ARCTOS

Acta Philologica Fennica

VOL. XXVIII

_____

1994

ARCTOS

VOL. XXVIII

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXVIII

ARCTOS. ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

INDEX

VESSELS FOR MUSHROOMS?

ANNE HELTTULA

At the beginning of the first century AD a new delicacy appeared at Roman banquets: mushrooms.[1] The first recorded experiment was not successful: Cicero had a severe attack of diarrhoea after eating some unspecified *fungi* at a vegetarian dinner (fam. 7,26 = Shackleton Bailey 210). But by Tiberius' time the imperial mushroom-hunters had learned to pick the right ones for the Emperor's table, and the *boleti* were already competing with *ficedulae, ostreae* and *turdi* for his favour (Suet. Tib. 42,6). The *boleti* were the divine food, *deorum cibus*, that raised Claudius into the company of the gods (Suet. Nero 33,1).[2] In spite of this calamity the mushrooms established their place among exotic delicacies, oysters, game and rare kinds of fish. Eating mushrooms became a symbol of luxurious living, and as such it was severely criticized by moralists, e.g. Seneca (epist. 108,15 *Inde ostreis boletisque in omnem vitam renuntiatum est; nec enim cibi sed oblectamenta sunt ad edendum saturos cogentia, quod gratissimum est edacibus et se ultra quam capiunt farcientibus, facile decensura, facile reditura*) and Juvenal (14,6 *Nec melius de se cuiquam sperare propinquo / concedet iuvenis, qui radere tubera terrae, / boletum condire et eodem iure natantis / mergere ficedulas didicit nebulone parente / et cana monstrante gula*).

The description given by Pliny the Elder (nat. 22,92–93) makes it clear that the famous and highly appreciated *boletus* was *Amanita caesarea*, Caesar's agaric, typical of northern Italy and southern France. This

---

[1] See A. Helttula, Mushrooms in ancient Greece and Rome, OpusculaIRF 4 (1989) 20–21.

[2] Claudius' death seems to have been caused by a dish of poisoned mushrooms (*boletus medicatus*; Suet. Claud. 44,4), not by any poisonous species; cf. also Plin. nat. 22,92; Tac. ann. 12,67.

identification has been generally accepted.[3]

The word *boletus* is used in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD by many Latin writers (Seneca, Pliny, Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, Martial and Juvenal). It is not found in Greek before Galen (alim. fac. 2,67,1–2), who considered the βωλίτης the best and safest kind of mushroom, the only one, as far as he knew, that had not yet killed anyone.[4]

Therefore, the Greek word coud well be a loan from Latin.[5] But I find it even more likely that *boletus* was the local name of this mushroom, used in the main areas of its appearance, Northern Italy and Southern Gaul, and borrowed into both Latin and Greek as the name of this particular commodity.[6]

Two names of vessels have been explained as derivatives of *boletus*.

According to Mart. 14,101 the vessel called *boletar* (*voletarium* Vet.Lat. Marc. 14,20 cod. c)[7] was named after *boleti*: *Cum mihi boleti dederint tam nobile nomen, / prototomis (pudet heu!) servio coliculis.* But was it a plate or bowl originally used for serving mushrooms?

Apicius uses *boletar* for *isicia* (rissolles; 2,1,5), *apothermum*[8] 2,2,10), lentils (5,2,1–2), peas (5,3,4), roast fowl (6,2,5) and roast pork (8,7,13) – but he does not mention it in his recipes for mushrooms. It is a serving dish used after the food had been prepared in a *caccabus* (2,1,5 *coagitabis et exinanies in boletari*; 2,2,10 *in boletari inferes*; 5,2,2 *cum in boletar miseris, addes oleum viridem*); cf. anth. 142,3 Shackleton Bailey (153,3 Riese) *comptas*

---

[3] Cf. G. Maggiulli, Nomenclatura micologica latina, Genova 1977, 47; Helttula, 32.

[4] The form is βωλίτης in glosses too (III 315,19 βωλῖται *boleti*) and in geop. 12,22,6; βωλήτης only in Athen. 3,113c. G. Redard (Les noms grecs en -της, -τις, Paris 1949, 68 and 70) explains the Greek form as analogous: -ιτης was a normal suffix in names of plants.

[5] P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque, Paris 1980, 203, and A. Ernout & A. Meillet, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, Paris 1959[4], 72. In ThLL II 2066,65 the Latin word is given as a derivative of the Greek one.

[6] The element *bol, bul* is found in Celtic(?) plant names: **bolo-sero-n*, Gallic for 'ivy' in Apul. de virt.herb. 99 (cf. A. Holder, Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz I, 1896, 477); *bulluca/ga*, name of some *poma parvola* (wild berries?) growing in the wilderness, Vita Columb. 1,9 (cf. Holder 631).

[7] *... qui tingit mecum manum in catino* Vulg.; Vet.Lat. cod. a *in catinum*, cod. q *in acitabulo*, cod. c *in voletario*, cod. d *in parapside* (εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον).

[8] Explained as "une bouillie ou un gâteau de semoule mélangée de vin de liqueur" by J. André in his edition of Apicius, Paris 1974, 148.

nolo dapes, vacuum mihi pone boletar.

Catili boletari are mentioned in the potters' tally-lists found at La Graufesenque in Aquitania (Nos. 163, 166 and 167 Marichal; [...]*oletari* No. 154).[9] These records have been written on discarded fragments of their own ware.[10] The adjective *boletarius* defines the type of the *catillus* – plate or shallow bowl – in question. Abbreviations (*bol.*) and fragments of the word appear fourteen times (Nos. 46, 86, 94, 96 and 159). The order is reversed in No. 86, where *bol(etari)* [..., *bol(etari) cat(ili)* and *bol(etari) par(axidi)* (= *paropsides*)[11] appear.

Both *catillus* and *paropsis* (παροψίς) were dishes in which food was served at the table. *Catillus* was probably a plate or a shallow bowl,[12] *paropsis* a little deeper.[13] In the graffiti of La Graufesenque these nouns are often qualified by adjectives which define the form, colour, decoration, quality, or method of manufacture of the dish;[14] according to Marichal, however, *boletarius* would have described its use.[15] This was also the interpretation given by J. André to Apicius' *boletar*.[16] According to Hilgers (121), the *boletar* was used for fish (he refers to hist. Aug. Claud. 17,5; see below), mushrooms and cabbage.[17]

I have shown above that Apicius used the *boletar* for many kinds of dishes, among which mushrooms are **not** mentioned. Martial only said that it was **named after** the mushrooms, not that it was originally used for serving them. The connection with the type *atramentarium pultarium*

---

[9] Les graffites de la Graufesenque, ed. by R. Marichal, Paris 1988 (suppl. 47 of "Gallia"); earlier edition by F. Hermet, La Graufesenque, Paris 1934.

[10] For the hypotheses advanced to explain these lists, see D.P.S. Peacock, Pottery in the Roman world, London & New York 1982, 126.

[11] For the forms of this word used at La Graufesenque, see Marichal, 90.

[12] Cf. W. Hilgers, Lateinische Gefässnamen, Düsseldorf 1969, 48–49 and 142–144. For the names of the dishes produced in La Graufesenque, see also Hermet, La Graufesenque, 320–322, and Marichal, 80–92.

[13] Hilgers, 33–34 and 238–239.

[14] Marichal, 83–84.

[15] This was already the opinion of F. Hermet, RA 4 ser. 3 (1904) 82, and La Graufesenque, 321; similarly explained by others too, e.g. D.E. Strong, Greek and Roman Gold and Silver Plate, London 1966, 129.

[16] Index of the utensils, 224.

[17] According to J. Loth (Les graffites gaulois de la Graufesenque, RC 41, 1924, 28) *boletar* was "terrine pour légumes frais" (reference to Mart. 19,10).

vinarium, i. e. vessels in *-arium* named after the substance they were used for, is secondary, because *boletarium* is an analogous singular formed from the plural *boletaria*. Besides, why would mushrooms have needed a particular kind of dish – in fact two, a *catillus* and a *paropsis*?

I find it much more probable that the word describes the outward appearance of the vessel. Apicius called the caps of the mushrooms *caliculos*, "little bowls" (diminutive of *calix*; 7,15,5); could the *boletar* have been a dish that resembled the cap of a *boletus*?

In fact, both Chantraine (see footnote 4 above) and Frisk[18] think that the corresponding Greek word – as the other Greek derivatives of *boletus* too (see below) – describes the shape, not the use of the object.

The Greek word appears twice in a papyrus from the 2nd cent. AD (BGU 781 I 1; III 8.10). The fragmentary text contains a list of various sets of dishes, which are also described. In col. III πινάκια βωλητάρια [= *catilli boletari*!] ... σὺν ποδίοις καὶ διαπηγίοις are mentioned, i.e. vessels equipped with feet and transverse handles, as the latter word is explained by F. Preisigke.[19]

In its basic form the *boletar* (*boletarium*, βωλητάριον) could have been a dish with a distinctive foot supporting a wide, shallow, plate-like upper part. It could also have been a dish decorated with radiating flutes or ribs resembling the gills of a mushroom.

There are fine examples of fluted (ribbed, 'pillar-moulded') bowls made of silver and glass.[20] Perhaps the Gaulish potters at La Graufesenque imitated the forms and decorations of such finer wares. In fact, the *catili boletari* seem to have been a rare and special type of dish: of the total of 155,058 *catilli* mentioned in the graffiti, only 5,800 are specified as *boletari*.[21] We also know about a *boletar halieuticum* in silver, mentioned among precious gifts sent to the Emperor in hist.Aug. Claud. 17,5. It could have been meant for serving fish, but the word *halieuticum* could also refer

---

[18] H. Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I, Heidelberg 1960, 278.

[19] F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden I, Berlin 1925, 280 (adj. βωλητάριος) and 358 (διαπήγιον).

[20] For ribbed silver bowls, see e.g. the illustrations in Strong: Pl. 43A (bowl found at Berthouville), 51A (Chaourse) and 65B (Kaiseraugst). For glass bowls, see D.B. Harden, Glass of the Caesars, 1987, 19–20, Nos. 26–28; D.F. Grose, Ancient Glass, 1989, 211–212, 244–249 and Nos. 228–242.

[21] These are Hermet's figures (La Graufesenque, 328–330).

to a decorative motif, perhaps a frieze around the edge of the bowl.[22]

By the time that Apicius' cookery book appeared in its final form (4th–5th century AD?), the meaning of the word had been generalized. The serving-dishes mentioned by Apicius are *boletar*, *discus* and *lanx*.[23] Their difference must have been in size and shape, certainly not in decoration. The *voletarium* which, according to the translator of the Vetus Latina manuscript c, was used by Jesus and the apostles at their last supper must have been quite an ordinary dish. Its distinctive features could have been the foot and the plate-like upper part, but hardly the ribbed pattern.

According to B. Meinersmann,[24] both the πινάκια βωλητάρια quoted above and the βωλήτι[ο]ν only found in a 3rd century papyrus (P.Oxy. 1657,4) were mushroom-shaped bowls with a foot.

The assumed βωλήτιον is one of the bronze items contained in a mess kit. According to the editors, βωλητάρ[ι]ν for βωλητάριον would be a possible reading, but it would suit the papyrus less well.[25] Their translation is "saucepan".

The existence of the noun βωλήτιον is supported by the adjective βωλητῖνος found in Athenaeus' discussion on bread (3,113c). Athenaeus claims that there were mushroom-shaped loaves of bread (ὁ δὲ βωλητῖνος καλούμενος ἄρτος πλάττεται μὲν ὡς βωλήτης). His source was a treatise on bread-making (ἀρτοποιϊκόν) by Chrysippus of Tyana, of unknown date but certainly later than Apicius, since he named a type of cake after him (᾿Απικιανόν [κλοῦστρον], Athen. 14,647c). In the passage different methods of baking bread are discussed (3,113a ὁ ἀρτοπτίκιος ἄρτος καλούμενος κλιβανικίου καὶ φουρνακίου διαφέρει; cf. Plin. nat. 18,105 *furnacei vel artopticii aut in clibanis cocti*).

The making of the βωλητῖνος ἄρτος is described: it is clearly an ἀρτοπτίκιος type of bread, i.e. baked in an earthenware dish (ἀρτόπτης).[26]

---

[22] The other dishes included in the gift are defined in terms of their material and decoration; e.g. *discus corymbiatus argenteus*, *lanx argentea pampinata* and *patena argentea hederacia*.

[23] Cf. Hilgers, 170 (*discus*), and 206–209 (*lanx*). Cf. also André's index of the utensils, 224–226.

[24] B. Meinersmann, Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den griechischen Papyri, Leipzig 1927, 13.

[25] The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIV, ed. B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt, London 1920.

[26] "The kneading-trough is greased and sprinkled with poppy-seed, on which the dough is spread, and so it does not stick to the trough during the rising. When it is placed in the

Perhaps βωλήτιον was the type dish used, and the bread was named after it. In Athenaeus' text, the dish is called simply κέραμος. The use of this method could have produced a "mushroom-shaped" loaf broadened above the rim of the dish, perhaps also decorated with gill-like radial cuts.

To conclude: the βωλήτιον – if it existed – and the *boletar/*βωλητάριον were different kinds of vessels, the first a cooking or baking dish, the second a serving-dish (with a foot? with a rib-pattern?). But since the pan in the soldier's kit was made of bronze, it was perhaps a βωλητάριον after all.

University of Helsinki

---

oven, some coarse meal is sprinkled over the earthenware pan, after which the loaf is laid upon it and takes on a delightful colour, like that of smoked cheese" (transl. by C.B. Gulick in the Loeb CL edition of the Deipnosophistae, 1937).

FABIA ACONIA PAULINA AND THE DEATH
OF PRAETEXTATUS – RHETORIC AND IDEALS
IN LATE ANTIQUITY (CIL VI 1779)*

MAIJASTINA KAHLOS

The purpose of this article is to study the funerary poem of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus and his wife Fabia Aconia Paulina in CIL VI 1779. I shall discuss questions connected with Praetextatus' death, the creation of the funerary poem, and particularly Paulina's role in its composition. This poem is especially interesting because it illustrates late Roman ideas of female virtue and the ideals of marriage and marital love. I shall end with a discussion of the women initiated into mystery cults by their husbands and of the choice of religious affiliation in Late Antiquity.

Vettius Agorius Praetextatus (310/320–384) often appears together with the well–known names of Q. Aurelius Symmachus and Nicomachus Flavianus. He has been considered the spiritual leader and the unifying force of the Roman pagan senators in the fourth century.[1] He seems to have made a strong impression on his contemporaries and the generations after him since most writers praise him. The letters Symmachus wrote to Praetextatus show respect for him; the historian Ammianus Marcellinus, who otherwise disapproves of the Roman senators and their morals, describes him as a senator of noble character and old–time dignity.[2] Macrobius' *Saturnalia*,

---

[1] PLRE I, Praetextatus 1, 722–724. E.g. G. Boissier, La fin du paganisme, 2, Paris 1891, 265; H. Bloch, A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West, 393–394 A.D., HThR 38 (1945) 203–204, 217–219; R. Klein, Symmachus, Darmstadt 1971, 47–50. J. Matthews, Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425, Oxford 1990², 6 describes him as a characteristic – though outstanding – product of late Roman paganism.

[2] Amm. 22,7,6.

written a generation after Praetextatus, depicts him as the main character and the leading figure among the Roman pagan senators.[3] Praetextatus is also known to have been devoted to literature and philosophy.[4]

In addition to literary sources there are also several inscriptions that give information about Praetextatus' political career and his religious activities. Praetextatus' *cursus honorum* is displayed in CIL VI 1777, 1778 and 1779. He was *quaestor candidatus, praetor urbanus, corrector Tusciae et Umbriae* and *consularis Lusitaniae* before 362.[5] After the city prefecture in Rome in 367–368 Praetextatus was either five or seven times a legate of the senate.[6] Under the reign of Valentinianus II, after the death of the emperor Gratian, he became *praefectus praetorio Illyrici, Italiae et Africae*.[7] He was married to Fabia Aconia Paulina, the daughter of Aconius Catullinus Philomathius.[8]

AFTER THE DEATH OF PRAETEXTATUS

In 384 Praetextatus was appointed consul for the following year but he died before the New Year, perhaps in December 384.[9] The whole city of

---

[3] Of the date of Macrobius' *Saturnalia* see Alan Cameron, The Date and Identity of Macrobius, JRS 56 (1966) 25–38.

[4] Paulina refers (CIL VI 1779, v. 8–12) to his literary activities within the circle of Symmachus. Praetextatus' own writings have perhaps not been preserved. He is known to have translated the paraphrases of Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics written by Themistius from Greek into Latin. W. Ensslin believes that he also wrote the *Categoriae decem ex Aristotele decerptae* usually ascribed to Augustine. Ensslin, s.v. Praetextatus, RE XXII, 1579.

[5] CIL VI 1777, 1778, 1779.

[6] CIL VI 1779: *legatus a senatu missus V*; CIL VI 1777: *legato amplissimi ordinis septies et ad impetrandum reb(us) arduis semper opposito.*

[7] CIL VI 1779. According to CIL VI 1777 and CIL VI 1778: *praefectus praetorio II Italiae et Illyrici.* J. Nistler, Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, Klio 10 (1910) 469 believes that Praetextatus was a pretorian prefect twice (in 383 and in 384).

[8] PLRE I, 675, Paulina 4. PLRE I, 187–188, Catullinus 3: Fabius Aconius Catullinus Philomathius, *PPO* 341, *PVR* 324–325, *cos.* 349.

[9] Symm. rel. 12,5. Barrow, Prefect and Emperor, Oxford 1973, 72 proposes December 384 as the date of his death. Praetextatus was still alive on the 9th of December 384 (Cod. Iust. 1,54,5), but dead by the 1st of January 385.

Rome mourned his death: *ad cuius interitum urbs universa commota est.*[10] Symmachus relates that his death caused so great a sorrow that the people of Rome refrained from the usual pleasure of the theatre. Symmachus himself asked for release from the city prefecture, because he was so upset by his friend's death. His own words suggest that he sought consolation in private life: *Et ille quidem functus est lege naturae, nos vero socios animi sui vestrique iudicii tanto dolore confudit, ut otii remedium postulemus.*[11] The emperors granted Symmachus permission to erect statues to Praetextatus in the name of the senate. Inscriptions CIL VI 1778 and 1779a may have been made for the statues erected in the Forum Romanum.[12]

Because Praetextatus had been *pontifex Vestae* and a supporter of the Vestal virgins, he had probably paid most of the expenses of the cult. After his death the Vestal virgins and *sacerdotes virginum Vestalium* decided to erect a statue of their own to him. Symmachus opposed this project because he believed it to be against religious protocol. It is, he said, inappropriate for priestesses of sacred Vesta to pay such homage to men. It did not accord with tradition, because that honour was never given to Numa Pompilius or Metellus or any *pontifex maximus.*[13] H. Bloch interprets this as a difference in spiritual outlook between the two currents in Roman paganism. Peter Brown regards Symmachus' opponents as the extremists of Symmachus' own party.[14]

Symmachus lost this dispute when the chief of the Vestals Coelia Concordia erected a statue in the name of all the Vestal virgins. Praetextatus' widow Paulina erected a statue of Coelia Concordia probably in her own house to thank her for this honour. The inscription engraved on the pedestal of the statue has been preserved (CIL VI 2145). In it Paulina states that Coelia Concordia had erected a statue to Praetextatus, to a man outstanding in every way and worthy to be honoured by the Vestal virgins and priests. Paulina's words and their tone could be understood as a polemic against Symmachus.

---

[10] Hier. ep. 23.

[11] Symm. rel. 10,2.

[12] Symm. rel. 12,2. Ensslin, 1579 (CIL VI 1779a); Nistler, 472 (CIL VI 1778).

[13] Symm. epist. 2,36.

[14] H. Bloch, The Pagan Revival in the West at the End of the Fourth Century, The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century, Oxford 1963, 217–218, n. 6; P. Brown, Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy, JRS 51 (1961) 4.

THE COMPOSITION OF CIL VI 1779

The text of CIL VI 1779 (= CLE 111 = ILS 1259) is written on the four sides of a marble base upon which there may have been a statue of Praetextatus.[15] The text contains Praetextatus' *cursus honorum*: priesthoods and magistracies (part a) and a funerary poem in iambic senarii (parts b, c and d). The poem is a double *laudatio*. In part d Paulina addresses her husband for the last time and praises his qualities and achievements. In parts b and c Praetextatus praises his wife Paulina. There is uncertainty about the correct order of the parts of the inscription.[16] His *cursus honorum* is only mentioned briefly in the poem (1. 18–20), because it is regarded as *caduca ac parva*. Instead of the emphasis on worldly affairs, his intellectual activities get all the attention: literature, philosophy, and religion.

Was the inscription made immediately after Praetextatus' death or after Paulina's death? It is possible that some parts were written after Praetextatus had died and Paulina was still alive, and the rest of the inscription was engraved after her death. It is also probable that the whole inscription was engraved after they both had died.

How was the poem composed? Had the couple decided together to immortalize their marital love and fidelity and mutual ideals, or was it Paulina alone who composed the poem? Could their children have had it made, or some of Praetextatus' friends or supporters? The eulogy of Praetextatus could have been done by Paulina herself after Praetextatus' death and the parts concerning Paulina by her relatives after her death. It is also possible that both eulogies could have been composed by the same person.

Lambrechts supposes that the funerary poem is based on the funerary oration (*laudatio funebris*) delivered by Paulina at Praetextatus' funeral.[17]

---

[15] CIL VI 1779 was found in Rome, was first published in 1750, and is now in the Capitoline Museum in Rome.

[16] Boissier 264 has proposed the order c–d–b: Praetextatus speaks first, Paulina answers, the poem reaches its climax. The order c–b–d has been proposed by J. Cholodniak, Carmina Sepulchralia Latina 1897, n. 55. P. Lambrechts, Op de grens van heidendom en christendom: het grafschrift van Vettius Agorius Praetextatus en Fabia Aconia Paulina, Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en schone Kunsten van Belgie, Klasse der Letteren, XVII,3, Brussel 1955, 11 regards the order b–c–d as the most logical, because it forms a dialogue between husband and wife: Paulina poses a question, Praetextatus answers.

[17] Lambrechts 10, 12–14.

Jerome must have known Paulina's words because in his letter to Marcella concerning the death of a Christian woman, Lea, he refers to Praetextatus as *non palmatus consul, sed sacratus*, that is *consul designatus*. Praetextatus is the opposite of Lea, who is enjoying eternal happiness after her death. Like a triumphant general he had entered the Capitoline hill a few days earlier. Now he was dead, but he had not reached the heavenly palace as his miserable widow pretended, but was rather cast in disgusting darkness: *Nunc desolatus est, nudus, non in lacteo caeli palatio, ut uxor conmentitur infelix, sed in sordentibus tenebris continetur.*[18]

Jerome wrote his letter soon after Lea's death. It is evident from the context of the letter that Praetextatus had died only a little while before her (*ante paucos dies*). Jerome attacks the idea that Praetextatus had become immortal. It has been proposed that Praetextatus' epitaph must have been erected immediately after his death because Jerome had already seen it. Lambrechts has suggested that the *pauci dies* separated the death of Praetextatus from the moment when Jerome wrote his letter to Marcella. It is quite unlikely that the funerary inscription for Praetextatus could have been engraved in such a short time. It is more probable that Jerome heard the funerary speech delivered at the funeral. The ideas expressed in the *laudatio funebris* were inscribed on the epitaph; the poem in the funerary inscription was only a résumé of the speech.[19]

A *laudatio funebris* was an old Roman genre and an essential part of the Roman aristocratic funeral tradition. The *elogium* of an aristocrat had two phases. A *laudatio funebris* was delivered by a member of the family on the rostra on the day of the funeral, and its shortened verse form was inscribed on the tombstone. According to Suetonius, Augustus gave an oration at Drusus' funeral, composed a eulogy both in verse and in prose, and had it engraved on his tombstone.[20] The original eulogy could also be inscribed on the monument, as the so-called *laudatio Turiae* (CIL VI 1527) was. In an inscriptional *elogium* the *gens* of the deceased is introduced, as well as a person's political and administrative career, virtues, habits and

---

[18] Hier. epist. 23,2–3; Lambrechts 9. Praetextatus is not mentioned by name, but there is no doubt about the identity of the consul designate, because Praetextatus was to be consul at the beginning of the next year (Saint Jérôme, Lettres II, ed. J. Labourt, Paris 1951, 8, n. 1).

[19] Lambrechts 9–10, n. 5.

[20] Suet. Claud. 1,5.

cultural and intellectual activities. The eulogy ends with some pious wishes
or consolation.[21] The *laudatio funebris* was still in use in the fourth
century.[22] Lambrechts concludes from Lucianus' narrative on funerals (*De
luctu*) that both men and women delivered funerary orations. If this was still
the custom in Rome at the end of the fourth century it is not unlikely that
Paulina delivered the *laudatio funebris*, and that Jerome reacted to her
strong manifestation of pagan immortality.[23]

Jerome's hostile words refer to the lines of the funerary poem in
which Paulina mourns her husband. She comforts herself, saying that after
her own death she will soon be his again:

His nunc ademptis maesta coniunx maceror,
felix, maritum si superstitem mihi
divi dedissent, sed tamen felix, tua
quia sum fuique postque mortem mox ero.

Paulina, who is *felix* in the funerary poem is emphatically an *uxor in-
felix* in Jerome's letter. Paulina's illusions of heavenly palaces mentioned by
the church father are reminiscent of the words in the funerary poem: *cura*
soforum, porta quis caeli patet.[24] Paulina and her deceased husband are also
mentioned in Jerome's letter to Paula. Again, the widow has illusions of her
husband being transferred to heaven: *Melior diaboli ancilla quam mea est.*
Illa infidelem maritum translatum fingit in caelum. Letting Christ himself
speak in this passage, Jerome contrasts the faith of the pagan Paulina with
the despair of the Christian Paula, whose daughter Blesilla had recently

---

[21] W. Kierdorf, *Laudatio funebris*, Meisenheim 1980, 59; Lambrechts 12–14.

[22] M. Durry, Éloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine, Paris 1950, xxx–xxxi, lxxix. E.g.
Ausonius composed a series of eulogies in commemoration of his relatives and col-
leagues, *Parentalia* and *Commemoratio professorum Burdigalensium*.

[23] Lambrechts 9–10, n. 5. Lucianus (de luctu 13) explains the custom in which the
mother or the father throws herself or himself upon the dead child and expresses sorrow
by speaking loud and clear. I would not interpret this passage as an actual *laudatio*
funebris but simply as a lamentation for the dead. Elsewhere Lucianus (de luctu 23)
mentions that some people deliver funeral orations at the monuments. Neither men nor
women are specially indicated in this text.

[24] Cf. a similar expression in Mart. Cap. 1,97: *uti postridie omnis ille deorum senatus in*
palatia, quae in Galaxia Iovis arbitri habitationem potissimam faciunt.

died.[25]

Symmachus refers to Praetextatus' death in one of his relations to the imperial court. He praises Praetextatus' virtues and writes that the deceased man considered material pleasures transient: *gaudia corporis ut caduca calcavit*.[26] This expression could be an echo of Paulina's words *caduca ac parva* in the funerary poem.

LAUDATIO PAULINAE

The ideal of a Roman wife is presented in Paulina's *laudatio*. Her virtues listed in verse resemble those of earlier centuries. Chastity, purity both in mind and body and marital fidelity are emphasized: *veri et castitatis conscia, ... pudens, fidelis, pura mente et corpore ... fomes pudoris, castitatis vinculum, amorque purus et fides caelo sata. Castitas, pudor* and *fidelitas* are the qualities of a spouse, especially of a wife, often praised in Latin tomb inscriptions.[27]

Paulina is presented not only as a perfect wife but also as a devoted mother, a caring sister and a modest daughter:

> *pietate matris, coniugali gratia,*
> *nexu sororis, filiae modestia.*

Pietas, devotion to family, husband, children, parents and relatives was a highly esteemed feminine value. A good, dutiful wife was a blessing to her

---

[25] Hier. epist. 39,3. L. Cracco Ruggini, Il paganesimo romano tra religione e politica (384–394): per una reinterpretazione del Carmen contra paganos, RAL 8, 23,1 (1979) 3–141; La Donna e il sacro, tra paganesimo e cristianesimo, Atti del II convegno nazionale di studi su la donna nel mondo antico, Torino 18–19–20 aprile 1988, Torino 1989, 274, n. 55) believes that the anonymous senator and his widow mentioned in the so–called *Carmen contra paganos* (v. 115–122) are Praetextatus and Paulina.

[26] Symm. rel. 12,2–4.

[27] Cf. CIL VI 11602 = ILS 8402: Anymone was i.a. *pudica* and *casta*. CIL VIII 11294 = ILS 8444: Postumia Matronilla was *pudica, univira* and *unicuba*. ILS 8394: Murdia was exalted for *modestia, probitas, pudicitia* and *fides*. CIL VI 9499 = CLE 959: Aurelia Philematio is praised for being *fido fida viro, casta* and *pudens*. *Castitas, continentia* and *pudicitia* were especial feminine virtues both in pagan and Christian society, but also qualities of a virtuous man. Ruggini, La Donna, 266; Galletier 123–124.

household, always busy and useful like Paulina *utilis penatibus*.[28]

The so-called *Laudatio Turiae* (CIL VI 1527) is similar to our funerary poem. The husband mourns for the deceased wife to whom he has been married for over 40 years. He shows great gratitude to his wife for her loyalty and devotion to him. Her domestic virtues, such as *pudicitia, obsequium, comitas, facilitas, religio sine superstitione* are exalted. There is no religious element in this inscription, and the only reference to immortality is the veneration of her memory (*desiderem quod immortalitati ad memoriam consecratam tradidi*). In the end the husband hopes that the *manes* will let her lie in peace (*Te di manes tui ut quietam patiantur atque ita tueantur opto*).[29]

TOGETHER IN THE AFTERLIFE

CIL VI 1779 mentions that the marriage of Praetextatus and Paulina lasted 40 years: *Hi coniuncti simul vixerunt annos XL*. Only the husband's death has separated the spouses, but after Paulina's death they will be united again. The couple seems to have had at least one child: *subolemque pulchram, si tuae similis, putant.*

The marriage of Praetextatus and Paulina is celebrated as a holy union created by the gods in heaven. The purity of their marital bed is emphasized:

---

[28] Cf. CIL VIII 11294 = ILS 8444: Postumia Matronilla is mentioned as *mater bona, avia piissima, laboriosa, efficaxs, vigilans, sollicita, totius industriae et fidei matrona*. CIL VI1527, 31670, 37053: *reverentia in patrem, pietas in sororem, tuorum caritas, familiae pietas, lanificium*; CIL VI 11602 = ILS 8402: *lanifica, pia, domiseda*. ILS 8394: *lanificium, diligentia*. CIL I^2 1007 = CIL VI 15346 = CLE 52 = ILS 8403: *domum servavit, lanam fecit. Lanificium*, making wool, was a traditional activity frequently mentioned in inscriptions. It is not mentioned in the case of Paulina but it still appears in Ausonius' praise of his mother (Aus. par. 2,4). D. Flach, Die sogenannte *Laudatio Turiae*, Darmstadt 1991, 38; Durry 39; E. Galletier, Étude sur la poésie funéraire d'après les inscriptions, Paris 1922, 224

[29] CIL VI 1527 = ILS 8393 is often called *Laudatio Turiae* because it had earlier been attributed to Q. Lucretius Vespillo (*cos.* 19 BC) in praise of his wife Turia. Durry shows that this identification is neither proven nor probable. Wistrand agrees with him. Durry lvii–lxii; E. Wistrand, The so–called *Laudatio Turiae*, Lund 1976, 9; R. Lattimore, Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs, Illinois 1942, 278, n. 96; Lambrechts 53.

> *munus deorum, qui maritalem torum*
> *nectunt amicis et pudicis nexibus.*

The pure love of our couple manifested itself as loyalty produced in heaven (*amorq(ue) purus et fides caelo sata*). The husband could expect loyalty and honesty from his wife; they were joined in trust as friends: *et quanta amicis iungimur fiducia*. Praetextatus had entrusted the hidden secrets of his heart to Paulina: *arcana mentis cui reclusa credidi*. Peter Brown writes about the need of intimacy in the later Roman empire. Aristocratic men needed confidantes whom they could trust. Aristocratic women like Paulina were left by their husbands to manage their huge estates while their husbands were involved in political and cultural activities.[30] Paulina is praised for being a helpful and loving, adoring and devoted wife to her husband – *iuvans maritum, diligens, ornans, colens*. The purpose of the poem is to show that Paulina was tied closely and intensely to her husband in all his activites, religious as well as secular.

At the very end of CIL VI 1779 Paulina assures herself that she will be together with her husband in the afterlife. The idea that marital love lasts even after death is a frequent theme in Latin funerary inscriptions. Some epitaphs say that the married couple has been buried in the same grave, their mutual tomb being now their marital bed: *quos iungit tumulus, iunxerat ut thalamus*.[31] In a dialogue between Atimetus and the deceased Homonoea the surviving spouse laments the cruel fate of his wife, while she asks him to stop weeping because tears are useless:

> *parce tuam, coniux, fletu quassare iuventam*
> *fataque maerendo sollicitare mea!*
> *nil prosunt lacrimae nec possunt fata moveri.*[32]

---

[30] Brown, The Body and Society, 15.

[31] CIL VI 25427 = CLE 1142. Cf. a Christian inscription ICUR II 4209 = CLE 1432: the spouse will be *thalami tumulique comis* after death. Other funerary poems of married couples: CLE 1559; CLE 1027.

[32] CIL VI 12652 = CLE 995, from first century Rome. Cf. a dialogue between Aurelius Hermia and Aurelia Philematio from the first century BC: CIL VI 9499 = CLE 959. A dialogue in ancient Greek and Roman funerary poems is usually presented between a dead person and a surviving one. In our poem we have a rare dialogue between the two dead. Lambrechts 14.

Moving farewell words in tomb inscriptions and farewell scenes on reliefs
do not imply any certainty or belief in immortality; on the contrary, pagan
epitaphs contain usually bitter lamentations or gloomy scepticism.[33] The
difference between the resignation in earlier Latin inscriptions and the
happy longing for death in CIL VI 1779 is striking. We find the same
joyous tone in Christian authors, e.g. in Jerome's writings.[34]

The possibility of immortality in an afterlife is frequently denied in
Latin epitaphs, often with the formula *non fui, fui, non sum, non curo*, but
many funeral inscriptions clearly react against this Epicurean nihilism and
play on the same words. Paulina's words *tua quia sum fuique postque
mortem ero* could be interpreted as a manifestation of her belief in life after
death, directed against this scepticism. Though Paulina mourns her
separation from her husband she is optimistic; the word *maceror* is twice
followed by *felix*.[35]

INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES

Paulina had received her conviction of immortality from mystery
cults, having taken part in Praetextatus' religious activities. In the funerary
poem she tells how her husband had guided her to all the mysteries and thus
freed her from death:

> *tu me, marite, disciplinarum bono*
> *puram ac pudicam sorte mortis eximens*
> *in templa ducis ac famulam divis dicas;*
> *te teste cunctis imbuor mysteriis.*

Praetextatus had prepared his wife for sacred rites:

> *tu Dindymenes Atteosq(ue) antistitem*
> *teletis honoras taureis consors pius;*

---

[33] Lattimore 249; Lambrechts 51, 53.

[34] E.g. Hier. ep. 23; ep. 39.

[35] E.g. CIL VI 13528 = CLE 1559: *Quod fueram non sum, sed rursus ero quod modo
non sum*. Tertullian has the same play on words, apol. 48,6: *Qui non eras, factus es, cum
iterum non eris, fies*. Lambrechts 50–52.

Hecates ministram trina secreta edoces
Cererisque Graiae tu sacris dignam paras.

CIL VI 1779 and CIL VI 1780 show that Paulina was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries (*apud Eleusinam*), and the Lernan mysteries (*apud Laernam*) of Dionysus and Demeter, and into the cults of Hecate (*sacrata apud Eginam Hecatae; hierophantria*), Magna Mater (*tauroboliata*) and Isis (*isiaca*).

The words *te teste cunctis imbuor mysteriis* indicate that Praetextatus was a witness for Paulina before the gods. He had led her into their temples and dedicated her to the gods as their servant. He had taught her the secrets of the cults and prepared her to be worthy of divine rites (1. 24, 28–29). Praetextatus not only testified to her readiness and suitability for initiation, but was also the witness of the gods before Paulina. He witnessed that the gods had accepted her and the right moment had come.[36]

The same aspect of witnessing is found in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, where Lucius urgently desires to be initiated into the mysteries of Isis. The request is refused because Lucius has not yet been "invited". The goddess will let her priest know when the time has come to initiate Lucius into her mysteries. The priest, as a double *testis*, speaks for Lucius in front of Isis.[37]

A woman initiated by her husband also appears in an epitaph on a sarcophagus from Ravenna. C. Sosius Iulianus and his wife Tetratia Isias have a conversation for the last time. The wife thanks her husband for having initiated her into the mysteries and taught her to say the ritual words (ἀοίδιμα γράμματα) to the goddess in the face of death. Like Paulina (1. 23), she has learned sacred secrets from her husband that save her from death. These passwords are ritual formulae that help the deceased on his way to the afterlife. The reliefs and signa on the sarcophagus belong to the cult of Isis. In the initiation scene the husband ritually opens the wife's eyes with balsam; they hold a book together in their hands.[38]

---

[36] A.J. Festugière, Initiée par l'epoux, MMAI 53 (1963) 136–138.

[37] Apul. met. 11,21: *Nec minus in dies mihi magis magisque accipiendorum sacrorum cupido gliscebat, summisque precibus, primarium sacerdotem saepissime conveneram petens ut me noctis sacratae tandem arcanis initiaret ... Nam et diem quo quisque possit initiari deae nutu demonstrari, et sacerdotem qui sacra debeat ministrare eiusdem providentia deligi ...*

[38] Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiae, coll. L. Vidman, Berlin 1969, n. 586. The inscription from the second century is written in Greek but in Latin letters. I

In his Advice on Marriage Plutarch had written that husbands should make their wives conform to their choice of gods as well as of friends. It was the duty of a good wife to worship only the gods of her husband and not to perform any foreign rites and superstitions.[39] He warned that if women were left to themselves they conceived strange ideas and low emotions; that is why the husband ought to be the philosophical mentor and the moral guide of his wife. As a result of his quiet authority the husband could expect appreciation and gratitude from his wife.[40] Paulina's words show appropriate respect for her husband:

patriam, senatum coniugemq(ue) inluminas
probitate mentis, moribus, studiis simul,
virtutis apicem quis supremum nanctus es.

Because of her husband she is known and blessed throughout the world:

Te propter omnis me beatam, me piam
celebrant, quod ipse me bonam, disseminas
totum per orbem: ignota noscor omnibus.

Vidman refers to several inscriptions from the third and fourth centuries in which husbands initiate their wives into mystery cults. However, Brown regards the marriage of Praetextatus and Paulina, where Praetextatus took in hand the religious education of his wife, as an exception in the fourth century. Religious differences within an aristocratic family usually seem to have been either tolerated or ignored. In mixed

---

have followed the interpretation of the last two lines proposed by Festugière and accepted by Vidman. Vidman, Sylloge, 268; R. Egger was the first to understand the mystic meaning of the reliefs. Festugière 137–144; Egger, Zwei oberitalienische Mystensarkophage, MDAI(R) 4 (1951) 37, 51–53, 57–58; Vidman, Isis und Sarapis bei den Griechen und Römern, Berlin 1970, 130–137.

[39] Plut. praec. con. 19,140D: Ἰδίους οὐ δεῖ φίλους κτᾶσθαι τὴν γυναῖκα, κοινοῖς δὲ χρῆσθαι τοῖς τοῦ ἀνδρός. Οἱ δὲ θεοὶ φίλοι πρῶτοι καὶ μέγιστοι. Διὸ καὶ θεοὺς οὓς ὁ ἀνὴρ νομίζει σέβεσθαι τῇ γαμετῇ καὶ γιγνώσκειν μόνους προσήκει... Ruggini, La donna, 263, presumes that this passage is a warning of the dangers of Christianity. Plutarch composed his Advice on Marriage to a Greek couple, Pollianus and Eurydice ca. 100 AD.

[40] Plut. praec. con. 48,145E. Brown, The Body and Society, 13.

marriages between pagans and Christians particularly, the husband had to accept the religious conviction of his Christian wife. Plutarch's advice was not generally followed by the Roman aristocracy in the fourth century.[41]

THE RHETORIC OF CIL VI 1779

CIL VI 1779 presents the marriage of Praetextatus and Paulina as filled with harmony; for example, in the expression *iugi fideli simplici concordia..* Kate Cooper calls this the rhetoric of conjugal unity. Aristocratic families publicized marital concord in order to assert the moral character of the husband.[42] A man who was able to live in harmony with his legitimate wife could be supposed to harmonize polis, agora and friends.[43] The use of representations of conjugal relationships was a code for dealing with the problem of self–control.

The contradiction between Paulina's traditional female virtues described in the funerary laudation and her obviously active role in Late Roman society is striking. The rhetoric of conjugal unity explains why Paulina was depicted as an example of female modesty and piety. Here she was intended to represent her husband; her virtues carried implicit meanings about Praetextatus. She may have been a poetess and influential person in the private and religious spheres, but in public she had to be defined in relation to her husband.

University of Helsinki

---

[41] Vidman, Isis und Sarapis, 136–138; Brown, Aspects 6; M.R. Salzman, Aristocratic women: conductors of Christianity in the fourth century, Helios 16 (1989) 214. Brown has stated that the situation was even the reverse: aristocratic wives and mothers gradually influenced their husbands and children, converting them to Christianity. Salzman challenges this view, stating that the role of aristocratic women in the Christianization of the Roman aristocracy after Constantine has been greatly overemphasized.

[42] K. Cooper, Insinuations of Womanly Influence: An Aspect of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy, JRS 82 (1992) 151. Cooper's article discusses the classical rhetoric of womanly influence in a man's private life in both a negative (a woman as a seductress) and a positive version (female family members persuade a man to hear the voice of reason). A wife was acting either on behalf of the common good or as a lurid temptress. The Roman male discourse about female power served as a rhetorical strategy within the competition for power among males themselves. Cooper 151–156, 163.

[43] Plut. praec. con. 43,144C; Brown, The Body and Society, 14; Cooper 153.

ZUR FRAGE DER ROMANISIERUNG DURCH DAS HEER IN GERMANIA INFERIOR AM BEISPIEL KAISERKULT

UTA-MARIA LIERTZ

Namque ut homines (...) per voluptates adsuescerent, hortari privatim, adiuvare publice, ut templa fora domos extruerent (Tac. Agr. 21,1). So beschreibt Tacitus die kulturisierende d.h. romanisierende Tätigkeit des Agricola während der Winterpause in der Unterwerfung Britanniens. Gemeinhin wird den römischen Legionen durch ihre Eroberungen und ihren Aufbau einer ersten Infrastruktur in neueroberten Gebieten die Hauptrolle bei der Romanisierung zugeschrieben und das in vieler Hinsicht sicher zu Recht. Wie aber sieht es mit seinem weiteren Einfluß aus, nachdem die erste Eroberung abgeschlossen ist und *templa fora domus exstructa sunt*? Kann man tatsächlich von einem starken Einfluß sprechen?[1] Dieser Frage soll auf der Grundlage der Inschriften für Germania Inferior – nicht, wie das Agricolazitat vermuten lassen könnte, für Britannia – nachgegangen werden. Die Germania Inferior bietet durch ihre Randstellung und den damit verbundenen langandauernden hohen Militärpräsenzgrad einerseits und durch die weitentwickelte Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensis als zivilen Gegenpol andererseits ein – fast – ideales Forschungsfeld. Fast, denn die rasch überschaubare Inschriftenzahl könnte sich leicht als trügerisch erweisen. Ein geeignetes "Objekt" findet sich im Komplex Kaiserkult, der zugleich als Instrument und als "Thermometer" für den Romanisierungsgrad gelten kann.[2]

Dabei scheint es sinnvoll zwischen direktem und indirektem Kaiserkult zu unterscheiden. Zum direkten Kaiserkult sind alle die Inschriften zu

---

[1] D. Fishwick, Imperial Cult in the Latin West (im folgenden abgekürzt: ICLW) 2, 1 (1991), 413 Anm. 60 merkt an: "Indeed, civilian cult as a whole must have been largely influenced by military in a province like Britain. This is true at least of northern Britain, as of Belgica and the Germanies".

[2] Selbstverständlich handelt es sich beim Kaiserkult nur um einen von vielen Aspekten der Romanisierung, aber er kann doch wohl als exemplarisch angesehen werden.

zählen, die den bzw. die Kaiser in Form von *genius Imperatoris* oder *numen Augusti* als Objekt verehren oder aber ein Priesteramt belegen. In der Germania Inferior sind uns drei *genius-*, eine *numen-*, sechs *sacerdos-* und acht *sevir Augustalis*-Inschriften überliefert.[3] Zum indirekten Kult gehören Weihungen an Götter und Personifikationen mit dem Epithet Augustus[4] und rund dreißig Inschriften mit der Formel *in h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae)*.[5] Schließlich werden auch 21 Inschriften mit Formulierungen wie *pro salute* o.ä. hinzugezogen, die sich für unsere Fragestellung als aufschlußreich erweisen.[6]

Zeitlich gesehen sind die ersten beiden datierten Inschriften aus den letzten Monaten der Regierung Neros[7] und die späteste ein *sacerdos-*Grabstein aus dem Jahr 352 n. Chr.,[8] der größte Teil, wie ja auch sonst belegt,[9] vom Ende des zweiten bis zur Mitte des dritten Jahrhunderts. Es ist also zunächst festzuhalten, daß es sich nicht um den Zeitraum der "Erstromanisierung", der Eroberung und z.B. mutmaßlichen Errichtung

---

[3] CIL XIII 8001; BerRGK 1959, 212; BerRGK 1977, 169; CIL XIII 8502, 7918, 8244, 8727, 8772; BerRGK 1937, 162; 225; CIL XIII 7834, 8499, 8742, 8807; BerRGK 1927, 262; BerRGK 1959, 218, 229; B. und H. Galsterer, Neue Inschriften aus Köln - Funde der Jahre 1974-1979, ES 12 (1981), Nr. 5. Nicht einbezogen werden die Weihungen von zwei Statthaltern, die ihrer Zugehörigkeit zum Sodales-Kollegium Ausdruck verleihen, CIL XIII 8006, 8007. Ihr Priesteramt ist unerreichbar für die meisten, die Kaiserüberhöhung in Gedichtform (8007) zu sublim, um einen ernsthaften Einfluß auf den lokalen Kult ausüben zu können. Zu 8007 vgl. D. Fishwick, ICLW 2, 1, 445; sonst W. Eck, Religion und Religiosität in der soziopolitischen Führungsschicht der hohen Kaiserzeit, in: ders. (Hg.) Religion und Gesellschaft in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Kölner historische Abhandlungen 35 (1989) 15-51.

[4] Victoria Aug. CIL XIII 8035; 2x Mercur. Aug. CIL XIII 8223; B. und H. Galsterer, ES 12, Nr. 13; m. E. hinzuzuziehen Mithras CIL XIII 8523, 8524.

[5] Belege s. u. differenziert S. 9 f.

[6] Belege S.3 f. Obwohl *pro salute*-Inschriften wie auch m. E. die *in h. d. d.*-Formel nicht Kaiserkult im eigentlichen Sinne sind, bilden sie als Zeugnisse der Kaiserehrung einen wichtigen Bezugspunkt für das Verständnis desselben.

[7] CIL XIII 8701, Ch. B. Rüger, Römische Inschriftenfunde aus dem Rheinland 1978-1982, ES 13 (1983) Nr. 44.

[8] CIL XIII 7918.

[9] Vgl. z.B. E. A. Meyer, Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs, JRS 80 (1990), 74-96; T. Derks, La perception du Panthéon Romain par une élite indigène: Le cas des inscriptions votives de la Germanie Inférieure, MEFRA 104 (1992) 1, S. 7-23.

eines Kaiserkultzentrums in Köln handelt[10] – aus dieser Zeit ist kein inschriftliches Zeugnis überliefert. Vielmehr ist bereits ein Menschenalter seit der Eroberung und damit an ständiger Berührung von "römischem" und "einheimischem", von "militärischem" und "zivilem" vergangen.

Wenn man die Anzahl an Inschriften als Gradmesser für die Verbreitung und Akzeptanz der einzelnen Phänomene und damit als Grad von Romanisierung betrachtet, mag vor der Behandlung der Einzelaspekte noch ein Blick auf die geographische Verteilung der Inschriften erlaubt sein. Aus dem nördlichen Bereich der Germania Inferior stammen lediglich 4 der 24 zum Kult gehörigen Inschriften und 4 der *pro salute*-Inschriften, während alle übrigen aus dem Köln-Bonner Raum kommen.

Um Spuren militärischen Einflusses bei der Provinzbevölkerung zu folgen, müssen zunächst die militärischen von den zivilen Inschriften unterschieden werden: Als militärisch werden alle jene Zeugnisse betrachtet, in denen ein militärischer Amtsträger oder eine Einheit als Dedikant, d.h. als "Kaiserkult-Ausführender" genannt sind oder sonst der militärische Zusammenhang eindeutig ist. Zu den zivilen Personen gehören in erster Linie die Sacerdotes und Sevirn, sodann auch Weihungen durch lokale Einrichtungen wie *ordo decurionum*, *vicani* und Berufs- oder andere Vereine. Im Falle von Angehörigen der Oberschicht läßt sich natürlich eine – in der Regel jedoch spätere – militärische Tätigkeit nicht ausschließen. In der Inferior haben wir hierfür aber keinen positiven Beleg. Eine Anzahl von Inschriften entzieht sich selbstverständlich durch ihren fragmentarischen Zustand einer Klassifizierung.

Nähern wir uns dem Kaiserkult sozusagen von außen nach innen. Außer einer Dedikation der Legio VI Victrix an Vespasian[11] und einer weiteren an Diva Iulia (Domna) durch die Legio I Minervia,[12] die beide ganz in römischer Tradition verwurzelt sind, interessieren hier zunächst die zwanzig Inschriften mit *pro salute* oder ähnlichen Ausdrücken. Sie sind insofern interessant, als sie viel über die Einschätzung der Person des Kaisers verraten: Seine Verletzbarkeit ist in dem geäußerten Wunsch *pro salute*, fast immer mit konkretem Namen versehen,[13] implizit enthalten. Trotz seiner

---

[10] Vgl. dazu D.Fishwick, ICLW 1, 1 (1987), 137 ff..

[11] Ch. B. Rüger, ES 13, Nr. 45.

[12] CIL XIII 12042.

[13] Ausnahmen: CIL XIII 7865, 8238, 8492, 8854; BerRGK 1927, 254; M. Clauss, Neue Inschriften im Rheinischen Landesmuseum Bonn, ES 11 (1976), Nr. 14. In CIL XIII

herausragenden Stellung und seinen, zumindest oft, vergöttlichten Vorfahren, müssen andere "normale" Götter zu seinem Heil angerufen werden. 14 der 20 Inschriften sind datiert, 2 in die Zeit des Antoninus Pius,[14] eine für Marc Aurel,[15] eine für Diocletian[16] und 7 in den Zeitraum von 211-244 n Chr.[17] Diese 12 sind alle von militärischen Einheiten oder Würdenträgern gesetzt. Zwei dem Mars *pro salute Neronis* geweihte Steine[18] in Rindern und Xanten wurden von *cives Remi* bzw. *cives Lingonum* aufgestellt. Nach C. B. Rügers Interpretation[19] muß man hier direkte Einflußnahme von seiten des Militärs, in dessen Umgebung sich diese Händler- oder Handwerkergruppen niedergelassen hatten, annehmen. Von den 6 nicht datierbaren Inschriften ist bei zweien[20] kein Dedikant mehr sichtbar, bei einer ist lediglich der Rest eines Namens,[21] bei einer weiteren drei Männer und eine Frau als Stifter genannt,[22] wodurch man wohl auf zivile Herkunft schließen kann. Einen Stein schließlich weiht ein Kultverein der Magna Mater.[23] Die sechste undatierte Inschrift ist wieder eindeutig von Soldaten aufgestellt.[24] Vom Dedikanten her gesehen handelt es sich also bei *pro salute*-Inschriften um ein vom Militär beherrschtes Phänomen, das von der Zivilbevölkerung nur zufällig bisweilen übernommen wurde. Von einem Beispieleffekt kann man in diesem Fall also kaum sprechen. Ein Blick auf die Palette der angerufenen Götter dagegen läßt eher den Eindruck entstehen, daß das Heer "germanisiert" wurde: Neben sechs ausschließlich römischen Göttern geweihten stehen immerhin sieben, die in die Götterreihe einheimische Göt-

---

8203 ist durch Konsulatsdatierung offensichtlich, welcher Kaiser gemeint ist.

[14] CIL XIII 8036, 8517.

[15] CIL XIII 8203.

[16] CIL XIII 8019.

[17] CIL XIII 7793, 7944, 7996, 8201, 8607, 8811 und 11984.

[18] CIL XIII 8701; Ch. B. Rüger, ES 13, Nr. 44.

[19] Vindex cum inermi provincia? Zu einer weiteren Neronischen Marsinschrift vom Rhein, ZPE 43 (1981) 329-335, hier v.a. 333 ff..

[20] BerRGK 1927, 254; M. Clauss, ES 11, Nr. 14.

[21] CIL XIII 8854.

[22] CIL XIII 8238, vgl. B. und H. Galsterer, Die römischen Steininschriften aus Köln. Wissenschaftliche Kataloge des Römisch-Germanischen Museums (im folgenden abgekürzt: Steininschriften), 1975, 123.

[23] CIL XIII 7865.

[24] CIL XIII 8492 = B. und H. Galsterer, Steininschriften, 39; vgl. auch G. Alföldy, Die Hilfstruppen der römischen Provinz Germania Inferior, ES 6 (1968), Nr. 184.

ter wie verschiedene Matrones[25] oder römische Götter mit einheimischen Beinamen[26] einreihen, wozu natürlich die Rekrutierung aus den Provinzen beigetragen haben wird. In vier Fällen beginnt der Text mit der Formel *in h. d. d.*,[27] was offenbar nicht als Widerspruch empfunden wurde.

Den Übergang zu einem weiteren Phänomen, dem des Epithets *Augustus*, stellt eine Weihinschrift aus Bonn dar:[28] Nach *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo)* und *[Marti] Propugnatori* werden *Victoriae* und *Saluti Imperatoris Severi Alexandri* etc. angerufen, also nicht wie üblich die Götter *pro salute*. Die Kombination von der Göttin Victoria mit *pro salute*[29] oder *optans salutem pro reditu*[30] ist durchaus geläufig, die Personifizierung der *Salus Imperatoris* jedoch ziemlich außergewöhnlich.[31]

Aber auch durch das Epithet *Augustus* kann man den Kaiser in den Wirkungsbereich eines Gottes bringen.[32] In der Inferior sind sehr wenige Zeugnisse erhalten. In Bonn ist im Jahr 222 n. Chr. vom Statthalter und den Legionslegaten eine Dedikation an *Victoria Augusta* durchgeführt und die Inschrift von einem Primus Pilus besorgt worden.[33] Während sich in der Superior mehrere Zeugnisse für *Vic(toria) Aug(usta)* finden, ist dies in der Inferior das einzige und auch das einzige militärische Beispiel für das Epithet *Augustus*. In Köln allerdings finden sich zwei Inschriften mit *Mercurius Augustus* – auch hierfür in der Superior wenigstens acht. Eine Inschrift steht im Zusammenhang mit einem Tempel für den besagten Gott, dediziert

---

[25] Abirenes CIL XIII 8492, Aufanes CIL XIII 11984, auch Ancamna BerRGK 1926, 254.

[26] Hercules Magusanus CIL XIII 8492, Mars Lenus BerRGK 1926, 254, Camulus CIL XIII 8701, Cicolluis Ch. B. Rüger, ES 13, Nr. 44, Diana Mahalin. CIL XIII 8492.

[27] CIL XIII 7944, 8019, 8607 und 8811.

[28] CIL XIII 8017.

[29] CIL XIII 8492.

[30] CIL XIII 7793.

[31] Im gesamten Bereich des CIL XIII ist dies der einzige Fall, in Rom in den Arvalakten CIL VI 2103.

[32] Das bedeutet sicher nicht eine Identifizierung mit dem besagten Gott - bisher wären es 111 verschiedene Gottheiten. Vgl. D. Fishwick, ICLW 2, 1, 446-448. Für die Identifizierung spricht sich z.B. D. Ladage, Soziale Aspekte des Kaiserkults, in: W. Eck - H. Galsterer - H. Wolff, Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte (Festschrift F. Vittinghoff), 1980, 378 aus.

[33] CIL XIII 8035, vgl. W. Eck, Die Statthalter der germanischen Provinzen vom 1.-3. Jh., ES 14 (1985), S. 207.

nach der Revision von O. Doppelfeld vom Ordo der Colonia Claudia Arae Agrippinensis.[34] Die ergänzte Formulierung *[pro salute impera]toris Titi Caesari[s Vespasiani Aug(usti)]* macht die bewußte Unterscheidung zwischen einem Hilfe spenden könnenden Gott und dem schutzbedürftigen Kaiser deutlich.[35] Die zweite Kölner Inschrift ist in ihren Ergänzungen sowohl, was die Dedikantennamen als auch was die Götter angeht, umstritten,[36] und damit auch ob der möglicherweise zu ergänzende Name *[Merc]uri[o]* tatsächlich das Epithet *Augustus* trug. Galsterer hält als Dedikantengruppe neben Kult- oder Berufsvereinen durchaus auch eine militärische Einheit für möglich. Die überlieferten Namen und Namensreste weisen viele im Rheinland beliebte Formen auf.[37] In der Frage nach dem Einfluß des Heeres bringen uns diese Inschriften allerdings kaum weiter.

Kurz eingegangen werden soll aber noch auf Mithras. Zwar ist die bei anderen Göttern übliche Form der Inbezugstellung durch *Augustus* nicht überliefert,[38] aber es wäre verwunderlich, wenn bei Mithras oder Sol Invictus keinerlei Verhältnis zum Kaiserkult hergestellt werden könnte. Schließlich sind die wohl hauptsächlich von Soldaten und Seeleuten verbreiteten Kulte orientalischer Sonnengottheiten durch das Heer auch nach Germanien gelangt. Durch die Förderung dieser Kulte durch viele der Kaiser Ende des zweiten bis ins dritte Jahrhundert hinein wurde oft die Grenze zwischen Gott und Kaiser verwischt, so beispielsweise bei Elagabal und Aurelian. Für "den kleinen Mann" dürfte die Unterscheidung – wie auch für den heutigen Betrachter – nicht leicht gewesen sein. Sollte ein *Imp.* in einer Weihung *D(eo) S(oli) I(nvicto) Imp(eratori)* nicht vielleicht doch die gewünschte Verbindung herstellen? Im Mithraeum von Dormagen finden sich zwei solche von Soldaten der selben militärischen Einheit gesetzte Inschriften.[39] Wie dem auch sei, es zeigt sich, daß bzgl. Mithras das Heer

---

[34] CIL XIII 8236 = AE 1969/70, 441, ebenda der Text von O. Doppelfeld. Der Tempel konnte archäologisch noch nicht nachgewiesen werden, H.G. Horn, Die Römer in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Stuttgart 1987, 486.

[35] T. Bechert, Römisches Germanien zwischen Rhein und Maas (=Ger II inf.), 1982, 227 sieht hier tatsächlich einen gemeinsamen Tempel für Merkur und Titus.

[36] B. und H. Galsterer, ES 12, Nr. 13.

[37] Ebenda S. 245.

[38] Allerdings 1x in Germania Superior, M. Vermaseren, Corpus Inscriptionum et monumentorum religionis Mithriacae 2 (1960) 1352.

[39] CIL XIII 8523, 8524. Vgl. G. Alföldy, Hilfstruppen, ES 6, S. 28, 104, 183. Vgl. M. Clauss, Mithras. Kult und Mysterien, 1990, 35.

den "Romanisierungserwartungen" Genüge getan hat: Von den insgesamt zehn Mithrasinschriften in der Inferior sind jeweils fünf militärisch bzw. zivil.[40]

Zu einem Kernpunkt des Kaiserkultes führt die Frage der Verehrung des *Genius Imperatoris* und die seines Numens. Taeger bezeichnet den Geniuskult als "die Seele des Kaiserkultes, die im ganzen Reich die eigentlich dominante Erscheinung blieb".[41] Für die germanischen Provinzen scheint sich das nicht zu bestätigen. Außer einer bildlichen Darstellung auf der großen Mainzer Jupitersäule in der Superior[42] sind in der Inferior drei Weihungen an IOM und den Genius des Kaisers erhalten, und zwar alle aus dem militärischen Umfeld. Die erste ist von einem Centurio der Legio I Minervia in Köln um die Wende vom 1. zum 2. Jahrhundert *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) et Genio Imp(eratoris)* geweiht,[43] eine weitere errichten in Bonn im Jahr 216 n. Chr. zwei Benefiziarier der selben Legion *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) et genio d(omini) n(ostri) M(arci) Aur(elii) Antonini et genio cast- rorum.*[44] Die dritte, eine Bauinschrift aus Lessenich richtet sich an *I(upiter) O(ptimus) M(aximus)*, *Fortuna*, den *genius loci* und den des Antoninus Pius, Name und Rang des Aufstellers sind leider nicht erhalten,[45] die räumliche Nähe zum Legionslager dürfte aber einen militärischen Zusammenhang sicher machen. Bei einer so geringen Anzahl von Zeugnissen kann man sicher nicht von einem verwurzelten Kult des *genius Imperatoris* sprechen. In anderen Gebieten, etwa der Superior oder in Britannia ist im Zeitraum unserer Geniusinschriften die sehr viel ausdrucksstärkere Numenverehrung in vollem Gange.[46] Hier dagegen scheint die Genius-Verehrung von der im dritten Jahrhundert sich schnell ausbreitenden *in h. d. d.*-Formel direkt abge- löst worden zu sein. Die zivile Bevölkerung hat der Geniuskult des Kaisers

---

[40] Vgl. B. H. Stolte, Religiöse Verhältnisse in Niedergermanien, ANRW 2, 18, 1 (1986), 612 f.; in Anm. 52 eine Liste der Inschriften.

[41] Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes 2 (1960), 135.

[42] W. Selzer, Römische Steindenkmäler. Mainz in römischer Zeit. Katalog zur Sammlung der Steinhalle des Landesmuseums Mainz, 1988, 89 f..

[43] BerRGK 1959, 212 = B. und H. Galsterer, Steininschriften 64.

[44] BerRGK 1977, 169.

[45] CIL XIII 8001.

[46] In der Germania Superior immerhin 22 Inschriften mit *num. Aug.*, zu Britannia vgl. D. Fishwick, ICLW 2,1, 400 ff..

nicht einmal gestreift.[47] Dem einzigen *numen*-Zeugnis, in der Formel *devoti numini maiestatique*[48] aus dem Kastell Divitia, einer Ehrung Konstantins, kann für ein Verständnis des Kaiserkultes sicher kaum etwas abgewonnen werden und noch weniger für den zu diesem Zeitpunkt in Köln sicher abgeschlossenen Romanisierungsprozeß.

Dies mag ein Blick auf die Priesterinschriften, die naturgemäß ziviler Herkunft sind, verdeutlichen. Vier Inschriften mit *sacerdos* bzw. *sacerdotalis* stammen aus Köln oder von Kölner Dekurionen, davon sind zwei Grabinschriften, die anderen beiden Weihungen an verschiedene Göttinnen. Am eindeutigsten ist der Grabstein des Masclinius Maternus aus dem Jahr 352 n. Chr., dessen Laufbahn als *decurio c(oloniae) A(grippinensis)* die Ämter eines Aedil, Duumvir, Curator und Sacerdos umfaßte und der mit dem Titel *ex comitibus* seine munizipalen Pflichten als erfüllt hinter sich läßt.[49] Hier ebenso wie bei Claudius Iustus, einem *IIviralis [sac]erdotalis [c(oloniae) C(laudiae)] A(rae) A(grippinensis)*, handelt es sich sicher um Priester des munizipalen Kaiserkultes der Colonia.[50] Diese Inschrift ist übrigens den Aufanien geweiht und keineswegs einem kaiserlichen Numen oder Attribut. Die andere Weihung an *Semelae et sororibus* ist im Zusammenhang mit Bacchusmysterien zu sehen, die Angabe am Ende *sub sacerdotal(e) Seranio Catullo patre* könnte aber durchaus das Munizipalpriesteramt z.B. als Datierungsmittel erwähnen.[51] Die letzte, recht fragmentarische Inschrift gibt uns die Variante *sacerdos*, also vielleicht einen amtierenden Munizipalpriester.[52] Die Inschrift ist insofern interessant, als man einen Bezug zwischen städtischem Leben und Militär herstellen kann: Der Vater – und Errichter der Grabinschrift – dieses *sacerdos* ist *praefectus classis Germaniae p(iae) f(idelis)*, wie uns eine Weihung von Vater und Sohn an

---

[47] Anders die Verehrung des *genius loci*, wie ein Blick in die Indices des CIL belehrt.

[48] CIL XIII 8502.

[49] CIL XIII 7918. Zu *ex comitibus* vgl. O. Seeck, RE IV, 636. Auch bei der erwähnten Cura handelt es sich am ehesten um eine munizipale.

[50] BerRGK 1937, 162. So auch J. Deininger, Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr., (Vestigia 6) 1965, 112 ff. und G. Rupprecht, Untersuchungen zum Dekurionenstand in den nordwestlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches, 1975, 205; dagegen H. Nesselhauf, BerRGK 1937 ebenda.

[51] CIL XIII 8244; vgl. J. Deininger, Provinziallandtage, 114; H. G. Horn, Römer in Nordrhein-Westfalen, 282; *pater* hier als Bezeichnung des Mystengrades.

[52] BerRGK 1937, 225.

Jupiter mitteilt.[53] Ist der Sohn noch während der Erfüllung seiner munizipalen Pflichten gestorben, bevor er den Spuren seines Vaters in der Ritterlaufbahn folgen konnte? In diesem Fall hätten wir einen Hinweis auf die in anderen Provinzen öfters belegten Aufstiegsmöglichkeiten der munizipalen Oberschicht auf Reichsebene,[54] was wiederum einen hohen Romanisierungsgrad in Köln voraussetzt.

Zu einer weniger einflußreichen, aber doch wohlhabenden Schicht der Bevölkerung gehören die *seviri Augustales*. Von den acht uns in der Inferior bekannten, gehören sechs wohl zum Kölner Sevirkollegium,[55] zwei bezeichnen sich als *sevir Aug(ustalis) c(oloniae) U(lpiae) T(raianae)*.[56] Unter diesen Sevirn vermerkt nur einer seinen Freigelassenenstatus.[57] Eine Verbindung zum Militär in irgendeiner Form ist nicht herzustellen. Aber immerhin zeigt die Existenz solcher Kollegien[58] den Grad an Romanisierung, im Sinne von städtischem Leben, Wohlhaben und daher Profilierungswunsch der Reicheren – in der Colonia Ulpia Traiana sind dies jedenfalls die ersten Anzeichen. Die insgesamt geringe Anzahl an Inschriften ist hier sicher nicht nur auf die niederrheinische Steinarmut zurückzuführen.[59] Dies zeigen eigentlich deutlich zwei Inschriften von Priestern anderer Provinzen, die in der Nordinferior errichtet wurden, von einem *sacerdos Romae et Augusti* aus der benachbarten belgischen Colonia Morinorum[60] und ein *flamen ann[uus?]* aus der pannonischen Colonia Savaria.[61]

Seit dem Beginn des dritten Jahrhunderts überflutet die Formel *in h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae)* die nordwestlichen Provinzen. Als geradlinige

---

[53] CIL XIII 8198.

[54] Wie z. B. Iulius Camillus aus Aventicum CIL XIII 5093, 5094; für Beispiele aus den spanischen Provinzen s. R. Etienne, Le Culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien, 1958, 152 ff..

[55] CIL XIII 7834, 8499; BerRGK 1927, 262; BerRGK 1959, 218, 229; B. und H. Galsterer, Neue Inschriften aus Köln II: Funde der Jahre 1980-1982, ES 13 (1983), Nr. 5.

[56] CIL XIII 8742, 8807.

[57] BerRGK 1959, 218; vgl. L. Lazzaro, Esclaves et affranchis en Belgique et Germanies romaines: une approche d'après les sources épigraphiques. Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne 102, 1993, S. 246, Nr. 282.

[58] Auf ihre Funktion und Aufgaben soll an dieser Stelle nicht eingegangen werden, vgl. dazu R. Duthoy, Les *Augustales, ANRW 2, 16, 2 (1978), 1253-1309.

[59] So etwa Ch. B. Rüger, ZPE 43 (1981), 329.

[60] CIL XIII 8727.

[61] CIL XIII 8772.

Loyalitätserklärung[62] wird sie allen möglichen Weihinschriften vorange-
stellt – oft jedoch außerhalb des eigentlichen Textzusammenhangs, manch-
mal, so läßt die falsche Interpunktion vermuten, ohne verstanden worden zu
sein. In der Inferior sind rund die Hälfte dieser Inschriften von Personen aus
dem Heer gesetzt worden,[63] fast alle sind datiert. Von der anderen Hälfte ist
der größere Teil so fragmentarisch erhalten, daß über den Aufsteller keine
Aussagen gemacht werden können.[64] Fünf wurden von verschiedenen
Vereinen errichtet, eine von einem Sevir Augustalis.[65] Vielleicht darf man
daraus schließen, daß diese Art der wenn auch nur formelhaften
Kaiserverehrung sich gleicherweise und gleichzeitig im zivilen wie
militärischen Bereich ausgebreitet hat. Das numerische Übergewicht und die
größere Genauigkeit bzgl. der Datierung auf militärischer Seite ist wohl zum
einen auf die üblichere Praxis zurückzuführen und zum anderen auf die
größere Notwendigkeit, Loyalität zum jeweiligen Kaiser zu bezeugen.

    Welche Schlußfolgerungen lassen die bisherigen Betrachtungen zum
Aspekt "Einfluß des Heeres auf den zivilen Kaiserkult" zu? Es sieht
schlichtweg so aus, als gäbe es keinen solchen Einfluß. Vielmehr zeigen die
Inschriften ein Nebeneinander von zivilem Kult und militärischen
Kultäußerungen. Auf ziviler Seite werfen fast ausschließlich
Priesterinschriften, also personenbezogene Zeugnisse, Licht auf den Kult
und zeigen, daß der Kult in erster Linie als Profilierungsmittel, das Amt als
Statussymbol diente. Dieser Aspekt tritt im Laufe der Zeit sogar vor den der
Loyalitätsbezeugung. Hier brauchte und konnte das Heer keinerlei Einfluß
ausüben. Sobald ein gewisser Wohlstand und bürgerrechtlicher Status z.B.
als Colonia erreicht war, entwickelte sich ein solcher Kult in Eigendynamik.
Daß dies bereits einen hohen Grad an "Romanisiertheit" voraussetzt, ist
selbstverständlich. Vielleicht liegt eben hier der Grund für die "Unter-
entwicklung" in den beiden nördlichen Zentren, Colonia Ulpia Traiana mit

---

[62] D. Fishwick, ICLW 2, 1, 423 ff., vgl. F. Taeger, Charisma 2, 249 ff., s. auch M.-Th.
Rapsaet-Charlier, La datation des inscriptions latines dans les provinces occidentales de
l'Empire Romain d'après des formules <in h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae)> et <deo,
deae>, ANRW 2, 3 (1975), 232-283.

[63] Fünfzehn sichere: CIL XIII 7786, 7826, 7944, 8015, 8019, 8206, 8207, 8208, 8607,
8728, 8811, 8841, 11987, AE 1975, 652, AE 1990, 728.

[64] CIL XIII 7975, 8230, 8253, 8858, 11828, BerRGK 1937, 183, 196, Ch. B. Rüger, ES
12, Nr.1, AE 1975, 635, 648, ILB 491.

[65] CIL XIII 8193, 8255, 8518, 8808, B. und H. Galsterer, ES 12, Nr.3, Sevir: CIL XIII
8499.

ersten Ansätzen eines Kultes und Oppidum Batavorum, wo nicht das leiseste Anzeichen für Kaiserkult erhalten ist.[66]

Im Heer ist dagegen bereits eine feste Hierarchie gegeben, so daß keinerlei Profilierung durch einen Kult möglich oder auch nötig wäre. Vielmehr konzentriert sich alles auf die Person bzw. Familie des Kaisers, je nach Geschmack, wie die Bandbreite der Inhalte zu seinen Gunsten zeigt. Hier sollte Loyalität bewiesen werden, und sicher spielten gemeinsame Weiheakte auch als Integrationsfaktoren eine Rolle. Daß die Äußerungen des Kaiserkultes beiderseits so wenig Gemeinsamkeiten zeigen, obwohl die Eingliederung vieler einheimischer Soldaten im Heer einerseits, aber auch die Ansiedlung ausgedienter Soldaten im Land einen ständigen Austausch förderten,[67] gibt Anlaß, die Rolle des Heeres als solches bei der Romanisierung nicht zu überschätzen. Ziviler und militärischer Kaiserkult sind einfach zu verschieden, als daß sie sich berühren könnten. Formen und Inhalte verraten, daß vor allem der praktische Nutzen gesucht wurde. Das ist auch eigentlich nicht erstaunlich in einer Provinz, die letztlich in ein etabliertes Prinzipat mit erprobten Formen hineingeboren wurde und darin ihren Platz finden wollte: Die Formen wurden übernommen, ohne die spürbare Begeisterung, aus der heraus sie einst entstanden waren.[68] Dies erklärt letztlich auch, warum trotz der langjährigen, sicher effektiven "römischen Erziehung"[69] die Veteranen in den städtischen Äußerungen zum Kaiserkult in Germania Inferior nicht hervortreten. Inwiefern die Verhältnisse sich auf andere Provinzen übertragen lassen, muß weitere Forschung erst herausstellen.

Universität Helsinki

---

[66] Vgl. hierzu allgemein: W. S. Hanson, Administration, Urbanisation and Acculturation in the Roman West, in: D. Braund (Hg.), The Administration of the Roman Empire 241 BC-AD 193, 1988, 66 ff.

[67] Vgl. zu dem Gesamtaspekt W. Eck - H. Wolff, Heer und Integrationspolitik, Köln 1986.

[68] Zu einem ähnlichen Ergebnis kommt M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, Diis Deabusque sacrum. Formulaire votif et datation dans les Trois Gaules et les Deux Germanies, Paris 1993, 12: "A l'intérieur de l'ensemble étudié, la Germanie inférieure se présente donc comme la province faisant le moins état de son dévouement au pouvoir impérial par le biais des dédicaces religieuses".

[69] Fr. Vittinghoff, Militärdiplome, römische Bürgerrechts- und Integrationspolitik in der Hohen Kaiserzeit, ebenda 535-555.

SULLA GENESI DI CIL V 1863*

FULVIA MAINARDIS

Nelle vicinanze del Passo di Monte Croce Carnico – Plöckenpass, nei pressi dell'attuale confine di Stato tra Italia e Austria, sono scolpite sulla viva roccia tre iscrizioni rupestri – CIL V 1862, 1863 e 1864 – che fin dalle prime edizioni hanno suscitato un'ampia e vivace discussione.[1]

Benché si tratti di monumenti frutto di epoche e committenze diverse,[2] l'oggetto dei tre testi epigrafici è molto simile. In un caso è ricordata l'apertura (CIL V 1863), negli altri due il rifacimento di strade attraverso il valico alpino.[3] La natura del luogo, soggetta a frane e smottamenti rendeva evidentemente necessari continui lavori di ripristino per garantire la viabilità di questa arteria di grande traffico. Oltre alla direttrice che seguiva il Canale del Ferro sino alla Sella di Camporosso, era possibile raggiungere il Norico anche attraverso il Passo di Monte Croce cui conducevano le valli del Tagliamento e del But, suo affluente di sinistra. La

---

[1] Per la storia della tradizione vedi G. Bandelli, Le iscrizioni rupestri del Passo di Monte Croce in Carnia. Aspetti generali e problemi testuali, in Rupes loquentes. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studio sulle iscrizioni rupestri di età romana in Italia (Roma 13-15 X 1989), Roma 1992, pp. 156-159.

[2] CIL V 1862: munificenza di Valentiniano, Valente e Graziano; CIL V 1863: uno schiavo; CIL V 1864: uno schiavo addetto alla dogana del conductor *T. Iulius Perseus*.

[3] Si può notare l'uso di espressioni e forme verbali identiche, quasi un linguaggio tecnico: CIL V 1862, *iter, animalia cum periculo commeabant*; CIL V 1863, *inuium (transitum) commiantium periclitante*; CIL V 1864, *iter inuium, conmeantes periclitabantur*.

CIL V 1863

via publica, di cronologia tuttora dibattutta e controversa, ricalcava percorsi noti e in uso fin dalla protostoria. In epoca romana a beneficiare del facile accesso ai paesi transalpini (le iscrizioni attestano in epoche diverse almeno tre tracciati per il valico) fu soprattutto la colonia di Iulium Carnicum a cui apparteneva questa parte del territorio.[4]

Sebbene i tre monumenti presentino, in misura differente, alcune difficoltà interpretative, CIL V 1863, l'iscrizione che costituisce l'oggetto di questo contributo, appare problematica sia dal punto di vista cronologico, sia da quello più strettamente logico-sintattico.[5]

Se alcuni indizi interni consentono di attribuire con certezza gli altri due testi rispettivamente alla seconda metà del II secolo (CIL V 1864) e alla seconda metà del IV secolo (CIL V 1862, 373 d.C.), per il terzo non disponiamo di elementi sicuri. La paleografia[6] e le caratteristiche linguistiche (vedi *infra*) potrebbero essere comunque spia di una datazione non anteriore alla fine del III secolo d.C.

Manca invece una spiegazione soddisfacente dei numerosi problemi testuali dell'epigrafe, per risolvere i quali sovente gli editori[7] non hanno

---

[4] Cfr. L.Bosio, Itinerari e strade della Venetia Romana, Padova 1970, pp. 147-160 e pp. 163-177; A.Grilli, Sulle strade augustee nel Friuli, Atti Centro studi e documentazione sull'Italia romana, 7, 1975-1976, pp. 316-349; P.Basso, I miliari della Venetia romana, (Archeologia Veneta, 9), Padova 1986, pp. 210-213; L.Bosio, Le strade romane della Venetia et Histria, Roma 1991, pp. 173-183 e pp. 185-191.

[5] Si tratta di un'iscrizione (85 x 88,5 cm; alt. lett. 9,5-4 cm) scolpita su una parete rocciosa alla sinistra dell'antico percorso che portava al valico (a pochi metri si trova una ex caserma degli Alpini).

[6] Essa sembra fortemente influenzata dalla scrittura *actuaria* vd. ad es. la A, M, N, S, Q e cfr. gli esempi dei nn. 584, 594, 677, 683 databili fra l'età severiana e diocleziana in Ae. Hübner, Exempla scripturae epigraphicae Latinae a Caesaris dictatoris morte ad aetatem Iustiniani, Berolini 1885.

[7] CIL V 1863; ILS 5886; CLE 891; P. Sticotti, Le rocce inscritte di Monte Croce in Carnia, Arch. Tr., III s., 31, 1906, pp. 164-165, tav. II; R. Egger, Die Felsinschriften der Plöckenalpe, in Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte Kärtens. Festgabe M. Wutte, Klagenfurt 1936, pp. 18-19, fig. 2; P.M. Moro, Iulium Carnicum (Zuglio), Roma 1956, pp. 200-203, nr. 5, fig. 63; AE 1956, 260; J.H. Oliver, Iulium Carnicum by Placida M. Moro (rec.), AJA, 62, 1958, p. 123; J.W. Zarker, Studies in the Carmina Latina Epigraphica, Princeton 1958, pp. 200-201, nr. 90; P. Cugusi, Aspetti letterari dei Carmina Epigraphica, Bologna 1985, pp. 235-237, nr. 6; P. Cugusi, Rilettura di Carmina Epigrafica vecchi e nuovi, Epigraphica, 48, 1986, pp. 77-78; A. Buonopane, Iscrizioni romane su roccia nell'arco alpino (Alpes Maritimae, Alpes Cottiae, Regiones XI, X), in Benaco '85. La cultura figurativa rupestre dalla protostoria ai nostri giorni: archeologia e

risparmiato decisi e discutibili emendamenti delle parti più controverse. Proprio in considerazione della disparità delle edizioni e quindi delle interpretazioni che ne derivano, fornisco la revisione del testo su base autoptica:

```
     [. .]M
     [. . . . . . . . . . . .]VIIS CETERISQVE DIBV[.]
     [.]RAMC[.]M[. . . . .]SOLLEMNE VOTVM DI[.]
     HERMIAS⋄ SVCCEPTOR⋄OPERIS AETERNI
   5 TITVLVM IMMANEM MONTEM ALPINVM
     INGENTEM LITTERIS INSCRIPSIT⋄QVOTSAIPE
     INVIVM COMMIANTIVM PERICLITANTE
     POPVLO AD PONTEM TRANSITVM NON
     PLACVIT CVRIAE ET⋄ATTIO BRAETIANO
  10 Q EORVM⋄VIRO ORNATO⋄VIAM NOV
     DEMONSTRANTE HERMIA⋄MVLT⋄ANI
     MIS FIDES OPERISQVE PARATVS⋄VNA
     NIMES OMNES HANC VIAM EXPLI⋄CVIT
```

[I(oui) O(ptimo)] M(aximo),
[Triuiis, Quadri]uiis ceterisque dibu[s]
[a]ram c[u]m [signo] sollemne uotum di[c(auit)]
Hermias, succeptor operis aeterni,
5 *titulum immanem montem Alpinum*
   ingentem litteris inscripsit. Quot saipe
   inuium commiantium periclitante
   populo ad pontem transitum non
   placuit curiae, et Attio Braetiano
10 *q(uaestore) eorum, uiro ornato, uiam nou(am)*
   demonstrante, Hermia, mult(um) ani-
   mis fide(n)s operisque paratus, una-
   nimes omnes, hanc uiam explicuit.

---

storia di un mezzo espressivo tradizionale. Atti del 1° Convegno Internazionale di Arte rupestre (Torri del Benaco 1985) Torino 1986, pp. 98-99, nr. 25; M.F. Petraccia Lucernoni, I questori municipali dell'Italia antica, Roma 1988, pp. 254-255, nr. 399; G. Bandelli, op. cit. (*supra* nt. 1), pp. 174-184 e pp. 191-193.

Apparato crit.: 2: DIB(us) Mommsen, Sticotti. 3: ARAM O[b solutum merit]O Mommsen, Sticotti; [ar]AM C[u]M [suis] Egger; [ar]AM C[u]M [signo] Moro (da Degrassi); A[r]AM C[u]M [sign(o)] Cugusi 1985; A[r]AM _ ∪ Cugusi 1986; ar̲AM C[u]M [sign]o̲ Bandelli. D[ed(it)] Mommsen, Sticotti; DI[c(auit)] Egger, Oliver, Zarker, Bandelli, Cugusi. 4 HERMIA Egger. OPERIS AETERNI [et?] Bandelli 5 TITVLVM ‹in› IMMANEM Oliver, Zarker, Cugusi, 1985; IMMANEM ‹in› MONTEM Cugusi, 1986. 6 SAEPE Mommsen, Sticotti; SA[e]pe Egger. 7 COMM[e]ANTIVM Mommsen, Sticotti, Egger; PERICLITAN[te] Buonopane. 8 POPV[l]O Mommsen, Sticotti. 9 P[raeb]VIT CVRA[nt]E Mommsen, Sticotti; PLACVIT CVRAE ET Dessau; PLACVIT CVR‹i›AE ET Bücheler, Bandelli; CVRA[r]E T ATTIO Egger, Moro; CVRA‹r›E T ATTIO Oliver, Zarker, Cugusi 1985; CVRA‹r›E {e} T ATTIO Cugusi 1986. 11-12 MVLTANIMIS FIDES Mommsen, Sticotti, Bandelli; MVLTA NIMIS FIDES Dessau, Bücheler, Egger, Moro.

Nella discussione fiorita intorno all'iscrizione quella relativa alla sua struttura metrica ha avuto fino a tempi recenti un ruolo secondario. La maggior parte degli editori ha infatti ignorato questo aspetto e nel migliore dei casi CIL V 1863 è stato considerato un grossolano centone di versi e prosa, come la lingua incerta e sintatticamente scorretta poteva indurre a pensare. Il primo a notare l'esistenza di sezioni metriche è stato il Bücheler, il quale oltre al distico elegiaco finale accolto nella sua silloge, ha supposto anche la presenza di senari giambici nella pericope compresa fra *immanem* e *transitum*. Soltanto recentemente, però, il Cugusi ha ripreso in esame il testo, riuscendo in due contributi a precisarne la struttura metrica:[8]

$$\overset{\cup\cup-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;\cup\;\cup}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;\;\cup\;-}{}$$
1 *[Triuiis,|Quadri]ui|is ce|teris|que dibu[s]*

$$\overset{-\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\cup}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;\;-\;\;-}{}$$
2 *[a]ram| c[u]m [sig|no] sol|lemne| uotum| dic(auit)*

$$\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;\cup\cup}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;\cup\;-}{}$$
3 *Hermias,| succep|tor ope|ris ae|terni| titulum*

$$\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;-}{}$$
4 *imma|nem mon|tem Alpi|num ingen|tem lit|teris*

$$\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\;-}{}\Big|\overset{-\;\;\cup}{}\Big|\overset{\cup-}{}\Big|\overset{\cup\;-}{}$$
5 *inscrip|sit. Quot| saipe in|uium com|mian|tium*

---

[8] Cfr. bibliografia a nt. 7; il testo e le scansioni riportate rappresentano un adattamento dell'edizione del Cugusi, di cui non sono qui accolti alcuni emendamenti e correzioni.

$$\cup - \ | \cup - \ | \cup \ \cup \ \cup | \ - \ - \ | - \ \ - \ | \cup -$$
6 *peric|litan|te popu|lo ad pon|tem tran|situm,*

non placuit curīae, et Attio Braetiano

q(uaestore) eorum, uiro ornato, viam nou(am) demonstrante

$$- \ \cup\cup | \ - \ \ \ \ \cup\cup | \ - \ - | \ - \ \ \cup\cup | - \ \cup \ \cup | - \ -$$
7 *Hermia,| mult(um) ani|mis fi|de(n)s ope|risque pa|ratus,*

$$- \cup \cup | \ - \ - | \ - \ \ - \ \ \cup\cup \ | - \ \cup\cup | -$$
8 *unani|mes om|nes, hanc uiam| explicu|it.*

Sembra trattarsi di un carme polimetrico, formato, secondo il Cugusi, da senari giambici catalettici (v. 1), senari giambici (vv. 2-6), distici elegiaci (vv. 7-8) e una breve interruzione prosastica (*non placuit ... demonstrante*).[9] Soprattutto i primi due versi appaiono assai poco riusciti e presentano numerosi vizi prosodici, tuttavia essi rispecchiano le caratteristiche di questa produzione poetica, strettamente legata alla circostanza e all'occasione.[10] Molto spesso l'andamento ritmico era infatti creato "ad orecchio" senza grande attenzione per le regole prosodiche. Si potevano cioè comporre, come in questo caso, versi con ritmo senario, o che riecheggiassero dei senari, anche prescindendo dall'esatta successione di lunghe e brevi. Il risultato poteva essere perciò prosodicamente scorretto ma efficace dal punto di vista ritmico per un pubblico che riconosceva come familiari certe clausole e certe successioni di sillabe.

Nella breve interruzione prosastica, prima del distico elegiaco finale, sembrano concentrarsi le maggiori difficoltà sintattiche che riguardano la seconda parte del carme, quella iniziante con *quot*. Le proposte interpretative avanzate dagli editori, a iniziare da quelli di CIL V e dei CLE, sono sostanzialmente divergenti. Intendendo *inscripsit* come verbo reggente della proposizione causale introdotta da *quot*, il Mommsen identifica due ablativi assoluti, *curante Attio Braetiano* (risultato di un pesante emendamento del

---

[9] Come nota P. Cugusi, Epigraphica, 48, 1986, pp. 77-78, sono tutt'altro che inusuali nella produzione dei *carmina epigraphica* accostamenti di metri differenti come in CLE 1526, 1533, 1536, 1559; cfr. inoltre E. Galletier, Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'aprés les inscriptions, Paris 1922, pp. 285-286. La scansione del pentametro, senza elisione fra *uiam* e *explicuit*, come suggeritomi dal Sanders, non è affatto eccezionale in una poesia di tale livello.

[10] Per i vizii vd. P. Colafrancesco, M. Massaro, Concordanze dei Carmina Latina epigraphica, Bari 1986, s.v. relative.

testo, cfr. app. critico) e *demonstrante Hermia*. Il Bücheler ne considera invece uno solo, *demonstrante Hermia*. Da qui due diverse letture: nel primo caso sono *Attius Braetianus* e *Hermias* gli autori del progetto della *uia noua*; nel secondo, sulla base dell'emendamento *curiae* di l. 9, sono invece il senato locale e *Attius Braetianus* ad avere il merito di aver riconosciuto la pericolosità del vecchio percorso a cui l'opera di *Hermias* ha posto rimedio (la causale *quot ... non placuit* regge, l'infinitiva soggettiva *inuium...transitum...* con *esse* sottinteso).

La precisazione Nel suo lavoro dedicato alle tre iscrizioni rupestri del passo alpino, l'Egger considera la causale *quot..non placuit cura[r]e* una dipendente dell'ultima proposizione, costituita dall'*explicuit*, che, per lo studioso austriaco, avrebbe come soggetto *Hermia*.[11] Partendo da questa proposta l'Oliver (seguito dallo Zarker e dal Cugusi) ha riconosciuto in *mult animis fides* l'apocope e la sincope di *mult(um) animis fide(n)s*, facilmente riferibili, a questo punto, a *Hermia*, soggetto di *explicuit*. Come ho potuto verificare su base autoptica, le letture MVLTANIMIS e MVLTA NIMIS (vd. app. critico) sono da respingere anche per la presenza di un punto tra MVLT e ANIMIS che distingue le due parole.

La difficoltà di intendere la forma *Hermia* come nominativo, punto debole della restituzione dell'Egger, può essere risolta su base prosodica, come suggerito dall'Oliver. Nel verso 7 il nome è usato senza la terminazione *-as* per costituire il primo dattilo dell'esametro, come accadeva frequentemente con i nomi greci che permettevano l'oscillazione tra le due diverse forme (ad es. in Plauto). *Hermia* è così senza dubbio il soggetto di *explicuit* e a lui vanno riferiti i due participi *fide(n)s* e *paratus*. La validità di tale interpretazione è confermata anche dall'esplicito richiamo ad una nota clausola dell'Eneide, dove con il participio *fidens* è impiegato un raro genitivo di relazione: *obtulerat, fidens animi atque in utrumque paratus* (Aen. 2, 61).[12] Questo sembra essere, a quanto mi risulta, l'unico caso di ripresa in ambito epigrafico di tale verso in cui Virgilio sintetizza la malvagia risolutezza del traditore Sinone. Infatti non è ricordato nel lavoro dell'Hoogma, che può essere ancora considerato la raccolta più completa delle citazioni e dei *loci similes* virgiliani e non è segnalato neppure

---

[11] Vd. *supra* nt. 7.

[12] La costruzione è ripresa anche da Sen. dial. 7,8,3: *incorruptus vir sit externis et insuperabillis miratorque tantum sui, fidens animo atque in utrumque paratus artifex vitae*; per *paratus* vedi anche Quint. 10,5,12 *in omnes causas paratus*.

nell'aggiornamento del Solin,[13] né nell'edizione dell'iscrizione del Bücheler, dell'Oliver e del Cugusi.

Se osserviamo il carme polimetrico, risultato della ricerca del Cugusi, si può notare una breve ed inspiegabile interruzione dell'andamento metrico (secondo lo studioso determinata dai *tria nomina* e dalla carica del magistrato), dove si concentrano le maggiori difficoltà. Questa parte in prosa appare come una cesura troppo marcata e in certo qual modo del tutto estranea all'economia del carme. Proprio per questa ragione proporrei di considerare il testo escludendo per un momento le righe prosastiche e supponendo una prima redazione leggermente diversa:

1 *[Triuiis, Quadri]uiis ceterisque dibu[s]*
2 *[a]ram c[u]m [signo] sollemne uotum di[c(auit)]*
3 *Hermias, succeptor operis, aeterni titulum*
4 *immanem montem Alpinum ingentem litteris*
5 *inscripsit. Quot saipe* inuius *commiantium*
6 *periclitante populo ad pontem* transitus,
7 *Hermia mult(um) animis fide(n)s operisque paratus,*
8 *unanimes omnes, hanc uiam explicuit.*

Dobbiamo supporre che nella redazione definitiva su pietra sia intervenuta, per l'evidente necessità di adattare la struttura sintattica, una modifica rispetto alla versione metrica originaria per cui l'*inuius transitus* dei vv. 5-6, soggetto della causale introdotta con *quot* (*quod*) e con il verbo essere sottinteso, divenne l'*inuium transitum* delle ll. 7-8 del testo iscritto. Il carme senza la sezione metrica non presenta difficoltà e può essere inteso e tradotto: "(A Giove Ottimo Massimo), alle Trivie, alle Quadrivie e a tutti gli altri dei, *Hermias*, colui che ha intrapreso l'opera eterna, ha dedicato un'ara (con una statua) [e] ha inscritto con lettere l'altissimo monte alpino,

---

[13] R.P. Hoogma, Der Einfluss Vergils auf die Carmina Latina epigraphica. Eine Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der metrisch-tecnischen Grundsätze der Entlehnung, Amsterdam 1959 con aggiornamento in H. Solin, Epigrafia, in Enciclopedia Virgiliana, Roma 1986, II, pp. 332-340. Va pertanto esclusa l'interpretazione del Bandelli il quale, pur segnalando in nota la ripresa virgiliana cui non attribuisce però particolare valore, considera *paratus* un sostantivo (per *apparatus*), analogo a *fides*, che costituirebbe insieme a quest'ultimo il soggetto di *explicuit* (concordanza del verbo con uno solo dei soggetti).

[facendolo divenire] un immane monumento epigrafico.[14] Poiché spesso il transito verso il ponte [era] difficile per i viaggiatori che a loro pericolo passavano, *Hermias*, molto confidando nelle sue capacità e preparato all'impresa, con unanime consenso, costruì questa strada."

Se prendiamo in esame questo carme originario, la natura dell'iscrizione sembra più chiara. Si tratterebbe di una dedica votiva alle divinità menzionate nelle prime righe. La stessa presenza del verbo *explico* invece dei più comuni *aperio*, *munio*[15] conferma il carattere del documento. Mentre, infatti, nelle fonti letterarie *explico* è usato indifferentemente come sinonimo di *aedifico*, *perficio*, *facio*,[16] in ambito epigrafico appare limitato alla sfera sacra, dal momento che indica la costruzione di edifici quali ex

---

[14] La traduzione qui proposta parte dai possibili significati in questo contesto del termine *titulus*. Con *titulus* si può intendere l'iscrizione separata dal supporto in espressioni come *titulus ipse spoliis inscriptus* (Liv. 4,20,6) o *cum titulo laminae aeneae inscripto* (Liv. 23,19,18). Si può inoltre intendere la globalità dell'oggetto (cfr. G. Susini, Epigrafia romana, Roma 1982, p. 16; pp. 146-147), costituito dal supporto e dall'iscrizione: *quae tibi sepulchra... qui tumulus sat est? Hic totus orbis famae erit titulus tibi* (Sen. Her.O. 1827) oppure *incisum in duro nomen erit titulo* (CIL VIII 15716, iscr. rupestre). Le diverse fasi della preparazione, composizione, incisione di un testo (e soprattutto *titulus* come supporto per l'iscrizione) sono evidenti in *petram excidi, titulum fecit, nomina scripsit et sculpsit* (CIL III 633, ILS 5466), *titulum po(suit) inscrispi (sic) litteras* (CIL V 8856) e ancora *posuit titulum et loricam cum filiis adiuvantibus* (CIL V 7349). Nell'iscrizione qui considerata sembra inutile correggere il testo con <*in*> *montem Alpinum* come proposto dal Cugusi e dal Sanders: nel momento dell'incisione del carme metrico l'intero monte alpino diventa l'iscrizione o meglio il "titolo" (per maggiore fedeltà all'espressione latina e mancando un equivalente italiano) di *Hermias*. Il monte alpino è dunque la gigantesca (come tradurre altrimenti *immanis titulus?*) iscrizione che ricorderà ai posteri l'opera di *Hermias* come *totus orbis* nel passo di Seneca.

[15] ILS 5834; CIL VIII 10114, ILS 5835; ILS 5845a: *uiam nouam aperuit strauit* CIL II 3270, ILS 5513:...*uiam angustam, fragosam periculosamque munitam ut...*; CIL II 3270, ILS 5513: *uiam corruptam munit*; così anche CIL III 3198, ILS 5829 e CIL 3201, ILS 5829a. Compare frequentemente anche il verbo *restituo*, usato per indicare il rifacimento di qualunque edificio pubblico comprese le strade, cfr. CIL VIII 10335, ILS 5862; CIL XII 5605, ILS 5818; CIL X 6854, ILS 5822 e la nota iscrizione (CIL V 7992, ILS 5860) *uiam Anniam longa incuria neglectam influentibus palustr(ibus) aquis eververatam sic et commeantibus inuiam...restituit.*

[16] Dig. 34,1,17 *tempore, quo templum explicatum fuerit*; Sall. hist. frg. 3,30 *unde pons in oppidum pertinens explicatur*; Vitr. 2,8,17 *innumerabiles habitationes opus est explicare.*

voto per la divinità o semplicemente ad essa dedicati.[17]

Resta invece difficilmente precisabile la figura di *Hermias*, autore dell'opera. Il nome singolo di origine greca[18] indurrebbe a credere che si tratti di uno schiavo. L'omissione del nome del padrone e della parola *seruus* potrebbe essere dovuta sia alla loro ovvietà (perché a tutti era nota la sua condizione), sia al tono del carme. Non è neppure inverosimile pensare che *Hermias* sia uno schiavo pubblico della colonia, anche se il suo interesse per una strada del passo farebbe piuttosto pensare ad uno schiavo legato alla *statio* doganale situata più a valle. In uno degli altri due documenti rupestri, CIL V 1864, è infatti ricordato un *seruus vilicus* del *conductor T.Iulius Perseus* coinvolto, per quanto il cattivo stato di conservazione del testo lascia intuire, nel rifacimento di uno dei percorsi alpini.[19] Sappiamo che nel caso di *uota* anche gli schiavi sono autorizzati ad usare somme dal *peculium,* anche senza il consenso del padrone, per l'adempimento della promessa verso la divinità.[20] Inoltre nella dedica manca qualunque indicazione relativa alla lunghezza della strada e al denaro speso, usuale invece in questa tipologia di documenti. Il silenzio potrebbe essere dovuto alla scarsa "poeticità" di somme e misure, oppure al fatto che

---

[17] CIL VII 984, RIB 1212 (Risingham): *Fortunae Reduci/ Iulius Seuerinus/ trib(unus) explicito balineo v(otum) s(oluit) l(ibens) m(erito)*; CIL VIII 1474 (Dugga): *[A]ug(ustis) sacr(is)/ Beatianus liberalit[ate]/ [ex]plicauit, excoluit, ded[icauit].*; CIL XIII 6509 (Schlossau): *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo)/ uexil(latio)/ coh(ortis) I/ Seq(uanorum) et Raur(icorum)/ eq(uitatae) sub cur(a)/ Antonini Natallis (centurionis) leg(ionis) XXII P(rimigeniae) /P(iae) F(idelis) ob burg(um) ex/plic(itum) u(otum) s(oluit) l(ibens) m(erito).* Per l'uso del perfetto *explicuit* al posto di *explicauit* cfr. V. Väänänen, Introduction au latin vulgaire, Paris 1967, p. 51.

[18] Cfr. H. Solin, Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch, I, Berlin-New York 1982, pp. 338-340.

[19] Nella percezione dei *vectigalia* il passaggio dai *conductores* al fisco non sembra così netto, come sostenuto ad esempio da S. de Laet, Portorium. Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains surtout à l'époque du Haut-Empire, Brugge 1949, pp. 403-404, ma i due sistemi sembrano coesistere ancora per lungo tempo, cfr. M. Guarino, "Portorium" de M. de Laet (rec.), Iura 1, 1950, pp. 515-517, G. Boulvert, Esclaves et affranchis imperiaux sous le Haut-Empire romain. Rôle politique et administratif, Napoli 1970, pp. 321-324 e R. Delmaire, Largesses sacrées et res privata. L'aerarium impérial et son administration du IVe au VIe siècle, (Coll. École. franç. 121), Roma 1989, pp. 287-293.

[20] Cfr. M. Kaser, Das römische Privatrecht, I, München 1955, p. 219, W.L. Westermann, The Slave System of Greek and Roman Antiquity, Philadelphia 1955, pp. 83-84 e K. Visky, Il "votum" in diritto romano, Index 2, 1971, p. 317.

la nuova via era in realtà un tratto abbastanza limitato, alternativo a quello che conduceva al ponte menzionato nel testo. In base alle medesime osservazioni sulla condizione servile di *Hermias*, va osservato che non si può escludere a priori che egli possa essere un liberto il cui gentilizio, sempre per ragioni metriche, sarebbe stato omesso. Tuttavia mi sembra difficile ritenere che in un documento di carattere pubblico-ufficiale come questo (non un'iscrizione funeraria) si volesse rischiare di essere confusi, a causa del nome grecanico, con una persona di condizione servile.

Il carme di *Hermias* si presenta pertanto come una dedica votiva che ricorda la costruzione della via in onore di tutti gli dei, a cominciare da Giove, dalle Trivie e dalle Quadrivie, divinità particolarmente adatte in questo ambito per la loro funzione di protettrici di strade e crocicchi.[21]

Tuttavia il tono e l'uso di espressioni ricercate, come il calco virgiliano, lasciano intuire qualcosa d'altro. *Hermias* è detto *succeptor operis aeterni* (v.3) e più sotto *multum animis fidens* e *operisque paratus* (v.7). Mentre in quest'ultimo caso si può riconoscere un'allusione alla sua disposizione d'animo di fronte alla gravosa e pericolosa impresa,[22] l'esatta definizione di *susceptor* appare più complessa. Il sostantivo *succeptor*, per il più usuale *susceptor,* non conta molte attestazioni in ambito epigrafico. Lo troviamo impiegato per il *susceptorum Ostiensium sive Portuensium antiquissimum corpus*, ovvero la corporazione dei riscossori della tassa doganale del

---

[21] Il medesimo tipo di dedica è noto anche nella *statio Maiensis* (CIL V 5090, ILS 1561) in un contesto geografico-doganale analogo; per la presenza di Giove Ottimo Massimo, cfr. I.Chirassi Colombo, I culti locali nelle regioni alpine, AAAd IX, 1976, pp. 192-193; per quanto riguarda la statua menzionata nel carme potrebbe essere stata quella di *Iuppiter*, non solo per la sua ben nota importanza nel pantheon romano rispetto a tutte le altre divinità, ma anche per il particolare rilievo dato dalla posizione e dall'altezza delle lettere (alte più del doppio delle altre). Resta ancora da segnalare che la cavità laterale, intesa come nicchia che doveva contenere l'ex voto (così ad esempio in R. Egger, op. cit. (*supra* nt. 7), p. 20 e in M. Bagnara, Le Alpi Orientali in epoca classica. Problemi di orografia storica, Firenze 1969, p. 111, e ancora in A. Buonopane, op. cit. (*supra* nt. 7), p. 98, secondo il quale l'iscrizione è addirittura scolpita sotto la nicchia), presenta una profondità minima e manca di un piano di appoggio orizzontale. Inoltre la sua esecuzione ha danneggiato im modo evidente il lato destro dello specchio epigrafico nelle prime quattro righe. Mi sembra perciò difficile sostenere che tale cavità sia coeva all'iscrizione e soprattutto che l'altare e la statua dedicati da *Hermias* potessero trovarvi posto.

[22] *Opera* è qui da intendere come fatica, sforzo cfr. ad esempio Caes. bell. Gall. 5, 11, 5 *res erat multae operae ac laboris* e Cic. Rosc. 51 *homines qui... in agris ... colendis aliquantum operae temporisque consumpserint.*

porto di Ostia in una dedica della metà del IV secolo[23] e come epiteto della divinità, *Deus susceptor*, nel senso di guardiano, protettore, difensore, in alcune iscrizioni cristiane.[24] Per il testo qui considerato ritengo vada preferita un'accezione non tecnica, ovvero *susceptor* come colui che ha intrapreso, colui che si è preso l'incarico di fare qualcosa. Il complemento di specificazione *operis aeterni* parrebbe infatti assegnare al termine un valore prettamente poetico.[25] *Hermias* è perciò colui che si è assunto l'onere di questa importante realizzazione. Ancora una volta egli esalta se stesso: egli si è accinto all'impresa con fiducia nelle proprie capacità e consapevolezza delle difficoltà (*fidens* e *paratus* come il giovane Sinone), che sono senz'altro note anche all'intera comunità che concede l'approvazione, espressa dal *nominativus pendens unanimes omnes*.[26] Il linguaggio e il tono del carme votivo risultano pertanto ricchi di espressioni di elogio e di esaltazione, molto simili a quelle che possiamo trovare impiegate anche in documenti di altro tipo, come ad esempio nelle dediche onorarie.

---

[23] CIL VI 1741, ILS 1243. L'uso tecnico del termine come sinonimo di *conductor e redemptor* è documentato da Giustino *susceptores sollicitare i.e. homines quarere qui opera facienda conducant* (8, 3, 4) al quale va collegato anche il significato più generale di collettore di tasse alla cui figura sono dedicati ampi capitoli nella giurisprudenza tardoantica (Cod. Th. 12,6; Cod. Iust. 10,70 e anche Amm. 17,10) su cui si veda V.K. Lammers, RE IV A, 1932, s. v. susceptor, cc. 974-988.

[24] ILCV 2414, ICVR IV 9370 (VI sec. d.C.) e CIL III 6701, ILCV 2414 adn. (L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde, Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie, IV, Laodicée. Apamène, Paris 1955, n. 1393) cfr. anche Vulg. Psa. 3,4; 41,10; 9,2 al. Il verbo *suscipio* è usato in relazione ad un'opera viaria in CIL IX 6011 (Buonalbergo): *[I]mp(erator) Cae[sar]/ [L. S]eptimius Se[uerus]/.../[et i]mp(erator) M. Aure[lius]/.../[l]abentem uiam [ampl]issimis operib[us] [s]usceperunt, ob[ie]/[c]tisque molib[us]/ [su]a pecunia mu/nierunt*. Per la forma *succeptor* cfr. A. Zamboni, Contributo allo studio del latino epigrafico della X Regio augustea (Venetia et Histria). Il lessico, in Studi Linguistici Friulani 1, Udine 1969, p.113.

[25] Non è ovviamente da escludere a priori un significato tecnico per *susceptor* in base al quale il testo andrebbe inteso "*Hermias, succeptor, operis aeterni titulum immanem montem Alpinum ingentem litteris inscripsit*" e tradotto "*Hermias*, esattore, iscrisse con lettere il monte alpino altissimo [facendone] un gigantesco monumento commemorativo di un'opera eterna". Va osservato che, anche accogliendo questa audace ricostruzione, le considerazioni e le ipotesi avanzate in questo contributo non sono, nella loro sostanza, compromesse.

[26] Per il *nominativus pendens* o nominativo assoluto cfr. V. Väänänen, op. cit. (*supra* nt. 17), pp. 180-181 e A. Zamboni, Contributo allo studio del latino epigrafico della X Regio augustea (Venetia et Histria). Morfologia, AAPat 80, 1967-68, p. 161.

A questo punto, dopo aver considerato il carme nella probabile versione originaria, possiamo riprendere l'analisi del testo nella sua globalità partendo proprio dalla sezione in prosa. Nell'economia della dedica metrica questa parte sembra un'inutile e difficile zeppa che rompe l'andamento di una composizione, che, sebbene non sia opera di un grande poeta, tradisce comunque una certa ambizione. Se osserviamo come il componimento poetico riesca ad avere un senso compiuto anche senza di essa, sembra plausibile ritenere che si tratti di un inserimento posteriore in una minuta che, almeno nella prima fase, doveva essere completamente metrica. Solo immaginando l'esistenza di una prima versione poi modificata, si possono comprendere le incertezze sintattiche e le reggenze difficili che nessuno degli editori ha potuto finora giustificare.

Nel tentativo di determinare il processo che ha condotto alla formulazione dell'iscrizione che noi tuttora leggiamo sulla parete rocciosa, potrebbe essere di qualche utilità analizzare le righe in prosa come un'aggiunta concepita in un secondo momento e in maniera del tutto autonoma rispetto al carme.

Nel periodo compreso fra *non placuit* e *demonstrante* si distinguono due elementi chiave: da una parte la *curia*, il senato locale,[27] dall'altra *Attius Braetianus, q(uaestor) eorum*. La lettura *curia* è quasi del tutto sicura, sia per la traccia di un nesso RI, come si intuisce dall'asta della R leggermente più allungata e dall'apicatura pronunciata, sia per il senso che tale lettura ha nel testo e nella titolatura del questore. La particolarità della formula *q. eorum*, praticamente senza confronti, non è stata sufficientemente sottolineata e soprattutto spiegata. In realtà il pronome *eorum* per essere giustificato deve avere un antecedente che non può essere però *populo*, come ritenuto dal Mommsen, perché troppo generico e qui indicante la moltitudine dei *commeantes*, sinonimo di *viatores*.[28] L'antecedente è invece senza dubbio il sostantivo *curia*. Si tratterebbe perciò di un (o del) questore dell'*ordo decurionum*, simile al *quaestor a decurionibus* di un'iscrizione di

---

[27] Cic. de orat. 3,167 *ex quo genere* (*sc. metonymia*) *haec sunt... "curiam" pro senatu, "campum" pro comitis, "togam" pro pace*. Per le numerose attestazioni epigrafiche cfr. ad esempio CIL III 13917 (Salona): *decre(to) curiae*; CIL V 532, ILS 6680 (Trieste): *per aedilitatis gradum in curiam nostram*; CIL VIII 1548, ILS 6827 (Agbia) *statuam genii curiae in curia posuit*; CIL X 4725 (*ager Falernus*): *dignus curiae et populi patronus*; CIL XII 6038, ILS 6364 (Narbonne): *in curia sua et concilio provinciae Narbonensis*.

[28] A. Zamboni, op. cit. (*supra* nt. 24), p. 137 si tratta di un participio predicativo sostantivato, equivalente a *uiator*, tipico della tradizione postclassica.

Terni,[29] da intendersi come magistrato scelto dai decurioni (e decurione egli stesso) per un compito specifico. Questa procedura doveva essere molto comune in un'epoca come quella a cui appartiene CIL V 1863, quando la questura era ormai diventata un *munus*[30] e i magistrati erano scelti tra i *curiales*. L'utilizzazione del plurale *eorum* riferito al sostantivo singolare non genera difficoltà, poiché vi era chiara coscienza della metonimia *"curia"* e della pluralità di notabili che la costituivano.[31]

Se osserviamo infine il linguaggio usato, si nota un brusco cambiamento di registro; il nuovo verbo aggiunto, *placuit*, rimanda infatti ad un ambito strettamente giuridico-amministrativo e senza dubbio stride con le ardite immagini poetiche che *Hermias* ha voluto nel suo *titulus* . Mi pare perciò difficile sostenere che queste righe facessero parte della minuta originaria dell'iscrizione rupestre, soprattutto se consideriamo che proprio nella menzione di una delle istituzioni più importanti della colonia e di uno dei suoi magistrati, il *uir ornatus Attius Braetianus*,[32] si realizza la rottura dell'andamento poetico di un carme che tradisce invece, in altri punti, una voluta ricercatezza.

Se dunque vi è stato, come ritengo verosimile, un intervento sulla minuta metrica, con l'inserzione di una parte prosastica che scompaginò e modificò non solo la successione dei versi ma anche la struttura sintattica (e quindi il significato) dell'iscrizione, è necessario chiedersi quale ne possa essere stato il motivo. Come si è detto, il carme di *Hermias* celava nella forma di una dedica sacra chiari intenti autocelebrativi. Rimanevano inoltre in secondo piano, o scomparivano del tutto, coloro che, dopo aver giudicato

---

[29] CIL XI 4190, ILS 6628: *Sex. Pomponius C.f. Clu./ Balbus IIII uir i(ure) d(icundo),/ quaestor a decurionibus,/ tr(ibunus) mil(itum)*.

[30] Dig. 50,4,18,2 Arc. Char. lib. de muner. civil.: *Et quaestura in aliqua civitate inter honores non habetur, sed personale munus est*. I compiti del *quaestor* furono presto assunti dal *curator r.p.* come è attestato anche a *Iulium Carnicum* in una delle altre due iscrizioni rupestri (CIL V 1862) databile al 373 d.C.; sul problema cfr. R. Ganghoffer, L'évolution des institutions municipal en Occident et en Orient au Bas-Empire, Paris 1967, p. 142 e anche F.M. Ausbüttel, Die Verwaltung der Städte und Provinzen im spätantiken Italien, Frankfurt am Main 1988, pp. 27-28.

[31] Un fenomeno analogo è documentato anche in CIL XII 1585, ILS 4356 (*Lucus Augusti-Dea Augusta Vocontiorum*) dove si legge *adlecto in curiam Lugdunensium nomine incolatus a splendidissimo ordine eorum*.

[32] Per *uir ornatus* cfr. A. Chastagnol, Le formulaire de l'épigraphie latine officielle dans l'antiquité tardive, in La terza età dell'epigrafia, Atti del Convegno (Bologna, ottobre 1986), Faenza 1988, p. 46.

pericoloso il vecchio percorso e dopo averne indicato uno nuovo, gli aveva-
no offerto la possibilità di costruire la *uia noua*. Il rilievo assunto da *Hermi-
as*, a discapito dei veri autori del progetto, probabilmente suscitò qualche
difficoltà nel momento in cui si doveva concedere il permesso di scolpire
l'iscrizione sul suolo pubblico accanto alla strada. Ritengo perciò che il
compromesso fra le esigenze delle due parti sia stata proprio la zeppa pro-
sastica che, pur determinando un latino incerto e approssimativo, consentì di
chiarire i diversi ruoli e in definitiva rese possibile l'incisione del testo.

Così nella minuta metrica, mancando sicuramente l'ignoto poeta che
l'aveva composta (o piuttosto, come suggeritomi dal Sanders, poiché
l'autorità parla in modo ufficiale)[33], fu inserita la parte in prosa, badando
che il verbo della causale, iniziante con *quot*, fosse il nuovo *non placuit*,
verbo reggente dell'infinitiva soggettiva con l'infinito *esse* sottinteso il cui
soggetto diventava il probabile *inuius transitus* del carme "prima maniera"
modificato ora in *inuium...transitum* (con il passaggio dal nominativo all'ac-
cusativo). L'aggiunta si saldava così sulla prima versione metrica e ne
modificava la parte centrale allo scopo di chiarire la genesi del progetto e i
meriti di *Attius Braetianus*. Infatti essa va intesa e tradotta: "poiché non
piacque ai decurioni che il transito verso il ponte (fosse) spesso difficile per
i viaggiatori che a loro pericolo passavano e indicando *Attius Braetianus*,
uomo di valore, questore scelto da loro, un nuovo percorso... ". Risulta in tal
modo chiaro che l'azione di *Hermias* era stata preceduta da una delibera a
livello di consiglio decurionale come prescriveva la legge, *si uiae publicae
exemptus commeatus sit uel uia coartata, interueniunt magistratus*,[34] cui
aveva fatto seguito il progetto del questore che seppe *demonstrare* una
nuova strada, cioè suggerire, indicare[35] un percorso alternativo per sosti-

---

[33] La discussione relativa agli autori dei *carmina* soprattutto funerari è ancora aperta:
delle tre posizioni (gente di mestiere – retori, grammatici, avvocati – un parente che
componeva o che imitava un altro carme) sembra prevalere quella che privilegia l'inter-
vento della famiglia, cfr. G. Sanders, Une jeune dame de Mevaniola, in Cultura epigrafi-
ca dell'Appennino. Sarsina, Mevaniola e altri studi, Faenza 1985, pp. 25-27, ntt. 25-28 e
D. Pikhaus, La poésie épigraphique en Cispadane, Cispadana e letteratura, in Documenti
e studi, vol. 21, Bologna 1987, pp. 161-162, nt. 9. Per i *carmina* non funerari è più vero-
simile pensare a gente di mestiere, capace di comporre a tema, come nel caso qui consi-
derato.

[34] Dig. 43,8,2,25.

[35] Per il significato di *demonstrare* cfr. Cic. de orat. 1,203 *demonstrare itinera*; Cic. pro
Tull. 17 *demonstrare fines*.

tuire quello antico ormai inagibile. Solo a questo punto vi fu l'intervento di *Hermias* che, forse su richiesta della comunità o, più probabilmente, per sua spontanea iniziativa evergetica, attuò il progetto del magistrato.

L'inserimento della zeppa proprio in questo punto, invece che alla fine o all'inizio del carme, da un lato rispondeva all'esigenza dell'autorità di mettere in luce il giusto *iter* amministrativo (delibera, progetto, realizzazione), e dall'altro era giustificato dal fatto che con un minimo sforzo (l'unico cambiamento è il passaggio di *inuius transitus* all'accusativo) e lasciando pressocché intatta la dedica, le giuste proporzioni erano state ristabilite.

Anche se ai nostri occhi il risultato non è dei più felici per lingua e sintassi, il testo dovette risultare sufficientemente chiaro e soprattutto sembrò consentire anche ai decurioni e al questore di *Iulium Carnicum* di partecipare all'eternità che l'opera e l'iscrizione avrebbero saputo garantire.

Università di Trieste

P. CAIR. ZEN. 4.59532 –
TWO EPITAPHS FOR A HUNTING DOG CALLED TAURON

TIINA PUROLA

Ἰνδὸν ὅδ' ἀπύει τύμβος Ταύρωνα θανόντα
κεῖσθαι, ὁ δὲ κτείνας πρόσθεν ἐπεῖδ' Ἀίδαν
θὴρ ἅπερ ἄντα δρακεῖν, συὸς ἥ ῥ' ἀπὸ τᾶς Καλυδῶνος
λείψανον, εὐκάρποις ἐμ πεδίοις τρέφετο
Ἀρσινόας ἀτίνακτον, ἀπ' αὐχένος ἀθρόα φρίσσων
λ]όχμαις καὶι γε[ν]ύων ἀφρὸν ἀμεργόμενος·
σὺν δὲ πεσὼν σκύλακος τόλμαι στήθη μὲν ἑτοίμως
ἠλόκισ', οὐ μέλλων δ' αὐχέν' ἔθηκ' ἐπὶ γᾶν
δρα]ξάμενος γὰρ ὁμοῦ λοφιᾶι μεγάλοιο τένοντος
ο]ὺ πρ[ὶ]ν ἔμυσεν ὀδόντ' ἔσθ' ὑπέθηκ' Ἀίδα.
........] Ζή[νω]να πον[ων] ἀδίδακτα κυναγόν,
καὶ κατὰ γᾶς τύμβῳ τὰν χάριν ἠργάσατο.

ἄλλο
σκύλαξ ὁ τύμβῳ τῷδ' ὑπ' ἐκτερισμένος
Ταύρων, ἐπ' αὐθένταισιν οὐκ ἀμήχανος·
κάπρῳ γὰρ ὡς συνῆλθεν ἀντίαν ἔριν,
ὁ μέν τις ὡς ἄπλατος οἰδήσας γένυν
στῆθος κατηλόκισε λευκαίνων ἀφρῷ·
ὁ δ' ἀμφὶ νώτῳ δισσὸν ἐμβαλὼν ἴχνος
ἐδράξατο φρίσσοντος ἐκ στέρνων μέσων
καὶ γᾷ συνεσπείρασεν· Ἀίδᾳ δὲ δοὺς
τὸν αὐτόχειρ' ἔθναισκεν, Ἰνδὸν ὡς νόμος.
σώζων δὲ τὸν κυναγὸν ᾧ παρείπετο
Ζήνον' ἐλαφρᾷ τᾷδ' ὑπεστάλη κόνει.*

The archive of Zenon is the largest and the best known documentary papyrus archive of the Hellenistic period and it has a tremendeous value for studies on the social and economic history of early Ptolemaic Egypt.[1] The archive does also include a few literary papyri, of which P. Cair. Zen. 4.59532 contains two epigrams.[2] Both of these epigrams deal with the same subject, the death of a dog called Tauron who died defending his master Zenon against a wild boar. Both epigrams are relatively long, the first of them has 12 verses of elegiac metre, the other consists of 11 iambic lines. The epigrams are separated from each other with the heading ἄλλο. The papyrus is vertically folded and on the back side of the papyrus is the adress: τῷ παρ' 'Απολλωνίου Ζήνωνι.

The poems have been published several times in collections containing epigrams and literary papyri, but, strangely, the papyrus has very seldom been studied as a whole.[3] In my opinion, however, what is interesting in this papyrus is the question whether the epigrams were really meant to be inscribed on stone, as generally believed. This rarely questioned hypothesis of the "grave stone" of Tauron has always puzzled me because, it is in fact most difficult to say whether a Hellenistic epigram known from a non–inscriptional source is really epigraphical or not. The difficulty is caused by the emergence of the new genre of epigram, the fictional epitaph. This problem of the epigrams of Tauron cannot be solved if the poems are separated from each other and if we do not ask why the papyrus was stored in the Zenon archive, or what is principally the relationship between literary and documentary texts in such documentary archives.The aim of this article is to put these epigrams into the context of the archive of Zenon, to compare

---

[1] The definition of an "archive" is not a simple matter and should perhaps be carefully reconsidered. In this article by an "archive" is meant papyri, which have been found in the same physical context and which can be linked togehther through one or more persons occurring in the papyri. Details of the Zenon Archive can be easily found for example from Pestman, A Guide to the Zenon Archive, Pap. Lugd.-Bat. 21 (1981)

[2] Editio princeps: P. Edgar 48, ASAE 19 (1920).

[3] U. Wilcken, Archiv 6 (1919-20), 453-4; SB III-IV (1926) no. 6754; D.L. Page, Greek Literary Papyri (=GLP), Loeb, London 1942, no. 109; Peek, Griechische Vers-Inschriften (=GVI), Berlin, 1955, no. 1968; Pack, The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from the Graeco-Roman Egypt[2] (=Pack), Ann Arbor 1965, no 1761; Hengstl (ed.), Griechische Papyri aus Ägypten, München 1978 (Tusculum Bücherei), no. 98; Page, Further Greek Epigrams (=FGE), Cambridge, 1981, 456-8; Supplementum Hellenisticum (=SH) no. 977; I. Cazzaniga (Eirene 11 (1973) 71-89), for instance, has written an article on the papyrus but studies the elegiac epigram only.

the poems with epigraphical and literary epigrams of the early Hellenistic period and to find out if this approach confirms the assumption that Tauron's epitaphs are composed to be inscribed, or if, on the other hand, it becomes more probale that they represent the Alexandrian genre of fictional epitaph.

As I already said, the archive of Zenon is one of the most important sources for the early Ptolemaic Egypt. Zenon worked for the *dioiketes* Apollonios, and he was in charge of Apollonios' estate in Philadelphia (Fayum), and the archive consists mainly of the correspondence between these two men and of the documents concerning the organisation of the estate. The documents have been dated between the years 261 and 239 B.C. The literary texts are very few compared to the documentary ones: the number of the papyri in the archive published so far amount to more than 3000 and only thirteen of them are of literary nature, dealing either directly or indirectly with literature.[4]

In his article W. Clarysse discusses the interesting matter of literature in documentary archives.[5] Concerning the Zenon archive he concludes that although the literary pieces give a vivid picture of the "cultural" interests of Zenon, they were not stored on purpose: "it is clear that these fragments drifted only accidentally into Zenon's papers."[6] He also notes that Zenon no doubt had a personal library but that it is completely lost to us. About the library of Zenon Clarysse is definitely right, but I am not quite sure about the statement that the literary papyri in the archive are there only by chance. If we look at the literary pieces in the Zenon archive, we notice that two of them seem to be school exercises,[7] and W. Pestman in his typological survey suggests that at least P. Cair. Zen. 4.59535 might have been written by Epharmostus, the younger brother of Zenon. Among the "literary" papyri there is also a farming calendar written by Zenon himself[8] and a list of strange words and phrases[9] of which the exact meaning and contents, however, remain unsolved. The remaining literary texts in the archive of

---

[4] For a typological survey of the Zenon papyri, see W. Pestman, A Guide to the Zenon Archive, Pap. Lugd.-Bat. 21a.

[5] W. Clarysse, Literary papyri in documentary "archives", Studia Hellenistica 27 (1983) 43-62.

[6] W. Clarysse, *op. cit*, p. 53.

[7] P. Cair. Zen. 4.59533 and 59535.

[8] P. Lugd.-Bat. 20.64.

[9] P. Cair. Zen. 4.59534.

Zenon deal with literature only indirectly.[10]

Analyzing the reasons why literary texts have been preserved in the archives, W. Clarysse states that besides coincidently, the texts might have, for example, been used as handbooks (and this might be the reason for saving the word list mentioned above). In my opinion, emotional reasons, too, could make one not to throw away a piece of a text which seems unimportant as such. In fact, the literary texts among official and personal documents might be something someone does not deliberately save, but hesitates to destroy, too. The school exercises of Epharmostus (if this is a correct assumption) might well have been something Zenon saved for emotional reasons, since he seems to have been most affected to his brother. The same is true with the text Zenon wrote himself: he might have been too shy to put it into his library but could not throw it away, either.[11]

What about the epigrams for Tauron? As I mentioned in the beginning of this article the papyrus was folded, which could indicate that it was deliberately saved. Most scholars agree that the epigrams of Tauron were ordered from some Alexandrian poet on the occasion of Tauron's death during Zenon's hunting trip and that the poems were really meant for inscription.[12] Those who have suggested that the epigrams are literary

---

[10] P. Col. Zen. 2.60 (a fragment of a letter concerning schoolbooks, probably for Epharmostus), P.Cair. Zen. 4.59651 (on the verso of a "hypomnema" a quotation of the play "Myrmidon" by Aeschylus), P.Cair. Zen. 4.59588 (a mention about some books copied in Zenon's office), P.Cair. Zen. 4.59603 (a fragment of a letter concerning a lecture on Homer which was going to be held in Philadelphia) and P. Mich. Zen. 77 (a letter containing iambic verses among prose. W. Claryssse mentions that Edgar identifies the author of this letter with the author of the epigrams on P.Cair. Zen. 4.59532. This, however, is not quite correct: having initially suggested the identification Edgar concludes: "There remains little likelihood that they were composed by the same author" (P. Mich. Zen. p. 156)). There are still three more papyri, namely P. Lugd.-Bat. 20. 14, 15, and 16, which all contain literary fragments. These texts, however, according to the typology of the archive of Zenon by Pestman, do not belong with certainty to the archive.

[11] Of course, there is always the possibility that the literary papyri were put in the archive simply to wait for the transportation to the cartonnage-factory or to be otherwise re-used (most of the papyri I have referred to here do have some blank space). However, in my opinion this explanation is somewhat too simple: Would an archive of documents be the obvious place for waste-papyrus? But if so, the speculation for the reasons why literary texts have been preserved, for example, in the archive of Zenon will have been superfluous.

[12] For example, Page, FGE, p. 457; Gow - Page, HE II, p. 90; SH p. 490; P. M. Fraser,

"exercises" have argued that a dog dying for his master is a literary *topos* and that it is improbable that the area of Fayum was so dangerous in the 3rd century.[13] These arguments are not very convincing as such, but we must also ask why the papyrus was saved, if the epigrams had been inscribed: after the poems had been inscribed the papyrus would have become useless. The easiest solution is that the epigrams were inscribed and the papyrus was sent to the archive to be reused, but as I observed in note 11, in my opinion the other possibilities are worth considering, too. It is possible that 1) only one of the epigrams was inscribed (both of the epigrams give the same information); or that 2) the epigrams come from the latest period of the archive and they simply never reached a stone; or that 3) Zenon had ordered poems from several poets and decided to inscribe an epigram other than one of these two. Since all the alternatives are thinkable there still remains the possibility that the epigrams are fictional: the epigrams could have been sent for Zenon attached to a private letter, without being meant to be inscribed, and that is why they have been found in the archive. But let us now turn to search for epigraphic evidence for epitaphs of dogs to see if there are parallels for the assumed grave monument of Tauron.

Animals are not uncommon in Greek literature and animals, also dogs, have been discussed in various monographs and articles.[14] In the case of Tauron the work most referred to is the study by Herrlinger from the year 1930, which include metrical epitaphs for animals throughout the ancient world.[15] The problem is that although Herrlinger, unlike many others, does separate the epigraphical material from the literary one, the epigraphical epigrams to which everyone after Herrlinger refers to, are of much later date

---

Ptolemaic Alexandria I, p. 611. M. Rostovtzeff, A large estate in Egypt in the third century B.C., New York 1979 (reprint of the 1922 ed.)), p. 112 goes even further: "Who knows that some fortunate excavator will perhaps find in Philadelphia the grave of the brave dog and it's epitaph on stone, not on paper."

[13] Préaux, L'économie royale des Lagides, Bruxelles 1939, p. 201 and Gorteman, CdE 32 (1957) 116-118. I have not noticed that the existence of boars in Philadelphia would as such have been questioned. It should, however, be remembered that boars were not the most usual animals to be hunted in Egypt and the landscape in Arsinoites is not the typical one for boars.

[14] For example, see S. Lilja, Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry, Comm. Hum. Litt. 56, Helsinki 1976 with bibliography.

[15] Herrlinger, Totenklage um Tiere in der Antiken Dichtung, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 8, 1930.

than the epigrams of Tauron: the earliest example of a metrical epitaph for a dog, GVI 309 (Mytilene) is not earlier than 1st century A.D., and other examples, GVI 691, 1365 and 192 are of even later date. On the other hand, I do not want to argue that it would be impossible that earlier epigrams for dogs or other animals existed: we know of relatively old inscriptions for race horses, and the latest finds in the Syntagma-square in Athens show that dogs were highly appreciated: the excavations have revealed in a cemetery, which contains tombs of Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods and among them there have been found graves for dogs and horses.[16] The fact remains, however, that we do not really have epigraphical evidence for epigrams for animals from the Ptolemaic period.[17] Somewhat surprisingly there are practically no epigrams on animals at all from Egypt where one above all would expect to find them. The only metrical inscription on an animal is for a cobra, of which the length of the poem is notable: the cobra–epitaph contains 12 lines, as is also the case in the first one of the epigrams for Tauron.[18]

Compared to the epigraphical evidence we do have many epigrams on animals in the Anthologia Palatina, AP 7,189-216 consists entirely of such poems. A dog can be found in only one epigram in this group, AP 7,211 by Tymnes where the name of the dog is Tauros (!). A dog is presented also by a later poet, Antipater of Thessalonica in his epigram AP 9,417. Anyte of Tegea who was among the first to compose epigrams on animals has written at least one for a dog (= HE Anyte X) and so has "Simonides" (= FGE Simonides LXIX).[19] From an epigram preserved on a papyrus we know of still one more dog, but the fragment is too small for any conclusions on the nature of the epigram.[20] The majority of the animal epigrams in the AP are on animals other than dogs, for example on birds or dolphins, and the very

---

[16] For the epigrams for race horses see, FGE "Anacreon" VI (= AP 6,135) 6th cent B.C. and commentary, FGE, p. 401-02. For the Syntagma square excavations, see the newspaper "Kathimerini" 12.5. 1994.

[17] The same is true of the inscriptions containing two epigrams: For example Peek, Griechische Grabgedichte (=GG) lists many "Parallelgedichte", GG 457 and 265 are even separated with the heading ἄλλο, but they are both dated to the late antiquity.

[18] Bernand, Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine, Paris 1969. It is also true, of course, that animal cults were an Egyptian phenomenon and that erecting grave monuments with epigrams was part of the Greek culture.

[19] The poem by Simonides is generally considered as Hellenistic, Page FGE, p. 291.

[20] The text can be found in SH, number 986.

favorite subjects of Hellenistic animal epigrams are different kinds of grasshoppers. This raises the question of fictionality in animal epigrams, *i.e.* it seems unlikely that such epigrams could have been written for real inscriptions. A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page have presented a fascinating theory about these epigrams, suggesting that they could have been meant to be inscribed on a cheaper material than marble and that they were perhaps written for children.[21] This is a very tempting idea, but most of the epigrams on animals are very stereotypical and clearly imitate each other and it is hard to imagine that they are anything else than literary creations. If we compare the epigrams for Tauron with the epigrams in the AP, it becomes clear that the theme is exactly the kind which would have fascinated a Hellenistic epigrammatist.

If we take a closer look at the language and the style of theTauron epigrams we can immediately say that they resemble more the epigrams in the Anthologia Palatina than the epigraphical epigrams in general. In fact the style is very much the usual learned Hellenistic and their syntax is somewhat complicated as is usual in Alexandrian epigrams. It is interesting to note that the language of the epigrams is a mixture of epigraphical formulas and Hellenistic allusions to mythology. For example, the first couplet of of the first poem could very well be from an inscription but, at the same time, it contains the verb ἀπύω, which we do not know from the inscriptional epigrams and is rare in the AP as well (it is attested only in AP 9,99 and 16,17). It is also worth noting that although the first poem gives an impression of learned style (the complicated allusion to the Calydonian boar) it contains also somewhat clumsy repetition (the words τύμβος and Ἀίδης occur twice). As far the latter epigram is concerned, we can say that it is more intensive than the first one, but its phraseology is also unusual for inscriptions (for example the expression ἐπ' αὐθένταισιν οὐκ ἀμήχανος and the word αὐτοχείρ are very strange). The most typical epigraphical expression of the second epigram occurs in the last verse, but even here it is somewhat suspect: the idiomatic adjective with κόνις is κούφη, but here it is used with the word ἐλαφρή. But most important is that the poems seem to be written in a manner of Hellenistic imitation: the second epigram is a skilful variation of the first one. They have several words in common without giving the impression of being exactly alike and this is what makes them more literary than inscriptional: they could very well be written for an

---

[21] Gow-Page HE II, p. 91.

anthology of epigrams, which in the 3rd century seem to have been rather common.

To conclude, there seems to be almost no evidence at all for the inscriptional nature of these epitaphs of Tauron: we do not know such epigrams for dogs on stone during the early Hellenistic period and the language is not typical of the early Hellenistic epigraphical epigrams, either. It is true, on one hand, that the incident of the dog's death is very realistically described, but realism is a distinctive feature in all the fictional epitaphs. It is also to be noted that the epigram AP 15,51 by Archias, which seems to be epideictic as it describes a sculpture representing the Calydonian boar, contains much the same phraseology as the epigrams of Tauron. This may indicate that the theme was common in Hellenistic epigrams, because Archias often writes variations of early Hellenistic themes. It is also possible that the incident described in the epigrams really happened. In this case it might be that the poet took part to the hunting and was touched by the courage of Tauron and sent a couple of epigrams to Zenon as consolation. But this, of course, is only speculation and cannot be confirmed in any way.

I hope to have been able to show that at least certain doubts should be raised about the usual statement on the epigraphical nature of Tauron's epitaphs and epigrams known from papyri in general, because the Hellenistic epigrammatists were excellent in imitating reality if they wanted to. Thus, realism in a description of a certain event is no reason alone for assuming that an epigram was inscribed on stone.

University of Helsinki

OBSERVATIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE STYLE OF LATIN HONORIFIC INSCRIPTIONS
DURING THE EMPIRE

OLLI SALOMIES

The corpus of Latin written in Antiquity consists to a not unimportant degree of inscriptions on stone and on other material. About 200,000 or 300,000 Latin inscriptions may have been published up to this date, a quite respectable number. For those wishing to study the development of Latin it is obviously of some use to keep an eye not only on Latin authors, but also on the epigraphical sources.

In fact, epigraphical Latin has been the object of keen scholarly interest since the 19th century, when epigraphical corpora of some scientific reliability began to published. Numerous monographs and articles have been devoted to the study of epigraphical Latin.[1] However, if I am not altogether mistaken, these studies seem rather to concentrate on the "unclassical" aspects of Latin inscriptions, the inscriptions being preferably used to illustrate aspects, especially those belonging to the sphere of morphology and phonology, of archaic or, on the other hand, "vulgar" Latin. Of course it is true that Latin inscriptions offer invaluable material for the study of the development of Latin forms and sounds. But a significant number of the Latin inscriptions have been written in a language which hardly offers points of interest to the student of these aspects. Texts of this type, for instance early imperial building inscriptions or honorific inscriptions attached to statues of emperors, are in fact, I think, more often referred to by historians than by philologists.

However, the inscriptions written in a language not including archaic or "vulgar" forms can also be of some interest from a philogical (rather than from an historical) point of view. For example, they can be used to illustrate

---

[1] Cf. e.g. the works listed in A. Szantyr, Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik (1965) p. LXVIII; G.C. Susini, Epigrafia latina (1982) 96f.

the development of Latin syntax and style. But although scholars whose interests are not limited to the study of literary Latin have always taken into account also the epigraphical material at our disposal,[2] there is still some work to be done. Let me illustrate this with some examples. In his authoritative exposition of the syntax of Latin cited in n. 1, A. Szantyr says (p. 575) that in "late Latin" (Spätlatein) clauses beginning with explicative or causal *quod* often have the predicate in the subjunctive mood, referring (among other texts) also to three inscriptions, only one of which, from Africa, has a date (AD 276/82). This certainly does not tell the whole truth; in fact, from about the beginning of the second century almost all inscriptions, including solemn ones set up in the capital by the Roman senate and people, which give the reason for the setting up of the accompanying monuments and which use clauses introduced by *quod*, use the verb in the subjunctive.[3] Another example: readers of inscriptions referring to emperors cannot fail to notice that in Augustan and other early texts the fact that an emperor is in the possession of the *tribunicia potestas* is regularly indicated by the use of the ablative of (as it seems) quality, *tribunicia potestate I, II* etc., but that, on the other hand, all kinds of texts, from dedications to milestones, seem to go over to the use of the genitive *tribuniciae potestatis* from about the early second century. But in spite of the fact that this observation obtrudes itself on any reader of inscriptions, I do not seem to find it referred to in expositions dedicated to the history of the Latin *genetivus* and *ablativus qualitatis*.[4]

---

[2] Inscriptions are quite frequently cited to illustrate syntactical and stylistic phenomena of classical (i.e. neither archaic nor "vulgar") Latin e.g. in the works of Einar Löfstedt, although only a small selection is usually included in the indexes (cf. e.g. Syntactica I[2] [1942] 339, II [1933] 111, 123, 130, 138 for inscriptions quoted in the text, but omitted from the Index locorum).

[3] Cf. ILS 298 (AD 115, on the arch of Trajan in Ancona) *imp. Caesari ... senatus p. q. R., quod accessum Italiae .. tutiorem ... reddiderit*; ILS 1098 (statue base at Rome, c. AD 170) *M. Claudio ... Frontoni cos. ...; huic senatus ..., quod ... pro r(e) p(ublica) fortiter pugnans ceciderit, armatam statuam [poni] .. cen[suit]*. Instances of the use of the indicative in the second century and later are not inexistant, but rare (the prime example is the inscription on the arch of Constantine at Rome, ILS 694, but this is a text the wording of which includes some unusual formulations [cf. Th. Grünewald, Constantinus Maximus Augustus (1990) 63ff.]; further examples from the 4th century: ILS 1219; 5698; both the indicative and the subjunctive are used in ILS 1256, as also in ILS 5062 from AD 249)

[4] One may add that, although genitives of quality, especially those used to describe

But the Latin used in inscriptions can, I think, also be of some interest as an independant object of study, and not only as material offering parallels to phenomena found in Latin authors. On one hand, epigraphical Latin, or at least the epigraphical Latin which is used in inscriptions from the late Republic and the earlier Empire, has some syntactical and stylistic features of its own which in themselves are not unworthy of study. On the other hand, anyone familiar with Latin imperial inscriptions is only too aware of the fact that the style of the inscriptions changes quite remarkably between the early and the later empire, this change also being of some interest.

The style of Latin inscriptions of the "classical" period does not seem to have been the object of very many studies,[5] and I do not think that there exists a grammar or a similar work dedicated to them. Those dealing with inscriptions simply have to know what is normal and what is exceptional. For instance, anyone who has had something to do with inscriptions knows that inscriptions enumerating the stages of a career, senatorial or other, do, or at least should do, this asyndetically (and so one rises an eyebrow when one encounters a text like I.Ephesos 660E [c. AD 215], *proc. Aug. n.*

---

honorands in honorific inscriptions, become very common in inscriptions from the 3rd century onwards, epigraphic examples of ablatives of quality are almost nonexistent. In the certain instances I know of, the ablatives are used to define a statue (ILS 1257 of AD 377, *statuam pari splendore*) and a city dedicating an honorific monument (ILS 9408 [IRT 569] from the 4th century, *Lepcis magna, inclita fide, devotione praestans*; note that this seems to be an imitation of Sallust, Hist. 2, 64 [cf. below at n. 105]). In IRT 571 (AD 378) one has to restore something in the lacuna after *te[n]aci iustitia*, probably a present participle, so that the words do not describe the man himself, but his activities. On the other hand, observe the new reading of AE 1983, 247 (Luceria, Constantinian) by M. Chelotti and G. Mennella, ZPE 103 (1994) 168, *[... et singula]re* (?) *iustitia [Aureli]o Consio Quarto*; however, the reading does not seem absolutely certain.

[5] For some studies on honorific inscriptions see below. – The 18th century work by S.A. Morcelli (on whom see S.A. Morcelli, Atti del colloquio 1987, Brescia 1990), De stilo inscriptionum Latinarum (1780), is, of course, only of antiquarian interest. Not very much can be gained by reading the sections on language and style in books on Latin epigraphy which are usually quite unimpressive and in some cases, in fact, rather disappointing (see e.g. R. Cagnat, Cours d'épigraphie latine [1914[4]], e.g. 257ff. on honorific inscriptions; E. Meyer, Einführung in die lateinische Epigraphik [1973] 83ff.; I. Calabi Limentani, Epigrafia latina (1981[3]) 153; G.C. Susini, Epigrafia romana [1982] 88ff.). For an interesting study of the style and formulations used in Latin building inscriptions, see K. Gast, Die zensorischen Bauberichte bei Livius und die römischen Bauinschriften (Diss. Göttingen 1965) 40ff.; cf. M. Aberson, Le formule dell'iscrizione di Petronius Modestus e la datazione del teatro di Trieste, in: Il teatro romano di Trieste (ed. M. Verzár-Bass, Istituto Svizzero di Roma 1991) 146ff.

provinciae Asiae et a sacris cognitionibus),[6] *et, ac* and (though not used in quite the same sense) *item* only being used to combine two or more elements coming under the same heading or depending from a single superior concept;[7] but I do not recollect having seen this formulated as a rule. Neither do I believe that it has been often put down in writing that Latin building inscriptions, if mentioning the object at all,[8] normally refrain from using a demonstrative pronoun defining the object.[9] Now this is, in

---

[6] For the interpretation of the career, the man being promoted from the procuratorship of Asia to the position *a sacris cognitionibus*, see H.-G. Pflaum, Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-empire romain (1960-61) 768. Cf. AE 1917-18, 51 (Lambaesis, from the time of Severus Alexander), *leg. leg. I Adiut. et leg. Aug. pr. pr. prov. Galatiae.* From a later period: AE 1977, 198 (Puteoli, 330s) ... *comiti Orientis, comiti primi ord[i]nis et proconsuli provinciae Africae*, the proconsulate being the last stage of the career (in later inscriptions one quite often finds asyndetical enumerations ending with an *et* or *ac* between the last two items, cf. e.g. ILS 1284, CIL VI 1735, VIII 5367, IRT 103). Quite remarkable is CIL II 4112 = RIT 155 (Tarraco, 4th cent.) *M. Aur. Vincentio v. [p]. p(raesidi) [p(rovinciae) H[ispaniae)] Tarraconensis ac super omnes reliqu[os] praesides iustissimo.*

[7] On the interpretation of *et* and *item* in career inscriptions see S. Mrozek, Mélanges P. Lévêque III (1989) 280ff.; K. Dietz, Chiron 19, 1989, 443 n. 173. It is true that *item* can sometimes be used in an enumeration of similar offices even if the main word is repeated, cf. e.g. AE 1950, 66 (Mactar, 130s), *leg. pro pr. [imp. Caes. Traiani Hadri]ani Aug. provinciae Cappadociae, item leg. pro pr. [imp. C]aesaris Traiani Hadriani Aug. provinciae Moesiae i[nferior]is*; this is, however, a somewhat special case, though we cannot go into that here (cf. the interpretation of R. Syme, Roman Papers V [1988] 573). Special cases are also inscriptions such as AE 1956, 124 (Diana veteranorum, in honour of M. Valerius Maximianus; time of Commodus), in which *item*, though appearing between complete designations of offices (*leg. leg. ..., item leg. leg. ...*), is used to indicate that the commands were simultaneous, not successive.

[8] Cf. Gast, op. cit. (n. 5) 47; Aberson, art. cit. (n. 5) 148f.

[9] The only instance mentioned by Gast (p. 50, along with adjectives and other words defining the object), is *hance aquam*, CIL X 8236 = I² 825 = ILS 5742. From the Empire there are some further examples; an early one is ILS 5889 (AD 41/54), *hanc viam*; ILS 3841 (*has aedes imp. Caes. ... et imp. Caes. ... fecerunt*) is from AD 161/169; ILS 6587 (*hanc porticum*) seems to be from the second century. In the fourth century this may have been more common, cf. e.g. ILS 762, 774, 5885. (By this time one also sometimes finds *iste* for *hic*, though not in the accusative defining objects: cf. *istius fabricae munitione* ILS 724; ibid. 1203, *istarum aedium conditori*; ibid. 5477; CIL XI 2834, *curator r.p. ‹i›stius civitatis.*) As for *hic*, observe that the use of this pronoun is fairly common in inscriptions referring to someone's possessions or the limitation of land, cf. ILS 5998ff. (and also e.g. CIL V 1001 = Inscriptiones Aquileiae 526) with expressions like *cippi hi finiunt hortos* or *in his praediis* or *hic lucus sacer macerie cinctus.*

fact, most interesting, because in Oscan building inscriptions it is, somewhat surprisingly from the point of view of the student of Latin epigraphy, on the contrary absolutely normal to use the equivalent of *hic* to define the object.[10] One observes, at least in this case, very clearly how Latin epigraphy is based on a tradition differing somewhat from the epigraphical tradition among other Italic peoples.

The object of this paper is to study, according to its title, some aspects of the development of the language and the style of a certain category of Latin inscriptions, namely those attached to monuments set up in honour of individuals (emperors, senators and others), known usually, when Latin inscriptions are classified, as honorific inscriptions. The style of honorific inscriptions follows to a large degree certain quite strict rules which are typical only of them, and it is of some importance to keep the honorific inscriptions apart from other kinds of epigraphical texts (but I have not refrained from sometimes citing building inscriptions, the formulations of which, at least in later antiquity, offer interesting parallels). This becomes clear, for instance, if one has a look at inscriptions using a style which is closer to literary Latin, e.g. inscriptions citing different kinds of decrees, letters written by emperors or other officials, *senatus consulta* etc.; even the earliest ones use formulations which would be unheard-of in honorific inscriptions of the same period.[11]

It is of course true that the Latin[12] honorific inscription is a topic on

---

[10] See E. Vetter, Handbuch der italischen Dialekte I (1953) no. 11, *trííbum ekak* ('domum hanc'); ibid. 8, 12, 152, 155; P. Poccetti, Nuovi documenti italici (1979) 14, 15, 132, 133, 134.

[11] Cf. e.g. the *decreta Pisana* (ILS 139, 140) from the time of Augustus, in which one finds Augustus defined as *totius orbis terrae praeses* and peoples defeated by the Romans as *bellicosissimae ac maxsimae gentes*. Observe also the *s.c. de aedificiis* of c. AD 47 and 56 (ILS 6043), the style of which, correctly characterised by R. Frei-Stolba, MH 26, 1969, 24, as "barock und schwülstig", has always struck me as reminiscent of a much later period (note e.g. the use of expressions such as *foedus* and *splendere*; and cf. also Å. Fridh, Terminologie et formules dans les Variae de Cassiodore [1956] 42f.). The *tabulae patronatus* also offer formulations which become common in honorific inscriptions only much later (for instance, the *patronus* is described as *tantae virtutis vir* in ILS 6106 from c. AD 101).

[12] I am going to concentrate only on inscriptions written in Latin, although, at least in the later period, Greek honorific inscriptions sometimes offer interesting parallels to the Latin ones. The formulations of Greek honorific inscriptions and their evolution differ so much from those used in Latin ones that the two groups cannot really be used to illustrate

which there do exist studies. There is the well-known article by I. Kajanto, Un analisi filologico-letteraria delle iscrizioni onorarie,[13] and the studies by G. Alföldy[14] have also decisively advanced our understanding of Roman honorific inscriptions. On Italian inscriptions referring to *domi nobiles* we now have the useful book by E.P. Forbis, The Language of Praise in Roman Honorary Inscriptions for Italian Municipals, A.D. 1-300, Diss. Chapel Hill

---

each other. In the Greek world, the original form of honouring an individual was the honorific decree, the honorific inscription coming into existence only gradually and fairly late. Although the Greek honorific inscriptions are not to be regarded as simple "abbreviations" of honorary decrees (cf. on this the recent admirable article by F. Gschnitzer, Zwischen Denkmal und Urkunde. Kaiserzeitliche Neuerungen im Formular der Psephismata, in: E fontibus haurire. Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften, eds. R. Günther and S. Rebenich [Festschrift H. Chantraine, 1994] 281ff.), they always did preserve some features typical of decrees, which I think is one of the main reasons why they differ so much from Latin ones. Looking at those honouring Romans, and comparing them with contemporary Latin ones, one cannot fail to notice the great stylistic differences. At a time when Latin inscriptions usually define the honorand only by mentioning his (latest) office, Greek inscriptions – often beginning with the dedicator – can be very generous in referring to the merits of the honoured person (for some examples of Greek inscriptions honouring early emperors and including striking formulations see A. Scheithauer, ZPE 72, 1988, 155 n. 2). As for the syntax, one finds, for instance, that certain memorable deeds can be specified by the use of (aorist) participles (see e.g. ILS 8770 honouring L. Iulius Caesar, the censor of 89 BC), whereas in Latin inscriptions the use of participles to describe the honorand's merits becomes common only centuries later. Even during the later period, when Latin honorific inscriptions, too, start to become wordy (which I cannot imagine having been much influenced by Greek epigraphical habits [cf., however, n. 64]), one finds notable differences in the tone and the phraseology (Latin inscriptions never call emperors "masters of the land and the sea"). Furthermore, there is the fact that Greek honorific inscriptions for private persons become (unlike Latin ones) scarce in the 4th century, so that at the same time when people who formulated Latin honorific inscriptions displayed remarkable *eloquentiae cura* and *mentis vigor* (to quote expressions used in the 5th-century inscription in honour of Merobaudes the poet, ILS 2950), there is not much parallel material on the Greek side.

[13] Epigraphica 33, 1971, 3-19.

[14] Die Rolle des Einzelnen in der Gesellschaft des römischen Kaiserreiches, in: Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. - hist. Kl. 1980, vol. 8; Individualität und Kollektivnorm in der Epigraphik des römischen Senatorenstandes, Tituli 4, 1982, 37-53 (one will find both studies in the author's Die römische Gesellschaft [1986], pp. 334-377 and 378-394). Observe also the same author's Augustus und die Inschriften: Tradition und Innovation. Die Geburt der imperialen Epigraphik, Gymnasium 98, 1991, 289-324, especially the section on honorific inscriptions, p. 305ff.

1988. Many further points of importance have been illustrated in other studies.[15] In spite of this, I cannot help thinking that there is still some work to be done, for the majority of the studies cited in the preceding notes mostly concentrate on studying *what* the Latin honorific inscriptions say, which is, of course, most important, but one might also try to find out *how* this is being expressed. Also, although it is by now well known that inscriptions honouring provincial governors start to use adulatory expressions during the second century, or that fourth-century honorific

---

[15] On the evolution of the use of laudatory epithets applied to Roman emperors see R. Frei-Stolba, Inoffizielle Kaisertitulaturen im 1. und 2. Jh. n. Chr., MH 26, 1969, 18ff. (for individual emperors see the material listed e.g. in A. Mastino, Le titolature di Caracalla e Geta attraverso le iscrizioni [1981], esp. p. 125ff.; G. Sotgiu, Studi sull'epigrafia di Aureliano [1961] 26ff.; T. Grünewald, Constantinus Maximus Augustus [1990] 274ff. ["Panegyrische Formeln"]; cf. also A. Magioncalda, Lo sviluppo della titolatura imperiale da Augusto a Giustiniano [1991; mainly for students, and using almost exclusively material in Dessau's ILS] and M. Peachin, Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, A.D. 235-284 [1990; the emphasis is on the official rather than on the "inofficial" titulature]; on the use of *beatus* etc. see A. Arnaldi, Epigraphica 43, 1981, 165ff., on *pius* see E. Van't Dack, CE 68, 1993, 234ff., on the phrase *super omnes retro principes gloriosissimo* and the like see A. Scheithauer, ZPE 72, 1988, 155ff., and on the "eternity" of emperors see G. Di Vita-Evrard, in: Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IVe siècle ap. J.-C. [Coll. École française de Rome 159, 1992], 229ff.). On the evolution of titles such as *c(larissimus) v(ir)* etc. see now above all H.-G. Pflaum, Titulature et rang social sous le Haut-empire, in: Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique (1970) 159ff.; on the use of laudatory epithets in inscriptions honouring Roman officials and others see e.g. M. Christol, Hommages publics à Lepcis Magna à l'époque de Dioclétien: choix de vocabulaire et qualité du destinataire, RHD 61, 1983, 331ff.; id., Les hommages publics à Volubilis, in: L'Africa romana III (1986) 83ff.; M. Christol - A. Magioncalda, in: L'Africa romana VI (1989) 158f. n. 66 (governors honoured at Lambaesis); G. Alföldy, Chiron 11, 1981, 177 n. 44 = id., Die römische Gesellschaft (1986) 170 n. 44 (equestrian officials). On the phraseology found in the epigraphy of the later Roman empire one can find much of interest in the volume Atti del convegno "La terza età dell'epigrafia" (ed. A. Donati, 1988), e.g. A. Chastagnol, Le formulaire de l'épigraphie latine officielle dans l'antiquité tardive (p. 11ff.). Furthermore, observe V. Neri, L'elogio della cultura e l'elogio delle virtù politiche nell'epigrafia latina del IV secolo d.C., Epigraphica 43, 1981, 175ff. On funerary inscriptions see e.g. M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni, Les qualitatifs reservés aux défunts dans les inscriptions ... d'Ostie et de Portus, ZPE 43, 1981, 57ff.; J.-F. Berthet - B. Pagnon, Le vocabulaire moral des inscriptions de Lyon et de Vienne, in: La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule (Coll. centre d'études romaines et galloromaines n. s. 7, 1989) 43ff.; H. Desaye, Les épithètes laudatives et affectives dans les épitaphes de la moyenne vallée du Rhone, ibid. 59ff.

inscriptions generally use a bombastic style which often makes one think that those who planned the wording must have done their best to surpass the limits of human imagination, the evolution of all this still does not seem to have been set out in a way which would take proper account of the different stages and which would try to distinguish between different ways of expressing things. Of course, it is not my aim to try to accomplish something like this in this paper; I only wish to point out some interesting aspects of the development of Latin honorific inscriptions which seem to obtrude themselves upon the reader.

At the beginning of the history of the Latin honorific inscription in its definite form, with the name of the honoured person in the dative (this type being attested from the early 1st century B.C. onwards),[16] the structure of the text is generally quite simple. The formulation of the earliest attested honorific inscription with the name in the dative (of 91 BC, Kajanto 9), from Delos, is as follows: *C. Iulio C.f. Caesar[i] pro cos. olearei* (CIL I^2 705 = ID 1712 = ILS 7172), i.e. the name is followed by a definition, the office currently held; the text finishes off with the dedicator; the predicate is omitted. Approximately the same pattern is followed in the inscriptions in honour of Sulla (ILS 870ff.) and in many other texts (including those dedicated to Caesar and Augustus) until the early empire (e.g. ILS 896 [Augustan] from Herculaneum, *M. Nonio M.f. Balbo pr. pro cos. Herculanenses*), although one finds that sometimes more than one office is mentioned (usually a choice of the highest offices held, or possibly a priesthood in addition to the highest office is given). In many inscriptions of this period even the dedicator is omitted.[17]

After the early Empire one only rarely finds texts of this simple and "lapidary" structure. Revolutionary in many other respects, the establish-

---

[16] For the prehistory of the honorific inscription see Kajanto, art. cit. (n. 13) 7ff.

[17] For a somewhat exceptional inscription, note CIL XI 4213 = I^2 2510 = ILS 6629 from Interamna Nahars, *A. Pompeio A.f. Clu. q., patrono ..., quod eius opera universum municipium ex summis pereiculeis et diffultatibus expeditum et conservatum est, ex testamento L. Licini T.f. statua statuta est* (observe the *amplificatio* in the mention of the problems which the city had faced and the use of two verbs which seem to have about the same meaning). Scholars used to date this inscription to the time of Sulla (C. Cichorius, Römische Studien [1922] 185ff., followed by A. Degrassi in ILLRP 364), but it seems now that this date is too early and that the inscription must, in fact, date from the early Augustan period (see Degrassi's addenda to ILLRP 364, vol. II p. 385, and to CIL I^2 2510, CIL I^2 2, 4, p. 941). However, despite the new dating the formulations remain remarkable.

ment of the rule of Augustus and the beginning of Empire also coincides with a decisive change in the epigraphic culture at Rome. The setting up of all kinds of monuments accompanied by inscriptions suddenly became extremely common.[18] Of course, this "epigraphic revolution" affected not only the numbers of inscriptions being set up, but quite soon also their structure and contents. On the whole one can say that all types of inscriptions tend to become more and more detailed and informative, although one must note that the two aspects go hand in hand only until about the third century; during and after this time inscriptions, or at least the more public ones (the development of funerary inscriptions is quite another story), still become more and more detailed and wordy, whereas the actual information useful to the historian given in them becomes more and more rare, the general impression one gets being that of extreme vagueness.

To describe the evolution of the style of honorific inscriptions, it would be a good idea to choose a single expression covering, if possible, all the aspects of the evolution, and I wish to suggest here that the term *amplificatio* borrowed from the technical language of rhetoric[19] could be quite suitable. Although we shall obviously not be dealing with quite the same thing that Cicero or Quintilian had in mind, I think that the term *amplificatio* can, *mutatis mutandis*, be applied to all the aspects of the evolution, for in a way it is question of more or less the same phenomenon: in imperial inscriptions, a very simple narrative structure is "amplified" with more and more details, some of them meaningful, some of them not, to produce a text which (I suspect) would have seemed to the contemporary Roman to be more in line with the taste of the new, Imperial Rome, contrasted with the simple taste of earlier times.

In formulating imperial honorific inscriptions, any part of the structure of the original type could be "amplified"; i.e., one could give more information, often eloquently formulated, on the honoured person, on his status and career, and on the dedicator. But in addition to that, information not usually present in the primitive type, such as a specific reason for the setting up of the honorific monument, could be added. In the beginning, the *amplificatio* consists mainly of elements which can be thought of as being

---

[18] Cf. for all this, G. Alföldy, art. cit. (in Gymnasium 98, 1991, see n. 14) 291ff. (Id., Studi sull'epigrafia Augustea e Tiberiana di Roma [Vetera 8, 1992] concentrates on details rather than on the overall evolution.)

[19] Cf. e.g. M. Erren, Einführung in die römische Kunstprosa (1983) 12ff.

objective; with time, the elements tend to become more subjective, their addition seemingly meant to add colour to the whole rather than to give precise extra information. For instance, one starts to find descriptive, but not necessarily very meaningful, adjectives, often in the superlative, being added, not only to define the honoured person, but to define any expression appearing in the text. The emperor, if mentioned in a text honouring a private person, acquired an adjective such as *sacratissimus*, the Roman senate was labeled as *amplissimus*, Rome as *sacra* (and later *aeterna*),[20] a local senate, a city or a province as *splendidissima*,[21] military campaigns as *felicissimae*,[22] defeated peoples as *bellicosissimae gentes*.[23] In exactly the same way imperial building inscriptions referring to restoration began to describe the reasons which lead to the destruction of the building being restored;[24] later also the state in which a building was found[25] and the quality of the work may be specified.[26]

---

[20] *Sacra*: e.g. ILS 98, 1128 (Severan); *aeterna* (common in the 4th century) in the time of Severus Alexander: ILS 3926.

[21] *Splendidissimus ordo* (thus usually in the third century, later more often *ordo splendidissimus*) is of course most common in Severan and later times (e.g. ILS 1138). Cities defined as *splendidissimae*: e.g. ILS 4052 (AD 169, *splendi‹di›ssimae civitati Gortyniorum*), 1140 (Severan, *civitatis splendidissimae Nicomedensium*), 6815 (Carthage, earlier 3rd cent.). One also finds *splendida* (ILS 1216, Carthage; 1273, Alexandria) and other adjectives (e.g. ILS 1235, 6809). Provinces being designated as *splendidissimae* in honorific inscriptions: ILS 1168 and 9488 from the early third century (in the *s.c. sumptibus ludorum* of AD 177/80, ILS 5163, one finds *fidelissimarum Galliarum vestrarum* and *splendidissimarum Galliarum*). *Splendidissimus* can be applied also to an office, cf. ILS 1420, *exornato sacerdotio splendidissimo pontif(icatus) minor(is)* (180/192; cf. ILS 3049, 8918).

[22] E.g. AE 1957, 123 (Lambaesis, c. 202/205), *secunda Par[t]hica felicissima expedi[tio]ne*.

[23] ILS 374, set up in honour of Marcus Aurelius by the senate and the people in 176 (cf. above n. 11 for the use of *bellicosissimae gentes* in a different context in the time of Augustus).

[24] E.g. ILS 245 (AD 71/2; in fact an honorific inscription) *vias urbis neglegentia superior(um) tempor(um) corruptas*; 336 (AD 139) *opus ... vi maris conlapsum*.

[25] E.g. ILS 2943 *plateam ... [omni] lapide spoliatam* (early 4th cent.); CIL VI 1728a *nymphium sordium squalore foedatum* (a popular expression in this period) *et marmorum nuditate deforme* (391).

[26] E.g. ILS 774 *ad summam manum perfectionis* (late 4th cent.); 5557 *ad omnem splendorem* (368/70); AE 1955, 52 *pretorium pulcherrimum* (368/70). (The habit of saying that a building was restored *ad pristinam faciem, ad pristinum statum* etc. is

Giving more detailed information on the career of an honoured senator is a kind of *amplificatio* which appears early in honorific inscriptions. We have seen that in late Republican inscriptions a senator's status was usually defined by mentioning only the office currently held, more detailed descriptions of careers (which are not very common) being restricted to funerary inscriptions of a private nature. In the time of Augustus, however, one suddenly starts to find also honorific inscriptions in which the career is set out in full, from the beginning to the latest office; the earliest datable instances seem to be the inscriptions from Athens and Corinth (ILS 928; Corinth VIII 2, 54) in honour of the proconsul of Achaea, L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus from about 3 BC.[27] This was a most important development, for from now on "career inscriptions", often most detailed and thus extremely useful to the student of senatorial offices during the Empire, make up an important part in the corpus of inscriptions referring to senators.

Another important kind of *amplificatio* is that applied to the honoured person. First of all, from the time of Augustus onwards, honorific inscriptions begin to be more precise in the rendering of the nomenclature of the honorand. In Republican inscriptions, the tribe was not normally mentioned (and in early Augustan texts even the filiation is sometimes omitted); but from now on the nomenclature used of honorands tends to be as complete as possible, including the tribe, so that the nomenclature now, in fact, becomes a copy of the official name form used of Romans in census lists. This is, of course, most useful information. But with time honorands also start to be described in a somewhat more subjective manner, their moral and other qualities being referred to, so as to make the dedication of the honorific monument seem even more justified. This could be done in two ways. One possibility was to define the honorand by the use of an abstract noun, e.g. *pietas* or *benevolentia*, and to refer such a noun to the honorand by the use of a preposition, usually *ob*.[28] The other possibility was to attach an attribute to the name of the honorand to describe him more closely, i.e. an adjective, usually in the superlative, a verbal form (present

---

attested earlier, cf. ILS 406 etc.)

[27] On all this, see the remarkable exposition by W. Eck, Senatorial Self-representation: Developments in the Augustan Period, in: Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects (eds. F. Millar & E. Segal, 1984), 129-169, esp. 149ff.

[28] For these and other expressions see Forbis, op. cit. (above at n. 15).

participle etc.) or a noun with a concrete and active meaning. Since it is not useful to separate the former type from those cases in which a specific reason for the setting up of a honorific monument is announced, a phrase like *ob benevolentiam* obviously being on the same level as e.g. *ob dedicationem thermarum*, we shall come back to these expressions later. Instead, let us have a look at attributes used to describe honorands (although, as will be observed below, attributes also sometimes refer to something very concrete and are in fact often used to explain the reason for the honorific monument, *restitutori rei publicae* [CIL VI 1146] conveying of course the same meaning as *ob rem publicam restitutam* [ILS 425]).[29] In inscriptions honouring emperors, one seems to find the honorands being defined by the use of nouns and adjectives beginning in the time of Tiberius, in whose case expressions such as *iustissimus*, *optimus* and *conservator patriae* are attested, although one must note that these texts are not necessarily representative of their age.[30] For the later history of the adjectives see the exposition of Frei-Stolba (n. 30);[31] since the author only

---

[29] It could be of some profit to compare inscriptions honouring emperors and others with inscriptions honouring deities, i.e. votive inscriptions, for one observes many similarities, at least in the vocabulary, between the two classes of inscriptions. Reading e.g. the votive inscriptions in Dessau's ILS (2957ff., esp. 2996ff.), one finds that, during the Empire, deities are more and more often characterised by nouns and adjectives in the superlative (but note also *Herculi victori pollenti potenti* in ILS 3434 from AD 81), and that these are in many cases identical with expressions attested in honorary inscriptions for emperors and others (e.g. *conservator*, *defensor*, *rector*, *restitutor*, *victor*; *excellentissimus*, *exsuperantissimus*, *praestantissimus*; on the other hand, e.g. *tutator* [ILS 3021, 3027] and, understandably, *exauditor* [ILS 3002] seem to be attested only in votive inscriptions).

[30] See R. Frei-Stolba, MH 26, 1969, 22ff., who notes (p. 22) that one finds in inscriptions referring to Tiberius many formulations which remind one of later times (cf. ILS 157 from Interamna Nahars, *nati ad aeternitatem Romani nominis*); not unreasonably, the author connects the phenomenon with the events of AD 31. In an inscription on an epistyle from Aegae in Mysia Tiberius is designated (in the nominative) as *conditor uno tem[pore XII civitatum t]errae motu ve[xatarum]* (CIL III 7096), this, of course, being a translation of a Greek formulation (which in fact survives in ILS 8785 = IGR IV 1351; cf. on this text W. Kuhoff, Felicior Augusto, melior Traiano. Aspekte der Selbstdarstellung der römischen Kaiser während der Prinzipatszeit [1993] 212).

[31] Let me only add that *sacratissimus*, referring, it is true, not to the emperor himself, but to his birthday, is now attested in an inscription of AD 28, AE 1969/70, 110 (Cales, *sacratissimo die natali divi Augusti*).

treats the first two centuries, one could perhaps add that adjectives used in the positive seem to appear only in Severan and later inscriptions; at least *magnus* and *inclitus* (both expressions later becoming most popular, *magnus*, often combined with *invictus*,[32] already in the 3rd century, and *inclitus* in the time of Valentinian I) are attested for Caracalla,[33] and before Diocletian one finds in addition also *inlustris* and *perpetuus*.[34] As for nouns, it is of some use to distinguish between other nouns and those ending in *-tor* (or *-sor*) formed from verbs, for the nouns of the former category, not very common, tend to be more abstract and vague,[35] whereas nouns ending in *-tor* during the earlier Empire often refer to something very precise and are in many cases used to give a reason for the erection for the monument. Moreover, this class of nouns is most interesting because it becomes, with time, very common in honorific inscriptions (and not only in those honouring emperors), so that, by the fourth century, one finds a marvellous variety in the repertory of these nouns, the suffix *-tor* in late antiquity obviously having become extremely productive.[36] After the early instance under Tiberius (see above), the next example of a noun ending in *-tor* is the

---

[32] Severus and Caracalla are described (in the ablative) as *in]victi* in an inscription of c. 202/205 from Lambaesis (AE 1957, 123). For Caracalla see also Mastino, op. cit. (n. 15) 128. For Philip see IRT 880.

[33] See Mastino, op. cit. (n. 15) 128, 134.

[34] ILS 597; Sotgiu, op. cit. (n. 15) 29f. In the 4th century, one finds many more, sometimes quite picturesque, expressions, e.g. *venerabilis* (ILS 707), *strenuus* (*bellis*, ILS 768), *caelestis* (IRT 57. 472), not to mention *divus* and *divinus* being used of living emperors (e.g. ILS 707, 760; in inscriptions other than honorific: ILS 5358, 5520; observe that in a *decree* one finds Antoninus Pius designated as *divinus princeps*: ILS 6680; cf. CIL X 1558, cited by Frei-Stolba p. 38, where the restorations are, however, not certain).

[35] Thus one finds *vind(ici)* *lib(ertatis)* in an inscription (containing unusual formulations) in honour of Claudius from Cyzicus (ILS 217; *vindex et conditor Romanae disciplinae* referring to Septimius Severus in an inscription in honour of Caracalla: ILS 446; in 4th-century texts: ILS 8938, CIL VI 13734; in inscriptions for *privati*: ILS 1247/8; IRT 571); *fortissimo duci* in an inscription from Capena honouring Pertinax (ILS 409; *dux* - not used as an official title – also appears in private inscriptions from the 2nd century onwards, e.g. ILS 1097, 1354, 2771); quite extravagantly *numini praesenti* in an inscription of 199 honouring Caracalla (ILS 453, Tusculum). Of course one also often finds *princeps* (defined by an adjective); for *dominus noster* see Chastagnol, art. cit. (n. 15) 12ff.

[36] Cf. e.g. G. Haverling, Studies on Symmachus' Language and Style (1988) 54ff.; and below at n. 110.

inscription in honour of Claudius cited in n. 35, where one must no doubt read *devi[ctori regum XI] Britanniae*;[37] which is interesting because – unlike the somewhat vague *conservator patriae* – the noun refers to a precise accomplishment of the emperor. This is the case also in ILS 252, set up in Rome in 77/8 by the *sodales Titii* in honour of Vespasian, *restitutori aedium sacrarum* (but he is also more generally defined as *conservatori caerimoniarum publicarum*).[38] Although already attested in the first century, nouns in *-tor* seem to become more common in the second; inscriptions in honour of Trajan and later emperors offer quite a few examples. Although often rather general in tone,[39] one also encounters pleasant instances in which the nouns refer to something very specific.[40]

In addition to adjectives and nouns, honoured emperors could be characterised also by the use of nonfinite forms of verbs, i.e. with present, past and future participles and with gerundives. Except for past participles, which are not a very interesting category,[41] these forms are all attested only during the later Empire. Especially the use of present participles[42] became eventually quite popular,[43] although evidently not as popular as in in-

---

[37] One could of course also think of restoring *devi[ctis regibus* (and earlier *vind(icata) lib(ertate)*), but in early imperial inscriptions the noun appears regularly at the beginning of ablative absolutes. (On the other hand, this is an inscription from Cyzicus, and one with somewhat unusual formulations.)

[38] Titus is called *conser[va]tor Pacis Aug.* in ILS 259 from Valentia.

[39] E.g. CIL VI 958 (Trajan), *propagatori orbis terrarum, locupletatori civium* (the point of view is narrower in ILS 321 from Gabii for Hadrian and Sabina, *locupletatoribus municipii*); ILS 304 (Trajan) from Baetica, *conservatori generis humani*, which could in fact be a suitable designation for a 4th-century emperor. (On Septimius Severus as *propagator imperii* in African inscriptions see J.-L. Desnier, MEFRA 105 [1993] 561.)

[40] E.g. ILS 315 (Hadrian), from Athens, *restitutori coloniae suae Troadenses*; I. Parion 7 - 9 (Hadrian), *conditori col(oniae)*; ILS 340 (Pius in 142), *constitutori sacri certaminis iselastici*; ILS 2155 (Severus in 207), *restitutori castrorum Ostiensium*.

[41] Trajan is *optime de re p. merito* in ILS 292 (AD 112). In the fourth century one finds expressions such as *diis auctoribus procreato* (ILS 665), *patre, avo imperatoribus nato* (ILS 721), *pietate praedito* (IRT 471), and of course the popular *bono rei publicae nato* (on which see Chastagnol, art. cit. [n. 15] 17, cf. 25f.). Already Tiberius appears in the genitive as *nati ad aeternitatem Romani nominis* in an inscription set up by a *sevir Augustalis* after the Sejanus affair, cf. above n. 30.

[42] For gerundives, cf. ILS 751 (*venerando principi*: Julian), 758; ILTun. 814 (used in the nominative in a building inscription: ILS 703). For a future participle, cf. ILS 721 (*semper orbi taerre profuturo*).

[43] Cf. e.g. ILS 689, 726, 734, 752, 8947; CIL VIII 1179. Note, by the way, that there

scriptions honouring private persons. The same can be said of genitives of quality. Attested, as far as I can see, for the first time in an inscription in honour of Pertinax (ILS 409: *omnium virtu[t]uum* [sic] *principi*), one finds more instances in 4th-century inscriptions,[44] but not in quite the same numbers as in inscriptions referring to *privati*; those wishing to define an emperor not only by the use of the official titles, but also by the use of other expressions – and there were many such people in later antiquity – normally preferred adjectives and nouns ending in *-tor*.

As for inscriptions honouring private persons, one observes much the same evolution. Of course, one has to remember that, as a class, inscriptions honouring persons other than emperors by nature differ somewhat from those in honour of emperors, for instance, in that one has to distinguish between the more private ones, e.g. those set up by relatives and dependants, usually in private locations (to these one may add many funerary inscriptions, in the case of senators and others representing the upper classes not always easy to be kept apart from honorific inscriptions), and those meant for public display. In inscriptions of a more private nature, one finds laudatory epithets of various kinds from the earliest empire, just as one finds adjectives such as *pientissimus* or *incomparabilis* in the normal type of funerary inscriptions set up in memory of deceased representing the *plebs*. One thus finds expressions such as *sanctissimo et iustissimo ... patrono semper de se merito* (ILS 962 [Pergamon], from the time of Claudius) and *[op]timo constantissimo* (ILS 1102 [Cirta], from the time of Marcus Aurelius);[45] or *amico optimo et praesidio suo* (CIL VI 1625a, c. AD 140). In the more public honorific inscriptions, laudatory epithets are extremely rare before the later second century. The earliest provincial governor to whom a superlative is applied is to my knowledge T. Caesernius Macedo, procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis in AD 107, who is called *innocentissimo praesidi* in ILS 9008. However, this instance is clearly an

---

may be an interesting early example of the use of a present participle, namely the extremely fragmentary inscription ILS 145 from Centumcellae, set up in honour of Tiberius when he was still the colleague of Augustus; the text is restored by Mommen as follows: *[consilia adiuvan]ti [optimi maximique pri]ncipis.*

[44] ILS 758; VI 31381. 31394a.

[45] Cf. ILS 990/991, 1064, 1095 etc. In a funerary inscription of a IVvir of Volcei from the period between AD 14 and 42 the man is decribed as *optimo et indulgentissimo viro* (ILS 9390).

exception,[46] for provincial governors normally begin to be provided with laudatory superlatives only in the period of last Antonines.[47] As for other types of epithets, the rare adjectives used in the positive are, at least before the 4th century, rather uninspiring;[48] nouns ending in -tor (and -sor) seem, unlike in the case of emperors, to be rare before the late third century,[49] after which time they become extremely common.[50] Of the use of present participles, also common in, and typical of, the fourth century, there are some not very interesting examples from the second century and the Severan period,[51] the earliest instance clearly representing the type common

---

[46] ILS 6173 from Ostia (with *patrono et defensori V corporum ... dignissimo atque abstinentissimo viro*, and some more formulations in the same style) is also at least seemingly fairly early, for it is dated to AD 147; however, many features of the inscription make me suspect that this monument may in fact be later, for there are quite a few examples of reused monuments in which the original date (inscribed not on the front, but on the side) was left untouched (cf. e.g. CIL VI 1119, 1173, 1659, 1662 [= ILS 5357], 31128, 33856, 36954 [= ILS 726]; CIL X 1814, 3344 = ILS 5902).

[47] Cf. G. Alföldy, Die römische Gesellschaft (n. 14) 388ff.; M. Christol - A. Magioncalda, in: L'Africa romana 6 (1989) 158f. n. 6 (Lambaesis). Superlatives in inscriptions honouring *domi nobiles* datable (more or less certainly) to the Severan period: e.g. ILS 6263, 6449, 6504, 6656, 6744; AE 1975, 872. Observe that in CIL IX 4206 a man holding only municipal offices and obviously not of equestrian rank is characterised as *splendidissimo viro*.

[48] E.g. *patrono incomparabili* ILS 1161 (Severan; in a more private context ILS 1083 and 1190, *amico incomparabili*); *viro bono* ILS 5076 (c. Severan, referred to a municipal man; *bono viro* ILS 6817; in an inscription of 208/210 honouring the daughters of a legate of Numidia the legate himself is mentioned in the genitive as *hominis boni, praesidis clementissimi*): ILS 9488. There is somewhat more inspiration in ILS 1357 from Auzia (in Mauretania), in which the Severan governor Octavius Pudens is honoured (in the accusative) as *praesidem incomparabilem, innocentia praecipuum omniumque virtutum virum* (for the genitive of quality see below at n. 52). Note also CIL VIII 18268 (in honour of the Numidian legate – in the 240s – Cominius Cassianus, to whose inscriptions we shall be referring also in the following), *claro et inlustr(i) v(iro)*. In the fourth century, one encounters expressions such as ILS 1254, *pleno aequitatis ac fidei*; ILS 5511, *castitate conspic[uo*.

[49] ILS 5076 (from Africa, significantly), with *bono viro amatori munic.* may be about Severan.

[50] E.g. ILS 1247, 1248 (and 5341), 1263, 1276, 2937, 5509, 5511 (with seven nouns ending in -tor, including five instances of *reparator*), 5692, 6349, 5697, 6186, 6611; CIL VI 1706; CIL X 3844; AE 1972, 75b.

[51] ILS 6264, *exemplis munificentiae suae optime merenti* (rather lame, *merenti* being borrowed from the language of common funerary inscriptions; cf. *optime de re publica*

to late antiquity being from the time of Philip, ILS 1154 from Lambaesis, in which the legate of Numidia, Cominius Cassianus (to whose inscriptions we shall return), is described as *omnibus virtutibus abundanti viro*. At about the same time, genitives of quality also start to become common. There are a few unobtrusive examples from the second century,[52] but the more spectacular use of genitives of quality seems to begin with the Mauretanian inscriptions honouring procurators of Severan date, ILS 1357 (Octavius Pudens), already quoted in n. 48, and CIL VIII 9359 (Aelius Peregrinus), which both have a formulation which was to become extremely popular, *omnium virtutum viro* (*virum* in ILS 1357); many further instances of similar character appear in other inscriptions from the third century,[53] not to speak of later texts. In most instances the well-known rule that the genitive of quality must depend on an expression such as *viro* is followed, but this is not always the case; cf. e.g. ILS 1443 (from Dalmatia, 3rd cent.), *mi[r]ae inte[g]ritatis [e]t bonitatis*; ILS 6325 (probably from Puteoli, dated to AD 241),[54] *mirabilis munificentiae*, or (the genitive of quality coming before the name) ILS 1228 (Africa, Constantinian), *mirae iustitiae atq. eximiae*

---

merito ILS 1071 from the time of Pius; for ILS 962 see above at n. 45). AE 1954, 168 (Capena) with e.g. *ludos edenti* (i.e. the man is honoured *inter alia* because he had arranged *ludi*) is dated to AD 172, but almost everything in the text seems to point to a later date, and so we may in fact be dealing with a case similar to that referred to in n. 46. In a funerary inscription of a senator from the time of Pius one notes the somewhat striking expression *habenti quoque salutation(em) secundam imp. ... Pii* (ILS 1078).

[52] ILS 1061 (Tibur, from the time of Pius), *quinquennali maximi exempli* (a senator; cf. 1071, from the same period and also from Tibur); for later instances of the use of *exempli* see e.g. ILS 1333; CIL VIII 8327 (in funerary inscriptions, one encounters earlier examples, cf. e.g. CIL VI 10515, *uxori sanctissimae et rarissimi exempli* [this inscription is dated to ca. AD 125-135 by D.E.E. Kleiner, Roman Imperial Funerary Altars with Portaits (1987) 227f. no.92]). In ILS 6334 of AD 187 from Puteoli a woman is honoured as *honestae et incomparabilis sectae matron(ae)*. Observe, incidentally, that one starts to find (usually abbreviated) titles of the type *bonae memoriae vir* about the same period.

[53] E.g. ILS 1411 (*singularis integritatis viro*). 6836 (*omnium virtutum viro*); CIL VIII 8327 (*praesidi exempli [rarissimi]*); CIL VIII 11105 (*omnium virtutum [et t]otius iustitia[e] viro*); AE 1916, 107 = 1917-18, 114 (*unicae bonitatis viro*). In AE 1939, 38, in honour of Cominius Cassianus (cf. above), *viro* is replaced most remarkably by *genio*. Observe that these inscriptions all come from Africa. For genitives of quality appearing before the nomenclature see below; and for *virtutum omnium vir* cf. e.g. Symm. Rel. 10,1; 11.

[54] But I think that this inscription is in fact later (Die römischen Vornamen [1987] 399 n. 139). Cf. the case above in n. 46.

moderationis and ILS 1249 (Rome, c. 350), *singularis integritatis et boni-tatis exsimiae*. However, in such cases the omission of *viro* in connection with the genitives may have been influenced by the fact that *viro* appears in the texts earlier (or later), as part of the titulature.[55]

An important development in the formulation of honorary inscriptions is the introduction of the use of laudatory epithets which precede the name.[56] In inscriptions honouring emperors, the earliest examples seem to date from the reign of Caracalla (Chastagnol, art. cit. [n. 15] 19, dates the appearence of this type too late); often one finds only laudatory expressions (thus ILS 452 [AD 214] from Rome, *magno et invicto ac super omnes principes fortissimo felicissimoque imp. Caes.* etc.),[57] but in some cases these are preceded by *domino nostro* (thus CIL VI 1066, AD 213, *domino nostro invictissimo [et] omnium principum v[irtute] benivolentia indulgentia exsuperantissimo imp. Caes.* etc.).[58] In the beginning, the epithets consist mainly of adjectives, but gradually nouns ending in *-tor* were also intro-

---

[55] Thus in the inscriptions cited above, ILS 1443 leading off with *viro ex equestribus turmis egregio*, ILS 6325 with *c.v.*, ILS 1228 and 1249 continuing after the name of the honorand with *v. c.* or *c. v.* Cf. e.g. IRT 576 (*singularis integritatis et moderationis* being preceded by *omnium virtutum viro* - appearing before the name - and *v. p.*), AE 1972, 79 (Puteoli, c. 340), ILS 5011 (the genitives of quality appearing before the name perhaps depending on *v(irgini)* in the title *v(irgini) V(estali)*. In IRT 577 the genitive of quality *singularis aequitatis et beniboli vigoris* is preceded by *v.p.* and followed by *omnium virtutum viro*. The only exceptions I can find in inscriptions honouring persons other than emperors are IRT 570 and CIL VI 1755 (AD 395), *Aniciae Faltoniae Probae fidei, nobilitatis antiquae* (for inscriptions in honour of emperors cf. CIL VI 31381 and 31394a, although one might assume that the genitives were thought to depend on *domino*). ILS 1236 (340s, from Cirta) is an interesting, although of course not unparalleled (cf. A. Szantyr, op. cit. [n. 1] 70) case, for the genitives have no attribute (*v.c. et consulari, continentiae integritatis patientiae aequitatis adque honorificentiae singulari ac praecipuo viro*; cited by E. Löfstedt, Syntactica I[2] [1942] 282n.); but the genitives obviously depend on the adjectives *singulari ac praecipuo* (cf. ILS 1235 in honour of the same man, *eximio ac singulari virtutum omnium*).

[56] Usually this does not mean that there are no epithets after the name; on the contrary, it is quite normal that the characterisation goes on after the name of the honorand (e.g. ILS 5697 of AD 341 from Ocriculum, *bonae originis suboli et sinceritate praecipua praedito M. Caesolio Saturnino ... laudabili viro, restauratori thermarum* etc.).

[57] Also e.g. CIL VI 1067 (214); ILS 506 (Philippus in 244); RIU 1144 (Gallus in 252); ILS 542. 547 (Gallienus).

[58] Also e.g. ILS 2158 (Gordian in 239), 8934 (Maxentius), 692 (Constantine). In the genitive: ILS 485; CIL VIII 8781 (Severus Alexander).

duced (e.g. CIL XI 3089 [Gallienus], *rectori orbis et domino terr[arum ac redin]tegratori col. Faliscorum imp.* etc.),[59] and by the time of Diocletian one also finds genitives of quality (CIL VI 31381 [Diocletian in AD 294], *mirae virtutis et [...] pietatis fortissimo [d.n.* etc.; cf. 31394a [Maxentius]);[60] in this period it seems to have been more usual to begin an honorific inscription with a characterisation of the emperor than with the simple *imp. Caes.* or *d. n.* followed by the name.[61]

In inscriptions honouring persons other than emperors, one seems to find epithets preceding the name[62] somewhat later; in sharp contrast to inscriptions in honour of emperors, those honouring senators and others start by using genitives of quality and go over to other formulations only later. The earliest instances I know of are from the reign of Gordian and Philip, all from Africa and set up in honour of legates of Numidia.[63] CIL VIII 2393 from Thamugadi, with *virtutum omnium viro* coming in front of the nomenclature *T. Iulio Tertullo Antiocho* (legate in 242), seems to belong to a more or less private sphere, because the legate is not given any title and because the dedicator calls himself *cliens eius*. But in the dedications for M. Aurelius Cominius Cassianus (legate under Philip), the formulations of whose inscriptions have already been noted (above n. 48; at n. 52; n. 53), we are obviously dealing with public honours. Interestingly, already in these rather early instances the style can be remarkably florid. Note especially AE 1917-18, 72 (Lambaesis), *insignis patientiae et admirabilis integritatis ac summarum virtutum viro M. Aurelio Cominio Cassiano* etc.[64] From the

---

[59] Also e.g. ILS 579 (Aurelian in 274, from Brixia) *magno Augusto, principi max(imo), imp(eratori) fortissimo, conservatori orbis L. Domitio* etc. (remarkable for the use of several nouns all meaning 'emperor'; observe the *variatio* and that the name is introduced without an attribute).

[60] Most striking is the Spanish inscription in honour of Probus, ILS 579, which in addition to quite colourful laudation also has the appellations *Gothi]co* and *Germanico*, both strikingly accompanied by the adjective *vero* (cf. G. Alföldy, Die römische Gesellschaft [above n. 14] 341), before the beginning of the nomenclature.

[61] But cf. e.g. ILS 615, 639, 649, 650a, 654, 655, 678.

[62] With 'name' I mean the name appearing in the dative, not the *signum* (ending usually in *-i(i)* - which I think is normally meant to be a genitive [cf. CIL X 4863, 5200]) which one finds at the beginning of many honorific inscriptions in later antiquity.

[63] For the details on these legates (and on other governors) see B.E. Thomasson, Laterculi praesidum I (1984).

[64] Cf. AE 1917-18, 73 (fragmentary in the beginning). CIL VIII 7033 = ILAlg. II 617 (Cirta), no doubt in honour of the same legate, begins with *totius [bonitatis viro(?)]*, and

third century there are also other examples of genitives of quality preceding the name;[65] other types of laudatory epithets, nouns, adjectives, present participles, gerundives[66] and others, do not seem to appear before the time of Diocletian,[67] during and after which they (as well as genitives of quality) become extremely common, the inscriptions offering marvellous variation in the choice of expressions. In African inscriptions of the fourth century, one notes the tendency to add other kinds of details in the section coming before the name of the honorand; one finds the date being defined,[68] the merits of the honorand being referred to by the use of clauses beginning with *ob*,[69] or the emperors being named as the inspiration for the setting up of the monument.[70] In a not very well known 4th-century inscription from Comum, the local *schola iuvenum seu caplatorum*, setting up a monument in honour of a certain Iucundus Faustinianus *v. p.*, names itself at the beginning of the text.[71]

An important aspect of the *amplificatio* in the formulation of honorific inscriptions is the addition of a reason for the erection of the monument. In Latin Republican inscriptions a specific reason is not usually

---

so we find the use of *totus* defining an abstract noun (reminding no doubt many of the Greek πᾶς), so typical of genitives of quality in later honorific inscriptions, already in this early instance. Observe, by the way, that there are also Numidian inscriptions in honout of this legate which begin with the name (ILS 1154; AE 1917-18, 71 and 74)

[65] E.g. CIL VIII 10988; ILS 5361. In the series of the dedications to Vestal Virgins from the Forum in Rome the earliest instance in which the epithets precede the name is CIL VI 2142 of AD 301 (*mirae sanctitatis adque in cerimoniis antistiti deorum Terentiae* etc.).

[66] CIL X 4863, *aequitate magnifico, benivolentia colendo, abstinentia continentiaq. mirando, virtute constantiaque conspicuo* etc.

[67] E.g. CIL VI 1696 (AD 307/308), *(inlu]stri viro et omnium retro praefecto[rum] industriam supergresso Attio Insteio Tertullo* etc.

[68] IRT 571 (the consular date AD 378); somewhat more colourfully IRT 480 (*florentissimis saeculis dd. nn. Honori et Theodosii* etc.).

[69] IRT 568, 574; cf. 567.

[70] ILS 1235-6 (Cirta). In ILS 738 from Cyprus, Constantius and Gallus, ordering the erection of an honorific monument, appear (in the nominative) at the beginning of the inscription, possibly following the Greek practice; similarly in ILS 1273 from Alexandria (Theodosius and Arcadius).

[71] A. Sartori, Le iscrizioni romane. Guida all'esposizione, Como, Musei Civici (1994) p. 38 (with references to earlier publications by G. Baserga in RAComo 46, 1902 and A. Sartori, ACeSDR 4, 1972-73): *Schola iuvenum seu caplatorum bene merenti Iucundo Faustiniano v. p. cur. quondam civitatis Comensium* etc.

given, and where one is mentioned, this happens usually in inscriptions either coming from the Greek part of the Empire or set up by Greeks, and the formulations, normally very discreet, are for the most part borrowed from, or at least influenced by, the phraseology of Greek inscriptions. One thus finds expressions like *virtutis* or *benefici ergo*,[72] or *honoris causa*.[73] During the Empire, it became much more common to specify the reasons for the erection of honorific monuments, although one gets the impression that this was especially common in inscriptions from the municipal sphere. I. Kajanto, in his article mentioned above (n. 13), distinguishes (p. 11f.) six different ways of expressing a motivation for an inscription: one could use the preposition *ob*; one could use clauses introduced by *quod*; one could use an ablative absolute (which of course has a causal touch); one could use an epithet (e.g. *conservatori*); one could use a relative clause (example given: ILS 6045, *plebs urbana quae frumentum publicum accipit*); or one could use a construction with a participle (example given: CIL VI 972 [= CIL XIV 95], *colonia Ostia conservata et aucta omni indulgentia eius*; cf. below n. 80). These are, in fact, the most usual types,[74] although one could perhaps

---

[72] ILS 30ff., 37 (this inscription, set up at Nemus Dianae in honour of C. Salluvius Naso by *Musei* and other peoples in Asia Minor, also has a clause introduced by *quod*); CIL I² 718.

[73] ILS 864, 891. For later instances, see Forbis, op. cit. (above at n. 15) 116 n. 2 (add her no. 103 = AE 1959, 97 from Velia). Also in ILS 1095 (Ephesus), 1102 (Cirta, set up in honour of P. Iulius Geminus Marcianus by his *strator* when he was legate in Arabia), 2648.

[74] For *ob* - quite often used with the ablative – one could sometimes substitute *propter* (e.g. ILS 1361 2934 [cf. CIL VI 1512], 6530) or *pro* (e.g. ILS 6459; combined with *ob*: CIL VIII 9046). Sections introduced by *ob* are often used to give a very specific reason for the erection of the monument (the formulations are then most often of the type *ob dedicationem thermarum* [ILS 406] or *ob rem publicam restitutam* [ILS 425]), but rather vague and general references to the honorand's virtues (of the type *ob innocentiam et laborem* [ILS 1118; the inscription in fact has *labori*], *ob eximium amorem in patriam* [ILS 1347]) are also quite common (cf. above at n. 28). Note that motivations expressed by the use of ablative absolutes seem to concentrate in the early principate (cf. ILS 81, 84, 926, 6614, from the Augustan period; IAM 369, set up by the city of Volubilis in honour of Claudius in 44, with the formulation *impetrata c. R. et conubio et oneribus remissis*); ILS 289 (cited by Kajanto, p. 12) is from the time of Trajan. The latest examples known to me are ILS 6449 (about Severan, from Paestum: a *nutritor* formulates his reasons for having the honorific monument erected with the words *multis largitionibus in se conlatis*) and CIL VI 2134 and 32419 (set up in 247 in honour of a Vestal Virgin by a certain Veturius Memphius *v.e., plurimis in se conlatis beneficiis*); cf.

say more on relative clauses and add the clauses beginning with a demonst-
rative pronoun (usually *hic*). In fact, the example of a relative clause given
by Kajanto is possibly not very representative, for normally relative clauses
appearing in honorific inscriptions have a more complex structure, and refer
to the honorand, not to the dedicator (as in the example above).[75] It is true
that one finds rather simple relative clauses such as *qui ... annonae diffi-
culitates* (sic) *iuvit* (ILS 1118 from Concordia, period of Marcus Aurelius;
cf. e.g. ILS 1262, 6949, 6988); but normally relative pronouns, more often
in cases other than the nominative, introduce rather elaborate sections in
which the style may often come closer to that of *elogia* rather than to that of
honorific inscriptions. For an example, cf. e.g. ILS 5054 (about Severan, in
the National Museum in Naples): *qui cum privilegio ... munitus potuisset ...
excusari, praeposito amore patriae et honorem ... laudabiliter administravit*
etc.; or ILS 6726 (Severan or possibly somewhat later, from Bergomum),
cuius eximia liberalitas post multas largitiones hucusque enituit ut etc.
Much the same thing can be said of explanations given with the use of a
demonstrative pronoun, which is normally *hic*.[76] As in the sections
introduced by relative pronouns, those beginning with *hic* usually depart
from the strict style of honorific inscriptions and use a style resembling that
of *elogia*. But whereas relative clauses, despite their style, tend to give, and
to specify, the reasons which have caused the dedication of the monument
in question, clauses beginning with *hic*, especially those in which *hic* is in
the nominative, very often seem rather to give eint outside the scope of
normal honorific inscriptions or to refer to additional merits of the honorand
whose right to be honoured by a statue has already been made clear;
moreover, sections introduced by *hic* usually appear at the end of
epigraphical texts. Observe, e.g., ILS 1401 (c. Severan, apparently from

---

also the fragmentary inscription CIL V 8269 = Inscriptiones Aquileiae 448 for an
uncertain example of Constantinian date. A votive inscription from Apulum of probably
Severan date with the formulation *redditis sibi luminibus*: ILS 3847.

[75] For a parallel from the third century, observe CIL VIII 2734, another inscription in
honour of the legate Cominius Cassianus, in which the dedicators describe themselves as
follows: *qui iu[dicia] eius for[i iustitiamque] tot[ies admirati sunt]* (thus the restorations
in the corpus).

[76] Sometimes one also finds *is*; e.g. ILS 932 (Superaequum, earliest empire) *is primus
omnium Paelign(orum) senator factus est et eos honores gessit* (observe the strikingly
elliptical wording); cf. ILS 5062, 6225; CIL IX 4686. In the votive inscription ILS 3001
is refers to Jupiter.

Puteoli), in which the listing of the offices of the honorand (which include the patronate and the curatorship) and the motivation *ob rem publ. bene ac fideliter gestam* is followed by extra information, beginning with *hic*, on gladiatorial games arranged in a novel fashion by the honorand; or CIL XIV 376 (Ostia, 2nd century), where a long list of local offices, fully justifying the erection of a statue, is followed by a list of special achievements, introduced by *hic* (which is followed by several instances of *idem*).[77] On the other hand, clauses beginning with the dative *huic*, stylistically resembling those beginning with the nominative form, and often including an *ob* or a *quod* clause, are usually used to refer to special honours earned by the honorand.[78]

We have so far had a look at quite a few ways of "amplifying" the bare structure of the original type of honorific inscriptions during the Empire. One could add the fact that, whereas earlier inscriptions are usually syntactically incomplete in that they leave the verb unexpressed, later inscriptions, especially those from about the middle of the fourth century onwards, tend to finish off the text with a predicate (often, but not always, accompanied by an object, usually *statuam*), *conlocare* being the most common verb; e.g. ILS 1229 (Rome, AD 346), *L. Turcio Aproniano v.c. ... statuam ... ordo Spoletinorum ... conlocavit.*[79] But, although the addition of

---

[77] Cf. e.g. ILS 1011, 1048, 5502, 6271, 6587. In ILS 6228 and 6584, the section beginning with *hic* has been inscribed on the side of the statue base, not on the front which has the main inscription.

[78] In inscriptions in honour of senators, usually describing a special honour decreed by the senate (a statue, *triumphalia ornamenta* or the like), often adding a reason (e.g. *ob res ... prospere ge[st]as* ILS 1956): e.g. ILS 921, 984, 985, 1022, 1056, 1098, 1100 (+ 1094), 1112 (in 4th-century inscriptions: ILS 1240, 1250). In municipal inscriptions which also add a motivation: ILS 5062, 6296 (*huic* followed by *quod*); ILS 6313, 6372, 6655 (*huic* followed by expressions such as *ob merita*).

[79] (In this case the text in fact continues with additional information, but this does not form a part of the main honorific inscription.) One also finds, especially in inscriptions set up by emperors (for in late antiquity, emperors at least formally often appear as dedicators of honorific statues; cf. Symm. Rel. 12, 2), *conlocari iussit* or *iusserunt*. Another possibility is a formulation of the type *ponendam censuerunt* (thus in the relatively early, about Severan, instances ILS 1390 [Lugdunum] and ILS 1909 [Anagnia]; ILS 6780, with *ponendam censuit*, though not datable, may be even earlier; for further examples cf. ILS 1244, 1250, 1278, 5698, 6505; CIL X 5200; AE 1976, 141). Besides *conloco*, one finds also verbs such as *loco* (e.g. ILS 1221, 1234), *pono* (cf. above and e.g. ILS 1226, 1231, 1235f.), *constituo* (e.g. ILS 809, 5363; IRT 558, 562), or simply *dare* (ILS 1230). Among the inscriptions cited above, the object (*statuam*) is omitted e.g.

a predicate (and an object) can also be classified as "amplification", let us
turn to somewhat more striking aspects of this phenomenon. We could go
on for a long time, for the imagination of those who formulated honorific
inscriptions during the later Empire seems to have had no limits. Over time,
dedicators, initially content to mention possibly an office or a relationship,
start to characterise more closely not only the honorand, but also
themselves[80] and, somewhat later, the splendor of the honorific
monument;[81] one also starts to find references to the happiness of the

---

in ILS 1226, 1231, 1235, 6505, 6780. An early, but somewhat exceptional, example of
the use of a predicate is ILS 6629 (cf. above n. 17), where the verb is, however, used
passively (*statua statuta est*).

[80] Thus one starts to find, in inscriptions honouring emperors, formulations of the type
devotus, *devotus numini* etc. (sometimes *dicatissimus*; *dicatissime devoti* ILS 6888 from
Mauretania, AD 238/244), for which see H. Gundel, Epigraphica 15, 1953, 128ff.,
Kajanto, art. cit. (n. 13) 13ff., Chastagnol, art. cit. (n. 15) 355ff., who, however,
concentrate on those cases in which *devotus* appears combined with the dative *numini*
and soon also with *maiestati*. These phrases appear in texts of the Severan period (ILS
421 of AD 198/202 is noted as an early instance by Kajanto 14). But it would perhaps be
useful to have a look at the earlier history of the expression *devotus* (not yet combined
with *numini*) referring to emperors. Observe e.g. AE 1950, 58 of AD 126 from Gemellae
in Numidia in honour of Hadrian, *coh. I ... devotissima ipsi*; and cf. ILS 7155 from
Sarmizegetusa, set up in honour not of an emperor, but of the legate Furius Saturninus in
ca. 161 by the *n(omini) felicissim(o) et praecipuis virtutib. eiiu[s] obstricta simul et
devota provincia*. Quite another thing is the use of past participles in order to indicate
special reasons for the erection of honorific monuments, a habit which is attested fairly
early (cf. above at n. 74; and also e.g. ILS 9399 *caelesti beneficio ... auctus* [168]; 371
col]onia ... ancipiti periculo ... restituta [169/177]; 456 *beneficia ... consecutus*
[202/204]; 1438 *amore ... et dignatione protecti* [209/211]), but which is also found in
the fourth century and later, the verb in this period often being *foveo* (typical, by the way,
of *tabulae patronatus*), which is attested from the earlier 3rd century onwards (e.g. ILS
8978, time of Severus Alexander; AE 1916, 107; c[f]. *refoti* ILS 452, AD 214). For
adjectives defining dedicators, also sometimes used to indicate a reason for a honorific
monument, cf. e.g. ILS 946 (Pola, from the time of Claudius), *Sex. Palpellio ... Histro ...
C. Precius Felix ... memor benefici* (*memor* also in ILS 6504; IRT 566); in later times,
one finds more picturesque adjectives such as *laetus* (ILS 794 for Arcadius and
Honorius, *s.p.q.R. vindicata rebellione et Africae restitutione laetus*), *cliens* used as an
adjective (ILAlg. I 4011, *cliens ordo Madaurensium*), *fidelis et innocens* (*ordo*, IRT
475).

[81] E.g. ILS 1284 *statuam auro fulgentem*, AE 1934, 159 *statuam sub auro*, ILS 1275
statuam sub auro fulgentem (the material of the monument introduced with the
preposition *sub* also e.g. in ILS 1244. 1255, CIL VI 1739); ILS 1257 *auro inlustrem
statuam*, ILS 1221 *statuam ... auro superfusam*, CIL VI 1696 *statuam aere insignem*.

times;[82] moreover, one finds that the definition of the honorand's merits, in earlier times often simply enumerated, is given more and more thorough and eloquent attention e.g. by the addition of descriptive adverbs.[83] An interesting, although not very common, aspect of *amplificatio* is that which consists of adding some colour to the enumeration of offices and titles (the latter, of course, in many cases originally having been laudative epithets).

Sometimes those who formulated the descriptions of the monuments, possibly people not averse to philosophy, kept an eye on the future rather than on the present (e.g. ILS 809 *statuam, meritorum perenne monumentum*; ILS 1237 *monumentum perennis memoriae*).

[82] Thus *felicissi[mis tem]poribus* I. Novae 28 (AD 208); *felicissimo saeculo* ILS 4424 (Severan); cf. L. Mrozewicz, Archeologia 31 (1980) 108ff.; M. Christol - A. Magioncalda, in: L'Africa Romana VII (1990) 918f. Later formulations of this type become much more common and varied; at the same time it becomes common to express the idea by putting the times (*tempora, saeculum*) in the genitive, this genitive being governed by a descriptive noun (most common is *beatitudo*, but one also finds *felicitas, magnificentia* [ILS 5554] and the like). Of course, these expressions are more typical of building inscriptions than of honorific texts (and note that in other contexts one encounters references to the happiness of the times much earlier; e.g. in the *senatus consulta de aedificiis* of c. AD 47 and 56 [cf. above n. 11], which include expressions such as *felicitas saeculi instantis* and the like; cf. also e.g. the edict of Nerva cited by Pliny, epist. 10, 58, 7 on which cf. Fridh, op. cit. [n. 11] 44), with *felicitas temporum*, to be compared with the rather more discreet formulation of Trajan in the famous letter, epist. 10, 97, 2, *nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri saeculi est*).

[83] Of this, there are some fairly early instances, but in these cases the merits are referred to in clauses beginning with *quod* or relative pronouns and are defined by the use of adverbs or ablative absolutes (e.g. AE 1925, 126 [Domitianic] *quod industrie prospexit annon(ae)*; AE 1962, 153 [from the time of Commodus?] *quod adhibita moderatione et r.p. statum foverit et universos consuluerit*; ILS 5054 [Severan] *qui ... honorem ... laudabiliter administravit* etc.). From the third century onwards adverbs and adjectives are sometimes inserted into the enumeration of the offices (e.g. ILS 6630 [AD 240] *omnibus honoribus honeste functo* [*honeste* also e.g. in AE 1983, 196]; ILS 1239 *corr(ectori) ... memorabili*). For other formulations cf. e.g. ILS 1272 *in actu publico fideli exercitatione versato*; CIL VI 1747 *[sine fr]aude provinciarum rem sibi iniunctam ... fideliter egit*. But those who formulated honorific inscriptions could go even further, for instance, by pointing out that the honorand's merits do demand a reward in the form of a monument (e.g. ILS 1234 *provocantibus eius meritis*; AE 1934, 159 *statuam ... quam ... iamdudum meruerat*; ILS 6459 *honorem devitum* [sic]; ILS 1244) or that they are of a kind that can hardly be described (ILS 6348, *cuius facta enarari* [sic] *non possunt*; CIL X 520, *cuius si universa refoveamus* [this must mean something like "recall"] *dies non sufficit*; cf. e.g. ILS 1237, CIL X 5200, IRT 562 for adjectives such as *innumerabilis, immensus* and *infinitus* referring to merits); or that the meritorious acts, in some cases known to absolutely everybody (ILS 4932, 4936), have been performed both in the public and in the private sphere (e.g. ILS 1221, 1243, 1258, 2939).

For instance, setting up a monument in honour of Caracalla, the people of Lavinium, instead of saying what was normal, *imp. Caesari M. Aurelio Antonino Pio Felici Augusto* (*Pius* and *Felix* now belonging to the official titulature), had the idea of adding *optimo sanctissimoque* between the name and the titles (CIL VI 1066);[84] similarly, in an African inscription what is usually formulated as *praetor candidatus Augusti* (*Augustorum*) is rendered as *candidato Auggg. et eis devotissimo praetori* (ILS 1147, Severan). In the later third and in the fourth century, titles such as *vir clarissimus* and *vir eminentissimus* are sometimes supplemented by additional information, this leading to striking combinations of a title and a description, for instance *v(iro) c(larissimo) eloquentissimoque* (ILS 1282).[85]

Another pleasant way of adding some force and colour to the enumeration of the merits of the honorand was to differentiate the list of merits by pointing out activities of the honorand of especial interest. This effect was most often produced by inserting *etiam*, *quoque*, *sed et(iam)*, *non solum ... sed etiam* and the like in the enumeration; for instance, *abundantissimi muneris, sed et praecipuae laetitiae theatralis editori* (ILS 6623 from Hispellum, from the time of Constantine). There are some early instances which foreshadow the future (e.g. ILS 298 on the arch of Trajan in Ancona, AD 115 *quod accessum Italiae, hoc etiam addito ex pecunia sua portu, tutiorem ... reddiderit*, more reminiscent of formulations found in the third century and later: ILS 7155 [c. 161, from Sarmizegetusa], *quod ... singulos universosque benig‹ni›tate tractarit, oneribus etiam relevaverit*),[86]

---

[84] Cf. CIL VIII 2438 (AD 197) in honour of Severus, where *[f]ortissimoque principi* is added between *Aug. Pio Fe[l.]* (observe the order) and *Arabi[co] Adiabenico* (somewhat similarly in AE 1911, 106 from Cuicul), and also those cases in which superlatives are added between the formula *dominus noster* and the name of the emperor (above n. 58). In AE 1958, 100 (Hippo Regius, 198/9) *fel]icissimo* may possibly define some word to be restored in the lacuna rather than the following expression *principi iuventutis* (i.e., Caracalla).

[85] Cf. ILS 1281, *v(iro) c(larissimo) et omnibus meritis inlustri*; ILS 1333, *eminentissim(o) et singularis exempli viro*; ILS 6501, *perf(ectissimo) et praestantissimo viro*; ILS 9357, *amplissimi et c(larissimi) v(iri)*. Cf. ILS 1443, *viro ex equestribus turmis egregio*.

[86] Cf. also ILS 6209 (Gabii, 138/161), *quod post inpensas ... factas ob sacerdotium opus porticus ... refecturam se promiserit populo* etc. (cf. the building inscription ILS 5570A [Cilli, probably 3rd cent.], with *post alia arcum quoque*); the same idea is expressed by *super* in ILS 6780 (Gigthis, 2nd cent.?), *quod super multa ... merita et amplissimum munificentiae studium, legationem ... ad Latium ... petendum ... susceperit.*

but the great majority of the examples one encounters belong to the Severan period and the third and fourth centuries. As in the examples cited above, the effect produced by the use of *etiam* etc. is most common in references to special acts,[87] although in the case of emperors these tend to be rather vague and general in tone (e.g. ILS 692 [Constantine, from Rome], *d.n. restitutori humani generis, propagatori imperii dicionisque Romanae, fundatori etiam securitatis aeternae*), but one observes the use of this device sometimes also in descriptions of careers, as e.g. in ILS 1440, *procuratori ... fun[c]to etiam partibus ducenari* (Segermes [Africa], 3rd cent.).[88]

But there is still another important aspect in the *amplificatio* of the formulations of honorific inscriptions, namely that belonging more closely to the sphere of language and style, to which we shall now turn. As we have seen, with the evolution of the honorific inscription, more and more details were added to the original structure, the honorific inscriptions accordingly becoming increasingly wordy. Especially the addition of details of a more subjective nature, of course, meant that the wording of the honorific inscriptions, which originally obeyed strict rules, became more and more varied, and in the end the honorific inscriptions, which during the early Empire with their recurring identical expressions make extremely dull reading, exhibit remarkable individuality. This individuality is apparent not only in the phrasing, but also in the structure, for whereas earlier honorific inscriptions generally stick to a business-like enumeration of what was to be enumerated (though sometimes lapsing, especially in sections beginning with demonstrative pronouns, into more informal diction), one observes that many late antique inscriptions in places altogether abandon the sternly

---

[87] Also e.g. ILS 5784 (Ausculum, 3rd cent.), *patrono civitatis Auscul., qui cum multa et maxima in rem p. saepius praestiterit, fontem quoque novum ... induxit* etc.; ILS 6252 (Praeneste, perhaps Severan), *quot is ... plurima contulerit, ludum etiam gladiatorium·... optulerit*; ILS 5698 (Interamna Lirenas, 3rd [or 4th ?] cent., *quod opera thermarum ... restituit exornavitque, porticos etiam ... constituit*; I. Paestum 91 (about Severan), *adiectis* (to gladiatorial *munera*) *etiam ursis mirae magnitudinis, set et noxeo* etc. Cf. CIL X 5426, *huic ... populus ... tabulam aeneam patronatus ... sed et statuam perpetuabilem ... censuer. constituendam.* For building inscriptions introducing activities of especial interest cf. e.g. ILS 5518 (326/333, from Africa: *aedem sive curiam, sed et sexsagonem*); 5633.

[88] Cf. also e.g. CIL VI 1747, *Cam(?)]paniae set et Siciliae* (Constantinian); CIL IX 3667 (Marruvium, 3rd cent. [?]), *cur. r[ei] p. ... civita[tis] Mars. Marr., eodem [t]empore et cur. viar(um)* etc. Cf. ILS 1274 (Rome, AD 399), *consulari Aemiliae, addita praedictae provinciae ... etiam Ravennatium civitate.*

enumerative structure and turn to a highly rhetorical descriptive style
embellished e.g. by the use of final and consecutive clauses. The result is
that more and more honorific inscriptions from the third century, and the
majority of those from the fourth [89] – not to speak of those from the fifth –
leave the impression of being unique in their expressions, although it is true
that one could borrow a nice phrase if one happened come upon one[90] or
use the same phrase, if thought well put by the dedicator, in inscriptions set
up at different times[91] or at different places.[92]

---

[89] For exceptions, observe e.g. the inscriptions honouring Egnatius Lollianus cos. 333,
ILS 1223ff., AE 1977, 198, with a remarkably simple and matter-of-fact style.

[90] This becomes clear if one has a look at the third-century dedications for Vestal virgins
from the Forum in Rome (CIL VI 2131ff., 32403ff.; ILS 4925ff.), which stylistically
form a most remarkable group of texts, presenting many features which make one think
of the fourth or the fifth rather than of the third century. From those in honour of Campia
Severina (in the 240s) onwards there are so many striking words and phrases common to
two or more texts that the conclusion seems inevitable that people who formulated the
later texts must have had a look at, and found some inspiration in, the earlier, already
existing dedications. Observe, for instance, the explicatory relative clauses beginning
with *cuius*, present in so many of the texts; or phrases and expressions such as *cumulare
laude* (ILS 4928, 4934), *per omnes gradus sacerdotii* (ILS 4930, 4931, in honour of the
same woman, but by different dedicators and with an interval of 10 years; cf. ILS 4934),
pervigil administratio (ILS 4934; CIL VI 2133; *laudabilis administratio* ILS 4930),
sanctissimae ac religiosissimae (ILS 4931, 4936; CIL VI 32417, 32421), *super omnes
retro* followed by a superlative (ILS 4936; CIL VI 2134, 32419), *cuius* (object) *numen
quoque Vestae comprobavit* (CIL VI 2134, 2136, 32419; cf. ILS 4935), *antistes* (ILS
4935, CIL VI 2142), *opera, operor* and *operatio*, referring to the duties imposed by the
priesthood (ILS 4930, 4932, 4937; CIL VI 2136); *sincerus* (ILS 4928; CIL VI 32441).
For another instance, note how the inscriptions in honour of the two Turcii at Rome, ILS
1229 (AD 346) for Apronianus, set up by the *ordo Spoletinorum*, and ILS 1230 for the
latter's brother Secundus, set up by the *ordo ... Amiterninae civitatis*, strike one as
including phrases which one seems to have borrowed from the other (*omni virtute
praestanti* 1229 ≈ *in omni denique virtute perfecto* 1230; *ad memoriam perpetui nominis*
1229 ≈ *ad perpetui nominis gloriam* 1230).

[91] Observe that one finds the agreeable, but unique phrase *benevoli vigoris* in two 4th-
century inscriptions at Lepcis, one set up in honour of a certain Flavius Victorinus, the
other honouring Valerius Vibianus (IRT 570, 577).

[92] Thus Antonius Dracontius *v.c.* who, in setting up statues of Valentinian and Valens
both at Sabratha and at Lepcis in the 360s, used the unique phrase *iustitia pariter ac
pietate caelestis adq(ue) Romanae felicitatis perpetuus fundator* (name of emperor to be
inserted here) *victoriosissimus* (*princeps* added here in the texts from Lepcis) *ac totius
orbis Aug(ustus)* (IRT 57, 58; 472, 473). Dracontius must have been pleased with his
choice of words (although he used other formulations in ILS 758). *Augustus* is, by the

Now, since those who formulated honorific (and other types of) inscriptions in later antiquity did not any longer feel very much restricted by conventions which had to be followed in earlier times, but being instead able to apply all the methods of *inventio* they could think of to the planning of the wording of the texts, one observes that epigraphical texts start to have more and more features resembling those of texts of the same period belonging to the sphere of administration. From the second century onwards (although one can find earlier examples)[93] the language, both Latin and Greek, used by Roman administrators underwent a development which resulted, in the fourth century, in a style (to be found e.g. in imperial constitutions and, to a somewhat lesser degree, in works such as those of Symmachus and Cassiodorus) which strikes one as being extremely florid and long-winded. R. MacMullen, in his admirable study on "Roman Bureaucratese" (in: id., Changes in the Roman Empire [1990] 67ff.), characterises (p. 71) the style as follows: "Its dominant feature is obscurity. That it prefers two words where one will do, or a long one where a short one would be clearer; that it avoids, wherever possible, the *mot juste*, or envelops its meaning in synonyms, baroque fancies, archaisms, superlatives, and analogies; that it introduces perfectly unnecessary *loci communes*, or moralizes, or rants." (One could, in fact, go on, for MacMullen's list is by no means exhaustive: there is also for, instance, the tendency to use abstract nouns instead of concrete ones and the striving for certain rhythmical clausulae.)

This "höherer Kanzleistil" soon also influenced the language written outside the imperial chancellery. As H. Zilliacus (art. cit. [n. 93] 161) puts it, it "wirkte sich nach unten aus". One thus finds all of its features present – in addition to administrative documents on a lower level known especially

---

way, used with the genitive also in ILS 763 from the same period (actually mentioning Dracontius, but set up by the *ordo Furnitanus*). One also finds *triumphator* followed by a genitive in inscriptions of this period (ILS 688, 752; cf. Min. Fel., Octavius 40, 2).

[93] Cf. e.g. the *senatus consulta* of Claudian date cited in n. 11. For the style used in administrative documents in late antiquity cf., in addition to the paper of R. MacMullen (cf. below) and the literature cited there, e.g. R. Macpherson, "The Language of Roman Authority", in id., Rome in Involution. Cassiodorus' Variae in their Literary and Historical Setting (Poznan 1989) 155ff. For the bibliography of H. Zilliacus, of prime importance for the Greek used in late antique administration, see H. Solin, Arctos 5 (1967) 177ff. (note e.g. the concise paper covering all aspects, "Zum Stil und Wortschatz der byzantinischen Urkunden und Briefe", in: Akten des VIII. intern. Kongresses für Papyrologie (1955 [1956]) 157 - 165); add the study cited below at n. 98.

from papyri – also in honorific inscriptions from later Antiquity. Let us have a look at some of these features.

As in "Roman Bureaucratese", features which one can class as "obscurity" are not altogether alien to honorific inscriptions from about the middle of the 3rd century onwards, the impression of obscurity arising above all from the tendency to a certain vagueness, caused apparently in many cases by an urge for *variatio* and for rhetorical embellishment. Military units may be designated simply as *manus*,[94] and cities of any status (*colonia, municipium* etc.) may be termed untechnically as *civitates* or *urbes*,[95] which may at least in part be attributed to the wish to attain rhythmical clausulae (*civitas*, used in oblique cases, being a ditrochee useful at the end of certain Ciceronian clausulae, cf. below nn. 142, 145). Moreover, one observes a tendency to vagueness in descriptions of careers; instead of giving all the details, many inscriptions from late antiquity, although describing often at length the personality of the honorand,[96] dismiss individual stages of the career by using phrases such as *per omnes honorum gradus ... provecto* (ILS 1273); *per gradus clarissimae militiae ad columen gloriae ... evecto* (ILS 1277); *exercitiis militaribus effecto* (ILS 2937); or *castrensi experientia claro* (ILS 2950).[97] The exact number of urban prefectures held by the honorand apparently seemed of little importance to the people who set up ILS 2948 (Rome, AD 435: *praef. urbi saepius*).

Besides giving ample information on the personality and the *mores* of

---

[94] E.g. (the Philippi) *circuitum muri manu militari ... fecerunt* (ILS 510, Romula); *fabricatus est burgus ... mano* (sic) *devotissimorum equitum VIIII Dalm.* (ILS 773 of AD 371, from Arabia).

[95] *Civitas*: ILS 1230 (Amiternum), 1236 (Constantina [i.e., Cirta]; but Milev is referred to as *colonia* in the same text), 1239 (Beneventum; also 6501), 1274 (Ravenna), 1909 (Anagnia, later second century or Severan), 5701 (Segusio). *Urbs*: ILS 5508 (Beneventum).

[96] Cf. the observations of G. Alföldy (Tituli 4 [1982] 48 = id., Die römische Gesellschaft [1986] 389) on the inscription from Rome in honour of Petronius Probus, ILS 1265 (AD 378), which is quite eloquent in describing the personality, but rather defective in describing the career of the honorand.

[97] Something like this is, of course, also attested earlier, namely in inscriptions referring to municipal notables, which from the second century onwards quite often condense a municipal career into a phrase like *omnibus honoribus functus* (on which see L. Wierschowski, ZPE 64 [1986] 287ff.). But municipal careers usually follow a regular pattern and include only a small number of offices, so that the enumeration of the individual stages would have been quite unnecessary in most cases.

the honorand, late honorific and other inscriptions also tend to compensate for the vagueness in factual information by a certain verbal abundance. As in "bureaucratese", both Latin and Greek (for the latter, cf. H. Zilliacus, Zur Abundanz der spätgriechischen Gebrauchssprache [1967], with interesting observations on p. 11ff. on "Vielwörterei als allgemeines Phänomen"), things for which there was one word tend to be expressed with two or more words. The easiest way to achieve the desired effect of profusion was to use several words with about the same meaning together; for instance, instead of saying *beneficia quibus provinciam sublevavit*, which, I think, would have been clear enough, one could get the idea of saying *beneficia quibus provinciam conpendiis remediis et virtutibus fovit sublevabit erexit* (IRT 103, AD 378); and instead of saying *victis Gothis* one could say *victis superatisque Gothis* (ILS 770, from the time of Valentinian).[98] This phenomenon is especially common in building inscriptions, in which one finds restored objects being defined by two expressions with similar meaning at least from the Severans onwards (e.g. ILS 424 of AD 201, *arcus ... conlapsos et corruptos*; ILS 488 of AD 237, *viam corruptam adque dilapsam*); on the other hand, one notes some profusion in the use of verbs describing the activities of those who built or restored something already from the turn of the first and second century (ILS 4051 [Trajan, AD 98/102], *viam ... instituit consummavit dedicavit* ; AE 1955, 137 [Severus in 198], *opus amphitheatri refecit exornavitque*; ILS 2619 [AD 222], *baselicam ... aedificavit consummavitque*). Of course it is true that the verbs do not mean exactly the same thing, but earlier building inscriptions seem to be content with the use of lapidary expressions such as *fecit* (and *refecit*) or *faciendum curavit*, with the possible addition of the not at all meaningless *probavit*.[99]

Some abundance of expression can, however, be achieved not only by using two or more synonyms, but also by not using a significant noun alone, but making it depend on another noun with a more general meaning; for instance, instead of saying *statuam* some preferred to say *statuae monumentum* (ILS 1251 from Rome, c. 350) or *ornamenta statuae* (AE 1976, 141

---

[98] Also e.g. ILS 618, *rectori orbis ac domino* (Diocletian; note that late inscriptions like to collocate a genitive on which two expressions depend between the first of the two expressions and the copula, cf. also e.g. ILS 1277 *consiliis eius et provisione*; ILS 1219, 1438 [AD 209/211]; contrast, however, the following inscription); ILS 1257, *meritorum ordinem ac seriem*; a little differently ILS 756, *pro beatitudine felicium temporum*.

[99] Cf. Gast, op. cit. (above n. 5) 59ff.

from Puteoli, c. 380);[100] or one could say *ob insignia remediorum genera* where *ob insignia remedia* would have been enough (ILS 1265, from the time of Valentinian).[101]

It is important to note that in many cases the abundance of expression is not caused simply by some urge for profusion, but also by the wish to apply certain stylistic devices to the formulation of the texts. For instance, the addition of *dicionisque* in the inscription from Rome in honour of the emperor Constantine, ILS 692, *restitutori humani generis, propagatori imperii dicionisque Romanae*, may possibly be explained by a desire to follow the "law of increasing members".[102] Furthermore, the use of two verbs connected by -*que* at the end of honorary and building inscriptions so often produces popular clausulae (cf. phrases such as *constitui locarique iusserunt* [ILS 1255] or *faciendam exaedificandamque curavit* [ILS 5535]) that one cannot help suspecting that it is the clausula rather than the abundance of expression in general that was sought after (on all this, cf. below).

Another striking feature of late antique inscriptions – again one which they share with "bureaucratese" – is the propensity to use archaic, poetic or unusual and *recherché* phrases and words in general.[103] One could think of turning to a poet or a better-known writer for a nice turn of expression; for instance, *dis genitus* (in inscriptions honouring tetrachic emperors and Constantine) comes no doubt from the Aeneid (9, 642),[104] *inclita fide*, a

---

[100] Cf. Symm. Rel. 12, 2, *ut virum ... mirabilem statuarum diuturnitas tradat oculis posterorum*; and CIL X 5426, *statuam ... cum pictura{m} similitudinis eius*. Note that saying *ornamenta statuae* instead of *statuam* allows the author of AE 1976, 141 to finish off with *erigenda decrevit*, which produces a most popular clausula (cf. below).

[101] Cf. *litus ad labem ruinae labefactatum* ILS 489 (AD 238); *thermarum speciem* (= *thermas*) ILS 5702; *edomitis ... barbarorum gentium populis* ILS 8938. Observe, however, that the use of *opus* defined by a genitive (e.g. *opus amphitheatri* = *amphitheatrum*) is attested already in the 2nd century (ILS 6218 from the time of Pius, *quod ... opus porticus ... refecturam se promiserit*; AE 1934, 40 [183/185]; AE 1955, 137 [AD 194]). In the fourth century one finds also the plural *opera* (ILS 5698, *opera thermarum restituit*).

[102] Cf. below n. 126.

[103] On the use of archaisms and poetical expressions in this period cf. e.g. F. del Chicca, Q. Aureli Symmachi v.c. laudatio in Valentinianum seniorem Augustum prior (1984), Index p. 264 s.v. arcaismi; vocaboli prevalentemente poetici; Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 112ff.; on poetic words in late Greek "Gebrauchssprache" see Zilliacus, op. cit. (above at n. 98) 71ff.

[104] ILS 629; AE 1940, 182; AE 1984, 367; cf. the editor's note on the latter inscription

description of the city of Lepcis Magna (ILS 9408 = IRT 569) is (as observed by Dessau) surely an adaptation of Sallust, Hist. 2, 64.[105] Further study could easily produce even more examples.[106] Then, there is the great number of archaic or poetic words, many of which may also have been found in ancient authors. Although it is possible to convey here only the faintest idea of the richness of the vocabulary found in late antique inscriptions, perhaps even a few examples may be of some interest. For nouns mainly typical of poetry or of an elevated style, observe e.g. *fluentum* (used in the plural for 'water': ILS 5520, 5730),[107] *luctamen* (ILS 1272; cf. TLL VII 2, 1726f.; Haverling, op. cit. [n. 36] 74), *munimen* (ILS 724; cf. TLL VIII 1654; Haverling 73f.), and the not uncommon *prosapia*.[108] In some cases one observes quite normal words being given a novel or unusual meaning, no doubt in search of variation and colour; for example, *oratio* seems to be used in the sense of 'inscription' in ILS 1257 (Rome, AD 377),[109] and *series,* attested, it is true, as referring to the passing of time in phrases such as *series annorum* or *saeculorum*, is used somewhat strikingly in ILS 5554 (Thamugadi, AD 364/367), *porticus ... seriae* (sic) *vetustatis absumptas*.

On the other hand, the urge for variation and novel expressions and, in addition, the propensity to use nouns ending in *-tor* to describe honorands, is reflected by the appearance of a significant number of words unknown to early or classical Latin. Some words one encounters seem to be

---

(from Saepinum, honouring Constantine).

[105] Cf. above n. 4.

[106] Observe e.g. *reb(us) arduis* in ILS 1258 (Rome, AD 384), which makes one think of Horace, carm. 2, 3, 1; or *aeternum robur* in CIL VI 1696 (c. 307), which could have been formulated with an eye on Verg., Aen. 7, 609f. Note also *laborum quos in praefectura emensus est* in ILS 738 (from Cyprus, an inscription set up by the emperors in 351/4 in honour of a high official), for which cf. Seneca, Med. 611; Silius 4, 54. For "dichterische Reminiszenzen" in late Greek "Gebrauchssprache" see Zilliacus, op. cit. (above at n. 98) 68ff.

[107] Cf. TLL VI 1, 949ff.; observe that the word is defined by the adjective *piger* (*aquae pigra fluenta* ILS 5730) also in Apul., Met. 6, 18.

[108] E.g. ILS 711, 1262, 8950; CIL VI 1706; AE 1972, 79. In a letter of Constantine: AE 1934, 158. An earlier attestation, but in a *tabula patronatus*: ILS 7217 (AD 224). Cf. Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 43f.

[109] (...) *auro inlustrem statuam ... idem ... principes ... constitui adposita oratione iusserunt, quae meritorum eius ordinem ac seriem contineret*. For other senses in which *oratio* can be used in Late Latin, cf. Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 36f.

without parallel; thus at least *benedicentia, maximatus, redonator*.[110] Then
there are words which are also attested in other late texts, some of them only
in inscriptions (thus perhaps *restaurator* and *subventor*),[111] some also in
post-classical authors. In the latter group, one is struck by the number of
nouns attested (according to the dictionaries) in Latinity for the first time in
Tertullian – another reminder of the important role of Tertullian in the
history of Latin.[112] Of course, many of these nouns are those which end in
-tor (*institutor, recreator, redintegrator, remunerator*),[113] but there are also
others (e.g. *exaltatio*, and *operatio* used of an office "in cultu
religionis").[114] In addition to these, one finds of course many other late
words, some attested for the first time in the second century (e.g.
compendium meaning something like *auxilium, triumphator*, expressions
appearing for the first time in Apuleius),[115] some in the third century (e.g.
iussio),[116] some only in the fourth or later (e.g. *consularitas, inlustrator,
instaurator, primaevitas, provector*).[117]

In addition, in the choice of verbs in later Antiquity one observes a

---

[110] *Benedicentia*: IRT 108 (AD 378, the last in a list of eight virtues, beginning with
integritas moderatio iustitia, attributed to the *praeses* Fl. Vivius Benedictus); *maximatus*:
ILS 4937 (c. 286, in honour of a *Virgo Vestalis maxima*; only this instance in TLL VIII
520); *redonator* (*viae populi*): ILS 6349 (Nola 4th cent.; only this instance in Georges).

[111] The dictionary of Georges mentions only epigraphical attestations of these nouns (as
for *restaurator*, add AE 1967, 494; 1969/70, 631).

[112] Cf. G. Devoto, Geschichte der Sprache Roms (1968) 266ff.

[113] Epigraphical attestations for these expressions: *institutor*: ILS 5509; *recreator*: ILS
6349; AE 1969/70, 631; *redintegrator*: ILS 1276; CIL XI 3089 (Gallienus);
remunerator: ILS 809.

[114] For *exaltatio*, see CIL II 1972 (a fragmentary 4th-century inscription from Malaca in
which it is used among other nouns such as *bonitas, prudentia* and *eloquentia* to describe
the honorand; cf. TLL V 2, 1156f.); for *operatio* (cf. *operor, opera*) describing the
activities of Vestal Virgins see above n. 90. Cf. TLL IX 1, 672, 36ff.

[115] For *compendium* see IRT 103 and TLL III 2039, 72ff.; *triumphator* (for which see
also above n. 92) is, of course, one of the most common attributes of emperors in the
fourth century.

[116] E.g. in ILS 774. 1236. 1254. 1422. 5699. 5964; cf. TLL VII 1, 1975.

[117] *Consularitas*: CIL VI 1722 (cf. TLL III 573); *inlustrator*: CIL VI 1706 (TLL VII 1,
304); *instaurator*: e.g. ILS 1248. 9408; CIL X 5200; IRT 562 (cf. TLL VII 1, 1975);
primaevitas: ILS 1272 (AD 389; for a literary attestation of the expression from about
the same period see Georges); *provector*: AE 1972, 75b (Capua, Constantinian [for the
interpretation see G.A. Cecconi, Governo imperiale e élites dirigenti nell'Italia
tardoantica (1994) 73]; attested also in a letter of the pope Gelasius, 14, 23).

notable predilection for the poetic and the unusual. In Augustan Rome, one would, I think, hardly have had the idea of using the past participle of *convellere* to describe a theatre which had to be repaired (ILS 793); and *consurgere* referring to building (in ILS 762, *muros consurgere imperarunt*) is definitely a poeticism (cf. TLL IV 621, 33ff.). Observe also e.g. the use, hardly imaginable in earlier times, of verbs such as *desudo* (ILS 1275, *pace belloque in re publica desudanti*) or *pubesco* (IRT 475, *pubescente Romani nominis gloria*). *Sublimitare* (in ILS 1283 from Aricia [5th cent.], *tertio praefecto urbi utriusque imperii iudicii‹s› sublimitato*) is unique (and seems to be registered only in the dictionary of Forcellini). Fullness of diction, but, of course, also an agreeable clausula, seems to have been sought after by the (somewhat pleonastic, it would seem) use of *videri* in inscriptions such as ILS 1274 (*Ravennatium civitate quae antea Piceni caput provinciae videbatur*) or ILS 5520 (*curia ... feda[ta] iacuisse [v]idebatur*).[118] As for adjectives and adverbs, observe the appearance in epigraphical Latin of expressions such as *adfatim* (AE 1969/70, 21, *[an]nona ... adfatim submini[strata]*), *iugis* (ILS 1275; IRT 577; cf. TLL VII 2, 629), *perpes* (ILS 727),[119] *pervigil* (ILS 4934; CIL VI 2133), *sublimis* (ILS 1237), *sublimiter* (I. Paestum 91)[120] and, to give an example of a new coinage, *perpetuabilis* (CIL X 5426; not otherwise attested). In the choice of pronouns and prepositions, one could hardly simply use one's imagination, but at least one could turn to archaisms such as *fl(amen) p(er)p(etuus)*

---

[118] Cf. CIL X 5200, *cuius immensis beneficiis patria cognoscitur cumulata.*

[119] Cf. Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 50f.

[120] Observe also, from a somewhat earlier period, the most remarkable inscription ILS 4424 (AD 206/209) from the quarries of Syene in Egypt, set up in honour of *I. O. M.* and other deities by an *ala*, the reason being *quod primiter sub imperio p. R., felicissimo saeculo dd. nn.* etc. *iuxsta Philas novae lapicaedinae adinventae (sunt)* etc.; the adverb *primiter* seems to be known only from Pomponius, the author of *Atellanae*, and this text. Note also the "etymologizing" orthography *lapicaedinae* (cf. TLL VII 2, 941, 25ff.), the most uncommon *adinvenio* (attested otherwise from Irenaeus onwards, cf. TLL I 698, 21ff.), and the description of the Roman *imperium* as belonging simply (as in much earlier times) to the Roman people (*imperium populi Romani* also e.g. in R.K. Sherk, Roman Documents from the Greek East [1969] no. 23 [73 BC], 49 [τῆς ἡγεμονίας τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων]; Augustus, RG 27. 30; cf. Th. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht III [1888] 1257f. It is true that this formulation also appears in the inscription on the arch of Severus in Rome [ILS 425], but this is a very peculiar inscription). The fellow who planned the wording of this text from Syene clearly did not represent the normal type of man one would expect to find in these parts.

huiusce civitatis (ILS 9043 from Missua [Africa]; cf. Haverling, op. cit. [n. 36] 114), the preposition *propter* meaning 'near', 'close to' (ILS 9408 [IRT 569, from Lepcis], *Lepcis magna ... statuam ... se propter* ["scil. in curia vel ante curiam" Dessau] *constituit*), or *ergo* for '*ob*' or '*causa*' (ILS 2948 from Rome, AD 431, *virtutis ... ergo*).[121] On the other hand, observe the late Latin use of *iuxta* in the sense of '*erga*' (ILS 1233; AE 1962, 184; cf. TLL VII 2, 753, 46ff.).

The above observations give only a very limited idea of what people formulating inscriptions could think of in the third century and later. One could continue almost indefinitely, noting, for instance, the tendency to use abstract nouns instead of concrete ones,[122] to use adjectives as nouns and the like,[123] or to variation (often producing a desirable clausula) effected by

---

[121] Note, by the way, that some inscriptions seem to offer instances of *erga* (collocated before the main word) used in the meaning '*ob*' or '*propter*'; cf. ILS 1909, *erga amorem patriae et civium* (cf. OLD s.v. no. 3, "expressing vaguer relationships ... 'in consideration of'"); ILS 3737, *erga suorum sanitatem* (cf. TLL V 2, 755, 77ff.: "i. q. causa").

[122] This begins, in fact, quite early in the case of emperors being referred to; cf. e.g. *vicani ... consecuti ab indulgentia ... imp. ... Pii ... beneficia* ILS 2735 (138/161); *providentia maximorum imperat. missus* ILS 1118 (from the time of Marcus Aurelius). Note that in the earlier instances (and in most of the later ones) the abstract noun does not appear in the nominative as the subject of a clause, this type being (as it seems) attested only from about the time of Diocletian (e.g. *cuius* [Diocletian] *providentia ... iussit* ILS 613 [Nicomedia]; *cuius providentia adque civilitas et integritas ... providit* [sic] ILS 1220 [Rome, AD 334]; *castellum ... dispositio dedit et usui tradidit* ILS 5791 [Rome, AD 365/6]). For further instances, cf. e.g. *ad ... praefecturam iudicio Aguste* (sic) *remunerationis evectus* ILS 5904; *statuam nobilitati eius* (= *ei*) *erigendam* CIL X 681; *meritorum ... ab eius praesentia* (= *ab eo*) *conlatorum* IRT 566. Note also e.g. *ad celebritatem thermarum* for *in thermas* (ILS 5478; cf. above at n. 101) and *laetitia theatralis* for 'theatrical performance' (ILS 6623; cf. *curules ac scaenicas voluptates* Symm. Rel. 6, 2). Some interesting parallels e.g. in Fridh, op. cit. (n. 11) 170 n. 1 (*sub iudicis integritate* etc.).

[123] Adjectives referring to people: e.g. *v(irgini) V(estali) max(imae) ... super omnes retro maximas religiosissimae* ILS 4936 (AD 286); *ad perpetuam laudabilis* (scil. *viri*) *memoriam* AE 1934, 159 (AD 364/367); *per clarissimos Alexandrinae civitatis* ILS 1273 (late 4th cent.); adjectives etc. referring to something else: e.g. *ob insignia eius unibersa* ILS 1276 (c. AD 400); *ob insignia meritorum* IRT 480 (AD 408/425; cf. *inter praecipua negotiorum* Symm. Rel. 5, 1); *facere laudanda ... praecipuo* ILS 2950 (AD 435; note that this is the only instance given in TLL X 2, 475, 83f. of *praecipuus* followed by an infinitive).

the reversal of a more or less established word order;[124] or one could go on citing less easily classifiable formulations such as *burgum milites ad summam manum perduxerunt perfectionis* (ILS 774; cf. below n. 142 on the clausula) or *monumentum statuali veneratione dicaverunt* (ILS 1237). But it should be observed that in addition to inscriptions offering a few striking or unique expressions there are many texts, mainly from the later fourth and the fifth century,[125] of which it would be quite useless to cite only a part, there being hardly any passage which could not be described as being extremely *recherché*. Observe e.g. texts such as ILS 1262, 1272, 1275, 2937, 2950, 2951, 9408, and, among inscriptions other than honorific, e.g. ILS 3132, 5520, 5596. Since it does not seem to be practical to cite any of these texts at length in this paper, let us conclude by touching upon, rather in passing, the embellishment of late Latin inscriptions by the use of various stylistic devices and rhythmical clausulae.

Since, as we have seen, honorific and other inscriptions in late Antiquity in many cases did not any longer follow the strict rules observed in the past, but were, apparently, often rather conceived of as rhetorical exercises, authors formulating epigraphical texts could turn to the use not only of striking expressions and phrases thought to elevate the tone of the texts, but also of devices more closely belonging to the sphere of rhetoric and stylistics. Any reader of Tetrarchic and later inscriptions will note the

---

[124] This is, in fact, most common in late inscriptions (but note ILS 157 from the time of Tiberius [cf. below] and *Romanae disciplinae* in ILS 446 of AD 197). Especially *Romanus* tends to be collocated before the concept it defines (e.g. *Romanum imperium* ILS 699, CIL VI 36947; *Romanum nomen* ILS 157 (Tiberian!), 734, IRT 475; *Romana res* ILS 741; *Romanus orbis* AE 1969/70, 631; *Romana religio* ILS 752; *Romana securitas* ILS 8938; *Romana felicitas* IRT 57), but the same goes also for *publicus* in phrases such as *publica libertas* (ILS 648, 674, 789, 792). Another common type is, in many cases caused by the wish to attain a good clausula (cf. above at n. 95, below nn. 142, 145), *Amiternina civitas* (ILS 1230; cf. 804, 1236, 1239, 1273, 5508, 5701, 5777, 6501; note that there is, in fact, an Augustan example of this, but referring to, and possibly coming from, the Greek part of the Empire: ILS 2683, *censum egi Apamenae civitatis*). One also finds the type *Saenensium* or *Lepcimagnensis ordo* (CIL VI 1793, IRT 475; cf. IRT 480. 558). For further instances, cf. e.g. *devota Venetia* (ILS 760), *togata statua* (ILS 1281f.), *Africani tribunalis orator* (ILS 4152) and, for concepts defined by expressions in the genitive, *populi Romani necessario usui* (ILS 702), *Gratiani triumfalis principis pontem* (ILS 772; note the Ciceronian clausula effected by this order), *iuventutis principi* (ZPE 99, 1993, 290).

[125] But observe the 3rd-century dedications to Vestal Virgins from the Forum (above n. 90).

abundant use of different techniques familiar from rhetorical theory. We have already noted the possibility that in an inscription in honour of Constantine the enumeration of the emperor's virtues has been drawn up according to the "law of increasing members" (cf. above at n. 102 on ILS 692), but there are many further instances; see e.g. ILS 687 (Ostia), *restitutori publicae libertatis, defensori urbis Romae, communis omnium salutis auctori* (Constantine); or ILS 1237 (Rome, AD 347), *singulari auctoritatis splendore pollenti, admirabilisque eloquentiae benevolentie* (sic) *felicitate glorioso, cunctarumque dignitatum fastigia faborabili* (sic) *moderatione iustitiae supergresso Vulcacio Rufino v. c.* etc.[126] Another device appearing in enumerations of virtues and on other occasions is the chiastic collocation of nouns defined by adjectives (or vice versa); for instance, instead of *bellis strenuo consiliisque optimo* some preferred *bellis strenuo optimoque consiliis* (thus ILS 768 [from Africa] in honour of Valens). In inscriptions in honour of senators, one observes phrases such as *singularis integritatis et bonitatis eximiae* (ILS 1249 from Rome, c. 350) or *fidem iuncxit* (sic) *ingenio, prudentiae miscuit libertatem* (ILS 1272 from Rome, AD 389).[127] On the other hand, it is true that the majority of inscriptions stick to parallelism of the type *censurae veteris pietatisque singularis* (CIL VI 31394a; Maxentius).[128] Some inscriptions, again, combine the two, using both the chiastic and the parallel collocation of nouns defined by adjectives, no doubt to produce a nice contrast (and often also a desirable clausula); observe for instance the inscription from Ostia honouring Constantine cited above, ILS 687, *restitutori publicae libertatis, defensori urbis Romae, communis omnium salutis auctori* (– ∪ – – –); or ILS 765 (in honour of Valentinian, from Rome), *legum domino Romanarum, iustitiae aequitatisque rectori, domitori gentium barbararum, conservatori liberta-*

---

[126] Cf. ILS 648, 674, 742, 751, 752, 758; CIL X 4863; IRT 471. On this "law", cf. e.g. L. P. Wilkinson, Golden Latin Artistry (1963) 175ff.; Szantyr, op. cit. (n. 1) 722ff.; T. Habinek, The Colometry of Latin Prose (1985) 175ff. (I borrow the expression from Wilkinson; "law of increasing magnitude" in L. R. Palmer, The Latin Language [1952] 87, cf. 93, whereas Habinek 17, 175 leaves the German "Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder" untranslated, and J.D. Denniston, Greek Prose Style [1952] 68 only describes the phenomenon without giving it a name).

[127] Cf. ILS 648, 739, 2950 (*non verbena vilis nec otiosa hedera*; *seu in castris probatos seu optimos vatum*), 5511, 5777 (*felicis saeculi providentia et instinctu Mercurii potentis*), 6817; IRT 562. From the 3rd century: ILS 533 (AD 254), 6826.

[128] Cf. e.g. ILS 674, 688, 1228, 1236, 1277; AE 1955, 150.

tis.[129]

Furthermore, one observes carefully chosen antitheses (e.g. ILS 688 [Constantine, from Cirta], *qui libertatem tenebris servitutis oppressam sua felici victoria nova luce inluminavit*),[130] the use of figures such as the litotes[131] and the hyperbaton,[132] and, in general, the search for variation both in the choice of words[133] and of syntactical constructions.[134]

The fact that the hyperbaton is often used to produce sought-after clausulae allows us to finish this paper by touching upon the tendency (already referred to in many places in the preceeding exposition), discernible in later antiquity (in fact, in many cases at least from the second century onwards) not only in "bureaucratese",[135] but also in many inscriptions, to follow the principles concerning rhythm laid down in the

---

[129] Also e.g. in ILS 751, 5511, 6349. In the famous inscription on the arch of Constantine in Rome (ILS 694) the chiastic *instinctu divinitatis, mentis magnitudine* is contrasted by *liberatori urbis, fundatori quietis*.

[130] Noted by Kajanto, art. cit. 17. Cf. also e.g. ILS 1262 (*in ipso flore iuvenilis aetatis frugem maturae auctoritatis*), 2950 (*inter arma litteris militabat ... in viro antiquae nobilitatis, novae gloriae*).

[131] ILS 4152, *causarum non ignobilis orator*; AE 1930, 120, *tribunal quod minus exornatum repperit.*

[132] This is very common, and I have already cited ILS 765, *legum domino Romanarum* (cf. above). In addition to that, e.g. ILS 740, *ad perpetuam quietis firmitatem*; ILS 809, *intra vicesimum quintum adsecutus aetatis annum*; ILS 1234, *ad hos eum dignitatum apices*. In most cases the desired effect is no doubt that of a pleasing rhythm (in ILS 4944 a hiatus is avoided by inserting *nimis* between *longa* and *aetate neglectas*).

[133] Both *omnis* and *universus* are used to avoid repetition in ILS 688 (Constantinian, from Cirta). Note also ILS 724 (with both *munitio* and *munimen*), ILS 1272 (*iuncxit* [sic] *ingenio, prudentiae miscuit*), ILS 2767 (*in cives amorem ... erga patriam adfectionem*). On the other hand, some authors of epigraphical texts did not have a large repertory of interchangeable expressions at their disposal; in ILS 613, *providentia* is one of the subjects of the clause which ends with *providit*; in ILS 1278, *adfinitatis* is soon followed by *adfini etiam*; in ILS 1284 *censura* is used twice to describe the honorand. Cf. ILS 5511, which has *reparatori* (referring to different activities of the honorand) five times, only once inserting *restitutori.*

[134] Cf. e.g. ILS 794, *s.p.q.R. vindicata rebellione et Africae restitutione laetus*; ILS 795, *[o]b squ[alore]s ac pernic[iem ex]tendendo]*; ILS 1237, *singulari auctoritatis splendore ... admirabilisque eloquentiae ... felicitate.* Cf. ILS 1265, with an interesting variation of nouns of the second and those of the third declension, some defined by one word in the genitive, some by two.

[135] Cf. P. Collinet, REL 5, 1927, 250ff.; R. MacMullen, art. cit. (above at n. 93) 299 n. 33; and in general Szantyr, op. cit. (above n. 1) 715ff.

rhetorical tradition. Since we are not studying a single author, but hundreds of variously educated writers of epigraphical texts all around the Roman Empire, it is obviously not easy to say much of pertinence, and anything one says is bound to be based largely on subjective impressions. The subject could, however, possibly merit a closer study than the few rather superficial observations which follow.

First of all, as in imperial prose in general, one seems to note in later inscriptions a clear tendency to avoid hiatus. This is achieved in many ways. One may use a word in the plural instead of the singular. For instance, saying *administrationibus egregio* when *virtute mirifico* follows (where the plural might also have been possible)[136] may perhaps be attributed to the above-mentioned tendency (AE 1955, 150 from Hippo, 4th cent.). Another possibility is to change the word order: for instance, *est (h)abita* at the end of ILS 1218 (Mutina, Constantinian; cf. ILS 1274. 5785); and using the order *vetera civitatis insignia* in a text which also includes the expression *ornamenta liberta(tis)* eliminates the hiatus threatening if the order were *insignia civitatis* (ILS 5570B, from Cilli in Africa, c. 319; of course the order actually used also produces a nice chiasm). But hiatus can also be avoided by either adding a word beginning and ending with a consonant (thus perhaps ILS 4944 [Rome, 4th cent.], *longa nimis aetate neglectas*) or omitting a word beginning with a vowel; it is typical of late inscriptions to omit the infinitive *esse* in formulations of the type *statuam conlocandam censuit* (ILS 1250),[137] and a possible explanation may in many cases be, in fact, the ensuing avoidance of hiatus (on the other hand, in some of the cases in which *esse* is used one observes that this produces a popular clausula, so that some people seem to have thought the clausula to be of more importance than the avoidance of hiatus).[138]

As for the clausulae themselves, it is, as noted above, not easy to say

---

[136] For *virtus* used in the plural cf. e.g. ILS 371, 425, 1154, 1239, 1243, 7155; CIL V 5127 = AE 1984, 455; IRT 103.

[137] Also e.g. ILS 1236, 1244, 1250, 1272, 1278, 5698, 6505; CIL X 5200; IRT 562; AE 1976, 141 (from an earlier period: ILS 1390, 6218, 6726, 6780).

[138] ILS 5508 (Beneventum, 4th cent.), *statuam ponendam esse duxerunt*. Similarly in IRT 558 at the end of a colon. Cf. ILS 1256, where *statuam ... postulandam esse credidit* leads to a clausula which, though not one of the most popular, is not unknown to Cicero (cf. e.g. Wilkinson, op. cit. [n. 126] 141, 156). Of course, one can also find many further instances of a hiatus not being avoided; a notable one is AE 1972, 79 (Puteoli, c. 340?), *statuam ponendam sollicite adcurarunt.*

much of interest or value on the their use in inscriptions. In spite of this, let me offer a few observations which seem to obtrude themselves upon the reader. Let us start with ILS 1265, the inscription set up in Rome in AD 378 in honour of Petronius Probus by *Histri peculiares eius*. The text leads off with a lengthy series of commata describing the honorand (*nobilitatis culmini, litterarum et eloquentiae lumini, auctoritatis exemplo* etc.), all of them without exception ending in Ciceronian (and also later favoured) clausulae, these including two instances each of − ∪ − − x, − ∪ − − ∪ x and − ∪ − − ∪ − x. I think that this can hardly be called a coincidence, and so this inscription may serve as an introduction to the following observations. Let us go on with the favoured clausula − ∪ − − x, which, by the way, also appears in other commata of the above type (e.g. *communis omnium salutis auctori* ILS 687 [Constantine]).[139] We have already seen that the use of two passive infinitives connected by -*que* (*statuam constitui conlocarique iusserunt* etc.), not uncommon in late inscriptions, may have, at least in part, been caused not only by a certain general urge for pleonasm, but also by the clausula produced above at n. 102), and the same goes for the use of two gerundives connected by -*que* and followed by *curavit* (e.g. ILS 1261 [Rome, 4th cent.], *statuam faciendam conlocandamque curavit*).[140] It was also observed above that saying *ornamenta statuae ... erigenda decrevit* instead of *statuam ... erigendam decrevit* has the same effect (n. 100). However, often this clausula was attained simply by choosing convenient expressions to be collocated in a suitable word order. Thus, for instance, ILS 1284 (Rome, 440s) not only finishes off with *erigi conlocarique iusserunt*, but also has cola ending in *censura servaret* and *legatione mandata*. Sometimes, it is true, there had to be some manipulation of the word order (cf. above n. 124 on *Gratiani triumfalis principis pontem* in ILS 772). Of this, there is, in fact, a quite early instance, ILS 309, an inscription set up in Rome in honour of Hadrian in 118: it seems more than likely that the formulation *qui ... non praesentes tantum cives sed et posteros eorum praestitit hac liberalitate securos* had been chosen because of the clausula.

---

[139] (Cf. above at n. 129 for this text.) In CIL VI 1755 (AD 395), we find three successive commata ending with this clausula (*castitatis exemplo, consulum proli, consulum matri*). Also e.g. IRT 562 (*moderatione perpenso*). For instances where the clausula is produced by the use of -*que*, cf. ILS 765 (Valentinian) *iustitiae aequitatisque rectori*; CIL X 4863 (Venafrum, 4th cent., *abstinentia constantiaq(ue) mirando*; AE 1972, 75b and 76 (Capua).

[140] Also e.g. in ILS 5510, 5535.

More usual were, however, lighter manipulations, such as moving a finite verb from the end to some other collocation (e.g. ILS 2951 [Rome, 5th cent.], *possit aequari*; on the other hand, cf. *esse laetantur* in CIL VI 1706 [AD 400]) or the reversal of the order of a noun and an adjective (e.g. ILS 4152 [Rome, AD 376], *Africani tribunalis orator*). A further possibility was to use short perfect forms; for instance, *aeternitate signarunt* at the end of ILS 6836 (Sufetula, c. Diocletianic?) or *benig‹ni›tate tractarit* (in spite of *relevaverit*) at the end of a colon in ILS 7155 (Sarmizegetusa, c. 161). In any case, one seems to recognize the use of this clausula in a large number of epigraphical texts, and this only confirms what is known of its popularity in literary (and subliterary) texts.[141]

An interesting case is the inscriptions of AD 377 from Rome referring to the setting up of statues in (probably) the *basilica Aemilia* by the urban prefect Probianus. CIL VI 1658b (known only from early descriptions) has the text *statuam ... quae ornamento esse poossit* (sic?) *basilicae inlustr(i)*, which has a hiatus in two places and a not very Ciceronian clausula, whereas CIL VI 1658a and AE 1984, 33 have the same text, but the order *basilicae esse posset inlustri*, which eliminates one hiatus and ends with the favoured clausula. If the reading in 1658b was actually *poossit*, one might think of the possibility that this statue base (found, it is true, in S. Adriano, i.e. in what is now known as the *curia*) was rejected and that, when new ones were being produced, the clausula was also emended.

Let me finish with a quick glance at two other Ciceronian (and also later popular) clausulae, leaving the rest of the work to others,[142] namely

---

[141] Cf. also e.g. ILS 1278 (*adfinitatis evecto*), 2950 (*eloquentiae cura*), 4931 (AD 257, *aetate pervenit*), 5505 (*munitione sublatum*). In building inscriptions: e.g. ILS 4944, 5522, 5523, 5635, 5715. For contracted perfect forms used with a view of attaining clausulae cf. e.g. Å. Fridh, Études critiques et syntaxiques sur les Variae de Cassiodore (1950) 16.

[142] In spite of this, let me point out a few cases in which other Ciceronian clausulae seem to have been used; for $- \cup - - \cup$ x, cf. e.g. ILS 8985 (Neapolis, 4th cent.), *provido semper et strenuo*; CIL VI 1793 (AD 394), *cuius meatum series temporum vetustasque consumpserat* (in CIL VIII 5367 = 17496 = ILAlg. I 288, *accedente auctoritate proconsulum*, the clausula may be accidental). For $- - - \cup -$ x, cf. e.g. ILS 774 (Pannonia, late 4th cent.), *ad summam manum perduxerunt perfectionis*; ILS 1230, 1236, 6501 (*Amiterninae, Constantinae* and *Beneventanae* being followed by *civitatis*); CIL X 5200 (Casinum, c. Diocletianic?), *therm(a)e ... nobis in usu sunt restitutae*. This clausula is also attained if one formulates the conclusion of a honorific inscription as *(statuam) ponendam censuerunt* (e.g. ILS 5698, CIL XIV 4449, CIL X 520).

the famous *esse videatur* type – ∪ ∪ ∪ – x and the cretic + ditrochee type – ∪ – – ∪ – x. Though possibly not as popular as the clausula discussed above, both are found in quite a few epigraphical texts. That these clausulae have been expressly sought after is clear in cases such as ILS 5694 (Ostia, 375/378), in which the use of the short perfect form *decorarunt*, preceded by *curante*, leads to the former, and in the inscriptions of Petronius Probus (ILS 1267 and 1268) and his wife Faltonia Proba (CIL VI 1755 [AD 395]), set up by their children, in which the use of *dedicarunt*, preceded by *filii* (3 syllables) in ILS 1267 and CIL VI 1755, and by *debitum* in 1268, leads to the latter.[143] As for the former, other cases do not seem to be as clear, although there can not be much doubt about examples such as ILS 809 (Rome, 5th cent.), *statuam, meritorum perenne monumentum*, or ILS 5505 (Sicca, 4th cent.), *patrono fido amore posuerunt, amor* ascribed to the dedicators (and not to the honorand) not being common in honorific inscriptions. The most unusual conclusion of ILS 6726 (Bergomum, possibly as early as Severan) with a clause beginning with *ut* (but this not the only striking feature in this inscription), *huius ....beneficia ita remuneranda censuerunt, ut effigiem illius perpetua veneratione celebrarent* also makes one think that the *esse videatur* clausula is not accidental.[144] As for the latter clausula (cretic + ditrochee), in addition to the instances noted above, it seems more than probable that this clausula has been deliberately inserted in the inscription from Beneventum notable for its use of rhetorical ornamentation, ILS 5511 (4th or 5th cent.), in which one finds the formulation *ac totius prope civitatis [post h]ostile incendium conditori*. This clausula can also be produced by the reversal of the word order in some of the phrases of the type *conlocandam censuit*, and since this is, in fact, rather rare, one suspects that at least in some of the instances of the reversed order (e.g. *censuit conlocandam* in ILS 6505 [Beneventum, 4th cent.]) the reason may have been the attainment of this popular clausula. Furthermore, a suitable cretic word preceding a verb of the structure of *conlocavit* also has the same effect, and this may well be the reason for the formulation

---

[143] ILS 1269, another inscription in honour of Faltonia Proba set up by her children, also ends with *dedicarunt*, but here the clausula is ∪∪ – – ∪ – x (*maternis meritis dedicarunt*).

[144] Observe also e.g. ILS 724 (Moesia, AD 337/340, *latrunculorum ... impetum perennis muniminis dispositione tenuerunt*); ILS 6810 (Ammaedara, 3rd or 4th cent., *statuae honore cumulavit*); ILAlg. I 4011 and 4012 (Madauros, 330s, *liberalitate posuerunt*).

thermarum ... gratiam in ILS 5716 (Rome, 4th or 5th cent.) and for the addition of *votis omnibus* (a not at all common phrase) in IRT 475 (Lepcis, 375/378), collocated in both instances before the concluding *conlocavit*.[145]

University of Helsinki

---

[145] Also e.g. in the building inscription ILS 5701 (Segusio, 375/378) the word order *thermas ... usui Segusinae reddidit civit[atis* seems to suggest that the author of the text had the clausula in mind.

ANALECTA EPIGRAPHICA

HEIKKI SOLIN

CLV. VERKANNTE NAMEN

Prunice. So, nicht *Pruni C.f.* ist auf der pompeianischen Grabstele NSc. 1894, 14 zu lesen. A. Sogliano in NSc. schreibt PRVNI/CF· und A. Mau, RM 10, 1895, 159, sogar PRVNI/C·F·, doch findet sich kein Punkt nach dem C, und außerdem ist am Ende eher E statt F zu lesen (aufgrund der Autopsie im Archäologischen Museum von Neapel, wo die Stele sich befindet). *Prunicus Prunice* ist des öfteren in der römischen Namengebung belegt (in meinem Namenbuch 1030 sind 1 Frauennamen– und 5 Männernamenbelege verzeichnet). Der Name ist griechisch (Bechtel HPN 519) und ist aus der griechischen Namengebung nach Rom entlehnt worden. Trotz der für die Römer nicht durchsichtigen 'Bedeutung' des Namenwortes dürfte es keinerlei Schwierigkeiten bereiten, diesen Namen als griechisch empfundenes Anthroponym in Italien anzusetzen.

Brundisinus. Diesen Namen glaube ich in der lateinischen, aber mit griechischen Buchstaben geschriebenen altchristlichen Inschrift Βρενζεινο πατρει βενεμερεντι Sylloge des Finnischen Rominstituts 78 = ICVR 23847 erkannt zu haben (die Lesung ist sicher). Die Editoren der Sylloge denken an *Verentinus*, was durch nichts einleuchtet, während Ferrua in ICVR die Erklärung offen läßt. Nun wird bekanntlich der Name von Brundisium wie seiner Einwohner gelegentlich *Brent-* geschrieben, und im Griechischen überwiegt die Schreibung Βρεντέσιον. Durch eine Synkope in der nicht betonten Mittelsilbe entstand die hier belegte Form. Daß die übriggebliebene Konsonantengruppe νζ geschrieben wurde (*-nds-* und *-nts-* sind von Hause aus unlateinisch), ist vollends verständlich in diesem späten Namen und reflektiert die Aussprache des Namens in den Kreisen, in denen die Inschrift hergestellt wurde. Als Cognomen ist *Brundisinus* nicht ganz unüblich und kommt auch außerhalb von Apulien vor: in Rom in CIL VI 14107 (in der Form *Brendesinus*). 17291. NSc. 1919, 322 Nr. 63; in Capua (CIL X 4137);

in Vienna (CIL XII 1968).

CLVI. VARIA URBANA

1. Die in Forma Italiae, regio I, 4, Tellenae, Roma 1967, 138 Nr. 110, 4 veröffentlichte Inschrift (= AE 1967, 66, ebenfalls schlecht) muß aufgrund des in Abb. 337 publizierten Photos folgendermaßen gelesen werden: *[---]io L.l. Nan[---] / [---]us L.l. Diogene[s] / [fecit? pa]trono et sibi et / [---] L.l. Arguta[e]*. Interessant am Text ist das Cognomen der erstgenannten Person, von dem nur *Nan[---]* erhalten ist. Es wird sich entweder um eine Ableitung aus dem Gentilnamen *Nanneius*, etwa *Nanneianus* handeln; freilich sind keine solchen Formen uns überliefert, aber *Nanneius* selbst ist nicht ganz unüblich (zur Belegung vgl. O. Salomies, in Solin - Salomies, Repertorium 125). Oder aber wir haben es mit einem Namen aus der Sippe Ναν- zu tun, die besonders in Kleinasien (Zgusta, Kleinasiatische Personennamen 346-354 und Neue Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen Anthroponymie 66) verbreitet war; es handelt sich um eine große Sippe von Lallnamen, welche auch im griechischen Gebiet bezeugt sind (etwa in den Inseln des Ägäischen Meeres; vgl. die Bemerkungen von O. Masson, RPh 1974, 87; die Belege jetzt in LGPN I 323) und die so als griechisches Namengut nach Rom haben wandern können, auch wenn Namen auf *Nan-* nur selten in stadtrömischen Inschriften auftreten (CIL VI 8021. 28510).

2. In der in demselben Band 147 Nr. 134, 1 (Photo Abb. 352) publizierten verhältnismäßig alten Inschrift muß der erste Name folgendermaßen gelesen: *A. Iunius A. et 1. Felicio*. Der Editor plädiert für *Felicis(simus)* (so auch AE 1967, 64 = 1975, 182). Doch wäre die Abkürzung *Felicis(simus)* recht eigentümlich.[1] Vor allem aber ist *Felicissimus* ein typisch später Name, der erst im 2. Jh. modisch wird; Belege, die sicher aus dem 1. Jh. stammen, dürften exzeptionell sein (mir liegen zur Zeit keine auf der Hand).[2] *Felicissimus* ist also ein Modename

---

[1] Vidman in seinem Cognominaindex 261 führt eine Form *Feicis(simus)* aus 29593 an, die aber völlig in der Luft hängen bleibt, denn die Stelle ist korrupt (eher liegt Korruptel von *fecit* vor).

[2] CIL VI 16265 und 17796 können dem 1. Jh. zugeschrieben werden, brauchen es aber nicht; ebenso gut kann eine Datierung ins 2. Jh. befürwortet werden. Statistisch ist aber die Möglichkeit, Belege aus der früheren Kaiserzeit aufzuspüren, nicht groß; dem kritisch gesichteten und zeitlich geordneten Verzeichnis stadtrömischer Sklavennamen

erst während der fortgeschrittenen Kaiserzeit geworden, als typisches Produkt der Gattung der Wunschnamen. Dagegen haben sich Suffixableitungen aus *Felix*, das selbst schon in republikanischer Zeit als Sklavenname auftritt,[3] wie *Felicio* oder der Frauenname *Felic(u)la* beträchtlich früher durchgesetzt; allein aus der stadtrömischen Dokumentation kenne ich mehrere Belege aus der frühesten Kaiserzeit,[4] und der Name kommt auch auf Stempeln der arretinischen Keramik vor (CIL XV 5551). Wie schon angedeutet, ist die Inschrift alt, aus der frühen Kaiserzeit (wohl augusteisch), wie sowohl die Diktion als auch die Buchstabenformen zeigen. Aus dem Photo zu schließen, ist das Schluß-S alles andere als sicher, so daß der Lesung *Felicio* kaum Hindernisse im Wege stehen.

3. CIL VI 26057 wird folgendermaßen ergänzt: *[L. Secundi]nius L.l. Sindaeu[s,] / [Secun]dinia L.l. Laudica*. Das ist weniger ansprechend, denn die Inschrift scheint verhältnismäßig alt zu sein (sie stammt wohl, aus dem Wortlaut zu schließen, aus der frühen Kaiserzeit), während der Gentilname *Secundinius* den erst in der fortgeschrittenen Kaiserzeit verbreiteten, aus üblichen Cognomina gebildeten Typ neuer Gentilicia vertritt. Von den in Frage kommenden Namen ist etwa *Surdinius* älter und mehr 'römisch' als *Secundinius*, der einen für die provinziale Namengebung charakteristischen Typ vertritt; kein Wunder, daß die meisten stadtrömischen Belege Provinzialen gehören.[5]

4. A. Ferrua, Riv. arch. crist. 68, 1992, 175-182 hat aus einem im Jahre 1805 an Gaetano Marini geschriebenen Brief von Giacinto Ponzetti (1735-1812) die von diesem summarisch und teilweise ganz korrupt angeführten altchristlichen Inschriften (freilich findet sich darunter auch

---

(in dem in Kürze erscheinenden Onomastikon der römischen Sklavennamen) entnehme ich, daß von *Felicissimus* insgesamt 23 Sklavennamenbelege in Rom belegt sind, von denen also nur zwei dem 1. Jh. gehören können, während die übrigen spät sind (manche sind mit Sicherheit ins 2. Jh. datierbar).

[3] Etwa CIL VI 2247 = I[2] 1263 vgl. Epigraphica 38, 1976, 124; VI 5734 = I[2] 1283; CIL XV 5243. 5552. 5735 (Stempel der arretinischen Keramik).

[4] Der julisch-claudischen Zeit gehören wenigstens CIL VI 4243, 5854, 6449, 19247, 20792 *b*,17, 21085; AE 1933, 146. 1989, 97; Collezione epigr. dei Musei Capitolini (1987) 24; Sen. epist. 1,12,3 (= PIR[2] F 138).

[5] CIL VI 2445 gehört einem Prätorianer und stammt aus dem 2./ 3. Jh. 2914 wurde errichtet von *Secundinius Maximus*, der *heres* eines Urbanicianus war, also selbst zweifellos auch ein Soldat. 32806 *Secundinius Verus* war ein Eques singularis *natione Suebus*. Außerhalb der Militärkreise bleibt nur 26058 *Secundinia Paterna* aus dem 2./ 3.Jh.

heidnisches Gut) zusammengestellt und sich auf S. 182 einige von diesen zu identifizieren bemüht. Die Gleichsetzung mit schon bekannten Inschriften ist in den meisten Fällen unproblematisch, denn die von Ponzetti angeführten Inschriften waren für das Museum der Vatikanischen Bibliothek bestimmt und sollen sich auch allesamt in den Vatikanischen Museen finden und sind deswegen leicht identifizierbar. Ich führe noch einige Gleichsetzungen an, die ein gewisses Interesse beanspruchen:

Problepeius f. 97 ist zweifellos ICVR 27153, weil diese sich in der Galleria Lapidaria der Vatikanischen Museen befindet und weil der Name *Problepius* (von Ponzetti mißverstanden) sonst nicht belegt ist.

Septimia Afrodite f. 97 ist ICVR 2398.

Moneratia Sanctipe f. 97 ist ICVR 4468. Von Ponzetti falsch gelesen, das Gentile heißt *Honeratia*. Ponzettis Zeugnis erhärtet die Annahme, die Inschrift sei christlich (auch in CIL VI 9800 publiziert).

Vitulius Calligonus f. 97 ist ICVR 1797, von Ponzetti falsch gelesen: das Gentilicium ist *Utulius*.

Aurelia Gorgonia f. 97 ist ICVR 2160.

Quiriacetus f. 97v ist nichts anderes als der heteroklitische Dativ *Quiriaceti* von *Cyriace* in ICVR 1445; die Gleichsetzung ist dadurch gesichert, da ICVR 1445 sich im ehemaligen Lateranmuseum im Vatikan befindet (ICVR 29 = 4084, wo ebenfalls *Quiriaceti* belegt ist, kommt nicht in Frage, da diese Inschrift Ponzetti nicht gegenwärtig sein konnte).

Sisinnius f. 97v ist ICVR 2509. Der Name heißt *Sisinnus*.

Aeoni Gregori f. 97v ist CIL VI 19611, in den Vatikanischen Museen befindlich. Es erhebt sich die Frage, ob die Inschrift, wegen des Zeugnisses von Ponzetti, eher als christlich anzusehen sei. Der Inschrift haftet nichts speziell Christliches an (wenn sie auch aus der späteren Kaiserzeit stammt), und da durch Ponzettis Hände aus den Katakomben allerlei Materialien, nicht nur christliches Gut, geschleppt wurden, besteht keine Notwendigkeit, die Inschrift als christlich anzusehen. Dasselbe trifft für die folgende Inschrift zu.

Ulpia Quinta f. 98v ist zweifellos die in der Galleria Lapidaria der Vatikanischen Museen befindliche CIL VI 29388.

Ulpia Dionisia f. 98v scheint dagegen bisher unbekannt zu sein; jedenfalls ist dieses Namenpaar weder in CIL VI noch in den ICVR I-X zu finden.

5. Nochmals zu ICVR 2564. Ich hatte ZPE 87, 1991, 247 für den in ICVR 2564 korrupt publizierten Namen ACKME die Verbesserung

'Ασκλᾶς aufgrund der Autopsie angesetzt (einverstanden damit A. Lajtar, ZPE 93, 1992, 142). Nun will aber D. Feissel, Bull. épigr. 1993, 784 dafür mit Kirchhoff, CIG 9820 eher Δέκμε konjizieren, da die Änderung paläographisch ökonomischer sei. Die Entscheidung fällt nicht leicht. Für Kirchhoff und Feissel könnte der Umstand sprechen, daß das erste A anders gemacht ist als die anderen, die mehr kursivähnlich sind. Andererseits wäre *Decmus* mit Synkope etwas ungewöhnlich in altchristlichen Inschriften. Und *Decimus* als solcher (also ohne suffixale Bildungen) ist nicht sonderlich üblich in römischen altchristlichen Urkunden (ich kenne nur ICVR 14177 und 21747; dazu fem. Δεκίμη 26016), während das reichliche Vorhandensein der Sippe Asklepios in der christlichen Namengebung nicht überrascht, wohnt doch den Namen dieser Sippe auch ein 'heilsgeschichtlicher' Begriffsinhalt inne.

6. In zwei altchristlichen Inschriften, ICVR 12888 = 1864 und 24674 wird der Name *[De]mophilus* ergänzt; da diese Bildung sonst gänzlich in der römischen Namengebung fehlt, wäre es wohl vorzuziehen, in beiden *[Her]mophilus* zu ergänzen, der ein üblicher Name in Rom war (in meinem Namenbuch 58 sind 7 Belege verzeichnet).

7. In ICVR 24765 SVR/ARCO MARITO vermutet der Editor den Namen *Cyriacus* (geschrieben QVRIACO). Da diese Änderung etwas gewaltsam ist, schlage ich als Alternative vor, hier den Namen *Syriarches* zu sehen; er kommt in den römischen Inschriften (auch in späterer Zeit) vor (s. mein Namenbuch 1013 mit 3 Belegen). Die Endung *-us* wurde in Anlehnung an die üblichen Namen auf -αρχος gewählt.

CLVII. PRISCILLIANA

Unten folgen einige Anmerkungen zu Inschriften aus Priscilla, kürzlich von D. Mazzoleni in ICVR 24828-26311 zusammengestellt.

24836. De Rossi und Marucchi vermuteten in Acilius Glabrio einen Sohn oder Enkel des Konsuls 91, was ausgeschlossen sein dürfte. Kein Deut von der Problematik der Zuweisung der vermeintlichen christlichen Acilii Glabriones in Priscilla. Es ist nicht einmal wahrscheinlich, daß diese Glabriones Christen waren.

24912. Das von Ponzetti überlieferte AFROMENES wird vom Editor als *Aphromenes* (Indices S. 397) gedeutet. Das ist aber kein Name. Viel eher *Aeromenes* = *Eromenes*, Genetiv von *Eromene*, das des öfteren in Rom als

Cognomen belegt ist (s. mein Namenbuch 884).

24939. Es besteht keine Notwendigkeit, *Refrigerium* mit Ferrua als einen Frauennamen aufzufassen. Der Text lautet *dulcissimo Antistheni coniugi suo refrigerium*; daß der Name der Errichterin nicht eigens erwähnt wird, hat nichts Außergewöhnliches.

24984. Mir scheint ein *N(umerius) Aurelius* ausgeschlossen. Wohl Schreibfehler für M.

25004. Das Cognomen *Micalus* soll ein Unicum sein. Doch es vertritt einen guten griechischen Namen aus der überaus populären Sippe Μῖκος (Bechtel HPN 485). Und *Miccalus* läßt sich in Rom belegen (Solin Namenbuch 663f).

25136. *Eumenor* ist kein Name. Es muß doch mit De Rossi an *Euenor* gedacht werden.

25137. Der Name ist wohl *Eupaes*. Vgl. Solin Namenbuch 956.

25339. Hier ist eine eigentümliche Konfusion eingetreten. Obwohl der Text in CIL VI, bei Dessau und Diehl publiziert worden ist, hat der Editor seinen Wortlaut nicht verstanden. Er liest *Fusciane c(larissima) f(emina) et Camenicu(s)* statt des richtigen *Fusciane c(larissimae) f(eminae) et Cameni c.v.*!

25344. Ich vermute hier den Namen *Thelymitres*. Vgl. Solin, Namenbuch 861; dazu noch AE 1979, 109.

25366. *Nicarius* wäre ein ghost-name. Warum nicht *Panc(h)arius*, ein überaus häufiger Name unter den alten römischen Christen?

25447. *Nana* als Name wäre einmalig; als Parallele könnte höchstens die besonders in Kleinasien verbreitete Lallnamensippe Ναν- herangezogen werden (s. oben S. 108). Da aber schon der erste Buchstabe N (nach der publizierten Abschrift) unsichtbar geworden ist, fragt man sich, ob nicht am Anfang noch mehr fehlt; also Schlußteil eines beliebigen Frauennamens auf *-niana* (das Wegfallen von *i* bei diesem Suffix ist überaus häufig in altchristlichen Inschriften).

25544. Die vom Editor zur Deutung dieser Inschrift gegebenen Erklärungen sind abenteuerlich.

26041. EYNOI braucht nicht zu Εὐνοι[κός] ergänzt zu werden. Εὐνοι ist ein heteroklitischer Dativ, auch sonst in Rom belegt: Moretti IGUR 642. Vgl. ZPE 67, 1987, 201f.

26179. Warum soll gerade [᾽Εγ]κρατία ergänzt werden? Es gibt in Rom eine Handvoll viel üblicherer Bildungen auf *-cratia*, wie etwa *Callicratia Cratia Socratia*.

CLVIII. BLATTFÜLLSEL

1. Chr. Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia, Istanbuler Forschungen 39, 1993, 171 Nr. 52 aus Amastris ist zu lesen *L. Sempronio militi et tubicini cohortis Camp(anorum), (centuria) L. Allidi, Magna Titi Atti filia uxor eius.*

2. A Passion for Antiquities. Ancient Art from the Collection of Barbara and Lawrence Fleischman, The J. Paul Getty Museum in association with the Cleveland Museum of Art, Malibu 1995, 336-38 Nr. 178 mit gutem Photo ist ein Grabrelief aus augusteischer Zeit, begleitet von einer Inschrift, die folgendermaßen gedeutet wird: *P(aulus!) Curtilius Placat[us] / faber argentarius.* Anhand des Photos lese ich ohne die geringsten Schwierigkeiten *P. Curtilius P.l. Agat[ho].*

Universität Helsinki

NOTES ON EROS IN MIDDLE PLATONISM

HOLGER THESLEFF

The Platonic Eros and the history of its interpretation is an inexhaustible topic. In this paper, I shall take up the relatively rarely raised question of what happened, within Platonism between Plato and Plotinus, to the idea of Eros as a sublime, awe-inspiring, and ennobling force, the daimonic Eros, "Eros Ouranios".[1] I am not concerned, principally, with φιλία or ἀγάπη or other forms of emotional inclination, or with ordinary sexual love. Perhaps surprisingly, there does not seem to have existed a separate Platonist theory of sexual love, distinct from the Aristotelian, Stoic, or Epicurean theories of emotion where sexuality is a risky appetite or passion to be kept in check, but friendship is a recommendable attitude.[2] And Platonists after Plato, and before the Renaissance, show little or no interest in homosexuality.[3]

Though the evidence is very fragmentary, I shall try to focus on two problems: did a doctrinalization of the theory of Eros come about before Plotinus; and how did the notion of love (*eros* / *amor*) of God arise?

It is important to keep in mind the visionary, poetic, sometimes auto-

---

[1] Middle Platonist ἔρως οὐράνιος vs. πάνδημος (cf. Pausanias in *Symposium* 180d) has not attracted much attention even among theologians engaged in the Nygren controversy (references below, n. 33 and 36). J.M. Rist, Eros and Psyche (Phoenix Suppl. 6), 1964, concentrates on Plato, Origen, and Plotinus.

[2] Sexuality is principally a base passion in Platonism too, and the potentials of Plato's imagery were not developed into a theory of sublimation of sexuality; cf. Philo, Plutarch, and Alcinous (below; also Galen, Plac. 4,5, V 393 f. Kühn). – In the platonizing Ps.-Pythagorean texts, chastity is recommended (esp. Okkelos 135-138 Th) though ἔρως, being an ἐπιθυμία, is part of the συναρμογά of soul and the universe (Aresas 49,5, cf. Kallikratidas 103, Theages 190 Th); φιλία is rather intellectual (e.g. Aresas 50,10, Hippodamos 97,14 Th). It is only στέργειν and ἀγαπᾶν that comprise the entire soul: Metopos 117 Th, cf. Arist. EN 3,2,1111b.

[3] It is ventilated, rather repudiatingly, in some of the speeches of Plutarch's *Amatorius*. For Plotinus' attitude, see Porphyry, V.Plot. 15.

biographic, and often somewhat playful character of Plato's erotic imagery in the *Symposium, Phaedrus* and elsewhere. The hyperbolic byplay of one of the notorious passages in the *Republic* (6,490ab) suggests that eros, even here, is not merely a metaphor for non-sexual "desire" (as ἐρᾶν and its derivatives are occasionally in classical Greek outside Plato). Shorey translates, with slightly misleading decency, "... nor would his (sc. the philosopher's) desire (τοῦ ἔρωτος) fail till he came into touch with the nature of each thing itself by that part of his soul to which it belongs... and through that approaching it, and consorting with reality (μιγεὶς τῷ ὄντι) really, he would beget (γεννήσας) intelligence and truth, attain to knowledge and truly live and grow, and so find surcease from his travail (ὠδῖνος) of soul, but not before. - No plea could be fairer." Philosophy is here turned into 'love of Being' and, in a desparate tour de force against vulgar detractors, into 'making love to Being'. We can imagine Socrates' amused mien at this bizarre thought. I am inclined to think that ἔρως is nowhere in Plato a metaphor devoid of sexual overtones, though in moods and different contexts he plays differently with these overtones. It is τὸ καλόν that arouses love, and it is the proximity of the Fine to the Good, and the Forms' character of true Being, that make the play with Love of Being possible.

But whatever philosophic problems Plato may have faced in and through his conception of Eros, he surely did not intend it to be part of a consistent doctrine.

The next generation of Platonists, however, had a different sense of humour and a different need of decency and dogmas. It seems that Xenokrates, the most influential one of the Academics after Plato's death, considered the Platonic Forms as inherent in cosmic Nous, and included Eros the daimon in his demonology. Hence he could have explained philosophy as sublimated daimonic love for Nous.[4] A reflex of the Academic discussion of Nous-directed Eros may perhaps be seen in

---

[4] The most comprehensive discussion of this complex is H.J. Krämer, Der Ursprung der Geistesmetaphysik, 1964. Here the emphasis is on the doctrine of Principles and Nous after Plato, but Eros is considered in passing (esp. 127 ff., 178). Krämer gives some support to Heinze's view of the demonology of Xenokrates (1892); cf. also Krämer, Platonismus und hellenistische Philosophie, 1972, 175 f. Philip of Opous wrote a Π. ἔρωτος (Suda s.n.) and probably prepared for Xenokrates' conception (cf. *Epinomis* 984de). A daimonic love for Nous is perhaps implied in the mystifying end of the Platonic *Epistle* VI. We do not actually know how Xenokrates explained philosophy; the Platonic *Definitions* (414b) resorts to the idea of ὄρεξις taken over by Aristotle.

Aristotle's famous remark in *Metaphysics* Λ (1072b4) on the Prime Mover: it moves as being an object of love (κινεῖ ὡς ἐρώμενον).

If Eros Ouranios was on the verge of being doctrinalized in the Old Academy (this is rather conjectural), he was soon forgotten in "official" Platonism: the Sceptical Academics did not concern themselves with such topics, as far as we know.[5] We should expect Eros to reappear with the metaphysical and religious trends that were reintroduced by Antiochos and Eudoros in the 1st century B.C., and in fact he did so, but very hesitatingly and ambiguously.

The orientation towards the Divine is henceforth in Platonism the ultimate aim of man at his best, the philosopher. The aim is to "become like god", according to the formula taken over from the *Theaetetus* (176b), or "follow god", with a more Pythagorean formulation.[6] God is mainly understood as Nous. But Middle Platonism operates with a divine hierarchy that requires some comments here.

On the whole (though there are many variations and some controversial points), it seems to me possible to distinguish three main levels in the hierarchy: a somehow transcendent Supreme God who at the same time is one (but not The One), pure Good, and pure Intelligence; the Demiurge God (variously interpreted) whose active νοῦς comprises all Platonic Forms; and the World Soul with two aspects, a better and a worse one. The difference between the levels, especially between the First and the Second God, is not categoric: it tends to become blurred into mere aspects (cf. Plotinus' chain or continuum of Being). The three levels can be derived, chiefly, from three confluent sources: Old Academic interpretations of the *Timaeus*; interpretations of the Platonic First Principles, ἕν versus ἀόριστος δυάς (a contribution apparently made already by Xenokrates); and a new interpretation of the Pythagorean tradition concerning the Monad procreating or generating Kosmos by means of the (feminine) Dyad.[7] This

---

[5] And Cicero does not take up the concept of *amor*. For *caritas* and *diligere* (corresponding to φιλεῖν), see de fin. 3,19,62 f., 5,23 ff., 65.

[6] Stob. 2,7,3[f], Iambl. V.Pyth. 86, 137; J. Dillon, The Middle Platonists, 1977, 122 ff. R.E. Witt, Albinus and the history of Middle Platonism (Transactions of the Cambr. Philol. Soc. 7), 1937, is still helpful, in fact more so than Festugière's much-used conspectus in La Révélation IV, 1954, 102 ff.

[7] See in general Krämer 1964; cf. the papers in Entret. Hardt V, 1960; J. Whittaker, Vigiliae Christianae 23, 1969, 91 ff., Dillon 1977 (esp.117 ff.) and id., The Golden Chain, 1991 (esp. IV, on female principles). Though the Dyad is a principle that comes in

last-mentioned idea of generation received secondary support from Greek and non-Greek procreation myths variously introduced by various authors. The feminine level is often represented by cosmic Psyche or semi-mythic figures associated with it (such as Dike or Sophia in Philo, and the Moon or Isis in Plutarch). And then there are the daimons (or angels in Philo), moving more freely between the levels than a human incarnate psyche can.

As in ancient philosophy generally, it is trivially obvious to a Platonist that the human individual, whose soul is tied to the body, is nevertheless able to ennoble it or its faculties. To a Middle Platonist, this is possible by striving (somehow) via the World Soul toward Nous and God. The aim of the striving is Nous, of course – not The One as yet: ἕν is a divine principle, not a god.[8] The process of reaching the level of Nous is (relatively) unproblematic so long as the striving is seen in terms of, say, the λογιστικόν, the higher, cognitive aspect of soul which is naturally cognate to the World Soul and the Nous. More Stoically, the process may be said to be a ὁρμή with the help of λόγος, led by the ἡγημονικόν of man. Or to put it in Aristotelian terms, the striving toward Nous is basically an ἔφεσις or an ὄρεξις (cf. the opening words of the *Metaphysics*). Sometimes Platonists resort to the idea of οἰκείωσις in this connection.[9] And terms such as φιλόθεος occur in religious contexts, implying an "inclination" (as in φιλοσοφία), a "pious attitude", but not primarily "love".

Given the religious, archaizing and dogmatic features of the model

---

with the World Soul, it is associated with matter. For the 'Pythagorean' Monad, cf. references in the Index of Pythag. Texts, ed. Thesleff, 1965, and below, n.8. It should be noted that the source of DL III 67-80 is Old Academic rather than Middle Platonist.

[8] On the traditions about One as a principle (and the role of Speusippos), see now J. Halfwasser, Der Aufstieg zum Einen (Beitr. z. Alt.kunde 9), 1992. There are some confused reports on the 'Pythagorean' ἕν, cf. Thesleff 1965, 56, 237 (with references); Dillon 1977, 120. According to Eudoros (Simpl. in Phys. 181, Dillon 126 f.), the Pythagoreans postulated ἕν as the supreme principle, to be called ὁ ὑπεράνω θεός; but this is apparently a metaphor on the basis of Old Academic henology, cf. Archytas Π. ἀρχῶν 19,25 Th, Moderatos in Porph. V.Pyth. 48 ff., Nikomachos Theol.arithm. 3,1 ff., and the pythagorizing speculations of Ammonios in Plut. de E 393a-c (see esp. J. Whittaker, CQ 19, 1969, 185 ff., SO 48, 1973, 77 ff. who, however, overrates the theological aspect). The Middle Platonists did not operate with the One as a god.

[9] Both ὁρμή and οἰκείωσις are commonly used in this context by e.g. Philo (see the Index of Cohn-Wendland's edition); for a piece of very 'eclectic' terminology, see the Ps.-Pythag. Kriton 109 Th. The idea of οἰκείωσις is prefigured in *Republic* 6,490b, quoted above.

sketched, and the potential erotic interplay with the idea of cosmic proliferation and male and female concepts, we should, as I said, expect Eros the daimon to come in automatically. The fact that he does not is worth some pondering.

The fragments of Eudoros, Thrasyllos, and some other early Middle Platonists whom we can trace, have nothing to offer us in erotics.[10] But Philo of Alexandria and Plutarch have.

Philo is bound to adjust his stoicizing Platonism to Jewish theology, and so he combines the two first Platonist levels into One God who is also the Demiurge and whose Logos (including Platonic Forms and Number) or Pneuma affects the world through intermediate beings, angels and demons. Sometimes he implies an erotic relationship between Logos and a female cosmic figure (proto-Gnostically) called Sophia or Dike and vaguely corresponding to the Platonist Dyad.[11] But ἔρως is not normally found in this context, as if this term were reserved for more Platonistic ideas; an occasional remark such as τὸ γενόμενον ἐρᾷ τοῦ φυτεύσαντος (de fug. 97) may, however, reflect a tradition ultimately deriving from Xenokrates.[12] On the whole, the function of Philo's Sophia seems to be to explain the procreative and "downward" influence of God, not to explain or to aid the "upward" striving of man, the ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ, which is one of Philo's basic concerns.[13]

This upward striving is often in Philo described as a ὁρμή, but quite often too in terms of ἔρως, sometimes οὐράνιος ἔρως (vs. πάνδημος) or θεῖος ἔρως. Such instances, however, do not seem to be dogmatic at all, or even philosophically doctrinalized. Nothing is said of how Eros is awakened, or of sublimation (Eros is no Angel). The object of Philo's ἔρως is sometimes an abstract concept such as τὸ καλόν, ἀλήθεια, or ἐπιστήμη (or σοφία which, however, is sexualized already in the terminology of the *Septuagint,* cf. e.g. *Wisdom* 8.2).[14] Though there are some reminiscences of

---

[10] A useful conspectus of the authors in Dillon 1977; cf. also Krämer 1964. For Thrasyllos, see now H. Tarrant, Thrasyllan Platonism, 1993.

[11] References in Dillon 1977, 163 ff. (with some additions 1991, IV).

[12] Cf. Arist. met. Λ 1072b, above.

[13] E.g. fug. 63, virt. 8; cf. the Index.

[14] Cf. LXX Prov. 4,1-9. But it is not the cosmic Sophia that is the object of ἐρᾶν and its derivatives in Philo, e.g. quis rer.div. 14. I can find no sexual implications in the cases listed in Cohn-Wendland's Index. For instance, in Cherub. 20 the Cherubs are inspired by

the *Phaedrus* myth, and once also of the *Symposium*,[15] Philo's use of erotic terminology appears to me to be rather a de-sexualized literary device. The object of ἔρως, mark well, is never God. An extreme case, easily misinterpreted, is a passage in *De Abrahamo* (170) where the ἔρως θεῖος of Abraham, going to sacrifice Isaac, is contrasted to family affection; the Loeb translation has "love for God", in my view wrongly. Eros is a metaphor for "holy zeal". On the other hand, Philo often refers to ἐνθουσιασμός, the inspiration of prophets and others which is achieved by God's logos or pneuma, and to silence and rest in the presence of God, but such ekstasis has normally nothing to do with ἔρως.[16] Only once does the word occur in a context which, from a Neoplatonic perspective, has a ring of Unio Mystica: *De somniis* II 232 (the Loeb translation) "When the mind (ὁ νοῦς) is mastered by the love of the divine (ἔρωτος θείου), when it strains its powers to reach the inmost shrine, when it puts forth every effort and ardour on its forward march, [then,] under the divine impelling force (θεοφορούμενος) it forgets all else, forgets itself, and fixes its thoughts and memories on Him alone (μόνου τοῦ...) Whose attendant and servant it is, ... But when the inspiration (τὸ ἐνθουσιῶδες) is stayed, and the strong yearning (ἵμερος) abates, it hastens back from the divine (τῶν θείων)...". The imagery is somehow Platonic, and νοῦς here stands for ψυχή. It is not God but τὰ θεῖα that is the object of ἔρως (and ἵμερος), though he is the ultimate cause of it. The idea of νοῦς being carried by ἔρως has parallels in Plutarch (below). It is taken from the Platonist tradition, but it is not part of Philo's own metaphysics.

Plutarch's approach to philosophy and religion is entirely different from Philo's, but he offers us a broad spectrum of ideas and allusions. His personal religious convictions appear to include a Demiurge God, unseen by

---

πτηνὸς ἔρως, a rhetorical reminiscence of *Phaedrus*, but certainly without 'carnal' undertones. Cf. n. 16.

[15] Vit. cont. 59-60; cf. the implicit references in somn. 1,133-156, a commentary on Jacob's ladder where no point is made of Eros.

[16] Occasionally the idea of 'holy zeal' may occur, as in Cherub. 20 (quoted in n. 14). Sometimes γλίχεσθαι is used of the striving of the sage to come near God, see esp. post.Cain. 18 ff. An interesting case is spec.leg. 1,300 where it is said that man may love God as his benefactor but fear him as his Lord, but here the word for 'love' is ἀγαπᾶν (cf. n. 34). In vit.cont. 90, θεοῦ φιλία 'love of God' is an emendation. The implications of the φιλόθεος / θεοφιλής terminology are often overinterpreted, e.g. by Y. Amir, Die hellen. Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandrien, 1983, 206 ff.

man but mirrored by the Sun whose mythic symbol is Apollo, and a demonology associated with the Moon. God's providence and the "become like god" rule are taken for granted.[17] Eros quite often comes in, not only in Platonist contexts, but mostly through myths or images alluding to the *Symposium* or *Phaedrus*.[18] However, as also the speeches of his *Amatorius* indicate, Plutarch is more inclined to present suggestive stories about the effects of Love, than to construct a coherent picture, let alone a philosophy, of Eros.

Yet some passages give interesting glimpses of a Platonist discussion of Eros. For instance, Plutarch is prepared to ponder whether the wings of Love in the *Phaedrus* myth stand for anamnesis of divine beauty, or for ἡ λογιστικὴ δύναμις of the soul which is akin to the divine (Plat.quaest. 6,1004cd). In a fragment from the essay *De amore* (135 Sandbach) he mentions various explanations of ἔρως, most of them unphilosophical; but one is δαιμόνιον κίνημα τῆς ψυχῆς. Reflections about the relation of eros to reason occur occasionally, in imitation of Plato.[19]

The daimonic aspect of Eros is connected with Plutarch's Moon religion and ultimately, I suspect, with ideas taken from Xenokrates.[20] We may note here a passage in *De facie* (944de) where shamanistic ekstasis is presented in Platonist terms: such a state can be achieved "once the mind (ὁ νοῦς) has been separated from the soul. It is separated by love (ἔρωτι) for the image in the sun through which shines forth ... the desirable (ἐφετόν) and fair and divine and blessed towards which all nature in one way or another yearns (ὀρέγεται); for it must be out of love (ἔρωτι) for the sun that the moon herself goes her rounds and gets into conjunction (συγγίνεσθαι) with him in her yearning (ὀρεγομένην) ‹to receive› from him what is most

---

[17] D.A. Russell, Plutarch, 1973, 63 ff. rightly points out the inconsistencies in Plutarch's religious beliefs. One of Plutarch's Platonist sources is Xenokrates, but he was personally engaged in the Delphic cult of Apollo.

[18] E.g. amat. 751f, 756b ff., 764a-766b. Also Presocratic ideas of Love are adduced, e.g. de fac. 926f-927a.

[19] E.g. virt. 442e, 445c, 447b ff., referring to the *Phaedrus*. The ὁρμή of soul towards Nous is discussed in rather Stoic terms in de gen. 588f-589f, but with the remark that a motivated individual becomes οἷον ἐπτερωμένον (589a). Cf. however the very Stoic discussion of ἐπιθυμία in Ps.-Plut. Libid. ('Tyrwhitt's Fragment' 1), ed. Sandbach (Loeb) XV, 1969.

[20] Cf. def.or. 416de, from Xenokrates: daimons have πάθος θνητοῦ but θεοῦ δύναμις; Pyth. 404ef; de gen. 591e: the νοῦς part of soul is really a daimon.

fructifying (τὸ γονιμώτατον)" (Loeb transl.) In one of the *Amatorius* speeches Plutarch presents (764b-766b) an elaborate cosmology of Love, with some "Egyptian" traits: the Moon is like Aphrodite (744d) who aided by divine and wise Eros (θεῖος, σώφρων ἔρως) leads man to τὸ ἀληθείας πεδίον (765a).[21] Allusions to Plato abound in the context, but the presentation is more literary than philosophical.

Especially in his well-known Isis myth (*de Iside*), Plutarch combines in a remarkably detailed manner Egyptian mythology with Platonistic ideas. Probably this essay reflects more of Plutarch's own convictions than the *Amatorius* speech just quoted. Isis is here associated with the Moon (372e), with the Dyad, and with Artemis (354f, whereas Apollo represents the Monad). She is a cosmic nurse (372ef, with allusion to *Timaeus* 49a), and she has a natural love (σύμφυτος ἔρως) for the First God, here Platonistically identified with τἀγαθόν (372ef, cf.374f). She produces (γεννᾷ) Horus as an image of the νοητὸς κόσμος (373ab), and she loves beauty (383a). But it is Osiris who is Eros, a primary cosmic force, as in Hesiod (374cd; cf. *Symposium* 203b).[22]

Thus it seems to me that Plutarch's Platonic eros remains on the mythic and literary level. His erotic imagery has some religious implications, but no philosophic consistency. Whatever Old Academic and Middle Platonist interpretations of eros he may have encountered, he has not internalized them.

What we know of the more professional Platonists of the second century A.D. does not alter this picture substantially.

The fullest Middle Platonist document we have is the Διδασκαλικός of Alcinous / Albinus.[23] Typically, philosophy is defined right at the beginning of the tract (152,2) as ὄρεξις σοφίας, but a little later it is said that the philosopher must be "enamoured (ἔχειν ἐρωτικῶς 152,12) of the truth": this is a Platonistic metaphor which is rooted in the *Republic* passage

---

[21] Cf. *Phaedrus* 248b, *Republic* 10, 621a. The Egyptians are said to regard Eros as the Sun (764b), but the Sun is not provided with erotic components here. I doubt that Plutarch wanted to make Eros the 'intelligible archetype' of the Sun (and the Good of *Republic* 6), as Dillon 1977, 200 suggests. Cf. n. 22.

[22] By identifying Eros with Osiris, Plutarch seems to emphasize the daimonic character of the former. Isis has much in common with Plato's World Soul.

[23] Now properly edited, translated, and commented on, as Alcinous, by J. Whittaker (1990) and J. Dillon (1993). Cf. Witt 1937.

quoted above, but without any glimpse of humour, to be sure.[24] In the chapter on God (10,164,23) Alcinous states that the transcendent First Nous moves the heavens "as the object of desire (ὄρεξις) moves desire, while remaining motionless itself": remarkably enough, and contrary to Aristotle (!), Alcinous here fails to speak of ἔρως. Eros is no integral part of his metaphysics. This is evident further on in the same chapter where three methods of reaching God are listed: abstraction, analogy, and the third way which is in fact modelled on the mystery teaching of Diotima, but with the erotic component reduced to a minimum: the beauty of bodies, souls, customs, etc, is to be "contemplated" by the philosopher (θεωρῶν 165,24, certainly not ἐρῶν); and when he eventually experiences (νοεῖ) the Good, after "the sea of Beauty", its description as ἐραστὸν καὶ ἐφετὸν ὥσπερ φῶς φανέν (165,28) looks as mechanically taken from the tradition.[25] Eros is also a somewhat embarrassing topic to Alcinous in his chapter on ethics (33) where he in a rather Aristotelian way again, discusses love together with friendship. He tries to cope with Plato's daimonic love by classing it (187,26 ff.) as a median sort of ἐρωτική that yearns (ὀρεγομένη) both for the body and the beauty of the soul, but he goes on to explain that good erotics freed from passion (ἀπηλλαγμένη πάθους) is technical (τεχνική) and belongs to the rational side of the soul (τὸ λογιστικόν); hence it can be used for developing virtue in the beloved, and the aim of such love is the progress from being lovers to becoming friends.[26] It seems that Alcinous has not understood the essence of Plato's erotic myths.

A similar lack of interest in the Platonic Eros can be seen in the fragments of Numenios, a rather well informed Platonist, less 'pythagorizing' than Theon, Moderatos or Nikomachos, and apparently intent on presenting what he regards as Plato's true metaphysics.[27] There is

---

[24] Later, the intellectual activity of the 'approach to god' is said to be accompanied by a 'happy feeling' (ἡ ψυχή... εὐπαθεῖν λέγεται 153,5, a reminiscence of *Phaedrus* 247d, but cf. Stoic εὐπάθεια). An explicit reference to the wings of the soul occurs at 155,34.

[25] Similarly ἐράσμιον as an epithet of what is ἀγαθόν, 180,7; cf. Dillon's comment, p. 168.

[26] The next paragraph refers in passing to Diotima's love-daimon (*Symposium* 202e). There are also other remote allusions to Platonic passages. In his commentary (p. 200 ff.), Dillon suggests that Alcinous' source operated with an exegesis of *Alcibiades* I; but much of this seems to me to have an Aristotelian and also Stoic ring.

[27] Contrary to most ancient and modern critics, I would regard Numenios as a Platonist rather than a Neopythagorean. Dodds (Entret. Hardt V, 1960, 3-61), though rightly

a sexual element in his version of the 'Sophia syndrome': his Demiurge God
has "lust" (ἐπορεξάμενος fr. 11 des Places) for matter which is dyadic and
epithymetic. But nothing of that kind occurs in the lengthy Fragment 2
where Numenios appears to describe a kind of Unio Mystica. The idea of
reaching a state of being "alone" with τἀγαθόν may remind us of some
Philonic ekstasis passages, and Numenios was indeed acquainted with
Jewish mysticism.[28] But as is generally recognized, we are here closer to
Plotinus. Numenios is concerned with man's striving along the *via negativa*,
not with God's revelatory inspiration. Though one might detect reflexes of
the mystery of Diotima here,[29] it is remarkable that ἔρως is totally absent.
The θεία μέθοδος recommended at the end of the fragment is rather that of
the *Republic*, though without any erotic byplay.

The platonizing sophists of this period, Apuleius and Maximos of
Tyre, have a somewhat better understanding of Plato's Eros. Though
Apuleius' Platonist position otherwise is close to Alcinous, he has much to
say on Eros the daimon (*genius*). But in his *De Platone* (ch. 20-23), the
ultimate approach to God comes about rather in the Stoic fashion: the
Perfect Sage has practically nothing to do with erotics.[30] Maximos,
however, tries to popularize a kind of combination of Plato's visions in the
Symposium and *Phaedrus* into a single mystic way, to reach a transcendent
divine calm (γαλήνη) by means of ἔρως (most explicitly in Speech 11,10).
We also have four other speeches of Maximos on the Eros theme, with

---

minimizing the 'Oriental' traits in Numenios, unnecessarily emphasizes his Pythagorean
bias. Cf. Krämer 1964, 65 ff. – Theon of Smyrna also inclines to explicit Platonism. He
recommends the μαθήματα of *Republic* 7 as a method of initiation into the 'mystery' of
Plato's philosophy; the last stage is total εὐδαιμονία, when the ὁμοίωσις is a fact (p. 15,
21 Hiller), but ἔρως is not mentioned. Probably Theon's source is Thrasyllos (cf. Tarrant
1993, 98 ff.); and cf. Numenios, below. – The pythagorizing metaphysics of Moderatos
is irrelevant here. – In Nikomachos, the cosmic process of emission, reception, and
recompense is described in sexual terms (cf. Dillon 1977, 356) with an orientalizing
imagery of the 'Sophia syndrome' type.

[28] Cf. Dodds, above, n. 27; J. Whittaker, Phoenix 21, 1967, 196 ff.

[29] The image of the Good as a lonely little ship on the open sea is very odd, but one may
speculate about a remote connection with Diotima's 'sea of beauty' (cf. also des Places ad
l. and p. 104 f.). The idea of a 'lookout' occurs in Philo spec.leg. 3,48.

[30] The sage is unmoved by passions, 248, 252 (but there are faint reflexes of *Phaedrus*,
notably at 251). For the sources of Apuleius, see Dillon 1977, 311 ff. Amor (Cupido) the
genius is discussed in some detail in *De deo Socratis*, but in *De dogmate Platonis*
(ch.13-14) love and friendship are treated very much in the same manner as in Alcinous.

many Platonic reminiscences (18-21). Unfortunately his sources are an open question.[31]

Though I have not scrutinized the Gnostic and Hermetic texts, I am rather sure that they do not really enrich our picture of the interpretation of Plato's Eros. It is true that Gnosticism in particular indulges in sexual myth and symbolism. But there seems to be very little of Plato's Eros in all this. It is mainly the procreation idea that is seen as an erotic process, and the background is here Oriental. The desire of Sophia or other Aeons to reach their roots or their Father may look more Platonic, but as far as I can see it is not described in terms of Platonic sublimated ἔρως. If I am right, the Sophia syndrome is interesting here chiefly as one of the more remote sources for Plotinus' imagery, and as a parallel to Plutarch's more Platonistic Moon and Isis myths. And note also the fact that Eros is not found among the series of abstract concepts that function as powers, δυνάμεις, in the Gnostic systems; but Ἀγάπη occurs in Valentinianism.[32] Possibly, however, there are more distinctly Platonistic elements in some of the Chaldaean Oracles which refer to a πατρικὸς νόος and the ἔρως caused by and directed to it (cf. 39, 42, 44, and 134 des Places).

Alexandrian Platonism of the late 2nd and early 3rd century, and above all the enigmatic figure of Ammonios Sakkas, and the question of the

---

[31] I know of no detailed study of the platonism of Maximos. Passages such as 21,4, where he distingues ἔρως which is directed to τὸ καλόν from ordinary ἐπιθυμία, suggest that he was quite well informed on a Platonist discussion about Eros Ouranios which we cannot trace. – For some references to the 'minor Platonists' of the 2nd century A.D., see Dillon 1977; cf. also H.Koch, Pronoia und Paideusis (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 22), 1932. Tauros lectured on the *Symposium* in the 140s; Attikos and Harpokration are said to have written on the *Phaedrus* (see Dörrie & Baltes, eds., Der Platonismus III, 1993, 197); but we know nothing of their interpretation of Eros, or of Kelsos's (cf. Orig. c.Cels. 8,28, 33, 35 on his demonology).

[32] For Gnosticism, I have relied on the references in Koch 1932, Krämer 1964 (esp. 223 ff.), Dillon 1977, and R.T. Wallis (ed.), Neoplatonism and Gnosticism (Studies in Neoplatonism 6), 1992; for Hermeticism, also on A.-J. Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I³-IV, 1950-54. For instance, the bewilderment and frustrations of Sophia, trying to reach her Father, would provide an almost boundless field for research (for example, have any Gnostics studied the Penia story, *Symposium* 203b-204a?). Very occasionally more manifest traces of Platonic ideas seem to occur: one is the doctrine of Basileides (in Hippol. 7,22,8, cf. Krämer 1964, 235 ff.) that all nature strives (ὀρέγεται) towards the ὑπερβολὴ κάλλους of its God and Father (cf. *Republic* 6,509a). For lists of δυνάμεις, see Krämer 242. – For the 'narcissistic love affair' implied in the *Poimandres*, see Dillon 391.

debt of Christian theology to Middle Platonism regarding the Eros/Amor complex in particular, form a notorious set of problems of considerable relevance to my present theme. With much more reason than in the case of Gnosticism and Hermeticism, I regret that I have not been able at the present time to reexamine the texts. Some notes on the basis of secondary sources may be allowed.[33]

Clement does not seem to have an eros doctrine, any more than had Philo, who is one of his principal sources. God's 'downward' flowing providential benevolence is agapistic but certainly not erotic; and approaching God is to Clement an intellectual, 'non-erotic' process, if my information is correct.[34] Origen, however, (the Christian, if he is to be separated from the Platonist)[35] goes further than Clement. His variety of the Sophia syndrome includes an interpretation of the Song of Songs where the desire of the Bride for her Lord is seen allegorically as the love of man's soul for God in terms of ἔρως (amor in the translation of Rufinus, but Origen makes it clear that he operates with Platonic terminology). Also elsewhere he sometimes tends to identify divinely inspired Platonic love with ἀγάπη so as to make the Christian God factually the object of sublimated Eros.[36]

Now, since Origen (both Origens, if they were two) and Plotinus had

---

[33] See again Koch 1932, Krämer 1964 (282 ff.); further, Rist 1964 (195 ff.), and notably S.R.C. Lilla, Clement of Alexandria, 1971, and H. Pietras, L'amore in Origene (Studia Ephem. 'Augustinianum' 28), 1988.

[34] The starting point for the Christian theory of 'love of God' is LXX Deuteronom. 6,5 ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου... (Vulg.: diliges), with its reflexes in the NT. Nygren argued (since the 1920s) that ἀγάπη was influenced by Platonic ἔρως even before Clement; I do not deny this, but I believe it can be shown that the terms were kept apart at least until Origen. This can be seen in the apologists, too. For instance, Justin dial. 8,1 speaks of the ἔρως of prophets rather in the Philonian manner. The notorious 'crucified ἔρως' of Ignatius (Sources Chrét. 10, 134, cf. Pietras 1988, 45 f.) sounds to me rhetorical rather than dogmatic (cf. the similar rhetorical bias in Plotinus' identification of Τἀγαθόν with Eros, Enn. 6,8,15,1-10, though cf. Rist 1964, 78 ff.).

[35] An open question to Krämer 1964, 284 n. 357.

[36] A problem to A. Nygren, see the references in n. 33. A specific problem, worthy of more scrutiny, is the tendency (admitted by Pietras 1988, 34) of Latin translations to use amor for other terms than ἔρως: thus φιλόθεος becomes amator Dei (cf. Origen Hom.Ez. 3,3). Whittaker (like Rist), perhaps too anachronistically, tries to harmonize Agape and Eros: see esp. his 1970 essay on the subject, reprinted in Platonism and its Christian heritage, 1985.

been pupils of Ammonios Sakkas, and Ammonios was an ex-Christian, it seems to me reasonable to assume that Ammonios had taught something of this kind. More specifically, it can be claimed that Ammonios had made a point of the tradition about Eros of which we have seen some scattered traces in Middle Platonism and which perhaps derives ultimately from Xenokrates: as Plato was supposed to have taught in the *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*, Eros is an elevating cosmic force or a daimon that may aid man in approaching, not only the Form of Beauty, but the Supreme God, Nous. Man may become "enamoured of Nous". It has been rightly remarked, however, that since Origen's God is still a Nous God, and not The One, the Plotinian concept of a supranoetic One cannot plausibly be attributed to Ammonios.[37]

But the above notes seem to suggest that this interpretation of sublimated Eros was not part of a consistent Middle Platonist doctrine. Since early Hellenistic times, Eros functioned mainly as a mythic device or a literary metaphor in Platonism, whatever had been the intentions of Xenokrates. The Platonic overtones of the term ἔρως suited the imagery of religious authors such as Philo, or philosophizing literates such as Plutarch or Maximos; but Eros did not become "internalized" into philosophy or doctrinalized until, possibly, Ammonios' teaching in Alexandria opened new perspectives. Man's "love of god" had been no Middle Platonist tenet, any more than "love of the One" could have been so.[38]

It is therefore particularly interesting that Plotinus gives as much emphasis to Eros as he does. Of course he relied on the tradition and its accretions. But it seems to me that he interpreted them, together with the relevant passages in *Symposium, Phaedrus,* and the *Republic,* in the light of

---

[37] On this, see Dodds 1960, 24 ff., Dillon 1977, 382 f. But Dörrie, commenting on Dodds (1960, 43), argues that Ammonios may have taught a ἕνωσις doctrine after all. I am not convinced.

[38] Cf. above, n. 8. Middle Platonic ideas of course lingered on long after Plotinus. Longinos, who is usually considered the last Middle Platonist, was pronouncedly conservative in doctrinal matters though he too had been a pupil of Ammonios (cf. Porph. V.Plot. 14, 17 f., 20 f.; Proklos in Tim. 1,322 D). And many later authors, including Calcidius and also Augustine, continue to draw on Middle Platonist sources beside whatever Plotinian ideas may have reached them. The above notes suggest, however, that Augustine's statement (civ. 8,8), *Platonem determinasse ... hoc esse philosophari, amare Deum*, originated in Neoplatonic sources (or Origen, via translations).

an intensely personal experience of Unio Mystica. The pointed identification
(wherever he got it from) of the First Principle ἕv with the First Form,
τἀγαθόν, and the idea of a concentric system of hypostases forming a
continuum (with ῞Εv-᾽Αγαθόν in a "transcendent"centre) made this new
interpretation of Eros possible. I argued this in a paper published in 1980,[39]
where I drew attention to the many passages in the *Enneads* where Eros is
not only the force that moves human psyche towards Nous, and via τὸ
καλὸν towards τὸ ᾽Αγαθόν. There is also a distinct erotic imagery in
Plotinus' description of the actual process of ἕvωσις, a vocabulary that later
mystics have often found inspiring, and many have found embarrassing.[40]
To Plotinus as to Plato (though surely less consciously), ἔρως is sublimated
sexuality. The bewilderment of Alcinous vis à vis Eros is forgotten. Plotinus
gave a new status, a new object, and indeed, new wings to Plato's Eros that
would have both amused and bewildered 'Socrates'.

University of Helsinki

---

[39] Arctos 14, 1980, 101-114.

[40] Cf. Rist 1964 (passim) who, however, did not take full account of the evidence.

ON THE CONCEPT OF *BARBAROLEXIS*
IN THE ROMAN GRAMMARIANS*

RAIJA VAINIO

Cinnam, Cinname, te iubes vocari.

non est hic, rogo, Cinna, barbarismus?

tu si Furius ante dictus esses,

Fur ista ratione dicereris.

(Mart. 6,17)**

The conventional definition of the concept of *barbarolexis* – given by later Roman grammarians and modern scholars – is the use of barbarian words in the language. It is related to the concept of barbarism, i.e. impropriety in speech or pronunciation,[1] and by some *barbarolexis* is also included in it.[2] This is almost all that we are able to read about the subject.[3] My intention is to show how this concept became differentiated from *barbarismus*, and for what reason.

In the Stoic list of the virtues of language the most important is ἑλληνισμός, the correct Greek.[4] It can be violated by errors, of which two

---

** "Cinnamus, you want to be called Cinna. But isn't that, I ask you Cinna, a barbarism? If your name was earlier Furius, you would, following the same logic, now be called Fur (= Thief)."

[1] The definition is given in the Oxford Latin Dictionary.

[2] Cf. H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. München 1960, §476-478.

[3] Cf. L. Holtz, Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude et édition critique. Paris 1981, 137 and 150; H. Mihăescu, O barbarismo segundo os gramáticos latinos. Coimbra 1950 (trans. by M. de Paiva Boléo and V. Buescu), 27.

[4] But already before the Stoics there was a treatise on the subject by Theophrastus the Peripatetic (c. 370 – c. 287 BC), of which Cicero (orat. 79) informs us. Cf. E. Siebenborn, Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien: Studien zur anti-

are mentioned in particular: βαρβαρισμός and σολοικισμός.[5] This division is found for the first time in Diogenes of Babylon (240-150 BC).[6] G. Calboli[7] thinks he could have got it from Chrysippus, who had dedicated two books to solecisms.[8] Later, this division was adopted by the Romans.[9]

According to Aulus Gellius, the word *barbarismus* was not in use – neither in Latin nor in Attic Greek – before the era of Augustus. Gellius quotes a passage from P. Nigidius Figulus' (d. 45 BC) *Commentarii grammatici*, explaining that the same mistake which in his time was defined as barbarian had been defined as rustic by Nigidius.[10] This implies that the grammarians had no uniform theory of this question.

Contrary to the opinion of Aulus Gellius, in Greek the first occurrence of βαρβαρισμός is found in Aristotle. The meaning is 'unclear speech', caused by the use of rare words (γλῶτται).[11] Also in Dionysius Thrax γλῶττα has this meaning.[12] These words had their origin mainly in the dialects of Greek, but J. Lallot thinks they could also come from other

---

ken normativen Grammatik. Amsterdam 1976 (Studien zur antiken Philosophie 5), 24.

[5] Cf. Lausberg 1960 §470; Siebenborn 1976, 26; Holtz 1981, 71-72; M. Baratin & F. Desbordes, La 'troisieme partie' de l'*ars grammatica*. HL 13 (1986) 215-240.

[6] Diog.Laert. 7,59 = Diog.Bab. frg. 24 in *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*.

[7] G. Calboli, *Cornifici rhetorica ad C. Herennium*: introduzione, testo critico, commento. Bologna 1969, 303.

[8] Diog.Laert. 7,192: περὶ σολοικισμῶν α' and περὶ σολοικιζόντων λόγων πρὸς Διονύσιον α'.

[9] L. Holtz is of the opinion (1981, 137-138) that βαρβαρισμός was previously the exact opposite of ἑλληνισμός, and σολοικισμός was the reverse of ἀττικισμός.

[10] Gell. 13,6 tit.: *quod vocabulum 'barbarismi' non usurpaverint neque Romani antiquiores neque Attici*. 13,6,2-4: *quod nunc autem 'barbare' quem loqui dicimus; id vitium sermonis non barbarum esse, sed 'rusticum' et cum eo vitio loquentes 'rustice' loqui dictitabant. P. Nigidius in* commentariis grammaticis: *'rusticus fit sermo,' inquit, 'si adspires perperam.' Itaque id vocabulum, quod dicitur vulgo 'barbarismus', qui ante Augusti aetatem pure atque integre locuti sunt, an dixerint, nondum equidem inveni*. Cf. also 5,20,4-5: *sed nos neque 'soloecismum' neque 'barbarismum' apud Graecorum idoneos adhuc invenimus; nam sicut* βάρβαρον, *ita* σόλοικον *dixerunt*.

[11] Poet. 22, 1458a: (sc. ὄνομα) ξενικὸν δὲ λέγω γλῶτταν καὶ μεταφορὰν καὶ ἐπέκτασιν καὶ πᾶν τὸ παρὰ τὸ κύριον. ἀλλ' ἄν τις ἄπαντα τοιαῦτα ποιήσῃ, ἢ αἴνιγμα ἔσται ἢ βαρβαρισμός· ἂν μὲν οὖν ἐκ μεταφορῶν, αἴνιγμα, ἐὰν δὲ ἐκ γλωττῶν, βαρβαρισμός.

[12] Dion.T. 1 Lallot = *Grammatici Graeci* 1:1,5-6.

languages.[13] A passage from Sextus Empiricus supports this view (adv. gramm. 1,313); he explains that there is no difference in intelligibility between a foreign and an obsolete word because they sound equally strange. Accordingly, γλῶττα also refers to foreign words,[14] and βαρβαρισμός means speaking in a foreign way.

In the Iliad (2,867) we find the word βαρβαρόφωνος referring to the Carians (the word βάρβαρος does not exist in Homer). In Herodotus (5th c. BC) the same adjective occurs in two oracles, referring to Persians (8,20; 9,43). If we derive the adjective from βάρβαρος φωνή, we obtain the meaning 'speaking barbarously'.[15] By the time of Strabo at the latest, who comments on the same passage of the Iliad, the word had developed the meaning 'speaking bad Greek' (14,2,28). Although L. Holtz (1981, 137) regards it as likely that the original sense of βαρβαρισμός is that of *barbarolexis*, an intrusion of a barbarian word into "pure" language, I find the sense deriving from βαρβαρόφωνος more probable.

For the Greeks, anyone who was not a Greek was a barbarian, including the Romans. For a long time this view was accepted by the Romans themselves.[16] But the expansion of the Romans and their subjection of the Greeks strengthened the national spirit in Rome and aroused resistance to the notion that Latin too was a barbarian language.[17] In consequence, there developed a theory that Latin was a dialect of Aeolic. These ideas culminate in the work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who explains that Latin is not completely barbarian nor really Greek but

---

[13] La grammaire de Denys le Thrace. Paris 1989, 77-79.

[14] Already Lausberg (1960, 599 note 1) connects *barbarolexis* with γλῶττα.

[15] The original meaning of this word has usually been described as 'speaking a foreign tongue' but E. Lévy is of the opinion that it could have been 'stumbling, stuttering'. E. Lévy, Naissance du concept de barbare. Ktéma 9 (1984) 5-14.

[16] E.g. Paul. Fest. p. 36: *Barbari dicebantur antiquitus omnes gentes, exceptis Graecis. unde Plautus Naevium poetam Latinum barbarum dixit*; Plaut. Trin. 19; Asin. 11; Mil. 211; even Cicero in *Orator* (160): *cum Phrygum et Phrygibus dicendum esset, absurdum erat etiam in barbaris casibus Graecam litteram adhibere aut recto casu solum Graece loqui*. Cf. M. Dubuisson, Le latin est-il une langue barbare? Ktéma 9 (1984) 55-68.

[17] Cf. Murethach, an eighth-century commentator of Donatus, who explains that the concept of *barbarismus* originates from that time (*Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis* 40,189): *illi autem subiugati, postquam coeperunt latinam discere linguam, corruperunt eam decretumque est ab illis Romanis illud vitium appellari barbarismum a barbaris nationibus, id est alienationem.*

something in between (ant. 1,90,1).[18] For the Romans, therefore, the word "barbarian" referred to foreign peoples, Greeks excluded.

The Greek language had an exceptional position in the Roman world. It was never regarded as a barbarian language; on the contrary, it had high prestige among the Roman nobility.[19] The use of Greek words in Latin was generally approved of – and inevitable – for the very reason, as Quintilian says, that "Latin is to a great extent translated from Greek". Loanwords could be taken from Greek to denote things for which there were no words of Latin origin, or for which the Greek ones were more suitable; likewise, the Greeks borrowed words from Latin.[20] It is important to keep this in mind when we try to understand the substance of *barbarolexis*.

In Latin literature we find the word *barbarismus* in the *Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*, composed probably between 86-82 or 86-75/70 BC.[21] This is also the first existing passage where *barbarismus* and *soloecismus* are specified by a Roman writer, barbarism as a mistake in a single word, solecism concerning many words, i.e. an error in syntax.[22] This definition was thereafter to be repeated from century to century.

The concept of barbarism is divided into categories by Quintilian in two different ways. This again implies that the linguistic theory was far from fixed. Quintilian states in the first book of his *Institutio oratoria* (1,5,6) that there are some barbarisms which appear in writing and others which arise in speech (could we see here a continuation of βαρβαρόφωνος?). All of them, however, are noticed in speech: if you write a word incorrectly, you are also

---

[18] Cf. Dubuisson 1984, 59-60. The first person to formulate this theory was perhaps Philoxenus of Alexandria (1st century BC; fragment in A. Mazzarino, *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta aetatis Caesareae*. Turin 1955, 396).

[19] Cf. J. Kaimio, The Romans and the Greek language. Helsinki 1979 (*Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 64), 320-331.

[20] Quint. inst. 1,5,58; also 3,6,97; Gell. 2,26,18: *Vergilius ... maluit verbo uti notiore Graeco, quam inusitato Latino*. On the Greek point of view cf. Sextus Empiricus (adv.gramm. 1,234): it is acceptable to use a foreign (i.e. Latin) word, even if a Greek word is available, if the foreign one has become more common. Cf. also Kaimio 1979, 295-315.

[21] Calboli 1969, 17.

[22] Rhet.Her. 4,12,17 *Latinitas est, quae sermonem purum conservat ab omni vitio remotum. vitia in sermone, quo minus is Latinus sit, duo possunt esse: soloecismus et barbarismus. soloecismus est, cum in verbis pluribus consequens verbum superius non adcommodatur. barbarismus est, cum verbis aliquid vitiose efferatur. haec qua ratione vitare possumus, in arte grammatica dilucide dicemus.*

bound to pronounce it erroneously.[23] Quintilian observes that there are some mistakes which do not appear in writing. According to another, tripartite division (1,5,7-10), *unum genus barbarismi* is the use of a foreign word in Latin speech,[24] an African or Hispanian word like *cantus*,[25] or Gallic like *ploxenum* and *casamo*, or Sardinian like *mastruca*. The last example is taken from Cicero's speech *Pro Scauro* (45), where he uses it – as Quintilian says, again successfully avoiding a criticism of Cicero – to raise a laugh. The *alterum genus* is defined as *barbare loqui*, that is, as a barbarous and uncivilized way of speaking, expression of a vulgar and aggressive temper.[26] Finally, the *tertium genus* is the barbarism caused by the addition (*adiectio*), omission (*detractio*), substitution (*inmutatio*), or transposition (*transmutatio*) of a letter or a syllable.[27]

But the first time we find the term *barbarolexis*, it is not applied to a foreign word. A third-century grammar attributed to Sacerdos[28] regards

---

[23] This remark of Quintilian is not to be taken literally; he is well aware of the fact that in Latin every sound did not have a written equivalent, which caused uncertainty in writing (cf. inst. 1,4,7-11).

[24] Diomedes quotes a fragment from Varro, where different kinds of syllables are enumerated (GL 1,428,22-28 = Varro frg. 243 in H. Funaioli, *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta*. Leipzig 1907). Among them also barbarian ones are mentioned: ... *barbarae sunt, ut gaza; graeculae, ut hymnos Zenon*. This may have something to do with our subject. As usual, Greek is distinguished from barbarian words.

[25] A. Magne thinks that *cant(h)us* is probably Gallic (s.v. in Dicionário etimológico da língua latina. Rio de Janeiro 1953), but A. Ernout & A. Meillet regard it as a loan in Celtic, of uncertain origin (s.v. in Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots. Paris 1979[4]).

[26] Cf. Consentius in the 5th century (gramm. 17,21-18,3 Niedermann): *tendunt longius plerique scriptores vitium barbarismi. nam quicquid in habitu, quicquid in gestu, quicquid in motu, etiam quicquid citiore aut tardiore incessu quis peccat, ut id ab eligantia eruditi hominis distare videatur, barbarismum dicunt.*

[27] For a closer discourse, see W. Ax, *Quadripertita ratio*: Bemerkungen zur Geschichte eines aktuellen Kategoriensystems (*Adiectio – Detractio – Transmutatio – Immutatio*). HL 13 (1986) 191-214; Holtz 1981, 150-153; Siebenborn 1976, 43-45. These four categories are known to us also from Varro: discussing the origin of words, he shows the ways in which they can be changed (ling. 5,6).

[28] The edition of H. Keil (*Grammatici Latini* 6,415-546, Leipzig 1874) contains three books attributed to Marius Plotius Sacerdos. Two of them survive in a single manuscript, and the author's name is given as M. Claudius Sacerdos. Whether the third book *De metris*, attributed on the basis of the manuscripts to Marius Plotius Sacerdos, really was written by the same person, is uncertain. Cf. M. Baratin, La naissance de la syntaxe à

barbarolexis as a defect similar to *barbarismus* with the difference that the former occurs in writing, the latter in speech. Therefore, he follows the division of barbarisms already found in Quintilian but gives one of the types a name of its own.[29]

Why is it just a mistake in writing that Sacerdos calls *barbarolexis*? If my view of the original sense of barbarism is right, the new coinage *barbarolexis* would have been needed for the more recent class of mistakes, while *barbarismus* was restricted to the original sense, the errors in speaking.[30]

Sacerdos says that a barbarism can be caused in eight ways, and on the basis of his definition we can say that four of these mistakes can also belong to the category of *barbarolexis*. The four which cannot appear in writing (and are therefore only barbarisms) concern vowel length (a short vowel pronounced long and vice versa) and accent (an accent placed on the wrong syllable or two accents with places interchanged). The four which can be both are: *aspiratio* (an extra aspiration), *lenitas* (a lacking aspiration), *immutatio litterarum* (a substitution or transposition of letters), and – a quite interesting point which I have not found in other grammarians – *immutatio loquellarum*, a replacement of Latin with Greek (and vice versa). He means that you make a *barbarolexis* if you write a Greek word (*philosophus*) as if it were Latin (*filosofus*), or vice versa (*phelix pro felix*).

Sacerdos names two classes of *immutationes*. *Immutatio litterarum* also includes a *transmutatio litterarum*, a change in the order of two letters, to

---

Rome. Paris 1989, 509-510; V. Law, The insular Latin grammarians. Woodbridge 1982 (Studies in Celtic History 3), 13; 25-26.

[29] The treatise on barbarism is part of the first book of his grammar. GL 6,451,4-15: *Barbarismus est vitiosa dictio unius verbi, qui fit modis octo: per productionem, ac si dicas pērnix et per producas, quae correpta est: per correptionem, stetĕrunt te correpta, quae longa est: per aspirationem, ac si dicas hora vultus, cum ora debeant dici: per lenitatem, ac si dicas oram tempus diei, cum horam debeas dicere: per immutationem litterarum, ac si dicas ohminem pro hominem: per accentum, ac si dicas iste et te acuas, cum is debeas: per immutationem loquellarum, ac si graecum nomen latine dicas vel latinum nomen graece scribas vel dicas, ut puta si philosophum per f scribas, cum per p et h scribere debeas, vel si felix scribas per p et h, cum f ratio exigat: per immutationem accentuum, ac si dicas Cĕrĕs ce longa, cum brevis sit, et res brevi, cum sit longa. haec vitia, cum dicuntur, barbarismi sunt; cum scribuntur, barbarolexis.*

[30] In ancient linguistics barbarism traditionally applies to λέξις (a single word) and solecism to λόγος (a thought which is expressed with several words); λέξις alludes to the form, λόγος to the meaning. Cf. Holtz 1981, 139; Calboli 1969, 302.

which the example *ohminem pro hominem* points:[31] the transposition of letters can be considered to consist of two substitutions. As to the famous question already seen in Quintilian (inst. 1,5,19), whether *h* is a letter or only a mark of aspiration, Sacerdos accepts the first alternative, as his example shows.

Immutatio loquellarum must concern sounds, too. Otherwise there would be only seven categories and Sacerdos' list would be deficient, since he says that a barbarism can arise in eight ways. In this context, therefore, the word *loquella* 'word' must also have the meaning 'sound'. Sacerdos does not mean the substitution of any Latin word by any Greek one or vice versa: actually the word itself remains the same.

The example *philosophus* must have been chosen to illustrate both writing and pronouncing although Sacerdos does not use the verb *dicas* in connection with this example. On the other hand, he does not use the verb *scribas* in his definition (*si graecum nomen latine dicas*). The whole structure of his classification points in the same direction. The examples for the other three categories which can be both *barbarolexis* and *barbarismus* always allude to both the written and to the spoken form of the word at the same time. If the word *philosophus* did not, it would be the only exception. Therefore Sacerdos must imply that there was a difference between the pronunciation of *ph* and *f*.

Quintilian suggests the same by saying that the Greeks found the Latin *f* difficult to pronounce.[32] Also his description of *f* in the twelfth book (12,10,29) – that it is hardly a human sound – indicates that there was no such "horrible" sound in Greek. The learned men, who knew that *ph* was the equivalent of the Greek φ,[33] could produce this sound in the right words and did not confuse it with *f*. However, by Sacerdos' time the Greek φ had de-

---

[31] Grammarians usually give *olli pro illi* as an example of *immutatio litterarum* (e.g. Don. mai. 654,1 Holtz, Char. gramm. 350,17 Barwick). This is a stock example, while *ohminem pro hominem* is to Sacerdos of current interest, and tells us about regional differences in pronunciation.

[32] Inst. 1,4,14: ...'*fordeum*' '*faedos*'*que pro adspiratione velut simili littera utentes: nam contra Graeci adspirare ei solent* (the reading by Winterbottom; others read *adspirare f ut φ*, nevertheless the meaning remains the same). Quintilian gives as an example Cicero, who, when delivering his *Pro Fundanio*, had laughed at a witness who could not pronounce the first letter of the name of the defendant.

[33] In classical Greek φ represented an aspirated plosive /ph/, not a voiceless spirant like the Latin *f* (cf. L.R. Palmer, The Greek language. London 1980, 207-208).

veloped into a fricative; it begins to be translitterated with *f* in the first century AD.[34] Yet we should bear in mind that as late as the sixth century the problematic nature of *f* still occupies the grammarians, for Marius Victorinus says (gramm. 3,21 Mariotti): *f quidam errantes duplicem dicunt, quia ex p et h composita videatur*. As a guardian of the pure language Sacerdos shows an interest in this problem. Diomedes (GL 1,423,28-30) gives the same advice as Sacerdos about the use of *f* and *ph* in writing: *et hoc scire debemus quod f littera tum scribitur, cum Latina dictio scribitur, ut felix. nam si peregrina fuerit, p et h scribimus, ut Phoebus Phaethon.*[35] Quintilian too discusses the replacement of Greek letters by Latin ones (*z-s* and *y-u*).[36]

Sacerdos' *immutatio loquellarum* means that you make a mistake, both in speaking and in writing, if you take an element – in his example a sound and its written equivalent – from one language and put it into another. There is no evidence to show whether this element could be a whole word. In any case we cannot say that this class of *barbarolexis* would be the same as *barbara dictio*, a barbarian word, because Greek words are discussed.[37] And we must keep in mind that Sacerdos also mentions the alternative: *si graecum nomen latine dicas*, if you violate Greek by a Latin pronunciation. But what we have here is an interference between or rather a confusion of two languages. Neither Latin nor Greek were barbarian languages, but if a word – either a Latin or a Greek one – was corrupted by an element from the other language, this was a *barbarolexis*, a barbarous way of writing the word.

The definition of *barbarolexis* unanimously accepted by later grammarians is the one given by Donatus (in the middle of the fourth century): *in nostra loquella barbarismus, in peregrina barbarolexis dicitur,*

---

[34] Palmer 1980, 178.

[35] Also in 1,424,17-18: *pro hac* (sc. *f littera*) *in Graecis dumtaxat nominibus p et h utimur, ut Phaethon.*

[36] Inst. 12,10,27-28: *namque est ipsis statim sonis durior, quando et iucundissimas ex Graecis litteras non habemus (vocalem alteram, alteram consonantem, quibus nullae apud eos dulcius spirant: quas mutuari solemus quotiens illorum nominibus utimur; quod cum contingit, nescio quo modo hilarior protinus renidet oratio, ut in 'zephyris' et 'zopyris': quae si nostris litteris scribantur, surdum quiddam et barbarum efficient) et velut in locum earum succedunt tristes et horridae, quibus Graecia caret.* For a discussion of this passage, see R.G. Austin, *Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae liber XII.* Oxford 1972[2], 175-176.

[37] Cf. Diomedes above, who uses the words *Latina dictio* and *peregrina* (not *barbara*).

ut siquis dicat mastruga cateia magalia (mai. 653 Holtz). He gives three examples of *barbarolexis*, and his commentators explain the origin of these barbarian words: *mastruga* is Sardinian (*sagum*, 'cloak'),[38] *magalia* African (*casae*, 'huts')[39] and *cateia* Gallic (*telum*, 'missile weapon').[40] Pompeius (5th c.) adds a Median word *acinaces* (*gladium*, 'sword').[41] Augustine (AD 354-430) mentions a Punic word *dellas* (*carex*, 'sedge, reed-grass') as an example of *barbarum*,[42] his equivalent to *barbarolexis* (GL 5,496,6-12), and provides a further explanation: *si alicuius gentis verbum est non receptum*, if you use a foreign word which is not acceptable. But, he adds, there is no name for the error committed by using a word of jargon, *nullius omnino gentis verbum*, which is not any language at all.

It is less obvious in Donatus but quite clear in Pompeius that not only the use of a barbarian word, but also its use in an erroneous way was called *barbarolexis* (GL 5,284,24-28): *praeterea quaeritur, quem ad modum fiat* (sc. *barbarismus*) *in peregrinis verbis. ... in istis verbis siqui peccaverit, non dicitur fecisse barbarismum, non dicitur fecisse metaplasmum, sed dicitur fecisse barbarolexin. siqui velit dicere mastruga aut cateia aut magalia, si peccaverit in istis ipsis verbis, non dicitur barbarismus aut metaplasmus, sed barbarolexis.* Therefore Murethach, who later explains the subject,

---

[38] This example is already found in Quintilian (inst. 1,5,8), cf. above. Pomp. GL 5,284,21-22. The information given by Isidore of Seville in his *Origines* in the sixth century is confused: in 19,23,1 he does say that *mastruca* is a characteristic cloth of the Sardinians, but in 19,23,5 he at first defines it as *vestis Germanica* and then gives a quotation from Cicero, where it is said to be of Sardinian origin. Murethach (189,75-76) causes more confusion by quoting the wrong passage: "according to Isidore *mastruca* is a German garment".

[39] Pomp. GL 5,284,21-23; cf. Isid. orig. 15,12,4: *magalia dicta quasi magaria, quia 'magar' Punici novam villam dicunt, una littera commutata L pro R, magalia, magaria.*

[40] Isid. orig. 18,7,7; Iulian.Tolet. gramm. 1,3 Lindsay; Mur. 190,77. Pompeius (GL 5,284,23) considers it a Persian word. In a fragment from *de commentis Einsidlensibus* (possibly from Remigius of Auxerre, in the ninth century) it is regarded as African (frg. 18a gramm.suppl. cxv). The fragment also gives the examples *mastruga* and *magalia*, to which the word *mapalia* with the same meaning is added.

[41] Consentius gives the same examples (2,6-10 Niedermann). Also Servius (or Sergius) hints at the existence of foreign words which cause a *barbarolexis* (GL 4,444,7-8): *habemus enim multa* (sc. *verba*) *et a Gallis et ab Africis et ab aliis gentibus.*

[42] Diomedes (GL 1,449,6-11) has also a definition of *barbarum*; he divides the mistakes in speech into three types: *obscurum inornatum barbarum. Barbara oratio* contains solecisms and barbarisms.

could not clarify *barbarolexis* as the usual *barbara dictio*[43] but needed a new term *alienatio* (189,66-68): *quisquis enim propriam corrumpit linguam barbarismum facit, corrumpens autem barbaram non barbarismum sed barbarolexin, id est alienationem.* He also explains why the errors are termed *barbarolexis* as well (190,87-89): *omnia ista, quia latina non sunt, quocumque modo dixeris, barbarolexin facies, quia nescis proprietatem illarum pronuntiationum.* Because you do not know – you are not expected to know – how these words should be pronounced.

From Charisius on *barbarolexis* does not refer to Greek words. The examples given by grammarians, and already those in Quintilian, are words originating in the Roman provinces, where the local languages had influenced the spoken Latin. The grammarians did not want them to spread into the "pure" Latin as well. Consultius Fortunatianus, a rhetorician living probably in the fourth century, instructs his readers to avoid words which are characteristic of certain nations (rhet. 3,4):[44] *gentilia verba: ... quae propria sunt quarundam gentium, sicut Hispani non cubitum vocant, sed Graeco nomine ancona, et Galli facundos pro facetis, et Romani vernaculi plurima ex neutris masculino genere potius enuntiant, ut hunc theatrum et hunc prodigium.*[45] His example **non cubitum** sed ancona shows that he agrees with Quintilian: in his opinion these words – also Greek ones – were to be avoided, if there already was a Latin word which was sufficiently exact.

A *barbara locutio* is distinguished from a *barbarismus* in the *de differentiis liber* (GL 7,526,19-20): *barbara locutio proprie peregrina est, barbarismos fit etiam in latini sermonis locutione.* The definition of *barbara locutio* here is the same as the one given later for *barbarolexis*. Chronologically this is in accordance with the attribution of the treatise to Cornelius Fronto, who lived about AD 100-176.

The term is given in the form of *barbaros lexis* by Cominianus (in Char. gramm. 350,4 Barwick) and Diomedes, probably through Charisius.[46]

---

[43] E.g. Char. gramm. 350,4 Barwick; Diom. GL 1,451,30; Audax GL 7,361,21.

[44] But he does not use the term *barbarolexis* – perhaps because he refers to Greek words as well.

[45] We can see here the regional division which led to the development of the Romance languages: Spanish, French, Italian. I am grateful to Prof. Viljamaa for making me aware of this passage.

[46] It is clear from Diomedes that the term must be regarded as two separate words, as he says *barbaros autem lexis* (GL 1,451,30-32).

This could imply that Cominianus – who is known to us only through Charisius (4th century) – lived in the third century, as the term *barbarolexis* had not yet been established.

To my knowledge the only passage in Greek literature where foreign words are included in the concept of barbarism or are even discussed in connection with it, is found in the late *scholia* on Dionysius Thrax (GG 1:3, 447,26-28). It says that it is a barbarism to call a palm-branch βάϊον,[47] because when speaking of a branch, you should specify the name of the tree (κλάδος τοῦ φοίνικος). Generally speaking, you should not introduce a foreign word into your language, even if it had no suitable word for the concept. I think that this concerns common things only, not for instance technical vocabulary. In any case the theory does not seem to be very ancient, especially when we bear in mind what Sextus Empiricus says (see footnote 20 above). The example is taken from the Septuagint (Maccab. 1,13,51) or from the New Testament (Ev.Jo. 12,13); this implies that ancient Greek grammarians had neither examples on the subject nor even any theory of it. Moreover, in the passage of the *scholia* the word βάρβαρος is not used: the idea is expressed by the words περὶ λέξιν ξένην. If the Romans had adopted the theory of *barbarolexis* from the Greeks, one would expect to find it,[48] whereas now it seems rather to be the opposite.

The Greeks do not seem to have worried about barbarian words as much as the Romans did. Instead, they seem to have been more interested in the different dialects of Greek.[49] In the passage of the *scholia* on Dionysius Thrax where the foreign words are mentioned, another class of barbarism is defined as περὶ διάλεκτον. The passage is unique also in this regard; the divisions given by Herodian, Choeroboscus, Polybius and an anonymous writer discussing barbarisms and solecisms contain nothing of the kind.[50] If an unfamiliar word had found its way into a Greek dialect, its most probable

---

[47] According to P. Chantraine, a loan from Egyptian (s.v. in Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots. Paris 1968).

[48] I have found only two passages in which βάρβαρος is used in the connection of λέξις. Sextus Empiricus (adv.gramm. 1,313) uses them once to refer to foreign words, but not in connection with barbarisms. The other passage (sch. Dion.T. GG 1:3,346,26) does not discuss barbarisms, either, but syllables in barbarian words. Usually expressions such as βάρβαρος φωνή and βάρβαρον ὄνομα are used.

[49] Cf. K. Versteegh, Latinitas, hellenismos, 'arabiyya. HL 13 (1986) 425-448.

[50] J.Fr. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis* III, 229-261; Choer. GG 4:1,103-104.

origin was another dialect of the same language. The answer to the question "what is barbarian, what is not?" was more simple for the Greeks than for the Romans. Therefore the Romans also needed a more specific terminology.

Originally *barbarismus* was an all-inclusive term which contained all that was connected with foreign, barbarous behaviour: uncivilized manners, cruelty, aggressive temper, uncultivated speech. Gradually it was limited to indicate an incorrect use of language, and finally it became a technical term referring only to spoken or written mistakes in a single Latin word.

The examples of *barbarolexis* given by Donatus and his commentators are mainly taken from poets.[51] The grammarians used the same source when they discussed barbarisms. They explain that a poet had the right to commit a "barbarism"; but then it was called a metaplasm instead, and was not an error but a virtue. But examples referring to two opposite things were a problem for the grammarians. Consentius points this out; he realizes that examples of barbarisms should not be taken from poets but from colloquial language; expressions which can be heard by everyone ought to be used (gramm. 10,17-11,2 Niedermann). On the other hand, the grammarians taught that a barbarism and a metaplasm arise in the same way. Yet the concept of metaplasm has no equivalent to *barbarolexis*. In my opinion this might be one reason why the Roman grammarians had to specify *barbarolexis* by distinguishing it from *barbarismus*.

I come to the conclusion that the Roman grammarians began to employ the term *barbarolexis* probably around the turn of the 2nd to the 3rd century. The development of the concept would have been from *barbarismus* to *barbara locutio / dictio*, for which the Roman grammarians would have employed a term formed from Greek (βάρβαρος λέξις)[52] and latinized it as *barbarolexis*, because there was no sufficiently accurate term in Latin.

University of Turku

---

[51] *Mastruga* Cic. Scaur. 45; *cateia* Verg. Aen. 7,741; *magalia* Verg. Aen. 1,421; *acinaces* Hor. carm. 1,27,5.

[52] It may have been influenced by the Greek definition of barbarism, ἁμαρτάνειν περὶ μίαν λέξιν. Cf. footnote 30.

CORPUS TRAIECTUS MARMORARIORUM AT OSTIA*

RISTO VALJUS

At Ostia we have knowledge of at least four professional corporations which have the word *traiectus* in their name: *corpus traiectus Luculli, corpus traiectus marmorariorum, corpus traiectus Rusticelii, corpus traiectus togatensium.*[1] Two of these, those named after Lucullus and Rusticelius, were probably formed by ferrymen who carried passengers and goods across the Tiber. To allow ships to travel up the river to Rome there was no bridge across the river at Ostia. To get to the other side of the river and to the imperial harbours one had to use a ferry. The two other corporations, *corpus traiectus marmorariorum* and *corpus traiectus togatensium*, also have been thought to have some connection with the ferrymen who provided transport across the Tiber.[2]

---

[1] CIL XIV 403, ... *corp(oris) treiect(us) togatensium* ...; 409, ... *corpor(atorum) scapharior(um) et lenuncularior(um) traiect(us) Luculli* ...; 425, ... *corporis treiec[t]us marmorariorum* ...; 4553, ... *corpori traiect(us) Ru[stic(eli)* ...; 4554, ... *[corp(ori) t]raiectus [Rusti]celi ... corpor[i tr]aiect[us Rusticeli]* ...; 4555, ... *[co]rp. traie[ct(us) Rustic(eli)]* ...; 4556, ... *[corp. tr]aiect(us) Rustic(eli)* ...; 5320, ... *[co]rpus lenunclariorum traiectus Luculli* ...; 5327, ... *c]orpori [scaph]ariorum [traiectus] Rusticeli* ...; 5328, ... *corpori s[caphariorum] traiec[tus Rust. ...]*; AE 1987, 176a, ... *corp(oris) trai]ectus L[uculli ---]* ... *corp[oris ? --- lenu]ncul[ariorum traiec]tus [Luculli]* .; 176b, ... *co]rporis [lenuncular(iorum) tr]aiectus [Luculli]*.; 194, ... *corp(us) tr(aiectus) Lucul(li)* .; 195, ... *corp]ori lenun[culario]rum traiec(tus) Lucul(l)i* ...; 196, ... *corp(orum) lenunc(ulariorum) t]reiect(us) Luculli* ...; 197, ... *corporis traiectus Luculli* ...; AE 1989, 125, ... *corp(ori) traie(ctus) R[ustic(eli)* ...

[2] R. Meiggs, Roman Ostia, Oxford 1973², 297; L. Casson, Harbour and River Boats of Ancient Rome, JRS 55 (1965) 34; A. Licordari, I *lenuncularii traiectus Luculli* ad Ostia, Miscellanea greca e romana 12, Roma 1987, 149-150; H. L. Royden, The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third Century A.D., Pisa 1988, 51, 104.

The *corpus traiectus marmorariorum* has been given other inter-
pretations, as well. Le Gall thinks that it was named after the docks on the
Tiber bank where marble cargos were handled.[3] Licordari speaks of the
transport of marble but does not clarify his opinion more precisely.[4] The
name of the corporation has made scholars think about the marble blocks
which have been found in the northern part of the Isola Sacra and in Trajan's
canal. It has been thought that in that area there was an imperial marble yard,
statio marmorum, to which marble was brought from different quarries
around the Mediterranean to be shipped on to Rome.[5] In Baccini Leotardi's
opinion, with whom Pavolini and Fant agree, the name *corpus traiectus
marmorariorum* refers to the transport of marble. They think that the
members of the corporation carried marble from the yard at Portus to
Rome.[6] In my opinion this view can not be accepted.

We know very little about the *corpus traiectus marmorariorum*. So far
only one inscription has been found.[7] Like often the names of the other
corporations mentioned above,[8] it does not have any word indicating any
kind of boat, raft or ship. But there is no reason for thinking that the
members of this corporation used vessels larger than a *lenunculus* or a
scapha.[9] It has been thought that the *corpus traiectus marmorariorum* and

---

[3] J. Le Gall, Le Tibre, fleuve de Rome dans l'antiquité, Paris 1952, 224-225. Meiggs
rejected this view and the argument that only one ferry service across the river would
have sufficed at Ostia (Meiggs 297 note 3).

[4] Licordari 150.

[5] Meiggs 168; P. Baccini Leotardi, Marmi di cava rinvenuti ad Ostia e considerazioni sul
commercio dei marmi in età romana, Scavi di Ostia X, Roma 1979, 42; C. Pavolini, La
vita quotidiana ad Ostia, Roma-Bari 1986, 124-125; J. Clayton Fant, The Roman imperial
marble yard at Portus, Ancient stones. Quarrying, trade and provenance, Acta
archaeologica Lovaniensia, Monographie 4, Louvain 1992, 115.

[6] Baccini Leotardi, Marmi di cava, 43; id., Nuove testimonianze sul commercio dei
marmi in età imperiale, Roma 1989, 117; Pavolini 125; Fant 115.

[7] CIL XIV 425 (= CIL X 542), *T. Testio Helpidiano seviro Aug. idem qq. item patrono et
qq. corporis treiec[t]us marmorariorum* ...

[8] CIL XIV 403, ... *corp(oris) treiect(us) togatensium* ...; 4553, ... *corpori traiect(us)
Ru[stic(eli)]* ...; 4554, ... *[corp(ori) t]raiectus [Rusti]celi ... corpor[i tr]aiect[us Rusti-
celi]* ...; 4555, ... *[co]rp. traie[ct(us) Rustic(eli)]* ...; 4556, ... *[corp. tr]aiect(us) Rusti-
c(eli)* ...; AE 1987, 176a, ... *corp(oris) trai]ectus L[uculli ---]*; 194, ... *corp(us) tr(aiectus)
Lucul(li)* .; 197, ... *corporis traiectus Luculli* ...; AE 1989, 125, ... *corp(ori) traie(ctus)
R[ustic(eli)* ...

[9] A *lenunculus* was a harbour barge or a large rowing boat, a *scapha* was a small rowing

the *corpus traiectus togatensium* were two of the group of corporations called *quinque corpora lenunculariorum*.[10]

Although we cannot know exactly what kind of boat the members of this corporation used, we can deduce the nature of the vessel from the word *traiectus*. It means a passage across a river or a sea[11] and, accordingly, a place where one could cross a river.[12] At Ostia *traiectus* no doubt meant the crossing of the Tiber. This is the way it has been interpreted in the names of the other corporations mentioned above.[13] The journey from Portus to Rome, some thirty kilometers along the winding river, was not a *traiectus*.

I am not convinced that *corpus traiectus marmorariorum* even had anything to do with the transport of marble, although I agree that it was in some way connected with the marble yard at Portus. *Marmorarius* was a marble worker. The transport of marble would have been called *traiectus marmorum* and not *traiectus marmorariorum*.[14] *Marmorariorum* refers to those persons who were transported, as probably *togatensium* in the name of an other corporation, *corpus traiectus togatensium*.[15]

Casson has given a good outline of the vessels that were used at the mouth of the Tiber, in the harbours of Portus and on the Tiber up to Rome. Big ships came from the sea to the harbour, smaller vessels, rafts and boats moved in the harbour basins, canals and on the river around Ostia and Portus. Goods were shipped to Rome usually in special riverboats (*naves codicariae*).[16] Probably they also carried marble from Portus to Rome. In

---

boat, a ship's boat or a harbour barge (Meiggs 297; L. Casson, Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World, Princeton 1973[3], 329-330, 335-336).

[10] CIL XIV 352, ... *V corpor. lenunculariorum Ost.* ...; 4144, ... *V corporum lenuncularior. Ostiens. universi navigarii corpor. quinque* ...; The three others are *corpus lenunculariorum tabulariorum auxiliariorum Ostiensium* (CIL XIV 250, 251, 341), *corpus lenunculariorum pleromariorum auxiliariorum Ostiensium* (CIL XIV 252) and *corpus lenunculariorum traiectus Luculli* (see note 1 above). Meiggs 296-297; Casson, Harbour and River Boats, 34; Licordari 152-153.

[11] See for example Caes. Gall. 5,2,3; id. civ. 2,20,1; Liv. 1,3,8; 35,51,1.

[12] See for example Bell. Alex. 56,5; Tac. ann. 15,34,1.

[13] Meiggs 297; Licordari 150.

[14] For comparison see CIL VI 30760 (... *stationis marmorum* ...) and CIL III 25 (... *operi ma[r]morum* ...).

[15] CIL XIV 403; Licordari 150 note 3.

[16] Casson, Harbour and River Boats, 36. The word *codicarius* also appears in the names of professional corporations (CIL XIV 106, ... *codica]ri navicula[ri* ...; 131, ... *codicari*

my opinion *corpus traiectus marmorariorum* was a professional corporation formed by those who operated a ferry service, which was especially used by the marble workers to cross the Tiber. The marble workers probably favoured this ferry service because it operated close to the imperial marble yard or it was otherwise convenient for their trip from Ostia to the yard.

University of Helsinki

---

nabiculari infernates ...; 170, ... *codicarii navicularii* ...; 185, ... *codicari nav[iculari] infra pontem S[ublicium]* ...; 4144, ... *corporis splendedissimi codicar.* ...).

DE NOVIS LIBRIS IUDICIA

Literacy and Power in the Ancient World, eds. Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolf. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994. ix, 249 p. ISBN 0-521-43369-X. GBP 77.50.

The present book is the second from the Cambridge University Press on a similar topic within a short time, since "Literacy and Orality" by R. Thomas was published only in 1992. Like the study of Ms. Thomas, "Literacy and Power" is also a very useful book on the basic questions concerning the nature of literary sources of ancient cultures. The book consists of 12 articles by various authors on different aspects of the main theme, namely the relationship between writing, literacy and power. The editors have also provided the volume with an introduction, which briefly describes the main problems discussed and their cultural context. The introduction also reveals that the present articles were originally papers delivered at a congress in Oxford in 1992. As the editors state, the theme "literacy" is quite fashionable nowadays, which might partly be due to the "graphocentrism of our own society", which, however, does not mean that the subject would not be important.

What makes this collection interesting is that one single and all-sufficient concept of power has not been adopted. Thus, with "power" the use of religion as a source of authority can be meant as well as general cultural "superiority". In many cultures the importance of written text did not lie in the message of the text, but in its physical appearance. All the authors are well-established and reliable experts in their own fields and the reader can be sure that they know what they are writing about. The articles cover geographically most of the Mediterranean world and besides that parts of Northern Europe, from the 7th century BC to the 9th century AD, so the book probably has something to offer for everyone.

This book makes it clear, once more, that although our picture of antiquity has been changed in many respects by the publication of *e.g.* papyri, we must also bear in mind how much the value of new literary sources depends on the archaeological context. As D. Thompson points out, the Hellenistic papyrus material, for example, comes from a restricted area in Egypt and so our picture of Greco-Egyptian relationships must be related to this fact. In several articles attention is drawn to bureaucracy, which is often considered as a parallel phenomenon to literacy. Another more than once discussed theme in this collection is the problem of bi– and multilingualism. Especially interesting chapters in this book are those, written by J. Ray, concerning the relationship between the Demotic, Greek and Coptic script and languages in Egypt during the late and Persian

periods. Mr. Ray suggests that Demotic was reacting to the increasing use of Greek with a conservativeness which Coptic, for example, later does not show. There are also chapters on Roman Britain and Judaea as well as on Europe in the migration period. In such a wide cultural and chronological frame it is somewhat surprising that a paper on the early Imperial period in Rome is missing.

To conclude, generally speaking, this is a most interesting and handsomely produced volume, which everyone interested in the problematics of literacy should make acquaintance with.

Tiina Purola

Antonio Agustin between Renaissance and Counter-reform. Edited by M.H. Crawford. Warburg Institute Surveys and Texts XXIV. London 1993.

Antonio Agustin, 1517-1586, Spanish high ecclesiastic, is also known for his contributions to the study of Roman Law and institutions. He was modern enough to understand the relevance of Roman inscriptions to these studies. There were already collections or *sylloges* of inscriptions, for the most part in manuscript form, but their unsystematic arrangements made their use unduly laborious. Agustin, in collaboration with Jean Matal, composed a rich collection of epigraphs, provided with meticulous references, but he also drew upon inscriptions to explain the genesis of the Roman Law, both from historical and from linguistic points of view. Although the collection has remained unprinted, Agustin's system of classification influenced M. Smetius's well-known collection, 1588, and consequently later epigraphy as well.

The collective volume contains contributions by 13 scholars in five languages, including Latin. The papers more immediately concerned with epigraphical studies are J.J. Wilkes's on Cyriac of Ancona's copying of Dalmatian inscriptions, R. Cooper's on epigraphical research in Rome in Agustin's times, which is certainly of considerable interest to a historian of epigraphy, M.H. Crawford's on the development of Greek epigraphy, and A.M. Prestianni Giallombardo's on Sicily's Greek and Latin epigraphy. The other papers discuss Agustin's biography, his legal scholarship etc. All the papers are scholarly and sufficiently well documented.

Iiro Kajanto

Carmina Anacreontea. Edidit M.L. West. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993 (2. Aufl.). xxvi, 66 S. DEM 36.

ARISTOTELES: *Athenaion politeia.* Edidit M. Chambers. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993 (2. Aufl.). xx, 84 S. ISBN 3-8154-1113-0. DEM 36.

DEMOSTHENES: *Orationes.* Vol. I, pars I-III. Edidit C. Fuhr. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1994. xxxi, 535 S. ISBN 3-8154-1254-4. DEM 138.

LONGUS: *Daphnis et Chloe.* Edidit M.D. Reeve. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1994. xx, 105 S. ISBN 3-8154-1932-8. DEM 48.

PLUTARCHUS: *Moralia I.* Ediderunt W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, H. Gärtner. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993 (3. Aufl.). xlviii, 408 S. ISBN 3-8154-1678-7. DEM 140.

PLUTARCHUS: *Vitae parallelae: Alexander et Caesar.* Edidit K. Ziegler. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1994. ISBN 3-8154-1692-2. iv, 187 S. DEM 34. *Demosthenes et Cicero.* Edidit K. Ziegler. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1994. ISBN 3-8154-1691-4. iv, 95 S. DEM 26.

Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum. Pars I. Edidit O.L. Smith. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993 (2. Aufl.). xxviii, 218 S. DEM 124.

APULEIUS: *Opera quae supersunt.* II,1: *Apologia (De magia).* II,2: *Florida.* Edidit R. Helm. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1994 (5. Aufl.). vi, 123 S; lx, 51 S. ISBN 3-8154-1056-8. DEM 39; DEM 28.

AURELIUS VICTOR: *De Caesaribus.* Edidit F. Pichlmayr. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993. xxii, 210 S. DEM 68.

M. TULLI CICERONIS *Scripta quae manserunt omnia.* Fasc. 1: *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Edidit F. Marx. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993 (3. Aufl.). xxiv, 195 S. DEM 42. Fasc. 19: *Oratio pro P. Sulla.* Edidit H. Kasten. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993 (4. Aufl.). xvi, 49 S. DEM 24.

DICTYS CRETENSIS: *Ephemeridos belli Troiani libri.* Edidit W. Eisenhut. Teubner, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993. ISBN 3-8154-1301-X. lii, 151 S. DEM 64.

Während der letzten zwei drei Jahre hat der Verlag Teubner uns wieder mit mehreren Neudrucken der altbewährten Bibliotheca Teubneriana beschenkt. Da ich schon früher in dieser Zeitschrift (26, 1992, 141f) auf die Problematik der Neudrucke von Texten antiker Autoren hingewiesen habe, brauche ich mich nicht zu wiederholen. Unter den hier angekündigten Ausgaben handelt es sich um bloße Neudrucke (ich notiere [ohne ausgedehntere Nachprüfungen gemacht zu haben], daß in Chambers' aristotelischer Athenaion politeia die Akzentfehler ausgemerzt worden sind, auf die ich in Arctos 24, 1990, 185 hingewiesen habe); nur der berühmte Zieglersche Plutarch enthält Nachträge und Berichtigungen von Hans Gärtner, die auch älteres Gut zusammenstellen (zu meiner Freude bemerke ich, daß in den Addenda zur Periklesvita auf einen Aufsatz unseres Ivar A. Heikel vom Jahre 1926 hingewiesen wird; Heikel ist einer der bedeutendsten finnischen Altertumswissenschaftler aller Zeiten). – Nur ein Wunsch: es wäre schön und würde die Arbeit der Benutzer erleichtern, wenn in dem Titelblatt von bloßen Neu-

drucken auch das Erscheinungsjahr der zugrundeliegenden Auflage erwähnt würde.

Heikki Solin

ARISTOTLE: *History of Animals. Books VII–X.* Edited and translated by D. M. Balme, prepared for publication by Allan Gotthelf. The Loeb Classical Library 439. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. & London 1991. 605 p. GBP 21.00.

This last volume of the Loeb *History of Animals* has been rather ill-fated. Arthur Peck, who edited the two first volumes, died before he could complete his work, and David Palme was invited to do it. This he nearly did, but again death intervened, and the work was finished by Allan Gotthelf. But the readers will not suffer on account, on the contrary. This is much more than one is used to in a Loeb edition. Indeed, it is an edition founded on a new collation of manuscripts, though necessarily with a minimum of critical apparatus.

The volume under review contains books VII–X. Their authenticity has been suspected, and especially book X has been generally rejected. Here its inclusion has been defended by the hypothesis which makes it an earlier, independent work of Aristotle. Be that as it may, it is good to have a new edition of this book as well. It too often happens that what is deemed unauthentic is just left out of editions, of studies, and of handbooks. Even if not by Aristotle, book X is certainly old, and it has its own place in the history of ancient science.

The order of books VII–IX is changed according to early MSS which always put our IX immediately after VI and VII–VIII only after it. The order followed in earlier editions seems to date from the 15th century Latin translation by Theodorus Gaza.

The book is concluded by an Index to the three volumes of the *History of Animals*.

Klaus Karttunen

DIOGENES OF OINOANDA: *The Epicurean Inscription.* Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Martin Ferguson Smith. La Scuola di Epicuro, Suppl. n⁰ 1. Bibliopolis, Napoli 1992. 660 S. ISBN 88-7088-270-5. ITL 200.000.

Bekanntlich hat die epikureische Inschrift des Diogenes von Oinoanda in neuester Zeit eine erheblich größere Textmasse erhalten. Zu den 88 in den Jahren 1884 bis 1895 von Franzosen und Österreichern gefundenen Inschriftfragmenten mit insgesamt 3550 Wörtern sind durch die britischen Untersuchungen (1968-1983) im alten Oinoanda in der

südwestlichen Türkei weitere 124 Fragmente mit 2320 Wörtern hinzugekommen (auch wurden 59 der "alten" Fragmente wieder aufgefunden). In den Jahren 1970 bis 1984 wurden die sog. New Fragments (NF) in 10 Zeitschriftenaufsätzen mit Kommentaren herausgegeben, und zwar von Martin Ferguson Smith, der 1969-1973 die NF 1-38 allein und viele der übrigen NF als "Diogenes-Zuständiger" der Expeditionen (1974-1983) des British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara entdeckt hatte.

1984 erschien dann in Florenz Angelo Casanovas Diogenes-Ausgabe. Für meine Besprechung in Gött.Gel.Anzeigen 239, 1987, 265-273 hatte ich die Überschrift "Casanovas Gesamtedition des Diogenes von Oinoanda" gewählt, weil hier zum ersten Mal die längst bekannten Fragmente mit den meisten der von M.F.Smith edierten New Fragments (nämlich NF 1-121) zusammen publiziert wurden – also eine Gesamtedition.

Die umfangreiche Arbeit, die Smith jetzt 8 Jahre nach Casanova vorlegt, enthält nicht nur die drei weiteren NF, sondern unterscheidet sich auch hinsichtlich ihrer Grundlage von Casanovas Buch. Während dieses noch – ebenso wie die Ausgaben von William 1907, Grilli 1960 und Chilton 1967 – ausschließlich auf gedruckter Information über Diogenes' Inschrift fußte, kann sich Smith auf Autopsie aller Steine stützen, die bei den englischen Untersuchungen im Felde in und bei Oinoanda gefunden bzw. wiedergefunden wurden. Den Text der bisher nicht wiedergefundenen 29 "alten" Fragmente hat Smith mit Hilfe von Abklatschen und anderen Angaben (z.B. Notizbüchern, Zeichnungen) überprüft. Somit wird der Benutzer seiner Edition möglichst genau an das physische Substrat des diogenischen Textes herangeführt und in die Lage versetzt, nicht nur die Verläßlichkeit des vorgelegten Textes einzuschätzen, sondern auch sich von den noch zu lösenden Problemen eine Vorstellung zu machen.

In vierfacher Weise bringt Smith den Text des Diogenes dem Leser nahe: durch seine eigentliche *Edition* (144-363) mit einem kombinierten paläographischen und textkritischen Apparat (in englischer Sprache); durch seine englische *Übersetzung* (365-426); durch seine kommentierenden Anmerkungen *(Notes,* 427-597); schließlich durch die sehr nützlichen *Synopsen,* die er oft den Anmerkungen vorausschickt.

Die *Einleitung* (35-143) berichtet über die Geschichte der diogenischen Studien seit 1884 und befaßt sich besonders mit der möglichen Anordnung der verschiedenen Teile der Inschrift auf der Rückwand der Säulenhalle; diese Mauer wird auch archäologisch beschrieben (76 n.2; 95). Schön und kurz wird die Inschrift als Quelle für den Epikureismus gewürdigt (127). Smith datiert mit überzeugenden Gründen unseren Diogenes um 120 n.Chr. Seine veränderte Numerierung der Fragmente war unvermeidlich (und gute Konkordanzen sind beigegeben).

Die textkritische Arbeit besteht im vorliegenden Fall ja darin, Lücken der Steine möglichst überzeugend auszufüllen und zu versuchen, vorhandene Buchstabenreste zu deuten. Letztere gibt Smith, wenn er keine Deutung gefunden hat, sozusagen in Faksimile wieder (z.B. fr. 17 III und IV), um dem Leser eine Vorstellung davon zu geben, was auf den Steinen vorhanden ist. So ermöglicht er künftige Mitarbeit. Eine genauere Würdigung seiner Edition und vor allem ein Vergleich mit Casanova muß einer anderen Gelegenheit vorbehalten werden. Aber fr. 2 III 6 statt φημὶ in der Ergänzung lieber οἶδα.

Mit dieser Edition steht Smith noch klarer als *primus inter pares* in der Diogenes-
forschung da. Schön betont er jedoch, wie diese in hohem Maße eine Sache der
Zusammenarbeit sei (75). In der Tat hat er mit Akribie und Selbstlosigkeit alles, was
andere Forscher in verschiedenen Ländern zum Text des Diogenes beigetragen haben, in
seinen Apparat (und bisweilen in seinen Text) hineingearbeitet. Nach Casanova bildet
dieses Werk somit als neue Kodifikation eine unumgängliche Grundlage: für Diogenes
beginnt eine neue Ära.

Rolf Westman

HOMER: *The Odyssey. Books VI-VIII.* Edited by A. F. Garvie. Cambridge Greek and
Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994. viii, 368 p. ISBN 0-521-
33840-9. GBP 14.95 (paperback).

Our cultural tradition has considered Books VI-VIII of the *Odyssey* as one of the
highlights of the poem. They deal with Odysseus' encounter with Nausicaa as well as the
description of the Phaeacian society including the episode of the singer Demodocus. The
story of Odysseus and Nausicaa has fascinated many romantic minds, whereas
Demodocus has been (for good reason) considered significant as regards the manner in
which how the *aoidoi* used to sing epic poems in Mycenaean and Dark Age societies.

It is somewhat surprising that it is only now that the commentary by Stanford on
the whole epic (2nd ed. 1959) which is in many respects insufficient is being gradually
superseded. Garvie's work is in fact the first commentary on Books VI-VIII issued on an
entirely English initiative since the one by Hainsworth was published first in Italy (1981)
and later on revised for an Oxford edition in 1988.

The reading of this book suggests to me that Garvie's intention has not been to
provide a scientific tool for specialists (as is the case with Hainsworth) but a useful ori-
entation for students. This solution is perhaps the one that best meets the actual need, and
one cannot but agree that it does so in a reliable manner. In the introductory part the Ho-
meric question, meter and textual tradition are briefly treated. Thirteen pages are dedica-
ted to issues concerning the land and the people of the mysterious Phaeacians. Garvie is
certainly right in opting for the view that they belong totally to the realm of fantasy.
However, I would not share his categorical denial of their pre-Homericity. It is rather
dangerous to speak of Homeric "inventions" with regard to the subject matter of the po-
ems which, after all, mainly operate with traditional mythology. According to the English
and American custom, the emphasis in the commentary itself is on questions of literary
technique and poetic artistry. Fortunately, also linguistic matters are given some space.
Unfortunately, less attention is paid to archaeology, religious questions and mythology.

Jaakko Aronen

MICHAELIS PSELLI *Orationes hagiographicae.* Ed. Elizabeth A. Fisher, Teubner, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994. xvii, 355 p. ISBN 3-8154-1665-5. DEM 138.
MICHAELIS PSELLI *Orationes panegyricae.* Ed. George T. Dennis, Teubner, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994. xvi, 214 p. ISBN 3-8154-1666-3. DEM 120.
MICHAELIS PSELLI *Orationes forenses et acta.* Ed. George T. Dennis. Teubner, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994. xviii, 199 p. ISBN 3-8154-1667-1. DEM 96.

From the re-editing work of the extant writings of Michael Psellus, which was initiated by prof. L.G. Westerink, have been issued this year already three volumes.

Elisabeth A. Fisher has collected and re-edited the texts of Psellus which can be categorized mainly as homiletics, ecclesiastical orations, which were meant to be delivered as part of the liturgy in certain days of the liturgical year (annunciation Day 25th March, Good Friday, the day of John the Baptist 29th Aug., the day of St. Michael 8th Oct., the memorial days of St. Auxentius and Simeon Metaphrastes). Text n. 4 differs totally from that category, being an *ekphrasis* of a miracle which happened in the Blachernai 1075. The writings are to be found in 26 manuscripts, which can be dated from the 12th century to the 15th century. One reason for such an amount could be that the name of Michael Psellus was already in the twelfth century taken as an example of high literary style and so had become a didactic paradigm in rhetorical education.

So might be the case also with the "secular" oratory of Psellus. The 21 extant speeches edited by George T. Dennis, which can be categorized as panegyrical oratory, can be found also in a number of different manuscripts. The speeches represent rather well the application of the rules of classical epideictical genos for different occasions in the Byzantine court; *prosfonesis, demegoria,* and *syntakterios.* All different types of the same genos meant to be delivered in different ceremonial occasions. This, of course, demands from the historian different ways of approach, if he wants to understand them in another way than has been usually done, i.e. as empty Byzantine court-rhetoric. The panegyrical genos was a literary concept that covered a wide and profound oratorial practice, *rhetoric in action.*

The other edition of George T. Dennis, *orationes forenses et acta,* reintroduces long ago edited judical speeches of Psellus, and at the same time raises a question concerning the fate of forensic oratory, which has been maintained to have been dead since the late antiquity. There is one speech of accusation and two apologies. The other texts of the edition, *acta,* are three *chrysobulloi* of emperors drawn up by Psellus, and two judical texts, *hypomnemata,* reference records of judical scrutinies.

It would be most desirable that through these editions of the rhetorical works of Michael Psellus, the research on Byzantine oratory, until quite recently a neglected branch of studies, would get a good start, not only as a literary and stylistic study, but also as a socio-historical study: oratory seen as a social and political instrument of formal and ceremonial communication between different levels of Byzantine society.

Mika Hakkarainen

La cultura in Cesare. Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi. Macerata – Matelica, 30 aprile – 4 maggio 1990. A cura di Diego Poli. Quaderni Linguistici e Filologici V (1990). Università di Macerata. Editrice "Il Calamo", Roma 1993. I – II, pp. xv, 844. ISBN 88-86148-01-1. ITL 180.000.

This "convegno internazionale" was held to celebrate the 700th anniversary of the University of Macerata. The "atti" include about 30 papers mostly in Italian, with summaries in English (in addition, there are two papers in French and one in Spanish), representing five aspects defined as "spazio geografico, etnografia, ambiente", "la cultura greca", "tra 'artes' e tecniche", "il mito, il rito e il tempo", "tra retorica e critica", "la grammatica, il latino, le lingue altre" and "Cesare nella cultura" (this section deals with his "Nachleben").

As a subject to be discussed in a colloquium, Caesar, seen not as a politician but as an intellectual, is certainly most suitable, and the organisers can only be congratulated for this choice. As a representative of his age, Caesar should be placed somewhere close to Cicero, but his achievement seems to suffer from a certain lack of interest on the part of modern scholars, the explanation being, of course, that most scholars get faced with his *oeuvre* at school at an age which prohibits a deeper understanding of the man, his thought and his style.

Although some of the papers seem to be only of marginal interest from the point of view of someone wishing to concentrate on Caesar (e.g. M. Costantini on *Xénophon ou l'art de la bonne distance* – in itself a most interesting paper with an agreeable personal touch; S. Sconocchia on *La scienza medica nell'età e nelle opere di Cesare* with the not very surprising conclusion that there is not much on "realtà medica" in Caesar's works), as a whole, this is a collection of papers most worthy of the attention of both scholars and others interested in Caesar. Almost every imaginable aspect is dealt with between Caesar's "scritti giovanili" (G. Zecchini) and Caesar "come ‹‹weltgeschichtliches Individuum›› nella filosofia di Hegel" (F. Biasutti). If I may be allowed to point out contributions which seemed most interesting to me, I must mention the two papers analyzing individual passages in the *Bellum Gallicum* (G. Cipriani on 5, 44 and E. di Lorenzo on 7, 77) and P. Poccetti's *Teorie grammaticali e prassi della* Latinitas *in Cesare* (who observes that judgments, both ancient and modern, of Caesar's style in his historical writing have, from Cicero onwards, generally been unfavourable; on Cicero's famous appraisal in Brutus 262 see p. 604: "ammantato di una veste solo ironicamente elogiativa, è nella sostanza fortemente negativo"). It is also good to be reminded of the interesting fact that Caesar's *divinitas* and reputation in general seem to fade away fairly early from official use in imperial propaganda (G. Bonamente on *La scomparsa del nome di Cesare dagliu elenchi dei divi*).

One can only hope that these volumes will stimulate further interest in the man.

Olli Salomies

IULIUS FRONTINUS: *Strategemata*. Hrsg. von R. Ireland. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1990. xxxiv, 129 S. ISBN 3-322-00746-4. DM 59.

Frontins Buch über die Wasserversorgung Roms hat in letzter Zeit erneutes Interesse auf sich gezogen und auch eine gute fachmännische Ausgabe innerhalb der Bibliotheca Teubneriana erhalten. Es war also an der Zeit, auch Frontins zweites Hauptwerk, das über die Kriegslisten, in der Teubneriana neu aufzulegen, zumal seit dem Erscheinen der früheren Teubneriana, der klassischen Ausgabe von Gundermann aus dem Jahre 1888, schon über ein Jahrhundert verflossen ist. Die Erörterung über die Überlieferung ist mustergültich und enthält viel Neues. Gundermann hatte, ganz richtig, die Handschriften in zwei Klassen geteilt (sie gehen auf einen Archetypus zurück), hatte aber den einzelnen Familien weniger Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt, und hier bringt Ireland Neues. Der Text selbst scheint vorzüglich zu sein, der kritische Apparat wie die Testimoniensammlung gut und behutsam aufgebaut. Alles in allem eine gute fachmännische Ausgabe, die gute Dienste leistern wird.

Heikki Solin

GUNHILD VIDÉN: *Women in Roman Literature. Attitudes of Authors under the Early Empire*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia LVII. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Göteborg 1993. 194 p. ISBN 91-7346-260-8. SEK 160.

The problem with women's studies (or with almost any other studies) relating to classical antiquity is that we have to gather information from very heterogenous sources. For example, statements found in works belonging to different literary genres are usually not commensurate, and even if they are, we cannot know for sure. "When dealing with antiquity scholars have always compared apples with pears and plums, because if we want to fill our basket we have to use all the fruit that is available" (p. 174).

Vidén has read through the works of Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, Seneca, Martial and Juvenal and excerpted those passages which state opinions about women, both about individuals and about the gender as such. She concludes that these authors did not primarily strive for an accurate description of historical women. The female stereotypes and the portraits of individual women were used to highlight the writers' opinions about men and about Roman society in general. Thus, any information extracted from this evidence must be handled with a certain caution. Regarding the general pattern of thought of the upper-class authors, Vidén makes some pertinent remarks, like: "a chaste woman is not necessarily a good woman, but a good woman is of necessity a chaste woman" (p. 176).

There is no reason to doubt these conclusions. It is even possible that similar

warnings have been issued before. However, it is not a bad thing that the problem has been stressed again, especially in such a systematic and judicious study. The book is clearly written and well documented.

Antti Arjava

GREGORY VLASTOS: *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1991. 334 p.
GREGORY VLASTOS: *Socratic Studies*. Edited by Myles Burnyeat. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994. 152 p. ISBN 0-521-44213-3, GBP 30.00 (hb). ISBN 0-521-44735-6, GBP 9.95 (pb).

These two important volumes constitute Gregory Vlastos' intellectual testament for future generations of scholars in Socratic and to some extent also Platonic studies. The earlier of them turned out to be the last work finished by the author himself who died shortly after the book was published. At the time of his death at the age of 84, Vlastos was, however, preparing a companion volume including revised versions of his important and influential articles on Socrates' elenctic method of argument, his disawowal of knowledge, and his relationship with the Athenian democracy. Familiarity with the theses presented in these papers, especially the one on the elenchus, is virtually presupposed from the reader of *Socrates* . Therefore, it is very convenient to have them now published together in a collection edited by Myles Burnyeat.

Together with G.E.L. Owen, Gregory Vlastos must be regarded as the most important contributor to the huge growth and improvement of scholarship in ancient philosophy especially in English-speaking countries during the last couple of decades. He was obviously a most stimulating teacher and it was his insistence on a thoroughgoing training both in classics and in philosophy that played an important part in revolutionizing the role of ancient philosophy in academic communities. For Vlastos it was never sufficient just to recount what ancient philosophers *said*; the important thing was to understand what they *meant*. This required interpreting ancient texts in the light of the argumentative clarity and rigor of the best analytic philosophy. Perhaps it is just his striving for clear and precise presentation that has aroused so much debate and controversy around his numerous papers on Presocratic and Socratic philosophy. Even if he has not always succeeded in convincing his readers he has very often set out a fruitful basis for future critical discussion.

These qualities of clarity and precision, but also controversiality, are very much in the foreground both in *Socrates* and in *Socratic Studies*. Vlastos' main thesis is that in his dialogues Plato attributes to Socrates two philosophies which are not only incompatible but even antithetical and irreconcilable. In the dialogues, conventionally dated as early ones, we find a Socrates who is exclusively a moral philosopher, who does

not discuss epistemological, psychological or metaphysical questions, who seeks knowledge by elenchus, i.e. questioning his opponents and refuting false beliefs by deducing their negation from premisses agreed to by the opponent, who disavows any certain expert knowledge but is a philosophical populist who believes that every human being has in his mind the true moral beliefs needed to refute the false ones and reach moral truth. In the *Meno*, *Phaedo*, *Symposium*, *Cratylus*, and *Republic*, however, we find a very different Socrates who presents a complex metaphysical theory of separately existing Forms and a tripartite soul which learns by recollecting pieces of its innate knowledge, who seeks demonstrative knowledge by a hypothetical method borrowed from mathematics and is confident that he has found such knowledge, and who is an elitist convinced that only a handful of exceptionally talented and well-trained philosophers are able to reach the truth. Besides the philosophical thesis of the irreconcilability of the philosophies of these two Socrateses Vlastos also presents the historical thesis that the former of them is in fact the historical Socrates, whereas the latter is merely a mouthpiece for Plato's own doctrines.

Vlastos' forceful defense of his central claims cannot be done full justice here, let aloneconclusively refuted. However, they do not seem very plausible to me. The historical thesis claiming the authenticity of the character of Socrates in the elenctic dialogues is mainly based on the evidence of Aristotle, who clearly distinguishes Socrates' doctrines from Plato's later ones. Vlastos exaggerates the reliability of Aristotle as a historical source on earlier philosophies and underestimates Plato's creative ability at the early stages of his career. While we need not agree with the pessimistic conclusions of Charles S. Kahn, for example, that any historical claims about the philosophy of Socrates beyond a couple of familiar paradoxes are bound to be inconclusive Vlastos' reliance on the historical authenticity of Plato's account and Aristotle's confirmation of it seems to be far too optimistic.

Vlastos' philosophical thesis is at least equally controversial. According to him, the philosophies of the two Socrateses in Plato's dialogues are not only different but even antithetical and irreconcilable. The evidence for the sharp discontinuity between early and middle Plato is, however, far from conclusive. Most Plato scholars nowadays seem to reject the discontinuity thesis and opt for a moderate version of a developmental view of his philosophy. The novelties presented in the so-called middle dialogues are seen by them more as an extension and completion of the philosophical program of the Socratic dialogues and an answer to some aporias Plato had been driven to than a beginning of a completely new problematic.

Vlastos' insistence on fundamental discontinuity is mainly based on his interpretation of the Socratic philosophical method, the elenchus. He thinks that the seeking of moral truth through a method which proceeds through questions and answers and deduces the refutans of the opponent's false beliefs from premisses admitted by the opponent himself represents a completely different philosophical attitude from that behind Plato's later method, which is inspired by contemporary mathematics and relies on hypothesis and demonstrative argument to raise the metaphysical structure based on

the theory of Forms.

Even if we admitted the irreconcilability of the two methods, Vlastos' case would be weakened by the fact that he exaggerates the role of elenchus in the Socratic dialogues and underestimates other elements which show continuity between so-called early and middle Plato. What is a little more disturbing is that even Vlastos himself has to admit that there is a bridge from the Socratic elenchus to Platonic metaphysics. It is very natural to ask how it is possible that each and every human being has somewhere in her or his mind those true beliefs needed to refute all the false ones. This is a necessary condition of the successful application of the elenctic method to reach moral truths. One way to justify it is Plato's theory of the soul as having gone through several incarnations and acquired pre-natal knowledge about everything, knowledge which was supposed to be recoverable through recollection. Thus Platonic metaphysics after all seems to give answers to problems arising from nowhere else than Socratic elenchus.

Vlastos does not pay too much attention to the problems of Platonic chronology. He accepts the conventional division between early, transitional, middle and late dialogues and sneers at Kahn's attempt to move the date of the *Gorgias* back to a position immediately following the *Apology* and the *Crito* as not having "gained a single adherent in the critical literature". The more radical revisions of traditional chronology like that of Thesleff are not even mentioned. This is unfortunate for two reasons. First, there is a danger that the prevalent orthodoxy in Platonic chronology will become more and more dogmatic. Second, Thesleff's attempt to date at least some of the elenctic dialogues to a much later period in Plato's development has consequences that are worthy of consideration from the philosophical point of view. If the elenctic dialogues are not early works but dialectical exercise pieces written for the Academy, perhaps partly by people other than Plato, they could be seen as throwing new light on the problematic relation between Plato and Aristotle and the early history of Aristotelian dialectic reflected especially in the *Topics*. The acceptance of the revisionist chronology would of course also lead to a major reinterpretation of Plato's philosophical development. As far as I know, this has not seriously been attempted in recent scholarship, but the line of thought could still be worth following.

Quite apart from the controversial chronological questions, Vlastos' view of the relation between the Socratic elenchus and Aristotelian dialectic based on ἔνδοξα is far from satisfactory. His assumption of a fundamental antagonism between these two methods seems to me to be quite artificial. He seriously underestimates the power of Aristotle's dialectic to criticize prevailing moral conceptions. Even if reputable beliefs constitute the court of last appeal for settling moral disagreemen ts, it is not just the statistical frequency of support but also the more or less fundamental role in the total system of beliefs that determines the degree to which a belief is reputable. Aristotle's dialectic has the power to distinguish our most basic convictions from those that are less basic and correct the latter in the light of the former in much the same way as the Socratic elenchus. The difference between the Socratic and Aristotelian methods is not in the critical power but in the fact that the elenchus is directed to an individual opponent

whereas Aristotelian dialectic is more communal. This criticism of Vlastos' account of the elenchus has been made in different forms by many commentators. The revised version of his paper on the elenchus published in the *Socratic Studies* reveals that he had already made minor concessions to his critics. It is a pity that he did not live long enough to give further consideration to these questions.

Despite these criticisms it should be admitted that Vlastos' two books are major achievements in their field. They contain brilliant pieces of scholarship the lasting value of which is quite independent of the controversial general framework. The discussions on irony, piety, the rejection of retaliation, and the role of virtue and happiness in Socratic-Platonic philosophy are particularly enlightening. *Socrates* and *Socratic Studies* will remain necessary equipment for all scholars of ancient philosophy for a very long time.

Juha Sihvola

RICHARD BUXTON: *Imaginary Greece: The Contexts of Mythology.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994. XVI, 250 p. ISBN 0-521-32978-7. GBP 35.00 (hb). ISBN 0-521-33865-4. GBP 12.95 (pb).

Ever-growing interest in Greek religion and mythology has recently given rise to high-quality contributions addressed not only to specialists but to a wider audience as well. In addition to the book under review we may mention Ken Dowden's *The Uses of Greek Mythology* (1992) and the brand-new English translation of Fritz Graf's *Griechische Mythologie* (originally 1985). Common to all these treatments is that they contribute to the liberation of Greek myth from the realm of just entertaining stories, deformed history or literary fiction, and recognize its value as a mode of thought by which the Greeks constantly described, organized and motivated the realities of their everyday life.

The present study especially stresses the principle that myths are to be interpreted within their determined historical and cultural context. This is a principle more than familiar to those who (like the present reviewer) have followed the work of Italian historians of religions such as Brelich, Bianchi and Sabbatucci. The Italians, however, do not receive any special acknowledgement in Buxton's book which appears more inspired by other eminent contemporary mythologists (Vernant, Detienne, Vidal-Naquet, Calame, Graf, Burkert, Bremmer).

The author approaches the contexts of mythology from various angles. Particularly rewarding is the section where the myth-telling situations (the narrative contexts) are discussed. In fact, this is a surprisingly little studied territory, despite its fundamental importance. One obvious reason for this is that myths have been predominantly read in the form of written texts and treated in terms of philological-historical *Quellenforschung* or literary criticism. However, recent discussions of the im-

pact of oral-aural communication in ancient Greece necessitate a new assessment of questions like 'where', 'when', 'how' and 'by whom' was the mythical patrimony transmitted and retold. Buxton deals with the argument rather sketchily (for obvious reasons of space) but manages to provide many valuable insights and starting points for further research. He examines the performance of myths from the point of view of the situation (private/public) and the age-groups and sexes: children were told myths at home mostly by women (nurses, mothers), school exercises might have involved mythological poetry, at various festivals myths were represented to the whole community by choruses of youths (both boys and girls). In spite of the common festivals, adults recounted and listened to tales at banquets, during rhapsodic and dramatic contests, etc. In this chapter a slight motivation for criticism may be aroused by the fact that Buxton somewhat neglects the important aspect that narrative contexts (not only public ones but also the *symposia*) are almost regularly ritual. These ritual settings reveal the link that after all could exist between myth-telling and cultic activity. Fortunately, however, Buxton does not see the distinction between domestic (private) and public myth-telling as clear-cut since he ascribes to the former the vital role "of preparing children for entry into the symbolic world of the adult community" (p. 21). I would see private and public myth-telling as complementary. In both cases it is ultimately a question of cultural self-identification and integration into the basic values of the community.

The second part of the book is dedicated to the relationship between the ordinary everyday life and the mythical world. Buxton takes as his point of departure aspects of the 'real world' (natural environment, family, religion), and examines how they are reflected in myths. Similarities between everyday life and myths lead to the conclusion that mythology is in many ways based on the perceptions of everyday life. Although I personally side with those who stress the temporal and qualitative *difference* of the mythical world in respect to the actual reality, I found many good analyses and a lot of sound argumentation. This is especially true in the pages where Greek attitudes to uninhabited wild landscapes are investigated. The last part provides a survey on ancient and modern opinions on the functions of mythological narratives. Here the author proves free from dogmatism and artificial classifications paying due attention to the polyvalence of myths and, at the same time, to the importance of the historical contexts in which they were created and narrated.

Jaakko Aronen

JÖRG RÜPKE: *Domi militiae. Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom.* Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1990. 312 S. ISBN 3-515-05679-3. DEM 68.

Religion und Staat, Krieg und Gesellschaft waren in Rom seit jeher engstens miteinander verflochten. Diesem Befund geht Rüpke in seiner vom Militärgeschicht-lichen Forschungsamt Freiburg im Br. herausgegebenen Tübinger Dissertation nach, deren Gegenstand die Rituale bei der Vorbereitung, Durchführung und Beendigung der Kriegszüge der Römer sind. Rüpke will durch Interpretation der rituellen Details und religiösen Vorschriften die Relevanz des Sakralwesens für das Kriegsverständnis der Römer verdeutlichen, um "den Ort des Krieges in der römischen Kultur" vom Beginn der Republik bis zum frühen Prinzipat zu bestimmen (S. 14). Das Kapitel I ("Roma parata") behandelt die Einstellung der Römer zum Krieg und Kampfgeschehen, den Zyklus der sog. Kriegsfeste, Probleme der Sakraltopographie Roms, die Zusammensetzung römischer Heere, Aushebungen und Rechtsstellung der Soldaten. Die Kapitel II-IV orientieren sich am "typischen Verlauf" eines Kriegszuges, behandeln aber auch sakralrechtliche Aspekte verschiedener Art. In Kapitel V ("Krieg und Religion in Rom") versucht Rüpke, durch Differenzierung von vier Zeitstufen den Bestand an Ritualen mit den sich wandelnden "konstitutionellen und politischen Strukturen" in Verbindung zu bringen. – Rüpke, dessen Argumentation zu folgen nicht immer leicht ist, hat wiederholt Thesen aufgestellt, die sich nicht immer eindeutig beantworten lassen. Insgesamt aber verdient sein Bemühen, durch interdisziplinären Ansatz originelle Antworten auf vieldiskutierte Fragen zu finden, alle unsere Anerkennung. Er hat auch eine ungeheuere Menge an moderner Literatur durchgearbeitet (seine Bibliographie umfaßt nicht weniger als 33 Seiten!), wobei man freilich den Eindruck hat, daß die Arbeit dadurch gewonnen hätte, wenn Rüpke statt Durcharbeitung der erstaunlichen Fülle von Sekundärliteratur sich mehr an Primärquellen gehalten hätte. An Einzelheiten gibt es einiges zu bemängeln, aber im ganzen handelt es sich um ein anregendes, wenn auch stellenweise diffiziles Buch.

Heikki Solin

MIRANDA GREEN: *The Sun-Gods of Ancient Europe.* B. T. Batsford Ltd., London 1991. 168 p. ISBN 0-7134-5856-9. GBP 25.00.

Die Sonne hat im Leben der Menschen immer eine entscheidende Rolle gespielt und zwar eine umso wichtigere je weniger ihre Funktionen durch technische Errungenschaften ersetzt werden konnten. Daher ist es nicht verwunderlich, daß in allen alten Kulturen auf die Sonne, als Gott verstanden, mit verschiedenen Mitteln einzuwirken versucht wurde. Den verschiedenen Formen dieses Sonnenkultes im alten Europa, von Skandinavien über Irland und die britischen Inseln bis Spanien, aber mit

Schwerpunkt auf keltischem Gebiet, geht Miranda Green in diesem reichlich illustrierten, und auch für ein weiteres Publikum leicht verständlichen Buch nach. Die Untersuchung umfaßt den gesamten Zeitraum vom Neolithikum angefangen bis zum Ende des römischen Reiches.

Die Sonne als Spender von Leben, Wärme und Licht regte von Anfang an die Menschen zu ihrer Darstellung – und nur darauf kann man sich bis zu dem Zeitpunkt , an dem mit den Römern auch schriftliche Zeugnisse Eingang in unsere Überlieferung finden, stützen – an und zu ihrem"in Bann halten" z. B. mit Hilfe von Öffnungen, die das Licht zu einem exakt bestimmten Zeitpunkt, z. B. zur Wintersonnenwende, ein Steingrab voll erleuchten ließen. Die Sonne wurde in vielfältigen Formen und Symbolen dargestellt, als Kreis, Strahlenkreis, Blumen, Auge und Spirale, als Kreuz und Swastika und selbstverständlich als Speichenrad. Im Zusammenhang mit diesen Symbolen tauchen auch Wagen, Boote und verschiedene Tiere (z.B. Bullen und Pferde) auf, die als Hinweise auf Sonenkult angesehen werden können. Auch Reste von Schmuckstücken, Amuletten, Kesseln und Tonfiguren mit Sonnensymbolen können uns Hinweise auf Priester und Verehrer geben. Bei dem berühmten Stonehenge handelt es sich vielleicht um einen entsprechenden Kultplatz. In der Folge der Begegnung mit der römischen, mimetischen Göttervorstellung werden auch die keltischen Sonnengottdarstellungen anthropomorph. Die Figuren werden jetzt fast ausschließlich noch durch das Rad als Sonnengott identifiziert. Inschriften ermöglichen nun, die gedankliche Identifizierung von Göttern der römischen Götterwelt mit keltischem Gedankengut nachzuvollziehen. Die Autorin kommt zu dem Ergebnis, daß außer Jupiter auch Apollo, Sucellus, Venus, Juno und Fortuna sowie die Muttergottheiten mit dem Sonnenkult in Verbindung gebracht werden können aufgrund ihrer Eigenschaften bzgl. von Kampf, Heilfähigkeit und Fruchtbarkeit. Mit keinem Wort erwähnt werden allerdings die im gallisch-keltischen Raum in der Kaiserzeit sehr populären orientalischen Sonnengottkulte wie etwa der des Mithras, obwohl sonst vielfache Vergleiche mit Kulten anderer Kulturen angestellt werden. Auch kann man sich irgendwie nicht des Eindruckes erwehren, daß die zur Verfügung stehenden Quellen oft mit einer "Sonnengottbrille" interpretiert werden. In letzter Konsequenz würde dann die Schlußfolgerung naheliegen, daß alle vor- und frühgeschichtliche Religion sich auf den Sonnenkult reduzieren ließe. Dennoch handelt es sich um einen interessanten Versuch, die Koordinaten in der Gedankenwelt der Menschen im alten Europa zu erhellen.

Uta-Maria Liertz

Prof. Luigi De Anna has specialized in the study of the relations between Italy or the Mediterranean countries and the North, especially Finland. This year he has produced two relevant works, one of which is reviewed here. The theme is intriguing: the ideas which classical antiquity and the Middle Ages had of the Northern peoples, viz. the peoples who were living outside the Mediterranean civilization. The North was, however, more an anthropological than geographical concept. Besides the British Isles and Scandinavia, it also comprised the Russians and the peoples of the steppes of Asia, and underwent some changes in the course of time.

The author reviews the main differences which the "civilized" peoples perceived, or thought to perceive, between themselves and the Northerners. The ancient theory of the influence of climate not only upon the character but also the physique of people was of decisive significance. Cold and darkness rendered the Northern peoples hard and cruel, big- and strong-bodied, and hence fearful warriors. To the Greeks and Romans the peoples to the north of their own civilization were predominantly barbarians. These ideas were bequeathed to the Middle Ages. Despite the mitigating influence of Christianity and the conquests of new areas to civilization, the basic attitude persisted, with only minor modifications. The barbarities perpetrated by the Vikings and the horrors of the Mongol invasions added fresh fuel to the abhorrence felt for these strange peoples.

The author also surveys differences in daily life, which the Mediterraneans found, if not always barbaric, at least unfamiliar and repulsive, such as the habit of the Northern warriors to dress in skins and their diet, which consisted more of raw meat than of cereals, oil and wine, which the cultivated Mediterraneans preferred. The visitors to these peoples often described their disgusting gluttony and heavy drinking. The author argues that furs, hunting and meat diet later served as the status symbols of the medieval nobility.

De Anna is to be congratulated for this informative and well-written book. His conclusions are based upon original sources, which he amply, but not obtrusively, quotes, and upon the results of modern scholarship. Considering the vastness of his subject, his bibliography cannot be exhaustive, but in any case it is sufficiently comprehensive.

Iiro Kajanto

Quaderni Linguistici e Filologici I (1981). Università di Macerata. Roma s.a.

Quaderni Linguistici e Filologici 1982-1984. Università di Macerata. Roma 1984.

Episteme. In ricordo di Giorgio Raimondo Cardona. A cura di Diego Poli. Quaderni Linguistici e Filologici IV (1986-89). Università di Macerata. Roma 1990. ISBN 88-85876-10-2. ITL 50.000.

La cultura in Cesare. Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi. Macerata – Matelica, 30 aprile – 4 maggio 1990. A cura di Diego Poli. Quaderni Linguistici e Filologici V (1990). Università di Macerata. Editrice "Il Calamo", Roma 1993. I – II, pp. xv, 844. ISBN 88-86148-01-1. ITL 180.000.

MARIO NEGRI: *Le tavolette delle classi A, C, E, F, G di Pilo.* Quaderni Linguistici e Filologici VI (1991). Università di Macerata. Editrice "Il Calamo", Roma 1993. Pp. xv, 88. ISBN 88-86148-02-X. ITL 35.000.

Dal 1981 l'Istituto di Glottologia e Linguistica generale dell'Università di Macerata pubblica dei Quaderni di vario indirizzo il cui contenuto va dall'antichistica fino alla linguistica moderna. Si annunciano qui brevemente i sei primi volumi (il vol. V sarà recensito più dettagliatamente da O. Salomies, v. sopra p. 152). Nei primi due, contenenti anche saggi di non-italiani, gli argomenti sono vari, mentre il quarto volume, intitolato "Episteme", è una raccolta in ricordo di Giorgio Raimondo Cardona con numerosi saggi interessanti di studiosi italiani e stranieri. Il sesto fascicolo è costituito dall'esegesi di alcune tavolette di Pilo a cura di Mario Negri. I diversi volumi (particolarmente il quinto) rispecchiano in bella maniera i vasti interessi dei linguisti e filologi maceratesi.

Heikki Solin

Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike. Hrsg.: Carl Werner Müller, Kurt Sier, Jürgen Werner. Palingenesia, Band 36. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1992. 252 S. ISBN 3-515-05852-4. DEM 76.

This volume includes the papers of a colloquium held in Saarbrücken in 1989 and organized in cooperation between the universities of Saarbrücken and Leipzig. The theme is very promising, but the reader soon becomes disappointed. Already the introductory paper by Jürgen Werner, *Zur Fremdsprachenproblematik in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, shows the direction, in going through a list of much discussed passages by ancient authors, but omitting all epigraphical and papyrological material as well as all methods used and questions posed by modern sociolinguistics.

Amidst the fifteen papers, one – a short listing of interference phenomena in the inscriptions of Belgica by Helmut Freis – deals with other than literary sources. The others handle, for instance, the knowledge and use of foreign language elements and

sources by Herodotus, Aristophanes and Plautus as well as the translation techniques of Cicero, Vitruvius and Aulus Gellius. Most papers are not without interest, some of them bring even new results – my favourite was Carl Werner Müller's analysis of Herodotus' sources for his short story on Rhampsinit's thesaurus. But the whole does not surpass mediocre quality, and the impression remains rather oldfashioned.

Jorma Kaimio

JERZY KOLENDO: *Nomenclator, "memoria" del suo padrone o del suo patrono.* Epigrafia e antichità 10. Fratelli Lega, Faenza 1989. 94 p.
GABRIEL SANDERS: *Lapides memores. Païens et chrétiens face à la mort: Le témoignage de l'épigraphie funéraire latine.* Edd. Angela Donati, Dorothy Pikhaus, Marc van Uytfanghe. Epigrafia e antichità 11. Fratelli Lega, Faenza 1991. 527 p.
L'epigrafia del villaggio. A cura di Alda Calbi, Angela Donati e Gabriella Poma. Epigrafia e antichità 12. Fratelli Lega, Faenza 1993. 606 p. ITL 200.000.

Il lavoro di Kolendo supera in più punti lo studio di Joseph Vogt sullo stesso tema (Gymnasium 85 [1978] 327 ss.), soprattutto perché quest'ultimo si era (a volte eccessivamente) concentrato alla problematica psicologica del lavoro dei *nomenclatores*, omettendo quasi del tutto le iscrizioni. Con l'aiuto di un'utile *appendix epigraphica* (54 numeri) l'autore delinea un quadro complessivo del ruolo dei *nomenclatores* nella società romana, la cui funzione primaria era quella di fornire informazioni pratiche al padrone o al patrono, ovvero i nomi delle persone che questi incontravano o dovevano incontrare, e con tale ruolo esercitavano una notevole influenza nella vita dell'aristocrazia romana procurandosi anche una certa agiatezza.

L'undicesimo volume della fertile collana "Epigrafia e antichità" è una silloge dove si pubblicano in ordine cronologico 21 articoli del compianto Gabriel Sanders. Oltre ad essere un omaggio alla memoria di Sanders, grande conoscitore della letteratura delle iscrizioni e della poesia funeraria romana, la raccolta di scritti usciti tra il 1968 e 1987, risulta gradita perché offre al grande pubblico studi non sempre presenti ed accessibili nelle biblioteche specialistiche. Tre articoli del testo, del resto, sono stati tradotti dall'olandese in francese per poter essere inclusi nel volume. La raccolta è preceduta dalla bibliografia di Sanders.

Il dodicesimo volume della collana raccoglie gli Atti del Colloquio Borghesi promosso dalla rivista "Epigraphica" nell'occasione del 50° anno dalla fondazione. Come indica il tema, "l'epigrafia del villaggio", gli autori dei venticinque articoli hanno cercato di studiare la cultura epigrafica delle comunità non urbanizzate, in rapporto con quella delle comunità propriamente urbane. Naturalmente si è parlato molto dei termini *pagus* e *vicus* (e dei loro equivalenti nel mondo ellenofono) nonché dell' amministrazione e della produzione epigrafica paganico-vicana. La conclusione cui sono pervenuti molti autori

sembra sia stata quella di mettere in dubbio l'esistenza dell'"epigrafia del villaggio": in varie regioni dell'Impero romano risulta inesistente o comunque non rilevabile dalla documentazione. A seconda delle circostanze tale omogeneità della cultura epigrafica tra la città e il suo territorio può essere reale o solo apparente. Per sottolineare la ricchezza del volume sarà opportuno renderne noto il contenuto: A. Donati: Premessa; G. Susini: "Epigraphica", cinquant'anni: l'epigrafia sul Duemila; G. Mihailov: L'épigraphie du village; A. Sartori: L'epigrafia del villaggio, il villaggio dell'epigrafia; C. Letta: L'epigrafia pubblica di *vici* e *pagi* nella *regio IV*: imitazione del modello urbano e peculiarità del villaggio; M. Buonocore: Problemi di amministrazione paganico-vicana nell'Italia repubblicana del I secolo a.C.; F. Bérard: *Vikani, kanabenses, consistentes*: remarques sur l'organisation des agglomérations militaires romaines; L. Mrozewicz: *Canabenses, consistentes* et la question du loyalisme d'état dans les provinces limitrophes; G. Wagner: L'épigraphie du village dans l'Egypte grecque et romaine; M. Sartre: Communautés villageoises et structures sociales d'après l'épigraphie de la Syrie du Sud; J.-P. Rey-Coquais: Villages du Liban et de la Syrie moyenne (de Damas au coude de l'Oronte) à l'époque impériale romaine; M.B. Hatzopoulos: Épigraphie et villages en Gréce du Nord: *ethnos, polis* et *kome* en Macedoine; V. Velkov: Le village dans la province de Thrace. La documentation épigraphique; V. Najdenova: Les cultes religieux dans le village de Thrace romaine; E. Weber: L'epigrafia fuori dai grandi nuclei: l'esempio norico; M. Tarpin: Inscriptions des *vici* et des *pagi* dans les Trois Gaules et les Germanies: remarques et problémes; J. D'Encarnaçao: L'épigraphie du village à l'extrême Occident d'Hispania; G. Mennella: Epigrafi nei villaggi e lapicidi rurali: esempi della *IX regio*; M.G. Angeli Bertinelli: Segni della cultura antica dalle cave di marmo di Luni; G.L. Gregori: L'epigrafia del territorio bresciano; F. Cenerini: Stento e cultura nell'orizzonte pagense del Forlivese: su un cippo a *Iuppiter*; H. Solin: L'epigrafia dei villaggi del Cassinate ed Aquinate; G. Guadagno: *Pagi* e *vici* della Campania; M. Chelotti: Proprietari e patroni tra Canosa e Venosa; A. Mastino: Analfabetismo e resistenza: geografia epigrafica della Sardegna; G. Paulis: La forma protosarda della parola *nuraghe* alla luce dell'iscrizione latina di *Nurac Sessar* (Molaria); G. Manganaro: Greco nei *pagi* e latino nelle città della Sicilia "romana" tra I e VI sec. d.C.; V. Cicala: Erudizione epigrafica di storia locale.

Mika Kajava

Rupes loquentes. Atti del Convegno internaziole di studio sulle Iscrioni rupestri di età romana in Italia (Roma – Bomarzo 13.-15.X 1989). A cura di Lidio Gasperini. Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto Italiano per la storia antica LIII. Roma 1992. Pp. 614. ITL 200,000.

This interesting publication is the result of another "convegno" which, to judge from the detailed description of the programme (p. XIff.), one should not have missed. There are about 25 papers dealing with "iscrizioni rupestri", the papers covering much of Italy (including Sardinia and Sicily) from the north to the south. Some of the papers have been conceived as definite inventories of the material in some more extended part of Italy (e.g. that of C. Letta on Regio IV – although, in fact, despite the title, only a part is taken into consideration – that of H. Solin and M. Kajava on *Latium adiectum* and that of G. Manganaro on Sicily), whereas other papers deal with smaller areas and some with individual inscriptions (some of which do, however, not seem to merit an attention as thorough as that accorded here).

I must say that, taken as a whole, the book is extremely useful, and I have read the papers with much profit. But not everyone will have the time to read the whole, and a less agreeable thing about this book is that it has no index at all, although costing a considerable sum. Of course I know that this is not the only publication of its kind without indexes, but the omission of them is really a very bad habit which I think should be abandoned.

Truthfully, I cannot help thinking, from time to time, about the relevance of studies like these which concentrate on the material rather than on the contents of inscriptions. To me many of the texts seem otherwise absolutely normal (e.g. the inscription from Ferentinum dealt with at some length by A. Pasqualini, p. 385ff.) and could equally well have been inscribed on statue bases and the like, and so I would very much have liked to find a paper on "iscrizioni rupestri" as a general phenomenon with information, for example, on what kinds of texts one is dealing with and pointing out differences – other than purely technical – and similarities between them and "normal" inscriptions etc.

Olli Salomies

Supplementa Italica. Nuova Serie. 11, 12. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1993; 1994. 218 pp.;
168 pp. ISBN 88-7097-031-0; 88-7140-063-1. ITL 70.000; 70.000.

These two new volumes of *Inscriptiones Italiae* appeared between the autumn of
1993 and the spring of 1994, and so everything seems to be going well with this
remarkable series.

The cities covered in these volumes are, as so often, on the smaller side, and the
emphasis is on Central Italy and the North rather than on the South. From southern Italy
there is in fact only Gnathia in regio II (vol. 11, by M. Chelotti); then there is, in regio V,
Tolentinum (vol. 11, G. Paci); from Umbria one finds (i.e., regio VI) Mevaniola (vol. 12,
F. Cenerini) and Attidium (vol. 12, S.M Marengo); Aemilia (regio VIII) is represented
by Parma (vol. 11, M.G. Arrigoni Bertini), Liguria (regio IX) by Industria (vol. 12; G.
Cresci Marrone, G. Mennella, E. Zanda; in the case of many of the texts one could have
cited, though not necessarily with profit, my *Die römischen Vornamen*). The rest of the
contributions cover cities in regio X: in vol. 11 A. Buonopane's Ager inter Benacum et
Athesin a Bardolino usque ad Roveretum, in vol. 12 the same author's Ausugum (a
mansio east of Tridentum) and F. Mainardis' Iulium Carnicum. I would have thought that
Parma would have been the city with the largest number of new texts, but in fact Iulium
Carnicum (52 inscriptions) turns out to be number one, followed by Gnathia (49).
(Parma, in fact, only has 15.) The relative importance of Iulium Carnicum is well
balanced by the remarkably thorough and learned prefatory presentation by Mainardis.

It is possible that these volumes include a smaller number of inscriptions of
special interest than what is normally the case, but at least there is a text mentioning the
title – unique, it seems – *mag. municipi* (Tolentinum 5), and in Attidium one observes
freedmen of Afranius Burrus, the praetorian prefect (no. 5). The most interesting text is,
however, surely Parma 2, known already from Année épigraphique 1962, 161, which
records the testamentary donation of *hortulorum haec iugera XXXV* to *sodales* by a
certain C. Ventilius Praeconius Magnus, the main text being followed by a poem inspired
by Propertius; though this is not an early text, it is notable for its orthography, for one
finds not only *in perpetuom* and *supstituerentur*, but also quite remarkably *ibe* (recalling
Livy's *sibe*) and *perossus* (for *perosus*).

According to vol. 12 p. 2, the next volumes will include Ateste (the whole of vol.
13) and indexes to vols. 8-13 (vol. 14), and, moreover, that Ateste is already "in stampa".
One is thus pleased to observe that the pace is not slowing down.

Olli Salomies

JOHANNES BAPTISTA BRUSIN: *Inscriptiones Aquileiae* I – III. Deputazione di storia patria per il Friuli 20, Udine 1991–93. Pp. 1407.

Before one starts to use this edition, of great interest because of the importance of Aquileia and the large number of (in many cases not well known) epigraphical texts from the city and its surroundings, one should have a close look at the "premessa" of Maurizio Buora on p.p. xiii-xv (which seems to have been written quite a long time ago when the volumes were still intended to be included in the series "Inscriptiones Italiae") and possibly even a more close one at the "avvertenze per il lettore" by Claudio Zaccaria on p.p. 1257-59 (added, as it seems, at a late stage in the production of the book) which help the reader to understand many of the strange features of these volumes.

The author had already died in 1976, leaving a manuscript lacking e.g. a preface, and so the final editing (and the compilation of an index) was entrusted to M. Buora. Choosing the only reasonable policy, Buora decided to produce a "diplomatic" edition of the manuscript, eliminating only obvious errors and systemizing bibliographical references, but not altering in any way, or adding anything to, the original text. Although he does refer to this only in a somewhat vague manner, quoting (on p. xv) Le Roy Ladurie's description of a book as "having at least the merit of existing", Buora does not seem have been altogether satisfied with Brusin's work, and the reader's suspicions are fully confirmed after the perusal of Zaccaria's note, in which it is not only made clear that in general this edition represents something which would have been acceptable in the thirties, but that there are also mistakes in the readings and interpretations, not to speak of other weaknesses typical of an "opus imperfectum" (p. 1257).

All this, of course, soon becomes clear to the reader. But there is still more: although the unattractive title "Inscriptiones Aquileiae" (I would have preferred "Aquileienses") could of course be taken to mean that the collection includes m a n y , but not necessarily a l l , inscriptions from Aquileia, I think I am right in suspecting that all potential users of this book will without any hesitation think of it as a corpus, especially as the number of texts included is as high as 3570 (and moreover the outward appearance of the volumes makes one think of a *monumentum aere perennius*). However, the truth is that many Aquileian texts are in fact missing (cf. the "comparatio numerorum" on p. 1263ff.). Now it is true that some of the texts collocated under the heading "Aquileia" in CIL V were actually found somewhere else (e.g., CIL V 735 in Verona, 852 in Trieste), and were only assigned to Aquileia, in most cases probably correctly, by Mommsen on the basis of various criteria (and one would of course wish to have had Brusin's opinion on this), but for instance CIL V 852, missing here, was found in Aquileia and was seen there by Mommsen. Besides texts already in CIL V, also many inscriptions published later in various journals have apparently been omitted; for instance, I do not seem able to locate the funerary inscriptions of a C. Vibius and a T. Curius, known to me from the not very accessible journal Mittheilungen der k. u. k. Central-Commission 17 (1891) 45 and 23 (1897) 79. (And of course one should not expect to find recently discovered Aquileian texts in this collection.)

The structure of this edition also presents some peculiarities. The inscriptions are given in five sections: Republican, Imperial, Christian, inscriptions from Grado, "Additamenta". Now the uses of the separation of the Christian inscriptions from the earlier ones are of course obvious, but the separation of the Republican inscriptions from the later ones is rather problematic, many texts not being exactly datable. The separation in these sections becomes even more problematic when one considers that in the section "Additamenta" the corresponding heading has acquired the somewhat modified formulation "tituli aetati liberae rei publicae vel Augusti tribuendi". This could possibly be understandable if this section only included a few texts found after the completion of the earlier sections, but in actuality the "Additamenta" contain material for the most part already appearing in CIL V, a fact which, by the way, seems to point to serious trouble at some stage of the compilation of this collection. Most of the readers not exactly familiar with local circumstances would probably also wish to find some explanation for the fact that the texts from Grado have been given a separate section, for they seem to fit well into the series of texts from Aquileia proper, and were in any case enumerated with the rest by Mommsen; moreover, other texts coming from the *ager* of Aquileia do not seem to have received a similar treatment.

It thus seems that everything is not all right with this edition. And although I would perhaps not go as far as Zaccaria who says (on p. 1258) that the readers are advised to check in each single case the reading of Brusin by having a close look at the original or at least at the photograph – a statement certainly not common in introductions to epigraphical publications – I must say that without the photographs this edition would be only of limited use, for the readings present so many mistakes and misunderstandings (although it is true that we are usually dealing only with small details); cf. e.g. nos. 49, 182, 380, 484, 1339, 1567 (*T. lib.* in line 5), 2797, 3253, 3771 (read *Eucarpia*; and where does all the text come from which does not appear on the photograph?); and Zaccaria, p. 1258. The commentaries are also usually less impressive; what is said on onomastic matters is in any case usually practically worthless (e.g. on no. 339, "gens *Campania* Latinae originis, cf. ..." [a reference to Schulze follows]) or simply false (e.g. on no. 40).

On the other hand, since the book d o e s have photographs, brings together a large material previously scattered in publications of partly limited availability, and is furnished with indexes (on p. 1314, correct the cognomen of a certain Cn. Vibius in no. 1583 to *Quinctilis* – a previously unknown name), it goes without saying that this is, in spite of its shortcomings, a useful edition which should figure in any respectable epigraphical library. However, this does not mean that I do not feel that the job could stand to be done again.

Olli Salomies

Inscriptions Latines de Narbonnaise (I.L.N.). II. Antibes, Riez, Digne. Éd. par André Chastagnol. Gallia, Suppl. 44. Éditions du CNRS, Paris 1992. ISBN 2-222-04676-9. FRF 420.

Inscriptions Latines de la Gaule Lyonnaise. Actes de la table-ronde de novembre 1990 réunis par F. Bérard et Y. Le Bohec. Collection du Centre d'Études Romaines et Gallo-Romaines, Nouvelle série, no. 10. Lyon 1992. ISBN 2-904974-09-1. FRF 120.

Militaires romains en Gaule civile. Actes de la table-ronde de mai 1991 réunis par Y. Le Bohec et A. Buisson. Collection du Centre d'Études Romaines et Gallo-Romaines, Nouvelle série, no. 11. Lyon 1993. 77 p. ISBN 2-904974-10-5. FRF 90.

Immer mehr ist in den letzten Jahren die Erforschung einzelner Provinzen und Städte in den Vordergrund des Interesses getreten. Dies wird selbstverständlich auch bei den Veröffentlichungen der letzten Jahre deutlich.

Hier liegt nun zunächst ein weiterer Band des I.L.N. vor, in dem die Inschriften von Antibes, Riez und Digne und ihrer jeweiligen Umgebung in handlicher Form zusammengestellt werden. Dem eigentlichen Inschriftencorpus – ausgeschlossen sind lediglich die bereits leicht zugänglichen christlichen Inschriften und das Instrumentum Domesticum – geht jeweils eine ausführliche Einleitung zur Geschichte und den Hauptforschungsproblemen voraus. Zu den mit qualitätvollen Photographien, sofern möglich, und ausführlichem Kommentar inclusive einschlägiger Literatur versehenen Inschriften ermöglichen auch die differenzierten Indices einen problemlosen Zugang. A. Chastagnol fügt hier außerdem eine Liste der Inschriften, die außerhalb des jeweiligen Gebietes Bezug auf dasselbe nehmen. Der Band stellt ein weiteres wichtiges Arbeitsinstrument für die Auseinandersetzung mit diesen Städten und für vergleichendes Hinzuziehen bei der Erforschung anderer Civitates dar.

In dieselbe Richtung zielen auch die beiden vorliegenden Publikationen des Centre d'Études Romaines et Gallo-Romaines. Es handelt sich um die Akten von Round-table-Konferenzen. Band Nr. 10 befaßt sich mit dem Projekt der Inscriptions Latines de Gaule Lyonnaise (I.L.G.L.), ein paralleles Unterfangen zu den I.L.N. In sechzehn Beiträgen werden das Projekt selber und erste Übersichten über die Arbeit zu den Corpora der verschiedenen Civitates gegeben, aber auch einige neue Inschriften vorgestellt. In einigen Aufsätzen sind Spezialfragen zu Datierungskriterien, Onomastik, Material und einer Steinmetzwerkstatt behandelt. Die I.L.G.L. versprechen ein ebenso wertvolles Werkzeug zu werden wie es in den Bänden des I.L.N. bereits vorliegt. Es bleibt zu hoffen, daß die Forschung nicht allzulange darauf warten muß und daß auch für andere Provinzen diese ebenso mühsame wie anspruchs- und verdienstvolle Arbeit vorangetrieben werden kann.

Der folgende Band des C.E.R.G.R., Nr. 11, greift ein Thema auf, das bisher in der Forschung nur wenig behandelt wurde, nämlich das der Präsenz von römischem Militär im zivilen Gallien. Zwei Beiträge befassen sich mit der Frage der mutmaßlichen Cohors urbana in Lyon, außerdem werden zwei "vergessene" Lager in Aulnay-de-Saintonge und in Bliesheim-Oedenburg ins Blickfeld gerückt. Auch die Lager von Alésia und Mirebeau

werden zum einen mit Hilfe der Luftarchäologie, aber auch anhand der Inschriften beleuchtet. Schließlich zeigt ein Beitrag, in dem die Überreste von Pferdegeschirren von equites behandelt werden, die wirtschaftlichen Implikationen für offensichtlich ortsansässige Handwerker – hier am Beispiel Alésia – auf. Beide Bände sind mit qualitätsvollen Photographien und Illustrationen versehen.

Uta-Maria Liertz

DOROTHY PIKHAUS: *Répertoire des inscriptions latines versifiées de l'Afrique romaine (Ier – VIe siècles). I. Tripolitaine, Byzacène, Afrique Proconsulaire.* Epigraphica Bruxellensia 2. Bruxelles 1994. 161 pp. ISBN 2-9600010-1-X. BEL 1.000.

D. Pikhaus, déjà connue par plusieurs publications sur des *Carmina epigraphica*, était pour ainsi dire prédestinée à cette tache, sa thèse, soutenue en 1983, portant précisément sur des questions de l'épigraphie versifiée des provinces africaines. Il s'agit d'un répertoire très utile qui ne manquera pas de rendre les plus grands services aux épigraphistes, philologues et historiens, ainsi qu'aux historiens de la mentalité, qui sont tellement à la mode aujourd'hui. L'introduction succincte est suivie du répertoire même, qui se compose des références bibliographiques de tous les *carmina* africains connus, en ordre géographique. A la fin du livre sont présentés divers indices: les *initia* des inscriptions (dans une seconde liste, les inscriptions semi-métriques sont classées selon le premier élément versifié); index des mètres; index des lieux de provenance; index des noms de personne; index chronologique; index typologique; concordances.

Heikki Solin

ANTONIO FERRUA: *La polemica antiariana nei monumenti paleocristiani.* Studi di antichità cristiana 43. Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, Roma 1991. 313 p.

Il nuovo lavoro del P. Antonio Ferrua S.I. condivide le note caratteristiche dei suoi scritti precedenti: l'acume metodologico connesso con la profonda conoscenza del materiale epigrafico, archeologico e letterario paleocristiano. Questa volta si tratta di indagare come l'eventuale polemica contro il movimento ariano (nato nel IV, ma presente in diverse sfumature anche nei secc. V e VI), definito, nella chiesa cattolica (a concilio di Nicea nel 325) come una eresia, venga riecheggiata nelle iscrizioni. Sono stati presi in considerazione non solo i testi ma in alcuni casi anche la parte iconografica dei

monumenti nonché l'uso accentuato, – a volte indicativo dell'antiarianesimo, – dei tre cristogrammi sui monumenti. Un lettore laico potrebbe, però, domandarsi: a cosa serve, per la maggior comprensione delle dispute, concentrarsi esclusivamente sulla polemica antiariana e lasciare fuori i documenti di stampo ariano?

Jaakko Aronen

WOLFGANG KUHOFF: *Felicior Augusto Melior Traiano. Aspekte der Selbstdarstellung der römischen Kaiser während der Prinzipatszeit*. Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main 1993. 373 S., 15 Tafeln. ISBN 3-631-46228-X. DEM 89.

Keine umfassende Untersuchung kaiserlicher Selbstdarstellung will Kuhoff auf diesen fast 400 eng und sehr klein beschriebenen Seiten geben. Vielmehr soll auf der Basis von Inschriften, Münzen und archäologischen Funden die öffentliche Eigenwerbung der Kaiser von Augustus bis in die Mitte des dritten Jahrhunderts beschrieben werden. Im Mittelpunkt stehen die Vermittlung von Herrschaftsübernahme und -weitergabe und die Methoden der Leistungspräsentation. Von vornherein ausgeschlossen bleiben literarische Quellen – ausführlich behandelt werden die Res Gestae des Augustus, sowie der Panegyricus des Plinius – und der gesamte Bereich des Kaiserkultes (ob dessen völliges Übergehen sinnvoll und berechtigt ist, soll dahingestellt bleiben).

Im ersten Großabschnitt werden nach einem historischen Überblick zunächst die verschiedenen Darstellungsträger, nämlich Münzen, Inschriften, bildliche Zeugnisse und Nutz– und Repräsentativbauwerke in ihren Besonderheiten und ihrer Wirkungsart als Transporteure kaiserlichen Selbstverständnisses vorgestellt. Darauf folgt im zweiten Teil die Behandlung von Nachfolgeregelungen. Leider bleibt die eigentliche Selbstdarstellung gegenüber der etwas langatmigen Beschreibung fast aller Nachfolgeregelungen bis Numerianus sehr im Hintergrund. Zwar wird das Faktum "Bekanntmachung der Herrschaftsnachfolge bzw. -rechtfertigung" immer wieder betont. Meist vergeblich aber sucht man nach einer eingehenden Untersuchung des Wie dieser Bekanntmachung oder gar konkreter Unterschiede zwischen den verschiedenen Kaisern. Immerhin ermöglichen die Hinweise in den Fußnoten dem Leser ein schnelles Auffinden der Quellen, so daß er selbst diese Lücke schließen kann.

Daran schließt sich die Untersuchung der Fürsorgetätigkeit für die Reichsbevölkerung und ihre Propagierung an. Hier weist der Autor darauf hin, daß etwa die Lebensmittel– und Wasserversorgung in Rom, Straßen und Nutzbauten aber auch Festveranstaltungen und Maßnahmen wie z.B. Trajans Alimentarinstitution per se die Sorge, Großzügigkeit und Güte des jeweiligen Kaisers zumindest in der jeweils profitierenden Umgebung zeigte. Sie wurden daher mit Hilfe von Münzen nur sporadisch und vereinzelt verkündet. (Diese Verkündigungsfunktion der Münzen sollte sowieso nicht überschätzt werden). Daß die Kaiser dieser zivilen Tätigkeit dennoch

große Bedeutung gaben, zeigt der Ehrenbogen Trajans von benevent, den der Autor in einem sehr fundierten Exkurs beschreibt und deutet (wobei im sonst sehr umfangreichen Anmerkungsapparat Hinweise auf die Tafeln am Ende des Buches hilfreich gewesen wären). Anders als im zivilen Bereich – man sollte nicht übersehen, daß die Selbstdarstellung hier im Ganzen eher ein Nebeneffekt ist – zielen die danach im Rahmen von Außen– und Grenzpolitik behandelten Siegesdenkmäler, nämlich Triumphbögen und -säulen sowie Reiterstatuen ganz direkt auf die Selbstdarstellung der eigenen Macht und des kaiserlichen Selbstverständnisses.

Im zusammenfassenden Schlußkapitel wird als Entwicklungsstrang deutlich, daß das aus der Darstellung von Persönlichkeit und Leistung gewonnene Monopol der Selbstdarstellung im Laufe der Jahrhunderte zu einer Verselbständigung der Selbstdarstellung führt, deren Anspruch in keinem Verhältnis mehr zur Bewältigung der konkreten Aufgaben steht. Auf den Selbstdarstellungswert der vielfältigen Dokumente, die über die verschiedenen Indices leicht zu ermitteln sind, aufmerksam gemacht zu haben, ist sicher ein bleibendes Verdienst.

Uta-Maria Liertz

DIRK-ACHIM KUKOFKA: *Süditalien im Zweiten Punischen Krieg.* Europäische Hochschulschriften. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main 1990. xxi, 181 S. ISSN 0531-7320; ISBN 3-631-42792-1.

Eine Dissertation von guter Qualität, wie man von Heidelberger Spezimina zu erwarten gewohnt ist. Schon das zehn Seiten lange Literaturverzeichnis ist Zeichen einer ungeheuren Arbeitsleistung. Die Untersuchung ist vor allem historisch angelegt. Auf der Grundlage einer gesichteten Überlieferung wird eine Beschreibung und Interpretation des Kriegsablaufes in Süditalien worunter der Verfasser in erster Linie Lucania, Bruttii und Calabria versteht, gegeben. Der Quellenanalyse wird der ihr gebührende Platz eingeräumt. Als eine Art Kommentar zu den Passagen antiker Historiker hat der Verfasser Verdienstliches geleistet; der inneren Geschichte der fraglichen Landschaften mißt er nicht so große Aufmerksamkeit bei. Alles im allem aber eine gelungene Dissertation.

Heikki Solin

FRANCESCA REDUZZI MEROLA: *"Servo parere": Studi sulla condizione giuridica degli schiavi vicari e dei sottoposti a schiavi nelle esperienze greca e romana.* Pubbl. della Facoltà di Giurisprudenza della Università di Camerino 35. Jovene Editore 1990. 305 p.

This book is a study on the juridical condition of the *servi vicarii* in the Greek (Chapter I) and the Roman world (Chapters II-VI), the stress, obviously, heavily on the Roman side. Chapter II treats the *servi vicarii* and *servi peculiares* in Plautus, Cato and Cicero. Chapters III, IV, and VI are dedicated to the analysis of the juridical writers, Chapter V to the inscriptions with an excursion to the *Cena Trimalchionis*. The latest period treated is that of Hadrian. After that time, the number of the sources on *vicarii* diminishes strongly, and the institution seems to lose its importance.

The author clearly brings out the elaborateness of the Roman slave system which included not only the *vicarii* but also the *vicarii* of the *vicarii*. The term could also have many meanings, in some cases the *vicarius* was not the substitute of the slave, owned by the slave, but an assistant, employed thus by the wish of the *dominus*.

Pekka Tuomisto

HANS VOLKMANN: *Die Massenversklavungen der Einwohner eroberte Städte in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit.* Zweite, durchges. und erw. Aufl. von Gerhard Horsmann. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1990. 202 S. ISBN 3-515-05770-6.

Das zuerst im Jahre 1961 erschienene Werk von Hans Volkmann fand als Pionierarbeit weithin Beachtung und Zustimmung. Wegen der regen Nachfrage des seit langem vergriffenen Büchleins entschloß sich die Kommision für Geschichte des Altertums der Mainzer Akademie, es neu aufzulegen. Bei der Bearbeitung wurde der Weg eines Neudrucks gewählt, der durch zahlreiche Berichtigungen und Nachträge des Bearbeiters, G. Horsmann, begleitet ist. Man begrüßt mit Freude die Neuauflage des klassischen Büchlein; nur fragt man sich, ob der gewählte Weg eines mit Nachträgen versehenen Neudruckes (in dem sogar reine Druck– und Akzentfehler stehengeblieben sind, die erst in den Nachträgen korrigiert werden) statt einer Neubearbeitung richtig war. Denn Volkmanns Studie hat neben unbestreitbaren Verdiensten auch etliche Schwächen, auf die auch der Bearbeiter hinweist. Schon der Ausgangspunkt der Untersuchung, die Auffassung, den gefangenen Einwohnern eroberten Städte habe sich im Gegensatz zu den von ihrer Heimatgemeinde losgekauften in einer Schlacht Gefangenen keine Chance mehr eröffnen können, der Sklaverei zu entgehen, ist in ihren Prämissen verfehlt. Trotz dieser und anderer Beanstandungen haben wir es mit einer durchaus nützlichen Bearbeitung des schwierigen Stoffes zu tun, der hoffentlich in einer nicht allzu langer Zeit eine völlige Neubearbeitung des Themas folgen wird.

Heikki Solin

ELISABETH HERRMANN-OTTO: *Ex ancilla natus: Untersuchungen zu den "haus-geborenen" Sklaven und Sklavinnen im Westen des Römischen Kaiserreiches.* Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei 24. Franz Steiner, Stuttgart 1994. viii, 512 S. ISBN 3-515-06329-3. DEM 168.

This book is an admirably richly documented and detailed study on houseborn slaves. The starting point is the controversial question of the importance of the natural reproduction of slaves. As the ancient sources are insufficient in many ways, the question has received very different answers over the years.

The first part of the book begins with a profound analysis of the meaning of the term *verna* itself, and of its juridical implications, followed by an equally painstaking discussion on the position of the *vernae* and *ex ancillis nati* in the family, and in the *familia*, both private and imperial. The special groups *vernae vicarii*, *servi publici* and *municipales* are also treated separately. The evidence is mostly based on the inscriptions, and also the juridical literature. As a result we are given a detailed picture of the many-sided nomenclature of the *vernae*, and of the terminology that is used in the inscriptions and texts that deal with them.

The second part deals with the more general question, namely the significance of natural reproduction. The method chosen is to follow the "career" of the *verna* from birth to death. This is due to the well-known fact that the source material does not allow statistics to be applied, when it comes, for example, to the birth and mortality rates of the slave population.

In the end, the author is careful not to give definitive answers too readily, and understandably so, considering the incoherence of the sources. Nevertheless, she concludes the book, answering the initial question as follows: "Dennoch kann man abschließend sagen, daß neben anderen Quellen wie Aussetzung, Menschenraub und -handel sowie weniger stark praktizierter Kriegsgefangenschaft die unfreie Geburt eine bedeutsame Rolle für den Fortbestand der römischen Sklaverei vor allem in der Kaiserzeit bis in die Spätantike gespielt hat, jedoch ohne alle Systematisierung und Planung, die dem Römer auf diesem Gebiet fremd war."

Pekka Tuomisto

Current Research on the Romanization of the Western Provinces. Ed. by Mark Wood and Francisco Queiroga. BAR International Series S575. Tempus Reparatum. Oxford 1992. 121 p. ISBN 0-86054-728-0. GBP 21.00.

"Opportunity or Opposition?: Life in the West from Roman Conquest until the end of the Roman Empire" war der Titel eines Symposions in Oxford im November 1989. Viele der dort vorgetragenen Forschungsergebnisse werden hier in neun Beiträgen

unter dem Stichwort "Romanisierung" wiedergegeben. Moderne Technik erlaubt auch die Wiedergabe vieler Tabellen und Karten. Gemeinsam ist den meisten Aufsätzen auch der fast ausschließlich archäologische Ansatzpunkt.

Die ersten beiden Beiträge befassen sich mit Fragen des agrarischen Umfeldes. M. Millet zeigt anhand von Beispielen die Möglichkeiten und Gefahren statistischer Untersuchungen als neue, unabhängige Quelle auf, während C.C. Haselgrove und C.J. Scull die gallo-römische Belgica in ihrer Untersuchung der Besiedlungsstrukturen in die Spanne von vor– zu nachrömischer Zeit einbetten. J. Drinkwater und H. Vertet wundern sich in ihrem Artikel "'Opportunity' and 'Opposition' in Roman Gaul?" über den erstaunlich geringen Widerstand und führen das darauf zurück, daß einerseits Grundbesitzer und Händler vom neuen System profitieren, aber die Masse der Bevölkerung, Landarbeiter und kleine Handwerker, in ein größeres Abhängigkeits-verhältnis mit verringerten Widerstandsmöglichkeiten gerät.

Die folgenden Aufsätze beschäftigen sich mit einzelnen Regionen des westlichen Raumes. P. Galliou kommt für die Bretagne trotz der archäologisch nachweisbaren Integration, was den Handel betrifft, aufgrund der spärlichen Inschriftenreste aus römischer Zeit auf Analphabetismus der Führungsschicht schließend und aufgrund der Kontinuität von Götter-und Beerdigungsriten zu dem Ergebnis, daß Armorica nie ganz aus ihrer Urgeschichte ("protohistoire") herausgekommen ist. P. Blaszkiewicz weist mit hilfe von hand– und kunsthandwerklichen Resten sowie der Handelsrouten die zwar nicht privilegierte, aber doch integrierte Stellung der Normandie nach. Nach Untersuchung der vorrömischen Festungen, der römischen Villen und des Handels kommen J. Naveiro López und F. Pérez Losada für Galizien zu der Schlußfolgerung, daß unter römischer Herrschaft ein Ausgleich zwischen dem vorher reicheren Küstengebiet und dem Inland stattgefunden hat und daß der Seehandel stark abgenommen hat.Dieser spanische Artikel wird auf English zusammengefasst.

Die letzten drei Beiträge wenden sich wieder allgemeineren Fragen zu. P. J. Casey vergleicht die Einführung des Geldhandels (monetization) in Dritte-Welt-Ländern mit der Entwicklung des allgemeinen Geldverkehrs in Britannien im 1. Jh. n. Chr. Er stellt fest, daß das Heer erst nach seiner festen Ansiedlung durch Warenaustausch zur Vergeldlichung betrug, daß aber vor allem das Steuersystem Geld notwendig machte und auswärtige Geldverleiher somit zur Bildung von Märkten beitrugen und unterpriviligierten eine Chance gaben. Ein für Rom erfreulicher Nebeneffekt sei, daß die vorrömische Führungsschicht, um ihren Lebensstandard zu halten, Schulden machte und als Folge nach ein bis zwei Generationen verschwand. K. Greene beschäftigt sich mit dem Technologietransfer und weist außer auf die Notwendigkeit der Nachfrage auch auf die bedeutende Rolle des Heeres hin. Im letzten Beitrag schließlich unternimmt Y. Perrin den ebenso amüsanten wie interessanten Versuch – er selbst überschreibt ihn mit "Divertissement géopolitique" –, eine Brücke von keltisch-römischen Verhältnissen zu Caesars Zeiten zum Wahlverhalten in heutigen Frankreich zu schlagen. Anlaß dazu geben einige Karten, in denen die im 20. Jahrhundert überwiegend konservativ wählenden Gebiete mit denen der antirömisch eingestellten Stämme zur Zeit der

Eroberung durch Rom übereinstimmen und umgekehrt. Abgesehen von den zahlreichen, historisch fundierten Gedankengängen weist Perrin sicher zu Recht auf die Notwendigkeit und die Aufgabe der historischen Geographie hin, den Raum in die historische Reflexion zu integrieren.

Insgesamt gesehen bietet die Sammlung sowohl inhaltlich als auch methodisch anregende neue Aspekte.

Uta-Maria Liertz

RICHARD DUNCAN-JONES: *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990. xvi, 245 p. ISBN 0-521-35477-3. GBP 35.00.

This book is a sequel to the author's *Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies* (1974). The thirteen essays are heterogenous and hardly constitue an integrated work; and sometopics are only tangentially related to economic matters. They are organised into five parts: Time and Distance, on communication and trade (the first essay, "Communication-Speed and Contact by Sea in the Roman Empire" is a very important contribution, providing new documentation from Egypt on the passage of time between the death of emperors and the first known official references to their successors in surviving documents; another question, also worth further exploration, would be that of the speed of diffusion of new consuls' names); Demography and Manpower, on questions of age-awareness, life-expectancy, and military recruitment; Agrarian Patterns, on land-holding and the price of wheat in Egypt, The World of Cities, on public construction in Roman cities; and Tax-Payment and Tax-Assessment, on the collection of taxes during the principate and late empire. This is a most welcome addition to the literature on Roman social and economic history. Duncan-Jones has put classicists deeply in his debt by his work in collecting and analysing statistical data about Roman empire and thus bringing new insights to the study of ancient history. This debt has recently been deepened further by Duncan-Jones' fresh work *Money and Government in the Roman Empire* (1994).

Heikki Solin

Nomos. Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society, eds. Paul Cartledge, Paul Millett and Stephen Todd. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990, xv, 240 p. ISBN 0-521-37022-1. GBP 30.00.

The present book, a collection of papers originating in a series of seminars held in Cambridge in 1986-7, deals with the question of how legal texts may be used as documents in writing a history of society. That the emphasis lies more on historical than purely juridical aspects is seen also by the fact that all the contributors are ancient historians, mostly British scholars of the younger or middle generation. This has given an underlying unity to the book, which sets out to explore the relationship between law on the one hand and society and politics on the other, which historians of ancient Greece have in the past tended to treat as separate subjects. This is a salutary approach, making this a book of central importance. Its contents are as follows: Law, society and Athens; The purpose of evidence in Athenian courts; Fowl play: a curious law-suit in classical Athens; Plato and the Athenian law of theft; Vexatious litigation in classical Athens: sykophancy and the sykophant; The sykophant and sykophancy: vexatious redefinition?; The law of *hubris* in Athens; The Solonian law of *hubris*; The social context of adultery at Athens; Sale, credit and exchange in Athenian law and society.

Greek law has recently been described as "notoriously a step-child in modern study" (Finley), and according to the authors of the first chapter of this book, Athenian law could even be called "a step-child overawed by several overbearing sisters". So modern approaches in the field are most welcome, and this collection in particular contains good contributions with interesting points of view and fruitful discussions. If some of the contents seem somewhat superfluous, and we see well-known facts repeated, that lies more in the tradition of English scholarship. All in all, this is a well-balanced contribution to an important but often underestimated subject.

Heikki Solin

VALENTINA MANZELLI: *La policromia nella statuaria greca arcaica.* Studia archaeologica 69. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1994. 342 p., 20 ill. b/n, 21 tav. a col. f.t. ISBN 88-7062-854-X. ITL 350.000.

È uscito un importante libro di Valentina Manzelli sulla policromia nella statuaria greca arcaica. L'autrice ha preso come soggetto dello studio un aspetto della statuaria antica riconosciuto già da secoli ma spesso dimenticato e trascurato. Il Palladio e specialmente il Winckelmann sono colpevoli del concetto della pura colorazione bianca della statuaria greca. La scultura e l'architettura greca non si differenziano, però, dalla policromia delle altre civiltà del bacino mediterraneo, e per questo l'autrice vuole esaminare la filosofia, il valore simbolico e l'aspetto estetico della policromia in un contesto vasto.

Il materiale, 223 statue o rilievi, è stato scelto per due motivi. Le tracce della poli-cromia sono rilevabili in maggiore quantità quasi esclusivamente sulla statuaria arcaica, che ha goduto di una obliterazione volontaria in antico. Non essendo state esposte all'aria per millenni, le opere si sono meglio preservate. Questo criterio per la sua scelta del materiale la Manzelli lo esprime solo a p. 157 del suo libro. Suo altro criterio, espresso solo a p. 276, è che cronologicamente le statue arcaiche sono più vicine alla nascita della codificazione del legame fra colore e simbolo, che poi col tempo diventa un comune mezzo di espressione. A parte sculture stesse il materiale per lo studio comprende naturalmente le fonti letterarie che testimoniano un ampio uso della policromia nella decorazione dei monumenti, i dati forniti da numerosissimi resti scultorei, spesso meglio visibili nelle prime fotografie fatte nell' Ottocento, e anche la catalogazione dei reperti alla registrazione della realtà oggettiva quale fu rilevata da viaggiatori e archeologi a partire del Settecento.

Il primo capitolo d'introduzione è molto utile. L'autrice presenta e commenta la bibliografia precedente sulla policromia di monumenti antichi. I primi studiosi, contemporanei del Winckelmann, dovettero già affrontare il problema della policromia, ma la questione venne aperta ufficialmente solo nel 1814. All'inizio si credeva che la policromia fosse limitata all'età arcaica e alle pietre povere. Poi, nel 1833 una disputa sulla presenza di tracce della policromia sulla Colonna Traiana aprì la strada alla discussione sulla tecnica utilizzata per il fissaggio dei colori sul marmo. Il problema della policromia aveva visto il suo culmine fra gli anni '30 e '50 dell'Ottocento. Nell'altra metà dell'Ottocento si giunse a tacerne del tutto, per quanto si riconoscesse, ad esempio, il problema della colorazione delle copie di originali bronzei. La prospettiva mutò dall'inizio del Novecento. Le opere della Richter, del Boëthius e specialmente lo studio del P. Dimitriou del 1947 hanno preparato la strada per il nuovo studio della Manzelli.

Nella prima sezione del libro, piuttosto sostanziosa, l'autrice si concentra a presentare l'uso e la simbologia dei colori nelle civiltà antiche, accennando un sistema cromatico quasi esclusivamente triadico – rosso bianco e nero (solo in una quantità modesta anche blu-azzurro e giallo-oro), cioè la triade primordiale dei colori fondamentali, su cui influì solo il cristianesimo, con i suoi codici simbolici diversi, che introduce in luogo di porpora un altro colore dominante, *caeruleus color*, cioè l'azzurro. Per gli antichi i colori erano elementi integrati in un contesto culturale articolato e complesso. Si potrebbe istituire, secondo la Manzelli, una relazione fra le classi sociali, le divinità loro protettrici e i colori. I molti nomi dei colori non definiscono con precisione le gradazioni e le sfumature diverse, e sembra che non fosse il colore vero e proprio ad avere un valore incisivo per gli antichi, bensì la sua luminosità.

L'altra sezione del libro si divide in due capitoli: le fonti letterarie sulla tecnica di pittura delle statue e le evidenze letterarie e archeologiche dei pigmenti utilizzati. La dipintura di una statua doveva essere un'usanza diffusa, un fatto riflesso anche dagli accenni sommari e dalle brevi descrizioni riservate ad una pratica comune e a un'abitudine della realtà quotidiana. La Manzelli analizza meritevolmente le voci *ganosis, kosmesis, circumlitio* e conclude che la pittura su pietra era eseguita in tutti i

periodi della storia dell'arte greca e romana mediante la tecnica dell'encausto. L'uso della tempera era un'altra tecnica utilizzata per la dipintura dei monumenti.

Mediante l'uso dell'archivio computerizzato Daidalos si sono potuti analizzare accuratamente, ad es., i colori, la loro locazzione, la funzione dell'oggetto (votivi, funerari, cultuali), il materiale, la provenienza. Dall'analisi dell'uso dei colori emerge con un'evidenza inconfutabile la netta prevalenza del rosso (94%). La grande percentuale riflette anche il metodo dell'autrice di non analizzare le porzioni di superficie sulle quali compare. Un altro fattore importante è il basso costo del pigmento rosso, derivato da ocre (ossidi di ferro), facili da reperire in tutto il territorio ellenico. Secondo l'autrice anche questo fatto ha aumentato l'uso del rosso. Mancano, però, le analisi chimiche per precisare i pigmenti utilizzati. Emerge anche che le tinte vengono combinate secondo regole ben precise ed erano accuratamente evitate combinazioni di colori intermedi.

Come ho detto all'inizio, si tratta di un libro molto importante. C'è comunque qualche cosa sia nella forma che nel testo stesso che avrebbe meritato un po' di revisione, per evitare le ripetizioni, come p. es. le continue implicazioni simboliche con i colori e l'uso delle fonti secondarie. Nella seconda sezione l'analisi dei colori si fonda sul vocabolario europeo, e prende esempi addirittura dall'irlandese, dall'islandese e da parole baltiche. Per la statuaria stessa la Manzelli ha voluto escludere, però, l'inventariazione di tutti i reperti riferibili all'area magnogreca e siceliota, perché il loro studio avrebbe portato ad inevitabili confronti con la produzione artistica italica. Il sistema Daidalos, molto importante e interessante in sé, avrebbe potuto essere presentato nell'appendice.

Leena Pietilä-Castrén

LUIGI POLACCO: *Il teatro di Dioniso Eleutereo ad Atene*. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 186 p. ISBN 88-7062-685-7. ITL 220.000.

Si tratta di un'importante edizione del teatro di Dioniso Eleutèreo ad Atene, la prima che soddisfi alle esigenze moderne della scienza antichistica. Non è poco, dopo i magistrali studi del Dörpfeld, del Bulle e del Fiechter. In dieci capitoli vengono trattate le parti vitali del teatro, cominciando dalle strutture precedenti il teatro stesso. L'ultimo capitolo è dedicato alla storia del teatro, dai primordi fino all'età imperiale. Un ben riuscito volume, importante non solo per gli studiosi di architettura ed archeologia, ma anche per i normali antichisti. Come si sa, il nome di Eschilo e di altri autori è legato alle sorti di questo teatro.

Heikki Solin

GIUSEPPE ANDREASSI, MIMMA LABELLARTE, GRAZIA A. MARUGGI, ANNA PATERA: *Ceramica greca della collezione Chini nel museo civico di Bassano*. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore 1990. 111 p. ISBN 88-7689-052-1.

Il ritmo della pubblicazione della bella collana delle collezioni e musei archeologici del Veneto, che esce sotto la benemerita egida della Casa editrice Giorgio Bretschneider, si è in ultimi tempi aliquanto rallentato. Questo volume, l'ultimo finora uscito, è dedicato alla ceramica greca della Collezione Chini nel Museo Civico di Bassano del Grappa, e viene così a completare due precedenti volumi della stessa collana dedicati alla ceramica italiota e apula. In esso vengono descritti i tre generi di ceramica greca maggiormente presenti nella collezione: ceramica corinzia (e imitazioni), ceramica attica a figure nere e a figure rosse, ceramica greca a vernice nera; ognuna delle tre parti è stata redatta da diversi autori. Le descrizioni sono di buona qualità, come anche le fotografie. Nell'insieme un volume ben riuscito.

Heikki Solin

MARIA WEBER: *Baldachine und Statuenschreine*. Archaeologia 87. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1990. xviii, 258 S. ISSN 0391-9293; ISBN 88-7689-036-X.

Die Aufgabe des aus einer Frankfurter Dissertation hervorgegangenen Buches ist es die griechischen Baldachine und Statuenschreine von ihren Vorläufern in Ägypten und im Alten Orient herzuleiten und auf diese Weise zu ihrem Verständnis beizutragen; auch der römische Befund wird berücksichtigt. Es gab bisher keine zusammenfassende Untersuchung zum Thema, so daß das Buch eine Forschungslücke schließt. Anerkennung findet die Bestrebung der Verfasserin, das regional und zeitlich weit gestreute Material zusammenfassend zu interpretieren, auch wenn einiges problematisch bleibt; der Rez., ein Nichtspezialist, hat das Gefühl, daß in manchen Einzelbereichen noch weitere Untersuchungen nötig sind.

Heikki Solin

Analecta Romana Instituti Danici XIX. Ed. cur. Tage Nielsen. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 261 p. ISBN 88-7062-690-3. ITL 160.000.
Analecta Romana Instituti Danici XX. Ed. cur. Otto Steen Due, Karen Ascani, Jesper Carlsen. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1992. 194 p. ISSN 0066-1392. ITL 85.000.

Ecco due nuovi interessantissimi volumi della serie dell'Istituto danese di Roma. Spiccano nel XIX volume l'articolo di un'équipe su questioni demografiche dei demi attici alla luce delle iscrizioni sepolcrali, un contributo importante, e quello della Nielsen sulle sacerdotesse ed associazioni cultuali femminili in Etruria, senza dimenticare gli altri contributi riguardanti l'antichità classica, anch'essi importanti per un antichista. Come è noto, l'interesse dell'Istituto dei fratelli scandinavi non è limitato all'antichità classica, e anche gli articoli sui tempi recentiori contenuti nei volumi sono pieni di argomenti interessanti. Il XX volume, che comprende anche tre contributi di antichisti italiani, è anch'esso di grande interesse. A mo' d'esempio ricordo il contributo del Gradel sulla dedica di Mamia a Pompei e quello del Carlsen sul magister pecoris. Insomma, due volumi ben riusciti.

Heikki Solin

The Inscribed Economy: Production and distribution in the Roman empire in the light of instrumentum domesticum. *The proceedings of a conference held at The American Academy in Rome on 10-11 January, 1992.* Edited by W.V. Harris. Journal of Roman Archaeology. Supplementary Series 6. Ann Arbor, MI 1993. 192 p. USD 39.75.

The preface by W.V. Harris to this publication was written within ten months after the conference itself. The editor writes that this speed is "reasonable"; it is, in my opinion, more admirable than reasonable.

The introductory part begins with W.V. Harris' article, in which he raises many pertinent questions concerning the history of the Roman economy, showing "where some of the pathways into the very imperfectly explored interior of the Roman economy are situated." Silvio Panciera, in his part, introduces "Un gruppo romano per lo studio dell'*instrumentum domesticum*", an initiative indeed worthy of support concerning the development of the publication and study of this material group.

Part 2 is concerned with some specific stamped products. Daniele Manacorda brings the utility of comparing groups of stamped products into consideration in his article "Appunti sulla bollatura in età romana." The other articles, Daniele Manacorda's and Clementina Panella's "Anfore", Carlo Pavolini's "I bolli sulle lucerne fittili delle officine centro-italiche", Giuseppe Pucci's "I bolli sulla *terra sigillata*: fra epigrafia e storia economica", Mara Sternini's "I vetri" and Emilio Rodríguez-Almeida's "Graffiti e produzione anforaria della Betica", not only describe the actual state of the study of each material group, but could be used as an introduction to the field in general.

Three articles (by J. Theodore Peña, Gloria Olcese, Gerwulf Schneider) are dedicated to new and promising scientific methods which may in the future totally change the approach to the study of the Roman pottery by offering a more accurate way of determining the age and origin of the products. The results achieved so far seem to be quite promising.

In the fourth part the questions of the organization of the *instrumentum domesticum* in general are approached by Margareta Steinby; J. Clayton Fant treats the distribution of the imperial marbles, and Jean-Jacques Aubert discusses the feature of the workshop manager.

The volume is concluded by the articles of André Tchernia ("Des timbres d'amphores à l'organisation du commerce") and W.V. Harris ("Production, distribution, and *instrumentum domesticum*"). In general, I feel that the importance of this collection lies not so much in the answers it gives to the various questions concerning the *instrumentum domesticum*, but for its inspiring spirit, by demonstrating the many opportunities for further study.

Pekka Tuomisto

Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae, vol. I (A-C). A cura di Eva Margareta Steinby. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1992. 485 p., 196 ill. ISBN 88-7097-019-1. ITL 240.000.

L'impresa gigantesca di procurare un nuovo repertorio topografico della città di Roma è stata felicemente inaugurata con la pubblicazione del primo volume del *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae* da parte di un folto gruppo internazionale di studiosi sotto la direzione esperta di Eva Margareta Steinby, ora ordinaria di archeologia dell'impero Romano all'Università di Oxford. I precedenti repertori topografici, sia il *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* di S.B. Platner e Thomas Ashby che il *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* di Ernest Nash, risultano già, dopo gli ultimi scavi ed i rispettivi studi, irrimediabilmente invecchiati. È da felicitarsi con la casa editrice Quasar di Severino Tognon ed il comitato scientifico per il risultato ottenuto e per aver potuto disporre di un gruppo di esperti così autorevole disposto a lavorare insieme. Gli editori hanno preferito pubblicare i singoli lemmi nella lingua originale degli autori (italiano, inglese, francese o tedesco), evitando così le eventuali difficoltà di traduzione. Ovviamente, questo fatto limita in una certa misura la divulgazione del *Lexicon* tra il pubblico facendone piuttosto uno strumento per i soli studiosi. Ne segue che le esigenze di esattezza dell'informazione fornita crescono ancora.

Il compito della direttrice e del comitato scientifico non dev' essere stato né facile né invidiabile: alcuni degli esperti chiamati a partecipare al lavoro non l'hanno potuto compiere delegando il compito ad allievi. Sebbene loro stessi abbiano spesso controllato il risultato, ciò ha lasciato delle tracce nel complesso. Come spesso succede, alcuni degli

autori non hanno rispettato i limiti stabiliti in precedenza con la direzione, e la direttrice ammette di non aver voluto violentemente tagliare i testi. Ha ragione nel sostenere che qualche volta ciò è stato giustificato dalla novità e importanza dei dati esposti. Ne risulta, comunque, un certo squilibrio tra i vari lemmi. Può sorprendere, ad esempio, che gli articoli su *Arcus Augusti* e *Atrium Vestae* risultano altrettanto lunghi che l'intero articolo, pur ottimo, del Wiseman *su Campus Martius*. Fra molti altri begli articoli vale la pena di menzionare per l'integrità d'informazione quello di Alessandro Viscogliosi su *Apollo, aedes in Circo*.

Ogni tanto si avvertono, fra i vari autori, lievi tracce di polemica che forse non apparterrebbero ad un'opera di questo genere. Cito, ad es. i due lemmi su *Aemiliana* del Coarelli e del Rodríguez Almeida, oppure l'articolo del Coarelli su *Athenaeum,* e quelli dello Zevi su *Atrium Minervae* e *Chalcidicum,* in cui lo stesso passo di Cassio Dione è citato ben tre volte in diverso contesto topografico. Per quanto riguarda gli *Aedificia Mummiana,* Domenico Palombi insiste nell'interpretare il passo (Paul. Fest. 125 L) come nome di *un* monumento, benché sia ben chiaro che si tratti di vari monumenti, come in altri casi corrispondenti (ad es. *Aemiliana*). Può meravigliare che nel suo lungo articolo su *Arcus Constantini* Alessandra Capodiferro non abbia minimamente toccato la recente discussione sulla datazione dell'arco stesso.

La scelta delle illustrazioni mi sembra alquanto inconsistente: alcuni dei lemmi sono forniti di parecchie piante e fotografie, anche grandissime (ad. es. figg. 1-2; 72-76; 96, 102-107; 136-139; 185188), mentre altri ne risultano privi. La qualità non è sempre ottima (ad es. fig. 16). Il già menzionato bell'articolo del Wiseman su *Campus Martius* avrebbe meritato una pianta disegnata apposta tenendo conto delle informazioni dettagliate che l'autore fornisce sui suoi confini che egli definisce molto specifici.

Le mancanze che ho notato sono poche; per completare citerei i seguenti casi:
Apollo Argenteus CIL VI 29967;
Sex arae 9178 (meglio sotto *ara* che non sotto *sex!*);
Ara marmorea 9403, 10020, Epigraphica 38 (1976), 46?;
Aureliana (horrea?) 37780;
Balneum Augustae 33765;
Catedrae duae 10037.

È da augurarsi che i prossimi volumi escano presto e che continuino a dimostrare lo stesso acume scientifico nonostante il trasferimento della direttrice a nuova sede.

Paavo Castrén

Artigiani e botteghe nell'Italia preromana. A cura di Maria Bonghi Jovino. Studia Archaeologica 56. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 252 p., 38 tav. ISBN 88-7062-698-7. ITL 200.000.

In questo volume collettivo, nato da un seminario sulla coroplastica antica vengono affrontati alcuni aspetti della vasta e complessa realtà dell'artigianato artistico di area etrusco-laziale-campana nel quadro dell'Italia preromana. I singoli contributi impostano vari problemi specifici e generali alla luce di monumenti noti o anche inediti. Attraverso il controllo dei dati di base, effettuato tramite varie analisi, si esplorano i modi, i tempi e la dinamica dei vari aspetti dell'artigianato artistico. Il volume si può intendere quale un contributo alla delineazione della fisionomia e dell'attività degli artigiani e delle loro botteghe nell'area considerata.

Heikki Solin

MARIA JOSÈ STRAZZULLA: *Il principato di Apollo. Mito e propaganda nelle lastre "Campana" dal tempio di Apollo Palatino.* Studia Archaeologica 57. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 147 p. ISBN 88-7062-704-7. ITL 120.000.

Questo lavoro è dedicato alle famose lastre "Campana" rinvenute nell'area del tempio di Apollo sul Palatino. La maggior parte di esse sono note da tempo, ma nel 1968, nel corso degli scavi condotti nell'area del tempio, si rinvennero numerosi nuovi frammenti di antefisse e di lastre, il che ha dato nuovi impulsi all'interpretazione di questo gruppo di monumenti. Per l'alto livello qualitativo della loro esecuzione e per la peculiarità di temi mitologici e decorativi in esse insiti, le lastre "Campana" costituiscono un nucleo di fondamentale importanza nella ricostruzione della genesi e dello sviluppo di questa categoria di decorazione architettonica, per cui il tentativo dell'autrice di riprendere il loro studio è senz'altro lodevole. L'analisi da ella effettuata consente di recuperare il filo conduttore che legava tra loro i vari soggetti, nell'ambito di un ponderato programma iconografico dove propaganda politica ed ispirazione religiosa si fondevano in un'unità organica, per il tramite di una riappropriazione del mito greco, destinata a creare i presupposti del nascente principato. La discussione va avanti: pressoché contemporaneamente è uscito un importante articolo di E. Lefèvre, "Das Bild-Programm des Apollo-Tempels auf dem Palatin", Xenia 1989, che differisce, anche notevolmente, dalla Strazzulla in alcuni punti essenziali.

Heikki Solin

Il Palazzo del Quirinale: Catalogo delle sculture. A cura di Lucia Guerrini e Carlo Gasparri. Collezioni romane di antichità 3. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1993. viii, 256 p., 2 ill., 65 tav. f. t. ISBN 88-7062-819-1. ITL 300.000.

Ebbi il piacere di annunciare alcuni anni or sono in questa rivista (Arctos 23, 1989, 299) il volume preparatorio sulle collezioni di antichità del Palazzo del Quirinale, ed ecco ora il ponderoso volume del catalogo delle sculture a nostra disposizione. Il catalogo comprende tutti i materiali attualmente in situ nel palazzo e nei giardini. Si tratta di una superba edizione di una interessantissima raccolta di opere d'arte, edizione corredata da eccellenti commenti di ordine storico-artistico e da ottime fotografie. Si raccomanda a tutti coloro che vogliano avere un'immagine della ricchezza delle sculture antiche o dall'antico esistenti a Roma.

Mi sia permesso finire con due parole sulle iscrizioni pubblicate a fine volume (p. 239-243, nn. 107-109). La novità più importante che è emersa dal nuovo studio autoptico dei documenti epigrafici, è che l'altare con la dedica alla Pax Augusta, CIL VI 199 cfr. 36747, non sarebbe un esemplare novicio, come supposto dal Kellermann che trascrisse il testo nel giardino del Quirinale, bensì un pezzo antico. Devo tuttavia confessare che in base alla fotografia pubblicata nella tav. LIII, non si ricava una certezza dello stato delle cose. Importante è inoltre notare che nella superficie scrittoria sembrano esserci oggi dei tratti che avranno mancato ancora nei secoli precedenti quando Cittadini, Lipsio ed altri lessero il testo. Questi tratti hanno anche indotto l'autore del capitolo sulle iscrizioni, Federico Rausa, inganno quando egli per es. scrive nella riga 11 [S S] ‹II› D, invece di S P D D, come hanno visti autori antichi e come si deve senz'altro intendere. – Nella forma del testo sono anche rimaste altre inesattezze: nella riga 3 leggi TAVRISCVS; e non si può scrivere TARQVIN(I)ES, in quanto c'è un chiaro nesso di N e I (esatto il CIL); in 12 leggi ARRICINI.

Heikki Solin

RITA MARIA COSENTINO E LAURA RICCIARDI: *Catacomba di Commodilla, Lucerne ed altri materiali dalle gallerie 1, 8, 13.* Studia archaeologica 66. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1993. ISBN 88-7062-833-7.

The publication of Rita Cosentino and Laura Ricciardi presents lamps and other small finds that were found during the excavations of the Catacomb of Commodilla in Rome during the year 1953, in galleries 1, 8 and 13. This group of finds represents otherwise unpublished and less well-known material from the latest period of use of cemeteries outside the city walls. The small objects from the Catacomb of Commodilla provide a rarely seen example of a combination of tombs and material in the *loculi*.

In the first chapter, Cosentino has documented the finds still *in situ* in galleries 1,

8 and 13, and compared the list to the publication of Antonio Ferrua from 1957 where Ferrua had presented the results of the excavation in the catacomb. Ricciardi presents and discusses the typological and chronological arrangement of the lamps in the second chapter. The third chapter, by Cosentino, is dedicated to the decorative repertory; there symbolic meaning and iconographic development of decorative motifs of the disk, rim and base are examined briefly.

The catalogue, prepared by Cosentino, includes a clear presentation of each object, but the reader would have wished to know the authors' opinion of the datings of the lamps. The quality of the photographs is quite good, although I would have preferred to see an illustration of the whole lamp top instead of a detail of the lamp top with the disk representation, as has been done in 13 cases. The authors have chosen to arrange the catalogue in sections according to the types of Provoost, even though they point out that the typology is out-of-date and insufficient. A deeper analysis has been given of the locally produced copies of North African lamps. The North African lamps follow the typology of Pavolini and Anselmino in the "Atlante delle forme ceramiche" published in "Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica" in 1981.

All in all, this publication is a valuable addition to the group of publications about the lamps of Late Antiquity, not least for the presentation of material from an important archaeological site, the Catacomb of Commodilla at Rome. The book is useful for both lychnologists and for those who study the connection between tombs and grave goods.

Arja Karivieri

MARIA CECILIA D'ERCOLE: *La stipe votiva del Belvedere a Lucera*. Corpus delle stipi votive in Italia III. Archaeologica 80, Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1990. 320 p., 102 tav. ISSN 0391-9293. ISBN 88-7689-076-9. ITL 700.000.

Ecco un ulteriore volume della serie del Corpus delle stipi votive in Italia. In esso M.C. d'Ercole si è proposta di mettere a disposizione del mondo scientifico il complesso votivo lucerino detto "del Belvedere", portato alla luce nel corso di due consecutive campagne di scavo condotte da R. Bartoccini nel 1934 e nel 1935, sulle pendici dell'omonimo colle nell'area della Villa Comunale di Lucera. E vero che i reperti furono pubblicati dal Bartoccini nel 1940, ma si tratta di un resoconto sommario e di un'edizione solo parziale dei reperti. La maggior parte del volume è costituito dal catalogo dettagliato delle stipi di vari tipi: teste, statue, statuette, ex voto anatomici, statuette di animali, ecc. Nella seconda parte l'autrice considera problemi topografici dell'area sacra e la tipologia del culto. Un volume anche questo, come i precedenti, assai ben condotto e importante. Auguriamo alla serie una crescita e un ampliamento il più possibile duraturi.

Heikki Solin

Archeologia e botanica. Atti del convegno di studi sul contributo della botanica alla conoscenza e alla conservazione delle aree archeologiche vesuviane. Pompei 7-9 aprile 1989. A cura di Marisa Mastroroberto. Ministero per i beni culturali ed ambientali. Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei, monografie 2."L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 120 pp., 40 ill. ITL 80.000.

L'aspetto botanico, da tanto tempo solo oggetto di semplice annotazione sui diari di scavo, trova qui un vivo interesse da parte degli studiosi sia delle scienze umanistiche (filologia ed archeologia) che di quelli delle c.d. scienze esatte (paleobotanica e palinologia). Questi atti del convegno di Pompei possono essere ritenuti come un vero punto di partenza per una ricerca interdisciplinare sulla botanica e la conservazione delle aree archeologiche vesuviane. Il convegno si è articolato lungo due filoni fondamentali: quello della conoscenza e quello della conservazione. Attraverso una diversa lettura delle aree archeologiche vesuviane sono emersi risultati interessanti: i reperti sono stati revisionati e l'indagine dei testi classici è stata approfondita in chiave interdisciplinare. Gli archeologi hanno p.es. portato alla luce un vivaio di alberelli destinati ai piccoli orti urbani e la fabbrica dei profumi che delineano il quadro di una economia cittadina agricola che sfruttava i piccoli spazi verdi urbani. Ci sono anche tracce delle vaste aree forestali con la presenza del faggio (oggi poco reperibile nella regione vesuviana), dell'ontano e dell'acero, identificabili grazie alle indagini palinologiche. I reperti testimoniano che il fiume Sarno, ombreggiato da salici, era ricco di pesci e conchiglie, ora spariti dai corsi d'acqua.Per la conservazione, sia quella dei monumenti che quella della flora, l'enorme problema sono le piante infestanti: le scerbature sporadiche non bastano più a controllare la vegetazione infestante. La vegetazione spontanea risulta non solo antiestetica e difficile da governare ma anche, e soprattutto, dannosa per le strutture. Perciò si è ricorso anche alle possibilità offerte dalla chimica (cioè a prodotti rispettosi dell'uomo e dell'ambiente secondo il testo) per evitare il rigenerarsi delle piante indesiderate. Il volume presenta dei mezzi di lotta chimica (sostanze diserbanti), biologica (uso di parassiti naturali p.es.funghi, insetti, virus) e fisici (falciatura meccanica o manuale). Il *glyphosate* (un sale organico derivato dalla fosfonazione dell'aminoacido, la glicina) è stato lanciato dalla Società Monsanto (che liberalmente ha sponsorizzato p.es. il diserbo della Grande Palestra adiacente all'Anfiteatro) come soluzione per il problema della vegetazione spontanea nell'area archeologica di Pompei. I risultati sono stati incoraggianti.

Questo interessante volume ci offre anche un breve ma utile articolo sui giardini greci nell'antichità e un altro sulla storia della conservazione, plantumazione e diserbo nella storia degli scavi.

Per quanto riguarda l'illustrazione, di grande interesse sono i disegni e le incisioni di Pompei eseguiti dai vedutisti ed artisti del Settecento e dell'Ottocento (Desprez, Piranesi, Le Riche ecc).

Eva Nyman-Kaarakka

J. L. FRANKLIN: *Pompeii: The 'Casa del Marinaio' and its history*. Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei. Monografie III. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. Pp. 70, 12 pls. ISBN 88-7062-697-0. ITL 70.000.

A. KOLOSKI OSTROW: *The Sarno Bath Complex*. Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei. Monografie IV. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. Pp. 137, 125 pls. ISBN 88-7062-700-4. ITL 150.000.

G. IOPPOLO: *Le Terme del Sarno a Pompei*. Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei. Monografie V. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1992. Pp. 189. ISBN 88-7062-784-5. ITL 200.000.

During recent years the publication activities of the Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei has been lively. This group of publications continues the series of monographs the aim of which is an in-depth study of single houses and monuments. The monuments dealt with in these publications belong to less known buildings in Pompeii.

Casa del Marinaio is a large atrium house to the west of the Forum. The house was originally built on a high terrace on two levels. On the lower level were twenty-seven subterranean rooms which contained *horrea* and a bakery. The *horrea* were interconnected with the house but in excavation reports house and *horrea* were treated separately. That has led to an assumption that they really were separate entities but Franklin has been able to demonstrate the connexion between the structures.

In the first two chapters the house and *horrea* found by excavators are described room by room. Nothing valuable was found in the excavations as salvagers had made their way into the complex after the eruption and retrieved almost all movable objects. In these chapters Franklin has also some socio-economic observations but he does not pursue any detailed analysis.

The third chapter deals with the building history of the house. Franklin describes thoroughly the six phases. However, it seems that the captions of some figures have been changed (at least in figs. 5, 6, 7, 8) which complicates the understanding.

The Sarno Bath Complex is situated in the southern part of Pompeii, not far from the Forum. Until recently the complex has been largely ignored by scholars. However, in the latest edition of the Guida Archeologica di Pompei (Mondadori 1994) the lacuna has been already filled.

The multistorey complex consists of two extended atrium houses.
In the last phase the complex had five different levels and at least 96 rooms. The bath chambers are situated on the fourth level. The studies of Ioppolo and Koloski Ostrow give two different approaches to the interpretation of the complex. When reading these studies at the same time some confusion may arise (e.g. Ioppolo and Koloski Ostrow apply different number systems) but in generalthey complement to each other.

Koloski Ostrow aims to give a detailed architectural and socio-economic analysis of the whole complex proceeding level by level and recording each room meticulously. The study of Koloski Ostrow is a thorough one but, however, it seems that she has some misunderstandings, e.g. the wax tablets were not found in the room that connected the

establishment VII, 2, 21 with the so-called Palestra (cf. NSc 1889, 120).

Ioppolo for his part deals more with the topography, building techniques and materials concentrating on the bath complex. His method is profound and thorough. He records not only the architecture and building technique of each room but makes an impressive stratigraphical and metrological analysis as well. Some special points such as thermography are discussed in appendices. Figures, photographs and drawings of high quality are essential for readers.

Liisa Savunen

JOHANNES BERGEMANN: *Römische Reiterstatuen. Ehrendenkmäler im öffentlichen Bereich.* Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Beiträge zur Erschliessung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur, Band 11. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1990. XII, 196 S, 4 Beilagen, 96 Tafeln. DM 158.

Wieder wird uns in der von Paul Zanker und Klaus Fittschen inaugurierten Reihe ein vorzüglicher Band geschenkt. Eine moderne Bearbeitung römischer Reiterstatuen ist lange Zeit ein zentrales Desiderat der Altertumswissenschaft gewesen. Diesem wird durch diesem Band, eine Dissertation aus der Schule von Paul Zanker, bestens nachgeholfen.

Vor allem wichtig ist, daß der Verfasser neben der rein formgeschichtlichen und ikonographischen Betrachtung auch den gesellschaftlichen Aspekten dieser Gattung gebührend Aufmerksamkeit schenkt.

Der Verfasser ist Archäologe und hat in dieser Hinsicht seine Aufgabe glänzend gemeistert. Aber auch im Historischen ist er gut bewandert; davon hat mich die Zusammenstellung der epigraphischen Zeugnisse für Reiterstatuen überzeugt (nicht ganz so gut gelungen scheint die Bewerung numismatischer Quellen zu sein). Ich habe diesen Teil durchgeblättert und finde ihn zuverlässig; nur wenige Stellen lassen Beanstandungen zu: E30 stammt nicht aus Neapel, sondern aus Puteoli und ist in die traianische Zeit datierbar (und die von de Franciscis gebotene Lesung ist schlecht); E37: Iusteia Polla war nicht Priesterin der *vergöttlichten* Livia, denn nach ihrem Tod wäre aus dem Namen der Livia *diva* kaum ausgelassen worden, d.h. zugleich, daß die Inschrift in die Jahre 14–42 datiert werden kann; in den Text von E41 hat sich ein tückischer Lapsus eingeschlichen: in Zeile 2 ist nicht *l.*, sondern *Fl.* zu lesen. Das sind aber mehr Quisquilien und vermindern nicht den positiven Gesamteindruck, den das Buch hinterlassen hat.

Heikki Solin

Quaderni dell'archeologia della Libia 15. A cura di Lucilla Anselmino. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1992. 335 p. ISBN 887062-723-3. ITL 520.000.

Ai lettori di questa rivista interesserà particolarmente il primo articolo, con la pubblicazione delle inscrizioni della tomba di Demetria a Cirene, a cura di Joyce Reynolds. Le iscrizioni, incorporate anche nel CIG, sono note da quasi due secoli, ma la Reynolds è riuscita a migliorarne notevolmente la lettura. L'iscrizione principale, l'epitaffio cristiano di Demetria (o Dimitria come si scrive nell'epigrafe), è interessante da molti punti di vista, per cui siamo felici di essere ora in possesso di un testo appurato.

Heikki Solin

GÉZA DE FRANCOVICH: *Santuari e tombe rupestri dell'antica Frigia*. I: Testo, II: Tavole. Mediaevalia 3. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 208 p., 512 ill. ISBN 88-7062-683-0. ITL 350.000.

Uno strano libro, un miscuglio di ipotesi stravaganti e di lavoro paziente sulle montagne dell'Asia Minore. Secondo l'autore, tutte o quasi le lavorazioni nelle rocce e pietre sorgenti in mezzo a paesaggi dell'antica Frigia, sarebbero da mettersi in rapporto con luoghi di culto di Cibele (o di Attide). Si tratta di un'enorme prestazione di lavoro sul campo, in quanto l'autore ha percorso la regione frigia con immensa pazienza, fotografando tutti i monumenti a lui apparsi connessi con il culto di Cibele. E si deve senz'altro ammettere che egli abbia promosso notevolmente la comprensione di questo tipo di monumenti, anche se per un non addetto ai lavori non sarà sempre facile dare un giudizio sulla qualità dei risultati in dettaglio. Ma l'interpretazione dei monumenti in un più vasto contesto storico mi sembra il punto debole del libro. L'autore – distaccandosi dalla stragrande maggioranza degli studiosi – vuol dimostrare che i Frigi, la cui lingua non avrebbe niente a che fare con il trace o altre lingue indoeuropee, avrebbero vissuto in Anatolia già nel secondo millennio a.C., che il culto di Cibele avrebbe dovuto anch'esso esistere già nel secondo millennio e che quello di Attide sarebbe solo un poco più recente. Davanti a tali affermazioni un normale antichista rimane molto perplesso.

Heikki Solin

MARIA TERESA PALEANI: *Le lucerne paleocristiane.* Monumenti Musei e Gallerie Pontificie, Antiquarium Romanum, Cataloghi 1 (a cura di Francesco Buranelli). "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1993. ISBN 88-7062-815-9. ITL 150.000.

Maria Teresa Paleani has undertaken the great task of publishing the first scientific catalogue of the Antiquarium Romanum of the Vatican Museums, presenting the Early Christian lamps preserved in the collections of the Antiquarium. When Provoost (1970) published his typology of lamps found in the catacombs of Rome, he did not provide a complete inventory of the objects. In this book Paleani has made the classification and commentary on the lamps of the Antiquarium following Provoost's typology and added some critical notes as well as made the typology more up-to-date.

Paleani publishes 72 lamps which she dates between the third and the seventh century A.D. She has chosen to call all these lamps Early Christian since most of the lamps have Christian motifs. The lamps that have mythological representations she has interpreted as representative of Christian re-use of old motifs, explaining her choice by the supposition that the traditional Roman iconography was interpreted as purely decorative by the Christians who used the traditional motifs to fill the lamp disk.

The catalogue is exhaustive, with a thorough discussion about each lamp, decorative elements and good bibliographical notes. A useful table for corresponding types in earlier published typologies is presented on p. 85, followed by discussion on pp. 86-98. The author has preferred not to create a new typology but to use Provoost's typology, and to add one type from Deneauve's typology in her presentation (type VIII B) because this lamp type did not occur in Provoost's publication. However, only six of Provoost's types were related to the lamps of the Antiquarium Romanum, and Paleani has chosen to follow in her publication a chronological sequence and not the order used by Provoost.

Short chapters in the book are dedicated to the formation of the collection of the Antiquarium Romanum, to production marks, and final remarks. Comparative tables at the end present lamp inventory numbers and corresponding pages in Provoost's article where the lamps have been cited. Important additions are an index for the places, museums and collections that are mentioned in the text, and another for the proper names.

Perhaps most useful in Paleani's study are the new datings which derive from her typological and iconographical analyses of the lamps, as well as from comparisons with similar and analogous lamps, some of which come from a well-known exavation. The author has used, in a praiseworthy way, the decorative motifs of Terra Sigillata Africana, and the dates suggested for these motifs, as comparison for the lamps decorated with similar motifs.

Paleani suggests new dates for Provoost's types as well as discusses their relation to the North African products. An important observation is that the type Provoost 9 (Hayes II, Atlante delle forme ceramiche X and XI) is not documented in the catacombs of Rome where the absence of the type is almost total. The author explains this by the

late date of this type which could be the reason why these lamps have been found more often on the surface of the necropoli and in the habitation areas.

In brief, this publication is important for everyone interested in the North African lamps of Late Antiquity, and for those who want to obtain more information about their importance for the local lamp production in Central Italy as well as in other centres of the Mediterranean area in the same period.

Arja Karivieri

J. M. C. TOYNBEE: *Morte e sepoltura nel mondo romano*. Introduzione di Lidiano Bacchielli. Traduzione di Maria José Strazzulla. Società e cultura greca e romana 2. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1993. xv, 285 p., 92 ill., 30 fig. ISBN 88-7062-728-4. ITL 100.000.
FRIEDRICH WILHELM DEICHMANN: *Archeologia cristiana*. Traduzione di Alessandro de Lachenal e Rosa Taliani. Studia Archaeologica 63. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1993. 355 p., 194 ill. ISBN 88-7062-826-4. ITL 250.000.

Translations of such general works as Toynbee's *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (1971) and Deichmann's *Einführung in die Christliche Archäologie* (1983) are always welcome, not least because they can more easily find readers outside the professional circles in their language area.

In cooperation with a thoughtful publisher the occasion of a translation may also provide a good opportunity for the author to make corrections and amplifications to the work, as has happened with Deichmann's *Archeologia cristiana*, the usefulness of which is also guaranteed by an updated bibliography, an essential feature in a work of this kind.

Pekka Tuomisto

INDEX LIBRORUM IN HOC VOLUMINE RECENSORUM

LIBRI NOBIS MISSI

L'Afrique dans l'Occident Romain (Ier siècle AV. J.-C.- IVe siècle AP. J.C.). Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome sous le patronage de l'Institut national d'archéologie et d'art de Tunis (Rome, 3-5 déc. 1987). École Française de Rome, Palais Farnèse 1990. viii, 624 p.

CLEOMEDES: *Caelestia* Hrsg. R.B. Todd. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1990. xxxi, 118 S. Kartoniert DEM 56.

PIERRE CHUVIN: *A Chronicle of the Last Pagans*. Transl. by B.A. Archer. Revealing Antiquity Series 4. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1990. 188 p. USD 29.95.

Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto. A cura di Lucia Criscuolo e Giovanni Geraci. Atti del colloquio internazionale. Bologna, 31 agosto - 2 settembre 1987. Editrice Clueb Bologna 1989. 717 p. ITL 140.000.

EURIPIDES: *Hecuba*. Hrsg. Stephen G. Daitz. 2., verbesserte Aufl. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1990. xxxvi, 102 S. DEM 22,50.

Greek and Latin Studies in Memory of Cajus Fabricius. Edited by Sven-Tage Teodorsson. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia LIV. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. 1990. 265 p. SEK 100.

DEMETRIOS E. KOUTROUBAS: *Secunda centuria (Nova carmina latina)*. Athenis MCMXCII. 143 p.

DEMETRIOS E. KOUTROUBAS: *Centum voces (Carmina nova)*. Athenis MCMLXXXX. 135 p.

ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ. Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto di Storia Antica dell'Università di Palermo XXXIV-XXXV 1988-1989. Atti del VII congresso internazionale di studi sulla Sicilia antica. tom. 1-2. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1992-1993. ISSN 0392-0887; ISBN 88-7689-073-4.

PAULA KAY LAZRUS: *Discovering the Etruscans*. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 57 p.

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: *The Classical Foundations of Modern Histography*. The Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 54. University of California Press 1990. xiv, 162 p. USD 24.95.

RENATO ONIGA: *Il confine conteso. Letteratura antropologica di un capitolo sallustiano (Bellum Iugurthinum 79)*. Scrinia 2 (Collana di Studi Classici diretta da Paolo Fedeli e Giovanni Cipriani). Edipuglia 1990. vi, 174 p., 22 tav.

PAUSANIAS: *Graeciae descriptio* Vol. I-III. Hrsg. Maria Helena Rocha-Pereira. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1989-1990. ISBN 3-322-00508-9; 3-322-00213-6; 3-322-0509-7. xxvi, 358 S; v, 338 S.; v, 329 S. DEM 59; 56; 68.

PLUTARCHUS: *De Homero*. Hrsg. Jan Frederik Kindstrand. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner, Leipzig 1990. lxxii, 168 S. ISBN 3-322-00744-8. DEM 74.

Post-Herulian Athens. Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens A.D. 267-529. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, vol. I. Ed. by Paavo Castrén. Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens, Helsinki 1994. 192 p., 34 illustrations.

MARIA REHO: *La ceramica Attica a figure nere e rosse nella Tracia Bulgara*. Archaeologica 86. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1990. 176 p., 35 tav.

Rivista di Archeologia XVII. Diretta da Gustavo Traversari. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1993. ISSN 0392-0895.

SCHÄFER: *Imperii insignia*. Römische Mitteilungen, Ergänzungsheft 29. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1990. DEM 198.

Schede Medievali. Rassegna dell'Officina di Studi Medievali, numero 16, gennaio-giugno 1989. 286 p.

LAMBERT SCHNEIDER & CHRISTOPH HÖCKER: *Die Akropolis von Athen. Antikes Heiligtum und modernes Reiseziel*. Dumont Buchverlag, Köln 1990. 309 S. DEM 39,80.

I trattati di mondo antico. Forma, ideologia e funzione. A cura di Luciano Canfora, Mario Liverani e Carlo Zaccagnini. Saggi di Storia Antica 2. Istituto Gramesci, Seminario di Antichistica. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1990. 256 p.