

EOS CXI fasc. 1–2
2024

E O S

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTORZY

AGNIESZKA KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA (REDAKTOR NACZELNA)
KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA

Rocznik CXI 2024
Zeszyt 1–2

WROCŁAW
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE
I UNIWERSYTET WROCŁAWSKI
2024

E O S

COMMENTARII
SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE
POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

COMMENTARIOS EDENDOS CURAVERUNT

AGNES KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA (EDITRIX PRINCIPALIS)
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA

Volumen CXI 2024
Fasciculus 1–2

WRATISLAVIAE
SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM
ET UNIVERSITATIS WRATISLAVIENSIS
2024

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

GEORGIUS AXER, VARSOVIAE
MARGARITA BOROWSKA, VARSOVIAE
SOPHIA GŁOMBIOWSKA, GEDANI
CASIMIRUS KORUS, CRACOVIAE
LESCUS MROZEWICZ, POSNANIAE
CATHARINA OCHMAN, WRATISLAVIAE (ex officio)
IACOBUS PIGOŃ, WRATISLAVIAE
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
eos.ptf.edu.pl

EDITORUM ADIUTRIX

OLGA KUBICA

Wersją pierwotną (referencyjną) czasopisma jest wersja drukowana

Hoc volumen in lucem editum est sumptibus
instituti, cui nomen Fundacja Lanckorońskich,
auxiliante Universitate Wratislaviensi

Wydano dzięki subwencji Fundacji Lanckorońskich
przy wsparciu finansowym
Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego
i współpracy wydawniczej Wydziału Nauk
Historycznych i Pedagogicznych UW



FUNDACJA
LANCKOROŃSKICH



Uniwersytet
Wrocławski

EVS EDITORES
IACOBO PIGOŃ
ACADEMIAE WRATISLAVIENSIS
ERVDITISSIMO PROFESSORI
S. P. D.

Nomine non solum nostro sed omnium eorum quotquot hos commentarios legunt vel ad eos symbolas dant, maximas gratias tibi agere velimus, Iacobe PigoŃ, cum principalis „Eus” editoris munere fideliter per quattuor lustra perfunctus iam lampada tradis.

Tempore quo hoc officium administrabas, non solum summis integritatis academicae et elegantiae editorialis legibus paruisti, sed etiam societatem communemque studiorum et eruditionis amorem inter sodales aluisti. Ductu tuo „Eos” floruit et vixit apud Polonos ut princeps locus studiis classicis deditus, ubi et veteres et novi homines docti res suas indagationesque communicare potuerunt.

Labor tuus indefessus ac mira facultas pervestigandi mutationes, quas editio academica nostrae aetatis postulat, in annalibus „Eus” memoriam tuam perpetuam reliquerunt. Vere sumus tibi grati pro studio, prudentia, diligentia, quibus multum ad incrementum prosperitatemque commentariorum nostrorum contulisti.

Cum autem novos vitae cursus ingrediaris, valde speramus fore ut omnia tua consilia ex animi sententia succedant. Etsi tuo discessu huic capiti historiae „Eus” veluti finis imponatur, tua tamen auctoritas et vestigia venturis annis semper manebunt.

Gratias tibi agimus, Iacobe noster, quod tua opera tantum ad commentarios nostros contuleris.

Vale quam optime et de litteris antiquis praeclare promerere perge.

DIE VICESIMO SECUNDO MENSIS MAII
ANNO BIS MILLESIMO VICESIMO QUARTO
DE VITA DECESSIT

ROBERTUS CHODKOWSKI

QUONDAM
CATHOLICAE UNIVERSITATIS LUBLINENSIS IOANNIS PAULI II
PROFESSOR
CATHEDRAE DRAMATIS ET THEATRI ANTIQUI PRAEFECTUS
HONORARIUS SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM SODALIS
PERITISSIMUS ET DILIGENTISSIMUS
TRAGOEDIAE GRAECAE INDAGATOR
AESCHYLI SOPHOCLIS EURIPIDIS HOMERI
INTERPRES INSIGNIS
VENERABILIS MEMORIAE ARTIUM ET LITTERARUM ANTIQUARUM
CULTOR EXIMIUS
MULTARUM DENIQUE GENERATIONUM PHILOLOGORUM
PRAECEPTOR ET FORMATOR FIDELIS
CUIUS DOCTRINA ET PIETAS HUMANITATIS
PRAECLARUM LUMEN EFFULSERUNT
ERUDITIONIS CLARITATE, HUMANITATE, ET STUDIO PERPETUO
EXCELLENS

VIR HONORATUS MEMORIAM SUAM
APUD OMNES DISCIPULOS ET COLLEGAS
GRATO ANIMO RELIQUIT
CUIUS NOMEN PER FUTURA TEMPORA
CUM LAUDE CELEBRABITUR

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE

COMMENTATIONES

Kenneth MOORE, Xenophon's 'Sustained Civic Income' in the <i>Ways and Means</i> : Naïve, Exploitative and/or a Plan Ahead of Its Time?.....	11–53
Gościwit MALINOWSKI, Arimaspi and Issedonians Reconsidered	55–87
Damian PIERZAK, The <i>Ara Pacis</i> and the Date of Augustus' Restoration of the <i>Flamonium Diale</i> : A Note on Tac. <i>Ann.</i> III 58, 2 and Dio LIV 36, 1	89–97
Jeffrey TATUM, Plutarch and the Performance of Belatedness at <i>Nicias</i> 1	99–124
Elżbieta WESOŁOWSKA, Tuticanus and his Secret: Hypothetical Considerations (Ovid, <i>Ex Ponto</i> IV 12, IV 14, and IV 16).....	125–133
Kamil BIAŁY, Xiphilinus and the Alexandrian Embassy of 57 BC.....	135–152
Michał CHOPIANY, <i>Dudithiana novissima (cum minutia Bezana)</i> : Two overlooked letters by Andreas Dudith and unrecorded entries from the <i>liber amicorum</i> of Jan and Adam Čejka.....	153–174
Grzegorz BARTUSIK, 'Father of the People': The Ancient Roman Metaphor for the Ruler in Medieval Icelandic Contexts	175–197
Michał BZINKOWSKI, Nikos Kazantzakis' <i>Travelling: The Morea – Byzantium</i> as an Ideological Construct or a Unique Source of Personal Inspiration?	199–225
Elwira KACZYŃSKA & Krzysztof Tomasz WITCZAK, Ancient Greek ΣΤΑΧΥΣ and ΑΣΤΑΧΥΣ: Semantic and Morphological Discrepancies.....	227–242
Marek STACHOŃ, Ein Sonett an Leuconous: Marian Hemars polnische Nachdichtung von Horaz' <i>Ode</i> I 11	243–250

MISCELLANEA

Pierre-Jacques DEHON, Retour en terrain connu: <i>igne vs imbre</i> dans Tibulle I 1, 48.	251–259
Boris KAYACHEV, Tibullus I 1, 78: An Emendation	261–263
Wojciech SOWA, Zum lesbischen Wort für Stein – ψᾶφαξ (Gregor von Korinth Περὶ Αἰολ. 66) oder ψᾶφρυξ?.....	265–274

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

Revisiting Hellenistic Historiography: The Dynamics of the Human Psyche (A Review Article): Dirk Rohmann, <i>Psychologie in der hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung</i> , Stuttgart 2023 (Marcin KURPIOS).....	275–279
Rafał Matuszewski, <i>Being Alone in Antiquity: Greco-Roman Ideas and Experiences of Misanthropy, Isolation and Solitude</i> , Berlin–Boston 2022 (Martin STÖCKINGER)...	280–282
A New Chapter in Gellian Studies (A Review Article): Scott J. DiGiulio, <i>Reading Miscellany in the Roman Empire: Aulus Gellius and the Imperial Prose Collection</i> , New York 2024 (Katarzyna OCHMAN).....	283–287
Libri annis MMXXIII et MMXXIV recepti.....	288

The editors and authors of *Eos. Commentarii Philologiae Polonorum*, vol. CXI, wish to express their heartfelt gratitude to the outgoing editor-in-chief, Jakub Pigoń, for his invaluable contribution to the preparation of this volume and for accepting for publication the papers by K. Biały, M. Choptiany, J.-P. Dehon, E. Kaczyńska and K.T. Witczak, B. Kayachev, J. Moore, M. Stachoń, M. Stöckinger, and E. Wesołowska.

XENOPHON'S 'SUSTAINED CIVIC INCOME'
IN THE *WAYS AND MEANS*:
NAÏVE, EXPLOITATIVE AND/OR A PLAN AHEAD OF ITS TIME?

by

KENNETH MOORE

ABSTRACT: This article examines Xenophon's proposal for what will be termed here a 'Sustained Civic Income' in his *Ways and Means* (*Poroi e peri Prosodon*) as an approach for preventing civil strife and promoting a type of self-sustaining prosperity among citizens, based (not unequivocally) on non-imperialist methods. The article considers some of the observable, epistemological roots for Xenophon's scheme, with particular regard to the moral and political philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, alongside some Spartan exemplars. The article also contrasts Xenophon's plan with Pericles' juror pay along with some similar notions put forward by Aristophanes, particularly in his *Wasps*. The practicality of Xenophon's plan is assessed with recourse to such real-world figures, in terms of size and population, as are available, albeit within obviously limited degrees of accuracy. The article asserts that the subject of something like a universal basic income is of considerable relevance to the present, perhaps even more so than it was pertinent to Xenophon's own historical context.

The prospect of a universal basic income (UBI) for all citizens is a subject of contention in the modern world. The notion is increasingly being regarded seriously by both academics and policy-makers¹. It is seen more and more as an attractive possibility given the sheer number of traditional jobs that are being taken, and will continue to be taken, by automation and the advancing state of artificial intelligence, and which are not likely to be replaced in numbers by equivalent posts. At its most fundamental, a UBI amounts to "an unconditional, periodic cash payment that a government makes to everyone with no strings attached" giving them sufficient means for food, housing etc. at a basic level,

¹ See K. MILLER, *Radical Proposal: Universal Basic Income to Offset Job Losses Due to Automation*, HAI: Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence, Stanford University, 20 October 2021 [hai.stanford.edu/news/radical-proposal-universal-basic-income-offset-job-losses-due-automation, last accessed 24 June 2024].

ideally a comfortable but not lavish quality of maintenance². In relatively recent history, the likes of Thomas Paine, Napoleon Bonaparte, Robert Heinlein and Martin Luther King Jr., among other notables, have all advocated some form of UBI. In the United Kingdom, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, an independent ‘social change organisation’ working to end poverty, has argued that such an arrangement “could be designed to reduce poverty, improve income security and boost well-being”; however, they are also aware that it would likely “be expensive and challenging to introduce”³. As the gap between rich and poor widens, however, the need for some innovative solution is becoming more urgent, given that the so-called ‘free market’ does not appear to be effectively addressing this problem except in the most brutal sense. And there remains a highly relevant and sensitive issue: who pays for it? With an estimated 57% of the world’s jobs at risk of being replaced by automated systems in the near future, and even more assuredly to follow, one solution might be to derive the UBI out of the productivity of automation itself⁴. Taxing the profits of the *automata* to feed and house large segments of the population seems reasonable, given that robots themselves do not purchase the products that they produce, while simultaneously generating an industrial surplus on a scale never before imagined. Indeed, the whole system might grind to a halt if most people should end up being unable to afford the goods and services that our economy keeps churning out and on which it depends for its very existence. These and other related issues will be for us as a society to resolve, hopefully sooner rather than later, and likely not without some significant socio-political wrangling.

It might therefore surprise some readers to learn that the question of a Universal Basic Income for citizens is not entirely a novel feature of modernity, even if it appeared in the early-modern era through the thoughts of the above-named luminaries. At least one ancient Greek writer, Xenophon of Athens (c. 430–355/354 BC), had conceived of something like a practical UBI for Athenian citizens in the 4th century BC⁵. He did not do so in isolation, as it happens. Certainly the philosophical influences of his mentor Socrates, his fellow student Plato and others may be observed here and these will be discussed further below – along with another Athenian who was not a philosopher *per se*, though he was acquainted with

² D. FLOYD, *The Long, Weird History of Universal Basic Income – and Why It’s Back*, Investopedia, part of the Guide to the Joe Biden Presidency, 21 June 2022 [www.investopedia.com/news/history-of-universal-basic-income, last accessed 24 June 2024].

³ ANON., *Is Universal Basic Income a good idea?*, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 27 May 2021 [www.jrf.org.uk/report/universal-basic-income-good-idea, last accessed 24 June 2024].

⁴ See A. STERN, *Is a Universal Basic Income the Answer to Automation-Caused Unemployment?* in *Futurism*, 25 December 2016 [futurism.com/is-a-universal-basic-income-the-answer-to-automation-caused-unemployment, last accessed 24 June 2024].

⁵ See esp. J. DILLERY, *Xenophon: The Small Works*, in: M.A. FLOWER (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, Cambridge 2016, 195–222.

many of the same philosophers as Xenophon. The playwright Aristophanes of Athens (c. 446–c. 386 BC) had earlier presented a similar notion for something like a pension scheme for retired Athenians in the latter quarter of the 5th century. Neither system, as we shall see, would have been a truly Universal Basic Income in the modern sense if implemented; although, Xenophon's approach arguably comes closest to that. What are these schemes? Can we trace their epistemological roots? And would they have actually worked?

It seems that the answer to the last question is 'maybe', in both instances. We shall see that Xenophon's plan actually had considerable potential, although it also presented some difficulties, especially in the details. Aristophanes' plan too, perhaps somewhat oddly, given its comedic context, likely would have also worked, albeit with caveats. And kudos go to Aristophanes for having worked out most of the economic details for his plan, if not all of the social ones. These and other related issues will be considered in further detail below in order to offer more comprehensive answers. This article shall firstly do so by examining what its author is calling Xenophon's Sustained Civic Income (sometimes abbreviated as SCI), in terms of its efficacy and then we shall consider potential sources and influences for the idea itself. The latter will include, naturally, the uniquely different Spartan economy as we understand it, along with Plato's adoption of aspects of that system in the *Republic* and the *Laws*. The article will also consider key passages of Aristophanes' *Wasps* as a potential influence on Xenophon. In that play there is proffered a more limited type of UBI, which is in fact a sort of universal pension scheme in its own right, as indicated above. It will sometimes be referred to as the Aristophanic Pension Plan (APP).

From the inception it is important to note that both plans proposed by these ancient Athenians, whether seriously or otherwise, depend almost completely on the exploitation of other human beings and, as such, would be morally reprehensible in the modern era. Some would have considered them morally reprehensible in their own era, though perhaps for differing reasons. Even so, it is interesting that these thinkers of the first democracy were contemplating the need for such a system. Of course, the situation had changed by the middle of the 4th century, when Xenophon was writing, with Athens much reduced. But that was not the case when Aristophanes wrote *Wasps* in the latter quarter of the 5th century, nearer to the zenith of empire; although perhaps he saw the way the wind was blowing, so to speak. Even in that more prosperous era, it seems that the wealth gap and relative poverty within the *polis* deemed by Pericles to be an "Education to the Greeks" was something that required extraordinary state intervention in order to 'level the playing field', among its citizenry. This would be even more so the case by the time that Xenophon was writing his treatise. But let us first consider the man himself and his context, alongside his novel plan.

In book IV of the *Poroi*, Xenophon proposed that a universal income for all Athenian citizens could be achieved. This would require each Kleisthenic

tribe to collectively obtain a certain number of slaves per citizen; said slaves would then generate revenue, primarily through mining but through other types of work as well, with some reinvestment in more slaves over time. He reckoned that a putative 10,000 slaves could produce a return of 100 talents per year, to give citizens a regular income and to produce a self-sustaining cycle of investment and output.⁶ The details and functionality of this plan will be presently considered below. However, it is firstly essential to bear in mind Xenophon's background and context and what bearing all of that almost certainly had on his thinking in the *Poroi*. He was a Greek military leader, a philosopher who studied alongside Plato under Socrates' tutelage, an historian and, as should be obvious, an elite member of his society. At the age of thirty, he was chosen to command one of the largest Greek mercenary armies at the time, known as the Ten Thousand, in the employ of the Achaemenid Empire of Persia⁷. Under his leadership, they besieged, albeit unsuccessfully, the fabled city of Babylon in 401 BC. Working closely with the Persians likely helped in his research on the *Kyropaideia* but also earned Xenophon exile from his home *polis* in that same year⁸. Thereafter, his friendly associations with Spartan royalty resulted in the latter gifting Xenophon with an estate at Skillous, near Ellis. Xenophon may be rightly characterised as a 'Lakonophile', arguably even more so than Plato. During his time of exile from Athens, Xenophon even served as Sparta's representative to Olympia, making it very clear with whom he had thrown in his lot. He also sent his sons to Sparta for their education which presumably likewise helped to inform his knowledge of the Spartan *agoge*, found variously throughout his writings but particularly in his *Constitution of the Spartans* (Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτεία). His fortunes were indeed yoked for a time to Sparta's and it was in the wake of the Battle of Leuktra, in 371 BC, that he lost his estate to the resurgent Eleans. We are told that he passed away in Corinth in 355/354 BC⁹. However, as HIGGINS has observed, the fact that he died in Corinth does not mean that he lived there for the seventeen years' interval between the time of his hasty departure from Ellis and his eventual demise¹⁰. His exile from Athens had been rescinded, likely in 368 BC, and there is every reason to believe that he returned, at least for a time, to his home *polis*¹¹. Some part of him apparently

⁶ X. *Vect.* IV 23–30.

⁷ Paus. V 6, 5 and IX 15, 5.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Paus. V 6, 5 ff. See B. HUSS, *Xenophons Symposion: Ein Kommentar*, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1999 (BzA 125), p. 493.

¹⁰ W. E. HIGGINS, *Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis*, Albany (NY) 1977, p. 128.

¹¹ See Diog. Laert. II 53, II 59. The rescension of Xenophon's exile likely came after the accord reached between Athens and Sparta around the time of Leuktra.

never truly left Athens, as he certainly made that city the focus of much of his later writing.

Xenophon spent his final years, in and out of exile, producing many of his famous works; but considered to be the final treatise attributed to him is the *Poroi e peri Prosodon* (Πόροι ἢ περὶ Προσόδων) or *On Revenues*, usually rendered as *Ways and Means* or just *Poroi*¹². It is a curious attempt at addressing the faults and woes of his sometimes estranged homeland. In it, Xenophon exhorts them to abandon expansionist policies as the chief means of increasing state revenues and instead to adopt programs aimed at improving existing resources, infrastructure and trade, and thus to enhance the common welfare of both the *polis* and its citizens. DILLERY optimistically described this as “a proposal and conceptual framework virtually without parallel in all antiquity”¹³. Perhaps it is ultimately “without parallel” in its scope and aims; but it did not appear *ex nihilo*, as shall be presently considered. It is worth noting too, by way of a caveat, that Xenophon does sometimes invoke irony in his writings. And it is possible that his proposed UBI (SCI) is an example of that, aimed at social criticism of the Athenians much as Aristophanes has done in the *Wasps*, as discussed below. However, Xenophon’s use of irony has been generally observed in works other than the *Poroi*; and there seems no apparent reason to assume that he is being other than frank here¹⁴. Taking his candour as given, his unique economic solution would not be echoed again with seriousness, barring perhaps some of the communally religious societies of the medieval era, which shall be mentioned briefly below by way of contrast, until modernity. Notions of welfare and questions of how to deal with poverty were ‘in the air’, so to speak, at the time, and they naturally derived out of existing historical processes and contexts, albeit reacting to pressing necessities unique to the era and locality.

We can firstly consider a most obvious epistemological influence on, and precursor to, Xenophon’s plan in Pericles’ subsidy for jury and assembly attendance, which was initially two obols per day, rising later to three; pay for attending the Assembly had been the same but was later doubled to six (= one drachma) and nine obols for major assembly meetings¹⁵. This was only for jurors

¹² See S. SCHORN, *Xenophons Poroi als philosophische Schrift*, *Historia* LX 2011, pp. 65–93, for extensive background on the historical reception of the *Poroi* and esp. n. 9 on its generally accepted authenticity. See too D. WHITEHEAD, *Xenophon. Poroi: Revenue-Sources*, Clarendon Ancient History Series, Oxford–New York 2019, *passim*, on the date of composition of the *Poroi*.

¹³ J. DILLERY, “Xenophon (4)” [www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0004:entry=xenophon, last accessed 29 October 2024].

¹⁴ See Y.L. TOO, *Xenophon’s Other Voice: Irony as Social Criticism in the 4th Century BCE*, London 2023.

¹⁵ The two obols’ pay *per diem* was first instituted by Pericles in the 450s for jury and assembly attendance (Arist. *Pol.* 1274a8; *Ath.* 27, 3–5), increased to three obols under Kleon in the 420s (Ar. *Eq.* 51; 797–800; *V.* 88; 300); assembly pay was doubled to one drachma (1.5 drachmas

and assemblymen and not all citizens, at any given time, and trials and assembly meetings did not transpire every day. It is, in fact, quite difficult to tell exactly how many such events occurred in a given year or precisely how many jurors and assemblymen were involved and were receiving this pay. In the case of jury service, HANSEN had argued that between 150 and 200 days of trials occurred per year during the Classical era¹⁶. By contrast, AVILÉS and MIRHADY concluded that there were likely fewer court days, arguing that the system described in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* assumes as many as ten trials occurring in a day. Thus they conclude that 1,500–2,000 trials per year would have been an improbable number of proceedings, even for the notoriously litigious citizens of Classical Athens¹⁷. Having re-examined the evidence, O'CONNELL has concluded that 150 trial days per year would have been a somewhat high, though not utterly implausible, figure; however, it would have almost certainly been fewer in reality and the overall quantity was probably reduced in the 4th century as compared to that of the 5th¹⁸. Much of the uncertainty comes from our lack of knowledge about all of their sacred days and festivals on which trials could not occur and on which the Assembly could not meet. However, if we assume 3,000 citizen *dikasts* in any given year, during the time of the *Poroi*, (it had been closer to 6,000 in Pericles' era), and take the more generous figure of 1,500 trials, then that could equate to 150 drachmas of additional income per year for an individual. But this assumes that a single juror could have attended at least one trial on each of the 150 days, which may not have been possible in reality.

The total cost to the state, again assuming 3,000 jurors and 150 trial days, at ten trials per day, comes to about 450,000 drachmas per year or 75 talents¹⁹. As O'CONNELL has argued, there probably would have been fewer than 150 trial days and it is highly unlikely that the same juror could have reasonably attended all of them or even that all 3,000 jurors would have necessarily been required in any given year in any kind of predictably consistent way. Roughly, then, we can estimate that Pericles' paid jury duty amounted to an income supplement of between approximately 50 and 100 drachmas per year for some individuals, and roughly the same group of individuals too, albeit with significant scope for variation. Many of these would have been elderly and retired, thus having the time

for major assemblies) sometime between the 390s and 320s (Arist. *Ath.* 62, 2). See M.M. MARKLE, *Jury Pay and Assembly Pay at Athens*, *History of Political Thought* VI 1/2 1985, pp. 265–297 [www.jstor.org/stable/26212473, last accessed 24 June 2024].

¹⁶ M.H. HANSEN, *How Often Did the Athenian Dicasteria Meet?*, GRBS XX 1979, pp. 243–246.

¹⁷ D. AVILÉS, D.C. MIRHADY, *Law Courts*, in: H. BECK (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, Malden (UK) 2013, pp. 205–218, and esp. p. 214.

¹⁸ P.A. O'CONNELL, *How Often Did the Athenian Dikasteria Meet? A Reconsideration*, GRBS LX 2020, pp. 324–341.

¹⁹ See below where Aristophanes gives a figure of 150 talents per year for 6,000 *dikasts* in the 5th century.

to devote to jury duty or for attending the Assembly. And so we might consider this a sort of *de facto* pension for many but by no means all citizens. Or perhaps we might think of it as more of an income supplement or subsistence pay, but in no ways a universal basic income.

It is worth noting that Plato, whose ideas clearly influenced Xenophon, was critical of paying jurors and assemblymen. At *Gorgias* 515e, he writes that Pericles “made the Athenians idle, cowardly, outspoken and money-loving by establishing this pay at state expense”²⁰. Isokrates too, at *Areopagitikos* VII 54, acknowledged that wages for jury service do in fact provide the necessities of life for many Athenians. In the same work however, at VII 24–27, he also exaggerated the amount of money that citizens could earn from serving the state in these capacities, claiming that “they administer their own property with recourse to the public funds” and he clearly prefers an idealised past in which “those who had sufficient leisure and property were running the public affairs”²¹. So we see that even amongst those who might be sympathetic to economic plans that promote civic concord, there was a conservative backlash against simply giving people money from the state for what would be considered by elites to be simply doing one’s duty, along with an expectation that a certain class (not the poor) should always be in charge.

While the state funding of *dikasts* and assemblymen was almost certainly an influence on Xenophon in the economic sense, he seems to have also been echoing certain ethical sentiments found in Thucydides, who probably passed away sometime after 399 BC. His history ends abruptly while describing events of 411 BC, but there are references in the work to events that happened as late as 399 BC. And Thucydides had considered that the fear of Athenian expansionism was the root cause of the war with Sparta. He regarded the unrestrained acquisition of wealth and power (*pleonexia* = ‘seeking to get more than’ others), alongside the competitive love of honour (*philotimia* – ‘honour’, effectively a commodity for a certain class in this context), as the chief causes of civil strife within *poleis*²². Clearly displaying an intimate awareness of such matters, likely from first-hand experience, Xenophon came up with a novel solution to these problems. In sympathy with Aristotle’s later assertion that “poverty produces sedition and crime”, he also connected want (penury) with immorality and vice²³. His *Poroi* advises a means by which people would be able to supplement

²⁰ See Pl. *Resp.* 345e, where “no one is willing to voluntarily hold office, except that they demand pay”, and at 346a–347b he cites the institution of pay for magistrates as support for his argument that one who holds office should benefit the ruled and not line his own pockets.

²¹ See too MARKLE, *op. cit.* (n. 15), p. 272.

²² Thuc. III 82, 8 and cf. I 75, 3 and II 85, 7; see HIGGINS, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 128.

²³ Arist. *Pol.* II 1265b, 11–12, and see below where this passage has some further bearing on this argument.

their income, which would ideally lead to improved economic stability for the precariat classes. In this respect, HIGGINS has argued that the *Poroi* may be read as “anti-imperialistic”, since it aims at promoting social equity and eschewing expansionistic growth for its own sake in favour of a more sustainable efficiency²⁴. Xenophon’s moral approach reflects both the lessons he sought to impart in the *Hellenika* as well as certain Platonic/Socratic values concerning moderation, which are widely known, and some of which will be further discussed below²⁵. DILLERY has also argued in favour of an anti-imperialist agenda, saying that Xenophon’s writings reflected some of the anti-imperialist rhetoric found in the works of Isokrates (436–338 BC), a near-contemporary who, as we have seen, shared some broadly similar views on poverty, crime and civil strife²⁶. Even so, it is important to note the historical context of *On the Peace* with its rejection of empire *vis-à-vis* the Athens of the early/mid-fifth century, as distinct from that of the changed world of the *Poroi* in the mid-4th century²⁷.

It is worth emphasising, therefore, that regarding Xenophon as wholly anti-imperialistic is not unproblematic. Indeed, it is not unproblematic that various scholars have vehemently argued that Xenophon was variously pro- or anti-imperialist, as well as being pro- or anti-democratic, without much definitive conclusion²⁸. FARRELL has asserted that Xenophon does not in fact adopt an anti-imperialist outlook in the *Poroi*; rather, he was seeking to re-align imperial ambitions with Athenian ideals and more traditional models for securing hegemony²⁹. FARRELL contextualises Xenophon’s ideas in the *Poroi* with consideration for his ‘Socratic’ distinction between tyranny and kingship, as well as his wider advice for ruling well. He argues that Xenophon’s proposals for securing the consent of the allies reiterate ideas that he has outlined across his other works, especially the *Hiero* and *Kyropaedia*. Even so, it seems to the author of this article that Book IV of the *Poroi*, at least, does come across as at the

²⁴ HIGGINS, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 140.

²⁵ On Xenophon’s moralising in the *Hellenika*, see L.I. HAU, *Xenophon, Hellenica, Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*, Edinburgh 2016, pp. 216–44 [www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.cttlbh2hwv.11, last accessed 24 June 2024].

²⁶ J. DILLERY, *Xenophon’s Poroi and Athenian Imperialism*, *Historia* XLII 1993, pp. 1–11 [www.jstor.org/stable/4436268, last accessed 24 June 2024]. See e.g. Isoc. *De pace* 119, *et passim*: “If you will go over these and similar questions in your minds, you will discover that excess and hubris have been the cause of our misfortunes while moderation has been the source of our blessings” (ἦν γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα διεξίητε πρὸς ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς, εὐρήσετε τὴν μὲν ἀκολασίαν καὶ τὴν ὕβριν τῶν κακῶν αἰτίαν γιγνομένην, τὴν δὲ σωφροσύνην τῶν ἀγαθῶν).

²⁷ J. POWELL, *Xenophon’s Poroi: risk, rationality and enterprise in fourth-century Attica*, PhD thesis, Birkbeck University of London, 2015, p. 66.

²⁸ See *ibid.*, p. 45 f. and p. 65 f. for an excellent overview of these scholarly trends and debates.

²⁹ C.A. FARRELL, *Xenophon Poroi 5: Securing a ‘More Just’ Athenian Hegemony*, *Polis* XXX 2016, pp. 331–355.

very least anti-expansionist, more or less in keeping with DILLERY's position, but perhaps not quite anti-imperialistic in quite the same way as Isokrates, and for arguably different reasons given their respective contexts. It may be that Xenophon did, as FARRELL asserts, aim to revise Athenian imperialism, rather than eschew it entirely, along the lines of the idealised but clearly conservative Platonic/Aristotelian views of aristocracy. But if he was in fact pro-imperialist, then why not avail the vast resources readily obtainable from subject-states (as Aristophanes has half-seriously suggested in the *Wasps*) instead of proposing his sustained civic income scheme based largely on mining revenues coupled with enhanced trade? As MCBRAYER has argued, Xenophon's vision of Athens in the *Poroi* is (not un-problematically) either a "rentier republic" living plainly off the labour of others and/or a commercial state in which trade and entrepreneurship would replace thalassocratic imperialism as sources of the city's revenues³⁰. Whatever Xenophon was precisely thinking about Athenian imperialism, it is certain that either of these alternatives that MCBRAYER has identified would likely have been welcomed with alacrity by the impoverished and much-reduced Athens of 355 BC, when *Poroi* was published.

It seems to the author of this article that some critique of empire may indeed be read in Xenophon. That he has been less than specific concerning his stance on the matter suggests, at the very least, that it was perhaps not at the forefront of his mind when composing the *Poroi*. In it, Xenophon has laid out a method by which Athens could sustain its populace with economic self-sufficiency and do so, crucially, without recourse to militaristically expansionist policies. His approach amounts to making the most efficient use of available resources for the common good, rather than solely for individual gain. And perhaps it was Xenophon's unique background and experiences that allowed him to contemplate such a novel approach. His multiple and close relations with the Spartans, along with his philosophical training, add an extra dimension to his character and thought, whose undercurrents and influences may perhaps be observed here. It is tempting to assert that he had a kind of 'military mindset', however we may choose to define such a thing, and the preoccupation that such a mind-set might have had with logistical problems perhaps resulted in his development of this scheme. But it would be an error to cast him so one-dimensionally, given the breadth and depth of his interests and background. At best, Xenophon's military experience perhaps aided his thinking but did not likely dominate it³¹. And there is something too in the *Poroi* of the frugal aristocrat aiming for the well-organized husbandry of his holdings. We know, for example, that he often discussed the running of the state and society with metaphorical recourse to the art of

³⁰ G.A. MCBRAYER (ed.), *The Shorter Writings by Xenophon*, New York 2018, 175–188.

³¹ M. CHRIST, *Xenophon and the Athenian Democracy: The Education of an Elite Citizenry*, Cambridge 2020; see the chapter on the *Poroi*, *et passim*.

horsemanship³². And he appears to have approached the issue of his proposed Sustained Civic Income project both philosophically as well as from that husbandry-oriented position. As noted above, his plan depends utterly on the shared ownership of slaves among tribesmen, who would then reap the rewards of their labours and is thus, as we would say today, based on the unethical exploitation of human beings. While, as stated, this would be unacceptable in the (civilised) modern world, given some appropriately altered version of it (e.g. utilising automation instead of human slaves), the prospect appears more approachable today. In both Xenophon's era and the modern world there is economic hardship, burgeoning class and wealth inequality, and the fear of civil strife in consequence thereof. As a concept, his plan is also worthy of note for being well in advance of Xenophon's own era, even if it never came to pass at that time. It was even more ambitious as his failed attempt to conquer Babylon.

What are the details of his plan, then? Would it actually work or was he being *naïve*, as some have argued³³? What he has proposed is that each *deme* should own a certain number of slaves, mostly for mining, and that the net of their profits should then be distributed to all citizens of that deme. Let us first consider some facts and figures that are relevant here. The hinterland of Attika was approximately 2,500 square kilometres and this held a population in latter part of the 5th / early 4th century of somewhere between 250,000 and 300,000 people, with 90,000 to 100,000 living in the urban centre of Athens³⁴. Some fifty percent of these inhabitants were probably slaves, with another, smaller percentage being resident aliens. And Xenophon is not seeking to provide any of them with a direct income supplement. Potentially, the plan would be for supporting only about 30,000 or so adult, male citizens and their families, although that number is by no means certain, as we shall see³⁵. It is worth noting that the population had been significantly higher in the mid-5th century, prior to the Peloponnesian Wars³⁶. CARTLEDGE, based on Thucydides' account, estimated

³² See HIGGINS, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 135 f.

³³ For a good overview and some criticism of it, see J. OBER, *The Instrumental Value of Others and Institutional Change: An Athenian Case Study*, in: I. SLUITER, R. JOHNSON (eds.), *Valuing Others in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden 2010, pp. 156–178.

³⁴ K.R. MOORE, *A Re-Evaluation of the Application of Keynesian Economic Theory to Classical Athens*, *The Athens Journal of History* IV 2017, pp. 7–18. See M.H. HANSEN, *Polis: An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State*, London–New York 2010, pp. 92–93 *et passim*. See too J. THORLEY, *Athenian Democracy: Lancaster Pamphlets in Ancient History*, London–New York 2005, p. 74.

³⁵ P. GAUTHIER, *Xenophon's Programme in the Poroi*, in: V. GRAY (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Xenophon*, Oxford 2010, pp. 113–136, esp. p. 121 [Originally published as P. GAUTHIER, *Le programme de Xénophon dans les Poroi*, *RPh* LVIII 1984, pp. 181–199].

³⁶ J. ROTHCHILD, *Introduction to Athenian Democracy of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BCE*, Wayne State University Law School Research Paper, No. 7–32 (Oct. 2007) [dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1020397, last accessed 24 June 2024].

that the total population of Athens in 431 BC was between 360,000–610,000³⁷. Adult, male citizens living in Athens itself then numbered around 60,000 until the losses resulting from the wars with Sparta effectively halved that total. The lower population and loss of empire in the 4th century necessitated some economic re-positioning. The chief forms of direct taxation were known as the *eisphora*, which was a direct wealth-tax imposed on wealthy Athenians during financial crises, and the *leitourgeia*, whereby the richest members more or less voluntarily financed certain state activities for which they received honours. As FIGUEIRA has noted, with a reduced population and therefore smaller economy, 4th century Athens had promulgated a significantly extended incidence of such taxes compared to the previous century, albeit with limited effect in terms of revenues raised³⁸. Xenophon was looking in the *Ways and Means* at areas in which one might legislate with the hope of some gains in the intermediate-to longer-term³⁹. He focused on efficiency and increasing the use of slave and foreign labour in order to maximise profit and to also promote trade. If he was correct that a lack of labour was the main issue, then increasing the availability of slave workers was an acceptable solution at the time, although scholars have been variously praising or condemnatory of the scheme's viability⁴⁰. As POWELL has noted, interpretations of the *Poroi*'s economics tend to "reflect the political and scholarly obsessions of their times whilst mirroring the evolution of the wider assessment of Xenophon's writing"⁴¹. And this article is no different, though it does acknowledge that interpretations of Xenophon are becoming more nuanced than they used to be, which is only appropriate.

In the description of his plan, Xenophon refers to the ten artificial "tribes" (*phulai*) to which all Athenians belonged, following the 5th century reforms of Kleisthenes⁴². Each would collectively own a body of slaves as their dedicated, profit-earning workforce. If we assume that he was referring exclusively to all adult, male Athenian citizens, which does indeed seem to be the case, then the total population of a given Kleisthenic tribe that is relevant here would be

³⁷ P. CARTLEDGE, *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History 1300 to 362 BC* (2nd ed.), Oxford 2002, p. 174.

³⁸ T.J. FIGUEIRA, *Economic Thought and Economic Fact in the Works of Xenophon*, in: F. HOBDEN, C. TUPLIN (eds.), *Xenophon: Ethical Principle and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden 2012, p. 674.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ See S. LAUFFER, *Das Bergbauprogramm in Xenophons Poroi*, in: H. MUSSCHE, P. SPITAEELS, F. GOEMAERE-DE POERCK (eds.), *Thorikos and the Laurion in Archaic and Classical Times*, Ghent 1975, pp. 171–194, for a fairly sympathetic critique of Xenophon's plan, along with POWELL below.

⁴¹ POWELL, *op. cit.* (n. 27), p. 44.

⁴² J.S. TRAILL, *The Political Organization of Attica: a Study of the Demes, Trittyes and Phylai and their Representation of the Athenian Council*, Hesperia Suppl. XIV 1975, pp. i–169 [doi.org/10.2307/1353928, last accessed 24 June 2024].

around 3,000 at this time. He has stated that “the Athenians, of course, are divided into ten tribes [...] assume that the state were to offer each tribe an equal number of slaves, and that when new cuttings were made, the tribes were to pool their luck”⁴³, and “I have now explained what regulations I think should be introduced into the state in order that *every Athenian* [emphasis mine] may receive sufficient maintenance at the public expense”⁴⁴. He has gone on to propose an economic process of self-sustaining labour and investment, along with some limited details, as he wrote:

Assume, however, that the total number of slaves to begin with is twelve hundred. By using the revenue derived from these, the number might in all probability be raised to six thousand at the least in the course of five or six years. Further, if each man brings in a clear obol a day, the annual revenue derived from that number of men is sixty talents. Out of this sum, if twenty talents are invested in additional slaves, then the state will have forty talents available for any other necessary purpose. And when a total of ten thousand slaves has been reached, then the revenue will be a hundred talents⁴⁵.

We are apparently to assume that some of the putative 40 talents would also be needed for the upkeep of the slaves – or did he imagine that the state would fund their sustenance? If so, then that subsidy would enhance the profitability and income generated by the slaves. Setting aside problems with this rather optimistic (though not, as it turns out, unrealistic) mining forecast for the moment, how much would these figures work out as income for each citizen if they followed his plan for investment by tribe, culminating in this rough figure of 10,000 slaves producing revenue for them? Firstly, let us assume that Xenophon meant 10,000 slaves per tribe as opposed to 10,000 shared among all ten tribes. We shall return to the latter consideration below. For the time being, if the 10,000 slaves could indeed produce 100 talents per tribe, and it was 6,000 drachmas per talent in this era, then 600,000 drachmas would annually accrue per tribe. Therefore, taking the above figure of 3,000 citizens as the relevant

⁴³ X. *Vect.* IV 30, trans. mine. The Greek text is taken from E.C. MARCHANT (ed.), *Xenophon's Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, Oxford 1920: εἰσὶ μὲν γὰρ δήπου Ἀθηναίων δέκα φυλαί: εἰ δ' ἡ πόλις δοίη αὐτῶν ἴσα ἀνδράποδα, αἱ δὲ κοινωσάμεναι τὴν τύχην καινοτομοίεν, οὕτως ἂν, εἰ μία εὖροι [...].

⁴⁴ X. *Vect.* IV 33: καὶ ἐμοὶ μὲν δὴ εἴρηται ὥς ἂν ἡγοῦμαι κατασκευασθείσης τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὴν ἂν πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίοις τροφὴν ἀπὸ κοινοῦ γενέσθαι.

⁴⁵ X. *Vect.* IV 23–24: ἦν γε μέντοι τὸ πρῶτον συστῆ διακόσια καὶ χίλια ἀνδράποδα, εἰκὸς ἦδη ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς προσόδου ἐν ἔτεσι πέντε ἢ ἑξ μὴ μείον ἂν τῶν ἑξακισχιλίων γενέσθαι. ἀπὸ γε μὴν τούτου τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἦν ὀβολὸν ἕκαστος ἀτελῆ τῆς ἡμέρας προσφέρειν, ἢ μὲν πρόσοδος ἐξήκοντα τάλαντα τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ. ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων ἦν εἰς ἄλλα ἀνδράποδα τιθῆται εἴκοσι, τοῖς τετταράκοντα ἦδη ἐξέσται τῇ πόλει χρῆσθαι εἰς ἄλλο ὃ τι ἂν δέη. ὅταν δὲ γε μύρια ἀναπληρωθῇ, ἑκατὸν τάλαντα ἢ πρόσοδος ἔσται. See D. WHITEHEAD, *Xenophon. Poroi: Revenue-Sources*, Oxford–New York 2019, *passim*.

population of a given tribe, it would then work out at 200 drachmas per (adult, male) citizen per year. And this would seem to be sufficient for a universal basic income.

It was 6 obols to the drachma in this era and the average wages for an unskilled labourer are estimated to have been about 4.2 obols per day⁴⁶. Their yearly income, based on these figures, was about 256 drachmas, so not far off from this optimistic reading of Xenophon's figures. 200 drachmas per year would certainly have been a satisfactory income in itself, if not a lavish one. In order to meet that basic income figure for each of the 3,000 citizens of a given tribe, each tribe would need to collectively own 10,000 slaves. For it to work for all tribes, they would then need a total of 100,000 slaves altogether in order to meet that level of basic income per citizen. It is not impossible, of course, that fewer slaves might produce greater revenue above and beyond mining, to which Xenophon has alluded. And it is important to bear in mind that the initial figure of slaves to be provided by legislation was 1,200 (though he is unclear as to whether that was per tribe or on the whole). It might take a decade or two to reach 10,000 through both breeding and purchases of additional slaves; although, scrupulous re-investment of the initial profits could theoretically bring up that number rapidly, as Xenophon has imagined. The tribesmen would have to be content with a much smaller income initially. It would be about 24 drachma per citizen per year derived from the labours of 1,200 slaves, with about 5 drachmas from each being reinvested, so about 19 drachmas per citizen in the beginning, but rising steadily as numbers increased.

We can 'massage' these figures somewhat, noting that 15,000 slaves per tribe would give each of its 3,000 citizens 300 drachmas per year, which would probably amount to a more comfortable, if still fairly basic, liveable income. It would perhaps grant them the leisure to pursue other income-generating activities like international trade and so suffice to uplift many citizens from poverty. Possibly some citizens would not participate in the scheme, having their own adequate sources of income. He has not specified this. Even so, Xenophon has rightly anticipated objections to the feasibility of his plan stating:

Some may imagine that enough money would never be subscribed to provide the huge amount of capital necessary, according to their calculations, to finance all of these schemes. Nevertheless, they need not despair. For it is not essential that the plan should be carried out in all its details in order that any advantage may come of it. No, whatever the number of houses built, or of ships constructed, or of slaves purchased, they will immediately prove a paying concern. In fact in one respect it

⁴⁶ D. FRISBY, *What Wages in Ancient Athens Can Tell us About the Silver Price Today*, MoneyWeek, 2 March 2017 [moneyweek.com/462534/what-wages-in-ancient-athens-can-tell-us-about-the-silver-price-today, last accessed 24 June 2024]. See too S. VON REDEN, *The Cambridge Companion to the Ancient Greek Economy*, Cambridge 2022, *passim*.

will be even more profitable to proceed gradually than to do everything at once⁴⁷

He appears to envision a diversity of productive activities by slaves, not limited to silver mining only, though heavily invested in that enterprise, in order to fund this system. And he recognised the need for the plan to develop gradually so as to avoid economic pitfalls such as inflation and labour shortages.

It should be apparent that there is much uncertainty here as to the precise details of Xenophon's strategy. The author of this article has assumed that the number of slaves specified for the plan at IV 23, stated as initially 1,200 and then increasing to 10,000, is in fact per tribe. But Xenophon has not described this as explicitly as one might desire. He first refers to a "total number" of 1,200 to 10,000 slaves at IV 23, and then later, at IV 30, discusses how the risk of unproductive mines could be offset by distributing to "each tribe an equal number of slaves". It may therefore be the case that the 1,200–10,000 slaves are the total number per tribe as the author of this article has assumed for purposes of exploration above; but it could also be the case that these numbers represent the total number of slaves before their equal distribution among the ten tribes. If so, then they would amount to 120–1,000 slaves per tribe. The revenue derived from these numbers of slaves would be 10 times less than that calculated above: 20 drachmas per citizen per year at the high end of 1,000 slaves per tribe. If so, then it would not in fact constitute a 'basic income' at all, only amounting to a supplemental income akin to that of jury pay.

It is worth repeating that Xenophon has described this proposed source of revenue as providing "sufficient maintenance" (ικανὴν [...] τροφήν) for "every Athenian". However, this is ambiguous; and one might rightly ask 'sufficient for what?' Was he referring to the total annual cost of food, shelter, clothing and everything else? Countering the work of SCHÜTRUMPF, who had also argued that Xenophon was anti-democratic, GAUTHIER concluded that "The reader must therefore adopt an interpretation of the τροφή that suits both the short term (when the public revenues are still limited) and the long term (when the payment of the daily triobol becomes possible)"⁴⁸. GAUTHIER's figure of three obols (triobol), suggests Xenophon's plan would be closer to the already established jury/assembly payments, just for many more citizens instead of selected ones,

⁴⁷ X. *Vect.* IV 34–36: εἰ δέ τινες λογιζόμενοι παμπόλλης ἂν δεῖν ἀφορμῆς εἰς ταῦτα πάντα οὐχ ἡγούνται ἱκανὰ ἂν ποτε χρήματα εἰσενεχθῆναι, μηδὲ οὕτως ἀθυμούντων. οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει, ὥς ἀνάγκη ἅμα ταῦτα πάντα γίνεσθαι ἢ μηδὲν ὄφελος αὐτῶν εἶναι: ἀλλ' ὅποσα ἂν ἢ οἰκοδομηθῇ ἢ ναυπηγηθῇ ἢ ἀνδράποδα ὠνηθῇ, εὐθὺς ταῦτα ἐν ὠφελείᾳ ἔσται. ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τῇδέ γε συμφορώτερον τὸ κατὰ μέρος ἢ τὸ ἅμα πάντα πράττεσθαι. And see too D. WHITEHEAD, *op. cit.* (n. 45).

⁴⁸ GAUTHIER, *op. cit.* (n. 35), p. 122. For an opposing view see E. SCHÜTRUMPF, *Xenophon Poroi, Vorschläge zur Beschaffung von Geldmitteln oder Über die Staatseinkünfte, Einleitung, krit. Textausgabe, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Darmstadt 1982 (reprinted with corrections 1987).

which is worth considering; but we have seen how the scheme could entail much more. And GAULTHER too envisions the amount funds growing over time; although he also expresses considerable uncertainty over details such as how payments would even be made to individual citizens.

And other details persist in posing problems. Was Xenophon referring solely to the urban populace and not those in the countryside, where the numbers were higher? Did Xenophon and the *demos* of Athens feel sufficiently entitled to consider that they ought to expect to be able to meet all, or even most, of their necessary living expenses without the need for gainful employment of any kind? That seems unlikely, given the author's conservative tendencies. Yet he does not seem to be talking about a pittance, and Xenophon has noted how the mining activity of his scheme would produce additional revenues, declaring:

The rent derived from the slaves would not, however, be the only source of relief to the community. With the concentration of a large population in the mining district, abundant revenue would be derived from the local market, from houses owned by the *polis* near the silver mines, from the furnaces and all the other sources⁴⁹.

He imagines the knock-on effect whereby this increased mining and income would impact a wide range of economic activity in a positive way. Some of this would clearly represent private income; although, his language here suggests he imagines some form of taxation as well. Certainly rents raised from state-owned housing would seem to be a money-spinner for the treasury. Is it then the case that the plan envisaged would simply aim for enough supplemental income just to keep citizens out of poverty and improve their standard of living without exclusively providing them with a living itself? Xenophon has not precisely said; but the passages from *Poroi* strongly suggest that this plan was designed as more of a (perhaps very) basic income, but less of a supplement. The latter would place it in the realm of modern tax credits or child benefit, whereas he does seem to be talking about higher figures than such analogous measures alone would represent, if perhaps not much higher.

The lack of an explicit indication from Xenophon about the precise number of slaves to be assigned to each tribe admits the possibility that he envisioned the smaller figure of 1,200–10,000 slaves total (or 120–1,000 per tribe) at the start of the scheme. The higher figures considered above also present us with the practical difficulty of how one might go about obtaining roughly 100,000 publicly owned slaves, with the effect of doubling the existing slave population

⁴⁹ X. *Vect.* IV 49: οὐ τοίνυν μόνον ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδραπόδων ἀποφορὰ τὴν διατροφήν τῇ πόλει αὖξοι ἂν, ἀλλὰ πολυανθρωπίας περὶ τὰ μέταλλα ἀθροιζομένης καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς τῆς ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀπ' οἰκιῶν περὶ τὰργύρεα δημοσίων καὶ ἀπὸ καμίνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων πρόσδοι ἂν πολλαὶ γίγνοιτο.

of Athens at its height in the 5th century by most estimates⁵⁰. The cost would be significant even for an initial number of 12,000 slaves. SCHEIDEL gives an average price of 180 drachma (179 drachmas in 414 BC, and 180 in 355 BC) for a slave mineworker⁵¹. The initial cost therefore for 12,000 slaves, for example, would have been an eye-watering 2,160,000 drachmas, as opposed to a considerably more modest 21,600 for 120 slaves or even a more substantial 180,000 for 1,000 slaves. As we have seen, Xenophon acknowledged concerns about the initial cost, rather casually explaining them away. Yet we do not know for certain as to whether his arguments relate to 1,200–10,000 slaves or 12,000–100,000. The smaller figures seem more reasonable, given the ease with which Xenophon has played down the cost of setting up his scheme. But it is important to emphasise here that we do not know the exact figures that he intended (if he knew them himself), just as we do not know how large he imagined the scheme would grow; though he has suggested that it could develop into quite a substantial concern.

And there are other issues still; although they are not insurmountable. In addition to the cost, it is useful to consider the supply of slaves accessible for such a plan. Were 12,000 (or 100,000) slaves so readily available for the state to purchase, outwith the number that would have been privately purchased in any given year? We know of four primary sources of slaves: war, in which the defeated would be enslaved by the victorious, those taken in piracy or banditry, those born into slave families and the wider, international slave trade, whose ‘merchandise’ derived from all of the previous sources and more⁵². Possibly Xenophon imagined that many of those that would be needed for his plan could be taken in war. That would be the most convenient method as it would eliminate much of the initial set-up cost – or transfer it to the cost incurred by the *polis* from wartime activities; even so, he has not said this. And it seems unlikely given the apparently anti-expansionist stance of the *Poroi*. Certainly some significant number would need to be purchased and that is implicit in his discussion of the plan. Xenophon has suggested that private slave owners might willingly sell their slaves to the *polis* in order to top up the necessary numbers. Even if that were true, as noted, we do not know for certain the precise num-

⁵⁰ P. CARTLEDGE, *The Political Economy of Greek Slavery*, in: P. CARTLEDGE, E. COHEN, L. FOX-HALL (eds.), *Money, Labor, and Land: Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece*, London–New York 2005, pp. 156–166. See too N. FISHER, *Slavery in Classical Greece*, 2nd ed., London–New York 1998 and S. FORSDYKE, *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 2021.

⁵¹ W. SCHEIDEL, *Real Slave Prices and the Relative Cost of Slave Labor in the Greco-Roman World*, *AncSoc.* XXXV 2005, pp. 1–17.

⁵² D.M. LEWIS, *The Market for Slaves in the Fifth- and Fourth-Century Aegean*, in: E. HARRIS, D.M. LEWIS, M. WOOLMER (eds.), *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*, Cambridge 2015, pp. 316–36. More specialised slaves could be very costly, with the average slave builder at that time going for about 600 drachmas.

bers that he had in mind, or if many private owners would indeed have been so willing to part with their valuable chattel for cash. If private slave owners did in fact sell off significant numbers of their slaves to this scheme, then one might rightly inquire as to ask who would undertake all of the agricultural, crafting, domestic, and other labour that we presume the slaves of Attica had been doing for their private owners. In response to that, at least, we can note that Xenophon envisioned the slaves in his scheme to be engaged in activities other than just mining. And so therefore some of these state-owned slaves might still undertake that other work as part of the scheme, though perhaps with lessened profitability when compared with mining revenues.

Another issue, however, involves both the cost and the supply of slaves, and the average working life of each slave, given that work in the silver mines was especially debilitating and dangerous. There is a high content of toxic lead present in galena (silver ore), and the harsh nature of the work and the regularity of cave-ins meant 'turnover' was significant amongst those slaves doing this type of work. The undesirability of such work was evidenced during the Dekelean War phase (413–404 BC) of the Peloponnesian Wars when, according to Thucydides, no fewer than 20,000 slaves escaped to surrender to the Spartans, preferring to have them as their masters than to work for the Athenians⁵³. It is reasonable to assume that many of their numbers were from the mines – as Xenophon himself has indicated in referring to that very event⁵⁴. We can deduce therefore that more slaves would have to be purchased on a regular basis in order to maintain the requisite numbers for Xenophon's plan than would be the case for other types of labour. Again, this too is not insurmountable; though it is something about which Xenophon has not provided much detail. We can imagine him arguing that, at some point, a 'critical mass' would be achieved whereby sufficient profits would be generated in order to maintain the numbers needed – a self-sustaining cycle—topping up losses as they are incurred. Possibly the Athenians would have also decided to introduce some form of health and safety regulations in order to protect their investment in these human 'units of value'. No doubt, Xenophon realised that many aspects of his plan would need some fine-tuning, adjustment and accommodation as time progressed. These issues raised, and others, would have to be addressed in detail for the scheme to properly function, if implemented⁵⁵.

If we imaginatively concede, as a thought experiment, that Xenophon's plan would be successful in the larger sense, defining "maintenance" as nearer

⁵³ Thuc. VII 27. And see R. HOPPER, *The Attic Silver Mines in the Fourth Century B.C.*, ABSA XLVIII 1953, pp. 200–254.

⁵⁴ X. *Vect.* IV 25.

⁵⁵ See J. POWELL, 'An Obol a Day Net': *Problematizing Numbers in Xenophon's Poroi*, *Historia* LXX 2021, pp. 2–28.

to a universal basic income, then the number of slaves being exploited in the longer term would become fairly substantial. His plan would represent an aggregate increase in the numbers of slaves, at any rate, as well as in the dependency upon them, even with the lesser numbers considered above. If the scheme were expanded to become a proper UBI, then Athens would likely end up with a free-to-slave ratio akin to that of that other *polis* which had occupied so much of Xenophon's attention: Sparta. We know that they had a very large number of slaves in contrast to citizens; however, it is difficult to determine the precise ratio. And it likely changed over time. According to Herodotus (c.484–c.425 BC) in his *Histories*, over 70% of the Spartan population appears to have been helots. He wrote of the battle of Plataea in 479 that “they ordered five thousand Spartans to march before dawn [...] seven helots were appointed to attend each of them, and they gave the command to Pausanias son of Kleombrotos”⁵⁶. So, 5,000 (almost certainly male) citizens to 35,000 helots is a 1/7 ratio or 70%, if those figures are also accurate for the wider Spartan population, which they probably are not⁵⁷. At its peak in c. 500 BC, CARTLEDGE has argued that Sparta had about 20,000–35,000 citizens⁵⁸. As with Athens, their numbers were also reduced in the 4th century. At the start of that century, according to Xenophon himself, only forty full Spartan citizens could be counted in a crowd of 4,000 present in their agora⁵⁹. This gives a 1/10 ratio or 90% citizen to slave, assuming the rest were helots, although he was probably also including the *perioikoi*, whose status was akin to that of Athenian metics. The total population of helots at that time, including women, has been estimated by CARTLEDGE to have been between 170,000–224,000⁶⁰. The higher figure, with an estimated 35,000 citizens would yield about 85% slave. Assuming therefore that somewhere between 70% and 80% of the Spartan population was indeed comprised of helots and some *perioikoi*, then the Athenian slave to citizen ratio under Xenophon's plan would, at least initially, still be lower, but rapidly approaching Sparta's levels in almost every respect. Using the number of 100,000 slaves to 30,000 adult, male citizens, then they would make up approximately 77% of the population, with adult, male citizens at about 23%. If we were to use the higher figure of

⁵⁶ Hdt. IX 10, 1: νυκτὸς ἔτι ἐκπέμπουσι πεντακισχίλιους Σπαρτιητέων καὶ ἑπτὰ περὶ ἕκαστον τάζαντες τῶν εἰλωτῶν, Παισανίῃ τῷ Κλεομβρότου ἐπιτάξαντες ἐξάγειν.

⁵⁷ See J. DUCAT, *Les Hilotes*, Athènes: École française d'Athènes, BCH suppl. XX 1990, pp. 431–432, esp. the table on p. 209 [cefael.efa.gr/detail.php?site_id=1&actionID=page&prevpos=14&serie_id=BCHSuppl&volume_number=20&issue_number=0, last accessed 24 June 2024].

⁵⁸ See I. MORRIS, *The Growth of Greek Cities in the First Millennium BC. v.I*, Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics, December 2005, and see too T.H. NIELSEN (ed.), *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre, München 2017, *passim*.

⁵⁹ X. *HG* III 3, 5.

⁶⁰ P. CARTLEDGE, *Agasilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*, London–New York 1994, p. 174.

150,000 slaves, for a more generous version of Xenophon's SCI, then it works out at about 83% slave and 17% citizen. And it bears repeating that most of these numbers are rough estimates only, based as they are upon potentially dubious or imprecise sources along with a fair share of unknown and sometimes unknowable data. What is more, Athenian women, children and metics have been excluded from these figures; although, much the same was done with Sparta's demographics above. Yet, these imperfectly known numbers do yield some details, as we have seen. And, if implemented, Xenophon's plan would have transformed Athenian society, though possibly not in a way of which many at the time might have approved.

Certainly the figure of 83% is not massively off from some estimates for Sparta above, whence, in all likelihood Xenophon's scheme was ultimately, though not exclusively, derived. It falls well within the 70% to 90% range suggested by our sources. The 4th century BC Athenian numbers compare quite well with the reported population of Sparta in the early 5th century. If Xenophon's plan had actually been carried out, it would have amounted to another slave-based economy on a truly industrial scale. It is difficult to find fault with a system that appears to have sustained Sparta for several centuries until, perhaps as Xenophon would argue, they became too greedy for wealth and power, leading to their inevitable decline. Nevertheless, FINLEY was highly critical of this plan, albeit for somewhat opaque reasons, arguing that the Athenians had not properly addressed "the basic economic cleavage" between a civic-economy and a non-civic economy of metics and *xenoi* in their society which he thought would be an impediment to Xenophon's plan⁶¹. Even so, working with the limited data available on ancient economics and demographics, it is possible that Finley and others have failed to realise that the author of the *Poroi* knew better than they how such matters might obtain. It is also possible that the mines, along with other going concerns, might end up being more profitable under the proposed system and so require a lesser number of slaves than here imagined in order to provide a comfortable income to all citizens. To his credit or otherwise, Xenophon seems to have been combining elements of both Spartan and Athenian economic systems, picking those parts from each that he perhaps thought would work better and more efficiently than they did in their respective real-world contexts. Indeed, his Sustained Civic Income system seems to be a mixture of Spartan 'command economy' with Athenian 'consumer culture', aimed at limiting the excesses of the latter with some (albeit lesser) recourse to the regulation of the former.

⁶¹ M.I. FINLEY, *The Ancient Economy*, Berkeley, CA 1951, pp. 77–78. See too J. JANSEN, *Strangers Incorporated: Outsiders in Xenophon's Poroi*, in: F. HOBDEN, C. TUPLIN (eds.), *Xenophon: Ethical Principle and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden 2012, pp. 746–753 and FIGUEIRA, *op. cit.* (n. 38), pp. 676 f.

Would democratic Athens – even the much-reduced and demoralised Athens of the Second Empire era – be willing to so thoroughly ‘Lakonise’ itself? Because that is, in effect, what Xenophon’s plan would likely accomplish if played out to its logical end. One can imagine its author and his fellow aristocrats readily embracing such a system; but would the *demos* accept it with such alacrity? It is possible that Xenophon was well aware that his scheme would transform Athens into an image of Sparta but that he left it unstated so as not to distress his fellow Athenians, while an ancient equivalent of ‘slowly boiling the frog’ played out: by the time most people realised what was going on, it would be too late. However, it is also possible that Xenophon’s silence on this matter is due to the fact that he did not envision such an enormous and socially disruptive a number of slaves for his scheme in the first place. The latter interpretation would consider the plan to be merely an income supplement rather than a UBI. The numbers hinge on precisely what he meant by “sufficient maintenance”. And we may never know. But it has not stopped scholars from wading into the debate. Was his plan aimed at stripping the *demos* of political power, or to maintain both the rich and the poor with a sounder economic underpinning? GOLDHILL, while exploring the politics of gender in the *Memorabilia*, has pointed out that Xenophon was indeed no fan of Athenian-style democracy⁶². JOHNSTONE argues that Xenophon’s plan was aiming especially at the preservation of the elites within the Athenian democracy – a kind of preventative measure against revolutionary upheavals⁶³. Xenophon has defined the poor as “those who lack the means to meet their necessary expenditures” or simply “that which they need”⁶⁴. Giving them a state-sponsored subsidy to meet these needs could be interpreted cynically as a means of keeping them complacent and in their place, not engaged in violent revolution, thus preserving the *status quo* for elites. But Xenophon has not explicitly said this and it is dangerous to speculate without better evidence. GAUTHIER has grappled with opposing interpretations of this issue to the effect that Xenophon aimed to reconcile the needs of the elites with those of the common people⁶⁵. He concludes that “the prosperity of the democracy will go hand in hand with social harmony”, a less cynical interpretation that aims at civic concord rather than something more sinister⁶⁶. But, again, we do not know for certain what Xenophon was thinking.

⁶² S. GOLDHILL, *The Seductions of the Gaze: Socrates and his Girlfriends*, in: V. GRAY (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Xenophon*, Oxford 2010, pp. 167–194.

⁶³ S. JOHNSTONE, *Virtuous Toil, Vicious Work: Xenophon on Aristocratic Style*, in: V. GRAY (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Xenophon*, Oxford 2010, pp. 137–166.

⁶⁴ X. *Mem.* IV 2, 37.

⁶⁵ GAUTHIER, *op. cit.* (n. 35), pp. 113 f.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

And there are other economic matters that come to bear here. Some modern scholars have considered his plan to be both *naïve* and unworkable⁶⁷. Yet, mining did feed the Athenian treasury through leases, fees for minting coinage, along with commercial and other taxes⁶⁸. If Xenophon's system were based mainly on silver mining, the risk would be that the mines might play out at some unpredictable point; and yet Xenophon seems to have downplayed that prospect. On the contrary, expressing considerable optimism over their long-term viability, he wrote:

Now, we all agree that the mines have been worked for a very long time. At any rate, no one has ever tried to give a date for the beginning of mining operations. Even so, although mining and the removal of silver ore have been carried out for such a long time, note how small the size of the till is when compared with the untouched, silver-laden hills. And it is continually being discovered that, far from shrinking, the silver-yielding area extends ever farther⁶⁹.

In fact, we know today that the Laurion silver mines, to which he is referring, had been exploited since the Late Neolithic era (c. 3200 BC) and that they were extensively mined by the Mycenaeans in the Bronze Age as well⁷⁰. The Athenians, with more efficient methods, had extracted approximately 3,000 tonnes of silver in the early 5th century, with which Themistokles would largely finance their famous fleet⁷¹. The mines' yield had lessened markedly by the end of the Peloponnesian Wars; although, that was largely due to the lack of human

⁶⁷ See N. HUMBLE, Review of D. GISH, W. AMBLER (eds.), *The Political Thought of Xenophon*, Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought XXVI 2009, BMCRev 2011.05.33 [bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2011/2011-05-33.html, last accessed 23 May 2024], similarly D. GISH, review of R.B. STRASSLER (ed.), *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika, with a New Translation by John Marincola*, New York 2009, Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2011.10.17 [bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2011/2011-10-17.html, last accessed 23 May 2024]. POWELL, *op. cit.* (n. 27), pp. 43–44, is highly critical of these.

⁶⁸ FIGUEIRA, *op. cit.* (n. 38), p. 674 n. 35.

⁶⁹ X. *Vect.* IV 2–3: οὐκοῦν ὅτι μὲν πάνυ πάλαι ἐνεργά ἐστι, πᾶσι σαφές: οὐδεὶς γοῦν οὐδὲ πειράται λέγειν ἀπὸ ποίου χρόνου ἐπεχειρήθη: οὗτω δὲ πάλαι ὀρυττομένης τε καὶ ἐκφορουμένης τῆς ἀργυρίτιδος κατανοήσατε τί μέρος οἱ ἐκβεβλημένοι σωροὶ τῶν αὐτοφυῶν τε καὶ ὑπαργύρων λόφων. οὐδὲ μὴν ὁ ἀργυρώδης τόπος εἰς μεῖον τι συστελλόμενος, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκτεινόμενος φανερός ἐστιν. See D. WHITEHEAD, *Xenophon. Poroi: Revenue-Sources*, Oxford–New York 2019.

⁷⁰ See T. SAKOULAS, *Lavrion Ancient Silver Mines*, Ancient-Greece.org [ancient-greece.org/archaeology/lavrion.html, last accessed 24 June 2024] and Z.A. STOS-GALE, N.H. GALE, *The Sources of Mycenaean Silver and Lead*, Journal of Field Archaeology IX 4 1982, pp. 467–485.

⁷¹ D. BRESSAN, *How the Mines of Laurion Saved Ancient Greece and Made Western Civilization Possible*, Forbes, 17 December 2018 [www.forbes.com/sites/davidbressan/2018/12/17/how-the-mines-of-laurion-saved-greece-and-by-extension-made-western-civilization-possible, last accessed 24 June 2024].

labour available to Athens in its reduced condition as the loser of those wars⁷². It is known that mining resumed at Laurion around 370 BC and that such endeavours proved more successful than expected, resulting in a temporary economic boom that aided in the resurgent ‘Second Athenian Empire’⁷³. In one of his speeches, for example, Demosthenes refers to a man named Pantainetos renting the right to mine there from the *polis* for a fee of 90 *minae*⁷⁴. Certainly the Thracian and Macedonian mines, some of which had been taken from Athens, along with others, would yield more silver in the age of Philip II and Alexander the Great. Even so, there would be another mining boom at Laurion following the Roman annexation of Macedonia in 168, when Rome closed those previously lucrative mines in order to hinder further uprisings being funded by their productivity. According to Livy, “It was also resolved to abolish all contracts for the working of the Macedonian mines, which afforded considerable revenue, and also all leases of the royal domains”⁷⁵. And even though the Laurion mines were showing a diminished yield by the 1st century BC, Roman strip-mining techniques brought further gains in silver, alongside improved refining methods which allowed even more to be harvested from the scoria (waste material from previously refined ore) from earlier generations of mining. And there is evidence of mining activity continuing there well into the Byzantine era⁷⁶. So, it seems fair to say that Xenophon’s optimism about the productivity of those mines was not misplaced. More troubling is the sheer number of slaves that would seem to be necessary in order to provide his Sustained Civic Income. Likely it would have worked better with a smaller population of citizens, on which see below. And possibly a general tax on slave-produced revenues, distributed to all citizens, might have been more practical and efficacious, albeit perhaps even harder to implement. Nevertheless, Xenophon is clearly correct in identifying

⁷² U. KAMPMANN, *The Laurion Silver*, Coins Weekly, 14 October 2009 [new.coinsweekly.com/antiquity/the-laurion-silver/, last accessed 24 June 2024).

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ Dem. XXXVII (*Against Pantaenetus*) 22: “Read the complaint itself, which he brings against me. ‘Complaint: Nicobulus has harmed me by laying a plot against me and against my property, having ordered Antigenes, his slave, to take away from my slave the silver which he was bringing to be paid to the state for the mining property which I bought for ninety *minae*, and having also caused me to be inscribed as debtor to the treasury for double that amount’” (taken from A.T. MURRAY, *Demosthenes with an English translation*, Cambridge (MA)–London 1939: λέγε δ’ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐγκλημα, ὃ μοι δικάζεται. “Ἐγκλημα – ἔβλαψέ με Νικόβουλος ἐπιβουλευσας ἐμοὶ καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ τῇ ἐμῇ, ἀφελέσθαι κελεύσας Ἀντιγένην τὸν ἐαυτοῦ οἰκέτην τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦ ἐμοῦ οἰκέτου, ὃ ἔφερεν καταβολὴν τῇ πόλει τοῦ μετάλλου, ὃ ἐγὼ ἐπριάμην ἐνενήκοντα μνῶν, καὶ αἴτιος ἐμοὶ γενόμενος ἐγγραφῆναι τὸ διπλοῦν τῷ δημοσίῳ”).

⁷⁵ Liv. XLV 18, 3: *metalli quoque Macedonici, quod ingens vectigal erat, locationes praediorumque rusticorum tolli placebat.*

⁷⁶ U. KAMPMANN, *op. cit.* (n. 72). See too R. HOPPER, *The Laurion Mines: A Reconsideration*, ABSA LXIII 1968, pp. 293–326.

the revenues associated with the mines as a potential for long-term income, notwithstanding new mines being opened elsewhere that could contribute to this, providing that the Athenians, both the *demos* and their wealthy elites, could be convinced to adopt something like his plan.

Another perhaps more pressing issue about the feasibility of Xenophon's plan is the effect that such an increase in the supply of silver, which it would necessarily entail, would have on the value of that precious metal itself. This would presumably have a direct impact on the much-vaunted Athenian silver coinage, which was absolutely crucial for Athens' economic survival and prosperity. Xenophon does explicitly broach this issue, as it happens. And it is in that regard that some would perhaps find him to be *naïve* in his analysis. This is because he seems to think that silver is somehow unique among commodities in that its value would not go down if its supply were substantially increased. He wrote:

Mining, in fact, is quite different from other industries [...] an increase in the amount of the silver ore discovered and of metal won is accompanied by an increase in the number of people who take up this industry [...] note too that, whenever states are prosperous, silver is in high demand. Men will spend money on fine arms and good horses and magnificent houses and establishments, and the women go for expensive clothes and gold jewellery [...] If anyone says that gold is quite as useful as silver, I am not going to contradict him; but I know this, that when gold is plentiful, silver rises and gold falls in value⁷⁷.

One expects that this might hold true in relation to relatively small increases in the silver supply. However, if increasing numbers of slaves were working the mines, then the corresponding increase in the quantities of silver obtained over time would almost certainly result in a decrease in its value per unit – at least, it should according to modern economic thinking. If so, then this would hinder some of the benefits that the increased revenue could provide. The value

⁷⁷ X. *Vect.* IV 6–10: καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ὥσπερ ὅταν πολλοὶ χαλκοτύποι γένωνται, ἀξίων γενομένων τῶν χαλκευτικῶν ἔργων, καταλύονται οἱ χαλκοτύποι, καὶ οἱ σιδηρεῖς γε ὡσαύτως: καὶ ὅταν γε πολὺς σίτος καὶ οἶνος γένηται, ἀξίων ὄντων τῶν καρπῶν, ἀλυσιτελεῖς αἱ γεωργίαι γίνονται, ὥστε πολλοὶ ἀφέμενοι τοῦ τὴν γῆν ἐργάζεσθαι ἐπ' ἐμπορίας καὶ καπηλείας καὶ τοκισμοὺς τρέπονται: ἀργυρίτις δὲ ὅσῳ ἂν πλείων φαίνεται καὶ ἀργύριον πλέον γίνηται, τοσοῦτόν πλείονες ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο ἔρχονται. καὶ γὰρ δὴ ἐπιπλεονάζοντες, ἐπειδὴν ἱκανὰ τις κτήσεται τῇ οἰκίᾳ, οὐ μάλα ἔτι προσωνοῦνται: ἀργύριον δὲ οὐδεὶς πω οὕτω πολὺ ἐκτήσατο ὥστε μηκέτι προσδεῖσθαι: ἀλλ' ἢν τις γένηται παμπληθὲς, τὸ περιτετεῶν κατορύττοντες οὐδὲν ἥττον ἥδονται ἢ χρώμενοι αὐτῷ. καὶ μὴν ὅταν γε εὖ πράττωσιν αἱ πόλεις, ἰσχυρῶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀργυρίου δέονται. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ ὅπλα τε καλὰ καὶ ἵππους ἀγαθοὺς τε καὶ οἰκίας καὶ κατασκευὰς μεγαλοπρεπεῖς βούλονται δαπανᾶν, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες εἰς ἐσθήτα πολυτελεῖ καὶ χρυσοῦν κόσμον τρέπονται. ὅταν τε αὖ νοσήσωσιν αἱ πόλεις ἢ ἀφορίαις καρπῶν ἢ πολέμῳ, ἔτι καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον, ἀργοῦ τῆς γῆς γιγνομένης, καὶ εἰς ἐπιτήδεια καὶ εἰς ἐπικούρους νομίσματος δέονται. εἰ δὲ τις φήσκει καὶ χρυσίον μηδὲν ἥττον χρήσιμον εἶναι ἢ ἀργύριον, τούτῳ μὲν οὐκ ἀντιλέγω, ἐκεῖνο μὲντοι οἶδα, ὅτι καὶ χρυσίον ὅταν πολὺ παραφανῇ, αὐτὸ μὲν ἀτιμότερον γίγνεται, τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον τιμιώτερον ποιεῖ.

of Athenian silver coinage would seemingly also be diminished as a knock-on effect, and the resulting inflation would dent the purchasing power of the income from the mines, whether UBI or supplemental, never mind how it would affect the rest of the economy⁷⁸. This is not fatal to the practicability of Xenophon's scheme, given that the overall benefits of the plan would almost certainly outweigh its demerits over time. Markets would adjust and the organisers of the plan would need to target growth in a more controlled manner in order to limit the negative impact of inflation. *Q.e.d.*, Xenophon's rather sweeping dismissal of such issues perhaps seems to us to denote some fiscal *naïveté* on his part. All of this would need to be considered, along with the other potential drawbacks of the plan indicated above, well in advance of its implementation. This lack of detail can be discouraging but we can perhaps sympathise with HUMBLE's consternation at the "still all too common tendency to criticize Xenophon for what he has not done"⁷⁹. Possibly Xenophon imagined teams of educated slaves, such as those like the famed banker Pasio, who would address these persistent details⁸⁰.

But is he truly being *naïve* here about the value of silver not decreasing as supply increases? The subject of practicality looms large here, as we have seen, and some scholars still hold to FINLEY's view of an ancient Greek economy in which Xenophon's proposal would be "too modern" and all but impossible⁸¹. Contrariwise to this, both ENGEN and OBER have given brief but important consideration to Xenophon's *Poroi* as part of their larger analyses of the ancient Greek economy, treating that work in a more serious vein rather than dismissing it⁸². And it is understandable that Xenophon's plan would present problems for modern economic theory. The latter maintains that an excess of money will almost certainly result in cost inflation and currency devaluation in virtually every instance imaginable⁸³. However, ancient Athens was not the modern, industrialised West with its fiat currency linked to mechanised production. Citing the demand-side research of John Maynard Keynes, SHULSKY has argued that:

⁷⁸ See MCBRAYER, *op. cit.* (n. 30), for more on this and other moral issues discussed in this article.

⁷⁹ HUMBLE, *op. cit.* (n. 67), qtd. in Powell, *op. cit.* (n. 27), p. 44 n. 196.

⁸⁰ See Demosthenes, *Against Phormio*.

⁸¹ M.I. FINLEY, *op. cit.* (n. 61), pp. 77–78 and above.

⁸² See D.T. ENGEN, *Honor and Profit: Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece, 415–307 B.C.E.*, Ann Arbor (MI) 2010, whose title is drawn from Xenophon's *Poroi* III 4, for more specifics on trade and its regulation in ancient Athens. See too J. OBER, *Democracy and Knowledge*, Princeton (NJ) 2008.

⁸³ So argues the CFI Team, *Quantitative Easing. A technique to alleviate economic underperformance*, The Corporate Finance Institute [corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/economics/quantitative-easing/#:~:text=The%20increase%20in%20the%20money,financial%20behavior%20and%20increase%20prices, last accessed 24 June 2024].

As a practical matter, however, it is likely that the amount of silver Athens could produce, which would circulate throughout the Mediterranean, would be insufficient to produce a noticeable inflation; indeed, it is more likely that an increase in the amount of silver would rather lead to the monetarization of trade with and among tribes that were accustomed to barter⁸⁴.

In a more mercantilist system, therefore, increasing the aggregate supply of silver would not evidently stoke inflation as it would in modern economies, and it would also permit a consumer-city such as Athens to continue to sustain itself with imports. It is worth noting that Xenophon has assumed, firstly, that silver will be produced under conditions of constant (or predictable) returns to scale and, as a result, the average cost of production would remain constant and predictable. Secondly, it seems that he has correctly assumed that there would be a virtually unlimited demand for money in *poleis* because what is not needed for consumption is always hoarded in such a pre-modern economic system. And these assumptions appear valid for the Athenian economy in the middle of the 4th century BC. As LIANOS has written, "Xenophon's conclusion that there cannot be an overproduction of silver that could reduce its value is completely justified"⁸⁵. In other words, the empirical observation that the supply of silver did not reduce the value of money is perfectly understood within the framework of demand for, and supply of, silver in the ancient Mediterranean world as Xenophon has presented it. So, he was probably not being *naïve* about inflation then, even if his economics *vis-à-vis* inflation seem so to us today.

Regardless of whether or not his scheme could have been implemented and, if implemented, whether it would have worked, the novel enterprise that Xenophon has proposed may be seen to derive, at least in part, from a range of observable sources, to which this article has alluded above. As with Xenophon, the sources representing such ideas were variously concerned with both material and moral improvement. This article will now consider some of them in greater detail. And one very evident candidate for the epistemological inspiration for Xenophon's Sustained Civic Income is of course Sparta, especially given his fondness for, and connections with, that *polis*. It is thanks to Xenophon in no small part that we know some details of their polity, as may be safely said to be known. According to our accounts of the mytho-historical Lykourgian Reforms of the mid-8th century BC, the Spartiates were apportioned estates drawn from land divided into 9,000 units; these *kleroi* were expected to be sufficient in

⁸⁴ A. SHULSKY, *Xenophon's Proposal for Peace and Prosperity: Reflections on His Poroi*, The American Political Science Association 2010 Annual Meeting, p. 12 [available at SSRN: ssrn.com/abstract=1641727, last accessed 24 June 2024].

⁸⁵ T.P. LIANOS, *Xenophon's Theory of Money*, *History of Economic Ideas* XX 2014, pp. 41–53 and esp. p. 51.

sustaining them in the material sense⁸⁶. The land itself was worked by helots who, not unlike medieval serfs, retained half of what they produced. From the other half, the Spartiates were expected to provide for the common meals (*sysitia*), and the cost of educating their children in the *agoge*. However, we know very little of the finer details of wealth such as how land was bought, sold, inherited, or whether daughters received dowries⁸⁷. Contemporary primary sources are scarce and mostly consist of Xenophon himself, Plato, Aristotle and Ephoros of Kyme. Later, the likes of Strabo and Plutarch would use all of these, along with others no longer extant, as their main sources on Sparta.

In his *Constitution of the Spartans*, Xenophon details what amounts to at least his impression of how the Spartan economy worked in relation to common messes, slaves and common property⁸⁸. With a similar optimism as with his plan for the Athenian Sustained Civic Income, he declares of the Spartans: “Truly, how should wealth be a serious object there, when he [Lykourgos] insisted on equal contributions to the food supply and on the same standard of living for all, thus eliminating the attraction of money for the sake of indulgence⁸⁹?” Elsewhere (11 ff.), he has considerable praise for their martial attributes and it seems clear that Xenophon admired the Spartan system of efficiently organising their society like a military camp. Nearly five centuries later, Plutarch (c. AD 46–after AD 119), a biographer, Platonist philosopher and priest of Apollo at Delphi, would give us his own description of the Spartan economy, which is somewhat more detailed. And it is clear that he was using Xenophon as his main source; however, he was clearly deriving some of his material from elsewhere too. He wrote:

Determined therefore to banish insolence, jealousy, crime and luxury, and those yet more deep-seated afflictions of the state, poverty and wealth, he [Lykourgos] persuaded his fellow-citizens to make a single portion of all of their territory and divide it up anew, and to live with one another on a basis of entire uniformity and equality in the means of subsistence, seeking pre-eminence through virtue alone, assured that there was no other difference or inequality between man and man than that which was established by blame for foul deeds and fame for good ones⁹⁰.

⁸⁶ Plut. *Lyc.* XXX 1, *Agis* V 1, *Inst. Lak.* 42 [*Mor.* 239e–240a], Diod. Sic. VII 15; and see too A.H.M. JONES, *Sparta*, Oxford 1967, pp. 40–43.

⁸⁷ See CARTLEDGE *op. cit.* (n. 37), pp. 142–144 for a discussion on property in ancient Sparta. See too S. HODKINSON, *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*, Swansea (Wales) 2000, *passim*.

⁸⁸ X. *Lac.* IV–VII.

⁸⁹ X. *Lac.* VII 3: καὶ γὰρ δὴ τί πλοῦτος ἐκεῖ γε σπουδαστέος, ἔνθα ἴσα μὲν φέρειν εἰς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, ὁμοίως δὲ διατᾶσθαι τάξας ἐποίησε μὴ ἡδυπαθείας ἔνεκα χρημάτων ὀρέγεσθαι;

⁹⁰ Plut. *Lyc.* VIII 1 f.: δεινῆς γὰρ οὔσης ἀνωμαλίας καὶ πολλῶν ἀκτημόνων καὶ ἀπόρων ἐπιφερομένων τῇ πόλει, τοῦ δὲ πλούτου παντάπασιν εἰς ὀλίγους συνερρηκότος, ὕβριν καὶ φθόνον καὶ κακουργίαν καὶ τρυφὴν καὶ τὰ τούτων ἔτι πρεσβύτερα καὶ μείζω νοσήματα πολιτείας, πλοῦτον

It is clearly a heavily idealised vision of society, moderated by the likes of Plato and Xenophon in their works that touched on Sparta, that probably never existed as they imagined it. But the ideal is perhaps more important here than the reality. Plutarch further adds that “The lot of each was large enough to produce annually seventy bushels of barley for a man and twelve for his wife, with a proportionate amount of wine and oil” and that, upon witnessing the equal division of sustenance, Lykourgos declared that all of Lakonia appeared as “a family estate newly divided among many brothers”⁹¹. And it is no accident that the Platonist Plutarch took such an interest in the Spartan polity. This theme of structured, distributed sharing of resources runs deeply through a range of philosophical sources.

While it is difficult to separate the real from the mythical, Sparta no less appears to have captivated the interest of numerous philosophers on account of its unusual qualities. We are told that the Pythagoreans were keenly interested in that legendary *polis*⁹². And the Pythagorean Society, as we understand it, also appears to have possessed communal characteristics, not dissimilar to those of the Spartans – both of which in turn influenced Plato’s idealised societies in the *Republic* and *Laws* and most likely, by extension, almost certainly had a direct impact on Xenophon’s thinking as well. For example, Plato’s narrator in the *Laws*, the Athenian Stranger, has asserted that “the state and constitution come first, and the laws are best, where there is observed as much as possible throughout the whole of the *polis* the old saying, as it is said: ‘friends have all things truly in common’”⁹³. This is a Pythagorean maxim cited multiple times by Plato and others with similar philosophical outlooks⁹⁴. In the *Lysis*, for example, Plato’s Socrates ironically teases Lysis and Menexenus by telling

καὶ πενίαν, ἐξελαύνων, συνέπεισε τὴν χώραν ἅπασαν εἰς μέσον θέντας ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναδάσασθαι, καὶ ζῆν μετ’ ἀλλήλων ἅπαντας ὁμαλείς καὶ ἰσοκλήρους τοῖς βίοις γενομένους, τὸ δὲ πρωτεῖον ἀρετῇ μετιόντας, ὥς ἄλλης ἐτέρῳ πρὸς ἕτερον οὐκ οὔσης διαφορᾶς οὐδὲ ἀνισότητος, πλὴν ὅσῃν αἰσχυρῶν ψόγος ὀρίζει καὶ καλῶν ἔπαινος.

⁹¹ Plut. *Lyc.* VIII 3–4: ὁ δὲ κλῆρος ἦν ἐκάστου τοσοῦτος ὥστε ἀποφορὰν φέρειν ἀνδρὶ μὲν ἑβδομήκοντα κριθῶν μεδίμνους, γυναικὶ δὲ δώδεκα, καὶ τῶν ὑγρῶν καρπῶν ἀναλόγως τὸ πλῆθος [...] καὶ εἰπεῖν πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας ὥς ἡ Λακωνικὴ φαίνεται πᾶσα πολλῶν ἀδελφῶν εἶναι νεωστὶ νενεμημένων.

⁹² K.R. MOORE, *Was Pythagoras Ever Really in Sparta?*, Rosetta: Papers of the Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology at the University of Birmingham, VI Spring 2009, pp. 1–25 [rosetta.cal.bham.ac.uk/issues/issue-06.html, last accessed 24 June 2024].

⁹³ *Lg.* 739b7–c2: ἄριστοι, ὅπου τὸ πάλαι λεγόμενον ἂν γίγνηται κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν ὅτι μάλιστα: λέγεται δὲ ὡς ὄντως ἐστὶ κοινὰ τὰ φίλων.

⁹⁴ See e.g. *R.* 424a: δεῖ ταῦτα κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα κοινὰ τὰ φίλων ποιεῖσθαι; *Plt.* 305D: [...] τὴν ἀρχὴν τε καὶ ὁρμὴν; *Lys.* 207C 10: οὐκοῦν κοινὰ τὰ γε φίλων λέγεται (“Well, it is said that friends have all things in common”); and compare too with the dramatist Euripides, *Or.* 734–735: “Orestes: I am ruined, to briefly make plain to you my troubles. Pylades: You must destroy me too then; for friends have all things in common” (Ορέστης: οἰχόμεσθ’, ὥς ἐν βραχεῖ σοι τὰμὰ δηλώσω κακά. Πυλάδης: συγκατασκάπτεις ἂν ἡμᾶς: κοινὰ γὰρ τὰ τῶν φίλων).

them that he will refrain from asking them who is the richest, since he assumes that, as friends, they must have “all things in common”⁹⁵. As alluded to above, this particular Platonic, and hence Pythagorean, influence may also be observed in its later impact on monastic life in the Christian era. In his famous *Rule*, the 6th century St. Benedict quoted Acts 4, 43: “Let everything be held in common” in his 33rd rule which mandated the elimination of private property from monasteries. His rules were especially concerned with socioeconomic equality, and therefore harmony, within these contemplative communities⁹⁶.

Xenophon too was aware of this maxim and his Socrates treats it with a more serious tone in the *Memorabilia* than Plato’s Socrates seemingly did in the *Lysis*, deploying the saying in his formulation of ideal friendship as a good for society. He warns how gross inequality leads to “strife and anger leads to hostility, covetousness to enmity, jealousy to hatred”, and he goes on to declare a remedy as follows:

[...] they cannot only share wealth lawfully, keeping away from jealousy, but can also supply one another’s needs; they can recast strife not only without pain, but with advantage to one another, and prevent wealth from pursuing its way towards remorse: but jealousy they take away utterly, regarding their own goods as belonging to their friends, and thinking their friend’s goods to be their own⁹⁷.

Here we seem to see the foundations being laid for the SCI in *Ways and Means*. Admittedly, Xenophon’s plan there does not exactly represent such an idealised level of philosophically enlightened communism as may be seen in Plato’s *Republic*; although, it does nonetheless bear some semblance to it. This may be observed inasmuch as the citizens of Athens, under his scheme, would have the income together in common from their collectively owned slaves working the silver mines etc., which is explicitly aimed at promoting a fairer, less divisive society.

⁹⁵ *Lys.* 207c10, see previous note and see the following for more on Xenophon’s and Plato’s contrasting views on *philia*: M. TAMIOLAKI, *Plato and Xenophon on Friendship. A Comparative Study (Plato Lysis and Xenophon Conversations of Socrates 2.6)*, CHS Research Bulletin II 2014 [research-bulletin.chs.harvard.edu/2014/09/05/plato-and-xenophon-on-friendship, last accessed 24 June 2024].

⁹⁶ St. Benedict, C. WHITE (trans. and ed.), *The Rule of St. Benedict*, London–New York 2008, rule 55. And see too rules 34 on the distribution of goods based on need, 55 on moderate clothing and footwear and 59 on the restrictions of bringing family wealth into monasteries. These and others are regarded as merely the “start on the path to Justice” (rule 73) and are intended to promote harmonious equality.

⁹⁷ *X. Mem.* II 6, 21–23: [...] δύνανται δὲ καὶ χρημάτων οὐ μόνον τοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν ἀπεχόμενοι νομίμως κοινωνεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπαρκεῖν ἀλλήλοις; δύνανται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἔριν οὐ μόνον ἀλύπως, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμφερόντως ἀλλήλοις διατίθεσθαι καὶ τὴν ὀργὴν κωλύειν εἰς τὸ μεταμελησόμενον προϊέναι: τὸν δὲ φθόνον παντάπασιν ἀφαιροῦσι, τὰ μὲν ἑαυτῶν ἀγαθὰ τοῖς φίλοις οἰκεία παρέχοντες, τὰ δὲ τῶν φίλων ἑαυτῶν νομίζοντες.

The widespread interest among ancient intellectuals in political and social 'engineering', in accord with such philosophical agendas, may or may not have originated with the Pythagoreans; nonetheless, that legacy was alive and well in the succeeding generations of philosophers, with a direct line of epistemological transmission through Plato. There can be no doubt that the students of Socrates, along with many of their subsequent students, shared a fascination for the moral and material improvement, as they saw it, of *poleis*. And they, like the Pythagoreans, often took Sparta as their model, if not necessarily in every detail. It is hardly surprising therefore that we can observe a similar dispensation in the utopian fictions of Plato (428/427 or 424/423–348/347 BC), given his manifest interest in the Spartans. Hailing from a city founded on the termination of helotry, the historian Polybius of Megalopolis (c.200–c.118 BC), for example, would cite not only Xenophon, Aristotle (384–322 BC) and Ephorus (c.400–330 BC) but also made extensive recourse to Plato in giving his account of the organisation of the Spartan state in his *Histories*⁹⁸. It is unequivocal that Plato had borrowed much from Sparta in formulating his *Kallipolis*. And that includes an idealised form of the Spartans' own equivalent to a UBI (for Spartiates only, of course). *Republic* Book III describes the upkeep of the guardian class in the *Kallipolis* in ways that echo not only Xenophon's plan but also the later Benedictine monks who almost certainly took their cue from it:

In the first place, none must possess any private property save the indispensable. Secondly, none must have any habitation or treasure-house which is not open for all to enter at will. Their food, in such quantities as are appropriate for athletes of war who are sober and brave, they must receive as an agreed stipend from the other citizens as the wages of their guardianship, so measured that there shall be neither excess at the end of the year nor any dearth. And resorting to a common mess like soldiers on campaign they will live together⁹⁹.

As will become more relevant given the discussion below on *Wasps*, the line about having neither excess nor dearth is almost precisely the same distinction that Aristophanes would make between beggary and honourable poverty in *Wealth*. In that play, Penury personified says: "The beggar, whom you have depicted to us, never possesses anything. The poor man lives thriftily and attentive to his work; he has not got too much, but he does not lack what he really

⁹⁸ See Arist. *Pol.* II 10 and Strab. X 4, 8–9 for Ephorus. See Polyb. *Hist.* VI 45, 3–5, and esp. VI 47 where he references the *Republic* as a source on Sparta, *et passim*.

⁹⁹ Pl. *Resp.* III 416d–e: πρῶτον μὲν οὐσίαν κεκτημένον μηδεμίαν μηδένα ἰδίαν, ἂν μὴ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη: ἔπειτα οἰκῇσιν καὶ ταμιεῖον μηδενὶ εἶναι μηδὲν τοιοῦτον, εἰς δ' οὐ πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος εἴσεισι: τὰ δ' ἐπιτήδεια, ὅσων δέονται ἄνδρες ἀθληταὶ πολέμου σώφρονές τε καὶ ἀνδρεῖοι, ταξαμένους παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν δέχεσθαι μισθὸν τῆς φυλακῆς τοσούτον ὅσον μῆτε περιεῖναι αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸν ἐναυτὸν μῆτε ἐνδεῖν: φοιτῶντας δὲ εἰς συσσίτια ὥσπερ ἐστρατοπεδευμένους κοινῇ ζῆν.

needs”¹⁰⁰. And it seems clear that both Aristophanes and Plato here are discussing a basic level of subsistence that promotes good health and avoids excess. Like Xenophon, having taken his paradigm partly from Sparta, Plato’s proposed organisation of society in the *Republic* is very clearly along regulated lines. Also as with Sparta, the *Kallipolis* will depend on an artisan class (III 414d), quite similar to the Spartan *perioikoi*, with comparably reduced franchise and a large slave class for most of the manual labour; although, he has pointedly not given concrete figures for these and tends to ignore the virtual army of slaves that his ideal city would require in order to provide for all of the citizens.

Both Plato and his famous student, Aristotle, were interested in remedying the problem of civil strife, much as with Xenophon. The latter likely never encountered Aristotle nor could he seemingly have read his works, given that most of Aristotle’s major treatises were composed in the thirty years after Xenophon had passed away. Even so, it seems convincing that Aristotle almost certainly read Xenophon and, as Deslauriers has demonstrated, the former “was clearly responding” to views put forth by both Xenophon as well as Plato in his *Politics*¹⁰¹. Their mutual interest in addressing similar societal issues appears to draw a distinct line directly back to Socrates, if not also to the Pythagoreans. Aristotle, like Plato, focused more on polity and (mixed) constitutional structures than on economics¹⁰². However, like Xenophon, he too identified inequality between citizens as a root cause of internal conflict in *poleis*. Jealousy over unequal shares of wealth, status and power was seen as a major source of civic strife. Aristotle therefore favoured in the *Politics* a relatively small but also relatively equal citizen-class who would have a more or less equal share of both resource and governance¹⁰³. In keeping with his theory of “natural justice”, he argued for a “mixed” constitution, ruled by this “middle” group of citizens who would of course be at least moderately wealthy, although characterised as being a kind of golden mean between rich and poor¹⁰⁴. Recollecting analogous themes

¹⁰⁰ Ar. *Pl.* 552–553: πτωχοῦ μὲν γὰρ βίος, ὃν σὺ λέγεις, ζῆν ἐστὶν μηδὲν ἔχοντα: τοῦ δὲ πένητος ζῆν φειδόμενον καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις πρὸς ἔχοντα, περιγίγνεσθαι δ’ αὐτῷ μηδέν, μὴ μέντοι μηδ’ ἐπιλείπειν.

¹⁰¹ M. DESLAURIERS, *The Argument of Aristotle’s Politics I*, Phoenix LX 2006, pp. 48–69 [www.jstor.org/stable/20304580, last accessed 24 June 2024].

¹⁰² See e.g. *Politics* II 1, 1261a18; III 1, 1274b32–1275b20; III 6, 1278b8–10 and see too *Physics* II 3 and *Metaphysics* A 2. On further epistemological connections such as these, see too D.T. ENGEN, *Reconsidering the Economy: Traditional Values and Philosophical Theory versus Public and Private Practice in Fourth-Century BCE Athens*, in: I. DARMANN, A. WINTERLING (eds.), *Oikonomia and Oikonomie im klassischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart 2022, pp. 67–88. Other works in this volume also address issues of Xenophon’s economics.

¹⁰³ *Pol.* III 6, 1278b 37–1279a 13.

¹⁰⁴ *Pol.* III 8, IV 4–11 and VI 2. The six-fold division of constitutions derives almost directly from Plato’s *Statesman* 302c–d.

from Xenophon's *Ways and Means* and *Hellenika*, he would develop his own approach to this matter while also being critical of some of Plato's views about it.

Aristotle considered Plato's organisation of society in the *Republic* to be faulty, objecting that the *polis* would split into two hostile factions, that is, between the Guardian class and the workers¹⁰⁵. Aristotle's objection to the effect that the *Kallipolis* would break up into two hostile camps, "is plagiarized", as SHOREY writes, "in expression from Plato's similar censure of existing Greek cities at 422 E"; Aristotle assumes that the "enforced disinterestedness, the superior education, and the other precautions" of the Platonic republic will not be sufficient in order to avoid the danger to which Plato first calls attention¹⁰⁶. It is nonetheless clear that Plato had indeed given considerable attention to such internal threats of disunity. Aristotle was also critical of the size of the *polis* proposed in Plato's *Laws*, which operated under a curiously not dissimilar system to that of Xenophon's whereby slaves would provide most of the labour and sustenance for the citizens¹⁰⁷. There were to be 5,040 families (each with two children, so 20,160 citizen-class people in all) in the Magnesia of the *Laws*, and Aristotle objected saying that "we cannot overlook the fact that such a number would require the territory of Babylon" or some other comparably large country¹⁰⁸. As NIXON and PRICE suggest, perhaps Aristotle felt that a population centre of this magnitude could "hardly be counted as a real *polis*"¹⁰⁹. Magnesia would have about 150,700 inhabitants (counting slaves and resident aliens), occupying about 268 square kilometres of *chora* (hinterland), making it roughly half the population of Athens in the mid-4th century, which still occupied an even vaster territory¹¹⁰. This suggests that Aristotle must have implicitly considered Athens to have been too large a *polis* to manage as well. And population is fundamental to his arguments about the welfare of a state. In the *Politics*, he

¹⁰⁵ *Pol.* II 1, 1264a24.

¹⁰⁶ P. SHOREY (ed. and trans.) *Plato, Plato in Twelve Volumes*, vols. 5–6, Cambridge (MA) – London 1969, n. 1 on 416a.

¹⁰⁷ *Leg.* 737e, there will be 5,040 (a number divisible by 12, 10, etc.) administrative units for land-holdings by the citizens of Magnesia; see 684d for the difficulties of land distribution considered. Each Magnesians lot supports one family, the number of families is meant to remain at more or less a constant of 5,040 (740b–c): one of the male children will inherit the holding and the females are given in marriage where appropriate; excess offspring will be obliged to emigrate (740d–e, 741).

¹⁰⁸ *Pol.* II 9, 1265a13. At 1276a29, Babylon "it is said, had been captured for two whole days – before some of the inhabitants knew of the fact".

¹⁰⁹ L. NIXON, S. PRICE, *The Size and Resources of Greek Cities*, in: O. MURRAY, S. PRICE (eds.), *The Greek City: From Homer to Alexander*, Oxford 1990, pp. 137–170 (esp. p. 163).

¹¹⁰ K.R. MOORE, *Plato, Politics and a Practical Utopia*, London–New York 2012, p. 38. By contrast, the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar (c. 605–562 BC) held approximately 250,000 people, with an 8 square kilometres urban centre and many hundreds of square kilometres of hinterland, *ibid.* 31.

considered that some form of population control would likely be needed else, as is written, “for the matter to be left alone, as it is in most states, is bound to lead to poverty among the citizens, and”, strongly resonating with the sentiments of Xenophon and others, “poverty produces sedition and crime”¹¹¹. Population control was also a major theme of both Plato’s *Republic* and *Laws* but only appears to be implied in Xenophon, if present at all. Of perhaps greater relevance is that Aristotle too has pointedly connected poverty with criminality and social strife. In Book VI he echoes Xenophon’s even more so, asserting:

[...] the truly democratic statesman must study how the multitude may be saved from excessive poverty; for this is what causes democracy to be corrupt. Measures must therefore be contrived that may bring about lasting prosperity¹¹².

It does seem as if he had been reading Xenophon’s *Ways and Means*, alongside the *Memorabilia* and *Hellenika* and was in agreement with their themes in principle if not in every detail. Perhaps it is not surprising that he would prefer Socrates’ other student to his own mentor, with whom he appears to have often disagreed over fundamentals. Aristotle did not specifically suggest some form of UBI, but something like Xenophon’s plan would certainly seem to qualify as “measures [...] contrived” to ensure prosperity and eliminate poverty.

Aristotle’s interest in population control, to the point of criticising Plato for his approach to it, is not without some merit when exploring practical solutions to the problems of poverty and the strife that it engenders. Modern scholarship has observed that societies with a larger population, both historically and currently, tend to have higher levels of inequality¹¹³. This is partly explainable in terms of availability of resource relative to the given populace. However, in societies with a higher population, the wealthy also tend to use their monopoly on resources in order to exploit the poor themselves, treating them as a disposable resource (‘units of value’). And this is perpetuated through rigid social hierarchies of power and legitimacy that serve to justify and formalise such exploitation. As indicated above, Aristotle’s idealised state in the *Politics* preferred a smaller citizen population in order to maintain civil harmony even if, unlike Plato, he has not provided us with specific details in terms of actual numbers; he wrote:

But this ought to be regulated much more in the supposed case than it is currently [...]. And one might think that restriction ought to be put on the birth-rate rather than on property, so as not to allow more than

¹¹¹ Arist. *Pol.* II, 1265b1–10: τῶν ἄλλων ἀτεκνίαν. τὸ δ’ ἀφεῖσθαι, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς πλείσταις πόλεσι, πενίας ἀναγκαῖον αἴτιον γίνεσθαι τοῖς πολίταις, ἡ δὲ πενία στάσιν ἐμποιοῖ καὶ κακουργίαν.

¹¹² Arist. *Pol.* VI, 1320a30–35: ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸν ἀληθινῶς δημοτικὸν ὄραν ὅπως τὸ πλῆθος μὴ λίαν ἄπορον ᾗ: τοῦτο γὰρ αἴτιον τοῦ μοχθηρὰν εἶναι τὴν δημοκρατίαν. τεχναστέον οὖν ὅπως ἂν εὐπορία γένοιτο χρόνιος.

¹¹³ See C. LALUEZA-FOX, *Inequality: A Genetic History*, Boston (MS) 2022.

a certain number of children to be produced, and that in fixing their number consideration should be paid to the chances of its happening that some of the children born may die, and to the absence of children in the other marriages; but for the matter to be left alone, as it is in most states, is bound to lead to poverty among the citizens, and poverty produces sedition and crime¹¹⁴.

What then would the ideal population be in order to avoid strife and to share resources in a more equitable manner? Possibly Aristotle considered Macedonian Pella or even Stageira, his hometown, to be better proportioned. He has not told us this but we can consider some facts for comparison. In around 383 BC Xenophon wrote that Pella was “the largest of all Macedonian cities”¹¹⁵. The *Copenhagen Polis Project* has classified ancient Pella as a category 4 *polis*, meaning that its population is estimated to have been between approximately 7,000 and 50,000 persons¹¹⁶, with Pella being at the higher end of that spectrum. This makes it significantly smaller than Athens, even if a larger figure obtains, though comparable with its fellow Dorian *polis* of Sparta. Pella would have had roughly the same overall population as Sparta, although perhaps employing more peasant-style serfs in support of a martial nobility that governed their regions like mini-kingdoms. Stageira would have been significantly smaller¹¹⁷. And it is worth noting that a less-populated *polis* would require fewer slaves to make something like Xenophon's Sustained Civic Income more practical. Yet, at the lower-population end of the spectrum, having slaves as the source of most revenue and materiel, supporting in that way a smaller number of citizen-elites, the situation appears, as noted, to be something more akin to medieval feudalism. The system that Xenophon proposed has some things in common with that too but seems closer to a command economy (or mixed command and market economy) in which both the public and private sectors are intertwined.

¹¹⁴ Arist. *Pol.* II, 1265b1–12: δεῖ δὲ τοῦτ' οὐχ ὁμοίως ἀκριβῶς ἔχειν περὶ τὰς πόλεις τότε καὶ νῦν: νῦν μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἀπορεῖ, διὰ τὸ μερίζεσθαι τὰς οὐσίας εἰς ὅποσονοῦν πλῆθος, τότε δὲ ἀδιαφρέτων οὐσῶν ἀνάγκη τοὺς παράζυγας μηδὲν ἔχειν, ἐάν τ' ἐλάττους ᾧσι τὸ πλῆθος ἐάν τε πλείους. μᾶλλον δὲ δεῖν ὑπολάβοι τις ἂν ὀρίσθαι τῆς οὐσίας τὴν τεκνοποιῖαν, ὥστε ἀριθμοῦ τινὸς μὴ πλείονα γεννᾶν, τοῦτο δὲ τιθέναι τὸ πλῆθος ἀποβλέποντα πρὸς τὰς τύχας, ἂν συμβαίνει τελευτᾶν τινας τῶν γεννηθέντων, καὶ πρὸς τὴν] τῶν ἄλλων ἀτεκνίαν. τὸ δ' ἀφείσθαι, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς πλείεσταις πόλεσι, πενίας ἀναγκαῖον αἴτιον γίνεσθαι τοῖς πολίταις, ἡ δὲ πενία στάσιν ἐμποιεῖ καὶ κακουργίαν.

¹¹⁵ *HG V* 2, 13.

¹¹⁶ *The Copenhagen Polis Project* [polis.stanford.edu, last accessed 24 June 2024].

¹¹⁷ D.S. XVI 52, 9–55, 3. Philip II of Macedon had conquered Aristotle's hometown as part of his Olynthian War (349–348 BC), where it does not even get mentioned by name in Diodorus, selling of the inhabitants to slavery. We are told that Philip had to rebuild Stageira and repopulate it in order to get Aristotle to teach young Alexander; but we are not given actual numbers by Plutarch (*Alex.* 7–8.). It has a present population of about 500 people; and it was likely a great deal larger in the Classical era considering that it shared an acropolis and several small temples with the neighbouring villages [www.hellenicaworld.com/Greece/Geo/en/Stagira.html, last accessed 24 June 2024].

Plato was writing and theorising in a different era from either Xenophon or Aristotle, though closer to the former than the latter. While they all pick up on similar themes, contemporary events will have coloured the approaches adopted by each as much as their individual inclinations. Plato's own approach does seem rather theoretical, even if the *polis* proposed in the *Laws* tends to hedge somewhat more toward potential realism than that of the *Republic*. He does discuss some demographic figures of Magnesia in limited detail. Aristotle was clearly also pondering both social structures and actual numbers of people; and, as with Xenophon, he seems to have considered that *theoria* ought to be applied in *praxis*. Perhaps this was the product of his Northern Greek upbringing amidst court, king and baron. But Plato had other things in mind. And his hypothetical cities were not purely exercises in urban planning or social engineering, however much subsequent readers have tended to focus on those particular aspects of them. While Aristotle too was concerned with 'natural justice', as he defined it, in *poleis*, Plato's *Republic* is itself about defining Justice (that which is 'truly Just', or 'Justness' itself) with regard to the organisation of the human *psyche*. The latter is seen as analogous to the organisation of a *polis*. The *Laws* is not dissimilar in that regard, if inclining somewhat more toward practical reality as it too aims at justice and the 'correct' arrangement of the *psyché*. But both of these works are exercises of the intellect, not blueprints for utopia. Plato's narrator in the *Republic* has expressly identified the fictitious and imaginary nature of his enterprise, saying that a city like the *Kallipolis* "can be found nowhere on earth [...] perhaps there is a pattern laid up for it in the heavens"¹¹⁸.

Utopia, it seems, really is 'no place'; even its earthly exemplars persistently attempt to live up to such ideals, and it is in certain such instances that we can clearly see the gaps between the ideal and the real. We can note for example that, in Book II of his *Politics*, Aristotle asserted that the Spartan system of equal allotments had broken down in his era, largely due, as he indicates, to women owning a disproportionately large amount of property. He reported that nearly two-fifths of Spartan land had fallen into the possession of its citizen-women by the time of the Battle of Leuktra in 371 BC¹¹⁹. There is some debate about how this land came into their possession, whatever the actual amount, whether through gifts or inheritances¹²⁰. While Spartan law supposedly forbade the buying and selling of estates (as with Plato's Magnesia in the *Laws* or the *Kallipolis*

¹¹⁸ Pl. *Resp.* IX 592a–b: ἐπεὶ γῆς γε οὐδαμοῦ οἶμαι ἀλλ', ἣν δ' ἐγώ, ἐν οὐρανῷ ἴσως παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται.

¹¹⁹ *Pol.* II 9, 1269b12–1270a6.

¹²⁰ P. CARTLEDGE, *Spartan Wives: Liberation or Licence?*, CQ XXXI 1981, pp. 84–105, argues that "what Aristotle calls 'large dowries' were really [...] marriage-settlements consisting of landed property together with any movables that a rich father (or mother) saw fit to bestow on a daughter", p. 98. But see too S.B. POMEROY, *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representation and Realities*, Oxford 1997, p. 43 for a contrasting interpretation.

in the *Republic*), it appears to have permitted anyone who wished to transfer land through gifts and bequests. Although the precise mechanism is unknown, according to Plutarch's *Moralia*, the Spartans had a type of inheritance similar to dowries whereby a daughter might receive part or all of her father's household estate when she married¹²¹. BLUNDELL argues that the passage in Aristotle is referring "somewhat inaccurately, to two types of female inheritance, one where the daughter inherited the entire estate, and one where she received a share of it on marriage"¹²². HODKINSON is more in favour of universal female inheritance in Sparta but notes that, even if one rejects that hypothesis, preferring to view landed dowries as gifts, then "it is apparent that by the fourth century, marriage-settlements were often quite large"¹²³. While Aristotle's figure of two-fifths is likely an exaggeration, possibly due to his apparently innate misogyny and Macedonian distrust of all things Spartan, it does suggest that the system reportedly established by Lykourgos had deteriorated through a fairly predictable process of wealth accumulation by those who were able to do so. And it calls into question whether Xenophon's Sustained Civic Income scheme would not suffer a similar fate, perhaps due to certain demes, or individuals within demes, using their slave-based wealth to accumulate more than everyone else. Might the allotments of slaves be inheritable or transferable between individuals? If the much-vaunted, martial regime of Sparta was subject to such decay, some of which even Xenophon himself was keenly aware and noted with distaste¹²⁴, how might *laissez faire* Athens hope to do better? His Sustained Civic Income would need strong, fairly un-democratic regulations, at least to Athenian sensibilities, in order to keep it from failing in precisely the ways suggested here.

Sparta's well-structured society arguably provided some regulatory elements that might overcome Athenian 'free market' tendencies for wealth accumulation. The kind of slave-derived sustenance that it developed for its citizen populace was certainly a major influence on Xenophon's proposal in *Ways and Means*, as this article has been arguing. And Xenophon's plan for wealth won off the labours of slaves would require a degree of regulation at some loss to what the Athenians might have considered their civil liberties¹²⁵. Again, both Xenophon's

¹²¹ Plut. *Mor.* 227 ff., the Spartan lawgiver had forbidden dowries by legislation believing, much as the Athenian Stranger in Plato's *Laws*, so that character rather than wealth should determine the choice of a bride.

¹²² S. BLUNDELL, *Women in Ancient Greece*, London 1995, p. 156.

¹²³ HODKINSON, *op. cit.* (n. 87), p. 103.

¹²⁴ X. *Lac.* XIV 1 ff.: "Should anyone ask me whether I believe that the laws of Lykourgos still remain unchanged to this day, I certainly could not say that with any confidence whatsoever" (εἰ δέ τις με ἔροιτο εἰ καὶ νῦν ἔτι μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ Λυκούργου νόμοι ἀκίνητοι διαμένειν, τοῦτο μὰ Δία οὐκ ἂν ἔτι θρασέως εἴποιμι).

¹²⁵ E.g. Pericles' funeral oration, esp. Thuc. II 37, where "the liberty that we enjoy in our government also extends to ordinary life. Far from exercising a jealous surveillance over each other,

and the Spartan systems appear to have more in common with medieval serfdom than any modern formulation of a Universal Basic Income. But Xenophon's plan and the Spartan economy also differ in that the benefits of the exploited labour are spread among a wider citizen base more so than the medieval equivalent. However another aspect akin to the feudal order is how that system both sustained, and was sustained by, a martial element that required considerable resource for its perpetuation. It is important to bear in mind that a common feature of a substantial military hierarchy, such as that which resulted from Sparta's peculiar socioeconomic system (and which possibly caused it), much admired by Xenophon the military commander, comes at a necessary loss of individual liberty. Almost all militaries depend on some external supply of resource, whether it be taxes paid by those not in the military or, in the case of Sparta (or medieval Europe), the labour of peoples subjugated by the very militarised elites that they are obliged to support. It seems also fair to suggest that Xenophon's scheme for a Sustained Civic Income in Athens would appear to necessitate a not dissimilar martial ordering of society as in Sparta, though he has not specifically indicated this, if only to keep such a large proportion of slaves as would be required under control. Perhaps, as has been mooted here, that was his hidden agenda: to transform Athens into a polity more akin to that of Sparta. We may never know, although we can speculate. Even so, the notion of a basic income for citizens, or its equivalent, in Classical Athens is interesting and deserves some further consideration beyond Xenophon, Plato, Aristotle and the Spartans.

The conservative, aristocratic, anti-war (with the Spartans), comic playwright Aristophanes may seem an odd individual to whom to turn when considering the subject of a universal basic income. However, we have already seen that he appears to have been sympathetic to philosophical tenets underlying the concept. And there are multiple interpretive intersections between his works and Xenophon's, just as the two men had a considerable deal in common as individuals. Aristophanes was not unacquainted with many of the ideas of at least two of those philosophers discussed above. As it happens, he was also thinking about promoting the general welfare of the Athens of his era through a kind of supplemental income – for some at least. He was certainly a keen observer of how the rich manipulated the poor, usually through nationalistic and populist rhetoric, which forms a significant portion of his critique of what we might term 'mobocracy'. This of course is presented in the humorous context of his fictional writings, within the genre of dramatic stage comedy, and was almost

we do not feel called upon to be angry with our neighbour for doing what he likes, or even to indulge in censorious looks which cannot fail to be offensive, although they inflict no actual penalty" (ἐλευθέρως δὲ τὰ τε πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν πολιτεύομεν καὶ ἐς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὑποψίαν, οὐ δι' ὀργῆς τὸν πέλας, εἰ καθ' ἡδονὴν τι δρᾷ, ἔχοντες, οὐδὲ ἀζημίους μὲν, λυπηρὰς δὲ τῇ ὧσιν ἀχθηδόνας προστιθέμενοι).

certainly not intended to be regarded, *in toto*, as a serious proposition. It was, rather, presented as a form of social criticism through comedy. Though, like all of his other comedic works, there is an 'edge' to it and thus an implicit element of seriousness that begs some deeper reflection.

Most of what we know about Aristophanes comes from his own plays, which makes his true nature as an individual sufficiently opaque as to invite no small degree of conjecture. We know that he satirised prominent fellow artists such as the socially-sensitive dramatist Euripides, while also grudgingly acknowledging the latter's influence on his own writing¹²⁶. He was especially critical of the populist politician Kleon, possibly going to court several times over accusations of slandering that statesman and damaging his reputation¹²⁷. And he was critical too of those citizens who followed what he considered to be populist demagogues, supporting their agendas, with *Wasps* being a prominent example of such criticism. Aristophanes is considered to have been aristocratic, politically conservative and staunchly against the wars with Sparta – a set of characteristics that he also shared with Xenophon. His dramatic works have been particularly scathing in their criticism of those who profiteered from such wars¹²⁸. His plays consistently opposed radical influences in Athenian society, usually through comic and ironic inversions within his caricatures of such views. *Assemblywomen* aptly illustrates this, in which he was certainly not advocating some kind of gynocracy based loosely on Plato's *Republic*, though, clearly influenced by aspects of it, while at the same time satirising it; but he was likely being critical of the panicky, 'knee-jerk' adoption of novel political approaches for their own sake in response to given crises – which is one of many such acute observations on his part that are also unsettlingly *apropos* to the modern democracies.

Aristophanes' conservative inclinations manifest in his works which often express civic pride, apparently devoid of jingoism, especially in the achievements of the earlier generations who fought in the Persian Wars¹²⁹. He appears to have regarded those wars as just, perhaps as the triumph of good over evil; whereas, he considered the Peloponnesian Wars to be quite the contrary. This is an oversimplification for purposes of convenience here, of course, and the features that made the latter wars 'bad' concerned not only political and military action but also the exploitation of the crisis by elites in order to line their own pockets, the pockets of their friends and to propel themselves into ever higher offices and status while the *polis* and most of its citizens suffered as a consequence. Again,

¹²⁶ D. BARRETT, A. SOMMERSTEIN (eds.), *The Birds and Other Plays*, London–New York 2003, p. 9.

¹²⁷ *Ar. Ach.* 377–382.

¹²⁸ W. RENNIE, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*, London 1909, p. 7 (reproduced by Bibliolife).

¹²⁹ E.g. *Wasps* 1075–1101; *Knights* 565–576; *Acharnians* 692–700.

this is a criticism that seems curiously modern in its aptness. More to the point for this article, then, like Xenophon, Aristophanes appears to have been an ‘enlightened’ aristocrat, acquainted with philosophers and their works, and alarmed about the direction in which his *polis* was going. As noted, he was acquainted with some of the same philosophers discussed above. He was arguably more unambiguously anti-imperialist than Xenophon; but, like him, was also concerned with the stability, prosperity and future of his society.

In his *Wasps*, he presents a more narrowly delineated version of a basic income scheme that is, akin to Xenophon’s plan, likewise based on the exploitation of large numbers of non-citizens. It is also not truly ‘universal’ but would have been applicable only to a specific section of the population. Aristophanes’ character of Bdelykleon (“Kleon-hater”), is trying to reason with his reactionary father, Philokleon (“Kleon-lover”), who follows Kleon’s lead. The son outlines a prospective approach to the problem of poverty in old age, a condition which the play presents as being taken advantage of by populists such as Kleon:

We have now a thousand *poleis* that pay us tribute; let them compel each of these to feed twenty Athenians; then twenty thousand of our citizens would be eating nothing but hare, would drink nothing but the purest of milk, and be always crowned with garlands, they would be enjoying the delights fitting for the great name of their land and the trophies of Marathon; whereas today you are like hired labourers who gather in the olives; you follow the one who pays you¹³⁰.

We can note that this plan, albeit very much presented within a comedic context, is here limited to only about 20,000 Athenian citizens. If our earlier figure of between 90,000 and 100,000 citizens occupying the urban centre in the 5th century is correct, then Aristophanes’ 20,000 would seem to refer mainly to retirees, as alluded to by the “trophies of Marathon”. Namely, these would be the sort of people, like the elderly Philokleon, who typically made up the juries and filled the assembly, having the time to do so, not being able to undertake other work. Rather than a UBI, Aristophanes plan is very clearly more like a state pension scheme; although, it could also be theoretically used for unemployment insurance as well or as benefits for the disabled; though, this is pure speculation and Aristophanes’ fictional characters have not said any such thing. That it seems to apply to the elderly alone is indicated with the reference to the Battle of Marathon (490 BC), whose veterans would have been in their seventies, eighties or older, if they were still alive at the opening of *Wasps* in 422 BC.

¹³⁰ Ar. *V.* 707–710, trans. mine. The Greek text is taken from Aristophanes, *Aristophanes Comediae*, ed. F.W. HALL, W.M. GELDART, vol. 1. Oxford 1907: εἰσὶν γε πόλεις χίλιναι αἱ νῦν τὸν φόρον ἡμῖν ἀπάγουσι: τούτων εἴκοσιν ἄνδρας βόσκειν εἴ τις προσέταξεν ἐκάστη, δύο μυριάδ’ ἂν τῶν δημοτικῶν ἔζων ἐν πᾶσι λαγώοις καὶ στεφάνοις παντοδαποῖσιν καὶ πυριάτη, ἅξια τῆς γῆς ἀπολαύοντες καὶ τοῦ ν Μαραθῶνι τροπαίου. νῦν δ’ ὥσπερ ἐλαολόγοι χωρεῖθ’ ἅμα τῷ τὸν μισθὸν ἔχοντι.

In the above passage, based as it is upon exploitation of the subject states, Aristophanes' character has been understandably less than specific about actual sums of money. However, Bdelykleon has provided us with some other interesting figures to consider in an earlier passage, referring to the income from tributes paid. He says:

Listen to me, father dear: un-ruffle that frowning brow and calculate, as you can without trouble, not with pebbles, but on your fingers, what is the sum-total of the tribute paid by the allied *poleis*? In addition to this, we have the direct taxes, a mass of percentage dues, the fees of the courts of justice, *the profits from the mines* [emphasis mine], the markets, the harbours, public lands and confiscations. All of these together amount to nearly two thousand talents. Take from this sum the annual pay of the jurors; they number six thousand, and there have never been more in this town; so therefore it is one hundred and fifty talents that come to you all¹³¹.

Earlier, it was estimated that 75 talents were needed to cover 3,000 jurors' pay in the 4th century; double that for Aristophanes' era to 6,000 and the sum of 150 talents squares quite well with these figures. It is also interesting that, not unlike Xenophon, Aristophanes' character has also included income from the mines being worked by slaves leased to the *polis*, though he has not suggested the proliferation of them, neither their distribution among tribes, nor based his entire plan upon them. Still, the similarity of thought is interesting. Given that the playwright was of the previous generation from that of the mercenary commander, it is not impossible that the comic lines of the former may have influenced the ideas of the latter. Indeed, this is highly plausible given that *Wasps* was first performed in 422 BC and the *Poroi* is believed to have been written in around 355 BC, considered the last work by Xenophon¹³². He had ample opportunity to see that play, or read it, in the intervening sixty-seven years since its premier. And its influence upon Xenophon may have even been more subtle or even subconscious.

This passage from the play does not tell us exactly what a pension scheme for 20,000 Athenians would cost. But it is clear that Bdelykleon is proposing an outlay considerably greater than the apparently 150 talents needed to fund Pericles' 6 obols a day for a mere 6,000 jurors. Aristophanes' version would

¹³¹ Ar. *V*. 655–663: ἀκρόασαί νυν ὃ παππίδιον χαλάσας ὀλίγον τὸ μέτωπον: / καὶ πρῶτον μὲν λόγισαι φαύλως, μὴ ψήφοις ἀλλ' ἀπὸ χειρός, / τὸν φόρον ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων συλλήβδην τὸν προσιόντα: / κἄῤω τούτου τὰ τέλη χωρὶς καὶ τὰς πολλὰς ἑκατοστὰς, / πρυτανεῖα μέταλλ' ἀγορὰς λιμένας μεσθοὺς καὶ δημόπρατα. / τούτων πλήρωμα τάλαντ' ἐγγὺς δισχίλια γίγνεται ἡμῖν. / ἀπὸ τούτου νυν κατάθεε μισθὸν τοῖσι δικασταῖς / ἑνιαυτοῦ ἐξ χιλιάσιν, κοῦπω πλείους ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ κατένασθεν, / γίγνεται ἡμῖν ἑκατὸν δῆπου καὶ πενήκοντα τάλαντα.

¹³² HIGGINS, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 138. And see too D. WHITEHEAD, *Xenophon. Poroi: Revenue-Sources*, Oxford–New York 2019, *passim*, for more on the date of composition of the *Poroi*.

seem to come across as being comparable to Xenophon's at least insofar as it entails a large number of non-citizens subsidising Athenians with their productivity. He does not give us precise figures, however, saying only that the total sum available from which to draw his pension plan was "nearly two thousand talents". He only specified that each of the roughly 1,000 subject *poleis* should have to feed twenty citizens (20,000 citizens total, then, at a time when the adult, male population would have been around 90,000) and did not give us the cost of their "hare" and "purest of milk". If that sum amounted to about the 256 drachmas identified earlier as the average income of a non-skilled labourer, then the total expenditure would be about 853 talents, or less than half the yearly revenues of the League at that time. It is certainly plausible in that regard and would have likely kept most retirees in relative comfort. But, as indicated, it is evidently more a pension than a universal basic income, given that it is not intended as 'universal' for all citizens, at least presumably until they reach an age appropriate for retirement.

It may also seem curious that Aristophanes' pension scheme is based on imperial revenues. He has not explicitly told us what he thought about the Athenian Empire, whose apex and decline he personally witnessed. It is more than likely that this too grated against his conservative sensibilities insofar as the Athenian version was shored up by populist politicians and war-mongering profiteers, as he saw them, whom he regularly and scathingly criticised. This article earlier referred to him as anti-imperialist, which appears borne out by his writings. His comedic version of a fully state-funded pension (APP) in the *Wasps* plays upon this theme; it is presented purely as parody but, as argued, tinged with a note of seriousness. It certainly would have provoked some thought in his audience, which was perhaps the main intent all along. And the notion of the empire's funds being more democratically distributed, as his character proposes, would have been underscored by the opening ceremonies for the City Dionysia itself, with which his audience would have also been intimately familiar. These featured the ritual arrival of the god Dionysus, a parade in full armour of the sons of soldiers who had died for the *polis* that year and, at least until the end of the Peloponnesian Wars, a highly visible presentation of the annual tribute collected from Athens' subject *poleis*¹³³. However, based on internal evidence (lines 1017–1022), *Wasps* was most likely produced for the winter *Lenaia* festival in 422 BC rather than the spring/summer Dionysia¹³⁴. It is no less interesting that the subject *poleis*' tribute should figure so prominently into his formulation of his state-funded pension plan here. This perhaps suggests that he may have

¹³³ A. SOMMERSTEIN (ed.), *Aristophanes: Lysistrata, The Acharnians, The Clouds*, London–New York 1973, pp. 18 f. See too E. O'NEILL, Jr. (trans. and ed.), *Aristophanes, Wasps, The Complete Greek Drama*, vol. 2, New York 1938.

¹³⁴ SOMMERSTEIN, *op. cit.* (n. 133), p. 37.

originally intended the play for the Dionysia but then changed his mind and presented it at the *Lenaia* instead. HENDERSON argues that he likely chose the winter festival because his *Clouds* had failed to win first or even second prize at the Dionysia during the previous year's performances¹³⁵.

We cannot know this for certain and, either way, his audience would have been fully cognisant of the annual collection and visible display of tribute from the Delian League within the wider context of the Dionysia—intimately linked to the dramatic *milieu*. Granted, the theatrical impact would have been more forceful if *Wasps* had been first performed at the summer festival than at the winter one. Whenever the play was actually performed or intended to be performed, did Aristophanes seriously consider it appropriate to use the empire's subject states to fund Athenian pensioners? We do not know; however, it seems more likely that he was in fact pointing out the extent of both the vast resources available to Athens at the time on account of that empire, as well as the greed (*pleonexia*) that hoarded such vast wealth in few hands, denying it to those who needed it the most, with that situation presenting further opportunities to be exploited by unscrupulous politicians, thereby leading to civil strife. In this regard, his philosophical aims are in perfect keeping with those of Plato, Xenophon and others already discussed above. Aristophanes has therefore offered a characteristically comedic remedy to the social problem of inequality in an ostensibly prosperous state, in keeping with his dramatic *ethos*, inviting his audience to reflect upon the matter further in their own time.

Here is a summary of the different approaches discussed in this article for comparison: Xenophon's proposed SCI: 3,000 citizen males per tribe with 1,200–10,000 slaves at an initial (high end) cost of 216,000 drachmas (36 talents) for 1,200 slaves or 1,800,000 drachmas (300 talents) for 10,000 slaves respectively, yielding a yearly income of about 200 drachmas per citizen per tribe; or the same number of citizens with a lower number of slaves at 120–1,000, at an initial cost of 21,600 (3.6 talents) to 180,000 drachmas (30 talents), yielding a maximum of about 20 drachmas per year per citizen per tribe¹³⁶.

The Aristophanic Pension Plan: 20,000 citizens at 256 drachmas per year each = a cost of 853 talents per year¹³⁷; Pericles'/Kleon's actual juror subsidy:

¹³⁵ J. HENDERSON (trans. and ed.), *Aristophanes: Clouds, Wasps, Peace*, Cambridge (MA)–London 1998, p. 215.

¹³⁶ Note that Xenophon's is the only scheme here that is designed to be self-sustaining and not costing the state coffers, except perhaps for the initial set-up. And note too that it is expected to grow its income. See above for alternatively higher figures and their consequences.

¹³⁷ NB: the cost would be approximately the same as Xenophon's if raised to 300 drachmas per year and extended to 30,000 citizens, but would require fewer slaves, being dependent upon on imperial revenues.

6,000 jurors at 3 obols (= ½ drachma) *per diem*, estimated at between 75 and 150 drachmas per year per juror = a cost of c. 150 talents per year¹³⁸.

Xenophon's plan is expensive, requiring the figures above to be multiplied by ten, costing either 300 talents at start-up with 1,200 slaves, or 3,000 talents at start-up with 10,000 slaves per tribe. Given that the higher number is a thousand more talents than Aristophanes reported as the yearly income of Athens at the height of empire, likely 10,000 slaves would be a goal toward which the scheme might work, rather than a *fait accompli* at its inception. And the *Poroi* implies that such would likely be the case, as we have seen. It is also ironic that Aristophanes' Athens could have better afforded Xenophon's scheme than it could have in 355 BC.

While Xenophon's Sustained Civic Income may be, as noted by Dillery above, "without parallel in all antiquity", along with the wider import of *Ways and Means*, the epistemological roots of these ideas must be firmly grounded in his historical and philosophical *milieu*, as has been demonstrated here. The innovative solutions to the problem of poverty devised respectively by Xenophon and Aristophanes, and others, are clearly products of their time and socio-historical context. In keeping with prevailing attitudes in ancient Greece, they are necessarily based on the exploitation of someone whose value is reckoned as being lower than even an impoverished citizen, within a wider and implicitly hierarchical system of values levied on the worth of individuals according to criteria of wealth, status and power. Even so, these and other thinkers realised that not all citizens shared in the prosperity that surrounded them, and that this was disruptive to the smooth running of society, and so they came up with ways to redress that deficiency. Xenophon deserves some signal honour for devising such a scheme. In the modern age, we have the luxury of offering a not-dissimilar solution; however, as stated, it can be based on the less morally equivocal (to us) 'harvesting' of the productivity of automation in order to provide a living for those who will be otherwise hedged out by the very industrial progress that such automation and AI will surely bring. And, as also indicated, we may have to do so if only to preserve some semblance of the current economic dispensation, else very soon only a vanishingly small few will be able to afford the products and services being churned out by factories that will be operated by the unpaid 'thinking machines'. We may need to adopt some form of this solution in order to avoid a worse sort of divisiveness and *stasis* in our society, which is seemingly obsessed with conspicuous consumption and excessive display of wealth

¹³⁸ We must bear in mind all of the caveats and uncertainties about this; but we do have Aristophanes' helpful figure of 150 talents, discussed above, for corroboration. This is not counting Assembly pay, which would amount to more; while one assumes that many, if not all regular jurors, would also attend the Assembly and receive pay, it is unclear how many would do both and how many would do just one of them.

amidst growing inequality, akin to that defect which Xenophon was seeking to remedy in his own society.

That is not to say that there are not alternatives; although, some of them are much less palatable from an ethical standpoint than others, e.g. some kind of 'neo-feudalism', banning AI altogether or, worse, simply allowing the poor to starve – unconscionable to say the least and unworthy of our own greatness, such as it may be. It is a fact that, on our present trajectory, *automata* will take many, and possibly most, jobs that currently exist. However we choose to deal with it will be socially divisive. It already is. A UBI of the sort that Xenophon recommends, with some modern adjustments, is one way to avoid the darker outcomes. When and if artificial intelligence should become truly sentient, then we shall have to revisit questions of rights and liberties *vis-à-vis* their exploitation. And the author of this article will gladly re-examine those matters, should that ever come to pass in his lifetime. Until then, we can take a lesson from Xenophon, and to an extent Aristophanes (and Plato, Aristotle, the Pythagoreans and even the Spartans), and apply the means of our technological prosperity to the greater good. As R. Buckminster Fuller has so wisely stated, "it is now highly feasible to take care of everybody on Earth at a higher standard of living than any have ever known [...] It is a matter of converting the high technology from weaponry to livingry"¹³⁹. It seems probable that Xenophon would agree with that sentiment, in principle if not necessarily also in detail. He and Aristophanes, Plato and Aristotle, all recognised an urgent need that was present in their respective societies and historical contexts and they have proposed some plans, albeit not un-problematically, in order to address that urgent need. Society at the time chose not to undertake any of those plans, as it happens; and the urgent need posed by gross inequality was arguably never fully addressed in any lasting sense, then or in subsequent eras. We have a need of comparable though greater proportions in this current age. And we have a means to address it even better than the schemes of 5th and 4th century BC thinkers grappling with similar crises. It is the hope of this author that, as a society, we will act according to the philosophical principles that we purport to embrace and which are ultimately derived out of Aristophanes' and Xenophon's (and Plato's and Aristotle's) realm of ideas in an epistemologically discernible tradition that the author has sought to demonstrate in this treatise.

Teesside University
K.R.Moore@tees.ac.uk

¹³⁹ R. BUCKMINSTER FULLER, K. KUROMIYA (adjuvant), *Critical Path*, 2nd edition, New York 1982, p. xxv.

ARIMASPI AND ISSEDONIANS RECONSIDERED

by

GOŚCIWIT MALINOWSKI

ABSTRACT: This study critically reassesses the mythical figures of the Arimaspi and Issedonians within the framework of ancient Greek ethnographic traditions and literary representations. Originating in Aristeeas of Prokonnesos' now-lost *Arimaspea*, the Arimaspi were described as one-eyed warriors engaged in perpetual conflict with gold-guarding griffins, located at the northernmost edges of the Greek worldview. Drawing on Herodotus and other Classical sources, the paper examines the evolving depictions of these enigmatic tribes, tracing their transformation from poetic invention to components of broader ethnographic and geographical discourse. Particular emphasis is placed on the textual and cultural contexts that influenced their portrayal, including their intersection with the Scythian narrative, their role as mediators of northern liminality, and their connection to the economic and symbolic significance of gold in the Greek imagination. Through a comparative analysis of literary texts, iconographic evidence, and modern interpretations, the article aims to reconstruct the layered significance of the Arimaspi and Issedonians, shedding light on their enduring legacy within ancient Greek intellectual history and their contribution to conceptualizing the northern frontier.

The Arimaspi were in the Greek imagination one of the most important peoples of the northern *oikumene*. They are first mentioned by Aristeeas of Prokonnesos, in whose epic poem their fundamental role is reflected in its very title, *Arimaspea*¹. Unfortunately, this work is lost and our entire knowledge of the Arimaspi must be gleaned from later fragments of *Arimaspea*, testimonia on this work and tradition concerning this people². Apart from literary sources, iconographical relics are also helpful, since in some eras the battle between the Arimaspi and griffins was a frequently-used motif in vase- and wall-paintings, sculptures, bas-reliefs, etc.³ In scholarly literature, many researchers have sought

¹ J.D.P. BOLTON, *Aristeeas of Prokonnesos*, Oxford 1962. The scholarship on Aristeeas is abundant, cf. A. BONDZHEV, *Aristeeas' Journey to Hyperborea*, Open Journal for Studies in Philosophy VII 2023, pp. 1–8.

² *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta*, A. BERNABÉ (ed.), Leipzig 1987. *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, M. DAVIES (ed.), Gröningen 1988. K. DOWDEN, *Aristeeas* (35), in: I. WORTHINGTON (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*, Leiden 2009 [referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/aristeeas-35-a35]; second edition 2021.

³ M. LEVENTOPOULOU, *Gryps*, in: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, vol. VIII: *Thespiades–Zodiacus et Supplementum: Abla–Thersites*, Zürich–Düsseldorf 1997, pp. 609–611.

to interpret ancient sources on the Arimaspi, including locating them either on the mythological map of *oikumene* as imagined by the Greeks in the archaic period, or on the archaeological map of northern Eurasia in the early Iron Age. In these sources they see the folklore creation of Boreal peoples or the distant ancestors of later historical peoples⁴.

The aim of this article is not to suggest another interpretation of accounts of the Arimaspi, but to offer a re-examination of the extant Greek (and Latin) literary sources of information about them, including the lost sources of these extant testimonia, their context, and functions in particular literary texts. Only a more thorough analysis of the sources, which takes into account narrative strategies and the aims of the ancient author in question, will allow us to work on a reliable reconstruction of the image of the Arimaspi in the epic *Arimaspea* by Aristeas and to separate the archaic motifs from later innovations in their depiction, which were gradually introduced in ancient and mediaeval literature. The first extant text, which refers to the Arimaspi, is that of Herodotus, who supplies the basic information relating to Aristeas and his legendary life, and who also used *Arimaspea* in his description of Scythia. Herodotus' *History* is very likely to have originated in the years 440–430 BCE, but the dating of *Arimaspea* is difficult to establish. According to Herodotus it would not have been later than c. 680 BCE; however, the majority of scholars today place the date in the later decades of the 7th century or even in the 6th⁵. The context in which Herodotus refers to the Arimaspi at the same time indicates that they were a people from the Scythian borders of the *oikumene*, who did not, however, play any role in the events connected with Darius' march against the Scythians in 514 BCE, although this event gave the historian the pretext to include the account of the Scythians in his *History*.

Herodotus refers to the Arimaspi four times. The most important reference is found at the beginning of book 4, where he presents Darius' march against Scythia as resulting from a desire to avenge the attack by the Scythians on Media, which had taken place much earlier. The Scythians attacked Media in pursuit of the Cimmerians and reigned over Media for 28 years, and after their return to the Pontic steppes they had to contend with the illegitimate offspring born to the Scythian women and their slaves (there follows a digression on the blind slaves in Scythia and the making of kumiss). After describing the Scythian lords' victorious battle against the illegitimate offspring, Herodotus offers an account of the Scythians' origins, referring to three possible/different versions:

⁴ J. RATCLIFFE, *Arimaspians and Cyclopes: The Mythos of the One-Eyed Man in Greek and Inner Asian Thought*, Sino-Platonic Papers CCXLIX 2014, pp. 1–71.

⁵ Д.А. ЩЕГЛОВ, Путешествие Аристия Проконнесского: проблема датировки, in: *Боспорский феномен. Часть I* [D.A. SHCHEGLOV, *The Journey of Aristeas of Proconnesus: The Problem of Dating*, in: *The Bosphoran Phenomenon. Part I*], SPb VI 2001, p. 5–17.

- 1) The Scythians' own account, that they are the youngest people and descended from Targitaos and his three sons: Lipoxais, Arpoxais, and Kolaxais (IV 5–7);
- 2) The account of the Greeks who live in Pontus, that the Scythians' ancestors were Heracles and Echidna, who had three sons: Agathyrsoi, Gelonos, and Scythes (IV 8–10);
- 3) A different account, neither mythological nor genealogical (IV 11), that Scythians from Asia, under pressure from the Massagetae, crossed the river Araxes and attacked the Cimmerians. After their kings' deaths, the Cimmerians abandoned their native land, but even now their name remains evident in that region. The Cimmerians reached Sinope with the Scythians in pursuit, but the Scythians then got to Media by mistake. This account recalls the main narrative in Herodotus' first books, that is 'the account of Lydian and Persian kings'. In summing up, Herodotus writes (IV 12) that this is a different (third) account, common to Greeks and barbarians (by whom he means the Persians rather than other non-Scythian peoples of the Achaemenid empire).

After these three accounts (two of a mythological and genealogical nature and one suggesting an archetypal migration without any mythological input), Herodotus offers a fourth account (IV 13), namely that connected with the figure of Aristaeus of Prokonnesos, and it is here that we have the appearance of the Arimaspi. In contrast with the earlier accounts, this does not refer to communities: 1) the Scythians, 2) the Greeks in Pontus, 3) the Greeks and barbarians together, but the authorial narrative and Herodotus refer to unusual events in Aristaeus' life, including his epiphany 240 years after his death in Metapontus, in Italy. But let us put these biographical details to one side and concern ourselves exclusively with the contents of *Arimaspea* according to Herodotus:

- 1) Source: Ἐφη δὲ Ἀριστέης ὁ Καῦστροβίου ἀνὴρ Προκοννήσιος, ποιέων ἔπεα,
- 2) Where the source derives its knowledge: ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Ἴσσηδόνας φοιβόλαμπτος γενόμενος,
- 3) Periegesis on the countries neighbouring the Issedonian:
 - a) Ἴσσηδόνων δὲ ὑπερρικέειν Ἀριμασποὺς ἄνδρας μονοφθάλμους,
 - b) ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων τοὺς χρυσοφύλακας γρυῖπας,
 - c) τούτων δὲ τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους κατήκοντας ἐπὶ θάλασσαν·
- 4) The account of attacks by neighbouring peoples, a factor causing migration:
 - a) τούτους ὧν πάντας πλὴν Ὑπερβορέων, ἀρξάντων Ἀριμασπῶν, αἰεὶ τοῖσι πλησιοχώροισι ἐπιτίθεσθαι,
 - b) καὶ ὑπὸ μὲν Ἀριμασπῶν ἐξωθέεσθαι ἐκ τῆς χώρας Ἴσσηδόνας,
 - c) ὑπὸ δὲ Ἴσσηδόνων Σκύθας,
 - d) Κιμμερίους δὲ οἰκέοντας ἐπὶ τῇ νοτίῃ θαλάσῃ ὑπὸ Σκυθῶν πιεζομένους ἐκλείπειν τὴν χώραν.

In conclusion, Herodotus emphasises that Aristetas' account here does not correspond with what the Scythians themselves say about their country (Οὕτω οὐδὲ οὗτος συμφέρεται περὶ τῆς χώρας ταύτης Σκύθησι). He only lists them, so this is concerned solely with the first account (IV 5–7), probably because it is static. The Scythians are a young nation who have at this point been living in their own country for 1,000 years. The two remaining accounts – from the Greeks in Pontus (IV 8–10) and the Greco-barbarian one (IV 11) are not contrasted here with what we have from Aristetas, probably because account of the Greeks in Pontus is static like the Scythian one (the descendants of Agathyrso and Gelon left the country, but Scythes' descendants remained). On the other hand, the Greco-barbarian account is dominated by the same dynamic aspect, which characterises that of Aristetas: the Scythians took over their current region as a result of their conquest. Yet we need not expect that this account will include the same elements as that of Aristetas, namely the Arimaspi and the griffins, although the Issedonians might have appeared (cf. I 201). So what Herodotus is pointing out from Aristetas' *Arimaspea* is an authorial version of the poet from Prokonnesos which is not found in other accounts:

- that the poet made a supernatural journey to the Issedonians when he was possessed by Phoebus; and here Herodotus begins the geographical part on the further progression of peoples in the direction described by Aristetas;
- and here the first people after the Issedonians are the Arimaspi. Herodotus places emphasis on one feature of theirs at this point, namely that they have one eye;
- behind them are griffins, who are guardians of gold; Herodotus does not give here any additional details, noting that this account is known to his imagined reader, and that one can also refer here to his own earlier account (III 116), where in describing the northern borders of Europe he writes:

Πρὸς δὲ ἄρκτου τῆς Εὐρώπης πολλῷ τι πλεῖστος χρυσὸς φαίνεται ἐόν.
 Ὅπως μὲν γινόμενος, οὐκ ἔχω οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀτρεκέως εἶπαι, λέγεται
 δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν γρυπῶν ἀρπάζειν Ἀριμασποὺς ἄνδρας μονοφθάλμους·
 πείθομαι δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦτο, ὅπως μονόφθαλμοι ἄνδρες φύονται, φύσιν
 ἔχοντες τὴν ἄλλην ὁμοίην τοῖσι ἄλλοισι ἀνθρώποισι.

But in the north of Europe there is by far the most gold. In this matter again I cannot say with assurance how the gold is produced, but it is said that one-eyed men called Arimaspi steal it from griffins. But I do not believe this, that there are one-eyed men who have a nature otherwise the same as other men.

(trans. A.D. GODLEY⁶)

⁶ Herodotus, trans. A.D. GODLEY, London–New York 1923.

This testimony is still very important, despite Herodotus' scepticism regarding the one-eyed people, since it presents the relationship between the Arimaspi and the griffins, where the former play an active role and rob the griffins of gold. The Arimaspi are given the same adjective 'one-eyed' (ἄνδρας μονοφθάλμους), which might indicate a certain formula by which they appeared in our image of the Greek world.

To return to Herodotus on *Arimaspea* at IV 13: he goes on that according to Aristeas the Hyperboreans lived beyond the griffins, and beyond them was the sea. The Hyperboreans are an ancient concept of Greek ethnography, presented as living on the far borders of the world, and known to us from sources pre-dating Aristeas (Hesiod, the Trojan Cycle)⁷. We will not dwell on them here, as they are not closely connected with the Arimaspi; the griffins, on the other hand, like the Arimaspi, are mentioned first by Aristeas, although the scholia to Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* connects their first mention to Hesiod (ΣΑ *Pr* recentiora 801a: περὶ ὧν Ἡσίοδος πρῶτος ἑτερατεύσατο⁸).

After presenting this geography of the *oikumene* in relation to the Issedonians – Arimaspi – griffins – Hyperboreans, Herodotus develops a completely different direction, suggesting that the migrations are caused by the enmity of those living nearby. All those in the region traversed by Aristeas were said to have been involved in this hostility, with the praiseworthy exception of the Hyperboreans, as is emphasised *expressis verbis* at the very beginning. The battle was initiated by the Arimaspi, who displaced the Issedonians from their native land. In this way the Arimaspi begin to constitute a very aggressive force on the borders of the *oikumene*, gaining wealth by robbing the griffins of their gold and driving their neighbours from their land. The Issedonians in turn drove out the Scythians, who had no other option but to press upon the Cimmerians who lived by the southern sea and to force them to leave their land.

The abovementioned point is especially important, since the reference to the southern sea (ἐπὶ τῇ νοτίῃ θαλάσῃ) obviously also implies the existence of the northern sea (βορείῃ θάλασσᾳ). In an Egyptian context such a distinction also suggests in Herodotus the area between the Mediterranean and Erythrean Seas (II 158, III 17, IV 42), and in a Persian context it also suggests the southern Erythrean Sea (IV 37). However, in the context of Aristeas we have the Scythian perspective and the southern sea here is indubitably the Euxine Sea, while the northern sea in relation to this is certainly the one beyond the Hyperboreans (the Baltic?). This geographical observation is essential, since it indicates that the axis, upon which Herodotus places the people described in *Arimaspea*, is North–South, not West–East, the latter having been the interpretive tendency of many

⁷ T.P. BRIDGMAN, *Hyperboreans. Myth and History in Celtic-Hellenic contacts*, New York–London 2005.

⁸ C.J. HERINGTON, *The Older Scholia on the Prometheus Bound*, Leiden 1972.

scholars in imagining the peoples mentioned in Aristeeas: the Issedonians, the Arimaspi, and the griffins, as being the people of Dzungaria and Altai, or western Mongolia⁹.

The reference Herodotus makes to the Cimmerians' necessary abandonment of their land on the Black Sea to the Scythians as a result of pressure from the neighbouring peoples is an important *terminus post quem* for the origin of the epic poem *Arimaspea*. Of course the dating of the Scythians' origins on the Black Sea can only be very approximate (end of the 8th/beginning of the 7th century BCE), but we can say with confidence that the world of *Arimaspea* is later than that of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, in which the native Cimmerians are not presented as being under any threat, and nomadic peoples are merely described without the ethnonym Scythian (*Iliad* XIII 5–6), a term which might have still been unknown to the Greeks.

At IV 16 Herodotus offers some essential information on the Arimaspi, although he doesn't actually mention them:

Τῆς δὲ γῆς τῆς περὶ ὅδε ὁ λόγος ὄρμηται λέγεσθαι, οὐδεὶς οἶδε ἀτρεκέως ὅ τι τὸ κατύπερθε ἐστι. Οὐδενὸς γάρ δὴ αὐτόπτεω εἶδέναι φαμένου δύναμαι πυθέσθαι· οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδὲ Ἀριστεύης, τοῦ περ ὀλίγω πρότερον τούτων μνήμην ἐποιεύμην, οὐδὲ οὗτος προσωτέρω Ἰσσηδόνων αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖσι ἔπεισι ποιέων ἔφησε ἀπικέσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὰ κατύπερθε ἔλεγε ἀκοῇ, φᾶς Ἰσσηδόνας εἶναι τοὺς ταῦτα λέγοντας. Ἀλλ' ὅσον μὲν ἡμεῖς ἀτρεκέως ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἰοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἀκοῇ ἐξικέσθαι, πᾶν εἰρήσεται.

As for the land of which my history has begun to speak, no one exactly knows what lies north of it; for I can find out from no one who claims to know as an eyewitness. For even Aristeeas, whom I recently mentioned – even he did not claim to have gone beyond the Issedonians, even though a poet; but he spoke by hearsay of what lay north, saying that the Issedonians had told him. But all that we have been able to learn for certain by report of the farthest lands shall be told.

(trans. A.D. GODLEY)

The key words here are τῆς δὲ γῆς τῆς περὶ ὅδε ὁ λόγος ὄρμηται λέγεσθαι, but specifically ὅδε ὁ λόγος. Herodotus is concerned here with some type of account – whether a general one on the Scythians, or some type of sub-logos relating to this. Earlier at IV 14 he mentions *logos*, i.e. biographical accounts of Aristeeas at Prokonnesos and Kyzikos. At IV 11 and IV 12 *logos* refers to the third, Greco-barbarian account of the Scythians' origins. At IV 8 it appears in relation to Okeanos in the account of the Scythians' origins by the Greeks at Pontus. So it is probably not a mistake to understand the words ὅδε ὁ λόγος as referring to a fourth account on the Scythians, i.e. that which Herodotus has

⁹ A. MAYOR, M. HEANEY, *Griffins and Arimaspeans*, Folklore CIV 1993, pp. 40–66.

gleaned from *Arimaspea*. This begins by mentioning the Issedonians, and the fact that what is beyond their land is not entirely known to the Greeks. Aristeas made his mystic journey to their land but no further, so he knew the Arimaspi only from the Issedonians' account. This is also likely the case in relation to his knowledge about more distant lands, the griffins guarding their gold, the Hyperboreans and the northern sea. Of all these, however, the Arimaspi, who gave his poem its title, must have played the greatest role within it; the title was used at least from Herodotus' times.

We cannot establish with certainty here whether Aristeas really did make such a journey, or whether he also made a journey to the Issedonians only in his poetic or shamanic imagination and deliberately created this in his epic. Scholars have sometimes confidently stated that Aristeas really did travel, while they also posit that everything in *Arimaspea* is an imagined poetic reality, for which the realia of the northern boundaries of the *oikumene* only constitute a stock of images and motifs for the creation of this poetic realia¹⁰. Here let us focus only on the fact that in his epic Aristeas states that he did not get as far as the land of the Arimaspi, and so everything he knows about them comes from the neighbouring Issedonians. The same applies to his account of the lands beyond the Arimaspi, those of the griffins and the Hyperboreans and the sea beyond them.

Following his discussion of *Arimaspea*, Herodotus moves on to the geography of Scythia (IV 17–24), starting from the emporium of Borystheneans (Berezan Island) in the middle of the Black Sea, so at the southern side of the country. In his account Herodotus makes use of several axes in a southern-northern direction, but he begins with one located very far west, on the river Hypanis (the Southern Bug). Then comes an axis along the Borysthene (Dnieper), after which Herodotus merely describes the nomadic Scythians to the north of the Sea of Azov and then the royal Scythians who live south of the Blackcloaks (Melanchlaeni). He then mentions the Tanais (Don); here we have the final axis, which is now West–East: Sauromatai – Budini – desert – Thyssagetai – Iyrkai – an offshoot of the royal Scythians – rocky mountains – the bald Argippeans. As far as the latter is concerned, the lands are known to both the Scythians and the Greeks from the Borysthene port, but beyond the Argippeans there is no clear information. They themselves state that men with goats' feet live further afield.

This account of Scythian geography thus finishes on a fantastical note, but Herodotus decides not to pursue further enquiry, displaying a sceptical attitude to the information. At IV 25–27 he writes:

¹⁰ Д.А. ЩЕГЛОВ, *Аристей из Проконнеса: факты и интерпретации*, Аристей: Вестник классической филологии и античной истории [D.A. SHEGLOV, *Aristeas of Proconnesus: Facts and Interpretations*, Aristeas: Journal of Classical Philology and Ancient History] I 2010, pp. 9–34.

Μέχρι μὲν δὴ τούτων γινώσκεται, τὸ δὲ τῶν φαλακρῶν κατύπερθε οὐδεὶς ἀτρεκέως οἶδε φράσαι· ὄρεα γὰρ ὑψηλὰ ἀποτάμνει ἄβατα καὶ οὐδεὶς σφεα ὑπερβαίνει. Οἱ δὲ φαλακροὶ οὗτοι λέγουσι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, οἰκέειν τὰ ὄρεα αἰγίποδας ἄνδρας, ὑπερβάντι δὲ τούτους ἀνθρώπους ἄλλους οἱ τὴν ἐξάμηνον καθεύδουσι· τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι ἄρχιν. Ἄλλὰ τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἡῶ τῶν φαλακρῶν γινώσκεται ἀτρεκέως ὑπὸ Ἰσσηδόνων οἰκούμενον, τὸ μέντοι κατύπερθε πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον οὐ γινώσκεται οὔτε τῶν φαλακρῶν οὔτε τῶν Ἰσσηδόνων, εἰ μὴ ὅσα αὐτῶν τούτων λεγόντων.

As far as these men this country is known, then, but what lies north of the bald men no one can say with exact knowledge; for high and impassable mountains bar the way, and no one crosses them. These bald men say (although I do not believe them) that the mountains are inhabited by men with goats' feet, and that beyond these are men who sleep for six months of the twelve. This I cannot accept as true at all. But the country east of the bald-heads is known for certain to be inhabited by the Issedonians; however, of what lies north either of the bald-heads or the Issedonians we have no knowledge, except what comes from the report of these latter.

(trans. A.D. GODLEY)

Herodotus therefore does not accept that there are only men with goats' feet beyond the Argippeans. This was the belief of the Greeks from Borysthene, who travelled from the Sauromatians' land as far as that of the Argippeans, but who no longer ventured any further east. Here (IV 26), however, there is some crossover between two accounts of the north: 1) the Borysthenean route from Tanais to the Argippeans and 2) Aristeeas' journey to the Issedonians, the distant first (and last) destination in his poetic expedition. Herodotus accepts without any argument that the Issedonians must have been to the east of these Argippeans. In the entire Scythian account up to this point the Issedonians have not been taken into account at all. Earlier they appear only as a point of reference in Aristeeas' account of the Arimaspi. We do not know if the inclusion of the Issedonians as well as the Argippeans is a Herodotean invention or whether he found it in an earlier source, e.g. Hecataeus, who we know from elsewhere mentioned the Issedonians, although we do not know the context. In Herodotus the Argippeans and the Issedonians are mentioned as parallel peoples inhabiting the border of the *oikumene*, and by association we know of their neighbours to the north only from their accounts. Herodotus is only interested in these northern peoples, and Aristeeas seems to focus on the south-north axis and not the Borystheneans, who travel from west to east. So here we have a confluence of two traditions from the Borystheneans and Aristeeas; in the latter's account of the Issedonians the Argippeans probably did not originally appear, and in the Borysthenean tradition on the Argippeans, nor did the Issedonians.

The most striking point here is the inconsistency in directions. First we have East – the Issedonians live to the east of the Argippeans, although in the original

route of the Borystheneans the final location in the East was the Argippeans. Then Herodotus mentions two independent sources of knowledge about the North, the favoured region of Aristéas, but not of the Borystheneans' account, since they were aiming for the East. These separate sources are meant in both cases to be the native Argippeans and the Issedonians. In the Borystheneans' account the Argippeans mention the men with goats' feet and beyond these those who sleep for six months of the year, which is previously unknown in Greek tradition. But in Aristéas' account we have the previously unknown Arimaspi, although they are characterised by elements known from epic: the single eye, the griffins, the neighbouring Hyperboreans, the sea in the north, i.e. the Ocean, which surrounds everything.

According to Aristéas, the Issedonians were meant to be the Arimaspi's neighbours, whom he had seen in person. Insofar as his description of the Arimaspi appears to be an authorial invention (almost everything relating to them in Greek literature and iconography can be traced to *Arimaspea*, just as we gain information from Herodotus, which is supplemented by details supported in iconography and some other testimonia), the Issedonians may have been more widely known in the Greek tradition of the archaic period, which may be supported by the fact that there are various forms of the ethnonym, while the Arimaspi have only one¹¹. Herodian (Hdn. *Gr.* III 1, p. 26; III 2, p. 527) and Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v. Ἰσσηδόνες) state that Alcman was the only writer to refer to them as Essedonians (Ἐσσηδόνας – the manuscript however spells the word Ἀσσηδόνας, cf. Alcman. F. 156 Page). It is interesting that we also find *Essedones* in Pseudo-Plutarch (*Prov. Alex.* 10) and Latin authors (Pompon. II 2, 3; II 9, 1; II 13, 3; Luc. III 280; Plin. IV 88, 5; VI 21, 1; VI 50, 6). In Herodian's *On Orthography* and in Stephanus the term Ἰσσηδόνες appears, which could be written in the archaic alphabet, which did not yet use the letter η as a long [e]. There are discrepancies not only in the spelling, but also the morphology. The term is most often in the third declension with the ending Ἰσσηδών/-όν-, and more rarely appears as Ἰσσηδοί with the stem Ἰσσηδ-. Such a difference in ethnic designation is not unusual in Greek and Latin: e.g. *Gotones*, Γότθοι – Goths, and proves the variety in naming traditions.

Traditions relating to the Issedonians are also far more varied than Aristéas' on the Arimaspi. This is how they appear in the first book of Herodotus in relation to the history of the Persian kings (I 201): "When Cyrus had conquered this nation, too, he wanted to subject the Massagetae. These are said to be a great and powerful people dwelling towards the east and the sunrise, beyond

¹¹ И.В. Пьянков, *Аристей: путешествие к исседонам*, Исседон. Альманах по древней истории и культуре, т. 3 [I.V. Pyankov, *Aristeas: Journey to the Issedones*, Issedon. Almanac of Ancient History and Culture, vol. 3], Ekaterinburg 2005, pp. 15–35.

the Araxes and opposite the Issedonians; and some say that they are a Scythian people”.

In contrast with Aristeas, where the axis Scythians to Hyperboreans lies south-north, the Issedonians are presented here as the Massagetae's (northern) neighbours, although the Massagetae themselves are clearly based in the East. The Greek archaic tradition does not place the Arimaspi in Central Asia, but the Issedonians are located there at least as far back as Herodotus' account of the Persian kings in the 6th century (cf. also IV 11 – the Massagetae beyond the Araxes drove out the Scythians). Is the juxtaposition of the Massagetae and the Issedonians speculative on the part of Herodotus (like that of the Issedonians and the Argippeans at IV 26), or does it suggest another more ancient tradition regarding the Issedonians? We do not know, although Stephanus of Byzantium states that Hecataeus mentions the Issedonians in his description of Asia but not of Europe. And Herodotus himself decided at IV 26 to locate the Issedonians in the east.

We have already discussed this in relation to Herodotus' crossover between the Borysthenean tradition and that of Aristeas. But we must also emphasise that the account is internally contradictory. First Herodotus writes that no one can tell who is beyond the bald Argippeans (οὐδεὶς ἀτρεκέως οἶδε φράσαι), and that he does not believe in the existence of the men with goats' feet and those who sleep for six months of the year. However, he then goes on to say that according to reliable information (γινώσκεται ἀτρεκέως) the Issedonians live beyond the bald men in the east. He then ends by saying that it is unknown who lives further north of the bald men (Argippeans) and the Issedonians.

Apart from Herodotus and Aristeas, at least Alcman and Hecataeus were known to have mentioned the Issedonians, so we can posit that by contrast with the Arimaspi, who were known only from one tradition (that of Aristeas), in the case of the Issedonians Herodotus mixed up the accounts, associating their role in Aristeas' epic with the Greeks' general knowledge of this people as eastern neighbours of the Scythians – possibly also their north-eastern neighbours, but in the non-Aristean tradition the eastern direction was dominant.

We know that Aristeas stated that he travelled to the Issedonians, from whom he knew about the Arimaspi, the griffins, and the Hyperboreans. We also find the suggestion that his accounts of the Hyperboreans were not accepted by the Greeks at first, and had to be supported by Apollo himself. Maximus of Tyre writes in *Oration* 38:

Ἐγένετο καὶ ἐν Προκοννήσῳ ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος, ὄνομα Ἀριστεάς· ἡπιστεῖτο δὲ αὐτῷ οὐχὶ σοφία τὰ πρῶτα, διότι μηδὲνα αὐτῆς διδάσκαλον προὔφερεν. Πρὸς οὖν δὴ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπιστίαν ἐξεῦρεν λόγον· ἔφασκεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῷ καταλιπούσαν τὸ σῶμα, ἀναπτᾶσαν εὐθὺ τοῦ αἰθέρος, περιπολῆσαι τὴν γῆν τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ τὴν βάρβαρον, καὶ νήσους πάσας, καὶ ποταμούς, καὶ ὄρη· γενέσθαι δὲ τῆς περιπολήσεως αὐτῇ τέρμα τὴν Ὑπερβορέων γῆν· ἐποπτεῦσαι δὲ πάντα ἐξῆς νόμια καὶ ἥθη πολιτικά, καὶ φύσεις χωρίων, καὶ ἀέρων μεταβολάς, καὶ

ἀναχύσεις θαλάττης, καὶ ποταμῶν ἐκβολάς· γενέσθαι δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θέαν πολὺ τῆς νέρθεν σαφεστέραν. Καὶ ἦν πιθανώτερος λέγων ταῦτα ὁ Ἀριστεάς μᾶλλον μὴ ὧνια ἐξ ἀγορᾶς, ἢ Ξενοφάνης ἐκεῖνος, ἧ τις ἄλλος τῶν ἐξηγησαμένων τὰ ὄντα ὡς ἔχει· οὐ γάρ πω σαφῶς ἠπίσταντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὴν ψυχῆς περιπόλῃσιν, οὐδὲ οἷσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἕκαστα ὄραν, ἀλλὰ ἀτεχνῶς ἀποδημίας τινὸς ᾤοντο τῇ ψυχῇ δεῖν, εἰ μέλλει ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου φράσειν τὰ ἀληθέστατα.

There was also once a philosopher in Prokonnesos called Aristeeas. His wisdom was at first regarded with mistrust, because he could produce no teacher for it. Eventually, therefore, he invented an explanation to counter this human mistrust. He said that his soul was in the habit of leaving his body and flying straight up to the bright sky, making a circuit of both Greek and foreign lands, along with all their islands and rivers and mountains. The far point in his soul's excursion was the land of the Hyperboreans, and it surveyed systematically all laws and civic customs, types of landscape and variations in climate, expanses of sea and mouths of rivers; what is more, the view it then had of the heavens was much clearer than from below on earth. Aristeeas was more convincing when he said this than Anaxagoras or the celebrated Xenophanes, or any other exegete of the nature of reality. Men did not yet understand clearly about his soul's peregrinations, nor about the nature of the 'eyes' with which it saw all, but believed that the soul had literally to travel abroad if it was to give a wholly true account of all things.

(trans. I. Hilton)

This lack of acceptance probably did not apply to the actual existence of the Issedonians, the Scythians' neighbours, and so a people which may have been known to the Greeks thanks to the active Greek–Scythian relations from the 6th century, but rather to the unusual customs of the Issedonians and of the peoples known exclusively from their accounts; and of course from Aristeeas' own expedition to those distant lands.

Of course, the least likely possibility is the idea of the Issedonians' endocannibalism, which Herodotus describes in detail (IV 26):

Νόμοισι δὲ Ἰσσηδόνες τοιοισίδε λέγονται χρᾶσθαι. Ἐπεὰν ἀνδρὶ ἀποθάνῃ πατήρ, οἱ προσήκοντες πάντες προσάγουσι πρόβατα καὶ ἔπειτα ταῦτα θύσαντες καὶ καταταμόντες τὰ κρέα κατατάμνουσι καὶ τὸν τοῦ δεκομένου τεθνεῶτα γονέα, ἀναμείζαντες δὲ πάντα τὰ κρέα δαῖτα προτιθέαται. Τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ψιλῶσαντες καὶ ἐκκαθίραντες καταχρυσοῦσι καὶ ἔπειτα ἅτε ἀγάλματι χρέωνται, θυσίας μεγάλας ἐπετείουσιν ἐπιτελέοντες. Παῖς δὲ πατρὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖ, κατὰ περ Ἑλλήνες τὰ γενέσια. Ἄλλως δὲ δίκαιοι καὶ οὗτοι λέγονται εἶναι, ἰσοκρατέες δὲ ὁμοίως αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖσι ἀνδράσι. Γινώσκονται μὲν δὴ καὶ οὗτοι.

It is said to be the custom of the Issedonians that, whenever a man's father dies, all the nearest of kin bring beasts of the flock and, having killed these and cut up the flesh, they also cut up the dead father of their host, and set out all the flesh mixed together for a feast. As for his head,

they strip it bare and clean and gild it, and keep it for a sacred relic, to which they offer solemn sacrifice yearly. Every son does this for his father, just like the Greeks in their festivals in honour of the dead. In other respects, these are said to be a law-abiding people, too, and the women to have equal power with the men. Of these too, then, we have knowledge.

(trans. A.D. GODLEY)

This was a source of fascination to the Greeks; Herodotus mentions it in relation to other peoples as well, but it is possible that Aristéas was the first to ascribe this practice to the Issedonians. The last people to be described in this part of Scythian geography surely owed much to Aristéas, although Herodotus does not mention him here. Of course, we cannot exclude the possibility that the Aristéan tradition was in some way embellished by a predecessor of Herodotus; but all the same his account tallies more strongly with the epic world view than with the Borysthenean travellers.

The motif of endocannibalism is made use of by paremiographers from the 2nd century CE. This is the case with Pseudo-Plutarch, or Zenobios (V 25: Ἴσσηδόνες τοὺς γονεῖς ἐσθίουσι, χωρὶς τῆς κεφαλῆς· τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν χρυσοῦσι), when the Issedonians stopped being simply an element of the archaic past and began again to be an actual people from the Silk Road. Their habits – endocannibalism and the gilding of skulls to serve as dishes – did not stop them from being a just society in which women and men had equal power. Γινώσκονται μὲν δὴ καὶ οὗτοι (“Of these too, then, we have knowledge”) – these words of Herodotus testify to the fact that the Issedonians are known thanks to having been seen at first hand. Only the account by the Issedonians themselves can tell what is actually within their land; and here we come back to the familiar motifs of the one-eyed men and the gold-guarding griffins (IV 27): Τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτων τὸ κατ’ ὑπερθεῖ Ἴσσηδόνες εἰσὶ οἱ λέγοντες τοὺς μουνοφθάλμους ἀνθρώπους καὶ τοὺς χρυσοφύλακας γρύπας εἶναι.

However, in contrast with what we find here, when Herodotus mentions Aristéas, he now writes that the Scythians absorbed the above motifs from the Issedonians, and that the Greeks have now taken it from the Scythians and call the one-eyed men by the Scythian term Arimaspi, after the Scythian ‘arima’ (one) and ‘spou’ (eye): παρὰ δὲ τούτων Σκύθαι παραλαβόντες λέγουσι, παρὰ δὲ Σκυθῶν ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄλλοι νενομίκαμεν, καὶ ὀνομάζομεν αὐτοὺς σκυθιστὶ Ἀριμασπούς· ἄριμα γὰρ ἐν καλέουσι Σκύθαι, σπού δὲ ὀφθαλμόν.

This is interesting from an etymological perspective, and occurs elsewhere in authors who are clearly influenced by Herodotus but who sometimes provide different details. This passage does not add much to the already-known description of the Arimaspi themselves, as it focuses on familiar motifs such as the one-eyed men and the gold-guarding griffins, but it is important as an alternative

source by which this information is transmitted. This is not the knowledge gained by Aristeas from the Issedonians, but rather it is transmitted indirectly by neighbouring peoples, the catalogue of whom is parallel to that of those people pressing upon each other that we know from Aristeas (IV 13). The Scythians took the name from the Issedonians and from the Scythians we now use the Scythian term 'Arimaspi'. It is interesting to consider whether such transmission and etymology are found in Aristeas, who after all stated that he had reached the Issedonians in person, or whether Herodotus sought to adapt the information he learned from Aristeas to a general image of the Scythians. This leads to a chain similar to his account of peoples forced to move on by their neighbours: Issedonians – Scythians – Greeks. The last link is, then, not the Cimmerians, who lost their native land and disappeared, but the Greeks, gathering information about a distant people.

This issue is much more important: did the Greeks really have information on the Arimaspi which they had not gleaned from Aristeas, but which was transmitted by the Scythians, for instance on the etymology of their name as based on the Scythian language or an image of that language? Or is this whole passage a rationalisation of Aristeas' account, since later authors could have questioned such details as the single eye or even the possibility that Aristeas could have travelled as the crow flies to the Issedonians and therefore these authors could have assumed that he learned about the Arimaspi indirectly from the Scythians.

A passage in Herodotus (IV 32) indicates that two lines of transmission of information on the Arimaspi might have existed: "Concerning the Hyperborean people, neither the Scythians nor any other inhabitants of these lands tell us anything, except perhaps the Issedonians. And, I think, even they say nothing; for if they did, then the Scythians, too, would have told, just as they tell of the one-eyed men. But Hesiod speaks of Hyperboreans, and Homer too in his poem *The Epigoni*, if that is truly the work of Homer".

The criterion here is the Hyperboreans, who were well known in ancient Greek literature and are also mentioned by Aristeas, who is said to have learned of them in the Issedonians' land. The Scythians however remained ignorant of the Hyperboreans, although they did know of Aristeas' Arimaspi.

So for Herodotus the Arimaspi and the Issedonians are essential to his geography of Scythia, but interestingly they play no role in his account of Darius' invasion, unlike the majority of other peoples mentioned in this geographical account. The Arimaspi are also mentioned in the context of discussing the unfamiliarity of the western and northern borders of Europe at III 115 f., where they appear close to the mention of the river Eridanus and the Tin Islands (Cassiterides). Herodotus mentions these in relation to their production of certain products – amber, tin and gold, but he does not know where exactly they are located. However, he does associate gold above all with the northern regions, the griffins, and the one-eyed Arimaspi, but does not mention the Scythians as

being rich in that metal. In the context of the etymology noted at IV 27 it is possible that the Scythians themselves pointed to the Arimaspi when the Greeks inquired about the origins of gold in this country. This of course might imply an attempt to locate the Arimaspi, but for our present purposes we will concentrate on how later sources refer to Aristeas.

After Herodotus, the next extant source on the Arimaspi is Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, which may have been written by his son Euphorion or even by someone else. There is no conclusive evidence of authorship; scholars in favour of Aeschylus date the play between the years 480–456 and state that he did not compose it before 430, which would make it more or less contemporaneous with, or possibly a little later than, Herodotus' *Histories*¹². If we adhere to this position, we come next to this tragedy, which is not, however, in any way dependent on Herodotus. We find in it a brief but illuminating description in Prometheus' speech as he is chained to the Caucasus and advising Io in which direction to go and whom to avoid in order to get safely to Egypt. She is meant to avoid the Phorides (Graiai), who are half-swan, the Gorgons, and (803–806):

ὄξυστόμους γὰρ Ζηνὸς ἀκραγεῖς κύνας
γρῦπας φύλαξαι, τὸν τε μουνῶπα στρατὸν
Ἄριμασπὸν ἵπποβάμον', οἳ χρυσόρρυτον
οἰκοῦσιν ἀμφὶ νᾶμα Πλούτωνος πόρου·

beware the griffins, the dogs of Zeus that bite
but never bark, and the one-eyed mounted troop
of Arimaspians, who live beside
the River of Wealth, whose torrent flows with gold

(trans. D.H. ROBERTS¹³)

The griffins are called the sharp-beaked dogs of Zeus, who do not bark, while the Arimaspi are a one-eyed clan who ride on horses and who live by Pluto's stream, which flows with gold. Aeschylus' idea of the north is entirely different from Herodotus'; it is uninhabited, but it does include three sources of unusual danger – the Graiai, the Gorgons, and the griffins together with the Arimaspi. We do not know if the same juxtaposition existed in Aristeas, or if Aeschylus is the first to do so. The Graiai and the Gorgons were part of the Greek mythical imagination at least as far back as Homer and Hesiod, where they are situated on the western boundaries of the *oikumene*. Unlike Herodotus, Aeschylus does not mention if the griffins fight with the Arimaspi. The third section of his monster catalogue consists of two elements: 1) the griffins – dogs of Zeus; and

¹² N. MANOUSAKIS, *Prometheus Bound – A Separate Authorial Trace in the Aeschylean Corpus*, Berlin–Boston 2020.

¹³ Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, translated with introduction and notes by D.H. ROBERTS, Indianapolis 2012.

2) the one-eyed army. He also mentions gold, but as a product of Pluto's stream, near where the Arimaspi live. The stream is absent in Herodotus, but from later traditions on the Arimaspi we can deduce that the battle occurred in a place rich in water (marshland is mentioned by Dionysius Periegetes; river streams by Zenothemis; a bordering river by Dionysius Periegetes in *Ixeutikon*). The scholia elaborate on this location, but there are plenty of inconsistencies or mistakes (e.g. Pluto is a river in Ethiopia).

Aeschylus' image of the griffins and the Arimaspi is therefore much more detailed than what we find in Herodotus, but it lacks the fundamental link. He was probably aware that his audience knew the story, and so he created a poetic description rather than a full narrative. Are the particular details found in the tragedy an Aeschylean invention, or had they already been found in Aristeas? This question is difficult to answer, especially given that it was precisely in the 5th century that the griffins' battle with the Arimaspi became a popular motif in Greek iconography.

We also have evidence that Herodotus and Aeschylus were not the only authors who referred to this story in the fifth and fourth centuries. Strabo's opinion is especially important at XI 6, 2 (C. 507):

ἅπαντας μὲν δὴ τοὺς προσβόρρους κοινῶς οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγραφεῖς Σκύθας καὶ Κελτοσκύθας ἐκάλουν· οἱ δ' ἔτι πρότερον διελόντες τοὺς μὲν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Εὐξείνου καὶ Ἰστροῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἀδρίου κατοικοῦντας Ὑπερβορέους ἔλεγον καὶ Σαυρομάτας καὶ Ἀριμασπούς, τοὺς δὲ πέραν τῆς Κασπίας θαλάττης τοὺς μὲν Σάκας τοὺς δὲ Μασσαγέτας ἐκάλουν, οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀκριβῶς λέγειν περὶ αὐτῶν οὐδέν, καίπερ πρὸς Μασσαγέτας τοῦ Κύρου πόλεμον ἱστοροῦντες. ἀλλ' οὔτε περὶ τούτων οὐδὲν ἠκρίβωτο πρὸς ἀλήθειαν οὔτε τὰ παλαιὰ τῶν Περσικῶν οὔτε τῶν Μηδικῶν ἢ Συριακῶν ἐς πίστιν ἀφικνεῖτο μεγάλην διὰ τὴν τῶν συγγραφέων ἀπλότητα καὶ τὴν φιλομυθίαν.

Now all the peoples towards the north were by the ancient Greek historians given the general name 'Scythians' or 'Celtoscythians'; but the writers of still earlier times, making distinctions between them, called those who lived above the Euxine and the Ister and the Adriatic 'Hyperboreans', 'Sauromatians', and 'Arimaspi', and they called those who lived across the Caspian Sea in part 'Sakai' and in part 'Massagetae', but they were unable to give any accurate account of them, although they reported a war between Cyrus and the Massagetae. However, neither have the historians given an accurate and truthful account of these peoples, nor has much credit been given to the ancient history of the Persians or Medes or Syrians, on account of the credulity of the historians and their fondness for myths.

(trans. H.L. JONES¹⁴)

¹⁴ *The Geography of Strabo*, trans. H.L. JONES, London–New York 1961.

Strabo continues his argument in discussing the relationship between history and mythography, referring to three historians – Ctesias (died after 380 BCE), Herodotus, and Hellanicus (died in 405 BCE). This is also why Jacoby included the above passage in the fragments of Hellanicus (*FGrH* 1a, 4 F 185), yet there is no firm evidence to support this. Even so, Strabo's text offers especially important information regarding the location in which the ancient Greek historians placed the Arimaspi. He tells us that they called all northern peoples Scythians or Celtoscythians, and historians from even earlier periods divided them into groups, as seen above. So, he offers two chronologically unspecified generations of historians, between whom we may distinguish οἱ παλαιοὶ – 4th/3rd centuries BCE, and οἱ δ' ἔτι πρότερον – 6th/5th centuries. What is essential here is that the Arimaspi are stated to be a people from the borders of Europe and are juxtaposed with the Hyperboreans (as in Aristaeas) and the Sauromatians (earlier they did not appear in this context). Moreover, they are contrasted with the nomads from Asia, so for Strabo the Greek tradition on the Arimaspi left no doubt that they were a northern European people.

Here we should also focus on the Arimaspi in the catalogues of people living above Maeotis or the catalogues where Maeotis serves as a reference point. These appear in several sources, including the *Orphic Argonautica*, a rather late and complex source containing *hapax legomena*, e.g. ἄρσωπας (1059–1064):

Καί ῥα πανημερίησι πονεύμενοι εἰρεσίησι,
Μαιώτας πρώτους ἀφικάνομεν ἄβροχίτωνας·
ἡδὲ Γελωνὸν ἔθνος, Βαθυχαίτων τ' ἅπλετα φύλα,
Σαυρομάτας τε, Γέτας καὶ Γυμναίους Κέκρυφας τε
ἄρσωπας τ' Ἀρίμασπας, ἔθνη πολυπήμονα λαῶν
ὧν περὶ ναιετάει ἐν γῇ Μαιώτιδα λίμνην.

Weary from an entire day of rowing, we arrived first at the softly-robed tribe of the Maeotae, and then the Geloni and the long-haired Bathychaeti, and the Sauromatae, Getae, and Gymnaei and Cecryphes, and the Arsopes and Arimaspi, peoples rich in cattle, of whom a tribe was living near the lake of Maeotis.

(trans. J. COLAVITO¹⁵)

The Arimaspi appear on the European side among the peoples causing much suffering (ἔθνη πολυπήμονα probably ought to be understood as an active construction). At the same time the *Orphic Argonautica* presents a catalogue of people very different from Herodotus, where the Arimaspi are known as a noteworthy northern people, but are taken completely out of their original Aristean context (the Issedonians, Hyperboreans, griffins). This relocation of the Arimaspi on the poetic or geographical map of Scythia most certainly occurred

¹⁵ *The Orphic Argonautica*, trans. J. COLAVITO, Albany (NY) 2011 [topostext.org/work/549].

in the Hellenistic period, or maybe even earlier, as might be testified to by the crossover between the Aristean and Borysthenean traditions in Herodotus, as noted earlier.

Stephanus of Byzantium in turn indicates that the Arimaspi were mentioned by a pupil of Hellanicus, Damastes of Sigeum, in his work *On Nations*, s.v. Ὑπερβόρειοι: Δαμάστης δ' ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἐθνῶν· Ἄνω Σκυθῶν Ἰσσηδόνας οἰκεῖν, τούτων δ' ἀνωτέρω Ἀριμάσπους, ἄνω δ' Ἀριμασπῶν τὰ Ῥίπαια ὄρη, ἐξ ὧν τὸν βορέαν πνεῖν, χιόνα δ' αὐτὰ μήποτε ἐλλείπειν· ὑπὲρ δὲ τὰ ὄρη ταῦτα Ὑπερβορέους καθήκειν εἰς τὴν ἐτέραν θάλασσαν.

Here we have exactly the same placings as in Herodotus – the Issedonians live beyond the Scythians, and the Arimaspi live beyond them. But a detail not mentioned by Herodotus then occurs: that beyond the Arimaspi are the Rhipaeian Mountains, whence comes the northern wind and ceaseless snowfall; and that beyond these mountains are the Hyperboreans, by a second sea. The first sea is not mentioned in Stephanus' testimonium, but obviously what we have here is the southern sea, i.e. the Black Sea (or Our (Mediterranean) Sea in general, or maybe the Adriatic?).

The Rhipaeian Mountains and Maeotis are mentioned in relation to the Arimaspi by Pomponius Mela (II 1 f.):

Asiae in Nostrum mare Tanainque vergentis quem dixi finis ac situs est, ac per eundem amnem in Maeotida remeantibus ad dexteram Europa est, modo sinistro latere innavigantium adposita. in ea Rhipaeis montibus proxuma, et huc enim pertinent, cadentes adsidue nives adeo invia efficiunt, ut ultra ne visum quidem intendentium admittant. deinde est regio ditis admodum soli, inhabitabilis tamen, quia grypi, saevum et pertinax ferarum genus, aurum terra penitus egestum mire amant mireque custodiunt, et sunt infesti attingentibus. hominum primi sunt Scythae Scytharumque quis singuli oculi esse dicuntur Arimaspoë, ab eis Issedones usque ad Maeotida.

That is the boundary, as I have said, and the border of Asia where it borders our sea and the river Tanais. If people travel by the Tanais to Maeotis, Europe is on the right, where it was recently on the left. The region near the Rhipaeian mountains (which reach this far) are inaccessible, since constant snowfall means that one cannot even see anything. Then comes a very rich region, but one which is inhabitable, since the griffins who live there – wild and savage beasts – have a wondrous love for the gold dug up from the earth and guard it fiercely, attacking anyone who tries to touch it. The first people we meet here are the Scythians, and of the Scythians the Arimaspi, who it is said have only one eye; after them the Issedonians are found all the way to Maeotis.

(trans. I. Hilton)

Here we have the same depiction of mountains and snow as in Damastes, and separate references to the griffins and the Arimaspi, as in Aeschylus; and the

neighbouring Issedonians as in Herodotus. The geographical localisation points clearly to Europe (the European part of Maeotis), and there is no progression here into the depths of Asia, as in Herodotus IV 27.

Pliny the Elder next offers us a description abundant in detail not found elsewhere (VII 10):

sed iuxta eos [sc. Scythas], qui sunt ad septentrionem versi, haut procul ab ipso aquilonis exortu specuque eius dicto, quem locum Ges clith<r>on appellant, produntur Arimaspi, quos diximus, uno oculo in fronte media insignes. quibus adsidue bellum esse circa metalla cum grypis, ferarum volucris genere, quale vulgo traditur, eruente ex cuniculis aurum, mira cupiditate et feris custodientibus et Arimaspis rapientibus, multi, sed maxime inlustres Herodotus et Aristaeas Proconnesius scribunt.

In the vicinity also of those who dwell in the northern regions, and not far from the spot from which the north wind arises, and the place which is called its cave, and is known by the name of Ges kleithron, the Arimaspi are said to exist, whom I have previously mentioned, a nation remarkable for having but one eye, and that placed in the middle of the forehead. This race is said to carry on a perpetual warfare with the griffins, a kind of monster, with wings, as they are commonly represented, for the gold which they dig out of the mines, and which these wild beasts retain and keep watch over with a singular degree of cupidity, while the Arimaspi are equally desirous to get possession of it. Many authors have stated to this effect, among the most illustrious of whom are Herodotus and Aristaeas of Proconnesus.

(trans. I. Hilton)

It is true that the Rhipaeian Mountains are not mentioned here, but the context is clearly mountainous: the caves (*Ges kleithron*), whence comes the wind, and the mines, and underground paths, where the griffins procure their gold, beneath the earth, as in Pomponius Mela. The underground paths might be associated with Pluto, whose stream was meant to be the source of gold in Aeschylus. In the scholia this stream is sometimes called Horismos, at the borders of Pluto's realm. The *Ges kleithron* is a locked pathway, so perhaps the entrance to the Underworld. The essential detail is the northern (not western) direction for the location of the Arimaspi.

At VII 10 Pliny emphasises that he has already mentioned the Arimaspi in his *Natural History*. There are two references: at IV 88–89 he presents the geography of northern Europe:

a Taphris per continentem introrsus tenent Auchetae, apud quos Hypanis oritur, Neuroe, apud quos Borysthenes, Geloni, Th<y>ssagetae, Budini, Basilidae et caeruleo capillo Agathyrsi. super eos Nomades, deinde Ant<h>ropo<ph>agi, a Buce vero super Maeotim Sauromatae et Essedones. at per oram ad Tanain usque Maeotae, a quibus lacus nomen accepit, ultimique a tergo eorum Arimaspi. mox Ripaei montes et adsiduo nivis casu pinnarum similitudine Pterophoros appellata regio,

pars mundi damnata a rerum natura et densa mersa caligine neque in alio quam rigoris opere gelidisque Aquilonis conceptaculis. Pone eos montes utraque Aquilonem gens felix, si credimus, quos Hyperboreos appellavere, annoso degit aevo, fabulosis celebrata miraculis.

Leaving Taphris and going along the mainland, we find in the interior the Auchetae, in whose country the Hypanis has its rise, as also the Neuroe, in whose district the Borysthenes has its source, the Geloni, the Thyssagetae, the Budini, the Basilidae and the Agathyrsi with their azure-coloured hair. Above them are the Nomades, and then a nation of Anthropophagi or cannibals. On leaving Lake Buges, above the Lake Maeotis we come to the Sauromatians and the Essedones. Along the coast, as far as the river Tanais, are the Maeotae, from whom the lake derives its name, and the last of all, in the rear of them, the Arimaspi. We then come to the Rhiphaean mountains, and the region known by the name of Pterophoros, because of the perpetual fall of snow there, the flakes of which resemble feathers; a part of the world which has been condemned by the decree of nature to lie immersed in thick darkness; suited for nothing but the generation of cold, and to be the asylum of the chilling blasts of the northern winds. Behind these mountains, and beyond the region of the northern winds, there dwells, if we choose to believe it, a happy race, known as the Hyperboreans, a race that lives to an extreme old age, and which has been the subject of many marvellous stories.

(trans. I. Hilton)

This account conflates many different elements: peoples known from Herodotus' Scythian geography; the relocation of the Arimaspi and the Issedonians in the environs of Maeotis and the additional image of the Rhiphaean mountains, possibly Aristean in origin. These Arimaspi are a people from Europe, who are mentioned by Pliny at VI 50, where in turn they are said to be a tribe from Asia:

ultra sunt Scytharum populi. Persae illos Sa<c>as universos appellavere a proxima gente, antiqui Aramios, Scythae ipsi Persas Chorsaros et Caucasum montem Croucasim, hoc est nive candidum. multitudo populorum innumera et quae cum Parthis ex aequo degat. celeberrimi eorum Sacae, Massagetae, Dahae, Essedones, Astacae, Rumnici, Pestici, Homodoti, Histi, Edones, Camae, Camacae, Euchatae, Cotieri, Authusiani, Psacae, Arimaspi, Antacati, Chroasai, Oetaei. ibi Napaei interisse dicuntur a Palaeis.

This catalogue of Scythian peoples in which the Arimaspi appear is a type of later corruption. Pliny starts with the Sakai and the Massagetae, the Issedonians are mentioned fourth, but the Arimaspi come much further down the list. The catalogue is surely the work of a Hellenistic scholar.

In the classical period Choerilos of Samos wrote the following on the Arimaspi (F 13a Bernabé):

[]εραν μάλα δῆρι[ν ἔ]θεντο
 []ονοι ἡδ' Ἀριμασποῖ
 [ποτ]αμῶν ὕδατοτρεφελώτων·

they waged a fierce battle, || ... and the Arimaspi || [beside] rivers
 of lotuses growing in the water

However, the fragmentary nature of the papyrus indicates only that Choerilos mentioned the Arimaspi in his *Persika*. We mention him here only to consider how the Arimaspi could have been a popular and recognised motif in literature of the classical period – to the point that a joke arose that the Arimaspi were relatives of one-eyed Philip II, king of the Macedonians (Philostr. *VS* II 584).

In the Hellenistic period the Arimaspi appear reasonably often in poetry. In his *Aetia* Callimachus calls the Hyperboreans' expedition to Hellas an Arimaspaean journey (ἐξ Ἀριμα]σπεινῆς δειδέχεται κο[μ]ι[δ]ῆς, F. 186 Pfeiffer), which can be understood only by those aware that the Arimaspi were (if only approximately) neighbours of the Hyperboreans. In the *Hymn to Delos* the same motif appears, if articulated slightly differently (291–295):

πρῶταί τοι τάδ' ἔνεικαν ἀπὸ ξανθῶν Ἀριμασπῶν
 Οὐπίς τε Λοξώ τε καὶ εὐαΐων Ἑκαέργη,
 θυγατέρες Βορέας (...)

First, these gifts were brought to you from the blond-haired Arimaspi:
 Oupis, Loxo, and blessed Hecaerge,
 Boreas' daughters (...)

In this way Callimachus ascribes blond hair to the Arimaspi, which is typical of northern peoples. According to Herodian / Stephanus of Byzantium (and therefore the scholastic tradition of commentators) Callimachus simply called the Hyperboreans Arimaspi. Herodian (III 1, p. 188) and Stephen (s.v.) sometimes write that the Arimaspi are a Hyperborean people; but more often they are called Scythians (cf. Eustathius, in *Dionys. Per.* 31).

The Hellenistic period saw the editing and collation of extant archaic and classical texts in the form in which they now appear. *Arimaspea* happened to be preserved only in the form of a small number of fragments cited by later authors. The longest fragments are found in the 12th century author John Tzetzes' *Chiliades*, where (book VII, story 144, vv. 668–684) he writes about the Arimaspi and the Issedonians using citations from three poets:

Καὶ ὁ Φερένικος φησὶ περὶ Ὑπερβορέων,
 ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ζηνόθεμις, ὁμοῦ καὶ Ἀριστέας,
 ὁ Ἀριστέας ὁ σοφὸς ὁ τοῦ Καῦστροβίου,
 οὐπὲρ αὐτὸς μὲν ἔπεσιν ἐνέτυχον ὀλίγοις,
 Ἡρόδοτος δὲ μέμνηται. Λέξω δ' ἐκ Φερενίκου·
 “Ἀμφὶ δ' Ὑπερβορέων, οἵτ' ἔσχατα ναιετάουσι,
 νηφ' ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος, ἀπείρητοι πολέμοιο.”

Φησὶ καὶ ὁ Ζηνόθεμις ἐν τῷ Περίπλῳ τάδε·
 “Σύγχορτον δ’ Ἀριμασποῖσι νάει μέγα φύλον
 Ἰσσηδῶν Σκυθίης, νάμασι πᾶρ ποταμοῦ.”
 Καὶ Ἀριστεάς δε φησὶν ἐν τοῖς Ἀριμασπείοις·
 “Ἰσσηδοὶ χαίτησιν ἀγαλλόμενοι ταναῆσι
 καὶ σφᾶς ἀνθρώπους εἶναι καθύπερθεν ὁμόουρους
 πρὸς Βορέω, πολλοὺς τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς κάρτα μαχητάς,
 ἀφνειοὺς ἵπποισι, πολύρρηνας, πολυβούτας.
 Ὀφθαλμὸν δ’ ἐν ἑκαστος ἔχει χαρίεντι μετώπῳ,
 χαίτησι λάσιοι, πάντων στιβαρώτατοι ἀνδρῶν.”

And Pherenicus says about the Hyperboreans,
 Just as Zenothemis as well as Aristéas,
 Aristéas the wise man, son of Kaystrobios,
 Whose few verses I am familiar with,
 And even Herodotus recalls them. I will quote the verses by Pherenicus:
 “Regarding the Hyperboreans, who dwell in the extremities of the earth,
 Under the protection of the temple of Apollo, lacking the experience of war”.
 And Zenothemis relates these things in his *Periplus*:
 “Bordering the Arimaspi, a big tribe
 Of the Scythian Issedones, dwells beside the streams of the river”.
 Now Aristéas says in his *Arimaspea*:
 “The Issedones, exulting in their long flowing hair,
 He also says that there are men dwelling farther up and neighbouring them
 Up above Boreas, and that they are many and very noble warriors,
 Rich in horses, possessing many herds of sheep and many herds of cattle.
 Each has a single eye in the middle of his elegant forehead,
 They are shaggy with hairs, the strongest of all men”.

(trans. V. DOGANI¹⁶)

Later Tzetzes cites a fragment from Simmias’ *Apollo* on the half-dogs and dog-headed people, which suits the Hyperborean–Apolline context; but we find no indication that this appeared in Aristéas in the context of the Arimaspi. So let us turn instead to what remains elsewhere on the topic of the Hyperboreans in the less well-known Pherenicus from the Pontic Heraklea (between the 2nd century BCE and the 2nd century CE) and Zenothemis (2nd century CE), as well as Aristéas. There is some doubt as to whether the fragment cited really comes from *Arimaspea* or whether it is from Hellenistic apocrypha. There is also controversy as to whether the Aristéan verses preserved in the *De sublimitate* ascribed to Longinus are authentic¹⁷.

¹⁶ John Tzetzes’ *Chiliades in English*, trans. A. UNTILA (book I), G. BERKOWITZ (books II–IV), K. AMIOTS (books V–VI), V. DOGANI (books VII–VIII), J. ALEXANDER (books IX–X), M.S. FADHIURRAHMAN (book XI), N. GIALIOUSIS (book XII–XIII), s.l. 2018 [www.theoi.com/Text/TzetzesChiliades1.html].

¹⁷ C.M. BOWRA, *A Fragment of the Arimaspea*, CQ VI 1956, pp. 1–10.

Pherenicus' reference in Tzetzes makes no mention of the Arimaspi, but from the Scholia to Pindar we know the next three verses:

ἀμφὶ θ' Ὑπερβορέων, οἳ τ' ἔσχατα ναιετάουσι
 νηῶ ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος, ἀπείρητοι πολέμοιο.
 τοὺς μὲν ἄρα προτέρων ἐξ αἵματος ὑμνήσουσι
 Τιτῆνων βλαστόντας ὑπὲρ δρόμον αἰθρήεντα
 νάσασσθαι Βορέαο γῆν Ἀριμασπὸν ἄνακτα.

Around the Hyperboreans, who live on the borders [of the world],
 Beneath the protection of Apollo's temple, untried in war.
 Those who came from the blood of long-ago Titans will sing
 From their undisturbed path how the king Arimaspus
 Inhabited the realm of Boreas.

In turn in the *Periplus* of Zenothemis the Issedonians are mentioned as a great tribe of Scythia, sharing grass with the Arimaspi, and living by the creeks of a river. This is clearly relating to the steppe, grass being common land which both peoples share, and the river features also as the place where the Issedonians have settled; it is certainly not the same river associated with Pluto, where the Arimaspi found their gold (Tz. *H. VII* 675–677).

Φησὶ καὶ ὁ Ζηνόθεμις ἐν τῷ Περίπλῳ τάδε·
 “Σύγχορτον δ' Ἀριμασποῖσι ναίει μέγα φύλον
 Ἰσσηδῶν Σκυθίης, νάμασι πὰρ ποταμοῦ.”

And Zenothemis relates these things in his *Periplus*:
 “Bordering the Arimaspi, a big tribe
 Of the Scythian Issedones, dwells beside the streams of the river”.

(trans. V. DOGANI)

On the other hand, the passage from Aristeas (F. 4–6 Bernabé) is the fullest description of the Arimaspi, who are not mentioned by name but are defined as northern neighbours of the Issedonians:

Ἰσσηδοὶ χαίτησιν ἀγαλλόμενοι ταναῆισι.
 καὶ φάσ' (αν) ἀνθρώπους εἶναι καθύπερθεν ὁμῶρους
 πρὸς Βορέω, πολλοὺς τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς κάρτα μαχητάς,
 ἀφνειοὺς ἵπποισι, πολύρρηνας, πολυβούτας.
 ὀφθαλμὸν δ' ἔν' ἑκαστος ἔχει χαρίεντι μετώπῳ,
 χαίτησι(ν) λάσιοι, πάντων στιβαρώτατοι ἀνδρῶν.

The long-haired Issedonians
 And those neighbouring people beyond
 Towards Boreas, many most noble warriors
 Riders of horses, rich in ewes, rich in oxen,
 Each one with a single eye on his graceful forehead
 Their hair flowing long, the strongest of men.

The two peoples are connected through their common feature of long hair. Apart from this, the poet emphasises that there are many Arimaspi and that they are very powerful warriors. This explains why they pose a threat to the Issedonians, compelling them to press hard upon the Scythians. Also mentioned is the nomadic herd of horses, the Arimaspi's sheep and bulls, and the fairy-tale element of the single eye.

It is interesting that Lucan, in presenting the endless catalogue of Pompey's eastern allies, at one point writes (III 281 f.): *hinc Essedoniae gentes aureoque ligatas / substringens Arimaspe comas* ("From another quarter came the Issedonian tribes, the Arimaspians who loop up their hair bound with gold", trans. J.D. DUFF). We have not yet met with such an image, which of course evokes the concept of the Arimaspi's acquisition of gold from the griffins and Aristean's emphasis on both their and the Issedonians' long hair. The latter feature in juxtaposition with the Arimaspi in this catalogue, while the Massagetae are known sometimes as the Issedonians' neighbours and sometimes as a great northern people; and the Sarmatians and Geloni recall the catalogue from the *Orphic Argonautica*.

On a second occasion Lucan mentions the Arimaspi together with a people rich in gold from Spain (VII 756):

quidquid fodit Hiber, quidquid Tagus expulit auri,
quod legit diues summis Arimaspus harenis,
ut rapiant, paruo scelus hoc uenisse putabunt.

Whatever gold is mined in Hiber is borne out by the Tagus,
And collected by the rich Arimaspi on the highest sands,
Still they thought, whatever they took, that their guilt was small.

The detail "summis harenis" clearly indicates that the Arimaspi collect gold on upper reaches of sand; there is no mention of the griffins, but in combination with Pliny's account we can posit that during the Empire the image of the gold-guarding griffins was close to the image of gold-digging ants in Herodotus, and that these creatures first mined the gold from the depths of the earth and then refused to allow people to take it; in the case of the griffins this undoubtedly took place on river sand at the foot of mountains.

The Aristean (or possibly the Hellenistic Aristean) citation found in Longinus has nothing in common with the Arimaspi, but is rather a certain criticism of life by the sea, somewhat similar to Anacharsis' disinclination to travel by sea (F. 11 Bernabé):

θαῦμ' ἡμῖν καὶ τοῦτο μέγα φρεσὶν ἡμετέρησιν.
ἄνδρες ὕδωρ ναίουσιν ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι·
δύστιγνοί τινές εἰσιν, ἔχουσι γὰρ ἔργα πονηρά·
ὄμματ' ἐν ἄστροισι, ψυχὴν δ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἔχουσιν.
ἧ πού πολλα θεοῖσι φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἔχοντες
εὖχονται σπλάγχνοισι κακῶς ἀναβαλλομένοισι.

This is a great miracle for us and for our minds:
 People living on the water, by the sea and far from land.
 They are an unhappy lot, with a miserable task,
 And with their eyes on the stars and their souls in the sea.
 Always holding up their dear hands to the gods
 They pray over entrails that foretell bad omens.

In the Hellenistic period Greek geographical horizons broadened considerably and various geographers mention the Arimaspi, making use of their image in describing the borders of the *oikumene* and the Ocean, but there is nothing in their descriptions of a contemporary people engaging in human interaction. So in Dionysius Periegetes we find a description of the Ocean surrounding the *oikumene*. It contains geographical emphases dependent on the four corners of the earth – the Atlantic in the west, Indian in the east. Erythrean and Ethiopian in the south and Kronos in the north. But the subsidiary location of the northern ocean is interesting (31–35):

πρὸς βορέην, ἵνα παῖδες ἀρειμανέων Ἀριμασπῶν,
 πόντον μιν καλέουσι πεπηγότα τε Κρόνιον τε·
 ἄλλοι δ' αὖ καὶ νεκρὸν ἐφήμισαν εἵνεκ' ἀφανροῦ
 ἡελίου· βράδιον γὰρ ὑπεῖρ ἅλα τήνδε φαίνειν,
 αἰεὶ δὲ σκιερῇσι παχύνεται ἐν νεφέλῃσιν·

To the north, where the sons of the mighty Arimaspians
 call it the frozen sea, also known as Kronian.
 Others, however, name it dead because of the feeble sun;
 for it shines over this sea only dimly,
 and is always thickened by shadowy clouds.

The north is where the sons of the Arimaspi live, overcome by the frenzy of war. Here again we find the emphasis on the Arimaspi's military qualities, battling as they did with both the griffins and the Issedonians, and their location being in the north and not the east. Furthermore, Dionysius expects that his readers will know the account of the Arimaspi and helps them to locate them in this geographical image of the sea of Kronos. The Arimaspi must have had some significance for Dionysius, since in his *Ixeutikon* he begins with a description of their battle with the griffins:

Πάντων δὲ χρὴ προκρίνειν τοὺς ἀετούς, ἐπεὶ μηδὲν ὑπὲρ γρυπῶν σαφὲς
 ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, οὓς φασιν ἐν τοῖς τῶν πλουσίων Ἀριμασπῶν ἔλεσι τρε-
 φομένους χρυσὸν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀγείρειν ὀρύσσοντας· τοὺς Ἀριμάσπας δὲ
 τούτους οὐχὶ δύο τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ἀλλ' ἓνα ἕκαστον ἔχειν φασίν.

It is necessary to prefer the eagles above all, since nothing is clear about the griffins, which are said to dwell in the glens of the wealthy Arimaspians, gathering gold from the earth by digging. As for these Arimaspians, they are said not to have two eyes, but each to have only one.

The Arimaspi are here referred to as rich; the griffins which live in the depths of their land have gathered gold mined from the earth. Again we have no direct reference to the one-eyed Arimaspi's battle with the griffins, but the reader is expected to know this detail.

In the Hellenistic era new traditions arise identifying as Arimaspi a certain people encountered by the Greeks during Alexander's expedition. Diodorus Siculus in writing of that expedition transfers the Arimaspi to Drangiana (XVII 81), which Alexander reached in the year 330/329 BCE from Hyrkania. When he had concluded his business there, he marched against a people who used to be called the Arimaspi, but who are now (i.e. in the context of Alexander's expedition) known as the Benefactors (*Euergetai*), because they once rescued Cyrus' army when it was starving in the desert by bringing them 30,000 wagons of food. The Benefactors also received Alexander kindly and he rewarded them with gifts, just as he did with the neighbouring Gedrosians. This account appears in the so-called Vulgate Tradition on Alexander's expedition, and is also known to the Latin authors: Curtius Rufus (VII 3, 1) and Justinus in the *Epitome of Pompeius Trogus* (12, 5).

Herodian in *De prosodia catholica* refers to the Benefactors as a Scythian people (III 1, p. 73): Εὐεργέτης Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος. Στράβων ὁ καὶ Ἀριμασποὶ ἐλέγετο. ἐκεῖ γὰρ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀργοῦς χειμῶνος πνεύσαντος διασωθῆναι τὸ σκάφος καὶ οὕτω κληθῆναι. Here he refers to Strabo (XV 2, 10, C. 724), who does refer to the Benefactors from Drangiana in a context close to Diodorus', but does not identify them with the Arimaspi. Yet the explanation for this name in Herodian is utterly surprising: "The Arimaspi were called by this name, for the boat Argo was rescued in their country when a winter wind was blowing, and this is why they have this name". But the Argonauts did not reach the Asiatic Drangiana, so this event must have taken place somewhere during the Argo's voyage to the countries of the North. On the other hand, in the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus an Arimaspi is mentioned among the Scythian allies of Perses, the brother and enemy of the Colchidian Aeetes (VI 131).

In his description of the Scythians' origins, Diodorus at II 43 writes that originally they were a small people living by the river Araxes. One of their kings was warlike and acquired territory as far as the Caucasus and Maeotis, the ocean and the river Tanais. At that time it is said that a being which was half-woman, half-echidna was born from the earth among them, with whom Zeus had a son called Skythes. The latter had two sons, Palos and Napes, from whom two Scythian peoples, the Pali and the Napae, descended. They crossed the Tanais and acquired territory as far as Thrace, and on the other side up to the Nile in Egypt. Between these two peoples the Scythian hegemony reached the eastern ocean, the Caspian Sea, and Maeotis. Later they grew even more powerful and had notable kings, from whom the Sacae, the Massagetae, the Arimaspi, and many others descended. Then the Scythians began to branch out into Assyria, followed by the Sauromatians, the Amazons, and finally Cyrus.

This account is clearly inspired by Herodotus' account of the Scythians' origins, but it has many adjustments and additions, and a completely different in-depth chronology. What is important for our present purposes is that the Arimaspi appear as an ancient people worthy of mention next to the powerful Sacae and Massagetae.

For Strabo at I 2, 10 (C. 10) the Arimaspi have their roots in the distant past. He writes that their having one eye was transferred to the Cyclopes from Scythian history, in which the Arimaspi appear as described by Aristeeas. In this way Strabo appears to be referring to the group of authors who believed Aristeeas to be older than Homer, and his teacher (Strabo XIV 1, 18 (C. 639); Tatianus *Oratio ad Graecos* 41).

During the Roman Empire the Arimaspi are mentioned in relation to the distant past to an even greater extent than in the Hellenistic era. They are referred to by Aulus Gellius at IX 4, 1–5 in his description of the acquisition of old books at Brundisium. Pausanias at I 24 also describes the helmet on the statue of Athena, made by Phidias in the Parthenon in the year 438/437 BCE. "In the middle of the helmet is an image of the Sphinx (...) on both sides of the Sphinx are griffins in bas-relief. Aristeeas of Proconnesus says in his poem that these griffins battle for gold with the Arimaspi, who live beyond the Issedonians, and that this gold, which they guard, is produced by the earth itself. So these Arimaspi, all without exception, are meant to be – according to him – people who are one-eyed from birth, and the griffins are wild animals similar to lions, with wings and eagles' beaks. Enough on the griffins."

The schema here is obviously based on Herodotus, and of course we have the developments in that the earth itself produces the gold, that the Arimaspi are born one-eyed and in the appearance of the griffins; but we do not know if these details were found in Aristeeas or if they result from Pausanias' explanatory narrative and the broader image of the griffins found in the Hellenistic world. It is possible that Pausanias engages in a polemic with this feature of the Arimaspi's single eye, as also occurs in Favorinus' *De exilio* 20, 3–7 (ed. Barigazzi): Ἀριμασποὶ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐκ παίδων τοῦ ἑτέρου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀφαιρούμενοι τῷ νόμῳ πείθονται, Ἀμαζόνες δὲ τοῦ μαστοῦ. The Arimaspi in obeying the law lose their second eye from early childhood – similarly to the Amazons and their breasts. In this way they would not have been presented as a monstrous people, but would have been included in the catalogues, so popular with the Greeks, of barbarians who live by strange rules. A different rationalisation of the Arimaspi's one eye is found in Eustathius, who writes that they squinted in order to aim their arrows well (*in Dionys. Per.* 31):

διότι τοξικάτατοι ὄντες ἐπιμύουσι τὸν ἕτερον ὀφθαλμὸν, διὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν βολὴν εὐστοχόν. Καὶ τάχα διὰ τὴν ἄγαν ἐκ παίδων εἰς τοῦτο συνάσκησιν, ὥς καὶ οἱ παλαιοὶ λέγουσιν, εἰς βραχύτερον αὐτοῖς συνέσταλται ὁ ἕτερος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοιοῦτοι, ὥς εἰκόσ, ἐκ προῦπαρξά-

ντων ὁμοίων γεννῶνται πατέρων, καὶ τούτου γινομένου εἰσαεῖ, περιέ-
στη τὸ πάθος εἰς ἐθνικὴν ιδιότητα.

For, being highly skilled archers, they close one eye, in order to aim more accurately when shooting. Perhaps, due to their intense training from childhood in this practice, as the ancients also say, one of their eyes has become reduced in size. Furthermore, it is likely that such traits arise because they are born from parents who already exhibit similar characteristics, and as this continues over generations, the condition has become a national peculiarity.

Similarly in the scholia to Aeschylus (804b–805e):

μουνῶπα: Ὁ μονόφθαλμος· οὐχ ὅτι εἰσὶ μονόφθαλμοι (οὐ γὰρ ἡ φύσις ἐποίησε τὸ τερατωδέστερον), ἀλλ' ὅτι εἰσὶ τοξόται καὶ οὕτως, τοξεύοντες, ἔμυνον τὸν ἓνα ὀφθαλμόν. ἢ ἐκ πατρός· εἶχον γὰρ οὗτοι πατέρα κεκτημένον τὸν ἓνα ὀφθαλμόν μικρότερον. ἢ ὅτι περὶ Σκύθας «ἄριμασπός» λέγεται ὁ μονόφθαλμος· ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ λέγουσι τὸ «ἄρι» ἔν, καὶ τὸ «μασπὸν» ὀφθαλμόν.

μουνῶπα: The one-eyed. Not because they are truly one-eyed (for nature did not create such an extreme deformity), but because they are archers and, while shooting, they close one eye. Alternatively, it may derive from their ancestry, as they had a father whose one eye was smaller. Or, it may be because among the Scythians, ἄριμασπός is said to mean 'one-eyed'; for they say that ἄρι means 'one', and μασπός means 'eye'.

On another occasion Pausanias' reference to the Arimaspi (at I 31, 2) is within the context of Apollo's temple at Prasiai: "Gifts from the Hyperboreans, one of the first tribes, probably get there via the Arimaspi to the Issedonians, from whom the Scythians get them and hand them to Sinope; from there via Greek intermediaries the gifts reach Prasiai". And again, we have a catalogue of people similar to Herodotus, and unlike what we find in Callimachus the Arimaspi are not identified with the Hyperboreans. It is interesting that the point of departure in the Greek world for these gifts is Sinope, which is also known for the fact that the Cimmerians took refuge close by when they were fleeing from the Scythians.

The lexicographer Julius Pollux as the explanation of the words μονόφθαλμος mentions the Cyclopes and the Arimaspi (παρ' Ἡροδότῳ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ φύσεως ἔν' ἔχόντων ὀφθαλμόν, οἷον Κυκλώπων καὶ Ἀριμασπῶν); these are not the only one-eyed peoples – we also find the people called *expressis verbis* Monommatoi (Aeschylus), Monophthalmoi (Scylax, Megasthenes).

Elsewhere Julius Pollux writes (4, 77): Σκύθαι δέ, καὶ μάλιστα τούτων Ἀνδροφάγοι καὶ Μελάγχλαινοι καὶ Ἀριμασποί, αἰτῶν καὶ γυπῶν ὅστοις αὐλητικῶς ἐμπνέουσιν ("The Scythians, and especially the Androphagi, Black-cloaks and the Arimaspi, blow on pipes made from the bones of eagles and vultures"). Here the Arimaspi appear in a catalogue with two peripheral Scythian peoples, whom Herodotus also mentions in the context of Darius' expedition.

Next we find an interesting account in Clemens of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV 26, 172 f.):

εἰκόνας τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ κτίζουσι γράφοντες· αἱ γὰρ Ὑπερβόρειοι καὶ Ἀριμάσπειοι πόλεις καὶ τὰ Ἠλύσια πεδία δικαίων πολιτεύματα· ἴσμεν δὲ καὶ τὴν Πλάτωνος πόλιν παράδειγμα ἐν οὐρανῷ κειμένην.

Poets also create images of such town when they write: the Hyperborean and Arimaspean towns, as well as the Elysian Fields are just societies. And we also know of Plato's city, which is set as a paradigm in the heavens.

The Hyperborean and Arimaspean towns, and the towns of just peoples on the Elysian Fields are created in poetic texts as a utopia. Could the adjective Arimaspean here be a synonym for Hyperborean? And could these towns have appeared in Aristeas, or was this a later concept? We do not know; the Suda account indicates that there were two adjectives for Arimaspean in the Greek lexical resource – one used in an ethnic context and the other in a topographical one, which could refer not only to the country but maybe also to towns (Ἀριμάσπειος· τόπος. καὶ Ἀριμασπός, ἐθνικόν).

The Arimaspi continue to feature as a symbolic northern people in the epic poetry of late antiquity. In the ecphrasis on the singers' podium in the Hagia Sophia, Paul the Silentiary mentions the Garamantes in the South and the Arimaspi in the North as being two opposite peoples.

There is an even greater range of traditions to be found in the Byzantine period; in George Kedrenos (11th–12th centuries) we read about Alexander, who, when he had destroyed the Persian Empire and burnt Persepolis, went on: πρὸς Μάρδους καὶ Κεδρουσίους καὶ Ὑρκανοὺς καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους Ἀριμασπούς, ἐξ ὧν Θαλευτήν τὴν Ἀμαζόνα σύμμαχον ἐδέξατο. The Mardians, Gedrusians, and Hyrkanians are eastern Iranian peoples; the juxtaposition with the Arimaspi might have been a type of allusion to the Benefactors from Drangiana, but strangely enough they are connected with the Amazons, from whom Thaleute was meant to have descended. She was an ally of Alexander, known from the Alexander Romance as Thalestris, queen of the Amazons.

We have a similar crossover in Constantine Manasses (died c. 1187) in the poetic romance *Loves of Aristander and Callithea*, where he mentions various borders of the *oikumene*, where the one-hundred-eyed Argos was meant to have pursued Io, daughter of Inachos (F. 37, 6–12):

ὡς Ἄργος ὁ πολύγληνος τὴν Ἰνάχειαν κόρην,
κἂν Ἄτλαντος νιφόντας ὑπερπηδήσῃ πάγους,
κἂν τοῖς βυθίοις ἐγκρυβῇ τοῦ Τρίτωνος θαλάμοις,
κἂν ὑποδὺς Ὠκεανὸν ὑπόβρυχα μιμνάζῃ,
κἂν πτερωθεὶς ὡς ἀετὸς Λιβύην ὑπερπτέῃ
καὶ τὰ παρὰ Καυκάσια καὶ τὰ Γαδείρων πέρα,
κἂν φύγῃ πρὸς Ἀριμασπούς, κἂν ἐπὶ Μασσαγέτας.

as many-eyed Argos did Inachos' daughter,
 even though he leaps over the snowy wastes of Atlas,
 even though he hides in the deep chambers of Triton,
 even though he plunges into the Ocean and lingers under water,
 even though, winged like an eagle, he soars over Libya
 and the regions beyond the Kaukasos and Gadeira,
 even though he flees to the Arimaspoi and to the Massagetai.

(trans. E. JEFFREYS¹⁸)

The Arimaspi were no doubt viewed here as a Scythian people from Asia (cf. Diodor. II 43). Elsewhere they feature in a significantly longer catalogue of Scythian peoples (F. 71, 1–8):

Τὸ γὰρ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως συμπεῖθει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
 καὶ συναλγεῖν καὶ συμπενθεῖν ἐν τοῖς ἀλλήλων πόνοις·
 οἶδεν ἢ φύσις δυσωπεῖν καὶ Σκύθας, Ταυροσκήθας,
 Ἱππημολγούς, Ἀριμασποὺς καὶ τοὺς Κυνοπροσώπους,
 καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τὸν Καύκασον καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ Ἀράξην
 τοῖς δυσπραγοῦσι συμπονεῖν καὶ βαρυδαιμονοῦσιν
 οὐδὲ γὰρ σιδηρόπλαστα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σπλάγχνα,
 οὐδὲ θηρὸς οὐδὲ δρυὸς κῆμα παλαιφάτου.

Common humanity persuades men to share
 in the grief and mourning of others who suffer;
 this humanity can shame Skythians, Tauroskythians,
 the Hippomolgoi, the Arimaspoi and the Kynoprosopoi,
 and can make those beyond the Kaukasos and those beyond the Araxes
 sympathize with those who are in trouble and deeply distressed;
 for mankind's hearts are not made of iron,
 nor are they the offspring of wild beasts or the famed oak of antiquity.

(trans. E. JEFFREYS)

Nicetas Choniates (died 1215/1216) in *Oratio* 8, p. 77 mentions the Arimaspi along with the Erempi and Brahmani as inhabitants of India. This manifestation of Byzantine learning is difficult to interpret; the Arimaspi are almost an empty sound, whereas there is a subtle allusion in Manuel Holobolos, an orator in the empire of Michael VIII Palaiologus: ἐπὶ τοὺς ἡπειρώτας Ὑπερβορέους Ἀριμασπούς, ἐπὶ τοὺς νησιώτας τῶν Βρεττανῶν. The headland-dwelling Hyperborean Arimaspi are placed in opposition to the island-dwelling Hyperborean Britons.

After Herodotus, the Issedonians are mentioned more rarely than the Arimaspi, usually only as a point of reference to the latter (Damastes, Zenothemis). Unlike the Arimaspi, the Issedonians were not griffin-fighting heroes and were not

¹⁸ *Four Byzantine Novels*: Theodore Prodromos, *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*; Eumathios Makrembolites, *Hysmine and Hysminias*; Constantine Manasses, *Aristandros and Kallithea*; Niketas Eugenianos, *Drosilla and Charikles*, translated with introductions and notes by E. JEFFREYS, Liverpool 2012.

presented as a motif in Greek iconography, nor in vase painting or other art forms. Here the north-eastern borders of the *oikumene* were reserved for the Scythians or the Amazons, who dressed like the Scythians. It was only in the 2nd century CE that there was a change, when Greek and Latin literature (especially geographical works) began to encompass the so-called Silk Road, the land route which from the 1st century CE connected the Mediterranean with the territories of the Han dynasty. Among many new places, the Issedon polis appears (SB). This is the same as Ptolemy's Scythian Issedon (VI 15, 4: Ἰσσηδὼν* (Ἡσσηδὼν*) Σκυθική 140°E i 38°N) or the Serian Issedon (VI 16, 7: Ἰσσηδὼν* Σηρική 152° E i 45°N). These towns were found on the path of a Greek traveller who made a useful survey, of which Ptolemy gives us some idea (VIII 24, 3–5). Did this traveller belong to the group sent by Maes Tatianus? It is possible that a revival or perhaps an updating of what was known of the Issedonians took place at the end of the 1st century CE. However, Ptolemy locates the Issedonian tribe not in Asiatic Scythia but in Serica (VI 16 5):

Πάλιν δὲ ἀνατολικώτεροι μὲν τῶν Ἀννίβων Γαριναῖοι (Γαρηναῖοι) καὶ Ῥαββαναῖοι (Ῥαβάνναι), ὑπὸ δὲ τούτους ἡ Ἀσμιραία χώρα ὑπὲρ τὰ ὁμόνυμα ὄρη, ὑπὸ δὲ ταῦτα μέχρι τῶν Κασίων Ἰσσηδόνες μέγα ἔθνος, καὶ ἀνατολικώτεροι αὐτῶν Θρόανοι, εἴτα ὑπὸ μὲν τούτους οἱ Ἰθάγουροι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν τοῦ ὁμωνύμου ὄρους, ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς Ἰσσηδόνας Ἀσπακάραι, καὶ ἔτι ὑπὸ τούτους Βαῖται, καὶ μεσημβρινώτατοι παρὰ τὰ Ἡμωδὰ καὶ Σηρικὰ ὄρη Ὀττοροκοραὶ (Ὀτγοροκόρραι).

Further to the east of the Annibai are the Garinaioi (or Garenaioi) and the Rhabbanaioi (or Rhabannai). Below them lies the land of Asmiraia, beyond the mountains of the same name. Below this region, extending as far as the Casian mountains, are the Issedones, a great nation, and further to the east of them are the Throanoi. Then, below these are the Ithaguri, situated to the east of the mountain of the same name. Below the Issedones are the Aspakarai, and below them are the Baitai. The southernmost are the Ottorokorai (or Otgorokorrai), near the Emoda and Serica mountains.

This far eastern location corresponds to what we find in Herodotus, although there is still the issue as to whether this reference to the Issedonians is a mixture of various ancient traditions, or whether some people on the Silk Road acquired the name, which probably went as far back as at least the 6th century BCE as a form of Issedonian ethnic identity.

The increasing role of the Issedonians in the conflation of ancient traditions which we see in the times of the Second Sophistic is reflected in this account from Aelianus' *De natura animalium* (III 4, 4):

Οἱ μύρμηκες οἱ Ἰνδοὶ τὸν χρυσὸν φυλάττοντες οὐκ ἂν διέλθοιεν τὸν καλούμενον Καμπύλινον ποταμόν. Ἰσσηδόνες δὲ τούτοις συνοικοῦντές γε τοῖς μύρμηξι καλοῦνται τε καὶ εἰσιν.

The Indian ants, which guard the gold, would not cross the river called the Kamylinos. The Issedones, who dwell alongside these ants, are both called such and are indeed their neighbors.

Here we have both the Indian ants of Herodotus, the crossover with the Issedonians, and the gold-guarding animals; and in particular how the ants inhabit the Issedonians' country and not a separate territory divided from them by a river. Of course this reference makes sense if we apply it to the Arimaspi and the griffins. Elsewhere, Philostratus in *Heroicus* (28, 12) writes of Cyrus' unfortunate expedition against the Massagetae and Issedonians during Herodotus' time, only stating that the latter lived beyond the former and making no connection between them and Cyrus' battles.

The existence of such confections or simple mistakes is clear from John Tzetzes' *Allegoriae in Homeri Odysseam* XI 121:

ὁ Κύκλωψ, ὁ μονόφθαλμος, οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπους ἦσθεν.
οἱ Ἴσσηδοὶ μονόφθαλμοι, ὥς Ἀριστεῆας γράφει·
“Ἴσσηδοὶ χαίτησιν ἀγαλλόμενοι ταναῆσι
καὶ σφας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι καθύπερθεν ὁμοῦρους
πρὸς Βορέω, πολλοὺς τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς κάρτα μαχητάς,
ἀφνειοὺς ἵπποισι, πολύρρηνας, πολυβούτας.
ὀφθαλμὸν δ' ἐν ἑκαστος ἔχει χαρίεντι μετώπῳ·
χαίτησι λασίησι πάντων στιβαρότεροι ἀνδρῶν.”
οἱ Ἴσσηδοὶ μονόφθαλμοι, οὐ τὰ Κυκλώπων γένη.

The Cyclops, the one-eyed being, was not human.
The Issedones are one-eyed, as Aristeeas writes:
“The Issedones, exulting in their long flowing hair,
He also says that there are men dwelling farther up and neighbouring them
Up above Boreas, and that they are many and very noble warriors,
Rich in horses, possessing many herds of sheep and many herds of cattle.
Each has a single eye in the middle of his elegant forehead,
They are shaggy with hairs, the strongest of all men”.
The Issedones are one-eyed, not of the race of the Cyclopes.

(trans. V. DOGANI)

In spite of these contents and his own knowledge, evident from the *Chiliades*, Tzetzes refers to the Issedonians and not to the Arimaspi as one-eyed, possibly because he focused on the Cyclopes and the northern tribe here were merely a sub-feature. After the 3rd century CE, the Issedonians again vanish from the extant sources, appearing only in lexicographical works or commentaries, and only in connection with the Arimaspi, who were more frequently drawn to the attention of the Roman or Byzantine readership of Greek texts, and who were mentioned along with peoples other than the Issedonians. In the 12th century Tzetzes and even more importantly Eustathios of Thessalonika wrote commentaries and paraphrases on literary works from bygone eras, as if predicting the

year 1204 when the number of Greek manuscripts was reduced during the Sack of Constantinople.

Concluding, in the archaic period (7th–6th centuries BCE) the term Issedonian was recognised in the Greek world as the ethnonym for the north-eastern neighbours of the Scythians. Aristeeas of Prokonnesos used the Issedonians as the destination point of the journey which he did actually make, in his imagining of the ecstatic (shamanic) cult of Apollo, or they were only used in literary fiction, in an epic on northern peoples. This epic was called *Arimaspea*, because it centred on the powerful, warlike, one-eyed Arimaspi, who fought with the gold-guarding griffins and became its most memorable motif. At the same time the poem presented traditions of the Hyperboreans, Apollo's followers and the griffins that were known even before the archaic period (i.e. pre-8th century). The epic of Aristeeas conflated these traditions: the north and its peoples, the Rhipaeian mountains (the Carpathians?) and the northern sea (the Baltic?). Perhaps it even reached the Mycenaean period and the expedition to the north in search of amber, incorporating the emerging realities of the northern nomadic world: the fall of the Cimmerians, the constant conflicts and incursions among nomadic tribes, the griffins exemplifying the zoomorphic art of the Scythian nomads, and the prominence of gold as Scythia's principal source of wealth. Unlike the Issedonians, the Arimaspi are the poetic creation of Aristeeas, but it is possible that they were based not on pre-archaic Greek traditions, but rather on Scythian folklore, with which, as with gold artefacts of Scythian art, the Greeks came into contact in the 7th–6th centuries on the northern shores of the Euxine Sea. However, the image of the Arimaspi arose through its use of the realia of the nomadic world of the Great Steppe as the Greeks knew it, and therefore it does not present any real people of the contemporary world, and so does not need to be identified as a specific known nation from the archaeological culture of either Asia or Europe. Traditions relating to the Arimaspi are unusually homogeneous, and besides the detail of their battle with the griffins over the gold, we also have the account of the Benefactors of Cyrus at Drangiana in the Vulgate on Alexander, which originated as a result of a complex confluence of various details from Hellenistic times. The Aristean Arimaspi were also added to Scythian geography at least from Herodotus' time and included in various configurations with at least more than ten ethnonyms from the north-eastern *oikumene*.

In the case of the Issedonians we have the ethnic name which the Greeks gave to the Scythians' north-eastern neighbours during the archaic period, so it is possible to identify them with some type of archaeological culture of central Asia during that period. But they are unlikely to be identified with the Wusun people known from Chinese sources, even if the Wusun (烏孫) does mean 'originating from the raven', which is more strongly associated with the role of this bird in the folklore of northern lands (Eurasia, North America) than with any

direct association with Aristéas' expedition¹⁹. The possibility cannot be excluded that the people from beyond the Silk Road called Wusun might have had some influence on the revival of the term Issedon in literature in the 1st and 2nd century CE, but there is no proof that the Issedonians of Aristéas or the Essedonians of Alcman from the 7th/6th centuries BCE had anything in common with these people, except for the introduction of the intervocalic 's' in both names²⁰.

University of Wrocław
gosciwit.malinowski@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-2159-4154

¹⁹ V.A. SEMENOV, *The Wusun in Northeastern Central Asia*, Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia XXXVIII 2010, pp. 99–110.

²⁰ I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Ita Hilton for her translation of the article into English. Unless otherwise noted, all other translations of ancient authors are mine. The ancient authors are cited, unless otherwise indicated, according to the electronic editions prepared by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* project and the Packard Humanities Institute.

THE *ARA PACIS* AND THE DATE OF AUGUSTUS'
RESTORATION OF THE *FLAMONIUM DIALE*:
A NOTE ON TAC. *ANN.* III 58, 2 AND DIO LIV 36, 1*

by

DAMIAN PIERZAK

ABSTRACT: Based on his analysis of the procession of the imperial family depicted on the southern side of the *Ara Pacis Augustae* and his interpretation of a passage from Cassius Dio (LIV 36, 1), G.W. BOWERSOCK (in his 1990 paper) challenges the emendation proposed by LACHMANN (*quinque* instead of *duobus*) in Tacitus (*Ann.* III 58, 2). Subsequently, he suggests that the appointment of a new *flamen Dialis* by Augustus occurred in 14 BC. Although BOWERSOCK's perspective finds favor among numerous Tacitean scholars, this paper contends that it lacks robust support. A more plausible scenario, as argued herein, is that Augustus reinstated the *flamonium Diale* in early 11 BCE.

The text of the Medicean manuscript of Tacitus (Codex Mediceus sive Laurentianus 68.1, 9th century, designated as *M* by the editors) for *Annales* III 58, 2 reads: “duobus et septuaginta annis post Cornelii Merulae caedem neminem suffectum, neque tamen cessavisse religiones”. This statement is embedded within an entreaty put forth by Ser. Cornelius Lentulus Maluginensis in 22 CE, seeking approval to draw lots for the province of Asia¹. Given his role as the *flamen Dialis* (priest of Jupiter), his life was circumscribed by a set of taboos, which included a ban from leaving Italy². Consequently, he had to convince Emperor Tiberius, who held the title of the *pontifex maximus*, that the

* I am deeply indebted to Prof. Jakub PIŁOŃ, as well as the two anonymous reviewers for *Eos*, for their numerous insightful suggestions and invaluable feedback. Their thoughtful comments have greatly improved the quality of my paper and helped me avoid several errors, for which I am sincerely grateful. Any remaining mistakes are entirely my own responsibility.

¹ Cf. LEVICK 1999: 77; on the speech of Servius Maluginensis, see the comprehensive analysis by BALBO 2007: 259–265 and 2008. Additionally, in relation to Augustus' religious reforms, cf. BEARD, NORTH, PRICE 1996: 131 f.; SCHEID 1999: 14; RIDLEY 2005: 295 f.; MUSIAL 2014: 103; SHANNON-HENDERSON 2019: 140–149.

² See Gell. *NA* X 15, 14, Plut. *Mor.* 274c with SCHEID 2012: 144, and cf. on the subject VANGGAARD 1988: 62–69, 88–104 (on restrictions on political life of the *flamines*); BEARD, NORTH, PRICE 1996: 28–29, 106; MARCO SIMÓN 1996: 103–110 (p. 106 on Maluginensis specifically);

religious observances would not be disrupted during his one-year absence. He contends that this continuity had been maintained for seventy-two years (assuming we adhere to the MS reading) from the time of L. Cornelius Merula's suicide until the appointment of the new *flamen Dialis* (likely himself³). He was appointed as the priest of Jupiter when this office was reinstated as part of Augustus' religious reforms (Suet. *Aug.* 31, 4).

The question that arises is: when exactly did this event take place? Cassius Dio (LIV 36, 1) provides the following information under 11 BC: *Κὰν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ χρόνῳ ὃ τε ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς πρῶτον μετὰ τὸν Μερούλαν ἀπεδείχθη*⁴. Now, since we know that Merula committed suicide during the Marian terror of 87 BC⁵ and there is an interval of 75 years between that date and the year to which Dio assigns Augustus' restoration of the *flamonium Diale*, K. LACHMANN suggested reading *quinque* instead of *duobus* at Tac. *Ann.* III 58, 2⁶ in order to harmonize the two sources. This emendation has been accepted by modern editors and scholars⁷.

The issue resurfaced over three decades ago when G.W. BOWERSOCK proposed a theory suggesting that the scenes depicted on the south side of the *Ara Pacis Augustae* represent “a procession of the imperial family on the day that Augustus became *pontifex maximus* [i.e. 6 March 12 BC]”⁸. As his overall in-

LIU-GILLE 1999: 436–437 (n. 23 on Maluginensis); BALBO 2008: 613 f.; KACZOR 2014: 34; GOLDBERG 2015: 335 f.; SHANNON-HENDERSON 2019: 142; GREGORATTI 2023: 293.

³ Tentatively, HOFFMAN LEWIS 1955: 30 suggests that the election probably occurred after 12 BC. This view is supported by MARCO SIMÓN 1996: 217, as well as by RIDLEY 2005: 290 and BALBO 2007: 259.

⁴ “And at the same time, the priest of Jupiter was appointed for the first time after Merula”, trans. mine.

⁵ See D.S. XXXVIII 3; Val. Max. IX 12, 5; Vell. II 20, 3, II 22, 2; Tac. *Ann.* III 58; Plut. *Mar.* 41, 1; 45, 2; App. *BC* II 328, 332–338, 341–342; Flor. II 9, 16; Augustin. *Civ. D.* III 27; *MRR* II 47; KOESTERMANN 1963: 532; SZEMLER 1972: 171; GRISÉ 1982: 37, 68.

⁶ On the assumption that the numerals *ii* and *v* could be easily confused by a scribe. See WOODMAN, MARTIN 1996: 424 *ad loc.* Similarly KOESTERMANN 1963: 532 *ad loc.*, although he entertains the possibility that Tacitus himself might have made a mistake (following SYME 1958: 746, n. 3; cf. BALBO's view quoted below [n. 9]).

⁷ Among editors, e.g., by C.D. FISHER in his OCT (first published 1906), E. KOESTERMANN in his Teubner (first published 1960), and H. HEUBNER in his Teubner of 1983. Among scholars, implicitly by HOLLEMAN 1973: 223; LIU-GILLE 1999: 437, n. 23; and GOLDBERG 2015: 338. Cf. now GREGORATTI 2023: 293: “Maluginensis [...] was appointed *flamen Dialis*, according to Tacitus, seventy-two years after the suicide of the last priest, Cornelius Merula, in 87 BC (*Ann.* III 58, 3), although Cassius Dio gives a later date (11 BC, Cass. Dio LIV 36, 1)”.

⁸ See BOWERSOCK 1990: 392. For a more recent perspective, cf. FLOWER 2017: 324, where FLOWER suggests that the procession “may well refer to a specific contemporary occasion (such as Augustus assuming the office of *pontifex maximus* on 6th March 12 BC or the dedication of this very altar to Pax Augusta at the end of January 9 BC)”. For a broader assessment of this paper, see, for instance, RIDLEY 2005: 289.

interpretation presumed that every individual portrayed on the altar frieze participated in the procession in 12 BC, he had to explain the presence of a *flamen Dialis*. BOWERSOCK asserts that he resolved this issue by contending (1990: 392 f.) that “seventy five” (*quinque et septuaginta*) in Tacitus is “nothing more than an emendation” and that Dio’s “characteristically vague expression” ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ χρόνῳ (“at about the same time”) could also refer to 14 BC, a period seventy-two years after Merula’s death. From what I gather, his argument garnered acceptance from the majority of Tacitean scholars, although not without some reservations⁹. In my opinion, this interpretation has at least two drawbacks:

(1) despite BOWERSOCK’s assertions to the contrary, the reading of *M* does, in fact, contradict Dio’s testimony¹⁰; apart from LIV 36, 1, the phrase καὶ / ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ χρόνῳ occurs 7 times in Dio, and, with one exception where it serves as a transition between two events separated by approximately 20 months, it consistently juxtaposes events that took place during the same year¹¹. In line

⁹ In his 1991/1992 Teubner edition, S. BORZSÁK retained the MS reading, although I am uncertain on what basis. A.J. WOODMAN, in his review of this edition (in: *Gnomon* LXVI 1994, p. 219), remarks that “B. keeps *duobus*, but Lachmann’s *quinque*, which he tentatively supports, is surely correct”. In their edition with commentary of Book 3 (1996), WOODMAN himself and R.H. MARTIN print *duobus et septuaginta*, but it is not evident from their commentary on III 58, 2 (p. 424) that they strongly favor either of the possibilities (cf. WOODMAN 2004: 112: “seventy-two years”). After a brief overview of the scholarship on the subject, BALBO 2007: 264 (see also BALBO 2008: 612, n. 11), arrives at the following conclusion: “La situazione è quindi non molto chiara e credo che, per prudenza e uniformandomi a Woodman, Martin 1996 e Borzsák, sia più opportuno mantenere il testo tradito, senza però scartare l’ipotesi di un errore tacitano”. BOWERSOCK’s conclusions prompted J. RÜPKE, an eminent scholar of Roman religion and the author of a monumental catalogue of Roman priesthoods, to date Maluginensis’ *flamonium* to 14 BCE (RÜPKE 2008: 638, n. 11: “In the face of Dio’s vague date and the conjectures consequent upon it, Bowersock [...] has had recourse to the 72 years of vacancy recorded in the Mediceus”; cf. now RÜPKE 2018: 183–210, who [at p. 124] asserts that the *flamonium Diale* “remained vacant until 14 BC”). SHANNON-HENDERSON 2019: 145 aligns with BOWERSOCK’s dating of the event to 14 BC, yet she prints *Ann.* III 58 with LACHMANN’s *quinque*. For a brief summary of the *status quaestionis*, see WARDLE 2011: 283.

¹⁰ See, e.g., RICH 1990: 216 (reprinted with some additions and corrections in 2007; the author does not indicate, however, whether he took notice of BOWERSOCK’s paper); BALBO 2007: 264 (“contro la testimonianza di Dione Cassio”).

¹¹ At XXXVII 51, 4 Faustus Cornelius Sulla holds gladiatorial games in honor of his father (cf. BERRY 1996: 241 on Cic. *Sull.* 4, 2) at about the same time as Q. Caccilius Metellus Nepos “carried a law to abolish the customs dues in Italian ports” (*MRR* II 183) – both events in 60 BC; by using this expression at XXXIX 5, 2, Dio shifts from Caesar himself to his lieutenant Ser. Sulpicius Galba (*MRR* II 203, 205) when recounting the events during the Gallic campaign in 57 BC; at XXXIX 64, 1, Julia, the wife of Pompey, dies at about the same time as Aulus Gabinius was convicted for extortion (*TLRR* no. 303) – both events in 54 BC; at XLVIII 32, 3, after describing the riots at the *Ludi Plebei* in November 40 BC, Dio reports that at about the same time (towards the end of that year) the triumvirs celebrated the festival vowed at Philippi (cf. SUMI 2005: 197); at XLVIII 54, 1 begins Dio’s account of the conference of Tarentum, which took place at about the same time as M. Oppius was elected to the aedileship in 37 BC (*MRR* II 396 f.; PELLING 1988: 213–220); finally, at LX 9, 6 some barbarian tribes are defeated in certain parts of Numidia

with the Roman annalistic tradition, Dio structured his historical accounts by delineating events year by year, often commencing with eponymous consuls¹². Particularly in the so-called end chapters, he employed recurrent temporal phrases, which likely corresponded to Latin expressions in his source, such as ἐξόδοϛ ἡδὴ τοῦ ἔτους ὄντος ~ *exitu anni* or κὰν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἔτει ~ *eodem anno*¹³. If taken as a reference to 14 BC, therefore, the expression κὰν / ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ χρόνῳ (an equivalent of Latin *sub / per idem tempus*) would appear more unusual than “characteristically vague”;

(2) the scholar himself admits to certain shortcomings in his argument. At p. 393 he observes that before his return to Rome in 13 BC, “Augustus was already thinking about new appointments to strengthen his revival of the old traditions of Roman religion”. Then he adds: “By what procedures he secured the election of *flamines* in the lifetime of Lepidus is unknown, but we know that he did”¹⁴.

The fact that the office of *pontifex maximus* was still held by Lepidus at that time is precisely what J. SCHEID (apparently unaware of BOWERSOCK’s article) cited as evidence against dating the restoration of the flaminiate of Jupiter prior to Augustus’ assumption of the pontificate. SCHEID duly reminds us that the election of a *flamen Dialis* involved the nomination of three candidates of patrician origin, either by the college of pontiffs or the senate, followed by the selection of one of them by the chief pontiff¹⁵. If Augustus had allowed Lepidus to

at about the same time (during the reign of Claudius) as Cn. Hosidius Geta fought against the Moor Salabus (42 CE) and subsequently pacified Mauretania (44 CE). Little is known about the former event outside of this reference, cf. HURLEY’s (2001: 134) commentary on Suet. *Claud.* 17, 1. In chapter LVIII 2, 1 (Xiph.) of Dio’s work the narrative shifts from the account of the imprisonment and death of Titius Sabinus in early 28 CE (cf. WOODMAN 2018: 316) to Livia’s death on September 28th, 29 CE (~20 months). This narrative segment, based on the *Epitome* by Xiphilinus, requires separate analysis from the passages discussed earlier.

¹² See SWAN 1997: 2529–2535; cf. KEMEZIS 2014: 90–149 (ch. 3: *Cassius Dio: the last annalist*).

¹³ See SWAN 1997: 2538 with n. 41. I am much indebted to Professor J. PIGOŃ for his valuable insights into Dio’s methods of composition.

¹⁴ RIDLEY 2005: 295 has pointed out that here BOWERSOCK contradicts himself by admitting that the Vestals (as opposed to the *flamines*?) were “unattended for nearly two decades”. During the time when Lepidus held the office of *pontifex maximus*, at least two new *flamines* were selected: L. Cornelius Lentulus as the *flamen Martialis* and Sex. Appuleius as the *flamen divi Iuli* (HOFFMAN LEWIS 1955: 75, 77 f.; BILLOWS 1993: 87, n. 21; RIDLEY 2005: 290 prints Lentulus’ *praenomen* as ‘Marcus’), both of whom are presumably represented on the *Ara Pacis Augustae*. The former priesthood, however, has not remained vacant for any longer period, while the latter was established for the first time in 44 BC with Antony inaugurated as the *flamen* in 40 BC. This means that, unlike the *flamonium Diale*, neither of them needed to be restored.

¹⁵ We know that this practice persisted until at least 23 CE when, on the death of Maluginensis, it became challenging to fill the vacancy in the office. To address this difficulty, Emperor Tiberius suggested a slight modification to the rule regarding the selection of the *flamen Dialis* (cf. HOFFMAN LEWIS 1955: 74). His speech on that occasion, as recorded by Tacitus (*Ann.* IV 16,

preside over this ceremony, it might have seemed as if the latter were regaining a position of influence¹⁶. Moreover, to alleviate some of the restrictions imposed on a priest of Jupiter, Augustus would have needed to convene a senate meeting, if only to maintain a façade, and discuss the matter with the pontiffs¹⁷. Despite our understanding of Augustus' ambitious religious initiatives, he appeared more focused on revitalizing old practices¹⁸ than radically altering them. Considering all these factors, breaking with tradition on this matter seems inconsistent with Augustus' overall approach, especially given that his successor, when addressing Maluginensis' request (Tac. *Ann.* III 71, 2), was notably cautious in adhering to the established rules¹⁹.

The question of the *Ara Pacis*, vowed in 13 BC and dedicated in 9 BC, and its potential relevance to dating the restoration of the *flamonium Diale* remains. There is no doubt that the four priests, identifiable by their distinctive headgear, depicted alongside Augustus on the south side of the altar, represent the four major *flamines*²⁰. The priest of Mars and the *flamen divi Iuli* could have participated in the event in question (cf. n. 14), and it is plausible that a *flamen Quirinalis* also attended, given that "it is extremely unlikely that the priesthood of Quirinus, the deified Romulus, was unfilled"²¹. Regarding the priest of Jupiter, his presence underscores the significance Augustus assigned to this of-

2) in *oratio obliqua*, begins as follows: "nam patricios confarreatis parentibus genitos tres simul nominari, ex quis unus legeretur, vetusto more". We gain further insights into this 'old custom' (*vetustus mos*) from other sources (Liv. XXVII 8, 4–5; XL 42, 11–12; Gell. *NA* I 12, 15, V. Max. VI 9, 3, etc.): after being nominated, one of the candidates was chosen (literally 'seized') by the *pontifex maximus*, an act known as *captio*. Then, during the final stage of the ceremony, the new priest was inaugurated in the *comitia calata* (Gell. *NA* XV 27, 1; cf. PALMER 1970: 191, 194; LINDERSKI 1986: 2257 f.; LIU-GILLE 1999: 451, n. 109). For a more detailed discussion of this procedure, see, for instance, GLADIGOW 1970: 369–379; MARCO SIMÓN 1996: 71 f.; LIU-GILLE 1999: 446–452; RIDLEY 2005: 281 f.; DELGADO DELGADO 2010: 257; WARDLE 2011: 283; GILLMEISTER 2018: 32.

¹⁶ Cf. also SCHEID 2005: 188: "He [i.e. Augustus] avoided all decisions or reforms that would necessitate the consultation or the personal intervention of the *pontifex maximus*. For example, only the *pontifex maximus* could appoint the *flamen Dialis* [...]. It was enough, then, for Augustus to avoid bringing up the matter and to wait [i.e. until 12 BC]".

¹⁷ See SCHEID 1999: 13–14. Cf. RIDLEY 2005: 279.

¹⁸ On Augustus' religious reforms, see, e.g., LIEBESCHUETZ 1979: 55–90; SCHEID 1999: 13 ("le restaurateur de la tradition et de la religion"); 2005: 186–187 (on the 'archaic touch' in Octavian's religious policy) and *passim*. Cf. FLOWER 2017: 269 f.

¹⁹ Cf. BEARD, NORTH, PRICE 1996: 93; BALBO 2008: 617; MUSIAL 2014: 104. According to SHANNON-HENDERSON 2019: 145–146, the only support Tiberius needed to refuse Maluginensis' request to go to Asia was the decisions once made by Augustus. On Tiberius' policy of carrying out Augustus' 'administration and decrees,' see further COWAN 2009: 470 and *passim*.

²⁰ See BILLOWS 1993: 84–87; RIDLEY 2005: 290–291. For the *flamines*' headgear as depicted on the south frieze of the *Ara Pacis*, cf. BEARD, NORTH, PRICE 1996: 19 (Fig. 1.3); ZANKER 2009 (21990): 125 / 1988: 120 (Fig. 98).

²¹ Thus HOFFMAN LEWIS 1955: 75. Cf. SCHEID 2005: 184–186.

fice and his commitment to maintaining a semblance “of normality and the *pax deorum*”²². However, it poses a challenge if we adopt BOWERSOCK’s perspective that, on the historical friezes, the individuals depicted were actively serving in Rome at the time in the exact capacities that are artistically portrayed²³. There is almost a general consensus among scholars that the gathering depicted on the *Ara Pacis* does not precisely correspond to any specific historical event but is intended as an idealized assembly, detached from reality²⁴. On this matter, I agree with R. BILLOWS, who concludes as follows: “Everyone who should be present at such a symbolic occasion is shown as present: we see history as it ought to have been”²⁵. With this perspective, we should not attribute excessive significance to either the presence or absence of any person portrayed on the altar when determining the chronology of the middle Augustan period.

Returning to the textual issue in Tacitus, *Ann.* III 58, 2, we must consider whether the editors are justified in rejecting LACHMANN’s emendation based on the representation of the *flamen Dialis* on the *Ara Pacis Augustae*. It appears that none of them (cf. n. 9) has adequately acknowledged the fact that BOWERSOCK’s view – that the scene on the south side of the altar (1990: 392) “is a procession of the imperial family on the day that Augustus became *pontifex maximus*” – has not garnered approval from either archeologists or art historians. For this assertion to be valid, moreover, it is also required that: (1) the prevailing view as to the nature of the *Ara Pacis* must be contested; and (2) an assumption needs to be made that: (a) Augustus showed less regard for religious scruples than is generally acknowledged, and (b) in Dio LIV 36, 1, the same phrase, which the historian often uses to indicate a time lapse of a few months, actually signifies a period of three years.

The final question to address is the approximate date of Augustus’ restoration of the *flamonium Diale*. To begin with, BOWERSOCK’s arithmetic is incorrect²⁶: to arrive at 14 BC, one would need to write $87 - (72 + 1)$ rather than $87 - 72 + 1$

²² RIDLEY 2005: 291.

²³ Scholars have proposed various interpretations regarding the depicted event: (1) a sacrifice accompanying the *dedicatio* or *constitutio* of the altar; (2) Augustus inaugurating the terrestrial *templum* intended for the *Ara Pacis*; (3) a sort of ‘disguised’ triumph; (4) the festival of Augustus’ elevation to the post of the *pontifex maximus* in 12 BC; and (5) a *supplicatio* in honor of Augustus (as listed by BILLOWS 1993: 80 who favors no. 5, followed by KLEINER, BUXTON 2008: 57–89). Additionally, POLLINI 2012: 223–227, initially leaned toward no. 2 but now inclines toward a combination of nos. 2 and 5. Cf. the discussion above, n. 8, for further context.

²⁴ See TORELLI 1982: 54 f.; BILLOWS 1993: 91: “we should probably understand the friezes as depicting an idealized version of history”; GALINSKY 1996: 142.

²⁵ BILLOWS 1993: 91. Cf. ZANKER 2009 (2010): 128–130.

²⁶ So was mine, until one of the anonymous reviewers for *Eos* kindly instructed me on the correct method of calculating dates using the Roman inclusive reckoning, for which I am very grateful. The alternative hypothesis regarding the scribal error also comes from their suggestion.

(which equals 16 BC), but the former does not account for the Roman inclusive method of calculation. Similarly, if we want Tacitus' account to agree with Dio's dating, we must assume that the scribe either shortened or omitted the figure "v" within the numeral "vii". Only then, using the Roman inclusive reckoning, do we arrive at 11 BC ($87 - 77 + 1$)²⁷. While the possibility of an error on Tacitus' part remains (cf. above, n. 6 and 9), it seems unlikely, given that he was not only better informed than Dio but also came from the same *gens* as Merula and Maluginensis. If this reasoning holds, Dio's testimony would allow us to pinpoint the date more precisely. P.M. SWAN provides a useful summary of the 'end chapter' of 11 BC (LIV 35, 4–36, 1):

ἐν δὲ τῷ ἔτει ἐκείνῳ (cf. *eo anno*):

- marriage of Julia and Tiberius
- death and obsequies of Octavia

καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ χρόνῳ (cf. *per idem tempus*):

- appointment of a *Flamen Dialis*
- oversight of senate decrees transferred to quaestors from tribunes and aediles²⁸

According to Dio, Augustus reinstated the priesthood of Jupiter around the time (cf. n. 11) of Octavia the Younger's death (in 11 BC, although the exact date is unknown). Dio also mentions the marriage of Julia and Tiberius, which likely occurred between mid-January and mid-March 11 BC, following a ten-month to one-year period after Agrippa's death in mid-March 12 BC²⁹. Dio's use of temporal phrases borrowed from Roman annalistic tradition suggests a reference to the specific year account, in this case 11/10 BC. Therefore, it is more plausible that Augustus appointed a new *flamen Dialis* about a year after assuming the office of *pontifex maximus*, rather than immediately³⁰.

University of Silesia
damian.pierzak@us.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-4140-842X

²⁷ For 11 BC, see HOFFMAN LEWIS 1955: 74; KOESTERMANN 1963: 532; PRICE 1996: 828; BEARD, NORTH, PRICE 1996: 130; LIOU-GILLE 1999: 437, n. 23; MUELLER 2002: 2; RIDLEY 2005: 290; 12 BC: SCHEID 2005: 187; LINDERSKI 2007: 637; GOLDBERG 2015: 338; HOLLEMAN 1973: 223 and WARDLE 2011: 283 read either 12 or 11 BC, whereas MONTANARI 1988: 144 either 13 or 10.

²⁸ SWAN 1997: 2539.

²⁹ LEVICK 1999 18; cf. BALBO 2007: 263.

³⁰ Thus BEARD, NORTH, PRICE 1996: 130, n. 47. Similarly SCHEID 2005: 190 ("immediately").

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BALBO 2007: A. BALBO, *I frammenti degli oratori romani dell'età augustea e tiberiana*. Parte seconda: *Età tiberiana*, T. I, Alessandria 2007.
- 2008: A. BALBO, *Oratoria, religione e storiografia negli Annales di Tacito: il caso di Servio Maluginense*, BStudLat XXXVIII 2008, pp. 609–618.
- BEARD, NORTH, PRICE 1996: M. BEARD, J. NORTH, S.R.F. PRICE, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I: *A History*, Cambridge 1996.
- BERRY 1996: D.H. BERRY (ed.), *Cicero: Pro P. Sulla oratio*, Cambridge 1996.
- BILLOWS 1993: R. BILLOWS, *The Religious Procession of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Augustus' Supplicatio in 13 B.C.*, JRA VI 1993, pp. 80–92.
- BOWERSOCK 1990: G.W. BOWERSOCK, *The Pontificate of Augustus*, in: K.A. RAAFLAUB, M. TOHER (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–Oxford 1990, pp. 380–394.
- COWAN 2009: E. COWAN, *Tiberius and Augustus in Tiberian Sources*, Historia LVIII 2009, pp. 468–485.
- DELGADO DELGADO 2010: J.A. DELGADO DELGADO, *Los derechos senatoriales del flamen Dialis*, Veleia XXVII 2010, pp. 255–266.
- FLOWER 2017: H.I. FLOWER, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden. Religion at the Roman Street Corner*, Princeton–Oxford 2017.
- GALINSKY 1996: K. GALINSKY, *Augustan Culture. An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton 1996.
- GILLMEISTER 2018: A. GILLMEISTER, *Flaminat Juliusza Cezara – alternatywny sposób kariery patrycjuszowskiej?*, Klio XLVII 2018, pp. 29–39.
- GLADIGOW 1970: B. GLADIGOW, *Conditio und Inauguratio: Ein Beitrag zur Römischen Sakralverfassung*, Hermes XCVIII 1970, pp. 369–379.
- GOLDBERG 2015: C. GOLDBERG, *Priests and Politicians: rex sacrorum and flamen Dialis in the Middle Republic*, Phoenix LXIX 2015, pp. 334–354.
- GREGORATTI 2023: L. GREGORATTI, *Lucius Cornelius Maluginensis*, in: V.E. PAGÁN (ed.), *The Tacitus Encyclopaedia*, vol. I, Hoboken–Chichester 2023, p. 293.
- GRISÉ 1982: Y. GRISÉ, *Le suicide dans la Rome antique*, Montréal–Paris 1982.
- HOFFMAN LEWIS 1955: M.W. HOFFMAN LEWIS, *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians. A Study of the Nobility from 44 B.C. to 68 A.D.*, Roma 1955.
- HOLLEMAN 1973: A.W.J. HOLLEMAN, *An Enigmatic Function of the Flamen Dialis (Ovid. Fast., 2.282) and the Augustan Reform*, Numen XX 1973, pp. 222–228.
- HURLEY 2001: D.W. HURLEY (ed.), *Suetonius: Divus Claudius*, Cambridge 2001.
- KACZOR 2014: I. KACZOR, *Sakralna symbolika zakazów i nakazów obowiązujących kapłanów rzymskich*, Studia Classica et Neolatina XI 2014, pp. 23–40.
- KEMEZIS 2014: A.M. KEMEZIS, *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian*, Cambridge 2014.
- KLEINER, BUXTON 2008: D.E.E. KLEINER, B. BUXTON, *Pledges of Empire: The Ara Pacis and the Donations of Rome*, AJA CXII 2008, pp. 57–89.
- KOESTERMANN 1963: *Cornelius Tacitus, Annalen*, Band I, Buch 1–3, erläutert und mit einer Einleitung versehen von E. KOESTERMANN, Heidelberg 1963.
- LEVICK 1999: B. LEVICK, *Tiberius the Politician*, London–New York 1999.
- LIEBESCHUETZ 1979: J.H.W.G. LIEBESCHUETZ, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*, Oxford 1979.
- LINDERSKI 1986: J. LINDERSKI, *The Augural Law*, ANRW II 16 (3) 1986, pp. 2146–2312.
- 2007: J. LINDERSKI, *Addenda et Corrigenda Altera to Roman Questions I*, in: *Roman Questions II. Selected Papers*, Stuttgart 2007, pp. 609–640.
- LIU-GILLE 1999: B. LIU-GILLE, *César, "flamen Dialis destinatus"*, REA CI 1999, pp. 433–459.
- MARCO SIMÓN 1996: F. MARCO SIMÓN, *Flamen Dialis. El sacerdote de Júpiter en la religión romana*, Madrid 1996.
- MONTANARI 1988: E. MONTANARI, *Identità culturale e conflitti religiosi nella Roma repubblicana*, Roma 1988.

- MUELLER 2002: H.-F. MUELLER, *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*, London–New York 2002.
- MUSIAL 2014: D. MUSIAL, *The Princes as the Pontifex Maximus. The Case of Tiberius*, *Electrum* XXI 2014, pp. 99–106.
- PALMER 1970: R.E.A. PALMER, *The Archaic Community of the Romans*, Cambridge 1970.
- PELLING 1988: C.B.R. PELLING (ed.), *Plutarch: Life of Antony*, Cambridge 1988.
- POLLINI 2012: J. POLLINI, *From Republic to Empire. Rhetoric, Religion, and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome*, Norman 2012.
- PRICE ²1996: S.R.F. PRICE, *The place of religion: Rome in the early Empire*, in: A.K. BOWMAN, E. CHAMPLIN, A. LINTOTT (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 10: *The Augustan Empire, 43 b.c.–a.d. 69*, Cambridge ²1996, pp. 812–847.
- RICH 1990: *Cassius Dio. The Augustan Settlement (Roman History 53–55.9)*, edited with an introduction, translation and commentary by J.W. RICH, Warminster 1990.
- RIDLEY 2005: R.T. RIDLEY, *The Absent Pontifex Maximus*, *Historia* LIV 2005, pp. 275–300.
- RÜPKE 2008: J. RÜPKE, *Fasti Sacerdotum. A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*, translated by D.M.B. RICHARDSON, Oxford 2008.
- 2018: J. RÜPKE, *Pantheon. A New History of Roman Religion*, translated by D.M.B. RICHARDSON, Princeton–Oxford 2018.
- SCHEID 1999: J. SCHEID, *Auguste et le grand pontificat. Politique et droit sacré au début du Principat*, *RD LXXVII* 1999, pp. 1–19.
- 2005: J. SCHEID, *Augustus and Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation*, in: K. GALINSKY (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, New York 2005, pp. 175–193.
- 2012: *Plutarch, Römische Fragen. Ein virtueller Spaziergang im Herzen des alten Rom*, herausgegeben, übersetzt, kommentiert und interpretiert von J. SCHEID, Darmstadt 2012.
- SHANNON-HENDERSON 2019: K.E. SHANNON-HENDERSON, *Religion and Memory in Tacitus' Annals*, Oxford 2019.
- SUMI 2005: G.S. SUMI, *Ceremony and Power. Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*, Ann Arbor 2005.
- SWAN 1997: P.M. SWAN, *How Cassius Dio Composed his Augustan Books: Four Studies*, *ANRW* II 34 (3) 1997, pp. 2524–2557.
- SYME 1958: R. SYME, *Tacitus*, vol. II, Oxford 1958.
- SZEMLER 1972: G.J. SZEMLER, *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions Between Priesthoods and Magistracies*, Bruxelles 1972.
- VANGGAARD 1988: J.H. VANGGAARD, *The Flamen: A Study in the History and Sociology of Roman Religion*, Copenhagen 1988.
- TORELLI 1982: M. TORELLI, *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs*, Ann Arbor 1982.
- WARDLE 2011: D. WARDLE, *Augustus and the Priesthoods of Rome: the Evidence of Suetonius*, in: J.H. RICHARDSON, F. SANTANGELO (eds.), *Priests and State in the Roman World*, Stuttgart 2011, pp. 271–289.
- WOODMAN 2004: *Tacitus, the Annals*, translated, with introduction and notes, by A.J. WOODMAN, Indianapolis–Cambridge 2004.
- 2018: A.J. WOODMAN (ed.), *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 4*, Cambridge 2018.
- WOODMAN, MARTIN 1996: A.J. WOODMAN, R.H. MARTIN (eds.), *The Annals of Tacitus. Book 3*, Cambridge 1996.
- ZANKER 2009 (c1990) / 1988: P. ZANKER, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*, München 2009 (c1990; English edition: *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, transl. A. SHAPIRO, Ann Arbor 1988).

PLUTARCH AND THE PERFORMANCE OF BELATEDNESS AT *NICIAS* 1

by

JEFFREY TATUM

for Jerzy Linderski

ABSTRACT: In the preface to his *Nicias–Crassus*, Plutarch unpacks aspects of what he deems the correct literary approach to a master text, in this instance, Thucydides. He does so by way of approaches familiar in ancient historiography and ancient literary criticism. Timaeus, in this preface, exemplifies the wrong approach. By contrast, Plutarch, by emphasising his belatedness, strikes the correct pose toward a classic. But Plutarch’s preface is neither an apology nor a confession of diffidence: he appropriates and repurposes Thucydides’ assertions regarding his historical achievement (Thuc. I 22, 1–4) in order to make a statement about the distinctive and timeless value of the *Parallel Lives*.

1. BELATEDLY YOURS

Who said that? It sounds too good to be my own. Not that I don’t think of some extraordinary things to say.

Uncle Fred in Springtime (P.G. WODEHOUSE 1939)

anxiety and influence

Published more than fifty years ago, Harold BLOOM’s *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* incited approbation and outrage in almost equal measure. Partisan, even pugilistic, this book, populated as much by declarations and pronouncements as by close readings, constituted a one-two punch against a crusty New Criticism and a surging Structuralism. For readers of conservative inclinations, BLOOM’s return to the view that literary criticism ought to be an exercise in literary history was a very welcome move. And through its unpacking of the creative process, *Anxiety* appealed to a fading modernist mood which luxuriated in ‘the exhaustions of being a late-comer’ and insisted on foregrounding the abiding presence of the pastness of the past¹. As a bonus, BLOOM rendered

¹ The quotation is from BLOOM 1973: 12; cf. ELIOT 1920: 44: “the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence”.

everything electric through his embrace of FREUD – early in a decade when psychoanalysts in America were still very much working on a groovy thing and when many hip readers remained unperturbed by the sexism of BLOOM’s diagnosis of strong poetry as an Oedipal contest between men. This Freudian fixture, essential to BLOOM’s model of multi-generational literary agonism, was further elaborated in *A Map of Misreading*, which appeared in 1975: there one finds BLOOM’s detailed account of *misprision* and *belatedness*, which for him is the psychology of revisionist poetic competition – ‘creative misreading’ as BLOOM defines it – and the impulse which ultimately subsumes literary tradition².

Since its appearance, the influence of Bloomian anxiety has waxed and waned in literary studies – mostly waned actually – and Freudian belatedness, revised or reconceived more than once, has in recent years mattered more in the unpicking or elaboration of trauma in literary texts than in the explanation of poetic creativity³. Still, belatedness, often unmoored from its original fixture in BLOOM’s poetics, remains a robust perspective for literary historians – including classicists.

Nowadays anyway. If *L’Année Philologique* is any guide, and on this topic it is in fact my only guide, classicists came late to BLOOM. This standard database records no reviews of BLOOM’s books in any philological journal, and Bloomian influence finds its first hits only in papers published in the eighties and especially in the nineties, mostly and unsurprisingly in papers on Hellenistic Greek or Latin literature. A quick glance at any of these works reveals a minimal fascination with psychoanalysis or the Oedipus complex. Instead, one encounters a fairly traditional preoccupation with literary emulation – *imitatio* or *mimesis* – papers in which classicists rehearse by way of an invigorating Bloomian apparatus what even then was a venerable and beloved philological interest in literary history as expressed through intertextuality. Increasingly, *belatedness* became first a fashionable then soon a standard term for classicists and historians writing in English – especially anyone working on a period which past generations tended to dub as derivative: Philip HARDIE, writing in 1993 about what was once known as Silver Latin, described BLOOM’s approach as ‘something of a godsend to critics of ancient literature’⁴.

For classicists, few arenas can appear better suited to BLOOM’s macho mano-a-mano model of fretful, insecure literary competition than the world of imperial Greek literature⁵. Here we find writers working against an antique, fixed canon and

² BLOOM 1975: 4 (creative misreading) and 36 (tradition subsumed); the word *belatedness* does not occur in BLOOM 1973.

³ *Nachträglichkeit* and its discontents: NÄGELE 1987; CARUTH 1996; see also (i.a.) BOHEEMEN-SAAF 1999; LAPLANCHE 1999: 260–5; EICKHOFF 2007; BALAEV 2014; NADAL, CALVO 2014.

⁴ HARDIE 1993: 116.

⁵ WOOLF 1994: 121–32; GLEASON 1995; SWAIN 1996; WHITMARSH 2001: esp. 41–89; RICHTER, JOHNSON 2017.

composing in a language which was largely classical in vocabulary, syntax, and (often) style. The age made a show of its feelings of loss, melancholy, nostalgia – belatedness: to do otherwise was to be out of key with one’s time. But, for all its emphasis on coming afterwards, this period was also populated by marvellously and undeniably creative talents – few better than Plutarch, whose *Parallel Lives* broke fresh ground in conception, literary form, and moral purpose.

Plutarch also displays the very real difficulties entailed in trying to reduce this age and its writers to a handful of adjectives. In more than one passage, Plutarch underlines for his readers how much times have changed: the political realities of classical Greece, he stresses, are all in the past and irrecoverable. This is a condition which has implications for reading and literary creation: speechifying under the empire is not the same as speechifying in classical Athens (this was already an old point)⁶. Nonetheless, in ways which matter just as much – perhaps more – the distance between now and then is, for Plutarch, also often collapsible, at least in a sense.

This is certainly true in moral terms. For Plutarch, the common measure of everyone’s virtue lies in Platonic philosophy: this is simply and universally true and it is non-negotiable. Which means that everyone, man or woman, Greek or Roman, ancient or modern, is, in the category that matters most, in the same predicament, notwithstanding the interesting and revealing distinctions between men and women, Greeks and Romans, ancients and moderns. *Paideia*, by which Plutarch means a sound Platonic philosophical education, remains the true universal guide to virtue, whatever one’s situation⁷. Plutarchan biography, then, by way of making this point, operates in more than one culture and in more than one time zone. Its project is not intended to divide us even if the divisions between us remain very real. As Plutarch puts it in the preface to his *Aemilius Paulus–Timoleon*:

Ἐμοὶ τῆς τῶν βίων ἄγασθαι μὲν γραφῆς συνέβη δι’ ἐτέρους, ἐπιμένειν δὲ καὶ φιλοχωρεῖν ἤδη καὶ δι’ ἑμαυτόν, ὥσπερ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ πειρώμενον ἀμῶς γέ πως κοσμεῖν καὶ ἀφομοιοῦν πρὸς τὰς ἐκείνων ἀρετὰς τὸν βίον. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλ’ ἢ συνδιαιτῆσει καὶ συμβιώσει τὸ γινόμενον ἔοικεν, ὅταν ὥσπερ ἐπιξενούμενον ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐν μέρει διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας ὑποδεχόμενοι καὶ παραλαμβάνοντες ἀναθεωρῶμεν “ὅσος ἔην οἷός τε,” τὰ κυριώτατα καὶ κάλλιστα πρὸς γνῶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων λαμβάνοντες.

I first set to work writing these Lives for the sake of others, but their composition has proved so congenial that I now persist in it for my own improvement. I am using history as if it were a mirror, in the reflection of which I am trying to adorn my own life, so to speak, by making its virtues resemble the ones displayed in my biographies. For me the

⁶ E.g., Plut. *Prae. ger. rep.* 805a; cf. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 22 on the gap separating modern readers of a speech by Demosthenes from the lived experience of his contemporary auditors.

⁷ STADTER 1965; DUFF 1999: 13–98; PELLING 2002: esp. 301–347; TATUM 2010.

experience is very much like actually spending time with the figures from the past and enjoying their companionship: whenever, by way of my historical research, I welcome into my home one of my biographical subjects, I scrutinise him carefully, in order to determine 'his god-like aspect and magnificent size'. I then select from his career what is noblest and most important to know (*Aem.* 1, 1–2).

One notes the complicating metaphor of a mirror and observes the archly classicising introduction of a line from Homer (*Iliad* XXIV 630). But one also recognises that this line from Homer describes the elderly, past-it Priam examining the younger – and superior – Achilles. This is anything but a simple, long-
ing backwards look, and worth recalling as we turn to the opening of Plutarch's *Nicias–Crassus*.

preface to Plutarch

Two of Plutarch's formal prologues – his introductions to *Alexander–Caesar* and *Nicias–Crassus* – commence by bringing to the fore the author, his biographical subjects, his readers, and their horizon of literary expectations (Plut. *Alex.* 1, 1–2; *Nic.* 1). Both prologues throw up the issue of omissions and how best to replace what is missing. And each underlines the moral programme of Plutarchan life-writing, an emphasis which introduces a generic distinction between biography and history. Now no passage in Plutarch has been cited more frequently than the opening of his *Alexander–Caesar*, in which Plutarch insists that he is writing biography and not history – as a result of which he will not include every great deed performed by his subjects⁸. For our purposes, it suffices to point out a crucial difference between this preface and the introduction of the *Nicias–Crassus*: although both prologues define a relationship between Plutarch and his predecessors, in *Alexander* that relationship is *principally* generic – the biographer does not begin to name the many writers who have recorded the deeds of Alexander or Caesar, nor does he furnish anything in the way of an assessment of them. He instead makes the simple point that they accumulate far more in the way of adventure and thrilling action than he will preserve. Not that Plutarch stints on battles or carnage – the body count in this pairing is massive – but some blood and guts he must omit in order to find room for less exciting everyday moments, the ostensibly little things often so vital to the reader's grasping of a great man's character – the truly good stuff that makes Plutarchan biography so valuable.

The *Nicias–Crassus* prologue (too long for quotation here) is quite different⁹. It is sharply focused on its Greek not its Roman Life. And here battles and

⁸ There is no reason to rehearse here the ample criticism which has been applied to this passage: cf. DUFF 1999: 14–22.

⁹ WARDMAN 1975: 154–157; CITTI 1983; STADTER 1988: 289; PELLING 2002: 117–119 (= PELLING 1992); DUFF 1999: 22–30; DUFF 2014; FRAZIER 2016: 49–52; 388–941 (esp. 389: in the

carnage, we are told, are unavoidable: they define the appropriate setting for getting at Nicias' nature and character, his *ēthos* and *tropos*. And not any selection of battles and carnage: Plutarch ignores most of Nicias' life and centres his account of it on the Sicilian Expedition. For that reason, Plutarch underlines, the historical material reported by Thucydides and Philistus cannot be omitted, even if, in Plutarch's version, its rehearsal will be concise and uncluttered by unnecessary particulars. These are interesting divergences from the *Alexander*. But they account for only a modest slice of this preface, the bulk of which is devoted to Thucydides and Philistus not primarily as sources but as *predecessors* – indeed, as classics. Here, conspicuously, Plutarch lays out his position as a reader of both authors as well as their successor: he concentrates especially on Thucydides. Although here as always his orientation is ultimately determined by his moral designs as a biographer, he nonetheless elaborates his *literary* relationship with both historians. In so doing, and in interesting ways, he appears to elide somewhat the distinction between life-writing and history which is to the fore in *Alexander*. That, we shall see, is a bit of a feint. Moreover, and also unlike the *Alexander*, Plutarch's prologue is suffused by an unmistakeable atmosphere of belatedness.

Thucydides as master text

Perhaps, when confronted with Thucydides, a pose of belatedness was inevitable for any writer possessed of even an iota of *aidōs*¹⁰. Which is not to say the canonical author lacked epigones of the second rank. Apparently, there were lots of these, although it was the part of a sane man to respect the insurmountable barrier between himself and the great writer and his history. Cicero, admittedly for tactical reasons, ridiculed anyone who imagined he could make himself Thucydides' twin. A generation later, Dionysius of Halicarnassus identified those parts of Thucydides which no one could improve along with those which anyone could do better, but before doing so was careful to make it unmistakably clear to his reader that Thucydides without question was the superior talent. And a generation after Plutarch, Lucian could ridicule historians who believed they could equal Thucydides by plagiarising him¹¹. The same inescapable point recurs: for historians, Thucydides' history is the master text.

The status of Thucydides' history is also made clear by its frequent appropriation by later writers. Even the austere Polybius adapted elements from Thucydides' account of the Sicilian expedition in order to infuse his narrative of the First Punic

relationship between the two prologues we find “une perspective inverse, mais complémentaire”); CHRYSANTHOU 2017.

¹⁰ Plutarch and Thucydides: ROMILLY 1988; PELLING 2002; MORO 2019; PELLING 2022b.

¹¹ Cic. *Orat.* 32; Dion. Hal. *Thuc.*; Lucian *Hist. conscr.* 15. Thucydides' reputation in antiquity: HORNBLOWER 1995; NICOLAI 2009.

War with a classical resonance¹². Imperial writers, too, redeployed Thucydidean phrases and ideas. But literary success remained elusive. Chris PELLING has pointed out how often the results of so much keen Thucydideanism simply fell flat¹³. And when it worked, this was less often because writers had done anything creative by way of an emulating encounter with Thucydidean style but more commonly because they managed to evoke something in the way of a Thucydidean atmosphere in narratives which they hoped to put in parallel with an episode from the Peloponnesian War. For instance, Plutarch, Appian, and Dio each of them introduces obvious references to Thucydides' account of the Final Battle in the Great Harbour when narrating sea battles during the Romans' civil wars¹⁴. Thucydides on the Final Battle – we shall return to this point – was widely regarded as Thucydides at his best. Which is perhaps why, in these instances, these writers eschew elaboration or recasting: they allude. As PELLING rightly observes, their allusions 'tend to be short and perfunctory'¹⁵. Again, Thucydides furnishes the master text, relatable to be sure but not really contestable. Hence Plutarch's difficulty in *Nicias*: here he had little choice, so he apologetically insists, but to rewrite the master. And it is a premise of his prologue that its readers both know Thucydides well and are already familiar with the events of the Sicilian expedition (his criticisms of Timaeus rely on this acquaintance). This is not a matter Plutarch feels he can treat lightly, and so he elaborates, in detail and with care, his situation as a successor (in this Life) to Thucydides.

after Thucydides

Much of Plutarch's prologue consists of polemic directed against Timaeus. Now delivering harsh verdicts on the competence of one's predecessors was a highly conventional feature of ancient historiography – Polybius is our best attested example of the practice – but here Plutarch appears to map a historian's predictable move onto the wider practice of literary polemic and correction¹⁶. In more than one respect, Plutarch unfolds his manifesto in the manner of a literary critic. He employs technical vocabulary, issues unqualified judgements which he supports by way of specific illustrations, and conveys his views through a mixture of explicit pronouncements and apt allusions. These techniques, familiar to us from reading Dionysius of Halicarnassus, were doubtless natural moves in any sophisticated critical discourse, and in what follows I aim at emphasising some of the ways in which Plutarch deploys some of the conventional features

¹² ROOD 2012. Polybius introduces Thucydides in other contexts too: e.g. Polyb. III 43, 7–8 with WALBANK 1957: 15.

¹³ PELLING 2010.

¹⁴ Plut. *Ant.* 65 f.; App. *B. Civ.* 4, 71; Dio 49, 1.

¹⁵ PELLING 2010: 108.

¹⁶ Polemic and self-fashioning in ancient historiography: MARINCOLA 1997: 217–257.

of criticism in order to concentrate his readers' attention on what is distinctive in the literary claims he advances in this preface¹⁷. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, consequently, becomes a key supporting player, unsurprisingly in any text which addresses the artistic merits of Thucydides. Now there is nothing unnatural in detecting Dionysius in the background to this preface: Plutarch was a close reader of the *Antiquities* and doubtless was familiar with Dionysius' critical writings¹⁸. To be sure, classicising criticism had a robust history by Plutarch's day, even if, apart from Dionysius, next to nothing survives for us in any readable shape. Still, Dionysius' influence on Plutarch – as a historian and as an expert on style – was a significant one and Plutarch almost certainly looks back to him here¹⁹.

With this in mind, it is perhaps worth recalling the remarkable way in which Dionysius, in defending his criticism of Thucydides, figures himself as reliving the conundrum of Thucydides' Nicias in his letter to the Athenians:

τούτων ἡδῖω μὲν εἶχόν σοι περὶ Θουκυδίδου γράφειν, ὃ βέλτιστε Κόιντε Αἴλιε Τυβέρων, οὐ μὴν ἀληθέστερα.	τούτων ἐγὼ ἡδῖω μὲν ἂν εἶχον ὑμῖν ἕτερα ἐπιστέλλειν, οὐ μέντοι χρησιμώτερά γε, εἰ δεῖ σαφῶς εἰδότας τὰ ἐνθάδε βουλευσασθαι. καὶ ἅμα τὰς φύσεις ἐπιστάμενος ὑμῶν, βουλομένων μὲν τὰ ἡδίστα ἀκούειν, αἰτιωμένων δὲ ὕστερον, ἦν τι ὑμῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν μὴ ὁμοῖον ἐκβῆ, ἀσφαλέςτερον ἡγησάμην τὸ ἀληθές δηλῶσαι.
I could, my esteemed Quintus Aelius Tubero, have written you something about Thucydides which was more pleasant than this, but not something which was more true. (Dion. Hal. <i>Thuc.</i> 55, 5).	I could have sent you different, more pleasant news, but certainly not more useful, if, as you make plans, you are to have clear perception of how things are here. In addition, I understand your nature: you desire to hear the most pleasant things, but afterwards you find fault, if anything turns out contrary to your expectations; for this reason, I deemed it safer to tell you the truth. (Thuc. VII 14, 4).

Richard Hunter points out this connection, unmissable once observed, and goes on to urge us to recognise in Nicias' letter an internal reprise of the dynamics of Thucydides' famous mission statement at Thuc. I 22, 4.²⁰ That is a text we'll come back to, but for Hunter's purposes – and ours – it is enough here to perceive in Nicias' letter the same tension between beguiling pleasure and hard truth which animates Thucydides' fundamental claim for his own History. And if we are persuaded by Hunter, and I am, we may wish to push these intertexts a bit harder. Thucydides and his Nicias confront a common problem and that problem lies in the shallow sensibilities of The Many: Thucydides writes for a discriminating

¹⁷ On Dionysius of Halicarnassus' allusivity, see HUNTER 2019, esp. 40–43.

¹⁸ Plutarch and Dionysius' *Antiquities*: RUSSELL 1995 (originally published in 1966).

¹⁹ On Dionysius' importance to imperial Greek writers, see SWAIN 1996, 21–27; WHITMARSH 2001: 71–75.

²⁰ HUNTER 2019: 43; cf. JONGE 2017: 645 f.

reader of history, aware his efforts will disappoint a majority; Nicias attempts to deploy the truth in order to ward off the anger of a fickle democracy. Each is wary of the dangers entrained by the lack of vision on the part of The Many. So too, in his own way, is Dionysius when he criticises Thucydides.

What has this to do with Plutarch? As we shall see, Plutarch, too, is concerned with correcting the views of the many – indeed, a recurring theme of his biography is the inability of the many to recognise Nicias’ true character – and although he does not put himself forward as a critic of Thucydides in the strictest sense, he nonetheless, as we shall see, radically reconceives the great historian’s mission statement. And he does so by way of literary reprise – not explicit declaration. Perhaps in Dionysius’ bold figuration of himself as a kind of Nicias who is a kind of Thucydides, Plutarch found some encouragement for making use of the *Nicias* as a site for further defining his biographical project. After all, there was no obvious reason for prefacing *this* pairing with a programmatic prologue: Alexander, yes, Pericles too, even Aemilius Paullus, a figure so pivotal in the history of Rome’s domination of the east. Owing to Dionysius, perhaps, Nicias became for Plutarch an attractive vehicle for expressing any candid, belated confrontation with the reputation of Thucydides and the predilections of his admirers.

Plutarch’s prologue

Let’s turn, now, to *Nicas* 1. Here Plutarch strikes the pose of an apologist: a late-comer, he cannot evade his literary historical circumstances – but unlike others he knows how to negotiate them properly. He expresses himself, in the first instance, by way of a literary *synkrisis*, furnishing his reader with two contrasting examples of literary emulation. Philistus is the first and right sort of successor. Now Philistus was an important eye-witness source for events in Sicily, but as a historian he was preceded by Thucydides, a relationship made clear by his manner and style, or so we are told. That Philistus was a very close imitator of Thucydides was a precept so familiar by Plutarch’s day that he could adduce the two writers as a natural and venerable pairing²¹. Not everyone in antiquity, it is true, held Philistus in high esteem, but Plutarch remains undistracted by that controversy. Here he does not unpack for us the basis for his assertion of Philistus’ success: he simply insists on it, and by doing so writes into his prologue proof that coming later than a literary masterpiece does not inevitably entail falling short of it.

The wrong reaction to the condition of belatedness is figured by way of Timaeus, the polemical historian so roughly and comprehensively worked over by Polybius²². And like Polybius, Plutarch disapproves of Timaeus’ rewriting of the classics. According to Plutarch, Timaeus aimed at excelling Thucydides

²¹ Dion. Hal. *De imit.* 4; *Pomp.* 4; Cic. *QFr.* II 11, 4; *De or.* II 57; Quint. X 1, 74.

²² BARON 2012 (assembling texts and references); on Polybius’ deployment of Timaeus for the sake of self-fashioning, see BARON 2012: 174 f.

in *deinotēs*, a critical term which here should probably be understood along the lines of its definition by Dionysius: the happy combination of intensity, gravity, and emotional force (*tonos, baros, pathos*) which (says Dionysius) Herodotus and Thucydides introduced to Greek historiography²³. The ambitious Timaeus also hoped to show up Philistus by shaming him as a vulgar amateur.

This lapse, Timaeus' failure to recognise the literary superiority of Thucydides and Philistus, appears to reflect something of a classic failure and not a deficiency unique to the Greek historian. This is an inference we can draw from the internal irony animating Cicero's long discussion of the elder Cato in the *Brutus*. In this dialogue, Cicero the Interlocuter, endeavouring to burnish the censor's stylistic reputation, compares him with Lysias and with the double act of Thucydides and Philistus. Later in the piece, Atticus rejects this as rubbish. Matching Cato with Lysias Atticus dubs a delightful and humorous specimen of irony (*bella ironia si iocaremur: Brut. 293*). But putting him on a par with Philistus and Thucydides is too absurd to bear:

Origines vero cum omnibus oratoris laudibus refertas diceres et Catonem cum Philisto et Thucydide compares, Brutone te id censebas an mihi probaturum? quos enim ne e Graecis quidem quisquam imitari potest, his tu comparas hominem Tusculanum nondum suspicantem quale esset copiose et ornate dicere.

But when you characterised the *Origines* as replete with every virtue of eloquence and likened Cato to Philistus and Thucydides, did you really reckon you could persuade Brutus of that – or me? These are men whom not one of the Greeks is able to imitate, yet you rank them alongside a man from Tusculum who hadn't an inkling what it meant to speak eloquently and stylishly (*Brut. 294*).

Now it strikes me as essential to the joke here – that is, to its being obvious how egregious was Cicero's blunder in taste – that the paired excellence of Thucydides and Philistus be too familiar to everyone to provoke any controversy. That they constituted an incomparable and inimitable team must have been a truism frequently deployed in Hellenistic discussions of style, from which source the witty Cicero – the author not the interlocutor – filched it.

Returning to the *Nicias*, we find that Plutarch does not in principle disapprove of literary rivalry, not even with a classic, so long as the superiority of one's model is duly acknowledged. Timaeus would not attract Plutarch's censure if, when emulating Thucydides and Philistus, he had seen himself like the pedestrian in Pindar's image²⁴, a man on foot beside a Lydian chariot (Plut. *Nic.* 1.1):

διὰ μέσων ὠθεῖται τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τῶν μάλιστα κατορθωμένων ἐκείνοις ἀγώνων καὶ ναυμαχιῶν καὶ δημηγοριῶν, οὐ μὰ Δία

²³ Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 23; cf. LOMBARDO 2003.

²⁴ Pind. fr 206 MAEHLER.

παρὰ Λύδιον ἄρμα πεζὸς οἰχνεύων
 ὥς φησι Πίνδαρος, ἀλλ' ὅλως τις ὀψιμαθῆς καὶ μειρακιώδης φαινόμε-
 νος ἐν τούτοις, καὶ κατὰ τὸν Δίφιλον
 παχὺς, ὠνθυλευμένος στέατι Σικελικῷ.

With these purposes in mind, he pressed on with a history that depicted battles on land, clashes at sea, and public speeches which these historians had already set out superlatively – not, by Zeus, like ‘a man on foot going beside a Lydian chariot’, as Pindar puts it. Instead, in these matters he appears a perfect specimen of pedantic irrelevance and immaturity – along the lines formulated by Diphilus, ‘a fat man, stuffed with Sicilian suet’.

Plutarch also uses Pindar’s line in his *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* (*De ad. et am.* 65b): there, like here, it illustrates an uneven contest which is not a dishonourable one. Plutarch’s Timaeus, however, is less realistic and therefore less respectful. Hence his dismissal by Plutarch as an *opsimathēs*, the late learner who gets everything passionately wrong. Polybius also accused Timaeus of *opsimathia*, for which fault WALBANK devised the apt translation, ‘pedantic irrelevance’²⁵. Missing the point – like missing the mark – matters in this prologue. In the same breath, strikingly, Plutarch goes on to complain of Timaeus’ immaturity, another Timaeian censure he shares with Polybius, who again and again puts the same idea to work in ridiculing Timaeus’ style as worse than a schoolboy’s²⁶. In Plutarch’s view, there is little profit and no dignity in trying to improve stylistically on writing which is beyond imitation, and in trying to do so Timaeus gets it wrong. Even Polybius recognised that.

2. OPEN SPACES

The fact has not been mentioned, for, as we have explained, a historian cannot mention everything.

Pigs Have Wings (P.G. WODEHOUSE 1952)

mind the gap

But this is not Timaeus’ only failing. Perceiving gaps in the classical historians, Timaeus endeavours to fill them by larding his narrative with jejune, comically bad supplements, a habit Plutarch parodies by quoting an unkind (but rather funny) line from Diphilus (see above). Timaeus’ industry we might elect to understand, following Harold BLOOM, as an effort ‘to clear imaginative space’²⁷.

²⁵ Polyb. XII 4c, 1; WALBANK 1967: 328.

²⁶ Polyb. XII 25i, 5; XII 25k, 11; XII 26, 9; XII 26d, 6; XII 25k, 2.

²⁷ BLOOM 1973: 5.

After all, in BLOOM's theory the act of completion – he adopts the Lacanian term *tessera*, understood by BLOOM as a completing link – is a crucial means of literary agonism: it is, as he puts it, 'as much misprision as a revisionary swerve'²⁸. Nevertheless, Timaeus' exertions, in Plutarch's view, do him no credit. We will come back to this quotation from Diphilus, but for now I want to observe just how much space Plutarch devotes to rehearsing what he considers Timaeus' unsuccessful additions to Thucydides and Philistus: *opsimathia* again. This, too, is rewriting, even creative rewriting, but it remains the wrong kind of rewriting. Plutarch emphasises the issue of gaps here because, as he will presently explain to his readers, he, too, intends to improve on the story of Nicias by including overlooked or underappreciated material – creative space, however, of a different order. By putting a posture of belatedness to work in this preface, Plutarch makes it clear how he intends to get it right.

Now it was apparently a staple feature of Thucydidean criticism to make much of his omissions. It still is. Pointing out omissions constitutes a central chunk of Dionysius' catalogue of animadversions, a brand of complaint which, Dionysius points out, can be traced back to the historian's own day. He adduces Cratippus – Thucydides' contemporary – whom he describes as a figure who collected and wrote down the things excluded by the great historian²⁹. It does not matter to us whether we are to think here of a continuation of Thucydides' history or a separate essay criticising it: the pertinent point is that Dionysius underlines a long tradition of faulting Thucydides for what he left out – and of proffering suitable additions and emendations. Timaeus, at least according to Plutarch, found his place in that same tradition. And in *Nicias* Plutarch reprimands him for furnishing the wrong kind of supplements.

Plutarch adduces specimens of Timaeus' failure. Two involve unfortunate wordplays: Timaeus drew out the significance of *nikē* in Nicias' name, which rendered it a bad omen when he sought to avoid commanding the expedition against Sicily, and he observed a connection between the name of the Syracusan leader Hermocrates and the infamous mutilation of the Herms. Timaeus also included bad mythological explanations: he reckoned Heracles an ally of the Syracusans and put forward an argument, predicated on legend, for the god's disposition. Now Plutarch was not alone in reproving Timaeus' punning: the author of *On the Sublime* also disliked it. Presumably both writers are part of a larger if undocumented stream of Timaeian criticism³⁰. As for Timaeus's inclination to deploy arguments relying on mythology, this, too, is a staple indictment of the man³¹. Nothing really novel, then, in Plutarch's treatment of Timaeus: he joins

²⁸ BLOOM 1973: 66.

²⁹ CANFORA 2006: 740 f. (assembling texts). Cratippus: Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 16; cf. COSTA 2015.

³⁰ [Longinus] *Subl.* 4; cf. BARON 2012: 191–194.

³¹ Polyb. XII 24, 5–6; cf. PEARSON 1987: 37–51; 149–150; BARON 2012: 191 f.

a convention going back at least to Polybius and, and this is the point, entirely familiar to his readers.

il miglior fabbro

Timaeus' blunders do not count as proof that Thucydides, inimitable though he is, is perfect in every way. Plutarch also rewrites Thucydides – quite a lot. For our purposes here, he must: as BLOOM puts it, 'weaker talents idealize; figures of capable imagination appropriate for themselves'³². And it is clear elsewhere how much Plutarch disapproves of readers who, when confronted by genius, abandon their critical faculties³³. In his *Nicias*, Plutarch reworks Thucydides, but always, so he insists in his prologue, with a propriety suitable to his standing as a secondary author pursuing an agenda different from the historian's. The various techniques employed by Plutarch when reworking Thucydides have been unpacked in an influential paper by Chris PELLING: Plutarch recasts Thucydides through abbreviation, sometimes by way of a citation which sends the reader back to the original; at other times, as promised in the prologue, Plutarch expands Thucydides by introducing material from other sources; just as often, however, Plutarch expands material from Thucydides by exercising his native acumen: he makes explicit what, in his view anyway, was already implicit in Thucydides. The purpose of this industry, predictably, is always centred round the depiction of character and not an analysis of historical cause-and-effect.³⁴ Two examples must suffice.

Of particular interest is Plutarch's version of the Final Battle in the Great Harbour at *Nic.* 25. Thucydides' account of this event (VII 69, 4–72, 1) is adduced by Dionysius as a sterling specimen of the historian at his best: it is, he concludes, simply perfect. For that reason, after quoting the whole of the passage, he praises it at length and almost gushingly (Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 26–28). Neither the specialist critic, he insists, nor the amateur, nor even the ignorant masses – the many again – can find fault: nothing should be added, nothing taken away. So admired and so familiar was this section of Thucydides that, as we have seen, later writers allusively adapted it to other conflicts, like the Punic Wars or decisive battles in the Romans' civil wars.

What we find at *Nic.* 25 is very different. In Plutarch's abbreviated version of the Final Battle, much, obviously, has been taken away from Thucydides' masterpiece: Plutarch's narrative is brief and pedestrian. That it is there at all, as he tells us, is owing to his determination to avoid a reputation for sloth. For

³² BLOOM 1973: 5.

³³ Plut. *Adulator.* 26b. This view was a staple of ancient criticism; cf. Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 34, 3; *Pomp.* 1,1 (one is right to approach a classic author σεβαστικῶς but that attitude ought not to inhibit criticism).

³⁴ GOMME 1959: 71–72; ROMILLY 1988; PELLING 2002: 117–142.

a historian, this is the climactic moment which seals the failure of the Athenians. For the biographer, however, it does little to illustrate Nicias' character. The debacle in the Great Harbour is the culmination of Nicias' prior bad decisions – mistakes Plutarch has fully explicated – but it is not an episode which per se reveals Nicias' nature. For that, what follows is what matters. In this passage, true to his promise in the prologue, Plutarch eschews competing with Thucydides at his best.

But there is a curiosity. Plutarch introduces this battle with an anecdote. The Syracusans, having regained access to their Heracleum owing to a (bad) tactical decision made by Nicias, offered the god sacrifice as they prepared for the Final Battle. On this occasion, the diviners predicted a victory but only if the fighting was begun by the Athenians. Heracles, they observed, always won because he always fought in reaction to others' aggression. This item, almost certainly, derives from Timaeus³⁵. For that reason, some scholars have suggested that the whole of Plutarch's account of the Final Battle is also lifted from Timaeus³⁶. That hardly follows, and in any case, as we have seen, Plutarch's account is so minimal that it hardly makes sense to view it in terms of *Quellenforschung*. But why a gesture toward Timaeus here?

That Athenian aggression in Sicily proved destructive is a theme common to Plutarch and Thucydides and doubtless every ancient writer who addressed the subject of the Sicilian expedition. So, too, Nicias' opposition to the expedition. Which makes the moral of the episode at the Heracleum – Athenian aggression will be their undoing – apposite to this *Life*. But this episode is not inserted in a way that renders it adventitious. Here the Syracusans' sacrifice contrasts with Nicias' fruitless sacred exertions at the start of chapter 24 (Plut. *Nic.* 24, 5–6), the sequel to the episode of the eclipse which terrified all the Athenians, not least Nicias (Plut. *Nic.* 23). Busy sacrificing and seeking for signs, Nicias remains distracted while the Athenians lose yet another sea battle. It is in reaction to *this* loss that Nicias abandons his camp, the shift which allows the Syracusans to sacrifice to Heracles and thereby learn how best to win the favour of the god in the Final Battle. Nicias' piety and his caution are again his undoing. So here Plutarch introduces an un-Thucydidean supplement – one he borrows from the upstart Timaeus – but also one which he integrates seamlessly into both the narrative structure and the moral purpose of his biography.

In the aftermath of the Syracusans' victory in the Final Battle, when the Athenian situation has become hopeless, Plutarch gives us the soldiers' view of Nicias.³⁷ They see Nicias' despair much in the way Thucydides viewed the man

³⁵ Polyb. XII 26, 2; cf. fr. 22 *BNJ*.

³⁶ BUSOLT 1899: 296; MARASCO 1976: 185–187.

³⁷ PELLING 2002: 120–121; CHRYSANTHOU 2018: 85–91.

after his death, although Plutarch has very much adapted Thucydidean observations gathered from more than one spot in the historian's narrative.³⁸ In the end, the soldiers are appalled by Nicias' misfortune, a horror they express in terms which revise Thucydides' lament on Nicias' sad end:

Οὐ μόνον δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ὄψιν ὀρῶντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λόγων μνημονεύοντες καὶ τῶν παραινέσεων ἃς ἐποίησατο κωλύων τὸν ἐκπλουν, ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐνόμιζον ἀναξίως ταλαιπωρεῖν· καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἐκ θεῶν ἐλπίδας ἀθύμως εἶχον, ἐννοοῦντες ὡς ἀνὴρ θεοφιλὴς καὶ πολλὰ καὶ μέγала λαμπρυνάμενος πρὸς τὸ θεῖον οὐδενὸς ἐπιεικεστέρα τύχη χρήται τῶν κακίστων ἐν τῷ στρατεύματι καὶ ταπεινοτάτων.	καὶ ὁ μὲν τοιαύτη ἢ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τούτων αἰτία ἐτεθνήκει, ἥκιστα δὲ ἄξιος ὢν τῶν γε ἐπ' ἐμοῦ Ἑλλήνων ἐς τοῦτο δυστυχίας ἀφικέσθαι διὰ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐς ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην ἐπιτήδευσιν.
It was not only because they could see his current state but also because they remembered the speeches and admonitions through which he had tried to forestall the expedition that they now all the more believed his misfortune was undeserved. And they despaired of any hope from the gods when they reflected how so pious a man, whose sacred services were so many and so great, now met a fate no seemlier than the basest or meanest men in his army (Plut. <i>Nic.</i> 26.6).	And it was for a reason like this, or a reason very close to these, that he [Nicias] was put to death, a man who of all the Greeks of my time was least worthy of suffering such a misfortune because the whole of his life was ordered in accordance with virtue (Thuc. VII 86,5).

Here as elsewhere Plutarch re-assembles material and alters the point of view of various texts in order to underscore a moral point which is central to the thematic structure of his *Life*. The wretchedness of the Athenians' camp (Thuc. VII 75, 2–7), Nicias' debilitation (Thuc. VII 77, 2), even Nicias' piety (Thuc. VII 77, 2–4), these are all elements of Thucydides' account of the collapse of the Sicilian expedition. But these, along with a reprise of Thucydides' personal reaction to Nicias' death, are gathered and concentrated on the desperate exertions of Nicias' final struggle.

Here Nicias' moral fibre and Thucydides' reaction to it are shifted from an authorial judgement to the opinion of the Athenian Everyman – in a *Life* which has been careful to distinguish the real Nicias from his reputation among the many. This is a complication which is possibly inspired by the ambiguity of Thucydides' verdict on Nicias' character. Thucydides' Greek, it is generally conceded, could be clearer: do we take it to mean that Nicias conducted his

³⁸ Plutarch's own description of Nicias' death is perfunctory and comes without commentary: his focus is on the conduct of the victors (*Nic.* 28).

entire way of life in accordance with virtue or that his entire way of life was in accordance with conventional (which is to say, traditional Athenian) virtue? The former is probably the likeliest construal but nothing forbids the latter – which if taken unkindly *could* (though probably should not) stimulate the conclusion that Nicias' virtue was in some respects more apparent than real³⁹. That, however, is a view of Nicias which Plutarch expresses, in a suitably nuanced formulation, at *Nic.* 4–6 (although even there Nicias' religiosity is deemed sincere: *Nic.* 4, 1). Whatever we decide is the right take on Thucydides' verdict, it takes some work on the reader's part to come to a decision. Plutarch's Athenian soldiers, however, disambiguate matters. But do they get it right?

Thucydides' emphasis on aristocratic *aretē* is dropped even if its sensibility is sustained when the soldiers' lament Nicias' sad if democratic reduction to the same condition as the meanest of his men. Instead of Nicias' virtue we get his religiosity (itself an unsimple, ambiguous concern which animates both *Lives* in this pairing). What the soldiers feel is clear enough, but the fact that it is they, not Plutarch, taking this view of Nicias introduces a degree of interpretive uncertainty for the reader seeking the truth about Nicias' character. At the same time, because this is the judgment of Nicias' fellow sufferers, the men who had the most cause to reproach his imperfections, and because these Athenians see in Nicias' fate a dire lesson for them all, the scene is rendered affecting, perhaps even touching. But perplexity persists⁴⁰. Here the soldiers read through Nicias' career to apprehend his character and they apply this lesson to themselves – a practice that recalls but does not really reproduce the fundamental dynamic of reading Plutarchan biography, not least reading the *Nicias*. What kind of readers, after all, are the many – in this *Life* especially? Surely, in the world of this *Life*, they are not observers possessing the same level of discrimination as the sophisticated readers posited in the prologue. Does that difference render them wrong, and what does their judgement mean for our understanding of *Thucydides'* verdict on Nicias? Here Plutarch, although he eliminates the grammatical ambiguity conspicuous in Thucydides, introduces in its place a moving narrative the underlying dynamics and values of which provoke difficult questions about the right reading of Nicias' virtue and character – here and in Thucydides.

³⁹ GOMME, ANDREWES, DOVER 1979: 463; ROOD 1998: 183–185 and 198–199; HORNBLOWER 2008: 741–743; PELLING 2022a, 26–32 and 255–257; the basic question is whether, at Thuc. VII 86, 5, one should construe *nenomistmenēn* with *epitēdeusin* or *aretēn*.

⁴⁰ PELLING 2022b: 220: “Why not discuss Thucydides' verdict directly? [...] The puzzle remains”.

mission statements

Plutarch closes his prologue with a concise mission statement, one in which Thucydides' famous declaration of his methodology and purpose is deeply implicated⁴¹:

ἃς γοῦν Θουκυδίδης ἐξήνεγκε πράξεις καὶ Φίλιστος, ἐπεὶ παρελθεῖν οὐκ ἔστι, μάλιστα γὰρ δὴ τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὴν διάθεσιν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων παθῶν καλυπτομένην περιεχούσας, ἐπιδραμὼν βραχέως καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀναγκαίων, ἵνα μὴ παντάσιν ἀμελὲς δοκῶ καὶ ἀργὸς εἶναι, τὰ διαφεύγοντα τοὺς πολλοὺς, ὑφ' ἐτέρων δ' εἰρημένα σποράδην ἢ πρὸς ἀναθήμασιν ἢ ψηφίσμασιν εὐρημένα παλαιοῖς πεπεῖραμαι συναγαγεῖν, οὐ τὴν ἄχρηστον ἀθροίζων ἱστορίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς κατανόησιν ἥθους καὶ τρόπου παραδιδούς.	τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραγθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἠξίωσα γράφειν οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατόν ἀκριβεῖα περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελθὼν. ἐπιπόνως δὲ ἠύρισκετο, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις ἐκάστοις οὐ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι. καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται· ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὐθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει. κτῆμά τε ἐς αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν ζῶγκεται.
Still, when it comes to the events described by Thucydides and Philistus, omitting these is impossible here because they do so much to reveal the man's nature and disposition, which were laid bare by his many and terrible calamities. These episodes I have rehearsed briefly, keeping to essentials, in order to avoid the imputation of carelessness or sloth. Details which have escaped the notice of most writers, however, or evidence which others have introduced but only in an unfocused or haphazard way, or which is found in sacred dedications and civic decrees, this material I have endeavoured to collect. In doing so, my aim is not to pile up useless historical research but rather to hand down historical research which allows one to perceive Nicias' nature and character (Plut. <i>Nic.</i> 1, 5).	As to what actually took place during the war, I thought it best to record this not by way of what I learned from chance information nor what I deduced from ideas of my own but rather by way of an investigation, as accurate as possible, of each particular both in the case of events at which I was present and those for which I relied on what I was told by others. This was a laborious investigation because those who were present at the same event furnished different accounts of it, sometimes owing to partisanship, sometimes to varying recollections. And it may well be that the absence of the fabulous from my narrative will seem less pleasing to the ear; but whoever shall wish to have a clear view both of the events which have happened and of those which will someday, given human nature, happen again in the same or a similar way— if these discriminating readers deem my history useful, that will be enough for me. And, indeed, my history has been composed, not as a prize-essay to be heard for the moment, but as a possession for all time (Thuc. I 22, 1–4).

⁴¹ On Thuc. I 22, 1–4, see GOMME 1959: 139–150; HORNBLOWER 1991: 59–62; PELLING 2022a: 12–14. The resonance of Thucydides' mission statement in later writers: NICOLAI 2009: 394–403; LEON 2021: 7–32.

Each author emphasises his intensive, exacting research; each appeals to discriminating readers; and each insists on the value of his narrative. Still, it is the differences between them that matter most here, and it is no accident that Plutarch begins his mission statement by relegating Thucydides and Philistus, canonical classics at the commencement of his prologue, to the role of required background reading.

Plutarch promises to assemble evidence which the majority, including Thucydides, have overlooked, or which others have spotted but not fitted into any meaningful discussion of Nicias and his fall. He will glean this fresh material from ancient sources, including sacred dedications and civic decrees. At the very least, this sounds like Plutarch claiming he has undertaken serious historical research. But that is a claim every historian makes, most famously Timaeus, who boasted of his exhaustive examination of inscriptions posted in temples and other public documents (Polyb. XII 11, 1–4). Even Polybius appears to concede Timaeus that much. Not that all this work made Timaeus any good, at least according to Polybius. Plutarch may have felt differently about Timaeus' actual research, which may help to explain why, in this prologue, Timaeus is cited for his puns and mythological thinking instead of his investigations. After all, he must have known that Timaeus was notable for his documentary research: it is hard, when one comes to this section of the prologue, not to remember it. In which case, Plutarch expects his readers to know that boasting of careful research does not per se render one a suitable successor to Thucydides.

Timaeus may not be the only kind of historian we're meant to think of here. In the beginning, or at least so Dionysius and others believed, before there was a Herodotus or a Thucydides, there were local historians. They, too, plunged themselves into both documentary and literary research. In Dionysius' discussion of this stage of Greek historiography, he observes how these early figures studied memorials, texts inscribed on sacred objects, and old books – all with a single purpose in mind: the preservation of past traditions. Owing to the nature of their sources – and owing to the principle on which they assembled their evidence – these early historians included myth, dramatic tales, and much that was inane. This was pardonable, in Dionysius' view, because it was never their intention to be discriminating. For these writers, including such diverse and apparently attractive material was a matter of literary embellishment (*poikilia*: Dionysius uses the verb *poikillein* at *Thuc.* 7)⁴².

Polybius' mission statement, too, may be pertinent⁴³. In reprising Thucydides' distinction between history which is useful (and aimed at discriminating readers) and history which is entertaining to the many, Polybius also justifies his

⁴² Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 5 and 7; cf. JONGE 2017: 651–653.

⁴³ Polyb. IX 1–2; cf. WALBANK 1967: 116 f.; MARINCOLA 1997: 24 f.; MCGING 2010: 52–93, esp. 58–61; MOORE 2020: 14–18, esp. 17.

conspicuous exclusion of topics he deems unnecessary distractions from serious history, however attractive to readers of varying interests: he omits mythical material, genealogies, city-foundations – in short, the kind of things which constituted the chief subject matter of the early historians described by Dionysius. Polybius does not expressly disapprove of research of this kind. It is rather that he believes there is little new to say on these matters and in any case they are unsuitable to his Thucydidean ambitions⁴⁴. That Plutarch looked back to Polybius as an important predecessor is clear, and in reading this prologue one sometimes feels one detects Plutarch playing, or playing with, the part of Polybius the critical historian who endeavours to preserve Thucydidean accuracy and austerity⁴⁵. But Plutarch is not exactly channelling Polybius (or Dionysius), although he wishes to call our attention to the potentially controversial aspects of his supplements to Thucydides' master text.

Plutarch's notice that he will undertake fresh investigations into old texts and documentary sources, like the early historians described by Dionysus, begins to look a bit like a demurrer to Polybius' reading of Thucydides and in any case marks off an approach to writing history that may appear old-fashioned and out-of-date. Once more, however, Plutarch deploys varying time zones in situating his literary project. His sources may be ancient, but his methodology is modern: he is not gathering data simply for the sake of making an accumulation of facts and fictions. He is very much a post-Thucydidean writer. So was Timaeus, of course. But his errors lay elsewhere: he extracted valuable evidence but failed, at least in Polybius' view, to make good sense of it. Nor, in Plutarch's view, did Timaeus manage to sort out the good stuff from the silly stuff.

We should not miss how striking it is that the biographer draws attention to his recovery of evidence from sacred dedications and civic decrees. True, familiarity with arcane and antiquarian matters was a part of Plutarch's intellectual equipment, just as it was for other erudite figures in his time. Still, these are perhaps not the most obvious or natural materials for depicting character⁴⁶. Plutarch, however, has a methodological point to make, and he does so early on, in chapter three, lest his reader forget this bit of the prologue. There Plutarch adduces three facets of Nicias' munificence, gestures designed to inflate Nicias' political reputation by way exhibiting wealth, piety, and his devotion to civic values. These are: (1) Nicias' repeated choregic victories and the enduring monuments commemorating them (*Nic.* 3, 2–3; cf. *Pl. Gorg.* 472a), (2) his

⁴⁴ MARINCOLA 1997: 24 f., identifies more than one tension between this passage and the views Polybius expresses at Polyb. I 1–4.

⁴⁵ Plutarch and Polybius: CANDAU MÓRON 2005; ZECCHINI 2005; ZADOROJNY 2006: esp. 117 f.; ALMAGOR 2020.

⁴⁶ FRAZIER 2016: 51. Plutarch's documentary research in *Nicias* does not in fact appear extensive: GOMME 1959: 75 f.; cf. FRAZIER 2016: 49–52.

flamboyant manumission of a pretty slave boy who had won public favour at a dramatic festival (*Nic.* 3, 4), and (3) his reform of choral performances on Delos, including his generous endowment to the people of Delos, marked by the installation of a bronze palm-tree and an inscription (*Nic.* 3, 5–8).

For the evidence of Nicias' choregic victories, Plutarch asserts autopsy, a claim which must be true even if questions arise over just what it is he saw⁴⁷. As for Nicias' freed slave, although Plutarch's account includes problematic details, its basic story, however singular, is not implausible (its singularity, after all, is one reason for its inclusion). Nicias certainly grasped the sheer electricity generated by any handsome civic spectacle. Perhaps this episode came to Plutarch by way of an oral tradition, but it is certainly possible that the manumission of Nicias' slave in the theatre was commemorated by an inscription⁴⁸. Nicias' Delian palm-tree is possibly another instance of Plutarchan autopsy⁴⁹. His familiarity with Nicias' inscription too, perhaps, although it is equally likely that he read it in the collection by Craterus of Macedon, a work Plutarch puts to work in other *Lives*⁵⁰. In their ensemble, this is evidence which demonstrates Plutarch's capacity for finding good biographical stuff in material and documentary evidence. But there is nothing helter-skelter here: each case is linked to Nicias' fame as a sponsor of dramatic choruses – the civic quality of which hardly requires unpacking – and is incorporated here as a contribution to Plutarch's depiction of Nicias as rich, pious, and occupied by fraught exertions in winning over the many. In view of Plutarch's tendency elsewhere in the *Lives* to adduce theatre and theatricality as potential red flags for marking a discrepancy between appearance and reality, this understated chapter imbues the biographer's ostensibly raw evidence with thematic moral significance for our understanding of Nicias character⁵¹. All together, these items illustrate in solid terms the expensive practicalities of Nicias' religiosity and ambition – and caution the reader to regard them warily. At the same time, they exemplify Plutarch's capacity for research and for uncovering overlooked evidence – and putting the results to work in life writing.

not history but historia

In his prologue, Plutarch makes it plain that he is writing *historia*, although it is equally obvious that he is exploiting the imprecise scope of a word which

⁴⁷ It is just possible Plutarch mistook the (extant) choregic monument of the later Nicias (son of Nicodemus) for a monument of our Nicias, but there is no compelling reason to doubt Plutarch's evidence as he reports it; cf. WILSON 2000: 226–235, esp. 228 f.

⁴⁸ See also Aesch. *In Ctes.* 41–44; cf. WILSON 2007: 137 f.; ROCCA 2015: 17 f. (epigraphic evidence for freeing slaves in the theatre during dramatic festivals).

⁴⁹ The remains of Nicias' monument: COURBIN 1973.

⁵⁰ *Alc.* 22, 4; *Arist.* 19, 7; 20, 6; *Cim.* 13, 5; cf. STADTER 1989: lxix f.; HIGBIE 1999.

⁵¹ Misleading theatricality: MOSSMAN 1988; PELLING 1988: 21 f.

does not invariably denominate a specific genre. DUFF finds a parallel for this passage in Dionysius' assessment of Theopompus: this historian, Dionysius insists, could reveal even to an undiscerning majority the inner lives of his historical actors⁵². He could, in short, uncover their character. The comparison is an apt one and helps us to grasp Plutarch's sense here. At the same time, we must not miss Plutarch's more obvious, indeed unavoidable reference to Thucydides' famous programmatic statement at Thuc. I 22: there Thucydides eschews the predilections of the many in order to produce a work which is timeless and useful – to those who know how to read it. The similarity of Plutarch's programme with Thucydides' underlines their differences. Unlike Thucydides, Plutarch does not seek to furnish a timeless guide to understanding future events but instead offers his readers a lasting revelation of individual character, the purpose of which, every reader of Plutarch knows, is to aid a student of any age in attaining to eternal Platonic virtues, notwithstanding the particular events amid which virtue must be instantiated. Plutarch is composing a *historia*, yes, but he is writing biography, not history, and here he positions his work against Thucydides not by way of any epigonal posture but through an assertion of creative renewal grounded in a fresh generic setting⁵³.

It is with this in mind that I should like to take up a suggestion made by Tim DUFF. Plutarch, he points out, introduces to his *Life* knowledge unperceived by *hoi polloi*, 'a claim with a long history', as DUFF puts it, citing Callimachus⁵⁴. Now *hoi polloi*, it is obvious, need not activate Alexandrian sensibilities. But it appears that Thucydidean criticism was an environment in which writers felt obliged to draw attention to their distinctive boldness and innovation even when paying homage to the master's superior qualities. Dionysius, for instance, although he concedes the point that he is not the first scholar to criticise Thucydides (Thuc. 3), nonetheless depicts himself as the first and only figure to break new and remarkable ground by digging up Thucydidean animadversions. Now this metaphor, a bit of a cliché in Greek, is not quite the same thing as the Alexandrian conceit of trail-blazing, which itself generated a cliché in Roman society, but it is a not-too-distant cousin⁵⁵. DUFF's observation is perhaps worth pushing a bit harder.

Plutarch, to return to our prologue, when he writes biography, distinguishes himself from the many (*Nic.* 1.5: 'details which have escaped the notice of *most* writers, viz. the *hoi polloi*), an expression which *may* evoke a Callimachean

⁵² Dion. Hal. *Ad Pomp.* 6, 7; cf. DUFF 1999: 23 f..

⁵³ Plutarch and *historia*: HERSHBELL 1997.

⁵⁴ DUFF 1999: 23; cf. Callim. *Epigr.* 28 PFEIFFER; *Hymn* 2, 105–112.

⁵⁵ Trail-blazing: Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1, 26; Choerilus *SH* 317; cf. Lucr. 1, 925–927; Verg. *G.* 3, 8–11; Hor. *Epist.* I 19, 21–34; the cliché in Roman society of being 'first to write' something up: LINDERSKI 2007.

origin *if* a reader chooses to squeeze hard the earlier quotation from Diphilus. Now it is obvious how easily Diphilus' *pachus* can be deployed as a stylistic slur – the *LSJ* cites numerous examples – but is it possible that here, in a passage which is at once a literary polemic and a programmatic statement mapping out Plutarch's relationship with a literary tradition he responds to by eschewing a venerable genre (history proper) in favour of something more experimental (the *Parallel Lives* are surely that), that should, as we ruminate on Pindar and Diphilius, recall fr. 1 of the *Aetia*? There, the passage is a familiar one, the poet is instructed by Apollo to prefer a slender Muse – and to avoid the wide paths frequented by big wagons⁵⁶. One cannot be certain, but few writers were more influential in formulating an attitude of creative belatedness than Callimachus. And there is no doubting that Plutarch was a close reader of the *Aitia*⁵⁷. It is not, after all, the Augustan figuration of Callimachus which is at stake here but rather the poet's identity in imperial Greek literature. That topic appears to be somewhat understudied, but enough has been done to make it clear how often Callimachean allusion in imperial Greek is a matter of 'faint echoes or ornamental borrowings', some significantly reworked⁵⁸. This is a practice which should not surprise us in view of the nature of imperial education, which stressed abbreviating, paraphrasing, and embellishing the poets⁵⁹. Consequently, a Callimachean allusion in Plutarch's prologue can by no means be excluded.

In any case, the question of genre is certainly central to Plutarch's refitting of Thucydides' mission statement. Even in Thucydides, generic distinctions are a part of the mix: Thucydides sharply separates himself from poets and logographers (Thuc. I 21, 1), but does so by way of negative self-definition. As Simon HORNBLLOWER observes, "Thucydides manages to avoid saying what he himself is"⁶⁰. A vaguely similar sort of segregation is observable in Callimachus: he reacts to the influence of Homer and the epic tradition by *not* writing epic but instead redeploying elements from the epic tradition to fresh purposes within a very different generic setting. Similarly, Plutarch – by now it is obvious – redeploys Thucydides and the historical tradition associated with the Sicilian expedition to fresh purposes within a different genre: biography in the shape of his distinctive *Parallel Lives*. And he, like Thucydides, offers his readers a work of eternal value. In the end, then, this is a prologue which hardly laments 'the exhaustions of being a late-comer' but instead puts to work its pose

⁵⁶ *Aet.* fr. 1, 21–28; cf. HARDER 2012: 56–68.

⁵⁷ D'IPPOLITO 2005; RIBEIRO FERREIRA 2005.

⁵⁸ DE STEFANI and MAGNELLI 2011: esp. 551 f. and 555.

⁵⁹ Quint. I 9, 2 f.; cf. BING 2019.

⁶⁰ HORNBLLOWER 1991: 58.

of belatedness, its anxiety over the influence of a strong predecessor, in an assertion of creative literary innovation. Plutarch's preface is deferential, but it is hardly modest.

Plutarch, like Thucydides, writes about Nicias and therefore, like Thucydides, must write about the Sicilian expedition, Thucydides' masterpiece. He negotiates this relationship by striking a pose of belatedness and admitting his anxiety over finding a place in the canon of Sicilian historians. In the end, of course, that isn't what he does, because, although he undertakes historical research, he is not a historian. He underlines this distinction by lining himself up against the greatest historian of them all. For Thucydides, human nature drives historical events – hence the enduring value of his work – whereas, for Plutarch, historical events furnish the context in which we understand personal character, which is not quite the same as Thucydides' τὸ ἀνθρώπινον⁶¹. The utility of Thucydides' history resides in its capacity for rendering his readers not better people but better thinkers, better judges of historical cause and effect. Plutarch, by contrast, endeavours to make his readers better men and women full stop, because they are better judges of virtue. This is a brand of *historia* which is anything but useless: indeed, as Plutarch puts it in the *Aemilius Paullus*:

ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ περὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν διατριβῇ καὶ τῆς γραφῆς τῇ συνηθείᾳ
 παρασκευάζομεν ἑαυτοὺς, τὰς τῶν ἀρίστων καὶ δοκιμωτάτων μνήμας
 ὑποδεχομένους ἀεὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς, εἴ τι φαῦλον ἢ κακὸς ἢ ἀγεννὲς αἱ
 τῶν συνόντων ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὁμιλίας προσβάλλουσιν, ἐκκρούειν καὶ διω-
 θεῖσθαι, πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν παραδειγμάτων ἴλεω καὶ πρᾶξιαν ἀπο-
 στρέφοντες τὴν διάνοιαν

I, on the other hand, am always welcoming into my thoughts the records of the noblest and most illustrious of men. This is on account of my historical research and the deep familiarity with men of the past that comes from writing their biographies, which has prepared me to reject or repulse anything base or wicked or disgraceful cast against me in the course of my unavoidable dealings with contemporaries. Instead, I calmly and composedly shift my attention away from such provocations towards splendid paragons of the past (*Aem.* 1, 5).

Plutarch's prologue to the *Nicias*, then, for all that it elaborates a familiar canon of historians, isn't really about history, in that sense, at all. Although Plutarch aligns himself with the virtues of Philistus and contrasts himself with the failings of Timaeus, his orientation towards Thucydides is fundamentally different from theirs, for all that each of them is absorbed by conventional writerly concerns. Plutarch's prologue is about biography, in the canon of which the *Parallel Lives* finds a creative space sufficient to satisfy anyone's anxiety stemming from his condition of belatedness.

⁶¹ HORNBLLOWER 1991, 61.

tradition and (belated) originality

Unlike the prologue to the *Alexander*, then, the opening of the *Nicias* elaborates the several ways in which history and biography are alike. Each, when done properly, is highly literary, each entails investigation, and each furnishes its readers lasting utility. Each is, in its own way, *historia*, but it is by way of concentrating on the similarities between the two genres that Plutarch highlights important distinctions, a familiar Platonic methodology.⁶² Although Plutarch puts Timaeus to work as a figure for the wrong kind of imitation and emulation within the world of historiography, the implications of his deficiencies have a general application because imitation is a literary practice which looks past generic boundaries: a significant part of Thucydides' claim to fame, as Plutarch and his readers knew, resided in the prevailing conviction that his style inspired Demosthenes and by way of Demosthenes' achievement influenced the entire field of oratory and rhetoric. Adapting what is best in Thucydides, however, remained a problem for critics, one which Plutarch here professes to have solved⁶³. He renders his account of this solution arresting through striking a pose of conspicuous belatedness – not by way of an apology or a confession of diffidence but rather an assertion of a creative independence which is appropriately aware of its situation within Greek literary history and is conscious of generic proprieties. Plutarch's moves in this preface are highly conventional ones – he takes up historiographical polemic and the techniques of criticism (including allusivity) – and therefore draw attention to his fundamental claims for his brand of life writing, which is original and distinctive. Indeed, in Plutarch's estimation the *Parallel Lives* merits respect as a possession for all time⁶⁴.

Victoria University of Wellington
jeff.tatum@vuw.ac.nz

WORKS CITED

- ALMAGOR 2020: E. ALMAGOR, *How to Do Things with Hellenistic Historiography: Plutarch's Intertextual Use(s) of Polybius*, in: T.S. SCHMIDT, M. VAMVOURI, and R. HIRSCH-LUIPOLD (eds.), *The Dynamics of Intertextuality in Plutarch*, Leiden 2020, pp. 161–172.

⁶² Pl. *Meno* 71e–73c; cf. Plut. *Mul. virt.* 243b–d.

⁶³ Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 53–55; *Pomp.* 3; *Dem.* 10; Cic. *Brut.* 286–288; *Or.* 30–32.

⁶⁴ Earlier versions of this paper were presented to the London Ancient Literature Seminar, the Classics Research Seminar at Victoria University of Wellington, and The Working Group in Roman History; I am thankful to the audiences for each of these presentations, especially Marco Fantuzzi and Michael Trapp. I am also grateful to Chris Pelling, who read and improved an early draft. The journal's anomous reader, too, was very helpful. All translations in this paper are my own.

- BALAEV 2014: M. BALAEV (ed.), *Contemporary Approaches in Literary Trauma Theory*, New York 2014.
- BARON 2012: C.A. BARON, *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography*, Cambridge 2012.
- BING 2019: P. BING, *Thanks Again to Aristaenetus: The Tale of Phrygius and Pieria in Callimachus' Aetia (frs. 80–83B Harder) through the Eyes of a Late-Antique Epistolographer*, in: J.J.H. KLOOSTER, M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, and G.C. WAKKER (eds.), *Callimachus Revisited: New Perspectives in Callimachean Scholarship*, Leuven 2019, pp. 27–49.
- BLOOM 1973: H. BLOOM, *The Anatomy of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, Oxford 1973.
- 1975: H. BLOOM, *A Map of Misreading*, New York 1975.
- BOHEEMEN-SAAF 1999: C. VAN BOHEEMEN-SAAF, *Joyce, Derrida, Lacan, and the Trauma of History: Reading, Narrative, and Postcolonialism*, Cambridge 1999.
- BUSOLT 1899: G. BUSOLT, *Plutarchs Nikias und Philistos*, *Hermes* XXXIV 1899, pp. 280–297.
- CANDAU MÓRON 2005: J.M. CANDAU MÓRON, *Polybius and Plutarch on Roman Ethos*, in: G. SCHEPENS and J. BOLLANSÉE (eds.), *The Shadow of Polybius: Intertextuality as a Research Tool in Greek Historiography*, Leuven 2005, pp. 307–328.
- CANFORA 2006: L. CANFORA, *Thucydides in Rome and Late Antiquity*, in: A. RENGAKOS, A. TSAKMAKIS, L. CANFORA, and E.J. BAKKER (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden 2006, pp. 721–753.
- CARUTH 1996: C. CARUTH, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, History*, Baltimore. 1996
- CHRYSANTHOU 2017: C.S. CHRYSANTHOU, *The Proems of Plutarch's Lives and Historiography*, *Histos* XI 2017, pp. 128–153.
- 2018: C.S. CHRYSANTHOU, *Plutarch's Parallel Lives: Narrative Technique and Moral Judgement*, Berlin 2018.
- CITTI 1983: V. CITTI, *Plutarcho, Nic. 1.5. Storiographia e biografia*, in: A. MASTROCINQUE (ed.), *Omaggio a Piero Treves*, Padova 1983, pp. 99–110.
- COSTA 2015: V. COSTA, *Kratippos (of Athens?)* (64), in: I. WORTHINGTON *Brills New Jacoby*, Leiden 2015.
- COURBIN 2015: P. COURBIN, *Le colosse Naxien de le palmier de Nicias*, *BCH suppl.* I 1973, pp. 157–172.
- DE STEFANI, MAGNELLI 2011: C. DE STEFANI and E. MAGNELLI, *Callimachus and Later Greek Poetry*, in: B. ACOSTA-HUGHES, L. LEHNUS, S. STEPHENS (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, Leiden 2011, pp. 534–565.
- D'IPPOLITO 2005: G. D'IPPOLITO, *Callimaco in Plutarco*, in: A. PÉREZ JIMÉNEZ and F.B. TITCHENER (eds.), *Valori letterari delle opere di Plutarco: studi offerti al Professore Italo Gallo dall'International Plutarch Society*, Logan 2005, pp. 83–89.
- DUFF 1999: T. DUFF, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*, Oxford 1999.
- 2014: T. DUFF, *The Prologues*, in: M. BECK (ed.), *A Companion to Plutarch*. Chichester 2014, pp. 333–349.
- EICKHOFF 2007: F.W. EICKHOFF, *On Nachträglichkeit: The Modernity of an Old Concept*, *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* LXXXVII 2007, pp. 1453–1469.
- ELIOT 1920: T.S. ELIOT, *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*, London 1920.
- FRAZIER 2016: F. FRAZIER, *Histoire et morale dans le Vies Parallèles de Plutarque*, 2nd ed., Paris 2016.
- GLEASON 1995: M.W. GLEASON, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton 1995.
- GOMME 1959: A.W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. I, Oxford 1959.
- GOMME, ANDREWES, DOVER 1970: A.W. GOMME, A. ANDREWES, and K.J. DOVER, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 4, Oxford 1970.
- HARDER 2012: A. HARDER, *Callimachus: Aetia*, 2 vols., Oxford 2012.
- HARDIE 1993: P. HARDIE, *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*, Cambridge 1993.
- HERSHBELL 1997: J.P. HERSHBELL, *Plutarch's Concept of History: Philosophy from Examples*, *Ancient Society* XXVIII 1997, pp. 225–243.

- HIGBIE 1999: C. HIGBIE, *Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship*, TAPhA CXXIX 1999, pp. 43–83.
- HOLDEN 1887: H.A. HOLDEN, *Plutarch's Life of Nikias*, Cambridge 1887.
- HORNBLOWER 1991: S. HORNBLOWER, *A Commentary of Thucydides*, vol. I, Oxford 1991.
- 1995: S. HORNBLOWER, *The Fourth-Century and Hellenistic Reception of Thucydides*, JHS CXV 1995, pp. 47–68.
- 2008: S. HORNBLOWER, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. III, Oxford 2008.
- HUNTER 2019: R.L. HUNTER, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Idea of the Critic*, in: R.L. HUNTER and C.C. DE JONGE (eds.), *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Augustan Rome: Rhetoric, Criticism and Historiography*, Cambridge 2019, pp. 37–55.
- JONGE 2017: C.C. JONGE, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Thucydides*, in: R.K. BALOT, S. FORSDYKE, and E. FOSTER (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, Oxford 2017, pp. 641–658.
- LAPLANCHE 1999: J. LAPLANCHE, *Essays on Otherness*, London 1999.
- LEON 2021: D.W. LEON, *Arrian the Historian. Writing the Greek Past in the Roman Empire*, Austin 2021.
- LINDERSKI 2007: J. LINDERSKI, *The Menander inscription from Pompeii and the expression primus scripsit*, ZPE CLIX 2007, pp. 45–55.
- LOMBARDO 2003: G. LOMBARDO, *Sublime et deinôtès dans l'antiquité gréco-latine*, Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger CXCI 2003, pp. 403–420.
- MAEHLER: H. MAEHLER, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989.
- MARASCO 1976: G. MARASCO, *Vita de Nicia*, Rome 1976.
- MARINCOLA 1997: J. MARINCOLA, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge 1997.
- MARO 2019: A. MARO, *L'utilizzazione de Tuciddide nella Vita di Nicia di Plutarco*, Maia LXXI 2019, pp. 128–144.
- MCGING 2010: B. MCGING, *Polybius' Histories*, Oxford 2010.
- MOORE 2020: D.W. MOORE, *Polybius: Experience and the Lessons of History*, Leiden 2020.
- MOSSMAN 1988: J.M. MOSSMAN, *Tragedy and epic in Plutarch's Alexander*, JHS CVIII 1988, pp. 83–93.
- NADAL, CALVO 2014: M. NADAL, M. CALVO, M. (eds.), *Trauma in Contemporary Literature: Narrative and Representation*, London 2014.
- NÄGELE 1987: R. NÄGELE, *Reading After Freud, Freud: Essays on Goethe, Hölderlin, Habermans, Nietzsche, Celan, and Freud*, New York 1987.
- NICOLAI 2009: R. NICOLAI, *Ktēma es aei: Aspects of the Reception of Thucydides in the Ancient World*, in: J.S. RUSTEN (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Thucydides*, Oxford 2009, pp. 381–404.
- PEARSON 1987: L. PEARSON, *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaeus and His Predecessors*, Atlanta 1987.
- PELLING 1988: C. PELLING, *Plutarch: Life of Antony*, Cambridge 1988.
- 1992: C. PELLING, *Plutarch and Thucydides*, in: P.A. STADTER (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*, London 1992, pp. 10–40.
- 2002: C. PELLING, *Plutarch and History*, Swansea 2002.
- 2010: C. PELLING, “Learning from that violent schoolmaster”: *Thucydidean Intertextuality and Some Greek Views of Roman Civil War*, in: B. BREED, C. DAMON, and A. ROSSI (eds.), *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars*, Oxford 2010, pp. 105–118.
- 2022a: C. PELLING, *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War, Book VII*, Cambridge 2022.
- 2022b: C. PELLING, *What Your Best Friend Won't Tell You: Thucydidean and Plutarchan Silences on Sicily*, in: J. BENEKER, C. COOPER, N. HUMBLE, and F. TITCHENER (eds.), *Plutarch's Unexpected Silences: Suppression and Selection in the Lives and Moralia*, Leiden 2022, pp. 210–222.
- RIBEIRO FERREIRA 2005: J. RIBEIRO FERREIRA, *Calímaco em Plutarco: as citações como demonstração*, in: A. CASANOVA (ed.), *Plutarco e l'età ellenistica: atti del convegno internazionale di studi: Firenze, 23–24 settembre 2004*, Florence 2005, pp. 207–214.

- RICHTER, JOHNSON 2017: D.S. RICHTER, W.A. JOHNSON (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, Oxford 2017.
- ROCCA 2015: F. ROCCA, *La liberazione degli schiavi e il teatro*, *Epigraphica* LXXII 2015, pp. 9–38.
- de ROMILLY 1988: J. de ROMILLY, *Plutarch and Thucydides or the Free Use of Quotations*, Phoenix XLII 1988, pp. 22–34.
- ROOD 1998: T. ROOD, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation*, Oxford 1998.
- 2012: T. ROOD, *Polybius, Thucydides, and the First Punic War*, in: C. SMITH, L.M. YARROW (eds.), *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius*, Oxford 2012, pp. 50–67.
- RUSSELL 1995: D.A. RUSSELL, *Plutarch's Life of Coriolanus*, in: B. SCARDIGLI (ed.), *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*, Oxford 1995, pp. 357–72.
- STADTER 1964: P.A. STADTER, *Plutarch's Historical Methods: An analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes*, Cambridge MA 1965.
- STADTER 1988: P.A. STADTER, *The Proems of Plutarch's Lives*, ICS XIII 1988, pp. 275–95.
- 1989: P.A. STADTER, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*, Chapel Hill 1989.
- SWAIN 1996: S. SWAIN, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World ad 50–250*, Oxford 1996.
- TATUM 2010: J. TATUM, *Why Parallel Lives?*, in: N. HUMBLE (ed.), *Plutarch's Lives: Parallelism and Purpose*. Swansea 2010, pp. 1–22.
- WALBANK 1957: F.W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary of Polybius*, vol. I, Oxford 1957.
- 1967: F.W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary of Polybius*, vol. II, Oxford 1967.
- WARDMAN 1967: A. WARDMAN, *Plutarch's Lives*, London 1975.
- WHITMARSH 2001: T. WHITMARSH, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford 2001.
- WILSON 2000: P. WILSON, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: the Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge 2000.
- WOOLF 1994: G. WOOLF, *Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East*, PCPhS XL 1994, pp. 116–143.
- ZADOROJNYI 2006: A.V. ZADOROJNYI, *King of his castle: Plutarch, Demosthenes 1–2*, PCPhS LII 2006, pp. 102–127.
- ZECCHINI 2005: G. ZECCHINI, *Polibio in Plutarco*, in: A. PÉREZ JIMÉNEZ and F.B. TITCHENER (eds.), *Historical and Biographical Values of Plutarch's Works: Studies Devoted to Professor Philip A. Stadter by the International Plutarch Society*, Logan 2005, pp. 513–522.

TUTICANUS AND HIS SECRET:
HYPOTHETICAL CONSIDERATIONS
(OVID, *EX PONTO* IV 12, IV 14, AND IV 16)¹

by

ELŻBIETA WESOŁOWSKA

ABSTRACT: This article attempts to examine the multilayered character representation of the addressee of two closing elegies (IV 12 and IV 14) of Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Tuticanus, who is also alluded to in the final poem of this collection (IV 16). I seek to trace the elements of wordplay in the name of Ovid's mysterious friend, as well as in the poet's efforts to draw the reader's attention to the impossibility of fitting this name into the metre of the elegiac distich. What is also notable here are the close parallels between the lives of the formal addressee and the poet, including their keen interest in poetry. The fact that Tuticanus figures in elegies 12 and 14, and periphrastically in 16 of Book IV suggests that a special role has been assigned to him, namely that maybe he seems to epitomise the *Amores*, the first collection of poetry composed by Ovid. It is also argued that as an example of Ovid's late poetic works, the three elegies discussed in this article also mark the endpoint of the poet's oeuvre, the tone and mood of which no longer accords with the poems of the early period.

It could reasonably be argued that Ovid's poetic innovation and virtuosity shine most strongly in the ways in which he transformed the poetic form. Moreover, his exceptional ability to construct multi-layered meanings helped him to deflect the criticism of those who accused his exile poems composed in Tomis of being monotonous and sycophantic². Ovid's poems are characterised by the use of wordplay such as so-called 'cacemphaton', which appears in *Heroides* X 71–72), acrostics, anagrams, and onomatopoeia – the latter in the famous passage dealing with Narcissus and Echo (*Met.* III 380–389)³.

In this article, I will analyse the semantic complexity in the name of the poet's friend, Tuticanus, who is the addressee of letters 12 and 14 in Book IV

¹ My thanks to two anonymous reviewers for their helpful criticisms and suggestions and also to my former student Zuzanna Ciomborowska for her fresh ideas.

² WESOŁOWSKA 2022: 77.

³ For more information on wordplay and jokes in Ovid's works, see: WINNICZUK 1974 (wit in the *Fasti*), Courtney 1998 (jokes in the *Amores*), Coleman 2010 (wordplays in the *Heroides*), DANIELEWICZ 2020 (acrostics in the *Ars amatoria*), and BATTISTELLA 2020 (literary games in the *Heroides*), among other scholars.

of *Epistulae ex Ponto*⁴. Letter IV 12 is in many ways an exceptional elegy. But its uniqueness is due neither to its affective impact, which – for all the depictions of lifelong intimacy between the addressee and the poet – is rather conventional, nor to its aesthetic value, as the elegy is too verbose. It is the poet's admission of his artistic limitations that render this poem extraordinary. The poet appears to be unable to fit his friend's name into the elegiac metre – both in the hexameter and pentameter – due to the metrical value of the name of Tuticanus, which produces a cretic rhythm (Tūtīcānus). The poet playfully demonstrates how the inclusion of the name into the metre would interfere with the poem's rhythm by giving the incorrect length of the syllables (*Pont.* IV 12, 1–6):

Quo minus in nostris ponaris, amice, libellis,
nominis efficitur condicione tui;
aut ego non alium prius hoc dignarer honore,
est aliquis nostrum si modo carmen honor.
Lex pedis officio fortunaque nominis obstat
quaque meos adeas, est uia nulla, modos.

The bar, my friend, that prevents your finding a place in my verse, is set up by the nature of your name, else of my part I should deem no other worthier of the honour – if only my verse involves any honour. 'Tis my metre's law and your unfortunate name that oppose the compliment, and there is no method by which you can enter my rhythm⁵.

Not much is known about Tuticanus himself. The nomen *Tuticanus* belongs to a class of *nomina gentilitia* formed from cognomina ending in *-as*, *-atis*, or *-anus*, all relatively often derived from the names of towns. *Tuticanus* presumably refers to a native of Tuticum, a town in Samnium⁶. This name is a *nomen gentilicium* of a plebeian family⁷. If the friendship between the poet and his addressee – cemented by their mutual fascination with poetry – is as intimate as is supposed, one may wonder why the latter is not mentioned in the earlier books as well. Uncertainties of this kind prompt the reader to consider the possibility that the role of Tuticanus in the poem is also symbolic⁸. When read along these

⁴ For more discussion of the special omission of the names of addressees in *Tristia*, see Oliensis (1997), who calls this special rhetoric of names here “return to sender”.

⁵ All English citations from *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* in this paper, if not indicated otherwise, are excerpts from WHEELER 1988.

⁶ *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, vol. I, p. 844 (“Aequum Tuticum”). See also DICKEY 2002: 61 f.

⁷ We may find several testimonies in CHASE 1897: 118 of the *nomina gentilitia* derived directly from the names of Italian towns, e.g. Aefolanus, from the town Aefola, Trebulanus, from the town Trebula, etc.

⁸ We presumably have such an example of a parallel situation in Ovid's exilic poetry; cf. FONSECA JUNIOR 2022, who in his meticulous analysis of *Tr.* III 4a concludes that the anonymous addressee of this elegy can be read as the poet's *alter ego*.

lines, Tuticanus would embody the poets who used to be closely associated with Ovid, but who are now far away, not only geographically, but also emotionally and artistically. This is because while not being in exile themselves, these poets are unable to understand lines that would accurately describe the pains of exilic experience. The pessimism and resigned tone of IV 12 is particularly palpable against the uncommon and unserious *excusatio* of the opening part of the elegy. As I also argue elsewhere, elegy IV 12 poses a considerable challenge to the translator⁹.

Returning to the question of the literary significance of names in Ovid's exile poetry, let us consider the problem of omitting the addressees' names in the *Tristia*. Although these omissions fly in the face of epistolary poetic conventions, Ovid, by his own account, resorts to them to avoid bringing trouble on his well-meaning addressees or making them feel obliged to him. However, considering that the purpose of the letter is to solicit help from his addressees, the latter reason appears to be self-contradictory. Moreover, if the poet identifies the addressee as unsympathetic to him, he always refrains from mentioning their names. This strategy marks the poet's refusal to celebrate the names of his adversaries or else his wish that they would change their attitude towards him. Consequently, the poet's reputed antagonists are addressed anonymously in both collections. This pattern can be traced back to ancient epigrams, which were modelled on epitaphs or epigrams purporting to be epitaphs that contain utterances allegedly spoken by the dead. In these utterances, the deceased curse their anonymous adversaries for assaulting them¹⁰.

A closer investigation of the poet's epistolary logic in the *Tristia* helps grasp the shift in terms of addressing the characters that the poet introduces in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. This alteration can be seen as a symptom of the anguish of the exiled poet, who is however not apologetic about the change of convention. After all, the addressees in the elegies from the second set of poems are clearly defined, except for the poems directed to (his) enemies. It could be gathered from this that the poet considers those poems, which are dedicated or addressed to specific people, as more persuasive¹¹. However, the only "positive" addressee, who in the second set remains almost anonymous, is the mysterious Tuticanus from *Pont.* IV 12 and IV 14. In IV 16, his translation of the Phaeacian episode

⁹ See WESOŁOWSKA 2022 and 2023 for more information about alternative strategies of translating lines 5–16 into Polish. However, these examples do not do justice to the complexity of Ovid's wordplay, due to differences in the Polish and Latin systems of poetic composition. See also SKWARA 2008 and KLINE's interesting ideas (2003: 272).

¹⁰ See, for example, epigram *AP* VII 580.

¹¹ Of course, we should remember that in the second set of the exile elegies the tone of literary reflection is more audible. Nevertheless, the *Ex Ponto* did not lose the character of an intimate complaint.

of the Odyssey is mentioned at vv. 27 f., but as a result of the difficulties with his name, we get the periphrasis in this passage¹².

The ambiguity of this character manifests itself on several levels. No other sources mention him. All we know about him comes from Ovid's account. It has already been mentioned that his family name does not fit the hexameter and pentameter patterns. Although the name could have been replaced in the poem by other personal details of the friend (*praenomen* or *cognomen*), the poet refuses to consider the possibility of replacement. After DICKEY, we may assume that Tuticanus did not have or did not use his *cognomen*, or that his *praenomen* was too common to use in order to identify the person¹³. But I believe there is also a slight possibility that Ovid consciously did not take advantage of such an exchange in order to play a game with the reader.

This enables the poet not only to be playful with the reader, but also to experiment with the metre. While formal playfulness was not entirely new in classical poetry, no one went to such great lengths in this respect as Ovid¹⁴. His exile poems are generally melancholic, but occasionally rapturous. *Pont.* IV 12 is the only light-hearted elegy from this period, considering both collections of poems. Ovid's poetic playfulness fulfils a metametrical and autoironic function in the text. Do any other functions present themselves? Let us consider this matter further.

To address this question, one must examine the word TUTICANUS¹⁵. It should be mentioned here that the poet was keen on using various kinds of puns in his poems¹⁶. After all, it was a habit of Ovid's to play with the names of his addressees (Maximus, Carus, etc.)¹⁷. E.g. *Pont.* IV 13, 1 f.:

O mihi non dubios inter memorande sodales
qui quod es, id uere, Care, uocaris, aue!¹⁸

¹² BEAR AKRIGG 1985: 458.

¹³ DICKEY 2002: 61 f.

¹⁴ CAMPS 1958 and KASSEL 1975.

¹⁵ After submitting this article for review, it turned out that several ideas used here, related to the semantic aspects of the name TUTICANUS, had been presented five years earlier in an article by GALASSO 2019, of which I was not aware.

¹⁶ Cf. DANIELEWICZ 2020 and COLEMAN 2010. The latter is credited with discovering the refined rhetorical figure of *cacemphaton* in *Her.* X, which can be also an emulative allusion to Catullus' "labyrinthine joke" in poem 64 (on the latter device, see PIĘTKA 2019).

¹⁷ Cf. SMITH 2012: 6 f.

¹⁸ Furthermore, we may find in the subsequent lines (v. 9 f.) a probable hint to *Ars amatoria*, although it could be treated as speculation, because the group of letters ART was not very rare in Ovid's poems. However, we dare to see here an allusion to *Ars Amatoria* because of the special conjunction between PUDEAT and ARTE (+ ART), which could be a significant sign of his infamous poem on the 'vocal level'.

To you who must be counted among my undoubted friends?
to you are in very truth what you are called, Dear – greetings!

Thus, TUTI – CANUS (*canus* – old), as they are known to be childhood friends, are presumably of the same age (vv. 29 f.):

Hic tenor, haec viridi concordia coepta iuventa
venit ad albentis inlabefacta comas.

This constancy, this harmony of tastes begun in the green of youth, has
continued unweakened to the time when our hair is white.

TUTI – CANUS (*cānere* – to praise, to make verse). It is to imply that his friend is a poet. And yet, the word *cānere* contains the vowel of a short ‘a’, and as such (– UU, dactyl), it is compatible with the metre. However, in this case, we would have a prosodic shift, since the first syllable of the verb *cano* is short and thus does not correspond exactly to *Tūtīcānus*. The prosodically incorrect *Tūtīcānus* would, on the other hand, fit the metrical pattern. And Ovid, in fact, makes use of this incorrect prosody, but only in jest (vv. 9 f.):

Et pudeat, si te, qua syllaba parte moratur,
artius adpellem Tuticanumque vocem.

I should be equally ashamed if, where a syllable is long, I should shorten
it and address you as Tuticānus.

We should also consider TUTI. Why not see here a hint to the completely different situation of Tuticanus, so safe in Rome, in contrast to Ovid, who is vegetating on the edge of the Empire?

On the other hand, the fact that he does allude to the verb *canere* is symptomatic and can be interpreted in various ways. It may suggest that he is mentioning his friend’s status as a poet. This may be confirmed by the evocative lines of the poem (vv. 19 f.), where Ovid is grasping at the role of a poet:

teque canam quacumque nota, tibi carmina mittam,
paene mihi puero cognite paene puer,

and I’ll sing you in some measure, send you a song, you,
known to me, barely a lad, when you were barely a lad.

(trans. A.S. KLINE 2003)

But maybe we should also see here the suggestion that they both belong to different worlds, so their exilic poems composed in different circumstances are fundamentally mutually obscure, hence Ovid cannot insert his name in the rhythm in the exilic poem. The ambiguous addressee of the closing elegies may be treated as an allusion to a bygone period of poetry created by the poet, and even Tuticanus could be seen as a real person. Perhaps he is to epitomise the

poetry of Rome, which was characteristic of Ovid and his fellow poets from a bygone era and which has little in common with Ovid's later poetic voice. Paradoxically, however, although the name Tuticanus containing the short "a" vowel fits in with the elegiac metre (when connected with *cānere*), it is indeed in contradiction with the original form of his name.

From Ovid's point of view, his Roman poetry lost its capacity to reflect his life, nor did it resonate with his latest elegiac works. This incompatibility may explain why the name Tuticanus cannot fit in with the metre of the elegiac distich even though, intriguingly, the metrical structure of the real name is compatible with the poem's metre, providing it refers to *cānere*. This may suggest that the poet's attempt to present his addressee as a real figure, through a form of autothematic metareflection, serves to bridge life and poetic invention¹⁹.

Another question to investigate is why the references and allusions to Tuticanus follow the sequence of 12, 14, and 16 in the fourth book. Several possibilities present themselves:

The elegies separating the three elegies addressed to Tuticanus or mentioning him may have been intended to retain the effect of *variatio*²⁰, with elegy IV 16 structured for the main part as a catalogue of poets contemporary to the author, including an epitaph and imprecation addressed to a nameless adversary.

In the very last elegy, the poet inserted a huge catalogue of his contemporary Roman poets. At this juncture, the poet's celebrated words "Non minor illis" – *Tristia* IV 10, 127 – should be recalled. But how does the very last elegy *Pont.* IV 16 compare in this respect? Is the catalogue conceived by the poet to aggrandize his poetry, despite his pronouncements of modesty? We may be sure (vv. 45–46):

Dicere si fas est, claro mea nomine Musa
atque inter tantos quae legeretur erat.

and with them, if it's not wrong to say so, my Muse's bright name, she
too being read among all those others.

(trans. A.S. KLINE 2003)

Is this role assigned to Tuticanus, the author or the translator of the poem (v. 27: *qui Maeoniam Phaecida vertit*)²¹ about the sojourn of Odysseus, a wanderer and sometimes a poet, in the remote lands of the welcoming Phaeacians?

¹⁹ See also WÓJCIK 2001.

²⁰ We should remember that we cannot be sure if the last book of *Ex Ponto* was published by the poet himself or by one of his friends after the author's death, cf. WULFRAM 2008: 259.

²¹ We should bear in mind the words from *Pont.* IV 12, 27 f.: *Dignam Maeoniis Phaecida condere cartis / cum te Pieriae perdocuere deae.*

The fate of Odysseus brings to mind events from Ovid's own life²². Moreover, in his speech to the Phaeacians (*Od.* IX–XII) Odysseus the wanderer impresses the reader with a superb poetic account of his wanderings. Intriguingly, it is among the Phaeacians that Odysseus reclaims his own voice – by addressing them directly in the first person, thus manifesting his subjective agency – and displays the full range of his achievements²³.

Does this association of Odysseus with Ovid reveal that the ageing poet, be it in jest or through his tears, has lost his mastery over the poem's metrical structure? Although examples of ironic distance of this sort may be rare in Ovid's exile poetry, it is not unreasonable to assume that this device allows the poet to display his "metrical incapability" as he bids farewell, albeit with a forced smile, to his works²⁴ and his fading life. He, the poet *per se*, the living embodiment of poetry, is like a dryad who lives and dies with the tree it inhabits.

It should also be remembered that it was not uncommon for Ovid to end his poems on a playful, and yet sophisticated, note. Taking as a point of departure Alessandro BARCHIESI's proposition that Ovid plays a host of games with the reader in the final parts of his poems *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*,²⁵ together with the observation that similar devices are used in the poet's exile elegies, it could be argued that the poet is also playing with the reader in the closing lines of the elegies composed in Tomis. While readers find themselves on the receiving end of the poet's elaborate joke, they also act as the poet's allies. Tuticanus, in turn, may be seen as a human embodiment of the poet's estrangement from the care-free poetry of his youth, and presumably nothing, not even Ovid's poetic genius, allows him to mend these severed ties. The poet's scepticism resonates with his dissatisfaction with the general reception of his Tomis poems. If readers do not entirely trust the reliability of the account of Odysseus the poet (even though they often enjoy its poetic mastery), they also refuse to believe in the tragic fate of the poet Ovid²⁶. The latter discusses this issue in an episode of *Tr.* IV 1. 9 ff., in which he draws parallels between himself and the great wanderer. The difference, he claims, is that while Odysseus's account of his adventures is partly

²² We have considerable evidence of Ovid associating his life with that of Odysseus, cf. GREBE 2010 and FEDDERN 2021.

²³ About Odysseus as a poet, see BECK 2005 and PARRY 1994, among other sources.

²⁴ The poet bids his farewell not only to the poetry of his youth, but also even to the present poetic works. After all, Naso claims that he has lost his mastery over the elegiac metre.

²⁵ BARCHIESI 1997, who takes into account the final parts of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*.

²⁶ ARFT 2022 shows the importance of the scene in which Queen Arete enquires into the origins of her guest. Arft offers a study centred on Arete, the Phaeacian queen, and her central role in the epic's construction of Odysseus' *kleos*. We can assume that the queen's name, Arete (perfection) is significant as the starting element of a reader's opinion of Odysseus's mastery as a poet. The enigmatic figure of Arete is to construct the process by which the epic poem immortalises Odysseus in poetry as a *nostos* hero, and let us add, as a poet.

made up, he, Ovid, writes entirely from experience. Although, in *Tr.* I 5, 57–60, Odysseus is not mentioned by name:

pro duce Neritio docti mala nostra poetae
 scribite: Neritio nam mala plura tuli.
 ille breui spatio multis errauit in annis
 inter Dulichias Iliacasque domos.

Ye learned poets write of my evils instead of Neritian hero's! for I have borne more than the Neritian. He wandered over but a narrow space in many years – between the homes of Dulichium and Ilium.

It can be gathered from this that Tuticanus, as the addressee (be it the real person or a poetic construct) of the final elegies of Ovid's oeuvre, not only provokes the poet to smile through his tears, but also to strike this last chord in the meta-literary play addressed to the readers and to himself, as demonstrated in the episodes in which Ovid bids farewell to his early poems, thus showing his full awareness of his own poetic greatness.

If we presume that Tuticanus epitomises (in different ways) Ovid's poetry of the Roman period, Ovid himself is the force that makes the closing lines of the poem his true 'farewell gesture' as he bids adieu to himself and the world governed by a ruler who is completely different from the kind and hospitable Alcinous of Scheria, but who instead gives a great poet the embrace of death.

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
 elzbieta.wesolowska@amu.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0003-2053-4889

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAMOWSKA 1992: J. ABRAMOWSKA, *Odys współczesny*, in: A. BRODZKA and E. SARNOWSKA-TEMERUSZ (eds.) *Topika w literaturze polskiej XX wieku*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1992, pp. 9–52.
- ARFT 2022: J. ARFT, *Arete and the Odyssey's Poetics of Interrogation: The Queen and Her Questions*, Oxford 2022.
- BARCHIESI 1993: A. BARCHIESI, *Il poeta e il principe. Ovidio e il discorso augusteo*, Roma–Bari 1993.
- BATTISTELLA 2020: C. BATTISTELLA, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula 10: Ariadne Theseo, Introduzione, testo e commento*, Berlin–New York 2020.
- BEAR AKRIGG 1985: M. BEAR AKRIGG, *The Last Poems of Ovid* (original unpublished edition 1985), first published edition, corrected and augmented 2006: www.gutenberg.org/files/21920/21920-h/21920-h.htm (accessed 17 May 2024).
- BECK 2005: D. BECK, *Odysseus: Narrator, storyteller, poet?*, CPh C 2005, pp. 213–227.
- CAMPS 1958: W.A. CAMPS, *Critical notes on some passages in Ovid*, CR IV 1954, pp. 203–207.
- CHASE 1897: G.D. CHASE, *The origin of Roman praeenomina*, HSPh VIII 1897, pp. 103–184.
- COLEMAN 2010: K.M. COLEMAN, *Cacemphaton in the labyrinth: Ovid, "Heroides" 10.71, Mnemosyne LXIII 2010*, pp. 280–286.

- COURTNEY 1998: E. COURTNEY, *Some literary jokes in Ovid's "Amores"*, BICS XXXV 1998, pp. 18–23.
- DANIELEWICZ 2020: J. DANIELEWICZ, *Rates/rates: another gamma-telestych in Ovid's „Ars amatoria” or an acrogram among anagrams*, Eos CVII 2020, pp. 59–64.
- DELLA CORTE 1974: Ovidio, *I Pontica*, vol. I e II, transl. & comm. F. DELLA CORTE, Genova 1974.
- DICKEY 2002: E. DICKEY, *Latin Forms of Address from Plautus to Apuleius*, Oxford 2002.
- FEDDERN 2021: S. FEDDERN, *Zu Ovids Vergleich zwischen seinem und Odysseus' Leiden (Trist. I 5)*, in: R. MATUSZEWSKI (Hg.), *Being Alone in Antiquity, Greco-Roman Ideas and Experiences of Misanthropy, Isolation and Solitude*, Berlin 2021, pp. 361–388.
- FONSECA JUNIOR 2022: A. DE OLIVEIRA FONSECA JUNIOR, *A name without a body: Ovid's "Tristia" 3.4A*, Classica XXXV 2022, pp. 1–12.
- FRÄNKEL 1970: H. FRÄNKEL, *Ovid. Ein Dichter zwischen zwei Welten*, Darmstadt 1970.
- GALASSO 2019: L. GALASSO, *Miseros prudentia prima reliquit. Le epistole a Tuticano nel IV libro delle Ex Ponto*, in: C. BATTISTELLA (ed.) *Ovidio a Tomi: Saggi sulle opere dell' esilio*, Milano–Udine 2019, pp. 23–36.
- GREBE 2010: S. GREBE, *Why did Ovid associate his exile with a living death?*, CW, CIII 2010, 4, pp. 491–509.
- HELZLE 1989: M. HELZLE, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum liber 4: A Commentary on Poems 1 to 7 and 16*, Hildesheim–Zurich–New York 1989.
- HUSKEY 2004: S. HUSKEY, *Strategies of omission and revelation in Ovid Heroides 6.12 and Tristia. 3.9*, Philologus CXLVIII 2004, pp. 274–289.
- KASSEL 1975: R. KASSEL, *Quod versu dicere non est*, ZPE XIX 1975, pp. 211–218.
- KLINE 2003: Ovid, *The Poems of Exile (Tristia, Ex Ponto, Ibis)*, translation A.S. KLINE, s.l. 2003.
- KRISAK 2014: *Ovid's Erotic Poems: Amores and Ars Amatoria*, translation L. KRISAK, introduction S. RUDEN, Philadelphia 2014.
- OLIENSIS 1997: E. OLIENSIS, *Return to sender: The rhetoric of nomina in Ovid's Tristia*, Ramus XXVI 1997, pp. 172–193.
- PARRY 1994: H. PARRY, *The Apologos of Odysseus: Lies, All Lies?*, Phoenix XLVIII 1994, pp. 1–20.
- PIĘTKA 2019: R. PIĘTKA, *Catullus 64: The game of names*, Eos CVI 2019, pp. 23–29.
- SKWARA 2008: E. SKWARA, *Muza na nierównych kołach, czyli o przekładzie dystychu elegijnego w „Ars amatoria” Owidiusza*, Przekładaniec XVIII–XIX 2008, pp. 55–76.
- SMITH 2012: E. SMITH, *Names and Naming in Ovid's Exile Poetry, A Dissertation in Classical Studies*, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 2012.
- WESOŁOWSKA 2022: E. WESOŁOWSKA, *Jak powiedzieć, żeby nie powiedzieć (lub odwrotnie), czyli kłopoty z przekładem elegii wygnańczej Owidiusza Ex P. 4. 12.*, Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium XXXII 2022, pp. 77–86.
- WESOŁOWSKA 2023: E. Wesołowska, *Pół żartem-pół serio, czyli kłopot z Owidiuszem*, Przekładaniec XLVII 2023, pp. 201–206.
- WHEELER 1988: Ovid, *Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto*, with an English translation by A.L. WHEELER, Cambridge, MA–London 1988.
- WINNICZUK 1974: L. WINNICZUK, *Humour and wit in Ovid's Fasti*, Eos LXII 1974, pp. 93–104.
- WÓJCIK 2001: A. WÓJCIK, *Owidiusz wobec swego poetyckiego talentu. Autorefleksje poety w Tristia i Epistulae ex Ponto*, Eos LXXXVIII 2001, pp. 57–74.
- WULFRAM 2008: H. WULFRAM, *Das römische Versepistelbuch. Eine Gattunganalyse*, Berlin 2008.
- ZARZYCKA-STĄNCZAK 1981: K. ZARZYCKA-STĄNCZAK, *Nasonis tres libelli. O debiucie poetyckim Owidiusza*, Lublin 1981.

XIPHILINUS AND THE ALEXANDRIAN EMBASSY OF 57 BC

by

KAMIL BIAŁY

ABSTRACT: The present papers focuses on the analysis of minor episode from the Xiphilinus' *Epitome* of Cassius Dio's *Roman History* devoted to the issue of restoration of Ptolemy XII's to the Egyptian throne and the actions undertaken by delegation of Alexandrians under the leadership of Dio, a Stoic philosopher, to undermine Ptolemy's efforts. It is argued that Xiphilinus, while providing a derivative account based on a single source, followed in his narrative a different agenda than Dio. His focus lies in presenting actions of Ptolemy and his Roman allies (*dynatoi*) as evidence for unlawfulness, corruption and bribery which in Xiphilinus' view formed a common characteristic of late republican Roman polity.

Xiphilinus' *Epitome*, an abridged version of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*, is a monumental work by the early third century Roman senator and writer who described the history of Rome from its legendary origins up to his own time during the early reign of the emperor Severus Alexander. It could be considered as being one of the most peculiar and significant works of 11th-century Byzantine historiography¹. It was envisaged by its author as a kind of handbook of Roman history and it is widely accepted that its recipient was the emperor Michael VII Doukas². Its aim was to increase the young emperor's historical, political and institutional awareness regarding the ancient Roman roots of Byzantine polity³. In a broader sense, the *Epitome* can be seen as part of an 11th-century resurgence of interest in the ancient Roman past, including its Republican and pre-Christian

¹ The most recent edition is that of BOISSEVAIN contained in his edition of Dio: *Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt*, ed. U.P. BOISSEVAIN (ed.), vol. 3, Berlin 1885–1901.

² For his programmatic statement see Xiph. 87, 3–11; cf. C. MALLAN, *The Style, Method, and Programme of Xiphilinus' Epitome of Cassius Dio's Roman History*, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies LV 2013, pp. 611 f.

³ J. LJUBARSKIJ, *Some Notes on the Newly Discovered Historical Work by Psellos*, in: J. JELISAVETA, S. ALLEN, J. LANGDON (eds.), *ΤΟ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΝ: Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis*, New Rochelle–New York 1993, pp. 217–218; A. MARKOPOULOS, *Roman Antiquarianism: Aspects of the Roman Past in the Middle Byzantine Period (9th–11th centuries)*, in: E. JEFFREYS (ed.), *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies*. London, 21–26 August 2006, I. Plenary Papers, Aldershot–Burlington 2006, p. 294.

heritage⁴. It should be noted that Xiphilinus in particular expresses special interest in Republican Rome, contrary to older and contemporary Byzantine historiography, thus becoming a precursor of later historians who shared his interests, including Ioannes Zonaras and Ioannes Tzetzes⁵.

Xiphilinus' work is also of special significance to modern scholars because the fragmentary preservation of Dio's original text makes the *Epitome* the only available substitute in many cases. Of 80 books of Dio only XXXVI–LX survived. The rest has been reconstructed using the works of Zonaras, a 12th century historian valuable for books I–XXXV, Xiphilinus for books LXI–LXXX and *Constantinian Excerpts* which provides us with fragments from various parts of the *Roman History* and are especially valuable for the contemporary books of Dio. Also important to the history of Dio's own time is a partially preserved manuscript Cod. Vat. Graec. 1288 which includes later stages of the reign of Caracalla, the entire reign of Macrinus and the early years of Elagabalus.

Xiphilinus' work remains of relatively little interest to modern scholars despite of its originality and significance, while Cassius Dio is enjoying a significant increase of scholarly attention, if not to say, a renaissance⁶. In Xiphilinus' case, this lack of interest may stem from earlier scholarly views that regarded the *Epitome* as an unoriginal, derivative work produced by an uneducated monk

⁴ J. SCHARF, *Quellenstudien zum Prooimion der Epanagoge*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift LII 1959, p. 79; P. MAGDALINO, *Honour among Romaioi: the framework of social values in the world of Digenes Akrites and Kekaumenos*, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies XIII 1989, pp. 183–218; see also M. ANGOLD, *The Byzantine State on the Eve of the Battle of Manzikert*, Byzantinische Forschungen XXVI 1991, p. 27, who connects political views expressed by Dio (LVI 43, 4), with those of Byzantine elites and legislature of the emperor Nicephorus Botaneiates; R. MACRIDES, P. MAGDALINO, *The Fourth Kingdom and the Rhetoric of Hellenism*, in: P. MAGDALINO (ed.), *The Perception of the Past in 12th Century Europe*, London–Rio Grande 1992, pp. 118 f.; A. KALDELLIS, *A Byzantine Argument for the Equivalence of All Religions: Michael Attaleiates on Ancient and Modern Romans*, International Journal of the Classical Tradition XIV 2007, pp. 1–22; D. KRALLIS, “Democratic” Action in Eleventh-Century Byzantium: Michael Attaleiates’ “Republicanism” in Context, Viator XL 2009, pp. 35–53.

⁵ Before Xiphilinus, Constantinian Excerpts were the first literary production since John Lydus’ *De magistratibus* which showed interest in the Roman Republic with extensive citations from Polybius, Dionysius, as well as from Cassius Dio. It seems that the aim of *Excerpta* was to expand the available knowledge of a Roman history, including the early republican period, A. NÉMETH, *Excerpts versus Fragments: Deconstructions and Reconstitutions of the Excerpta Constantiniana*, in: A. GRAFTON, G.W. MOST (eds.), *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach*, Cambridge 2016, p. 256.

⁶ B. SIMONS, *Cassius Dio und die Römische Republik. Untersuchungen zum Bild des römischen Gemeinwesens in den Büchern 3–35 der “Romaika”*, De Gruyter 2009; A. KEMEZIS, *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans*, Cambridge 2014; V. FROMENTIN *et al.* (eds.), *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures*, 1–2, Bordeaux 2016; H. LANGE, J.M. MADSEN (eds.), *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, Leiden–Boston 2016; J. OSGOOD, C. BARON (eds.), *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*, Brill 2019; C.H. LANGE, A. G. SCOTT (eds.), *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*, Leiden 2020; C. BURDEN-STREVENS, J.M. MADSEN, A. PISTELLATO (eds.), *Cassius Dio and the Principate*, Venezia 2020.

and as such not worthy of individual study. This view is linked to a broader concept of Byzantine “chronicles”, which were deemed as a passive form of historical writing when compared to the more elaborate and sophisticated “histories”. This dichotomy originated in the classical studies of Karl KRUMBACHER who classified Xiphilinus’ *Epitome* among “chronicles”, and, consequently saw him as an unoriginal and passive copyist. Later studies slowly challenged that view, though this only occurred in the later decades of 20th century⁷. This shift in Byzantine studies occurred only after Fergus Millar’s pioneering study of Cassius Dio. Millar was clearly influenced by Krumbacher in his opinions on Xiphilinus and, in turn, influenced later scholars’ perspectives on Cassius Dio⁸.

Because of the above mentioned factors Xiphilinus has only started to slowly attract scholarly attention in the last decade when studies showing his originality, and at the same time advocating for a more attentive approach to his work — as a substitute for Dio’s lost books— began to emerge⁹. These pioneering studies show that Xiphilinus can be approached as an original and independent author whose working methods reveal active authorial input determined by his own contemporary agenda. Primarily he represents a mixed approach to his source material which is subjected either to diligent copying or creative paraphrasing. In both cases important is not only what Xiphilinus included in his *Epitome* but also what he decided to omit. In the same way, studies devoted to Xiphilinus’ agenda, although not numerous, already highlight intriguing interpretative topics and prove that the *Epitome* could be used as an interesting source of knowledge about the mentality of Byzantine elites in the 11th- century. The aim of this paper

⁷ K. KRUMBACHER, *Die Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur*, München 1897, p. 220; the first to challenge that view was H.-G. BECK, *Die byzantinische ‘Monchschronik’*, in: H.-G. BECK (ed.), *Ideen und Realitäten in Byzanz. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, London 1972, pp. 188–197; D. AFINOGENOV, *Some Observations on the Genres of Byzantine Historiography*, Byzantion LXII 1992, pp. 3–33; J. LJUBARSKIJ, *New Trends in the Study of Byzantine Historiography*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* XLVII 1993, pp. 133 f.

⁸ F. MILLAR, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964, p. 2, see also P.A. BRUNT, *On Historical Fragments and Epitomes*, *CQ* XXX 1980, pp. 488–492.

⁹ C. MALLAN, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 610–644; K. JUNTUNEN, *The Lost Books of Cassius Dio*, *Chiron* XLIII 2013, pp. 459–486; *idem*, *The Image of Cleopatra in Ioannes Xiphilinos’ Epitome of Cassius Dio: A Reflection of the Empress Eudokia Makrembolitissa?*, *Acta Byzantina Fennica* IV 2015, pp. 123–151; B. BERBESSOU-BROUSTET, *Xiphilin, abrégiateur de Cassius Dion*, in: V. FROMENTIN, E. BERTRAND, M. COLTELLONI-TRANNOY, M. MOLIN, G. URSO (eds.), *Cassius Dion: Nouvelles lectures*. Bordeaux 2016, pp. 81–94; K. BIALY, *John Xiphilinos on the Civil War Between Caesar and Pompey in the Epitome of Cassius Dio*, in: D. ŚLAPEK, I.A. ŁUC (eds.), *Przemoc w świecie starożytnym: Źródła, struktura, interpretacje*, Lublin 2017, pp. 437–449; S.C. ZINSLI, *Beobachtungen zum Epitomatorenhandwerk des Ioannes Xiphilinos*, in: B. BLECKMANN, H. BRANDT (eds.), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Dusseldorpiense*, Bari 2017, pp. 197–221; A. SIMPSON, *The Reception of Cassius Dio’s Imperial Narrative in Byzantium (Tenth–Twelfth Centuries)*, in: C. DAVENPORT, C. MALLAN, eds., *Emperors and Political Culture in Cassius Dio’s Roman History: Twelve Studies*. Cambridge 2021, pp. 289–307; M. KRUSE, *Xiphilinos’ Agency in the Epitome of Cassius Dio*, *GRBS* LXI 2021, pp. 193–223.

is to show how Xiphilinus' background may have influenced his interpretation of the events described by Dio in the case of an event of nominal importance to the Byzantine historian, that is, an account of the Alexandrian Embassy of 57 BC.

This topic forms part of a broader issue known in modern historiography as the "Egyptian Question" in Roman politics during the late Republic. In this narrower case, it concerns the events after the expulsion from Egypt of its king, Ptolemy XII, by the citizens of Alexandria and the king's attempts to seek aid from the Romans in his reinstatement. To counter the king's efforts, the Egyptians sent a delegation of one hundred men to Rome led by the Stoic philosopher Dio in order to convince the Senate to reject the king's pleas. There is a rich literature on the topic¹⁰, but for the purpose of this study I will not try to examine the relevance of Dio's version for the study of this matter, but I will limit myself to the analysis of differences between Dio and Xiphilinus and their significance for the interpretation of the latter's agenda.

In Dio's version of the event, the author connects the turmoil in Egypt, which resulted in Ptolemy XII's escape, with the king's policies, through which he tried to strengthen his position by obtaining Roman recognition of his rule and protection as *amicus populi Romani*. To aid himself in his efforts, he offered generous bribes to influential Romans. The money for this endeavour came partially from his own coffers and the rest was from loans. The burden of repaying those loans was placed on Egyptian citizens. What is more, the required funds were collected by force (Cass. Dio XXXIX 12, 1). This induced the wrath of the Egyptian population who were also displeased with the king's submissive policy towards Rome. Demands were put on the king for Cyprus, which has recently been handed over to the Romans, to be returned to Egypt, and for Ptolemy to relinquish the title of *amicus* (Cass. Dio XXXIX 12, 2). The king, unable to calm the Egyptians down, fled the country and went to Rome, where he accused his subjects of expelling him from his kingdom (Cass. Dio XXXIX 12, 3). Ptolemy's efforts were at first fruitful and the task of his restoration was placed on Publius Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, who additionally received the governorship of Cilicia (Cass. Dio XXXIX 12, 2–3).

The Alexandrians, who according to Dio's version weren't aware of the king's escape and who believed him to be dead, put Ptolemy's daughter Berenike on

¹⁰ See for example: I. SHATZMAN, *The Egyptian Question in Roman Politics (59–54 B.C.)*, Latomus XXX 1971, pp. 363–369; G. HÖLBL, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches. Politik, Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander d. Gr. bis zur römischen Eroberung*, Stuttgart 1994, pp. 195–202; M. SIANI-DAVIES, *Ptolemy XII Auletes and the Romans*, Historia XLVI 1997, pp. 306–340; W. HUSS, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332–30 v. Chr.–C.H.*, München 2001, pp. 683–695; R. WESTALL, *The Loan to Ptolemy XII, 59–48 BCE*, Ricerche di Egittologia e di Antichità Copte XII 2010, pp. 23–41; A. ŁUKASZEWICZ, *Ptolemy XII and the Romans – An Alexandrian money story*, The Polish Journal of Arts and Culture. New Series III 2016, pp. 29–39.

the throne. When they found out what had happened to him and that he was actively pursuing his reinstatement with the help of the Romans, they sent their own delegation to counter his efforts and to make a formal complaint. It consisted of one hundred men and the Alexandrian Stoic philosopher Dio was put at its helm (Cass. Dio XXXIX 13, 1, although Dio is mentioned by name later at XXXIX 14, 2). Ptolemy, on learning this, sent forth his own agents to engage them before they could reach Rome. As a result, most of them died en route while the rest were killed on their arrival. The few survivors were either intimidated or bribed into silence about what happened to them or why they had come (Cass. Dio XXXIX 13, 2). Nevertheless, this affair caused a huge scandal, even abroad, and the Senate was very displeased by it. According to Dio, the matter was put on the Senate's agenda by Marcus Favonius who argued that numerous envoys sent by Rome's ally were murdered and many Romans again accepted bribes on this occasion (Cass. Dio XXXIX 14, 1).

To resolve this matter the senate summoned Dio, the surviving leader of the envoys, in order to hear the truth about what had happened. Ptolemy, however, again utilised his connections and bribes and as a result not only did Dio fail to appear before the Senate, but also no one mentioned the matter anymore while Ptolemy was present in Rome (Cass. Dio XXXIX 14, 2). Later Dio was also murdered on the orders of Ptolemy and even then the king did not meet any punishment thanks to his association with Pompey, who welcomed him in his own house and offered assistance. According to Dio, none of Ptolemy's men was punished either. Many Alexandrians were accused, but very few were convicted. As for the Romans, many accepted bribes, but fearing the consequences of their actions, they cooperated with each other to avoid punishment (Cass. Dio XXXIX 14, 3). Finally, the Senate decided not to pursue Ptolemy's restoration because of the advice given by the Voice of the Sibyl which discouraged the Romans from offering any armed assistance to the king (Cass. Dio XXXIX 15, 2). In spite of this, his restoration was put forth by Pompey and Aulus Gabinius, contrary to the will of both the oracle and the Senate (Cass. Dio XXXIX 55, 1–2).

It seems that the oracle and its role are key for interpretation of the events in Dio's narrative and its whole point. With this event Dio is marking the beginning of the fall of the Republic due to the displeasure of the divine. Thus, the restoration of Ptolemy represents a symbolic collapse of the Republican system at the hands of the powerful elite (δυναστεῖαι) who acted against the will of the senate and the divine. The flood of the Tiber, which subsequently befell Rome, is clearly connected with this sacrilege and is seen by Dio as a result of it (Cass. Dio XXXIX 61, 1–4). In this way Dio highlights the issues which, in his opinion, contributed to the decline of the Republican political system¹¹.

¹¹ The restoration of Ptolemy as a reason for the fall of the Roman Republic in Dio's narrative was emphasised by J. OSGOOD, *Dio and the Voice of the Sibyl* in: OSGOOD, BARON (eds.),

The version of Xiphilinus, while being much shorter than the original, contains some interesting alterations and omissions which make it possible to identify and highlight a different agenda of the author, grounded in the realities of his own time. It is also notable that Xiphilinus mentions this incident at all given the level of compression he applies to this part of Dio's work and the fact that the protagonist of the narrative is a secondary character. Starting with the circumstances of Ptolemy's exile, Xiphilinus ignores the specific reasons for the Egyptians' discontent (namely taxes and demand for return of Cyprus, Cass. Dio XXXIX 12, 1–2) and states in very general terms that the king's banishment was a result of discontent among the Egyptians who were displeased with the way in which they were governed. According to Xiphilinus "the Egyptians rose against Ptolemy because he ruled them more violently (τὸ βιαιώως) than lawfully (ἢ νομίμως)" (Xiph. 12, 4–6). Likewise, instead of providing the details about involvement of Spinther (Cass. Dio XXXIX 12, 3), Xiphilinus only vaguely states that Ptolemy tried to regain his throne by winning over "the powerful" (τοὺς δυνατοὺς) with money (Xiph. 12, 7–9).

More radical changes to Dio's narrative were made by Xiphilinus regarding the fate of the Alexandrian delegation. While Dio only vaguely mentioned what happened to the envoys – stating that most of them never made it to Rome and several were killed thereafter (Cass. Dio, 13, 1–2), Xiphilinus states that they were secretly eliminated by means of poison (φαρμάκοις δολοφονῆσαι) before they could make an accusation against the king. While this seems like a natural simplification on the part of Xiphilinus, it also suggests the severity of the terms by which Xiphilinus evaluated Ptolemy's actions. What is more, he

op. cit. (n. 6) pp. 209–211; generally scholars interpret Dio's opinion on the reasons for fall of the Roman Republic either as character driven or more as stemming from its degrading political system. For character driven, or 'human nature' based interpretations see for example: M. REINHOLD, *In Praise of Cassius Dio*, *L'Antiquité Classique* 55 1986, pp. 213–222; M. COUDRY, *Cassius Dio on Pompey's Extraordinary Commands*, in: C.H. LANGE, J.M. MADSEN (eds.), *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, Leiden 2016, pp. 33–50; C. BURDEN-STREVEVS, *Cassius Dio's Speeches and the Collapse of the Roman Republic*, Brill 2020; E. BERTRAND, M. COUDRY, *De Pompée à Auguste: les mutations de l'imperium militiae. 2. Un traitement particulier dans l'Histoire romaine de Dion*, in: V. FROMENTIN et al. (eds.), *Cassius Dion. Nouvelles lectures*, Bordeaux 2016, 598–608; E. BERTRAND, *Point de vue de Cassius Dion sur l'imperialisme romain*, in: V. FROMENTIN et al. (eds.), *Cassius Dion. Nouvelles lectures*, Bordeaux 2016, pp. 678–700; K. WELCH, *Cassius Dio and the Virtuous Roman*, in: OSGOOD, BARON (eds.), *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 97–128; A.W. LINTOTT, *Cassius Dion and the History of the Late Roman Republic*, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* XXXIV 1997, pp. 2517–2521; On Dio's 'systematic approach' see for example: W. REES, *Absolute power corrupts absolutely: Cassius Dio and the fall of the Roman Republic*, *Acta Classica* LVII 2012, pp. 151–168; A. KEMEZIS, *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans. Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian*, Cambridge 2014; M.O. LINDHOLMER, *The Fall of Cassius Dio's Roman Republic*, *Klio* CI 2019, pp. 473–504; For a general outline of those concepts see J. OSGOOD, C. BARON, *Introduction: Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*, in: OSGOOD, BARON (eds.), *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 4–6 and M.O. LINDHOLMER, *op. cit.* (n. 11), pp. 474–476.

makes no mention of the Senate's debate or the role of Marcus Favonius (Cass. Dio XXXIX 14, 1) and instead speaks generally about a "terrible" (πᾶνδεινον) event which became known to the Roman people (τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ῥωμαίων). When the affair became public knowledge, the leader of the envoy, Dio, was also murdered before he could formally charge Ptolemy (Xiph. 12, 10–14). Thus he could not present his testimony and Ptolemy did not face any punishment for his actions because, among other things, the king was received by Pompey in his own house and was offered assistance. Xiphilinus concludes his narrative with a pessimistic statement about the prevalence of bribery in Rome at the time (Xiph. 12, 15–18), omitting any mention of the Sibylline oracle.

Let us look at the conclusion of the Xiphilinus version first. While the statement on the issue of bribery in Rome is similar to Dio's version, more striking is the omission of any mention of Sibyl's voice and its role in the events. In this way, the narrative on Ptolemy XII's actions in Xiphilinus' version is deprived of the conclusions and intended significance, as it was presented by Cassius Dio, namely, of its metaphysical importance for Rome's demise because of displeasure of the gods caused by the violation of Sibylline oracle's advice. That Xiphilinus deliberately omitted that context is shown by the fact that when he narrates the flood in Rome, he treats it as a simple anecdote and catastrophic ekphrasis without any meaning or connection to any other event or to the case of Ptolemy in any way (Xiph. 13, 30–14, 3)¹². Yet in Dio it is a consequence of restoration of Ptolemy by the Romans contrary to the oracle's judgement. What is more, Xiphilinus not only passes the oracle in silence but also the conclusion of the whole narrative – Ptolemy's restoration. If he wasn't interested in the outcome of Ptolemy's story, his exile, his actions in Rome, and his eventual restoration, even without mentioning the oracle, then what is the point of mentioning him at all? As such, it seems that Xiphilinus wanted to highlight different aspects of this story. As it ends with Xiphilinus' comment about bribery, it could be concluded that his main interest in this passage is the unlawful conduct of Ptolemy and the Romans.

If Xiphilinus looked at this passage from the above mentioned perspective of legal transgression, it sheds more light on another major difference between his version and that of Dio, namely additional information on the poisoning of the

¹² In many other instances Xiphilinus shows an interest in portents but, at the same time, he is critical of Dio's overreliance on them in his narrative, see C. MALLAN, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 623 f. and n. 44 for examples. This paradoxical situation could be probably explained by Xiphilinus' urgency to follow tastes of his readers, notably of Michael VII Doukas whose interest in occult, portents and astrology was notorious, see P. MAGDALINO, *Occult Science and Imperial Power in Byzantine History and Historiography (9th–12th Centuries)*, in: P. MAGDALINO, M. MAVROUDI (eds.), *The Occult Sciences in Byzantium*, Geneva 2006, p. 137. There is also evidence that the emperor too active interest in those matters, and tasked Michael Psellus, his tutor, to prepare an oration on the 'usual miracle' at Blachernae, a supernatural occurrence involving the veil of an icon of the Theotokos: *Michaelis Pselli orationes hagiographicae*, E.A. FISHER (ed.), Stuttgart 1994, no 4.

Alexandrian delegates. It appears that Xiphilinus is the only available source of this information in the Greek language. Apart from Dio, the only Greek narrative source mentioning the murder is Strabo, yet he does not mention the involvement of poison (Strab. XVII 1, 11). It seems that Xiphilinus used another source, which is not available to us, for this information. We know from the content of the *Epitome* that he consulted other works¹³. He mentions a missing work of Asinius Quadratus which he used for parts of the *Epitome* where copy of Dio he used was damaged or some of its parts missing (Xiph. 257, 12)¹⁴. Xiphilinus does not mention, which of the works of Quadratus he employed, *Parthica* or *Chilieteris*. However, if the information about the poisoning of the Alexandrians originates from Quadratus it could probably have only been found in *Chilieteris* – a work similar to that of Dio describing the events from the foundations of Rome to the reign of Alexander Severus¹⁵. It should be noted, however, that Xiphilinus' use of other sources in this particular case was dictated by the unavailability of Dio's books describing the reign of Antoninus Pius which forced him to use alternative sources¹⁶. There is also a slight possibility that Xiphilinus took this information from Appian. Although the episode on the murder of Dio does not appear in the extant portions of Appian, it is possible that Xiphilinus consulted his now lost work on the history of Egypt (App. Syr. 258). It is possible that the account on Dio was included in the first of four books of *Egyptian History*, which probably covered an outline of early relations between Rome and Egypt up to 35 B.C., or later¹⁷. There is also some evidence of Xiphilinus' familiarity with Appian¹⁸, although due to the fact that *Egyptian History* did not survive, it cannot be concluded with certainty that the historian knew this work specifically. If true, Xiphilinus' account could be identified as a witness for Appian's now missing *Egyptian History*. Yet even in that case, it remains a mystery why Xiphilinus wanted to supplement Dio's account with an alternative authority for the description of such a minor episode when in most cases he follows a single source. Due to this theory, although less likely, other possibilities should be considered.

Information about the poisoning of the Alexandrian delegation in surviving works only appears in Latin sources with, Cicero being the most important

¹³ The question of Xiphilinus' alternative sources is only partially answered, see MALLAN, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 629 f.; JUNTUNEN, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 482, n. 85.

¹⁴ MALLAN, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 633.

¹⁵ For the collection of surviving fragments of Quadratus work see *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, T.J. CORNELL (ed.), vol. 2, Oxford 2013, pp. 1128–1143.

¹⁶ JUNTUNEN, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 459.

¹⁷ T. JAMES LUCE, JR., *Appian's "Egyptian History"*, *Classical Philology* LIX 1964, p. 261.

¹⁸ M. BANDINI, *Il Vat. gr. 141 di Appiano da Giovanni Xifilino a Giano Lascaris (passando per Pietro Miani e Guarino Veronese)*, in: M. CRONIER, B. MONDRIAN (eds.), *Le livre manuscrit grec: écritures, matériaux, histoire*, Paris 2020, pp. 681–698.

witness and closest to the events. It should be noted, however, that these sources mention the poisoning of Dio of Alexandria specifically, and not the other members of the envoy who were subjected to multiple means of repression. Cicero mentions the poisoning in his speech in defence of Marcus Caelius Rufus (*Pro Marco Caelio*) who in 56 BC was charged, among other things, with the murder of Dio¹⁹. More generally about the poison used against Alexandrians, without mentioning any names, Cicero tells us only vaguely in his other work, *On the Responses of the Haruspices* where he mentions daggers and cups of poison as methods of committing murder²⁰. Consequently, thanks to Cicero, we know that poison was involved specifically in a scheme against Dio, although not against the rest of the envoys. This fact alone makes it probable that Xiphilinus used an intermediary or much later Greek source, or even added the information about poison from memory in a confabulated form.

The current state of research on the knowledge of Latin in eleventh-century Byzantium, however, makes it highly unlikely that Xiphilinus took that information directly from a Latin source even though increased interest in the Latin language in a legal context at the time is well attested. The novel by Constantine IX from 1047, in which he established a law school at the monastery of Saint George of Mangana in Constantinople, required from a leader of that school – *nomophylax*, proficiency in the Latin language²¹. The reality

¹⁹ On this trial see F. MÜNZER, *Aus dem Leben des M. Caelius Rufus*, Hermes XLIV 1909, pp. 135–142; R. HEINZE, *Ciceros Rede pro Caelio*, Hermes LX 1925, pp. 193–258; D. LIEBS, *Die Herkunft der Regel bis de eadem re ne sit actio*, Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Romanistische Abteilung LXXXIV 1967, pp. 104–132; J. LINDERSKI, *Ciceros Rede pro Caelio und die Ambitus- und Vereinsgesetzgebung der ausgehenden Republik*, Hermes LXXXIX 1961, pp. 106–119; E.S. GRUEN, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, University of California Press 1974, pp. 305–309; M.C. ALEXANDER, *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC*, Toronto 1999, pp. 134–135; the charge was based on *vis* – a political violence, Cic. *Cael.* 70; A.W. LINTOTT, *Violence in Republican Rome*, Oxford 1968, pp. 111–112; GRUEN, *op. cit.* (n. 19), pp. 305; M. COUDRY, *Contrôle et traitement des ambassadeurs étrangers sous la République romaine*, in: C. MOATTI (ed.), *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne: procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*, Rome 2004, pp. 558–559; *Pro Marco Caelio*, A.R. DYCK (ed.), Cambridge 2013, p. 96; it is assumed that it was *Lex Plautia de vi* which regulated armed assault for political reasons specifically, J.N. HOUGH, *The Lex Lutatia and the Lex Plautia De VI*, *AJPh* LI 1930, pp. 135–147; while Cicero himself mentions that Caelius' charge in fact didn't involve *vis* but rather should have been tried under provisions of Sullan *Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis*, law against murderers and poisoners, Cic. *Cael.* 72; *Cicero Pro M. Caelio Oratio*, R.G. AUSTIN (ed.), Oxford 1977, p. 153; on this law see J.-L. FERRARY, *Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis*, *Athenaeum* LXXIX 1991, pp. 417–434; K. AMIELAŃCZYK, *Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis*, *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska*, sectio G (Ius) XLIII 1996, pp. 286–293.

²⁰ Cic. *Har. resp.* 34, in this passage Cicero condemns the murder of the Alexandrians in relation to their diplomatic immunity; the case of Caelius is also mentioned by later authors, see Quint. *Inst.* IV 2, 27; Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 26; Tac. *Dial.* 21.

²¹ *Novella Constitutio Saec. XI Medii a Ioanne Mauropode conscripta a Constantino IX Monomacho promulgata*, A. SALAC (ed.), Prague 1954, pp. 16; 14–17; on this novel see also

of that requirement was disputed by scholars who believe that a knowledge of Latin didn't surpass an acquaintance with basic legal terminology appearing in legal texts and commentaries²². That this terminology was discussed in eleventh century Byzantine jurisprudence is confirmed by the content of the anonymous treatise known as *Μελέτη περὶ ψιλῶν συμφώνων* (*Meditatio de nudis pactis*). This work was written by a Constantinopolitan judge as a consulting tool for his peers, although its interest in Latin is limited to explanation of the meaning of the old Latin legal terms employed in Byzantine jurisprudence²³. The same could be said about the *Synopsis ton Nomon* of Michael Psellus, addressed to Michael VII Doukas, which provided the emperor with explanations of various Latin terms and their Greek equivalents²⁴. Yet no piece of literature of this kind engages with Latin literature or provides hints that their authors knew the Latin language and consequently they should be regarded as no more than examples of antiquarianism²⁵. As such, it is safe to assume that the knowledge of Latin in Byzantium in the eleventh century was not at the level required to read and understand Latin texts.

Another possibility is that Xiphilinus used a Greek translation of a work originating from the Latin tradition and involving information taken from Cicero or another source. While direct translations from Cicero and other Latin texts survived in Egyptian papyri, which were prepared for educational reasons, such a tradition did not continue in later Byzantine periods²⁶. We know about le-

F. DÖLGER, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, vol. 2, Berlin 1925, no 863, pp. 5 f.; S. TROIANOS, *Η Νεαρά Κωνσταντίνου του Μονομάχου: ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναδείξει καὶ προβολῇ τοῦ διδασκάλου τῶν νόμων*, Byzantina Symmeikta XXII 2012, pp. 243–262.

²² N. VAN DER WAL, *Problèmes linguistiques rencontrés par les juristes byzantins*, in: M. GOSMAN, J. VAN OS (eds.), *Non nova, sed nove: mélanges de civilisation médiéval, dédiés à Willem Noomen*, Groningen 1984, p. 280, who doubts whether even Xiphilinus, the first *nomophylax*, knew Latin at the level indicated in the novel, see also MARKOPOULOS, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 291; TROIANOS, *op. cit.* (n. 21), p. 257.

²³ W. WOLSKA-CONUS, *L'école de droit et l'enseignement du droit à Byzance au XI^e siècle: Xiphilin et Psellos*, Travaux et Mémoires VII 1979, pp. 13–21; the authorship of the *Meditatio* is disputed on p. 37, where WOLSKA-CONUS says that its author was John Xiphilinus; earlier this work was connected with Constantine of Nicaea, A. SCHMINCK, *Studien zu mittelbyzantinischen Rechtsbüchern*, Frankfurt a. Main 1986, pp. 39–44.

²⁴ On the *Synopsis ton Nomon* see Z. CHITWOOD, *Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition, 867–1056*, Cambridge 2017, pp. 178–191; M.Th. TANALOS, *Ein Kommentar zur Synopsis Pselli des elften Jahrhunderts und seine Spuren*, Fontes Minores XIII 2021, pp. 265–278.

²⁵ MARKOPOULOS, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 290–292.

²⁶ Some of these works are bilingual, like the fragments of *In Catilinam*, I 6, 16; 7, 17 and II 14–15, R. CAVENAILE, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*, Wiesbaden 1956, pp. 71–75, there is also a surviving Latin version of *Pro Caelio* but without a Greek translation, *ibidem*, pp. 82–94; on the importance of these texts see V. REICHMANN, *Römische Literatur in griechischer Übersetzung*, Philologus: Supplementband XXXIV 1943, pp. 28–57; R. E. GAEBEL, *The Greek Word Lists to Vergil and Cicero*, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library LII 1969–1970, pp. 296–325; E. FISHER, *Greek translations of Latin literature in the fourth century A.D.*, in: J.J. WINKLER, G. WILLIAMS (eds.), *Later Greek Literature*, Cambridge 2010, pp. 183–189.

gal texts written in Greek as commentaries on Roman legal tradition from Late Antiquity authored by the so called *antecessores* and *scholastikoi*, their successors from the turn of the sixth and seventh centuries²⁷. It should be noted that Byzantine legal procedure at the time usually involved the mention of ancient laws as a form of rhetorical exercise to reinforce an argument based on old historical authorities. Examples of this phenomenon can be found in the eleventh-century *Peira* of Eustathius Romaëus which shows how judges still used laws coming down from the Roman Republic as a justification for their rulings²⁸. There is also evidence that these kinds of legal texts were consulted during education which could be inferred from Constantine IX Monomachos' *novel* creating the law school in Constantinople which stipulated a cooperation between *nomophylax* and a *bibliophylax*, the imperial librarian who provided the school with materials needed in the course of education²⁹.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of surviving material it is not possible to say whether information about the poisoning of the Alexandrian ambassadors was contained in one of these works. However, a connection between Middle Byzantine jurisprudence and its Ancient Roman roots tracing back to the Republic is clearly detectable. As such, I would like to argue that Xiphilinus' interest in this minor episode and his interpretation of Dio's narrative, combined with our knowledge about his background, should be considered in this legal context.

From the available information about Xiphilinus' background it could be inferred that he was a typical representative of the lay Byzantine intellectual elites from the eleventh century. In this regard, he is not an isolated example in a milieu that produced writers of Byzantine historiography such as Michael Attaleiates, John Skylitzes and later John Zonaras or Nicetas Choniates who produced works of historiography with their legal and administrative careers as a backdrop³⁰. We can conclude that Xiphilinus was a representative of this

²⁷ From many such works only two survived, that of Theophilus and Julian. For a survey of the works that did not survive see CHITWOOD, *op. cit.* (n. 24), pp. 154–156. As for their style, from the content of the preserved *Paraphrase* by Theophilus, *Theophili Antecessoris Paraphrasis Institutionum*, H.A. LOKIN, R. MEIJERING, B.H. STOLTE, N. VAN DER WAL (eds.), Groningen–Chimaira 2010, it could be concluded that they were characterised by a readable style and consisted of a paraphrase of a Latin text in Greek and commentaries (*paragrafhai*).

²⁸ Πείρα Εὐσταθίου τοῦ Ρωμαίου, P. ZEPOS (ed.), Athens 1934, pp. 116; 499–500; also: R. MACRIDES, *Killing, Asylum, and the Law in Byzantium*, *Speculum* XXXIV 1988, p. 524; N. OIKONOMIDEËS, *The “Peira” of Eustathios Romaïos: an abortive attempt to innovate in Byzantine law*, in: N. OIKONOMIDEËS (ed.), *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade: Studies, Texts, Monuments*, *Variorum Collected Studies* 1992, pp. 169–192.

²⁹ The works of *antecessores* and *scholastikoi* could also have been among these books, see CHITWOOD, *op. cit.* (n. 24), p. 171.

³⁰ A. LAIOU, *Law, Justice, and the Byzantine Historians: Ninth to Twelfth Centuries*, in: A. LAIOU, D. SIMON (eds.), *Law and Society in Byzantium Ninth–Twelfth Centuries*, Washington 1994, p. 173; the legal mindset and its influence on the interpretation of the events is especially

intellectual milieu on the basis of the limited information we have about his background. I will not attempt to present a biography of Xiphilinus at this point³¹, but suffice it to say that from preserved sigillographic evidence we know that he held the office of *krites*, a civil thematic administrator and judge³². There were other such personalities present at the court of Michael VII Doukas. Among them, Michael Attaleiates and Michael Pselus should be mentioned. The latter was more interested in philosophy and rhetoric than in law, yet both of them dedicated legal treatises to the emperor; which were handbooks of the history of law – *Ponema Nomikon* and the oreviously mentioned *Synopsis ton Nomon* respectively³³. Additionally, Psellus dedicated to this emperor his short biographies on Roman kings, consuls and emperors up to the reign of John Tzimiskes called *Historia Syntomos*³⁴. Consequently, works on the law and history of early Rome dedicated to Michael VII Doukas should be regarded as evidence of increased interest in earlier, pre-Christian history of Rome at his court. It is not surprising that this interest began within the ranks of civic imperial elite educated in law, rhetoric, and history. Earlier historiography viewed universal history through a strictly Christian lens according to tradition set by Eusebius of Caesarea, treating the history of Rome before its Christianisation with less detail. Now, however, Roman history and its forms of government formed the core part of the historical narrative. It was undoubtedly a consequence of the legal and administrative perspective of writers of this kind of historiography. Roman law transcended the chronology imposed by Christianity and resulted in increased interest in the Roman past before the establishment of the Christian

visible in the case of Skylitzes and his opinion of the marriages of Byzantine emperors, *eadem*, *Imperial Marriages and Their Critics in the Eleventh Century: The Case of Skylitzes*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* XLVI 1992, pp. 165–176.

³¹ For those see W. TREADGOLD, *Middle Byzantine Historians*, Palgrave 2013, p. 310; MALLAN, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 614; A.-K. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, *Die Familie Xiphilinos im 11. Jahrhundert: der Beitrag der Spiegel*, in: B. CASEAU (ed.), *Les réseaux familiaux Antiquité tardive et Moyen Âge*, in memoriam A. Laiou et É. Patlagean, Paris 2012, no 6, p. 314; M. KRUSE, *The Epitomator Ioannes Xiphilinos and the Eleventh-Century Xiphilinoi*, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* LXIX 2019, pp. 257–274, who identifies him as a student of Psellus known from Psellus' letters addressed to John VIII Xiphilinus, see *Michaelis Pselli Scripta minora magnam partem adhuc inedita. II: Epistulae*, E. KURTZ, S. DREXL (eds.), Milan 1941, 310, 8–19.

³² N. OIKONOMIDES, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles*, Paris 1972, pp. 322–323; *idem*, *L'évolution de l'organisation administrative de l'Empire byzantin au XI^e siècle (1025–1118)*, *Travaux et Mémoires* VI 1974, pp. 148–149; H. GLYKATZI-AHRWEILER, *Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IX^e–XI^e siècles*, Paris 1960, pp. 67–75.

³³ For the *Synopsis ton Nomon* see n. 21; on *Ponema Nomikon* see *Michaeli niceiotae Ponema nomikon*, in: J. ZEPOS, P. ZEPOS (eds.), *Jus Graecoromanum*, Athenai 1931, vol. 7, pp. 411–497; D. KRALLIS, *Michael Attaleiates and the Politics of Imperial Decline in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, Tempe 2012 p. 38.

³⁴ *Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos*, W.J. AERTS (ed.), Berlin–New York 1990.

empire³⁵. Xiphilinus could be seen as one of the first authorities to initiate this trend, although it could be argued that its first fully developed representative was Ioannes Zonaras, whose work contains much more personal input from its author than Xiphilinus' *Epitome*³⁶.

The legal and historical perspective outlined above influenced Xiphilinus' interpretation of Dio's narrative³⁷, including the Alexandrian Embassy analysed here. It sheds some light on Xiphilinus' evaluation of Ptolemy XII's conduct in Rome. This is visible at the beginning of the narrative where Xiphilinus presents the reasons for Ptolemy's exile. While he doesn't mention specific reasons as presented in Dio and other sources, he offers a vague statement in which he evaluated Ptolemy's method of governance, seeing it more as a rule of violence than of law. While this could be seen as a silent summary of Ptolemy's unpopular tax measures and submissive policy towards Rome, a description entirely omitted by Xiphilinus, the wording used here – τὸ βιάως and ἡ νομίμως again points to his legal background. In my opinion, the focus on the unlawfulness of the protagonist's conduct forms a main basis of the interpretation of Xiphilinus' narrative on Ptolemy and is directly connected to his background and preoccupation. Regarding the terms mentioned above, the discrepancy between violence and the rule of law constitutes one of the major themes of Byzantine political ideology. Because imposing limitations on imperial power was out of the question in the Byzantine world, the discussion was instead focused on finding an 'antidote',

³⁵ After Theophanes Byzantine historians weren't much interested in ancient history but were more focused on contemporary events, M. HOLLERICH, *Making Christian History Eusebius of Caesarea and His Readers*, Berkeley 2021, p. 173; Photios for example was not interested in Roman republican history per se but in Roman conquests in the East, D. MENDELS, *Greek and Roman History in the Bibliotheca of Photius – A Note*, Byzantion LVI 1986, pp. 201–203.

³⁶ T. KAMPIANAKI, *John Zonaras' Epitome of Histories: A Compendium of Jewish–Roman History and Its Reception*, Oxford 2022, pp. 102–108.

³⁷ To mention only cases of bribery, they are present in various parts of the *Epitome*: Sallust trial for bribery in Africa (Xiph. 26, 8–16; cf. Cass. Dio XLIII, 9, 2); Junius Cilo's corruption as governor of Bithynia under Claudius (145, 4–9 = Cass. Dio LX 33, 6); the anecdote on the honesty of Victorinus (273, 26–274, 5 = Cass. Dio LXXIII(LXXII) 11, 1–4) yet due to the lack of original books by Dio it is possible to identify how Xiphilinus modified the original narrative only in the case of Sallust. The case of Victorinus would be especially interesting. It is a relatively long anecdote that Xiphilinus' inserted in the *Epitome* in spite of his usual hesitation when it comes to putting secondary characters in his narrative (This can be seen through comparison with Dio's original from cod. Vat. 1288 containing the late reign of Caracalla, the whole of Macrinus and the beginning of Elagabalus). The fact that he modified it in some way can be inferred from the minor differences between his version and that contained in Exc. Val. 319 which show that Xiphilinus abridged the introduction to this anecdote while presenting the case of Victorinus' measures against the corruption among his subordinates in full detail. It should be noted that Xiphilinus is not the only historian in the eleventh century whose writing bears the influence of legal education and experience, with others being Michael Attaleiates and John Skylitzes (writing at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries). The latter's legal stance on marriages of emperors and empresses and its subsequent influence on his evaluation of them was analysed by A. LAIOU, *op. cit.* (n. 30), pp. 165–176.

a term used by Gilbert DAGRON, for its holder. The aim was not to limit the power of the emperor but to urge him to self-impose a moderate course based on moral principles – to have him limit his power himself. Consequently, the ultimate goal was not to change the nature of imperial power, which for the Byzantines was beyond imagination, but to change the holder of imperial office himself in a way that made the situation more bearable to the Byzantine elites – to transform pure violence, which constitutes the core of absolute power, into legitimate authority (ἐννομος ἀρχή)³⁸. Xiphilinus himself specifically mentions this transition in his *Epitome* interpreting Maecenas' proposal of a new form of government advocated to Augustus as “a monarchy both royal and lawful” (μοναρχίαν βασιλικήν τε καὶ ἔννομον) (Xiph. 80, 31 f.)³⁹.

The same attitude can be seen in Xiphilinus' interpretation of the murders committed on Ptolemy's command. He is highly critical here and considers it a “terrible” (πάνδεινον) act. Dio does not use a specific adjective to describe Ptolemy's deed; hence, its inclusion in Xiphilinus' version is significant. This opinion on the part of the Byzantine historian was undoubtedly influenced by the still functioning rule of the inviolability of ambassadors in Byzantine diplomacy with its roots in the ancient world⁴⁰. In fact, Byzantine treaties on diplomacy advocated for the special treatment for ambassadors who should be entertained and well-treated but also overwhelmed and highly impressed by Byzantine wealth and the court ceremonial. The importance of these matters is clearly visible in the content of *de Ceremoniis*, commissioned by emperor Constantine VII, which is devoted to diplomatic conduct. Based on the lost work by Peter the Patrician, it contains detailed description of the procedure for receiving ambassadors from foreign nations, both from the West and from the East (“from the Persians”). Furthermore, the ambassadors' “entertainment” and “well-being” (θρέψαι καὶ θεραπεῦσαι) is especially highlighted in case of those from the East⁴¹. This diplomatic protocol was formulated and reinforced using

³⁸ G. DAGRON, *Lawful Society and Legitimate Power: ἔννομος πολιτεία, ἔννομος ἀρχή*, in: A. LAIOU, D. SIMON (eds.) *Law and Society in Byzantium, 8th–12th Centuries*, Washington 1994, pp. 32 f.

³⁹ This term is also directly connected to Plato's *Stateman* where he presents μοναρχίαν βασιλικήν as an uncorrupted form of monarchy contrary to tyranny, Pl., *Pol.* 302d.

⁴⁰ A. KAZHDAN, *The Notion of Byzantine Diplomacy*, in: J. SHEPARD, S. FRANKLIN (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy*, Belfast 1992, p. 30; D. NERLICH, *Diplomatische Gesandtschaften zwischen Ost und Westkaisern, 756–1002*, Berne 1999, pp. 138–149; there were instances where ambassadors were mistreated, see: N. DROCOURT, *L'Ambassadeur maltraité. Autour de quelques cas de non-respect de l'immunité diplomatique entre Byzance et ses voisins (VI^e–XI^e s.)*, in: (no eds.), *Les Relations diplomatiques au Moyen Âge: sources, pratiques, enjeux. Actes du XL^e Congrès de la SHMESP, Lyon 3–6 juin 2010*, Paris 2011, p. 87–98.

⁴¹ *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris de ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo*, J.J. REISKE (ed.), *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae XVI*, Bonn 1829, p. 400, 15; on the communication between Byzantine and Arab embassies in tenth and eleventh centuries see A. BEIHAMMER, *Die Kraft der Zeichen: Symbolische Kommunikation in der byzantinisch-arabischen Diplomatie*

ancient sources that provided historical examples of Byzantine diplomatic conduct. Similarly, the collection *On Embassies* contained within the monumental yet only very partially preserved work called *Excerpta Constantiniana*, commissioned by Constantine VII, is also important in this context. It contains passages from ancient authorities, including Dio's *Roman History*, selected and re-arranged according to the thematic content of the collection⁴².

Thus, it is not surprising that Xiphilinus negatively perceived the treatment of the Egyptian ambassadors even if they were assaulted by their own king and on Roman soil. This negative perception is further strengthened by the fact that it was the Romans who aided Ptolemy in his actions not only helping him to avoid any prosecution, but also taking an active role in his restoration. Furthermore, Xiphilinus creates a sharp contrast between the *dynatoi*, who accepted bribes from Ptolemy, and the Roman people (τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ῥωμαίων, Xiph. 12, 12), who were shocked by his crimes⁴³. In this, Xiphilinus differs distinctly from Dio, who doesn't mention the *dēmos*, but simply states that the deaths became so notorious abroad (περιβόητον) so that even the Senate got annoyed (Cass. Dio XXXIX, 14, 1). In doing so Xiphilinus creates a greater sense of a larger world outside of the Senate that is affected by the corruption and violence.

Further alterations to Dio's version are evident in Xiphilinus' description of the events following the murder of the ambassadors. Xiphilinus accuses Ptolemy of wanting to obtain a favourable decision from the Senate to avoid prosecution by bribing τοὺς δυνατοὺς. Dio uses the term *dynatoi* in the *Roman History* when referring to the Optimates but does not mention them in this specific case. He only says that Ptolemy transferred money to τισι τῶν Ῥωμαίων, without specifying a particular group or political faction. Thus, the use of the term by Xiphilinus in this specific instance is part of his own interpretation, not a paraphrase or copy of Dio's account. Whether he meant the Optimates is difficult to determine but seems unlikely given that in his *Epitome* he omitted all sections of Dio's account where they are mentioned. It seems more likely that he uses the term *dynatoi* in its broader, contemporary sense, i.e. the "powerful". This label is common in Byzantine legislative literature where it denotes the high social strata. They often appear in the land legislation of the Macedonian

des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts, Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik LIV 2004, pp. 159–189; on the reception of ambassadors in general see L. BRÉHIER, *Les institutions de l'empire byzantin*, Paris 1970, pp. 250–254; J.-C. CHEYNET, *La diplomatie byzantine*, in: D. SAKEL (ed.), *Byzantine Culture*, Ankara 2014, pp. 325–327.

⁴² J. SHEPARD, *Byzantine diplomacy, A.D. 800–1204: means and ends*, in: SHEPARD, FRANKLIN (eds), *op. cit.* (n. 40), p. 53; A. NÉMETH, *The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past*, Cambridge 2018, pp. 58–59.

⁴³ It is possible to interpret this phrase as "in the land of the Romans" where this event took place and in that case Xiphilinus considered it as a πάνδεινον because the Romans didn't care about the ambassadors' safety.

emperors, aimed at curtailing a prevailing procedure of the accumulation of land by *dynatoi* at the expense of farmer-soldiers, the *stratiotai*⁴⁴. Byzantine legislation during the Middle Byzantine period strongly sanctioned situations in which the patronage of a *dynatos* could influence the outcome of court proceedings⁴⁵. It is within this context in which Xiphilinus uses the term *dynatoi* as powerful individuals who aided Ptolemy. Similarly, Ptolemy followed the same course later in the case of the murder of the Alexandrian envoys when he avoided prosecution thanks to Pompey's aid and hospitality. Without a doubt, taking into account the meaning of the term *dynatoi* in Byzantium, Xiphilinus regarded Pompey as one of the Roman *dynatoi* as well.

Xiphilinus' negative assessment of Ptolemy's actions in the context of criminal prosecution or its avoidance could be explained by his personal views, which were shaped by contemporary Byzantine stances towards bribery. Cecaumenus (late eleventh century) in his *Strategikon* advises his son not to preside over cases involving friends because the unjust resolution of such cases (including suspicion of bribery) could result in the transferal of the case to a higher court. This passage could be interpreted as evidence of bribery as a common phenomenon in provincial courts, whose judgments could be corrected by courts of a higher standard in the capital⁴⁶. What Cecaumenus highlights, namely a friendly relationship (*philia*) between a judge and the person on trial – was, in fact, an important moral issue in the Byzantine judiciary. John Mauroπους openly questions the credibility of judges in such cases⁴⁷. It is also worth mentioning the less straightforward stance of Michael Psellus whose letters provide an informative source on this issue. Their content shows that he considered the function of provincial judge to be a very lucrative source of income⁴⁸. To some extent, Psellus normalises the phenomenon of “gift-giving” motivated by the possession of certain qualities which a good judge should display: goodwill, mercy, respect, and affection. Based on these qualities, a judge should take into consideration

⁴⁴ R. MORRIS, *The Powerful and the Poor in Tenth-Century Byzantium: Law and Reality*, Past and Present LXXIII 1976, pp. 3–27; M. KAPLAN, *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VI^e au XI^e siècle: Propriété et exploitation du sol*, Paris 1992, pp. 359–444; J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Crown Lands and the Defence of Imperial Authority in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*, *Byzantinische Forschungen* XXI 1995, pp. 75–100.

⁴⁵ On the patronage (*prostasia*) in Byzantium see, H. SARADI, *On the 'archontike' and 'ekklesiastike dynasteia' and 'prostasia' in Byzantium with particular attention to the legal sources. A study in social history of Byzantium*, *Byzantion* LXIV 1994, pp. 314–351.

⁴⁶ *Raccomandazioni e consigli di un galantuomo*, M.D. SPADARO (ed.), *Hellenica* II, Alessandria 1998, pp. 6, 8–12; CHITWOOD, *op. cit.* (n. 24), pp. 64–65.

⁴⁷ *Ioannis Mauropodis Euchaitorum Metropolitae Epistulae*, A. KARPOZILOS (ed.), *Thessalonike* 1990, pp. 28; 21 f..

⁴⁸ *Michael Psellus. Epistulae*, S. PAPPASIOANNOU (ed.), Berlin–Boston 2019, LIII 214; cf. M. JEFFREYS, *Summaries of the Letters of Michael Psellos*, in: M. JEFFREYS, M. LAUXTERMANN (eds.) *The Letters of Psellos. Cultural Networks and Historical Realities*, Oxford 2017, KD 35, p. 184.

“friendship” he shares with the person on trial⁴⁹. Interestingly, he does not think of friendship and justice as opposing or conflicting concepts but instead sees them as strengthening each other. Thus, a judge must take into account his affection towards the person on trial when delivering his verdict⁵⁰.

This relativism of the impartiality of justice implemented against official imperial legislation and Xiphilinus’ negative stance on the issue of bribery should be seen in this context. His idealistic position could be explained by the anti-bribery measures functioning in Byzantium. The *Ecloga* was the first legal compilation to address the corruption among state officials as a moral problem⁵¹. The Byzantine state attempted to curb this issue but, at the same time, it accepted that the practice of “gift-giving”, or paying a customary fee known as *sportulae* was ingrained in Byzantine legal culture during the Middle Byzantine period. Instead of banning this practice, it sought to regulate it by setting limits on the amount of money provincial judges were supposed to receive. The Novel of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus stipulated that if a case involved both the *dynatoi* and the “poor” (*ptochoi*), the latter were obliged to pay lower fees than *dynatoi* or in some instances they were exempted from this obligation entirely. Moreover, the giving of *sportulae* was completely prohibited in the courts in Constantinople⁵². Thus, it is tempting to assume that Xiphilinus’ negative opinion of powerful Romans, including Pompey, whom he labelled as *dynatoi*, was in some way influenced by his personal views on bribery which was commonly committed by *dynatoi* of his own time.

Xiphilinus’ stance on the issue of bribery more closely resembles that of Cecaumenus and Mauropus than that of Psellus, although all three acknowledge the existence of the issue discussed above. It is possible that this influenced Xiphilinus’ interpretation of Ptolemy’s actions. Ptolemy was guilty of bribing the Roman *dynatoi*, while the Romans, including Pompey, were guilty of taking bribes to hinder any potential prosecution of Ptolemy. This may explain why Xiphilinus is negatively predisposed towards the actions of Ptolemy and Pompey – he interprets the term *dynatos* within the legal context of the eleventh century. In Dio’s version, Dio of Alexandria was supposed to be summoned

⁴⁹ A. KAZHDAN, *Some observations on the Byzantine concept of law: three authors of the ninth through the twelfth centuries*, in: A. LAIOU, D. SIMON (eds.), *Law and Society in Byzantium, Ninth–Twelfth Centuries*, Washington 1994, pp. 210–211; more generally on Psellus’ network of former students see F. BERNARD, *Educational Networks in the Letters of Michael Psellos*, in: JEFFREYS, LAUXTERMANN (eds.) *op. cit.* (note 47), p. 22–32.

⁵⁰ CHITWOOD, *op. cit.* (n. 24), pp. 67–70.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 56.

⁵² *Jus graecoromanum*, J. ZEPOS P. ZEPOS (eds.), vol. 3, Aalen 1962, p. 220; for discussion of this novel see H. SARADI, *The Byzantine tribunals: problems in the application of justice and state policy (9th–12th c.)*, *Revue des études byzantines* LIII 1995, p. 183; on the changing attitudes towards bribery in Byzantium in general see CHITWOOD, *op. cit.* (n. 24), pp. 53–75.

(μετεπέμψαντο) by the senators to the Senate-house in order to learn the truth (τὴν ἀλήθειαν παρ' αὐτοῦ μαθησόμενοι), meanwhile, according to Xiphilinus' imagination he intended to bring charge against Ptolemy (κατηγορήσων αὐτοῦ) at court but was unable to do so, while Ptolemy faced no charges for his deeds (καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐπὶ τούτοις δίκην δέδωκε). It should be noted that Xiphilinus' makes a small but significant modification to Dio's account here. While the latter states that Ptolemy faced no penalty specifically for Dio's murder (ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ δίκην ἔδωκε), Xiphilinus broadens his version and speaks about Ptolemy's crimes in the plural form (ἐπὶ τούτοις δίκην). Thus, Xiphilinus used Cassius Dio's passage to present a negative outcome of the entirety of Ptolemy's affair and not related only to the murder of Dio. Ptolemy avoided any prosecution by bribing the *dynatoi*, but more crucially thanks to his friendship with Pompey, who hosted him in his own house and lent him his full support. There is a distinct emphasis by Xiphilinus on bribery and the money received from Ptolemy as the ultimate motive behind Pompey's actions. Dio, on the other hand, gives more of a sense that Pompey and Gabinius were interested in the larger political game of interfering in Egypt. Xiphilinus' negative assessment of the Roman elites' integrity is reinforced by his remark on the prevalence of bribery in Rome at the time (τοσοῦτον τότε ἡ δωροδοκία ἴσχυεν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ). The phrase τοσοῦτον τότε indicates that Xiphilinus was interested in the affair involving Ptolemy specifically to showcase the extent of corruption of the Republican elites at that time and this can be inferred from his strong wording that it was far removed from his own contemporary and idealistic standards.

Taking into account considerations presented above, it could be concluded that Xiphilinus inserted the story about Ptolemy XII into his narrative for reasons distinct from those of Dio. The latter presented the narrative about Ptolemy XII mainly in order to show how his restoration by the Romans, carried out against the will of the Sibylline oracle, contributed to the crisis and ultimate fall of the Roman Republic. Xiphilinus, on the other hand, is largely focused on law breaking and bribery as a characteristic feature of the late Roman Republican elites. This assumption is further supported by alterations to Dio's original narrative, additions of information not found in the *Roman History* (manner of death of the ambassadors) and his complete silence on the conclusion of Ptolemy's story. His interest in this topic could be explained by his background and preoccupations and more generally by characteristics of eleventh-century Byzantine literary culture where a renewed interest in Roman antiquity emerged among intellectuals educated in rhetoric and law, often with legal and administrative careers.

University of Szczecin, Historical Institute
kamil.bialy@usz.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-4068-6188

DUDITHIANA NOVISSIMA (CUM MINUTIA BEZANA):
TWO OVERLOOKED LETTERS BY ANDREAS DUDITH
AND UNRECORDED ENTRIES FROM THE *LIBER AMICORUM*
OF JAN AND ADAM ČEJKA*

by

MICHAŁ CHOPTIANY

ABSTRACT: This article introduces two hitherto overlooked letters by the heterodox humanist Andreas Dudith (1533–1589). These letters, addressed to Joachim Meister of Görlitz and Lorenz Scholtz of Freystadt, not only shed additional light on the corpus of letters to and from Dudith that have come down to us, but also provide new information about the complex relations between members of the Silesian intellectual elite and show that apart from the people already identified by the editors of *Epistulae*, which are also confirmed by the two documents edited here, some new names should be taken into consideration. The article also provides a critical edition of Dudith's note on Girolamo Savonarola inspired by the latter's effigy in Theodore Beza's *Icones* of 1580. The newly identified Prague copy of this inscription, unlike the two copies preserved in Berlin and Wrocław, allows one to tie this text with the now lost *album amicorum* of Czech noblemen, Jan and Adam Čejka of Olbramovice. The Prague copy also brings a hitherto unrecorded epigram dedicated by Beza to the Čejka, an edition of which is also included in this paper.

INTRODUCTION

Whenever an edition of correspondence comes to an end, it becomes more than certain that subsequent years will bring forth further documents supplementing the materials gathered and published by the editors. Although the physical volumes radiate the feeling of completeness, they are usually the result of a multi-lateral compromise between the ambitions of scrupulous and diligent

* Research for this article was done within the framework of the project “Debates over Biblical Chronology in the Intellectual Culture of Silesia and Upper Lusatia (1550–1650)”, funded by the National Science Centre (grant no. 016/23/D/HS3/00422).

It is my pleasure to express my gratitude to, *omissis titulis*, Alicja Bielak, Ewelina Drzewiecka, Wojciech Kordyżon, Jakub Niedźwiedź, Agnieszka Pawłowska-Kubik, Anna Skolimowska, Aleksander Sroczyński, Vladimír Urbánek, Maciej Włodarski and two anonymous reviewers for their encouraging comments about the materials that I have gathered, for help in solving some mysteries around certain figures, and/or for joining me in a collaborative effort to decipher the really nasty handwriting of Lorenz Scholtz.

editors, the processual and cumulative nature of the editorial activity, the survival rate of primary sources that could yield any kind of information about the letters, the legibility of the material that could be consulted, and the availability of information about the location of the letters. It is therefore not a surprise that nearly every single volume of the *Correspondance* of Théodore de Bèze (1519–1605)¹ has brought various additions to the previous tomes, some of which came from a better understanding of the contents of the letters already published, while others simply stemmed from the fact that some documents have been accessed for the very first time². The same can be said about the epistolary corpus of Andreas Dudith (1533–1589), whose correspondence amounting to 1313 identified and edited letters was concluded in 2019³. The concluding pages of the final volume brought a ray of hope for further research focused on Dudith as they contain a list of 28 letters that have been identified in the course of preparation of the entire edition, mostly in the archives of Vienna, which may make one start to wonder if there are still letters to or from Dudith that could expand this list even further.

Since both of these long-lasting editorial enterprises share inherent and inevitable open-endedness, it is perhaps no wonder that they can also be supplemented by means of a single study based on findings from three different libraries. And while the adequacy of certain additions to the central corpus of correspondence may be subject to discussion – and in fact was, especially in the context of the materials supplementing some of the volumes dedicated to Beza⁴ – their importance can be boiled down to one rudimentary fact, i.e. they bring additional data – dates, places, and names of people – that allow one to make the social network created by the agents participating in and shaping European intellectual life even more complex.

This article aims to therefore introduce to a wider scholarly audience two hitherto unknown and unpublished letters by Dudith and copies of two previously unrecorded entries in a late sixteenth-century *liber amicorum* that can be

¹ H. AUBERT (ed.), *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vols. I–XLIII, Genève 1960–2017 (hereafter Beza, *Correspondance* followed by the number of the volume in Roman numerals); for an overview of most recent scholarship on Beza see *Théodore de Bèze, 1519–1605: Actes du Colloque de Genève, septembre 2005*, ed. I. BACKUS, Genève 2007.

² For a list summarising this effort see the lengthy list of uncovered letters and other documents in Beza, *Correspondance*, T. XLIII, pp. 155–160.

³ L. SZCZUCKI, T. SZEPESSY (eds.), A. Dudithius, *Epistulae*, Budapest, 1992–2019, partes I–VII (hereafter Dudith, *Epistulae* followed by the number of the volume in Roman numerals and the number of the letter in Arabic numerals). The most thorough and up-to-date account of Dudith's network and scholarly business can be found in G. ALMÁSI, *The Uses of Humanism: Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584) and Andreas Dudith (1533–1589), and the Republic of Letters in East Central Europe*, Leiden–Boston 2009.

⁴ For a formulation of this critique see C. MOSER, review of Beza, *Correspondance*, vols. XXV–XXVII, *The Sixteenth Century Journal* XXXVIII 2007, pp. 204–206, at 206.

attributed to Dudith and Beza that I came across during my research on the debates over biblical chronology in the intellectual milieu of early modern Silesia and Upper Lusatia.

The core of this study will have a threefold structure, with the first two parts corresponding to single letters, i.e. letters sent by Dudith to Joachim Meister of Görlitz and Lorenz Scholtz of Freystadt (Kožuchów), while the third part will offer a joint discussion of an unrecorded seventeenth-century copy of two entries in the *liber amicorum* of Adam and Jan Čejka of Olbramovice, made by Dudith and Theodore de Bèze. Every section will contain a brief description of the codicological context in which the documents were identified, followed by an edition with a commentary. In the process of preparing the transcriptions for publication, I have followed the practice of most recent editions of early modern scholarly correspondence in terms of the way the text of the sources is rendered (the standardisation of Latin spelling, especially concerning the use of *i/j* and *u/v*, the modernisation of punctuation and the construction of the textual notes). All conventional ligatures and abbreviations have been tacitly expanded, and the editor's conjectures have been marked with angle brackets. For the convenience of readers, I am also giving the two letters their relevant *numeri currentes*, although this decision also entails and reveals limitations of this form of numbering of letters, which is much less functional, unlike the system adopted by the editors of the correspondence of Justus Lipsius, Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon, as well as the authors of certain inventories⁵.

1. ANDREAS DUDITH (BRESLAU) TO JOACHIM MEISTER (GÖRLITZ),
23 FEBRUARY 1580 (= *EPISTULAE*, NO. 993 BIS)

This letter came down to us as an autograph bound in volume II of a collection of *Epistulae Reformatorum* which was acquired by the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (HAB) in the late 1980s. These two volumes, Cod. Guelf. 108 and 109 Noviss. 2°, are an extremely rich and apparently somewhat understudied assembly of early modern letters of intellectuals from German-speaking lands, which until World War II were part of the collection Wallenberg-Fenderlinsche Bibliothek in Landeshut in Schlesien (now Kamienna Góra)⁶. As part of the Depot Landeshut, these two volumes eventually found home at the

⁵ For an explanation of the efficiency of numbering letters according to the YYYY-MM-DD system see C. HEESAKKERS, D. VAN MIERT, *An Inventory of the Correspondence of Hadrianus Junius (1511–1575)*, Lias XXXVII 2010, pp. 109–268, here p. 126–127, see also M. LEWIS *et al.*, *Time*, in: H. HOTSON, T. WALLNIG (eds.), *Reassembling the Republic of Letters in the Digital Age: Standards, Systems, Scholarship*, Göttingen 2019, pp. 99–117, esp. 116–117.

⁶ For digital copies of these MSS see diglib.hab.de/mss/108-noviss-2f/start.htm and diglib.hab.de/mss/109-noviss-2f/start.htm.

HAB and offer a vast collection of letters to and from such scholars, physicians and statesmen as Abraham Buchholzer, Joachim Camerarius, David Chytraeus, Paul Eber, Caspar Peucer, Philipp Melanchthon, Johann Crato von Krafftheim, Zacharias Ursinus and many others. The existence of this collection, catalogued long before it left the library in Landeshut⁷ and discussed some time ago by Helmar Härtel⁸, has been acknowledged to date by some of the projects aimed at mapping the documents pertaining to epistolary networks of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries⁹ yet these materials still remain somewhat understudied and an underused source for the study of early modern intellectual history.

1.1. Text

Original: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 109 Noviss. 2°, fol. 339r–340v

Address: Excellentissimo Viro Domino Joachimo Meistero, P[oetae] L[auareatae] et Scholae Gorliciensis Rectori Doctissimo, amico honorando; below the address, in Meister's hand: Andreae Duditii Viri Nobilissimi etc. primae ad me; quas accepi, pridie cal. Martias 1580

Salutem plurimam.

Agam tecum, sine prooemiis; nude, ac simpliciter, doctissime Joachime. Amo te et magni facio; ob singularem doctrinam, atque in pangendis versibus accuratam quandam elegantiam. Vidi etiam epistulas aliquot, a te scriptas, omnibus ornatae orationis, ac suavis eloquentiae luminibus distinctas. Tui similes; qui sane pauci sunt; ab ineunte aetate mea amavi plurimum, ac, quibus potui, semper officiis prosequutus sum, atque ad illorum me amicitiam aggregavi. Quae causa fuit, ut te salutaverim, meamque benevolentiam tibi amice detulerim, per

⁷ T. LANGNER, *Katalog der von Wallenberg-Fenderlin'schen Bibliothek zu Landeshut in Schlesien*, Landeshut 1881, see p. 112 for a general description and pp. 117–135 for a detailed inventory of letters. For an even earlier account of the library's history and its early 19th-century catalogue see W. PERSCHKE, *Verzeichniss der öffentlichen von Wallenberg-Fenderlinschen Bibliothek zu Landeshut in Schlesien*, Landeshut 1829.

⁸ H. HÄRTEL, *Zwei Kodizes der ehemaligen Von Wallenberg-Fenderlins'schen Bibliothek aus dem schlesischen Landeshut in der Herzog August Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel: Notizen zu ihrer Entstehung, ihren Schicksalen und ihrer Erschließung*, in D. HELLFAIER; H. SCHMIDT-GLINTZER, W. SCHMITZI (eds.), *Der wissenschaftliche Bibliothekar: Festschrift für Werner Arnold*, Wiesbaden 2009, pp. 311–336. Although HÄRTEL mentioned numerous correspondents and recipients of letters bound in these two volumes and refers to Meister, for some reason he did not make a reference to Dudith.

⁹ This is the case of the “Frühneuzeitliche Ärztebriefe des deutschsprachigen Raums (1500–1700)” database, which records some of the letters to and from physicians yet at the same time does not offer a comprehensive overview of this collection. The metadata that can be excerpted from the volumes or the 1881 registry in the catalogue cannot be easily integrated with other records.

communem amicum nostrum Monavium. Id mihi bene cecidisse valde gaudeo, et gratiam tibi habeo, quod gratam tibi fore amicitiam meam, atque hoc meum, non mediocre profecto, studium, non obscure prae te fers. Dabo equidem operam, ne te unquam propensionis istius in me paenitere queat. Cupio te hanc meam libertatem in optimam partem accipere; tum hoc quoque, quod statim initio abs te petere non dubito, ut ad legendum nobis mittas theologorum illorum adversaria scripta, quorum in tuis ad Monavium litteris mentionem iniecisti. Statim ad te salva, et integra redibunt. Tantumne est, mi ornatissime Meistere, a divinis tuis cogitationibus atque adeo lucubrationibus ocii, ut etiam ineptias meas legas? Ac, quod magis etiam mirum videatur, tam immodice laudes? Sive tu hoc serio, sive ioco facis, rogo te maiorem in modum, per bonitatem tuam, et veritatis, qua nihil nobis carius esse debet; studium, ut scriptum illud a me *πρόβλημα* diligentius ac exquisitam illam praeclari iudicii tui trutinam, per ocium, revoces, suisque ponderibus examines: deinde mihi, ut libere, atque amice significes, quid addendum, quidue minuendum, quid mutandum videatur. Nam idem [*fol. 340v*] ille typographus, qui antea libellum edidit, nunc parat eum denu(o)^a recudere; nonnullis locis a me quoque emendatum, atque auctum. Adiunget quaedam eiusdem argumenti tum aliorum, tum Erasti in primi magni philosophi et medici. Cave putes mihi gratius accidere posse, quare iterum te rogo, ne hunc, mea causa, ac sane iam veritatis investigandae, atque ex densissimis tenebris eruendae <per>^b laborem suscipere graveris. Siquid erit, quod ego quoque in usum tuum praestare potero, promptum experieris.

Vale, vir praestantissime, et Dominum Scultetum, meis verbis, tum alios amicos et collegas^c tuos pl. sal. d. Vratislaviae, 23 Februarii 1580.

P.T.

Addictissimus amicus

Andreas Dudith
Consiliarius Caesareae Maiestatis
manu propria

TEXTUAL NOTES

^a denu(o)] *macul. ms.*

^b <per>] *lectio incerta.*

^c Dominum ... collegas] *sic.*

1.2. Commentary

The letter in question was sent by Dudith from Breslau to Joachim Meister (1532–1587) on 23 February 1580 and received by the addressee – as we know from a note in his hand placed below the address – six days later, on February 29

(1580 was a leap year). Apart from the amount of time the document required to get from Breslau to Görlitz, the note in Meister's hand yields important information about his relationship with Dudith as the document is the first letter that the Lusatian poet received from the heterodox nobleman. Moreover, in the light of materials assembled by the editors of Dudith's correspondence, it is the only known example of their epistolary exchange, as the published letters do not include even minor references to Meister. In this context, the opening sentences of the letter suggest that Meister, rector of the Görlitz gymnasium and an extremely prolific Neo-Latin poet, sound particularly curious as apparently he had been trying to draw Dudith's attention for quite a while. The imperial counsellor alluded to some letters Meister had sent to others that Dudith had had occasion to read, and the latter offers words of praise for Meister's eloquence.

In the absence of other letters that would document this exchange, a remark made by Dudith sheds some light on the nature of the network he has built over the decades of his activity and here Jakob Monau comes out as an important agent and intermediary as he was a friend of both correspondents. It might be therefore rewarding to have a closer look at the correspondence of Monau, which is still understudied, unedited, and scattered¹⁰, and to check if there are any letters exchanged between Monau and Meister that would reveal further details of the nature of the relation between Dudith and Meister and hint at possible letters that are now lost.

What is worth noting is that Dudith also approached Meister for theological reasons, which today are not entirely clear. The humanist wrote that he had learned from Meister's letter to Monau about certain theological work – which in itself is an intriguing case in the story of the confidentiality of early modern correspondence¹¹ – and as a diligent reader of works published in this field he must have become eager to read it, so this urge created a perfect opportunity to contact Meister and reciprocate the latter's earlier epistolary efforts.

It also seems that Dudith alludes to the editorial and publishing fortunes of the collaborative work on the cometary theory that stemmed from the observations of and discussions about the Great Comet of 1577. This process resulted in the publication of Dudith's dissertation on the significance of comets in Basel in 1579, which was accompanied by Thomas Erastus's much shorter rejoinder

¹⁰ See, e.g. a long series of letters from Meister to Joachim Camerarius in München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 10367 (= Camerariana 17), nos. 163–294, which is evidence of the networks of Dudith and Camerarius overlapping thanks to such figures as Monau and Crato.

¹¹ On this see especially D. VAN MIERT, *Confidentiality and Publicity in Early Modern Epistolography: Scaliger and Casaubon*, in: A. BLAIR A.S. GOEING (eds.), *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in Honor of Anthony Grafton*, vol. 1, Leiden–Boston 2016, pp. 3–20, and C. VAN DEN HEUVEL et al., *Circles of Confidence in Correspondence: Modeling Confidentiality and Secrecy in Knowledge Exchange Networks of Letters and Drawings in the Early Modern Period*, *Nuncius* XXXI 2016, pp. 78–106.

to Dudith's text¹². However, it was only a year later when Peter (Pietro) Perna¹³ published a new, revised, and significantly expanded edition, which included all the materials from the 1579 booklet and added a few new things, including studies by Marco Squarcialupi and Simon Grynaeus and new replies from Erastus¹⁴. Dudith's text seems to allude to this process of the team of contributors assembling the new book and the publisher reassembling the text, a process which, as the erratum at the beginning of the volume shows, was never fully completed¹⁵. Above all, he hints at his own *Commentariolus*, which appeared in the 1580 volume.

In this context Dudith's regards passed on to "Dominus Scultetus" seem quite significant. Although the heterodox scholar did not write this explicitly, greeting Bartholomaeus Scultetus could have been an attempt at ensuring that he would read the volume of cometary dissertations, but also a way of inviting the Burgermeister and city astronomer into his circle, and hence was probably a more general reference to other colleagues of Meister's based in Görlitz¹⁶. Since the corpus of Dudith's letters does not include any documents sent to or by Scultetus and contains only a few, very brief remarks about the Lusatian astronomer and chronologer¹⁷, it seems that this attempt might have ended in failure.

2. ANDREAS DUDITH (BRESLAU) TO LORENZ SCHOLTZ DER ÄLTERE (FREYSTADT), 30 APRIL 1584 (= *EPISTULAE*, NO. 1188 BIS)

Unlike the letter to Meister, this document came down to us as a copy, written in the addressee's hand. It was included in a large collection of letters documenting not only the epistolary network of Lorentz Scholz the Elder

¹² A. Dudith, *De cometarum significatione commentariolus*, Basel: Peter Perna, 1579; C.D. HELLMAN, *The Comet of 1577: Its Place in the History of Astronomy*, 2nd ed., New York 1971, pp. 352–353.

¹³ On Perna see L. PERINI, *La vita e i tempi di Pietro Perna*, Roma 2002.

¹⁴ T. Erastus, A. Dudith, M. Squarcialupi, S. Grynaeus, *De cometis dissertationes novae*, Basel: Peter Perna, 1580; see C.D. HELLMANN, *The Comet of 1577* (n. 12), pp. 355–358; on Dudith's cometary views see A. MOSLEY, *Past portents predict: cometary historiae and catalogues in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*, in: D. TESSICINI, P.J. BONER (eds.), *Celestial Novelties on the Eve of the Scientific Revolution 1540–1630*, Firenze 2013, pp. 1–32, here at 19–25 and G. ALMÁSI, *Astrology in the Crossfire: The Stormy Debate after the Comet of 1577*, *Annals of Science* LXXIX 2022, pp. 137–163.

¹⁵ T. Erastus, A. Dudith, M. Squarcialupi, S. Grynaeus, *De cometis* (see above, n. 14), sig. *3v.

¹⁶ Cf. Dudith, *Epistulae*, VI, no. 1027, Dudith to T. Hájek, 24 November 1580 (referring to observations of the comet of 1580 and the Görlitz milieu in general).

¹⁷ See, e.g., Dudith, *Epistulae*, P. VII, no. 1278, Dudith to J. Praetorius, 27 September 1588 (in the context of controversies over and different positions taken towards the reformed calendar).

(1552–1599), but also circles of correspondents that can be loosely associated with him, either by location, common friends or their shared medical profession (and sometimes all three factors at once). The codex in question, now preserved in the University Library in Wrocław (hereafter BUWr) under the shelfmark M 1039¹⁸, brings together hundreds of copies of letters to and from Scholz, in his terrible handwriting, as well as letters by other physicians and scholars active in Silesia in the second half of the sixteenth century, such as, once again, Crato von Krafftheim, Caspar Hoffmann, Caspar Peucer, and Abraham Buchholzer.

The origins of the whole compilation are unclear, but one of the plausible explanations is that it might have served as one of the steps in assembling a large corpus of medical letters that were eventually divided into various publications containing not only the epistles but also medical prescriptions and recommendations, including the seven-volume collection of medical *consilia* authored by Johann Crato von Krafftheim (and the satellite members of his network)¹⁹. This manuscript, which has not yet been included in any of the projects dealing with early modern letters (EMLO, Kalliope, Ärztebriefe)²⁰, should also be seen in the broader context of the entire *Nachlass* of Scholz, which includes not only copies of letters, but also loose notes of a different character, including those dedicated to pharmacy and still preserved in the Wrocław collections²¹.

2.1. Text

Original: lost

Copy: Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, rkps M 1039, fol. 39r–v (in Scholtz's hand)

Dating: it is unclear which calendrical system has been used by Dudith, so the editor decided to leave it as is.

¹⁸ For the digital copy of the manuscript see www.bibliotekacyfrowa.pl/dlibra/publication/edition/135958. The codex, as well as other manuscripts that belong to Scholtz's *Nachlass* were initially part of the Magdalenenkirche; cf. BUWr, Cat. 368 a, *Katalog der Handschriften der Magdalenen-Kirchen-Bibliothek* (1847), fol. 3r. This collection, along with those of other church libraries, was later incorporated into the Stadtbibliothek Breslau, which after WWII eventually become today's University Library; on this see L. SPYCHAŁA, *Wegweiser durch die Handschriftenbestände der Universitätsbibliothek Wrocław/Breslau*, in: K. GARBER (ed.), *Kulturgeschichte Schlesiens in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Bd. II, Tübingen 2005, pp. 655–746, here 701 f.; B. KUMOR-GOMULKA, *Biblioteka Miejska we Wrocławiu (Stadtbibliothek Breslau) 1865–1945*, Wrocław 2017, pp. 85–92.

¹⁹ For an account of Scholtz's activity as the editor of *consilia* see: B. DIVIŠOVÁ, *Medical Case Studies (Consilia medica) of the Early Modern Period: Small Pox Documented*, transl. F.A. SCHULTZ, Amsterdam 2022, pp. 47–57.

²⁰ For instance, apart from the Dudithianum discussed here, the volume contains copies of previously unrecorded letters to Abraham Buchholzer and any scholarly project dealing with Silesian section of the Republic of Letters should take this volume into consideration.

²¹ The volumes in question are MSS BUWr M 1039, M 1041 and M 1043 A.

Address: unknown; letter copied under heading “Laurentio Scholzio Med[i]co”, in the margin annotation in Scholtz’s hand: “Reddatur 6 Junii A[nn]o [15]84”, which indicates that the letter must have been sent to Freystadt (Kozuchów), where Scholtz practiced as a physician between 1580 and 1585.

Salutem plurimam^a.

Quas ad me literas, Vir Doctissime, de variis artis vestrae rebus docte atque eleganter disserentes miseras superioribus mensibus uni fasciculo inclusas, cum responso meo Dominae Matri tuae remittendas non ita multo post tuum a nobis discessum tradi iussi. Ea te omnia jampridem accepisse puto et cupio.

Ad Orestem Catum, amicum nostrum, literas item tuas libenter transmissi: monui eum, ut tibi, homini optimo, doctissimo et amicorum studiosissimo quamprimum responderet. Verum ille neque ad tuas, ut video, neque ad meas literas respondit. Longe abest in ultimis Podoliae finibus et principi servit omnium^b occupatissimo, qui in perpetuo motu est, ut non sit mirum vel tardum ei redditae esse literas nostras, vel non esse ei tantum otii, ut quieto animo rescribere quaeat. Itaque quod ego facio, rogo, ut tu quoque excusatum eum habeas. Incluseram, ni fallor, Doctoris Caroli quoque ad te literas, praecipuis quibusdam arcanis praegnantibus, quas certe interiisse nolim. Quare te rogo ut primo quoque tempore mihi significes, an recte redditae sint.

Ad Dominum Bucholzerum quoque Virum Clarissimum de quaestione quadam chronologica amicus ille noster Orestes iam ante multos menses retulit, quem non est responso dignatus. Etsi autem morbum gravem excusare potest, tamen quis credat hominem, tam ad dissolvendos hui^cmodi^c nodos paratum, atque omnibus liberalibus artibus instructum tot mensium intervallo non potuisse tam breves a morbo suo inducias impetrare, praesertim te mediatore quasi quodam, ut dictare amanuensi suo aliquid potuerit quo Doctissimo viro et meo quoque si quid hoc ad rem ponderis adferre quaeat, [fol. 39v] desiderio satisfaceret, vel amico, et in eadem palaestra exercitatissimo socio suo Domino Krenzhemio viro eruditissimo et, ut animadv^der^dto^d, perquam officioso id negotii dedisset, quod ille, ut arbitror, quam eius humanitas, et bonum de studiosis historiarum merendi studium est, non gravatim fecisset, et etiamnum faceret. Peto abs te ut hanc rem urgeas, et ei persuadeas, ut alterutrum faciat. Sic apud amicum nostrum magnam gratiam inibis, et me quoque hoc nomine tibi obligabis.

Remitto tibi egregium de thermis scriptum et literas adiunctas, et gratias ago; remunerar te perquam libenter, sed nihil est ad manum. Ain’ tu recuperari posse, atque instaurari humidum illud, quod radicale vocant? Si id est, quid impedit magnopere, quin immortales in his terris vitam degamus? Ego contra sentio. Verum tuas rationes, si quae sunt, quibus in hac s^enten^ti^a confirmatus es, audire cupio.

Vale et Domino Bucholzero plurimam salutem ex me dicas cuius chronologica nondum apparet, ac ne meus quidem historicus, quo tamen non utitur

amplius. Si quem eius librum nactus ero, tota vita eum retinebo, ut par pari referam. Sed haec ioco dicta sunt: ita tamen, ut si meo libro non eget, remittat, malo quovis thesauro, quam libris carere.

Vale iterum, et me mutuo ama, et coniugem tuam saluta. Breslae ultima Aprilis 1584.

Excellentiae Tuae amicus deditissimus
Andreas Dudith,
Sacrae Caesareae Maiestatis orator

^f Rogo te, ut quod a te petit Dominus Raphanus de Tr(i)angula^g, mecum quoque communicates^f.

TEXTUAL NOTES

^a Salutem plurimam] Laurentio Scholzio Medico *ins. supra ms.*

^b omnium] *lectio incerta.*

^c hui(us)modi] *macul. ms.*

^d ut animadv(er)to] *lectio incerta.*

^e s(enten)t(i)a] *lectio incerta.*

^f Rogo ... communicates] *add. in marg. ms.*

^g Tr(i)angula] *lectio incerta.*

2.2. Commentary

This letter sheds some additional light on the dynamics of the epistolary exchange between Dudith and Scholtz as until now the only recorded evidence of their correspondence was a letter from 1583, known only from Scholtz's edition²² which was published just recently in the final volume of *Epistulae*²³. The identification of this letter therefore provides not only a second known document pertaining to this exchange, but it also makes it possible to show its continuation in the following year and to infer that at least a parcel of letters must have been sent over the few months that separate both documents, something that the opening sentence of the letter hints at ("literas [...] uni fasciculo inclusas").

The document is also of great value to those who are engaged in reconstructing Dudith's social network and are interested in analysing various ways in which it overlapped and interlocked with other contemporary networks. This letter contains for instance a mention of a certain Orestes Catus (Oreste Cato, fl. 1578). He was never referred to in the seven volumes of *Epistulae*, yet the nature of this mention suggests a certain level of familiarity between Dudith, Scholtz and Catus (the latter being called "our [*scil.* 'their common'] friend". Additionally, the fact

²² *Epistolarum philosophicarum, medicinalium ac chymicarum volumen*, ed. L. Scholtz, Frankfurt am Main: Claude de Marne, Jean Aubry, 1598, col. 46–47.

²³ See Dudith, *Epistulae*, VII, no. 1166 (Dudith to Scholtz, 24 July 1583).

that Dudith served as intermediary in the exchange of letters between Scholtz and Catus shows that the latter, after obtaining a doctorate in medicine from Basel²⁴, moved across Central and Eastern Europe, which does not come as a surprise, given the history of his father Constantino, who was a religious exile²⁵. Although we know very little, if anything at all, about Catus's views, the very fact of this mention supplements the complex mosaic of two overlapping kinds of networks of intellectual exchange – those established by practicing physicians, including Scholz, Catus, Niccolò Bucella and Agostino Doni (both of whom served as physicians at the court of king Stephen Báthory of Poland²⁶), and the networks created by such heterodox thinkers as Dudith, Bucella, Giovanni Bonifacio d'Oria and possibly also Catus²⁷. A brief reference to “Doctor Carolus”, i.e. Karl Oslevius (1526–1584), whose letters to Scholtz and Dudith were attached to the document discussed above, shows once again the central position of the humanist in the Silesian network and his role as an information hub²⁸.

Two other mentions are also precious in the context of what we already know about Dudith's network as they bring references to two Silesian chronologers, Abraham Buchholzer of Freystadt (1529–1584) and Leonhard Krentzheim of Liegnitz (1532–1598)²⁹.

²⁴ Catus' dissertation was published as O. Catus, *De animae facultatibus partiumque, quibus incident munere et dignitate, theses*, Basel: Officina Brylingeriana, 1579; see also Basel, Universitätsbibliothek (hereafter UBB), AN II 4 (Rektoratsmatrikel der Universität Basel, Band 2 (1568–1653), fol. 26r [www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/list/one/ubb/AN-II-0004], and UBB, AN II 21 (Matricula Facultatis Medicinae II, 1570–1814), fol. 6r [www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/list/one/ubb/AN-II-0021].

²⁵ Cf. UBB, Frey-Gryn Mscr II 4, Nr 70, A. Doni to Th. Zwinger I, 13 June 1582 [doi.org/10.7891/e-manuscripta-11810]. Catus's connection to Lesser Poland is also confirmed by his dedicatory letter of 27 June 1579 addressed to Niccolò Bucella, see O. Catus, *De animae facultatibus*, sig. Av, as well as a trace of his last will preserved in Kraków, Archiwum Narodowe, fond 33 – Akta Miasta Krakowa, series I.1.1 – Inscriptioes, item 24 – Acta Scabinalia Cracoviensia 1588–1591, pp. 495–496.

²⁶ On Bucella see K. LEPSZY, *Buccella Mikołaj*, in: J. BROŻEK, F. CHWALCZEWSKI (eds.), *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, t. 3, Kraków 1937, pp. 74–75, on Doni see R. SUITNER, *Reformation, Naturalism, and Telesianism: The Case of Agostino Doni*, in: P.D. OMODEO (eds.), *Bernardino Telesio and the Natural Sciences in the Renaissance*, Leiden–Boston 2019, pp. 202–216.

²⁷ On the connections between Bonifacio, Dudith, and Catus see M. WELTI, *Giovanni Bernardino Bonifacio, marchese d'Oria im Exil 1557–1597: Eine Biographie und ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Philippismus*, Genève 1976, pp. 204–265. For a case study of cultural transfer mediated by the medical network of Catus see A. LESZCZYŃSKA, *Emanuel Wurstisen, His Tablature and Links to Poland: Lute Music with Medicine in the Background*, *Muzyka* LXV 2020, pp. 3–24, here at 11–12.

²⁸ One of these letters could be from K. Oslevius to Scholtz, 22 April 1584, published in *Consiliorum et epistolarum medicinalium Ioannis Cratonis a Krafftheim [...] liber tertius*, Frankfurt am Main: Claude de Marne and Jean Aubry, 1592, pp. 414–420 [www.aerztebriefe.de/id/00020410]; the letter was sent from Prague so it's quite plausible that it could have reached Breslau by the end of the month and could have been enclosed in Dudith's letter.

²⁹ For other references to Buchholzer in Dudith's known correspondence see *Epistulae*, VII, no. 1166. Dudith to Scholtz, 24 July 1583 (greetings for Buchholzer) and no. 1178, Dudith to T. Hájek, 14

In the context of Buchholzer, Catus' name appears once again, as Dudith mentions that the Italian sent a chronological inquiry of some sort, now most likely lost, to the author of *Isagoge chronologica*. It seems that letters of this kind, formulated out of curiosity or for scholarly reasons, happened to reach Buchholzer from time to time³⁰. Unfortunately, we know very little about Catus's question and the reasons behind it, and – as Dudith's letter suggests – it was probably too late for Buchholzer to prepare a reply as his health deteriorated significantly and he passed away less than two months later, on the 14th of June. In terms of social networks, this letter operates on two levels: firstly, it simply addresses one of Buchholzer's local colleagues or friends who could be approached more easily than the chronologer. On the other level, however, it also seeks some kind of information about the medical condition of the Freystadt-based scholar, which might be of some further use to Dudith and his circle.

Krentzheim, Superintendent of the Duchy of Liegnitz and Brieg and yet another chronologer in this set of epistolary fragments, is referred to as a possible source of help in benefitting from Buchholzer's expertise or finding an alternative source to whom Catus could turn if Buchholzer's condition proved to be too poor. Although the corpus of letters sent to and by Leonhard Krentzheim is significantly larger than that of Buchholzer and includes over 100 documents, no letter from Cato could be identified until now, so it's quite unlikely that Cato received the reply he was hoping for.

The letter also shows the way certain texts circulated within the epistolary network co-created by Dudith. Here the heterodox humanist referred to “*de thermis scriptum*”, which most likely denotes a description of the hot springs in Bad Warmbrunn near Hirschberg (now Cieplice, a district of Jelenia Góra) written by Caspar Hoffman (1529–1584), a copy of which can also be found in Scholtz's collection of epistolary apographa and which was edited by him in the first volume of *consilia medica*³¹. Finally, a brief postscript in Scholtz's copy, squeezed

December 1583 (on Buchholzer's critique of Scaliger – now lost – and the anticipated death of the Freystadt chronologer due to his serious health condition). For references to Krentzheim see *Epistulae*, VI, no. 1021, Dudith to P. Monau, 7 October 1580 (an unknown controversy between Krentzheim and Paul Wittich) and VII, no. 1224, Dudith to Johann Sithius, 28 December 1584 (on Dudith's connection with Krentzheim, mediated by Sithius, and theological controversies).

³⁰ Buchholzer's correspondence offers at least one example of a letter written as an elaborate reply to a chronological inquiry, it is a *sine anno* letter of July 20, which was sent to Jakob Monau, allowing him to either pass it on to Beza or paraphrase it in Monau's own words. The letter was edited in Beza, *Correspondance*, T. XLII, pp. 137–147 (Addendum XII to vol. XXIV), yet interestingly, the edition is based on an apograph in Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, MS 1458, fol. 288v–291v, and not the original in Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, Chart. A 404, fol. 267r–268v.

³¹ Cf. BUWr, rkps M 1039, fols 8r–12v and L. Scholtz (ed.), *Consiliorum et epistolarum medicinalium Ioannis Cratonis a Krafftheim [...] liber primus*, Frankfurt am Main: Claude de Marne and Jean Aubry, 1591, pp. 240–258; in both versions the text is dated 15 June 1569 and bears a dedication to Paul

between Dudith's signature and the beginning of another letter in the series, shows Dudith asking about Wenceslaus Raphanus, yet another correspondent of his, and this time in a context that is rather typical of Dudith's exchanges with Johannes Praetorius. Apparently Raphanus was somehow involved in the Breslau humanist's efforts to publish Praetorius's works on geometry and a lack of information from Praetorius forced Dudith to ask Scholtz about possible hints.

3. DUDITH'S ENTRY IN THE *ALBUM AMICORUM* OF ADAM AND JAN ČEJKA

Of the four sources discussed here, the last two may be the most unusual. The Library of the National Museum in Prague (Knihovna Národního muzea, hereafter KNM) has in its holdings under shelfmark VIII C 9 a composite volume, bound in recycled medieval parchment over cardboard, which previously belonged to Bartholomäus Schwalb (1551–1605), a physician based in Glogau (now Głogów). Among the prints included in the volume are Abraham Buchholzer's *Isagoge chronologica*, Reiner Reinecke's *Oratio de historia*, and a few other, less significant titles. The printed matter is however surrounded and interwoven with additional quires of paper which contain various original documents and their apographa³². Among these handwritten materials, there is a hitherto unrecorded and previously misattributed autograph letter from Abraham Buchholzer to Schwalbius³³, followed by a copy of *Idyllium patria* by Kaspar Peucer, fragments of other documents pertaining to the political life of Central Europe at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and a block of 26 pages, written upside down and therefore even given a parallel foliation by the library staff³⁴. This portion of the material brings two items related to Dudith

Luther (1533–1593), son of Martin. (1533–1593), son of Martin and physician of the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony. Curiously, due to the belated and posthumous publication of his work in 1590s, Caspar Hoffman, who actually authored this treatise, is occasionally confused with his namesake (1572–1648), who was teaching medicine at Altdorf. This confusion dates back as far as to the seventeenth century, cf. J.A. van der Linden, *De scriptis medicis libri duo*, Amsterdam: Jan Blaeu, 1662, p. 191, where the dissertation on hot springs ("De Thermis Hirsbergensibus liber. Extat cum Consiliis et Epistolis Io. Cratonis, Francofurti] apud haeredes Andreae Wecheli, 1591, in 8") is enumerated alongside works by the other Hoffman, which date deep into the 17th century.

³² For a characteristic of this *Sammelband* see F.M. BARTOŠ, *Soupis rukopisů Národního muzea v Praze*, vol. II, Praha 1927, p. 71.

³³ I intend to discuss this letter on another occasion. For now, it is worth noting that it provides the second known evidence of epistolary ties between the two men, the other being a copy, in Scholtz's hand, of a letter from 1 June 1584 Schwalbius to Buchholzer, which has been included in MS BUWr, M 1039, in the same way as the letter from Dudith to Scholtz discussed above.

³⁴ According to the continuous foliation, this part of the volume is to be found on fols. 343–364. The text can be read only when the volume is turned upside down and the folios should be read in the following order 1r–v = 364v–r, 2r–v = 363v–r, etc.

and Theodore de Bèze, i.e. copies (in an unknown hand) of two entries from the *liber amicorum* of Adam and Jan Čejka of Olbramovice, two brothers and descendants of a noble family dating back to the 13th century³⁵, who apparently visited Breslau where they met Dudith and at some point also went to Geneva to meet Theodore de Bèze.

The dating of these entries is slightly confusing as the heading reads as follows: “1589. Andreas Dudith on Girolamo Savonarola” (and this is most likely an addition by the scribe, perhaps Schwalbius, dating the act of making the very copy in question) while the subscription offers an earlier date, i.e. 14 September 1581 (with the last cipher written in such a hesitant way that could be also read as “5”). The reading of “1581” becomes justified when one juxtaposes this text with a piece of evidence known to scholars since the publication of J.F.A. Gillet’s two-volume study of Crato’s circle of learned friends. In it, Gillet edited the same text, but using a different witness, i.e. a copy by an unknown seventeenth-century hand which was inserted into a larger collection of Dudithiana, a volume which is now preserved in the Depot Breslau collection at Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin³⁶. The Berlin copy has its own tradition, as in the Wrocław University Library there is a mid-eighteenth century apograph made by the local historian Samuel Beniamin Klose³⁷, yet this copy only confirms what can be found in the Berlin manuscript and thus plays a secondary role. What is curious is that these two variants of a relatively short text provide different information to the reader as the Berlin witness mentions only vaguely Dudith’s “dearest friends” (*amicis-simi*) as being the recipients of this entry, while the text from Prague clearly indicates Jan and Adam Čejka. This difference allows one to assume that the copy in Berlin might have been made using Dudith’s autograph, perhaps a draft of the entry, which did not contain information about the owner(s) of this specific *album*. On the other hand, the person who copied the text into the Prague codex must have had access to the autograph in the *Stammbuch*.

Both variants are 333 words in length and a slightly longer *locus* in the Berlin manuscript is compensated for with an omission in another part of the text. It

³⁵ See J. HALADA, *Lexikon české šlechty (erby, fakta, osobnosti, sídla a zajímavosti)*, Praha 1992, pp. 36–37. Very little can be said about Adam Čejka (d. 1597) and the path of his career, most likely cut short by his premature death, but his brother Jan (1565/1566–1623) pursued a state career and in the early seventeenth century he was performing his duties as *Summus Notarius* and *Defensor* of the Margraviate of Moravia.

³⁶ J.F.A. GILLET, *Crato von Crafftheim und seine Freunde: Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte*, Th. 1–2, Frankfurt am Main 1860, here Th. 2, Anhang Nr. 81 (pp. 553–554); this text was reprinted after Gillet’s transcription in D. CANTIMORI, *Umanesimo e religione nel Rinascimento*, Torino 1975, pp. 120–121, n. 28 without acknowledging the relocation of the manuscript to Berlin. Before WWII the codex was known as Breslau, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. R 253 and GILLET refers to it as Ms. R XI, as the eleventh volume in a collection of early modern letters from the Rehdiger library.

³⁷ On his scholarly workshop and oeuvre see L. HARC, *Samuel Beniamin Klose (1730–1798): Studium historiograficzno-źródłoznawcze*, Wrocław 2002.

is somewhat peculiar that the Prague witness at the same time offers spelling closer to classical Latin (i.e. *authoritas* and *oboedientia* instead of *autoritas* and *obedientia* in the Berlin MS), and yet subsequently misspells the last name of the Italian monk. This inconsistency makes it impossible to decide which text is closer to the original as it would require a thorough analysis of Dudith's spelling customs based not on the printed editions but on manuscripts. The most intriguing difference, however, lies in the fact that the final inscription in the *Stammbuch* (unlike the hypothetical authorial draft or variant used by the author of the Berlin copy) does not contain a reference to Jan Hus, and instead offers a mention about harmonies.

The other entry is undated, so locating it precisely on the timelines of Beza and the Čejkas would require some additional information from either side, which at the moment seems to be unavailable³⁸. While *libri amicorum* are often treated as difficult-to-overestimate sources in provenance research, here, paradoxically, it was provenance research related to the reception of works authored by Abraham Buchholzer that has led to the identification of the fragments of a lost *Stammbuch*³⁹.

In what follows, I shall make an attempt to reconstruct the hybrid, textual, visual and ideological entity, that was, either physically or virtually, created by the woodblock portrait of Savonarola, texts by Beza and Marcantonio Flaminio (the latter embedded within Beza's brief narrative) and Dudith's inscription inspired by these elements. Since the epigrammatic inscription by Beza is closely tied to the Prague copy of Dudith's text, I will also include a brief edition of the poem in this section.

3.1. Text: Savonarola – Beza – Dudith

(i) Portrait of Girolamo Savonarola

Source: Théodore de Bèze, *Icones, id est verae imagines virorum doctrina simul et pietate illustrium*, Genève: Jean Laon, 1580, sig. B_{iii}v, author unknown⁴⁰

(ii) Beza on Savonarola

Source: Théodore de Bèze, *Icones* [...], sig. B_{iii}r = ed.

³⁸ For an overview of the *album amicorum* tradition in the context of the Bohemian lands see M. RYANTOVÁ, *Památníky aneb štambuchy, to jest alba amicorum. Kulturně historický fenomén raného novověku*, České Budějovice 2007.

³⁹ Cf. C. COPPENS, *An Album Amicorum as a Source of Provenance*, *Bibliologia* V 2010, pp. 107–125.

⁴⁰ For a digital copy see doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-6395.

Hieronymus Savonarola Italus Florentinus, concionator,
ex Dominicanorum Ordine

Quis vero non miretur tam miseris temporibus tantam in homine cucullato, et quidem sub Dominici, professi iam olim piorum hostis, nomine, pietatem tanto cum zelo coniunctam, quanta haec in te, Hieronyme Savonarola, extitisse plurima tua scripta testantur? Sed et ipsa mors tibi laudatissimae vitae testimonium^a tribuit, teque facile ab obiectis criminibus falsissimis absoluit, siquidem homini tam perditae scelerato quam fuit Alexander ille Borgia, Romanus eius nomine Pontifex VI, usque adeo displicuisse, ut non nisi te indignissime damnato et cremato quiescere potuerit, maximum esse videtur singularis tuae pietatis argumentum, quam merito postea Marcus Antonius Flaminius, excellentissimus poeta, versibus istis optimis celebravit:

Dum fera, flamma tuos, Hieronyme, pascitur artus,
Religio sanctas dilaniata comas,
Flevit et o, dixit, crudeles, parcite flammae,
Parcite, sunt isto viscera nostra rogo.

Strangulatus est ac postea crematus Florentiae, postulatu Pontificis Alexandri VI, maximo cum bonorum civium luctu, anno Domini MCCCCXCVIII^b.

TEXTUAL NOTES

^a vitae testimonium] *corr. ex vitaet estimonium in ed.*

^b MCCCCXCVIII] CIO CCCC XCVIII *ed.*

(iii) *Dudith on (Beza on) Savonarola*

Sources:

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Depot Breslau, 11, Nr. 69 (= fol. 40r–v) = *B*

Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, VIII C 9, fols 360r–359v (= 9v–10r) = *P*

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, rkps Kl. 169 (*olim* Akc. 1949/594), fol. 57r–v = *W*

Hieronymum^a Savonarolam^b doctum, ut eius monumenta ostendunt, Philosophum^c et Theologum, qui suis martyribus annumerant, non videntur^d meminisse, quibus ille de rebus accusatus, convictus, damnatus, exustus denique fuerit. Repetant id ex eius concionibus, ex historiis, ex Ambrosii Catharini Episcopi, eiusdem sectae Dominicani, ex Thomae Nerii Florentini, Dominicani item, libris de huius monachi vita, doctrina, morte copiose scriptis. Intelligent eum Romanae et Pontificiae religionis propugnatorem acerrimum religiosissimumque fuisse neque ullius unquam haereseos, ut illi vocant, suspicione laborasse neque quicquam in eo aliud a Romana Ecclesia reprehensum ac vindicibus flammis punitum fuisse, quam quod seditionis concionibus et confictis vaticiniis, quae ex primariis Senatoribus earumque uxoribus hauriebat, Rempubicam

Florentinam, magnis tum factionibus misere conflictatam, totam denique Italiam turbaret, tum quod excommunicationis non eam, quam Pontifex volebat, rationem duceret, sed obedientia^e abiecta muneris sui oblitus, falce in alienam messem iniecta^f (ut hoc genus solet) contra stimulum calcitraret. Multa ille arcana, ut erat cautus et curiosus, ex illorum, quos dixi, Primariorum, qui Rempublicam gerebant, confessionibus^g religiosis discebat; quae postea ad populum artificiose concinnata tanquam a Spiritu sancto sibi divinitus patefacta pro revelationibus Prophetis^h venditabat. Quae cum non raro eventus comprobasset, tantam Prophetarumⁱ et divinitatis auctoritatem^j consecutus^k fuit, tantum sectatorum numerum habuit, ut iam Principibus ipsis metuendus esset. Itaque non ob religionem, sed ne omnia sursum deorsum ferret communemque tranquillitatem convelleret, e vivis sublatus est. Quare eximenda est Evangelicis Ecclesiis (hoc enim nomine a Pontificia dissentientes vocantur) falsa de Savonarolae^k sententia opinio, ne pro suo cive ac Martyre eum habeant, cuius doctrina^l omnis Romanae Ecclesiae dogmatibus consentanea fuit. Ne in Husso quidem cum harum^m, quas dixi, Ecclesiarum placitis consentientem doctrinam invenient, qui eius libros diligenter evolvent. Itaque hunc quoqueⁿ eximant ex suis martyrologiis, ne hostibus suis obtrectandi ansam praebeant. Non eget his adminiculis vera religio neque eius a Martyrum copia pendet auctoritas^o; quorum est maior in aliis sectis (quibus tamen veritatis fidem abrogamus) et longe numerosior multitudo. Si vincere volumus, non martyrum^p qualiumcunque numerum in aciem producemus, sed veritatem Christi, Prophetarum et Apostolorum doctrina stipatam pro inexpugnabili propugnaculo hostibus obiiciemus^r.

TEXTUAL NOTES

^a Hieronymum] Andreas Dudithius adscripsit ad Elogium Bezae de Hieronymo Savonarola *ins. sup. BW* | Anno 1589 Andreas Dudithius de Hieronymo Savonarola *sic ins. sup. P*

^b Savonarolam] Savanorolam *sic P*

^c Philosophum] φυμ *P*

^d videntur] verentur *P*

^e obedientia] oboedientia *P*

^f iniecta] \in/abiecta *W*

^g confessionibus] consessionibus *P*

^h Prophetarum] prophetarum *P*

ⁱ auctoritatem] authoritatem *P*

^j consecutus] consequutus *P*

^k Savonarolae] Savanorolae *sic P*

^l doctrina] doctrinae *P*

^m Ne in Husso quidem cum harum] Nec cum Harmoniis *P*

ⁿ quoque] *om. P*

^o auctoritas] authoritas *P*

^p martyrum] martyrumque *P*

^r obiiciemus] Haec Vratislaviae 14 Sept. 81^o amicissimis suis scribebat Andreas Dudithius *ins. inf. BW* | Scripta ad effigiem Savonarolae [*sic*], quae in Iconibus Beza<e> [*sic*] habetur, in libro nobilium Adami et Johannis fratrum Czeykionem ab Olbramowicz. Wratislaviae, anno 1581 [vel 1585, *lectio incerta*], 14 Septembris *ins. inf. P*

3.2. Text: *Beza's entry in the album amicorum*

Source: Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, VIII C 9, fol. 359v (= 10r) = *ms.*

^a Salvete aeternum concordi pectore fratres^a
 Patria quos eadem iunxit idemque genus
 Quos itidem nectunt pariter pietasque fidesque
 Quos Christi certo faedere vinxit amor
 Et patrias salvi rursus rideatis in oras
 Qui vos iunxit, vos quoque servet amor.

TEXTUAL NOTE

^a Salvete ... fratres] Eidem libro Theodorus Beza manu propria hac inseruit *supra ins.* *ms.*

3.3. Commentary

The entry attributed to Dudith is a bit surprising as it does not offer a standard, polite and at the same time lofty inscription made in the spirit of conviviality and a shared affirmation of scholarly virtues or a sense of belonging to the same religious or social community, which is a typical feature of many other inscriptions from that period. What it offers instead is a brief meditation upon the effigy of Girolamo Savonarola and Beza's commentary, both published in the latter's *Icones* just a few years earlier.

The scarcity of information available allows one to put forward at least three hypotheses on what the original *Stammbuch* of the Čejkas might have looked like:

- (1) It could have been an inter-foliated copy of Beza's *Icones*, which would have been made by the bookbinder with the intention that the blank pages would inspire the prospective authors of inscriptions not only to enter a conventional quotation and their signature, but also to refer somehow to the *icon* of their choice⁴¹;

⁴¹ I do not know an example of a similar practice with Beza's *Icones*, but a very close case can be observed in MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Rothschild 3370 (2522f), which is an interfoliated *Sammelband* of the *Icones sive imagines vivae* by Nicolaus Reusner and *Icones aliquot clarorum virorum* by Theodor Zwinger (both Basel: Konrad Waldkirch, 1589) that contains a very rich *album amicorum* by Johann Lange of Liegnitz. What is characteristic is that the order of entries is far from chronological and it seems that at least in some of the cases the placement of the inscription in the vicinity of a certain *icon* was not accidental. For a detailed analysis of an early modern Silesian album made of an interfoliated print, now preserved in Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS Berol. Alba amicorum 1 see A. SZCZEPANIEC, *Adam von Gruttschreiber's Album Amicorum: An Unknown Source for the History of Culture in Silesia in the Latter Half of the 16th and Early 17th Centuries*, Polish Libraries IX 2021, pp. 24–78.

- (2) The *liber* might have been a typical blank notebook, but the inscription by Dudith could have been accompanied by the illustration (or illustration and text) cut out from the *Icones* and pasted into the album;
- (3) Dudith's inscription was the only element in the *Stammbuch* and it encouraged the reader either to recall the effigy and Beza's printed commentary from memory or to consult a physical copy of the book⁴².

Regardless of the way this has been solved on the level of the materiality of the *liber amicorum*, Dudith's inscription implies an intriguing, semi- or quasi-emblematic three-element relation between the woodblock portrait of Savonarola, a brief commentary published by Beza, and Dudith's response based on the previous two elements. In this respect, this structure seems not only to be more sophisticated than other inscriptions left by Dudith⁴³, but also up to a point echoes the trilateral structure of an early modern emblem, with a caveat that instead of a traditional *lemma* followed by *subscriptio*, there are in fact two subscriptions, but their mutual relations seem to be similar to more "orthodox" examples of this poetical genre.

In Beza's *Icones* Savonarola's effigy is squeezed between entries dedicated to Jan Hus and Hieronymus of Prague as well as Johann Reuchlin. The overarching aim of this assembly of effigies and short commentaries was to present a gallery of defenders of true faith (as opposed to the Satanic forces frequently associated with the institutional Church of Rome), and Dudith choose to strengthen this tendency even further by emphasising the martyrdom of Savonarola and the opposition between the truth of the Gospel of Christ and the doctrine of the Church⁴⁴. Contrary to Beza, however, Dudith was not keen to include the Dominican into the pantheon of reformers, as he maintained that despite the circumstances of his

⁴² For a magisterial account of the broad and complex phenomenon of *libri amicorum* up until the 18th century see W.W. SCHNABEL, *Das Stammbuch: Konstitution und Geschichte einer textsortenbezogenen Sammelform bis ins erste Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen 2003, on the material aspect of these objects see pp. 122–149. See also W. LUDWIG, *Stammbücher vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert Kontinuität und Verbreitung des Humanismus*, Hildesheim 2012.

⁴³ For instance, Dudith once made an inscription in an interleaved copy of Johannes Sambucus *Emblemata* (Antwerp: Officina Plantiniana, 1564), which was used as an *album amicorum* in the early 1580s by Jan Zborowski, castellan of Gniezno and brother of Dudith's second wife, Elżbieta. The volume, preserved as MS Kórník, Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1513, contains Dudith's entry on fol. 50r (which faces p. 38 of the print, containing an emblem dedicated to Dudith by Sambucus), has an epigrammatic form, and is significantly smaller than that from the *Stammbuch* of the Čejka brothers.

⁴⁴ In this spirit, Dudith's entry, if perceived not only as a gesture of courtesy towards two noblemen, but also a reader's response to the text, seems to be a perfect illustration of the auctorial intentions behind the entire cycle of *Icones*, which were based on the instrumentalisation of historical knowledge in the service of the Reformation; on this see M. YARDENI, *Eruditio Ancilla Reformationis: Theodore Beza and the Uses of History in the Icones*, in: A. BEN-TOV, Y. DEUTSCH, T. HERZIG (eds.) *Knowledge and Religion in Early Modern Europe: Studies in Honor of Michael Heyd*, Leiden–Boston 2013, pp. 13–23, see also D. CANTIMORI, *op.cit.* (n. 36), pp. 112–126.

death, his views were in line with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, which, according to the humanist, were already a corrupted version of the original faith of the primitive Church. Lastly, using the Florentine thinker and leader seems particularly meaningful in light of the fact that in his correspondence Dudith referred to the Dominican reformer and theocrat in the context of his involvement in the discussion over the legitimacy of astrology⁴⁵.

Curiously, there is yet another albeit indirect connection between this entry in a book authored by Beza and Dudith's exploration of the territories of heterodoxy. At some point the humanist acquired a work by the Genevan theologian on the heretics punished by the civil authorities. This copy, which was – by Dudith's standards – relatively densely annotated by him, bears clear signs of the humanist's interest in determining what was heresy and what was blasphemy and how these two concepts were related to the principles of the primitive early Church and the teachings of the Gospels⁴⁶. Taking the rise and fall of Savonarola as a point of departure for his reflection in the *Stammbuch* is thus based on a similar approach, i.e. using historical material as a mirror for one's theological views and actions related to the religious community.

In the Prague *Sammelband*, the apograph of Dudith's lengthy entry is immediately followed by a copy of the inscription made by Beza. To the best of my knowledge, this entry has not been recorded by the editors of the *Correspondance*⁴⁷, nor was it mentioned in the broadest to-date account of Beza's presence in various *Stammbücher*⁴⁸. Although certain pieces of epigrammatic poetry of the Genevan humanist were published during his lifetime, the six-line piece from Prague was not included in this early collection⁴⁹. While Dudith's entry gives us a precise date and location under which the inscription was made, the six verses attributed to Beza are only preceded by a heading

⁴⁵ See, e.g. Dudith, *Epistulae*, P. VI, no. 1013, Dudith to T. Hájek, 3 August 1580: "Id ego si post veteres non paucos sapientes viros: post Iohannem et Franciscum Picos, post Savonarolam, theologum illum praestantem, post Erastum, post alios, quos nominare omnes longum sit, summos homines, multis ratiocinationibus ostendere coner, putidus atque ineptus sim et arrogantiae reprehensionem non effugiam".

⁴⁶ Cf. T. Beza, *De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis libellus*, Genève: Robert Estienne, 1554, Dudith's annotated copy in Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, shelfmark Theol.ev.dogm.1099.s.misc.2 [digital copy: digital.slub-dresden.de/id1832646238], see J. JANKOVICS, I. MONOK, *Dudith András könyvtára: Részleges rekonstrukció*, Szeged 1993, no. 36, coll. 2.

⁴⁷ For the edited entries in *libri amicorum* see Beza, *Correspondance*, T. XXVII, ann. IV, p. 233; T. XXII, ann. V, p. 215; T. XXXV, ann. 2, p. 207.

⁴⁸ J.L.R. LEEDEGANG-KEGSTRA, *La présence de Théodore de Bèze dans les Albums Amicorum (1559–1605)*, Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français CLV 2009, pp. 421–446.

⁴⁹ Cf. T. Beza, *Poemata varia*, Genève: Henri Estienne, 1597.

suggesting that the *liber amicorum* contained an autograph. This opens some space for speculation in at least two areas:

- (1) The way the original inscription looked and possible reasons for the omission of metadata in the apograph (we do not even know if the entry by Beza is chronologically earlier or later than the 1585 entry by Dudith).
- (2) What was the criterion of authenticity used by the anonymous apograph in relation to Beza's epigram? Since we do not know if the copy presents the complete text of the inscription, we also do not know if it contained Beza's signature with the letter "Z" so characteristic that it was even imitated by those who copied his letters⁵⁰.

Again, regardless of the identity of the copyist of the KNM codex, the epigram is typical evidence of "pilgrimages" of Eastern- and Central-European members of the nobility and aspiring scholars to the luminaries of intellectual and religious life. It documents one of a long series of such encounters yet in the light of further evidence of contacts between the Czech noblemen and the intellectual circles of Geneva, it is nearly impossible to formulate more complex hypotheses.

CONCLUSION

Even with such fragmentary sources as those presented above, the general image of Dudith's network can be improved and supplemented with some new facts and names. Although the documents in question constitute only a very small fraction of what is now known as the humanist's epistolary corpus, they are indispensable sources of information about contacts that Dudith established in the 1580s which have not been confirmed in the already published letters. They also shed additional light on well-established connections, such as those with Raphanus and Oslevius, and show how these were used in the process of facilitating the circulation of information between various social milieux and locations like the circles of Dudith in Breslau and of Scholtz in Freystadt, as well as those of Oslevius in Prague and Bucella in Kraków. One should also remember that epistolary exchange was often interwoven with personal contacts between two correspondents, which seems to be the case of Dudith and Scholtz.

These bits and pieces cannot be overestimated in the context of networks less exposed by those of Dudith and Beza. The survival rate of letters sent by and to Buchholzer, Krentzheim and Scultetus is relatively low and despite the richness of printed materials for the first two scholars and clergymen and manuscript sources for the Görlitz astronomer, it makes it difficult to reconstruct the process

⁵⁰ Cf. apographic "signatures" in one of the most important collections of Beza's letters, Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, MS 1455, *Epistolae haereticorum*, vol. 2, fols 15r, 16r, 17v etc.

by which they formulated their ideas and the broader context in which they functioned. Every piece of reference, even if it is a supposition on one's death as was the case of Dudith writing about Buchholzer, is therefore of great value.

This dynamic of exchange is supplemented by the information that can be inferred from the entry in the *Stammbuch* of the Čejka brothers and it operates on at least two levels. Firstly, in combination with other entries in Dudith's hand that can be identified in other *alba amicorum*, it allows one to produce even more precise image of his social network, even if encounters testified by the inscriptions were of a one-off or short-term character, and did not find continuation in the form of correspondence or further personal meetings. This argument also remains valid for the material pertaining to Beza. Secondly, such elaborate entries as the one on Savonarola may also show the way certain ideas formulated within the walls of one's *studiolo* or in a closed circle of friends were propagated further and shaped in various, sometimes highly ephemeral ways. By the early 1580s Dudith was certainly self-aware of his heterodox (for others: heretical) position so his reflection, confirmed by the notes in the 1564 work by Beza, finds a serendipitous extension in an entry that parasitically dwelled on the text prepared by the Genevan theologian and creator of an immense network of correspondents that also happened to overlap in many areas with that of Andreas Dudith⁵¹.

Faculty of 'Artes Liberales'
University of Warsaw

⁵¹ Apart from the most obvious element in this field, i.e. the direct exchange between Dudith and Beza, documented in the *Epistulae* of the former and *Correspondance* of the latter, one of the key connectors is Jakob Monau. Still, both epistolary corpora, albeit well documented and researched, require further analysis from the standpoint of network studies, cf. P.P. ASPAAS *et al.*, *Networking the Republic of Letters*, in: HOTSON, WALLNIG (see above, n. 4), pp. 399–416. For an analysis of a later case see H. HOTSON, *Highways of light to the invisible college: Linking data on the seventeenth-century intellectual diasporas*, *Intellectual History Review* XXVI 2016, pp. 71–80.

‘FATHER OF THE PEOPLE’: THE ANCIENT ROMAN METAPHOR FOR THE RULER IN MEDIEVAL ICELANDIC CONTEXTS¹

by

GRZEGORZ BARTUSIK

ABSTRACT: The aim of this paper is to analyse the reception of the metaphor of ‘the ruler as father of the people’ and ‘the people as family’, a conceptual metaphor specific to the culture of ancient Rome, in both the vernacular and Latin literature within the medieval Nordic region, particularly as found in translations of classical literature into Old Icelandic. Its dissemination within the local Latin and vernacular literature can be used as a marker for Latinisation in Nordic Europe to help determine when, and to what extent, the local intellectual elites started thinking in Latin categories. For this purpose, I examine the resemantisation, namely the creation of new meaning in a changed context, of this metaphor in the Nordic region after Christianisation in order to determine the understanding of the concept of power relations between a ruler (state), the subjects (citizens), and the territory.

Iceland was settled between ca. AD 870 and AD 930 primarily by Norwegians. At the turn of the tenth and eleventh centuries, the Norsemen accepted Christianity and Church structures were gradually established in Nordic Europe, followed by educational institutions, libraries, and scriptoria, as well as cathedral and monastic schools providing a Latin-based education, the *trivium* of Latin grammar, logic, and rhetoric.

Between the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the first bishoprics in Norway were erected at Niðaróss, Selje/Bergen, Oslo (1068), Stavanger, and Hamar (1152). In Iceland, the first episcopal sees were established at Skálholt (1056) and Hólar (1106). They were initially under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen, later that of Lund in the Kingdom of Denmark (1103/4) and finally Niðaróss (1153), after it had been elevated to the status of an archbishopric. In the twelfth century, the first Benedictine and Augustinian monasteries were founded: in Norway, on the islands of Selja and Nidarholm, and at

¹ This article is part of a research project entitled *Dissemination of the Latin Conceptual Metaphors in Old Norse–Icelandic literature as a Cognitive Manifestation of the Christianisation and Europeanisation of Mediaeval Scandinavia*, funded by the National Science Centre, Poland (grant no. 2017/27/N/HS3/00740).

Munkeliv, on the Nordnes peninsula; in Iceland, at Þingeyrar (1133), Þykkvibær (1133), Munkaþverá (1155), Flatey-Helgafell (1172), and Kirkjubær (1186).

Education in Latin was available in Norway in the middle of the twelfth century in Niðaróss, Oslo, Bergen, and Hamar (ca. 1152/1153), and later also in Stavanger (after 1260); in Iceland in the early twelfth century it came to cathedral schools in Skálholt (established by 1100) and Hólar (founded by Bishop Jón Ögmundarson shortly after 1106), to schools at church-farms in Vellir, Oddi, and Haukadalr, and in monasteries in Þingeyrar, Þykkvibær, Kirkjubær, Helgafell, and Munkaþverá.

The works of ancient Roman literature used for the teaching of Latin in the cathedral and monastic schools in Norway and Iceland most probably included Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Sallust's *De bello Iugurthino* and *De coniuratione Catilinae*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (alternatively *Heroides*, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, or *Ars amatoria*), Vergil's *Aeneis* and *Eclogae*, Horace's *Carmina*, the anonymous *Ilias Latina*, *De excidio Troiae*, *Disticha Catonis*, and the grammatical works of Priscian and Aelius Donatus².

Literary production in Latin and the vernacular began in the monastic scriptoria in Norway and Iceland in the early twelfth century. Along with hagiographies and royal chronicles in Latin and Old Norse (the anonymous *Historia Norvegie*, *Historia de antiquitate regum Norwagiensium* by Theodoricus Monachus, and the Norse-Icelandic kings' sagas), the oldest prose works are translations from Latin into Old Icelandic of classical literature on the history of the ancient world: *Rómverja saga* (Story of the Romans, ca. 1180), *Trójumanna saga* (Story of the Trojans, ca. 1200), *Gyðinga saga* (Story of the Jews, ca. 1260), and *Alexanders saga* (Story of Alexander the Great, ca. 1260). Compiled together with the Old Icelandic translation of the Pentateuch and historical books of the Old Testament (*Stjórn*, dated to the early fourteenth century) into compendia of universal history (e.g. in the AM 225 fol. and AM 226 fol. manuscripts, produced around 1350–1360 in the monastery at Helgafell in Iceland), they were probably used as history textbooks³.

It is possible to observe the consequential influence of Latin culture in medieval Scandinavia and Iceland, reinforced by classical education, as well as their literary production and consumption, on the micro-scale of language. Absent from the conceptual world of Old Norse, the paternal and familial metaphors for ruler and ruled were culturally transferred from Latin to Old Norse-Icelandic after the

² See LEHMANN 1937: II, 10–21; and G. JENSSON, A.M.K. MARNER, ISLANDIA LATINA: An online database project gathering information on Latin authors, texts and manuscripts known and used in medieval Iceland: islandialatina.hum.ku.dk.

³ See the manuscripts AM 225 fol. and AM 226 fol. in the digital library of manuscripts of the Arnarnagnæan Manuscript Collection (Den Arnarnagnæanske Samling) in Copenhagen and the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies in Reykjavík, online: handrit.is.

Scandinavians and Icelanders were Christianised and Europeanised⁴. With the introduction of a Latin-based education, patriarchal metaphors started to appear in the local literature as a loan translation from Latin, in both Latin and the vernaculars, and were adopted into the local language and literature by extending the semantic spectrum of the vernacular terminology for the family into the political dimension.

Language, texts, and books played a key role in the creation, distribution, and maintenance of social institutions and power relations inherent to the processes of Christianisation and Europeanisation, namely the religious and educational institutions of the Catholic Church and the administrative apparatus of a centralised monarchical state.

However, since only a limited number of classical texts were accessible in medieval Scandinavia and Iceland, the reception of the concepts of *patria* and *pater patriae* was restricted, and therefore their range of meanings was constrained⁵. In Latin texts originating from Scandinavia⁶, according to Erik LÖNNROTH⁷, the distinct meanings of the term *patria* are threefold: 1) one's country of origin, 2) Heaven as a reward for a godly life (*patria caelestis*)⁸, and 3) the people's rights (*leges patriae*) against the power of the king, as can be seen in the following examples. There is a passage in *Vita S. Erics* (thirteenth century⁹), describing the just

⁴ On the conceptual metaphor of 'the ruler as father of the people' and 'the people as family', see LAKOFF 2002: 65–142, 153–161. On the linguistic realizations of the paternal and familial metaphor in Latin see *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, s.v. *patria*, *terra patria*, *patria civitatis*, *patria communis*, *patria naturae*, *patria propria*, *amor patriae*, *caritas patriae*, *pietas erga patriam*, *pater patriae*, *parens patriae*, *patres conscripti*, *patres senatores*, *auctoritas patrum*, *patricii*, *patriatus*, *patrocinium*, *patronatus*, *patronus*.

⁵ On the concepts of *patria* and *pater patriae* in ancient Roman literature see: ALFÖLDI 1971.

⁶ The linguistic material from the medieval Latin literature of Nordic countries presented here is extracted from *The Digital Corpus and Dictionary of Norwegian Medieval Latin*: www.nb.no/forskning/medieval-latin. In the absence of a comprehensive linguistic corpus, the medieval Latin and vernacular linguistic material from Denmark, Sweden, and Iceland examined in this article comes from literature which I have investigated myself, and from dictionaries of Old Icelandic: primarily the electronic version of *The Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*: onp.ku.dk. *ONP* is also my main point of reference for the dating of Scandinavian manuscripts in this article.

⁷ LÖNNROTH 1959: 275.

⁸ The Christian understanding of *patria* was strongly impacted by the Pauline and Augustinian notion of citizenship of Heaven (*civitas caelestis*, *civitas Dei*, *civitas sanctorum*). In Christian Latin, the terms *patria caelestis* (celestial fatherland), *patria superna* (supernal fatherland), and *patria angelica* (angelic fatherland) were used to emphasise God the Father as the creator of the universe and the divine parent of humanity. The notion of a heavenly fatherland evoked the statelessness of Christians on Earth, where they believed themselves to be guests, strangers or pilgrims (*hospes*, *advena* or *peregrinus super terram*). It functioned in binary opposition to *patria terrestris* or *terrena* (earthly fatherland). See *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, s.v. *patria*, *civitas*, *civis* (see the post-classical and Christian usage – *usu christiano*).

⁹ The text of *Vita S. Erics* has been dated to the thirteenth century. Its origin is linked to Uppsala Cathedral, and the earliest manuscript, Additional MS 40146, British Museum, has been dated to the late thirteenth century.

rule of King Erik of Sweden over his people, in which *patria* can be seen to have the three above-mentioned aspects, 1) the country of Uppland as the homeland of the kings and the end of *the Eriksgata* (*via regia*), the newly chosen king's tour of the country to swear and to receive oaths of allegiance, 2) Heaven as his reward for a just rule (which he will receive after his martyrdom), and 3) the rights of the homeland (in other words the people):

Deinde regnum suum circuiens, ad populum visitans universum, via regia incedens, nec ad dexteram declinans favore vel precio, nec ad sinistram deflectens timore vel odio, tramite recto, qui ducit ad patriam, inflexibiliter gradiebatur.

He went around his kingdom and visited all his people, treading the king's way, walking firmly along the right path which leads to the fatherland, declining neither to the right for favour or gain, nor to the left for fear or hatred¹⁰.

In Norwegian medieval Latin, the term *patria* conventionally meant 'country of one's origin', as attested in *Historia de antiquitate regum Norwagiensium* by Theodoricus Monachus (ca. 1177–1188)¹¹ and *Acta sancti Halvardi* (thirteenth century)¹². However, according to Edvard BULL, in *Historia Norvegiae* (ca. 1150–1200) this conventional meaning was superseded by an idiosyncratic understanding of the term *patria* as a regional epithet, denoting a type of country subdivision into legal or assembly provinces (with *patria* therefore being synonymous with *provincia*), as in this work the term is frequently applied to the individual regions of Norway¹³. In this context, Sverrir JAKOBSSON regards the term *patria* as an identity unit demonstrating subnational, emotional, and political identification with a specific region, on which the individual's local patriotism was supposedly focused during the Middle Ages in Nordic countries¹⁴.

Yet metaphorical usage of the term *patria* is predominantly meant to denote Heaven: *superna patria* (supernal fatherland), *angelica patria* (angelic

¹⁰ Trans. by J.E. CROSS. See CROSS 1956–1961: 323–326. The phrase *nec ad dexteram nec ad sinistram* is a Biblical allusion to Deut. 5:32, 17:11, 28:14, Prov. 4:27, Isa. 30:21. In a similar way, the duty of a king towards his people was described by St Bridget of Sweden in her *Revelations* (Birgitta de Suecia, *Revelationes caelestes* IX 80, 9) as: *Omnes secundum leges patrie iuste et pie regere et gubernare* ("To rule over everyone according to the people's rights, justly and piously"). Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.

¹¹ Theodoricus Monachus, *Historia de antiquitate regum Norwagiensium*, VI, X, XI, XIV, XV, XVI, XVIII, XX, XXI, XXV, XXXII, XXXIV, pp. 13, 17, 18, 25, 26, 29, 34, 35, 44, 45, 50, 63, 67.

¹² *Acta sancti Halvardi* II, p. 156.

¹³ BULL 1931: 20 f. *Historia Norvegiae*, pp. 77, 78, 81, 93, 97, 106, 116, 118, 124, 205, 211, 216.

¹⁴ JAKOBSSON (S.) 1999: 93–94. Cf. ROBBERTAD 1949–1951: 187–191.

fatherland), and *caelestis patria* (heavenly fatherland)¹⁵. For example, in *Acta sancti Olavi regis et martyris* (late thirteenth century) we read about St Olaf, King of Norway, working towards the Christianization of the Norwegians:

Nonnullos ad saeculi contemptum et amorem supernae patriae mirabilis
ejus devotio et vita continentissima medullitus inflammavit.

His remarkable devotion and most continent life deeply inflamed many
with contempt for the world and a love for the heavenly fatherland¹⁶.

In the Latin literature in Denmark, among conventional uses of the term *patria* (relating to Denmark) in *Chronicon Roskildense* (twelfth century)¹⁷ and *Brevis historia regum Dacie* by Sven Aggesen (late twelfth century)¹⁸, there are examples of its use in the form of the metaphor of ‘the ruler as father’ for a king and a bishop, frequently so in *Gesta Danorum* by Saxo Grammaticus (early thirteenth century). In the context of the martyrdom of King Canute IV, we read in *Gesta Danorum* that the people and nobility gathered at the assembly did not dare discuss King Niels the Old’s involvement in the murder of the saint out of their filial reverence for King Niels as *parens patriae*:

Itaque patriae parentem, honoris pariter eius atque aetatis aestimatione
verecundius habita, ab hoc animadversionis genere immunem reliquit¹⁹.

Absalon, chosen to be the Archbishop of Lund during the renewed invasions of Denmark by the Slavs, was similarly described by Saxo Grammaticus as the

¹⁵ *Acta sancti Olavi regis et martyris* III, p. 128. See also: *The Nidaros Office of the Holy Blood*, p. 37: “Gratia Dei Jesum Christum, qui nos liberavit sui pretio sanguinis, liberet nos de tenebrarum principibus et constituat in caelesti patria gaudentes secum in sempiterna Gloria” (“[Let us] give thanks to God [for] Jesus Christ, who liberated us by his precious blood, liberate us from the princes of darkness, and make our abode in the celestial fatherland, rejoicing with him in sempiternal glory”); *Fra Breviarium Nidrosiense*, p. 240: “Inclita martyrij recolentes iure trophea: laudes christe tibi pangimus assidui: qui pietate tui festum solenne dedisti: olavi meritis martyris egregij: qui proprij pro te perfusus sanguinis vnda: fulget in angelica perspicuus patria” (“Contemplating the glorious trophies of the martyr, we duly give praises to you, Christ! You have given [us] the solemn feast, [by which we may] honour you, [the feast] of Olaf the martyr, illustrious for his merits. Drenched in the stream of his own blood, he shines brightly in the angelic fatherland”).

¹⁶ *Acta sancti Olavi regis et martyris* III, p. 128. The contemporary manuscript, Corpus Christi College MS 209, is dated to the late twelfth century.

¹⁷ *Chronicon Roskildense* VI, XIII, XX.

¹⁸ Svenonis Aggonis filij, *Brevis historia regum Dacie* I, II, III, XI, XX.

¹⁹ Saxo *GD* XIII 7, 6 (“They therefore left the father of his country unscathed by this kind of censure, since they were unpresuming enough to judge both his dignity and age worthy of regard”, trans. P. FISHER). Similarly, in XIV 28, 23: “Ita patriae parens, prosperum reditum emensus, exoptatam adventus sui copiam ovariantibus civium animis obtulit” (“So it came about that the rejoicing hearts of his citizens greeted the longed-for occasion of Valdemar’s homecoming, the father of their country, once he had travelled safely back to Denmark”, trans. P. FISHER).

parent of his fatherland (*parens patriae*) because of his patriotic engagement (*erga patriam pietas*) in defending the country against them:

Nec pensi duxit duratos gelu fluctus hibernis sulcare navigiis, ne ullum anni tempus salutaribus vacaret excubiis aut insignis eius erga patriam pietas necessitati cedere videretur. Itaque non minus patriae parentem quam pontificem egit, militiae et religionis sociato fulgore conspicuus.

Nor did he believe it a huge task to cleave the furrows of the frozen waves with his vessels in winter, since he was keen that at no time of year should appropriate vigilance be relinquished or his outstanding sense of duty towards his homeland be seen to yield to compelling pressures. He was a parent as much as a pontiff of his country, striking for his brilliant combination of soldiering and priesthood²⁰.

These examples may quite possibly attest solely to the erudition of the Scandinavian Latinists of that time and their exclusive intellectual milieu (working for nation-building purposes), and not to any broader national awareness, which would have transcended local and pluralistic social organisation and institutions such as family, kinship, friendship, neighbourhood, or fraternities, and other personal alliances. The term *patria*, according to Lars HERMANSON, “may not have had any deeper meaning for the majority of people. It was merely a constructed term, known to a small group of scholars”²¹, for example to Saxo and his patrons, Archbishop Absalon and King Valdemar I, and their allies working towards the centralisation of Denmark, who had borrowed a unifying idea of fatherland from classical literature for this very purpose²².

Interestingly, around the same time, the exact meaning of the word *patria* also proved difficult to interpret for the first Icelandic translators of classical literature.

The Icelandic word *föðurland* (fatherland, father’s land) originated in the late Middle Ages as a through-translation of the Latin term *patria*. Richard CLEASBY and Guðbrandur VIGFÚSSON describe the Icelandic term *föðurland* as “a rare word, sounding even now affected and modern; Icelanders prefer saying *éttjörð*, *fóstrjörð*, or the like”²³.

The term *fóstrjörð* (foster-land, land of one’s fostering) indicates child-rearing and the indigenous Old Icelandic institution of fostering other people’s

²⁰ Saxo *GD* XIV 21, 3, trans. P. FISHER. In medieval Latin, the paternal metaphor was used to denote a lay ruler of a state (an emperor, king, or prince), but also a high-ranking member of the clergy (such as a bishop or an abbot), as leaders of their respective Christian communities.

²¹ HERMANSON 2019: 201.

²² ANDERSEN 2012: 222–232, 239 f.

²³ *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, s.v. *föðurland*. For examples of their usage, consult *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog. The Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*, s.v. *föðurland*, *fóstrjörð*, and *éttjörð*.

children (*fóstr*), whose function was to create or strengthen friendly relations between two unrelated families and to establish a political alliance between them. *Ættjörð* signifies ‘land of one’s ancestral family clan’, also pointing to the clan-nish family structure (*átt*) of indigenous Icelandic society. The words *áttjörð* and *fóstrjörð* denoted one of three core elements of identity in Scandinavia: homeland, family clan, and name²⁴. In this way, Óláfr Tryggvason, a future king of Norway (995–1000), introduced himself to his kinsman Sigurðr, who found him as an orphan in Garðaríki (according to the *Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar* by Oddr Snorrason, dating to ca. 1190):

“Nú seg mér nafn þitt ok átt ok fóstrjörð.” Hann svarar: “Óláfr heiti ek, en Noregr er áttjörð mín; kyn mitt er konungligt”.

“Now tell me your name, family clan, and homeland.” He answered
“I am called Óláfr, Norway is my homeland, my family clan is kingly”²⁵.

In medieval Iceland, family clan and land (understood as a private estate), and not a native land (seen as a political community), were the main markers for denoting a ‘sense of belonging’²⁶. When studying Old Icelandic sagas for motivational factors influencing someone’s return to their native land or their decision to stay (even when banished under penalty of death), which might resemble some sort of quasi-patriotic sentiment expressing an identity and a ‘sense of belonging’, we can see that they are manifested as a relationship to a local community (of blood relatives), a household and family clan, and by landownership²⁷. The latter provided the possibility for fulfilling the Old Norse moral imperative for self-sufficiency, the ability to feed oneself rather than to be fed, which can best be achieved by farming your own land. As attested by the *Brennu-Njáls saga*, “illt er þeim er á ólandi er alinn” (“it is ill for those who live in a foreign land”)²⁸ and *Hávamál*, “Bú er betra, / þótt lítit sé, / halr er heima hvern; / blóðugt er hjarta, / þeim er biðja skal / sér í mál hvert matar” (“A farm of your own is better, / even if small, / everyone’s someone at home; / a man’s heart bleeds / when he has to beg / for food for himself at meal-times”)²⁹.

²⁴ See PHILLPOTTS 2010: 11–46; HASTRUP 1990: 44–58. It should be noted that the Icelandic kinship system was bilateral, i.e. an individual’s kinship was traced through both mother’s and father’s lines, as attested by genealogical trees of both the *langfeðgatöl* (patrilinear) and *áttartölur* (mixed patrilinear and matrilinear) type, popular in Iceland at that time, as well as by the early Icelandic codes of law (the sections on inheritance and the payment of wergild in compensation for homicide).

²⁵ Oddr munkr Snorrason *Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar* 8, trans. T.M. ANDERSSON.

²⁶ JAKOBSSON (Á.) 2014: 275–287.

²⁷ *Egils saga* 64; *Brennu-Njáls saga* 75.

²⁸ *Brennu-Njáls saga* 6. The phrase *er alinn* means ‘to be given food’ (*að ala* – to feed, give food to, nourish, sustain, raise, breed animals).

²⁹ *Hávamál* 37, trans. C. LARRINGTON.

These culture-specific characteristics of Norse civilisation can also be observed in the Old Icelandic translations of the Latin term *patria*.

In *Hugsvinnsmál* (written ca. 1250–1300), a translation of *Disticha Catonis* (known in Iceland in the mid-twelfth century), one of Cato's sayings, *pugna pro patria*, 'fight for fatherland', was translated as *ver þú óðaljörð þína oddi ok eggju*, 'fight for your allodial land with point and edge'³⁰. It is an example of the scaling down of the concept of *patria* as an abstract political community to a concrete and personal community of a household. *Óðalsjörð*, or simply *óðal*, was the real estate held by a family in an unbroken succession from father to son through generations, or in other words a patrimony.

In *Rómverja saga* (written ca. 1180s in the Þingeyrar monastery)³¹, an anonymous translation of Sallustius's *De bello Iugurthino* and *De coniuratione Catilinae* together with Lucan's *Pharsalia*, the Latin term *patria* is most often translated as the Old Icelandic *fóstrjörð*, for example in the following passage, where Julius Caesar addresses his soldiers before the battle of Pharsalus (48 BC): 'If in defence of me you have attacked your native land [*patria* > *fóstrjörð*] with fire and sword, fight fiercely today and use your sword to clear your guilt'.

Si pro me patriam ferro flammisque petistis, / nunc pugnate truces gladioque exolvite culpam³².

En ér kuaðuz fyrer minar saker sækia fostr iarðina með uapnum ok elldi.
Beriz nu hart þa læysið nu af hendi þenna bardaga³³.

In one instance, the Icelandic translator interpreted *patria* as a foster-brotherhood (*fóstbræðralag*), a specifically Old Icelandic social institution, in which people who were not related by blood were socially bonded by a solemn oath of loyalty to each other (imposing the obligation to avenge the death of a foster-brother). In this passage, the author of *Rómverja saga* changes the words of Catilina, the rebel who attempted a coup d'état in Rome in 63 BC. In the Latin original he declares that he "does not intend to fight against his fatherland" (*patria*); but in the Old Icelandic adaptation, however, he states that he "did not take up arms to fight against his foster-brothers" (*fostbrædr*):

Deos hominesque testamur, imperator, nos arma neque contra patriam cepisse neque quo periculum aliis faceremus³⁴.

³⁰ *Hugsvinnsmál* 11, trans. T. WILLS, S. GROPPER.

³¹ The earliest preserved manuscripts of *Rómverja saga* were produced in the mid-fourteenth century: AM 595 a–b 4^o, AM 225 fol. and AM 226 fol.

³² Luc. VII 261 f. See also: *Rómverja saga*, p. 216. Cf. Sall. *Cat.* 58, 8. *Rómverja saga*, p. 253. Cf. Luc. II 388–391.

³³ *Rómverja saga*, p. 329.

³⁴ Sall. *Cat.* 33, 1.

Ek sver þess bædi við god ok menn at ek hefir æigi vapn tekít til þess at heria æ fastbræðr mína³⁵.

This aberrant reading of the original text by the translator was potentially caused by the lack of a concept of a civic nation (a political community constituted within a state), a greater social community extending beyond familial networks or alliance systems, to which the translator could equate the ancient Roman term for a civic nation (*patria*). It is also possible, although unlikely, that the translator incorrectly interpreted the Latin term *patria* in this fragment, as an adjective and not a substantive, and therefore considered it a derivation from the adjective *patrius*, -a, -um (belonging to a father, fatherly, paternal), and thus with the meaning of relatives linked through the father (as well as foster-father and a relationship of foster-kinship), construed in analogy to *patruus* (father’s brother) or *patrinus* (godfather). This might justify the choice of *fóstbræðra-lag* (foster-brotherhood) as an equivalent to *patria* in this fragment of *Rómverja saga*.

Alexanders saga (written ca. 1250)³⁶, a translation of *Alexandreis* by Walter of Châtillon credited to Brandr Jónsson, abbot of Þykkvibær and bishop of Hólar (who died in 1264), also shows the preference of Icelanders for *fóstrjörð* as the term for a native land³⁷. The translator rendered the term *pater patriae* as *faðir fostriarðar* in the following passage of *Alexanders saga*, in which Philip of Acarnania, Alexander the Great’s physician, cures the king from an attack of malady, saves his life, and is praised for it by Alexander’s courtiers:

Concurrunt proceres auidi spectare Philippum. / Illius iniciunt iocundi
brachia collo, / Huncque patrem patriae seruatoremqe salutant.

The princes then run eagerly to see Philip. They throw their arms around his neck in joy, and hail him as the fatherland’s father and saviour³⁸.

Hofðengiarnir renna nu ahals Philippo læcne hver at oðrum oc þacka honom heilsu konungsens. kalla hann nu verit hafa foðor fostriarðar sinnar oc gezlo mann.

Now the chieftains fall around the neck of Philip, the physician, one after the other, and thank him for the king’s health, and they declare that he has shown himself to be a father of his foster-land and its guardian³⁹.

³⁵ *Rómverja saga*, p. 185.

³⁶ The earliest manuscript of *Alexanders saga*, AM 519 a 4°, dates to ca. 1280.

³⁷ *Alexanders saga*, pp. 14, 91, 113.

³⁸ *Alexandreis* II, 251–252, trans. D. TOWNSEND.

³⁹ *Alexanders saga*, pp. 26–27.

The term *föðurland* (fatherland) only emerged in Old Icelandic, as a neologism, in the late Middle Ages. It appears in texts translated from Latin (as a translation of words such as *patria* and *civitas*), and is used to denote the country of one's birth, parents, and ancestors. For instance, it can be found in *Stjórn*, the Old Icelandic paraphrase of the Bible⁴⁰. It is applied, for example, to Israel as the fatherland of the Israelites returning from Babylonian captivity, and is most probably a translation of the Latin term *civitas* (the term used in the Latin source text):

Nöckurr þatr af Jsraels folki for þegar medr hertoga Zerobabel heim
i sitt föðurland.

Some part of the folk of Israel then came home with Prince Zerubbabel
to their fatherland⁴¹.

This passage in *Stjórn* is an interpolation to the Book of Genesis, most probably taken from the Book of Ezra (I Esr 2:1–2): “hii sunt autem filii provinciae qui [...] reversi sunt in Hierusalem et Iudam unusquisque in civitatem suam qui venerunt cum Zorobabel”.

In another passage of *Stjórn*, the term *föðurland* refers to Macedonia as the fatherland of Alexander the Great, as an Old Icelandic equivalent of the Latin *patria*: “fedrland hins mikla Alexandri” (“*patria Alexandri Magni*”)⁴².

The term *föðurland* also occurs in indigenous chivalric sagas, as part of texts pieced together by Icelandic authors in the late Middle Ages from both various Old French romances and classical literature, reusing their motifs, narratives, and learned and lofty style. *Bærings saga fagra* (early fourteenth century)⁴³ calls the region of Holstein (Old Icelandic *Hollseta*, *Hollsetaland*) the fatherland of the main protagonist of the saga:

En Bæringr sneri ferþ sinni norðr til Saxelfar ok yfir ana, ok er nv i föðvr
landi sinnv, Hollsetv.

But Bæringr turned the direction of his journey northwards to the river
Elbe and across the river, and is now in his fatherland, Holstein⁴⁴.

⁴⁰ *Stjórn* was compiled in the first half of the fourteenth century on the basis of earlier Biblical translations, one of them probably by Brandr Jónsson. ASTÅS 2010: 10–53 discusses Brandr Jónsson's possible authorship of *Stjórn*. The earliest manuscripts of the preserved version of *Stjórn*, AM 226 fol., AM 227 fol. and AM 228 fol., are dated to the middle of the fourteenth century.

⁴¹ *Stjórn* 17. I. *Mosebog* 5, p. 52.

⁴² *Stjórn* 21. I. *Mosebog* 12, p. 85. The passage in *Stjórn* about Macedonia is an interpolation to the Book of Genesis, taken from Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* XIV 4, 13. Isidore's *Etymologiae* were known in Iceland in the Middle Ages.

⁴³ The oldest manuscripts of *Bærings saga fagra*, AM 567 4° and AM 580 4°, are dated to the early fourteenth century, with the text probably being contemporary with these manuscripts.

⁴⁴ *Bærings saga fagra* XXVIII, p. 115. See also: *Dínuss saga drambláta*, p. 83 (the oldest manuscript, AM 575 4°, dated to ca. 1400): “Dreijffest nu hinn mesti hlutur þessa herss, og sæker

The earliest Old Icelandic texts, translated from Latin in the twelfth–thirteenth century, are examples of resemantisation: the creation of new meanings for these imported texts within the changed context of indigenous concepts, which were culture-specific to the pre-Christian civilisation of the North.

In late medieval Icelandic literature, the dissemination of the paternal metaphor, similar in structure and function to the Latin one, correlates with the appearance of social changes. It might be indicative of a social change in which attachment, or a “sense of belonging”, extends to a community beyond that of the household and family, in particular to the community established by the Catholic Church. It can be best observed in the emergence in Old Icelandic of the use of the term “fatherland” to denote Heaven and in the use of the term “father” for both God and the clergy. For example, in the Old Icelandic translation of Bernard of Clairvaux’s *Meditationes* (preserved in manuscript AM 624 4° dated to ca. 1500), we read that, after death, sinners who lived according to the flesh, loved the world more than God, and followed the devil, will be banished from Heaven, the paradisaal fatherland, to Hell:

Procul quippe a beata paradisi patria exsultantes, cruciabuntur in gehenna perpetua, nunquam lucem visuri, nunquam refrigerium adepturi; sed per millia millium annorum in inferno cruciandi; nec inde unquam liberandi, ubi nec qui torquet, aliquando fatigatur; nec qui torquetur, aliquando moritur.

Hvatlegt er þeir voru eru utlægðir langt í frá hinu sæla paradísar fauðurlandi ok skulu pínast ævenlega í helvíti; þeir skulu alldri sjá ljós ok alldri munu þeir auðlast hvíll, nema um ótaululega maurg þúshundrað þúsundraða vetra eru þeir pínandi í helvíti, ok alldri þaðan leysandi, þar sem hvorki er at sá mæðist nokkut sinni er pínir ok hann deyr alldri er þeimist⁴⁵.

Meanwhile, saints and godly men are supposed to go to Heaven, which is denoted in Old Icelandic as the eternal, paradisaal or heavenly fatherland (*himnesk föstrjörð* and *himneskt föðurland*). For example, in the *Katrínar saga*, in the context of her martyrdom, God orders St Catherine “gud leti hana nv koma til himneskrar fostiardar”⁴⁶ (“to come to the heavenly fatherland”).

huor sem mest mā heim j sitt fōdurland” (“The greatest part of this army was now dispersed, and everyone went back home, as best as they could, to their fatherland”).

⁴⁵ *Ritning Bernharðs*, p. 196; Bernardus Claraevallensis *Meditationes piissimæ de cognitione humanæ conditionis* III, 11. The Old Icelandic translation is very close to the Latin text, almost word for word: “They will be banished far away from the blessed paradisaal fatherland and they shall be tortured everlastingly in hell, never to see the light, never to be refreshed, but only to be tormented in the abyss for thousands and of thousands of years; and no one ever is to be released from there, where neither the one who tortures ever gets tired, nor the one who is tortured ever dies”.

⁴⁶ *Katrínar saga*, p. 113. The same notion can be found in *Stjórn* 18. I. Mosebog 6, p. 55: “Þiat hann uar eigi þaleidiss algorr sem madrinn sua sem hann er i sinu fōdurlandi. þat er i himinriki.

As a consequence of the Christianisation of Old Norse vocabulary, the pre-Christian meanings of the Old Icelandic term *faðir* were extended with Christian ones, and thus it predominantly denoted: 1) God as the father of Jesus, 2) God as part of the Holy Trinity, the father, 3) God as the father of all Christians and the creator of everything, 4) Adam as forefather, progenitor, 5) the ancestors of Christians, 6) the Old Testament patriarchs, 7) the prophets, 8) the Church Fathers, 9) the Desert Fathers, 10) the Apostles. By extension, it was also applied to the offices of the Church: 11) the Pope, 12) a bishop or archbishop, 13) the patron or prior of a monastery, 14) a cleric, an older fellow Christian⁴⁷.

The conceptualisation of the Christian God as Father became frequent in the Old Icelandic literature of the Catholic period. In skaldic poetry God is described using kennings *faðir foldar* (the father of earth), *snjallastr faðir allra* (the most valiant father of all), and *hreinflífr faðir dróttar* (pure-living father of the host), as demonstrated by the *Leiðarvísan* poem for example. This poem was composed by an anonymous skald in the second half of the twelfth century (the dating of its manuscripts is ca. 1390–1410 for AM 757 a 4^o and ca. 1490–1510 for AM 624 4^o). It is an Old Icelandic version of the *Carta Dominica*, an apocryphal letter from Christ, instructing Christians to observe the Lord's day, and enumerating the reasons for its holiness. Christ's resurrection on Easter Sunday is one of the reasons given:

Dag reis sinn með sigri
 snjallastr faðir allra
 — sonr huggaði seggi
 sólar hauðrs — af dauða.
 Áðr batt flærðarfróðan
 fjanda heilagr andi
 fast ok fyrða leysti
 fremðarstyrkr ór myrkum.

The most valiant father of all [= God (= Christ)] rose from death with victory on his day; the son of the land of the sun [SKY/HEAVEN > = God (= Christ)] comforted men. Previously the honour-strong Holy Spirit bound fast the deceit-learned fiend and released men from darkness⁴⁸.

helldr eptir sinni kynferd sem kigtligum manni er mattulight” (“That is why he was not in that way as perfect as such a man who is in his fatherland, that is in the Kingdom of Heaven, but rather after his kindred, because only this is in the power of a carnal man”); and manuscript ÁM 672 4^o, a theological manual for priests, folio 82 verso, line 23: “Fyrir hugskots augu hverr sætleikur sér ok fagnaður sér hins himneska föðurlands” (“In the mind's eye everyone sees the sweetness and joy of the heavenly fatherland”).

⁴⁷ *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*, s.v. *faðir*, see the examples there.

⁴⁸ *Leiðarvísan* 31, trans. K. ARTWOOD. The term “father” accorded to the Christian God in skaldic poetry: *Leiðarvísan* 31, p. 168; *Drápa af Máriugrát* 31, p. 781; Níkulás Bergsson, *Jónsdrápa*

The notion of abstract or spiritual fathers, for example priests as the fathers of Christians and bishops as the fathers of priests, might at first have seemed strange to many pagan Icelanders during the missionary period, similarly to the concept of a godfather (*patrinus* in Latin, *guð-faðir* and *skíri-faðir* in Old Icelandic), which had initially been misunderstood by them. A story, perhaps dating back to the conversion period (late tenth century)⁴⁹, tells of Friðrekr, a missionary bishop to Iceland (ca. 981–986). He converted and baptised a certain Þorvaldr víðförli and his family in Iceland, becoming their baptismal father. On hearing this, the Icelandic pagans composed a *níðvísa*, a defamatory poem, alleging that Friðrekr, the missionary bishop, and Þorvaldr, the convert, had children together (thereby insinuating a homosexual liaison between them): “The bishop has borne nine children, and Þorvaldr is father of them all”⁵⁰, alluding either to Þorvaldr’s children, to whom Friðrekr was godfather, or perhaps to the people in Iceland they baptised together after Þorvaldr’s conversion, when he became the bishop’s follower and a missionary himself⁵¹.

However, after the clergy had gained political, economic, and moral power in Iceland, language had to follow the social reality. It therefore became easier to imagine priests as fathers, or figures endowed with father-like attributes. The term *father*, as a title for a clergyman, empowers the individual regarded as such with rights and duties, which are linguistically constituted, but which extend beyond semantics. According to the linguist John SEARLE, institutional reality and political power, and the state with its apparatus of power and functionaries, are linguistically constituted by speech acts known as “status function declarations” in the human social world⁵². A “status function declaration” is a type of speech

postula 2, p. 68; Gamli kanóki, *Jónsdrápa* 4, p. 136; *Leiðarvísan* 3; 29; 31; 38, pp. 143, 166–167, 168, 173; *Sólarljóð* 75, p. 349; *Heilags anda drápa* 4; 11; 13; 16; 17, pp. 454–455, 460–461, 463–464; 465–466; 466–467; *Máriudrápa* 36, p. 508; *Lilja* 57; 81, pp. 627–628, 653–654; *Máriuvisur* II 20; III 1, pp. 714–15, 719; Kálfr Hallsson, *Kátrínardrápa* 10; 27, pp. 938, 948; *Pétursdrápa* 1; 2, pp. 797–798; Hallfreðr vandræðaskáld Óttarsson, *Lausavísur* 9.

⁴⁹ The story survived in *Kristni saga* and *Þorvalds þáttr víðförla*, which are preserved in late medieval manuscripts (*Hauksbók* AM 544 4^o, written in Iceland and Norway in the period 1290–1360; and *Flatneyjarbók* GKS 1005 fol., written in Iceland in 1387–1394.). The authorship of *Kristni saga* is commonly ascribed to Sturla Þórðarson (ca. 1214–1284). The *níð* verse, however, is considered to have been composed in the last quarter of the tenth century, according to Finnur Jónsson – in 984.

⁵⁰ *Kristni saga* 4; *Þorvalds þáttr ens víðförla* 6; *Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta* in *Flatneyjarbók* 223.

⁵¹ Their literal understanding of the paternal metaphor is reminiscent of Nicodemus in John III 3–4: “How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother’s womb and be born?” (ESV). In FULTON SHEEN’s words (2008: 104–106), Nicodemus “was a literalist; he doubted the exactness of the term born. (...) He could understand a man’s being what he is, but he could not understand a man’s becoming what he is not. Nicodemus understood about redecorating the old man, but not about creating an entirely new man”.

⁵² SEARLE 2010: 90–122, 169–170.

act which creates extralinguistic facts and entities (existing outside language) in human social reality by assigning “deontic powers” (rights and duties) to actual people. Through speech acts of this type, humans create social institutions and maintain their existence, along with the power relations inherent to them. These power relations require a linguistic representation. It has to be declared (and in response to this, collectively recognised by the people involved) that certain individuals are in a power relation for it to be established and maintained. In SEARLE’s own words, a leader of men “has a continuing deontic status, an *authority* represented by and created by language”⁵³.

The title of *father* was applied to Catholic clergymen, and bishops in particular, in Scandinavia and Iceland through the following phrases, frequently found in literary and documentary sources produced by local church and state institutions: *andaligr faðir* (spiritual father), *virðiligr faðir* (worshipful father), *virðiligastr faðir* (the most venerable father), *kæri faðir í guði* (dear father in God), *signaðr faðir* (blessed father), *heilagr faðir* (holy father), *mildr faðir* (gentle father), *minn hinn sæti faðir* (my sweet father)⁵⁴.

For example, in the royal decree on sheep husbandry (*Seyðabrævið*) issued by King Hákon Hákonarson of Norway in 1298, the king addresses the bishop of the Faroes as “Andalegr fader ok war hin kæraste win Herra Erlendr biskup j færøyum” (“Our spiritual father and dearest friend, Erlendr, bishop of the Faroes”)⁵⁵.

In skaldic poetry, the kenning *faðir klerka* (father of priests) was used to denote a bishop⁵⁶. Arngrímr Brandsson, abbot at the monastery of the Order of Saint Benedict in Þingeyrar in the fourteenth century, in his poem on St Guðmundr, the *Guðmundardrápa*, applied this kenning to Þórir, the archbishop of Niðaróss:

Geysiligt tók upp at æsaz,
ilsku róg af fjandans plógi,

⁵³ SEARLE 2010: 95.

⁵⁴ The term “father” as applied to Catholic clergymen in Old Icelandic documentary texts: document no. 324. *1 Marts 1481. á Hólum. Syðrahóltsbréf*. In: *Diplomatarium Islandicum*, vol. VI (1481–1491), p. 346; document no. 220. *3 December 1492. á Hólum. Blængzhóll*. In: *Diplomatarium Islandicum*, vol. VII (1492), p. 151; document no. 99. *29. Oktober 1522. á Hólum*. In: *Diplomatarium Islandicum*, vol. IX (1522), p. 120; document no. 71. *21. Maí 1522. í Björgvin*. In: *Diplomatarium Islandicum*, vol. IX (1522), p. 84; document 356. *11 December 1359. Nidaros*. In: *Diplomatium Norvegicum*, vol. II, p. 287; document 33. *1360, 20. juli. Skálaholt*. In: *Diplomata Islandica*, p. 37; *Réttarbótr Magnúss Eiríkssonar*, vol. III, p. 153; *Seyðabrævið*, p. 45; document no. 46. *1297. 23. juni. Tautra [Frosta]*. In: *Norske diplomer til og med år 1300*, p. 83; manuscript from the *British Library collection: Additional manuscripts* no. 26050, folio 1 recto; *Réttarbótr Hákonar Magnússonar*, vol. III, p. 99; *Sáttargerð í Túnsberg*, vol. II, p. 475; *Kristinn rétr Jóns erkibyskups (hinn nýi)*, vol. II, p. 354; *Réttarbótr Magnúss Hákonarsonar*, vol. II, p. 481. See also the examples from literary texts: *Guðmundar saga byskups*, vol. II, p. 4; *Jóns saga byskups ens helga*, p. 94; *Thomas saga erkibyskups*, pp. 99, 105, 138, 190.

⁵⁵ *Seyðabrævið*, p. 45.

⁵⁶ MEISSNER 1921: 395.

Þórir hlýðir, enn á eyði,
 erkibyskup, faðir klerka;
 embættit tók alt í brottu
 (ólz sorg af því) byskups Hóla;
 hugsar hinn at huggan vaxi
 heilagur maðr af skepnu deili.

At the devilish ploughing, an enormous slander was stirred against the destroyer of wickedness [= holy man]; Archbishop Þórir, father of the clerics [= bishop], hearkens to it; he entirely took away the office of Bishop of Hólar from him (sorrow was born of it); he, the holy man, thinks that he will be comforted by the ordainer of creation [= God]⁵⁷.

In what would seem to be emblematic for Iceland after Christianisation, the first Icelandic saints and bishops, Þorlákr Þórhallsson of Skálholt (1133–1193) and Jón Ögmundarson of Hólar (1052–1121), are (to the best of my knowledge) the only people who are described as “father of the fatherland” (*pater patriae*) in medieval Icelandic literature⁵⁸. Here is an example from the hagiographical biography of Saint Þorlákr (*De sancto Thorlaco episcopo et aliis episcopis nostris*, dated to ca. 1200, ms. AM 386 4°, 1190–1210):

His igitur presulibus et eximiis plebis sibi commisse rectoribus Scalotensis ecclesia uiguit, et usque ad sancti Thorlaci tempora sicut modo comprobatur magis ac magis in suo statu amplificata et dignanter confirmata conualuit. Isti sunt precipui gregis dominici pastores et uerissimi patres patrie qui sue et suorum subditorum utilitati bene prouidentes, suos sequaces crebris ammonitionibus et bonorum operum ex[emplis exhortantes].

Thus the Church of Skálholt flourished under these bishops and excellent leaders of the people committed to their charge, and up to St. Thorlacr’s time, as is now shown, it grew more strong, extended in its state and worthily reinforced. These are the distinguished shepherds of the Lord’s flock and the wholly true fathers of their native land [*fatherland* – G.B.], who, well providing for their own and their people’s need [exhorted] their followers with repeated admonitions and the ex[ample] of good works⁵⁹.

⁵⁷ Arngrímur ábóti Brandsson *I. Guðmundar kvæði (drápa?) byskups* 35(33). The phrase *Af fjandans plógi*, literally “at the devilish ploughing”, means *at the devil’s instigation*. See also HARDARSON 2021.

⁵⁸ See the Latin liturgy of the saints and their *vitae*. The antiphon for Saint Jón of Hólar in the manuscript AM 241 b IX fol.: “Presul Islandie, / decor orbis et pater patrie, / tutor regni regis Norvegie” (“The bishop of Iceland, / the ornament of the world and the father of the fatherland / the guardian of the kingdom of the king of Norway”). *Officium S. Thorlaci* in manuscript AM 241 a II fol., and the liturgical fragments preserved in manuscripts AM 322 fol. and AM 733 4°. See also LEHMANN 1937: II 26, 108, 114, 116.

⁵⁹ *Latinubrot um Þorlák byskup: De sancto Thorlaco episcopo et aliis episcopis nostris* 1, trans. K. WOLF.

The reception of the paternal and familial metaphor demonstrates the culture-specific idiosyncrasies of Icelanders, especially regarding the concepts of power relations between a ruler and his subjects within existing social institutions. The fact that the paternal metaphor was applied exclusively to the Christian God and Catholic clergymen, and in particular to bishops, reveals their extraordinary positions of power in Icelandic society. As early as 1073–1076, Adam of Bremen attests to it, writing in his chronicle about the king-like power of bishops in Iceland:

Episcopum suum habent pro rege; ad illius nutum respicit omnis populus, quicquid ex Deo, ex scripturis, ex consuetudine aliarum gentium ille constituit, hoc pro lege habent.

They hold their bishop as king. All the people respect his wishes. They hold as law whatever he ordains as coming from God, or from the Scriptures, or even from the worthy practices of other peoples⁶⁰.

From the Icelandic perspective, bishops also appeared to be kingly, as attested by the *Hungrvaka*, the history of the first five bishops of Skálholt and the origins of the church in Iceland (composed shortly after 1206–1211). Bishop Gissur Ísleifsson (ca. 1042–1118) is described in the saga as *konungr ok biskup yfir landinu* (a king and bishop over the land), commanding universal obedience:

Eptir þat fór Gizurr biskup út til Íslands, ok tók öll alþýða feginsamliga við honum. Hann tók tígn ok virðing svá mikla, þegar snemmendis biskupdóms síns, ok svá vildi hverr maðr sitja ok standa, sem hann bauð, ungr ok gamall, sæll ok fátækr, konur ok karlar, ok var rétt at segja, at hann var bæði konungr ok biskup yfir landinu meðan hann lifði.

After that, Bishop Gizurr went out to Iceland and all the people received him joyfully. He found such great honour and respect when early in his episcopate and thus would each man sit or stand as he bade, young and old, rich and poor, women and men; and it was right to say that he was both a king and bishop over the land while he lived⁶¹.

As a matter of fact, in the absence of an executive power in Iceland, or any single political centre (before Norwegian kings gained sovereignty over Iceland in 1262–1264), the Icelandic bishops gradually became the most influential official authority there⁶².

According to the *Jónsbók*, the Icelandic legal code from 1281, the bishop and the king were God's two agents in Iceland, the bishop having dominion

⁶⁰ Adamus Bremensis, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum* IV 35, trans. F.J. TSCHAN.

⁶¹ *Hungrvaka* VI, trans. C. BASSET. See also JAKOBSSON (Á.) 1997: 288–303 and 2007.

⁶² VÉSTEINSSON 2000: 144–178; MARTIN 1994: 561–576; JAKOBSSON (S.) 2018: 193–210.

in spiritual matters, and the king in secular ones, with both of them working for "the defense of good men and their rights and to the punishment and the purgation of wicked men from the land"⁶³. While the king was always absent, effectively delegating executive power to local sheriffs (*sýslumaðr*), the bishop was always present and his power was visible, as the bishop not only resided in his see in Iceland but also made annual visitations within the diocese as a whole "to visit every commune so that people may meet him"⁶⁴.

In addition to their official dignity, their position of power rested on support groups (kin, friends, and clients), landownership, taxation, and a privileged legal status, including exerting an influence on legislation and judicial prerogatives.

Clerical positions in the early Icelandic church were largely filled by members of the aristocracy, the class of chieftains (*goði* and *höfðingi*) and their kin, with some even ordained as bishops (before 1190, a prohibition on the ordination of chieftains as priests). The first two bishops of Skálholt were Ísleifr Gissurarson and his son Gissur Ísleifsson, of the aristocratic clan of Haukdælir, and the episcopal see was located at their landed estate at Skálholt.

Bishops were chosen at the Althing, the general assembly of Icelanders (by acclamation, if the preceding bishop had designated a successor), and afterwards the *electus episcopus* had to be accepted by the other of the two bishops of Iceland in post at the time. The bishop-elect was then consecrated by an archbishop in Germany, or later in Denmark and Norway (however since the thirteenth century the Niðaróss archbishop's *capitulum* was supposed to select a candidate to be bishop). This legitimisation by the Althing and the Holy Anointment (in a similar way to Scandinavian kings at the time⁶⁵) also contributed to the bishop's position of power in Iceland.

The bishops had their own *þingmenn* (chieftain's supporters), bound by a patron-client relationship, and they appeared in public with this retinue. They also fielded their own troops, numbering in the hundreds. At the battle of Víðines in 1208, together with three hundred men, Bishop Guðmundr Arason faced the four hundred men assembled by Icelandic chieftains who opposed the Church's privileges of *libertas ecclesiae* (*frelsi heilagrar kirkju*), and the bishop won the day. Just a year later in 1209, after losing the battle of Hólar, he was removed from his see.

The Church amassed land across Iceland through benefices called *staðir* (the parish church and adjacent farmland, fully controlled by the Church after 1297),

⁶³ *Jónsbok* II 2, *Um vold konungs ok biskups*, p. 27, trans. J. SCHULMAN.

⁶⁴ *Grágás* K 4, vol. I, p. 32, trans. A. DENNIS, P. FOOTE, R. PERKINS.

⁶⁵ Traditionally, a candidate to the throne of Norway had to seek acceptance as a king by the people gathered at the provincial assemblies. Magnus Erlingsson was the first Norwegian king crowned and anointed in a religious ceremony, consecrated by Eysteinn Erlendsson, Archbishop of Niðaróss (1163).

and in time, the bishops became wealthy landowners with vast estates. They also expanded the diocesan estate by buying up more land. Bishop Magnús Einarsson (1134–1148) acquired the Vestmannaeyjar archipelago for the see of Skálholt.

They indulged in a royal lifestyle, receiving numerous guests, sometimes hundreds at a time, and organised feasts, at which an exchange of gifts was a vital component (a royal custom in Scandinavia at the time). Bishop Jón of Hólar stipulated that every man should visit the episcopal residence at least once a year, and if possible more often. For the consecration of a new cathedral at Skálholt, Bishop Klængur Þorsteinsson held a splendid feast, to which eight hundred guests were invited.

Yet in contrast to kingship or chieftainship, their governance in Iceland was based on a new model of power relationships, aimed at preserving social peace and founded on a duty of care for the people in their community (they promoted the *pax* and *treuga Dei* in Iceland from the start of the thirteenth century), as well as both moral and physical welfare⁶⁶.

The bishops exercised patronage power, distributing benefices, acting as peacemakers in court (through arbitration), and sometimes also as advocates on behalf of their clients or allies. They worked towards the moral reform of society and began to exert influence over the intimate aspects of an individual's life, exercising spiritual guidance (pastoral power) regarding the ethical self-care of an individual⁶⁷. At the same time they initiated a social welfare system in Iceland and oversaw it, redistributing wealth through taxes such as the poor-relief tithe.

As early as 1096–1097, even before Icelanders had submitted to the king of Norway, the tithe was introduced in Iceland on the initiative of Bishop Gissur Ísleifsson, with one-quarter going to the bishop (*biskupstíund*), and one-quarter to the poor, thus ensuring wider community support for the bishop's leadership, both among the poor and the affluent, since it attempted to address the problem of poverty, which constituted a risk for society as a whole⁶⁸.

The bishops also enacted laws for the country, starting with the local norms of canon law, *Kristinn réttir hinn forni* (1122–1133), implementing the Christian moral code. Over time, Icelandic bishops gained significant jurisdiction over cases dealing with matters of the spirit and moral offences (such as matrimonial issues, illicit sexual relations, heresy), and had the authority to impose a penalty for such.

⁶⁶ JAKOBSSON (S.) 2008: 205–213.

⁶⁷ More on pastoral power: BARTUSIK 2023: 5–12.

⁶⁸ *Grágás* K 5, vol. I, pp. 35–36. See also JAKOBSSON (S.) 2024.

Therefore, calling the bishop *pater patriae* or *konungr ok biskup yfir landinu* was not “merely a pious exaggeration”⁶⁹. Concrete power lay behind those words.

University of Silesia in Katowice

grzegorz.bartusik@us.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-8693-0932

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions

- Acta sancti Halvardi*, in: G. STORM (ed.), *Monumenta historica Norvegiæ; latinske kildeskrifter til Norges historie i middelalderen*, Kristiania 1880, pp. 153–158.
- Acta sancti Olavi regis et martyris*, in: G. STORM (ed.), *Monumenta historica Norvegiæ; latinske kildeskrifter til Norges historie i middelalderen*, Kristiania 1880, pp. 125–144.
- Alexanders saga*, ed. FINNUR JÓNSSON, København 1925.
- Arngrímur ábóti Brandsson, *1. Guðmundar kvæði (drápa?) byskups*, in: F. JÓNSSON (ed.), *Den norsk-islandske skjaldedigtning*, København og Kristiania 1914–1915, vol. AII, p. 355; vol. BII, p. 381.
- Bernard de Clairvaux, *Meditationes piissimæ de cognitione humanæ conditionis*, in: J. MABILLON (ed.), *Sancti Bernardi abbatis Clarae-Vallensis Opera omnia*, Paris 1839, vol. 2, part I, cols. 661–691.
- Brennu-Njáls saga*, ed. E. ÓL. SVEINSSON, Reykjavík 1954.
- Breviarium Nidrosiense*, in: G. STORM (ed.), *Monumenta historica Norvegiæ; latinske kildeskrifter til Norges historie i middelalderen*, Kristiania 1880, pp. 229–282.
- Bærings saga fagra*, in: G. CEDERSCHIÖLD (ed.), *Fornsögur Suðrlanda : Magus saga jarls / Konraðs saga / Bærings saga / Flovents saga / Bevers saga*, Lund 1884, pp. 85–123.
- Chronicon Roskildense*, in: M. CL. GERTZ (ed.), *Scriptores Minores Historiæ Danicæ*, København 1917–1918, vol. 1, pp. 14–33.
- Dínuss saga drambláta*, ed. J. KRISTJÁNSSON, Reykjavík 1960.
- Diplomatarium Islandicum (Íslenzkt fornbréfasafn)*, eds. J. SIGURÐSSON et al., Kaupmannahöfn and Reykjavík 1857–1972, vol. I–XVII.
- Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, ed. C. C. A. LUNGE et al., Christiania and Oslo 1849–1995, vol. I–XXI.
- Document no. 33. 1360. 20. juli. *Skálaholt*, in: S. KARLSSON (ed.), *Diplomata Islandica : Íslenzk bréf & skjöl. Islandske originaldiplomer indtil 1450*, København 1963, p. 37.
- Document no. 46. 1297. 23. juni. *Tautra [Frosta]*, in: F. HØDNEBØ (ed.), *Norske diplomer til og med år 1300*, Oslo 1960, p. 83.
- Document no. 71. 21. Maí 1522. *i Bjorgvin*, in: J. SIGURÐSSON et al. (eds.), *Diplomatarium Islandicum (Íslenzkt fornbréfasafn)*, Kaupmannahöfn and Reykjavík 1857–1972, vol. IX (1522), p. 84.
- Document no. 99. 29. Október 1522. *á Hólum*, in: J. SIGURÐSSON et al. (eds.), *Diplomatarium Islandicum (Íslenzkt fornbréfasafn)*, Kaupmannahöfn and Reykjavík 1857–1972, vol. IX (1522), p. 120.

⁶⁹ MARTIN 1994: 563: “The case of Gizurr Ísleifsson appears to have been special. The saga-writer made the strange comment that ‘he was both king and bishop over the land as long as he lived [...]’. It is hard to interpret the meaning of the expression ‘king’. It appears that it is merely a pious exaggeration to describe a man of unusually fine character who did great deeds for the church by putting it on a firm financial foundation and causing a second diocese to be established”.

- Document no. 220. 3 December 1492. *á Hólum. Blængzhóll*, in: J. SIGURÐSSON et al. (eds.), *Diplomatarium Islandicum (Íslenzkt fornbréfasafn)*, Kaupmannahöfn and Reykjavík 1857–1972, vol. VII (1492), p. 151.
- Document no. 324. 1 Marts 1481. *á Hólum. Syðrahóltsbréf*, in: J. SIGURÐSSON et al. (eds.), *Diplomatarium Islandicum (Íslenzkt fornbréfasafn)*, Kaupmannahöfn and Reykjavík 1857–1972, vol. VI (1481–1491), p. 346.
- Document no. 356. 11 December 1359. *Nidaros*, in: C.C.A. LUNGE et al. (eds.), *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, Christiania and Oslo 1849–1995, vol. II, p. 287.
- Disticha Catonis*, ed. M. BOAS, H.J. BOTSCHUYVER, Amsterdam 1952.
- Drápa af Máriugrát*, ed. K.E. GADE, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 758–795.
- Gamli kanóki, *Jónsdrápa*, ed. B. LA FARGE, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 133–136.
- Grágás. Laws of early Iceland*, trans. A. DENNIS, P. FOOTE, R. PERKINS, Winnipeg 1980.
- Gualtherus de Castellione, *Alexandreis*, ed. FR.A.W. MUELDENER, Lipsiae 1863.
- Guðmundar saga byskups*, in: G. VIGFÚSSON, J. SIGURÐSSON, Þ. BJARNARSON, E. JÓNSSON (eds.), *Biskupa sögur*, København 1878, vol. II, pp. 1–220.
- Heilags anda drápa*, ed. K. ATTWOOD, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 450–467.
- Historia Norvegiae*, in: G. STORM (ed.), *Monumenta historica Norvegiae; latinske kildeskrifter til Norges historie i middelalderen*, Kristiania 1880, pp. 69–124.
- Hugleiðing um miskunn Guðs*, in: Manuscript ÁM 672 4^o (Manual of a Priest), folio 82 verso – 83 verso, available in the online repository of the Arnarnagænan Manuscript Collection in Copenhagen and the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies in Reykjavík: handrit. is/da/manuscript/view/da/AM04-0672.
- Hugsvinnsmál*, ed. T. WILLS, S. GROPPER, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 358–449.
- Hungrvaka. Translation*, trans. C. BASSET, Reykjavík 2013.
- Hungrvaka*, in: B. KAHLE (ed.), *Kristni saga. Þáttir Þorvalds ens víðförla. Þáttir Ísleifs biskups Gizurarsonar. Hungrvaka*, Halle 1905, pp. 87–126.
- Isidorus Hispalensis, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W.M. LINDSAY, Oxford 1911.
- Jóns saga byskups ens helga*, ed. P. FOOTE, København 2003.
- Jónsbók. The Laws of Later Iceland*, ed. J. SCHULMAN, Saarbrücken 2010.
- Kátrínar saga*, eds. B. ÓLAFSSON, Þ. HELGADÓTTIR, Reykjavík 2017.
- Kálfr Hallsson, *Kátrínardrápa*, ed. K. WOLF, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 931–64.
- Kristinn réttir Jóns erkibyskups (hinn nýi)*, in: R. KEYSER, P.A. MUNCH (eds.), *Norges gamle Love indtil 1387*, Kristiania 1846–1849, vol. II, pp. 341–385.
- Latinubrot um Þorlák byskup: De sancto Thorlaco episcopo et aliis episcopis nostris*, in: Á. EGILSDÓTTIR (ed.), *Biskupa sögur*, Reykjavík 2002, vol. II, pp. 339–364.
- Leiðarvísan*, ed. K. ATTWOOD, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 137–78.
- Lilja*, ed. M. CHASE, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 544–677.
- Lucan *The Civil War*, ed. J.D. DUFF, Cambridge, Mass. 1928.
- Máriudrápa*, ed. K. ATTWOOD, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 476–514.
- Máriuvisur*, ed. K.E. GADE, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 678–738.
- Nikulás Bergsson, *Jónsdrápa postula*, ed. B. LA FARGE, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 66–69.

- Oddr Snorrason, *The Saga of Olaf Tryggvason*, trans. Th.M. ANDERSSON, Ithaca (NY)–London 2003.
- Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar eptir Odd munk Snorrason, ed. Ó. HALLDÓRSSON, Reykjavík 2006.
- Pétersdrápa, ed. D. McDUGALL, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 796–844.
- Réttarbótr Hákonar Magnússonar, in: R. KEYSER, P.A. MUNCH (eds.), *Norges gamle Love indtil 1387*, Kristiania 1846–1849, vol. III, pp. 106–108.
- Réttarbótr Magnúss Eiríkssonar, in: R. KEYSER, P.A. MUNCH (eds.), *Norges gamle Love indtil 1387*, Kristiania 1846–1849, vol. III, pp. 153–154.
- Réttarbótr Magnúss Hákonarsonar, in: R. KEYSER, P.A. MUNCH (eds.), *Norges gamle Love indtil 1387*, Kristiania 1846–1849, vol. II, pp. 481–486.
- Ritning Bernharðs (Bernard de Clairvaux, *Meditationes piissimæ de cognitione humanæ conditionis*), in: Þ. BJARNARSON (ed.), *Leifar fornra kristinna fræða íslenzkra : Codex Arna-Magnæanus 677 4to auk annara enna elztu brota af íslenzkum guðfræðisritum*, København 1878, pp. 188–198.
- Rómverja saga, ed. Þ. HELGADÓTTIR, Reykjavík 2010.
- Sallust, *The War with Catiline. The War with Iugurtha*, ed. J.C. ROLFE, Cambridge (MA) 2013.
- Sancta Birgitta, *Revelaciones extravagantes*, ed. L. HOLLMAN, Uppsala 1956.
- Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum. The History of the Danes*, ed. K. FRIIS-JENSEN, trans. P. FISHER, Oxford 2015.
- Seyðabrævið, ed. J.H.W. POULSEN, U. ZACHARIASEN, trans. M. BARNES, D.R. MARGOLIN, Tórshavn 1971.
- Sólarljóð, ed. C. LARRINGTON, P. ROBINSON, in: M. CLUNIES ROSS (ed.), *Poetry on Christian Subjects. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 7*, Turnhout 2007, pp. 287–357.
- Stjórn: Gammelnorsk Bibelhistorie fra Verdens Skabelse til det babyloniske Fangenskab, ed. C.R. UNGER, Kristiania 1862.
- Svenonis Aggonis filii, *Brevis historia regvm Dacie*, in: M.CL. GERTZ (ed.), *Scriptores Minores Historiæ Danicæ*, København 1917–1918, vol. I, pp. 64–143.
- Séttargerð í Túnsberg, in: R. KEYSER, P.A. MUNCH (eds.), *Norges gamle Love indtil 1387*, Kristiania 1846–1849, vol. II, pp. 468–477.
- The Alexandreis of Walter of Chatillon: A Twelfth-Century Epic*, trans. D. TOWNSEND, Philadelphia, Pa., 1996.
- Theodoricus Monachus, *Historia de antiquitate regum Norwagiensium*, in: G. STORM (ed.), *Monumenta historica Norvegiæ; latinske kildeskrifter til Norges historie i middelalderen*, Kristiania 1880, pp. 1–68.
- The Nidaros Office of the Holy Blood. Liturgical Music in Medieval Norway*, ed. G. ATTINGER, A. HAUG, Trondheim 2004.
- Thomas Saga Erkebyskups: Fortælling om Thomas Becket Erkebiskop af Canterbury: To Bearbejdelser samt Fragmenter af en tredie*, ed. C.R. UNGER, Kristiania 1869.
- The Poetic Edda*, trans. C. LARRINGTON, Oxford 2014.

Dictionaries and linguistic corpora

- An Icelandic-English dictionary*, ed. R. CLEASBY, G. VIGFÚSSON, W.A. CRAIGIE, Oxford 1957.
- Digital corpus and dictionary of Norwegian medieval Latin*, ed. E. KARLSEN, The Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters and The National Library in Oslo, available online: www.nb.no/forskning/medieval-latin.
- The Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*, eds. A. SIGURDARDÓTTIR, A. SPEED KJELSEN, B. CHR. JACOBSEN, CH. SANDERS, E. ÞÓR JÓHANSSON, E. RODE, H. DEGNBOL, J.E. KNIRK, J. LINDHOLM, M. ARVIDSSON, P. ELLYTON, S. BATTISTA, T. WILLS, Þ. HELGADÓTTIR, The Arnamagnæan Collection in the Department of Nordic Studies and Linguistics at the University of Copenhagen, available online: onp.ku.dk.
- Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, München, available online: thesaurus.badw.de.
- Studies

- ALFÖLDI 1971: A. ALFÖLDI, *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken*, Darmstadt 1971.
- ANDERSEN 2012: K.H. ANDERSEN, *Fædreland og folk i Gesta Danorum: Studier i Saxos anvendelse af patria og natio*, in: P. ANDERSEN, T.K. HEEBØLL-HOLM (eds.), *Saxo og hans samtid*, Aarhus 2012, pp. 215–240.
- ASTÅS 2010: R. ASTÅS, *Et bibelverk fra middelalderen : Studier i Stjórn I*, Tønsberg 2010.
- BARTUSIK 2023: G. BARTUSIK, *The Biblical Metaphor of “Governing as Shepherding” and Catholic Biopolitics in Medieval Icelandic Contexts*, *Maal og Minne CXV* 2023, pp. 1–40.
- BULL 1931: E. BULL, *Det norske folks liv og historie gjennem tidene. Fra omkring 1000 til 1280*, Oslo 1931.
- CROSS 1956–61: J.E. CROSS, *St Eric of Sweden*, *Saga-Book of the Viking Society XV* 1957–1961, pp. 294–326.
- HASTRUP 1990: K. HASTRUP, *Island of Anthropology. Studies in Past and Present Iceland*, Odense 1990.
- HARÐARSON 2021: G. HARÐARSON, *Music and Manuscripts in Skálholt and Þingeyrar*, in: G. HARÐARSON and K.G. JOHANSSON (eds.), *Dominican Resonances in Medieval Iceland. The Legacy of Bishop Jón Halldórsson of Skálholt*, Leiden–Boston 2021, pp. 260–289.
- HERMANSON 2019: L. HERMANSON, *Friendship, Love, and Brotherhood in Medieval Northern Europe, c. 1000–1200*, Leiden 2019.
- JAKOBSSON (Á.) 1997: Á. JAKOBSSON, *Í leit að konungi: konungsmýnd íslenskra konungasagna*, Reykjavík 1997.
- 2007: Á. JAKOBSSON, *Hinn fullkomni karlmaður: Ímyndarsköpun fyrir biskupa á 13. öld*, *Studia theologica islandica XXV* 2007, pp. 119–30.
- 2014: Á. JAKOBSSON, *A Sense of Belonging: Morkinskinna and Icelandic Identity, c. 1220*, Odense 2014.
- JAKOBSSON (S.) 1999: S. JAKOBSSON, *Defining a Nation: Popular and Public Identity in the Middle Ages*, *Scandinavian Journal of History XXIV* 1999, pp. 91–101.
- 2008: S. JAKOBSSON, *The Peace of God in Iceland in the 12th and 13th centuries*, in: P. KRAFL (ed.), *Sacri canones servandi sunt. Ius canonicum et status ecclesiae saeculis XIII–XV*, Praha 2008, pp. 205–213.
- 2018: S. JAKOBSSON, *Saints and Politicians: The Bishops of Hólar in Troubled Times*, *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia XIV* 2018, pp. 193–210.
- 2024: S. JAKOBSSON, *A Cultural Revolution. Lawmaking and Historiography in Iceland, 1096–1133*, *Scandinavian Studies XCVI* 2024, pp. 1–20.
- JENSEN 2017: K.V. JENSEN, *Crusading at the Edges of Europe. Denmark and Portugal c. 1000–c. 1250*, Abingdon 2017.
- LAKOFF 2002: G. LAKOFF, *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*, Chicago–London 2002.
- LEHMANN 1937: P. LEHMANN, *Skandinaviens Anteil an der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. II, München 1937.
- LÖNNROTH 1959: E. LÖNNROTH, *Kring Erikslegenden*, *Septentrionalia et Orientalia XCI* 1959, pp. 270–281.
- MARTIN 1994: J.S. MARTIN, *The function of bishops in the early Icelandic church*, in: SVERRIR TÓMASSON (ed.), *Samtíðarsögur / The Contemporary Sagas*, Reykjavík 1994, pp. 561–576.
- MEISSNER 1921: R. MEISSNER, *Die kenningar der skalden: ein Beitrag zur skaldischen Poetik*, Bonn 1921.
- VÉSTEINSSON 2000: O. VÉSTEINSSON, *The Christianization of Iceland: Priests, Power, and Social Change 1000–1300*, Oxford 2000.
- PHILLPOTTS 2010: B.S. PHILLPOTTS, *Kindred and Clan in the Middle Ages and After. A Study in the Sociology of the Teutonic Races*, Cambridge 2010.
- ROBBERSTAD 1949–1951: K. ROBBERSTAD, *Ordet patria i Historia Norvegiæ*, *Historisk tidsskrift XXXV* 1949–1951, pp. 187–191.
- SEARLE 2010: J. SEARLE, *Making the social world: the structure of human civilization*, Oxford 2010.
- SHEEN 2008: F.J. SHEEN, *The Life of Christ*, New York 2008.

- WOLF 1989: K. WOLF, *A Translation of the Latin Fragments Containing the Life and Miracles of St Thorlákr along with Collections of Lectiones for Recitation on His Feast-Days*, Proceedings of the PMR Conference, Annual Publication of the Patristic, Medieval and Renaissance Conference XIV 1989, pp. 261–276.

NIKOS KAZANTZAKIS' *TRAVELLING: THE MOREA* – BYZANTIUM AS AN IDEOLOGICAL CONSTRUCT OR A UNIQUE SOURCE OF PERSONAL INSPIRATION?

by

MICHAŁ BZINKOWSKI

ABSTRACT: In September 1937, Nikos Kazantzakis (1883–1957) set out on a tour of the Peloponnese commissioned by the newspaper *Kathimerini*. Relying on Kazantzakis' account from his *Travelling: The Morea*, I focus on his impressions of the Byzantine heritage that he had the opportunity to contemplate *in situ*, as an eye-witness. Such an approach to Kazantzakis' work (which has previously been mistreated) may shed some light on the Byzantine past not merely as an abstract idea used for ideological purposes, which is rather obvious, but as something more tangible, especially for a Greek, and thus constituting a significant component of personal inspiration for the writer. I will devote my attention both to visible traces of the cultural wealth of Byzantium, especially in Mystras, and to notable and influential Byzantine personages he mentions while sightseeing in the former capital of the Byzantine Despotate of the Morea, i.e., George Gemistos Plethon and Constantine Palaiologos. My aim is to show the uniqueness of the reception of Byzantium in Kazantzakis' travelogue which, in my opinion, significantly differs from the well-known stereotypical West European perspective.

Να βυθιστώ στο όραμα Βυζαντίου
N. Kazantzakis, 8 December 1914

I. GREEK BYZANTIUM – A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

In 2019, the Museum of Nikos Kazantzakis and the Museum of Byzantine Culture, together with the Regional Directorate of Crete, organized the exhibition *Kazantzakis and Byzantium: the Quest for the Divine* (15 March–15 September 2019) in Thessaloniki. The items on display, most of which were shown to the public for the first time, included Kazantzakis' earliest personal diaries from his visits to Mount Athos and the Peloponnese in 1914 together with his spiritual brother, the renowned poet Angelos Sikelianos (1884–1951)¹. The organisers

¹ The diary was published in 2020 by the Nikos Kazantzakis Museum, see KAZANTZAKIS 2020.

intended not only to remember one of the most world-renowned 20th-century Greek writers on the sixtieth anniversary of his death, but also to highlight the significance of the legacy of Byzantium in Kazantzakis' oeuvre, a subject that had hitherto been researched only marginally and somewhat unsuccessfully.

There have been various attempts in this regard, focusing on different aspects of the reception of Byzantium, such as the indebtedness of his quasi-autobiographical *Report to Greco* to accounts of the lives of saints that he used to read as a child, as well as the religious tradition of Crete that he was brought up in (DETORAKIS 1987: 184–185)², his tragedies on Byzantine topics, *Julian the Apostate*, *Nikiforos Fokas*, and *Constantine Palaiologos* (OMATOS 1987; BIEN 1998; ROILS 2001; BOROWSKA 2004; LAMBAKIS 2007), or an unrealised project *Akritas* (DETORAKIS 1987: 196–198; ROILS 2001: 230–231; BZINKOWSKI 2017). Surprisingly, scholars of Kazantzakis' work tend to overlook his early work, which includes the travel essays published in the *Travelling* series. Apart from BIEN, who devoted a small chapter to *Travelling: The Morea* in his influential monograph (BIEN 2007: 33–42), Kazantzakis' essayistic texts have never been studied either systematically or in terms of their reception of Byzantium. Meanwhile, this early work, in my opinion, not only sheds more light on the writer's sources of inspiration, but also allows us to trace the crystallisation process of his main philosophical ideas in his later works. However, this topic is beyond the scope of this essay and, in my opinion, deserves a separate study taking into account not only the travel essays but also the film scripts by Kazantzakis, some of which are still in typescript form³.

In my essay, based on Kazantzakis' account in his *Travelling: The Morea* (*Ταξιδεύοντας. Ο Μοριάς*)⁴, I focus on his impressions of the Byzantine world

² As Kazantzakis writes in his *Report to Greco*: "I read the saints' legends, listened to fairy tales, overheard conversations, and inside me all this was transformed–deformed into dazzling lies. [...] Much, much later, when I started writing poems and novels, I came to understand that this secret elaboration is termed 'creation'" (KAZANTZAKIS 1973: 72 f.). DETORAKIS also mentions that Kazantzakis always had a small icon of the Black Madonna with him and that he also had a lot of icons on his desk by well-known painters such as Fotis Kondoglou or Takis Kalmouchos. See DETORAKIS 1987: 186–187.

³ The period 1928–1932 coincides with his stay in Russia, during which Kazantzakis was particularly interested in the possibilities that cinema offered the writer in terms of narrative techniques. Information on this subject can be found, among others, in Kazantzakis' correspondence with Eleni Samiou and Pantelis Prevelakis. During this period, Kazantzakis wrote eight scripts: *The Red Handkerchief* (1928), *Saint Pakhôme et Cie* (1928), *Lenin* (1928), *The Buddha* (1931–1932), *Don Quixote* (1932), *The Muhammad* (1932), *An Eclipse* (1932), and *Decameron* (1932). See BZINKOWSKI 2023: 288.

⁴ Although the official English translation is *Journey to the Morea* (KAZANTZAKIS 1965), in this paper I will use the title *Travelling: The Morea*, as it more accurately renders the Greek original and also emphasises the process of the journey. He uses the name of the Peloponnese from the time of the Frankish occupation, used also in late Byzantium. The texts on the Peloponnese are included in the volume: KAZANTZAKIS 1970, which also includes travel essays from Italy, Egypt, Mount Sinai, Jerusalem,

and its heritage that he had the opportunity to come into direct contact with, admire and contemplate in situ, as an eyewitness. In his account, the Byzantine legacy becomes, as I shall attempt to explicate, not merely an abstract idea that he uses only for ideological purposes, but something concrete, that is first and foremost a source of personal inspiration for the writer, as has already been noted, among others, by ROILS (2001: 228).

In my opinion, this kind of approach has often been misconceived in scholarship on Kazantzakis' oeuvre, which is predominantly researched ideologically or in the context of his multi-layered philosophical or religious background⁵. However, I am convinced that it merits a closer look, as it broadens our view of Kazantzakis as an exceptionally astute observer of the world, people and their creations. Moreover, the analysis of the reception of Byzantium in Kazantzakis' travelogue may also contribute to research on Modern Greeks' approach to Byzantium as a component of their cultural identity. Finally, a review of Kazantzakis' Byzantine inspirations in his early work may, in my view, contribute to a fuller exploration of the sources of the expressive means and inspirations of a writer whose style fully crystallised in his well-known novels and became so well recognized.

I shall pay attention both to visible traces of the cultural heritage of Byzantium in places significant for the medieval history of Greece, especially in Mystras, the former capital of the Despotate of the Morea and the centre of the Palaiologan Renaissance – as well as to notable Byzantine personages he mentions while visiting the Peloponnese: the Neo-Platonist philosopher George Gemistos Plethon, whose residence was in Mystras, and Constantine XI Dragases Palaiologos, the last Byzantine emperor⁶.

Whereas the presence of the Byzantine tradition in West European culture, both high and popular, or in Eastern Slavic Orthodox countries has been a subject of diverse detailed studies focusing on a variety of fields, including literature, music and art (MARCINIAK, SMYTHE 2019), the Greek case is definitely less known and rarely discussed⁷.

and Cyprus. In this essay, I use the 3rd edition of the book. The first edition of this set of essays was published in 1961. In 1927 the first edition of the texts mentioned above was published without Morea: *Ταξιδεύοντας (Ισπανία, Ιταλία, Αίγυπτος, Σινά), Αλεξάνδρεια*: εκδ. Σεράπειον 1927.

⁵ See especially BIEN 2007: 33–42 (*Journey to the Morea*) or DETORAKIS 1987.

⁶ Kazantzakis' travelogue mentions other notable Byzantine personages, but they are of rather minor importance. He hints at, among others, a Byzantine mystic and writer, Nicholas Kabasilas (1319/1323–1139), whom he calls “an old and revered figure, a great long-forgotten Byzantine mystic” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 31). As DETORAKIS notes, Kazantzakis read Kabasilas during his stay on Mount Athos. See DETORAKIS 1987: 193–194. See also KAZANTZAKIS 2022: 125.

⁷ Exceptions include articles on the presence of Byzantium in Greek cinema and the historical novel *Sergios and Bacchos* by M. KARAGATSIS in a recently published collective volume. See KULHÁNKOVÁ, MARCINIAK 2023: 177–189; 239–248.

However, as it turns out, the Greek reception of Byzantium differs remarkably from stereotypical clichés rooted in the West which are based on the misconception that it was exotic, Oriental and degenerate (LIAKOS 2008: 207; MARCINIAK, SMYTHE 2019: 1–5). This image was initiated by Montesquieu, Voltaire and, above all, by Gibbon's widely-known hostile misinterpretation of and contempt for the Eastern Roman Empire.

Meanwhile, for the Greeks, the Byzantine Empire is definitely something much more familiar. This is due not only to the obvious fact that they are Orthodox Christians, inheriting their faith from their predecessors who wouldn't renounce their Orthodox creed during the Ottoman Empire, but, more importantly, because throughout its existence the Byzantine Empire's official language was Greek. Its speakers described themselves as Romans (*Romaioi*, *Romioi*), as for them the Empire was a continuation of the Roman Empire and until the early nineteenth century, three hundred years after the Fall of Constantinople⁸, they still referred to themselves using the same name and their language was described as "Romaic" (BEATON 2019: 7)⁹. Thus, what the West identifies as "Byzantium", using the name coined many centuries after its final destruction in 1453 (MARCINIAK, SMYTHE 2019: 2), belongs for the Greeks to their own legacy and constitutes an inextricable component of their cultural identity.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the issue thoroughly, but, without entering into detailed analysis, one point should be remembered and accentuated. Byzantium as an integral part of Modern Greeks' heritage was not accepted by the Greeks until after 1844. This is when the irredentist *Great Idea* (*Μεγάλη Ιδέα*) of Prime Minister Ioannis Kolettis appeared (BEATON 2004: 66–67; MACKRIDGE 2008: 180; LIAKOS 2008: 208)¹⁰. Yet, initially, as KITROMILIDES convincingly proves, Byzantium was rather absent from political discourse, being rather a rhetorical device, not proper to the Enlightenment ideas Kolettis grew up with¹¹.

⁸ Kazantzakis' attitude to Constantinople within the broader context of general Greek perception of the 'spiritual capital' of Hellenism is beyond the scope of this paper and requires separate treatment. Some of Kazantzakis' impressions of Constantinople may be found in his letters. See ROILOS 2001: 228; 238. As for the question of Byzantium in the Russian context as well as of neo-Byzantinism of the 1920s, see CALOTYCHOS 2011: 201–204; KITROMILIDES 1996: 169 f.

⁹ The Greeks started to use the term "Hellene" (Ελληνες) to define themselves after 1821. See BEATON 2019: 9.

¹⁰ Greece, according to this idea, meant all Greek-speaking communities. The aim of the policy at that time was to regain Constantinople as the spiritual capital of Hellenism and re-establish it as the second capital of the state. See BEATON 2004: 66.

¹¹ Contrarily, in a poem by Alexander Soutsos published in 1843, the notion of Byzantine heritage appears to be inextricably interwoven with 'a claim on the Byzantine Empire', KITROMILIDES 1998: 27. As for the attitude to Byzantium of the intellectuals of the Age of Enlightenment regarding the Greek context, see KITROMILIDES 1996: 104–113.

Not much later, the idea gained a strong theoretical basis when the intellectuals Constantine Paparrigopoulos¹² and Spyridon Zambelios – as a reaction to Fallmerayer's concept of the "racial degeneration" of the Greeks since antiquity (MACKRIDGE 2009: 159–160) – put forward a concept of "Helleno-Christian civilization", of which Byzantium was a missing link¹³. Thus, the Byzantine past, as clearly delineated by Paparrigopoulos, was understood as something totally familiar and domesticated for the Greeks, which he underlined using phrases such as: "Medieval Hellenism", "the Medieval Greek Empire" or "our Medieval forefathers" (KITROMILIDES 1998: 29).

It was at this time, following the publications of Paparrigopoulos and Zambelios, that the newly-born Greek national historical school elaborated the concept of "Hellenism" understood as a "Hellenic genius", which in the Greek case, broadly speaking, encompassed all of Greek history and, by extension, identified "Hellenism" – also "Byzantine Hellenism" – with the concept of the Greek nation (KOUBOURLIS 2009: 60)¹⁴.

II. NIKOS KAZANTZAKIS AS A CORRESPONDENT AND TRAVELLER

Kazantzakis travelled through the Peloponnese during the period 4–19 September 1937, visiting, among others, places such as Patras, Olympia, Bassae, Mystras, Monemvasia, Sparta, Argos, and Mycenae (KARALIS 2011: 263)¹⁵. At the time he was wandering through the provinces of the Morea, the

¹² Constantine Paparrigopoulos (1815–1891) is the author of the monumental *History of the Greek Nation* (Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους, 1860–1874). The first version of his work was published in 1853 and, although it contained just a few passages on Byzantium, significantly contributed to its legitimization. See MACKRIDGE 2009: 181. As KITROMILIDES points out, Paparrigopoulos' account on Byzantium is "not a mere rhetorical eulogy. [...] He provides the reader with an extensive and substantive acquaintance with Byzantine history". See KITROMILIDES 1998: 28.

¹³ MACKRIDGE 2008: 301–302; MACKRIDGE 2009: 181; KOUBOURLIS 2009: 59–60; KOLIOPOULOS, VEREMIS 2010: 98–99; KITROMILIDES 1998: 27; KITROMILIDES 2013: 327; BEATON 2019: 8 f.

¹⁴ Paparrigopoulos found his arguments in the works of the German historian Johann Gustav Droysen (1808–1884). However, the concept of "Hellenic genius" was adopted from Droysen's disciple, Otto Abel (1824–1854). For Zambelios, all historical events, especially national disasters, were necessary and were keys leading to the crucial event in Greek history: the war of independence in 1821. Initially, Zambelios understood the Byzantine monarchy as a foreign, namely Roman, element, which Paparrigopoulos rejected. See KOUBOURLIS 2009: 60–61. Interestingly, for Zambelios, the role of Byzantium was crucial in the context of the transmission of popular tradition and of preserving Greek nationality and culture. See KITROMILIDES 2013: 327.

¹⁵ The newspaper announces the writer on 31 October and 1 November as "well-known for his masterful travel impressions, significant scholar, Nikos Kazantzakis" (γνωστόν δια τας αριστοτεχνικάς ταξιδιωτικές περιγραφάς του διαπρεπή λόγιον κ. Νίκον Καζαντζάκη), who "thanks to *Kathimerini* having been on a tour of the whole Greece starts publishing his impressions in a series of his essays" (περιοδεύσας χάριν της 'Καθημερινής' ολόκληρον την Ελλάδα

dream of a “Great Greece” had been shattered; the disaster that followed the Greco-Turkish War (1919–1922) had caused the uprooting of Greek populations from Asia Minor. The articles he wrote during his wanderings were published in *Kathimerini* in November and December of the same year¹⁶ and gathered in 1961 in a separate travel book also containing his impressions from journeys to Italy, Egypt, Sinai, Jerusalem, and Cyprus (BIEN 2007: 33).

The first “literary” travel accounts that could be ranked among the narratives belonging to that genre appeared in Greece in the late twenties and the early thirties¹⁷ together with two writers who travelled to Spain: Kostas Ouranis and Nikos Kazantzakis (HATZANTONIS 1980: 74; BIEN 2007: 17; CALOTYCHOS 2010: 190–191)¹⁸. The latter who, before he set out to the Peloponnese, had visited Spain three times (1926, 1932–1933, 1936) and similarly Russia in the period 1925–1929, had already gathered some experience in travel writing, yet it should be stressed that he had no stable background in Greek letters as far as travel literature is concerned¹⁹.

Throughout his long literary career, Kazantzakis worked as a foreign correspondent for various well-known Athenian newspapers, such as *Kathimerini* or *Eleftheros Tipos* (ARAMPATZIDOU 2012: 180). He later revised his newspaper articles and incorporated them into his travel writing cycle which he called *Travelling* (*Ταξιδεύοντας*)²⁰. Yet, compared to other travel accounts, the texts devoted to the Peloponnese are in many ways unique and of special interest.

αρχίζει δημοσιεύων εις σειράν άρθρων τας εντυπώσεις του). See DIMADIS 2018: 294 f. All cited fragments in Greek are given in the monotonic system in this paper.

¹⁶ The texts were published in *Kathimerini* during 7 November–21 December 1937. It was a cycle of 17 texts in 21 parts, entitled *A trip to the Peloponnese* (*Ένα ταξίδι εις την Πελοπόννησον*). See DIMADIS 2018: 277.

¹⁷ There had been some earlier travel accounts, but we cannot treat them as “literary”. For more, see ARAMPATZIDOU 2012: 181. For more on Greek travel writing before Kazantzakis and Ouranis, see especially CALOTYCHOS 2011: 193–194.

¹⁸ BIEN suggests that it was Kostas Ouranis (1890–1953) who invented this genre in Greece, but Kazantzakis was the one who established it as an art form of literature. See BIEN 2007: 17. As for Ouranis’ attitude to the Byzantine past, see BZINKOWSKI 2020.

¹⁹ ARAMPATZIDOU, who mainly analyses Kazantzakis’ innovations based on his travelogue on England (1939), writes that he became quite innovative in the poetics of travel writing and that his originality comes from the genre hybridity between fiction and travel writing. See ARAMPATZIDOU 2012: 181.

²⁰ The cycle *Travelling* consists of the following parts (I note here the first editions in Greece): *Russia* (1928), *Spain* (1937), *Japan – China* (1938), *England* (1941), *Italy–Egypt – Mount Sinai – Jerusalem – Cyprus–Peloponnese* (1961) – firstly published in 1927 without the part devoted to the Peloponnese. See DIMADIS 2018: 276. Kazantzakis’ account of his visit to Mount Athos in 1914, which wasn’t incorporated into the cycle, was published in French in *Messenger d’Athènes* in 1915 and later in Greek in 2001 under the title: *Sketches from Mount Athos* (*Σκίτσα από το Άγιον Όρος*).

This is the case because, firstly, on visiting his homeland far from the capital the writer discovers rather obscure regions that are still economically undeveloped and preserve older ways of life and ancient customs and beliefs, and, secondly, because his texts were written under special ideological circumstances (DIMADIS 2018: 290–300). It suffices to mention here that the accounts Kazantzakis contributed to *Kathimerini* were inseparably connected with the newspaper's policy of publishing the cycle of articles about the province with the clearly propagandistic aim of winning the support of the peasants and refugees from Asia Minor for the Metaxas dictatorship (DIMADIS 2018: 291)²¹.

BIEN's suggestion that "the primary aim in many of the travelogues was very non-intellectual and non-analytic: it was to evoke a people and their surroundings" (BIEN 2007: 17)²², is partly what I intend to follow in my paper. In my opinion, Kazantzakis' personal inspiration drawn from Byzantine heritage is much more relevant to the reception of Byzantium in his travelogue than his strictly ideologically-oriented approach. Moreover, such a personal perspective when describing Byzantine legacy reveals Kazantzakis' unique attitude to multi-dimensional layers of Greek history and highlights a significantly new perspective of the 20th-century reception of Byzantium that differs remarkably from the Western European view.

However, the achievement of Kazantzakis should firstly be seen within the context of the *Kathimerini* announcement to its Athenian readers: "Perhaps it is the first time when Greece is revealed to the Modern Greeks" (Ίσως δια πρώτην φοράν η Ελλάς αποκαλύπτεται εις τους Νεοέλληνας, DIMADIS 2018: 295). Thus, according to the newspaper's policy, Kazantzakis' texts had a clear goal: to familiarise the Greeks, at least those living in Athens, with their native land, to show some parts of the Peloponnese within the context of the historical and ideological framework, at the same time highlighting the most crucial question: the connection of the natural landscape to the formation of Greek civilization (KARALIS 2011: 264)²³, which I shall also discuss briefly below.

²¹ The cycle of articles for *Kathimerini*, as DIMADIS attests, was placed in the column "Modern Greece" (*Η σύγχρονη Ελλάς*) and its subtitles fully complied with the newspaper's ideological purposes. Suffice it to mention here, for example: "Peloponnese, the cradle of Hellenism". See DIMADIS 2018: 293. As BIEN notes, Kazantzakis' attitude to the Metaxas regime was very ambiguous: it was simultaneously negative, as he didn't feel comfortable "with a regime that suppressed Pericles and Sophocles, and because he was a republican and a Venizelist", and positive, because of the attitudes he revealed, for instance, in *Spain*, *Journey to the Morea*, and *England*. For more on this complex question, see BIEN 2007: 43–59.

²² As he notes, Kazantzakis "was not a tourist; yet he was a sociologist and philosopher; often a brilliant one", *ibidem*.

²³ Kazantzakis was at the time influenced by the significant book: *Modern Greek Society and Economy* (*Η νεοελληνική κοινωνία και οικονομία*, 1934) by Dimosthenis Daniilidis (1889–1972), which was the first systematic study of Neohellenism seen as an entity that developed in specific geographical and economic conditions, always turned toward the East. See KARALIS 2011: 265.

III. THE PELOPONNESE – THE CRADLE OF HELLENISM

As Kazantzakis writes to his second wife, Eleni Samiou, the task of composing the articles from his journey seemed extremely hard, more difficult than he had expected: “I’m writing the articles on the Peloponnese now. There’ll be 20 of them. They’re overwhelmingly difficult, whereas they might have been overwhelmingly easy. But I don’t want to slip into platitudes and I’m being very careful. Impossible to write more than one a day”²⁴. The reasons for such a complaint might result, as is sometimes accentuated, from the general disappointment of the writer as well as from his attempt to avoid the occasionally stereotypical and negative views of people he encountered during his trip (BIEN 2007: 34). Anyhow, the difficulties he came across are vividly expressed in the first chapter of his travelogue, where he underlines the peculiar character of the history of Greek land that appears to be for him a palimpsest with multilayered epigraphs. The Peloponnesus, “the cradle of Hellenism” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 12) constitutes a sort of focal point where all Greek history manifests itself, as Kazantzakis demonstrates briefly in the preface to his travelogue:

The face of Greece is a palimpsest bearing twelve successive inscriptions: Contemporary; the period of 1821; the Turkish yoke; the Frankish sway; the Byzantine; the Roman; the Hellenistic epoch; the Classic; the Dorian middle ages; the Mycenaean; the Aegean; and the Stone Age. Pause on a patch of Greek earth and anguish overcomes you. It is a deep, twelve-levelled tomb, from which voices rise up calling to you. Which voice should you choose? Every voice, every spirit longs for its body; your heart is shaken, and cannot decide.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 7²⁵)

Kazantzakis’ holistic approach to Greek history, which he emphasises at the beginning of *Travelling: The Morea*, is a complex and far-reaching construct. What is relevant for the reception of Byzantium is that the writer considers it an inextricable part of Hellenism but above that – which seems pivotal here – demonstrates the way he faces this legacy: not by means of intellect but mainly emotionally, with the two constantly fighting elements, heart and mind, which Kazantzakis defines as an “ageless struggle” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 7). Thus, from the very beginning, the author reveals his deeply personal attitude to Greek history, and implicitly also to the way he perceives the legacy of Byzantium. This becomes clearer in the subsequent part, where he alludes directly to a crucial moment in the history of Hellenism:

²⁴ I cite the English translation from BIEN 2007: 34. The source is KAZANTZAKIS 1998: 421.

²⁵ All English translations of Kazantzakis’ account of the Peloponnese are by F.A. REED, 1965.

Your full heart leaps forward to resurrect a pale, death-destined body; it wants to turn back the wheel of time to the sixth of January, 1449, when here, high up in Mystras, that body accepted the tormented, short-lived crown.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 7 f.)

Kazantzakis explicitly hints at the end of the Byzantine Empire, as he discerns the symbol of its decline and collapse in the ruins of medieval Mystras. The last Byzantine emperor of the Palaiologan dynasty, Constantine XI, was symbolically crowned in one of the churches here, probably in the Palace of the Despot, on 6 January 1449, and reigned until his death in battle in 1453 defending Constantinople (NICOL 1992: 37)²⁶. His devotion became so famous and admired that he was mythologised in folk imagination and became known as the legendary “Marbled Emperor” (Μαρμαρωμένος Βασιλιάς). Many folk tales about his fictional wife and children have been created, as well as many prophecies about the resurrected king that turned to marble and became immortalised²⁷.

For Kazantzakis – who must have known the folk tales about the Marbled King, especially those echoed in the renowned composition by Kostis Palamas, *Emperor's Reed-Pipe* (1910)²⁸ as well as in other Modern Greek works of that time²⁹, and who was aware of the connotations his figure carries for the Greeks³⁰

²⁶ As there was no Patriarch in Mystras and due to the fact that there is no evidence that the ceremony was conducted by a local bishop, it is presumed that it was rather a civil ceremony. See NICOL 1992: 37. Constantine XI wasn't crowned in Hagia Sophia later, a fact which itself was so unusual that some historians believe the last Byzantine emperor to have been John VIII. The site of coronation is also unknown: it took place either in Mitropolis or in the church of Hagia Sophia in Mystras. See RUNCIMAN 2009: 77. Yet, to be proclaimed an emperor in a provincial city was not unusual; suffice it to recall here the founder of the dynasty of Palaiologoi, Michael VIII (Nicaea) or John VI Cantacuzene (Adrianople), although both of them were crowned again at official ceremonies in Constantinople. See NICOL 2004: 370. For Byzantine sources concerning Constantine Palaiologos' death, see Nikolaidou 2015: 265 ff.

²⁷ As for the legends and myths concerning Constantine XI, see especially the chapter “The Immortal Emperor” in NICOL 1992: 95–120. See also ROILLOS 2001: 236. PERTUSI, who has thoroughly researched prophetic literature related to the fall of Constantinople, argues that the origins of the legend of the emperor turned into marble should be sought in the seventh and eighth centuries in the Syriac-Greek-Latin tradition, in texts such as *Apocalypsis Methodii*, *Visio Danielis*, and *Oracula Leonis*. See PERTUSI 1988: 92; 111; 154.

²⁸ Palamas' composition is unique, for it encompasses, probably for the first time in Modern Greek literature on such a scale, the synthesis of antiquity and the living present, of classical and Byzantine tradition, pagan and Christian elements. For more, see BEATON 2004: 90 f.

²⁹ The figure of the last emperor appears in the verse of Giorgios Vizirinos (1849–1896), but more importantly in some poems by Georgios Drosinis (1859–1951) and Kostas Kariotakis (1896–1928) that echo the success of King Constantine I in the Balkan wars. See NIKOLAIDOU 2015: 272 f.

³⁰ Popular imagination has associated King Otto, when he was enthroned as King of Greece in 1832 and King Constantine I (king of Greece in 1913–1917, 1920–1922), with the last Byzantine Emperor. See NIKOLAIDOU 2015: 271.

– Constantine XI Palaiologos turns into a symbol of bravery. His figure appears to fit perfectly into one of Kazantzakis' key concepts, that of "The Cretan Glance" (Κρητική ματιά) that relies, broadly speaking, on the conviction that even a fight doomed to failure is worth fighting, and that one should live and work, always remembering the shadow of imminent death – an idea that echoes the philosophy of Nietzsche – one of the philosophical masters for the writer (LEVITT 1971–1972: 173–175; VITTI 1994: 342)³¹:

I know. Let us, like the people, be courageous, let us live and die like men, like the sorrowing last emperor of Byzantium setting out from this ruined palace before me to rescue the remains of the City, and to perish valiantly.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 115)

However, it is not just a concept or personal mythology that was evoked while Kazantzakis was contemplating the ruins of Mystras. Constantine XI, due to his presence in folk mythology and his manifestations in countless demotic songs and fairy tales, undoubtedly belongs to collective Greek memory and therefore may constitute a component of Greek national identity.

The dialogue below may be a vivid confirmation of the suggestion made above. Kazantzakis, visiting the Church of Saint Demetrios, the earliest of the surviving churches of Mystras (second half of the thirteenth century), known as the Metropolis, has a conversation with an old sacristan woman. She points him to the double-headed eagle carved in a marble plaque, the distinctly recognisable symbol of the Byzantine Empire:

'Here', she said, 'stood Constantine Palaiologos, when he was crowned emperor of Byzantium.'
'Was it long ago', I ask.
But the old woman who now led the Metropolis, its saints and kings in her control, answered with authority, as if reading some gravestone:
'The sixth of January, fourteen forty-nine.'

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 110 f.)

The Fall of Constantinople is regarded by the Greeks as one of the biggest "national" disasters, as it is sometimes underlined in Greek historiography

³¹ Kazantzakis expresses his idea abundantly in the final chapter of *Report to Greco* entitled "The Cretan Glance": "I know perfectly well that death is invincible. Man's worth, however, lies not in victory but in the struggle for victory. [...] Man's worth lies in one thing only, in this: that he live and die bravely, without condescending to accept any recompense. And [...] the certainty that no recompense exists must not make our blood run cold, but must fill us with joy, pride and manly courage" (KAZANTZAKIS 1973: 482). It is worth mentioning that Kazantzakis devoted his doctoral thesis to Nietzsche's philosophy. See BIEN 1971–1972.

(KOUBOURLIS 2009: 60). In light of this, Constantine XI appears to be one of the greatest national heroes for Kazantzakis. The writer would return to this figure of the last Byzantine emperor many years later. Between 1943 and 1944, just before Greece's liberation, when, as BIEN notes, Kazantzakis was grappling with threads throughout Greek history to reaffirm its continuity and also to rediscover its roots, he began writing the tragedy *Constantine Palaiologos*.³² Yet, this does not mean that he was obsessed with the subject for so many years. As he confesses in a letter to Prevelakis, "It is a subject that has suddenly gripped me" (Aegina, August 1944).³³ However, it should not be forgotten that the aforementioned drama was written in difficult times for Greece, during the last days of the Second World War and, at the same time, at the beginning of the civil war. As it is believed, both events significantly influenced the formation of the image of the main characters in Kazantzakis' tragedies which were written at that time. Also Constantine Palaiologos is not free from pessimistic sentiments about the surrounding reality. As PETRAKU, among others, points out – he becomes the epitome of "The Cretan Glance" and does not stop acting until the end, although he sees no hope of being saved.³⁴

It would therefore be highly risky to juxtapose the character Constantine Palaiologos from a drama written then with the character Kazantzakis refers to in *Travelling: The Morea*. The two texts were written in a completely different period of creativity and bear the marks of slightly different inspirations. As I have already underlined, Kazantzakis' approach to Byzantium in *Travelling: The Morea* is remote from any stereotypical view and is an image marked by a personal emotional attitude. Thus, consequently, by referring to the figure of the last Byzantine emperor, the writer distances himself from any attempt to reconstruct the glorious past.

³² As BIEN notes, he began the play in late July or early August 1944. For more, see the whole chapter by BIEN 2007: 224 (Chapter sixteen, *Constantine Palaiologos*). In the 1940s, Kazantzakis was also working on a never-completed work, *Akritas*, based on another Byzantine national hero. For more, see BZINKOWSKI 2017: 45–54. Prevelakis is known to have read the finished manuscript as late as 1953. See KAZANTZAKIS 1984: 655. See also BOROWSKA 2004: 174, who also gives a comprehensive summary of the play. His tragedies on Byzantine topics, *Julian the Apostate*, *Nikiforos Fokas*, and *Constantine Palaiologos* form the so-called "Byzantine trilogy" and should be read as a whole. See BOROWSKA 2004: 167. As is sometimes stressed, it is his only Byzantine tragedy that to some extent deals with nationalistic sentiments (ROILOS 2001: 236).

³³ KAZANTZAKIS 1984: 518 (Letter no 299).

³⁴ PETRAKU 2012: 216. For more on the tragedy, see especially BIEN 2007: 224–236. As he writes significantly about the uniqueness of this tragedy: "The linkage here between Hellenism and Christianity, like that previously between Byzantium and Sparta, is presented without excessive strain; indeed in general the various syntheses in this play – the ways in which the Byzantine subject is fused with both Neohellenism and antiquity, giving a sense of unity and diversity – are among the happiest in Kazantzakis's oeuvre". See BIEN 2007: 230.

Yet, Kazantzakis' heroes are not modelled merely to fit his ad hoc ideological concepts, but may rather be conceived as universal symbols. Returning to the above-mentioned fragment, the association of Constantine Palaiologos with "the martyr's crown" obviously reverts the well-known imagery and, as such, it may appear somehow hackneyed. But only seemingly, since Kazantzakis reiterates here his pivotal concept of heroic pessimism fully expressed in "The Cretan Glance". In this regard, the last Byzantine emperor, who died defending the City as a common soldier (NICOL 2004: 388), appears to be a perfect manifestation of the same Nietzschean idea that haunted Kazantzakis throughout his life, manifested in the concept of "The Cretan Glance", as I have already mentioned, that the true value of a man and his true dignity lies in keeping up the fight until the very end, no matter how pointless it is.

The above-mentioned example is also meaningful as far as the reception of Byzantium is concerned, for it allows us to realize the close relation between Kazantzakis' inspirations in Byzantine legacy and his philosophical concepts (ROILOS 2001: 227–228). The Byzantine motives are also never confined in his oeuvre to Greek nationalist symbols – even if they may appear to be so – but are universal points of reference. As BIEN argues, for instance, the links between Constantine, Odysseus and Akritas are quite easily detectable (BIEN 2007: 225), as all of them constitute the same idea that Kazantzakis was working on from the early stages of his writings (BZINKOWSKI 2017: 47).

In *Travelling: The Morea* Kazantzakis introduces another figure living at the same time, just before the fall of Constantinople, namely the highly influential Neoplatonic philosopher George Gemistos Plethon. He was born in Constantinople circa 1360 and died in 1452, but spent most of his life in Mystras, having been sent there by Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos between 1405 and 1410³⁵. However, for Kazantzakis, Plethon – the author of *Nómoi* (*Nóμοι*, *Book of Laws*), inspired by Plato's *Laws* – is not important due to his contribution to studies on Plato and the introduction of his philosophy, together with the *Geography* of Strabo (WOODHOUSE 2000: 181–186), which until then had been unknown to the West³⁶. Instead, Kazantzakis focuses on Plethon's ideas, which

³⁵ Plethon was one of the most important intellectuals and advisors in the emperor's court in Mystras and was fully aware of Manuel's philosophical and political merits as a personification of Plato's ideal philosopher king (SINIOSSOGLOU 2011: 4). As SINIOSSOGLOU adds, Plethon might have been sent to Mystras by Manuel to some sort of intellectual exile (SINIOSSOGLOU 2011: 131). He became the counsellor of Manuel's son, Theodore II, and advisor to the emperor on the problems of the Morea. See NICOL 2004: 343.

³⁶ WOODHOUSE enumerates all the Italian intellectuals that must have listened to the lectures that he gave in 1439 in Florence "On the Differences of Aristotle and Plato" and comes to the conclusion that, in fact, it is extremely hard to find absolute proof of his influence on the scholars of that time. According to him, Plethon's intentions were different from what he really achieved. In fact, he managed to interest not the philosophers, as he had wished, but writers and artists. See WOODHOUSE 2000: ix–xi; 156 ff.

were of crucial interest to Greek intellectuals, on the rebirth and continuity of Hellenism understood not as a synonym for “pagan” but in reference to the nation which was in need of rebirth (BIEN 2007: 226)³⁷. In the subsequent chapter, significantly entitled “The Prophet of Modern Greece”, Kazantzakis encounters the shadow of the last Byzantine philosopher:

Among the stones wandered a shade, thin-haired, staff in hand. I stopped, ashamed; I recognized him at once – Giorgios Gemistos, Plethon. [...] For years this last sacred sacrificial lamb, this pale countenance, this wearied and courageous hand had fascinated my heart.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 118)

Through Plethon's utterance, Kazantzakis outlines the reasons for the doom that the philosopher wanted to forestall, although all his efforts were in vain (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 118). Interestingly, he tends to emphasize the internal symptoms of degeneration rather than the external, hostile forces. Thus, his diagnosis becomes a universal miniature of the collapse of every civilization that rots from the inside and is doomed to fall, a concept that will recur in his other works³⁸.

In Kazantzakis' travelogue, Plethon, who, as BIEN notes, was a dreamer, believed in national continuity and wanted to fashion the new world with Hellenic qualities (BIEN 2007: 226 f.), is described as ‘a great harbinger of the modern Greek renaissance’ (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 122). Similarly to Constantine Palaiologos, Gemistos constitutes a link between the Hellenic identity in Byzantium, which manifested itself in the notion of being *Romios* (MACKRIDGE 2009: 48), and the Modern Hellenes. Kazantzakis fully realizes that the philosopher's ideas were premature and far ahead of his time: “he was born several centuries too soon – who could hear him? [...] The voice of the defiant [...] It cried out, even when there were no ears to hear” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 121).

The Cretan writer alludes directly to Plethon's theory of ethnic continuity, claiming that the Byzantines were immediate descendants of Ancient Hellenes, and that Mystras, lying so close to ancient Sparta – in earlier chapters

³⁷ Plethon is also mentioned by Kostis Palamas (1859–1943) in his well-known composition *The Dodecalogue of the Gypsy* (1907), Part VI, *Around a fire* (Γύρω σε μια φωτιά).

³⁸ The people of Constantinople were unable to defend the City, because among them there were, as he stresses, “inhuman, uneducated dissolute archons, so bereft of the virtues of nobility”, monks who were “superfluous, unclean louts” or the army consisting of “all races, avaricious brigands and thieves, ready at any moment to surrender” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 119). Similarly, Kazantzakis' Odysseus from *The Odyssey: A Modern Sequel*, lives, as PREVELAKIS 1961: 77 notes, “between a civilization that is dying and one that is about to be born”, which, together with the other motives, echoes Marx's dialectic of history and Spengler's theory of historic comparative morphology. The kingdoms of Sparta, Crete and Egypt in Kazantzakis' *Odyssey* were also decadent. See PREVELAKIS 1961: 77–79.

of *Travelling: The Morea* he alludes to the Spartan heritage as another essential component of Greek history – might be an ideal place for the rebirth of Hellenism (NICOL 2004: 343).

The ideas of Plethon, whose voice was not heard because he lived, as Kazantzakis adds, in the times of “the quarrels of the Palaiologoi”, was scorned by his famous pupil George Scholarios, later Patriarch of Constantinople in the times of Mehmed II, who burnt his writings (SINIOSSOGLU 2011: 131–134)³⁹. Notably, Kazantzakis focuses not on Plethon’s social and political utopia based on classic Athenian culture with elements of Platonism and Stoicism (which was so strongly condemned by his contemporaries⁴⁰), but on the question of his attitude to tradition. However, it is not specifically Hellenic tradition that one could expect, but tradition *par excellence*, one that is not invariable and, according to Kazantzakis, should be adjusted to a constantly flexible and fluid reality. As he explains Plethon’s central idea:

Tradition is worthy of respect, but living man is not obliged to obey it blindly. He must, above all, have Reason as his guide. Man’s conceptions of divinity, of good and evil, of right and wrong, are not invariable; they change according to time and place; they are full of confusion and contradiction. They are not divine institutions but rather human ones, changing along with man.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 121 f.)

As in the case of Constantine Palaiologos, apart from the fact that Gemistos is one of the last Hellenes in moribund Byzantium, he constitutes a universal symbol of the one who, conversing with his tradition, tries to encompass in his concepts only the things that fit with his time and to change the reality, but struggles in vain as there is no one to listen to him. Therefore, his figure ties in perfectly with other Kazantzakian protagonists; loners, mystics and great religious reformers. The philosopher’s Byzantine origins and Mystras, the place he lived in for most of his life, are irrelevant to a greater degree. The ruin of a Byzantine city is just a place that evokes some associations and a convenient starting point, firstly, to reflect on the essence of Hellenism within the context of its continuity, and secondly, and more importantly, on the human condition in critical times, on the freedom of proclaiming one’s views while no one else shares them.

³⁹ Scholarios, as SINIOSSOGLU adds, in his most famous work against Plethon, *Defence of Aristotle*, was anxious about the Hellenism that – as an ideological and philosophical paradigm – was aimed at overthrowing Orthodoxy in the Peloponnese. See SINIOSSOGLU 2011: 142; WOODHOUSE 2000: 240 ff. NICOL 2004: 345.

⁴⁰ In fact, he went so far as to totally reject Christianity in favour of a new “Hellenic” religion with the pantheon of Greek gods and based on Plato’s philosophy with some elements of Zoroastrianism. See NICOL 2004: 345.

The Byzantine Empire, as Kazantzakis tends to stress in the chapter analysed above, becomes for him just a miniature of every state consisting of a mosaic of nations that have nothing in common with each other but their fear of the rulers⁴¹.

However, Mystras reminds Kazantzakis not only of significant figures evoking the principal ideas that tormented him throughout his life, such as the aforementioned 'Cretan Glance', but also, more importantly, reveals the inspiring wealth of the Byzantine world that has survived in the ruins and scattered fragments of mosaics in small churches.

IV. MYSTRAS – THE GOLDEN AGE OF BYZANTINE ART

The archaeological site of Mystras, picturesquely situated on the slopes of Taygetus, was inscribed in 1989 on the UNESCO World Heritage List⁴². When Kazantzakis visited it, it had been abandoned for a hundred years⁴³ and the state of the frescoes in the churches was rather pitiful. Yet, the writer was greatly impressed by them, especially by the paintings that were for him exponents of fresh new ideas that couldn't have been expressed by others.

Close to ancient Sparta, Mystras, where in the last decades of the Byzantine Empire classical learning was still flourishing thanks to Plethon, was a perfect place for Kazantzakis to find new inspiration. What is noteworthy is that Mystras could also have been known to him from Goethe's *Faust*, where in the second part it becomes the setting in which Faust meets Helen of Troy (RUNCIMAN 2009: 132). This is not just a random coincidence if we take into account the fact that Kazantzakis was translating the first part of *Faust* into Greek at the time (BIEN 2007: 2), but also due to the fact that, much later, in the early fifties, he planned a project, which was never realized, similarly to *Akritas*, that he called *Third Faust*, the plot of which he intended to locate right there in Mystras⁴⁴. Yet,

⁴¹ As there is no unifying internal element other than violence, such an organism must, in his view, inevitably disappear, which is what actually happened to Byzantium: "The Byzantine Empire was reduced to a mosaic of ill-matched nationalities, which only force and fear could bind together" (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 119).

⁴² As KOURELIS significantly notices, hinting at the mythopoiesis of Mystras in modern times: "When Greece's political agenda shifted from the ultra-nationalism of the twentieth into the European multiculturalism of the twenty-first century, Mystras adjusted as a site of multi-ethnic vitality and global heritage". See KOURELIS 2011–2012: 299.

⁴³ For the history of Mystras, see especially RUNCIMAN 2009.

⁴⁴ The sketch of Kazantzakis' project can be found in PREVELAKIS' commentary to their letters. See Kazantzakis 1984: 624 f. Apart from *Third Faust*, Kazantzakis also planned a composition based on the figure of Gemistos Plethon. See KAZANTZAKIS 1984: 624; BIEN 2007: 479 f. Some hints regarding the project can be found in letters no. 361 (April 1950); no. 363 (24 July 1950); no. 366 (11 November 1950); no. 367 (25 January 1951); no. 372 (22 February 1951) and

above all, he was enchanted by the beauty of the Byzantine art he encountered there, as he stresses, “proclaiming new times”:

Frescoes unfolded free, refreshing, full of life in the churches of Mystras [...] As is so often observed in history, here, too, art and painting, first among the arts, led the way, proclaiming new times. Where the poet could not yet succeed, where the citizen did not yet dare, the painter took the risk and thus proclaimed, spreading such joyous color and lively movement, the advent of a new freedom.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 120)

His authentic admiration of the works created during the Palaiologan Renaissance, the last stage of Byzantium under the reign of the Palaiologan dynasty (1261–1453)⁴⁵, is beyond any doubt. He shares this feeling of awe with others, since, as it has been underlined, it is in Mystras, especially in the fourteenth century, that Byzantine art could rival the magnificent art of Constantinople (BAYET 2009: 169).

Kazantzakis’ reflections in Mystras, which “gleamed alone” while “darkness covered the rest of Greece” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 120), are as yet devoid of any specific commentary that could reveal his deeper knowledge of the Byzantine heritage of that place⁴⁶. As has often been noted, Kazantzakis never expressed any explicit opinion about Byzantium and drew from it only those elements that accorded with his eclectic philosophy (ROLOS 2001: 227 f.). In this light, the golden age of Byzantine art seems to have been for him just an exemplum through which he could express the role of art at crucial moments of history when one order was replaced by the other.

The Despotate of the Morea, which Mystras was the capital of, survived until 1460 when it passed into Turkish hands (NICOL 2004: 398), which was the swan song of the decline of the Byzantine Empire. Therefore, for Kazantzakis it was

no. 374 (6 March 1952). See KAZANTZAKIS 1984: 622–645. For more on the *Akritas* project, see BZINKOWSKI 2017.

⁴⁵ The art of the Palaiologan Renaissance, which drew abundantly from miniatures of the manuscripts that were very popular at that time, as regards wall-paintings, may be characterised as very expressive, which is visible in the gestures of the figures represented on the frescoes, their sudden postures, their slow or violent movements as they raise their garments, and their highly expressive glance. Faces are often full of nostalgia and melancholy and express a sense of drama. Besides that, the artists represent scenes from family life that are rich in detail. See DELVOYE 2000: 518. The same is the case with portable icons, where the figures are presented as more human, which makes them more accessible to people. See DELVOYE 2000: 554.

⁴⁶ DETORAKIS notes that among the books from his personal library that were donated to the Historical Museum of Crete there is not a single book related to Byzantium besides one small publication on Digenes Akritas by Stilpon Kyriakides. See DETORAKIS 1987: 193. Kazantzakis with certainty read Nicholas Cabasilas, the *Ptochoprodromika* of Theodore Prodromos, Gregory of Nazianzus, the chronicle of Georges Sphratzes or Doukas. See DETORAKIS 1987: 195–197.

an ideal point from which he could approach both the past and the future of Hellenism – one that had already been vanishing and that was to be born after some centuries of lethargy. Since in Mystras, for him ‘the eternal Greek spirit had awakened’ (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 111).

However, the exceptionality of Mystras at the time of Kazantzakis' visit is also evidenced in the framework in which it was placed in the thirties in the context of the national discourse. During that time, Mystras became central in archaeological discourses and, thanks to generous donations from the state, restoration was begun in order for the city to become a showcase of Byzantine civilization, both for domestic and international audiences (KOURELIS 2011–2012: 297)⁴⁷. As such, it became for Kazantzakis a perfect ideological topos, since – having been founded in 1249 by William II Villehardouin – it encompassed both the West and the East as the capital of the Despotate of the Morea (KOURELIS 2011–2012: 298). Apart from the fact that not every archaeological work was carried out in accordance with the state of the art, especially as regards the houses⁴⁸, the frescoes Kazantzakis admired in the churches of Mystras revealed to him an unprecedented treasury of late Byzantine art of the late Palaiologan era.

The writer doesn't pay much attention to domestic architecture, but contemplates mostly religious art. What remained from the ruined Mystras, where “no longer does any living man reside here”, are “only the churches, noble Byzantine damsels, [...] Perivleptos, Evangelismos, Mitropolis, Aghioi Theodoroi, Afendiko, and Pantanassa” and “the despotic palace of the Katakouzenes and the Palaiologoi, with that noble church Aghia Sophia, with the rich deserted mansions: balconies of stone, towers, huge vaulted halls, and battlements” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 107–108).

Mitropolis, the Metropolitan Church of Saint Demetrios, with which Kazantzakis starts his description of Mystras, is the oldest of the surviving churches⁴⁹. Yet, what initially strikes the author is not the magnificent church itself and its unique frescoes, but an intriguing object situated in the courtyard. It is a Roman sarcophagus, placed in front of the church and still in place nowadays, covered with magnificent carvings representing the Dionysian thiasos.

⁴⁷ As KOURELIS convincingly proves, Anastasios K. Orlandos (1887–1979), the director of the archaeological excavations in Mystras in the thirties and a pioneer of Byzantine archaeology, created an illusion that the houses of Mystras are the best preserved examples of domestic Byzantine architecture and are part of a real Byzantine city that only lacks inhabitants. Thus, he created a paradigmatic Byzantine city, which was far from the truth, for the houses were continuously inhabited throughout the Ottoman, Venetian and modern Greek periods. See KOURELIS 2011–2012: 304.

⁴⁸ KOURELIS argues that Orlandos neglected all the post-byzantine history of Mystras. See KOURELIS 2011–2012: 303 ff.

⁴⁹ The exact date is still unknown. An indisputable fact is that the archbishop of Sparta, Nicephoros Moschopoulos founded the church in 1291 as the metropolitan church of Mystras. He is also said to have rebuilt the church. See DELVOYE 2000: 505; 507.

Characteristically, such a find becomes for the writer a convenient pretext for reflection on the continuity of the Hellenic tradition and on the liveliness of some religious concepts:

In the centre the ancient marble sarcophagus with the joyous cupids and marble grapes shines in the sun. What are the wily, archaic demons up to in this Christian court? It is as if Dionysos has sneaked into the transept and eavesdrops on the mournful, so familiar cries of God being killed.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 110)

As Kazantzakis reports, the elderly sacristan, who noticed his bewilderment, rushed to answer that the sarcophagus is in fact “the Marmara fountain” and “it used to be down in the village” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 111), which probably echoed a local folk story about its origin. To a facetious comment of the writer that “it doesn’t go with the church at all! Who are those naked, dancing children?”, she convincingly answered that they were just “little angels” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 112).

The passage humorously reveals Kazantzakis’ attitude to Hellenic tradition that he treats both holistically and, as regards religious concepts, in a syncretic way. Therefore, the ancient sarcophagus with the representations of frenzied dancers, which in folk imagination turned into angels, in the proximity of a Byzantine church doesn’t seem improper, but constitutes a living reminder of a complex Hellenic tradition. It may also be something more: it reminds Kazantzakis of the coexistence of various traditions, pagan and Christian, that communicate on different levels (PAPALEXANDROU 2001: 238).

Entering the Church of Saint Demetrios, Kazantzakis realizes that the frescoes of the Second Coming and the martyrdom of Saint Demetrios that he had seen some years before, now are in a terrible state of preservation:

The colours glow dimly, the passage of time has obscured them, year by year they grow dimmer still. A few years ago I could easily make out the Preparation of the Throne, the angels running, terror-stricken, the throne in the middle empty and savage, awaiting the fearsome monarch. This last flowering of Byzantine art is vanishing, obscured by white wash and smoke.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 110)

Thanks to the sacristan, who lit a candle, he could take a closer look at the remarkable wall paintings in the church depicting the above-mentioned scenes and other Christian miracles. He focuses on their originality, comparing them to pieces of art created before the Palaiologan Renaissance, and he underlines the change in the means of expression and the liveliness of the represented figures. It appears that the writer must have seen the original, freshly uncovered

upper frescoes that were created before the middle of the fifteenth century. It is known that they were covered by later work by the then Metropolitan Matthew, who destroyed the original layers (DELVOYE 2000: 507; RUNCIMAN 2009: 94). In the description that follows, Kazantzakis reveals his admiration for the excellent workmanship, especially for something that RUNCIMAN defined as “a strong sense of movement” (RUNCIMAN 2009: 94–95)⁵⁰, a feature that will also enchant him elsewhere:

Refreshing, cheerful colours, Pompeian composition [...]. Fantasy and pathos, daring expression, freedom of movement. By then the immobile Byzantine forms began to move, the saints smiled [...]. For a long time these saints and angels had been sullen and tremulous. Yellow cheeks, wild eyes, closed mouths. But little by little they've been mollified; the cheerful valley – the lemons, the tangerines, the rhododendrons – laid them siege and they surrendered.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 111)

The monument, which seems to vibrate with energy, becomes for Kazantzakis a sort of “living organism”. However, in this particular case, this work of art should not be narrowed down to Byzantine heritage alone (PAPALEXANDROU 2001: 238; 249 f.). It is an experience of authentic art that radiates from the Middle Ages until the present, transcending the constraints of time.

Subsequently, Kazantzakis describes other Byzantine monasteries in his travelogue: the Brontochion Monastery, the Pantanassa Monastery and the Peribleptos Monastery. As for the first two, the writer conveys some general impressions and provides brief information concerning their importance. The Brontochion Monastery, as he observes, “was the richest and most famous [...]. A centre of spiritual life” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 112). He is fully aware of its importance, as he mentions that the tombs of the despots of the Morea are located right there. Yet, though one can still discern the cells, kitchens and dining halls, the place seems to be completely ruined. What strikes the writer the most are once more the remarkable wall paintings he admires in the Church of the Hodegetria, known also as Aphentiko – a *katholikon* of the monastery – that he describes as “a masterpiece of architecture” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 112). Built in the beginning of the fourteenth century in a new architectural style (RUNCIMAN 2009: 88), the church contains famous frescoes representing the cycle of the Dormition of the Virgin. However, the writer is enchanted by something else, the “brilliant-toned frescoes”:

⁵⁰ He notes that the artists must have belonged to the same school as those who painted the frescoes in the chapel of the Church of Our Saviour in Chora in Constantinople. See RUNCIMAN 2009: 94. For the origins of the frescoes, see also DELVOYE 2000: 528 f.

A few brush strokes from the robes and figures of the old kings have endured. Certain of these saintly heads are superb, full of life and movement and pride, like Homeric heroes.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 112)

Similarly, Kazantzakis is especially impressed by the movement and the liveliness of the painted figures. Thus, the somehow fossilised and stiff patterns of the earlier periods, which are common clichés in the reception of Byzantium in West European imagination, are here replaced, according to Kazantzakis, by new means of expression. The figures are not only wrapped in clouds of mystic exaltation and timeless sanctity, but they also possess a feature of essential importance for Kazantzakis – they seem to be in constant motion and therefore alive.

The Pantanassa Monastery, founded in 1426 (RUNCIMAN 2009: 94), which is the only one still inhabited by nuns, doesn't attract Kazantzakis very much. However, he remembers visiting one of the cells some time earlier, when he had the impression that "he had suddenly been transported to paradise" (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 112 f.). He notes the general cleanness of the place, which is well kept by the nuns. One of them, scared at the sight of the visitors, ran away, and her movements are compared to the frescoes of the Divine Liturgy he will admire in the Peribleptos Monastery. "The angels, running with the chalice in their hands, take just hurried strides" (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 113).

The Peribleptos Monastery, architectonically unique in Mystras due to the variety of shapes of the exterior structure, built in the mid-fourteenth century by Manuel Kantakouzenos, the first Despot of the Morea (DELVOYE 2000: 529), is described in the chapter "Mortals and Immortals". This section is worth a closer look because it is the only one in the whole travelogue in which Kazantzakis deals exclusively with the art of wall painting.

He notices from a distance the uniqueness of the monastery, which, as he observes, appears as if it were "hanging amid complex scaffolding in mid-air like a church chandelier" (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 127). Yet, in this place, he will be followed by an unusual guide – the famous painter and writer Fotis Kondoglou⁵¹ who at the time was supervising the conservation of the remarkable Byzantine frescoes at the Peribleptos Monastery⁵².

⁵¹ Fotis Kondoglou (1895–1965), who was a refugee from the Asia Minor catastrophe of 1922 (he was born in Ayvalık), is known mainly as a painter who strove to revive the traditional art of icon-painting. Orthodox Christianity also plays an important part in his novels. He was one of the few Greek writers whose work – as BEATON stresses – could be characterised as "escapism" from the Greek reality, as he did in his novel *Pedro Cazas* (1923), which was an adventure story more similar to Defoe. See BEATON 2004: 109. Kondoglou's use of Orthodoxy and his passion for exotic adventures make him one of the most original Greek writers, whose style VITTI describes as "naïf with clearly personal tint". See VITTI 1994: 375 f.

⁵² Kazantzakis mentions the meeting in a letter, no. 244 dated 15 September 1937, to Prevelakis. See KAZANTZAKIS 1984: 469.

In an extensive account, Kazantzakis describes what he learnt from Kondoglou – whom he regards as a kind of hero – about the conservation of the wall paintings that are now devoured by “the mist and the salt” but were also altered by eighteenth-century painters who “came here to correct [...], to freshen them up” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 130). Kondoglou explains to Kazantzakis the way the Byzantines used to make frescoes, using a method that was in his opinion partly wrong, because it resulted in a lot of damage: “they used thick paint, with paste; so in many places the brush-strokes form relief, and the salt adheres readily. [...] the Byzantines knew well the chemical secrets of paint – thus their frescoes do not fade” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 129 f.).

What is also relevant to the question of the reception of Byzantine art in Kazantzakis' travelogue is the detailed description of the frescoes that were restored by Kondoglou. As elsewhere, Kazantzakis is deeply impressed by the mastery with which Byzantine painters rendered the movement of the figures and he expresses his delight by using more verbs than adjectives in his description, thus making his depiction more narrative than descriptive⁵³.

The passage is too extensive to be cited in its entirety, yet I will quote a sample of it to highlight the energy and vitality of the scenes depicted there. As is often accentuated, the late phase of Byzantine art, with abundant examples at the Peribleptos Monastery, is characterised by the special treatment of space and movement comparable to the work of Western artists (LABATT 2004; NICOL 2004: 342; DELVOYE 2000: 531). In comparison with the traditional Constantinopolitan school from which the frescoes obviously draw inspiration, they may be described as more lively and more realistic in detail, and simultaneously more contemplative and mystic (NICOL 2004: 341 f.; DELVOYE 2000: 530 f.). The aesthetic as well as the human dimension of the scenes that Kazantzakis discerns in the Christian message⁵⁴ lead him to this astonishing conclusion:

White-clad angels holding the vessels of Communion hasten with great strides toward the depth of the church. Lower, two warriors with averted faces: nobility, grace and sadness. You see them setting out, curly-headed, with embittered eyes and compressed lips, fully-armed for war. And they know that there is no hope. The game is lost. These warriors must have been painted a few years before the Fall, at the crucial instant of nobility and despair

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 128 f.)

⁵³ RUNCIMAN has a different impression, noting that the decoration of the monastery is one of the most interesting of all in Mystras, yet the frescoes may be characterised as less vigorous and the figures float rather than move. See RUNCIMAN 2009: 95. According to him, the frescoes are the work of a native school on account of their individuality. They also seem closer to the frescoes in the Chora. The scenes of Divine Liturgy and the Nativity are, in RUNCIMAN's opinion, the most beautiful pieces of Byzantine art (*ibidem*). The uniqueness of the frescoes is also underlined by DELVOYE 2000: 530 f.. See also NICOL 2004: 341.

⁵⁴ For the historical context of the frescoes, see DELVOYE 2000: 530 f.

The whole description is written in an unmistakably Kazantzakian style that I would call “cascading” – we come across it in almost all of his works – based on a juxtaposition of verbs, whose usage – similarly to the method used in Greek demotic songs – is aimed at attracting the audience not by means of detail but through action. It is a flow of overlapping layers of images with the purpose hidden in the final sentences, as if they were the punch line. All the movement, excitement and rush reflected in the frescoes lead Kazantzakis to recall a crucial moment in the history of Hellenism, the Fall of the City, and his concept of heroic pessimism. At the same time, he adds to the reflection the idea that such a visual aesthetic power may be born only in specific circumstances: when an empire feels that it is approaching its end and one order is about to be replaced by another.

Yet, in this peculiar “graveyard suspended in mid-air” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 137), as Kazantzakis calls Mystras, where he experiences a revelation of a different face of Byzantium, he invariably seems to find a link to his different philosophical ideas. The conventional patterns of art of earlier periods that were for him associated with abstract religious concepts, are now embodied in lively scenes from the frescoes. The human dimension of Christian art made the writer think of a sort of reconciliation between hieratic, conservative Byzantine spirituality and earthly existence.⁵⁵

His admiration of Palaiologian art is also neatly expressed in an oneiric dialogue with his imagined female companion, with whom he visited the Pantanassa Monastery once more:

I never expected to find such sweetness, such simple, familiar human emotion in Byzantine paintings. [...] Until now I've seen only harsh ascetic figures holding parchment with red letters and calling out to us to hate nature, to take to the desert, to die so that we may be saved. [...] With these paintings, for the first time in my life I can reconcile myself with the relentless Byzantine Pantocrator. The saints are human like me, the angels smile and sorrow like men, the kingdom of heaven is not beyond death; it is within my earthen and impatient heart.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 140 f.)

⁵⁵ Here one might be tempted to draw an analogy with Kazantzakis' later novels in which he ponders the dilemma between the body and the spirit, *Zorba the Greek* and *The Last Temptation* – historical and religious novels in which he focuses on the human aspect of Christ. Yet, the subject requires a more thorough comparative analysis. Both novels, as far as I am aware, have not been researched in terms of the reception of Byzantium, and various kinds of stereotypes weigh on both. Interestingly, as BEATON indicates, the exact Greek title of the novel, which can be understood as “The life and times of Alexis Zorbas”, was not translated into English and thus the translation is devoid of Kazantzakis' express allusion to the tradition of *synaxarion* – a compilation of hagiographies known in Greek popular tradition. See BEATON 2004: 177. On the novel *The Last Temptation* in this context, see BIEN 2007: 428 ff.

In the final chapter of *Travelling: The Morea*, Kazantzakis analyses the problems of modern Hellenism, focusing on the paradoxes of Greek identity, including one that is unsolvable for him – the association between the East, that could be linked to the Orient, and the West, two cultural powers that he characteristically calls “conflicting” (BIEN 2007: 38)⁵⁶. In this context, it seems that Byzantium is not unambiguously and precisely defined in Kazantzakis' travelogue, just as it is not implicitly expressed elsewhere in his work (ROILOS 2001: 227). As I have mentioned, if Digenes, “of Greek father and Oriental mother” was for him “the symbolic hero of the race” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 166), it might suggest that, in a similar way, Byzantium could be regarded as a transitional phase between the past and the future of Hellenism.

Such an assumption is not unfounded given the references to Byzantium in his travelogue that I have analysed above. For the Greek writer, who eagerly sought an “organic correspondence between man and landscape” (KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 18; 271) and was disappointed at not finding it anywhere in the Peloponnese, the Byzantine treasures he found there had more vitality and life than the people he came across during his trip⁵⁷. Paradoxically, in the frescoes dating from the reign of the last Palaiologoi and in the ideas of some prominent figures of the time before the Fall of the City, he discovered signs of the new spirit foretelling the future of Hellenism.

This is extremely important given the historical context in which his texts are written, as I mentioned above. It is worth recalling at this point that Kazantzakis writes and publishes his articles in *Kathimerini* under particular ideological conditions. There was a considerable debate about Hellenism (more specifically, Greekness), which on the one hand was caused by the ideology of the Metaxas regime, but on the other was an aftermath of the Asia Minor Disaster (DIMADIS 2018: 296–297)⁵⁸. In this light, the *Kathimerini* propaganda objective becomes clearer. In view of the fact that Greece had lost the lands of Asia Minor, which had been an important component of the Hellenes' identity for millennia, it

⁵⁶ However, I find BIEN's statement that the Oriental and Byzantine Greek might be synonymous unjustified, as it finds no direct and unambiguous correlation in *Travelling: The Morea*. See BIEN 2007: 38. The identification of the Orient with the Byzantine Empire was characteristic of Greek ideology until Paparrigopoulos' *History of the Greek nation* (1860–1877). In the second half of the 19th century, the notion of Byzantium in oriental terms was in fact on the wane and one could ask how it could have still been in use in the 1930s. In my opinion, such a correlation in Kazantzakis' case is an anachronism.

⁵⁷ See also BIEN's analysis of his love/hate attitude to the Greeks: BIEN 2007: 34 ff.

⁵⁸ BIEN also underlines a strong connection between Kazantzakis' ideas of Hellenism with the concepts of Ion Dragoumis (1878–1920), especially in his *Samothrace* (1908). See BIEN 2007: 39 ff. Dragoumis, in his essay *Greek civilization* (*Ελληνικός πολιτισμός*, 1914) argues that Byzantium and modernity are a continuum and the Modern Greek's task is to draw the new creative force from the year 1453, or in other words, to look to Byzantium for guidance. See KOURELIS 2011–2012: 301.

was important in this situation to show the continuity of Hellenism manifested, among other things, in all its abundance in the medieval monuments of the Peloponnese.

The writer's unconcealed admiration for Greece in *Travelling: The Morea*, which he then somehow rediscovered after his self-imposed exile in Germany, Russia, France, and Spain, may be regarded, as BIEN notes (2007: 34), as an "initial step toward a new nationalism, [...] a crucial document in his political development and [...] artistic development"⁵⁹. Although some parts of his account indeed may seem somehow nationalistic, we should not forget that the writer's admiration for the monuments of Byzantine art, especially the art of the Palaiologoi, is genuine. A stay in Europe endowed the writer with various inspirations of a philosophical and religious nature. However, when confronted with the medieval Byzantine heritage in the Peloponnese, Kazantzakis almost desperately searches for the right means of expression when those at his disposal prove inadequate. Though ROILOS' opinion in this regard, that Kazantzakis' interest in Byzantium first and foremost was never primarily nationalistic but was rather a source of personal, aesthetic inspiration and a constant point of reference⁶⁰, may seem somehow Romantic and oversimplified, I can partially agree with him. Not free from the ideological debates of his time, which is rather obvious, Kazantzakis, by creating such an intimate and personal vision of the Byzantine past, undoubtedly seems to strive to also create his own personal expression regarding the complicated Greek heritage.

Even if BIEN blames Kazantzakis for the extremity of his views and his general failure to overcome the contradictions of his relationship with Greece and its people, as well as the impossibility of freeing himself of the ideology of the Megali Idea (BIEN 2007: 42), the reception of Byzantium in his travelogue is of remarkable significance. The examples presented show not only the deep emotion that Byzantine art evokes in the writer, but also challenge deeply held beliefs about Byzantine conservatism in its approach to Greco-Roman heritage. Kazantzakis' travel essays reveal a non-obvious perspective on the cultural heritage of Hellas, showing its lesser-known face, even, as it turns out, to the Greeks themselves. There is no doubt that they are also a unique record of descriptions of art works and could serve as a kind of guide to the Byzantine Peloponnese. Indeed, the writer recorded many details that are no longer visible today – either due to the reconstructions to which the works of art he describes have since been subjected, or to the destructive effects of time.

⁵⁹ BIEN 2007: 34. As BIEN notes, some passages of his travelogue were later incorporated into his best known novel, *Alexis Zorbas*. *Travelling: The Morea* shows Kazantzakis' new approach to nationalism and, as such, may be crucial to understanding the development of his ideas in his later novels. See BIEN 2007: 37. On Kazantzakis' interest in *synaxaria*, see also DETORAKIS 1987: 184–186.

⁶⁰ ROILOS 2001: 228.

Last but not least, Kazantzakis revealed to Athenian readers still undiscovered and commonly unknown treasures possessed of unique vitality and of aesthetic value, which are not hieratic – as Byzantine art has normally been perceived, especially in the West – but deeply human. The words of Kondoglou indeed may sound quite prophetic in this context and may be regarded as a punch line to Kazantzakis' approach to Byzantium:

At first bats flew in through the broken windows and scratched the frescoes. Now they've put in windows and glass, doors have been installed. The bats don't go in and out any longer. We'll bring the frescoes of the Perivleptos to life, you'll see, and then we'll go and revitalize the paintings of the Mitropolis – that's where the miracles are! Tourists will come, Greeks and foreigners, and open their mouths wide with admiration.

(KAZANTZAKIS 1965: 133)

Jagiellonian University in Kraków
michał.bzinkowski@uj.edu.pl

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ARAMPATZIDOU 2012: L. ARAMPATZIDOU, *Nikos Kazantzakis and Travel Writing: Innovating in Poetics and Politics*, *The Historical Review / La Revue Historique* VIII 2012, pp. 179–208.
- BAYET 2009: Ch. BAYET, *Byzantine Art*, New York 2009.
- BEATON 2004: R. BEATON, *Introduction to Modern Greek Literature*, Oxford 2004.
- 2019: R. BEATON, *Greece: Biography of a Modern Nation*, Chicago 2019.
- BIEN 1971–1972: P. BIEN, *Kazantzakis Nietzscheanism*, *Journal of Modern Literature* II 1971–1972, pp. 245–256.
- 1998: P. BIEN, *Kazantzakis's Metachristian Play Nikifóros Fokás*, *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* XVI 1998, pp. 265–284.
- 2007: P. BIEN, *Kazantzakis. Politics of the Spirit*, Vol. 2, Princeton, New Jersey 2007.
- BOROWSKA 2004: M. BOROWSKA, *Dramaty bizantyńskie Nikosa Kazandzakisa*, in: J. ŁAWSKI, K. KOROTKICH (eds.), *Bizancjum – Prawosławie – Romantyzm. Tradycja wschodnia w kulturze XIX wieku*, Białystok 2004, pp. 167–181.
- BZINKOWSKI 2017: M. BZINKOWSKI, *Akritas – Nikos Kazantzakis' Little-Known Unrealized Epic Project*, *Classica Cracoviensia* XX 2017, pp. 45–54.
- 2020: M. BZINKOWSKI, *The Byzantine Gibraltar – Impressions of Monemvasia in Kostas Ouranis' Travelogue*, *Classica Cracoviensia*, XXIII 2020, pp. 161–174.
- 2023: M. BZINKOWSKI, *O Nikoς Kaζαντζάκης, o Παναΐτ Ισπράτι και η Επανάσταση του 1821 – ένα ξεχασμένο, απσπραματοποίητο κινηματογραφικό σενάριο*, in: T. DINU, K. ΚΑΙΜΑΚΑΜΙ, *Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου «Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση και οι Ρουμανικές Χώρες»*, București 2023, pp. 282–296.
- CALOTYCHOS 2010: V. CALOTYCHOS, *Kazantzakis the Greek? Travel and Leisure, Hunger and Pathos, Localism and Cosmopolitanism in Nikos Kazantzakis's Journeying*, *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Suppl. XXVIII 2010, pp. 189–217.
- DELVOYE 2000: Ch. DELVOYE, *Βυζαντινή τέχνη, μετάφραση Μαντώ Β. Παπαδάκη*, Αθήνα 2000.

- DETORAKIS 1987: Θ. ΔΕΤΟΡΑΚΗΣ, *Ο Καζαντζάκης και το Βυζάντιο*, Παλίμνηστον IV 1987, pp. 181–198.
- DIMADIS 2018: Α.Κ. ΔΗΜΑΔΗΣ, *Πεζογραφία και εξουσία στη νεότερη Ελλάδα*, Αθήνα 2018.
- HATZANTONIS 1980: Ε. HATZANTONIS, *Spain and the Genesis of Neohellenic Travel Literature*, *Hispanófila* LXIX 1980, pp. 73–88.
- KARALIS 2011: Β. ΚΑΡΑΛΗΣ, *Το ταξίδι στον Μοριά και στην μοίρα του τοπίου*, in: R. BEATON (ed.), *Εισαγωγή στο έργο του Νίκου Καζαντζάκη. Επιλογή κριτικών μελετών*, Ηράκλειο 2011, pp. 263–270.
- KAZANTZAKIS 1965: Ν. ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ *Journey to the Morea*, transl. by F.A. REED, New York 1965.
- 1970: Ν. ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ, *Ταξιδεύοντας. Ιταλία-Αίγυπτος-Σινά-Ιερουσαλήμ-Κύπρος-Ο Μοριάς*, Αθήνα 1970.
- 1973: Ν. ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ, *Report to Greco*, transl. by P.A. BIEB, New York 1973.
- 1984: Ν. ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ, *Τετρακόσια Γράμματα του Καζαντζάκη στον Πρεβελάκη*, Αθήνα 1984.
- 1998: Ν. ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ, *Ο Ασυμβίβαστος*, Αθήνα 1998.
- 2020: Ν. ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ, *Άγιον Όρος. Ν/βρης – Δ/βρης 1914. Ημερολόγιο (Επιμέλεια-εισαγωγή-σχόλια Χριστίνα Ντουνιά – Παρασκευή Βασιλειάδη)*, Ηράκλειο 2020.
- 2003: Ν. ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ, *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο*, Αθήνα 2003.
- KITROMILIDES 1996: Π.Μ. ΚΙΤΡΟΜΙΛΙΔΗΣ, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός. Οι πολιτικές και κοινωνικές ιδέες*, Αθήνα 1996.
- 1998: Π.Μ. ΚΙΤΡΟΜΙΛΙΔΗΣ, *On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigopoulos, Byzantium and the Great Idea*, in: D. RICKS, P. MAGDALINO (eds.), *Byzantium and Modern Greek Identity*, London 1998.
- 2013: Π.Μ. ΚΙΤΡΟΜΙΛΙΔΗΣ, *Enlightenment and Revolution*, Cambridge 2013.
- KOLIOPOULOS, VEREMIS 2010: J.S. KOLIOPOULOS, T.M. VEREMIS, *Modern Greece: A History since 1821*, New Jersey 2010.
- KOUBOURLIS 2009: Ι. ΚΟΥΒΟΥΡΛΙΣ, *European historiographical influences upon the young Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos*, in: R. BEATON, D. RICKS (eds.), *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, & The Uses of the Past (1797–1896)*, London pp. 53–63.
- KULHÁNKOVÁ, MARCINIAK 2023: Μ. ΚΥΛΗΑΝΚΟΒΑ, P. MARCINIAK (eds.), *Byzantium in the Popular Imagination. The Modern Reception of the Byzantine Empire*, London 2023.
- KOURELIS 2011–2012: Κ. ΚΟΥΡΕΛΙΣ, *Byzantine Houses and Modern Fictions: Domesticating Mystras in 1930s Greece*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* LXV–LXVI 2011–2012, pp. 297–331.
- LABATT 2000: Α. LABATT, *Frescoes and Wall Painting in Late Byzantine Art in Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History*, New York 2000 [available at: www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/fwbz/hd_fwbz.htm, accessed 27 February 2021].
- LAMBAKIS 2007: Σ. ΛΑΜΠΑΚΗΣ, *Λαϊκοί Θρύλοι και Δοξασίες για την Άλωση στην τραγωδία Κωνσταντίνος Παλαιολόγος*, in: *Ο Νίκος Καζαντζάκης και ο κρητικός πολιτισμός*, Ηράκλειο 2007.
- LEVITT 1971–1972: Μ.Ρ. ΛΕΒΙΤΤ, *The Cretan Glance: The World and Art of Nikos Kazantzakis*, *Journal of Modern Literature* II 1971–1972, pp. 163–188.
- LIAKOS 2008: Α. ΛΙΑΚΟΣ, *Hellenism and the Making of Modern Greece: Time, Language, Space*, in: K. ZACHARIA (ed.), *Hellenisms: culture, identity, and ethnicity from antiquity to modernity*, Farnham 2008, pp. 201–236.
- MACKRIDGE 2008: Ρ. ΜΑΚΚΡΙΔΖ, *Cultural Difference as National Identity in Modern Greece*, in: K. ZACHARIA (ed.), *Hellenisms: culture, identity, and ethnicity from antiquity to modernity*, Farnham 2008, pp. 297–320.
- MACKRIDGE 2009: Ρ. ΜΑΚΚΡΙΔΖ, *Language and National Identity in Greece, 1766–1976*, Oxford 2009.
- MARCINIAK, SMYTHE 2019: Ρ. ΜΑΡΚΙΝΙΑΚ, D.C. ΣΜΥΘ (eds.), *The Reception of Byzantium in European Culture since 1500*, London 2019.
- NICOL 1992: D.M. ΝΙΚΟΛ, *The Immortal Emperor: The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, Last Emperor of the Romans*, Cambridge 1992.
- 2004: D.M. ΝΙΚΟΛ, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453*, Cambridge 2004.

- NIKOLAIDOU 2015: E. ΝΙΚΟΛΑΪΔΟΥ, *Η «μυθική» μορφή του τελευταίου αυτοκράτορα του Βυζαντίου σε έργα της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, in K.A. ΔΗΜΑΔΗΣ (ed.), *Πρακτικά Ε' Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών*, Τόμος Β', Αθήνα 2015, pp. 265–283.
- OMATOS 1987: O. OMATOS, *Bizancio en la obra dramática de N. Casantsakis*, Erytheia VIII 1987, pp. 143–166.
- PAPALEXANDROU 2001: A. PAPALEXANDROU, *Conversing Hellenism: The Multiple Voices of a Byzantine Monument in Greece* Journal of Modern Greek Studies XIX2001, pp. 237–254.
- PERTUSI 1988: A. PERTUSI, *Fine di Bisanzio e fine del mondo*, Roma 1988.
- PETRAKU 2012: K. PETRAKU, *Inspiracje filozoficzne w dziełach teatralnych Nikosa Kazantzakisa*, in: M. BOROWSKA, M. KALINOWSKA, P. KANIECKI (eds.), *Wyspiański, Kazantzakis i modernistyczne wizje antyku*, Warszawa 2012, pp. 193–222.
- PREVELAKIS 1961: P. PREVELAKIS, *Nikos Kazantzakis and his Odyssey. A Study of the Poet and the Poem*, New York 1961.
- ROILOS 2001: P. ROILOS, *Byzantium and Heroic Pessimism in Nikos Kazantzakis*, Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora XXVII 2001, pp. 227–241.
- RUNCIMAN 2009: S. RUNCIMAN, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, New York 2009.
- SINIOSSOGLOU 2011: N. SINIOSSOGLOU, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium. Illumination and Utopia in Gemistos Plethon*, Cambridge 2011.
- VITTI 1994: M. VITTI, *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Αθήνα 1994.
- WOODHOUSE 2000: C.M. WOODHOUSE, *George Gemistos Plethon. The Last of the Hellenes*, New York 2000.

ANCIENT GREEK ΣΤΑΧΥΣ AND ΑΣΤΑΧΥΣ: SEMANTIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL DISCREPANCIES

by

ELWIRA KACZYŃSKA, KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK

ABSTRACT: The Greek appellative στάχυς m. ‘ear of corn’ cannot be treated as a synonym of ἄσταχυς. The latter form represents a compound noun ἄ-στάχυς with the primitive meaning ‘grain growing in the field; (mowed) cereal plant with the stem and ear’ (< Proto-Greek *ἄ-στάχυς ‘(of corn) having the ear; with the ear’). The original sense is securely preserved in Homeric poems (*Il.* II 148; *HH. Cer.* 454, 456), as well as in the works of Herodotus of Halicarnassus (*Hdt.* V 92), Callimachus of Cyrene (*Call., H.* 4, 284; 6, 20; *Aet.* fr. 75, 46) and Aratus of Soli (*Arat.* 150). It is suggested that the confusion of these two terms appeared in late antiquity (see the Hesychian gloss ἄσταχύεσσι· τοῖς στάχυσιν), probably not earlier than the 1st century BC. Most modern dictionaries of the Ancient Greek language suggest an incorrect meaning of the compound ἄσταχυς.

1. INTRODUCTION

We are of the opinion that the Greek appellative ἄσταχυς has not received a proper semantic explanation in the existing lexicographic literature. It is not a synonym of the word στάχυς m. ‘ear of the corn’, but rather an independent derivative with the specialized meaning of ‘grain growing in the field; (mowed) cereal with the stem and ear’. In the present article, we intend to perform both a semantic and morphological analysis of this lexeme. To that end, we will discuss all attestations of the term ἄσταχυς in Greek literary and lexicographic sources in order to establish the correct meaning of the word. Additionally, we will shed new light on the word formation and etymology of the lexeme discussed.

2. THE GREEK APPELLATIVE ΑΣΤΑΧΥΣ IN LEXICOGRAPHIC TRADITION

The dictionaries of Ancient Greek are in agreement regarding the three basic definitions of the Greek appellative ἄσταχυς:

2.1. ‘ear of corn’ (LIDDELL, SCOTT 1899: 125; 1996: 260; BEEKES 2010: 155; DIGGLE 2021: 232) or ‘spike of grain’ (MONTANARI 2018: 320), cf. also

‘Ähre’ (AUTENRIETH 1887: 57); ‘Kornähre’ (KAEGLI 1931: 116); ‘kłos / corn-ear’ (RAPAPORT 1932: 100); ‘κοιός / corn-ear’ (DVORETSKY 1958: 250); ‘kłos zboża / ear of corn’ (ABRAMOWICZÓWNA 1958: 350, JUREWICZ 2021: 118); ‘espiga’ (PABÓN DE URBINA 1970: 91); ‘espiga de trigo’ (FERNANDEZ GALIANO 1976: 91); ‘spiga’ (SCHENKL, BRUNETTI 1991: 132); ‘spiga di grano / spike of grain’ (MONTANARI 1999: 342; 2018: 320); ‘Kornähre’ (BLAŽEK 2003: 6); ‘ear of corn’ (DIGGLE 2021: 232);

2.2, *metaph.* βοστρύχων ἀστάχυνες pl. only in Philostr. *Im.* 1, 7, to be translated as ‘the crop of curls’ (FAIRBANKS 1960, 31) or ‘spighe di riccioli / spike of ringlets’ (MONTANARI 1999: 342; 2018: 320);

2.3. *med.* ‘a bandage (formed like a spike)’ (LIDDELL, SCOTT 1996: 260; BEEKES 2010: 155; MONTANARI 1999: 342; MONTANARI 2018: 320).

The authors of lexical and etymological works point to the semantic and structural similarity between the word ἄσταχυς and the productive Greek appellative στάχυς m. ‘ear of corn’, *metaph.* ‘offshoot’, *med.* ‘surgical bandage’ (LIDDELL, SCOTT 1899: 125; 1996: 260; HOFMANN 1950: 333; CHANTRAINE 1968: 127; BEEKES 1969: 29, 50, 72; 2010: 155, 1392), cf. Modern Greek στάχυ n. ‘ear of corn’ (STAVROPOULOS 1992: 815). FRANCISCO R. ADRADOS (1991: 563) follows suit, referring readers to the entry σταχύς (*sic!* should be στάχυς). The word-initial vowel α [a] is seen as “prothetic” (e.g. KAEGLI, 1931: 116; RAPAPORT 1932: 100; FRISK 1960: 170; LIDDELL, SCOTT 1996: 260; BEEKES 2010: 155), as an additional euphonic element (LIDDELL, SCOTT 1899: 125; SCHENKL, BRUNETTI 1991: 132), as the Asia Minor “prefix” ἄ- (KRETSCHMER 1932: 89; see also FRISK 1962: 779), or as a particle ἄ- of indeterminate character (MONTANARI 1999: 342; 2018: 320)¹. Most scholars consider the form στάχυς to be primary. WERNER WINTER (1950: 19) disagrees, seeing the lexeme ἄσταχυς as original and accounting for the form στάχυς through the apheresis of the vowel ἄ-.

In our opinion, the word ἄσταχυς is not synonymous with the appellative στάχυς m. ‘ear of corn’, being rather an archaic derivative with a specific meaning of ‘grain growing in the field; cereal with the stem and ear’ (originally *ἄ-σταχυς ‘the overground part of a cereal, i.e. the whole plant together with the ear’). The prefix *ἄ- ‘together with, jointly’ (< PIE. *sm-, cf. Sanskrit *sa-* ‘together with; accompanied by; having the same’²; Proto-Iranian *ha-; Proto-

¹ At this point, it should be noted that MONTANARI (1999: 45; 2018: 1) distinguishes four alternative explanations of the Greek element ἄ-: (1) a privative prefix indicating lack or absence; (2) an intensifying prefix; (3) a prothetic vowel; (4) ἄ- or ἄ-: a copular prefix expressing a direct connection with the derivational base.

² The Vedic and Sanskrit particle *sa-* may be defined as follows: “an inseparable prefix expressing junction, conjunction, possession (as opposite to *a-* privativum), similarity, equality; and when compounded with nouns to form adjectives and adverbs it may be translated as ‘with’, ‘together or along with’, ‘accompanied by’, ‘added to’, ‘having’, ‘possessing’, ‘containing’, ‘having the same’ [...]” (MONIER-WILLIAMS 1999: 1111; quotation slightly improved).

Slavic *sq-) is perfectly attested in the Greek plant names (BLAŽEK 2003: 5 f.). We will demonstrate that the meaning posited is well attested in the ancient Greek texts where the term ἄσταχυς appears.

3. THE ATTESTATION OF THE GREEK TERM ΑΣΤΑXYΣ IN *ILIAD* AND *HOMERIC HYMNS*

The Greek appellative ἄσταχυς appears for the first time in Homer's *Iliad*, in the dative plural form, ἀσταχύνεσσιν, which is treated as the so-called hapax (Hom., *Il.* II 148)³. Quoted below is the relevant passage, together with its English translation:

ὥς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήϊον ἐλθὼν
λάβρος ἐπαγίζων, ἐπὶ τ' ἡμύει ἀσταχύνεσσιν,
ὥς τῶν πᾶσ' ἀγορὴ κινήθη· τοὶ δ' ἀλαλητῶ
νῆας ἔπ' ἐσσεύοντο [...]

(Hom., *Il.* II 147–151)

or a field of standing grain when wind-puffs from the west cross it in billows, and the tasseled ears are bent and tossed; just so moved this assembly. Shouting confusedly, they all began to scramble for the ships

(trans. FITZGERALD 1992: 40)

Obviously, the wind from the west is tossing not just the ears but the entire cereal. In other words, the wind is bending the cereal growing in the field – that is, the stem and the ear. Therefore, ἀσταχύνεσσιν (dat. pl.), occurring in the second book of Homer's *Iliad*, should not be identified with the dative plural form σταχύνεσσιν (Hom., *Il.* XXIII 598). The latter word refers to the corn-ears only.

Ἦ ῥα καὶ ἵππον ἄγων μεγάλου Νέστορος υἱὸς
ἐν χεῖρεσσι τίθει Μενελάου· τοῖο δὲ θυμὸς
ιάνθη ὥς εἴ τε περὶ σταχύνεσσιν ἐέρση
λήϊον ἀλδήσκοντος, ὅτε φρίσσουσιν ἄρουραι·
ὥς ἄρα σοὶ Μενέλαε μετὰ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ιάνθη

(Hom., *Il.* XXIII 596–600)

“When he had spoken, the son of Nestor led the mare across and put the bridle in Meneláos’ hands. And Meneláos was refreshed at heart as growing grain is, when ears shine with dew, and the fields ripple. So the heart within you, Meneláos, was refreshed”

(trans. FITZGERALD 1992: 554)

³ AUTENRIETH (1887: 57) indicates the hapax through the sign †, cf. RAPAPORT (1932: 100). HOPKINSON (1994: 108) also stresses that the term ἀσταχύνεσσιν represents “a Homeric *hapax*”. The Hesychian gloss ἀσταχύνεσσι· τοῖς στάχυσιν supports this statement.

In other words, Homer's text still displays a clear semantic distinction between the base form στάχυς m. 'ear of corn' and its potential derivative ἄσταχυς m. 'grain growing in the field; cereal with the stem and ear'. Given these examples, it is not tenable to treat the words as synonyms.

The word ἄσταχυς occurs twice in Homer's *Hymn to Demeter* (lines 454 and 456). It is worthwhile to quote the relevant passage and its English translation:

[...] ἔκευθε δ' ἄρα κρῖ λευκὸν
μήδεσι Δήμητρος καλλισφύρου· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
μέλλεν ἄφαρ ταναοῖσι κομήσειν ἄσταχύεσσιν
ἦρος ἀεξομένοιο, πέδω δ' ἄρα πῖονες ὄγμοι
βρισέμεν ἄσταχύων, τὰ δ' ἐν ἑλλεδανοῖσι δεδέσθαι

(*HH. Cer.* 452–456; APPEL 2001: 70)

[...] the white grain was hidden by design of trim-ankled Demeter.
But afterwards, as spring-time waxed, it was soon to be waving with
long ears of corn, and its rich furrows to be loaded with grain upon the
ground, while others would already be bound in sheaves.

(trans. EVELYN-WHITE 1995: 321)

The lexeme under discussion appears in the quoted passage in two different grammatical cases: in the dative plural as ἄσταχύεσσιν and in the genitive plural as ἄσταχύων. In his English translation, EVELYN-WHITE (1995: 321) renders the Greek forms as follows: 'long ears of corn' and 'grain'. Neither version is fully adequate. Line 454 concerns a cereal growing in the spring, meaning that it cannot be harvested yet and has no well-developed ears. Then, in line 456, the author mentions the ἀστάχυνες, which are 'bound in sheaves'. Thus, the reference cannot be to the corn-ears only – because no sheaf can be formed of these alone – and must be to the cut, above-ground portion of the plant, i.e. the stem with the ear. Clearly, the term ἄσταχυς is not interchangeable with the word στάχυς m. 'ear of corn', since it first denotes a 'cereal plant growing in the field', and then 'a cut stem of a cereal plant together with the ear'.

Entirely different imagery is used in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (*Op.* 473), which features the other term, στάχυς m. 'ear of corn'. The poet directly writes that, as they ripen, the heavy "corn-ears will bow to the ground" (στάχυνες νεύοιεν ἔραζε, trans. EVELYN-WHITE 1995: 39). Thus, it is apparent that the archaic poets retain a clear distinction between the two lexemes under analysis (ἄσταχυς refers to the whole plant growing in the field or the mowed grain together with the stem and ear, whereas στάχυς evidently denotes the ear of corn)⁴.

⁴ Pseudo-Hesiod's *Shield of Heracles* will be excluded from our discussion for two reasons. First, the author and time of composition of this archaic epic poem are uncertain. Second, it is completely unclear whether line 290 includes the words βριθόμενα σταχύων or βριθόμεν' ἀσταχύων.

4. THE TERM ΑΣΤΑXYΣ IN HERODOTUS'S HISTORICAL WORK

The word ἄσταχυς was also used by historian Herodotus of Halicarnassus (5th century BC) in his account of how Periander, a young ruler of Corinth, sent an envoy to Thrasybulus, the tyrant of Miletus (Hdt. V 92; LEGRAND 1946: 127 f.; GODLEY 1957: 110). The English translation of this interesting story of how best to govern a state (according to an autocrat) is worth quoting in its entirety:

He [i.e. Cypselus] reigned for thirty years and made a good ending of his life; and his son Periander succeeded to his despotic power. Now Periander at the first was of milder mood than his father; but after he had held converse by his messengers with Thrasybulus the despot of Miletus, he became much more blood-thirsty than Cypselus. For he sent a herald to Thrasybulus and enquired how he should most safely so order all matters as best to govern his city. Thrasybulus led the man who had come from Periander outside the town, and entered into a sown field; where, while he walked through the corn and plied the herald with still-repeated questions anent his coming from Corinth, he would ever cut off the tallest that he saw of the stalks, and cast away what he cut off, till by so doing he had destroyed the best and richest of the crop⁵; then, having passed through the place and spoken no word of counsel, he sent the herald away. When the herald returned to Corinth, Periander was desirous to hear what counsel he brought; but the man said that Thrasybulus had given him none, "and that is a strange man", quoth he, "to whom you sent me; for he is a madman and a destroyer of his own possessions", telling Periander what he had seen Thrasybulus do. But Periander understood what had been done, and perceived that Thrasybulus had counselled him to slay those of his townsmen who stood highest; and with that he began to deal very evilly with his citizens.

(trans. GODLEY 1957: 111)

Our focus here is on the actions of Thrasybulus, who, having waded into the field of corn, pulled out the finest and thickest spikes. It is a well-known fact that it is difficult to sever a spike which is yet to ripen from the rest of the plant, but it is very easy to eradicate the whole plant. This is what Thrasybulus did as he wanted to demonstrate to Periander's envoy the most efficient way in which a tyrant may rule a state. There is no doubt that the Greek appellative ἄσταχυς in Herodotus's text does not refer to the corn-ear alone, but rather to the 'ear of corn together with the stem and the roots', that is, an entire cereal plant.

⁵ The essential part of the Herodotean passage (Hdt. V 92) in the original Greek version reads as follows: Θρασύβουλος δὲ τὸν ἐλθόντα παρὰ τοῦ Περιάνδρου ἐξήγαγε ἔξω τοῦ ἄστεος, ἐσβὰς δὲ ἐς ἄρουραν ἐσπαρμένην ἅμα τε διεξήϊε τὸ λήϊον ἐπειρωτῶν τε καὶ ἀναποδίζων τὸν κήρυκα κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Κορίνθου ἄπιξιν, καὶ ἐκόλουε αἰεὶ ὅπως τινὰ ἴδοι τῶν ἀσταχῶν ὑπερέχοντα, κολούων δὲ ἔρριπτε, ἐς ὃ τοῦ λήϊου τὸ κάλλιστόν τε καὶ βαθύτατον διέφθειρε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ (LEGRAND 1946: 127).

It should be pointed out that the Attic authors of the 5th century only used the primary appellative *στάχυς* in the sense of ‘ear of corn’ (Aesch. *Pers.* 821; *Suppl.* 761; fr. 193, 8 and 609, 7 M.; Soph. fr. 210, 28; 395, 1; 581, 7 R.; Eur. *Herc.* 5, *Hyps.* fr. 1; Ar. *Eq.* 393; *Ran.* 1240). The secondary term *ἄσταχυς* is never attested in their works.

5. THE APPELLATIVES ΣΤΑΧΥΣ AND ΑΣΤΑΧΥΣ IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

We will now discuss works by Callimachus of Cyrene, the most eminent poet of the Alexandrian era, who in his *Hymns* and *Aetia* uses both words under analysis, i.e. *ἄσταχυς* (Call., *H.* 4, 284; 6, 20; *Aet.* fr. 75, 46; FERNANDEZ GALIANO 1976: 91) and *στάχυς* (Call. *H.* 3, 130; 6, 136; FERNANDEZ GALIANO 1980: 587). Let us see if they were still semantically distinct in the Hellenistic period.

In the *Hymn to Delos* (4, 284), the word *ἄσταχυς* occurs in the following context:

οἱ μὲν τοι καλάμην τε καὶ ἱερὰ δράγματα πρῶτοι
ἄσταχύων φορέουσιν· ἃ Δωδώνηθε Πελασγοί
τηλόθεν ἐκβαίνοντα πολὺ πρῶτιστα δέχονται,
γηλεχέες θεράποντες ἀσιγνήτοιο λέβητος

(Call., *H.* 4, 283–286; STEPHENS 2015: 171)

These [i.e. the Hyperboreans] are the first to bring you the stalk and holy sheaves of corn ears, which the Pelasgians from Dodona, stepping out from afar, first receive, servants of the unsilent cauldron, who sleep on the ground.

(trans. STEPHENS 2015: 177⁶)

The text makes an explicit mention of “holy sheaves of corn ears” (*ἱερὰ δράγματα ἄσταχύων*). Therefore, it is beyond doubt that the word *ἄσταχυς* does not denote a spike, but rather the part of the plant cut during the harvest which spans the stem together with the ear, since sheaves (Gk. *δράγματα*) cannot be composed of ears alone.

It is also worth looking at *Hymn to Demeter*, where the Greek word under scrutiny also appears (Call., *H.* 6, 17–20; STEPHENS 2015: 269):

⁶ See also MAIR’s earlier translation of the quoted passage: “These first bring thee cornstalks and holy sheaves of corn-ears (*καλάμην τε καὶ ἱερὰ δράγματα πρῶτοι / ἄσταχύων φορέουσιν*), which the Pelasgians of Dodona, who couch upon the ground, servants of the caldron which is never silent – far first receive, as these offerings enter their country from afar” (MAIR 1989: 107–109).

μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμες ἃ δάκρυον ἄγαγε Διοῖ·
 κάλλιον, ὥς πολίεσσιν ἐαδότα τέθμια δῶκε·
 κάλλιον, ὥς καλάμαν τε καὶ ἱερὰ δράγματα πρᾶτα
ἄσταχύν ἀπέκοψε καὶ ἐν βόας ἤκε πατῆσαι [...]

Do not, do not speak things that bring a tear to Deo. Better, say how she
 gave fair laws to cities; better, how she first cut sheaves and holy corn
ears and placed them for oxen to tread upon.

(trans. STEPHENS 2015: 273⁷).

The situation described in this hymn is similar to the previous one: Mention is again made of “holy sheaves of corn-ears” (ἱερὰ δράγματα ἄσταχύν), which oxen are supposed to tread upon on the goddess’s orders. Surely, the oxen did not tread upon the ‘corn-ears’ (Gk. στάχυες) alone, but on the corn-ears cut with a sickle together with the stem. It is believed that in ancient times cereals were not cut at the base but mowed at half the height of the stem (HOPKINSON 1994: 171; HUNTER 1999: 213). Regardless of the cutting technique, the bundles were first formed into sheaves, which in Greek were called *amallai* or *dragmata* (Gk. ἄμαλλαι nom. pl. f. or δράγματα nom. pl. n.). The sheaves were tied by the harvesters’ helpers, the *amallodetai* (Gk. ἀμαλλοδέται, literally ‘those who tie the sheaves’), who then laid them on the field in rows. After the cereal was dried, the sheaves were taken to a threshing place, and then cattle were driven over them in order to remove the grain from the spikes. Thus, the cattle trod upon ἄσταχυες, i.e. ‘the ears of corn cut together with the stem’.

The third occurrence of the word ἄσταχυς is recorded in Callimachus’s *Aetia* (Call., *Aet.* fr. 75, line 46: οὐ σφυρὸν Ἰφίκλειον ἐπιτρέχον ἄσταχύεσσιν). The poet mentions the feet of Iphicles, “who ran upon the corn-ears” (trans. TRYPANIS 1989: 59). The form in the dative plural, ἄσταχύεσσιν, which is used in the relevant passage, means the cereal growing in the field, i.e. the spikes together with the stem, not the spikes alone.

The word στάχυς appears twice in Callimachus’s *Hymns* (Call., *H.* 3, 130; 6, 136). Both cases are attested in the fixed phrase φέρει στάχυν (‘bears the corn-ear’), which is also used in the singular imperative φέρε στάχυν (‘bring the corn-ear’). In *Hymn to Artemis*, the poet explains that thanks to the favor of Artemis the life-giving soil yields the grain in return for the farmer’s work. We quote the original passage and its English translation:

⁷ See also two earlier translations: “But we will not speak of what brought tears to Deméter. / Prettier to tell how she gave cities their laws, / How she was the first to cut straw, bind / Holy sheaves, and put the oxen to tread them” (LOMBARDO, RAYOR 1988: 37); “Nay, nay, let us not speak of that which brought the tear to Deo! Better to tell how she gave to cities pleasing ordinances; better to tell how she was the first to cut straw and holy sheaves of corn-ears (καλάμαν τε καὶ ἱερὰ δράγματα πρᾶτα / ἄσταχύν ἀπέκοψε) and put in oxen to tread” (MAIR 1989: 127).

οἷς δέ κεν εὐμειδής τε καὶ ἴλαος ἀνγάσσειαι,
 κείνοις εὖ μὲν ἄρουρα φέρει στάχυν, εὖ δὲ γενέθλη
 τετραπόδων, εὖ δ' ὄλβος ἀέξεται [...]

(Call., *H.* 3, 129–131)

“But those on whom you would gaze smiling and gracious, their field
 bears abundant corn, abundant their race of four-footed beasts, and
 abundantly does their household increase”

(trans. STEPHENS 2015: 119⁸)

The wording “[the] field bears abundant corn” indicates that the term *στάχυς* denotes only the part of the plant which includes grain. In other words, it refers to ‘corn-ear’, unlike the word *ἄσταχυς*, which has a broader meaning of ‘ear of corn together with the stem’.

Callimachus’s *Hymn to Demeter*, which includes the phrase ‘bring the corn-ear’, concludes as follows:

Hail, goddess, and save this people in harmony and in prosperity, and
 in the fields bring us all pleasant things! Feed our kine, bring us flocks,
bring us the corn-ear, bring us harvest! and nurse peace, that he who
 sows may also reap. Be gracious, O thrice-prayed for, great Queen of
 goddesses!

(trans. MAIR 1989: 135)

A review of the attestations of the appellatives *ἄσταχυς* and *στάχυς* clearly shows that Callimachus of Cyrene took note of their distinctiveness and properly retained the semantics.

In his *Phaenomena*, Aratus of Soli, an eminent poet of the Hellenistic period, uses both *ἄσταχυς* and *στάχυς*. Let us examine how these nouns are employed in this text. In the first case, the poet mentions fields after a harvest, where cereal no longer grows (Arat. 150: *ἄσταχύων κενεαὶ φαίνονται ἄρουραι*), while in the other, a “Maiden, who in her hands bears the gleaming Ear of Corn” (Arat. 97: *Παρθένον, ἥ ῥ' ἐν χειρὶ φέρει στάχυν*) (translated by Gilbert Robinson MAIR 1989: 215). Similarly to Callimachus, Aratus keeps the distinction between *ἄσταχυς* m. ‘cereal growing in the field; a corn-ear cut together with the stem’, and *στάχυς* m. ‘ear of corn’.

Based on the above evidence, we have every reason to argue that the words *ἄσταχυς* and *στάχυς* have long been semantically distinct (‘grain growing in the field; corn-ear together with the stem’ vs. ‘ear of corn’), this difference being well-attested in the archaic period (specifically in Homer’s *Iliad* and *Homeric*

⁸ Note also an earlier translation by MAIR 1989: 71: “But on whomsoever thou lookest smiling and gracious, for them the tilth bears the corn-ear abundantly, and abundantly prospers the fourfooted breed, and abundant waxes their prosperity”.

Hymns) and then continuing into the classical period (in the works by Herodotus of Halicarnassus) and the Hellenistic period (in the works by Callimachus of Cyrene and Aratus of Soli).

6. THE TERM ΑΣΤΑXYΣ IN GREEK EPIGRAMS

The epic word ἄσταχυς occurs only incidentally in the extant collections of the Greek epigrams, i.e. in *The Palatine Anthology* and *The Anthology of Planudes*. To the best of our knowledge, it was used in only one votive epigram (*AP* VI 53), which the Byzantine editors of the surviving collections ascribe to Bacchylides of Keos (c. 516–450 BC). We quote the original Greek text after Hugo STADTMÜLLER's now classic edition (1894).

Εὐδημος τὸν νηὸν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε
 τῷ πάντων ἀνέμων πιστάτῳ Ζεφύρῳ.
 εὐξαμένῳ γάρ οἱ ἦλθε βοαθόος, ὄφρα τάχιστα
 λικμήσῃ πεπόνων καρπὸν ἀπ' ἄσταχύων.

(*AP* VI 53: STADTMÜLLER 1894: 252 f.)

Eudemus dedicated this temple in his field to Zephyr the richest of all winds; for he came in answer to his prayer to help him winnow quickly the grain from the ripe ears.

(trans. PATON, 1960: 327)

Eudemus planted this shrine on his fields / For Zephyrus, ripest of all the winds, / Who bore down hard at the sound of his prayer, / And they flayed chaff from his swelling stalks.

(trans. FAGLES, 1998: 102)

We cannot be certain if, for Bacchylides, the term ἀστάχυες denotes 'corn-ears' or rather 'ears cut together with the stem'. It can be inferred from the epigram only that Eudemus eventually obtained grain from the mowed cereal, and the western wind helped him separate it from the chaff. The mowed cereal, bound in sheaves, was first placed in a field so that the corn-ears would ripen in the sun. After a few days, the sheaves were collected and bundles of cereal were strewn across a threshing place. The Greeks then drove cattle over them in order to obtain the grain from the mowed cereal. It was only later that the chaff was removed with the help of gusts of wind. The conciseness of the epigram makes it impossible to resolve the issue at hand. The passage πεπόνων [...] ἀπ' ἄσταχύων lends itself to various interpretations: 'from the ears which ripened in the sun', or 'from the cereal which ripened in the field', or even 'from the sheaves which ripened in the sun'. Such obscure phrasing may have easily led

to a secondary identification of ἄσταχυες = στάχυες, which was actually attested in the dictionary of Hesychius of Alexandria (cf. section 7, 3. below).

At this point, it is worth noting that Meleager of Gadara (1st century BC), the compiler and editor of the first collection of epigrams entitled *The Garland* (Gk. Στέφανος), compared the poetic output of Bacchylides to “corn-ears” (acc. pl. στάχυας):

λείψανὰ τ' εὐκαρπεῦντα μελιστάκτων ἀπὸ Μουσέων,
ξανθοὺς ἐκ καλάμης Βακχυλίδεω στάχυας

(*AP* IV 1, 19 f.; STADTMÜLLER 1894: 70)

and yellow-eared grain gleaned from Bacchylides, fine fruit on which
the honey of the Muses drops

(trans. PATON 2014: 177)

Meleager of Gadara liked to make references to the phytonyms appearing in the poetic works of particular epigrammatists, e.g. to the roses in Sappho's poetry or the myrtle in Callimachus's works (KACZYŃSKA, WITCZAK 2014: 32, 37–38). If we assume that the creator of the first global anthology came up with the idea to compare Bacchylides's literary achievements to “corn-ears” (acc. pl. στάχυας) having been inspired by the extant epigram *AP* VI 53 (where gen. pl. ἄσταχύν occurs), it may well be concluded that in the latter part of the Hellenistic period (1st century BC) the word ἄσταχυς was fully interchangeable with the appellative στάχυς in the sense of ‘corn-ear’. However, it has to be emphasized that this conjecture cannot be verified independently. Also, it cannot be ruled out that Meleager of Gadara was in possession of a slightly different version of the ending of Bacchylides's epigram, e.g. λικμήση πεπόνων καρπὸν ἀπὸ σταχύων (line 4).

7. THE TERM ΑΣΤΑΧΥΣ IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE ERA

In the days of the Roman Empire, the term ἄσταχυς ceases to be used in its original sense (‘grain growing in the field; mowed cereal together with the stem and ear’), though it was still distinguished from the ear of corn (Gk. στάχυς) in the first and second centuries CE. This semantic difference is clearly recognized by Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BC–ca. 50 CE), Pausanias Periegetes (ca. 110–ca. 180) and Julius Pollux (ca. 135–193).

The word στάχυς in Philo's works is regularly used for indicating ‘the ear of corn’ (*Ios.* 102, 108, 111; *Somn.* 218; *Mut.* 269), whereas the term ἄσταχυς describes the whole plant growing in the field (*Dec.* 160; *Virt.* 49; *Her.* 296). Philo also treats the phrase ἄσταχύν καρπός (*Sacr.* 80), whose literal meaning is ‘fruit of the cereal plants’, as a synonym for ‘grain’ (rather than for ‘the ear

of corn'). In his description of Achaea, Pausanias *Periegetes* (2nd c. CE) uses the appellative ἄσταχυς twice. In his account, young unmarried children (both girls and boys) of the citizens of Patrai crowned their heads with "cereal" wreaths (VII 20, 1: τῶν ἐπιχωρίων παῖδες [...] ἀστάχυσιν ἐστεφανωμένοι τὰς κεφαλὰς). These wreaths were then laid at the feet of a goddess, i.e. Artemis Laphria (VII 20, 2: στεφάνους μὲν τῶν ἀσταχύων ἀποτίθενται παρὰ τῇ θεῷ). In our opinion, the wreaths were made of harvested grain together with the stalk and ear, and not of the corn-ear alone. It would be difficult to make a wreath to be worn on one's head from corn-ears only.

Onomastikón (I 53), written by Iulius Pollux, a Greek scholar and sophist from the Egyptian Naucratis (2nd c. CE), also contains a sentence which reads ἄνεμος τοὺς ἀστάχῃς ἐκένωσεν „wind emptied the cereal plants” (BETHE 1998: 16)⁹. In other words, Pollux (similarly to Pausanias) seems to preserve the archaic distinction between the whole grain growing in the field (ἄσταχυς) and the corn-ear (στάχυς).

Other authors seem to have abandoned the formal and semantic distinction between the two concepts. The most obvious example occurs in Jewish writer Josephus Flavius' (ca. 37–ca. 100) work entitled *Περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου* (*The Jewish War*):

Before he [i.e. Archelaus] was summoned by Caesar, so we are told, he dreamt that he saw nine large, full ears of corn (στάχυς ἑννέα πλήρεις καὶ μεγάλους) devoured by oxen. He sent for the seers and some of the Chaldaeans and asked what they thought this foretold. Various interpretations were given, Simon, one of the Essenes, suggesting that the ears (τοὺς μὲν στάχῃς) denoted years and the oxen a political upheaval, because by ploughing they overturned the soil. Archelaus would rule one year for every ear (τὸν τῶν ἀσταχύων ἀριθμόν) and would pass through various political upheavals before he died. Five days after hearing this the dreamer was called to his trial

(trans. WILLIAMSON 1967: 124)

It is highly probable that Flavius Josephus (who was not a native speaker of the Greek language) was one of the first writers to have identified the archaic word ἄσταχυς with στάχυς 'ear of corn'.

The term ἄσταχυς also appears in different, clearly innovative senses. In medical papers of Claudius Galen (c. 130–200 BC), the word ἄσταχυς denotes 'a kind of surgical bandage'. In the period of the Second Sophistic, this appellative is revisited by Flavius Philostratus (2nd–3rd century CE), who only uses

⁹ We would like to thank one of the two anonymous reviewers for many valuable remarks, as well as for indicating to us Pollux's attestation, which "goes in the direction of the interpretation of ἄσταχυς as the whole plant".

it metaphorically (e.g. ‘shoot of a plant’, ‘lock of hair’) and in novel contexts. Consider the following two spectacular examples of such unusual usage:

7.1. ὅσος δὲ ὁ τῶν βοστρύχων ἄσταχυς (Philostr. *Im.* I 7) “how long is the crop of curls” (FAIRBANKS 1960: 31).

7.2. διὰ μέσου γὰρ τοῦ ὕδατος ἀμάραντα νεύει τὰ μὲν ἔνθεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκεῖθεν, ἡδεῖς ἀστάχυνες καὶ βάλλοντες ἄνθει τὸ ὕδωρ (Philostr. *Im.* I 9) “In the midst of the pool amaranth flowers are nodding this way and that, sweet clusters that pelt the water with their blossoms” (FAIRBANKS 1960: 39)

Flavius Philostratus would probably not have come across this word in actual speech. Following contemporary Atticism (also called Archaism), which promoted returning to the diction of the old masters, he took the then archaic word ἄσταχυς from works of popular bards (not only Attic, and including Homer, Herodotus, Callimachus of Cyrene, and Aratus of Soli) and, not knowing its proper semantics, bandied it about in a somewhat frivolous manner.

We are thus bound to conclude that the epic word ἄσταχυς in its primary meaning (‘grain growing in the field; mowed cereal together with the stem and ear’) fell out of popular use, while the appellative στάχυς m. ‘corn-ear’ remained productive not only in late antiquity (Nonnos of Panopolis, 5th century CE, who uses the term στάχυς thirty times, never employs the noun ἄσταχυς in the *Dionysiaca*) but also in the modern period (ANDRIOTIS 1974: 510 f.).

The lexicographers of late antiquity identified the nouns with each other: Hesychius of Alexandria in late 5th century defined the word ἄσταχυς, which occurred in the dative plural form ἀσταχύεσσι, through the Greek στάχυς ‘corn-ear’.

7.3. ἀσταχύεσσι· τοῖς στάχυσιν (LATTE 1953: 265; CUNNINGHAM 2018: 357).

It appears that in the days of the late Roman Empire and the early Byzantine Empire the original semantic distinctiveness of ἄσταχυς and στάχυς, which still obtained in the Hellenistic epoch and the two first centuries of the Christian era, was obliterated. Both these Greek appellatives went on to denote ‘corn-ear’, which led to a gradual elimination of the first of the two, and they additionally took on the specialized meaning of ‘a kind of surgical bandage (in the form of a spike)’, attested, for example, in medical papers by Claudius Galen and Oribasius¹⁰. It cannot be ruled out that the false identification of phonetically similar words (ἄσταχυς = στάχυς) happened because of a misunderstanding or an unclear context, as in the case of the epigram *AP* VI 53 (see section 6 above).

¹⁰ It is worth noting that Claudius Galen, a Roman military doctor working in the 2nd century AD, employs the two words in question, ἄσταχυς and στάχυς, to refer to a surgical bandage. But we cannot be completely sure if he meant the same kind of bandage in both cases. The medical sense of the word στάχυς is also confirmed by Oribasius, a 3rd-century doctor (Orib. 48, 46).

8. THE GREEK APPELLATIVE ΑΣΤΑΧΥΣ FROM THE WORD-FORMATION AND ETYMOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Earlier in the present article (see section 7), we showed that the Greek term ἄσταχυς was only identified with the primary word στάχυς m. ‘corn-ear’ in the Roman Empire period. In the archaic, classical, and early Hellenistic periods, the Greek appellative ἄσταχυς retained its semantic distinctiveness and denoted ‘grain growing in the field’, as well as ‘mowed cereal together with the stem and ear’, i.e. ‘the entire stalk together with the corn-ear that has not been cut off yet’ (originally ἄ- ‘together with’ and στάχυς ‘the corn-ear’). In works by Homer, Herodotus, Callimachus of Cyrene, or Aratus of Soli, this (primary) meaning is nicely documented (see sections 3–5). Since at one point the Greek language exhibited a semantic opposition between ἄσταχυς and στάχυς, the prothetic character of ἄ-, posited by Robert BEEKES (2010: 155), must be seriously questioned.

At this point, we intend to demonstrate that the word ἄσταχυς m. ‘grain growing in the field’, ‘mowed cereal together with the stem and ear’ is a complex formation, which consists of the primary noun στάχυς m. ‘corn-ear’ and the purely Hellenic prefix ἄ- (< PIE. **sm̥-* ‘together with, jointly’, cf. Sanskrit *sa-*, Proto-Iranian **ha-*, Proto-Slavic **sŕ-* ‘id.’, Proto-Celtic **sam-*; BLAŽEK 2003: 6). This prefix often occurred in the Greek vocabulary with smooth breathing as the result of either psilosis, regularly operating in the Aeolic and East Ionic dialects, or regular regressive dissimilation of aspirated consonants according to Grassmann’s Law (COLLINGE 1985: 47–61; VINE 2014: 26–27).

In Ancient Greek, there are numerous attested instances of systematic distant dissimilation of aspirated consonants spanning more than two syllables:

8.1. Gk. ἄλοχος f. ‘bedmate; wife; cohabitant; concubine’ < Proto-Greek **ἄ-λοχος* < PIE. **sm̥-logʰos* ‘having the same bed; lying together in a bed; the action of lying together’, cf. OCS *splogъ* m. ‘bedmate, husband, lover’, Srb-CSl. *сѣлогъ* m./f. ‘bedmate; σύγκοιτος’, Cz. *souloh* m. ‘intercourse’, see also Ru. *сѣложъ* f. ‘bedmate, wife’ (POKORNY 1959: 6f.; BEEKES 2010: 74, 852; KACZYŃSKA 2022: 150 f.).

8.2. Gk. Ionic ἀδελφεός, Attic ἀδελφός m. ‘brother’ < Proto-Greek **ἄ-δελφειός* < PIE. **sm̥-gʷelbʰeǵs* adj. ‘(descending) from the same womb’, cf. OInd. *ságarbhya-* adj. ‘born from the same womb’, *sagarbhā-* f. ‘pregnant woman’ (POKORNY 1959: 473; BEEKES 2010: 20; KACZYŃSKA 2022: 150). See also Gk. δελφύς f. ‘womb’, OInd. *gárbha-* m. ‘womb’.

8.3. Gk. Cret. †ἀλλάθαρον· ἄλμυρόν. Κρήτες “*allátharon* – something salty, [so called by] the Cretans” (LATTE 1953: 110; CUNNINGHAM 2018: 146) < Proto-Greek **ἄλ-φάθαρον* n. ‘salt source’ (KACZYŃSKA 2022: 150–155).

The Greek words ἄσταχυς, ἄλοχος and ἀδελφός display the identical morphological structure, i.e. consist of the prefix ἄ- (earlier **ἄ-*) ‘together, jointly’ as the first component, and the relevant noun which follows (cf. Gk. στάχυς

m. ‘corn-ear’, Gk. λόχος m. ‘ambush site, ambush; company, unit; childbirth’, Gk. δελφύς f. ‘womb’). The word ἄσταχυς m. ‘grain in the field; (mowed) cereal together with the stem and ear’ (originally ‘together with the corn-ear; accompanied by the corn-ear; having the same corn-ear’) has a transparent and undeniable Greek etymology (cf. Gk. ἄ- / ἁ- ‘together, jointly’ and στάχυς m. ‘corn-ear’; BLAŽEK 2003: 6). The hypothesis of its substrate character should be rejected. In addition, the current state of research does not, in our opinion, warrant positing the prothetic or euphonic character of the initial vowel ἄ- [a].

9. CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis of the surviving attestations of the word ἄσταχυς in Greek literature has led us to the following conclusions:

9.1. The word ἄσταχυς is not semantically identical with the noun στάχυς m. ‘corn-ear’, despite what the modern dictionaries of Ancient Greek suggest. Instead, it denotes a whole cereal plant, i.e. ‘grain growing in the field’ or ‘mowed cereal stem together with the ear’.

9.2. The lexeme ἄσταχυς m. ‘grain growing in the field; mowed cereal plant together with the stem and ear’ (originally ‘together with the corn-ear; accompanied by the corn-ear; having the same corn-ear’) is a compound consisting of two parts: ἄ- and στάχυς. The word stress falling on the antepenult of the appellative in question clearly testifies to a derivational process¹¹.

9.3. The initial element ἄ- is neither prothetic nor euphonic, but is a reflection of the original copular prefix ἄ- [ha] (< PIE. *s_{mi}- ‘together with, jointly; accompanied by; having the same’) in its psilotic (or dissimilated) form ἄ- [a].

9.4. The loss of the word-initial rough breathing in the Greek appellative (< *ἄ-σταχυς ‘the overground part of a cereal together with the ear’) may be a result of regressive dissimilation of aspirated consonants according to Grassmann’s Law, which describes the influence of the voiceless aspirated consonant χ [k^h] on the word-initial aspirated consonant ‘ [h].

9.5. BEEKES’s hypothesis about the substrate character of the Greek words ἄσταχυς m. ‘grain in the field; corn-ear with the stem’ and στάχυς m. ‘corn-ear’ is unfounded.

Acknowledgements

The present article is part of the research project entitled *Greek-Oriental contacts in a comparative perspective*, financed by the scholarly development

¹¹ It is worth noting that prothesis does not, as a rule, cause a word-stress shift, cf. Gk. σπαίρω and ἄσπαίρω ‘to pant, struggle, resist’, σταφίς vs. ἄσταφίς f. ‘fried grapes, raisins’, στεροπή vs. ἄστεροπή f. ‘lightning’, βληχρός vs. ἄβληχρός adj. ‘weak’.

fund of the Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz. We would like to thank the two peer reviewers for their suggestions and remarks, Dr. Maciej Grabski (University of Lodz) for his constant assistance in translating our paper, as well as Dr. Paul Sheldon Cohen for checking and improving our English style.

Department of Classical Philology, University of Lodz

elwira.kaczynska@uni.lodz.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-4545-1927

krzysztof.witczak@uni.lodz.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-8895-974X

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAMOWICZÓWNA 1958: Z. ABRAMOWICZÓWNA (ed.). *Słownik grecko-polski*, vol. I, Warszawa 1958.
- ADRADOS 1991: F.R. ADRADOS, *Diccionario griego-español*, vol. III, Madrid 1991.
- ANDRIOTIS 1974: N. ANDRIOTIS, *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten*, Wien 1974.
- APPEL 2001: W. APPEL, *Ὕμνοι Ὀμηρικοί czyli Hymny homeryckie*, Toruń 2001.
- AUTENRIETH 1887: G. AUTENRIETH, *Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten*, Leipzig 1887.
- BEEKES 1969: R. BEEKES, *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*, The Hague–Paris 1969.
- BEEKES 2010: R. BEEKES, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, vols. I–II, Leiden–Boston 2010.
- BETHE 1998: E. BETHE (ed.), *Pollucis onomasticon*, vol. I, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1998.
- BLAŽEK 2003: V. BLAŽEK, *The Prefix *Sḡ- / *Som- in the Indo-European Tree- & Plant-Names*, *Linguistica Brunensia* 2003 LII, pp. 5–11.
- CHANTRAINE 1968: P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, vol. I, Paris 1968.
- COLLINGE 1985: N.E. COLLINGE, *The Laws of Indo-European*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 1985.
- CUNNINGHAM 2018: I.C. CUNNINGHAM (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. I, Berlin–Boston 2018.
- DIGGLE 2021: J. DIGGLE (ed.), *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, vols. I–II, Cambridge 2021.
- DVORETSKY 1958: I.H. DVORETSKY, *Drevnegrečesko-russkiy slovar'*, vol. I, Moskva 1958.
- EVELYN-WHITE 1995: H.G. EVELYN-WHITE, *Hesiod, Homeric Hymns, Epic Cycle, Homerica*, Cambridge (MA)–London 1995.
- FAGLES 1998: Bacchylides, *Complete Poems*, trans. R. FAGLES, New Haven–London 1998.
- FAIRBANKS 1960: A. FAIRBANKS, *Philostratus: Imagines, Callistratus: Descriptions*, London–Cambridge (MA) 1960.
- FERNANDEZ-GALIANO 1976-1980: E. FERNANDEZ-GALIANO, *Lexico de los himnos de Calimaco*, vols. I–IV, Madrid 1976–1980.
- FITZGERALD 1992: R. FITZGERALD, *Homer: The Iliad*, London 1992.
- FRISK 1960–1962: HJ. FRISK, *Griechische etymologische Wörterbuch*, vols. I–II, Heidelberg 1960–1962.
- GODLEY 1957: A.D. GODLEY, *Herodotus in four volumes*, vol. III, London–Cambridge (MA) 1957.
- HOPKINSON 1994: N. HOPKINSON, *A Hellenistic Anthology*, Cambridge 1994.
- HUNTER 1999: R. HUNTER, *Theocritus: A Selection. Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*, Cambridge 1999.
- JUREWICZ 2000: O. JUREWICZ, *Słownik grecko-polski*, vol. I, Warszawa 2000.
- KACZYŃSKA 2022: E. KACZYŃSKA, *Reflections on a Cretan Gloss Denoting a Salt Source*, *GRBS LXII* 2022, fasc. 2, pp. 148–160.

- KACZYŃSKA, WITCZAK 2014: E. KACZYŃSKA, K.T. WITCZAK, *Komentarz do Meleagra z Gadary. Przedmowy do Wieńca*, Nowy Filomata XVIII 2014, fasc. 1, pp. 29–45.
- KAEGI 1931: A. KAEGI, *Benselers griechisch-deutsches Schulwörterbuch*, Leipzig–Berlin 1931.
- KRETSCHMER 1923: P. KRETSCHMER, *Zur ältesten Sprachgeschichte Kleinasiens*, Glotta XXI 1923, fasc. 1–2, pp. 76–100.
- LATTE 1953: K. LATTE, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. I, Hauniae 1953.
- LEGRAND 1946: Ph.-E. LEGRAND, *Hérodote: Histoires, livre 5: Terpsichore*, Paris 1946.
- LIDDELL, SCOTT 1899: H.G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1899.
- 1996: H.G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, with a revised supplement, 9th edition, Oxford 1996.
- LOMBARDO, RAYOR 1988: S. LOMBARDO, D. RAYOR, *Callimachus: Hymns, Epigrams, Select Fragments*, Baltimore–London 1988.
- MAIR 1899: A.W. MAIR, *Callimachus: Hymns and Epigrams, Lycophron*, with an English translation by A.W. MAIR, *Aratus*, with an English translation by G.R. MAIR, Cambridge (MA)–London 1899.
- MONIER-WILLIAMS 1999: M. MONIER-WILLIAMS, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Delhi 1999.
- MONTANARI 1999: F. MONTANARI, *Vocabolario della lingua greca*, Torino 1999.
- 2018: F. MONTANARI, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden–Boston 2019.
- PABÓN DE URBINA 1970: J.M. PABÓN DE URBINA, *Diccionario manual griego-español*, Barcelona 1970.
- PATON 1960: W.R. PATON, *The Greek Anthology*, vol. I, London–Cambridge (MA) 1960.
- PATON, TUELLER 2014: W.R. PATON, *The Greek Anthology*, vol. I, revised by M.A. TUELLER, London–Cambridge (MA) 2014.
- POKORNY 1959: J. POKORNY, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern–München 1959.
- RAPAPORT 1932: A. RAPAPORT, *Słownik grecko-polski do wyboru z pieśni Homera*, Lwów–Warszawa 1932.
- SCHENKL, BRUNETTI 1991: F. SCHENKL, F. BRUNETTI, *Dizionario greco-italiano, italiano-greco*, Genova 1991.
- STADTMÜLLER 1894: H. STADTMÜLLER, *Anthologia Graeca epigramatum Palatina cum Planudea*, vol. I, Lipsiae 1894.
- STAVROPOULOS 1992: D.N. STAVROPOULOS, *Oxford Greek-English Learner's Dictionary*, Oxford 1992.
- STEPHENS 2015: S.A. STEPHENS, *Callimachus: The Hymns*, Oxford 2015.
- TRYPANIS 1989: C.A. TRYPANIS, *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and Other Fragments*, edited and translated by C.A. TRYPANIS, *Musaeus: Hero and Leander*, edited by T. GELZER, translated by C. WHITMAN, London–Cambridge (MA) 1989.
- VINE 2014: B. VINE, *Grassmann's Law*, in: G.K. GIANNAKIS (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, vol. II, Leiden–Boston 2014, pp. 26–27.
- WILLIAMSON 1967: Josephus, *The Jewish War*, translated by G.A. WILLIAMSON, Harmondsworth 1967.
- WINTER 1950: W. WINTER, *Studien zum "prothetischen Vokal" im Griechischen*, Hamburg 1950.

EIN SONETT AN LEUCONOUS: MARIAN HEMARS POLNISCHE NACHDICHTUNG VON HORAZ' *ODE* I 11

von

MAREK STACHOŃ

ABSTRACT: In 1971, Marian Hemar published a Polish adaptation of the better part of Horace's lyric poems, for the preparation of which he used, as he tells us in the preface, the old edition with an English translation and commentary by Joseph DAVIDSON (London 1746). In this article, I analyze Hemar's version of *carmen* I 11 with special regard to the question to which degree he reproduces Horace's wording, how much he was influenced by DAVIDSON's edition, and what he added to the poem by himself.

Im Jahre 1971, kurz vor seinem Tod, veröffentlichte Marian HEMAR (1901–1972) unter dem Titel *Ody Horacjusza* einen Band mit polnischen Nachdichtungen ausgewählter lyrischer Stücke des Horaz¹. Zwar verließ Hemar bereits zu Beginn des Zweiten Weltkrieges als jüdischer Flüchtling seine Heimat und hielt sich seit 1941 in England auf, wo er, da er auch nach Kriegsende aufgrund seiner politischen Aktivität nicht ins kommunistische Polen zurückkehren konnte, bis zu seinem Lebensende blieb, doch hielt er nicht zuletzt durch engen Kontakt zu Julian Tuwim, dem die *Ody Horacjusza* posthum gewidmet sind², Kontakt nach Polen und genoss dort durch seine von 1953 bis 1969 wöchentlich ausgestrahlte Kabarett-Sendung im polnischen Programm von *Radio Free Europe* einige Popularität³. Vornehmlich ist er als politischer Satiriker bekannt, doch scheinen seine Horaz-Übertragungen weder staatskritisch noch besonders bissig zu sein. Sie entstanden, so berichtet er im Vorwort, als er während einer Krankheit im Januar 1969 mehrere Tage zuhause blieb und eine Beschäftigung suchte, die er in der Übersetzung horazischer *Oden* fand: In der Zeit, die er krank zuhause verbrachte, erstellte er zuerst einen Zyklus von 12 Gedichten,

¹ Vgl. M. HEMAR, *Ody Horacjusza*, London 1971, Neuauflage, Łomianki 2021. Das Manuskript befindet sich heute in Krakau (Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Archiwum Oficyny Poetów i Malarzy, t. 191, sign. 3176).

² Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 12 f.

³ Zur Biographie HEMARS vgl. A. MIESZKOWSKA, *Marian Hemar od Lwowa do Londynu: Szkic do biografii artysty*, London 2001, oder M. URBANOWSKI, *Hemar, Marian*, in: E. ZARYCH (Hg.), *Encyklopedia literatury polskiej*, Kraków 2005, S. 235 f.

den er noch in der gleichen Woche erst auf 24, dann auf 33 und schließlich auf 44 Gedichte erweiterte; um von sich sagen zu können, er habe den größeren Teil der horazischen Lyrik übersetzt, fügte er später noch 17 Oden hinzu, sodass er mit 61 Gedichten mehr als die Hälfte der 120 lyrischen Stücke des Horaz bearbeitet hat⁴. Als Textgrundlage und Kommentar benutzte er eine von Joseph DAVIDSON im 18. Jahrhundert besorgte Ausgabe mit lateinischem Text, grammatisch vereinfachter Paraphrase, englischer Übersetzung und englischem *Variorum*-Kommentar, die er einige Jahre zuvor günstig gekauft hatte⁵. Da es für ihn außer Frage steht, dass die horazischen Gedichte zum Gesang mit Lyra-Begleitung bestimmt gewesen seien, bemüht er sich, anstelle einer versgetreuen Abbildung des Originals, die Musikalität der Stücke in die Zielsprache zu übertragen, also gewissermaßen polnische Liedtexte zu komponieren; das Geheimnis eines guten Liedes, so erklärt er, habe schon immer in der Symbiose der Melodie mit dem Text gelegen⁶. Den Umgang mit sperrigen Versformen und musikalischen Rhythmen hat er schließlich bereits unzählige Male beim Texten von Lyrics zu Jazz-Songs erprobt; die Übertragung horazischer Lieder ins Polnische empfindet er als eine damit vergleichbare Herausforderung⁷. Was den Sprachstil angeht, will er sich nicht darum bemühen, den lateinischen Text durch ein archaisierendes, pseudo-zeremonielles Polnisch wiederzugeben, sondern eine für ihn aktuelle dichterische Diktion zu benutzen⁸.

Wie er diese an sich selbst gestellte Aufgabe gelöst hat, sei exemplarisch an seiner Übertragung des *Leuconoe*-Gedichts, *carmen* I 11, analysiert. Das lateinische Gedicht gehört mit seiner Sentenz *carpe diem* zu den berühmtesten Stücken des Horaz⁹.

⁴ Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 6; O. JUREWICZ, *Hemar i Horacy*, *Kultura i Życie* XIX 1990, S. 2, Sp. a¹-c², bes. Sp. a²-b¹; MIESZKOWSKA, *op. cit.* (Anm. 3), S. 194 f. Die vier horazischen *Oden*-Bücher zählen zusammen 103 Gedichte, die *Epoden* 17; Hemar übertrug aus dem ersten Buch 21, aus dem zweiten 14, aus dem dritten 11, aus dem vierten 7 *Oden* sowie 8 *Epoden*. B. HADACZEK, *O twórczości Mariana Hemara i magii Lwowa*, in: M. KURKIEWICZ, R. MIELHORSKI (Hgg.), *Marian Hemar wczoraj i dziś ...*, Bydgoszcz 2012, S. 11–28, S. 13 Anm. 12, würdigt die Horaz-Übertragungen kurz ohne nähere Besprechung als „znakomity przekład“ („ausgezeichnete Übersetzung“).

⁵ Vgl. J. DAVIDSON, *The Odes, Epodes, and Carmen Seculare of Horace, translated into English Prose, as near the Original as the different Idioms of the Latin and English Languages will allow ... for the Use of Schools as well as of Private Gentlemen* (1741), 3rd ed., London 1746; eine Auflage des entsprechenden Buches von 1726, von der HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 5, spricht, ist im *Karlsruher Virtuellen Katalog* nicht nachweisbar: Vielleicht hat HEMAR die Jahreszahl MDCCXLVI (1746) als MDCCXXVI (1726) verlesen.

⁶ Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 7, sowie JUREWICZ, *op. cit.* (Anm. 4), Sp. c¹. URBANOWSKI, *op. cit.* (Anm. 3), S. 236, spricht von über 3000 Liedern, zu denen HEMAR im Laufe seines Lebens Texte und teils auch Melodien schrieb.

⁷ Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 7.

⁸ Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 9, sowie Jurewicz, *op. cit.* (Anm. 4), Sp. b¹, Sp. c².

⁹ Der hier gebotene Text folgt der Ausgabe von D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Opera*, Berlin 2001, S. 13; in der von Hemar benutzten Ausgabe von DAVIDSON, *op. cit.*

Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi
finem di dederint, Leuconoe, nec Babylonios
temptaris numeros. ut melius, quidquid erit, pati,
seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam,
quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare
Tyrrenum! sapias, vina liques et spatio brevi
spem longam reseces. dum loquimur, fugerit invida
aetas. carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero.

Du sollst nicht nachforschen – es zu wissen, ist ein Frevel –, welches
Ende mir, welches dir / die Götter zugebracht haben, Leuconoe, auch von
babylonischen / Horoskopen solltest du die Finger lassen. Wieviel besser
ist es doch, was auch immer kommen mag, zu erdulden, / ganz gleich,
ob uns Jupiter noch mehr Winter gewährt oder ob es der letzte ist, / der
jetzt an den steilen Klippen das tyrrenische Meer / müde peitscht! Sei
vernünftig, verdünne den Wein und auf kurze Zeit / beschränke deine
weitreichende Erwartung. Während wir reden, entflieht uns missgünstig
/ die Lebenszeit. Pflücke den Tag, sei nach Möglichkeit nicht so
leichtgläubig anzunehmen, der nächste Tag würde sicher kommen.

In der von ihm benutzten Ausgabe von DAVIDSON hat er folgende Übersetzung
vorgefunden, an der er sich bei eigenen Verständnisschwierigkeiten wahrschein-
lich orientiert hat¹⁰:

Seek not, Leuconoe, to inform yourself of the Day and Hour of
your Death or mine, this Curiosity is forbidden; and consult not the
Calculations of the *Babylonians*: You will act more wisely *in disposing*
your Mind to bear whatever happens *with Patience and Contentment*,
whether Jupiter grants you[†] a longer Course of Years, or has resolv'd
that this shall be the last of your Winters, in which you are building
a Mole in the Tuscan Sea, to break the Violence of its Waves. Live
contented, take your Glass freely, and entertain no Hopes of Things
too distant for so short a Life: Envious Time retires from us the very
Moment we are speaking. Enjoy therefore the present Hour, and don't
depend upon tomorrow.

* What End the Gods have given me or you.

† More Winters.

Es wird eine Frau namens *Leuconoë* angesprochen und es wird ihr angeraten,
sie möge nicht bei Sterndeutern oder anderen Wahrsagern danach fragen, was
die Zukunft bringe, sondern sich lieber mit jedem einzelnen Moment zufrieden
geben: Jeden Tag solle sie so leben, als gäbe es keine Sicherheit, dass die Sonne
am nächsten Morgen wieder aufgehe.

(Anm. 5), S. 38, unterscheidet sich der Text lediglich in der Orthographie und Interpunktion. Die
deutsche Übersetzung stammt von mir.

¹⁰ Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 5. Der englische Text wird zitiert nach DAVIDSON, *op. cit.* (Anm. 5), S. 39.

Hemar hat in seiner Übertragung nicht versucht, das antike Versmaß, den *Asclepiadeus maior*, nachzuahmen, sondern stattdessen ein formal etwas unkonventionelles Sonett verfasst mit sechshebigen und zum Abschluss der Terzette dreihebigen rhythmischen Versen und dem Reimschema *aabb cdcd eef ggf*¹¹.

Do Leuconoa

Nie dociekaj, (grzech wiedzieć!) jaki mnie, jaki tobie,	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	a	
Kres szykują Bogowie	i	gdzie	i	w	jakim	grobie?	×	×	×	×	a
Nie radź się liczb chaldejskich,	ni	babilońskich	kabał,	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	b
Jakiej byś strzegł się daty,	jakiego	byś	się	dnia	bał?	×	×	×	×	×	b
Przywitaj mile każdy	ranek, z czymkolwiek dnieje,	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	c
I na lepsze, cokolwiek	przyniesie ci, obracaj.	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	d
Dopij wina. A nazbyt	dalekosiężne nadzieje	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	c
Przybliż na krótszą metę	i cugli marzeniom skracaj.	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	d
Czy ci wiele zim jeszcze	ześle wyniosły Jowisz,	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	e
Czy ta jest twą ostatnią?	Nadaremnie się głowisz,	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	e
Nic z tego nie wynijdzie.		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	f
Żyj dniem. My tu gwarzymy,	a czas zazdrośnie się śpieszy.	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	g
Nie licz na żadne jutro,	że zmartwi cię, że cię ucieszy,	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	g
Ani na to, że przyjdzie.		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	f

Frage nicht nach – Sünde ist es, das zu wissen –, was mir, was dir / für ein Ende die Gottheiten bereiten, wo und in welchem Grab. / Berate dich nicht mit chaldäischen Rechnungen oder mit babylonischen Machenschaften, / vor welchem Datum du dich in Acht nehmen solltest, welchen Tag du fürchten solltest. // Begrüße liebevoll jeden Morgen, womit auch immer der Tag aufwartet, / und wende es, was auch immer der Tag dir bringt, zum Besseren. / Trink den Wein aus! Zu weitreichende Hoffnungen / nähere auf ein kürzeres Maß an; verkürze die Zügel der Träume! // Ob dir noch viele Winter der stolze Jupiter herabsendet, / ob dieser dein letzter ist, darüber zerbrichst du dir umsonst den Kopf, / nichts wird dabei herauskommen. // Lebe mit dem Tag! Wir reden hier, und die Zeit eilt neidisch davon! / Zähle nicht auf irgendein „morgen“, dass es dir Sorgen machen, dass es dich erfreuen könnte, / zähle nicht einmal darauf, dass es kommt!

Neben der Anpassung des Gedichts in der bloßen Form springt eine Besonderheit ins Auge: Es wird nicht mehr eine weibliche, sondern eine männliche Person angesprochen. Die Verbformen *strzegł* und *bał* sind männliche

¹¹ Der Text folgt der genannten Neuauflage von HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 33; die deutsche Übersetzung, die sich einerseits um Wörtlichkeit bemüht, andererseits aber auch die Verseinteilung beizubehalten sucht, stammt von mir. Zur polnischen Metrik und der Sonettform in der polnischen Literatur vgl. M. GIERGIELEWICZ, *Introduction to Polish Versification*, Philadelphia 1970, S. 83–91 bzw. S. 168–171. In seiner kurz vor den Horaz-Nachdichtungen erschienenen Shakespeare-Übersetzung (*Sonety Szekspira*, London 1968) bedient sich Hemar der Elisabethanischen Sonettform mit vier Quartetten und einem abschließenden Verspaar, wobei er, teils von der Vorlage abweichend, als Reimschema auch *abba cddc effe gg* oder *abba cddc eeff gg* benutzt. In den *Ody Horacjusza* ist die Umsetzung einer horazischen Ode als sonett-artiges Gedicht singulär.

Formen, bezogen auf eine Frau hieße es *strzegła* bzw. *bala*; zudem müsste der Titel, wenn das Gedicht an eine Frau namens *Leuconoë* gerichtet wäre, *Do Leuconoi* oder *Do Leuconoe* lauten. Wie genau der von Hemar angenommene Name der angesprochenen Person lauten könnte, lässt sich nicht sicher erschließen: Eine polonisierte Form wie *Leuconousz* würde dekliniert wohl eher zu einem Titel wie *Do Leuconousza* führen¹²; Personennamen auf *-us* werden von Hemar dagegen im Genitiv teils auf *-usa*, teils auf *-a* dekliniert: So könnte die Person also *Leuconous* und ein Gedicht an ihn wahlweise *Do Leuconousa* oder *Do Leuconoa* heißen¹³. Alternativ ließe sich die Genitiv-Form *Leuconoa* von einem ungewöhnlich endenden Namen wie *Leuconoo* ableiten: Dieser könnte als Verlesung des abschließenden *e* als *o* in der alten Ausgabe von DAVIDSON entstanden sein; schließlich weist DAVIDSON weder in seiner Übersetzung noch in seinen Anmerkungen darauf hin, dass es sich bei der angesprochenen Person um eine Frau handelt. Vielmehr könnte sein Einleitungstext, in dem für „Menschen“ das generische Maskulinum *men* gebraucht wird, diese Fehldeutung angeregt haben:

Men in all Ages have been the Dupes of Superstition; but one of the most foolish and ridiculous Kinds of it is, to consult judicia! Astrologers and Fortune-Tellers with regard to the Period of our Lives, and what Occurrences are to befall us. *Leuconoe* had this Weakness in common with several others. *Horace*, according to the Principles of his Philosophy, ridicules this Practice, in shewing this pretended art to be no more than a downright Imposture, and that true Wisdom consists rather in enjoying the Delights and Pleasures of Life, than in knowing the Hour of our Death.¹⁴

Auch in der Anmerkung zu der Textstelle, an der die Adressatin von Horaz *credula* genannt und damit noch einmal grammatisch ihre Weiblichkeit bestätigt wird, spricht DAVIDSON von *men*:

Carpere, is applied to the Action of gathering Fruits or Flowers as one goes along, without stopping [...]. Every Day is a delicate Flower, that flourishes but a short Time, and that decays and wastes while one delays to take it up. *Horace* concludes with an Advice, which he could wish all Men followed¹⁵.

¹² Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 43: „Do Wergiliusza“ (c. 1,24), S. 72: „Do Focuszsa“ (c. 2,4).

¹³ Vgl. HEMAR, *op. cit.* (Anm. 1), S. 70: „Do Delliusa“ (c. 2,3), S. 79: „Do Valgiusa“ (c. 2,9), S. 85: „Do Grosfusa“ (c. 2,16), S. 93/118: „Do Bacchusa“ (c. 2,19; c. 3,25), daneben allerdings auch S. 54: „Do Tibulla“ (c. 1,23), S. 68: „Do Kryspa Sallusta“ (c. 2,2), S. 83: „Do Postuma“ (c. 2,14), S. 135: „Do Torquata“ (c. 4,7), S. 137: „Do Liguryrna“ (c. 4,10).

¹⁴ DAVIDSON, *op. cit.* (Anm. 5), S. 38 f.

¹⁵ DAVIDSON, *op. cit.* (Anm. 5), S. 39.

Außer im Titel nennt Hemar den Namen der angesprochenen Person im Text des Gedichts allerdings nicht mehr: Die Aussage des Gedichts, die Aufforderung, jeden Tag zu genießen, richtet sich dadurch nicht mehr an eine bestimmte Person, sondern spricht alle an, die die Übertragung lesen; liest man das Gedicht ohne den Titel, lassen sich also auch *strzeż* und *bał* als generische Maskulina lesen. So mag die Entscheidung für einen (generisch) maskulinen Adressaten auch bewusst von Hemar getroffen worden sein, um das Gedicht von der erotischen Interpretation, der es zur damaligen Zeit vermehrt unterzogen worden ist, zu befreien¹⁶.

Auch an anderen Stellen scheint Hemar eher von der Übersetzung DAVIDSONS beeinflusst zu sein als vom lateinischen Text. So ergänzt er etwa mit DAVIDSON ein Personalpronomen der zweiten Person im Dativ zu *seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam: Czy ci wiele zim jeszcze ześle wyniosły Jowisz, / Czy ta jest twą ostatnią?* entspricht *whether Jupiter grants you a longer Course of Years* [^{Fn.} *more Winters*], *or has resolv'd that this shall be the last of your Winters*, während die Frage im lateinischen Original allgemeiner ohne *tibi* formuliert ist¹⁷. Auch an einer anderen Stelle im Text lässt *Dopij wina* eher das englische *take your Glass freely* anklingen als eine Übertragung von *vina liques* („verdünne den Wein“) zu versuchen. Auch einzelne Ausschmückungen Hemars, die kein Vorbild im horazischen Text haben, scheinen von DAVIDSON inspiriert zu sein: Nachdem er *Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi / finem di dederint* sehr wortgetreu mit *Nie dociekaj, (grzech wiedzieć!) jaki mnie, jaki tobie, / Kres szykują Bogowie* wiedergegeben hat, ergänzt er ein zusätzliches Interesse am Ort des Todes und Grabplatzes (*i gdzie i w jakim grobie*); bei den babylonischen Sterndeutern, zu denen er die chaldäischen hinzufügt (*Nie radź się liczb chaldejskich, ni babilońskich kabał*), rät er ohne horazisches Vorbild davon ab, nachzufragen, vor welchem Datum man sich denn fürchten solle (*Jakiej byś strzeż się daty, jakiego byś się dnia bał*) – dies wird wohl ebenfalls

¹⁶ So nehmen etwa D. WEST, *Reading Horace*, Edinburgh 1967, S. 64, und R.G.M NISBET, M. HUBBARD, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book I*, Oxford 1970, S. 135, an, der Dichter wolle Leuconoe umwerben.

¹⁷ Wie im lateinischen Text beim *tribuit* die indirekten Dativ-Objekte *mihi* und *tibi* aus V. 1 nachschwingen, so erwartet man auch bei polnischen Verben wie *zesłać* („herabsenden“) und ähnlichen Wörtern aus dem Bedeutungsfeld „geben, schicken, bringen“ ein indirektes Objekt; vgl. andere polnische Übersetzungen der Stelle: „czy Jowisz nas jeszcze wielu zimami obdarzy“ (M. MOTTY, *Horacego ody, epody, satyry i listy*, Poznań 1896, S. 14), „czy też nam przysporzy / Lat jeszcze kilka“ (H. Sienkiewicz [†1916], *Pisma zapomniane i niewydane*, I. CHRZANOWSKI (hrsg.), Lwów 1922, S. 468), „Czy więcej zim da nam Jowisz“ (Z. KUBIAK, *Muza rzymska: Antologia poezji starożytnego Rzymu*, Warszawa 1963, S. 66). Einen Vergleich verschiedener polnischer Übersetzungen der *Ode I 11* bietet J.R. KACZYŃSKI, *To, co najtrudniejsze, czyli problemy z tłumaczeniem Ody Do Leukonoe*, *Meander LX* 2005, S. 175–182. Eine kurze Geschichte der polnischen Horaz-Übersetzungen bis zum Erscheinen des Werks Hemars bietet J. KRÓKOWSKI, *Wstęp*, in: J.K. (Hg.), *Horacy, Wybór poezji*, Wrocław 1971, S. iii–lxii, bes. S. lxxviii–liv.

von der Übertragung DAVIDSONs beeinflusst sein (*to inform yourself of the Day and Hour of your Death or mine*). Andere Ergänzungen Hemars haben weder ein exaktes Vorbild bei Horaz noch bei DAVIDSON: So fügt er zur kürzer zu stützenden *spes longa* noch die „Zügel der Träume“ hinzu, die kürzer zu ziehen seien (*i cugli marzeniom skracaj*); der morgige Tag könne, so ergänzt er ebenfalls gegenüber Horaz, entweder Sorgen oder Freude bringen (*że zmartwi cię, że cię ucieszy*). Die denkbar konzise lateinische Formulierung, die Adressatin solle *quam minimum credula postero* sein, löst Hemar in zwei Perioden auf: Man solle nicht auf Morgen zählen (*Nie licz na żadne jutro*) – in dem Verb *liczyć* (*na coś*), „(auf etw.) zählen“, klingen übrigens die chaldäischen und babylonischen Zahlenspielerereien, *liczby chaldejskie*, wieder an –, ja man könne sich nicht einmal sicher sein, dass es einen nächsten Tag überhaupt gebe (*Ani na to, że przyjdzie*). Während Horaz nur empfiehlt, geduldig zu ertragen, was Jupiter bestimmt hat (*ut melius, quidquid erit, pati, / seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam*), fügt Hemar hinzu, dass jeglicher Gedanke daran unnütz und zwecklos sei (*Nadaremnie się głowisz, / Nic z tego nie wynijdzie*). Obwohl Horaz in seinem Gedicht nicht den Tag von der Nacht unterscheidet, weist Hemar als angemessenen Zeitpunkt zur Dankbarkeit für das Leben einen jeden Morgen aus: *Przywitaj mile każdy ranek*. Die Formulierung, man möge, was auch immer der Tag bringe, „zum Besseren wenden“ (*na lepsze, cokolwiek przyniesie ci, obracaj*), könnte einem Missverständnis der Worte *ut melius* („als Besseres“ anstelle von „um wieviel besser“) herrühren. Auch den Vers *quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare / Tyrrhenum*, den DAVIDSON in seiner Übersetzung *in which you are building a Mole in the Tuscan Sea, to break the Violence of its Waves* offenbar recht frei interpretiert hat, konnte Hemar wohl in diesem Sinne nicht im lateinischen Text wiederfinden. Er ließ ihn schließlich unübersetzt; zum *mare Tyrrhenum* hatte sein intendiertes polnische Publikum ohnehin weitaus weniger Bezug als die Römer zur Zeit des Horaz, sodass das Gedicht durch die Auslassung eine Aktualisierung und Verallgemeinerung erfährt.

Beachtlich ist schließlich die Formulierung, mit der Hemar die Sentenz *carpe diem* wiedergibt: *Żyj dniem*. Ungeachtet der Erklärung DAVIDSONs, *carpere* sei mit *καρπίζειν* verwandt, womit das Ernten von Früchten oder das Aufsaugen von Blütennektar gemeint sei¹⁸, benutzt Hemar einen Imperativ von *żyć* („leben“). Dazu ergänzt er aber nicht etwa, wie es zu erwarten wäre, einen Genitiv im Sinne eines Temporalis, z. B. *żyj dnia każdego*, sondern einen Instrumentalis: *Żyj dniem*. Obwohl der polnische Instrumentalis einerseits ganz schlicht als

¹⁸ Vgl. DAVIDSON, *op. cit.* (Anm. 5), S. 39: „Horace has happily explained the *καρπίζειν* of Epicurus. This Word not only imports our enjoying some Pleasures, but likewise our exhausting them of what is valuable in them; in Allusion to the Bees, who suck from Flowers and Herbs their finest Juices”; vgl. dazu auch NISBET, HUBBARD, *op. cit.* (Anm. 16), S. 142. Das Bild des Pflückens eines jeden Tages, als wäre er ein Stück Obst, verwendet auch KUBIAK, *op. cit.* (Anm. 17), S. 66, in seiner Übersetzung: „Dzień każdy zrywaj jak owoc!“

Zeitangabe gebraucht werden kann („Lebe am Tag“), schwingt hier doch andererseits auch der Aspekt der Anwendung des entsprechenden Objekts mit, also etwa „Lebe unter Nutzung des Tages“ oder „Lebe mit dem Tag“¹⁹.

Neben den Freiheiten bei der Übertragung einzelner Wendungen und Bilder und der Anpassung der Form an eine moderne Tradition, erlaubt es sich Hemar, auch die Reihenfolge der Gedanken umzustellen: So zieht er das Pendant zu *spatio brevi spem longam reseces* vor die Frage, ob man denn noch mehr Winter zu leben habe oder ob es der letzte sei; ebenso stellt er seine Übertragung des *carpe diem* vor diejenige des Satzes *dum loquimur, fugerit invida aetas*.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich feststellen, dass Marian Hemar eine Nachdichtung gelungen ist, die zwar eng an das horazische Vorbild angelehnt ist, es aber mit ihren Ergänzungen, Auslassungen und einer Ausweitung des Adressatenkreises der Antike entrückt, was der zeitlosen Kernaussage des Gedichts durchaus gut ansteht²⁰.

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz
mstachon@uni-mainz.de

¹⁹ Zum polnischen Instrumentalis vgl. M. SKIBICKI, *Polnische Grammatik*, 2. Aufl., Hamburg 2016, S. 36 f. Ähnlich wird die Nutzung des Tages unterstrichen in der Übersetzung von S. GOŁĘBIOWSKI, *Horacy, Dzieła I*, Warszawa 1980: „Z dnia korzystaj“ (zitiert nach KACZYŃSKI, *op. cit.* [Anm. 17], S. 176).

²⁰ Von den zwei einst von F. SCHLEIERMACHER, *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens* [1813/1816], in: *eiusdem, Akademievorträge*, M. RÖSSLER (hrsg.), Berlin 2002, S. 67–93, vorgestellten Übersetzungsmethoden, entweder „den Schriftsteller möglichst in Ruhe“ zu lassen und „den Leser ihm entgegen“ zu bewegen, „oder ... den Leser möglichst in Ruhe“ zu lassen und „den Schriftsteller ihm entgegen“ zu bewegen (S. 74), die L. VENUTI, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, New York 2018, S. 15, später mit den Begriffen *foreignization* („Verfremdung“) und *domestication* („Einbürgerung“) kennzeichnete, entscheidet sich HEMAR also entschieden für die *domestication* des Horaz in die polnische Kultur des 20. Jahrhunderts.

RETOUR EN TERRAIN CONNU:
IGNE VS. *IMBRE* DANS TIBULLE I 1, 48*

par

PIERRE-JACQUES DEHON

ABSTRACT: The aim of this paper is to provide a brief analysis of the text of Tibullus I 1, 48, focusing on the competing readings *igne*, present in almost all the manuscripts, and *imbre*, found in the *Guelferbytanus* 82.6 *Aug. F°* (G), as well as in the *Excerpta Parisina*. Critics have long been divided on the issue, but a review of the arguments proposed over time and the presentation of elements of criticism internal and external to the text itself make it possible to opt for *igne*. The parallels suggested in order to argue for *imbre* lack relevance. Only *igne* guarantees the full deployment of Tibullus' catalogue of images and themes in the text, while avoiding possible misinterpretation and consolidating the unity of the poem.

La première élégie tibullienne, poème d'introduction au recueil et pièce programmatique¹, ne cesse d'être l'objet de toutes les attentions. Il y a une trentaine d'années, je me penchais moi-même sur les vers 45–48², qui forment un tout quasi autonome et proposent une représentation saisissante de la mauvaise saison, de ses inconvénients, mais aussi – plus singulièrement – de ses avantages³:

Quam iuuat immites uentos audire cubantem
 Et dominam tenero continuisse sinu,
 Aut, gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster,
 Securum somnos igne [uel imbre] iuuante sequi!

* Toute ma reconnaissance va aux deux réviseurs anonymes de *Eos* pour leurs suggestions bienvenues, dont j'ai tiré le meilleur profit. Erreurs ou omissions, cela va de soi, me restent imputables.

¹ Voir JACOBY 1909: 601 sq.; REITZENSTEIN 1912: 63 sq. et 115 sq.; MARTIN 1947: 361–364 et 368; ELDER 1962: 78; POWELL 1974: 109; WIMMEL 1976: 37 sq. et 80; CAIRNS 1979: 11; LEACH 1980: 86 sq.; BOYD 1984: 273–277; MILANESE 1995: 1101; LEE-STECUM 1998: 32 sq. et 67–71; JAMES 2001: 228–231; MALTBY 2002: 116; PUTNAM 2005: 126 et 136; TZOUNAKAS 2006: 111–116; GOLD, LIVELEY 2021: 58 sq. À signaler les nuances de MURGATROYD 1980: 51.

² DEHON 1993b.

³ Le texte utilisé, comme partout ailleurs dans cet article, est celui de LUCK 1988.

Je m'efforçais alors de démontrer que l'écrivain avait réussi à affirmer sa propre originalité tout en situant sa production dans le sillage de prédécesseurs tels qu'Homère, Alcée, Xénophane, Sophocle ou Apollonios de Rhodes. À cette occasion, je prenais appui, dans ma lecture du vers 48, sur la leçon *igne*, celle de presque tous les manuscrits, qui se trouve en concurrence avec *imbre*, celle du *Guelferbytanus* 82.6 Aug. F^o (G) et des *Excerpta Parisina*⁴. G est un témoin important pour l'établissement du texte de Tibulle, mais il portait aussi *igne* en première main, avant correction⁵; quant aux *Excerpta*, ils sont étroitement dépendants de G⁶. Mon choix de suivre la majorité des *codices* était, à l'époque, brièvement justifié dans une note fondée sur un état de la recherche qui a continué à évoluer depuis. Car cette *crux* qualifiée de « famous » par LEE⁷ reste, comme l'observait GALINSKY⁸ dès 1973, une *quaestio disputatissima* et une mise au point actualisée et plus développée n'est pas inutile aujourd'hui.

Précisons d'abord que les critiques⁹ n'ont pas tort de considérer que les deux leçons peuvent offrir un sens puisque la pluie est un corollaire naturel de la mauvaise saison tandis que l'hiver est le moment le plus opportun pour allumer un feu dans l'âtre: les poètes latins n'ont manqué de signaler de manière récurrente ni l'un ni l'autre aspect de cette période de l'année¹⁰. J'ajouterai que ces leçons sont grammaticalement et métriquement indifférentes. Leur niveau de pertinence est donc à apprécier indépendamment de leur correction *stricto sensu* et de leur caractère signifiant. Diverses tentatives¹¹ ont été faites de rapprocher les vers de Tibulle d'autres morceaux qui évoquent le bruit de la pluie ou de l'eau courante comme un facteur favorable à l'endormissement: on ne peut nier l'existence de

⁴ Sur la tradition du vers 48, voir en particulier GOETZ 1882: 142; PONCHONT 1926: 12; GALINSKY 1973: 161; DELLA CORTE 1980: 14; LUCK 1988: 3; MALTBY 2002: 76; PORTUESE 2017: 130.

⁵ Voir GOETZ 1882: 142; DELLA CORTE 1980: 14; LUCK 1988: 3.

⁶ Sur G et les *Excerpta*, voir GOETZ 1882: 141; CARTAULT 1906: 310 sq.; 1909: 136–139 et 147 (plus réservé quant à la place à donner à G); LUCK 1988: VII–VIII; MALTBY 2002: 22.

⁷ LEE 1974: 113.

⁸ GALINSKY 1973: 161. Sur le problème, voir aussi CARTAULT 1906: 439, 497 et 1909: 154; FUNAIOLI 1927: 162; LEVY 1927: 4; PASQUALI 1929; ALFONSI 1945: 3; MARTINAZZOLI 1948; WESTENDORP BOERMA 1951; KREFELD 1957: 25; LENZ 1959: 12, 46 et 172; CHETRY 1961; ENK 1961: 180 sq.; LEE 1966: 188; DELLA CORTE 1967; FISHER 1969: 380; LOIZZI 1972; GALINSKY 1973: 161 sq.; PIERI 1973: 60–73; PUTNAM 1973: 57; LEE 1974: 113; BONJOUR 1975: 389; O'NEIL 1975: 134 sq.; WIMMEL 1976: 40–43; DELLA CORTE 1980: 131; MURGATROYD 1980: 300 et 1982: 145 sq.; MADER 1981: 175 sq.; FORMICOLA 1998; PERRELLI 2002: 31 sq.; WHITE 2005: 263; CHRYSOSTOMOU 2009: 16–19; ANDREONI FONTECEDRO 2013: 22 sq.; RAMÍREZ DE VERGER 2015; PORTUESE 2017.

⁹ Voir PASQUALI 1929: 320; DELLA CORTE 1967: 105; FISHER 1969: 380; PORTUESE 2017: 130.

¹⁰ Voir respectivement DEHON 1993a: 318 et 324.

¹¹ Voir MARTINAZZOLI 1948; WESTENDORP BOERMA 1951: 310–312; DELLA CORTE 1967: 106 sq.; O'NEIL 1975: 134 sq.; WIMMEL 1976: 42 sq.; DELLA CORTE 1980: 131; FORMICOLA 1998: 55; CHRYSOSTOMOU 2009: 17 sq.; ANDREONI FONTECEDRO 2013: 22.

ces parallèles¹², mais il faut reconnaître qu'ils n'appartiennent pas toujours au même registre que l'élégie tibullienne – la plupart sont des extraits en prose – et qu'ils sont quantitativement moins impressionnants que les *loci similes* recourant au motif du feu hivernal, lequel traverse toute la poésie grecque et latine depuis Homère et Hésiode¹³.

À vrai dire, les passages les plus significatifs en la matière sont ceux où des poètes¹⁴ dépeignent les charmes bucoliques d'une scène se déroulant auprès d'un ruisseau ou d'une fontaine en pleine saison estivale et où l'eau courante, chose bien distincte de la pluie¹⁵, favorise le sommeil, mais surtout atténue l'impact des fortes chaleurs. Soit l'exacte antithèse de notre vignette hivernale. Tibulle lui-même y recourt à l'occasion et c'est ce type de scène qu'il vise, sans mentionner les bienfaits soporifiques de l'eau courante, dans la pièce même qui nous occupe (I 1, 27 sq.):

Sed Canis aestiuos ortus uitare sub umbra
Arboris ad riuos praetereuntis aquae.

Un décor qui fait naturellement penser à celui planté dans une autre élégie du recueil tibullien (I 2, 79 sq.):

Nam neque tum plumae nec stragula picta soporem
Nec sonitus placidae ducere possit aquae.

Cependant, la *iunctura placidae [...] aquae* ne saurait, contrairement à ce qu'indiquent WESTENDORP BOERMA¹⁶ ou O'NEIL¹⁷, viser le son de la pluie ou en tout cas pas celui d'une pluie accompagnant une tempête telle que celle mentionnée dans la première élégie. Les autres morceaux où *placidus* est mis en relation avec un élément liquide ne permettent pas de douter puisque le qualificatif se réfère au caractère paisible ou apaisé de l'eau¹⁸. De façon analogue, le

¹² Cf. Soph. fr. 636, 3 Radt; Liv. XXIV 46, 5; 47, 1; Cels. III 18, 15; Paul. Aeg. I 98; peut-être Sen. Prov. III 10 et Plin. Nat. XII 9.

¹³ Cf. Hom. Od. XI 191; Hes. Op. 493; Alc. fr. 48 Garzya; Alc. fr. Z14, 5 sq. Lobel-Page; Xenoph. Eleg. XVIII 1 Farina; Pind. Pyth. IV 472; Lycophr. Alex. 483; Ps.-Theoc. IX 19; Bion III 2, 6 Beckby (= Fr. Buc. XV 6 Legrand); Varro Men. 78 Cèbe; Verg. Ecl. V 70; VII 49 sq.; Georg. III 377 sq.; Hor. Carm. I 4, 3; 9, 5 sq.; III 17, 13 sq.; Ov. Rem. 188; Moret. 6–9; Priap. 84, 3 sq. Bücheler-Heraeus; Mart. I 49, 27; V 30, 5; Iuv. III 102.

¹⁴ Cf. Verg. Ecl. I 51 sq.; V 46 sq.; Hor. Epod. II 27 sq.; Tib. I 2, 79 sq.

¹⁵ Comme justement souligné par MURGATROYD 1980: 300 et CHRYSOSTOMOU 2009: 17, cette dernière critique considérant néanmoins que la pluie peut tenir lieu de fontaine pour qui, comme Tibulle, mène une vie simple et n'a pas les moyens de s'en offrir une.

¹⁶ WESTENDORP BOERMA 1951: 310; cf. également MARTINAZZOLI 1948.

¹⁷ O'NEIL 1975: 134.

¹⁸ Voir Enn. Ann. 377 Skutsch; Catull. LXIV 269; Verg. Aen. VIII 88; Ecl. II 26; Prop. I 8, 20; III 21, 20; Ov. Tr. III 4, 16; Paneg. in Mess. 126; Sen. Herc. F. 680.

passage d'Horace sur lequel WESTENDORP BOERMA¹⁹ encore ou CHRYSOSTOMOU²⁰ prennent appui vise le murmure des sources à la saison estivale (*Epod.* II 27 sq.: *lymphis obstrepunt manantibus*, / *Somnos quod inuitet leuis*): même si CHRYSOSTOMOU a raison de souligner que cette eau courante suscite un bruit conséquent (cf. le choix du verbe *obstrepunt*)²¹, qui pourrait faire penser à celui de la pluie, l'image intervient dans une section du poème (vv. 23–28) qui contraste nettement avec l'intervention, juste après dans le texte (vv. 29–36), de l'hiver et précisément de ses pluies (*imbres*, v. 29)²². La décision, quelque peu nuancée, de WIMMEL²³ d'opter pour *imbre* à partir de ce même parallèle n'est pas davantage convaincante puisque le critique bouscule la structure et le découpage du texte pour mettre la formule *quod inuitet leuis* directement en relation avec le portrait hivernal qui suit. La deuxième épode a régulièrement été rapprochée de l'élégie inaugurale de Tibulle²⁴, à juste titre tant la communauté d'inspiration est évidente, mais cette parenté n'autorise pas de tels raccourcis.

En dépit de ces essais donc, la préférence me paraît toujours devoir être donnée à *igne*, sans pour autant aller jusqu'à imaginer, un peu trop astucieusement, avec WHITE²⁵ que le mot prend ici par métonymie celui d'« être aimé » et renvoie à *dominam* déjà exprimé au vers 36: ce sens est effectivement attesté²⁶, mais il créerait aux vers 27 sq. une redite par rapport aux vers 25 sq.; certes, Tibulle apprécie la répétition, la tautologie et le pléonasme²⁷, mais une telle lecture appauvrit et affaiblit le texte en le privant d'une image additionnelle qu'il est possible de justifier à part entière. Au premier chef, j'y ai déjà insisté, la mention d'un feu d'intérieur s'inscrit dans la ligne du topos récurrent du foyer hivernal et elle contribue pleinement à situer le passage tibullien dans une longue tradition pour mieux la contourner ou la dépasser. L'existence d'un tel héritage suffit à rendre caducs le questionnement et les hésitations de certains²⁸

¹⁹ WESTENDORP BOERMA 1951: 311.

²⁰ CHRYSOSTOMOU 2009: 18 sq.

²¹ Cf. Hor. *Carm.* II 18, 20 (*marisque [...] obstrepentis*); IV 14, 48 (*obstrepit Oceanus*); Liv. XXI 56, 9 (*obstrepente pluuiā*); Stat. *Silv.* II, 2, 118 sq. (*maria ipsa [...] / obstrepere*).

²² Sur les images et les oppositions saisonnières dans cet extrait, voir encore DEHON 1991: 42 sq.

²³ WIMMEL 1976: 42.

²⁴ Voir JACOBY 1909: 617–620; REITZENSTEIN 1912: 81 et 112–114; LEE 1974: 101 sq.; WIMMEL 1976: 23, 42 et 108–113; MURGATROYD 1980: 49; BALL 1983: 33; LEE-STECUM 1998: 40; MALTBY 2002: 56 sq. et 116; CAIRNS 2012: 129–131.

²⁵ WHITE 2005: 263.

²⁶ Cf. Ter. *Eun.* 85; Verg. *Ecl.* III 66; Ov. *Am.* II 16, 11; III 9, 56; *Epist.* XVI 104.

²⁷ Cf. entre autres I 2, 30 (*imber aqua*); 3, 16 (*tardas [...] moras*); 4, 5 (*hibernae [...] brumae*); dans l'élégie I 1 même, le triangle *lecto / toro / cubantem* en fin de vv. 43, 44 et 45.

²⁸ Voir ENK 1961: 180 sq.; MURGATROYD 1980: 300 et 1982: 145; MADER 1981: 175 sq.

sur la possibilité effective pour le poète d'avoir un point de chauffage dans la chambre où est censée se dérouler la scène. Si des réflexions sur les systèmes de combustion ou les hypocaustes romains font sens lorsqu'il s'agit d'expliquer un texte ancré dans la réalité quotidienne ou un traité de nature scientifique, elles sont hors sujet et perdent toute valeur probante face à une pièce élégiaque: l'imaginaire poétique et la force des topoi y prennent bien entendu le dessus par rapport à toute considération d'ordre technique.

D'autres éléments encore peuvent être tirés du texte même, mais aussi de son contexte, et certains critiques²⁹ ne s'y sont pas trompés. Pour repartir des manuscrits, PORTUESE³⁰, auteur d'une contribution assez récente et à mes yeux des plus concluantes, a montré comment le passage d'un *igne* originel à un fautif *imbre* pouvait se justifier par une erreur de lecture à partir d'un codex en semi-onciale, vu les caractéristiques des lettres « g » et « r » dans cette écriture. Indépendamment du type d'écriture, cette confusion entre les deux mots est d'ailleurs assez répandue, comme en témoignent d'autres textes à la tradition hésitante³¹. Le critique a en conséquence accordé la préséance à la leçon *igne*, tenue pour une *lectio difficilior* face à *imbre*, qui se serait introduit dans le vers en raison du voisinage avec *gelidas* [...] *aquas* au vers 47. J'ajouterai quant à moi que cette lecture, voire correction, banalisante peut avoir été influencée également par la proximité avec *tristes* [...] *pluuias*, au vers 50. PORTUESE³² a en outre récapitulé d'autres arguments essentiels que les commentateurs ont mis en avant au fil du temps pour soutenir *igne* et que je reprendrai à mon compte en raison de leur pertinence: primo, la difficulté de justifier l'antériorité exprimée par *fuderit* dans la proposition temporelle³³ si l'on comprend que c'est la chute même de la pluie qui suscite le plaisir du poète; secundo, l'écho que produit *igne* au vers 48 en sonnante comme un rappel de celui du vers 6 de la pièce (*Dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus*), une figure que GALINSKY³⁴ n'a pas hésité

²⁹ Voir surtout CARTAULT 1909: 154; CHETRY 1961: 351–354; ENK 1961: 180 sq.; LEE 1966: 188; LOIZZI 1972; GALINSKY 1973: 161 sq.; PIERI 1973: 60–73; PUTNAM 1973: 57; 2005: 126 sq. et 139; BONJOUR 1975: 389; MURGATROYD 1980: 300 et 1982, 145 sq.; PORTUESE 2017: 131–133.

³⁰ PORTUESE 2017: 132 sq.

³¹ Cf. Lucr. I 784 sq.; Catull. LXII 7; Germ. fr. 4, 63 Le Boeuffle; éventuellement Val. Fl. V 414.

³² PORTUESE 2017: 131.

³³ Même si l'on ne peut tout à fait exclure que le parfait (du subjonctif), comme l'ont proposé WESTENDORP BOERMA (1951: 312 sq.), CHETRY (1961: 349) ou LEE (1974: 113), soit ici dépourvu de sa nuance d'antériorité, pour revêtir une valeur éventuelle, potentielle, itérative, voire, selon la suggestion formulée par un des réviseurs anonymes, un résultat qui se poursuit sur la durée (l'averse a été causée par le vent, mais continue ses effets). De même, si on interprète la forme, avec DELLA CORTE (1980: 131), comme un (indicatif) futur antérieur, celui-ci peut recevoir une valeur de *perfectum* très affaiblie, voire inexistante. Sur tout ceci, voir ERNOUT, THOMAS 1951: 222 sq.; 226; 251 sq.

³⁴ GALINSKY 1973: 161 sq.; cf. aussi PUTNAM 2005: 126 sq., 134 sq. et 139.

à appeler un leitmotiv; tertio, l'antithèse appuyée que génère *igne iuuante* avec les *gelidas* [...] *aquas* répandues par l'Auster au vers précédent (v. 47). Ces deux derniers éléments sont particulièrement significatifs puisqu'ils tendent d'une part à consolider l'unité thématique du poème et d'autre part à souligner les effets rhétoriques ou stylistiques à l'oeuvre dans la pièce.

À cet égard, il est possible d'aller plus loin encore, en rappelant combien Tibulle est friand de ce type de jeux et de combinaisons: les antithèses, le plus souvent posées par des anaphores³⁵, sont au coeur de sa poésie, dans le reste du recueil, mais aussi dans l'élégie I 1 même (cf. *immites uentos* >< *tenero* [...] *sinu* au distique précédent, vv. 45 sq.), une pièce qui tout entière repose sur une série de contrastes³⁶. Ainsi, les oppositions entre les éléments (chaud / sec et froid / humide), en relation directe ou indirecte avec les saisons, animent le corpus tibullien en d'autres endroits, comme en témoignent les poèmes I 2 (v. 52):

Cum libet, **aestiuo** conuocat orbe **niues**
et I 4, à deux reprises pour ce dernier (vv. 2 et 5 sq.):

Ne capiti **soles**, ne noceantque **niues**
Nudus et hibernae producis **frigora brumae**,
Nudus et **aestiui** tempora **sicca** Canis.

Dans la pièce qui ouvre le recueil, l'influence des vents déchaînés et de leurs eaux glaciales, éléments extérieurs, se voit contrebalancée par la dimension chaleureuse du feu, élément intérieur et générateur de l'intimité nécessaire à la scène d'amour. Comme ailleurs chez Tibulle, vents et pluies proposent une image négative³⁷, à laquelle l'âtre ou le foyer (au sens le plus strict) offre un contrepoids positif et bienvenu³⁸.

Là où *imbre* entraînerait seulement la répétition inutile d'une image déjà développée à suffisance dans les vers environnant le vers 48 (*aquas*, v. 47 et *pluuias*, au v. 50), la leçon *igne*, et elle seule, permet d'assurer un équilibre indispensable au plein déploiement des thématiques tibulliennes dans le texte

³⁵ Voir VEREMANS 1981 et MALTBY 2018: 116–123.

³⁶ Voir FISHER 1970: 767–771; GALINSKY 1973: 161 sq.; MURGATROYD 1980: 51 sq.; GAISSER 1983: 58–67; MILLER 1999: 191–195; DÖPP 2005: 463–465 et 469–472.

³⁷ Pour les vents, voir PUTNAM 1973: 56 sq. et cf. I 4, 21 sq.; 6, 54; 9, 9 sq. et 14. Pour la pluie, cf. I 2, 7 (*te uerberet imber*) et 30 (*multa decidit imber aqua*); la seule allusion à un effet bénéfique de la pluie dans le recueil est une mention de sa contribution potentielle à la lutte contre un incendie (I 7, 25 sq.), où se remarque à nouveau une antithèse typiquement tibullienne (*arida* [...] *pluuio*, v. 26).

³⁸ Pour le foyer, cf. en particulier II 1, 22 (*Ingeret ardentis grandia ligna foco*). Sur la valeur affective du foyer domestique en poésie latine, voir surtout BONJOUR 1975, 385–390 (389 pour notre texte). À noter aussi, chez Tibulle et les autres auteurs du corpus, une série de références, plus traditionnelles dans un contexte religieux, aux foyers sacrés (I 2, 82; 8, 70; II 2, 3; 5, 52; III 10, 24; 11, 12; 12, 4).

et dans son contexte immédiat et élargi (cf. v. 6). Son association avec la forme verbale *iuuante*, aux connotations tout aussi positives, résonne comme une évidence quand celle de *imbre* avec le même participe présent aurait un côté paradoxal par rapport au catalogue d'images offert par le corpus. Comme chez Horace par exemple, le feu hivernal est ici motif de réjouissance (cf. *Carm.* I 4, 3: *gaudet [...] arator igni*) et joue le rôle de remède (φάρμακον) contre la saison froide (cf. *Carm.* I 9, 5 sq.: *Dissolue frigus ligna super foco / Large reponens*): ceci peut expliquer le choix d'un verbe appartenant entre autres au vocabulaire médical³⁹ et dont la reprise par le polyptoton encadrant ce court tableau (*iuuat*, v. 45, deuxième mot, et *iuuante*, v. 48, avant-dernier mot) est conforme au goût déjà mentionné de Tibulle pour la répétition. À qui enfin serait tenté d'objecter que la première occurrence (*iuuat*) se trouve en position rapprochée de *uentos* (*iuuat immites uentos audire*, v. 45), l'on demandera de ne pas perdre de vue que *uentos* n'est que le complément de *audire*, lui-même sujet de *iuuat*: cet intermédiaire instaure une indispensable distance entre l'intérieur du foyer, où le poète se réjouit de profiter d'un bon moment, et le monde extérieur, où les éléments peuvent se déchaîner sans risque pour lui, comme dans la sixième *Satire* de Perse⁴⁰. Sous peine de contresens et pour les autres raisons invoquées ci-dessus, c'est bel et bien *igne* qu'il faut lire au vers 48.

Université Libre de Bruxelles
 pierre-jacques.dehon@ulb.be

ORCID: 0000-0002-0384-6963

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- ALFONSI 1945: L. ALFONSI, *L'elegia di Propertio*, Milano 1945.
 ANDREONI FONTECEDRO 2013: E. ANDREONI FONTECEDRO, *Tibullo: elegia campestre e politica agraria*, Paideia LXVIII 2013, pp. 9–23.
 BALL 1983: R.J. BALL, *Tibullus the Elegist. A Critical Survey*, Göttingen 1983.
 BONJOUR 1975: M. BONJOUR, *Terre natale. Études sur une composante affective du patriotisme romain*, Paris 1975.

³⁹ Cf. Hor. *Epist.* I 2, 51 sq. (*iuuat [...] / Vt lippum pictae tabulae, fomenta podagram*); Ov. *Am.* II 9, 8 (*Confossum medica [...] iuuat ope*); *Trist.* II 270 (*Quaeque iuuat [...] quaeque sit herba nocens*); Cels. I 6, 2 (*Venatio durique pisces [...] assa caro maxime iuuant*); IV 28, 3 (*sic ut uenter ipse mediocriter calentibus iuuetur*). On aura compris que, comme la plupart des éditeurs modernes, je ne vois aucune nécessité de corriger le *iuuante* de la tradition manuscrite: WESTENDORP BOERMA 1951: 308 rappelle quelques-unes des tentatives en la matière, aussi malheureuses qu'ingénieuses.

⁴⁰ La perspective et l'éloignement y sont identiques dans une peinture hivernale dont le vocabulaire même semble indiquer un souvenir de Tibulle (cf. *Hic ego securus uolgi et quid praeparat Auster / Infelix pecori, securus*, vv. 12 sq.).

- BOYD 1984: B.W. BOYD, *Parva Seges Satis Est: The Landscape of Tibullan Elegy in 1.1 and 1.10*, TAPhA CXIV 1984, pp. 273–280.
- CAIRNS 1979: F. CAIRNS, *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge 1979.
- 2012: F. CAIRNS, *Horace Epode 2, Tibullus 1.1 and Rhetorical Praise of the Countryside*, in: *Roman Lyric. Collected Papers on Catullus and Horace*, Berlin–Boston 2012, pp. 122–131.
- CARTAUT 1906: A. CARTAUT, *À propos du Corpus Tibullianum. Un siècle de philologie latine classique*, Paris 1906.
- 1909: A. CARTAUT (ed.), *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris 1909.
- CHETRY 1961: A. CHETRY, *Nota tibulliana*, GIF XIV 1961, pp. 349–354.
- CHRYSOSTOMOU 2009: T. CHRYSOSTOMOU, *Textprobleme in Tibull 1.1*, MH LXVI 2009, pp. 1–22.
- DEHON 1991: P.-J. DEHON, *Horace, Epodes 2,23–28*, Arctos XXV 1991, pp. 41–44.
- 1993a: P.-J. DEHON, *Hiems Latina. Études sur l'hiver dans la poésie latine, des origines à l'époque de Néron*, Bruxelles 1993.
- 1993b: P.-J. DEHON, *Tradition et innovation dans Tibulle, I, 1*, 45–48, LEC LXI 1993, pp. 221–226.
- DELLA CORTE 1967: F. DELLA CORTE, “Igne” o “imbre”? (*Tib. I 1*, 48), GIF XX 1967, pp. 105–109.
- 1980: F. DELLA CORTE (ed.), *Tibullo. Le elegie*, Verona 1980 [éd. rev. 2014].
- DÖPP 2005: S. DÖPP, *iam modo, iam possim contentus uiuere paruo! Die Struktur von Tibulls Elegie 1,1*, Hermes CXXXIII 2005, pp. 458–474.
- ELDER 1962: J.P. ELDER, *Tibullus: Tersus atque Elegans*, in: J.P. SULLIVAN (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature. Elegy and Lyric*, Cambridge 1962, pp. 65–105.
- ENK 1961: P.J. ENK, CR de LENZ (1959), *Mnemosyne* XIV 1961, pp. 179–182.
- ERNOUT, THOMAS 1953: A. ERNOUT, F. THOMAS, *Syntaxe latine*. 2^e édition, Paris 1953 [éd. rev. 1984 et 2002].
- FISHER 1969: J.M. FISHER, *Three Notes on Tibullus I, 1*, Hermes XCVII 1969, pp. 378–380.
- 1970: J.M. FISHER, *The Structure of Tibullus' First Elegy*, Latomus XXIX 1970, pp. 765–773.
- FORMICOLA 1998: C. FORMICOLA, *Anfibologia ed imitatio in Tib. I 1,48*, BStudLat XXVIII 1998, pp. 45–56.
- FUNAIOLI 1927: G. FUNAIOLI, CR de LEVY (1927), *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* XI 1927, pp. 161 f.
- GAISSER 1983: J.H. GAISSER, *Amor, rura and militia in Three Elegies of Tibullus: 1.1, 1.5 and 1.10*, Latomus XLII 1983, pp. 58–72.
- GALINSKY 1973: G.K. GALINSKY, *Some Emendations and Non-Emendations in the Third Edition of Corpus Tibullianum*, *Mnemosyne* XXVI 1973, pp. 160–169.
- GOETZ 1882: G. GOETZ, *Ueber den Codex Guelferbytanus des Tibull*, RhM XXXVII 1882, pp. 141–146.
- GOLD, LIVELEY 2021: B.K. GOLD, G. LIVELEY (eds.), *A Guide to Latin Elegy and Lyric*, Hoboken 2021.
- JACOBY 1909–1910: F. JACOBY, *Tibulls erste Elegie. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Tibullischen Kunst*, RhM LXIV 1909, pp. 601–632 et LXV 1910, pp. 22–87.
- JAMES 2001: S.L. JAMES, *The Economics of Roman Elegy: Voluntary Poverty, the Recusatio, and the Greedy Girl*, AJP CXXII 2001, pp. 223–253.
- KREFELD 1957: H. KREFELD, *Zum Naturgefühl der Römer*, Gymnasium LXIV 1957, pp. 23–26.
- LEACH 1980: E.W. LEACH, *Poetics and Poetic Design in Tibullus' First Elegiac Book*, *Arethusa* XIII 1980, pp. 79–96.
- LEE 1966: A.G. LEE, CR de J. ANDRÉ (ed.), *Tibulle. Élégies. Livre premier*, Paris 1965, CR XVI 1966, pp. 188–189.
- LEE 1974: G. LEE, *Otium cum indignitate: Tibullus 1.1*, in: T. WOODMAN, D. WEST (eds.), *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge 1974, pp. 94–114.
- LEE-STECUM 1998: P. LEE-STECUM, *Powerplay in Tibullus. Reading Elegies Book One*, Cambridge 1998.
- LENZ 1959: F.W. LENZ (ed.), *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*, Leiden 1959 [éd. rev. 1964 et 1971].

- LEVY 1927: F.W. LEVY (ed.), *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*, Lipsiae 1927.
- LOIZZI 1972: F. LOIZZI, *Su Tibullo I 1*, 48, GIF XXIV 1972, pp. 301–305.
- LUCK 1988: G. LUCK (ed.), *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina*, Stutgardiae–Lipsiae 1988 [éd. rev. 1998].
- MADER 1981: G. MADER, CR de MURGATROYD (1980), AClass XXIV 1981, pp. 175–177.
- MALTBY 2018: R. MALTBY, *The Language, Style and Metre of Tibullus*, in: H.-C. GÜNTHER (ed.), *A Short Companion to Tibullus and the Corpus Tibullianum*, Nordhausen 2018, pp. 111–134.
- 2002: R. MALTBY (ed.), *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge 2002.
- MARTIN 1947: J. MARTIN, *Tibulls erste Elegie*, WJA II 1947, pp. 361–368.
- MARTINAZZOLI 1948: F. MARTINAZZOLI, *Interpretazioni tibulliane*, AFLC XV 1948, pp. 193–199.
- MILANESE 1995: G. MILANESE, *La campagna, la vita semplice: Esplorazioni tra filosofia, poesia elegiaca, lessicografia*, in: L. BELLONI, G. MILANESE, A. PORRO (eds.), *Scripta classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*, vol. II, Milano 1995, pp. 1101–1119.
- MILLER 1999: P.A. MILLER, *The Tibullan Dream Text*, TAPhA CXXIX 1999, pp. 181–224.
- MURGATROYD 1980: P. MURGATROYD, *Tibullus I. A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, Pietermaritzburg 1980.
- 1982: P. MURGATROYD, *Reply to Review*, AClass XXV 1982, pp. 145–147.
- O'NEIL 1963: E.N. O'NEIL, *A Critical Concordance of the Tibullan Corpus*, Ithaca 1963.
- 1975: E.N. O'NEIL, CR de LENZ (1959), CPh LXX 1975, pp. 133–138.
- PASQUALI 1929: G. PASQUALI, *Leggendo. VI*, SIFC VII 1929, pp. 316–320.
- PERRELLI 2002: R. PERRELLI, *Commento a Tibullo: Elegie, Libro I*, Soveria Mannelli 2002.
- PIERI 1973: M.P. PIERI, *Due immagini tibulliane*, SIFC XLV 1973, pp. 60–87.
- PONCHONT 1926: M. PONCHONT (ed.), *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris 1926 [réimpr. 1968].
- PORTUESE 2017: O. PORTUESE, *Tibull. I,1,48: tracce di deperditi in semionciale?*, GFA XX 2017, pp. 127–133.
- POWELL 1974: B.B. POWELL, *The Ordering of Tibullus Book 1*, CPh LXIX 1974, pp. 107–112.
- PUTNAM 1973: M.C.J. PUTNAM, *Tibullus: A Commentary*, Norman 1973.
- 2005: M.C.J. PUTNAM, *Virgil and Tibullus I.1*, CPh C 2005, pp. 123–141.
- RAMÍREZ DE VERGER 2015: A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, *Nota crítica a Tibulo I 1*, 45–50, Maia LXVII 2015, pp. 533–537.
- REITZENSTEIN 1912: R. REITZENSTEIN, *Noch einmal Tibulls Erste Elegie*, Hermes XLVII 1912, pp. 60–116.
- TZOUNAKAS 2006: S. TZOUNAKAS, *Rusticitas versus Urbanitas in the Literary Programmes of Tibullus and Persius*, Mnemosyne LIX 2006, pp. 111–128.
- VEREMANS 1981: J. VEREMANS, *L'anaphore dans l'oeuvre de Tibulle*, AC L 1981, pp. 774–800.
- WESTENDORP BOERMA 1951: R.E.H. WESTENDORP BOERMA, *De Tibullo I 1*, 48, Mnemosyne IV 1951, pp. 308–313.
- WHITE 2005: H. WHITE, *Notes on the Text of Tibullus*, Veleia XXII 2005, pp. 263–273.
- WIMMEL 1976: W. WIMMEL, *Tibull und Delia. Erster Teil. Tibulls Elegie I,1*, Wiesbaden 1976.

TIBULLUS I 1, 48: AN EMENDATION

by

BORIS KAYACHEV

ABSTRACT: The paper re-examines the text of Tibullus I 1, 48, *securum somnos igne [imbre] iuuante sequi*: besides briefly reviewing the choice between the manuscript variants *igne* and *imbre* (in favour of the former), it argues that *iuuante* cannot be right either and may be an error for *fouente*.

In the first elegy of book I, Tibullus presents his ideal of idyllic poverty; rather than facing the elements in pursuit of wealth (49 f.), he is content to experience bad weather from the safety of his humble home (45–48):

quam iuuat immites uentos audire cubantem
et dominam tenero continuisse sinu
aut, gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster,
securum somnos igne iuuante sequi.

The passage hosts a well-known textual problem: at 48, the codex Ambrosianus (A) with the rest of the complete manuscripts read *igne*, but the Florilegium Gallicum offers *imbre* (the confusion between the two nouns can be paralleled at Lucr. I 784 f., Catull. 62, 7, Germ. *Arat.* fr. 4, 63, 70, and I believe *Dirae* 39, though it should be noted that the correct reading is in all these cases restored by conjecture)¹. While there are parallels for the notion that the sound of running water can be conducive to sleep, I agree with MURGATROYD and MALTBY (among others) in preferring *igne*². As conveniently summed up by PORTUESE, there are four arguments in its favour, which cumulatively appear compelling:

- (1) *igne* is the *lectio difficilior*, as contextual pressure can explain *igne* → *imbre* but not the other way round;
- (2) the perfect *fuderit* at 47 sounds awkward if the rain is still falling at 48;
- (3) the echo of 6 *dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus* is attractive;

¹ Cf. R.E.H. WESTENDORP BOERMA, *De Tibullo I 1, 48*, Mnemosyne IV (1951), pp. 308–313, at 313.

² P. MURGATROYD, *Tibullus I*, Pietermaritzburg 1980, p. 300; R. MALTBY, *Tibullus*, Cambridge 2002, p. 139.

- (4) the contrast of *igne* with 47 *gelidas ... aquas* is more appropriate (cf. that between 45 *immites* and 46 *tenero*) than the recurrence of the notion of rain would be (one may add that with *imbre* the second distich will become too similar to the first, as both will refer to the sound of wind/rain)³.

Against *igne*, the main argument is that *iuuante* is easier to understand with *imbre*; but neither side of the debate seems to realise that *iuuante* is in fact problematic in and of itself⁴.

What does it mean? With *imbre*, it is natural to understand the verb as ‘to help forward, promote’ (*OLD* s.v. *iuuo* 2), implying the commonplace of running water having a soporific effect. With *igne*, it is more difficult to see why a fire should be described as sleep-inducing: while it is true that excessive warmth can make one sleepy, this is not what one expects to hear in this context; one has no choice but to take *iuuante* in the sense of ‘to give pleasure to, delight, gratify’ (*OLD* s.v. 5), yet while there is nothing wrong with the notion that a fire can be delightful, it leaves the ablative absolute only vaguely related to the context: when the weather is cold, ‘pleasantness’ is not the most salient characteristic of fire that comes to mind. However, a more serious problem of *iuuante*, whether it is read with *igne* or *imbre*, is that it is inelegantly tautological after 45 *iuuat*, especially as (a fact that critics and commentators seem to ignore) the infinitive clause of 48 directly depends on *iuuat*: *iuuat ... somnos igne [imbre] iuuante sequi* sounds confusing, to say the least, as the reader is bound to wonder whether the repetition is deliberate (is it plausible that Tibullus would not have noticed it? if he did, why would he have kept it?) and whether the verb is intended in the same sense in both places. I find it likely that *iuuante* is a corruption, no doubt triggered by *iuuat*, still fresh in the scribe’s mind. What can it be concealing? I have thought of *leuante* (cf. *Ov. Rem.* 188 *igne leuatur hiems*), but it would be somewhat conspicuous so soon after 44 *membra leuare toro*, and the omission of a word for ‘winter’ or ‘cold’ is harsh. I have thought of *calente* (cf. *Cic. Fin.* I 30 *calere ignem*), yet though it would produce a suitable contrast with 47 *gelidas*, it may not be immediately clear how the ablative absolute is related to the overall context (‘fire being hot’ sounds rather like a general statement, cf. the Ciceronian parallel). I have thought of *sonante* or *crepante*, but a steadily burning fire does not seem to be normally thought of as producing noise (contrast *Sen. Thy.* 585 *ignis aeternis resonans caminis*, *Sil.* 5, 571 f. *stipula crepitabat inani | ignis iners*). Although no doubt there can be further alternatives to consider, I propose *fouente*, in the sense of ‘To make or keep warm’ (*OLD* s.v. *foueo* 1): *igne fouente* – ‘the fire keeping me warm’ – will perfectly

³ O. PORTUESE, *Tibull. I,1,48: tracce di deperditi in semionciale?*, GFA XX (2017), pp. 127–133, at 131.

⁴ See esp. W. WIMMEL, *Tibull und Delia*, vol. 1, Wiesbaden 1976, pp. 41–43; T. CHRYSOSTOMOU, *Textprobleme in Tibull I.1*, MH LXVI (2009), pp. 1–22, at 17.

counterbalance *gelidas ... aquas* in the preceding line⁵. While I cannot parallel *fouere* with *ignis* as subject, fire often figures in an instrumental role with the verb (e.g. Ov. *Her.* 4, 15 *fouet igne medullas*, *Met.* VII 427 *fouet ignibus aras*, Luc. IX 184 *igne fouet terras*), and there seems to be no intrinsic reason why the noun could not function as subject (as e.g. *calor* can, cf. Sen. *Epist.* 90, 25 *calor qui ima simul ac summa foueret aequaliter*, or *focus*, cf. below)⁶. At the same time, the unusual construction (if unusual it is) might serve to draw attention to the possibility of etymological wordplay, *igne fouente* being a kenning for *focus* (recalling 6 *igne focus*), in recognition of the common derivation of *focus* from *fouere* (cf. esp. Ov. *Fast.* VI 301 *at focus a flammis et quod fouet omnia dictus*). While scribal reminiscence of 45 *iuuat* may be sufficient to explain the corruption, one might further speculate that *fouente* could be misread as *iouante* – a spelling that is both attested in the manuscripts and consistent with phonological developments in postclassical Latin⁷.

Trinity College, Dublin

⁵ The omission of an expressed object with *fouente* seems to present no great difficulty, as it is clear that it should be the (implied) subject of the accusative and infinitive construction; for *fouere* without an expressed object, cf. e.g. Lucr. I 807–8 [*nisi*] *solque sua pro parte fouet tributumque calorem, | crescere non possint fruges arbusta animantes*.

⁶ It is true that *ignis* can function as the direct object of *fouere*, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* II 19, 15 *tepidosque refoverat ignes*, *Fast.* III 419 *quos sancta fouet ille manu, bene uiuitis, ignes*, but this does not mean that it cannot play the role of subject: note that *focus* can function with *fouere* as both object (Arnob. *Nat.* II 67 *perpetuos fouetis focos*) and object (Ov. *Fast.* VI 301, quoted below), or that it is equally possible to say ‘I burn a fire’ and ‘a fire burns me’ (though also note that the verb ‘to burn’ will have slightly different meanings in these two expressions, just as *fouere* will not mean quite the same thing when it is used with *ignis* as object as opposed to subject).

⁷ Note e.g. the variant *iouat* at Ennod. *Ep.* 16.6; on the merger of *u* and *o*, see e.g. J.N. ADAMS, *Social Variation and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 63–67; I am grateful to Mikhail Shumilin for discussing with me this issue.

ZUM LESBISCHEN WORT FÜR STEIN:
ΨΑΦΑΞ (GREGOR VON KORINTH ΠΕΡΙ ΑΙΟΛ. § 66)
ODER ΨΑΦΙΓΞ?*

von

WOJCIECH SOWA

ABSTRACT: The paper addresses two primary questions: first, what constitutes a specifically dialectal lexical element, particularly in cases of secondary attestation, and second, how to interpret ancient grammatical sources on ancient Greek dialects. To tackle these challenging yet crucial questions for Greek dialectology, the paper examines a section of Gregory of Corinth's treatise on the Aeolic dialect, focusing on an example provided by the Byzantine grammarian and bishop. The chosen example involves the lexeme ψάφαξ, purported to mean 'pebble' and considered equivalent to the Attic ψῆφος. By rejecting the authenticity of this gloss, identified as a ghost word, the paper conducts a thorough analysis of the lexemes ψάφιξ and ψάφιγξ as found in grammatical literature, comparing their use with that found in Lesbian epigraphic sources. This analysis is framed within both a Greek and a broader Indo-European perspective. Furthermore, the paper argues that the form ψάφιγξ can be considered a genuine dialectal special form, implicitly suggesting that forms presented by grammarians as dialectal require rigorous scrutiny before being accepted as authentic.

Eine der besonderen Herausforderungen bei der Bearbeitung des altgriechischen dialektalen Vokabulars liegt darin, wie wir die lexikalischen Fakten, die in verschiedenen Dialekten und in verschiedenen Arten der Dokumentation (Inschriften, literarische Texte oder grammatische und lexikalische Quellen) belegt sind oder solchen Dialekten zugeschrieben werden, interpretieren sollten. Die Frage ist, ob wir sie lediglich als 'griechische Wörter einer Region' betrachten oder als 'spezifisch dialektal' interpretieren sollen (vgl. dazu GARCÍA RAMÓN 1997: 524). Die vorgeschlagenen Kriterien (wie die von GARCÍA RAMÓN), die versuchen, in einem Dialekt belegte Formen mit ihren Synonymen in anderen Dialekten zu konfrontieren, mögen für den epigraphischen Kontext gut funktionieren, wobei auch hier verschiedene Chronologien, mögliche Einflüsse von außerhalb der Region oder andere Faktoren, wie Stilisierung auf anderen Dialekten oder Dichtung berücksichtigt werden müssen (vgl. GARCÍA RAMÓN 1997:

* Die folgende Studie wurde im Rahmen des wissenschaftlichen Projekts BPN/BEK/2021/1/00104/DEC/1 NAWA (Narodowa Agencja Wymiany Akademickiej) finanziert und ist während des Aufenthaltes am Departamento de Filología Clásica e Indoeuropeo, Universidad de Salamanca entstanden.

522 f.; mit kleinen Modifizierungen GARCÍA RAMÓN 2018: 58–60; vgl. auch die Illustration der Methode anhand des lesbischen epigraphischen Materials und der Glossen SOWA 2006: 233–258). Diese Kriterien scheinen jedoch schwer anwendbar zu sein, wenn man die elaborierteren literarischen Variationen betrachtet, die in verschiedenen dialektalen Regionen auftreten, oder wenn man die grammatischen und lexikographischen Quellen betrachtet, die viele seltene Wörter (γλῶσσαι) oder bemerkenswerte Begriffe (λέξεις) bewahren, diese jedoch oft ohne Kontextkommentar überliefern (ohne Hinweis auf die ursprüngliche Quelle, den Autor oder Erklärung ihrer regionalen Verbreitung). In der Forschung gibt es die Tendenz, diese Quellen lediglich als Hilfsmittel zu betrachten und nicht als eigenständige wissenschaftliche Werke. Es besteht generell wenig Interesse an den Gründen, warum bestimmte Lemmata zitiert oder in ein Lexikon aufgenommen wurden, sowie an der Methodik und linguistischen Argumentation hinter bestimmten Interpretationen (s. dazu TRIBULATO 2019).

Der folgende Aufsatz befasst sich mit zwei Fragen: zunächst was als ein spezifisch dialektales lexikalisches Element angesehen werden kann, insbesondere im Fall von sekundär belegtem Material, und zweitens wie man die antiken grammatischen Quellen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten interpretieren soll. Dabei wird als Grundlage eine systematische Bearbeitung des Äolischen durch Gregor von Korinth (Kapitel über den äolischen Dialekt) herangezogen. Das Werk von Gregor, das wahrscheinlich für didaktische Zwecke erstellt wurde, versucht die dialektalen Unterschiede anhand von Lexikonbeispielen ausführlich zu illustrieren. Ob es dies erfolgreich tut, ist eine andere Frage. Die dialektologische Analyse wird verwendet, um die allgemeine Zuverlässigkeit der Quelle zu bewerten. Das übergeordnete Ziel ist der Versuch, einen Blick in die Methode Gregors zu werfen: vor allem, ob wir verstehen können, was als dialektal für den Autor zählte, wenn er das tradierte Material mit seiner linguistischen Norm (byzantinische Koine) konfrontiert und welche Erwartungen er an die antiken dialektalen Formen stellte.

Gregorios Pardos (oder Gregor von Korinth) gilt als typischer byzantinischer Autor, der sowohl im Bereich der theologischen Schriften als auch im Bereich der Grammatik tätig war. Er ist hauptsächlich als Autor der Abhandlung über die antiken griechischen Dialekte bekannt¹, das einzige Werk aus längerer Tradition,

¹ Der Autor ist im Vergleich zu anderen antiken oder byzantinischen Grammatikern historisch schwer greifbar. Sein Leben wird normalerweise auf das 12./13. Jahrhundert datiert, obwohl vermutet wird, dass er sein Bischofsamt zwischen 1092 und 1156 innehatte. Extreme Ansichten datieren sein Leben sogar ins 10. Jahrhundert (siehe dazu LAURENT 1963, BECARES 1988, MONTANA 1995, xviii–xix; DICKEY 2007: 82 f.) Eine klare Identifikation seines richtigen Namens ist auch nicht gegeben, d.h. ob es Gregor oder Georg (Γρηγόριος ~ Γεώργιος) Πάρδος ist. Es scheint, dass Gregor eine Zeit lang als Professor an der patriarchalen Schule in Konstantinopel tätig war und später zum Bischof ernannt wurde, wobei er das Amt des Erzbischofs von Korinth übernahm. Daher stammt auch sein Beiname, der in den Manuskripten vermerkt ist, in lateinischer Version GEORGIUS (GREGORIUS) CORINTHUS (Κόρινθος). Manchmal wird er aufgrund

das nicht anonym überliefert oder zweifelhafter Zuschreibung ist (vgl. WILSON 1983, 187 f.). Auf der Grundlage früherer Abhandlungen (vgl. dazu BOLOGNESI 1953: 101) und seiner eigenen Lektüre (BOLOGNESI 1953: 107) beschreibt Gregor das Attische und Ionische, Dorische und Äolische. Er liefert viele grammatische Regeln, Beispiele und für Attisch und Ionisch auch umfangreiche literarische Zitate. Gregor diskutiert die Unterschiede und Ähnlichkeiten zwischen den Hauptdialekten des antiken Griechenlands: Ionisch-Attisch, Dorisch und Äolisch, er erwähnt gelegentlich aber auch die anderen Varianten wie das Böotische oder Thessalische. Sein Werk steht in der antiken grammatikalischen Tradition, die z.B. Dionysios Thrax oder Apollonios Dyskolos umfasst, die die Dialekte nach ihren phonetischen, morphologischen und syntaktischen Merkmalen klassifizieren. Gregor fügt seiner Analyse jedoch einige originale Elemente hinzu, wie die Verwendung von Beispielen aus Dichtung und Prosa, den Vergleich dialektaler Formen mit dem, was er für die standardmäßigen attischen Formen hält, sowie die Bewertung der dialektalen Verwendung nach Normen von Richtigkeit und Eleganz.

In seinem Kapitel über den äolischen Dialekt (anscheinend ist hier die lesbische oder kleinasiatisch-äolische Variante gemeint) wird die Beschreibung des Dialekts sehr formal durchgeführt. Der Autor zitiert die Informationen über den Dialekt und formuliert eine Reihe von Regeln, die darauf hinweisen, was eine ‘Abweichung’ von der ‘Norm’ zu sein scheint. Die Struktur spiegelt die unmittelbare Quelle wider, in diesem Fall sind es die Fragmente von Johannes Grammaticus (Philoponus), die als *Compendia Peri Aiolidos* bekannt sind – wobei der Schwerpunkt auf dem phonetischen/phonologischen System liegt (mehr als die Hälfte der Absätze der Gesamtzahl von 67), danach werden die Morphologie von Nomen und Verben präsentiert. Den letzten Platz nehmen Beispiele konkreter Formen des Wortschatzes ein, die, nach Ansicht des Autors und früherer Quellen, spezifisch für das Lesbische sein sollen².

eines Kopistenfehlers CORITHUS (Κορίθου, Gen.) oder CORUTUS (Κορύτου, Gen.) oder sogar CORYTUS genannt. Zu seinem Werk siehe KOMINIS 1960, DONNET 1966, WILSON 1983: 184–90, BOLOGNESI 1953, GLUCKER 1970, MONTANA 1995, ROBINS 1993, 163–72, HUNGER 1982. Gregors Name wird am deutlichsten mit seinem Traktat über die altgriechischen Dialekte assoziiert (Περὶ διαλέκτων), das einzige Werk, das aus der langen Tradition bis in unsere Zeit nicht in anonymer Form erhalten ist (siehe Wilson 1996², 188). Die handschriftliche Überlieferung ist sehr reich und über ganz Europa verstreut, was belegt, dass die Studie sehr bekannt und häufig kopiert wurde. Die ältesten Handschriften (8) reichen bis ins 13. Jahrhundert, also etwa 100 Jahre nach Gregors Lebenszeit. Es gibt jedoch keine Publikationen, die alle vorhandenen Handschriften hierarchisieren (siehe die Einteilung in 3 Handschriftenfamilien in BOLOGNESI 1953: 100).

² Siehe die Paragraphen von 57–67: 57. Τὸ ἐγὼ περισπῶσιν, ἐγὼν λέγοντες, καὶ ἐμὸν ἐμόν; 58. Τὸ σὺ τὸ ὁμοίως τοῖς Δωριεῦσι λέγουσι; 59. Καὶ τὸ ἡμῖν ἄμμιν, ἡμεῖς ἄμμες; 60. Τὸ ἐνθάδε, τῆδε; 61. Τὸ ἄλλοσε, ἐτέροσε; 62. Τὰ χεῖρωνα, χέρρωνα; 63. Τὸ ἐπαινῶ, αἰνῆμι; 64. Τὰ ἱμάτια, ἔμματα; 65. Ἡ μία, ἱα; 66. Ἡ πῆφος, ψάφαξ; 67. Τὸ ἔστρωται, ἐστόρηται.

Da diese Struktur sich nicht wesentlich von vielen modernen Abhandlungen über verschiedene griechische Dialekte unterscheidet, muss man schon betonen, dass die klaren Grenzen zwischen verschiedenen Kategorien verschwommen sind. So wurden etwa Beispiele aus dem Lexikonsystem verwendet, um eine phonologische oder morphologische Regel abzuleiten, es gibt aber auch Fälle, in denen reine morphologische Phänomene fälschlicherweise als Beispiele für dialektale phonetische Prozesse interpretiert wurden, oder wo Beispiele spezifischer lexikalischer Einheiten zitiert wurden, auch wenn sie heute als rein morphologische oder phonologische Varianten erkannt werden, usw.

Gemäß Gregors Vorschlag wird in der äolischen Dialektform für einen kleinen Stein (att. ψῆφος) die Form ψᾱφαξ verwendet (vgl. § 66 Ἡ ψῆφος, ψᾱφαξ (scil. λέγουσι)). Diese Form kommt jedoch weder in literarischen Werken noch in epigraphischen Denkmälern vor: die grammatikalische Literatur erwähnt lediglich die Varianten ψᾱφιξ und ψᾱφιγξ (die Formen, die in *Etym. Magn.* 554, 49–52 nach Herodian περὶ παθῶν 284, 23–25 zitiert werden), und verweist auf eine ähnliche Beziehung wie bei den Formen λᾱας/λᾱος ‘Stein’ und λᾱῖξ/λᾱῖγξ³.

Es scheint, dass das erwähnte ψᾱφαξ seinen direkten Ursprung in der Information von § 56 des *Kompēdiums III* von Johannes Philoponus hat, vgl. ἡ ψῆφος ψάφαξ (mit anderem Akzent in handschriftlicher Überlieferung, s. HOFFMANN 1893: 222)⁴. Die anderen grammatischen Quellen scheinen keine solche Formation mit *-k-* Suffix zu bestätigen. Ein solches Suffix ist im Griechischen sehr verbreitet, es wird z.B. bei der Bildung von Personenbezeichnungen, oft mit pejorativer (deteriorativer) Konnotation benutzt, wo es an die nominale Basis tritt (vgl. BALLE 2008: 204). Es wird produktiv und bildet substantivische und adjektivische Bezeichnungen für Personen, Tiere und Sachen, oft mit diminutiver, augmentativer oder pejorativer Konnotation und kann ferner auch bei weiteren Bezeichnungen für Personen, Tiere oder Sachen gefunden werden, vgl. z.B. νέᾱξ ‘Jüngling’, γαύραξ ‘Prahler’, χαύνᾱξ ‘Lügner, Windbeutel’; πλούτᾱξ

³ Vgl. λαῖγγες: παρὰ τὴν λᾱος γενικὴν γίνεται λαῖξ καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ γ λαῖγξ, ὥσπερ καὶ παρὰ τὸ ψῆφος γίνεται ψῆφιξ καὶ ψᾱφιξ καὶ ψᾱφιγξ; siehe auch als kretisch tradiert λᾱς: λίθος in sog. Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις (Urb. gr. 157 fol. 276v); zur Problematik der dort zitierten Formen und der Evaluation der belegten lexikalischen Elemente aus dialektologischer Sicht, siehe SOWA 2023).

⁴ Nach HOFFMANN kannte und verwendete Gregor in seinem Werk nur das *Kompēdium I* und *II* (wiedergeben in *Theusauri cornu copiae et Horti Adonidis*, Erstausgabe von Aldus Manutius et Urbanus Bolzanus Bellunensis 1496). *Kompēdium III*, behauptet der Autor, sei Gregor unbekannt geblieben (HOFFMANN 1893: 209). Diese Behauptung ist grundlegend falsch. Laut HOFFMANN besteht Gregors Werk nur aus 38 Absätzen, von denen die Hälfte mit dem *Kompēdium II* des Philoponos übereinstimmt. Hervorzuheben ist, dass HOFFMANN sich in seiner Stellungnahme auf die handschriftliche Form von Gregors Nachlass bezieht, andererseits aber zitiert er auch die bereits vorhandene Ausgabe des gesamten Gregor-Textes von 1811. Es muss klar gesagt werden, dass alle drei *Kompēdien* die primäre Quelle und der Bezugspunkt für Gregors Text sind, wobei das *Kompēdium III* als Grundlage vor allem im zweiten Teil des Werkes erscheint, wo es größtenteils wörtlich zitiert wird (SOWA, *im Druck*).

‘reicher Protz’, φλόαξ ‘Possenspiel’, πόρδαξ ‘Furzer’; ὄμφαξ ‘Herling (unreife Weintraube)’, ‘junges Mädchen’, κόραξ ‘Rabe’, σκύλαξ ‘Hündchen’, vgl. außerhalb des Griechischen Beispiele wie lat. *senex*, ai. *yuvásā-* ‘jung’, lat. *iuven-cus*, ai. *putraká-* ‘kleiner Sohn, oder slaw., z.B. russ. *сынок, телёнок* (‘kleiner Sohn’, ‘Kalb’) usw. (RISCH 1974: 161; BALLES 2008: 204, 239 f.).⁵

Es scheint, dass zumindest bei einem Teil dieser Bildungen das Suffix **-āk-* als Fortsetzung des ursprünglichen **-ah₂-k* zu interpretieren ist, d.h. das Suffix ist eine *k*-Erweiterung zu kollektiven **-ah₂-*Stämmen. Es ist auch möglich, dass in den ion.-att. -ηκ-Bildungen mit altem *-ēk-* gerechnet werden kann. Zum Teil werden hier auch *-k-* Ableitungen zu *n*-Stämmen fortgesetzt, vor allem bei den **-ak*-Bildungen (etwa **-η-k-*; vgl. BALLES 2008: 249 f.).

Zu den Beispielen, die diesem Wortbildungstyp angehören finden sich auch die Benennungen von Steinen (und Ähnliches), wie μύλαξ m. ‘Mühlstein’, λίθαξ πέτρη ε 415, ἐριβόλαξ neben ἐριβώλος (vgl. βώλος ‘Erdscholle’), ἄνθραξ, vgl. auch ferner πίδαξ f. ‘Quelle’ (RISCH 1974: 162). In solchen Fällen können wir die Derivation gut verfolgen, vgl. μύλος, λίθος, ἐριβώλος, usw. Daher muss man annehmen, dass im Falle von angeblichem ψᾶφαξ zu ψῆφος das gleiche Muster vorliegt, auch wenn wir nicht ganz sicher sein können, ob die Form als sprachwirklich zu betrachten ist. Wie schon erwähnt kommt der *-ak-* Stamm ψᾶφαξ nicht vor, weshalb es interessant ist zu fragen, wie er seinen Weg in Philoponus und Gregors Werk gefunden hat. Es wird allgemein angenommen, dass die Bildungen auf *-ak-* aus der Umgangssprache stammen, sie werden auch in der Literatur, vor allem in der Komödie zur Markierung des niedrigeren Stils benutzt (BALLES 2008: 204). In der lesbischen Dichtung aber sind solche Fälle nicht häufig belegt, vgl. in deutlich pejorativer Bedeutung in sekundärer Überlieferung des Alkaios, γάρρηξ (durch Suda dem Dichter zugeschrieben, Fr. 429³ V. γάρρηκα δέ-), vgl. Hsch. Γ 209 γάρρηξ· ὁ γαυριῶν gegen die positive Semantik in γαῦρος ‘frohlockend’ bei Arch. Fr 114, 2 οὐδὲ βοστρύχοις γαῦρον οὐδ’ ὑπεξυρημένον; das Nebeneinander von *-k-* (vgl. ἄλιξ Sapph. Fr. 119) und *-ko-* wird deutlich von den Beispielen mit *-ko-* dominiert (s. HAMM 1957: 72 f.).

Es ist schwer zu glauben, dass das von Gregor zitierte ψᾶφαξ ein sprachwirkliches Element des dialektalen Lexikons darstellt, so wie die in grammatischen Quellen belegten anderen Formen ψᾶφιξ und ψᾶφιγξ, vgl. das oben erwähnte

⁵ Man sollte vielleicht doch noch zwischen den thematischen Suffixen **-ko-*, das deminutive, possessive und Zugehörigkeitsbedeutungen hat, und **-kō-*, dass die Annäherung an den Begriff des Grundwortes zum Ausdruck bringt und die Bedeutung des Grundwortes oft nur geringfügig modifiziert, differenzieren. Es ist jedoch für diesen Aufsatz nicht essenziell. Wie das formale und funktionale Verhältnis dieser thematischen Suffixe zu den athematischen Suffixen **-k-* (bzw. **-k̑-*?) ist, müsste noch genauer untersucht werden. Ein athematisches Suffix **-k-* mit deutlich agentiver Bedeutung liegt in dem Typ lat. *vorā-c-* : *vorā-re* vor (wahrscheinlich auch in lat. *-trī-c-* f. : *-tōr-* m.). Die Funktion weicht jedoch von der in den unten genannten griechischen Bildungen mit athematischem **-k-*-Suffix ab.

bei Herodian belegte *περὶ παθῶν* 284, 23–25 (E.M. 554, 49) *παρὰ τὸ ψῆφος γίνεται ψῆφιζ καὶ ψᾶφιζ καὶ ψᾶφιγξ*. Wir müssen mit HODOT annehmen, dass lediglich *ψᾶφιγξ* als dialektisch betrachtet werden darf (HODOT 1990: 101).

Die erwähnte Form *ψᾶφιγξ* tritt in lesbischen Inschriften auf, vgl. ERE 01, a16; b16 (zweite Hälfte des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.; politischer Erlass), jedoch in veränderter Bedeutung ‘Abstimmung’, z.B. ... *κρινα[ι μ]εν αυτον κρυπται ψαφιγγι ... περ[ι] [θ]ανατω⁶ ...* ‘... sie verurteilten ihn zum Tode durch geheime Abstimmung ...’; b16: ... *[κ]ρινναι μεν αυτον [κ]ρυπται ψαφιγγι κα[τ]α ταν διαγραφαν τ[ω] [β]ασιλεος Αλεξανδ[ρω κ]αι τοις νομοις ...* ‘... sie verurteilten ihn zum Tode durch geheime Abstimmung, gemäß dem Erlass von König Alexander und dem Gesetz...’.

Es ist hervorzuheben, dass das Substantiv *ψᾶφιγξ* nur in Inschriften aus Lesbos belegt ist. In den anderen Regionen Griechenlands findet sich normalerweise, meist in offiziellen Dokumenten⁷, das äquivalente ionisch-attische *ψῆφος* oder das nicht-attische *ψᾶφος*.

Die morphologische Analyse des Substantivs *ψᾶφιγξ* bereitet keine Schwierigkeiten – es handelt sich um eine Ableitung von dem Substantiv *ψᾶφος* mit dem Suffix *-ιγγ-*, das in vielen anderen Wörtern belegt ist, z.B. in *λαῖιγξ*, *σμῶδιγγες*, *στροφάλλιγξ*, *ῥαθάμιγξ*, *φόρμιγξ*, *σάλλιπιγξ*, *σύριγξ* etc. (BECHTEL 1921: 126 f.). Die letzten drei Beispiele sind Musikinstrumente, die als Fremdwörter im griechischen Wortschatz betrachtet werden (RISCH 1974: 175). Das Suffix *-ιγγ-* wurde als ‘pelasgischer Einfluss’ auf die griechische Sprache betrachtet und als velare Erweiterung von ererbten Stämmen auf **-n* interpretiert, vergleichbar den germanischen Bildungen auf **-inga-* und **-unga-*, z.B. ahd. *arming* ‘Armer’ (van WINDEKENS 1952: 48). Diese Analogie ist jedoch wegen der unterschiedlichen Herkunft der germanischen Formen nicht korrekt, wo *-inga-/unga-* hauptsächlich als ‘individualisierende’ Suffixe bei der Ableitung von Nominalformen aus ursprünglichen adjektivischen Bildungen oder Substantiven auf **-n* fungieren⁸,

⁶ Die im epigraphischen Kontext belegten Formen werden konventionell ohne diakritische Zeichen dargestellt.

⁷ Vgl. z.B. ERE 01, a 29: *και τα δικαια ευ εμμεναι, τοις δε παρα το δικα[ιο]ν ταν ψαφον φεροντεσσι τα εναντια τουτων*; Olympia IvO 52, col II 66: *και οπως ουτ[οι] ουτως κατεχωσιν. των ψηφων, αις εδοξεν κατεισ[χρησθαι]*; Arkadien *IPark* 17 A 7 (Stymphalos 303–300 BCE): *αι δε κα του α[γο]μενου, οφλετω ταν γεγραμμεναν δικαν και ψαφος μηκει φερεσθω*; 17 A 62: *επ[ε]ι δ[ε] κ[α] και κριθη α δικα και ταν ψαφον προ[θωσιν και] διαριθμησωντα[ι]*; Delphi *FD* III, 1, 153, 4: *[δεδοχθαι τ]αι πολει των Δελφω[v] εν αγοραι τελειωι συμ ψαφοις ταις εννομοις επαινεσαι Πυρρον [Λ]υκου Ναυπακτιον*; *IG* IX, 1(2); 3, 609 A a 10 (Ätol., Akarn., Lokr.): *hoστις δε δαιθμον ενφεροι ε ψαφον διαφεροι εν πρειγαι, εν πολι, εν αποκλεσiai ε στασιν ποιειοι περι γαδαισιας*; vgl. auch lokrisch *ψαφιζεις* und kretisch *ψαφιγμα*, z.B. *IG* IX, 1(2); 3, 718, B 46: *ειμεν και χρεματα παματοφαγεισται, το μερος μετα φοικιαταν. διομοσαι hoπον τον νομιον. εν υδριαν ταν ψαφιζειν ειμεν* und kret. (Arkades) *IC* I, 5, 20 A 17: [----- τ]ων ψαφιγματ[ων].

⁸ Nach Schaffner ist das Suffix **-inga-*, das zur Bildung von individualisierenden Substantiven verwendet wird, von **-inga-*, das in anderen Bildungen, wie zum Beispiel Possessivbildungen,

z.B. altengl. *wædling* ‘armer Mensch, Bettler’ (< **uēþlinga*-) neben altengl. *wædla* (< Maskulinum **uēþlan*- id.), ahd. *wādal* ‘arm, bedürftig’ (< **uēþla/e*-). Die Produktivität individualisierender Ableitungen auf *-*inga*- neben thematischen Adjektiven führte dazu, dass im Verlauf der Ableitungskette **uēþla*- Adj. ‘arm’ → (**uēþlan*- Subst. ‘Armer’) → **uēþlinga*- Subst. ‘Armer’ der zweite Schritt übergangen werden konnte und die individualisierende Bildung **uēþlinga*- funktional mit dem Adjektiv **uēþla*-, verbunden wurde (SCHAFFNER 2015: 165 f.). Etymologisch gesehen kann das Suffix *-*inga*- als uridg. *-*e-n-ko*- rekonstruiert werden, d.h. als Erweiterung mit dem Suffix *-*ko*- von individualisierenden Stämmen auf *-*n* zu thematischen Bildungen, z.B. ved. *yuvaśá-* ‘jung’, urgerm. **iunga*- ‘jung’, lat. *iuvencus* < **h₂ju-h_xŋ-kó*:- ved. *yúvan*- ‘jung’ < **h₂ju-hxe/on*-; ved. *arvaśá-* ‘schnell’ < **o-ŋ-kó*- zu ved. *árvan*- ‘ds.’; ved. *babhruśá-* ‘bräunlich’: *babhrú-* ‘braun’.

Das Suffix -ιγγ- wird von BEEKES (2010: XXXVII) als Bestandteil des nicht-indoeuropäischen vor-griechischen Sprachguts (‘Pre-Greek’) klassifiziert. Es gibt jedoch relativ viele Belege, die darauf hindeuten, dass hier zu einer bestimmten Zeit in der Geschichte des Griechischen eine produktive Klasse vorlag. Nach SCHWYZER handelt es sich bei dem Suffix um ein einheimisches Element, das eine diminutive/pejorative Bedeutung ausdrückt. Sein Ursprung sei in der expressiven Geminierung von /g/ zu finden, d.h. in Formen auf -αγ-, -ιγ- und -υγ- (parallel zu -ακ-, -ικ-, -υκ-, SCHWYZER 1939: 496, 498; BALLES 2008: 255). Die Koexistenz von Paaren wie φάρυξ ~ φάρυγξ könnte auf einen sekundären, innergriechischen Charakter der Formen mit [ηγ] hinweisen, vergleichbar den Stämmen auf -κ- und -κο-, die ebenfalls zur Alltagssprache gehören und eine abwertende, diminutive Bedeutung aufweisen (RISCH 1974: 161). Das Auftreten von [ηγ]-Varianten wie ψᾱφριγξ im Vergleich zu ψῆφος scheint dialektbedingt zu sein. Ein Vergleich mit Daten aus anderen Dialekten bestätigt das -n- und den velaren Nasal, wobei die Herkunft jedoch unerklärt bleibt (die Form könnte analog zur Paarbildung λαῖγξ ‘kleiner Stein’: λαᾱς ‘Stein’ entstanden sein; vergleiche auch das interessante Beispiel altir. *lie, lía, liac(c)* ‘Stein, Pfeiler’ < urkelt. **liuanks* : urkelt. **liuā* MATASOVIĆ 2009: 242, das denselben Ableitungstypus mit *-*Vnk*- zu uridg. **lehlu*- zeigt. Diese Ableitung

die meistens in Eigennamen vorkommen, zu trennen, vgl. *Asdingi* (Jord.), später *Hasdingi*, eine königliche Familie unter den Vandalen (= altnord. *Haddingjar*, alteng. *Heardingas*, mhd. *Har-tunge*), zu anord. *haddr* ‘lange Haare’; vgl. auch die Zugehörigkeitsbildungen wie z.B. alteng. *Lindesfarnelanding* ‘Bewohner von Lindesfarne’, *Centingas* ‘Bewohner von Kent’, aisl. *sveitungr* ‘Mitglieder des *sveit* (Fürstenschar)’, usw. (SCHAFFNER 2005, 331–339, mit Literatur).

⁹ Aus struktureller und formaler Sicht entspricht dem urgerm. *-*inga*- < *-*e-n-ko*- das litauische Suffix -*iñka*- < *-*i-n-ko*-. Es leitet Substantive von Adjektiven auf -*ini*- ab, die Zugehörigkeit ausdrücken, wie zum Beispiel lit. *laukiniñkas* ‘Bauer’: *laukinis* ‘landwirtschaftlich, zur Erde gehörig’ (vgl. *lauškas* ‘Feld, Acker’), lit. *darbiniñkas* ‘Arbeiter’: *darbinis* ‘arbeitsbezogen, zur Arbeit gehörig’ (vgl. *dárbas* ‘Arbeit’, usw.).

könnte schon urindogermanisch gewesen sein)¹⁰. Das belegte lesbische ψᾶφιγξ unterscheidet sich jedoch von ψᾶφος ‘kleiner runder Stein’. In der zitierten Inschrift ERE 01 findet man die Form ψαφιγξ neben den Ausdrücken ψαφον φερωντεσσι und ψαφοφοριας ταις κατα τυραννων. Offensichtlich bezieht sich ψαφιγξ hier auf ‘Abstimmungsprozedur’, während ψαφος ein materielles Objekt beschreibt, das während dieser Handlung verwendet wird, und ψαφοφορια in diesem Kontext das Ergebnis, also ‘Beschluss, Dekret’ bedeutet (HODOT 1990: 102). Der Unterschied zwischen lesbischem ψαφιγξ und ψαφος betrifft sowohl die problematische Morphologie als auch die Semantik (vergleiche auch die Verwendung des allgemein belegten ψαφισμα, ψαφιζην), doch die Form ψαφιγξ kann als dialektale Spezialform betrachtet werden und als Element der politisch-administrativen Terminologie.

Jagellonen Universität Krakau

wojciech.sowa@uj.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-3425-8435

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Die antiken Autoren werden nach der elektronischen Ausgabe, vorbereitet von “Thesaurus linguae Graecae” project (Packard Humanities Institute CD 5), zitiert. Die Abkürzungen entsprechen dem Modell von *LSJ*. Wenn nicht anders angegeben, werden die Inschriften nach der

¹⁰ S. die Etymologie von λᾶας in Frisk *GEW* II 64 ff., BEEKES 2010: 817 f. betrachtet das Wort als ungeklärt und mögliche externe Verbindungen als zweifelhaft. Es scheint jedoch, dass das altir. *lie, lía* (Mask. auf *-nk) ‘Stein’ (vgl. die altir. Glossen *lie* . . . gl. *lapis* Corm Y, 810 oder *lie uilnech* gl. ‘angularis lapis’, Wb. 21c6, Ml. 131c12) mit gr. λᾶας ‘Stein’ und arm. *learn* ‘ds.’, verglichen werden kann. Dabei läge Dehnstufe **lēh*₂- ohne Einfluss des Laryngals auf den vorangehenden Vokal vor, gemäß Eichners Gesetz (siehe EICHNER apud MAYRHOFER 1986: 133). Die Wortbildung dieser Formationen ist nicht völlig transparent, λᾶας sollte wahrscheinlich als **lās*- interpretiert werden, vgl. kypr. -*la-o* (Gen. sg.) und myken. *ra-e-ja* (Adj.) ‘steinig’ (RASMUSSEN 1999: 398 f.). NIKOLAEV nimmt an, dass die Form λᾶας eine singuläre Bildung **leh*₂-*h*₂-*s* ‘einzelner Stein’ darstellt, als Ableitung aus einem kollektiven neutralen *s*-Stamm **leh*₂-*es*-*h*₂ ‘Sammlung von Steinen’. Das armenische *learn* < **lēh*₂-*u*-*r*-*no*- und das altrirische *lie, lía* < **lēh*₂-*u*-*n*-*k*- wären dann andererseits das Ergebnis einer Derivation aus dem *u*-Stamm **lēh*₂-*u*-, das in griechischen Wörtern wie z.B. *λαιαί* < **lauiā* ‘Steine; als Gewichte verwendete Steine’, attisch *λαῦρα* ‘Gasse, Allee’, ἐλεύσθην (Aorist Passiv) ‘wurde gesteinigt’ und vielleicht in hethitisch *lahḫura*- ‘Opferfisch’ zu finden ist (NIKOLAEV 2010, 191 ff., 196-199). Auf der anderen Seite aber kann nach ZAIR die urkeltische Form nicht als **līuank*- < **lēh*₂-*u*-*n*-*ko*- rekonstruiert werden, insbesondere aufgrund der fraglichen phonologischen Entwicklung **lēh*₂- > **lē*- > urkelt. **lī*-, angesichts der erwarteten kurzen Silbe mit *-*ē*- (siehe Dat. Pl. *lecaib* ‘Steinen’ in Táin Bó Froích; MEID 2009: 35, 104 f.). Auch das intervokalisches *-*u*- in der Position vor synkopierten *-*ē*- sollte im Irischen zur Palatalisierung führen, was in Formen des Dat. Pl. ***leicaib* < **leu*’*egabih* < **leu*’*n*-*obhis* (s. UHLICH 1995: 15) resultieren würde. Als mögliche Lösung könnte man die Existenz eines *s*-Stammes, ähnlich wie im Griechischen, annehmen, hier aber mit kurzem Vokalismus **lesank*-, oder ähnlich (ZAIR 2012: 252 f.).

elektronischen Ausgabe in PHI CD 6/7 (vorbereitet für Packard Humanities Institute von Greek epigraphy project, Cornell University) zitiert. Die Abkürzungen entsprechen dem Standardmodell. Lesbische Inschrift ERE 01 = IG XII 2, 526; (s. HODOT 1990: 298).

- BALLES 2008: I. BALLES, *Latein. Altgriechisch. Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen. Die Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischen Einzelsprachen*, hrsg. von R. LÜHR. Band 1, Hamburg 2008.
- BECARES 1988: V. BECARES *Ein unbekanntes Werk des Gregorios von Korinth und seine Lebenszeit*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift LXXXI, S. 247–248.
- BECHTEL 1921: F. BECHTEL, *Die griechischen Dialekte. Erster Band: Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt*, Berlin 1988.
- BEEKES 2010: R. BEEKES, *Etymological dictionary of Greek*, with the assistance of L. van BEEK, Boston–Leiden 2010.
- BOLOGNESI 1953: G. BOLOGNESI, *Sul Περὶ διαλέκτων di Gregorio di Corinto*, Aevum XXVII 1953, S. 97–120.
- DICKEY 2007: E. DICKEY, *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A guide to finding, reading and understanding scholia, commentaries, lexica and grammatical treatises, from their beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford 2007.
- DONNET 1966: D. DONNET, *Précisions sur les oeuvres profanes de Grégoire de Corinthe*, Bulletin de l'institut historique belge de Rome XXXVII 1966, S. 81–97.
- FRISK GEW: H. FRISK, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1960.
- GARCÍA RAMÓN 1999: J.L. GARCÍA RAMÓN, *Cuestiones de léxico y onomástica tesalios. Katà diálekton*, in: A.C. CASSIO (Hg.), *Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca. Napoli–Fiaiano d'Ischia, 25–28 settembre 1996*, AION (filol) XIX 1999, S. 521–552.
- 2018: J.L. GARCÍA RAMÓN, *Ancient Greek Dialectology: Old and New Questions, Recent Developments*, in: G. GIANNAKIS, E. CRESPO and P. FILOS (Hgg.), *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects from Central Greece to the Black Sea*, Berlin–Boston 2018, S. 29–106.
- GLUCKER 1970: J. GLUCKER, *Thucydides I 29, 3, Gregory of Corinth and the Ars Interpretandi*, Mnemosyne XXIII 1970, S. 127–149.
- HAMM 1957: E-M. HAMM, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, Berlin 1957.
- HODOT 1990: R. HODOT, *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie. La langue des inscriptions VII^e s. a.C. IV^e s. p.C.*, Paris 1990.
- HOFFMANN 1893: O. HOFFMANN, *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange, Band 2: Der nord-achäische Dialekt*, Göttingen 1893.
- HUNGER 1982: H. HUNGER, *Gregorios von Korinth, Epigramme auf die Feste des Dodekaorton*, Analecta Bollandiana C 1980, S. 637–51.
- KOMINIS 1960: A. KOMINIS, *Gregorio Pardos, metropolita di Corinto, e la sua opera*, Roma–Atene 1960.
- LAURENT 1963: V. LAURENT, [Rez. von] KOMINIS 1960, REbyz XXI 1963, S. 290 f.
- MATASOVIĆ 2009: R. MATASOVIĆ, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden–Boston 2009.
- MAYRHOFER 1986: M. MAYRHOFER, *Indogermanische Grammatik, Band I, 2: Lautlehre*, Heidelberg 1986.
- MEID 2009: W. MEID, *Die Romanze von Froech und Findabair; Táin Bó Froi*, 2. Auflage, Innsbruck 2009.
- MONTANA 1995: F. MONTANA, *Gregorio di Corinto, Esegese al canone giambico per la pentecoste attribuito a Giovanni Damasceno*, Pisa 1995.
- NIKOLAEV 2010: A. NIKOLAEV, *Time to gather stones together: Greek λᾶς and its Indo-European background*, in: S.W. JAMISON, H.C. MELCHERT, B. VINE (Hgg.), *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles October 30th and 31st, 2009*, Bremen 2010, S.189–206.
- RASMUSSEN 1999: J.E. RASMUSSEN, *Selected Papers on Indo-European Linguistics: With a Section on Comparative Eskimo Linguistics*, Copenhagen 1999.

- RISCH 1974: E. RISCH, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin–New York 1974.
- ROBINS 1993: R.H. ROBINS, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, Berlin–New York 1993.
- SCHAFFNER 2005: S. SCHAFFNER, *Untersuchungen zu ausgewählten Problemen der nominalen Morphologie und der Etymologie der altindogermanischen Sprachen*, Habilitationsschrift Regensburg 2005.
- 2015: S. SCHAFFNER, *Zu den Wortbildungstypen der altgermanischen Völkernamen mit n-Suffix*, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft LXIX 2015. S. 145–189.
- SCHWYZER 1939: E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*, 1. Band: *Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. München 1939.
- SOWA 2006: W. SOWA, *Bemerkungen zum Lesbischen dialektalen Wortschatz*, Emerita LXXIV 2006, S. 233–258.
- 2023: W. SOWA, *Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις. Greek dialects through the lenses of the ancient lexicography*, in: B. MACHAJDÍKOVÁ, L. ELIÁŠOVÁ BUZÁSSYOVÁ (Hgg.), *Greek – Latin – Slavic. Aspects of Linguistics and Grammatography*, Tübingen 2023, S. 115–144.
- , im Druck: W. SOWA, *Αἰολικά. Studia nad dialektem eolskim (na podstawie Περί Αἰολίδος Grzegorza z Koryntu)*, Kraków.
- TRIBULATO 2019: O. TRIBULATO, *Making the Case for a Linguistic Investigation of Greek Lexicography: Some Examples from the Byzantine Reception of Atticist Lemmas*, in: E. PASSA and O. TRIBULATO (Hgg.), *The Paths of Greek: Literature, Linguistics and Epigraphy*, Boston–Berlin 2019, S. 241–270.
- UHLICH 1995: UHLICH, *On the fate of intervocalic *-u- in Old Irish, especially between neutral vowels*, Ériu XLVI, S. 11–48.
- WILSO 1983: N.G. WILSON, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London 1983 (revised edition 1996).
- VAN WINDEKENS 1952: A.J. VAN WINDEKENS, *Le Pélasgique. Essai sur une langue indo-européene préhellénique*, Louvain 1952.
- ZAIR 2012: N. ZAIR, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. Leiden–Boston 2012.

REVISITING HELLENISTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY:
THE DYNAMICS OF THE HUMAN PSYCHE
(A REVIEW ARTICLE)

Dirk ROHMANN, *Psychologie in der hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2023 (Palingenesia. Schriftenreihe für Klassische Altertumswissenschaft, Bd. 173), 239 pp., ISBN 978-3-515-13473-6 (print); ISBN 978-3-515-13475-0 (e-book), €56.00.

Dirk ROHMANN's book consists of an introduction, five main chapters, a conclusion, a bibliography, an index of names and places, a general index and an *index locorum*. In the extensive introduction, ROHMANN (= R.) states that while the influence of the medical and philosophical concepts of the human psyche on the literature of the Classical age have been explored, the impact of those kinds of discourse on Hellenistic historiography remains understudied (p. 9). R. also stresses the scarcity of medical writings from the Hellenistic period devoted to the human soul, as well as the non-existence of psychology as a scientific field *sensu stricto* in antiquity. The questions and theories posed by the modern discipline of psychology belonged largely to ancient medicine and philosophy. R. offers an overview – chiefly for the Classical and Hellenistic period – of the different approaches to the soul in historiography, tragedy, philosophy and medicine. In the case of medicine, recent scholarly works on the question of the soul and its illnesses are discussed in more detail (pp. 16–19). R. also provides an outline of the problem of the soul and general psychology in Galen's texts (pp. 19–22), which is followed by a brief analysis of a piece from the second book of Cicero's *De republica* in which the idea of the state-as-soul occurs, which leads R. to the exposition of the core argument ("Kernthese") of the study. It posits that in Hellenistic historical works negative attributes of the soul and mental illness, in particular of leading statesmen and rulers, are conceived as infectious and as a major cause of the fall of states. R. focuses on Polybius and Diodorus of Sicily; fragmentary Hellenistic historians are also covered to a certain extent.

In chapter one ("Der Historiker als Arzt oder Verderber der Seele") R. discusses explicit ancient theories of the soul and its illnesses, as well as those of a group's soul and an individual soul, concentrating on Polybius and Diodorus. In subchapter 1.1, R. offers an interesting reading of the passages in Polybius in which the historian thematises historiography as a type of therapy for the soul. R.'s analysis of Polybius' famous critique of Timaeus of Tauromenium highlights the idea that the relation between a historian and his reader is analogous to that of a doctor and his patient. There is a clear methodological angle in that analogy, namely that just as a doctor who knows his treatment methods solely from handbooks can be a threat to his patient, a historian that has no personal experience of the political and military reality can be dangerous to his reader's soul. As the critique of the so-called "tragic historiography" by Polybius shows, sensational history can be the cause of an illness of the reader's soul. This can especially be the case when the recipient of the work is a statesman who further shapes his people's souls. Various passages in Polybius (i.a. Polyb. III 7, 5; XXXVIII 16, 7–9; V 88, 3) suggest that negative conditions of the soul, such as ὕβρις or insanity, can be transmitted "top down" from the leader to the lower parts of the society. Such a perspective is particularly valuable in the context of Polybius' analysis of the Roman constitution in book six of the *Histories* (pp. 36–37). An ideal historian, according to R.'s interpretation of Polybius, is one who is able to fulfil the Stoic ideal of ἀπάθεια, or freedom from passion in writing. R. continues (subchapter 1.2) with the motive of the soul's wanderings and the historical determinism in

Diodorus¹. Taking Diodorus' *prooemium* as the starting point, R. argues that the historian, similarly to Polybius, has the psychological impact of his work on the reader in mind, and tries to achieve it, e.g., by displaying the falls of prominent historical figures. The discussion of Diodorus' notion of the eternal nature of the soul and its afterlife runs parallel to those recorded in his work but clearly attributable to other thinkers, especially Pythagoras. Through a close reading of the numerous passages of the *Library*, R. intends to show that a specific theory of the soul ("Seelenlehre") is vital to Diodorus' concept of the function of providence in the life of individuals. R. also notes that Diodorus was skeptical about the existence of the soul after death. Diodorus' philosophical stance concerning the soul thus seems to be eclectic. Next (subchapter 1.3), R. approaches several pieces by lost Hellenistic historians, arguing that some of them had a propensity towards the Pythagorean doctrine of the soul, but also towards other currents assuming the soul's eternal life (e.g. Manetho and Megasthenes). A look into Plutarch's writings, that concludes the section, serves R. as additional evidence for the adduced testimonies about the soul and foreshadows the next chapter.

In chapter two ("Die Psychologie von Herrschern bei Polybios") R. endeavours to demonstrate how Polybius' understanding of historical work in medical terms shapes his depictions of statesmen, kings and tyrants. In the section on Philip V of Macedon (subchapter 2.1), R. highlights the Polybian notion of the detrimental impact of the king's counsellors on his psychological disposition and character. In Polybius' view, it is crucial whether or not the given leader takes bad advisors on board, and whether he wilfully allows them to influence his judgment and actions. Hence, in the case of Aratus of Sicion (subchapter 2.2) Polybius' assessment is different from that of Philip, as the former was able to take decisions and act independently from external pressures and influences. On the other hand, Polybius admits that Aratus was sometimes considered to be inconsistent in terms of emotion and action, which R. interprets in the context of how inconsistencies of character reflect upon inconsistencies in his narrative. R. shows that such a perspective is due to the broader Polybian tendency of "Psychologisierung des historischen Geschehens" (p. 62). As the third instance of Polybius' approach to psychology and character of historical figures, R. adduces the depictions of the Scipios (subchapter 2.3). R. first analyses the famous *Somnium Scipionis* that constitutes a part of Cicero's *De republica* and the concepts/ideas about the soul and its wanderings after death, stressing the notion of the eternal existence of the soul. Then R. looks forward to the reception of the *Somnium* by the Neoplatonic Macrobius: that apparently far excursion is crucial to the proper understanding of Polybius' depiction of the Scipios, as Macrobius offers additional philosophical perspectives and insights concerning the soul, which are otherwise only indirectly accessible to us. The reception of the mantic abilities of the Scipios in Cicero and the secondary reception by Macrobius can be indicative of the intentions of the primary text of Polybius (in relation to those later authors), e.g. for his suggestions regarding Scipio Maior's godlike qualities and his prescience in political matters (Polyb. X 2). As the last books of Polybius are very fragmentarily preserved, and Scipio's dream would be located around 149 BC while the *Histories* end with 146 BC, we do not find the dream among the extant pieces of the work. But in his extensive argument R. makes a compelling case that in Polybius' account Scipio was also probably seen as able to bring his soul in contact with divine providence. Moreover, Polybius seems to have contrasted Scipio's dream with the "demonic" dreams of his literary opponent Timaeus of Tauromenium. In the fourth section (2.4), R. explores Polybius' descriptions and mentions of tyrants in relation to their psychological qualities, showing that in contrast to ideal statesmen (such as the Scipios), tyrants would not have direct contact with the divine, that their souls would be full of anger and folly, and that their degeneration impacted the entire generations of their subjects, who were destined to be punished by the gods for their masters' deeds.

¹ Or in Diodorus' underlying sources: R. is mindful of the problem of Diodorus' use of sources, and argues that the latter's psychological concepts and theories are largely homogenous across the *Library* (p. 38 with n. 39).

In the third chapter (“Psychologische Wirkung schlechter Herrscher bei Diodor”), R. develops a reading of Diodorus’ *Library* in which the Pythagorean concept of the harmony of the soul, as well as the Stoic and Epicurean notion of the tranquility of the soul (ἀπάθεια) permeate the narrative of universal history. As for the complex problem of Diodorus’ input vs. reproducing his underlying material, R. admits that generally we are unable to decide with certainty to whom we can actually attribute the given ideas or notions (Diodorus or his source), yet still that material in the books under analysis comes from Hellenistic authors, and as such offers insight into Hellenistic historiography in general. In the subchapter 3.1, R. discusses potential Hellenistic projections of some Hellenistic ideas on ancient Egypt. In particular, we learn how Diodorus (or his source) views the Egyptian rulers – R.’s reading is through the Stoic lens, including the ideal of a leader free from excessive passion. That is set in a wider context, namely that of how in book I of the *Library* the constitution of the ruler’s soul and his dealing with justice impact the well-being of the entire state.

In the next section (3.2), R. explores Diodorus’ world of Greek heroic figures. R. argues that the figures Diodorus mentions display a consistency when it comes to ideas about the soul and its well-being or illness. As an example, the account about Heracles is analysed, illustrating how the historian would conceive of madness and the murder of a member of one’s family. In this part R. focuses on insanity/mental illness and the acts caused by it. The section concludes with a reading of Diodorus’ narrative on how in the time of Cronos such specific qualities of the ruler’s soul as justice and simplicity were believed to be transmitted to the members of the generations that stemmed from that time. This is meant to demonstrate that Diodorus’ notion of the transmission of certain characteristics of the soul from the ruler to the ruled is consistent across the *Library*, and how it applies to the descriptions based on myth rather than history. In section 3.3, R. explores Diodorus’ use of the term μεγαλοψυχία, which, supported by its definitions in other authors, esp. philosophers, can be read as a quality close to ἀπάθεια or absolute calmness of the soul. R. sets Diodorus’ account of the valours of Pittacus’ of Mitylene against the account of Cambyses. In this part, the political-constitutional connotations are important: Pittacus is depicted as sound and democratic, while Cambyses represents insanity and despotism. This reading is bolstered by Diodorus’ account of Aristogeiton: the greatness of soul implies and spurs the opposition to tyranny. Diodorus’ narratives on the lawgivers in the Magna Graecia (section 3.4) allow R. to further explore the concept of the influence of one soul on another: here it is the lawgiver that impacts those who are to apply his laws. Laws themselves are conceived as a tool for moral and soul-focused shaping of the body of citizens, and a lawgiver that cares about his citizens’ souls is similar to a doctor looking after his patients; just as a historian has been shown to be in chapter one of the study. R. then moves to an exposition of how the tendencies and notions described up to this point resonate in the account of more recent history, namely that of the late Classical period and in particular the idea of how the harmony of the soul of the citizenry determines the course of its fate, e.g. Sparta after Mantinea in 362 BC. Diodorus’ thinking about the degeneration of the communal, political soul seems particularly important when applied to the account of the transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic age. Diodorus depicts Epaminondas as the last Greek political figure with great soul and character, while the statesmen that came after him were affected by mental illness. R. continues (section 3.6) with an analysis of the notion of greatness of soul as an effect of philosophical instruction on Philip II (influenced by Lysis of Taras) and Dion of Syracuse (influenced by Plato). The link between these figures is a philosophical association with Pythagorean doctrine. The next subchapter (3.7) is devoted to Diodorus’ treatment of Alexander, and shows how differently the historian viewed the king in comparison to pre-Hellenistic rulers or statesmen. The Macedonian king is, as R. convincingly argues, deliberately depicted by Diodorus as not influenced by philosophy, even if he is still described in a largely positive light. R.’s exposition makes it evident that the history of Alexander is also filtered through Diodorus’ overarching idea of providence steering historical events. In the concluding section 3.8, R. enquires into the parts of the *Library* that cover the Hellenistic period in search of the connection between the soul of the ruler and the well-being of the state. The fate of some of the despotic rulers is shown to be a direct consequence of the degeneration of their soul. Agathocles is paradigmatic as

a tyrant with an ill soul, whose end comes through divine punishment – another instance of providence’s intervention in the history. The moral degeneration of Antigonus is interestingly depicted as a model for the degeneration and fall of the whole world of Greek *poleis*. R. also advances an interesting interpretation of Diodorus’ metaphorical use of the word μητρόπολις in relation to historiography: the latter is meant to morally “colonise” the world, as in Diodorus’ mind it is meant to shape the characters and souls of its audience. In contrast to the negative characteristics of the degenerate kings and tyrants, Diodorus presents the Roman statesmen’s features of the soul; the paragons are – as in Polybius – the Scipios, who possessed the virtues of *clementia* and *moderatio*.

In chapter four (“Psychologie der Kriegsführung”) R. delves into the question of the psychological aspects of military command in Polybius and Diodorus. In section 4.1, R. analyses the general framework of the Polybian ideal of a statesman, highlighting how the historian combines the moral and the psychical elements in his concept. The characterisation of Scipio emphasises his μεγαλοψυχία, influencing his soldiers, the citizenry and the well-being of the entire Roman state. R. detects another instance of the medical analogy in the Polybian descriptions: the military commander is like a doctor of the soul for his soldiers, just as the historian is for his audience. The antithesis for the Scipios thus characterised is Philip V and his destructive impact on the Macedonian state. R. also discusses the attention Polybius paid to the ethnic homogeneity vs. heterogeneity of the army, which seems to be a crucial factor in maintaining its psychological integrity. As opposed to the Roman army which is ethnically “pure”, the Carthaginian army is composed of heterogeneous elements and thus fallible to insanity (even of an animal-like character: R. aptly spots Polybius’ use of ἀποθηριώω in this context). In section 4.2, R. continues with a reading of Diodorus’ thinking of the military commander as the soul interconnected with the body of the army under his command. Diodorus seems to view the soul as primary to the body, and to be less interested than Polybius in the characteristics of the soul of Roman commanders. Diodorus’ convictions about the Greek *paideia* as civilizing the soul are at work, as the military successes of the Thebans are explained by their training in the Greek gymnasia. Their mental health is antithetical to the psychological condition of the Macedonian army, which again comes close to insanity, especially during the aggressive war in Asia.

The fifth chapter (“Interaktion der Seele mit dem Göttlichen”) integrates the findings from the preceding chapters into an examination of the concepts of interactions between the soul and the gods/divinities in Polybius and Diodorus. The idea of infectious insanity works in the background of both historical works – but R. highlights yet another aspect, namely that insanity can be conceived as divine punishment or revenge. Thus, in section 5.1, R. demonstrates how Polybius connects the sacrilegious acts of Philip V, Antiochus III, Antiochus IV and Prusias II with their mental illness, as well as with the calamities their armies faced. We learn that the very decline of the world of independent Greek *poleis*, as well as of Macedon, is – in Polybius’ narrative – ultimately caused by divine agency, taking the form of the mental or moral illness of the central figures; and those figures, as already shown in the preceding chapters of the study, transmit that illness further to their peoples. Then, R. examines Diodorus’ descriptions of divinely-induced insanity and plague (section 5.2). In this part, R. adduces abundant evidence bolstering the already adumbrated reading of Diodorus’ views on sacrilege and its consequences regarding the mental condition of men. In at least one instance in the *Library* we can find the notion of mental illness transmitted as if it was a plague: and there, R. points out, it is imposed by the gods as revenge for the destruction of sacred objects: the illness that befalls the Carthaginians upon their war on Sicily in 396 is a punishment imposed directly to the commander who committed the crime, but is then transmitted to the entire army.

The book concludes with a brief summary of the study’s findings, and a look at the phenomena discussed in the book in the Imperial period and Late Antiquity. As R. notes, the idea of insanity was often employed as a tool of political rhetoric against the emperors by historians and biographers, although there were various beliefs as to what constituted that madness: intemperance of passions, deification during one’s life, etc. In Late Antiquity the notion of insanity gains new contexts, particularly as applied to the Christians in the Roman Empire, which were seen by members of the Roman elite as spreading an infectious disease. Early Christianity would use the notion

of insanity as a tool in the conflict with its opponents, and after its success it in turn would perceive heresy as an infectious disease threatening the emperor and the state.

To sum up, R.'s monograph is an interesting read, as it provides a new perspective on the concepts of the soul, the psychology and the character, of the Hellenistic historians, in particular Polybius and Diodorus. Moreover, it presents the problem in a broad spectrum of contexts including medical and philosophical discourse and religious beliefs. R.'s diligent study highlights the less explored layer of the Hellenistic authors' historical thinking, i.e. that of the cause and effect beyond the political or military "material" processes, namely that of the "spiritual", psychic and moral factors, as well as how they are interconnected and integrated into the historical narrative. Those factors intertwined, as R.'s study shows, are not mere additions to the historical account. They can actually be seen as the key drivers of the Polybian and Diodorean narrative.

This review has been, thus far, focused mainly on analysing the content of the *Psychologie in der hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung*, as I found very few faults with the book. It is definitely a well-researched and insightful study, particularly important for scholars specialising in Polybius and Diodorus². The bibliography used for the study is extensive and up-to-date (pp. 207–220). If I were to indicate some aspect worth taking into consideration, it would be the use of terminology related to soul. The word ψυχή has several basic senses that are only partly compatible, e.g. ψυχή as a life force or animating principle, spirit; ψυχή as the centre of emotions, desires and thoughts, or ψυχή as character/personality, etc. R. seems to be aware of those distinctions, although it is not always self-evident what overarching conception of ψυχή is in the background in the passages that are discussed in the given section, where the argument focuses on the various notions and ideas around that conception. Given that in R.'s book philosophical thought on the human soul and psychology is a vital part of the background for the concepts found in historical works, the argument could possibly be enriched by including more of the Panaetian understanding of ψυχή and his creative input in the psychological theory of the Stoic school, especially in view of the philosopher's probable impact on Polybius³. R. is not unfamiliar with Panaetius, as he mentions him several times, once discussing μεγαλοψυχία (pp. 64, 69, 108 n. 68); we could supplement that e.g. with Panaetius' fragment 86a VAN STRAATEN, which analyses ψυχή in greater detail⁴.

Without a doubt, these remarks do not diminish the worth of R.'s important book, which can be highly recommended to scholars of ancient historiography, particularly to those specialising in Polybius and Diodorus, as well as those interested in ancient mentality in general.

Marcin Kurpios

University of Wrocław, Faculty of Languages, Literatures and Cultures
marcin.kurpios2@uwr.edu.pl

² There are exceptionally few, minor typographical errors in the book. I have noted "Nikoloas" instead of "Nikolaos" on p. 175; "and" instead of "und" on p. 56; in the table of contents the "Personen- und Ortsregister" has 222 as the starting page, while it is actually page 221.

³ For the so-called "Scipionic circle", of which Polybius and Panaetius were a part, see also M. SOMMER, *Scipio Aemilianus, Polybius, and the Quest for Friendship in Second-Century Rome*, in: B. GIBSON, T. HARRISON (eds.), *Polybius and His World: Essays in Memory of F.W. Walbank*, Oxford 2013, pp. 307–318; J. BARLOW, *Scipio Aemilianus and Greek Ethics*, CQ LXVIII, 2018, pp. 114–117. Panaetian concepts have been traced especially in the sixth book of the *Histories*, see E. VIMERCATI, *Il Mediostoicismo di Panezio*, Milan 2004, pp. 189–190; 198–202; cf. G. MOHAY, *Imperium Iustum: Panaitios' Theorie bei Polybios*, AAntHung XLVII 2007, pp. 175–184.

⁴ For that fragment see M. VAN STRAATEN, *Panétius: sa vie, ses écrits et sa doctrine avec une édition des fragments*, Amsterdam 1946, pp. 99–100; 119–129; A.J. VOELKE, *L'idée de volonté dans le Stoïcisme*, Paris 1973, pp. 115–120; F. ALESSE, *Panezio di Rodi e la tradizione stoica*, Naples 1994, pp. 214–215; *Panezio di Rodi: Testimonianze*, Naples 1997, pp. 261 f. E. VIMERCATI's edition (*Panezio. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Milan 2002) places that passage among the "frammenti attribuibili" (B 26).

Rafał MATUSZEWSKI, *Being Alone in Antiquity: Greco-Roman Ideas and Experiences of Misanthropy, Isolation and Solitude*, Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, IX + 470 pp., ISBN: 9783110757934, 129,00 €.

Während der Lockdowns in der Pandemie mussten viele von uns Einsamkeit am eigenen Leibe erfahren. So hat das bereits im Jahr 2019 geplante, für April 2020 angesetzte und letztlich abgesagte *Salzburger Frühlingssymposium* zum Thema „Einsamkeit und Isolation in der Antike“ eine ungeahnte Aktualität erhalten, wie Rafał MATUSZEWSKI gleich zu Beginn des von ihm herausgegebenen interdisziplinären Sammelbandes schreibt. Zusammen mit insgesamt 21 Beitragenden aus Alter Geschichte, Klassischer Philologie und Medizingeschichte hat er sich dazu entschlossen, das Publikationsprojekt auch ohne vorausgehende Tagung durchzuführen. Das daraus resultierende Buch ist gegliedert in eine Einleitung sowie drei Abteilungen zu den Themenblöcken „Times and Places“, „Individuals, Norms and Stereotypes“ und „Gender, Emotions and Mental Conditions“. Ich bespreche im Folgenden nur einen Teil seiner Beiträge, die in englischer, deutscher und französischer Sprache verfasst sind und sich etwa hälftig auf den griechischen und römischen Kulturkreis verteilen.

In der Einleitung stellt MATUSZEWSKI zunächst effektiv den in *P.Oxy.* L 3555 dokumentierten Fall einer alleinstehenden Dame namens Thermouthion, die um ihre verletzte Sklavin Peina – ihren einzigen Sozialkontakt – bangt, neben moderne Konstellationen von (Angst vor) Vereinsamung und garniert dies mit aktuellen Statistiken und soziologischen Studien. In der Folge tritt der Herausgeber wieder einen Schritt zurück, indem er wichtige definitorische Arbeit leistet: Freiwillige, unfreiwillige und pathologische Isolation werden voneinander abgegrenzt, außerdem wird in loser Anspielung an Uvo Hölscher klargestellt, dass – bei aller scheinbarer ‚Nähe‘ antiker Erfahrungen von Einsamkeit – diese aufgrund semantischer und soziokultureller Unterschiede unserem modernen Verständnis ‚fremd‘ bleiben und deshalb einer genauen Erforschung bedürfen. Der Grund für die folgenden Kapitel, die im zweiten, längeren, Teil der Einleitung (S. 9–17) zusammengefasst werden, ist auf diese Weise bereitet.

Die Sammlung selbst beginnt mit zwei Aufsätzen zur griechischen Kultur, von Angelos CHANIOTIS über nächtliche Einsamkeiten und Karolina SEKITA über Einsamkeit und Isolation im Angesicht des Todes. SEKITA berührt viele interessante und anregende Punkte, unter anderem Aspekte von Sehen und Unsichtbarkeit im homerischen Epos und der attischen Tragödie: Hell-Dunkel-Kontraste in Sterbeszenen, das Schwinden des Augenlichts und das Hinübergehen ins Reich der Unsichtbarkeit sind allesamt Elemente dieser auch optisch vermittelten Isolation (S. 45–46). Ein weiterer überzeugender Gedanke ist die herausgearbeitete Dialektik von Ausschluss aus dem Reich der Lebenden bei gleichzeitigem Eintritt in die Menge der Toten oder in kosmische Zusammenhänge (47–49); ebenfalls dialektischen Denkfiguren verpflichtet sind SEKITAS auf eine Vielzahl von Texten gestützte Erwägungen über Grabmäler als Zeichen der Absenz und Permanenz (49–51).

In seiner Studie über die Inszenierung von Einsamkeit römischer Eliten auf ihren Landgütern macht es sich Darrel JANZEN zur Aufgabe, die Rolle von Sklaverei innerhalb des privilegierten Lebensraums der Villa zu untersuchen. Dass auf realhistorischer Ebene Sklaven unabdingbar für diese Lebensform waren, ja diese erst ermöglicht haben, sollte jedem sofort einleuchten. Aber JANZEN deckt anhand einer eingehenden, mitunter etwas langatmigen Diskussion einiger Plinius-Briefe (I 3; I 22; II 10 und II 17 u.a.), Sen. *Ep.* 55 und Stat. *silv.* 2,2 noch weitere wichtige Verwendungen von Sklaverei im Villendiskurs auf, die zuweilen widerstreitend sind: So wird Sklaverei metaphorisch verwendet, bald zur Beschreibung des neuen zurückgezogenen Zustands jenseits der politischen Entscheidungszentren in der Stadt, bald als Kontrastfolie zur Beschreibung des rastlosen urbanen Lebens, das man hinter sich gelassen hat.

Die Darstellung des Proteus bei Homer, Vergil und Ovid ist Thema des Beitrags von Francesca BOLDREER. Die Studie ist weniger intertextuell angelegt, als dass sie wiederkehrende Elemente dieser für die vorliegende Fragestellung einschlägigen Figur sammelt. Zwei Hauptergebnisse werden von der Autorin herausgearbeitet: Proteus als „eine nicht kontaminierte Natur voller Geheimnisse“ (S. 136), der deshalb in seiner Isolation eine besondere Anziehungskraft auf Sterbliche ausübt, die Wissen über Vergangenheit und Zukunft erlangen wollen, und Proteus' Schicksal als Bürde, weswegen in den poetischen Zeugnissen stets eine gewisse Sympathie für diese menschen scheue Gestalt durchscheint.

Fabio TUTRONE nimmt in seinem Aufsatz die Funktion des epikureischen Gartens insbesondere für Lukrez in den Blick. Der Rückzug in den Garten gemäß dem *lâthe biôsas*-Ideal und die im Lehrgedicht zu beobachtende Wendung ins Innere sind nach TUTRONES Interpretation nicht Ausdruck einer Menschenflucht, sondern überhaupt erst Voraussetzung für die epikureische Philanthropie.

Generell weist der Band leider wenige explizite Querverbindungen und Interaktionen zwischen den einzelnen Beiträgen auf. Eine Ausnahme bilden hier die Aufsätze von Bernadette DESCHAMPS und Andres V. MATLOCK zu Cicero: Beide widmen sich der Zeit nach 45, als Cicero, politisch kaltgestellt und schwer getroffen vom Tod seiner Tochter, sich erneut der philosophischen Schriftstellerei zuwandte. Während DESCHAMPS Ciceros Briefe an Atticus aus dieser Zeit und aus der Zeit seines Exils im Jahr 58 untersucht, benutzt MATLOCK eben jene Briefe aus dem Jahre 45 zu einer biographischen Grundierung seiner Interpretation des Beginns des fünften Buchs von *De finibus* – aber ohne dabei in einen kruden Biographismus abzugleiten. Beide Aufsätze sind reich an Einsichten zu diesen wichtigen Lebens- und Schaffensphasen Ciceros und daher unbedingt lesenswert (einzig bei DESCHAMPS' einleitenden semantischen Abgrenzungen lateinischer Wörter aus dem Wortfeld Einsamkeit hätte man sich aus philologischer Sicht etwas mehr Sorgfalt in Form von Wörterbuch- oder Primärtextbelegen gewünscht). Insbesondere MATLOCKS Text enthält einige Gedanken, die über eine Stelleninterpretation hinausgehen und den Blick auf größere Zusammenhänge eröffnen: Zunächst besticht die Beobachtung, dass die einzelnen Teile von *De finibus* in einer immer weiter entfernt liegenden Vergangenheit situiert werden (Bücher 1 und 2 im Jahr 50 v. Chr., 3 und 4 im Jahr 52 und Buch 5 schließlich im Jahr 79), und dass damit eine zunehmende Fiktionalisierung der Dialogteile einhergeht. Bereits die Figuren des Dialogs seien in Buch 5 schon eher als autobiographische Erinnerungsorte Ciceros denn als historische Gestalten aus Fleisch und Blut zu begreifen. Auf dieser Linie argumentiert MATLOCK sodann, dass der Ort des Dialogs, die attische Akademie, von den Dialogpartnern nicht aus touristischem Interesse, sondern wegen des *genius loci* aufgesucht werde. In den frühen 80er Jahren haben die führenden Akademiker Antiochus und Philon die Stadt verlassen müssen, und in der Folge ist die Schule in verschiedene Strömungen zerfallen. Das Wort *solitudo* erhält auf diese Weise eine doppelte Bedeutung, insofern die Dialogpartner zugleich an der alten Einheitlichkeit der Akademie und an der nachmittäglichen Abgeschlossenheit des Ortes interessiert sind, letztlich aber Fragmentierung und Verlassenheit vor Augen geführt bekommen. So ist auch in Ciceros Briefen aus dieser Zeit die Einsamkeit in höchstem Maße ambivalent, wenn nicht gar paradox: Einerseits wird sie als angenehm, andererseits als feindlich und schmerzhaft dargestellt. Auf vielfache und komplexe Weise spiegeln sich die beiden Textcorpora ineinander, sodass MATLOCK zu dem Schluss kommt: „Cicero uses the word *solitudo* to describe both the site of his battle with grief and the Academy of his reminiscence. This repetition marks a seam between real and written worlds, between human experience and the goals of philosophy. Cicero's compositional technique [...] allows us to see an author tracing the ambit of his life, registering in the discrete space of his text the trajectory of his vita“ (S. 260–261).

Mit Suetons Darstellung des Kaisers Tiberius, den der Lyriker Durs Grünbein einmal treffend als „Misanthrop auf Capri“ bezeichnete, setzt sich Monika FRASS in ihrem Beitrag auseinander. Textnah und konzis entfaltet sie das Bild eines Alleinherrschers im Wortsinn und seiner immer weiter zunehmenden sozialen, emotionalen und räumlichen Isolation. Aus den vielen anregenden Bemerkungen heraus ragt in meinen Augen FRASS' an Suet. *Tib.* 40,1 entwickelte Interpretation

zur Insel Capri: „Die Beschaffenheit des bewusst erkorenen Ausstiegsortes, die abgelegene Insel Capri wird nahezu allegorisch zum Spiegel seiner [Tiberius'] Person durch Begriffe wie Unzugänglichkeit, Isolation, Schroffheit, und somit zur idealen Destination für die charakterliche Disposition des Herrschers“ (S. 281).

Stefan FEDDERN möchte in seinem Aufsatz den – mit zahlreichen Belegen aus der antiken Dichtungstheorie unterfütterten – Nachweis antreten, dass „Ovids Vergleich zwischen seinen und Odysseus' Leiden (*trist.* 1, 5)“ (Zitat aus dem Titel des Beitrags S. 361) nicht komisch, sondern durchweg ernsthaft angelegt sei. Zumindest in weiten Teilen gelingt FEDDERN das auch, jedoch leidet seine Interpretation ein wenig darunter, dass er, ohne es zu benennen, eine ausschließlich produktionsästhetisch orientierte Perspektive auf den Text einnimmt: Würde man den Blick etwas weiten und den Text auch von einer Rezeptionsästhetischen Warte betrachten, könnte man schnell dem Gedanken verfallen, dass gerade eine zur Schau gestellte hohe Ernsthaftigkeit oftmals – und so zuweilen auch hier – äußerst komische Effekte zeitigt.

In Florian KRÜPES Beitrag wird die Rezeption der Kaisertochter Julia in fünf historischen Romanen aus dem 20./21. Jahrhundert und einer Verfilmung präsentiert. Die einführenden Bemerkungen zur Person der Julia, zunächst zentrales Element in der augusteischen Erbfolgepolitik, später auf die Insel Pandateria exiliert, geben einen effizienten Überblick über die antike Quellenlage und die aktuellen Forschungspositionen. Die folgende Besprechung der Romane, die zwar alles andere als unreflektiert ist, aber bedauerlicherweise ohne expliziten Rezeptions- und transformationstheoretischen Fundierung daherkommt, vermittelt ein umfassendes und lebendiges Bild von dem Film und den Büchern und ihrem gattungsspezifischen Schwanken zwischen Fiktion und Historie.

Nadine METZGER untersucht in dem den Band abschließenden Beitrag den Misanthropie-Diskurs bei kaiserzeitlichen und frühbyzantinischen medizinischen Autoren. Auch literarische Zeugnisse aus der Komödie, der Biographik und der Epigrammatik werden in den Blick genommen. METZGER streicht einen tendenziellen Bedeutungswandel heraus, der sich von einer Verhaltensauffälligkeit hin zum Pathologischen und schließlich zum Moralischen und von eher passiven Symptomen hin zu aggressiven Verhaltensweisen entwickelt, oder in ihren Worten: ‚verschärft‘.

Alles in allem liegt hier ein gut gemischter und anregender Band zu einem interessanten und großen neuen Forschungsfeld vor. Dass manche Beiträge weniger sorgfältig redigiert und bibliographiert sind als andere (ein Beitrag kommt mit einem Literaturverzeichnis aus, das nur drei Titel umfasst), schmälert den Verdienst des Unterfangens nur geringfügig. Um die Ergebnisse der Forschungsarbeiten besser herauszustellen, hätte auf allen Ebenen auch der Wille zum expliziten Vergleich und zur Synthese noch ausgeprägter sein dürfen; die kurzen Abstracts in der Einleitung und das Register vermögen es nur bedingt, die einzelnen Resultate zusammenzuführen und in einen Dialog zu setzen. Aber dieses Defizit ist wahrscheinlich zu einem gewissen Grade auch der eingangs geschilderten Genese des Projekts geschuldet. Die Stärke des Buches liegt ohnehin in der Vielfalt der Beiträge und behandelten Themen, die dennoch Raum lässt für Vertiefung, Ausweitung und Übertragung auf andere Bereiche der griechisch-römischen Kultur und Literatur – und darüber hinaus.

Martin Stöckinger
mstoecki@uni-koeln.de
Universität zu Köln

A NEW CHAPTER IN GELLIAN STUDIES (A REVIEW ARTICLE)

Scott J. DiGIULIO, *Reading Miscellany in the Roman Empire: Aulus Gellius and the Imperial Prose Collection*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2024, XIII + 340 pp., ISBN: 9780197688267 (hardback), \$120.00.

The international community of Gellian scholars¹, familiar with Scott J. DiGIULIO's previous research, looked forward with anticipation to the publication of his latest book. Now that *Reading Miscellany in the Roman Empire* is finally out, it turns out that it surpasses all expectations. This is a book that needed to be written and was written at the perfect moment in the history of Gellian scholarship. Thirty-five years have passed since Leofranc HOLFORD-STREVENS' monumental monograph on Gellius², a work that firmly set the course for two generations of scholars and will remain the first piece of *Sekundärliteratur* read by any future Gellian scholar for centuries to come. In the intervening years, much has been written – on the *NA*, on the genre of poikilography, and on imperial literature more broadly. DiGIULIO's work does not aim to replace HOLFORD-STREVENS' seminal contribution. Rather, he synthesises existing scholarship and offers a fresh, coherent methodology for interpreting the *NA* as a dynamic, pedagogical, and intertextual masterpiece.

DiGIULIO's publication originated as a doctoral dissertation titled *Aulus Gellius, the Noctes Atticae, and the Literary Logic of Miscellany Under the High Roman Empire*, submitted in 2015 at Brown University³. As expected, the findings from his earlier research have now been significantly refined and expanded. Notably, Chapters V and VII introduce entirely new material that extends beyond the scope of the original dissertation. Additionally, Chapters I and IV offer a detailed exploration of ideas that DiGIULIO had previously addressed only briefly.

In the "Introduction", DiGIULIO provides a concise yet highly informative overview of various approaches to the *NA* that have emerged over the past two hundred years (a topic he later expands upon in Chapter VII). He pays particular attention to the most recent interpretations shaped by different strands of modern literary theory, offering clear guidance through often complex concepts.

He then proceeds to outline his own approach. While terms "textualities" (in quotation marks, p. 7) or "chronotopic" (p. 14) may initially unsettle those classicists who prefer a more conventional outlook, DiGIULIO reassures the reader with his emphasis on blending diverse new methodologies with a traditional philological framework (p. 8). He acknowledges that his work draws heavily on the insights of Joseph HOWLEY, whose interpretations also balance classical philology with modern theoretical perspectives.

DiGIULIO's central idea is straightforward: "[...] by centering Gellius as an author who exercises control over his work, I offer a pathway to understanding him as a mainstream Roman literary figure, and to examining the implications of reading the *NA* as we would other works of imperial prose literature" (p. 9). He then introduces the original concept of multiple "ways of reading" the *Attic Nights* (p. 11), closely tied to the previously mentioned "textualities" or distinct layers of the

¹ Readers interested in staying updated on new publications in the field of Gellian studies are warmly invited to join the *Collegium Gellianum*, a Facebook group founded in 2020, which now gathers several dozen of participants, including some of the most prominent Gellian scholars from around the globe [www.facebook.com/groups/collegiumgellianum].

² L. HOLFORD-STREVENS, *Aulus Gellius*, Chapel Hill 1988, later expanded into *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and His Achievement*, Oxford 2003, rev. ed. 2005.

³ Available at Brown Digital Repository [repository.library.brown.edu/studio/item/bdr:419519].

text, of which Gellius, as the author, is fully aware. DIGIULIO promises to explore and illustrate these rival yet complementary ways of reading in the subsequent chapters – a promise he delivers on admirably. The different ways of reading, he argues, are proposed (or “encoded”, p. 18) by Gellius himself and can be applied to further our understanding of the *NA* once they are recognised. Examples of such readings are thoroughly investigated in Chapters I, II and III.

It is worth noting here that DIGIULIO is fully aware of the limitations of his methods. He acknowledges that his approach “may lead a reader to see connections where they might not have been intended originally” (p. 8 n. 22)⁴. At the same time, he underscores the risks inherent in other interpretations of the *NA* and he accepts the challenges posed by his own interpretative paradigm.

Before we survey the main content of DIGIULIO’s book, I would like to consider the generic identity of the *NA* and the name of this genre – both topics briefly dealt with on p. 3–5. DIGIULIO not only adopts the word *miscellany* throughout his book, even though he acknowledges that “to do so is anachronistic” (p. 3), but even embraces it to the extent of including it in the book’s title. This is, to a certain extent, understandable, because this term is very well established in English. A comprehensive discussion of terminology was made in 2005 by Amiel VARDI⁵ in his deservedly well-known paper where he concludes that there is no compelling reason to abandon the term *miscellany*. There have been, however, other terminological suggestions in other languages, which could be easily promoted and adopted in English. One such proposal was made in 2005 by Krystyna BARTOL in the largely overlooked paper *Per una morfologia della ‘poikilographia’ antica*⁶. In this study, the Polish scholar reintroduces the term ‘poikilography’. The expression is not an ancient one: the adjective ποικιλογράφος appears only once in Diogenes Laertius, but the substantive *Poikilographie* (in German) as a name of the genre entered scholarly literature when Felix JACOBY announced his monumental plan in the preface to the first volume of *FGrHist*⁷. Among the few scholars who have employed the term is Albrecht DIHLE⁸, who references Clement’s Στρώματαίς as an example of “die sogenannte Poikilographie”. In my opinion,

⁴ This brought to mind a conference I once attended, titled *Without Order or Narrative? Reading Latin Text Collections from Late Roman Republic to the Early Middle Ages*, where participants joked that this was an event for classicists indulging in conspiracy theories (Durham–Tübingen *Latin Text Collections* on-line seminar, 15–16 April 2021, organised by Roy Gibson and Robert Kirstein).

⁵ A.J. VARDI, *Genre, Conventions, and Cultural Programme in Gellius’ Noctes Atticae*, in: L. HOLFORD-STREVS, A. VARDI (eds.), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, Oxford 2004, pp. 159–186, here at p. 163.

⁶ Eos XCII 2005, pp. 210–223 [available at eos.ptf.edu.pl]. DIGIULIO does not seem to know it.

⁷ F. JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Erster Teil*, Berlin 1923, p. V. The challenges of his categorisation were later highlighted by G. SCHEPENS in the preface to *FGrHist* IV.A.1 [scholarlyeditions.brill.com/bnjo/preface-iv]. The planned vol. IV.E of the *FGrHist* was at that point set to bear the title: *Paradoxography, Poikilography, and Antiquities*, which, however, eventually appeared as IV.E. *Paradoxography and Antiquities* (Leiden 2022). The forthcoming vol. IV.F is currently announced as: *Collections, Anthologies and Hypomnemata (and related genres)*.

⁸ A. DIHLE, *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit. Von Augustus bis Justinian*, München 1989, p. 339. Even though the calque *Buntschriftstellerei* is well established in German, some researchers are dissatisfied with it and prefer *Poikilographie*, like G. KRAPINGER, “Poikilographie (dt. Buntschriftstellerei)” in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 6: Must-Pop*, G. UEDING (hrsg.), Tübingen 2006, while at the same time others explore still different options, e.g. J.-O. LINDERMAN, *Aulus Gellius, Noctes Atticae, Buch 9: Kommentar*, Berlin 2006, p. 28, where the Latin word *commentarii* is proposed as a *terminus technicus*.

there is no reason not to use this term in all languages of modern scholarship. As a neologism it is free from the charge of being anachronistic, and as a word derived from Greek – just like so many other *-graphia* compounds – it can be easily incorporated into any language system.

DiGIULIO's discussion of the characteristics of the genre derives from the analysis of VARDI, who examines Gellius' own references to the *NA* and to other similar works and identifies several defining features common to this kind of writing: (1) Knowledge (*doctrina* or *historia*): content of the book; (2) Accumulation: the author's effort in gathering appropriate material; (3) Choice: the author's deliberate decision about what to include; (4) Isolation: the author's skill in arranging the content into digestible sections. Incidentally, these conclusions could not have been taken into account by BARTOL, whose paper on poikilography was published only a few months later. She proposes a definition of the genre based on a comparison of the prefaces by Gellius and Pliny the Elder, as well as the epilogue to Aelian's *Περὶ ζῴων ιδιότητος*, independently identifying three constitutive features of such literary production: (1) Variety of content (*disparilitas*), characterised by its eclectic subject matter; (2) Compilatory character, emphasising the accumulation of references to earlier works, which underscores the third feature: (3) Internal coherence, where the author's creative input lies in transforming old material into a new, aesthetically cohesive text.

The similarities in BARTOL and VARDI's conclusions, despite differing methodologies, encourage us to embrace both proposals, each highly convincing in its own right. VARDI highlights the structural organization of the text, while BARTOL places greater emphasis on its artistic elaboration – together, these elements define the full scope of a poikilographic work. Both perspectives are now represented in a balanced way in the work by DiGIULIO, but had BARTOL's paper not been published in Italian, maybe her insights would have entered the scholarly discourse much earlier.

DiGIULIO's Chapter I "Reading the *NA* through the Latin Literary Past: Gellius and the Imperial Prose Tradition" offers deep analysis of the relationship between Gellius and several earlier writers: Pliny the Elder (unsurprisingly), Seneca (notoriously disliked by Gellius), Quintilian, as well as Pliny the Younger. Especially the inclusion of the latter author deserves a lot of attention: since Pliny's *Epistulae* are never explicitly quoted in the *NA*, no one, as far as I know, had ventured such an interpretation before. DiGIULIO's hypothesis is that "[i]n his letters Pliny represents himself as an avatar of the intellectual culture of his day, and he provides an artistic and a social model for Gellius to emulate" (p. 36). This hypothesis challenges previous scholarship by suggesting that Gellius' interactions with earlier Latin literature are much more nuanced than mere citation or critique.

Chapters II and III ("Approaching a Miscellanistic Work from the Outside In: Paratextual Strategies" and "Prescribing a Way of Reading: Gellius' Preface as Critical Model") not only convincingly apply Gérard GENETTE's interpretative framework to Gellius' title, preface, and table of contents, but also offer a deep and coherent philological analysis of these paratexts. Furthermore, Gellius' ideas in the *praefatio* are thoughtfully compared with those of Pliny the Elder's *Historia naturalis* and Plutarch's *De audiendis poetis* and *De recta ratione audiendi*.

Chapter IV bears the brilliant title, "Confronting Variety in the *NA*: A Guide for the Perplexed". While much has been said about *varietas* in Greco-Roman literature generally and in Gellius specifically, DiGIULIO elevates the discussion to a new level: not only does he explore its pedagogical impact in the *NA*, but also provides a detailed analysis of the numerous ways in which *varietas delectat* (*docetque*) its readers – an effect, he argues, consciously envisioned and meticulously crafted by the author.

Chapter V, titled "The Poetics of Prose: Gellius, Alexandrianism, and the Composed Book," introduces a highly original idea: that Gellius consciously situates his prose compilation within the realm of poetry collections, while sharply contrasting the two realities on the level of language. DiGIULIO's argument begins with the intertextual link between *NA praef.* 20 and Horace's *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* (*Carm.* III 1, 1). While previous scholars have noted this parallel

phrasing⁹, DiGIULIO sees it as signalling Gellius' deliberate positioning of his work as a prose counterpart to the aesthetic and cultural ideals of poetry. Drawing on Alexandrian models of refinement and intellectual elitism, Gellius adapts these principles to his prose miscellany, crafting a text that rejects the formal unity of poetry while retaining its emphasis on erudition and selectivity. This interplay invites readers to approach the *NA* with the same critical mindset they would bring to poetry, elevating it from a collection of trivia to a carefully composed poikilographic work designed to challenge, educate, and entertain.

Chapter VI guides the reader through Book III of the *NA* and offers compelling insights on "How to Read a Book". DiGIULIO proposes three distinct "ways of reading": (1) The character-oriented method, which focuses on the interactions and roles of figures such as Favorinus; (2) The citation-oriented approach, which examines Gellius' use of authoritative sources; And (3) the intratextual reading, which explores thematic and structural connections within and across chapters, encouraging a deeper engagement with the *NA* as a unified work. In 1999 Stephen BEALL accurately prophesied that "the next 'wave' of Gellian scholarship will include a cautiously speculative inquiry into the genesis of individual chapters of the *Attic Nights*"¹⁰. DiGIULIO does exactly that, and more: his book collects the results of such analyses of many chapters and combines it into a coherent and innovative interpretative framework.

Instead of including a typical "literature review" or "reception" section, commonly found in introductions to scholarly dissertations (think for instance of the introduction to the monumental edition of Gellius by Hertz), DiGIULIO chose to place this content in the final Chapter VII, "Approaches to Reading Miscellanistic Aesthetics from Late Antiquity to Today", using it as a conclusion to his work. In this chapter, he traces the influence of Gellian miscellanism on figures such as Poliziano, Montaigne, Robert Burton, Isaac D'Israeli, and Jorge Luis Borges. This is fitting, as the history of various approaches to the *NA* underscores Gellius' enduring legacy and provides a kind of open ending. It leaves the reader with the assurance that new interpretations and influences will continue to emerge, both in academic literature and creative writing. "The *NA* thus casts a long shadow over the evolution of prose collections and of writing about reading, and in helping others think about their own place within the literary firmament" (p. 22).

Throughout the book, DiGIULIO's ideas are very well documented by his detailed scrutiny of the source texts. In each chapter, he first gives a general interpretation of Gellius' literary practices, and then proceeds to the analysis of the sources. Each chapter is then summarised. This might be just my personal preference, but I found this order to be counter-intuitive. I needed to read the analysis and then to go back to the initial general interpretation in order to fully appreciate it. In my opinion, introduction to each chapter might serve better as its conclusion (and the other way round), but again, this is probably just a difference in the personal style of processing information.

The only aspect of DiGIULIO's book that might be considered a flaw is its repetitiveness. The content of the entire work is first summarised in great detail in the "Introduction". Then, each chapter begins with its own introduction and concludes with an extensive summary. These introductory and concluding sections often reiterate ideas previously discussed in the main "Introduction" or re-introduce concepts already covered in other chapters. A notable example is the beginning of Chapter VII, which focuses on the reception of Gellius but opens with the following passage (p. 267): „In many ways, the *NA* is a paradoxical text. From the outset, Gellius declares its disordered, random state yet he introduces a table of contents that codifies its order. He openly disdains the literary pretensions of his Greek counterparts in the same breath that he challenges his reader to recognize the

⁹ HOLFORD-STREVS, *Aulus Gellius...*, p. 209 n. 64; expanded by J. SHEPPARD, *Self-education and Late-Learners in The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, MA dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, 2008, p. 80 (the latter not cited by DiGIULIO).

¹⁰ S.M. BEALL, *Aulus Gellius 17.8: Composition and the Gentleman Scholar*, CPh XCIV 1999, pp. 55–64, here at p. 55.

artistry inherent in his miscellanistic collection. Perhaps most importantly, he aligns his work with traditions of encyclopedic and other technical writing that presume a reference-oriented method of reading while simultaneously advertising a critical approach that invites his audience to understand the disparate parts of the work as different sides of a dialogue operating in concert”.

While these observations are compelling, all this has already been said before. The discussion continues for an entire page before transitioning into a straightforward review of other ideas covered in earlier chapters: „Throughout this book, I have elaborated a broad set of ways of reading, invited by Gellius himself in the Preface and in his other comments on reading throughout the work” (p. 268). This pattern extends across the next *three* pages, as DiGIULIO reiterates: “As I have argued throughout this book, Gellius demonstrates awareness of the different ways of reading that are inherent in miscellanistic composition [...] (p. 269). It is only in the last paragraph of this introductory section, on p. 270, that we finally encounter anything related to the chapter’s announced subject: the reception of the *Attic Nights*. To be clear, I am not complaining – *repetitio est mater studiorum*. However, as a reviewer, I feel it is my duty to prepare future readers for this occasionally overflowing stream of consciousness, which might have been tempered by a more exacting editing process. That said, this does not detract significantly from the value of DiGIULIO’s excellent work; it merely requires readers to exercise patience and navigate some recurring content.

Apart from the frequent repetitions, I greatly appreciate the composition of DiGIULIO’s book. It is interesting that a scholarly work dealing with the art of literary composition, itself manifests a rather unique structure. The book’s organization mirrors its subject matter, as chapters build upon each other in a way that reflects the interplay of *varietas* and cohesion central to the *NA*. This alignment of form and content reinforces DiGIULIO’s arguments, subtly guiding the reader through a meta-experience of the very principles he attributes to Gellius.

On the whole, the book is excellently edited, with hardly any typographical mistakes catching my attention¹¹. One major observation – directed, however, to the publisher rather than the author – is that it would have been far preferable if the review copy had been provided in a physical paper version (or at the very least in a .pdf format) instead of the online e-book format¹². An e-book is a soul without a body.

This soul, however, is a very beautiful one. I do not hesitate to call this work groundbreaking. For any future student of Aulus Gellius, I would suggest the following reading order: first, the *Attic Nights*; second, Leofranc HOLFORD-STREVS’ *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and His Achievement*; and then, before anything else, Scott J. DiGIULIO’s *Reading Miscellany in the Roman Empire: Aulus Gellius and the Imperial Prose Collection*.

Katarzyna Ochman

University of Wrocław, Faculty of Languages, Literatures and Cultures

¹¹ On p. 5 “If we characterize Gellius’ work is a miscellany” should be “If we characterize Gellius’ work as a miscellany”. On p. 7 the sentence: “In the same year Erik Gunderson interpreted the *NA* as a production of ‘antiquarian literature’ and reading the text as a sequence of interactions with the world of knowledge” should be reformulated to “In the same year, Erik Gunderson interpreted the *NA* as a production of ‘antiquarian literature,’ reading the text as a sequence of interactions with the world of knowledge”. On p. 35 “complaints” should be “questus” instead of “quaestus”. In note 90 on p. 56 the phrase “changes it” at the end of the sentence is redundant. The name of Katarina Petrovičová is misspelled both in the footnotes and in the bibliography.

¹² The book was made available to me via VitalSource Bookshelf which meant that I could not even download it to my Kindle device. Do not misunderstand me: I use e-books daily for both research and leisure reading. However, as a reviewer I can better appreciate the essence and character of a book by experiencing it in print. It is valuable to see at a glance a well-edited scholarly text alongside its footnotes, to physically evaluate the proportions of chapters, to quickly compare different passages, to distinguish the book’s main content from its references and indices. These qualities are entirely lost in a web-based reader.

LIBRI COMMENTARIIQUE PERIODICI
ANNIS MMXXIII ET MMXXIV RECEPTI¹

- Krzysztof NAWOTKA, Agnieszka WOJCIECHOWSKA (eds.), *Legacy of the East and Legacy of Alexander*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2024.
- Scott J. DIGIULIO, *Reading Miscellany in the Roman Empire: Aulus Gellius and the Imperial Prose Collection*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2024.
- Taras SHMIHER, *Liturgical translation in Ukraine and Poland: A comparative approach to text, religion and culture*, Lviv 2024.
- Ágora. Estudios Clásicos em Debate: vol. XXIV 2022.
- Athenaeum. Studi di Letteratura e Storia dell'Antichità pubblicati sotto gli auspici dell'Università di Pavia: vol. CX fasc. 1, vol. CXI 2023, fasc. 2.
- Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique: vol. CILVI 2022, fasc. 2.
- Journal of Hellenic Studies: vol. CXLII 2022
- Humanitas (Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra. Instituto de Estudios Clásicos): vol. LXXXIII 2023.
- Listy Filologicke – Folia Philologica: vol. CXLVI 2023, fasc. 3–4, vol. CXLVII 2024, fasc. 1–2.
- Symbolae Osloenses, Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies: vol. XCVII 2023.
- Vetera Christianorum: vol. LIX 2022, LX 2023.
- Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie, Patristik und lateinische Tradition: vol. CXXXVII 2024.

¹ Accedunt volumina aliquot, quorum, licet ad nos ante annum MMXXIII missa essent, nullam perperam in prioribus indicibus mentionem fecimus.