

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XII

1978

ARCTOS
VOL. XII

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XII

HELSINKI 1978 HELSINGFORS

ARCTOS
ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA
Vol. I-II A. 1930-1931 EDITA
EDITIO TOTA EXHAUSTA EST

ARCTOS
ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA
NOVA SERIES
VOL. I-XI A. 1954-1977 EDITA
SUPPLEMENTUM I 1968

MANDATU SOCIETATIS
"KLASSILLIS-FILOLOGINEN YHDISTYS —
KLASSISK-FILOLOGISKA FÖRENINGEN"

VOL. XII EDENDUM CURAVERUNT
HENRIK ZILLIACUS
ROLF WESTMAN
HEIKKI SOLIN
ULLA NYBERG

L E T R A N S P O R T D U B L É
E T L E R O L E D E S E Π Ι Π Λ Ο Ο Ι *

J a a k k o F r ö s é n

L'étude sur les questions relatives au transport du blé offre un bon exemple de la recherche papyrologique et de ses méthodes et montre en même temps que l'étude des institutions et la recherche sur l'histoire sociale et économique de l'Egypte se fondant sur les documents, exige, comme nous le savons bien, une expérience personnelle dans le domaine de la papyrologie et la connaissance des méthodes de la publication des textes.

Pour assurer l'acheminement du blé, qui était d'une importance primordiale pour l'Etat, au lieu de destination en temps voulu et dans la quantité requise, à une époque pleine de risques de toutes sortes, en plus des fonctionnaires municipaux et centraux, on avait besoin de main d'œuvre en dehors de l'administration publique, d'entrepreneurs privés, et on devait exercer une surveillance minutieuse. Le traitement du blé public en plusieurs endroits, dans les champs, dans les magasins des villages et du nome, dans le port et à destination fait qu'aucun document, que se soit un ordre, un avis de réception ou bien une quittance, ne nous donne plus qu'un fragment de ce vaste système. En plus, les réformes d'administration, si insignifiantes qu'elles soient, surtout au lieu de destination à l'époque Romaine, se reflètent, comme nous le verrons, dans le système

* Communication présentée au XV^e Congrès International de Papyrologie, Bruxelles-Louvain, 29 août - 3 septembre 1977.

entier et font qu'il est difficile de généraliser des éléments trouvés dans des documents divers et fragmentés. Si les grandes lignes se dégagent assez facilement, l'étude approfondie du transport du blé ne peut se baser que sur des matériaux abondants, divers et étendus. L'état de la question laisse beaucoup de problèmes insolubles concernant surtout les tâches des employés et leur rôles dans le système.

Les études approfondies de Rostowzew (1904), Wilcken (1912), Oertel (1917), Börner (1939) et Schwartz (1948)¹ donnent une analyse subtile des documents et en même temps une synthèse excellente et pleine d'une intuition admirable. Puis les études spécialisées de Guéraud (1950), Youtie (1967), Brecht (1941, publiés en 1962) et Świderek (1969/70)² et les publications de nouveaux documents, surtout P.Oxy. XXXIII 2670 par Parsons (1968) et P.Petaus 55-58 par Hagedorn, Hagedorn, Youtie, Youtie (1969), tous de la même maîtrise, apportent des détails instructifs. Dans ces conditions on peut se demander s'il est possible de présenter quelque chose de nouveau en ce qui concerne le problème central, c'est-à-dire la question de la surveillance. Le rôle des subrécargues, ἐπίπλοοι, s'est présenté à nous comme sujet de cet exposé grâce à deux documents inédits parmi les textes d'Oxyrhynchos déposés à Helsinki par Eric G. Turner, à qui nous exprimons nos meilleurs remerciements. La publication sera achevée dans quelques mois.

Parmi les textes publiés jusqu'à aujourd'hui nous avons 26 documents qui nous donnent directement des indications sur les ἐπίπλοοι. Parmi ces textes il y en a un qui est douteux à cause de la date tardive (P.Vindob.Worp. 8, 340 après J.-C.). Ainsi, avec les deux nouveaux textes, en avons-nous maintenant 27, du III^e siècle

-
- 1 M. Rostowzew, APF 3 (1904-6) 201-224, U. Wilcken, Grundzüge 368-380, F. Oertel, Die Liturgie, 1917, 121-131, E. Börner, Der staatliche Korntransport, Diss. Hamburg 1939, 22-45, J. Schwartz, Le Nil et le ravitaillement de Rome, BIFAO 47 (1948) 179-200.
 2 O. Guéraud, JJP 4 (1950) 107-115, H.C. Youtie, TAPhA 98 (1967) 520-526, C.H. Brecht, Zur Haftung der Schiffer im antiken Recht, Münch. Beiträge 45 (1962), A. Świderek, The Responsibility in Corn-Transport to Alexandria, Eos 58 (1969/70) 63-66.

av. J.-C. jusqu'au II^e ou III^e siècle de notre ère.³

Les 9 documents venant de l'époque Ptolémaïque nous disent que les ἐπίπλοοι étaient des surveillants officiels qui veillaient la cargaison pendant le voyage et qui devaient laisser un gage jusqu'à la livraison (P.Cairo Zen. I 59077). Nous apprenons aussi que l'ἐπίπλοος donnait son avis sur l'embarquement, au moins dans certains cas (SB V 8257, BGU VIII 1742-3, P.Berl.inv. 16876). Par contre nous ne savons pas s'ils étaient des agents de l'expéditeur ou fournisseur, c'est-à-dire le naoclère et le capitaine, ou bien du destinataire. Nous ne savons pas non plus, et ici je vais contre l'opinion commune, s'ils étaient armés. BGU VIII 1742-3 nous montre qu'en plus des sub-récargues il y avait des surveillants, des φυλακῆται, qui étaient élus par les sitologues ou par les ἀντιγραφεῖς et à qui on remettait l'échantillon de blé (le δεῦγμα) prélevé et scellé au champ et envoyé au port. Les ἐπίπλοοι de P.Ryl. IV 576 et de P.Tebt. III 1035 ne sont pas nécessairement les mêmes personnes que les φυλακῆται, guère plus les ἐπίπλοοι de P.Berl.inv. 16876 les mêmes personnes que les περὶ τὴν διοίκησιν μαχαιροφόροι, même si, en ce cas-là, on pouvait attendre l'article défini: καὶ τῶν ἐπιπλῶν. En tous cas l'ἐπίπλοος de P.Cairo Zen. I 59077 est un civil, et si notre interprétation n'est pas bonne on doit supposer, qu'au III^e ou plutôt au II^e siècle il y a eu au moins une réforme administrative qui a touché la responsabilité des fonctionnaires. Nous n'en sommes pas convaincus, bien que les ἐπίπλοοι du I^{er} siècle après J.-C. soient des légionnaires envoyés d'Alexandrie. Que le subrécargue soit armé ou non, c'est une question secondaire; qu'aurait-il pu faire avec ses armes dans une attaque des brigands ou contre l'équipage beaucoup plus nombreux? - Pour protéger la cargaison il aurait eu besoin d'une mitrailleuse!

Constatons que, au fur et à mesure que nous pouvons le vérifier dans nos textes, les ἐπίπλοοι sont toujours mentionnés avec les capitaines, les κυβερνήται, tandis que les ναυλωτικαί (dont nous avons une grande quantité), signalées toujours par les naoclères,

³ Voir la liste p. 12-15.

n'attachent pas d'attention à cette organisation. Il nous manque les quittances des capitaines - mais il est possible qu'elles n'existent pas. Tout cela permet de conclure que la livraison de la cargaison s'est effectuée au lieu de destination et que les ἐπίπλοου Ptolémaïques étaient des représentants des expéditeurs, nommés par ces derniers ou par le stratège ou βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς.

Les documents du début de l'époque Romaine nous donnent une image assez claire du système de transport sur le Nil du blé destiné à Rome. L'Etat ne prend pas à sa charge le transport même; les fonctionnaires donnent les ordres et s'occupent de la surveillance. Quant aux nauclères nous n'en savons rien. Ce sont toujours les κυβερνήται qui rendent les ναυλωτικὰ aux fonctionnaires d'Etat, et, ce qui est frappant, ils le font δι' ἐπιπλόου, avec les ἐπίπλοου, qui sont maintenant des légionnaires envoyés d'Alexandrie pour la surveillance de l'embarquement et de la cargaison pendant le transport. Tous les ἐπίπλοου légionnaires attestés dans nos textes de 2 av. J.-C. jusqu'à 77 après J.-C. - nous en avons maintenant quatre - viennent de la XXII^e légion Deioteriana. Si nous pouvions admettre avec M. Fink,⁴ que le papyrus latin de Genève (1) appartient à la III^e légion Cyrenaica, et si la formule *exit ad frumentum Neapoli* ou *Mercuri* concerne les devoirs des ἐπίπλοου, ce texte nous montrerait que, jusqu'au règne de Domitien, les subrécargues du I^{er} siècle viennent des deux légions installées à Alexandrie. Selon M. Schwartz⁵ nous pourrions penser que c'est sous Trajan qu'on a libéré les soldats de ces occupations, entre 110 et 118.

En ce qui concerne les φυλακῖται nous n'en savons rien. Par contre nous lisons dans les ναυλωτικὰ, que c'étaient les capitaines et les ἐπίπλοου eux-mêmes qui transportaient l'échantillon à Alexandrie avec la cargaison de blé (SB VI 9223, W.Chrest. 443). La formule δι' ἐπιπλόου nous rappelle la formule de l'époque Ptolémaïque

4 R.O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, 1971, 9-10 et 51 = PSI XIII 1307.

5 Schwartz 185.

μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπιπλῶν γνώμης. Par ces formules on déclare que la responsabilité a été transmise des sitologues aux ἐπίπλοοι. Mais la formule δι' ἐπιπλόου fait savoir aussi que la responsabilité est passée des expéditeurs aux destinataires, parce que ce sont eux qui sont maintenant représentés par le subrécargue, et que la cargaison a été livrée au port du nome. Si nous avons raison, une ζυγοστασία et une δειγμάτων ἄρσις préliminaires ont été indispensables avant le transport sur le Nil et c'est justement à cet événement que se rapporte le vase publié par M. Guéraud.⁶ Dans le port du nome on a dû ouvrir le vase contenant l'échantillon et après la vérification, le sceller de nouveau, ou bien on en avait deux, tous les deux cachetés; l'un a été transporté à Alexandrie tandis que l'autre a été remis au magasin du nome pour plus de sécurité. Cette solution explique en même temps, pourquoi le vase a été découvert à Oxyrhynchos et pourquoi la dernière ligne du texte désigne l'échantillon par le pluriel τὰ δειγμάτα. Ainsi sont effacés les derniers points d'interrogation dans l'interprétation de ce texte si important.

Au début du II^e siècle nous retrouvons les civils dans les fonctions des ἐπίπλοοι, comme représentants des expéditeurs. Nous en avons en tout 12 dans les documents divers, de 127 jusqu'à environ 185. Parmi ces textes il n'y a qu'un seul exemple des ναυλωτικαί (P.Oxy. XXXIII 2670), un document d'une importance primordiale; il nomme le premier ἐπίπλοος civil, qui est en même temps le dernier subrécargue mentionné dans les ναυλωτικαί. Nous reviendrons plus loin à la formule δι' ἐπιπλόων καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς, qui pourrait être un reste de l'époque des ἐπίπλοοι légionnaires, mais qui pourrait aussi révéler quelque chose des transformations administratives.

SB V 7737 nous informe que l'ἐπίπλοος civil donne la quittance χειρόγραφον de la cargaison qu'il a réceptionnée. Une ναυλωτική rendue par le capitaine contenant la formule δι' ἐπιπλόου est exclue - cela veut dire que 127, la date de P.Oxy. XXXIII 2670 est le *ter-*

⁶ Voir n. 2 = SB VI 9223.

minus post quem pour ce document. Dans P.Grenf. II 46 a nous voyons que le subrécargue devait être présent aux παράδοσις et συγροσασία à l'arrivée. C'était évidemment important, car cette lettre du procurator Neaspoleos au stratège ne contient aucune autre information. La même chose est soulignée dans M.Chrest. 340. P.Berl.inv. 1419, publié et interprété par M. Świderek,⁷ éclaire le partage de la responsabilité: les sitologues sont responsables de la qualité du blé transporté et assuré par le δείγμα, tandis que les ἐπίπλοοι sont responsables de la quantité, vérifiée pendant l'embarquement dans le port du nome par le χειρόγραφον, comme nous l'avons vu. Une quittance de cette espèce se trouve dans P.Cairo Goodspeed 28. Le texte a paru très difficile à interpréter⁸ à cause de la formulation laconique: ὅσος πλήρης. Nous proposons une explication plus simple que celles de M. Wilcken et de M. Crönert. L'ἐπίπλοος certifie que la quantité et la provenance du blé déclarées par le sitologue sont celles qu'on a déclarées dans l'ἀπόστολος du procurator Neaspoleos, dont une copie se trouve chez le sitologue et l'autre en possession du capitaine (ὅσος) et que toute la quantité est livrée (πλήρης). La méthode de reconnaissance est la même que celle que l'on trouve à l'époque Ptolémaïque dans le système des σύμβολον et ἀντισύμβολον.⁹

Les autres textes informent sur le caractère liturgique de ἐπιπλοία (nous lisons ce mot pour la première fois dans le nouveau papyrus d'Oxyrhynchos - P.Oxy. inv. 43 5B.71/G (1-7)b). P.Petaus 55 et une proposition, faite par le κωμογραμματεὺς, pour la nomination des ἐπίπλοοι. Malheureusement le papyrus est en si mauvais état que plusieurs lignes sont inintelligibles. Il nous informe que les devoirs d'ἐπίπλοος étaient non seulement ἐπιπλεῦσαι mais encore παραδοῦναι, livrer la charge à Alexandrie, chose qui dans les autres textes, surtout dans les ναυλωτικά, est exclusivement l'affaire du

7 Voir n. 2.

8 U. Wilcken, APF 3 (1904-6) 116, W. Crönert, SPP 4 (1905) 87, M. Merzagora, Aegyptus 10 (1929) 140.

9 Cf. par exemple P.Strassb. 562, P.Hibeh. I 39, BGU VIII 1744, 1749, 1950 et 1951.

capitaine. P.Grenf. II 46 a et M.Chrest. 340 aussi, comme nous l'avons vu, ne mentionnent que l'obligation d'être présent pendant la livraison. Cela est normal, car si nous nous rappelons comment s'effectuait la livraison de la charge dans le port du nome à l'époque des ἐπίπλοοι légionnaires, nous pouvons constater que ce sont les capitaines qui signaient la quittance et que les ἐπίπλοοι, qui ici n'étaient responsables que théoriquement, sont mentionnés par la formule δι' ἐπιπλόου comme en passant. Le document nous montre aussi que le πόρος des personnes proposées pour cette fonction s'élevait de 700 à 800 drachmes et qu'ils avaient entre 30 et 35 ans. P.Petaus 58 est une liste des personnes élues pour cette charge de même que P.Amh. II 123 (cfr. P.Cairo Goodspeed 28 et APF 3 [1904-6] 116).

Si nous suivons les mesures dans l'ordre, nous trouvons dans P.Phil. 10 une plainte contre une nomination abusive et dans le nouveau texte d'Oxyrhynchos la description de l'entrée en charge avec les garanties personnelles et collectives et les serments requis (appendice 2). Ce qui est intéressant ici c'est la définition de la charge: ἐπιπλεύσειν καὶ τὸν ἐμβληθησόμενον πυρὸν παραφυλάξω ἄχρι ἂν παραδοθῆ (?) etc. Comme P.Petaus 55, notre papyrus est en mauvais état, mais je crois que, en comparant les deux textes, nous pourrions lire quelques mots de plus dans l'un ou l'autre - malheureusement P.Petaus 55 n'est pas muni de photographie et je n'ai pas vu l'original. Notre ἐπίπλοος est un affranchi de 40 ans et son ἐγγυητής a 30 ans. Pour en finir avec les témoignages directs, P.Lond. II 342 (p.173) montre comment fonctionnait le système des garanties ou plutôt ne fonctionnait pas, car comme nous le savons, les mesures coercitives étaient presque quotidiennes.

Voici ce que nous pouvons tirer des textes qui nous renseignent directement sur les ἐπίπλοοι. Mais notre recherche n'est pas terminée avant que nous n'ayons parcouru les textes qui ne mentionnent pas les subrécargues. Mais puisque nous n'avons pas le temps d'examiner la documentation papyrologique *in extenso*, même pas le temps d'en parcourir la partie la plus importante, les ναυλωτικαί de l'

époque des ἐπίπλοου liturgiques, constatons seulement, que jusqu'ici nous n'avons pas parlé des changements qui se sont produits au lieu de destination, surtout la création du χειρισμὸς Νέας πόλεως - nous le trouvons pour la première fois dans les ναυλωτικαί en 135 (P.Strassb. 205) - qui pourrait expliquer la formule δι' ἐπιπλόου dans P.Oxy. XXXIII 2670, et la transformation des κυβερνήται en ναύκληροι χειρισμοῦ Νέας πόλεως, qui se produit en même temps que la disparition des ἐπίπλοου, et que la mise en place des conseils municipaux. Le dernier subrécargue daté est celui de P.Lond. II 342 (p.173) en 185, et le premier ναύκληρος χειρισμοῦ Νέας πόλεως que nous connaissons est celui de P.Med.inv. 71.72 en 211.¹⁰

Appendice 1. Liste des ἐπίπλοου

1. III^e s. a.C. P.Ryl.IV 576 Rapport de déchargement en Alexandrie
1. 1-2] ἐπίπλους Κλέαρχος φυλακίτης
2. 257 P.Cairo Zen.I 59077 Lettre de Krotos à Zenon
1. 1-2 γίνωσκε Ἄλεξις οὐθέν πεποιηκότα τὸ κα[τὰ] τὴν παιδίσκην, ἣν ἐνεχυράσαμεν παρὰ τῶν ἐπιπλευσάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐλα[ίου]
3. 235 P.Tebt.III 701 Liste des affaires publiques
1. 214 καὶ εἰς τὸν ἰχθὺν ἐπιπλοῦς κ[αὶ] πα...οῦς ὀψώνια καὶ ἄλλ' ἀνηλώματα
4. III^e s. P.Cairo Zen.III 59389 Lettre d'Apollonios à Zenon
1. 3 τῷ ἐ]πιπλ[έο]ντι προσαγαγεῖν ἐπι.[
5. II^e s. P.Tebt.III 1035 Liste des embarquements
1. 1-2 ἐ]πίπλους Ἐρμάφιλος Ἡ[ρακλείδου (?) _] | φυλακίτης τῶν ἐκ Κ[_]
1. 12 ἐπίπλους Ἀθεμμεῦ[ς]
6. 187?-161 SB V 8257 = W.L. Westermann, APF 13 (1938) 1sqq.
Ordre d'envoi d'un vaisseau

¹⁰ C. Balconi, Aegyptus 54 (1974) 31-33.

7. 64/63 1. 9-10 ἐφ' οὗ ἐπιπλ[εύσει (?)]! [ὁ δεῦνα τῶν ἡγε]μόνων
BGU VIII 1742-3 = W. Kunkel, APF 8 (1927) 169sqg.
Ordre d'embarquement
1. 17 μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπιπλῶν γνώμης
8. 49/48 ? SB V 8754 = H. Zilliacus, Aegyptus 19 (1939) 59sqg.
Ordre d'embarquement
1. 19-20 μετὰ τῆς Παγκράτου καὶ Δημητρίο[ν τῶ]ν [πε-
ρὶ τῆν]διοσκήσιν μαχαιροφόρων καὶ ἐπιπλῶν γνώ[μης]
9. 2 SB VI 9223 = O. Guéraud, JJP 4 (1950) 112sqg.
Scellage de l'échantillon du blé
1. 2 δι' ἐπιπλόου Λουκίου Οὐκλατίου στρατιώτου
1. 4 δι' ἐπιπλόου Λουκίου Καστρικίου στρατιώτου
1. 10 ἐσφραγίσμ(εθ)α τὰ δύγματα
10. 15 p.C. W.Chrest.443 = P.Lond.II 256 (p.99) Ναυλωτική
1. 2 δι' ἐπιπλ[όου] Σέκτος Ἀτύλιος (cfr. S. Daris,
Aegyptus 38 [1958] 157)
11. 77 P.Oxy.II 276 Ναυλωτική
1. 8-9 δι' ἐπιπλόου Κλαυδίου Κέλερος στρατιώτου
12. I^{er}/II^{es}. P.Oxy.inv. 21 3B.29F (1-2)a Ναυλωτική
1. 8 δι' ἐπιπλόου Γαίου Λογγύ[ο]υ στρατιώτ(ου)
13. I^{er}/II^{es}. PSA Athen.63 Lettre
1. 8 στρ]ατιώτη ἐπιπλόω
14. II^{es}. SB V 7737 = O. Guéraud, Annales du Service des
Antiquités de l'Egypte 33 (1933) 59sqg. Lettre
privée
1. 2-5 ὁ ἀδελφός σου []θωτης ἐπίπλους βέβληται
σεῖτου εἶ[ς Ἀλε]ξάνδρειαν καὶ ἐχειρογράφησεν καὶ
ἦ[δη] παραλαμβάνει τὸν σεῖτον
15. 127 P.Oxy.XXXIII 2670 Ναυλωτική
1. 11-13 δι' ἐπιπλόων Ἀμμωνίου Ἀμμωνίου καὶ Πα-
ποντιῶτος Παποντιῶτος ἀπὸ Παώμεως καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς
16. 139 W.Chrest.431 = P.Grenf.II 46 (a) Lettre de procu-
rator Neaspoleos ?
1. 6-9 οἱ ἐπίπλοοι παρέτυχον τῇ γενομένῃ παραδόσει

- καὶ ζυγοστασίᾳ
17. 138-161 M.Chrest.340 = P.Lond.II 301 (p.256) Réception du devoir de κυβερνήτης
 1. 8-11 ὁμνύω κτλ. καὶ πᾶσαν φροντίδα ποιήσασθαι τοῦ παραμεῖναι τοῦς ἐπιπλόους μέχρι τῆς ἐν πόλει ζυγοστασίας καὶ παραδώσω κτλ.
18. 138-161 P.Berol.inv.1419, A. Świderek, Eos 58 (1969/70) 63-65 Lettre de procurator Neaspoleos
 1. 16-18] . ους ἐπιπλόους Ἐφροδεΐσιον Ποτᾶ(μμωνος?) | [καὶ τοῖς σ]ὺν αὐτῷ πρᾶξον εἰς τὸν κυριακὸν λόγον | [] τῆς ἐγδεΐας κτλ.
19. II^e s. P.Cairo Goodspeed 28 Quittance de ἐπίπλους
 1. 1-4 Πτολεμαῖος [ψ] Πανομιέως | ἐπίπλους ἀπὸ Καρανίδος | Ἰσιδώρου Ἰσιδώρου κυβ(ερνήτου) | ἕσος πλήρης
20. II^e s. P.Amh.II 123 Liste des ἐπίπλου
 11. 1-3 Βακχιάδος ἐπίπλου· Ἀλεξᾶς Ἐκ[ύ]σεως, Κοπρῆς Πουβλε (?).
21. 139 P.Phil.10 = BGU VII 1572 Pétition des tisserands au stratège, au sujet d'une liturgie
 1. 8-9 ἐκ τούτων τέσσαρες ἐδόθησαν εἰς ἐπίπλου
22. c.185 P.Petaus 55 Présentation pour ἐπίπλους
 1. 4-5 et 20-21 εἰς τὸ ἐπιπλεῦσαι καὶ παραδοῦναι
23. c.185 P.Petaus 58 Liste des ἐπίπλου
 1. 1-7 Κερκεσοῦχων Ὄρους ἐπ[ύ]πλους Πααῦς Ὀννώφρεως μητ(ρὸς) Ταύρεως ἐπικ(αλούμενος) ὁ τοῦ Θεωδώρου Ἰωρος Ὀννώφρεως μητρὸς Τανεσεῦτος κτλ.
24. 138-141 P.Oxy.inv. 43 5B.71/G (1-7)b Réception du devoir d'ἐπίπλους
 voir l'appendice 2
25. 185 P.Lond.II 342 (p.173) Pleinte au beneficiarius
 1. 6-8 ἄλογον ἀηδέαν συνεστήσαντο πρόφασι τοῦ κατέχειν ἐπιπλόους τοῦς συγγενεῖς μου
26. III^e s. ? P.Iand.150 Liste de contribuables

27. III^e s. ? 1. 16 ἐπιπλευστῆ (δραχμᾶς) δ
P.Iand.151 Liste de contribuables
1. 14-15 Κάστορι ναυτικῶ [ἐ]πιπλεύσαντι μετὰ .[]
(δραχμᾶς) ρ
28. 340 P.Vindob.Worp. 8 Ναυλωτικῆ
1. 40 ἐπι]πλόου ἀχύρου

Appendice 2

P.Oxy. inv. 43 5B.71/G (1-7)b (transcription préliminaire)

col. i

- Πετρωνίω Δ[ι]ον(υσίω στρ[ατηγῶ]
Σαρᾶς ἀπελε[ύ]θῆρος Δ[ιφύλου]
ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως [κα-]
ταγινόμενος ἐν τῷ Νό[μου]
5 ἐποικίω ὡς ἐτῶν μ̄ οὐλ[ῆ]
γαστρογνημῆ ἀρεστερός
ποδὸς εἰσδοθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ
τοῦ Νόμου ἐποικίου κωμ[(ογραμματέως)]
εἰς ἐπιπλωτῶν δημοσί(ο) (πυροῦ)
10 καταγ[ο]μένου εἰς Ἀλεξάν-
δρ[ια]ν. ὀμνύω Αὐτοκράτορα
Κα[ίσα]ρα Τύτου Αἰλίου Ἀδριανὸν
'Αντωνεῖνον Σεβασ[τ]ῶν
Εὐσεβῆ ἐπιπλεύσειν
15 [π]λοῦτος δυσὶ θέωνος Ἀπολ-
[λ]ωνίου κυβερνήτου καὶ
τὸν ἐμβληθησόμενον εἰς
αὐτὰ πυρὸν πα[ραφ]υ[λ]ᾶξω
ἄχρη ἂν ἀκαχοῦρ[γῆτ]ως πα-
20 [ρ]αδο[θ]ῆ (?) τοῦ[ς] .[...]
πλήρη τὸν γ[όμ]ον [ῶ]ς [τοῦ]
κιν[δύ]νον [ῶ]ντο[ς] .[...]

καὶ μ[...]τη...υ[...]
 α.ο.[...].ο.τατη[...]
 25 ἡ ἔνοχο[ς εἶ]ην τῷ ὄ[ρκῳ].
 [(ἔτους) Ἰ. Αὐτοκράτορο[ς κ]αύσα[ρος]
 [Τύτου] Αἰλίου Ἀδριαν[οῦ]
 [Ἀντων]εύγου Σεβασ[τοῦ]
 [Εὐσεβοῦ]ς Τύβ[ι] ὑγ.
 (m.²?) 30 []...[], []
 []. []
 [].. []

.

col. ii

1 Περὶ [νύφ Δ]ιον(υσύφ) στ[ρατ(ηγῶ)]
 Ἀχιλλᾶς Καστορός μ[ητ(ρὸς)]
 θαήσιος ἀπὸ κώμης Σε[ντῶ]
 ὡς (ἐτῶν) ἄ ο(ύλῆ) μετόπ(ω). ὁμυ[ύω]
 5 Αὐτοκράτορα Καύσα[ρα]
 Τύτον Αἰλιον Ἀδριανόν
 Ἀντωνεῦγον Σεβαστό[ν]
 Εὐσε[βῆ] ἡροῦς[ως ἐγ-]
 γυᾶσθα[ι Σα]ράν ἀπελ[εῦ-]
 10 θεροῦ [Δι]φύλου ἀπ' Ὀξ[υρ]ύγ-
 χων πόλ(εως) καταγι(νόμενον) ἐγ [τῶ]
 Νόμου [ἐπου]κίω εἰσό[ο-]
 θέντος εἰς ἐπιπλωά[ν]
 δημο[σίο(υ) (πυροῦ)] ὄν καὶ παρέ-
 15 ξομα[ι] ἐ[μφα]νή δπην[ύ-]
 κα ἐ[ὰν ἐπι]ζητ[ηθ]ῆ
 ἐκτὸς παντὸς ἀσύλου
 τόπου σκέπης πάσης
 ἑκάστῳ ἀπαρτίζω[ν]

.

[ἡμετέρας ἐπιπέρας]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς] 20
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς (τῆς ἀποστολῆς)]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς] 15
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς] 10
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς] 5
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς] 1
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]

COL. 1:1

.

[ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς] 25
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς] 20
 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς]

E I N I G E B E M E R K U N G E N
Ü B E R D I E A I S C H I N E S - P A P Y R I *

P a a v o H o h t i

Wie bekannt, bietet die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Reden des Aischines viele Probleme. Die einzige Untersuchung der handschriftlichen Überlieferung stammt von Heyse (1912).¹ Seine Methoden und Resultate sind aber hart kritisiert worden, zuletzt von Leone² in seiner Studie über die handschriftliche Tradition der Reden. Schon vor ihm hatten die französischen Editoren der Reden, Martin und de Budé ihren Zweifel an der Heyseschen Klassifikation der Handschriften geäußert.³ Die Budé-Edition wurde ihrerseits von Goldschmidt⁴ kritisiert. Goldschmidt hat darin teilweise recht, dass die Budé-Edition für eine textkritische Studie mangelhaft ist. Aber andererseits ist sie die einzige, die das damals zur Verfügung stehende Papyrusmaterial benutzen konnte. Eben auf Grund des Papyrusmaterials hatten die Editoren das eklektische Prinzip befolgt.⁵ Tatsache ist je-

* Vortrag gehalten auf dem XV internationalen Kongress der Papyrologie (Brüssel-Louvain, 29 August - 3 September 1977).

1 M. Heyse, Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Reden des Aeschines. Erster Teil: Die Handschriften der ersten Rede. Progr. Gymn., Ohlau 1912.

2 P.L.M. Leone, Appunti per la storia del testo di Eschine. Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università di Macerata, V-VI (1972-73) 11-43.

3 Eschine, Discours. Tome I: Contre Timarque, Sur l'ambassade infidèle. Texte établi et traduit par Victor Martin et Guy de Budé. Coll. des Univ. de France, Paris 1927, VI-XI.

4 E.D. Goldschmidt, Rez. der obengenannten Edition, Gnomon 4 (1928) 212-217.

5 Siehe S. XVIII.

doch, dass die Editionen von Schulz (1865),⁶ Francke (1887)⁷ und Blass (2. Ed. 1908)⁸ die Basis für die textkritische Arbeit bilden. In der zweiten Auflage seiner Edition konnte Blass zwei Oxyrhynchospapyri benutzen, Martin-De Budé hatten schon acht Papyri. Bisher sind insgesamt fünfzehn Papyri der Reden des Aischines veröffentlicht worden.⁹

Wie gesagt übten die Papyri einen grossen Einfluss auf das Editionsprinzip von Martin-De Budé aus. Auf Grund dieser Texte konnten sie feststellen, dass die Textform der Reden schon in der römischen Zeit stark variierte.¹⁰ Zweitens wurde klar, dass die Papyrustexte zu keiner der uns bekannten Handschriftengruppen gehören.¹¹ Diese zwei Tatsachen veranlassten die Editoren zu der Schlussfolgerung, dass jede Variante isoliert und einzeln betrachtet werden muss.¹² Vor einigen Jahren publizierte Pietro Leone seine Studie 'Appunti per la storia del testo di Eschine'. Er behandelt nebenbei die mittelalterlichen Handschriften, das Hauptgewicht liegt aber auf der Analyse des Papyrusmaterials - insgesamt 14 Stücke. Zu den Handschriften stellt er fest, was bereits früher bekannt war: die Arbeit, die Heyse vorgelegt hat, kann nicht das letzte Wort zur Sache bleiben. Wir brauchen eine verlässliche Studie über die handschriftliche Tradition. Die Analyse der Papyrustexte zeigte seiner Meinung nach, dass ihre Textform besser war, als die mittelalterliche Tradition. Seine Analysen bestätigten die schon von Martin-De Budé gewonnene Überzeugung, dass unsere Papyri keiner Handschriftengruppe folgen.

6 Aeschinis orationes. Edidit F. Schultz, Lipsiae 1865.

7 Aeschinis Orationes. Iterum edidit Friedericus Franke, Lipsiae 1887.

8 Aeschinis Orationes. Post Fr. Frankium curavit Fridericus Blass. Editio altera correctior, Lipsiae 1908.

9 Zu den bei Leone, 18-20 genannten Papyri tritt noch P.Colon.Inv. 5927 (gegen Timarchos 18-20), publiziert in ZPE 14 von Charalambakis-Hagedorn-Kaimakis-Thüngen. Vgl. auch ZPE 16 (1975) 69-75 und 145-148 die Reaktionen von Wankel und Merkelbach.

10 S. X.

11 S. XV-XVIII.

12 S. XIX.

Das Material von Oxyrhynchos gibt noch ein Stück Evidenz von den Reden des Aischines. Es handelt sich um einen noch nicht veröffentlichten Papyrus, der die Kapitel 130-133 der zweiten Rede *De falsa legatione* im Fragment enthält.¹³ Ein neues Stück dieser Rede ist besonders interessant, weil sie am wenigsten durch Papyrustexte unterstützt ist.¹⁴ Dieses Fragment stammt aus dem zweiten Jahrhundert. Es ist sorgfältig geschrieben, enthält aber keine Korrekturen, Akzente oder andere Lesezeichen.

Das neue Fragment bringt keine besonderen Neuheiten. Interessant sind jedoch vier Wortumstellungen, von denen zwei nicht in den mittelalterlichen Handschriften bestätigt sind. Die erste Variante ist

τ]ο γαρ
αυτο ηυξησε]τε τα
των εν φωκευ]σι τυ
ραννων πραγμα]τα
και]

Die Handschriften geben τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ ἠύξησε τε τῶν ἐν Φωκεῦσι τυράννων τὰ πράγματα. Aischines spricht hier über den Verfall von Phokis und sagt, dieselbe Ursache, die sie gross gemacht habe, habe sie auch zerstört. Der Verfall ist schon im vorhergehenden Satz erwähnt: τὰ δ' ἐν Φωκεῦσι διεφθάρη πράγματα πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὴν τύχην, ἡ παντῶν ἐστὶ κυρία, (ἔπειτα διὰ τὸ μῆκος τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τὴν δεκάτη πόλεμον). Dieser Satz gibt dieselbe Stellung für den Artikel und πράγματα wie in der neuen Variante, ἐν Φωκεῦσι bleibt zwischen ihnen. Ein ähnliches Prinzip der Stellung des Artikels ist für den ganzen Passus charakteristisch. Unsere Variante wird mit ἡ τοῦς ἀπορουμένους στρατοπέδοις συνήθης παρακολουθοῦσα στράσους und ἡ φαλαίκου περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι πραγμάτων ἄγνοια fortgesetzt. Eine unmittelbare Stellung des Artikels neben dem Substantiv in ähnlichen Fällen ist bei

13 43 5B. 68/F2(4-5). Dieser Text wird bald mit anderen in Helsinki bearbeiteten Oxyrhynchos-Papyri publiziert.

14 Drei Fragmente (P.Oxy 458, P.Oxy 440, P.Erl. 11) gegen zwei Fragmente der ersten Rede, aber es ist in ihnen nicht viel zu lesen.

Aischines nicht üblich. In dieser zweiten Rede habe ich nur eine Stelle gefunden, wo die Handschriften eine solche Lesart angeben. Im Kapitel 20 steht πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ πολέμου. Francke hat diese Lesart beibehalten, während Blass korrigiert: τοῦ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν πολέμου. Wahrscheinlich denkt Blass hier an die Deutlichkeit des Ausdrucks sowie an den üblichen Gebrauch bei Aischines. Gerade an dieser Stelle hat Blass nicht korrigiert, sondern die Variation in dem Passus gelassen. Vielleicht scheute Blass auch den aus der Korrektur resultierenden starken rhetorischen Eindruck. Es folgt eine starke Alliteration: τε τὰ τῶν ἐν φωκεῦσι τυράνων. Auf der anderen Seite könnte man denken, dass die Lesart der Handschriften speziell die phokischen Tyrannen betont. Dafür lässt sich aber aus dem Kontext kein Grund nachweisen, weshalb diese Erklärung unwahrscheinlich ist. Natürlich ist es schwer zu sagen, ob die neue Lesart ursprünglich ist. Wir können nur feststellen, dass diese neue Variante grammatische Deutlichkeit zeigt, wobei auch eine starke rhetorische Wirkung erzielt wird.

Eine ähnliche Tendenz zur deutlichen Textform erscheint in der zweiten Variante:

φηφ[ι]σαμένων δε υ
μων πα[ρ]αδοῦναι τους
φωκέας [ταυτα τα χω
ρια Προξ[ε]νωι τωι στρα
τηγωι κ[α]

Die Handschriften geben hier φηφισαμένων δ' ὑμῶν παραδοῦναι Προξένωι τῷ στρατηγῷ τοὺς Φωκέας ταῦτα τὰ χωρία. Im Kontext können wir keine auf Uniformismus weisende Stellen finden, wenn nicht der Ausdruck ἐπαγγελλόμενοι παραδώσειν "Ἀλκωνον καὶ Θρόνιον καὶ Νικαίαν des vorhergehenden Satzes als solche betrachtet wird.

Die dritte Variante lautet:

τετ[α]ρ[τ]ον δ η φαλαικου
περι τῶ[ν]
πραγμ[α]των
αγνοια[

Blass und Martin-de Budé geben hier mit der Mehrheit der Handschriften $\text{περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι πραγμάτων ἄγνοια}$. Es ist aber offensichtlich, dass das in unserem Papyrus nicht so geschrieben sein kann. Dass diese Stelle schwierig oder zweifelhaft gewesen ist, zeigen die Varianten in den Handschriften. Gruppe A mit f^1 lassen μελλόντων weg, während i πραγμάτων ignoriert. Eine mögliche Ergänzung für unseren Papyrus wäre $\text{περὶ τῶν μελλόντων πραγμάτων ἔσεσθαι ἄγνοια}$, aber würde das eine Verbesserung darstellen? Andererseits könnte man hier auch mit einem Schreiberfehler des Kopisten rechnen, der unter Einfluss von $\text{τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων ἄφασθαι}$ gerade nach $\text{τῶν μελλόντων πραγμάτων ἔσεσθαι}$ geschrieben hätte. Leider gibt unser Fragment keine endgültige Lösung für diese zweifelhafte Stelle. Wichtig aber ist, dass unser Papyrus eine Lesart gegen i und gegen die Gruppe A gibt. Diese Handschriften wurden von Blass als besonders zuverlässig bezeichnet.

Die vierte Variante ist auch gegen die Handschrift i :

$\text{οὐ πολλ[ω δε χρονω}$
 προτερο[ν
 $\text{προς υμ[ας ειρηνην}$

Blass gibt hier $\text{οὐ πολλῶ δε χρόνω πρότερον ἢ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰρήνην}$. Er folgt dabei eben der Pariser Handschrift i aus dem XIII. Jahrhundert. Es ist wiederum klar, dass unser Text anders gelautet hat. Andere Handschriften ausser i geben entweder πρότερον πρὶν oder πρότερον πρὶν ἢ an. Diese beiden Lesarten sind hier als Ergänzung möglich, die letztere aber wahrscheinlicher, da sie der Praxis des Aischines und anderer Redner folgt. Diese letztgenannte Lesart hat Francke beibehalten.

Diese zwei Varianten gegen die Pariser Handschrift i geben unserem Papyrus ein besonderes Interesse, weil diese Handschrift eben von Blass und zuletzt auch von Leone sehr geschätzt wurde. Ihre Auffassung wurde durch einen Oxyrhynchos-Papyrus Nr. 440 unterstützt. Dieser Papyrus bringt nämlich zwei gemeinsame Lesarten mit der Pariser Handschrift, bei beiden Lesarten handelt es sich um Wortumstellungen. Leone war der Ansicht, dass i eine antike Edition ganz

oder teilweise fortsetze.

Eine genauere Untersuchung aller Lesarten in unserem Papyrus zeigt eine Tendenz gegen die Gruppe A der mittelalterlichen Handschriften.

- 131 δια [την τυχην] pap.: δια om. A
 132 την] προς υμ[ας ευρηνην pap.: ημας A, aghimp
 περι τω[ν] πραγματων pap.: μελλοντων om. A, f
 133 [ταυτα τα χω]ρια Προξ[ενωι τωι στρα]τηγωι κ[αι
 πεντηκον]τα πλη[ρουσιν τριηρεις] και τ[ου]ς [μεχρω pap.:
 ταυτα...μεχρω om. A.

Zu diesen Stellen kommen noch drei Varianten, die gegen die Handschrift k aus der Gruppe A sprechen. Hinzu kommen noch einige Lesarten, die unter den Handschriftengruppen derart variieren, dass man keine Grenzen zwischen den Gruppen ziehen kann. Wir können also feststellen, dass die Lesarten in unserem Papyrus mit allen anderen Handschriften entweder gegen Gruppe A oder Handschrift i stehen, oder ohne Rücksicht auf Gruppenzugehörigkeit variieren. Diese letztgenannte Variation ist für alle Aischines-Papyri gemeinsam, nicht aber eine derart klare Opposition gegen eine Gruppe oder eine Handschrift, wie sie in unserem Papyrus erscheint.

Beim Vergleich mit einem anderen Fragment aus Oxyrhynchos, Nr. 458, das die Kapitel 21, 26-27, 29-30 aus derselben Rede wiedergibt, können wir eine ähnliche Tendenz feststellen. Dort gibt der Text drei Varianten wie in allen Handschriften ausser der Gruppe A an, während andere Varianten unter den Gruppen unterschiedlich variieren. Ausserdem spricht eine Variante noch gegen Gruppe A und Handschrift i.

Der dritte Papyrus ist zu fragmentarisch, als dass etwas von den Varianten gesagt werden könnte. Schon oben habe ich von dem Oxyrhynchos-Papyrus 440 erwähnt, dass er die Handschrift i unterstützt, und ausserdem können wir noch feststellen, dass er der Gruppe A folgt.

Der neue Text zeigt also einerseits Selbständigkeit, und auf der anderen Seite ergibt sich, dass die bisher bekannten Papyri der

zweiten Rede entweder gegen oder für A und i sprechen; hinzu kommt die übliche Variation. Diese Situation ist deshalb bemerkenswert, weil die Papyri der anderen Reden sich nicht so verhalten, sondern in einer anderen Weise mit einigen Handschriften gegen verschiedene Gruppen stehen. Im Vergleich zu diesen zeigen die Papyri der zweiten Rede eine klarer feststellbare Linie. Es wäre verlockend, auf Grund dieser Situation festzustellen, dass unsere Papyri der zweiten Rede zwei verschiedene antike Traditionen repräsentieren. Ich fürchte aber, dass das Material für eine solche Feststellung auch nach diesem Fragment zu knapp bleibt.

THE HEREAFTER IN ANCIENT
CHRISTIAN EPIGRAPHY AND POETRY

I i r o K a j a n t o

The eschatological ideas in Christian epitaphs, for all their importance, have been little explored. The standard handbooks of Christian epigraphy, C.M. Kaufmann¹ and F. Grossi Gondi,² give them only a summary treatment. R. Lattimore, it is true, discussed the problems in more detail.³ But I hope to be able to prove that some of his views and interpretations are not tenable. A. Stuiber, a theologian, not an epigraphist, utilized epigraphical material in his monograph on the idea of the intermediate state in the ancient Church.⁴ Part of his interpretations are likewise challengable.

The ideas of after-life found in epitaphs can be properly studied only in connection with the theological thought of the period. It is unthinkable that the writers of the epitaphs should have ventured radical innovations in a world as delicate as that of religious ideas. In addition to patristic literature, Christian poetry should also be considered. It is indeed one of the aims of the present paper to show that epigraphy may here have conformed with Christian poetry even more than it did with the Christian fathers.

1 Handbuch der altchristlichen Epigraphik, 1917, 198-209.

2 Trattato di epigrafia cristiana, 1920, 237-241.

3 Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs, 1962², 304-316.

4 Refrigerium interim. Die Vorstellungen vom Zwischenzustand und die frühchristliche Grabeskunst, Theophaneia 11, 1957, 105-120.

Development of the ideas of the hereafter
in Christian antiquity

In the New Testament, the basic eschatological ideas were the resurrection of the body, Christ's Second Coming, which was believed to be imminent, and the Last Judgement. As yet, little attention was given to the intermediate state between death and resurrection.⁵ In Paul, there may be some allusions to it, but the interpretation of the relevant passages is far from certain.⁶ At any rate, in late Judaism there had arisen the belief that the departed spirits were confined to the sheol or the Hades until the Day of Judgement. Originally there was no difference between good and evil souls. All shared the same shadowy existence. Before long, however, the Hades was differentiated into an interim place of reward or punishment, according to the merits of the soul.⁷ This idea was echoed in the New Testament in the parable of the Dives and Lazarus, Luke 16,19-31. Here "Abraham's bosom", the place of rest for the beggar, represents that part of the Hades where the good were rewarded. A chasm separated it from the place where the Dives was being tortured. Yet nothing in the story suggests that it was only the souls of the rich man and the beggar that were carried off to the Hades.

In the subsequent period, Christ's Second Coming fading into ever more distant future, these somewhat vague ideas of after-life underwent elaboration at the hands of people schooled in Greek philosophical thought. The late Judaic idea about the sheol or the Hades and the Greek conviction of the immortality of the soul combined to produce the doctrine of the intermediate state. Body and soul were different entities. Upon a person's death, they were separated. The body was left in the earth, to be resurrected at Doomsday. The soul,

5 So in the crucial Paulinian passages on resurrection, I Cor. 15 and I Thess. 4,13-17. In the latter passage, the dead are claimed to be "sleeping". For the radical contrast between the Biblical belief in resurrection and the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul, see O. Cullman, *Unsterblichkeit der Seele und Auferstehung der Toten*, *ThZeitschr.* 12 (1956) 126-152.

6 Phil. 1,23 and II Cor. 5,1-5.

7 Stuiber (fn. 4) 17sqq.

stripped of the flesh, was carried off to the Hades to enjoy rest or to be subjected to retribution in anticipation of general resurrection and the reunification of the body and soul. Only then would Heaven and Hell be opened. The Christian idea of the intermediate state was thus dualistic. It was only resurrection that would put an end to this dualism.

The martyrs were an important exception.⁸ Their souls were thought to ascend to Heaven immediately after their martyrdom. Even this idea came from late Judaism.⁹ In the New Testament, the crucial passage is Rev. 6,9-11, "I saw under the altar (scil., in Heaven) the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held..." Their number was still to be increased by "their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were..." In the age of the Apostolic Fathers, Polycarp of Smyrna argued that the martyrs "have now reached a well-earned place at the side of the Lord whose pains they shared."¹⁰ The Acts of the martyrdom of Polycarp record his prayer that he may be received the very same day in the presence of God.¹¹ In these writings, it was not yet clearly stated that it was the s o u l of the martyr that was taken to Heaven. From a somewhat later period, the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas report the dream of another martyr, Saturus, about Paradise to which he was due to be admitted. Here dualism is already explicit, *exivimus de carne*.¹² Paradise as described by him was a place full of light, a typical *locus amoenus*, where the souls enjoyed the Beatific Vision, the company of God and Christ.¹³ But it was still the souls of only the martyrs that were

8 Ibid. 40-42.

9 Thus the famous Seven Maccabeans and their mother, victims of Antiochus' cruelty, went straight to God after their death, IV Macc. 16,25; 17,18; 18,23.

10 Epist. 9.

11 The Acts of the Christian Martyrs, ed. by H. Musurillo, 1972, 14.

12 Musurillo's edition (see above), 11,2.

13 Ibid. 11,5 *Factum est nobis spatium grande, quod tale fuit quasi viridiarium arbores habens rosae et omnigenus flores, etc.*

raised there.¹⁴

The attitude of the Latin Fathers is important for us because most of them wrote in the very same period in which Christian epigraphy was flourishing. Dualism of body and soul was by now an established doctrine. Tertullian upholds the traditional ideas. Before resurrection, the souls stayed in the Hades, where they were either punished or rewarded. The place of reward was called *refrigerium interim*. Only the martyrs' souls were already in Heaven.¹⁵ Similar ideas were advocated by the majority of the Latin Fathers. Lactantius argued that the souls would be judged only at Doomsday. Prior to resurrection, good and evil souls were kept in appropriate places.¹⁶ Hilarius made use of the Biblical expression of Abraham's bosom to describe the intermediate state between death and resurrection.¹⁷ In one passage, he recorded the descent of the souls *ad inferos* upon death.¹⁸

Augustine's position is not equally unambiguous, and scholars have often come to different conclusions as to his eschatology.¹⁹ On the whole, however, and despite some hesitation in regard to the exact nature of the hereafter, he seems to stand by the traditional doctrine. Between death and the resurrection of the body, the souls were kept *abditis receptaculis*, having rest or suffering tribulation earned by their conduct in life.²⁰ Essential for Augustine was, however, the immense difference in quality between pre- and post-

14 Cf., however, 13,8 *et coepimus illic multos fratres cognoscere sed et martyras*, which may imply that not all the brethren were martyrs.

15 Cf. especially De anima 55 and 58 and the comments of J.H. Wasznik (1947). *Refrigerium interim* in monog. 10.

16 Inst. 7,21,7; cf. 7,7,13. For the old Judaic idea, adopted by Lactantius, according to which the sinners would be excluded from resurrection, cf. Stuiber (fn. 4) 74.

17 Tract. Psalm. 120,12.

18 Tract. Psalm. 138,22.

19 Cf. A. Portalié, Augustin, DTC I.1 (1931) 2444sg.

20 Enchir. 109; cf. civ. 12,9 *secretis animarum receptaculis sedibusque requiescit*.

resurrectional reward or punishment.²¹ He is even occasionally uncertain whether the Saints were already in Heaven.²² Later Fathers were explicit on this point.²³

From the last century of antiquity, we may cite Cassiodorus as an exponent of the conventional ideas about the intermediate state of the souls between death and resurrection.²⁴

In the Latin theological thought between 200-600, the traditional eschatological ideas were thus dominant. The souls of ordinary Christians had to await resurrection in a separate Hades. Only the Saints' souls were already in Paradise.

The idea of martyrdom, however, underwent a change of great consequence. The martyrs were thought to have wiped out all their sins by their death for faith.²⁵ Hence the very sinlessness of a soul could be held to guarantee its immediate ascent to Heaven.²⁶ One of the earliest advocates of the idea was Cyprian, who argued that though a man, who was prepared to suffer a martyr's death, should die prematurely, his faith would not be without its due reward.²⁷ But he continued in an even more liberal vein, *in persecutione militia* (i.e. martyrdom), *in pace conscientia coronatur*. Thus a good and virtuous Christian life could be claimed to suffice for an immediate enjoyment of celestial bliss. Especially after the discontinuance of the persecutions, when there were no longer martyrs,

21 Cf. sermo 283,5: *Sicut enim plurimum distat inter laetitias miseriasve somniantium et vigilantium; ita multum interest inter tormenta vel gaudia mortuorum et resurgentium; similarly in evang. Ioh. 49, 10 . Cf. Kari Elisabeth Børresen, Augustin, interprète du dogme de la résurrection, Studia Theologica 23 (1969) 151.*

22 *Retract.* 1,14,2.

23 Gennadius, *De eccl. dogm.* 79, *post ascensionem Domini ad caelos, omnium sanctorum animae cum Christo sunt; cf. Isidorus, sentent. liber primus, 14,16; Greg. Magnus, mon. 4.*

24 *Expos. Psalm. 24,12 quia iustis hominibus exutis corpore non statim perfecta beatitudo datur.*

25 Cf. Tertull., *apol.* 50,16 *omnia enim huic operi (i.e., martyrdom) delicta donantur.*

26 H.v. Camphausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*, 1936, 140sqg.

27 *Epist. ad. Fortun.* 13.

this idea came to have considerable significance.²⁸ Yet the direct ascent to Heaven was still thought to be an exception, not a rule.²⁹

Eschatological ideas in Christian poetry

I am not going to canvass here all the Latin Christian poets nor all the eschatological ideas. I shall consider only two representative poets, Paulinus of Nola and Prudentius, to ascertain what they have to say on the nature of the hereafter, especially during the period immediately after death.

Paulinus of Nola, a wealthy aristocrat who became an ascetic and was finally elected bishop, dealt with eschatological ideas especially in the poem xxxi, a poetic *consolatio* on the death of Cel-sus, the young son of his friends.

There is some inconsistency in Paulinus' ideas about the soul's fate upon death. The departed, a boy of eight, was not a martyr. He died of an ailment of the throat, probably of diphtheria.³⁰ Nevertheless, Paulinus suggests that his soul was already in Paradise, *terra suam partem tumultata carne recepit / spiritus angelico vectus abit gremio* (39sq.), where "angels' bosom", modelled upon "Abraham's bosom", was a poetic expression for Heaven.

The dualistic conception suggested by the verse will meet us in a great number of varieties in Christian epitaphs. The body is confined to earth, to await general resurrection and the reunification with the soul (295sqg.) whereas the soul is raised to Paradise. Except for the fact that the sphere of the people admitted to the immediate Beatific Vision has been widened, there is nothing heretical here.

Towards the end of the poem, Paulinus seems to retrace his

28 Cf., e.g., Caesar. Arel. (Ps. Aug. sermo 303, 2) *non solum martyribus praemia promittuntur caelestia, sed etiam integra fide et perfecta charitate Christum sequentibus.*

29 Cf. H. Koch, Kirche und Auserwählung beim hl. Kyprian, Intern. Kirch. Zeitschr., N.F. 12 (1922) 65sqg.

30 Cf. 35 *causa fuit leti suffusus faucibus umor.*

steps. After describing the resurrection of the body, he argues that at Christ's Second Coming, Our Father will raise to Heaven all who repose in faith,³¹ which implies that between death and resurrection, Heaven was still barred, even to the righteous.

Paulinus suggests two alternatives as to the fate of the departed boy's soul. One is the traditional "Abraham's bosom", the place of interim rest different from Heaven.³² But the other alternative is clearly Heaven, where the martyrs are already enjoying the company of Christ, *aut cum Bethlaeis infantibus in Paradiso...inter odoratum ludit nemus atque coronas / texit honorandis praemia martyribus. / talibus inmixtus regem comitabitur agnum (i.e., Christ) virgineis infans additus agminibus (584sqq.)*.

Paulinus' suggestion that the dead child was already in Paradise, in the circle of the Holy Innocents, is understandable in a poem of consolation addressed to the grieving parents. Thus the poem illustrates the psychological motives behind the expansion of the original idea of the immediate Beatific Vision granted to martyrs. To the relatives, the conviction that their beloved departed was now enjoying all the joys of Paradise was naturally a great solace. But it was in poetry and in funeral inscriptions that the idea was prominent. Theological writers were no doubt more bound by the traditional doctrine. As shown above, according to the Latin Fathers, primarily only the Saints' souls were entitled to the pre-resurrectional ascent to Heaven, whereas the other souls had to await, in a separate Hades, general resurrection and the Last Judgement. Yet Paulinus did not modify the traditional doctrine quite without doubts. Hence his hesitation between Abraham's bosom and Paradise at the end of the poem.

The greatest of the Latin Christian poets, Prudentius, wrote a hymn of 172 lines on Christian burial (cathem. 10). Prudentius

31 *sic et eos quicumque fide vivente quiescunt / adducet Christo cum remeante pater, 565sq.*

32 *aut illum gremio exceptum fovit almus Abraham / et blandus digitorum Eleazar alit, 583sq.*

was one of the Christian intellectuals who were not overzealous to repudiate classical culture. This is evident in the hymn on burial, too. The primary theme of the poem is the dualism of body and soul and their different fates after death. According to Prudentius, the soul is of a fiery substance, originating from the ether.³³ Accordingly it rises up to the heavens³⁴ or to the stars³⁵ upon death. The dead body also reverts to its place of origin.³⁶

So far, there is little that could be called specifically Christian. The conviction that the soul descends from the ether or from the stars, is imprisoned in the body, and returns to its native place upon a person's death, was a commonplace in the philosophical and religious thought of late antiquity.³⁷ Apart from the fact that Heaven was imagined to lie high up above the earth, the Bible gave no precise idea of its topology.³⁸ Augustine, for his part, argued

33 *si generis memor ignis (scil. est anima), 28; quae (scil. anima) germen ab aethere traxit, 24.*

34 *petit halitus aera fervens, 11.*

35 *pariterque reportat ad astra, 32; cf. 92, ad astra doloribus itur.*

36 *humus excipit arida corpus, 12.*

37 Cf. F. Cumont, *Lux Perpetua*, 1949, 142-188, and *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*, 1966², 373-388. For an example, see Macrobius, *Comment. somn. Scip.*, 1,12 *descensus vero ipsius, quo anima de caelo in huius vitae inferna delabitur, sic ordo digeritur, etc.*, representing the Neoplatonic point of view. Pagan epitaphs often report the ascent of the soul to Heaven, CE 1311 *nam mens aeterna profecto / pro meritis potitur sedibus Elysiis; 2152 spiritum [que]m tu ferebas corpore elabi sacrum, corpus ut terram manere, spiritum celum sequi*, where the dualistic conception of body and soul is patent; one epitaph even records eternal light, one of the distinctive qualities of Christian heaven (cf. p. 36), CE 591 *terrenum corpus, caelestis spiritus in me, / quo repetente suam sedem nunc vivimus illic / et fruitur superis aeterna in luce Fabatus*; the ascent to the stars was mentioned in an explicit contrast to the traditional ideas of the underworld, CE 569 *non tamen ad Manes sed caeli ad sidera pergis*; the journey to the stars was a reward of virtuous life, CE 1061,11 *hic posita: an superas convisit luminis auras / innocua aeternis condita sideribus?* Though the extracts may sound Christian, they were all from epitaphs of undoubted pagan origin. In contrast to Christian eschatological ideas, pagan dualism was, however, final, not only temporary. The body would turn into earth without a hope of eventual resurrection.

38 P. Bernard, *ciel*, DTC II (1939) 2475sqq.

that the location of Heaven was God's secret. Realistic ideas of the hereafter were superfluous.³⁹ Nevertheless, realistic ideas, largely drawn from contemporary pagan thought, proved unavoidable. Paul himself, II Cor. 12,2, told us how he had been "caught up to the third heaven", which meant Paradise.⁴⁰ Paul's description certainly suggests a primitive astronomy which not yet distinguished the planets from the fixed stars.⁴¹ The identification of Heaven and the stars enjoyed, especially in poetry and epigraphy, great popularity. In the poem of Paulinus discussed above, references to the "stars" were still more frequent than they were in Prudentius.⁴²

In Prudentius, these ideas of pagan origin had been imbedded in deep Christian soil.⁴³ Two ideas are of significance here. First, though the body has reverted to earth, it will before long⁴⁴ be reawakened and, in company of its former soul, be carried *volucres ... in auras* (43). We may here pass Prudentius' conviction of the nearness of Christ's Second Coming. What is important for us is the argument that the body, entrusted to the sepulchre, is not dead but given up to sleep (55sq.). Thus only the body was in sleep, not the whole man (cf. fn.5). All that are now in cold sleep will presently be alive. Hence the care shown by the Christians for the burial of their dead (61sq.). Whatever the condition of the dead body, God

39 Enarr. Psalm. 30,8.

40 Cf. I Thes. 4,17 (about Doomsday) "Then we which are alive...shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air..."

41 Cumont, *Lux Perpetua* 185.

42 *pater ipse polo miseratus ab alto*, 81; *nostrum secum corpus in astra tulit*, 134; *Christus in astra vocat*, 190; *corporeum remeare ad sidera Christum / cernimus et gremio nubis in astra vehi*, 397sq.

43 Verses 9-16, where the pagan ideas were most obtrusive, were in later manuscripts replaced by new ones of more palatable Christianity, 9-13 *sic cuncta creata necesse est / obitum tolerare supremum / ut semina dissociata / sibi sumat origo resorbens*, were superseded by (from 14) *labefacta senescere tandem / compactaque dissociari / et dissona texta retexi*. Some editors ascribe the recast to the poet himself (cf. Cunningham, *Corp. Christ. Ser. lat.* 126, 1972, p.53). I leave the matter open here.

44 *spatium breve restat*, 35; *venient cito saecula cum iam...*, 37.

will recollect and resuscitate it (141-144), a traditional Christian doctrine.⁴⁵

Near the end of the poem, Prudentius takes up a serious problem. Before the resurrection of the body, where does God order the pure soul to rest (151sq.)? His treatment of the theme may owe something to poetic licence. At any rate, he first proposes Abraham's bosom, following the traditional story in Luke (153-156). We may notice here a detail not found in the original story. According to Prudentius, Lazarus had flowers all about him. This detail came from the rich ancient traditions of earthly Paradise, the Golden Age, and the *locus amoenus*. But what is of primary importance is the fact that Prudentius identifies Abraham's bosom with celestial Paradise. After recording the well-known words of Our Lord to the malefactor on the Cross (Luke 23,43), he continues, *patet ecce fidelibus ampli / via lucida iam paradisi, / licet et nemus illud adire / homini quod ademerat anguis* (161-164). Paradise, described as the Garden of Eden, was accordingly open to the souls of the righteous even before resurrection. The soul, the servant of God, was to be consecrated to God in its original home, which it had left to wander in exile (165-168).

Apart from the realistic details borrowed from the Biblical description of earthly Paradise, enriched by the pagan mythology of the Golden Age and the poetic tradition of the *locus amoenus*, which are all present here, celestial bliss was usually qualified as *requies* and *lux*.⁴⁶ These ideas were crystallized into the famous lines of Christian liturgy, *requiem aeternam dona eis, domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis*, due to Gregory the Great.⁴⁷ In Prudentius' hymn, there are references to them, *animam requiescere* (152) and *via lucida paradisi* (162).

45 Cf. Augustine, civ. 12,20.

46 Cumont, Symbolisme (fn. 37) 386sqq.

47 Liber antiphon., PL 78,722. According to Cumont, op.cit. 385 fn. 1, the idea of rest in celestial light came from the Orient, and was a commonplace in late antiquity.

In the eschatological beliefs of Paulinus and Prudentius, three points are of significance. Firstly, there is a clear dualism of body and soul. Upon a person's death, the body is left in earth, the soul raised to Heaven. Yet this is wholly within Christian orthodoxy. The body will not be abandoned for ever but will be resuscitated at the Last Judgement. This is decisively at variance with pagan thought, which admitted the immortality of the soul but denied physical resurrection. Even gnosticism repudiated the resurrection of the body.⁴⁸ Secondly, the right to the direct ascent to Heaven was extended from the Saints to all righteous souls. Here the departure from the traditional doctrine represented by the majority of the Fathers is noticeable. Especially in Prudentius, the old difference between the interim place of rest in "Abraham's bosom" and celestial Paradise was abolished, and the just and faithful souls were admitted to Heaven. Finally, celestial bliss was described as the Garden of Eden, as rest in light, and as the Beatific Vision.

The intermediate state of the souls

There is little epigraphical evidence of a belief in the intermediate state, of a sojourn of the souls in a subterranean place between death and the resurrection of the body. Stüber certainly cites as evidence the words *refrigerium*, *refrigerare*, in part also *pax*.⁴⁹ But his arguments are not quite convincing. He maintains that the reticence of the epitaphs about the precise nature of *refrigerium* is significant.⁵⁰ In contrast to this reticence, later epitaphs were quite explicit about the ascent of the soul to celestial bliss. Again, *pax*, *in pace* does not refer to celestial bliss.⁵¹ Instead,

48 R.M. Grant, *Gnosticism and the Early Christianity*, 1959, 61.

49 Op.cit. (fn. 4) 105sqq.

50 "Es fällt auf, dass *refrigerium* ohne erklärende Zusätze als angebliche Bezeichnung für die himmlische Seligkeit unbestimmt und geradezu zaghaft wirkt; man würde bestimmtere und kräftigere Ausdrücke erwarten..." p. 111.

51 "So ist auch bei der *pax*-Formel der Grabinschriften kein Anzeichen dafür vorhanden, dass die abgeschiedenen Seelen nur im Himmel in *pace* weilen könnten."

it could suggest the intermediate state. Stuibler concludes, "Wägt man alle Gründe ab, die für die Deutung der refrigerium-Inschriften anzuführen sind, so kann man kaum mehr daran zweifeln, dass im allgemeinen refrigerium auf den Inschriften den Zustand der Ruhe der Gerechten im Zwischenzustand bedeutet..." (p. 113).

Now it seems to me that Stuibler's eagerness to prove his case has made him misconstrue evidence.

Firstly, *refrigerium*, *refrigerare* was not a very frequent expression in epitaphs, which certainly reduces its significance.⁵² Further, most of the phrases are too brief to allow any decision between the alternatives of celestial bliss or rest in the Hades, e.g. *spiritum tuum deus refrigeret*;⁵³ *bene merenti in pace et in refrigerium*,⁵⁴ etc.

In some cases, a more positive interpretation may be possible. In one epitaph, overlooked by Stuibler, *refrigerare* seems to suggest the intermediate state. The epitaph commemorates an African bishop, *huius anima refrigerat, corpus hic in pace quiescit / resurrectionem expectans futuram de mortuis primam / consors ut fiat sanctis in possessione regni caelestis*.⁵⁵ The "first resurrection" is a reference to Rev. 20,4 and to the millennium promised there to the martyrs and other righteous people. The Biblical reference implies that the epitaph was written by a man versed in eschatological doctrines. Thus it is possible, though by no means certain, that *refrigerare* here suggests the rest of the soul in the Hades, from which it would be released at the first resurrection to join the company of the Saints.

In other cases, *refrigerium*, *refrigerare* suggests celestial bliss. A graffito from a Roman catacomb, *refrigeri Ianuarius Agatopus Felicissim(us) martyres*,⁵⁶ can only refer to Heaven, where the souls of the martyrs already were. A phrase like *cuius spiritum in refri-*

52 Material in ILCV 2304-2322A.

53 ICVR 15402.

54 ILCV 2722.

55 CE 1837

56 ILCV 2318.

*gerium suscipiat dominus*⁵⁷ implies Heaven. We cannot imagine God receiving souls in the Hades. Finally, since intercession is possible only in Heaven, *Ianuarina bene refrigera et roga pro nos*,⁵⁸ suggests celestial bliss. On the other hand, *refrigera cum spirita sancta*, a. 291, quoted as evidence of celestial bliss,⁵⁹ is ambiguous. The word *sancti* certainly later stood for the "Saints", the martyrs and others officially venerated by the Church. In epigraphy, however, *sancti* were often only the faithful, those who had obtained bliss.⁶⁰

The fallacies of the general arguments advanced by Stuiber are equally obvious. They are *argumenta ex silentio*, which are always of a doubtful value. Now the epitaphs recording *refrigerium* were seldom dated. In general, however, acclamations, of which type *refrigerium*-formulas usually were, belonged more to the early than to the later period of Christian epigraphy. If the epitaphs were early, i.e. from the late 3rd and early 4th century, their reticence about the precise nature of *refrigerium* was not due to the fact "dass man die Seelen der Toten noch nicht im Himmel wusste" but to the general briefness of the early Christian epitaphic style.

The results of the review of the material and of Stuiber's arguments are accordingly, at best, inconclusive. I do not deny that *refrigerium*, *refrigerare* may have been used in the Tertullianic sense in some early epitaphs, though we cannot be very positive about this because of the briefness of the relevant expressions. On the other hand, there is evidence that *refrigerium* could suggest celestial bliss.

As to *pax*, one cannot dismiss this ubiquitous word as rapidly as Stuiber does. A proper analysis of the meaning and use of *pax*

57 ICVR 311.

58 ICVR 9913.

59 ICVR 13886; cf. A.M. Schneider, *Refrigerium I. Nach literarischen Quellen und Inschriften*, diss. Freiburg, 1928, 21sq. Stuiber, 111 fn. 15, erroneously considered *Spirita* a singular and argued that it "wahrscheinlich" referred to the soul of the departed. This is bad linguistics. *Spirita* is a common Vulgar neuter of *spiritus*, see ILCV III p. 409.

60 H. Delehaye, *Sanctus* (*Subsidia hagiographica* 17), 1927, 30sqq.

would require a monograph. Here I can only discuss a few points relevant to the present theme.

In Christian epitaphs, *pax* was found in almost any position, from acclamations like *te in pace, pax tecum*, to combinations with the different elements of an epitaph. It was included in age records, *vixit in pace*, in the phrases signifying dying, *decessit/obiit in pace*, or repose in the grave, *dormit/iacet/quiescit/requiescit in pace*, burial and dedication, *depositus in pace, fecit/posuit in pace, benemerenti in pace*. In a great number of cases, *in pace* simply followed the name of the defunct or was syntactically unrelated to the rest of the epitaph.⁶¹

Clearly *pax* cannot have been used in quite the same sense in all these contexts. Blaise distinguishes 11 different meanings for the word.⁶² In a phrase like *vixit in pace*, it probably suggested the "peace" due to the reconciliation of man with God through Christ's mediation, "salvation", the reward of faith; cf. the phrase *in pace fidelis*, common in African epitaphs. In the phrases signifying dying, a similar meaning is also conceivable, whereas in the expressions for "burial" and "dedication", *in pace* may suggest "peace of the grave".⁶³ Admittedly, the meaning of "salvation" is equally possible in many of the cases.

For us, the most significant meaning is that of "celestial peace". As stated, *requies* and *lux* were general qualities of life in Heaven. Now *requies* and *pax* are closely related. Hence it is natural that the latter word should also have been used in describing celestial life.⁶⁴

61 Cf. P. Bruun, SICV I.2, 1963, 77sq.

62 Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens, 1954, s.v.

63 Cf. the corresponding Jewish phrase ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἢ κοίμησις αὐτοῦ. and Bruun, op.cit. 79. An example of this meaning is found in ICVR 10183, quoted on p. 44.

64 Cf. Augustine, civ.19,20 *summum bonum civitatis dei cum sit pax aeterna atque perfecta*. In this sense, *pax* was found in liturgy, too, in the Gregorian sacramentary, *locus lucis refrigerii et pacis*, quoted by Schneider (fn. 59) 25.

Though the general briefness of the Christian epitaphic style often makes it difficult to establish the exact meaning of a word, in some cases *pax* certainly represents celestial bliss, thus in the epitaph dedicated to a bishop from the late 5th century, *qui pace perenni / mysticus antistes paradysi sede locatus*,⁶⁵ where the reference to Paradise excludes the possibility of interpreting *pax* in any other sense. Again, *recessit a seculo, ingressa in pace*,⁶⁶ must suggest Heaven because of the contrast to the "present world". *Laurentius ad deum in pace*;⁶⁷ *aeternam in pacem unde erat et rediit*,⁶⁸ are also unequivocal. There are some other cases on p. 50sq.

It is also possible that a number of phrases, in which the soul is reported to be *in pace*, suggest celestial bliss, *dulcis anima in pace* or *anima dulcis in pace* or *in pace animae dulcis*,⁶⁹ and still more clearly *q(uius) an(i)ma in pace (Christi) quiescit*, from the 6/7th century,⁷⁰ which already anticipates the Medieval formula *cuius anima in pace requiescat*, where *pax* cannot have a meaning other than "celestial peace", the doctrine of the intermediate state having been abandoned.⁷¹

The analysis of the material has accordingly revealed that *refrigerium* and *pax*, especially the latter, more readily referred to "celestial bliss" than to the intermediate state in the Hades.

Clearer evidence of the belief in the intermediate state may be the references to "Abraham's bosom". Unluckily, there are only a few of them, even they often fragmentary. The most unequivocal is the epigram of a youth buried in the church of St. Felix at Nola. Though the beginnings of the lines are lacking, the sense is restorable, *cum tuba terri]bilis sonitu concusserit orbem / [humanae-*

65 CE 705.

66 ICVR 9410.

67 ILCV 3337.

68 CE 1431,12.

69 ICVR 2420; 2618; 3314.

70 ILCV 1543.

71 I shall discuss the problem in my forthcoming book on the Medieval and Renaissance epitaphs of the City of Rome.

*que ani]mae rursus in sua vasa redibunt / [Felici merito?] hic sociabitur ante tri[bunal / interea?] in gremio Abraham [...].*⁷² Despite the uncertainty due to the fragments, it seems clear that the departed was imagined as lying "in Abraham's bosom", i.e. in the Hades until the Last Judgement. On the other hand, in the epitaph of a virgin, it is unclear whether *in sinus iam requiescis Abraham Iacob adque Isaac*,⁷³ suggests Heaven or Hades.⁷⁴ In one epitaph, the meaning of Heaven is probable, *suscipiat te Christus qui vocabit te, in sinum Abrahae angeli deducant te.*⁷⁵ Christ receives the souls in Heaven, not in the Hades.

Though epigraphical evidence of a belief in the pre-resurrectional stay of the souls in the Hades is scanty, this does not imply that there was no such conviction among the rank and file of Christians. But epigraphical evidence begins to flow more abundantly only since the early 4th century. From the crucial third century, usable material is regrettably meagre. Moreover, early epitaphs are usually brief, which makes the interpretation of single words and acclamations arduous or downright impossible. At any rate, *refrigerium* and "Abraham's bosom", which have been argued to suggest the intermediate state, were rare, and still rarer in this meaning.

Purgatory in epitaphs

The doctrine of Purgatory came slowly into being during the last centuries of the ancient Church. Before Augustine, there is evidence of a belief in purifying pains, in concrete terms fire, at the Last Judgement, which would eventually lead to the salvation of all who believe in Christ. In this doctrine, Augustine made two major innovations. Firstly, he rejected the belief in the eventual salvation of all who profess the Christian faith. Mortal sins would

72 CE 684.

73 CE 749,5.

74 Stuiber, 119 fn.45 argues that these epitaphs imitate Greek liturgical prayers.

75 S. Aurigemma, *L'area cimiteriale cristiana di Ain Zāra*, 1932, 131.

be punished by eternal fire in Hell, only the venial ones could be atoned for by Purgatory. Secondly, he placed the purifying pains between death and resurrection.⁷⁶

In epitaphs, references to Purgatory are few and uncertain. Perhaps because of natural piety, the relatives were reluctant to suggest that the departed, dear to them, was suffering pains. Moreover, this would reflect upon the defunct's conduct in life. In my material, there is in fact only one relevant case, the epitaph of a priest, significantly enough, probably composed by himself, *O deus altipotens de caelis proflue rorem / ut animam satiet gutta beata meam.*⁷⁷ These words suggest a soul in pain below the heavens. The possibility that the writer was alluding to Purgatory is increased by the next lines, which express the hope that at Doomsday the defunct may be counted among the saved, *efflue astrigeros de caeli conclave nimbos / et recrea cineres protinus inde meos, / ut iudex veniens cum tu discusseris omnis / dextram optineam effugiamq(ue) levam.* Though the epitaph is undated, a late date is more probable than an early one.

Epitaphs referring to resurrection

The number of the epitaphs referring to resurrection but ignoring the fate of the soul in the intervening period, is not very considerable.⁷⁸ This is naturally no argument to the effect that the soul too was thought to lie dormant before resurrection. The epitaphs are sooner interpretable so that the postmortem fate of the soul, which was well-known, was passed in order to save space, or for some other secondary reasons.

In one relevant epitaph, the soul's fate is certainly referred to but not clarified. The epitaph is lengthy, the language Vulgar, and the metre defective. It recorded the building of an arcisolum

76 A. Michel, *Purgatoire*, DTC XIII (1936) 1212sqg.

77 CE 1562.

78 A collection of cases in ILCV 3458-3480.

by the deacon of Pope Marcellinus (a. 296-304).

3 *fecit mansionem in pace quietam*
 4 *... quo membra dulcia somno*
 5 *per longum tempus factori et iudici servet.*
 6 *Severa dulcis...*
 7 *reddidit VIII februarias virgo kalendas*
 8 *quam dom(inu)s nasci mira sapientia et arte*
 9 *iusserat in carnem donec resurgat ab ipso*
 10 *quique animam rapuit spiritu sancto suo*
 11 *castam pudicam et inviolabile semper*
 12 *quamque iterum dom(inu)s spiritali gloria reddet.*⁷⁹

The epitaph gives good insight into the acceptance of the Christian doctrine by a man on the lowest rung in Christian hierarchy and, to judge from the quality of the language and metre, of little education. The following points are worth notice. The body was thought to lie in peaceful sleep in the grave awaiting the Last Judgement (3-5). The Second Coming was, however, a thing of the distant future (5). Resurrection was described in 9sqg.

The Christian doctrine of the soul is of an equal interest here. L. 7 *reddidit* is an elliptical expression for (*animam/spiritum*) *reddidit*.⁸⁰ The soul was created by, and returned to God. God had caused the *virgo* to be born into a body of wondrous qualities (8-9). Yet the fate of the soul upon death is not explained. God carried off the soul of the dead girl (10), but it is not stated whether to Heaven or to the Hades. At any rate, God will return her soul, full of spiritual glory (12), to be reunited with the resurrected body. One could argue that the idea of resurrection was of such importance to the writer of the epitaph that he did not give equal attention to

79 ICVR 10183.

80 For documentation, see ILCV 3314sqg.

the fate of the soul in the interim period.⁸¹

In other cases, only the resurrection of the body was recorded.⁸² One epitaph briefly states the doctrine of the resurrection, *credite victuras anima remeante favillas / rursus ad amissum posse redire diem*.⁸³ A Spanish epitaph from a late period is the first example of the quotation from the Vulgate rendering of Job 19,25-26, which became of some popularity in Medieval epitaphs, *credo quod redemptor meus vivet et in novissimo die de terra sussitabit pel(l)em meam et in carne mea videbo dominum*.⁸⁴ The quotation is not quite literal, but the inaccuracies are of minor interest.⁸⁵

Epitaphs referring to Heaven and resurrection

More frequent are the epitaphs which certainly speak of resurrection but which simultaneously record the ascent of the soul to Heaven after death. The earliest of the dated cases is from a. 382, the epitaph of a young lady, who

2 *fecit ad astra viam, Christi modo gaudet in aula...*

6 *inde p(er) eximios paradisi regnat odores*

7 *tempore continuo vernant ubi gramina rivis*

81 ICVR 3847 also records the Last Judgement and mentions the soul but does not explain its pre-resurrectional fate, *redditus in terra corpus cui vita herebat, sp(iritu)s animaque mea expecta(t) die ultimo causa(m)*, probably late. Cf. CE 1435, *hic iacet hinc anima in carnem redeunte resurget*, which is likewise silent about the soul's fate before resurrection.

82 CE 1477 *suscipe terra tuo corpus de corpore sumptum / reddere quod valeas vivificante deo*, has a phrase which seems to have been common property; it reappears in the epitaph of Gregory the Great (fn.89). CIL X 7972 *hic situs...expectat Christi ope rursus sua(m) videre carne(m) et gaudia lucis nobae ipso dominante videre*, probably very late, qualifies celestial bliss as light. There were often local varieties, so in Gallia Narb., where *resurrecturus in Christo* was popular, ILCV 3468Asqq.

83 CE 902.

84 Vives 151.

85 In Rome, the first case is from the 9th or 10th century, A. Silvagni, *Monumenta epigraphica christiana saeculo XIII antiquiora I*, 1943, tab. xxxix.2.

- 8 *expectatque deum superas quo surgat ad auras*
 9 *hoc posuit corpus tumulo mortalia linquens.*⁸⁶

The epitaph actually contains most of the eschatological ideas found in epigraphy. The soul journeys to Heaven immediately after death (2). Heaven, Christ's palace, is located in the stars. Because of her contempt of the present world (3), her righteousness and faith (4), the defunct was taken to Paradise, described as a *locus amoenus* with eternal spring, good odours, grass-bordered brooks (6-7). Yet she was still without her body, which was left in the grave to await resurrection (8-9).

There is a number of other epitaphs recording both resurrection and the soul's immediate ascent to Heaven. Singularly many of them were Papal epitaphs, Celestinus I (d. a. 432), who is claimed to enjoy the Beatific Vision;⁸⁷ Pelagius I, a. 561;⁸⁸ Gregory the Great, a. 604, with an epitaph composed of trite phrases;⁸⁹ Bonifacius IV, a. 615, with a more detailed description of the physical resurrection.⁹⁰

The souls of the Popes, even when they were not martyrs, were accordingly thought to go straight to Heaven, an indication of the spread of the more liberal interpretation of the soul's pre-resurrectional fate. All the cases are, however, late, which somewhat reduces their significance. In the epitaph of an unknown Pope, possibly from the 4th century, the right to the direct journey to Heaven was limited to patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs, *sancti*

86 CE 669.

87 U. Montini, *Le tombe dei papi*, 1957, No. 99 (p. 43) *corporis hic tumulus, requiescunt ossa cinisque / nec perit hinc aliquid d(omi)no, caro cuncta resurget. / terrenum nunc terra tegit, mens nescia mortis / vivit et aspectu fruitur bene conscia Christi.*

88 ICVR 4155 *vivit in arce poli celesti luce beatus... surgere iudicio certus.*

89 ICVR 4156 *suscipe terra tuo corpus de corpore sumptum / reddere quod valeas vivificante deo, / spiritus astra petit, etc. Cf. fn. 82.*

90 ICVR 4159,12 *mittere ad astra animam, reddere corpus humo, / saucia multiplici siquidem nam membra dolore / rursus in antiquo / pulvere versa manent, / quae coniuncta animae stabilito in corpore surgant / ad vitam aeternam, etc.*

in the proper sense of the word (see p. 39), quite in accordance with the teaching of the Church.⁹¹

In addition to the Papal epitaphs, there are only a few others recording both the soul's ascent to Heaven and resurrection, the epitaph of a nun from a. 449;⁹² an epitaph from a. 491;⁹³ the epitaph of a bishop, undated;⁹⁴ another of a boy of eight.⁹⁵

The frequency of this type of references in Papal epitaphs may be ascribable to the fact that in regard to the head of the Church, the eschatological doctrine had to be stated in unequivocal terms.

Dualism of body and soul

The epitaphs referring to resurrection were few in comparison with the great number of inscribed stones recording the different fates of the body and soul upon death but making no mention of resurrection. The body is left to decompose in earth, the soul reverts to Heaven. The very frequency of these cases, as well as the fact that they were found in the epitaphs of the clergy, proves their unchallengable orthodoxy. Lattimore certainly maintains that these epitaphs suggest a dualistic conception of man: "the body dies and the soul lives on". According to him, only those epitaphs "which speak of depositio, of sleep, of resurrection and judgement" were orthodox. The epitaphs expressing the dualistic point of view were heretical, due to "the carrying over into Christian doctrine of a strain of Greek thought."⁹⁶

I think the material discussed in this paper proves the vulnerability of these arguments. The body was certainly left in earth, but not for ever. All the Christians *qua* Christians believed in the

91 CE 787,42sqq.

92 ICVR 942, fragmentary.

93 ILCV 1587 *anima ad autorem d(ominu)m remeante terrena membra terris reliquit...resurgit in (Christo) d(o)m(in)o nostro.*

94 CE 778.

95 CE 756: *he is now virginio...in cetu.*

96 Op.cit. (fn.3) 304-311.

eventual resurrection of the body. Because this was taken for granted, it was needless always to record it, especially as space in epitaphs was limited, and many other things had to be commemorated there.

Though there is a considerable number of dated cases, the earliest of them is as late as a. 363. This could be taken to suggest that the belief in the soul's immediate ascent to Heaven became popular only since the mid-fourth century. Though this view cannot be offhand rejected, we should remember that longer verse epitaphs, the usual vehicle for recording eschatological ideas, were uncommon in early epigraphy. Consequently, though there might have been belief in the immediate Beatific Vision before the mid-fourth century, we have little epigraphical evidence of it, largely because of the brevity and ambiguity of early prose epitaphs, acclamations, etc. A few early cases will, however, be quoted below on p. 49. But references to the intermediate state were fewer and more ambiguous. Hence it may be warrantable to conclude that for all the uncertainty of evidence, the belief in the immediate Beatific Vision was more widespread even in the early period than the dogma of the intermediate state.

This was due to the fact that the sphere of the people whose souls were entitled to the direct ascent to Heaven was gradually enlarged from the Saints to other righteous people. Piety and affection on the part of the members of the family help to explain the certainty expressed in epitaphs of the presence of the defunct's soul in Heaven. His or her special merits to earn celestial bliss were certainly occasionally recorded, thus in the epitaph from a. 363 *tu]us spiritus a carne recedens / [est sociatus?] sanctis pro meritis et opera tanta;*⁹⁷ one soul was raised to Heaven *pro casto santo [vitae proposito?];*⁹⁸ another *meritis*, a. 475⁹⁹ and a. 551;¹⁰⁰ *merito*, after

97 ICVR 1426.

98 ICVR 4921.

99 CE 1359,3.

100 CE 2100,14.

a. 573;¹⁰¹ *pro meritis*, undated.¹⁰² Once it is faith that assures the ascent of a priest's soul *ad caelos et super astra*, a. 529.¹⁰³ In one epitaph, the departed is boldly put on a par with the just.¹⁰⁴

On the whole, the number of the relevant cases was inconsiderable. To claim that the defunct had lived a virtuous life in actual fact amounted to naive praise. There may have been natural reluctance to go too far in this direction.

One of the most interesting problems suggested by the material is the description of Heaven. Here genuinely Christian features co-existed with the pagan ones, or entered into various combinations with them.

Most unequivocally Christian are the cases in which the soul is claimed to have ascended to God, Christ or the Saints. There may be a case as early as a. 217, *Prosenes receptus ad deum*.¹⁰⁵ But it is not certain whether the inscription is Christian. The epitaph of a suffete consul from 4th century is explicit, *terrenos terrenis sedibus artus / reddidit inque sinum summi genitoris apertum / aethera pervolitans levibus se sustulit alis*,¹⁰⁶ where the last line is a Virgilian reminiscence.¹⁰⁷ In an epitaph from a. 475, partly classicizing *regna beata poli* is followed by genuinely Christian *Christi imperium*.¹⁰⁸ Again, *siderea omnipotentis aula* is clearly classicizing,¹⁰⁹ *innupte virginis aula* only Christian.¹¹⁰

Describing the soul's rise to the Saints was somewhat commoner, e.g. *Procula d(ei) famula a terra ad martyres*.¹¹¹ Here, as well as

101 CIL XIII 2399.

102 ICVR 8453; CE 2099,5; CIL XII 2114.

103 CE 1371,7.

104 CE 781 *quisquis post mundum aetherias conscendere plagas / posse putat iustos Marcellinum quoq(ue) credat / presbyterum caeli sedes habitare quietas*.

105 ILCV 3332.

106 ICVR 307.

107 Aen. 6,57 and 9,14.

108 CE 1359.

109 CE 667,2.

110 CE 1442

111 ILCV 3353.

in a number of other cases,¹¹² there can be no doubt that Heaven, not the intermediate state in the Hades, was meant. A number of other cases are somewhat harder to classify, due to the ambiguity of the term *sancti* in epigraphy (see p. 39).¹¹³

The Beatific Vision, seeing God or Christ face to face in Heaven or simply being in their company, was not often explicitly referred to.¹¹⁴ Paradise was usually described as the Garden of Eden or as the classical *locus amoenus*. One case has been quoted on p. 45. In another, from a. 449, Paradise, equated with *astra* and *aurea regna* of classical traditions as well as *tua limina, Christe* and *angelicas domos* of authentic Christianity, was described as a place with fragrant grass and flowers and gardens, well above the earth, from which the departed *subiectasque videt nubes et sidera caeli*.¹¹⁵ Similar descriptions of Paradise were well-known in Christian literature.¹¹⁶

I have already observed that peaceful rest and light were the main qualities of life in Heaven. In epitaphs, these qualities were sometimes referred to, *caeloque et terris placida sic pace repostus /*

112 CE 703,6 a. 528 *corpores hanc requiem meruit pro munere vitae / commendans sanctis animam corpusque fovendum*, referring to the practice to have one's grave near the sepulchre of a Saint as a guarantee of protection in Heaven; ICVR 17106 *caelo tamen animam cum iustis credo receptam*; 14076, an intriguing combination of astral ideas and Christianity, *Bassa caret membris vivens per saecula (Christo) / aeterias secuta domos et regna piorum... stelliger accepit polus hanc et sidera caeli*. ICVR 396, the ascent to *caelorum regna* is called *sanctorum iter*.

113 ICVR 8716 a. 268 or 279, *vibas inter sanctis*; ILCV 2232 *in pace cum spirita xanta*, probably old, see De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea* III, 1877, 132; ICVR 13886 a. 291, quoted on p. 12; other cases, ICVR 2692 *ispiritus tuus cum sanctis*; 9613 *spiritum tuum inter sanctos*; 15829 *habes requiem in numerum iustorum*; ILCV 3361 *accepta ad spirita sancta*; 3349 *pergens ad iustos et electos*, etc.

114 In addition to the epitaphs quoted on p. 46 and 49, another from a. 472, *viventemque deo (scil., cum deo) credite flere nefas*, ICVR 4964.

115 CE 688,14sqq.

116 Cf., e.g. the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas quoted on p. 29; Paulinus of Nola, p. 32; Prudentius, p. 36; Dracontius, Poet. Lat. Min. V p. 8sq., etc.

felix luce nova saeculorum in saecula gaudet, from the 4th century,¹¹⁷ where *pax* implies both the peace of the grave and the rest in Heaven. There is a number of other cases.¹¹⁸

Finally, the Biblical phrase of the Kingdom of Heaven was not rare. The usual expression was *caelestia regna*;¹¹⁹ other varieties, *celica regna* a. 579;¹²⁰ *celes sedes*;¹²¹ *regnum melius* a. 630, which implies devaluation of the present world,¹²² or simply *caelum*.¹²³

It is more problematic whether the epitaphs which record the return of the defunct's soul to Heaven were specifically Christian. The descent and ascent of the soul was a doctrine shared by many philosophies and religions in late antiquity (see p. 34). Though an expression like *anima Christo reddita est*¹²⁴ is naturally only Christian, *tradedit anima(m) d(omin)o* a. 454,¹²⁵ *deo [anim]am reddidit*¹²⁶ could be possible in some non-Christian epitaph as well, not to speak of *dans animam superis* a. 512?¹²⁷ which is clearly classicizing, or *caelebem...spiritum caelo refudit almo* a. 518;¹²⁸ *revehens caelo...animam*.¹²⁹ In pagan epitaphs, there were similar, though rarer, expressions, thus *hic corpus vatis Laberi, nam spiritus ivit / illuc unde ortus* (CE 1559,13).

117 ICVR 307.

118 ICVR 13289 a. 567 *anima tua in luce et in pace aeternam*; 1857 ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς εἰρήνην; 8574 and CE 755 (but cf. p. 857: borrowed from Nemesianus) *lux celestis*; CE 782,2 *lux perpetua*; CIL V 6729 a. 520 *lux* juxtaposed with *vita perennis*; cf. fn.82 and 88; CE 781 *aetherias conscendere plagas...caeli sedes habitare quietas*; CE 1407 *quem inter astra tenet alma quies*.

119 ICVR 1477 a. 565; CE 772; 788.

120 CE 1389,8.

121 CE 795,4 *liquit mundum celitem sed scandens ad sedem*.

122 Vives 285.

123 CE 782,9 *composuit corpus caelum cum laeta petivit*; ICVR 7205 ἡ ψυχὴ σου εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς.

124 ICVR 1673.

125 CIL XIII 2359.

126 ICVR 16997.

127 CE 1366,4.

128 ILCV 2440.

129 CIL XII 2114 (genuine?)

In a great number of cases, the destination of the soul was stated to be high up in the skies, *sublimia caeli*;¹³⁰ *superna*;¹³¹ *superas domos*.¹³² The commonest expression was *astra*, the earliest dated case being from a. 381.¹³³ The way to Heaven was *astrigera via*.¹³⁴

There were some other, though less frequent expressions for the starry heavens, *sidera*, recorded as the abode of Christ in an epitaph from a. 392;¹³⁵ *polus*, a. 440-461.¹³⁶ Besides in the stars, Heaven was thought to lie in the ether, *ae]therias domos*, etc.¹³⁷ The classical name for Heaven, *Olympus*, was not quite unknown in Christian funeral poetry.¹³⁸

The origin of the astral theology has been discussed on p. 34. Though of pagan origin, it had been incorporated into Christian thought. Placing Heaven in the stars was scarcely felt to be an un-Christian feature, witness the fact that in many an epitaph genuinely Christian features, such as the abode of Christ or God or the Saints, were combined with astral ideas.

Conclusion

The distinction between pre- and post-resurrectional state of the human soul was not observed in funeral inscriptions. There is

130 ICVR 8453.

131 CE 1394,22.

132 CE 1447,4.

133 CE 668 *corporeos rumpens nexus qui gaudet in astris*; CE 692 a. 476 *membra solo posuit, celi perexit ad astra*; CE 1362,5 a. 501 *astra fovent animam, corpus natura recepit*; cf. CE 2100,14 a. 551; Vives 273 a. 641; ICVR 5568; 5569; CE 1433; 1836; CIL X 8174.

134 CIL V 6202.

135 ICVR 4827 *no]n tamen haec tristes habitat po[st l]imine sedes / [proxima?] sed Cristo sidera celsa tenet*; another case of *sidera celsa*, CIL XIII 2399, post a. 573.

136 ICVR 15842 *sedibus en propriis mens pura et membra quiescunt / ista iacent tumulo gaudet at illa polo*; another case CE 2099.

137 CE 1340; cf. CIL V 6266 *aetherias graderis sine carne per arces*; ICVR 13549 *aetheria sedes*.

138 CE 758 *hoc tumulo Baioli conduntur membra sepulti / sed pollens anima praeclaro manebit Olympo*.

little evidence of belief in the intermediate stay of the soul in the Hades before the resurrection of the body. Eschatological ideas were usually spoken of in the verse epitaphs after the mid-fourth century. The usual notion was one of the body left in earth, the soul raised to Heaven. There was no pagan or gnostic dualism in this. Though the resurrection of the body was seldom explicitly mentioned, it was tacitly assumed.

Clearly the fine distinction, elaborated by the Fathers, between the intermediate state and the ultimate celestial bliss, was too subtle for the ordinary Christians. The souls of martyrs, later on even of people who lived like martyrs, were always thought to go straight to Heaven. It was not difficult to extend the concept of the martyr until it eventually encompassed all the righteous. The way had here been paved by the Fathers themselves.

Christian poets, such as Paulinus of Nola and Prudentius, represented quite the same ideas. There is little in funeral epigrams that is not found in Christian poetry as well.

ABBREVIATIONS

CE = *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, conlegit Fr. Buecheler (*Anthologia Latina* II. 1-3), 1895-1926.

DTC = *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, 1903-1950.

ICVR = *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae*, ediderunt A. Silvagni & A. Ferrua, 1922-.

ILCV = *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres I-III*, edidit E. Diehl, 1925-1931.

SICV = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Christianarum Veterum Musei Vaticani*, (*Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae* I), 1963.

Vives = Vives, J., *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*, 1969.

DESCRIPTIONS OF HUMAN APPEARANCE
IN PLINY'S LETTERS

S a a r a L i l j a

Pliny's account of the floating islands on Lake Vadimon, in a letter addressed to Gallus (8,20), ends with this comment: *nam te quoque ut me nihil aeque ac naturae opera delectant*. Pliny's own interest in nature is understandable, when one thinks of the scholarly zeal of his uncle in producing such a large-scale work as the Natural History. We do not know anything specific with regard to Gallus' interest in nature,¹ but it can be said that a certain general curiosity about natural phenomena seems to have been in the air at that time, witness not only the Natural History of Pliny the Elder, but also Seneca's Natural Questions.

In addition to a taste for natural wonders, many of Pliny's letters reveal an aesthetic appreciation of nature as well. The latter aspect is most prominent in his descriptions of villas and their settings.² In spite of his great interest in nature in its wild as well as cultivated forms, Pliny was less impressed by the outward appearance of human beings. He thus resembles modern biologists, many of whom speak of nature as a clear-cut contrast to

1 Especially as he cannot be identified for certain: see A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny*, Oxford 1966, pp. 186, 294 and 471.

2 Above all his own Laurentine villa (2,17) and his Tuscan villa (5,6). The most notable of other relevant letters are the accounts of Lake Larius (4,30) and Lake Vadimon (8,20), of the Clitumnus springs (8,8), and of the dolphin of Hippo (9,33), not to mention the famous Vesuvius letters (6,16 and 6,20).

human beings, as though man were not part of nature. In antiquity this was as much the normal attitude of the inhabitants of a big city as it is today.



Pliny's eulogy of his young wife Calpurnia, in a letter addressed to her aunt (4,19), is concerned entirely with her mental qualities, and it is this point he also emphasizes in her love towards himself: *non enim aetatem meam aut corpus, quae paulatim occidunt ac senescunt, sed gloriam diligit* (§ 5). One cannot, of course, take offence at a husband attaching importance to his young wife's mental faculties, but adding a word about her appearance would, one feels, not have come amiss. The diminutive form *corpusculum* in Pliny's letter to Calpurnia, when she has left him alone for the first time in order to visit Campania, may be partly affectionate, though the context shows that it refers mainly to the wanness caused by her illness: *simul esse cupiebam, ut oculis meis crederem, quid viribus, quid corpusculo appareres* (6,4,2).³ There are two further descriptions of female qualities which concentrate wholly on the intellectual aspect, namely, the eulogy of Fundanus' daughter who had died at the age of thirteen (5,16) and that of Fannia (7,19). In the former, it is true, Pliny remarks in passing (§ 9) that Fundanus' daughter had resembled her father not only in character, but also in outward appearance, although, in fact, we know nothing about the father's looks. Only on one occasion does Pliny praise a lady's outward appearance, namely, the youthful constitution of an old lady who does not look her nearly eighty years: *viridis atque etiam ultra matronalem modum compacto corpore et robusto* (7,24,1).

The references to male beauty are more numerous. In a passage

³ The same diminutive form is used by Trajan (10,18), when he speaks of Pliny's debilitated appearance due to the hot climate and subsequent fever. In both these contexts, however, the diminutive might perhaps simply reflect a more colloquial style.

mentioning the death of Arria's son, he is described by Pliny as *filius - - eximia pulchritudine* (3,16,3). Another young man is *conspicuus forma* (7,24,3), and a third one characterized by his *eximia corporis pulchritudo* (3,3,4).⁴ The longest description of male beauty is found in a letter where Pliny recommends Minicius Acilianus, a young man of his acquaintance, as a suitable husband for Mauricus' niece: *est illi facies liberalis multo sanguine, multo rubore suffusa, est ingenua totius corporis pulchritudo et quidam senatorius decor* (1,14,8). While the adjectives *liberalis*, *ingenuus* and *senatorius* describe the young man's noble gentility in a general way, *facies* and *totius corporis pulchritudo* refer to his good looks more specifically. Such effusive praise for Minicius' beauty is so exceptional that Pliny thinks it necessary to add this explanation: *quae ego nequaquam arbitror negligenda; debet enim hoc castitati puellarum quasi praemium dari.*⁵

One detail about Minicius' countenance is of particular interest, namely, that his face was *multo sanguine, multo rubore suffusa* (1,14,8). This fact might refer not only to the young man's healthiness and physical vigour, but also to his emotional sensitivity. I am reminded of a passage where Pliny analyzes those characteristics that enhance the qualities of a good orator in court, one of them being *omnibus motibus animi consentaneus vigor corporis* (2,19,2). Minicius' ruddy countenance might further reveal the young man's decent bashfulness. When praising the recital of Calpurnius Piso, Pliny mentions as an important detail *multum sanguinis, multum sollicitudinis in ore* (5,17,3), and what

4 Further, vaguer comments on young men's good looks are *mira - - in ore ipso vultuque suavitas* (2,13,6) and *quanta probitas in ore* (9,9,2).

5 After praising Euphrates' impressive appearance (see below, pp.58f.), Pliny adds a similar excuse: *quae licet fortuita et inania putentur* (1,10,7). Too much attention paid to one's outward appearance clearly irritated him, one example being a certain Hostilius Firminus to whom he refers disparagingly as *hominis compti semper et pumicati* (2,11,23).

he means by this is evident from his adding that *magis in studiis homines timor quam fiducia decet*.⁶ Apart from these shades of meaning, we are left with perhaps the most natural explanation, that ruddiness was simply regarded as beautiful. It seems that the ancient attitude to a ruddy or tanned complexion, which had formerly been looked upon as ugly and unfashionable, began to change during the first century after Christ. There is more and more evidence of the importance attached to sunbaths, whether for health's or beauty's sake. Pliny's uncle, to take only one example on this occasion, used to take sunbaths regularly: *aestate, si quid otii, iacebat in sole* (3,5,10).⁷

Pliny's description of the imposing appearance of the philosopher Euphrates consists of the following four points: *proceritas corporis, decora facies, demissus capillus, ingens et cana barba* (1,10,7). Tall stature had been a characteristic of both male and female beauty in Homer and ever since, probably due to the fact that heroes and heroines were traditionally taller than ordinary people.⁸ The superhuman quality of tallness is specially underlined in Pliny's description of the female ghost, *mulieris figura*, who had appeared to Curtius Rufus, as *humana grandior pulchriorque* (7, 27,2). This superhuman trait suitably characterizes the Emperor Trajan, whose *proceritas corporis* is mentioned in the Panegyricus twice (4,7 and 22,2); in the latter of these passages he is even called *elatiior aliis et excelsior*. A more general admiration for size is expressed in Pliny's letter to Tacitus: *vides, ut statuas,*

6 In this light it is easy to see that Regulus' paleness, to which Pliny pays special attention, was a sign of his notorious insolence: *expalluit notabiliter, quamvis palleat semper* (1,5,13).

7 Cf. *usus - - sole* (6,16,5). Further particulars will be found in a paper which I am preparing on the ancient attitude to sunbaths. Pliny the Younger did not care for the sun - at any rate the letter dealing with his daily summer routine at his Tuscan villa (9,36) makes no mention of sunbaths.

8 See K. Jax, *Der Frauentypus der römischen Dichtung*, Innsbruck 1938, 25, and S. Lilja, *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women*, Helsinki 1965, 123-127.

signa, picturas, hominum denique multorumque animalium formas, arborum etiam, si modo sint decorae, nihil magis quam amplitudo commendat (1,20,5). Quadlbauer notes here a similarity with Longinus: ἐπὶ μὲν τέχνης θαυμάζεται τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν φυσικῶν ἔργων τὸ μέγεθος (de subl. 36,3).⁹ Longinus thus distinguishes natural creatures from artefacts, in which exactness is more desirable than size.

Euphrates is further characterized, apart from his tall stature and beautiful lineaments (*decora facies*), by his long hair and large white beard: *demissus capillus, ingens et cana barba* (1,10,7). Stoic philosophers had been uncouth and austere of old, with long hair and beards, but by Pliny's time they had begun to pay more attention to outward appearance. It was exceptional, and for this very reason impressive, that Euphrates still wore his hair long, albeit well-groomed, as can be seen from Pliny's explicit remark *nullus horror in cultu*. On the other hand, there is nothing out of the ordinary in Euphrates' large white beard, since his teacher Musonius insisted on the full growth of the natural beard as the mark of a man.¹⁰ There were, of course, individual differences in the attitude to a long beard: Quintilian, for instance, disapproved of large beards (Inst. 12,3,12). Pliny, for his part, seems to have been particularly fascinated by hair in general. In his description of Trajan's good looks he dwells on the Emperor's *honor capitis prematurely whitened: nec sine quodam munere deum festinatis senectutis insignibus ad augendam maiestatem ornata caesaries* (Paneg. 4,7).

A couple of incidental comments in Pliny's letters throw some light upon the art of portrait-painting at that time. Pliny writes to Tacitus: *esse nobis curae solet, ut facies nostra ab optimo quoque artifice exprimatur* (7,33,2). It had been fashionable to sit for a picture from the beginning of the first century B.C. onwards,

⁹ F. Quadlbauer, WS 71 (1958) 108, n. 446.

¹⁰ The reappearance of the beard in Roman society under the influence of Hadrian thus seems to have derived from the school of Musonius: see Sherwin-White, op.cit. 109.

from the time when the late Hellenistic portrait style gradually began to impose realistic traits on the more or less impersonal *imagines* of older Roman tradition. The following remark shows that Pliny did not trust the skill of artists: *pictores pulchram absolutamque faciem raro nisi in peius effingunt* (5,15,1). A beautiful model, however, did not impress him personally, for he had bought a small statue of Corinthian bronze explicitly because it was *expressum*, characteristically expressive (3,6,1). Unlike many of his contemporaries, Pliny did not normally care much for Corinthian bronze.¹¹ His words *neque enim ullum adhuc Corinthium domi habeo* (3,6,4) sound complacently supercilious, and his mockingly modest remark *quantum ego sapio, qui fortasse in omni re, in hac certe perquam exiguum sapio* (3,6,1) is even more clearly directed against the great connoisseurs of his time, such as the Mamurra of Martial.¹² Spurinna, Pliny's great hero, did possess some Corinthian bronze, but the devoted admirer succeeded in finding an extenuating excuse: *quibus delectatur nec adficitur* (3,1,9).

Pliny's detailed description of the Corinthian statuette he had bought enumerates the realistic, even naturalistic, traits of the late Hellenistic portrait style: *effingit senem stantem; ossa, musculi, nervi, venae, rugae etiam ut spirantis apparent, rari et cedentes capilli, lata frons, contracta facies, exile collum, pendent lacerti, papillae iacent, recessit venter; a tergo quoque eadem aetas ut ante* (3,6,2). The major problem concerns the sex of the person represented. While Sherwin-White states that "the realistic 'old woman' was a favourite type in late Hellenistic sculpture", most others seem to be of the opinion that the statuette

¹¹ Moreover, the statuette he had now bought was to be presented to the temple of Jupiter at Comum.

¹² Mamurra *consuluit nares an olerent aera Corinthon* (Mart. Epigr. 9,59,11). Cf. Trimalchio's opinion on glassware as compared with Corinthian bronze: *certe non olunt* (Petron. Sat. 50). These passages are certainly meant to be humorous, but metal objects do in fact tend to acquire a strange odour: see S. Lilja, *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity*, Helsinki 1972, 213.

in question represented an old man,¹³ and even one of the two sculptures referred to by Sherwin-White himself represents an old fisherman.¹⁴ The female sex finds some support in Pliny's remark about the *papillae*, a word not often used of a man's breast - but old men's breasts are apt to grow as the result of a change in the hormonal balance. Pliny's remark about the model's thinning hair, on the other hand, would be more appropriate to the male sex - although old women, too, often show signs of losing their hair.

Pliny's description of the Corinthian statuette as representing a *senex stans* brings together the model's characteristic traits in a realistic way to form a lively whole, as lively as the portrait itself (note his words *ut spirantis*). Guillemin rightly remarks that this passage testifies to the late Hellenistic influence upon Pliny in preferring the characteristic to the beautiful,¹⁵ but her other examples, Trajan and Julius Bassus, are perhaps not quite relevant in this connection. The very brevity of Pliny's description of Bassus' outward appearance renders it insignificant: *in procero corpore maesta et squalida senectus* (4,9,22). The style of the Panegyricus, on the other hand, is so elevated that it does not allow for very realistic details, with the exception perhaps of the Emperor's prematurely whitened hair: *iam firmitas, iam proceritas corporis, iam honor capitis et dignitas oris, ad hoc aetatis inflexa maturitas nec sine quodam munere deum festinatis senectutis insignibus ad augendam maiestatem ornata caesaries* (4,7).¹⁶ There

13 This view is shared, for example, by A.-M. Guillemin, *Pline et la vie littéraire de son temps*, Paris 1929, 153. The quotation is from Sherwin-White, *op.cit.* 226.

14 See H. Stuart Jones, *The Sculptures of the Palazzo dei Conservatori*, Oxford 1926, 144, n. 27, Plate 50.

15 Guillemin, *op.cit.* 153: "Pline semble avoir préféré le modèle caractérisé au modèle beau et a très bien réussi d'autres vieillards encore." See also A.W. Lawrence, *Later Greek Sculpture*, London 1927, 40-41.

16 The other passage in the Panegyricus (22,2) is concerned only with Trajan's tall stature: *sola corporis proceritate elatior aliis et excelsior.*

is, however, a better example of late Hellenistic realism in Pliny's letters, namely, his description of a phantom appearing in the shape of an old man: *senex macie et squalore confectus, promissa barba, horrenti capillo* (7,27,5).¹⁷

*

To sum up: there are very few descriptions of a person's outward appearance in Pliny's letters, at any rate when compared with those of natural scenery, both wild and cultivated. Pliny was least interested in describing female beauty, for he does this only once, when praising an old lady's youthful looks. There are some eulogies of male beauty, but most of them are quite short or, if longer, followed by an excuse of some sort. Characteristically expressive traits - preferably those of an old person, whether male or female - are the ones that attract Pliny most, and his descriptions of them are as realistic as the models themselves. This is quite in accordance with the general predilection found in the late Hellenistic portrait style, which had gradually become predominant in Rome since the beginning of the first century B.C.

It would certainly be worth comparing Pliny's attitude to the description of human appearance in general, together with his special interest in the characteristic and the expressive aspects of appearance, with corresponding descriptions in other authors of antiquity. This would, I feel, provide a stimulating and instructive area of research for any scholar interested in the subject.

¹⁷ Cf. Pliny's description of Euphrates' impressive appearance (above, pp. 58f.).

ÜBER INSCRIFTLICHE ABKÜRZUNGEN
DER GOTISCHEN UND HUMANISTISCHEN
SCHRIFTPERIODEN

U l l a N y b e r g

Vom Standpunkt der antiken Epigraphik aus sind die Inschriften, besonders die Epitaph, der gotischen und der humanistischen Stilrichtungen äusserst interessant. Die gotischen Inschriften bedeuten sowohl inhaltlich als auch paläographisch den Abschluss einer schon im Altertum begonnenen und durch das Mittelalter weitergegangenen Entwicklung, die humanistischen dagegen eine ausgeprägte, bewusst durchgeführte Rückkehr in die ältere, vorchristliche Epitaphform der Antike.¹ Paläographisch bilden also diese zeitlich naheliegenden Epochen äusserste Gegensätze zueinander und als Teil der Schreibformen waren auch die Abkürzungen an diesen Veränderungen beteiligt.

In der vorliegenden Untersuchung soll mit Hilfe von Inschriften (Anfang des 11. Jhs. bis Mitte des 16. Jhs.) aus drei römischen Kirchen geprüft werden, wie der für die gotische Periode so charakteristische Zuwachs der Abkürzungen im inschriftlichen Gebrauch vor sich gegangen ist und andererseits, in welchem Grade und wie schnell die Humanisten den quantitativ wie auch qualitativ sehr beschränkten Abkürzungsgebrauch ihrer Vorbilder, d.h. der vorchristlichen Inschriften, aufgenommen haben. Die Untersuchung gründet sich auf die von

¹ Über diese Veränderungen im allgemeinen s. den Artikel von I. Kajanto, "Origin and Characteristics of the Humanistic Epitaph", *Epigraphica* 41, 59-119.

V. Forcella publizierte Inschriften der Kirchen S. Maria in Aracoeli, S. Maria Maggiore und S. Sabina.²

Das Verständnis der Veränderungen, die das mittelalterliche Abkürzungssystem bei seiner Entfaltung aus der antiken Grundlage durchlaufen hat, erfordert einen kurzen Überblick über ihre Geschichte.

Wahrscheinlich schon im 2. Jh. n. Chr. wurde auf der Grundlage der älteren tachygraphischen Zeichen, der Tironischen Noten, sowie der allgemein verwendeten Siglen ein System von Buchstabenkürzungen, die sog. *notae iuris*,³ gebildet. Unter diesen Noten waren hinsichtlich der Buchstabenverbindungen schon alle Hauptarten vertreten; die Suspension (auch die Siglenform, d. h. nur der Anfangsbuchstabe des Wortes), die gemischte Suspension⁴ und die Kontraktion. Ausser echten Buchstabenkürzungen gehörten zu den juristischen Noten viele den Tironischen⁵ Noten entnommene Zeichen, z. B. *P* = *pro*, *P̄* = *per*,

2 V. Forcella, *Iscrizioni delle chiese ed altri edifici di Roma dal secolo XI fino ai giorni nostri*, I-XIV, 1861-1884. Da die Schriftreform auf dem Gebiet einer einzelnen Stadt, in diesem Fall Roms, sicherlich verhältnismässig einheitlich vorgegangen ist, und weil das Material gerade von S. Maria in Aracoeli sehr repräsentativ ist, mag dieses - an sich beschränkte - Material zur Ermittlung der wichtigsten Entwicklungslinien genügen. Es ist auch kein geringer Vorteil, dass mir eine Reihe von Photographien über die Inschriften dieser Kirchen zur Verfügung stehen, eine Tatsache, die ich Prof. Kajanto verdanke. Über die Mängel der Publikation von Forcella s. Kajanto 96f.

3 Näheres s. L. Schiaparelli, *Note paleografiche. Le notae iuris e il sistema delle abbreviature latine medievali*. Archivio Storico Italiano a. 73 (1915) vol. 1 disp. 1^a 275ff.

4 Von Schiaparelli "troncamento misto" genannt, *Avviamento allo studio delle abbreviature latine nel medioevo*, Firenze 1926, 84. Da diese Abkürzung oft aus silbenanlautenden Buchstaben zusammengesetzt ist (z. B. BN = BENE, KLD = KALENDAS), wird sie meistens "syllabare Suspension" genannt. Weil jedoch einerseits die Buchstaben dieser Abkürzungsart nicht in allen Fällen silbenanlautend sind und andererseits die syllabare Struktur auch mit dem finalen Teil des Wortes (also in einer Kontraktion) vorkommt, ist die syllabare Bildung nur als *e i n e* Art der inneren Struktur der Abkürzungen zu betrachten; vgl. G. Cencetti, *Lineamenti di storia della scrittura latina*, Bologna 1954, 453.

5 Auch den Ursprung dieser Zeichen will Schiaparelli aus reinen Buchstabenabkürzungen erklären; s. L. Schiaparelli, *Note paleografiche. Segni tachigrafici nelle notae iuris*. Arch. St. It. a. 72 (1914) vol. 1 241ff.

oder rein konventionale Zeichen, z.B. \aleph = *enim*, $\$$ = *sed*.⁶ Als allgemeine Abkürzungszeichen verwendete man den Punkt (mit seinen Abarten, u.a. den Apostroph) und den Abkürzungsstrich. Auch der übergeschriebene Buchstabe war als Zeichen üblich.⁷

Diese Abkürzungen verwendete man aber nur auf bestimmten Gebieten, vor allem in juristischen Schriften. In literarischen Handschriften wurden dagegen nur einige bestimmte Suspensionen (-B = *-bus*, -Q = *-que*, die Nasalkürzung am Zeilenschluss) zugelassen.⁸

Auf Inschriften war die Suspension jahrhundertlang die einzige Abkürzungsart.⁹ Erst im 2. Jh. n.Chr. tauchen die ersten gemischten Suspensionen und im 3. Jh. die ersten Kontraktionen in lateinischen Inschriften auf.¹⁰ Das Abkürzungszeichen war zuerst der Punkt (bei einer Suspension), später auch der Horizontalstrich (bei gemischten Suspensionen und Kontraktionen) und der übergeschriebene Buchstabe (besonders bei Kontraktionen). Im Gegensatz zum juristischen Gebrauch sind auf Inschriften die determinativen Abkürzungszeichen und die daraus entstehenden Silbenkürzungen nur sehr selten zu finden.¹¹ Überdies sollen bei Behandlung der inschriftlichen Abkürzungen der Spätantike die kontraktionsartigen Bildungen der christlichen Termini, die sog. *Nomina sacra*,¹² die seit dem 5. Jh. ausserordentlich oft vorkommen, berücksichtigt werden. Überhaupt ist für spätantike Inschriften, wie auch für andere damalige Schreibmodi,

6 Cencetti 395f.

7 Schiaparelli, Arch. St. It. 1915 259ff., 298ff.

8 Vgl. Cencetti 373 und W.M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, Hildesheim 1963, 228f., 381f.

9 Die frühesten Belege stammen aus dem 5. Jh. v.Chr., Cencetti 370.

10 Z.B. POTS = POTESTATE vom J. 179 CIL VIII 26253, PC PSR = PECVNIA POSVERVNT vom. J. 190 CIL XIV 65, STA = SCRIPTA vom J. 236 CIL XIII 7281.

11 Vgl. Schiaparelli, *Avviamento* 47, 70ff. und Cencetti 441ff., 448ff. Z.B. \mathcal{C} = CON- u.a. ICVR 15995 a. 396, \mathcal{G} TIVM = GENTIVM, P·CONIIS = PRAECONIIS CIL 6850/51 a. 501, SV \overline{P} = SVPER CIL 307 *infimae aetatis*, \mathcal{C} TRA = CONTRA CIL X 15.

12 Über die problematische *Nomina sacra* -Frage s. die Zusammenfassung von Cencetti, 399ff. Neuere Literatur A.H.R.E. Paap, *Nomina sacra in the Greek papyri of the first five centuries a.d.*, *Papyrologica Lugudo-Batava* vol. 8 (1959), und Sch. Brown, *Concerning the Origin of the Nomina Sacra*, *Studia papyrologica* 9 fasc. 1^o (1970).

das häufige Vorkommen abgekürzter Formen charakteristisch.¹³

Der allgemeinen Schriftsplitterung im frühen Mittelalter entsprechend, wo die verschiedenen Schreibschulen sich selbständig ohne den römischen Einfluss weiterbildeten, entwickelte sich auch der Abkürzungsgebrauch je nach dem Schreibort unterschiedlich. In den kontinentalen Schreibschulen wurden Abkürzungen im allgemeinen recht sparsam gebraucht, wogegen sie in der insularischen Schrift lebendig blieben und üppig weiterentwickelt wurden.¹⁴ Während der karolingischen Zeit interessierte man sich aber auch auf dem Festland, neben der allgemeinen Begeisterung für die Antike, gleichermassen für das alte Abkürzungssystem; einerseits wurden die antiken juristischen Noten, jetzt auch um insularische Einflüsse ergänzt, wiederbelebt und andererseits die Formen der bis dahin ungezügelt entwickelten Abkürzungen einigermassen vereinheitlicht. Um die Wende des 10. und 11. Jhs. war diese Reform durchgeführt und Abkürzungen wurden wieder öfter und in systematischerer Form verwendet.¹⁵

Im grossen und ganzen blieb das karolingische System bis zum 13. Jh. im Gebrauch, wo die durch das Aufblühen der wissenschaftlichen Studien und durch die gleichzeitige Entstehung der grossen Universitäten Europas bedingten starken Umwälzungen des Schriftwesens Veränderungen auch im Abkürzungsgebrauch hervorriefen.¹⁶ In der nun sich entwickelnden gotischen Schrift nahm die Verwendung der Abkürzungen stetig zu, und seit dem 14. Jh. sind schon deutliche Zeichen einer Dekadenz des Abkürzungssystems wahrnehmbar; sowohl die Anzahl der Abkürzungen als auch ihre Bildungsarten scheinen fast grenzenlos

13 Den überwuchernden Gebrauch beweisen auch die im 5. und 6. Jh. erlassenen Verbote der Verwendung von Abkürzungen, vgl. Schiaparelli, Arch. St. It. 1915 288ff. und Cencetti 397ff.

14 Schiaparelli, Avviamento 38f., Cencetti 427ff.

15 Schiaparelli, Avviamento 40f., Cencetti 427ff., D. Bains, A Supplement to Notae Latinae, Hildesheim 1963, Vff. Vgl. auch die vielen aus dieser Zeit uns erhaltenen alphabetischen Abkürzungslisten, P. Lehmann, Sammlungen und Erörterungen lateinischer Abkürzungen in Altertum und Mittelalter, Abh. Bayr. Ak. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Abt. N.F. 3 (1929).

16 G. Battelli, Lezioni di paleografia, Città del Vaticano 1949, 220ff., Cencetti 437ff.

zu sein.¹⁷

Als die Humanisten dann Anfang des 15. Jhs. anstelle der schwerförmigen gotischen Schrift die klaren Buchstabenformen früherer Zeiten beleben wollten, waren es eben die Handschriften der Klassikertexte hauptsächlich der späteren karolingischen Schriftperiode, die sie sich als Vorbild genommen haben.¹⁸ Da Abkürzungen auch in diesen Handschriften vorkamen, wurden sie in der neuen Schrift auch nicht sofort alle aufgegeben, wenn auch der zuvor zügellose Gebrauch der spätgotischen Zeit recht stark systematisiert wurde. Mit der Entwicklung der humanistischen Schrift ging die Verwendung der Abkürzungen immer stärker zurück, was sicherlich damit zusammenhängt, dass in der 2. Hälfte des 15. Jhs. auch in die Buchstabenformen der Humanistenschrift Einflüsse aus antiken Inschriften hinüberspielen.¹⁹ Besonders in gedruckten Büchern verschwanden die Abkürzungen in kurzer Zeit völlig.²⁰

Die inschriftlichen Belege des früheren Mittelalters sind ziemlich spärlich.²¹ Vor allem in Rom nimmt die Anzahl der Inschriften nach dem 6. Jh. als Folge der äusseren Verhältnissen stark ab. Hinsichtlich des Abkürzungsgebrauches unterscheiden sich diese Inschriften nicht sehr von denen der Spätantike; der eigentlich einzige auffallende Zug ist, dass jetzt die beim manuellen Schreiben gebrauchten Nasalkürzungen und die tachygraphischen Silbenkürzungen (mit deter-

17 Schiaparelli, *Avviamento* 41f. Obwohl die gotische Schrift in Italien (sog. rotunda) sich in den Buchstabenformen nie in eine so grosse Spitzwinkligkeit und Gedrängtheit wie sonst in Europa entwickelte, ist sie in anderen Beziehungen, z.B. im Abkürzungsgebrauch, vollkommen 'gotisch' auch dort, B.L. Ullman, *Ancient Writing and Its Influence*, Massachusetts 1969, 131.

18 Stanley Morison, *Early Humanistic Script and the First Roman Type*, *The Library* 4. Ser. vol. 24 Nos. 1,2, 25.

19 Morison 26.

20 Auf gewissen Gebieten (vor allem in juristischen Schriften) erhielten sich die Abkürzungen oft noch bis zum 17. Jh. und länger, Cencetti 440f. S. auch P.A. Grun, *Schlüssel zu alten und neuen Abkürzungen*, *Grundriss der Genealogie* Bd. 6 (1966) 6f. sowie Ullman 185f.

21 Vgl. A. Silvagni, *Monumenta epigraphica christiana saeculo XIII antiquiora quae in Italiae finibus adhuc extant*, 1943.

minativen oder relativen Abkürzungszeichen) immer häufiger auch auf Inschriften vorkommen.²²

Mit den frühesten von Forcella publizierten Inschriften der drei erwähnten Kirchen kommen wir direkt in die nachkarolingische Schriftperiode. Auf den wenigen Inschriften des 11. und des 12. Jhs. (F. 1,401 a. 1028; F. 1,402 a. 1055; F. 1,403 a. inc. sec. 11; F. 11, 1 a. 1150) ist die Anzahl der Abkürzungen schon ziemlich hoch, wogegen die Abkürzungsarten selbst sehr wenig variieren. Die absolut häufigste Abkürzungsart ist die Nasalkürzung. Diese schon im Altertum unter gewissen Bedingungen gebrauchte Abkürzungsart²³ behauptete sich durch die karolingische Schriftperiode, aber wurde meistens nur für *m* oder *n* am Schluss zuerst eines Wortes, später auch einer Silbe verwendet.²⁴ Gegen Ende des Jahrtausends wurden beim manuellen Schreiben die Nasalkürzungen (besonders für *m*), ausgenommen in prä vokalischer Position, ganz allgemein.²⁵ Einen vorzüglichen Beleg für die Beliebtheit dieser Abkürzungsart auch in inschriftlichem Gebrauch bietet uns F. 1,401, wo auf den 35 metrisch gebundenen Zeilen 21 Nasalkürzungen vorkommen.²⁶ In den meisten Fällen handelt es sich um ein wortauslautendes *m*, z.B. Z. 5 NIMIV̄ = NIMIVM, Z. 6 CV̄ = CVM, Z. 16 TVV̄ = TVVM. Einige Male ist auch das *n*, entweder wort- oder silbenauslautend, durch Strich bezeichnet: Z. 15 NŌ = NON, Z. 29 CALĒDAS = CALENDAS, Z. 31 QVĀTV̄ = QVANTVM.

Neben den Nasalkürzungen erscheint auf diesen früheren In-

22 S. Silvagni, Monumenta vol. I z.B. tab. XXXVII,1 (8. Jh.): ALIOR = ALIORVM, QVOR = QVORVM usw.; tab. XXXVII,6 (8. Jh.): TVMVLV̄ MEV̄ = TVMVLVM MEVM; tab. III,2 (10. Jh.): P̄SOLVENS = PERSOLVENS; tab. XVII,2 (10. Jh.): P̄PETVV̄ = PERPETVVM, P̄MITTIMVS = PROMITTIMVS.

23 Vgl. S. 65. Das älteste Beispiel ist angeblich vom J. 167, Cencetti 442, 444. Über den griechischen Ursprung dieser Abkürzung s. Schiaparelli, Avviamento 56 Fn. 1. Ab und zu kommen Nasalkürzungen auch besonders auf spätantiken Inschriften vor, vgl. z.B. CIL XII S. 948.

24 Lindsay 342f.

25 Bains 56ff.

26 Obwohl Forcella die Inschrift nur nach früheren Kopien publiziert hat, werden alle Zweifel über die Echtheit der Kürzungsformen durch ihre Häufigkeit auf späteren, auch jetzt noch vorhandenen Inschriften beseitigt.

schriften in relativer Häufigkeit nur das Enklitikon *-que*, durch $-Q$ bezeichnet (mit einem Querstrich über den Schaft, F. 1,401 und 402, oder mit zwei übereinander stehenden Punkten, F. 1,401,402, 403), sowie einige andere Silbenkürzungen alten tachygraphischen Ursprungs, z.B. $SEMP$ = SEMPER, $PLEM$ = PROLEM, PAT' = PATER, $MORIB$ = MORIBVS F. 1,401, $\bar{P}MIA$ = PRAEMIA F. 1,402.²⁷ Die allgemeinen Wortkürzungsarten der antiken Epigraphik, die Suspensionen (\bar{M} = MENSE, \bar{D} = DIE, $\bar{A}VG$ = AVGVSTO, $\bar{A}NN$ = ANNO F. 1,402), die gemischten Suspensionen ($\bar{I}NDC$ = INDICIONE, $\bar{M}LL$ = MILLESIMO, $\bar{I}NCARNT$ = INCARNATIONE F. 1,402, $\bar{P}P$ = PAPA F. 11,1) und die Kontraktionen ($\bar{N}RI$ = NOSTRI F. 1,401, $\bar{G}LA$ = GLORIA F. 11,1) sind dagegen ziemlich selten.

Die recht häufigen *Nomina sacra* -Bildungen erscheinen mit einer Ausnahme ($\bar{D}N$ = DOMINI F. 1,402 in der Datierungsformel) in der schon unter Spätantike üblich gewordenen kontraktiven Form, u.a. $\bar{D}S$ = DEVS, $\bar{D}NI$ = DOMINI F. 1,401, $\bar{S}CIS$ = SANCTIS F. 1,402, $\bar{X}PI$ = CHRISTI F. 11,1).

Das 13. Jh. bedeutet in der Epigraphik ausser dem Vorkommen der gotischen Buchstabenformen auch einen starken Zuwachs an Abkürzungen. Diese der spätmittelalterlichen Schrift so eigenen Züge scheinen aber nicht immer unbedingt miteinander verknüpft zu sein. Oft sind nämlich noch im 13. Jh. die Inschriften, deren Buchstabenformen schon gotische Züge aufweisen oder deren äussere Form sonst der Epitaphform der gotischen Periode entspricht ("in giro"),²⁸ noch fast frei von allen schwerfälligen Abkürzungen (z.B. F. 1,404 a. inc.; F. 7,589 a. 1215; F. 9,3 a. 1257). Andererseits sind schon ziemlich früh viele und in ihrer Art typisch spätmittelalterliche Abkürzungen auf solchen Inschriften zu finden, die andere gotische Züge noch entbehren (z.B. F. 7,591 a. 1248; F. 7,592 a. 1263; F. 1,410 a. 1266).

Bei der Verwendung der Nasalkürzungen, die im 13. Jh. immer häufiger vorkommen, ist der auffallendste Unterschied zum früheren

²⁷ S. Fn. 11, 22 und dazu Bains 36. Das normale Zeichen für die Silbe *-ter* war der Horizontalstrich, Lindsay 333ff., s. aber auch Bains 53ff.

²⁸ Normalerweise läuft in einem gotischen Epitaph der Text an den Rändern des Steines um eine Mittelfigur herum, vgl. Kajanto 99.

Gebrauch der, dass die Nasale jetzt allgemein auch in der Wortmitte durch Strich bezeichnet werden. Hatten wir noch im vorigen Jh. Belege nur für silbenauslautende Nasale, so kommen jetzt auch prävo-kalische, also meistens silbenanlautende Nasale als durch Strich bezeichnet vor: \overline{AIA} = ANIMA²⁹ F. 7,589 a. 1215, F. 1,410 a. 1266, F. 1,413 a. 1298, F. 1,414 a. 1298, \overline{BONOIE} = BONONIE F. 1,414 a. 1298, $\overline{COIVGALIS}$ = CONIVGALIS F. 1,408 a. inc. In den meisten Fällen findet sich die Nasalkürzung jedoch noch im 13. Jh. am Schluss eines Wortes, u.a. \overline{QVONDA} = QVONDAM F. 7,589 a. 1215, \overline{OCTAVA} = OCTAVAM, \overline{DATV} = DATVM F. 7,590 a. 1238, $\overline{SALARIV}$ = SALARIVM F. 1,414 a. 1298. Für die schon aus den juristischen Noten stammende Abkürzung \overline{I} = IN, die mit der Zeit für eine normale Nasalkürzung gehalten wurde,³⁰ kommen auch Belege vor, teils, wie ursprünglich, als Präposition (z.B. F. 7,591,592, F. 1,410,414), teils als Präfix, wie z.B. $\overline{IDVLGETIA}$ = INDVLGENTIAM F. 7,591.

Besonders fallen auf den Inschriften des 13. Jhs. die Abkürzungen nur einer Silbe oder sogar eines einzigen Buchstabens auf. Sehr oft ist jetzt die Endung *-us* auch anderswo als in der Silbe *-bus* (z.B. F. 7,591, F. 11,3) abgekürzt und meistens durch einen Apostroph oder durch das determinative Zeichen für *-us* bezeichnet.³¹ In der Abkürzung \overline{VOCATV} ' = VOCATVS F. 1,414 a. 1298 steht das Zeichen für blosses *s*, was beim Handschreiben besonders im 11. und 12. Jh. üblich geworden war.³² Ein paarmal sind auch andere Endungen oder Endbuchstaben durch einen Apostroph bezeichnet, u.a. \overline{FIDEL} ' = FIDELIS F. 1,408 a. inc., \overline{DOCTO} ' = DOCTOR F. 1,414 a. 1298, oder das

29 *Anima* gehört eben zu den Wörtern, bei denen die sonst ziemlich späte Nasalkürzung in prävokalischer Position am ehesten in Verwendung gekommen ist, Lindsay 345, Bains 1, 57.

30 Schiaparelli, *Avviamento* 73, Lindsay 349, Bains 58.

31 Schiaparelli, *Arch. St. It.* 1915 253f., *Avviamento* 51, 66. Vgl. auch Lindsay 381ff. Weil Forcella keinen Unterschied zwischen diesen zwei Zeichen gemacht hat, ist es mir nicht möglich, die Häufigkeit des determinativen *-us*-Zeichens im ganzen zu schätzen. Einige Belege kann ich jedoch anführen: zweimal bei *unius* F. 7, 591 a. 1248, bei *opus* F. 11,10 a. 1299.

32 Schiaparelli, *Avviamento* 66.

Zeichen steht in der Mitte des Wortes für eine Silbenkürzung wie z.B. V'BANI = VRBANI F. 7,592 a. 1263, E'GGIVS = EGREGIVS F. 1,414 a. 1298.³³ Solche wenig ersparenden Abkürzungen sind gerade für Inschriften mit mehr oder weniger gotischen Buchstaben typisch. Von den alten tachygraphischen Zeichen des 13. Jhs. seien noch erwähnt P̄ = PER F. 7,591,592, C̄ = CON³⁴ in C̄SECRATV = CONSECRATVM F. 7,591 und das im Insularischen erhaltene Zeichen 7 = ET F. 7,591, F. 1,410, das einige Zeit vor der gotischen Periode in die kontinentale Schrift übergegangen war.³⁵

Unter den anderen Abkürzungen des 13. Jhs. fällt besonders die stark erhöhte Anzahl der Kontraktionen auf (beinahe die Hälfte aller Bildungen). Fast regelmässig sind sie durch Strich bezeichnet, z.B. FRĒS = FRATRES, NRĒS = NOSTROS, F. 7,590, ĒĒT = ESSET F. 1,410, MAGĒRI = MAGISTRI F. 7,590. In der zweiten Hälfte des Jhs. kommt auch der übergeschriebene Buchstabe als Zeichen der Kontraktion vor: P^EP̄ = PAPAE F. 1,410 a. 1266, IND^E = INDICIONE F. 11,9 a. 1296. Üblich sind auch die Siglen und längere Suspensionen, von denen erstere meistens nicht durch Zeichen, letztere durch einen Horizontalstrich bezeichnet sind. Gemischte Suspensionen sind ausser in den Fällen, wo sie als Folge mehrerer Silben- oder Nasalkürzungen entstanden sind (z.B. P̄ŌTIFICAT̄ = PONTIFICATVS F. 7,592), äusserst selten zu finden: P̄P̄ = PAPAE F. 7,591,592, Q̄N̄ = QVONIAM F. 7,592.

Die *Nomina sacra*-Bildungen erscheinen in den Inschriften des 13. Jhs. zahlreich und fast ausnahmslos in der normalen kontraktiven Form (u.a. F. 1,409,410,412,414, F. 7,591,592, F. 11,10).

Während des 14. und der ersten Jahrzehnte des folgenden Jhs.

33 Dieser Apostroph kommt besonders in der gotischen Schrift des 13. Jhs. vor. Nach Cencetti handelt es sich dabei nicht um einen wahren Apostroph, sondern um eine Abwandlung des Hakenstriches, Cencetti 454f.

34 Das antike *con*-Zeichen erhielt sich im Mittelalter hauptsächlich in der insularischen Schrift, wogegen auf dem Festland dafür meistens der Buchstabe *c* mit einem Horizontalstrich gebraucht wurde, Schiaparelli, Arch. St. It. 1915 245ff., Lindsay 323f. Vgl. *consecra/tum*, *-tionis* in F. 7,591 Z. 19 und F. 7,592.

35 Schiaparelli, Avviamento 66. Näheres s. Lindsay 74ff.

vervollkommnet sich die gotische Stilrichtung in der Epigraphik; fast jedes der Epitaphien hat jetzt die typische Form "in giro" und die spitzwinkligen, gedrängten Buchstabenformen. Im Gebrauch der Abkürzungen war quantitativ gesehen der Höhepunkt schon im vorigen Jh. erreicht; jetzt nehmen die Abkürzungen auf Inschriften nicht mehr zu. Dagegen sind in der Häufigkeit der verschiedenen Abkürzungsarten deutliche Veränderungen zu sehen, die den schon im 13. Jh. bemerkbaren Tendenzen folgen.

Die Nasalkürzungen sind jetzt ausserordentlich zahlreich und ebensooft in der Wortmitte wie am Wortschluss zu finden. In der Wortmitte kommen sowohl silbenanlautende als auch silbenauslautende Nasale, oft auch prävokalisch, abgekürzt vor: u.a. $\bar{A}DREA = ANDREA$ F. 1,425 a. 1306, $IOC\bar{V}DI = IOC\bar{V}NDI$ F. 1,444 a. 1317, $ORDIN\bar{A}D\bar{V} = ORDINANDVM$, $T\bar{A}T\bar{V}D\bar{E} = TANTVND\bar{E}M$, $N\bar{O}I\bar{E} = NOMINE$ F. 11,18 a. 1325, $REQ\bar{E}SC\bar{V}T = REQVIESCVNT$ F. 7,601 a. 1372, $VL\bar{T}I\bar{A} = VLTIMA$ F. 11,25 a. 1383. Wie schon im vorangegangenen Jh. ist auch jetzt die Kürzung $\bar{I} = IN$ sowohl für die Präposition (u.a. F. 1,440,449,452, F. 7,601) wie für das Präfix (u.a. $\bar{I}DICIIS = INDICIIS$, $\bar{I}TEGRALITER = INTEGRALITER$ F. 11,18) üblich.

Überhaupt ist sehr charakteristisch für die Abkürzungen des 14. Jhs., dass sie jeweils nur für eine Silbe oder einen Buchstaben ausgeführt sind. So können dann verschiedene Silben- (oder Buchstaben)-kürzungen gleichzeitig in demselben Wort vorkommen, wie z.B. $EI'D\bar{E} = EIVSDEM$, $OP\bar{V} = OPERVM$ F. 11,18 a. 1325, $PSECVT' = PROSECVTVS$ F. 1,453 a. 1348. Die Arten der Silbenkürzungen sind vorwiegend dieselben wie im vorigen Jh. (s. oben, P, P, \bar{P} , die Silben *-us* und *-que*, die Nasalkürzungen usw.). Hinzu kommen jetzt die vielen Fortlassungen des *r* oder einer Silbe mit *r*, was meistens durch eine gewellte Linie bezeichnet wird,³⁶ z.B. $ANIV\bar{E}S'IV = ANNIVERSARIVM$, $DEC\bar{E}N\bar{E}TES = DECERNENTES$, $E\bar{X} = EXTRA$, $P\bar{O}T\bar{A} = PORTAM$, $FAC\bar{E} = FACERE$ F. 11,18 a. 1325, $VX\bar{O}IS = VXORIS$, $REC\bar{V}SVS = RECVRSVS$ F. 11,24 a. 1380, und die Abkür-

³⁶ S. Cencetti 445, 448f., Grun 20. Der Ursprung der gewellten Linie ist nach Cencetti in der kursiver Form des Buchstabens begründet, loc.cit.

zung -R der Endsilbe *-rum*,³⁷ z.B. CANONICOR = CANONICORVM F. 11,14 a. 1310, MINOR = MINORVM F. 1,441 a. 1314. Diese Abkürzung verallgemeinert sich auf Inschriften jedoch erst Anfang des nächsten Jhs. Im grossen und ganzen scheint es aber, dass im 14. Jh. jeder beliebige Buchstabe eines Wortes durch die allgemeinen Abkürzungszeichen, den Horizontalstrich oder den Apostroph, bezeichnet werden kann, z.B. IPIV̄S = IPSIVS F. 11,18 a. 1325, MAGI'TER = MAGISTER F. 1,473 a. inc., ISTIS̄ = ISTIVS F. 11,17 a. inc. Auch die Zahl der Belege für das konventionale Zeichen 7 = ET hat stark zugenommen (u.a. F. 1,425,432, 434,435).

Gegenüber den Abkürzungen der beschriebenen Art sind die in der Epigraphik seit jeher gebräuchlichen Bildungen, in denen das Wort als Ganzes abgekürzt wird, deutlich zurückgegangen. Innerhalb dieser Gruppe hat aber die kontraktive Kürzungsart stark zugenommen; zahlenmässig übertreffen die Belege für Kontraktionen jetzt sogar zum erstenmal die für Suspensionen, wenn dies auch vor allem an der Häufigkeit des fast regelmässig durch die Kontraktion D̄NS/D̄NA abgekürzten typisch mittelalterlichen Titels *domin/us*, *-a* liegt. Das normale Zeichen für Kontraktionen ist der Strich, z.B. B̄TI = BEATI F. 1,425, F̄RM = FRATRVM F. 7,594, T̄PE = TEMPORE F. 1,443, aber auch übergeschriebener Buchstabe kommt schon häufiger vor, obwohl auch jetzt nicht sehr verbreitet: u.a. -Q^E = -QVE F. 11,18 a. 1325, MAG^{CI} = MAGNIFICI F. 1,449 a. 1340, A^O = ANNO F. 1,459 a. 1398. Unter den Suspensionen macht sich oft die Tendenz zu längeren Bildungen bemerkbar (vgl. die Beliebtheit der Silbenkürzungen im gleichen Zeitraum), so dass die Kürzung nur die letzte Silbe des Wortes betrifft, z.B. ROMAN̄ = ROMANI F. 1,432 oder SEPTEMBR = SEPTEMBRIS F. 11,25. Andererseits hat auch die Siglenform sich gut behauptet. Die gemischte Suspension tritt fast nur in der syllabaren Form des Wortes *papa* auf PP = PAPAE u.a. F. 1,443, F. 7,593,594.

In der *Nomina sacra*-Gruppe fällt die Häufigkeit der Sigle D

37 Beim manuellen Schreiben war das ursprünglich antike Zeichen schon im frühen Mittelalter recht üblich, Schiaparelli, *Avviamento* 59, Lindsay 36lff. Vgl. auch. Fn. 22.

für das Wort *Domini* auf (ein Viertel aller Belege, meistens in der Datierungsformel, z.B. F. 1,420,432,437,442,450,459). Diese gerade für gotische Inschriften merkwürdige Rückkehr von der normalen Kontraktion DNS, DNI usw. zur Siglenform dürfte sich jedoch durch die Verbreitung der Kontraktionsform desselben Wortes als Titel erklären. Einige Male kommt das Wort als *Nomen sacrum* in der Form D'O = DOMINI vor (F. 1,434,435 a. 1312, F. 11,16 a. 1323).

Obwohl die frühesten Zeichen des beginnenden humanistischen Stils in Handschriften schon um die Wende des 14. und 15. Jhs. zu sehen sind,³⁸ gehören die ersten drei Jahrzehnte des 15. Jhs. in der epigraphischen Praxis Roms noch fast völlig der gotischen Stilrichtung an. Hier machen sich die ersten Veränderungen in den Buchstabenformen wie auch im allgemeinen Stil und der Idiomatik der Epitaphe erst in den dreissiger Jahren des Jhs. bemerkbar.³⁹

Der allgemeinen Entwicklung entsprechend besteht der Abkürzungsgebrauch des 14. Jhs. bei den Inschriften bis zu den dreissiger Jahren des 15. Jhs. fort. Die Inschriften sind wie früher mit Nasal- und Silbenkürzungen überhäuft, und die reinen Kontraktionen und Suspensionen werden länger: z.B. PONTIFICAT = PONTIFICATV F. 11,32 a. 1422, PAE = PACE F. 11,37 a. 1433, PPAE = PAPAE F. 11,38 a. 1434. Üblich ist es auch, dass mehrere Abkürzungen im selben Wort vorkommen, wie z.B. LRAR̄ APPLICAR = LITTERARVM APOSTOLICARVM F. 11,35 a. 1424. Kurz gesagt, die Zeichen der Entartung des mittelalterlichen Abkürzungssystems sind noch deutlicher als im vorigen Jahrhundert.

Wenn die ersten Nachahmungen der antiken Epitaphformeln in der erste Hälfte des 15. Jhs. erscheinen,⁴⁰ so sind sie meist ohne Abkürzungen geschrieben; sie waren ja zu der Zeit immerhin neue Ausdrücke und als solche nicht allen bekannt. So steht der Ausdruck *vixit annis...* ausgeschrieben, überraschend genug, schon auf einer

38 Morison, op.cit.

39 Vgl. Kajanto, op.cit. Unter den Kirchen Roms ist es eben S. Maria in Aracoeli, in deren Epitaphen der neue Stil zuerst auftaucht, Kajanto, op.cit.

40 Über die frühesten Belege der verschiedenen Ausdrücke s. Kajanto, op.cit.

Inschrift vom Jahre 1424 (F. 11,35), obwohl auf derselben Inschrift die oben erwähnten typisch mittelalterlichen Kürzungsformen \overline{LRAR} und $\overline{APEICAR}$ vorkommen. In unabgekürzter Form ist der Ausdruck auch in folgenden frühen Beispielen geschrieben: F. 1,493 a. 1438, F. 1,507 a. 1448, F. 1,519 a. 1463. Ebenso verhält es sich mit anderen antiken Ausdrücken, z.B. *benemerenti* ausgeschrieben in F. 1,496 a. 1440, F. 11,41 a. 1447-1455, F. 1,513 a. 1456, F. 1,519 a. 1463.

Aus der Übergangsperiode (1430-1480)⁴¹ haben wir auch einige Belege dafür, dass man versucht hat, die neuen Formeln durch die damals gewohnten Abkürzungen auszudrücken: $\overline{FACI\overline{VDV}^M}$ CVRAVIT = FACIYN-DVM... F. 1,506 a. 1447, \overline{PDIE} NONAS IVNII = PRIDIE... F. 1,519 a. 1463, $\overline{K\overline{I}VII}$ = KALENDIS IVNII F. 11,44 a. 1464. Stilistische Mischformen dieser Art trifft man aber nur ausnahmsweise, denn meistens sind die Inschriften dieser Zeit sowohl betreffs der Abkürzungen (wie auch der Paläographie im allgemeinen) als auch des Inhalts entweder mittelalterlich (z.B. F. 1,490,497,501,503,505,508,511,515-517) oder humanistisch (z.B. F. 1,496, F. 11,40,41). Jedoch kann man auch auf den Inschriften des mittelalterlichen Stils deutliches Abnehmen der Abkürzungen bemerken; ein solches Übermass von abgekürzten Ausdrücken, wie man es im 14. Jh. oft trifft, ist kaum mehr zu finden.⁴²

Zum erstenmal erscheinen Ausdrücke der antiken Epitaphe in abgekürzter Form auf einer Inschrift vom Jahre 1443 (F. 11,40). In diesem auch inhaltlich stilreinen humanistischen Epitaph kommen mit der Ausnahme der Kontraktion EPVS = EPISCOPVS nur reine Suspensionen vor: das Alter ist durch die Suspensionen VIX AN...M...D... =

41 Kajanto 111 f. (S. Maria in Aracoeli), 112 (S. Maria Maggiore).

42 Der reichste Abkürzungsgebrauch innerhalb der Übergangsperiode dürfte auf folgenden Inschriften zu finden sein: F. 1,511 a. 1453, F. 1,515 a. 1457, F. 1,516 a. 1458, F. 11,44 a. 1464, F. 1,530-532 a. 1470-1472, F. 11,48 a. 1474, F. 1,537 a. 1475. Nach diesen Inschriften kommen Abkürzungen in grösserer Masse nur noch auf einer Inschrift vom J. 1497, F. 7,605, vor.

VIXIT ANN/OS, -IS...MENSES...DIES...⁴³ ausgedrückt, das Datum in der Form PR NON IAN = PRIDIE NONAS IANVARIAS, und bei der Suspension POSS der Verbform *posuerunt* wird sogar die Pluralform durch Verdoppelung des letzten Abkürzungsbuchstabens ausgedrückt. Dieses im inschriftlichen Gebrauch der Antike recht übliche Pluralzeichen war im Mittelalter fast aus dem Gebrauch gekommen und wurde nur bei gewissen Wörtern verwendet.⁴⁴ Auch in unserem Material der drei Kirchen gibt es vor der erwähnten Inschrift kein Beispiel für diese Pluralverdoppelung, wogegen spätere Beispiele auf den humanistischen Inschriften gelegentlich auftauchen: PONTT = PONTIFICES F. 1,563 a. 1494, PRINCIPP = PRINCIPES F. 1,563 a. 1494, POSS = POSVERVNT F. 11, 62 a. 1532, F. 1,640 a. 1546.

Vollkommen ausgeführt finden wir den neuen Abkürzungsgebrauch erst auf einer Inschrift vom Jahre 1464 (F. 1,521), auf der Abkürzungen nur antiker inschriftlicher Art vorkommen: VIX ANN, KAL = KALENDAS und die Abkürzung BM = BENEMERENTI, die, auf dieser Inschrift zum erstenmal auftretend, in der Folgezeit bald sehr üblich wird (z.B. F. 1,525, 532, 538, 550, 560). In S. Maria in Aracoeli bedeutet gerade diese Inschrift den Anfang für häufiges Vorkommen abgekürzter Formen der antiken stereotypen Ausdrücke. Schon für die sechziger Jahre finden wir oft die Suspensionen der Altersangabe *vixit annis* usw. (F. 1,522, 523, 524, 525, 527, 529), und für die nächsten Jahrzehnte sind sie fast in jedem Epitaph zu finden (F. 1,532a, 538, 539, 543, 544, 547, 548, 550, 551, 553, 556-565 usw.). Um dieselbe Zeit treten auch immer öfter Suspensionen verschiedener antiker Epitheta

43 Die ausgeschriebenen Fälle der Altersangabe zeigen, dass die Jahre auf humanistischen Inschriften dem antiken Gebrauch entsprechend bald durch Ablativ (z.B. F. 11,35, F. 1,493, F. 1,519, F. 1,559), bald durch Akkusativ (z.B. F. 1,507, F. 1,555, F. 11,61, F. 1, 592a, F. 11,63) ausgedrückt wurden. Bei den Monaten und Tagen sind die unabgekürzten Formen sehr selten; hier scheint der Akkusativ gebräuchlicher gewesen zu sein (DIES F. 1,527, F. 1,600, F. 1,611, F. 1,619, F. 1,626, F. 1,631, MENSES F. 1,611). Auch die Ablative *mensibus*, *diebus*, kommen vor, aber mit der Ausnahme eines sehr frühen Beispiels (F. 11,35 a. 1424) gewöhnlich erst später: z.B. F. 1,639 a. 1545, F. 11,71 a. 1563, F. 11,76 a. 1565.

44 Schiaparelli, *Avviamento* 82f.

auf, wie z.B. *dulcissimo* in der Form DVLCISS (u.a. F. 1,532 a. 1473, 545 a. 1471-1484, 551 a. 1485, 558 a. 1489) oder DVLCIS (F. 1,553 a. 1487) oder DVLC (F. 1,560 a. 1490), OPT = OPTIMO (u.a. F. 1,539 a. 1478, 542 a. 1480, 563 a. 1494), PIENTISS = PIENTISSIMO (F. 1,548 a. 1484). Das Verb *posu/it*, *-erunt* dagegen bleibt bis zum Anfang des letzten Jahrzehntes des 15. Jhs. meist unabgekürzt, wonach die Suspensionen POS und P üblicher werden (frühere Belege, ausser dem schon auf S.75s. erwähnten, sind nur F. 1,539 a. 1478, 551 a. 1485, 558 a. 1489; aus den neunziger Jahren dagegen F. 1,563,564,565,575, 579 usw.).

In S. Maria Maggiore treffen wir entsprechende Suspensionen, mit Ausnahme eines vorzeitlichen Beispiels (F. 11,40 a. 1443, vgl. S. 75), erst ein gutes Jahrzehnt später (F. 11,51 a. 1476, 52 a. 1481, 57 a. 1489 usw.) und in S. Sabina sind die frühesten Belege erst vom Jahre 1500 (F. 7,606).

Die Formen der humanistischen Suspensionen entsprechen mit erstaunlicher Genauigkeit den im Altertum üblichsten Suspensionsformen dieser Wörtern. So wird z.B. *vixit* meistens durch die Suspension VIX, weit seltener durch die Sigle V ausgedrückt, wie es auch im Altertum der Fall war. Ebenso ist *ann/is*, *-os* gewöhnlich in der Form AN oder ANN, seltener als Sigle A zu finden. Von *mens/es*, *-ibus* und *di/es*, *-ebus* sind dagegen die normalen Formen die Siglen M und D, wenn man auch gelegentlich die längeren Suspensionen MENS, MEN bzw. DI trifft.⁴⁵

Die Tendenz von der Kontraktionsform zur Suspension zeigt sich deutlich schon in der Periode 1440-1470, obwohl der dominierende Epitaphtyp damals der mittelalterliche war: noch zu Anfang des 15. Jhs. ist ungefähr die Hälfte der Abkürzungen kontraktiver Art, aber schon in den vierziger Jahren geht ihr Anteil auf ein Drittel, im nächsten Jahrzehnt auf ein Viertel und in den sechziger Jahren sogar bis auf ein Siebentel zurück. In den siebziger Jahren trifft man Kontraktio-

45 Vgl. über die Formen von *vixit* CIL VI 7:5 5739-65, 5867-68, 5932-74, von *ann/is*, *-os* CIL VI 7:1 6-32, 247-328, von *mens/es*, *-ibus* CIL VI 7:3 3513-3993, von *di/es*, *-ebus* CIL VI 7:2 1356-82, 1605-07.

nen noch ebensooft wie im vorigen Jahrzehnt, aber von den achtziger Jahren an sind sie nur noch in Ausnahmefällen zu finden. Gleichzeitig werden die typisch mittelalterlichen Silbenkürzungen immer seltener, so dass man besonders in der zweiten Hälfte des Jhs. nur noch vereinzelte Belege findet. Die Nasalkürzungen dagegen behaupten sich gut und gehen erst seit den achtziger Jahren entscheidend zurück. Zusammen mit den mittelalterlichen Kürzungsarten verschwinden natürlich die Abkürzungszeichen dieser Zeit (der Apostroph, der übergeschriebene Buchstabe usw.) und auch der Horizontalstrich kommt jetzt nur bei den wenigen Kontraktionen oder Nasalkürzungen vor.

Die Formen der *Nomina sacra* verändern sich zusammen mit der Erneuerung der Ausdrücke. Wenn die typisch humanistische Formel *Deo Optimo Maximo* sich ungefähr von den achtziger Jahren an durchsetzt,⁴⁶ so geschieht dies fast ausnahmslos in der Siglenform D O M (z.B. F. 1,541 a. 1478, 549 a. 1484, 551 a. 1485, F. 11,57 a. 1485, F. 1,553 a. 1487). Bei der Jahresangabe erhält sich einerseits der normale mittelalterliche Ausdruck *anno Domini*. Obwohl die normale Abkürzungsform des Wortes *Domini* besonders seit den siebziger Jahren die Sigle D ist, findet man für einen langen Zeitraum, sogar noch für Anfang des 16. Jhs., auch einzelne Belege der Kontraktion DNI (z.B. F. 1,602 a. 1512, F. 11,62 a. 1532). Andererseits wird auf den humanistischen Inschriften das Wort *Domini* auch oft fortgelassen (F. 1,506 a. 1447, 509 a. 1449, 531 a. 1472, 542 a. 1480 usw.), oder, so besonders von den achtziger Jahren an, durch das Wort *salutis* ersetzt, so dass die üblichste Datierungsformel danach ANN SAL = ANNO SALVTIS ist (z.B. F. 1,554,558,560,564).⁴⁷ Die anderen Worte der *Nomina sacra*-Gruppe kommen nur selten vor (XPI = CHRISTI F. 11,47 a. 1474, XPM = CHRISTVM F. 1,537 a. 1475), und später sind auch sie als Suspensionen geschrieben (F. 1,614 a. 1522, 636 a. 1544 usw.).

Mit Beginn des 16. Jhs. ist die Übergangsperiode in den Abkürzungsformen eigentlich schon vorüber, und die normale Kürzungsform

⁴⁶ Vgl. Kajanto 115f.

⁴⁷ In einem frühen Beispiel durch gemischte Suspension bezeichnet: AN SALT F. 1,551 a. 1485.

ist nunmehr die Suspension, entweder in Siglenform oder als längere Bildung. Jetzt sind sogar die charakteristischen mittelalterlichen Ausdrücke, wenn sie sporadisch noch vorkommen, durch Suspensionen bezeichnet, z.B. C.A.R. IN PACE = CVIVS ANIMA REQVIESCAT... (F. 1, 595 a. 1510). Trotzdem tauchen als Relikte des mittelalterlichen Abkürzungsgebrauches gelegentlich noch lange auch vereinzelt Kontraktionen (z.B. ORNAM^o = ORNAMENTO F. 1,593 a. 1510, BAPTĀE = BAPTISTAE F. 1,602 a. 1512, EPO = EPISCOPO F. 11,65 a. 1539, CAPLI = CAPELLANI F. 11,65 a. 1551), Silbenkürzungen (z.B. PCHARO = PRAECHARO F. 1,587 a. 1505, QVOR = QVORVM F. 1,610 a. 1519, TRIB' = TRIBVS F. 11,67 a. 1551) und besonders Nasalkürzungen auf, die in späterer Zeit vor allem in der Wortmitte erscheinen (z.B. MĒSIS = MENSIS, BENE - MERĒTI = BENEMERENTI F. 1,633 a. 1544).

Der Übergang vom gotischen Abkürzungsgebrauch zu den einfachen Kürzungsformen der humanistischen Zeit im eigentlichen Sinne beginnt also auf Inschriften in den sechziger Jahren des 15. Jhs. und wird zum grössten Teil während der zwei folgenden Jahrzehnte durchgeführt. Wie die Gleichzeitigkeit dieses Vorgangs mit den paläographischen und inhaltlichen Veränderungen im Epitaphstil, zeigen auch die Abkürzungsformen selbst, vor allem der strenge Verzicht auf alle anderen Abkürzungsarten ausser der Suspension (sogar bei den *Nomina sacra*), deutlich, dass es sich dabei nicht nur um eine Reinigung des im Mittelalter fast bis zur Unverständlichkeit entwickelten Abkürzungsgebrauches, sondern um eine getreue Nachahmung der antiken, vorchristlichen Inschriften handelt.

ON THE ALLEGED VARIATION
DĒLĒNIŌ ~ DĒLĪNIŌ

M a r t t i N y m a n

1. Introduction

The status of *delinio*, the spelling variant of *delenio* in manuscripts (for Plautine and Ciceronian loci, see Corssen II² [1870] 420) abides an explicit critical assessment. The problem is to know whether it is feasible to regard *delinio* as an authentic variant; i.e., whether it is possible, at least in principle, that e.g. Plautus sometimes wrote *delenio* and sometimes *delinio*. As *delenio* is doubtlessly the orthographic representation of /dĒlēniŏ/, it is clear that if *delinio* is authentic, it must stand for /dĒlīniŏ/. So, the solution to the authenticity problem depends on whether the reality of the phonological representation /dĒlīniŏ/ can be established in an intersubjectively controllable manner.

2. In search for the source of *delinio*

2.1. It is generally held that *delinio* reflects the prehistorical change from the initially accented *dĒlēniŏ to dĒlīniŏ (Sommer, 1914, 102; Leumann, 1977, 54); whereas *delenio* is defined as standing for a later, yet prehistorical, recomposition on the model of the simplex verb *lēniŏ*, i.e. *dē-lēniŏ* (Solmsen, 1897, 15; LEW I³ 338). To be sure, as an exemplification of the prehistorical sound law $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$, *dĒlīniŏ* would indeed evidence the authenticity of the manuscript

spelling *delinio*, but unfortunately this sound law is a linguistic artifact - despite the fact that it is accepted in the most authoritative codifications of Latin historical phonology and morphology. The reality of this sound law hinges crucially on two instances only, viz. *suspīciō* (<*súspēciō) and *dēlīniō* (<*dēlēniō). Therefore, Otrębski's (1939, 243) note was in order: "Darauf kann man aber kaum ein Lautgesetz bauen". Furthermore, it is made evident in Nyman (in prep.) that *suspīciō* was formed on the verb *suspīcor* in accordance with the relative chronology *e>i>ī*; it is also argued there that the stem vowel in *suspīciō* was lengthened in order to differentiate the noun stem from the verb stem. (Synchronically, then, *suspīciō* belongs to those nominalized forms in which the nominalization is morphophonologically (co-)signalled by the lengthening of the stem vowel.)

2.2. The upshot of the preceding paragraph is that it is not feasible to derive *dēlīniō* from *dēlēniō* by means of a sound law. Consequently, *dēlīniō* must be traced to another source, if we wish to argue for the authenticity of the spelling *delinio*. One such source was conceived by Osthoff (1884, 115 n.1) who suggested that *dēlīniō* was a folk-etymological word-blend: "... so mag leicht auch hier bei der bedeutung 'durch schmeicheln oder liebkosungen oder list gewinnen, für sich einnehmen, bezaubern' die volksetymologie ihr spiel, und zwar mit *līnum* 'zuggarn, netz', getrieben haben; man vergleiche unser *umgarnen* oder auch *auf den leim locken*". Osthoff made his suggestion only casually in a footnote, and obviously it was not supposed to be taken very seriously, as is evidenced by the fact that four years later (in 1888, 401) he did not hesitate to replace it by another suggestion. Nevertheless, this suggestion deserves attention, because it involves a possible solution to a semantic peculiarity observable in the relation of *delenio* to the adjective *lenis* from which it derives.

Delenio belongs to the verb type that has been formed on the pattern *de+ADJ+o*; i.e., by means of the prefix *de+* attached to a verb derived on the model of an adjective stem. The meaning is in

principle the same as that of respective simplex verbs (ADJ+o), viz. 'to make ADJ'. For example,

ADJ	<i>de</i> +ADJ+o
/+alb+/'white'	<i>de</i> +alb+o 'to whiten'
/+klār+/'clear'	<i>de</i> +clar+o 'to declare'
/+lass+/'tired'	<i>de</i> +lass+o 'to tire out'
/+mutil+/'mutilated'	<i>de</i> +mutil+o 'to mutilate'
/+nigr+/'black'	<i>de</i> +nigr+o 'to blacken'
/+nūd+/'nude'	<i>de</i> +nud+o 'to denude'
/+prāw+/'distorted'	<i>de</i> +prav+o 'to distort'
/+sōl+/'deserted'	<i>de</i> +sol+o 'to desert, abandon'.

In contradistinction to the foregoing verbs in which the meaning of the ADJ-stem is transparent, only the simplex verb *lēniō* is semantically compatible with the adjective *lēnis*; e.g. Verg. Aen. 2, 782 *leni fluit agmine Thybris*; 8,86-87 *Thybris ... fluvium ... tumentem / leniit*. On the other hand, the meaning of *dēlēniō* cannot be accounted for by the paraphrase 'to make *lēnis*'; thus, it would scarcely have been possible to say ²*Thybris fluvium tumentem deleniit*. Obviously this semantic idiosyncrasy of *dēlēniō* must be attributed to an interference coming from another lexeme, and now this word would conceivably be Osthoff's *līnum*.

In Plaut. Amph. 844 the manuscript reading *delinitus sum* (*profecto ita ut me qui sim nesciam*) could be taken as authentic by the virtue of the meaning 'I have been fooled' which becomes quite understandable if *līnum* is considered to have exerted an influence on *dēlēniō* both phonologically and semantically. However, editors usually write *delenitus* after Nonius (278 M. = 427 Ly), and although we, *qua* linguists, are often not too well served by critical editions (as is well argued by Frösén 1974; cf. also Meillet 1923), this editorial solution is likely to be correct.

Now consider Plaut. Cist. 517 where we again face the problem of semantic opacity. Here Melaenis disturbs Alcesimarchus' invocation by pedantic interruptions, until he exclaims: *tu me delenis!* Here the meaning of the adjective stem /*lēni*+/ is entirely irrecoverable, but

the semantic gap would be well bridged by referring, again, to the interference of *līnum*. The trouble is, however, that only *delenis* is attested in manuscripts, and it would be bad methodology to substitute the tradited reading for *delinis* just in order to back up an uncertain explanandum. To clinch the case, Osthoff's *līnum* must be replaced by Eutyches' *lēna* (GLK 5,454,18). The use of *dēlēniō* witnesses quite clearly that Romans perceived this verb as being related to *lēna* 'procuress; seductress' and *lēnō* 'procurer; enticer' (recall also the word-pun in Trabea, com.1 Ribb. *leno delenita argento*).

The semantic impact of *lēna*, *lēnō* on the use of *dēlēniō* appears, then, in Cist. 517 where the semantic nuance of seduction (of the attention, in this case) is necessary for the proper understanding of Alcesimarchus' exclamation. This assumption also backs up the editorial decision to write *delenitus* in Amph. 844. The influence of *lēna*, *lēnō* can be perceived also in other Plautine, as well as in Ciceronian, etc., instances. But let us content ourselves with only one more example.

In Stich. 456 the parasite Gelasimus decides to pay a visit to his patron Epignomus, *ut eum advenientem deleniam* (A)/*deliniam* (P) 'in order to get him into a favorable mood, when he arrives'. Here, too, the authentic spelling is quite evidently *deleniam*, firstly because it is preserved in the old Ambrosian palimpsest, and secondly because the choice of *dēlēniō* can be taken as conditioned by the situation in which Gelasimus is metaphorically assuming the role of *lēnō* in order to pander to his own case.

2.3. The above discussion suffices to bring home the claim that the variant *dēlēniō* can be derived neither by means of the sound law $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$, nor by referring to an alleged blend with *līnum*.¹ In fact,

¹ At the end of his treatment of *suspīciō* Otrębski (1939, 245-6) offers a speculation concerning the source of *dēlēniō*. According to him, the change $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$ was conditioned by a *horror aequi*: "Dieses Verb hat sein \bar{i} wahrscheinlich im Perfekt erhalten, und zwar im Zusammenhang mit der schwankenden Gestalt des suffixalen Elements: $-\bar{i}-bam$: $-\bar{i}\bar{e}-bam$. Es standen vielleicht nebeneinander: *dēlēnībam*, aber *dēlīnīēbam*." However, the linguistic conditioning and psychological backing of this suggestion are questionable (for a criticism of arguments based on the *horror aequi*, see Schopf, 1919, 34-5).

given the association of *dēlēniō* with *lēna*, *lēnō*, the possibility of an authentic *dēlīniō* becomes highly improbable. What can, then, be the source of the spelling variant *delinio*? To answer this question, we must ask a more general question: What is the most usual source of the spelling variation *e/i* in medieval manuscripts? It is of course the merger of the classical Latin phonemes /i/ and /ē/ into one single phoneme in Vulgar Latin (e.g. Väänänen, 1974, 82). Now my claim is that also the spelling variation *delenio/delinio* is an orthographic reflex of this merger. Scholars seem to have been prevented from venturing this interpretation by the "tic" that the *-i-* in the variant *delinio* must stand for a long /-ī-/ (cf. the reasoning of Keller, 1879, 189). But this is an elementary mistake, because we are of course not allowed to be anxious about metrical requirement before the authenticity of the variant in question has been established.

But the merger *i/ē* forms only a general background for the spelling *delinio*. In fact, (*dē*)*lēniō* came to be "contaminated" with the verb *linō* 'to smear'. In Vulgar Latin, speakers tended to apply the inflectional pattern of the 4th conjugation to verbs which according to the norm of Classical Latin belonged to the 3rd conjugation (see Rönsch, 1875, 285; Neue III³, 1897, 248-53). As far as the verb *linō* is concerned, this phenomenon is observable rather early in technological writers; witness *Vitr. 5,10,3 liniantur* (norm: *linantur*), *Cels. 4,4 linire* (for *linere* which is, incidentally, Marx' "correction") (for other instances, see TLL VII, 1456,48-51). This change implies a move from a less iconic inflectional pattern to a more iconic one, quite in accordance with what is said by Paunonen (1976) about the dynamic relations of allomorphic influence. Now, on the sociolinguistic stratum conventionally referred to as Vulgar Latin, the verb stems /*lēnī*+/ and /*linī*+/, complying to the same, i.e. 4th, conjugational pattern, became homonymous in consequence of the quantity collapse and the merger *i/ē*; i.e.,

/*lēnī*+/ > /*lini*+/

/*linī*+/ > /*lini*+/.

Given the homonymy, it is understandable that these verbs, earlier distinct in form and meaning, were confused with each other (cf. TLL VII, 1142,50-1; 1456,47-51), and eventually even abductively perceived as a single polysemous verb the sememic structure of which was, roughly, the conjunction of the sememic structures of the homonymous verbs. That this was indeed the case is evidenced by glossators some of whom present the verb *delenio* as a lexical blend; CGL 4,225,24 *DELINITUS deplacatus unctus* (the first meaning component pertaining to the classical *dēlēniō*, and the second one, to *linō*); likewise 5,496,17 *DELINITI placati delectati uncti*; 5,285,32 gives *DELINITI placati uincti* but *uincti* may be a correction of *uncti* (though this is not absolutely sure; also 4,225,32 has the variant reading *uinctus*). The fact that in glossators' lemmata the verb in question is written invariably as *delinitus*, *-i* also speaks in favor of the perception of *delenio* as a single lexical entry (in the psychological sense).

3. Epilogue

3.1. The attitude of editors. As a rule, editors always write *delenio*, and in this they happen upon the correct solution. But it must be emphasized that this is likely to be an accident, because whatever the rationale behind this editorial practice is, it is certainly not of a linguistic nature. It has been made plain by Frösén (1974, 206-21) that in their preoccupation with the textual content, editors tend to neglect the formal variation occurring in the manuscripts and to "normalize" the textual form by eliminating the variation according to certain preconceived principles which are supposed to generate the text of the autograph. Often the normalization serves only the convenience of readers, as may be the case in the consistent selection of *delenio* to be written in the current text. This practice may also involve a non-committal way of bringing out the fact that it is impossible to determine which variant was actually used by the author in a given passage. It has be-

come evident, however, that in the case which has been the object of the discussion in this paper, the editors should always write *delenio* in the current text, but the variant spelling, being linguistically significant in that it reflects the *état de langue* of later copyists, ought to be recorded in the critical apparatus (cf. Meillet 1923).

3.2. The attitude of lexicographers. The entries for the verb *delenio* are usually given in the form "*dēlēniō (-līn-)*", or something to this effect. This is supposed to be understood so that *dēlēniō* is recognized to have the facultative variant *dēlīniō*. We have seen, however, that **dēlīniō* is an artifact which never existed as a variant of *dēlēniō* in the system of the Latin language. The spelling *delinio* is a kind of "rajeunissement" (cf. Redard 1956) made by later copyists probably *in scribendo* (hence the diffusional character of the attestations of *delinio*).

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

- CGL = Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, ed. G. Götz, I-VII. Leipzig 1888-1923 (repr. Amsterdam 1964).
- Corssen II² = Corssen, W., Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache, II: Das Verb. 2nd ed., Leipzig 1870.
- DELL⁴ = Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, par A. Ernout & A. Meillet. 4ème éd., Paris 1959.
- Frösén, J., Prolegomena to a Study of the Greek Language in the First Centuries A.D.: The Problem of Koiné and Atticism. (Diss.), Helsinki 1974.
- GLK = Grammatici Latini, ex. rec. H. Keilii, I-VII. Leipzig 1855-80 (repr. Hildesheim 1961).
- Keller, O., Epilegomena zu Horaz, I. Theil., Leipzig 1879.

- Leumann, M., Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, München 1977.
- LEW³ = Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, von A. Walde. 3., neubearbeitete Auflage v. J.B. Hofmann, I-II, Heidelberg 1938-1954.
- Meillet, A., Ce que les linguistes peuvent souhaiter d'une édition. Bull. de l'Assoc. G. Budé 1923, 33-37.
- Neue III³ = Neue, F., Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, III: Das Verbum. Dritte, sehr vermehrte Aufl. v. C. Wagener, Berlin 1897.
- Nyman, M., A Latin Ghost Rule. Ms. in prep.
- Osthoff, H., Zur geschichte des perfects im Indogermanischen, Strassburg 1884.
- Osthoff, H., Etymologica I,3: Flehen, gr. λαυκάς, lat. *lēna*. PBB 13 (1888) 399-401.
- Otrębski, J., Lateinische und griechische Wortdeutungen, 2: Lat. *suspīciō*. KZ 66 (1939) 243-46.
- Paunonen, H., Allomorfien dynamiikkaa. Virittäjä 1976, 82-107 (Engl. summ.: Allomorph dynamics, 106-07).
- Redard, G., La rajeunissement du texte de Plaute. Hommages à M. Niedermann, Bruxelles 1956, 296-306.
- Rönsch, H., Itala und Vulgata. Zweite, berichtigte u. vermehrte Ausgabe, Marburg 1875.
- Schopf, E., Die konsonantischen Fernwirkungen, Göttingen 1919.
- Solmsen, F., Beiträge zur geschichte der lateinischen sprache, 1: Der übergang von *ē* in *ī*. KZ 34 (1897) 1-18.
- Sommer, F., Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre, Heidelberg 1914.
- TLL = Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig 1900-.
- Väänänen, V., Introduzione al latino volgare, Bologna 1974.

WARUM WOLLTE VERGIL
DIE AENEIS VERBRENNEN?

T e i v a s O k s a l a

"Als er im 52. Lebensjahr dabei war, die letzte Hand an die Aeneis zu legen, beschloss er, sich nach Griechenland und Kleinasien zu begeben und drei Jahre ununterbrochen nur die Fehler zu beseitigen, um für den Rest seines Lebens nur noch der Philosophie frei sich widmen zu können. Als er aber nach Antritt der Reise in Athen auf den vom Orient nach Rom zurückreisenden Augustus traf und beschloss, sich nicht aus seinem Gefolge zu entfernen und sogar zusammen mit ihm zurückzureisen, holte er sich, während er bei glühender Sonnenhitze die benachbarte Kleinstadt Megara besichtigte, einen Schwächeanfall und verschlimmerte ihn durch die ununterbrochene Seereise so sehr, dass er bedeutend schwerer erkrankt in Brundisium an Land kam, wo er innerhalb weniger Tage verstarb am 21. September unter dem Konsulat des Cn. Sentius und des Q. Lucretius. Seine Gebeine wurden nach Neapel übergeführt und beigesetzt in einem Grabhügel, der an der Strasse nach Puteoli innerhalb des zweiten Meilensteines liegt; auf dem Grabhügel lies er folgendes Distichon anbringen:

Mantua gab mir das Leben, Kalabrien nahm es, Neapel
birgt mich; Weiden besang, Felder und Führer mein Lied."

So berichtet die bedeutendste antike Vergilvita¹ über die letzten Tage des Dichters. Das Schicksal der Aeneis ist auf eine erschütternde Weise mit diesen Ereignissen verknüpft (VSD 39-41):

"Vor seiner Abreise von Italien hatte Vergil mit Varius abgemacht, er möge, falls ihm, dem Vergil, etwas zugestossen sei, die Aeneis verbrennen. Varius aber hatte sich heftig geweigert, das zu tun. Daher verlangte Vergil, als es ihm schon sehr schlecht ging, beständig nach den Buchbehältnissen, um sie selbst zu verbrennen; da aber niemand sie ihm brachte, traf er zwar keine ausdrückliche Bestimmung über die Aeneis, im übrigen jedoch vermachte er demselben Varius und zugleich dem Tucca seine Schriften nur unter der Bedingung, nichts herauszugeben, was nicht von ihm herausgegeben worden sei. Varius aber gab auf Veranlassung des Augustus die Schriften Vergils heraus, aber nur oberflächlich emendiert; denn er liess sogar etwa vorkommende unvollständige Verse stehen (...)"

Das Schicksal der Aeneis ist ausserordentlich. Es ist kein Wunder, dass es die Phantasie der Nachwelt gefesselt hat bis zu unseren Tagen. Ein Zeugnis davon ist Hermann Brochs Roman "Der Tod des Vergil" (1945), der die letzten 24 Stunden im Leben des Dichters schildert. Dabei wird meistens der innere Monolog gebraucht, um die Erfahrung des sich nähernden Todes als einen Strom des Bewusstseins zu vermitteln. Man betont mit Recht,² dass es sich nicht um einen eigentlichen historischen Roman handelt, obgleich der Verfasser reichlich die historischen Quellen verwendet. Vergils Tod und das Schicksal der Aeneis bieten den Rahmen für das Thema, dessen Kern die Frage nach der Verantwortlichkeit des Dichters und der Wahrhaftigkeit des literarischen

1 Die sog. Sueton-Donat-Vita (=VSD), hier und im Folgenden verdeutscht von K. Bayer: Vergil, Landleben (ed. J.u.M. Götte). Vergil-Viten (ed. K. Bayer) 1970.

2 Z.B. H. Riikonen, Die Antike im historischen Roman des 19. Jahrhunderts, 1978, 16.

Kunstwerks ist. Dessenungeachtet kann Brochs Vergilroman mit all seiner Phantasie auch dem Vergilforscher nützlich sein, indem er ihn daran erinnert, dass die eigentlichen Motive des Vergil, sein Hauptwerk zu verbrennen, nicht an der Oberfläche, sondern in der Tiefe zu suchen sind.

Warum wollte Vergil die Aeneis verbrennen? Wahrscheinlich werden wir niemals eine endgültige Antwort als das Ergebnis einer lückenlosen Beweiskette bekommen. "Weil er damit nicht fertig wurde" ist keine genügende Antwort. Das Problem ist hermeneutisch: wir können den extremen Entschluss des Dichters und seinen Hintergrund als ein Feld der menschlichen Möglichkeiten verstehen lernen. Die Nachrichten von den letzten Tagen des Dichters stammen wahrscheinlich aus dem Werk *De P. Vergilii ingenio moribusque*, das die Freunde veröffentlichten, und sind in den wichtigsten Punkten vertrauenswürdig.³ Die anderen Viten helfen uns nicht weiter, weil ihre Berichte von dem Schicksal der Aeneis offensichtlich aus der differenzierten Schilderung der Sueton-Donat-Vita abgeleitet und vereinfacht worden sind. Wenn man die historisch bezeugten Tatsachen im Leben Vergils deutet und bewertet, kann man jene Kenntnisse zum Vergleich heranziehen, die wir aus der schöpferischen Arbeit bekommen haben. Ich halte es für sicher, dass die schöpferische Arbeit hinsichtlich ihrer tiefsten Schichten in der Antike wesentlich dieselbe war wie heutzutage. Die Technik wandelt sich, aber jene Kräfte, die die bewussten Methoden bewegen, bleiben dieselben. Besonders ergiebig sind gute Künstlerbiographien, die sich nicht mit den äusseren Tatsachen begnügen, sondern ihre Aufgabe darin sehen, die Genese

3 Zum Informationswert der Sueton-Donat-Vita, siehe Büchner, P. Vergilius Maro. Der Dichter der Römer, Sp. 38,46-41,58 und Bayer, op.cit. 673-675 u. 678-682.

der Kunstwerke zu beschreiben und zu erklären.⁴

Ich möchte die Auffassungen, die uns Vergils äussersten Entschluss verstehen lehren, unter drei Gesichtspunkten zusammenfassen und wie folgt ordnen.

Die äusserste Selbstkritik und das künstlerische Gewissen

Der auffallendste und sichtbarste jener Faktoren, die wir in Betracht ziehen müssen, ist Vergils Selbstkritik, die mit den Jahren nur strenger wurde und vor dem Tode dem unvollendeten Werk keine Gnade erweisen wollte. Vergil legte grosses Gewicht auf die "letzte Hand" (*summa manus*); nachdem er elf Jahre an der Aeneis gearbeitet hatte, reservierte er sich noch drei Jahre zum Feilen (*emendare*): *statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare*.⁵ Sicherlich wollte er auch in der "echten" Umgebung Griechenlands und Kleinasiens Inspiration suchen. Die For-

4 Z.B. die Sibelius-Biographie von Erik Tawaststjerna (Jean Sibelius 1-4, 1965-1978, in finnische Sprache; die Bände 1-2 sind auch schon in englischer und schwedischer Sprache erschienen) bietet reichlich höchst interessante Informationen von der Entstehungsgeschichte der einzelnen Tonwerke und vermehrt das Verständnis für die schöpferische Arbeit im allgemeinen. Sibelius eignet sich zum Vergleich, weil er als Künstlertypus dem Vergil sehr ähnlich war. Das gilt in etwa auch für die Werke. Z.B. die Worte, mit denen man die thematische Verarbeitung in den *Georgica* beschreibt, wären geeignet, den Gebrauch der Keimotive in den Symphonien von Sibelius zu charakterisieren. Dazu kommt noch das Schicksal der achten Symphonie, deren Material vom Komponisten selbst verbrannt wurde (dazu später Anm. 19).

5 Die *Servius-Vita* betont die Bedeutung des *emendare* (als *terminus technicus*) im Zusammenhang mit allen drei Werken: *Tunc ei proposuit Pollio, ut carmen bucolicum scriberet, quod eum constat triennio scripsisse et emendasse. item proposuit Maecenas Georgica, quae scripsit emendavitque septem annis. postea ab Augusto Aeneidem propositam scripsit annis undecim, sed nec emendavit nec edidit; unde eam moriens praecepit incendi*; dazu siehe bes. Büchner, op.cit. Sp. 41,32-42, der dieser Nachricht einen hohen Informationswert beimisst, indem er den Hauptgrund zu der verzweifelten Forderung des Dichters im überempfindlichen künstlerischen Gewissen sieht.

derung des letzten Schliffs (*ultima lima*) hatten die Augusteer von der Generation der Neoteriker geerbt. Catull nennt rühmend seinen Freund Cinna, der sein Smyrna-Epos erst nach neunjähriger Arbeit veröffentlicht hatte (C. 95). Dies entspricht ungefähr der Zeit, die Vergil den *Georgica* opferte (sieben Jahre) und steht im Einklang mit den Belehrungen des Horaz (*Ars poet.* 388-390):

(. . .) *nonumque prematur in annum
membranis intus positis: delere licebit,
quod non edideris; nescit vox missa reverti.*

Man darf natürlich nicht vergessen, dass elf Jahre nicht viel für die *Aeneis* sind, die viermal so gross ist wie die *Georgica* und als ein ausserordentlicher epischer Entwurf allerlei Vorstudien erforderte. Die Betonung des letzten Schliffs ist ein tragender Gedanke in der *Ars poetica* (V. 289-294):

*Nec virtute foret clarisve potentius armis
quam lingua Latium, si non offenderet unum
quemque poetarum limae labor et mora. vos, o
Pompilius sanguis, carmen reprehendite, quod non
multa dies et multa litura coercuit atque
praesectum deciens non castigavit ad unguem.*

Derselbe Gedanke wird auch im Augustus-Brief ausführlich entwickelt (*Epist.* 2,1,93-213). Das Feilen (*ultima lima, litura*) ist eine *conditio sine qua non* für einen Dichter, der das hohe Niveau der Griechen erreichen will. Horaz entwirft auch ein Bild vom idealen Kritiker (*Ars poet.* 445-452):

*Vir bonus et prudens versus reprehendet inertis,
culpabit duros, incomptis adlinet atrum
transverso calamo signum, ambitiosa recidet
ornamenta, parum claris lucem dare coget,
arguet ambigue dictum, mutanda notabit:
fiet Aristarchus; non dicet 'cur ego amicum
offendam in nugis?' hae nugae seria ducent
in mala derisum semel exceptumque sinistre.*

Vergils Bestrebungen entsprachen also den Werten und Prinzipien, die in seiner literarischen Umgebung walteten. Horazens Metapher mit dem Winzer ist aufschlussreich, mehr als ein blosses Bild.⁶ Es handelte sich nicht um einen minutiösen Perfektionismus, sondern um das Streben nach einer organischen Form und einem klaren Ausdruck. Horazens Idealkritiker verhält sich ebenso wie Vergils Winzer in den *Georgica*, wenn er seinen rankenden Pflegling mit Milde und Strenge "erzieht" (*Georg.* 2,362-370).

Arbeitsmethoden und Inspiration

Die ausserordentliche Selbstkritik des Dichters war der erste und sichtbarste Faktor, der ihn zu dem Entschluss führte, die *Aeneis* zu vernichten. Er genügt aber nicht, allein diese extreme persönliche Entscheidung zu erklären. Wir haben zu fragen: warum war der Dichter nicht imstande, sein Werk in die endgültige Form zu bringen oder jedenfalls bis zu einem gewissen Punkt, so dass die guten Freunde - die sicher die Absichten des Dichters so gut wie möglich kannten - die letzte Hand daran gelegt hätten? Die Antwort ist in der Genese der *Aeneis* und in den Arbeitsmethoden des Dichters zu suchen. Sueton-Donat-Vita hat sehr interessante Sachen darüber zu berichten (22-24):

Cum Georgica scriberet, traditur cotidie meditato mane plurimos versus dictare solitus ac per totum diem retractando ad paucissimos redigere, non absurde carmen se ursae more parere dicens et lambendo demum effingere. Aeneida prosa prius oratione formatam digestamque in XII libros particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque, et nihil in ordinem arripiens. ac ne quid impetum moraretur, quaedam imperfecta transmisit, alia levissimis versibus veluti fulsit, quos per iocum pro

⁶ Dazu vgl. das Bild des Schmiedens in *Ars poet.* 441: *et male tornatos incudi reddere versus.*

tibicinibus interponi aiebat ad sustinendum opus, donec solidae columnae advenirent.

Diese Nachrichten stammen wahrscheinlich aus dem Werk De P. Vergilii ingenio moribusque.⁷ Die zwei originellen Vergleiche, die auf den Dichter selbst zurückgeführt werden, vermehren das Gefühl der Echtheit. Die unten gegebenen Zitate aus den Briefen des Augustus selbst stützen die Nachricht über die Aeneis (VSD 31).⁸

Als Vergil die Georgica schuf, diktierte er morgens sehr viele Verse, überarbeitete und reduzierte sie dann zur endgültigen Form, "wobei er gar nicht so übel sagte, er gebäre sein Gedicht nach Art einer Bärin und bringe es durch Lecken erst in Form". Der Dichter bezeichnete sich nicht als einen strengen Winzer, sondern als eine zärtliche Bärenmutter - wie vergilisch! Als Dichter vertrat Vergil offensichtlich einen Inspirationstypus, der sein Material *ex improviso* in freiem Schwung des Geistes (*impetus*, Inspiration) schuf, dann aber viel Zeit auf die bewusste Überarbeitung (*retractare*) verwandte.⁹ Die beschriebene Methode wäre kaum möglich gewesen, hätte er nicht einen mehr oder weniger gegliederten Gesamtplan, eine Leitidee, ein künstlerisches Telos gehabt, in dessen Stamm er dann die täglichen Teileinheiten einfügte.¹⁰ Diese Urkonzeption wurde während des Schaffensprozesses mehr und mehr differenziert. Unsere Hypothese entspricht dem, was wir von der schöpferischen künstlerischen Arbeit wissen. Demgemäß ist die künstlerische Arbeit zielstrebige Tätigkeit, kein additiver Prozess, sondern ein synthetischer Gestaltungs-

7 Gell. 17,10,2-3 bezeugt, dass der Vergleich mit der Bärenmutter aus diesem Werk stammt, und kommentiert ihn näher.

8 Vgl. Macr. Sat. 1,24,11; siehe S. 99.

9 Jean Sibelius fand seine Themen durch Inspiration und verwandte viel Mühe und Zeit darauf, sie fertig zu "schmieden", wie er selbst zu sagen pflegte (vgl. den Vergleich bei Horaz).

10 T. Oksala, Studien zum Verständnis der Einheit und der Bedeutung von Vergils Georgica, 1978, 9-10.

und Gliederungsprozess.¹¹ Das Urerlebnis der *Georgica* ist m.E. in Hesiods *Erga*¹² und in der Ciceronischen Cato-Gestalt zu suchen (bes. Cic. Cato maior 54): *Nec vero segetibus solum et pratis et vineis et arbustis res rusticae laetae sunt, sed hortis etiam et pomariis, tum pecudum pastu, apium examinibus, florum omnium varietate*. In diesem Zitat keimen sozusagen die ganzen *Georgica* mit ihren Stoffbereichen.¹³ Dasselbe gilt auch für das erste Lehrstück (*Georg.* 1,43-70), in dessen Rahmen das ganze Werk als eine ganzheitliche Gestalt erscheint.¹⁴

Die *Aeneis* stellte an den Dichter ganz andersartige Forderungen.¹⁵ Möglicherweise hatte er sich schon vor der Eklogenperiode an einem ennianischen Epos versucht (VSD 19): *Mox cum res Romanas inchoasset, offensus materia ad Bucolica transiit etc.* Das Proömium des dritten *Georgicabuches* mit seiner rätselhaften Tempel-Phantasmagorie spiegelt auch Vergils Tasten nach einer Eposkonzeption wider.¹⁶ Vor der eigentlichen Versarbeit musste Vergil das vielseitige Problem des Gesamtplanes lösen: er konzipierte die Synthese der damals bekannten Epostypen, indem er das homerische Heldenepos, das ennianische *res gestae*-Epos und das epische Lobgedicht auf einen einzelnen Menschen zu demselben Ganzen miteinander verschmolz. So entstand ein Werk, das zugleich ein Aeneas-, Rom- und Augustus-Epos

11 Tawaststjerna, Sibelius 4 (1978) 49-76 (siehe bes. die Skizzenabbildungen zu S. 176) hat gezeigt, dass der Keim der sechsten Symphonie von Sibelius ein undifferenziertes, mit der Tonart verknüpftes Erlebnis gewesen ist und dass die ersten Skizzen der fünften Symphonie die zwei "Urthemen" des Werks betreffen, die im Finale ihren endgültigen Platz fanden. Der Komponist hat von Anfang an nach dem Aufstieg des Finales getastet; dieses Telos hat mehrere Jahre und drei Fassungen hindurch seine Bedeutung behalten.

12 Oksala, op.cit. 10-12.

13 E. de Saint-Denis, REL 16 (1938) 297-317. Oksala, op.cit. 12-14.

14 Oksala, op.cit. 20-21.

15 Gute Anmerkungen zu den Problemen der *Aeneis* und zu ihrer Lösung bei K. Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid*, 1968, 23-58. B. Otis, *Virgil*, 1963, 1-4 betont mit Recht die ungeheure Schwierigkeit und die unvergleichbare Grösse dieser Aufgabe.

16 Oksala, op.cit. 63-66.

war.¹⁷ Die *errores et arma Aeneae* boten den Rahmen für die anderen Ziele, was klar in der Antike erkannt wurde (VSD 21): *Novissime Aeneidem inchoavit, argumentum varium ac multiplex et quasi amborum Homeri carminum instar, praeterea nominibus ac rebus Graecis Latinisque commune, et in quo, quod maxime studebat, Romanae simul urbis et Augusti origo contineretur.*

Als Vergil so den Gesamtplan der Aeneis konzipiert hatte, konnte er nicht auf dieselbe Weise wie bei den Georgica fortschreiten. Die "Bärenmutter" kam nicht in Frage, die Aufgabe setzte einen Architekten und einen Baumeister voraus. Vergil stand nicht die mündliche Kompositionstechnik eines Homers zur Verfügung, um grosse erzählerische Ganzheiten zu beherrschen. Darum musste er eine "unnatürliche" Arbeitsweise annehmen. Er arbeitete zuerst eine Prosaversion in zwölf Büchern aus und setzte ("komponierte") sie dann Stück für Stück in Verse um. Inmitten dieses gewaltigen Prosakomplexes war Vergils Hauptproblem seine Inspiration wach zu halten, weil er ohne sie nicht die hölzerne Prosa in den Marmor der Dichtung verwandeln konnte. Er ergriff davon, was ihn jeweils inspirierte (*prout liberet quidque*), und arbeitete ohne jedes System (*nihil in ordinem arripiens*). Die Inspiration (*ne quid impetum moraretur*) führte ihn zu einer aussergewöhnlichen Methode: um den vom Dichter selbst gebrauchten Vergleich fortzusetzen, sprang er *ex improviso* von einem Stockwerk zum anderen und setzte dort die Bauarbeit fort; dabei musste er Baustützen (*tibicines*) verwenden, damit das ganze Gebäude nicht zusammenstürzte. In seinem innersten Wesen war er eine "Bärenmutter" und kein Baumeister - ein genialer Architekt, aber kein Baumeister. Spuren der unsystematischen Arbeit sind ja im heutigen Text an manchen Stellen zu bemerken.¹⁸ Zuerst wurden das zweite, das vierte und das sechste Buch fertig (VSD 32) - eben jene Partien, die auch wir einstimmig für die unbedingten Höhepunkte des Werkes halten: in seiner Inspiration war der Dichter mit uns derselben Meinung. - Ich möchte annehmen, dass

17 Dazu siehe bes. F. Klingner, *Virgil. Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis*, 1967, 367-382.

18 Büchner, *op.cit.* Sp. 403,25-404,68.

Vergil wegen dieser "unnatürlichen" Arbeitsmethode in die Klemme geriet: er fühlte, nie mit der Aeneis fertig zu werden, es gab immer noch Baustützen zwischen den Marmorsäulen, die sich in der Sonne schon zu verfärben begonnen hatten.

Vergil begab sich nach Griechenland, nicht um oberflächlich an seinem Werk zu feilen, sondern um seine schöpferischen Kräfte zum letzten Kampf zu versammeln: die Inspiration sollte das ganze Werk durchwehen, alle Baustützen sollten durch Marmorsäulen ersetzt werden.

Der Druck der Öffentlichkeit¹⁹

Nach dem Zeugnis der Viten war Vergil ein scheuer und sehr empfindlicher Mensch, der sich vor aller Öffentlichkeit fürchtete (VSD 11): (. . .) *ac, si quando Romae, quo rarissime commeabat, viseretur in publico, sectantis demonstrantisque se subterfugeret in proximum tectum*. Als die Aeneis kaum begonnen war, erregte sie schon ausserordentliches Aufsehen und weckte grösste Erwartungen (VSD 30-31):

Aeneidos vixdum coeptae tanta extitit fama, ut Sextus

19 Jean Sibelius arbeitete beinahe zehn Jahre an seiner achten Symphonie. Er hatte schon mit Serge Koussevitzky und dem Boston Symphony Orchestra die Uraufführung vereinbart. Koussevitzky hatte die Sache der Weltpresse mitgeteilt, die aus der geheimnisvollen achten Symphonie des finnischen Meisters eine Sensation machte. Die Uraufführung wurde immer wieder verschoben und zuletzt ganz aufgegeben. Die achte Symphonie ist spurlos aus dem Nachlass des Komponisten verschwunden (mit der Ausnahme eines vom Komponisten selbst überstrichenen Skizzenblattes). Erik Tawaststjerna hat gezeigt (öffentliche Vorlesung an der Universität Helsinki 1976), dass wenigstens ein Satz der Symphonie schon kopiert vorlag (das ist durch eine Quittung bezeugt). Da aber der Komponist mit seinem Werk offensichtlich nicht zufrieden war, verbrannte er selbst das existierende Material. Tawaststjerna sieht als einen der entscheidenden Beweggründe dafür den Druck der Öffentlichkeit, der für den alten und sehr empfindlichen Komponisten zu stark wurde. Dazu kam noch die Selbstkritik, die mit den Jahren immer nur stärker wurde und die der Komponist selbst als tragisch empfand. - Ich danke Prof. Tawaststjerna herzlich für die Überprüfung dieser Informationen.

Propertius non dubitaverit sic praedicare:

Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai:

nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade -,²⁰

Augustus vero - nam forte expeditione Cantabrica aberat - supplicibus atque etiam minacibus per iocum litteris efflagitaret, ut 'sibi de Aeneide', ut ipsius verba sunt, 'vel prima carminis ὑπογραφή vel quodlibet κῶλον mitteretur'.

Wir können nur ahnen, wie geschmacklos Properzens bombastische Fanfare in den Ohren des Vergil und des Horaz geklungen hat. Das rege Interesse und die dringende Anteilnahme seitens des Augustus vermehrte sicherlich noch den inneren Druck, wie man vielleicht in der brieflichen Antwort des Dichters lesen kann (Macr. Sat. 1,24,11): *De Aenea quidem meo, si mehercule iam dignum auribus haberem tuis, libenter mitterem; sed tanta incohata res est, ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar, cum praesertim, ut scis, alia quoque studia ad id opus multoque potiora impertiar.* - Ausserdem ist auch die negative Kritik zu beachten, die Vergil von seiten der böswilligen Kritiker (*obtrectatores*) zuteil wurde (VSD 43-46): "(. . .) Asconius Pedianus macht ihm in dem Buche, das er gegen die hämischen Kritiker Vergils geschrieben hat, nur sehr wenige Vorwürfe, und zwar durchweg mit Rücksicht auf die Behandlung der Geschichte und deshalb, weil er sehr viel von Homer übernommen habe; aber er sagt, Vergil habe gerade diesen Vorwurf so abzuwehren gepflegt: warum denn jene Kritiker nicht dieselben Plagiate versuchten? Aber sie würden bald einsehen, dass es leichter sei, dem Herkules die Keule als dem Homer einen Vers zu entreissen. Trotz allem habe er beschlossen, die Auslandsreise zu machen, um alles zur Befriedigung der Böswilligen zum Abschluss zu bringen." Gewiss ist die Aeneiskritik der *obtrectatores* erst nach dem Jahre 19 n.Chr. erschienen, aber nach dem Zeugnis des Asconius Pedianus habe sie schon während der Schöpfungsperiode der Aeneis in der Luft gelegen: Vergil habe sie mit Humor aufgenommen,

20 Prop. 2,34,65-66.

aber sie daneben auch ernst genommen, und mit der Vollendung seines Werks darauf antworten wollen.

In summa: Vergils Beweggründe, sein Hauptwerk zu vernichten, stammten m.E. aus drei Quellen: 1) aus der Selbstkritik, 2) aus den "unnatürlichen" Arbeitsmethoden, 3) aus dem Druck der Öffentlichkeit; dazu kam noch als ein endgültiger Schlag des Schicksals, dass ihm die Zeit verrann: die bösesten Ahnungen des Dichters wurden Wirklichkeit. In dieser extremen Situation und unter dem grossen Druck der Öffentlichkeit gab die äusserste Selbstkritik dem unvollendeten Werk keine Gnade, das in Schwierigkeiten geraten war, weil die Arbeitsmethoden des Dichters nicht seinem inspirationsgemässen Künstlerwesen entsprachen. Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, dass der Einsatz in der Aeneis gewaltig war. Wir wissen nicht, ob der Dichter sein Werk vollendet hätte, wenn ihm die nötigen drei Jahre vergönnt gewesen wären. Offensichtlich waren die Ursachen tiefer als an der Oberfläche; den letzten Schliff hätten die Freunde gut geben können. Da die Freunde nicht den letzten Willen des Sterbenden befolgten, entschloss sich dieser zu einem Kompromiss, der implizit die Veröffentlichung der Aeneis verbot.

C R I T I C A L A N D E X E G E T I C A L N O T E S
O N T A C . G E R M .

T u o m o P e k k a n e n

1. *licentia ioci*

In his critical note on Germ. 22,3 Robinson (1935, 298) says: "As the variants *loci: ioci* are at least as old as Hf., and probably older, it may be a matter of individual preference which is adopted." He himself decides for *loci* and is followed by Koestermann (1964) and Winterbottom (1975). Anderson (1938,⁴1970, 123) translates *licentia loci* as "in the freedom of the occasion" and regards the reading *ioci* as not suitable to the description. Gudemann (1916, 245) also thinks that "*ioci* hier völlig unhaltbar ist", but Much (²1967, 310), although he chooses *loci*, says that "sowohl *ioci* wie *loci* gibt einen guten Sinn".

As the manuscript tradition cannot here offer any solution and neither of the readings rightaway seems unsuitable to the passage, a further discussion of the problem remains fruitless, until new materials in favour of either of the variants is presented. I think that the decisive evidence to support *ioci* is to be found in the context, but has so far not been brought into the discussion even by those earlier editors (Reeb 1930, Lenchantin 1945, Perret 1949, Fehrle-Hünnerkopf 1959, Valmaggi 1962) who gave this variant the preference.

It is a well-known fact that Tacitus, particularly in the first part of Germania (cc. 1-27), contrasts German customs and institutions with Roman ways. Like every author who writes about

foreign peoples, he is more concerned with the differences between the Germans and his countrymen than with the resemblances, and therefore many passages of the monograph are ununderstandable, unless we keep in mind the Roman conditions, with which the Roman features are, directly or implicitly, compared.

Another characteristic, familiar to the readers of the *Germania*, is that the many topics discussed follow one another in a natural, well-thought order and are connected by elaborate transitions.¹ Various forms of antithesis are a much used stylistic device that serves the thematic contexture.²

The theme of c. 22 is the daily life of the Germans. The author follows the everyday routine of the Germans emphasizing features contrary to the Roman custom: morning wash (*statim e somno... lavantur*), breakfast (*lauti cibum capiunt*), the day's business (*negotia*), banquets (*convivia*). In contrast to the Romans who rose early in the morning, the Germans are told to prolong their sleep into the day (*e somno, quem plerumque in diem extrahunt*); at meals they were seated apart, each at his own table (*separatae singulis sedes et sua cuique mensa*), whereas the Roman custom was to recline on the *triclinium* round a common table. The *negotia*, as they are discussed in the other chapters of the monograph, are here passed over without comments, so that the reader is almost directly led from the morning meal to the banquet, about which the first novelty is that it began early in the day and might last all the night without reproach to anybody (*diem noctemque continuare potando nulli probrum*).³ The account of the German *convivia* forms the main part of c. 22, the theme of which thus is a natural continuation to c. 21 where their *convictus* and *hospitia* are described.⁴

The emphatic position of *armati* 'arms in hand' (*ad convivia*

1 Cf. E. Kraggerud, *SOslo* 47 (1972) 7-35 and Gudeman 37f.

2 Cf. also B.-R. Voss, *Der pointierte Stil des Tacitus*, 1963, 24ff.

3 Cf. *Ov. am.* 3,1,17 *nequitiam vinosa tuam convivia narrant*.

4 Cf. Kraggerud 27.

procedunt armati, cf. 11,1 *considunt armati*; 13,1 *Nihil autem neque publicae neque privatae rei nisi armati agunt*) already shows that the presence of arms in feasts and banquets also was a strange feature to the Romans.⁵ Excessive drinking, uncommon in Italy, caused in the German banquets quarrels, which were often settled with wounds and bloodshed (*crebrae, ut inter vinolentos, rixae raro conviciis, saepius caede et vulneribus transiguntur*).

The verb *transigere* 'to carry through, to finish, to settle' (also used in Germ. 19,2) is a technical term of the iuridical and commercial language.⁶ By this verb we are reminded of the foregoing *negotia*, which word is often used together with it.⁷ In antithesis to *caede et vulneribus transiguntur* follows the mentioning of the more peaceful transactions, which were likewise performed in the banquets: the mutual reconciliation of enemies (*de reconciliandis invicem inimicis*), the forming of family alliances (*et iungendis affinitatibus*), the adopting of chiefs (*et asciscendis principibus*), and the matters of peace and war (*de pace denique ac bello plerumque in conviviis consultant*). The various topics of the negotiations are introduced with a climax proceeding from private to public affairs and culminating in the most important of all questions, viz. that of peace and war. That such serious things were discussed in banquets was very odd to Tacitus' Roman readers, for whom the *convivium* was a part of the *otium* (not *negotium*) and a merry entertainment.⁸ It is here that Tacitus breaks the plain narrative with

5 Cf. Hor. *carm.* 1,27,5 *vino et lucernis Medus acinaces / immane quantum discrepat*, and the note of Kiessling-Heinze ad locum.

6 Gudeman 127.

7 E.g. Cic. *fam.* 13,14 *Peto a te...ut negotium conficiendum cures, ipse suscipias, transigas*. Cic. *Phil.* 2,9,21 *negotiumque transegisses nisi se ille in scalas tabernae librariae coniecisset*. Cf. Kraggerud 27 "Die Verbindung von *negotia* und *convivia* im selben Satz (22,1) erweist sich im Folgenden als eine durchaus sinnvolle. Denn bei dem germanischen Gastmahl werden auch Geschäfte von grösster Bedeutung erledigt."

8 Cf. Ter. *Ad.* 863 *ille suam semper egit vitam in otio, in conviviis*. Cic. *Cato* 45 *bene...maiores accubitionem epularem amicorum, quia vitae coniunctionem haberet, convivium nominaverunt*. - Horace, when he was asked to praise the wars of Octavianus and Agrippa, declared himself unable to undertake the task, as his muse was *imbellis lyrae potens* and his themes rather were the *convivia* and *proelia virginum sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium* (*carm.* 1,6).

a subjective explanation of the strange custom: *tamquam nullo magis tempore aut ad simplices cogitationes pateat animus aut ad magnas incalescat. gens non astuta nec callida aperit adhuc secreta pectoris licentia ioci; ergo detecta et nuda omnium mens.*

Catullus, speaking of dinner-parties (12,2), uses the expression *in ioco atque vino* (cf. 50,6 *per iocum atque vinum*).⁹ Cf. also Iuv. 9,10 *conviva ioco mordente facetus*; Sen. contr. 9,2,10 *numquid vobis videor describere convivales iocos*. In Sen. benef. 3,26,1 *ebrii* and *iocantes* appear in a synonymical function: *excipiebatur ebriorum sermo, simplicitas iocantium*. Mela, describing the banquets of the Scythians, uses the word *iocantes* as a substantive in the same way: 2,13 *inter epulas quot quisque interfecerit referre laetissima et frequentissima mentio, binisque poculis qui plurimos rettulere perpotant. is inter iocantis honos praecipuus est (inter iocantis = inter epulantes or potatores)*.¹⁰ An interesting similarity with the Tacitean description of German banquets is found in Apul. met. 4,8,5, in which a barbarous dinner-party is described: *estur ac potatur incondite pulmentis acervatim, panibus aggeratim, poculis agminatim ingestis; clamore ludunt, strepitu cantillant, conviciis iocantur, ac iam cetera semiferis Lapithis euantibus Centaurisque similia.*

As the banquets - barbarian as well as Roman - are thus referred to by the authors as occasions of *ioci* and the banqueting guests as *iocantes*, it might seem that no more evidence to support the reading *licentia ioci* is necessary. There are, however, other facts that lead to the same result.

The chapters 23-24 of the Germania are thematically closely connected with c. 22, since c. 23 is an account of the drink and

9 For the expression, cf. Thuk. 6,28,1 *μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ οἴνου*; Long. 2,31,1 *ἐν πότῳ καὶ παιδιᾷ*.

10 Cf. further Petron. 26 *iam ebriae mulieres longum agmen plaudentes fecerant thalamumque incesta exornaverant veste, cum Quartilla quoque iocantium libidine accensa et ipsa surrexit*. Mart. 6,44 *Festive credis te, Calliodore, iocari...sic te convivam posse placere putas*. TLL s.v. *iocor* col. 283,25ff.

food of the Germans, c. 24 that of their amusements. Of the German articles of food and beverage Tacitus mentions only the ones that were strikingly different from Roman. He emphasizes the simplicity of the diet (*cibi simplices*), but also reminds here of the intemperance of the Germans in facing thirst (*adversus sitim non eadem temperantia. si indulseris ebrietati*, etc.). The amusements also were simple; in contrast to the variety of games at Rome, the Germans are told to have only one public game, viz. their spear-dance: 24,1 *genus spectaculorum unum atque in omni coetu idem*. The words *in omni coetu*, 'in all festal gatherings', once again call to mind the *convivia*, precedently described. The German dance was performed by young men as a pastime (*iuvenes, quibus id ludicrum est*), not for hire or gain (*non in quaestum tamen aut mercedem*), as might have been expected by a Roman reader. The other pastime of the Germans, described by Tacitus, was dice-playing, which the Romans also practised, but there was a surprising difference: in Rome the dicing was an after dinner amusement¹¹ accompanied with wine-drinking;¹² by the Germans, however, it was practised in all seriousness in their sober hours: 24,2 *Aleam, quod mirere, sobrii inter seria exercent*. It is here that we finally find the antithesis to 22,3 *licentia ioci*: Important matters were handled by the Germans in their drinking-parties (cf. 22,1 *diem noctemque continuare potando, inter vinolentos*, 23 *non eadem temperantia, ebrietati*), but dicing was one of the serious occupations of sober men. The nice antithesis *inter vinolentos, licentia ioci - sobrii inter seria* is badly spoiled, if

11 Plaut. Capt. 72 *nam scortum in convivio / sibi amator, talos cum iacit, scortum invocat*. Curc. 354 *postquam cenati atque appoti, talos poscit sibi in manum, / provocat me in aleam, ut ego ludam*. Cf. RE IV col. 616,47ff.

12 Titius or. frg. Macr. sat. 3,16,14 *ludunt alea studiose, delibuti unguentis, scortis stipati...inde ad comitium vadunt...dum eunt, nulla est in angiporto amphora quam non impleant, quippe qui vesicam plenam vini habeant*. Cic. Catil. 2,10 *quod si in vino et alea comissiones solum et scorta quaererent*. Cic. Phil. 13,24 *in lustris, popinis, alea, vino tempus aetatis omne consumpsisses*. Ov. Pont. 4,2,41 *nec vinum nec me tenet alea fallax*.

the variant reading *loci* is taken to the text.

Except for Germ. 22,3, the word *iocus* appears in Tacitus only once, and there it is also used to mark the contrast to *serius*: ann. 2,13,1 *cum hic nobilitatem ducis, decorem alius, plurimi patientiam comitatem per seria per iocos eundem animum laudibus ferrent*. In other texts this antithesis is rather common: Plaut. Amph. 906 *nec ioco nec serio*. Liv. 7,41,3 *ioco seriove*. Sen. contr. 3 praef. 17 *vel ioco vel serio*. Sall. Iug. 96,2 *ioca atque seria*. Sen. epist. 18,15 *non minus inter seria quam inter lusus et iocos*.¹³

2. The Transition 25,2 - 26,1

The theme of amusements (c. 24) is followed by the account of slaves and freedmen (c. 25) with an easy transition. As it is told about the German dicers that they might face voluntary slavery (25, 2 *victus voluntariam servitutem adit*) and that the slaves so acquired were disposed of by trade (*servos condicionis huius per commercia tradunt*), the description of the slaves in general (25,1 *ceteris*¹⁴ *servis*, etc.) is a natural continuation of the foregoing subject. Then we come to the freedmen (25,2 *liberti non multum supra servos sunt*), and, in the next chapter, to usury (26,1 *Faenus agitare*, etc.) and agriculture (26,2 *agri pro numero cultorum*, etc.). The connection between the two topics of c. 26 is clear, as the exploitation of capital and that of land were intimately connected.¹⁵ There are, however, diverging opinions about the associations that connect 25,2 and 26,1.

13 For more examples, see TLL s.v. *iocus* col. 289,78ff. The expression *seriae curae*, 'serious affairs', is used by Pliny to point the contrast to dicing and other Roman vices of the leisure: paneg. 82,9 *Otio prodimur. An non plerique principes hoc idem tempus in aleam, stupra, luxum conferebant, cum seriarum laxamenta curarum vitiorum contentione supplerent*.

14 *ceteris* MSS., the correction *ceterum*, proposed by Ed. Wolff and accepted by Koestermann and Much, is unnecessary.

15 Cf. Tac. ann. 6,17 *senatus praescripserat, duas quisque faenoris partes in agris per Italiam conlocaret...faeneratores omnem pecuniam mercandis agris condiderant*.

Anderson (131) thinks that "the usual skilful transition to a new subject is missing here, but the description links on to the account of the condition of slaves on the land in c. 25,1." Kraggerud (31) suggests a connection between the two chapters in the way that "das Fehlen der Zinsen und des Geldgeschäftes ist ein weiteres Indiz für die Freiheit der Germanen - ein *libertatis argumentum*. Denn wo der Wucher herrscht, da steht auch der Mensch in Gefahr, die Freiheit zu verlieren." Much (331), although he regards the transition as unclear, offers two possible explanations: "Es könnte ja der Umstand, dass die germanischen Sklaven schon als zinspflichtige Katenleute geschildert werden, die landwirtschaftliche Erzeugnisse abliefern, auf die Feldbestellung im allgemeinen geführt haben. Zunächst ist jedoch von etwas anderem, Negativem, dem Fehlen der Geldwirtschaft die Rede und das könnte ein eingeschobener Gedanke sein, herbeigezogen durch den Gegensatz der Naturalwirtschaft. Aber ebensogut ist ein anderer Gedankengang möglich. Denn die in Rom gerade bei den Grosskapitalisten sehr ausgebildete Sklavenwirtschaft sowohl als auch das römische Kolonat, das Tac. streifte, konnten ihn an die von denselben Unternehmern betriebenen Geldgeschäfte und ihren Grossgrundbesitz erinnern und ihn auf die Frage führen, was dem bei den Germanen entspricht oder gegenübersteht."

It seems to me that the explanations quoted are rather forced or - to say it more politely - none of them quite hits the mark. In my opinion, the missing associative link between the two chapters is found in the words *liberti* (*libertini*) and *faenus*.

It is a well-known fact that in imperial Rome the freedmen entered into every phase of commercial life and gained a dominating position in trade and industry.¹⁶ Among the professions that were first of all condemned by true Romans and left to freedmen and their descendants, was that of the usurer (*faenerator*). In his account of vulgar occupations (off. 1,150), Cicero says: *Primum improbantur ii quaestus, qui in odia hominum incurrunt, ut portitorum, ut faene-*

¹⁶ See A.M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, 1928, 105ff.

ratorum. For this prejudice, usury (*faenus agitare*) became in Rome an important activity of the freedmen, who made by it great fortunes.¹⁷ In the account of his career, Trimalchio, the type of a successful freedman, tells (Petron. 75 and 76) how he, after buying up all the estates which had belonged to his patron, retired from active business and began to finance his own freedmen: 76,9 *postquam coepi plus habere quam tota patria mea habet, manum de tabula: sustuli me de negotiatione et coepi libertos faenerare*.¹⁸ The expression *libertos faenerare*¹⁹ 'to finance freedmen', 'to exploit capital through freedmen', contains the two elements, *liberti* and *faenus*, that form the transition from Germ. 25 to 26. It was the role of the Roman freedmen as usurers that evoked in the mind of Tacitus the association between freedmen and usury, so that he felt it appropriate after his description of the German freedmen to point out that *faenus agitare et in usuras tendere* was unknown in German society.

3. *centum pagis habitantur*

Tacitus' chapter about the Semnones ends with a statement, which has grammatically been misunderstood by the modern editors: Germ. 39,3 *adicit auctoritatem fortuna Semnonum: centum pagis habitantur, magnoque corpore efficitur ut se Sueborum caput credant*. "The prosperity of the Semnones gives them also prestige: their land is occupied by hundred cantons, and from their great number it results that they consider themselves the head of the Suebi."

¹⁷ For the wealth of the imperial freedmen, see Duff 124f.

¹⁸ Cf. Duff 91f. "A master frequently set up his slave in business, lent him capital, and the slave paid him interest; or the master made his slave his agent, took the profits for himself and encouraged the slave with wages or presents. In either case the slave might receive his freedom by free gift or by commercial transaction, but continue in the same occupation after as before manumission." For Trimalchio's career, cf. *ib.* 125.

¹⁹ Bücheler (1958) and Smith (1975) correct with Heinsius *(per) libertos faenerare*.

Here all the MSS. read *centum pagis habitantur*, but these words have generally been taken for corrupted and the editors have preferred either Brotier's (1771) correction *centum pagi (ii)s habitantur* (Koestermann 1964, Much ²1967, Valmaggi 1962, Fehrle-Hünnerkopf 1959, Reeb 1930, Persson 1929, etc.) or Ernesti's (1752) *centum pagis habitant* (Robinson 1935, Anderson ⁴1970, Perret 1949, Winterbottom 1975). Lenchantin (1945) modified Brotier's suggestion into *centum pagi (hi)s habitantur*. In my own edition of the *Germania* (1976), however, I restored the manuscript tradition *centum pagis habitantur* into the text, because I do not find any reason for mistrusting it.

The verb *habitare* is not infrequently used by the Latin authors with the construction *regiones habitantur domibus, oppidis, urbibus, vicis, etc.* The TLL s.v. *habito* col. 2479,77 gives of this use the following examples: Hor. epist. 1,14,2 (*agellum habitatum quinque focis*). Sen. Tro. 826 *Olenos tectis habitata raris*. Curt. 8,2,14 *Scythiae confinis est regio habitaturque pluribus ac frequentibus vicis*. Mela 1,28 *regio ignobilis et vix quicquam illustre sortita parvis oppidis habitatur*. 2,112 *centum quondam urbibus habitata Crete*. Plin. nat. 3,146 *Noricis iunguntur lacus Pelso, deserta Boiorum; iam tamen colonia Divi Claudii Savaria et oppido Scarabantia Iulia habitantur*. 5,125 *extra sinum sunt Rhoetea litora, Rhoeteo et Dardanio et Arisbe oppidis habitata*. 5,132 *Rhodos ...habitata urbibus Lindo, Camiro, Ialyso, nunc Rhodo*. Tac. hist. 5,7,1 *Haud procul inde campi, quos ferunt olim uberes magnisque urbibus habitatos fulminum iactu arsisse*.²⁰ It appears from the quoted examples that this use of *habitare* mostly occurs in geographical texts and passages. That Tacitus was well familiar with

20 Amm. 21,10,4 (*planities*) *nullis habitetur obstaculis ad usque fretum*, added in the TLL to the examples quotes, is, however, of a different kind, for *nullis obstaculis* means 'without obstacles', 'uninterruptedly'. In his edition Seyfarth (1968) quite correctly translates "so dass sie (= die Ebene) bis zur Meerenge...ohne jede Unterbrechung bewohnbar ist."

the construction *campi urbibus habitantur*, is seen from hist. 5,7,1. His statement about the Semnones, *centum pagis habitantur*, must be understood in the same way. The only difference is that here the predicate *habitantur* is supplied with *Semnones* in the sense of *fines Semnonum*.

The use of the names of peoples to denote their lands is common in all the Indo-European languages and ultimately due to the fact that the names of lands are a relatively young phenomenon.²¹ There are in Latin numerous names of tribes and peoples, for which the corresponding landname is missing, e.g. *Aequi*, *Aurunci*, *Hernici*, *Marrucini*, *Marsi*, *Paeligni*, etc., from outside of Italy *Chatti*, *Chauci*, *Usipetes*, *Tencteri*, etc.

The name of a people could also be used to denote its lands in the case that the geographical name existed too. The first example of this kind is Plaut. Mil. 648 *post Ephesi sum natus, non enim in Apulis (= in Apulia)*.²² In Caesar we find e.g. Gall. 5,12,2 and 5,25,4 *ex Belgio*, 2,2,6 *ad fines Belgarum*, 4,38,4 *in Belgis*. The elder Pliny often uses the names of peoples for those of their lands or *vice versa* for stylistic variation: nat. 3,112 *Umbri eos expulere, hos Etruria, hanc Galli*. 8,32 *Elephantos fert Africa... ferunt Aethiopes et Trogodytae, ... sed maximos India*. 12,80 *ad Persas etiam prius... quam in Syriam aut Aegyptum*. 84 *India et Seres*. 104 *Indis atque Syriae*. 13,90 *Indorum atque Arabiae*. 115 *apud Medos aut in Achaia*. 21,11 *ab India aut ultra Indos*. 36,51 *Aethiopia usque... immo vero etiam in Indos*.²³

The Roman grammarians regarded the names of peoples, denoting their lands, as place names, *nomina locorum*: Varro ling. 5,32 *Europae loca nominata aut translaticio nomine ab hominibus, ut Sabini aut Lucani, aut declinato ab hominibus, ut Apulia et Latium*. Analogously, Caesar refers to *in* + tribal names with the word *loca*²⁴ and

21 E. Hermann, KZ 56 (1928) 139. H. Jacobsohn, KZ 57 (1929) 97.

22 Cf. Jacobsohn l.c.

23 Cf. J. Müller, *Der Stil des älteren Plinius*, 1883, 65.

24 Gall. 7,7 *praesidia in Rutenis provincialibus, Volcis Arecomicis, Tolosatibus circumque Narbonem, quae loca hostibus erant finitima, constituit*.

Ammianus enumerates the tribal names *Bactriani*, *Sogdiani* and *Sacae* in his list of the Persian *regiones*.²⁵

The local function of the ethnic names also appears from the fact that they could be used as correlates of the local adverbs *inde*, *unde*, *quo*: *Caes. Gall. 4,21 in Morinos proficiscitur, quod inde erat brevissimus in Italiam traiectus. Cic. Flacc. 26,62 Adsunt Athenienses, unde humanitas doctrina, religio fruges, iura leges ortae atque in omnes terras distributae putantur. Sall. Iug. 66,2 Vagenses, quo Metellus initio Iugurtha pacificante praesidium imposuerat, fatigati regis suppliciis neque antea voluntate alienati principes civitatis inter se coniurant.*²⁶

In Tacitus the juxtaposition of the names of peoples and territories is a much used means of achieving stilistic inconcinnity: *dial. 10,2 ex Hispania vel ex Asia - de Gallis. Agr. 15,3 Britanni - Germanias. Germ. 1,1 Germania - a Gallis Raetisque et Pannoniis... a Sarmatis Dacisque. 37,3 non Samnis, non Poeni, non Hispaniae Galliaeve, ne Parthi quidem. hist. 1,2,1 Illyricum... Galliae... Britannia - Sarmatarum ac Sueborum gentes... Dacus... Parthorum arma. 2,29,1 spolia Galliarum - Viennensium aurum. 2,81,2 in Pontum et Armenios. 3,59,1 Samnis Paelignusque et Marsi - Campania. 4,14,4 Germanos - Gallias - Romanis. 4,21,2 Bructeri Tencterique et - Germania. 4,57,2 Aeduos - Galliasque. 4,69,2 Treveris Lingonibusque apud Gallias - 3 ad Treviros - nomine Galliarum. ann. 2,5,3 Germanos - Gallias. 2,60,3 Libya Aethiopia Medisque et Persis et Bactriano ac Scytha. 3,46,1 Germaniarum victores adversum Gallos... ducerentur. 4,5,1 Hispaniae - 2 Mauros - Africae... Aegyptus. 14,29,1 Britannia - 2 obtinebat Britannos (cf. Agr. 39,3 Britanniam obtinebat; hist. 1,79,5 Moesiam obtinens; ann. 4,13,3 Africam obtinuerat). 15,12,1 regionem Commagenam, exim Cappadociam, inde Arme-*

²⁵ 23,6,14 *Sunt autem in omni Perside hae regiones maximae... Assyria, Susiana, Media, Persis, Parthia, Carmania maior, Hyrcania, Margiana, Bactriani, Sogdiani, Sacae, Scythia (infra Imaum et) ultra eundem montem, Serica, Asia, Paropanisadae, Drangiana, Arachosia et Gedrosia. Cf. H. Hagendahl, *Studia Ammianea*, 1921, 130.*

²⁶ Cf. E. Palmén, *Arctos* 2 (1958) 119.

nios petivit. The names of peoples and towns appear juxtaposed in ann. 2,47,3 *Temnios, Philadelphenos, Aegeatas, Apollonidenses, quique Mosteni aut Macedones Hyrcani vocantur, et Hierocaesariam, Myrinam, Cymen, Tmolium.*²⁷

In the *Germania*, the share of the territorial names is very small compared with those of tribes and peoples. The names denoting German tribes or tribal groups number in all fifty four, but, except for the generic names *Germania* and *Suebia*, the author has no separate names for their lands and habitations.²⁸ This is why he several times resorts to bold expressions, metonymically transferring to peoples such things that actually concern their territories: Germ. 29,1 *Batavi...pars Romani imperii fierent.* Cf. 29,3 *qui decumates agros exercent...sinus imperii et pars provinciae habentur.*²⁹ - 34,1 *Angrivarios et Chamavos a tergo Dulgubini et Chasuarii cludunt;* 43,1 *Retro Marsigni, Cotini, Osi, Buri terga Marcomanorum Quadorumque cludunt.* Cf. ann. 2,20,3 *hostem a tergo palus, Romanos flumen aut montes claudebant;* 14,34,1 *deligitque locum artis faucibus et a tergo silva clausum;* Germ. 45,1 *mare...quo cingi cludique terrarum orbem hinc fides.*³⁰ - 35,1 *Chaucorum gens...omnium quas exposui gentium lateribus obtenditur, donec in Chattos usque sinuetur.* Cf. Agr. 10,2 *Britannia...in orientem Germaniae, in occidentem Hispaniae obtenditur;* ann. 2,16 *is (sc. campus) medius inter Visurgim et colles...inaequaliter sinuatur.* - 41,1 *Et haec quidem pars Sueborum in secretiora Germaniae porrigitur.* Cf. ann. 1,64,4 *nam medio montium et paludum porrigebatur planities.* - 45,2 *dextro Suebici maris litore Aestiorum gentes adluuntur.* Cf. hist. 2,81,2 *quidquid provinciarum adluitur mari.* 3,42,1 *Picenus ager Hadria adluitur.* Further, Manil. 4,599 *(pontus) Numidas Libyamque calentem adluit.* Sen. Oed. 475 *quas...Maeotis alluit gentes.* Mela 2,6 *Borysthenes gentem sui*

27 Cf. G. Sörbom, *Variatio sermonis Tacitei*, 1935, 11f.

28 Cf. Arctos, *Suppl.* 1 (1968) 70-71,77.

29 Anderson 150 "The grammatical subject is *ii qui...exercent*, the logical the lands themselves."

30 Cf. additionally ann. 2,19,2; 4,25,1; 14,14,2.

nominis adluit.

To the examples enumerated may be added *centum pagis habitantur*, "their land is occupied by hundred cantons", in which the *consensus codicum* offers a blameless construction of the Tacitean Latinity. As in 45,2 *gentes adluuntur* (= *fines adluuntur*), Tacitus also states in 39,3 about the people a fact that strictly speaking holds true about their land (*habitantur* sc. *Semnones* = *Semnonum fines*). The resorting to this kind of metonymy was the more natural as the use of tribal names for the territorial ones was old-established in Latin literature.

S O M E A S P E C T S O F T H E L I F E
O F L U C I U S M U M M I U S A C H A I C U S

L e e n a P i e t i l ä - C a s t r é n

Lucius Mummius is known to posterity only for his participation in the sack of Corinth in 146 BC and for the events of his censorial year 142. The judgements formed about him have often been very superficial. The only more profound study of some objectivity is F. Münzer's RE-article.¹ Its bibliographical material is not, however, complete. Furthermore, since its publication some new information has come to light. It is perhaps possible that a scrupulous study of all sources might shed new light on Lucius Mummius' origin and career, and the development of the literary tradition which has been hostile to him.

The origin of the *gens Mummia* has been rather widely discussed. Wiseman hesitantly proposes that Lucius Mummius came from Labici, south-east of Rome,² with reference to the origin of Mummia Achaica, the emperor Galba's mother. According to a myth she descended from queen Pasiphae of Crete,³ whose son Glaucus was given the name Labicus upon his arrival in Italy. It is doubtful, however, whether such a mythical piece of information can be taken into serious consideration. Its purpose was most likely to create an honourable descent for the emperor, who was not a blood relative of former emperors, nor was he adopted by the previous emperor.

1 N:o 7A, RE XVI 1195-.

2 Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 BC - 14 AD*, 1971, 187 n. 6.

3 Suet. Galba 2 & 3,4.

On the other hand the Mummii might have had relations with Telesia, as it is there that a *Lucius Mummius Luci filius* appears as a *praetor duovir* in the last years of the Republic.⁴

The gentilicium *Mummius* (a short stem ending in double consonant + *ius*) belongs to a group of names which is common in a geographically quite limited area. The Gellii and the Lollii were Sabellians, the Memmii, the Tillii and the Tullii came from the Volscian territory, while the Mammii came from Praeneste and the Bennii, the Monnii and the Ninnii came from northern Campania.⁵ It is worth noting that the name *Mammius* appears in some inscriptions written with a single *m*, just like *Mummius* in the inscription of Nursia and Fregellae.⁶ It could be taken as a hypothesis that the *gens Mummia* also came from the area inhabited by the Volscians or from nearby areas inhabited by the Sabellian tribes.

Lucius Mummius was the first man of his family to become a consul. In the eyes of the old nobility he was still a *homo novus*, although his father had been praetor. Our knowledge of Lucius Mummius' forefathers is very scarce: his grandfather was a Roman citizen, if one may judge from his nomenclature in the Capitoline Fasti.⁷ The elder Lucius was a *tribunus plebis* in the year 187 together with his brother Quintus⁸ and he was elected one of the praetors for the year 178. On this occasion he was given by lot the province of Sardinia. Owing to the serious political situation Sardinia was made a consular province in that year,⁹ and Lucius Mummius the Elder was given the task of organizing the trials of those Latins who had moved to Rome to gain full citizenship and who had not returned to their former homes by a fixed limit of time.¹⁰ Perhaps he was particularly well-suited for this task because of his origin.

4 ILLRP 675 = CIL I 1747. Cf. Suolahti, *The Roman Censors*, 1963, 394.

5 See Castrén, *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus*, 1975, s.v.

6 See below page 121.

7 Fast.Cap. a. 146: *L.Mummius L.f. L.n.*

8 Liv. 38,44. Niccolini, *I fasti dei tribuni della plebe*, 1934, 111.

9 Liv. 41,8,1-3.

10 Liv. 41,9,9-11.

Spurius, the brother of Lucius Mummius, was a member of the commission of the legates in Corinth,¹¹ or more likely his brother's personal legate.¹² Spurius was also known for his friendship with Scipio Aemilianus.

There is no information available concerning the political career of Lucius Mummius until the time of his praetorship in Spain in 153-152, where he fought with the Lusitanians.¹³ After his Hispanian triumph in 152, which he celebrated, breaking tradition, as a praetor, he is not mentioned again until in 146, when he obtained the consulship, conquered Corinth and then destroyed it by order of the Senate.¹⁴

After the consulship Mummius remained in Greece as a proconsul organizing her affairs. There is epigraphical evidence of his activity in several Greek towns, such as Olympia,¹⁵ Tegea,¹⁶ Nemea,¹⁷ Epidaurus,¹⁸ Oropus,¹⁹ Thespieae,²⁰ Thebes²¹ and Aulis.²² From literary sources we know that he also visited Delphi²³ and Pheneus.²⁴ The inscriptions concern the gifts which Lucius Mummius distributed; usually he reutilized old monuments. Olympia and Epidaurus, being the most famous cult-places of Greece, were obvious recipients of these gifts. Tegea was well-known for her worship of Athena and Heracles, Nemea for the cults for Zeus and Heracles and the Nemean Games, Thespieae as the cult-place of Heracles and the Muses, Thebes

11 Cic. Att. 13,30.

12 Cic. Att. 13,5.

13 App. Hisp. 6,10,56-57.

14 Cic. Manil. 4,11. Cf. Paus. 7,16,7.

15 Furtwängler, Arch.Zeit. 36 (1879) 86, n:o 131 and 132, Arch.Zeit. 37 (1880) 146-147, n:o 291 and 292.

16 IG V 2,77.

17 SEG XXIII 180.

18 IG IV 1183.

19 IG VII 434.

20 IG VII 1808.

21 IG VII 2478 and IG VII 2478a. Keramopoullos, Arkh.Delt. 13 (1931) 106. IG VII 2413-14.

22 SEG XXV 541.

23 Polyb. 39,6,1.

24 Dio Chrys. 42.

for the cults of Apollo and Heracles, Aulis for the worship of Artemis, and Oropus for her famous oracle. It becomes clear from this list that Lucius Mummius visited all the important cult-places of mainland Greece. In addition, some partiality for Heracles is noticeable.

Returning to Rome with his army towards the end of the year 145,²⁵ Mummius celebrated his second triumph. In the procession were carried statues of bronze and marble, paintings and other works of art from the booty of Corinth.²⁶ Without analyzing further these works of art the sources reveal that most of the dedications in Rome and its environs originated from Corinth.²⁷

The most important Mummius-inscription comes from *mons Caelius* in Rome.²⁸ It is of peperino tufa and it is partly written in Saturnian metre:

- 1 *L(ucius) Mummius L(uci) f(ilius) co(n)sul duct(u)*
- 2 *auspicio imperioque*
- 3 *eius Achaia capt(a) Corinto*
- 4 *deleto Romam redieit*
- 5 *triumphans ob hasce*
- 6 *res bene gestas quod*
- 7 *in bello voverat*
- 8 *hanc aedem et signu(m)*
- 9 *Herculis Victoris*
- 10 *imperator dedicat*

It appears from the text that the victory over Achaia was won by the personal leadership of Lucius Mummius in his consular year (1-3). During the battle he had made a vow to build a temple for Hercules Victor and a cult-statue in the case of victory (7-9). He dedicated this temple while celebrating the triumph and when he still had the proconsular imperium (10). Evidently it was immediately af-

25 Brunt, *The Italian Manpower 225 BC - AD 14*, 1971, 428.

26 Liv. Per. 51. App. Pun. 8,20,135.

27 Strab. 8,6,23.

28 CIL I 2,626.

ter his victory that he gave the order to build the temple in Rome, in order to be able to dedicate it upon his arrival.²⁹ Thus there remained roughly a year for construction of the temple. This would have been enough, if Pape is right in claiming that the temple was small.³⁰

The temple was certainly built of the same material as the inscription, that is peperino, for imported marbles were still at that time rare and expensive. And yet, if such a material had been used, the inscription, too, would have been written on the same material.³¹ In the inscription there is no evidence for the theory that the temple had been dedicated as late as 142, Mummius' censorial year.³² In this connection there is no need to refer to Plutarch's *praec. rei publ.* 816 (like the editor of CIL 1 suppl. does). This passage concerns another temple, Scipio's round temple of Hercules - *aedes Aemiliana Herculis*. It was situated not far from the *Ara Maxima* and the shrine of *Pudicitia Patricia*, in the *Forum Boarium*. Another Hercules-temple in the same area was the temple of *Hercules Olivarius*, the famous round temple near the Tiber.³³ Scipio's temple was dedicated in his censorial year, 142, but Mummius seems to have consecrated his temple some years earlier.

The place of discovery of the Mummius-inscription might explain why Mummius in his text calls himself *imperator*. It has been convincingly suggested that there on the Caelian hill a Hercules-cult was practised by the inhabitants of an extramural *pagus*.³⁴ If this is correct the temple was situated in the area between Ss. Quattro Coronati and the Lateran, where there also ran an underground branch

29 Kienast, *Zeitschr. Savigny-Stift.*, Rom. Abt. 78 (1961) 410-411.

30 Pape, *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute und ihre öffentliche Aufstellung in Rom*, 1975, 18. The only support for this claim is, however, the fact that no traces of it have been found!

31 Even if the inscription had been later recopied, it is unlikely that a marble-inscription would have been remade on tufa.

32 Thus e.g. Platner-Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 1929, 256-257.

33 Coarelli, *Guida archeologica di Roma*, 1976, 287-288.

34 Colini, *Mem.Pont.Acc.* 3 VII (1944) 41 and 299. CIL VI 302.

of *Aqua Marcia* called *rivus Herculanus*.³⁵ This part of Caelius was evidently outside the republican walls, since the easily defendable hill of Ss. Quattro Coronati certainly formed a part of the system of defence.³⁶ In the inscription Mummius calls himself *imperator* because he had not yet entered the *pomerium* at the moment of the dedication. Thus it must have taken place in 145.

During the two years following the triumph Lucius Mummius seems to have been active in decorating Rome and other Italian towns with works of art, which were brought from Greece. His every step may have been carefully planned in order to facilitate his chances in applying for the censorship.

Mummius had every reason to set up one of his many donations in Italica in Spain,³⁷ where he had waged war successfully as a praetor, though he had not been able finally to pacify the country. Italica was founded by Scipio Africanus Maior in 206 as an outpost against the Lusitanian tribes. It is most likely that even Mummius had his stronghold in Italica. It was later a very famous producer of olive oil. Perhaps as early as in the second century there were immigrants from the oilproducing districts of southern Latium, who could have been Mummius' clients. This remains, of course, merely a hypothesis.

The Mummius-inscription in Parma was discovered in the theatre constructed in the second century AD.³⁸ Its original site is not known, but it might have represented Apollo or one of the Muses, as it was later placed in the theatre. Parma is recorded as a Roman colony in 183, when the *Via Aemilia* was built. It is the only town in Cisalpine Gaul where Mummius is known to have bestowed a statue. His connections with Parma were perhaps due to his earlier career,

35 Platner-Ashby, op.cit. 26.

36 Coarelli, op.cit. 21.

37 CIL I 2,630: [L(ucius) Mumm]ius L(uci) f(ilius) imp(erator)
[ded(it) Co]rintho capta
[?Vico Ital]icensi

38 CIL I 2,629: L(ucius) Mummius [L(uci) f(ilius)]
co(n)s(ul) p(opulo) P(armensi?)

like the period of his quaestorship in the late 160's. He wanted to be remembered in this way by the natives of Parma.

The inscriptions of Nursia,³⁹ Cures,⁴⁰ Trebula Mutuesca,⁴¹ and Pompeii (in Oscan letters)⁴² show the normal formula: *L(ucius) Mummius L(uci) f(ilius) co(n)s(ul) Achaea capta N.N.* The Fregellan inscription is the only one without a dedication to a community and without the expression that the monument in question came from Greece.⁴³ So the statue was perhaps of Mummius himself and was erected by the inhabitants of Fregellae to commemorate his deeds.

The Mummius-inscriptions which we possess are evidently only a small proportion of the original number.⁴⁴ It is the general opinion that Mummius distributed his booty during his censorial year 142-141. It is worth noting, however, that his title in these inscriptions is always *cos*, meaning *consularis*,⁴⁵ never *ensor*. Also the passage in Livy makes it clear that Mummius made his donations as a part of his propaganda campaign before the censorial elections, not during the censorship.⁴⁶

Considering the chronology of these years in general, it should be remembered that the censors took office late in the year.⁴⁷ This, too, supports the claim that the donations of Mummius are from the years before the censorship.

39 CIL I 2,628: *L(ucius) Mummius
co(n)s(ul) ded(it) N(ursinis)*

40 CIL I 2,631: [*L(ucius) Mummius L(uci) f(ilius)*]
co(n)s(ul) Achaea capta

41 CIL I 2,627: *L(ucius) Mummius co(n)s(ul)
vico*

42 Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, 1897, 80.

43 Bizzarri, *Epigraphica* 35 (1973) 141.

44 CIL I 2,632 does not belong to them. See e.g. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic II*, 1952, 643. The Mummius-inscriptions in general have been most lately discussed by G. Waurick (*Kunstraub der Römer: Untersuchungen zu seinen Anfängen anhand der Inschriften*), in *Jahrbuch des Römisch-germanischen Zentralmuseums* 22 (1977) 1-46. The article leaves, however, many important questions open.

45 *cos* = *consularis*: CIL III 7731 and CIL VII 5.

46 Liv.Epit.Oxyr. 53.

47 Suolahti, *op.cit.* 75 and 78.

If we compare the two groups of inscriptions, we notice that in Greece they were dedicated to gods as a token of gratitude and as a part of Roman propaganda in a conquered country. On the other hand the inscriptions found in Spain, Cisalpine Gaul and Italy have another purpose: here Lucius Mummius wanted to remind the citizens of the climax of his career, undoubtedly wishing that the recipients would support his and his descendants' efforts in the future, too. The inscriptions of Italica and Parma shed new light on the first steps of his career. The fact that so many donations were concentrated in a relatively small part of Central Italy, and also that they were made to places of small importance, makes one suspect that the family of the Mummii or their allies had lands and clients in this particular area.⁴⁸ The exceptional inscription from Fregellae may prove that the colony and Mummius had a special relationship. Future excavations may show whether Lucius Mummius was a native of Fregellae or patron of the colony.

Mummius' patrician colleague in the censorship was Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus. During their political careers the two colleagues had many points in common and were therefore subjects of comparison favoured by many authors. According to Dio Cassius, Scipio performed his duty with the strictest integrity and impartiality, whereas Mummius was more popular and charitable.⁴⁹ In Velleius Paterculus Scipio was introduced as the champion of every form of learning, while Mummius was so uncultivated and primitive that he gave instructions for the statues and pictures made by the greatest artists to be replaced by new ones in case they were lost during the transportation from Corinth to Italy.⁵⁰

It is this passage of Velleius Paterculus that has greatly influenced the modern opinion of Lucius Mummius. The oldest and most

48 Bianchi Bandinelli, *Etruschi e italici prima del dominio di Roma*, 1976, 328.

49 Dio Cass. 76.

50 Vell. 1,13,3-4. See the comments of Münzer, n:o 7A, RE XVI 1200.

reliable sources such as Polybius and Cicero give a different, very positive picture of Lucius Mummius and his activity as a whole.⁵¹ In fact Velleius is the first Roman author who had such a negative attitude towards Mummius. The motives of Velleius Paterculus may have been, firstly, to use a pair of rhetorical contrasts and, secondly, he may have been influenced by the hostile literary tradition created among the partisans of Scipio.⁵²

The comparison of Mummius and Scipio is rewarding in that the former seems to have represented traditional Roman education, while the latter was a famous philhellene. Our sources on Lucius Mummius seem to derive from two different traditions: a positive one in the older sources and a negative one in some later sources.

51 E.g. Polyb. 39,3,3 and 39,6. Cic. Verr. 2,1,20,55. Cic. parad. 38.

52 See Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus*, 1967, 330-331.

THE ROMAN SENATE
AND CRIMINAL JURISDICTION
DURING THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen

The senatorial criminal jurisdiction of the Empire has been dealt with in several studies.¹ The discussions about the origins of this practice have been based on the sources reporting the "causes célèbres" of the immediately preceding epoch i.e. of the late Republic.² It has, however, been noted that these trials connected with the Gracchi, Saturninus and the followers of Catilina cannot be considered normal,³ because pronouncements of the *senatus consultum ultimum* had been passed on each occasion.⁴ Consequently it has been argued that the Senate had had no right to criminal jurisdiction during the Republic and that it acquired it only in the

1 A.H.M. Jones, *Imperial and Senatorial Jurisdiction in the Early Principate*, *Historia* 3 (1954) 464-488; Franca de Marini Avonzo, *La Funzione Giurisdizionale del Senato Romano*, Milano 1957; Jochen Bleicken, *Senatsgericht und Kaisergericht*, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 3 Folge*, 53 (Göttingen 1962); Wolfgang Kunkel, *Ueber die Entstehung des Senatsgerichts*, *Kleine Schriften*, Weimar 1974, 267-323.

2 See especially Bleicken 17-29.

3 Avonzo 5ff.; Mommsen, *Strafrecht* 252; Kunkel 268ff. These S.C. have been studied in great detail by J. Ungern-Sternberg von Pürkel, *Untersuchungen zum Spätrepublikanischen Notstandrecht*, *Vestigia* 11 (1970).

4 J. Lengle, however, thinks that the 'konsularisch-senatorische' processes of the Empire were initiated by Cicero, i.e. were based on the example of the consul seeking the help of the Senate in the trial against Catilina and his followers, *Römische Strafrecht bei Cicero und den Historikern*, Leipzig und Berlin 1934, 61ff.

Empire.⁵ The *S.C. Calvisianum*⁶ of the year 4 B.C., whereby the Senate was given the right to elect a commission from among its members to investigate certain cases of *crimen repetundarum*, has also been regarded as evidence of the fact that the Senate had not been able to exercise criminal jurisdiction before that date and was even now granted it only in a limited way.⁷ This interpretation of the *S.C. Calvisianum* is, however, not water-tight.⁸ Moreover this *S.C.* on *crimen repetundarum* does not, of course, preclude the possibility that the Senate could have exercised criminal jurisdiction in other kinds of cases, and there are, indeed, quite a number of sources showing earlier cases of senatorial jurisdiction which have been ignored so far.

The references to the oldest cases of Republican senatorial jurisdiction that we possess date from the early 5th century. In 499 B.C. the Senate decreed that the conspirators who had wanted to restore Tarquinius Superbus as King should be sought and put to death provided that the populace also deemed it so.⁹ This provision was necessary because, according to the Twelve Tables Law, free Roman men had the right to appeal to the populace when the death sentence was pronounced on them.¹⁰

Some thirteen years later the consul Spurius Cassius was accused of aspiring to the monarchy. There are two versions of his trial and death. According to one account he was condemned to death

5 Avonzo 7ff., 20; Kunkel 267ff.; P. Willems, *Le Sénat de la République Romaine II*, Louvain 1883, 279. According to Kunkel the senatorial jurisdiction began properly only under Tiberius, but in the review of Bleicken's book, *Kl. Schriften* 328, he admits that three cases of senatorial jurisdiction under Augustus were, nevertheless, 'echte Senatsprozesse'.

6 FIRA I² 403ff.

7 Avonzo 8; cf. Kunkel 284ff. and J.G.C. Andersen, *Augustan Edicts from Cyrene*, *JRS*, 17 (1917) 46ff.

8 Jones, *op.cit.* 480 and *ibid.*, *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate*, Oxford 1972, 92.

9 Dion. Hal. 5,27,3. Cf. Dio Cass. 39,61,3f. according to whom the Senate decreed in 54 B.C. that the populace and magistrates should punish Gabinius most severely, i.e. he was to be put to death.

10 Cic. de leg. 3,11.

by the populace and then hurled down from the Tarpeian Rock by the quaestors.¹¹ According to the other record his own father accused him in the Senate and after the Senate had found him guilty the father put him to death.¹²

According to Cincius Alimentus and Calpurnius Piso, a rich plebeian *eques*, Spurius Maelius, another aspirant to the monarchy, was put to death in 439 B.C. after the Senate had discussed the matter and being convinced of his guilt had appointed Servilius Ahala to perform the task.¹³ This means, if true, that the Senate violated the Twelve Tables Law. On the other hand it could have been argued that Maelius had been caught in the act of bribing the plebs to further his cause and consequently it was permissible to slay him without a trial.¹⁴ Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, however, record quite a different version of Maelius' death. According to them the Senate caused T. Quinctius Capitolinus to be elected Dictator in order to deal with Maelius. The Dictator for his part chose Servilius Ahala as his Master of Horse. When Servilius then went to call Maelius to the Dictator and he refused to follow him Servilius slew him on the spot.¹⁵ So Maelius died, his property was confiscated and his house razed to the ground, but was he killed by Servilius the Master of Horse or Servilius, a private citizen who was executing the sentence of death decreed by the Senate? The latter possibility is probably the correct one; the evi-

11 Livy 2,41,11f., Dion. Hal. 8,77,1f.

12 Dion. Hal. 8,79,1f., cf. Livy 2,41,10. The custom that the father could take justice into his own hands in the case of an offending magistrate still survived in the second century B.C. According to Livy, Per. 54, praetor D. Iunius Silanus was accused by Macedonian envoys of bribery and plundering of the province in 141 B.C. When the Senate was about to investigate the case his father asked for the right to conduct the *cognitio* himself. This was granted and having found his son guilty he banished him. The ex-praetor duly hanged himself, cf. Val. Max. 5,8,3, who tells the story in a slightly different way.

13 Ap. Dion. Hal. 12,4,2. This tradition is also followed by Plut. Brut. 1,3.

14 Cf. Sall. Cat. 52,36, App. BCiv. 2,6 and Mommsen, Strafrecht 256f.

15 Livy 4,13,1-16,8, Dion. Hal. 12,1,1-4,6.

dence of Cincius Alimentus and Calpurnius Piso must anyway be considered more credible than that of Livy.¹⁶

The conflicting stories about the death of the *legatus* Q. Pleminius seem also to offer an example of capital jurisdiction by the Senate. In 204 B.C. Pleminius was sent, under arrest, to Rome because he had committed great outrages at Locri.¹⁷ Many senators were intent on having him put to death,¹⁸ but the populace who alone could have condemned him to death, seemed willing to acquit the man.¹⁹ Before the investigations were completed Pleminius was, however, reported to have died in prison and the Senate confiscated his property.²⁰ Yet according to Clodius Licinus, Pleminius was sent to Tullianum, i.e. put to death, *ex senatus consulto* in 194 B.C., eight years later, after he had tried to escape from the prison.²¹ If Clodius Licinus, himself a senator, is to be trusted in this matter,²² it seems probable that the Senate had fabricated the intelligence concerning Pleminius' death in 204 B.C. in order to prevent his acquittal by the populace. Then when he tried to escape from the prison he could be put to death without further ado, because the

16 See Münzer, RE 2,2, nr. 32 C. Servilius Ahala, 1768f.

17 Livy 29,16,4-20,11, Diod. 27,4ff.

18 Livy 29,19,3-20,3.

19 Livy 29,22,8. Note that in 329 B.C. when the Senate had decreed that Vitruvius was to be scourged and put to death he was kept imprisoned until the consul returned to Rome, i.e. the Senate waited for the consul to preside over the comitia where the populace would confirm the death sentence, Livy 8,20,7 and 10. This was obviously also the reason why the Senate expressly instructed the magistrates of Ardea not to allow Minius Cerrinus, one of the three leaders of the Bacchanalian conspiracy, to commit suicide, Livy 39,19,2. His death sentence is not recorded in our sources, but there is no doubt about it, because hundreds, perhaps thousands of people who had taken part in the Bacchanalian rites were executed, cf. Livy 39,17,6 and 18,4f.

20 Livy 29,22,9 and Diod. 27,4,7.

21 *Ap.* Livy 29,22,10f. and 34,44,6ff., cf. *App.* Hann. 55.

22 F. Münzer, *Die Todesstrafe Politischer Verbrecher in der Späteren Röm. Republik*, *Hermes* 47 (1912) 162-166, suggests that Clodius' record may be fictional, but the above interpretation of the sources is equally possible.

attempt to escape could be regarded as a fresh criminal act in which he had been caught and it was therefore permissible to put him to death without a trial.²³

In 414 B.C. a military tribune - with consular power - was accidentally stoned to death and his colleagues asked the Senate to hold a *quaestio* about this matter. This was, however, prevented by the veto of the tribunes of the plebs who seemed to fear that the Senate would not pass an impartial verdict.²⁴

In cases where the crimes committed did not require capital punishment the Senate had obviously a free hand to inflict various penalties. Thus during the Second Punic War the Senate condemned the banker L. Fulvius to imprisonment because he had worn a chaplet of roses in the daytime. The crime seems to have been considered very serious as Fulvius was obviously imprisoned for several years.²⁵ At that time the Senate also punished an aedile with a fine for making sexual advances to the son of Marcus Claudius Marcellus.²⁶ At an earlier date the Senate had punished a slave-master - probably with a fine too - for scourging his slave in the circus before the beginning of the Great Games.²⁷ In 180 B.C. the Senate banished Marcus Fulvius Nobilior,²⁸ a tribune of the soldiers, to Farther Spain, because he had dismissed the second legion stationed at Pisa during his period of command. It is noteworthy that this officer was not punished by the consul. It was the Senate who decided the fate of Fulvius at the express wish of the consul Aulus Postumius, though he himself undertook to punish and bring back to Pisa all the common soldiers whom he could seize.²⁹ Very probably Postumius delegated

23 See above n. 14.

24 Livy 4,50,5f.

25 Pliny, nat. 21,8.

26 Plut. Mar. 2.

27 Dion. Hal. 7,69,1 and 7,73,5, Cic. de div. 1,55, Livy 2,36,1f.

28 See Broughton MRR I 391 n. 3 about the identity of this man.

29 Livy 40,41,8-11, cf. Val. Max. 2,75. Mommsen seems to have turned a blind eye to this piece of evidence, because he writes that cases of military jurisdiction were never brought before the Senate, Strafrecht 252.

the case to the Senate in order to avoid incurring the resentment of the other tribunes and the influential relatives of Fulvius.

On considering the above cases there seems to be one characteristic common to them all. The persons accused were clearly guilty and the Senate did not need to hold long investigations. A large number of more complicated criminal cases were also brought before the Senate, but they were regularly delegated to the consuls, praetors or special commissions.³⁰ This was, indeed, unavoidable anyway if they had taken place elsewhere in Italy or in the provinces. Yet, on two occasions the Senate itself meted out punishments to large numbers of Roman citizens who lived outside Rome. In 391 B.C. the Senate punished the inhabitants of Satricum for siding with the Latins,³¹ and in 210 B.C. the Senate inflicted very detailed punishments on the Capuans who had sided with Hannibal.³² In general it seems, however, that for the sake of expediency the Senate as a body judged only those cases in which the trial was not likely to take much time.³³

According to Polybius the crimes that expressly belonged to the sphere of senatorial jurisdiction were treason, conspiracy, poisonings and assassinations.³⁴ A little later he added, however, that the Senate could not investigate capital crimes even if directed against the State without permission from the populace.³⁵ This obviously refers to the *ius provocationis* granted by the Twelve Tables Law.³⁶ The cases of the slave-master, Marcellus' son, and the Fulvii show, however, that the Senate could and did also take

30 See e.g. Livy 8,20,7; 9,26,20; 10,13; 28,10,4; 29,14,6; 29,20,4f.; 29,36,10; 31,12,3f.; 32,26,10-18; 39,3,2f.; 39,14,6; 40,37,4.

31 Livy 26,33,10.

32 Livy 26,34,1-13.

33 See Pol. 33,1,3 about the senatorial voting system in criminal cases.

34 6,13,4. Ὁμοίως καὶ ὅσα τῶν ἀδικημάτων τῶν κατ' Ἰταλίαν προσδεῖται δημοσίας ἐπισκέψεως, λέγω δὲ, οἷον προδοσίας, συνωμοσίας, φαρμακείας, δολοφονίας, τῆ συγκλήτῃ μέλει περὶ τούτων.

35 6,16,1f.

36 Cic. de leg. 3,11.

action in less serious criminal cases. The offenders brought before the Senate can also equally well have been private citizens or magistrates, though in principle a Roman magistrate could not be prosecuted during his year of office. The Senate had, however, various means of punishing recalcitrant magistrates such as banishment,³⁷ imprisonment,³⁸ and the withdrawal of the magistrature.³⁹ If the consuls and praetors were unwilling to bring such matters before the Senate it could in an extreme case resort to the help of the tribunes of the plebs.⁴⁰ *De iure* the Republican Senate could, indeed, deal with only such cases which the consuls or praetors presented to it. Yet if it was intent on undertaking action in a certain case it seems always to have managed to persuade either one of the magistrates to present this case to it or the populace to pass a plebiscite according to which the case was to be brought before the Senate.⁴¹ On the other hand a magistrate could hasten to take action against somebody while the Senate was still considering the best means of doing it.⁴² It is also noteworthy that the Senate could refuse to take action in some cases presented to it. This was certainly not common, but on occasion it seems to have happened, because the Senate feared that the pronouncements of judgement on certain cases would have led to unpleasant consequences either for the populace or for the Senate itself.⁴³

It is difficult to say anything definite about the age of senatorial jurisdiction. In fact Dionysius of Halicarnassus states that it was Romulus himself that gave the senators the right to judge -

37 App. Reb. Syr. 51, Livy 40,41,8-11.

38 Dio Cass. 40,55,1f. Imprisonment, instead of capital sentence, was also the punishment that Caesar advised the Senate to inflict on Catilina's followers, *ibid.* 37,36,2f. and Sall. Cat. 51,43.

39 Dio Cass. 37,34,2, cf. Livy 3,54,5f.

40 Livy 42,21,1-5ff., cf. 26,33,13f.

41 Livy 42,3,5ff., cf. 26,33,13f.

42 Diod. Sic. 31,9,1.

43 Livy 5,20,9 and 25,3,12, cf. Suet. Caes. 23, the Senate was obviously afraid of taking action against Caesar.

nota bene - minor criminal cases,⁴⁴ and according to Zonaras, certainly on the authority of Dio Cassius, the Senate investigated into the assassination of Tarquinius the Elder and condemned the culprits to death.⁴⁵ It is, indeed, quite possible that the Senate was used as a court of justice during the period of the Kings when Rome was still a very small town without proper judicial magistrates. References to jurisdiction by the *decuriones* and *conscripti* in small communities survive even from a much later period.⁴⁶ The concrete examples of senatorial jurisdiction from the Republic are, however, too few to allow any conclusions about the development of this practice. The statements of Polybius suggest, however, that senatorial criminal jurisdiction was considered to be an established institution during the Mid-Republic. The several cases brought before the Senate by Augustus seem also to confirm this view,⁴⁷ for he made a show of following good Republican precedents with painstaking conscientiousness.⁴⁸ The reasons why senatorial jurisdiction began to flourish in the first century A.D. are certainly manifold, and we must not forget the fact that its thriving appearance in comparison to the picture that we have of it during the Republic is, no doubt, partly due to the far more abundant sources. Many a Republican senatorial trial may not be mentioned in our scanty sources at all. The main reason for the Emperors to bring cases before the Senate was certainly that it gave the trials an outward show of impartiality.

44 2,14,1.

45 Zon. 7,9.

46 Cf. Cic. Clu. 41: *Illum tabulas publicas Larini censorias corrupisse decuriones universi iudicaverunt. FIRA I², Lex Municip. Malacit. p. 217, c. 66, line 7f.: de ea ad decuriones conscriptosue referatur, de ea decurionum conscriptorumue iudicium esto.*

47 See Avonzo 21-24, Bleicken 30-35, Jones, *Historia* 480, Kunkel 275-284, 294-300 for the sources and discussion.

48 Also Cicero referred to senatorial jurisdiction as an old custom, *de Domo* 13,33. In general this passage has, however, been understood to be only an attempt to defend the Senate's decision to put Catilina's followers to death without giving them the possibility to use the right of *provocatio*.

That is why in 29 B.C. Maecenas expressly advised Augustus to have the senators and their families condemned in the Senate.⁴⁹ The guilty would be punished - the Senate was sure to know the will of the Emperor and judge accordingly - and yet Augustus himself would remain without blame. Another reason for senatorial jurisdiction in the Empire was surely that there were no proper consuls to whom the Senate could have delegated the investigations of criminal cases as there had been during the Republic. The consulate had rapidly deteriorated into a short-term nominal office to which the Emperor, his relatives and friends were usually appointed, and the praetors' competence was also declining. So the Senate was obliged to undertake the investigations itself and as it had been deprived of many of its governmental functions it certainly had time for this kind of task.⁵⁰

49 Dio Cass. 52,31,3.

50 Some cases concerning the relatives and friends of the Imperial family were surely also best judged in the Senate rather than publicly in the Forum, thus Kunkel 297ff. See *ibid.* 320-323 and Bleicken 44ff. for further discussion.

S O M E N O T E S O N V I R T U S
I N S A L L U S T A N D C I C E R O

J u h a n i S a r s i l a

In the political terminology of the last decades of the Roman Republican period *virtus*¹ was indubitably one of the most explosive concepts.² With its many levels of meaning *virtus*, as a political slogan, apparently contained impressive power similar to that of *libertas*.³ In fact *virtus* often occurs together with *libertas*. In or. 35 Cicero writes that he is afraid of the *regnum* of Caesar, which, being hostile to *virtus* has suppressed the old republican *libertas*.⁴ The profoundly humane value of *virtus* is emphasized in

1 This article is connected with the dissertation I am preparing on *virtus* from the Twelve Tables to Livy.

2 Cf. J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*, 1963, 242f.; *Un aspect de la littérature de propagande politique à la fin du I^{er} siècle avant J.C.*, *Revue des études latines* LII (1974) 207f.; D. Earl, *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*, 1967, 20.

3 About the concept of *libertas* see A. Michel, *Histoire des doctrines politiques à Rome*, 1971, 44ff.; O. Gigon, *Der Begriff der Freiheit in der Antike*, *Gymnasium* 80 (1973) 8ff.

4 Cf. Cic. *Balb.* 51; *Flacc.* 25; *Phil.* 5,41; *Sall. Cat.* 58,11; *Tac. Agr.* 1,15; 11,4. As the precondition to *virtus* in these parallelisms (*libertas - virtus*) *libertas* does not imply mental independence of an individual confronted by external pressure, but certain legal rights which are the basis of life worth living. As to *virtus*, it characterizes an action that is appropriate for the purposes of man and society (cf. K. Büchner, *Humanitas Romana*, 1957, 311). In the political vocabulary the terms denoting "historical consciousness" are inevitably ambiguous. So they ought to be considered impressive rather than precise. (About this problem cf. R. Koebner-H.D. Schmidt, *Imperialism, The Story of Significance of a Political Word 1840-1960*, 1965, xiv-xv). Thus Earl (1967) determinedly argues that *virtus* is untranslatable (8).

the Circle of Scipio Aemilianus by Lucilius (frg. 1326-38 Marx = Lact. inst. 6,5,3),⁵ who was well acquainted with Stoic thought, and later on by Cornelius Nepos (Ages. 5,3; 8,1; Lys. 1,1; Eum. 1,1),⁶ who wrote biographical monographs in a moralizing tone. As it presupposes ethical behaviour in any situation *virtus* is the source of knowledge for distinguishing between the good and evil. In the light of their own political careers, Sallust and Cicero readily saw the criterion of the ideal statesman in *virtus*.

In the beginning of his monograph on Catilina, Sallust clearly points out the intellectual aspect of *virtus*. By it, he denotes mental abilities⁷ having an absolute historical and universal value for himself (Cat. 1,4): *divitiarum et formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, virtus (mental excellence) clara aeternaque habetur*.⁸ According to Sallust, *divitiae* (wealth) and *forma* (physical beauty), which are external qualities, are not to be included into *virtus*, a mental ability. In Cat. 1,3 he uses *ingenii vires* and in Cat. 2,2 *ingenium* as near synonyms of *virtus*. It is an intellectual quality leading to success in all walks of life: *quae homines arant, navigant, aedificant, virtuti omnia parent* (Cat. 2,7).

Sallust describes (Cat. 2,9) a man who deserves to be mentioned and remembered as follows: *is demum mihi vivere atque frui anima videtur, qui aliquo negotio intentus praeclari facinoris aut artis bonae famam quaerit*. *Virtus* is not the mental quality of those who are quiet and inactive but must be displayed all the time. As he

5 About Lucilius' *virtus* see Büchner, Altrömische u. Horazische *virtus*, Studien zur römischen Literatur III (1962) 10f.; A.N. van Omme, *Virtus*, een semantiese studie, Proefschrift (1946) 83f.

6 About Nepos' *virtus* see W. Eisenhut, *Virtus Romana; Ihre Stellung im römischen Wertsystem*, *Studia et Testimonia Antiqua XIII* (1973) 46f.

7 There are no occurrences of *virtus* in plural in the whole Corpus Sallustianum.

8 Cf. Cic. Sest. 143.

demands that *virtus* should be active⁹ Sallust exhibits a feature typical of Roman thought. There is one occurrence of *virtus* in the extant fragments of Naevius, in "Tarentilla", a comedy: Two young men return home having lavishly spent all their money on entertainments. With the absolute authority of *pater familias*, the fathers reproach them: *primum ad virtutem ut redeatis, abeatis ab ignavia / domi patres patriam ut colatis potius quam peregri probra* (com. 92f. Ribbeck). "In order to return to decency (*virtus*), you must first give up your (moral) indifference (*ignavia*) so that you should honour your fathers and your native country at home rather than disgrace abroad."¹⁰ In this case, in contrast to *virtus*, *ignavia* has the meaning of moral indifference, quality condemned in practical ethics.¹¹ D.C. Earl has pointed out that Greek philosophy has not had a particular influence on Sallust's thought.¹² Moreover, V. Pöschl has argued that, in Sallust, *virtus* is inseparably combined with the concepts of *industria* (persistence) and *labor* (effort).¹³ As the term of Sallust's greatest approval, *virtus* is the result of discipline and experience.¹⁴ This is peculiar to Roman thought, as can be seen in the following examples. According to Virgil *virtus* can be learned: Aeneas advises Ascanius for the future (Aen. 12, 435f.): *disce puer, virtutem (manly conduct) ex me verumque laborem (effort), / fortunam ex aliis*.¹⁵ The author of the treatise "Ad He-

9 Cf. A. Ernout, *Les noms latins en -tūs*, *Philologica I, Études et Commentaires* 1 (1946) 225: "Il (= *virtus*) marque l'activité et la qualité." ἀρετή is active, too; cf. Arist. eth. Nic. 1099a 3f.; Thuc. 2,43,1f.; see J.L. Kukulides, *Staatsphilosophische Ideen zur Zeit des Perikles u. der Sophisten u. ihre pädagogische Bedeutsamkeit*, 1968, 22f.; 58ff.

10 Translated by the author; for further evidence cf. Plaut. Trin. 650; Pseud. 581f.; Cic. Sest. 138; Cat. 4,15; Tac. Germ. 31,1.

11 Cf. Eisenhut 24: "Da sie (= *virtus*) in Gegensatz wird zu *ignavia*, muss sie "Tüchtigkeit, Tatkraft" oder ähnliches bedeuten."

12 *The Political Thought of Sallust*, 1961, 37ff.

13 *Grundwerte römischer Staatsgesinnung in der Geschichtswerken des Sallust*, 1967, 20.

14 Cf. Eisenhut 51.

15 Cf. Acc. trag. 156; 619f. Ribbeck.

rennium" further illustrates the restrictions in acquiring *virtus*: *non posse virtutem sine doctrina comparari; quoniam ne equus quidem indomitus idoneus possit esse* (4,59).¹⁶

Sallust expresses that, principally, *virtus* can be attributed to anyone who has displayed intellectual vigour (*ingenium*) and persistent energy (*industria, labor*) in any walk of life (Cat. 2,9). Nevertheless, in practice he only gives his final approbation on condition that the person in question has historical significance. After a lengthy deliberation on the historical rise of the Roman Republic, Sallust comes to the conclusion that the success was due to *egregia virtus paucorum civium* (Cat. 53,4).¹⁷ Before the destruction of Carthage *virtus omnia domuerat* (Cat. 7,5) in the Roman life, but soon afterwards it was degenerated (Cat. 12,1; 53,5) by *desidia* (inactivity) and *luxus* (extravagance) so that, for a long time, there was no one worthy of *virtus* in Rome. Only in his own age does he believe to see *virtus* emerge in the political careers of Caesar and Marcus Cato (Cat. 53,6). *virtus* (energy and persistence) is the connecting feature between the two vastly different characters (*divorsis moribus*).

According to Sallust, historical knowledge is useful because it enables the understanding of *virtus* in others and its development in oneself. In Iug. 4,5 he tells that the eminent men of the Roman political life had been in the habit of declaring that, while watching the waxen masks of their glorious ancestors, a desire was kindled in their hearts for the acquisition of merit.¹⁸ The pursuit of excellence is psychologically motivated, not by some supernatural power hiding in the waxen effigies (Iug. 4,6): *scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam vim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum eam flammam egregiis viris in pectore crescere neque prius sedari, quam virtus eorum famam atque gloriam adaequaverit*.¹⁹

16 Cf. Cic. Flacc. 63.

17 Cf. Liv. 1,25,2.

18 "ad virtutem"; cf. Cic. Tusc. 1,3; fin. 5,21f.

19 Cf. Verg. Aen. 6,823.

It is only by *virtus* that real honour can be achieved (Cat. 1,2ff.). Even then this quality, which requires activity, remains the privilege of the happy few (*pauci et egregii*).

Cicero regards *virtus* as a privilege of a statesman similar to him, who has created his career solely by himself, without inherited resources. *Ad gloriam...ego...a me ortus et per me nixus, adscendi*, Cicero proudly declares in *Planc.* 67. Persistence (*industria*) and assiduous effort (*labor*), both qualities included into the Sallustian *virtus*, have paved the way for those without the blessing of noble birth.²⁰ In *Verr.* 5,180ff. Cicero describes the careers of the *homines novi*. He complains that the hereditary *nobilitas* resents the ability (*virtus*) and energy (*industria*) of these "new" men (*Verr.* 5,181): *quanta sit in invidia...novorum hominum virtus et industria*.²¹ Cicero's political self-esteem reached its zenith in the year of his consulate. This is reflected in his speeches against Catilina, in which he attributes *virtus* to himself three times (3,14; 29,4,5). In these cases, *virtus* symbolizes a politician's conviction of his own ability: *denique ita me in re publica tractabo ut meminerim semper quae gesserim curemque ut ea virtute, non casu gesta esse videantur* (3,29).²² In order to preserve his political status also in future, Cicero considers it necessary to emphasize that his success in exposing the conspiracy of Catiline was not due to chance but genuine ability.²³ Sallust and Cicero (*nat. deor.* 1,110) both shared the opinion that *virtus* does not exist at all unless it is *actuosa*.

20 Cf. *rep.* 1,1f.; *Cat.* 3,14; 4,5; 4,16f.

21 In *Iug.* 53,7; 73,7 and 85,13 Sallust relates how the ruling *nobilitas* unjustifiedly made attempts to prevent the access of *homines novi* (like Marius) to the public offices. - For further examples illustrating *virtus* and the idea of *homo novus* see *Cic.* *Balb.* 51; *Sest.* 136f.; *Cluent.* 111; *Liv.* 1,34,6f.; 4,3,17; 54,6; 7,1,1; 39,41,2.

22 Cf. *Quir.* 9.

23 Hence the impressive antithese *casus* - *virtus*.

According to Cicero, the ideal Roman statesman has *amorem ad communem salutem* (rep. 1,1f.). It does not suffice that he possesses *virtus* (*quasi artem aliquam*) but he must also use it actively for the best of society (rep. 1,2). In his letter to Atticus (Att. 8,11) on the 27th of February, 49 BC, Cicero writes that Pompey does not fulfil the above condition, let alone Caesar, for *dominatio quaesita ab utroque est, non id actum, beata et honesta civitas ut esset* (2). The pursuit of absolute power (*dominatio*) is repugnant to Cicero, who is imbued with the Roman-Stoic principle that a statesman's first duty is to serve his state without seeking his own advantage.²⁴ In rep. 3,40 (Lact. inst. 5,18,4) Cicero illustrates this as follows: *vult plane virtus honorem, nec est virtutis ulla alia merces...multi aut inimici potentes suis virtutem praemiis spoliant.*²⁵ Genuine *virtus* can be attributed only to a statesman who does not use his energy for the acquisition of material profit. The only appropriate reward of *virtus* is *honor*. Political or ideological considerations do not make Cicero restrain from attributing *virtus* to his opponents.²⁶

In rep. 5,6 (= Att. 8,11,1) Cicero-Scipio defines the duty of the ideal statesman, who possesses *virtus*: "as a safe voyage is the aim of the pilot (*gubernator*), health of the physician (*medicus*), victory of the general (*imperator*), so the ideal statesman will aim at the happiness of the citizens of the state so that their life should be based on material security (*opes*), copious wealth (*copia*), wide-spread reputation (*gloria*) and honest virtue (*virtus*)."²⁷ I have taken this passage under consideration because it seems to me that

24 Cf. R. Stanka, Die politische Philosophie des Altertums, Geschichte der politischen Philosophie Bd. 1, 1951, 280; Michel 34f.

25 Cf. Sall. Cat. 12,1; Liv. 3,26,7.

26 Ti. Gracchus fin. 4,65; Marius Manil. 47; Balb. 46; Caesar Rab. Post. 42 and even Catiline Cael. 11f. Sallust does not use *virtus* so generously; cf. Pöschl 27.

The quality repeatedly attributed to Pompey in the speech "Pro imperio Cn. Pompei" allegedly refers to his success as a military leader (e.g. 33; 49; 64; cf. prov. cos. 27).

27 This is the translation of the Loeb-edition (Rolfe) slightly modified.

Eisenhut's interpretation *ad locum* calls for further discussion. Eisenhut argues that "die Aufgabe des guten Staatsmannes ist es, die *virtus* des Volkes herbeizuführen".²⁸ As a matter of fact, this might be plausible, for Cicero, as a statesman-orator could quite well consider himself to be *magister virtutis*.²⁹ Eisenhut's statement is not, however, appropriate for the context discussed; in this case, *virtus* is by no means the ruling concept or even the synonym of *beata vita*.³⁰ Immediately after this, Eisenhut quite appropriately points out that the *beata vita* of the citizens depends on four fairly equal aspects (*opes, copia, gloria, virtus*). Therefore, the above quotation could be regarded as an irrelevant addition in this context. It would be more consistent to use *beata vita* instead of *virtus*.

Eisenhut justifiably remarks that the characteristic (Charaktereigenschaft) *virtus* is here presented on equal terms with three totally external qualities.³¹ Surely it is very illustrative to make a comparison between Cicero and Aristotle in this connection; only it should be done on a more extensive basis than Eisenhut's commentary *ad locum*. In Pol. 7,1-3; 1323a 14 - 1325b 32 Aristotle discusses how the citizens of a πόλις could achieve εὐδαιμονία, and comes to the conclusion that they can succeed in this solely by means of ἀρετή. Further, in Polit. 1,2, 1253a 29ff. he states that the possession of ἀρετή is enough to make a man a socially acceptable being.³² Why does Aristotle imply that εὐδαιμονία of the citizens presupposes only ἀρετή (and nothing else in addition) while, according to Cicero, *beata vita civium* requires securing external prerequisites

28 Eisenhut 58.

29 De orat. 2,35: *quis cohortari ad virtutem (virtuous life) ardentius, quis a vitiis acrius revocari?*

30 The matter is entirely different in Tusculanae disputationes, where Cicero deliberates on the conditions of human happiness after his active political career has come to an end; H. Steinmeyer, Der *virtus*-Begriff bei Cicero u. Seneca, Der altsprachliche Unterricht 17,2 (1974) 53f.

31 Eisenhut 58₁₅₂.

32 These two *loci* are also referred to in Eisenhut.

in addition to *virtus*? Eisenhut concludes his interpretation with the statement that "Cicero wollte den Gedanken nicht fallen lassen, dass der Mensch nur auf Grund der ἀρετή ein sozial brauchbares Wesen sei."³³ This does not, however, complete the discussion. The *virtus* of Cicero cannot simply be defined in terms of Aristotle's ἀρετή.

It should be defined what Aristotle means by εὐδαιμονία on one hand and by ἀρετή on the other when he discusses their interrelation when applied to the citizens of a πόλις. As far as ἀρετή is restricted to mean solely the perfection of soul as such, it is probable that an εὐδαιμονία that, in addition to the perfection of soul, includes that of body and external conditions as well, remains inaccessible. Thus Aristotle thinks (eth. Nic. 1153b 17-21) that ἀρετή, in the restricted meaning of the perfection of soul, is not a sufficient condition for individual independence, the main aspect of εὐδαιμονία.³⁴ But when ἀρετή is extended to mean the perfection of body and external conditions besides that of soul, it actually becomes identical with εὐδαιμονία. Accordingly, Aristotle's and Cicero's points of view differ to a certain degree. A.W.H. Adkins has argued that Aristotle's ἀρετή and εὐδαιμονία both refer to the active life of the free citizens of a πόλις.³⁵ According to Adkins Aristotle considered external ἀγαθά indispensable to the happy life of the citizens of a πόλις, and thus inseparable from their ἀρετή.³⁶ In fact, there were activities which, connected with ἀρετή (in the meaning of the Sallustian *virtus*) required considerable wealth.

As to Cicero, he consciously excluded *virtus* from external qualities. This can mainly be explained in terms of his own character rather than as a response to the ἀρετή of the Aristotelian tradition. As has been stated above, Cicero was a *homo novus* who created a successful political career without any support than his own *virtus* and *industria*. He had the conviction that material prerequisites (= *opes*,

33 Eisenhut 58₁₅₂.

34 Cf. eth. Nic. 1097b 6-8 and 1176b 5-6; see Gigon 13f.

35 From the many to the one, 1970, 207.

36 Adkins 206.

copia) were not to be included into *virtus*. So there is an evident connection between Cicero's *virtus* in rep. 5,6 (= Att. 8,11,1) and the idea of *virtus* as a purely mental quality in Sallust's monograph on Catilina.

A N A L E C T A E P I G R A P H I C A

H e i k k i S o l i n

L. ZU INSCHRIFTEN AUS ADRIA

B. Forlati Tamaro veröffentlicht Epigraphica 18 (1956 [1958]) 50-76 neue Inschriften aus Adria. S. 52 Nr. 5: Das Cognomen hiess zweifellos *D]amale*. - S. 64 Nr. 27: *Silia Advena*, nicht *Silia advena*. Das Wort *advena* ist in hier vorliegenden Zusammenhängen in der epigraphischen Sprache nicht gebräuchlich, während *Advena* ein gängiger Name war, und zwar ein Commune. - S. 67 Nr. 35: statt *Turpio Teid[ius* zu verstehen *Turpio Teidi*.

LI. NOCHMALS ZU FREIGELASSENEN OHNE COGNOMEN

Nach meinen und Pancieras Darlegungen dürfte nunmehr feststehen, dass die Freigelassenen gelegentlich ohne Cognomen noch zu Anfang der Kaiserzeit erscheinen konnten (s. L'Onomastique latine, 1977, 192-198). Doch war diese Praxis schon seit sullanischer Zeit selten geworden. Wenn Inschriften, die etwa flavisch oder später datierbar sind, Freigelassene ohne Cognomen bieten, ist Verdacht immer am Platz. O. Freda, Pubbl. dell'Univ. del Sacro cuore, Contributi dell'Istituto di filologia classica, Sez. di Storia antica (1963) 248 Nr. 6 veröffentlicht aus Larinum folgende Inschrift: *D M S / --- Antoni / M(arci) l(iberti) / Ianuaria / --- p(osuit)*. Die Inschrift soll Freda zufolge aus republikanischer Zeit sein, eben wegen des Fehlens des Cognomens von Antonius. Aber schon *D M S* zeigt, dass die Inschrift später ist; ich würde sie ans Ende des 1. Jh. oder ins 2. Jh. ver-

legen. Ferner soll das Praenomen des Antonius verschwunden und auch nicht festzustellen sein, weil in jener Zeit die Herren und Freigelassenen verschiedene Praenomina geführt hätten. Aus dem Photo geht jedoch deutlich hervor, dass der Vorname seit jeher fehlte. Der Text ist unbeholfen konzipiert, deswegen das Fehlen des Praenomens und des Cognomens.

LII. ZUR LISTE DER KORPORATION DER SCHIFFBAUER
AUS OSTIA CIL XIV 256

Die Liste CIL XIV (=Thylander, *Inscriptions du Port d'Ostie* B 344), nur bei Iucundus überliefert, enthält manche falsche Namen und sonst undurchschaubare Namenbildungen.

5 --- ARAMON zweifellos *P]aramon*. Ein guter griechischer Name, gehört zu Παράμωνος und Παραμένων. In Rom CIL VI 157 (131 n. Chr.) und ICVR 6466.¹

123 QVINASVS ist dunkel. Es liegt vielleicht der Name *Quintasius* vor. NT kann in Ligatur gestanden haben, oder es liegt eine Verlesung des einzigen Zeugen vor. *-us* für *-ius* bereitet keine Schwierigkeiten, da das neue Suffix *-ius* seit seinem Eindringen in die römische Namengebung sehr oft *-us* geschrieben wird; sicher ist die Schreibung *-us* im 3. Jh., aus welchem die Inschrift stammt, gut möglich. *Quintasius* ist ein Produkt der späteren Namengebung, bisher mit Sicherheit nur aus Afrika belegt (Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* 174), aber aus späterer Zeit sind Namen wie *Primasius Protasius* bekannt, so dass der Typ einigermaßen verbreitet war, auch ausserhalb von Afrika. Ein ausserafrikanischer Beleg liegt vielleicht in *Inscr Ital.* III 1, 263 vor; der Editor Bracco liest den Anfang *Aur]elio Quinasno* (schon CIL X 375, aber aus alten schlechten Kopien, in denen der Name verkannt wurde); anhand des Photos glaube ich den Namen *Quin[t]asius* zu erkennen.

¹ Auszuscheiden ICVR 14527, wo eher *Paramonus*, vgl. GGA 229 (1977) 105.

175 EPITTA ist zweifellos gleich *Epicta*. *Epictas* / -es ein guter griechischer Name, in Rom CIL VI 17204. 17211. ICVR 4657. 8857 (hier sogar *Epittas*). Sonst Cod.Inst. 3,31,3 (205 n.Chr.).

208 ACHIDENVS ist dunkel. Vielleicht *Acidinus*?

220 PVLLAS, wenn richtig überliefert, könnte zur Sippe *Pullus* (Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* 299f.) gehören. Das Suffix -as ist in der lateinischen Namengebung nicht ganz unproduktiv: *Longas Lucas Poplas* usw.

257 und 270 *Polychronus* ist gleich *Polychronius*, ein seit dem 3. Jh. gängiger Name.

275 DIOCAS steht für *Diogas* (im Index verkannt).

351 TVRANVS ist wohl *Tyrannus*.

352 PIVSIO ist wohl in *Plusio* zu emendieren. Πλουσίων ist ein guter griechischer Name (Bechtel, *Hist. Personennamen* 535). Nicht in Rom belegt, vgl. aber *Plusia Plusias*, beide öfters in Rom.

353 MARANVS vielleicht *Marianus*. Dieselbe Schreibung ICVR 1478.

Dessau verzeichnet im Kommentar zwei sichere Peregrine, *Arion Amoni fil.* 148 und *Chrysippus Ptolomei* 185. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia* 216 macht aus ihnen beiden Ägypter, aber unnötigerweise, denn *Ptolemaeus* ist überall in der hellenistisch-römischen Welt verbreitet. Bei *Ammonius* ist die Chance ägyptischer Herkunft grösser, wenn auch dieser Name in der griechisch-römischen Namengebung einigermaßen Eintritt gefunden hat. Ägypter könnte vielleicht noch *Valerius Trimorus* 261 sein. *Sacrilis* 265 könnte ein keltischer Name sein. *Servilius Belli* 323 und *Antonius Bervi* 333 könnten, wenn die Namen richtig und ungekürzt überliefert sind, auch peregriner Herkunft sein. Weiterhin ist *Paramon* (s. oben) häufig in Ägypten belegt, die Normalform dort ist aber Παράμμων, und *Paramon* lässt sich bestens aus dem Griechischen erklären.

LIII. WEITERES ZU OSTIENSISCHEN NAMEN

Thylander, *Inscriptions du Port d'Ostie* A 234 SPAE IZOTICE. *Spae* soll Gentiliz sein und *Izotice* ein prothetisches *i* haben. z er-

hält aber nur in präkonsonantischer Stellung einen prothetischen Vokal. Der Vater heisst *Edychrus*, das für *Hedychrus* steht (im Index verkannt), ist also wohl Sklave, so dass auch die Tochter mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit Sklavin sein wird. Wenn dem so ist, kann kein Gentiliz vorliegen. So schlage ich vor, *Spaei Zotice* zu lesen. Die Tochter hätte zwei Cognomina, *Spes* und *Zotice*, beide durchaus häufig im Sklavenmilieu.

A 181 *L. Mindio Diocae*. Am Photo ist jedoch G für C erkennbar. Es ist also *Diogae* zu lesen, nicht nur zu verstehen, wie in CIL XIV 256, 257 (vgl. oben).

In A 79 soll nach dem Index *Fucarius* vorliegen. Aber E statt F und wegen *-vie* wohl Frauennamen. Etwa *Fla]vie Eucarpiae* oder *Euc(h)aridi*.

A 28. Vom Editor ist verkannt worden, dass *IHERAX* für *Hierax* steht.

A 102. Das unverständliche *IVSNO* (nach dem Photo scheint die Lesung sicher) ist wohl in *Ius<ti>no* zu emendieren.

A 110 und 196. Der Name ist *Pharnaces* nicht *Pharnax*.

A 22 *Sicundinus* ist natürlich *Secundinus*, was vom Editor verkannt wurde. Schlimmer aber, dass der Name derselben Person in A 23 *Si]cundinus* ergänzt wird.

CIL XIV 1056 = Thylander B 75 *Flaviae Tyrallidi*. Von Dessau in der Edition mit *sic* versehen, aber im Index ohne Sternchen. Thylander hat natürlich nichts bemerkt. Der Name war *Pyralis*. T für P entweder Verschreibung oder Verlesung.

LIV. VERKANNTTE IDENTITÄTEN

CIL VI S. 3430f. wird eine Liste von Inschriften gegeben, die P.E. Visconti im Volusiermonument und sonst in der Vigna Amendola und Umgebung abgeschrieben hatte (Cod.Lanciani 3f. 69-76). Von den als *Inedita* angegebenen stand aber im CIL schon die vorletzte der lateinischen Inschriften in der Liste auf S. 3431: VI 11474 (im Lateranmuseum von Henzen gesehen), und zwar besser; es handelt sich

B) TERRA.LEVI.TUMULO.LEVIÓR.NÉ.DEGRAVET.OSSÁ
 PAVPERIS.INPOSITVM.SVSTINET.ARTE.SVPER
 IVNIA.FORMOSAS.INTER.MEMORANDA.PVELLA
 IVNIA.CASTARVM.HERBES.IN.VRBE.DECVS
 IN.CINERES.VERSSA.ESS.TVMVLOQVE.INCLVSA.
 [CICADAE
 DICERIS.CONIVNXS.VNA.FVISSE.VIRI

Die Textgestaltung lässt einiges zu wünschen übrig, wie auch der Kommentar und die Übersetzung. Ferner ist dem Herausgeber entgangen, dass die Inschrift schon bekannt ist. Sie wurde nach Pinders Abschrift von Henzen BullInst. 1863, 41 und dann CIL VI 14404 veröffentlicht. Henzen konnte sie nicht mehr wiederfinden. Auch CLE 1038. Die Textform von Henzen ist auch nicht einwandfrei, denn Pinder konnte die kursive Schrift anscheinend nicht gut lesen.

1 *L. Carisius L.l. Gemellus* richtig Henzen. Der Unterschied von E und I ist minimal, und zweifellos liegt hier das Gentilicium *Carisius* vor.

2 las Henzen aus Pinders Abschrift IVNIAE R L C F L; aufgrunddessen er und Bücheler verschiedene Konjekturen machten, die nicht stehen können. Der neue Editor ist auf der richtigen Spur (nur ist die Angabe des Herrn deutlich *Q.l.*, nicht *A.l.*). Ich sah die Inschrift im Frühjahr 1978, doch das Ende der Zeile war bereits verschollen, so dass man sich auf das nicht allzu scharfe Photo des Ausstellungskatalogs verlassen muss. MELA scheint sicher. Nach den Buchstabenresten zu schliessen (ich glaube auf dem Photo nach MELA und der Lücke von einem Buchstaben einen vertikalen Strich und ein A zu erkennen) ist *Melania* wohl möglich. Möglich auch *Melaena* (freilich bereitet EN etwas Schwierigkeiten), belegt CIL VI 38405, oder *Melanta*; allerdings sind sowohl *Melanta* als auch *Melantha* Männernamen (Μελάντας Bechtel Hist. Personennamen 303, *Melantha* CIL VI 10385).

Das Gedicht hat Rodríguez nicht gut verstanden, wie seine Übersetzung verrät. 2 ist zu verstehen *pauperis arte superimpositum tumulum sustinet*. 3 *puella*[s ist sicher; S wurde gesehen von Pinder und ist auch durch den Apex über A sichergestellt. 4 HERBES von

Rodríguez ist Nonsens, auch HOC ES von Pinder und Henzen ist nicht möglich, wie man auf dem Photo sieht. Ich wage *heu, bis* (E und I sind, wie gesagt, in der Inschrift fast identisch, aber der vorletzte Buchstabe scheint eher ein I zu sein). *Bis* meint die zweifache Tugend der Verstorbenen, ihre *formositas* und ihre *castitas*. 5 *Cicada*: die von Mommsen und Bücheler vorgebrachten künstlichen Erklärungen entfallen, nachdem Rodríguez richtig gesehen hat, dass *Cicada* der Name des Besitzers des Grabes ist. Kein üblicher Name, bezeugt als Männer- und Frauenname (Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* 333). 6 *una* Enallage, häufig bei *unus*. - Dem Ausstellungskatalog entsprechend wurde das Kolumbarium im Jahre 1958 entdeckt. Ich überlasse es den römischen Archäologen zu untersuchen, ob sich darüber nicht ebenfalls ältere Notizen finden lassen.

LVI. VARIA URBANA

1. *Calpurnia Salvia*. [Sp]urius Nicepo[r hic es]t situs. *Calpurnia Hilara*. *Sibi et patro[nis] posuit Emagenes*. So veröffentlicht A. Sadurska, *Klio* 52 (1970) 383 eine neue stadtrömische Inschrift. Über den bizarren Namen *Emagenes* verliert sie kein Wort. Die Editoren von *AE* 1974, 22 vermuten (H)e(r)magenes. Der übliche Name war aber *Hermogenes*; Ἑρμαγέννης, bekannt im Griechischen, kann ich nicht im römischen Bereich belegen. Alles deutet darauf hin, dass *imagines* zu verstehen ist. Anhand des von Sadurska beigefügten nicht guten Photos würde man freilich EMAGENES oder höchstens IMAGENES lesen, dass aber der Sinn *imagines* fordert, liegt ausser Zweifel. Der Text steht unter zwei Frauenporträts. Der unter dem linken Porträt stehende Text ist zu lesen *Calpurnia Salvia*. [F]urius (also nicht [Sp]urius) Nicepo[r hic es]t situs, der rechts stehende *Calpurnia Hilara sibi et patro[nae] posuit imagines*. Sadurska sieht in den zwei Frauen Schwestern, aber *Calpurnia Hilara* ist jedenfalls eine Freigelassene von *Salvia*. *Furius Nicephor* war anscheinend der Mann von *Calpurnia Salvia*; weil sein Porträt fehlt, wurde *hic situs est* hinzugefügt. - *Posuit imagines* lässt sich öfters in Grabinschriften belegen.

2. Die von Ferrua, *RendPontAccArch.* 48 (1975-1976 [1977]) 373 Nr. 9 Abb. 3 a veröffentlichte Inschrift ist interessant. Ferrua

ergänzt *Pius Aug.ñ.* [*lib.*, aber der Zusatz *noster* ist üblicher in der Nomenklatur kaiserlicher Sklaven als in der der Freigelassenen. Also ebensogut *Aug.ñ.* oder *Aug.ñ.* [*ser.* Ein Homonym begegnet uns in einem römischen Bronzesignaculum CIL XV 8025, das lautet *Pius Aug.ñ.* Es scheint sich um ein und denselben Kaiserdiener zu handeln.

3. ICVR 1567, gesehen von de Rossi, lautet CONCIO COSMO HELPI COSMVS MVSER PATER. Eigentümlich ist *Helpi*. *Helpis* ist durchweg Frauennamen (die wenigen Ausnahmen, wo ein Männername vorliegt, sind von Masson, ZPE 16 [1975] 36, 20 [1976] 232 zusammengestellt worden). Weil auch *Helpis* der Flexion *Helpid-* (oder *Helpin-*) folgt, während mir von *Helpi-* keine Belege bekannt sind, geziemt es sich, hier die Abkürzung eines Agnomens *Helpi(dianus)* zu sehen. - MVSER könnte für *miser* stehen.

NOTES ON THE NEW
EPICCHARMEAN 'IATROLOGY'

H o l g e r T h e s l e f f

Eric Turner, with Eric Handley as his deuteragonist, recently published an interesting papyrus fragment of Doric tetrameters.¹ Their reasons (49-54, 57f.) for regarding the piece as Epicharmean - in a broad sense - seem to me on the whole convincing. Some details may however require modification.

The problem of the short vowel plural accusative ending of o and α stems (50) is indeed a complicated matter. The tendency to use the short form before consonant and the long form before vowel, seen in some Cretan inscriptions,² cannot as far as I know be ascertained elsewhere. In general the short form, where it occurs, is a less common variety beside the long form. In literary Doric prose the short form does not appear at all.³ In Doric poetry it is used for metrical convenience without any conspicuous preferences in sandhi or syntax (such as using the short form in unstressed words, as Epich. fr. 170,13 Kaib. τὸς ἀνθρώπους would suggest).⁴ In the extant Epicharmea, note in addition to the instances mention-

1 WS N.F. 10, 1976, 48-60.

2 Buck, Greek Dialects², § 78; cf. Thumb & Kieckers § 141,18b, Schwyzer Gr. Gr. 1,556 with ref.

3 Cf. H. Thesleff, Introd. to the Pythag. Writings, Acta Acad. Aboensis, Hum. 24,3, Åbo (Finland) (1961), 85; 92-96. But to some extent this may be due to a normalising tradition.

4 Gow, in his edition of Theocritus, 1,LXXIII n.1, is hardly right in assigning the short forms to Coan influence.

ed by Turner and Handley (which are from the 'Αρπαγαύ and from Alcimus' collection respectively), from the Ἡβας γάμος fr. 42,3 Kaib. πορφύρα̃ς, but 10 τᾶς (relative); fr. 54,2 καλλίστοῦς (but the context is not certain); fr. 67 ἐκτραπελογάστοῦς; from the Μεγαρύς fr. 90,1 πλευρά̃ς; from the Σευρήνες fr. 124,1 ἀφύα̃ς. Most cases of plural accusative stand in anceps position or before consonant, and the normal spelling of o stem accusatives in such cases is -οῦς.⁵ I do not think there is sufficient material to indicate positively that the usage of the papyrus is Epicharmean in particular, nor indeed whether it is authentically Epicharmean or Pseud-epicharmean. - In this connection it may be noted that δυσπνοος in v. 24 of the papyrus is unlikely to be an accusative plural, as Handley tentatively suggests (59), because the normal spelling would be -οῦς unless the short form is required by the metre.

For the metrical problems of v. 17 (Turner 51), see below.

It is true that τεσσάρων v.3 (Turner 51) is the only clearly non-Doric form in the piece (viz., the only form that is not easily acceptable in literary Doric). The correct Doric form would be τεττόρων,⁶ and the author has not used it, as is shown by the metre. Rather than explaining the long first syllable as an occasional Epicharmean homerism, I would interpret it as a normal Pseudepicharmean lapsus.

There is at least one additional linguistic indication that the text was produced in the 4th century rather than in the 5th (or 6th). The connective δῆ seen in v. 3 and, probably, in v. 6 (if there is no eavesdropper, see below), is more typical of 4th century than of 5th century Greek;⁷ and two instances in this brief fragment are together rather symptomatic.

For ἦ ὄτι and the eavesdropper, see below.

5 E.g. fr. 42 passim, 88, 136,2, 161,1; 'Pseudepich.' fr. 254,5, 255-257.

6 E.g. Epich. fr. 149,2, 3 Kaib. - not τεττόρων which is pseudo-Doric and only found in Timaeus Locrus as far as I know.

7 Denniston, Greek Particles², 237f.

*

The main part of the fragment I would read as follows:

- 2 αὔτις ἐνλαυτός, διότι ἐν αὐτὸς αὐτῶι πάν[τ' ἔχει.
 τεσσάρων δὴ δεῦ λαβεῦν ὥραν τριμήνων λ[όγον, ὅκα
 ὁ νοσέων νοσεῦ τις ἢ ὁ τι. πολλάκις γὰρ τυγχ[άνει
 5 κατ τὰς ἀλικίας ἐκάστας καὶ τὰς ὥρας ταὶ γ[όσου
 συμπύτνουσαι. τοῦτο δὴ 'στι χαλεπὸν, αὖ κα [τ]υγ[χάνη
 παιδίωι χειμῶνος ὥραν συμπετοῦσα τις γ[όσος.
 ἔστι γὰρ χειμ[

Comments:

V. 2 αὔτις may sound a bit strange here, and the reading is not perhaps absolutely certain. But weak 'adversative' αὔθις (αὔτις) seems to have been in colloquial use in the 4th century.⁸

I accept Parsons' supplement of the verse as practically certain. The problem of the relation of this etymologising line to Euripides fr. 862 Nauck⁹ is particularly interesting in view of the other contacts known to exist between Epicharmean and Euripidean sentences.¹⁰ In this case at least a direct dependence is probable considering the specific iambo-trochaic formulation ἐν αὐτὸς αὐτῶι πάντα in both passages. I suspect that Euripides, the pupil of the sophists, should be given the priority.

Vv. 3 - 4. With some modification of Handley's supplement, and accepting his motives for excluding the eavesdropper from the scene (59), I would read λαβεῦν...λ[όγον which makes perfect sense, and [...ὅκα]...νοσεῦ τις ἢ ὁ τι which produces three 'variables' to be taken into account in curing diseases, season, patient and symptom: "Now, one must take account of four three-monthly seasons when the patient, whoever he is, is ill, or whatever (he suffers from)". The combination ὁ νοσέων...τις seems to be in order; in

8 Cf. Alexis fr. 245,8 Kock; and Men. Sam. 626(281), 637(292) to which Turner refers.

9 ἐνλαυτός is called so ὁθούνεκα | ἐν (αὐτὸς) αὐτῶι πάντα συλλαβῶν ἔχει.

10 See the references in Vorsokr. 1⁸ 194.

addition to the Sophoclean illustration produced by Handley (59), one might refer to the Aristotelean ὁ τῆς ἀνθρώπου.¹¹ It is curious that a similar elliptic use of ἢ ὅτι has been found in, and indeed only in Epicharmus;¹² the exact context is unknown, but the commentary glosses ἢ ὅτι as ἢ τὸ τυχόν and paraphrases ῥᾶστα ἄν τοῦτ' ἐργασάμην ἢ τὸ τυχόν which presumably implies the sense "or whatever you like". And this sense, by the way, would not really suit the eavesdropper theory which requires in ἢ ὅτι the meaning "or something of the sort".

Vv. 4 - 5. The 'schema Pindaricum' with proleptic τυγχ[άνει is hardly very remarkable though no exact parallels have been recorded in the handbooks.¹³ The author may have begun constructing his verse with the more sophisticated νοσηματα in his mind.

V. 6. Possibly the author felt πύτνω to be the authentic Doric present corresponding to the Doric aorist ἔπετον which he employs in v. 7. We can hardly prove that πύτνω is not Doric; but we can reasonably assume that it is a pseudo-Doric archaism, as it is very commonly used in tragedy.

Vv. 6 - 7. [τ]υγ[χάνη and τῆς γ[όσος are in my opinion rather unavoidable supplements (in spite of Turner's doubts, 56; cf. Handley 59). The photograph does suggest τῆς, and I understand Turner (cf. 53) would not regard it as entirely impossible.

V. 12. Rather ἐφή[βωι than hyper-Doric ἐφά[βωι, but there are of course many possibilities.

V. 13. A form or derivation of νοῦσος is even less likely because the stem νοσ- is used elsewhere in the papyrus.

V. 17. I cannot see that ἔπτ' ἐν τᾷ φύσει is satisfactory (Turner 56), even from a factual point of view: the hebdomatic speculations of Ps.-Hippocrates Hebd., chapters 1-11, have been shown to be late Hellenistic by J. Mansfeld.¹⁴ The photograph would seem

11 LSJ s.v. τῆς A II 10.

12 Ὀδυσσεὺς Αὐτομόλος, P.Oxy. 2429 fr.1 (a) col. II 10; Turner 51.

13 Kühner & Gerth 1,68f.; Schwyzer 2,608; cf. Handley 59.

14 The Ps.-Hippocratic Tract Π. ἑβδομάδων, Philosophical Texts and Studies 20, Assen 1971; this does not of course apply to ch. 16 to which Turner refers in an earlier passage (55).

to admit, for instance, -τοῦ τὸ θέρος ἔπει' (= ἔπειται; or ἔπει' = Att. ἔπεσε) ἐν ταῖς φύσει.

V. 24. δυσπνόςος, see above.

So I would agree with Handley (60) that the verses are more likely to come from a 4th century 'iatrologising' treatise than from a 5th century comedy. And so the Χύρων is a more likely source than Dinolochus' 'Ιατρός (Turner 53f.). For the Χύρων, cf. also Vorsokr. 1⁸,209 (with references). It is clear from fr. 290 Kaib. that the Χύρων was composed in trochaic tetrameters, and that the speaker was a doctor (presumably the Centaur) giving medical advice.

L I V Y 1 , 4 7 , 1 - 7 : A N O T E
O N T H E H I S T O R I C A L I N F I N I T I V E

T o i v o V i l j a m a a

Three elements typical of Latin historical prose which frequently occur in Livy's narrative are: (1) the insertion of direct or (2) indirect speech, and (3) the use of historical infinitives (infinitives of narration). By these methods Livy enlivens and dramatizes those moments where the chronological sequence of narrated events and acts is interrupted. Direct and indirect speech in the general structure of Livy's narrative has been extensively studied by philologists and literary critics, sometimes in minute detail, and the results of these investigations are well-known; thus there is no need to repeat them in this context.¹ As for the historical infinitive, everybody knows that it is one of the most widely discussed problems of the Latin language; however, though it is a narrative construction par excellence, suprisingly few studies have been devoted to an examination of it in the framework of narrative technique.²

1 For reference see P.G. Walsh, *Livy*, Cambridge 1961; A.H. McDonald, *JRS* 47 (1957) 155-172; R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*, Oxford 1965; and the articles in E. Burck (ed.), *Wege zu Livius*, Darmstadt 1967.

2 In a recent study S. Contino (*L'infinito storico latino*, Bologna 1977) tries to revive the old theory of ellipse using transformational terminology. The results of his study would be more convincing (see the criticism by B. Löfstedt in *Language* 54 [1978] 237-239), if he had explained more clearly the narrative structures underlying the use of the historical infinitive.

Of the numerous studies that deal with the historical infinitive I shall only mention the three I have found most useful. Leo Spitzer (Word 10 [1954] 442-456) compares the use of the construction in different languages and in different text-types and warns us not to explain all instances of independent infinitives in terms of a single overall meaning. André Lambert (Die indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius, Zürich 1946) emphasizes that in Livy historical infinitives most frequently occur in connection with indirect discourse. This use of the construction can be explained by the fact that both devices serve for dramatic elaboration of picturesque scenes. In his study of narrative expression in the Latin historians Jean-Pierre Chausserie-Laprée (L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins, Paris 1969) makes important observations about the use of the historical infinitive especially in scenes introduced by dramatic particles like *iam*, *tum vero*, *enimvero*. Because his purpose is to list and classify the types of narrative expression by statistical methods, he does not, however, attempt to formulate any linguistic definitions and contents himself with the well-known psychological explanations of the construction, for example, "it is the primary function of the historical infinitive, in its original form, to express direct, impetuous, unpremeditated action flowing from a strong impulse, feeling, or disposition..." (J.J. Schlicher, Class. Phil. 9 [1914] 287). The linguistic explanation is, however, necessary for the simple reason that the narrator needs to rely on the reader's or hearer's knowledge of the language. Just as the narrator can use lexical items with their various nuances of meaning, so has he at his disposal the patterns of the syntactic system and it is the reader's or hearer's intuition of these patterns that makes the narration understandable.

I have referred to the similar function of direct or indirect speech and the historical infinitive. In the structure of Livy's narrative they have the common property of being included in descriptions of situations. They have their place in those scenes with

which Livy creates a pause in the regular sequence of narrated events: the narrator depicts a situation which begins at a given moment and portrays persons involved in the situation in a way that enables the reader to make his own observations about the characters and motives of the persons. This method may be called "indirect characterization" (see Walsh, *op.cit.* 82-83). Instead of stating directly what the characters and their actions are like, the narrator uses their words and describes their whereabouts, habits, and mental or physical reactions. This method of indirect characterization has generally been pointed out in studies dealing with the use of direct and indirect speech in narrative. Sometimes also students of the historical infinitive have been compelled to make similar observations, see, for example, Schlicher in *Class. Phil.* 9(1914) 288-289 and 290: "Hence it is not simply a rhetorical device, but an accurate description of what takes place, to portray the meeting of friends or relatives, as in I,15 (= *Claud.Quadr.* 39 P), by *comprehensare suos quisque, saviare, amplexare*..." "It is rather the way in which the act impresses the speaker, and specially, the form which this impression assumes in view of the person to whom he is communicating it."

To illustrate the syntactic consequences of indirect characterization, I take a simple example. Because the person involved in a narrated situation can be shown using words which express his mental or physical reactions, there may be in narrative texts sentences which are difficult to analyse syntactically. On the basis of the numerous instances in Livy where the verb *orare* occurs I compose the following three sentence-types, all possible in Latin:

- (a) *Tum ille: "Oro ut..."* (direct speech)
- (b) *Tum ille se orare ut...* (indirect speech)
- (c) *Tum ille orare ut...* (historical infinitive or indirect speech?)

The syntactic ambiguity of (c) follows from the fact that in Latin the narrator can insert the speeches, words or thoughts of individuals into the narrative without any introductory *verbum dicendi*.

This phenomenon is very common and it naturally makes for dramatic effect.

From the above observation it is easy to proceed to a linguistic explanation of the historical infinitive. By what means are we able to identify indirect discourse? The answer is: by observing the syntactic structure. The formal realization of indirect discourse follows the syntactic patterns in Latin, which indicate that it is syntactically subordinate. And in the grammatical description we can state that the indirect speech is a complement to a subordinator which belongs to the semantic class of *verba dicendi*, irrespective of whether the subordinator is realized in the actual utterance or not. If the introductory verb is missing, nobody, I think, would claim that there is an ellipse at the level of actual linguistic expression. But it may be necessary to explain this as an ellipse when the utterances are analysed at a more abstract level. For instance the accusative with an infinitive construction is indicative of syntactic subordination, and, in my opinion, the case is similar when the infinitive occurs with the subject-nominative: the construction indicates its syntactic relationship to a subordinator; compare, for example, the following "complete" sentences: [*ille orare*] *videbatur*; [*ille orare*] *coepit*.

I shall illustrate my view of the matter by analysing the structure of Livy's narrative in 1,47,1-7. The passage is part of the tragic story of the last days of Servius Tullius, the sixth king of Rome,³ and it begins the second act of the story. L. Tarquinius and Tullia, the king's daughter, have committed their first criminal act. Murdering their spouses, Tullia's sister and Tarquinius' brother, they have cleared the way for their own marriage and are now ready to attack the king himself. Livy, however, does not directly proceed to the events of the second act, but first concentrates on the new situation. By portraying the persons and their

3 For the form of the story and its development in Roman historical tradition see Ogilvie, *op.cit.* 184-187.

activities he is preparing for the account of actual events.

Situation:	<i>TUM VERO in dies infestior Tulli senectus,</i>
(A) Servius Tullius	<i>infestius COEPIT regnum esse;</i>
(B) Tullia	<i>IAM ENIM ab scelere ad aliud spectare mulier scelus. Nec nocte nec interdium virum con-</i> <i>quiescere pati, ne gratuita praeterita par-</i> <i>ricidia essent: non sibi defuisse...</i>
B ¹ (indirect speech)	
B ² (direct speech)	<i>"Si tu is es..."</i>
B ³ (Livy's comment)	<i>His aliisque increpando iuvenem instigat,..</i>
(C) Tarquinius	<i>HIS MULIEBRIBUS INSTINCTUS FURIIS Tarquinius</i> <i>circumire et prensare minorum maxime gentium</i> <i>patres; admonere paterni beneficii ac pro eo</i> <i>gratiam repetere; allicere donis iuvenes;</i> <i>cum de se ingentia pollicendo tum regis</i> <i>criminibus omnibus locis crescere.</i>
Event:	<i>POSTREMO...in forum inrupit...</i>

There are three persons participating in the situation. All have their own roles: the victim (A), the instigator (B), and the performer of the act (C). The division into roles forms the disposition of Livy's description.

In (A) Livy expresses the situation of the king very briefly, using two structurally parallel phrases which draw attention to two important factors in his position: he is an old man (*Tulli senectus*) and he is a king (*regnum*). Because of these factors his life is threatened. The external factor which makes the situation even more menacing for him is the change brought about by the previous act of the criminal couple (*tum vero*).

In (B) Livy describes Tullia's behaviour and concentrates upon the motives which made her persuade her new husband to kill her own father. Because the character of Tullia is the most important in the story, this part of the description is most extensive. Tullia's motives and her character are presented in three different ways: in indirect speech, in direct speech, and in the narrator's comment.

Finally, in (C) Livy focuses attention on Tarquinius' activities. By employing expressions commonly used in connection with electioneering (see Ogilvie, op.cit. 190) he gives the reader the impression of Tarquinius' acting like a candidate, in devious ways but for a definite purpose.

The whole scene is clearly separated from the rest of the story. It begins with *tum vero* and is interrupted by the adverb *postremo*, with which Livy begins his account of the events themselves (note the perfect form of the predicate). It is the use of adverbs that gives the impression of unity to the scene. The description is divided into parts according to the roles in the situation, but Livy connects the parts in a way which strengthens the impression of unity. *Tum vero* opens the scene. In the chronological sequence of the story it marks the moment to which all the states and activities of the narrated situation are related. *Iam enim* (B) connects the portrayal of Tullia's behaviour to the preceding *infestior* and *infestius*. The description of Tarquinius activities is connected to the preceding part by the phrase *his muliebribus instinctus furiis*.

A most remarkable contribution to the unity of the description is made by the fact that all the predicates indicating the state, behaviour, or activity of the persons are infinitives: *infestior... infestius esse* (A); *sperare, pati* (B); *circumire, prensare, admonere, gratiam repetere, allicere, crescere* (C). The verbs are those that can normally occur in Latin narrative as historical infinitives.⁴ However, according to traditional Latin grammar only those in (B) and (C) are classified as historical infinitives, whereas the infinitive phrases in (A) are classified as object complements of the predicate *coepit*. But this classification is inconsistent with

⁴ Compare Liv. 2,6,1; 2,22,6; 3,11,9-10; 3,12,5-6; 3,14,5; 3,17,10; 3,69,3-5; 7,12,12-14; 9,7,9-12; 22,22,21; 27,20,9-10; 40,56,7; and the lists in Schlicher, op.cit. 282-292, and W. Dressler, Studien zur verbalen Pluralität, Wien 1968, 130-140. With *coepit*, e.g. Liv. 3,47,2, cf. Caes. civ. 2,28,2.

the reader's impression of the unity of the scene. In my opinion, all the infinitives have the same place in a description of the syntactic structure, because they denote simultaneous states and activities and are all related to the moment which opens the situation (*tum vero coepit*). It is for this reason that here, and often also in passages where no form of *coepi* occurs in the context, the historical infinitives are conceived to be complements of an aspectual verb, like *coepi*.

The above analysis of infinitive constructions implies a revision of the usual concept of the syntax of auxiliary verbs like *coepi*. Many problems connected with the syntactic behaviour of *coepi* may be solved if it is considered to be, not a transitive which takes infinitives as object complement, but an intransitive aspectual verb which takes entire propositions as complement. This is, in my opinion, also consistent with the notion "aspect", if it is defined semantically as the narrator's concept of action or being.⁵

Note that I am not proposing that all instances where independent infinitives occur in Latin narratives should be explained in the same way, and I am certainly not claiming that there is an ellipse of *coepi* at the level of actual expression (see, the discussion above about indirect discourse where there is no overt introductory verb). In many cases, however, a form of *coepi* may be added without causing any substantial change in meaning. The reason is that historical infinitives occur in narrative episodes where the narrator portrays situations as reactions to or continuations of preceding events. It is the form of the construction (infinitive with subject-nominative) and the way it is inserted in the narrative that indicate the syntactically subordinate status of the historical infinitive.

⁵ I discuss the problems of the syntax of *coepi* in an article entitled "Coepi, a problem in Latin syntax" (in *Four Linguistic Studies in Classical Languages*, Publ. of the Dept. of General Linguistics, Univ. of Helsinki, 5 [1978]).

E U R I P I D E S M E D E I A 2 1 4 - 2 2 1
U N D E N N I U S

H e n r i k Z i l l i a c u s

Κορύνθιαι γυναῖκες, ἐξῆλθον δόμων,
μή μοι τι μέμνησθ': οἴδα γὰρ πολλοὺς βροτῶν
σεμνοὺς γεγῶτας, τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο,
τοὺς δ' ἐν θυράοις· οἱ δ' ἄφ' ἡσυχου ποδῶς
δύσκλειαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ῥαθυμίαν.
δίκη γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς βροτῶν,
ὅστις πρὶν ἄνδρὸς σπλάγχχνον ἐκμαθεῖν σαφῶς
στυγεῖ δεδορκῶς, οὐδὲν ἠδικοημένως.

Es gibt wenige Stellen griechischer Tragödie, die so zahlreiche und kontroversielle Interpretationen veranlasst haben, wie die einleitenden Worte der Medeia, mit denen sie vor dem Chor der korinthischen Frauen hervortritt. Meine Absicht ist nun keineswegs, diese ganze Frage aufs neue aufzurollen. Selbst ein Forschungsbericht mit Anspruch an Vollständigkeit würde kaum der Mühe wert sein. Hier sei nur kurz auf die wichtigsten Erörterungen in späterer Zeit hingewiesen: D. Page, Euripides Medea (Oxford 1938) 87f.; J.E. Harry, Médée énigmatique, RPh. 13 (1939) 5-20; O. Regenbogen, Randbemerkungen zur Medea des Euripides, Eranos 48 (1950) 21-56; P. Mazon, De quelques vers d'Euripide, RPh. 27 (1953) 119-121; U. Schindel, Euripides' Medea 214-221, Hermes 91 (1963) 491-499. Auf die endlose Argumentation über den Sinn von 216f. τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο, τοὺς δ' ἐν θυράοις will ich nicht weiter eingehen. Trotz den ausführlichen Einwendungen von Harry (12-18) und Schindel

(496f.) scheint mir die Interpretation des Scholiasten endgültig statthaft: τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ χωρίζεσθαι καὶ ἀποθεῖν τῶν ὀμμάτων εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ διὰ τὸ προέρχεσθαι καὶ συνεχῶς ἐπιφαίνεσθαι. Hierüber sind Page, Regenbogen und Mazon einig, vgl. Page (87): "as well abroad as in seclusion", Regenbogen (29): "solche, die sich den Blicken entziehen, und solche, die sich draussen unter den andern bewegen", Mazon (120): "aussi bien parmi ceux qui fuient tous les regards que parmi ceux qui se montrent en public".

Wesentlich diskutabler scheint mir die Interpretation von σεμνοῦς. Mit kleineren Variationen haben sich alle Philologen moderner Zeit der Auffassung des Scholiasten angeschlossen, wonach σεμνός in der pejorativen Bedeutung 'hochmütig', 'stolz' zu verstehen wäre, vgl. schol. ἐξῆλθον πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὧ γυναικες, ἵνα μή μοί τι μέμψησθε ὡς δι' ὑπερηφάναν μὴ προσελθούση. Als Gewährsmann wird auf Eirenaios (1. Jh. n. Chr.) hingewiesen. Vgl. auch Photios: σεμνόν· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑπερηφάνου τιθέασιν. Εὐριπίδης Μηδεία. Die älteste Interpretation der betr. Zeilen stellt indessen die Übersetzung oder Paraphrase von Ennius dar, von Cicero Ep. ad fam. VII 6,1 (ad Trebatium) wiedergegeben: *nam multi suam rem bene gessere et publicampatria procul; multi qui domi aetatem agerent, propterea sunt improbati.* In der Nachfolge des Ennius notieren wir A. Poliziano, Miscell. 27: *Quando multi honesti procul a patria, multi contra domi fuerunt inglorii - -; Barnes, Euripidis quae exstant omnia... (Cambridge 1694): novi etiam multos homines, qui clari fuerunt, alios quidem procul a conspectu, alios vero inter suos: alii vero ex eo, quod quieverunt, comparaverunt sibi infamiam et opinionem ignaviae; Heath, Notae sive lectiones ad Tragicorum Graecorum veterum quae supersunt dramata (Oxford 1762): Novi etiam multos, qui venerationem ab hominibus assecuti sunt, partim procul ab oculis hominum remoti atque abdit, partim in exteris regionibus vitam exigentes; illi autem, qui otiosi aetatem inter cives egerunt, et malam existimationem nacti sunt et ignavi devenerunt.* Von der späteren Forschung wird die ennianische Interpretation kaum mehr notiert. Nur Harry (8) bemerkt sarkastisch: "Il est étonnant que

la lourde interprétation d'Ennius reparaît de nos jours encore dans la collection d'Everyman: 'I have known full many who obtained fame and high rank...'

Man fragt sich: Ist die ennianische Interpretation durchgehend "lourde" ?

Zeitlich steht Ennius mit seiner Interpretation dem Original am nächsten. Ausserdem war er ein hervorragender Hellenist. Vielleicht könnte dasselbe von Cicero gesagt werden! Dass Ennius trotzdem mit seiner 'Übersetzung' ἐν θυραίοις = *patria procul* den Gedankengang des Euripides missverstanden hat, ist einleuchtend. Nach O. Skutsch, *On the Medea of Ennius* (Studia Enniana 1968) 166-174, hätte es sich nicht um ein Missverständnis gehandelt: Ennius hätte den Sinn bewusst geändert und zwar weil er an seine eigene Situation als Fremde in Rom gedacht hätte. Dem sei nun wie ihm wolle - stillschweigend (und irrelevant) bezieht Cicero das Zitat dann auf die Situation des Trebatius im fernen Britannien.

Hieraus folgt aber keineswegs, dass auch die Übersetzung *clari* falsch wäre. Die primäre und gewöhnlichste Bedeutung von σεμνός ist ohne weiteres 'ehrwürdig', 'erhaben', 'ehrenwert'. Gewöhnlich werden hiermit Götter und göttliche Dinge charakterisiert. Dies ist aber nicht immer der Fall. Oft wird das Wort auch auf Sterbliche bezogen. Euripides gibt zwar selbst ein paar gute Beispiele der pejorativen Sekundärbedeutung 'hochmütig', 'stolz', 'vornehm tuend', z.B. Hipp. 94 τὺς δ' οὐ σεμνὸς ἀχθελνὸς βροτῶν. Öfter hat aber das Adjektiv bei ihm - auch wenn es sich um Sterbliche handelt - die primäre Bedeutung 'ehrenwert', usw., z.B. Hel. 454 (von Menelaos) οὐκοῦν ἐκεῖ που σεμνὸς ἦσθ', οὐκ ἐνθάδε; Rhés. 946 σεμνὸν πολύτην. Die Frequenz gestattet indessen keine sichere Schlussfolgerungen. Entscheidend für die Interpretation sind einerseits die psychologische Situation und der logische Zusammenhang, andererseits die Kontrastierung.

Welcher unrechten Beschuldigung will also Medeia entkommen, indem sie vor die Frauen heraustritt? Das einleitende γάρ könnte an und für sich darauf hindeuten, dass sie gerade dem Tadel für Hochmut entgehen will. Dieser Deutung widerspricht aber die seelische

Haltung der Medeia, so wie sie die Amme kurz vorher (20-45) dramatisch geschildert hat. Sie schwankt zwischen Apathie und Jammer, sie versäumt sowohl Essen als körperliche Pflege, sie ist ein Raub der tiefsten Verzweiflung. Diese Schilderung zeugt kaum für Stolz und Hochmut, für σεμνότης in der Bedeutung ὑπερηφανία. Eher kann dann die seelische Haltung der Medeia, so wie sie auf die Zuhörer wirkt, als Ratlosigkeit und Untätigkeit bezeichnet werden, also mit ῥαθυμία, selbst wenn man ein stärkeres Wort erwarten würde. Dieser ungerechten Beschuldigung will sie entgegentreten. Sie will zeigen, dass sie keiner Apathie anheimgefallen ist. Sie ist keine quantité négligeable, sie ist tatkräftig und sie wird handeln, wenn auch die Formen ihrer Aktivität noch im Dunkeln liegen. Geachtet, sagt sie, kann man leben sowohl in der Stille wie im Licht der Öffentlichkeit. Wer sich aber dem Umgang mit anderen Leuten entzieht, setzt sich leicht dem unberechtigten Vorwurf für Untätigkeit und Indifferenz aus: δύνη γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς βροτῶν.

Die eigentliche Schwierigkeit liegt in der Kontrastierung und im antithetischen Partikelgebrauch. δύσκλεια (übler Ruf) verlangt ihre Antithese - hier wird logisch σεμνοῦ (achtungswert) dargeboten. Die σεμνοῦ werden im regelmässig untergeordneten Gegensatzpaar τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο und τοὺς δ' ἐν θυραίοις gegliedert. Normaler Sprachgebrauch hätte zwar anstatt des οἷδα γάρ ('freilich') ein einleitendes οἷδα μὲν erwarten lassen. Vielleicht wollte Euripides das wiederholte μὲν meiden: οἷδα μὲν - - τοὺς μὲν würde kaum schön klingen. Die Gliederung γάρ - - δέ mag hart erscheinen, alleinstehend ist sie aber keinesfalls. Denniston, Greek Particles (1954²) 70 führt einige Beispiele an, z.B. Thuk. 4,132.2 καὶ ἐτύγχανε γὰρ τότε Ἰσχαγόρας ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος στρατιᾶν μέλλων περὶ πορεύσειν ὡς Βρασίδαν, ὁ δὲ Περδίκκας - - διεκώλυσε - - (δὲ von Dobrêe athetiert!). Noch klarer scheint mir Hdt. 5,50 χρεὼν γὰρ μιν μὴ λέγειν τὸ εἶναι, βουλόμενόν γε Σπαρτιήτας ἐξαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίην, λέγει δ' ὧν τριῶν μηνῶν φᾶς εἶναι τὴν ἄνοδον. Wir haben hier denselben konzessiven Anflug wie in der Ansprache der Medeia.

Summa summarum: Vielleicht war die Auffassung der Situation bei Ennius (und Cicero) nicht in allen Stücken so irrig wie sie im Urteil von zweitausend Jahren philologischer Forschung erscheinen kann.

DE NOVIS LIBRIS IUDICIA

Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana: Euripides: Orestes. Edidit Werner Biehl. 1975. LXI, 158 S. M. 40.-. -
Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae exstant omnia. Pars I: Scholia in Agamemnonem Choephoros Eumenides Supplices continentes. Edidit Ole Langwitz Smith. 1976. XXVIII, 218 S. M. 47.-. -
BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig.

In den letzten zwanzig Jahren haben mehrere wichtige Arbeiten (A. Turyn, 1957; G. Zuntz, 1965; V. Di Benedetto, 1965; A. Tuilier, 1968) das Bild der Euripides-Überlieferung geklärt. Auf dieser Grundlage sind neue Euripides-Editionen nötig. Nach der kommentierten Edition von V. Di Benedetto (1965) legt uns jetzt Werner Biehl eine neue, auf der Basis der Ergebnisse der vorgenannten und seiner eigenen, besonders auf Orestes konzentrierten Forschungen stehende Edition vor, die vortrefflich sowohl in der sorgfältigen Exposition des Textes als auch bezüglich der anderen Teile ist. In der Praefatio werden der "offene" Charakter der Texttradition und die Gaben der Papyri und der anderen Quellen (Testimonia, Imitationen usw.) erklärt; in zwei Anhängen wird der kritische Apparat ergänzt. Wie in anderen neuen Teubner-Editionen gibt es eine gute Bibliographie und eine Übersicht der Metrik, und hierzu noch eine detaillierte Übersicht der Konstruktion des Dramas.

Sehr willkommen ist der erste Teil der Edition der Scholien zu Aischylos von Ole Smith. Wir haben bisher keine moderne Edition aller Aischylos-Scholien gehabt - die letzte nach Vollständigkeit strebende Edition stammt von W. Dindorf, aus dem Jahre 1851; nach ihm sind Scholien einzelner Handschriften oder zu einzelnen Dramen veröffentlicht worden (N. Wecklein, 1885; A. Kirchhoff, 1880; F. Blass, 1906-1907; A. Turyn, 1943; G. Thomson, 1966; O. Smith, 1970). In der neuen Teubner-Edition sind jetzt die scholia vetera, die scholia proto-tricliniana (metrische Scholien) zu Agamemnon und Eumeniden und Triclinius' Scholien zu Agamemnon und Eumeniden sorgfältig, zuverlässig und klar dargelegt - eine nützliche Arbeit, deren zweiter Teil hoffentlich auch bald folgt. Maarit Kaimio

Emilio Bodrero: Heraclito. Testimonianze e frammenti. Ristampa anastatica invariata dell'edizione Torino, 1910. Philologica 3.
Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. XXXII, 212 p. Lit. 40000.
Bodrero's book on Heraclitus is probably regarded as classical in Italy, and so there is at least some motivation for a reprint.

Most non-Italians will consider the book manifestly out of date. This applies primarily to the expansive introductory essay on the philosophy of Heraclitus - a well-written and very personal approach, certainly, with an air of the days and haze of d'Annunzio. After all a great deal has happened in the world and in Pre-Socratic studies since 1905 when Bodrero dated his preface. The second part of the book gives Italian translations of the testimonies and fragments according to Diels² (which has not undergone substantial change in later editions), and some additional comments. The Pseudo-Heraclitan Epistles are also included. Some Greek-less readers are likely to find the translation of the testimonies and the doxography useful. But there are mistakes, misprints and many statements of doubtful accuracy.

H. Thesleff

Hermannus Usener: Glossarium Epicureum. Edendum curaverunt M. Gigante et W. Schmid. Lessico Intellettuale Europeo XIV. Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri, Roma 1977. XLVIII, 873 p.

The material for this Glossary was collected some hundred years ago when Hermann Usener was preparing his edition of Epicurea (1887, reprints 1963 and 1966). The original manuscript was kept in Bonn where it was slightly damaged during an air-raid in 1944. Fortunately a few copies had been taken, one of them for the Institute of Papyrology at Naples. Since the Berlin Academy has been unable to carry out their plans for a re-edition of all Epicurean texts together with a complete Index, the decision was made in Italy to publish Usener's Glossary approximately as the manuscript has it. Professors Marcello Gigante of Naples and Wolfgang Schmid of Bonn were trusted with the editorial work. The result is a substantial, beautifully produced volume, a remarkable achievement in many respects.

All Greek words that occur in Usener's Epicurean texts (he did not include, for instance, Diogenes of Oenoanda) are listed with ample quotations of the context and occasionally some brief notes of explanation or discussion, together with textual criticism. The list of occurrences is obviously intended to be complete for most words; selective examples are given only for very common words such as particles and εἶναι. The references are of course to editions current in Usener's time. Usener himself was a very accurate scholar, and as sample tests will show, the editors have managed to maintain his high standard, which must have involved much painstaking labour (not least on the part of the typesetter). The usefulness of the work is increased by a list of bibliographical references where some (rather too few) of the more recent works are also mentioned. There is an *Index Grammaticus* (pp. 741-772); and an Index of the vocabulary of Polystratus (pp. 773-811) was appended by Usener. The book concludes with an Index compiled by I.F. Fabiano to the Epicurean *Gnomologium Vaticanum*.

The book is not only a new and striking proof of the vitality of classical studies in Italy at the present time, and an act of

piety to the memory of Hermann Usener. It will also be of considerable service to many students of Greek philosophy and Greek language, and perhaps first and foremost to those concerned with the restitution of the text of Philodemus. H. Thesleff

Arrian. Vol. I: Anabasis Alexandri Books I-IV. New edition with an English translation by P.A. Brunt. The Loeb Classical Library No. 236. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. - William Heinemann Ltd, London 1976. LXXXVI, 547 p., map. £ 2.95.

The new edition of Arrian's *Anabasis* by Professor P.A. Brunt replaces that by E. Iliff Robson published in the Loeb series in 1929 (repr. up to 1961). The Greek text adopted by Brunt is that of the Teubner edition by A.G. Roos, revised by G. Wirth. Brunt's translation is based on that of Robson, now made more accurate and clearer by removing old fashioned expressions. Thus, the main concern of the new edition is not for the textual criticism but for the interpretation of the text. Now that there exists a vivid interest among historians in the age of Alexander the Great, an edition like this is surely welcome. In order to explain what Arrian says and to facilitate the evaluation of his work Brunt provides a thorough introduction, the necessary commentary on the text and fifteen appendices. The most interesting part of the edition is its introduction. As an introduction to the first volume it must necessarily be of a general nature; it deals therefore with Arrian's life and works, the principles involved in making the edition, the sources for history of Alexander, the Macedonians and their relations with Greece, Philip's last year and Alexander's accession, the Persian Empire and Alexander's army. These surveys form the necessary general background and there remains no place for a detailed discussion of Arrian's sources and historical methods. These questions Professor Brunt has promised to discuss in the second volume. We await with great interest the evidence for his claim that "Arrian was a simple, honest soul, but no historian". Paavo Hohti

Plotini opera. Ediderunt Paul Henry et Hans-Rudolf Schwyzer. Tomus II: Enneades IV-V. Oxford Classical Texts. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press 1977. XXXVI, 302 p. £ 7.50.

It is with great satisfaction that one welcomes the appearance in the OCT series of Volume II of P. Henry's and H.-R. Schwyzer's Plotinus. It includes Enneads IV (on the soul) and V (on the highest hypostases). One notes again in particular the high scholarly quality of the editors' work for which their *Editio Maior* (Paris, Brussels and Leyden, 1951-1973) has paved the way. H. Thesleff

Libanius: Selected Works. With an English translation, introduction and notes by A.F. Norman. Vol. II: Selected orations. The Loeb Classical Library No. 452. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. - William Heinemann Ltd, London 1977. XIV, 542 p. £ 3.40.

The second volume of Libanius' Selected Works contains orations from the Theodosian age and they are, as the editor points out, arranged as far as possible in chronological order. With his selection A.F. Norman appropriately gives the selections published by P. Wolf and J. Festugière, the criterion of the selection being to give translations of the orations which are not easily accessible elsewhere. The grounds for a selection from the great body of Libanius' orations is always debatable and the editor is fully conscious of the individual character of his choice. Nevertheless, the philologist and historian of the Theodosian age should be grateful for the clear and reliable translations. The orations are preceded by useful introductions and short notes on manuscripts and bibliography. The general bibliography supplies the main up-to-date information of the editions, translations, sources, and modern literature on the orations included in the volume.

Paavo Hohti

Cicero. Vol. X: In Catilinam I-IV. Pro Murena. Pro Sulla. Pro Flacco. With an English translation by C. Macdonald. The Loeb Classical Library No. 324. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. - William Heinemann Ltd, London 1977. XXXIX, 596 p. £ 3.40.

Apart from the text itself together with its relevant translation, this volume contains a general introduction, which deals with the years 60 to 50, a joint introduction to the Catiline speeches and separate introductions to the other three speeches. The work is designed to replace the 1937 L.E. Lord edition, which it does creditably. As far as the text is concerned, the work has nothing new to offer. For the most part it follows the Clark edition; there is no critical apparatus; and even the few textual remarks of a critical nature often seem redundant (for example, p. 40 and p. 64).

The real value of the work lies in its introductions - and, of course, in the new English rendering, an aspect the assessment of which does not properly belong here. As regards the speeches of the years 63-59, the general introduction to the 60's provides essential background information. At the same time it shows quite clearly (as the writer himself also points out) that our knowledge of the events of the 60's is in many respects not completely sound. The introduction to the Catiline speeches is extensive and is based on the most recent scholarly findings. This work contains a larger number of references to more recent literature than can be found in the earlier volumes of this series. Macdonald attempts to do justice to Catiline, mentioning, among other things, the stalwart support that the latter enjoyed in consular circles and Cicero's intention to defend Catiline in the mid 60's. On page 9, the writer states that it can be shown that many things were charged to Catiline's account that were in all probability quite false. Justifiably, Macdonald asks whether our sources do not give an exaggerated picture of the significance of the conspiracy.

This is a far-reaching question, since it is connected, in all classical research, with serious reservations as to the casual nature of our sources.

In his introduction to the Pro Murena speech, the writer describes, among other things, election machinations and the measures adopted to rid the system of its abuses in the Rome of Cicero's day and earlier. The introduction to the Pro Flacco speech, on the other hand, illustrates, for instance, the legislative measures taken to combat the extortion to which the inhabitants of the provinces were subjected in the century up to Cicero's time. In the introduction to the Pro Sulla speech, Macdonald looks for - and finds - reasons behind Cicero's defence of Sulla (who probably took part in Catiline's ventures), without endeavouring, however, to provide any completely final answer.

The speeches are all linked in one way or another with the Catiline episode and the fine introductions bestow upon the work a coherent and readable unity.

Raimo Tuomi

P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus. With a commentary by R.G. Austin. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press 1977. X, 303 p. £ 5.00.

To R.G. Austin's commentaries on Books I, II and IV of Virgil's Aeneid has been added a new volume, his posthumous commentary on Book VI (the author completed his work a few days before his death in 1974). The present volume contains the text (Mynors' Oxford Classical Text with some modifications), a detailed running commentary, an appendix on the Avernus topography by Colin Hardie and three indices (*Nominum, Verborum, Rerum*). Metric, linguistic, stylistic comments and those relating to content are profound and appropriate. The rhythmic qualities of the metrum are carefully assessed (e.g. the relation of accent and ictus). Virgil's position in the development of the language of the Latin epic is taken into account throughout. In his stylistic notes the author prefers describing the case in question to rhetoric formulations (enallage etc.). He pays special attention to the topographical aspects (e.g. the Cave of the Sibyl in the light of the most recent excavations). The author also cites parallel places from Roman literature (the context provided where necessary): from Ennius (see esp. pp. 93-94), Ovid and the poets of the Silver Age. But the treatment of Homer is, in my opinion, inadequate; the author ignores G.N. Knauer's important book (*Die Aeneis und Homer*, 1964) and on the whole pays no attention to the structural influence of Homer (*Odyssee XI*). Servius and Ti. Donatus are adequately represented. Austin repeatedly refers to certain important works (Norden on Aeneid VI, Frazer on Apollod. Bibl., Ogilvie on Livy I-V, Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace I), but ignores others (Knauer, see above; Büchner, whose RE article should be regarded as a living study, not as an encyclopaedic contribution; Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid*, 1968). Of the central Virgilian scholars Otis and Klingner are only consulted in passing.

In summa: In spite of some defects, particularly with regard to

the structure of the book and the unity of the work, Austin's post-humous commentary is an important contribution to the field of Virgilian scholarship and the most beautiful legacy he has bequeathed to us.

Teivas Oksala

Erik Wistrand: Miscellanea Propertiana. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XXXVIII. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 1977. 84 p. Sw.Cr. 50.-.

This book deals with some of the many controversial passages still found in Propertius' text and, somewhat unexpectedly, with one Livian passage (6,25,7-10). The introductory essay "Poetic Patriotism under Augustus" (pp. 8-30), which discusses the affinity between Prop. 3,4 and Hor.carm. 3,14, was the one which appealed to me most. Wistrand's arguments (pp. 9-14) in favour of his conjecture *Quiris*, instead of *viri*, in Prop. 3,4,3 and his interpretation (pp. 23-26) of *virginum...iuvenumque* and of *pueri et puellae* in Hor.carm. 3,14,9-10 impressed me as both well-considered and sound. The other essays do not perhaps quite reach this high standard. In addition to the *Index Locorum* and the *Index Rerum* and *Verborum* (pp. 81-84), the reader would have appreciated a separate Bibliography.

Saara Lilja

Giordana Pisi: Fedro, traduttore di Esopo. Università degli Studi di Parma, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Magistero 4. La Nuova Italia Editrice, Firenze 1977. 93 p. Lit. 3000.

The detailed lexical analysis of eight fables of Phaedrus, compared with the corresponding fables in Aesop, is in many ways a highly commendable work. The author's skill in interpretation is impressive, and so is her economy in saying much in a concise manner, at the same time giving all the necessary arguments in footnotes. Unfortunately some of her perceptive observations remain hanging in the air, since we do not know for certain how much the Greek text translated by Phaedrus differed from the version known to us, one which derives from a considerably later time. Be this as it may, Pisi's comparative study contributes to a better understanding of Phaedrus' creative approach to the traditional fables. It is a pity that Chapter V entitled "Aspetti formali" (pp. 75f.) was not given as much attention and care as the lexical analysis.

Saara Lilja

Manilius: Astronomica. With an English translation by G.P. Goold. The Loeb Classical Library No. 469. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. - William Heinemann Ltd, London 1977. CXXII, 388 p. £ 3.90.

It is with pleasure that one can announce that the Loeb Classical Library has at last published a work that is important in a scholarly sense, too. This edition of Manilius' *Astronomica* by G.P. Goold, in positive contrast to most predecessors in the series, actually approaches in many respects the editions of the Collection Budé. The main emphasis is still on the translation, but this has been preceded by a complete research of the text, including textual criticism, philological interpretation and an analysis of the contents. It is clear that only through this preparatory work can the translation acquire the reliability, which is required by editions used by people not able to check the original.

Noting this positive development in the Loeb Classical Library and expressing one's admiration for Dr. Goold for the completion of a two decades labour, one is bound to ask whether it is not time to change the editorial principles of the Library in the better interests of the reader. This applies above all to the critical apparatus, but also to the over concise notes; the introduction with several illustrative figures is good. But it is fair neither towards the editor, who has made an extensive independent study, nor towards the reader to announce that the information concerning different readings may be found in Housman's large edition.

Jorma Kaimio

Hygini qui dicitur de metatione castrorum liber. Edidit Antonino Grillone. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1977. XXIII, 28 S., 11 Illustrationen. M. 13.-.

Bei der vorliegenden Edition Grillones handelt es sich um eine im c. Arcerianus (saec. VI) überlieferte, ohne Grund Hygin beigelegte kurze Schrift (wahrscheinlich aus dem 3. Jh.), die einem hochgestellten Offizier als Anleitung für die praktische Handhabung der Lagervermessung dienen soll.

In einer ausführlichen *praefatio* der Ausgabe werden u.a. die Handschriften und die früheren Editionen besprochen. Durchaus angebracht ist die in einem *conspectu librorum* (S. XXI-XXII) beigebrachte Literatur sowohl über diese Schrift wie über die römischen Heereseinrichtungen im allgemeinen. Ein Vorzug ist ferner, dass der Herausgeber auf jeder Seite unter dem eigentlichen Text einen reichhaltigen Apparat bringt, in dem die betreffende Stelle, wenn nötig, mit ausgiebigen Parallelen und Literaturhinweisen versehen ist. Ein gutes Gesamtbild über die technischen Angaben der Schrift geben die dem Text nachgestellten 11 Illustrationen.

Der textkritische Apparat ist sehr ausführlich, vor allem im Vergleich zu dem der früheren Edition von Domaszewski (1887). Die Textgestaltung selbst ist trotz mehrerer glücklicher Emendationen des Herausgebers immer noch stellenweise problematisch, was mit einer starken Verderbtheit der einzigen massgebenden Hs. zusammenhängt. Was ich sehr bedaure, ist die Tendenz des Herausgebers zur Normalisierung der Sprache (z.B. 10 S. 5, 11 *libello ostendimus* statt *de libello o.* (A; Domaszewski). Der *notabilium index* (S. 24ff.) ist weniger sorg-

fältig und anschaulich, z.B. ein Hapax *gromaticus* (TLL VI,2,2335, 54ff.) findet sich unter *professores*, die alphabetische Reihenfolge der Wörter ist zuweilen nicht gewahrt (z.B. bei *v-*) usw.

Obgleich Grillones Ausgabe kein Musterstück einer Edition ist, hat sie mehrere Vorzüge und ist somit mit Freude zu begrüßen.

Reijo Pitkäranta

Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis. Vol. XL & XL A-C: Grammatici Hibernici Carolini Aevi. - Pars I: Murethach (Muridac): In Donati artem maiorem. Edidit Ludovicus Holtz. LXXXVI, 301 p. - Pars II: Ars Laureshamensis. Expositio in Donatum maiorem. - Pars III,1: Sedulius Scottus: In Donati artem maiorem. Pars III,2: Sedulius Scottus: In Donati artem minorem. In Priscianum. In Eutychem. Edidit Bengt Löfstedt. XV, 281 & XV, 480 & XXXVI, 154 p. - Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Turnholti 1977.

The edition of the ninth century commentaries on Donatus will be welcomed by classicists and students of medieval culture, not only because few grammatical writings of the Middle Ages have been edited so far, but especially because the new volumes form a unit which extensively documents the continuation of Latin grammatical tradition from late antiquity to the Dark Ages and which besides is a representative example of the Irish contribution to the Carolingian Renaissance. The editions are based on an accurate analysis of the mss. and, as can be expected of two eminent scholars, experts in codicology and medieval Latin, the result is excellent.

The editors adopt a cautious attitude to the questions of establishing an authentic text-form as well as to the quality of the commentaries. In medieval studies the influence of the wandering Irish (*Scotti peregrini*) on the culture of the Carolingian age has been largely discussed and variously appraised. The works of Irish grammarians support the opinion that their impact must not be overrated. Certainly, they mastered the Latin language and transferred the tools of learning (i.e. the traditional grammatical exegesis) from Ireland to the land of the Franks, but on the other hand they were not original thinkers and their knowledge of antiquity and classical literature was superficial and defective. It seems, however, that Holtz (p. LXXII) when emphasizing their technical skills of teaching is too severe in his estimate of their standard of knowledge (the text of Mur. 82,25sq. does not support the claim that the commentator considered Eunuchus and Orestes to be names of poets).

Each volume is provided with accurate *indices locorum*. The general index of the three commentaries on Don. mai. is added in Part III,1. In the introductory sections Holtz and Löfstedt discuss several larger and some minor topics: the manuscript tradition, the influence of the Irish savants and their relations to each other, the latinity and orthography of the commentaries etc. The discussions contain many interesting details and demonstrate the fruitfulness of Holtz's and Löfstedt's investigations. It is, therefore, with satis-

faction that one notes their promise (Preface to Part I) to prepare a larger study on Hibernolatin grammars. Toivo Viljamaa

*

Thesaurus linguae Latinae. Editus iussu et auctoritate consilii ab academiis societatisque diversarum nationum electi. Vol. VII,2 fasc. XI, *locus - ludibundus*. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1977. Sp. 1601-1760. M 24.-.

Dieser vorletzte Faszikel des Buchstabens L enthält eine Menge wichtige Wörter. Abgesehen vom Ende des Wortartikels *locus*, sind hier solche wichtige Sippen enthalten wie *loquor*, *lucrum*, *lucere lux*, *luctor*, *luctus*. Aber auch die selteneren Wörter beanspruchen das Interesse des Philologen, und man sieht wieder einmal deutlich, wie grundlegend dieses Wörterbuch ist. Vergleicht man das hier behandelte Material mit entsprechenden Partien eines gängigen Wörterbuches wie Georges, so sieht man einen gewaltigen Unterschied sowohl an Vollständigkeit, Zuverlässigkeit als auch an lexikographischer Interpretation.

Ich mache diesmal auf einige Eigentümlichkeiten der Zitierweise aufmerksam. Bei der Zitierung von metrischen Inschriften möchte wenigstens der Epigraphiker neben CE auch die CIL-Nummer sehen, weil er so den Beleg gleich geographisch lokalisieren kann. Auch sonst hätte der Epigraphiker mehrere Wünsche betreffs der Zitierweise. Ich greife nur ein Beispiel heraus: 1659,27 steht Tab.devot. (Inscr.Iugoslav. Hoffiller-Saria) 557 I 12. Das ist unschön. Logisch würde es bedeuten, dass der Beleg in Nr. 557 einer Fluchtafeledition enthalten ist, was ja gar nicht stimmt. Etwa durch ein Versetzen der Klammern wäre schon vieles geholfen. - Die Papstbriefe werden durch Epist. pontif. mit der Nummer einer gegebenen Sammlung zitiert. Es wäre schön, wenn der Name des betr. Papstes hinzugefügt werden könnte, denn so könnte der Benutzer den Beleg sofort in den richtigen zeitlichen und sachlichen Zusammenhang stellen.

Einzelheiten. *lodiciarius*. Dieses im Thesaurus fehlende Wort könnte in CIL XIII 2003 vorliegen. Überliefert ist NEC LAVDECENARI, wofür Zangemeister *neg(otiatoris) laudicari* (für *lodicari*) vorschlägt. Vgl. auch CIL XIII 5 p. 162. - *longaevus*: die Schreibung *-gev-* noch CIL V 6817 = CE 777 und CIL VI 8401 = CE 1388; dieser letzte Beleg ist unter I B 1 b hinzuzufügen. - Bei *longitudo* I B 1 a könnte man noch Edict.Diocl. 11,8 anführen. - Zu *longus* die Schreibung *longgus* CIL VI 29401. - Zu *lorarius* CIL XIII 1198 hinzuzufügen. - *lubricus*: unter II A b könnte noch *lubrica secla* CE 1362 angeführt werden. - *lucerna*. Erwähnung hätten die afrikanischen *lucernae colatae* (CIL VIII 22642 usw.) verdient. Zu *lucerna* beim Grab noch CIL X 633. XI 2596. AE 1927, 132. Ferner *l. aeria* EE VIII 624 = Dessau 3495. Schliesslich CIL VI 3038. - Bei *lucrum* sei erwähnt *lucro suo* (Dat. fin.) CIL IX 2029 zu 1722,74. Dazu *Lucilla ex corpore lucrum faciebat* CIL IV 1948. Die Standardedition des 1720,6 angeführten Papyrus ist POxy. 3208. - Zu *luctus* erwähne ich *minui luctus matronarum* im Edikt der XVviri s.f. über die *minutio luctus* der Frauen während der Ludi saeculares 17 v.Chr., enthalten im bekannten Commentarium CIL VI 32323.

Zu 1742,47ff. *gravis luctus* CIL X 5665. XI 315. Zu 1742,39ff. *in luctu liquit* AE 1930, 59. Zu 1743,20 *luctus solacia* AE 1968, 236. - *lucus*: zu 1754,1 *lucus sanctus* InscrIt. IV 1,72. *lucorum sacrorum quae sunt Alexandreae* AE 1924, 78 (Ephesos). 1754,27 wird *ab luco Libitina(e)* geschrieben, es liegt hier aber wahrscheinlich ein erstarrter Nominativ vor, vgl. *domus Lupercus* CIL IV 4853 u.dgl. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* I² 78.

Der Verweis *v. Onom.* (oder *cf. Onom.*; welcher Unterschied besteht zwischen den zwei Verweisformen?) fehlt in diesem Faszikel des öfteren; er ist unter folgenden Wörtern hinzuzufügen: *lorica, loripes, lotus, lubricus, lucens, lucrosus, luctuosus*. All die betreffenden Personennamen finden sich bei Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*. - Druckfehler sind äusserst selten; ich habe nur einen notiert: 1619,84.

Heikki Solin

*

Jean Andreau: Les affaires de monsieur Jucundus. Collection de l'École Française de Rome 19. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1974. 390 p. Fr. 157.-.

In July 1875 a coffer containing 153 wax tablets with writing on them were found in a house in Pompeii. As it turned out, the tablets were part (presumably a very small part) of the archives of the master of the house, a banker named L. Caecilius Jucundus. Two types of Jucundus' business affairs are documented in the tablets: 1) the organizing and financing of auctions: 137 of the tablets are receipts by the sellers acknowledging that Jucundus has paid the sum due to them; 2) the leasing of public property and taxes (of the colonia of Pompeii): 16 of the tablets are receipts by a representative of the colonia acknowledging that Jucundus has paid the lease. Apart from the text of the acknowledgement, and the date and the name of the payee, each document contains a varying number (in most cases seven) of signatures by witnesses. - With a detailed study of this material as his point of departure, Jean Andreau sets out to construct as complete a picture of L. Caecilius Jucundus, his activities and position in the Pompeian milieu as possible. In two introductory chapters the documents and the central person are presented; the second part is a study of the financial operations documented by the tablets and of the position of Jucundus in the business world of Pompeii. More than half of the space is devoted to a detailed study, from various viewpoints, of the composition of Jucundus' clientele, i.e. the sellers (some 50 persons) and witnesses (350 persons) whose names appear on the tablets; many of the persons belonging to this group are also met with elsewhere in the inscriptions of Pompeii, some being magistrates or candidates to magistratures. *Tapio Helen*

Giovanni Gera: L'imposizione progressiva nell'antica Atene. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1975. 212 p. Lit. 10000.

Was the decadence of Athens during the 4th century B.C. caused

by a heavily redistributive fiscal policy pursued by the Athenian state? If not, then what was the cause of the decadence? This book is an attempt by the author to answer these far-reaching questions. - The first question is given a negative answer; and then other "materialistic" theories (i.e. theories which derive the decadence from physical, social and economic conditions) put forward by scholars are examined and discarded as unsatisfactory. In this way a broad survey of the explanations for Athenian decadence emerges. The author's own view is that in the final analysis the explanation is to be found not in material conditions but in the psychology of the Athenian man. The Athenians used their capacities to produce cultural values, the notion of a people limiting itself to material production for production's sake being alien to them. In the long run such an attitude led to economic stagnation and retrogression: Athens succumbed to her more production-orientated competitors on the international markets. - The author is a social scientist and he treats the Athenian fiscal system as a special case of the general category of redistributive fiscal policy. He comes closest to the inductive historical type of research in the chapters on the Athenian *eisphora* (p. 25-83), which constitute a good introduction to this problem to which so much scholarly ingenuity has been devoted ever since the times of Böckh. In this matter the author arrives at the conclusion that in the 4th century the *eisphora* was a proportional property tax and not a progressive personal wealth tax.

Tapio Helen

Tabula Peutingeriana - Codex Vindobodensis 324. Herausgegeben von Ekkehard Weber. Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt. Graz 1976. Vol. I: Faks.-Ausg. in Originalformat, vol. II: Kommentarbd. 67 S. mit 21 Textill. S 1980.-.

Die neue Ausgabe der T.P. besteht aus separatem Text- und Kartenband. Das ist ausgezeichnet, weil man dadurch viel Mühe beim Nachschlagen spart. Im Kartenband sind die 11 Blätter der T.P. in Originalgrösse farbig reproduziert. Diese Farb reproduktionen befinden sich jeweils auf der rechten Seite des Bandes, während links eine Reproduktion in Halbton erscheint. In letztere hat man moderne Platznamen eingefügt, die die Verwendung der Tafeln erleichtern sollen. Die Idee ist gut, aber nicht gut verwirklicht. Wenigstens in den Exemplaren, die ich gesehen habe, ist die weisse Schrift stellenweise nur sehr mühsam zu entziffern. Auch die Wahl der auf diese Weise identifizierten Orte lässt zu wünschen übrig, erfolgte sie doch recht willkürlich. Auf eine eingehende Kritik möchte ich verzichten, da der Autor selbst gutmütig eingesteht, dass unter seinen Identifikationen ganz falsche sein mögen.

Wer in dem Textband die lange ersehnte kritische Ausgabe der T.P. erwartete, wird enttäuscht. Der Autor hat sich darauf beschränkt, Geschichte und Beschreibung der T.P. darzustellen. Wie er selbst feststellt, hat er dabei nicht viel sagen können, was nicht schon einmal anderswo gesagt worden ist. Warum gab er sich dann aber nicht die Mühe, das Wenige redaktionell einwandfrei darzustellen? Wenn Agrippa als Mitarbeiter von Augustus bezeichnet wird, so ist das nicht nur historisch unrichtig, sondern fällt auch stilistisch - wie manches andere auch - aus dem Rahmen einer wissenschaftlichen Publikation.

Der Fehler, dass in der Bibliographie ein Artikel von Radke gleich zweimal zitiert wird, ist daneben nur ein weiterer kleiner Schönheitsfehler. Er zeugt, wie auch ein Fingerabdruck auf der Halbton-tafel VI, V, von einer mit einer solchen Editions-aufgabe unvereinbaren Unsorgfältigkeit. Doch lassen wir uns ob dieser Mängel die Freude daran nicht verderben, dass jetzt eine erste moderne Farbproduktion der T.P. herausgegeben wurde. *Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen*

*

J.R. Green: Gnathia Pottery in the Akademisches Kunstmuseum Bonn.
Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1976. 32 p., 32 plates.
DM 48.-.

The collection of Gnathia pottery in the Akademisches Kunstmuseum Bonn consists of 34 entire objects and two fragments. The author has divided the material according to the style of decoration and technique into three main phases of the Apulian workshops. His account is in general punctilious, thus complementing the precision of the photographic documentation (in black and white).

The development of decoration in Gnathia pottery from the Rose Painter's delicate lines through degeneration of style and taste to unclear traces of the former skill becomes quite clear even from a small selection like this.

To make the reader's task easier it would have been preferable to have incorporated the footnotes in the text itself. As it is, the reader needs at least three fingers at various points in order to follow the text, the notes and the planches correctly. Furthermore, many of the footnotes contain relevant additional information e.g. as regards the colours and decoration.

Is it an oversight or simple naïvety that induces the writer to state at the top of page 4: "However not all Gnathia vases were funerary even if most of them have been preserved for us in graves"?

The author constantly compares his material with the red figured vases. Another comparison - even more fruitful - could have been made with the possible connections with the third Pompeian style, as is suggested by Bianchi Bandinelli.

Since relatively little is known of republican pottery, every attempt to assess and publish material is welcome. This small edition is a proof of profound knowledge of the field.

Leena Pietilä-Castrén

Libri nobis missi

- Actes du colloque 1972 sur l'esclavage.* Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne, vol. 11. Annales littéraires de l'université de Besançon 163. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1974. 393 p.
- Actes du colloque 1973 sur l'esclavage.* Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne, vol. 18. Annales littéraires de l'université de Besançon 182. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1976. 462 p.
- Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete.* Eingel., übers. u. erl. von Jan Assmann. Die Bibliothek der alten Welt. Artemis Verlag, Zürich 1975. 656 S. Sfr. 78.-.
- Aristotle's Political Theory: An Introduction for Students of Political Theory* by R.G. Mulgan. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press 1977. VI, 156 p. £ 1.85.
- Aspects des études classiques.* Actes du colloque associé à la XVIe Assemblée Générale de la Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques. Édités par Jean Bingen et Guy Cambier. Université Libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres LXVI. Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles 1977. 101 p. FrB. 250.-.
- T.W. Beasley: *Le cautionnement dans l'ancien droit Grec.* Ristampa anastatica invariata dell'edizione Paris 1902. Juridica 9. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. 77 p. Lit. 18000.
- Ernst Berger: *Die Geburt der Athena im Ostgiebel des Parthenon.* Studien der Skulpturhalle Basel, Heft I. Archäologischer Verlag Basel, in Kommission bei Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1974. 90 S. DM 48.-.
- Daria de Bernardi Ferrero: *Teatri classici in Asia minore.* Vol. 1: Cibyra-Selge-Hierapolis. 1966. 77 p., XXI tav. - Vol. 2: Città di Pisidia, Licia e Caria. 1969. 218 p., XXXIII tav. - Vol. 3: Città dalla Troade alla Pamfilia. 1970. 216 p., XLIV tav. - Vol. 4: Deduzioni e proposte. 1974. 264 p., VII tav. Studi di Architettura Antica I,II,IV,V. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma.
- M.A. Bezborodov: *Chemie und Technologie der antiken und mittelalterlichen Gläser.* Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975. 327 S. DM 68.-.
- Friedrich Bodenstedt: *Phokäisches Elektron-Geld von 600-326 v. Chr.* Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. 170 S., 22 Taf. DM 120.-.
- Giuseppe Brini: *Della condanna nelle Legis actiones.* Ristampa anastatica invariata dell'edizione Bologna 1878. Juridica 7. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. 70 p. Lit. 15000.

- Giuseppe Brini: Possesso delle cose e possesso dei diritti nel diritto romano.* Ristampa anastatica invariata dell'edizione Bologna 1906. *Juridica* 8. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. 51 p. Lit. 11000.
- Hans-Günther Buchholz: Methymna.* Archäologische Beiträge zur Topographie und Geschichte von Nordlesbos. Mit einem Beitrag über methymnäischen Münzen von P.R. Franke. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975. 273 S., 32 Taf. DM 140.-.
- Luigi Capuano: I primi del diritto romano.* Ristampa anastatica invariata dell'edizione Napoli 1878. *Juridica* 10. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. XV, 339 p. Lit. 50000.
- Guglielmo Cavallo: Rotoli di Exultet dell'Italia meridionale.* Adriatica Editrice, Bari 1973. XVI, 262 p., 61 tav.
- Francois Charpin: L'idée de phrase grammaticale et son expression en latin.* Reproduction des thèses Université de Lille III, 1977. 777 p. Fr. 80.-.
- M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia.* Fasc. 9: Oratio pro Q. Roscio comoedo. Edidit Jerzy Axer. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1976. XVI, 20 S. M 7.50.
- Texte, politique, idéologie: Cicéron.* Pour une analyse du système esclavagiste: le fonctionnement du texte cicéronien. Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne, vol. 20. *Annales littéraires de l'université de Besançon* 187. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1976. 352 p. Fr. 150.-.
- Cirene e la Grecia.* A cura di Sandro Stucchi. Quaderni di archeologia della Libia 8. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1976. 492 p.
- Annamaria Comella: Il materiale votivo tardo di Gravisca.* *Archaeologica* 6. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. 103 p., XXXIX tav.
- Josephus Jimenez Delgado: Latine scripta.* Disquisitiones ad humaniorum litterarum cultum. Imprenta Sáez, Madrid 1978. 420 p. Ptas 1500.
- Euclidis Elementa.* Vol. V, pars 1: Prolegomena critica, Elementorum libri XIV-XV, Scholia in libros I-V. Post I.L. Heiberg edidit E.S. Stamatis. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. 2. Auflage. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1977. LXXXIX, 243 S. M 54.-.
- Bianca Maria Felletti Maj: La tradizione italica nell'arte romana I.* *Archaeologica* 3. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1977. 404 p., LXXXIII tav. Lit. 80000.
- Festschrift für Frank Brommer.* Herausgegeben von Ursula Höckmann und Antje Krug. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1977. XVI, 309 S., 85 Taf. DM 148.-.
- Festschrift für Waldemar Haberey.* Herausgegeben von Thea Elisabeth Haevernick und Axel von Saldern. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. XI, 156 S., 34 Taf. DM 88.-.
- Führer durch die Antikenabteilung des Martin von Wagner Museums der Universität Würzburg.* Herausgegeben von Erika Simon. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975. 301 S., 64 Taf. DM 68.-.

- Hartmut Galsterer: Herrschaft und Verwaltung im republikanischen Italien.* Die Beziehungen Roms zu den italischen Gemeinden vom Latinerfrieden 338 v.Chr. bis zum Bundesgenossenkrieg 91 v.Chr. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte Heft 68. C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München 1976. XIII, 224 S. DM 54.-.
- Günter Grimm* (unter Mitarbeit von *Mohiyy Ibrahim* und *Mohammed Mohsen*): *Kunst der Ptolemäer- und Römerzeit im Ägyptischen Museum Kairo.* Aufnahmen von *Dieter Johannes*. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975, 34 S., 118 Taf. DM 98.-.
- Stefan Hiller: Mykenische Keramik.* Alt-Ägina Bd. IV,1, herausgegeben von *Hans Walter*. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975. 101 S. 38 Taf. DM 98.-.
- N. Himmelmann: Typologische Untersuchungen an römischen Sarkophagereliefs des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts n.Chr.* Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1973. 66 S., 60 Taf. DM 78.-.
- Nikolaus Himmelmann: Drei hellenistische Bronzen in Bonn.* Mit einem Anhang über den Dornauszieher Castellani. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1975, Nr. 2. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, in Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1975. 35 S., 24 Taf. DM 27.20.
- Nikolaus Himmelmann: Das Hypogäum der Aurelier am Viale Manzoni.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz: Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissensch. Klasse, Jahrgang 1975, Nr. 7. Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1975. 28 S., 25 Taf. DM 29.20.
- Wilhelm Hornbostel: Kunst der Antike.* Schätze aus norddeutschem Privatbesitz. Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1977. XIV, 556 S. DM 68.-.
- L'instrumentum domesticum di Ercolano e Pompei nella prima età imperiale.* Quaderni di cultura materiale I. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1977. 182 p., LXXXVII tav.
- Eva Keuls: The Water Carriers in Hades.* A Study of Catharsis through Toil in Classical Antiquity. Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam 1974. 189 p., XXXIV plates. Hfl. 54.00.
- Kolloquium über frühmittelalterliche Skulptur.* Bd. I-III: Vortragstexte 1968, 1970, 1972. Herausgegeben von *V. Milojevic*, Redaktion *W. Schrickel*. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1969, 1971, 1974. 71 S., 45 Taf. & 111 S., 67 Taf. & 187 S., 79 Taf. DM 98.-. & 83.-. & 132.-.
- Ernst Langlotz: Studien zur nordostgriechischen Kunst.* Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975. 206 S., 70 Taf. DM 135.-.
- Adrienne Lezzi-Hafter: Der Schuwalov-Maler.* Eine Kannenwerkstadt der Parthenonzeit. I: Text (XI, 141 S.), II: Tafeln (180). Forschungen zur antiken Keramik, II Reihe. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. DM 160.-.

- Hans Peter L'Orange e Hjalmar Torp: Il Tempietto Longobardo di Cividale.* Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia Instituti Romani Norvegiae vol. VII, 1-2. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1977. 23 p., CXCIV tav. & XXVI, 286 p., illustrazioni comparative 60.
- Marianne Maaskant-Kleibrink: Catalogue of the engraved gems in the royal coin cabinet the Hague.* I: Plates (189); II: Text (380 p.). Government Publishing Office, The Hague, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1978. Hfl. 400.-.
- Clarence Augustus Manning: A Study of Archaism in Euripides.* Ristampa anastatica invariata dell'edizione New York 1916. Philologica 4. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. 95 p. Lit. 20000.
- Max Martin: Das fränkische Gräberfeld von Basel-Bernerring.* Mit einem anthropologischen und einem osteologischen Beitrag von R. Bay und B. Kaufmann. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. XXVIII, 398 S. DM 148.-.
- In memoriam Otto J. Brendel.* Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities. Ed. by Larissa Bonfante and Helga von Heintze with the collaboration of Carla Lord. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. XVIII, 261 p., 62 plates. DM 135.-.
- Heide Mommsen: Der Affecter.* Bd. I-II. Forschungen zur Antiken Keramik, II Reihe. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975. XI, 139 S. & XI S., 140 Taf., Beilagen A-Z. DM 160.-.
- Brinna Otto: Geometrische Ornamente auf anatolischer Keramik.* Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Kommission für antike Keramik: Keramikforschungen I. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. XIII, 203 S. DM 120.-.
- Panorama von Athen,* an Ort und Stelle aufgenommen und herausgegeben von Ferdinand Stademann. Dr. Franz Wild'schen Buchdruckerei, München 1841. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1977. 47 S., 16 Taf. DM 98.-.
- I Papiri ercolanesi II* (Indice topografico e sistematico). A cura di Vincenzo Litta con prefazione di Alberto Guarino. I Quaderni della Biblioteca di Napoli, serie IV, N. 6. Industria Tipografica Artistica, Napoli 1977. 351 p.
- Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio.* Vol. II, libri V-VIII. Edidit Maria Helena Rocha-Pereira. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1977. V, 338 S. M 56.-.
- John Griffiths Pedley: Greek Sculpture of the Archaic Period: The Island Workshops.* Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. 69 p., 47 plates, DM 78.-.
- Marina Pensa: Rappresentazioni dell'oltretomba nella ceramica apula.* Studia archaeologica 18. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1977. VIII, 88 p., XVI tav. Lit. 22000.
- Flavii Philostrati Heroicus.* Edidit Ludo De Lannoy. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1977. XXXII, 131 S. M 38.-.
- Mario Pintacuda: Tragedia antica e musica d'oggi.* La musica nelle rappresentazioni moderne dei tragici greci in Italia, elenco cronologico delle principali rappresentazioni tragiche dal 1904 al 1977 in Italia. Lorenzo Misuraca Editore, 1978 Cefalù. 58 p. Lit. 1500.

- Mario Pintacudà: La musica nella tragedia greca.* Lorenzo Misuraca Editore, Cefalù 1978. 233 p. Lit. 4000.
- Problemi attuali di scienza e di cultura. Colloquio italo-francese: La filosofia greca e il diritto romano.* Vol. I-II. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, quaderno N. 221. Roma 1976, 1977. 201 & 319 p. Lit. 8500 & 20000.
- Die römischen Bronzen der Schweiz.* Bd. I: *Annemarie Kaufmann-Heinimann: Augst und das Gebiet der Colonia Augusta Raurica.* 1977. VII, 183 S., 193 Taf. DM 198.-. - Bd. II: *Annalis Leibundgut: Avenches.* 1976. 154 S., 99 Taf. DM 148.-. Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum zu Mainz, Forschungsinstitut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein.
- Karl Schefold: Wort und Bild.* Studien zur Gegenwart der Antike. Herausgegeben von *Ernst Berger* und *Hans Christoph Ackermann.* Archäologischer Verlag Basel, in Kommission bei Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein, 1975. 231 S., 12 Taf. DM 98.-.
- Luigi Schiaparelli: La scrittura latina nell'età romana (Note paleografiche).* Como 1921. Ristampa anastatica 1976. Bottega d'Erasmus, Torino. XI, 207 p. 32 illustrazioni.
- Gemma Sena Chiesa: Gemme di Luni.* Archaeologica 4. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. 141 p., XXV tav.
- Erika Simon: Pergamon und Hesiod.* Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Kommission für antike Mythologie: Schriften zur antiken Mythologie III. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1975. 63 S., 32 Taf. DM 78.-.
- Sandro Stucchi: Architettura cirenaica.* Monografie di Archeologia Libica IX. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1975. XII, 696 p., con 604 fig., VI tav. Lit. 120000.
- Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms.* Bd. 2: Vorträge des 10. Internationalen Limeskongresses in der Germania inferior. Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher Bd. 38. Rheinland-Verlag GmbH, Köln, in Kommission bei Rudolf Habelt Verlag GmbH, Bonn 1977. 615 S., 72 Taf. DM 140.-.
- Petros G. Themelis: Frühgriechische Grabbauten.* Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. 111 S., 18 Taf. DM 88.-.
- Theophrastus: De causis plantarum.* Vol. I: Books I-II. With an English translation by *Benedict Einarson* and *George K.K. Link.* The Loeb Classical Library No. 471. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. - William Heinemann Ltd, London 1976. LXVII, 361 p. £ 2.95.
- Winfried Weber: Die Darstellungen einer Wagenfahrt auf römischen Sarkophagdeckeln und Loculusplatten des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Archaeologica 5. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1978. 146 S., XXXI Taf.
- Wolfgang Fritz Volbach: Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters.* Dritte völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage. Römisch-germanisches Zentralmuseum zu Mainz, Forschungsinstitut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte: Kataloge vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Altertümer Bd. 7. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1976. 154 S., 116 Taf. DM 148.-.
- Marie-Louise Vollenweider: Die Porträtgemmen der römischen Republik.* Vol. I: Text (316 S.), Vol. II: Katalog und Tafeln (110 S., 168 Taf.). Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1972, 1974. Je Bd. DM 195.-.

I N D E X

Jaakko Frösén	Le transport du blé et le rôle des ἐπίπλοοι.....	5
Paavo Hohti	Einige Bemerkungen über die Aischines-Papyri.....	19
Iiro Kajanto	The Hereafter in Ancient Christian Epigraphy and Poetry.....	27
Saara Lilja	Descriptions of Human Appearance in Pliny's Letters.....	55
Ulla Nyberg	Über inschriftliche Abkürzungen der gotischen und humanistischen Schriftperioden.....	63
Martti Nyman	On the Alleged Variation <i>dēlēniō</i> ~ <i>dēlīniō</i>	81
Teivas Oksala	Warum wollte Vergil die Aeneis verbrennen?.....	89
Tuomo Pekkanen	Critical and Exegetical Notes on Tac. Germ.	101
Leena Pietilä-Castrén	Some Aspects of the Life of Lucius Mummius Achaicus.....	115
Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen	The Roman Senate and Criminal Jurisdiction during the Roman Republic.....	125
Juhani Sarsila	Some Notes on <i>virtus</i> in Sallust and Cicero.....	135
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica L - LVI.....	145
Holger Thesleff	Notes on the New Epicharmean 'Iatrology'.....	153
Toivo Viljamaa	Livy 1,47,1-7: A Note on the Historical Infinitive.....	159
Henrik Zilliacus	Euripides Medeia 214-221 und Ennius	167
De novis libris iudicia	173

ISSN 0570-734X
Helsinki 1978
Helsingin yliopiston monistuspalvelu