ETYMOLOGY

7.1. So far, to the best of my knowledge, P. BANCEL (1989: 20–37) has presented the only really documented etymology of Eg. hbnj among the African language families, namely Niger-Kordofanian and esp. its Bantu branch. In his hypothesis (p. 21), this word is “a very likely borrowing from a Negro-African language” (*sic*), whose cognates he was seeking, beside the Niger-Congo and Mande languages, among others, in Proto-Bantu *-pínd- (BANCEL’s notation), i.e. *-pínd- ‘to become black’ [GUTHRIE 1971, part 1, vol. II, 136, #1555]⁵⁶. Among the reflexes of this root⁵⁷, we also find those with plain *Auslaut* -n- resolved from the cluster *-nd-. Aside from the cognates signifying the colour black (not a tree name), he also dealt with some reflexes in Bantu (p. 28): Tunen (Cameroon) í-píndópíndò ‘ébène’, which he surprisingly identified with that he regarded as other Tunen reflexes of *-pínd- like u-mbil, í-mbil ‘noirceur’, -íl- ‘être noir

⁵⁴ Both of these recent works are unfortunately extremely poorly elaborated regarding their comparative linguistic data as I pointed out in my reviews on them (TAKÁCS 2013 and 2014).

⁵⁵ In his view (p.c., June 2021), there are interesting *comparanda* in Nile Nubian: Mahas hambū, ámbī, Dongolawi hámbū, Kenuzi ámbū ‘dourm-palm (*Hyphaena thebaica*)’ (MURRAY 1923: 8, 68). He mentioned the bark of this tree as characterised by the dark-grey hue (cf. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hyphaena_thebaica). Both semantically and regarding its consonantal sequence, however, this term, in my view, can hardly represent a possible source of Eg. hbnj.

⁵⁶ BANCEL (1989: 24, n. 6): “Cette racine correspond à la C.S. 1555 de Guthrie; ce dernier l’a écrit *-pínd-, où *í note une voyelle très fermée. Il faut noter par ailleurs que cette racine n’est pas reconstruite par Meeussen (1969), qui propose pour la même glose *-piit-, ainsi que *-pi (sans tonalité), obscurité. Il paraît certain, même en l’absence de séries comparatives publiées par Meeussen, que ces reconstructions reposent sur d’autres données. Par contre, elles pourraient éventuellement témoigner de la persistance au stade PB d’un doublet plus ancien, ainsi que le pose Mukarowsky [*sic*: -w-, GT] (1987) pour le Proto-Nigritique Occidental...”.

⁵⁷ Quoted by the author (p. 25) as follows: “Guthrie (id., vol. 4, p. 67) en cite des réflexes dans toute une série de langues du nord-ouest du domaine bantu (ses zones A, B et C): A.11 Lundu (Cam.) -ind-, A. 24 Duala (Cam.) -wind-, A.34 Benga (Guinée Equat., Gab.) -bind-, A.43a Basaa (Cam.) -hənt-, A.74 Bulu (Cameroun) -vin-, B.11a Mpongwe (Gab.) -bind-, -pind-, B.22b Ngom (Gab.) -wind-, B.61 Mbeté (Congo) -piin-, B.75 Ibalí (Cong., Zaïre) -peen-, C.32 Bobangi (Zaïre) -yind-. De plus, Guthrie fournit deux autres réflexes présentant une évolution sémantique et provenant des parties centrale et orientale de l’aire bantu: L.31a Luba Lulua (Zaïre) -find- ‘être obscur’, E.55 Kamba (Kenya) kə-βindu ‘obscurité’. L’on remarquera que le second des deux est un déverbal, et que l’on peut retrouver dans la zone A cette dérivation [...]: A.75 Fang (Gabon) e-vina (cl. 7) noir(ceur), -vin- ‘être noir’”.

(à propos de fruits mûrs)', mbilikitikitikiti (ideophone) and fíííí 'très noir'. To be frank, one can only be puzzled by such a confusing presentation of lexical data perfectly devoid of outlines of the historical processes and the regular *Lautverschiebungen* connecting them. E.g., where is the author's insight into the historical phonology of such *comparanda* as, e.g., Tunen -íl- vs. u-mbil, i-mbil vs. fíííí treated as the "reflexes" of Bantu *-pínd-? Strangely, the author forgot to present them⁵⁸. One can hardly follow his further line of controversial speculative guesses on Tunen verbal root -híj- 'être noir' either, which he regarded as a further remarkable cognate form whose precise Bantu derivation he again left uncertain (p. 28, n. 11)⁵⁹. No better is BANCEL's typically ambiguous remark when he attached a further Bantu dendronym, Ipunu ivííl 'ébène' as cognate whose controversial alternative derivation from a proto-root variety seems purely arbitrary, being utterly devoid of any exact argumentation (p. 29, n. 12)⁶⁰. Only later we arrive at probably the most impressive piece of Bantu lexical data corroborating "la série lexicale du tunen" presented by BANCEL: Njabi (Gabon) i-vindu (tones unmarked) 'ébène'⁶¹ vs. -pínd- 'être noir', which "montre [...] la possibilité d'une mutation sémantique de noir à ébène dans une langue africaine" (p. 29). It is a pity that BANCEL failed to set just this term in the focus of a thorough diachronic study and to reply or even to address the evidently arising questions: (1) what the prefix here was (*ki- > *hi- > Njabi i- or otherwise???), (2) whether this Bantu form was the sole term for 'ebony' among the possible reflexes of the underlying common Niger-Kordofanian root and, if yes, (3) in which form might one deduce for the latter more ancient level a *lautgeschichtlich* plausible parental lexeme for 'ebony'. Noteworthy, BANCEL only devoted a footnote (p. 25, n. 7) to the fact that "Guthrie reconstruit un thème nominal signifiant ébénier", apparently misquoted by him as *-péngò (*sic*), but in fact listed by M. GUTHRIE (1971:

⁵⁸ Instead, without any further reasoning, he only admitted the simple fact that "Chacun de ces réflexes, y compris celui désignant l'ébène, est irrégulier en quelque manière au regard des correspondances phonologiques établies par Guthrie (1967–71) entre PB et tunen" (p. 28).

⁵⁹ He argued: "De fait, une autre. Il pourrait s'agir ici encore d'un réflexe irrégulier de *-pínd-, être noir, mais l'évolution d'une nasale alvéolaire à une vélaire, bien qu'inexpliquée, semble sporadiquement attestée en tunen, ainsi que dans les langues du groupe A.70. Mais il est tout de même intrigant de constater qu'il pourrait aussi bien s'agir d'un réflexe déverbal, phonologiquement régulier, du thème *-péngò, ébène, étant donné que /h/ est le réflexe régulier de *p en tunen. On aurait alors un exemple de la mutation sémantique inverse de celle que nous supposons ici (mais identique à la dérivation *ebony* > *ebonite*), avec la mutation (être pareil à l')ébène > être noir" (p. 28).

⁶⁰ In his view, this form "...relève probablement de la variante *-piit- reconstruite par Meeussen, alors que, dans cette même langue, abondent les réflexes (irréguliers) de *-pínd-. Ceci, à notre sens, renforce l'hypothèse d'un doublet".

⁶¹ S. CAPO CHICHI (kind p.c. on 19 Jan. 2021): "La forme *i-vindu* semble être du tunen et non de l'ibali (ou ibaliban langue dont je n'ai pas entendu parler)".

136, #1533) as *-píngò ‘ebony-tree’⁶². This form may apparently have dissatisfied BANCEL, so he ignored it⁶³.

7.2. Outside the Bantu subbranch, at least in BANCEL’s list (p. 26), this root has numerous cognates in some other branches of the Niger-Kordofanian phylum: i.a., (1) Niger-Congo⁶⁴: (1a) Gur, Oti-Volta: Moba binn, Birifor biri, Wama bitirida, Gbanyan -bila, Hanga bir-, Dagara ble, all ‘black’; (1b) Kru: Dida blií ‘très noir’; (1c) Kwa: Igbo bilibili ‘obscurité’, Fon wì ‘être noir’; (1d) Adamawa-Ubangi: A2 vikri, A4 Dourou vît/vîl, Péerè vinè, A5 virki, A6 pir, E1e Monjombo bī, Gbanzili bīkī, E3 Nzakara bī-bīlī ‘noir’; (2) Mande: Soninke binne ‘noir’⁶⁵, Tura bilibili ‘très noir’, Bozo pī, Jula fī ‘noir’. The problem here too, is that this rich, albeit not at all impressive, variety of look-alikes was accumulated in the fashion of the mass comparison, i.e., without any well-founded reconstruction, a method very useful in GREENBERG’s day (1950s) at that stage of AA comparison, but now long out-dated in all those linguistic domains (e.g., in the examined ones also) where since then the regularities of historical phonology have been more or less elaborated. His lexical data were, in fact, not subject for BANCEL to a detailed diachronical analysis demonstrating the regularity of the individual sound shifts according to some paradigm of Niger-Congo and Mande historical phonology, resp. Therefore, the mass of data above in its present shape can hardly yield any use for our investigation.

7.3. Unfortunately, the same is valid about how BANCEL (p. 27), following H.G. MUKAROVSKY (1987), adduced and handled some distant parallels (?) to his Niger-Kordofanian cognates (?) from other African phyla like Nilo-Saharan: Zarma bi ‘noir’, bi-ri ‘noirceur’ and Afro-Asiatic: WCh.: Karekare berem || CCh.: Musgoy mbleṇmbleṇ || ECh.: Sumrai minyo | Mokulu ḥiriny~ (sic: -ny~) ‘noir’.

⁶² Whereas one finds no mention of it at all *apud* GUTHRIE (1971: 135), following the entry for Bantu *-pèng ‘to put leaning’ (#1486).

⁶³ As he expressed it: “mais celui-ci ne convient pas à une hypothèse d’emprunt, d’abord par la distribution géographique exclusivement orientale de ses réflexes, soient les zones de Guthrie E, G et P (c.à.d. Kenya, Tanzanie, Malawi, Mozambique and Afrique du Sud), donc loin du foyer originel de dispersion du Proto-Bantu, ce qui nous empêche de le considérer comme relevant obligatoirement de ce stade...”.

⁶⁴ He commented on this attestation: “Dans la branche primaire Niger-Congo, le seul rameau manquant est l’Ouest Atlantique, qui n’a cependant pas fait l’objet d’investigations approfondies. Avec les attestations du Mande, ceci indique clairement que la racine est en fait très ancienne, bien qu’elle ne soit pas reconstruite par Mukarowsky (1976–77) pour son Proto-Nigritique Occidental. Cependant, nous n’avons pas eu accès à la documentation lexicale dans les langues kordofanienues, et leur absence du tableau de données ci dessus n’est donc significatif que de cette lacune” (p. 27).

⁶⁵ As Mr. S. CAPO CHICHI (p.c. on 19 Jan. 2021) kindly informed me, “le mot *binne* est tiré de Mukarovsky et signifie ‘noir’. Il est aussi documenté dans le dictionnaire de Diagana, Ousmane Moussa. Dictionnaire Soninké-français : Mauritanie, Paris: Karthala, 2011”.

7.4. Then, BANCEL ventured to justify “la plausibilité de la mutation sémantique de noir à ébène impliquée par l’hypothèse de l’emprunt”, i.e., how the Niger-Kordofanian etymon⁶⁶ evolved into the Egyptian dendronym, which led him to “considérations générales sur le fait que la noirceur de l’ébène est sa plus remarquable particularité à l’intérieur de sa classe sémantique naturelle (/bois, arbre/, [...])...”, which is just as original an observation as his other conclusion: “le mot *ébène* lui-même [...] a donné naissance au dénominal *ébonite*, sur la seule base sémantique de la noirceur” (pp. 27–28). But all this hardly proves a bit about Eg. hbnj as being borrowed from Bantu *p̥ind- ‘black’. More thinkable, but equally hypothetical is his argument from the classical antiquity⁶⁷.

7.5. Undisturbed by the phonological controversies, BANCEL *a priori* concluded that one may assume a direct phonological correspondence between Eg. heben(y)⁶⁸ (*sic*) vs. PBantu *(ki)-pind-V (pp. 29–30)⁶⁹. As for the unexplicable anomaly of Eg. h- ~ Bantu *k-, he launched again into mere speculation (p. 31)⁷⁰ about the element *ki⁷¹, with which one can barely agree as the lenition of OK (or later) Eg. h- < *k- has not been observed⁷². Thus, it is hardly of any use for Eg. hbnj. Apparently dissatisfied with this scenario, BANCEL alternatively suspected Eg. h- to reflect the Proto-Bantu prefix *pi- evolving into hi- in some

⁶⁶ Supposed, in his words, “en l’absence de documents attestant la réalité de cette mutation [...] pour la langue supposée être à la source de l’emprunt” (p. 28).

⁶⁷ “D’ailleurs dans la koiné gréco-latine des botanistes, *melanoxylon*, bois noir, est le descriptif de plusieurs espèces d’ébéniers. Ceci pourrait déjà être une indication d’un contexte d’emprunt où une forme véhiculaire – type linguistique faisant en règle générale un large usage de descriptifs – d’une langue africaine aurait été utilisée”

⁶⁸ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): “L’égyptien *h (et la ‘copie’ grecque ἔ ou ἐ de la syllabe initiale du mot égyptien) représente ce préfixe obligatoire. Au moins au stade PB tous les préfixes ont en effet la structure *CV-”.

⁶⁹ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): “La racine PB est reconstruite sans préfixe, mais ne peut en aucun cas être réalisée sans. Ceci est valable au stade PB, mais aussi à tous les stades Niger-Kordofan pertinents en l’occurrence...”.

⁷⁰ For him “L’identification précise du préfixe reste incertaine, à cause des 2 millénaires séparant l’emprunt égyptien du stade PB. Cependant, il est tentant d’établir un lien avec le préfixe PB *ki- (classe 7), qui fournit une correspondance satisfaisante [*sic*] avec la séquence *h(e) de l’égyptien” (*loc. cit.*), which is out of the question for me (cf. EDE I 143–148).

⁷¹ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): “ce préfixe est également celui actuellement employé dans la dérivation dénominal des réflexes de *pind-, et en particulier en tunen et njabi pour désigner l’ébène. Ce préfixe n’est d’ailleurs pas canonique pour les noms d’arbres en bantu, quoique certains noms d’arbres et de plantes appartiennent à cette classe (genre 7/8) dans les langues actuelles. Cependant, une des valeurs sémantiques identifiées pour ce genre est de regrouper divers objets matériels, ce qui convient à la fois aux vocables tunen et njabi (ébène et non ébénier) et à la situation présumée de l’emprunt, où l’ébène se présente comme une matière première et non un végétal”.

⁷² I found but one single case of Eg. h- corresponding to Cu. *ḳ- (EDE I 295), which proves here nothing.

modern languages (p. 31)⁷³, on which his theory *eo ipso* collapses, his pre-Bantu ****hi-pĩnd-** ‘ebony’ being fully anachronistic and ill-founded. As to the Egyptian 2nd radical, BANCEL has chosen the path of assuming an interchange of Bantu ***b ~ *p** (p. 31)⁷⁴. Interestingly, he overlooked the cases of labial variation in Egyptian⁷⁵. As for the 3rd radical, BANCEL was undisturbed by the anomaly of Eg. **n ~ Bantu *nd** too (p. 32)⁷⁶. Even if we accept (*pace* BANCEL above) that the age of Proto-Bantu was a couple of millennia later than the Old Kingdom, what about the even more recent shift of ***-nd- > -n-** in certain Bantu daughter languages? How could any of these serve as the source of borrowing for an OK word? Being apparently embarrassed by such an anachronistic scenario implied, he immediately moved on to his second scenario to speculatively explain the anomaly of the final radicals as some sort of “secondary” shift⁷⁷. But one may ask: where is the thorough demonstration of such a daring allegation in Bantu historical linguistics? Or in BANCEL’s paper? Why is there no mention of it? No surprise that, instead, he at once turned to his third scenario on the final radicals: “L’hypothèse que la correspondance soit en fait égypt. ***ny ~ PB *nd** reste une autre possibilité étayée par la présence de semi-consonnes palatales en sumrai et mokulu, corrélativement à la possibilité d’une évolution ***d > y**, attestée, par exemple, en bantu A.70”. This comparison of the final radicals in Bantu with those in Afro-Asiatic (Chadic) daughter languages (without having examined their internal *Lautgeschichte*) is, however, just the same anachronistic *ad hoc* guess without any piece of comparative evidence. Then BANCEL dealt with the “correspondence” he formulated as “***y ~ ?**”; not wasting a word on the Old

⁷³ “Cependant, d’autres préfixes PB pourraient également se prêter à la comparaison avec la séquence CV initiale de l’emprunt égyptien, notamment ***pi-**, cl. 19, dont on connaît des évolutions en **/hi-/** dans les langues actuelles. Mais la correspondance avec ce préfixe n’est pas du tout confirmée sur les plans morphologique et sémantique”.

⁷⁴ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): “Cette correspondance peut sembler triviale par elle-même. Il est cependant à remarquer que dans le contexte intervocalique qui nous intéresse, si l’évolution ***p > b** est effectivement naturelle, l’inverse ne l’est pas. L’antériorité du terme emprunté par l’égyptien sur la racine PB impliquerait donc l’existence de deux branches collatérales dès la date de cet emprunt, l’une ayant préservé le ***p** d’une racine commune encore antérieure, et aboutissant au PB, l’autre ayant très tôt procédé au voisement du ***p** et fournissant le terme à l’égyptien. Cependant, le fait que la plupart des cognats, hors du groupe bantu, aient une initiale voisée, ainsi que le problème des doubles réflexes des occlusives en bantu laissent ouverte cette question”.

⁷⁵ Among the numerous instances of Eg. **b** vs. Sem./AA ***p** (discussed e.g. in *EDE* I 284–286), I collected also some (ca. 3) reliable exx. also.

⁷⁶ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): “Cette correspondance est également naturelle dans sa forme inverse par rapport aux datations respectives, c’est-à-dire que ***nd > n** est bien plus attendu que l’inverse. De fait, un certain nombre de réflexes de ***pĩnd-** ont réduit la prénasalisée à une nasale simple”.

⁷⁷ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): “Cependant, l’on trouve ci-dessus, dans les données extérieures au PB, deux géminées (en moba et soninke), ainsi que des séquences **C2VC3** alvéolaires comprenant généralement une nasale (en wama, karekare, musgoy, sumrai et mokulu), qui pourraient faire attribuer le ***nd** du PB à un développement secondaire”.

Kingdom phenomenon of defectively (un)written weak consonants, he again just scattered diverse guesses. First, he tried to maintain a *mater lectionis* nature of the final Eg. -j (pp. 32–33)⁷⁸. He then alternatively formulated the second hypothesis: “Nous avons vu ci-dessus qu’il pourrait également être l’image d’une *C₃, ayant abouti avec *C₂ au PB *nd”. But right at once he put forward a third one: “De plus, *y pourrait également correspondre à la *V* finale de la variante grecque ἔβένη, et cette voyelle elle-même, ne différant que par la longueur des deux précédentes, correspondant elles-mêmes au PB *i, pourrait être l’image d’un *-i ou d’un *-e finaux”. Luckily, he himself immediately admitted the absurdity of this anachronistic comparison of Old Kingdom Egyptian with Greek morphology two millennia later⁷⁹. All in all, BANCEL equally failed in either way to explain and demonstrate any of the dubious Bantu matches to the root consonants of Eg. hbnj. Still, he maintained the match itself (pp. 33–34)⁸⁰, which thus remains just an arbitrary and ill-founded hypothesis.

7.6. Still, BANCEL was undisturbed to draw a daring “conclusion de cette comparaison phonologique” (*sic*) (p. 34), which, as I indicated above, has not even happened in fact. He supposed the ultimate source of our dendronym in the Niger-Kordofanian phylum so that “des locuteurs d’une langue de ce phylum se trouvaient il y a quelque 5000 ans dans une région en contact avec l’Égypte”, which is but an all too daring speculation built upon this one single phonologically ill-founded and thus dubious parallel. It used to be elaborated the reverse way! Where is the linguistic evidence, i.e., a considerable number of isoglosses shared by Egyptian and Niger-Kordofanian proving an areal contact? A decade later (1999), I have collected among the non-AA lexical parallels to Egyptian roots at least 21–23 cases where Niger-Kordofanian is implied, and among these, a strikingly high percentage of Bantu matches (*EDE* I 38–46)⁸¹, but even this

⁷⁸ “Avec les réserves exprimées plus haut quant à la nature radicale ou non du *y égyptien, nous pouvons néanmoins constater qu’il correspond à la fois à la voyelle de la racine PB, et aux voyelles radicales reflétées par le grec (avec toutefois un écart d’un degré d’aperture). Cette correspondance est cependant à rejeter, impliquant que le hiéroglyphe qui le représente ne soit jamais à la place assignée par sa position dans la séquence phonologique”.

⁷⁹ “Ceci n’est pourtant pas un argument très fort, puisque la *V* finale grecque est une terminaison féminine régulière, et peut représenter une réflexion purement hellénique aussi bien qu’un phonème du mot égyptien. En tout cas, la finale grecque -ος de la seconde variante, ne correspondant à rien dans la racine égyptienne, est à coup sûr un (autre ?) exemple d’une telle régularisation”.

⁸⁰ “Soulignons cependant que plusieurs des faits déjà mentionnés renforcent indirectement la correspondance, à savoir fondamentalement la correspondance entre ἔβένη et *-pīnd-, et celle, beaucoup moins sûre, entre voyelles de la première syllabe, ainsi que la présence du *y dans la racine égyptienne, difficile à attribuer avec certitude”.

⁸¹ Namely, Eg. (?) rn ‘Name’ (OK-, *Wb*)*, ph or mph (udder det.) ‘udder’ (PT 1548, FAULKNER 1969: 235, n. 4), (?) hp3 ‘Nabel’ (PT-, *Wb*), bn.w ‘waist or buttocks’ (PT 1464, FAULKNER 1969: 226, n. 17), tbn ‘Gehirn’ (Med-, *Wb*)*, qn ‘fett (sein)’ (Med-, *Wb*), tr [regular < *kr] ‘das Rote, als Bezeichnung für Blut’ (PT, *Wb*), wdd ‘Galle(nblase)’ (Med-, *Wb*)*, p^cp^c ‘gebären’ (GR, *Wb*)*,

modest evidence (along with that from Nilo-Saharan and Khoisan) had not compelled me to any hasty allegations⁸². Unconvincing is BANCEL's speculation how to overcome the apparent time gap separating the Old Kingdom (3rd mill. BC) from Proto-Bantu (1st mill. BC)⁸³. As for the historical context of his hypothesis, he felt the borrowing into pharaonic Egypt to have taken place in Sudan⁸⁴. Thence, following his line of speculations, he unstoppably proceeded further to deduce the primary habitat of Niger-Kordofanian to have been right here⁸⁵. But

znj 'vorbeigehen' (LP-GR: von der Zeit) (PT, *Wb*)*, b 'Böses' (LP-, *Wb*)*, jb.w 'Zufluchtsstätte' (MK-, *Wb*) = 'shelter, refuge' (*FD* 15)*, dbb ~ dbj 'verstopfen' (MK-, *Wb*)*, km 'vollständig machen, vollenden' (MK, *Wb*)*, tt.t (fem.) 'Fesslerin' (PT, *GHWb* 967)*, fnfn.w 'Lohn' (XVIII, *Wb*) = 'recompense' (*FD* 98)*, d.t [regular < *g.t] 'Hörige' (OK-, *Wb*) = 'serf' (*FD* 318)*, hp.t 'Steuerruder' (MK-, *Wb*) = 'oar' (*FD* 168)*, jwrj.t 'Bohne' (MK-, *Wb*), j'n 'Pavian' (OK-, *Wb*) = 'baboon' (*FD* 11)*, jnp.w 'Anubis' (OK-, *Wb*) = 'recumbent dog (rather than a jackal)' (*EG* 1927, 451, E15), (?) jtn [if *jtl < *tyl] 'sun' (MK, *Wb*). The Niger-Kordofanian matches of the asterisked (*) Egyptian glosses are also attested in Bantu.

⁸² Instead, I only dared to put some questions (*EDE* I 47): "Can we suppose that, after the split-up of the Afro-Asiatic unity, the Proto-Egyptian tribes had a long coexistence with the ancestors of Chadic as well as of Nilo-Saharan somewhere in the Saharan macroarea? Can we identify the bearers of the paleolithic-neolithic Saharan culture with a wide conglomeration in which Proto-Egypto-Chadic and other ancient African (Nilo-Saharan, Bantu etc.?) populations could also have taken part?"

⁸³ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): "Nous avons déjà implicitement admis que la racine PB était postérieure à celle empruntée par l'égyptien. En effet, si les calculs glotto-chronologiques nous paraissent devoir faire l'objet de grandes précautions, il nous semble dans ce cas particulier que l'assez faible profondeur temporelle de l'éclatement du Proto-Bantu, et l'important écart avec la date minimale de l'emprunt égyptien excluent la contemporanéité des deux".

⁸⁴ He claimed: "qu'il a été démontré que le foyer de l'expansion bantu se trouve sur la côte Ouest de l'Afrique, et donc qu'il faut rajouter à la date de dispersion quelques siècles au moins pour que des locuteurs de langues bantu aient pu se trouver dans une région géographiquement susceptible d'avoir été en contact avec l'Égypte. Par contre, les langues de la branche primaire kordofanienne du phylum Niger-Kordofan, dont l'ancienneté les rend tout à fait susceptibles de correspondre à la profondeur temporelle de l'emprunt égyptien, sont actuellement parlées dans le sud du Soudan actuel, et répondent donc également aux impératifs géographiques de l'emprunt" (*loc. cit.*).

⁸⁵ BANCEL (1989: 35): "Il découle de ceci une conséquence tout à fait importante. La forte présomption qu'à cette époque, des locuteurs d'une langue de ce phylum aient pu se trouver dans les parages de l'actuel Soudan, laisse à penser que cette région pourrait bien être le berceau de la famille toute entière. Dans cette hypothèse, les branches primaires Niger-Congo et Mande résulteraient de migrations vers l'ouest à partir de ce foyer originel. Cette théorie, basée sur un rapprochement lexical indirect, paraîtra certainement risquée. Il est certain que l'identification de cognats de *-pind- dans des langues kordofaniennes actuelles (auxquelles nous n'avons pas eu accès pour la rédaction de ce travail) la renforcerait considérablement. Il nous semble en tout cas que le facteur d'erreur imputable à la méthode glottochronologique à cette profondeur temporelle empêche ses résultats d'être valablement opposés à notre hypothèse. Inversement, il n'est pas exclu qu'elle puisse être invalidée par la découverte d'une racine d'une autre famille linguistique qui se prêterait aussi bien à l'emprunt égyptien. La famille Nilo-Sahara pourrait éventuellement être ici en cause, voire la famille Khoisane que l'on soupçonne d'avoir occupé dans des temps reculés une aire bien plus vaste que celle qui lui est aujourd'hui dévolue en Afrique australe". In the English abstract to

it is not clear where all the linguistic facts thereof are, and how their analysis, necessary for corroborating the supposed temporal and areal coordinates, is replaceable by but one unconvincing look-alike, which is by far not sufficient for any guess about ancient contacts. The daring theory above would expectably badly need a careful elaboration of an extensive linguo-archaeological context.

7.7. Nevertheless, following his path a decade later, V. BLAŽEK (2001: 154, #f) too, looked for the source of Eg. hbnj among the Niger-Congo languages only quoting Soninke (Mande) binne ‘black’ and Ibalí (Bantu) i-vindu ‘ebony’, i.e., *‘blackwood’ vs. -peen- ‘to be black’ < proto-Bantu *-pɪnd- ‘to be black’, although he also left the controversy of Bantu *-nd- vs. Eg. -nj- untouched.

8. SOUTH ASIAN ORIGIN OF EGYPTIAN hbnj?

8.1. An idea of the Asiatic provenance of Eg. hbnj as an open question, still declined by V. LORET (1892: 125)⁸⁶, occurs as early as G. BEAUVISAGE (1897: 78)⁸⁷. Perhaps the most thorough survey on the ebony trade in Ancient Egypt is the thesis by D.M. DIXON (1961), a milestone on the subject, where the author has given the most careful and detailed examination, ever known to my mind, of all the facts suggesting a possible Indian and/or Ceylonese source of what is meant by Eg. hbnj. He explained the complete silence of Classical authors “on the occurrence of ‘ebony’ in the coastal region of the Red Sea” at any African port by supposing that goods from Arabia, East Africa, and India “did not enter Egypt by the Red Sea, but travelled thither overland and down the Nile, though in the Graeco-Roman period the Nile route was little used on account of the hardships involved” (pp. 152–153). Having surveyed all main ebony-producing species of India and Ceylon (pp. 169–174), first he gave an exhaustive account of previous views on ancient Egyptians’ ebony import from there (pp. 175). Enumerating a few items from prehistorical Egypt⁸⁸, “the nearest source of supply” for which

his paper, accordingly, BANCEL ended up assuming that the ancestor root of Bantu *-pɪnd- “could well have been the source of the Old Egyptian borrowing, although the age of the Egyptian attestations prohibits a borrowing directly from Proto-Bantu, whose dispersion may hardly be older than the first millennium B.C. This suggests that languages belonging to the Niger-Kordofan family, were spoken at the beginning of the 3rd millennium B.C. in the region where the Kordofanian languages are now spoken (South of the Sudan)” (p. 21).

⁸⁶ He wrote: “Les égyptiens n’ayant connu que l’ébène éthiopienne, c’est la seule dont je m’occuperai ici”.

⁸⁷ Whether solely Ethiopian or also Indian ebony was used by the Egyptians, he left undecided: “À la question ainsi posée j’apporte une réponse partielle: [...] Il était certes permis de supposer que les anciens Égyptiens employaient plutôt l’Ebène de l’Éthiopie que l’Ebène de l’Inde; mais c’était peut-être s’aventurer bien imprudemment que de transformer cette hypothèse en une affirmation affirmative”.

⁸⁸ Like (1) a stone axe possibly made of jadeite from the neolithic settlement at Merimde, (2) a predynastic nephrite axe from Hamra Dom, (3) the bark (identified as possibly either sandal

“would presumably have been India”, he pointed to the lapis lazuli (whose nearest source was Badakshan in north-eastern Afghanistan) found in several sites of predynastic Egypt, which, in his theory, may have been imported from overseas by the so-called square-boats (“type of vessel with high vertical prow and stern and straight keel”, depicted in the rock-drawings of Wadi Hammamat and elsewhere on the routes connecting the Nile Valley with the Red Sea and also at the coast), which appeared also from Mesopotamia (pp. 176–177). All this led DIXON to state that the square-boats “were very probably the means whereby contact was [...] maintained, between Egypt and Iran and further east” (p. 178)⁸⁹. Already the Classical authors distinguished “l’ébène d’Éthiopie au bois noir luisant et sans nœud, et l’ébène de l’Inde à taches blanches et rougeâtres” (CHANTRAINE 1999: 309). DIXON also pointed to the peculiar yellow streaks of black wood as depicted by the Egyptians⁹⁰, which by no means agree with the typically white-streaked ebony of Nubian origin⁹¹ and – as he admitted – “which resemble more those on certain species found in Asia producing what is known as Calamander wood or Andaman marble-wood or zebra-wood” (p. 183). Hence, DIXON surmised an South Asian provenance (p. 184)⁹². But he voiced his doubts also: “...even if it were possible to equate this yellow-streaked *hbny* with one or more species at present found in India and Ceylon, it would not necessarily follow that it was always obtained from thence. Even now comparatively little is known of the ecology of these species and nothing of their distribution in

or cinnamon, neither having ever grown in ancient Egypt or the southern Red Sea area according to D.M. DIXON *loc. cit.*, “despite the statements of the Classical writers”) among the contents of a large two-handled pot from the predynastic village débris at Badari.

⁸⁹ Elsewhere, DIXON assumed that “from Pharaonic times [...] lapis-lazuli continued to enter Egypt, though now apparently almost entirely from the north, via the land-route across Western Asia” (p. 178).

⁹⁰ “Among items received from Punt depicted in the tomb of Puyemrē are two piles of black logs prominently streaked with various shades of yellow and golden yellow [...] labelled ‘*hbny*’. Other representations of black or blackish wood streaked or blotched in varying degree with shades of yellow are attested from the New Kingdom and as far back as the Third Dynasty”. DIXON (1961: 201, n. 61) enumerates mostly MK and NK instances of such a peculiar depiction of what he supposed to be Eg. *hbny*: “In the publications this wood is usually termed ‘ebony’. Though it is not labelled, it may very well depict a variety of *hbny*. It is, of course, impossible to draw any conclusions regarding the availability of such wood from the frequency with which it appears in the tomb-paintings”. He did not exclude that this depiction “was highly prized on account of its decorative appearance and therefore often imitated”.

⁹¹ DIXON (*loc. cit.*): “the colour of the *hbny* shown being delivered by Nubians [...] is either black or sometimes streaked with lighter colours, but it is never streaked or blotched with yellow. Again, though much of the wood now sold in the Sudan is streaky, no species of African wood at present regarded as ebony shows these pronounced golden-yellow markings”.

⁹² DIXON (*loc. cit.*): “Is this yellow-streaked *hbny*, then, to be identified with one or more species at present found in India and Ceylon? It is by no means impossible that products from these lands found their way to the southern end of the Red Sea, particularly in the New Kingdom”.

ancient times. They may, therefore, have occurred [...] even in Africa” (p. 186)⁹³. As a further argument for a South Asian origin of Eg. hbnj is the fact of a clear distinction made in the Annals of Thotmes III between hbnj vs. “black wood” as shown by DIXON (1961: 187)⁹⁴, which may well be in accordance with W.F. LEEMANS’ (1960: 11 with n. 5) statement that “the kinds of ebony which come from tropical Africa are blacker than those from India and Ceylon”. Finally, DIXON has carefully only concluded (among others) that, “while it is not impossible that quantities of *hbnj* were also obtained from Asia (India, Ceylon), there is as yet no definitive evidence that such was the case” (p. 208). P. BANCEL (1989: 21) too, seems to have played even with the idea of an Asiatic source of ebony in ancient Egypt that “must have been an imported product from tropical regions, either African or Asiatic”⁹⁵. This species, as opposed to *Diospyros dendo* of West Africa, is the *Diospyros ebenum* which is in principle not supposed to have occurred in ancient Egypt. Claiming, however, that “there is no evidence for these latter species’ presence in ancient Egypt”, B.J. NOONAN (2019: 91, n. 191) has unfortunately ignored the data about a specimen of ebony from Dynasty V (examined by L. WITTMACK) stated to be *Diospyrum ebenum* as mentioned among others by L. BORCHARDT (1909: 68)⁹⁶ and then by A. LUCAS and J.R. HARRIS (1962: 435). The latter, however, of course, remained sceptical: “but as it seems to be improbable that ebony should have been obtained from India and Ceylon at such an early period, and as it is difficult to be sure of the species from an examination of the dead wood, this identification needs confirmation...”. Elsewhere in this fundamental handbook (p. 467), the chapter “Historical Summary” warned “as worthy of note that, so far as is known, there was not any

⁹³ He further argued that “in view [...] of regular and ruthless felling of *hbnj*-producing trees, the possibility remains that this black and yellow was derived from an African species, supplies of which were long ago exhausted” (pp. 185–186). “In this connection”, DIXON referred to “the existence on the island of Bahrein (Tylos) in the fourth century B.C. of a tree producing a very heavy wood, variegated ‘like the tiger’s skin’”, according to Theophrastus, “which Thiselton-Dyer suggested might possibly be Calamander wood” (p. 186).

⁹⁴ Cf. *Urk.* IV 666, 16; 667, 4–5 vs. *Urk.* IV 705, resp.

⁹⁵ Elsewhere also in his paper, P. BANCEL (1989: 23–24) claims that “Son origine a été très discutée, étant donné que des arbres fournissant un bois noir ainsi désigné croissent dans toutes les zones tropicales du globe [...], notamment *Dalbergia melanoxylon* (Afrique), *Diospyros spp.* (Inde et Indonésie)”.

⁹⁶ L. BORCHARDT (1909) described the object in question found during his Abusir expedition (excavating the burial monument complex of king Neferirkare, first half of Dyn. V, ca. late 25th cent. BC) as follows: “...das Mittelsück (Berl. Mus. Nr. 18 171) eines Schiebedeckels von einem kleinen, etwa 20 cm lang gewesenen Holzkästchen, dessen Material Geh.-Rat Wittmack als Ebenholz (*Diospyrum ebenum*) bestimmte, und das sauber eingeritzt die Inschrift trug: [...] Der König von Ober- und Unterägypten *Nefer-ir-ke3-re*’...”. Equally very briefly has written L. WITTMACK himself (1910: 191) on this strange find of his, where, in fact, he merely repeated the description of the object *apud* BORCHARDT but, for some unspecified reason, omitting the ebony specimen: “Dieser Deckel ist, wie ich fand, aus Ebenholz und trägt nach Borchardt eingeritzt die hieroglyphische Inschrift”. That is all.

material used in ancient Egypt until about the Eighteenth Dynasty that can be traced to India, though India and Ceylon possessed [...] commodities [...] that were in great demand in Egypt [...]. It is possible that some of the fragrant woods mentioned in Egyptian records as having been received from Punt may have been of Indian origin". Referring to the fragments of Ceylonese ebony species from Dynasty V according to the new thesaurus of Egyptian plant remains by C. DE VARTAVAN (1997: 103, 106–107), also D. MEEKS (2002: 280, cf. also n. 76) carefully ventured to suspect trade with regions beyond Arabia at that period⁹⁷. The reluctance to assume trade between early pharaonic Egypt and India is persistent until the present time⁹⁸. In their monograph on the Puntite sea trade in the Middle Kingdom, K.A. BARD and R. FATTOVICH (2018: 168) confirmed, among the import from Punt, also some (!) "*Diospyros* sp.", which they, strangely, regarded as "African ebony"⁹⁹. In this respect, C. DE VARTAVAN's (*loc. cit. supra*) result was quoted most recently by J.Ch. COOPER (2020: 289, n. 919) with the same scepticism as seen *apud* J.R. HARRIS (*loc. cit. supra*): "... although one should doubt the Fifth Dynasty entry of *Diospyros ebenum*, as this would entail trade reaching India". However, recently, *Diospyros* species was excavated by the team of R. GERISCH¹⁰⁰ at Mersa Gawasis (i.e., at the Middle Kingdom Egyptian Red Sea harbour built for the Puntite trade), one of the sources of the Egyptian ebony import, which, most recently, A. MANZO (2011: 76, n. 74; 2020: 11)¹⁰¹ and J.Ch.

⁹⁷ "Ces vestiges, datant de la V^e dynastie, sont donc contemporains des premiers voyages maritimes entrepris vers Pount. On imagine qu'un bois aussi exotique a plus vraisemblablement transité par la péninsule arabique que par le continent africain, pour parvenir jusqu'en Égypte".

⁹⁸ Pondering whether rendering Eg. tj-šps as 'cinnamon' may be right, I. INCORDINO's (2017: 48) eventual counter-argument was the presupposed lack of such a trade: "since the most important source of cinnamon is Sri Lanka, it seems unlikely that India was included in the Egyptian trade network already during dynastic period".

⁹⁹ They wrote (*loc. cit.*): "Several fragments of carbonized ebony wood (*Diospyros* sp.) have been excavated in deposits in front of the gallery-caves at Wadi Gawasis. [...] Ebony was certainly part of the cargo of the ships returning to the harbor site as this hard wood had been imported to Egypt since the 1st Dynasty and was recorded among the products from Punt [...]. African ebony (*Diospyros* sp.) could be obtained from the northwestern slopes of the highlands in Eritrea [...], which supports the hypothesis that Egyptian ships from Saww reached the coast of the northern Horn of Africa. The discovery of four rod-like pieces of ebony at Mersa/Wadi Gawasis suggests that the wood was cut in this shape in Punt in order to be more easily transported to Egypt..."

¹⁰⁰ For the archaeobotany of the Wadi Gawasis excavations in general see BOROJEVIC, GERISCH 2007 and 2010. The dendrological examination of the charcoal and wooden finds is due to R. GERISCH (2007a, 2007b and BOROJEVIC, GERISCH 2007: 43–45, 2010: 51–58). He stated the presence of *Diospyros* sp. brought in the form of logs and rods among the trading goods from Punt (see esp. GERISCH 2007b: 183–184; 2010: 56–57).

¹⁰¹ A. MANZO (2011, *loc. cit.*) corroborated that "African ebony (*Diospyros* sp.) may have been imported from Punt and was discovered at Mersa/Wadi Gawasis, from where several expeditions to Punt were launched in the 12th Dynasty. [...] So far, the finds from Mersa/Wadi Gawasis seem to confirm that this prized wood imported from Punt should be identified at least in the Middle Kingdom with *Diospyros* sp. and not with *Dalbergia melanoxylon*, contra GALE, GASSON, HEPPEL,

COOPER (2020: 322)¹⁰² equally pointed to. One wonders where the ships loaded with *Diospyros* species may have arrived from.

8.2. All this, however unlikely the chances of an Indian import may appear at this moment, suggests that we check the term in Proto-Dravidian also, which may have potentially been contemporary with neolithic Egypt (5th–4th mill. BC) and the dawn of the united kingdom in the lower Nile Valley (3rd mill. BC). In the *Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* by T. BURROW and M.B. EMENEAU (1961), I found, beside the widespread common Dravidian root *tum- denoting diverse *Diospyros* sp. [DED 217, #2732], only two further locally (south) restricted roots: *kar(V)k- [DED 90, #1077] and *paničči (or sim.) (Tamil and Malayalam) [DED 271, #3323], but even the latter's form stands all too distant from Eg. hbnj. At my request, G. STAROSTIN (RGGU/RSUH, Moscow, p.c. on 29 Jan. 2021), recently specialised on Dravidian root reconstruction, summed up the present state-of-the-art on this matter 50 years after DED: "there are quite a few terms for specific subspecies of ebony, but the one that is the most common is *tum- [...], it can hardly be the source for the Egyptian word. Nor can other terms be found scattered in various South Dravidian languages"¹⁰³.

9. THE NEW CHADIC MATCH FOR EG. hbnj

9.1. On the basis of some striking cognates found at least in three Central Chadic groups, which have never been examined in this context so far, we can

and KILLEN 2000, 338–340". He maintained (MANZO 2020, *loc. cit.*): "At Mersa/Wadi Gawasis, the harbour on the Egyptian Red Sea coast from where the maritime expeditions to the land of Punt were launched during the Middle Kingdom, fragmentary rods of *Diospyros* sp. (a dark hard wood perhaps to be identified with that named *hbnj* by the Egyptians) were collected".

¹⁰² As J.Ch. COOPER (2020: 322, Chapter 5) stated, "The excavations at *Mersa Gawasis* have identified both *Diospyros* as well as *D. melanoxydon* in local charcoal deposits" (see also his n. 1069 listing the brandnew archaeological finds from some decade ago). F.A.K. BREYER (2016: 420), in turn, had hardly anything original to say about ebony from Punt repeating purely the well-known facts stated by others in general: "Kuriöserweise war das altägyptische Ebenholz gerade nicht das klassische *Dalbergia eburnum*, sondern die Art *Dalbergiamelanodendron*-xylon". For a deservedly sharp critique of BREYER's work see the thorough review by D. MEEKS (2018), whose ultimate opinion agrees with our impressions: "Bien qu'il ait pris la peine de réunir une abondante documentation, parfois hors sujet, par l'attitude adoptée vis à vis des tenants d'opinions autres que la sienne, l'A[uteur] n'a pas, non plus, fait preuve de maîtrise dans sa démarche ni contribué à la sérénité des débats" (p. 292).

¹⁰³ From his extensive database (<https://starling.rinet.ru/>), G. STAROSTIN (kind p.c. on 25 Feb. 2021) listed for me, beside Proto-Dravidian *tum 'ebony', all the roots for 'ebony' in Proto-South Dravidian he knows of, namely: *ār- 'Bauhinia tree', *āt-i 'mountain ebony', *ir- (?) 'a kind of tree (blackwood)', *kar-ŋ-āl- ~ *kar-V-mar- 'blackwood'. He concluded that "Это только South Dravidian, но по другим ветвям дравидийской семьи ничего, кроме *tum-, рефлексов не обнаруживает. Наверняка есть еще разные отдельные слова по отдельным словарям, но это уже не очень интересно, нас все-таки интересуют этимологии, претендующие на какую-то древность. Ничего похожего на египетское слово вроде бы нет, так что чадская этимология, наверное, верна".

assume an etymon **haban-* ‘ebony tree’ [GT], none of which can evidently be treated as an Egyptian loan: Logone ábana ‘*Diospyros mespiliformis*, afrikanischer Ebenholzbaum (Pflaumenbaum)’ [NACHTIGAL *apud* LUKAS 1936: 83] = àbáná [TOURNEUX]¹⁰⁴ | Mafa-Mada (proto-Matakam) **hawan* ‘ebony’ [GRAVINA]¹⁰⁵: Mafa háwán ‘*Diospyros mespiliformis* (Ebenacées)’ [BARRETEAU, BLÉIS 1990: 172] = hawan ‘sicomore’ [NDOKOBAI quoted by GRAVINA]¹⁰⁶, Mofu North hów’er [-r < *-n] ‘*diospyros mespiliformis*’ [GRAVINA], Mofu-Gudur háwar, héwer [-r < *-n] ‘*Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst. ex A. DC (Ebenacées)’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 131] = héwer ‘arbre fruitier’ [GRAVINA], Merey (Mofu of Meri) hewer [-r < *-n] ‘espèce d’arbre (ébène?), ebony tree’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003], Uldeme [-r < *-n] xwāxwár ‘*Diospiros* [*sic*: -pi-] *mespiliformis* Hochst. ex A. DC *Ebenaceae*’ [DE COLOMBEL 1997: 257, 303] = hwahwar [hwāhwár] [-r < *-n] ‘arbre dont le bois est utilisé pour la manche des houes, *Diospiros* [*sic*: -pi-] *mespiliformis*’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 70], cf. also Gis/ziga huway ‘*Balanites aegyptiaca*, Wüstendattel’ [LUKAS 1970: 124] = huwuj [TOURNEUX], Giziga-Moutourwa huwuj, huvbuj (*sic*: -vb-)¹⁰⁷ ‘arbre fruitier’ [MICHIELAN *apud* GRAVINA] | Sukur hawun ‘1. tree: Nigerian ebony’ vs. hawun ‘2. plants (is a tree mostly used for fruits and firewood)’ [GRAVINA *pace* THOMAS, DAVID].

9.2. These parallels are all the more curious, since, as R. GRAVINA (p.c., 23 Feb. 2021) also voiced, “ebony was from the rain forest, and not the Sahel. The gloss ‘ebony’ does appear a lot in the data though”. Since the Egyptian and the Central Chadic dendronyms are supposed in the *communis opinio* to cover different species, H. TOURNEUX (kind p.c., 1 May 2013)¹⁰⁸, the doyen of Central Chadic linguistics, is inclined to consider this resemblance to be due to pure chance. For

¹⁰⁴ During my research for an Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian, I had until 2020 come across but this one single potential cognate. The Egypto-Logone parallel was first published by G. TAKÁCS (2013: 574), which was adopted now by J.Ch. COOPER (2020: 289, n. 919). But R. GRAVINA (p.c. on 25 Feb. 2021) did not record this word: “Unfortunately I don’t have the Logone /abana/ in my data”.

¹⁰⁵ I owe much of the Mafa-Mada data to R. GRAVINA (p.c., 23 Feb. 2021).

¹⁰⁶ The information on the Mofu-Gudur and Gisiga parallels was kindly shared with me by H. TOURNEUX (p.c., 22 Feb. 2021).

¹⁰⁷ R. GRAVINA’s comment on this special cluster: “I don’t have a regular correspondence between **w* and *vb*. There is a marginal phoneme /C/ in several languages, represented orthographically as ‘vb’ which is a {voiced} labio-dental flap. It is possible that **w* developed into this phoneme in one dialect, but it is unlikely that the ‘vb’ represents a retention of an earlier sound” (kind p.c. 25 Feb. 2021). Cf. also https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voiced_labiodental_flap.

¹⁰⁸ As he informed me, the species the Logone word denoted “c’est un grand arbre qui donne de gros troncs. Chez les Kotoko de Logone-Birni, on en tire des chevrons utilisés en construction [...] pour faire des pirogues. Son bois n’est pas noir, mais gris rosâtre veiné et très lourd”, which greatly differs from “l’ébène des pharaons ou ébenier du Sénégal (*Dalbergia melanoxylon* Guill. et Perr., Fabaceae) [...] bien connu au Nord Cameroun [...] un petit arbre épineux dont le bois de coeur est brun foncé à violet noir, très dur et très lourd”. Besides, the local Arabic word for *Dalbergia melanoxylon* is bābanūs.

this and similar considerations, R. GRAVINA (p.c., 25 Feb. 2021) was equally sceptical: “The most likely scenario is that it’s a chance resemblance. With the current data, we can’t be certain that it’s referring to the same object”. But upon an extensive archaeobotanical examination, most recently, J.Ch. COOPER (2020: 290 and also 289, n. 919) – perhaps to all our surprise – concluded that Eg. hbnj covered both species: “The balance of this evidence may suggest that Egyptian ebony, as per Dixon’s argument, could also include *D. mespiliformis*, as well as the commonly cited *D. melanoxylon*”. Even if this were not so, what about the possible shifts between subspecies among the cognates denoting the same species in the diverse daughter languages pending on their individual climatic-environmental conditions after their separation from the parental community? Why such an astonishing match emerges precisely from these two geographically apparently distant branches of the Afro-Asiatic macrofamily¹⁰⁹ and where is the lexical evidence for the regularity of their phonological correspondences – all these we shall investigate below.

10. EVIDENCE OF CHADO-EGYPTIAN AND AFRO-ASIATIC PHONOLOGY

Because a comprehensive Egypto-(Central) Chadic comparative phonology has not yet been written, in this case we need to examine each case of consonantal matches in the light of sufficient lexical evidence:

10.1. Logone Øa/V- vs. Eg. h- is only poorly documented. Still, along with two indirect parallels¹¹⁰, one firm Eg.-Logone match is also certainly attested:

• Logone am (pl.) ‘Wasser’ [LUKAS 1936: 90] = aamáj [CYFFER], Buduma aamáj ~ ámei ‘Wasser’ [NACHTIGAL *apud* LUKAS 1936: 83] etc. < PCh. *ham- ‘water’ [GT]¹¹¹ ||| (?) Brb. *a-[H]am-an¹¹² ‘water’ [GT]: esp. i.a. Guanche: Gran

¹⁰⁹ Comprising six branches: Semitic, Egyptian, Berber, Cushitic, Omotic and Chadic.

¹¹⁰ • Logone árdó ‘geschnittener Riemen’, bíle tóphel árdó ‘Lederarbeiter’ [NACHTIGAL *apud* LUKAS 1936: 84] ||| Bed. harid ‘to slaughter’ [ROPER 1928: 198] ||| Sem.: Ar. harada ‘1. déchirer, fendre, 2. cuire trop la viande, la réduire en charpie’, hard- ‘désordre, émente’ etc. [DRS 450]. • Logone úee, ue-le ‘gebären, erzeugen’ [NACHTIGAL *apud* LUKAS 1936: 84] < Common Ch. *hawVý-/ *wahVý-/ *hVýaw- ‘to give birth’ [CLD] (Ch. data: JI 1994: II 160–161) ||| Bed. hīw ‘Kamelfolen’ [REINISCH 1895: 130] = hīwa ‘camel foal up to 6 months old’ [ROPER 1928: 200] || SCu. *h/yawa ‘children’ [EHRET 1980: 381, #4] > Rift *hawa ‘children’ [EHRET 1987] (Cu.: EHRET 1987: 127, #552) ||| SBrb.: Wlmd. ahw, Ayr əhw, cf. also Ahaggar √wh_h: iwi, pf. iwā, Nslm. iwi ‘naître’ (SBrb.: PRASSE 1969: 90, #631). Ch.-SCu.-SBrb.: CLD V 97–98, #95.

¹¹¹ Cf. e.g. WCh. *hama ‘water’ [STOLBOVA 1987: 229; 1977: 64]: PAngas-Sura *ham [GT 2004: 153] | Ron *ham [GT after JNG. 1970: 390] | Bole-Tangale *am [SCHUH 1984: 214] || CCh.: Mofu āam [STRÜMPPELL] = yām [BARRETEAU] etc. (CCh.: STRÜMPPELL 1922–1923: 127) || ECh.: Mubi ʔāamé ‘water’ [JNG.] etc. (Ch.: NM 1966: 240; JNG. 1970, 420; PRH. 1972: 15, #4.1.; NEWMAN 1977: 34; JI 1994: II 340–341).

¹¹² If this is a pl. of the root *-Ham- (analysis debated) (Guanche/Brb. data: WÖLFEL 1955: 87, #22; Guanche: MILITAREV 1991: 165 *pace* WÖLFEL 1965).

Canaria a-hemon ~ a-hamen etc. ‘water’ [WÖLFEL] ||| Sem.: Ar. hamūm- ‘qui abonde en eau, qui contient/donne beaucoup d’eau (puits), qui verse une quantité abondante de pluie (nuage)’, hamīm- ‘3. pluie fine, 4. lait qui est resté longtemps dans une outre et dont on ne fait pas de beurre’, hamīm-at- ‘2. (pl.: hamāyam-) pluie douce qui tombe par petites gouttes’, tahmīm- ‘pluie fine’, cf. hamma I ‘5. faire fondre, liquéfier de la graisse’, VII ‘1. être fondu, liquéfié (se dit de la graisse)’ [BK II 1442–1443; DRS 424] || Tigre ham’a ‘tremper dans l’eau’, hamə? ~ ham’at ‘dissolution’ [DRS 420] < AA *√hm ‘1. water, 2. fluid’ [GT]¹¹³.

10.2. Mafa-Mada *h- seems to agree regularly with Eg. h- in a considerable number of instances, let alone the indirect evidence of its derivation < AA *h¹¹⁴.

¹¹³ For this etymology: MILITAREV 1991: 256, n. 9; HSED #1156; SKINNER 1995: 34. G. TAKÁCS (2004: 63, #357) suggested further reflexes of this root in the AA anatomical terminology, cf. Sem.: Ar. √hmy I: hamā (n. act. hamy- ~ hamiyy- ~ himyān-) ‘1. couler (de l’eau ou d’une larme qui s’échappe de l’œil), 2. verser, répandre des larmes (des yeux)’, also hmw: hamā (n. act. hamw-) ‘couler (d’une larme)’ [BK II 1450; DRS 422], cf. Maghrebi Ar. hamā? ‘couler (larmes), répandre des larmes (des yeux)’ [DRS 420, HM? 2] ||| Eg. hmh ‘Speichel’ (NK, Wb II 490, 8; GHWb 492) ||| SCu. *hVm- ‘sweat’ [GT]: Iraqw hame ‘sweat’ [EHRET] = hamē [MAGHWAY 1989: 102] | Dahalo himma ‘dirt of the body’ [EHRET] = himā ‘sweat, dirt of body’ [EEN 1989: 15] (SCu.: EHRET 1980: 305).

¹¹⁴ • Mafa-Mada *√hyv ‘exhausted’ [GT]: Uldeme hivi (hīvi) ~ var. hivo ‘fatigue extrême’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 68], Muktele yāvək and Mofu yivó ‘tired out’ [ROSSING 1978: 348, #748] ||| Sem.: Ar. √hyf: I hāfa ‘être mince, élané’, Marazig dialect hāf ‘maigrir, perdre ses forces’, Egyptian Ar. hāf ‘être intellectuellement limité, se faire prendre sa part’, Sudanese dialect ‘périr’, hāyaf ‘démolir, abîmer’, hāyif ‘vil, méprisé’, cf. also Ar. √hfy: I hāfā ‘être affamé, mourir de faim’, Hadramaut hafā ~ hafī ‘périr, diminuer, maigrir’ etc. (Sem.: DRS 404, 440). • Uldeme hats (hāts) ‘cherchant à finir, s’arrêter pile’, -hats (-hāts) ‘1. arrêter de couler, reculer qqch., remonter, 2. amoindrir’, -hatsay (-hātsāy) ‘cesser de...’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 67–68] ||| Sem.: Ar. hus- (pl.) ‘hommes qui périssent’ [DRS 397]. • Uldeme hāza (hāza), also hizaṇ (hizān) ‘forge’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 68–69] ||| Sem.: Ar. hašša ‘abattre du feuillage pour le bétail’, Iraqi dialect hašš ‘croquant, croustillant’ [DRS 463]. • Gisiga hana ‘dies’ [LUKAS 1970: 121], Mbuko hēna₁ (adv.) ‘maintenant (now)’, hēna₂ ‘ici’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003], Muyang hini [xínī] ‘this’ [SMITH 2003: 39], Uldeme hanene (hānēnē) ‘ainsi’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 67] ||| NOm. *ha/en- ‘now’ [GT] > Macro-Ometo-Koyra *(h)a(n)T- [BENDER] | Kefoid *and ‘now’ [BENDER 2003: 170, #97] | Mao: Hozo heṅgé and Sezo helde (sic: -l-) ‘now’ [ATIEB and BENDER in BENDER 2003: 277, #97] ||| LECu.: Somali han (pron. demonstr. m. nach Vokalen) ‘dieser’ [REINISCH 1902: 204] etc. || SCu.: WRift *han ~ *hin (anaphoric demonstr. pron. base) > e.g., Burunge han ~ hin, cf. also Iraqw hanōs/q ‘there it is!’ [KIESSLING, MOUS 2004: 131–132] ||| Sem.: e.g., Hebrew hēn ‘voici’, hēnnāh ‘(par) ici’ | Ar. hunnā, dial. hanna ~ hinna ‘ici’ (Sem.: DRS 427). • Muyang hīfī [-l- < *-r-] ‘grain’ [ROSSING 1978: 262, #322], Uldeme helefe (hēlēfē) ‘1. graine, sémence, 2. famille’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 67] ||| Sem.: Hebrew hāri(y)pōt (pl., only 2x: 2Sam 17, 19 and Pr 27, 22) ‘graines (?)’, traduction latine: orge mondée (pas d’interprétation sûre)’ [DRS 457 with discussion] = emended h/ārīpōt ‘grains of sand, added to the grain when it is crushed’ [KB 256, 353]. • Uldeme halahalaṇ (hālāhālāṇ) [-l- < *-r-] ‘envie, avare, convoitise’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 66] < Ch. *hVy/wVr- ‘to love, want’ [STOLBOVA] ||| Bed. haru(w) ‘suchen, wollen, wünschen’ [REINISCH] ||| Sem.: Ug. hrr ‘to be inflamed about, crave’ || Tigre harār ‘to wish ardently’ (DUL I 342). CLD V 118, #147: Ch.-Sem.-Bed. • Mofu-Gudur -háhiy- ‘désirer, aimer’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 132], Uldeme -hayēṇ (-hāyēṇ) ‘aimer, apprécier, féliciter’, cf. also hawa (hāwā) ‘cour’, mōgyā hāwā ōntā wāl ‘faire la cour à une femme’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 67], Zulgo hāwā (ṅá) (m) ‘désir’ [HALLER 2003: 13] ||| WCh.: Pa’a hwo ~ ho ‘to like, love, want, wish’ [M. SKINNER 1979: 180] < Ch. *hVwVy- ‘to love, want, be eager’ [STOLBOVA] ||| LECu.: Oromo hawwa ‘to wish for, desire’, hawwī ‘ambition,

• Uldeme -hubay (-hùbày) ‘danser’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 66] ||| Eg. hb.t ‘Tanz (?) (zur Huldigung vor [...], mit n)’ (XVIII, *Wb* II 486, 13) vs. jhb ‘1. tanzen, 2. Tanz(ried), 3. Tänzer (?)’ (OK–, *Wb* I 118, 12–17) > jhb.w ‘Jubelliedsänger und –tänzer’ (1st IMP, *ÄWb* I 199b) ||| Sem.: Hadramaut hawb ‘danse’ [DRS 383: isolated].

• Gisiga hov ‘bearbeiten (Farm)’ [LUKAS 1970: 121], Mofu-Gudur -həv- ‘cultiver, houer’, nomen instr.: méhəvey ta slá ‘charruer’ (litt.: ‘cultiver avec boeuf’) [BARRETEAU 1988: 131] ||| Eg. hb Pflug’ (OK–, *Wb* II 485, 10) ||| Sem. *√hyb > Syr. hiba | Dathina hīb, hībāh ‘hache, houe’ (Sem.: DRS 399).

• Mbuko hamay ‘payer (une dette), pay debt’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003], Merey hama ‘payer’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003] ||| Eg. hm.t ‘Fährlohn’ (PT–, *Wb* II 490, 5) > LEg. hm.w ‘fare’ (DLE II 83) > Dem. hm.t ‘Fracht, Lohn’ (DG 275).

• Gisiga han ‘1. sich niederlegen, 2. die Nacht verbringen’ [LUKAS 1970: 121], Zulgo hóná ‘1. se coucher, 2. passer la nuit’ [HALLER 2003: 13], Merey hēna ‘coucher’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003] < Ch. *hV(wV)n- ‘to lie etc.’ [STOLBOVA] ||| Eg. hn ‘aufhören (mit etw.)’ (XVIII, *Wb* II 492, 6; from 1st IMP: *ÄWb* I 750) = ‘to halt, cease’ (FD 158) ||| NBrb.: Qabyle henni ‘1. calmer, laisser tranquille’ [DALLEY 1982: 292] ||| Sem.: Thamudi hwn ‘repos’ [DRS 389], Ar. √hwn ‘se reposer, se calmer, s’endormir’, hawn- ‘2. repos, tranquillité’ [BK II 1460–1461] || Tigre han gā’a ‘devenir désert’, also hən gā’a ‘rester muet, être stupéfait’ [DRS 427–428], Tigrinya hana ~ hona ‘ruines, destruction’ [DRS 433]. Ch.-Ar.: CLD V 112–113, #134. Here may eventually belong also AA *√hn ‘night’ [GT], cf. Sem.: Ar. hin? ‘partie de la nuit’ [DRS 428] ||| NOm.: Kafa hānā ‘der Abend’ [REINISCH 1888: 297] = hānā ‘evening’ [BENDER 2003: 170, #95] | She ēhn ‘night’ [CERULLI in BENDER 2003: 170, #95] ||| ECh.: Ndam ʔinyán ‘night’ [JNG. in JI 1994 II 257].

• Uldeme -heṇ (-hèn) ‘briser, démolir’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 67] ||| Eg. whn ‘A. eigtl.: (Mauern) niederreißen, zerstören, B. intr.: 1. zerfallen (von einem Bauwerk und vom Menschen), 2. (Med.) vom Abfallen des Scharfs einer Geschwulst’ (MK–, *Wb* I 345, 11–13).

• Uldeme hahawa [hāhàwà] ‘cage pour les animaux pendant la saison sèche (usage: clôture faite d’épines dans laquelle les animaux viennent prendre l’air après le pâturage)’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 66] ||| Eg. *h ‘courtyard’ (EG¹ 1927, 481, O4). Ch. EHRET (1995: 379, #768) combined the Eg. word also with Cu. *hā ‘outside’ [EHRET 1987: 126, #545] based on his comparison of Bed. hata ‘outside, space in front or outside house or village’ || SCu. *hā ‘beyond’.

desiring’ [GRAGG 1982: 205], Somali hawo ‘désir, passion’ [COHEN] | HECu.: Burji hayy- ‘to love, like, agree’ [SASSE] etc. ||| (?) Eg. hj ‘Jauchzen, Jubeln’ (MK–, *Wb* II 483) ||| Sem. *hwy ‘to love’ [GT]: Ar. hwy III ‘1. aimer qqn. d’une affection vive, 2. caresser, flatter, cajoler’, hawa ‘amour, passion qu’on éprouve, désir, vive affection, objet des désirs’ [BK II 1462] || MSA: CJibbali √hwy: shābē ‘to appreciate sg. (beautiful), think sg. is fine, like sg. overmuch (aimer à l’excès)’ [JOHNSTONE 1981: 100], Mehri √hwy: šāhwū ‘to like (aimer)’ [JOHNSTONE 1987: 162] (Sem.: DRS 386) < CAA *√hwy ‘to love’ [GT]. LECu.-Sem.: COHEN 1947: 97, #92; Ch.-Sem.-ECu.: CLD V 92, #86.

• Mafa-Mada *-huwa ‘to run’ [ROSSING 1978: 318, #601]: Mafa pà-hwá [ROSSING], Mbuko haw ‘courir, fuir’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003], Merey hway ‘courir’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003], Muyang ts-hwa [ROSSING] = huwā [h^wà] ‘run, chase’ (n.) [SMITH 2003: 41], Muktele hwáy [ROSSING], Mofu-Gudur -hw(á) ‘1. courir, (s’en)fuir, 3. rouler vite (voiture, mobylette)’, háwa ‘viens-vite ici! accours!’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 132] | Sukur xwí ‘to run’ [WOLFF 1974 cited in DAVID 2003: 16] = huwi [DAVID 2004: 13] < Ch. *hVwVy- ‘to run’ [STOLBOVA] ||| SCu.: WRift *haw?-ut (med.) ‘to go away’ [KIESSLING, MOUS 2004: 134] || LECu.: Saho haw-ere ‘to go away’ [M. VERGARI, R. VERGARI 2003: 95] ||| SBrb.: Ahaggar ə-hy [< *√_{h₂}y?] ‘chasser devant soi très rapidement’ [PRASSE 1969: 73, #441] ||| Eg. hwhw ‘davonlaufen (von den Füßen)’ (Lit. MK, *Wb* II 485, 1) ||| Sem. *√_{hwy}: i.a., Egyptian Ar. dialect hawa ‘vite!’ || Tigre hawā ‘s’enfuir, laisser échapper’, Tigrinya haw bälä ‘se hâter, partir précipitamment, s’éloigner’ (Sem.: *DRS* 385-386). Sem.-Eg.-SBrb.-ECu.: *DRB* 385; Ch.-Eg.: *CLD* V 93, #88.

• Mbuko hawar ‘brûler qqn.’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003], Muyang hərə ‘to burn’ [ROSSING 1978: 218, #100] etc. < Ch. *hVwVr- ‘to burn’ [STOLBOVA] ||| SCu.: WRift *hur-im (dur.) ‘to cook’ [KIESSLING, MOUS 2004: 145] ||| ECu. *hUr- ‘to kindle’ [GT] > PSam *huri ‘schüren (Feuer)’ [HEINE 1977: 292] = ‘to kindle’ [HEINE 1978: 63] | Burji hur-i- ‘to kindle fire’ [SASSE 1982: 102] | Dullay *hōr- [GT] > Dobase hor-as- (caus.) ‘kochen’, Gollango hōr- ‘wärmen’ (Dullay: AMS 1980: 162, 202) ||| Eg. h3 [regular < *√_{hr}] ‘rösten (in den Bez. für Brotsorten)’ (NE, *Wb* II 475, 9) = ‘Glut’, ‘q n h3 ‘Röstbrot’ (*GHWb* 486) ||| Sem.: Ar. hara’a I ‘4. cuire trop les viandes, au point qu’elles soient en charpie’, hari’a ‘être en charpie pour avoir été trop cuit (se dit des viandes)’ [BK II 1409] || Tigrinya harhar bälä ‘être en flammes’ [*DRS* 451] < AA *√_{hr} ‘to heat up (?)’ [GT]. Cf. also *CLD* V 118–119, #148; Ch.-ECu.-Eg.

• Mbuko huhwal ‘tomber (fall)’ [GRAVINA *et al.* 2003] ||| NOm. *hUl- ‘to fall’ [GT] > Wolayta ul- ‘to fall’ [MORENO in BENDER 2003, 317, #28] | Kafa hol ‘to fall’ (cf. Burji hal) [CERULLI *apud* BENDER 2003: 340, #28] ||| HECu.: Burji hal- ‘to fall’ [SASSE 1982: 90: isolated in ECu.] ||| Eg. h3j [regular < *√_{hly}] ‘herabsteigen’ (PT–, *Wb* II 472–474) = ‘to come/go down, descend, fall’ (*FD* 156). NOm.-Eg.: HODGE 1990: 646, #11.

• Mafa-Mada *hay ‘grain’ [ROSSING 1978: 262, #322] > i.a. Uldeme hay ‘mil’ [KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: 66] < Ch. *(h/ʔu)h[a]y- ‘kind of corn (guinea corn)’ [STOLBOVA] ||| Eg. jhj ‘Art Getreide’ (OK, *Wb* I 118, 10). Ch.-Eg.: OS 1992: 183; *HSED* #1167; *CLD* V 98-99, #97.

10.3. The shift of Mafa-Mada -w- < *-b- was unfamiliar to R. GRAVINA¹¹⁵, the greatest authority on Central Chadic historical phonology for the time

¹¹⁵ Who stated: “I don’t have any evidence for *-b- > w-, so it would be hard to make a link with Eg. The English word comes from the Eg., but I’m not sure we can make that connection for

being¹¹⁶. Although, of course, some cases for a current Mafa-Mada -w- < AA *-w- appear in, e.g., Mafa¹¹⁷, Gisiga¹¹⁸, and Mofu-Gudur¹¹⁹, still, a great deal of strong pieces of a counter-evidence of medial Mafa-Mada *-w- < AA *-b- is also attested in my data. Cf., e.g., the following cognates directly proving a match of Mafa-Mada -w- = Sem. and Eg. *-b-:

● Mofu-Gudur zāwal zāwal ~ zēwél zēwél ‘traîner qqch. (corde, placenta)’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 265] ||| Eg. zbj [-j possible < palatalised *-l] ‘2. (tr.) führen, geleiten, aussenden, vertreiben, herbeibringen usw.’ (PT–, *Wb* III 429–431) = ‘2. (tr.) to send, conduct, spend/pass (time), attain (good reputation)’ (*FD* 219) > zb.t ‘Transport’ (OK, *Wb* III 432, 5) ||| Sem. *√zbl ‘porter’ [*DRS*]: Akk. zabālu ‘(trans-, sup)porter’, zubbulu ‘porter, faire attendre, languir (de maladie)’ || Hebrew *zābal

CCh. We would need evidence from other branches of Ch., and Brb. or Cu., before that could be established with confidence”.

¹¹⁶ Cf. his epoch-making monography on Central Chadic historical phonology (2014), where, however, the external (WCh., ECh., AA) evidence was unfortunately not considered.

¹¹⁷ ● Mafa tēwél- ‘faire le tour de’, cf. ntewéle-wéle ‘faire le tour d’un arbre en s’y tenant par la main (jeu d’enfant)’, tēwél géd ~ ntēwélā ged ‘rite sp. (litt.: faire le tour de la tête)’ [BARRETEAU, BLÉIS 1990: 275, 354] ||| SBrb.: EWlmd. & Ayr e-tāwel ‘disque, plateau circulaire (de cuisine), etc.’ [PAM 2003: 805] ||| Sem.: cf. a probable metonymic survival of this root in Ar. √twl I tāla ‘exercer un enchantement, un sortilège’, tawl-at- ‘3. un enchantement, sortilège à l’aide duquel une femme cherche à se concilier l’amour de son mari’ vs. tabala ‘3. rendre fou, tourner la tête à qqn. (s.d. d’une femme qui inspire une passion violente)’ [BK I 192, 211]. ● Mafa zāwāl- ‘faire une ronde de surveillance’ [BARRETEAU, BLÉIS 1990: 394] < Ch. *zVwVl-/*zVlVl- ‘to look at’ [*CLD* III 128, #465] ||| Eg. z3w ‘bewachen, hüten’ (PT–, *Wb* III 416–417).

¹¹⁸ ● Gisiga duwal [l < *r] ‘morgen’ [LUKAS 1970: 121] ||| HECu. *dar- ‘morning’ [GT]: Hadiyya dara ‘morning’, cf. Kambatta sōdarāro ‘early morning’ (*darār- contracted with sōz- ‘to dawn’) [HUDSON 1989: 89] ||| Eg. dw3.w ‘1. Morgenfrühe, 2. morgige Tag’ (MK–, *Wb* V 422–423) = ‘1. dawn, morning, 2. tomorrow, the morrow’ (*FD* 310). ● Gisiga tuway (tuwi) ‘weinen’ [LUKAS 1970: 136] < Mafa-Mada *tuway ‘to cry (tears)’ [ROSSING 1978: 232, #170] < Ch. *√tw ‘to weep’ [JS 1981: 284B] = *tVw/y- ‘to weep, (funeral) crying’ [*ChED* 317, #724] ||| Bed. tiw ‘schreien, brüllen, muhen, grunzen u.s.w. (von Tieren überhaupt)’ [REINISCH 1895: 232]. ● Gisiga zuwan ~ žuwon ‘sich fürchten’ [LUKAS 1970: 121] < Mafa-Mada *žun-waḏ ‘to fear’ [ROSSING 1978: 249, #257] ||| (???) Eg. snḏ ‘sich fürchten, Furcht haben’ (PT–, *Wb* IV 182–183) ||| Sem.: (???) Ar. √šmṣ VII ‘être saisi de frayeur, trembler de peur’ [BK I 1270] < AA *√šNṣ ‘to fear’ [GT].

¹¹⁹ ● Mofu-Gudur -ḏúwl- [l < *r] ‘supplier, demander, prier en parlant aux ancêtres’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 111] ||| SBrb. *√ḏwr: EWlmd.-Ayr ə-ṭṭər ‘demander (à Dieu) dans la prière (qqch.)’, Ayr e-ṭṭar ‘demande en mariage’ [PAM 2003: 797] ||| Eg. tw3 ‘jemandem bittend angehen, jemandem bittend etwas vortragen’ (MK–, *Wb* V 248, 6–7) = ‘to put a claim (on s’one), claim from (s’one), appeal to (s’one)’ (*FD* 295). ● Mofu-Gudur -tawar- [r < *n] ‘chercher partout, partir en quête’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 247] ||| Sem.: Ar. √tnw VI: tatāwana ‘poursuivre sa proie et chercher à la tourner tantôt du côté droit, tantôt du côté gauche’ [BK I 211]. ● Mofu-Gudur ‘zewéd ‘corde en fibre végétale mâchée, ficelle’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 265] < Mafa-Mada *zawi(ḏ) ‘rope’ [ROSSING 1978: 317, #596] ||| SBrb.: EWlmd.-Ayr ā-zḏu, Ayr ə-zḏu ‘1. tisser, 2. natter (cheveux), 3. tresser (corde, cravache, natte), 4. être tissé, tressé etc.’ [PAM 2003: 912]. ● Mofu-Gudur -zawal- [l < *r] ‘tomber (nuit), obscurcir’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 265] ||| ES: Gurage: Ennemor, Endegeny, Gyeto zāwre, Chaha, Ezha zore, Muher zorā ‘greyish (cattle), dark-brown’ [LESIAU 1979: III 717] = ‘brun, sombre (bétail)’ [*DRS* 709].

‘élever, exalter’ [DRS] | Ar. zabala ‘to carry’ [WARD] = ‘(em)porter’ and Ar. (southern dial.) zabal ‘jeter, lancer’ [DRS] (Sem.: WARD 1963: 426; DRS 674).

● Mafa tsawar- ‘enlever un morceau pourri d’un fruit, de viande’ [BARRETEAU, BLÉIS 1990: 364] ||| Sem.: Ar. sabrada ~ sabada ‘1. raser (les cheveux, le poil), 2. dépouiller la tête de cheveux en les arrachant (avec acc. de la tête)’ [BK I 1043]. For the iconsonantal origin of this isogloss, cf. WCh.: Hausa sàḥè V ‘e) cut off hair from head’, šaššaabo [assimilation < *šaḥšāḥ-] ‘a) cut off large lump of meat, c) cut green wood’ [BARGER 1934: 876, 932] ||| Eg. sbj ‘(als Überschrift einer Beschneidungsszene)’ (OK, *Wb* IV 81, 15), s^{eb} ‘(Stiere) verschneiden, kastrieren’ (MK, *Wb* IV 43, 11) ||| Sem. *√šbb ‘разрезать’ [SISAJa]. Eg.-Sem.: SISAJa III #18; HSED 458, #2168.

● Gisiga gawla [l < *r] ‘junger (erwachsender) Mann’, gawlay ‘junge Leute’ [LUKAS 1970: 121], Mofu-Gudur gúwla ‘jeune homme, jeune (avec une connotation de puissance sexuelle)’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 121] ||| SCu.: Dahalo gáḃara ‘male lion’ [EHRET 1980: 234, §VII A.3; EEN 1989: 31] ||| Eg. *db3 [regular < *√gbr] (?) > Cpt. (SL) **ጸልልልል** ‘hart, fest, kräftig sein’ (KHW 414) vs. (B) **ጸዐዋ** ‘hart, streng, grausam sein’ (KHW 429) ||| Sem. *gabr- ‘homme fait, dans toute sa force’ >/~ i.a. Akk. gabr- ‘fort’, gab/pāru ‘vaincre, être supérieure’ || Hbr. gābar ‘être fort’, Punic gybrh ‘puissance’ | Ar. ḡabr- ‘1. puissant, 2. esclave corvéable, 3. force, contrainte’, ḡubār- ‘violence’ || Tigre gābrä ‘faire violence’ (Sem.: DRS 97). Dahalo-Sem.: HSED 194, #860.

Numerous further cognate sets equally evidence the correspondence of Mafa-Mada -w- = Sem. *-b- (i.e., indirectly also Eg. -b-) < AA *-b-, even without an Egyptian match¹²⁰.

¹²⁰ ● Mofu-Gudur -dāwār- [r < *n] ‘1. se gâter, se perdre, 2. devenir malheureux, maudire’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 107] ||| SBrb.: Ahaggar é-debni, pl. i-debn-ân ‘sépulture préhistorique (tombeau antérieur à l’introduction de l’islamisme)’ [FOUCAULD 1951–1952: 159] ||| ES: Amharic dābbānā ‘mourir vite’, Gurage-Muher dobbānā ‘mourir sans être égorgé (bétail)’, Gafat dābbānā ‘cadavre’ (Sem.: DRS 210 pace Leslau 1956: 195; 1979: III 196). ● Mofu-Gudur tewére [r < *n] ‘petite flûte sp.’ [Barreteau 1988: 247] ||| Sem.: Ar. tabn- ~ tibn- ‘1. paille’ [BK I 192]. ● Mofu-Gudur zuwét ‘lance’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 265] ||| Sem.: Ar. dialectal *√zbṭ ‘schleudern’ [GT] > i.a. Dathina zabaṭ ‘donner un coup de pied’, Maghrebi Ar. zbṭ ‘(se) contraindre, (se) forcer, lancer violemment (sur un mur, sur le sol), face contre le sol’, tt-zəbbəṭ ‘se laisser tomber, se jeter lourdement’, Hassaniya ‘terrasser violemment, abandonner brutalement sa femme’ (Sem.: DRS 672). But cf. also Maghrebi Ar. zāwəṭ ~ zāyəṭ ‘lancer avec force’ [DRS 701]. ● Mofu-Gudur -zāwāl- ‘grandir rapidement’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 265] ||| Sem. *√zbl ‘to rule’ [WARD]: Ug. zbl ‘prince, souveraineté’ [DRS], Hbr. PN zəbūl (DRS: lit. ‘résidence’), ʾIzebel (the Phoenician wife of Ahab) (Sem.: WARD 1963: 426; DRS 674) upon the analogy of Sem.: Hbr. nāšī? ‘Fürst’ < √nš? ‘(er)heben’ [GB 522–525] or SBrb.: EWlmd. əṇəy, Tadghaq, Nslm. əṇəy ‘1. Tadghaq, Nslm.: monter (+ monture), 2. Tadghaq, EWlmd.: commander, présider sur, gouverner, régner sur, dominer, 3. être puissant (chef régissant)’, EWlmd.-Ayr tā-ṇaya ‘autorité suprême, commandement, pouvoir absolu (de Dieu Omnipotent)’ [PAM 2003: 634]. Alternatively, if the meaning of this Semitic root was secondary, i.e., originally < *to conduct (?) [GT], it may well imply an ultimate cognacy with Sem. *√zbl ‘porter’ [DRS] (usually linked to the preceding Semitic root) ||| Eg. zbj [-j < *-l?] ‘2. (tr.) führen, geleiten, aussenden, vertreiben, herbeibringen usw.’ (PT-, *Wb*) = ‘2. (tr.) to send, conduct, spend/pass (time), attain

10.4. The Eg. medial *-b-* normally continues earlier (AA) **-b-*. The development of AA **-VwV- > Eg. *-b-*, if existed at all, may only be paralleled by some exceptionally rare items (2 pieces) of counter-evidence, which makes the probability of OK *hbn < proto-Eg. *hwn* unlikely:

- Eg. *sbq* ‘Bein’ (PT–, *Wb* IV 93, 12–17) = ‘calf of leg’ (*FD* 220) = ‘general word for leg’ (WARD 1972: 23) ||| Sem. **šāk-* ‘coscia’ [FRONZAROLI] = ‘thigh, leg’ [*SED*]¹²¹. Sem. **šāk-* < **šawḳ-* = Eg. *sbq* from **swq?* < **sawq-* as it has commonly been supposed for more than a century by now¹²².

- Eg. *zbt* [regular < **zbk*] ‘lachen’ (PT–, *Wb* III 434) ||| Ch. **žVḳ-* ‘to smile, be happy’ [STOLBOVA] > WCh.: PAngas **žuk* [GT]: Angas *žuk* ‘to smile’ [FOULKES 1915: 204] = *žuk* (Kabwir dialect) ‘to smile’ [JNG. 1962: 15] || CCh.: Mandara *zak-a* [dzak-a] ‘to laugh’ [MIRT in JI 1994: II 219], Malgwa *záka* [LÖHR: dzá-ka, STOLBOVA: vowel assim. < **žəka* < **žəka*] ‘(aus)lachen’ [LÖHR 2002: 291], Paduko *zógda* ‘comédie, amusement’ [JARVIS, LOGONA 2005] (Ch.: *CLD* III 237, #1093). Should we assume a special Angas-Eg. *mediae* *-w-* isogloss (‘hollow root’) yielding PEg. **zwk* → early OK **zbk* → OEg. *zbt*? The special isogloss of CCh.: Muyang *jək-jək*, [ʒəḳ-ʒəḳ], i.e., *žəḳ-žəḳ* (in the Muscovite notation) ‘happy’ [SMITH 2003: 43] ||| Sem.: Ar. *ḍakḍak-at-* ‘1. tranquillité d’esprit, absence

(good repute)’ (*FD*) ||| Mofu-Gudur *záwal záwal ~ zéwél zéwél* ‘trainer qqch. (corde, placenta)’ [BARRETEAU] (details above). • Mafa *tsawəl-* ‘rincer un récipient’ [BARRETEAU, BLÉIS 1990: 364] ||| Sem.: Ar. *sabbala* IV ‘1. verser, laisser couler un torrent (de larmes, de pluie, s.d. de l’homme, des yeux, du ciel)’ [BK I 1047]. Biconsonantal, cf. Ch. **cVḥə* ‘to wash sg.’ [NEWMAN 1977: 33, #141] ||| SBrb.: EWlmd. & Ayr *sābb-āt* ‘1. absorber, 2. purifier (plaie), 5. s’imprégner, être imprégné (d’un colorant), etc.’ [PAM 2003: 699]. • Mofu-Gudur *-gāwāl-* ‘2. tourner qqch. dans sa bouche’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 121], Muktele *gwālā* ‘to turn’ [ROSSING 1978: 351, #763.a] ||| Sem. **√gbl* > i.a. Neo-Hebrew *gābal* ‘pétrir, délayer’, Neo-Syriac *gāwil* ‘1. former, façonner, 2. mélanger’, Aysor *g’āvil* ‘mélanger’, *g’āmbil* ‘tournoyer’ | Ar. *ḡabala* I ‘2. mêler de la terre avec de l’eau, de la chaux, du sable’ (Sem.: *DRS* 96). • Mofu-Gudur *-lāwād-* ‘marcher en se déhanchant, onduler (serpent) marcher timidement’ [BARRETEAU 1988: 159] || ECh.: Mokilko *libidā* ‘(en)rouler’ [Jng. 1990: 132] ||| Sem.: Ar. *labāṭa* I ‘2. aller au galop en faisant tomber à la fois les deux pieds de devant sur le sol’, V ‘1. se coucher, être couché par terre, 2. se vautrer, se rouler par terre’, VIII ‘1. se coucher par terre et s’étendre tout du long, 3. aller au galop, lever et faire tomber à la fois les deux pieds de devant’, *labāṭ-at-* ‘1. course d’un homme ou d’une bête qui boite beaucoup, 2. galop’ [BK II 960]. The same AA root seems to be present in SBrb.: EWlmd.-Ayr *√lbḍ*: *nālbāḍ* (refl.) ‘se réunir réciproquement l’un avec l’autre’ [PAM 2003: 446] ||| Sem.: Ar. *√lbṭ* VIII ‘5. entourer qqn. et se grouper en masse autour de lui’ [BK II 960]. For the CCh. root cf. alternatively Ar. *√rws* I: *rāsa* ‘1. s’écarter de la ligne droite, en allant à gauche ou à droite, 2. prendre la direction d’un lieu pour s’y réfugier, replier sur un point’ [BK I 953].

¹²¹ Cf. e.g. Hbr. *šōq* ‘Schenkel, Bein’ [GB] = ‘Unterschenkel’ [ERMAN] = ‘thigh, fibula, shank of an animal’ [KB 1448] | Ar. *sāq-*, pl. *sūq, sīqān-*, *ʾaswuq-* ‘jambe, tibia (entre le genou et la cheville du pied)’ [BK I 1167] = ‘Bein’ [ERMAN] = ‘tibia (in medical terminology), shank, leg’ [WARD 1972: 23] (Sem.: *SED* I 212–213, #241).

¹²² This chain of shifts facilitating this etymology was commonly assumed by the adherents of the old school of Egypto-Semitic comparison: ERMAN 1892: 118; HOLMA 1911: X, 134; EMBER 1911: 90; 1912: 90; *ESS* §7.c, §18.a.22, §20.a.17; FARINA 1924: 13; COHEN 1947: #265; LACAU 1970a: §§329–335 (reviewed by WARD 1972: 23).

de soucis, 2. gaieté, bonne humeur' [BK I 776; *DRS* 332: isolated] < (?) AA *√kžk 'gay' [GT] may also be akin.

11. THE AFRO-ASIATIC BACKGROUND OF THE EGYPTO-CENTRAL CHADIC DENDRONYM

11.1. Not too surprisingly, our Egypto-Central Chadic dendronym seems to be rooted in the deeper layers of the Afro-Asiatic ancestral root stock if we look at SAA *√hbn 'dark' [GT], whose outlines seem to emerge behind North Cushitic: probable cognates with a nasal assimilation and a substantial semantic shift testifying to *hEmni(y) 'afternoon' [GT]¹²³ || ECu. *habn- > *hawn- '1. darkness, 2. evening' [GT] > LECu.: Somaloid (PSam) *hibèen 'night' [HEINE 1978: 63] = *hawēn- 'Nacht, Zeit der Dunkelheit' [LAMBERTI] = *habēn- [GT]: Somali habēn 'der späte Abend, die Nacht', cf. habēn-o 'Schwachsichtigkeit' [REINISCH 1902: 195] = hábēn, pl. hábēnnó 'night', habēní-mo 'night-time', inḁa^habēno bān lé^ahay 'I have weak sight' [ABRAHAM 1964: 100] = habēn-ka 'night' [HEINE], NSomali ḥaḇe:n 'Nacht, Zeit der Dunkelheit' [LAMBERTI], Jabarti hamēn-ki (m) 'die Nacht' [REINISCH 1904: 68] = hamīṇ 'night' [HEINE], Boni *hàbée 'night' [HEINE 1982, 119] = ḥawē: (m), det. ḥawē:ṇi 'Nacht' [SASSE 1980: 98] = ḥaḇ/wē: 'Nacht' [LAMBERTI], cf. Boni haw'ēṇ-ka 'this night' [HEINE], Garre habē [< *hawē] 'Nacht, Zeit der Dunkelheit' [LAMBERTI], Rendille ib'ēn, pl. ib'ēne (m/f) 'night' [HEINE] = ḥbe:n 'Nacht, Zeit der Dunkelheit' [LAMBERTI] (Sam.: HEINE 1978: 63) | HECu.: (???) Burji hawun- 'to cover'¹²⁴ [SASSE 1982: 93] | PDullay *awn- 'Nacht' [GT *pace* AMS]: cf. also Gollango áwnēté 'in der Nacht', awnuy- 'Nacht werden' (Dullay: AMS 1980: 25) | Yaaku áun (f, no pl.) 'night', 'áun (f) 'nighttime, darkness' [HEINE 1975: 123, 130] = awn- 'Nacht (mit Nullstufe)' [LAMBERTI] (ECu.: LAMBERTI 1986: 268, 364, 427, n. 146) ||| SOm./Aroid *√(h) bn [GT]: Hamer (?)jibān [FLEMING], Hamer-Karo ibon [FLEMING *apud* BENDER 1994: 149] 'evening' (SOm.: BENDER 2003: 214, #95 s.v. 'night'). It is still hard to say whether WCh.: Kulere má-fwòn 'schwarz' [JNG. 1970: 353] = ma-ffòn

¹²³ There can be hardly any doubt, on the one hand, about the relatedness of Beja hemeni(t) 'Abend', hemenáya 'Abends verreisen' [MUNZINGER *apud* BLAŽEK] = húmnay 'Nachmittags reisen (abreisen)' [ALMKVIST 1885] = húmnay & húmne (f) 'der späte Nachmittag, die Zeit um Asser, Abend' [REINISCH 1895] = hemni (f) 'afternoon' [R. HUDSON] = himni (f) 'afternoon, the period from about 2 p.m. to sunset' > himənai 'to set off in the afternoon', himənīt 'to spend the afternoon' [ROPER 1928: 196] = (Ammar'ar dialect) himni 'afternoon' [STARKEY] = 'late afternoon' [EHRET]. The match of Bed. -mn- vs. ECu. *-bn- can hardly pose a serious problem, although one would need to have further instances of Bed. -mn- < *-bn-. But the stimulus of the meaning change would have to be explained.

¹²⁴ Perhaps originally 'to darken sg. by covering it'? H.-J. SASSE (1982: 93) insisted on a phonologically dubious derivation < ECu. *hagōg- 'to cover over', where both Burji -w- and -n- would remain rather obscure. Perhaps a contamination of these two roots?

[GT: < *ma-fwon] ‘black’ [IL] (prefix ma-)¹²⁵ | Warji vina- in: vina-hinna ‘black’ [GOWERS] (WCh.: JI 1994: II 28), in which one might easily figure the usual Chadic spirantisation of internal *-b- > f ~ v (i.e., of *hVbVn), represent a scarce proof for the existence of Southern Afro-Asiatic *√hbn ‘dark’ [GT] also in Chadic. Curiously, in Northern Afro-Asiatic, in turn, SAA *√hbn is opposed solely by a metathetic root variety, cf. SBrb./Twareg *√h₂nby [PRASSE]: Ahaggar hənəy ‘avoir la tête noire’, adj. vb. e-hənəy [PRASSE 1969: 59, #298], EWlmd. & Ayr hənəy ‘1. avoir la bouche noire (âne), 2. avoir la bouche fardée en noir (femme)’, tā-hhənəy-t vb.n., Ayr həbbəy (Gh. Mohamed: = hənəy) ‘1. avoir les lèvres fardées en noir, 2. femme aux lèvres fardées en noir’, hənəy ‘femme à la bouche fardée en noir’ [PAM 2003: 325, 337], whose *IVae infirmae* root surprisingly reminds us of Eg. hbnj *sine* metathesis. From all these data, a safely reconstructible **Common Afro-Asiatic** root appears to emerge, namely SAA *√hbn ~ **Twareg** *√hnby ‘dark’ [GT], where our special isogloss of the **Egypto-Central Chadic** dendronym *haban- ‘African blackwood’ [GT] (dating back not earlier than the 8th mill. BC) may have originated from. If this hypothesis is right, we may assume that the Saharan ancestors of the Egyptians arrived first in the Nile valley with the knowledge of the blackwood in general and its term hbnj (whichever species it may have covered) that they, in fact, never ceased to have contact with.

11.2. A concurring etymological theory on the proto-Cushitic etymon, which was serving as the basis for the reconstructions above (§11.1), should also be discussed in this article. Ch. EHRET (1987: 127, #549) equated Bed. himni ‘late afternoon’ and his PSomali *hammēn ‘night’ (reconstructed from the dialectal forms above) directly with the Hadiya and SCu. reflexes of a biradical Cushitic root for ‘black’ with original C₂ *m¹²⁶, all of which he derived from his PCushitic simplex *ha/im- ‘darkness’¹²⁷. The parental root for the Cushomotic forms quoted above was figured the same way by V. BLAŽEK (p.c., June 2021) too, for whom, in the Beja and some Somali dialectal reflexes, the C₂ *-m- seems to be primary

¹²⁵ It remains puzzling if Fyer ɸwii ‘schwarz’ [JNG. 1970: 353] is eventually related along the rule of Chadic implosives carrying the trace of a lost laryngeal + plain plosive (onto which the glottalisation was transposed secondarily), i.e., Fyer ɸwii < *hVbwī, but there seems now to be no reason to assume in *-ī < *-i(n), i.e., an etymon like **hVbwīn.

¹²⁶ • LECu.: Elmolo hīme ‘darkness of a moonless night’ [HEINE] | HECu.: Libido and Hadiya hīmo ‘night, evening’ vs. hēma-ča ‘black’ [KORHONEN *apud* BLAŽEK] = Hadiya hēm- ‘to be black’, hēm-ačča ‘black’ [HUDSON 1989: 28] || SCu. *ham- ‘black’ [EHRET]: Ma’a -hāme ‘to be black’ | Dahalo hīmṣate ‘black’ vs. hīma ‘night’ > hīma-ne (TOSCO: sg. of hīma? EEN: no comment) ‘tomorrow’ [EEN 1989: 15; TOSCO 1991: 135] (SCu.: EHRET 1980: 304, #D.5). Note that Asa huma ‘red’ attached by Ch. EHRET to SCu. *ham- may better be akin to Sem. *√hmr ‘to be red’ [GT *pace* DRS 884–885].

¹²⁷ Later, in the gigantic dictionary of additional AA roots by Ch. EHRET (2000 MS: 322, #2515), we find this as PCu. *hām- ‘to become dark’) with an original C₂ *-m- (with no mention at all of the C₂ -b- forms above).

with regard to the existence of apparently related forms (Hadiya, SCu.) without the third radical *-n-, which, in his view, could have caused the change *-b- > *-m-. A reverse process (*-bn- assimilated into *-mn-), nevertheless, may have just as well been the case, so this can hardly be used as an argument in either way. The problem is, in any case, that, on the one hand, the C₁- of the underlying biradical CAA root could be but *h-¹²⁸ (the Dahalo cognate being the only firm proof of a variety with *h-), let alone its variety extended by a dental C₃ can solely be set up as CAA *hVnT-¹²⁹ (where the cluster *-nT- was assimilated regressively from *-mT-). The Twareg cognate *√hnb with metathesis, on the other hand, equally provides a firm support for *-b- in the Cushitic root, in my view. All of this suggests that above we are dealing with two distinct PAA roots: *√hbn vs. *√m (var. *√hm), which may have denoted diverse dark tones.

11.3. Remarkable is the (quite normal) lack of the first syllable *hV- in the West Chadic cognates, which H.G. MUKAROVSKY (1987: 97) has not hesitated to affiliate with Soninke binne (binna-, binni-) ‘black’ in Mande along with highly dubious Chadic parallels having medial -l-/r- < Ch. *√blm ‘black’ [JS 1981: 44A₅] and ECh.: Somray minyo ‘black’ [JNG.], whose derivation < *biny is so far baseless, to which he (the same page but as a distinct entry) even attached

¹²⁸ The corresponding forms also appear in Sem. (in fact, just based on Ar. data) birad. *√hm ‘to be black’ [EHRET 2000 MS: 305, #2436]: Ar. √hmm ‘devenir noir’, ḥumam- ‘charbon, suie, cendres’, ḥimhim- ‘très noir’ (sic: -h-), ḥamā and ḥam?-at- ‘vase noire’, Dathina ḥumum ‘suie’, ḥmūm ‘saleté’ || Mehri ḥom ‘recueillir du charbon de bois’, Mehri & Harsusi ḥamīm, Mehri ḥamūm, Jibbali ḥūm, Soqotri ḥēmhom (sic: -h-) ‘charbon’ || Geez ḥammat ‘charbon, suie’, Tigriña ḥammāt ‘charbon’ etc. (Sem.: DRS 878–879, 882). For Ar.-Cu.: HSED 273, #1232. For Sem.-Hadiya: Ehret 2000 MS: 305, #2436. By the way, elsewhere Ch. EHRET (2000 MS: 322, #2515) affiliated his PCu. *hām- ‘to become dark’ with Ar. hamt- (v.n.) ‘to disappear’.

¹²⁹ Attested in Sem.: Ar. ḥandasa I and II ‘être très-sombre (se dit de la nuit)’, II also ‘2. tomber de faiblesse, et n’avoir pas assez de force pour se relever’, hindis- ‘nuit très-sombre, ténébres’, hundusiyy- ‘très-noir, -sombre’ [BK I 502] || SCu.: WRift *hāntē ‘1. darkness, 2. shadow’ [KM]: Iraqw hanta ‘1. shadow, 2. spirit’ [EHRET] = hāntē ‘1. darkness, 2. shadow, 3. emptiness’ [KM], Gorowa hāntē ‘1. darkness, 2. shadow’ [KM], Burunge hante ‘darkness’ [EHRET] = hāntē ‘1. darkness, 2. shadow’ [KM], hence: WRift *hāntē-s- (caus. *-s- suffix) ‘1. to obscure, 2. hide, cover’ [KM] | (SCu.: EHRET 1980: 304, #D.5) || NOM. *ūnt ‘night’ [GT]: Chara ūnt-a ‘night, evening’ [AKLILU YILMA in BENDER 2003: 91, #95] | She int ‘night’ [FLEMING in BENDER 2003: 170, #95] || WCh.: Geruma hanžini ‘black’ [GOWERS] = žinni [SCHUH] || CCh.: Masa *henže (with *-, E < **dE???) ‘night’ [GT] || ECh. *ʔānT- ‘1. darkness, 2. night’ [GT]: (?) Ndam ʔinyán [-y- < *-ž- < **d-???) ‘night’ [JNG.] | Lele indūwā ‘black’ [GOWERS], Kabalay āndā ‘black’ [CAPRILE] | Dangla-Migama *ʔānd- ‘night’ [GT] > EDangla āandō (f) ‘la nuit, de nuit’ [DM 1973: 15], WDangla āándō (f) ‘nuit’ [FÉDRY 1971: 11], Migama ʔāandōn ~ ʔāandō (m) ‘nuit’ [JA 1992: 63] | Mubi-Toram *ʔanTiŋV ‘darkness’ [GT]: Toram ʔandenji ‘obscurité’ [ALIO 2004: 252, #19], Birgit ʔandāṅē (m), pl. ʔandāṅāy ‘nuit’ [JNG. 2004: 350], Jegu ʔántiŋ ‘Nacht’ [JNG. 1961: 110], Kofa ʔántiŋi (m) ‘night’ [JNG. 1977 MS: 9, #201] (ECh.: JI 1994: II 28–29 and 257). Besides, Ch. EHRET (1980, *loc. cit.*) directly equated the WRift C₃ *-t- forms with the SCu. biconsonantal root. R. KIESSLING and M. MOUS (*loc. cit.*), in turn, conceived of this WRift stem is a ‘noun of quality’ of their WRift *ham ‘to be lost’ assuming the former stem to go back to a pre-WRift *hāmītē “which underwent syncope and nasal assimilation”. Semantically untenable.

forms like WCh.: Fyer ɓwûi < Ch. *fi/pi ‘black’ [NM], whose cognacy in this form is certainly out of the question¹³⁰. Consequently, although one wonders why a term for ‘black’ had to be borrowed, if there was any link between the etyma of Warji vina- vs. Soninke binne in the frames of a Mande-Chadic areal cohabitation visioned by the outstanding Viennese Africanist, it could only have been possible substantially later, i.e., subsequent to the proto-Chadians’ arrival in the Mega-Tchad area through Wadi Howar (?) after their definitive separation from proto-Egyptians in the East Sahara (6th mill. BC the latest), which can logically only allow us to suppose the Chadic term to have passed into Mande (but by no means *vice versa*). Summing up: the mass of diverse Chadic words for ‘black’ listed by H.G. MUKAROVSKY (*loc. cit.*), having a distinct *Lautgeschichte*, have hardly anything in common with **East Cushito-Aroid-West Chadic** *√hbn.

11.4. In addition to all this, finally, it remains unavoidable to mention a curiously isolated match in LECu.: Somali háyb-a ‘Gattung Baum mit schwarzer Rinde aus dessen festen Holze Stöcke, Knüttel, sowie die Kugel für den mohammedanischen Rosenkranz geschnitzt werden’ [REINISCH 1902: 214] = háyb-e ‘type of tree (túsbaḥ is made from it)’¹³¹, cf. háybe bû u égyahay ‘he’s very dark-skinned’ [ABRAHAM 1964: 106] = haybe (≈ hurre) ‘(in Somali:) midob madawdhalaal ah (English: a kind of shining black color)’ [PUGLIELLI, ABDALLA 2012] = haybe (Djibouti) ‘1. (in Somali:) magac ama naanays loo baxsho wiil midab aad u madaw leh (English: name or nickname given to a boy whose complexion is very black), 2. (magac, lab, keli) geedka ugu wanaagsan geedaha tusbaxa laga qoro (the best one of the trees from which rosary beads are carved)’ [BELELOO 2013 *pace* ABRAHAM and REINISCH]. Having no idea about the Cushitic cognates of this puzzling Somali word, G. BANTI (kind p.c., 2 March 2021) has confirmed that Somali yusur is the southern dialectal word, whereas haybe is known for the tree only in the northwest (REINISCH, ABRAHAMs, Djibouti dictionary by BELELOO) only pointing out the former’s match with another Arabic loanword in LECu.: Afar yusúr ~ yasúr ‘1. ébène, perles d’ébène, 2. ext.: couleur d’ébène, noir intense’¹³². I.e., we

¹³⁰ In West Chadic, MUKAROVSKY ignored that the regular spirantisation of the intervocalic *-VbV- as well as of the cluster *bw- are usual shifts, which can only mean in WCh. the cognates like Kulere má-fwòn ‘schwarz’ [JNG. 1970: 353] = ma-ffōn [GT: < *ma-fwon] ‘black’ [IL] (prefix ma-) and Warji vina-hinna ‘black’ [GOWERS] (listed above) a former triradical root with an extinct first syllable (*CIVbVn), lost due to lenition of an initial *h-, and their ultimate cognacy with the Aroid word for ‘evening’ where the syllabic trace of the first *hV- has been retained, cf. Hamer (?)ibân [FLEMING], Hamer-Karo ibon [FLEMING *apud* BENDER 1994: 149].

¹³¹ As G. BANTI (p.c. on 2 March 2021) kindly informed me, the Somali-Italian dictionary has only yusur, quoted in R.C. ABRAHAM’s (1964) dictionary, as possibly related to haybe ‘glossy black complexion’: (m) ‘1. colore nero lucido della pelle, 2. pianta dal cui legno scuro si ricavano perle per il rosario’. FARAH and HECK (1993) apparently missed it.

¹³² For Somali yusur, beside Afar, G. BANTI (p.c. on 3 March 2021) has only found Arabic yusur in PIAMENTA’s dictionary of Mediaeval Yemeni Arabic and in HINDS and ALSAID BADAWI’s dictionary of Egyptian Arabic, translated as ‘black coral’. The authors of the Sem. root lexicon

have here a precious unique piece of evidence for a NWSomali hayb- ‘very black’ vs. ‘ebony’ at a time (!) without a third *-n, whose loss (by any historical phonology in Somali) is unattested to the best of my knowledge.

11.5. Naturally, we cannot speak of a direct (synchronic) etymological connection between Somali hayb- vs. Somaloid *habēn-, only of their ultimate cognacy having sprung from a remote PAA biradical common source. The meaning of north-western Somali hayb-being confirmed by G. BANTI as ‘shining black wood’, irrespective of its apparent isolation, at least, for the time being¹³³, the question obviously arises: does it display a fossilised sporadic remnant of the original PAA biconsonantal root *√h(y)b whence SAA *√hbn and (Egypto-???) Twareg *√h₂nby were derived by the root extension?

12. IMPLICATIONS ON THE AFRICAN PREHISTORY

12.1. Based purely and merely upon his ill-founded Niger-Kordofanian > Bantu etymology of Eg. hbnj that we have clearly discarded above, P. BANCEL (1989: 34) was not reluctant to deduce a daring scenario of areal contacts between Egyptians with Niger-Kordofanian ancestors ca. 3000 BC¹³⁴. These guesses, built upon one single supposed borrowing along with a confessed failure even to check the whole root stock of his own chosen linguistic target domain, let alone his having failed to collect beforehand a considerable set of parallel Niger-Kordofanian borrowings, led him (p. 35) to go forward drawing even some major prehistorical conclusions on the Sudanese homeland of the entire Niger-Kordofanian family and the westward migrations of the Niger-Congo et Mande branches¹³⁵.

(DRS 1154) compared also JPArām. (no form quoted) and Moroccan Ar. yusr- ‘grains de corail noir’ [DOZY II 852] || Geez yotor (*sic*: -t-) ‘pierre précieuse’ [LESIAU 1987: 628], Tigre ‘esurat ‘sorte de chapelet des Musulmans fait de perles de bois noir’ [LITTMANN, HÖFNER 1956: 362].

¹³³ As G. BANTI (p.c. on 2 March 2021) kindly informed me, the Somali-Italian dictionary has only yusur, quoted in R.C. ABRAHAM’s (1964) dictionary, as possibly related to haybe ‘glossy black complexion’: (m) ‘1. colore nero lucido della pelle, 2. pianta dal cui legno scuro si ricavano perle per il rosario’. FARAH and HECK (1993) apparently missed it.

¹³⁴ His daring teory was, however, solely based on his ill-founded Niger-Kordofanian etymology of Eg. hbnj (above): “...nous devons [...] supposer que des locuteurs d’une langue de ce phylum se trouvaient il y a quelque 5000 ans dans une région en contact avec l’Égypte. [...] Sur le plan historique, [...] il a été démontré que le foyer de l’expansion bantu se trouve sur la côte Ouest de l’Afrique, et donc qu’il faut rajouter à la date de dispersion quelques siècles au moins pour que des locuteurs de langues bantu aient pu se trouver dans une région géographiquement susceptible d’avoir été en contact avec l’Égypte. Par contre, les langues de la branche primaire kordofanienne du phylum Niger-Kordofan, dont l’ancienneté les rend tout à fait susceptibles de correspondre à la profondeur temporelle de l’emprunt égyptien, sont actuellement parlées dans le sud du Soudan actuel, et répondent donc également aux impératifs géographiques de l’emprunt”.

¹³⁵ BANCEL (*loc. cit.*): “Il découle de ceci une conséquence tout à fait importante. La forte présomption qu’à cette époque, des locuteurs d’une langue de ce phylum aient pu se trouver dans

12.2. The phonologically regular Egypto-Central Chadic dendronym is both in form and semantics a logical derivative of SAA $\sqrt{\text{hbn}}$ ‘dark’ akin to Twareg $\sqrt{\text{h}_2\text{bny}}$ ‘black’, which proves its native origin perfectly beyond any doubt, i.e., Eg.-CCh. $\sqrt{\text{haban}}$ (?) ultimately rooted in the Common Afro-Asiatic (ca. 10th, but prior to the 8th mill. BC) ancestral colour terminology. Whether the CAA root has anything to do with P. BANCEL’s (1989) PBantu $\sqrt{(\text{ki})\text{-pind-V}}$ ‘black’ is to be easily answered regarding a whole series of obstacles elucidated above: (1) a several millennia older native CAA (Levant) root, whose anachronism is *eo ipso* clear, could hardly have been borrowed from the Bantu stem (2) with, by the way, an anomalous first consonant ($\neq$ CAA $\sqrt{\text{h-}}$) and $\sqrt{\text{-nd-}}$ ($\neq$ CAA $\sqrt{\text{-n-}}$), (3) let alone that the semantic motivation for borrowing a colour name in place of the attested native one would be incomprehensible.

12.3. In my parallel paper on the etymology of Eg. qmj.t > Greek κόμμι ‘gum’¹³⁶ (cf. its §12) forthcoming in the next volume of “Eos”, I have outlined the linguistic and possible archaeological background of how the Egypto-Chadic isogloss for ‘gum’ may be set in the context of the supposed areal cohabitation of the Egyptian and Chadic ancestral communities projected into the mid-Holocene East Saharan savannah zone. However attractive may a cultural loaning *a priori* appear for Eg. hbnj from some other language family, the lack of a convincing foreign source makes an impression that some cultural exchange cannot necessarily be relevant in this case. Moreover, the Central Chadic match (§9.1) and the Cushomotic cognates (§11.1) convince us that there can be no talk about such an extra-Afro-Asiatic scenario whatsoever here. From the evidence in §§9–11, it seems likely that our dendronym may and could only have been “invented” by the proto-Egypto-Chadic community from their native (i.e., SAA) root stock when they got acquainted with the ebony tree without borrowing a local foreign name, but it may perhaps be better to suggest instead a temporary (?) extension of their habitat to some tropical zone or even *vice versa*. But this daring line of thoughts has to be stopped at this point as it would lead us to assuming the savannah-dweller proto-Egypto-Chadians to have explored the closer

les parages de l’actuel Soudan, laisse à penser que cette région pourrait bien être le berceau de la famille toute entière. Dans cette hypothèse, les branches primaires Niger-Congo et Mande résulteraient de migrations vers l’ouest à partir de ce foyer originel. Cette théorie, basée sur un rapprochement lexical indirect, paraîtra certainement risquée. Il est certain que l’identification de cognats de $\sqrt{\text{-pind-}}$ dans des langues kordofaniennes actuelles (auxquelles nous n’avons pas eu accès pour la rédaction de ce travail) la renforcerait considérablement. [...] il n’est pas exclu qu’elle puisse être invalidée par la découverte d’une racine d’une autre famille linguistique qui se prêterait aussi bien à l’emprunt égyptien. La famille Nilo-Sahara pourrait éventuellement être ici en cause, voire la famille Khoisane que l’on soupçonne d’avoir occupé dans des temps reculés une aire bien plus vaste que celle qui lui est aujourd’hui dévolue en Afrique australe”.

¹³⁶ Entitled Greek κόμμι: *Its Ultimate Origin and Implications on the Afro-Asiatic Prehistory*.

tropical parts by themselves¹³⁷. Therefore, these investigations are only to be pursued further by using the expertise of palaeobotanists.

13. CONCLUSIONS

Our goal was to present and critically evaluate all available facts and theories relevant to the origin of Eg. hbnj ‘ebony’, rather puzzling until now. Doing so, we have arrived at a number of unforeseen and even unexpected new results. First of all, a brandnew strong suspicion could be formulated about its plausible Coptic (so far uncharted) reflex attested as a *hapax* in an ophthalmological unguent (§5.1) neatly agreeing with the parallel use of ebony in remedies for the pupil of the eye in pap. Ebers (§5.2) as well as in the ancient Greek (§5.3) and mediaeval Arabic medical texts (§5.4). Coptic (S) **2BOINE** (f), besides, if our rendering is correct, would corroborate the consonantal (and not *mater lectionis*, i.e., *quasi* vowel) value of the final -j of MEG. hbnj > medial -j- of Dem. hbjn (§5.6) forming *pro forma* (*sine* semantics) an astonishing *IVae infirmae* exclusive isogloss with Twareg *√h₂nby (§11.2 and §11.5). After having dealt with and ruled out the unsuccessful theories on some obscure (never specified) “Nubian” (§6) and Niger-Kordofanian (§7, also §12.2) etymologies of Eg. hbnj, a recent suspicion about the Puntite naval (?) import of *Diospyros* sp. (of Indian origin) (§8.1) compelled me to thoroughly check any possibility of its borrowing from proto-Dravidian. But here too, the outcome was completely negative (§8.2). My new theory on the cognacy of Eg. hbnj with an etymon *haban- ‘ebony tree’ [GT], abundantly attested in at least three Central Chadic language groups, is demonstrated in every detail (§9.1) along with a considerably etymological evidence adduced for the regular nature of the underlying consonantal correspondences (§10). This Egypto-Central Chadic dendronym is then set in its native Afro-Asiatic lexical root stock context as a special Egypto-Chadic innovation inherited from SAA *√hbn ‘dark’ [GT] (§11.1) akin to Twareg *√hnby ‘black (of lips, head)’ [GT], a *pro forma* astonishing *IVae infirmae* match with Eg. hbnj (§11.2). These facts examined above suggest that the name of ‘ebony’ was presumably an exclusively Egypto-Chadic innovation during their supposed East Saharan cohabitation (ca. 7th–6th mill. BC, not later) due to their contact with this tropical tree (§12.3). In a way, D.M. DIXON’s (1961: 208) purely speculative assumption on Eg. hbnj as “probably the Egyptian rendering of a vernacular name [...] a general term for a number of species probably belonging to various genera and families”, may turn out to be right in the light of our present investigation

¹³⁷ As confirmed by for me by A. ZBORAY (p.c. on 16 Jan. 2021), a leading expert of Holocene Saharan archaeology and rock-art, ebony tree had certainly grown only in the tropical rain forests, which may have perhaps expanded in the Holocene pluvials northwards more than in the historic times, but max. up to the Kordofan, hardly further.

suggesting that the ancestors of the Egyptians had long known the term Eg.-Ch. *haban- ‘black wood’ since the time of their areal community with the Proto-Chadians, which the descendants settled in the neolithic Nile Valley labelled diverse species varying according to diverse historical conditions.

Egyptian Language School at Balatonederics
Department of Classical Philology, University of Łódź
gabtak@datatrans.hu
 ORCID: 0000-0002-2466-6451

ABBREVIATION OF LANGUAGE NAMES

AA: Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic); **Akk.:** Akkadian; **Ar.:** Arabic, Aramaic; **Ass.:** Assyrian; **(B):** Bohairic; **Bab.:** Babylonian; **Brb.:** Berber; **C:** Common; **CAA:** Common Afro-Asiatic; **Ch.:** Chadic; **Cpt.:** Coptic; **Cu.:** Cushitic; **E:** East; **Eg.:** Egyptian; **GR:** Greek (Ptolemaic) and Roman period; **Hbr.:** Hebrew; **L:** Late or Lowland; **LECu.:** Lowland East Cushitic; **LP:** Late Period; **M:** Middle; **Med.:** ancient Egyptian medical texts; **MK:** Middle Kingdom; **N:** New/o- or North; **NK:** New Kingdom; **O:** Old; **OK:** Old Kingdom; **Om.:** Omotic; **Nom.:** North Omotic; **OT:** Old Testament; **P:** Proto-; **S:** South; **(S):** Sahidic; **Sem.:** Semitic; **Som.:** South Omotic; **Syr.:** Syriac; **W:** West; **WCh.:** West Chadic; **XVIII:** 18th dynasty; **XIX:** 19th dynasty.

ABBREVIATIONS FOR AUTHOR NAMES

AMS: AMBORN, MINKER, SASSE; **BK:** BIBERSTEIN KAZIMIRSKI; **DLG.:** DOLGOPOL'SKIJ; **DM:** DJIBRINE, MONTGOLFIER; **EEN:** EHRET, ELDERKIN, NURSE; **GB:** GESENIUS, BUHL; **GI:** GAMKRELIDZE, IVANOV; **GT:** (Gábor) TAKÁCS; **JA:** JUNGRAITHMAYR, ADAMS; **Jl:** JUNGRAITHMAYR, IBRISZIMOW; **JNG.:** JUNGRAITHMAYR; **JS:** JUNGRAITHMAYR, SHIMZU; **KB:** KOEHLER, BAUMGARTNER; **KM:** KIESSLING, MOUS; **NM:** NEWMAN, MA; **OS:** OREL, STOLBOVA; **PAM:** PRASSE, ALOJALY, MOHAMED; **PRH.:** PORHOMOVSKIJ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (BOOK ABBREVIATIONS IN BOLD)

- AĀG:** E. EDEL, *Altägyptische Grammatik*, Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955.
 ABRAHAM 1964: R.C. ABRAHAM, *Somali-English Dictionary*, London: University of London Press, 1964.
AEPT: R.O. FAULKNER, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
AHW: W. VON SODEN, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, vols. I–III, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965–1981.
 ALIO 2004: Kh. ALIO, *Préliminaires à une étude de la langue kajakse d'Am-Dam, de Toram du Salamaat, d'ubi du Guéra et de masmaje du Batha-est*, in: G. TAKÁCS (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 229–285.
 ALLISON 2003: S. ALLISON, *Makary Kotoko Provisional Lexicon*, MS of 21 May 2003. Online available from the SIL.
 ALMKVIST 1885: H. ALMKVIST, *Die Bischari-Sprache Tū-Bedāwie in Nordost-Afrika*, vol. II: *Bischari-deutsches und deutsch-bischarisches Wörterbuch*, Uppsala: Akademische Buchdruckerei, 1885.

- AMBORN, MINKER, SASSE 1980: H. AMBORN, G. MINKER, H.-J. SASSE, *Das Dullay. Materialien zu einer ostkuschitischen Sprachgruppe*, Berlin: Reimer Verlag, 1980.
- ANDORLINI 2018: I. ANDORLINI, *Πολλὰ ἱατρῶν ἐστὶ συγγράμματα*, vol. II: *Edizioni di papiri medici greci*. A cura di N. REGGIANI, Milano: Le Monnier Università–Mondadori Education, 2018.
- ÄWb I**: R. HANNIG, *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I: *Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit*, Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2003 (Hannig-Lexica 4).
- ÄWb II**: R. HANNIG, *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II: *Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit*, Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2006 (Hannig-Lexica 5).
- BANCEL 1989: P. BANCEL, *Ébène: un emprunt de l'égyptien ancien à une langue Negro-Africaine au 3ème millenaire av. J.-C.*, *Pholia* IV 1989, pp. 21–37 [also *Linguistique africaine* III 1989, pp. 5–18; the paper is quoted after the *Pholia* version].
- BARD, FATTOVICH 2011: K.A. BARD, R. FATTOVICH, *The Middle Kingdom Red Sea Harbor at Mersa/Wadi Gawasis*, *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* XLVII 2011, pp. 105–129.
- 2018: K.A. BARD, R. FATTOVICH, *Seafaring Expeditions to Punt in the Middle Kingdom. Excavations at Mersa/Wadi Gawasis, Egypt*, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2018 (*Culture and History of the Ancient Near East*, vol. 96).
- BARGER 1934: G.P. BARGER, *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary Compiled for the Government of Nigeria*, London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- BARNES 1956: J.W.B. BARNES, *Five Ramesseum Papyri*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- BARRETEAU 1988: D. BARRETEAU, *Description du mofu-gudur. Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun*, vol. II: *Lexique*, Paris: Éditions de l'ORSTOM, 1988.
- BARRETEAU, BLÉIS 1990: D. BARRETEAU, Y. BLÉIS, *Lexique mafa. Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun*, Paris: Éditions de l'ORSTOM–Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1990.
- BAUER, LEANDER 1922: H. BAUER, P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, vol. I: *Einleitung, Schriftlehre, Laut- und Formenlehre*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962 [reprint of the 1922 edn.].
- BEAUVISAGE 1897: G. BEAUVISAGE, *Recherches sur quelques bois pharaoniques. II. Le bois d'ébène*, *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* XIX 1897, pp. 77–79.
- BEEKES 2010: R. BEEKES with the assistance of L. VAN BEEK, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, vol. I, Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- BELELOO 2013: Aadan Xasan Aadan BELELOO (Hoggaaminta iyo Tifaftkka guud), *Qaamuus afsoomaali*, Jabuuti: Soo maal, 2013.
- BENDER 1994: M.L. BENDER, *Aroid (South Omotic) Lexicon*, *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* XXXVIII 1994, pp. 133–162.
- 2003: M.L. BENDER, *Omotic Lexicon and Phonology*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Printing / Duplicating, 2003.
- BIBERSTEIN KAZIMIRSKI 1860: A. DE BIBERSTEIN KAZIMIRSKI, *Dictionnaire arabe-français*, Paris: Maisonneuve & Co. Editeurs, 1860.
- BLACK 1974: P.D. BLACK, *Lowland East Cushitic: Subgrouping and Reconstruction*, PhD diss., Yale University 1974.
- BLAŽEK 2001: V. BLAŽEK, “Elephant” in *Indo-European Languages*, in: M.E. HULD et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, May 26–28, 2000*, Washington: Institute for the Study of Man, 2001, pp. 147–167.
- BOISACQ 1916: É. BOISACQ, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, Heidelberg–Paris: Carl Winter–Klincksieck, 1916.
- BORCHARDT 1909: L. BORCHARDT, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Nefer-ir-ke'-re. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Abusir 1902–1908*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909.
- BOROJEVIC, GERISCH 2007: K. BOROJEVIC, R. GERISCH, *Botanical and Wood Remains*, in: FATTOVICH, BARD 2007, pp. 39–45.

- 2008: K. BOROJEVIC, R. GERISCH, *Paleoethnobotany*, in: FATTOVICH, BARD 2008, pp. 70–72.
- 2010: K. BOROJEVIC, R. GERISCH, *Archaeobotany*, in: FATTOVICH, BARD 2010, pp. 47–58.
- BREYER 2016: F.A.K. BREYER, *Punt. Die Suche nach dem "Gottesland"*, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2016 (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, vol. 80).
- CD**: W.E. CRUM, *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- CHANTRAINE 1999: P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Avec un Supplément sous la direction de A. BLANC, Ch. DE LAMBERTERIE, J.-L. PERPILLOU, Paris: Klincksieck, 1999.
- CHAPMAN 2016: S.L. CHAPMAN, *The Embalming Ritual of Late Period through Ptolemaic Egypt*, Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham 2016.
- CHASSINAT 1921: E. CHASSINAT, *Un papyrus médical copte*, Le Caire: IFAO, 1921.
- ChED**: O.V. STOLBOVA, *Этимологический словарь чадских языков. Etymological Dictionary of the Chadic Languages*, Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences 2016.
- CLD III**: O.V. STOLBOVA, *Chadic Lexical Database. Issue III: sibilants and sibilant affricates s, z, c, ç, č, ž*. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009.
- CLD V**: O.V. STOLBOVA, *Chadic Lexical Database. Issue V: ʔ, h, h, [ʕ], γ, fi*, Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2019.
- COHEN 1947: M. COHEN, *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*, Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1947.
- COLOMBEL 1997: V. DE COLOMBEL, *La labgue ouldémé (Nord-Cameroun). Précis de grammaire, texte, lexique*, Paris: Association de Linguistique Africaine, 1997.
- COOPER 2020: J.Ch. COOPER, *Toponymy on the Periphery. Placenames of the Eastern Desert, Red Sea, and South Sinai in Egyptian Documents from the Early Dynastic until the End of the New Kingdom*, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2020 (Probleme der Ägyptologie 39).
- DALLET 1982: J.-M. DALLEY, *Dictionnaire qabyle-français. Parler des At Mangellat (Algérie)*. Paris: Société d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France, 1982.
- DAVID 2003: N. DAVID, *Comparison of Renderings of the Sukur Language*, MS, ca 2003, 20 pp.
- 2004: N. DAVID, *Sukur-English Lexicon*, MS, version of 1 Dec. 2004.
- DED**: T. BURROW, M.B. EMENEAU, *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- DELIC**: W. VYICHL, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*, Leuven: Peeters, 1983.
- DG**: W. ERICHSEN, *Demotisches Glossar*, Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1954.
- DIXON 1961: D.M. DIXON, *The Ebony Trade in Ancient Egypt*, Ph.D. diss., London University 1961.
- DLE**: L.H. LESKO, *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*, vols. I–IV. Berkeley: B.C. Scribe Publications, 1982–1989.
- DM 1973: B.A.Z. DJIBRINE, P. DE MONTGOLFIER, *Vocabulaire dangaléat. Kawo danla*, [place of publication not indicated: publisher not indicated, ca 1973].
- DOLGOPOLSKY 1999: A.B. DOLGOPOLSKY, *From Proto-Semitic to Hebrew: Phonology. Etymological Approach in a Hamito-Semitic Perspective*, Milano: CUSCUS, 1999.
- DOZY 1881: R. DOZY, *Suppléments aux dictionnaires arabes*, vols. I–II, Leiden–Paris: Brill–Maisonneuve, 1881.
- DRB**: K. NAÏT-ZERRAD, *Dictionnaire des racines berbères*, Leuven–Paris: Peeters, 1998–.
- DRS**: D. COHEN, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*, fasc. 1–2, Paris–La Haye: Mouton, 1970–1976, fasc. 3–, Leuven: Peeters, 1993–. With continuous pagination.
- DUL**: G. Olmo Lete, J. Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, pt. 1 [ʔ(a/i/u)–k], pt. 2 [l–z]. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- EBBELL 1937a: B. EBBELL, *The Papyrus Ebers, The Greatest Egyptian Medical Document*, Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1937.
- 1937b: B. EBBELL, *Ägyptische anatomische Namen*, Acta Orientalia XV 1937, pp. 293–310.

- EDE I:** = G. TAKÁCS, *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*, vol. 1: *A Phonological Introduction*, Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- EG¹ 1927:** A.H. GARDINER, *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.
- EHRET 1980: Ch. EHRET, *The Historical Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic Phonology and Vocabulary*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1980.
- 1987: Ch. EHRET, *Proto-Cushitic Reconstruction*, *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* VIII 1987, pp. 7–180.
- 1995: Ch. EHRET, *Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian): Vowels, Tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary*, Berkeley–Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1995.
- 2000: Ch. EHRET, [*Additions to the Afroasiatic Reconstructions*], MS. Los Angeles, 2000, 585 pp.
- EHRET, ELDERKIN, NURSE 1989: Ch. EHRET, E.D. ELDERKIN, D. NURSE, *Dahalo Lexis and Its Sources*, *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* XVIII 1989, pp. 5–49.
- EMBER 1911: A. EMBER, *Semito-Egyptian Sound Changes*, *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* XLIX 1911, pp. 87–92.
- 1912: A. EMBER, *Notes on the Relation of Egyptian and Semitic*, *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* L 1912, pp. 86–90.
- ERMAN 1892: A. ERMAN, *Das Verhältnis des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen*, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* XLVI 1892, pp. 93–129.
- ERNŠTEDT 1953: P.V. ERNŠTEDT, *Egipetskie zaimstvovanija v grečeskom jazyke*, Moskva–Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk, 1953.
- ESS:** A. EMBER, *Egypto-Semitic Studies*, Leipzig: The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation, 1930.
- FARAH, HECK 1993: M.A. FARAH, D. HECK, *Somali Wörterbuch*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1993.
- FARINA 1924: G. FARINA, *Le vocali dell'antico egiziano*, *Aegyptus* V 1924, pp. 313–325.
- FATTOVICH, BARD 2007: R. FATTOVICH, K.A. BARD (eds.): *Mersa/Wadi Gawasis 2006–2007*, https://www.academia.edu/518412/MERSA_WADI_GAWASIS_2006_2007.
- 2008: R. FATTOVICH, K.A. BARD (eds.): *Mersa/Wadi Gawasis 2007–2008*, http://www.unior.it/userfiles/workarea_231/file/Progetti/WadiGawasis/Final%20Report%20WG%202007-2008.pdf.
- 2010: R. FATTOVICH, K.A. BARD (eds.): *Mersa/Wadi Gawasis 2009–2010*, http://www.unior.it/userfiles/workarea_231/file/Progetti/WadiGawasis/Final%20Report%20WG%202009-2010.pdf.
- FAULKNER 1969: R.O. FAULKNER, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- FÄW:** J. KAHL, *Frühägyptisches Wörterbuch*. Unter Mitarbeit von M. BRETSCHNEIDER und B. KNEISSLER, fasc. 1–4, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002–2004.
- FD:** R. O. FAULKNER, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- FÉDRY 1971: J. FÉDRY (avec la collaboration J. DE KHAMIS, M. O/NEDJEI), *Dictionnaire dangaleat (Tchad)*. Thèse de 3ème cycle, Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, Lyon 1971 (Afrique et Langue).
- FOUCAULD 1951–1952: Ch. DE FOUCAULD, *Dictionnaire touareg-français, dialecte de l'Ahaggar*, vols. I–IV, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France, 1951–1952.
- FOULKES 1915: H.D. FOULKES, *Angass Manual, Grammar; Vocabulary*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1915.
- FOURNET 1989: J.-L. FOURNET, *Les emprunts du grec à l'égyptien*, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* LXXXIV 1989, pp. 55–80.
- GALE *et al.* 2000: R. GALE, P. GASSON, N. HEPPER, G. KILLEN, *Wood (Botany)*, in: P.T. NICHOLSON, I. SHAW (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 334–352.
- GAMKRELIDZE, IVANOV 1984: T.V. GAMKRELIDZE, V.V. IVANOV, *Indoeuropejskij jazyk i indoevropejcy*, vols. I–II, Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo Universiteta, 1984.

- GB:** W. GESENIUS, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Bearbeitet von F. BUHL, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1962 [reprint of the 1915 edn.].
- GERISCH 2007a: R. GERISCH, *Identification of Charcoal and Wood*, in: FATTOVICH, BARD 2007, pp. 43–45.
- 2007b: R. GERISCH, *Identification of Charcoal and Wood*, in: K.A. BARD, R. FATTOVICH (eds.), *Harbor of the Pharaohs to the Land of Punt. Archaeological Investigations at Mersa/Wadi Gawasis Egypt 2001–2005*, Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, 2007, pp. 170–188.
- 2008: R. GERISCH, *Wood and charcoal*, in: FATTOVICH, BARD 2008, pp. 70–72.
- 2010: R. GERISCH, *Charcoal and Wood Remains*, in: FATTOVICH, BARD 2010, pp. 51–58.
- GERMER 1979: R. GERMER, *Untersuchung über Arzneimittelpflanzen im Alten Ägypten*, Ph.D. diss., Universität Hamburg 1979.
- 1985: R. GERMER, *Flora des pharaonischen Ägypten*, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1985.
- 2002: R. GERMER, *Die Heilpflanzen der Ägypter*, Düsseldorf–Zürich: Artemis & Winkler, 2002.
- GHwb:** R. HANNIG, *Grosses Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800–950 v. Chr.)*, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1995.
- GORDON 1955: C.H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Manual*, Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955.
- 1965: C.H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook*, Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965.
- GRAGG 1982: G. GRAGG, *Oromo Dictionary*, East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, 1982.
- GRAVINA, DUMOK, BOYDELL 2003: R. GRAVINA, E. DUMOK, A. BOYDELL, *Merey Provisional Lexicon*, SIL, 2003.
- GRAVINA, NELEZEK, TCHALALAO 2003: R. GRAVINA, R. NELEZEK, R. TCHALALAO, *Mbuko-French-English Dictionary*, SIL, 2003.
- GUTHRIE 1971: M. GUTHRIE, *Comparative Bantu. An Introduction to the Comparative Linguistics and Prehistory of the Bantu Languages*, part I, vol. 2: *Bantu Prehistory, Inventory and Indexes*, Westmead: Gregg International Publishers, 1971.
- HALLER *et al.* 2003: B. HALLER, A. LAWARUM, D. DOUATAI, H. POURTSHOM, J.-P. BAITOUA, G. MAGDEME, J. AMADOU, *Zulgo Lexicon*, SIL, finalised in 1986, version of 2003.
- HAM:** W. WESTENDORF, *Handbuch der altägyptischen Medizin*, Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- HARRIS 1961: J.R. HARRIS, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961.
- HEINE 1975: B. HEINE, *Notes on the Yaaku Language (Kenya)*, Afrika und Übersee LVIII 1975, pp. 119–138.
- 1977: B. HEINE, *Bemerkungen zur Boni-Sprache (Kenia)*, Afrika und Übersee LX 1977, pp. 242–295.
- 1978: B. HEINE, *The Sam Languages. A History of Rendille, Boni and Somali*, Afroasiatic Linguistics VI 1978, pp. 23–115.
- 1980: B. HEINE, *The Non-Bantu Languages of Kenya*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1980.
- 1982: B. HEINE, *Boni Dialects*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1982.
- HODGE 1990: C.T. HODGE, *The Role of Egyptian within Afroasiatic*, in: Ph. BALDI (ed.), *Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology*, Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990, pp. 639–659.
- HOLMA 1911: H. HOLMA, *Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. Eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B VII/1 (1911), pp. 1–183.
- HSED:** V.É. OREL, O.V. STOLBOVA, *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- HUDSON 1989: G. HUDSON, *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary*, Hamburg: Buske, 1989.
- HUDSON 1996: R.A. HUDSON, *A Dictionary of Beja*. Draft Printout, February 29, 1996. Version prepared by R.M. BLENCH.
- INCORDINO 2017: I. INCORDINO, *African Aromata in Egypt: The “ti-shepes”*, in: I. INCORDINO, P.P. CREASMAN (eds.), *Flora Trade between Egypt and Africa in Antiquity: Proceedings*

- of a Conference Held in Naples, Italy, 13 April 2015*, Oxford–Philadelphia: Oxbow Books, 2017, pp. 41–53.
- IVANOV 1981: V.V. IVANOV, *Recenzija na AION. Annali del Seminario di Studi del Mondo Classico*, *Étimologija* 1981, pp. 174–179.
- 1983: V.V. IVANOV, *Istorija slavjanskih i baltijskih nazvanij metallov*, Moskva: Nauka, 1983.
- 1984: V.V. IVANOV, *O proišoždenii dr.-greč. ἑλεφας 'slonovaja kost', slon'*, in: *Étnogenez narodov Balkan i severnogo Pričerno-mor'ja. Lingvistika, istorija, arheologija*, Moskva: Nauka, 1984, pp. 66–75.
- JA 1992: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, A. ADAMS, *Lexique migama*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag 1992.
- JOHNSTONE 1981: T.M. JOHNSTONE, *Jibbāli Lexicon*, London: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- 1987: T.M. JOHNSTONE, *Mehri Lexicon*, London: University of London, 1987.
- JUNGRAITHMAYR 1961 [= JNG. 1961], H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, *Beobachtungen zur tschadohamitischen Sprache der Jegu (und Jonkor) von Abu Telfan (Republique du Tchad)*, Afrika und Übersee XLV 1961, pp. 95–123.
- 1962: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, *Wörterbuch der Angas-Sprache*, MS, 1962.
- 1970: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, *Die Ron-Sprachen. Tschadohamitische Studien in Nordnigerien*, Glückstadt: Verlag J.J. Augustin, 1970.
- 1977: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, *Kofa Wordlist*, MS. 1977, 18 pp.
- 1990: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, *Lexique mokilko*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1990.
- 2004 [= JNG. 2004]: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, *Das Birgit, eine osttschadische Sprache – Vokabular und grammatische Notizen*, in: G. TAKÁCS (ed.): *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl*, Leiden: Brill, 2004, pp. 342–371.
- JUNGRAITHMAYR, IBRISZIMOW 1994: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, D. IBRISZIMOW, *Chadic Lexical Roots*, vol. II: *Documentation*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1994.
- JUNGRAITHMAYR, SHIMIZU 1981: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, K. SHIMIZU, *Chadic Lexical Roots*, vol. I: *Tentative Reconstruction, Grading and Distribution*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1981.
- 1990: H. JUNGRAITHMAYR, *Lexique mokilko*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1990.
- KAHL, KLOTH, ZIMMERMANN 1995: J. KAHL, N. KLOTH, U. ZIMMERMANN, *Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie. Eine Bestandsaufnahme*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995.
- KHW**: W. WESTENDORF, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1977.
- KIESSLING, MOUS 2004: T. KIESSLING, M. MOUS, *The Lexical Reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic*, Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 2004 (Kuschitische Sprachstudien 21).
- KINNAIRD, OUMATÉ 2009: W. KINNAIRD, T. OUMATÉ, assistés par Z. MOKFETYA, G. FÉFÉ et le Comité d'Orthographe de la Langue Ouldémé, *Dictionnaire ouldémé-français*, SIL, 2009.
- KOEHLER, BAUMGARTNER 1994–2000: L. KOEHLER, W. BAUMGARTNER, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vols. I–V, Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.
- KOGAN, LJOZOV 2009: L.E. KOGAN, S.V. LJOZOV, *Drevneevrejskij jazyk*, in: A.G. BELOVA *et al.* (eds.), *Jazyki mira. Semitskie jazyki. Akkads-kij jazyk. Severozapadnosemitskie jazyki*, Moskva: Rossijskaja Akademia Nauk, Institut Jazykoznanija, 2009, pp. 296–375.
- KTU**: M. DIETRICH, O. LORETZ, J. SANMARTÍN, *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places*, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995.
- LACAU 1970a: P. LACAU, *Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1970.
- 1970b: P. LACAU, *Études d'Égyptologie*, vol. I: *Phonétique égyptienne ancienne*, Le Caire: IFAO, 1970.
- LAMBDIN 1953: Th. O. LAMBDIN, *Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament*, Journal of the American Oriental Society LXXIII 1953, pp. 145–155.
- LAMBERTI 1986: M. LAMBERTI, *Die Somali-Dialekte. Eine Vergleichende Untersuchung*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1986.
- LÄ**: W. HELCK, W. WESTENDORF (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*. Begründet von W. HELCK, E. OTTO, vols. I–VII. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975–1992.

- LEEMANS 1960: W.F. LEEMANS, *Foreign Trade in the Old Babylonian Period as Revealed by Texts from Southern Mesopotamia*, Leiden: Brill, 1960 (Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia 6).
- LEFÈBVRE 1956: G. LEFÈBVRE, *Essai sur la médecine égyptienne de l'époque pharaonique*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de la France, 1956.
- LESLAU 1956: W. LESLAU, *Étude descriptive et comparative du gafat (éthiopien méridional)*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1956.
- 1979: W. LESLAU, *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*, vol. III: *Etymological Section*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1979.
- 1987: W. LESLAU, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987.
- LEW:** A. WALDE, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3., neubearbeitete Auflage von J.B. HOFMANN, vols. I–III, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1938–1956.
- LEWY 1895: H. LEWY, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*, Berlin: R. Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung Hermann Heyfelder, 1895 [= Hildesheim: Olms, 1970].
- LITTMANN, HÖFNER 1956: E. LITTMANN, M. HÖFNER, *Wörterbuch der Tigre-Sprache. Tigre-Deutsch-Englisch*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1956.
- LOKOTSCH 1927: K. LOKOTSCH, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen (germanischen, romanischen und slavischen) Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1927 [= 1975].
- LORET 1883: V. LORET, *L'ébène chez les anciens égyptiens*, Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes V 1883, pp. 125–130.
- LORET 1892: V. LORET, *La flore pharaonique*, Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892 [= 1975].
- LÖHR 2002: D. LÖHR, *Die Sprache der Malgwa (Nará Málgwa). Grammatische Erstbeschreibung einer zentralschadischen Sprache Nordost-Nigerias*, Frankfurt a/M.: Peter Lang, 2002.
- LUCAS, HARRIS 1962: A. LUCAS, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*. 4th edn., revised and enlarged by J.R. HARRIS, London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1962.
- LUKAS 1936: J. LUKAS, *Die Logone-Sprache im Zentralen Sudan*, Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1936 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXI 6).
- 1939: J. LUKAS, *Die Sprache des Buduma in Zentralen Sudan*, Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1939 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXIV 2).
- 1970: J. LUKAS, *Studien zur Sprache der Gisiga (Nordkamerun)*, Hamburg: Verlag J.J. Augustin, 1970.
- MAGHWAY 1989: J.B. MAGHWAY, *Iraqw Vocabulary*, Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere XVIII 1989, pp. 91–118.
- MANZO 2011: A. MANZO, *Punt in Egypt and Beyond: Comments on the Impact of Maritime Activities of the 12th Dynasty in the Red Sea on Egyptian Crafts with Some Historical and Ideological Thoughts*, Ägypten und Levante / Egypt and the Levant XXI 2011, pp. 71–85.
- 2020: A. MANZO, *Back to Mahal Teglinos: New Pharaonic Evidence from Eastern Sudan*, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology CVI 2020, pp. 89–104.
- MEEKS 2002: D. MEEKS, *Coptos et les chemins de Pount*, Topoi. Orient–Occident, Suppl. III 2002, pp. 267–334.
- 2018: D. MEEKS, *A-t-on enfin trouvé le pays de Pount?*, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung CXIII 2018, pp. 283–292.
- MEEUSSEN 1980: A.E. MEEUSSEN, *Bantu Lexical Reconstructions*, Archives d'Anthropologie (Tervuren: Royal Museum of Central Africa) XXVII 1980, pp. 1–55.
- MILITAREV 1991: A.Ju. MILITAREV, *Guančskie jazyki. Fonetika*, in: V.M. SOLNCEV (ed.), *Jazyki Azii i Afriki*, vol. IV 2, Moskva: Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury, 1991, pp. 163–173.
- MITTWOCH, HIRSCHBERG, LIPPERT 1904: E. MITTWOCH, J. HIRSCHBERG, J. LIPPERT (eds.), Ali ibn Isa al-Kahhal: *Erinnerungsbuch für Augenärzte*. Aus arabischen Handschriften übersetzt und erläutert von J. HIRSCHBERG, J. LIPPERT, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit, 1904.

- MUKAROVSKY 1976: H.G. MUKAROVSKY, *A Study of Western Nigritic*, vol. II, Wien: Afro-Pub., 1976.
- 1987: H.G. MUKAROVSKY, *Mande-Chadic Common Stock. A Study of Phonological and Lexical Evidence*, Wien: Afro-Pub. 1987.
- MURRAY 1923: G.W. MURRAY, *An English-Nubian Comparative Dictionary*, London: Oxford University Press, 1923.
- MÜLLER 1877: A. MÜLLER, *Semitische Lehnworte im älteren Griechisch*, Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen I 1877, pp. 277–301.
- MWNR**: W. HELCK, *Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reiches*, parts 2–6, Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1960–1969 (Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse).
- NBA**: J. OSING, *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*, vols. I–II, Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1976.
- NENCIONI 1939: G. NENCIONI, *Innovazioni africane nel lessico latino*, Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica, N.S. XVI 1939, pp. 3–50.
- NEWMAN 1977: P. NEWMAN, *Chadic Classification and Reconstructions*, Afroasiatic Linguistics V 1977, pp. 1–42.
- NEWMAN, MA 1966: P. NEWMAN, R. MA, *Comparative Chadic: Phonology and Lexicon*, Journal of African Languages V 1966, pp. 218–251.
- NOONAN 2019: B.J. NOONAN, *Non-Semitic Loanwords in the Hebrew Bible: A Lexicon of Language Contact*, University Park: Penn State University Press, 2019.
- OREL, STOLBOVA 1992: V.É. OREL, O.V. STOLBOVA, *On Chadic-Egyptian Lexical Relations*, in: V. SHEVOROSHKIN (ed.), *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind*, Bochum: Brockmeyer 1992, pp. 181–203.
- OSBALDESTON, WOOD 2000: T.A. OSBALDESTON, P. WOOD, *Dioscorides: De Materia Medica, Being an Herbal with Many Other Medicinal Materials. Written in Greek in the First Century of the Common Era: A New Indexed Version in Modern English*, Johannesburg: Ibis Press, 2000.
- PEUST 1999: C. PEUST, *Egyptian Phonology. An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*, Göttingen: Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag, 1999.
- PORHOMOVSKIJ 1972: V.Ja. PORHOMOVSKIJ, *Istoričeskij konsonantizm jazykov kotoko*, Moskva: Institut Jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1972.
- PRASSE 1969: K.-G. PRASSE, *A propos de l'origine de h touareg (tahaggart)*, København: Munksgaard, 1969.
- PRASSE, ALOJALY, MOHAMED 2003: K.-G. PRASSE, Gh. ALOJALY, Gh. MOHAMED, *Dictionnaire touareg-français (Niger)*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press–University of Copenhagen, 2003).
- PT**: K. SETHE, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte*, vols. I–II, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1908–1910.
- PUGLIELLI, ABDALLA 2012: A. PUGLIELLI, O.M. ABDALLA, *Qaamuuska af-soomaaliga*, Roma: Centro di Studi Somali, 2012.
- RAC**: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, vols. 1–, Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1950–.
- REINISCH 1888: L. REINISCH, *Die Kafa-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. II. Kafa-Deutsches Wörterbuch und Deutsch-Kafa'sches Wörterverzeichnis*, Wien: Tempsky, 1888 (Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften CXVI 4, pp. 251–386).
- 1895: L. REINISCH, *Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache*, Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag, 1895.
- 1902: L. REINISCH, *Die Somali-Sprache*, vol. II: *Wörterbuch*, Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag, 1902.
- 1904: L. REINISCH, *Der Dschäbärtidialekt der Somalisprache*, Wien: Gerold, 1904 (Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften CXLVIII 5, pp. 1–88).
- ROPER 1928: E.-M. ROPER, *Tu BeTawie. An Elementary Handbook for the Use of Sudan Government Officials*, Hertford: Stephen Austin & Sons 1928.

- ROSSING 1978: M.O. ROSSING, *Mafa-Mada: A Comparative Study of Chadic Languages in North Cameroun*, Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison 1978.
- RT**: Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes (Paris).
- SASSE 1980: H.-J. SASSE, *Textproben der Boni-Sprache, Afrika und Übersee* LXIII 1980, pp. 79–101.
- 1982: H.-J. SASSE, *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1982.
- EL-SAYED 2011: R. EL-SAYED, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz im älteren Ägyptisch. Untersuchungen zur ägyptisch-afrikanischen Interferenz im dritten und zweiten Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Leuven: Peeters 2011.
- SCHRÄDER RL: O. SCHRÄDER, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde. Grundzüge einer Kultur- und Völkergeschichte Alteuropas*, Strassburg: Trübner 1901.
- SCHUH 1984: R.G. SCHUH, *West Chadic Vowel Correspondences*, in: J. BYNON (ed.), *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1984, pp. 167–223.
- SED I**: A. KOGAN, A. MILITAREV (with assistance of A. BELOVA, A. KOVALEV, A. NEMIROVSKAJA, D. NOSNITSYN), *Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 1: *Anatomy of Man and Animals*, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.
- SERVAJEAN 2019: F. SERVAJEAN, *Les pays des arbres à myrrhe et des pins parasols: À propos de T3-ntṛ*, Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne XII 2019, pp. 87–122.
- SETHE 1925: K. SETHE, *Zur Wiedergabe des ägyptischen h am Wortanfang durch die Griechen*, Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse 1925, pp. 50–56.
- SISAJa I**: I.M. D'JAKONOV et al., *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskich jazykov. Vypusk 1. p-p̣-b-f.*, in: *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XV godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, Moskva: Nauka, 1981, pp. 3–127.
- SISAJa III**: I.M. D'JAKONOV et al., *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskich jazykov. Vypusk 3. s-č-c-ž, č-č-ž, š-č-č s labialami*, in: *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XVI godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, Moskva: Nauka, 1986, pp. 3–46.
- SKINNER 1979: M.G. SKINNER, *Aspects of Pa'anci Grammar*, Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison 1979.
- 1995: N. SKINNER, *Evidence for Earlier Nominal Affixation in Afroasian*, in: D. IBRISZIMOW, R. LEGER (eds.), *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 1995, pp. 25–35.
- SMITH 2003: T. SMITH, *Muyang Provisional Lexicon*, SIL, version of 21 May 2003.
- SPIEGELBERG 1907: W. SPIEGELBERG, *Ägyptische Lehnwörter in der älteren griechischen Sprache*, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung XLI 1907, pp. 127–132.
- 1921: W. SPIEGELBERG, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1921.
- STOLBOVA 1977: O.V. STOLBOVA, *Materialy k sravnitel'noj fonetike afrazijskich jazykov (zapadnočadskie rekonstrukcii)*, in: V.V. IVANOV et al. (eds.), *Konferencija "Nostratičeskije jazyki i nostratičeskoe jazykoznanie". Tezisy dokladov*, Moskva: Institut Slavjanovedenija i Balkanistiki Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1977, pp. 64–65.
- 1987: O.V. STOLBOVA, *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika i slovar' zapadnočadskih jazykov*, in: V.Ja. PORHOMOVSKIJ (ed.), *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie. Problemy rekonstrukcii*, Moskva: Nauka, 1987, pp. 30–268.
- STRÜMPPELL 1922–1923: F. STRÜMPPELL, *Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen des Mandara-Gebirges (Adamaua)*, Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen XIII 1922–1923, pp. 109–149.
- TAKÁCS 2004a: G. TAKÁCS, *Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 2004.
- 2004b: G. TAKÁCS, *Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XIX*, Rocznik Orientalistyczny LVII 2004, fasc. 2, pp. 47–89.

- 2013: G. TAKÁCS, [rev. of: ZIBELIUS-CHEN 2011], *Bibliotheca Orientalis* LXX 2013, pp. 569–581.
- 2014: G. TAKÁCS, *Questions of the African Lexicon in Older Egyptian* [rev. of: EL-SAYED 2011], *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* CIX 2014, fasc. 4–5, pp. 1–13.
- TILL 1951: W.C. TILL, *Die Arzneikunde der Kopten*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951.
- 1955: W.C. TILL, *Koptische Grammatik. Saïdischer Dialekt*, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1955.
- TOSCO 1991: M. TOSCO, *A Grammatical Sketch of Dahalo*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1991.
- Urk. I:** K. SETHE, *Urkunden des Alten Reiches*, vol. I, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, ²1932–1933.
- Urk. IV:** K. SETHE, W. HELCK, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1927–1930 (issues 1–16), 1955–1958 (issues 17–22).
- ÜMT:** H. von DEINES, H. GRAPOW, W. WESTENDORF, *Übersetzung der medizinischen Texte*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958.
- VARTAVAN 1997: C. DE VARTAVAN, *Codex of Egyptian Plant remains. Codex des restes végétaux de l'Égypte ancienne*, 2nd enlarged edn., London: SAIS Books, 1997.
- M. VERGARI, R. VERGARI 2003: M. VERGARI, R. VERGARI, *A Basic Saho-English-Italian Dictionary*, Asmara, Eritrea 2003 (publisher not indicated).
- WARD 1963: W.A. WARD, *Notes on Some Semitic Loanwords and Personal Names in Late-Egyptian*, *Orientalia* N.S. XXXII 1963, pp. 413–436.
- 1972: W.A. WARD: [rev. of LACAU 1970a], *Bibliotheca Orientalis* XXIX 1972, pp. 18–23.
- Wb:** A. ERMAN, H. GRAPOW (eds.), *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, vols. I–V, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, ²1957–1971.
- WITTMACK 1910: L. WITTMACK, *Untersuchung altegyptischer [sic] Holzproben aus Abusir*, Sitzungsberichte der Gesellschaft Naturforschender Freunde zu Berlin IV 1910, pp. 181–192.
- WMT:** H. von DEINES, W. WESTENDORF, *Wörterbuch der medizinischen Texte*, vols. I–II, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1961–1962.
- WOLFF 1974: E. WOLFF, *Neue linguistische Forschungen in Nordostnigeria*, Afrika und Übersee LVIII 1974, pp. 7–27.
- WÖLFEL, J.D. WÖLFEL, *Eurafrikanische Wortschichten als Kulturschichten*, [Salamanca]: Universidad de Salamanca, 1955 (*Acta Salamantica*. *Filosofía y letras* IX 1).
- 1965: J.D. WÖLFEL, *Monumenta linguae Canariae. Die kanarischen Sprachdenkmäler. Eine Studie zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte Weißafrikas*, Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1965.
- WUS:** J. AISTLEITNER, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963 (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse CVI 3).
- ZIBELIUS-CHEN 2011: K. ZIBELIUS-CHEN, “Nubisches” *Sprachmaterial in hieroglyphischen und hieratischen Texten: Personennamen, Appellativa, Phrasen vom Neuen Reich bis in die napatanische und meroitische Zeit*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011 (*Meroitica* 25).

EINE KONJEKTUR ZU LUCR. I 703

von

HEIKO ULLRICH

ABSTRACT: An emendation upon the text of Lucretius' *De rerum natura* is offered.

Auch nach DEUFERTS *Editio Teubneriana* des Lukrez, die soeben – flankiert von einer Darstellung der Überlieferungsgeschichte in den *Prolegomena* und einem *Kritischen Kommentar* – erschienen ist, bleiben einzelne Textstellen umstritten, was freilich nicht gegen, sondern im Gegenteil nachdrücklich für DEUFERTS Arbeit spricht, die sich zwar auch durch gewichtige eigene Verbesserungsvorschläge, in erster Linie aber durch die kritische Sichtung der Forschungslage auszeichnet.

Ein Vers, mit dem der Herausgeber selbst offenbar nicht recht glücklich geworden ist (und dessen Verständnis er gleichwohl entscheidend gefördert hat), ist Lucr. I 703. Hier ist die zweite Vershälfte bekanntlich unvollständig überliefert; im gedanklichen und syntaktischen Zusammenhang der Verse I 701–704 stellt sich die umstrittene Stelle also folgendermaßen dar:

Praeterea quare quisquam magis omnia tollat
et uelit ardoris naturam linquere solam,
quam neget esse ignis, †tamen esse relinquat†?
aequa uidetur enim dementia dicere utrumque.

Zunächst hat hier Q², der humanistische Korrektor des Quadratus¹, eingegriffen und vor *tamen* das Wort *aliam* eingefügt, ungefähr gleichzeitig überliefern die Korrekturschichten des verlorenen Poggianus, die DEUFERT unter der Sigle ξ zusammenfasst², an derselben Stelle *summam*³. Beide Konjekturen sind später geringfügig variiert worden: das *aliam* von Q² durch SMITH (*aliud*)⁴ und

¹ Vgl. zu dieser Korrekturhand und ihrer zeitlichen Einordnung DEUFERT 2017: 59–63.

² Ebd.: 90–120.

³ Verteidigt von MÜLLER 1959: 118.

⁴ SMITH 1975.

das *summam* von ξ durch Gian Biagio CONTE (*cunctas*)⁵. Gegen *summam* hat DEUFERT zunächst völlig zu Recht eingewendet, dass an dieser Stelle nicht „die Materie in ihrer Gesamtheit“ gemeint sein könne und „das Prädikat *relinquat* nicht zu einem Ausdruck der All- oder Gesamtheit“ passe, während *cunctas* aufgrund des Numeruswechsels von singularischem *naturam* in Vers 702 zu pluralischem (*naturas*) *cunctas* unwahrscheinlich sei⁶.

Bereits NENCINI hat festgestellt, dass *ignis* vor *aliam* (und entsprechend auch vor *aliud*) nicht mehr als Genitiv Singular (*scil.* zu *naturam* aus 702) aufgefasst werden könnte, sondern pluralisch gelesen werden müsste⁷; den Versuch SHACKLETON BAILEYS, mit *terrae* ein bestimmtes Element (das zugleich das metrische Problem löst) zu konjizieren⁸, wiederum lehnt DEUFERT aus gutem Grund als „zu konkret“ ab⁹: Gemeint muss tatsächlich sein, dass der hypothetische Anti-Heraklitianer, den Lukrez dem von ihm bekämpften Original gegenüberstellt, um schließlich in Vers 704 beide der *dementia* zu zeihen, das genaue Gegenteil des überlieferten Monismus darstellt, also zwar die Existenz des Feuers leugnet, dafür aber diejenige aller anderen Elemente zugesteht.

Die von GIUSSANI in seinem Kommentar als „tutte l’altre cose“ definierte Bedeutung des gesuchten Begriffs¹⁰ sieht DEUFERT dagegen in LACHMANNs *quidvis* realisiert¹¹, das er als „jedes beliebige andere Element außer dem Feuer“ auffasst¹², während BUTTERFIELD das gesuchte „anything else“ in *quamuis* gefunden haben will – einem ausdrücklichen Versuch, LACHMANNs *quiduis* durch die Herstellung der Kongruenz zu *naturam* aus der ersten Vershälfte zu verbessern¹³. Problematisch erscheint an diesen Konjekturen jedoch insbesondere die Semantik von *quiuvis*, die sich nicht nur in der Regel auf eine beliebig große Anzahl von einzelnen Dingen bezieht¹⁴, während an unserer Stelle konkret die drei „Elemente

⁵ Vorschlag per E-Mail, dokumentiert bei DEUFERT 2018: 47–48.

⁶ Ebd., 48. Während DEUFERT wohl zu Recht vermutet, *summam* könnte aus den Versen 705–706 („Quapropter qui materiem rerum esse putarunt / ignem atque ex igni summam consistere posse“) ergänzt worden sein, beruft er sich für die Idiomatik von *relinquere* auf einen mündlichen Hinweis von Kurt SIER.

⁷ NENCINI 1896: 305.

⁸ SHACKLETON BAILEY 1985: 27.

⁹ DEUFERT 2018: 47, ähnlich auch BUTTERFIELD 2008: 18.

¹⁰ GIUSSANI 1896–1898 z. St.

¹¹ Vgl. den Text bei LACHMANN 1850a sowie den Kommentar LACHMANN 1850b z. St.

¹² DEUFERT 2018: 47; den Versuch, aus stilistischen Gründen (also konkret der syntaktischen Parallelität zu *ignis*) anstelle von *quiduis* den Genitiv *cuiusuis* zu konjizieren, verwirft DEUFERT umgehend wieder (ebd.).

¹³ BUTTERFIELD 2008: 18–19; dieselbe Konjektur wurde unabhängig auch von Kurt SIER erwogen (mündlicher Vorschlag, dokumentiert bei DEUFERT 2018: 47).

¹⁴ Vgl. aus Buch I nur die Verse 102, 141, 416, 556 und 1073.

Luft, Wasser und Erde“ gemeint sind¹⁵, sondern auch den Ausschluss des in der ersten Vershälfte genannten *ignis* aus der genannten Anzahl nicht explizit zum Ausdruck bringt, sondern alleine der gedanklichen Mitarbeit des Leser anheimstellt „– ein Verständnis, das nach dem unmittelbar vorangehenden *neget esse ignis* gewiss nicht schwerfällt“, wie DEUFERT (vielleicht etwas zu) optimistisch annimmt¹⁶.

Dass man den in der Korruptel von I 703 verloren gegangenen Begriff überhaupt und unter Hintanstellung der semantischen Präzision zugunsten stilistischer Erwägungen wie der strengen Parallelität zu (*naturam*) *ignis*¹⁷ hat suchen müssen, ist angesichts einer eigentlich schlagenden Parallelstelle auf den ersten Blick äußerst erstaunlich. Denn tatsächlich ist I 701–704 lediglich die stilistisch anspruchsvolle Ausformulierung eines kurz vor unserer Stelle, nämlich in I 696–697, schon einmal ausgesprochenen Gedankens: „*credit enim sensus ignem cognoscere uere, / cetera non credit, quae nihilo clara minus sunt*“ („Denn er glaubt, dass die Sinne das Feuer richtig erkennen können, bei den anderen Elementen hält er dies nicht für möglich, obgleich diese um nichts weniger deutlich zu erkennen sind“)¹⁸.

Auf den zweiten Blick ist es natürlich unmittelbar einsichtig, warum bislang niemand versucht hat, *cetera* zu konjizieren¹⁹ – die metrischen Hürden scheinen

¹⁵ DEUFERT 2018: 47.

¹⁶ Ebd.

¹⁷ Löst man den allenthalben hervorgehobenen Chiasmus korrekt auf, muss man ohnehin feststellen, dass (*naturam*) *ignis* zwar tatsächlich genau so aufgebaut ist wie *ardoris naturam*, diesem aber im ersten Teil des Chiasmus der Neutrum Plural *omnia* gegenübersteht – woraus eigentlich automatisch zu schlussfolgern wäre, dass das gesuchte Wort nicht (wie BUTTERFIELD und DEUFERT glauben) parallel zu (*naturam*) *ignis*, sondern eben zu *omnia* aufgebaut worden sein müsste.

¹⁸ Vgl. zur Verwendung von *cetera* in diesem Sinne allein in Buch I auch die Verse 403, 456, 519, 842 und 1104.

¹⁹ Thomas RIESENWEBER hat mich in einer E-Mail darauf hingewiesen, dass LACHMANN'S Konjektur durch die unspezifische Verwendung von *omnis* (und folglich auch *quiuvis*) im Sinne einer *summa ceterorum* verteidigt werden könne, wie sie *ThLL* IX 2, 615–616 und *HOFM.*–Sz. 203 dokumentiert sei; tatsächlich ist diese Lizenz für die Reihenfolge *unum* – *omnia* (anders als für die umgekehrte Reihenfolge *omnia* – *unum*) aber weder für Lukrez noch für syntaktisch, stilistisch oder inhaltlich mit Lucr. I 701–703 vergleichbare Stellen bezeugt. Diejenigen *ThLL* IX 2, 616 im Umfeld von Lucr. I 701, wo *omnis* im Sinne einer *summa ceterorum* verwendet wird, aufgeführten Stellen, die eine ähnliche Verschränkung wie der Komplex Lucr. I 701–703 aufweisen, sprechen eher für die Verwendung von *ceterus*, wenn das der Gesamtheit genannte Einzelne voransteht, während umgekehrt auf die Nennung von *omnis* durchaus eine Einschränkung erfolgen kann; vgl. beispielsweise die im Aufbau unserer Stelle besonders ähnlichen Parallelen Cic. *Sull.* 39: „*celatum esse Cassium de Sulla uno; nam de ceteris certe sciebat; etenim domi eius pleraque conflata esse constabat. Qui negare uoluit esse in eo numero Sullam quo plus spei Gallis daret, dicere autem falsum non ausus est, se nescire dixit. Atque hoc perspicuum est, cum is qui de omnibus scierit de Sulla se scire negarit, eandem uim esse negationis huius quam si extra coniurationem hunc esse se scire dixisset*“ oder Cic. *Phil.* 10, 4: „*Qui est iste tuus sensus, quae cogitatio, Brutus ut non probes,*

unüberwindlich. Und tatsächlich ist man gezwungen, die komplette zweite Hälfte des Verses 703 unter Generalverdacht zu stellen, obgleich die im Laufe der Überlieferungsgeschichte unternommenen Versuche der Wiederherstellung vieles so richtig gemacht zu haben scheinen, dass ihre meist naheliegenden, aber letztlich eben doch falschen (und im Übrigen ja auch nicht abschließend erfolgreichen) Konjekturen die Restitution des erwartbaren *cetera* heute fast unmöglich erscheinen lassen.

Dennoch möchte ich im Folgenden den Versuch unternehmen, einen zunächst einmal vielleicht etwas gewaltsam erscheinenden Heilungsversuch für die Stelle vorzustellen und zu rechtfertigen:

Praeterea quare quisquam magis omnia tollat
et uelit ardoris naturam linquere solam,
quam neget esse ignis, tamen <etsi cetera> linquat?
aequa uidetur enim dementia dicere utrumque²⁰.

Warum sollte außerdem irgendjemand eher alles abschaffen und nur das Wesen des Feuers beibehalten wollen, als dass er die Existenz des Feuers leugnete, selbst wenn er dann wohl die übrigen Dinge beibehalten dürfte? Denn beide Behauptungen scheinen gleichermaßen wahnwitzig zu sein.

Lukrez verwendet die viermal gebrauchte Konjunktion *etsi* in V 1156: „etsi fallit enim diuom genus humanumque“ in Verbindung mit *enim* sowie in I 487: „etsi difficile esse uidetur credere quicquam“ ohne weitere Ergänzung; an den beiden übrigen Stellen aber – wie in der vorgeschlagenen Konjektur – in Verbindung mit *tamen*: In I 120–121: „etsi praeterea tamen esse Acherusia templa / Ennius aeternis exponit uersibus edens“ steht erst die Konjunktion, dann das verstärkende *tamen*; III 1018: „quae tamen etsi absunt“ dagegen weist exakt die Wortstellung der vorgeschlagenen Konjektur auf²¹.

David BUTTERFIELD hat mich in einer E-Mail darauf hingewiesen, dass *etsi* so kurz vor dem Satzende dennoch einen unerwartet starken Einschnitt markiere. Bedauerlicherweise habe ich tatsächlich keinen Beleg gefunden, der diesen berechtigten Einwand wirklich endgültig widerlegen könnte, aber möglicherweise hat Lukrez sich an unserer Stelle an der Sprache der Komiker orientiert, etwa am ähnlich paradoxen „non uidi eam, etsi uidi“ (Plaut. *Mil.* 407) oder am syntaktisch etwas komplexeren „nam de reducenda, id uero ne utiquam honestum esse

Antonios probes; quos omnes carissimos habent, tu oderis, quos acerbissime ceteri oderunt, tu constantissime diligas?“, wo im zweiten Satzteil offenbar trotz der parallelen Stellung kein *omnes* mehr gesetzt wird, weil der bereits etablierte Gegensatz zu *tu* nun das logisch strengere *ceteri* nahelegt.

²⁰ An derselben Versstelle wie in der vorgeschlagenen Konjektur erscheint *cetera* in I 403: „sunt, per quae possis cognoscere cetera tute“ und in I 456: „libertas, bellum, concordia, cetera quorum“.

²¹ Vgl. dazu auch den Verweis *ThLL* V 2, 975.

arbitror / nec faciam, etsi amor me grauitur consuetudoque eius tenet“ (Ter. *Hec.* 403–404). Auch bei Cicero erscheint *etsi* zum Abschluss einer längeren Periode: „est omnino, cum de illo genere rei publicae quod maxime probo quae sentio dixero, accuratius mihi dicendum de commutationibus rerum publicarum, etsi minime facile eas in ea re publica futuras puto“ (*Rep.* I 65) oder: „quod quale sit, non tam definitione, qua sum usus, intellegi potest, quamquam aliquantum potest, quam communi omnium iudicio et optimi cuiusque studiis atque factis, qui permulta ob eam unam causam faciunt, quia decet, quia rectum, quia honestum est, etsi nullum consecuturum emolumentum uident“ (*Fin.* II 45). An derselben Stelle im Hexameter, an der Lukrez – die Richtigkeit der hier vorgeschlagenen Konjektur vorausgesetzt – *etsi* verwendet, erscheint die Konjunktion beispielsweise bei Statius: „diua quidem uobis, etsi caelestis origo est“ (*Theb.* IV 776, ebenso in V 242 und in V 456)²².

Der entscheidende Vorteil der hier vorgeschlagenen Konjektur liegt dagegen – neben der m.E. schlagenden Parallelität zu I 696–697 – in der paläographischen Plausibilität²³. Bedenkt man die überwältigende Prominenz der Formel *et cetera*²⁴, wäre ein Ausfall der zweiten Worthälfte von *etsi* keine Überraschung („quam neget esse ignis, tamen et †...† cetera linquat“). Damit kann der (bereits unmetrisch gewordene) Vers folgendermaßen verschriftlicht werden: „quam neget esse ignis, tamen †&c† linquat“. Erfolgt nun die Abkürzung durch eine Kombination aus der tironischen Note für *et* und der Initiale *c*, darf eine Verlesung dieser Abbreviatur zu *re* (zumal angesichts der relativen Häufigkeit von *relinquere* gegenüber dem Simplex *linquere*) erneut als geradezu folgerichtig gelten: „quam neget esse ignis, tamen †re†linquat“.

Dass ein derart korrupter Vers bereits in der frühen Überlieferungsgeschichte – in diesem Fall spätestens durch den Archetypus Ω repräsentiert – Besserungsversuche provoziert haben muss, ist natürlich evident: Aus dem durch

²² Verwendet wird *etsi* am Ende einer relativ langen Periode auch in Iuv. 12, 115–120: „alter enim, si concedas, mactare uouebit / de grege seruorum magna et pulcherrima quaeque / corpora, uel pueris et frontibus ancillarum / imponet uititas et, si qua es nubilis illi / Iphigenia domi, dabit hanc altaribus, etsi / non sperat tragicae furtiua piacula ceruae“; allerdings hat Jakub PÍGON in einer E-Mail zu Recht bemerkt, dass gerade die Position am Ende eines Hexameters im Kontext von Juvenals spezifischer Behandlung des Versendes gesehen werden muss und Parallelen zu unserer Lukrezstelle daher nicht unmittelbar gezogen werden können. Eine Pointe leitet *etsi* auch an der folgenden Stelle ein: „hanc utinam faciem nolit mutare senectus, / etsi Cumaeae saecula uatis aget“ (Prop. II 2, 15–16); obgleich etwa *mutare* (vgl. z. B. Lucr. I 669), *senectus* (vgl. z. B. Lucr. I 414 oder II 74) oder die negative Darstellung der Sibylle in Analogie zur Präsentation der Pythia in Lucr. I 739 (= V 112) auf den ersten Blick an Lukrez erinnern mögen, hat Donncha O’ROURKE mich in einer E-Mail davon überzeugt, dass ein direkter Einfluss des Lukrez auf das fragliche Distichon kaum nachzuweisen sein dürfte.

²³ Zu diesem Aspekt des Problems vgl. neben MERRILL 1916: 7 auch BUTTERFIELD 2008: 19.

²⁴ Vgl. z. B. *ThLL* III 969.

Verlesung entstandenen *relinquere* ergibt sich die (für *linquere* nicht existente)²⁵ Möglichkeit, beim Auffüllen der nun endgültig unübersehbar gewordenen Lücke mit einem AcI weiter zu konstruieren, wie Lukrez dies ja auch in I 515 (also im mehr oder minder unmittelbaren Vorfeld unserer Stelle) tut: „si non, quod cohibet, solidum constare relinquo“. Was läge also näher, als in Anbetracht der Parallelität innerhalb von Vers 703 *esse* aus der ersten Vershälfte auch in die offensichtlich unvollständige zweite Vershälfte zu integrieren, zumal sich der Infinitiv metrisch so nahtlos an *tamen* anschließen lässt? Dieser Stand aber ist die (einhellig)²⁶ überlieferte Form des Verses: „quam neget esse ignis, tamen ꝑesse reꝑlinquat“.

Bruchsal
heiko.f.ullrich@web.de

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- BUTTERFIELD 2008: D. BUTTERFIELD, *Supplementa Lucretiana*, Arctos XLII 2008, S. 17–30.
 DEUFERT 2017: M. DEUFERT, *Prolegomena zur Editio Teubneriana des Lukrez*, Berlin–Boston 2017.
 ——— 2018: M. DEUFERT, *Kritischer Kommentar zu Lukrezens ‚De rerum natura‘*, Berlin–Boston 2018.
 ——— 2019: Titus Lucretius Carus: *De rerum natura*, ed. M. DEUFERT, Berlin–Boston 2019.
 GIUSSANI 1896–1898: C. GIUSSANI, *T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex. Revisione del testo, commento e studi introduttivi*, Torino 1896–1898.
 LACHMANN 1850a: K. LACHMANN, *Titi Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex*, Berlin 1850.
 ——— 1850b: K. LACHMANN, *In T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libros commentarius*, Berlin 1850.
 MÜLLER 1959: G. MÜLLER, *Die Darstellung der Kinetik bei Lukrez*, Berlin 1959.
 NENCINI 1896: F. MÜLLER, *Lucretiana*, RFIC XXIV 1896, S. 304–314.
 MERRILL 1916: W.A. MERRILL, *Criticism on the Text of Lucretius with Suggestions for Its Improvement. Part I, Books I–III*, University of California Publications in Classical Philology III 1916, S. 1–46.
 SHACKLETON BAILEY 1985: D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Lucretiana*, Phoenix XXXIX 1985, S. 27–29.
 SMITH 1975: M.F. SMITH, *Lucretius de rerum natura*. With an English translation by W.H.D. ROUSE. Revised with new text, introduction, notes and index, London 1975.

²⁵ Vgl. *ThLL* VII 1, 1461 mit den entsprechenden Belegen insbesondere bei Lukrez. Auf die offensichtliche Korrespondenz von *linquere* in Vers 702 und (vermeintlichem) *relinquat* in Vers 703 verweist beispielsweise BUTTERFIELD 2008: 18, Anm. 5.

²⁶ Zur Randglosse des Korrektors O², der noch vor den Humanisten Q² (*aliam*) und ξ (*summam*) das wenig sinnvolle *ignem* ergänzt und von DEUFERT sowohl im Text seiner *Editio Teubneriana* als auch im *Kritischen Kommentar* mit Stillschweigen übergangen wird, vgl. BUTTERFIELD 2008: 18 mit dem Verweis auf die erledigte Forschungsdiskussion zu den „attempts to introduce another form of *ignis*“ (ebd., Anm. 4).

LA RELAZIONE TRA *MENTHA* E *MENTULA*
ED ALTRI PROBLEMI NEL TESTO DEL *DE HONESTA*
VOLUPTATE DI BARTOLOMEO PLATINA*

da

KAROLINA EKES E MIKOŁAJ SZYMAŃSKI

ABSTRACT: The article proposes some emendations to the text of *De honesta voluptate et valetudine* by Bartolomeo Platina. Platina's text was published many times in the 15th and the 16th century and has had two recent critical editions, but it cannot be regarded as error-free.

Il trattato *De honesta voluptate et valetudine* di Bartolomeo Platina, scritto probabilmente nel 1467, è conservato in alcuni manoscritti (tra i quali il più importante è il codice M della Biblioteca Trivulziana, Triv. 734) ed in molte edizioni quattrocentesche e cinquecentesche. Inoltre due studiosi, Mary Ella MILHAM ed Enrico Carnevale SCHIANCA, ne hanno recentemente preparato due distinte edizioni critiche¹. Ciononostante il testo continua ancor oggi a presentare numerosi errori.

Alcuni di essi sono ovvi e facili da correggere, come *frustra* ('invano') in parecchi luoghi dove il senso richiede *frusta* ('pezzi'): II 21, VII 52, VIII 42 e 47, X 4, e *frustratim* invece di *frustatim* ('in pezzi'): VI 24.

Analogamente sembra strano che nessuno prima di noi abbia corretto la forma inesistente *olfantium* (III 29) con *olfactantium* ('di quelli che fiutano').

Non meno ovvio è l'errore nella frase *coctum in aqua cyathis tribus* (III 35). Qui la traduzione di SCHIANCA mostra che il traduttore cerca disperatamente di cavarsela con la strana formula latina: «decotto in acqua in ragione di tre tazze». Non c'è dubbio che il Platina scrisse: *coctum in aquae cyathis tribus* «decotto in tre tazze d'acqua».

* Ringraziamo il professore Danilo FACCA per avere corretto il nostro italiano e la Biblioteca Trivulziana per ci avere fornito scansioni del codice M (Triv. 734).

¹ M.E. MILHAM (ed.), Platina: *On Right Pleasure and Good Health. A Critical Edition and Translation of De honesta voluptate et valetudine*, Tempe: Arizona State University Press, 1998 (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 168); E.C. SCHIANCA (ed.), Bartolomeo Platina: *De honesta voluptate et valetudine. Un trattato sui piaceri della tavola e la buona salute. Nuova edizione commentata con testo latino a fronte*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2015 (Biblioteca dell'«Archivum Romanicum». Serie I: Storia, Letteratura, Paleografia 440).

Al capitolo IV 21 il Platina paragona il valore della carne di vari animali. Nel codice M e nelle edizioni leggiamo: *Meliores [...] gallinae quam galli [...], vervecei quam agni* (nella traduzione di SCHIANCA: «le galline sono da preferirsi ai galli [...], i castrati agli agnelli»). Qui non è giustificato l'uso dell'aggettivo *verveceus* invece del sostantivo *vervex* 'montone castrato'. Dunque dobbiamo emendare *vervecei* in *verveces*.

C'è poi un altro errore che non è difficile ad emendare. Al capitolo IV 27 (*De damis*) leggiamo sul daino: *Raro mansa fieri potest*, che SCHIANCA traduce: «Raramente si riesce ad addomesticarlo». Il senso è certamente corretto, solo che non ci pare appropriato il termine *mansus* che può essere un participio di *mando* ('masticare') oppure di *maneo* ('rimanere'). È ovvio che il Platina scrisse: *Raro mansuefieri potest*.

Al capitolo VIII 8 (*Moretum genistinum* che secondo SCHIANCA significa «Pesto ginestrino») si legge: *in patinas convivis appones*, che il traduttore rende: «servilo nei piatti ai convitati». E' sufficiente una mediocre conoscenza del latino per sapere che il cibo si serve non *in patinas* ma *in patinis*. Vedi anche VII 72: *in patinis convivis appones*.

Troviamo un accusativo invece che l'ablativo anche al capitolo VIII 46: *in patellam bene unctam [...] coques* (secondo SCHIANCA: «farai la torta in una padella bene ingrassata»). Non c'è dubbio che il Platina scrisse *in patella bene uncta [...] coques*, come in VIII 34: *omnia in patella [...] coques*, e 39: *in patella [...] frigito*.

Il capitolo IX 17 comincia dalla frase: *Polinem cum aqua salis et saccharo subigito*, che SCHIANCA rende: «Impasta la farina con acqua, sale e zucchero». La traduzione è corretta, ma che cosa significa *aqua salis*? Ovviamente dobbiamo leggere: *cum aqua, sale et saccharo*. La correzione trova conferma nella fonte di questo capitolo, il *De arte coquinaria* del Maestro Martino (Martino da Rossi o Martino da Como), scritto in italiano negli anni 1456–1467. I brani utilizzati dal Platina sono pubblicati da SCHIANCA nell'appendice II della sua edizione. Al numero 177, infatti, si legge: «Togli del fiore di farina et d'acqua, di sale et del zuccaro».

Al capitolo X 18 (*De scauro*) si dice, se dobbiamo prestare fede al codice M ed alle edizioni, che il prefetto Ottavio, dopo aver importato lo scaro dall'Asia, *piscem inter Ostiam et Campaniam ea lege sparsit ut quinquennio, donec multiplicaret, intactus relinqueretur* che SCHIANCA rende: «disseminò questo pesce nel tratto di mare fra Ostia ed il litorale campano, avvertendo che fosse rispettato almeno per cinque anni, finchè non si fosse riprodotto». Ma «riprodursi» nel latino non è *multiplicare* ma *multiplicari*: nel passo di *Genesi* 1, 22 Dio non dice *Crescite et multiplicare*, ma *Crescite et multiplicamini*. Dunque *multiplicaret* va corretto in *multiplicaretur*. La desinenza *-tur* veniva spesso abbreviata in *-t* e ciò sembra all'origine dell'errore.

Il titolo del capitolo X 46, dedicato al gongro, è nel M e nelle edizioni *Congrum*. Non c'è dubbio che un titolo richieda non l'accusativo ma il

nominativo, in questo caso *Conger*. Lo sbaglio si spiega con il fatto che la prima parola del capitolo è *Congrum*.

Al capitolo X 65 (*De vino*), dopo un'enumerazione di ottimi vini, si legge: *Non negaverim in Piceno, in Cisalpina inque reliquis Italiae partibus alia et digna esse fama* (secondo SCHIANCA: «Non intendo disconoscere che nel Piceno, nella Valle Padana e nelle rimanenti regioni d'Italia si trovano altri vini altrettanto degni di fama»). Qui non quadra la congiunzione *et: alia et digna* non è una buona accoppiata. Invece di *et*, avremmo bisogno dell'avverbio *etiam* ('anche'). Questa parola veniva spesso abbreviata in *et'*, ed in questo modo possiamo spiegare l'errore.

*

Un lettore attento si accorgerà senza fatica che la frase (I 1): *Quis est [...] qui non corpore et animo aliqua profundatur voluptate?* contiene un errore. Il senso richiesto: «Chi è [...] che non senta talvolta un intenso piacere?» non si può ottenere con il verbo *profundere* che significa 'versare', dove il suo oggetto è il liquido versato (per esempio vino o lacrime). *Profundatur* debbe essere emendato in *perfundatur*. *Perfundere* ('bagnare, inondare') viene infatti metaforicamente usato parlando di sentimenti, per esempio da Livio (XXVI 5, 9): *gaudio perfusus* – 'riempito di gioia'.

Al capitolo I 11 viene proposta la seguente dieta per l'estate, se prestiamo fede al codice M ed alle edizioni: *Utendum est [...] carne assa ut saepius ante cibum, sic exigua utendum est* («Si deve mangiare spesso prima del pasto carne arrostita, ma in poca quantità»). I bambini volentieri gustano i dolci prima di cena, ma l'idea di mangiare carne prima del pasto sembra molto strana. Il testo deve emendarsi secondo la fonte del Platina, Celso (*De medicina* I 3, 37, anche le edizioni più vecchie): *Ei tempori aptissima [...] caro assa [...]. Ut saepius autem cibo utendum, sic exiguo est*. Dunque probabilmente il Platina scrisse: *Utendum est [...] carne assa. Ut saepius autem cibo, sic exiguo utendum est* («Si deve mangiare [...] carne arrostita. Inoltre, si deve fare uso del cibo più spesso, ma in poca quantità»).

Al capitolo II 13 (*De oleo*) il Platina narra una storia ripresa dagli *Stratagemmi* di Frontino (II 5, 23): prima della battaglia della Trebbia Annibale unse i suoi soldati con olio e in questo modo diede a loro corpi – secondo il codice M e le edizioni – *lenitatem et robur*. Questo significherebbe «mitezza e forza». Ma mitezza è una qualità dell'anima e non del corpo, e non è nemmeno particolarmente utile durante una battaglia. Senza dubbio si deve leggere *levitatem* – 'agilità'.

Al capitolo III 6 leggiamo sulle carrube: *cibus earum urinam ciet* (secondo SCHIANCA «stimolano la diuresi»). Ma in latino non si dice *cibus fructuum*, come nemmeno in italiano si dice «cibo dei frutti». Secondo noi *cibus* va corretto in *usus*, come per esempio in I 19: *Usus prunorum ante cibum, si moderatus est, alvum citam facit*, oppure IV 6 (sulla portulaca): *Plurimus eius usus oculos hebetat*.

Al capitolo III 8 (*De pipere*) l'autore descrive come il pepe bianco venga trasformato in pepe nero. Nel codice M e nelle edizioni leggiamo: *candidum piper [...] tostum solibus calore rugisque mutatur* che SCHIANCA traduce: «i grani di pepe bianco [...] torrefatti al sole cambiano aspetto per il calore e per la rugosità». A prima vista la menzione del calore sembra accordarsi bene con quella del sole. Ma la parola che appare come *calore* deve – insieme con *rugis* – riferirsi all'aspetto del pepe. Dunque, visto che il pepe diventa nero, qui abbiamo bisogno non di *calore*, ma di *colore*. E' infatti così che scrive Plinio il Vecchio (*Naturalis historia* XII 26, anche le edizioni più vecchie): *candidum piper [...] tostum solibus colore rugisque mutatur*.

Al capitolo III 34 (*De nepita*) leggiamo nel M e nelle edizioni: *Nepitam Graeci calamitan nostro vulgo dici affirmant* che SCHIANCA traduce: «Affermano i Greci che presso di noi la calaminta si chiama nepitella». Ma perchè si dovrebbero invocare i Greci come autorità per un nome latino? Il senso richiede qui l'opposizione *Graeci* – *nostri*: *Nepitam Graeci, calamitan nostri vulgo dici affirmant* («I Greci affermano che il nome popolare di questa pianta è *nepita* e i nostri *calamita*»). Il pronome *nostri* è stato corrotto in *nostro* per influenza di *vulgo*. Si deve notare che il Platina prende il nome latino per il greco e viceversa. Il testo su cui questo capitolo è basato sono i *Geoponica* di Gargilio (Quintus Gargilius Martialis, III sec. d. C.) dove si legge (20, citato da SCHIANCA): *Nepetam Graeci calamitam vocaverunt; nostri vulgo nepitam dicunt*. L'errore del Platina deve essere ascritto all'inizio della proposizione di Gargilio: *Nepetam Graeci*.

Al capitolo IV 1 si menzionano *lactucas, intybum ac reliquam olerum herbarumve conditivam* (nella traduzione di SCHIANCA: «la lattuga, l'indivia ed i rimanenti vegetali da insalata»). Ma *conditivam* è una forma del aggettivo *conditivus* – 'appropriato per condire' usato dal Platina due volte al capitolo II 13 in riferimento ad un tipo di olive. Qui, invece, abbiamo bisogno di un sostantivo che significhi 'insalata'. Questo sostantivo è *conditura*; per esempio al capitolo IV 7 si parla di alcuni che *e floribus rosmarini condituram faciunt*. Dunque qui *conditivam* è da correggere in *condituram*.

Il capitolo IV 22 (*De bove*) comincia così nel codice M e nelle edizioni: *Bovem [...] magno usui esse mortalibus nemo est qui ambigat, a ratione vectura, lacte, caseo, corio*, che SCHIANCA rende: «Nessuno dubita che il bue [...] sia di grande utilità all'uomo, vuoi come animale da tiro, vuoi per la produzione del latte, del formaggio e del cuoio». Il traduttore non ha tenuto conto delle parole *a ratione*, il cui senso e la cui funzione nella sintassi della proposizione sono oscuri. Senza dubbio si deve scrivere: *aratione, vectura, lacte...*: l'aratura era il principale uso a cui era destinato il bovino.

Al capitolo IV 25 (*De cervo*) si legge che alcuni imperatori mangiavano carne di cervo *omnibus matutinis diebus*. Ma non esistono «giorni mattutini». Qui è andato corrotto l'ordine delle parole. Il Platina probabilmente aveva scritto: *omnibus diebus matutinis* («tutti i giorni al mattino»). *Matutinum* è qui un sostantivo.

La fonte di questo brano è Plinio (*Naturalis historia* VIII 119) che scrive proprio *omnibus diebus matutinis* (così anche nelle edizioni più vecchie).

Al capitolo V 5 (*De ciconiis*) si legge nelle edizioni cinquecentesche ed in quelle moderne che in Asia le cicogne si radunano nei campi, *ubi congregatae inter se commurmurant et eam quae novissima venit lacerant* (nella traduzione di SCHIANCA: «si radunano in un mormorio generale, e fanno a pezzi quella che arriva per ultima»). Tuttavia, il codice M e le edizioni quattrocentesche invece di *et eam* hanno *aedemque* ('e un tempio'). Come però spesso accade, questa lezione alquanto assurda è la più vicina alla verità. Il brano è mutuato da Plinio (*Naturalis historia* X 62), il cui testo oggi recita *eamque quae novissima advenit*, mentre nelle edizioni più vecchie leggiamo *eam denique quae novissima advenit* (*denique* significa 'finalmente'). Dunque *aedemque* va corretto in *eam denique quae*.

Al capitolo VI 26 (*Pulmentarium in carbone*, secondo SCHIANCA: «Pietanza alla brace») troviamo la frase: *Coqui non admodum hoc pulmentarium debet; calidum item convivis apponatur*, che SCHIANCA traduce: «Questa pietanza non deve cuocere troppo e va servita ai commensali ben calda». Qui sembra strano l'avverbio *item* ('parimenti, similmente'). Il senso richiede *statim* ('immediatamente') che corrisponde al «subito» del Maestro Martino citato da SCHIANCA nell'appendice II al numero 26, dove si legge: «Et queste tal brasole devono essere non troppo cotte, et magnate subito così calde calde».

Al capitolo VIII 1 il Platina dice che l'uso di condimenti è giustificato – secondo il codice M e le edizioni – *si propter aegritudinem aut nimios aestus aut honestos labores desiderium edendi rescinderit*, nella traduzione di SCHIANCA: «quando il desiderio di cibo si affievolisce per ragioni di salute o per eccessivi ardori o a seguito di sane fatiche». Il senso non lascia dubbi, peccato che la grammatica non conosce la forma *rescinderit*. Anche se sostituissimo la forma corretta del verbo *rescindo*, *resciderit*, non otterremo un buon risultato: *rescindo* è un verbo transitivo che significa 'strappare, lacerare' mentre qui abbiamo bisogno di un verbo intransitivo che significhi 'affievolirsi'. Il verbo che cerchiamo è *recidere* e non c'è dubbio che il Platina scrisse *recciderit*.

Il capitolo VIII 61 è dedicato al piatto chiamato *rapum armatum*, letteralmente 'rapa armata'. Nelle edizioni rinascimentali si legge: *cum sit perniciosum, et voracissimo Domitiano apponatur* (*Domitianus* è lo pseudonimo sotto quale il Platina menziona uno dei suoi compagni). SCHIANCA, vedendo che lo *et* qui non quadra, lo cancella e traduce la frase: «essendo il cibo pesante, si serva al voracissimo Domiziano». Questo non sembra però molto logico. Se il cibo è nocivo (è proprio questo il significato di *perniciosum*), non dovrebbe essere dato a nessuno, eccetto che a Domiziano che divorerà tutto. Dunque invece di eliminare *et*, lo dobbiamo cambiare in *tantum* ('soltanto'): «si serva soltanto al voracissimo Domiziano». Secondo noi, l'erroneo *et* è una corruzione dell'abbreviazione *tm* (*tantum*).

Al capitolo IX 28 (*De boletis et fungis*) il Platina scrive, secondo il codice M e le edizioni, che velenosi sono i boleti che *apud ferrum et serpentum cavernas nascuntur* (nella traduzione di SCHIANCA: «quelli che crescono vicino a rottami di ferro ed a tane di serpenti»). Ma ai tempi del Platina i boschi non erano ancora pieni di frigoriferi rotti, gettativi da furbi e mascalzoni. Si deve invece leggere *apud ferarum et serpentum cavernas* («vicino a tane di animali selvaggi e serpenti»).

*

Al finale di questo articolo abbiamo riservato i casi che ci sembrano più interessanti.

Al capitolo I 1, se ci fidiamo del manoscritto M e delle edizioni, il Platina dice sui nemici del piacere: *Valet apud hos, ut video, Ciceronis auctoritas, qui quidem ut Aristoteles Platonem, Pythagoram, Zenonem, Democritum, Chrysippum, Parmenidem, Heraclitum, sic Epicurum segetem et materiam eruditionis ac doctrinae suae facit*, che SCHIANCA traduce: «Per questi critici, a quel che vedo, conta l'autorità di Cicerone, il quale d'altra parte – come Aristotele ha fatto con Platone, Pitagora, Zenone, Democrito, Crisippo, Parmenide, Eraclito – altrettanto fa con Epicuro, traendone la messe e la materia prima della propria dottrina ed erudizione». Abbiamo qui almeno tre problemi. Il paragone in sé è già alquanto artificioso: perché dire che Cicerone utilizza Epicuro come Aristotele fa con vari filosofi? Inoltre, come SCHIANCA stesso osserva nella sua nota, Aristotele non poteva basarsi su Crisippo, perché questo nacque molti anni dopo la morte dello Stagirita. Infine, Epicuro appare qui come l'unica fonte della filosofia ciceroniana, il che non è accettabile neanche nel contesto di una esagerazione retorica. A tutti e tre questi problemi possiamo ovviare semplicemente cambiando *Aristoteles* in *Aristotelem*: *Ciceronis auctoritas, qui quidem ut Aristotelem, Platonem, Pythagoram [...] sic Epicurum segetem et materiam eruditionis ac doctrinae suae facit* («l'autorità di Cicerone, il quale come fece di Aristotele, Platone, Pitagora [...] la base della sua erudizione, così fece anche di Epicuro»).

Al capitolo II 14 (*De melle*) si legge sulle api: *Legem habent ad similitudinem optimi principatus* [in alcune edizioni *principis*], *ad quem omnia deferuntur. Hoc precedente [...] de loco ad locum proficiscuntur* («Hanno una legge che assomiglia ad un'ottima monarchia [o «monarca»]. Tutte le decisioni gli sono affidate. Con lui a capo volano da un luogo all'altro»). La parola *lex* ('legge') non ha qui un senso accettabile: la legge non può svolazzare davanti ad uno sciame di api, e nemmeno quadra grammaticalmente: *quem* e *hoc* non possono riferirsi ad un sostantivo femminile. Senza dubbio il Platina sta parlando della regina delle api, chiamata dagli antichi *rex* (vedi per esempio Virgilio, *Georgiche* IV 106–107). Dunque *Legem* va cambiato in *Regem* e *principis* va scelto al posto di *principatus*: *Regem habent ad similitudinem optimi principis* («Hanno un re che assomiglia ad un ottimo principe»).

Al capitolo III 23 (*De mentha*) leggiamo sulla menta: *praeterea mentulam dictam quasi donum amoris vel quasi meritam, vel quod mensam grato odore percurrat*, che SCHIANCA traduce: «per cui potrebbe anche essere chiamata *mentula* [nome latino del membro virile] come a dire dono d'amore, oppure quasi fosse *merita* 'meritevole', o perché con il suo profumo gradevole percorre la 'mensa'». Qui *mentula*, *merita* e *mensa* sono tre proposte etimologiche per *mentha*, e dunque *mentulam* va corretto in *a mentula*: menta «è detta così da *mentula*, come dono d'amore», la cui spiegazione si trova nella proposizione seguente: *Excitat enim hec herba [...] demortuam venerem* (secondo il traduttore: «Questa erba, in effetti, [...] stimola gli appetiti erotici assopiti»).

Il capitolo VII 15 (*De lente*) comincia nelle edizioni cinquecentesche e moderne dalla proposizione: *Lens ut pisum in vere seritur* (secondo SCHIANCA: «La lenticchia, come il pisello, si semina a primavera»). E' però poco probabile che il Platina scriva *in vere*, dato che altrove per designare la stagione dell'anno egli scrive semplicemente *vere*. Prima di tutto però è importante spiegare l'origine delle assurde lezioni quattrocentesche: *vomere* nel codice M ed in alcune edizioni e *movere* nelle altre edizioni. Questo brano si basa sul Plinio (*Naturalis historia* XVIII 123), cui testo odierno dice: *Ex leguminibus autumnove vereve seruntur lens et in Graecia pisum*, mentre nelle edizioni più vecchie invece di *autumno vereve* appare *autem Novembri*, e la voce *Novembri* sembra corrotta in *movere* e *vomere*.

*

Il trattato del Platina destò un notevole interesse nei secoli XV e XVI, quando vide numerose edizioni; ma anche oggi il suo testo è stato oggetto di ricerca da parte di due studiosi. Tuttavia, come abbiamo dimostrato, rimangono ancora aperti non pochi problemi testuali che aspettano una soluzione.

L'Istituto di Filologia Classica dell'Università di Varsavia

k.ekes@uw.edu.pl

mj.szymanski@uw.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-6183-7849 (M.Sz.)

SUMMARIA DISSERTATIONUM INAUGURALIUM

Eos CVIII 2021

ISSN 0012-7825

DOI: 10.34616/e.2021.181.193

THE BOSPORAN KINGDOM AND ROME*

by

MICHAŁ HALAMUS

The Bosporan Kingdom is a good example of an ancient multicultural state, where inhabitants of the Greek *apoikiai* (colonies) had to function hand in hand with both the local non-Greek societies (e.g. Maeotians, Taurians, Sindians) and the nomadic peoples of Iranian stock, who roamed throughout the vast regions of the Eurasian Steppe and who also inhabited the Cimmerian Bosphorus territory. The heterogeneity of the local population played an important role in the functioning of the Bosporan Kingdom. However, external political and cultural influences were not without significance. The Northern Black Sea area, due to its geographical isolation, was on the outskirts of the *oikoumene* throughout the centuries. However, limited impact of stronger political organisms, starting with the Achaemenid Empire and Athens, can be traced. Nevertheless, the strongest influence on the functioning of the Bosporan Kingdom and remaining Greek centres in the region belonged to the invading nomadic tribes. At every stage of Bosporan history, at least one of these major peoples – Scythians, Sarmatians, Goths or Huns – played a significant part.

The end of the second c. BCE and the first half of the first c. BCE saw changes in the Bosphorus as the kingdom, together with adjacent territories, was subjugated by Mithridates VI Eupator. Becoming a part of the vast Pontic State went hand in hand with entering the broader international political arena and it also meant becoming an enemy of Rome. The fall of Eupator did not signal the

* This paper is a summary of a PhD thesis that has been completed as part of the Project “The Eastern Mediterranean from the 4th century BC until Late Antiquity”, within the framework of the International PhD Projects Programme of the Foundation for Polish Science and the Maestro grant “Greek City in the Hellenistic and Roman Age and the Territorial Powers” founded by the National Science Centre (UMO-2014/14/A/HS3/00132). The work has been supervised by Professor Krzysztof NAWOTKA (University of Wrocław, Institute of History) and was defended on July 6, 2020. The PhD thesis was reviewed by Professor Leszek MROZEWICZ (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań) and Professor Mariusz MIELCZAREK (Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology in Łódź).

end of his legacy. Bosporan rulers from the Pontic/Sarmatian dynasty developed a pattern with regard to self-representation, showing themselves as loyal friends of Rome. However, they simultaneously legitimised their position by referring to the past glories of Mithridatic tradition and by using Iranian elements in their official propaganda, which was directed mostly towards their local subjects. However, the role played by the Iranian world (in the broad sense of the word) – nomads of Iranian stock and the Pontic kingdom – in Bosporan history and its attitude towards Rome was not necessarily as crucial as ROSTOVTZEFF and his followers proposed¹.

The main goal of the doctoral dissertation was to examine the position of the Bosporan Kingdom within Roman imperial policy and the attitude of the ruling elite of Bosphorus towards the Empire. The chronological time frame of the study is defined by the beginning of Mithridates Eupator's rule at the end of the second c. BCE, and the end of the third c. CE. Nevertheless, my intention was to also present the interstate and historical contexts of the processes under discussion, which had their roots in the centuries preceding Eupator.

Moreover, the issues that are discussed concerning Roman–Bosporan relations can be placed into two categories depending on the perspective. The Bosporan perspective can be broadly understood as its attitude towards the Empire. Phenomena that were significant in shaping that attitude were: (1) Mithridatism – referring to Eupator's anti-Roman heritage; (2) Sarmatisation – the growing influence of the non-Greek element within Bosporan society; (3) official propaganda of the Bosporan rulers – titulature visible in the epigraphic and numismatic material used to underline loyalty to Rome or the legitimization of power; and last but not least (4) the motivations of Bosporan *reges socii* to remain under Roman supervision – whether a fear of military intervention went hand in hand with a willingness to remain under Roman protection and to be subdued.

From the Roman point of view, however, Bosphorus was just one brick in the wall of their whole client state system. Most of these political bodies ceased to exist, as they were incorporated into the provincial administration throughout the first c. CE. To look more closely at the factors which allowed the Bosporan Kingdom to avoid that fate, I have decided to juxtapose this northern Black Sea state with other kingdoms functioning in, as MILLAR called it, the two-level sovereignty system². Among many client states, the cases of Nabataea and Armenia are very helpful in the assessment of the Roman attitude towards the Bosporan Kingdom. Besides the meaning of the Hellenisation, the role of the indigenous dynasties and geographical localisation, the importance of a given state can be judged by its strategic localisation³. The significance of Armenia for Rome's

¹ ROSTOVTZEFF 1922; GAJDUKEVIČ 1949; GOLUBCOVA 1951; HEINEN 2001.

² MILLAR 2004: 229–230.

³ See HALAMUS 2018.

Parthian policy shows clearly that the role of Bosphorus, although truly significant, should be understood as being only of local importance.

A work which is certainly worth mentioning is *Greeks and Scythians* written by a British archaeologist, MINNS, who presented the archaeological material from the Northern Black Sea area in a comprehensive way before others did⁴. Nevertheless, it was the book by ROSTOVTZEFF, published in 1922, which influenced the shape of ancient Black Sea studies to a large extent⁵. The Russian scholar was forced to leave his country in 1918 due to the Bolshevik Revolution. According to ROSTOVTZEFF, the Northern Black Sea region had its own unique characteristics – it was a mixture of Hellenism and the Oriental, namely Iranian, world. This approach was fairly innovative at that time and can be seen as a precursor of modern ideas of hybridisation⁶. Another concept which played an important role in ROSTOVTZEFF's narration was the idea of Eurasia – a territory which, thanks to its geographic conditions, was ideally placed for establishing vast empires. Thanks to that idea, Scythians, Sarmatians, Goths, Huns and finally Slavs, were seen as protoplasts of the future Russian Empire.

Interestingly, although ROSTOVTZEFF was ostracised after leaving Russia as a member of bourgeoisie, some of his ideas were not. They were useful in presenting the roots of the Soviet Union as a totalitarian multinational state dominated by the Slavic culture. Naturally, all that had to go hand in hand with principles set down by Marxism. An example of how these ideas were used to create the historical narration can be found in a paper by ŽEBELEV concerning the Mithridates Eupator and the rebellion of Saumaces in the Bosporan Kingdom⁷. According to that scholar, Saumaces was not a noble Scythian, but a slave leader, who led rest of the oppressed masses to fight against their Greek oppressors. The Thaw after Stalin's death made the exchange of ideas between East and West less difficult, although the ideologies still played an important role in studies of the history of the northern Black Sea area⁸.

According to HEINEN, notions of Euroasia and Graeco-Iranian civilisation strongly shaped the approaches of other scholars like GOLUBCOVA and GAJDUKEVIČ⁹. However, the latter decided to remove some of these ideas from the German translation of his book – for example Slavic culture as a successor of the previous Iranian-nomadic civilisation. Moreover, HEINEN points out that the belief about the importance of the Bosporan Kingdom for Roman imperial policy

⁴ MINNS 1913.

⁵ ROSTOVTZEFF 1922.

⁶ MEYER 2011; VLASSOPOULOS 2013.

⁷ ŽEBELEV 1938.

⁸ GRAHAM 1961.

⁹ See GAJDUKEVIČ 1949 and 1971; GOLUBCOVA 1951; cf. HEINEN 2001: 365–369.

and the idea of the anti-Roman Mithridatism are aftermaths of the previously mentioned approaches. Most of HEINEN's remarks are accurate, although it should be underlined that whether it was anti-Roman in principle or not, Mithridatism was a real thing and certainly influenced the history of the Bosporan Kingdom.

The second chapter is devoted to the Roman client states in the East. Firstly, it was necessary to discuss the background of that phenomenon by looking more closely at the implementation of the traditional Roman network involving *cliens*, *amicus* and *patronus* on an interstate level¹⁰. Simultaneously, I pointed at the gradual development of the Empire and such co-occurring circumstances as hostage taking, the willingness to receive a proper education in the capital or to establish useful social connections. In the later part of this chapter, attention is paid to the number of client states and *reges amici et socii*, as their position could have been ambiguous and depended on the various factors, namely: an individual's political acumen, the policy of a particular emperor or the geostrategic importance of a given territory.

The remaining parts of the chapter focus on Nabataea and Armenia. A closer look at their history helps in better understanding of the Bosporan situation, which is discussed in the following chapters. Although issues like the socio-cultural composition and politics of the local dynasties were not insignificant, while discussing long-term imperial policy it is geostrategic importance that should be assessed as well. Trade routes, land borders with the empire, types of potential enemy a given kingdom bordered – all these matters might have influenced the level of Roman interest.

The next chapter focuses on the history of the Bosporan Kingdom before Mithridates VI Eupator. The unification under the Archaeanaetids and the later expansion under the Spartocids went hand in hand with constant interaction with the non-Greek peoples inhabiting the northern Black Sea region. The subjugation of several adjacent tribes is reflected in the titulature of the Spartocid rulers, who presented themselves as both Greek archons and barbarian kings. The close relationship that existed between the Bosporan ruling house and the Scythian elites is particularly evident in the second half of the second c. BCE. This closeness was mainly due to intermarriage and the revolt led by Saumacus, who was a member of the Scythian elite rather than a slave¹¹.

The fourth chapter discusses the role of Mithridates VI Eupator in the history of the Bosporan Kingdom, and presents in detail the moment when it permanently entered into the Roman orbit. Before this happened, Rome gradually expanded its power over the Hellenistic states in Asia Minor. Finally, it met with fierce resistance from the Pontic King. An analysis of Eupator's mixed Graeco-Iranian

¹⁰ Cic. *Deiot.* 1, 3, 8–12; *De off.* I 35; *Sest.* 9; Joseph. *AJ* XV 6, 6; Liv. XXXIX 47, 10; Tac. *Hist.* II 81; Suet. *Aug.* 60, 1; *RGDA* 31–33.

¹¹ ŽEBELEV 1938: 9–33; GRAHAM 1961: 194–201; GAJDUKEVIČ 1949: 304 and 1971: 317–318.

background, his official propaganda and his willingness to conduct imperial policy may clarify the phenomenon of his legend in the later history of the Bosphorus. One of the key issues is to point at the foundation of that legend and to define the role of the ruler's propaganda, his political relations with Greeks and non-Greeks, and also the reforms he carried out. The significance of Eupator's activities for the northern Black Sea area – the Cimmerian Bosphorus especially – can be fully appreciated when looking at the evidence concerning political activity in the region in the mid-second c. BCE. The absence of the Bosporan state in the treaty ending Pharnaces I's Pontic War¹², with the simultaneous presence of the other Pontic states, can indicate the poor state of the Kingdom. Although this is in fact an *argumentum ex silentio*, it is hard not to connect the later appearances of the Cimmerian Bosphorus in literary sources with Mithridates Eupator's activity¹³.

To properly examine the goals and research objectives of this thesis, it is advantageous to follow the political history and socio-cultural functioning of the Bosporan Kingdom throughout ca. seven centuries. However, it is the Roman period that is of the greatest significance. Therefore, both the fifth and the sixth chapters focus on the external and internal situation of the Bosporan Kingdom from the times of Pharnaces II (63–48/47 BCE) onwards. As it has already been mentioned, the first *bellum Bosporanum* against Mithridates III (ca. 45–49 CE), marked the end of the occasional tensions between Rome and its *amici et socii*. Chapter five challenges the idea that Mithridatism was anti-Roman in principle, and tries to discuss the possibility that the main political goal of the Bosporan rulers when they first began functioning under “two-level sovereignty” was to become a recognised *amicus et socius* rather than fighting for full independence. This also refers to the later period of the Roman–Bosporan *status quo*, discussed in the sixth chapter. To achieve my objectives, besides investigating the limited literary evidence, I looked more closely into the titulature and symbols on coins and inscriptions. The appendix presents a detailed list of 135 texts mentioning Bosporan rulers throughout the centuries which were closely examined in the second section of the sixth chapter.

Therefore, the main research hypothesis is that some of the theories presenting the Bosporan Kingdom as a militarily and politically strong state – which despite its vivid anti-Roman traditions remained Rome's loyal ally for ca. 350 years – are exaggerated. Initially no special links existed between Mithridates VI Eupator and the Sarmatian peoples inhabiting the northern Black Sea area. However, alliances and further actions of his descendants led to the creation of ties between the royal house and the indigenous societies of non-Greek descent¹⁴. Bosporan

¹² Polyb. XXV 2.

¹³ App. *Mith* 107; Cass. Dio XXXVII 3, 12–14; Strabo VII 4, 4.

¹⁴ App. *Mithr.* 15; 19; 69; Strabo XI 5, 8.

rulers, unlike most of the Roman “friendly kings”, came from a local dynasty that was established before the Roman presence. That presence should not be strongly linked with the Parthian Empire, which was periodically able to carry out dynamic policy in the East, engaging other client kingdoms to a far greater extent. Instead, it was local strategic significance that strengthened the bonds between Rome and the Bosphorus, as the remainders of that alliance together with the subsidies that were occasionally received¹⁵, survived the Gothic invasions of the mid-third c. CE¹⁶.

In the third and the sixth chapters there are separate sections concerning the epigraphic curves of the Bosporan Kingdom throughout its history, which is reflected in no less than 2286 inscriptions carved in stone and on various metal objects¹⁷. The outcome from the Kingdom has been juxtaposed with that from Chersonesus. That comparison may be interesting as these two neighbouring political organisms, although functioning in the same environment, had different political systems – one was a democratic *polis*, and the other a centralised territorial state. The purpose of this research was to check whether the epigraphic habits of Chersonesus and the Bosporan Kingdom correspond with the historical context of the region. However, it was also important to point at some individual characteristics belonging to these neighbouring political units, namely, the peaks occurring at various times during the Roman period and changes in the composition of the curve which reflected differences in the political systems¹⁸.

The conclusions are presented in the final part of the dissertation. Thanks to his bold foreign policy regarding the northern Black Sea area at the end of the second c. BCE, Mithridates VI Eupator significantly impacted the history of the Bosphorus. The subjugation of the region went hand in hand with fighting the Scythian and Sarmatian tribes, whose aggressive action directed against Chersonesus was – at least officially – the main reason for the entire expedition. However, once defeated, the nomads became allies of the Pontic king and served in his army during the wars against Rome. Besides his military endeavours, Eupator introduced other reforms that permanently reshaped the socio-political landscape of the Bosporan Kingdom. These reforms mirrored previous measures adopted in Mithridates’ ancestral domains. For example, thanks to Aspurgus’

¹⁵ Luc. *Alex.* 57; Zosim. I 31.

¹⁶ Amm. Marc. XXII 7, 10.

¹⁷ Most of the inscriptions can be found in the Packard Humanities Institute database (<https://epigraphy.packhum.org>) and the new online database IOSPE – Inscriptiones antiquae Orae Septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae et Latinae (<http://iospe.kcl.ac.uk>), vol. III and V. Furthermore, traditional corpora are included: *Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani* [= CIRB]; *Inscriptiones antiquae Orae Septentrionalis Pontis Euxini Graecae et Latinae*, vol. I, 2nd edn.; *Inscriptiones Tyriae, Olbiae, Chersonesi Tauricae*; *Latinskie nadpisi Khersonesa Tavricheskogo*; *Novye Epigraficheskie Pamiatniki Khersonesa* and individual volumes of *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

¹⁸ See also HALAMUS 2020: 102–117.

rescript dated to ca. 15 CE, we know that “Eupator’s law” was enacted in the city of Gorgippia¹⁹. Thanks to this law, the Greek *polis* was able to seize properties that had been left by citizens with no heirs.

As MAREK and MCGING pointed out²⁰, Mithridates’ determined resistance, combined with several aggressive military operations, resulted in the acceleration of the Roman conquest of the East. This observation can also be applied to the Bosporan Kingdom, which thanks to the Pontic King entered the Roman sphere of influence – initially (70 BCE) as one of the dominions controlled by Machares, and later (63 BCE) as a separate client state. It was not only another alliance that was formed in 63 BCE; Bosporan affairs were also directly shaped by the Romans for the first time. Pompey allowed Pharnaces to remain as king, although he limited his power to the Cimmerian Bosporus except for the city of Phanagoria, which was rewarded for starting the rebellion against Eupator²¹.

Pharnaces II remained faithful to the provisions of the treaty for about a decade. In an inscription that was probably carved during this period, he is referred to as φιλορῶμαιος (friend of the Romans)²², but other evidence, both numismatic and epigraphic, reveals that he did not abandon his father’s Pontic/Achaemenid heritage. Furthermore, he decided to use the hostilities between Pompey and Caesar as a cover for invading Asia Minor in order to take control over his paternal dominions. After being defeated at Zela, Pharnaces managed to return to the North, although he was soon killed by his former deputy and now usurper, Asander. The Pontic line, however, was continued by Eupator’s granddaughter Dynamis, whom Asander married.

The rule of Asander and Dynamis prompts a lot of questions due to the scarcity of source material and the ambiguity regarding their attitude towards Rome. One such question concerns the chronology of their rule, which is discussed in detail in chapter five. This discussion reveals that numismatic evidence appears to be the most reliable form of material. In my opinion, it is accurate to assume that Asander’s official reign began as early as 49/48 BCE; thus Dynamis would have minted her gold staters (as the sole ruler of the Kingdom) from 21/20 BCE.

While dealing with these chronological issues, one needs to look at the geopolitical context of the Black Sea area during the second half of the first c. BCE. According to SAPRYKIN, who is convinced of Roman omnipotence, Asander waited before demonstrating his supreme position in the Kingdom due to the absence of Caesar’s acceptance²³. In my opinion, however, the bold and risky

¹⁹ SEG XLVI 940; BLAVATSKAYA 1965; SAPRYKIN 1996; cf. HEINEN 2001; 2006.

²⁰ MAREK 2009: 35–37; MCGING 2009: 211–213.

²¹ App. *Mith.* 110; Plut. *Pomp.* 41, 5.

²² SEG LVII 704.

²³ SAPRYKIN 2002, 58–73.

actions undertaken by Asander – his rebellion against Pharnaces and his defeat of Mithridates of Pergamum – show that fearful lingering was not a method he valued most. Moreover, in the forties BCE, the northern Black Sea area might have been of secondary importance to the Romans; we should bear in mind that they did not respond to Burebista's decimation of the Western Pontic coast.

Despite the odds, Asander managed to retain power over the Bosphorus. Later, he also adopted the title of φιλορῶμαιος, which was accompanied by the Pontic/Achaemenid βασιλεὺς βασιλέων μέγας (great king of kings)²⁴. However, the application of both pro-Roman and Mithridatic elements in official propaganda is clearer in the case of queen Dynamis. These actions were meant to highlight her legitimate claim to the Bosporan throne and to strengthen her position in the Kingdom. Although Asander and Dynamis presented themselves as friends of Rome, their position was uncertain, because Roman plans to replace the ruling dynasty in the Bosphorus did not end with Mithridates II's failed expedition, as they were rekindled by Augustus.

The episode of Polemo I lasted for about eight years (from 14 to 8 BCE). A closer look at some of the ongoing events from this turbulent period may be helpful when discussing Roman–Bosporan relations. First, the case of Scribonius demonstrates once again how the scarcity of sources can sometimes lead to the creation of disputable theories. PARFENOV and SAPRYKIN discussed the possibility of Scribonius being Augustus' agent, who was sent to Bosphorus several years before Asander's death in order to prepare for the change of monarch or even to annex the client state²⁵. Furthermore, PARFENOV follows some of ROSTOVTZEFF's ideas, according to which Marcus Agrippa himself invaded the Bosporan Kingdom to help install Polemo I on the throne. He then took Dynamis and the underage Aspurgus to Rome. Unfortunately, there is little evidence in the source material to support these interesting hypotheses. In my opinion, this kind of narration – placing the Bosphorus in the middle of important historical events and processes without sufficient evidence – can be observed in relation to the Kingdom's history as a whole and is somehow connected with ROSTOVTZEFF's idea of South Russia.

The circumstances concerning Aspurgus' coming to power are also debatable. In my opinion, however, a recently discovered inscription from Gorgippia dated to 6/7 CE, which refers to him as both king and φιλορῶμαιος, sheds new light on these events. First, the titulature used indicates that Aspurgus' supreme position in the Kingdom was already established. Hence, this provides some support for the claim that the series of gold staters that were issued between 9/8 BCE and 7/8 CE should be associated with Aspurgus rather than Dynamis or an unknown Roman governor. Moreover, I reject COŞKUN's assumption that Asander should

²⁴ CIRB 30.

²⁵ PARFENOV 2007: 292–295; cf. SAPRYKIN 2010: 161–169.

not be treated as Aspurgus' father²⁶. Indeed, Strabo's Aspurgians were probably a Sarmatian faction that supported Aspurgus²⁷, although it is extremely unlikely that Asandrochos, to whom Aspurgus referred to as his father, was not the same person as Asander, king of the Bosporus.

During his long reign, Aspurgus managed to expand his kingdom and, perhaps even more importantly, to consolidate his position as *amicus et socius*. Furthermore, Aspurgus is the first Bosporan ruler who used both titles indicating friendship with the Romans and Caesar – φιλόκαισαρ καὶ φιλορώμαιος²⁸. This definite pro-Roman propaganda, just as in the case of his alleged mother Dynamis, went hand in hand with references to Pontic/Achaemenid titulature and other gestures, such as naming one of his sons Mithridates. These actions should be seen as being aimed at emphasising the legitimacy of his rule over the Kingdom. Despite becoming the king of the Bosporus by defeating the Roman favourite Polemo II, Aspurgus remained within the “two-level sovereignty” system as a role model of a client king²⁹. His pro-Roman attitude and his acceptance of the Roman client state system can be seen not only in his propaganda that appeared in inscriptions and on gold coinage, but also in his actions. The rule over the Kingdom stayed in the hands of the local ruler, although, thanks to Aspurgus' marriage with the Thracian princess Gepaepyris, the two ruling houses merged. This joining of ruling houses was typical amongst Roman client dynasties³⁰.

In my opinion, HEINEN's critical approach to the view that “Mithridatism” was anti-Roman is generally correct³¹. Oftentimes references to alliances with Rome went hand in hand with Pontic/Achaemenid titulature and symbolism. Attributing Eupator's anti-Roman attitude to all his descendants was part of a broader theory, according to which the northern Black Sea area in antiquity had its own Graeco-Iranian culture and a separate sense of identity. This idea can find some justification in terms of art or intercultural contacts³², but it should be rejected when discussed in terms of interstate policy. The latter, when juxtaposed with twentieth century ideologies, may lead to the false assumption that Pharnaces II, Asander, Dynamis, Aspurgus and Mithridates III were guardians of Graeco-Iranian civilisation against Roman imperialism³³.

²⁶ COŞKUN 2019.

²⁷ Strabo XI 2, 11.

²⁸ CIRB 40.

²⁹ MILLAR 2004: 229–237.

³⁰ SAPRYKIN 2002: 167–174.

³¹ See HEINEN 2001 and 2006.

³² See MEYER 2013.

³³ HEINEN 2001: 368–369.

However, HEINEN seems to underestimate the meaning of this phenomenon regarding the internal affairs of the Kingdom, not only in the first period, but also after the *bellum Bosporanum* (ca. 45–49 CE). It is justified to state that from the first century CE onwards, the local ruling dynasty legitimised its position by referring to the past glories of the Mithridatic tradition. Rome's meddling in local politics forced Bosporan rulers to draw support from their Asiatic subjects in order to strengthen their position and retain power. Therefore, Mithridatism can be seen as a tool that might have been helpful in keeping the status of a Roman client. It seems that the conscious emulation of Iranian customs and languages endeared the rulers to the Sarmatians, who used the royal support to elevate their status in the Bosporan Kingdom.

The pacification of Mithridates III and the installation of Cotys I on the Bosporan throne saw the beginning of a new chapter in relations between Rome and the Kingdom. For about two centuries, Tiberii Iulii, members of the Bosporan hereditary dynasty, remained subordinate to the emperors, eagerly using pro-Roman titlature and symbols in their inscriptions and coinage. As mentioned above, Cotys I was the first Bosporan king – that we know for sure – to use the *tria nomina* in his official titlature.

From among all of the inscriptions mentioning Bosporan rulers from the times of Cotys I onwards, 82 (out of 95) have some sort of pro-Roman titlature. The last of them belongs to king Teiranos (275–279 CE)³⁴. The title of high priest of the imperial cult occurs in royal inscriptions on 13 occasions under six different rulers – starting with Cotys I and ending with Rhescuporis III (211–227 CE). As BLAVATSKYI rightly noticed, the existing evidence does not suggest that the imperial cult, as performed by the king, had a significant impact on Bosporan society³⁵.

The longevity of the Roman–Bosporan alliance was beneficial for both sides. Bosporan kings occasionally fought against local non-Greek tribes and kept them away from Greek harbours, something which finds confirmation in one of Sauromates II's inscriptions³⁶. The text praises the ruler for defeating the barbarians and making the sailing routes to Pontus-Bithynia safe again. Moreover, Bosporan *amici et socii* could have been useful sources of information concerning the situation in the steppes and could also have acted as potential intermediaries between Rome and the nomads. Perhaps this kind of “urgent news” was carried by the envoys mentioned by Pliny the Younger³⁷. For the Tiberii Iulii, supporting Rome may have had various benefits. As rulers of the Greek cities, it was crucial for them to remain allied with the Empire, thanks to which free trade

³⁴ CIRB 36.

³⁵ BLAVATSKYI 1985: 191–195.

³⁶ CIRB 1237.

³⁷ Plin. *Ep.* X 63, 64, 67.

and contacts with other parts of the Graeco-Roman world were possible. Conflict with adjacent barbarians sometimes required direct military support. Such support might have been sent during the reign of Sauromates II under the second *bellum Bosporanum* (ca. the end of the second c. CE). Additionally, it is possible that Bosporan kings received some sort of financial support in order to increase the efficiency of their actions towards non-Greek peoples. Passages from Lucian (with information about σύνταξις, a yearly tribute carried by Bosporan envoys) and Zosimos possibly support this hypothesis³⁸.

Nevertheless, in terms of its overall importance within Roman imperial policy, the Bosporan Kingdom should be seen as an outpost that was significant in terms of local Pontic issues. As SARNOWSKI rightly stated, the Roman presence in the Crimea was rather limited in character³⁹. However, two direct interventions took place in the first c. CE. Interestingly, while describing the events of the first *bellum Bosporanum*, Tacitus mentions Bosporans equipped in the Roman fashion⁴⁰. This information shows that Roman military presence might have influenced Bosporan warfare, at least to a certain extent. On the other hand, however, it must be stated that the main and dominant trend in Bosporan military organisation during the Roman period was Sarmatisation⁴¹.

Having an allied kingdom in the eastern part of the peninsula was certainly an advantage, as it limited the necessity of direct engagement. Being a Roman ally combined with having the presence of imperial troops on the peninsula apparently worked well for both Chersonesus and the Bosporan Kingdom. The relatively good situation of these political organisms seems to be reflected in the epigraphic curve, as it grows throughout the first c. CE to reach its peak in the second c. Then it decreases rapidly in the third c. CE, which should be connected with the barbarian invasions and the worsening situation in the steppes. However, a comparison of the epigraphic evidence clearly demonstrates differences in the political systems. Whereas the activity of Chersonesean democratic bodies is well documented, Bosporan inscriptions attest to a centralised and non-democratic way of governing.

One of the main purposes of this dissertation was to present the Bosporan Kingdom as an interesting multicultural state on the outskirts of the *oikoumene*, bound by a long-lasting alliance with the Roman Empire. However, through comparing it with other regions and client states, it is possible to weigh the actual importance of the Bosporan Kingdom within Roman imperial policy. The history of the states situated between Parthia and Rome, especially Armenia, shows that they were crucial to the Empire's eastern policy, whereas Danubian provinces,

³⁸ Luc. *Alex.* 57; Zosim. I 31, 1–3.

³⁹ SARNOWSKI 1988: 147–151.

⁴⁰ Tac. *Ann.* XII 15–22; MIELCZAREK 1999a: 5–9.

⁴¹ MIELCZAREK 1999b: 98–102.

especially Moesia, were responsible for defending the Empire against the steppe barbarians⁴². Therefore, one should be extremely cautious when discussing the meaning of the Bosphorus as a buffer both against Parthia and the steppe nomads. Instead, the Bosporan Kingdom with its distant location, local ruling dynasty and strong nomadic elements, played the role of a useful outpost. Unlike Nabataea, which shared most of these features, it never became a province. However, this desert state had land borders with territories controlled directly by Rome and was crossed by important trade routes, which apparently was enough for it to be incorporated by Trajan.

Institute of History, University of Wrocław
michal.halamus@uwr.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-7087-5414

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BLAVATSKAYA 1965: T.V. BLAVATSKAYA, *Reskripty carya Aspurga* ["Rescripts of King Aspurgus"], *Sovetskaya Archeologija* IX 1965, fasc. 2, pp. 197–209.
- BLAVATSKYI 1985: V.D. BLAVATSKYI, *O kulte rimskich imperatorov na Bospore* ["On the Roman Imperial Cult in the Bosphorus"], in: IDEM (ed.) *Antichnaya archeologija i istorija* ["Ancient Archaeology and History"], Moskva 1985, pp. 191–195.
- COŞKUN 2019: A. COŞKUN, *The Date of the Revolt of Asandros and the Relations between the Bosporan Kingdom and Rome under Caesar*, in: M. NOLLÉ et al. (eds.): *Panegyrikoi Logoi. Festschrift für Johannes Nollé zum 65. Geburtstag*, Bonn 2019, pp. 125–146.
- GAJDUKEVIČ 1949: V.F. GAJDUKEVIČ, *Bosporskoe Tsarstvo* ["The Bosporan Kingdom"], Moskva–Leningrad 1949.
- 1971: V.F. GAJDUKEVIČ, *Das bosporanische Reich*, Berlin 1971.
- GOLUBCOVA 1951: E.C. GOLUBCOVA, *Severnoe Pritchernomore i Rim na rubezhe naschey ery* ["The Northern Black Sea Area on the Verge of the Common Era"], Moskva 1951.
- GRAHAM 1961: H. GRAHAM, *Soviet Classical Scholarship and the Black Sea Region*, *CJ* LVI 1961, pp. 194–202.
- HALAMUS 2018: M. HALAMUS, *Annexing the Near East and Long-Lasting Bosporan Autonomy*, *Eos* CV 2018, pp. 221–238.
- 2020: M. HALAMUS, *The Epigraphic Curve in the Northern Black Sea Region: A Case Study from Chersonesus and the Bosporan Kingdom*, in: K. NAWOTKA (ed.), *Epigraphic Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity*, New York 2020, pp. 102–117.
- HEINEN 2001: H. HEINEN, *Die mithradatische Tradition der bosporanischen Könige – ein missverständener Befund*, *Studia Phoenica* XVI 2001, pp. 355–370.
- 2006: H. HEINEN, *Antike am Rande der Steppe. Der nördliche Schwarzmeerraum als Forschungsaufgabe*, Wiesbaden 2006.
- HØJTE 2009: J.M. HØJTE (ed.), *Mithridates VI and the Pontic Kingdom*, Aarhus 2009.
- MAREK 2009: Ch. MAREK, *Hellenisation and Romanisation in Pontos-Bithynia: An Overview*, in: HØJTE 2009, pp. 35–46.
- MCGING 2009: B.C. MCGING, *Mithridates VI Eupator: Victim or Aggressor?*, in: HØJTE 2009, pp. 203–216.

⁴² MROZEWICZ 1982: 79–82; 2013: 436–442.

- 1986: B.C. MCGING, *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates Eupator*, Leiden 1986.
- MEYER 2011: C. MEYER, *Iranians and Greeks after 90 Years: A Religious History of Southern Russia in Ancient Times*, *Ancient West & East* X 2011, pp. 75–159.
- 2013: C. MEYER, *Greco-Scythian Art and the Birth of Eurasia. From Classical Antiquity to Russian Modernity*, Oxford 2013.
- MIELCZAREK 1999a: M. MIELCZAREK, *O piechocie bosporańskiej w II wieku n.e. Kilka uwag o treści malowidła ściennego z grobowca odkrytego w Kerczu w 1872 roku* [“On the Bosporan Infantry in the 2nd c. CE. Some Remarks Concerning a Tomb Painting Found in Kertch in 1872”], in: K. FILIPOW (ed.), *Księga jubileuszowa Muzeum Wojska 1968–1998* [“Anniversary Book of the Army Museum 1968–1998”], Białystok 1999, pp. 5–9.
- 1999b: M. MIELCZAREK, *The Army of the Bosporan Kingdom*, Łódź 1999.
- MILLAR 2004: F. MILLAR, *Emperors, Kings, and Subjects: The Politics of Two-Level Sovereignty*, in: IDEM, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, ed. by H.M. COTTON, G.M. ROGERS, vol. 2: *Government, Society, and Culture in the Roman Empire*, Chapel Hill–London 2002, pp. 229–248.
- MINNS 1913: E.H. MINNS, *Scythians and Greeks: A Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine*, Cambridge 1913.
- MROZEWICZ 1982: L. MROZEWICZ, *Roman Military Settlements in Lower Moesia*, *Archeologia* XXXIII 1982, pp. 79–105.
- 2013: L. MROZEWICZ, *Resettlement into Roman Territory across the Rhine and the Danube under the Early Empire (to the Marcomannic Wars)*, *Eos* C 2013, fasciculus extra ordinem editus electronicus, pp. 424–442.
- PARFENOV 2007: V.N. PARFENOV, *Zagadka Skriboniya* [“Scribonius’ Riddle”], *Problemy Istorii, Filologii, Kultury* XVII 2007, pp. 291–298.
- ROSTOVTZEFF 1922: M.I. ROSTOVTZEFF, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, Oxford 1922.
- SAPRYKIN 1996: S.J. SAPRYKIN, *Pontijskoe tsarstvo. Gasudarstvo Grekov i Varvarov v Pritchernomore* [“The Pontic Kingdom. The State of Greeks and Barbarians in the Black Sea Area”], Moskva 1996.
- 2002: S.J. SAPRYKIN, *Bosporskoye tsarstvo na rubezhe dvukh er* [“The Kingdom of Bosporus on the Verge of Two Epochs”], Moskva 2002.
- 2010: S.J. SAPRYKIN, *Zagadka Skriboniya?* [“Scribonius’ Riddle?”], in: S.J. SAPRYKIN *et al.* (eds.), *Vostok, Evropa, Amerika v drevnosti. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov XVI Sergeevskikh chteniy* [“East, Europe, America in Antiquity: Collection of Scientific Papers of the 16th Sergeev Readings”], Moskva 2010, pp. 159–173.
- SARNOWSKI 1988: T. SARNOWSKI, *Wojsko rzymskie w Mezji Dolnej i na północnym wybrzeżu Morza Czarnego* [“Roman Army in Lower Moesia and the Northern Coast of the Black Sea”], Warszawa 1988.
- VLASSOPOULOS 2013: K. VLASSOPOULOS, *Greeks and Barbarians*, Cambridge 2013.
- ŽEBELEV 1938: S.A. ŽEBELEV, *Poslednij Perisad i skifskoe vosstanie na Bospore* [“The Last Paerisades and the Scythian Uprising on the Bosporus”], *VDI* 1938, fasc. 3, pp. 49–71.

Richard RAWLES, *Callimachus*, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019 (Ancients in Action), 139 pp., ISBN 978-1-4742-5486-1 (hb.) / 978-1-4742-5485-4 (pb.), £50.00 (hb.) / 17.99 (pb.).

I could not resist the instant temptation to say that Callimachus would have probably approved of this book, because it is by no means a big one. The book is also a very ambitious attempt to summarise the most prolific (author of 800 works, according to the *Suda Lexicon*) and influential poet of the Hellenistic period in just 140 pages. The book by Richard RAWLES (= R.), however, constitutes part of a relatively new series which in an approachable way introduces general readers and students who are not acquainted with Greek or Latin to major figures of ancient culture and history, ranging from Homer and Vergil to Cleopatra and Boudicca. I would like to add that readers are not only not expected to know dead languages, but are also not required to know any modern ones except English, in which all the further reading recommended in the book was written.

The book under review deals with the life and – most importantly – the works of Callimachus of Cyrene (3rd century BC), a poet who combined the theory and practice of poetry in a masterful manner. R. divided his book into five parts, analysing: Callimachus' poetic and philological contribution, some questions concerning the voices of Callimachean narrators, the presentation of the poet and his attitude towards the gods and religion, the picture of the new world that emerged after Alexander's death, and a very short section devoted to some stories in the *Aetia* that linked Callimachus with the Roman era, that is, the newer world to come.

The method R. used was to combine a brief general presentation of historical and literary questions with a thorough study of selected passages and fragments that are in some way significant to Callimachus' work. This method has proved very effective, since on the one hand it does not tire readers, while on the other it provides them with some detailed analysis of Callimachus' main poetic strategies. This allows R. to show not only other researchers' opinions, reflections and conclusions, but also his own insights into Callimachus' poetics. For instance, he underlines the importance the Alexandrian authors attached to the written word – in contrast to the spoken one – by highlighting two scenes from the *Aetia* (fr. 73 and 75 a–b HARDER), where a character expresses his love through writing, namely carving words on the outside of an apple and on the bark of a tree (p. 24). This goes together with a programmatic passage coming from the same work, which depicts the young Callimachus taking a writing-tablet in his hands for the first time, while Apollo is sitting next to him (*Aet.* fr. 1, 21–28). R. also makes an attempt, which proves successful (not an easy task when his readers are not expected to know ancient Greek), to present Callimachus' usage of rare words, which not only point to the poet's erudition, but also modify the tone of a given scene, frequently adding a tinge of humour to it (pp. 26 p.). In a similar vein, R. draws attention to the individualisation of language; he takes Hecale as his example and shows how emotional her manner of speaking is, ranging from love and happiness to despair and hatred (p. 54).

Moreover, R. has managed to tackle a difficult problem connected with the poor state of preservation of Callimachus' œuvre: he translates a fragment as extant and then narrates the rest of the (reconstructed) story. However, sometimes that strategy might be misleading when he does not specify that the information he is giving comes from another source, as in the case of a detail from the story of Acontius and Cydippe, which is preserved in Aristaeetus' *Letters* (I 10, 25–45) and not in the *Aetia*, as the reader might be prompted to understand (p. 20).

As far as the translation is concerned, I would not render the word *σχοῖνος* as 'parasang' (p. 29, cf. p. 32), although it is provided with the attributive *Περσῖς*. Indeed, the Persian unit

of measurement of distance was *parasang* (Greek παρασάγγης), and not σχοῖνος, which was an Egyptian one. However, when someone as erudite as Callimachus writes the phrase σχοῖνος Περσίδῃ (*Aet.* fr. 1, 18 PFEIFFER; HARDER) in a very important programmatic passage that constitutes an introduction to his *opus magnum*, the *Aetia*, we should assume that he does so on purpose. It is most likely that he wanted to provoke confusion and to make readers think and seek an explanation for this “error”. What they were (and are) supposed to find is a passage from Herodotus’ *Histories* (II 6, 7–8), where both terms are mentioned close to each other. The passage was certainly well known to all the Alexandrian readers of the *Aetia*, since it comes from the beginning of the book which gives an extensive account of Egypt, their new land. On the other hand, σχοῖνος Περσίδῃ actually points to *parasang*, and there is another Greek writer who uses the word notably often (actually most often of all), namely Xenophon, in whose *Anabasis* παρασάγγης appears 56 times in repetitive formulaic sentences describing tiresome marches of the Ten Thousand through the vast Persian interior. My guess, then, is that Callimachus used the disagreement between the noun and its attributive to criticise these two works, taking into account their form and content at the same time. While saying: “and hereafter/ judge poetry by its art, not by the Persian *schoinos*” (transl. A. HARDER) he wanted to point out the “big book” (Herodotus’ *Histories*) and the other one that deals with war (Xenophon’s *Anabasis*). Additionally, by mentioning a Persian *schoinos*, he intended to evoke a feeling of the weariness that accompanied not only exhausting marches, but also reading about them. In effect, he manages to encompass his own negative opinion concerning the style and subject matter of both works in just two words.

Since the book is intended for the non-specialist reader and student, perhaps in some particular areas they should be provided with more information to spark their interest. For instance, they probably will not be impressed by information about the sum of fifteen talents that Ptolemy III was willing (and able) to pay for the texts of the three Athenian tragedians, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides (p. 6). To catch the reader’s eye, it would have been better to mention how much it weighed in gold, and that nowadays it would probably amount to the equivalent of millions of dollars (L. CASSON, *Libraries in the Ancient World*, New Haven–London 2001, p. 35). Similarly, while mentioning Sotades’ abusive verse criticising the marriage of Ptolemy II to his sister Arsinoe (p. 5) it would have been interesting to add that, according to an ancient tradition, the poet was condemned to death by the offended ruler (Ath. XIV 621a–b). The hint that a poet could be locked in a leaden chest and thrown into the sea for having written just one line would definitely have made the story more vivid. On the other hand, even in a book intended for a wider audience some details matter, for instance data (omitted by R.: pp. 9, 10, 12) about the number of hymns, iambs and epigrams that Callimachus wrote. As far as precision is concerned, not all the “Homeric hymns” come from the archaic period (p. 71), but some of them were written later. Moreover, Asterie was not Apollo’s mother (p. 96). Actually, she was his aunt (cf. Hes. *Th.* 404–407), although that is what Callimachus expected his readers to know.

Nevertheless, these are not such important details. The *Callimachus* is a good read for all those who want to learn about the very beginnings of poetics and poetry which had a great influence on Roman literature in particular and, consequently, on European culture in general. Perhaps, unlike R. himself, who says that he came to Callimachus through the study of Roman poetry (p. 123), having read the book more readers will take a shortcut and get to him directly.

Emilia Żybert

Institute of Classical, Mediterranean and Oriental Studies

University of Wrocław

emilia.zybert-pruchnicka@uwr.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-8068-4278

Bernd LORENZ, *Griechische Grabgedichte Thessaliens. Beispiele für poetische Kleinkunst der Antike*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter 2019 (Kalliope – Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Poesie 16), 294 pp., ISBN 978-3-8253-6941-5, €58.00.

In this book, Bernd LORENZ (= L.) has produced an extensive (294 pp.) collection of Greek funerary verse-inscriptions from Thessaly. The inventory of testimonies is followed by a long introduction dealing with inscriptions in general (first part) and inscribed funerary poems from Thessaly (second part), followed by some concluding remarks (third part). The inventory is basically geographical, arranged according to the importance of regions and cities (Achaia, Thebes, and the like); the subdivisions are arranged chronologically, with subsequent sequences of epigrams for males, females, youth and children. The result is somewhat lacking in coherence, constituting a rather disconcerting accumulation of variously formulated headers with the names of the deceased, their professions, *topoi* appearing in the epigrams, etc. As a result, the inscriptions do not have the chance to receive any systematic, thematic treatment, something which would be only suitable for a selection of Thessalian inscriptions. One could think of a number of distinct categories of verse-inscriptions from this region that are worth studying in their context; not to mention paying attention to specific local features of funerary poetry as compared to other regions. It would be also interesting to learn something about the evolution of the genre. No broader cultural, historical or social aspects are discussed. The introduction is somewhat erratic. On occasions the narrative is inconsistent or simply disrupted by an array of unnecessary digressions, citations, bibliographical references, among them Internet links which come out of the blue – e.g. on p. 19, regarding geography of Thessaly. Proper editing of the book would have done it a service.

The purpose of the collection is defined in an unabashedly subjective manner – Thessaly is a favourite, long-term object of the author's studies (p. 19). In fact, L.'s 1974 Ph.D. (published in 1976) dealt with early verse-inscriptions from Thessaly¹. Also, his intent is to deliver some kind of *Forschungsbericht* with regard to verse-inscriptions and their *Textforschung* and *Rezeptionsgeschichte* (p. 22).

The approximate number of funerary verse-inscriptions from Thessaly is 200 (out of 6000 inscriptions overall). L. has included 117 in his collection, hence more than half of the total number. He does not explain the criteria for his choice. Chronologically, they cover around 1000 years of the ancient history of the region, from the Archaic period to Late Antiquity (the most numerous group, totalling around 30, are Hellenistic, 3rd–1st century BC²). In L.'s view, collecting Late Antique (up to the 4th century AD) verse-inscriptions from Thessaly remains a scholarly *desideratum* of the highest order (p. 25). He does not take into account other, parallel categories of testimonies: epigrams from the *Anthologia Palatina* and "Orphic" tablets.

The texts are dated and references to their origins and places of preservation (mostly museum inventory numbers) are given. Apart from the Greek texts and translations into German (most in prose, some in verse as well) and, if available, into other languages (English, French, Italian and Latin as well as German versions made by others – but with a number of curious omissions of existing translations), we have short, disparate comments or notes and extensive bibliographies (with references to the *editiones principes*) for every single verse-inscription (*Notizen*). The epigraphic

¹ B. LORENZ, *Thessalische Grabgedichte vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Innsbruck 1976 (Commentationes Aenipontanae 22).

² For which see E. CAIRON, *Les épitaphes métriques hellénistiques du Péloponnèse à la Thessalie*, Budapest 2009.

material is presented without proper, methodical commentary. In contrast to the lemmata, the critical apparatus is minimal or non-existent. Most importantly, the author does not state in his introduction that he was aiming at a new edition (or a revision of earlier editions), something which would entail making editorial decisions to any extent; as a result, his texts are simply collected from a number of existing (even if scattered) editions. Luckily, the collection has been made perfectly searchable: at the end of the volume we have a list of places where the inscriptions are being kept (pp. 279–281), a *comparatio numerorum* (pp. 283–286), chronological tables (pp. 287–288), an index of names appearing in the texts of inscriptions (pp. 289–292) and a list of proveniences (pp. 293–294).

While reading this volume, and recalling the late Louis ROBERT's notoriously strained relations with luminaries of German scholarship in the field of epigraphy, I often wondered what his reaction to this book would have been, and trembling at the thought. Werner PEEK (whom L. calls upon as one of his model scholars, especially as the author of an exemplary collection of translations, *Griechische Grabgedichte*³) received a 30-page long scathing and crushing criticism of his monumental, landmark and sadly unfinished edition of *Vers-Inschriften*⁴.

Overall, L.'s book – despite all appearances – is not so much an in-depth scholarly endeavour as an enthusiastic journey through the world of Thessalian epigraphic poetry, which has been his life-long love – and here is the merit. At its core are lucid, accurate translations of these pieces of *Poetische Kleinkunst*, as the title suggests. For the first time, the German-reading public can read and enjoy at one go such an important part of ancient Greek poetical tradition. I am not sure whether ROBERT would have appreciated this. I do.

Andrzej Wypustek

Institute of History, University of Wrocław
andrzej.wypustek@uwr.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-5823-0704

³ W. PEEK, *Griechische Grabgedichte. Griechisch und Deutsch*, Berlin 1960 (Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt 7).

⁴ L. ROBERT, *Les "Griechische Vers-Inschriften" de W. Peek*, *Gnomon* XXXI 1959, pp. 1–30 = IDEM, *Opera minora selecta. Épigraphie et antiquités grecques*, vol. III, Amsterdam 1969, pp. 1640–1669.

Eos CVIII 2021

ISSN 0012-7825

DOI: 10.34616/e.2021.199.202

Tobias BOLL, *Ciceros Rede cum senatui gratias egit. Ein Kommentar*, Berlin–Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2019 (Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft. Beihefte, Neue Folge 10), 260 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-062921-7, €113.95.

Contemporary scholarship notably lacks an adequate modern commentary on Cicero's speech of 57, *cum senatui gratias egit*, which is better known under the alternative title, *post reditum in senatu* (henceforth referred to as *Red. Sen.*)¹. Thus, the recent book by Tobias BOLL (henceforth referred to as "B.") will be much appreciated by scholars of republican Rome and especially students of Cicero. The book is divided into an introduction, commentary, appendix, bibliography, and a general index of names and subjects. The appendix provides a calendar of the events of Cicero's exile in the years 58/57. The introduction begins with a brief survey of the current state of research on the *Red. Sen.* (pp. 3–5). B. raises a series of issues in need of scholarly attention, including those pertaining to the MS. tradition, the relation between *Red. Sen.* and the *post reditum ad Quirites*, the invective against Piso and Gabinius at §§ 10–18², and several disputed points regarding the historical background. These points of historical contestation include questions over Clodius' cooperation with the triumvirs, the abrogation of the *leges Aelia et Fufia*, and the presence of Caesar's army at the gates of Rome at the beginning of 58. Chapters two through seven address these issues and, while B.'s conclusions are for the most part indecisive, his discussions will certainly open up venues for further research.

The *Red. Sen.* is unique among Cicero's speeches in that it was read from a script (*de scripto*)³. B. discusses this unique feature of the speech at the beginning of his "historical introduction" (pp. 6–42). He seems to agree with the common view that Cicero read his speech *de scripto* in order to make sure he did not overlook anyone who contributed to his recall from exile (also at pp. 213–214 on § 30). There are other possible explanations for Cicero's decision to read the speech like this, for example that Cicero lacked self-confidence after a long break from public speaking⁴, but B. neglects to discuss these possibilities. He does, however, make an interesting suggestion that the *Red. Sen.* had been disseminated in written form prior to its delivery to the senate (pp. 6–7). B. then provides an account of the speech's historical background, which is split into three subchapters: "Cicero, Clodius und der *bona dea*-Skandal", "Clodius, Caesar und das Triumvirat", and a lengthy chapter in which all the main characters of the play (the *dramatis personae*) are introduced, including Pompey, Caesar, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, Aulus Gabinius (the consuls of 58), P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos (the consuls of 57), T. Annius Milo, P. Sestius, Q. Tullius Cicero, and of course P. Clodius Pulcher. Inevitably, there are multiple

¹ Cf. A.R. DYCK, *Cicero's Devotio: The Roles of Dux and Scape-Goat in His Post Reditum Rhetoric*, HSCPh CII 2004, pp. 299–314 (not in BOLL's bibliography), at p. 307, n. 38: "One feels acutely the lack of a modern commentary on this speech [= *Red. Pop.*], as on its counterpart, *Red. sen.*". All dates in this review are BCE.

² This has been recently dealt with by A. THURN (*Rufmord in der späten römischen Republik. Charakterbezogene Diffamierungsstrategien in Ciceros Reden und Briefen*, Berlin–Boston 2018, pp. 206, 211, and passim), whose book was also published by Walter de Gruyter, but in another series (Philologus. Supplemente).

³ See Cic. *Planc.* 74 with J.N. SETTLE, *The Publication of Cicero's Orations*, diss. Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 1962, pp. 170–174; Ch. HELM, *Zur Redaktion der Ciceronischen Konsulatsreden*, diss. Göttingen 1979, p. 2 with n. 5.

⁴ Cf. DYCK, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 301 with n. 11.

thematic overlaps between these sections. Yet the reader will certainly come away with a clear sense, insofar as such clarity is possible, of Cicero's relationship with and attitudes toward those mentioned or referenced in the speech.

Next, B. analyses the *Red. Sen.* and *Red. Pop.* as parallel speeches (pp. 43–57). His analysis largely relies on the findings of previous scholars⁵, yet he ends up disagreeing with their conclusions more often than not. The difference between these two speeches, surprisingly, is argued to lie in Cicero's approach rather than in their stylistic elaboration. That is, in the *Red. Sen.*, when expressing his gratitude to individual members of the senate, Cicero needed to proceed in a prosaic manner, but could nonetheless occasionally afford to disrupt the sequence of events. In the *Red. Pop.*, by contrast, he takes a more emotional tone, while simultaneously presenting the chronology in a systematic way. B. discusses four main points of divergence between the two orations. The speeches are said to diverge with respect to their "rhetorical situation", the "political situation", the "emotional dimension", and "historical dimension". The difference in rhetorical situation of the two orations means that the invective against Piso and Gabinius and the eulogies of Cicero's supporters are virtually lacking in the *Red. Pop.* Further, in the *Red. Sen.* the speaker emphasises the role of the senate in bringing about his recall, whereas the role of the people is emphasised in the *Red. Pop.* The differences in political situation result in Pompey featuring more prominently and being depicted more favourably in the *Red. Pop.*, whereas in the *Red. Sen.* Cicero had to tone down his own self-praise. By the "emotional dimension" B. means that in the *Red. Pop.* Cicero refers more freely to his family and highlights the merits of his brother Quintus. Cicero also puts greater emphasis on divine intervention and avoids legal matters when speaking in front of the people. The "historical dimension" refers to the fact that Cicero appears to invoke different historical *exempla* according to the expectations of the audience (cf. pp. 236, 241, 243). This also leads to Marius being portrayed in a better light along with Pompey in the *Red. Pop.*

This discussion of the points of divergence between the two speeches is followed by a table listing passages of the two speeches which exhibit phraseological parallels. The next chapter, "Ziele und Strategie Ciceros" (pp. 58–63), highlights Cicero's multiple aims in the *Red. Sen.* Cicero's primary aim was to assign praise and blame; thus, the speech belongs to the *genus demonstrativum*. However, B. argues that Cicero also sought to use the speech to reclaim his political position after exile⁶. It is worth bearing in mind that this speech is an early (if not the earliest) instance of what has come to be known as a *gratiarum actio*. Thus, while Cicero's efforts to deprecate the consuls of 58 may seem strange to a modern reader, the Roman audience would have expected him not only to acknowledge his allies, but also to repudiate his enemies. Further, the orator questions the legality of his exile (to which he euphemistically refers as *calamitas*, *discessus*, etc.) and, in justifying his withdrawal from Rome, he emphasises his own merits. For example, he claims that he had prevented bloodshed and saved the state a second time, etc. To equate himself with the Republic, which P. MACKENDRICK famously described as the "*L'État, c'est moi syndrome*"⁷, was likewise an important part of Cicero's rhetorical strategy. As previously noted, the invective was an integral part of epideictic as well as judicial oratory at Rome. On pp. 64–67, B. enumerates the *topoi* characteristic of the rhetorical invective that can be found in the *Red. Sen.* He counts no fewer than 15 types from among the total of 17 that were specified

⁵ Esp. D. MACK, *Senatsreden und Volksreden bei Cicero*, Würzburg 1937, and C.E. THOMPSON, *To the Senate and to the People: Adaptation to the Senatorial and Popular Audiences in the Parallel Speeches of Cicero*, diss. The Ohio State University 1978. Another, more recent book to which he refers throughout is J. NICHOLSON, *Cicero's Return from Exile. The Orations Post Reditum*, New York 1992.

⁶ On this aspect of the *post reditum* speeches, see J. KENTY, *Cicero's Political Personae*, Cambridge 2020, pp. 84–89, 132–134, 158–161 and *passim*.

⁷ P. MACKENDRICK, *The Speeches of Cicero. Context, Law, Rhetoric*, London 1995.

by C.P. CRAIG⁸. Next, B. briefly outlines the structure and contents of the speech (pp. 68–71). The *Red. Sen.* does not conform to any theoretical model in terms of its disposition, making it difficult to distinguish its formal parts, with the exception of the *exordium* and *peroratio*. B. proposes the following division: §§ 1–2 *Prooemium* / Praise of the Senate; §§ 3–5 Further praise of the Senate and of some of the supporters; §§ 6–7 Characterisation of Cicero’s enemies; §§ 8–9 Praise of the consuls Lentulus and Metellus; §§ 10–18 Invective against Piso and Gabinius; §§ 19–23 Praise of other supporters (esp. Pompey) / Cicero’s recall; §§ 32–36 Justification of his withdrawal from Rome / Self-fashioning as a martyr; §§ 37–38 historical *exempla*, § 39 *Peroratio*⁹. The last chapter before the commentary (pp. 72–90) is devoted to a detailed discussion of the MS. tradition. While B. in one place speaks of his book as an “edition” (p. 83: “in dieser Ausgabe”), he neither prints the text of previous editors nor offers a text of his own. Considering the time and effort he has clearly spent in studying the MSS., a text certainly would have been welcome, especially given that his text deviates in numerous ways from both PETERSON’s OCT and MASŁOWSKI’s Teubner¹⁰.

The commentary (pp. 94–245) is rich and informative, but at the same time literally exhaustive in that it reiterates, sometimes *ad nauseam*, many points discussed at length in the historical introduction and often repeats itself where a simple cross-reference would suffice¹¹. This repetition is partly the natural result of the fact that several themes recur repeatedly throughout Cicero’s *Red. Sen.* For example, Cicero’s self-fashioning as a martyr, his self-identification with the *res publica*, and his self-praise for having twice saved the state from a disaster by suppressing the Catilinarian conspiracy in 63 and by preventing the bloodshed in 58 can all be found in multiple places across the speech. One notable exception is the section on Cicero’s invective against Piso and Gabinius at §§ 10–18 which afforded B. an opportunity to demonstrate his wide knowledge not only of the themes of the ancient invective, but also of numerous facets of Roman daily life. Beyond this, the comments on legal and institutional matters pertaining to the turbulent events of Cicero’s withdrawal from Rome are of great value (e.g. on the *leges Aelia et Fufia* at pp. 138–139)¹². Further, the many prosopographical entries on otherwise elusive figures, such as L. Ninnius Quadratus (p. 104), L. Aelius Lamia (p. 143), M. Cispus (p. 180), or Q. Fabricius (p. 182), will prove useful to students of the *post reditum* speeches. B.’s deft treatment of Cicero’s figurative language is particularly insightful. He provides interesting commentary on “the orphaned republic” (pp. 111 and 224), the military imagery at § 8 where P. Lentulus takes up the role of a *servator* (pp. 120–121),

⁸ Cf. C.P. CRAIG, *Audience Expectations, Invective, and Proof*, in: J.G.F. POWELL, J.J. PATERSON (eds.), *Cicero the Advocate*, New York 2004, pp. 187–213.

⁹ He makes it clear that it differs from those of THOMPSON, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 121, NICHOLSON, *op. cit.* (n. 5), pp. 115–116, and MACKENDRICK, *op. cit.* (n. 7), pp. 124–127.

¹⁰ He lists 37 deviations from the former and 25 from the latter. This has been also pointed out by another reviewer (T. RICCHIERI in *Ciceroniana On Line* V 1, 2021, pp. 199–204 [at p. 200: “un testo critico da lui costituito e annesso al suo commento [...] non sarebbe stato fuori luogo”]), who contests (pp. 201–202) some of B.’s textual choices (esp. at §§ 13, 25, and 33). Contrast, for instance, the recent edition of Cicero’s *Agrarian Speeches* by G. MANUWALD (Oxford 2018), who adopts MAREK’s version (Teubner) throughout, although she is well-aware of its shortcomings (p. LII). This drawback of the book under review is mitigated by the fact that the Latin text accompanies each entry of the following commentary.

¹¹ It is quite remarkable that it took B. 151 pages to comment on Cicero’s speech that is 39 paragraphs in length, especially when we realise that R.G. NISBET’s commentary on *De domo sua* (147 paragraphs) is only 132 pages long (a new commentary on that speech, by C. SCHEIDEGGER LÄMMLE of the University of Basel, is now under way. The completion of the project is envisaged for the late summer of 2022). The repetitions, however, may be useful for those readers who do not like to switch back and forth between different entries.

¹² More examples are listed by RICCHIERI, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 201.

and the “funeral of the republic” (p. 169)¹³. Unfortunately, little attention is given to the historical puzzle over Cicero’s exile concerning the presence of Caesar’s troops at the gates of Rome in 58. This puzzle is mentioned only briefly in the commentary (whenever a reference is made to the *contio* in the *Circus Flaminius* of March 58). This is perhaps because there is only one allusion to Caesar in the speeches *post reditum par excellence* (*Red. Sen.* 32: “Erat alius ad portas cum imperio in multos annos magnoque exercitu”). Commenting on this passage, B. tentatively suggests (pp. 221–222) that the words *ad portas* may allude to the proverbial phrase *Hannibal ad portas*. I would only add that nearly a decade later, in 49, Cicero made the same association by likening Caesar to the Carthaginian leader explicitly¹⁴. On the other hand, one of the most striking features of this speech with respect to rhetorical tropes is the number of occurrences of what B. DUFALLO calls “the topos *mortuos (ab inferis) excitare*”¹⁵. This topos refers to a certain figure of speech, which the Greek rhetoricians described as εἰδωλοποιία¹⁶, and which is translated into Latin by Priscian as *simulacri fictio*¹⁷. We see a variant of this topos in, for instance, Cicero’s allegation (pp. 109, 130–131, 199) that under Clodius’ proposed law he would be allowed to return “if and when the men who almost destroyed Rome came back to life” (§ 4: “si revixissent ii, qui haec paene delerunt”, tr. D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY). A much more explicit case is in Cicero’s references to a speech by P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus (*cos.* 79) at *Red. Sen.* 25, where a textbook example of this figure of speech had been employed. In both cases, B. focuses almost exclusively on the historical events and people referred to by both speakers through the aforementioned figure of speech. While he does quote some parallel passages, B. pays no attention to rhetorical theory whatsoever.

These remarks are not meant as criticism. Rather, they show that even a commentary as extensive as this one requires its author to make choices regarding which aspects of the text to neglect in favour of those that seem either more interesting or demanding. This, obviously, will always be subjective. B.’s commentary is admirable in its thoroughness with respect to textual and grammatical difficulties, which never go unnoticed, making the book highly useful for scholars and students alike. Overall, the *Kommentar* appears carefully written and meticulously edited. The few misprints that I have noticed do not impede the reader’s comprehension¹⁸.

Damian Pierzak

Institute of Literary Studies, University of Silesia in Katowice
damian.pierzak@us.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-4140-842X

¹³ Cf. now B. WALTERS, *The Deaths of the Republic. Imagery of the Body Politic in Ciceronian Rome*, Oxford 2020, p. 85 and passim.

¹⁴ See Cic. *Att.* VII 11, 1 = 134 SB. It is worth noting that for Cicero’s letters B. apparently uses TYRRELL/PURSER instead of SHACKLETON BAILEY. If he consulted the latter’s editions, there is no trace of it in the text. Cf. THURN, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 107–108.

¹⁵ See B. DUFALLO, *The Ghosts of the Past. Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome’s Transition to a Principate*, Columbus 2007. Cf. IDEM, *Appius’ Indignation: Gossip, Tradition, and Performance in Republican Rome*, TAPhA CXXXI 2001, pp. 119–142 (not in B.’s bibliography). This figure of speech is the subject of my recent book: D. PIERZAK, *Ab inferis ad rostra. Przywoływanie zmarłych w retoryce rzymskiej okresu republikańskiego*, Katowice 2019 (in Polish).

¹⁶ [Hermog.] *Prog.* 9; Aphth. *Prog.* 11 (vol. X, p. 34 SPENGEL).

¹⁷ Prisc. *Praeex.* 9 = RLM, p. 558 HALM.

¹⁸ On p. 25, n. 140 read “Cicero” for “Ciceros”; on p. 31, n. 174 read “Kap. 5” for “Kap. 6”; on p. 159 a quotation mark is missing; the only misprint that may cause some confusion is on pp. 160–161: when reproducing the text of *Red. Sen.* 15 in his lemma, B. prints *accidit*, but when commenting on that word he misspells it as *accedit*.

Eos CVIII 2021

ISSN 0012-7825

DOI: 10.34616/e.2021.203.207

Joanna KENTY, *Cicero's Political Personae*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, X, 274 pp., ISBN 978-1-108-83946-4, £75.00.

Another important book on Cicero has recently come to light¹. Building on the work of her predecessors (MAY's *Trials of Character* and GILDENHARD's *Creative Eloquence*², among others), Joanna KENTY (= K.) explores the ways in which Cicero promoted his public persona, or, in this case, "personae". What the author calls "Cicero's political personae" is a "wide range of oratorical roles he routinely adopted to achieve political ends". In short, her objective is to "explore how and why he plays those roles in particular orations" (p. 3). Cicero's oratory is thus the primary focus of the book. K. nonetheless supplements her argument with copious references to his correspondence and occasionally notes how his contemporaries (Clodius, Antony, etc.) developed their respective political programmes. The opening "Preface" and "Acknowledgments" are followed by an "Introduction" that presents the *status quaestionis*, research objectives, methodology, and offers a brief outline (pp. 1–25). The main body of the book consists of eight chapters discussing various personae, a "Conclusion" (pp. 223–227) and a rich and up-to-date bibliography (pp. 228–260). The monograph ends with an always useful *index locorum* and a general index.

In addition to the relevant Ciceronian scholarship, the reader is introduced to Ervin GOFFMAN's notion of "public self" and Stephen GREENBLATT's notion of "self-fashioning", two important ideas which provide a theoretical framework for further discussion. K. rightly confines herself to the period from Cicero's return from exile in 57 until his death in 43 (all dates in this review are BCE). This confinement is logical since this period saw Cicero succumbing to the political pressure exerted on him by others, while still having to justify his political stance. Overlooking Cicero's earlier career allows her to pay closer attention to several important but understudied speeches, for instance, the *Pro Balbo* and some of the *Philippics*. The chapters are divided thematically, with each devoted to one of Cicero's personae, while each individual chapter's material is presented in basic chronological order. "While this may be disorienting to readers familiar with Cicero's biography", she explains (pp. 13–14), "disorientation can help to put matters in a new light and open up new ways of perceiving patterns in the corpus, to tell a different story about Cicero's career"³. The following remarks (pp. 17–23) clarify K.'s approach to "Cicero's Personae". Taking the classification in Cicero's *De Officiis* as her starting point, she distinguishes between various aspects of personae, including social role, identity, character, the "affect" of the speaker⁴, and his relationships. These distinctions guide K.'s analysis, which divides Cicero's rhetorical self-fashioning

¹ Its publication coincides with that of D.H. BERRY, *Cicero's Catilinarians*, New York 2020, and R.A. KASTER, *Cicero: Brutus and Orator*, Oxford 2020 (cf. also below, n. 6). I am most grateful to Prof. Katarzyna MARCINIAK for drawing Joanna KENTY's book to my attention.

² J.M. MAY, *Trials of Character. The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*, Chapel Hill–London 1988; I. GILDENHARD, *Creative Eloquence. The Construction of Reality in Cicero's Speeches*, Oxford–New York 2011.

³ To make the reader better oriented, the author provides constant cross-references to other sections that help them to view the subject in question from a wider perspective.

⁴ The idea of affect is derived from the Latin *ad-fectus*. K. understands "affect" as both the speaker's mental state "in reaction to the circumstances" and his capacity to impose the same mental state upon his audience. This idea is clearly inspired by Aristotle's *ethos* and *pathos*. The terminology, however, can be misleading, as there is no mention of the currently fashionable "affect theory". See, e.g., M. GREGG, G.J. SEIGWORTH (eds.), *The Affect Theory Reader*, Durham–London 2010.

in the years 57–43 into eight prominent personae, including “The Orator as Attacker” or “The Champion of the Senate”. The chapters that follow the brief outline “proceed roughly from the most generic personae, useful in a wide variety of rhetorical contexts, to the more specifically late republican political roles adopted by Cicero” (p. 23).

Cicero is famous for his wit and the ruthless verbal assaults that he launched on his political opponents. The first chapter of K.’s book, “The Orator as Attacker” (pp. 26–52), argues that the Roman invective, though it conformed to socially accepted norms, ought to be balanced lest the orator end up being seen as either a clown or a rioter (*rabula*). Cicero was always careful not to fall into either extreme. His strategy commonly involved attempting to make his attacks appear to have been provoked by his adversaries, for example by Clodius or Piso. Cicero’s attacks on his enemies after his recall from exile were aimed at rehabilitating his damaged public image, displaying his strength, or simply retaliating. K. makes an especially interesting and illuminating suggestion about Cicero’s decision to humiliate Piso in the senate, instead of starting legal proceedings against him. She argues that this was not only because the latter course of action would be inappropriate for a senior statesman, but also due to the unpredictability of the Roman legal system⁵. Cicero notably took greater liberties towards the end of his career, for instance in his character assassination of Antony, when the stakes were high and his political influence was at its peak. While Cicero was determined to seek retribution against his enemies, he was also mindful of the favours he had received from others. The next role discussed by K., “The Orator as a Friend” (pp. 53–81), was, according to Cicero himself, “his default persona”. Cicero was able to enhance both his own *auctoritas* and that of his allies by expressing gratitude towards his allies and heaping lavish praise upon them. His admiration was typically feigned, the flattery being enforced by an unspoken rule of reciprocity. This is attested to by the example of the speech in defence of P. Sestius, whom Cicero did not otherwise hold in high regard. Pompey and Caesar presented something of a challenge for this persona of Cicero. As K. noted in the previous chapter, they had been “glossed over” by Cicero the attacker. Thus, Cicero chose, within what the author calls “economy of praise”, to forget about Pompey’s initial indifference to his misfortune. It was perhaps a harder task for Cicero to justify his political inconsistency with respect to Caesar. Having previously opposed most of Caesar’s policies, Cicero made an about-face in the speech *De provinciis consularibus*, in which he defended the extension of Caesar’s governance over the Gallic provinces. In that speech, Cicero highlights his own innate leniency and conciliatory attitude on the one hand, while on the other he praises Caesar as a commander, whose leadership is beneficial to the state. In his later orations, the *Pro C. Rabirio Postumo*, *Pro Marcello*, and *Pro rege Deiotaro*, Cicero made use of “praise as pressure”. That is, he extolled Caesar’s civic qualities in an effort to influence his behaviour. Cicero also attempted to exert similar influence on his younger friends and disciples, notably including Dolabella and Hirtius. Yet, he was rarely successful in these efforts.

The following two chapters deal respectively with Cicero’s self-pity and self-condescension. In the former, “The Orator as a Martyr” (pp. 82–102), Cicero’s willingness to make concessions is juxtaposed with Cato’s uncompromising self-sacrifice. Consider the speech *De domo sua*, in which Cicero speaks openly about his miseries in order to arouse pity⁶. Compare this to the *Pro Sestio*, in which he sets himself up as a role model for the younger generations, thus becoming a martyr who announces his political manifesto. It was not until the *Philippics* that Cicero was more inclined to

⁵ For a similar interpretation, see S. TREGGIARI, *Ancestral Virtues and Vices: Cicero on Nature, Nurture and Presentation*, in: D. BRAUND, C. GILL (eds.), *Myth, History, and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*, Exeter 2003, pp. 139–164 (at 142): “Usually [...] rival politicians seem to have resorted merely to counter-charges and not to have taken legal action”.

⁶ Cicero’s self-fashioning as a martyr in his *post reditum* speeches has been recently discussed by T. BOLL, *Ciceros Rede cum senatui gratias egit. Ein Kommentar*, Berlin–Boston 2019, pp. 48, 61 and passim (see index, s.v. “Märtyrer”), which must have appeared too late to be included in K.’s book.

pledge his life, even if only nominally, to the cause. Even then, however, he still seemed to think his self-sacrifice worthwhile only if it would achieve the desired result⁷. Eventually, as we all know, he did not have the final say on this matter, which is why Cato's martyrdom has always been more appealing. The Chapter "The Orator without Authority" (pp. 103–128) analyses those orations in which Cicero had to face men of exceptional power, especially Pompey and Caesar. Cicero often adopted, in these speeches, a pose of either deference or self-mockery in order to ingratiate himself with the audience. During the trial of Milo in 52, when the forum was surrounded by Pompey's soldiers, Cicero first pretends to be frightened, before attempting to dispel the tension by addressing the sole consul in a playful and even slightly sarcastic manner. Cicero adopted a similar *modus operandi* in the Caesarian orations. He either acted with courtesy or made open jests at his own and Caesar's expense. This left Caesar no choice but to treat his clients with the same clemency with which he treated others, including Cicero himself. At this time Cicero removed himself from public life, notwithstanding the notable exception of his defence of former Pompeians, and thus neither endorsed nor opposed Caesar's dictatorship. This was of course a calculated move and a statement in and of itself, for Cicero was aware that his voice could have had a great impact.

The remaining portion of the book is devoted to a discussion of the various roles Cicero adopted as a statesman, for example that of a political leader or as a spokesman for certain people or groups. Chapter Five, "The Champion of the Senate" (pp. 129–153), presents the orator as a guardian of traditional values, while at the same time setting the stage for the subsequent chapters. Whenever it suited his goals, Cicero would style himself as one devoted to merely executing the senate's will. This style is on display, for example, in his refusal to take sole responsibility for the execution of the Catilinarians. Likewise, he cited his recall from exile and the restoration of his house on the Palatine as evidence of the senate's support for his policies. On the other hand, Cicero depicted his opponents, notably including Piso, Gabinius, and Clodius, as questioning the authority of the senate, and thereby acting like autocrats and forfeiting the membership of this body. This illusion of the "will of the senate" was of course a great oversimplification, but one which Cicero was able to use to his advantage, for instance in his apologism for Caesar's cause in the *De proviciis consularibus*. It should not escape our notice that Cicero maintains this illusion in the *Philippics*, at a time when the majority of the old senators, with whom he identified, were replaced by Caesar's men. For Cicero, the interests of the people and those of the senate overlapped for the most part. Paradoxically, therefore, Cicero could earnestly claim to be popular, even as he acted as the champion of the senate, unlike the likes of Clodius. In the Chapter "The Popular Orator" (pp. 154–176), K. traces Cicero's nuanced deployment of the term *popularis* and explores the ways in which he posed as a popular leader. If Cicero's recall from exile and the restoration of his house on the Palatine could be taken as proof of his senatorial support, then so too could his triumphal return, which he never misses an opportunity to mention, be taken as evidence of popular support. Cicero uses the adjective *popularis* with at least two distinct meanings. This allows him to brand Clodius, Antony, and their followers as not truly popular, while simultaneously attributing the real concern for the Roman people to those who were commonly referred to as *optimates*. Antony, Clodius, and their followers were, according to Cicero, demagogues who only possessed a kind of "fake" popularity called *levitas*. Just as we noted that the invective required a subtle balance between bad taste and urbanity, likewise, Cicero exercised caution and prudence in moderating his claims of popularity. Issues of political affiliation and allegiance are further addressed in Chapter Seven, "The Voice of a Faction" (pp. 177–198), with particular attention given to the complex problem of "political faction / party". We find across Roman republican oratory an arbitrary division between "liberal" and "conservative" policies, which were frequently treated as irreconcilable extremes. This compounded the difficulty of the challenge facing Cicero, in cutting through these

⁷ Cf. Cic. *Fam.* VII 3, 6 = 183 SB (to M. Marius, of mid-April 46) with C.E.W. STEEL, *Reading Cicero. Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome*, London 2005, p. 102.

divides and convincing the audience that he and his allies were the true *populus*, whilst Clodius' supporters were little more than mercenaries and packs of slaves. K. refers to this style of argument as "partisan rhetoric". It is perhaps most evident in Cicero's speeches in defence of P. Sestius and T. Annius Milo, both of whom organised armed gangs to oppose Clodius. Partisan rhetoric was also employed in the political contestation that followed the Ides of March. The idea of Rome being split into competing "political factions", each of which claiming Caesar's political inheritance, turns out to be largely a rhetorical trope utilised by Cicero in an effort to idealise the *optimates* and discredit the false *populares*. In her last Chapter ("A Great Men's Spokesman", pp. 198–222), the author takes a closer look at Cicero's awkward position with the dynasts, the so-called First Triumvirate, and how this awkward position was reflected in his oratory. She argues that, unlike the young ambitious tribunes and aspiring statesmen, Cicero preferred to pose as the triumvirs' partner rather than their mouthpiece. Consider the period after his return from exile, when Cicero's reputation was once again under threat as a consequence of the Conference at Luca. His public justification for his subjection to the dynasts was that he cooperates with Caesar and Pompey out of concern for the common good. Yet, privately, he was embarrassed to admit that he had no alternative⁸. Attaching oneself to a great man was an efficient way to advance one's career at Rome, as is attested to by the careers of C. Scribonius Curio and Antony. Such "political capital" could even be exploited after a dynast's death, as we see with the so-called Clodius' avengers, who included Q. Pompeius Rufus, T. Munatius Plancus Bursa, and Sallust. For Cicero himself, as mentioned, it was not appropriate either to openly oppose or support Caesar.

In her closing remarks ("Conclusion", pp. 223–227), K. reminds us that it was crucial for the orator to balance carefully between various roles he played, as there was always the risk of falling into the extremes. This process, moreover, did not take place in a vacuum. Cicero's choice of a suitable political persona depended largely on external circumstances, determined by the need to consider how to engage people on specific occasions. He could, for instance, act as if he was forced into a verbal exchange by an opponent, or he could speak on someone's behalf ostensibly to return a favour. The author observes that the rhetorical strategies analysed in her book were rarely successful in a larger political context. However, thanks to his adaptability to a range of different conditions, Cicero was able to maintain his influence for a long period of time. While it seems somewhat disappointing that he never seriously challenged Pompey or Caesar, as he did Catiline and Antony, this was apparently because he was resigned to the fact of "certain threats to the republic as an inevitability". Although (deliberative) oratory lost its political significance after Cicero's death, his modes of self-fashioning and partisan rhetoric were imitated by later orators, and his narrative techniques have been a source of constant inspiration to this day.

Overall, I found very few faults with the book, and so this review has been largely confined to presenting an overview of its content⁹. *Cicero's Political Personae* is not only a well-informed and deeply researched study, but also a highly entertaining read for everyone acquainted with Cicero. By "linking philology and persuasive process criticism with history" (p. 14), K. walks us through the nuances of Roman republican oratory and politics. Her stimulating discussion of Cicero's

⁸ It is worth noting K.'s claim on p. 202 against this background: "while it is clear in hindsight that Caesar and Pompey were extraordinary and important figures, they likely seemed less extraordinary to their contemporaries before the civil war; others, including Cato, Clodius, and Cicero, led more or less analogous networks of influence". This seems to me to be a slight overstatement in need of some qualification.

⁹ There are also exceptionally few typographical errors. I have noticed some repetition (p. 7, n. 22: "of the powers of the powers" quoting J. DUGAN, *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*, Oxford–New York 2005, p. 13 where no such error occurs; p. 63, n. 47: "to be to be"), an asyndeton ("I will not obey my hatred I will not be a slave to anger" translating Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 2), and an erroneous quotation mark on p. 44 ("dishonest and honest alike").

varying self-portrayals across his varying oratorical roles sometimes draws explicit parallels with modern society, exhorting the reader to notice similarities with the contemporary PR industry. I strongly recommend this book to students of Cicero and the late Roman republic, as well as to anyone interested in the shaping of the public self.

Damian Pierzak
Institute of Literary Studies, University of Silesia in Katowice
damian.pierzak@us.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-4140-842X

ORANGE FOUR, GREEN AND YELLOW FIFTEEN: TWO COMMENTARIES ON TACITUS' *ANNALS* FROM CAMBRIDGE

The Annals of Tacitus, Book 4. Edited with a Commentary by A.J. WOODMAN, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 58), XXII + 349 pp., ISBN 978-1-108-41963-1, £84.99.

Tacitus, Annals, Book XV. Edited by Rhiannon ASH, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018 (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), XVI + 368 pp., ISBN 978-1-107-00978-3, £77.00 (hb.) / ISBN 978-0-521-26939-1, £24.99 (pb.).

The Cambridge “orange” series, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries (= CCTC), was inaugurated in 1965, and seven years later the first Tacitus volume was published, namely F.R.D. GOODYEAR's *Annals 1.1–54* (as CCTC 15)¹. So far, up to October 2021, out of the 63 volumes which appeared in this series, as many as six are on Tacitus, including three which are either authored or co-authored by Anthony John WOODMAN (henceforth AJW), a scholar whose contribution to Tacitean studies over the past five decades is unquestionably enormous². Thus Tacitus fares here much better than, say, Sophocles and Euripides (three volumes each, including the spurious *Rhesus*), or, on the Roman side, Ovid and Seneca (one and two volumes respectively, including the *Octavia*) – not to mention his fellow historians Sallust and Livy, who have not found their way to the series at all. Only Cicero, who has twelve volumes, is better represented than Tacitus, but this is mainly due to the multi-volume edition of Cicero's letters to Atticus by D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY.

CCTC's younger and – at least in principle – less ambitious sister, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (= CGLC), commonly referred to as the “green and yellow series”, has so far produced some 130 commentaries, six of which are on Tacitus, including two by Rhiannon ASH (henceforth RA)³. Interestingly, the first Tacitus volume published in CGLC was *Annals, Book IV* by

¹ For an illuminating discussion of the series, see R. GIBSON, *Fifty Shades of Orange. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries*, in: C.S. KRAUS, C. STRAY (eds.), *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre*, Oxford 2015, pp. 346–375. GOODYEAR was a pupil of C.O. BRINK, the founder of the series; his first contribution to it was the *Aetna* (CCTC 2, 1965).

² His first publication on Tacitus appeared almost 50 years ago (*Remarks on the Structure and Content of Tacitus, Annals 4.57–67*, CQ XXII 1972, pp. 150–158) – thus in the same year as (his Cambridge teacher) GOODYEAR's *Annals 1.1–54*. For AJW's contribution to Tacitean scholarship, see esp. (apart from five commentary volumes) *Tacitus Reviewed*, Oxford 1998, and *From Poetry to History: Selected Papers*, Oxford 2012; cf. C.S. KRAUS, J. MARINCOLA, C. PELLING (eds.), *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman*, Oxford 2011. The Tacitus volumes in the “orange” series include, apart from AJW's three volumes (on which more below), GOODYEAR's *Annals 1.1–54* as well as *Annals 1.55–81* and *Annals 2* (1981) and Simon MALLOCH's *Annals 11* (2013). Salvador BARTERA's *Annals 16* (originally a PhD dissertation supervised by AJW) has recently been submitted for the “orange” series. Also AJW's two Velleius volumes in CCTC should be mentioned (1977 and 1983); on the sad fortune of the former one, see GIBSON, *Fifty Shades...* (n. 1), p. 358, n. 48.

³ This series has also been discussed by R. GIBSON: *Fifty Years of Green and Yellow: The Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Series 1970–2020*, in: S. HARRISON, C. PELLING (eds.), *Classical Scholarship and Its History. From the Renaissance to the Present. Essays in Honour of Christopher Stray*, Berlin–Boston 2021, pp. 175–217.

R.H. MARTIN and AJW (1989)⁴. The latter returned after almost thirty years (and MARTIN's death in 2008) to the same book and wrote a new commentary for the "orange" series, thus establishing a precedent of the same ancient text being edited and commented *both* in CCTC and CGLC by the same scholar⁵. Of course, as AJW says in the preface to the "orange" edition, "[t]he present book should be read on the assumption that its contents are more or less entirely new" (p. X; we shall come back to this issue later).

GOODYEAR's original plan was to publish a commentary on *Annals* I–VI in four volumes, which he hoped "to complete within about ten years"⁶; his two "orange" volumes were in fact published as the first two instalments of the project. His premature death in 1987 (he was fifty-one) shattered this plan⁷, but the project as such has been taken over by AJW and R.H. MARTIN, who published in 1996 *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 3*, as volume 32 of the CCTC series, and dedicated it "To the memory of Frank Goodyear"⁸. More than two decades later, AJW added his commentary on what remains from Book V and on Book VI (2017, CCTC 55); with the publication of the volume under review the first hexad of the *Annals* has finally been covered and the project initiated by GOODYEAR more than forty-five years earlier has come to its successful conclusion.

The year 1972 saw the publication of GOODYEAR's first volume, but also that of another full-scale Tacitus commentary, Kenneth WELLESLEY's *The Histories, Book III*. Until then, the English-speaking readership had at their disposal only shorter commentaries to individual books of Tacitus' major works, such as Norma P. MILLER's *Annals I* (1959)⁹. They might be useful and reliable, but they were mainly addressed to less advanced audience – sixth-formers and undergraduates. Now the situation has changed completely. There are only a few books of both the *Histories* and the *Annals* that still lack a major commentary – and even these gaps are likely to be filled in a few years (for *Ann.* XIV and XVI, see above, notes 4 and 2 respectively)¹⁰.

⁴ Others are, in chronological order, the *Dialogus* by Ronald MAYER (2001), *Histories, Book I* by Cynthia DAMON (2003; see my review in *Gnomon* LXXVII 2005, pp. 418–421), *Histories, Book II* by RA (2007; see my review in *Gnomon* LXXXII 2010, pp. 324–329), the *Agricola* by AJW, with contributions from C.S. KRAUS (2014), as well as RA's volume under review. Christopher WHITTON's *Annals, Book XIV* is forthcoming. Since the publication of *Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus' Histories*, London 1999, RA has established herself as an expert in Tacitean historiography; see also R. ASH (ed.), *Tacitus*, Oxford 2012 (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies).

⁵ Cf. GIBSON, *Fifty Shades...* (n. 1), p. 348, n. 8: "Whether through accident or design, actual reduplication of coverage between the two CUP commentary series is rare" (adducing Sophocles' *Electra* by J.H. KELLs [CGLC] and by P.J. FINGLASS [CCTC] as the only example).

⁶ The quotation is from his preface to the 1972 volume (p. VII).

⁷ "Alcoholism ravaged his last years", says H.D. JOCELYN, *Gnomon* LX 1988, p. 763. He was one of the most brilliant Latin scholars of his generation; his commentary on *Annals* I–II will remain indispensable to students of Tacitus for many years to come.

⁸ It was the first commentary on Tacitus that took into account the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre* (the inscription, with an extensive commentary, was published by W. ECK, A. CABALLOS and F. FERNÁNDEZ in the same year).

⁹ The situation with the *opera minora* was better (Alfred GUDEMAN's *Dialogus* of 1894; J.G.C. ANDERSON's *Germania* of 1938; R.M. OGILVIE's and I. RICHMOND's *Agricola* of 1967).

¹⁰ I do not count here the historical commentaries on *Hist.* I and II (1979) and *Hist.* IV and V (1985) by G.E.F. CHILVER. For an important distinction between historical and historiographical commentaries on ancient historians (Tacitus in particular), see R. ASH, *Between Scylla and Charybdis? Historiographical Commentaries on Latin Historians*, in: R.K. GIBSON, C. SHUTTLEWORTH (eds.), *The Classical Commentary. Histories, Practices, Theory*, Leiden 2002, pp. 269–294.

The two commentaries under review here, that by AJW on *Ann.* IV and that by RA on *Ann.* XV, share many similarities, but they also (inevitably) differ in a number of ways. Perhaps the most important difference lies in their respective treatment of textual matters¹¹. AJW has produced his own text with critical apparatus, including a number of significant departures from HEUBNER's Teubner (which may be viewed as today's standard text) – and a number of his own emendations. Moreover, textual problems are given ample treatment in the commentary. RA, too, occasionally departs from the vulgate, but she does not propose conjectures of her own and her text lacks an apparatus¹². Textual issues are raised in her commentary, but they do not play as important a role as they do in AJW¹³.

AJW's textual choices include putting a lacuna after *favoris* at **12, 1** (his own proposal; cf. p. 116: "There is a seemingly unnoticed problem of logic here"); reading *ferax scelerum* instead of *ferox* at **12, 2** (HARTMAN; cf. S.J. HARRISON, CQ XLIV 1994, pp. 557–559); emending *actitando* to *factitando* at **21, 3** (AJW, comparing *Hist.* II 10, 1: "delationes factitaverat", etc.); supplying <*pater*> before *praeparatur* at **28, 1** (MARTIN & AJW); adopting KIESSLING's¹⁴ *conflata* and excising [*haud*] (MADVIG) at **33, 1** (cf. p. 179 for a thorough discussion of this difficult passage); reading "sic, converso statu neque alia <*fiducia*> rerum quam si unus imperitet" at **33, 2** (AJW; a much debated passage, cf. LIPSIUS' "neque alia re Rom<ana>" and BRINGMANN's "neque alia rerum <*salute*>"); inserting <*adnotatum*> between *tum* and *quod* at **33, 4** (AJW; cf. p. 184: "there seems to be no parallel for *tum quod* in the sense of *adde quod* or *accedit quod*"); deleting [*externi reges aut*] at **35, 5** (AJW; cf. p. 204: "There are three reasons for believing that T. did not write this concluding sentence as it is found in M"; the trouble with this proposal is, however, that there is no explanation of how this insertion could have occurred); supplying <*ad*> before *te* in the words "illi magistatus et primores qui te invitum perrumpunt" at **40, 5** (AJW; cf. pp. 222–223 where he frankly admits that "this intransitive use + *ad* is not found elsewhere in T." – which is why I am rather sceptical about this emendation: Tacitus uses *perrumpere* elsewhere 23x, always transitively); reading *inculti* instead of the transmitted *incultu* at **46, 1** (BEROALDUS); adopting COURTNEY's *angusto* instead of *angustum* at **47, 2** (so that now the adjective qualifies *dorso*, not *montem*); inserting *proficiscitur* after *Caesar* in "tandem Caesar in Campaniam" at **57, 1** (AJW, *alii alia*), a controversial passage frequently adduced (as transmitted) to illustrate Tacitus' *breviloquentia*;

¹¹ This is, of course, mainly (but not exclusively) due to the fact that the "orange" series, in contrast to the "green and yellow" one, puts much emphasis on the constitution and elucidation of a text – although in the last decades textual criticism has ceased to be as important an issue as it was in the early volumes (J.B. HALL's *De Raptu Proserpinae* from 1970 did not discuss any other matter than the text). On this, see GIBSON, *Fifty Shades...* (n. 1), pp. 361–364 (and pp. 349–350 for a comparison between CCTC and CGLC in this respect); see also n. 13 below.

¹² The only "green and yellow" Tacitus volumes which do provide an apparatus are those (co-) authored by AJW (*Ann.* IV of 1989 and *Agr.* of 2014). Thus an emphasis on textual issues in his "orange" *Ann.* IV is, obviously, also his own choice. Cf. his *Textual Notes on Tacitus' Annals*, PLLS XII 2005, pp. 321–329.

¹³ Cf. clause 6b of the 1971 guidelines for contributors to the CGLC series, which I quote after GIBSON, *Fifty Shades...* (n. 1), p. 350: "Textual criticism is a vital part of literary criticism, but must be kept in perspective. [...] textual problems should be discussed only where they are of real critical interest: i.e. when they have implications for style and content". In his CGLC chapter (*Fifty Years...* [n. 3], p. 185), GIBSON observes in this context that "[t]here is an obvious contrast here with the contemporary CUP 'orange' series, which regarded the establishment of a fresh critical text as fundamental, in the tradition of Housman".

¹⁴ In the "orange" edition this conjecture is rightly attributed to Gottlieb KIESSLING (1829). Cf. the "green and yellow" volume where it is ascribed to E. HARRISON (1923). KOESTERMANN, too, names HARRISON instead of KIESSLING in his apparatus.

emending *vultuque* to *utroque* at 59, 2 (AJW); following SHACKLETON BAILEY in reading *vindicis* instead of *iudicis* at 59, 3; separating *nominibus et molibus* with *cruces* at 67, 3 (MARTIN & AJW; cf. p. 308: “Modern editors print the transmitted text without any indication that there may be something amiss with it, yet this is one of the most challenging cruces in Book 4”); and reading <cautissime> *agens* where M has *egens* at 69, 3 (MARTIN)¹⁵.

The examples given above (and I have been selective) palpably show the extent of AJW’s editorial involvement; some emendations are his own, but he also makes ample use of textual proposals put forward by other scholars, with the time span ranging from BEROALDUS to COURTNEY. Two other areas in which he makes textual decisions should be mentioned. Firstly, he occasionally goes back to the *paradosis*, rejecting some old emendations that have been adopted in many modern editions and have thus almost acquired the status of *textus receptus*; a good example is 44, 1, where LIPSIUS replaced the transmitted *paratae* (“magnae opes innocenter paratae et modeste habitae”) with *paratae*; “there seems no justification for the change” (p. 235). At 67, 3, AJW retains *occultior* against the *occultior<es>* of WEISSENBORN, discussing the matter fully in the commentary (pp. 309–310); this is most probably right, but, on the other hand, adopting WEISSENBORN’s conjecture would produce a fine chiasmic arrangement “quanto intentus olim publicas ad curas, tanto occultior<es> in luxus et malum otium resolutus”, with a stark contrast between *publicas* and *occultiores*¹⁶. Secondly, AJW makes some important changes in punctuation, and these are sometimes combined with textual changes; see e.g. 3, 1 (a colon after *domus* and a comma after *adferebant*, coupled with the transposition of *et* after *intutum*); 7, 2 (an exclamation mark after *dicatur* and a question mark after *eset*); 8, 2 (a semicolon after *ostentaret*); 19, 3 (a full stop after *patres* and a comma after *premeretur*)¹⁷, and so on; needless to say, these alterations result from a different understanding of the text (and in particular the syntax) than that of previous editors. A subcategory in this group deserves a separate mention: several statements in Tacitus have been recognised as “mini-digressions” or “footnotes within the main text” (these designations are my own) and put in parentheses; thus 16, 2 (“a very difficult section”, admirably discussed on pp. 128–129); 19, 2 (“proprium id Tiberio fuit scelera nuper reperta priscis verbis obtegere”); 33, 1 (about the mixed constitution); 35, 1 (Cremutius Cordus on the Greeks’ *libertas/libido*); 71, 1 (“ni mihi destinatum foret...”: future fates of Titius Sabinus’ accusers). Most of these passages have already been thus separated in the CGLC volume of 1989¹⁸.

RA’s departures from the “vulgate” text¹⁹ are less numerous. To give only some examples, at 13, 2, she regards *Italico populo* (which follows *Samnitibus*) as a gloss (but did *Samnitibus* really

¹⁵ Some of AJW’s textual decisions presented above have already been made in the “green and yellow” volume (21, 3; 28, 1; 46, 1; 59, 2; 67, 3; 69, 3). At 57, 1, the editors read “in Campaniam <concessit>”, following OTTO.

¹⁶ Other examples: 41, 1 (MURETUS); 43, 4 (RITTER); 45, 3 (BEZZENBERGER); 73, 3 (LIPSIUS). Here and in the two examples adduced in the main text the scholars’ emendations are adopted by FISHER, KOESTERMANN and HEUBNER, the three editors whom I have consulted for this purpose (the only exception is 43, 4, where FISHER retains the *paradosis*). In three instances here AJW follows the decisions already made in the “green and yellow” edition (43, 4; 67, 3; 73, 3).

¹⁷ As a result, “silente reo vel, si defensionem coeptaret, non occultante cuius ira premeretur” becomes a “regular” ablative absolute placed at the beginning of a sentence and not – as so often in Tacitus – appended at the end. No discussion of this changed punctuation is offered in the commentary.

¹⁸ RA uses parentheses more sparingly, e.g. at 44, 3 (a famous statement about the *auctor nominis* of the Christian religion) or 51, 1 (a short aside on Epicharis’ attitudes). By AJW’s standards, parentheses should have been added at 34, 2 (on Vatinius) or at 42, 2 (Nero’s extravagant civil engineering project).

¹⁹ “The text printed here is based on Heubner’s 1994 Teubner text, but some spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing are different” (p. 28).

demand such an explanation? Maybe Tacitus added these two words in order to strengthen the contrast with the Parthians, who are described as “Romani imperii aemulis”); at **21, 2**, she adds <ius> after *provincialibus* to syntactically explain *ostentandi* (W.A. SCHMIDT), cf. p. 127: “The absence from the transmitted text of any ‘hook’ for the genitive gerund verges on the obscure (even for T.)”; at **41, 1**, she reads *Lu<ci>nae* on the grounds that Servius Tullius is not credited with founding Luna’s temple in Rome, whereas he is recorded as having founded that of Diana (p. 190; RA does not say who proposed this alteration; KOESTERMANN – who also has *Lucinae* and discusses the matter fully in his commentary *ad loc.* – specifies that this is the reading of the *Leidensis*); at **44, 4**, she follows GETTY in reading “correpti qui<dam> fatebantur”²⁰; at **58, 3**, she adopts WOODMAN’s “<non meri>ta ta<n>tum erga coniuratos” against FUCHS’ (followed by HEUBNER) “<non stud>ia t. e. c.”; at **63, 3**, she prints, adopting COURTNEY’s conjecture, “quae in vulgus edita eius verbis in <mea> vertere supersedeo”²¹; at **74, 1**, she puts a lacuna after *eo loci* (NIPPERDEY) and deletes [ex]; at **74, 2**, she retains the *paradosis*, assuming that “in praesens haud animadversum” immediately follows “inscripsitque Iovi Vindici” (ACIDALIUS: <id>; FUCHS: <quod>; the latter addendum seems a better reading in view of such passages as *Hist.* II 70, 2: “quae laeta in praesens mox perniciem ipsis fecere” or *Ann.* IV 31, 3: “quod aspere acceptum ad praesens mox in laudem vertit”). Some departures from HEUBNER’s text are not discussed in the commentary; this is usually the case in those passages where RA reverts to the manuscript reading (47, 1: *Neroni*; 51, 3: *senatui*; 55, 3), but cf. **49, 3** where M has “Plautiusque Lateranus consul designatus” and RA simply omits the last two words without marking this (obvious) deletion in her text or mentioning it in her commentary²².

Present-day commentators usually pay as much attention to details (textual, lexical, syntactical, historical, literary, etc.) as they do to the overall appreciation of a given text as a work of literature²³ – its purpose and message, its generic identity, its main themes or its structure. This is a highly desirable approach, because what should be expected from commentaries – especially when we are approaching them with a view to reading major portions of them, not just consulting a specific passage – is that they strike a welcome balance between analysis and synthesis. The reader should not get lost in the tangle of details, which may be totally unconnected to each other.

The volumes here under review have achieved this balance in a number of ways. Firstly, in the introductions to their respective books (RA’s more extensive introductory chapter, pp. 1–28, is wider in compass, discussing in its subchapters such issues as “*Annals* 15: Structure and Artistry”, “Parthia and Armenia”, “The Perils of *Gloria*: Corbulo and Seneca”, “Speeches, Style,

²⁰ And later in the same section she has “aut crucibus adfixi ac flammandi, ubi...” where M reads “a. c. a. aut flammandi atque ubi...” and HEUBNER follows ANDRESEN in deleting “aut flammandi atque”. Her comment *ad loc.* (p. 208), “Since M’s text is problematic [...], editors emend variously”, epitomises the difference in the approach to textual matters between the “green and yellow” and “orange” series (see nn. 11 and 13 above); in a commentary published as a CCTC volume, there would have been a full discussion of the text.

²¹ I have serious doubts about this emendation, proposed by E. COURTNEY in *Seven Passages of the Annals (and One of Manilius)*, in: KRAUS, MARINCOLA, PELLING, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 271–274. In my opinion, the problem of the transmitted text does not lie in *invertere* (despite COURTNEY), but in *eius verbis* – which seems redundant after “quae in vulgus edita” (referring to the dying Seneca’s last words). In view of this, I find J.J. HARTMAN’s conjecture, discussed and discarded by COURTNEY, highly attractive: “mihi ne umbra quidem restat dubitationis quin legendum sit: ‘meis verbis invertere supersedeo’” (*Analecta Tacitea*, Lugduni Batavorum 1905, p. 259).

²² At 13, 2 not only *pacis* but also *neque* should be put in angle brackets (cf. p. 100). Conversely, at 19, 2, since M reads *adeuntibus*, there is no need to use these brackets in *adeunt*, <ius>.

²³ Cf. the 1971 instructions to prospective contributors to the “green and yellow” series which stipulated that “the emphasis in both introduction and commentary should be on the book concerned as a work of literature”; I quote after GIBSON, *Fifty Years...* (n. 3), p. 185.

and Language”; AJW’s shorter chapter, pp. 3–12, is focused on what he identifies as a particularly important interpretive key to Book IV, namely its intertextual involvement with Sallust). Secondly, both AJW and RA provide a “bird’s eye view” on larger sections of their respective books in general introductions to these sections; their titles give an instant clue to their main purport (e.g. RA’s “Shadow-Boxing in the East: A Diplomatic Solution in Parthia” on XV 24–31, alluding to her paper of 2015; “Deviant Reconstruction” on XV 42–45, Nero’s rebuilding of Rome – or, rather, his building of the Golden House; AJW’s titles are more descriptive). Importantly, these introductions signalise themes that will be dealt with in commentaries to individual passages; thus AJW says on p. 303, characterising in general terms the section on Tiberius’ withdrawal to Capri with its remarkable description of the island, that “[t]he description can be compared point by point with the rhetorical guidelines for the *laus locorum* found in Menander”; the reader is thus alerted to numerous references to Menander Rhetor that follow (pp. 305–308). Similarly, in her introduction to “Bloodbath: Seneca’s Suicide and Other Deaths” (on XV 60–70), RA observes: “Striking too is how often in narrating the suicide [of Seneca] T. paraphrases Seneca’s writings” (p. 274); here too, more specific comments that follow provide details. Moreover, both AJW and RA pay considerable attention to the structure of Tacitean narrative, especially to its annalistic format (AJW has short but highly instructive introductions to the years covered in Book IV, namely AD 23–28: pp. 59, 132, 188, 239, 287, 312–313), but also to links between individual sections, cross-references and ring composition (e.g. AJW’s illuminating observation on p. 332: “Just as Book 4 began with Sejanus and a seduction (1–3), so it ends with Sejanus and a wedding”)²⁴. And even the carefully drawn up indexes help to get a larger view of (e.g.) literary issues raised in the commentary; AJW’s entry on “metaphors” (one of his main focuses) as well as RA’s on “metaphorical language” are particularly welcome²⁵.

Roy GIBSON in his chapter on the “orange” series makes an instructive comparison between MARTIN’s and AJW’s note on a single passage in their CGLC edition of *Annals* IV (“adeundo, appellando” at 2, 2) and their comment on a similar passage in their CCTC edition of *Annals* III (“suprema...munera fungerentur” at 2, 1)²⁶. This comparison, in fact, may be viewed as a *pars pro toto* of the fundamental difference between the two series. When we now take AJW’s new note on “adeundo, appellando” and compare it with its 1989 counterpart²⁷, we can observe the following: (1) the

²⁴ For this and other examples of ring composition in Book IV, see also pp. 9–10. Cf. AJW’s and MARTIN’s remark on the framing of *Ann.* III with two women, Agrippina and Junia (p. 11 of the 1996 commentary). Since Book III ends memorably with statues (“sed praefulgebant Cassius atque Brutus, eo ipso quod effigies eorum non visebantur”, *Ann.* III 76, 2), it is a pity that AJW does not stress in his new commentary how important a role they play in *Ann.* IV (see 2, 3; 7, 2; 15, 2; 23, 1; 35, 2; 37, 3; 38, 2; 52, 2; 64, 3; 67, 4; 74, 2). As for links between individual sections, it would have been advisable to comment on IV 16, 4 (“utque glisceret dignatio sacerdotum”) in combination with 17, 1 (*sacerdotes* and other high-ranking magistrates rebuked by Tiberius)

²⁵ Since RA, as a contributor to CGLC, is writing (also) for an audience which is less advanced in scholarly terms, she explains in her “General Index”, under individual entries, the meaning of such concepts as anacoluthon, litotes or syllepsis; this is very helpful.

²⁶ GIBSON, *Fifty Shades...* (n. 1), pp. 350–353. Since his chapter appeared before the publication of AJW’s *Annals*, Book 4, GIBSON could not compare two notes on the same passage from Book IV. But see his general assessment in the 2021 chapter (*Fifty Years...* [n. 3], p. 197): “Woodman’s recent edition of Tacitus, *Annals* IV (2018) for the latter [orange] series gives some idea of what an audience composed entirely of fellow scholars may be supposed to demand from a commentary, when compared with Woodman’s and R.H. Martin’s edition of the same Tacitean book published nearly three decades before in the green and yellow series (1989)”.

²⁷ Admittedly, not an exact counterpart, since in his “orange” volume AJW has “adeundo, appellando; simul...ipse deligere”; there is a separate note in the “green and yellow” commentary on “ipse deligere”, but it deals with a question not discussed by AJW in his 2018 edition.

2018 note consists of two paragraphs; while the first one deals with (roughly) the same issues as the 1989 note, the second much longer paragraph introduces entirely new subject matter, Tacitus' predilection for two-element asyndeton (asyndeton is mentioned in the earlier commentary, e.g. *ad* 8, 4 and 8, 5, but it is not discussed at length, as here); (2) the first paragraph of the 2018 note is organised in another way, places its accents differently (1989: "Sejanus' are the standard activities of a general immediately before a battle"; 2018: "Each of these activities is characteristic of the ideal leader"), introduces new aspects ("the sentence illustrates T.'s 'familiar trick of making something normal sound something sinister' (as Mr Seager aptly puts it)"), and cites other evidence; (3) the 1989 note presents its agenda "with admirable economy"²⁸ – which is, however, beaten in the 2018 note. The "Each of these" sentence, quoted above, continues as follows: "(see respectively 3.45.2n., Oakley on Liv. 8.39.4, and *Agr.* 19.2n.)". Since "each of these" refers to *adeundo*, *appelando* and *ipse deligere*, the reader is thus instructed to consult AJW's and MARTIN's commentary on *Ann.* III for the first idea, OAKLEY's on Livy for the second, and AJW's on the *Agricola* for the third; there is no need – it should be assumed – to discuss the matter here, since this has been done elsewhere²⁹; (4) the 2018 note's second paragraph (on two-element asyndeton) refers not only to Latin sources other than Tacitus, but also to modern authorities, namely to S. MALLOCH's commentary on *Ann.* XI, two works by J.N. ADAMS³⁰ and a German paper by E. WÖLLFLIN; while MARTIN's and AJW's commentary from 1989 does not shrink from citing scholarly literature (and, for that matter, references to it appear frequently in RA's edition; witness her vast bibliography on pp. 326–350), the extent to which literature is not only referred to but also quoted – whether in English or in other languages – and discussed in the "orange" volume is beyond comparison.

It would be still more instructive to compare "orange" and "green and yellow" notes on controversial passages – even in those instances when there has been no revision of the editor's views between 1989 and 2018³¹. Such is the case with "pluresque eius rei causas adferebat..." at 16, 2: both commentaries propose the same interpretation of this "very difficult section" (2018, p. 128), but what in the "green and yellow" volume has been dealt with relatively briefly (11 lines), now requires no less than 47 lines (plus three footnotes) to be elucidated in every detail. Needless to say, such full, elaborate discussions of difficult passages (e.g. pp. 65, 72–73, 140–141, 200, 272–273, 304–305) constitute a particularly valuable element of the "orange" volume and should be regarded as important contributions to Tacitean scholarship (even if some of the solutions proposed by AJW are perhaps open to debate).

Among many fine observations which are contained in RA's commentary, I find her subtle treatment of Tacitus' style, especially as viewed as a means to convey his message, particularly valuable. Thus, discussing Vatinius' characterisation at 34, 2, she notes: "T. combines lofty (*alumnus*) and everyday (*sutrinae tabernae*) language, aptly reflecting Vatinius' peculiar mix of power

²⁸ Thus GIBSON, *Fifty Shades...* (n. 1), p. 351.

²⁹ Cf. the last sentence of his note on 25, 3 ("infensus miles..."): "*infensus memoria* recurs only at 2.3.2 (for *infensus* see 3.15.2n.); for sing. *miles* see above, 2.1n.; for *eludentes* and 'foreign trickery' see 3.74.1n.; for the form *aduersum* see 3.14.1n." (p. 157). In his note on 17, 2 (p. 133), AJW makes no mention of *senecta* (*senecta* vs *senectus*: *Hist.*: 5/3, *Ann.* I–VI: 10/7, *Ann.* XI–XVI: 12/3); only *ad* 50, 2 (p. 250) we read: "[f]or *senecta* see 3.23.1n., Oakley on Liv. 6.8.2". Economy is, indubitably, important, but referring the reader again and again to information provided elsewhere does not make consulting this commentary an easy task.

³⁰ To which we may add now J.N. ADAMS, *Asyndeton and its Interpretation in Latin Literature. History, Patterns, Textual Criticism*, Cambridge 2021. There is a long chapter dealing with historians (pp. 544–643) in which Tacitus receives ample treatment.

³¹ For an example of such a revision, see p. 94 (and cf. 1989, p. 110). AJW, as a rule, does not acknowledge that he has revised his views (cf. p. X), but see p. 200: "In 1989 I proposed a different interpretation...".

and vulgarity” (p. 163). On the historian’s unusual opening of the narrative of AD 65 (48, 1) she says: “T., by abandoning the ablative absolute formula to open the year [...], highlights the conspiracy’s exceptional nature [...] in a typical appendix sentence: the complex subordinate clause relying the controversial material dwarfs³² the simple main clause” (p. 220). Or, commenting on Tacitus’ syntax at 55, 1, she observes: “although remarkably simple syntax conveyed the journey to the residence (*Milichus...pergit*), the elaborate procedure for gaining access to Nero (despite the urgent news) involves complex syntax, full of subordinate clauses. The main verbs *pergit* and *docet* occupying the same final position in their respective clauses sharpens this contrast” (p. 253). Similarly, she draws attention to such stylistic devices as alliteration³³, asyndeton, chiasmus or (peculiarly Tacitean) *variatio*, showing how they are employed by the historian to suit his own narrative or interpretive ends³⁴. Moreover, she gives helpful statistics about Tacitus’ word usage, also often taking into account a given word’s frequency in other authors, including those postdating the historian; the reader is thus informed about how carefully Tacitus’ lexical choices were made. Unfortunately, her data are not always completely reliable. RA usually bases her statistics on the PHI Latin database (<https://latin.packhum.org>) which, for texts later than Fronto and Gellius, is very selective. Thus, when she says that a given word is attested a certain number of times in “extant Latin”, her figures may not be accurate. Apart from Christian authors, she misses e.g. Ammianus, a historian whose debt to Tacitus, also on the lexical level, seems highly probable³⁵.

It may be supposed that an “orange” volume, because it is more “scholarly” than a “green and yellow” one, must also be relatively longer, that is to say must exhibit a higher ratio between commentary and text. This is certainly true about AJW’s 2018 edition on the one hand and his and MARTIN’s 1989 volume on the other (6.8: 1 and 4.7: 1 respectively). But RA’s “green and yellow” Tacitus beats AJW’s “orange” one in this respect (11.3: 1, one of the highest counts in the CGLC series)³⁶. Although certainly high, 6.8: 1 does not look particularly impressive for the “orange” series or, for that matter, for AJW’s other commentaries. His and MARTIN’s *Annals, Book 3* shows the commentary to text ratio as 10.5: 1 and his “green and yellow” *Agricola* comes very close to RA’s figure for her *Annals, Book XV* (11.1: 1). One of the reasons is AJW’s “admirable economy” in presenting his material (see above). Another is the “green and yellow” series’ focus on providing information, especially relating to linguistic matters, which may be helpful to less advanced classicists coping with their author; RA dutifully responds to these expectations. There

³² RA likes using this verb in such a context; cf. pp. 79, 88, 184, 191.

³³ In her note on “ceterisque [...] Cervario [...] convincendum [...] conisis” at 66, 2, she writes: “This alliterative ablative absolute captures the conspirators’ collective efforts to pursue Faenius Rufus” (p. 295, my emphases). This is most probably intentional; cf. p. 324 (“publica pecunia poneretur” translated as “should be put up by public payment”).

³⁴ AJW is less concerned with this. However, in his lemmata, using an elaborate system of underlining and italicising, he marks instances of *Lautinstrumentierung* that occur in *Ann. IV* (he does not discuss them). To his numerous examples add 10, 1 (“eorundem temporum rumorem”); 49, 1 (“fossam [...] passuum ambitu amplexus”); 51, 2 (“insignitius flagitium”); 69, 1 (“metus visus, sonitus aut forte ortae suspicionis erat”).

³⁵ A few examples: *lentitudo* appears “11x in extant Latin” (p. 234; there are more examples, e.g. *Amm. XVIII* 5, 6 or *Oros. III* 6, 1); *delenimentum* is found “22x in extant Latin” (p. 286; many more examples are listed in *ThLL V* 1, col. 432, 20–62, even though the entry is selective); “twenty-seven of thirty-six attestations [of *conservator*] are in Cic.” (p. 310; here, apart from a number of instances from Christian writers, we have many examples of this word appearing in inscriptions and referring to deities or emperors. This is relevant to the Tacitus passage [71, 1] and RA herself cites one epigraphic example in her note).

³⁶ For more statistics of this kind, see GIBSON, *Forty Years...* (n. 3), pp. 213–214. The record seems to belong to S.J. HARRISON’s commentary on Horace, *Odes III* (2017): 11.8: 1.

is no need for such information in an “orange” volume. Yet a third reason may be advanced: AJW is somewhat selective in discussing his Tacitus; in some respects he is very detailed, while other points are either only briefly indicated or not mentioned at all. It is of course a matter of dispute regarding what deserves a mention in a scholarly commentary and what should be left to readers to discover for themselves. A commentary that provides a “full service” may be counter-productive in that it is likely to deprive readers of the joy of interacting with the text on their own. This being said, I still regard some of AJW’s omissions as regrettable; a few examples may be found below (see also n. 23 above).

In order not to make this review unbearably long, I shall now give a highly selective list of comments on individual passages from the two commentaries. I shall begin with AJW.

1, 2 (p. 62): perhaps it would have been apposite to note that Sejanus’ CV begins, quite fittingly, with *genitus* and ends with *ceciditque*.

11, 2 (p. 112): commenting on “facinorum omnium repertor”, AJW refers to Verg. *Aen.* II 164 and Cic. *Vat.* 22. Cf. also *Ann.* II 30, 3: “callidus et novi iuris repertor Tiberius”, which alludes to Sall. *Hist.* IV 69, 7: “callidi et repertoires perfidiae”.

15, 1 (pp. 125–126): this narrative segment begins with Tiberius’ sorrow (“luctu Caesarem adfecit”) and ends with the senators’ joy (“laetas inter audientium adfectiones”).

19, 1 (p. 138): there is no note on “immissusque Varro consul”. A military metaphor; Varro is dispatched as though he were a squad of soldiers sent to assault the enemy (cf. *Hist.* I 68, 2; *Ann.* IV 73, 2; XIII 54, 4). Also in reference to accusers at XI 1, 1.

31, 3 (p. 170): P. Suillius condemned for having taken money *ob rem iudicandam*. A reference to XI 5–7 is strangely missing.

52, 4 (p. 260): no mention, in the context of Domitius Afer’s first recorded appearance as an orator, of his obituary in XIV 19. There is a link between these two passages: compare “divulgato ingenio” and “prosperiore eloquentiae quam *morum* fama fuit” with “ut par ingenio ita *morum* diversus”. Afer’s life, as reported in the *Annals*, is flanked on either side by *ingenium* and *mores*.

53, 1 (p. 261): “the verb [*implicari*] occurs nowhere else in T.”. But see *Germ.* 45, 6; *Hist.* III 77, 2; V 15, 1; *Ann.* I 11, 2; XI 8, 3; XII 4, 1; 47, 2.

59, 3 (p. 283): Tiberius is described as “torvus ac falsum renidens vultu”. This portrayal combines characteristics mentioned in the depiction of two notorious informers, Epirus Marcellus (*minacibus oculis*) and Vibius Crispus (*renidens*), at *Hist.* IV 43, 2. Cf. Epirus’ another appearance, at *Ann.* XVI 29, 1: “ut erat torvus ac minax”. Incidentally, “vultu diverso [...] renidens” from the *Histories* passage would be enough to reject RITTER’s proposal to delete *vultu* here (cf. p. 284). (On *renidens*, see also RA, p. 295.)

64, 1 (p. 297): according to AJW, the fire on the Mons Caelius in AD 27 “is absent from Suetonius”. But see Suet. *Tib.* 48, 1.

64, 1 (p. 297): “ni Caesar obviam isset” (in reference to Tiberius aiding the people of Rome after the fire) contrasts with his *absentia*, mentioned a line earlier. The emperor “went to meet” his subjects in the capital, but only on the level of metaphorical language.

66, 1 (p. 302): commenting on “accusatorum maior in dies et infestior vis sine levamento grassabatur”, AJW pays attention to the imagery of disease. But perhaps even more important here is the imagery of fire (the real fire on the Mons Caelius looms in the background); for *vis*, see IV 64, 3, for *grassari*, XV 40, 1; and cf. I 73, 1 where the *gravissimum exitium* of political trials and accusations is described in metaphorical terms as a fire which finally “cunctaque corripuerit”. Note that Tacitus’ next sentence at IV 66, 1 begins with *corripueratque*; for this verb used in reference to flames, see XV 38, 2 and 4. Of course, as RA reminds us, fire and disease are often combined (p. 181).

And now Book XV and RA’s commentary.

20, 3 (p. 124): Thrasea’s use of the verb *emendari* deserved a comment. Cf. *emendatio*, also in reference to Thrasea, at XIII 49, 3. Neither the verb nor the noun is used elsewhere in the *Annals*.

22, 1 (p. 129): “The unusual consensus [of the senators who approved of Thrasea’s motion] is striking after an earlier meeting of the senate where Thrasea’s *libertas* is contrasted with others’ *seruitium* (14.49.1)”. Yes, but even on that earlier occasion Thrasea’s proposal met with universal approval (“pedibus in sententiam eius iere”).

23, 2 (p. 133): “Nero’s delight is exceptional, but T. elaborates much more expansively the excessive joy stage-managed by the senate”. Additionally, note the chiasmic arrangement of material in this section: Nero’s joy (described briefly) – the senate’s joy (described at length) – the senate’s grief (at length) – Nero’s grief (briefly).

34, 2 (p. 163): RA’s comment on the presentation of Vatinius as “inter foedissima eius aulae ostenta” (*foedus* as a term of abuse in late-republican invective; “[t]here is neat inversion: Vatinius produces the show, but is himself a ‘phenomenon’ at display”) misses the quasi-religious connotations of this phrase. The adjective was regularly applied to portents, cf. Liv. XXVII 37, 6 (“foedum ac turpe prodigium”); XL 19, 1; Tac. *Hist.* III 56, 1 – and Vatinius is such a portent. The chapter began with the collapse of the Neapolitan theatre, which many people interpreted as a prodigy; it has now moved to another *ostentum*, the jester Vatinius.

50, 2 (p. 229): in RA’s comment on “speciem amicitiae” one crucial reference is missing. *Ann.* XVI 32, 3. Cf. also R. Seager, *Amicitia in Tacitus and Juvenal*, AJAH II 1977, pp. 40–50.

55, 1 (p. 254): *iussit* referring to Milichus, not to Nero. We may compare XI 35, 1 and 3 on Narcissus (of course, Nero is no Claudius). Note that in this and the next chapter Nero does not appear as an active figure; everything proceeds, as it were, behind his back. He returns to the narrative only at 57, 1.

59, 1 (p. 267): *militum* picks up *castra*, *populi* picks up *rostra*.

59, 4 (p. 270): *immotus his* may be compared to *commotus/permotus his* at I 74, 6; XI 36, 2; XII 20, 2; 41, 3; XIII 56, 1; XIV 22, 3; XV 2, 1. At XI 24, 1, Claudius is *haud permotus his*. For a similar context, see XIV 59, 1: Rubellius Plautus is encouraged by his father-in-law to bravely oppose his impending doom, “sed Plautum ea non movere”.

59, 5 (pp. 271–272): the emperor in Piso’s will. Strangely, there is no reference to *Agr.* 43, 4.

63, 2 (p. 285): commenting on “contemplatione vitae per virtutem actae” (Seneca to Paulina), RA cites Sen. *Cons. ad Marc.* 24, 4 and Tac. *Agr.* 46, 1, but she omits the crucial point that *contemplatio* is mentioned alongside *virtus* in only these three texts. In the consolatory part of his *Agricola* Tacitus referred to Seneca’s consolation; now he refers both to the *Agricola* and to the Senecan passage. He uses *contemplatio* (a philosophical term frequently found in Seneca) only here and at *Agr.* 46, 1.

69, 1 (p. 303): *conatus consulis*, i.e. Vestinus’ alleged conspiracy against Nero. “Alliteration conveys Nero’s vehemence and underscores the travesty of attacking an incumbent consul”. Cf. Catiline’s *conatus* which were thwarted by Cicero the *consul* (Cic. *Cat.* 1, 11; 2, 27; *Sull.* 51).

73, 3 (p. 320): Junius Gallio as proconsul of Achaia; strangely, there is no reference to *Ac. Ap.* 18, 12–15.

74, 3 (p. 325): “agere inter homines desierit”; cf. Nero’s pun on Claudius, “morari eum *desisse inter homines* producta prima syllaba vocabatur” (Suet. *Nero* 33, 1). Claudius was deified.

Both commentaries have been finely produced and carefully proof-read (especially the “orange” volume). With a view to future revised editions, I append a list of *corrigenda*.

AJW: p. 60: “**Fortuna**” in the lemma, but “fortuna” in the text (p. 15); p. 207: for “*memoriam sequentis aevi*” read “*sequentis aevi memoriam*”; p. 249: “**ut mos barbaris**” is separated in the lemma with commas, but in the text with brackets (p. 41); p. 253: “See also next n.” should be changed to “...next n. but one”; p. 254: “**salus**” followed by a comma in the lemma, but not in the text (p. 42); the punctuation is important here, because it affects the understanding of the sentence; p. 266: for “**diuissise**” read “**diuississe**”. On p. 247 there is a reference to “Minicioni 166–7” and on p. 313 to “Heinz 58–62”; neither is mentioned in the bibliography.

RA: p. 89: a reference to “*HA* 10.3” should be corrected; p. 105: for “*ignominiae*” read “*ignominiae*”; p. 135: for “Suet. *Cl.* 24.2” read “Suet. *Cal.* 24.2”; p. 161: for “climatic” read “climactic”;

p. 165: for “**libertas**” read “**libertos**”; p. 189: for “*Transiberina*” read “*Transtiberina*”; p. 197: a reference to Statius should be corrected to “*Silv.* 4.3.7–8”; p. 200: “*essent*” should be inserted after “*custodes*”; p. 202: for “**decorum**” read “**decorem**”; p. 222: for “*sermo comes*” read “*...comis*”; p. 224: for “*lenitudinis*” read “*lentitudinis*”; p. 236: a reference to Vergil should be corrected to “*Virg. G.* 3.46–7”; p. 276: something has gone wrong with “T. previously signalled stresses Piso’s affability”; p. 285: for “**ne aeternum**” read “**ne<u> aeternum**”; p. 292: “*varie prodidere*” should be added to the quotation from *Hist. I* (the sentence lacks a predicate); p. 296: a reference to Cicero should be corrected to “*Cic. Mil.* 89”; p. 313: for “*contract*” read “*construct*”. On p. 252 there is a reference to “Fletcher 1945”; what we find in the bibliography is “Fletcher 1964”. “Batomsky” should be corrected to “Bastomsky” (pp. 274, 291, 328).

AJW closes his introduction by quoting SYME’s verdict on *Annals*, Book IV as “the best that Tacitus ever wrote” (p. 12). But even if we award the palm of priority to this book, we should regard *Ann.* XV as coming quite close to the winner. Intriguingly, despite obvious differences between the Tiberian and the Neronian Rome as depicted in the *Annals*, these two books have a lot in common: a conspiracy (Sejanus / Piso *et consortes*), a fire (Mons Caelius / Rome), a building catastrophe (Fidenae / Naples), a brave death of a tortured prisoner who does not reveal his/her accomplices (an anonymous Spaniard / Epicharis), a righteous senator’s intervention in the senate (Lepidus / Thrasea), the subservience of Roman elite, strongly emphasised towards the end of the book (IV 74 / XV 74), and allusions to future events, concentrated in the last chapter(s) (IV 74, 5 and 75 / XV 74, 2 and 3). Obviously, Sejanus dominates the narrative in *Ann.* IV to a far greater degree than Corbulo or Seneca do in *Ann.* XV (not to mention the miserable Piso) – but the latter book also contains many memorable portraits and scenes. These are splendid books, and they certainly deserved detailed, accurate, learned and insightful commentaries. Such as those discussed in this review.

Jakub Pigoń
Institute of Classical, Mediterranean and Oriental Studies
University of Wrocław
jakub.pigon@uwr.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-9272-7490

Paul J. BURTON, *Roman Imperialism*, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2019 (Brill Research Perspectives in Ancient History), S. 114, ISBN 978-90-04-40462-5, €70.00.

Das zu rezensierende Buch von Paul J. BURTON (= B.), eine synthetische Darstellung des römischen Imperialismus, führt den seit mehr als hundert Jahren stattfindenden Diskurs über das Charakteristische an der Außenpolitik des antiken Roms fort. In seinen Erörterungen setzt sich B. hauptsächlich mit Diskussionsbeiträgen aus dem nordamerikanischen Wissenschaftlerkreis, jedenfalls aber mit dem Standpunkt der englischsprachigen Forscher auseinander. Sein Interesse gilt insbesondere dem in den 80er Jahren des 20. Jhs. begonnenen und bis heute andauernden Diskurs. Das Werk umfasst 114 Seiten und besteht aus fünf Kapiteln.

Das erste Kapitel („Introduction“, S. 1–9) bietet einen Überblick über den bisherigen geschichtswissenschaftlichen Diskurs zur römischen Eroberungspolitik. Zunächst wird die von Tenney FRANK vorgenommene erste systematische Analyse dieser Problematik (*Roman Imperialism*, New York 1914) unter die Lupe genommen. Anschließend stellt B. die Thesen anderer im 20. Jh. tätigen Forscher des römischen Imperialismus vor (die damalige Geschichtsschreibung neigte überwiegend zur Theorie des defensiven Imperialismus). Dieses Revue endet mit dem 1979 erschienenen Werk des britischen Forschers W.V. HARRIS (*War and Imperialism in Republican Rome*, Oxford 1979), wobei auch die in den 80er Jahren vorgebrachten Entgegnungen auf HARRIS' Thesen (A.N. SHERWIN-WHITE, J. NORTH, E. GRUEN) zusammenfasst werden. Im selben Kapitel finden wir außerdem einen kurzen Überblick über die antiken Quellen zum römischen Imperialismus (S. 7–8).

Das zweite Kapitel („Imperialism“, S. 10–17) beginnt mit einer Definition des Hauptbegriffs, um dann zur Geschichte des Diskurses über die neuzeitliche Theorie des Imperialismus überzugehen. Als Erstes analysiert B. die Auffassungen John HOBSONs, die von diesem in der monumentalen Studie aus dem Jahre 1902 zu den politisch-wirtschaftlichen Aspekten des römischen Imperialismus (*Imperialism: A Study*, London 1902) dargelegt sind, und zum Schluss betrachtet er die Auffassungen der Forscher aus dem 20. Jh. Dabei spricht sich B. für die Definition Michael W. DOYLES aus, wonach: „Imperialism is simply the process or policy of establishing or maintaining an empire“. Zum Charakter jenes Prozesses meint DOYLE: „It can be achieved by force, by political collaboration, by economic, social, or cultural dependence“ (M.W. DOYLE, *Empires*, Ithaca 1986, S. 45). Und das Imperium an sich sieht er als „a system of interaction [formal or informal] between two political entities, one of which, the dominant metropole, exerts political control over the internal and external policy – the effective sovereignty – of the other, the subordinate periphery“ (S. 12). Das so definierte Forschungswerkzeug sei, so B., optimal für die Untersuchung der Eroberungspolitik Roms.

Am Anfang des mit „Roman Imperialism“ (S. 18–72) betitelten dritten Kapitels unterzieht B. den römischen Imperialismus einer Bewertung. Die Frage „Did the Romans have an empire, in Doyle's terms?“ wird von ihm bejaht (S. 18). Zu Recht bemerkt er, dass es in Diskussionen und Forschungen zu den imperialistischen Aktivitäten Roms stets am schwierigsten sei, Folgendes zu klären: „did the Romans covet an international empire, and how aggressively did they pursue it?“ (S. 19). Um diese Frage zu beantworten, prüft er antike Quellen auf die Einstellung ihrer Verfasser zu dem von Rom aufgebauten Reich hin. Im zweiten Unterkapitel (S. 39–73) wird die Titelfrage nicht mehr – wie im ersten Unterkapitel – aus der Perspektive antiker Geschichtsschreiber, sondern aus dem Blickpunkt gegenwärtiger Historiker betrachtet. Ausgegangen wird hier von der These William HARRIS' (*War and Imperialism...*), der auf die außenpolitischen Motivationen der Römer einen metrozentrischen Maßstab anlegen wollte. Anschließend erörtert B. den in der Geschichtsschreibung durch HARRIS' These hervorgerufenen Diskurs.

Das nächste, vierte Kapitel („The Diversification of the Field“, S. 73–92) ist weiterhin den modernen Forschungsergebnissen gewidmet. B. beleuchtet hier die römische Imperialismusfrage

zunächst metrozentrisch (die Aggression sei von Rom initiiert worden), dann perizentrisch (die Aggression sei von der nichtrömischen Seite ausgegangen), schließlich systembetont (und eben diese Perspektive wird vom Verfasser bevorzugt). B. konzentriert sich auf die Zeit der Mittleren Republik und die Anfänge des Prinzipats. Die beiden Kapitel (das 3. und 4.) sind für B.s Ausführungen am relevantesten. Im fünften Kapitel dagegen (S. 93–104) werden die Betrachtungen der vorigen Kapitel zusammengefasst. Der Verfasser bietet hier seine eigene Sicht auf das Wesen des römischen Imperialismus. Entscheidende Faktoren, die den Imperialismus der Römer hervorgebracht haben sollen, erblickt B. in Bedrohungen von außen, und was die römische Eroberungspolitik gefestigt habe, sei eine „combination of a coercive protection regime of warlord clans over a vulnerable population, individual major victories (especially over the Latin League in 338), accompanied by a massive expansion in the Roman manpower and resource base, and the expansionary momentum of the Italian alliance system“ (S. 94) gewesen. Im Hinblick auf die hinter dem römischen Imperialismus stehenden Ursachen und Motive zeigt sich B. von der These eines defensiven Imperialismus nicht überzeugt. Die Beziehungen der Römer mit der Außenwelt seien durch militärische Assertivität, nicht durch Aggressivität, geprägt gewesen.

B. zeigt aber zu diesem Thema auch künftige Forschungsaussichten. In der Zusammenfassung (S. 104) meint er: „Determining the precise extent to which unit-level versus system-level factors, and discourse versus system realities shaped Roman imperial behavior over the centuries, is the task of future research“. Es lohne sich zu überlegen, was zuerst dagewesen sei: der römische Expansionismus oder das römische „social ethos“ der Expansion. Zu beachten seien archäologische Funde als eine Überlieferungsquelle von hohem Forschungspotenzial. Die Problematik rund um das Staatsgrenzen-Verteidigungssystem müsse holistisch angegangen werden. Und es seien Forschungen vonnöten, aus denen man endlich eine Antwort auf die ewige Frage nach den Ursachen der Erfolge Roms erhalten könnte.

B.s Studie bedient einen bestehenden Forschungsbedarf und ist in Bezug auf die unterschiedlichen Konzepte rund um den römischen Imperialismus hochaktuell. Durch redaktionelle und konzeptuelle Erfordernisse der Publikationsreihe ist dieses Werk, obwohl es sich einem so intensiv diskutierten Problem widmet, vom Umfang her eingeschränkt. Deswegen stellt das zu rezensierende Buch, wegen der zwingend einzuhaltenden Regeln der ganzen Fachserie, keine detaillierte Zusammenschau sämtlicher Forscheransichten dar, sondern eben eine synthetische Studie, deren Verfasser die ausgewählten, repräsentativsten Forschungsstandpunkte bespricht. Schade, dass sich B. in seiner Analyse der bisherigen Imperialismus-Forschung auf den englischsprachigen Wissenschaftlerkreis beschränkt. Diese Entscheidung begründet er zwar gleich am Anfang damit, dass er selber dieses Milieu vertrete, sowie mit der Tatsache, dass die – nach seiner Meinung – wichtigsten Beiträge zu diesem Thema innerhalb der letzten vierzig Jahre eben in englischer Sprache entstanden seien. Doch man darf sich hier wohl mehr wünschen, denn die Forschungen zum Imperialismus, besonders zu seinen vielfachen Aspekten, werden ja in mehreren Sprachen betrieben und veröffentlicht und tragen so zum Diskurs und zu unserem aktuellen Wissensstand mit neuen Denkanstößen bei.

Der kleine Publikationsumfang, um noch einmal auf ihn zurückzukommen, gereicht dem Buch indessen definitiv zum Vorteil. Es liegt hier nämlich eine synthetische, ansprechende und kritische Studie des römischen Imperialismus vor, die dem Leser die wichtigsten Ansätze des bisherigen und gegenwärtigen Diskurses über den Charakter und das Wesen des römischen Imperialismus näherbringt. Trotz des bescheidenen Buchumfangs ist es B. darin gelungen, nicht nur die eigene Auffassung zu präsentieren, sondern auch – was man ihm hoch anrechnen muss – Wegweiser für die künftige Erforschung der Titelfrage aufgestellt. Ein derart breites und so viele Aspekte in sich bergendes Thema, wie das des römischen Imperialismus, synthetisch heranzugehen, erscheint als schwierige und anspruchsvolle Aufgabe. Solche Veröffentlichungen sind ja gezwungen, die meisten Aspekte allgemeiner zu behandeln, als man sich vielleicht wünschen würde. Dies ist jedoch vollkommen verständlich. Das besonders Wertvolle an B.s Werk besteht darin, dass es nicht nur den Diskursverlauf lebhaft und dynamisch abbildet, sondern auch verschiedene in diesem Diskurs

vorhandene theoretische Ansätze berücksichtigt. Dadurch erblicken wir den Forschungsgegenstand – d. h. Roms Außenpolitik und Imperialismus – aus verschiedenen Perspektiven. Somit ist es ein wertvoller Beitrag zum heutigen Wissensstand. B.s Buch verfolgt nicht das Ziel, eine erschöpfende Studie zum römischen Imperialismus vorzulegen, weil das Thema allzu komplex und aspektenreich ist. Darauf macht der Verfasser übrigens selbst aufmerksam im Schlussabsatz des Buches, wo er die künftig einzuschlagenden Forschungsrichtungen aufzeigt und dabei den quantitativen wie qualitativen Reichtum an offenen Forschungsfragen einerseits und an möglichen Beantwortungswegen andererseits präsentiert.

Katarzyna Balbuza
Adam-Mickiewicz-Universität, Poznań
balbuza@amu.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-3105-3792

Francesco BERARDI, *La retorica degli esercizi preparatori: glossario ragionato dei Progymnasmata*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2017 (Spudasmata, vol. 172), 343 pp., ISBN 978-3-487-15595-1, €58.00.

The interest in *progymnasmata*, elementary exercises in the composition of minor rhetorical forms and genres, has been steadily increasing over the last decade¹. In 2011, the term *progymnasmata* appeared in titles of only three papers presented during the 18th Biennial Conference of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric (ISHR)². In 2015, during the ISHR 20th Biennial Conference, there were already thirteen papers³ and one separate session dedicated to *progymnasmata* or similar school exercises in rhetoric and two years later, during the ISHR 21st Biennial Conference, there were two sessions dedicated only to *progymnasmata* in the 16th and 17th centuries and the term itself came up in a dozen of papers. In 2018, an international conference devoted exclusively to *progymnasmata* took place in Paris (“Les *progymnasmata* en pratique de l’antiquité à nos jours”).

The latest research on *progymnasmata* was initiated by an edition of the earliest surviving textbook of Greek prose composition by Aelius Theon. Michel PATILLON, the editor of this work, as well as of textbooks by Pseudo-Hermogenes and Aphthonius’ *Progymnasmata*⁴, claimed in 1997 that “the interest in the *progymnasmata* manuals cannot be overstated”. This sentence in its original French „[o]n ne saurait exagérer l’intérêt des traités de *progymnasmata*”⁵ opens a “Prefazione” by Maria Silvana CELENTANO to Francesco BERARDI’s *La retorica degli esercizi preparatori* (p. 7). Prof. CELENTANO recommends this glossary as a valuable tool (“un prezioso strumento di lavoro”) for those who want to read textbooks of *progymnasmata*, as well as for those who are interested in classical rhetoric and its influence on the writing of literary texts (p. 9). However, the question can be raised whether only this one type of composition exercises needs a separate glossary. And BERARDI (henceforth B.) answers this question in the chapter entitled “Perché un glossario ragionato dei Προγυμνάσματα” (pp. 15–25).

After this, he describes briefly the structure of exercises and other *progymnasmatic* terms discussed in the book (pp. 27–28). Each is presented according to the following scheme: (1) designation and definition of the exercise (“denominazione e definizione dell’esercizio”), (2) taxonomy (“tassonomia”), i.e. what is the place of a given *progymnasma* in the study process, (3) an internal division into types and/or subcategories (“classificazione”), (4) its elaboration (“elaborazione”), (5) disposition of the argumentation (“disposizione”), (6) style (“stile”) and the rhetorical purpose

¹ The development of studies on this topic (including editions and translation) up to 2006 is presented by M. KRAUS, *Progymnasmata, Gymnasmata*, in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. VII, Tübingen 2005, pp. 159–190, and up to 2008 also by B.B. AWIANOWICZ, *Progymnasmata w teorii i praktyce szkoły humanistycznej od końca XV do połowy XVIII wieku*, Toruń 2008, pp. 18–27.

² In 2013 Francesco BERARDI was one of the ISHR Research Fellowship Recipients.

³ Including BERARDI’s paper *I Progymnasmata come libri di cultura*.

⁴ M. PATILLON, Hermogène: *L’art rhétorique. Exercices préparatoires, États de cause, Invention, Catégories stylistiques, Méthode de l’habileté*. Traduction française intégrale, introduction et notes par... , Paris 1997; IDEM, *Corpus rhetoricum*. Anonyme: *Préambule à rhétorique*; Aphthonios: *Progymnasmata*, en annexe: Pseudo-Hermogène: *Progymnasmata*. Textes établis et traduits par... , Paris 2008.

⁵ See PATILLON, Hermogène... (n. 4), p. 42.

(“finalità retorica”) of the exercise. Such an arrangement is logical and transparent and it organises the glossary very well.

The last chapter that precedes the *glossario* is dedicated to ancient and Byzantine progymnastic sources (“le fonti progimnastiche”: pp. 31–38). B. begins here with the famous passage from the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (1436a 25) where the term προγύμνασμα appeared for the first time, but he does not mention that many scholars consider the sentence ἀναλαμβάνειν αὐτὰς κατὰ τὰ προγυμνάσματα in this passage to be a later interpolation⁶. The greatest advantage of this chapter is an extensive presentation of direct and indirect papyrus sources and testimonies of the rhetoric exercises in composition. Then, B. discusses, very shortly, collections of model exercises from the late imperial and Byzantine periods and, finally, the manuals of *Progymnasmata* by Theon, Pseudo-Hermogenes, Aphthonius and Nicolaus of Myra. These manuals are the main sources of our knowledge about ancient preliminary exercises, and therefore it would have been appropriate to devote to them more space, paying more attention to their development and changes over the centuries. It should be noted, however, that the author refers often to books by KENNEDY (2003) and PATILLON (2008) that discuss the topic in a greater detail.

The glossary itself (pp. 41–295) contains the following progymnastic terms arranged alphabetically by their Greek names: ἀκρόασις (*auditio*, “audizione”, “listening”), ἀμφιβολία (*ambiguitas*, “ambiguità”, “ambiguity”), ἀνάγνωσις (*lectio*, “lettura”, “reading”) – all three as *progymnasmata* present only in works by Theon and Quintilian, then: ἀνασκευή (*refutatio*, “confutazione”, “refutation”), ἀντίρρησις (*antirrhexis*, “contraddittorio”, “contradiction”), ἀπαγγελία (*expositio*, “esposizione”, “restatement”)⁷, γνώμη (*sententia*, “sentenza”, “maxim”), διαίρεσις (*partitio* or *divisio*, “disposizione degli argomenti”, “division”), διατύπωσις or ὑποτύπωσις (*diatyposis* or *descriptio*, “ipotesi”, “hypotyposis”), διήγημα or διήγησις (*narratio*, “narrazione”, “narration”), ἐγκώμιον (*laus*, “encomio”, “praise”), εἰδωλοποιία (*simulacri fictio*, “personificazione”, “apparition-making”), εἰκών (*imago*, “immagine”, “image”[sic!]⁸), εἰσφορά νόμου or νόμος (*legis latio*, “presentazione di legge”, “introduction of a law”), ἔκφρασις (*descriptio*, “descrizione”, “ecphrasis”)⁹, ἑλληνισμός (*Latinitas*, “purezza della lingua”, “Hellenism”), ἐνάργεια (*evidentia* or *praesentia*, “evidenza”, “vividness”), ἐπιφώνημα or ἐπιφώνησις (*epiphonema*, “epifonema”, “comment / moral”), ἐργασία or ἐξεργασία (*operatio*, “elaborazione”, “elaboration”), ἡθοποιία (*allocutio*, “etopea”, “ethopoeia”), θέσις (*thesis* or *positio*, “tesi”, “thesis”), κατασκευή (*confirmatio*, “dimostrazione”, “confirmation”), κεφάλαιον (*capitulum*, “punto di sviluppo”, “heading”), κλίσις (*flexio*, “flessione”, “inflection”), κοινὸς τόπος (*locus communis*, “luogo comune”, “common-place”), μῦθος (*fabula*, “favola”, “fable”), παράφρασις (*paraphrasis*, “parafrasi”, “paraphrase”)¹¹, περίστασις (*circumstantia*, “circostanza del discorso”, “circumstance”), πιθανότης (*probabilitas*, “credibilità”, “persuasiveness”), πρέπον (*decorum*, “decoro”, “appropriateness”),

⁶ See also p. 229 of the reviewed book. For a discussion about the possible interpolation, see especially M. FUHRMANN, *Anaximenes: Ars rhetorica, quae vulgo fertur Aristotelis ad Alexandrum*, München–Leipzig 2000, *app. crit. ad loc.*; AWIANOWICZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 29 f.; KRAUS, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp.

⁷ Both present in the manuals by Theon and by Nicolaus only.

⁸ An untypical exercise, proposed by Fronto to the young Marcus Aurelius, not present in canonical manuals of *progymnasmata*. English translation by B. is improper here; “image” is a verb, so it should be replaced by “image” or “picture”.

⁹ B. (p. 117) has a wrong accent: εἰσφορά.

¹⁰ The term “description” is more common in English translations and English literature on *progymnasmata*.

¹¹ An exercise known especially from Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria*; cf. Theon’s ἀπαγγελία (p. 218 in B.’s book).

προγυμνάσματα / γυμνάσματα (*praeexercitamina*, “*esercizi preparatori*”, “preliminary exercises”), προσωποποιία (*conformatio*, “*prosopopea*”, “personification”), σαφήνεια (*perspicuitas*, “*chiarezza*”, “clarity”), σύγκρισις (*comparatio*, “*parallelo*” or “*confronto*”, “comparison”), συντομία (*brevitas*, “*brevità*”, “brevity”), υπόθεσις (*causa* or *suppositio*, “*discorso oratorio*”, “hypothesis”)¹², φαντασία (*phantasia* or *imaginatio*, “*fantasia*”, “imagination”) and χρεία (*chria* or *usus*, “*aneddoto*”, “*chria*”). Accordingly, B. presents different categories in alphabetical order: ancient preliminary exercises, their elements (κεφάλαια), virtues of style discussed especially in the context of the narration (ἐλληνισμός, πρέπον, σαφήνεια and συντομία), as well as the term προγυμνάσματα / γυμνάσματα itself.

The glossary arranged as presented above is undoubtedly helpful, but especially for those who are already familiar with the structure and history of ancient *progymnasmata* and especially of the most important manuals by Theon and Aphthonius. Useful are also two indices: *Index locorum* (pp. 321–333) and *Index verborum rhetoricorum* (pp. 335–343). In short, I can agree with Rodolfo GONZÁLEZ EQUIHUA, an author of the review of B.’s glossary in “*Rhetorica. A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*” (XXXVII 2019, pp. 85–87), that “solvo las matizaciones indicadas¹³, el glosario constituye una aportación altamente significativa en el panorama de los estudios de la retórica escolar y un instrumento valioso para el análisis histórico-crítico, literario y contextual de la literatura clásica”.

Bartosz Awianowicz

Chair of Classical Philology, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

Bartosz.Awianowicz@umk.pl

OCID: 0000-0001-7380-2272

¹² Once again an exercise attested only in Quintilian and Theon.

¹³ Although I noted some other shortcomings of the book.

Peter Franz MITTAG, *Römische Medaillons*, vol. II: *Antoninus Pius*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2019, 207 pp. + 108 tables, ISBN 978-3-515-12429-4, €56.00.

2019 was a year of great importance for all scholars and collectors interested in ancient Roman imperial coins and medallions of the second century AD, because two long-awaited books appeared. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. II, part 3: *From AD 117 to 138: Hadrian*, the standard reference work for coins of that period, was published by Spink and Son Ltd¹, and *Römische Medaillons*, vol. II: *Antoninus Pius* was published by Franz Steiner Verlag. What the two publications have in common is the long period of time that has elapsed since previous volumes have appeared: a second fully revised and expanded edition of *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. II, part 1: *From AD 69 to 96: Vespasian to Domitian* by I.A. CARRADICE and T.V. BUTTREY was published in 2007² and *Römische Medaillons. Caesar bis Hadrian* in 2010³ (second edition in 2012). The second feature that connects these two books of 2019 is the person of Peter Franz MITTAG, who is the author of a section on medallions in the *RIC* II 3 and the two volumes of *Römische Medaillons*.

MITTAG (henceforth M.) mentions in the foreword to his new book that he originally did not intend to go beyond the reign of Hadrian, but the positive response to the publication of his *Römische Medaillons* encouraged him to prepare a similar volume on medallions of Antoninus Pius (p. 7). An outstanding example of the positive reception of the publication dedicated to the period from Julius Caesar to Hadrian is a review by Cristian GAZDAC who writes that M.'s first book on medallions "is an excellent update to the works by F. Gneecchi, *I medaglioni romani* (1912), P.L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zu römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts, Teil II. Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Hadrian* (1933) and J. Toynbee, *Roman Medallions* (1944)"⁴. The same can be written about *Römische Medaillons*, vol. II: *Antoninus Pius*, only the book by Paul STRACK should be replaced by his *Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Antoninus Pius* (1937).

While the first volume of *Römische Medaillons* opens with M.'s theoretical discourse on the term 'medallion' and the difference between 'coinage', 'medal' and 'medallion' (pp. 11–22), in the introduction to the second volume (pp. 9–13), the German numismatist discusses medallions in the context of the emperors' private lives and he claims that such little pieces of art "die (auch) an persönliche Freunde des Kaisers verteilt wurden" (p. 13) can be regarded as sources for some aspects of "personal parts" ("persönliche Seiten") of "the good emperors". The intimate character of the Antonine medallions is also emphasised in the detailed analyses of many types discussed in the next three chapters which are dedicated to the chronology ("Datierung") and historical order ("Historische Einordnung") of medallions of Antoninus Pius (pp. 14–62), of his wife Faustina I (pp. 63–73) and those issued during his reign for young Marcus Aurelius (pp. 74–85) and Faustina II (pp. 86–89). M. connects, for instance, the medallion with Aesculapius on the reverse (no. 25 in the catalogue) with Faustina I's disease shortly before her death in autumn 140 AD (pp. 25–26), while Aesculapius-Eschmūn (young deity with long hair, without a beard, but with Aesculapius' serpent-entwined wand) or Apollo Medicus on the reverse of the medallion minted for Marcus Aurelius in 147 AD (no. 232) is linked here with his daughter and granddaughter of Pius, Domitia

¹ R.A. ABDY, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. II, part 3: *From AD 117 to 138: Hadrian*. With a section on medallions by P.F. MITTAG, London 2019.

² I.A. CARRADICE, T.V. BUTTREY, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. II, part 1. 2nd fully revised edn., London 2007.

³ P.F. MITTAG, *Römische Medaillons. Caesar bis Hadrian*, Stuttgart 2010.

⁴ C. GAZDAC, *CR* LXII 2012, p. 254.

Faustina, who fell ill shortly after her birth (p. 78). This interpretation is supported by sculptures of children discovered in the temple of Eschmûn (Eshmun), but it can be confusing, because according to the older literature⁵ Domitia Faustina was not the first, but the third child of the imperial couple and she was born not earlier than 149 AD, and their first daughter, named Annia Galeria Aurelia Faustina, was born in 146, while in 147 a son was born. The study of medallions struck for Aurelius and Faustina II, carried in minute detail, shows how their conjugal joy (types with Bacchus and Ariadne) was intertwined with an anxiety for their children's health (types with Aesculapius and Salus).

The main chapter of the book by M. is the catalogue ("Katalog": pp. 90–180) of 286 types of medallions. All of them are presented in a chronological order and very well described. It should be emphasised that the German numismatist tries to find all specimens of a certain type, both kept in museum collections and put out for auctions, and he verifies older reference books, when he notes, for example, "non vidi" in the description of a Vienna specimen of the type 86, that appeared in GNECCHI's *I medaglioni romani* (p. 118). The catalogue is completed with the chapter "Nicht in den Katalog aufgenommene Stücke" (pp. 181–184), where M. lists all types noted by BANTI, GNECCHI, STRACK and TOYNBEE that he excluded because they are either coins without the abbreviation SC or (early) modern cast copies. The catalogue chapters are followed by the *addenda* and *corrigenda* to the earlier *Römische Medaillons. Caesar bis Hadrian* (pp. 185–186), concordance tables between the old classifications by GNECCHI and STRACK and M.'s newest catalogue (pp. 187–189) and Antonine medallion dies links ("Stempelkopplungen": pp. 190–191). M. also gives us a comprehensive bibliography (pp. 192–200) and useful indices of people, places and things (pp. 201–204), as well as of reverse legends (pp. 205–207). The book ends with 108 plates of high-quality black-and-white photographs depicting not only almost all main types, but often also several specimens of the same type from various collections.

Bernhard WEISSER has emphasised in his review of *Römische Medaillons. Caesar bis Hadrian* that M.'s book is "ein eindruckliches Zeugnis jahrelanger Recherche in Museen, aber auch in schwer zugänglichen Privatsammlungen und im Münzhandel"⁶. His *Römische Medaillons*, vol. II: *Antoninus Pius* is characterised by the same thorough and extensive research and I can recommend it as the most important reference book of all medallions produced during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161). I am looking forward for the appearance of a section on medallions by Peter Franz MITTAG in a future new, revised edition of volume III 1 of *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, devoted to this emperor.

Bartosz Awianowicz

Chair of Classical Philology, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

Bartosz.Awianowicz@umk.pl

OCID: 0000-0001-7380-2272

⁵ See e.g. A. STEIN, *Domitia Faustina*, *RE* V 1 (1903), col. 1511.

⁶ B. WEISSER, *BJ* CCXII 2012, p. 490.

RECONSTRUCTING THE ANCIENT LATIN CLASSROOM*

Eleanor DICKEY, *Learning Latin the Ancient Way. Latin Textbooks from the Ancient World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016, XII + 187 pp., ISBN 978-1-107-47457-4, £18.99.

Eleanor DICKEY, *Learn Latin from the Romans. A Complete Introductory Course Using Textbooks from the Roman Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018, XVII + 512 pp., ISBN 978-1-107-14084-4, £24.99.

It is well known that ancient Romans learned Greek – a fact amply attested in ancient sources and thoroughly studied for a long time. On the other hand, the idea that Greek speaking inhabitants of the Mediterranean took effort to learn Latin is much less conspicuous, especially for non-specialists. An important contribution to the history of teaching and learning Latin as a second language in antiquity was made by Eleanor DICKEY (henceforth: D.) in 2012 and 2015 when she published her excellent edition¹, including translation and commentary, of the so-called *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* – a fascinating collection of ancient dialogues and phrasebooks, dating from anywhere between 1st and 5th century AD, which were widely used by non-Romans (mainly native speakers of Greek) who wanted to learn Latin² – the language of public life in the Roman Empire, including administration, jurisdiction, and the military. The *Hermeneumata* turned out to be so convenient and effective as learning material that they ended up being used throughout the Middle Ages into the early Renaissance – a success which their original authors never even imagined.

In the 15th–16th century the *Hermeneumata* were replaced by various *Colloquia Scholastica* composed by many Latin teachers³ such as Maturinus Corderius, Laurentius Corvinus, Ioannes Ludovicus Vives, Petrus Mosellanus, Iacobus Pontanus, or – last but not least – Erasmus himself, who elevated this humble didactic genre from simple schoolbooks to a fully fledged literary masterpiece. These new *Colloquia* corresponded much better to the circumstances and conditions of learning Latin at that time, and therefore the ancient *Hermeneumata* became obsolete and largely forgotten⁴.

* I am indebted to Luke Amadeus RANIERI (www.youtube.com/user/ScorpioMartianus) for reviewing the English of this paper.

¹ *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*. Vol. I: *Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani*. Vol. II: *Colloquium Harleianum, Colloquium Montepessulanum, Colloquium Celtis, and fragments*, edited with translation and commentary by E. DICKEY, Cambridge 2012–2015.

² The oldest sections of the *Hermeneumata* were originally composed for Romans learning Greek. On the complex origin of the collection, see the introduction to D.'s edition (esp. pp. 52 and 96), supplemented by her paper *The Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana in the Greek East*, *Linguarum Varietas* VI 2017, pp. 211–229.

³ A convenient list of names and titles, as well as links to full-text electronic resources are available at stoa.org, currently only accessible through the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine (web.archive.org/web/20190405153208/http://www.stoa.org/colloquia), but hopefully soon to be restored to a stable server. Some of these dialogues are also available as audio recordings made by the students of the University of Kentucky.

⁴ One notable exception is Hans H. ØRBERG's school edition of the Latin text of eleven dialogues from the *Hermeneumata* in the 2004 booklet *Sermones Romani*, which is a part of his *Lingua Latina*

Brought back to light by D.'s edition, the *Hermeneumata* contributed to renewed interest in ancient teaching methods as such, and in the history of teaching Latin as a second language in particular. For D. herself the edition constituted a starting point for a series of "spin-off" books placed within the *Hermeneumata* universe, two of which are the subject of this review article⁵.

The first book in the order of publication, *Learning Latin the Ancient Way*, offers a selection from the *Hermeneumata* and other ancient didactic materials, such as *Sententiae Hadriani* and other legal texts, model letters, annotated passages from classical authors (chapter 2), Dositheus' and Charisius' grammars (chapter 3), glossaries (chapter 4) and transliterations (chapter 7). The layout preserves the two columns of the original, but Greek translations have been replaced with English ones. Two exceptions are: chapter 8, meant for readers acquainted with both languages, where the Greek text is given next to Latin just as it was in the original, and chapter 9, where we are shown some examples of texts, both in Latin and in Greek, edited according to ancient standards, i.e. without word division, punctuation and capitalisation. Each section and each of the selected passages is preceded by a short introduction providing cultural and educational context. Chapter 10, "Overview of the ancient Latin-learning materials", contains a complete list of published sources that have survived from the ancient times, both papyri and in manuscript, each with a short description and estimated dating. The introductory chapter 1 provides a very accessible presentation of the original target groups of these didactic resources and the history of their transmission from antiquity to modern times.

The book is very well researched – as can be expected from the author with such great expertise on the subject – thoughtfully arranged, and extremely interesting. As far as I am aware, the presented sources are not part of any standard curriculum in Classics, and therefore many of them are unknown to anyone who does not specialise in the history of ancient education. D. gave us – and by "us" I mean academic teachers of ancient languages – a chance to directly access a new category of authentic Latin (and Greek) texts, completely different from what we are normally used to. *Learning Latin the Ancient Way*, concise (not even 200 pages) and yet comprehensive, is a prêt-à-porter textbook for a 30-hours course on "Education in Ancient Greece and Rome", or similar. It can also be safely assigned to students as an enlightening independent reading⁶.

That being said, I cannot but point out several thoughts that kept bothering me as I was reading *Learning Latin the Ancient Way* – and trying to use it with my students. In her introduction D. says that the book's intention is "to show modern Latin teachers and Latin students how ancient Latin learning was conducted, by making the ancient materials accessible to modern readers in a format that allows them to be used as they were originally intended to be used" (p. XI) and "to make it possible for those who wish to do so to recreate the ancient Latin-learning experience,

per se illustrata series. Most important studies on the *Hermeneumata* are conveniently selected in D.'s open-access article *The Ideal Child Does not Play: Insights from Europe's Oldest Children's Book*, Pallas CXIV 2020, p. 85–94, n. 2 (available at academia.edu).

⁵ The third one is D.'s wonderful *Stories of Daily Life from the Roman World. Extracts from the Ancient Colloquia* (Cambridge 2017). The book's title does not give justice to its content: it is not simply a selection of translated passages, but a full scale introduction to everyday life in ancient Rome, illustrated by the author herself, and appropriate for readers with little or no previous knowledge of ancient Greek and Roman culture. It is not only an interesting read, but can be a very valuable resource to teachers of ancient languages and cultures. It is not, however, connected to the topic of teaching Latin as L2, and therefore I excluded it from this analysis. A Dutch translation is available (Amsterdam 2017), with more languages hopefully to follow.

⁶ As a teaser I suggest sending students a link to *Latin Classes during the Roman Empire*, D.'s guest post at latinitium.com, 28 November 2017, or to her lecture *Naked From the Knees Up – Ancient Latin Textbooks Rediscovered* (The Roman Society in London, 8 November 2016, www.youtube.com/watch?v=0909NqMwxXI).

by presenting the ancient materials in a format that enables modern students to use them as the ancient students did” (p. 8). Such statements, however, do not give justice to the fact that written materials form only a very meagre part of what normally counts as language learning experience, regardless of the language in question. What is more, written materials are not even necessary to learn a language at all – the best example is the way each of us mastered our native language(s) when we could not yet read or write, and the same experience can be repeated with any other language we acquire later in life. Of course, a textbook, a grammar, a word-list, a paradigm, or a translation can be very helpful⁷, but the function of written materials for L2 acquisition is only auxiliary. This is true now and was true in antiquity, in the Middle Ages, and in the Renaissance⁸, for such is the nature of human brain: the most straightforward way to successfully learn a new language is through immersion and interaction. Latin had been taught this way for more than two thousand years: the so-called grammar-translation method, even though it is commonly referred to as the “traditional” one, is in fact only a short episode in the long history of teaching Latin as L2, a distinctive trend that started no more than three hundred years ago⁹. Modern language teachers also briefly experimented with similar methods, but have already renounced them as very ineffective – and a similar development can be currently observed in the teaching of ancient languages¹⁰, even though in natural circumstances they are not normally spoken any more.

In trying to recreate ancient (or mediaeval, or 16th-century, for that matter) experience of learning Latin as a foreign language, it is important to remember that such a process took place in an at least partially bilingual, or sometimes even mostly L2-monolingual environment. The learner’s world was full of people speaking and shouting, singing and whispering in the language he was learning. The teacher could be a native speaker of Latin, or at least possessed very advanced communicative skills in the language of the Romans¹¹. And – what seems to be the most important factor – the student’s goal was primarily to be able to communicate with Roman merchants, soldiers

⁷ They can indeed be used with much success especially if the learner already has some background knowledge of grammar and relations between languages, or when he or she is naturally aware of linguistic phenomena – some people, myself included, simply *like* to analyse how languages work, or prefer written forms of communication to oral ones. Such individual propensities do not change the academic consensus that humans are neurologically wired to acquire languages by hearing.

⁸ I am not trying to say that teaching *techniques* remained the same throughout centuries, but it is certain that from the Roman times to the 17th–18th century the main *objective* of learning Latin remained unchanged: to be able to communicate with other people, both orally and in writing; also, the learners had many opportunities for immersion (not to mention that the language used in classroom was Latin). “There is evidence that the teaching of grammar and translation has occurred in language instruction through the ages; but the regular combination of grammar rules with translation became popular only in the late eighteenth century” (C.A. BONILLA CARVAJAL, “Grammar-Translation” *Method. A Linguistic Historic Error of Perspective: Origins, Dynamics and Inconsistencies*, Praxis & Saber IV 2013, p. 247).

⁹ See also BONILLA CARVAJAL, *op. cit.* (n. 8), who analyses “the reductionist assumptions and popular beliefs” concerning the GT approach and argues convincingly – while by no means trying to defend its effectiveness – that it was never even proposed as a “method” and as such should not have been subject to the harsh criticism it has received.

¹⁰ See M.E. LLOYD, S. HUNT (eds.), *Communicative Approaches for Ancient Languages*, London 2021.

¹¹ Cf. the statement by Quintilian who actually *warns* parents against making their children speak only in L2 for too many years, because this might result in a foreign accent contaminating their native language (*Inst.* I 13). The context here is opposite: Roman children learning Greek, but the point remains.

and magistrates, not only to understand Latin texts¹². Considering these circumstances – and I am not even mentioning the relative scarcity of writing materials or general levels of literacy – it is reasonable to assume that in the ancient times the main component of L2 acquisition was the oral-aural one, whereas reading, writing, conscious memorising and understanding the rules of grammar were only supplementary¹³.

Therefore, if we really want to learn Latin “the ancient way”, as the title of D.’s book promises, we should first of all start, in my opinion, by recreating the *Latin speaking* environment. It is excellent that we now have a collection of ancient learning materials at our disposal, but their main value still seems to be in bringing us closer to some aspects of everyday life in ancient Greece and Rome, rather than in reconstructing the linguistic atmosphere of a 2nd century classroom. If we really want to feel what a Greek teenager felt when he was learning Latin, we should try and have conversations in Latin – starting with basic expressions, everyday topics¹⁴ and recent events, moving on to various levels of literature, and eventually to serious matters of law, politics or philosophy. Such an approach would not only mean learning Latin “the ancient way”, but also the way Latin was taught throughout the history of Western civilisation up until the 17th or 18th century¹⁵. And it is already happening¹⁶.

D.’s second book, *Learn Latin from the Romans*, subtitled *A Complete Introductory Course Using Textbooks from the Roman Empire*, is indeed a complete introductory course. However, a quick look at the table of contents is enough to reveal that it is a very well structured textbook of Latin *grammar* rather than Latin *language* as such. Each chapter presents one or more specific grammar categories (1: “Verbs: Inflection and Word Order”, 2: “Nouns: Nominative, Vocative, and Accusative of First and Second Declensions”, 3: “Adjectives: Gender, Agreement, Neuters, and Vocabulary Format”, 4: “Tenses: Future, Perfect, and Principal Parts”, *etc.*, ending with 56: “Relative Clauses with the Subjunctive, Participle Overview”, 57: “Ablative Absolute”, 60–61: “Gerunds”) which are explained in a very comprehensible way. The intended target group are L1 English speaking students with little or no background knowledge of grammar in general – examples are given both in Latin and in English and comparisons are often drawn between the two

¹² D. is, of course, perfectly aware of these educational goals (see p. 2 of her “Introduction”), but they do not seem to be reflected in the way she pictures the teaching process.

¹³ Or, as BONILLA CARVAJAL put it, “classroom, as well as independent study, compensated what cannot be seen now in the texts” (*op. cit.* [n. 8], p. 248).

¹⁴ When I say “everyday topics” I do not mean forcing students to focus on learning Latin names for all possible modern objects. There is much more to discuss in Latin using classical vocabulary than it is usually assumed. A great example are the 16th-century *Colloquia Scholastica* – most of them are perfectly classical in their lexical choices. I hope that modern yet altogether idiomatic *Colloquia universitaria* can be published one day (cf. www.youtube.com/watch?v=oZ2JP3m5f_0).

¹⁵ See J.C. RICHARDS, T.S. RODGERS, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, New York 2014, esp. pp. 4 ff., with necessary criticism by BONILLA CARVAJAL, *op. cit.* (n. 8). Interestingly, the strong aversion against translation in modern L2 teaching has been fading away in the last decade; it is enough to compare the entries on “(Foreign) Language teaching” in the 2nd and 3rd editions of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (ed. by M. BAKER, G. SALDANHA, Abingdon–New York 2008, pp. 112 ff. and 2020, pp. 271 ff., respectively) to notice that the “monolingual bias” has been recently renounced. The 2020 version of the entry was entirely re-written and now quotes studies that recognise the value of translation (as one of many different teaching techniques, of course – not as a general didactic approach). The broader context of this paradigm shift seems to be the increased interest in bilingual and multilingual education.

¹⁶ See e.g. L. MANNING, *Active Latin in the Classroom: Past, Present and Future*, in LLOYD, HUNT, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 9–16, as well as other contributions to this volume which give examples of the application of the “active” methods of teaching Latin and Ancient Greek all over the world.

languages. A good balance is kept between attention to detail and conciseness. The explanations are very pleasant to read, even entertaining – a feature rarely present in grammar textbooks. It is evident that the book is a result of thousands of hours of lessons given by a passionate teacher – it makes the reader want to enroll to one of D.’s classes. Each theoretical section is followed by “Practice”, which consists of identifying grammatical forms, declining and conjugating, and translating to and from Latin¹⁷.

Some sections are not committed directly to grammar, but to “Reading practice”. The selection of texts is very interesting and non-standard. Apart from some adapted material from the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (43 passages) the reader is exposed to Martial (27 passages), graffiti and inscriptions (23 passages), Cicero (16 passages, mostly from his *Letters*), several selections from Plautus, Terence, Catullus, Virgil, Vitruvius, Livy, Apicius, Augustine, and the Vulgate, as well as one papyrus letter. The beginning of Caesar’s *De bello Gallico* is also included – as it should be in every decent textbook. Each text is accompanied by a short introduction and a running vocabulary.

Sometimes – not too often – the smooth progression of the material is interrupted by a “Vocabulary to learn” section – a well-chosen list of the most important words that the student should commit to memory.

Audio recordings of the contents of the book – not only Latin passages and exercises, but also the English text and the vocabulary lists! – have been prepared by the author herself and are available at the publisher’s website¹⁸.

All the above characteristics make the book perfect for self-study, and it has been indeed used this way, as can be seen from many positive customer reviews online. The same reviews, however, deplore the fact that no answer key to the exercises is provided – a shortcoming that can be easily eliminated by the publisher. But even without the answer key, as a classroom textbook for a grammar-oriented course, or in the context of homeschooling with a parent or teacher who knows enough Latin, *Learn Latin from the Romans* will surely satisfy its intended users: “students who have a certain intellectual maturity and want to understand fully everything they learn, but who do not necessarily have any background knowledge of grammar or of the ancient world” and those who “need to have a firm grasp of [...] essentials to avoid fear and confusion” (p. XII). The book is a friendly and accessible yet exhaustive and reliable guide through the intricacies of the Latin grammar system – “so that those who like to understand things can feel confident rather than confused” (*ibid.*).

What it is not, however, is a way “to enable today’s students to learn Latin using the ancient materials” (*ibid.*). First of all, as I mentioned before, D.’s textbook teaches mostly *about* Latin and about Latin grammar, but does not facilitate the acquisition of the competences necessary to master a language: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. Analysing the grammatical structure of an L2 passage is not “reading”. Recordings provided online are most welcome, but they seem to serve mainly to familiarise the students with the correct pronunciation and do not involve any real “listening comprehension” practice. Translating from L1 into L2 can be a very useful exercise, but it does not mean “writing” in the sense of “Latin composition”. The last skill, “speaking”, is not taken into account at all¹⁹.

¹⁷ The amount of exercises may seem intimidating, but – as D. herself explains in the introduction – they should not be treated as obligatory (p. XIII).

¹⁸ The first 111 pages have been recorded so far and can be downloaded from www.cambridge.org/highereducation.

¹⁹ With the exception of a short description of the activities of modern Latin speakers in the introduction (p. 2), although the concluding statement that “today’s neo-Latin enthusiasts can easily discuss computers and aeroplanes in Latin” seems to perpetuate the harmful and often ridiculed stereotype of a Latin speaker not interested in classical literature and serious philology.

I am not trying to say that Latin teachers and Latin textbooks should blindly imitate all the practices common in modern language pedagogy – especially since our main goal is different from that of modern language teachers: we strive to enable our students to *understand* Latin texts, and not necessarily to speak Latin fluently²⁰. But the question remains: is the title *Learn Latin...* appropriate for a book in which Latin material (paradigms and exercises included) does not even constitute ¼ of the content? To be sure, this concern can be applied not only to D.'s book, which otherwise has its undeniable merits, but in general to the notorious post-Enlightenment habit of saying "Latin" where one should actually say "Latin grammar". My criticism here is triggered mainly by frustrated expectations: knowing that the source material for D.'s textbook comes from the *Hermeneumata* – dialogues on everyday topics (!), which I have successfully used before as supplementary material in my Latin-speaking classroom (see above, n. 4), I was certain that in *Learn Latin from the Romans* the communicative approach would be taken into account at least to a certain extent.

Which brings me to another important point: *...from the Romans*. This phrase made me ask myself several questions:

1. From *whom* do we ever learn Latin, if not from the Romans? Since literary Latin in its form used in the 1st century BC and 1st century AD became the fixed standard for all subsequent generations²¹, everyone who learnt Latin did it in the context of a specific canon of texts composed by an elite group of Roman writers. Even if sometimes simpler didactic texts were published, such as the Renaissance *Colloquia*, or – in our times – Ørberg's *Familia Romana*, and even D.'s own "modern sentences", as she calls them (p. XIII) – they all strive to reproduce the "classical" or "golden" variant of Latin, once used in the times of Augustus. Since Latin became immortal and unchangeable, the date of composition and the nationality of the author does not matter to the learner – as long as the text is idiomatic²². And even if the author diverges from the classical standard, the

²⁰ I prefer to say "understanding" rather than "reading", because in the history of ancient language teaching the word "to read" changed its meaning and is too often used in the sense "to analyse the grammatical forms and lexical choices of the original text in order to mentally create a working translation in L1". "Understanding", on the other hand, is what happens when I read a text and instantly, intuitively grasp its basic meaning. Structural analysis can be helpful if the passage is particularly difficult, or if I want to make sure that I interpreted it correctly, but it should not be confused with "reading". I believe that understanding Latin texts is a perfectly achievable objective of teaching Latin in a modern classroom, just as it was for the previous generations of those who learned Latin as L2, but still were able to fully participate in the Republic of Letters. Another question, which I cannot answer in this short footnote, is whether understanding texts in L2 is a skill that can be acquired without ever speaking the language, and – even if the answer is positive – to what extent, as well as whether it is not at least helpful to use spoken language in order to facilitate the understanding of written material.

²¹ For this topic I cannot recommend enough the excellent socio-linguistic study by J. LEONHARDT, *Latin. Story of a World Language*, Cambridge–London 2013. Even in the case of the so-called "Mediaeval Latin" LEONHARDT argues that such a variant should not be distinguished as a separate form of Latin: the best mediaeval writers were perfectly able to write Ciceronian Latin; the others were not as well educated, or simply did not care, and in the end some mistakes became pervasive within the mediaeval literary community. However, the typically mediaeval ways of speaking have never completely replaced the classical forms or prevented them from being understood (which would be a clear sign of language evolution). Even in the Middle Ages the teachers were still the ancient Romans, only the students were more rebellious.

²² I do not take into account lexical development, which can be interpreted as only reflecting changes in the surrounding world, not as a process within the language itself. When new words are introduced, language *expands* and covers more of the existing reality, but its structure remains the same.

readers – if they are competent enough – will be able to correct him according to the Golden Age canon. Ultimately, the Romans are our only teachers.

2. What does it mean that a Latin text is “authentic”? In the context of the 2,000 years of Latin literature, what are the criteria of authenticity? D. says that in her textbook she included many “authentic” passages from the *Hermeneumata* and more than 5,000 “modern sentences” composed by herself. Are her exercises not “authentic” just because she is not an ancient Roman native-speaker of Latin, or because they were written with a didactic purpose in mind? I do not believe so – such a notion would bring us dangerously close to depriving not only Ørberg, Foster or Tunberg, but also Erasmus, Pontanus and Vives of the right to be unreservedly called “Latin writers”²³. D.’s 5,000 sentences do not need to be called “modern” – their author is a 21st century Latinist, but their language is ancient and “authentic” – i.e. based on the *authority* of Cicero *et consortes*. On the other hand, D. provides the learner with the excerpts from the *Hermeneumata*. Are they still “authentic” if – even though they were written by native or near-native speakers of (some variant of) Latin – they could only be included in a Latin textbook after their grammar and spelling had been revised to match classical standards? To me, D.’s own “*agricolae verba mea non legunt*” (p. 27) is more real and more Roman than “*possumne accipere meam pecuniam, quam mihi tam diu debes?*” (p. 77), adapted by her from *Colloquium Harleianum* 23c: “*nondum possum accipere meum quod mihi debes tanto tempore?*”, where post-classical phrases have been replaced with the standard, eternal Latin.

My conclusions after reading these two books are the following: the *Hermeneumata* are a wonderful collection of texts and we should be grateful to Professor Eleanor DICKEY for bringing them back into the spotlight. As a professional classicist, I still prefer her 2012–2015 edition with its comprehensive commentary and all the Greek, but I will happily recommend the more lightweight *Learning Latin the Ancient Way* to my students, with the hope that they are as excited as I was when they read every page of it.

As for *Learn Latin from the Romans*, the selection of original passages – especially the inscriptions and Martial’s epigrams – presented in the textbook is inspiring and I will surely include some of them in my teaching. The *Hermeneumata*, in my opinion, could be better saved for advanced students, who can then read them in their original form with the task of identifying and “correcting” all the non-classical forms. The theoretical sections of the textbook will be very useful in my work with international groups of students, especially with those who feel the need to understand *everything* before they continue with new material. I would also love to watch a series of video recordings of Professor DICKEY herself explaining each concept to real students – I am sure that many Latin learners and teachers would find it highly interesting.

Katarzyna Ochman

Institute of Classical, Mediterranean and Oriental Studies

University of Wrocław

katarzyna.ochman@uw.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0003-1554-1531

²³ The hypothesis that Ørberg is a true and original Latin author deserves a separate study, with a full analysis of the entire *Familia Romana* universe.

Tino LICHT (ed.), Walahfrid Strabo: *De imagine Tetrici. Das Standbild des Russigen Dietrich*. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert von..., Heidelberg: Mattes Verlag, 2020 (Reichenauer Texte und Bilder 16), 132 pp., ISBN 978-3-86809-164-9, €12.80.

This inconspicuous little book is a fine example of a carefully executed edition of a mediaeval text.

The author of this text, Walahfridus Strabo, was a Benedictine monk born in Germany in 808 or 809. He was educated at the monastery on the island of Reichenau, then continued his studies at Fulda. He became abbot of the monastery at Reichenau in 838 and died on August 16, 849.

Strabo is the author of several works. Besides his theological treatises, such as *Glossa ordinaria*, *Expositio quattuor Evangeliarum* or *De rebus ecclesiasticis*, he also wrote historical texts (e.g. *Vita sancti Galli*) and some poems. Probably the best known of his poems is *De cultura hororum*. Another of his poetic works, *De imagine Tetrici*, was recently edited by Tino LICHT (= L.) and published by the Heidelberg publishing house, Mattes Verlag, as the 16th volume of the series "Reichenauer Texte und Bilder".

De imagine Tetrici is a very unusual and intriguing poem that deserves the scholarly interest it generates. It has survived in only one manuscript, St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 869, on folios 143–163. The codex dates from about 900 and was made in the St. Gallen scriptorium. It contains several poems by Walahfrid as well as some other texts. It is a valuable witness, especially for Strabo's *carmina minora*. An important feature of this manuscript is that some poems have been interrupted by the introduction of other material. This is the case of *De imagine Tetrici*: on folios 153–156 we find interpolated poems: *De libro Machabeorum priore* and *De sancto Gallo*, as well as two poems by Bede the Venerable.

The author of the latest edition of *De imagine Tetrici* describes the manuscript and also all the previous editions; this is done in order to provide justification for his own work. Indeed, one may wonder why prepare another edition of Walahfrid's poem when the previous one is only 30 years old. As L. points out, this previous edition, by Michael HERREN, deviated from the manuscript basis. "The above-mentioned insertions in the St. Gallen manuscript caused Herren to redistribute the parts of the poem in a different order so that all verses from 128–238 are in a new place". This decision was, in L.'s opinion, unjustified and did nothing to improve the text of the poem. As for the older editions, they all contain some errors and misinterpretations. Heinrich CANISIUS, who published the *editio princeps* of the poem in the sixth volume of *Lectiones antiquae* in 1604, closely followed the St. Gallen manuscript, with all the interpolations. The editor of the *MGH*, Ernst DÜMMLER (1884), also mistakenly considered a portion of Bede's work as part of *De imagine Tetrici*. The edition by Alois DÄNTL (1930) provides the text which, for prosodic reasons, is not correct in some places. His edition, however, presents the first complete German translation of the poem.

His own edition, as L. explains, adheres closely to the manuscript but excludes the poems inserted on folios 153–156. L. has also decided to include in the critical apparatus not only the *marginalia* preserved in the manuscript, but also the conjectures of all previous editors in order to allow readers to appreciate different approaches to the task of editing a mediaeval text. As a result, we receive a carefully prepared scholarly edition of one of the most intriguing poems from the 9th century.

A poem which is not what it at first sight seems to be. Its real subject is not the *imago Tetrici*.

The equestrian statue of the Gothic king Theodoric the Great is merely a pretext, an object that triggers a conversation between the author (Strabus) and his muse (Scintilla). The dialogue quickly turns to the king himself, his personality and his reign. However, the poet does not aim

for a panegyric of Theodoric, but describes him as a cruel tyrant. The panegyric comes later: when a procession formed by the emperor Louis the Pious, his family and his court enters the square in front of the statue. The first part of the poem now takes on its real meaning: it was a background that provided a contrast to the focal image. Moreover, the eulogy of the new emperor is formulated allegorically, comparing Louis, his wife, sons and associates to important figures from the Old Testament.

Such an unusual narrative requires analysis on more than one level, and L. provides it. After the Prologue and the first chapter describing the manuscript and previous editions, the next chapter (“Das Reiterstandbild Theodorichs des Grossen”) is devoted to the statue of Theodoric and its history. What could have been dismissed as an imaginary object from an allegorical poem actually attracts the attention of scholars, because we know of the existence of the statue from another source, the *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis* by Agnellus. Thanks to both texts, we know that an equestrian statue was brought to Aachen from Ravenna by order of Charlemagne. Since the statue has not survived, we cannot know with certainty whose representation it really was. Various proposals have been offered by scholars. However, Walahfrid was undoubtedly convinced that it represented Theodoric the Great. The question of why Charlemagne placed the statue of the Gothic king in front of his imperial palace is another point L. addresses in this chapter. The emperor’s interest in popular and vernacular traditions may provide the answer.

The next two chapters are devoted to literary analysis. The first of them, entitled “Literarisches”, deals with the question of the literary genre to which *De imagine Tetrici* might belong. Some scholars have associated the form of poetic dialogue with the bucolic, but other features of Walahfrid’s work undermine this theory. L. compares the antithetical composition of *De imagine Tetrici* to the *Psychomachia* by Prudentius. He provides a detailed analysis of all the passages in the poem that can be seen as allusions to the *Psychomachia*. He also discusses numerous allegories that refer to biblical figures and events. Another work that influenced Strabo (as already noted by Ludwig TRAUBE) is Lucretius’ *De rerum natura*. All references and quotations from Prudentius, Lucretius, the Bible and other works (Ovid, Virgil, patristic literature, etc.) are marked in the edition and discussed in the Commentary that follows.

The next chapter, “Metrik, Sprache und Stil” contains an examination of Walahfrid’s language and poetic style. Here, L. reveals the sources of inspiration and the models Strabo used to compose his work. The final chapter of the first part of the book is devoted to the historical and political context of *De imagine*. It may indeed seem strange that Walahfrid, while intending to praise Louis the Pious and his reign, chose to contrast it with the reign of Theodoric, whose statue was placed in Aachen by Louis’ father. Although the poet does not criticise Charlemagne himself, he allows for the idea that Louis is a better ruler. As L. points out, Louis’ reign was one of change rather than continuation. By reintroducing the practice of travelling with the royal court, he had already broken with Charlemagne’s project to establish the imperial capital at Aachen.

The first, descriptive part of the book ends with an epilogue. The second part consists of the edition of Walahfrid’s poem with critical apparatus and a German translation. It is followed by notes (the chapter entitled “Kommentar”). A very rich bibliography and three indexes (“Handschriftenregister”, “Namenregister”, and “*Initia carminum*”) conclude the book.

Overall, this latest edition of *De imagine Tetrici* is a very useful and well written work. The quality of the edition is matched by the insightful commentaries on historical and literary questions which are presented by Walahfrid Strabo’s poem.

Beata Spieralska-Kasprzyk
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
b.spieralska@uksw.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-2013-2313

Regine MAY, Stephen J. HARRISON (eds.), *Cupid and Psyche. The Reception of Apuleius' Love Story since 1600*, Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2020 (Trends in Classics – Pathways of Reception, vol. 1), 465 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-064119-6, €109.95.

The book which is the subject of this review is the proceedings of a conference which was held at Leeds in 2016, containing twenty two contributions as well as a Preface, an Introduction, and an Index. In the Introduction, the editors, Regine MAY and Stephen J. HARRISON, point out that the volume focuses on the reception of the tale of Cupid and Psyche (henceforth *C&P*) after the year 1600, since there are already valuable studies on the earlier reception¹, while there is no comprehensive study of the more recent history of *C&P* in various areas of culture.

The Introduction to the volume briefly considers a number of issues, such as the originality of Apuleius' tale (as opposed to the hypothesis that it is derived from earlier sources), its literary features or its reception up to the year 1600. The book is divided into five thematic parts, all of which touch upon not only the literary reception of *C&P*, but also cover opera, the visual arts and cinema. The first part is "Baroque and the Influence of La Fontaine" and it contains four papers on 17th century opera librettos and examples from the visual arts. The second, "Romanticism and Philosophy", consists of six papers on figures such as Mary Tighe, Thomas Taylor, John Keats, Walter Scott, Søren Kierkegaard and Robert Bridges. In the next part, "*Fin de Siècle* and Psychology", four contributions focus on literary sources, psychoanalysis and the visual arts at the turn of the 20th century. The fourth part, "Twentieth Century and Modernism", also contains four papers about three prose works (by Eudora Welty, C.S. Lewis and William Faulkner) and the poetry of Sylvia Plath. The last part is entitled "New Audiences" and touches upon a variety of culture texts: stories for children, theatre, ballet and cinema.

I will say a few words about six of the twenty two contributions. Stephen HARRISON, one of the editors, wrote a piece entitled: "Apuleius at the Court of Louis XIV. *Psyché* (1671, 1678) and its English Version (1675)". He begins by pointing out that all those versions of the tale were based on La Fontaine's 1669 prose version, which made it *en vogue* in the 1670s in France. HARRISON compares the way the story was used in the 1671 *tragicomédie et ballet*, which was co-written by Molière, Pierre Corneille and Philippe Quinault, with musical interludes by Jean-Baptiste Lully (who was soon to become the main figure in baroque French opera, working in tandem with Quinault). HARRISON analyses the differences between the version by Molière et co. and a later adaptation of the tale in the 1678 *tragédie lyrique* composed by Lully to the libretto written by Thomas Corneille (the brother of Pierre) and the philosopher and essayist Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle. Examples of these differences are the disappearance or absence of the wicked sisters or the pre-marital pregnancy. In between these two versions there is an English adaptation, written by Thomas Shadwell in 1675. HARRISON shows the relationship between the theatrical versions and Apuleius' original novel, and he writes, quite interestingly, about their use of classical sources other than Apuleius. The socio-political context for all these adaptations is also treated, for example with the celebrations of peace in the two French plays (alluding to Louis XIV's ending of the wars with Spain and with Holland) and the religious and military motifs in Shadwell's version (the conflict between Protestants and Catholics and the war against Holland).

¹ R.H.F. CARVER, *The Protean Ass. The Metamorphoses of Apuleius from Antiquity to Renaissance*, Oxford 2007; J.H. GAISSER, *The Fortunes of Apuleius and the Golden Ass*, Princeton 2008.

The paper by Robert H.F. CARVER ("The Platonic Ass: Thomas Taylor's *Cupid and Psyche* in Context (1795–1822)"), an author of the book on the reception of *C&P* from antiquity to the Renaissance, is a very fine treatment of Thomas Taylor's translation of the tale in question. CARVER begins by giving a brief report on the presence of *C&P* in England before Taylor and provides some context for Taylor himself, a passionate Platonist who was mocked by his contemporaries as a religious eccentric and considered ignorant in classical languages, but who was, surprisingly, highly praised by Ralph Waldo Emerson during his meeting with Wordsworth. CARVER analyses Taylor's allegorical interpretation of *C&P* as well as his translation of the tale. He shows that the latter was dependent on an earlier translation by Gildon (first published in 1708) and underlines Taylor's strange attempts at rendering Latin words with their English etymological descendants whenever possible, producing such *curiosa* as "poisoned serpent" (*uenenati serpenti*) with his "various volumes" (*multinodis uoluminibus*).

Regine MAY, also an editor of the volume, wrote a very good piece on the presence of *C&P* in John Keats' poetry ("Keats's 'Ode to Psyche'. Psyche as Poetry and Inspiration"). MAY begins by talking about Keats' interest in and knowledge of classical languages and culture in general, and Apuleius' novel in particular. She then proceeds to analyse three poems: "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Little Hill", "Ode to Psyche" and "Ode on Melancholy". She aptly shows that Keats' engagement with Apuleius was much deeper and more sophisticated than generally assumed. A particularly interesting case is ll. 6–8 of his "Ode on Melancholy", where MAY finds not only an elaborate allusion to the Psyche/soul/butterfly motif, but also to two other places from the *Metamorphoses*, which are outside *C&P*: an owl (the bird into which the witch Pamphile transforms) and mysteries (into which Lucius is initiated at the very end).

Not all contributions are equally solid and interesting. Zacharias ANDREADAKIS writes about "Kierkegaard as a reader of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*" and as much as I found his treatment of the Danish philosopher's familiarity with classical languages and literature engaging, I am not convinced by the main point of his paper. ANDREADAKIS demonstrates the presence of *C&P* in Kierkegaard's *œuvre* (both in personal notes and in his famous works, such as *Either/Or* and *Fear and Trembling*) and points out that for Kierkegaard Psyche stands for the Christian faith as the Danish existentialist understood it. However, ANDREADAKIS attempts to show that there might be some inspiration drawn from Apuleius in Kierkegaard's highly original proto-existentialism, and specifically in his famous concept of anxiety as the awareness of the limitations of the self. ANDREADAKIS fails to show that there is such an inspiration in the first place. I do not think that the fact that Apuleius uses the word *anxius* twice, both in *C&P* and at the end of the novel, has anything to do with Kierkegaard's own thinking about anxiety. ANDREADAKIS suggests that Kierkegaard's belief that true conversion may be impossible might have been influenced by the fact that Lucius, after his conversion, is still described as *anxius*. Well, it might have been influenced or it might not have. ANDREADAKIS' final remarks that we often lack any hard evidence for literary and philosophical influence hardly strengthen the case he makes.

Geoffrey C. BENSON wrote a piece about Franz Riklin's psychoanalytical interpretation of *C&P* ("Psyche the Psychotic. *Cupid and Psyche* in Dr. Franz Riklin's *Wish Fulfilment and Symbolism in Fairy Tales*"). Riklin was a Swiss psychiatrist and a Freudian who collaborated with C.G. Jung during his early years. BENSON discusses Riklin's interpretation of *C&P* (discussed many years earlier by James GOLLNICK²), which was the first psychoanalytic reading of the Apuleian story. BENSON tries to rehabilitate Riklin and points out, in general, that classicists could benefit more from psychoanalytical readings of Apuleius. But these are two quite different claims. Riklin, with his shallow and naïve interpretation of *C&P* which was rightly criticised by GOLLNICK in his monograph, is strangely incompetent when compared to the contemporary, fascinating, albeit unorthodox

² J. GOLLNICK, *Love and the Soul: Psychological Interpretations of the Eros and Psyche Myth*, Toronto 1992, pp. 36–39.

psychoanalytical readings of literature by Sigmund FREUD himself (e.g. Wilhelm Jensen's novel *Gradiva*) or by Gustaw BYCHOWSKI (in his 1930 monograph on one of the greatest Polish Romantic poets, Juliusz Słowacki)³. Moreover, Riklin's interpretation is done in the footnotes he gives to *C&P* and even from a purely psychoanalytical point of view it is embarrassing. Riklin's "reading" should definitely remain a historical curiosity.

I will end by saying a few words about an excellent paper by Friedemann DREWS ("*Cupid & Psyche* and C.S. Lewis' *Till We Have Faces*. A Christian-Platonic Metamorphosis"), one of the best in the whole collection, if not simply the best. Lewis' *Till We Have Faces* is a work which is very difficult to read due to its complexity and allusiveness which is characteristic of Lewis' method of concealing literary and philosophical meanings in his prose works⁴. It is also almost experimental in its attempt to recreate the religious experience of listening to the myth as a "sacred story". DREWS competently discusses the relationships between the novel and Apuleius who is openly declared by Lewis to be his "source" and nothing more. It seems that Lewis' engagement with his "source" is much more sophisticated than assumed and DREWS opens a path for further study of this. In the tantalisingly short third section of his paper, he writes about structural parallels between the two novels. But the longest and most important part of his contribution is the section on ancient philosophy in *Till We Have Faces* and on Christianity in relation to that.

DREWS does a solid job in showing the Stoic sources for Orual's (the main protagonist) mentor, Fox. But the matter is not as simple as DREWS suggests, since Fox's Stoicism sounds very often much more like 19th century naturalism than the works of Seneca or Marcus Aurelius that DREWS quotes in his argument. Perhaps it is due to the limited space of the piece, but it is striking how different Fox is from, say, Marcus Aurelius, since Fox's Stoicism is quite irreligious or even antireligious, and reminds us very much of the contemporary forms of Stoicism which are increasingly popular among younger people and on the Internet. This is a Stoicism without its essential part which Anthony LONG calls the "theocratic postulate"⁵, that is, without a personal God, and that picture, in the end, is quite alien to the spirit of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*⁶. DREWS shows very convincingly, however, how this Stoicism is contrasted with Platonism in Lewis' novel. DREWS avoids (perhaps, due to his knowledge of Augustine) the mistake of opposing Platonism and Christianity in Lewis and makes a very good choice in underlining the fact that the key, distinctly Christian motif in *Till We Have Faces* is the idea of Psyche as a mediator between the gods (or God) and humans. DREWS' paper is a model example of reception studies.

All in all, the volume in question provides the reader with exactly what it promises: a panorama of how *C&P* was read, understood, felt, and used from 1600 to our times.

Mateusz Stróżyński

Institute of Classical Philology, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
monosautos@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-1881-8965

³ G. BYCHOWSKI, *Słowacki i jego dusza. Studium psychoanalityczne*, Warszawa–Kraków 1930.

⁴ The feature of Lewis' fictional prose brilliantly demonstrated in Michael WARD's *Planet Narnia: The Seven Heavens in the Imagination of C.S. Lewis*, Oxford 2008.

⁵ A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 2001, p. 150.

⁶ See LONG on Marcus Aurelius: *ibidem*, p. 197, n. 21. LONG's interpretation has been challenged, for instance, by Julia ANNAS. For the discussion of the debate and bibliography, see Ch. GILL, *Marcus Aurelius*, in: R.W. SHARPLES, R. SORABJI (eds.), *Greek and Roman Philosophy 100 BC–200 AD*, London 2007, vol. I, pp. 175–187, on p. 181.

CIX ZJAZD POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA FILOLOGICZNEGO (POZNAŃ, 16–18 WRZEŚNIA 2021)

CIX Zjazd Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego został zorganizowany przez Oddział Poznański. Ze względu na nieprzewidywalną sytuację epidemiczną Komitet Organizacyjny już w marcu 2021 podjął decyzję o tym, że niezależnie od możliwego złagodzenia obostrzeń sanitarnych wydarzenie odbędzie się w trybie zdalnym. Zjazdowi towarzyszyła konferencja naukowa pt. „Gatunki literatury antycznej. Tradycja, recepcja i współczesna refleksja literaturoznawcza” oraz sesja dydaktyczna.

15 września (środa)

18.00 Posiedzenie Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa
Filologicznego

16 września (czwartek)

9.00–9.30 Uroczyste rozpoczęcie CIX Walnego Zjazdu Polskiego
Towarzystwa Filologicznego i konferencji naukowej

- Prof. dr hab. Tomasz Mizerkiewicz (Dziekan Wydziału Filologii Polskiej i Klasycznej UAM)
- Dr hab. Mateusz Stróżyński, prof. UAM (Dyrektor Instytutu Filologii Klasycznej UAM)
- Dr Katarzyna Ochman (Prezes Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego)

9.30–10.30 Wykład inauguracyjny

- Dr hab. Anna Maria Wasyl, prof. UJ, *Jak stracić tożsamość, by odzyskać konotacje gatunkowe? Perypetie Maksymiana.*

10.50–12.30 Sesja I

- Prof. dr hab. Marian Wesoły (Akademia im. Jakuba z Paradyża w Gorzowie Wlkp.), *Mimesis – wyróżniki twórczości poetyckiej według Arystotelesa.*
- Dr hab. Gościwit Malinowski, prof. UW, *Physei czy thesei – rozważania nad typologią gatunków literackich w greckiej i chińskiej praktyce i teorii literackiej.*

- Dr hab. Zbigniew Kadłubek (UŚ), *Filologia dramatu. Poza dialog Eurypidesa*.
- Dr hab. Tomasz Mojsik (Uniwersytet w Białymstoku), *Mitografia jako gatunek antyczny*.

14.00–15.40 Sesja II

- Prof. dr hab. Robert Zaborowski (PAN), *Pochwała Achillesa*.
- Dr Anna Głodowska (UMK), *Kompozycja i funkcja dramatycznych prologów w diegematycznych dialogach Platona*.
- Dr hab. Anna Marchewka, prof. UG, *Zasadność klasyfikacji genologicznej kolekcji Listów Ksenofonta oraz Listów Sokratesa i sokratyków. Pomiędzy nowelą a powieścią*.
- Dr hab. Katarzyna Jażdżewska (Aarhus University), *List i dialog w pseudo-epigraficznym 17 Liście Hipokratesa*.

16.00–17.40 Sesja III

- Dr Aleksandra Arndt (UAM), dr hab. inż. Piotr Krzywiec, prof. ING PAN, *Korespondencja listowna jako nośnik estymy w środowisku protoprzyrodoznawczym – na podstawie XVIII-wiecznych listów Georga Andreasa Helwiga do Johanna Jacoba Scheuchzera*.
- Dr hab. Magdalena Stuligrosz, prof. UAM, *Pochwały miast w epinikiach Pindara a antyczna teoria encomium urbis*.
- Dr Damian Pierzak (UŚ), *Kategoria bajki w antycznej teorii wymowy*.
- Dr hab. Iwona Słomak, prof. UŚ, *Tradycja i innowacja w dramatach Seneki z perspektywy genologicznej*.

17 września (piątek)

9.00–10.40 Sesja I

- Dr Alexandra Madela (University of St Andrews), *Pasterz Chiron: Rezolucja konfliktów poprzez agon bukoliczny w poezji epickiej późnego antyku*.
- Dr Tomasz Babnis (UJ), *Nie tylko Herodot, czyli recepcja greckich narracji historiograficznych o wojnach perskich w poezji rzymskiej*.
- Mgr Katarzyna Borkowska (UW, PAN), *Dialog platoński a dialog cyceroński*.
- Dr Anna Lasek (UAM), *Różnorodność gatunkowa Dionysiaka na przykładzie trenu*.

11.00–12.20 Sesja II

- Dr hab. Monika Szczot, prof. UAM, *Ciekawe życie „nieczystych” gatunków literackich. Starożytna i staropolska satyra menippejska w perspektywie komparatystycznej*.
- Mgr Michał Heintze (UAM), *Mieszanie się gatunków literackich na przykładzie pieśni Horacego I 23, jej reminiscencji i pierwowzoru*.

- Mgr Elżbieta Górka (UWr), *Bukoliki z elegią spotkanie. Z gatunkowych rozważań nad zbiorem bukolik Adolescentia Baptisty Mantuana.*

14.00–15.20 Sesja III

- Prof. dr hab. Piotr Bering (UAM): „*Ponadczasowość*” piśmiennictwa retorycznego.
- Dr hab. Monika Miazek-Męczyńska, prof. UAM, *List Julii do Augusta autorstwa Marka Alexandra Boyda – próba opisanie gatunku.*
- Dr hab. Agnieszka Borysowska (Książnica Pomorska im. Stanisława Staszica w Szczecinie), *Heksamet „kunsztowny” i inne formy sztuczne w twórczości Valentina Jurgi von Winthera (1578–1623).*

15.20–15.40 Podsumowanie konferencji naukowej

16.20–17.20 Spacer z przewodnikiem

- Mgr Dawid Barbarzak (UAM), Wirtualny spacer Traktem Królewsko-Cesarskim: Poznański Szlak Nauki

18 września (sobota)

9.00–10.00 Sesja dydaktyczna I

- Dr Anna Szymańska-Budzińska (Studium Języków Obcych WUM), *Metody nauczania, formy aktywizowania studentów i materiały do nauki zdalnej na kierunkach medycznych.*
- Dr Anna Maciejewska (Studium Języków Obcych UŁ), *Wartość testów typu prawda/fałsz jako narzędzia do oceny rozumienia tekstu.*

10.20–11.40 Sesja dydaktyczna II

- Dr Katarzyna Ochman (UWr), *Ad honestae eruditionis cupidinem, albo Noce attyckie Aulusa Gelliusza jako podręcznik (z ćwiczeniami).*
- Dr Katarzyna Kaniecka-Juszczak (Studium Językowe UAM), *Ørberg w sieci. Metody teatralne aktywizujące studentów podczas pracy zdalnej z podręcznikiem Lingua Latina per se illustrata.*

14.00 Walne Zgromadzenie Sprawozdawczo-Wyborcze Delegatów PTF

PROTOKÓŁ Z CVII WALNEGO ZGROMADZENIA
DELEGATÓW POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO (18 WRZEŚNIA 2021)

Walne Zgromadzenie Delegatów Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego odbyło się 18 września 2021 o godzinie 14:00 za pośrednictwem środków komunikacji elektronicznej.

W posiedzeniu udział wzięli:

1. Aleksandra Arndt
2. Bartosz Awianowicz
3. Piotr Bering
4. Katarzyna Borkowska
5. Agnieszka Borysowska
6. Małgorzata Cieśluk
7. Zbigniew Danek
8. Anna Głodowska
9. Dariusz Gwis
10. Aleksandra Hołomej
11. Katarzyna Jażdżewska
12. Idaliana Kaczor
13. Aneta Kliszc
14. Agnieszka Kotlińska-Toma
15. Grzegorz Kotłowski
16. Joanna Kozioł
17. Olga Kubica
18. Jan Kucharski
19. Jan Kwapisz
20. Agata Łuka
21. Gościwit Malinowski
22. Monika Miazek-Męczyńska
23. Przemysław Nehring
24. Ewa Nowak
25. Katarzyna Ochman
26. Damian Pierzak
27. Jakub Pigoń
28. Jacek Pokrzywnicki
29. Joanna Porucznik
30. Janusz Ryba
31. Joanna Rybowska
32. Piotr Stępień
33. Magdalena Stuligrosz

34. Maria Szarek
35. Anna Szymańska-Budzińska
36. Rafał Toczko
37. Teodozja Wikarjak
38. Hubert Wolanin
39. Emilia Żybert-Pruchnicka

Porządek obrad był następujący:

CZĘŚĆ PIERWSZA – SPRAWOZDAWCZA

1. Otwarcie obrad przez Prezesa Zarządu Głównego PTF.
2. Uczczenie pamięci zmarłych członków PTF.
3. Wybór protokolanta obrad.
4. Wybór komisji skrutacyjnej.
5. Sprawozdanie merytoryczno-finansowe z działalności Zarządu Głównego PTF.
6. Dyskusja i głosowanie w sprawie uchwały o przyjęciu sprawozdania ZG PTF.
7. Sprawozdania z działalności Oddziałów Terenowych PTF.
8. Sprawozdanie redaktora naczelnego „Eos”.
9. Sprawozdanie z działalności Fundacji *Traditio Europae*.
10. Sprawozdanie Komisji Rewizyjnej.
11. Dyskusja i głosowanie w sprawie uchwały o przyjęciu sprawozdania Komisji Rewizyjnej.
12. Wniosek w sprawie absolutorium dla ZG PTF.
13. Dyskusja i głosowanie nad uchwałą w sprawie absolutorium dla ZG PTF (głosowanie bez udziału członków ZG PTF).

CZĘŚĆ DRUGA – WYBORCZA

14. Wybór przewodniczącego obrad.
15. Dyskusja i głosowanie w sprawie zatwierdzenia list kandydatów na prezesa, członków Zarządu, członków Komisji Rewizyjnej i członków Sądu Koleżeńskiego.
16. Głosowanie nad wyborem prezesa Zarządu Głównego PTF.
17. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania nad wyborem prezesa ZG PTF.
18. Głosowanie nad kandydaturami do Zarządu Głównego PTF.
19. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania nad kandydaturami do Zarządu Głównego PTF.

PRZERWA

Krótkie zebranie nowo wybranego Zarządu Głównego w celu ustalenia podziału funkcji.

20. Głosowanie nad przyjęciem uchwały w sprawie wyboru ZG PTF.
21. Głosowanie nad kandydaturami do Komisji Rewizyjnej PTF.

22. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania nad kandydaturami do Komisji Rewizyjnej PTF.
23. Głosowanie nad przyjęciem uchwały w sprawie wyboru Komisji Rewizyjnej PTF.
24. Głosowanie nad kandydaturami do Sądu Koleżeńskiego.
25. Ogłoszenie wyników i przyjęcie uchwały w sprawie wyboru Sądu Koleżeńskiego.
26. Wystąpienie nowo wybranego prezesa ZG PTF; przejęcie przewodnictwa obrad.
27. Interpelacje i wolne wnioski.
28. Zamknięcie obrad przez prezesa ZG PTF.

Obrady otworzyła prezes Zarządu Głównego PTF dr Katarzyna Ochman. W pierwszej kolejności pani prezes poprosiła o uczczenie pamięci tych, którzy odeszli od nas w ciągu ostatnich dwóch lat, zarówno członków PTF, jak i innych osób, które zasłużyły się dla realizacji celów Towarzystwa. Byli to: Małgorzata Wysocka-Mielczarska (1951–29 czerwca 2020), prof. Sylwester Dworacki (3 listopada 1937–12 października 2020), Zofia Danielewiczowa z domu Modrzewska (zm. 26 października 2020), dr hab. Angelika Modlińska-Piekarz (1 lutego 1974–1 listopada 2020), Wiesława Musiał (1931–2020), Stanisław Tekieli (18 września 1965–19 listopada 2020), Sergiusz Szarypkin (22 października 1941–19 listopada 2020), o. Jan Ożóg SI (12 marca 1934–3 grudnia 2020), Hubert Kaczmarek (1951–28 grudnia 2020), prof. Sławomir Wyszomirski (27 września 1955–27 lutego 2021), Ewa Juzoń (14 września 1943–27 marca 2021), dr Józef Macjon (8 grudnia 1938–13 kwietnia 2021), prof. Józef Korpany (15 lutego 1941–11 września 2021).

Następnie pani prezes wyznaczyła na protokolanta obrad panią dr Małgorzatę Cieśluk oraz zaproponowała kandydaturę pana profesora Piotra Beringa do komisji skrutacyjnej w składzie jednoosobowym. Ze względu na elektroniczną formę planowanych głosowań propozycja ta nie spotkała się ze sprzeciwem. Odnotowano obecność 39 osób (spośród 50 uprawnionych do udziału w Walnym Zgromadzeniu) i stwierdzono *quorum*.

Pani prezes przedstawiła sprawozdanie merytoryczno-finansowe z działalności Zarządu Głównego w latach 2017–2021. Sprawozdanie zostało przyjęte większością 94,9% głosów (37 głosów „tak”, 1 „nie”, 1 wstrzymujący się).

Kolejnym punktem przewidzianym w programie posiedzenia było odczytanie sprawozdań z działalności Oddziałów Terenowych PTF, jednak na życzenie Delegatów sprawozdania zostały przekazane do protokołu. Następnie pan dr hab. prof. UW. Jakub Pigoń przedstawił sprawozdanie Redakcji „Eos”, a pan dr hab. prof. UMK Rafał Toczko – sprawozdanie Komitetu Głównego Olimpiady Języka Łacińskiego. Pan dr hab. prof. UMK Bartosz Awianowicz przedstawił sprawozdanie z działalności Fundacji *Traditio Europae*.

Pani dr hab. Idaliana Kaczor przedstawiła sprawozdanie z działalności Komisji Rewizyjnej. Sprawozdanie zostało przyjęte większością 81,1% głosów (1 głos na „nie”, 6 głosów wstrzymujących). Następnie przeprowadzono głosowanie nad uchwałą w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium ustępującemu Zarządowi Głównemu. Uchwała została przyjęta większością 95% głosów (19 głosów na „tak”, 1 głos na „nie”).

Przewodniczenie obradom przejął następnie pan prof. Piotr Bering, który koordynował przebieg głosowań elektronicznych. Ich wyniki przedstawiały się następująco:

- Głosowanie w sprawie zatwierdzenia list kandydatów na prezesa, członków Zarządu, członków Komisji Rewizyjnej i członków Sądu Koleżeńskiego:
 - 100% (37 głosów na „tak”, 0 na „nie”, 0 wstrzymujących).
- Głosowanie nad wyborem prezesa Zarządu Głównego PTF:
 - dr Katarzyna Ochman: 100% (35 głosów na „tak”, 0 na „nie”, 0 wstrzymujących).
- Głosowanie nad kandydaturami do Zarządu Głównego PTF:
 - dr hab. prof. UMK Rafał Toczko (Toruń): 84,6% (33 głosy)
 - dr hab. Agnieszka Kotlińska-Toma (Wrocław): 82,1% (32 głosy)
 - dr Olga Kubica (Wrocław): 64,1% (25 głosów)
 - dr hab. prof. UAM Magdalena Stuligrosz (Poznań): 59% (23 głosy)
 - prof. dr hab. Mikołaj Szymański (Warszawa): 59% (23 głosy)
 - dr Małgorzata Cieśluk (Szczecin): 51,3% (20 głosów)
 - dr Janusz Ryba (Kraków): 46,2% (18 głosów)
 - dr Łukasz Berger (Poznań): 35,9% (14 głosów)
 - dr hab. prof. UŚ Tomasz Sapota (Katowice): 35,9% (14 głosów)
 - dr Julia Doroszevska (Warszawa): 33,3% (13 głosów)
 - mgr Aleksandra Hołomej (Gdańsk): 28,2% (11 głosów)
 - dr hab. prof. UAM Monika Szczot (Poznań): 17,9% (7 głosów)

Po ogłoszeniu wyników tego głosowania osoby, które uzyskały powyżej 50% głosów wraz z nowow wybraną prezes dr Katarzyną Ochman przełączyły się do osobnej wideokonferencji, podczas której ustalony został podział funkcji w ramach Zarządu Głównego. Proponowana obsada funkcji została następnie przedstawiona Walnemu Zgromadzeniu i poddana głosowaniu:

- Głosowanie nad przyjęciem uchwały w sprawie wyboru ZG PTF w składzie: dr Katarzyna Ochman – prezes; prof. dr hab. Mikołaj Szymański i dr hab. prof. UMK Rafał Toczko – wiceprezesi; dr Olga Kubica – sekretarz; dr Małgorzata Cieśluk – skarbnik; dr hab. Agnieszka Kotlińska-Toma i dr hab. prof. UAM Magdalena Stuligrosz – członkowie Zarządu:
 - 97,4% (37 głosów na „tak”, 0 na „nie”, 1 wstrzymujący).
- Głosowanie nad kandydaturami do Komisji Rewizyjnej PTF:
 - dr Joanna Porucznik (Wrocław): 91,9% (34 głosy)
 - dr Anna Głodowska (Toruń): 86,5% (32 głosy)
 - mgr Maria Szarek (Kraków): 83,8 (31 głosów)
 - dr hab. Idaliana Kaczor (Łódź): 67,6% (25 głosów)

- dr Aneta Kliszczyk (Kraków): 48,6% (18 głosów)
- Głosowanie nad przyjęciem uchwały w sprawie wyboru Komisji Rewizyjnej PTF w składzie: dr Anna Głodowska, dr hab. Idalia Kaczor, dr Joanna Porucznik, mgr Maria Szarek:
 - 94,3% (33 głosy na „tak”, 2 głosy wstrzymujące)
- Głosowanie nad kandydaturami do Sądu Koleżeńskiego:
 - dr hab. prof. UW r Jakub Pigoń (Wrocław): 94,9% (37 głosów)
 - dr hab. Aleksandra Klęczar (Kraków): 87,2% (34 głosy)
 - prof. dr hab. Przemysław Nehring (Toruń): 87,2% (34 głosy)
 - dr Małgorzata Cieśluk (Szczecin): 79,5% (31 głosów)
 - prof. dr hab. Mikołaj Szymański (Warszawa): 76,9% (30 głosów)
- Głosowanie nad przyjęciem uchwały w sprawie wyboru Sądu Koleżeńskiego w składzie: dr Małgorzata Cieśluk, dr hab. Aleksandra Klęczar, prof. dr hab. Przemysław Nehring, dr hab. prof. UW r Jakub Pigoń, prof. dr hab. Mikołaj Szymański:
 - 94,7% (36 głosów na „tak”, 1 głos na „nie”, 1 głos wstrzymujący).

Po zakończeniu głosowań przewodnictwo obradom przejęła prezes Katarzyna Ochman, która podziękowała zebranych za udział w wyborach i wobec braku wolnych wniosków zamknęła posiedzenie.

*Protokolowała
dr Małgorzata Cieśluk*

*Prezes Zarządu Głównego PTF
dr Katarzyna Ochman*

SPRAWOZDANIE Z DZIAŁALNOŚCI ZARZĄDU GŁÓWNEGO POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA FILOLOGICZNEGO ZA OKRES OD 13 WRZEŚNIA 2019 DO 18 WRZEŚNIA 2021

I. ZARZĄD GŁÓWNY

W okresie sprawozdawczym Zarząd Główny działał w następującym składzie: prezes Zarządu Głównego – dr Katarzyna Ochman; wiceprezesi Zarządu Głównego – dr hab. prof. UW r Gościwit Malinowski, dr hab. prof. UMK Przemysław Nehring, dr hab. prof. UJ Hubert Wolanin; skarbnik Zarządu Głównego – dr Joanna Porucznik; sekretarz Zarządu Głównego – mgr Ewa Nowak; członkowie Zarządu Głównego – dr hab. Barbara Bibik, dr Małgorzata Cieśluk, dr Edyta Gryksa, dr hab. Monika Miazek-Męczyńska, dr Damian Pierzak, dr Jacek Pokrzywnicki, dr hab. Monika Szczot, dr hab. Joanna Usakiewicz; przewodniczący Komisji Nagród i Wyróżnień – prof. dr hab. Marian Szarmach; redaktor naczelny „Eos” – dr hab. prof. UW r Jakub Pigoń; przewodniczący Komitetu Głównego Olimpiady Języka Łacińskiego – dr Rafał Toczko; przewodniczący Oddziałów Terenowych – dr Tomasz Mojsik (Białystok), mgr Aleksandra Hołomej (Gdańsk), dr hab. Jan Kucharski (Katowice), dr Janusz Ryba (Kraków), dr Agata Łuka (Lublin), dr Joanna Rybowska (Łódź), prof. dr hab. Joanna Rostropowicz (Opole), dr hab. prof. UAM Magdalena Stuligrosz (Poznań), dr Agnieszka Borysowska (Szczecin), dr Jan Kwapisz (Warszawa), dr Mariusz Plago (Wrocław).

W okresie sprawozdawczym odbyły się trzy posiedzenia Zarządu Głównego: 8 września 2020, 28 czerwca 2021 i 15 września 2021. Członkowie Zarządu pozostawali ze sobą w stałym kontakcie za pośrednictwem środków komunikacji elektronicznej.

II. DZIAŁALNOŚĆ WYDAWNICZA

W okresie sprawozdawczym ukazały się dwa zeszyty „Eos”: 2019/1 i 2019/2. Zeszyt 2020/1–2 jest obecnie w druku, a 2021/1–2 – w opracowaniu redakcyjnym.

Począwszy od rocznika 2019 artykuły publikowane w „Eos” są opatrzone numerami DOI i na bieżąco zamieszczane w Repozytorium Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego (z zachowaniem dwuletniego okresu karencji). Materiały z wcześniejszych roczników będą systematycznie dodawane do Repozytorium.

W latach 2020 i 2021 MEiN nie ogłaszało konkursów na dofinansowanie publikacji czasopism. Redakcja pozyskała częściowe dofinansowanie dla roczników 2020 i 2021 ze środków Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego. 6 września 2021 r. MEiN ogłosiło nabór wniosków do nowego programu pt. „Rozwój czasopism naukowych”; wniosek o dofinansowanie publikacji rocznika 2022 jest w trakcie przygotowania.

13 września 2021 nastąpiła zmiana w składzie redakcji: funkcję sekretarza redakcji w miejsce dr Katarzyny Ochman objął dr Piotr Głogowski.

Strona internetowa czasopisma została przeniesiona z dotychczasowego adresu w domenę uni.wroc.pl pod adres www.ptf.edu.pl/eos i funkcjonuje odąd jako sekcja na stronie internetowej Towarzystwa.

III. OLIMPIADA JĘZYKA ŁACIŃSKIEGO

W roku szkolnym 2019/2020 odbyła się XXXVIII Olimpiada Języka Łacińskiego. W etapie szkolnym, który odbył się 8 listopada 2019, wzięło udział 338 uczniów z całej Polski, a w etapie okręgowym (16–17 stycznia 2020) – 197. Etap centralny Olimpiady, który miał się po raz pierwszy odbyć w Toruniu, został decyzją MEN odwołany ze względu na sytuację epidemiczną, a tytuły finalistów Olimpiady przyznano wszystkim uczestnikom, którzy zakwalifikowali się do etapu centralnego. *Certamen Ciceronianum Arpinas* nie odbyło się.

W roku szkolnym 2020/2021 odbyła się XXXIX Olimpiada Języka Łacińskiego. Wszystkie etapy konkursu przeprowadzono w formie zdalnej. W etapie szkolnym (13 listopada 2020) wzięło udział 273 uczniów z 63 szkół (najmłodszy uczestnik z VIII klasy SP 8 w Gdyni). Zdaniem Komitetu Głównego znaczny spadek liczby uczestników w tym roku można częściowo tłumaczyć przeciążeniem uczniów obowiązkami wynikającymi ze zdalnego nauczania. W etapie okręgowym (21–22 stycznia 2021) uczestniczyło 123 uczniów. Do części centralnej (18–19 marca 2021) zakwalifikowało się 45 osób, spośród których wyłoniono 14 laureatów. Zwyciężczynią XXXIX Olimpiady została Jadwiga Zymer z XIV Liceum Ogólnokształcącego im. S. Staszica w Warszawie. *Certamen Ciceronianum Arpinas* odbyło się w formie zdalnej. Polskę reprezentowali: Michał Barczak, Aleksandra Byczkowska, Jan Jaśkowicz, Olga Łuczak, Natalia Piątkowska i Stanisław Szczawiński.

Liczba uczestników XXXVIII OJŁ w poszczególnych okręgach				
Okręg	Etap			Fina- liści
	szkolny	okręgowy	centralny	
Kraków	111	60	15	
Lublin	14	12	4	
Łódź	26	13	5	
Poznań	25	11	2	
Toruń	23	18	9	
Warszawa	99	59	8	
Wrocław	40	24	3	
razem	338	197	46	46

Liczba uczestników XXXIX OJŁ w poszczególnych okręgach				
Okręg	Etap			Fina- liści
	szkolny	okręgowy	centralny	
Kraków	123	53	12	8
Lublin	13	6	5	4
Łódź	22	13	9	4
Poznań	15	3	2	1
Toruń	15	10	4	4
Warszawa	61	27	11	8
Wrocław	24	11	2	2
razem	273	123	45	31

We wrześniu 2021 utworzono profil Olimpiady Języka Łacińskiego w serwisie Facebook, wykorzystując do tego infrastrukturę profilu znanego wcześniej pod nazwą „Polska w Europie – Łacina w szkole”, który cieszy się zainteresowaniem ok. 3000 użytkowników, co daje nadzieję na zwiększenie rozpoznawalności konkursu w kolejnych latach.

Komitet Główny przygotowuje ankietę dla nauczycieli, by poznać ich opinię na temat organizacji i poziomu trudności Olimpiady.

W okresie sprawozdawczym nastąpiła zmiana personalna w okręgu łódzkim, gdzie nowym sekretarzem została dr Aneta Tylak.

IV. ŁACINA W SZKOLE

Począwszy od roku szkolnego 2020/2021 w liceach funkcjonuje nowy przedmiot: „Język łaciński i kultura antyczna” w zakresie podstawowym w wymiarze jednej godziny w tygodniu w pierwszej klasie (jeden z czterech przedmiotów do wyboru obok filozofii, muzyki i plastyki). Zarząd PTF gromadzi statystyki dotyczące rozpowszechnienia tego przedmiotu oraz wpływu jego obecności w programie nauczania na dotychczas prowadzone kursy języka łacińskiego, tj. „Język łaciński i kulturę antyczną” w zakresie rozszerzonym oraz łacinę realizowaną w formie przedmiotu uzupełniającego w ramach tzw. godzin dyrektorskich.

V. PROMOCJA I POPULARYZACJA

We wrześniu 2020 uruchomiono nową stronę internetową Towarzystwa (pod dotychczasowym adresem: www.ptf.edu.pl). Profil PTF w serwisie Facebook jest obserwowany przez ok. 1400 osób. Ponadto założone zostały profile PTF w serwisach Instagram i Twitter.

W okresie sprawozdawczym zorganizowano dwie kolejne edycje letniej szkoły języka łacińskiego i greckiego (*Schola Aestiva Latinitatis Vivae Posnaniensis*), które ze względu na sytuację epidemiczną odbyły się w formie kursów online. W roku 2020 w zajęciach wzięło udział ok. 60 osób z całego świata, a w 2021 – 30. Mniejsza liczba uczestników związana jest m.in. z szybko rosnącą konkurencją w dziedzinie kursów języka łacińskiego online w wielu ośrodkach na całym świecie.

Zarząd z radością obserwuje rosnącą popularność konferencji oraz odczytów naukowych i popularnonaukowych organizowanych za pośrednictwem internetu, co przyczynia się znacznie do wzrostu zainteresowania naszą dziedziną.

W kwietniu 2020 Zarząd we współpracy z członkami PTF z Łodzi i Wrocławia opracował wniosek pt. „Lingua aeterna. Promocja języka łacińskiego i kultury klasycznej”, który został złożony w ramach programu „Społeczna Odpowiedzialność Nauki”. Wniosek został odrzucony ze względu na to, że zdaniem recenzentów projekt „posiada cechy działania edukacyjnego, co w połączeniu z brakiem popularyzacji nauki a jedynie szerzeniem kultury klasycz-

nej oraz ofertą edukacyjną języka łacińskiego nie wpisuje się w Społeczną Odpowiedzialność Nauki”.

VI. WSPÓŁPRACA MIĘDZYNARODOWA

W grudniu 2019 *Fédération internationale des associations d'études classiques* podjęła decyzję o powierzeniu Polskiemu Towarzystwu Filologicznemu organizacji siedemnastej edycji FIEC International Congress w Polsce. Kongres odbędzie się w lipcu 2025 roku na Uniwersytecie Wrocławskim i zgromadzi ok. 1000 przedstawicieli nauk o starożytności z całego świata.

W październiku 2020 Zarząd Główny PTF powołał Komitet Organizacyjny Kongresu w następującym składzie: dr hab. Agnieszka Kotlińska-Toma (ISKŚiO UWr) – przewodnicząca; dr Katarzyna Ochman (Prezes Zarządu Głównego PTF); dr hab. Katarzyna Biernacka-Licznar (Dyrektor ISKŚiO UWr); dr hab. Artur Błazejewski, prof. UWr (archeologia – IAr UWr); dr hab. Gościwit Malinowski, prof. UWr (filologia klasyczna – ISKŚiO UWr); prof. dr hab. Krzysztof Nawotka (historia starożytna – IH UWr).

*Prezes Zarządu Głównego PTF
dr Katarzyna Ochman*

SPRAWOZDANIA Z DZIAŁALNOŚCI ODDZIAŁÓW TERENOWYCH
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA FILOLOGICZNEGO
ZA OKRES OD 13 WRZEŚNIA 2019 DO 18 WRZEŚNIA 2021

SPRAWOZDANIE ODDZIAŁU GDAŃSKIEGO

W okresie objętym sprawozdaniem działalność Oddziału skupiała się – jak w poprzednich latach – na organizowaniu prelekcji i spotkań, zarówno dla członkiń i członków, jak i wszystkich osób zainteresowanych popularyzacją wiedzy o antyku grecko-rzymskim. Zarząd Oddziału – w miarę możliwości – pamiętał również o współpracy ze szkołami (zwłaszcza niższego szczebla).

Wśród przygotowanych i przeprowadzonych spotkań dla dorosłych wymienić należy:

1. Dr hab. Agnieszka BORYSOWSKA (Książnica Pomorska im. Staszica), *„Hieroglifami” o wielkim brandenburskim zwycięstwie. Na marginesie oblężenia Szczecina w 1677 r.* (18 XI 2019).
2. Dr Aleksandra ARNDT (UAM), *Z XIX-wiecznego wokabularza miłosnego. Miłosny wymiar „Przemian” w szacie językowej Brunona hr. Kicińskiego* (25 XI 2019).
3. Dr Daria WĘSIERSKA, *Osobiste szczęście dziecka i jego znaczenie dla społeczności wspólnotowej w starożytnej Grecji* (3 XII 2019).
4. Spotkanie przedsięwzięte dla Członków, Członkiń i wszystkich sympatyków Oddziału Gdańskiego PTF (19 XII 2019).
5. Dr Maria MICHALSKA, *Inspiracje mitologiczne w sygnetach drukarskich, winitach i inicjałach* (30 I 2020).
6. Dr hab. Lucyna STANKIEWICZ, *Semantyka słów wernakularnych wywodzących się z języków klasycznych* (25 II 2020).
7. Dr hab. Lucyna STANKIEWICZ, *Sztuka żartu, dowcipów i replik w świecie rdzennych Rzymian* (26 II 2020).

Od marca do listopada 2020 roku sytuacja epidemiczna przyczyniła się do ograniczenia aktywności Zarządu Oddziału. Mimo to udało się zorganizować dwa wykłady online, które zgromadziły całkiem szeroką publiczność, nie tylko członkinie i członków Oddziału. Prelegentkami były:

1. Mgr Aleksandra HOŁOMEJ, *Bogowie i herosi w popkulturze* (17 XII 2020).
2. Dr hab. Monika MIAZEK-MĘCZYŃSKA, prof. UAM, *Czy łacina powinna brykać i dlaczego warto ją do tego nakłonić* (2 III 2021).

W ramach współpracy ze szkołami w Trójmieście Przewodnicząca Oddziału przeprowadziła w LO nr XIX im. Mariana Mokwy wykład okolicznościowy pt. *Bogowie i herosi w popkulturze* (5 III 2021, online).

Przewodnicząca Oddziału Gdańskiego PTF
mgr Aleksandra Hołomej
Sekretarz Oddziału Gdańskiego PTF
dr Jacek Pokrzywnicki

SPRAWOZDANIE ODDZIAŁU LUBELSKIEGO

W okresie sprawozdawczym Oddział liczył 44 członków (w tym 10 pracowników emerytowanych). W skład zarządu Oddziału do 16 VI 2021 wchodziły następujące osoby: dr Agata Łuka – przewodnicząca; mgr Alicja Narecka – zastępca przewodniczącej; dr Małgorzata Siwicka – skarbnik; dr Natalia Turkiewicz – sekretarz; dr Helena Błazińska – członek Zarządu ds. kontaktów z nauczycielami; dr Henryk Kowalski – członek Zarządu. W skład Komisji Rewizyjnej wchodził: dr hab. Jolanta G. Malinowska – przewodnicząca; dr hab. Krzysztof Narecki, prof. KUL, dr Marian Babiński – członkowie Komisji.

16 VI 2021 odbyło się zdalne zebranie wyborcze Oddziału, podczas którego powołano Zarząd w następującym składzie: dr Agata Łuka – przewodnicząca, dr Małgorzata Siwicka – skarbnik; dr Natalia Turkiewicz – sekretarz.

W okresie sprawozdawczym Oddział Lubelski PTF prowadził działalność statutową w następujących formach:

- I. Posiedzenia Zarządu i Oddziału połączone z odczytami naukowymi:
 1. Dr Wojciech KOPEK, *Ubi frustra requirit Ochinus verbum „alia”. Marcina Kromera polemika z Bernardino Ochino w Colloquiorum de religione liber secundus* (20 XI 2019).
 2. Dr Stanisław MAJDAŃSKI, *Pierwszoosobowość – wątki semiofilozoficzne* (28 I 2020).
 3. Dr Agata ŁUKA, *Tak z poezji wyszła proza, czyli o niepoprawnym czytaniu metrycznym w audiobookach* (25 II 2020).
 4. *Quem di diligunt, adulescens moritur*. Wspomnienie o †Angelice Modlińskiej-Piekarz (1 XII 2020, online).
 5. Ks. Michał ŁUKASZCZYK, *Recepcja literatury antycznej w myśli Ojców Kościoła* (24 II 2021, online).
- II. Patronat nad Olimpiadą Języka Łacińskiego: Oddział organizował I i II etap Olimpiady w województwie lubelskim i czuwał nad ich przebiegiem.
- III. Działalność popularyzatorska: zorganizowano XI edycję otwartych warsztatów interpretacyjno-translatorskich w Instytucie Studiów Klasycznych i Orientalnych KUL (30 III – 15 VII 2020 r.) oraz *Horrida tempestas, czyli zostań w domu* – warsztaty poświęcone epodzie 13 Horacego, w ramach seminarium prof. Mikołaja Szymańskiego (IFK UW) w formie telekonferencji (13 V 2020).

Sekretarz Oddziału Lubelskiego PTF
Natalia Turkiewicz

SPRAWOZDANIE ODDZIAŁU POZNAŃSKIEGO

- I. W okresie sprawozdawczym Oddział działał pod egidą zarządu w następującym składzie: dr hab. Magdalena Stuligrosz, prof. UAM – przewodnicząca;

dr Teodozja Wikarjak – wiceprzewodnicząca; dr Aleksandra Arndt – sekretarz; mgr Ewa Nowak – skarbnik; dr Marlena Puk – członek Zarządu. Komisja Rewizyjna: prof. dr hab. Krystyna Bartol; prof. dr hab. Elżbieta Wesołowska; dr hab. Radosław Piętka.

II. Działalność naukowa i statutowa:

W okresie sprawozdawczym odbyły się trzy zebrania naukowe, podczas których wygłoszono następujące odczyty:

1. Dr Aleksandra ARNDT (UAM), *Arca Noë, Turris Babel – gdańskie dzieła jezuit, który „wiedział wszystko”* (15 X 2019).
2. Prof. dr hab. Marian WESOŁY (UAM), *Konstantyn filozof, czyli kto?* (19 XI 2019).
3. Dr Rafał TOCZKO, *Polemiki listowne św. Augustyna z donatystami a retoryka sądowa* (21 I 2020).

III. Działalność popularyzacyjna:

Członkowie Oddziału powołani do Okręgowej Komisji Olimpiady Języka Łacińskiego: dr hab. Magdalena Stuligrosz, prof. UAM – przewodnicząca, dr Sławomira Brud – sekretarz, dr Aleksandra Arndt, dr Teodozja Wikarjak, oraz członkowie Okręgowej Komisji Egzaminacyjnej: dr Łukasz Berger i dr Anna Lasek przeprowadzili eliminacje I i II etapu XXXVIII i XXXIX Olimpiady.

Członkinie Oddziału: dr Justyna Zaborowska-Musiał i dr Marlena Puk pod egidą IFK UAM zorganizowały w latach 2019/2020 i 2020/2021 kolejne edycje Konkursu Wiedzy o Antyku dla uczniów gimnazjów i liceów województwa wielkopolskiego. W opracowanie pytań i przeprowadzenie eliminacji ustnych dla uczniów liceów zaangażowali się: prof. dr hab. Krystyna Bartol, prof. dr hab. Piotr Bering, prof. dr hab. Ewa Skwara, prof. dr hab. Piotr Urbański, prof. dr hab. Elżbieta Wesołowska, dr hab. Maria Marcinkowska-Rosół, prof. UAM, dr hab. Magdalena Stuligrosz, prof. UAM, dr Sławomira Brud, dr hab. Monika Miazek-Męczyńska, prof. UAM, dr hab. Radosław Piętka, prof. UAM, dr Teodozja Wikarjak.

Dr Marcin Loch z Poznańskiego Oddziału PTF zorganizował w Instytucie Filologii Klasycznej UAM Międzynarodową Letnią Szkołę Języka Łacińskiego i Greckiego w formule online.

W roku akademickim 2019/2020 wykładowcy reprezentujący Oddział Poznański PTF przeprowadzili wykłady w ramach Akademii Antycznej w Muzeum Narodowym w Szczecinie.

IV. Obecnie Oddział liczy 51 członków; w okresie sprawozdawczym 1 osoba zapisała się do oddziału, 1 osoba zmarła. W listopadzie 2020 r. członkowie Oddziału przygotowali filmowe wspomnienie o zmarłym profesorze Sylwestrze Dworackim.

*Przewodnicząca Oddziału Poznańskiego PTF
dr hab. Magdalena Stuligrosz, prof. UAM*

SPRAWOZDANIE ODDZIAŁU TORUŃSKIEGO

W okresie sprawozdawczym liczba członków Oddziału wynosiła najpierw 17, a od przedwczesnej śmierci 27 lutego 2021 roku wieloletniego pracownika Katedry Filologii Klasycznej oraz zasłużonego członka PTF, dra hab. Sławomira Wyszomirskiego, em. prof. UMK, 16. Przewodniczącym Oddziału od 2017 pozostaje dr hab. Bartosz Awianowicz, prof. UMK, wiceprzewodniczącą jest dr Alicja Brusewicz, zaś funkcja skarbnika i sekretarza pozostawała nieobsadzona.

Od października 2019 roku, dzięki podpisaniu umowy pomiędzy Oddziałem a Książnicą Kopernikańską w Toruniu, wykłady i zarazem spotkania Toruńskiego PTF odbywały się w głównym gmachu Książnicy przy ul. J. Słowackiego 8 w ramach cyklu „Piątków z antykiem”. Wyjście z przestrzeni uniwersyteckiej w przestrzeń znanej i licznie odwiedzanej przez mieszkańców Torunia biblioteki, znanej z organizowania różnorodnych spotkań autorskich, wystaw etc., miało pozwolić na dotarcie z wykładami starożytniczymi do szerszego grona zainteresowanych antykiem torunian i mieszkańców okolic. 22 listopada 2019 w ramach „Piątków z antykiem” odbył się wykład mgr Marty Szady z IH UW (obecnie dr Szada jest pracownikiem KFK UMK) pt. *Łacińscy arianie i ich literatura na późnoantycznym Zachodzie*, a 20 grudnia tego samego roku dr hab. Rafał Rosół, prof. UAM, wygłosił wykład pt. *Teatr Wielki w Poznaniu jako przykład recepcji antyku w dobie neoklasycyzmu*. W 2020 roku z powodu pandemii COVID-19 wykłady przeniosły się do Internetu na platformę Książnicy, gdzie 16 kwietnia dr hab. Bartosz Awianowicz, prof. UMK, mówił o *Zarazach i ich śmiertelnym żniwie w siedemnastowiecznym Toruniu*, a 8 czerwca wygłosił wykład pt. *Ratusz, gimnazjum, kościół: uroczystości w przestrzeni publicznej dawnego Torunia*, nadto 12 lutego 2021 mówił (wciąż zdalnie) o *Zainteresowaniu monetami antycznymi w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej od XVI do schyłku XVIII wieku*. Dr hab. Rafał Toczko, prof. UMK, z kolei wygłosił 7 czerwca 2021 roku wykład pt. *Epidemie, religia i szukanie kozłów ofiarnych w antyku i wczesnym chrześcijaństwie*.

Członkowie Oddziału tworzący jednocześnie Zarząd Fundacji *Traditio Europae* są nadto organizatorami Ligi Starożytniczej – comiesięcznych spotkań młodzieży szkolnej, podczas których uczniowie słuchają wykładów popularyzujących antyk i jego dziedzictwo. Po każdym wykładzie wypełniają krótki test zawierający pytania dotyczące właśnie przedstawionych zagadnień. Wyniki testów są sumowane i na zakończenie każdej edycji Ligi zwycięzcy otrzymują nagrody książkowe. W okresie sprawozdawczym edycja w roku szkolnym 2019/2020 została skrócona z powodu wybuchu pandemii w marcu 2020 roku, zaś edycja w roku 2020/2021 odbyła się zdalnie. W edycji zdalnej po raz pierwszy uczestniczyli uczniowie również spoza województwa kujawsko-pomorskiego.

*Przewodniczący Oddziału Toruńskiego PTF
dr hab. Bartosz Awianowicz, prof. UMK*

SPRAWOZDANIE ODDZIAŁU WARSZAWSKIEGO

I. Zarząd

W okresie sprawozdawczym Zarząd Oddziału działał w następującym składzie: dr hab. Jan Kwapisz – przewodniczący, prof. dr hab. Juliusz Domański – przewodniczący honorowy, dr Katarzyna Jażdżewska – wiceprzewodnicząca, dr Magdalena Zawadzka – wiceprzewodnicząca, mgr Jan Laskowski – sekretarz, dr Magdalena Popiołek – skarbnik, mgr Maria Poszepczyńska – przewodnicząca Sekcji Popularyzacji Wiedzy o Antyku, pozostali członkowie Zarządu: prof. dr hab. Adam Łukasiewicz, dr Julia Doroszevska, dr Krzysztof Łapiński, mgr Monika Mięka. Komisja Rewizyjna działała w składzie: prof. Mikołaj Szymański, mgr Ludmiła Bohdanowicz, dr Anna Szymańska-Budzińska.

II. Zebrania

W okresie sprawozdawczym odbyło się 10 zebrań Oddziału. Należy zaznaczyć, że z powodu nagłej sytuacji pandemicznej działalność Towarzystwa była przez rok wstrzymana. W części naukowej spotkań uczestnicy wysłuchali następujących referatów:

1. Prof. dr hab. Adam ŁUKASZEWICZ, *Kilka słów o nowościach epigraficznych z Aleksandrii* (11 X 2019).
2. Dr Przemysław BIERNAT (UJ), *Dzieje greckiej refleksji nad początkami cywilizowanego życia*.
Dr Tomasz MOJSIK (UwB), *Museion: antyczne korzenie muzeum nowożytnego* (29 XI 2019).
3. Prof. Włodzimierz LENGAUER, *Rozważania o Dionizosie* (24 I 2020).
4. Prof. Eleanor DICKEY, FBA (University of Reading), *Warsaw papyrus that changes the history of ancient lexicography?* (30 I 2020).
5. Dr hab. Jacek SOSZYŃSKI (Instytut Historii Nauki PAN), *Antologia średniowiecznego piśmiennictwa myślicielskiego* (21 II 2020).
6. Prof. dr hab. Adam ZIÓŁKOWSKI (IH UW), *Varro prawdę ci powie* (6 III 2020).
7. Dr hab. Emilia ŻYBERT, *Podwójność bis, czyli dublowanie słów w poematach Aleksifarmaka i Theriaka Nikandra* (25 III 2021, online).
8. Dr hab. Aleksandra KLĘCZAR (IFK UJ): *Kobiety i mężczyźni w hellenistycznych lamentach na śmierć Adonisa* (29 IV 2021, online – zebranie zorganizowane wspólnie z oddziałami PTF w Krakowie i Wrocławiu).
9. Dr hab. Agnieszka KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA (ISKŚiO UWr), *Kallimacha fragment 474 Pf., czyli co ma pysk konia do poezji hellenistycznej i rzymskiej* (13 V 2021, online – zebranie zorganizowane wspólnie z oddziałami PTF w Krakowie i Wrocławiu).
10. Dr hab. Jan KWAPISZ (IFK UW), *Anth. Pal. XIII 1 – klucz do zapomnianego skarbca greckiej liryki* (10 VI 2021, online – zebranie zorganizowane wspólnie z oddziałami PTF w Krakowie i Wrocławiu).

III. Działalność popularyzatorska

W okresie sprawozdawczym obejmującym rok akademicki 2019/2020 oraz 2020/2021 prace Sekcji Popularyzatorskiej tradycyjnie skupiały się na organizowaniu i prowadzeniu kursów języka łacińskiego i greckiego oraz Konkursu Kultury Klasycznej dla uczniów klas IV–VIII szkół podstawowych województwa mazowieckiego. Działalność sekcji komplikowały obostrzenia sanitarne związane z pojawieniem się pandemii koronawirusa.

Kursy języków klasycznych przeznaczone dla wszystkich chętnych są organizowane od wielu lat i prowadzone przez studentów i absolwentów filologii klasycznej. Kursy cieszą się zainteresowaniem osób w różnym wieku, od uczniów po emerytów. Oddział Warszawski PTF nie pobiera opłat od uczestników, a osoby prowadzące wykonują swą pracę społecznie. W roku akademickim 2019/2020 kursy języka łacińskiego prowadzili: język łaciński – Michał Godlewski, Wojciech Pach, Witold Tokarski, mgr Jan Laskowski; język grecki: Witold Tokarski, Maria Poszepczyńska. Większość kursów przestała funkcjonować z powodu zawieszenia zajęć stacjonarnych na UW od 11 marca 2020. W trybie online pracowała jedynie (na wyraźną prośbę uczestników) zaawansowana grupa grecka prowadzona przez mgr Marię Poszepczyńską.

Konkurs Kultury Klasycznej (KKK) dla uczniów klas IV–VIII szkół podstawowych jest organizowany przez Oddział Warszawski PTF oraz Mazowieckie Kuratorium Oświaty od 2005 roku. W okresie sprawozdawczym przeprowadzono XV i XVI edycję KKK. Mazowiecki Kurator Oświaty corocznie zatwierdza regulamin konkursu oraz osobnym pismem powołuje członków Wojewódzkiej Komisji KKK. Komisja działa w składzie: mgr Grażyna Kania – przewodnicząca; mgr Maria Poszepczyńska – sekretarz; prof. dr hab. Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, mgr Agnieszka Puchała, mgr Joanna Pudzianowska – członkowie. Przedstawiciel Kuratorium wyznaczany jest corocznie przez Kuratora. Opiekę merytoryczną sprawuje prezes Oddziału Warszawskiego PTF dr hab. Jan Kwapisz.

Konkurs Kultury Klasycznej należy do grupy „konkursów interdyscyplinarnych”. Finaliści i laureaci otrzymują dodatkowe punkty przy rekrutacji do liceów. Stałym mottem KKK są słowa: *Antiquitas magistra et amica nostra*. KKK ma strukturę trzystopniową: I stopień jest przeprowadzany w szkołach. Najpierw uczniowie przygotowują w domu pracę pisemną na zadany temat. W wyznaczonym dniu rozwiązują w warunkach kontrolowanych test, który jest sprawdzany przez Szkolną Komisję KKK. II stopień jest przeprowadzany w warunkach kontrolowanych w Instytucie Filologii Klasycznej UW. Zadanie uczniów polega na rozwiązaniu testu i napisaniu eseju na zadany temat. III stopień to odpowiedź ustna przed Wojewódzką Komisją KKK.

Temat XV Konkursu przeprowadzonego w roku 2019/2020 brzmiał: *Amicitia etiam post mortem durat – Przyjaźń trwa także po śmierci*. Tematy poszczególnych etapów to: I stopień (szkolny) – „Orestes i Pylades, czyli o przyjaźni bohaterów

mitologicznych i biblijnych”, II stopień (rejonowy) – „Cyceron i Attyk, czyli o przyjaźni postaci historycznych”, III stopień (wojewódzki) – „Cezar i Brutus, czyli różne oblicza przyjaźni”.

Do konkursu zgłosiło się 35 uczniów z 5 szkół podstawowych z Warszawy i okolic, a ostatecznie 19 listopada 2019 przystąpiło do niego 16 uczniów w 4 szkołach. Temat pracy pisemnej brzmiał: *Czy przyjaźń jest zawsze taka sama, czy za każdym razem inna? Rozważ powyższą kwestię na podstawie przeczytanych lektur i przykładów zaczerpniętych z literatury antycznej i Biblii*. Do stopnia rejonowego zakwalifikowano 10 uczniów.

W związku z pandemią koronawirusa i zamknięciem szkół oraz Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, w którego murach miały się odbywać kolejne eliminacje, planowany na 14 marca stopień rejonowy oraz planowany na 16 maja stopień wojewódzki został odwołany. Na mocy decyzji Mazowieckiego Kuratora Oświaty XV KKK uzyskał status konkursu jednostopniowego, a uczniowie zakwalifikowani do II etapu uzyskali tytuł finalisty.

Temat XVI Konkursu przeprowadzonego w roku 2020/2021 brzmiał: *Non vestimentum virum ornat, sed vir vestimentum – Nie szata zdobi człowieka, lecz człowiek szatę*. Tematy poszczególnych etapów to: I stopień – „Szaty i ozdoby w świecie helleńskim i biblijnym”, II stopień – „Ubiory i zabiegi kosmetyczne w starożytnym Rzymie”, III stopień – „Nagość i strój jako składnik kultury – od Adama i Ewy do szlacheckiego kontusza”.

Do konkursu zgłosiło się 50 uczniów z 5 szkół podstawowych. Temat pracy pisemnej brzmiał: *W jaki sposób opisy szat i ozdób uzupełniają naszą wiedzę o dawnych kulturach i cywilizacjach? Rozważ kwestię na podstawie przeczytanych lektur, dotyczących świata starożytnej Grecji i Biblii*. W związku z wywołaną gwałtownym wzrostem zakażeń decyzją o przejściu we wszystkich typach szkół na nauczanie w trybie zdalnym nastąpiła zmiana w sposobie przeprowadzenia I stopnia KKK. Został on przeprowadzony dwuetapowo: eseje zostały przesłane w pierwotnie wyznaczonym terminie (17 listopada), a rozwiązywanie testu I stopnia zostało przesunięte na 28 stycznia 2021. Do stopnia szkolnego XVI Konkursu Kultury Klasycznej przystąpiło ostatecznie 20 uczniów w 4 szkołach, do następnego etapu zakwalifikowano 14 osób. II stopień odbył się w reżimie sanitarnym 13 marca 2021 w Instytucie Filologii Klasycznej UW. Przystąpiło do niego 12 osób, dwoje uczniów nie przystąpiło do Konkursu z powodu zakażenia koronawirusem. Uczestnicy rozwiązywali test i pisali esej na temat: *Czy ustawy przeciwko zbytowi uchwalane w starożytnym Rzymie były koniecznością i potrzebą chwili czy kaprysem urzędników i panujących? Rozważ kwestię w nawiązaniu do przeczytanych lektur*. Do III stopnia, który odbył się 15 maja 2021, zakwalifikowano siedmiu uczniów. Wyłoniono jednego laureata i sześciu finalistów.

Sekretarz Warszawskiego Oddziału PTF
mgr Jan Laskowski

SPRAWOZDANIE ODDZIAŁU WROCŁAWSKIEGO

Oddział liczy 43 członków.

W okresie sprawozdawczym Zarząd Oddziału pracował w następującym składzie: dr Mariusz Plago – przewodniczący; dr Magdalena Wolf – wiceprzewodnicząca; dr Emilia Żybert-Pruchnicka – skarbnik; mgr Anna Jaworska – sekretarz; dr Barbara Szubert, dr Barbara Hartleb-Kropidło – członkowie Zarządu. Członkowie Komisji Rewizyjnej: dr Katarzyna Ochman, dr hab. prof. UW r Jakub Pigoń, dr Małgorzata Wróbel.

Kadencja Zarządu w wymienionym składzie zakończyła się 27 czerwca 2021. Zebranie wyborcze planowane jest na październik 2021.

W okresie sprawozdawczym odbyły się trzy spotkania naukowe Oddziału. Wygłoszono na nich następujące odczyty:

1. Dr hab. Gościwit MALINOWSKI, prof. UW r, *Cezar Rzymu, Turk Shahi Kabulu* (27 XI 2019).
2. Mgr Elżbieta GÓRKA, *Mantuanus w Polsce. Kilka uwag na temat anonimowego przekładu Eklogi VI Mantuanusa z połowy XVII wieku* (18 XII 2021).
3. Dr Marcin KURPIOS, *Fragmenty Dziejów Fylarcha z Aten: Polibiusz jako cover-text* (29 I 2020).

Formalna działalność Oddziału została zatrzymana przez sytuację epidemiczną, co nie przeszkodziło jednak jego członkom organizować na własną rękę odczytów i warsztatów w formie zdalnej (m.in. seria wykładów poświęconych historii Wandalów wygłoszona przez prof. Gościwita Malinowskiego czy cykl *Seminaria Gelliana* dr Katarzyny Ochman).

dr Mariusz Plago

SPRAWOZDANIE FUNDACJI *TRADITIO EUROPAE* ZA OKRES OD 11 WRZEŚNIA 2019 DO 15 WRZEŚNIA 2021

I. Zgodnie ze statutem organami Fundacji są: Rada Fundacji i Zarząd Fundacji. W skład Rady Fundacji wchodzi następujące osoby: prof. dr hab. Marian Szarmach, UMK – fundator; prof. dr hab. Przemysław Nehring, UMK – przewodniczący; dr hab. Tomasz Sapota, prof. UŚ – wiceprzewodniczący; dr Alicja Brusewicz, UMK – sekretarz; mgr Genowefa Malicka, VII LO w Toruniu; prof. dr hab. Kazimierz Korus, UJ; dr Mariusz Zagórski, UW (do 28 listopada 2019); dr hab. Zbigniew Nerczuk, prof. UMK (od 28 listopada 2019). W skład Zarządu Fundacji wchodzi następujące osoby: dr hab. Barbara Bibik, prof. UMK – prezes; dr hab. Bartosz Awianowicz, prof. UMK – wiceprezes; dr hab. Rafał Toczko, prof. UMK – sekretarz; mgr Wioleta Dudek – skarbnik; dr Magdalena Nowak – członek Zarządu (do 28 listopada 2019); mgr Magdalena Awianowicz – członek Zarządu.

II. Opis działalności statutowej w wyznaczonym okresie.

1. We współpracy z Katedrą Filologii Klasycznej i Toruńskim Oddziałem Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego kontynuowano pierwszy z programów Fundacji – „Ligę Starożytniczą”. Jest to specjalny program opracowany w formie konkursu, którego celem jest popularyzacja wiedzy o kulturze antycznej, rozbudzanie i pogłębianie zainteresowań antykiem oraz kształtowanie wśród młodzieży świadomości wspólnej tradycji europejskiej. Raz w miesiącu uczniowie uczestniczą w wykładach prowadzonych przez pracowników naukowych lub doktorantów; po wykładach organizowane są testy sprawdzające wiedzę uczniów. Konkurs trwa nieprzerwanie od 2007 roku. Adresowany jest do młodzieży z województwa kujawsko-pomorskiego. Rokrocznie do udziału w Lidze starożytniczej zgłasza się 150–250 uczniów z całego regionu (do jedenastej edycji konkursu w roku 2017/2018 zgłosiło się natomiast niemal 300 uczniów). Ze względu na wybuch pandemii i związane z nią ograniczenia w ramach XIII edycji przeprowadziliśmy wyłącznie cztery z siedmiu spotkań. Z tego też powodu jesienią 2020 roku podjęliśmy decyzję o organizacji XIV edycji konkursu (w roku szkolnym 2020/2021) w formie zdalnej. Do konkursu zgłosiło się ponad 50 uczestników. Obecnie przygotowujemy XV edycję konkursu. Od roku 2009 rokrocznie konkurs otrzymuje dotację z Urzędu Marszałkowskiego Województwa Kujawsko-Pomorskiego (w latach 2019–2021 dotacje z UM wynosiły: 3400 zł, 3500 zł, 3000 zł). Od 2009 roku rokrocznie Liga obejmowana jest również honorowym patronatem Kujawsko-Pomorskiego Kuratora Oświaty. Konkurs objęty został też patronatem Dziekana Wydziału Humanistycznego UMK.

2. Od września 2010 prowadzimy cykliczny projekt pt. „Toruńskie warsztaty numizmatyki antycznej”. Projekt organizowany jest we współpracy z Instytutem Archeologii UMK oraz Oddziałem Toruńskim Polskiego Towarzystwa

Numizmatycznego. Patronat nad warsztatami objął Institut für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte (Universität Wien) oraz Zarząd Główny Polskiego Towarzystwa Numizmatycznego. Kolejne edycje warsztatów organizowane są rokrocznie w lutym oraz wrześniu/październiku i cieszą się one dużym powodzeniem wśród numizmatyków z całej Polski. Od 2014 roku jesienne edycje warsztatów odbywają się w Krakowie, we współpracy z Muzeum im. Emeryka Hutten-Czapskiego. Ze względu na wybuch pandemii w 2020 roku warsztaty się nie odbyły, natomiast w 2021 roku odbyły się w formie zdalnej w terminie 21–22 maja jako „The 1st E-Conference of the Toruń Workshops in Ancient Numismatics”.

3. Od roku 2011 Fundacja przyznawała nagrodę dla najlepszego nauczyciela języka łacińskiego w Polsce. Nagroda przyznawana była uroczyście raz na dwa lata podczas walnego zjazdu Polskiego Towarzystwa Filologicznego. W bieżącym roku decyzją Zarządu i Rady Fundacja postanowiła wycofać się z finansowania tej nagrody.

4. Fundacja prowadzi działalność promocyjną na następujących portalach społecznościowych: www.facebook.com/traditioeuropae, www.facebook.com/lacinawszkole.

LIBRI COMMENTARIIQUE PERIODICI ANNO MMXXI
RECEPTI

- COŞKUN, Altay (ed.), *Ethnic Constructs, Royal Dynasties and Historical Geography around the Black Sea Littoral*, edited with the assistance of Joanna PORUCZNIK and Germain PAYEN, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2021 (Geographia Historica 43).
- LAURAND, Valéry, MALASPINA, Ermanno, PROST, François (éds.), *Lectures plurielles du De ira de Sénèque. Interprétations, contextes, enjeux*, Berlin–Boston: de Gruyter, 2021 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 399).
- VASILIAKIS, Dimitrios A., *Eros in Neoplatonism and its Reception in Christian Philosophy. Exploring Love in Plotinus, Proclus and Dionysius the Areopagite*, London–New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021.
- Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debrecensis: vol. LV 2019.
- Ágora. Estudios Clásicos em Debate: vol. XXIII 2021.
- Archaeological Reports for 2019–2020: Archaeology in Greece 2019–2020, ed. by Yannis GALANAKIS, Andrew SHAPLAND.
- Chiron. Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: vol. L 2020.
- Hyperboreus. Studia Classica: vol. XXVI 2020; fasc. 1; fasc. 2.
- The Journal of Hellenic Studies: vol. CXL 2020.
- Listy Filologické – Folia Philologica: vol. CXLIII 2020, fasc. 3–4.
- Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie, Patristik und lateinische Tradition: vol. CXXXIV 2021.