

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA

Danish Journal of Philology and History

EDITED BY

Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen · Marianne Pade

EDITORIAL BOARD

Jesper Carlsen · Karsten Friis-Jensen

Vincent Gabrielsen · George Hinge · Birger Munk Olsen

VOLUME 61

MUSEUM TUSCULANUM PRESS

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

2010

EDITORS

Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen (editor), University of Southern Denmark
Marianne Pade (associate editor), University of Aarhus
Jesper Carlsen, University of Southern Denmark
Karsten Friis-Jensen, University of Copenhagen
Vincent Gabrielsen, University of Copenhagen
George Hinge, University of Aarhus
Birger Munk Olsen, formerly University of Copenhagen

ADVISORY EDITORS

Eva Cantarella, University of Milan
Kostas Buraselis, University of Athens
Thomas Corsten, University of Vienna
Stephen Harrison, University of Oxford
Tomas Hägg, University of Bergen
Outi Merisalo, University of Jyväskylä
Gregory Nagy, Harvard University
Marjorie Woods, University of Texas at Austin
Greg Woolf, University of St. Andrews

EDITORIAL ADDRESS

Classica et Mediaevalia

Building 1414
University of Aarhus
Nordre Ringgade 1
DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

e-mail: classica@au.dk

website: www.mtp.dk/classicaetmediaevalia

fax: (+45) 8942 2050

PUBLISHER

Museum Tusculanum Press
University of Copenhagen
Njalsgade 126
DK-2300 Copenhagen S, Denmark

e-mail: order@mtp.dk

website: www.mtp.dk

fax: (+45) 3532 9113

SOCIETAS DANICA INDAGATIONIS ANTIQVITATIS ET MEDII AEVI

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA

Danish Journal of Philology and History

EDITED BY

Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen · Marianne Pade

EDITORIAL BOARD

Jesper Carlsen · Karsten Friis-Jensen

Vincent Gabrielsen · George Hinge · Birger Munk Olsen

[E-journal 2012]

volume 61

MUSEUM TUSCULANUM PRESS

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

2010

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA • VOL. 61

E-journal © Museum Tusculanum Press 2012 :: ISBN 978 87 635 3811 4

www.mtp.hum.ku.dk/details.asp?eln=300308

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA · VOL. 61

E-journal 2012

Copyright © Museum Tusculanum Press

ISBN 978 87 635 3811 4

ISSN 0106 5815

Unaltered version in pdf-format of

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA · VOL. 61

Copyright © Museum Tusculanum Press 2010

Composition by Pernille Borch Petersen

Printed in Denmark by Special-Trykkeriet Viborg a-s

ISBN 978 87 635 3670 7

ISSN 0106 5815

Published with the support of

The Danish Research Council

for the Humanities

E. Lerager Larsens Fond

Landsdommer V. Gieses Legat

MUSEUM TUSCULANUM PRESS

University of Copenhagen

Njalsgade 126

dk-2300 Copenhagen S

www.mtp.dk

Tel. +45 35 32 91 09

Fax +45 35 32 91 13

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA • VOL. 61

E-journal © Museum Tusculanum Press 2012 :: ISBN 978 87 635 3811 4

www.mtp.hum.ku.dk/details.asp?eln=300308

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| EFI PAPADODIMA | |
| The Term <i>dike</i> in Sophocles | 5 |
| JENS A. KRASILNIKOFF | |
| Marginal Land, its Boundaries, and the Rupestral Horoi of Attica | 49 |
| JACK LENNON | |
| Menstrual Blood in Ancient Rome: An Unspeakable Impurity? | 71 |
| JOAQUIN MUÑIZ COELLO | |
| Patrons, Tribes and Elections: The Roman Senator and Politics | 89 |
| ISAÍAS ARRAYÁS MORALES | |
| Diplomacy in the Greek <i>Poleis</i> of Asia Minor: Mytilene's Embassy to Tarraco. | 127 |
| TIBOR GRÜLL | |
| The Legendary Fate of Pontius Pilate | 151 |
| IRINI CHRISTOPHOROU | |
| The Presence of Homer's Achilles in Lucan's <i>Caesar</i> | 177 |
| SERENA CONNOLLY | |
| Lucan's Punic War in the <i>Disticha Catonis</i> | 193 |
| JENS E. DEGN | |
| Africain Romanisé ou Romain Africanisé? L'identité culturelle de Marcus Cornelius Fronto | 203 |

CHIARA MECCARIELLO

An Echo from Nonius Marcellus in Aldhelm's *Enigmata* 257

DAVID BLOCH

John of Salisbury, 'John' the Translator,
and the *Posterior Analytics* 267

DAVID R. CARLSON

A Fourteenth-Century Anglo-Latin Ovidian: The *liber exulis*
in John Gower's 1381 *Visio Anglie* (*Vox clamantis* 1.1359-1592) 293

THOMAS HAYE

Ein poetischer Lieferschein zu einem Tiertransport
des späten 14. Jahrhunderts: Gryfus von Padua und sein
Gedicht über Masthähne 337

LIST OF AUTHORS

349

THE TERM *DIKE* IN SOPHOCLES

By Efi Papadodima

Summary: This paper explores the uses of the term *dike* in extant Sophoclean tragedy and attempts a typology of its major meanings and functions. Whilst contributing to our understanding of various aspects of *dike*, such an exploration can at the same time offer interesting insights into some distinctive considerations and concerns of Sophoclean drama.

I. INTRODUCTION

PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON *DIKE* IN TRAGEDY*

Justice in tragedy is a broad and complex theme. In this study, I shall be concerned with the actual use of the term *dike* in extant Sophoclean drama, in an attempt to assess its importance and identify its probable distinctive features. Certainly, the exploration of the uses of the term *dike* cannot be viewed in isolation from the broader question of ancient Greek notions of justice, righteousness, and related values, yet it can by no means exhaust their scope and depth.

Dike has a wide range of meanings in classical literature.¹ As is the case with several terms in ancient Greek thought, *dike* can refer either to a pow-

* I am very grateful to Patrick Finglass for useful comments.

1 Important studies on various aspects of *dike* in classical literature include: Adkins 1960; 1972; Gagarin 1976; Havelock 1978; Garner 1987. Shorter discussions include Goldhill 1997: 137-39 and Cairns 2005: 306-9.

erful goddess or to a central, as well as controversial, value. The perception and representation of *Dike* as a deity who watches over interpersonal affairs, already manifest in archaic poetry,² is met in many dramatic contexts.³ *Dike* is closely associated with Zeus and the Erinyes, divine punishers of violations of family-ties and ministers of *Dike* among other things, as well as Αἴσα and Μοῖρα.⁴ Antigone appeals to Zeus and *Dike*, who lives together with the gods below and has set up everlasting laws for mortals (455-60); Oedipus, while cursing his sons, appeals to *Dike* who sits with the ‘ancient laws’ of Zeus (1382: ἀρχαίοις νόμοις).⁵ Teucer pairs the Olympian father with the μνήμων Ἐρινύς and the τελεσφόρος Δίκη, asking them to destroy the wicked Atreids (*Aj.* 1389-92) and recalling Ajax’s own appeal to the swift and ποίνιμοι Ἐρινύες, whom he tells to devour the whole Achaian army (*Aj.* 843-44). This is similar to Hyllos’ appeal to ποίνιμος Δίκη and

- 2 See Hes. *Theog.* 901 (where *Dike* is the daughter of Zeus and Themis, and the sister of Eunomia and Eirene) and Hes. *Op.* 213-85 (for the role of Δίκη and Ἀδικία). See further Rodgers 1971: 289-90, Gagarin 1973: 81-94; 1974: 186-97; Dickie 1978: 91-102. In Pindar, *Dike* and Eirene, the golden daughters of Themis, are depicted as the guardians of wealth for men and repellers of Hybris, the mother of Koros (*Ol.* 13, 8-10); cf. Hdt. 8.77.1. Bacchylides juxtaposes Δίκη with ὕβρις in *Dith.* 15.54-63. *Dike* is the mother of Hesychia in Pind. *Pyth.* 8.1-2. For the perception and treatment of *dike* primarily as a value of the *polis*, see especially Solon fr. 4W with Almeida 2003.
- 3 Aeschylus’ choral odes in particular abound in vivid images that encapsulate the nature and role of personified *Dike*. See, e.g., *Sept.* 642-48, where *Dike* is represented as a female figure on Polyneices’ shield, *Supp.* 708-9; *Ag.* 383-84 and 773-80; *Eum.* 516 and 563-65.
- 4 For the connection of *dike* with Zeus, the Erinyes, and Μοῖρα in Aeschylus see, e.g., *Ag.* 463-67, 525-26 (where Zeus is called δικηφόρος in reference to Troy’s destruction; cf. 1577, where Aigisthos welcomes the φέγγος εὐφρον ἡμέρας δικηφόρου), 1432-33, and 1535-36; *Cho.* 244-45; 306-16; 646-52 and 786-87; *Eum.* 511-12 and 619-21. See further Lloyd-Jones 1983. For the nature and role of the Erinyes in Sophocles, see Winnington-Ingram 1980: 205-16.
- 5 A dire fortune awaits him who is Δίκας ἀφόβητος and disrespectful of the gods, according to the Chorus (883-91). The Chorus in *Eumenides* declares that it is the citizens’ respect (σέβας) combined with fear (φόβος) that eliminate or prevent injustice (ἀδικία). Otherwise, if individuals and/or cities are totally fearless, there is no respect for δίκαι (522-25; 690-94; 699-703). Menelaos in *Ajax* also identifies lack of fear and/or respect (φόβος and δέος) for the ruler with lack of αἰδώς (1073-76) and claims that a commoner who does not consider it right (μηδὲν δικαιοῦν) to obey those who stand in command is a base man (1071-72). For the meaning of φόβος in relation to that of δέος, see Konstan 2006: 153-54.

the Erinyes to punish his mother for his father's death (808-9). Electra calls upon the Erinyes (alongside Hades, Persephone, Hermes, and the personified Ara or curse), who take note when one's life is unjustly (ἀδίκως) taken or when a marriage-bed is dishonoured, to come and help her avenge her father (111-13). In the first *stasimon*, the Chorus appeals to the πρόμαντις Δίκᾱ in the *strophe* (475-76) and the χαλκόπους Ἐρινυς in the *antistrophe* (489-91).⁶ The chief function of personified *Dike* is to restore order in the world and human relationships, an order roughly understood as reward of the virtuous and punishment of the wicked – even though *Dike* is mostly called upon in relation to the latter by people who think that they or their closest of kin have been wronged. Perplexities and problematic extensions of, or doubts about, the nature of divine justice frequently arise in tragic plots (either stated explicitly or clearly implied),⁷ yet the image of the personified *Dike* as such is in most cases straightforward.

When spoken of as a human construct or value, the meaning of *dike* can be non-ethical and descriptive (*custom, usage, balance, order*) or technical (*judgment, verdict, trial, charge, lawsuit*). Most often, *dike* relates to two major semantic fields that are laden with moral implications: (1) *righteousness, justice, fairness* and (2) *vengeance, retribution, punishment, penalty*. In archaic and classical literature, these two fields are closely related to one another and to the divine plane, and both are inextricably linked to a reciprocal understanding of the world and human affairs.⁸ The former domain, however, can extend to and embrace other conceptions, values or institutions that are irrelevant to the notions of the latter, notably fair distribution, fair chances, equality, truth-telling, and, in some ways, reasonableness.

6 Other Sophoclean contexts where *Dike* is personified: *Ant.* 853; *El.* 1441; *OC* 1381-82.

7 Notably in *Trachiniae*, as expressed in Hyllos' famous expression of resentment against the gods on account of their great ἀγνωμοσύνη (1264-74). For the view that Hyllos' words express resignation and true recognition of human limitations see Williams 1996: 43-53. Nussbaum 2003 questions this interpretation. Philoktetes claims that the gods somehow seem delighted always to protect and rescue the wicked, whereas they banish all things that are just and good (δίκαια καὶ τὰ χρηστᾶ); the hero wonders how he could praise the gods, since he finds them to be evil (446-52). Much later, he introduces a doubt about the justice of the gods only to belie it: the gods do have a concern for justice, since Odysseus would never have made this journey for Philoktetes unless some god-sent sign had driven him after the wretched hero. By extension, since the gods do care about *dike*, they will punish those who had wronged him (1035-39).

8 See also Burnett 1998.

In several contexts, *dike* seems to be nothing more than retaliation, returning like for like. The Chorus in *Ion* are afraid, while planning to harm a fellow-man, that they will find themselves getting harmed, as is δίκαιον (*Ion* 1247-49). The implication is that *dike* entails or demands that one should expect to suffer whatever one does to others. Similarly, Menelaos asks how it is 'right' that the man who tried to kill him should prosper (*Aj.* 1126: δίκαια). This idea is exploited *par excellence* in the dramatic handling of Orestes' myth. Despite the differences between the relevant plays of the three dramatists, the thought that the doer must suffer is repeatedly expressed as a deep-rooted conviction among most of the characters. In *Agamemnon*, *Choephoroi*,⁹ and Sophocles' *Electra*, in particular, Orestes perceives himself – and is viewed by the broader community – as the human agent of the Erinyes and the divine; the hero at the same time firmly believes in the just nature of his cause and is nowhere blamed by any other characters (save his victims).

Nevertheless, in the very frame of Orestes' myth, the idea is expressed that a just outcome for the recipient might entail or correspond to an unjust act on the part of the avenger. The justness of the outcome and the justness of the action that brings about this outcome are clearly separated and treated as distinct.¹⁰ This discrepancy arises from the avenger's particular identity and his/her relation to his/her victim. The clearest example is Castor's concise statement in the Euripidean *Electra*: Klytemnestra has died justly but Orestes' action was unjust (1244).¹¹ Thus, in this case, the retaliatory or retributive pattern is complicated by, and actually condemned and rejected on the grounds of, kinship.¹² Klytemnestra should not have been killed by her son.

9 See especially *Ag.* 1529 and 1560-66 (παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα), as well as *Cho.* 121-23 and 306-14 (δράσαντι παθεῖν).

10 This seems to be a Euripidean feature; apart from his *Electra*, it is also expressed in *Or.* (538-39). However, a hint at this idea can also be found in *Cho.* 930; Orestes claims that Elektra killed the man whom she should not have killed and she now suffers what she should not have suffered.

11 Castor, however, attributes the deed to extra-human factors or constraints (Apollo, μοῖρα, ἀνάγκη, and the ancestral curse).

12 Cf. *IT* 1174, where Thoas exclaims that matricide is too horrible and unthinkable even for a barbarian, as well as the relevant idea of the Sophist Hippias (Xen. *Mem.* 4.4.19), who considers condemnation of matricide a universal law. See also Hdt. 1.137 on the Persians' view of patricide and matricide as utterly abnormal and improbable.

More broadly, the principle of helping friends and harming enemies,¹³ which is essentially tied to the rule of reciprocity, is frequently presented as controversial or problematic, no less so because identities can themselves be fluid or even contradictory.¹⁴

On the other hand, a just cause can be considered as potentially bringing about an unjust outcome if that outcome threatens a larger community of people or, secondarily, if it violates prescribed civic laws. In cases where acts of punishment or vengeance can prove destructive for the social structure it is at least doubtful whether they can be justified, even if the cause that triggers them might be unanimously recognized as just.¹⁵ This is especially evident in a fair part of the Euripidean production, where acts or intentions of large-scale retributive violence (e.g., attack on a city-state) are explored in the light of their consequences for the *polis* and where *dike* is tightly linked to, and virtually dependent on, specific sociopolitical values and institutions (notably freedom, civic law, and equality), which could themselves deter acts of unlimited aggression, even if these appear as the outcome of corrective justice. Attention is shifted to the idea of civic justice and its complications or failures. Tyndareus in *Orestes* brings together both those aspects – that of injustice brought about by the special relationship between avenger and victim, and that of injustice brought about by the violation of prescribed civic laws. Tyndareus fervently attacks his grandson both because he murdered his own mother, who, however, deserved to die (*Or.* 538-39: θυγάτηρ δ' ἐμὴ θανοῦσα ἔπραξεν ἔνδικα: / ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πρὸς τοῦτ' εἰκὸς ἦν αὐτὴν θανεῖν), and because he did not conform to long-established legal customs (512-15) but chose to engage in a pattern of behaviour which, apart from

13 See especially Blundell 1989 and Belfiore 2000 about violations of *φιλία* in tragedy.

14 Cf. *Birds* 371, where friends by intention are juxtaposed with enemies by birth. Kreon in *Antigone* implicitly introduces the reverse idea. Friends by birth can become enemies by intention and, more generally, friends are not born but made (188, 190); the institution of the *polis* makes friendship outside the boundaries of family possible. Knox 1964: 108-10 and Blundell 1989: 115-20 consider that Kreon's actions in the play fail to uphold his definition of *φιλία*.

15 See, e.g., *Phoenissae*, where all dramatic characters, Eteokles included (see n. 17), acknowledge Polyneikes' just demand, yet the latter's decision to attack his own fatherland is not treated as something unproblematic or even just (notice especially Jokasta's questions to Polyneikes in 568-83).

making him lawless and impious (e.g., 524), would ultimately jeopardize the survival of society (509-11).

Especially in maxims, *dike* and its cognates, primarily when referring to the notions of *justice* or *righteousness*, are commonly used in conjunction with the values of αἰδώς,¹⁶ εὐσέβεια,¹⁷ ἀλήθεια, and σοφία, as well as the broader notions of ὅσιον,¹⁸ χρηστόν, ἀγαθόν, and καλόν.¹⁹ The adjective δίκαιος is occasionally used in conjunction with καλός or ἀγαθός, and the adjective ἄδικος in conjunction with κακός. Something which is perceived as δίκαιον is not necessarily perceived as καλόν. Someone can be characterized as both κακός and ἔκδικος, while in other cases the adjective δίκαιος seems to stand in opposition to κακός.²⁰ When roughly meaning *revenge* or *punishment*, *dike* is often paired with the notions of τιμωρία²¹ and ποινή.²² *Dike* is also related to θέμις, the primary meanings of which are *customary law*, *right* or *justice*.

16 See also *Heracl.* 458-60 and *Pl. Prt.* 322c-d; in the latter passage, *aidōs* and *dike* are defined as two virtues (ἀρεταί) which Zeus bestowed upon men for the best function of human communities.

17 Eteokles in *Phoenissae* states that man should be pious in all respects (εὐσεβεῖν χρεών), but, if one should do wrong (εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρεή), doing so for tyranny is best (524-25). It seems that committing an act of injustice might be conceived as a violation of εὐσέβεια.

18 The Servant in *Helen*, for instance, urges Theoklymenos to commit pious (ὅσια) as opposed to unjust acts (1638: τὰ δ' ἔκδικ').

19 Menelaos, for instance, characterizes Apollo as someone who is ἀμαθέστερος τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς δίκης (*Or.* 417).

20 See further Dover 1974: 185: 'dikaioi and adikoi and their derivatives express a range of valuations which includes, and at times extends beyond, our "fair", "honest", "justified", "reasonable", and their antonyms.'

21 The term is firstly used in *Persians* in relation to Xerxes' τιμωρία by glorious Athens (473). It is extensively employed in *Hecuba* in connection to Polymestor's killing of Polydorus. For the meanings of τιμωρός and τιμωρία see Mossman 1995: 171.

22 Δίκη, which came in due course and destroyed the people of Priam, is characterized as βαρύνδικος ποινά in *Cho.* 935-36.

2. DIKE IN SOPHOCLES – AN OVERVIEW

Dike in Sophocles relates to two major domains:

1) Divine law and religious imperatives, mostly referring to burial and supplication, and their interplay with human decisions. This theme in Sophocles is directly linked to the friends-enemies pattern and its complications. Central questions include the criteria by which a φίλος is defined and to what extent the values of friendship and enmity can or should influence the treatment of the dead.

2) Vengeance or punishment, most often viewed (by at least some of the characters) as an act of corrective or retaliatory justice. The association of *dike* with these domains is standard in Attic tragedy, yet the particular interplay between them is complex and varying both in the three dramatists and among particular plays.

What is more distinctive is that *dike* in Sophocles is connected with the ideas of:

1) Honesty, truthfulness or outspokenness (ἀλήθεια). This association can refer to two groups of cases. a) Contexts in which concealment, manipulation or distortion of (crucial) pieces of information are viewed in conjunction with the quality of δίκαιον, which roughly means *correct, valid* or *right*. The meaning of the adjective δίκαιος in these cases comes closer to the meaning of the adjective ὀρθός. b) Contexts in which the use of guile and trickery, as a means for achieving a self-interested objective at the expense of others or for prevailing over one's enemies, is perceived as an act of injustice. This is the case in *Philoctetes*, where deception is closely connected to the idea of shamelessness or dishonour, as well as that of righteousness or justice. More broadly, *dike* can be associated with other aspects of verbal communication (such as verbal assault and employment of rhetorical skills).

2) Shamelessness (τὸ αἰσχρόν). Shamelessness in conjunction with *dike* can relate to specific actions (*Philoctetes*) or to the way in which a character either communicates true facts (*Electra*) or conceals and manipulates them (*Philoctetes*). Even though there are cases where a shameful act is at once perceived as an unjust act, shamelessness and justice or righteousness do not seem to be mutually exclusive.

Both these ideas are examined within specific contexts of social interaction and communication; rather than pointing to internalized or abstract values, they refer to specific patterns of relating to one's fellow-men and to

the way in which these patterns are evaluated (by either the agent himself or other people of the community) under specific circumstances. Shamelessness in particular is very closely linked to one's social image.

3) Benefit-damage/expediency. *Dike*, understood as *justice* or *righteousness*, though unanimously recognized as an important value in tragedy as a whole, does not necessarily bring about beneficial results. The realization is expressed that it can in fact prove harmful to one's interests.

4) Acquisition/appropriation, authorship or 'ownership'.

5) Time.

6) Knowledge/awareness, wilfulness, and motivation.

2.1. *Dike* and Religious Imperatives as Opposed to Human Decrees

When referring to religious imperatives, *dike* in Sophoclean drama relates to burial and, secondarily, supplication. Respect for suppliants and the dead is a *topos* in ancient literature and, more particularly, tragic contexts. In practice, however, it often becomes complicated, particularly when it clashes with other considerations, duties,²³ and/or decisions imposed by a higher human authority. In both the relevant Sophoclean contexts, a refusal to bury the dead by persons of authority is based on the grounds that the former have turned out to be enemies of their own city or community, having engaged in an actual, as well as failed, attack against it (Polyneikes and Ajax). In these cases, the particular status that the dead man held in his community, determined by sociopolitical relationships and patterns of interaction, is considered to be more defining than the fact that the dead man no longer belongs to the realm of the living. The persons who oppose the leaders' decision, on the other hand, besides appealing to divine law, are themselves motivated by the dead man's particular status, which they assess and define in

²³ The tension between respect for suppliants and other duties or considerations is explored in the Aeschylean *Suppliants* and, even more challengingly, in Euripides' *Children of Heracles* and *Suppliants*. In the former play, Pelasgos is virtually forced to accept and assist the Danaids in the light of their threat that they will commit suicide at the altar (160-61; 346-69; 407-17; 472-79). In the Euripidean plays, expectations surrounding supplication are complicated by the threat of large-scale civil strife, while at the same time forming an integral part of Athenian self-image and praise, though the latter is not itself uncomplicated.

slightly different terms: Antigone holds Polyneikes to be her friend because of their kinship, while Teucer, besides being related to Ajax by bonds of blood, sets forth the latter's great services to his community. Odysseus introduces the broader claim that the dead man's individual merit should surpass enmity and that death should cause hatred to cease.

The first such context is *Ajax*, where the Atreids are determined to prevent the eponymous hero's burial. The notion of *dike* comes up in the arguments used in the major *agones* of the play, those between the generals and Teucer, though it is surprisingly rare. After the issue is resolved through the intervention of Odysseus, Teucer prays that Zeus, the μνήμων Ἐρινύς, and the τελεσφόρος Δίκη might destroy the wicked for their maltreatment of a man like his brother (*Aj.* 1389-92). The Erinyes and *Dike* watch over and control both the past and the future; together, they bring things to a conclusion when order is disturbed.

The Atreids structure their arguments upon: (1) The premise that one should punish one's enemies even when they are dead (1052-60, 1085-86, 1126, 1132,²⁴ 1134), which comes very close to Kreon's view in *Antigone*, and (2) basic principles of political organization; they more specifically appeal to the need for discipline and respect for both authority and the majority's opinion (1069-86²⁵ by Menelaos and 1242-49 by Agamemnon). Teucer, on the other hand, underlines Ajax's valour, noble lineage, and great contribution to the Achaians' common cause (particularly 1266-89), which gives him every right to receive his due honour (1286-315). Teucer will bury his brother

24 Menelaos considers that he does not transgress the laws of the gods, for it is not καλόν to bury one's enemies (1130, 1132). Teucer does not directly challenge this conviction (notice in fact 1133), but rather attempts to demonstrate that Ajax was a major and precious ally. Still, Teucer acknowledges the mutual hatred between Ajax and Menelaos, originating from Ajax's conviction that Menelaos had wronged him in the voting-process (1135). See further Connor 1971: 51 for the view that leaving an enemy unburied would be perfectly legitimate, mentioned in relation to Polyneikes.

25 Καίτοι κακοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἄνδρα δημότην / μηδὲν δικαιοῦν τῶν ἐφεστῶτων κλύειν (1071-72). In this frame, Agamemnon attacks Teucer on account of his bastard (1226-34) and barbarian origin (1263; cf. 1120), which allegedly forbid him to protest and pose demands, actually calling him δοῦλος and 'a nobody' (1231; 1235; 1261-62). Cf. Kreon's words in *Ant.* 479. Teucer, on the other hand, besides defending and vindicating his own background, questions Menelaos' authority over Ajax (1099-1108), as well as the nobility of Agamemnon's own lineage (1290-98). For the debate between Teucer and the Atreids see further Heath 1987: 201-2; Hesik 2003: 121; Finglass 2011-2012.

δικαίως (1109-10). At the same time, he introduces the common, as well as more general, idea that one who wrongs or maltreats the dead shall suffer damage (1131, 1154-55).

Odysseus, who exploits the factor of his friendship with Agamemnon to challenge the latter's reasoning (1329-32, 1353), picks up the major points in Teucer's defence of his brother. Odysseus underlines the unjust nature of Agamemnon's intention (ὥστ' ἂν ἐνδίκως γ' ἀτιμάζοιτό σοι), warning him not to overstep τὴν δίκην due to excessive hatred and hostility (1334-35).²⁶ Odysseus does not deny that Ajax has been the Atreids' enemy (unlike Teucer, who, at least in part, attempts to downplay this enmity); in fact, he explicitly acknowledges that he himself has been Ajax's great enemy, while the latter was still alive (1347, 1355).²⁷

Odysseus founds his conviction that Agamemnon's actions would violate τὴν δίκην upon three premises: (1) The valour and merit of the dead man, even if he has been an enemy, should be taken into account (1355). Ajax has been the bravest warrior in the Achaian army, being second only to Achilles (1340-41). In fact, excellence should weigh more heavily than and surpass enmity (1357: κινεῖ γὰρ ἀρετὴ με τῆς ἔχθρας πολὺ). (2) It is not right to harm a good man when he is dead, even if you hate him; hatred and its consequences should be confined to the living (1344-45: ἄνδρα δ' οὐ δίκαιον, εἰ θάνοι, / βλάπτειν τὸν ἐσθλόν, οὐδ' ἔαν μισῶν κυρῆις; 1347: ἐμίσουν δ', ἥνίκ' ἦν μισεῖν καλόν). (3) By harming a good man when he is dead, one violates the laws of the gods themselves (1342-43), and this cannot be in accord with *dike*. The latter two premises appear as possessing universal power and validity, while the first is presented as Odysseus' individual view. Odysseus further blurs the limit between friends and enemies, even when speaking about living persons, by his claim that most men are friendly at one time and bitter at another (1359);²⁸ therefore, he disapproves of an inflexible spirit (1361).

Odysseus thus introduces the connection between *dike* and limitations on enmity, on the one hand, as well as the divine world, on the other. Acts of excessive hostility can bring about the disturbance of *dike* – at least when they result in the violation of deep-rooted, religious and/or moral, laws or

26 Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.170.

27 As Teucer himself emphatically acknowledges (1383-84: ἔχθιστος Ἀργείων ἀνὴρ).

28 Cf. *OC* 612-15.

obligations. If Agamemnon allows the burial of Ajax, neither the Atreids nor Odysseus will appear δειλοί, as Agamemnon thinks, but ἔνδικοι in the eyes of all the Greeks (1362-63). Agamemnon ultimately yields to Odysseus' request, as a personal favour to him, but refuses to give up his hatred for Ajax, thus choosing to reproduce patterns of relating to the living in patterns of relating to the dead (1372-73: οὗτος δὲ καὶ κεῖ κἀνθάνδ' ὦν ἔμοιγ' ὁμῶς / ἔχθιστος ἔσται). Odysseus remarks that, even so, Agamemnon will prove χρηστός in all respects (1369).

The association of proper treatment of the dead with *dike* and the divine constitutes Antigone's chief argument during her confrontation with Kreon in the homonymous play (*Ant.* 449-95).²⁹ At the same time, similarly to *Ajax*, the particular status of the dead man (that is his virtue as manifested in his relation to his community), the issue of whether enmity continues in death, and the broader question of how friends and enemies are defined and distinguished (that is, on the basis of kinship or on the basis of their conduct) constitute the core discrepancy between the two parties. The tension between divine and civic law arises as an important issue in its own right, but the particular civic law regarding the burial of the brothers is a corollary of Kreon's view on the questions laid out above. Antigone's and Kreon's conflict is set in the frame of the organized *polis*, the role of which is primary in so far as principles of political organization both shape or inform Kreon's (and to some extent Haemon's) argumentation and are intertwined with values or rules pertaining to both the domestic sphere (honouring of kin) and the divine plain (respect for the dead). Antigone's employment of *dike* at this point is confined to the latter.³⁰ The heroine appeals to the imperatives established by Zeus and *Dike* (οὐ γὰρ τί μοι Ζεὺς ἦν ὁ κηρύξας τάδε, / οὐδ' ἡ ξύνουκος τῶν κάτω θεῶν Δίκη / τοιούσδ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν

29 On their conflict more generally see Winnington-Ingram 1980: 117-49; Nussbaum 1986: ch. 3; Foley 2001: 172-200.

30 This is not meant to exhaust Antigone's motivations, which are certainly more complex, since they also involve familial duty (her honouring of φιλία, understood as kinship), her consideration of brotherly relationships as supreme and irreplaceable when the parents are dead (511; 908-15 (assuming that these lines are genuine)), her longing for a liberating death (461-66), and her desire for κλέος (501-4). Antigone maintains that to bury her brother is both καλόν (72) and holy (76-77); Kreon's reasoning and rhetoric, on the other hand, are influenced by additional factors, such as his position as the new ruler of the state and his preoccupation with gender-roles (notably 677-80).

ᾧρισεν νόμους) which are everlasting, unchangeable, and unfailing, and, as such, more powerful in absolute terms than human decisions (450-60). Hence, in her view, they fully justify her determination to disobey Kreon's edict. Antigone repeatedly stresses that the nether gods demand and take pleasure in such rituals, regardless of the dead man's identity (e.g., 519: νόμους ἴσους).³¹ Antigone, moreover, denies that her brothers are enemies after death (515, 521), in response to Kreon's relevant point (512-15). In any case, she is not inclined to pay a penalty to the gods for overstepping their laws out of fear of a mortal, even if that mortal is the state's ruler (453-55: οὐδὲ σθένειν τοσοῦτον ωἰόμην τὰ σὰ / κηρύγμαθ' ὥστε ἄγραπτα κάσφαλή θεῶν / νόμιμα δύνασθαι θνητὸν ὄνθ' ὑπερδραμεῖν; 458-60). The citizens of Thebes are allegedly on her side (a point later picked up by Haemon) but afraid to oppose the king (509), contrary to what Kreon thinks (508).

Kreon, in his response, appeals to the city's laws (449, 481: νόμους ὑπερβαίνουσα τοὺς προκειμένους), human-made decrees established by the ruler. Kreon prioritizes civic law, which should be even stronger than family-ties, and also claims (though not in the frame of the present conflict) to know well that no mortal – and, thus, nor he himself – can ever defile the gods (1043-45). He then explains the reasoning behind his edict regarding the burial of the brothers. This is founded upon his conviction that it cannot be right if good and wicked men are treated identically, in life or in death (516, 520). Polyneikes had been an enemy to his own land, while Eteokles had been its great defender; since an enemy is never a friend, even when he has died (522), the dead brothers do not deserve equal treatment. This point resurfaces in his confrontation with Haemon, where father and son both accept the premise that it is not right to show respect for the disorderly or the wicked – this time, however, in relation to Antigone's conduct and, thus, the living.

Kreon is not presented as indifferent to the idea of righteousness or justice; in the overall frame of the play, he expresses thoughts involving *dike* that concentrate on the proper handling of people-citizens on the basis of their moral quality, as assessed by the ruler. Kreon has already drawn a dis-

31 After announcing his decision to imprison Antigone, Kreon reinforces the heroine's special attachment to Hades and his cults, and states that she will now learn, through her punishment, how vain it is to labour in order to revere the dead (777; 780).

inction between the just (τῶν ἐνδίκων) and the wicked (κακοί), and proclaimed that he shall never honour the latter more than the former (207-8). After his confrontation with Antigone, the king brings together the attributes of the ideal citizen and the ideal ruler, as well as the public and private spheres. The man who is χρηστός in the affairs of his home will also be δίκαιος when it comes to communal issues and the affairs of the state. This man will be a good ruler, while at the same time ready to be well-governed; thus, he will always remain a δίκαιος and ἀγαθὸς παραστάτης (661-71). The interesting inference lies in the fact that the good and just man should obey the ruler in everything, both his just and unjust decisions (666-67). Thus, the decisions of the ruler (even a good one?) are not by default or necessity just, not even in Kreon's view; yet the just citizen should obey them regardless. The man who thus obeys would be a good ruler no less than a good subject. This comes very close to Kreon's statement that it cannot but be δίκαιον to carry out the ruler's commands in Euripides' *Phoenissae* (1648: τάντεταλμέν' οὐ δίκαιον ἐκπονεῖν;), to which Antigone responds that if the ruler's commands happen to be ill-advised or grievous, it is not δίκαιον to obey them (1649). Thus, Antigone here shifts the focus to the citizen's right to overstep human edicts if he/she judges that they are ill-advised rather than the more abstract interplay between divine and human law – even if the criterion for judging the human edict as wrongful on the particular occasion might be respect for the divine.

Haemon himself speaks about *dike* when assessing his father's behaviour – even though he employs the term only twice and in a vague enough sense. Their altercation is very much concerned with the best way in which a ruler should govern the city and relate to the citizens. When Kreon asks him if men of his age are to be taught by much younger men, Haemon responds that he is trying to teach his father only those things that are just (728); Haemon is trying to change Kreon's mind because he considers that the latter is acting unjustly (743: οὐ δίκαια).³² Similarly to Antigone, Haemon mostly connects Kreon's unjust conduct with lack of respect for the nether gods (745, 749). In response to Kreon's question about what is wrong with

32 This is uttered in response to Kreon's exclamation that Haemon is attacking and accusing his father, which involves a different usage of *dike*: διὰ δίκης ἰὼν πατρί (742). Antigone has already employed the term when reciting Kreon's decree; the term there reflects the latter's belief in its (i.e., in his decree's) justness (23-30).

him honouring and being true to his principles (744), Haemon argues that his father does not respect his own prerogatives when he tramples on the honour of the gods (745). At the same time, Haemon's epigrammatic verdict that Kreon's conduct is unjust is closely linked to the latter's broader political mindset – even though there is no explicit association. Kreon's refusal to listen to any advice – founded, at least partly, upon his conviction that the city should be naturally ruled by one man and that discipline or obedience is the utmost virtue (734, 736, 738; cf. 666-67) – reaffirms and fuels his course of action that dishonours the gods. Haemon has already underlined the dangers of one-man rule, the benefits of collective deliberation, and the fact that the people of Thebes, who allegedly think that Antigone is worthy of great honour, are too afraid to speak their mind (690-91). He mentions that his father would make a fine ruler in the desert (739). The point on which father and son agree is that it could never be a worthy or useful task to show respect for those who are offensive (730 by Kreon: τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας σέβειν) or wicked (731 by Haemon: εὐσεβεῖν εἰς τοὺς κακοὺς). The essence of the disagreement consists in the criteria by which an offensive or wicked (and, inversely, a just) man is defined and by whom, an issue which is inevitably intertwined with the nature and limits of the ruler's power.

The choral odes offer interesting glimpses of the theme of lawfulness and justice which might at the same time illuminate the shortcomings, limitations or transgressions of the principal characters. Even prior to Antigone's and Kreon's confrontation, the Theban elders had underlined the need to honour the laws of the earth and the ἔνορκος δίκαια of the gods (369: νόμους γεραίρων χθονὸς θεῶν τ' ἔνορκον δίκαν).³³ After Antigone's and Kreon's debate, they praise the eternal power of Zeus, which no human or non-human agent can defeat, and lay out an unshakable and predominant law (νόμος), totally unaffected by restrictions of time (605-14); nothing that is vast (πάμπολυ) comes to the life of mortals without disaster (ἐκτὸς ἅτας). After Kreon's and Haemon's altercation, the elders sing about the intoxicating power of Eros and Aphrodite, which can turn out to be de-

33 Γεραίρων is Reiske's conjecture, adopted by Jebb 1891. Segal 1981: 168-70 argues that both Antigone and Kreon claim to honour both, yet both fail to revere them in practice.

structive; Eros seizes the minds of just men and drags them to injustice (δικαίων ἀδίκους φρένας παρασπᾶις), which ultimately results in their ruin (791-92). It was Eros who actually incited the fraternal conflict (794). These maxims are rendered with a universal force and could indeed be viewed in connection to all characters' conduct (the brothers', Kreon's, Antigone's, and Haemon's), while also bringing divine and human agency together.

As Antigone's and Kreon's destinies start to materialize, the Chorus individualize their perception of the workings of *dike*. They sing that Antigone has rushed to the utmost point of daring (ἐπ' ἔσχατον θράσους) and thus crashed against the high βᾶθρον of Δίκη (853-56). Δίκη is here personified, recalling Antigone's former appeal to Δίκη, who, in her mind, called for her brother's burial. However, the Chorus seem to perceive Δίκη as embracing a wider set of imperatives and duties. Antigone's crash against Δίκη as the outcome of her excessive boldness implies that Antigone overstepped the mark and ultimately either violated or failed to meet certain demands of, and show due respect for certain aspects of, Δίκη. The Chorus furthermore speculates that the heroine is paying for some paternal crime, recalling the second *stasimon*.³⁴

Shortly before departing to meet her death, Antigone remains fixated on the power of divine laws, on account of which, at least in part, she transgressed the laws of the state – and exhibited her pride in it. For the first time, she expresses her bewilderment in regard to divine command and the righteousness of her actions – though she does not actually express regret (921-28). The heroine wonders what δίκη of the gods she has transgressed (ποίαν παρεξελθοῦσα δαιμόνων δίκην) and why she should look to the gods any longer. She cannot understand how she earned a name of irreverence by her reverence (τὴν δυσσέβειαν εὐσεβοῦς' ἐκτησάμην). The heroine concludes that if this state of affairs pleases the gods, then she will learn and accept her mistake after suffering her doom; however, if those who convicted her are guilty, they should suffer no greater evils than those they inflicted on her ἐκδίκως. In a way, both of her speculations are affirmed.

³⁴ The Chorus sing about the sorrows of the house of the Labdakids and the inescapable power of Zeus and the divine.

Teiresias predicts that Kreon will be punished by the ὕστεροφθόροι Erinyes of Hades and the gods, who will seize him in these same sufferings (1074-76). The king will soon give a corpse in requital for corpses (1066-67), for, in his attempt to punish his enemies, secure order in the (his) city, and assert his authority, he had lodged a living being in the grave dishonourably (ἀτίμως), while at the same time detaining a corpse belonging to the nether gods in this world (1068-71). Thus, he has violated both the justice of the gods and the laws of the earth.

After Teiresias' intervention, and despite Kreon's earlier attack on the prophet (1033-47; 1059; 1061), the latter decides 'not to wage vain wars with necessity' (1106: ἀνάγκη) and free Antigone straightaway since he fears that it is best to keep the established laws (καθεστῶτας νόμους) to life's very end (1108-14). Yet, it is too late for Antigone to be rescued. Kreon indeed gives corpses in requital for corpse. He manifestly regrets his lack of sound judgment (1261-69) and admits that he has learnt the bitter lesson (1271), while the Chorus remark that the king has seen τὴν δίκην too late (1270).

Apart from the realm of the dead, *dike* appears connected with suppliants' rights in *Oedipus at Colonus*, in regard to both Oedipus' seeking refuge³⁵ and, more evidently, Kreon's intention to drive off the suppliants by force, which leads Theseus to characterize him as κακός and ἔκδικος (919-23; cf. 824-25).³⁶ Theseus actually mentions that Thebes is not accustomed to rearing unjust men (920) nor would the city praise Kreon if she learned that he is despoiling Theseus and the gods – i.e., that he is violating both human and divine law. The Chorus, in their turn, underline that Kreon's deeds are found to be evil, even though he is judged to be just by his origins (937-38). Besides the quite standard connection between supplication and the idea of justice or righteousness, Theseus and the Chorus express the view that the city and its institutions play an important part in the shaping of the citizens' identity or moral quality and, more particularly, their relation to justice.

35 Oedipus, for instance, thanks Theseus for his 'righteous care' for him (1042-43: ἐνδίκου προμηθείας).

36 See further Adkins 1966: 173, 175.

2.2. *Dike* – Vengeance/Just Retaliation

In all dramatic treatments of Orestes' myth, *dike* is closely associated, if not virtually identified, with retaliatory justice. However, there are significant differences in the way in which the principal characters relate both to each other and to the divine, as well as to the act of matricide.³⁷

The *Oresteia* closes with the establishment of some sort of legal institution which will serve and promote an Olympian design. The first two plays of the trilogy dramatize the intra-familial plight of the royal family. Even though there is no extensive debate between the conflicting parties (Klytemnestra-Agamemnon, Klytemnestra-Orestes), *dike* and its cognates seem very close to retaliation, which is inseparably tied to the divine world. Accordingly, *Dike* is spoken of in quite transcendental terms. In *Agamemnon*, Klytemnestra characterizes the killing of her husband as ἔργον δικαίας τέκτονος (1406; cf. 1396) and also appeals to the τέλειον Δίκην of her daughter, Iphigeneia, alongside Ἄτη and Erinys (1431-33).³⁸ *Dike*, who shines in gloomy houses and rewards the virtuous, while turning her eyes away from golden mansions where hands are foul, guides all things to their proper end, as the Chorus sings (772-81). At the beginning of *Choephoroi*, the Chorus urges Elektra to pray that a god or a man might show up. The women's response to Elektra's question about whether this man or god should appear as a δικαστής (judge) or as a δικηφόρος (avenger) implies that, in their view, the two are virtually indistinguishable; this human or divine agent should simply kill the perpetrators (121). Elektra, on her part, appears to distinguish (i.e., between the role of the judge and that of the avenger), at least at this stage. Responding to the heroine's hesitation about that prayer's piety (122: εὐσεβῇ θεῶν), the women reassure her that the murder could not but be pious, since in this way she would repay her enemies with ills (123: ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς).

Indeed, in her following prayer to Hermes, Elektra appeals to the gods, the earth, and the victorious *dike*, wishing that Orestes might arrive as a

³⁷ See further Cairns 2005: 306-9.

³⁸ See Garvie 1986 on *Cho.* 461. Apart from the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, Klytemnestra repeatedly refers to a δαίμων or the ἀλάστωρ of the house (e.g., 1475-80; 1497-1504; 1501), introducing the idea of inherited sin/guilt and Klytemnestra's perception of herself as the agent of the curse which dates back to Thyestes' feast, and also criticizes Agamemnon's bringing of Cassandra (1438-47).

τιμῶρος of his father (143) and justly (δίκη) ‘kill back’ (ἀντικατθανεῖν) the murderers (144). The heroine also calls upon Κράτος, *Dike*, and Zeus, asking them to be her allies (244-45). Orestes proclaims that Ares will clash with Ares and *Dika* will clash with *Dika* (461). *Dika* here seems to represent and embody the opposing claims that the conflicting parties pose on *dike*; Straight afterwards Elektra wishes that the gods might judge the plea of right ἐνδίκως (462). In the choral odes of the play, *Dike* is mostly depicted as a harsh, almost belligerent, deity who will sooner or later punish the wrongdoers through her human agent, Orestes. The slave-women call upon the great Μοῖραι, who, through the power of Zeus, grant fulfilment according to what τὸ δίκαιον requires (306-8).³⁹ *Dike*, turning the scales, cries aloud that hostile words should be repaid with hostile words, which is similar to what the ancient saying (μῦθος) allegedly demands: murder should be returned with murder and the one who acts must suffer (308-14: δρᾶσαντι παθεῖν). *Dike* is said to wield her sword and thrust it home. Upon the anvil of *Dike*, which she fixes deep inside the earth, Αἴσα hammers out her sword, until the Erinyes brings the avenger home (645-49).

Eumenides abounds in words associated with *dike* – the relevant references are approximately double those of the preceding plays. These are roughly divided into gnomic statements about *dike*, viewed mostly as a social value (e.g., 522-25; 690-94; 699-703), and technical uses of the term, which are very different from the vivid, personified images of *Dike* in *Choephoroi*. The jury of *Eumenides* is divided and thus there does not seem to be an easy or definite answer as to whether Orestes’ act was just. Rather the end of the trilogy presents us with the establishment of a legal institution that will formally regulate matters of vengeance.⁴⁰ Orestes is eventually found innocent because Athena votes for his acquittal and proclaims that this is what is going to happen from now on if the votes are equally divided (734-43; 752-53). The Erinyes, who seem to identify their power with the power of *dike* itself,

39 Klytemnestra will later argue that Μοῖρα must share responsibility (παραιτία) for the killing of Agamemnon, only to be told by Orestes that it is Μοῖρα who now brings this destiny to pass (910-11). In Sophocles’ *Electra*, Klytemnestra argues that *Dike* partook in the killing (528); Elektra’s answer (that, on the basis of Klytemnestra’s argument, she herself should be the first to die if she were to meet with *dike*) is more complex than Orestes’ answer in *Choephoroi*, both in terms of content and its dramatic function.

40 Kreon refers to the famous Areopagos which forbids polluted vagrants to stay within the city’s borders in *OC* 937-38.

overcome their rage only after securing that they will continue to be duly honored (890-92). Thus, some sort of order is restored both on the mortal plane and in the divine hierarchy. Whilst the drama places emphasis on the city of Athens, the idea of a divine jury does not leave much room for exploring how individuals could actually regulate their matters through civic institutions and what problems might arise in practice. Moreover, the jury's verdict does not offer an enlightening answer to the question of where true justice lies or what is the essence of justice.

In the Euripidean *Electra* and *Orestes*, matricide is treated as an act of dubious righteousness. In both plays, the siblings', but also the broader community's attitude towards matricide is far more ambivalent and varied. In both plays, moreover, the *deus ex machina* resolves the crisis. As far as *Electra* goes, Orestes expresses great hesitations and questions the rightfulness of Apollo's oracle shortly before the deed (971; 973), even speculating that some ἀλάστωρ might have spoken in the likeness of the god (979). Upon the exhortations of Elektra, who pressingly reminds her brother of the πατρώαν τιμωρίαν (974; 976; 978), the hero decides to proceed with the terrible deed, which is both bitter and sweet, if the gods so require (985-87). After receiving the news of Aegisthos' death, Elektra rejoices at the arrival of *Dike* who sees everything (771: πάνθ' ὄρωσα);⁴¹ according to the Chorus, Aegisthos had committed terrible things (δεινά) and he now suffered terrible things (δεινὰ δ' ἀντέδωκε), for *Dike* possesses μέγα σθένος (957-58). Both Orestes and Electra, however, express their remorse immediately after the matricide. The women of the Chorus themselves, who repeatedly express their conviction that the matricide is just (e.g., 957-58; 1155-56; 1169; 1189), are clearly shocked by the deed (e.g., 1218-20).

The play ends with the intervention of the Dioscuri; Castor declares that Orestes' act was not just, even though the death of Klytemnestra was, but he nonetheless blames it on the unwise words of Apollo (1245-46; 1301-2; 1295-96), as well as μοῖρα, ἀνάγκη, and an ancestral curse (1306-7: ἄτη πατέρων). Castor closes his speech with a moralizing statement about justice, injustice, and the gods' disposition towards mortals on the basis of the latter's way of relating to these values (1351-54): the gods come to the aid only of those who love piety (ᾀσιον) and justice (δίκαιον). This seems to imply

⁴¹ Sun and time are also described as seeing everything. About the sun, see *Odyssey* 11.109 and 12.323; cf. *Soph. El.* 823-25. About time, see *OT* 1213-15.

that Orestes is one of those men, even though his killing of his mother is explicitly considered unjust. Even though Castor prophesies the eventual acquittal of Orestes and Elektra's marriage, the play closes with the bitter separation of the siblings – Orestes heading for a long journey of expiation, while Elektra is forced to leave the land of the Argives.

The spirit and tone of *Orestes* are different from the other dramatic treatments of Orestes' myth in many respects. The play presupposes the existence of public justice; accordingly, Elektra makes it clear from the very beginning that the entire city of Argos will decide on the siblings' fate by vote. Tyndareus proposes an alternative (as well as anachronistic) punishment for Klytemnestra and debates over it. Nevertheless, this form of public justice, both the Argive assembly⁴² and Tyndareus' defence of civic law,⁴³ does not seem to function very effectively. The siblings' attitude towards matricide is ambivalent and fluid. As in the Euripidean *Electra*, Apollo's oracle and his own sensibility and *dike* are put into question by human agents, though in a far more emphatic way (notably 417 by Menelaos and 595-96 by Orestes). Apollo indeed shows up, after all the preceding rampage, and assumes full responsibility, while undertaking to settle things and restore Orestes' relationship with his community (1665).

In Sophocles, on the other hand, the identification of *dike* with just revenge or retributive justice appears to be less complicated. By contrast with both Aeschylus and Euripides, *Electra* closes with Orestes entering his ancestral palace to kill Aegisthos, having killed his mother. It is nowhere suggested that the hero will be forced to leave his land, pursued by the Erin-yes. This has given rise to much speculation. Modern interpretations are roughly divided as to whether the drama presents matricide as an uncomplicated act of retributive justice⁴⁴ or as an act of dubious righteousness or justification (either as such or in terms of the means by which it is achieved),

42 The Messenger's account of the Argive assembly presents the majority of the Argives as an easily manipulated mob, who are readily convinced by the words of an unnamed Argive, confident in bluster, to kill the trio (904-14). All speeches at the assembly are concerned with the welfare of the community rather than the essence of Orestes' case (885-952). See further Burnett 1971: 205-9; Euben 1986: 222-51; Garner 1987: 121-22.

43 Tyndareus himself ends up demanding Orestes' death (536, 612-15, 915-16).

44 See, e.g., Jebb 1894; Bowra 1944: 227; 231; Stevens 1978; Blundell 1989: 148; 182 – but notice 1989: 1; Burnett 1998: 141; March 2001; MacLeod 2001. Davidson 1988 explores the appropriation of the *Odyssey* by Sophocles.

which would also make the perpetrators less sympathetic, to say the least.⁴⁵ Those favouring the former are mostly based upon the oracle and the underlying presence of the divine (as primarily suggested by Apollo's 'answer' to Klytemnestra's prayer), as well as the absence of any expression of hesitation or guilt on behalf of the siblings or any substantial indication of their future punishment by the divine world. Those favouring the latter bring into focus the element of trickery (δόλος) and certain dark aspects of the siblings' behaviour and disposition (notably in the second part of the play), as well as probable hints that divine punishment will be inflicted.⁴⁶

Examination of the actual occurrences of *dike* suggests that the way in which the major characters (Klytemnestra, Elektra, Orestes) perceive and employ the term is similar, despite their particular conflicting claims.⁴⁷ Orestes clearly takes for granted that he must avenge his murdered father. His single consideration is the way by which he should accomplish it.⁴⁸ Accordingly, he narrates how he asked Apollo about the way in which he should get πατρός δίκας (*El.* 33-34); the god's oracle spoke about χειρὸς ἐνδίκου σφαγᾶς (37),⁴⁹ while also introducing the need for δόλος.⁵⁰ Ores-

45 Notably Sheppard 1927; Winnington-Ingram 1954-55; Friis Johansen 1964: 8-32; Gellie 1972: 130; Kells 1973; Segal 1981: 253-54; Shein 1982: 71-72; Seale 1982. Some critics think that the outcome is presented as just but at the same time terrible and shameful. See, e.g., Segal 1966: 475; Alexanderson 1966: 87; McDevitt 1983: 3.

46 See, e.g., Winnington-Ingram 1980: 218-28 and Segal 1981: 262, 290.

47 Foley 2001: 145-71 explores the different voices and strategies of Orestes and Elektra, attempting to define their ethical stances in relation to the cultural contexts in which they emerge. The broader differences between Orestes and Elektra as to the way in which they materialize their revenge, their relation to λόγος, their degree of emotional participation etc. cannot be discussed here. Foley's chapter offers a useful overview of various pertinent views.

48 For a recording of scholarly views about Orestes' probable fault, consisting in his failure to ask whether he should actually avenge his father's killers, see MacLeod 2001: 28, n. 17.

49 For the readings πατρός and ἐνδίκου see Finglass 2007 on *El.* 33 and 37. Kells 1973: 82 and Segal 1981: 280 argue that it is not clear whether the adjective is indeed used by Apollo or it constitutes Orestes' interpretation of the oracle. For the compelling view that this is indeed Apollo's saying and that the two perspectives (divine and mortal) merge see Kamerbeek 1974: 25; Gasti 2002: 7-15; Finglass 2007 on *El.* 37. See also Winnington-Ingram 1980: 236.

50 Cf. *Cho.* 556-59. On the 'intertextual game', see Dunn 1998: 438-43. For the probable reasons behind the god's particular instruction, see MacLeod 2001: 33, who connects it with the values of the *polis*, while arguing that these values inform the overall conduct of

tes should act alone and in secret. After receiving the oracle, the hero perceives himself as a δίκη καθαρῆς πρὸς θεῶν ὀρμημένος (69-70). Elektra, in her turn, while still ignorant of Orestes' course, prays for vengeance/punishment (209-12: ποίνιμα πάθεα) and, more emphatically, identifies the lack of retaliation (ἀντιφόνους δίκας) with the loss of both αἰδώς and εὐσέβεια among mortal men (247-50; cf. 298). She prays to Hades, Hermes, and the Erinyes (110-18).⁵¹ After the narration of Klytemnestra's dream, the Chorus sing that πρὸμαντις Δίκη⁵² will come, 'winning the just victory (δίκαια ... κράτη) of her hands' might' (472-75), together with the bronze-foot Erinys who lurks in her terrible ambush (489-90).⁵³ Klytemnestra herself structures her defence upon the idea of the just punishment of Agamemnon, as a response to his killing of Iphigeneia, whereas in Aeschylus and Euripides she also elaborates on other factors, notably the ancestral curse (in Aeschylus) and Cassandra (in both Aeschylus and Euripides).

In the central *agon* between Klytemnestra and Elektra,⁵⁴ the notions of *dike*, shamefulness and lawfulness are central. Each heroine starts off by pointing out and criticizing the shamelessness of the accusations or admissions of the other. In the opening of her speech, Klytemnestra attacks Elektra for the disgrace she is bringing upon her family (αἰσχύνειν φίλους) when publicly calling her mother a bold and unjust (πέρα δίκης) ruler (518-22); she goes on to argue that she herself does no violence but only returns the insults that she so often hears from her daughter (523-24). Klytemnestra's major concern in her main speech, however, is to demonstrate that *dike* has (literally) been on her side in the killing of her husband. The deity herself had been assisting her,⁵⁵ because Agamemnon, alone of all the Greeks, had

the siblings. This is in direct contrast with Griffin's view (1999: 77-82) about the play's lack of interest in the city of Argos. Compare Finglass 2005: 199-209.

51 Elektra has no doubts about the need for revenge, even though she expresses concern for other aspects of her behaviour, at least in the first part of the play. The heroine feels ashamed of the terrible things she is forced to do (e.g., 221; 223; 254; 308-9; 606-7; 616; 620-21) and recognizes that she is aggressive and extreme (e.g., 135, 222).

52 Cf. the Chorus' reference to themselves as a μάντις in 472.

53 The women, as well as Paedagogos, support and/or argue for the righteousness of Orestes' action throughout (174-84; also 1384-97, where the women pray that the Erinyes, Ares, and Hermes might assist Orestes in his deed; 1441).

54 See further Budelmann 2000: 66-87.

55 Ἡ γὰρ Δίκη νιν εἶλε, οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνη. Cf. Alkmene's similar statement about Eurystheus in *Heracl.* 941 (εἶλέ σ' ἡ Δίκη χρόνῳ).

the heart to sacrifice their daughter to the gods. Elektra should have supported that *dike* herself, if she had been in her right mind (528-32). Klytemnestra shares responsibility with *Dike*, but she also emphasizes that Agamemnon should pay the penalty to her (μοι δίκην δώσειν),⁵⁶ whether he killed Iphigeneia to please the Argives or for the sake of his brother. Menelaos and Helen, the ones who caused the expedition, had two children of their own, who should in fairness (εἰκός) have died instead of Iphigeneia. Klytemnestra asserts that she views the past with no repentance and concludes by inviting Elektra to (re)consider the rightfulness of her own judgments (γνώμην δικαίαν) before blaming those close around her.

Elektra employs a series of counter-arguments, namely that Agamemnon was constrained by divine necessity (563-76), while Klytemnestra was ultimately driven by lust, as proven by the fact that she later married her lover – the most shameful deed of all (584-94). Thus, neither can Agamemnon be held accountable for his deed, nor is Klytemnestra honest in regard to her motives. Elektra, however, goes a step further and introduces an argument which proves to be more intriguing in the light of the future course of events, since it could undermine the lawfulness of the siblings' own conduct: Klytemnestra would not be justified in seeking vengeance for herself, even if Agamemnon had been a free agent, for there is no such law or custom (577-83: ποίω νόμω;). Elektra, far from accepting that the deity *Dike* had been Klytemnestra's supporter, considers her mother's retaliatory act arbitrary and unfounded, aiming only at serving her shameful interests, and, by extension, illegitimate and unjust, independently of Agamemnon's agency. Despite Elektra's speculation that Klytemnestra's appeal to the just punishment of her husband on the grounds of his own criminal act is only a pretext (584), she warns her mother that by laying down such a law for mortals, she might make trouble for herself (580-81). If one has to take blood for blood, she herself would be the first to die, if she were to meet with *dike* (580-83: δίκης).⁵⁷ Elektra here takes on Klytemnestra's interpretation of *dike*,⁵⁸ that is return-

56 Especially since Agamemnon felt none of the pains that Klytemnestra did when she gave birth (533-34). Cf. 544.

57 Cf. the same argument in Euripides' *Electra*: εἰ γὰρ δίκαι' ἐκείνα, καὶ τὰδ' ἔνδικα (1093-96).

58 Many interpretations emphasize the similarities between mother and daughter in regard to their perception of retaliatory justice. See, e.g., Seaford 1985: 315-23 and Blundell 1989: 149-83.

ing like for like, if only to criticize and question it or highlight its consequences and dangers.

This retaliatory principle, however, will soon be materialized by the siblings, thus confirming that both mother and children base their actions upon the same perception of *dike* (just punishment of the killer through killing, as a means of avenging the killer's victims). Elektra questioned both Klytemnestra's employment of the 'blood for blood' law as her principal or real motive and, more implicitly, the validity of this law itself. By committing matricide, the siblings are submitting to this very law, and it is nowhere clearly suggested that it will also work to their disadvantage, as was the case with their mother. The consequences of matricide are not explored and no divine agent appears on stage.⁵⁹ In the light of the play's end, the principal characters (Klytemnestra and her children) are ultimately presented as defending the justness of their actions and condemning the actions of their opponents (both groups of action consisting in the killing of kin, as a response to a prior killing of kin) based upon their identification of *dike* with just retaliation (which is supported by the divine world),⁶⁰ and without showing substantial concern for the complications or contradictions that might arise from such an identification.⁶¹

2.3. Verbal Expression; Honesty – Truthfulness; Rhetorical Skills

The contexts in which the notions of honesty, truthfulness or outspokenness are linked to *dike* might be divided into two groups:

1) In some contexts, the adjectives δίκαιος or ἐνδίκος are used in connection with the accuracy or truthfulness of one's words, without having wider, or serious, ethical implications. The adjectives mean *correct*, *right*, *truthful*,

59 The single potentially complicating point could be Orestes' statement, after the matricide, that all is well in the house, if Apollo prophesied well (1424-25). Yet, see Finglass 2007 on *El.* 1425 for the compelling view that the statement does not signal doubt on Orestes' part and that there has never been any question as to whether Klytemnestra's killing is sanctioned by Apollo.

60 In the case of Klytemnestra, this is only her perception.

61 Orestes' closing words, where the hero proclaims that *dike* by killing shall be taken on all those who act above the laws, are most probably an interpolation. See Dawe 1973: 203-5 and Finglass 2007 on *El.* 1505-7.

exact and are used in cases where the characters who distort or conceal the truth are not motivated by a desire to harm the recipients of their words but by some other constraint (such as compassion, loyalty or fear).

The Messenger in *Trachiniae* twice employs vocabulary associated with *dike* while attempting to show that Lichas' reports are inaccurate, false or misleading. First, he claims that none of what Lichas has just told Deianeira is in strict accordance with the truth (δίκης ἐς ὀρθόν); then, he claims that Lichas has just now been dishonest (κακός) or else he had been lying (οὐ δίκαιος ἄγγελος) in his earlier report (346-48). Once again, δίκαιος is used in conjunction with the adjective κακός (ἀλλ' ἢ νῦν κακός / ἢ πρόσθεν οὐ δίκαιος ἄγγελος παρῆν). Shortly later, the Messenger engages in word-play involving *dike*: after Lichas declares that Deianeira is rightly (δικαίως) his queen, the Messenger asks him what punishment he will be willing to undergo (δοῦναι δίκην) if he is proven to be unjust (μὴ δίκαιος), that is dishonest, towards her. Lichas merely asks what the Messenger means by μὴ δίκαιος (409-12).⁶² Similarly, in *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Oedipus orders the Shepherd to reveal τοῦνδικον, upon realizing that the latter is trying to conceal the truth (1158).

2) In other cases, a lie or plot intended to harm a fellow-man's interests is identified with injustice. When Teiresias urges Kreon to free Antigone in the homonymous play, the king is certain that the prophet is lying out of love for money; thus, he characterizes him as someone who likes committing acts of injustice (τὰδικεῖν φιλῶν), despite being wise (1059).⁶³ As we shall see below, Neoptolemos considers his intended deception of Philoktetes unjust.

A more marginal case is Antigone's statement that *dike* will not allow her sister to claim that she partook in Polyneikes' burial (538-39). This context resembles the passages mentioned in the first group in that Ismene's urge to lie is not motivated by any bad intent. Ismene does not wish to fall short of Antigone's fate, she wants to acquire honour through death, and to make

62 For Lichas' lying tale and its function or effects, see Machin 1981; Davies 1984: 480-83; Halleran 1986: 239-47; Heiden 1988: 13-23.

63 Teiresias in *Phoenissae* twice claims that a seer's reluctance to disclose the divine truth constitutes an ἀδικία (926; 957-58). The first reference is vaguer; when Kreon orders Teiresias to keep silent, the latter remarks that Kreon orders him to do wrong (ἀδικεῖν). The second reference is more specific, since Teiresias clarifies that the seer wrongs the divine (ἀδικεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν) if he decides not to communicate the gods' wishes out of mercy for mortals.

due consecration to the dead (540-41, 544-55), while also envisaging that her life will be wretched if she is deprived of her sister. Ismene's claim as such would certainly be untrue; the notion of *dike*, however, as employed by Antigone, seems to be more strongly connected with the idea of authorship and, more loosely, fairness rather than that of truthfulness. Antigone's major objection lies in the fact that Ismene is not entitled to share in the deed, since she had not been willing to help; nor did Antigone herself give her a part in it. Antigone considers Ismene a friend only in words – an undesirable friend (538-39) – and, more distinctively, stresses that Hades and the dead are witnesses to the fact that the deed was exclusively hers (542-43). Even if Antigone is at least in part motivated by a desire to protect her sister (543), it is telling that she appeals to *dike* as the agent that will forbid the latter to make that false claim.

Dike can be more broadly connected with particular patterns of verbal communication or expression (notably verbal aggression). For one thing, the thought is expressed that a just cause does not necessarily justify a verbal assault. Following Teucer's fervent attack on the Atreids, the Chorus express their disapproval of harsh words, even if they are 'more than just' (*Aj.* 1119: ὑπέροδ''). Teucer, however, in response to Menelaos' remark about his harsh tongue, maintains that one who has justice on his side is entitled to display pride or 'think big' (1125: ξὺν τῷ δικάίῳ γὰρ μέγ' ἔξεστιν φρονεῖν).⁶⁴ In the broader frame of the heated exchange between Teucer and the Atreids, the notion of shamelessness (αἰσχρόν) is repeatedly employed in connection with insults and accusations (e.g., 1159-62; 1307; 1320; 1324). In *Oedipus at Colonus*, Oedipus calls Kreon unjust because the latter considers it fine to utter every sort of words, including those which are forbidden – meaning his accusations against Oedipus – in the presence of the men of Kolonos, while at the same time not hesitating to flatter Theseus and Athens (1000-7).⁶⁵ Both impious, as well as public, blame and flattery are considered by Oedipus to be unjust ways of relating to others. Kreon, in his turn, bases his attempt to seize the suppliants upon his conviction that he simply repays Oedipus for the wrong he has done him – and thus considers his cause to be

64 Cf. Menelaos' words in 1087-88, on which see Cairns 1994: 78-79. See also Cairns 1996: 10-13 about the relation of *hybris* to behaviour and disposition. See also Finglass 2011-2012: 715.

65 Kreon acknowledges that he must yield to Theseus, given his own lack of power (951-59).

just (δίκαια); Oedipus' unjust conduct allegedly consists in the bitter curses he has been calling down on Kreon and his race.

Dike can finally be associated with one's rhetorical ability and aptness, which, on certain occasions, is viewed as a means for manipulating the truth or a just plea/cause. Again in *Oedipus at Colonus*, Oedipus claims that Kreon would derive a crafty trick from any just plea (761). Kreon is a clever speaker (δεινός),⁶⁶ but no just man can produce from every side a pretty speech: ἄνδρα δ' οὐδὲν οἷδ' ἐγὼ δίκαιον ὅστις ἐξ ἅπαντος εὖ λέγει (806-7). Righteousness or justice pose certain restrictions of objectivity. There are limitations to the causes or arguments for the sake of which the just man can use his rhetorical skills.⁶⁷

2.4. *Dike* and Conflicting Values or Considerations (Shamelessness, Sagacity, Expediency/Advantage)

The interplay between *dike* and other values or considerations is hardly ever uncomplicated. An action's expected consequences or results might weigh more heavily than its righteousness on a character's motivation. Chrysothemis in *Electra* overtly claims that τὸ δίκαιον is not on her side, but on her sister's (338-39); what she prioritizes, in her view, is good sense, thoughtfulness or sagacity (394: εὖ φρονεῖν; 398: μὴ ἔξ ἀβουλίας πεσεῖν; 429:

66 Cf. *OT* 545, where Oedipus uses the same characterization of Kreon (λέγειν σὺ δεινός).

67 Cf. Polyneikes' *gnome* in *Phoenissae*: the words of truth and the just things are naturally simple and, therefore do not need subtle interpretations, while ἄδικος λόγος requires clever treatment, since it is sick in itself (469-70). This contrast implies a close connection between truth and *dike*, as well as between lying or distorting the truth and ἄδικία. ἄδικος λόγος should be manipulated so as not to appear as such. See also Meltzer 2006: 42. In *Philoctetes*, the eponymous hero claims that Odysseus would put his tongue to any base tale and to any mischief-making, if thereby he could hope to accomplish something criminal (405-9: μηδὲν δίκαιον). The interplay, or rather discrepancy, between beautiful or clever words and unjust deeds is a recurring consideration in *Medea*. After Jason's speech in the first *agon*, the Chorus remark that the hero has polished his words beautifully (εὖ ἐκόσμησας λόγους) but his deeds are unjust (576-78: οὐ δίκαια δοῶν). Medea argues that clever speaking (σοφούς λέγειν) is not an advantage to the unjust (ἄδικος); on the contrary, it is something that ensures their downfall (579-85). Cf. 1225-27.

μηδ' ἀβουλία πεσεῖν).⁶⁸ Chrysothemis must yield in all ways (πάντ')⁶⁹ to those who hold greater power, since, paradoxically enough, she wishes to live in freedom (339-40).⁷⁰ Much later, in her second debate with her sister, she rather fleetingly utters the more general thought that *dike* can bring about damage (βλάβην). Elektra responds that she does not wish to live in a world governed by such laws (1042-43).

The quality of δίκαιον is brought together with the concept of αἰσχρόν in several Sophoclean contexts. Elektra characterizes Klytemnestra's admission (λόγος) that she killed her husband as *par excellence* shameful (αἰσχίων), regardless of whether Agamemnon's killing was just (δίκαιον). In his influential study on Greek values, Adkins (1960: 156, 185-86) views the opposition between a just and an honourable deed (δίκαιον versus καλόν, the opposite of αἰσχρόν), which replaces the opposition of *dike* to *dike* in Aeschylus, as an attempted solution to the problem of interfamilial revenge. This scheme would make the quality of αἰσχρόν more defining as a criterion for the assessment of one's conduct. Thus, a shameful action is condemnable, even if it is at the same time just, for δίκαιον is of less importance. However, Elektra here seems to draw a distinction between the quality of the deed and the quality of its public admission and communication, and suggest that the admission of even a just deed can be αἰσχρόν (558-60). The opposition is not really between two separate qualities of the deed (just – honourable) but between the deed (which might or might not be just) and the way in which the perpetrator speaks about it (which, on the particular occasion, is in both cases shameful).⁷¹ More significantly, it becomes evident

68 Earlier, however, Chrysothemis had stated that it is unfitting for two people to argue about something that is just (τὸ δίκαιον); instead, they should jump to action (466-67). For an account of other possible, yet not so satisfactory, interpretations see Finglass 2007 on *El.* 466-67. Cf. Neoptolemos' words in *Philoctetes*: ἀνθρώποισι τὰς μὲν ἐκ θεῶν / τύχας δοθείσας ἔστ' ἀναγκαῖον φέρειν / ὅσοι δ' ἔκουσίοισιν ἔγκεινται βλάβαις, / ὥσπερ σύ, τούτοις οὔτε συγγνώμην / ἔχειν δίκαιόν ἐστιν, οὔτ' ἐπιοικτίρειν τινά (1316-20).

69 Cf. Kreon's words in *Ant.* 666-67.

70 Elektra, however, argues that, if her sister had σωφροσύνη, she would detest the status that she now has (364).

71 Among others, Finglass 2007 on *El.* 558-60 and Stinton 1990: 470 argue that Elektra here concedes that the same act can be both αἰσχρόν and δίκαιον. Stinton claims that the two values are of a different scale, yet Elektra's definition of an act as both shameful and just is a paradox. However, it is not quite clear that Elektra concedes that the same act

that for Elektra, the real point of conflict is the *dike*, the righteousness or justice, of Klytemnestra's action. Her main speech (immediately following her initial remark about the αἰσχίων λόγος) manifestly aims at showing that the killing of Agamemnon was certainly unjust (560-61: λέξω δὲ σοι, / ὥς οὐ δίκη γ' ἔκτεινας).

In *Philoktetes*, Odysseus' and Neoptolemos' initial dispute, but also Neoptolemos', Philoktetes', and Odysseus' confrontation in the second part of the play shed light on the interplay between *dike* and a set of deep-rooted values, including shame, piety, and honour, as well as military duty and expediency. Despite the fact that the action is situated outside the boundaries of the *polis*, the involvement of a broader community and its hierarchical structure (notice, e.g., line 15 and line 53) substantially affects the way in which both Odysseus and Neoptolemos approach questions of righteousness and justice. The two heroes' present enterprise aims precisely at securing that the Greeks will win the war, and Helenos' ambiguous prophecy seems to make the willing participation of Philoktetes necessary. Thus, divine constraint, consideration for the common good, personal ambition, and major ethical values interact in a complex and dynamic way as the play unfolds.⁷²

This interplay is manifested already in the opening scene, where the situation is relevantly simple. Odysseus, a veteran of the army familiar with both the particulars of Helenos' prophecy and Philoktetes' nature, is fully

can be both shameful and just at this particular point. Shortly afterwards, she seems to do so, when she more or less explicitly acknowledges the shamefulness of some of her own actions or intentions (605-9; 620-21), which she, however, considers just and, therefore, required and acceptable. The identification of an act as both just and shameful is clear in Euripides' *Orestes*, where Elektra implicitly accepts the Chorus' claim that the matricide was just, yet she modifies it by clarifying that it was not well-done or honourable (194-95: καλῶς δ' οὐ). More perplexingly, the Chorus in Euripides' *Electra* admit that the defence of Klytemnestra is just but her justice is shameful (1051-53: δίκαι' ἔλεξας, ἡ δίκη δ' αἰσχρῶς ἔχει). However, this is not necessarily an aspect unknown to Aeschylus, as Adkins' argument suggests. In *Choephoroi* as well, Orestes feels shame (αἰδεσθῶ) at the thought of killing his mother, even if momentarily (899), but otherwise has no doubts about the justness of his cause. Cairns 2005: 309 points out that Klytemnestra's killing of Agamemnon is characterized as αἰσχρὸν already in the *Odyssey* (11.433) – though this does not refer to matricide as is the case with the tragic contexts we mentioned.

⁷² On this as well as other important aspects of the plays which relate to values and characterization see Poe 1974; Rose 1976: 49-105; Blundell 1987: 307-29; 1988: 137-48; Easterling 1983: 217-28; Ryzman 1991: 35-41.

concerned with the success of his plan, which will greatly benefit the Achaian army. Neoptolemos is reminded that, if he does not yield to Odysseus' instructions, he will bring great sorrow to all the Greeks (66-67). Odysseus knows that neither persuasion nor force are apt means for achieving their purpose. The only resource available is trickery, which is also the only pattern of conduct that Neoptolemos is not inclined to employ, due to his *physis* and inherited virtue (86-93). Neoptolemos prefers an honourable failure to a dishonourable victory (94-95). Odysseus' central thoughts relating to *dike* are the following: (1) The particular pattern of behaviour that he urges Neoptolemos to adopt is shameful (83-85: ἀναιδῶς), though he later claims that a lie is not disgraceful (αἰσχρόν) if it can save one's life (108-9). (2) It is important for someone to be pious and just, at least most of the times (82; cf. 1050-51), and (3) One should not recoil when an action brings him profit (111).⁷³

Odysseus urges Neoptolemos to act shamefully, ἀναιδῶς, momentarily (for one brief day) and then revert to being pious and respectful (εὐσεβέστατος) for the rest of his life. Both men will be shown to be δίκαιοι in the future (81-85).⁷⁴ In this context, the notions of *dike*, αἰδῶς and εὐσέβεια appear closely related. Odysseus seems to imply that their cause will be proven to be just in the future, through its results, even though their conduct on this very day might lack in αἰδῶς and εὐσέβεια. Odysseus does not seem to underestimate the importance of being εὐσεβής for the most part. In fact he declares much later that in the judgment of those who are δίκαιοι and ἀγαθοί, no-one is more εὐσεβής than himself (1050-51) – thus implying that the moral quality of those who assess one's conduct or moral quality should be taken into account.

After learning that the bow is necessary for his capture of Troy (115), which will bring him honour and good repute (119), Neoptolemos is persuaded to proceed with the plan, laying πᾶσαν αἰσχύνην aside (120).⁷⁵ Neoptolemos befriends Philoktetes and gets hold of his bow through skilful cunning (e.g., 585-88). However, upon being ready to sail to Greece, as Philoktetes thinks, the young hero is struck with remorse (895-916). At this

⁷³ See further Goldhill 1997: 142-45 about the use of rhetoric, language, and Odysseus' sophistic pragmatism in this particular exchange.

⁷⁴ Cf. *OT* 613-15.

⁷⁵ See Williams 1994: 197-98, n. 32.

stage, he is greatly tormented by his concern that he will appear shameless (906: αἰσχρὸς φανοῦμαι· τοῦτ ἀνιῶμαι πάλαι;) and that he might appear wicked for a second time by concealing the truth and uttering most disgraceful words (908-9: ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δράσω; δεύτερον ληφθῶ κακός, / κρύπτων θ' ἃ μὴ δεῖ καὶ λέγων αἰσχιστ' ἐπῶν;).⁷⁶ Neoptolemos eventually reveals the truth: harsh necessity demands that Philoktetes go to Troy (922). Philoktetes is quite expectedly enraged and asks for his bow; Neoptolemos, however, refuses to hand it back on the grounds that both the ἔνδικον and the συμφέρον demand that it be taken (926: ἔνδικον καὶ συμφέρον ποιεῖ). Thus, righteousness/duty and ambition/expediency are here harmonized in Neoptolemos' mind and point to the same end. At the same time, the tactics involved for reaching that end bring about disgrace, as he himself acknowledges – echoing, to some extent, Odysseus' reasoning and disposition in the opening scene.

Later, however, on top of the notion of shamelessness, which appeared to be of secondary importance when compared to duty/righteousness (ἔνδικον) and advantage (συμφέρον), Neoptolemos introduces the aspect of his action's wrongfulness. His conduct towards Philoktetes has not only been disgraceful (1228: ἀπάταισιν αἰσχροῖς καὶ δόλοις) but also unjust, at least as far as the snatching and keeping of the bow are concerned: αἰσχρῶς γὰρ αὐτὰ κοῦ δίκη λαβὼν ἔχω (1234). The two values (injustice and disgrace or dishonour) are no longer separated but work complementarily in making the hero's action unacceptable by his standards. The only remaining consideration in the spectrum is expediency. Eventually, Neoptolemos decides to return the bow, implying that doing what is δίκαιον can be more important than doing what is σοφόν (1246). The latter adjective can point either to the notion of wisdom and prudence or to that of skilfulness or cleverness (invested with negative implications).

Given the particular context, however, it seems more plausible that the former alternative holds, at least from Neoptolemos' point of view. Neoptolemos has just accused Odysseus of not saying anything σοφόν despite having being born σοφός – in response to the latter's threat about the Achaian army's intervention. Odysseus, in his turn, replies that Neoptolemos neither says nor does σοφά (1244-45). Thus, Neoptolemos at this point suggests that justice and wisdom do not necessarily go hand in hand

76 Cf. Philoktetes' words in 1284.

(1246); each can lead a person to very different or even opposite courses of action. Neoptolemos' choice to do what is δίκαιον even if it is not σοφόν might bring to mind the interplay between *dike* and the idea of benefit or damage in Elektra's and Chrysothemis' interaction. The two sisters had agreed on the definition of δίκαιον, but disagreed over the definition of σωφροσύνη. By contrast with Chrysothemis, Neoptolemos eventually seems to end up placing the value of δίκαιον, which deters him from carrying out the Achaeans' plan, above other considerations.

Odysseus, however, raises another objection, which does not consist in the imperative need for the success of the enterprise. He argues that it is not δίκαιον if Neoptolemos hands back the bow, for the latter managed to take it thanks to Odysseus' plotting (1247-48). This connects *dike* with the idea of ownership, acquisition or appropriation.⁷⁷ Neoptolemos cannot have a just claim on the bow he is now in possession of, for he did not acquire it by himself. Neoptolemos in his response completely ignores that parameter and focuses once more on his former disgraceful mistake (1248-49: τὴν ἀμαρτίαν / αἰσχρὰν ἀμαρτῶν ἀναλαβεῖν περιάσσομαι). His trust in the just nature of his cause (ξὺν τῷ δικαίῳ) also eliminates his fear of the army's reactions (1251) – introduced as a semi-threat by Odysseus.⁷⁸ Having given up any thoughts about using deception or force, and acting in accordance with both justice and honour, Neoptolemos attempts to persuade Philoktetes to follow him to Troy on his own free will (1332-34). When the latter refuses outright (1392), the young hero sticks to his commitment and undertakes to take him back to Greece (1402). The course of events is reversed by the *deus ex machina*, who shows up in order to reveal the will of Zeus (1415: Διὸς ... βουλευμάτα): Troy should be sacked by the two men. Herakles closes his speech by moralizing about Zeus' supreme power and the utmost importance of εὐσέβεια, which does not die along with mortals (1423-44).

77 Cf. OC 759-60 for a looser expression of the idea of 'ownership' in connection to that of *dike*. Kreon claims that, even though Athens is worthy, Thebes has the first claim on Oedipus' reverence (δίκη σέβειτ' ἄν), since it nurtured him for so long.

78 Even though he later expresses his concern about how he could escape the blame of the army and their probable attack on his homeland. Philoktetes assures him that he is going to assist him, for now the two men are true friends (1402-8; cf. 1383-85).

2.5. *Dikaïos, Kakos* and Time

When Oedipus accuses Kreon of conspiracy in *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the latter responds with a gnomic statement about the way in which men's moral status and disposition should be assessed (609-15). Shortly prior to this, Oedipus had told his brother-in-law that he is not sane if he thinks that he can harm a kinsman without suffering the penalty (551-52: ὑφέξειν τὴν δίκην). While acknowledging that Oedipus spoke justly (ἐνδίκ' εἰρησθαί), Kreon demanded to know in what way he had wronged Oedipus (553-54). After the king's relevant response, Kreon utters the generalization that it is not just if one considers those who are virtuous wicked, and the other way around, on unproven inference (609-10: οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον οὔτε τοὺς κακοὺς μάτην / χρηστοὺς νομίζειν οὔτε τοὺς χρηστοὺς κακοὺς). Combined with his subsequent reference to the just man (δίκαιον ἄνδρα), as opposed to the bad man (κακόν), it seems that χρηστός in this context is used as a virtual synonym for δίκαιος. The criterion that Kreon introduces is time, which will safely show Oedipus (ἐν χρόνῳ γνώσῃ τάδ' ἀσφαλῶς) that he has not committed any injustice against him and, therefore, he has been a true friend.⁷⁹ The course of events and the accumulation of evidence will indeed prove that Kreon has not been plotting against the king. More generally, in situations in which there is difficulty in recognizing a just conduct as one, only time can and will provide the answer.⁸⁰

By contrast, a wicked man can be discerned in a single day: κακὸν δὲ καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ γνούςῃ μᾶ. If the subject of the Greek phrase is Oedipus, Kreon seems to be accusing the hero of jumping to quick and superficial conclusions.⁸¹ Time as the only (trustworthy) assessor of just men is brought in direct contrast with the hasty and misguided Oedipus. The Chorus im-

79 Cf. 1213-15: Time, who sees everything, has found Oedipus out and judges his monstrous marriage. The hero gets to know himself and gets ruined in a single day. See further Segal 1981: 228-31; Segal 1995: 138-60. For the idea of time as revealer of the truth cf. Pind. *Ol.* 1.33-34 and *Nem.* 4.41-43.

80 This might remind us of one of the most characteristic ideas in the play; no man can be considered blessed before he ends his life.

81 Shortly afterwards, when criticizing Oedipus' vehemence and excessive wrath, Kreon states that natures such as Oedipus' are justly (δικαίως) most difficult for themselves to bear (673-75). For this use of the term 'nature' and its connection with current medical discourse, see Knox 1998: 142-43.

mediately afterwards remarks on the dangers of quick, unsafe thinking (616-17). If the phrase more vaguely means that one can discern a bad man in a single day, the implication would be that a short period of time is enough for the bad man to be revealed and, thus, Oedipus would most probably already have known that Kreon was bad. In this case, time relates differently to men who are just and men who are wicked. Whilst a single day is enough for the bad man to be revealed, a man has to be consistently or diachronically just be revealed by time as being one.

2.6. *Dike* and Consciousness – Motivation

It is doubtful whether one who commits an outrage unconsciously (e.g., without having full knowledge of the related facts) and/or while having good intentions can be justly blamed. This idea is not commonly explored in tragedy, as opposed to the question of whether a human agent who follows a divine command or fulfills a divine oracle can be justly blamed.

In the case of Oedipus, both factors, that of divine planning and that of human consciousness, are brought together in Oedipus' interpretation and assessment of the *dike* of his own actions (*OC* 545-47, 960-99).⁸² The combination of these two factors makes Oedipus assert that he cannot justly be held accountable, neither for his slaying of Laios nor for his marriage with Jokasta (notably 270-74 and 989-90). The key notions involved are knowledge, wilfulness, and motivation, which, in Oedipus' view, are inseparably connected to the issue of moral guilt or reprehensibility. Already in the first episode (266-91), and while attempting to extract the support of the men of Kolonos, Oedipus lays out three reasons for which he cannot be considered evil (κακός)⁸³ in reference to his interfamilial affairs. (1) He claims to know full well that his acts had been in suffering rather than doing (266-67; cf. 521-23, 537-38). (2) Even if he had been acting in knowledge, he cannot be accounted innately wicked (κακὸς φύσιν), because he was merely defending himself (παθὼν μὲν ἀντέδρων). Therefore, his reaction would be justifiable and would not say anything bad about his nature. (3) As it is, he was

82 Antigone has already hinted at her father's guiltlessness on the grounds of his ignorance and lack of wilfulness (239-40: ἔργων / ἀκόντων ἀίοντες αὐδάν).

83 The term and its cognates figure very frequently in his speech.

totally ignorant of his actions (οὐδὲν εἰδώς), by contrast with those who wronged him and sought his ruin knowingly (εἰδότες). Oedipus concludes with moralizing statements about the need for piety and his self-definition as someone sacred and pious, who brings benefit to the people of Athens.

The notion of *dike* and its explicit connection with consciousness comes in later (545-48), when Oedipus responds to the Chorus' string of questions about the notorious events of his history. While admitting that he murdered his father, Oedipus clarifies that he does have some plea of justice (πρὸς δίκας τι); he murdered Laios in ignorance (ἄιδρις: cf. 525) and is, therefore, pure before the law (νόμῳ δὲ καθαρός).

In his confrontation with Kreon, Oedipus elaborates on the three major points of his rhetoric in the first episode (acting in ignorance and self-defence, and ultimately suffering rather than doing), while also emphasizing the factor of divine involvement – which can decisively influence both human knowledge and human will. All the miseries that befell Oedipus were not his choice (ἄκων), as he asserts, but they were dear to the gods (964). Shortly afterwards, he makes this far more emphatic by claiming that he had actually been led by the gods (998: θεῶν ἀγόντων). Oedipus repeatedly employs words associated with ignorance and involuntariness (μηδὲν ξυνιείς, οὐκ εἰδότες, ἄκων, τὸ ἄκον προἄγμ').

The murder of Laios had been dictated by an oracle, which dated back to the days when Oedipus was still unborn. The hero therefore considers that he cannot be justly blamed (971: πῶς ἂν δικαίως τοῦτ' ὀνειδίζοις ἐμοί;). As he has done before, when juxtaposing his unconscious acts with the conduct of those who wronged him knowingly, he now directly juxtaposes his involuntary deeds, as well as his reluctant recollection of them (985-86: ἐγὼ δέ νιν / ἄκων ἔγημα φθέγγομαι τ' ἄκων τάδε), with Kreon's wilful accusations (984-85: σὲ μὲν ἐκόντ' ἐμὲ / κείνην τε ταῦτα δυσστομεῖν). Oedipus slew his father ignorant of what he was doing and to whom, and he, likewise, married his mother without being aware of her identity; thus, he cannot reasonably be blamed for an unwitting deed (975-76: μηδὲν ξυνιείς ὦν ἔδρων εἰς οὓς τ' ἔδρων, / πῶς ἂν τὸ γ' ἄκον προἄγμ' ἂν εἰκότως ψέγοις;). Kreon, 'the just man' (992: δίκαιος), as Oedipus calls him,⁸⁴ would have done the same thing if his life were under threat, that is he

⁸⁴ Oedipus straight afterwards declares that Kreon is in fact not δίκαιος, on account of the way in which he relates to both Oedipus himself and the people of Athens (1000-7).

would have avenged the man who was trying to kill him rather than inquiring into whether that man could have been his father or looking for a justification (991-96). Oedipus did no more than any just or reasonable man would have done in a similar situation. In this context, the notion of εἰκός (meaning *reasonable, suitable, fair*) and that of δίκαιον appear closely related.⁸⁵

Oedipus' elaboration on his moral guiltlessness alongside his perception of his taint, which prevents him, for instance, from even daring to touch Theseus, as well as the way in which he is received by the Athenian community, are complex issues and would require much more thorough consideration.⁸⁶ What is interesting for our purpose is the explicit connection of just reproach with the factors of knowledge, wilfulness, and intentionality.

The other relevant case is Deianeira, whose plan, meant to restore her to her position as the 'true' wife of Herakles,⁸⁷ goes seriously wrong and results in the latter's death. A difference lies in the fact that Deianeira had been actively deceived but she had also knowingly engaged in an enterprise which she herself considered shameful and, to some extent, risky. Moreover, this time it is not the perpetrator, i.e., Deianeira, who argues for or even believes in her moral innocence. As regards the issue of moral culpability, the focus is shifted to the way in which Deianeira is or should be treated by other members of the community – her victim included – given the fact that she acted with good intentions and while lacking knowledge of all related facts.

In this case as well, the element of the supernatural plays a large part through the involvement of Nessos (which determines the outcome of Deianeira's action) and Zeus' oracle (which dictated Heracles' death). Deianeira's way of finding deliverance involves the use of a love-spell offered to her as a gift by Nessos. She imbues Heracles' robe with the blood of the Centaur, which is envenomed with black bane from the gall of the Lernaean hydra, making sure to follow carefully every instruction that the monster had given her while he lived (*Trach.* 553-87).⁸⁸ Deianeira, however, has to overcome – and actually does overcome – two possible complications. The first one,

85 Cf. Soph. *El.* 540-41.

86 See Bowra 1944: 317; Knox 1998; Winnington-Ingram 1980: 261-64; Blundell 1989: 226-59. Cf. Goldhill 1990; Griffith 1996; Markantonatos 2007: 84-85.

87 She fears lest Herakles, though called hers, turns out to be the man of the young Iole (550-51).

88 Notice the ambiguity in 575-77.

which has to do with practical parameters, consists in her doubts about the effectiveness of the charm, which lead her to seek the reassurance and advice of the Chorus (586-87, 590-91). The women respond that, if there is any promise of success, her plan is wise (588-89), for after all, knowledge comes only through action and experience (592-93). The second possible obstacle could be Deianeira's condemnation of women who engage in deeds of wicked daring and her consideration of her own act as shameful (582-83). Nevertheless, she soon decides to carry on with her plan if this is the only way by which she can prevail over the slave-girl, all the more so since even shameful deeds, when done in darkness, never bring disgrace (596-97).⁸⁹ This generalization places the stress on one's social image rather than an internalized feeling of shame.⁹⁰

In accord with the Chorus' view that knowledge comes through experience, Deianeira realizes the actual effects of the poison through an accidental experiment – and shortly before learning from Hyllos that Herakles is dying because of this same poison. For Deianeira, it now makes perfect sense that Nessos could not had been well-intended and that the poison would have disastrous effects, given its nature and origin (705-18). She goes on to emphasize her all-too-active involvement (729-30: ὁ τοῦ κακοῦ κοινωνός), in response to the Chorus' remark that in the case of those whose mistakes are unwitting, men's anger is softened (725-26). The Chorus is at this point concerned with the external, emotional response to the deed (that is, the way in which external agents assess it and relate to its perpetrator) rather than the perpetrator's status itself (that is, if and to what extent he/she should be held accountable). Hyllos, on the other hand, himself lacking knowledge of all relevant facts, as his mother did earlier, not only considers Deianeira guilty but also demands her harsh punishment, which he certainly considers just. After graphically describing his father's agony, he wishes that ποίνιμος Δίκη and the Erinyes might repay her with ills – since he is convinced that this is a premeditated murder. Hyllos does not omit to assert that his prayer is sanctioned (θέμις), for his mother has spurned all sanctity (θέμις) by killing the best of men (808-12). Deianeira withdraws in complete silence (813-14) and commits suicide, for, as she had earlier declared, she cannot live with a bad

89 See also Cairns 1993: 360, n. 52 and 363, n. 59.

90 Cf. Williams 1994 for the generally compelling view that shame (αἰδώς) for the Greeks is an ethical notion connected with inner self-evaluation and not only external reward.

reputation (721-22) – again putting the stress on the factor of external assessment. In the ensuing *stasimon*, the women bring in the old oracle that dictated Heracles' death (821-30; cf. 1023), while stressing that Deianeira, though having committed the deed, heeded the words of a stranger – who, as it turned out, had vengeful intentions – and could not have foreseen these developments (841-45). The women are certain that Kypriis is behind all this (860-61; cf. 515-16).

The question of Deianeira's moral culpability is complex and beyond our scope.⁹¹ What is associated with *dike*, though quite implicitly, is the aspect of her good intention. After finding out that Deianeira did not deliberately kill Heracles (945), Hyllos feels great regret. At the same time, he considers that order or rectitude (1116: ὦν δίκαια τυγχάνειν) require that his father learn the truth and thereby realize that the vengeful joy he seeks (1035-40, 1068-69, 1108-11, 1133) is empty. It is probably not without significance that Hyllos informs Herakles of Deianeira's involuntary error (1123: ἤμαρτεν οὐχ ἐκουσία) before informing him of her death, for that detail strengthens the implication that, even if Deianeira were alive, in Hyllos' view, she should not have been punished. It is clearly suggested that there is no point in seeking to avenge an involuntary harm-doing, while it is probably implied that avenging it would be unjust. Shortly afterwards, Hyllos clarifies that his mother not only made a mistake but her mistake was a product of a good intention (1136: ἤμαρτε χρηστὰ μωμένη). Herakles does not respond to this, and in fact soon seems to be losing any interest in his wife's actions and lot; he, however, later states that he has been killed by the Centaur – and thus the oracle came true (1163-64). Hyllos, in his turn, refers to Iole as the killer of both of his parents (1233-37; cf. 893-95), while the play closes with his famous expression of resentment towards the gods. Ultimately, none of these affairs are 'without Zeus'.

91 Whitman 1951: 111 and 114 stresses Deianeira's intellectual incompetence and considers the issue of her moral culpability rather off-point. Other works that focus on Deianeira's naïveté, ignorance, and trustfulness include Kirkwood 1941: 205; Musurillo 1961: 377; Easterling 1968: 63; Segal 1977: 125. For more mixed or nuanced views in regard to her probable guilt see Hester 1980: 1; Leinieks 1982: 28; Carawan 2000: 189-237.

3. CONCLUSION

Sophocles explores the idea of *dike* from a variety of viewpoints. Particularly when it relates to acts of vengeance or religious imperatives, its connection to the divine world remains strong and unquestionable. This is especially true for *Electra*, where Apollo's oracle inevitably introduces the question of theodicy, and, to some extent, *Antigone* and *Ajax*, which address the fundamental religious issue of proper disposal of the dead. We could argue that these plays present us with some of the standard conceptions of *dike*, treated either as the familiar goddess, the close companion of Zeus and the Erinyes, or a value closely related to or virtually identified with just retaliation, which is itself considered a part of the divine order.

Yet, *dike* is also viewed in conjunction with ideas, conceptions or considerations unrelated to the interplay between divine necessity and human agency, as well as to broader sociopolitical values. The (verbal) association of *dike* with a cosmic order is highly characteristic of Aeschylus, while its association with institutions of the (democratic) *polis* (notably equality before the law, freedom, and fair share) is a distinctive Euripidean feature.⁹² Many of the notions or ideas that are associated with *dike* in Sophocles, rather than becoming a subject of either transcendental or political thinking, are manifested in interpersonal, small-scale interaction and might relate to isolated behavioural instances, which however might bear strong ethical implications (i.e., truth-telling, restraint in reproach, honesty, shamelessness), more abstract, as well as neutral, notions (time), or factual considerations and aspects (expediency, consciousness, intentionality). *Dike* becomes more extensively intertwined with the individual's particular condition and inner, both emotional and cognitive, world (fears, vulnerabilities, ambitions, knowledge, motives).⁹³ Sophoclean characters show an increased interest in reflecting on

⁹² See Papadodima 2011.

⁹³ The fact that different tragic characters interpret values in different ways is of course a standard reality in tragedy. See particularly Vernant & Vidal-Naquet 1981: Ch. 2. According to Cairns 2005: 306: 'Tragedy is thus ethically polyphonic, and the dramatic context, the character's agenda, and the presentation of the character as the focus of sympathy or antipathy all matter in any interpretation of their values.' What is interesting is the particular way in (and the particular degree to) which individual plays or authors explore the different interpretations of the same values.

or assessing the quality of δίκαιον – as applying to the actions of others but also their own: (1) in conjunction with individual, both emotional and cognitive, parameters, such as one's degree of awareness or particular motivation (Oedipus, Deianeira), or the effects that one's particular status in society might have on one's morale and disposition (Kreon, Chrysothemis), and (2) in conjunction with potentially conflicting (broadly ethical rather than narrowly political) values (notably that of honour (καλόν)). Even the characters who decide to prioritize a different, conflicting value (Neoptolemos, Odysseus, Chrysothemis, Kreon in *Antigone* (in a far more indirect way)⁹⁴) are presented as having a solid conception of what is just and of the reasons for their choice not to follow it.

94 Kreon does not question the justice or righteousness of his actions in regard to his treatment of Polyneikes and Antigone (at least prior to his fall) but does claim that the good and just citizen should obey the ruler in both his just and his unjust decisions (666-67).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkins, A.W.H. 1960. *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values*. Oxford.
- Adkins, A.W.H. 1966. 'Basic Greek Values in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Hercules Furens*' CQ 16, 193-219.
- Adkins, A.W.H. 1972. *Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the End of the Fifth Century*. London.
- Alexanderson, B. 1966. 'On Sophocles' *Electra*' C&M 27, 79-98.
- Almeida, J. 2003. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems*. Leiden.
- Belfiore, E. 2000. *Murder among Friends: Violations of Philia in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Blundell, M.W. 1987. 'The Moral Character of Odysseus in *Philoctetes*' GRBS 28, 307-29.
- Blundell, M.W. 1988. 'The Physis of Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*' G&R 35, 137-48.
- Blundell, M.W. 1989. *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*. Cambridge.

- Bowra, C.M. 1944. *Sophoclean Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Budelmann, F. 2000. *The Language of Sophocles: Communal, Communication and Involvement*. Cambridge.
- Burnett, A.P. 1971. *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal*. Oxford.
- Burnett, A.P. 1998. *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy*. Berkeley.
- Cairns, D. 1993. *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Cairns, D. 1994. 'N.R.E. Fisher: Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece' *CR* 44, 76-79.
- Cairns, D. 1996. 'Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big' *JHS* 116, 1-32.
- Cairns, D. 2005. 'Values' in J. Gregory (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Oxford, 305-20.
- Carawan, E. 2000. 'Deianira's Guilt' *TAPA* 130, 189-237.
- Connor, W.R. 1971. *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Princeton.
- Davidson, J.F. 1988. 'Homer and Sophocles' *Electra*' *BICS* 35, 45-72.
- Davies, M. 1984. 'Lichas' Lying Tale: Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 26off.' *CQ* 34, 480-91.
- Dawe, R.D. 1973. *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*. Leiden.
- Dickie, M.W. 1978. 'Dike as a Moral Term in Homer and Hesiod' *CPh* 73, 91-101.
- Dover, K.J. 1974. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Berkeley.
- Dunn, F. 1998. 'Orestes and the Urn (Sophocles, *Electra* 54-55)' *Mnemosyne* 51, 438-43.
- Easterling, P.E. 1968. 'Sophocles' *Trachiniae*' *BICS* 15, 58-69.
- Easterling, P.E. 1983. 'Philoctetes and Modern Criticism' in E. Segal (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford, 217-28. Originally published in *ICS* 3 (1978), 27-39.
- Euben, J. 1986. 'Political Corruption in Euripides' *Orestes*' in J. Euben (ed.) *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 222-51.
- Finglass, P.J. 2005. 'Is There a Polis in Sophocles' *Electra*?' *Phoenix* 59, 199-209.
- Finglass, P.J. 2007. *Sophocles: Electra*. Cambridge & New York.
- Finglass, P.J. 2011-2012. *Sophocles: Ajax*. Cambridge & New York.
- Foley, H.P. 2001. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton.

- Friis Johansen, H. 1964. 'Die Elektra des Sophokles: Versuch einer neuen Deutung' *C&M* 25, 8-32.
- Gagarin, M. 1973. 'Dike in the *Works and Days*' *CPh* 68, 81-94.
- Gagarin, M. 1974. 'Dike in Archaic Greek Thought' *CPh* 69, 186-97.
- Gagarin, M. 1976. *Aeschylean Drama*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Garner, R. 1987. *Law and Society in Classical Athens*. Athens, London, Sydney.
- Garvie, A.F. 1986. *Aeschylus: Choephoroi*. Oxford.
- Gasti, H. 2002. 'The Free Indirect Speech in Sophocles' *Electra* 32-37: A Tentative Hypothesis' *Hellenika* 52/1, 7-15 [in Greek, with an English summary].
- Gellie, G.H. 1972. *Sophocles: A Reading*. Melbourne.
- Goldhill, S. 1990. 'Character and Action, Representation and Reading Greek Tragedy and its Critics' in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.) *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford, 100-27.
- Goldhill, S. 1997. 'The Language of Tragedy: Rhetoric and Communication' in P. Easterling (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, 127-50.
- Griffith, R.D. 1996. *The Theater of Apollo: Divine Justice and Sophocles' Oedipus the King*. Montreal.
- Griffin, J. 1999. 'Sophocles and the Democratic City' in J. Griffin (ed.) *Sophocles Revisited: Essays in Honour of Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford, 73-94.
- Halleran, M.R. 1986. 'Lichas' Lies and Sophoclean Innovation' *GRBS* 27, 239-47.
- Havelock, E.A. 1978. *The Greek Concept of Justice: From Its Shadow in Homer to Its Substance in Plato*. Cambridge, MA.
- Heath, M. 1987. *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*. Stanford.
- Heiden, B. 1988. 'Lichas' Rhetoric of Justice in Sophocles' "Trachiniae" *Hermes* 116, 13-23.
- Hesk, J. 2003. *Sophocles: Ajax*. London.
- Hester, D.A. 1980. 'Deianeira's "Deception Speech"' *Antichthon* 14, 1-8.
- Jebb, R. 1891. *Sophocles: Antigone*. Cambridge.
- Jebb, R. 1894. *Sophocles: Electra*. Cambridge.
- Kamerbeek, J.C. 1974. *The Plays of Sophocles. Part V: The Electra*. Leiden.
- Kells, J.H. 1973. *Sophocles' Electra*. Cambridge.
- Kirkwood, G.M. 1941. 'The Dramatic Unity of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*' *TAPA* 72, 203-11.

- Knox, B.M.W. 1964. *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Knox, B.M.W. 1998 (reissued). *Oedipus at Thebes: Sophocles' Tragic Hero and His Time*. New Haven.
- Konstan, D. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Greek Literature*. Toronto, Buffalo, London.
- Leinieks, V. 1982. *The Plays of Sophocles*. Amsterdam.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. *The Justice of Zeus* (2nd ed.). Berkeley.
- McDevitt, A.S. 1983. 'Shame, Honour and the Hero in Sophocles' *Electra*' *Antichthon* 17, 1-12.
- Machin, A. 1981. *Cohérence et Continuité dans la Theatre de Sophocle*. Québec.
- MacLeod, L. 2001. *Dolos and Dike in Sophocles' Electra*. Leiden.
- March, J.R. 2001. *Sophocles: Electra*. Warminster.
- Markantonatos, A. 2007. *Oedipus at Colonus: Sophocles, Athens, and the World*. Berlin.
- Meltzer, G.S. 2006. *Euripides and the Poetics of Nostalgia*. Cambridge, New York.
- Mossman, J. 1995. *Wild Justice: a Study of Euripides' Hecuba*. Oxford.
- Musurillo, H. 1961. 'Fortune's Wheel: The Symbolism of Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*' *TAPA* 92, 372-83.
- Nussbaum, M. 1986. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Nussbaum, M. 2003. 'Tragedy and Justice' *Boston Review*, October/December 2003.
- Papadodima, E. 2011. 'Forms and Conceptions of *dike* in *Heracleidae*, *Suppliants*, and *Phoenissae*' *Philologus* 155.
- Poe, J.P. 1974. *Heroism and Divine Justice in Sophocles' Philoctetes*. Leiden.
- Reinhardt, K. 1979. *Sophocles* (English translation). Oxford.
- Rodgers, V.A. 1971. 'Some Thoughts on *Dike*' *CQ* 21, 289-301.
- Rose, P. 1976. 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the Teachings of the Sophists' *HSCPh* 80, 49-105.
- Ryzman, M. 1991. 'Neoptolemus' Psychological Crisis and the Development of Physis in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*' *Erano*s 89, 35-41.
- Schein, S.L. 1982. 'Electra: a Sophoclean Problem Play' *Antike und Abendland* 28, 69-80.

- Seaford, R. 1985. 'The Destruction of Limits in Sophocles' *Electra*' *CQ* 35, 315-23.
- Seale, D. 1982 *Vision and Stagecraft in Sophocles*. London & Canberra.
- Segal, C. 1966. 'The *Electra* of Sophocles' *TAPA* 97, 473-545.
- Segal, C. 1977. 'Sophocles' *Trachiniae*: Myth, Poetry, Heroic Values' *YCS* 25, 99-158.
- Segal, C. 1981. *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles*. Cambridge, MA.
- Segal, C. 1995. *Sophocles' Tragic World*. Cambridge, MA.
- Sheppard, J.T. 1927. '*Electra*: a Defence of Sophocles' *CR* 41, 2-9.
- Stevens, P.T. 1978. 'Sophocles: *Electra*, Doom or Triumph' *G&R* 25, 111-20.
- Stinton, T.C.W. 1990. *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Vernant, J.P. & Vidal-Naquet, P. 1981. *Tragedy and Myth in Ancient Greece* (English translation). Brighton, NJ.
- Whitman, C.H. 1951. *Sophocles: A Study of Heroic Humanism*. Cambridge, MA.
- Williams, B. 1994. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles.
- Williams, B. 1996. 'The *Women of Trachis*: Fictions, Pessimism, Ethics' in R.B. Louden & P. Schollmeier (eds.) *The Greeks and Us: Essays in Honour of Arthur W.H. Adkins*. Chicago, 43-65.
- Winnington-Ingram, R.P. 1980. *Sophocles: An Interpretation*. Cambridge.

MARGINAL LAND, ITS BOUNDARIES, AND THE RUPESTRAL HOROI OF ATTICA

By Jens A. Krasilnikoff

Summary: This study discusses whether the rupestral ὄροι were in fact demarcating plots of marginal land otherwise known from the extant literary evidence, including the dominant Attic categories of ἐσχατιά and φελλεύς. The author argues that the development of marginal farming during the Classical and well into the Roman period induced entrepreneurs to claim ownership of productive lands in the hilly tracts of Attica. The rupestral ὄροι are best understood as reflections of this development, as markers of the economic landscape and as demarcations of the space from which members of corporate groups or individual farmers extracted a variety of different resources.

INTRODUCTION

It was Heracles who gave it this shape by bending it round with his hand, but I cannot say whether he set it to be a boundary mark against the Asineans in Argolis, since in no land, which has been abandoned, is it easy to discover the truth about the boundaries.

Pausanias, 2.28.2.

Modern scholars have often associated marginal land in Greek antiquity with notions and concepts of boundaries, liminality and transgression; and ostensibly, marginal land has been identified as elements of boundaries or boundary zones between states. Incontrovertibly, however, marginal land also emerges in the literary evidence as distinct types and ranges of producti-

Jens A. Krasilnikoff 'Marginal Land, its Boundaries, and the Rupestral ὄροι of Attica.' *CEM* 61 (2010) 49-69. © 2010 Museum Tusculanum Press • www.mtp.dk/classicaetmediaevalia

ve land, which in the case of Classical Attica were known as ἐσχατιά and φελλεύς. Yet, although various aspects of the history of marginal land and the wilderness have been clarified in recent years, little is understood of how they were organised as productive lands and how they aligned with the features of Mediterranean landscape categories (Jameson 2002: 63; Krasilnikoff 2008b: 45-46).

Moreover, the discovery of a number of boundary markers cut into the living rock in remote and marginal places in the southern part of Attica, on horizontal natural rock on ridges and saddles and on slopes in hilly country, adds further relevance to the renewed interest in marginal lands and their boundaries. To judge from the above-cited passage by Pausanias, the precise meaning of boundaries may have puzzled observers in later periods of antiquity. Thus, meanings are lost and local knowledge as well as contemporary contexts may be called upon in order to make sense out of particular contexts to second and third parties.¹ New approaches may, however, prove rewarding. Continually, scholars have understood the rupestral ὄροι as markers of deme boundaries and other subsections of Attica's geopolitical order of the late Classical through the Roman periods; and, subsequently, others have interpreted them as markers of the economic landscape.² Recently, however, it has been suggested that the range of epigraphic variation and the non-official character of this particular category of ὄροι probably indicate private and local origins rather than the physical manifestation of official and centralised state initiative. Hence, the purpose of this study is to discuss the possibility that the rupestral ὄροι were in fact demarcating plots of marginal land otherwise known from the extant literary evidence, including the dominant Attic categories of ἐσχατιά and φελλεύς. To do so, I shall first present an account of productive land and its boundaries and then discuss rupestral ὄροι as markers of marginal land.

1 See also Ober 1995: 115-21.

2 Langdon 1985a: 5-15, argued for clearly defined territories and boundaries, and thus against Thompson's (1971) position in favour of the 'constitutional' deme concept. Ober (1981) suggested early that markers on Alepovouni at Mount Hymettos had an economic function; see Langdon 1999: 494-99. The possibility that sequences of rupestral ὄροι demarcated pastoral land was considered by Stanton 1984: 301 and 1996: 341; 353-55; Jones 1999: 61. Goette 1994: 128 lists several potential objects and purposes of demarcation by ὄροι but apparently rules out productive land as a possibility.

I. MARGINAL LAND

ἐσχατιὰ and φελλεύς³

Attic farming involved the cultivation of fields (often termed χωρία and ἀγρός) organised in patchwork patterns in the numerous larger and smaller plains of the peninsula.⁴ Additionally, the evidence suggests that Attic farmers cultivated what has been called marginal lands where ἐσχατιαί and φελλεῖς appear to have been the predominant types.⁵ In addition, an assortment of entrepreneurs earned a livelihood by extracting resources from the mountainous regions of the peninsula (ὄρη).⁶

Until recently, Attic ἐσχατιὰ was believed to be a genus phrase denoting 'land at the borders' of the πόλις territory and in the border regions of demes, defined primarily by its geographic location and orientation.⁷ So apparently the etymology of the phrase rather than the actual features and

3 For a detailed discussion of the relationship between ἐσχατιὰ and φελλεύς, see Krasilnikoff 2008b: esp. 45-48.

4 The evidence for this type of field grid in Attica is, however, circumstantial. See further Burford 1993: 109-19, esp. 112. The terminology of productive land is treated in Osborne 1985: 15-22.

5 At least one other type is known from Attica: ἔλος, which seems to denote wetlands and marshes.

6 See further Jameson 1989: esp. 9; Olson 1991: passim, on wood enterprises and charcoal, and Buxton 1994: 81-84, on the many activities of the ὄρη. Forbes 1996 and 1997: esp. 195-206, the contributions in Kardulias & Shutes 1997 and the many observations in Grove & Rackham 2002 consider the economic potential of the wilderness. Little reflection on this subject is found in the publications of survey projects. Treatments of animal husbandry are found in Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 83-107 and Burford 1993: 144-59. Recently, Howe (2008) introduced the concept of 'Pastoral Politics', confining animal husbandry to elitist activities and mental construction; see a critique of this view in Krasilnikoff 2009.

7 *LSJ* s.v. ἐσχατιὰ. Lewis 1973: 210-12, suggested that Attic ἐσχατιὰ was essentially productive land to be found in hilly country, and finds most of the Attic ἐσχατιαί '... nowhere near the frontier or the sea ...', whereas Burford 1993: 111-12 confined them to border regions. To Lambert (1997: 225-34), the occurrences of ἐσχατιαί in the *Rationes Centesimarum* suggested a wider distribution throughout Attica. The meaning of ἐσχατιὰ outside Attica is somewhat obscure. For a general and conservative definition predominantly relying on Attic evidence and the *Suda*, see Chandezon 2003: 337. For discussions on the process of public sales of state property, see Hallof 1990: 402-26, and the response by Langdon 1994: 253-65.

nature of this type of land in Attica has been the guide to its definition. As we shall see, however, this explanation encapsulates neither the quality nor the nature of Attic ἐσχατιά.

Recently, Jameson suggested an alternative definition: ‘... *eschatia* in Attic usage refers to property in land that required terracing, or other attentive land management, if it is to be used for crop production, whether of field crops, vines or trees. It is marginal land in the sense that it is at the limits of cultivable land in whatever drainage it occurs, so it will often be on the lower slopes of hills or mountains or in their vicinity’ (Jameson 2002: 65). In a sense, Jameson’s definition fixes Attic ἐσχατιά as a distinct type of land situated above rather than beyond the farmland (ἀγρός) of the plains (πεδία). Additionally, the evidence for Attic ἐσχατιά suggests that it was planted with grain and vine (e.g., Ps.-Demosthenes *Or.* 42.7). Jameson’s general position in favour of terraces in Greek antiquity has gained support from the recent rather courteous but basically positive evaluation by Price and Nixon.⁸ Still, Price and Nixon seem to place little confidence in the findings and arguments that ancient terraces were employed in Southern Attica and the Hymettos region.⁹

Attic ἐσχατιά should therefore basically be perceived as cultivated land in hilly tracts, on the fringes of the plains but not necessarily located at and thus not constituting, the very deme or state border. What is more, in the southernmost demes of Attica it appears as if ἐσχατιαί are to be found close to places of residence.¹⁰ Additionally, we should think of ἐσχατιά as land where laborious effort was invested in preparing for cultivating the traditional crops of Mediterranean farming. That is to say, construction and modification took place at these sites in order to make them feasible for agricultural exploitation.

Another type of marginal land – φελλεύς – was peculiar to late Classical Attica. According to one of its earliest researchers, the dominant feature of

8 Price & Nixon 2005: passim. On the outline of agricultural terraces, past and present, see Rackham and Moody 1992: 123-30. In support of ancient agricultural terraces on the western slopes of Hymettos, Langdon (1999: 503-4) refers to I. Dekoulakou, *ArchDelt* 38 (1983) B1, 43.

9 Price & Nixon 2005: 669, with note 32 and 671, with note 52. See, however, Foxhall 2007: 61-68 on the problems related to the dating of the extant evidence.

10 Lohmann 1993: 161-62, associates ἐσχατιαί with ‘... den Grenzen des bebaubaren Landes ...’, but does not develop this observation in any detail.

φελλεύς was its poor, thin and stony soil (Sauppe 1841: 59-64; Osborne 1985: 20). Attic φελλεῖς would expectedly have patches of thin layers of soil alternating with stony ground and stretches of rock breaking the surface. The evidence suggests that φελλεύς was subjected to pastoral activities and woodcutting (Aristophanes, *Clouds* 71; *Archarnians* 273), and it refers to φελλεύς as rugged terrain, difficult to navigate and unsuitable for hunting (Xen. *Cyn.* 5.18). Accordingly, the evidence for the economic utilisation of φελλεῖς as land for pasturage and woodcutting suggests that they were uncultivated lands characterised by natural and scrubby vegetation. So the landscape and economic activities of φελλεύς corresponded well with the productiveness of the ὄρη.¹¹

Finally, it seems possible that larger areas referred to or known by the term φελλεύς were organised and subdivided into several plots, also designated as φελλεύς, which is probably true for the φελλεύς plots of the demes of Teithras (*SEG* 24.152) and Aixone (*IG* II² 2492; Krasilnikoff 2008b: 39, 45).

All in all, both ἐσχατιαί and φελλεῖς were found on elevated and rough ground but differed from one another in their quality and quantity of soil, as well as in the type and density of their vegetation. Ἐσχατιαί would have enough soil to enable the cultivation of the field crops of the Mediterranean triad of grain, olive and vine, whereas the dominant features of φελλεῖς were their natural vegetation: *maquis* and *garrigue/phrygrana* in modern terminology. Lease arrangements, lists of sales of public property (*Rationes Centesimarum*), and the forensic evidence establish Attic ἐσχατιαί and φελλεῖς as privately owned or leased plots. It appears that both categories of land were known and used in the Classical through the Roman periods.¹²

¹¹ Forbes 1996: passim, presents some general features of the 'waste', and Grove & Rackham 2002: esp. 169-72, offer exhaustive information. Krasilnikoff 2008b: 47.

¹² It appears that considerable attention was directed towards marginal resources in the fourth century; see Krasilnikoff 2008a: 195-99; 2008b: 45-49. For the usage of φελλεῖς in post-Classical periods, see Nesselrath 2006.

II. BOUNDARIES AND PRODUCTIVE LAND

It is plausible to suggest that the commonest types of boundaries in Attic landscapes were those demarcating productive land, including farmland. Presumably, most privately and publicly owned plots of land were demarcated to announce ownership, and property was thus proclaimed and safeguarded. Isager and Skydsgaard surmised that most state land was revoked and transferred to the administrative control of the newly formed demes at the time of Kleisthenes' reforms. Most of the peninsula was essentially divided into plots of private, sacred and deme land,¹³ and the epigraphic record seems to confirm the existence of 'commons' accessible to the δημόται.¹⁴ So, within the confines of the land controlled by demes, we may assume that three different types of land were demarcated: privately owned land, leased-out plots of deme land, and common deme land. Moreover, we may suppose that deme boundary zones emerged in rugged terrain – for instance, when the exploitation of common lands of adjoining demes were intensified and exact delimitations of marginal resources were needed. Boundary zones of the plains, on the other hand – for instance, in the Mesogeia region and the larger plains of the peninsula – would predominantly have consisted of adjoining plots of privately owned land or deme land, whose boundaries would have constituted consolidated boundaries.¹⁵

Accordingly, for those plots of lands where no distinct features of the landscape provided natural boundaries, the evidence suggests that two methods were used to delineate productive land: coherent and solid markers

¹³ Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 129. See, however, the discussion in Walbank 1991: 149–50, on the status of land in Aristotle's *Politics*, and what appears to be an incomplete treatment of the subject in the *Athenaion Politeia*.

¹⁴ The qualification δημοσία of an ἐσχατιά is probably known from the πωληταί record of the *Rationes Centesimarum* of the late Classical period, designating two ἐσχατιά plots sold from the deme of Poros. See Lambert 1997: 225–26; 229. Langdon also reflected on whether the activities on the Alepovouni hill were associated with the Roman period activities documented in the IG II² 1035 of the Augustan era. Apparently, it refers to land designated δημοσία which was conferred to public ownership in the Roman period. Langdon 1985b: 259; 1999: 496–99.

¹⁵ For the historiography of deme territoriality and deme boundaries, see Jones 1999: 59–65 and Lalonde 2006: 93–98.

such as fences and dikes,¹⁶ and boundaries indicated by tree lines, cairns or ὄροι placed at intervals.¹⁷ Throughout Attica, ὄροι were, of course, employed in a number of different roles and functioned as markers of productive land and mining plots, to display surety of loans, as indicators of the subsections of the post-Kleisthenic political geography, and as markers of enclosures belonging to a god or religious body. In addition, as we shall see below, some observations in the field suggest that monoliths were employed as boundary markers in concert with cairns and ὄροι to form coherent boundary lines.¹⁸

Hard evidence for clearly marked productive land in the Classical period is overwhelming. Whereas most examples from the literary corpus are circumstantial, the epigraphic record shows multiple and diverse examples of physical demarcation.¹⁹ The extant πωληταί records testify to all sorts of different boundary lines, used to mark the confines of mining plots in the Lauriotike and confiscated property all over Attica. Here, additionally, it seems as if mining contractors knew the extent of their concessions by way of boundary lines in the form of natural and man-made features of the landscape such as ridges, watercourses and roads.²⁰ What is more, the mining plots are frequently delimited by indications of bordering plots of productive land, such as the ‘φελλεύς of Kallias’, in *IG II*² 1582.53.

The context of marginal productive lands provides further information. One scenario from the forensic corpus indicates a gigantic estate of Phainip-

16 On the terminology of walls and dikes, see Price & Nixon 2005: 665-94, esp. 666-70.

17 Finley 1952 remains fundamental; Burford 1993: 110-18.

18 See further Traill 1982: 162-64. See Lohmann 1993: 219-26; 359; 418-20; 424; 428; 437; 446; 447; 449-50; 461; 46-66; 473-74; 476; 490; 507; 509; 522, Tafel 120-21, 137 on field boundaries and their documentation. See Βολεός (λίθοι) in non-Attic evidence, e.g. Epidauros, 2nd century BC. *IG IV*² 75.33; *LSJ*, s.v. Βολεός. Langdon 1985a: 5 and 9.

19 E.g., Plut. *Solon* 23.6; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 27.3. Lohmann 1993: 219 suggested that this example demonstrated the practice of not demarcating fields. Plut. *Cimon* 10.1. basically repeats Aristotle, except that Plutarch seems to indicate that the fences were removed, i.e., they had previously fulfilled the basic purpose of demarcation. Surely, the point to be made is that Kimon was acting in order to strengthen informal bonds of obligation to less fortunate Athenians. The uniqueness of this act of patronage and the anecdotal character of the narrative should warn against placing too much confidence in the ubiquity of the example. For additional documentation of the demarcation of gardens, see Osborne 1992: 381.

20 Langdon 1991: 53-69 on the functions and history of the board of πωληταί.

pos, measuring 40 stades in circumference.²¹ Clearly, the outer perimeter of this ἐσχατιά must have been marked by something, perhaps for practical reasons by ὄροι and cairns in concert with distinctive features of the landscape rather than fences or other kinds of solid demarcation. The slave girl, Θραίττα, in *Archarnians* 273 steals wood from a φελλεύς, which must imply that the φελλεύς in question belonged to someone, and that boundaries had been established to demarcate ownership (Olson 2002: 150–51).

A mid-fourth-century lease arrangement from Aixone (*IG II*² 2492) stated that this plot was to be marked by two ὄροι: ‘Having engraved the lease on stone στήλαι the treasurers of the demarchship of Demosthenes are to set one up in the sanctuary of Hebe, and the other in the ?meeting hall, and three-foot-high boundary markers on the estate, two on each side’.²² This stipulation clearly combines and juxtaposes marginal land and ὄροι, and, supposedly, the ὄροι were employed to demarcate the boundary between the plot in question and neighbouring lands. The Greek text leaves little doubt, however, that the ὄροι in question were inscribed and erected as στήλαι on this particular land.

The direct interference of *ad hoc* boards of officials in the process of boundary making is testified to in a mid-fourth-century ψηφίσματα regulating the complicated process of re-demarcating and re-establishing the boundaries of the *Hiera Orgas* at Eleusis, which involved consultations with the Delphic Oracle (*IG II*² 204). Undoubtedly, we should perceive this example as exceptional, partly because of the religious aspects involved (including frequent concerns with matters of εὐσέβεια, which demanded attention towards the accurateness of the process, and partly because it also impinged on the boundary of the neighbouring state of Megara.

Additionally, if we are to believe the ancient commentaries by Didymus (on Demosthenes and Androtion), the ‘cultivated land’ was ‘outlying lands’ or ἐσχατιαί.²³ A dominant element in this particular process of boundary-making was using existing boundaries of productive land to designate and clarify the dispositions made for the new boundaries by the commissioners.

21 [Dem.] 42. De Ste Croix 1966: 109–14; Osborne 1991: esp. 123–29 and Burford 1993: 112 discuss the features and qualities of Phainippos’ ἐσχατιά.

22 *IG II*² 2492, ll. 20–24. Translation by Burford 1993: 231–32. Also Jones 2004: 102–3 and Rhodes 2007: 184–85.

23 Commentaries in Lewis 1973: 211, Rhodes & Osborne 2003: 276–81.

In other words, the existing boundaries of productive lands were put to additional uses beyond the mere demarcation of agricultural land, in this particular case the re-establishment of the state boundary towards Megara.

In sum, the literary, epigraphic and archaeological evidence contains multiple references and allusions to the practice of demarcating productive land, which also includes marginal land. Moreover, it is a reasonable assumption that the type of boundary line most frequently established circumscribed productive land, and that different means were sometimes brought together to form coherent boundary lines. As we shall see below, at least two lines of rupestral ὄροι at Thiti and Megali Baphi were supplemented by additional types of markers to complete coherent boundary lines.

III. THE RUPESTRAL HOROI²⁴

Historiography reveals how the ὄροι have been used to argue for details of Attica's political geography; concurrently, however, assumptions have been made about their socio-economic functions and implications.²⁵ Hence, the ὄροι lines have been taken to denote and reflect very different purposes including various economic as well as 'constitutional' aspects of the demes. Several attempts have been made to study the ὄροι in concert, and one example in particular resulted in the formulation of a principle for the establishment of the ὄροι lines, which combines political and economic considerations. In 1985, Langdon suggested that boundary zones existed in the form of mountain ranges, ridges, watercourses, and other distinctive features

²⁴ Intense discussion has followed the discovery of most ὄροι, including meticulous observations on the dating and the epigraphic features of the inscriptions. References are made below to the relevant *Editiones Principes* and the relevant discussions; and only in those instances where this information is relevant to the argument have I chosen to include these observations.

²⁵ In 1986, Traill (117-21) compiled and discussed the known series of rupestral ὄροι consisting of one to seven markers, and additional ὄροι have been discovered since then. For general discussions of the rupestral ὄροι, see Langdon 1985a, 1988a: passim, 1999: passim, and Stanton 1984: 298-306, 1996: 353-64. A general survey of studies and positions is presented in Jones 1999: 59-65; and more recently, Lalonde 2006: 93-98, summarised the positions of scholars favouring the 'natural' and 'artificial' perceptions of deme territories, respectively.

of the physical landscape (Langdon 1985a: 10). Subsequently, Stanton proposed that exact boundaries emerged as protective measures against trespassers (Stanton 1996: esp. 353, 355); but Jones pondered the same scenario to the effect that 'Such a situation [the appliance of ὄροϛ-lines on ridges and/or saddles in hilly terrain to indicate deme boundaries], however, seems to me a contradiction in terms. Are not ridges and saddles the very sorts of conspicuous, well-defined topographical features that, if they constituted a boundary between demes, would *not* have to be marked?' (Jones 1999: 61). Subsequently, Jones (adjusting Stanton's main conclusion stated above) explained the actual occurrences of rupestral ὄροι as the outcome of quarrels over marginal resources, where exact boundaries became the physical manifestation of settlements between quarrelling demes. Although elements of these ideas are attractive, Langdon's more recent studies suggest a different set of solutions.

With Merle Langdon's reconsideration of known ὄροι and presentation of new ὄροι from the Alepouvouni promontory four kilometres to the east of Athens, we have a new opportunity to re-consider the functions and appliances of Attic rupestral ὄροι (Langdon 1999, *passim*). Although scholars have discussed this particular location before, Langdon's re-interpretation anchors the hill's ὄροι not as a fundamentally distinct type of inscription employed for demarcating deme boundaries, but as boundary markers of productive land. All in all, the 19 markers of the hill now identified, divided between 6 lines, were dated by Langdon to the period from the fourth century to the Roman period.²⁶ The first series applies the OPOΣ spelling and is dated by Langdon to the three centuries between 400 and 100 BC, whereas the remaining lines all apply the OPOC spelling and are dated by Langdon to the Roman period (Langdon 1999: 492-93). In two of the series (ὄροι nos. 15-17 and nos. 18-19), the spellings of OPOC are framed vertically by the initials *omikron* (above), *my* (below), and *zeta* (above), *omicron* (below), respectively. Apparently, however, none of the ὄροϛ lines completes a circular boundary of the productive plots in question, and other types of demarcations, such as cairns or fences, must therefore have been in use as well.

²⁶ A general dating for the rupestral ὄροι was set by Traill 1986: 118, to the final years of the fourth century and associated with the Macedonian reorganisation of the Attic demes in 307/6 BC.

As for the precise function of the demarcation lines of the ὄροι, Langdon suggested that the plots in question were used for other purposes than 'standard agricultural activity'. Concurrently, he surmised, due to the absence of agricultural terraces and other remains indicative of a domestic or industrial function, the rationale of the demarcation 'should be sought in the hill's natural vegetational cover', which included wood and aromatic herbs.²⁷ It is concluded that 'if private individuals owned land on the hill, their interest may have been in the commercial exploitation of the herbs growing naturally on its slopes'. Additionally, Langdon reasoned that activities related to wood cutting might have been '... an additional valued resource' (Langdon 1999: 494-96).

The general impression of Alepovouni is one of rugged terrain with no soil, and Langdon's assessment of the futility of normal agricultural activity thus complies with the present-day appearance of the hill. Even though we may speculate that the hill had patches of soil in antiquity, it should be safe for us to conclude that Alepovouni was not suitable for the regular cultivation of field crops, and consequently should not to be classified as ἐσχατιά. I would therefore suggest that Athenians of the late Classical through the Roman period recognised the plots of the Alepovouni hill as marginal lands of the φελλεύς category. Langdon's evaluation of the Alepovouni context effectively dissociates rupestral ὄροι from their alleged function as demarcations of deme boundaries; and it inspires us to re-consider the role and fecundity of the remaining series of Attic rupestral ὄροι.

The well-known series of ὄροι from Thiti partially discovered and subsequently published by Eliot consists of six cuttings including the unique OP//TIM spelling. Eliot first observed that the individual ὄροι were separated by 100 to 200 paces, ending on the top of the hill with '...a small mound of stones, now ruinous, probably the remains of a cairn. No inscription was found here, and perhaps we may assume that the cairn took its place' (Eliot 1962: 63-64). Subsequently, Traill interpreted the line as demarcating the boundary separating the demes of 'coastal' from 'inland' Lamp-trai, and several attempts have been made to match the initials with demes

27 See Megaloudi 2005: 73-74, for a short introduction to the subject. The evidence indicates that the cultivation of aromatic herbs was also a distinct feature of gardening. On the organisation and multifaceted produce of κήπτοι, see Osborne 1992: *passim*.

of the region.²⁸ However, the observation first made by Eliot is pivotal to our enquiry, so I shall elaborate on this first.

First, the cutting of the ὄροι at rather short intervals, which is indicative to some scholars of its private origin, echoes the practice observed by Langdon at Alepovouni.²⁹ What is more, the boundary line commences in a north-westerly direction from the foot of the hill towards the summit, marked with an altitude of 139 metres on modern maps. The line of ὄροι does not, however, continue down the other side of the slope in a north-westwardly direction to complete an intelligible sequence and indicate an extending boundary line. It is notoriously dangerous to argue from absence of evidence, but the abruptness of the Thiti ὄρος line should raise suspicion that this boundary line, whatever direction it may have taken, was supplemented by demarcations other than ὄροι (which seems to be implied by Eliot's observation on remains of cairns on the Thiti range). Clearly, the character of the Thiti massif inspires thought of its attractions in terms of marginal resources, pasturage and wood cutting and thus complies with the marginal land category of φελλεύς.

The application of initials following the mark of separation in the OP//IM spelling is to some extent paralleled in Langdon's two series from Alepovouni; or we should at least consider the possibility that the same principle and rationale were behind the application of the initials IM to the OP spelling. Hence, if Langdon's chronology and functional assessment of ὄροι nos. 15-19 of Alepovouni are correct, the purpose of cutting initials at Alepovouni was to identify the private or corporate plot owners. If this is so, we should also accept the same possibility for the OP//IM ὄροι of the Thiti range.

The inscrutable Roman period ΖΩ<ΟΡΟC>ΒΑ ὄροι from Lathoureza near Vari are probably to be interpreted along the same lines. For this late ὄρος line, Langdon opted for a dating to the post-Hadrianic era and suggested that they marked the line separating land belonging to the sanctuary

28 Traill 1982: passim. See, however, Stanton's reservations and remarks; Stanton 1984: 298-301, and 1996: 358-59.

29 There has been a tendency among scholars to associate short intervals between ὄροι with private origins, and longer intervals with official origins. I find this line of speculation to be quite imprecise. Eliot (1962: 63-64) was puzzled by the frequency of the cuttings. See Stanton 1996: 341; 353-55, and the critique by Langdon 1999: 495, with note 21.

of Apollo Zosterios at Cape Zoster on one side of the boundary, and an imperial or 'royal' possession on the other side (Langdon 1988c, *passim*). Although it is quite impossible to discern whether Langdon was right about these particular ownerships, there is, however, no reason to reject Langdon's basic idea that the initials refer to either individual landowners or corporate bodies. Regarding land type, my impression from observations on the site in 1995 was that the ὄροι probably demarcated an ἐσχατιά type of land since the environs may have been suitable for cultivation in the past.

All in all, nos. 15-19 from Alepovouni, Thiti and Cape Zoster constitute an 'exclusive' group of ὄροι, which are distinctively marked by initials to supplement the 'OPOC' or 'OP'. Apart from geography, the only difference between the Alepovouni demarcations and the ones at Thiti and Cape Zoster is that the former occur as one among six lines representing and reflecting the changes in ownership of sections of the hill in the period of the late Classical through Roman periods, whereas the lines of Thiti and Cape Zoster are singular lines, so presumably represent boundary making within a more confined chronology. All things considered, if the Alepovouni ὄροι lines can be accepted as demarcations of productive land, it should also be possible to accept the lines of Thiti and Cape Zoster as such.

An additional series of six cuttings of the fifth-century letters 'HO' was thought by Willemssen to have marked the boundaries of a sanctuary at Varkiza. The finding of an early fifth-century fragment of a Doric capital at the foot of the Thiti range – 'unter den Mauersteinen der dortigen Hausruinen' – prompted the idea that the ὄρος line in question announced the limits of the possession of a god.³⁰ On the one hand, since the existence of this sanctuary finds no support in the extant evidence, this line of argument does not provide a compelling explanation for the 'HO' ὄροι. On the other hand, judging from the features and quality of the hill, it must have been attractive from the point of view of shepherds, wood-cutters or marginal farmers. Hence, by changing perspective, the entire context of the hill should as a minimum generate interest in the portion of land on the other side of the boundary, and we might after all associate the HO line with productive land.

Several ὄροι have been discovered on the Megali Baphi ridge stretching in a north-south direction to the west of the southernmost deme of Atene. Al-

30 See further Eliot 1962: 56-58 and Willemssen 1965: 122-23. Also Lauter & Lauter-Bufe 1986: 285-309 and Goette 1995: 235-46.

though some disagreement exists over the number of ὄροι involved, all observers agree that the OPOC spelling is applied in all examples. Hence, the internal dating of the Megali Baphi ὄροι displaying the lunate *sigma* should immediately point to a late, presumably Roman, date. Additionally, Lohmann observed the existence of monoliths and cairns in the Megali Baphi area.³¹ Although the territory of the deme of Atene was probably abandoned in the late fourth century, this would not eliminate the need for any cutting after this period; however, the fact that late Classical, early Hellenistic, inscriptions use the lunate *sigma* as well may after all suggest a later fourth century dating of the line.³² The range is distinctively rough and rocky with uneven low to medium-high scrub and thus complies with the φελλεύς type of landscape.

The three OPOC ὄροι from above Vouliagmeni at the Kaminia ridge were re-considered (and a new ὄρος observed; *non vidi*) and evaluated as a deme boundary by Goette in 1994, and subsequently commented on by Stanton in 1996. Regarding the internal dating and size of the letters, the OPOC spelling here is equal to that of lines 2 to 4 of the Alepovouni paradigm. Again, in comparison to the larger epigraphic context and the character of the landscape, it is therefore a distinct possibility that this line of ὄροι in fact demarcated plots of marginal land or ranges of common land, presumably of the φελλεύς type rather than political territory only.³³ Additional ὄροι have been discovered, singly or in series, in various places, and their locations generally resemble the topographical contexts of the ὄρος lines already discussed.³⁴ One exception is, however, the four ὄροι from Spitharopousi/Soureza in the Lauriotike, just north of Agrileza and the single ὄρος discovered by Langdon in the Agrileza valley, indicating and reflecting a complexity of possible functions of the ὄροι as markers of agricultural as well as mining activities.³⁵

31 See further Lohmann 1993: 54-59, esp. 56.

32 Lohmann 1993: 108-9 seems to accept Thrall's dating of this boundary line to the 'Macedonian era' of 307/6. See Thrall 1986: 118.

33 See further Traill 1986: 118, Lauter 1982: 299-315, Stanton 1984: 298-300, id. 1996: 355-57, Langdon 1988a: 43-54, Goette 1994: 120-24, on the ὄροι of Kaminia above Vouliagmeni.

34 A number of these are listed in Traill 1986: 118, and Stanton 1996: 353-63.

35 Langdon & Watrous 1977; Stanton 1996: 359-60.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Ultimately, a set of tentative observations can be made. Boundaries make sense insofar as somebody needs them. Two observations are of great importance: first, one finds little support in the extant literary evidence for the alleged close relation between the rupestral ὄροι and the demarcation of deme boundaries;³⁶ and secondly, for practical reasons, the location and increasing number of ὄροι identified in Attica eliminates the idea that their primary function was as markers of political boundaries. Instead, we may assume that all categories of productive land would have been demarcated by a variety of different means, and it is reasonable to interpret the rupestral ὄροι in this particular context. Moreover, seen from the point of view of the epigraphist, as a collection of inscriptions, the rupestral ὄροι includes several different designs. The OPOS and OPOC spellings, which chronologically represent the beginning and the zenith of rupestral marking, date to the time span from the early fourth century to the Roman period, probably extending into the second century AD. Additionally, the enigmatic application of initials to supplement the OPOC of the Alepovouni ὄροι, the use of the abbreviation of PO together with the ΠΙΜ initials at the Thiti range, the ΖΩ<OPOC>ΒΑ ὄροι of Cape Zoster, and the abbreviations of HO at Varkiza and the wedge-shaped >OPO< at Kamarina, respectively, complete the impression of non-standardisation within the genre. Thus, the epigraphic evidence as well as the topographical contexts of the boundary lines suggest their making to be motivated by local concerns for the demarcation of productive land. Thus, the rupestral ὄροι are found in locations and in types of landscape which belong to the marginal segment of productive lands in Attica, and it therefore seems obvious to associate private rupestral demarcation specifically with the distinctive types of marginal lands, ἐσχατιὰ and φελλεύς. This is supported by the epigraphic features of the ὄρος lines of Alepovouni, Thiti and Cape Zoster, which indicate that local

³⁶ The only reference in the literary corpus to an Attic deme boundary is Strabo 1.65, which tells about the imprecision and doubts as to the course of the boundary line between the 'city-demes' of Kollytos and Melite. Thompson 1971: 73-74 examined the possible differences between boundary making in the *asty* and in the *chora*, respectively. See Lalonde 2006: passim, for a recent and exhaustive treatment of the intra-mural boundaries.

entrepreneurs made these for private and/or local reasons. Some of the lines, however, may be conceived as demarcations of common deme land as in the case of the lines at Megali Baphi and Kamarina.

The letter forms are the only guide to the dating of the ὄροι, indicating a lower limit in the first half of the fourth century, except for the one fifth-century line at Varkiza. The letter forms nevertheless suggest that the construction of boundary lines, with the occasional use of rock-cut ὄροι continued well into the Roman period. However, the further development and exploitation of marginal resources into the Hellenistic and Roman periods seems to adhere to individual as well as corporate demands (Langdon 1999: 492, 498-99). What is more, the probability that most ὄροι date to the post-Classical era might be explained as a response to a general shift from intensive strategies to more extensive forms of production focussing on animal husbandry and control of resources of the ὄρη.³⁷

Marginal farming apparently expanded from the late Classical period well into the Roman period, a development which induced entrepreneurs to claim adherence to and ownership of productive lands in the hilly tracts of Attica. The rupestral ὄροι are therefore best understood as reflections of this development, as markers of the economic landscape, and as demarcations of the space from which members of corporate groups or individual farmers extracted a variety of different resources. Thus, first and foremost, the rupestral ὄροι demarcated productive land; secondly – and more work needs be done on this possibility – we may infer that sections of privately constructed boundary lines came to serve a double function as sections of consolidated political boundaries in the late Classical through the Roman periods.

37 More studies are needed of post-classical Attica: Day 1942 is outdated and Fowden 1988 mainly subscribes to general descriptions of Attica's economic potential.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burford, A., 1993. *Land and Labor in the Greek World*. Baltimore and London.
- Buxton, R. 1994. *Imaginary Greece*. Cambridge.
- Chandezon, C. 2003. *L'élevage en Grèce (fin Ve-fin Ier s. a.C.): L'apport des sources épigraphiques*. Bordeaux.
- Day, J. 1942. *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*. New York.
- Eliot, C.W.J. 1962. *Coastal Demes of Attika: A Study in the Policy of Kleisthenes*. (Phoenix, Suppl. 5). Toronto.
- Finley, M.I. 1952. *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C.: The Horos-Inscriptions*. New York.
- Forbes, H.A. 1996. 'The Uses of the Uncultivated Landscape in Modern Greece: a Pointer to the value of the Wilderness in Antiquity?' in G. Shipley & J. Salmon (eds.) *Human Landscapes in Classical Antiquity. Environment and Culture*. (Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society). London, 68-97.
- Forbes, H.A. 1997. 'A "Waste" of Resources: Aspects of Landscape Exploitation in Lowland Greek Agriculture' in P.N. Kardulias & M.T. Shutes (eds.) *Aegean Strategies. Studies of Culture and Environment on the European Fringe*. New York and Oxford, 187-213.
- Forbes, H.A. & H.A. Koster, 1976. 'Fire, Axe and Plow: Human Influence on Local Plant Communities in the Southern Argolid' in M. Dimen and E. Friedl (eds.) *Regional Variation in Modern Greece and Cyprus: Towards a Perspective on the Ethnography of Greece*. (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 268). New York, 109-26.
- Fowden, G. 1988. 'City and Mountain in Late Roman Attica' *JHS* 108, 48-59.
- Foxhall, L. 2007. *Olive Cultivation in Ancient Greece: Seeking the Ancient Economy*. Oxford.
- Goette, H.R. 1994. 'Neue attische Felsinschriften' *Klio* 76, 120-34.
- Goette, H.R. 1995. 'Der Hügel der Panagia Thiti bei Vari und seine Inschriften' *AM* 110, 235-46.
- Grove, A.T. & O. Rackham, 2002. *The Nature of Mediterranean Europe: An Ecological History*. New Haven and London.

- Hallof, K. 1990. 'Der Verkauf konfiszierten Vermögens vor den Poleten in Athen' *Klio* 72, 402-26.
- Hanson, V.D. 1995. *The Other Greeks: Ancient Greek Farming and the Origin of Western Civilization*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Howe, T. 2008. *Pastoral Politics: Animals, Agriculture and Society in Ancient Greece*. (Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians, 9). Claremont, California.
- Isager, S. & J.E. Skydsgaard. 1992. *Ancient Greek Agriculture. An Introduction*. London.
- Jameson, M.H. 1989. 'Mountains and the Greek City States' in Jean-François Bergier (ed.) *Montagnes, Fleuves, Forêts dans l'Histoire. Barrières ou lignes de convergence? Berge, Flüsse, Wälder in der Geschichte: Hindernisse oder Begegnungsräume?*, St. Katharinen, 7-17.
- Jameson, M.H. 2002. 'Attic Eschatia' in K. Ascani, V. Gabrielsen, K. Kvist & A.H. Rasmussen (eds.) *Ancient History Matters: Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on His Seventieth Birthday, April 16, 2002*. (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, Supplementum 30), Rome, 63-68.
- Jones, N.F. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. Oxford and New York.
- Jones, N.F. 2000. 'Epigraphic Evidence for Farmstead Residence in Attica' *ZPE* 133, 75-90.
- Jones, N. F. 2004. *Rural Athens under the Democracy*. Philadelphia.
- Kardulias, P. & M.T. Shutes (eds.) 1997. *Aegean Strategies: Studies of Culture and Environment on the European Fringe*. Lenham and Oxford.
- Krasilnikoff, J.A., 2008a. 'Pan, Attica and Religious Innovation from the Persian Wars to the End of the Fourth Century BC' in A.H. Rasmussen et al. (eds.) *Religion and Society: Rituals, Resources and Identity in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World. The BOMOS Conferences 2002-2005*. (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, Supplementum 40). Rome, 189-200.
- Krasilnikoff, J.A. 2008b. 'Attic φελλεύς: Some Observations on Marginal Land and Rural Strategies in the Classical Period' *ZPE* 167, 37-49.
- Krasilnikoff, J.A. 2009. Review of Howe 2008. *The Classical Journal Online*, 2009 12 03, 1-5.
- Lalonde, G.V. 2006. 'IG I3 1055 B and the Boundary of Melite and Kollytos' *Hesperia* 75, pp. 83-119.
- Lambert, S.D. 1997. *Rationes Centesimarum: Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens*. Amsterdam.

- Langdon, M.K. 1985a. 'The Territorial basis of the Attic demes' *SO* 60, 5-15.
- Langdon, M. K. 1985b. 'Hymettiana I' *Hesperia* 54, 257-70.
- Langdon, M.K. 1988a. 'The Topography of Coastal Erechtheis' *Chiron* 18, 43-54.
- Langdon, M.K. 1988b. 'The ZW/BA *Horoi* at Vari in Attica' *GRBS* 29, 75-81.
- Langdon, M. K. 1991. 'II. Poletai Records' in G.V. Lalonde, M. K. Langdon and M.B. Walbank (eds.) *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, volume 19: Inscriptions. Horoi, Poletai Records, Leases of Public Lands*. Princeton, 53-143.
- Langdon, M.K. 1994. 'Public Auctions in Ancient Athens' in S. Hornblower and R. Osborne (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Democratic Accounts Rendered to D.M. Lewis* Oxford, 253-65.
- Langdon, M.K. 1999. 'Hymettiana III. The Boundary Markers of Alepovouni' *Hesperia* 68, 481-508.
- Langdon, M.K. & L.V. Watrous 1977. 'The Farm of Timesios: Rock-Cut Inscriptions in South Attica' *Hesperia* 46, 162-77.
- Lauter, H. 1982. 'Zwei Horos-Inschriften bei Vari: Zu Grenzziehung und Deme-lokalisierung in Südost-Attika' *AA*, 299-315.
- Lauter, H. & H. Lauter-Bufe. 1986. 'Ein attisches Höhenheiligtum bei Var-kiza' in R. Hanauer et al. (eds.), *Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Werner Böser* (Karlsruher Geowissenschaftliche Schriften, 2A). Karlsruhe, 285-309.
- Lewis, D.M. 1973. 'The Athenian Rationes Centesimarum' in M.I. Finley (ed.) *Problemes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*. Paris, 187-212.
- Lohmann, H. 1992. 'Agriculture and Culture Life in Classical Attica' in B. Wells (ed.) *Agriculture in Ancient Greece. Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 16-17 May 1990*. Stockholm, 29-60.
- Lohmann, H. 1993. *ATENE.. Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika, I-II*. Cologne, Weimar & Vienna.
- Megaloudi, F. 2005. 'Wild and Cultivated Vegetables, Herbs and Spices in Greek Antiquity (900 BC to 400 BC)' *Environmental Archaeology* 10, 73-82.

- Nesselrath, H.-G. 2006. *Plato: Kritias*. Übersetzung und Kommentar von Heinz-Günther Nesselrath. (Platon Werke. Übersetzung und Kommentar 8.4). Kritias. Göttingen.
- Ober, J. 1981. 'Rock-Cut Inscriptions from Mt. Hymettos' *Hesperia* 50, 1, 69-77.
- Ober, J. 1995. 'Greek horoi: artifactual texts and the contingency of meaning' in D.B. Small (ed.) *Methods in the Mediterranean: Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 135). Leiden, 91-123.
- Olson, S.D. 1991. 'Firewood and Charcoal in Classical Athens' *Hesperia* 60, 411-20.
- Osborne, R. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika*. Cambridge.
- Osborne, R. 1987. *Classical Landscape with Figure. The Ancient Greek City and its Countryside*. London.
- Osborne, R. 1991. 'Pride and prejudice, sense and subsistence: exchange and society in the Greek city' in J. Rich & A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.) *City and Country in the Ancient World*. London and New York, 119-45.
- Osborne, R. 1992. 'Classical Greek Gardens: Between Farm and Paradise' in J.D. Hunt (ed.) *Garden History: Issues, Approaches, Methods*. (Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture 13). Washington, D.C., 373-91.
- Price, S.R.F. & L. Nixon, 2005. 'Ancient Greek Agricultural Terraces: Evidence from Texts and Archaeological Survey' *AJA*, 109, 665-94.
- Rackham, O. & J. Moody. 1992. 'Terraces' in B. Wells (ed.) *Agriculture in Ancient Greece: Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16-17 May, 1990*. Stockholm, 123-30.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2007. *The Greek City States: A Source Book. Second Edition*. Cambridge.
- Rhodes, P.J. & R. Osborne. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC. Edited with introduction, translations, and commentaries*. Oxford.
- Sauppe, H. 1841. *Epistola critica ad Godofredum Hermannum*. Leipzig (reprinted with modifications in *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Berlin 1896) 117-21).
- Stanton, G.R. 1984. 'Some Attic Inscriptions' *BSA* 79, 289-306.
- Stanton, G.R. 1996. 'Some Inscriptions in Attic Demes' *BSA* 91, 341-64.
- Ste Croix, G.E.M. de, 1966. 'The estate of Phainippus (Ps-Dem. xlii)' in E. Badian (ed.) *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg*. Oxford, 109-114.

- Thompson, W.E. 1971. 'The Deme in Kleisthenes' Reforms' *SO* 46, 72-79.
- Traill, J.S. 1982. 'An Interpretation of Six Rock-Cut Inscriptions in the Attic Demes of Lamptrai', *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography. Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*, (*Hesperia* Suppl. Vol. 19) 162-71; 229.
- Traill, J.S. 1986. *Demos and Trittys. Epigraphical and topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*, Toronto.
- Walbank, M.B. 1991. 'Leases of Public Lands' in G.V. Lalonde, M.K. Langdon and M.B. Walbank (eds.), *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume 19: Inscriptions. Horoi, Poletai Records, Leases of Public Lands*. Princeton, 145-207.
- Willemsen, F. 1965. 'Ostraka' *AM* 80, 100-26.

MENSTRUAL BLOOD IN ANCIENT ROME: AN UNSPEAKABLE IMPURITY?

By Jack Lennon

Summary: This article examines the language and power associated with menstrual blood in Roman literature, focusing primarily on the issue of ritual impurity. In particular, it will highlight the importance of two phrases from Pliny's *Natural History* which can offer new insights into Roman perceptions of menstruation. Using comparisons from modern anthropological theory, it seeks to refute recent suggestions that Roman society felt no anxiety about menstrual pollution, but equally it will be argued that this anxiety was not on a comparable scale to earlier Greek regulations and practices.

In his vast discussion of impurity in ancient Greek society, Robert Parker noted the curious scarcity of menstrual blood in literary evidence, with the sole exception of medical treatises. Of particular significance was the lack of references to menstruation (unlike other bodily functions) in Old Comedy, which led him to suggest that this may have been a deeply significant taboo, 'a fact so shaming that it could not be alluded to at all, even to the extent of requiring purity from it in a sacred law'.¹ This paper aims to examine the

- 1 Parker 1983: 100-4. More recently, see Parker 2007: 121-22 demonstrating the religious incompatibility attached to menstruation, which required exclusion from religious spaces and expiation if this was not observed.

Jack Lennon 'Menstrual Blood in Ancient Rome: An Unspeakable Impurity?' *CEJ* 61 (2010) 71-87. © 2010 Museum Tusculanum Press • www.mtp.dk/classicaetmediaevalia

similarly problematic evidence that exists for ancient Rome. Although a number of works have explored the place of menstruation in Roman life and literature,² the paper will highlight two specific comments within Pliny's *Natural History* in connection with this blood which remain curiously unexplored, yet may shed further light on our understanding of Roman attitudes towards menstruation. While it does not go so far as to claim a total wall of silence existed, nevertheless it aims to demonstrate that menstrual blood was viewed as a source of danger and power, fundamentally polluting, and to be avoided whenever possible, even in passing reference.

For some time now, anthropologists have noted the importance of bodily secretions in the study of human pollution. Mary Douglas placed particular emphasis on the abnormal, and on emissions which 'transgressed' the boundaries of the body, and it is partly due to the fact that, of the various bodily secretions, menstrual blood has featured so heavily in studies of impurity that Parker considered the lack of Greek evidence anomalous.³ Despite numerous scholarly allusions to pollution in Roman literature, religion and society, a concentrated study of impurity in ancient Rome is still lacking.⁴ A recent (brief) discussion has been offered by Beck as part of a wider collective examination of purity in ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern societies, in which he states:

Roman culture seems to have been relatively free of the sense that there exists a class of naturally occurring things that pollute in and of themselves, for example, certain types of food source, menstruation and child-

- 2 In particular, see Gourevitch 1984: 95-103; King 1987: 117-27; Roux 1988: 58-72; Richlin 1992: 281-82; Hemelrijk 2009: 253-56.
- 3 Douglas 1966: 42, 149-59; Douglas: 1975: 106-115. At the point of transgressions, bodily substances became dangerous 'matter out of place', the central tenet in Douglas' classification of impurity. On the place of menstruation within the framework of impurity, cf. Langness 1967: 162; Girard 1977: 33-38; Meigs 1978: 304-18, esp. 307-10; Meigs: 1984: 15; 63; Buckley & Gottlieb 1988: 3-50; Mullin 1996: 514-15; Branham 1997: 53-70; Valeri 2000: 163-68; 349-56; Hoskins 2002: 299-301; Stewart & Strathern 2002: 352-55; Meyer 2005: esp. 123-203; Barrett 2008: 153; 160.
- 4 Only death-pollution has received significant attention in recent years. In particular, see Allara 1995: 69-79; Dumont 1995: 181-87; Bodet 2000: 128-51; Lindsay 2000: 152-73; Hope 2009: 70-71. More generally, Latte 1960: 47-50; Toynbee 1971: esp. 43-55; Thome 1992: 73-98; Attridge 2004: 71-83.

birth, and consequently women menstruating or giving birth. Death might appear to be the exception.⁵

Given the focus of this paper, Beck's statement may appear particularly contentious. A brief note by Festus on the days of ritual purification for newborn babies casts doubt on the suggestion that childbirth incurred no state of impurity, and the evidence examined throughout this paper will show categorically that fear of the polluting power of menstrual blood and the process of menstruation itself is demonstrated by our surviving sources.⁶

IMPURE BLOOD

We must first begin by establishing in what way menstruation was considered to be pollutive in Roman society. As Parker points out, menstruation was most openly discussed within medical treatises, where issues of ritual impurity were unlikely to feature prominently. This was as true in Rome as it was in Greece. Soranus, for example, viewed the process as a natural bodily catharsis which needed to be monitored, but not feared unless it failed to occur (a medical view shared by his predecessor, Celsus).⁷ Centuries later, various medical explanations for menstruation were discussed by Macrobius in his philosophical work *The Saturnalia*, which includes the theory that the process was the removal of harmful (*vitiosus*) material from the body.⁸ Parker suggests that because this was material that needed to be purged we should expect the blood to be viewed as a highly impure substance.⁹ Beyond the sphere of medical enquiry, however, references are few and far between. When they do appear we see that the process is repeatedly described in terms of staining and pollution.

5 Beck 2004: 509. On the links between the pollution surrounding menstruation and death, see Friedl 1975: 29-30; Meigs 1978: 312-14; Gottlieb 1988: 67-8; Cook 1999: 50.

6 Festus s.v. '*Lustrici*' ('*Lustrici* refer to those days, the eighth for girls, the ninth for boys, on which the children are purified and assigned their names').

7 Soran. 1.19-26; Cels. 2.7.7; 4.27.10; Gourevitch 1984: 93-94; Von Staden 1991: 271-96; Martin 2001: 101-3.

8 Macr. *Sat.* 7.7; King 1995: 144.

9 Parker 1983: 102.

The grammarian Sextus Pompeius Festus, writing in the late second century AD, offers a succinct and revealing comment on the subject: *Ancunulentaе feminae menstro tempore appellantur; unde trahitur inquinamentum*. ‘*Ancunulentaе* refer to women during the time of menstruation, from which we derive the word *inquinamentum*.’¹⁰

Usually translated as ‘impurity’, *inquinamentum* holds a number of negative connotations which suggest the potential for staining and contamination, and the verb *inquino* features prominently within the wide-ranging vocabulary of pollution in Latin language.¹¹ Richlin has observed that ‘*inquinamentum* is not a neutral word, and it appears with some frequency in sexual contexts’, citing as an example the disgust of Encolpius at being kissed by a *cinaedus* in Petronius’ *Satyricon* (*basiis olidissimis inquinavit*).¹² Like the majority of Latin verbs which denote staining or fouling of some kind, however, *inquino* is not limited to any one specific context. Indeed, the flexibility of Roman vocabulary is one of the most striking features of the way in which they dealt with ideas of impurity.¹³ The veracity of Festus’ claim is not at issue here. At this stage it is simply important to note the link he perceived between menstruation and pollution. It would be perfectly acceptable for the term to derive from ideas of impurity, provided that menstruation was seen as an unclean process in Festus’ own day.

With such negative connotations it is unsurprising that menstrual impurity could be used to attack enemies through invective. The younger Seneca uses it as a device to slander and discredit one such enemy as he recalls the actions of Mamercus Scaurus:

... cum Mamercum Scaurum consulem faceres, ignorabas ancillarum illum suarum menstruum ore hiantе exceptare? numquid enim ipse dissimulabat? numquid purus videri volebat?

¹⁰ Festus s.v. *Ancunulentaе*. Cf. *bubinare*, which also describes menstrual blood in terms of pollution, using *inquino*.

¹¹ For example, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.72; 5.34; *S.Rosc.* 68; Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.18; *Epod.* 16.64; Mart. 4.4.6.

¹² Richlin 1997: 204; Richlin: 1992: 26–31; Petron. 21.2.

¹³ Fantham 1991: 267–91; Thome 1992: 77–78 notes this as a key difference from Greek ideas of *miasma*, which she states ‘has no verbal equivalent in Latin, although it is not lacking in conceptual equivalents’.

When you made Mamercus Scaurus consul were you not aware that he used to drink up, with an open mouth, the menstrual discharge of his own slave girls? Indeed, did he try to conceal it? Did he even wish to seem pure?¹⁴

The idea of oral impurity (*os impurum*) as a result of sexual activity was well established in Roman literature, and carried the potential for contamination of one's words or, more commonly, resulted in one's kisses being shunned as impure.¹⁵ A woman sold into prostitution was described in the elder Seneca's *Declamations* as polluted by the kisses of her fellow whores (*conservarum osculis inquinatur*), again demonstrating the potential sexual dimension to pollutions referred to as *inquinamenta*.¹⁶ In the case of Mamercus Scaurus, the report also places heavy emphasis on Scaurus' failure even to attempt to conceal his actions. The prominence of purity in the viewing of menstrual blood, and in this case its consumption, is stressed by the use of *purus*. The scene works as part of a wider condemnation of Scaurus' actions, in particular his willing passive participation in sexual acts, but also his willingness to speak and perform them openly and, in the eyes of Seneca, shamelessly.¹⁷

The danger resulting from contact with the blood also appears in works relating to farming and agriculture. That menstrual impurity might affect agriculture is unsurprising, since the fertility of land appears especially susceptible to pollution in numerous societies, ancient and modern.¹⁸ In his treatise *On Agriculture*, L. Iunius Columella asserts that a shrub of rue will live for many years 'unless a woman who is menstruating touches it, in which case it withers'.¹⁹ He goes on to state that women should not be allowed near crops of cucumbers or gourds, 'for often the growth of plants is

¹⁴ Sen. *Benef.* 4.31.3. Cf. Sen. *Epist.* 87.16.

¹⁵ Catull. 79, 80; Cic. *Dom.* 25-26; *Har.Resp.* 11; Mart. 2.10; 12; 21-3, 33; Juv. 6.50-1; von Staden 1991: 278-79; Richlin 1992: 67-70; Tatum 1993: 31-45, esp. n. 25; Butrica 2002: 507-16.

¹⁶ Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.10; 1.2.16; Langlands 2006: 253-64.

¹⁷ Richlin 1992: 281-2. See also Cicero's condemnation of Sextus Cloelius for his passive sexual relationship with Clodia Metelli; Cic. *Dom.* 25; *Har.Resp.* 11; Wiseman 1985: 39-41; Damon 1992: 239.

¹⁸ See Meyer 2005: 5-8 with bibliography.

¹⁹ Colum. 11.38 ('... frutex pluribus annis permanent innoxius, nisi si mulier, quae in menstruis est, contigerit eum, et ob hoc exaruerit').

wilted by the contact of women. Indeed, if she is menstruating, the new crops will be killed even by her glance'.²⁰ It has been suggested that the danger posed to these phallic vegetables is indicative of the threat menstruation poses, not only to agricultural fertility, but also more specifically to male potency. This is also indicated by Pliny's comments regarding sexual intercourse during menstruation, along with his stress on the feminine nature of this source of power (*vis*).²¹ Finally, Columella advises farmers plagued by insect pests to make a girl experiencing her first menstruation walk three times around the fields bare footed, 'ashamed of the filthy blood (*obscaenus cruor*) that flows'. The result will be the death of all troublesome insects, at which point the crops may be planted.²² Again the language used to describe both the process and the results of menstruation points to the potential for transferrable contagion.²³ The verbs *contingo* and *neco* convey staining and death respectively, while Columella's description of the blood as *obscaenus* further compounds the themes of danger and disgust.²⁴ Early in the twentieth century, Warde-Fowler commented that in this case, the reports of Pliny and Columella were unusual indications of a positive aspect to the menstrual taboo. However, while the process of menstruation is utilised for beneficial purposes, its usefulness still derived from the destructive qualities of the blood, which could only be beneficial when carefully controlled. It is perhaps more realistic to say that the end result was beneficial, even if the means with which it was achieved was not. Therefore the 'positive' interpretation of the taboo is questionable.²⁵

20 Colum. 11.50 ('nam fere contactu eius languescunt incrementa virentium. si vero etiam in menstruis fuerit, visu quoque suo novellas fetus necabit'). Cf. Plin. *Nat.* 28.79.

21 Richlin 1997: 204; Plin. *Nat.* 28.77.

22 Colum. 10.358-66.

23 Burriss 1929: 150; Wagenvoort 1947: 128-86, esp. 173-75 discusses the role of *contagio* in relation to menstruation in Roman society.

24 On the sexual connotations of *obscaenus*, see Richlin 1992: 29-30.

25 Warde-Fowler 1911: 30; Parker 1983: 103. For a similar interpretation of 'positive' menstrual qualities, see Stewart & Strathern 2002: 355.

PLINY THE ELDER

The most extensive compilation and discussion of the (sometimes contradictory) powers attributed to menstrual blood comes from Pliny the Elder. Throughout his *Natural History* he refers to the various qualities it was thought to hold, including Columella's insecticide ritual.²⁶ A cursory glance at Pliny's lists suggests menstrual blood has the power to sour crops, wither fruit, dull the brightness of mirrors, rust iron and bronze, blunt razors, kill bees, pollute (*polluo*) fabrics dyed with the colour purple, drive dogs insane, drive off hailstorms, winds and lightning, and cause both mares and humans to miscarry through the slightest of contacts.²⁷ If menstruation occurs during periods of solar or lunar eclipse Pliny's sources imply that sexual intercourse can result in disease (*pestis*) or even death for the male partner.²⁸ In spite of these destructive and harmful properties, however, Pliny also lists a number of remedial or apotropaic uses, in which the touch of the menstruating woman cures gout, scrofula, skin-growths, erysipelas and fevers, as well as bites from rabid dogs – perhaps a reverse of the process by which menstrual blood *caused* the madness in dogs.²⁹ One source quoted by Pliny asserts that fevers may be cured by sexual intercourse if the woman is beginning to menstruate.³⁰ Thus while contagious impurity is frequently implied, it is not ever-present, unlike the notion of ritual power, which can be destructive, but whose destruction can be harnessed for beneficial purposes.³¹ Book 28 of Pliny's *Natural History*, which deals extensively with medico-magical substances derived from animals and humans, contains two statements that neatly demonstrate the conflicting views about the process of menstruation.

26 Plin. *Nat.* 28.78. Variations of the ritual also appear at Plin. *Nat.* 17.266-7; Ael. *NA* 6.36.

27 Plin. *Nat.* 7.63-4; 17.266-7; 28.70-82; Parker 1983: 102-3; Gourevitch 1984: 96-100; Beagon 2005: 229-39.

28 Plin. *Nat.* 28.77.

29 Plin. *Nat.* 28.82.

30 Plin. *Nat.* 28.83-4.

31 Gourevitch 1984: 101-3; Roux 1988: 60-61.

THE HOUSEHOLD DOOR

The first point we shall explore from Pliny's extensive list of supernatural qualities attributed to menstrual blood concerns its use upon the threshold of a home.

id quoque convenit, quo nihil equidem libentius crediderim, tactis omnino menstruo postibus inritas fieri Magorum artes, generis vanissimi ...

It is also agreed, and for my part there is nothing I would more willingly believe, that the arts of the Magi, the most duplicitous of peoples, are made useless if the doorposts have been touched by menstrual blood.³²

If the blood was truly *obscaenus*, *inquinans*, or otherwise 'polluting' then this might justifiably be viewed as the most unexpected ritual use to which it could be put. Doors, gateways and thresholds were sites of great ritual activity in Roman religion. In particular, they were susceptible to contamination and were passages through which harm could enter and affect those within.³³ New brides touched fire and water before the threshold of their new home in order to enter with purity.³⁴ According to myth, the parricide Tullia was stained (*cruenta*) by her father's blood and angered her household gods by entering in a polluted state.³⁵ Finally, when corpses were removed from a Roman house the threshold was ritually swept and purified to ensure the complete physical and spiritual removal of the deceased.³⁶ Under such circumstances one would expect the slightest contact between a doorway and menstrual blood to cause a serious pollution that could endanger the

32 Plin. *Nat.* 28.85. The Magi refer to practitioners of Persian magic and are perhaps the most despised authorities discussed by Pliny in his encyclopaedia; Plin. *Nat.* 30.1-19; Dickie 2001: 135-36; Janowitz 2001: 92-93.

33 Ogle 1911: 251-71; Verg. *Aen.* 6.563; Plin. *Nat.* 28.135; 142.

34 Verg. *Aen.* 6.563; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 1; Rose 1924: 169.

35 Liv. 1.48.7. The pollution of the act caused the spot where she desecrated his body to be permanently branded as the 'Street of Wickedness' (*vicus Sceleratus*); Varro *Ling.* 5.159; D.H. 4.39; Ov. *Ib.* 363; Val. Max. 9.11.1; Cic. *Rep.* 2.25.46; Festus s.v. *Vicus Sceleratus*.

36 Ov. *Fast.* 2.23-6; Festus s.v. *Everriator*; Frazer 1929: 2.279-83.

household, yet Pliny demonstrates no such reservation. Indeed, such is his hatred of the Magi that he states there is nothing he would more willingly believe than that their powers could be negated in this way.³⁷ In terms of the pollution we have seen attached to menstruation this presents an anomaly, but not necessarily an insurmountable one.

Our answer may be found in the symbolism attached to the human body. In explaining her theory of bodily pollution, Douglas argued the following:

The body is a model which can stand for any bounded system. Its boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened or precarious. The body is a complex structure. The functions of its different parts and their relation afford a source of symbols for other complex structures. We cannot possibly interpret rituals concerning excreta, breast milk, saliva and the rest unless we are prepared to see in the body a symbol of society ...³⁸

The application of bodily symbolism to 'any bounded system' corresponds appropriately to the Roman household, itself a microcosm of Roman society. Douglas also equates the entrances to the house with the orifices of the human body. As such, they were points of vulnerability through which unwanted entities could gain access.³⁹ This identification of the doorway with the human body, and in particular the female genitalia, may make the use of menstrual blood appear more logical.⁴⁰ The female body during menstruation was not in danger itself (danger is only implied if menstruation does not occur). Rather, the catharsis it underwent was dangerous only to others.⁴¹ However, this also meant that the menstruating woman was protected

³⁷ Plin. *Nat.* 28.85.

³⁸ Douglas 1966: 142.

³⁹ Douglas 1966: 150-51, 156; Douglas 1996: xxxvii. On the entrances to the body as symbols for those of the city, see Parker 2004: 563-601, esp. 568-70. Parker suggests the 'unpenetrated' bodies of the Vestal Virgins represented the inviolable walls of the city of Rome. Thus, the loss of a Vestal's virginity represented damage to the impenetrability of Rome's defences, and explained the curious custom of live interment *within* the city limits for Vestals who broke their vow of chastity. Cf. Wildfang 2006: 54-61.

⁴⁰ Adams 1982: 89. Comparisons between female genitalia and the door (*ianua*) also appear at Isid. *Etym.* 8.II.69; II.I.137.

⁴¹ Von Staden 1991: 274 notes Celsus' assertion that 'one should not be frightened if more

to some degree from various outside forces, and it is this protection that this act seeks to harness. As we have already seen, those uses of menstrual blood deemed 'beneficial' by Pliny are viewed as acceptable primarily in cases where its destructive capabilities are focused against physical ailments. In this case the magical curse, which would harm elements within the household, corresponds to the disease seeking entry to the body. Therefore what we are seeing is the application of those menstrual remedies listed by Pliny and others on a greater scale. Consequently the potential for menstrual pollution 'gaining entry' to the house may not have been thought an issue. The danger from menstruation flowed outwards, not inward, and although this does not change the fact that it remained a dangerous polluting substance, it may explain why no threat appears to have existed for the house or its threshold. Just as in the case of Columella's report on the removal of insects and pests from agricultural land, menstrual blood retained the power to harm, and even kill. That it represented a threat to unseen magical arts, however, also indicates that it was viewed as more than a simple physical poison. Its potential to infect could reach beyond the natural world and thus it should be viewed as a source of ritual power.⁴²

IMPURE WORDS

Our second passage, also from Book 28 of Pliny, is equally tantalising, yet in the major studies of menstruation in Roman medicine, rhetoric and literature it receives no mention. At the completion of the extensive list of magico-medicinal properties, Pliny ends on this curious note:

Haec sunt quae retulisse fas sit ac pleraque ex his non nisi honore dicto, reliqua intestabilia, infanda, ut festinet oratio ab homine fuge.

blood should flow from a woman's body' this way ('neque terreri convenit, si plus ex muliebri corpore sanguinis profluit'). However, this refers specifically to fears for the woman's health, and does not address the wider 'supernatural' fears demonstrated in the writings of Pliny or Columella. Cf. Cels. 7.26.4.

⁴² As such, it appears within the *Greek Magical Papyri* as an ingredient to be used in magical spells which cause sickness and delirium; *PGM* 4.2441-2621; 4.2622-2707; Betz 1986: 85-87.

This is all it would be right for me to report and most of that I do not say without shame. That which is left is detestable and unspeakable, and so my work should hasten from the subject of man.⁴³

Considering the extensive list of properties recounted by Pliny we are left wondering what could possibly have been left out. He may have declined to list the more harmful ways in which the blood could be used, such as in malignant spells or potions. The term *fās* may translate as 'that which is correct' or otherwise 'right', but at its most basic level indicates something which may be spoken. Its antithesis, *nefās*, was that which was 'unspeakable' and was frequently used to express religious offences even in official priestly language and judgements.⁴⁴ Richlin has commented on the importance of those words which share the root *-fā-* (*infamis* / *infamia* / *nefās* etc.), arguing that when used to describe sexually impure acts 'the idea is not so much that these things are not to be spoken of; rather, by being spoken of too much ... they demean, even stain, those involved in them'.⁴⁵ Thus, following his 'impure' liaison with his serving girls, Mamercus Scaurus was described by Seneca as speaking obscene words (*obscena verba*), and being an 'openly obscene man' (*homo palam obscaenus*), illustrating how the linguistic infection reflects the physical pollution of the carrier, which takes hold and spreads, staining the character of the perpetrator.⁴⁶ The elder Seneca's *Declamation* on the prostitute priestess demonstrates a comparable idea, as the prosecutors argue that a priestess should not even hear words connected with prostitution or sexual immorality, as even these will sully her candidacy.⁴⁷

In light of the number of magico-medicinal uses listed by Pliny it is possible that those things he deemed *nefās* involved uses of menstrual blood which were not performed for health or public benefit. Social convention did not prohibit him from discussing the topic, but was such that he felt the need to end with an apology, as well as to acknowledge that for the sake of decency there were things he had left 'unspeakable'. Even Celsus felt the need for explanation in his medical discussions of the 'obscene parts' (*obscenae*

43 Plin. *Nat.* 28.87. See also 28.65, 77.

44 For example Cic. *Att.* 1.13; Liebeschuetz 1979: 47, 132; Thome 1992: 76.

45 Richlin 1992: 30.

46 Sen. *Benef.* 4.31.4-5.

47 Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.4-5.

partes) of the body, and particularly for the necessity of using ‘foul words’ (*foeda verba*). However, whereas Pliny fled from his subject to protect his sense of decency (*pudor*), Celsus recognised the medical importance of addressing it, albeit simultaneously striving to write within the bounds of social decency.⁴⁸ Despite the clear signs of social awkwardness towards these subjects perhaps the most surprising aspect of the evidence we have is the *lack* of any clear indicator of religious pollution surrounding menstruation and menstrual blood. At no point is it suggested that a woman or a man contaminated by the stain of menstrual blood is to be excluded from religious sites or ceremonies, yet this is precisely the result we should expect given the emphasis on impurity, which, as Roux stresses, is so often incompatible with the sacred.⁴⁹ This is also significantly different from the status of pimps and prostitutes in ancient Rome, whose sexual impurity required them to be removed from temples as well as from the sight of religious officials, or from those who had had sexual intercourse before a ritual where a period of abstinence was demanded.⁵⁰

CONCLUSION

The study of Roman pollution faces a challenge in the case of menstruation different from that which confronted Parker in his study of the Greek world. One is not met with a wall of silence, but with a series of disparate, sometimes contradictory statements regarding the power of menstruation and its place in Roman society. In terms of ritual, the blood’s power as a substance remained great, while the potential for contamination, resulting in exclusion from religious activity, appears to have diminished. Nevertheless, menstrual blood remained a socially taboo subject. Given justification, even an unspeakable subject could be discussed, but the accounts of Columella, Seneca and Pliny all describe a feeling of shame (or a reprehensible lack thereof) as a result. The damage it caused, whether to crops, spells, persons

⁴⁸ Cels. 6.18.1.

⁴⁹ Roux 1988: 63.

⁵⁰ Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.1-4; 1.3.4; Tib. 1.3.23-6; 2.1.11-2; Prop. 2.33.1-6; Edwards 1997: 66-95; Beard, North & Price 1998: 1.297; Harries 2007: 90-91. However, cf. McGinn 2006: 161-76.

or reputation could always be described using the imagery of pollution and staining, which fitted with Festus' understanding of a link between menstruation and the term *inquinamentum*.

What are we to make, then, of Beck's suggestion that natural pollutions, such as those of childbirth and menstruation were not present in ancient Rome? The answer must surely be divided between those official regulations dictated by religious rituals, and those more changeable ideas that existed in wider society and Italian folklore. In terms of religious prohibitions, Beck may be correct in noting the absence of restrictions on menstruating women. However, this does not take into account the frequent allusions made in the ancient evidence to the infectious and dangerous properties of menstruation. Menstrual blood did, indeed, pollute in and of itself in a number of contexts, and remained a consistent source of danger, whether to a man, an insect, a plant or even a magic spell.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J.N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
- Allara, A. 1995. 'Corpus et Cadaver, la "gestion" d'un nouveau corps' in F. Hinard *La mort au quotidien le monde Romain*. Paris, 69-79.
- Attridge, H.W. 2004. 'Pollution, Sin, Atonement, Salvation' in S. Johnston (ed.) *Religions of the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA, London, 71-83.
- Barrett, R. 2008. *Aghor Medicine: Pollution, Death and Healing in Northern India*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Beagon, M. 2005. *The Elder Pliny on Human Nature*. Oxford.
- Beard, M., J. North & S. Price 1998. *Religions of Rome*, vol. 1-2. Cambridge.
- Beck, R. 2004. 'Sin, Pollution and Purity: Rome' in S. Johnston (ed.) *Religions of the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA, London, 509-11.
- Betz, H.D. (ed.) 1986. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation. Volume 1: Texts*. Chicago, London.

- Bodel, J. 2000. 'Dealing with the Dead: Undertakers, Executioners and Potter's Fields in Ancient Rome' in V. Hope & E. Marshall (eds.) *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*. London, 128-51.
- Branham, J.R. 1997. 'Blood in Flux, Sanctity at Issue' *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 31, 53-70.
- Buckley, T. & A. Gottlieb 1988. 'A Critical Appraisal of Theories of Menstrual Symbolism' in T. Buckley & A. Gottlieb (eds.) *Blood Magic: The Anthropology of Menstruation*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1-50.
- Burriss, E. 1929. 'The Nature of Taboo and its Survival in Roman Life' *CPh* 24, 142-63.
- Butrica, J.L. 2002. 'Clodius the *pulcher* in Catullus and Cicero' *CQ* 52, 507-16.
- Cook, L.A. 1999. 'Body Language: Women's Rituals of Purification in the Bible and Mishnah' in R.R. Wasserfall (ed.) *Women and Water: Menstruation in Jewish Life and Law*. Hanover, NH, 40-59.
- Damon, C. 1992. 'Sex. Cloelius, Scriba' *HSCPh* 94, 227-50.
- Dickie, M.W. 2001. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. London.
- Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity & Danger*. Oxford, New York.
- Douglas, M. 1975. *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology*. London, New York.
- Douglas, M. 1996. *Natural Symbols* (2nd edition). London, New York.
- Dumont, J.C. 1995. 'L'enlèvement du cadavre' in F. Hinard (ed.) *La mort au quotidien dans le monde Romain*. Paris, 181-87.
- Edwards, C. 1997. 'Unspeakable Professions: Public Performance and Prostitution in Ancient Rome' in J.P. Hallett & M.B. Skinner (eds.) *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton, 66-95.
- Fantham, E. 1991. 'Stuprum: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome' *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 35, 267-91.
- Frazer, J. 1929. *The Fasti of Ovid*. London.
- Friedl, E. 1975. *Women and Men: An Anthropologist's View*. New York, London.
- Girard, R. 1977. *Violence and the Sacred*. Baltimore.

- Gottlieb, A. 1988. 'Menstrual Cosmology among the Beng of Ivory Coast' in T. Buckley & A. Gottlieb (eds.) *Blood Magic: The Anthropology of Menstruation*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 55-74.
- Gourevitch, D. 1984. *Le mal d'être femme: la femme et la médecine dans la Rome antique*. Paris.
- Harries, J. 2007. *Law and Crime in the Roman World*. Cambridge.
- Hemelrijk, E.A. 2009. 'Women and Sacrifice in the Roman Empire' in O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner & C. Witschel (eds.) *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire*. Leiden, 253-67.
- Hope, V. 2009. *Roman Death*. London.
- Hoskins, J. 2002. 'Blood Mysteries: Beyond Menstruation as Pollution' *Ethnology* 41, 299-301.
- Janowitz, N. 2001. *Magic in the Roman World: Pagans, Jews and Christians*. London, New York.
- King, H. 1987. 'Sacrificial Blood: The Role of the ἀμνίον in Ancient Gynecology' in M.B. Skinner (ed.) *Rescuing Creusa: New Methodological Approaches to Women in Antiquity*. Lubbock, TX, 117-26.
- King, H. 1995. 'Self-help, Self-knowledge: In Search of the Patient in Hippocratic Gynaecology' in R. Hawley & B. Levick (eds.) *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*. London, New York, 135-48.
- Langlands, R. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- Langness, L.L. 1967. 'Sexual Antagonism in the New Guinea Highlands: a Bena Bena Example' *Oceania* 37, 161-77.
- Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. 1979. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford.
- Lindsay, H. 2000. 'Death-Pollution and Funerals in the City of Rome' in V. Hope & E. Marshall (eds.) *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*. London, 152-74.
- Martin, D.B. 2001. 'Contradictions of Masculinity: Ascetic Inseminators and Menstruating Men in Greco-Roman Culture' in V. Finucci & K. Brownlee (eds.) *Generation and Degeneration: Tropes of Reproduction in Literature and History from Antiquity to Early-Modern Europe*. Durham, NC 81-108.

- McGinn, T.A.J. 2006. 'Zoning Shame in the Roman City' in C. Faraone & L.K. McClure (eds.) *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*. Madison, 161-76.
- Meigs, A.S. 1978. 'A Papuan Perspective on Pollution' *Man* 13, 304-18.
- Meigs, A.S. 1984. *Food, Sex & Pollution: A New Guinea Religion*. New Brunswick.
- Meyer, M.M. 2005. *Thicker Than Water: The Origins of Blood as Ritual and Symbol*. Oxford.
- Mullin, A. 1996. 'Purity and Pollution: Resisting the Rehabilitation of a Virtue' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57, 509-24.
- Ogle, M.B. 1911. 'The House-door in Religion and Folklore' *AJP* 32, 251-71.
- Parker, H. 2004. 'Why Were the Vestals Virgins? Or the Chastity of Women and the Safety of the State' *AJP* 125, 563-601.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2007. 'Τὰ φυσικά in a confession inscription from Saittai' *ZPE* 163, 121-2.
- Richlin, A. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humour* (Revised Edition). New York, Oxford.
- Richlin, A. 1997. 'Pliny's Brassiere' in J.P. Hallett & M.B. Skinner (eds.) *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton, 197-220.
- Rose, H.J. 1924. *The Roman Questions*. New York.
- Roux, J.-P. 1988. *Le Sang: Mythes, symboles et réalités*. Paris.
- von Staden, H. 1991. 'Apud nos foediora verba: Celsus' Reluctant Construction of the Female Body' in G. Sabbah (ed.) *Le Latin medical: La Constitution d'un langage scientifique*. Saint-Étienne, 271-96.
- Stewart, P.J. & A. Strathern. 2002. 'Power and Placement in Blood Practices' *Ethnology* 41, 349-63.
- Tatum, W.J. 1993. 'Catullus 79: Personal Invective or Political Discourse?' *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 7, 31-45.
- Thome, G. 1992. 'Crime and Punishment, Guilt and Expiation: Roman Thought and Vocabulary' *Acta Classica* 35, 73-98.
- Toynbee, J.M.C. 1971. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. Baltimore, London.
- Valeri, V. 2000. *The Forest of Taboos: Morality, Hunting and Identity Among the Huaulu of the Moluccas*. Madison.

- Wagenvoort, H. 1947. *Roman Dynamism: Studies in Ancient Roman Thought, Language and Custom*. Oxford.
- Warde-Fowler, W. 1911. *The Religious Experience of the Roman People from the Earliest Times to the Age of Augustus*. London.
- Wildfang, R.L. 2006. *Rome's Vestal Virgins*. Oxford, New York.
- Wiseman, P.T. 1985. *Catullus and his World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.

PATRONS, TRIBES AND ELECTIONS: THE ROMAN SENATOR AND POLITICS

By Joaquín Muñiz Coello

Summary: This paper analyses some of the benefits, which were aspirations in the moral code of the Roman leading class. It discusses their meaning and the way they were obtained according to the times. The survey proceeds to reflect on the origin of agrarian wealth, the evolution of patronage and *clientelae*, the way offices were held, and the electoral system in the Late Republic. The main sources of this study are the lives of three prestigious senators, who serve as references for three different time periods.

Historians of ancient Rome are well accustomed to confront the scarcity of written sources and the uncertainty frequently attending the issues covered in them. Applicable to both the Republican and Imperial periods, this lack is mitigated by the presence of inscriptions, and, at least for the century that closes the Republican era, the availability of personal testimonies. Despite this, it is not far-fetched to assert that the scholars of ancient Rome must face literary sources that are discontinuous and disparate in their topics, as well as in the quantity and quality of the data. Thus, although we know a great deal about the morphology and utility of plants, about mythical heroes and ethnic stereotypes, or about rhetoric – usually a precondition for political success – we still lack information on the origin, development and function of institutions as rooted in Roman society as patronage and clientage. Such a vacuum in our knowledge presents a stimulus to attempt different courses of analysis.¹

1 Such a fundamental issue is only known through a couple of more or less lengthy texts,

This paper will analyse aspects of the daily behaviour of a Roman senator, as a patron and a statesman, and the role played by clients in the competition for magistracies. The following topics will be addressed: the origins of landed wealth and its role as an instrument in establishing clientage support; rural tribes and their role in elections, at least during the three middle decades of the last century of the Republic; and the connections of all of these with normal behaviour in the urban landscape. Wherever the texts permit, the aim is to gauge the effects of the figure's *factio* – action or influence – and the role of clientage groups in the political sphere.²

Because of the absence of data, it is useless to attempt a diachronic analysis. Therefore, this study concentrates on the biographies of three key figures. Although they belonged to different times, separated by a century and a half each, and the information available for them varies, they all stood out as pre-eminent in their historical period, and conclusions are based on a comparative analysis. They are Lucius Caecilius Metellus, consul in 251 and 247 BC, M.T. Cicero, consul in 63, and Pliny the Younger, consul with Trajan c. AD 100. The different relevance and historical importance of these figures is taken into consideration, especially of the first in relation to the other two. The latter certainly hold exceptional importance even for the entire Classical period, while Metellus' biography stands out against the obscurity which characterises the documentary evidence for the Roman Republic.

It is worth adding some reflections on Cicero and Pliny the Younger, the two senators chosen for this study. They were not only members of the elite within their *ordo*, but also they knew how to combine successfully their service to the *res publica* – or to the *princeps* – with their scholarly work, at which Cicero particularly excelled. Thus, whilst the letters of Pliny may be read as evidence of his solid learning, Cicero's extensive written work actually achieved the outmost acknowledgment within his own time. Nevertheless, such an intellectual capacity was an exception after all, and it can hardly be put forward at the same level as their political influence and personal wealth.

two or three brief references, and some hundreds of references that simply state its existence: D.H. 2.9-11; Plaut. *Men.* 571-88; Plu. *Rom.* 13; Gell. 5.13. A computerised search of the collections of classical sources produces 359 references for the terms *cliens*, *clients* or *clientage*, including the ones just mentioned.

2 *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968) 670, first meaning.

In fact, they can hardly be compared to any powerful and respectable senator, who ruled his *factio* or even the well-off man with plenty of resources, *facultates*, which actually resulted in political power, relations and influences for his own benefit. As a matter of fact, Cicero and Pliny the Younger accomplished almost every step of their regular *cursus honorum* to the highest political office, the consulship, with few outstanding military actions which deserved any mention at all.³ Both politicians and writers served only once in the provinces, were never elected as censors and, as for Pliny, being himself not an *eques* but a senator, he did not reach the *praefecturae* either. Of course, they were not *pedarii*, but wealthy landlords owning several rural estates and urban properties. However, many senators were wealthier than them. In addition, for several periods of his life, Cicero suffered from financial scarcity, asking for help from his very friend, the banker T. Atticus, but at the same time it is relevant to note that his wife Terentia's fortune was significantly larger than his own.⁴

Therefore, despite being a notorious exception as intellectuals themselves, there seemed to be a close relation between their wealth and the exact measure of their political influence, which in the case of Cicero reached its high point only after his consulship and for over a decade, whereas Pliny's increased progressively all through his career. In brief, that was the political and economic power we assume belonged to most of the senators as members of the same *ordo*.

There is a risk involved in addressing complex issues that are poorly documented, and whatever conclusions are arrived at from the perspective of these three biographies – belonging to different periods and chosen for their relevance – are not necessarily applicable to the whole bracket of dates they embrace. Nothing is further from the aim of this paper, but given the alternative posed by the present state of knowledge, any conclusion that might finally be deduced will serve to support the choice of method. Whatever the case, Livy's words are called to mind, when in his *praefatio* he alludes to the study of Rome's past, 'it will still be a great satisfaction to me to

3 From this point of view, cf. R. Syme (1939) 1960. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford, 4, where he writes, 'posterity, generous in oblivion, regards with indulgence ... the political orator ... the reason for such exceptional favour may be largely assigned to one thing: the influence of literature when studied in isolation from history.'

4 Cic. *Att.* II.1.2; 2.2; 4; 13.4; 15.20.4; *Q.fr.* 1.3.7; Terentia, Cic. *Att.* 2.4.5; 15.4; 7.3.6; 12.3.2; 15.17.1; Plu. *Cic.* 8.1.

have taken my part, too, in investigating to the utmost of my abilities, the annals of the foremost nation in the world.’⁵

I. A SENATOR OF THE THIRD CENTURY BC

The senator L. Caecilius Metellus was a paradigm for an illustrious life and as such the object of mention in later literature. He was praised for his bravery as a soldier, his tenacity and drive in his fight against Hasdrubal in Sicily during the First Punic War, and also for his distinctive sense of duty as a statesman, with no shortage of sacrifice. His funerary oration, dedicated by his son Quintus, consul in 206 BC, highlighted his two consulships, his triumph over the Carthaginians, and his roles as *magister equitum*, *decemvir* for the distribution of lands, *dictator*, and *pontifex maximus* for twenty-two years until his death in 221 BC. It also enumerated the *decem maximas res optumasque* that had constituted his philosophy of life, and were common in funerary orations. While not representing an objective measure of his achievements, these are nonetheless useful in sketching the contour of the statesman in a time marked by the absence of this type.⁶

Lucius Metellus dedicated his life to the Republic. Eight out of ten of his above-mentioned aims referred to his public role in life. He combined *toga* and *forum* in six different activities and another two as a military man; two was also the number of the aspirations achieved in the private sphere. The *res*

5 Liv. *prae*f. 3.

6 *Supremae laudes*, wrote Plin. *Nat.* 7.139-41; 8.16; 18.17; Plb. 1.39.8; Liv. *Perioch.* 19; Frontinus *Strat.* 1.7.1; 2.5.4; Flor. *Epit.* 1.18.27; D.S. 23.21; Oros. *Hist.* 4.9.15. The *Caecilii Metelli* were comparable to the *Cornelii Scipiones* or the *Claudii*. Both the plebeian branch of the *Marcelli* and the patrician of the *Pulchri* ranked among the greatest families of the Republic. Between 290 and 52, eighteen members of this family held the consulate, the majority between 143 and 52 BC. This ‘decalogue’ was covered in 1981 by professor E. Gabba 2000. ‘Riqueza y clase dirigente romana entre los siglos III y I a.C.’, *Sociedad y política en la Roma republicana (siglos III-I a.C.)*. Pisa: 179-93, a study addressing the origins of wealth; also see, J. Ooteghem 1967. *Les Caecilii Metelli de la République*. Brussels; M. Humm 2007. ‘Forma virtutei parisuma fuit: les valeurs hellénistiques de l’aristocratie romaine à l’époque (médi)républicaine (IV-III s.)’ *Aristocratie antique. Modèles et exemplarité sociale*. Dijon: 101-26. He was probably *magister equitum* of the dictator Aulus Atilius Calatinus, Flor. *Epit.* 1.18.12.

maximas optumasque were concerned with strength, power, wealth, weapons, prestige, and oratory, *potestates* that were related to each other, although not necessarily in that order or in the same proportion. Influence and power were derived from these, prioritizing one over the other, depending on the time and circumstances, and were reinforced and consolidated over the years, with the occasional reverses. Metellus waged war for at least five years, two as consul, one as proconsul, and another as *magister equitum*, assisting the *dictator*, probably Aulus Atilius Calatinus, in 249. At his triumph, after defeating Hasdrubal in Palermo, Sicily, there marched three Punic chiefs and 120 elephants for the admiration and imperishable memory of posterity. This distinguished warrior served in Rome for at least thirty years until his death in 221.⁷

It is worth commenting briefly on his consulships. In the mid-third century, the number of magistracies in Rome was that of a medium-sized power. Including extraordinary offices, such as the dictatorship and its *magister equitum*, the Republic needed to cover a total of twenty-seven magistracies, of which the consulship capped the career aspirations of an elite that did not conceive service to the state in any other way than through the wielding of weapons and the direction of armies. Additionally, in the times of Metellus, one could be elected consul several consecutive times, and at any given point of a public career, if that was the decision of the electors, and this might take place before or after holding other offices such as *aedilis*, *quaestor*, *praetor*, *ensor* and even military or plebeian tribune, for the consulship was not the end of any career, but its highest achievement.⁸

7 In his civil role, *auspicio suo maximas res geri*, 'personally manage the most important matters', *maximo honore uti*, 'achieve the highest rank', *summa sapientia esse*, 'be the most prudent and wise', *summum senatorem haberi*, 'be considered a distinguished senator', *optimum oratorem*, 'the best orator', and *clarissimum in civitate esse*, 'the most illustrious among citizens'. In his military role, *primarium bellatorem esse*, 'be a first class warrior, without comparison', and *fortissimum imperatorem*, 'the bravest and most resolute general'. In his private life, *pecuniam magnam bono modo invenire*, 'acquire great wealth in a good manner', and *multos liberos relinquere*, 'leave numerous offspring', Plin. *Nat.* 7.139-40. Warriors such as Gaius Marius, Caesar or Pompey, orators like Cicero, Marcus Antonius, the consul of 99, or Sulpicius Galba, consul of 144, and rich men like Marcus Crassus, Lucius Ahenobarbus or Lucius Lucullus.

8 Cic. *Rep.* 1.1; Cato 30; see T.R.S. Broughton [1951] 1968. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, Cleveland, Ohio, for data until the year 200. Designation by the senate, in D.H. 8.82.5; 87.1-2; 10.17.1-3. The impression created by the third-century senate on for-

The narratives of Dionysus and Livy are in agreement with this. When the time came to choose a consul, one of the outgoing consuls was charged by the senate to preside over the election that would be held amongst the centuries. But if any extraordinary circumstance prevented any of the two consuls from being present, the senate would ask them to name a dictator, who would then preside over the elections or himself name an *interrex*, who within a maximum interval of five days would hold the elections. Be it a consul, *dictator* or *interrex* who presided, it was the senate that after secret deliberations agreed, *ex sententia principum*, on the candidates to be elected. The decision was passed on the presiding magistrate, who was limited to submitting the names of the proposed senatorial candidates to the centuries. With their vote, they ratified in the Campus Martius the proposals of the *patres*. Nevertheless, there is something to take into account. The division of the *populus* into centuries, attributed to king Tullius, was done in such a way that the wealthier citizens, some of which held senatorial rank, constituted a sufficient majority. In this way, the candidates, proposed and voted by their *classis*, were usually ratified. In sum, according to the sources, the selection of new consuls was already resolved in the senate. In this context, it is feasible to think that Lucius Metellus did not put his efforts into achieving *honores*, the magistracies, but the *maximo honore uti*, 'the highest magistracy', for he only needed to add the votes of his *factio* to those of the rest of the *patres*.⁹ Regarding his private life, the funerary oration celebrates his having

eigners was significant. The Thessalian Cineas, Pyrrhus' ambassador for the negotiation of an armistice with the Romans, when questioned by the monarch on his impressions, answered that the senate had seemed to him like a council of many kings, Plu. *Pyrrh.* 19; App. *Sam.* 10.3; Iust. 18.2.10.

- 9 'Tullius, ... transferred this preponderance of votes from the poor to the rich': D.H. 4.20.3, the voting procedure in 4.75.2; 76.1; 80.2; 84.5, it is the *interrex* who names and later submits the candidates to be ratified by the people: 5.12.3; 19.2, when a consul dies, his colleague names a substitute: 8.82.5; 87.1-2, the presiding consul makes the people vote for the candidates elected by the senate: 90.5; 10.17.3. In the majority of cases, circumstances are omitted and the consuls are cited after the verbs *creo*, *facio*, *habeo*, *sequor* or *ineo*, Liv. 2.8.4; 15.1; 17.1; 18.1; 28.1; 51.4; 64.2; 3.8.2; 8.3.5; 16.4; 17.5; 9.7.15; *ex sententia principum*, 10.11.3; 11.10; 13.11; 47.5; *experta nobilitas* ... L. Aemilium Paulum ... *ad petitionem compellit*, 22.35.3. The model described by Liv. 1.43.4 and D.H. 4.16-18 actually reflects a later time than the consulship of Metellus, according to T.J. Cornell 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome. Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 B.C.)*. London & New York: 216, among others.

left numerous children, *multos liberos relinquere*. Other men to have big families were, a generation before, Ap. Claudius the Blind, who had nine sons and daughters; Metellus' own grandson, Macedonicus, consul in 143, who had six children and eleven grandchildren; or Ap. Claudius Pulcher, consul in 79, who also had six. But just as interesting is what the funerary oration omits. There are no references to clients, followers, and retinues of debtors, or even to relatives and friends, so important at the end of the Republic.

Presumably, the funerary oration highlighted the objectives that a distinguished man of those times would have selected as worthy of his efforts. There is no reference to the creation or increase of a court of followers, debtors, friends and servants, belonging to a great clientage, possibly because Lucius Metellus would have inherited it, as did the Blind. Clientage was an element that went hand in hand with the power and influence of a family, and a measure of the greatness of its patrons. Examples include the five thousand clients of Attus Clausus, the first of the Claudians; the clients of the mythical Coriolanus; the court of clients of Espurius Melius; those of Camillus; the ones that supported the three hundred and six *Fabii*; or the clients, as cumbersome as they were poor, described by Plautus. From what is known of the clientage groups at the beginning of the second century, they were not an attainable aim, a valuable aspiration for Metellus, *maxima res optumaque*, probably because they were not primordial but complementary; they did not play a decisive role in the ascent and public promotion of a patron. In the mid-third century, these clients were a reinforcement to the image of the powerful, but also an economic burden, consuming the patron's time and efforts.¹⁰

¹⁰ The children of the Blind, Plu. *Pyrrh.* 18; Val.Max. 8.13.5; Cic. *Cato*, 37; Plin. *Nat.* 7.59. The Republican clientages, D.H. 2.9-10. In Plaut. *Men.* 575-600, clients are indebted individuals, plebeians and poor farmers, modest and needy people that need the protection and security found in the shadow of the powerful, while the rich clients were scant and often undesirable; D.H. 4.40.3-5; Attus Clausus, from Regillus, 5.40.3; 7.54.3; 21.3; 9.15.3; Liv. 2.16.4; fines and clients, D.H. 2.10.2; Liv. 5.32.8; Plu. *Publ.* 21.1-5; *Rom.* 13; Espurius Melius, D.H. 12.1.2; Gell. 5.13.2-6; 20.1.40; the *Fabii*, Liv. 1.50.11; Ooteghem 1967; M. Pani 1991. 'Gruppi di governó e clientele: assemblee, elezioni', *Civiltà del Romani. Il potere e l'esercito*. Milano: 46-56; E. Albertini 1904. 'La clientèle des Claudii', *Mél. Arch. et d'hist.* 24, 247; E. Rawson 1973. 'The Eastern Clientelae of Clodius and the Claudii', *Historia* 19, 219-39; A. Drummond 1989. 'Early Roman Clientes' Wallace-Hadrill, A. (ed.)

Something may be said now on the aim of acquiring a great fortune, *pecuniam magnam invenire*. The text specifically uses the term *bono modo*, to highlight the subtle difference between one way of obtaining it and another, without clarifying which way is the acceptable one. Nevertheless, it can be explained. This expression tells us of an ethical code which belonged to a social class that discriminated between worthy and unworthy ways of accumulating wealth. It had disappeared by the first century BC, but remained linked to the ever heroic times of the past. We know from other sources what constituted indecent wealth; it derived from unworthy activities, such as retail trade, money-lending, craftsmanship and working for wages, among others. On the other hand, good wealth was obtained from warfare, if it later was invested in land and grazing, and consequently in agriculture and herding. From these practices derived the identification of the rich as *pecuniosi* and *locupletes*. Metellus must have acquired his wealth *bono modo* from the spoils of the Sicilian war, which he later invested in an unspecified extension of lands, large enough to eventually produce *magna pecunia*. This image contradicts the stereotype of grave, frugal and austere men, which the tradition of the Late Republic portrays.¹¹

Let us conclude the sketch of this third-century senator. He was praised at his funeral as being wise and prudent – *summa sapientia esse* –, conditions necessarily fulfilled by the respectable and influential office given to the president of the college of pontiffs, which Metellus held for twenty-two years. It vaguely mentions that he took personal decisions of a certain relevance, *auspicio suo maximas res geri*, some of which could possibly be those mentioned in his biography. Making use of his position as *pontifex maximus*, Metellus forbade A. Postumius Albinus, the recently elected consul of 242, to abandon the city, due to his position as *flamen* of Mars. Twenty-seven

Patronage in Ancient Society. London: 89-115; N. Rouland 1979. *Pouvoir politique et dépendance personnelle dans l'Antiquité romaine*. Bruxelles: 183; K. Verboven 2002. *The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of amicitia and patronage in the Late Republic*. Brussels: 49-63.

- ¹¹ The Greeks already considered land as the most dignified occupation and source of wealth, Pl. *Lg.* 743D; Arist. *Pol.* 1.3, which opinion then was passed on to Roman writers: Cic. *Off.* 1.26.92; Plu. *Cat.Ma.* 2-3; Cic. *Cato*, 24-25; 51-59; *Off.* 1.150; *Rep.* 2.4.7-8; 9.16. In Sall. *Catil.* 7 describing the heroes of the past, 'their aim was unbounded renown, but only such riches as could be gained honourably, *divitias honestas*'; Rouland 1979: 430; Gabba 2000: 180-81.

years after his first consulate, he held sufficient authority to be entrusted with conducting consular elections in 223 as *dictator*. The sources do not give the reason for this appointment, but taking into consideration that he was only designated when neither consul could preside over elections, it may have coincided with a spread of disease throughout the Roman camp after the victory over the Boii.¹²

Other references highlight the exceptional and attractive character of this conspicuous figure. His triumphal parade, on return from Sicily, remained in the collective memory because of the one hundred and twenty elephants that he brought as spoils of war. He was also remembered for his extravagant behaviour, both daring and heroic, *causa memorabilis*, while holding the highest religious office in Rome. When the Temple of Vesta was engulfed in flames, he risked his life to save the sacred objects inside, among them apparently a statue of Pallas. The story goes on to relate that the outcome was tragic, *eventu misero*, for Metellus lost his eyesight because of the fire. Regardless of the historical veracity of this narration, his old age was parallel to that of Caecus, 'the Blind', his predecessor by sixty years: both attended the senate, one on a litter and the other in a horse-drawn carriage, a sad counterpoint to the richness of their lives. Such incidents were later remembered as paradigms and made of Lucius Metellus a *clarissimus in civitate esse*. Nothing is known of his abilities in oratory – *optimus orator* – for he is not included in Cicero's treatises, perhaps because of his antiquity. We do know, though, that he belonged to a family of reputed orators, including his own son, Quintus, author of his funerary oration, and his grandson Macedonicus, consul in 143. Nevertheless, nothing more can be added about this Metellus, glorious example of a Roman senator, archetype of greatness and pride of his plebeian family.¹³

12 Pliny notes his participation in a committee of *decemviri agris adsignandis*, of which there is no other mention, and which is not recorded by Broughton 1968, although it is significant that his son Quintus belonged to a similar committee in 201, Liv. 31.4.3, presiding over land allotments in Apulia and Samnium. There are other coincidences, such as the appointment as *magister equitum* and dictator to conduct elections, motivated by the same reasons, an epidemic in the Roman camp which kept the consul away from Rome, for 224, in Plb. 2.35.8-10, and for 205 in Liv. 28.10.1-2; 29.10.2; 11.9.

13 The blindness of Metellus and Appius, D.H. 2.66.4; 16.3.1; Plin. *Nat.* 7.141; Liv. 9.29.11; *perioch.* 19; Cic. *Brut.* 57; 77; Val.Max. 1.1.17; T. Manlius Torquatus and Q. Fulvius Flaccus were consuls in 224, Plb. 2.31.8; Sen. *Contr.* 4.2; 7.2.7.

II. A SENATOR OF THE LATE REPUBLIC

There is no similar funerary oration for the figure of M. Tullius Cicero, but the information that has survived is just as full of praise. In general lines, his conduct was similar to that of Lucius Metellus. Although the times were different, many of the aforementioned values still applied, adapted to new contexts. After analyzing the meaning of concepts such as *toga praetexta*, *sella curulis*, *fascies*, *imperia*, *provinciae*, *divitiae*, *potestates*, *opes*, *honores*, and *regna*, among others, which are frequently used in his works, one is not stretched to identify them, at least those related to his public role, with the *maximas res optumasque* found in Metellus' text.¹⁴

Cicero's political career was brilliant. Within twelve years, he completed all the magistracies in the *cursus*, and later boasted of having finished the consulship – *maximum honorem uti*, in Metellus' oration – at the minimum established age, 43 if he is to be believed, only equalled in the ease of his political ascent by Pliny the Younger, our third senator. His success is highly significant, considering his *novitas*, the absence of a family tradition in politics. This meant that his immediate ancestors lacked any connection with the government, an obstacle that practically blocked those not belonging to the *nobilitas*. Furthermore, his *cursus* began in the years still marked by Sulla's conservative reforms. The dictator died only three years before Cicero left for Sicily as quaestor.

It is not the aim of this paper to ponder whether Cicero belonged to the Sullan *factio* or not, and if so, to what degree he supported the dictatorial régime, but the facts certainly show that the new order established by Sulla's government was favourable to him. Initially, he served in the dictator's ranks in Italy, but later held sufficient authority as an individual to defend opposite positions, as evidenced by his attacks on Chrysogonos, Sulla's powerful freedman, while defending Roscius of Ameria in court. His connections with powerful figures such as Pompey, Lucullus or Ahenobarbus were of key importance in the competition for the magistracies, although we are not able to say exactly in what measure, at what time or occasion. Above all, what

¹⁴ *Quinque rerum bonarum maxima et praecipua* are also highlighted in the case of P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus, consul in 131: riches, nobility, eloquence, expertise in law and becoming *pontifex maximus*, Gell. 1.13.10, cf. Gabba 2000: 182; Cic. *Cluent.* 154; *Rab. Post.* 16/17; *Rep.* 3.15. They are complemented by *aerarium*, *provinciae*, *magistratus*, *gloriae triumphique*, from Sall. *Iug.* 41.7.

stands out is his position as a patron, and it might or might not be coincidental that all his *villae* and *deversoriae* were located in different voting-tribes. His position as a senator was based, in part, on the mobilization of his protégés.¹⁵

Some of Metellus' aims are not included in the values listed by Cicero, like being the best orator, *optimus oratur*, a quality that was never disputed in his own time or later; or achieving prudence and wisdom, *summa sapientia esse*, a term that falls short in describing his extensive written works. Obviously, in Cicero's case, as previously in Metellus', qualities that were already possessed could not constitute values. For Cicero, many of these values were but an extension of the *maximus honos*, and like Metellus, he achieved it in his middle age, although it was not the end to political life for either of them. The Arpinian achieved the distinction of being the most distinguished member of the senate – *summum senatorem haberi*; his speeches are a testimony to that. But he also became the most distinguished citizen at key moments – *clarissimum in civitate esse* – such as those immediately following Catilina's death or at the return from his exile in 57 BC.

Cicero personally undertook the most important responsibilities – *auspicio suo maximas res geri* – in the words of Metellus' funerary oration. These were civil responsibilities, which included an ample range of forms of influence that the Arpinian employed to secure his own pre-eminent position and favour the promotion of his *familiares*. Thus, Cicero was well acquainted with the steps to be taken and the issues to be dealt with in order

15 Cicero was versatile and adapted easily to circumstances, which means that he could defend someone he had previously attacked and vice versa, as in the cases of Aulus Gabinius, Gaius Antonius, Publius Vatinius and even Catilina himself, whom he considered defending *de repetundis*, before 63, Cic. *Att.* 1.2.1; *Cael.* 14; 74; *Flacc.* 95; *Vat.* 28; *Fam.* 1.9.19; *Rab. Post.* 19; *Prov.* 9-12; Chrysogonus, *Plu. Cic.* 3; He supported Sulla's laws, Cic. *Leg.* 3.33, rejected a bill that was intended to give political rights back to the descendants of those proscribed by Sulla, Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 11.1.85; Cic. *Pis.* 4; *Att.* 2.1.3; *Plin. Nat.* 8.117; *Plu. Cic.* 12.1; 31. Cicero's supports, Cic. *Att.* 1.1.3; *Manil.* 5.10; 20-21; 26; *Leg.* 3.22; *Q. Cic. Comm. pet.* 5; E.S. Gruen 1974, 2nd ed. 1995. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: 139. He owned villas and *deversoria* in up to nine different tribes – others are unidentified: Pompeii in the *Menenia*, *CIL* 10.89, Puteoli in the *Palatina* (?), *CIL* 10.1777, Antium in the *Quirina*, *CIL* 6.2725, Tusculum in the *Papiria*, Cic. *Planc.* 19, Arpinum in the *Cornelia* and Formiae in the *Aemilia*, Liv. 38.36.19, Lanuvium in the *Maecia*, *CIL* 15.2104, Anagnina in the *Poplilia*, *CIL* 6.2377, and Frusino in the *Oufentina*, *Plin. Nat.* 3.64.

to ensure success in the senate. He intervened in elections, recommending his candidates, putting pressure on the electors, buying votes, promising compensations, and reminding others of previous services and favours. He was up to date on current issues, alliances, political manoeuvres and the daily movements of the leaders of the *factiones*, and except for a few special cases, he was able to predict the outcome of any decision put to the vote. He knew beforehand who would be elected magistrates in the centuriate assembly and delivered speeches against or in favour of decrees and *rogationes* for which he assured the outcome in the assembly, just as he did for verdicts affecting his own.¹⁶

Senator Cicero exerted influence in *quaestiones* to favour his own. He withdrew accusations in exchange for candidatures to the consulate, and offered to trade his political neutrality for lucrative provinces. He did not flinch at decisions that some would classify as below his level, and he was present at the drawing of *provinciae*, doing what was necessary, for example, to annul a destination that had already been assigned. He tried to favour his own with good *provinciae*, controlling the renewal of the post, and once back in Rome, worked so that the *patres* voted the *supplicationes* necessary for a triumph, just as he hindered the same process for his adversaries. Lastly, he tried to be always in touch with what went on in the *aerarium*, from the final drafting of legal texts and archiving of laws and decrees, to the assignation of expenses and the installation of magistrates, *viaticum* and *vasarium*,

16 Cf. the cases of Buthroton or of Sycon's debt, with Atticus, in 45, Cic. *Att.* 1.20.4; 14.10.3; 11.2; 12.1; 14.6; 19.4. In 57 BC, a law was approved that allowed him to return from exile, thanks to the *factio* of P. Lentulus Spinther, consul in that year, of Pompeius, the tribune P. Sestius, and others. These were voted by the centuries, securing the vote of the *prima classis* and *equites*, despite the control that Clodius' followers and those of his brother, the praetor Appius, held over the streets. Cic. *De div.* 1.60.29; *Pis.* 36; *Sest.* 109; 128; *P.red.in Sen.* 27; *P.red.ad quir.* 17; *Dom.* 75; 90; 142; *Ascon. Pis.* 10.15; A. Yakobson 1992. 'Petitio et Largitio: Popular Participation in the Centuriate Assembly of the Late Republic' *JRS* 82: 42. During the electoral scandal of 54, Cicero declared himself innocent of the plot, arguing that his candidate Messala did not stand to gain. In the provinces, the publicans compensated the *custodiae* the governor put at their service to protect their collections by participating in the juries he presided, Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.73; *Fam.* 2.13.4; *Q. fr.* 1.1.33; Cic. *Sest.* 103; *Att.* 1.18.7; *Planc.* 23. Powerful men held a much higher influence in the government and the tribunals, Caes. *B.C.* 1.4; Cicero knew beforehand that P. Cornelius Lentulus would be consul in 57, and Domicius Calvinus and his intimate friend Valerius Messalla, for the remainder of 53, Cic. *Q.fr.* 2.3.4; 3.2.3.

whether on their journeys or already at their destination, and all of this without entering into the broad field of his recommendations.¹⁷

But Cicero was not a *primus bellator*, a first class warrior, nor probably a *fortissimus imperator*, the bravest and most resolute general, as defined in the terms of the late third century or even of his own times. There is not much information on his service in the militia, save for his being under Sulla in Italy, and under Pompeius Strabo, the father of Magnus, during the Social War; a random action with Catilina and, years later, when he governed Cilicia. In such cases, his performance does not seem to have equalled his brilliance as a statesman. In fact, in the values he lists as belonging to any distinguished man, there is a subtle difference. There is silence on the *virtus* in combat, which he substitutes for *fascēs*, *imperia* and *honores*, attributes to direct them. His famous *dictum* 'let arms yield to the toga' was not just a brilliant rhetorical flourish.¹⁸

17 Cic. *Q. fr.* 1.2.7, spends the money assigned by the *aerarium* on his brother; Cicero's *factio*, in Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.7; 12; 2.17.6; 5.6.1; 10.25.2; 11.4; *Att.* 1.16.8; 12; 19.9; 2.6.5; 4.3.6; *phil.* 2.20; obstacles to the allotment of provinces, Cic. *Fam.* 8.5.3; C. Pomptinus waited seven years to celebrate his triumph over the Allobroges, because of the *factio* impeding it, Cic. *Q. fr.* 3.4.6; while considering defending Catilina *de repetundis*, he assured having the judges on his side, and expected Catilina to collaborate in his campaign for the consulate if absolved, Cic. *Att.* 1.2.1. Macedonia, for C. Antonius, Sall. *Catil.* 26; Plu. *Cic.* 12; Decimus Brutus, consul in 44, asked Cicero's support for the awarding of a *supplicatio*, Cic. *Fam.* 11.4; From Tarsus, Cicero himself Cic. *Fam.* 15.6.2, thanks Cato for his help in achieving the *supplicatio*, cf. *Fam.* 15.11.1; P. Cornelius Cethegus, *proditor*, *homo non probatissimus*, secured good destinations, Cic. *Brut.* 178; *Cluent.* 84; *Parad.* 5.40; Plu. *Luc.* 6; Sall. *Hist.* 1.77.20.

18 Several sources accuse him of cowardice, lack of daring and bravery, and of being clearly afraid of arms, a consensus that does not seem to reflect the unjustified critiques of his enemies. On the other hand, he was put to the test many times. In July 63, he showed up to preside over elections, clad in a large cuirass, which he later attempted to excuse; he was fearful in the presence of Pompey and his troops, who surrounded the senate in 52; a frivolous sensation took hold of him in Issus, where Alexander had been, whom he felt to be emulating; while he governed Cilicia, his glorious action against the 'dangerous' enemy of Pindenissum provoked the laughter of his friend Atticus; his continuous fear of the Parthians in neighbouring Syria made him wish for the termination of his mandate much before it was over, J. Muñiz Coello 2007. 'La ley, el Amano y la *virtus* de un procónsul' *REA* 109, 220-40; finally, he was present at Pharsalos, but not in the battle, because he

Lucius Metellus managed to have a large family, *multos liberos relinquere*, which guaranteed the continuity of his lineage, and left them a considerable fortune with no ethical stigma attached to it, for it was clearly stated to have been acquired in an honest way, *pecuniam magnam bono modo invenire*. Cicero had two children, of which only one survived, so this aspect became secondary in his scale of values, as expressed in one of his literary pieces, where he accommodated his personal circumstances through a barrage of rhetoric justification. On one occasion he laments not having had relatives, i.e., children and other close family members, in sufficient number, as they were fundamental in times of need, such as his exile, but immediately goes on to say that he felt compensated by the number of those who instigated, collaborated and actively worked towards making his return possible.¹⁹

III. PRAEDIA AND CLIENTAGE

Returning to the subject of fortune and 'good' ways of acquiring it, private wealth was an important distinguishing feature of aristocratic status, but not the only one, if we consider the decalogue of aspirations of our aristocrat of the third century BC. It consisted fundamentally of land, *praedia*, rural property, used for agricultural purposes, although sometimes only as a residence. For the purpose of continuity with the discussion that follows, it will be useful to refer to the context in which these kinds of properties arise.

claimed to be ill, which made Livy (*Perioch.* 111), exclaim that there was no man less suited for war, Cic. *Mur.* 52; *Catil.* 3.5; *Att.* 5.9.1; 11.4; Plu. *Cic.* 3; 35; D.C. 40.54. 2; Ascon. *Mil.* 42; Sall. *Catil.* 26. 4; *cedant arma togae*, Cic. *Pis.* 73; *Phil.* 2.20; *Off.* 1.77.

¹⁹ He classified values that he lacked, such as nobility, children, health or riches, as good, but unnecessary: *bonorum ... partim non necessaria*, and included in the same classification other values like *vires*, *forma*, *valetudo* and *clientelae*. In Cic. *Part.* 86, he established a rating of life values in terms of importance and need. The less relevant places were assigned to elements that our senator, of plebeian origin and a *homo novus*, lacked, such as numerous offspring, nobility and wealth. On the other hand, his philosophical stance on *nobilitas* and *divitiae* is found throughout his works. Any treaty or deliberative speech was a good occasion to expose his views on these values, see Cic. *Rep.* 1.51; *Off.* 1. 25; 2.71; *Rhet. Herenn.* 1.8.20; *Pred.ad quir.* 3.6; 4.9.

The origin of the estates belonging to Italy's *nobilitas*, as mentioned above, was linked to war and political changes, both the lucrative results of the holding of magistracies.²⁰ During the conquest of Italy, it was customary for Roman generals to be granted lands in the area where they had held command, as a token of gratitude or personal compensation for their contribution to the increase of the *ager publicus* in the region. Another custom was to invest their war spoils in the same kind of wealth, which gave them security and status. Alongside with the properties created by conquest were those that emerged from the war against Hannibal, and a century later, from the so-called Social War, but especially from Sulla's proscriptions, more recent and numerous. These victorious generals, who were by law admitted to the senate at their return from their campaign, which they themselves had created and voted for, also became perpetual *possessores* of lands belonging to the *ager publicus*, taxed with a symbolic *vectigal*, which was in theory collected by the publicans, although there is no evidence for this actually taking place. Hence, with time, such a lease, which was not subject to payment, was hardly different from *proprietas*. It was normal for a powerful and influential family to accumulate, over several generations, large expanses of land in the domain of several rural tribes, an economic heritage which later became a solid base for political power.²¹

²⁰ There is a stark contrast between the process of accumulation of great properties, resulting from the moral corruption that appeared with the Roman conquests, and the paradigm of the great Republican, an austere man, frugal and immune to luxury, tilling his own sterile and wild lands. This model, belonging to Late Republican historiography, is only a cliché, at best, a desirable moral patron of a ruling class in decline. Large estates already existed in the mid-fourth century, as may be judged from the laws of 366, see Lucan. 1.161-68; Val. Max. 4.4.4; 6.7; D.H. 19.16; Plb. 16.56.1-5; Liv. 3.26.8; Colum. 1.4.2; Cic. *Cato*, 28; 56; Gell. *prol.* 1.14; 6.8.7; Plu. *Cam.* 23; 39, on the *Curii, Fabricii, Reguli, Cincinnati, Aelii, Camilii*, and others.

²¹ The *ager exceptus*, Sic. Flacc. p. 157, 7-8L; Gruen [1974] 1995: 77; R.E. Mitchell 1996. Hudson, M. & B.A. Levine (eds.). '*Ager publicus*. Public Property and Private Wealth during the Roman Republic' in *Privatization in the Ancient Near East and Classical World* vol. 1, A Colloquium held at New York University, Nov. 17-18, 1994. Cambridge, MA. The creation of rural properties is not linked to their remaining in the hands of a single family, as demonstrated by E. Rawson 1976. 'The Ciceronian Aristocracy and its Properties', in M.I. Finley (ed.). *Studies in Roman Property*, Cambridge: 89 and 95, which indicates that a generational link of the landowner with his properties was infrequent. Lands were not kept, but sold and replaced by others. It was, besides, an effective way of creating

An influential senator held properties all over Italy, especially in Latium and Campania, two regions highly valued for their proximity to Rome, fertility and good climate. Some of these properties were only residential, a few kilometres from the city, used as second homes to rest from the daily political activity. These rural estates were used to strengthen ties of friendship and patronage with the locals, by hearing and attending their petitions and needs. To this effect, the powerful senator was registered in the corresponding rural tribe.²²

Cn. Pompeius Strabo, consul in 89, held properties in his home region of Picenum, to the east of the Apennines, which were later inherited by his son Cn. Pompeius Magnus, together with the patronage of many towns in the area. The magnitude of his power was reflected in the several thousand combatants of the region that responded to his call for arms. All of Pompey's fortune, valued in fifty million drachmas, was pawned by Antony during a second period of proscriptions. He did the same with a property in Casinum, belonging to the writer M. Terentius Varro. In his treaty on agriculture, Varro mentions having horses in Reate, the town where he was born, and herds of sheep grazing on his lands in Apulia. A similar capacity for mobilizing people, although in this case shepherds, was attributed to the pro-Sullan

links with voting-tribes. Such seems to be the origin of the lands of Terentia, wife of Cic. *Att.* 2.4.5; 15.4. P. Scipio Africanus owned land in Liternum, a Campanian colony created in 194, the year he was consul, Liv. 38.53.8; 45.38.7; Sen. *Epist.* 86.3; Val. Max. 2.10.2; M. Aemilius Lepidus, censor in 179, held properties in Terracina, a port south of Rome, where he constructed for his private use using public funds, Liv. 40.51.2; 43.1.6, for 173 BC; Sulla's confiscations, Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.81; *Off.* 2.83; *Leg. agr.* 3.3; *S. Rosc.* 125-30; Flor. *Epit.* 2.11.3; Plu. *Crass.* 2; F. Hinard 1985. *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*. Rome: 186-203; W.V. Harris 1979. *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327-70 B.C.* Oxford: 55 and 59. If the main source of income was agrarian, it was usually complemented by commercial business, such as money-changing and lending, trade in Italy or the provinces, or illegal participation in *publica* and *ultra tributa* through *particulae* and *adfines* of the *societates publicanorum*.

- 22 The remaining elements of aristocratic distinction, in the funerary oration for Lucius Metellus, Plin. *Nat.* 7.139-40; Cic. *Off.* 1.151; *Cato* 51; Harris 1979: 53-57; Mitchell 1996: 263; two centuries after Metellus, the texts highlight other values, apart from land, which people aspired to obtain. Their enumeration – *sella curulis*, *fascēs*, *divitiae*, *potestates*, *opes*, *honores*, *imperia*, *regna*, *provinciae*, triumphs, priesthoods, etc. – became a kind of declaration of personal *status* for the privileged, Cic. *Rab. Post.* 16/17; *Q. fr.* 3.3; *Cluent.* 154; *Rep.* 3.15.

C. Antonius Hybrida, Cicero's partner in the consulship and uncle of the triumvir, the owner of vast tracts of land in southern Italy. On the other hand, Aulus Gabinius contributed a contingent of eight hundred slaves and shepherds to Pompey's war against Caesar.²³

Marcus Crassus' fortune was valued at two hundred million *sestertii*, and besides many properties in the City, he must also have been a rural landowner in many regions. The banker Titus Atticus, known for sparing his expenses, held estates in Nomentum and Arretium in Italy, and in Buthroton in Epirus, besides a *domus* on the Quirinal. Horace, the poet, was a *scriba quaestorius* of medium income, and owned properties in Sabina, near Varia, Tibur and Tarentum, as well as a house in Rome. L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, consul in 54, considered one of the richest men of his time thanks to Sulla's confiscations, could promise fifteen iugera of land to each soldier *ex suis possessionibus* to his army camped in Corfinium, as well as proportional amounts to his centurions and veterans. Q. Valgius, father-in-law of P. Servilius Rullus, the tribune of the plebs who authored the *lex agraria* in 63, owned extensive lands in Samnium.²⁴

Considering the wealth just described, M. Cicero was not a rich man, at least not in comparison with the fortunes of the Scauri, Lucius Lucullus, Lucius Ahenobarbus or Marcus Crassus. For a member of his *census*, his fortune was considered moderate or barely above that. It consisted of *villae rus-*

23 Pompey and Picenum, Plu. *Pomp.* 6.1-2; Vell. 2.29.2; App. *BC* 1.80; 3.6; 5.79; Cic. *Phil.* 2.103; Val. Max. 5.2.9; *Bell. Afr.* 22.2, Gruen [1974] 1995: 376. The properties of C. Antonius, Cic. *Tog.cand.* apud Ascon. 86 Clark, acquired during Sulla's confiscations, see J. Muñiz Coello 2000. 'La carrera política de C. Antonio Hybrida, cónsul del 63' *HA* 24: 330.

24 Cic. *S.Rosc.* 6; 20 (= 6,000,000 HS), some six thousand *iugera*, (1,500 hectares). Lucius Ahenobarbus, together with Marcus Crassus, were the richest Romans of their time, P.A. Brunt 1975. 'Two Great Roman Landowners' *Latomus* 34: 619-35; Syme [1939] 1960: 14; I. Shatzman 1975. *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics*. Bruxelles: passim; Hinard 1985: 201; Caes. *Civ.* 1.15.7, Plin. *Nat.* 33.134, at 1,000 *sestertii* per *iugerum*, meant 200,000 *iugera*, or 50,000 hectares; Suet. *Vita Att.* 14.3; *Vita Hor.* 65; *Hor. Epist.* 1.7.45; *Sat.* 1.6.105; 1.14.2-3. Domitius had 20 cohorts, some 12,000 soldiers, in Corfinium, which made the sum of his promise 200,000 *iugera* of land; 17.4; 34.3; 56.3; D.C. 41.11.1; he was sufficiently rich so as to arm seven ships with freedmen, slaves and tenants. Varro, *Rust.* 3.5.9; 2.pr.6.8. The *ager hirpinus*, Cic. *Leg.agr.* 3.8; the *Hirpini*, neighbours of the inland Lucanians, Plin. *Nat.* 3.105; Str. 5.4.12; Gabinius' troops, in Caes. *Civ.* 3.4. Crassus' assets, Cic. *Att.* 1.4.3; 2.4.2; *Off.* 1.25; *Parad.* 6.45; *Tusc.* 1.12; *Div.* 2.22; Plu. *Crass.* 2. 3; Plin. *Nat.* 33.134.

ticae – between eight and eleven houses with farmland – a *domus*, and three *insulae* of apartments in Rome, besides a certain number of *deversoria* – or houses with gardens – but no considerable extents of land. *Deversoria* lined the different communication routes, and seem to have been used to lodge their owners and their friends on journeys, in order to avoid unknown and insecure roadside lodgings.²⁵

Cicero's estates were fundamentally rural and conformed to an ancient model of land occupation, in which diverse properties were dispersed throughout different regions. This model favoured the social consolidation of a typical system of clientage with the towns. After the legal changes that regulated the access to public office, the relationship between patrons and clients acquired political significance and played an important role in the election of magistrates for more than half a century, until the end of the Republic.

The dispersal of elite properties, therefore, was an instrument in the consolidation of the institution of clientage, a pact between the people and the ruling class, during the transformations of the first century BC, when Italy was incorporated into the political system of the Republic. Italian towns sought the protection of powerful, influential men with sufficient prestige and authority to successfully defend their rights before the public authorities in Rome. The relationship between patron and client was played out with the typical characteristics of the private sphere. It was based on a situation of mutual respect and affection, which was declared by both sides, and furthermore, was ready to be manifested, according to the capacity of each, when the occasion arose. Among the obligations assumed by patrons were

25 Plu. *Cic.* 7; Cicero's *deversoria* lined the route to Sabina and the Via Appia, to Campania and the Gulf of Naples, where he had his main villas, Plin. *Nat.* 18.35; his protégé Sextus Roscius held thirteen properties, many probably of this kind, in Umbria, along the Tiber Valley; the *Aemilii Scaurii* were very wealthy, although the father of the consul of 115 left a meagre legacy of six slaves and 35,000 *sestertii*, according to Val. Max. 4.4.11; Cic. *Scaur.* 45; *Off.* 1.138; Plin. *Nat.* 7.128; Ascon. 27-28C; Mitchell 1996: 270 and 285. House on the Palatine, *insulae* on the Aventine, Argiletum and Via Sacra, Cic. *Dom.* 103; 116; *Att.* 12.32.2; 16.1.5; properties in Tusculum, Formia, Antium, Pompeii, Cumae, Puteoli, Astura, Plin. *Nat.* 22.12; Cic. *Att.* 1.20.1; 2.4.1; 12.1; 13.1; 12.13.1; 15.13 A.6; *Ad Q. fr.* 2.12.1; *deversoria*, in Lanuvium, Anagnia, Frusino, Sinuessa, Minturnae and other places; J. Carcopino 1951. *Cicero. The Secrets of his Correspondence*, vol. 1. New York: 51 and 54, estimates the value of Cicero's assets at ten million HS, equally divided between the city and the country.

responsibilities of an ambiguous and imprecise nature, together with other more concrete ones: the procurement of benefits for clients, the cancellation or lightening of tax burdens, help in getting interviews in Rome, defending clients in public or private cases, among others.

Outside Italy, patronage relationships emerged out of the act of governing. Nevertheless, these patrons were not all that interested in creating relationships through land ownership. The populations of the provinces were not in a position to give benefits, but rather to ask for them, at least until the first century BC. From the third to the first century BC, for example, the Sicilians had among their patrons the Scipiones, Marcelli, Lentuli Marcellini and Cicero himself, during his quaestorship of 75. In the second century, the *Hispani* named as their patrons P. Cornelius Scipio, G. Sulpicius Gallus, M. Porcius Cato and L. Aemilius Paulus, all previous governors, to defend their interests in the Roman courts.²⁶

From the mid second century BC, clientage increased both in Italy and the provinces. Publius Scipio Aemilianus took a *cohors* of five hundred friends and clients with him when assuming the consulship in 134 to end the resistance in Numantia. Cato of Utica was patron of Cyprus and Cappadocia, T. Annius Milo *dictator* in Lanuvium, some twenty miles south of Rome, where he was born, just as Lucius Murena, a member of the Licinii Murenarum, while passing through Umbria in 64 on his way to the Transalpine province, levied generously and indulgently, a favour that was later translated into the support of various tribes of that region when he ran for the consulship in 62. On the day of his assassination, Publius Clodius was returning from Aricia, where he had given a speech before the *decuriones*. Aulus Cluentius, a client of Cicero, was an important man, respected for his lineage and virtue as patron of Larinum, his municipality, and its surrounding area, while the senator Q. Fabius Sanga, active in the preliminary stages of Catiline's conspiracy, was patron to the gaulish tribe of the Allobroges. In his bid for the aedileship, Gnaeus Plancius, quaestor of Macedonia in 58,

²⁶ See R. Morstein Marx 1998. 'Publicity, Popularity and Patronage in the *Commentariolum Petitionis*' *CA* 17, 259-88; E. Deniaux 1987. *Commendatio, recommandations, patronages et clientele à l'époque de Cicéron*. Paris. Of Cicero's correspondence, eighty letters are recommending or for the recommendation of his clients and friends. M. Cornelius Fronto has twenty and Plinius the Younger fifteen. G.E.M. de Ste. Croix 1954. 'Suffragium: From Vote to Patronage' *The British Journal of Sociology* 5.1, 40; E. Badian 1958. *Foreign Clientelae, 264-70 BC*. Oxford: 154-225.

was said to have had the support of eight municipalities belonging to five tribes, as well as others in remote parts of Samnium. Tried under the *lex Licinia de sodaliciis*, he was accused of having bought the votes of the tribes *Volturnia* and *Terentina*.²⁷

In the second century, the town of Reate, in Sabine territory, first had its *praefectus* Publius Vatinius as patron, the grandfather of the man who was accused and then defended by Cicero in 56, and later the town had Cicero himself, who assumed the legal defence of the its people, *qui essent in fide mea*, in a conflict over water with the people of Interamna. M. Antonius had clients in Campania, according to the Arpinian, who accused him of trying to favour them with his land commission. The orator was also patron of his city *Arpinum*, where both his son and nephew were *aediles*, of Capua from 63, and of Atella; he also charged Atticus with securing the support of Pompeii's *factio*.²⁸

27 Liv. 43.2.5; Cic. *Div. Caec.* 13.2; *Verr.* 2.2.103; 2.4.80; also Cic. *Att.* 14.12.1; *Scaur.* 26; *Brut.* 319; *Fam.* 13.11.3; 15.4.15. Patrons usually held office in the communities, which allowed them to intervene in local matters and keep regular visits. App. *BC* 2.4; Sall. *Cat.* 41.4. In Samnium, the tribe *Clustumina*, Plin. *Nat.* 3.105; Mela 2.66. We know he gained the support of Volaterra, north of Tuscany, and Atella, in Apulia, to the south, Cic. *Att.* 1.1.2; 2.1; 4.15.5; *Q. fr.* 2.12.3; *Scaur.* 27; *Fam.* 13.4.1; 7.4; *Div. in Caec.* 68; *Nat. deor.* 2.6; *Off.* 2.12.16; *Cluent.* 11; *Mil.* 10.27; Ascon. *Mil.* 4; App. *BC* 2.4; D.H. 2.10.1; Q. Cic. *Comm. pet.* 19; 29; the municipalities of Plancius were Atina, his native city, Venafrum, Allifae and Casinum – of the *tribus Terentina* – the neighbouring Arpinum – of the *Cornelia* – Aufidena – of the *Volturnia* – Sora – of the *Romilia* – Aquinum – of the *Oufentina* tribe – as well as Lucus Feroniae and perhaps Castrum Novum, in Samnium, Cic. *Planc.* 22; 43. It was so common to have all properties outside Italy that in Trajan's times, those who wished to compete for the magistracies had to hold at least a third of their lands in the peninsula, which produced an increase in the price of land and houses and a good occasion for selling, Plin. *Epist.* 6.19, to Mecilius Nepos.

28 Patron of Capua, *Sest.* 9; *Pis.* 25, of Reate, *Scaur.* 27; *Att.* 4.15.5; *Cat.* 3.5, of Atella, *Q. fr.* 2.12.3; Varro, *Rust.* 3.2.3; Antonius, Cic. *Phil.* 8.26; the *Murenae*, Cic. *Mur.* 42; 44; Marius obtained the support of L. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus, consul in 119, to be elected tribune of the *plebs* and of Gaius Herennius to be praetor, in both cases as a client, Plu. *Mar.* 4-5; Sall. *Jug.* 73; A. Yakobson 1995. 'Secret Ballot and its Effects in the Late Roman Republic' *Hermes* 123, 436, considers that in the Late Republic only money influenced the support received by the candidates. Electoral violence, G. Marius and Sabaco, the Herenni, Sulla, Gabinius and Rullus, in A.W. Lintott 1968. *Violence in Republican Rome*. Oxford; J. Muñiz Coello 2006. 'El discurso romano sobre el poder. Teoría y práctica a fines de la República' *Klio* 88.1, 163.

Cicero assured his listeners and readers that he had abandoned *imperia, exercitus, provinciae* and *triumpha*, besides clientages and ties of hospitality, for the salvation of the Republic. He underlined that respecting and fulfilling the obligations of *hospitia* and *clientela* were a form of respect for Justice. For this senator, just as for the rest of the men holding public office at the time, clientages were not only important for support, a testimony of their strength and power, but also because, following the changes introduced to the electoral procedures for the magistracies, they became indispensable for the political promotion and personal security of their patrons.

Let us go deeper into this last aspect. Quintus Cicero's *Handbook of Electioneering* gave advice and pointed out the best ways to increase the chances of the candidates; it was addressed to Marcus Cicero himself, who indeed enjoyed the support of the *publicani*, the sympathies of the equestrian *ordo*, to which his family belonged, as well as that of many Italian towns. But his most effective clients were young people, the majority of them part of the twelve equestrian centuries, like the cavalry detachment, *equitatus*, that accompanied him in 65, during his electoral campaign for the Cisalpine province, the ones who accompanied him from Reate, *praesidia amicorum atque clientum*, to join Lucius Flaccus and C. Pomptinus on the Milvian Bridge, or the ones that protected him when he marched to the Campus Martius, *firmissimo praesidio fortissimorum virorum*, to preside over the elections of 62, in the year of his consulship. A similar escort is cited when he went to the Capitolium to destroy the tribunician *tabulae* during his conflict with Clodius.²⁹

IV. THE TRIBES AND THE ELECTORS

The link between clientage and votes forces us to view the tribes as electoral units. It is still difficult to map them, given the confusing and scarce data. In

²⁹ Cic. *Cat.* 4.11.23; *Att.* 1.18.1; 2.1.7; 19.4; *Q.fr.* 1.2.5; 16; *Mur.* 52; *Rhet. Herenn.* 3.4; *compluri delecti adulescentes quorum opera*, Cic. *Catil.* 3.5; *Q. Cic. Comm.pet.* 3; 17; 33; *Plu. Cic.* 14.7; *Sall. Catil.* 26.4. The importance of the Cisalpine province, in E. Lo Cascio 1994. 'The size of the Roman Population: Beloch and the meaning of the Augustan census figure' *JRS* 84, 37; H. Mouritsen 2001. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: 119-20; see Gruen [1974] 1995: 128.

fact, of the thirty-one rural tribes to which the voters of Italy were assigned, only three formed territorial units, the rest consisted of dispersed areas. We know the total number of tribes, the origins and dates of the creation of some of them, various locations of their territories and several of the communities they encompassed. There are clear links between their names and natural elements of the landscape such as rivers, lakes, mountains, or, on the other hand, with the names of notable families, who had supposedly lived in those lands in the past. Nevertheless, much belongs to the domain of uncertainty.³⁰

Marcus Cicero set his dialogue on the Republic in the year 129, during the *feriae latinae*, a few days before the death of Scipio Aemilianus, the destructor of Numantia; through his mouth, he expounds the centuriate system of voting. It is assumed that this speech reflects the best of the Roman Republic, the period before the government of Gaius Gracchus, just when the model of the 'mixed' constitution was coming to an end. The text explains that the first class, together with the six votes of the equestrian centuries and the century of the carpenters, amounted a total of eighty-nine centuries; and if eight of the remaining one hundred and four were added, a majority was achieved. This meant that in the second half of the second century, the *prima classis*, together with the knights and the *sex suffragia*, still needed the vote of eight centuries from the *infra classem*, from the remaining 'census', with an expression attributed to Cato the Censor.³¹

30 According to tradition, Servius Tullius was their creator, Liv. 1.43.13; 2.16; 6.2.8; 26.9; 38.36.8-9; D.H. 5.40; Fest. p. 102; 304; 371; Varro, *Ling.* 5.9; Plin. *Nat.* 3.68; C. Nicolet 1979. *Le métier de citoyen dans la Rome républicaine*. Paris: 74; U. Laffi 2000. 'La Italia romana: ciudadaes y estructuras administrativas' in E. Gabba & U. Laffi, *Sociedad y política en la Roma republicana (siglos III-I a.C.)*. Pisa: 28; according to F. Millar 2002. *The Roman Republic in Political Thought*, The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures. Hanover and London: 25, all, in a radius of action of 200 kms. For A. Alföldy 1965. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor: 296, the place-name tribes are more ancient than the ones named after families or men; Yakobson (1995): 435; J. Muñiz Coello 2008. 'Las clases y el voto electoral de los itálicos en el siglo I a.C.' *Athenaeum* 96.1 261-62; G. Nicolini 1930. 'Le tribu locali romane', *Studi in onore di P. Bonfante*, 2. Milano: 235-51, the classic study of L.R. Taylor 1960. *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic: The Thirty-five Urban and Rural Tribes*. Roma, and the review of E. Badian, in *JRS* 52, 200-10, and the more recent of M. Rieger 2007. *Tribus und Stadt. Die Entstehung der römischen Wahlbezirke im urbane und mediterranen Kontext (ca. 750-450 v. Chr.)*. Göttingen.

31 Cic. *Rep.* 2.22.39; the best constitution, 1.47.71; App. *BC* 1.100; *Lex Villia Annalis*, 180, the

Several decades later, in 82, Sulla strengthened the political role of the tribes when the quaestorship, a secondary and barely attractive office for the *nobilitas*, became mandatory and a first stepping-stone in the *cursus honorum* leading towards the consulship. The number of places was increased to twenty and it was compulsory to occupy the post before reaching the praetorship, which in turn was compulsory before rising to the consulship. Sulla also added two more praetorships to the existing six, which attended the newly created *quaestiones*, all of which resulted in a more fluid electoral competition, which proved very conflictive in the last century of the Republic. Thus, the quaestorship, elected by the tribes, enhanced its role before the centuries, whose fusion with the tribes in 179 had not yet managed to divest elections from their urban nature. All these measures attempted to ameliorate the severe institutional crisis occasioned by the prolonged civil war and the proscriptions that followed it. In order to fill a half-empty senate – the tolls among the senators and equites came to a total of 2,700 victims – Sulla's senate agreed to admit military men, whose lack of rank was allegedly compensated by the trust placed in their fidelity.³²

minimum age Liv. 40.44.1, and a two-year interval between magistracies, Cic. *Fam.* 10.25.2; *Phil.* 5.17.47, C. Nicolet 1959. 'Note sur App. BC 1.100; 467. Sylla et la réforme électorale' *Mélanges d'Archeologie et d'Histoire* 71, 211-25. After the *lex Julia* of 90, the Italians were granted the *civitas*, but like the freedmen before them, in such a way that the existing citizens did not lose their control over the tribes, Vell. 2.20.2: the newcomers were incorporated into only eight of the thirty-five tribes, and according to App. BC 1.49, in ten blocks, that were ascribed to ten tribes, in which the new citizens voted at the end, so that their vote was practically useless. P. Fraccaro 1913-14. 'La procedura del voto nei comizi tributari romani' *Atti Accademia Torino* 49, 611-12, indicated that the tribes voted successively. The *lex Plautia* of 89 completed the incorporation of the remaining Italians under the same conditions, G. Rotondi 1966. *Leges publicae populi romani*. [Milano 1912] Hildesheim: 338, 340 and 345; Gell. 6.13.1-2, for Cato and the *classici*.

³² In 199, T. Quinctius Flamininus, quaestor at the time, asked for the consulship directly, as did P. Scipio Aemilianus, in 147, App. *Pun.* 112; Liv. *Perioch.* 80; 32.7.8-11. Fufidius, a *primipilaris*, Oros. *Hist.* 5.21.3, *gregarii milites*, Sall. *Cat.* 37; Cic. *Div. in Caec.* 8; Vell. 2.32.2; Tac. *Ann.* 11.22; changes in the elections, Liv. 40.51.9; the war victims: 90 senators, 15 consulars, 2,600 *equites*, App. BC 1.103; the senate of 86 had 150 members and in 81, 600, E. Gabba 1973. 'Il ceto equestre e il senato di Silla', *Esercito e società nella Repubblica romana*. Firenze: 408; Hinard, 1985: 117; J.R. Hawthorn 1962. 'The senate after Sulla' *G&R* 9, 53-60; H. Hill 1932. 'Sulla's new senators in 81 B.C.' *CQ* 26.3-4, 170-77; E.G. Hardy 1916. 'The Number of the Sullan Senate' *JRS* 6, 61-62; on the quaestorship in 82, Coello 2008: 276.

In the last century of the Republic, when the time for elections came around, the candidates travelled to the tribes where their interests lay. They either held properties or originated from there, and sought compensation for the benefits granted throughout the years. The frequent or regular trips of the Roman elite to their properties and villas strengthened the links with the local elites and the citizens, the *tribules*, who were always lacking in resources. The patrons presented their complaints before the central power, but also helped mitigate the chronic local shortages. The presence of elite figures was always an occasion for the display of munificence in the form of fully funded public works or the provision of supplies. Carefully calculated euergetism was useful in times of elections as a reminder of obligations, although the candidate still undertook some final efforts in the form of *praemia* and *sportulae*, or banquets and games.³³

Therefore, in principle, the vote of the Italian communities was cast in return, or as payment, for the benefits received. In this sense, the candidates had more control over rural votes than over urban ones, making the latter less interesting for the electoral dynamics. Candidates cultivated the tribes and centuries with fewest members, which were more manageable. For the centuries, the *equites* were more important than the *prima classis*; as for the tribes, those furthest from Rome were preferred, because fewer votes were expected, just as from unfertile and wild regions, such as Apulia, Lucania, Picenum, or the nearby but inhospitable Pupinia, all of which were less populated. This explains the frequent presence of important people in faraway regions apparently of little relevance: their lower number of *tribules* made them more controllable than the rest, while their vote held the same

33 'The time' could begin one or two years before elections, as seen with Cicero, who thinks of travelling to the Cisalpine region in 65. When he leaves Arpinum, he entrusts Philotimo, his wife's freedman, to attend his *tribules*, Cic. *Q.fr.* 3.1.1. They were the *noti homines* or *virii primarii*, Cic. *Leg.agr.* 2.21; *Off.* 2.15; he acquired for his *tribules* complete scaffolding for the circus, *Mur.* 72; 73; everyone knew it was basic to take them into account, Hor. *Epist.* 1.6.49-54; *beneficiis et officiis*, Q. Cic. *Comm.pet.* 3; 16; 18; 29; many voters spontaneously offered their services and affinity to powerful figures without being asked, Cic. *Cael.* 21. The *largitiones* made elections popular, for the candidate not only had to be rich, but popular, Cic. *Off.* 2.17.88; *Mur.* 38; Cn. Plancius offered games in Praeneste, Cic. *Planc.* 63; P. Veyne 1976. *Le pain et le cirque: Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*. Paris: 391 and 402; Lintott : 1968, 11; Jakobson 1992: 33. Getting help from *familiares* to gain votes was a practice rooted in the most ancient electoral tradition, Cic. *Planc.* 45.

value than the more frequented and prosperous tribes of the Latin territory, barely a day's journey from the City.³⁴

On the other hand, the search for rural votes did not change the relationship between governors and governed, nor did it make the secular Roman state more open. The towns' right to vote was a novelty in the habits of the oligarchy, whose voting interests had been managed from the urban sphere. For the oligarchy, the natural and perfect vote was the vote of the centuries; it was the vote of its highest assembly, which approved the best laws, and was the only guarantor of Justice. In contrast, the vote of the tribes, always preferred to the urban ones since the Gracchi, was a mercenary vote, belonging to the dregs of society, criminals, homeless and broken men, who approved disastrous laws, as was only to be expected of the illiterate masses, the unstable mob, unpredictable in their ignorance.³⁵

The changes did not increase the levels of participation or activate the part of society traditionally relegated to political passivity. After Sulla's laws there was no change in the behaviour of candidates or voters, as the changes only affected the phase before the elections. The strong rivalry between candidates and the importance of the tribes' votes took part of the campaign outside the city, and every year, the electoral retinues travelled throughout Italy in search of support, making the Italian communities participate in the imminent changes taking place in the magistracies.³⁶

34 T. Milo spent 'three fortunes' in his campaign for the consulship, according to Cicero, in Ascon. *In Mil.* 3; Cic. *Fam.* 2.6.3; *Q.fr.* 3.6.6; 7.2. He distributed one thousand asses *per capita* throughout the tribes, Ascon. *in Mil.* 9, which must be understood as to each effective voter in a tribe. To hinder the aedileship of Cicero cost 500,000 HS, Cic. *Verr.* 1.23-24; other sales of votes, Cic. *Att.* 1.16.13; 18.4; 4.17.2, U. Coli, 'Tribu e centurie dell'antica Repubblica romana' *SDHI* 21 (1955) 181-222; Jakobson 1995: 435. There were tribes with tens of thousands of citizens, while others barely numbered a few hundred. The depopulated Apulia, Cic. *Att.* 8.3.4. After years, it was not uncommon for the politically active members of a tribe to know each other, Cic. *Att.* 1.8.4; Nicolet 1979: 116. On the other hand, the fact that most tribes had dispersed territories must have made the control of votes a truly complex operation. 'But the urban crowd did not control consular elections', Gruen [1974] 1995: 132.

35 The tribes, that 'indigent and officious rabble, which had no thought of honour', Plu. *Coriol.* 20; Cic. *Dom.* 18; *Sest.* 65; *Pis.* 30; 46; armed slaves sent him to his exile with their vote, *Leg.* 3.44-45, Croix 1954: 33.

36 Panic in the assemblies, from the beginning of the century, App. *BC* 1.32. There was always little contact between the elite and the masses, in a world in which politicians un-

Various prohibitions aimed at keeping order in the city, such as forbidding elections on market days so that the rural population, coming to market, would not mix with the urban, coming to vote. It was believed that such a mixture would be a source of conflict and street violence among citizens, but in reality, despite the prohibition, violence continued and even increased during elections, due to the activity of criminal bands and parties, *operae*, of the candidates' followers and partisans. The confluence of farmers and urban workers was not the only source of violence, and the prohibition, besides avoiding conflicts, perhaps intended to create other benefits for its promoters. The truth was that in normal circumstances, and save for the votes promised to the candidates, Italian farmers rarely left their daily work to journey to Rome in order to vote. Therefore, it can be inferred that the participation of rural communities in elections was always scarce. It follows that banning elections on market days eliminated a risk of confrontation, but it also avoided having rural citizens take advantage of their trip to the city to cast a 'free' vote, annihilating all the candidates' previous work in the Italian communities, for if the number of compromised votes was surpassed, the results would in fact be unpredictable. The prohibition to vote on *nundinae* assured that the rural votes would only be the ones previously promised, from the people who journeyed to Rome expressly to vote.³⁷

dertook their functions separately from the people, Mouritsen 2001: 133. In fact, 'sembra piuttosto difficile fondarsi sul ragionamento polibiano per sostenere che alla metà del II sec. a.C. la partecipazione del popolo nei comizi rappresentasse un valore preminente nel sistema politico romano', E. Gabba 1997. 'Democrazia a Roma' *Athenaeum* 85, 266-71.

³⁷ The *operae*, Cic. *Att.* 1.14.5; *Q.fr.* 2.3.4, of 56 BC; Ascon. *Pis.* 7.3; *Mil.* 2; 49.6; *Corn.* 56.2. The bands of Lentulus and Publius Cethegus, Sall. *Cat.* 50, L. Labruna 1991. 'La violence, instrument de lutte politique à la fin de la République' *DHA* 17, 119-37. A trip to Rome from any part in Italy was always hazardous and cumbersome, very difficult to make alone, for at a rate of 20-25 km a day, in order to cover a distance of 150 km, two weeks would be needed for the return trip. Travel expenses and the maintenance of the family back home during absence also had to be considered, all of which made any vote that was not economically supported highly improbable. Elections were not held on *nundinae*. Coriolanus' trial attracted great expectation, to the point of attracting mobs from afar, filling the forum from early hours in the morning. Chrysogonus, Sulla's freedman, boasted of having properties near Rome, and pointed out that being a landowner in Salentino or in the lands of the Bruttii, if residing there, would mean only getting news from Rome three times a year, Cic. *S. Rosc.* 133, Rawson 1976: 92. The rural masses that had never before been in the city occupied the forum from dawn, D.H. 7.58.3-4; 59.1;

As for the electoral campaigns, the issues put to the vote had little to do with the population's needs and everything to do with the personal aspirations and plans of the candidates. Electors did not vote on a political agenda, for such a commitment never existed between the oligarchy and the citizens, not even formally, at any point during the Republic. In the last century, the Roman assemblies were still fundamentally urban, for it was in the city's fora and open spaces that the *contiones* were held, the leaders delivered their speeches, and laws and candidates were voted on. The *contio* was a good opportunity for candidates to make themselves known, announce their electoral pretensions, and win over public opinion. But this assembly also had its limitations as an instrument of general communication, for its role and format were adapted to the urban sphere and hardly transcended to the Italian regions.³⁸

Rome housed the places where the *patres* met, argued, deliberated and made decisions which affected Rome, Italy, and the whole Empire. Participation at any level in civic affairs was exercised through the tribes and centuries, but as stated above, this participation diminished as the distance from Rome increased. In fact, rural votes were always scarce in relation to the whole census, and were only numerous on extraordinary occasions that the texts took care to record. The Roman writers who recorded elections resided in Rome; they were all part of the system and many of them played active roles in politics. What other point of view, but the urban one, could there be when describing the institutions?³⁹

64.6; *nundinis urbem revisitabant et ideo comitia nundinis habere non licebat, ne plebes ruralia avocaretur*, Plin. *Nat.* 18.13-14; Mouritsen 2001: 34; Coello 2008: 273.

38 The Roman assemblies were never vehicles of democratic representation '... they formed part of a system of personal control that linked each voter with a member of the elite', Mouritsen, 2001: 125; Cic. *Sest.* 113. In fact, all of them directed speeches to the people, mainly the plebs. Some figures such as Clodius and Milo are only understood through their relationship with the streets. On the *contiones*, F. Pina Polo 1989. *Las contiones civiles y militares en Roma*. Zaragoza; M. Jehne 2006. 'Who attended Roman Assemblies? Some remarks on political Participation in the Roman Republic' in F. Marco Simó, F. Pina Polo & J. Remesal (eds.) *República y ciudadanos: modelos de participación cívica en el Mundo Antiguo*. Barcelona: 232; voters belonging to one of the 35 tribes could live up to 200 kilometres from Rome, the only place to cast their vote, Millar 2002: 19 and 25.

39 There was a rural vote, Cic. *Planc.* 21; *Mur.* 42; Q. Cic. *Comm.pet.* 50, but only in very small numbers. In fact, the majority of the people never went to Rome to vote, Millar 2002: 163; A.O. Larsen 1954. 'The Judgment of Antiquity on Democracy' *CPh* 49, 10,

At the time, the role of the plebs in elections was important, not for the relevance of their vote, which was of scant real value, but for their intervention in the different phases of the process. The *factiones* of the senate sought to have at their service the tribunes of the plebs, who controlled and manipulated the urban plebs. The leaders of the oligarchy channelled the will of the plebs at the *contiones*. Here, the rowdiest were often recruited to become part of the armed retinues, who eventually could cause street brawls and required exceptional measures to be taken. Their role was to block access to the voting place, intimidate the supporters of adversaries or disperse the rural plebs, less organized and regular in its attendance at elections.⁴⁰

Urban votes were variable, unpredictable and subject to last-minute changes, while rural ones, with less exposure to political contentions, appeared to be on open offer to all candidates, therefore more stable. The links between candidates and towns did not have a counterpart in Rome. The candidate could be registered as a citizen in a tribe or even in various rural tribes at a time, wherever he held properties, although his residence was in Rome. On the other hand, most of the *census* resided in the rural tribes, while the urban ones contained the degraded, the negligible plebs. Nevertheless, the latter shared the same urban space with the rich and powerful, the space of the urban tribes, although this did not imply any solidarity in elections.⁴¹

concludes that if the assemblies had really desired to know the preoccupations of the citizens, they would have set up ballot boxes in other cities. The publication of the date and content of an assembly took place inside the city walls, and it could be postponed by any bad augury, making it even more difficult for the rural population to plan a trip in advance. Jehne 2006: 226; A. Jakobson 2004. 'The People's Voice and the Speaker's Platform: popular Power, Persuasion and manipulation in the Roman Forum' *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23, 201-12.

⁴⁰ The urban tribes, especially the *Palatina* and *Collina*, in the words of Cic. *Sest.* 114; *Mil.* 25, harboured Clodius' followers, the most depraved citizens. There was a massive presence of soldiers in the Campus Martius to support specific candidates by mandate of their generals, as in the case of Lucullus for Lucius Murena and Caesar for Crassus and Pompey, Cic. *Mur.* 69; Plu. *Crass.* 14.6; D.C. 39.31.1-2; for others, it was more emotional than effective, given the value of their vote in their census, only intending to support and contribute a patriotic vote for a specific candidate, Gruen [1974] 1995: 377.

⁴¹ Augustus was registered in two tribes, Suet. *Aug.* 40.2, and there was no control over the people inscribed in each one, as inferred from Cic. *Sest.* 109; 'you must secure ... tribunes to secure the votes of the centuries – men of eminent popularity', Q. Cic. *Comm.pet.* 51.

During elections, the urban plebs did not move against the oligarchy. Disturbances and street brawls, violence in general, frequent during elections in this century were rarely spontaneous events but programmed instigations of an influential minority that attempted to control the city. Due to internal rivalries, an undesirable candidate could unexpectedly end up winning the consulship. Nevertheless, these were extreme circumstances and uncommon, and were recorded as such by the classical authors. In the majority of cases, citizens voted for the candidates backed by their traditional leaders, be these the tribunes of the plebs, consuls or praetors in office. Furthermore, confrontation between *factiones* was not necessarily caused by opposing sensibilities or different views on reality. Beyond ideology, debate, doctrines, and the daily fight for offices, there was hardly any difference between their interests and messages. The real differences existing in the Roman society were found in the yawning gap between rich and poor. The reality was that a voter's trust was only gained by those who promised to respect the *status quo*, i.e., the authority of the *boni*, the economic interests of the knights, and non-interference in the affairs of the *plebs*, all of which were guaranteed and secured by the members of the oligarchy.⁴²

In the first century BC, the century was named as *pars* of the tribe, in fact, Cicero considered that the margin of uncertainty and surprise in the electoral process was excessively high. 'Nothing is more uncertain than the common people – nothing more obscure than men's wishes – nothing more treacherous than the whole nature of the comitia', Cic. *Planc.* 49; *Mur.* 36; Coello 2008: 270–71.

- ⁴² The consul Gaius Piso refused to proclaim Marcus Palicanus candidate elect, *seditionis hominis pestiferis*, Val. Max. 3.8.3, in 67 BC. The urban tribes, manipulated by the tribunes, controlled Rome, D.H. 7.23.3; A.O. Larsen 1949. 'The Origin and Significance of the Counting of Votes' *CPh* 44, 175, erroneously simplifies the reality of the Late Republic by describing urban votes as progressive and the rural as conservative; *vulgus imperitorium ... multitudo indocta*, Cic. *Mur.* 38–39; Jakobson 1992: 36; Cic. *Sest.* 105; *Plb.* 6.14.9. The voting tablet condemned fewer than did the voice vote. The plebs had enough in being allowed to participate, and once this right was achieved, they submitted their remaining will to whomever had claim over it or could win their favour, Cic. *Leg.* 3.17.39. In fourth-century Athens, democratic leaders were rich, and cases like that of Aischines, who came from a humble family, were rare, Larsen 1954: 7; Q. Cic. *Comm.pet.* 53; W.V. Harris 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: 169.

V. A SENATOR OF THE FIRST CENTURY AD

At the end of the first century AD, the senator C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus, Pliny the Younger, travelled to his Italian properties not to ask for votes from the *tribules* for himself or for one of his *familiares* in compensation for his clientage obligations, but simply to take a rest from his daily obligations. In his time, that of Domitian, Nerva and Trajan, there was no need to travel throughout Italy before elections, since for three quarters of a century already, the people's vote and its relation to the tribes had been irrelevant. The election of magistrates was resolved in the city, as recalled in the oldest chronicles of the Early Republic, and the direct voters were all members of the elite, in fact, of only a sector of the elite; but above all, elections depended on the will of the *princeps*, the most important and powerful of the citizens.

For Pliny, politics was an issue of relative importance to which he hardly dedicated any time, for in his own words, he was completely employed in other occupations. At the beginning of the first century AD, Tiberius had regulated the elections for the highest magistracies, first by changing their setting and main figures, and later by modifying the voting procedure. The result was that the senators and knights inscribed in the *album iudicum* voted inside the senate on a list of candidates, endorsed by powerful and influential men known as *suffragatores*, whose merits and potential had previously been demonstrated. The most influential of all was the *princeps* himself, whose candidates always received the necessary votes. This list of candidates, or *destinati*, was presented to the people in the Campus Martius, where they were merely ratified, passing on to be finally *creati*.⁴³

43 Tac. *Ann.* 1.15.1, in AD 14; Plin. *Epist.* 3.20.10; 'all political power lies in the hands of one person, who for the common good has taken upon himself the cares and labours of the whole State', *Epist.* 3.20.12; Tiberius recommended the candidates, Vell. 2.124. In the *lex Valeria Cornelia*, of AD 5, published in the *Tabula Hebana*, in AD 19, people voted by tribes in ten, fifteen, and finally twenty centuries, chosen by draw, having nothing in common with the census system: P.A. Brunt 1961. 'Lex Valeria Cornelia' *JRS* 51, 71; M.H. Crawford 1996. *Roman Statutes*, 2 vols. London. On elections in this period, M.L. Paladini 1959. 'La votazione del senado romano nell'età di Traiano' *Athenaeum* 47, 3-134; B. Levick 1967. 'Imperial Control of the Elections under the Early Principate, *Commendatio, suffragatio* and *nominatio*' *Historia* 16, 207-30; M. Pani 1974. *Comizia e senato. Sulla trasformazione della procedura elettorale à Roma nell'età di Tiberio*. Bari.

Thus, access to the magistracies was dependent on the support and protection of relevant and consolidated figures, at least for the minor magistracies, while the higher ones were subject to the will of the *princeps*, the principal man of the Empire. All this meant that the candidates were included on the *destinatio* by consensus; the names to be elected were known up to one year beforehand, and when the time came there was little else to do than stage the procedure and ratify the results.⁴⁴

There were still old men around, according to Pliny, who had experienced – perhaps in the time of Claudius – peaceful elections by this method. In these, everything had taken place in excellent order and the candidates pronounced their speeches, in which they expounded their merits and brought forward witnesses and guarantors to testify on their behalf; all in all, the interventions were carried on serenely and solemnly, so that the whole procedure was always adequate and peaceful. A century later, Trajan introduced the use of the tablet for voting, which Pliny celebrated as an improvement that allowed more freedom to choose the best candidate. But a year after the secret vote was introduced, he wrote angrily on the way in which an irritating minority was taking advantage of the anonymous tablet. They scoff at the procedure by inscribing the names of the *suffragatores* instead of the candidates, thereby pouring derision on those who they are really voting for; they also included jokes and burlesques of doubtful humour, underlining their lack of confidence in the system.⁴⁵

There were clear precedents for this custom during the dictatorship of Caesar, who considered elections to be a cumbersome and insidious formalism. Save for the consuls, Caesar shared equally in the choice of candidates with the electors. When the election came along, he would distribute tablets throughout the tribes with the names of those he wanted to be elected. With the passive attitude of the majority and the broken spirit of the rest, his contempt for legality took him to the limits of imposture, for example, when he

44 When Plinius asked his friend C. Minicius Fundanus, governor of Asia in 122, to support one of his protégés trying to secure the quaestorship, he assured him the consulship for the following year, for as augur, Plinius would inform favourably of him and the emperor would not object, because of the good opinion he knew to hold with him, Plin. *Epist.* 4.15.5; 9.

45 Plin. *Epist.* 3. 20.2; 5-6; 9; 4.25.

turned a tribal assembly to elect quaestors into a centuriate assembly just for a few hours to elect a consul.⁴⁶

In Trajan's time, clientage had practically lost all of its original significance. Senators, and consequently their protégés, the clients from the towns, also lost relevance. There was no electoral interest in the Italian communities. Just like Lucius Metellus three centuries and a half earlier, Pliny did not need the vote of the towns to promote his chances. The available information does not give any indication that his *cursus honorum* was risky or demanded sacrifices. His rapid ascent is reminiscent of Cicero's: the latter benefited from the political situation left by Sulla and the former from the hand of Domitian, his best *suffragator*, at least until right before his consulate. He then went on to serve Trajan until his death. Like Cicero, Pliny did not come from a senatorial family, nor take up arms. During his governorship in Bithynia, he is not known to have intervened in any conflict, apart from merely keeping public order in the cities of his province. His entire public career was spent in administration and finance, in the courts, in the senate, audiences, correspondence with his *familiares* and the emperor, and visits to towns under his jurisdiction. His bureaucratic and peaceful *cursus* was in no way similar to Lucius Metellus', which took place during the clash of arms with Carthage and direct participation in active politics.⁴⁷

46 Suet. *Iul.* 41; *haec tibi ridicula videntur; non enim ades, quae si videres, lacrimas non teneres.* Cic. *Fam.* 7.30.1-2. Plinius acted as *suffragator* for Julius Naso, son of Julius Secundus, his teacher, for the quaestorship of 107, but also asked C. Minicius Fundanus, consul of 107, to accompany him for support, 'to show you off and do the rounds in your company', Plin. *Epist.* 4.15.5-9; 6.8; 9.1. Plinius saw the risks in such an enterprise as his own, and if the candidate did not succeed, the failure would also be his.

47 Besides the emperor himself, he also counted on the support of consulars like Julius Frontinus, Verginius Rufus and Cornelius Rufus, thanks to whom he occupied all the offices consecutively in only ten years. At eighteen, he was already a lawyer in the tribunal of the *centumviri*, shortly after military tribune for two or three months in Syria, followed by quaestorship and praetorship in 94-96, achieving the consulate with Trajan, in 100, for a month. Prefect of the treasury, augur in 103, *curator alvei Tiberis* between 104 and 107, and in 109-111 he was charged with the administration of Bithynia as propraetorian legate, Plin. *Epist.* 2.9.1; 4.17.6; 7. 31.2; 8. 2.23; 10.19; 31; 74; *Pan.* 60.4-5; 92.2-4; 14.7. In *Pan.* 3.5, there seems to be a reference to Cicero and the quote about togas and arms. A.N. Sherwin-White [1966] 1998. *The Letters of Pliny*. Oxford: 72-81; see, L. Burckhardt 1990. 'The Political Elite of the Roman Republic: comments on recent Discussions of the Concept *nobilitas* and *homo novus*' *Historia* 39, 77-99.

Towards AD 106, Pliny wrote that the advantage of having neighbouring properties was saving both time and expense. It was also convenient to make only one trip. Indeed, adjacent properties could be exploited with fewer workers and slaves; they used the same buildings and equipment, and limited travel, which was always costly and insecure. But for Pliny, dispersed properties also had their advantages. Besides not having to subject all the land to the climatic adversities of one region, there was also the pleasure derived from a change of scenery and from contemplating different landscapes as one travelled from one property to the other. In fact, dispersion was common in his family; his own mother-in-law, Pompeia Celerina, had three villas in Umbria and one in Etruria. These were the reflections of the naturalist's nephew in a letter to his friend, the *equus* Calvisius Rufus, *decurio* in the town of Como, asking advice on the possibility of acquiring a property on sale next to his.⁴⁸

Pliny's estate was in Umbria, bordering with Etruria and near Tifernum Tiberinum, a town of which he was patron; it is known in his letters as 'my Tuscan villa'. It had hunting grounds, forest, vineyards and farmland, with an abundant flow of water through it. The writer mentioned what an honour it was for the locals to have such an influential and powerful citizen as a neighbour. He explained to Fabatus that the residents of the town rejoiced in his arrival and were sad when he left. In his own words: 'as a return for their kindness – for it would never do to be outdone in affection' (as if speaking of a *potlatch*, one might add) 'I have at my own expense built a temple, and now that it is completed it would be hardly respectful to the gods to put off any longer its dedication ... which I have arranged to celebrate with a banquet'.⁴⁹

48 See, B. Bergmann 1995. 'Visualizing Pliny's Villas' *JRA* 8, 406-20; A.M. Andermahr 1998. *Totus in praediis. Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien in der frühen und hohen Kaiserzeit*. Bonn; J. Nicols 1980. 'Pliny and the Patronage of Communities' *Hermes* 108, 385, discusses Pliny's patronage links with his city of birth, Comum, but also with Tifernum, Firmum in Picenum and Baetica. Th. Späth 2007. 'L'exemplarité auto-proclamée: Pline le jeune et le quotidien d'un aristocrate sous le Haut-Empire', in *Aristocratie antique. Modèles et exemplarité sociale*. Dijon: 161-74.

49 Edition of J.C. Martin 2007. *Plinio el Joven. Epistolario (libros I-X)*. Madrid; Plin. *Epist.* 3.19.2-5, to Calvisius Rufus; 'I have explained to you why I prefer my Tuscan house to my other places at Tusculum, Tibur and Praeneste', *Epist.* 5.6.45. The difficulty of administering dispersed properties, in Plin. *Epist.* 1.4.1; 6.30.2; 8.20.3. The estate had been in-

The profile of Pliny the Younger belonged to a typical member of the ruling class, powerful and influential, who, as patron of the populations surrounding his properties, distributed munificence generously. A century and a half before, the figure of the patron was not an accessory to the structure of the Italian communities, but an essential part of the way the concept of *civitas* was understood. Towns entrusted the solution of many of their problems to the largesse of their patrons, who in turn used it as a way to introduce themselves in the civic institutions. In a letter to his friend Julius Genitor, master of Latin rhetoric, Pliny complained – more rhetorically than realistically – that when he was at his Tuscan villa, the locals barely allowed him any rest, for as soon as his arrival was known, they would gather at his estate and petition him to act as arbitrator of their disputes and as a mediator in their litigations. It was in fact an ‘exchange of goods’, of reciprocal obligations, although not simultaneous. In the middle decades of the last century of the Roman Republic, election to office was the optimal occasion to put these commitments to test.⁵⁰

It was taken for granted that communities with no patron faced an uncertain future; they were not viable, in the same way that an individual needed the protection of a powerful figure through clientage. Thus, after the death of Pliny the Elder, the town rapidly looked for a new patron, naturally searching among his heirs, Pliny the Younger among them. Nevertheless, Italy was different then than at the end of the Republic. It was a more disinterested patronage; it was the generosity proper of euergetism, which was

herited from Pliny the Elder, when he was no more than 17 or 18 years old, and the younger Pliny also held others; Tifernum Tiberinum, today Città de Castello, Plin. *Epist.* 4.1.4-6, to the *equus* L. Calpurnius Fabatus, grandfather of his third wife, born in Como and magistrate of the city, very rich in properties. The Tuscan villa is described in Plin. *Epist.* 5.6.8-9; 16-17; 32, 35, 46; 9.36.6, Sherwin-White 1966: 253-59. Plinius also held properties in Comum and in Laurentum, south of Ostia, *Epist.* 1.9.4; 22.11; 2.17.1; 3.4.2; 4.1.3; 6.1; 5.6.1; 45; 18.2.

⁵⁰ ‘There is no lack of people wanting me to act as judge or arbitrator’, *index aut arbiter*, Plin. *Epist.* 7.30.2; *Bell. Hisp.* 42.2, fragments of Caesar’s speech to the people of Hispalis. Plinius’ surreptitious complaints on the harshness and sacrifice of public life brush on nonsense, even for the standards of the time. He confesses to his correspondent that at barely 42 or 43 years of age, he is tired of his institutional charges and wishes to retire to a private life, for the last third of one’s life should be spent on oneself, *Epist.* 4.23.3-4; see, R. Duthoy 1984-1986. ‘Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire’ *AncSoc* 15-17, 121-54.

exercised without expecting compensation beyond a formal and felt recognition in the form of a plaque or stele. This was the way it worked in these times, due to the great distance separating the elite from the rest of the citizens, and to the irrelevance of these acts for the political and social ascent of these privileged individuals. The candidates were chosen by consensus by the senators, while the people were merely passive spectators who ratified the results, which were known beforehand, only as a reminder of how things had worked in another age.⁵¹

CONCLUSIONS

Lucius Metellus' *cursus honorum*, if complete, is detached from the accumulation of offices and posts of later years. There are six offices recorded in his name, one of them repeated. His consulships, although among his *maximae res optumaeque*, do not appear as the final reward for his long and successful career, but represent the best choice of the *patres* faced with a military emergency. The administrative model under which Metellus undertook his magistracies lacked the complexity and regulation that dominated in the times of Cicero and Pliny. His aspirations to be the best *bellator* and a *fortissimus imperator* stand out significantly as virtues that were concealed by Cicero behind the ambiguous terms *imperia*, *fascēs* and perhaps *provinciae*, and which with Pliny the younger disappear completely before the reality of a bureaucratized state.⁵²

⁵¹ Until 106, Pliny's liberalities are recorded in, his birthplace Comum, Tiferinum, as well as individual cases, the construction of a library, a private school, salaries to the teachers, a Corinthian statue, a temple dedicated to Jupiter and another to Ceres, public baths and the creation of a *institutio alimentaria*, all of which amounted to one million six hundred *sestertii*, Plin. *Epist.* 3.6.4; 4.13.5; 5.7.3; 6.3.1; 7.18.2; 9.39; D.H. 10.17.3, gives more information on the elections for the replacement consul of 460. The candidate was agreed on by the *patres*, and similarly to a *destinatus*, his name was submitted to ratification by the centuries, *commendatio*. On other occasions, the consul was replaced by an *interrex* or a dictator, expressly named for the purpose. Finally, the centuries confirmed him and the consul was *creatus*. See note 9.

⁵² Metellus' six *honores* contrast with Cicero's seven offices, plus another six he never made effective: the province of Macedonia, which he exchanged with his colleague C. Antonius for Cisalpine Gaul, and in the end, never went there either, Cic. *Phil.* 3.26; Sall. *Catil.* 26; Plu. *Cic.* 12; an *imperium* for Sicily, just returned from Cilicia, Cic. *Att.* 7.7.4, another to

The system by which Cicero, and a century and a half later Pliny, undertook their *cursus honorum* were different, although the latter was in a sense the heir of the former, and can only be fully understood with knowledge of the way Cicero worked. In both cases, there were complex and extremely formalized electoral systems, with laws regulating each stage of the process. Given the increasing number of candidates, to attain a magistracy or be a senator in Cicero's or Pliny's Rome was an arduous, disputed and tiresome enterprise. Nevertheless, while in the mid-first century BC, the personal effort of the candidates had to be divided between two kinds of voters, those sitting in the senate and the population of the Italian towns, by Trajan's time, following a tradition from Caesar's dictatorship, the *princeps suffragatio* and the simplification of the electoral body channelled and economized the candidate's efforts.

There is another great contrast between Cicero's intense, never-ending, and hectic public and private political activity, and Pliny's more sedate and moderate bureaucratic and literary occupations during a series of offices in the shade of the *princeps*, first Domitian, finally Trajan. While in Cicero's time, the selection of magistrates every year mobilized a fair number of patrons and clients, in the Rome of Lucius Metellus and Pliny the Younger, the call to ballot-boxes to choose magistrates, which brought the people together in the Campus Martius, was only a formal step in an irrelevant procedure, since the choice of the candidates had already been made. Metellus was consul twice and according to the mechanics described by Livy and Dionysius, it was only necessary to have the trust of the *patres*. In Pliny's case, the *suffragium* was a reflection of the same trust, the *suffragatio* of the other senators, although only valid if it coincided with the interests of the *princeps*.

There is no mention of clientage in the funerary oration for Metellus, and it is not possible to deduce from this whether it was an exception for its time. In fact, the important clientages of the Metelli were a reality of later periods. Independently of the historicity conceded to each, the first Claudius, Appius the Blind, Coriolanus, Spurius Melius and Camillus are among the great patrons cited by the classical authors. Since clientage was an element that denoted status for the already hallowed senators, like Lucius

levy in Campania, Cic. *Att.* 7.11.5; 14.1; 23.3; Capua, Cic. *Att.* 8.3.4; 11.5; 12.2, a *legatio votiva*, Cic. *Att.* 14.22.2, and another military one with Dolabella, Cic. *Att.* 14.13.4; 15.11.4. Pliny the Younger undertook ten effective magistracies, see Martín 2007: 67-73.

Metellus, it was an element that was taken for granted. It was not a goal to aspire to in a life full of glory and virtue.

In Pliny's Italy, as described above, clientage, as an institution, was devaluated in the same measure as a senator's position, for if they lost relevance, so did their protégés, the clients from the towns. The clientage model we see in these times reminds us of Plautus, at the beginning of the second century BC, and also coincides with what was transmitted by Dionysius. The image of the powerful figure arriving at the forum with his retinue of clients, as witnesses of his glory and virtue, was combined with the more pragmatic reality and less glorious image of the client, destitute and always begging, with his costly claims on the generosity and munificence of the powerful, who were sometimes his only means of survival.⁵³

Throughout the whole picture, there is one element that stands out, and that is land: both as a source of wealth and as support for the promotion and prestige of the privileged. The fortunes of the senators, consisting of villas and properties, sometimes dispersed through the territories of several tribes, functioned to generate new links between the powerful and the local population; as future clients they secured support for the promotion of their patron and his friends in upcoming elections. This is what the data tell us from the beginning of Roman imperialism in the Mediterranean, manifesting itself clearly in the first century BC, and certainly in Trajan's time. In the first century AD, the elite's estates were still dispersed, although at least in Pliny's case, they don't seem to have functioned as a mechanism of control over the tribal votes, but only as land exploitations and leisure residences, in the service of the necessary *otium*. Pliny spent long periods on his estates and shared the spiritual pleasure it gave him with his friends through his letters, in winter as in summer, and described them with prolix joy. He always wished to spend more time on them, despite having to condescend to receiving his neighbours, the farmers of the neighbouring villas, always requiring his advice, good judgement, and of course, expecting some kind of material manifestation of his largesse and munificence.

53 D.H. 2.9.3; 10.4. The retinues that accompanied the senators, *operae, cohors, exercitus*, included clients, but also other people, Cic. *Att.* 1.18.1; 2.1.7; 19.4; *Q.fr.* 1.2.5; *Phil.* 2.16; Plu. *Cic.* 14.7; *Caes.* 14; *Pomp.* 18, etc.

DIPLOMACY IN THE GREEK *POLEIS* OF ASIA MINOR: MYTILENE'S EMBASSY TO TARRACO

*By Isaias Arrayás Morales**

Summary: This essay examines the diplomatic activity undertaken by the city of Mytilene during the last decades of the first century BC. It aims to analyse East-West relations particularly through the leading figures of the *polis* and the embassies they presented before the Roman authorities. Emphasis will be placed on the embassy that took them as far as the city of Tarraco, in north-east Hispania. Evidence for this can be found in the ancient literary sources and Mytilene's epigraphy. Therefore, this paper sets out to analyse both the actual events and the reasons why this *polis* sent its representatives to the brand-new capital of *Hispania Citerior Tarraconensis*. **

Throughout the first century BC, the *poleis* of Asia Minor experienced an unprecedented development in their diplomacy with the Roman Senate. Its purpose was to claim and protect privileges and benefits.¹ These diplomatic missions were directed and financed by the leading figures of local elites,

* Researcher in the project *Vencedores y vencidos: imperialismo, control social y paisajes antiguos* (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, DGI HUM2007-64250), directed by Prof. Alberto Prieto Arciniega.

** This paper was written as part of the project *Polítiques públiques de la construcció de la pau: models de gestió de les crisis humanitàries en l'Antiguitat* (Institut Català Internacional per la Pau, RICIP 2009), directed by Prof. Toni Naco del Hoyo.

1 F. Canali de Rossi 1997. *Le ambascerie dal mondo Greco a Roma in età repubblicana*. Rome: 295-406.

2 The kind of relationship existing between the elites of the Hellenistic *poleis* and the Roman authorities is reflected exceptionally in the *Senatus consultum de Asclepiade* (78 BC) (*CIL* I.588; *RDGE* 22; *IGRR* I.118), in which three navarchs, *amici populi Romani*, were

who were influential enough to intercede before the Roman authorities.² Their euergetism was designed to restore, to a great extent, the cities' old links with Rome. These became severed after supporting Mithridates VI Eupator and in the deepening crisis caused by L. Cornelius Sulla's (*cos.* 88, 80; *pr.* 93) reprisals.³ Sulla's occupation of the cities and territories was very traumatic. He distributed troops throughout the cities and forced civilians to offer their hospitality to Roman soldiers. Although Plutarch's figures may be exaggerated (Plut. *Sul.* 25.5), the truth is that Sulla's military occupation of Asia imposed heavy financial burdens on the cities and their inhabitants.⁴ In all probability, *euergetai* had lent money at low interest rates to try to reduce the overwhelming public and private debts caused by usury. This was practiced by Roman-Italian financiers who had established themselves in the region (App. *Mithr.* 63; Cic. *Att.* 5.13.1, 5.16.1-2, *Q.Fr.* 1.12.35).⁵ So great was

invested with important privileges, although not the Roman citizenship. This did not occur until Caesar, and especially with Augustus, when we find the rich epigraphic *dossier* belonging to Seleucus of Rhosos (RDGE 58). See A. Raggi 2001. 'Senatus consultum de Asclepiade Clazomenio sociisque. The inscription. Previous editions of the Senatus consultum de Asclepiade' *ZPE* 135, 73-116; A. Raggi 2006. *Seleuco di Rhosos. Cittadinanza e privilegi nell'Oriente greco in età tardo-repubblicana*. Pisa; A. Raggi 2009. 'Cives Romani optimo iure optimaque lege immunes. Cittadinanza romana e immunità in Oriente nella Tarda Repubblica' in T. Naco & B. Antela (eds.) *Transforming historical landscapes in the Ancient Empires*. Oxford: 131-36; J.-L. Ferrary 1997. 'De l'évergétisme hellénistique à l'évergétisme romain' in M. Christol & O. Masson (eds.) *Actes du Xe Congrès International d'épigraphie grecque et latine*. Paris: 203-4; J.-L. Ferrary 2005. 'Les Grecs des cités et l'obtention de la ciuitas Romana' in P. Fröhlich & C. Müller (eds.) *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*. Paris: 51-75; P. Sánchez 2007a. 'La clause d'exception sur l'octroi de la citoyenneté romaine dans les traités entre Rome et ses alliés' *Athenaeum* 95, 215-70; M. Sartre 2007. 'Romanisation en Asie Mineure?' in G. Urso (ed.) *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia minore*. Pisa: 234-36; I. Arrayás 2009. 'Cives Romani en Asia Menor, de las Guerras Mitridáticas al Principado' in T. Naco & B. Antela (eds.) *Transforming historical landscapes in the Ancient Empires*. Oxford, 137-53.

3 App. *Mithr.* 62; Cassiod. *Chron.* 670; Plut. *Sul.* 25.4, *Luc.* 4.1, 20.4.

4 C. Vial 1995. *Les Grecs de la paix d'Apamée à la bataille d'Actium, 188-31*. Paris: 158-64; L. Ballesteros 1996. *Mitridates Eupátor, rey del Ponto*. Granada: 180-89; F. de Callataÿ 1997. *L'histoire des guerres mithridatiques vue par les monnaies*. Louvain-la-Neuve: 328; Ferrary 1997: 203-4; A. Mastrocinque 1999. *Studi sulle guerre Mitridatiche*. Stuttgart: 91-94; F. Santangelo 2007. *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire*. Leiden: 107-33.

5 This seems to be the case of Diodoros Paspáros from Pergamon. An inscription recognizes his efforts towards recovering the properties of the victims of the First Mithridatic War (*IGRR* 4.292), which also contributed towards the reconciliation of the civilian popula-

their service that their individual *poleis* thanked them by awarding them with the highest civic magistracies. In addition, extraordinary privileges and honours were granted in the same tradition as the extinct Attalid dynasty.⁶ Theophanes, son of Hieroitas,⁷ was the first man in Mytilene to establish a close friendship with Cn. Pompeius Magnus (*cos.* 70, 55, 52). This *imperator* was to grant him Roman citizenship *uirtutis causa* in 67 BC (Cic. *Pro Arch.*

tion, divided by the conflict between followers and detractors of the Pontic king. Diodoros was not an only case. Both Ptolemaios of Colophon and C. Julius Epikrates were honoured in Miletus with inscriptions for having facilitated credits without usury. See C.P. Jones 1974. 'Diodoros Paspas and the Nikephoria of Pergamon' *Chiron*, 4: 192, 194, 196-97; L. Migeotte 1984. *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques*. Paris: 221-28 (no. 64); B. Virgilio 1993. *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, Eredità*. Pisa: 73, 75, 79, 82; G. Reger 2005. 'The Economy' in A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: 352; F. Canali de Rossi 2002. *Iscrizioni Storiche Ellenistiche*, vol. III, Decreti per ambasciatori greci al senato, Rome: 150-61, 164-69, 204-11 (nos. 179, 181, 190).

- 6 P. Veyne 1976. *Le pain et le cirque*. Paris: 235; C. Préaux 1978. *Le monde hellénistique*, I. Paris: 202-7; P. Schmitt 1982. 'Évergétisme et mémoire du mort' in G. Gnoli & J.-P. Vernant (ed.) *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*. Paris: 177-18; P. Gauthier 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Paris: 53-66; Virgilio 1993: 76; S. Le Bohec 1991, 'L'idéologie officielle du roi de Macedoine à l'époque hellénistique', *L'idéologie du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Antiquité*. Paris: 34-37; G. Labarre 1996a. *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*. Lyon: 109, 116.
- 7 On the figure of Theophanes of Mytilene: M.H. de la Ville de Mirmont 1905. 'Théophraste de Mytilène' *REG* 18, 165-206; W.S. Anderson 1963. *Pompey, his Friends and the Literature of the 1st Century B.C.* Berkeley: 28-41; L. Robert 1969. 'Théophraste de Mytilène à Constantinople' *CRAI* 52, 42-64; M.H. Crawford 1978. 'Greek intellectuals and the Roman aristocracy in the first century BC' in C.R. Whitaker & P.D.A. Garnsey (eds.) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: 204; S.P. Haley 1983. 'Archias, Theophanes and Cicero: the Politics in the Pro Archia' *CB* 59, 1-4; B.K. Gold 1985. 'Pompey and Theophanes of Mytilene' *AJPh* 106, 312-27; D. Salzmann 1985. 'Cn. Pompeius Theophanes. Ein Benennungsvorschlag zu einem Porträt in Mytilene' *MDAIR* 92, 245-60; J.-L. Ferrary 1988. *Philhellénisme et Impérialisme*. Rome: 612; Ferrary 1997: 199-225; P. Pedech 1991. 'Deux Grecs face à Rome au Ier siècle av. J.-C.: Métrodore de Scepsis et Théophraste de Mytilène' *REA* 93, 65-78; V.I. Anastasiadis & G.A. Souris 1992. 'Theophanes of Mytilene: A New Inscription Relating to his Early Career' *Chiron* 22, 377-83; Vial 1995: 185-86; V.I. Anastasiadis 1995. 'Theophanes and Mytilene's Freedom Reconsidered' *Tekmeria*, 1, 1-13; V.I. Anastasiadis 1997. 'Theophanes and Mytilene's freedom reconsidered: a postscript' *Tekmeria* 3, 165-69; G. Labarre 1996b. 'Théophraste et l'octroi de la liberté à Mytilene: questions de méthode' *Tekmeria* 2, 44-54; Labarre 1996a: 92-99, 109; L. Amela 2002. *Las clientelas de Cneo Pompeyo Magno en Hispania*. Barcelona: 76-78; H.-L. Fernoux 2004. *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine (IIIe siècle av.J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap.J.-C.)*. Lyon: 162-67.

10.24; Val. Max. 8.14.3), thus pioneering the dissemination of *ciuitas* among the elite of the Greek *poleis*.⁸ Theophanes reached the office of *praefectus fabrum* during the Civil War against Caesar (Plut. *Cic.* 38.4; Caes. *BC* 3.18.3; Cic. *Att.* 9.11.3). This meant that he belonged to the equestrian order and possessed a minimum fortune of 400,000 *sestertii*. A similar relationship existed between Caesar and L. Cornelius Balbus, a native of Gades in *Hispania Ulterior*. Both figures were eminent members of the elite of their respective cities and achieved important roles in Roman politics, one advantage of belonging to the clientele of a Roman *imperator*. Balbus became the adoptive son of Theophanes (Cic. *Balb.* 57) and was protected by both Pompey and Caesar who granted him influence that led him to become consul *suffectus* in 40 BC, the first provincial to reach this office.⁹ Theophanes' influence over Pompey (Str. 13.2.3) resulted in the restitution, in 62 BC, of Mytilene's territories confiscated by Sulla and its return of the privileged status of *ciuitas immunis ac libera*, lost in the traumatic circumstances that followed the Mithridatic War (Liv. *Per.* 89.14; Plut. *Luc.* 4.2-3; Suet. *Iul.* 2.1).¹⁰ An inscription dated to 62-61 BC and found in the hippodrome of Constantinople is evidence of a statue erected by Mytilene in honour of *Cn. Pompeius Theo-*

8 Amela 2002: 76; Ferrary 2005: 51-75.

9 R. Mascantonio 1967. 'Balbus maior the unique: examination of some highlights of the career of L. Cornelius Balbus and some problems connected with it' *CW* 61, 134-38; Gold 1985: 322; Vial 1995: 185; J.F. Rodríguez Neila 1992. *Los Balbos de Cádiz*, Madrid; F. des Boscs-Plateaux 1994. 'L. Cornelius Balbus de Gadès: la carrière méconnue d'un espagnol à l'époque des guerres civiles (Ier siècle av. J.-C.)' *MCV* 30, 7-35; Amela 2002: 77; Sánchez 2007a: 215-70.

10 Mytilene's resistance lasted until 80 BC, when L. Licinius Lucullus (*cos.* 74; *pr.* 78) took the city by surprise (Plut. *Luc.* 4.1-3; Liv. *Per.* 89; Suet. *Iul.* 2.1). Nevertheless, the actual looting was probably headed by M. Minucius Termus (RE 64), praetor of Asia in 81 BC, who was substituting for the propraetor L. Licinius Murena, and may have run for the consulship in 65 BC (Cic. *Att.* 1.1.2, *Flac.* 98). This could explain his prosecution, jointly with the governor L. Valerius Flaccus, given the strong friendship between Theophanes and Pompey (Cic. *Pro Flac.* 39.98). Other Greek *poleis* would have joined in the accusation, also clients of Pompey, such as Tralles, also closely linked to the *imperator* through its most eminent figure, Pythodorus. See D. Magie 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, I-II. Princeton: 228, 237, 246, 319, 1124-25; T.R.S. Broughton 1951-86. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, II. Atlanta: 61-62, 81; A.C. Keaveney 1992. *Lucullus. A Life*. London-New York: 182-87; Vial 1995: 159; Ballesteros 1996: 184-85; Labarre 1996a: 92; Ferrary 1997: 210; F. Canali de Rossi 2005. 'Flacco, Minucio Termo e il koinòn dei Greci d'Asia' *EA*, 38, 105; L. Amela 2003. *Cneo Pompeyo Magno. El defensor de la República romana*. Madrid: 181.

phanes. This was in recognition for having restored the city's territories and liberty. Interestingly, details from the inscription highlight that this was done with Roman consent. Indeed, following the First Mithridatic War, Rome had held all land in *proprietas* by right of conquest, and acted as an overall benefactor.¹¹ Likewise, Pompey's dispositions concerning land possession in Mytilene were ratified in the *Senatus consultum de agris Mytilenaeum* of 55 BC (*RDGE* 25). Some time later, the same territorial issue was discussed in a letter that probably came from the governor of Asia (*RDGE* 51). Both documents attest to Mytilene's difficulties in making its newly acquired privileges prevail before the pretensions of the *publicani*.¹²

Mytilene had been a stipendiary city since 80 BC. This was not a favourable position for the city to be in and it only changed with the benefits achieved by Theophanes through his friendship with Pompey. Nevertheless, he was not the only Greek to gain liberty for his city by making use of the influences he had held over the Roman *imperatores*. Cnidus, for example, was granted its liberty as a favour from Caesar to his friend Theopompus (Plut. *Caes.* 48.1).¹³ These achievements, then, brought recognition to Theophanes. He was thus granted extraordinary titles by his city, including *soter*, *euergetes* and *ktistes*. In addition, divine honours, such as *Zeus Eleutherius Theophanes*, were granted to him. This is known from an inscription dated to the second half of the first century BC that also honours Pompey and Potamon, son of Lesbos, who was the next figure to act as benefactor of the city. Potamon, too, was honoured with the same titles (*IG* XII, 163; *IGRR* 4.55; *Syll.*³ 752).¹⁴

11 Ferrary 1988: 129-30; Ferrary 1997: 200.

12 Robert 1969: 52-53; R.K. Sherk 1963. 'Senatus Consultum de Agris Mytilenaeorum' *GRBS* 4, 217-30; J.-M. Bertrand 1992. *Inscriptions historiques grecques*. Paris: 259-60 (no. 147); J. Muñiz 1998. *Cicerón y Cilicia. Diario de un gobernador romano del siglo I a. de C.* Huelva: 193; J. Muñiz 1999. 'Las raciones de Cicerón. Prácticas financieras de un senador a finales de la República' *Hispania Antiqua* 23, 47-66; Labarre 1996b: 44-54; Labarre 1996a: 94, 96, 275-76 (no. 18); de Rossi 1997: 357-58 (no. 411); de Rossi 2002: 80-82 (no. 159).

13 G. Hirschfeld 1886. 'C. Julius Theopompus of Cnidus' *JHS* 7, 286-90; G. Thériault 2003. 'Evergétisme grec et administration romaine. La famille cnidienne de Gaios Ioulios Théopompos' *Phoenix*, 57, 232-56; Ferrary 2005: 51-75.

14 Robert 1969: 49-52; Gold 1985: 325; Vial 1995: 186; Labarre 1996a: 92, 276-77 (no. 19); de Rossi 1997: 357-58 (no. 411); de Rossi 2002: 80-82 (no. 159); Amela 2003: 181.

MYTILENE: A CITY IN A DILEMMA?

After Pharsalos, Potamon, the new leading figure in Mytilene politics, attempted to gain Caesar's support. The aim here was to preserve the privileges obtained through the mediation of Theophanes and to avoid a situation similar to that suffered by the *polis* after the First Mithridatic War and subsequent reprisals. His initiative complied with Pompey's last orders as *patronus*, who, it seems, advised all the Asian communities remaining on his side to submit to Caesar (Plut. *Pomp.* 75.3). The number of inscriptions relating to Potamon's role as a diplomat and benefactor began to increase in Caesar's time. Many of these inscriptions belong to an important monument erected in his honour, the *Potamoneion*.¹⁵ Among them we find one of the city's decrees (*IG XII*. 2, 35; *Syll.*³ 764; *RDGE* 26a) preparing to send no less than ten ambassadors before the dictator following his victory in Pharsalia (Plu. *Pomp.* 75.2). Among them was Potamon (*RDGE* 26a, ll. 3-5) and they were to meet with Caesar somewhere along the Troadic coast in 48 or 47 BC.¹⁶ Other fragmentary inscriptions alluding to contacts between Mytilene and the Thessalian *koinon* which may have included a role for Potamon, could have arisen from the emerging situation after Pharsalos (*IG XII* 2, 43).¹⁷ Furthermore, there is evidence for another embassy sent from

15 Only a small percentage of Potamon's inscriptions are dated before Caesar. The inscriptions on the *Potamoneion* were probably inscribed after Potamon's death, for they portray him at the height of his political career. On the figure of Potamon of Mytilene and the inscriptions of the *Potamoneion*: R. Hodot 1982. 'Deux notes sur des inscriptions de Mytilène' *ZPE* 49, 187; R. Hodot 1990. *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie. La langue des inscriptions, VIIe s.a.C. – IVe p.C.* Paris: 275; R.W. Parker 1991. 'Potamon of Mytilene and his Family' *ZPE*, 85, 115-30; Labarre 1996a: 99-106, 109-16.

16 It is unclear whether the inscription refers to Caesar's second consulate or second dictatorship. In the first case, the document should be dated to the end of October 48 BC, before he was named dictator for the second time. If not, it would have to be dated between October 48 and October 47 BC. Appian narrates how many Ionian and Aeolian *poleis* sent embassies to the victor of Pharsalos the moment he crossed the Hellespont. This allows to arrive at an approximate location of the meeting place, while testifying to its immediacy. See Magie 1950 I: 415-17; Broughton 1951-86 II: 284-85; A.E. Raubitshek 1954. 'Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar' *JRS* 44, 65-75; R.K. Sherk 1963. 'Caesar and Mytilene' *GRBS* 4, 217-30; R.K. Sherk 1969. *Roman documents from the Greek East*. Baltimore: 147, 152; Labarre 1996a: 110, 278, 283 (no. 20).

17 There is evidence for contacts between the Thessalian *koinon*, re-established in 196 BC, and Mytilene, including an invitation to take part in the festivities in honour of Ascle-

Mytilene to the dictator found in a fragment from an inscription, corresponding to the conclusion of a letter, probably written by Caesar himself, which could have taken place between May and August 47 BC, during the war against Pharnakes II, king of Bosphorus (*RDGE* 26b, ll. 1-5).¹⁸ This new diplomatic mission from Mytilene sought to obtain confirmation of its privileges, as well as the renewal of its *societas / symmachia* and *amicitia / philia* with Rome; this positive result is highlighted in the document.¹⁹ Another fragment from the *Potamoneion* mentions a new letter written by Caesar during his third dictatorship somewhere between April 46 and January or

pius. The fact that these references appear on the *Potamoneion* clearly indicates the leading role Potamon played in the relationship, which could have started just after Pharsalos. In this respect, it is worth remembering that Thessaly gained its freedom from Caesar after the battle, having sided with him, with the exception of Larissa that offered refuge to Pompey (App. *BC* 2.88; D.C. 42.2.2; Val.Max. 4.5.5; Caes. *BC* 3.35.2; Plut. *Pomp.* 75.3). Liberty probably meant the normalization of Thessaly's political situation, which had been suspended after previously lending support to Pompey (App. *BC* 2.88; Plut. *Caes.* 48.1). See L. Robert 1926. 'Notes d'épigraphie hellénistique' *BCH* 50, 479 (no. 2); L. Robert 1929. 'Notes d'épigraphie hellénistique' *BCH* 53, 153 (no. 2); J.A.O. Larsen 1938. 'Roman Greece' in T. Frank (ed.) *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. 4. Baltimore: 259-498; Raubitshek 1954: 66-67; Hodot 1982: 187 (no. 2); Vial 1995: 190-92; Labarre 1996a: III (no. 14).

18 Magie 1950 I: 409. The weakness of Pompey's clientage links with certain eastern territories is brought to light by the swiftness with which Caesar received the adhesion of *reges, tyrannos, dynastas provinciae finitimos, qui omnes receptos in fidem* (Caes. *B.Alex.* 65.4), at the end of the war against Alexandria and prior to his campaign against Pharnaces II. Mytilene was among the cities that still defended Pompey's cause after Pharsalos, just like *Larissa* in Thessaly (D.C. 42.2.1-3), but had no choice other than to follow the general dynamic in order to avoid reprisals. It is worth recalling that the Civil War between Pompey and Caesar was perceived by the Greeks as an internal Roman conflict, and they preferred not to interfere, but to wait for a final victor (App. *BC* 2.70; Plut. *Pomp.* 70.1), which could very well be the case of Mytilene. Cf. Vial 1995: 195; Amela 2002: 74-75.

19 The renewal of the treaties with Rhodes, Cnidus and the Lycian *koinon* also belong to the same context. The last is particularly relevant. After signing a first treaty of friendship and alliance in 81 BC, and remaining loyal to Rome during the First Mithridatic War, the Lycian *koinon* established a new treaty of peace, friendship and military alliance with Rome in 46 BC. Caesar thus recompensed the Lycians for their collaboration in his expedition against Egypt. This treaty is important because it is preserved intact and provides evidence of new clauses. See de Rossi 1997: no. 345; S. Mitchell 2005. 'The Treaty between Rome and Lycia (MS 2070)' *Papyrologica Florentina* 35, 163-250; C. Schuler 2007. 'Ein Vertrag zwischen Rom und den Lykiern aus Tyberissos' in C. Schuler (ed.) *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien*. Vienna: 51-79; P. Sánchez 2007b. 'La convention judiciaire dans le traité conclu entre Rome et les Lyciens (P.Schoyen I 25)' *Chiron* 37, 363-82.

February 45 BC.²⁰ This letter speaks of Potamon's diplomatic successes culminating in a decree ratifying and increasing the city's privileges, as well as approving the renewal of its friendship and allied *status* with Rome (RDGE 26b, ll. 6-36).²¹ Likewise, Caesar passed an edict specifically forbidding any citizen from Mytilene to be exempted from paying local taxes (*immunitas* or *uacatio muneris publici*) (RDGE 26 b, ll. 26-36). Such measures were applied to cities which had supported Pompey in the past, such as Mytilene, and were intended to punish and weaken sectors of the local elite and who had benefited from personal *immunitas* during his period of political hegemony.²² Caesar's coercive measures against communities and groups that had opposed him during the war are well known.²³ Nevertheless, considering that the dictator recognized Mytilene's *status* of *ciuitas immunis ac libera*, it may be that the measure was aimed mainly at feeding the dwindled civic

20 Broughton 1951-86 II: 294-95.

21 The reference to the renewal of *amicitia* with Rome could indicate the existence of a previous *foedus*. Nevertheless, *amicitia* did not necessarily imply the establishment of a treaty. See A. Heuss 1933. 'Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik in Republikanischer Zeit', *Klio* 13, 1-59; S. Accame 1946. *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla Guerra acaica ad Augusto*. Rome: 46-57, 91-92; Sherk 1969: 155; E. Badian 1958. *Foreign Clientelae, 264-70 B.C.* Oxford: 44; E.S. Gruen 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, I, Berkeley: 54-95.

22 Labarre 1996a: 101; de Rossi 1997: 378-80 (no. 440).

23 Caesar did not hesitate at expropriating his political adversaries or reducing the territory of enemy cities, by confiscating lands, imposing taxes, and in many cases, settling colonists (App. *BC* 2.94; Suet. *Caes.* 38.1; Cic. *De leg. Agr.* 1.5, 2.51). In Asia Minor, such cases seem to have included Sinope, Herakleia, Lampsakos or Parion. His measures in Macedonia, Egypt and Achaëa are much more evident, where most of the cities supported Pompey. Due to this, Cicero was obliged to intervene in the favour of clients and friends, with varied outcomes. In Dyme, Caesar expelled the pirates settled by Pompey in 67 BC, in favour of his own colonists (Cic. *Att.* 16.1.3). See E. Deniaux 1975. 'Un exemple d'intervention politique: Cicéron et le dossier de Buthrôte en 44 av. J.-C.' *Bull. Assoc. G. Budé* 1975, 283-96; E. Deniaux 1987. 'Atticus et l'Épire', P. Cabanes (ed.) *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité*. Clermont-Ferrand: 245-54; E. Deniaux 1993. *Clientèles et pouvoirs à l'époque de Cicéron*. Rome: 371-72, 487-89, 520-21; F. Papazoglou 1990. 'La population des colonies romaines en Macédoine' *ZAnt* 40, III-24; Vial 1995: 198; A.D. Rizakis 1996. 'Les colonies romaines des côtes occidentales grecques. Populations et territoires' *DHA* 22/1, 269-73; A.D. Rizakis 2004. 'La littérature grammatique et la colonisation romaine en Orient' in G. Salmeri, A. Raggi & A. Baroni (eds.) *Coloniae romane nel mondo greco*. Rome: 75, 82-85; M. Sartre 2001. 'Les colonies romaines dans le monde grec. Essai de synthèse' *Electrum* 5, 127; P.N. Doukellis 2007. 'Auteurs grecs et paysages coloniaux romains' *Historia* 56, 313; Arrayás 2009: 145.

finances.²⁴ The truth is that personal *immunitas*, first mentioned in the privileges given to the navarchs of the *Senatus consultum de Asclepiade* in 78 BC (*CIL* 1.588; *RDGE* 22; *IGRR* 1.118),²⁵ was spreading dangerously in the region, and was not only enjoyed by the residing *romaioi*, but also by certain local figures, who then went on to join their benefactor's clientele, and were thus compensated for their services to Rome. The dissemination of *immunitas* was so widespread that the Roman authorities were forced to adopt restrictive measures in order to secure local finances. As seen in Augustus' Third Cyrene Edict of 7-6 BC, *immunitas* constituted a privilege that went hand in hand with the citizenship, and was limited to assets held at the time of concession.²⁶

Be that as it may, the inscriptions show a political change on Mytilene's behalf. It was interested in reconciling itself with Caesar after Pharsalos. Although Sextus Pompeius continued resistance for a few years²⁷ and was enthusiastically received in Lesbos when he fled Sicily in 36 BC (App. *BC* 5.133; D.C. 49.17.5), the truth is that he did not stop in Mytilene. This fact throws doubt on the city's stance.²⁸ On the other hand, the people of Mytilene never renounced the memory of Pompey. Naturally, they considered the im-

²⁴ Sherk 1969: 154-55.

²⁵ Raggi 2001: 73-116.

²⁶ F. de Visscher 1940. *Les Édits d'August découverts à Cyrène*. Louvain-la-Neuve: 89-103; G.W. Bowersock 1966. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: 1-13; J.H. Oliver 1960. 'On Edict III from Cyrene' *Hesperia* 29, 324-25; J.H. Oliver 1989. *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri*. Philadelphia: 43: 52-53; M. Guarducci 1969. *Epigrafia greca*, II. Rome: 82-83; P. Gauthier 1991. 'Ateleia tou somatos' *Chiron* 21, 49-68; A. Mastrocinque 1999. 'Comperare l'immunitas' *MedAnt* 2/1, 85-93; Sánchez 2007a: 240-43.

²⁷ For the resistance of Pompey's sons, especially in Hispania, see: L. Amela 2000a. 'Las acuñaciones romanas de Sexto Pompeyo en Hispania' *AEspA* 73, 105-19; L. Amela 2000b. 'Acuñaciones de Cneo Pompeyo hijo en Hispania' *Numisma* 244, 7-33; L. Amela 2001a. 'Sexto Pompeyo en Hispania' *Florentia Iliberritana*, 12, 11-46; Amela 2002: 213-37; Amela 2003: 12; B. Segura Ramos 2003. 'Munda' *Faventia*, 25/1, 179-83; J. Gómez Pantoja 2005. 'Buscando Munda desesperadamente' in E. Melchor, J. Mellado & J.F. Rodríguez Neila (eds.) *Julio César y Córdoba: tiempo y espacio en la campaña de Munda (49-45 a.C.)*, Córdoba: 89-137; F. Pina Polo & W. Zanier 2006. 'Glandes inscriptae procedentes de la Hispania Ulterior' *AEspA*, 79, 29-50.

²⁸ Labarre 1996a: 102. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that Sextus Pompeius issued coinage in Mytilene, based on the analysis of the *Phraos* denarius (*RRC* 511/4). See J. DeRose Evans 1987. 'The Sicilian Coinage of Sextus Pompeius' *ANSMN* 32, 128; Amela 2002: 77.

portant benefits he had granted them and they were aware of their close link to the *gens Pompeia*. This can be seen from an inscription dedicated to Pompey, Caesar and Augustus' two adoptive sons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar (*IG* XII, 2, 165; *IGRR* 4.80). They were again to be honoured in another inscription, jointly with Augustus and Agrippa (*IG* XII, 2, 164; *IGRR* 4.79).²⁹ Both inscriptions constitute evidence of Mytilene's gratitude towards Pompey, in spite of having to redirect their politics after Pharsalos, and also the level that a relationship between a provincial community and its *imperator* and *patronus* could hope to reach.³⁰ Although Mytilene was not unique in the region,³¹ military developments usually strongly influenced the affections of both eastern and western cities. Most opted for ambiguity and avoided outspoken political preferences. In practice, they showed greater inconsistencies toward their alliances.³² For instance, the Thessalian *polis* of Demetrias did not hesitate in removing a bronze statue dedicated to *C. Caelius C. f. Rufus, legatus pro praetore and tribunus plebis designatus*. The city substituted for it one of Caesar celebrating both his victory at Pharsalos and the liberation of the Thessalians, granted by the dictator in gratitude for their support.³³ A similar case is found in Tarraco in *Hispania Citerior*. A moderate inscription, dedicated to Pompey (*RIT* 1), contrasts with the *graeca*

29 C.C. Vermeule 1968. *Roman Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor*, Cambridge: 204; R.W. Parker 1988. 'A Greek Inscription from Lesbos Honoring a Julio-Claudian' *ZPE* 75, 177.

30 Bowersock 1966: 12; Robert 1969: 49-50; R. Syme 1960. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: 263; B. Forte 1972. *Rome and the Romans as the Greeks saw them*, Rome: 146; D. Fishwick 1987. 'The Imperial Cult in the Latin West' *Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, 1. Leiden: 47; Ferrary 1997: 217; Vial 1995: 185; Labarre 1996a: 98 (nos. 15-19); L. Amela 2001b. 'Inscripciones honoríficas dedicadas a Pompeyo Magno' *Faventia*, 23/1, 87-102; Amela 2002: 77.

31 In 62 BC, Pompey donated 50 talents to Athens for its restoration after the destruction of 86 BC (Plut. *Pomp.* 42.11). Caesar donated the same amount in 50 BC for the construction of a new *agora* (Cic. *Att.* 6.1.25), which was completed by Augustus (*IG* II² 3175). See Ferrary 1997: 201; Vial 1995: 185.

32 For the western communities, vid.: J.C. Olivares 1998. *Conflicto político y promoción jurídica de comunidades en el Occidente romano (133 a.C.-174 d.C.)*. Alicante: 105-92; I. Arrayás 2006a. 'La instauración del modelo imperial en Hispania. La obra de César y Augusto' in T. Naco & I. Arrayás (eds.) *War and territory in the Roman World*. Oxford: 179-201.

33 Raubitshek 1954: 66-67; Broughton 1951-86 II: 241, III: 44; E.S. Gruen 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley: 187, 516; Amela 2002: 274; Amela 2001b: 101.

adulatio that characterizes the eastern inscriptions; on its reverse, another brief text was inscribed, dedicated this time to P. Mucius Scaevola (RIT 2). These inscriptions reflect the political pragmatism of Tarraco. After Caesar's victory in Ilerda in 49 BC (Caes. *BC* 1.37), the city sent a mission in support of Caesar, jointly with Osca, Calagurris, the Iacetanes and Ilercavones (Caes. *BC* 1.60.1-5). There were no doubts either in turning Pompey's commemorative stone around to inscribe on its reverse a dedication to one of Caesar's legates in Hispania. Therefore, contrary to what happened in Mytilene, cities like Demetrias and Tarraco systematically destroyed any symbol that reminded them of their Pompeian past. In all fairness, the link that united them to the *imperator* was not as strong. Moreover, Tarraco, the 'political and administrative centre' of *Hispania Citerior*, awaited the dictator's arrival as well as the surrender of delegates from throughout the province (Caes. *BC* 2.21).³⁴

- 34 M.C. Beltrán Martínez & J. Sánchez Real 1954. *Una inscripción a Pompeyo en Tarragona*. Tarragona; A. d'Ors 1972. 'Miscelánea epigráfica. Una inscripción pompeyana de Tarragona' *Emerita* 40, 62-64; C. Castillo 1973. 'El progreso de la epigrafía romana de Hispania (1967-1972)' *Emerita* 41, 110-127; G. Alföldy 1991. *Tarraco*. Tarragona: 28; J. Ruiz de Arbulo 1991. 'Los inicios de la romanización en Occidente: Los casos de Emporion y Tarraco' *Athenaeum*, 79, 459-93; J. Ruiz de Arbulo 1998. 'Tarraco. Escenografía del poder, administración y justicia en una capital provincial romana (s. II aC-II dC)' *Empúries* 51, 31-61; J. Ruiz de Arbulo 2002. 'La fundación de la colonia de Tarraco y los estandartes de César' in J.L. Jiménez & A. Ribera (eds.) *Valencia y las primeras ciudades romanas de Hispania*. Valencia: 137-56; A. Prieto 1992. 'Tarraco' *DArch* 10, 79-93; J. Martínez Mera 1998. 'Las ciudades hispanas ante la Guerra Civil' *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma* 11, 307-33; Amela 2001b: 96-100; L. Amela 2001c. 'RIT 1 y 2. La ciudad de Tarraco entre pompeyanos y cesarianos' in L. Hernández Guerra, in L. Sagredo & J.M. Solana (eds.) *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia Antigua*. Valladolid: 145-51; I. Arrayás 2004. 'Tarraco, capital provincial' *Gerión* 22/1, 291-303; I. Arrayás 2005. *Morfología histórica del territorio de Tarraco (ss. III-I a.C.)*. Barcelona: 67-68, 72-73, 86-87; I. Rodà 2009. 'Hispania en las provincias occidentales del Imperio durante la República y el Alto imperio: una perspectiva arqueológica' in J. Andreu Pintado, J. Cabrero & I. Rodà (eds.) *Hispania. Las provincias hispanas en el mundo romano*. Barcelona: 198, 201, 203.

MYTILENE AND THE *FOEDUS AEQUUM*

The Civil War had split Caesar's heirs and Mytilene supported Octavian. Having supported the winning side, the *polis* was granted important benefits that were specified in an alliance treaty in 25 BC, and which set down the basis of its relationship with Rome more firmly than the *amicitia/philía* recognized by Caesar.³⁵ Several inscriptions from the *Potamoneion* refer to a *foedus aequum*. In theory, this meant the two states were *de iure* equal, which would have allowed Mytilene to escape the authority of the Senate, and partially, of the governor of Asia (*IG XII. 2, 35; Syll.*³ 764; *RDGE* 26b; c; d).³⁶ There are fragments relative to two *Senatus consulta*, stating the compromise agreed with the representatives of the city in order to seal the treaty (*RDGE* 26b; c). Both decrees are datable to Augustus' ninth consulship in 25 BC. Nevertheless, the inscriptions specifically identify M. Junius Silanus (*cos.* 25), Augustus' co-consul for that year, as responsible for the *relatio*.³⁷ Augustus was not in Rome at the time, but in Hispania, personally directing the war against the Cantabri and Astures. However, he was forced to retreat to Tar-raco due to health problems.³⁸ Thus it was Silanus and not the *princeps* himself, who arranged a meeting of the Senate and undertook the *relatio* of the *foedus* with Mytilene, suggesting they send Augustus a letter to inform him and to ask his opinion (*RDGE* 26c, ll. 1-5).³⁹

35 Accame 1946: 97; Magie 1950 I : 468.

36 V. Arangio-Ruiz 1942-43. 'Senatus Consulta Silaniana de Mytilenensibus' *RivFil* 20-21, 125-30; Accame 1946 : 94-99; Sherk 1969: 155-57; Gruen 1984 I-II : 16, 50, 53, 743-44; Labarre 1996a: 103, 279-81, 284 (no. 20).

37 Broughton 1951-86 II: 353, 412-13, 416, 419, 426. Besides the fragments of inscriptions clearly related to Augustus' treaty, there are also others identified as the remains of a treaty and a magistrate's letter (*IG XII 2, 36; IGRR* 4.34; *RDGE* 73). The truth is that they do not seem to reflect an ancient treaty between Rome and Mytilene before 25 BC, and they probably belonged to the *foedus* concluded with Augustus, and a letter that could have come from M. Junius Silanus, announcing the treaty. Accame 1946: 96-97; Sherk 1969: 359; Labarre 1996a: 111-12; C. Eilers 1999. 'M. Silanus, Stratoniceia, and the governors of Asia under Augustus' *Tyche* 14, 77-86.

38 Suet. *Aug.* 26.3; Sen. *Con.* 10.14; Hor. *Carm.* 3.14; Flor. *Epit.* 2.33; D.C. 53.25.6-7; Oros. 6.21.19-21.

39 The promulgation dates for both *Senatus consulta* must have been very close, although they are difficult to determine. The first seems to date between 16 May and 13 June 25 BC (*RDGE* 26 b, ll. 35-43 and 26c, ll. 1-8). There is less precision for the second, which gives less detail (*RDGE* 26c, ll. 9-28). Nevertheless, considering that Silanus and the Senate

The *foedus* itself is found among fragments belonging to the *Potamoneion* (RDGE 26 d; e).⁴⁰ It was a treaty of peace, alliance and friendship, established, from a legal point of view, on equal terms between Rome and Mytilene. The clauses relative to the military defensive alliance (*societas/symmachia*) would have been reciprocal and drawn up to safeguard the authority (*archè*) and territorial possessions of each part. Nevertheless, there is an implicit 'majesty clause', introducing a clear hierarchy between both states, forcing Mytilene to recognize and defend, at all times, the *imperium maiestatemque populi Romani* (RDGE 26 d, ll. 1-6).⁴¹ It would also have included unilateral clauses favourable to Mytilene, by which Rome guaranteed the *polis* the possession and use of certain territories (RDGE 26 d, ll. 19-28),⁴² revealing the difference existing between the two signatory states. Through the unilateral concession of certain rights and privileges, Rome assumed and proclaimed its superiority. It protected its ally's interests and acted, in fact, like a *patronus*.⁴³ Indeed, this treaty confirmed the city's entry into the Julio-Claudian family's clientele. Additionally, Mytilene saw the ratification of its *immunitas*, as well as its previously bestowed privileges relating to the *scriptura* and the *uacatio muneris publici* (RDGE 26 b, ll. 26-36).⁴⁴ The *polis* would also be exempted from paying *portoria* and other indirect taxes which were collected up to that moment by the relentless *publicani*. Finally, the treaty seems to contain several clauses regarding the use of

were waiting for a reply from Augustus, temporarily residing in Tarraco, 29 June or July could be suggested. Only after knowing the *princeps'* decision, invested with *auctoritas*, could the Senate be again convened to elaborate a second decree that would authorize the establishment of a treaty with Mytilene. Accame 1946 : 96; Sherk 1969: 155-56; Labarre 1996a: 279-80, 284 (no. 20).

40 Labarre 1996a: 280-81, 284 (no. 20).

41 Accame 1946: 98-99; G. Gundel 1963. 'Der Begriff Maiestas im politischen Denken der römischen Republik' *Historia* 12, 283-320; A.N. Sherwin-White. *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford 1973: 159; Sherk 1969: 157; Labarre 1996a: 280-81, 284 (no. 20); Sánchez 2007a: 225 (no. 36).

42 Labarre 1996a: 281, 284 (no. 20).

43 It should perhaps be placed in the category of 'mixed' treaties (*Mischtypus*). See E. Täubler 1913. *Imperium Romanum*, I. Berlin-Leipzig: 62; Accame 1946: 98-99; J.-L. Ferrary 1990. 'Traité et domination romaine dans le monde hellénique' in M. Liverani, L. Canfora & C. Zaccagnini (eds.) *I trattati nel mondo antico: Forma, ideologia, funzione*. Rome: 232-35.

44 S. Mitchell 2008. 'Geography, Politics, and Imperialism in the Asian Customs Law' in M. Cottier et al. (eds.) *The Customs Law of Asia*. Oxford: 192-93.

Roman law in Mytilene. This may indicate the existence of a whole apparatus for regulating and organizing legal proceedings between Roman citizens and locals (*RDGE* 26e).⁴⁵ Unfortunately, the gaps in the text prevent us from knowing the exact content of this part of the treaty. Nevertheless, one could surmise that it might or might not prove that legal conflicts between both groups were common, to the point of requiring precise legal clauses.

In all probability, the Lycian *koinon* signed a very similar or identical treaty with Rome halfway during Caesar's third dictatorship in 46 BC. The document has survived intact on a bronze *tabula* measuring 87.5 x 53.5cm, and has been considered a complete *foedus aequum*, even granting the Lycians a legal status similar to the Romans residing in the region.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, like Augustus' treaty with Mytilene it proclaimed peace and friendship between the states, it included clauses guaranteeing neutrality and reciprocal military aid, and the Roman people unilaterally recognized the possession and use of several cities, towns, ports and territories. It thus reflected Rome's superiority over the confederation. Furthermore, it also included clauses concerning the organization of trials. By allowing Roman citizens to be extradited to Rome or to be heard by a Roman governor in the event of being accused by a Lycian, the Lycians gave up an important part of their sovereignty as an autonomous state. In exchange, the treaty only recognized the right of a Lycian, residing in the territory, to be judged by Lycian courts of law, even if the accuser were Roman. These measures were destined to give the residing *ciues romani* certain legal privileges that clearly interfered with the sovereignty of the allied state. The locals, however, were only granted the fundamental rights needed to avoid leaving them at the mercy of the *romaioi*. These legal clauses were probably also present in Augustus' treaty with Mytilene (*RDGE* 26e); their inclusion reflects the frequency of conflicts with the Roman-Italians. Established in the region in considerable numbers, and dedicated in their majority to making business, they did not stop at anything to make their investments profitable and collect their loans (Plut. *Luc.* 4.1, 7.7, 20.1-2).⁴⁷ Thus in AD 43, due to the accumulated social tensions in

45 Sherk 1969: 157; Labarre 1996a: 281 (no. 20).

46 Mitchell 2005: 163-250.

47 The creation of Asia as a province (129-126 BC) and the presence of a magistrate with *imperium et iuris dictio* (Str. 13.4.2; Liv. *Per.* 58; Flor. 1.35; Plu. *Ti.Gr.* 14) favoured the settlement of *romaioi* in Asian cities. Many of them were *negotiatores* and *publicani*, attracted by the *lex Sempronia Asiae* of 123 BC (Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.12). Their activities festered an 'anti-

Lycia and violent reactions toward the resident *romaioi*, the emperor Claudius decided to take their liberty away (Suet. *Claud.* 25.3; D.C. 60.17.3-4).⁴⁸ Therefore, conflicts between locals and Roman-Italians grew, rather than decreased in years between Caesar and Augustus. To the traditional Roman rapacity⁴⁹ were now added the *deductio* of Roman colonies in northern and southern Anatolia and the individual settlement of veterans in peregrine cities (*singillatim* or *uiritim*). These events were perceived by the local population as a punishment and a misfortune and usually took place in a violent and tense atmosphere, when the locals refused to leave their lands. There are well known cases such as Sinope and Herakleia, which ended in a massacre, or Buthroton, where the settlers sent by Caesar were expelled (Cic. *Att.* 15.29.3, 16.1.2).⁵⁰

Mytilene achieved the maximum privileges possible for a *polis* in the Empire. It, therefore, honoured Augustus in the same way it did Caesar and Pompey. Additionally, Potamon received exceptional honours from his compatriots, and was, just like Theophanes, proclaimed *soter*, *euergetes* and *ktistes*

Roman' sentiment that culminated in the 'Ephesian Vespers' of 88 BC (App. *Mith.* 22; 54:62; Plut. *Sull.* 24.7; V. Max. 9.2.3; Memn. 22.9; Cic. *Pomp.* 5.11), although this dramatic event would only be a brief parenthesis (App. *Mith.* 83; Plu. *Luc.* 4.1; 7.7; 20.1-2). There is a lot of evidence for Latin inscriptions in the main centres of Asia Minor of Caesar's and Augustus' time, a clear reflection of an increased Roman-Italian presence. A good many of them were veterans, settled during colonial *deductiones* or the distribution of *ager viritanus*. See R.M. Kallet-Marx 1995. *Hegemony to Empire*. Berkeley: 95-125, 138-48; Ballesteros 1996: 103-7; J. Thornton 1998. 'Misos Rhomaion o phobos Mithridatou? Echi storiografici di un dibattito diplomatico' *MedAnt* 1/1, 271-309; J.-L. Ferrary 2002. 'La création de la province d'Asie et la présence italienne en Asie Mineure' in C. Muller & C. Hasenohr (eds.) *Les Italiens dans le monde Grec*. Paris: 133-45; C. Brélaz 2004. 'Les colonies romaines et la sécurité publique en Asie Mineure' in G. Salmeri, A. Raggi & A. Baroni (eds.) *Colonia romana nel mondo Greco*. Rome: 187-209; M. Sartre 2006. 'Tuez-les tous ou les Grecs, Rome et Mithridate VI Eupator' *Histoires Grecques*. Paris: 315-23; Sartre 2007: 229-45; S.E. Alcock 2007. 'Making sure you know whom to kill: spatial strategies and strategic boundaries in the Eastern Roman Empire' *Millennium*, 4 13-20; T. Nāco et al. 2009. 'The impact of the Roman intervention in Greece and Asia Minor upon civilians (88-63 BC)' in T. Nāco & B. Antela (eds.) *Transforming historical landscapes in the Ancient Empires*. Oxford: 38-41; I. Arrayás 2009: 137-53.

48 J.-L. Ferrary 1991. 'Le statut des cités libres dans l'Empire Romain à la lumière des inscriptions de Claros' *CRAI* 569-73; Sánchez 2007a: 225 (no. 36); Sánchez 2007b: 363-82.

49 Kallet-Marx 1995: 153-58.

50 Deniaux 1975: 283-96; Vial 1995: 198; Rizakis 1996: 255-324; Rizakis 2004: 75, 82-85; Sartre 2001: 127; S. Goldhill 2001. *Being Greek under Rome*. Cambridge; Doukellis 2007: 313.

(*IG* XII, 2, 163; *Syll.*³ 752; *IGRR* 4.55).⁵¹ Several inscriptions belonging to the *Potamoneion* were part of decrees promulgated by Mytilene in honour of Potamon. They offer a good account of his role as a politician, diplomat and benefactor after Pharsalos, and highlight the two embassies that took him to far-off lands. The inscriptions also inform us of the magistracies he held in his *polis*. We know he acted as *agonothetes*, but he must also have been *archiereus* of the imperial cult, since he presided over the games and shows organized for the purpose. He also seems to have held the office of *nomothetes*, which entitled him to propose legislative changes. An inscription belonging to an Aurelia Artemisia, presented as the descendent of Potamon the *nomothetes*, seems to confirm this. Additionally, the magistracy is cited on what must have been the base of a statue, probably dedicated to Potamon by the *koinon* of Lesbos. In this inscription, Potamon is symbolically linked to the Aeolian king *Penthiolos*, stressing his role as the new founder of Mytilene and heir to the creators of the island's confederation.⁵² All of this indicates that Potamon, leader and benefactor of the principal city of Lesbos, also held offices and priesthoods in the wider setting of the *koinon*. It is worth remembering that the *koinon* of Lesbos, politically annulled after the First Mithridatic War, was restricted to religious activity surrounding the federal sanctuary of Messa. Even so, the confederation was partially reactivated in the late first century BC, perhaps with the consent of Caesar. Among Mytilene's inscriptions, there is a fragment that refers to the institution of the *Kaisarea* (*IG* XII, 2, 26), a festivity that celebrated Caesar's birth, also documented in Eresos. Nevertheless, there is the possibility that they were actually dedicated to Caesar Augustus and not to the dictator. In fact, for Mytilene, it would be plausible to attribute it to the *princeps*, since he granted the city the maximum privileges possible in respect to Rome.⁵³ Likewise, it is also possible that Potamon, as a privileged spokesman before

51 Accame 1946: 97; Labarre 1996a: 106, 110. Of special importance was the title of *ktistès*, with which the Hellenistic cities distinguished their most eminent *euergetai*. See Gauthier 1985: 59-60; Ferrary 2005: 51-75; de Rossi 2005: 105.

52 L. Robert 1935. 'Inscriptions de Lesbos et de Samos I-IV' *BCH*, 59 : 475; L. Robert 1940. *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*. Paris: 271, 309 (no. 272); Fishwick 1987: 177; Parker 1991: 116; Labarre 1996a: 113-14 (no. 22, 49); C. Eilers 2005. 'A Roman East: Pompey's Settlement to the Death of Augustus' in A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: 101.

53 Labarre 1996a: 111, 113-15 (no. 78).

the Roman authorities, would have negotiated on behalf of and represented, the entire confederation.⁵⁴

TARRACO, VIRTUAL CAPITAL OF THE GRAECO-ROMAN WORLD

A large part of Potamon's efforts as a politician and benefactor materialized in several diplomatic missions. His eagerness to defend and increase Mytilene's privileges took him to the extremities of the Mediterranean and to the city of Tarraco. Here, Augustus established the headquarters of the *legatus Augusti propraetore Hispaniae citerioris* in 27 BC (D.C. 53.12.5).⁵⁵ Tarraco, like Mytilene, sided with Pompey, but later retracted its support (*RIT* 1-2), and consolidated itself as the provincial capital, having served as the 'political and administrative centre' of *Hispania Citerior* since 218 BC.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ In a similar way, Diodoros Paspáros from Pergamon would have acted as spokesman for all the Asian provincials during an embassy to Rome, which took place after 85 BC (*IGRR* 4.292-93). An inscription from Aphrodisias informs us how the *koinon* of the Asian Greeks sent an embassy to Rome, perhaps between 80 and 71 BC, with the objective of presenting before the Senate the province's dire situation, hoping to restrain the activity of the *negotiatores* and *publicani*, which was facilitated by permissive governors (*AGR* 383). The mission was composed of important citizens of the Asian *poleis*. Of these the brothers Dyonisios and Hierocles of Tralles stand out, although residents of Aphrodisias, to which the *koinon* decreed exceptional honours, granting them the golden crown and dedicating them two bronze statues (de Rossi 2002: n. 166). See Jones 1974: 198; C.P. Jones 2000. 'Diodoros Paspáros Revisited' *Chiron* 30, 1-12; J. Reynolds 1982. *Aphrodisias and Rome*. London: 26-32 (no. 5); Virgilio 1993: 78, 89; Vial 1995: 165; A.S. Chankowski 1998. 'La procédure législative à Pergame au Ier siècle av. J.-C.: à propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l'honneur de Diodoros Paspáros' *BCH* 122, 194; de Rossi 1997: no. 383; de Rossi 2005: 101-8; de Rossi 2002: 100-4, 204-15 (nos. 166, 190, 191).

⁵⁵ Alföldy 1991: 55-59.

⁵⁶ Plb. 10.34; Liv. 22.19, 26.19.12-14, 26.51.10-11, 40.39.3-4; Caes. *BC* 2.21. Not in vain was Tarraco Rome's first 'rearguard' in Hispania. It was a creation of the Scipios, while Carthago Nova, with all its geographical importance, belonged to the Punics (Plin. *Nat.* 3.3.21). Nevertheless, it must be noted that the term 'capital' was used simply to designate the city where the governor resided, or spent a considerable amount of time, being his first destination when arriving to the province. See J. Ruiz de Arbulo 1992. 'Tarraco, Carthago Nova y el problema de la capitalidad en la Hispania Citerior republicana' *Miscel·lània Arqueològica a J.M. Recasens*. Tarragona: 115-30; J. Gimeno 1994. 'Plinio, *Nat. Hist.* III, 3, 21: reflexiones acerca de la capitalidad de Hispania Citerior' *Latomus* 53, 79;

Tarraco is mentioned in an inscription from Mytilene (fig. 1), probably belonging to the *Potamoneion*, jointly with the people of Mytilene and Augustus, which allows it to be dated to after 27 BC (*IG* XII, 2, 44; *IGRR* 4.38).⁵⁷ Tarraco appears in Mytilene's epigraphic record because of a historical circumstance noted in the literary sources. In 26-25 BC, Augustus, who commanded the Roman troops in Hispania during the first phase of the Cantabrian wars,⁵⁸ was forced to abandon the field of battle due to health problems and withdrew to Tarraco where he recuperated and received the attentions of the renowned doctor, Antonius Musa.⁵⁹ Given the situation, Augustus proceeded to direct his immense Empire from Tarraco by temporarily turning it into the centre of political power, into the capital of the Graeco-Roman world. Here, the *princeps* began his eighth and ninth consulship.⁶⁰ Here, he received news from Rome as well as about the campaigns against the Cantabri and Astures.⁶¹ Whilst going about his business in Tarraco, Augustus would also have received the diverse diplomatic missions arriving from around the Empire. Although brief, the sources attest to this as we note the arrival in Tarraco of *legati Indorum et Scytharum*.⁶² For sure,

M.D. Campanile 2003. 'L'infanzia della provincia d'Asia: l'origine dei conventus iuridici nella provincia' in C. Bearzot, F. Landucci & G. Zecchini (eds.) *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*. Milan: 275; Arrayás 2004: 291-303; Arrayás 2005: 37, 46-54, 73-94, 109-114; I. Arrayás 2006b. 'L'ager Tarraconensis (IIIe-Ier siècles av. J.-C.). Un territoire d'arrière-garde' in T. Nāco & I. Arrayás (eds.) *War and territory in the Roman World*. Oxford: 103-17.

57 Accame 1946: 96; Sherk 1969: 157; Labarre 1996a: 112 (no. 21); F.G.B. Millar 1966. 'The Emperor, the Senate, and the Provinces' *JRS* 56, 163 (repr. 2004, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, I. Chapel Hill: 286).

58 It was not the first visit of Augustus to Hispania. In 45 BC, the young Octavian travelled to Calpia in *Hispania Ulterior*, and visited Carthago Nova in the company of Caesar, who had just extinguished the last flames of Pompeian resistance. See L.A. Curchin 2001. 'Octavianus in Spain (45 BC)' in L. Hernández Guerra, L. Sagredo & J.M. Solana (eds.) *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia Antigua*. Valladolid: 152-57.

59 Hor. *Carm.* 3.14, *Epist.* 1.15; Suet. *Aug.* 59, 81; Tac. *Ann.* 4.24; Plin. *Nat.* 5.16, 25.38, 29.5, 29.39; Flor. 2.33.51; D.C. 53.25.6-7, 53.30. See R. Étienne 1952. 'Le voyage transpyrénéen d'Auguste en 26-25 a.C.' *Annales du Midi* 64, 5-14; E. Gozalbes Cravioto 1997. 'Los baños y la curación de Octavio Augusto en Tarraco' in M.J. Peréz (ed.) *Termalismo Antiguo*. Madrid: 241-45.

60 'Nec omnis Romae, sed quartum consulatum in Asia, quintum in insula Samo, octauum et nonum Tarracone init' (Suet. *Aug.* 26.3).

61 Sen. *Con.* 10.14; Hor. *Carm.* 3.14; Flor. *Epit.* 2.33; D.C. 53.25.6-7; Oros. 6.21.19-21.

62 'Interea Caesarem apud Tarraconem citerioris Hispaniae urbem legati Indorum et Scytharum

they would not have been the only ones, and Mytilene's representatives would have been among them. This can be seen in the epigrams of Krinagoras, son of Kallipos and close collaborator of Potamon (*Anth.Pal.* 7.376; 9.419; 9.516; 9.599).⁶³ While he was residing in Tarraco, the local authorities dedicated an altar to Augustus. This may have coincided with the arrival of the embassy from Mytilene (Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.77).⁶⁴ It could be argued that, whilst the embassy was dealing with other issues, it also announced the establishment of the Augustan cult, triggering devotion from the people of Tarraco.⁶⁵ Moreover, the construction of the altar was followed by the build-

rum, toto Orbe transmisso, tandem ibi inuenerunt, ultra quod iam quaerere non possent, refuderuntque in Caesarem Alexandri Magni gloriam: quem sicut Hispanorum Gallorumque legatio in medio Oriente apud Babylonam contemplatione pacis adiit, ita hunc apud Hispaniam in Occidentis ultimo supplex cum gentilitio munere eous Indus et Scythia boreus orauit. Cantabrico bello per quinque annos acto totaque Hispania in aeternam pacem cum quadam respiratione lassitudinis reclinata ac reposita, Caesar Romam rediit' (Oros. 6.21.19-21).

63 On Crinagoras, the poet of Mytilene, see F. Geffcken 1922. 'Krinagoras', *RE* 11.2, 1859-64; A.F.S. Gow & D.L. Page 1968 *The Greek Anthology: the Garland of Philip and some contemporary epigrams*, II. London, 210-13.

64 Labarre 1996a: 104; W.E. Mierse 1999. *Temples and Towns in Roman Iberia*. Berkeley: 125. Augustus' altar is depicted in the reverse of Tarraco's coins in the time of Tiberius, with the legend *C(olonia) U(rbs) T(riumphalis) T(arraconensis)*. In the obverse, these issues depict a radiate bust of the *princeps* with the legend *Divus Augustus Pater*. The symbolism in these coins is of great importance. From the altar springs a palm tree, the symbol of Caesar's victory at Munda, but it is also the tree of Apollo, the divine protector of Augustus. See A. Beltrán 1953. 'Los monumentos en las monedas hispano-romanas' *AEspA*, 26, 39-66; A. Beltrán 1980. 'La significación de los tipos de las monedas antiguas de España y especialmente los referentes a monumentos arquitectónicos y escultóricos' *Numisma*, 162-64: 137, 149; J.M. Blázquez 1974. 'Propaganda dinástica y culto imperial en las acuñaciones de Hispania' *Numisma* 120-31: 311-29; R. Étienne 1974. *Le Culte Impérial dans la Péninsule Ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien*. Paris: 366, 376-78; L. Villaronga 1979. *Numismática Antigua de Hispania. Iniciación a su estudio*. Barcelona: 273-74; M. Beltrán & F. Beltrán 1980. 'Numismática hispanorromana de la Tarraconense' *Numisma*, 162-64, 55-56; D. Fishwick 1982. 'The altar of Augustus and the municipal cult of Tarraco' *MM* 23, 223-33; V. Bejarano 1982-83. 'Tarragona en la literatura latina' *BARq* ép. V, 4-5, 283, 290; Alföldy 1991: 38; J. Benages 1994. 'Les monedes de Tarragona (Addenda Primera)' *BARq* ép. V, 16, 41-42; Gimeno 1994: 39-79; P.P. Ripollès 1997. 'Augusto: las cecas hispanas' in M. Campo (ed.) *I Curs d'Història Monetària d'Hispania*. Barcelona, 21-38; Arrayás 2004: 291-303; Arrayás 2005: 107-8.

65 The only image of the *Sebasteion* in Pergamon (Tac. *Ann.* 4.37.3; 55.6; DC 51.20.7) is found on a cistophorus issued in commemoration of Augustus' consecration in 19 BC (*BMCEmpire* 1, 705-6). Perhaps Mytilene also erected a temple to him, for Augustus was

ing of a temple. Permission for this was requested from the emperor Tiberius by a commission of Hispanics, only a year after the death of Augustus, *datumque in omnis prouincias exemplum* (Tac. Ann. 1.78.1).⁶⁶

.....

..... τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐ

..... θέσιω ἔργων ἐπιφανέστερον

[τήν]...ας ὑποκειμένεν πρὸς Μ]υτιλ[ηναίους

..... ἀπ]οδέδωκεν πάντα καὶ λέγων [καὶ πράττων]

τῶν τε συστάντων ἐκ τοῦ

..... [εσ]τῶτα τοῖς ἐκ τῆς πολιτήας...

... ὡν ἐν Ταρρακῶνι τῆς Ἰβη[ρίας] ..

... τὰ] κράτιστα καὶ συμφορώτατ[α.....

τοῦ συνε]δρίου καὶ τῶν νόμων κα[ί]....

κότες ἀνατετλήκασ[ιν]

ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λόγων κ[αί]

καὶ ξένων ἔτι εἴτε ἀκο[λουθ].....

Καίσα]ρι τῷ θεῷ καὶ.....

.. πράγματα καὶ τὰ τε..... (IG XII. 2, 44 = IGRR 4.38. Cf. fig. 1)

the personal culmination of imperial theology. Actually documented are the games that Mytilene celebrated in honour of the *princeps* and the existence of an *archiereus* to keep his cult, an office that may have been Potamon's. See Étienne 1974: 367; Bowersock 1966: 116; Vermeule 1968: 381 (no. 19); C.H.V. Sutherland 1970. *The Cistophori of Augustus*. London: 102-3; R. Mellor 1975. *The worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*. Göttingen: 140-41, 165-80, 217; R. Mellor 1981. 'The Goddess Roma' *ANRW* II.17.2, 950-1030; C. Fayer 1976. *Il culto della Dea Roma. Origine e diffusione nell'Impero*. Rome: 109-12; S.R.F. Price 1984. *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: 56, 133, 252; H. Hänlein-Schäfer 1985. *Veneratio Augusti*. Rome: 166-68; Virgilio 1993: 99-100; Labarre 1996a: 104.

- 66 The coins from Tarraco echoed the construction of this temple, clearly provincial in style. The obverse depicts the cult statue of Augustus, accompanied by the legend *Augusto Deo*, while the reverse shows a symbolic image of the temple, perhaps located in the colonial *forum*, surrounded by the words *Aeternitas Augustae* and the abbreviation for the colony, *C.V.T.T.* See Beltrán 1953: 39-66; Beltrán 1980: 137, 149; Étienne 1974: 406-14; Blázquez 1974: 311-29; Villaronga 1979: 273-74; Beltrán & Beltrán 1980: 55-56; Alföldy 1991: 59-60; Benages 1994: 41-42; Ripollés 1997: 21-38; D. Fishwick 1999, 'The Temple of Augustus at Tarraco' *Latomus* 58, 121-38; Arrayás 2004: 291-303; Arrayás 2005: 76, 109; Rodà 2009: 207-8.

The fragment mentioning Tarraco seems to belong to a decree in honour of Potamon and voted by the people of Mytilene, who on this occasion thanked him for his dealings during the diplomatic mission to the Hispanic city. The names of the personalities that took part in the embassy are not mentioned in the inscription, but considering that it was part of Potamon's monument, we can safely say that our benefactor was not only part of the envoy, but probably also its leader. The document would have referred to the details of the negotiation with Augustus and the results that had been obtained. Furthermore, it would also have stressed the role played by Potamon, who may even have funded the expedition himself, and enumerated the honours given to the benefactor by his fellow citizens. Among them was the dedication of two statues, one made of gold and erected in the *pronaos* of the temple of Asclepius, the other situated in a central location of the *agora*, placed over a fluted column which had an inscription praising Potamon.⁶⁷ Such honours were only bestowed to individuals for valuable service. Therefore, it is feasible to link the conclusion of the *foedus aequum* between Rome and Mytilene to 25 BC with the diplomatic mission to Tarraco. Initially, it was probably destined for Rome, which was the usual practice. However, with Augustus still occupied in Hispania, the ambassadors decided to continue their journey to Tarraco to be granted their audience.⁶⁸ On arrival, the diplomats presented the decree approved by the people of Mytilene. It began with the enumeration of the honours bestowed to him and his family, which

67 Labarre 1996a: 112. Such embassies were not without risks. Therefore, the contribution of its participants is stressed. In Stratonikeia, there is a funerary stele dedicated to Posidippos (*CIG* II. 2725; *I.Strat.* II.1, 1206; *AGR* 430) who died during an embassy to Rome. His death could have been due to the journey's events, given his old age. Nevertheless, the possibility of having been attacked cannot be eliminated. This was not exceptional, as may be gleaned from the killing of a hundred Alexandrian ambassadors at the hands of Ptolemy XII Auletes' hired assassins in 57 BC (D.C. 39.13) (*AGR* 650), or from the killers of Dorilaos (Cic. *Pro Flac.* 17.41) (*AGR* 401), Theodosius, *legatum ad senatum a ciuitate libera missum, sica percussum* (Cic. *De har. Resp.* 16.34) (*AGR* 407), and of an ambassador from Commagene (D.C. 52.43.1) (*AGR* 674). Additionally, the great benefactor Mithridates from Pergamon, who represented his city in the *de repetundis* trial opened in 59 BC against Asia's ex-governor L. Valerius Flaccus (Cic. *Att.* 2.25.1; Macrobian. *Saturn.* 2.1.13), had to declare before the court protected by a cuirass (Cic. *Pro Flac.* 17.41) (*AGR* 403). See de Rossi 1997: no. 402, 405, 407, 650; de Rossi 2002: no. 176; Amela 2003: 116, 123, 136.

68 Accame 1946: 96. On embassies to Rome, see J. Linderski 2007. 'Ambassadors go to Rome' *Roman Questions II. Selected Papers*. Stuttgart, 40-59.

he accepted and responded by establishing the *foedus* (RDGE 26d; e).⁶⁹ Besides Potamon, the aforementioned Krinagoras may have played a part in the delegation sent to Tarraco. We know this because he usually accompanied our benefactor on previous missions (RDGE 26 a, l. 3, b, l. 16). It is no coincidence that some of his epigrams mention a visit to Hispania (*Anth.Pal.* 7.376; 9.419; 9.516; 9.599).⁷⁰ It is plausible that the fragment mentioning Tarraco (*IG XII*, 2, 44; *IGRR* 4.38) may be indirect evidence for the approval of a decree presented by Mytilene to Augustus some time in 26 BC, while he was recovering in Tarraco. It may have opened the way for the establishment of the *foedus aequum*.⁷¹

Potamon walked in the political wake of Theophanes. He clearly understood the need of working towards gaining the maximum prerogatives from Rome. In addition, he established a valuable relationship with Rome, once the impossibility of escaping foreign dominion was accepted. The consequences of the First Mithridatic War were a hard lesson for the people of Mytilene to learn. It made them aware of the futility of resisting Rome. They followed the diplomatic practices of the time and sent embassies before the Roman authorities to defend the city's rights and attempt to increase them as much as possible. Potamon's epigraphic dossier closely resembles Mytilene's history. Both were marked by the Mithridatic Wars and by the relationship established between the Roman state and the Asian *polis*. Because of this, the relationship was sealed in a treaty that may well have been concluded at Tarraco in 25 BC. It was the brand-new capital of *Hispania Citerior* and that is where the *princeps* took up temporary residence.

69 Labarre 1996a: 280-81, 284 (no. 20).

70 Sherck 1969: 156-57; Parker 1991: 117-18; Millar 1966: 163. It was not uncommon for learned men to take part in their cities' embassies. Their dialectical ability and their intellectual prestige made them indispensable. This was the case of Philonides of Laodikea, who acted as ambassador of his city towards 160 BC (*AGR* 585), or of the also philosopher Apollopheanes, son of Demetrios, who could have acted as a consultant to the great benefactor Diodoros Paspáros of Pergamon during one of his embassies to Rome (*AGR* 410). Vid.: de Rossi 1997: 357 (no. 410); de Rossi 2002: 218-19 (nos. 190, 194); D. Gera 1999. 'Philonides, the Epicurean at court' *ZPE* 125, 77-83.

71 Accame 1946: 96; Labarre 1996a: 107, 112, 123 (no. 21 b).

ΕΤΩΝ ΤΕΝΕΚΕΝΕ
 ΟΞΙΝΕΡΓΕΝΕΠΙΤΑΝΕΣΤΕΡΟΙ
 ΪΣΥΠΟΚΕΙΜΕΝΕΝΠΡΟ ΥΤΙΑ
 ΟΔΕΡΓΕΝΠΑΝΤΑΔΙΑΒΕΒΛΗΝ
 ΓΟΝΤΕΣΥ ΕΤΑΝΤΑΝΕΚΤΟΥΓ
 ΓΕΤΑΤΟΙΣΕΚΤΗΝΠΟΛΙΤΗΑΣΙ
 ΕΝΕΝΤΑΡΡΑΒΕΝΙΤΕΧΙΕΝ
 ΚΡΑΤΙΣΤΑΚΑΙΣΥΜΦΟΡΕΤΑΤ
 ΑΡΙΟΥΣΑΙΤΟΝΝΟΜΟΝΕΑ
 ΕΟΤΕΧΑΝΑΤΕΤΑΝΚΑΙ
 ΕΚΤΕΝΙΑΙΩΝΑΟΓΕΝΕ/
 ΕΑΙΕΝΕΝΕΤΙΕΙΤΕΛΕΣ
 ΡΙΤΟΙΕΒΙΣΥΝΕΙΧΙΝΕΑ/
 ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΑΚΑΙΤΑΤΕ

Fig. 1. Honorific decree from Mytilene, reproduced from *IG* (XII, 2, 44)

THE LEGENDARY FATE OF PONTIUS PILATE

By Tibor Grüll

Summary: The extremely complex apocryphal *acta Pilati*-tradition was comprised of four different phases. The first phase is the official record of the imperial magistrate. The second component of the tradition is definitely pagan in origin and was used in anti-Christian propaganda. Christian texts which may have arisen in response to the pagan forgeries can be considered the third component of the tradition. The Christian texts can be divided into two separate branches: the Western textual tradition written in Latin usually demonizes Pilate, while in the Eastern tradition Pilate's character has totally metamorphosed: the *praefectus* became a confessor, saint, and martyr of the Church.

PILATE IN HISTORY

Pontius Pilate was the fifth governor of the Roman province of Judea, holding office from AD 26-37. As *praefectus Iudaeae* Pilate was in charge of maintaining law and order in probably the smallest imperial province, overseeing legal matters and supervising the collection of taxes. Governors of Judea, as was customary in a relatively unimportant imperial province, were drawn from the equestrian order. Despite its small size, the province presented many difficulties, significant being the fact that it was composed of different ethnic groups, each with its own religious sensitivities. In order to uphold law and order, an equestrian governor had only auxiliary troops at his disposal. In Judea these amounted to five infantry cohorts and one cavalry regiment. On the occasions when these auxiliary forces were not able to check riots and disturbances amongst the people, the prefect would call upon the Syrian legate to intervene with his legions. A further aspect of the

Tibor Grüll 'The Legendary Fate of Pontius Pilate' *C&M* 61 (2010) 151-76. © 2010 Museum Tusculanum Press · www.mtp.dk/classicaetmediaevalia

maintenance of law and order was the prefect's supreme judicial power within the province. In Judea, the prefect had the authority to try and to execute provincials and probably also citizens within his area of jurisdiction. Due to his role in the trial of Jesus, Pilate became the most well known Roman provincial governor ever.¹

Pontius Pilate is, however, one of the New Testament characters about whom we have several literary descriptions from roughly contemporary non-biblical sources.² Our earliest surviving literary reference to Pontius Pilate is found in Philo's *Embassy to Gaius*, which describes how Pilate offended against the Jewish Law by setting up gilded shields in Jerusalem (*Leg.* 299-305).³ In his *Jewish War*, Josephus relates two incidents involving Pilate: one describing his introduction of iconic standards into Jerusalem,⁴ the other his appropriation of Temple funds to build an aqueduct in the city (*Bell.* 2.169-77).⁵ The *Antiquities* contains four narratives involving Pilate. The first two – the standards and the aqueduct – were also found in the *War* (18.55-62). These are followed by the highly controversial text on Jesus and the Christians (18.63-64, cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15.44) and an incident involving Samaritans which culminated in Pilate's departure to Rome on the orders of Vitellius (18.85-88). These last events have no parallel in the *War*. We are also in possession of significant archaeological material from Pilate's term as governor.⁶ Bronze coins minted during his administration can be dated to three consecutive years, i.e. AD 29/30, 30/1 and 31/2.⁷ Perhaps the most dramatic archaeological evidence concerning Pilate is the stone found in 1961 in Caesarea, on which his name and title are clearly legible: *[Pon]tius Pilatus / [prae]fectus Iuda[ea]e*. The first line of the inscription has been, however, the object of a great deal of debate and speculation. Recently G. Alföldy has

1 A highly selective bibliography on this topic from the last six decades: Kilpatrick 1953; Blinzler 1959; Winter 1961; Sherwin-White 1965; Bammel 1970; Catchpole 1971; Cohn 1972; Bauman 1974; Harvey 1976; Betz 1982; Rivkin 1986; Millar 1990; Brown 1994; Vermes 2005.

2 Lémonon 1981; McGing 1991; McLaren 1991; Bond 1998.

3 Kraeling 1942; Brandon 1967; Maier 1969; Fuks 1982; Davies 1986.

4 Roth 1956; Bond 2007.

5 Lönnqvist 2000.

6 Evans 2006.

7 Bond 1996; Hoffeditz 2006.

concluded that the inscription concerns a lighthouse called *Tiberieum* that Pilate restored for the seamen of Caesarea.⁸

Josephus explains that the cause of Pilate's removal from his post, after ten years as governor, was the massacre at Mount Gerizim.⁹ The *koinon* of Samaria sent a delegation to Vitellius, the *legatus Syriae*, and the Jews joined them in complaining against the *praefectus*.¹⁰ Vitellius was willing to listen to the accusations of these undoubtedly influential leaders. He recalled Pilate immediately and sent him back to Rome to report on his official conduct. Pilate would probably have arrived in Rome shortly after the death of Tiberius, on 16th March 37. But when might Pilate have started his journey? The massacre on Mount Gerizim probably took place in the month of September, on the Samaritans' Day of Atonement.¹¹ Pilate's successor, Marcellus, could have arrived in Judea very soon after his departure, since Syria was a neighbouring province. Moreover, the law required that an ex-governor must report to Rome within three months after the arrival of a new governor.¹² Flavius Josephus suggests that Pilate 'hurried to Rome' (εἰς Ῥώμην ἡπείγετο), so it is easily conceivable that in the winter months (between November 10th and March 10th) he sailed through the 'closed sea' (*mare clausum*), despite the fact that the journey would be very risky.¹³ Pilate had

8 Alföldy 1999 (with extensive bibliography); cf. Grüll 2001; Alföldy 2002.

9 *Ant.* 18.4.1-2 [85-89]. According to Niese's edition, only one manuscript reads 'Samaritans'; the others, as well as the Epitome and the Latin version read 'Jews'. This textual version, however, was rejected by most scholars, except by Naber (in his edition) and Brandon 1968: 528 n. 3.

10 The *praefectus Iudaeae* was subordinated to the *legatus Syriae*, because Judea was not yet a separate province at this time, see Cotton 1999. According to Mommsen and Dessau, Vitellius had *imperium maius* in the East, as earlier Gaius Caesar and Germanicus, although there are opposing views as well, see, e.g., de Laet 1939; Magie 1950. See also Smallwood 1954; Schwartz 1992.

11 Flavius Josephus' text does not refer to the direct cause of Pilate's attack. Pilate probably recognized the Samaritans' gathering at Mount Gerizim as a messianic claim with political implications. For this view see, Bowman 1955; Bowman 1958; Bowman 1959: 47; MacDonald 1964: 361; Collins 1972.

12 It was Augustus' provision that 'when their successors arrived, they were to leave the province at once, and not to delay on the return journey, but to get back within three months', Dio 53.15.6. transl. by Earnest Cary (Loeb Classical Library).

13 For the dates see Veg. *De re mil.* 4.39. De Saint-Denis 1947 supplies numerous references from Latin authors to the sailing season and a review of out-of-season voyages both military (esp. 201-3) and commercial (esp. 203-7). Rougé 1952 adds references from the church

to give his report and defend himself against the accusations of Vitellius, the Samaritans, and most probably the Jews, in front of Caligula.¹⁴ But did the ex-governor have something to fear? Hardly anything. When the new emperor acceded to the throne he proclaimed general amnesty,¹⁵ and could not take Vitellius' accusations seriously either, of whose successes in the east he was very jealous. Gaius did recall Vitellius from Syria in AD 38/39, and appointed his friend, Marullus, in his place. Historical sources are silent about Pilate's fate after his arrival in Rome. There is no literary or epigraphic evidence concerning his late career or his death.

EARLIEST SOURCES ON PILATE'S FATE (CELSUS AND ORIGEN)

Pilate, as one of the few key figures of the New Testament, became a popular character in apocryphal literature. Pilate's character could be used as 'authentication' in these simple-minded stories filled with countless anachronisms. To a historian, however, neither the pious legends of the church fathers, nor the apocryphal correspondence, nor the ramose *Acta Pilati*-literature provide valuable information on the fate of the historical Pilate. Except, probably, one case which can be considered only as an *argumentum e silentio*.

Celsus, one of the first and severest critics of Christianity, argues in his *On*

fathers. For a useful summary of this question, see Casson 1971: 270-96. Accordingly I cannot agree with Maier who says that 'we may reasonably assume that he [i.e. Pilate] was forced to return via the overland route which led across Asia Minor and the Via Egnatia to Brundisium, because his journey would have been undertaken in the middle of mare clausum ... Josephus' statement that Pilate 'hurried' to Rome ... indicate that Pilate did not wait until spring and the time of *secura navigatio* ... The length of the journey would have been approximately 80 days', see Maier 1971: 364.

¹⁴ Maier is certainly right in supposing that the Samaritan (and possibly Jewish) delegation 'did not go the expense and inconvenience of making a trip to accuse a governor who was already dismissed, the case need not have come to a formal hearing or trial before Gaius' (Maier 1971: 366).

¹⁵ *Criminum, si quae residua ex priore tempore manebant, omnium gratiam fecit*, Suet. *Gaius* 15.2: 'took no cognizance of any charges that remained untried from an earlier time', transl. by J.C. Rolfe (Loeb Classical Library). According to Maier 'it is tempting to conclude that Pilate would clearly have been included in such a general amnesty' (Maier 1971: 367).

the True Doctrine (Λόγος ἀληθής), written around 178, that Pilate did not suffer at all for having had Jesus executed: 'But the one who condemned him [i.e., Jesus] did not even suffer any such fate as that of Pentheus by going mad or being torn in pieces'.¹⁶ Celsus alludes to the old Greek myth of the curse of Pentheus. According to Euripides' *Bacchae*, Pentheus was the king of Thebes who arrested, bound and scourged a stranger whom he failed to recognize as the god Dionysus. In turn, Dionysus arranged a special curse for the king, maddening Pentheus' own mother and sisters who saw him only as a lion and tore him limb from limb in a bacchic frenzy. But at the last moment, Dionysus opened all eyes: Pentheus knew he was paying with his life for having punished a god, and the women realized their atrocity.

Origen, interestingly, in his response to the work of Celsus in 248, does not refute this statement, but claims that responsibility for Jesus' death rests with the Jews:

οὐκ εἶδε δ' ὅτι οὐχ οὕτω Πιλάτος ἦν καταδικάσας αὐτόν, ὅς γε “ἤδει ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν” οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὡς τὸ Ἰουδαῖον ἔθνος ὅπερ καταδεδικάσται ὑπὸ θεοῦ σπαραχθὲν καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ὑπὲρ τὸν Πενθέως σπαραγμὸν διασπαρέν. Διὰ τί δὲ καὶ ἐκὼν παρεπέμψατο τὰ τῆς γυναικὸς Πιλάτου, ἐωρακυίας ὄναρ καὶ οὕτω κεκινημένης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὡς προσπέμψαι τῷ ἀνδρὶ καὶ λέγειν “Μηδὲν σοι καὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ τῷ δικαίῳ, σήμερον γὰρ κατ' ὄναρ πολλὰ ἔπαθον δι' αὐτόν”.

He [i.e., Celsus] did not see that it was not so much Pilate who condemned Him, since 'he knew that for envy the Jews had given him up' (Matth. 27.18), as the Jewish people. This nation has been condemned by God and *torn in pieces*, and scattered over all the earth, a fate more terrible than the rending suffered by Pentheus. Why also did he intentionally omit the story of Pilate's wife, who was so moved by a dream, she had seen that she sent to her husband and said: 'Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man; for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him' (Matt. 27.19)?¹⁷

¹⁶ Orig. *Contra Celsum* 2.34. = GCS Origenes I, 160. Transl. by Henry Chadwick, in Origen 1986: 95.

¹⁷ See the previous note.

Why did not Origen reflect on Pilate's fate? Perhaps because he had no reliable information on his later career; or if he had, but it did support Celsus' statement.¹⁸ In any case, it is remarkable that neither Philo nor Tacitus mentions Pilate's natural or unnatural death, though they were well aware of him. Philo of Alexandria, who visited Rome as an envoy during the time of Caligula (AD 39-40), gave an account of Pilate's governorship in his *Legatio*. Tacitus' silence also speaks, because in his *Annales*, published around AD 120., he referred not only to Pilate's activity, but also to the Christians', as well as to the unlawful activities of the emperors. As a matter of fact, Pilate's later life – since he was a lower-rank official – may have been of no significance to either Philo or Tacitus.

PILATE AS A PROPAGANDA HERO

In the course of time, as Christianity was becoming stronger and more widespread, Pilate's character became increasingly significant, even in pagan circles. As a governor of the Roman Empire, and as a pagan himself, Pilate had sentenced the God of the Christians, whose existence threatened the Empire and its religion, to death. Moreover, he had to make official records of this event: second to third-century church fathers were referred to these archival sources.¹⁹ Thus, anti-Christian pamphlets put into circulation under Pilate's name seemed to be a good choice from the perspective of the government. According to Eusebius' *Church history*, it was Maximinus Daia (310-313) who first used this idea. It is conceivable, of course, that such anti-Christian propaganda texts compiled in Pilate's name existed earlier, nevertheless, in the absence of hard evidence, the existence of this 'anonymous *Urtext*' cannot be proved. Daia persecuted Christians with incredible severity and undying cruelty, continuing the work of Diocletian, and in order to defame them, he ordered the 'Pilate-files' to be written and distributed.²⁰ These

18 According to Maier 'Clearly, then, there was no church tradition of Pilate's suicide, execution, or punishment in the second or third centuries' (Maier 1971: 370).

19 Just. *Apol.* I. 35.6-9, 48.1-3; Tert. *Apol.* 21.17-19; 21.23-24. According to Barnes, Tertullian's source might be the *Apology* of Apollonius, who converted under Commodus, see Barnes 1968, esp. 32-33. On Apollonius, see Sordi 1955.

20 We are in possession of numerous literary and documentary evidence relating to the persecution of Christians under Maximinus Daia, see Mitchell 1988; Christensen 1989.

were later probably incorporated into the first six chapters of the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus:²¹

οὐκοῦν σαφῶς ἀπελήλεγται τὸ πλάσμα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθές καὶ πρῶην διαδεδωκότων, ἐν οἷς πρῶτος αὐτὸς ὁ τῆς παρασημειώσεως χρόνον τῶν πεπλακότων ἀπελέγκει τὸ ψεῦδος. ἐπὶ τῆς τετάρτης δ' οὖν ὑπατείας Τιβερίου, ἡ γέγονεν ἔτους ἐβδόμου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ. τὰ περὶ τὸ σωτήριον πάθος αὐτοῖς τολμηθέντα περιέχει, καθ' ὃν δείκνυται χρόνον μὴδ' ἐπιστάς πω τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ Πιλᾶτος, εἴ γε τῷ Ἰωσήφῳ μάρτυρι χρῆσασθαι δέον, σαφῶς οὕτως σημαίνοντι κατὰ τὴν δηλωθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ γραφὴν ὅτι δὴ δωδεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς Τιβερίου βασιλείας ἐπίτροπος τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ Τιβερίου καθίσταται Πιλᾶτος.

...the forgery of those who have recently given currency to acts against our Saviour is clearly proved. For the very date given in them shows the falsehood of their fabricators. For the things which they have dared to say concerning the passion of the Saviour are put into the fourth consulship of Tiberius; which occurred in the seventh year of his reign; at which time it is plain that Pilate was not yet ruling in Judea, if the testimony of Josephus is to be believed, who clearly shows in the above-mentioned work [cf. Ant. 18.2.2] that Pilate was made procurator of Judea by Tiberius in the twelfth year of his reign.²²

πλασάμενοι δὴτα Πιλᾶτου καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα πάσης, ἔμπλεα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλασφημίας. γνώμη τοῦ μείζονος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν διαπέμπονται τὴν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν διὰ προγραμμάτων παρακελεύόμενοι κατὰ πάντα τόπον, ἀγρούς τε καὶ πόλεις, ἐν ἐκφανεῖ ταῦτα τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐκθεῖναι τοῖς τε παισὶ τοὺς γραμματοδιδασκάλους ἀντὶ μαθημάτων ταῦτα μελετᾶν καὶ διὰ μνήμης κατέχειν παραδιδόναι, ὧν τοῦτον ἐπιτελουμένων τὸν τρόπον.

21 Schneidweiler 1987; Speyer 1978 (A hitherto unknown ending of the Gospel of Nikodemus).

22 Eus. *Hist.Eccl.* 1.9.3-4. = GCS N.F. 6.1 *Eusebius Werke* II: 1, p. 72. ed. F. Winkelmann. Translation quoted from Schaff and Wace 1986: vol. I, 96.

Having therefore forged Acts of Pilate and our Saviour full of every kind of blasphemy against Christ, they sent them with the emperor's [Maximinus Daia's] approval to the whole of the empire subject to him, with written commands that they should be openly posted to the view of all in every place, both in country and city, and that the schoolmasters should give them to their scholars, instead of their customary lessons, to be studied and learned by heart.²³

There are no remaining textual traces of these anti-Christian 'Pilate-files' dating from the beginning of the fourth century, the circulation of which was facilitated in the eastern part of the Empire by Maximinus Daia at the time of the 'Great Persecution' of the Christians. However, it is possible to reconstruct their polemical content by comparing various Christian sources which mention them. These include Eusebius' *Church History*, the apologetic treatise of Lucian of Antioch and the *Acta Pilati* (henceforth *AP*), a Christian document bearing the same title as the pagan Acts.²⁴ Pilate's name became important in the propaganda war both against both Jews and Christians.²⁵

PILATE IN THE CHRISTIAN LEGENDS

Classification of the enormous Pilate-literature originating in the late antique / early medieval times poses a great challenge to historians of religion and literature.²⁶ Constantin Tischendorf in his tract *Pilati circa Christum iudicio quid lucis afferatur ex Actis Pilati*, attempted to show that there was a probability of truth in many of the non-evangelical statements which are contained in the *AP*. Tischendorf clung tenaciously to the belief that the *AP*, which he published, contained nothing foreign to the second century and might therefore very well have been the 'Pilate-files' to which Justin and Ter-

23 Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 9.5.1. = GCS N.F. 6.2 *Eusebius Werke* II: 2, p. 810. ed. F. Winkelmann. Translation quoted from Schaff and Wace 1986: vol. I, 359.

24 Leveils 1999.

25 Frend 1987. For the anti-Judaistic tendencies in the apocrypha see Dehandschutter 1989 and especially in the *Acta Pilati*, see Dubois 1986.

26 The first editions of the texts belonging to the *AP*-tradition: Tischendorf 1876: 210-486. The synoptic edition of the *AP* Greek A-B texts: Vannutelli 1938.

tullian refer.²⁷ The best exposure of the weakness of this position was Richard Adelbert Lipsius' critical investigation of the *Acts of Pilate*.²⁸

Lipsius analyses the *AP* into the following documents: First, there were the original *acta* which contained the first eleven chapters of the text, with the omission of the prologue, and which may also have extended as far as the sixteenth chapter. It professed to be derived from a Hebrew original written by Nicodemus. Second, there was a *Descensus ad inferos* currently attributed to Leucius and Charinus, the supposed sons of Simeon who received the child Jesus into his arms. They have been permitted to return from the dead to tell the story of Christ's descent into Hades. Third, these documents were worked over in the time of Theodosius and Valentinian in the name of a certain official named Ananias or Aeneas, to whom the first prologue of the *AP* is credited, the combination of the two previous writings, and perhaps the addition of chapters 12-16 of the existing acts. The documents, thus united, were worked over again at a time not earlier than the second half of the fifth century; the Latin mss. also show certain additional chapters which Lipsius assigns to a slightly earlier period. The main point here is that Lipsius maintains that the primitive *AP* cannot be dated earlier than the middle of the fourth century.²⁹

Although Lipsius' rather naive notion about dating and composition has been disproved, we are only at the beginning of the research. The first step towards the writing of a history of the *AP*'s eminently complex text-tradition was the publication of an extensive bibliography containing almost 1000 items.³⁰ Zbigniew Izydorczyk, spiritus rector of this monumental venture, includes the following works in the 'Pilate cycle':³¹ (1) *Epistula Pilati ad*

27 Tischendorf 1851: 63-70. He thought that *AP* was originally written by a Jewish-Christian of the second century: '... nihil obstat quin ab homine Judaeo secundi saeculi scriptum putemus ...': 66. n. 92; '... composita enim a Christiano ex Judaeis oriundo, id quod et stili et rerum et consilii ratio abunde docet ...': 67.

28 Lipsius 1871. (The second, corrected and enlarged edition was issued in 1886.)

29 'Mag einiges in obigen als Merkmal späterer Abfassung angeführte auch erst auf Rechnung der Bearbeitung vom Jahre 425 kommen, mögen selbst die Kapitel 12-16 erst vom Bearbeiter hinzugefügt sein, so wird doch hierdurch unser oben gewonnenes Ergebnis nicht umgestossen, daß auch die Grundschrift unserer Pilatus-Acten erst um die Mitte des 4. Jahrhunderts entstanden sei' (Lipsius 1871: 40). See also Harris 1898: 69-70.

30 Izydorczyk 1997: 419-519, which has been supplemented in Gounelle and Izydorczyk 2000.

31 Geerard 1992. Geerard gives full bibliographic references, not repeated here: (1) n. 62; (2)

Claudium (Greek, Latin, Syriac – age unknown); (2) *Anaphora Pilati* (Greek A-version, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Old Slavonic; Greek B-version – fifth century?); (3) *Paradosis Pilati* (Greek – fifth century?); (4) *Tiberii rescriptum* (Greek, Old Slavonic – fifth century?); (5) *Epistolae Pilati et Herodis* (Greek, Syriac – fifth century?); (6) *Epistola Pilati ad Tiberium* (Latin – sixteenth century); (7) *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* (Latin – fifth-eight century); (8) *Vindicta Salvatoris* (Latin – eight century); (9) *Mors Pilati* (Latin – late medieval); (10) *Vita Mariae Magdalenae* (Greek – medieval); (11) *Encomium in Mariam Magdalenam* (Coptic – medieval); (12) *Homilia de lamentis Mariae (Evangelium Gamalielis)* (Arabic, Ethiopian, Coptic – medieval?); (13) *Homilia de morte Pilati (Martyrium Pilati)* (Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopian – medieval?); (14) *Narratio Iosephi de Arimathea* (Greek, Old Slavonic – medieval?); (15) *De bono latrone* (Latin – medieval?).

Of these fifteen texts of various ages, languages and affiliations, seven (nos. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13) mention Pilate's later fate. In three cases, he is considered to be a very positive figure who became a true follower of Jesus, and suffered martyrdom for his faith (nos. 3, 12, 13). In four cases he is presented as a diabolical figure who was sentenced to exile or death by the emperor (nos. 4, 7, 8, 9).

THE DEVIL'S MAN

Historical evidence seems to indicate that Pilate's actual fate was unlike the traditional negative view, yet the legends became exercises in morbid imagination.³² There are two diametrically opposed conceptions of Pilate's fate. According to the first, the 'good emperor' condemned the 'unjust governor'. This version has three subvariations: (a) Pilate was exiled; (b) Pilate committed suicide; and (c) Pilate was executed. (All these three subvariations can be combined.) The second conception is that the 'evil emperor' condemned the 'good Pilate'.

Let us start with the first conception, that is, the 'good emperor' vs. the 'unjust governor'. The suggestion that Pilate committed suicide in Rome

nos. 65, 66; (3) n. 66; (4) n. 65; (5) n. 67; (6) n. 68; (7) n. 69; (8) n. 70; (9) n. 71; (10) n. 72; (11) n. 73; (12) n. 74; (13) n. 75; (14) nos. 76, 77; (15) n. 78.

³² Maier 1971: 368–71.

because he was not able to bear the weight of his decision in the eyes of future generations, occurs first in the works of Eusebius:

οὐκ ἄγνοεῖν δὲ ἄξιον ὥς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκείνον τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος Πιλάτον κατὰ Γάϊον, οὗ τοὺς χρόνους διέξιμεν, τοσαύταις περιπεσεῖν κατέχει λόγος συμφοραῖς, ὥς ἐξ ἀνάγκης αὐτοφονευτὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τιμωρὸν αὐτόχειρα γενέσθαι, τῆς θείας, ὥς ἔοικεν, δίκης οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν αὐτὸν μετελθούσης. ἱστοροῦσιν Ἑλλήνων οἱ τὰς Ὀλυμπιάδας ἅμα τοῖς κατὰ χρόνους πεπραγμένοις ἀναγραψάντες.

It is worthy of note that Pilate himself, who was governor in the time of our Saviour, is reported to have fallen into such misfortunes under Gaius [Caligula], whose times we are recording, that he was forced to become his own murderer and executioner, and thus divine vengeance, as it seems, was not long in overtaking him. This is stated by those Greek historians who have recorded the Olympiads, together with the respective events which have taken place in each period.³³

However, no extant records, Greek or otherwise, confirm this statement, and Eusebius himself calls it ‘tradition’.³⁴ Indeed, in his *Chronicon* Eusebius cites

33 Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 2.7. = GCS N.F. 6.1 *Eusebius Werke* II: 1. p. 122, ed. F. Winkelmann. Translation quoted from Schaff and Wace 1986: vol. I, 110. transl. by Ernest Cushing Richardson. Rufinus translated the Greek texts into Latin as follows: ‘Sed et Pilatus, qui in Salvatore iniqui iudicis functus officio est, isdem temporibus Gai tantis ac talibus malorum cladibus cruciatus est, ut propria se manu transverberasse et nefariam vitam vi abiecisse referatur, nec enim poterat tanti piaculi minister impunitus evadere, sicut in historiis Graecorum repperimus, eorum dumtaxat, qui Olympiadas scribunt et annales rerum gestarum libros ad posteritatis memoriam conducunt’. Orosius took over Eusebius’ statements concerning Pilate’s fate undoubtedly under the influence of Rufinus’ translation: ‘Pilatus autem praeses, qui sententiam damnationis in Christum dixerat, postquam plurimas seditiones in Hierosolymis excepit, ac fecit, tantis irrogante Caio angoribus coarctatus est, ut sua se transverberans manu, malorum compendium mortis celeritate quaesierit’, *Hist. adv. pag.* 7.5.10. = PL 31.1071-72. ed. S. Havercamp.

34 I venture to think that the story of Pilate’s suicide arose under a strong influence of Judas Iscariot’s calamitous end recorded in the New Testament (Matth. 27.5; Acts 1.18-19). On the literary topos, see Manns 1980. Judas’ name appears frequently in the curse-formulas of the Christian epitaphs as well, see van der Horst 1993.

‘the Roman historians’, rather than the Greek ones, as his source for the same statement, indicating that he had trouble documenting Pilate’s presumed suicide.³⁵ Moreover, Eusebius’ motivation in recording the tradition of Pilate’s suicide is less that of a critical historian, and more that of an apologist and moralist describing divine vengeance overtaking Pilate.

In three other apocrypha, Pilate’s fate is intimately connected with Tiberius’ miraculous healing. In the *Cura sanitatis Tiberii*, Tiberius is healed by an image of Christ; Peter confirms the truth of Pilate’s report on Jesus; and Nero exiles the ex-governor, who commits suicide. The *Vindicta Salvatoris* contains two narratives, one about the healing of Titus and his destruction of Jerusalem, and the other about the condemnation of Pilate and the healing of Tiberius. In the Old Latin apocryphon *Mors Pilati* – which can be considered an etiological legend of Veronica’s veil³⁶ and the shroud of Turin – Pilate was forced to commit suicide and his body was thrown into the Tiber. The demons and storms surrounding it were so terrifying that the corpse was taken out of the Tiber and cast into the Rhône instead, but with similar results. Thence it was taken for burial to Swiss territories, where the body remained surprisingly active:

Post autem paucos dies data est igitur in Pilatum sententia ut morte turpissima damnaretur. Audiens hoc Pilatus cultello proprio se necavit, et tali morte vitam finivit. Cognita Caesar morte Pilati dixit ‘vere mortuus est morte turpissima, cui manus propria non pepercit. Moli igitur ingenti aligatur et in Tiberim fluvium immergitur.’ Spiritus vero maligni et sordidi corpori maligno et sordido congaudentes omnes in aquis movebantur, et fulgura et tempestates, tonitrua et grandines in aere terribiliter gerebant,

35 ‘Pontius Pilatus in multas incidens calamitates propria se manu interficit. Scribunt Romanorum historici’, Eusebii-Hieronymi *Chronicon* ad CCIII Olymp. = *GCS* Eusebius 7.178c, ed. Rudolf Helm.

36 In the *Epistula Tiberii ad Pilatum*, the woman who reported Pilate to Tiberius was Mary Magdalen, see James 1897: 78–81. She also appears in the Greek *Anaphora Pilati*, in Tischendorf 1876: 435–49, as well as in Michael Glycas’ chronicle of the twelfth century: ‘Caeterum nonnulli perhibent post assumptionem Christi Mariam illam Magdalenam Romam pervenisse, graviterque accusasse omnes, quotquot in Christum deliquerant. Usque adeo illam denique Tiberii animum accendisse, ut et sacerdotes et scribas et ipsum quoque Pilatum capitis damnaret. Sunt tamen alii qui Pilatum sibimet ipsi manus attulisse commemorant’, Michaelis Glycae *Annalium* pars III = *PG* 158, 441c. Geerard 1989.

ita ut cuncti timore horribili tenerentur. Quapropter Romani ipsum a Tiberis fluvio extrahentes, derisionis causa ipsum in Viennam deportaverunt et Rhodani fluvio immerserunt: Vienna enim dicitur quasi via gehennae, quia erat tunc locus maledictionis. Sed ibi nequam spiritus affuerunt, ibidem eadem operantes. Homines ergo illi tantam infestationem daemonum non sustinentes vas illud maledictionis a se removerunt et illud sepeliendum Losaniae territorio commiserunt. Qui cum nimis praefatis infestationibus gravarentur, ipsum a se removerunt et in quodam puteo montibus circumsepto immerserunt, ubi adhuc relatione quorundam quaedam diabolicae machinationes dicuntur.

And a few days after, sentence was therefore passed upon Pilate, that he should be condemned to the most disgraceful death. Pilate, hearing this, killed himself with his own knife, and by such a death ended his life. When Caesar knew of the death of Pilate, he said: 'Truly he has died by a most disgraceful death, whom his own hand has not spared. He is therefore bound to a great mass, and sunk into the river Tiber.' But malignant and filthy spirits in his malignant and filthy body, all rejoicing together, kept moving themselves in the waters, and in a terrible manner brought lightnings and tempests, thunders and hail-storms, in the air, so that all men were kept in horrible fear. Wherefore the Romans, drawing him out of the river Tiber, in derision carried him down to Vienna, and sunk him in the river Rhône. For Vienna is called, as it were, *Via Gehennae*, the way of Gehenna, because it was then a place of cursing. But there evil spirits were present, working the same things in the same place. Those men therefore, not enduring such a visitation of demons, removed from themselves that vessel of malediction, and sent him to be buried in the territory of Losania [Lausanne in Switzerland]. And they, seeing that they were troubled by the aforesaid visitations, removed him from themselves, and sunk him in a certain pit surrounded by mountains, where to this day, according to the account of some, certain diabolical machinations are said to bubble up.³⁷

³⁷ The original Latin text see in Tischendorf 1876: lxxx-lxxxi, 434-35. The translation is quoted from Roberts and Donaldson 1986, vol. VIII, 467.

As we have seen, there are various traditions about the scene of Pilate's death. One legend says that he was banished to Vienna Allobrogum (Vienne, on the Rhône), where a singular monument – a truncated pyramid on a quadrangular base, fifty-two feet in height, which is actually a standard architectural ornament used to decorate the *spina* of a Roman circus – is called 'Pilate's tomb'.³⁸ According to another legend, Pilate sought to hide his sorrows on the mountain by the Lake of Lucerne, now called Mount Pilatus (originally, no-doubt 'Pileatus' or cloud-capped); and there, after spending years in its recesses, in remorse and despair rather than penitence, plunged into the dismal lake which occupies its summit.³⁹ The local habitants say that Pilate rises every Good Friday to sit and wash his hands on the top of the mount, to no avail.

One example indicates that the misinterpretation of an inscription may be the basis for the creation of apocryphal legends.⁴⁰ In the old town of today's Tarragona there stands a very stately, tower-like Roman building referred to as 'Torre del Pilatos' by the local habitants since the late eighteenth century. This tower lies, considering the topography of *colonia Tarraco*, in the upper part of the old city, in the southern corner of the impressive square, and within the territory of the sanctuary of the emperor-cult of *Hispania citerior*. The tower, built around AD 70, has almost perfectly retained its original walls up to the second floor. The third floor was partly added in the Middle Ages and is partly a reconstruction, with a wonderful view of the sea and the city. According to Prof. Géza Alföldy, various legends concerning Pilate are connected with this place, none of which have been collected or studied. According to popular local beliefs, Pilate was sent into exile to Tarragona and lived his last years in this tower.

The Tarragonians liked such stories. According to local traditions, a big tower over a tomb, also dating from the early ages of the emperors, on which you can see two Attis figures, is the sepulchral monument of Scipio Africanus' father and uncle, who both died in *Hispania* (Torre de los Escipiones). The local residents also claim that in 27-25 BC, Augustus lived

38 Chorier 1828: 30-33; Morison 1940: 234-36; Berlioz 1990.

39 Smith 1910: 750.

40 I am very much indebted to Prof. Géza Alföldy for the following data concerning Pilate's legend of Tarragona/Tarraco. Cf. Alföldy 1991: 603.

in Pilate's Tower while staying in Tarragona.⁴¹ The official name of the tower today is *pretorio* (in Catalan: *pretori*). This, of course, is also an error, because this tower was not the palace of the governor, as had been supposed earlier, but a passageway enabling people to get to the square from the *cryptoporticus* of the circus dividing the city, which was built on the south-western part of the square on a lower terrace. Balil, although he did not go into detail concerning his views, explained this tradition with a bad interpretation of the local Roman inscription.⁴²

Prof. Alföldy thinks that the tradition may be traced back to a misunderstanding of *CIL* 2.4220. This inscription, which was copied in the sixteenth century and has since been lost, was on the upper piece of the pedestal of a *flamen provinciae*. In the fourth and last surviving line, Antonius Augustinus, the great humanist of Tarragona in the sixteenth century, read the following: *PRAEFEC CHOR PILATO*.⁴³ Unfortunately, we do not know where the stone had been found, but certainly somewhere in the vicinity of the tower, as the statues of *flamines provinciae Hispaniae citerioris* were standing on the square.⁴⁴ So it is absolutely clear that the inscription gave the idea for the local Pilate-tradition and its connection with the Roman building (Torre del Pilatos), which was most probably not far from the place where the inscription was found, and is now the biggest Roman building in existence within the city walls of Tarraco.

We can add only one thing to Prof. Alföldy's interesting explanation. According to a medieval Ethiopian Pilate-legend, written down in 1582 under the title *Mazmura Krestos*, viz. 'Christ's Psalms', Tiberius sent Pilate into exile in *Andelos*, i.e. Andalusia.⁴⁵

41 As for the tower, see Balil 1969. For the position of the tower in the topography of the town see Aquilué, Dupré, Massó and Ruiz de Arbulo 1999: 74-83.

42 Balil 1969: 16.

43 The reading of the inscription is evidently false. *Cohors pilatorum* never existed at all, although Theodor Mommsen still believed it. The correct reading of the text is *PRAEFEC C(O)HOR[T]I LATO/[BICORVM ---]*, see Alföldy 1973: n. 57, and Alföldy 1975: 302 with extensive bibliography. The inscription can be dated to the first half of the second century. The *cohors I Latobicorum* was stationed in Germania Inferior at that time.

44 Alföldy 1973: 85-86; Alföldy 1978.

45 Cerulli 1966.

THE MARTYR AND SAINT

Now we turn to the second conception of Pilate's fate according to which the 'evil emperor' condemned the 'good Pilate'. Towards the end of the second century, Tertullian put Pilate in a favourable light by saying that the miracles accompanying Jesus' crucifixion were reported to Tiberius by Pilate, who 'became already a Christian in his conscience'.⁴⁶ It is not known, what report Tertullian refers to, hence the existence of any apocryphal text connected with the *AP*-tradition in the second century cannot be verified.⁴⁷ I venture to suggest that Tertullian – like Justin Martyr, a half century earlier – refers here to the official *commentarius* of the ex-governor, not to the pseudoepigraphic correspondence. As for Pilate's conscience, this is merely a rhetorical device, since one could never prove, or disprove, what Pilate thought. Tertullian used this device, of course, because his work was an apology on behalf of Christianity for Septimius Severus and his court.⁴⁸

In the *AP*-tradition, the fifth century Syriac version is the first to contain the motive of Pilate's conversion. As the story goes, when Tiberius was informed of the crucifixion of Jesus, he was filled with rage. He dispatched soldiers to bring Pilate to Rome as a prisoner. Under questioning, Pilate blamed the Jews for Jesus' condemnation and death. Hence Tiberius ordered Pilate to be held in custody, in order that he himself might learn the truth about Jesus. After this, the emperor sent Licianus, 'the governor of the chief palaces of the East' to take action against the Jews, specifically to scatter them and make them slaves among all the nations. In the end, Pilate was sentenced to death:

And again, the Caesar set himself to question Pilate; and he orders a captain named Albius to cut off Pilate's head, saying: 'Just as he laid hands upon the just man named Christ, in like manner also shall he fall, and not find safety'. And Pilate, going away to the place, prayed in silence,

46 *Ipse iam pro sua conscientia Christianus*, Tert. *Apol.* 21.24. ed. Dekkers.

47 Izydorczyk 1997: 23.

48 Barnes 1971: 102-14. esp. 108-9, where Barnes writes that 'Tertullian scoured the literature of the ancient world in search of tidbits', citing more than thirty pagan authors. 'The massive erudition was not designed as mere ostentation. Those who were familiar with the Sophistic Movement of the second century would not have expected less from an expert orator'. See also Barnes 1976: 3-20.

saying: 'Lord, do not destroy me along with the wicked Hebrews, because I would not have laid hands upon Thee, except for the nation of the lawless Jews, because they were exciting rebellion against me'. (...) And, behold, when Pilate had finished his prayer, there came a voice out of the heaven, saying: 'All the generations and families of the nations shall count thee blessed, because under thee have been fulfilled all those things said about me by the prophets; and thou thyself shalt be seen as my witness at my second appearing, when I shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel, and those that have not owned my name.' And the prefect struck off the head of Pilate; and, behold, an angel of the Lord received it. And his wife Procla, seeing the angel coming and receiving his head, being filled with joy herself also, immediately gave up the ghost, and was buried along with her husband.⁴⁹

This branch of the Pilate-tradition is represented only in Southern and Eastern Christianity.⁵⁰ The *Paradosis Pilati* (which is a continuation of the Greek *Anaphora Pilati* A-version) of the fifth century contains an account of the arrest and martyrdom of Pilate, presented as a follower of Christ. According to the Arabic, Ethiopic and Coptic *Evangelium Gamalielis*, Jesus was crucified through the conspiracy of Herod and the Jews, and Pilate was a true believer in Christ, destined to suffer martyrdom for his faith. The *Martyrium Pilati*, which was also popular among the Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic Christians, says that for his faith in Jesus, Pilate was crucified twice, once by the Jews and then by Tiberius, and together with his wife and two children he was buried near the sepulchre of Jesus.

In the Coptic and Ethiopian Church, Pilate and his wife were canonized as saints.⁵¹

In the sixth and seventh century Pilate may have been very popular among the believers of the Coptic church:⁵² by this time 'Pilate' had become a Christian name (*Taufname*) among the Christians of Middle Egypt, a name that was widely used until the eighteenth century.⁵³ If we believe the

49 Roberts and Donaldson 1986: vol. VIII, 464-65.

50 For a short review of the Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic Pilate-tradition, see Harris 1928.

51 Volkoff 1969-70.

52 van den Oudenrijn 1959: liv-lix.

53 Crum 1927: 23; Solin 1970: 108-9.

testimony of Johannes of Hildesheim, written in the second half of the fourteenth century, the medieval Coptic church put the *Gospel of Nicodemus* to liturgical use. In his *Liber de gestis ac trina beatissimorum trium regum translatione*, Johannes remarks, without citing his source, that in Coptic churches the apocryphon is read during mass.⁵⁴

In the Book of the Saints of the Ethiopian Church: [fol. 94a]⁵⁵, we find ‘(Xth month = June 5–July 4; XXV Sanē = June 19) This day has died Pilate, the Confessor. Hail to Pilate, who washed his hands from the blood of Jesus Christ!’

In the Ethiopian Synaxarium we find the following: ‘Month of Sanē. 25th of Sanē (June 19). Hail to Pilate, who washed his hands in order to show that he is pure from the blood of Jesus Christ, and hail to Abroqla,⁵⁶ his wife, who said to him: Do not commit sin! Because this man [i.e. Jesus Christ] is pure and righteous!’

An Arabic-Coptic Psalmody written in the nineteenth century, and used in the Coptic church of Virgin Mary at Hārat Zouaila (Cairo), contains an invocation to Saint Pilate:⁵⁷

This day is of the great martyr Bilātus of al-Buntī [Pilate of the Pontii]:

1. Our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified in his city of Jerusalem, in order to redeem us from our sins.
2. Pontius Pilate was crucified in the great city of Rome, because of the crucifixion of Jesus.
3. The body of Christ was buried in Jerusalem; Pontius Pilate was transferred to Him and buried with Him.
4. Oh, what a great glory, which Christ also agreed with, oh governor, helper of God, Saint Pilate!

⁵⁴ Izydorczyk 1997: 32.

⁵⁵ Wallis 1928: vol. IV, 1034.

⁵⁶ Hieronymus was the first to mention that Pilate’s wife was called Claudia Procla. In the apocrypha she appears as a proselyte (Tischendorf 1876: 223). ‘Origène et Nicéphore la (Procla) considèrent comme ayant appartenu aux ‘Prosélytes de la Porte’ avant de croire à l’Évangélisme’, in Ollivier 1896: 248. An epitaph bearing the name Claudia Procla has been found in Beirut, but according to the archaeologists’ opinion it originates from AD 125–200, consequently its attribution to Pilate’s wife is highly dubious, see Carington Smith 1984.

⁵⁷ Volkoff 1969–70: 169–70.

5. Abarkylle [i.e., Procla], your blessed wife, she is with you; your little infants, the blessed ones, are also with you.
6. Pray (for us), oh Pontius Pilate, with your wife and infants, for He (forgive our sins)!

Similar hymns composed in Ethiopian were published by E. Cerulli.⁵⁸

Pilate's relation with the Coptic church was strengthened by the legend of his Egyptian origin. Traces of this claim may be seen in the Egyptian (Arabic) version of the *Gesta Pilati*, where the angry Jews appeal to Herod against 'Pilate the king [*sic*], the wicked foreigner from the land of Egypt',⁵⁹ and again, in speaking to Tiberius' envoy in Pilate's defence: 'What profit thee his words, seeing he lieth unto thee in the Egyptian (Coptic) tongue?'⁶⁰

CONCLUSIONS

The extremely complex tradition of the apocryphal 'Pilate cycle', in my opinion, was comprised of five different phases. (1) The first phase is the record of the deeds of the imperial magistrate. Official records or minutes (*commentarii* / *hypomnemata*) were written by emperors, consuls, proconsuls, priests, down to the municipal magistrates in the Roman Empire.⁶¹ The first non-apocryphal *acta Pilati* might be the *commentarii praefecti Iudaeae*, the official report of the governor, which was kept in the customary way in the *tabularium principis*.⁶² These are the *hypomnemata* which Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1.35.9; 1.48.3) and probably Tertullian (*Apol.* 21.14) refer to. (2) The second component of the apocryphal Pilate-tradition is definitely pagan in origin. Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, chapters 1.9 and 9.5-7, repeatedly refers to *hypomnemata* of Pilate, forged as part of fierce anti-Christian propaganda, with the approval of Maximinus Daia. Eusebius, however, in

58 Cerulli 1973; Cerulli 1975-76; see also Beylot 1988.

59 Cod. Vat. Syr. (Karshūni) 199, 351. The Ethiopic translation bears the title *Pilātōs mašari* (British Museum, Orient. 690, 99a), 'Pilate the magician', which is no doubt merely a mistranslation from the Arabic *misiri*, 'the Egyptian', cited by Crum 1927: 23 n.10.

60 Paris Mss. Arabe 152, 15a, cited by Crum 1927: 23 n.11.

61 Mourgues 1998; Burton 1975.

62 The official archive of Rome was placed in the Atrium Libertatis, preserved until the sixth century AD. See Purcell 1993.

his same work (2.2.1), he mentions that ‘Pilate communicated to the emperor Tiberius the story of the resurrection from the dead of our Saviour Jesus...’, which –according to Izydorczyk – *might* reflect knowledge of a text from the cycle of Pilate, such as the *Anaphora Pilati*, but to him it seems more likely that Eusebius derived this knowledge from Tertullian. (3) The third component of the ‘Pilate cycle’ is the one or more Christian texts which may have arisen in response to the pagan forgeries. Thus, the birth of the Christian *AP*-tradition could be connected with the specific climate of social and religious controversies of the fourth century. Our proof for the existence of the Christian *AP* in the fourth century comes from Epiphanius (*Panarion* 50.1.5; 50.1.8), who testifies that the sect of Quatordecimans in Asia Minor, and especially in Cappadocia, use the *AP* for determining the date of Easter on 25 March. Epiphanius rejects that date not because the work on which it is based is apocryphal, but because, he knows other versions (*antigrapha*) of the *AP* which gave a different date for the Passion. Thus, already by the end of the fourth century, the text of the *AP* appears to have diversified among the Christian communities.⁶³ (4) The Christian *AP*-tradition can be divided into two separate branches. The first is the Western textual tradition written in Latin. The earliest of these mss. goes as far back as the fifth century. Greek manuscripts are much later, and it is also significant that the *Library* of Photius, the ninth-century bishop of Constantinople, does not mention any text that might be identified with the *AP*.⁶⁴ The western textual tradition usually demonizes Pilate’s character. (5) The *AP* did not remain confined to the Graeco-Roman world but were translated and adapted by various Southern and Eastern Christian communities.⁶⁵ In the Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopian tradition Pilate’s character has been totally metamorphosed: Pilate became a confessor, saint, and martyr of the Church.

The reason of the split into a Western and an Eastern Pilate-tradition is a very complex question which is hard to answer. Besides the numerous possible reasons that could be deduced from political or ecclesiastical history, the answer, in my mind, can be traced back to only one thing: that the Western and Eastern Christians viewed Pilate’s role in the crucifixion of the Saviour differently. It does not mean, however, that while the Western Christians

63 Izydorczyk 1997: 26.

64 Izydorczyk 1997: 27.

65 Izydorczyk 1997: 30.

found Pilate the arch-criminal in the trial and execution of Jesus Christ, the Easterners acquitted him of every charge. Conceivably the Christians in the East paid more respect to Christ's prayer on the cross: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' (Lk. 23.34). It is all the more likely, because – as it is well known – the overwhelming majority of the ecclesiastical writers both in the West and the East blamed the Jews for the crucifixion for the Saviour.⁶⁶ It cannot be said either that the Western Christians had more reason to hate the state power – which was represented by Pilate in the Gospels – than their brethren in the East. From time to time, Christians were persecuted in both parts of the Roman Empire.⁶⁷

The aim of this paper is to contribute to a better understanding of the apocryphal Pilate tradition which has nothing to do with the real fate of the historical person. We still do not know anything about Pilate's career after his return to Rome, nor how and where he died. Naturally nothing denies – just as nothing proves – that Pilate might have been elevated on the ladder of public office. In that case, inscriptional data could be found anywhere in the former territory of the Roman Empire.

66 The best comprehensive monograph on this important topic to date is Simon 1996.

67 Barnes 1968; Plescia 1971; P. Keresztes 1979.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alföldy, G. 1973. *Flamines provinciae Hispaniae citerioris*. Madrid.
 Alföldy, G. 1975. *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco*. Berlin.
 Alföldy, G. 1978. *RE* Suppl. XIV, 603-5.
 Alföldy, G. 1991. *Tarraco*. Tarragona.
 Alföldy, G. 1999. 'Pontius Pilatus und das Tiberieum von Caesarea Maritima' *SCI* 18, 85–108.
 Alföldy, G. 2002. 'Nochmals: Pontius Pilatus und das Tiberieum von Caesarea Maritima' *SCI* 21, 133–48.

- Aquilué, X., X. Dupré, J. Massó & J. Ruiz de Arbulo. (eds.) 1999. *Guide del Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya*. Tarragona.
- Balil, A. 1969. *Excavaciones en la Torre del Pilatos. Campanas de excavaciones de 1962* (Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España 65). Madrid.
- Bammel, E. (ed.) 1970. *The Trial of Jesus*. London.
- Barnes, T.D. 1968. 'Legislation against the Christians' *JRS* 58, 32-50.
- Barnes, T.D. 1971. *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford.
- Barnes, T.D. 1976. *Tertullian the Antiquarian* (Studia Patristica XIV). Berlin (reprinted in Barnes 1984, ch. XIV.)
- Barnes, T.D. 1984. *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire*. London.
- Bauman, R.A. 1974. *Impietas in Principem: A Study of Treason against the Roman Emperor with Special Reference to the First Century AD*. Munich.
- Berlioz, J. 1990. 'Crochet de fer et puits à tempêtes. La légende de Ponce Pilate à Vienne (Isère) et au mont Pilat au XIIIe siècle' *Le monde alpin et rhodanien* 1-2, 85-104.
- Betz, O. 1982. 'Probleme des Prozesses Jesu' *ANRW* II.25.1, 565-647.
- Beylot, R. 1988. 'Bref aperçu des principaux textes éthiopiens dérivés des Acta Pilati' *Langues orientales anciennes. Philologie et linguistique* 1, 181-95.
- Blinzler, J. 1959. *The Trial of Jesus*. Cork.
- Bond, H.K. 1996. 'The Coins of Pontius Pilate: Part of an Attempt to Provoke the People or to Integrate Them into the Empire?' *JJS* 27, 241-62.
- Bond, H.K. 1998. *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation* (SNTSMS 100). Cambridge.
- Bond, H.K. 2007. 'Standards, Shields and Coins: Jewish Reactions to Aspects of the Roman Cult in the Time of Pilate' in S.C. Barton (ed.) *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity*. London, 88-106.
- Bowman, J. 1955. 'Early Samaritan Eschatology' *JJS* 6, 70.
- Bowman, J. 1958. 'Samaritan Studies' *BJRL* 40, 298.
- Bowman, J. 1959. *Samaritanische Probleme*. Stuttgart.
- Brandon, S.G.F. 1967. *Jesus and the Zealots*. Manchester.
- Brandon, S.G.F. 1968. 'Pontius Pilatus in History and Legend' *History Today* 18, 528.
- Brown, R.E. 1994. *The Death of the Messiah*. New York.
- Burton, G.B. 1975 'Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire' *JRS* 65, 96-106.

- Carington Smith, J. 1984. 'Pilate's Wife?' *Antichthon* 18, 102-7.
- Casson, L. 1971. *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*. Princeton.
- Catchpole, D.R. 1971. *The Trial of Jesus*. Leiden.
- Cerulli, E. 1966. 'La légende de l'empereur Tibère et de Pilate dans deux nouveaux documents éthiopiens' *Byzantion* 36, 26-34.
- Cerulli, E. 1973. 'Tiberius and Pontius Pilate in the Ethiopian Tradition and Poetry' *Proceedings of the British Academy* 59, 141-58.
- Cerulli, E. 1975-76. 'Un hymne éthiopien à Pilate sanctifié' *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 49, 591-94.
- Chorier, N. 1828. *Recherches sur les antiquités de la ville de Vienne*. Lyon.
- Christensen, T. 1989. *Rufinus of Aquileia and the Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius. Copenhagen.
- Cohn, H. 1972. *The Trial and Death of Jesus*. London.
- Collins, M.F. 1972. 'The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Tradition' *JSJ* 3, 98-99.
- Cotton, H.M. 1999. 'Some Aspects of the Roman Administration of Judea/Syria-Palaestina' in W. Eck (ed.) *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen von 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert* (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 42). Munich, 75-91.
- Crum, W.E. 1927. 'Some further Meletian Documents' *JEA* 13, 19-26.
- Davies, P.S. 1986. 'The Meaning of Philo's Text About the Gilded Shields' *JThS* 37, 109-14.
- Dehandschutter, B. 1989. 'Anti-judaism in the Apocrypha' in *Studia Patristica* XIX, Leuven, 345-50.
- Dubois, J.-D. 1986. 'L'affaire des étendards de Pilate dans le premier chapitre des *Actes de Pilate*' in *Studia Patristica* XIX, Leuven, 350-58.
- Evans, C.A. 2006. 'Excavating Caiaphas, Pilate, and Simon of Cyrene: Assessing the Literary and Archaeological Evidence' in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.) *Jesus and Archaeology*. Grand Rapids, 323-40.
- Freund, W.H.C. 1987. 'Prelude to the Great Persecution: the Propaganda War' *JEH* 38, 1-18.
- Fuks, G. 1982. 'Again on the Episode of the Gilded Roman Shields at Jerusalem' *HTHR* 75, 503-7.
- Geerard, M. 1989. 'Marie-Madeleine, denonciatrice de Pilate' *Sacris erudiri* 31, 139-48.
- Geerard, M. 1992. *Clavis apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum. Turnhout.

- Gounelle, R. & Z. Izydorczyk 2000. 'Thematic Bibliography of the Acts of Pilate: Addenda and Corrigenda' *Apocrypha* 11, 259-88.
- Grüll, T. 2001. 'Pilate's Tiberiëum: A New Approach' *AAHung* 41, 267-78.
- Harris, R. 1898. *The Homeric Centones and the Acts of Pilate*. London.
- Harris, R. 1928. 'The Lament of the Virgin and the Martyrdom of Pilate' in *Woodbrooke Studies*. Cambridge, vol. II, 163-77.
- Harvey, A.E. 1976. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*. London.
- Hoffeditz, D.M. 2006. 'Divus of Augustus: the Influence of the Trials of "Maiestas" upon Pontius Pilate's Coins' *INR* 1, 87-96.
- Horst, P.W. van der 1993. 'A Note on the Judas curse in Early Christian Inscriptions' *OCP* 59, 211-15.
- Izydorczyk, Z. (ed.) 1997. *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Inter-texts and Contexts in Western Europe* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies). Tempe.
- James, M.R. 1897. *Apocrypha anecdota II*. (Texts and Studies V.1). Cambridge.
- Keresztes, P. 1979. 'The Imperial Roman Government and the Christian Church, I. From Nero to the Severi,' and 'II. From Gallienus to the Great Persecution,' in H. Temporini & W. Haase (eds.) *ANRW* II.23.1, 247-315, 375-86.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. 1953. *The Trial of Jesus*. Oxford.
- Kraeling, C.H. 1942. 'The Episode of the Roman Standards at Jerusalem' *HTHR* 35, 263-89.
- de Laet, S.J. 1939. 'Le successeur de Ponce-Pilate' *AntClass* 8, 413-19.
- Lémonon, J.P. 1981. *Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée: textes et monuments*. Paris.
- Levieils, X. 1999. 'La polémique anti-chrétienne des Actes de Pilate' *RHPR* 79, 291-314.
- Lipsius, R.A. 1871. *Die Pilatus-Acten*. Kiel.
- Lönnqvist, K.A. 2000. 'Pontius Pilate – an Aqueduct Builder? Recent Findings and New Suggestions' *Klio* 82, 459-74.
- MacDonald, J. 1964. *The Theology of Samaritans*. London, 361.
- McGing, B.C. 1991. 'Pontius Pilate and the Sources' *CBQ* 53, 416-38.
- McLaren, J. 1991. *Power and Politics in Palestine* (JSNT Suppl. 63). Sheffield.
- Magie, D. 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*. Princeton II 1364.

- Maier, P.L. 1969. 'The Episode of the Golden Roman Shields at Jerusalem' *HThR* 62, 109-121.
- Maier, P.L. 1971. 'The Fate of Pontius Pilate' *Hermes* 99, 362-71.
- Manns, F. 1980. 'Un Midrash chrétien. Le récit de la mort de Judas' *RSR* 54, 197-203.
- Millar, F.G.B. 1990. 'Reflections on the Trial of Jesus' in Davies, P.R. & R.T. White (eds.) *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Sheffield, 355-81.
- Mitchell, S. 1988. 'Maximinus and the Christians in AD 312: A New Latin Inscription' *JRS* 78, 105-24.
- Morison, F. 1940. *And Pilate Said: A New Study of the Roman Procurator*. New York.
- Mourgues, J.-L. 1998. 'Forme diplomatique et pratique institutionnelle des commentarii Augustorum' in *La mémoire perdue. Recherches sur l'administration Romaine*. (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 243). Rome, 123-97.
- Ollivier, M.J. 1896. 'Ponce Pilate et les Pontii' *RBi* 5, 248.
- Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Cambridge 1986.
- Oudenrijn, M.-A. van den 1959. *Gamaliel. Äthiopische Texte zur Pilatusliteratur* (Spicilegium Friburgense Bd. 4). Fribourg.
- Plescia, J. 1971. 'On the Persecution of the Christians in the Roman Empire' *Latomus* 30, 120-32.
- Purcell, N. 1993. 'Atrium Libertatis' *PBSR* 61, 135-51.
- Rivkin, E. 1986. *What Crucified Jesus?* London.
- Roberts, A. & J. Donaldson (eds.) 1986. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Grand Rapids.
- Roth, C. 1956. 'An Ordinance against Images in Jerusalem AD 66' *HThR* 49, 169-77.
- Rougé, J. 1952. 'La navigation hivernale sous l'Empire romain' *REA* 54, 316-25.
- Saint-Denis, E. de 1947. 'Mare clausum' *REL* 25, 196-214.
- Schaff, P. and Wace, H. (eds.) 1986. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Second series, Grand Rapids.
- Scheidweiler, F. 1987. 'Nikodemusevangelium. Pilatusakten und Höllenfahrt Christi' in Schneemelcher, W. (ed.) *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, in deutscher übersetzung*. I. Tübingen, 395-424.

- Schwartz, D.R. 1992. 'Pontius Pilate's Suspension from Office: Chronology and Sources, in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen, 202-17.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1965. 'The Trial of Christ' in Nineham, D.E. et al. (eds.) *Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament*. London, 97-116.
- Simon, M. 1996. *Verus Israel. A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire AD 135-425*. London.
- Smallwood, M.E. 1954. 'The Date of the Dismissal of Pontius Pilate from Judea' *JJS* 5, 12-21.
- Smith, W. (ed.) 1910. *Dictionary of the Bible: Comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History*. Hartford.
- Speyer, W. 1978. 'Neue Pilatus-Apokryphen' *VChr* 32, 53-59.
- Solin, H. 1970. 'Pilatus' *Arctos* 6, 108-9. (repr. Solin, H. 1998: 6-8).
- Solin, H. 1998. *Analecta Epigraphica 1970-97* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 23) Roma.
- Sordi, M. 1955. 'Un senatore cristiano dell'età di Commodo' *Epigraphica* 17, 104-12.
- Tischendorf, C. 1851. *De evangeliorum apocryphorum origine et usu, disquisitio historica critica*. The Hague.
- Tischendorf, C. 1876. *Evangelia apocrypha. Editio altera*. Leipzig.
- Vannutelli, P. 1938. *Actorum Pilati textus synoptici*. Rome.
- Vermes, G. 2005. *The Passion*. London.
- Volkoff, O.V. 1969-70. 'Un saint oublié: Ponce Pilate' *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 20, 167-75.
- Wallis Budge, E.A. 1928. *Book of the Saints of the Ethiopian Church. A Translation from the Ethiopian Synaxarium made from the MSS. Oriental 660 and 661 in the British Museum*. Cambridge.
- Winter, P. 1961. *On the Trial of Jesus*. Berlin.

THE PRESENCE OF HOMER'S ACHILLES IN LUCAN'S CAESAR

By Irini Christophorou

Summary: This paper examines the Homeric influence on Lucan; it is argued that Caesar's first speech is modelled on Achilles' speeches to Agamemnon and the Achaean embassy in the *Iliad*. Furthermore, Caesar's last words to the dead Pompey refer back to the first speech of Caesar in the *BC* and by intertextual relation to Achilles' speech to Agamemnon in the *Iliad*. Although the poet overall represents Caesar in a pattern of mercantile activity striving for wealth and world domination, he also allows him in his speeches to take recourse to Achilles' rationale of fighting for the restoration of his honour and spoils which have been forfeited.*

The question of Lucan's intertextuality and especially his epic's similarity to Homer's *Iliad* has raised great controversy among scholars, and many attempts have been made to trace and determine Homer's influence on Lucan's poem. Lausberg mentioned the similarity between Lucan's lamenting women of Rome (*BC* 2.28-37) and Homer's lamenting women of Troy (*Il.* 6. 293-304).¹ Von Albrecht traces the relation between Lucan and Homer in the connections between Caesar-Achilles, Pompey-Agamemnon and Cato-Odysseus.² In addition another scholar, Green, builds upon the hypothesis

* I would like to express my inmost dept of gratitude to Professor Spyridon Tzounakas, who generously provided me with help in writing this article.

1 Lausberg 1985: 1588-89. According to Lausberg, since this scene does not have a Virgilian intermediary, it can therefore be related directly to Homer.

2 Von Albrecht 1968, 1999: 229-33.

of Conte who proves the intertextual similarity between the proem of the *BC* and the *Iliad*. Most importantly, Caesar's speech (*BC* 1.299-351) is analytically compared to Achilles' angry tirade against Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1 and 9. The comparison of the two aforementioned speeches illustrates the intertextual relation between the *Iliad* and the *BC*.

Building upon the study of Green,³ I add some more intertextual parallels between the two epics. Firstly, Achilles' reply to the ambassadors in *Iliad* 9 as an intertextual parallel to Caesar's first speech. Secondly, I include as a parallel line of *mihi si merces erepta laborum est* (*BC* 1.340)⁴ (if I am robbed of my reward for toil)⁵ not only the line οὐ μὲν σοί ποτε ἶσον ἔχω γέρας (*Il.* 1.163)⁶ ('never do I have a prize like yours')⁷ but also the line καὶ δὴ μοι γέρας αὐτὸς ἀφαιρήσεσθαι ἀπειλεῖς (*Il.* 1.161) ('and you even threaten that you will yourself take from me the prize')⁸ pointing out the common words *merces laborum erepta est* and γέρας αὐτὸς ἀφαιρήσεσθαι ἀπειλεῖς. Thirdly, I trace the intertextual relation of the above Homeric lines with Caesar's words when he sees the dead Pompey and exclaims why he waged war against him: *dignaque satis mercede laborum / contentus par esse tibi* (*BC* 9.1101-2) (and to be your equal, satisfied with a reward quite worthy of my toils).⁹ In this way I find that the phrase *merces laborum* encapsulates again the price of the civil war as distribution of rewards for military services rendered, which refers back to Caesar's first speech in the first book of the *BC* and – by intertextual correspondence – to Achilles' similar statements in the first book of the *Iliad*. The use of the term *merces* both opens and closes the quarrel in the *BC* 1 and 9 and signals the intertextual relation between *BC* 1.340 and 9.1101-2.¹⁰ Moreover, Caesar at the end specifies the sufficient re-

3 Green 1991: 234-38.

4 For the text of Lucan, I follow the edition of Shackleton Bailey 1988. For the text of Homer's *Iliad*, I follow the edition of West 1998, and 2000.

5 Transl. Braund 1992: 12.

6 Green 1991: 237. Moreover, this intertextual parallel is absent from Roche 2009: 257-58 who rightly observes that *merces laborum* is Ciceronian (*Arch.* 28; *Fam.* 3.10.4). However, he does not mention the Homeric background of the phrase *mihi si merces laborum erepta est* which corresponds with the Homeric phrase *Il.* 1.161.

7 Transl. Murray & Wyatt 1999: 24.

8 Transl. Murray & Wyatt 1999: 24.

9 Translation from Braund 1992: 206.

10 Coffee 2009: 135-51 comprehensively analyses the actions of Caesar throughout the *BC*

ward for his labour: an equal share of power with Pompey, had Pompey been alive. In this way, this passage is intertextually connected with the first book of the *Iliad* (1.161; 163).

Caesar's first speech throws much light on his characterization, which can be better understood through intertextuality. Indeed, there are verbal echoes in Caesar's first speech which remind us of corresponding passages in *Iliad* 1 and 9. The *Iliad* greatly contributes to the understanding of Lucan's rendering of the opposition between Caesar and Pompey. The tale of Remus and Romulus was not the only cultural basis of his civil war story.¹¹ Lucan also used the *Iliad* as a starting point in order to enrich the plot of his story.¹² Homer narrated the events of the war between Trojans and Achaeans but most importantly he gave poetic expression to the wrath of Achilles. Lucan described an unnatural war which could win no triumph and wonders about its causes in the same way as Homer wonders τίς τὰρ σφῶε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; (*Il.* 1.8).¹³ Lucan's interest in Homer depends on the Achillean μῆνις, especially on the ultimate development of Achilles' spite against Agamemnon into a civil war with disastrous effect for the Achaian

and comes to the conclusion that Lucan builds a unique profile for Caesar with a pattern of mercantile activity that complements his abuse of reciprocal relations, 145.

11 Narducci 2002: 83-84 perceptively grasps Lucan's wish to destroy the Augustan myths specifically the Aeneas-Troy myth elaborated by Virgil. In particular, he detects Lucan's polemical attitude towards Virgil's Trojan myth and identifies the creation of a Roman indigenous anti-myth of the twins which expresses the cultural crisis with profound authenticity. Therefore, according to the narrator, the walls of Rome were built at the expense of fratricide (*BC* 1.95). Moreover, at *BC* 7.437-39, he exclaims that ever since Rome was founded it should have remained in slavery.

12 Most importantly, the poet compares himself to Homer, thereby implicitly comparing Caesar to Achilles when he assures us that posterity will never consign them to neglect (*BC* 9.980-86). What is striking in the episode with Caesar at Troy is the mixing of Greek and Trojan heroes. The hero who opens the narrative is Ajax, mentioned when Caesar passes from Rhoeteum, famous for the grave of Ajax (*BC* 9.962-63). For the history and importance of this grave in imperial times, Erskine 2001: 252-53. Moreover, Paris is ironically referred to as 'judge' (*iudex*); he is paired with a series of heroes associated with the old and flawed past of Troy. Caesar emphatically promises that the Italians will return, rebuild the walls and raise a new, Roman, Troy. His promise stands in stark counterpoise with Aeneas' toils *dum conderet urbem* as Caesar first devastates Rome and then promises to rebuild Troy. Ahl 1976: 209-22 interpreted this episode as an implicit attack against Caesar's propaganda built on the notion of his lineage from *Venus Genetrix*.

13 Conte 1966: 14.

camp. Homer's insistence on the destructive consequences of the insolence and dishonour that Agamemnon shows towards Achilles turns the personal strife into a collective one. Similarly, Homer criticises Achilles' refusal to accept Agamemnon's gifts and re-enter battle. In fact, one of the Greek representatives, who took the gifts to him, complains that Achilles does not turn his anger to friendship for the sake of his comrades (*Il.* 9.630). Therefore, Homer transposes the individual strife into military and collective conflict and thereby attaches political significance to the inter-personal military discord. This is shown in the scene of reconciliation in *Il.* 19.56-154 which is conspicuously absent from *BC* 9.1097-98, because of the death of Pompey. Unlike the conflict narrated by Homer, Lucan's quarrel has not progressed from strife to reconciliation but remained as strife on the personal, national and legal level, threatening the safety and liberty of Rome.

This Iliadic theme, of civil strife, pervades Lucan's poem, too, and influences the reaction of the hero. Lucan, influenced by Homer and Virgil, regresses from the macrocosm of civil war into the microcosm of strife between Caesar and Pompey and considers the death of Julia as the reason for the breakup of the marriage alliance between father-in-law and son-in-law and one of the pretexts for the outbreak of war. After her death, the marriage of Julia became a dire omen (*BC* 1.112) which turned the marriage torches into mourning ones. Unlike Helen, Julia's misfortune is her death which renders her helpless to restrain the rage of her father and husband (*BC* 1.115-16). Bruère mentions the common role shared by Virgil's Helen and Lucan's Cleopatra as instigators of the wars of Troy and Latium respectively, building upon the commonly noted verses *Troiae et patriae communis Erynis* (*Aen.* 2.537 of Helen) and *dedecus Aegypti, Latii feralis Erinyis* (*BC* 10.59 of Cleopatra) and finds other correspondences between *Aeneid* 2 and *BC* 10.¹⁴ In the same way that Helen becomes the cause of the destruction of Argos and Troy, Cleopatra is responsible for the wars in Italy (*BC* 10.60-62). The words

14 Bruère 1964: 267 adds the parallel lines of *Aen.* 2.567-69 and *BC* 10.458-60 which share the common motif of Helen hiding in an isolated part of Priam's palace during the sack of Troy and Caesar seeking refuge in a remote part of the palace. Moreover, he compares the running of Polites to escape Pyrrhus (*Aen.* 2.528-29) to Aeneas' moving around before he sees Helen, *Aen.* 2.570 with Caesar's wandering within the house (*BC* 10.460). Lastly, he compares Aeneas' threat to punish Helen (*Aen.* 2.585-86) with Caesar's command to King Ptolemy to follow him, with the intention of killing him, if he himself is unable to escape death (*BC* 10.462).

facie Spartana nocenti (BC 10.61) establish a link between Lucan's Cleopatra and Homer's Helen and recall the *Iliad* where, upon the sight of Helen on the Trojan walls, the elders exclaim that her beauty justifies the suffering of the Trojans and Achaeans who fight for her sake (*Il.* 3.156-57).

Although Lucan's choice of subject matter derives from historical facts it is at the same time expressed in epic form. To convert historical facts into epic requires a plot or a single theme that binds several events together. The microcosm of the civil war is the baneful conflict between Caesar and Pompey escalating into strife between two military camps which are both Roman. Consequently, the private hatred of the two Romans sends us back to the clash between Agamemnon and Achilles which could possibly give the new poet material for his own handling of the story. Furthermore, the plural in the very first verse of the poem expands the bounds of civil war and speaks of wars in general (BC 1.1). The poet will sing of wars as worse than civil strife because they are waged against kinsmen and men who are related by the bond of marriage.

Homer's opening line refers to Achilles' wrath which is accursed because it led to strife between the two men and caused many troubles and deaths among the Achaeans and men were perishing ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί (*Il.* 1.10). Lucan's account takes 7 verses to describe the destructive consequences of civil war and finishes with the equally puzzling question *quis furor, o cives, quae tanta licentia ferri?* (BC 1.8), which reminds us of Homer's τίς τάσ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; (*Il.* 1.8).¹⁵

This question, which describes civil war as strife, is not the sole reference to this theme in the poem; it is repeatedly emphasized by the symbolic equation of civil war with the game of power (BC 1.120) between Caesar and Pompey. Throughout the poem, Lucan emphasizes the family and personal setting of the war, either through personal authorial involvement expressed as hope that civil war will cease and that Caesar and Pompey will be friends again, through the rhetorical question asking why Caesar betrayed the Senate and his son-in-law (BC 4.802) or by wondering whether the bond of kinship appeals to him at last (BC 9.1048-49).¹⁶

¹⁵ Conte 1966: 13-14 admits the existence of an intertextual line here.

¹⁶ The concept of civil war as a strife between the two great men recurs throughout the poem and appears more characteristically in this context at BC 2.652, 3.32, 4.188, 4.802, 6.5, 6.12, 7.611, 7.806, 8.555, 9.952, 9.1015, 9.1026, 9.1048-49, 9.1058.

There is an interplay of a personal baneful quarrel, *furor*, which reminds us of Homeric μῆνις, from the beginning emphasizing its destructive consequences to Romans in the same way as Achilles' anger cost the Achaians dear ἡ μὲν Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν (*Il.* 1.2). The conversion of a personal conflict into a Roman concern certainly recalls the conversion of Achilles' wrath into a pan-Achaian problem.

One principal aspect of the civil war is the lack of trust in the partners' rule and the striving for absolute power: *nulla fides regni sociis* (*BC* 1.92). According to the poet, it is almost a natural law that absolute power resents the rule of a partner: *omnisque potestas inpatiens consortis erit* (*BC* 1.92-93). This verse recalls the pattern of negation in Odysseus' frequently quoted statement οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίῃ· εἰς κοίρανος ἔστω (*Il.* 2.204), ('one lord is better than many') used in his attack against Thersites' challenges to the authority of Agamemnon.¹⁷

Despite the negative use of Iliadic allusions, the causes of the disorder do not differ much, as Lucan is at pains to demonstrate. The struggle for power between the leaders contributes to the breakdown of the Triumvirate (*BC* 1.4). The game of power is played out by the king/consul who can bear no superior or equal to his dignity and the mighty warrior who strives against his might ἐριζέμεναι βασιλῇ ἀντιβίην (*Il.* 1.277-78). The clash of Roman leaders sends us back to the outbreak of the quarrel between the Achaian leaders *nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem/Pompeiusve parem* (*BC* 1.125-26).¹⁸

¹⁷ See Lausberg 1985: 1582.

¹⁸ For a discussion of Caesar's *dignitas* in historiography see Ruebel 1992: 133-41 where the author moderates Caesar's statement *sibi semper primam fuisse dignitatem vitaeque potiore* ('For him *dignitas* has always been foremost, and more compelling than life'), (*B. Civ.* 1.9.2) by claiming that the reason for crossing the Rubicon was not to destroy, but to defend himself, the rights of the Tribunes, and the rightful constitution, Ruebel 1992: 140. However, in the *BC* there is also emphasis on the Iliadic concept of τιμή which is validated by military rewards. For this reason Caesar asks what is due to him first and then to his soldiers for their services to the state *praemia belli reddantur* (*BC* 1.341-42). Tzounakas 2000: 76 maintains that Caesar obsessively sees the civil war in terms of interest when he promises his soldiers that the world they want to conquer will not cost them so much blood *nec sanguine multo / spem mundi petitis* (*BC* 7.269-70). However, Coffee 2009: 143 identifies a passage in the poem where Caesar promises to his soldiers that he will disburse the land and wealth of nations as gifts to them (7.300) although he declares after the war that he will not give gifts but that each man should take for himself the payment

Caesar's direct address to his soldiers (*BC* 1.299-351) is a parallel to Achilles' replies to Agamemnon in *Il.* 1 and the ambassadors' in *Il.* 9 which are however, expressed in the form of dialogue. The main points of convergence between the two speeches are: the emphasis on the services rendered to the Romans and the Achaian army respectively, the praise of Caesar's and Achilles' military achievements; the contempt exhibited towards the rival, namely, Pompey and Agamemnon and their followers; and most importantly the complaint about the unjust distribution of military rewards.

The emphasis on the services rendered to the Romans is firstly manifested when Caesar opens his speech by the rhetorical question addressed to his soldiers whether this is the reward of the toil of war (*BC* 1.301-2). Achilles, once informed of Agamemnon's despotic intentions to deprive him of his prize, asks how someone could trust him and go to battle with him (*Il.* 1.150-51). Moreover, he complains that Agamemnon takes no account of the fact that he is fighting against the Trojans not for personal interest but in order to recover the honour of Menelaos (*Il.* 1.159-60, 9.337-39). Furthermore, although Achilles is tired of fighting, the prizes of Agamemnon are always greater (*Il.* 1.163-68).¹⁹ It is obvious that both generals compare the services rendered with the reward received by the opposing party. The endless toil of Caesar's fighting on the fields of the North is expressed through the wounds, blood and death and winters spent in the Alps: *hoc cruor Arctois meruit diffusus in arvis / volneraque et mortes hiemesque sub Alpibus actae?* (*BC* 1.301-2: 'is this your reward for blood poured out in northern fields and wounds and death and winters spent beneath the Alps?')²⁰ in language that reminds us of Achilles' heart-rendering woes ἐπεὶ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ (*Il.* 9.321), many sleepless nights, ἄπνους νύκτας (*Il.* 9.325) and bloody days, ἡματὰ δ'αἵματόεντα (*Il.* 9.326) spent fighting for the sake of Agamemnon. Therefore, the issue of past services in the public interest is a common subject (*BC* 1.301-2, 1.340-42, *Il.* 1.165-68, 9.321-22, 9.325-27).²¹ Achilles in

of his blood (7.738). This change according to Coffee renders Caesar a war profiteer for whom war is *utile*, 2009: 136.

19 Green 1991: 238 cites the lines *BC* 1.301-2 and *Il.* 1.163-68 where Achilles complains that Agamemnon's prizes are always greater as parallels. I have added lines (*Il.* 1.150-51) from Achilles' speech because, like Caesar, he asks an assertive question.

20 Transl. Braund 1992: 11.

21 Especially lines *BC* 1.302 and *Il.* 9.325.

most emphatic terms says to Odysseus that he received no thanks for fighting ceaselessly against the enemy (*Il.* 9.316-17).

Apart from mentioning their past services, Caesar and Achilles place emphasis on their military achievements deemed to be very important for the whole of the army and the city respectively. Caesar puts a hypothetical question as to what will happen if the city is attacked by people from Gaul considering that only his army is capable of confronting the foreign enemies whom he describes as wild (*BC* 1.307-9). Here again there is a parallel to Achilles' irony against Agamemnon who did not accomplish much in his absence. Achilles warns that there will come a day when nobody can confront Hector (*Il.* 1.240-44) and mentions that while he was fighting, Hector never dared to march outside the wall. Instead, he only fought around the gates (*Il.* 9.349-55). Furthermore, Caesar introduces himself as Rome's soldier and a winner (*BC* 1.201-2). Similarly, Achilles is reckoned to be the best of spearmen and the hero upon whom the victory of the Achaeans depends (*Il.* 1.283-84).

In addition, the two speeches converge on the contempt exhibited by Caesar and Achilles against obeying the rival's rules. Green identifies a common grievance shared by Achilles and Caesar. On the one hand, Achilles' grievance is against Agamemnon who is arrogant, old, cowardly and greedy. On the other hand, Caesar's complaint is against Pompey who is oppressive because he is unfamiliar with the warrior's life and cites the lines of *Il.* 1.122, 1.203, 1.225-31 with *BC* 1.311-12, 1.314-15, 1.324-25, 1.333-34.²² I have added lines *BC* 1.338-40 as parallel to *Il.* 1.293-94 and *BC* 1.314-15; 17 as parallels to *Il.* 1.231-32 from the point of view of the assertion of the warrior's honour which refuses to submit to the bidding of the rival. Caesar's question: *ultima Pompeio dabitur provincia Caesar, / quod non victrices aquilas deponere iussus / paruerim?* (*BC* 1.338-40: 'shall Caesar be the ultimate task of Pompey because I did not obey his order to lay down my victorious eagles?'),²³ expresses his refusal of subordination and conveys the feeling of shame resulting in the demand for a reduction of Pompey's triumph. In many ways, Caesar's words capture Achilles' unrelenting spirit which in turn refuses to be subordinated to Agamemnon's higher authority.

²² Green 1991: 236.

²³ Transl. Braund 1992: 12.

ἦ γάρ κεν δειλός τε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς καλεοίμην,
εἰ δὴ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον ὑπείξομαι, ὅττι κεν εἴπης (*Il.* 1.293-94)

Yes, for I should be called a coward and a nobody,
if I am to yield to you in every matter whatever you say.²⁴

The attack on Pompey's despotic pretensions constitutes a large part of Caesar's speech and stigmatizes events from Pompey's past republican career. Here Caesar starts being aggressive and criticises Pompey's illicit and despotic renewal of high office as the consistent cover-up and retention of posts which he had previously usurped.

Scilicet extremi Pompeium emptique clientes
Continuo per tot satiabunt tempora regno? . . .
Ille semel raptos numquam dimittet honores? (*BC* 1.314-15, 17)

I ask you-shall Pompey's lowest minions, bought,
bestow on him his fill of power unbroken through so many years? ...
Shall Pompey never yield the privileges he once usurped?²⁵

In a similar manner, Achilles verbally blames Agamemnon for his decision to include the whole of the Achaean army. Caesar's reference to *extremi* and *emptique clientes* (*BC* 1.314) who continuously fill Pompey with despotic power, matches with Achilles' outcry against Agamemnon.

δημοβόρος βασιλεύς, ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις·
ἦ γὰρ ἄν, Ἀτρεΐδη, νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο. (*Il.* 1.231-32)

people-devouring king, since you rule over nobodies! Otherwise, son of Atreus, you would now be committing your final outrage.²⁶

Achilles' outcry is against Agamemnon's authority on the one hand and against the Achaian people on the other. According to Achilles, Agamemnon

²⁴ Transl. Murray & Wyatt 1999: 35.

²⁵ Transl. Braund 1992: 11.

²⁶ Transl. Murray & Wyatt 1999: 31.

is a 'people-devouring' king (meaning that he satiates himself by exploiting people) since he rules over vile and venal people. Otherwise the offence directed against him would not have been the last one.²⁷ In a similar manner, Caesar vents his rage against Pompey for the trial of Milo,²⁸ the bad administration of the corn supply²⁹ and the insolence shown by his refusal to gradually abdicate from power (*BC* 1.333-34). Moreover, Pompey's refusal to abdicate from the honourable positions he has usurped, *raptos honores*, bears an echo of Achilles' repeated complaint that Agamemnon took away his prize through his insolent act ἐλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας, αὐτὸς ἀπούρας (*Il.* 1.356, 1.507, 2.240, 9.107: 'for he has taken away and holds my prize through his own arrogant act').³⁰

What is striking is the crisis in the military and heroic code with respect to the distribution of the *praemia belli* as reported by Caesar and Achilles. Caesar appeals to a sense of injustice and dishonour committed against him and his army. The emphasis on frustrated dignity and injustice recurs in the following phrases *Hoc ... meruit?* (*BC* 1.301), *temptamur* (*BC* 1.311), *ultima Pompeio dabitur provincia Caesar* (*BC* 1.338), *merces erepta laborum est* (*BC* 1.340). Moreover, he raises the issue of spoils and complains about the violation of the military code involving not only him but also his soldiers, and wishes that his soldiers keep their rewards *praemia belli reddantur* (*BC* 1.341-42). As a soldier and a champion of the state, the complaint of Caesar matches the situation of Achilles whose speech similarly emphasises his long services to the Achaian army, criticizes Agamemnon's rule as well as the Achaians who adopt a passive attitude towards him, and most importantly condemns the unjust distribution of spoils which led to his segregation from

27 Green 1991: 236 quotes Caesar's words at *BC* 1.314 where he accuses Pompey of being oppressive. She juxtaposes these lines generally with *Il.* 1.225-31 where Achilles swears at Agamemnon and says that nobody can trust him to do war with them because he takes the prize from whoever opposes his authority. Contrary to Green, I cite lines *BC* 1.314-15 including 1.317 and I compare them to *Il.* 1.231-32 including line 232 because when seen together they convey the sense of exploitation by Pompey and Agamemnon respectively and express the baseness of their supporters.

28 In the trial of Milo accused of *vis* in 52 BC, Pompeian soldiers occupied the forum in order to influence the court's decision.

29 Pompey was accused of being responsible for the famine during his control of the corn-supply for five years beginning in 57 BC.

30 Transl. Murray & Wyatt 1999: 39.

the rest of the Achaians and the rest of the Myrmidons. Caesar's initial question whether this is the reward for the toil of war (*BC* 1.301) is answered at the end of the speech with the sad observation that he is being denied the credit for his services ... *merces erepta laborum est* (*BC* 1.340). In a similar way, Achilles complains repeatedly about Agamemnon's unfair conduct concerning the distribution of spoils (*Il.* 1.166-68, 9.318-20, 9.333-34) and is puzzled that he even attempts to take his prize away from him καὶ δὴ μοι γέρας αὐτὸς ἀφαιρήσεσθαι ἀπειλεῖς (*Il.* 1.161). However, Caesar insists that his soldiers should receive their long overdue rewards, by force if required, and hopes to prevent Pompey from giving preference to the pirates and therefore granting less to his veterans (*BC* 1.346). This comment is in accordance with the crisis of the military code and matches Caesar's initial complaint concerning his reception in Rome as another Hannibal (*BC* 1.304-5). In his turn, Achilles expresses a similar complaint about Agamemnon's conduct when he observes that he did not at all honour the best of the Achaians but instead treated him with insolence as if he were some refugee without no rights ὥς μ' ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν / Ἀτρεΐδης, ὥς εἴ τιν' ἀτίμητον μετανάστην (*Il.* 9.647-48).

In order to represent the motives of Caesar, Lucan in book 9 employs the language of commerce, as shown by the use of the word *merces*. In the *BC*, the course of the private clash between the two Roman generals completes its full circle with the murder of Pompey in book 8. However, Caesar's reactions at the sight of the dead Pompey are expressed with ironic albeit dramatic interest. The dramatic immediacy of the scene is accentuated by Caesar's tears and groans at the sight of Pompey's severed head (*BC* 9.1037-43). Although Caesar's tears are crocodile tears and his heart rejoices, the poet is still at pains to show the tragic outcome of a futile quarrel. The poet's love for the creation of emotional scenes³¹ is well exemplified by the exaggeration of Caesar's behaviour in this scene, particularly when he wishes that Pompey feels his presence and perceives his sympathy and sorrow *sentiāt adventum socieri vocesque querentis / audiat umbra piās* (*BC* 9.1094-95). Moreover, Caesar does not use reconciliatory language only but also exchanges friendly gestures with Pompey, crying how he once wanted to embrace him and to love him like in the good old times (*BC* 9.1100). Most importantly, Caesar regrets that he has been deprived of the ultimate privilege of civil war which is

31 Marti 1964: 182 thinks that Lucan had an inclination to drama. See Wick 2004: 424-25.

the granting of life to the defeated. The contradictory voice of the poet maintains the moral commentary of the passage which questions the sincerity of Caesar's words.³² What is striking is the fact that Caesar says not only that he would have spared Pompey's life but that he would have shared power with him (*BC* 9.1101-2) as a sufficient reward for the war he waged. Indeed the phrase *dignaque satis mercede laborum / contentus par esse tibi* (*BC* 9.1101-2) is reminiscent of Caesar's initial speech addressed to his soldiers in the beginning *mihi si merces erepta laborum est* (*BC* 1.340) which in turn refers back to Achilles' words καὶ δὴ μοι γέρας αὐτὸς ἀφαιρήσεσθαι ἀπειλεῖς (*Il.* 1.161), οὐ μὲν σοὶ ποτε ἴσον ἔχω γέρας (*Il.* 1.163) and to the repeated Iliadic verse ἐλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας, αὐτὸς ἀπούρας (*Il.* 1.356). Therefore, when Caesar addresses the dead Pompey, he expresses on the one hand his desire for reconciliation while on the other he repeats the motives for which he waged war against Pompey.

In a similar manner, Achilles' renunciation of wrath in the *Iliad* repeats the motive underlying the outbreak of his quarrel with Agamemnon which is the distribution of rewards albeit with a different interest. It is important firstly to analyse Caesar's reaction at the sight of Pompey's head and then juxtapose his behaviour to the words and behaviour of Achilles. When Caesar discovers that the head is Pompey's, he threatens to take revenge by sending Ptolemy the head of his sister *missem, Cleopatra, caput* (*BC* 9.1071). Likewise, Achilles wishes that Artemis had slain the girl on the ships τὴν ὄφελ' ἐν νήεσσι κατακτάμεν Ἄρτεμις ἰωί (*Il.* 19.59). However, Achilles wishes that a god has spared them, whereas Caesar wishes he could have taken revenge if Cleopatra were not hated by her brother.³³ Some lines later

32 The narrator comments in *BC* 9.1041-43 that Caesar pretends to mourn the fact that Pompey's head had been severed so as to make an excuse for withholding his obligation to the Egyptians. Wick 2004: 425-26 maintains that Caesar's speech is hypocritical through cross-examination with the speech of Ptolemy's follower who explains to Caesar the reasons why Ptolemy murdered Pompey. In short, Caesar's words are rendered hypocritical because only he benefited from this murder, since he is proven to be the winner while at the same time he is not involved in the murder (*BC* 9.1031-32). In this way, Lucan foreshadows his own negative interpretation of the episode which is to follow in his apostrophe to Caesar (*BC* 9.1046-62). Tzounakas 2000: 117-19 emphasizes the word *pignus* (*BC* 9.1019-21) which means the pledge forged between Caesar and the Egyptians through the murder of Pompey. Caesar takes the murder of Pompey as a guarantee for his safety to enter Egypt (*BC* 10.9-10).

33 As Edwards 1991: 241 notes, Achilles minimizes the importance of Briseis, now just a

the risk-loving general measures his expectations against the risks at stake at Pharsalus and concludes that the penalty for the flight was Ptolemy *poenae fugae Ptolemaeus erat* (*BC* 9.1087). Indeed, Achilles also wonders whether he or Agamemnon profited from this war (*BC* 19.56). As Caesar concludes, Ptolemy was the penalty for Pompey's defeat; Achilles realizes that the clash between them served Hector's and the Trojan cause Ἐκτορι μὲν καὶ Τρῳασι τὸ κέρδιον; (*Il.* 19.63). Moreover, both accounts have profound political meaning. Caesar says, characteristically, that the establishment of peace and concord with Pompey would have enabled Pompey to pardon his defeat and Pompey would have enabled Rome to vindicate his victory (*BC* 9.1102-4). Similarly, Achilles' reconciliation is celebrated in the *Iliad* not as a personal matter but as a pan-Achaian event bringing peace and establishing a new era of peace.³⁴ The difference between the two texts lies in the outcome as the death of Pompey has ipso facto destroyed every chance of re-conciliation and this is why Caesar's reaction at the sight of Pompey's head and commentary on the event become hypocritical.

The motives of the two heroes converge in their demand for the just distribution of military rewards. This is made manifest in both of Achilles' speeches in book 1 and 9 and in both Caesar's initial speech to his soldiers and his last speech to Pompey. Whereas Achilles concludes with the sad realization that this reward, namely Briseis, was not worthwhile, Caesar says hypocritically that the sufficient reward for his labour would have been to be Pompey's equal. Although Achilles downplays the military reward as the cause for quarreling with Agamemnon, Caesar compromises the price of the civil war as the equal share of power had Pompey been alive. It is exactly at this point that his speech becomes hypocritical since Caesar and his soldiers aim at domination over the opposing party and the imposition of imperialism in Rome (*BC* 1.290-91. 2.655, 7.240, 9.1076-78, 10.150, 10.169).

In the present paper I have tried to demonstrate the conception of civil war as strife, emphasizing the common motives of the respective leaders and

κούρη, no longer the γέρας which had been given him by the army (*Il.* 1.161-62, 1.356, 507, 2.240, 1.392, 9.367-68, 16.56, 18.444) and a woman whom he had come to love (9.336, 9.341-43). In doing this, he lays the blame on himself rather than Agamemnon. According to Wick 2004: 428-29, Caesar by threatening to reciprocate the murder of Pompey with the death of Cleopatra downplays the clemency he propounds at *BC* 9.1087-89.

34 Karavites 1992: 71-72.

the destructive consequences concerning the Achaian army and the Romans respectively. Moreover, I have argued for the intratextual connection between Lucan's *BC* 1 and 9 on the one hand, and the intertextual relation between Lucan's *BC* 1 and 9 with Homer's *Iliad* 1, 9 and 19 on the other hand, through the analysis of the most important tenet of the civil war: its price (*merces*) which reveals the motives of the leaders and both opens and closes the quarrel between the heroes and their rivals. The word *merces* appears in Caesar's initial speech to his soldiers and completes its full circle with its reappearance in his last speech to the dead Pompey and its definition as the sharing of power had Pompey been alive.³⁵ The author is at pains to portray Caesar as a hypocrite and as a soldier fighting for world dominion, both through the narrator's apostrophe and through Caesar's own words and actions³⁶ as well as through the address of Ptolemy's follower who expounds the advantages that Caesar refuses although he clearly gains from the murder.³⁷ I have highlighted the hypocritical elements of Caesar's speech by comparing it with Achilles' corresponding speech which shows that the latter takes responsibility for his actions. Lastly, I have associated Caesar with the earlier career of Achilles when both of them appear as two soldiers who are deprived of their rewards and fight for the restoration of their honour as conceived in the Iliadic terms of τιμή which is measured in rewards (*merces-γέρας*). Caesar's last statement *dignaque satis mercede laborum / contentus par esse tibi* (*BC* 9.1101-2) can be understood as the response to his reason for waging war against Pompey. Moreover, it can be seen as the logical conclusion to Achilles' claims that he is not granted from his prize and that he does not have equal share in spoil (*Il.* 1.161, 1.163). Caesar talking like Achilles in the presence of the dead Pompey takes recourse to the same ancient rationale of fighting for the restoration of his honour and the acquisition of military rewards by his veterans.

35 Although a mercantile state of mind is the main characteristic in the overall representation of Caesar, there is a tendency to compromise self-interest when Caesar assures that he would share power with Pompey had he been alive.

36 Coffee 2009: 135-51, Tzounakas 2000: 73-76, 86-87, 90, 96, 103-4, 106, 113, 115, 117-19, 129.

37 Wick 2004: 425-26.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahl, F.M. 1976. *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca and London.
- Braund, H.S. 1992. *Lucan: Civil War*. Oxford.
- Bruère, R.T. 1964. 'The Helen Episode in *Aeneid* 2 and Lucan' *CPh* 59, 267-68.
- Conte, G.B. 1966. 'Il proemio della Pharsalia' *Maia* 18, 42-53.
- Coffee, N. 2009. *The commerce of war: Exchange and social order in Latin Epic*. Chicago.
- Edwards, W.M. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume V: books 17-20*. Cambridge.
- Erskine, A. 2001. *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local tradition and imperial power*. Oxford.
- Green, C.M.C. 1991. 'Stimulos Dedit Aemula Virtus: Lucan and Homer Reconsidered' *Phoenix* 45, 230-54.
- Karavites, P. 1992. *Promise-Giving and Treaty-Making: Homer and the Near East*. Leiden.
- Lausberg, M. 1985. 'Lucan und Homer' *ANRW* II.32.3, 1565-1622.
- Marti, B.M. 1964. 'Tragic history and Lucan's Pharsalia' in C. Henderson Jr. (ed.) *Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies in Honour of B.L. Ullman*. Rome. I, 165-204.
- Murray, A.T. & Wyatt, F.W. 1999. *Homer: Iliad. 2 vols*. Cambridge, MA.
- Narducci, E. 2002. *Lucano: Un'epica contro l' impero: interpretazione della Pharsalia*. Rome.
- Roche, P. 2009. *Lucan De Bello Civili Book 1*. Oxford.
- Schackleton Bailey, D.R. 1988. *Lucanus De Bello Civili*. Stuttgart.
- Tzounakas, S. 2000. 'Η Μεταφορά στη Φαρσαλίδα του Λουκανού' Dissertation, University of Athens.
- West, M.L. 1998. *Homerus Ilias I-XII*. Stuttgart.
- West, M.L. 2000. *Homerus Ilias XIII-XXIV*. Stuttgart.
- Von Albrecht, M. 1970. 'Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition' in M. Durry *Lucain: Sept exposés*. Geneva, 269-308.
- Von Albrecht 1999. *Roman Epic. An interpretative introduction*. Leiden.
- Wick, C. 2004. *Marcus Anneaus Lucanus, Bellum Civile, Liber IX, II: Kommentar*. Munich.

LUCAN'S PUNIC WAR IN THE *DISTICHA CATONIS*

By Serena Connolly

Summary: The reference in a preface of the *Disticha Catonis* to Lucan's poem as treating *Romana et Punica bella* is not an error or description of an otherwise unknown work. Rather, it is metonymic for the *Pharsalia* as a whole and serves to remind the reader of Cato, whose death in North Africa is recounted in the ninth book. Inclusion of Macer, author of a work on cures for snake bites, in the preface provides another allusion to *Pharsalia* 9.*

Telluris si forte velis cognoscere cultus
Vergilium legito; quodsi mage nosse laboras
Herbarum vires, Macer tibi carmina dicit.
Si Romana cupis et Punica noscere bella,
5 Lucanum quaeres, qui Martis proelia dixit.
Si quid amare libet vel discere amare legendo,
Nasonem petito; sin autem cura tibi haec est,
Ut sapiens vivas, audi quae discere possis,
Per quae semotum vitiis deducitur aevum:
10 Ergo ades, et quae sit sapientia disce legendo.

If perhaps you want to understand cultivation of the land
Read Virgil; but if you are striving to know better
The powers of plants, Macer sings his song to you.

* I am very grateful to John Jacobs for his suggestions and comments on an earlier version of this piece and to the anonymous reader. I am also very happy to acknowledge the support of the Institute for Advanced Study, where I began my work on the preface.

- If you want to learn about Roman and Punic wars,
 5 Look for Lucan, who sings of the battles of Mars.
 If you want a love affair or to learn about love by reading,
 Seek out Naso; but if, however, this is your concern,
 To live as a wise man, hear what you could learn,
 So that you can lead a life free from wrongdoing:
 10 And so pay attention, and learn from reading what wisdom is.

These ten lines of dactylic hexameter preface the second book of the *Disticha Catonis*, a collection of approximately 145 moralizing maxims in hexameter couplets organized into four books that was composed sometime in the first three centuries AD and was well known by the fourth. The second, third and fourth books are preceded by prefaces, of which this is the longest, and our many manuscripts also transmit a smaller collection of about 50 brief *sententiae* along with the maxims.¹ The *Disticha* are little known even to Classicists today, but they were the first 'real' Latin text read by most students of Latin in the medieval period and beyond.² The relationship of the prefaces to the *Disticha* and their date are unclear, and it is not my intention in this brief note to discuss them.³ Rather, I am concerned with explaining the reference to Lucan in l. 4-5.⁴

- 1 Generally on the *Disticha Catonis*, see especially the edition of Boas 1952 and his preceding articles, which are listed in Boas 1952: LXXX-LXXXIII; Bieler 1957 offers helpful summaries of many of them. See also Bischoff 1890, Skutsch 1905 and Stechert 1912, whose studies along with that of Boas laid the foundation for all subsequent work.
- 2 The bibliography on the Fortleben of the *Disticha Catonis* is enormous, but see especially Zarncke 1852, Hazelton 1957, Brunner 1968, Roos 1984, and Taylor 1999 and 2004.
- 3 The consensus is that the prefaces are not the work of the maxims' author, but are later additions. See, for example, Skutsch 1905: 361-62. According to Hunt 1994: 1, by the ninth century 'the original distichs had been supplied with prefaces to the four books which constituted the collection'. Our extant manuscripts tend not to distinguish the prefaces from the maxims, presenting the contents of each book as continuous text. While the prefaces to the second and fourth books are self-contained thematically and syntactically, that to the third book, which is brief and offers simply general encouragement in the spirit of the last four lines of the preface under discussion, is difficult to distinguish from the maxims (see Boas 1952: 152-54).
- 4 Another curiosity of the preface is that the author recommends the *Georgics* for learning about agriculture, rather than the more obvious choice of Cato's *De agricultura*. Moreover, the *Georgics* are a curious choice of reference for cultivation of land, since only two

In the fourth and fifth lines, the author of the preface recommends Lucan to the reader who wants to learn about *Romana et Punica bella*.⁵ Scholars have felt compelled to correct or explain these lines. The sixteenth-century educator Mathurin Cordier, for example, in an attempt to prevent children from being misled, substituted *civica* for *Punica*. But this emendation fails on two grounds: there is no support in the manuscripts for *civica*, and *Punica* is the *lectio difficilior*.⁶ Moving forward in time, Ussani offered an explanation rather than a correction, claiming that the line might refer to a work titled *De bellis Punicis* and attributed to Lucan that was actually a collection of episodes from the *Pharsalia* set in North Africa or a paraphrase of them; alternatively, he noted, it might refer generally to the *Pharsalia*, thus reminding the modern audience of the importance to earlier readers of

of the four books deal with the topic. Most classicists would think of Cato and Columella before Vergil as writers from whom one would learn about this topic. Cato was not named, probably to avoid confusion, but the striking use of the plural *cultūs* – the singular is more common – may explain the choice of the *Georgics* over Columella's *De re rustica*. *Cultūs* is found also in the *De re rustica*, most significantly at 10.433:

Hactenus hortorum cultus, Silvius, docebam
 Siderei vatis referens praecepta Maronis,
 Qui primus veteres ausus recludere fontes
 Ascreum cecinit Romana per oppida carmen.

(So far, Silvinus, I have been teaching you cultivation of gardens, passing on the teachings of the starred poet Maro, who first daring to uncover old springs sang his Ascrean song through Roman towns.)

The phrasing of *telluris ... cultus* in the preface is strongly reminiscent of *hortorum cultus* in Columella (and indeed some manuscripts show *agrorum* or *arvorum* for *hortorum*), and I think it highly likely that the author of the preface knew to cite Vergil not because he had read the *Georgics*, but because he had read Columella. Such familiarity with Columella may suggest that the preface was composed in the medieval period, since according to Reynolds (1983: 146), the text of the *De re rustica* was little known until the middle of the ninth century.

- 5 According to Vacca's *Life of Lucan*, Statius's *Silvae* (2.7.60–61), and Suetonius' *Vita Lucani*, Lucan was the also the author of *De incendio urbis* and *Epistulae ex Campania* (on which see Ahl 1971), the *Iliacón*, the *Catachthonion*, *Laudes Neronianae*, the *Adlocutio ad Pollam*, *Saturnalia*, *Silvae*, a tragedy *Medea*, *Salticae Fabulae*, *Epigrammata*, and the Octavius Sagitta orations.
- 6 Cordier 1548 (there are many editions of this text). Boas 1952: 92. On Cordier and his colloquies (some of which referred to Cato), see generally Hudson 1978.

North Africa in the poem.⁷ Alternatively, the author of the preface may have been confusing Lucan's *Pharsalia* with Silius Italicus's *Punica*. Jacobs in his recent dissertation points out that since a garbled reference to Silius is indeed possible, we need not go along with Ussani's efforts to find an explanation in Lucan's works.⁸ The confusion of Lucan with Silius is perhaps understandable given that both produced works in same period and genre, and there is some similarity between the titles *Punica* and *Pharsalia*.⁹ Yet Lucan was a popular author, and there are almost as many manuscripts of his work extant from Late Antiquity through the medieval period as there are of Virgil's, while Silius Italicus slipped into obscurity.¹⁰ My solution, a refinement and simplification of Ussani's argument, is that the fourth line refers to Lucan's *Pharsalia* (and to this work alone), but only to one significant part of it, rather than the poem in its entirety, in a sophisticated example of metonymy.

The ninth book of the *Pharsalia* is set in North Africa and tells of a *bellum Punicum*, while the rest of the poem is concerned more widely with *bella Romana*. But the importance of North Africa is not simply confined to its use as the setting for Book 9: many scholars believe that the poem originally ended with that book.¹¹ Moreover, as Ahl points out, the history of the late Republic could be viewed – and indeed was by Horace – as bookended by Carthage's victory over Rome in 216 BC and her self-destruction at Thapsus in 46 BC, and Lucan's poem reflects the importance of the region for the period.¹² He refers early on in the poem to the end of the Punic Wars and later presents Curio's disastrous Libyan expedition as a source of vengeance for Hannibal.¹³ He also compares Caesar to Hannibal.¹⁴ Readers had long

7 Ussani 1918.

8 Jacobs 2009: 30–32.

9 I am following the assertion by Ahl 1971 and 1976: 326–32 that the title *Pharsalia* is preferable to *Bellum Civile*. Indeed the poem itself seems to be the source of the title (Luc. 9.985–86).

10 Silius was, by comparison with Lucan, ignored, as the manuscript history of the *Punica* reveals. See the introduction in Delz 1987: VI–IX, Bassett, Delz & Dunston 1976: 346–49, and Reeve in Reynolds 1983: 389.

11 See the discussion by Ahl 1976: 319–26.

12 Ahl 1976: 82–84 and 99. Horace, *Carm.* 2.1.25–28.

13 Carthage is mentioned at Luc. 1.39: *Poeni saturentur sanguine manes* (May the spirits of Carthage be filled with blood). Lucan associates Curio's expedition with the earlier Punic Wars at 4.788–793, on which see Ahl 1976: 98–99.

been aware of the importance of North Africa in the poem: in the early fifteenth century Amplonius Ratincq on three occasions in the catalogue to his library gives the title of the poem as *De bellis punicis*.¹⁵ Ussani may be right that the North African episodes were excerpted from the poem, but it is also very possible that the author of the *Disticha*'s preface, like many others, simply thought of the poem as both Roman and Punic in subject matter.

There is another reason why the author may have highlighted North Africa in the preface. In Lucan's poem, much of the action that takes place there concerns the final defeat and death of Cato the Younger at Carthaginian Utica. The *Disticha Catonis* were credited to 'Cato' as early as the fourth century, and the titles of the work in medieval manuscripts and later print editions very often also attribute the collection to 'Cato'.¹⁶ Cato the Elder, who was associated with moralizing sayings, is usually meant, but commentators and editors also suggest Cato the Younger as the possible author.¹⁷ As

14 Luc. 1.303-5. See the discussion of Ahl 1976: 107-12.

15 The catalogue lists the work as *libri Lucani de bellis Punicis, libri Lucani poete de bellis punicis inter Romanos et Karthaginenses*, and *libris Lucani de bellis punicis tam Romanorum quam Libicorum*. On Amplonius' career and library (which included a copy of the *Disticha*) and these citations, see Sabbadini 1914, 10-16, especially 13. Sabbadini, however, attributes the descriptions of the poem to a mistake: 'Piú probabilmente il nostro bibliofilo scambiò la guerra civile con la guerra punica' (13). (He makes the same point in Sabbadini 1911 in a correction at the end of the piece on p. 251.)

16 In a letter to the emperor Valentinian, his *comes archiatrorum* Vindicianus quotes from the *Disticha Catonis* 2.22 and attributes it to Cato: 'Quod cum pati coepisset infirmus, flens et gemens illud Catonis saepe dicebat: "Corporis exigua medico committe fideli"' (But when in his weakness he began to suffer, weeping and groaning he would often recite that saying of Cato: 'Trust only minor ailments to a trustworthy doctor'). The maxim in the collection reads 'Consilium archanum tacito committe sodali; / Corporis auxilium medico committe fideli' (Trust your private counsels to a friend who holds his tongue; trust care of your body to a doctor who keeps his faith). On the discrepancy in wording, see Boas 1926. The letter was preserved by Marcellus Empiricus at the start of his *De medicamentis*, a text of which is available in Niedermann 1968. On Vindicianus, see Prioreschi 1998: 528-31. Later titles are given in Boas 1952: LII-LVI and LXV-LXVII.

17 On Cato the Elder's apophthegmata, see for example Plutarch, *Cato Maior* 8-9 and the collection of fragments from various sources in Malcovati 1955 and Chassignet 1986. Plutarch, *Cato Maior* 20.7 describes Cato as having written a program of instruction – 'a history in big letters' – for his son, and there are references to and perhaps fragments from at least two works of Cato addressed or dedicated to him. The first, the *Ad filium*, is thought by Astin 1978: 183 to have been a one-book collection of pithy sayings and ad-

early as the ninth century, however, Remigius of Auxerre claimed in his commentary that the attribution was erroneous, although some subsequent commentators remained unconvinced.¹⁸ The twelfth-century *Accessus ad Auctores* suggests that the association with 'Cato' stemmed from the fact that the moralizing precepts of the *Disticha* were reminiscent of Cato the Elder's writings and so came to be called Catonian.¹⁹ Finally, a related explanation for the connection is that just as collections of precepts were later attributed to Menander and Seneca, so the *Disticha* were also attributed to 'Cato', not so much as an individual, but rather as a collective authorial persona.²⁰ Moreover, that persona might be a conflation of the two Catos, just as Valerius Maximus blended the Scipiones Nasicae into one figure.²¹ Since there is no mention of Cato in the maxims, it is impossible to know whether the attribution of them to one of the Catos or 'Cato' or the description of them as Catonian was made by the original author or someone later.

The author of the preface, being aware of the *Disticha's* Catonian connection, recommends book nine to the reader to learn not only about wars, but also about the death of the *Disticha's* supposed author (or that of his great-grandson). He recognized, as do scholars today, that the suffering and death of Cato the Younger in North Africa were a lesson in Stoic virtue, and was

vice, from which Pliny, Plutarch and other writers subsequently quoted. Astin 1978: 339 suggests that this was a collection of sayings on various subjects, including religious law, medicine and agriculture, which may have included sayings by Cato and others. Cicero, for example, in his *De officiis* 1.104 refers to a collection of sayings by Cato that was seemingly collected by him. The second work is the *Carmen de moribus*, from which three fragments are preserved in Gellius 11.2 (on which see Astin 1978: 186 and Schoenberger 1980: 388–90). On the works of Cato for his son, see most recently Suerbaum 2002: 409–13. Neither of these seems to have had any close connection with the *Disticha Catonis*. Confusingly, the collection is also attributed to an otherwise unknown Dionysius Cato, perhaps as a result of confusing Cassius Dionysius Uticensis with Cato Uticensis. The former, according to Varro, *de Agric.* 1.1.1, authored an agricultural work that was a translation of Mago of Carthage's earlier work in Punic.

18 On Remigius, Mancini 1902: 194. The first complete edition of Remigius' commentary from Brepols' series *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis* is keenly anticipated.

19 For a text of the *Accessus ad Auctores*, see Huygens 1954.

20 Texts of the *Sententiae Menandri* and *Liber Senecae* are found in Jäkel 1964 and Woefflin 1869 respectively.

21 Valerius Maximus, 7.5.2. On the conflation, see Briscoe 1993: 406–7. I owe the references to John Jacobs.

perhaps proposing that Lucan's account could usefully be read alongside the *Disticha*.²²

If the fourth line of the preface does indeed refer to Book 9, then the observant reader would surely have smiled at the author's mention of Macer in the previous line. We first learn from Ovid that Aemilius Macer composed a poem on the healing powers of plants, and he is also known for his *Theriaca*, a treatise on the treatment of snake bites.²³ Snakes, of course, play a memorable role in Book 9: Cato, having landed in Libya, proclaims himself ready to risk the dangers North Africa famously posed (l. 397 and 402), but soon afterwards his thirsty soldiers fall prey to them as they happen upon a snake-infested spring. Lucan weaves into his account of the snakes' attacks on Cato's soldiers (l. 607-937) a lengthy and fantastical digression on the history of snakes in the region, which may have been informed in part by Macer's works.²⁴ At the very least, the informed and attentive reader of the

22 On the lessons of the suffering and death of Lucan's Cato the Younger, see for example Grimal 1949: 58-61; Brouwers 1989; Leigh 2000; Gorman 2001; Saylor 2002. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for pointing out that Statius also associated Cato with the *Pharsalia* as he eulogizes Lucan in *Silvae* 2.7, 66-68 ('et Pharsalica bella detonabis, / quo fulmen ducis inter arma divi ... libertate pia Catonem') and l. 113-15 ('quo Pharsalica turba congregator, / et te nobile Carmen insonatem / Pompei comitantur et Catones').

23 Ovid, *Tristia*, 4.10.43-44: 'saepe suas volucres legit mihi grandior aevo, / quaeque necet serpens, quae iuvat herba, Macer.' The extant fragments of Macer are found in Blänsdorf 1995. The extant poem entitled *De viribus herbarum* was composed by Odo de Meung (Odo Magdunensis), a French writer of the eleventh century. The text may have been his original creation, or he may have drawn heavily on Macer's poem. Confusingly, from the early twelfth century, the same work was attributed to a certain Floridus Macer – probably a pseudonym since it combines the floral theme of the work with the knowledge that Aemilius Macer wrote a didactic text about plants. On the *De viribus herbarum*, see O'Boyle 1998: 106, n. 82, who claims that the work was written between 849 and 1112, but was attributed to Floridus Macer from 1120 or 1130. Odo is believed to have composed the text as it currently stands in the eleventh century, with several scholars pinpointing a date of 1080.

24 See Cazzaniga 1957: 28, as well as Morel 1928 and Brena 1992. Leigh 2000: 103-4, notes, however, that Lucan may have been drawing not on Macer, but on Nicander's *Theriaka*. More generally on the episode, see Ahl 1976: 72-74 and 268-71; Thomas 1982: 108-23; Batinski 1992; Bartsch 1997: 29-35; Leigh 2000; and Eldred 2000. Ahl (1976: 270) points out that Silius Italicus, *Punica* 6.140-293 tells of Regulus' battle with a snake during the Punic Wars. It could just be possible that the preface's author confused Silius' account with that of Lucan, though this might be too far-fetched.

Disticha's preface could have made the connection between the two Latin poets.

It is easy to dismiss the fourth line of this preface as a clumsy error. Smith even calls it 'a most gross blunder, such as no one but an illiterate monk would commit.' But the monk (if the author was indeed a monk) was not illiterate; rather, he knew his Lucan well.²⁵

²⁵ Smith 1861: 635 claims that 'all the prologues have the air of forgeries', and he also notes that the first syllable of *Macer* in this preface has the wrong quantity: it is long to fit the hexameter line, while Ovid in *Amores* 2.18.3 (and also in *Trist.* 4.10.44) scans it short. Yet once again, Smith may have rushed to judgment: the first syllable of the adjective *macer* can scan either short (e.g., *Catull.* 89.4, 6; *Verg. Ecl.* 3, 100; *Hor. Epist.* 2.1.181 and *Sat.* 1.5.72) or long (e.g., *Hor. Epist.* 1.7.33 and *Sat.* 1. 6.71; *Prop.* 4.1.22; *Juv.* 7.29 and 14.146; *Sid. Apoll. Carm.* 7.454; *Maxim. Eleg.* 1.85). The references are from TLL s.v. *macer*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahl, F. 1971. 'Lucan's *De incendio urbis, Epistulae ex campania* and Nero's Ban' *TAPhA* 102, 1-27.
- Ahl, F. 1976. *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca.
- Astin, A.E. 1978. *Cato the Censor*. Oxford.
- Bartsch, S. 1997. *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge, MA.
- Bassett, E., J. Delz & A. Dunston. 1976. 'Silius Italicus' in H. Cranz and P. Kristeller (eds.) 1976. *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, vol. 3. Washington.
- Batinski, E. 2002. 'Cato and the Battle with the Serpents' *Syllecta Classica* 3, 71-80.
- Bieler, L. 1957. 'Nachaugusteische nichtchristliche Dichter II. Von Hadrian bis zum Ausgang des Altertums' *Lustrum* 2, 207-93.
- Bischoff, E. 1890. *Prolegomena zu Dionysius Cato*. Erlangen.
- Blänsdorf, J. 1995. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart.

- Boas, M. 1926. 'Das älteste Cato-Zitat' *RhM* 75, 131-41.
- Boas, M. & J. Botschuyver (eds.) 1952. *Disticha Catonis*. Amsterdam.
- Brena, F. 1992. 'Nota a Macro, fr. 17 Büchner' *Maia* 44, 171-72.
- Briscoe, J. 1993. 'Some Notes on Valerius Maximus' *Sileno* 19, 395-408.
- Brouwers, J.H. 1989. 'Lucan über Cato Uticensis als exemplar virtutis' in Bastiaensen, A.A. (ed.) *Fructus centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M. Bartelink à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire*. Steenbrugis, 49-60.
- Brunner, I. 1968. 'On some of the Vernacular Translations of Cato's Distichs' in Buehne, S.Z., J.L. Hodge & L.B. Pinto (eds.) *Helen Adolf Festschrift*. New York, 99-125.
- Cazzaniga, I. 1957. 'L'episodio dei serpi libici in Lucano e la tradizione dei *Theriaka* Nicandrei' *Acme: annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università degli studi di Milano* 10, 27-41.
- Chassignet, M. 1986. *Cato: Les origines (fragments)*. Paris.
- Cordier, M. 1548. *Disticha de moribus, nomine Catonis inscripta ...* Paris.
- Delz, J. (ed.) 1987. *Sili Italici Punica*. Stuttgart.
- Eldred, K. 2000. 'Poetry in Motion: The Snakes of Lucan' *Helios* 27, 63-74.
- Gorman, V. 2001. 'Lucan's Epic *Aristeia* and the Hero of the *Bellum Civile*' *CJ* 96, 263-90.
- Grimal, P. 1949. 'L'épisode d'Antée dans la "Pharsale"' *Latomus* 8, 55-61.
- Hazelton, R. 1957. 'The Christianization of "Cato". The *Disticha Catonis* in the Light of Late Mediaeval Commentaries' *MS* 19, 157-73.
- Hudson, E. 1978. 'The Colloquies of Maturin Cordier: Images of Calvinist School Life and Thought' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, 57-78.
- Hunt, T. 1994. *Le livre de Catun*. London.
- Huygens, R. (ed.) 1954. *Accessus ad Auctores*. Brussels.
- Jacobs, J. 2009. 'Anne iterum capta repetentur Pergama Roma?': The fall of Rome in the *Punica* (Ph.D. Dissertation). New Haven.
- Jäkel, S. (ed.) 1964. *Menandri Sententiae; Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis*. Leipzig.
- Leigh, M. 2000. 'Lucan and the Libyan tale' *JRS* 90, 95-109.
- Malcovati, E. 1955. *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae*. Turin.
- Mancini, A. 1902. 'Un commento ignoto di Remy d'Auxerre ai Disticha Catonis' *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* ser. 5, 11, 175-98; 369-82.

- Morel, W. 1928. 'Iologica' *Philologus* 83, 347-53.
- Niedermann, M. 1968. *Marcelli de medicamentis liber*. Berlin.
- O'Boyle, C. 1998. *The Art of Medicine: Medical Teaching at the University of Paris, 1250-1400*. Leiden.
- Prioreschi, P. 1998. *Roman Medicine*. Omaha.
- Reynolds, L.D. 1983. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford.
- Roos, P. 1984. *Sentenza e proverbio nell'antichità e i 'Distici di Catone': il testo latino e i volgarizzamenti italiani*. Brescia.
- Sabbadini, R. 1911. 'Sulla fortuna di alcuni testi latini' *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 39 = n.s. 17, 240-51.
- Sabbadini, R. 1914. *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV. Nuove ricerche col riassunto filologico dei due volumi*. Vol. 2. Florence.
- Saylor, C. 2002. 'Vana species leti: Cato's march in Lucan, *Pharsalia* IX' in *Hommages à Carl Deroux*. 1. Brussels, 458-63.
- Schönberger, O. 1980. *Griechische Heischelieder*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Skutsch, O. 1905. *RE*, s.v. *Dicta Catonis*.
- Smith, W. 1861. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*. London.
- Stechert, E. 1912. *De Catonis quae dicuntur Distichis*. Greifswald.
- Suerbaum, W. 2002. 'M. Porcius Cato (Censorinus)' in Herzog, R., P.L. Schmidt, W. Suerbaum & J. Blänsdorf (eds.) *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Abt. 8: Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Bd. 1, Die archaische Literatur: von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod, die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr.* Munich, 380-418.
- Taylor, B. 1999. 'Michael Verinus and the *Distichs* of Cato in Spain: A Comparative Study in Reception' in Taylor, B. & A. Coroleu (eds.) *Latin and Vernacular in Renaissance Spain*. Manchester, 72-82.
- Taylor, B. (ed.) 2004. *Alonso de Cartagena (?), Cathoniana confectio: A Latin gloss on the Disticha Catonis and the Contemptum mundi*. Bristol.
- Thomas, R. 1982. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Ussani, V. 1918. 'Per Lucano *De bellis Punicis* e la critica dei *Dicta Catonis*' *Rassegna italiana di lingue e letterature classiche* 1, 11-16.
- Woelfflin, E. (ed.) 1869. *Pubilii Syri Sententiae*. Leipzig.
- Zarncke, F. 1852. *Der deutsche Cato*. Leipzig.

AFRICAIN ROMANISÉ OU ROMAIN AFRICANISÉ? L'IDENTITÉ CULTURELLE DE MARCUS CORNELIUS FRONTO

Par Jens E. Degn

Summary: Fronto's career as an orator and a teacher as well as his literary activities has caused much debate about his identity and allegiance to Rome and Africa respectively. The article traces the different interpretations of Fronto's background and shows how they have been closely linked to the ruling ideologies of their day: nationalism, colonialism and post-colonialism. The article concludes that the letter *M. Caes.* 2.3, to the mother of Marcus Aurelius, rather than being proof of any national identity or affiliation to either Rome or Africa should be understood as an elaborate display of *paideia* aimed at positioning Fronto firmly within a Greek cultural context.¹

Je me comparerai donc à Anacharsis, non pas, par Zeus, sur le plan de la sagesse, mais sur celui de notre état commun de barbare. Il était un Scythe issu des nomades scythes; je suis un Libyen issu des Libyens nomades. (*M. Caes.* 2.3)

Avant même la découverte par Angelo Mai d'une première partie de la correspondance de Marcus Cornelius Fronto en 1815, les savants discutaient

- 1 Nous tenons à remercier M. Yann Le Bohec pour nous avoir encouragé à étudier l'histoire romaine. De même, nous aimerions remercier M. Erik Christiansen et M. Helmuth Schledermann pour leurs conseils et Mme Suzanne Hanon qui a relu et corrigé le texte.

de son origine. Certains voulaient attribuer à Fronton une origine gauloise,² tandis que d'autres le considéraient comme originaire de Cirta en Afrique,³ et d'autres encore voyaient en lui tout simplement un auteur romain.⁴

Si une des lettres découvertes par Mai en 1815 a fourni la preuve que Cirta était effectivement la *patria* de Fronton,⁵ ceci n'a fait que ranimer le débat sur l'importance de cette origine. Or, pour les chercheurs du début du XIXe siècle, Fronton se transformait en paradoxe: 'africain' de naissance, il avait été comblé des honneurs réservés seulement aux plus grands esprits romains. Ses contemporains le considéraient comme le plus grand orateur latin de son temps,⁶ et il avait été choisi comme précepteur des deux princes et futurs empereurs Marc Aurèle et Lucius Verus. A la mort de Fronton, Marc Aurèle aurait demandé au sénat d'élever une statue en son honneur,⁷ et la postérité en est même arrivée à l'égaliser avec Cicéron.⁸

On a cherché à résoudre ce paradoxe de diverses manières, tantôt en dissimulant l'origine africaine de Fronton, tantôt en réévaluant son statut d'orateur romain. On a examiné la correspondance pour y trouver des informations qui pouvaient éclairer la question. Une lettre en particulier, *M. Caes.* 2.3,⁹ écrite en grec et destinée à la mère de Marc Aurèle, occupe une place importante dans la discussion de l'origine de Fronton. Récemment, Pascale Fleury a réaffirmé cette importance:

L'identification de la patrie de Fronton pose également certains pro-

2 Savaron 1680 cité par Bayle 1722: 1292; Zedler 1733: 2168; Jöcher 1750: 787; Longchamps 1767: 142-44.

3 Bayle 1722: 1291-93; Freytag 1732: I.

4 Tiraboschi 1777: 243.

5 *Ad Am.* 2.11 (van den Hout 1988: 199-200).

6 D.C. 69.18.3.

7 *Hist. Aug. Aur.* 2.5.

8 *Paneg.* 8[5].14.

9 Il n'existe pas encore une dénomination fixe des lettres. En dénommant la lettre *M. Caes.* 2.3, nous suivons l'édition critique la plus récente de van den Hout (van den Hout 1988: 21-24) qui a formé la base de deux traductions récentes (Portalupi 1997: 94-101 et Fleury 2003: 72-77). Dans les éditions et les traductions antérieures, la lettre a été appelée: Martín 1992: 119-22 = 41; van den Hout 1954: 20-23 = *M. Caes.* 1.10; Haines 1919: 130-37 = *Epist. Graec.* 1; Naber 1867: 239-42 = *Epist. Graec.* 1; Cassan 1830: 122-31 = *M. Caes.* 8; Mai 1823: 38-43 = *M. Caes.* 2.2; Niebuhr 1816: 57-61 = *M. Caes.* 2.5; Mai 1816: 400-11 = *Epist. Graec.* 2.

blèmes, non pas que les chercheurs remettent en cause son origine africaine – révélée entre autres par la fréquente mention de cette région dans la correspondance ...¹⁰

Dans la référence qui accompagne ce passage, Fleury renvoie le lecteur à *M. Caes.* 2.3 qu'elle juge 'significative à ce propos'. Au cours des années, les chercheurs n'ont pas fait preuve d'une pareille certitude. Au contraire, les interprétations du passage sont légion. Nous retenons donc que la lettre ainsi que la recherche relative à cette lettre méritent d'être réexaminées.

Fronton et sa correspondance constituent un objet d'étude privilégié pour plusieurs raisons. D'abord, la correspondance est une source riche et variée qui, malgré l'état pitoyable du palimpseste dans lequel elle a été conservée, nous procure une base solide pour pénétrer dans la pensée de Fronton et les conceptions de la société dans laquelle il vécut.¹¹ En outre, la découverte relativement tardive de la correspondance et, par là, les incertitudes qui ont longtemps subsisté par rapport à son origine ethnique, nous permettent de retracer plus clairement la formation et la diffusion des opinions des chercheurs modernes sur Fronton.

Avant de réexaminer la lettre *M. Caes.* 2.3, nous esquisserons la manière dont la recherche a abordé la question de l'identité et de l'origine de Fronton au cours des deux derniers siècles.¹² Il semble y avoir trois moments décisifs. Dans un premier temps, la recherche, surtout italienne et allemande, semble tirer son inspiration des sentiments nationalistes qu'engendrèrent les guerres napoléoniennes. Dans un deuxième temps, c'est l'entreprise coloniale qui va marquer surtout la recherche française et anglaise des dernières décennies du XIX^e siècle. Fronton est de plus en plus étudié dans le cadre de la romanisation de l'Afrique du Nord. Enfin, nous relevons un renouveau

¹⁰ Fleury 2003: 12.

¹¹ Cf. Champlin 1980: 3.

¹² Pour le bilan de la recherche, nous nous sommes basés sur les comptes rendus de Cova 1994; Cova 1971; Marache 1965: 213-25 (couvre les publications parues entre 1938-64); Penndorf 1941: 93-104 (couvre les publications parues entre 1929-37); Hache 1931: 7-15 (couvre les publications parues entre 1918-28); Klusmann 1961: 377-78 (originellement publié en 1912, il couvre les publications parues entre 1878-96); Burkhard 1903: 170-73 (couvre les publications parues 1897-1902); Burkhard 1897: 92-94 (couvre les publications parues 1891-96); Burkhard 1895: 192-204 (couvre les publications parues 1880-1890); Sittl 1888: 238-41 (couvre les publications parues 1879-84).

d'intérêt pour l'identité de Fronton à la suite de la décolonisation du Maghreb. Les reconsidérations que cette époque voit apparaître sur la notion d'identité se propagent aussi aux études de l'histoire romaine et résultent en une diversification des approches à la question de l'identité de Fronton.

1. HISTORIOGRAPHIE RELATIVE À L'IDENTITÉ CULTURELLE DE FRONTON

1.1. Nationalisme italien et allemand

Ce furent d'abord les savants italiens et, surtout, les érudits allemands qui s'intéressèrent à Fronton et à son identité et à son origine ethnique.¹³ Il n'est pas étonnant qu'Angelo Mai (1782-1854), celui qui a trouvé le palimpseste, ait souhaité avoir fait une découverte importante. Par conséquent, il voyait en Fronton ce grand orateur romain qu'avaient promis tant d'auteurs antiques et, en particulier, l'auteur du panégyrique de Constantin.¹⁴ Dans sa première édition de la correspondance,¹⁵ Mai affirma que Fronton était 'de la nation libyenne':

Le très charmant et élégant écrivain Fronton était de la nation Libyenne, Cirtéen de patrie. Car, la fine fleur de la langue latine ne pousse pas seulement en Italie. Or, sans parler d'autres, Phèdres qui naquit en

¹³ Crossley 1882: 47-48; Cawley 1971: 7.

¹⁴ Ainsi, dans le dédicace au comte Mellerio qui ouvre l'édition de 1816, Mai pouvait écrire: 'Comment aurais-je pu mériter une place dans le monde des lettrés si j'avais encore tenu caché un auteur si excellent? Or, au moment où les mots de Cicéron s'étaient éteints et le Forum Romain manquait une voix vraiment éloquente, alors cet orateur surgit de Cirta. Par sa langue s'est créée une nouvelle éloquence qui semblait en pacte avec le style. (Quomodo enim de litteraria republica bene meritis essem, si tam excellentem auctorem diutius in tenebris latere voluissem? Sane quum Tulli litterae iam pridem conticuissent, et romanum forum voce satis eloquenti careret, Cirta se demum iste Orator extulit, cuius lingua, ceu parente elocutionis, nova est disertorum concio procreata.)

¹⁵ Nous n'avons pas vu Mai 1815. Nous faisons référence à l'édition parue l'année suivante à Francfort et jugée par van den Hout 1988: lxx 'exemplar fidelissimum nonnulla tantum errata typographica habens, at contra pauca menda Maiana tacite corriguntur.'

Thracie et Tércence de Carthage, surpassèrent même les romains indigènes en ce qui concerne leur nature docile et leur parler suave.¹⁶

Lorsqu'il compare Fronton à Phèdre et à Tércence, Mai trahit, nous semble-t-il, une préoccupation: cette origine africaine rendrait Fronton moins 'romain'. Mai a procédé à l'examen des faits qui lient Fronton à sa patrie. Il renvoie à *M. Caes.* 2.3 et à *Ad Am.* 2.II:

Toutefois, beaucoup d'écrivains français qui rangent parmi les hommes intelligents et savants, ont essayé de réclamer Fronton à leur Aquitaine. Repasser en examen ces arguments en eux-mêmes douteux, réfutés méticuleusement dans les notes du Lexique de Bayle et de même ridiculisés par Tiraboschi, n'a plus d'intérêt et il ne faut pas trop s'y arrêter, car dans la seconde lettre grecque, Fronton lui-même se déclare Libyen; et encore il se définit citoyen cirtéen dans la sixième lettre du second livre des lettres aux amis. Donc, Fronton est Cirtéen, bien que l'on voie que sa descendance maternelle peut être retracée à la ville béotienne de Chéronée. Or, l'auteur savant et quasiment antique, Jean de Salisbury, confirme, ce que certains ont soutenu, notamment que Fronton, le précepteur de l'empereur Marc, était le petit-fils de Plutarque.¹⁷

Mais l'exposé de Mai prend un tournant surprenant. Après avoir constaté que Fronton est né à Cirta, Mai s'est servi d'une source médiévale, Jean de Salisbury, pour lui attribuer une origine grecque. Ainsi, il faisait de lui un

16 'Venustissimus Scriptor atque elegantissimus Fronto natione Libys fuit, patria Cirtensis. Neque enim omnes latinæ linguæ flosculi in ipsa Italia nati sunt. Nam, ut alios sileam, Phædrus in Thracia genitus, Terentius Carthagine, romanos ipsos indigenas docilitate ingenii et sermonis latini suavitate superaverunt.' Mai 1816: iv.

17 'Ceterum, ut sunt hominum ingenia partium studiosa, Galli multi Scriptores oratorem Frontonem Aquitaniae suæ vindicare conati sunt. Quorum argumenta per se futilia, et in notis ad Baylii Lexicon diligentissime confutata, a Tiraboscho item irrita, iam proffere non interest, vel diutius in hac quæstione versari, cum ipse Fronto in Epistula secunda græca Libem se dicat; in Epistula autem sexta alterius Libri ad Amicos Cirtensem adeo se civem satis certo significet. Etsi autem Cirtensis est Fronto, maternum tamen genus ab urbe Bœotiae Chæronea traxisse videtur. Perdoctus enim et satis antiquus auctor Ioannes Sarisburiensis ait quosdam existimasse Frontonem, qui Marco imperatori magister præfuit, Plutarchi fuisse nepotem.' Mai 1816: v-vi.

petit-fils de Plutarque du côté maternel,¹⁸ et il a opéré un véritable changement de cadre en se basant sur l'histoire familiale au lieu de l'histoire personnelle. Donc, Mai fait de Fronton un descendant des Grecs.

L'illustre poète (et philologue) Giacomo Leopardi (1798-1837) démontra très tôt combien cette dernière idée de Mai était mal fondée.¹⁹ Ainsi, dans le *De Vita et Scriptis M. Cornelii Frontonis Commentarius* déjà rédigé en 1815, Leopardi distingua prudemment notre Fronton d'avec celui d'Émèse. Toujours sur l'origine de Fronton, il laisse place au doute caractéristique du savant:

Il n'est pas certain que Fronton ait considéré Rome comme sa patrie. Le fait semble devenir moins clair chez ceux qui voulait faire de lui un Gaulois, notamment Longchamps et les auteurs Maurins de l'histoire littéraire gauloise. Il faudrait consulter le savant Girolamo Tiraboschi. Ceux qui prennent l'orateur cirtéen mentionné par Mincius Felix pour Marcus Cornelius Fronton, pensent que Fronton est originaire de la Numidie.²⁰

Cependant, Leopardi partageait l'enthousiasme de Mai pour Fronton. Cet enthousiasme semble lié à son amour pour l'Italie et à son animosité contre la France.²¹ Or, Leopardi, qui espérait trouver dans les Italiens des successeurs dignes des Romains et des Grecs,²² déclara que la découverte de la correspondance était un cadeau au peuple italien.²³ On peut donc dire que Leopardi cherchait à faire appartenir Fronton aux Italiens, comme d'ailleurs

18 Mai 1816: v. On retrouve ensuite cette idée chez Bähr 1828 et encore chez Charles-Picard 1990 et Portalupi 1997.

19 Flora 1953: 642-44.

20 'Utrum Romam Fronto patriam habuerit, incertum. Res minus perspecta fuisse videtur iis, qui Gallum eum faciunt, Longchamps nimirum et Maurinis auctoribus Historiae Gallicae litterariae. Consulendus vir doctus Hieronymus Tiraboschi. Frontonem ex Numidia oriundum putant, qui Cirtensem illum oratorem a Minucio Felice memoratum cum M. Cornelio Frontone eundem faciunt' (renvoyant dans la référence à la *Bibliotheca Latina* de Johann Albert Fabricius, que nous n'avons pas vu et Tillemont 1691). Cugioni 1878: 84.

21 Cf. Lettre à Mai, Flora 1953: 639.

22 Ainsi dans 'Agli Italiani', Flora 1953: 1070.

23 Flora 1953: 639.

Tiraboschi l'avait fait avant lui.²⁴ Dans son *Discorso sopra la vita e le opere de Marco Cornelio Frontone*, œuvre de vulgarisation qu'il avait rédigée au cours des quatre premiers mois de 1816, une bonne partie de la prudence érudite, dont il avait d'abord fait preuve, fut remplacée par une tendance à polémiquer.²⁵ Ici il reconnaît volontiers en Cirta le lieu de naissance de Fronton, d'autant plus que ce faisant il pouvait s'en prendre aux chercheurs français qui 'secondo la loro commoda costumanza, vollero rubar Frontone alla Numidia, e farlo di Aquitania'.²⁶ Cependant, Leopardi présentait avant tout Fronton comme un orateur romain, et la mention qu'il faisait de son origine, outre de ridiculiser les Français, semble devoir anticiper les réactions de ses contemporains:

Patria del nostro Frontone fu Cirta, metropoli della Numidia. L'Affrica, che è stata sempre considerata come la parte più barbara del mondo, ha prodotti ingegni, che tutte le altre parti di esso possono individuarli.²⁷

Alors que l'interprétation de Mai avait connu un certain succès,²⁸ les idées de Leopardi demeurèrent tout à fait inconnues du public jusqu'en 1878, où Gugioni publia les écrits philologiques jusqu'alors inédits.²⁹

Si Mai et Leopardi ne voyaient en l'origine africaine de Fronton aucune raison de mettre en question la valeur de ses écrits, le jugement des érudits allemands fut autrement incisif. En fait, Fronton fut vite associé à cette Afrique 'depuis toujours considérée barbare'. Si Mai et Leopardi avaient essayé de réconcilier le côté 'romain' et le côté 'africain' de Fronton, les chercheurs allemands en firent une véritable dichotomie. Dans leur conception, Fronton devint a-romain.³⁰ Les idées nationalistes de l'époque,

24 Tiraboschi 1777: 243. Pour Tiraboschi, le fait que Fronton ait vécu longtemps à Rome a suffi pour l'inclure dans son histoire de la littérature italienne.

25 Flora 1953: 639-56 et 1133.

26 Flora 1953: 642. Comparer aux attaques violentes contre les Français dans 'Agli Italiani', Flora 1953: 1170-81.

27 Flora 1953: 642.

28 Bähr 1828: 433; Charles-Picard 1959; Portalupi 1997: 25.

29 Pacella & Timpanaro 1969: 46. Ce n'est qu'après la redécouverte des écrits de Leopardi qu'est revenu l'intérêt pour Fronton en Italie, voir par exemple Linaker 1882: 382.

30 C'est notamment le cas pour H.C.A. Eichstädt *Inest M. Cornelii Frontonis Operum nuper in lucem protractorum Notitia et specimen*, 1816 que nous connaissons seulement à travers

souvent partagées et propagées par les érudits eux-mêmes, semblent avoir façonné leur conception de Fronton. Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776-1831) en est un bon exemple. Il devait profondément influencer la recherche ultérieure sur Fronton avec son édition de la correspondance publiée en 1816 et ensuite avec deux études publiées dans ses *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*. Bien que la question d'ethnicité et d'origine joue un rôle important dans les trois écrits, l'interprétation que Niebuhr a donnée de l'origine de Fronton change considérablement. Dans la préface de l'édition de 1816, très critique envers l'édition de Mai, Niebuhr déclare que Fronton, étant descendant de colons italiens, n'a rien d'africain:

Ainsi, quand il se dit Africain, à savoir Africain et Numide, cela ne signifie pas que l'on peut en déduire qu'il était d'origine étrangère ou que sa langue paternelle était autre que le latin ... Que Fronton ait fait remonter son origine à l'Italie, on peut le déduire du nom Cornelius.³¹

Dans cette interprétation, les racines ethniques de la famille prévalent donc sur le lieu de naissance et sur le passage de *M. Caes.* 2.3.³² Mai fit d'ailleurs sienne cette interprétation dans sa préface de l'édition de 1823 faisant suite à sa découverte d'une deuxième partie de la correspondance qui était à la bibliothèque du Vatican.³³

un compte rendu anonyme dans le *Leipziger Litteratur-Zeitung* (Anonyme 1816a:367-68). En outre, on voit le changement de conception dans une recension anonyme de l'édition de Mai dans le *Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung* (Anonyme 1816b: 763) où Fronton est décrit ainsi: 'Er schreibt freylich ungleich besser, als andre gelehrte Afrikaner, als ein Apuleius, aber er ist nicht frey von dem Fehlern sowohl des Zeitalters, dem er angehörte, als des Landes, aus dem abstammte.'

31 'Itaque quum se ipse Afrum dicit, Afrumque Numidam, non id adeo premendum est ut eum inde efficias peregrina stirpe ortum alio quam latino sermone patrio usum esse ... (...) Frontonem autem ab Italo genere originem duxisse vel ex ipso Cornelii nomine coniicere licet'. Niebuhr 1816: xix-xx.

32 Niebuhr 1816: xix, référence 4.

33 Mai 1823: xviii: 'La Patrie de Fronton était Cirta, jadis la demeure des rois numidiens bien fortifiée et florissante de littérature et d'arts. Car, Live et Diodore relatent que beaucoup d'entre ces rois numides, analysés par le jésuite Francisco Torres dans un commentaire notable, remplirent la ville de lettres grecques et d'autres arts. Nous savons de plusieurs traités et textes que le roi Juba II était fameux parmi ceux-ci. Dans cette ville, Fronton naquit (bien qu'il soit d'origine italienne comme l'indique son nom Cornelius,

Si Niebuhr, dans la préface de son édition, ne prêtait guère d'importance au lieu de naissance, il dressa une image tout à fait différente dans son essai *Ueber die zu Mailand entdeckten Schriften des Marcus Cornelius Fronto* écrit la même année. Ici, Niebuhr souligne l'appartenance provinciale de Fronton:

... die meisten lateinischen Litteratoren von Trajans Zeitalter an waren Provinzialen, die Latein als eine fremde Sprache erlernten. Dies bekennt Apulejus von sich, und es ist ebensowenig von unserm Fronto, als von ihm zu bezweifeln ... Für solche Provinzialen war es ein künstlicher Gesichtspunkt, Rom als ihr Vaterland zu betrachten.³⁴

Rome ne pouvait pas être considérée comme la patrie de Fronton, tout comme le latin ne pouvait pas passer pour sa langue maternelle. Pour Niebuhr, qui cherchait à expliquer ce qu'il considérait comme une décadence dans la littérature romaine et les débuts de la chute de l'empire romain, Fronton était devenu un exemple de la dilution du fait 'romain' sous l'influence de provinciaux. Il semble que Niebuhr tenait à cette interprétation, puisqu'il la répéta cinq ans plus tard en qualifiant Fronton de:

Verderber der alten Sprache, Verfälscher der Nationalität, und schuldig an der Ausartung des Geschmacks.³⁵

Nous proposons d'expliquer cette vision par les expériences personnelles de Niebuhr. La vie de Niebuhr est à plusieurs égards comparable à celle de

étant donc probablement descendant des colons nucléins de Sittius qui s'y étaient installés à l'époque du divin César. A Cirta, dis-je, Fronton naquit et se fit érudit en langues grecque et latine (Patria F[r]ontonis Cirta fuit, numidarum regum olim sedes, armis potens et litterarum quoque ornamentis diu florens: nam praeter multos numidas, quos peculiari commentario recensuit *A* Turrianus e soc. Iesu, ipsos eius reges graecis litteris et vario disciplinarum genere semet imbuisse tradunt Livius ac Diodorus. In his Iubam II regem plurimis scriptis et doctrina innumera inclaruisse scimus. Hac in urbe natus Fronto (origine tamen italica, ut eius nomen Cornelius suadet, et quidem genitus fortasse de Sittii nucerini colonis, qui Cirtam sub divo Iulio insederunt.) Cirtae, inquam, natus Fronto latinis impensius studiis quam graecis eruditus fuit.)'

³⁴ Niebuhr 1843: 61-62 (écrit en 1816).

³⁵ Niebuhr 1828: 326-27 (écrit en 1821).

Fronton. Né à Copenhague de parents allemands,³⁶ Niebuhr immigra en Prusse où il devint haut fonctionnaire au service du roi de Prusse. C'est dans cette fonction qu'il contribua à la reconstruction de la Prusse après les défaites infligées à ce pays par les armées napoléoniennes à Iéna et à Austerlitz.³⁷ Ces expériences eurent une profonde influence sur lui et il devint un pangermaniste convaincu, rallié à l'unification de l'Allemagne sous l'égide de la Prusse.³⁸ Ce que pensait Niebuhr du lieu de naissance et de l'origine ethnique est révélé dans une lettre adressée à Chr. A. Brandis (1790-1867), qui habitait alors à Copenhague:

It is very right and reasonable that you should wish to come to Prussia. That State in North Germany, which gladly receives every German, and regards him, when he has once entered her service, in the same light as a native citizen, is the true Germany; ... I would not exchange our nation for ancient Rome itself. In Denmark you, as a German, can never breathe freely, can never feel that you have a fatherland.³⁹

La lettre précède l'édition de la correspondance frontonienne de quelques mois. Nous pensons y voir le même genre de raisonnement que Niebuhr présentait pour le cas de Fronton: né en Afrique, il avait des racines italiques et avait immigré à Rome. Niebuhr lui-même était né au Danemark, avait des racines allemandes et avait immigré à Berlin. On pourrait ajouter que tous deux finirent comme précepteurs, Fronton de Marc Aurèle, Niebuhr du prince prussien. Cependant, nous voyons aussi apparaître dans la lettre des idées de pureté nationale qui peuvent expliquer pourquoi Niebuhr changea ensuite sa manière de voir Fronton. Il finit par ne pas considérer Fronton comme un romain 'pur'.

Friedrich Roth (1780-1852) autant que Niebuhr, parla de Fronton comme

36 Son père était originaire de Lüdingworth dans le pays de Hadelen, situé au Sud de l'Elbe, et sa mère était de Tübingen.

37 Nissen 1886: 650.

38 Non seulement Fronton, mais aussi son inventeur Mai subit un dur jugement à cause de son origine. Ainsi dans une lettre à l'anglais Lord Colchester, du 10 septembre 1822, où Niebuhr pouvait écrire: 'As a true Italian, his [Mai] mind is governed alternatively by vanity and avarice. But however provoking it be to us who have the good fortune to belong to nations differently animated ...' (Vischer 1981: 783).

39 Gerhard & Norvin 1929: 641 (26 septembre 1815).

un exemple de la décadence de l'empire romain dans un discours tenu devant l'Académie bavaroise en 1817 et publié plus tard. Roth, qui ne faisait référence ni à la recherche antérieure, ni à aucune source, se servait de la métaphore 'le sable d'Afrique' afin de décrire l'absence de pensées et d'informations utiles dans les lettres de Fronton, métaphore qui semble devoir souligner l'aridité littéraire de Fronton et le relier avec le désert très 'africain'.⁴⁰ Comme Niebuhr, Roth avait été très influencé par la catastrophe militaire d'Iéna, ce qui l'avait amené à écrire un *De bello borussico commentarius*, dont le titre rappelle l'œuvre fameuse de César. Nous retrouvons dans cette œuvre le même genre de considérations de pureté nationale que Niebuhr avait exposées, et Roth va jusqu'à expliquer les défaites prussiennes par la décadence du peuple germanique. En décrivant cette décadence, il ne manque pas de faire des comparaisons avec les *maleficii* puniques.⁴¹ Chez Roth, l'ordre du jour se confondait donc aussi avec la conception de l'histoire romaine et vice versa.

Nous retrouvons les idées de Roth et de Niebuhr résumées dans la *Grundriss der Römischen Litteratur* de Gottfried Bernhardt (1800-75).⁴² L'œuvre de Bernhardt est importante car elle eut un immense retentissement. En outre, nous retrouvons chez Bernhardt une radicalisation de l'image de Fronton comme 'africain'. Or, si Niebuhr se limitait à parler de Fronton comme 'provinzial' et que Roth se servait de métaphores, Bernhardt le décrit purement et simplement comme un 'Africain'.⁴³ Il rattacha Fronton à ce qu'il appelle 'Afrikanische Latinität'.⁴⁴ La conception négative que Bernhardt avait des Africains n'était pas nouvelle, elle remontait à Jean Luis Vivès et elle est partagée par beaucoup de ses contemporains.⁴⁵ Ce qu'il y a de nouveau chez Bernhardt, c'est qu'il relie explicitement Fronton à l'image stéréotypée de l'Afrique et des Africains.

Bien que deux contemporains de Bernhardt, Johann Christian Felix Bähr (1798-1872) et Anton Westermann (1806-69) hésitent à juger Fronton 'Africain' (Bähr se limite à reconnaître chez Fronton '... manche neue fremdartige

⁴⁰ Roth 1817: 4.

⁴¹ Roth 1809: 127.

⁴² Bernhardt 1830: 304 (référence à l'édition de Niebuhr et à la monographie de Roth).

⁴³ Bernhardt 1830: 304.

⁴⁴ Bernhardt 1830: 131-32.

⁴⁵ Bernhardt 1830: 133, référence 232 renvoyait aux œuvres de Vivès et de Casaubon. Cf. Lancel 1985a: 162-63.

Ausdrücke und Wendungen⁴⁶ et Westermann rejette l'idée que Fronton était un représentant d'une 'école africaine' de rhétorique⁴⁷), la perception de Fronton comme Africain devait s'établir solidement.

Nous voyons notamment comment la conception de Fronton et de son œuvre comme 'africains' s'affirma dans l'article fondamental publié dans la *Allgemeine Encyklopaedie der Wissenschaften und Künste* de Ersch et Gruber (1850) par Friedrich August Eckstein (1810-85). Ce philologue allemand influença Samuel Adrian Naber (1828-98), dont l'édition de la correspondance de Fronton publiée en 1867 devait rester l'édition de référence jusqu'au milieu du XXe siècle.⁴⁸ Or, Eckstein rassembla toutes les preuves données jusqu'alors des liens étroits de Fronton avec l'Afrique:

Seine Heimath ist die numidische Stadt Cirta, die schon im 1. Jahrh. v. Chr. durch römische Soldaten bevölkert zu einer blühenden Colonie erwuchs und noch jetzt unter dem Namen Constantine die volkreichste Stadt Algeriens ist. Er selbst nennt sie *Ad amic. II, 10: 311*; auf sie führt auch das Zeugniß seines Zeitgenossen Minucius Felix (*Octav. c. 9. id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio*, vergl. mit c. 31. *tuus Fronto non ut affirmator testimonium fecit, sed convicium ut orator aspersit*). Darum bezeichnet er sich in griechisch geschriebenen Briefen als Libyer, wie *ad Marc. Caes. II, 2:43*. ἐγὼ δὲ Λίβυς τῶν Λιβύων τῶν νομάδων).⁴⁹

C'est la première fois dans la recherche allemande, depuis une recension anonyme dans le *Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung* de 1816, que *M. Caes. 2.3* est considérée comme 'preuve' de l'origine africaine de Fronton. Le texte d'Eckstein constitue en quelque sorte un pivot dans la recherche allemande. Eckstein fit le bilan de la recherche publiée jusque là.⁵⁰ Dorénavant, les

46 Bähr 1828: 436.

47 Westermann 1835: 310 partageait les idées sur l'Africain de Bernhardt à qui il fait aussi référence. Cependant, il ne reconnaît pas ces traits en Fronton: 'Im schroffsten Gegensatz zu diesem afrikanischen Wesen steht Fronto, und ihn mit diesem in Verbindung zu setzen, dafür giebt es keinen andern Grund, als weil der Zufall ihn in Afrika geboren werden liess.'

48 Naber 1867: xxxii-xxxiv, remercie Eckstein et fait référence à son article qu'il qualifie de synthèse des travaux de Bernhardt, Bähr et Westermann.

49 Eckstein 1850: 442.

50 Eckstein 1850: 445-46

œuvres de référence les plus importantes renvoyaient à l'article d'Eckstein et présentaient un bilan analogue des sources attestant l'origine africaine. Cela vaut pour l'histoire littéraire de Teuffel, l'article de Brzoska dans la *Real-Encyclopedie* de Pauly-Wissowa et, plus tard, l'histoire littéraire de Schanz-Hosius, œuvres qui, à leur tour, sont devenues des références pour les érudits du monde entier.⁵¹

Les chercheurs allemands continuèrent à s'intéresser à Fronton et à nuancer leurs idées sur l'importance de son origine pour sa vie et son œuvre. Ainsi, Martin Hertz (1818-95), dans son livre *Renaissance und Rokoko in der römischen Litteratur* (1865), développa l'idée du 'tragikomische Zeitalter des Rokoko', dont Fronton aurait été l'écrivain prototype avec son manque de goût, son amour pour le trivial et son *Schwulst*.⁵² En linguistique, Alexander Budinsky, Karl Sittl et bien d'autres formulèrent leurs thèses sur le latin africain à partir, entre autres, des écrits de Fronton.⁵³ Parmi les historiens, Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903) et Hermann Dessau (1856-1931) décrivirent Fronton comme Africain.⁵⁴ Fronton, autrefois décrit comme la seconde gloire de l'éloquence romaine, était devenu 'étranger' à Rome, signe de sa décadence en matière linguistique, culturelle et intellectuelle, et la lettre *M. Caes.* 2.3 en était devenue la preuve.

1.2. Colonialisme français et anglais: les débuts des études de romanisation

Ce n'est qu'à partir des années 1860 que les savants français commencèrent à s'intéresser à Fronton. Hors de l'Italie et de l'Allemagne, Fronton ne reçut pas beaucoup d'attention avant la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. Certes, l'intérêt initial suscité par la découverte du palimpseste frontonien avait entraîné quelque attention. En 1816, dans le *Journal des Savans*, Pierre-Claude-François Daunou (1761-1840) avait publié une recension de l'édition de Mai, et en 1830, l'avocat français Armand Cassan (1803-37) avait présenté une traduction française de la correspondance.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Teuffel 1870: 730-34; Brzoska 1901: 1312-40; Schanz 1922: 100.

⁵² Hertz 1865: 25-33.

⁵³ Budinsky 1881: 259-60; Sittl 1882: 77-143. Pour un compte rendu des études d'*africitas*, voir aussi Lancel 1985a: 161-82.

⁵⁴ Mommsen 1885: 654-56, surtout 656; Dessau 1930: 478.

⁵⁵ Dans les courtes mentions que nous avons trouvées datant de la première partie du XIXe

D'abord, on s'intéressa à Fronton en sa qualité de précepteur des futurs empereurs Marc Aurèle et Lucius Verus,⁵⁶ mais l'origine africaine devait de plus en plus marquer l'idée que les chercheurs français se faisaient de Fronton. Ainsi, dans son *Tableau de l'empire romain* (1863), Amédée Thierry (1797-1873) présenta Fronton comme 'le Numide Corn. Fronto', ce qui ne l'empêcha pas de le décrire comme la gloire littéraire de l'Afrique et d'insister sur sa qualité d'ami vertueux de Marc Aurèle.⁵⁷

Les œuvres de Victor Duruy (1811-94) montrent comment la conception de Fronton se développa au cours de ces années. Dans son *Histoire romaine* publiée en 1867, Duruy décrivit tout simplement Fronton comme 'le rhéteur Fronton (sous Antonin) qu'on osa comparer à Cicéron' sans aucune mention de son origine. Neuf ans plus tard, en 1876, lorsque Duruy publia son *Histoire des Romains*, cette image avait changé considérablement et l'origine avait acquis une place centrale. D'une part, nous y rencontrons une prise de position personnelle plus accentuée vis-à-vis du personnage de Fronton et Duruy rappelle à son lecteur que '... l'on sait déjà ce qu'il faut penser de Fronton, malgré l'amitié de Marc Aurèle.'⁵⁸ D'autre part, Duruy peint Fronton comme le résultat de l'œuvre civilisatrice de Rome en Afrique.⁵⁹ Nous pensons que les idées colonialistes de Duruy se confondent dans cette description – d'ailleurs, Duruy lui-même le dit explicitement:

Sur cette terre où nous reportons la civilisation de l'Europe, le nom de Rome appelle celui de la France, et les deux noms se mêlent involontairement ...⁶⁰

Car, selon Duruy, la France était l'héritière de Rome en Afrique, et par conséquent, l'histoire de l'Afrique romaine était une page de l'histoire nationale de la France!⁶¹ Donc, le succès de Rome était aussi le succès de la France. On pourrait dire, à l'instar de Leopardi (qui jadis avait dénoncé le

siècle l'origine est peu mentionnée. Pierron 1852: 605-9; Boissonade 1856: 240; Joubert 1856: 946-49.

56 Par exemple de Suckau 1857; des Vergers 1860; Berger 1866; Boissier 1868.

57 Thierry 1863: 230.

58 Duruy 1876: 392

59 Duruy 1876: 205-6.

60 Duruy 1876: 205.

61 Duruy 1876: 206.

détournement de Fronton par les chercheurs français), qu'en s'emparant de l'Afrique, les chercheurs français s'approprièrent encore une fois Fronton.⁶²

La tendance à rattacher Fronton à l'histoire africaine fut renforcée à partir de l'œuvre de Gustave Boissière, *Esquisse de l'administration romaine en Afrique du Nord*, publiée en 1878. Boissière reprit et modifia la description de Thierry en y ajoutant une quantité considérable d'ironie.⁶³ Boissière ne voyait en Fronton aucune gloire littéraire, il se moquait du passage du Panegyricus, qui l'avait proclamé égal à Cicéron, et il omettait toute mention de l'amitié avec Marc Aurèle.⁶⁴ Même si Boissière ne consacre qu'une référence en bas de page à Fronton, son œuvre est importante, car elle marque un changement conceptuel dans la recherche sur Fronton. Si Thierry et Duruy avaient traité de Fronton dans le cadre de l'histoire romaine en général, le livre de Boissière traite exclusivement de l'Afrique. De même, il faut rapprocher l'œuvre de Boissière aux études de 'romanisation' que la fin des années 1870 vit naître en Allemagne, en France et en Angleterre.⁶⁵ Dorénavant, dans les études sur Fronton s'imisce la question de la 'romanisation', entendue comme l'assimilation des habitants indigènes après la conquête romaine.

L'intérêt pour l'Afrique et ses habitants n'était pas nouveau en France, présente en Algérie depuis 1830. Fronton, lui, n'avait pas auparavant été l'objet de l'attention dans la recherche relative à l'Afrique. L'engagement colonial français en Afrique du Nord s'intensifia après la chute du Second Empire à la suite de la défaite de Sedan. Au congrès de Berlin en 1878, les pouvoirs coloniaux se partagèrent entre eux l'Afrique, reconnaissant à la France non seulement l'Algérie mais aussi la Tunisie comme sphère

62 Flora 1953: 642.

63 Comparer Thierry 1863: 230 'Toutes les gloires littéraires de l'Afrique pâlirent d'abord devant le Numide Corn. Fronto, que l'engouement public proclama l'égal de Cicéron, mais dont nous ne connaissons point les œuvres oratoires, et en qui nous devons estimer surtout le précepteur et le vertueux ami de Marc Aurèle.' avec Boissière 1878: 380, référence 1: 'Toutes les gloires littéraires de l'Afrique pâlirent d'abord devant le Numide Corn. Fronto, que l'engouement public proclama l'égal de Cicéron: non secundum, sed alterum decus, a dit je ne sais trop quel fanatique admirateur', encore repris dans Boissière 1883: 610.

64 Boissière 1878: 379-80.

65 De Ceuleneer 1881: 194-95.

d'influence. C'est dans ce contexte qu'il faut considérer le renouveau d'intérêt pour Fronton et son origine africaine.

Si nous voyons dans les œuvres de Duruy et de Bossière l'entrée de l'histoire coloniale dans les études sur Fronton, le livre 'Les Africains' de Paul Monceaux (1859-1941) constitue en quelque sorte l'apogée. Chez Monceaux, qui tirait son inspiration et des événements coloniaux et des thèses de Sittl et de Wöllflin sur 'l'africitas',⁶⁶ la vie et l'œuvre de Fronton furent surtout interprétées à partir de l'origine ethnique. Même Cirta, la ville d'origine de Fronton, reçut un attribut ethnique et fut décrite comme 'une vieille cité berbère'. Pour Monceaux, Fronton était par son sang, par son caractère et même par ses vices, un 'Africain de cœur'.⁶⁷ Que Fronton se soit senti aussi Africain lui-même est attesté, selon Monceaux, par *M. Caes.* 2.3:

Il est une région où l'influence de Fronton fut beaucoup plus durable: c'est l'Afrique. Il avait conservé d'étroites relations avec son pays natal. En réalité, malgré son long séjour à Rome, il était resté jusqu'au bout un rhéteur africain. Il écrivait un jour à l'impératrice Faustine [sic! Domitia Lucilla] 'je suis un barbare ... Je suis un Libyen, et de la région des Libyens nomades'.⁶⁸

Monceaux a été parmi les propagateurs les plus convaincus de la thèse d'une particularité africaine en matière de littérature et de langue. Le portrait qu'il dresse des 'Africains' et de Fronton a déjà été critiqué par des contemporains comme par exemple l'illustre Gaston Boissier (1823-1908) et Edouard Norden (1868-1941).⁶⁹ Dans une recension dévastatrice du livre de Monceaux, Boissier détruisait l'une après l'autre ses thèses.⁷⁰ Boissier dresse un portrait tout à fait différent de Fronton dans son livre *L'Algérie romaine* (1895). Même si l'on retrouve chez Boissier des expressions essentialistes portant sur la race, l'influence du climat, etc., cet auteur fait une exception dans le cas de Fronton:

66 Monceaux 1894: 3 et 32. Voir aussi Lancel 1985a: 164-66.

67 Monceaux 1894: 224.

68 Monceaux 1894: 240. Dans la référence qui accompagne ce jugement, Monceaux renvoie à Naber 1867: 242 (*Epist. Graec.* 1 = *M. Caes.* 2.3).

69 Pour un résumé de la critique de l'œuvre de Monceaux voir l'analyse admirable de Serge Lancel 1985a: 165-67.

70 Boissier 1895a: 37-46.

Assurément Fronton n'oublia pas le pays d'où il était sorti; nous le voyons accepter d'être patron de Calama et de Cirta, et il s'est chargé de remercier l'empereur, dans un discours pompeux, au nom des Carthaginois, qui avaient reçu de lui quelque faveur. Il est pourtant probable qu'une fois sa fortune faite, il est resté à Rome, où le retenaient sa grande situation et ses hautes amitiés. De bonne heure il a cessé d'être un provincial pour devenir un de ces grands personnages qui appartenaient à l'empire entier.⁷¹

L'érudit allemand Edouard Norden ne croyait pas non plus aux idées de Monceaux, qu'il rejeta dans son *Die Antike Kunstprosa*.⁷² Son analyse de *M. Caes.* 2.3 se révèle particulièrement intéressante. Il finit par conclure que cette lettre était tout simplement un artifice atticiste conforme au goût sophistique de l'époque.⁷³

En dépit de ces critiques, ce fut la vision de Monceaux qui l'emporta. Elle eut un grand succès en France, en Angleterre et ailleurs.⁷⁴ Dans les années 1950, Jacques Heurgon (1903-1995), défendait toujours la vision de Monceaux dans un célèbre essai intitulé *Fronton de Cirta* publié à la veille de la décolonisation du Maghreb.⁷⁵ Pour Heurgon, Fronton était 'un Africain de souche' et *M. Caes.* 2.3 en était le témoignage personnel de Fronton:

Fronton était issu d'une famille riche de Constantine, et c'était un Africain de souche: nous avons là-dessus son témoignage personnel. Dans une de ses lettres grecques il se proclame Libyen, c'est-à-dire indigène de l'Afrique du Nord, 'Libyen d'entre les Libyens Numides.'⁷⁶

71 Boissier 1895b: 273.

72 Norden 1958: 361, référence 2. (La première édition parut en 1899.)

73 Norden 1958: 363-64. On se réfère aussi à Norden 1954: 98 et Marache 1952: 117-19.

74 Par exemple en France: Toutain 1896: 291; Jullien 1931: 207. En Angleterre par exemple: Graham 1902: 145 (echo de la théorie de Monceaux que Fronton aurait préféré le proconsulat d'Afrique à celui d'Asie) et 307 (pour l'interprétation générale de l'histoire de l'Afrique romaine); Ellis 1904: 6; Bouchier 1913: 8-10.

75 L'essai connut un grand succès auprès des érudits, cf. les jugements de Marache 1965 et de Cova 1971. Heurgon 1957-59: 141, référence 1, reconnaît sa dette envers Monceaux à qui il semble aussi avoir emprunté le titre 'Fronton de Cirta' puisque ceci figurait comme titre de chapitre chez Monceaux.

76 Heurgon 1957-1959: 141.

Le succès de l'œuvre de Monceaux se voit aussi dans *La civilisation de l'Afrique romaine* (1959) de Gilbert Charles-Picard. Même si Charles-Picard n'accorde qu'un rôle secondaire à la naissance et à l'origine ethnique,⁷⁷ et même s'il ne partage pas l'interprétation de *M. Caes. 2.3* proposée par Monceaux,⁷⁸ il nous présente toutefois Fronton comme 'L'Africain le plus en vue au milieu du II^e siècle' et renvoie son lecteur à l'œuvre de Monceaux.⁷⁹

Il faut aussi attirer l'attention sur le travail d'un autre historien français, spécialiste de l'Afrique du Nord, Louis Leschi (1893-1954). Vingt ans plus tôt, Leschi avait traité de Fronton en tant qu'enfant romanisé de Cirta. Leschi estimait que *M. Caes. 2.3* n'était pas seulement la preuve que Fronton était africain, mais qu'il était aussi fier de l'être:

M. Cornelius Fronton était né à Cirta autour de l'année 100, et il se vantait d'être un Libyen parmi les Libyens nomades.⁸⁰

En Grande-Bretagne, les études sur Fronton se multiplièrent aussi à la suite de l'engagement colonial en Afrique, mais un peu plus tardivement qu'en France.⁸¹ Tirant leur inspiration des études allemandes et françaises déjà citées, les chercheurs anglais donnèrent à Fronton tantôt une origine italique, tantôt ils virent en lui un 'Africain' plus ou moins indigène, tantôt un 'Romain' opposé à la culture grecque.

La tendance à rattacher Fronton à l'Afrique se voit d'abord dans une petite étude publiée pour la première fois en 1877 par Hastings Crossley.⁸²

77 Charles-Picard 1959: 103. Repris dans Charles-Picard 1990: 101.

78 Charles-Picard 1959: 128: 'Bien qu'il affectât de se dire, au faite de sa gloire "Libyen issu des Libyens nomades", il descendait sans doute d'une famille italienne établie avec Sittius dans la vieille capitale Massyle. Nous ignorons malheureusement l'histoire de ses ancêtres; on soupçonne seulement que par sa mère, il se rattachait à une famille grecque de Béotie et qu'un vague cousinage l'unissait à Plutarque.' Repris dans Charles-Picard 1990: 120.

79 Charles-Picard 1959: 127-28. Dans la référence qui accompagne cet énoncé, Charles-Picard renvoie à l'œuvre de Monceaux et à Bayet: *Littérature latine* tandis que, dans la réédition de 1990: 12, il renvoie à Le Glay 1982.

80 Leschi 1937: 38.

81 Pour une analyse de l'influence du colonialisme sur la recherche anglaise relative à l'histoire romaine de la fin du XIX^e et du début du XX^e siècle, voir Betts 1971 et Edwards 1999.

82 Avant l'étude de Crossley, il ne semble pas que les chercheurs anglais aient beaucoup traité de Fronton. Crossley ne cite que deux chercheurs anglophones – Alan et Ellis, qui

Fronton est successivement appelé ‘the African master’, ‘the aged African’, ‘the old Numidian’, ‘the African orator’ etc.⁸³ Ensuite, dans l’histoire littéraire de Charles Thomas Crutwell (1847-1911), publiée en 1877 et dans l’histoire littéraire de William Henry Simcox (1843-89) publiée en 1883, Fronton est le représentant d’une latinité africaine.⁸⁴

Un peu plus tard, en 1895, John William MacKail (1859-1945) ne voyait pas en Fronton un ‘Africain’ ethnique, mais il pensait qu’il avait été influencé par la géographie et la nature de son lieu de naissance:

Fronto was of African origin; and though it does not follow that he was not of pure Roman blood, the influence of a semi-tropical atmosphere and African surroundings altered the type, and produced a new strain, which we can trace later under different forms in the great African school of ecclesiastical writers headed by Tertullian and Cyprian, and even to a modified degree in Augustine himself.⁸⁵

La parution des premières histoires de l’Afrique romaine en langue anglaise ne fit que renforcer l’image de Fronton comme Africain. Ainsi, dans son *Roman Africa*, Alexander Graham, suivant l’exemple de Monceaux, réclamait Fronton pour l’histoire africaine:

On taking a general survey of the representatives of literature in Africa during the latter half of the second century, Apuleius of Madaura has to share the chief honours with M. Cornelius Fronto, a native of Cirta, the capital of Numidia.⁸⁶

De même, Robinson Ellis (1834-1913), qui consacra une étude à Fronton en

avaient tous les deux donné des émendations au palimpseste frontonien. Avant Crossley, nous avons seulement trouvé Ramsay 1854: 183, qui se limita à résumer le jugement de Niebuhr: ‘[Fronto] was by descent an Italian, but a native of Cirta, a Roman colony in Numidia, where, during the dictatorship of Caesar, a large body of the followers of P. Sittius had received allotments of land.’

83 Crossley 1882: 47, 51, 52 et 63.

84 Crutwell 1877: 456-57 et 463; Simcox 1883: 231-37.

85 Mackail 1895: 234.

86 Graham 1902: 142. L’influence de Monceaux est surtout attestée dans Graham 1902: 307-8.

1904, voyait en lui un représentant typique d'une latinité africaine.⁸⁷ L'empreinte de Monceaux est également visible chez Ellis, par exemple dans la description de Cirta comme 'the Berber town Cirta (modern Constantine) ...'.⁸⁸ Cependant, à la différence de la recherche antérieure, Ellis trouve que la correspondance était de valeur considérable comme source et son jugement sur Fronton n'était pas négatif.⁸⁹

Plus tard, en 1913, Edmund Spencer Bouchier publia son livre *Life and Letters in Roman Africa*, où il décrivait Fronton comme 'the gifted native of Cirta'.⁹⁰ Encore une fois, l'influence de Monceaux est clairement ressentie, mais bien que Bouchier partageât la vision de Fronton comme Africain, l'interprétation qu'il offre de *M. Caes.* 2.3 lui était propre. Or, selon Bouchier, les Africains eurent à subir des discriminations, ce qui les rendit plus conscients de leur origine:

However mixed their origin, the Africans possessed a national spirit more strongly developed than other provincial peoples. Their unpopularity at Rome encouraged them to accent their non-Italian elements, and to take a pride in calling themselves by the names of the barbarian tribes on the outskirts of the Roman dominions.⁹¹

Dans la référence qui accompagne ce passage, Bouchier renvoie à *M. Caes.* 2.3. Il y trouve une réaction de Fronton à une prétendue discrimination orchestrée par ses contemporains.

En 1911, Dame Madeline Dorothy Brock (1886-1969) publia son *Studies in Fronto and his Age*. Elle rompit avec ces tendances à rattacher Fronton au sol natif. Elle chercha à réhabiliter Fronton en modifiant les durs jugements portés sur lui dans le passé. Elle récusait aussi toute idée d'*africitas*, car il n'y avait pas suffisamment de 'preuves' linguistiques pour faire de Fronton quelqu'un d'africanisé. Elle voyait dans la lettre *M. Caes.* 2.3 l'expression d'un conflit entre la culture latine et la culture grecque. Selon elle, la culture latine vivait à l'époque une crise profonde alors que la culture grecque était

87 Ellis 1904: 5.

88 Ellis 1904: 6.

89 Par exemple Ellis 1904: 5 et 8.

90 Bouchier 1913: 57.

91 Bouchier 1913: 10-11.

florissante.⁹² C'est pourquoi Fronton, le représentant le plus important de la culture latine, aurait nourri une forte antipathie envers toutes *res graecae*. Ainsi, *M. Caes.* 2.3 révélerait le malaise que Fronton ressentait lorsqu'il devait s'exprimer en grec. Plus tard, la thèse de Brock fut soutenue par René Marache (1952) et Mario Attilio Levi (1994).

A peu près à la même époque réapparaît l'interprétation donnée par Niebuhr dans la préface de son édition de 1816. D'abord, nous la retrouvons chez W.D.H. Rouse:

M. Cornelius Fronto was a Roman by descent, but of provincial birth, being native to Cirta, in Numidia.⁹³

Une interprétation similaire fut donnée par C.R. Haines qui, le premier, prit soin de publier une traduction de la correspondance entière en anglais en 1919-20. La traduction marqua un tournant pour les études sur Fronton en rendant ainsi la correspondance plus accessible au grand public. A l'instar de Niebuhr, Haines conclut que la famille de Fronton était originaire d'Italie et, par conséquent, il voit dans le passage de *M. Caes.* 2.3 une plaisanterie de la part de Fronton:

He was born at Cirta, now Constantine, in Numidia. This was a Roman colony, and his name being Cornelius, he was doubtless of Roman descent, though he jestingly calls himself 'a Libyan of the nomad Libyans'.⁹⁴

Haines reprit cette description de Fronton dans un petit article publié l'année suivante, où il ajouta que le latin était pour Fronton sa 'native language'.⁹⁵

Malgré les réserves exprimées par des chercheurs tels que Brock et Haines, l'origine africaine devient un facteur explicatif dans l'interprétation de la vie et de l'oeuvre de Fronton. Dorénavant, les érudits discutent du degré de 'romanisation' de Fronton.⁹⁶ Il leur semble tout à fait naturel de supposer

92 Brock 1911: 38-39.

93 Rouse 1913: 159.

94 Haines 1919: xxiii.

95 Haines 1920: 15.

96 Broughton 1968 (thèse de doctorat d'abord de 1929): 144-45, voit en Fronton la preuve que Cirta était 'thoroughly romanized'.

que la naissance africaine était le facteur commun en s'interrogeant sur telle ou telle amitié révélée par la correspondance.⁹⁷ De même, on pouvait s'étonner que Fronton n'invoque pas ses dieux paternels 'africains' plus que ce n'était le cas dans la correspondance malgré son origine!⁹⁸

1.3. Histoire inversée et approches diversifiées: études post-coloniales

Depuis environ trente ans, la recherche 'ricca e vivace' a résulté en des approches très diversifiées.⁹⁹ De nouvelles approches à la question de l'identité de Fronton se mélangent aux interprétations du passé.

La décolonisation du Maghreb et la naissance d'histoires nationales des anciennes colonies de l'Afrique du Nord ont amené un renouveau d'intérêt pour les questions d'identité et pour le processus de romanisation.¹⁰⁰ La parution du livre fort discuté de Marcel Bénabou *La résistance africaine à la romanisation* (1976) et le débat que ce livre a engendré est caractéristique de ce changement d'optique.¹⁰¹ On soumet à de nouveaux examens l'idée de romanisation, la relation entre centre et périphérie. Surtout on revendique l'identité africaine comme un fait positif. Par rapport à la recherche sur Fronton, ces nouvelles orientations commencent à se manifester à partir de la biographie fondamentale d'Edward Champlin: *Fronto and Antonine Society*, parue en 1980.

Si l'optique change, l'ambivalence que nous avons déjà dégagée pour les périodes antérieures subsiste dans la recherche moderne. Ainsi, le livre de Champlin présente trois interprétations différentes et même contradictoires du même passage de *M. Caes.* 2.3. Alternativement, la lettre est considérée

97 Pflaum 1964: 544-47. Déjà Birley 1972: 271-72 avait problématisé la tendance à pré-supposer que l'Afrique était le facteur commun qui liait Fronton à ses amis, notamment dans les cas de P. Caelius Optatus et des Sardii.

98 Le Glay 1966: 5. Cette pensée est en accord avec la thèse de 'l'impossible romanisation des âmes' soutenue dans ce livre. Le Glay semble pourtant avoir délaissé cette thèse puisqu'il devait plus tard considérer Fronton comme l'exemple type de la romanisation réussie de l'élite provinciale de l'Afrique! (Le Glay 1982).

99 Cf. l'expression heureuse de Cova 1994: 871.

100 Nous renvoyons à l'exposé de Mattingly 1996, instructif dans son ensemble encore que hâtif et imprécis dans le détail.

101 Surtout *Annales ESC* (1981). Savamment résumé par Le Bohec 1986.

une preuve de la conception que Fronton avait de lui-même, une preuve de la discrimination dont les Africains auraient souffert à l'époque et, enfin, le passage en question est interprété comme un pur et simple artifice rhétorique. Ce sont là trois interprétations largement répandues dans la recherche contemporaine. Néanmoins, nous consacrerons aussi quelques lignes aux interprétations présentées par Mario Attilio Levi et par Felicità Portalupi qui se distinguent du reste de la recherche contemporaine.

Dans un premier temps, Champlin, polémiquant vraisemblablement contre des interprétations antérieures, conclut que:

The wording is ambiguous, for the assertion can be taken simply as 'I am an African from Numidia.' However, it should be read literally, for in a congratulatory letter to the emperor Lucius Verus on this Parthian success the orator solemnly asserts, 'and thus did I make prayer to my ancestral gods: O Jupiter Ammon ...'¹⁰²

Champlin profite de l'occasion pour aller à l'encontre des interprétations de Niebuhr, Haines et Charles-Picard et pour constater que l'origine ethnique de Fronton du côté de son père est 'undoubtedly indigenous'.¹⁰³ L'interprétation de Champlin se distingue de celles de ses prédécesseurs 'coloniaux' par le fait qu'il reconnaît à Fronton, pour ainsi dire, 'le droit' d'être africain, droit que la recherche antérieure d'après lui avait refusé à Fronton.¹⁰⁴ Champlin semble même aborder la question de l'ambivalence du sujet colonial lorsqu'il déclare que:

Such a background will give rise to an important tension, and one not confined to Fronto, between the native and the Roman elements in the provincial gentleman.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Champlin 1980: 7. Une interprétation à la lettre fut également proposée par Fasce 1973: 261-62.

¹⁰³ Champlin 1980: 8.

¹⁰⁴ Champlin 1980: 144, référence 21: 'Hence, perhaps, inquiry has been loath to admit his native blood.'

¹⁰⁵ Champlin 1980: 8. Pour une définition de la notion d'ambivalence, à l'origine introduite dans les études post-coloniales par Homi Bhabha, voir Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin 2000: 12-14.

Dans un deuxième temps, Champlin considère le passage comme une ‘apologie’ avec une attitude défensive accentuée.¹⁰⁶ Ici, Champlin soutient que le passage de *M. Caes.* 2.3 est dicté par la réaction que la société prés-entrerait confrontée avec l’origine africaine de Fronto. Le passage de *M. Caes.* 2.3 aurait pour cause le conflit culturel entre centre et périphérie:

The problem lies particularly in the tension between two levels of a single civilization, Rome’s and the provincial Roman’s, at a time when Africans were clamoring for attention. In such a climate it is not to be wondered that Fronto’s work should reveal almost nothing of his African heritage. The attitude is in itself an African one, and important in his own development. Provincialism was anathema, the Latin of Africa’s educated classes rigidly pure and overinclined to rhetoric.¹⁰⁷

Nous retrouvons cette thématique de la discrimination dans l’article *Fronton et Apulée – Romains ou Africains?* (1983), publié par Nicole Méthy. Lorsque Fronto se compare au Scythe Anacharsis, l’intention profonde ne serait pas de vanter son origine africaine, mais au contraire:

d’en atténuer le caractère choquant et de dissiper le préjugé défavorable que sa mention pourrait susciter.¹⁰⁸

Fronton serait donc sur la défensive et chercherait à dissimuler son origine afin de se rendre plus ‘romain’.¹⁰⁹ Même si elle souhaite supprimer la dichotomie ‘Rome – Afrique’ en introduisant un nouveau sentiment ‘occidental’, Méthy attribue une telle conception à l’époque en supposant que le but de Fronto était de surmonter les difficultés dues à une telle conception afin d’être accepté de ses contemporains.¹¹⁰

Dans un troisième et dernier temps, Champlin préfère interpréter le passage comme un artifice rhétorique:

106 Champlin 1980: 16-17. De même, Dauge 1981: 273, référence 594 bis.

107 Champlin 1980: 17.

108 Méthy 1983: 42.

109 Méthy 1983: 42.

110 Méthy 1983: 41-43. Article écrit à partir d’une intervention à un congrès sur l’Afrique romaine qui, de manière très politiquement correcte, eut lieu à Dakar au Sénégal.

Whatever the case, it is amusing that Fronto should portray himself as the barbarian Anacharsis, humbly anxious about the solecisms of his Greek. The image is intentionally misleading, a pose for the leader of Latin archaism, for one of the major surprises to be won from his correspondence is the extent of Fronto's involvement with Greek letters and with the Greek world in general.¹¹¹

L'idée que *M. Caes.* 2.3 n'est qu'un artifice rhétorique a été proposée à plusieurs reprises au cours des dernières années.¹¹² Certains ont soutenu qu'il s'agit d'une véritable caricature.¹¹³ D'autres, comme van den Hout, soutenant que Fronton n'était pas particulièrement conscient de son origine, pensent qu'il se moque de lui-même.¹¹⁴ Garnsey y voit un 'laboured joke' derrière laquelle se cache un hommage à Athènes comme centre culturel du monde de même qu'un sentiment de honte de son origine.¹¹⁵ D'autres encore ont proposé que Fronton se vante de son savoir de la culture grecque, de sa *paideia*. Particulièrement intéressant s'avère l'article 'Substructural elements of architectonic rhetoric and philosophical thought in Fronto's Epistles' (1997) de Michèle Valérie Ronnick. Traitant des aspects rhétoriques de l'œuvre de Fronton, Ronnick a analysé une série des images présentes dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 et elle arrive à la conclusion que:

On the surface the letter looks like a piece of self-serving bombast. Perhaps it is, but there is a degree of artistry here. For through his choice of similes Fronto has taken care to inform Domitia Lucilla of his African origin and his considerable learning.¹¹⁶

Une position similaire a été défendue par Maria Laura Astarita dans son livre *Frontone Oratore* de 1997. Au cours des trente dernières années, Astarita a consacré plusieurs articles à Fronton et développé une conception de Fron-

111 Champlin 1980: 26.

112 Birley 1966: 108; McCall 1969: 246-49; Lancel 1985a: 143; Birley 1990: 100. Anderson 1993: 122.

113 Salmann 1997: 282.

114 Van den Hout 1999: 60.

115 Garnsey 1978: 227. Garnsey se base sur la thèse de doctorat qui était à l'origine du livre de Champlin.

116 Ronnick 1997: 239.

ton comme 'provincial'.¹¹⁷ Dans la lettre elle voit une indication claire que Fronton était très conscient de son origine.¹¹⁸ En même temps, elle retient que la lettre atteste un intérêt général accru pour la culture grecque au moment où Fronton écrivait la lettre:

Quanto poi alla menzione della propria provenienza libica, che ha spinto qualche studioso a definire 'africano' il greco di Frontone, egli si paragona allo scita Anacarsi, di modestissime origini come lui stesso, ma di grande cultura. Con questa lettera il Cirtense vuole dimostrare di poter competere, quanto a cultura, con gli oratori greci contemporanei, non solo, ma di saper adattare gli argomenti (anche di natura politica come l'adozione) traendo spunto da autori greci.¹¹⁹

Il faut aussi songer quelques instants à l'interprétation donnée par Mario Attilio Levi dans son étude *Ricerche su Frontone* (1994), qui s'apparente à l'interprétation jadis défendue par Brock. Levi évite presque complètement de parler de l'origine ethnique de Fronton, dont il fait mention une seule fois.¹²⁰ A ses yeux, Fronton était un militant de la culture latine menacée par la culture grecque. Donc, si Fronton s'aventure à écrire une lettre en grec, cela n'atteste en rien de son goût personnel. Fronton ne fait que s'adapter au goût de l'époque. Ainsi, la lettre s'explique par l'hellénisation de la cour impériale commencée sous le règne d'Hadrien et non par les préférences personnelles de Fronton.¹²¹

Nous terminerons notre survol de la recherche sur Fronton en passant par les considérations de Felicità Portalupi sur l'origine de Fronton dans la préface de sa deuxième édition de la correspondance publiée en 1997. Cet auteur semble finir par revendiquer la position défendue à l'origine par Mai. Portalupi ne nie pas l'origine cirtéenne de Fronton et elle cite le passage de *M. Caes.* 2.3 comme preuve. Elle procède en évoquant l'opinion de Niebuhr selon qui le nom de Cornelius indiquerait une origine italique sans pour

117 Voir surtout Astarita 1980: 35 et Astarita 1992: 198.

118 Astarita 1997: 26-31 passe en examen plusieurs passages de la correspondance qui attesteraient, selon elle, de son origine 'nomado-libyque' et l'importance qu'il aurait donné lui-même à celui-ci.

119 Astarita 1997: 119.

120 Levi 1994: 253 où Fronton est décrit comme: 'insigne professionista di origine africana'.

121 Levi 1994: 248-51.

autant, semble-t-il, y adhérer. Finalement, elle réexamine l'idée que Fronton était le petit-fils de Plutarque. Elle ne semble pas accorder trop d'importance au témoignage de Jean de Salisbury qu'elle qualifie de 'confusa testimonianza', mais elle ajoute que c'est incontestable que dans l'œuvre de Fronton: '... si notano frequenti echi dell'argomentare plutarcho'.¹²² Cette dernière phrase fait douter que Portalupi se soit limitée à résumer les positions soutenues auparavant. Il semble qu'elle soit retournée au point de départ de Mai.

1.4. Considérations théoriques

Au cours des années, la manière d'aborder la question de l'identité dans l'histoire romaine a beaucoup évolué. De même, la vision que l'on a de Fronton. En se basant sur ce que l'on prétendait savoir sur son origine ethnique, ou encore en s'appuyant sur ses propres dires ou sur les jugements d'autrui, la recherche a fait de Fronton un Français, un Italien, un Africain, un Romain.

Pour notre part, nous nous inspirons des considérations apportées par Simon Goldhill à l'étude de l'identité culturelle grecque dans son *Being Greek under Rome*. Ainsi, nous adoptons sa définition d'identité culturelle comme 'something more than national, racial or ethnic identification ... Cultural identity should be taken here first to mark a set of questions about the formulation of the subject within Empire society'.¹²³ Il ne suffirait donc pas à nos yeux de constater que Fronton naquit à Cirta pour faire de lui un 'Africain'. Cependant, le lieu de naissance, l'origine ethnique, etc. peuvent acquérir une importance dans la mesure où ces facteurs jouent un rôle dans la représentation de soi, comme celle que Fronton livre dans *M. Caes.* 2.3. Ce qui nous intéresse, ce sont donc les expressions d'affiliation, d'identification et d'exclusion qui structurent l'autoreprésentation. Il importe ici de rappeler, que la rhétorique d'une telle autoreprésentation peut être compliquée, voilée et loin d'être évidente.¹²⁴ Nous procéderons donc à une analyse de ce que l'on pourrait appeler les contextes extra-, infra- et intertextuels de *M. Caes.* 2.3. Nous chercherons à placer la lettre dans son

¹²² Portalupi 1997: 25

¹²³ Goldhill 2001: 20.

¹²⁴ Goldhill 2001: 20.

contexte historique, en examinant les conditions de la réception, son but et le moment de l'écriture. Ensuite, nous établirons la position de la lettre par rapport aux autres lettres de la correspondance. Or, la correspondance de Fronton est une source riche mais très hétérogène. Elle couvre à peu près le tiers d'un siècle et les lettres ont été écrites dans des circonstances très diverses. On ne peut donc pas résumer les diverses expressions identitaires que l'on y trouve pour en tirer une position. Enfin, nous chercherons à insérer la lettre dans le contexte de la tradition littéraire en considérant les affinités de la lettre avec cette catégorie déformante du 'Second Sophistique' qui ne cesse d'intriguer les chercheurs.¹²⁵

2. M. CAES. 2.3 ET SA GENÈSE

2.1. L'état de préservation de *M. Caes. 2.3*

M. Caes. 2.3, lettre destinée à 'la mère du César', c'est-à-dire à Domitia Lucilla, mère de Marc Aurèle, a été relativement épargnée par le temps. Le fait que la lettre se termine d'une manière un peu brusque a amené une partie des chercheurs à penser que la fin de la lettre a été perdue.¹²⁶ D'autre part, Ronnick a vu dans la fin soudaine de la lettre un trait stylistique.¹²⁷ La phrase finale de la lettre semble effectivement terminer la lettre, puisque Fronton écrit qu'il la 'termine' (παύσομαι).¹²⁸ Or, si l'on compare la lettre aux trois autres lettres grecques dont la fin a été préservée, on voit qu'aucune de ces lettres ne présente de formules de salutation.¹²⁹ De même, le fait que *M. Caes. 2.3* ait été préservée deux fois dans la correspondance étaye, à notre avis, l'hypothèse de Ronnick selon qui la lettre a été préservée dans son intégralité.¹³⁰

Cependant, la transmission de la correspondance soulève une autre

¹²⁵ Cf. Goldhill 2001: 14. Voir aussi Whitmarsh 2005.

¹²⁶ Notamment Timpanaro 1955: 281; Levi 1994: 248; Astarita 1997: 118.

¹²⁷ Ronnick 1997: 240.

¹²⁸ Van den Hout 1988: 24, 13.

¹²⁹ *Ad Am. 1.2* (à Appios Apollonides); *Add. Epist. 8* (à Marc Aurèle), *M. Caes. 2.1* (à Hérode) sans formule; dans *Add. Epist. 5* (à Appien) et *M. Caes. 2.15* (à Domitia Lucilla) la fin a été perdue.

¹³⁰ Van den Hout 1988: 21 et 242.

question importante par rapport à l'authenticité de son contenu. Auparavant, les chercheurs ont étudié le côté linguistique de la lettre afin de dégager les compétences de Fronton en grec. On a voulu voir dans diverses fautes de langue une preuve que Fronton ne s'intéressait pas à la langue grecque ou même qu'il la haïssait. Cependant, déjà Leopardi retenait que les erreurs linguistiques que l'on trouve dans le manuscrit doivent être attribuées au copiste plutôt qu'à Fronton.¹³¹ Récemment, van den Hout a jugé que 'his Greek letters are somewhat scholastic and that they are far less smooth than his Latin ones, as if he wanted to show how well he knew Greek.'¹³² Donc, même si la lettre a été relativement bien conservée, il faut se montrer prudent avant de se prononcer sur les connaissances ou les défaillances linguistiques de Fronton.

2.2. Le contenu

Dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 Fronton s'excuse de ne pas avoir écrit à Domitia Lucilla. Reprenant un bon mot romain: 'il ne faut pas détester les habitudes d'un ami, mais en être instruit',¹³³ Fronton entreprend d'expliquer la raison qui l'a amené à ne pas écrire: il s'est entièrement consacré à l'écriture d'un discours à Antonin le Pieux. Tout au long de *M. Caes.* 2.3, l'image (ἔικων) occupe une place privilégiée. L'abondance d'images est telle que van den Hout va jusqu'à considérer la lettre comme une plaisanterie où Fronton se moquerait de la 'théorie ancienne' des images.¹³⁴ Vu l'importance que Fronton accorde aux images,¹³⁵ ce propos de van den Hout nous semble exagéré, mais aussi bien la quantité des images que l'usage que Fronton en fait est effectivement extraordinaire. Or, la lettre se présente comme une recherche de l'image la mieux adaptée à illustrer ses 'habitudes' d'ami.

D'abord Fronton se compare à la hyène, aux serpents appelés ἀκοντίαι et

131 Pacella & Timpanaro 1969: 93.

132 Van den Hout 1999: 60.

133 Van den Hout 1988: 22, 1; Portalupi 1997: 95.

134 Van den Hout 1999: 58.

135 L'importance de l'image dans la vision frontonienne de la rhétorique a été soulignée par Portalupi 1961: 99-100; Portalupi 1974: 22-52; Cawley 1971. Nous n'avons pas vu la thèse d'Anni Schmitt mentionnée par Van den Hout 1999: 58.

à des missiles.¹³⁶ Ensuite il évoque le vent favorable, la ligne droite et Orphée afin d'illustrer le dévouement avec lequel il a écrit le discours à Antonin le Pieux. Mais il rejette aussitôt ces images, les trois premières étant trop animales:

Ταύτας μὲν δὴ τρεῖς εἰκόνας ἐμαυτῷ προσεῖκασα, τὰς μὲν δύο ἀγρίας καὶ θηριώδεις, τὴν ὑαίνης καὶ τὴν ὄφεων, τρίτην δὲ τὴν τῶν βελῶν καὶ αὐτὴν ἀπάνθρωπον / οὔσαν καὶ ἄμουσον.

Je me suis appliqué ces trois images, mais deux sont sauvages et féroces – celle de la hyène et celle des serpents, la troisième, celle des traits, est inhumaine et rustre.¹³⁷

De même, la comparaison avec le vent favorable est jugée 'forcée', celle avec la ligne droite 'sans âme' et 'sans corps' et celle avec Orphée 'est également peu convaincante'. C'est seulement dans la comparaison avec le peintre Protogène que Fronton trouve une image satisfaisante: 'Cette défense même semblerait tout à fait allégorique et picturale, toute pleine qu'elle est d'images'.¹³⁸ Donc, tout comme Protogène qui avait mis dix ans pour achever un portrait, Fronton a consacré tout son temps à dépeindre Antonin le Pieux dans son discours.

Après avoir trouvé une image satisfaisante, Fronton se tourne vers les aspects linguistiques de sa lettre. Il s'excuse pour d'éventuelles erreurs qu'il aurait pu commettre en se comparant à Anacharsis. Ensuite, Fronton termine la lettre en déclarant: 'ainsi je termine cet écrit où il n'y a rien d'autre que des images'.¹³⁹

2.3. Destinataires

M. Caes. 2.3 se distingue de la plupart des lettres de la correspondance par la

¹³⁶ Le manuscrit donne τὸ ἀκοντία pour ἡ ἀκοντίας. Leopardi (Pacella & Timpanaro 1969: 93) attribuait l'erreur au copiste. Voir aussi van den Hout 1999: 57.

¹³⁷ Fleury 2003: 74 ; van den Hout 1988: 22, 12-14.

¹³⁸ Van den Hout 1988: 23.21-22; Portalupi 1997: 99.

¹³⁹ Van den Hout 1988: 24.12-13; Portalupi 1997: 101; Ronnick 1997: 239; Cassan 1830: 131.

langue dans laquelle elle a été rédigée et par sa destinataire, Domitia Lucilla. Or, de la main de Fronton, nous avons seulement six lettres en grec,¹⁴⁰ et dans deux lettres seulement, nous trouvons Domitia Lucilla dans l'en-tête.¹⁴¹

Domitia Lucilla reste un personnage peu connu malgré les progrès faits par la recherche au cours des dernières années,¹⁴² et la correspondance nous fournit peu d'informations sur ses rapports avec Fronton.¹⁴³ Cependant, le peu d'indices que nous pouvons y repérer suggère que la culture grecque a joué un rôle important dans la vie de Domitia Lucilla. D'abord, il faut mentionner la lettre *M. Caes.* 2.2, que les chercheurs rapprochent depuis une trentaine d'années de *M. Caes.* 2.3.¹⁴⁴ Or, dans *M. Caes.* 2.2, à laquelle *M. Caes.* 2.3 aurait été attachée comme appendice, Fronton demanda à Marc Aurèle de corriger la lettre grecque parce qu'il voulait éviter que Domitia Lucilla ne trouve des fautes de langue. Il est difficile de dire si son inquiétude était sincère, mais on peut en déduire que Domitia Lucilla savait le grec. Nous voudrions aussi attirer l'attention sur la description que Fronton a donnée de Domitia Lucilla dans la lettre *Ep. Var.* 8, aussi connue sous le nom de Λόγος Ἐρωτικός:

Εἰκὸς δέ σε ἢ παρὰ μητρὸς ἢ τῶν ἀναθρεψαμένων μὴ ἀνήκοον εἶναι ὅτι τῶν ἀνθῶν ἐστὶν τι ὃ δὴ τοῦ ἡλίου ἐρᾷ καὶ πάσχει τὰ τῶν ἐρώντων, ἀνατέλλοντος ἐπαιπόμενον καὶ ποπευμένου καταστρεφόμενον, δύωντος δὲ περιτρεπόμενον·

Il est probable que, par ta mère ou par tes éducateurs, tu ne sois pas ignorant que, parmi les fleurs, il y en est une qui est éprise du soleil et qui éprouve les sentiments des amants ...¹⁴⁵

Dans ce passage, Fronton nous présente Domitia Lucilla comme éducatrice

140 *M. Caes.* 2.1 (à Hérode Atticus); *M. Caes.* 2.3 (à Domitia Lucilla); *M. Caes.* 2.15 (à Domitia Lucilla); *Ad Am.* 1.2 (à Appios Apollonides); *Ep. Var.* 5 (à Appian) og *Ep. Var.* 8 (à Marc Aurèle).

141 *M. Caes.* 2.3; *M. Caes.* 2.15.

142 Raepsaet-Charlier 1987: 290-91; Birley 2000: 28-52.

143 Champlin 1980: 108-9.

144 Champlin 1974: 140; Cugusi 1983: 243-44; L'interprétation a été suivie par van den Hout 1999: 57 et Fleury 2003: 72, référence 38.

145 *Ep. Var.* 8; van den Hout 1988: 254.13; Fleury 2003: 394; Portalupi 1997: 569.

de son fils en matière de culture et de mythologie grecques.¹⁴⁶ Nous savons d'ailleurs que Domitia Lucilla avait grandi dans une maison où on cultivait la culture grecque, où Hérode Atticus avait été accueilli et où il avait grandi.¹⁴⁷ Tout ceci renforce l'image de Domitia Lucilla comme une dame savante et férue de culture grecque.

Cependant, il est fondé de croire que Domitia Lucilla n'était pas la seule destinataire de *M. Caes. 2.3*, mais que Fronton comptait au moins sur deux lecteurs.¹⁴⁸ Car Fronton avait demandé à Marc Aurèle de lire et de corriger la lettre. C'est à la lumière de cette observation que nous pouvons aborder la question du but de la lettre.

2.4. Le but de *M. Caes. 2.3*

Le but de *M. Caes. 2.3* semble donné dans les premières lignes. Comme nous l'avons déjà dit, Fronton aurait écrit la lettre afin de présenter à Domitia Lucilla ses excuses pour ne pas lui avoir écrit 'ces derniers jours' (τόντων τῶν ἡμερῶν).¹⁴⁹ Déjà le second réviseur du manuscrit frontonien annotait en marge:

epistula ista Graeca, quae a Frontone scribta est ad matrem Caesaris, continet excusationem isp<i>ius in laude scribenda Antonini, propter quod ad eam non scriberit post integritatam redditam.¹⁵⁰

Nous ne savons pas sur quelles informations le réviseur du manuscrit base cette observation, mais la plupart des chercheurs ont accepté cette explication.¹⁵¹ Cependant, la correspondance entre Fronton et Domitia Lucilla est très restreinte, seules deux lettres nous sont parvenues.¹⁵² Il n'y a donc

¹⁴⁶ Pour une analyse de cette lettre voir Fasce 1982.

¹⁴⁷ *M. Caes. 3.2*; van den Hout 1988: 36.19-21.

¹⁴⁸ Astarita 1997: 115.

¹⁴⁹ Fleury 2003: 72; van den Hout 1988: 21.18-19.

¹⁵⁰ Van den Hout 1988: 22.20-22

¹⁵¹ Cassan 1830: 123, pensait que c'était Domitia Lucilla qui avait été malade et non Fronton.

¹⁵² Il est peut-être question d'un hasard de préservation. Cependant, la correspondance abonde en exemples où Fronton demande à Marc Aurèle de saluer sa mère, et il semble

rien qui puisse nous expliquer de manière convaincante pourquoi Fronton devrait s'excuser pour ne pas avoir écrit 'ces jours'.

Au cours des années, d'autres explications ont vu le jour. Astarita a soutenu que la lettre doit être interprétée comme signe d'une prétendue rivalité entre Fronton et Hérode Atticus parce qu'ils avaient tous les deux porté les faisceaux la même année, en 143.¹⁵³ Ronnick a proposé que Fronton aurait besoin d'informer Domitia Lucilla de son origine, tandis que Levi a retenu que Fronton ferait savoir à Antonin le Pieux à travers Domitia Lucilla qu'il était en train d'écrire un éloge de l'empereur.¹⁵⁴

Aujourd'hui, grâce au travail méticuleux de Werner Eck et de Margaret Roxan, c'est un fait avéré que Fronton écrit *M. Caes.* 2.3 entre le 13 juillet et le 12 août de 142 de notre ère.¹⁵⁵ Cette datation affaiblit considérablement l'hypothèse d'Astarita. En outre, nous pouvons constater que la lettre est datable au moment où Fronton se trouvait au sommet de son *cursus*.¹⁵⁶ Au moment où il envoyait *M. Caes.* 2.3, il faisait depuis longtemps partie du cercle intime de la cour impériale, il était précepteur de Marc Aurèle au moins depuis 137/138 et sa femme, Kratia, avait noué des relations amicales avec Domitia Lucilla.¹⁵⁷ A notre avis, cette observation rend l'interprétation

que Fronton d'habitude se contentait de saluer indirectement Domitia Lucilla. Fronton demande au total 27 fois à Marc Aurèle de saluer sa mère: van den Hout 1988: 35.3 (*M. Caes.* 2.17); 35.8 (*M. Caes.* 2.18); 40.9 (*M. Caes.* 3.7); 42.2 (*M. Caes.* 3.8); 42.22 (*M. Caes.* 3.9); 43.25 (*M. Caes.* 3.11); 44.15 (*M. Caes.* 3.12); 50.6 (*M. Caes.* 3.17); 51.26 et 52.5 (*M. Caes.* 3.21); 70.6 (*M. Caes.* 5.3); 72.12 (*M. Caes.* 5.21); 74.3 (*M. Caes.* 5.29); 74.18 (*M. Caes.* 5.32); 74.21 (*M. Caes.* 5.33); 76.11 (*M. Caes.* 5.40); 77.1 et 77.7 (*M. Caes.* 5.42); 77.20 (*M. Caes.* 5.44); 77.27 (*M. Caes.* 5.45); 80.4 (*M. Caes.* 5.52); 81.8 (*M. Caes.* 5.56); 81.28 (*M. Caes.* 5.57); 82.14 (*M. Caes.* 5.59); 83.10 (*M. Caes.* 5.63); 84.11 (*M. Caes.* 5.69); 84.25 (*M. Caes.* 5.71).

153 Arista 1997: 115-16. Voir aussi Eck & Roxan 1995: 95.

154 Levi 1994: 248.

155 Eck & Roxan 1995: 92-95, surtout 92 sqq.; Eck 1998: 193-96.

156 Pour la datation du consulat à 142, voir Eck 1998. Pour la datation de la lettre voir en outre Champlin 1974: 140; van den Hout 1999: 57. À la lumière de la découverte d'Eck nous nous étonnons que Fleury 2003: 11, continue à soutenir que Fronton fut consul la même année qu'Hérode.

157 On se réfère par exemple à *M. Caes.* 2.13; *M. Caes.* 2.5 lettres écrites également en 142, et surtout à *M. Caes.* 4.6, écrite par Marc Aurèle en 140 selon Champlin, où il relate une conversation avec sa mère: 'Deinde cum matercula mea supra torum sedente multum garrivi. Meus sermo hic erat: "qui existimas modo meum Frontonem facere?" Tum illa: "quid autem tu meam Cratiam?"...' (van den Hout 1988: 62.20-63.1).

de Ronnick problématique. Il n'y a rien qui suggère que le *homo novus* de Cirta avait subi ou risquait une discrimination quelconque due à son origine. Bien au contraire, que son *cursus* culmine avec le consulat au moment où il écrivit *M. Caes.* 2.3, semble prouver le contraire.

En ce qui concerne l'explication de Levi, elle est convainquante par sa simplicité, mais elle ne tient pas compte de deux autres lettres de la même période où Fronton s'est servi de Marc Aurèle afin d'informer Antonin le Pieux de ses procédés.¹⁵⁸ Ceci suggère que Fronton communiqua plutôt avec Antonin à travers Marc Aurèle qu'à travers Domitia Lucilla.

Nous pensons donc qu'il faut chercher ailleurs la raison pour laquelle Fronton a écrit la lettre. D'abord nous pensons qu'il faut classer la lettre comme un exemple de rhétorique épideutique. Fronton se sert de l'excuse initiale afin de pouvoir écrire une lettre sur lui-même. A part l'aspect épideutique, nous voyons aussi dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 un aspect didactique prononcé.

3. L'AFRIQUE ET L'AUTOREPRÉSENTATION DE FRONTON

3.1. *Auriculas Serviendum*: le bon usage des images

Nous avons déjà noté la position marquante occupée par les images dans *M. Caes.* 2.3. Nous retrouvons la préoccupation pour le bon usage des images dans *M. Caes.* 2.2, lettre d'un caractère didactique accompagnant *M. Caes.* 2.3. Ici Fronton explique comment choisir et utiliser les images, en donnant deux expériences personnelles comme exemples.¹⁵⁹

D'abord, Fronton raconte un succès qu'il a eu peu avant en faisant un discours devant le peuple. Ensuite, il revient sur une expérience précédente où une image qu'il avait utilisée avait suscité le mécontentement du public:

at ubi genus nobile cum ignobili conparans dixi: 'ut si quis ignem e rogo

¹⁵⁸ *M. Caes.* 2.4 et *M. Caes.* 2.6; Voir *M. Caes.* 2.4 et *M. Caes.* 2.5. Pour une analyse du rôle de Marc Aurèle comme intermédiaire voir Champlin 1980: 101-3.

¹⁵⁹ Cawley 1971: 146 classe *M. Caes.* 2.2 [*M. Caes.* 1.9] comme une lettre didactique.

et ara accensum similem putet, quoniam aequae luceat', ad hoc pauculi admurmurati sunt. quorsum hoc retuli? uti te, domine, ita compares, ubi quid in coetu hominum recitabis, us scias auribus serviendum ...

Mais lorsque je comparai la noblesse et les gens de basse extraction 'comme on tenait pour semblables des feux allumés sur un bûcher et sur un autel sous prétexte qu'ils brillent tous deux', à cette phrase, quelques uns se mirent à murmurer. A quelle fin, ai-je rappelé cela? Pour que, souverain, tu te prépares, lorsque tu prononceras quelque discours devant une assemblée, à savoir qu'il faut te dévouer à leurs oreilles.¹⁶⁰

Ce passage nous permet deux observations. D'abord, Fronton accorde au public une attention considérable, il forge ses images afin de plaire à son public. En même temps, Fronton souligne qu'il relate les événements pour préparer Marc Aurèle. Qu'il procède en proclamant qu'il ne traite pas Marc Aurèle comme s'il avait vingt-deux ans et qu'il ne peut rien lui enseigner, renforce l'impression que c'était exactement ce qu'il était en train de faire.¹⁶¹

Les considérations que Fronton met en avant dans *M. Caes.* 2.2, sont notamment importantes pour la lecture de *M. Caes.* 2.3, qui y était attachée. Ainsi, nous aimerions avancer l'hypothèse qu'en incluant *M. Caes.* 2.3, Fronton a donné un exemple, à savoir comment mettre en pratique les conseils donnés dans *M. Caes.* 2.2. Marc Aurèle connaissait mieux que personne le goût de sa mère et sa prédilection pour la culture grecque. Il aurait reconnu dans la lettre l'habileté de Fronton pour plaire au goût de sa mère. Nous voyons dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 Fronton qui enseigne de manière indirecte à Marc Aurèle comment s'adapter au goût de son public.¹⁶²

Mais, pour Fronton les images n'ornent pas seulement le discours, mais aussi celui qui parle. Ainsi, explique-t-il dans *M. Caes.* 2.2, Marc Aurèle doit draper ses discours dans la pourpre, la seule couleur propre à un César:

160 Van den Hout 1988: 17.21-18.3; Fleury 2003: 66; Portalupi 1997: 89.

161 Van den Hout 1988: 19.5-20.6; Fleury 2003: 66-68.

162 Pour la conception frontonienne de l'image voir aussi *M. Caes.* 3.8 (van den Hout 1988: 40.13-15), où Fronton écrit la création des images comme l'acte de peindre, conformément à l'image de Protogènes présentée dans *M. Caes.* 2.3.

vobis praeterea, quibus purpura et cocco uti necessarium est, eodem cultu nonnumquam oratio quoque est amicienda.

Dès lors, pour vous, à qui il faut porter la pourpre et l'écarlate, le discours doit parfois être drapé avec la même recherche.¹⁶³

Il est donc impératif d'analyser comment Fronton s'est 'drapé' dans la lettre à Domitia Lucilla. Nous procéderons donc par une analyse de l'image de soi, des expressions d'affiliation et d'exclusion que Fronton nous présente dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 et *M. Caes.* 2.2.

3.2. Βάρβαρος et *Opicus* : Les catégories en jeu

C'est dans la comparaison avec Anacharsis dans le cinquième et dernier passage de la lettre que les chercheurs ont surtout voulu voir une expression de l'identité de Fronton:

Ἔτι κατὰ τοὺς γεωμέτρους αἰτήσομαι· τὸ ποῖον; εἰ τι τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ταύταις εἴη ἄκυρον ἢ βάρβαρον ἢ ἄλλως ἀδόκιμον ἢ μὴ πάνυ Ἀττικόν, ἀμ<ελεῖν μὲν> τοῦ ὀνόματος σ' ἀξιῶ, τὴν <δὲ> διάνοιαν σκοπεῖν αὐτὴν καθ' αὐτήν. οἶσθα γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ὀνόμασιν καὶ αὐτῇ διαλέκτῳ διατρίβω. καὶ γὰρ τὸν Σκύθην ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ἀναχάρσιν οὐ πάνυ τι ἀττικίασαι φασίν, ἐπαινεθῆναι δ' ἐκ τῆς διανοίας καὶ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων. παραβαλὼ δὲ ἑμαυτὸν Ἀναχάρσιδι, οὐ μὰ Δία κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ βάρβαρος ὁμοίως εἶναι.

Je vais demander, si dans cette lettre se trouvent des mots impropres ou barbares ou de quelque manière incorrects ou trop peu attiques, de négliger les mots, et se concentrer sur le sujet lui-même. Songe que j'emploie mon temps à l'étude des mots et de ce langage. On dit en effet que le célèbre Scythe Anacharsis ne parlait pas parfaitement attique, mais qu'il fut loué pour ses opinions et ses pensées. Je me comparerai

¹⁶³ Van den Hout 1988: 19.5-6; Fleury 2003: 66-68.

donc à Anacharsis, non pas, par Zeus, sur le plan de la sagesse, mais sur celui de notre état commun de barbare. Il était un Scythe issu des nomades scythes; je suis un Libyen issu des Libyens nomades. Il nous appartient à moi et à Anacharsis de brouter ces terres; il nous appartient donc aussi, en broutant ces terres, de bêler comme il nous plaît de bêler. Ainsi ai-je aussi comparé le parler barbare au fait de bêler.¹⁶⁴

D'abord Fronton se définit comme 'βάρβαρος' et il définit le fait d'être 'barbare' par rapport à la langue grecque, plus particulièrement par rapport à la capacité de parler attique (ἀττικίσαι). Fronton se compare donc à Anacharsis parce qu'ils ont tous les deux des difficultés linguistiques. Ce sont les considérations sur la langue qui amènent l'image de 'nomade'. Ce fait est d'autant plus souligné par la fin de la lettre où Fronton termine la comparaison avec Anacharsis en concluant qu'il a comparé le fait de parler barbare au fait de bêler. Fronton opère donc une distinction au niveau linguistique plutôt qu'au niveau ethnique. Il divise les hommes en deux groupes, 'les barbares' et ceux qui savent parler attique (ἀττικίσαι), selon leur connaissances linguistiques.

L'intérêt pour l'attique et les excuses pour le manque de maîtrise ont évidemment attiré la curiosité des philologues. Récemment, van den Hout a conclu que Fronton, dans *M. Caes.* 2.3, écrit un attique impeccable, même si un peu rigide 'comme s'il voulait faire preuve de ses capacités'.¹⁶⁵

Il convient ici de se reporter à *M. Caes.* 2.2, où Fronton demande à Marc Aurèle de lire et de corriger la lettre à Domitia Lucilla:

Epistulam matri tuae scripsi, quae mea inpudentia est, Graece, eamque epistulae ad te scriptae implicui. Tu prior lege et, si quis inerit barbarismus, tu, qui a Graecis litteris recentior es, corrige atque ita matri redde. nolo enim me mater tua ut Opicum contemnat.

J'ai écrit une lettre à ta mère, – telle est mon imprudence – en grec, et je l'ai jointe à la lettre que je t'ai écrite. Lis-la d'abord et, si quelques barbarismes y sont restés, toi, dont les études grecques sont plus

164 Van den Hout 1988: 24.1-8; Portalupi 1997: 99; Fleury 2003: 76.

165 Van den Hout 1999: 59-60.

récentes, corrige-la et donne-la ainsi corrigée à ta mère. Je ne voudrais pas qu'elle me méprise comme un *opicus*.¹⁶⁶

Comme dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 Fronton exprime de l'inquiétude pour son grec, et il parle de 'barbarismes'. Finalement, il emploie la notion d'*opicus*. Cette notion a fait l'objet d'études approfondies par le philologue belge Michel Dubuisson.¹⁶⁷ Dubuisson a retracé les développements de cette notion à travers les temps. Selon lui, *opicus* était au deuxième siècle de notre ère surtout employé par des romains hellénisés pour désigner ceux de leurs compatriotes qui savaient mal le grec.¹⁶⁸ Nous voyons Marc Aurèle utiliser *opicus* dans ce sens dans une autre lettre de la correspondance.¹⁶⁹ On peut donc soutenir que c'est dans ce sens précis, d'inculte en matière de culture grecque, que Fronton l'a utilisé. Ainsi, Fronton exprimerait-il qu'il ne voulait pas être pris pour un Romain ignorant en matière de langue et de culture grecques.

Alors que Fronton dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 se déclarait 'barbare', c'est-à-dire quelqu'un qui ne parle pas attique, dans *M. Caes.* 2.2, il faisait comprendre qu'il voulait éviter que Domitia ne le considère comme inculte en langue et culture grecques à cause de la lettre. Il faut donc se demander quelle était l'intention profonde de Fronton lorsqu'il se dépeint comme 'barbare'. Pour éclairer ce point, nous examinerons d'abord la représentation qu'il nous livre de l'Afrique.

3.3. La représentation de l'Afrique

Contrairement à ce qu'a soutenu Fleury, la correspondance de Fronton ne surabonde pas en références à l'Afrique et aux Africains. En fait, les termes *Africa*, *Li<bya>*, *Afri*, *African* et *Λιβυς* apparaissent seulement une fois

¹⁶⁶ Van den Hout 1988: 21.12-16; Portalupi 1997: 95.

¹⁶⁷ Dubuisson 1983: 522-45.

¹⁶⁸ Dubuisson 1983: 544.

¹⁶⁹ Fleury 2003: 73, référence 73 retient que Fronton aurait aussi employé *Opicus* pour désigner Hérode Atticus dans *M. Caes.* 3.6, mais le passage est lacunaire et il est impossible de dire dans quel sens et pour qui Fronton l'utilisait.

chacun, et c'est seulement dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 que Fronton définit explicitement son rapport à ces catégories.¹⁷⁰

Dans l'image de l'Afrique que nous donne Fronton dans *M. Caes.* 2.3, le nomadisme occupe une place privilégiée. Pourtant, le nomadisme n'occupe pas une place prépondérante dans la correspondance. C'est seulement dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 que Fronton en fait une mention explicite. Selon Haines, Fronton parlerait de nomades dans deux autres cas.¹⁷¹ Ainsi, ce serait le cas dans *Princ. Hist.*, où il paraphraserait un passage de Salluste ne trouvant pas que ces peuples (*nationes*) sont dignes d'être considérés comme de vrais ennemis du peuple romain.¹⁷² De même, dans *Ant. Pium.* 8, où Fronton parle d'un ami, Iulius Senex, qui avait chassé des brigands (*latrones*) en Maurétanie, il s'agirait de nomades.¹⁷³ Nous savons effectivement par Pausanias que les Romains combattirent des tribus nomades en Maurétanie à l'époque, ce qui peut renforcer l'interprétation de Haines de ce passage.¹⁷⁴ Si l'on accepte les conjectures de Haines, à savoir que Fronton utilisait 'brigands' (*latrones*) pour désigner des 'nomades', il ne semble pas qu'il chérissait beaucoup la culture nomade. De toute façon, nous pouvons conclure que Fronton ne traite pas souvent de l'Afrique ou des nomades et que dans les cas où il le fait, ses descriptions sont plutôt négatives. C'est là une attaque grave contre les tentatives diverses de chercher dans ses lettres

170 Une fois *Africa* fait partie d'un titre officiel ([*conductor quattor*] *public<or>um Africae*) (Van den Hout 1988: 79.3); *Li<bya>* est très mutilé (van den Hout 1988: 132.20); *Africanus* semble désigner Scipion l'Africain mais le texte est également très mutilé (van den Hout 1988: 129); Une fois seulement, Fronton parle d'Africains (*Afri*), et encore désigne-t-il des alliés de Carthage aux temps de la Seconde Guerre Punique, Fronton se réjouit que Scipion les ait massacrés (van den Hout 1988: 224.9). Nous n'incluons ni *Carthage*, ni *Cirta* parmi les expressions renvoyant à l'Afrique.

171 Cf. Van den Hout 1988: *index nominum*.

172 Van den Hout 1988: 205.28-29: '... vagi, palantes, nullo itineris destinato fini non ad locum, sed ad vesperum contenditur ... nationes quae rapinis et direptionibus clades ediderunt ...' (passage très lacunaire). Comparer à Sall. *Jug.* 18.2: 'Ei neque moribus neque lege aut imperio cuiusquam regebantur: vagi palantes, quas nox coegerat sedes habebant.' Cf. Poignault 1997: 104 et Fleury 2003: 329, référence 377.

173 Van den Hout 1988: 167.10-11.

174 Paus. 8.43.3. Pour un compte rendu des troubles en Mauritanie sous le règne d'Antonin le Pieux voir Euzennat 1984.

une prédilection pour le nomadisme due à sa descendance, comme l'a fait par exemple Astarita.¹⁷⁵

Par contre, plusieurs faits nous mènent à penser que Fronton, en décrivant les 'Libyens nomades' et l'Afrique, au lieu de décrire une Afrique réelle et 'vécue', reproduit l'image traditionnelle grecque de l'Afrique telle qu'on la retrouve à partir d'Hérodote.¹⁷⁶ D'abord, on trouve dans *M. Caes.* 2.3, des échos du style d'Hérodote. Van den Hout a porté son attention sur la description d'Antonin le Pieux comme 'μεγὰς βασιλεύς', où Fronton semble effectivement pasticher le langage d'Hérodote.¹⁷⁷ Il est également important de noter comment Fronton se positionne par rapport à ce qu'il raconte. Or, à l'instar de l'ethnographe Hérodote, il se pose en observateur extérieur. Ainsi, il réfère le dire romain d'après ce qu'ils 'disent' (φάσιν). De même, le fait que l'hyène ne peut pas plier le cou et le fait que les serpents ἀκοντίαι s'élancent en ligne droite est quelque chose qu'on lui a rapporté (λέγουσιν, φασιν).¹⁷⁸ Par ce procédé, Fronton se distancie du fait libyen aussi bien que du fait romain. Enfin, nous retrouvons aussi dans la lettre la mise en contraste des Libyens et des Scythes, thème du quatrième livre des *Histoires* d'Hérodote devenu un véritable lieu commun à l'époque de Fronton.¹⁷⁹

Fronton insiste sur le fait que les nomades errent et qu'ils vivent de leurs animaux. Il opère en fait une véritable animalisation des nomades. Ils bêlent et ils broutent comme leurs animaux. Nous voyons apparaître dans cette description non la réalité nomade mais ce que l'on a appelé un regard 'idéologique'.¹⁸⁰ Fronton nous donne une vision des nomades diamétralement opposée à la civilisation, allant jusqu'à les priver de langue et

175 Astarita 1997: 26-32.

176 Fronton témoigne d'une connaissance profonde des écrits d'Hérodote dans plusieurs des ses écrits, par exemple dans son *Arion* (cf. Jullien 1992; van den Hout 1988: 241-42), et dans *De Bell. Part.* 5-7, où il recourt à l'histoire de Polycrate (van den Hout 1988: 222-23).

177 Van den Hout 1999: 57.

178 Portalupi 1997: 95-97.

179 Hdt. 4. On retrouve la comparaison entre Scythes et Libyens chez Lucain 9.827 (serpent *iaculus* opposé à la flèche scythe) et chez Paus. 8.43.3 (comparaison entre nomades scythes et libyens).

180 Shaw 1982: 5-6 et 24. Voir aussi Troussset 1982: 199-200 et Lawless 1978: 164.

à en faire des animaux. C'est bien la vision stéréotypée de la tradition ethnographique grecque que Fronton nous donne.

En ce qui concerne la représentation de l'Afrique, Ronnick et Fleury ont eux aussi remarqué l'usage que fait Fronton de la hyène et des serpents ἄκοντίαι (latin: *iaculus*) et soutiennent qu'il s'agit là aussi d'une référence de Fronton à son origine.¹⁸¹ Nous avons déjà remarqué que Fronton se distancie de ces monstres en renvoyant à ce que d'autres avaient raconté. Les serpents ἄκοντίαι et l'hyène étaient effectivement liés à la faune africaine,¹⁸² dont ils constituaient des exemples types. Ainsi, chez Lucien de Samosate qui n'avait jamais mis les pieds en Afrique,¹⁸³ les serpents ἄκοντίαι étaient évoqués parmi les monstres peuplant le sol africain.¹⁸⁴ Chez Lucain, dans la *Pharsale*, nous trouvons aussi une description d'un de ces serpents 'que l'Afrique appelle *iaculus*'.¹⁸⁵ L'hyène était également tenue pour un animal fabuleux et monstrueux.¹⁸⁶

Cette manière de représenter l'hyène montre bien, à notre avis, que Fronton ne vise pas l'Afrique où il était né, mais bien celle de la tradition littéraire. Or, Fronton se réfère à 'la bête que les Romains appellent *hyène*'.¹⁸⁷ L'attribution du mot aux Romains a retenu l'attention de van den Hout, comme, avant lui, elle avait aussi retenu l'attention de Mai. Car Fronton devait savoir que le mot avait une origine grecque.¹⁸⁸ C'est Mai qui nous fournit une explication convaincante.¹⁸⁹ Selon Mai, Fronton démontrait précisément par cet énoncé qu'il était conscient du fait que l'hyène était connue sous plusieurs noms en grec.¹⁹⁰ Encore une fois, l'enjeu pour Fronton

181 Ronnick 1997: 239; Fleury 2003: 75, référence 41: 'Serait-ce encore une image à plusieurs niveaux, où l'orateur, en plus d'expliquer son état, exprimerait son origine?'.
 182 Van den Hout 1999: 57 fait le bilan des passages où ces créatures sont mentionnées.

183 Lucien *Dips.* 6.
 184 Lucien *Dips.* 3.

185 Lucain. 9.823-24.
 186 Cf. Van den Hout 1999: 57 Lauzi 1988: 540-46.

187 Van den Hout 1988: 22.3; Fleury 2003: 72-75.
 188 Van den Hout 1999: 57.

189 Mai 1816: 400. Nous pouvons seulement accepter la partie de l'argument qui porte sur la langue grecque. 'Belva' ne semble pas avoir signifié 'hyène', aux temps de Fronton. Il utilise *belua* ou *velua* une fois parlant de monstres marins (*M. Caes.* 3.8: van den Hout 1988: 40.16).

190 Van den Hout 1999: 57: γλάνος, γάννος.

semble donc être de démontrer ses connaissances de la tradition grecque plutôt que de révéler son origine africaine.

3.4. *Paideia* et purisme : Le Second Sophistique

Les références à la culture grecque dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 sont légion (histoire d'Orphée, références à l'Iliade, évocation de la géométrie et de l'art grecque, histoire d'Anacharsis, considérations sur la langue grecque). Cependant, c'est surtout par rapport à l'histoire d'Anacharsis que Fronton définit son rapport à la culture, et surtout à la langue grecque. Cette définition, et la présence massive de signifiants de culture grecque, soulèvent d'importantes questions sur le rapport que Fronton entretenait avec la culture grecque, et en particulier avec le phénomène du 'Second Sophistique'.¹⁹¹ Or, si 'le Second Sophistique' reste un sujet fort discuté, le rapport de Fronton à celui-ci est encore plus épineux et difficile à traiter.

Norden a ouvert le débat dans son *Antike Kunstprosa* (1899) en jugeant que Fronton et son goût pour les archaïsmes étaient fortement inspirés par la littérature grecque.¹⁹² Brock, qui a traité la question plus en profondeur, a reconnu au contraire chez Fronton une antipathie envers la culture grecque. Marache a, lui aussi, récusé l'analyse de Norden, retenant que Fronton était avant tout un écrivain latin et qu'il n'avait pas été inspiré par les lettres grecques. Plus tard, MacCall, dans une étude intitulée *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison* (1969) et Ramirez de Verger dans l'article 'Fronton y la segunda sofistica' (1973) ont à nouveau rapproché Fronton des écrivains du Second Sophistique.¹⁹³

Parmi les grands spécialistes contemporains du Second Sophistique, on peut noter une certaine ambivalence par rapport à Fronton. On pourrait dire que Fronton est tombé dans un vide entre ceux qui étudient la littérature grecque et ceux qui étudient la littérature latine. Bowie a évité de prendre position dans son étude fondamentale 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic' (1974) en excluant les auteurs 'latins' de sa recherche.¹⁹⁴

191 Sur le phénomène du Second Sophistique voir Bowersock 1969; Bowie 1974; Bowie 1991; Anderson 1993; Swain 1996; Goldhill 2001.

192 Norden 1958: 361-64.

193 MacCall 1969: 243; De Verger 1973: 115-16.

194 Bowie 1974: 167.

Bowersock (1969) et Graham Anderson (1993) ont inclus Fronton dans leurs travaux – mais plutôt comme source que comme objet d'étude. Récemment, Simon Swain a consacré quelques lignes à Fronton dans son *Hellenism and Empire* (1996). Reprenant les idées de Marache, il retient que Fronton était en opposition avec la culture grecque et qu'il faisait preuve d'un sentiment 'anti-grec'.¹⁹⁵

Cependant, nous trouvons dans *M. Caes.* 2.3 la thématique du purisme linguistique qui est considérée centrale pour les auteurs du Second Sophistique. En outre, Fronton se sert de l'histoire d'Anacharsis, un véritable lieu commun de l'époque, afin d'illustrer cette thématique.¹⁹⁶

Nous retrouvons l'histoire d'Anacharsis chez Lucien de Samosate et chez Apulée.¹⁹⁷ Lucien fait plusieurs fois mention d'Anacharsis et le range avec le roi romain Numa parmi les barbares sages. Dans *Le Schyte et le Proxène*, Lucien se compare à Anacharsis, parce qu'il est comme lui un 'barbare', c'est-à-dire quelqu'un qui n'est pas grec mais qui s'émerveille à la première rencontre avec Athènes et qui vénère la culture grecque.

Apulée évoque l'histoire d'Anacharsis dans son *Apologie*, où il se défend contre des accusations d'avoir fait de la magie. Il se sert de l'histoire d'Anacharsis pour exposer le manque de culture de ses adversaires. En fait, Apulée finit par ironiser sur l'origine de son adversaire en appelant sa ville natale Zarath 'attique'.¹⁹⁸

Fronton, Lucien et Apulée se servent donc tous les trois de l'histoire d'Anacharsis pour commenter leur culture et leurs capacités linguistiques. Tous les trois se servent de l'histoire d'Anacharsis afin de créer le paradoxe qu'Apulée résume par la formule '*patria barbara, eloquentia graeca*'. Nous retrouvons ce paradoxe chez Favorinus d'Arles, qui se vantait d'être 'Ταλάτης ὦν Ἑλληνίζειν'.¹⁹⁹ Certes, ces auteurs ont en commun de ne pas être des Grecs ethniques, mais ce qui est plus important, semble-t-il, ils ont en commun certaines idées sur la langue grecque. Nous y voyons une contestation de la définition traditionnelle de 'grec' et de 'cultivé', mais c'est une contestation par laquelle ils cherchent à se faire inclure dans une identité

195 Swain 1996: 78-79.

196 Fronton semble même faire référence à l'histoire d'Anacharsis dans une autre lettre grecque *Ep. Var.* 8; van den Hout 1988: 250.12-13; Portalupi 1997: 563.

197 Apul. *Apol.* 24; Lucien *Scyth.* 9.

198 Apul. *Apol.* 24.

199 Philostr. *VS.* 1.8.489.

culturelle grecque. Car en choisissant de se classer comme barbare, Fronton adopte en fait une vision grecque du monde. En plus, ces auteurs se servent d'une histoire tirée de la tradition grecque afin de l'illustrer. Nous retenons donc que Fronton, plutôt que d'accentuer son origine ethnique, se sert de celle-ci afin de se rattacher à la culture grecque et de faire preuve de sa *paideia*. Il joue au paradoxe, comme le font aussi ses contemporains cultivés, Lucien, Apulée, Marc Aurèle et Favorinus, et expose par là son savoir et sa compétence en matière de culture grecque. Qu'il s'incline devant l'Attique ne veut pas dire qu'il se sentait inférieur à la culture grecque, mais bien plutôt qu'il embrassait ses idéaux attiques. C'est là un signe d'affiliation à la culture grecque et non un signe d'exclusion, pour reprendre les notions employées par Goldhill.

Donc, par sa manière de nous représenter l'Afrique nomade et monstrueuse, par sa division du monde entre barbares et ceux qui savent parler Attique, par sa prosternation même devant cette langue grecque, Fronton fait preuve de sa *paideia*.

CONCLUSION FRONTON AFRICANISÉ PAR LA RECHERCHE

Il résulte de notre analyse que la lettre *M. Caes.* 2.3 avait un but didactique et un but épidéitique. D'une part, Fronton enseignait à Marc Aurèle comment utiliser les images, d'autre part, il exposait sa *paideia* à Domitia Lucilla, dame savante et nourrie de culture grecque. La lettre n'opère pas une distinction entre 'Africains' et 'Romains' ou entre 'Romains' et 'Grecs'. Par contre, il y est question d'une distinction entre l'être cultivé et l'être inculte. Être cultivé incluait avoir une connaissance profonde de la culture grecque. Certainement, Fronton révélait un rattachement à sa ville natale dans d'autres lettres, mais *M. Caes.* 2.3 n'atteste point son rapport avec l'Afrique.

Fronton n'avait aucune intention d'apparaître comme un barbare aux yeux de Domitia Lucilla. S'il évoquait sa propre origine, ce n'était que pour l'utiliser comme prétexte afin de faire preuve de sa *paideia*, c'est-à-dire de son intimité avec la culture grecque. Il n'idéalisait ni la vie nomade, ni l'Afrique. Il préférait raconter cette Afrique merveilleuse et monstrueuse, peuplée de serpents et d'hyènes, qu'il trouvait dans les livres.

Notre analyse de la recherche des deux derniers siècles a démontré une

tendance croissante à ‘africaniser’ Fronton plus que de raison. Les idéologies motrices de cette évolution ont été le nationalisme, le colonialisme aussi bien que le post-colonialisme (qui est au fond un nationalisme inversé). Dans ce contexte, la lettre et la réception moderne de la lettre soulèvent d’importantes questions sur les conceptions anciennes et modernes de la notion d’identité culturelle. L’origine africaine ne peut pas expliquer une lettre comme *M. Caes.* 2.3. Les diverses tentatives de comprendre la lettre comme une expression de discrimination, d’ambivalence, de fierté nationale ou d’un nouveau sentiment ‘occidental’ nous semblent des projections modernes propres à rendre compte de la personnalité de Fronton.

Fronton est né en Afrique du Nord, il faisait partie de l’élite absolue de l’Empire romain, au moment où il écrivit *M. Caes.* 2.3, il tint les faisceaux, ce qui ne l’empêcha cependant pas d’embrasser la culture grecque. Afin de comprendre le cas de Fronton, il faut élargir notre conception du fait romain. L’identité culturelle de même que les diverses catégories identitaires ne sont pas stables, mais susceptibles de subir des contestations et des redéfinitions selon leur contexte. Si nous ne sommes pas prêts à accepter ceci, nous risquons de nous retrouver dans l’impasse où tomba jadis Victor Duruy. Ayant examiné Fronton et bien d’autres auteurs, il devait conclure que malgré l’existence de l’empire romain, les Romains n’avaient jamais vraiment existé!

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- Anderson, G. 1993. *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London.
- Anonyme 1816a. ‘Kleine Schrift’ *Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung* 46, 367-68.
- Anonyme 1816b. ‘Lateinische Literatur’ *Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung* 96, 761-68.
- Ashcroft, B., G. Griffiths & H. Tiffin 2000. *Post-Colonial Studies. The Key Concepts*. London.
- Astarita, M.L. 1980. ‘Roma e l’Oriente: la ciceroniana *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* nella lettura di Frontone’ in B. Luiselle & M. Simonetti (eds.) *Romanobarbarica* 5. Rome: 5-35.

- Astarita, M.L. 1992. 'Appiano e Frontone. Rapporti sociali e culturali' in E. Flores (ed.) *Miscellanea di Studi in onore di Armando Salvatore*. Napoli: 159-71.
- Astarita, M.L. 1997. *Frontone Oratore*. Catania.
- Bayle, P. 1722. *Dictionaire historique et critique*, tome 2, Seconde édition revuë corrigée et augmentée par l'auteur. Rotterdam.
- Berger, A. 1866. 'Fronton historien' *Revue des cours littéraires de la France et de l'étranger* 28, 457-65
- Bernhardy, G. 1830. *Grundriss der Römischen Litteratur*. Halle.
- Betts, R.F. 1971. 'The Allusion to Rome in British imperialist thought of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries' *Victorian Studies* 15.2: 149-59.
- Birley, A.R. 1966. *Marcus Aurelius*. London.
- Birley, A.R. 1972. 'A Nickname for Commodus and the Date of Fronto's Death' *Chiron* 2: 463-73.
- Birley, A.R. 1990. *Marco Aurelio*. Milano.
- Birley, A.R. 2000. *Marcus Aurelius: a Biography*. London.
- Boissier, G. 1868. 'La jeunesse de Marc-Aurèle d'après les lettres de Fronton' *Revue des deux mondes* 1, 671-98.
- Boissier, G. 1895a. 'Les Africains. Étude sur la littérature latine d'Afrique par Paul Monceaux' *Journal des Savants*, Janvier, 35-46.
- Boissier, G. 1895b. *L'Afrique romaine: Promenades archéologiques en Algérie et en Tunisie*. Paris.
- Boissière, G. 1878. *Esquisse d'une histoire de la conquête et de l'administration romaines dans le nord de l'Afrique et particulièrement dans la province de Numidie*. Paris.
- Boissière, G. 1883. *L'Algérie romaine*. 2ème édition entièrement revue et considérablement augmentée. Paris.
- Boissonade 1856. 'Fronton (M. Cornelius)' in M. Michaud (ed.) *Biographie Universelle ancienne et moderne. Nouvelle édition, tome 15*. Paris.
- Bouchier, E.S. 1913. *Life and Letters in Roman Africa*. Oxford.
- Bowersock, G.W. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Bowie, E.L. 1974. 'Greeks and Their Past in the Second Sophistic' in M.I. Finley (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Society*. London.
- Bowie, E.L. 1991. 'Hellenes and Hellenism in writers of the Early Second

- Sophistic' in S. Saïd (ed.) Ἑλληνισμός – *Quelques jalons pour une conception de l'identité grecque*. Leiden: 183-204.
- Brock, M.D. 1911. *Studies in Fronto and his Age*. Cambridge.
- Broughton, T.R.S. 1968. *The Romanisation of Africa Proconsularis*. New York.
- Budinsky, A. 1881. *Die Ausbreitung der lateinischen Sprache über Italien und die Provinzen des römischen Reiches*. Berlin.
- Burkhard, K.I. 1895. 'Bericht über die Arbeiten zu den römischen Rednern (im weiteren Sinne mit Ausschluss von Cicero, Cornificius, Seneca, Quintilian, Ausonius und der christlichen Schriftsteller) aus den Jahren 1880-90' *Bursians Jahresberichte* 84, 155-234.
- Burkhard, K.I. 1897. 'Bericht über die Arbeiten zu den römischen Rednern (im weiteren Sinne mit Ausschluss von Cicero, Cornificius, Seneca, Quintilian, Ausonius und der christlichen Schriftsteller) aus den Jahren 1891-96' *Bursians Jahresberichte*, 93, 77-115.
- Burkhard, K.I. 1903. 'Bericht über die Arbeiten zu den römischen Rednern (im weiteren Sinne mit Ausschluss von Cicero, Cornificius, Seneca, Quintilian, Calpurnius Flaccus, Apuleius, Ausonius und der christlichen Schriftsteller) aus den Jahren 1897-1902' *Bursians Jahresberichte*, 117, 155-80.
- Brzoska, J.M. 1901. 'Cornelius Fronto' *RE* 4, 1312-40.
- Bähr, J.C.F. 1828. *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*. Karlsruhe.
- Cassan, A. 1830. *Lettres inédites de Marc Aurèle et de Fronton, retrouvées sur les palimpsests de Milan et de Rome, traduites avec le texte latin en regard et des notes*. Paris.
- Cawley, E.M. 1971. *The Literary Theory and Style of Marcus Cornelius Fronto* (thèse, Tufts University).
- Champlin, E. 1974. 'The Chronology of Fronto' *JRS* 64, 136-59.
- Champlin, E. 1980. *Fronto and Antonine Rome*. Cambridge, MA.
- Charles-Picard, G. 1959. *La civilisation de l'Afrique romaine*. Paris.
- Charles-Picard, G. 1990. *La civilisation de l'Afrique romaine*. Paris.
- Cova, P.V. 1971. 'Problematica Frontoniana' *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 1:3, 460-82.
- Cova, P.V. 1994. 'Marco Cornelio Frontone' *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.34.2: 873-918.
- Crossley, H. 1882. *The Fourth Book of the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*

- Antoninus: A Revised Text with Translation and Commentary and an Appendix on the Relations of the Emperor with Cornelius Fronto*. London.
- Cruttwell, C.T. 1877. *A History of Roman Literature from the Earliest Period to The Death of Marcus Aurelius*. New York.
- Cugioni, G. 1878-1880. *Opere inedite di Giacomo Leopardi pubblicate sugli autografi recanatesi I-II*. Halle.
- Cugusi, P. 1983. *Evoluzione e forme dell'epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell'impero, con cenni sull'epistolografia preciceroniana*. Rome.
- Dauge, Y.A. 1981. *Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation*. Bruxelles.
- Daunou, P. 1816. 'Œuvres inédites de M. C. Fronton' *Journal des Savans* Septembre, 27-35.
- De Ceuleneer, A. 1881. 'L'Afrique romaine. Quelques remarques à propos d'un ouvrage de M.G. Boissière' *Revue des questions historiques*, 185-203.
- De Suckau, E. 1857. *Étude sur Marc-Aurèle: sa vie et sa doctrine*. Paris.
- Dessau, H. 1930. *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, 2.2 *Die Länder und Völker des Reichs im ersten Jahrhundert der Kaiserzeit*. Berlin.
- De Verger, A. 1973. 'Fronton y la Segunda Sofística' *Habis* 4, 115-26.
- Des Vergers, N. 1860. *Essai sur Marc-Aurèle, d'après les monuments épigraphiques*. Paris.
- Dubuisson, M. 1983. 'Les Opici: osques, occidentaux ou barbares?' *Latomus* 42, 522-45.
- Duruy, V. 1876. *Histoire des romains depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à Dioclétien*, 5. Paris.
- Eck, W. & M. Roxan 1995. 'Two New Military Diplomas' in R. Frei-Stolba & M.A. Speidel (eds.) *Römische Inschriften: Neufunde, Neulesungen und Neuinterpretationen. Festschrift für Hans Lieb*. Bâle: 55-99.
- Eck, W. 1998. 'M. Cornelius Fronto, Lehrer Marc Aurels, Consul Suffectus im J. 142' *RhM* 141:2, 193-96.
- Eckstein, F.A. 1850. 'Fronto' in F.S. Ersch & F.G. Gruber (eds.) *Allgemeine Encyklopaedie der Wissenschaften und Kuenste*. Leipzig 1850, 442-46.
- Edwards, C. 1999. *Roman Presences. Receptions of Rome in European Culture, 1789-1945*. Cambridge.
- Ellis, R. 1904. *The Correspondence of Fronto and M. Aurelius: A Lecture Delivered in the Hall of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, December 3, 1903, With an Appendix of Emendations of the Letters*. Oxford.

- Euzennat, M. 1984. 'Les Troubles de Maurétanie' *CRAI*, 372-93.
- Fasce, S. 1973. 'L'Erotikós' di Frontone' *Argentea Aetas: in memoriam Entii V. Marmorale*. Genova, 261-72.
- Fleury, P. 2003. *Fronton: Correspondance*. Paris.
- Flora, F. 1953. *Tutte le Opere di Giacomo Leopardi: Le poesie e le prose, vol. 2: Pensieri, Discorsi e Saggi*. Milano.
- Freitag, F.G. 1732. *Ex antiqua historia litteraria de M. Corn. Frontone et Frontonianorum secta rhetorica publicis lectionibus in provinciali schola Portensi*. Nürnberg.
- Garnsey, P.D.A. 1978. 'Rome's African Empire under the Principate' in P.D.A. Garnsey & D. Whittaker (eds.) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, 223-54.
- Gerhard, D. & W. Norvin 1929. *Die Briefe Barthold Georg Niebuhrs*, 2: 1809-1816. Berlin.
- Goldhill, S. 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge.
- Graham, A. 1902. *Roman Africa: An Outline of the History of the Roman Occupation of North Africa*. New York.
- Hache, F. 1931. 'Bericht über die Literatur zu einigen römischen Schriftstellern des 2. Jahrhunderts aus dem Jahren 1918-28. II.-V. Teil Florus. Fronto. Gellius. Iustinus' *Bursians Jahresberichte*, 231, 1-30.
- Haines, C.R. 1919. *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto, vol. 1*. London & New York.
- Haines, C.R. 1920. 'Fronto' *The Classical Review* 34, 14-18.
- Hertz, M. 1865. *Renaissance und Rococo in der römischen Litteratur*. Berlin.
- Heurgon, J. 1957-59. 'Fronton de Cirta' *Recueil des notices et mémoires de la société archéologique de la province de Constantine* 70, 141-53.
- Jöcher, C.G. 1750. *Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexicon*, 2. Leipzig.
- Joubert, L. 1856. 'Fronton (M. Cornelius)' in Hoefer (ed.) *Nouvelle Biographie Générale depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours*, 17. Paris: 946-49.
- Julien, Y. 1992. 'Fronton: Histoire d'Arion – du mythe à l'affaire judiciaire' *Au Miroir de la culture Antique: Mélanges offerts au Président René Marache*. Rennes, 323-38.
- Jullien, Ch.-A. 1931. *Histoire de l'Afrique du nord*. Paris.
- Klussmann, R. 1961. *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum, II: Scriptores Latini*. Hildesheim.

- Lancel, S. 1985a. 'Y a-t-il une africitas?' *Revue d'Études Latines* 63, 161-82.
- Lancel S. 1985b. 'Africa II (literaturgeschichtlich) b. Fronto' in Theodor Klauser et al. (eds.) *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*, Suppl. 1[2]. Stuttgart: 142-44.
- Lauzi, E. 1988. 'Lepre, domole e iena' *Studi medievali* 29, 539-59.
- Lawless, R. 1978. 'Romanization and Berber resistance in Mauretania Caesariensis (western Algeria)' in M. Galley (ed.) *Actes de 2e Congrès international d'étude des cultures de la Méditerranée occidentale*. Alger: 161-67.
- Le Bohec, Y. 1986. 'Philippe Leveau, Caesarea de Maurétanie' *Bonner Jahrbücher* 186, 843-48.
- Le Glay, M. 1966. *Saturne Africain: Histoire*. Paris.
- Le Glay, M. 1982. 'Sénateurs de Numidie et des Maurétanies' *Tituli 5. Epigrafia e ordine senatorio II. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIEGL*. Roma, 755-81.
- Leschi, L. 1937. 'Cirta: De la Capitale Numide à la Colonie Romaine' *Revue africaine* 81, 25-42.
- Levi, M.A. 1994. *Ricerche su Frontone*. Rome.
- Linaker, A. 1882. 'Frontone e l'educazione di M. Aurelio Antonino' *Rassegna Nazionale* 11, 376-91 et 603-18.
- Longchamps, l'A. de. 1767. *Tableau historique des gens de lettres, ou abrégé chronologique et critique de l'histoire de la littérature françoise considérée dans ses diverses Révolutions, depuis son Origine, jusqu'au dix-huitième siècle*, 1. Paris.
- McCall, M.H. 1969. *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison*. Cambridge, MA.
- Mackail, J.W. 1895. *Latin literature*. London.
- Mai, A. 1815. *M. Cornelii Frontonis Opera inedita cum epistulis item ineditis Antonini Pii M. Aurelii L. Veri et Appiani nec non aliorum veterum fragmentis invenit et comentario parevio notisque illustravit Angelus Maius altera cui adduntur seu edita seu cognita eiusdem Frontonis opera*. Milano.
- Mai, A. 1816. *M. Cornelii Frontonis Opera Inedita*. Frankfurt.
- Mai, A. 1823. *M. Cornelii Frontoni et M. Aurelii Imperatoris epistulae*. Rome.
- Marache, R. 1952. *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au IIe siècle de notre ère*. Rennes.
- Marache, R. 1965. 'Fronton et A. Gellius (1938-1964)' *Lustrum* 10, 213-25.
- Martín, Á.P. 1992. *Frontón: Epistolario*. Madrid.

- Mattingly, D. 1996. 'From one Colonialism to Another' in J. Webster et N. Cooper (eds.) *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives*. Leicester, 49-69.
- Méthy, N. 1983. 'Fronton et Apulée: romains ou africains?' *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 25, 37-47.
- Mommsen, T. 1885. *Römische Geschichte*, 5: *Die Provinzen von Caesar bis Diocletian*. Leipzig.
- Monceaux, P. 1894. *Les Africains, étude sur la littérature latine d'Afrique: Les Païens*. Paris.
- Naber, Samuel Adrian 1867. *M. Cornelii Frontonis et M. Aurelii imperatoris epistulae*. Leipzig.
- Niebuhr, B.G. 1816. *M. Cornelii Frontonis reliquiae*. Berlin.
- Niebuhr, B.G. 1828. 'Zwey klassische lateinische Schriftsteller des Dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr.' *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften. Erste Sammlung*, 305-51.
- Niebuhr, B.G. 1843. 'Ueber die zu Mailand entdeckten Schriften des M. Cornelius Fronto' *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften. Zweite Sammlung*, 52-72.
- Nissen, H. 1886. 'Niebuhr, Barthold-Georg' *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 23. Leipzig, 646-61.
- Norden, E. 1954. *Die römische Litteratur: Mit Anhang: Die lateinische Literatur im Übergang vom Altertum zum Mittelalter*, 5. ergänzte Aufl. Leipzig.
- Norden, E. 1958 *Die Antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. Stuttgart.
- Pacella, G. & S. Timpanaro 1969. *Giacomo Leopardi: Scritti filologici (1817-1832)*. Florence.
- Penndorf, J. 1941. 'Sueton, Florus, Justin. Bericht über das Schrifttum der Jahre 1929-1937' *Bursians Jahresberichte* 273, 45-114.
- Pflaum, H.-G. 1964. 'Les Correspondants de l'orateur M. Cornelius Fronto de Cirta' in M. Renard & R. Schilling *Hommages à Jean Bayet*. Bruxelles, 544-60.
- Pierron, A. 1852. *Histoire de la littérature romaine*. Paris.
- Poignault, R. 1997. 'Fronton, lecteur de Salluste' in R. Poignault (ed.) *Présence de Salluste*. Tours, 95-118.
- Portalupi, F. 1961. *Marco Cornelio Frontone*. Torino.
- Portalupi, F. 1974. *Frontone, Gellio, Apulei.: Ricerca stilistica*. Torino.
- Portalupi, F. 1997. *Marco Cornelio Frontone – Opere*. Torino.

- Raepsaet-Charlier, M.-T. 1987. *Prosopographie des Femmes de l'ordre sénatorial I-II* s. 4. Louvain.
- Ramsay, W. 1854. 'Fronto, M. Cornelius' in W. Smith (ed.) *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 2. London, 183-85.
- Ronnick, M.V. 1997. 'Substructural Elements of Architectonic Rhetoric and Philosophical Thought in Fronto's Epistles' in W.J. Dominik (ed.) *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London, 229-45.
- Roth, F. 1809. *De Bello Borussico Commentarius*. Paris.
- Roth, F. 1817. *Bemerkungen ueber die Schriften des Marcus Cornelius Fronto und ueber das Zeitalter der Antoninen*. Nuremberg.
- Rouse, W.H.D. 1913. *Méric Casaubon: The Golden Book of Marcus Aurelius, with an introduction by W.H.D. Rouse*. London.
- Sallmann, K. 1997. '§456. Marcus Cornelius Fronto' in R. Herzog & P.L. Schmidt (eds.) *Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike* 4 (ed. Klaus Sallmann): *Die Litteratur des Umbruchs, von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur – 117 bis 284 n. Chr.* Munich, 281-91.
- Schanz, M. 1922. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 3. 3. neubearbeitete Auflage von C. Hosius und Gustav Krüger. Munich.
- Shaw, B.D. 1982. 'Eaters of Flesh, Drinkers of Milk – the Ancient Mediterranean Ideology of the Pastoral Nomad' *Ancient Society* 13, 5-31.
- Simcox, G.A. 1883. *History of Latin Literature. From Ennius to Boethius*, 2. London.
- Sittl, K. 1882. *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des afrikanischen Lateins*. Erlangen.
- Sittl, K. 1888. 'Jahresbericht über die spätlateinischen Schriftsteller vom Ende 1879 bis einschließlich 1884' *Bursians Jahresberichte* 55, 235-83.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*. Oxford.
- Teuffel, W.S. 1870. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Leipzig.
- Thierry, A. 1863. *Tableau de l'empire romain: depuis la fondation de Rome jusqu'à la fin du gouvernement impérial*. Paris.
- Tillemont, L.-S.L.N. de 1691. *Histoire des Empereurs. Tome second qui comprend depuis Vespasian jusqu'à la mort de Pertinax*. Paris.
- Timpanaro, S. 1955. *La Filologia di Giacomo Leopardi*. Florence.
- Tiraboschi, G. 1777. *Storia della letteratura italiana*, 2: *Dalla morte di Augusto, sino alla caduta dell'Impero Occidentale*. Napoli.
- Trousset, P. 1982. 'Villes, campagnes et nomadisme dans l'Afrique du Nord

- antique: representation et réalités' in P.A. Février et Ph. Leveau (eds.) *Villes et campagnes dans l'empire romain*. Aix en Provence.
- Toutain, J. 1896. *Les cités romaines de la Tunisie: Essai sur l'histoire de la colonisation romaine dans l'Afrique du nord*. Paris.
- Van den Hout, M.P.J. 1954. *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae*. Leiden.
- Van den Hout, M.P.J. 1988. *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae. Schedis tam editis quam ineditis Edmundi Hauleri usus iterum edidit*. Leipzig.
- Van den Hout, M.P.J. 1999. *A commentary on the letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*. Leiden.
- Westermann, A. 1835. *Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland und Rom. Zweiter Teil: Geschichte der römischen Beredsamkeit*. Leipzig.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2005. *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford.
- Vischer, E. 1981. *Barthold Georg Niebuhr: Briefe. Neue Folge, 1816-1830. 1: Briefe aus Rom, Zweiter Halbband*. Bern.
- Zedler, J.H. 1733. 'Fronto (M. Cornelius)' *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künsten*. Halle.

AN ECHO FROM NONIUS MARCELLUS IN ALDHELM'S *ENIGMATA*

By Chiara Meccariello

Summary: Nonius Marcellus was the source of Aldhelm of Malmesbury for the passage of *Enigma* 100 in which the Anglo-Saxon author uses the insect *tippula* (pond-skater) as an example of lightness. Nonius and probably Paulus, whose compendium of Festus' *de verborum significatu* also contains the entry *tippula*, seem to be recalled also in *Enigma* 38, a riddle entirely about this insect.

Manitius' pioneering essay on Aldhelm's sources and the useful *apparatus fontium* in Ehwald's edition of Aldhelm's works document the richness of his literary sources.¹ Both Manitius and Ehwald included the *De compendiosa doctrina* of Nonius Marcellus among Aldhelm's *auctoritates*.² Although the

* I would like to thank Professor Andrea Aragosti for his encouragement and patient supervision.

1 M. Manitius 1886. 'Zu Aldhelm und Baeda' *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 112, 535-634; R. Ehwald (ed.) 1919. *Aldhelmi Opera, MGH, Auct. Antiq.* vol. 15. Berlin. A less reliable contribution is J.D.A. Ogilvy 1936. *Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin*. Cambridge, MA. A database of the written sources of Anglo-Saxon authors is now available on the web at the URL <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/> (Fontes Anglo-Saxonici Project, ed., *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register*).

2 Besides the passages listed by Manitius 1886: 599-600 Ehwald identified two more *loci* of Aldhelm's *De metris* where Nonius is the source (164 n. 2, 165 n. 1). Nonius is pointed as Aldhelm's source also in G. Barabino 1975. 'Le voces animalium in Nonio Marcello' *Studi Noniani* 3, 7-56 = *Scripta Noniana*. Genova 2006: 41-91. Barabino considers the catalogue of *voces animantium* that Aldhelm included in his *De metris* (197-98 Ehw.).

In *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* (see previous note) Nonius is not recorded among the sources of Aldhelm nor of any other author.

knowledge of this work in late seventh-century England has been strongly doubted in more recent studies, there are no compelling reasons to deny *a priori* that Aldhelm had a copy of *De comp. doct.* and used it as a source.³ Indeed, I believe that another passage is to be added to the ones pointed out so far as deriving from Nonius, namely a verse of the riddle that closes Aldhelm's collection of hexametric *Enigmata* (*Enigm.* 100, 145-49 Ehwald).⁴ In

-
- 3 M. Lapidge 2006. *The Anglo-Saxon library*. Oxford & New York: 102-5 tends to exclude the knowledge of Nonius' work in late seventh-century England. According to Lapidge, the fact that 'no surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscript preserves the *Compendiosa doctrina*' and that L. (*Voss. Lat. F.* 73), the Leiden manuscript that was directly copied from the archetype at Tour probably during Alcuin's lifetime, has no Anglo-Saxon symptoms, make it improbable that this work circulated in Anglo-Saxon England in the late seventh century. Lapidge follows the reconstruction proposed by W.M. Lindsay 1901. 'A Study of the Leyden MS of Nonius Marcellus' *AJPh* 22, 29-38, whose conclusions have been recently challenged by G. Milanese 2005. 'Il *codex optimus* di Nonio e alcuni dati per la riconsiderazione della "seconda famiglia" noniana' in F. Bertini (ed.) *Prolegomena noniana V*. Genova, 55-66. In my opinion, even if we accept Lindsay's reconstruction, Lapidge's arguments are not conclusive. First, we cannot exclude that a manuscript independent of our tradition circulated in Anglo-Saxon England and then disappeared. Secondly, Aldhelm could have had a manuscript written in Continental Europe and free from the above-mentioned symptoms at his disposal. The relation between Aldhelm and France, the pivotal area for Nonius' manuscript tradition according to L.D. Reynolds 1983. *Texts and Transmission*. Oxford: 248-52, is documented by what remains of Aldhelm's correspondence with Cellanus (498-99 Ehw.). See also S. Gwara (ed.) 2001. *Aldhelmi Malmesbiriensi Prosa de Virginitate. Praefatio. Indices*. Turnhout: 25. On Aldhelm's library and the difficulties of its reconstruction see R. Thomson 1982. 'Books from the pre-Conquest Library of Malmesbury Abbey' *Anglo-Saxon England* 10, 1-19.
- 4 The *Enigmata* are edited by Ehwald (99-149) but F. Glorie's 1968 edition is also available in *Collectiones aenigmatum Merovingicae aetatis* vol. 1. Turnhout. A more recent work is N.P. Stork 1990. *Through a Glass Darkly: Aldhelm's Riddles in the British Library MS Royal 12.C.xxiii*. Toronto, which reproduces text and glosses of the riddles as preserved in the manuscript *Britannicus Regius 12, C, xxiii*. As to the title of Aldhelm's collection, Ehwald uses the form *Enigmata*, not *Aenigmata* as Giles did in his edition (Oxford 1844). Ehwald preserves the form without the diphthong transmitted by the manuscripts (with the only exception of the *explicit* in B, *Brit. Reg. 15 A xvi*: 'explicient aenigmata althelmi aegregii grammatici': but it is worth noting here the hyper-correct *aegregii*). In the whole of Aldhelm's work the word *enigma* is used many times (sometimes referring to Aldhelm's own riddles: see Ehwald's *index verborum*: 603) and usually transmitted without the diphthong, with only one significant exception, namely a passage of *Epistula ad Ehwfridum* (491, 1 Ehw.) where the manuscripts read unanimously *aenigmatibus*. The different ortho-

this riddle, whose solution, indicated in the title, is *creatura*, Aldhelm plays with contrasts and attributes certain qualities and their opposites to the object he is alluding to. In many cases, the quality is expressed in the comparative form and the object of the riddle, which speaks in the first person, asserts to have the given quality in a higher degree than an entity that possesses it notoriously or proverbially.

Verses 40-41 of the riddle concern the *gravis* / *levis* contrast:

sum gravior plumbo: scopulorum pondera vergo;
sum levior pluma, cedit cui tippula limphae.

I am heavier than lead: I tend to the weight of rocks;
I am lighter than a feather, to which even the pond-skater yields.

The *pluma* and the *tippula limphae* are here introduced for their extraordinary *levitas*, which makes them the ideal terms of comparison to emphasize the lightness of the object of the riddle. Aldhelm creates a sort of scale with the mysterious object on the top, followed respectively by *pluma* and *tippula*. The verb *cedit*, while assuring that the lightness of the *tippula* was proverbial, expresses at the same time Aldhelm's intent to overcome the paradigm by introducing another term, the *pluma*, so as to double the distance between the two extremes of the scale. Aldhelm's verse surely presupposes the use of *tippula* as the *levis* object *par excellence*. A few Latin sources document this use and it is among them that we must search Aldhelm's *auctoritas* for verse 41.⁵

graphy of the manuscripts in this case can be due to the fact that the tradition of the letter is completely separated from that of the *Enigmata*, but also to a deliberate change in Aldhelm's use. According to Gwara 2001: 315-16, whose study is about *Prosa de Virginitate*, the author was very accurate in reproducing the diphthong 'ae'. This consideration could give new value to Giles' choice to print regularly the initial diphthong where the manuscripts read *enigma*, but in the present paper I will adopt the standard form *Enigmata*.

- 5 The lightness of the feather is proverbial in Latin literature: see A. Otto 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig: 282 with *addendum*. Aldhelm uses this term in comparisons stressing on softness (*Prosa de virginitate*: 279, 17 Ehw. 'pluma molliores', *Carmen de virginitate* v. 1218, 404 Ehw. 'ut plumae mollescunt'). Writing *Enigm.* 100 Aldhelm could have remembered one of the two verses of Plautus recorded by Otto, namely *Men.* 488 'homo levior quam pluma' and *Poen.* 812 'levior pluma est gratia'. The first verse is quoted by Diomedes in a passage of his *Ars Grammatica* con-

The word *tippula*, rare in surviving Latin literature, is lemmatized in Nonius' *De comp. doctr.* (264, 8 Lindsay), where it is described as 'animal levissimum, quod aquas non nando, sed gradiendo transeat'. Nonius adds two examples from archaic poetry, namely a trochaic septenarius from Varro's *Bimarcus* (*men. fr.* 50 Astbury: 'ut levis tippula lymphon frigidus transit lacus') and a fragment from an unspecified and unidentifiable comedy of Plautus (*fab.inc.* fr. 33, v. 153 Lindsay: 'levior es quam tippula'). Lightness is the key idea in both the quotations. In Varro's verse *tippula* appears in a comparison that vividly describes the moving of the insect on the cold waters of a pond.⁶ In Plautus' fragment, of uncertain metrical interpretation, the speaker uses *tippula* as the light term of comparison *par excellence* so as to stress – and probably to mock – the *levitas* of the addressee.⁷ Plautus uses *tippula* in a similar way in *Persa*, v. 244, in order to emphasize the *levitas* of *fides lenonia*: 'neque tippulae levius pondust, quam fides lenonia'. This trochaic septenarius is quoted by Paulus Diaconus in his epitome of Festus' *de verborum significatu* to exemplify the lemma *tippula*, whose definition is 'bestiolae genus sex pedes habentis, sed tantae levitatis, ut super aquam currens non desidat'.⁸

Various elements contribute to the conclusion that Aldhelm's source for this passage is Nonius' entry with the two poetic quotations. First, the particular insistence on *levitas* both in the definition and in the quoted verses is the essential requirement for the 'competition with the model' that Aldhelm seems to engage here, shifting the *tippula* from the top to the bottom of a 'lightness scale'. Secondly, two formal elements are strong clues: 1) the comparative form of Plautus' fragment (*levior*) is exactly reproduced by Aldhelm with a different term of comparison, while the term of comparison used in

cerning the comparative form (*GL* I, p. 325, 22-24) and Aldhelm could have known it, maybe through an intermediate source. Yet this debt is not necessary because the feather is a very typical example of lightness, cf. the German adjective 'federleicht'.

- 6 Varro's fragment, quoted outside of its context, is of uncertain interpretation. For a review of the various hypotheses and for the possible relation of this fragment with fr. 49 Astbury see Cèbe (ed.) 1974. *Varron, Satires Ménippées* vol. II. Rome: 198 (fr. 51).
- 7 For a deep examination of Plautus' fragment and a reconstruction of Nonius' sources for the two quotations see A. Aragosti 2009. *Frammenti plautini dalle commedie extravarroniane*. Bologna: 242-44.
- 8 Paul. 503, 8 Lindsay. *Tippula* is the reading of Paulus, while the manuscripts of Plautus read the ametric *stipula*.

the source meaningfully becomes the subject of the following *cedit*; 2) the phrase *tippula limphae* in the riddle recalls Varro's *tippula lymphon*.⁹ Here *lymphon* is a genitive of definition depending on *lacus* (Cèbe 1974: 198), while in Aldhelm *limphae* is to be linked with *tippula* as a nomenclatural genitive.¹⁰ It is also possible that Aldhelm understood Varro's verse linking *lymphon* to *tippula* and not to *lacus*: if so, his *tippula limphae* would reproduce the phrase of the source with a single formal variation, the use of a more familiar form of genitive instead of the Greek ending adopted by Varro.¹¹

In Varro's verse, as in *Persa*, the metre requires that the penultimate syllable of *tippula* be long. In Aldhelm's verse, on the contrary, a short penultimate is required: *tippula* is here scanned as a dactyl as it is in the prose treatise *De metris* (164, 9 Ehw.), where the term is included in a list of dactylic words.¹² The difference between Aldhelm's and Varro's prosody is not a good reason to doubt Aldhelm's debt to Nonius: in fact, there is no evidence that Aldhelm knew and understood the structure of the trochaic septenarius and there is no certainty that he was able to identify the verse in this case.¹³ Besides, the hexameter-maker Aldhelm could not use Varro's verse for strictly reproducing metrical sequences in his own verses, therefore the different prosody, if seen, could have been disregarded.¹⁴

9 The transmitted *limfon* requires orthographic emendation but the other corrections recorded by Cèbe are unnecessary. We also find the typical *limphal/lympa* oscillation in Aldhelm's manuscripts: see Gwara 2001 (316) on the peculiarities of Aldhelm's orthography.

10 So Ehwald in *index verborum*: 720. See the English translation 'water-strider' in Stork 1990: 237 and 'pond-skater' in M. Lapidge & J. Rosier 1985, trans. *Aldhelm, The Poetic Works*. Cambridge: 93. A similar use of the genitive in the expression *machina limphae* of *Enigm.* 48, v. 8 (118 Ehw.) which surely means 'watermill': see Lapidge & Rosier 1985: 80.

11 On this grecism, E. Woytek 1970. *Sprachliche Studien zur Satura Menippea Varros*. Vienna: 51-52.

12 Aldhelm's prosody is the natural one for diminutives in -ulus. This is also the case of *tippula*, probably deriving from the Greek *tīphe*. See W. Kahle 1918. *De vocabulis Graecis Plauti aetate in sermonem Latinum vere receptis*. Münster: 10.

13 On Aldhelm's versification and on the difficulty in understanding Latin quantitative metrics in Anglo-Saxon England see Lapidge & Rosier 1985: 19-24, 183-90.

14 It is possible that Aldhelm could have scanned Varro's verse as a hexameter (so structured: ut levis / tippula / lymphon / frigidus / transit / lacus). Although *frigidōs* and *lācus* do not fit such a pattern, the first part of the verse, scanning *tippula* as a dactyl, can have an

Aldhelm centred an entire riddle on the *tippula* (*Enigm.* 38 Ehw.). There is no explicit reference to lightness in this riddle: the insect is alluded to through the description of its peculiar technique of locomotion, the same to which Nonius and Paulus refer:

pergo super latices plantis suffulta quaternis
nec tamen in limphas vereor quod mergar aquosas,
sed pariter terras et flumina calco pedestris;
nec natura sinit celerem natare per amnem,
pontibus aut ratibus fluvios transire feroces;
quin potius pedibus gradior super aequora siccis.

I walk on the waters held up by four feet
yet I do not fear to drown in the water currents,
rather I pass on foot equally through land and sea;
nature does not allow me to swim in the rushing stream,
or to cross the fierce rivers by bridge or by boat;
instead I walk with dry feet on the surface of water.

The ability to walk on water taking advantage of the surface tension is the key element for the identification of the *tippula*. The number of feet recorded by Paulus just assures that *tippula* is an insect, but the locomotion technique described by Nonius, Paulus and Aldhelm limits the choices to a few families of insects, namely *Gerridae*, *Veliidae* and *Hydrometridae*.¹⁵ The *tippula* is to be sought among the species of water insects belonging to these families.¹⁶ The first verse of *Enigma* 38 assures that the *tippula* described by

hexametric rhythm. Apart from the two prosodic flaws of the second part of the verse, this would be a *spondiazon* hexameter, a verse that Aldhelm never used but of which he was surely aware, as we can deduce from the passage of *Epistula ad Acircium* devoted to this subject (83 Ehw.), where *Aen.* 7.634 is adduced as an example. For this section Aldhelm drew heavily on Audax' *Excerpta* (*GL* 7, p. 337): see Lapidge & Rosier 1985: 266 n. 16, and M. Lapidge 1979. 'Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse' *Comparative Literature* 31: 213.

¹⁵ These families belong to the same infra-order *Gerromorpha*, according to the standard classification: see for example O.W. Richards & R.G. Davies (eds.) 1977. *Imms' General Textbook of Entomology*, 10th ed. London: 743-44.

¹⁶ See also N.M. Andersen & J.T. Polhemus 1976. 'Water Striders' in L. Chang (ed.) *Ma-*

Aldhelm is a *gerris*: *gerridae*, currently called pond-skaters, use only the middle and hind legs for locomotion,¹⁷ and these are longer and more conspicuous than the front pair, so at first glance the creature can appear to be four-footed.¹⁸ The detail of *plantae quaternae* is therefore conclusive to identify the insect: far from being an inaccuracy or a poetic licence – as the bishop does not give information about the total number of the feet but simply about those that hold the insect up on the surface of water – it reveals a profound knowledge of the *tippula* (Cameron 1985: 121).

Commenting on *Enigma* 38, Cameron also suggests that Aldhelm drew the description of the animal from direct observation.¹⁹ In fact the accurate description of the pond-skater seems to be rooted in what Manitius called ‘das lebhaftes Beobachtungsvermögen des Germanen’,²⁰ but probably the riddle was inspired by Nonius’ definition with its emphasis on the extraordinary locomotion technique of the *tippula*. Aldhelm’s poem seems in fact to contain other traces of Nonius’ entry: verse 4 ‘nec natura sinit celerem natare per amnem’ could be an elaboration of Nonius’ ‘non nando’, and the close of verse 5 ‘fluvios transire feroces’ has the same structure as Varro’s ‘frigidos transit lacus’. The use of *transire* in this verse and of *gradior* in the following confirm the hypothesis of a textual debt to the *De comp. doct.*²¹ This hypo-

rine Insects. Amsterdam: 189: ‘All water-striders belong to the infra-order Gerromorpha’. In the scientific denomination deriving from Linnaeus the term *tipula* and the derived forms *tipulina*, *tipulidae* indicate a few species of the order *Diptera* which cannot walk on water. The term *tipula* also survives in the French ‘tipule’, meaning the same species of insects, in English ‘crane flies’. On the basis of the information supplied by Nonius, Paulus and Aldhelm we can conclude that the modern *tipula* / *tipule* is not the same as the *tipula* in these authors. The similarity between *tipulidae* and *gerridae*, especially for their thin long legs (in spite of their different locomotion technique) can have caused the transfer of the name *tippula* from the pond-skater to the crane fly. On the identification of the insect, see also M.L. Cameron 1985. ‘Aldhelm as Naturalist: a Re-Examination of Some of His Enigmata’ *Peritia* 4, 121.

17 This is true neither of *Hydrometridae* nor of *Veliidae*: see Richards & Davies 1977: 743.

18 L. Kulzer 1994. ‘Water Striders, family Gerridae’ *Scarabogram* 169: 3: ‘At first glance, water striders appear to have only two pairs of legs. On closer inspection, the “missing” (first) pair, is shorter and held in front of the insect, typically resting on the surface film’.

19 Cameron 1985: 120: ‘The subject of our next enigma was one for which he had ample opportunity for direct observation’.

20 M. Manitius 1911. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. I. Munich: 138.

21 The last verse is surely modelled on Ovid *Met.* 14.50 ‘summaque decurrit pedibus super aequora siccis’: see Manitius 1886: 562.

thesis could also be enforced by the probable derivation of the first verse of the preceding riddle (*Enigm.* 37, *cancer*) from another of Nonius' entries (see Ehwald 113). The *cancer* protagonist of the riddle says about itself: 'nepa mihi nomen veteres dixere Latini'. Aldhelm seems to have drawn this information from the beginning of Nonius' entry NEPA (211 Lindsay):

NEPAM quidam cancrum putant ad illud Plauti (*Cas.* 443):
'retrovorsum cedam; imitabor nepam'
et illud aliud (cf. Enn. *trag.* 200): 'aut cum nepa est'

Some believe that the NEPA is the crab as in Plautus' verse 'I will proceed backwards; I will imitate the crab' and as in that other passage 'or when the crab is (?)'

That Aldhelm knew this passage seems to be assured by the use of *retrograda* in v. 3 of the same riddle, a word that recalls the form *retrovorsum* of Plautus' quotation.²²

For the first two verses of *Enigma* 38, Aldhelm seems closer to Paulus. First, the detail of the number of the feet could have been inspired by Paulus' entry. Rather than reproducing it mechanically, Aldhelm could have decided to modify the detail for a more realistic description of the locomotion technique of the *tippula*, thus obtaining at the same time a greater obscurity, suitable for a riddle. Secondly, the content of Paulus' phrase 'ut super aquam currens non desidat' is precisely expressed in v. 2 of the *Enigma*, 'nec tamen in limphas vereor quod mergar aquosas'.

We have an interesting clue to the circulation of the *De comp. doct.* in Anglo-Saxon England from some manuscripts of the *Enigmata* where the title of the riddle 38 is followed by a slightly modified form of Nonius' definition of *tippula*. In a group of manuscripts²³ the lemma is followed by the

22 The verse is preserved in Plautus' manuscripts in the form 'recessim cedam ad parietem, imitabor nepam', while Paulus quotes the verse s.v. 'nepa' (163 Lindsay) in the form 'dabo me ad parietem, imitabor nepam'. Apart from the textual arrangement of Plautus' verse, an interesting fact is that although Paulus' entry contains the word *cancer* as Nonius' one ('nepa Afrorum lingua sidus, quod cancer appellatur, vel, ut quidam volunt, scorpios'), Aldhelm's reference to 'veteres Latini' is better deduced from the beginning of Nonius' entry rather than from Paulus, who talks about 'Afrorum lingua'.

23 According to Ehwald, they are A (*Petropolitanus* Q I 15, eighth century), where the anno-

relative clause 'quae non nando sed gradiendo aquas transilit', while in *Britannicus Regius* 12 C xxiii 31²⁴ we read 'id est vermis qui aquas transit', which can be read in three other manuscripts, with slight variations.²⁵ In the eighth-century Latin-Anglo-Saxon glossary known as the *Leyden Glossary* the definition of *tappula* (clearly a mistake for *tippula*) is 'vermis qui currit super aquas',²⁶ which closely recalls Paulus' 'super aquam currens' and could indicate that his epitome was known in Anglo-Saxon England. If so, the hypothesis that Paulus was Aldhelm's source for vv. 1-2 of *Enigma* 38 would be more consistent. Certainly the bareness of the glossary entries and their lack of Latin quotations make it improbable that Aldhelm knew Nonius' and possibly Paulus' entries only through the intermediation of a glossographic source.

tation is added by a second hand, and a group of nine-tenth century manuscripts, namely e (*Einsidlensis* 302), S¹ (*Sangallensis* 242), S² (*Bremensis* 651), P² (*Parisinus* 7540).

24 B¹ in Ehwald. See Stork 1990: 5-10 for an analysis of this manuscript.

25 B (*Britannicus Regius* 15 A xvi, ninth century), V (*Vaticano-Reginensis* 2078, tenth century) and C (*Cantabrigiensis* Gg V 35, eleventh century). For the *variae lectiones* see Ehwald's apparatus *ad loc.*

26 J.H. Hessels 1906. *A Late Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary Preserved in the Library of the Leiden University*. Cambridge: 48. *Tippula* is glossed with 'vermis aquaticus' in other similar glossaries, namely the *Épinal Glossary* (27 C 31 Sweet), the *Erfurt Glossary* (*Glossarius Amplonianus Primus*, CGL V, 397, 44) and the *Corpus Glossary* (T 181 Lindsay). On these glossaries and the Leyden one, preserved by a few eighth-ninth century manuscripts, see W.M. Lindsay (ed.) 1921a. *The Corpus Glossary*. Cambridge: xiii-xv. On the relationship between these glossaries and Aldhelm see Lindsay 1921b. *The Corpus, Épinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries*. Oxford: 97-100. The use of *vermis* in these glosses as in Aldhelm's manuscripts cited in the previous note is more interesting when one considers that riddle 40 of the *Exeter Book*, a translation in ancient English of Aldhelm's *Enigma* 100, translates *tippula* with 'lytla wyrm' (v. 76): see K. O'Brien O'Keeffe 1985. 'The Text of Aldhelm's *Enigma* no. c in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697 and *Exeter Riddle* 40' *Anglo-Saxon England* 14, 69-70. Instead the gloss 'capra aquatica' added to the title of the *Enigma* 38 in P¹ (*Parisinus* 2339, tenth century) reproduces the old English 'wæter-bucca', i.e. the same water insect that the Latin called *tippula*, while 'bucca' alone means the 'buck': see T. Northcote Toller (ed.) 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*. Oxford s.v. 'wæter-bucca' and s.v. 'bucca'.

JOHN OF SALISBURY, 'JOHN' THE TRANSLATOR, AND THE *POSTERIOR ANALYTICS*

By David Bloch

Summary: In this paper two texts concerned with Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* are examined: (1) the preface to the 12th-century Latin translation of the *Posterior Analytics* by a certain 'John' and (2) the relevant part of John of Salisbury's *Metalogicon*. On the basis of these and some supporting evidence, it is argued that the *Posterior Analytics* must have been available in translation among the Latins earlier than is usually assumed.

INTRODUCTION: THE SOURCES

John of Salisbury finished the *Metalogicon* in 1159 at the latest, and this work is remarkable for several reasons.¹ Not only does it constitute an interesting and ambitious proposal for a new curriculum in the teaching of logic, that is, logic in the broad sense of 'a rational system of verbal expression and argumentative reasoning' (*loquendi vel disserendi ratio*);² it also provides a unique source for the philosophy and science of the first half of the 12th cen-

1 All medieval texts are cited from printed editions, but I have sometimes made changes in orthography and punctuation. John of Salisbury's *Metalogicon* is cited from Hall's edition: Ioannis Saresberiensis *Metalogicon* Hall, J.B. and K.S.B. Keats-Rohan (ed.), *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis* 98 (Turnhout 1991). Translations are my own. I wish to thank Sten Ebbesen and Karin Margareta Fredborg for comments and criticism.

2 *Metalogicon* 1.9, p. 28.

tury, and not least for the knowledge of Aristotle in this period.³ The *Meta-logicon* is a complicated work, divided into four books. John first defends eloquence and logic against Cornificius and his adherents, the so-called Cornificians. But he soon proceeds to a more general defense of logic and attempts to explain why logic has gained a somewhat bad reputation in some circles. It is in the course of this defense that John suggests a revision of the curriculum of his day, and to John's credit he wants to base the new curriculum on the Aristotelian *Organon*. John's own preferred text is, for several reasons, the *Topics*, but he gives the impression of at least some knowledge of the entire *Organon*.

Among Aristotle's treatises on logic, the *Posterior Analytics* was apparently the text that was least known in John's time, but John himself knew, or at least knew the existence and parts of, two translations: the first is James of Venice's translation which is usually dated, with a very generous timespan, to the period 1125-50,⁴ although it seems to be a general view in modern scholarship that it did not really reach the French universities until about 1150 or a little later;⁵ the second translation is one made by a certain 'John' at an unknown date after James'.⁶ However, 'John's' translation was not a success. Apart from John of Salisbury, no medieval author is known for certain to

3 The best-known work on John of Salisbury and philosophy is Jeauneau 1984, but excellent studies have been published both before and after, e.g., Bellenguez 1926; Mazzantini 1957; Diez 1975; Dotto 1986; Garfagnini 1990; Burnett 1996; Arduini 1997; Jeauneau 1997; and several others. There are also quite a few relevant but unpublished PhD dissertations. I shall treat John of Salisbury and (Aristotelian) philosophy and science in a forthcoming monograph.

4 Minio-Paluello & Dod 1968: xix. Dod 1982: 46, says 'probably made before 1150'.

5 See, e.g., Burnett 1996: 24: 'John is, therefore, a rare witness to what probably marks the entry of James' translations and revisions into the Île de France'. Burnett also states in the same article (27) that 'John was ... right at the centre of the Greek-Latin translating movement' and conjectures that 'John may himself have been partly responsible for bringing the new Greek-Latin translations north of the Alps'. So also Tweedale 1988: 196: 'James of Venice's version [sc. of the *Posterior Analytics*] began circulating towards 1150'. Minio-Paluello 1952: 269-70, n. 13, conjectures that James' translation did not 'come into circulation before ca. 1145'.

6 Both translations, along with Gerard of Cremona's and William of Moerbeke's, are edited in Minio-Paluello & Dod 1968. On the identity of 'John', see Dod 1982: 56-57; Jeauneau 1984: 105-8; Burnett 1996: 25-26. However, this problem is not important for the present analysis.

have seen it, and James' translation was the one generally used by subsequent scholars, thus defeating also the translations by Gerard of Cremona and William of Moerbeke.⁷

In modern scholarship 'John' the translator has, however, earned himself a significant place, not so much because of his work on the *Posterior Analytics* but rather as a result of the preface that he wrote to accompany the translation:

Though occupied by many duties, my love for you compelled me to translate Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* from Greek into Latin, a task I undertook so much more willingly, since I recognize that this work contains many fruits of knowledge, and it is certain that the Latins of our times are not well acquainted with it. For Boethius' translation is no longer found complete among us, and the parts of it that are extant are obscure due to corruption. James' translation, on the other hand, is known to the masters in France, as is the same James' translation of commentaries, but the masters by their own silence bear witness that James' version is wrapped up in the shadows of obscurity, and they dare not reveal their acquaintance with the work. Therefore, if some benefit will come to the Latin world from my translation, the credit for this should be given to your request. For I undertook to translate it not for money or empty fame but rather in order to please you by conferring something of value to the Latin world. Moreover, if in any matter I shall be found to have strayed from the path of reason, I shall not be ashamed to correct it guided by you or other learned men.⁸

7 See Dod 1982: 75 for the statistics concerning extant mss.: James 275, 'John' 1, Gerard 3, William 4. In addition, glosses from 'John's' translation are found in the margins of other medieval manuscripts, see Dod 1970: 8-II.

8 Edited in Minio-Paluello & Dod 1968: xlv: 'Vallatum multis occupationibus me dilectio vestra compulit ut *Posterioriores Analeticos* Aristotelis de Graeco in Latinum transferrem, quod eo affectuosius aggressus sum quod cognoscebam librum illum multos in se scientiae fructus continere, et certum erat notitiam eius nostris temporibus Latinis non patere. Nam translatio Boetii apud nos integra non invenitur, et id ipsum quod de ea reperitur vitio corruptionis obfuscatur. Translationem vero Iacobi obscuritatis tenebris involvi silentio suo perhibent Franciae magistri, qui, quamvis illam translationem et commentarios ab eodem Iacobo translatos habeant, tamen notitiam illius libri non audent profiteri. Eapropter, si quid utilitatis ex mea translatione sibi noverit latinitas

John of Salisbury expresses similar sentiments in an important chapter of the *Metalogicon* in which he introduces the *Posterior Analytics* to his reader:

The science/knowledge found in the *Posterior Analytics* is a subtle one and penetrable only for few intellects. There are evidently several reasons for this. First, the work contains the art of demonstration, and this art is more difficult than the other systems of argumentation. Second, this art has practically fallen into disuse as a result of the rarity of practitioners, since the use of demonstration is almost limited to the mathematicians alone, and even among these it is used almost exclusively by the geometers. However, this discipline is not one that is frequently used among us either, except perhaps in the Iberian region and in the confines of Africa. For these people, for the sake of astronomy, practise geometry more than other people. The same is true of the Egyptians and quite a few of the Arabic people. In addition to these observations, the book in which the demonstrative discipline is transmitted is much more confused than the others, both because of the transpositions of words and letters and the outdated examples that have been borrowed from different disciplines; and finally – which is not the author's fault – the work has been so much distorted by scribal errors that it contains almost as many chapters, as it contains obstacles. And actually, it is good when there are no *more* obstacles than chapters. Thus, many blame the translator for the difficulty and claim that the work has not been correctly translated.⁹

provenire, postulationi vestrae debet imputare. Non enim spe lucri aut inanis gloriae ad transferendum accessi, sed ut aliquid conferens latinitati vestrae morem gererem voluntati. Ceterum, si in aliquo visus fuero rationis tramitem excessisse, vestra vel aliorum doctorum admonitione non erubescam emendare'. Translations are also found in Dod 1982: 56-57, and (partially) in Ebbesen 2004: 71.

- 9 *Metalogicon* 4.6, p. 145: '*Posteriorum vero Analeticorum* subtilis quidem scientia est, et paucis ingeniis pervia. Quod quidem ex causis pluribus evenire perspicuum est. Continet enim artem demonstrandi, quae prae ceteris rationibus disserendi ardua est. Deinde haec utentium raritate iam fere in desuetudinem abiit, eo quod demonstrationis usus vix apud solos mathematicos est, et in his fere apud geometras dumtaxat. Sed et huius quoque disciplinae non est celebris usus apud nos, nisi forte in tractu Hiberno, vel confinio Africae. Etenim gentes istae astronomiae causa, geometriam exercent prae ceteris. Similiter Aegyptus, et non nullae gentes Arabiae. Ad haec liber quo demonstrativa traditur disciplina ceteris longe turbatior est, et transpositione sermonum, traiectione litterarum, desuetu-

Together these two texts are the earliest explicit evidence for medieval knowledge of the *Posterior Analytics*, and they provide much interesting information.

First, they contribute to the disputed question whether or not Manlius Boethius ever made a translation of the *Posterior Analytics*.¹⁰ Obviously, 'John' the translator's remarks must be taken as supporting evidence that he had seen at least fragments, but on the other hand it cannot be established on the basis of his translation whether he might have been inspired by such fragments.

More interesting are the remarks made by both authors as regards James' translation. It appears that James had acquired a reputation for having done quite a bad job with the *Posterior Analytics*, making the text even more obscure than the original. Whether or not this is true, it tells us that a number of scholars knew, or at least knew of, but did not use the *Posterior Analytics* in their teaching. This is relevant to what is, in my opinion, the most important conclusion that can be gathered from these two texts, namely concerning the date of the first post-Boethian Latin translation of the *Posterior Analytics* and the knowledge that the medieval Latins had of this text. From the two texts, it is clear that the *Posterior Analytics* was little used around 1150 – for several reasons, if the texts can be trusted – but the texts also bear witness to the fact that the possibility of using it was in fact there. The French masters (*Franciae magistri*, primarily Parisian of course, but there may have been others as well) consciously neglect the treatise, but this also proves that the work was there to be used. The only certain *terminus ante quem*, namely John of Salisbury's *Metalogicon*, and the apparently complete ignorance of the text in writers of the early 12th century have indicated to most scholars that the first translations of the *Posterior Analytics* were made not too long before 1150, and that the text certainly did not begin to circulate until about

dine exemplorum, quae a diversis disciplinis mutuata sunt, et postremo quod non contingit auctorem, adeo scriptorum depravatus est vitio, ut fere quot capita tot obstacula habeat. Et bene quidem ubi non sunt obstacula capitibus plura. Unde a plerisque in interpretem difficultatis culpa refunditur, asserentibus librum ad nos non recte translatum'.

¹⁰ See Minio-Paluello & Dod 1968: xii-xv; Dod 1970: 1-3. Most scholars believe that Boethius did indeed make a translation, see, e.g., Burnett 1988: 155 and Tweedale 1988: 196. For some scepticism concerning such a translation, see Ebbesen 2004: 70.

1150.¹¹ However, some very simple but, I think, weighty arguments against this view can be produced.

THE ARGUMENTS

(1) First, the chronology that can be established with some amount of certainty on the basis of the translator 'John's' preface and John of Salisbury's comments indicates that in 1159 James' translation at any rate must have existed for some time. John of Salisbury knew 'John' the translator's version of the *Posterior Analytics* in 1159 at the latest, to which he refers as the 'new translation' (*nova translatio*), and from which he quotes a few words.¹² We cannot know for certain what 'new' means in this context; it may mean 'recently translated', but it could also mean 'most recent (among the existing translations)', that is, 'new compared to James' translation'. However, even if we were to say that it belongs to the time around 1150-55, we do know that James' translation was in existence, and that it had been for some time; for both the preface by 'John' the translator and John of Salisbury's *Metalogicon* as cited above show that this very translation was often blamed for having made Aristotle's text more obscure. Also, John's comment that James was blamed by *many* scholars (*a plerisque*) obviously implies that quite a few Parisian masters had taken a position concerning the *Posterior Analytics*. Therefore, time is needed after the composition of the translation in order to make it circulate among the Parisian masters long enough to make it a generally feared text that was avoided in teaching situations. It seems to me, then, that modern scholars have generally read the passages wrongly as evidence for a very limited medieval knowledge of the treatise, although the texts do in fact bear witness to exactly the opposite.¹³ 'John' the translator is

11 See notes 4 and 5. Minio-Paluello 1952: 281 is actually willing to accept a date as early as 1130 for the translation, but on his views concerning the circulation of the text I do not understand how he can (see note 13 below).

12 *Metalogicon* 2.20, p. 96. See also *Metalogicon* 4.6, p. 145 (cited above, note 9) in which passage John basically expresses the same views as 'John' the translator does in his preface (also cited above, note 8).

13 Minio-Paluello 1952: 269, states that after the completion of James' translation the *Posterior Analytics* quickly circulated among the French masters, but if this was really true, it

very explicit that the *Posterior Analytics* exists in a Latin translation and is available but simply not used, and John of Salisbury is actually equally explicit; according to him the text is out-dated, so to speak, since it treats of a science (or art), *viz.* the demonstrative (*demonstrativa*), which is relevant primarily to mathematicians, and among these in particular to the geometers. And geometry, according to John, is not a discipline that is particularly cultivated by Latin scholars. That is, *this* is the reason why the *Posterior Analytics* is not used among the Latins; it is not because the text is not available. Even though John's is a strange argument, since demonstrative science in accordance with the Euclidian procedure was much admired and copied by other sciences in the 12th century,¹⁴ it constitutes, I believe, proof that the *Posterior Analytics* was not as badly known in the second quarter of the century, and it certainly was not unavailable during the entire period.

(2) Second, John of Salisbury's personal biography is very important when one evaluates the information provided in the *Metalogicon*, not least concerning the *Posterior Analytics*.¹⁵ John went to France to study under the greatest thinkers of his time, and his education lasted from 1136 until 1147. Afterwards he became involved in ecclesiastical administration, and eventu-

would indicate a real interest in the text that should not have been extinguished by fear. Furthermore, this statement does not accord well with his own suggestions in the very same article (281) that James' version was finished 1130-40, but did not circulate until c. 1145; and it must also be remembered that even in the third quarter of the century general knowledge of the work was rather poor.

¹⁴ See especially Burnett 1988. See also the remarks on Euclidian science below. Furthermore, John of Salisbury himself knows well that every Peripatetic philosopher would rank demonstrative science as very important, see *Metalogicon* 4.7, p. 145-46. In the second half of the 12th century the Latins learned, through the influential divisions of philosophy by thinkers such as Al-Farabi (translated into Latin) and Dominicus Gundissalinus, that demonstration is the most important part of logic: *Al-Farabi: Catálogo de las ciencias*, Edición y traducción castellana por Á. Gonzalez Palencia (2nd ed., Madrid, 1953; 1st ed. 1932) 142; *Dominicus Gundissalinus: De Divisione Philosophiae*. Herausgegeben und philosophiegeschichtlich untersucht von L. Baur (Münster, 1903). In the 13th century no sane philosopher would dispute the importance of demonstrative science, see Ebbesen 2004: 69-73, 84-85, and more generally Serene 1982. For general information concerning classifications of sciences, see Weisheipl 1965.

¹⁵ On John of Salisbury's biography, see the articles in Wilks 1984, and Nederman 2005: 1-39. Also, much useful information can still be found in some of the older studies, which should, however, be used with some caution: Schaarschmidt 1862; Webb 1932; Liebeschütz 1950.

ally he became part of archbishop Theobald's court at Canterbury. His precise whereabouts and activities in the period 1147-59 are not completely beyond dispute, but it is clear, on John's own authority, that he was engaged in diplomacy, not in scholarly pursuits.¹⁶ There are many comments to this effect in the *Metalogicon*, but the crucial, and to my mind deciding, passage in this regard is in the prologus to the third book:

About 20 years have elapsed, since difficulties in my personal matters and the advice of friends whom I could not disobey tore me away from the work-shops and the palaestra of those who teach logic. After this time, to confess the truth as it is known to my soul, I have not a single time, not even in passing, picked up the actual texts of the dialecticians – neither their treatises on arts nor their commentaries and glossaries – in which knowledge is produced, preserved or revised. For in the meantime I have been preoccupied with other tasks that were not only different, but almost directly opposed to the study of logic, so that I have hardly had as much as an hour for this; philosophy has only been possible to do in brief moments that I was able to steal.¹⁷

That scholars have apparently ignored this statement when discussing the date of the translation of the *Posterior Analytics*, seems very strange to me. Admittedly, John is almost certainly exaggerating to some extent; in particular, his career as a diplomat need not as such have spoiled his chances of studying while travelling in Southern Italy, and the *Metalogicon* indeed bears witness to learned discussions, perhaps even some relating to the *Posterior*

¹⁶ *Metalogicon* 1, prologus, p. 10. See also Jeaneau 1984: 85.

¹⁷ *Metalogicon* 3, prologus, p. 101: 'Anni fere viginti elapsi sunt, ex quo me ab officinis et palaestra eorum qui logicam profitentur rei familiaris avulsit angustia, et consilium amicorum quibus non obtemperare non potui. Exinde, ut ex animi mei sententia verum fatear, nec in transitu vel semel dialecticorum attigi scripta, quae vel in artibus, vel in commentariis aut glossematibus scientiam pariunt, aut retinent, aut reformat. Aliis namque et non modo diversis, sed et adversis fere occupationibus interim distractus sum, ut vix vel ad horam, et hoc quodam modo furtim philosophari licuerit'. See also, in a similar vein, *Metalogicon* 1.5, p. 22: '[E]t me fateor aliquos praemissorum habuisse doctores, et itidem aliorum audisse discipulos, et ab eis modicum id didicisse quod novi; neque enim ut Cornificius me ipsum docui'. The men referred to are John's teachers and friends during his studies in Paris (and Chartres?): Peter Abelard, Adam of Balsham, Gilbert of Poitiers, William of Conches and others.

Analytics.¹⁸ Thus, Haskins and Lockwood among others have concluded that 'it was doubtless in this region [Southern Italy] that the English humanist [John of Salisbury] gained his acquaintance with the *Posterior Analytics*'.¹⁹ But this seems to be wrong. John's comments on this work show that he and others acquainted with the work considered it extremely difficult and of little use to most people, but in Southern Italy the *Posterior Analytics* was apparently highly regarded and not at all a feared text.²⁰ Furthermore, if John obtained his knowledge of the *Posterior Analytics* from scholars in Southern Italy, we lose the connection to the French masters, and the existence of this connection is proved by 'John' the translator's reference to *Franciae magistri*, a comment which John of Salisbury probably knew, since he is acquainted with at least parts of 'John's' translation. In fact, considering that the two Johns comment on the *Posterior Analytics* in almost identical ways, it seems certain that they refer to the same tradition, that is, the French (primarily Parisian) tradition.

Further support of this view can, I think, be found in a letter from John of Salisbury to Richard 'the Bishop' written at some time in the period 1163-70, that is, some years after the *Metalogicon*. In this letter, John asks Richard, as he has apparently done several times before over a long period of time, to send him 'the works of Aristotle that you have'. He further asks Richard to comment on the difficult passages, since John does not completely trust the translator, who is, John has heard, an eloquent man but not well versed in grammar.²¹ There can be little doubt that this translator is James of Venice, as Minio-Paluello asserts, but it is certainly debatable whether he is right when he further asserts that the books which John asks for are basically all of

18 See, e.g., *Metalogicon* 1.15 (p. 35-39). Also, in the same work's 4.7, p. 145, John refers to the views of Burgundio of Pisa (1110-c. 1193) concerning the *Posterior Analytics*. Considering Burgundio's date of birth, these views are perhaps most likely to have become known to John only after his studies in France.

19 Haskins & Lockwood 1910: 97. See also Haskins 1914: 100-1; Haskins 1927: 223-41.

20 See Henricus Aristippus' comment on the work cited below, reference in note 37.

21 Millor & Brooke 1979: 294 (with a translation on p. 295): 'De cetero iam a multo tempore porrectas itero preces quatinus libros Aristotelis, quos habetis, mihi faciatis exscribi et notulas super Marcum, meis tamen sumptibus quibus, quaeso, in hac re nulla ratione parcatis. Precor etiam iterata supplicatione quatinus in operibus Aristotelis, ubi difficiliora fuerint, notulas faciatis, eo quod interpretem aliquatenus suspectum habeo quia, licet eloquens fuerit alias (ut saepe audiui), minus tamen fuit in grammatica institutus'.

James' translations *except* the *Posterior Analytics*.²² According to Minio-Paluello (arguing against Webb), John cannot be asking for the logical works, since he already knew them, and therefore he must be wanting works like *Physics*, *De Anima*, *Parva Naturalia* (only partially translated by James) and *Metaphysica vetustissima*. But if, as I have argued on the basis of John's own statements, he did not study the logical works in the period 1147-59, there is no reason to disqualify the *Posterior Analytics* from the list. On the contrary, even though John does not in the *Metalogicon* have much respect for the *Posterior Analytics*, he has already at that time heard from Burgundio of Pisa that this particular work made Aristotle entitled to be called 'the Philosopher'.²³ Perhaps John has simply at the time of writing the letter(s) grown wiser and decided, in accordance with Burgundio's view, that the *Posterior Analytics* may be more valuable than he allowed in the *Metalogicon* and deserves careful study. In any case, there is nothing in the letter to indicate to Richard that the *Posterior Analytics* should be excluded, and his distrust of the translator answers to the statements concerning precisely this work found in the *Metalogicon* and in 'John' the Translator's preface. Thus, I am inclined to think, contrary to the views of Minio-Paluello and Dronke, that John is *particularly* interested in obtaining a copy of the *Posterior Analytics* with a commentary by Richard, although this is obviously not the only work that he wants.

It seems clear, then, that John of Salisbury is arguing on the basis of what he learned in Paris, and his studies were carried out in the period 1136-47. Thus, based on the above arguments it would seem almost certain that John came to know the *Posterior Analytics* in this period, most likely in the late 1130s (*anni fere viginti elapsi sunt*); and that, as in the rest of the *Metalogicon*, the sections on this text represent the fruits of his education. But then it is also most likely that his remarks about the views of others concerning the *Posterior Analytics* represent his understanding of the situation as it was in his schooldays. Therefore, the many scholars familiar with the *Posterior Analytics*, who John refers to, are the French masters of the 1130s and perhaps

22 Minio-Paluello 1952: 292-95, followed without argument by Dronke 2002: 159.

23 *Metalogicon* 4.7, p. 145: 'Fuit autem apud Peripateticos tantae auctoritatis scientia demonstrandi, ut Aristoteles, qui alios fere omnes et fere in omnibus philosophos superabat, hinc commune nomen sibi quodam proprietatis iure vindicaret, quod demonstrativam tradiderat disciplinam. Ideo enim, ut aiunt, in ipso nomen philosophi sedit. Si mihi non creditur, audiatur vel Burgundio Pisanus, a quo istud accepi'.

those of the 1140s. The latter decade is, however, much less likely, since theology was the primary object of John's studies in this period; and furthermore, the fact that 'about 20 years have elapsed' in 1159 means that he refers to the late 1130s or early 1140s as marking the end of his studies in logic. In any case, he certainly cannot be referring to the masters of the 1150s.²⁴ At the very least, it must be stressed that, even if we disregard his remarks that he has not studied logic since his days in France (although I see no good reason to do so), John is not likely to have been a serious student of the text after 1147, since from then on he was engaged in more practical pursuits. Thus, not so much as a result of lack of time (although this was almost certainly also a factor), but rather because of other interests, John cannot have studied the *Posterior Analytics* with care in the period that followed his leaving Paris. The long timespan that has elapsed may also account, at least partly, for John's rather poor knowledge and understanding of the text.²⁵

(3) Third, an early translation of the *Posterior Analytics* as described in the previous two arguments is in perfect accordance with what is known about the translator: James of Venice.²⁶ James is a somewhat shadowy figure, but he is known to have spent some time in Constantinople; a visit in 1136 is well attested, but other similar travels are very likely.²⁷ In Constantinople, he probably met one of the leading Aristotelian Greek scholars of the time, Michael of Ephesus, who took part in Anna Comnena's Aristotelian project in the 1120s and in the first half of the 1130s.²⁸ Unfortunately, we know very little about Michael's life, but after the period of study initiated by Anna Comnena he complained that he had ruined his eyes by working on Aris-

24 *Pace Jacobi* 1988: 229, where it is said that John 'gives an account of current school practice both as it had shown signs of becoming in his student days and, above all, as it had developed in subsequent year'. But this is contrary to John's own statement (which Jacobi, in the same article, 227, accepts) that he has not had the time to study logic since his schooldays (see above).

25 In general, the precise extent of John's knowledge of the *Posterior Analytics* is very difficult to ascertain. I shall treat the subject in the previously mentioned forthcoming monograph (see note 3). For the present purpose, it may simply be noted that he seems not to have concerned himself with the entire text.

26 Minio-Paluello 1952 remains the most important study of James. See also Ebbesen 1977: 1-9; Ebbesen 1981, I: 286-89; Ebbesen 2004: 70-72; Ebbesen 2008.

27 For the biography, see Minio-Paluello 1952: 265-72.

28 The fundamental study of Anna Comnena's circle is Browning 1962. See also Ebbesen 1981, I: 268-89.

tote during the nights, because she demanded extraordinary efforts from him.²⁹ About 1138, Anna turned to the writing of her history, and thus the ‘Aristotelian’ connections between Michael and James are most likely to have been established in, say, the period 1125–35. Ebbesen even thinks it is most plausible that James got his Greek exemplar of the *Posterior Analytics* from Michael³⁰ along with a Greek copy of Philoponus’ commentary on book I (and perhaps some other commentary on book II), all of which James translated.³¹ Elsewhere, Ebbesen has made a good case for the view that James worked on the basis of Michael’s own working copy of his commentary on the *Sophistici Elenchi*. This makes a similar claim for the *Posterior Analytics* very natural.³² Since it is well established that James also translated the *Sophistici Elenchi* (although his version survives only in fragments), and probably did so before 1140, since he apparently had discussions with master Alberic in the 1140s on the interpretation of this text,³³ it is a tempting suggestion that James secured the Greek manuscripts for both the *Posterior Analytics* and the *Elenchi* when he established connections with Michael in the 1120s or in the early 1130s (see also the fourth argument below). Of course, these facts produce no hard evidence for the translation of the *Posterior Analytics*, but they are, I think, in complete accordance with the argument presented in the previous two sections, *viz.* a rather early translation of the *Posterior Analytics*.

(4) Fourth, and finally, Robert of Torigny, who is admittedly not the most reliable source, contains some evidence in favour of an early date. In a passage under the year 1128, Robert writes:

29 Browning 1962: 12 (appendix with edition): ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἐξ Ἐφεσίων ἡκηκόειν σοφοῦ ταύτη τῆς τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀβλεψίας τὴν αἰτίαν προσεπιρρίπτοντος, ὅτι παννύχοις σχολάσειεν ἀυπνίαις ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν Ἀριστοτελείων κελευούσης αὐτῆς ἐξηγήσεσιν, ὅθεν τὰ τελλύχνια τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς διὰ ξηρασίαν παθήματα.

30 Ebbesen 2004: 71.

31 On the possibility of a commentary made by James himself, see Ebbesen 1977: 1–3, who argues in favour of one, and Bloch 2008: 37–50, with an argument against the existence of such a commentary.

32 Ebbesen 1996: 263; Ebbesen 2004: 71.

33 See Dod 1982: 54–55.

The scholar James of Venice translated some books by Aristotle from Greek into Latin and commented on them, namely the *Topics*, the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics* and the *Elenchi*, even though older translations of these same books were in existence.³⁴

The earliest redaction of his *Chronicle* was completed 1156-57, and the cited passage was not found in this version; but in the revised version of 1169 the text is there. Of course, this is a rather uncertain reference, written at least 30 years after the proposed date and containing at least some statements that seem to disagree with known facts,³⁵ but it is noteworthy that the year 1128 goes well with the evidence for James' activities in the 1130s. As regards scholarly works concerned primarily with the *Posterior Analytics*, C.H. Haskins is, to the best of my knowledge, the only scholar who has accepted this evidence as trustworthy; for whereas most scholars do not comment upon the evidence, or leave the question open, Haskins explicitly believed that James' translation was produced in 1128 or at least in the years around 1130.³⁶

COUNTERARGUMENTS AND DISCUSSION

Against the above arguments in favour of a relatively early date for the first Latin translation of the *Posterior Analytics*, it may be argued that it would be strange if the medieval Latins did not even try to take advantage of this text, had it existed; for it is clear from the discussions of many 12th-century thinkers that *philosophia*, *scientia*, *ars* and divisions of these were important in this period. Concerning the *Posterior Analytics*, Henricus Aristippus writes

34 *Chronique de Robert de Torigni, Abbé du Mont-Saint-Michel, Tome I* Delisle, L. (ed.) Rouen 1872: 177: 'Iacobus clericus de Venetia transtulit de Graeco in Latinum quosdam libros Aristotelis et commentatus est, scilicet *Topica*, *Analiticos Priores* et *Posteriores*, et *Elenchos*, quamvis antiquior translatio super eosdem libros haberetur'. The text is also found in Haskins 1914: 91, in Minio-Paluello 1952: 267, in Dod 1982: 54, n. 24, and in Bloch 2008: 38, n. 7.

35 See Bloch 2008.

36 Haskins 1914: 91, 99. Still, Haskins seems to agree with later scholars that the text was not really known before c. 1150. His article contains much interesting material, but it is now out-dated in certain important respects.

in the middle of the 1150s in a letter addressed *ad Roboratum* (probably Aristippus' pun on a certain Robert, perhaps Robert of Selby) and inserted as a preface, albeit only in a single manuscript, to his translation of the *Phaedo*:

In Sicily you have the Syracusan and Greek library. Latin philosophy is not lacking. Theoridus of Brindisi is there to assist you, a man most learned in Greek literature. Your Aristippus is there, whom you can use at least as a whetstone if not as a blade. You have access to the *Mechanics* of Hero the philosopher, who discusses the void so subtly, how great its power is and the speed of movement through it. You have access to the *Optics* of Euclid, who discusses so truthfully and wonderfully the judgments about seeing that these judgments are proved by demonstrative reason. On the principles of the sciences you have access to Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, in which work he debates what goes beyond nature and sensation on the basis of axioms that are gained through nature and sensation.³⁷

Roboratus is planning to leave for England, and Aristippus is trying to make him stay by pointing out to him the many writings that will be accessible to him in Sicily but not in England. The *Posterior Analytics* is among these, and even though it is uncertain whether a Greek or a Latin copy is meant,³⁸ the reference does establish that at least in England the *Posterior Analytics* was not well known around 1155, and that scholars would naturally take an interest in this particular work on the principles of knowledge.

37 *Plato Latinus: Phaedo*, Interprete Henrico Aristippo, edidit et praefatione instruxit L. Minio-Paluello, adiuvante H.J. Drossaart Lulofs, *Plato Latinus II* (London 1950): 89: 'Habes in Sicilia Siracusanam et Argolicam bibliothecam; Latina non deest philosophia; Theoridus assistit Brundusinus, Graiarum peritissimus litterarum; Aristippus tuus praesens est, cuius si non acie verum cote fungi poteris. Habes Eronis philosophi *Mechanica* prae manibus, qui tam subtiliter de inani disputat, quanta eius virtus quantaque per ipsum delationis celeritas. Habes Euclidis *Optica*, qui tam vere et mirabiliter de opinione videndi disserit, ut opinabilia ratiocinatione probet demonstrativa. Habes de scientiarum principiis Aristotelis *Apodicticen*, in qua supra naturam et sensum de axiomaticis a natura et sensu sumptis disceptat.'

38 Dod 1970: 61 seems to believe that the reference to 'Aristotelis *Apodicticen*' indicates a Greek manuscript, but this is by no means certain. See, e.g., Alexander Neckam's reference to the contents of this work (cited below, note 66).

Also, Euclid's *Elements*, of which a complete translation was produced in the first half of the 12th century (but even the early Middle Ages had access to a truncated version of this work),³⁹ became immensely influential, and a number of authors of the 12th century in such disciplines as mathematics, theology and natural science took the axiomatic-deductive method, that is, the demonstrative method, as a model of science in general.⁴⁰ For instance, Alan of Lille's *Regulae Caelestis Iuris* (also known as *Regulae Theologicae*)⁴¹ and Nicholas of Amiens' *Ars Fidei Catholicae*⁴² are both based on demonstrative methods, and later Robert Grosseteste's rather idiosyncratic commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* apparently follows this kind of 12th-century tradition in using 'definitions', 'suppositions' and 'conclusions' (to be conceived as theorems).⁴³ But, as can be gathered from the preface to the 12th-century version of Euclid's *Elements* known as 'Adelard version III', this mathematical tradition was aware of the connection with the *Posterior Analytics*:

Demonstration is an argumentation that proceeds from primary and true principles [or 'premises'] to their conclusions. For the art here put forward is arranged in such a way that consequences follow necessarily and successively from the premisses or from the principles. For there is one demonstrative science that teaches to demonstrate and itself demonstrates, such as the [one presented in the] *Posterior Analytics*, and one that demonstrates but does not teach how to demonstrate, such as geometry.⁴⁴

Thus, 12th-century thinkers took a real interest in theories of science and,

39 Clagett 1954: 269; Burnett 1988: 159–60. On Euclid in the Middle Ages, see also Clagett 1953; Murdoch 1968; Murdoch 1971. Editions have been published by H.L.L. Busard.

40 On this and the following, see Burnett 1988. See also Evans 1980. It should also be noted that this fact effectually disproves John of Salisbury's contention that the demonstrative method is only useful for mathematicians (see the quotation above, reference in note 9).

41 Edition: Häring 1981.

42 Edition: Dreyer 1993.

43 Edition: Rossi 1981. On the commentary, see Evans 1983; Bloch 2009.

44 Printed in Clagett 1954: 275: 'Est autem demonstratio argumentatio, arguens ex primis et veris in illorum conclusionibus. Sic enim ars proposita contexta est quod sequentia necessario accidunt ex premissis aut principiis deinceps. Est enim scientia demonstrativa quae docet demonstrare et demonstrat, ut *Posterior Analetici*, et quae demonstrat et non docet demonstrare, ut geometria.'

not least, in demonstrative science. Many scholars and scientists were directly inspired by Euclidian geometry, and this tradition, as stated by the practitioners themselves, was founded on the principles of the theory that is put forward in the *Posterior Analytics*.⁴⁵

John of Salisbury and 'John' the translator provide at least the two major reasons why these thinkers did not immediately use the text.⁴⁶

(a) First, it was too difficult, and they were lacking the tools to unravel its secrets. James translated Philoponus' commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* book I (known to the Latin West under the name of 'Alexander'), or at least some version of its content, and probably also a commentary on book II, but, as is apparent from the scanty evidence for the text, it was not a success.⁴⁷ I suspect that James did not actually translate the entire commentaries but chose comments on individual passages for his translation; and this may, at least partly, account for the lack of success. More importantly concerning the early use of James' translation of the *Posterior Analytics*, Sten Ebbesen has argued forcefully that James also wrote a commentary on the text.⁴⁸ If such a commentary did exist to accompany the translation, it would indeed be strange that the best thinkers of the period did not make use of the *Posterior Analytics* because of fear. However, as I have attempted to show elsewhere, it is more likely that James never wrote a commentary of his own, and that the sources for this information, namely the chronicler Robert of Torigny and an anonymous and fragmentary 13th-century commentary on the *Sophistici Elenchi*, mistakenly took James' translations of Greek commentaries for his own commentary.⁴⁹

(b) Second, John of Salisbury is explicit that the *Posterior Analytics* is beneficial almost exclusively for the mathematicians, and in particular the

45 Southern 1992: 152-53 is wrong, I think, in saying that '[t]he problems in the *Posterior Analytics* ... scarcely existed for twelfth-century scholastic thinkers'. On the contrary, it can easily be established from the writings of this period that both problems and methodology of the *Posterior Analytics* would have been interesting to the best thinkers of this century.

46 In addition, one might claim with Longeway 2005 that the *Posterior Analytics* may have 'caused some concern because of its apparent disagreement with the dominant Augustinian theory of knowledge'.

47 For the fragments and discussions, see Ebbesen 1976: 89-107; Rossi 1978; Ebbesen 1990.

48 Ebbesen 1977.

49 Bloch 2008.

geometers. Now, John was not an original thinker regarding philosophical doctrine, so this view is not likely to have originated with him.⁵⁰ Just like his other comments on the *Posterior Analytics*, it is, in my view, almost certainly something he learned in Paris in his schooldays. If one believes that John actually relates the doctrine of some Parisian master(s) in the relevant chapter of the *Metalogicon*, this provides another possible reason why the Latins did not use the text in its early days: a general feeling that the text was not too relevant for most scholars and scientists. Of course, it cannot be determined who taught John this, nor how widespread the view was. Based on John's general views about them, Adam of Balsham⁵¹ or Richard 'the Bishop'⁵² may be good guesses, but perhaps many Parisian masters felt the same way about the work; and such feelings would obviously have been strengthened by their fear of the notoriously difficult text. In fact, their fear of the work may well have been the very cause of such feelings; for if they had carefully read and understood the *Posterior Analytics*, one would have expected them to be excited about its contents. Thus, the claim that the Aristotelian treatise is not useful has the air of an excuse.

Finally, it is one of the most frequent arguments in favour of a rather late date for the first translation of the *Posterior Analytics* that some masters, who would have referred to it in certain specific contexts, did not. In particular, it has often been pointed out that Thierry of Chartres did not include the *Posterior Analytics* in his *Heptateuch* (c. 1140),⁵³ and Otto of Freising, who had some interest in Aristotelian studies, seems not to have known the *Posterior*

⁵⁰ This is not to say that John was not original in other ways. For instance, the overall dispositions of the *Policraticus* and the *Metalogicon* may well be called original, and perhaps his political views found in the former texts are also evidence of an independent mind. But on logic, science and theories of science John did not have original views to offer. I shall examine this topic, too, in my forthcoming monograph (see note 3).

⁵¹ See *Metalogicon* 2.10, p. 72, which might indicate that John would turn to Adam for an authority on Aristotle, supported also by *Adam Balsamiensis Parvipontani: Ars Disserendi* VI-VII (ed. Minio-Paluello 1956) 5, which certainly inspired John in his descriptions of *Topics*, and may also have influenced his views on the *Posterior Analytics*. Apart from Adam, only Abelard (*Peripateticus Palatinus*) is characterised by John as a thoroughly Aristotelian scholar on a par with Adam, see *Metalogicon* 1.5, p. 20 (but see also the following note on Richard 'the Bishop').

⁵² See my comments on John's letter to Richard above, and his own words in *Metalogicon* 2.10, p. 71-72.

⁵³ Minio-Paluello 1952: 269-70, n. 13; Dod 1970: 59; Evans 1983: 729.

Analytics when he wrote the first recension of his *Chronica* (c. 1145).⁵⁴ This is not, however, a convincing argument; both of the reasons analysed in the preceding paragraphs can be used in relation to Thierry,⁵⁵ and at least the second could be used to explain the silence in Otto's work. But concerning Otto, one can also argue that since he completed his studies in Paris in 1132, or in 1133 at the latest, and then left for Germany,⁵⁶ he may not afterwards have been completely familiar with Aristotelian developments at the highest level in the 1130s. Even if Rahewin, the continuator of Otto's *Gesta Frederici*, and Hofmeister are right that Otto was more or less responsible for introducing Aristotle into Germany,⁵⁷ this does not tell us anything about the quality and extent of Otto's knowledge. Haskins claims that Otto was 'in close touch with philosophical developments in France and Italy until his death in 1158', but since the masters in Paris (and elsewhere in France?) did not publicly reveal much about their knowledge of the *Posterior Analytics*, there is no reason why Otto should have come to know this text well when he was no longer a student.⁵⁸

In any case, the *e silentio* argument is not a strong one. It may be that scholars of the period, say, 1125-50 show no real knowledge of the *Posterior Analytics*, but neither do most scholars in the rest of the 12th century, in which period there can be no excuse for the masters who do not know the work.⁵⁹ The relative silence about, and lacking usage of, James' and 'John's'

54 Minio-Paluello 1952: 269-70, n. 13; Dod 1970: 62.

55 See also Minio-Paluello 1952: 269-70, n. 13: '[I]t may well be that Thierry was one of those who "non audent eius libri notitiam profiteri" because of its difficulty'.

56 See Hofmeister 1912a: 126.

57 Rahewin's comment in *Ottonis Episcopi Frisingensis et Rahewini Gesta Frederici seu rectius Cronica*, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Bd. 17, ed. Schmale, Berlin, 1965: 538: 'philosophicorum et Aristotelicorum librorum subtilitatem in Topicis, Analeticis atque Elencis fere primus nostris finibus adportaverit'. Hofmeister 1912b: 679-80.

58 Haskins 1914: 90. See also Dod 1970: 62: '[I]t must remain a matter of some doubt whether Otto really knew the *Posterior Analytics* at all [that is, in 1157, as has sometimes been claimed]. If he *did* know it, then, as Rahewin says [see previous note], he was a pioneer in introducing it into Germany'. Rahewin (*ibid.*) also speaks of Otto's knowledge of the *Analytics*, but this might mean only the *Prior Analytics*, or it might mean both the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics*, but it still does not say anything about his more precise knowledge of the text.

59 Ebbesen 2004 is the most recent study of 12th-century knowledge of the *Posterior Ana-*

translations in the second half of the 12th century cannot be taken as an indication that the text was not available; the same is true for the second quarter of the century, and not least for some of the best masters of the time, such as Thierry of Chartres,⁶⁰ William of Conches,⁶¹ Adam of Balsham⁶² and Gilbert of Poitiers,⁶³ who may each have had their own reasons for not (publicly) using it; as for Otto of Freising, there are good reasons to suspect that he may not have known it, even though it did exist.

CONCLUSION

No absolutely certain conclusions can be arrived at concerning the date of James' translation of the *Posterior Analytics*; I believe that both arguments for and against an early date must remain to some extent speculative. But since, as I have attempted to show, the usual arguments against an early date are not valid, and since there are other and much stronger arguments pointing at least towards the 1130s, I conjecture that the translation was made in the period around 1130, perhaps in Bologna, as Dod suggests on the basis of ingenious speculations,⁶⁴ but Southern Italy, Sicily or, of course, Venice are also possible locations. For all we know, it could have been made in Constantinople and then brought to the Latin West. Certainly, it did not come into general use for some time; in fact, even in the third quarter of the 12th century understanding of the *Posterior Analytics* is limited and less than im-

lytics. See also Dod 1970 and Burnett 1988.

60 See also Minio-Paluello's comment cited in note 55.

61 Dronke 2002 argues that William may well have known the text at least in the third quarter of the 12th century. If the argument of the present article is correct, William probably knew it even earlier.

62 Adam's *Ars Disserendi* is very difficult to evaluate properly, due not least to its innovative terminology, but influence from the *Posterior Analytics* is not impossible (see also note 51 above with reference). Edition: Minio-Paluello 1956.

63 On the question whether Gilbert knew the *Posterior Analytics*, see also Nielsen 1982: 89 for an affirmative answer, and Marenbon 1988: 334, n. 27, who is sceptical. Evans 1980: 40, on the basis of a reference to the wording 'in praedicamentis et analeticis' in Gilbert's commentary on the *De Hebdomadibus* (Häring [1966]: 189), also suggests that Gilbert may well have known the Aristotelian treatise.

64 Dod 1970: 59.

pressive.⁶⁵ But, of course, in this period the text existed in at least two translations (James' and 'John's'), as the references in 'John' the translator and John of Salisbury prove, and probably the translation made by Gerard of Cremona (†1187) from an Arabic version was also in existence. In the fourth quarter of the century, the text must have become more widely known; Alexander Neckam certainly knew the text, and he had heard lectures on it in Paris.⁶⁶ At this time, Themistius' paraphrase and at least parts of Philoponus ('Alexander') would also have been available, and in any case even Neckam's knowledge of the text is somewhat limited. The situation was apparently no better in Oxford. Roger Bacon, admittedly writing much later (c. 1290), states that a certain master Hugh was the first there to lecture upon the *Posterior Analytics*.⁶⁷ It is somewhat uncertain when this master Hugh lectured, and certainly Bacon must be exaggerating as to the very late date, but in any case Hugh cannot be much earlier than 1200. It is not until Grosseteste's commentary (c. 1230) that we possess certain proof that the *Posterior Analytics* had finally been thoroughly studied and was in extensive use in the Latin tradition. Not too many years later, in the 1240s, this impression is confirmed by Robert Kilwardby's solid commentary. The *Posterior Analytics* had finally claimed its place as the foundation of science.

65 See Ebbesen 2004.

66 *Alexandri Neckam De Naturis Rerum*, Cap. 173, T. Wright (ed.) (London 1863): 293: 'Antequam legeretur liber ille [scil. *Posteriorum Analeticorum*] asserebant doctores Parisienses nullam negativam esse immediatam. Sed hic error sublatus est de medio per beneficium apodixeos'. On Neckham and the *Posterior Analytics*, see also Dod 1970: 66-69.

67 *Roger Bacon: Compendium of the Study of Theology* 1.2.14.10-13, T.S. Maloney (ed.) (Leiden et al., 1988): 46: 'Etiam logicalia fuerunt tarde recepta et lecta. Nam Beatus Edmundus, Cantuariæ Archiepiscopus, primus legit Oxoniae librum *Elencorum* temporibus meis. Et vidi magistrum Hugonem, qui primo legit librum *Posteriorum*, et librum {verbum mss.} eius conspexi'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Farabi 1953. *Catálogo de las ciencias*, Edición y traducción castellana por Á. Gonzalez Palencia, second ed. (first ed. 1932). Madrid.
- Alexander Neckam 1863. *De Naturis Rerum Libri Duo*, With the Poem of the Same Author, *De Laudibus Divinae Sapientiae*, Wright, T. (ed.). London.
- Arduini, M.L. 1997. 'Sola ratione in Giovanni di Salisbury' *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 89, 229-68.
- Bellenguez, P. 1926. *Un philosophe académicien du XIIe siècle, Jean de Salisbury: sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée*. Aire-sur-la-Lys.
- Bloch, D. 2008. 'James of Venice and the *Posterior Analytics*' *CIMAGL* 78, 37-50.
- Bloch, D. 2009. 'Robert Grosseteste's *Conclusiones* and the Commentary on the *Posterior Analytics*' *Vivarium* 47, 1-23.
- Browning, R. 1962. 'An Unpublished Funeral Oration on Anna Comnena' *PCPhS* 188 = n.s. 8, 1-12.
- Burnett, C. 1988. 'Scientific Speculations' in Dronke 1988, 151-76.
- Burnett, C. 1996. 'John of Salisbury and Aristotle' *Didascalica* 2, 19-32.
- Clagett, M. 1953. 'The Medieval Latin Translations from the Arabic of the *Elements* of Euclid, with Special Emphasis on the Versions of Adelard of Bath' *Isis* 44, 16-42.
- Clagett, M. 1954. 'King Alfred and the *Elements* of Euclid' *Isis* 45, 269-77.
- Diez, M.B. 1975. 'Lo que la historia ha pensado de Juan de Salisbury' *Escritos del Vedat* 5, 263-92.
- Dod, B.G. 1970. 'The Study of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: The Translators, Glossators, and Commentators and Their Methods' (unpublished B.Litt. thesis). Oxford.
- Dod, B.G. 1982. 'Aristoteles Latinus' in Kretzmann, Kenny & Pinborg 1982 45-79.
- Dreyer, M. 1993. *Nikolaus von Amiens: Ars Fidei Catholicae: Ein Beispielwerk axiomatischer Methode* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Neue Folge Bd. 37.) Münster.
- Dronke, P. (ed.) 1988. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Dronke, P. 2002 'William of Conches and the "New Aristotle"' *Studi Medievali*, serie terza 43, 157-63.

- Dotto, G. 1986. *Giovanni di Salisbury. La filosofia come Sapienza*. Assisi.
- Ebbesen, S. 1976. 'Anonymus Aurelianus II, Aristotle, Alexander, Porphyry and Boethius. Ancient Scholasticism and 12th-century Western Europe' *CIMAGL* 16, 1-128.
- Ebbesen, S. 1977. 'Jacobus Veneticus on the *Posterior Analytics* and Some Early 13th-Century Oxford Masters on the *Elenchi*' *CIMAGL*, 21, 1-9.
- Ebbesen, S. 1981. *Commentators and Commentaries on Aristotle's Sophistici Elenchi*, (Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum VII.1-3), vols. 1-3. Leiden.
- Ebbesen, S. 1990. 'New Fragments of "Alexander's" Commentaries on *Analytica Posteriora* and *Sophistici Elenchi*' *CIMAGL* 60, 113-20.
- Ebbesen, S. 1996. 'Anonymi Parisiensis Compendium Sophisticorum Elenchorum. The Uppsala Version' *CIMAGL* 66, 253-312.
- Ebbesen, S. 2004. 'Echoes of the *Posterior Analytics* in the Twelfth Century' in Lutz-Bachmann, Fidora & Antolic, 2004, 69-92.
- Ebbesen, S. 2008. 'Jacques de Venise' in Lejbowicz 2008: 115-32.
- Evans, G.R. 1980. 'Boethian and Euclidean Axiomatic Method in the Theology of the Later Twelfth Century. The *Regulae Theologicae* and the *De Arte Fidei Catholicae*' *Archives internationales d'histoire des sciences* 30, 36-52.
- Evans, G.R. 1983. 'The *Conclusiones* of Robert Grosseteste's Commentary on the *Posterior Analytics*' *Studi medievali*, serie terza 24, 729-34.
- Garfagnini, G.C. 1990. 'L'attività storico-filosofica nel secolo XII: Giovanni di Salisbury' *Medioevo* 16, 23-42.
- Häring, N.M. (ed.) 1966. *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*. Toronto.
- Häring, N.M. 1981. 'Alanus de Insulis. *Regulae caelestis iuris*' *AHDLMA* 48, 97-226.
- Haskins, C.H. 1914. 'Mediaeval Versions of the *Posterior Analytics*' *HSCP* 25, 87-105.
- Haskins, C.H. 1927. *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, second ed. (first ed. 1924). New York.
- Haskins, C.H. & D.P. Lockwood 1910. 'The Sicilian Translators of the Twelfth Century and the First Latin Version of Ptolemy's *Almagest*' *HSCP* 21, 75-102.

- Hofmeister, A. 1912a. 'Studien über Otto von Freising. I. Der Bildungsgang Ottos von Freising. I' *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 37, 99-161.
- Hofmeister, A. 1912b. 'Studien über Otto von Freising. I. Der Bildungsgang Ottos von Freising. II' *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 37, 633-768.
- Ioannis Saresberiensis *Metalogicon*, Hall, J.B. (ed.) 1991. Auxiliata K.S.B. Keats-Rohan (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 98) Turnhout.
- Jacobi, K. 1988. 'Logic (ii): The Later Twelfth Century' in Dronke 1988: 227-51.
- Jeaneau, E. 1984. 'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture des philosophes' in Wilks 1984: 77-108 (first published in *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 29 (1983), 145-74).
- Jeaneau, E. 1997. 'Jean de Salisbury et Aristote' in *Aristote, l'école de Chartres et la Cathédrale*. Chartres, 33-39.
- Kretzmann, N., A. Kenny & J. Pinborg (eds.) 1982. *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy. From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*. Cambridge.
- Lejbowicz, M. (ed.) 2008. *L'Islam médiéval en terres chrétiennes. Science et idéologie*. Paris.
- Liebeschütz, H. 1950. *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury* (Studies of the Warburg Institute 17). London.
- Longeway, J. 2005. 'Medieval Theories of Demonstration' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2005 Edition)*, in Zalta, E.N. (ed.), <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2005/entries/demonstration-medieval/>>.
- Lutz-Bachmann, M., A. Fidora & P. Antolic (eds.) 2004. *Erkenntnis und Wissenschaft/Knowledge and Science. Probleme der Epistemologie in der Philosophie des Mittelalters/Problems of Epistemology in Medieval Philosophy*. Berlin.
- Marenbon, J. 1988. 'Gilbert of Poitiers' in Dronke 1988: 328-52.
- Mazzantini, C. 1957. *Il pensiero filosofico di Giovanni di Salisbury*. Torino.
- Millor, S.J., W.J. & C.N.L. Brooke (eds.) 1979. *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2: The Later Letters (1163-1180)*. Oxford.
- Minio-Paluello, L. 1952. 'Iacobus Veneticus Grecus: Canonist and Translator of Aristotle' *Traditio* 8, 265-304.
- Minio-Paluello, L. 1956. *Twelfth Century Logic. Texts and Studies, vol. I:*

- Adam Balsamiensis Parvipontani, Ars Disserendi (Dialectica Alexandri)*
Roma.
- Minio-Paluello, L. & B.G. Dod (eds.) 1968. *Analytica Posteriora*, Aristoteles Latinus IV, 1-4. Bruges & Paris.
- Murdoch, J.E. 1968. 'The Medieval Euclid: Salient Aspects of the Translations of the *Elements* by Adelard of Bath and Campanus of Novara' *Revue de Synthèse* 89, 67-94.
- Murdoch, J.E. 1971. 'Euclid: Transmission of the *Elements*' *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* 4, 437-59.
- Nederman, C.J. 2005. *John of Salisbury* (Mediaeval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 288) Tempe, AZ.
- Nielsen, L.O. 1982. *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Gilbert Porreta's Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130-1180*. Leiden.
- Otto Episocopus Frisingensis et Rahewinus 1965. *Gesta Frederici seu rectius Cronica*, Textum imperatori transmissum editionibus G. Waitz et B. Simson nisus e codice Parisiensi edidit F.-J. Schmale, Übersetzt von A. Schmidt, Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, Bd. 17 (ed. Schmale). Berlin.
- Plato Latinus 1950. *Phaedo*, Interprete Henrico Aristippo, Edidit et praefatione instruxit L. Minio-Paluello, Adiuvente H.J. Drossaart Lulofs, Plato Latinus, vol. II. London.
- Robert de Torigni 1872-1873. *Chronique, Tomes I-II*, par L. Delisle. Rouen.
- Robertus Grosseteste 1981. *Commentarius in Posteriorum Analyticorum Libros*, introduzione e testo critico di Pietro Rossi. Firenze.
- Roger Bacon 1988. *Compendium of the Study of Theology*, Edition and Translation with Introduction and Notes by T.S. Maloney. Leiden.
- Rossi, P. 1978. 'Tracce della versione latino di un commento greco ai *Secondi analitici* nel *Commentarius in Posteriorum Analyticorum Libros* di Roberto Grossatesta' *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 70, 433-39.
- Rossi, P. 1981, see Robertus Grosseteste.
- Schaarschmidt, C. 1862. *Johannes Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie*. Leipzig.
- Serene, E. 1982. 'Demonstrative Science' in Kretzmann, Kenny & Pinborg 1982: 496-517.

- Southern, R.W. 1992. *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*, second ed. (first edition 1986). Oxford.
- Tweedale, M.M. 1988. 'Logic (i): From the Late Eleventh Century to the Time of Abelard' in Dronke 1988: 196-226.
- Webb, C.C.J. 1932. *John of Salisbury*. London.
- Weisheipl, J.A. 1965. 'Classification of the Sciences in Medieval Thought' *Mediaeval Studies* 27, 54-90.
- Wilks, M. 1984. *The World of John of Salisbury*. Oxford.

A FOURTEENTH-CENTURY
ANGLO-LATIN OVIDIAN:
THE *LIBER EXULIS* IN
JOHN GOWER'S 1381 *VISIO ANGLIE*
(*VOX CLAMANTIS* 1.1359-1592)

By David R. Carlson

Summary: The English writer John Gower (d. 1408) fashioned parts of his Latin poem on the peasant revolt of 1381 out of materials taken from Ovid: topics from the post-relegation verse and *Heroides* colour a long section shaped by the matter of Achaemenides from the *Metamorphoses* and concluded with the matter of Carmentis from the *Fasti*. The analysis establishes the quality of Gower's knowledge of the Ovidian *corpus* and his skill in deploying references to Ovid for his own literary-political purpose.

I. GOWER'S EXILE-SECTION AND OVIDIANISM

Notionally, it is a straightforward allegorical ennaration: the passage of the 'English' poet John Gower (d. 1408) – who was also the pre-eminent Latin poet of the 'Age of Chaucer', c. 1360-1410, in English literary history – in his Latin poem on the great Social Revolt of 1381, the *Visio Anglie*, transmitted as part of Gower's *Vox clamantis*. In the passage, the Gower-narrator describes himself as driven into a kind of exile by the invasion of the city of London during the three days of civic revolution, June 13-15 1381. By the *Visio*'s conclusion, the narrator's exilic wanderings having brought him on board a ship, storm-tossed but then finding its way to safe haven, Gower is

David R. Carlson 'A Fourteenth-Century Anglo-Latin Ovidian: The *liber exulis* in John Gower's 1381 *Visio Anglie* (*Vox clamantis* 1.1359-1592) · *C&M* 61 (2010) 293-335. © 2010 Museum Tusculanum Press · www.mtp.dk/ classicaet-mediaevalia

returned to his home: *Pax redit, atque probis fit renouata salus* (New peace returns and safety for the good, 1920). At the poem's beginning, the Gower-narrator had described the invasion itself of his city by a mob he represents *per allegoriam* as ravening beast-monsters. In the meanwhile of the poem's central section, he accounts his period of exile: a 'liber exulis' within the *Visio Anglie* (1359-1592).¹

Not verbally simple, in fact, this brief though central exilic passage of Gower's poem turns itself, instead, into a complex reweaving of lines and phrases from P. Ovidius Naso (43 BC-AD 17), quotations importing manifold illuminating allusions, to Ovid's post-relegation verse, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, to eight of the *Heroides*, and to some dozen episodes of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. Other writings of Gower's are Ovidian, howbeit in different ways, as are for example the numerous translation-paraphrases of Ovidian narrative matter incorporated into the English-language *Confessio amantis* (c. 1393). Likewise, Gower also quotes from other Latin poets in the *Visio Anglie*, as elsewhere in the *Vox clamantis*, though chiefly from high and late moderns – prominent nearer-contemporary Latin poets, especially Nigel Witeker (d. after 1206), the author of the *Speculum stultorum*, and Peter Riga, of the verse bible-paraphrase *Aurora* (c. 1170-1200) – rather than from ancients other than Ovid.² P. Vergilius Maro (70-19 BC), for example, has

- 1 Quotations from Gower's writings (parenthetically cited) are from G.C. Macaulay 1899-1902 (ed.) *Complete Works of John Gower*, 4 vols. Oxford; the modern English verse translations of Gower are by A.G. Rigg; other translations by the author of this paper. On the place of the *Visio Anglie* within the *Vox clamantis* (where the *Visio* is transmitted as Book 1), see Maria Wickert 1953. *Studien zu John Gower*. Cologne: 13-30 and 169-73; John Hurt Fisher 1965. *John Gower: Moral Philosopher and Friend of Chaucer*. London: 99-109, and Rigg 1992. *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature 1066-1422*. Cambridge: 287-88. 'Liber exulis' is from *Tristia* 3.1.1; cf. *Pont.* 2.6.3 'exulis haec vox est.' Astute comment on Gower's emulations of the post-relegation Ovid is in Andrew Galloway 1993. 'Gower in his Most Learned Role and the Peasants' Revolt of 1381' *Mediaevalia* 16, 341-43; see also Yoshiko Kobayashi 2009. 'The Voice of an Exile: From Ovidian Lament to Prophecy in Book I of John Gower's *Vox Clamantis*' in A. Galloway and R.F. Yeager (eds.) *Through a Classical Eye: Transcultural and Transhistorical Visions in Medieval English, Italian, and Latin Literature in Honour of Winthrop Wetherbee*. Toronto, esp. 349-53.
- 2 Gower's quotations were noted mostly already in the commentaries of Macaulay 1899-1902 and of Eric W. Stockton 1962. *The Major Latin Works of John Gower*. Seattle. More are to be added, however, as for example – in the present narrow instance – most significantly, the quotations from *Fasti* 1.479-95 at *Visio Anglie* 1545-58, discussed below, pp. 326-30; also, e.g., the quotation of *Met.* 14.199 at *Visio Anglie* 1367, or of *Pont.* 1.2.55-56 at *Visio Anglie* 1427-28.

nothing like a comparable place in Gower's writing, in fact hardly any place at all.³ Gower's *Visio Anglie* is his most pervasively Ovidian writing in this peculiar sense: of its 2150 lines, 305 contain quotations from Ovid, just more than fourteen percent of the total.

These Gower's numerous quotations from Ovid in the *Visio Anglie* are not evenly distributed, in two senses: first, the selections he chooses to quote are concentrated in particular places in Ovid's extensive oeuvre, and from particularly signifying places, rather than being decorative *flores*, say, drawn evenly from amongst the innumerable enticing lines distributed throughout Ovid's writings; and second, rather than distributing evenly within the *Visio*, Gower concentrates the quotations that he elected from the determined range of Ovidian sources narrowly within his own poem, in patches of concentrated Ovidian citation. His rate of Ovidian quotation runs at about fourteen percent in aggregate; as the poem moves forward, however, the rate varies significantly, in long passages running at near zero, though at other points, in relatively briefer passages, it approaches saturation: all Ovid, though always also selected and reassorted to suit Gower's own strong purpose. In the exile-section of the *Visio Anglie*, the rate of quotation approaches forty per cent: eighty-nine of its 234 lines incorporate quotations (38.03%); over ninety percent of the quotations are Ovidian (83/89 = 93.25%), and over half of these come from the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, with the topically linked *Heroides* (44/83 = 53.01%), though these writings do not constitute half of the Ovidian corpus, by any measure.⁴

For the exile-section of the *Visio*, Gower's pre-eminent source of reference is the post-relegation verse (30/89 = 33.71%). Various other Romans suffered much as Ovid did at and following his relegation in 8 AD, and some too wrote about the experience – from M. Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC) to the younger L. Annaeus Seneca (3 BC-AD 65), possibly including Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (c. 480-524 AD) much later, who was influenced by

3 Bruce Harbert 1988. 'Lessons from the Great Clerk: Ovid and John Gower' in Charles Martindale (ed.) *Ovid Renewed: Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: 86; also, Götz Schmitz 1989. 'Gower, Chaucer, and the Classics: Back to the Textual Evidence' in Robert F. Yeager (ed.) *John Gower: Recent Readings*. Kalamazoo: 104-5.

4 The quotations in *Visio Anglie* 1359-1599 are listed and indexed in the Appendices below.

Ovid's example in any event.⁵ None did so at such length, however, with the same concentration on the effects of exile on a writer, and a writer so focused throughout his career on his capital as Ovid was on Rome, like Gower on London, who claimed never to have resided elsewhere.⁶ For describing his allegorical exile from his own London home in the revolutionary upheavals of 1381 June, it was to the model of the Ovidian relegation verse that Gower turned, blatantly, though without so much as a mention of Ovid by name.

2. THE POST-RELEGATION VERSE IN GOWER'S *PROLOGUS*

Gower's poem's imbrication of itself with the post-relegation Ovid begins earlier than the exile-section, however, in fact at the beginning of the *Visio Anglie*, in a relatively brief passage incorporating concentrated citation of a relatively simple sort. The *prologus* Gower wrote for the *Visio* begins with a reference to the Old Testament prophet Daniel (*prol.* 7-8) and ends with another to a comparable New Testament figure, Gower's namesake, John of Patmos ('quem Pathmos suscepit ... Cuius ego nomen gesto', *prol.* 57-58), both possessed of the kind of voice with which Gower would identify his own in the *Vox clamantis*;⁷ between these paired visionary-references comes a sixteen-line passage drawn thoroughly though inexplicitly from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. 'Nam pius est patrie facta referre labor' (To write

5 See esp. Jo-Marie Claassen 1999. *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. Madison.

6 See Robert Epstein 2004. 'London, Southwark, Westminster: Gower's Urban Contexts', Siân Echard (ed.) *A Companion to Gower*. Cambridge: 43-60.

7 The references to Daniel and John in the *prologus* inaugurate a considerable series of references in the *Visio Anglie* to other such prophetic figures, chiefly non-scriptural ancient prophets, mostly Ovidian: Cassandra (1149; also 1931-32, by allusion), but also in more extensive development her brother Helenus (esp. 1001-1162 *passim*); Calchas (961); the Sybil of Cumae (1387-88; cf. also 1569, alluding to the Sybil-like Echo), as well as the Roman *Libri Sybillini* (765); Occyrhoe (1465-66); and Carmentis (1545-58). Of course the title of the larger work of which the *Visio Anglie* was eventually made a part alludes chiefly to the Christian-scriptural New Testament passages, in the gospels, referring to John the baptist: Mt 3.3, Mk 1.3, Lk 3.4, and Io 1.23 ('ego vox clamantis in deserto: dirigite viam domini').

one's country's deeds is pious work) being what Gower's *prologus* offers by way of explanation for his decision to write so soon on the Social Revolt ('Quos mea terra dedit casus nouitatis adibo' (I'll treat the new events my land's endured, *prol.* 29-30)), the *prologus* offers then, too, this explanation for the nature of Gower's poem, that it derives from the nature of the times of which he wrote. Here as subsequently in such quotations from Gower's verse, bold face represents lines and parts of lines, terms and parts of terms (ignoring orthographical difference) that Gower took from Ovid, italic represents paraphrase, and the right-hand figures cite the source-*locus*:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Flebilis vt noster status est, ita flebile carmen, | [<i>T.</i> 5.1.5 |
| Materie scripto conueniente sue. | [<i>T.</i> 5.1.6 |
| Omne quod est huius operis lacrimabile, lector | |
| Scriptum de lacrimis sentiat esse meis, | [<i>T.</i> 1.1.14 |
| Sepeque sunt lacrimis de me scribente profusis, | [<i>T.</i> 4.1.95 |
| Humida fit lacrimis sepeque penna meis. | [<i>T.</i> 4.1.96 |
| Scribere cumque volo, michi pondere pressa laboris | |
| Est manus, et vires subtrahit inde timor. | |
| Qui magis inspiciet opus istud, tempus et instans, | |
| Inueniet toto carmine dulce nichil. | |
| Si vox in fragili michi pectore firmior esset, | [<i>T.</i> 1.5.53 |
| Pluraque cum linguis pluribus ora fauent, | [<i>T.</i> 1.5.54 |
| Hec tamen ad presens mala, que sunt temporis huius, | [<i>T.</i> 1.5.55 |
| Non michi possibile dicere cuncta foret. | [<i>T.</i> 1.5.56 |
| Pectora sic mea sunt limo viciata malorum, | [<i>P.</i> 4.2.19 |
| Quod carmen vena pauperiore fluet. | [<i>P.</i> 4.2.19 |

A mournful song befits our mournful state:
 The style is suited to the tale it tells.
 What's tearful in this work, the reader must
 Accept, was written wholly from my tears.
 Often its lines are wet with the tears I spill
 While writing, often pen too is wet with tears;
 And when I want to write, my hand succumbs,
 By weight oppressed, and fear withholds my powers.
 If you inspect this work and present times,
 In all my song you'll find there's nothing sweet.

If my frail heart had now a stronger voice
 And yet more mouths and still more tongues to match,
 Yet all these present ills of our own time
 Could not be told by me – I could not cope.
 My heart is so befouled by evil's slime
 That what I sing will flow from turgid vein. (*prol.* 33-48)⁸

Gower has singled out a particular conceit – *fleBILE carmen*, Ovid has it, for a *lachrimabile tempus*, in Gower – from amongst a number of such conceits that Ovid had discovered for his post-relegation verse and then returned to, repetitiously: for of course, even within the same corpus of verse Ovid himself adverts the repetitiveness ('Quod sit in his eadem sententia, Brute, libellis, / carmina nescio quem carpere nostra refers' (That in these lines comes ever but one point, Brutus, you report that some deride my poetry, *P.* 3.9.1-2)) and ventures to explain why 'totiens eadem dicam' (so often I say the same things, 3.9.39), simply enough: 'Laeta fere laetus cecini, cano tristia tristis' (When joyous often I sang of joys; sorrowing, I sing of sorrows, 3.9.35).

'quis tibi, Naso, modus lacrimosi carminis?' inquis:
 idem, fortunae qui modus huius erit.

'What end to your tearful verses put you, Naso?' you ask; that self same end my ill fortune is to have. (*T.* 5.1.35-36)

Gower develops by agglomerating quotations of Ovid's repetitions from disparate parts of the corpus: specifically, this passage of Gower's *prologus* cites three of the four book-opening programmatic poems of the earlier collection, *Tristia* 1.1, 4.1, and 5.1 (with a similar use of the likewise programmatic *Tristia* 3.1 saved for later, *Tristia* 2 being – awkwardly unusable in other ways too – a single poem rather than a collection of pieces), combining his quotations from these prominently placed parts with quotations

8 In this instance, *prol.* 45-46 might more properly be regarded rather as paraphrasing *Tristia* 1.5.55-56: 'non tamen idcirco complecterer omnia uerbis, / materia uires exsuperante meas'. On Gower's quotation of the 'fleBILE carmen' passage, see Kobayashi 2009: 339-40.

from elsewhere in the same corpus, less prominent but topically related: *Tristia* 1.5, introducing too the exiled subject's 'moris amor' (1.5.6), develops the topic of the impossibility of voicing his sorrows; and 4.2 of the *Epistulae ex Ponto* is a late representative of the series of the pieces in which Ovid complains that circumstantial reduction has reduced too his poetic capacity: 'Nec tamen ingenium nobis respondet ut ante, / siccum sterili uomere litus aro' (Nor does my talent answer as once it did, / for I harrow but desiccate shore, at fruitless plough, 4.2.15-16).⁹

Gower's readings of Ovid need not be subtly perceptive in order to work. Rather, the quotations allude the better the more recognisable they are, by virtue of their placement in the source-corpus or their repetition: the *fleBILE carmen* was well known enough already, for example, to be invoked to begin Boethius's *Philosophiae consolatio*, the only one of the Boethian metres in Ovid-recalling elegiacs: 'carmina qui quondam studio florente peregi, / flebilis heu maestos cogor inire modos' (I who late brought to completion verses alike vivid and studied, / now alas am driven to put on the mode of desolation I.M.I.1-2).¹⁰

3. THE *LOCUS AMOENUS* COMPLEXIFICATION

Gower also does more complexly allusive Ovidian reassemblies in the *Visio Anglie*; a brief example (also involving the post-relegation verse) appears early in the *Visio*, in a passage describing narrator-Gower's entry into the dream-realm in which his vision of the invasion of London will take place. For Gower's poem is a secular dream-vision, the only surviving effort to put

9 Other instances of this particular Ovidian impossibility topic (in *T.* 5.1 and *P.* 2.7) are mentioned in Mary Thomsen Davisson 1981. 'Omnia Naturae Praepostera Legibus Ibunt: Adunata in Ovid's Exile Poems' *CJ* 76, 127-28. On the topic of the decay of the Ovidian *ingenium* in exile, see Georg Luck 1961. 'Notes on the Language and Text of Ovid's *Tristia*' *HSCPh* 65, 243-61; also, Gareth Williams 1994. *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*. Cambridge: 50-59.

10 On the reference of the first Boethian metre, see Gerard O'Daly 1991. *The Poetry of Boethius*. Chapel Hill: 36-41; for a different view, Antoinette Brazouski 2000. 'The Elegiac Components of the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* of Boethius' *C&M* 51, 237-42.

into contemporary Latin verse what was proving to be the pre-eminent genre of contemporary English vernacular poetry. It might be felt that Gower was attempting to rehabilitate for conservative or reactionary high culture the sort of socially-critical vision-writing best represented by *Piers Plowman* at the vernacular lower end, democratic or even radical; more clearly, Gower's work Latinises the erotic dream-vision being so successfully domesticated for the English high culture by Gower's contemporary Geoffrey Chaucer, from cognate French sources.¹¹

As in the Chaucerian dream-visions, Gower's Latin poem begins in a fair-weathered, fruitful *locus amoenus*, the interesting twist coming when the *pleasaunce* into which the Gower-narrator dreams himself will turn distinctively unpleasant. A like starkness of contrast begins another near-contemporary poem complaining of the local political-economic condition:

Syng I wolde, butt, alas!
decidunt prospera grata.
Ynglond sum tyme was
regnorum gemma vocata,
Of manhod the flowre,
ibi quondam floruit omnis;
Now gone ys that oure –
traduntur talia sompnis.¹²

Gower makes a similar evocative contrast between spring-time setting and ensuing nightmare, though his means for achieving so much is implicit Ovid-quotation, allusion importing. Of these twenty-eight lines at *Visio Anglie* 33–60, twenty quote Ovid.¹³

On the one hand – evoking the *pleasaunce* – Gower quotes from each of

11 Rigg 1997. 'Anglo-Latin in the Ricardian Age' in Minnis, A.J., Charlotte C. Morse, and Thorlac Turville-Petre (eds.) *Essays on Ricardian Literature in Honour of J.A. Burrow*. Oxford: 138–41.

12 'On the Times' 1–8, in James Dean (ed.) 1996. *Medieval English Political Writings* Middle English Texts Series. Kalamazoo: 140–46 = J. Boffey and A.S.G. Edwards 2005. *A New Index of Middle English Verse*. London: no. 3113.

13 The topic at issue was discussed in E.R. Curtius 1954. *Europäische Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter* (2nd ed. repr. Bern 1969): 202–6; particular Christian-scriptural analogues for the Gower passage are adduced in Kurt Olsson 1987. 'John Gower's *Vox Clamantis* and the Medieval Idea of Place' *Studies in Philology* 84, 140.

the four descriptions of the coming of spring that occur in Ovid's *Fasti*, in the Ovidian order: the creator-deity of the new year, Janus's account (1.63-294); Mars's account, in that deity's explanation of the Gradivalia (3.167-258); the account in Ovid's aetiology of the Cerealia, honouring the fertility-deity Ceres (4.393-620); and finally, the deity Flora's own comment, from the Ovidian account of the last of the Roman springtime festivals, the Floralia (5.183-378).

On the other hand, though also at the same time – for Gower intermingles his evocations of the pleasant with ill-portending matter – he also quotes a four-line passage from a *Tristia* item again: one of the topically connected series of items in which Ovid adumbrates the extent of his post-relegation misery by contrasting his memories of springtime Italy at home with the perpetual winter wasteland he finds at Tomis, though representation of the 'Scythian' conditions has as much to do with a passage of Vergil's *Georgics* as with anything real.¹⁴

In Gower, the couplets of the *Tristia* passage are separated, sandwiched between them, first, as if a description of the coming of day, a couplet in fact adapted from the *Amores* (rare in Gower's usage) in which a disappointed *amator*, *exclusus*, rebukes his own folly:

iamque pruinosis molitur Lucifer axes,
inque suum miseros excitat ales opus.
at tu, non laetis detracta corona capillis,
dura super tota limina nocte iace!

Already chill day-star loosens up its wheels,
and bird-song rouses wretches off to work,
while yet lie you there, night-long comfortless on the doorstep,
a garland tossed aside from joyless brow (*Am.* 1.6.65-68)

And second, another seemingly innocuous line that comes in fact from the fatal Phaeton episode in the *Metamorphoses*, 2.30, to which Gower gives more detailed though equally portentous attention elsewhere in the *Visio*.¹⁵

¹⁴ Williams 1994: 8-13.

¹⁵ In fact just preceding the *Fasti*-based passage at issue: *Visio Anglie* 9-32, where Gower uses a dozen quotations from *Metamorphoses* 2.1-226, alluding to the kind of disaster that im-

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Omnia tunc florent, tunc est noua temporis etas, | [F. 1.151] |
| Ludit et in pratis luxuriando pecus. | [F. 1.156] |
| Tunc fecundus ager, pecorum tunc hora creandi, | [F. 3.241] |
| Tunc renouatque suos reptile quodque iocos. | |
| Prataque pubescunt variorum flore colorum, | [T. 3.12.7] |
| Indocilique loquax gutture cantat auis. | [T. 3.12.8] |
| Queque diu latuit tunc se qua tollat in auras | [F. 3.239] |
| Inuenit occultam fertilis herba viam. | [F. 3.240] |
| Tuncque pruinosos mollitur Lucifer agros, | [Am. 1.6.65] |
| Inque suos pullos concitat ales opus. | [Am. 1.6.66] |
| Tunc glacialis yemps canos hirsuta capillos | [M. 2.30] |
| Deserit, et placidi redditus orbis erat. | |
| Quicquid yems operit gelido de frigore cedit, | [F. 3.235] |
| Et periunt lapse sole tepente niues. | [F. 3.236] |
| Arboribus redeunt detonse frigore frondes, | [F. 3.237] |
| Regnat et estatis pompa per omne nemus. | |
| ... | |
| Iam legit ingenua violas sibi compta puella | [T. 3.12.5] |
| Rustica, quas nullo terra serente vehit. | [T. 3.12.6] |
| Tot fuerant illuc quot habet natura colores, | [F. 4.429] |
| Pictaque dissimili flores superbit humus. | [F. 4.430] |
| O quia digestos volui numerare colores, | [F. 5.213] |
| Nec potui, numero copia maior erat. | [F. 5.214] |

At this new season all the world is filled
 With flowers, and cows rejoice in sweet green meads.
 The fields are fruitful, cows are near to birth,
 Each crawling thing renews its comic young.
 The meadows swell with many-coloured flowers;

pends from misrule's usurpations, in the case of Phaeton as in that of the English revolutionaries of 1381. Ill-portents in the *Visio's* opening section are discussed in Kobayashi 2009: 341-42.

Loquacious birds make song with untaught voice.
 Long-buried plants find out a hidden way
 To spread themselves and grow in spring's fresh winds.
 Then Lucifer works at the frozen ground,
 And birds are roused to bring their chicks to life.
 Then icy rough-clad winter sheds his old
 White hairs: a peaceful world returns at last.
 Whatever winter cloaked emerges from chill cold;
 The sun grows warm, and snows melt all away.
 The leaves, shorn off by cold, return to trees
 And summer's pomp holds sway in every grove.

...

A noble well-groomed girl picks violets
 Which earth brings forth, though no one sows a seed.
 All nature's colours shone there all at once;
 The painted earth was proud with all its flowers.
 I could have told of all the hues spread there,
 But could not, since the bounty was too rich. (33-48 and 55-60)¹⁶

¹⁶ The repetitions of *tunc* in this passage – eight times in the twelve lines at 33-44, including Gower's imposition of anaphora on the Ovid-deriving couplets at 41-44, where there was no anaphora originally in the disjunct Ovidian lines – make an instance of Gower's attraction to this figure of speech, excessive at times. In the *Visio Anglie* alone, Gower has the couplet-initial *O res mira nimis* x 6 (623-34), *Hec erat illa dies* x 17 (635-70, quoting from the *Speculum stultorum* 419-42), and *O vigiles sompni* x 3, to finish the *Visio* (2141-45). At 1743-64, thirteen of twenty-two lines begin with *turris*; also, in the exile-section the Ovid-deriving anaphoric series of couplets beginning *Ha, quociens* occurs four times (1415-22). Further, it might be argued that Gower's eye and memory were specially attracted to occurrences of the figure in Ovid, where it is in fact relatively more common than amongst the other ancient poets, though not as much so as in Gower or Nigel Witeker, for example (important analysis of ancient usage in Jeffrey Wills 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford, esp. 354-71); Gower's quotations from Ovid are often enough from passages where Ovid put anaphora even when Gower's quotations do not use the anaphoric portion proper: see, e.g., *Visio Anglie* 35-36, 943-44, and 1825-26; within the exile-section, see 1385-86, 1397-98, 1433-34, 1442, and 1496.

4. THE *RELEGATUS*-CHARACTER IN GOWER

The longest sustained, most complexly reassembled passage of this kind of Ovidian allusion in the *Visio Anglie* is, 1359-1592, the exile section, comprising the transitional centre of the nightmare-vision, in which the narrator-Gower, allegorically forced to leave his home, suffers in consequence. The sort of quotations from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* that Gower put earlier in the poem are especially numerous in this section, where earlier intimations of exilic suffering are brought to realisation in depiction of exile itself.

The remaining book-opening programmatic poem from the *Tristia* – 3.1, beginning ‘Missus in hanc uenio timide liber exulis urbem:/ da placidam fesso, lector amice, manum’ (An exile’s book come I into this great city, in trepidation sent on ahead: lend, dear reader, soothing hand someone already so far worn out, 1-2) – is brought in at this point, in Gower’s quotation of an evocative line from it on the exile’s friendlessness, the difficulty of knowing proper *fides* in others at distance. The way in which Gower uses the chosen line from *Tristia* 3.1 here indicates this difference in Gower’s selection of passages from the post-relegation verse for this section, however: not so much the programmatic, introductory matter, such as had occurred earlier in the *Visio*, as topically related passages from various poems characterising the particulars of the exilic condition in Ovid’s depiction of it. *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.6 – an interior poem, amongst many, from another book, from another collection, but also focused on *fides* in friendship: ‘Lenem te miseris genuit natura nec ulli / mitius ingenium quam tibi, Brute, dedit’ (Gently disposed to the wretched made nature you, Brutus, nor lent she anyone milder inclination than she did you), writes Ovid to his correspondent; ‘quique tuas pariter lacrimas nostrasque uideret / passuros poenam crederet esse duos’ (whoever had seen your tears and ours so alike had thought us two both to suffer punishment the same, 25-28) – was yet topically adjacent in Gower’s reading of Ovid’s post-relegation verse.¹⁷ What Gower does with Ovid in this instance, as elsewhere in his own exile-section, is combine the one Ovidian passage with another, discontinuous in the source but continuous

¹⁷ The survey in R. Syme 1978. *History in Ovid*. Oxford: 72-93, is especially instructive; see also Williams 1994: 100.

in substance:

Qui prius attulerat verum michi semper amorem, [P. 4.6.23]
 Tunc tamen aduerso tempore cessat amor. [P. 4.6.24]
 Querebam fratres tunc fidos, non tamen ipsos [T. 3.1.65]
 Quos suus optaret non genuisse pater. [T. 3.1.66]

The love which up to then had always brought
 True love departed when the times turned bad.
 I sought for trusty brothers, but not such
 As fathers would have wished they had not sired. (1501-1504)

Gower finds lines from *Tristia* 5.4 – another poem detailing Ovid’s *tristitiae causa* (7) – to use for describing his setting forth into exile (“Tuncque domum propriam linquens”):

Sic fugiens abii subite contagia cladis, [T. 5.4.33]
 Non ausus lese limen adire domus. [T. 5.4.34]

I fled contagion from the sudden plague;
 I dared not cross the step of plundered home. (1379-81)

Gower’s chief resource, however, for accounting this point of his departure from London is the substantively related *Tristia* 1.3, in which Ovid evokes memory of his last night in Rome, ‘tristissima noctis imago, qua mihi supremum tempus in urbe fuit’ (saddest image of night, when came the latest hour I had of the city, *T.* 1.3.1-2):

quid facerem? blando patriae retinebar amore,
 ultima sed iussae nox erat illa fugae.
 a! quotiens aliquo dixi properante ‘quid urges?
 uel quo festinas ire, uel unde, uide.’
 a! quotiens certam me sum mentitus habere
 horam, propositae quae foret apta uiae.
 ter limen tetigi, ter sum reuocatus, et ipse
 indulgens animo pes mihi tardus erat.
 What was to do? Rooted in place by sweet-persuading love of homeland,

yet the night was the last set for my bidden departure. How often, alas, said I to who would hurry me, 'why hasten so on? See whence you rush to go, and wherefore.' How often, alas, gave I the lie that an apt time for my going the road put before me had been settled. Thrice on threshold, thrice I called it back; I had a foot reluctant even, attuned to my state of mind. (*T.* 1.3.49-56)

Gower uses but one member of Ovid's 'a! quotiens' anaphora in direct quotation, immediately, though then he paraphrases the other intralineal repetition, Ovid's foot thrice *ad limen*, thrice drawn back; additionally, Gower prefaces these quotations with another, a portentously borrowed 'epic' simile from the *Metamorphoses*, where it had occurred to describe the desperate sea-beast about to die in Perseus's rescue of Andromeda.¹⁸

Sicut aper, quem turma canum circumsona terret, [*M.* 4.723

Territus extrema rebar adire loca.

Ha, quociens certam sum me mentitus habere [*T.* 1.3.53

Horam, proposito que foret apta meo. [*T.* 1.3.54

Si qua parte michi magis expediens foret ire,

Perstetit in media pes michi sepe via. [*T.* 1.3.56

Like frightened boar, surrounded by the bay

Of dogs, I thought I neared my final place.

I often told myself a lie: 'I have

A time that's sure and right for what I plan',

If I had anywhere a better way.

My foot stood still and halted in the path. (1395-1400)

Unlike the ancient *relegatus*, the Gower-narrator knows not where to go in the circumstance ('Quis locus ad vitam fert pociora meam?' (What place gives better hope to save my life?)), since, everywhere he looks, 'occupat hostis iter' (Foes blocked the path, 1404, 1410). For the figure of the *hostis*,

¹⁸ The allusion to the *Metamorphoses*' Perseus and Andromeda episode (4.663-789) here anticipates Gower's later use of the same Ovidian matter in greater symbolic-allegorical development, at *Visio Anglie* 1717-42.

Gower uses not *Tristia* 1.3 but *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.3.57-58, out of Ovidian context somewhat, to account his plight: '**Hostis adest dextra, surgens de parteque leua, / Vicinoque metu terret vtrumque latus**' (A foe to left, and at the right a foe: / Adjacent fear caused me alarm both sides, 1413-14). Then, however, he reverts to *Tristia* 1.3 describing departure from Rome for more of the Ovidian 'a! quotiens' anaphora, already quoted just above (1397-98) though not immediately developed upon its first appearance: Gower uses the Ovidian phrase to start the four successive couplets ensuing, '**Ha, quociens mentem pauor incutit**' (How often fear assailed my mind) et cetera (1415-21).

In Ovid, a mind so afflicted with exilic *pavor*, even with feverish dreams, is repeatedly said to produce a contagion afflicting the body too, for '**mens-que pati durum sustinet aegra nihil**' (a sick mind cannot bear anything difficult, *P.* 1.5.18). '**Ut tetigi Pontum, uexant insomnia**' (as soon as I reached the Pontus, sleeplessness beset me), and '**uitiant artus aegrae contagia mentis**' (a sick mind's contagion afflicts my limbs; *T.* 3.8.27, 25); '**ecquid, ubi incubuit iusto mens aegra dolori, / lenis ab admonito pectore somnus abit**' (for indeed where a sick mind dwells on proper misery, / kindly sleep goes out from the heart touched by it, *T.* 4.3.21-22). '**Nec melius ualeo, quam corpore, mente, sed aegra est / utraque pars aeque binaque damna fero**' (Nor fare I better in mind than in body, for both are sick alike and both's damages suffer I, *T.* 3.8.33-34); '**aeger enim traxi contagia corpore mentis**' (sick of body I suffer the contagion of my mind, *T.* 5.13.3); or, put most preposterously, '**corpore sed mens est aegro magis aegra**' (yet sicker my mind than sick my body is, *T.* 4.6.43). Gower combed the Ovidian verse corpus and combined, paraphrasing and quoting, with an apt line from the *Heroides* as well, and another of the *Metamorphoses*, to characterise his own condition as like that of the ancient *relegatus*:

| | |
|--|--|
| Dum mens egra fuit, dolet accio corporis, in quo | [<i>T.</i> 4.6.43 etc. |
| Ossa tegit macies, nec iuuat ora cibus. | [<i>T.</i> 3.8.28; cf. 1488 ¹⁹ |
| Iam michi subducta facies humana videtur, | [<i>M.</i> 2.661 |
| Pallor et in vultu signa reportat humi. | [cf. 1486 |

19 To *Visio Anglie* 1481 = *Tristia* 3.8.28 'nec iuuat ora cibus', cf. also *Tristia* 3.3.9 'non hic cibus utilis aegro.'

Sanguis abit mentemque color corpusque reliquit, [H. 14.37
Pulcrrior est et eo terra colore meo. [cf. T. 4.6.41, 1484
Sic magis a longo passum quod corpus habebam, [cf. T. 4.6.41
Vix habuit tenuem qua tegat ossa cutem. [T. 4.6.42; cf. 1482

While mind was sick, my body's movement dulled:
 My bones were thin; my mouth would take no food.
 It seemed to me my human form had gone;
 The pallor of my face bore signs of earth.
 Blood went, and colour left my mind and corpse;
 The earth is fairer in its hue than mine.
 The body I had suffered in so long
 Had hardly any skin to clothe its bones. (1481-88)

The Ovidian passage on which this one is most nearly based, though of course the matter is not so simple, may be *Tristia* 4.6.39-44 –

credite, deficio, nostroque a corpore quantum
 auguror, accedent tempora parva malis.
 nam neque sunt vires, nec qui color esse solebat:
 vix habeo tenuem, quae tegat ossa, cutem.
 corpore sed mens est aegro magis aegra, malique
 in circumspectu stat sine fine sui.

Believe you me, I am failing, and, as far as I can tell from the state of my body, small time remains for these my ills. My strength is not what it was, nor my appearance: hardly have I such thin skin as will serve to keep my bones in. Yet sicker my mind than sick my body is, and it indwells endlessly in inspection of its own illness.

– part of a piece in which Ovid asserts time's unusual failure to heal, in his special case, concluding with another version of the poet's grim death-wish: 'una tamen spes est quae me soletur in istis, / haec fore morte mea non diuturna mala' (A sole hope remains to console me in the circumstance, that, by my death, these ills of mine will not live long, T. 4.6.49-50).²⁰

The Gower-narrator too finds himself troubled by nightmares in sleep

which are characterised by phrases quoted from the *Epistulae ex Ponto*:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Sompnia me terrent varios imitancia casus, | [P. 1.2.43] |
| Et vigilant sensus in mea dampna mei. | [P. 1.2.44] |
| Sic mea sompniferis liquefiunt pectora curis, | [P. 1.2.55] |
| Ignibus appositis vt noua cera solet. | [P. 1.2.56] |
| Aut nisi restituar melioris ymagine sompni, | [P. 1.2.47] |
| Aspicio patrie tecta relictia mee. | [P. 1.2.48] |

Dreams terrify me, imitating wild
 Events: my wits are watchful for my loss.
 My breast dissolves with soporific cares,
 As new made wax does, when the fire is near.
 If not restored by sight of better dream,
 I'll see my homeland's houses derelict. (1425-30)

'Tristis eram,' has Gower's narrator, not only 'quia solus' (1457), without a friend; but also because 'et non est qui medicamen agat' (1464), where the conceit is Ovidian though the terms are not.²¹ The cause in Gower,

20 Davisson 1983. '*Sed sum quam medico notior ipse mihi*: Ovid's Use of Some Conventions in the Exile Epistles' *CLAnt* 2, 179-80.

21 The closest source for Gower's 1464 'et non est qui medicamen agat' may be *Tristia* 3.3.9-12, with a 'non qui' anaphora that Gower may have recalled: 'Non domus apta satis, non hic cibus utilis aegro,/ nullus, Apollinea qui leuet arte malum,/ non qui soletur, non qui labentia tarde/ tempora narrando fallat, amicus adest.' The other terms for the *Apollinea ars* that Gower would appear to have preferred occur widely enough in the post-relegation verse: e.g., 'Non est in medico semper releuetur ut aeger:/ interdum docta plus ualet arte malum' (P. 1.3.17-18), 'Ad medicum specto uenis fugientibus aeger' (P. 3.1.69), 'ad medicam dubius confugit aeger opem' (P. 3.4.8); other instances are discussed in Davisson 1983: 176 and 181. Gower's remarks are probably also clarified by his adjacent quotation, in 1465-66, from matter in the *Metamorphoses* 2.633-75 concerning the healing deity Aesculapius. The centaur Chiron's daughter Occyrhoe tells the future of her infant brother Aesculapius – 'totoque saluifer orbi' (2.642) she calls him: 'animas tibi reddere adeptas/ fas erit' (2.644-45); but Occyrhoe's revelations – that Aesculapius will himself long for death and not find it: 'posse mori cupies, tum cum cruciabere dirae/ sanguine serpentis per saucia membra recepto' (2.651-52) – so anger Jupiter that he takes away Occyrhoe's voice. In addition to this figure of a soteriological healer who will himself suffer *mortis amor*, the lines quoted allude also to another of the incompletely heard prophets with which Gower would align himself: see above, n. 7.

expressed in words taken from Ovid though the sense differs, is *ira dei* ('Ira dei magni causa timoris erat' (the cause of fear was God Almighty's wrath, 1456));²² the consequence in Gower is another Ovidian conceit, couched in borrowed terms too:

Sic lacrimae lacrimis, sic luctus luctibus assunt,
 Dum queror, *et non est qui medicamen agat.* [T. 3.3.10
 Pectoribus lacrimaeque genis labuntur aborte, [M. 2.656
 Dum fuerat fati spes inimica michi. [M. 2.655
 Fine carent lacrimae, nisi cum stupor obstitit illis, [P. 1.2.27
 Aut similis morti pectora torpor habet. [P. 1.2.28

Thus tears are paired with tears and grief with grief
 While I lament, and no one brings relief.
 Tears rise within my breast and run down cheeks,
 Since hope in destiny was then my foe.
 Tears fall unchecked except in stupor's grip
 When death-like numbness takes and holds the heart. (1463-68)

The chief conceit of Ovid's representation of his own banished circumstance is the one that Gower quotes just here, the *torpor similis morti*: that exile is a type of death, 'mortis imago,' also engendering a wish for death, 'mortis amor.'²³ Gower uses the expression of the topic from *Tristia* 1.11, the last poem of that work's first book, in which, as elsewhere later, Ovid develops the contrast between his wretched Scythian condition and the pleasures of his Roman garden at home in springtime: 'non haec in nostris, ut quondam, scripsimus hortis' (these verses were not at all composed in gardens properly ours, as used to be the case, 1.11.37): 'quocumque aspexi, nihil est nisi mortis

22 *Ira dei* occurs widely (e.g., T. 1.5.84, 1.10.42, etc.), with such variants as *Iovis ira* (T. 1.5.78, 3.11.62); also, 'Siue mihi casus siue hoc dedit ira deorum' (T. 5.1.13); and some *numinis ira* occurrences are listed below, n. 39. Usually, such phrases are equivalent in denotation to the still more widely occurring *Caesaris ira* (e.g., T. 1.2.3 and 61; 1.3.85; 3.11.17, 18 and 72; etc.): 'tantus amor necis est, querar ut cum Caesaris ira, / quod non offensas uindictet ense suas' (T. 3.8.39-40), varied with *principis ira* (e.g., T. 1.1.33, 4.10.98, 5.11.8).

23 On the death-topics, see Betty Rose Nagle 1980. *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid* Collection Latomus 170. Bruxelles, 22-32; also, Kobayashi 2009: 340-41.

imago, / quam dubia timeo mente timensque precor' (wherever I looked, there was nothing but a likeness of death, a death that, confused of thought, at once I fear and fearfully yet imprecate, 1.11.23-24). Gower quotes the topical phrase, in combination with lines that are substantively alike (*eadem sententia*) from the other Ovidian collection, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.4, the poem in which Ovid put too his version of the *vox dei*: the voice of the *vates* is divine, he has it: 'ista vox dei est: deus est in pectore nostro' (this voice is a deity's: indwells within this breast of ours the deity itself, *P.* 3.4.93). The beginnings of Gower's next pair of couplets repeat in varied terms the topic of the exilic *mortis amor* that overcomes Ovid in similar conditions, faced with the *mortis imago*: 'Sepe mori volui' (I often wished to die) and 'Velle mori statui' (I wished to die, 1523, 1525).

Si genus est mortis male viuere, credo quod illo [*P.* 3.4.75
 Tempore vita mea morsque fuere pares. [*P.* 3.4.76
 Sic vbi respexi, nichil est nisi mortis ymago, [*T.* 1.11.23
 Quam reputo nullum tollere posse virum. [*T.* 1.11.24

If wretched life's a kind of death, I think
 That at that time my life and death were one.
 I had no thing in view to see but death,
 Which no man, as I think, can take away. (1519-22)

5. THE *HEROIDES* REFERENCE

The *mortis amor* theme in the post-relegation writings culminates at *Tristia* 3.3.73-76, where Ovid, addressing his wife, writes his own epitaph, as Gower too was to do, though in different circumstances. Ovid practiced in advance, however, as if on another person but one whom he was impersonating, Phyllis, in the *Heroides* (2.145-48).²⁴

²⁴ At *Visio* 2033-34, Gower quotes from the Phyllis-Demophoonti epistle, *Her.* 2.123-24. For Gower's own epitaph (a quatrain like the two Ovidian analogues, beginning 'Armeri scutum nichil ammodo fert sibi tutum'), see Robert F. Yeager (ed. and trans.) 2005.

This kind of kinship of Ovid's post-relegation writings and the *Epistulae Heroidum* he had written earlier has been recognised, as it seems too to have been already by Gower: the Ovidian *Heroides* all represent themselves as the utterances – dramatic monologues in epistolary form – of persons suffering exile or exile-like abandonment or separation or estrangement, though the persons are legendary-mythical women whom Ovid impersonates rather than the similarly fictionalised *persona* he puts on for his own post-relegation verse.²⁵ For, after the post-relegation writings, Gower's most frequent recourse in this exile-section of the *Visio Anglie* was to lines from the *Heroides*, unusual for Gower, in Latin or in English. Nonetheless, here fourteen lines quote from various *Heroides*, Gower having selected a series of ill-portending lines that lend depth of amplification to the depiction of the plight of his narrator – likewise cast out and abandoned, facing dire consequences – though also lines, less characteristic of the *Heroides*, certainly harder to find in that corpus of verse, importing a possibility of a more fortunate outcome.

For example, though narrator-Gower's account of his exilic rustication may appear to recall contemporary romance – the Orpheus-romance, for example, where the protagonist 'That hadde y-werd the fowe & griis, / & on bed the purper biis, / Now on hard hethe he lith, / With leues & gresse he him writh'²⁶ – his quotation is from the Oenone-Paridi epistle of Ovid, *Heroides* 5.14: 'Copula **cum foliis prebuit herba thorum**' (My bed was grasses married to the leaves, 1442), from an anaphoric passage in which Oenone describes the idyllic wedded bliss ('saepe greges inter requievimus arbore tecti / mixtaque cum foliis praebuit herba torum' (Often did we rest beneath sheltering tree, flocks round about, and for us two grasses strewn with leaves made a bed, 5.13-14)) that preceded her husband Paris's betrayal of her and abandonment, for Helen's rape. Gower reverts to the same ill-portending letter later in this same section, though not elsewhere in his oeuvre, when he quotes Oenone's account of her cynically false husband's leave-taking ('flesti discedens' (You did weep as you left me): 'praeterito

John Gower: The Minor Latin Works, Middle English Texts Series. Kalamazoo.

25 On the connections, see H. Rahn 1958. 'Ovids elegische Epistel' *Antike und Abendland* 7, 105-20; and esp. P.A. Rosenmeyer 1997. 'Ovid's *Heroides* and *Tristia*: Voices from Exile' *Ramus* 26, 29-56.

26 A.J. Bliss (ed.) 1966. *Sir Orfeo* 2nd ed. Oxford, Auchinlek 241-44.

magis est iste pudendus amor' (the more therefore was that love of yours a shame, 5.43-44)): '**Miscuimus lacrimas mestus vterque simul**' (We both were filled with grief and shared our fears, 1496, quoting *H.* 5.46).

Similarly, Gower quotes '**Sanguis abijt mentemque color corpusque reliquit**' (Blood went, and colour left my mind and corpse, 1485) from the Hypermestra-Lynceo epistle (*H.* 14.37) where the woman describes her reaction to the discovery of her forty-nine sisters' epithalamic slaughter of their forty-nine husbands, ordered by Danaus, their father; for her filial disobedience, Hypermestra is confined ('clausa domo teneor / gravibusque coercita vinclis; / est mihi supplicii causa fuisse piam' (Close in the palace I am held, bound with strong bonds; for cause of my suffering I have it I was pious, 3-4)) and in fear of her own execution ('me pater igne licet, quem non violavimus, urat' (my father may put me to the fire (sc. of the wedding-altar), I allow, that I would not violate myself, 9)).

Again later, with greater display of the quality of his knowledge of this part of the Ovidian corpus, too, and so more pointedly, Gower marries quotations from both this and the other of the *Heroides* that involve protagonists waking from sleep to terror. Rejecting her father's injunction to murder her husband Lynceus in their wedding-bed, Hypermestra recalls expostulating: 'purpureos laniata sinus, laniata capillos / exiguo dixi talia verba sono: / "saevus, Hypermestra, pater est tibi,"' etc. (rent the fabric scarlet-hued, rent the curls of hair, I spoke such words as these though whispering: 'Yours is, Hypermestra, a father cruel indeed', *H.* 14.51-53). Gower uses Hypermestra's *dixi talia* to introduce a different direct discourse, which is in fact quoted from the Ariadne-Theseo epistle (*H.* 10).²⁷ Ariadne, expressing her version of Ovid's own post-relegation *mortis amor*, inveighs against the bad sleep during which her husband Theseus absconded, abandoning her to death, far from home: 'me somnusque meus male prodidit et tu, / per facinus somnis insidiate meis' (It was you, plotting crime against me while I slept, and my sleep too that have done me such wrong, *H.* 10.7-8).

Cum fuit in sompnis mea desperacio maior,

²⁷ This quotation at 1565-66 is the only reference to *Heroides* 10 in the *Visio*, and, when later Gower was to make the *Confessio amantis* 5.5231-495, he used the *Metamorphoses* instead and then chiefly in the medieval and vernacular redactions.

Exiguo dixi talia verba sono: [H. 14.52
‘Crudeles sompni, cur me tenuistis inermem?’ [H. 10.113
Quin prius instanti morte premendus eram.’ [H. 10.114

When desperation grew within my sleep,
 I said these words, though with a feeble sound:
 ‘Why, cruel sleep, did you seize me, so weak?
 I first should have succumbed to instant death.’ (1563-66)

Similar in its complexity of construction is a passage in which three of four consecutive couplets are made from diverse bits of different *Heroides*: the Canace-Macareo epistle (H. 11), where Canace describes her reaction to her father Aeolus’s attack on her (‘et vix a misero continet ore manus’ (and scarcely keeps he his hand back from my face, 80)), once her delivery of a child fathered by her brother Macareus is discovered, whom the father will murder; the Laodamia-Protesilao epistle (H. 13), where Laodamia remarks on the omens (‘cum foribus velles ad Troiam exire paternis, / pes tuus offenso limine signa dedit’ (When forth your ancestral gate for Troy you would go, your halting foot at the doorstep gave ill portent, 87-88)) that attend the setting forth for Troy of her husband Protesilaus – legendarily, the first of the Greeks to die on the foreign shore; and the Briseis-Achilli epistle (H. 3):

Sepeque *cum volui conatus verba proferre,* [H. 11.81
Torpuerat gelido lingua retenta metu. [H. 11.82
 Non meus vt querat noua sermo quosque fatigat;
Obstitit auspicis lingua retenta malis. [H. 13.86
 Sepe meam mentem volui dixisse, set hosti
 Prodere me timui, linguaque tardat ibi.
 Heu! **Miserum tristis fortuna tenaciter vrget,** [H. 3.43
Nec venit in fatis mollior hora meis. [H. 3.44

But then my tongue grew stiff with freezing fear.
 My words don’t bother all to ask for news:
 Ill omens checked my tongue and held it back.
 I often wanted to reveal my thoughts;
 I feared betrayal, and my tongue stood still.

Alas, sad fortune held me in its grip,
And in my fates no milder moment came. (1511-18)²⁸

Though in the one line from *Heroides* 3 that Gower chooses Briseis has a point about the tenacity of apparent misfortune over the spirits of such *miseri* as are subject to it, in the implication of her questions in the adjunct couplet too – ‘qua merui culpa fieri tibi vilis, Achilles? / quo levis a nobis tam cito fugit amor?’ (What fault, Achilles, of mine makes you value me so little? Why is that light love of yours so quick to leave me behind?, *H.* 3.41-42) – she will prove to be mistaken, about her *culpa*, Achilles’s *amor*, and what is to come for her. Turning Briseis’s questions into statements of fact emphasises the Gower-narrator’s myopic despair, even beyond the Ovidian heroine; like Briseis, however, and despite his own disconsolate tendencies, the Gower-narrator too will find that a ‘mollior hora’ comes.

Gower also invokes this same unusually well-portending Ovidian *epistula* elsewhere in his exile-section, the same line of it twice in fact. A quotation within a quotation: while she is still suffering separation from Achilles, Briseis yet recalls the comforting words Patroclus had addressed to her, as she was handed over to Agamemnon: “quid fles? hic parvo tempore,” dixit, “eris” (‘Why the tears?’, he asked; ‘you will be here but for brief space’, *H.* 3.24). The implicit promise is that it will not be long before Achilles has Briseis back, and, despite her intermittent suffering, represented in the Ovidian *epistula*, to the point of her despair (akin to that of the Gower-narrator at the point of the line’s first quotation, in other words), the promise is fulfilled.

Gower place this same line once early in the exile-section, where it represents the narrator’s immediate though misplaced fears for his own life: ‘Ha, quociens mentem pavor incutit hec michi dicens, / “Quid fugis? En, paruo tempore viuus eris!”’ (How often fear assailed my mind and said / ‘Why flee? You won’t be living here for long’, 1419-20), and then again more pre-

28 Gower quotes again from this Canace-Macareo *epistula* (*Her.* 11) in the *Visio* at 2001-2, and later he used it as the basis for *Confessio amantis* 3.143-336, one of only five tales in the *Confessio* to derive from matter in the *Heroides*; also, 1514 is Gower’s sole reference to the Laodamia-Protesilao (*Her.* 13) in the *Visio*, though he returned to it for making *Confessio amantis* 4.1901-34, another of the *Heroides* deriving *Confessio* tales. These two *Heroides*-references are discussed in Kobayashi 2009: 346.

cisely in the Ovidian phrasing, “**Quid fles? Hic paruo tempore,**” **dixit’** “**eris**” (‘Why weep? You won’t be here for long’, 1568), nearer the section’s conclusion, when prayer and divine answer (1533–58) have already made imminent the advent of the delivering ship. The remark may seem to threaten death – and Gower’s adaptations of it make this implication clearer – but it does not. Instead, it promises relief from suffering. Gower’s use of the line twice in the same section exploits its ambivalence, or depends on it: Gower’s narrator too may expect but will in fact be delivered from the death he fears.

The exile-section’s first quotation from the *Heroides* is of another of the rarities of that collection, a well-portending episode, from the double-epistle exchange of Cydippe and Acontius, in Acontius’s profession of love for Cydippe, which will yield happiness. Acontius’s promise is that once Cydippe will have tried him (in the legal sense implied by *reus* (20.91)), she will be satisfied:

cum bene se quantumque volet satiaverit ira,
 ipsa tibi dices: ‘quam patienter amat!’
 ipsa tibi dices, ubi videris omnia ferre:
 ‘tam bene qui servit, serviat iste mihi!’

When that anger of yours has had all it would, thoroughly satiate, you will say it for yourself, ‘He bears so much for love!’ You will say it for yourself, when you see me suffer all so patiently, ‘He who serves so well should be serving me!’ (*H.* 20.87–90)

Gower uses the immediately following lines, at a similarly early point in his own exilic misfortunes, where recognition of the context his quotation portends the fortunate turn of events that will later come:

Morsus ego linguis a dorso sepe ruebar,
 Et reus absque meo crimine sepe fui.
 Sic **reus infelix agor absens, et mea cum sit** [*H.* 20.91
Optima, non vllo causa tuente perit. [*H.* 20.92

I often stumbled, since tongues bit my back,
 And stood accused, although my guilt was none.
 While absent, I was charged, alas; my cause

Was good but failed without an advocate. (1383-86)

6. THE ACHAEMENIDES MATTER

In the grander scheme that is Gower's *Visio Anglie* complete, the point of the exile-section within is that it passes. Unlike Ovid in Tomis, unlike the better part of the abandoned heroines of the Ovidian epistolography, excepting the few singled out by Gower for reference, the Gower-narrator of the *Visio Anglie* will return home, to find all there well again, more or less, though, Odysseus-like, order's fullest restoration may not be quite possible, or will be achieved only through further efforts that will have yet to come by poem's end.²⁹

The exile-section is most pervaded by these references to the post-relegation verse and to the *Heroides*, chiefly though not exclusively ill-portending; the exile-section is structurally organised, however, by a series of strategically placed, topically appropriate allusions to the tale of Achaemenides – 'comes infelicis Ulixi' (ill-fated Ulysses' own), Vergil calls him (*Aen.* 3.613; 3.691) – who was left behind by the escaping Greeks at Aetna, 'Sicula desertus in Aetna' (bereft on Sicilian Aetna, *Ibis* 413), there to remain terrified by Polyphemus until his rescue by Aeneas and the rest of the errant Trojans, just before their African shipwreck near the widow Dido's Carthage – the tale of a terror-filled, exile-like abandonment, only relieved by a ship's unforeseen advent; in other words, a precisely evocative analogue for the Gower-narrator's contemporary progress, repeated from the ancient literature.

Nothing indicates that Gower was mindful of the passage in Vergil (*Aen.* 3.588-691), though some of it may have come through to him indirectly. As Gower's source was Ovid, so Ovid's was Vergil (albeit in a different sense); as

29 For example, the concluding couplet of the *Visio*, 'Quod solet esse michi vetus hoc opus amodo cedat, / Sit prior **et cura cura repulsa noua!**' (The ancient task I used to have must pass, / So let this new care drive the old away!, 2149-50), quotes *Rem.* 484 'Et posita est cura cura repulsa nova,' Ovid's advice to the disillusioning or disaffecting lover, prompted immediately by consideration (467-86) of the case of the *senex amans* Agamemnon, enjoying Chryseis, having been compelled to return Bryseis to Achilles (475-76): "Est" ait Atrides "illius proxima forma, / Et, si prima sinat syllaba, nomen idem."

often elsewhere, here, too, Ovid had reworked the Vergilian matter, differently for his own differing purposes, and what Gower preferred to use for the *Visio Anglie*, here as often elsewhere, was the Ovidian version of the tale (*M.* 14.154-222) exclusively.

One way and another, this exile-section of Gower's *Visio* incorporates quotations from all of *Metamorphoses* 14.198-219, with the exception of a line or two: this was a section of the Ovidian epic of mutability that Gower studied closely for purposes of constructing this part of his own poem, and he did not use the matter again elsewhere, in other writing of his. As in the post-relegation verse and *Heroides*, so too, in this section of the *Metamorphoses*, it is the victim of the exilic suffering who tells the tale:

haec et plura ferox; me luridus occupat horror
spectantem uultus etiamnum caede madentes
crudelesque manus et inanem luminis orbem
membraque et humano concretam sanguine barbam.
mors erat ante oculos, minimum tamen illa malorum.
et iam prensurum, iam nunc mea uiscera rebar
in sua mersurum, mentique haerebat imago
temporis illius, quo uidi bina meorum
ter quater adfligi sociorum corpora terrae,
cum super ipse iacens hirsuti more leonis
uisceraque et carnes cumque albis ossa medullis
semianimesque artus auidam condebat in aluum.
me tremor inuasit: stabam sine sanguine maestus,
mandentemque uidens eiectantemque cruentas
ore dapes et frustra mero glomerata uomentem:
taliam fingebam misero mihi fata parari.
perque dies multos latitans omnemque tremescens
ad strepitum mortemque timens cupidusque moriri,
glande famem pellens et mixta frondibus herba,
solus inops expes, leto poenaeque relictus,
hanc procul adspexi longo post tempore nauem
orauique fugam gestu ad litusque cucurri.

This and more the monster cried aloud. Lurid terror gripped me, looking on his visage dripping yet with gore, his hands of cruelty, the one socket

now void of eye, his massy limbs, and his beard stiff with clotted human blood. Death itself was staring me in the face, yet was itself the lesser of evils. I feared next being seized, next my insides being fed into his; bored into my mind's eye the image of that time when I had seen the bodies of two of my companions dashed against the rocks three or four times, while he stood there exulting, maned like a lion, feeding his avid maw on their organs and flesh and bright-marrowed bone and still quivering limbs. Trembling seized me: I stood, sickened to bloodlessness, seeing him spew the gory banquet back out his mouth and vomit, belching forth bits of them clotted with their own blood-wine: in my misery, I could see that just such a fate was being settled for me. Many a day I hid out, shuddering at the least sound, and I both feared death and was eager to die; I eased hunger with acorns and grasses mixed with greens; I was alone, destitute, hopeless, left for death and suffering; long time since, I saw afar the ship and I prayed by sign for my deliverance and ran out on to the shore. (*M.* 14.198-219)³⁰

Gower emplaced quotations from this Ovidian version of the tale strategically, at the beginning, middle, and end of his exile-section, making also a transition to his poem's next section, of the narrator's deliverance and tempestuous sea-voyage homewards, towards *salus*. Gower's exile-section begins, '**Hec ita cum vidi, me luridus occupat horror, / Et quasi mortifera stat michi vita mea**' (When I saw this, grim horror seized my mind: / My life was laid before me, full of death, 1359-60), with quotation from *Metamorphoses* 14.198; then follow directly three couplets quoting the Ovidian hexameters *Metamorphoses* 14.206 and 14.199-200 with interposed pentameters of Gower's invention:

Ter quater affligi sociorum corpora terre [M. 14.206
Vidi, datque sua mors michi signa mori.

³⁰ This *Metamorphoses* passage would have recalled the post-relegation verse in other substantive ways too, for the sort of attentive student-reader that Gower would appear to have been, esp. the *mortis imago* recalling phrase at *Met.* 14.202 '*mors erat ante oculos*' and the *mortis amor* recalling phrase at *Met.* 14.215 '*cupidusque moriri*.'

Aspiciens vultus aliorum cede madentes, [M. 14.199
 De propria timui morte remorsus ego;
Crudelesque manus, orbem sine lumine iuris [M. 14.200
 Precipiens dixi, 'Iam cadit ordo viri.'

Twelve times I saw my fellows' bodies fall
 To earth: their death showed me the signs of death.
 Beholding others' faces, slaughter-drenched,
 I felt a sting and feared for my own death;
 Foreseeing cruel hands, a world that lacked
 Law's light, I said, 'Man's order now declines.' (1365-70)

In the centre of the section comes a similarly constructed passage of Gowerian distichs reworking Ovidian hexameters of the same episode, concerning Achaemenides' fraught survival, in Ovid's order. The passage may appear more immediately to recall descriptions of protagonists' transient rustications in the vernacular romance more nearly contemporary with Gower again;³¹ in fact, the verbal particulars are quoted from Ovid:

Perque dies aliquot latitans, omnemque tremescens [M. 14.214
Ad strepitum, fugi visa pericla cauens. [M. 14.215
Glande famem pellens mixta quoque frondibus herba [M. 14.216
 Corpus ego texi, vix manus vna mouet.

I spent days skulking, shying at each sound,
 Avoiding all the perils that I saw.
 With acorns for my food, I clothed myself
 In grass and leaves; I scarcely stirred a hand. (1445-48)

Summing up, to conclude the exile-section, Gower's narrator – characterising his circumstances as not altogether hopeless, since 'redolet viuere **mortis amor**' (yet love of death still smells of life, 1584), the key phrase from the *Tristia*, in the same *sedes* (1.5.6) – can yet use the Ovidian Achaemenides's phrasing (M. 14.217) of himself, so closely modeled is the one exile on the

31 E.g., to 1447 'Glande famem pellens mixta quoque frondibus herba' (= M. 14.216), cf. 'In winter may he nothing finde / Bot rote, grases, & the rinde,' Bliss 1966: 259-60.

other: '**Solus, inops, expes, vite peneque relictus**' (1585).³² The exile-section's very concluding lines weave together this summary reference to the exemplary plight of Achaemenides with recollection of Ovid's own exilic sufferings – greater than tongue can tell – quoted and paraphrased from the *Tristitia*-item (1.5) that Gower had used prominently already in the *Visio*-prologue:

scire meos casus siquis desiderat omnes,
 plus, quam quod fieri res sinit, ille petit.
 tot mala sum passus, quot in aethere sidera lucent
 paruaque quot siccus corpora pulvis habet;
 multaque credibili tulimus maiora ratamque,
 quamuis acciderint, non habitura fidem.

Whoso would wish to know my misfortunes complete asks more than the state of affairs will licence. As many wrongs have I suffered as there are stars that shine above and as there are dust-motes underfoot. More have I borne than can be believed, and greater, such as could scarce find any credence, though in fact they have befallen me. (*T.* 1.5.45-50)

Gower quotes only one line complete; what else there is here is close paraphrase, nonetheless:

Est michi vita mori, mors viuere, mors michi vita
 Dulcior est, redolet viuere **mortis amor**. [*T.* 1.5.6
Solus, inops, expes, vite peneque relictus, [*M.* 14.217
 Attendi si que sors mea certa foret.
 Talia mira nimis longum narrando per annum,
 Que modo vix recolo, tunc paciebar ego.
Scire meos casus siquis desiderat omnes, [*T.* 1.5.45
 Quos loquar hos finem non breue tempus habet.

32 *Pene* is the homophonic sublimite of both CL *poenae* and *paene* in Gower's Latin, and so the second half of Gower's line may be a quotation: it is close in sense and may have been a current reading in the medieval tradition.

Sic tamen in variis mea lassa doloribus ipse
Tempora continuans asperiora tuli.

My life is death, death life, and death more sweet
Than life, yet love of death still smells of life.
Alone, poor, hopeless, nearly lost to life,
I watched to see if any chance was sure.
Such shocks – I scarcely can recall them now –
I then endured for O too long a year.
If anyone should wish to know my fates,
Short time is not enough to tell them all.
So in my varied griefs I bore those times
Of weariness and bitterness so long. (1583-92)

The sequential lines of the *Metamorphoses* Achaemenides – ‘hanc procul adspexi longo post tempore nauem / orauique fugam gestu ad litusque cucurri’ (*M.* 218-19) – packed together into the single Gowerian hexameter, ‘**Haud procul aspexi nauem, properansque cucurri**’ (Close by I saw a ship; I ran in haste, 1599), make a beginning for the next (non-exilic) section of Gower’s poem, when his narrator meets with the local-contemporary version of the Aeneidean vessel that delivers the likewise lonely, poor, and hopeless Ovidian Achaemenides from his durance.

Nor is this the only part of the *Metamorphoses* that Gower draws on allusively within his exile-section of the *Visio Anglie*: the one remaining quotation in it from Ovid’s Achaemenides occurs in a context that raises the issue of a differing facet of Gower’s Ovidianism; for throughout the section he has been quoting allusively too other cognate parts of the *Metamorphoses*, amplifying features of the Ovidian Achaemenides tale that lends its structure to Gower’s narrator’s exile. Nearing that exile’s end come four couplets incorporating hexameters quoted, only the one from the Achaemenides passage (14.210), the rest from disparate though thematically coherent parts of the *Metamorphoses*, in the foreseen alternation with pentameters of Gower’s invention:

Sic tenuant vigiles corpus miserabile cure, [*M.* 3.396
Quas vigili mente sompnia ferre dabant.
Me timor inuasit; stabam sine lumine mestus, [*M.* 14.210

Et color in vultu linquit habere genas.

Attonitus tanto miserarum turbine rerum, [M. 7.614

Vt lapis a mente sepe remotus eram.

Mens tamen vt rediit, pariter rediere dolores, [M. 9.583

Mortem dum menti vita negare nequit.

My sorry frame was thinned by wakeful cares,

Which dreams delivered in my wakeful mind.

Fear seized me and I stood, unseeing, sad,

And facial colour ceased to fill my cheeks.

Astounded by such storms of misery,

I froze, removed from mind, just like a stone.

But when my mind returned, grief came back too,

Since life cannot deny a death to mind. (1569-76)

Gower's 1575 is quoted from the *Metamorphoses* Byblis episode (M. 9.450-665), where her brother's rejection of her incestuous proposals causes Byblis to faint dead away: 'palles audita, Bybli, repulsa, / et pavet obsessum glaciali frigore corpus' (Your face drains of colour, Byblis, on hearing your repulse, and ice seizes your stunned body, gone all cold for fear, 9.581-82). Instead of being wisened, however, 'mens tamen ut rediit, pariter rediere furores' (yet soon as returned to self, at once too returned the madness, 9.583) – as opposed to the 'dolores' of the Gower-narrator – and her *furores* drive her to follow her fleeing brother into exile, where she will die.

Gower's 1569 quotes from the episode of the death of Echo (M. 3.393-401), whose wasting away leaves her barely more than a voice: 'vox tantum atque ossa supersunt' (voice and bones alone remain, 3.398), like other truth-telling figures with whom narrator-Gower would align himself. Already in the exile-section, he has referred to Aeneas's underworld wanderings in company of the Cumaean Sybil – 'Inde ferens lassos, aduerso tramite passus' (I dragged my weary steps in crosswise path, 1387) is *Metamorphoses* 14.120 – though Gower's reference predictably is not to Vergil's Sybil but to Ovid's, whose metamorphosis leaves her likewise but a voice. In Ovid, by Apollo's gift of immortality without youth, the Sybil wastes away near to incorporeality, the sound only of her prophecies remaining: 'vocem mihi fata relinquunt' (but a voice the fates do leave me), she laments; 'voce tamen noscar' (by voice alone do I manifest, M. 14.153).

Finally, Gower's 1573 is Ovid's line introducing the prayer to Jupiter of the king Aeacus, by consequence of which Aeacus and his afflicted city Aegina are relieved from plague (*M.* 7.614-15): '**Attonitus tanto miserarum turbine rerum**, / "Iuppiter o!" dixi, "si te non falsa loquuntur"' (Thunder-struck by this vortex of miseries so great, 'O Jupiter,' I began, 'if they say of you no falsehood') et cetera. Gower had earlier used matter from the Ovidian description of Aegina's plague for characterising the effect of revolutionary invasion on the city of London: '**Ante sacras vidi proiecta cadauera postes**, / Nec locus est in quo desinit esse nephas' (I saw the corpses thrown outside the church: / There was no place where wrong did not hold sway, 1161-62), for example, incorporates *Metamorphoses* 7.602. Gower uses too the sequential Ovidian line in the same descriptive passage, '**ante sacros vidi proiecta cadavera postes**, / ante ipsas, quo mors foret invidiosior, aras' (corpses have I seen tossed down at sacred gate, at the very altar itself, wherefore were those deaths the more hateful, *M.* 7.602-3) for, as Gower rephrases, '**Mors** etenim sacris **fuit** (heu!) **furiosior aris**' (Death was too fierce, alas, for sacred sites, 1143).³³

7. NARRATOR-GOWER'S PRAYER AND SOPHIA'S ANSWER

Depiction of an *alienus* – emphatically not a Christian-Augustinian *peregrinus*, but a pre-Christian ancient type of exile³⁴ – limned and coloured in by means of quotations from Ovid's post-relegation verse and *Heroides*; plotted on the model of the Achaemenides episode of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid – not its Vergilian analogue – as the strategically placed quotations from it (not strictly necessary for the plot-modelling) make the more pal-

33 There is only the one further reference to the Achaemenides matter elsewhere in Gower's oeuvre (to my knowledge), also in the *Visio Anglie*: 1781 'talía fingebam misero mihi fata parari' is *M.* 14.213. The remainder of Gower's *Metamorphoses* quotations in the exile-section, not otherwise discussed in this paper though all are susceptible of interpretation as proper allusions rather than as simple or inept phrasal recollections, are listed in the Appendices below.

34 Galloway 1993: 342-43: Gower's use of Ovid in this way 'is unusual, if not unique.'

pable; amplifying features of depiction and plot by references to other Ovidian writings, chiefly though not exclusive selected from the *Metamorphoses*; one more such Ovidian usage imports its significance to Gower's exile-section, also confirming Gower's preference for Ovid, even less obvious Ovid. Even when faced with the opportunity to draw instead from better known materials, conceivably more readily illuminating for his readership, Gower preferred Ovid, for the exile-section, as generally for the *Visio Anglie* containing it.

Despite the ancient verbal preferences, Gower being Gower, always also prosecuting a more and less overt Christian-dogmatic agenda, what brings the ship in that will deliver narrator-Gower from his exilic miseries is Jobish prayer: 'Ecce, Deus, tu scis quia non tua fata recuso, / Dum feris, en pacior que meruisse reor' (Then, God, you know I don't reject your doom; / You strike, and I'll accept what I've deserved, 1541-42). Despite the accessible Old Testament analogue, the Gower-narrator's prayer is verbally Ovidian again, deriving from Ovid's imprecations for relief from the 'tristia fata' of his relegation (*T.* 3.3.38). The prayer combines quotation from *Tristia* 5.4 – where, addressing his wife, Ovid describes the conditions of his 'maerens tempus' again (31) – with quotation from *Tristia* 3.3 – where, again addressing his wife, 'dubius vitae' (25), the poet sends her his epitaph (73-76), though 'mortuus exul' (the exile is a dead man, 66) already in any case: 'cum patriam amisi, tunc me periisse putato:/ et prior et gravior mors fuit illa mihi' (Think you that I had died then already when my homeland I did lose: the earlier and the graver was that death to me, 53-54):

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| O tibi quem presens spectabile non sinit ortus | |
| Cernere, quam melior sors tua sorte mea est! | [<i>T.</i> 5.4.4 |
| Heu! Mea consueto quia mors nec erit michi lecto, | [<i>T.</i> 3.3.39 |
| Depositum nec me qui fleat vllus erit. | [<i>T.</i> 3.3.40 |
| Spiritus ipse meus si nunc exhibit in auras, | |
| Non positos artus vnget amica manus. | [cf. <i>T.</i> 3.3.41 |
| Si tamen impleuit mea sors quos debuit annos | [<i>T.</i> 3.3.29 |
| Et michi viuendi tam cito finis adest, | [<i>T.</i> 3.3.30 |
| Ecce, deus, tu scis quia non tua fata recuso, | |
| Dum feris, en pacior que meruisse reor.' | |

O you, whose birth won't let you see what's here

To see, your lot is better far than mine!
 Alas, my death won't come in wonted bed;
 No one will mourn my body where it lies.
 If now my breath should vanish in the wind,
 No friendly hand will smear my limbs with oil.
 But if my fate has filled the years it owed
 And now the end of living is at hand,
 Then, God, you know I don't reject your doom;
 You strike, and I'll accept what I've deserved. (1533-42)³⁵

Christian-poetic justice comes, for God always answers such pleas in Gower's verse-universe. Later, the delivering ship hoves to (1599); intermediately, narrator-Gower has consolation from a heavenly voice, identified as the voice of the divine *Sophia* (answering the phrase 'Ecce, Deus' (1541) with anaphora, in the same line-initial position): 'Ecce Sophia meis compassa doloribus inquit' (Then Wisdom had compassion in my pains / And spoke, 1545). But the divine message is Ovidius Naso.

The figure whom Gower introduces at this point, to address his narrator on his God's behalf, might be felt to recall the figure in the Old Testament *Proverbia* (esp. Prov. 8), where the Vulgate had used *Sapientia* to render the well known Greek term *Sophia*: 'Numquid non Sapientia clamitat?' (Calls not Sapience out?, 8.1): "'O viri, ad vos clamito'" ('To you I call, ye men', 8.4); she cries out 'melior est enim sapientia cunctis pretiosissimis et omne desiderabile ei non potest comparari' (For wisdom is better than any most costly object, and all the things that may be desired are not to be compared to it, 8.11); then Christ-God like, 'Beati qui custodiunt vias meas' (Blessed are they who keep my ways, 3.32) and 'Beatus homo qui audit me, qui vigilat ad fores meas cotidie, et observat ad postes ostii mei; qui me invenerit inveniet vitam et hauriet salutem a domino' (Blessed is the man that hears me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors. For whoso

35 The line Gower quotes at 1534 occurs both as *Tristia* 5.4.4 and also as *Fasti* 4.520 'heu, melior quanto sors tua sorte mea est,' in the Cerealia section of the *Fasti* that Gower uses elsewhere in the *Visio Anglie* (see above, pp. 301-3, on 33-60); and the substantively similar line *T.* 5.12.6 is quoted later in the *Visio*, 1780 'Sorte nec vlla mea tristior esse potest.' Also, 1537 'Spiritus ipse meus si nunc exibat in auras' may recall *M.* 8.524 'inque leues abiit paulatim spiritus auras,' though it does not quote.

finds me finds life, and shall obtain favour of the lord, 8.34-35).³⁶ 'Factum est verbum Dei super Iohannem Zacchariae filium in deserto' (The word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness), has the New Testament, for accounting a like descent of divine *logos*, itself quoting an Old Testament passage of which Gower certainly was aware: 'sicut scriptum est in libro sermonum Esaiae prophetae vox clamantis in deserto parate viam Domini rectas facite semitas eius' (As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight, Lk 3.2 and 4).³⁷ But in Gower comes no verbal debt to Christian scripture.

Similarly, by virtue of calling her, not *Sapientia*, but *Sophia*, the figure whom Gower introduces at this point must be felt to recall the etymologically related impersonation *Philosophia* in Boethius, who, once the Boethian narrator can recognise her (the recognition described in an Ovid-recalling phrase, 'tristitiae nebulis dissolutis' (clouds of sorrows are broken up (*Phil. cons.* 1.p3.1)), does provide a form of *consolatio* cognate with that to reach Gower just here in the *Visio*, whose wise womanly personification too 'meis compassa doloribus' (had compassion in my pains, 1545). But again, there comes no evidence of a verbal debt to Boethius.

Instead, Gower's *Sophia* uses the words of Carmentis, the muse ('quae nomen habes a carmine ductum' (whose name derives from *carmen* (song)), Evander's mother, on the occasion of their exile. The banishment would bring the mother-son pair ship-borne through storm to safe harbour in Italy, where, upon landing, Carmentis predicts the Roman greatness to come ('novos caelo terra datura deos' (a land to lend the heavens new gods)), and the prophet-muse's son Evander is said to be 'felix' (blessed), inasmuch as 'exilium cui locus ille fuit' (he had the place to exile).³⁸ The episode is another near analogue for the Gower-narrator's case, in other words, and there is

36 It happens that one of the only three Bible quotations in the *Visio* (the others are *Biblia vulgata* 1 Sam. 17.40 in *Visio* 869 and Ps. 90.6 in *Visio* 737), and the only one of the three to occur in the exile-section is from the same Old Testament *liber*: 'Iram multociens frangit responsio mollis' (1509) from 'Responsio mollis frangit iram; sermo durus suscitatur furem' (Prov. 15.1).

37 Other comment on the same passage, Galloway 1993: 339-40; also, Kobayashi 2009: 351-53.

38 The quotations are *Fasti* 1.467, 1.510 and 1.540.

again a Vergilian version of the material (esp. *Aen.* 8.306-69). Gower does not use it, however, again, unless indirectly; for again here Gower prefers to take his divine figure's words from the lesser known passage, deriving from the Vergilian one, by Ovid, mother addressing son:

cui genetrix flenti 'fortuna viriliter' inquit
 '(siste, precor, lacrimas) ista ferenda tibi est.
 sic erat in fatis, nec te tua culpa fugavit,
 sed deus: offenso pulsus es urbe deo.
 non meriti poenam pateris, sed numinis iram:
 est aliquid magnis crimen abesse malis.
 conscia mens ut cuique sua est, ita concipit intra
 pectora pro facto spemque metumque suo.
 nec tamen ut primus maere mala talia passus:
 obruit ingentes ista procella viros.
 passus idem est Tyriis qui quondam pulsus ab oris
 Cadmus in Aonia constitit exul humo;
 passus idem Tydeus et idem Pagasaeus Iason,
 et quos praeterea longa referre mora est.
 omne solum forti patria est, ut piscibus aequor,
 ut volucris vacuo quicquid in orbe patet.
 nec fera tempestas toto tamen horret in anno:
 et tibi, crede mihi, tempora veris erunt.'

'Bear manfully up,' said the mother to her weeping child, '— no tears, I pray — this fortune that you must carry. So it was with the fates, nor is it some fault of yours that sends you into exile, but the will of a god: you are driven from the city by a god who has been done wrong. No penalty of merit is it that you suffer, but the deity's wrath; and it matters, amongst so many wrongs, that there is no crime. As each person's conscience is disposed within, just so, in undertaking this or that, the person feels hope or fear at heart. Moreover, you suffer so much wrong by no means the first so to do: a tempest like to yours has sunk mighty heroes. Alike did suffer Cadmus, who once was driven from Tyrian shore and stayed on as an exile in Aonia; alike did suffer Tydeus and alike Pagasaeon Jason, with others of whom to tell it were too long. For the brave soul, any land is a homeland, as for fish is the sea, as for the bird is anywhere in

the wide air that lies open. Nor do the storms blow wildly all the year round; for you too – believe you me – a spring will come.’ (*F.* 1.479-95)³⁹

The allusions to the larger Evander-matter that Gower’s verbal adaptations bring in, implicitly – without notice in Gower’s poem – serve to predict the course of the sea-journey that narrator-Gower, delivered from his own exile, will undertake in the next section of the *Visio*.

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Ecce Sophia meis <i>compassa doloribus</i> inquit, | [cf. 487; 479] |
| ‘Siste, precor, lacrimas <i>et pacienter</i> age. | [480] |
| Sic tibi fata <i>volunt non crimina</i> ; crede set illud | [481] |
| Quo deus <i>offensus</i> te reparando vocat. | [482] |
| Non merito penam pateris, set <i>numinis iram</i> . | [483] |
| <i>Ne timeas, finem nam dolor omnis habet.</i> ’ | [cf. 494] |
| <i>Talibus exemplis aliis quoque rebus</i> vt essem | [cf. 488, 490] |
| <i>Absque metu paciens</i> sepe Sophia monet; | [cf. 485-486] |
| Conscia mensque michi fuerat, culpe licet expers, | [485] |
| Spes tamen ambigue nulla salutis adest. | |
| Non fuerant artes tanti que <i>numinis iram</i> | [= 1449 = 483] |
| A me tollentes <i>tempora leta</i> ferunt. | [495] |
| Tanta mee lasse fuerat discordia mentis, | |
| Quod potui sensus vix retinere meos. | |

Then Wisdom had compassion in my pains
And said, ‘Stop weeping; suffer patiently.
The cause is not your crimes but fate; believe
That God, offended, calls you back to heal.
Your pain is not deserved: you feel God’s wrath.

39 This passage of the *Fasti* too anticipates or recalls features of the post-relegation verse: e.g., the mythological comparanda with the ‘passus idem’ anaphora in 489 and 491 are alike the passages *T.* 1.5.57-84, *P.* 1.3.61-84, *P.* 1.4.9-46, *P.* 4.10.9-28; 483 ‘non meriti poenam pateris, sed numinis iram’ – Gower repeats this phrase *numinis ira* twice here, in 1449 and 1455 – is a commonplace of the post-relegation verse, e. g., *T.* 1.5.45 ‘deminui siqua numinis ira potest,’ 3.6.23 ‘numinis ut laesi fiat mansuetior ira,’ 4.8.50 ‘plus tamen exitii numinis ira dedit,’ or 5.4.17 ‘Nec fore perpetuam sperat sibi numinis iram’ (cf. above n. 31, on such Ovidian phrasing).

Don't be afraid, for every pain has end.'
 By these and other means did Wisdom warn
 Me to be free of fear and to endure;
 My mind knew well: though it was free of guilt,
 There was no hope of certain safety here.
 There were no skills so great that would remove
 The wrath of God and bring back happy times.
 Such was the discord of my weary mind
 That I could scarcely hold my senses back. (1545-58)

8. GOWER'S OVIDIANISM IN THE EXILE-SECTION

'Non michi possibile dicere cuncta' (*prol.* 46), puts Gower of his own undertaking in the *Visio Anglie*. The phrase is another Ovidian quotation, from the *Tristia* (1.5.56). No more seems it necessary here to have put all that might be, about all of the eighty-three quotations even in this circumscribed 234-line sample of Gower's work – which is unusually crowded with such gestures, be it recalled – to licence these two points in conclusion.

First, concerning Gower's relation with the 'Medieval Ovid.'⁴⁰ As Kathryn McKinley has established, the culmination of this tradition's elaboration came to England, atypically, not in the twelfth century as it did elsewhere in Latinate Western Europe, but late in the fourteenth century, during the 'Age of Chaucer' that, too, was Gower's literary-historical moment.⁴¹ The apparatus of glossed and commented texts, exegetical and biographical paratexts, and paraphrastic-allegorical vernacular translations, somewhat unevenly disposed around the Ovidian corpus, was prodigious nonetheless; and there can be no doubt but that Gower had access to such material, that, broadly, it would have influenced Gower's readings of Ovid and understanding, and that, narrowly, Gower used it directly, especially the

⁴⁰ See esp. Conrad Mainzer 1972. 'John Gower's Use of the "Mediaeval Ovid" in the *Confessio Amantis*' *Medium Aevum* 41, 215-29; also, Schmitz 1989: 95-III.

⁴¹ Kathryn L. McKinley 1998. 'Manuscripts of Ovid in England 1100 to 1500' *English Manuscript Studies* 7, 41-85: 'the "Aetas Ovidiana" which characterises the continent in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries seems to recur in England in the fourteenth and perhaps even the fifteenth' (47).

Ovide moralisé, at particular points in his own work. It might be contended that Gower's resort to the vernacular departments of the 'Medieval Ovid' was more extensive when he was himself writing in one or the other of his own vernaculars; or that Gower's resort to the 'medieval Ovid' was less frequent, less reliant or dependent, than that of Chaucer his contemporary; and so forth. No matter: the evidence here adduced is to indicate that, whatever Gower may or may not have also known of the 'Medieval Ovid', and however he may have been influenced by it, Gower knew Ovid directly, thoroughly and well. The direct, particular knowledge that he disposed, as a matter of practice, extended over a considerable range of the *corpus Ovidianum*.⁴²

Second, then, as concerns this quality of Gower's Ovidian usage. It may be that Gower nodded, so to speak (as likewise the engaged Gower-reader may over-generously over-interpret), from time to time. In this one passage of this one part of the one great long Latin composition, Gower's Ovidian invocations are too frequent all to be alike apt, equally pointed.⁴³ However, the exile-section was elected for analysis because it is not representative of Gower's whole work, standing rather for a particular moment in his development. Later, he would work more freely with Ovidian matter, as with various other sources, including vernacular romance, the *Ovide moralisé*, Langland even and Chaucer; earlier, he had done more slavish tyronian imitations of other Latin poets too, school-boy like, where he inhabited his other models so thoroughly as to produce *cento*-like passages, probably free-standing imitative performances too, no longer in direct evidence.⁴⁴ Nor did Gower's practiced intimacy extend to other ancient poets.

Nonetheless, Gower studied Ovid closely indeed, including the more obscure provinces of the extensive corpus of Ovid's own original verse, it can

42 Harbert 1988: 86: 'The familiarity with Ovid – the whole of Ovid – that the *Vox clamantis* reveals is of an order that must be rare in any age: Gower 'drew on every part of Ovid's work.'

43 Reference is to the comments of Macaulay 1899-1902: 4.xxii-xxxiii, characterising Gower's Ovidian usage as 'schoolboy plagiarism.'

44 Reference is to the widely influential paper of Robert F. Yeager, 'Did Gower Write *Cento*?' in Yeager 1989: 113-32, with analysis of *Visio Anglie* 1501-20 (of the exile-section) at 116-19; two non-Ovidian instances are analysed in David R. Carlson 2003. 'Gower's Early Latin Poetry: Text-Genetic Hypotheses of an *Epistola ad regem* (c. 1377-80), from the Evidence of John Bale' *Mediaeval Studies* 65, 307-14.

be concluded, by virtue of the kind of use to which Gower put Ovid, in the form of the numerous illuminating, widely-drawn allusion-making quotations that he builds crowding into even just the one piece of writing. At this point, Gower was enough the master of Ovid's *ipsissima verba* as to make the master speak for him.

APPENDICES: QUOTATIONS IN *VISIO ANGLIE* 1359-1599

I. Lines containing quotations

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1359 = <i>Met.</i> 14.198 | 1433 = <i>Met.</i> 3.709 |
| 1363 = <i>Ars.</i> 3.723 | 1435 = <i>Met.</i> 3.28 |
| 1364 = <i>Ars.</i> 3.724 | 1442 = <i>Her.</i> 5.14 |
| 1365 = <i>Met.</i> 14.206 | 1445 = <i>Met.</i> 14.214 |
| 1367 = <i>Met.</i> 14.199 | 1446 = <i>Met.</i> 14.215 |
| 1369 = <i>Met.</i> 14.200 | 1447 = <i>Met.</i> 14.216 |
| 1379 = <i>Tr.</i> 5.4.33 | 1453 = <i>Met.</i> 4.263 |
| 1380 = <i>Tr.</i> 5.4.34 | 1459 = <i>Rem.</i> 581 |
| 1385 = <i>Her.</i> 20.91 | 1465 = <i>Met.</i> 2.656 |
| 1386 = <i>Her.</i> 20.92 | 1466 = <i>Met.</i> 2.655 |
| 1387 = <i>Met.</i> 14.120 | 1467 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.27 |
| 1389 = <i>Aurora</i> Iud. 199 | 1468 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.28 |
| 1390 = <i>Aurora</i> Iud. 200 | 1469 = <i>Met.</i> 13.539 |
| 1395 = <i>Met.</i> 4.723 | 1473 = <i>Met.</i> 8.469 |
| 1397 = <i>Tr.</i> 1.3.53 | 1475 = <i>Met.</i> 4.135 |
| 1398 = <i>Tr.</i> 1.3.54 | 1482 = <i>Tr.</i> 3.8.28 |
| 1401 = <i>Fasti</i> 5.315 | 1485 = <i>Her.</i> 14.37 |
| 1402 = <i>Fasti</i> 5.316 | 1488 = <i>Tr.</i> 4.6.42 |
| 1403 = <i>Aen.</i> 6.727 | 1496 = <i>Her.</i> 5.46 |
| 1403 = <i>Met.</i> 15.27 | 1497 = <i>Fasti</i> 5.237 |
| 1413 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.3.57 | 1501 = <i>Pont.</i> 4.6.23 |
| 1414 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.3.58 | 1502 = <i>Pont.</i> 4.6.24 |
| 1420 = <i>Her.</i> 3.24 | 1503 = <i>Tr.</i> 3.1.65 |
| 1424 = <i>Ars.</i> 2.88 | 1504 = <i>Tr.</i> 3.1.66 |
| 1425 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.43 | 1506 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.148 |
| 1426 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.44 | 1507 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.147 |
| 1427 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.55 | 1509 = <i>Prov</i> 15.1 |
| 1428 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.56 | 1512 = <i>Her.</i> 11.82 |
| 1429 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.47 | 1514 = <i>Her.</i> 13.86 |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1430 = <i>Pont.</i> 1.2.48 | 1553 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.485 |
| 1518 = <i>Her.</i> 3.44 | 1564 = <i>Her.</i> 14.52 |
| 1519 = <i>Pont.</i> 3.4.75 | 1565 = <i>Her.</i> 10.113 |
| 1521 = <i>Tr.</i> 1.11.23 | 1566 = <i>Her.</i> 10.114 |
| 1522 = <i>Tr.</i> 1.11.24 | 1568 = <i>Her.</i> 3.24 |
| 1534 = <i>Fasti</i> 4.520 = <i>Tr.</i> 5.4.4 | 1569 = <i>Met.</i> 3.396 |
| 1535 = <i>Tr.</i> 3.3.39 | 1571 = <i>Met.</i> 14.210 |
| 1536 = <i>Tr.</i> 3.3.40 | 1573 = <i>Met.</i> 7.614 |
| 1539 = <i>Tr.</i> 3.3.29 | 1575 = <i>Met.</i> 9.583 |
| 1540 = <i>Tr.</i> 3.3.30 | 1581 = <i>Aurora</i> Gen. 1171 |
| 1545 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.479 | 1582 = <i>Aurora</i> Gen. 1172 |
| 1546 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.480 | 1584 = <i>Tr.</i> 1.5.6 |
| 1547 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.481 | 1585 = <i>Met.</i> 14.217 |
| 1548 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.482 | 1589 = <i>Trist.</i> 1.5.45 |
| 1549 = <i>Fasti</i> 1.483 | 1599 = <i>Met.</i> 14.218 |
| 1517 = <i>Her.</i> 3.43 | |

II. Index of Ovidian quotations

| | | |
|---------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| <i>Ars amatoria</i> | 5.46 = 1496 | 1.482 = 1548 |
| 2.88 = 1424 | 10.113 = 1565 | 1.483 = 1549 |
| 3.723 = 1363 | 10.114 = 1566 | 1.485 = 1553 |
| 3.724 = 1364 | 11.82 = 1512 | 4.520 = 1534 |
| | 13.86 = 1514 | 5.237 = 1497 |
| <i>Remedia</i> | 14.52 = 1564 | 5.315 = 1401 |
| <i>Amoris</i> | 20.91 = 1385 | 5.316 = 1402 |
| 581 = 1459 | 20.92 = 1386 | |
| | | <i>Metamorphoses</i> |
| <i>Heroides</i> | <i>Fasti</i> | 2.655 = 1466 |
| 3.24 = 1420 | 1.147 = 1507 | 2.656 = 1465 |
| 3.24 = 1568 | 1.148 = 1506 | 3.28 = 1435 |
| 3.43 = 1517 | 1.479 = 1545 | 3.396 = 1569 |
| 3.44 = 1518 | 1.480 = 1546 | 3.709 = 1433 |
| 5.14 = 1442 | 1.481 = 1547 | 4.135 = 1475 |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| 4.263 = 1453 | <i>Tristia</i> | <i>Epistulae ex Ponto</i> |
| 4.723 = 1395 | 1.3.53 = 1397 | 1.2.27 = 1467 |
| 7.614 = 1573 | 1.3.54 = 1398 | 1.2.28 = 1468 |
| 8.469 = 1473 | 1.5.6 = 1584 | 1.2.43 = 1425 |
| 9.583 = 1575 | 1.5.45 = 1589 | 1.2.44 = 1426 |
| 13.539 = 1469 | 1.11.23 = 1521 | 1.2.47 = 1429 |
| 14.120 = 1387 | 1.11.24 = 1522 | 1.2.48 = 1430 |
| 14.198 = 1359 | 3.1.65 = 1503 | 1.2.55 = 1427 |
| 14.199 = 1367 | 3.1.66 = 1504 | 1.2.56 = 1428 |
| 14.200 = 1369 | 3.3.29 = 1539 | 1.3.57 = 1413 |
| 14.206 = 1365 | 3.3.30 = 1540 | 1.3.58 = 1414 |
| 14.210 = 1571 | 3.3.39 = 1535 | 3.4.75 = 1519 |
| 14.214 = 1445 | 3.3.40 = 1536 | 4.6.23 = 1501 |
| 14.215 = 1446 | 3.8.28 = 1482 | 4.6.24 = 1502 |
| 14.216 = 1447 | 4.6.42 = 1488 | |
| 14.217 = 1585 | 5.4.4 = 1534 | |
| 14.218 = 1599 | 5.4.33 = 1379 | |
| 15.27 = 1403 | 5.4.34 = 1380 | |

III. Non-Ovidian quotations

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Biblia Vulgata</i> | Peter Riga | Vergil |
| Prov. 15.1 = 1509 | <i>Aurora</i> | <i>Aen.</i> |
| | Gen. 1171-72 = 1581-82 | 6.727 = 1403 |
| | Iud. 199-200 = 1389-90 | |

EIN POETISCHER LIEFERSCHEIN ZU EINEM TIERTRANSPORT DES SPÄTEN 14. JAHRHUNDERTS: GRYFUS VON PADUA UND SEIN GEDICHT ÜBER MASTHÄHNE

Von Thomas Haye

Summary: The Ferrarese manuscript II. 175 (Bibl. Com. Ariost.) contains an unknown Latin poem of the late fourteenth century written by a Paduan physician called Gryfus. In the text, some capons are describing their long journey from Padua to a Lombard city where they are to be sold to the author's friend. The paper presents a critical edition of the poem, an introduction, and philological notes.

Die in der Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea zu Ferrara aufbewahrte Handschrift II. 175, ein aus dem Besitz des dortigen Karmeliterkonvents von S. Paolo stammender, aus sechs heterogenen Faszikeln bestehender Papiercodex des 15. Jahrhunderts, vereinigt Abschriften von Texten zumeist italienischer Dichter.¹ Verschiedene Hände haben hier einzelne Werke von Guarino, Bruni, Salutati, Heinrich von Settimello, Galfred von Vinsauf, Marra-sio, Panormita, Vegio, Boccaccio und anderen eingetragen. Von besonderem

1 Zur Handschrift siehe: Bonazza, Mirna (Hrsg.) Comune di Ferrara *manuScripti. I codici della Bibliotheca Comunale Ariostea*. Prefazione di Enrico Spinelli (Pugillaria 1) (Ferrara 2002) 200–9; Paul Oskar Kristeller *Iter Italicum. Vol. I: Italy* (London & Leiden 1977) 59.

Thomas Haye 'Ein poetischer Lieferschein zu einem Tiertransport des späten 14. Jahrhunderts: Gryfus von Padua und sein Gedicht über Masthähne' *C&M* 61 (2010) 337–48. © 2010 Museum Tusculanum Press · www.mtp.dk/classicaetmediaevalia

Interesse ist dabei der aus den Folia 11-38 gebildete zweite Faszikel des Codex, welcher auf fol. 36r-v ein Mariengedicht des Baptista Marchio Palavicinus, des späteren Bischofs von Reggio (1444-66), überliefert, das an Niccolò III. d'Este (1383/84-1441) gerichtet ist.² Unmittelbar vor diesem Text liest man auf fol. 35v-36r ein unbekanntes, offenbar unikal tradiertes lateinisches Gedicht,³ das die folgende, teils oberhalb, teils am Rand des Textes in rötlicher Tinte notierte Beischrift aufweist:

Gryphii Patavi versus, in quibus capones in agro Patavio orti et educati ad reverendum P. loquentes mittuntur, ut foedera pactaque inter eos facta serventur.

Die poetische Rede der hier genannten Masthähne richtet sich an den unbekannten Empfänger 'P.'. Das Gedicht setzt mit der Beschreibung eines *locus amoenus* ein: In der Nähe der Stadt Padua liegt ein von der Natur gesegneter Ort (vv. 1-8). Inmitten dieser schönen Landschaft steht ein bescheidenes Bauernhaus (vv. 9-10). Hier haben die späteren Kapaune in einem schlichten Hühnerstall das Licht der Welt erblickt: Die Mutter brütete die Eier aus, die Jungen schlüpften im warmen und trockenen Monat Juni (vv. 11-16). Zur Erntezeit verließen die Küken ihr Nest und liefen über den Hof (vv. 17-20). Sie ernährten sich von Würmern, welche sie mit ihren Schnäbeln pickten, sowie von ausgestreuten Körnern (vv. 21-22). Wenn die kalte Nacht hereinbrach, verwahrte sie die fürsorgliche Bäuerin in einem Weidenkorb (23-24). Doch es drohten weitere Gefahren: Ängstlich schützte das mütterliche Huhn seine Jungen vor Greifvögeln und Füchsen (vv. 25-28). Sobald die Tiere herangewachsen waren, wurden sie kastriert; man entfernte ihnen den Kamm, nahm ihnen das Augenlicht und sperrte sie in einen Käfig (vv. 29-34). Dort wurden sie von der jungen Tochter des Bauern einen Monat lang gemästet (vv. 35-40). In diesem Zustand kaufte sie der Paduaner Arzt Gryfus und erteilte den Auftrag, sie dem P. zu übersenden (vv. 41-42). Also schnürte der

2 Inc. *Virgo decus mundi caelo cui gratia aperto*.

3 Verzeichnet bei Ludwig Bertalot *Initia Humanistica Latina: Initienverzeichnis lateinischer Prosa und Poesie aus der Zeit des 14. bis 16. Jahrhunderts. Bd. 1: Poesie*. Im Auftrag des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom bearbeitet von Ursula Jaitner-Hahner. Mit einer Vorrede von Paul Oskar Kristeller (Tübingen 1985) Nr. 1533; nicht verzeichnet bei Hans Walther *Initia carminum ac versuum medii aevi posterioris latinorum* (Carmina medii aevi posterioris latina, I. 1). (Göttingen²1969)

Bauer die Kapaune zusammen und brachte sie in das Haus des P., welches sich in einer im Insubrerland gelegenen Stadt befindet (vv. 45-46).

Nachdem die Kapaune bislang in einer Rückblende von ihrer Herkunft und Aufzucht berichtet haben (vv. 1-46), beziehen sie sich in ihrer Rede nun auf die gegenwärtige Situation und ihr aktuelles Erscheinungsbild. Für ihr ungewöhnlich geringes Gewicht und ihre Magerkeit sei die lange und beschwerliche Reise verantwortlich (vv. 47-50): Der (personifiziert gedachte) Weg hat ihre Glieder 'verzehrt' (v. 48: *longum membra peredit iter*). Die Kapaune beteuern, dass sie die Ankunft keineswegs verzögert hätten: Sie hätten nicht etwa Angst vor dem Tod gehabt, sondern sich darauf gefreut, ihren Empfänger zu sehen, da dieser kein brutaler Schlächter sei und sie vielleicht noch eine Weile am Leben lasse. Doch seien sie natürlich auch zum Sterben bereit, wenn hierdurch Gryfus die versprochene Lieferung erhalte (vv. 51-60).

Der Gedanke des Versprechens (v. 59: *Si modo pollicitas Gryffus habebit opes*) leitet zum letzten Teil des Gedichts über: Die Kapaune haben ihren Auftrag erfüllt, indem sie ihre Heimat verlassen, eine weite Reise unternommen und nun das Haus des Empfängers P. erreicht haben (vv. 61-62). Dieser soll nun seinerseits den Vertrag erfüllen und die vereinbarte Summe zahlen, damit die lange Reise der Kapaune nicht vergeblich war (vv. 63-68). Mit dem eindringlichen Appell schließt das Gedicht.

Der Text präsentiert sich als eine poetische Rede, die einer Gruppe von Kapaunen in den Schnabel gelegt ist. In ihrer Vita und Verhaltensweise sind die Tiere andeutungsweise anthropomorph gezeichnet, der Text lebt von dem Instrument der Personifikation. Die Kapaune werden geboren und aufgezogen, um dem Empfänger als Speise zu dienen. Sie erscheinen als mutige und weitgereiste Helden, die zur Erfüllung ihrer Pflicht auch zu sterben bereit sind. Sie treten vor das Angesicht ihres neuen Herrn und erwarten demütig dessen Urteil: *morituri te salutant!* Die rhetorische Qualität des Textes zeigt sich auch in seiner Gliederung: Auf eine längere Narratio (vv. 1-58) folgt eine kürzere Petitio (vv. 59-68). In dieser deutlich reduzierten Form der oratorischen Struktur manifestiert sich somit die Verwandtschaft des Textes mit der Gattung des Briefes (wenngleich die Anrede und die Abschiedsformel fehlen). Der poetische Reiz des kleinen Gedichts besteht vor allem im bukolischen Ton der Narratio: Die Jugend dieser Kapaune ist als ländliches Idyll gemalt, das unausgesprochen mit der städtischen Szene kontrastiert, in welcher sich der Empfänger P. befindet. In sprachlicher Hinsicht zehrt der

Autor vor allem von den kanonischen Dichtern der römischen Antike (Vergil, Horaz, Properz, Tibull, Lucan, Statius, Claudian, Martial). Dass hierbei weitaus am häufigsten Ovid zitiert wird, dürfte nicht nur dem Versmaß, sondern auch dem elegischen Ton des Gedichts geschuldet sein.

Als Gelegenheitsgedicht übersteigt der Text den ausschließlich literarischen Rahmen und verweist auf seinen Sitz im realen Leben. Ein Paduaner Arzt namens Gryfus und ein im Insubrerland lebender Mann namens P. schließen einen Vertrag über die Lieferung von Kapaunen. Gryfus erwirbt deshalb auf einem nahen Bauernhof solche Vögel und lässt sie an die Adresse des P. liefern. Dem Bauern, welcher die Tiere zustellen soll, vertraut er ein Begleitgedicht an, das dieser ebenfalls dem P. zu übergeben hat. Im Gedicht wird die (trotz des geringen Gewichts der Kapaune) ordnungsgemäße Auslieferung des Vertragsgegenstandes konstatiert und in einem freundlichen, doch bestimmten Ton an die Zahlung der vereinbarten Geldsumme erinnert.⁴ Der Autor stellt heraus, dass die Zustellung fristgerecht (v. 65: *promisso in tempore*) erfolgt sei. Das Gedicht ist somit als poetischer Lieferschein und als versifizierte Rechnung zu einer vertraglich vereinbarten Lebensmittellieferung anzusehen. Dass so explizit auf die Geldzahlung hingewiesen wird, dürfte darauf zurückzuführen sein, dass die beiden Kontrahenten erstmals einen Vertrag über einen Tiertransport miteinander geschlossen und daher offenbar nur geringes geschäftliches Vertrauen zueinander haben (vgl. v. 67: *novo foedere*).

Poetische Beigaben zu übersandten Gegenständen und Geschenken haben innerhalb der lateinischen Poesie des Mittelalters eine lange Tradition. Aufgrund ihrer Anlassgebundenheit und ihres geringen Umfangs, der in der Regel nicht mehr als ein einzelnes, allzu anfälliges Blatt Pergament oder Papier erfordert, ist allerdings wohl nur ein geringer Teil der zahlreichen in Mittelalter und Renaissance produzierten Gelegenheitsgedichte dieser Couleur erhalten. So hat Venantius Fortunatus eine Reihe von Texten hinterlassen, die als Begleitgedichte zu kleinen Geschenken, zumeist Blumen oder Lebensmitteln, konzipiert sind oder in denen er für die Übersendung solcher Geschenke dankt (cc. 5.13; 8.6 u. 8; 11.13-20). Ähnliches findet man etwa auch bei dem hochmittelalterlichen Dichter Baudri von Bourgueil, der die Herausgabe eines Wachstäfelchens (c. 105) oder einer versprochenen *cap-*

4 Auf die Einhaltung eines Vertrages verweist auch die – möglicherweise auktoriale – Überschrift: ... *ut foedera pactaque inter eos facta servantur*.

pa (c. 135) fordert und sich für eine erhaltene Wachstafel (c. 144) bedankt. Die Spezifität des Gryfus-Gedichts besteht jedoch darin, dass es sich bei den hier übermittelten Gegenständen um Tiere handelt, die zudem selbst sprechen.

Die besondere Methode, ein eigenständiges (d. h. nicht als Teil eines Tier-epos konzipiertes) Gedicht als Rede eines Tieres zu gestalten, hat bis zum Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts nur eine sehr schwächliche Tradition ausgebildet:⁵ Radbod von Utrecht hat in karolingischer Zeit eine sprechende Schwalbe auftreten lassen (*De hirundine*), im 15. Jahrhundert schreibt Panormita über ein Pferd (*Hermaphr.* 2.36; *Caballus fame periens*), Tito Vespasiano Strozzi über zwei Hunde (*Pro canibus geminis parvis*), Pierre de Blaru über Vögel (*Aves de cavea loquuntur*), schließlich Cornelio Paolo Amalteo über einen Hund namens Biffus (*De cane Biffo*). Es handelt sich um eine so auffallend dürftige Textmenge, dass man von einer eigenen Gattung nicht sprechen darf. Von diesen Gedichten unterscheidet sich das Werk des Gryfus durch seinen dominanten Sitz im Leben, der die Verse als Lieferungsbestätigung einer übersandten Ware definiert. In poetischen Fabeln ist das Auftreten von Vögeln selbstverständlich nicht ungewöhnlich.⁶ Erinnert sei hier an den *Pavo* des Alexander von Roes oder an zwei Gedichte des Jakob Wimpfeling, in denen ebenfalls ein Pfau (als Symbol des Reiches) spricht.⁷ Bei Gryfus repräsentieren die Tiere jedoch keine Figuren, Abstrakta oder Instanzen, sondern nur sich selbst.

Die Informationen über Absender, Empfänger und Datierung des Textes sind sehr spärlich. Als Quelle dient im Wesentlichen das Gedicht selbst, darüber hinaus auch die Überschrift. Diese geht in einem einzigen Punkt über das in den Versen zu findende Informationsmaterial hinaus, indem sie den Anfangsbuchstaben des Adressatennamens mitteilt: *ad reverendum P.* Im Gedicht wird P. als Bewohner einer Stadt des Insubrerlandes vorgestellt: ... *Inchytaque Insubris defert ad moenia terrae* (v. 45). Man könnte hier zwar auch

5 Für die im Folgenden genannten Texte verweise ich auf die kurz vor dem Abschluss stehende Dissertation von Franziska Schnoor (Göttingen): *Das lateinische Tierlobgedicht in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*.

6 Vgl. Jan Ziolkowski *Talking Animals: Medieval Latin Beast Poetry, 750-1150* (Philadelphia 1993).

7 Vgl. Joseph Knepper *Nationaler Gedanke und Kaiseridee bei den elsässischen Humanisten* (Freiburg i. Br. 1898) (Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes I, 2-3) 199-203.

an Como, Pavia, Novara oder manche anderen Städte denken, doch dürfte die Formulierung angesichts des Fehlens eines Eigennamens wohl eher auf die Metropole Mailand hindeuten. Die im Gedicht verwendeten Junktoren *sedes ... tuas* (v. 42), *tuas ... , vir venerande, domos* (v. 46) und insbesondere *sanctos ... vultus* (v. 65) sowie der Hinweis auf die Milde (vv. 55–56) dienen als Indizien für die These, dass es sich bei P. um einen (hochgestellten) Geistlichen handelt.⁸ Es gibt allerdings keinen Grund, hier sogleich an den Mailänder Erzbischof zu denken.

Die Kapaune stammen von einem bei Padua (v. 1) gelegenen Bauernhof. Der Absender, ein Arzt namens Gryfus, wird im Gedicht ebenfalls als Paduaner bezeichnet (v. 41: *Phisicus interea patrio nos Gryfus in agro*). Auch in der Überschrift wird diese Herkunft erwähnt: *Gryphii Patavi versus*. Der Name des Absenders wird zudem in Vers 60 (*Gryffus*) noch einmal bestätigt. Der Jammer über die lange Reise der Kapaune ist angesichts der geographischen Distanz zwischen Padua und dem Insubrerland durchaus plausibel, wenngleich man sich fragt, inwiefern es sinnvoll ist, die Tiere aus so großer Ferne nach Mailand importieren zu lassen. Angesichts des sprechenden Namens *Gryfus* ('Greif') könnte man deshalb zunächst eine poetische Tarnung des Dichters vermuten, zumal da es sich um die Rede von Vögeln handelt, welche in ihrer Jugend von einem anderen Raubvogel, dem *milvus* (v. 26), bedroht worden sind. Wegen des im Italien des 15. Jahrhunderts vielfach bezeugten Eigennamens Griffi ist diese Vermutung jedoch eher abwegig.⁹ Zu erwähnen ist hier insbesondere der Dichter und spätere Erzbischof von Benevent Leonardo Griffi (1437/40–1485).¹⁰ Wie sich allerdings zeigt, ist er nicht mit dem Autor des vorliegenden Gedichts identisch. Der Ferrareser Codex enthält auf fol. 54r in einem Kolophon die Datierung *MCCCCXV*, jedoch befindet sich diese Seite nicht in dem genannten zweiten Faszikel

8 Vgl. auch die Überschrift: ... *ad reverendum* ...

9 Vgl. Mario Emilio Cosenza 1962. *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300–1800*. Vol. 2. Boston: 1678–79; 1685; 1688.

10 Vgl. M. Simonetta 'Griffi (Grifi, Grifo), Leonardo' in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*. Bd. 59 (Rom 2002) 360–63; Giovanni Casati *Dizionario degli scrittori d'Italia (dalle origini fino ai viventi)*. Bd. 1 (Mailand 1925) 232, Nr. 757 u. 760 (als zwei verschiedene Personen aufgelistet); Vincenzo Caputo *I poeti italiani dall'antichità ad oggi* (Mailand 1960) 310.

(fol. 11-38), welcher das Gedicht des Gryfus überliefert. Die Datierung hat daher nur eine geringe Aussagekraft.

Als wichtigeres Indiz kann das im selben Faszikel überlieferte Carmen des Baptista Marchio Palavicinus dienen, welcher als späterer Bischof von Reggio (1444-66) bekannt ist und in der Überschrift des Gedichts auch als *episcopus Regiensis* bezeichnet wird.¹¹ Da sich der Text an Niccolò III. d'Este (1383/84-1441) richtet, muss er allerdings noch vor der Übernahme des Episkopats durch Palavicinus entstanden sein. Darüber hinaus enthält der Faszikel Texte des Coluccio Salutati (1331-1406). Am Ende des zweiten Faszikels befindet sich auf fol. 38r zudem ein höchst interessanter chronikalischer Eintrag:¹²

MCCCCXVJ ... In palatio residentie Illustrissimi principis et excellentissimi d. domini nostrj d. Nicolaj dei gratia Marchionis Estensis et cetera Generosa d. domina çiliola Marchionisa Estensis et cetera et de Carara filia quondam bone memorie Magnifici d. d. Francisci de Cararia Padue et cetera nacti quondam M.ci d. d. Francisci de Cararia Padue [sic!] et cetera diem suum clausit extremum ...

Diese Notiz bestätigt nicht nur, dass das Gedicht des Gryfus spätestens im Jahr 1416 entstanden sein muss, sondern erklärt auch, wie diese Verse eines Paduaner Arztes in einen Ferrareser Codex gelangen konnten: Gigliola da Carrara (1379-1416) war die Tochter des Francesco Novello da Carrara, des Herrn von Padua. Im Jahre 1394 wurde sie mit dem jungen Herzog Niccolò III. verheiratet und an den Ferrareser Hof geschickt. Es ist daher zu vermuten, dass Gryfus' Verse gleichsam in Gigliolas Gefolge nach Ferrara gelangt sind. Das konzeptionell ungewöhnliche Gedicht des Paduaners könnte also schon im letzten Jahrzehnt des 14. Jahrhunderts verfasst worden sein.

¹¹ Vgl. zuletzt Fabio Forner 'Pio II e Battista Pallavicino, vescovo di Reggio nell'Emilia' in Canova, Andrea (ed.) *Rhegii Lingobardiae. Studi sulla cultura a Reggio Emilia in età umanistica* (Reggio Emilia 2004) 93-109.

¹² Zitiert nach Bonazza 2002: 203-4.

Text¹³

Gryphii Patavi versus, in quibus capones in agro Patavio orti et educati ad reverendum P. loquentes mittuntur, ut foedera pactaque inter eos facta serventur.

- Est ager exiguus Patavinae proximus urbi,
 Gramineo cingunt pinguia prata solo.
 Arbor ibi lentis exurgit plurima ramis,
 Quae patulam densa fronde coronat humum.
- 5 Pumice missa cavo bibulisque illisa lapilis
 Per campum querulo murmure lympa sonat.
 Populeis viret unda comis atque ordine longo
 Pendet in umbroso flumine cana salix.
 In medio virides ederis circundata muros
- 10 Stat domus et parvo rustica turba lare.
 Hic casa viminibus cretaque inspersa tenaci
 Nos tenuit faeno matre foverit levi.
 Ut primum ruptis lucem conspeximus ovis,
 Iunius aethereos duxit in orbe focos.
- 15 Et iam vestiti spicis flaventibus agri,
 Sicus et arenti pulvere campus erat.
 Area lata fuit tundende aptissima messi.
 Illic infirmo coepimus ire pede.
 Villa brevis turba resonabat tota loquaci.
- 20 Condebat mollem pluma tenella cutim.
 Escaque erat rostro vermis quaesitus acuto
 Assuetosque dabant parvula grana cibos.
 Hinc ad vimineum gelida sub nocte canistrum
 Portabat pleno laeta colona sinu.
- 25 Ah! quotiens trepidos mater contextit in alis,
 Cum rueret curvo milvus in orbe rapax.
 Ah! quotiens, mutum dum nox absconderet orbem,
 Horruit audita pallida vulpe parens.

¹³ Die Graphie der Handschrift wird grundsätzlich beibehalten. Nur die *e caudata* wird aufgelöst, zudem wird zwischen *u* und *v* differenziert.

- Protinus ut valido creverunt corpore penne,
 30 A reliquis maesti fratribus eripimur
 Vehunturque truci pudibunda latentia ferro,
 Ceditur et fluvido sanguine crista rubens.
 Carcer et exiguus praefixis ordine virgis
 Nos capit atque oculos impia filla suunt.
 35 Plenus aqua et densi plenus faragine grani
 Alveus ante pedes arte cavatus erat.
 Saepius hic tepido duratas fonte farinas
 Spargebat tenera parva puella manu.
 Candida vix, pleno vix luna refulserat orbe,
 40 Pinguia torpuerant pondere membra suo.
 Phisicus interea patrio nos Gryfus in agro
 Emit, ut ad sedes mitteret ille tuas.
 Arripit adiunctos pedibus sub fune ligatis
 Vilicus et tergo fuste tenente locat
 45 Inclytaque Insubris defert ad moenia terrae
 Atque tuas petimus, vir venerande, domos.
 Quod si nunc solita careat pinguedine corpus,
 Da veniam: longum membra peredit iter.
 Quot iuga, quot fontes vel quot transivimus agros,
 50 Pendula dum prono gutture colla iacent!
 Crede tamen: cupidis ardebant pectora votis
 Ad vultus avida fronte venire tuos.
 Nec, nos quod nomen mortis terreret acerbae,
 Humentes largo tinximus imbre genas.
 55 Non tu crudeli gaudes feritate nec unquam
 Est tua funesto sparsa cruore manus.
 Aut paulum lete produces tempora vitae
 Aut placida facies occubuisse nece.
 Et tamen horrendo patimur succumbere leto,
 60 Si modo pollicitas Gryffus habebit opes.
 Longinquam ex illo delati nuper ad urbem
 Nos nati patrium linquimus aede solum.
 Effice, ne in tenues sperata pecunia ventos
 Evolet et nullo pondere foedus eat.
 65 Venimus ad sanctos promisso in tempore vultus,

Mutua nunc iustas dent tua vota vices.
 Compositeque novo servantur foedere leges,
 Ne pereant longe milia tanta viae.

Anmerkungen

Patavio] so statt *Patavo*.

1 Est ager] Ov. *Met.* 10.644.

1 proximus urbi] Stat. *Theb.* 7.238 u. Iuv. *Sat.* 6.290.

2] Vgl. Ov. *Am.* 3.5.5 (Area gramineo suberat viridissima prato).

3 lentis exurgit plurima ramis] Vgl. Verg. *Georg.* 4.558 (lentis uvam demittere ramis).

4 coronat humum] Vgl. Prop. *Eleg.* 4.4.8 (coronat humo).

5 Pumice] Konj. Haye; *Punice* Hs.

5 Pumice ... cavo] Vgl. Verg. *Georg.* 4.44 (pumicibusque cavis).

5 lapilis] Haplographie, statt *lapillis*.

6 Per campum ...] Verg. *Aen.* 6.653.

7 Populeis viret unda comis] Vgl. Ov. *Am.* 1.7.54 (populeas ventilat aura comas) u. *Her.* 14.40 (populeas ut quatit aura comas).

7 ordine longo] Verg. *Aen.* 1.395.

8 Pendet in umbroso] Vgl. Luc. *Phars.* 8.798 (Pendet in Oceano).

8 cana salix] Luc. *Phars.* 4.131.

9 virides ... muros] Accusativus graecus.

9 circumdata muros] Vgl. Verg. *Aen.* 6.549 (circumdata muro).

10 Stat domus et ...] Verg. *Aen.* 8.192.

10 parvo ... lare] Vgl. Hor. *Carm.* 3.29.14 (parvo sub lare).

10 rustica turba] Ov. *Met.* 6.348.

11 cretaque inspersa tenaci] Vgl. Verg. *Georg.* 1.179 (et creta solidanda tenaci).

15 vestiti] sc. *erant*.

15 vestiti spicis flaventibus agri] Vgl. Ov. *Fast.* 4.707 (vestitos messibus agros).

16 Sicus] Haplographie statt *Siccus*.

17 Area lata] Ov. *Her.* 1.72 u. *Trist.* 4.3.84.

17 tundende] = *tundendae*; das auslautende e ohne cauda.

21 rostro vermis quaesitus acuto] Vgl. Ov. *Am.* 3.5.39 (rostro cornix fodie-

bat acuto).

- 23 gelida sub nocte] Vgl. Verg. *Georg.* 1.287 (gelida ... nocte).
 24] Vgl. Ov. *Fast.* 4.432 (cum plenos flore referte sinus).
 25 trepidos] Konj. Haye; *trepidus* Hs.
 25 mater] Nach Korrektur.
 25 ... in alis] Ov. *Met.* 5.546.
 26 milvus] Nach Korrektur.
 26 milvus in orbe rapax] Vgl. Mart. *Epigr.* 9.54.10 (rapax milvus).
 27 mutum ... orbem] Vgl. Stat. *Ach.* 1.621 (mutum ... orbem).
 28 pallida] *palida* vor Korrektur.
 29 Protinus ut ...] Ov. *Am.* 3.7.54 u. ö.
 29 penne] = *pennae*.
 31 Vehunturque] Die erste Silbe ist gelängt.
 31 truci ... ferro] Vgl. Claud. *Carm. mai.* 26.417 (truci ferro).
 32 crista rubens] Sil. *Pun.* 17.393.
 33 virgis] Nach Korrektur.
 34 filla] Diplographie, statt *fila*.
 37 fonte farinas] Vgl. App. Verg., *Moretum* 43 (fontes atque farinas).
 38] Vgl. (Ps.-)Tib. *Eleg.* 4.6.2 (Quos tibi dat tenera docta puella manu).
 39 pleno vix luna refulserat orbe] Vgl. Ov. *Her.* 2.3 (lunae pleno semel orbe coissent).
 45] am Rande notiert: *Insubris terrae*.
 48 Da veniam ...] Ov. *Pont.* 1.7.22 u. ö.
 48 longum membra peredit iter] Vgl. Ov. *Pont.* 4.9.24 (longum turba teneret iter).
 48 peredit] Nach Korrektur.
 51 Crede tamen ...] Ov. *Ars* 1.307.
 52] Vgl. Ov. *Her.* 16.244 (Ad vultus referens singula verba tuos).
 54 Humentes ... genas] Tib. *Eleg.* 1.9.38.
 57 lete] = *laetae*.
 57 tempora vitae] Ov. *Pont.* 3.2.29 u. ö.
 60 pollicitas Gryffus habebit opes] Vgl. Ov. *Ars* 1.408 (positas Circus habebit opes).
 62 Nos] Am Rande ergänzt.
 63 tenues ... ventos] Vgl. Ov. *Ars* 2.86 (tenues ventos).
 63 pecunia] Nach Korrektur.
 65] Vgl. Ov. *Trist.* 1.10.18 (venimus ad portus, Imbria terra, tuos).

66 dent tua vota] Vgl. Ov. *Pont.* 2.3.97 (dentur tua vota).

67 Compositeque] = *Compositaeque*.

68] Vgl. Ov. *Trist.* 5.12.2 (ne pereant turpi pectora nostra situ).

68 longe] = *longae*.

LIST OF AUTHORS

Isaías Arrayás Morales

Autonomous University of Barcelona
Campus UAB, Edifici B,
08193 Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain

David Bloch

University of Copenhagen,
Centre for the Aristotelian Tradition,
SAXO Institute,
Njalsgade 80,
2300 Copenhagen S, Denmark

David R. Carlson

University of Ottawa,
70 Laurier Avenue East,
Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 8G4, Canada

Irini Christophorou

Thermaicou 12 B,
Palouriotissa,
1048 Nicosia, Cyprus

Serena Connolly

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey,
131 George Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA

Jens E. Degn

Frederiksparken 8, 2.sal
6400 Sønderborg, Denmark

Tibor Grüll

University of Pécs,
Department of Ancient History,
Rókus u. 2,
7624 Pécs, Hungary

Thomas Haye

Universität Göttingen,
Zentrum für Mittelalter- und Frühneuzeitforschung,
Lehrstuhl für Lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit,
Humboldtallee 19,
37073 Göttingen, Germany

Jens A. Krasilnikoff

University of Aarhus,
Department of History and Area Studies,
Ndr. Ringgade,
8000 Århus C, Denmark

Jack Lennon

University of Nottingham,
Department of Classics,
Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK

Chiara Meccariello

University of Pisa,
Department of Classical Philology,
Via Galvani 1, Pisa, Italy

Joaquín Muñiz Coello

Universidad de Huelva,
Department of History,
Faculty of Humanities,

Avenida de las Fuerzas Armadas s/n,
21071 Huelva, Spain

Efi Papadodima

University of the Peloponnese,
Lamprou Katsoni 10,
Palaio Faliro,
17563 Athens, Greece

FORTHCOMING

**Urban Development and Regional Identity in the
Eastern Roman Provinces 50 BC–AD 250
Aphrodisias, Ephesos, Athens, Gerasa**

By Rubina Raja

This book presents a comparative treatment of four East Roman provinces in the period 50 BC–AD 250: Aphrodisias and Ephesos in Turkey, Athens in Greece and Gerasa in Jordan. With carefully researched scholarship, Raja examines the instrumental factors behind regional and local urban developments and what this can tell us about identity in these areas. She argues that local communities were responsible for the organisation and development of public space and buildings, lending itself to an understanding of self-knowledge in these communities within the Roman Empire. In this way, the urban landscape can provide useful information about many aspects of regional identity of a particular society.

Raja furthermore discusses the influence which the wealth of liberated imperial slaves had on the development of their native towns once they had returned to their homes (in this case Aphrodisias). She argues that this phenomenon, which is considerably more characteristic of the early imperial period, is more widespread than previously assumed.

Through an examination of the interaction between architectural developments and historical and regional factors, this compelling study provides important insight into the processes nurturing the interaction between the built environment and the social and political culture and urban identity of individual towns in the eastern Roman Empire.

Rubina Raja is Associate Professor at the Department of Classical Archaeology, Aarhus University.

Exp. 2011 · c. 350 pp. · Hardback · 17 × 24 cm
c. 45 colour illustrations · ISBN 978 87 635 2606 7
c. DKK 400 · \$ 80 · € 54

MUSEUM TUSCULANUM PRESS
UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

Njalsgade 126 · DK-2300 Copenhagen S
tel. +45 3532 9109 · fax +45 3532 9113 · www.mtp.dk · order@mtp.dk

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

Classica et Mediaevalia encourages scholarly contributions within the fields of Greek and Latin languages and literature up to, and including, the late Middle Ages as well as Graeco-Roman history and the classical influence in general history, legal history, the history of philosophy and ecclesiastical history. General linguistics, archaeology and art history fall outside the scope of the journal.

The languages accepted are English, French and German. Articles should not exceed 50 printed pages (c. 15.000 words). Manuscripts should be submitted on paper *as well as* electronically, i.e. by e-mail (preferred) or on CD-ROM and sent to the editorial address (see inside front cover). All major formats are accepted, but Microsoft Word or RTF are preferred.

The author's contact information, including address, phone, fax and e-mail, should be included on the first page of the manuscript. The address will, in case of publication, appear in *C&M* and will be used for sending proofs and offprints. The author's name should appear with one or more of his/her first names unabreviated. The ms. must be accompanied by a summary in English (irrespective of the language of the article) of 40-80 words.

References should comply with the following conventions:

Monographs

Taplin, O. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.

Periodicals

Quincey, J.H. 1977. 'Textual Notes on Aeschylus *Choephoroi*' *RhM* 120, 138-45.

Anthologies

Flashar, H. 1985. 'Aufführungen von griechischen Dramen in der Übersetzung von Wilamowitz' in Calder III, William M., Hellmut Flashar & Theodor Lindken (eds.) *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren*. Darmstadt, 306-57.

More detailed guidelines will be found on the *C&M* website:

www.mtp.dk/classicaetmediaevalia

FORTHCOMING

Byzantine Neumes
A New Introduction to the Middle Byzantine Musical Notation

By Christian Troelsgård

Not much is known about the medieval chant of Byzantium, although a large body of music has been preserved in neumatic notation. Coming into use around AD 1150, the Middle Byzantine musical notation is the earliest notational type of Byzantium that can be transcribed with reasonable accuracy; the musical content of manuscripts earlier than c. 1150 can only be fully understood through Middle Byzantine versions.

The book discusses such topics as chant transmission before the neumes, the varieties of Byzantine musical notations, words and music in Byzantine chant, Byzantine and Western neumatic notations, modes, melody and intervals, but its purpose above all is to serve as a key to the deciphering of melodies written in the Middle Byzantine notation. In addition, the book presents a panorama of the styles of Byzantine chant from simple psalmody to melismatic chant and it is accompanied by a set of specimens of musical manuscripts of known date and provenance. The text includes more than sixty musical examples and contains an annotated bibliography.

Exp. 2011 · c. 142 pp. · Paperback · 17 × 24 cm
22 plates · c. 65 musical examples and 10 halftones · ISBN 978 87 635 3158 0
Series: Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, Subsidia vol. IX · ISSN 0105-3566
c. DKK 500 · \$ 99 · € 67

MUSEUM TUSCULANUM PRESS
UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

Njalsgade 126 · DK-2300 Copenhagen S
tel. +45 3532 9109 · fax +45 3532 9113 · www.mtp.dk · order@mtp.dk

ISBN 978 87 635 3670 7



9 788763 536707