ARCTOS

Acta Philologica Fennica

VOL. XI

_____

1977

ARCTOS
VOL. XI

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XI

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

ARCTOS
ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA
NOVA SERIES
VOL. I-X A. 1954-1976 EDITA
SUPPLEMENTUM I 1968

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

VOL. XI EDENDUM CURAVERUNT
HENRIK ZILLIACUS
ROLF WESTMAN
HEIKKI SOLIN
ANNE HELTTULA
ULLA NYBERG

Σ Υ Μ Β Α Λ Λ Ε Σ Θ Α Ι

A N o t e o n C o n j e c t u r e s i n H e r o d o t u s

P a a v o H o h t i

On some occasions in his Histories Herodotus uses the word
συμβάλλεσθαι to introduce both his own conclusions and those of oth-
er people. This word, used in the middle voice, in the sense 'to con-
jecture, to consider' does not occur, as far as I can see, in other
historians. In fact, in addition to Herodotus, LSJ gives only one
other case of such a usage, in Heraclitus.[1] The active form of the
verb, on the other hand, is rather frequently used in its various
senses from Pindar to Aristotle, especially in drama.[2] It seems that
the conclusions characterized by the word συμβάλλεσθαι play a spe-
cial part in Herodotus' historical terminology. It is possible that
this use of the word is an Ionian idiom; to it would point the fact
that this verb occurs in Heraclitus together with Herodotus. This
paper is an attempt to define the specific nature of these conclu-
sions and to discover how they differ from other kinds of conclusions.

---

1 See LSJ s.v. συμβάλλω. The fragment is B 47 (D-K): μὴ εἰκῆ περὶ
τῶν μεγίστων συμβαλλώμεθα.
2 It seems that the Latin *conicere* 'to form a conclusion about, con-
jecture, guess' is adapted trough comedy. Oxford Latin Dictionary
gives the following cases: Ter. Eu. 547, Ph. 166; Plaut. Cas. 94.
It is many times used also by Cicero. For the use of *conicere* in
connection of oracles see below n.15.

In his study Form and Thought in Herodotus, Henry R. Immer-
wahr[3] suggests that the expression συμβαλλόμενος εὑρίσκω is used
when Herodotus draws a conclusion, basing it on a comparison of dif-
ferent variants of a story. Immerwahr cites four examples to support
his suggestion (4,15,1; 7,24,1; 7,184,1; 8,30,1). None of these, how-
ever, includes an explicit statement that different variants existed
or even that Herodotus had the idea of comparison in mind. Further-
more, there are similar expressions, which are used in the sense 'to
compute'. The cases with συμβαλλόμενος εὑρίσκω do not form a unified
group. Immerwahr's suggestion had already been called into question
by H. Verdin,[4] though from a different standpoint. Verdin does not,
however, offer his own suggestion for the meaning of this expression,
but leaves the questions unanswered.

It is possible to distinguish first the cases with the techni-
cal connotation of 'to compute'. 7,184,1 clearly constitutes such a
case, where Herodotus considers the number of the Persian ships; 7,
187,2 provides an even more obvious example, where Herodotus computes
the amount of grain needed by the Persian soldiers. On both occasions
he uses the expression συμβαλλόμενος εὑρίσκω.[5] One of Immerwahr's
examples, that which records Aristeas' apparition in Metapontion (4,
15,1) also seems to be based on the idea of computing: ταῦτα μὲν αἱ

---

3 P.5 and n.11. Comparison is one of the basic connotations of συμ-
  βάλλω and occurs very often in Herodotus. See Powell, A Lexicon to
  Herodotus, s.v.
4 H. Verdin, De historisch-kritische methode van Herodotus. Verhande-
  lingen van de Kon. Vlaamse Acad. voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en
  Schone Kunsten van Belgie, Kl. der Letteren 69(1971)189-190.
5 To these we may add 2,31, which Powell gives under 'count', while
  the other cases are given under 'suppose, reckon'.

πόλιες αὗται λέγουσι, τάδε δὲ οἶδα Μεταποντίνοισι τοῖσι ἐν ᾿Ιταλίῃ συγκυρήσαντα μετὰ τὴν ἀφάνισιν τὴν δευτέρην ᾿Αριστέω ἔτεσι τεσσερά-κοντα καὶ διηκοσίοισι, ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος ἐν Προκοννήσῳ τε καὶ Με-ταποντίῳ εὕρισκον. It is natural to assume that Herodotus heard the stories both in Proconnesus and in Metapontion. It presupposes that he can compute the time between Aristeas' disappearance and his re-turn. Computing in its turn presupposes a comparison of the given da-ta, the result being the number of years between disappearance and return. It is not a question here of a comparison of different vari-ants in the sense of arriving at an evaluation of the truth, as Im-merwahr's suggestion seems to indicate.[6]

There are three further cases where the participle συμβαλλό-μενος is made the subject of εὑρίσκω or δοκέω. In these cases the idea of conjecture is obvious. Herodotus speaks of the place where Darius crossed the Bosporus as follows (4,87,2): τοῦ δὲ Βοσπόρου ὁ χῶρος τὸν ἔζευξε βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν συμβαλλομένῳ, μέ-σον ἐστὶ Βυζαντίου τε καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ στόματι ἱροῦ. This statement is based, on the one hand, on the fact that Darius crossed the Bospo-rus and, on the other, on geographical possibilities. In other words, Herodotus concludes that Darius chose the most suitable place for crossing.[7] The second case comprises Herodotus' judgement concerning Xerxes and the Athos canal. Herodotus thinks that the canal was made

---

6 Ph.E. Legrand (Hérodote IV,57 n.1) rightly points out that Herodo-tus made calculations. J. Feix in his Tusculum edition of Herodotus unnecessarily corrects the text and emphasizes the aspect of com-parison: "wie ich durch Vergleich der Vorgänge in Prokonnesos und Metapontion fand".
7 Herodotus mentions the steles which once marked the place of cros-sing but which were later taken to Byzantium and to the temple of Dionysios (4,87,1).

because of Xerxes' μεγαλοφροσύνη (7,24) and says that Xerxes' purpose was to demonstrate his power and leave a μνημόσυνον: ὡς μὲν ἐμὲ συμβαλλόμενον εὑρίσκειν, μεγαλοφροσύνης εἵνεκεν αὐτὸ Ξέρξης ὀρύσσειν ἐκέλευε, ἐθέλων τε δύναμιν ἀποδείκνυσθαι καὶ μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι. Here Herodotus considers Xerxes' aims and gives an account of the immense work being done on the canal; the result corresponds to what Herodotus thinks to be the reason behind it; the two parts complement each other. The same idea of fitness is also clear in the account of the Phocians (8,30,1): οἱ γὰρ Φωκέες μοῦνοι τῶν ταύτῃ ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἐμήδιζον, κατ'ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος εὑρίσκω, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Θεσσαλῶν. εἰ δὲ Θεσσαλοὶ τὰ 'Ελλήνων ηὖξον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐμήδιζον ἄν οἱ Φωκέες· These three examples show that Herodotus forms his conclusions on the basis of two facts, which he considers together and then combines.

There are two important examples where συμβάλλεσθαι functions as predicate: 2,112,2 ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῷ τεμένεϊ τοῦ Πρωτέος ἱρὸν τὸ καλέεται ξείνης 'Αφροδίτης· συμβάλλομαι δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἱρὸν εἶναι 'Ελένης τῆς Τυνδάρεω, καὶ τὸν λόγον ἀκηκοὼς ὡς διαιτήθη 'Ελένη παρὰ Πρωτέϊ, καὶ δὴ καὶ ὅτι ξείνης 'Αφροδίτης ἐπώνυμόν ἐστι· ὅσα γὰρ ἄλλα 'Αφροδίτης ἱρά ἐστι, οὐδαμῶς ξείνης ἐπικαλέεται. 2,33,2 ῥέει γὰρ ἐκ Λιβύης ὁ Νεῖλος καὶ μέσην τάμνων Λιβύην· καὶ ὡς ἐγὼ συμβάλλομαι τοῖσι ἐμφανέσι τὰ μὴ γινωσκόμενα τεκμαιρόμενος, τῷ "Ιστρῳ ἐκ τῶν ἴσων μέτρων ὁρμᾶται. "Ιστρος τε γὰρ ποταμὸς ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν καὶ Πυρήνης πόλιος ῥέει μέσην σχίζων τὴν Εὐρώπην. The first of these is the simpler. The two facts (the temple and the information heard) are clearly distinguished. By combining them, Herodotus forms his own conjecture. The latter case is more complicated. It includes, together with

συμβάλλομαι, another word, τεκμαιρόμενος, which is also used to form
conclusions.[8] In this case, too, Herodotus combines two elements, the
Ister and the Nile. These elements, however, do not as yet resemble
each other fully (34,1): ὁ μὲν δὴ ῎Ιστρος, ῥέει γὰρ δι᾽οἰκεομένης,
πρὸς πολλῶν γινώσκεται, περὶ δὲ τῶν τοῦ Νείλου πηγέων οὐδεὶς ἔχει
λέγειν· ἀοίκητός τε γὰρ καὶ ἔρημός ἐστι ἡ Λιβύη δι᾽ἧς ῥέει. Herodo-
tus has some information regarding the Nile (34,1): περὶ δὲ τοῦ ῥεύματος
αὐτοῦ, ἐπ᾽ὅσον μακρότατον ἱστορεῦντα ἦν ἐξικέσθαι, εἴρηται. This seems
to refer to the east west direction of the Nile and to the fact that
it flows through Libya dividing it into two equal parts (31; 32,7).
In addition Herodotus knows the sites of the mouths of both rivers.
All this means that the rivers conform to a symmetrical pattern (34,
1-2): ἐκδιδοῖ (sc. Nile) δὲ ἐς Αἴγυπτον. ἡ δὲ Αἴγυπτος τῆς ὀρεινῆς
Κιλικίης μάλιστά κη ἀντίη κεῖται. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἐς Σινώπην τὴν ἐν τῷ
Εὐξείνῳ πόντῳ πέντε ἡμερέων ἰθέα ὁδὸς εὐζώνῳ ἀνδρί· ἡ δὲ Σινώπη τῷ
῎Ιστρῳ ἐκδιδόντι ἐς θάλασσαν ἀντίον κεῖται. οὕτω τὸν Νεῖλον δοκέω
διὰ πάσης τῆς Λιβύης διεξιόντα ἐξισοῦσθαι τῷ ῎Ιστρῳ. Thus, what is
known of Nile makes it possible to conclude analogically (τεκμαιρό-
μενος) that the rivers are similar. In other words, the known parts
of Nile are used as a τεκμήριον to infer the unknown parts. Now that
the rivers have been shown to be symmetrical, Herodotus can, on the
basis of a complete symmetry, conjecture (συμβάλλομαι) that the rivers
have their origin ἐκ τῶν ἴσων μέτρων.[9] Furthermore, these examples

---

8 See 1,57,1-2; 7,16 g 2; 7,234,1. For τεκμαίρεσθαι see also H. Dil-
  ler, ῎Οψις ἀδήλων τὰ φαινόμενα, Hermes 67(1932)16-23.
9 See also the thorough analysis of this text in G.E.R. Lloyd, Polar-
  ity and Analogy, Cambridge 1966, 342-345. He does not, however, dis-
  tinguish between the two words used by Herodotus.

demonstrate the principle of the combination of two facts. In order

for the combination to work, the facts have to complement each other.

They can be of different kinds as in the case of the temple: the in-

formation heard supplies the eponymon of the temple. In the second case

the parts are analogous, forming a symmetrical picture. The main pur-

pose and character of the συμβάλλεσθαι conclusion is that the combi-

nation results in an intelligible whole which has a significance of

its own and is more than the total of its parts. The process of com-

bining could be compared to doing a jigsaw puzzle although this would

be somewhat misleading, since in a puzzle several pieces have to be

joined. On the other hand, we may refer to σύμβολον, which in its

original and concrete sense is a thing made up of two elements.[10] As

σύμβολον consists of two complementary parts, so the conclusion with

συμβάλλεσθαι is also formed on the basis of two existing complemen-

tary parts. The parts must exist naturally, since if they do not,

they cannot be combined. We may now return to the Nile example. In

this case the Ister was known, but the Nile was not completely known,

i.e. the other part did not entirely exist (cf. 2,34,1). Because of

the aspect of the unknown, Herodotus uses the word τεκμαίρεσθαι when

he reaches a conclusion on the basis on some known fact; in this case

the basis is formed of similarities with the Ister: τοῖσι ἐμφάνεσι τὰ

μὴ γινωσκόμενα τεκμαιρόμενος. The Ister and the Nile constitute, as

Herodotus sees it, a symmetrical geographical picture on the map and

---

10 For archaeological evidence see e.g. Daremberg & Saglio, Diction-
   naire des antiquités III, Paris 1900, 298 s.v. *hospitium*. Cf. al-
   so Hdt 6,86 a,5. For the history of the concept, see J.A. Coulter,
   The Literary Microcosm, Theories of Interpretation of the Later
   Neoplatonists, Leiden 1976, 60-68.

this symmetry also provides both rivers with similar origins.[11] The

Nile and the Ister are identical parts. This aspect of identity pro-

duces major distinction in the case of Xeine Aphrodite, where the parts

are not identical, but provide supplementary information.

It is not possible to argue whether the idea of two complemen-

tary parts was always understood when the word συμβάλλεσθαι was used.[12]

Its general sense 'to conclude' is apparent in several cases, but by

the same token we should note that the two parts are nevertheless in

evidence. An interesting case is Etearchus' conclusion concerning the

Nile (2,33,2): τὸν δὲ δὴ ποταμὸν τοῦτον τὸν παραρρέοντα καὶ 'Ετέαρχος

συνεβάλλετο εἶναι Νεῖλον, καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ λόγος οὕτω αἱρέει. Etearchus

reaches this conclusion apparently by comparing what he knows of the

Nile with what he sees in reality.[13] The idea of two parts occurs al-

so in two negative cases, i.e. when the parts are not recognized as

belonging together. Herodotus cannot find a connection between three

names and one continent (4,45,2): οὐδ' ἔχω συμβαλέσθαι ἐπ' ὅτευ μιῇ

ἐούσῃ γῇ οὐνόματα τριφάσια κεῖται, ἐπωνυμίας ἔχοντα γυναικῶν - - οὐδὲ

τῶν διουρισάντων τὰ οὐνόματα πυθέσθαι, καὶ ὅθεν ἔθεντο τὰς ἐπωνυμί-

---

11 It is curious that Herodotus himself creates geographical symmet-
ries though he ridicules those who draw maps making Europe and
Asia equal in size (4,36, cf. 4,42). Cf. Lloyd, ibid. (n.8), who
also points to justified symmetrical assumptions in Aristotle, Me-
te. 362 b 30ff.
12 Cf. Aristoph. Vesp. 50-51 οὔκουν ἐναργὲς τοῦτο συμβαλεῖν, ὅτι ἀρ-
θεὶς ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἐς κόρακας οἰχήσεται; Douglas M. MacDowell suggests
in his commentary (Oxford 1971, 134) the translation "the obvious
thing to conclude" and speaks of logical plainness given by the
word ἐναργές. I am not sure whether it is quite correct to speak
about logic in this connection. For the general use of συμβάλλω
cf. also Aristoph. Eq. 426-427.
13 This example shows that the name and the thing together form a
σύμβολον. Another aspect occurs in Plato, Crat. 412 C Δικαιοσύνη
δέ, ὅτι μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ δικαίου συνέσει τοῦτο κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, ῥᾳ-
διον συμβαλεῖν, which also includes the two parts to be combined.

ας.[14] This is similar to the case of the message given to the Spartans. They cannot discover its meaning, i.e. they cannot connect it with reality. Similar cases are the interpretations of oracles where συμβάλλεσθαι is used when a correct interpretation is sought or when a statement is made that the oracle has been fulfilled. The problem here, too, is to find out the correspondence between the oracle and the real situation, to recognize similarities so that both parts can be combined.[15]

As we have seen, the συμβάλλεσθαι conclusion is based on the recognition that two existing parts belong together. There are, however, some cases where one part comprises the basis on which the counterpart is formed. In other words, one part is known while the other is not. The problem now is to recognize or to find the counterpart by means of a conclusion. In all these three cases (3,68,2; 7,10g,1; 8,94,2) the construction is different from the examples given above, συμβάλλομαι is used with the dative. Herodotus records Otanes' conclusion about the false Smerdis as follows (3,68,2): οὗτος ὁ 'Οτάνης πρῶτος ὑπώπτευσε τὸν μάγον ὡς οὐκ εἴη ὁ Κύρου Σμέρδις ἀλλ'ὅς περ ἦν,

14 A somewhat similar expression is used by Plato in Crat. 384a εἰ οὖν πῇ ἔχεις συμβαλεῖν τὴν Κρατύλου μαντείαν, ἡδέως ἂν ἀκούσαιμι.
15 The oracle is a sign, a σημεῖον. One of Heraclitus' fragments (B 93 D-K) elucidates this idea: ὁ ἄναξ, οὗ τὸ μαντεῖόν ἐστι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, οὔτε λέγει, οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει. The same idea also occurs in Herodotus (7,142,2): οἱ μὲν δὴ - - συνεβάλλοντο τοῦτο τὸ ξύλινον τεῖχος εἶναι, οἱ δ'αὖ ἔλεγον τὰς νέας σημαίνειν τὸν θεόν. Cf. also 5,35,3; 7,173,3 and 2,57,2. The interpreter who observes the particulars has to consider the connection between oracle and reality. Aristotle also uses this word in connection with oracles: frg. 532 καὶ συμβαλόντες τὸν χρησμὸν ἐντεῦθεν ἔλαβον τὴν συμμαχίαν, frg. 76 ὅπερ (sc. *oraculum*) οὐ δυνηθεὶς συμβαλεῖν "Ομηρος διὰ τὴν ἀθυμίαν ἐτελεύτησε. The Latin *conicere* is also used in connection of dreams and omens and oracles. The earliest case is in Plautus Cur. 253 and later it is used by Cicero.

τῇδε συμβαλλόμενος, ὅτι τε οὐκ ἐξεφοίτα ἐκ τῆς ἀκροπόλιος καὶ ὅτι

οὐκ ἐκάλεε ἐς ὄψιν ἑωυτῷ οὐδένα τῶν λογίμων Περσέων. Otanes forms

his conclusion on the basis of the fact that Smerdis does not show

himself to anyone and he wonders about the reason for this. Now the

appropriate counterpart to this statement of fact is that the Smerdis

on the throne is the Magian Smerdis and not the son of Cyrus. Hence

the two parts can be joined to form a σύμβολον, the final result

being reached when the counterpart has been found. In the case of

the origins of the Nile there was a somewhat similar process. In or-

der to obtain complete symmetry Herodotus used the word τεκμαίρεσθαι.

This word is given with the dative and the conclusion is inferred

on the basis of that fact (this could be construed as a τεκμήριον).[16]

I have argued above that the conclusions characterized by the

word συμβάλλεσθαι are based on the combination of two facts. For this

kind of combination to be possible, the facts have to complement each

other in some way; they can be similar, identical, symmetrical, anal-

ogous or supplementary. When a person forms this kind of conclusion

he has to recognize the qualities of the parts which together form

a whole, a σύμβολον.

When a historian forms his conclusions, he compares the various

pieces of evidence and chooses the significant facts.[17] In the συμ-

βάλλεσθαι conclusion the combination is based on the consideration of

the particulars. Because of this feature it differs substantially

from the εἴκος conclusion, which originates from universalities, from

---

16 For τεκμαίρεσθαι see above n.8. The word τεκμήριον occurs in Hero-
   dotus seven times: 2,13,1; 2,43,2; 2,58; 2,104,4; 3,38,2; 7,238,2;
   9,100,2.
17 Cf. above n.3. See especially 4,50,1 and 99,5.

what all men know generally happens. We have seen that there is also

a main difference in the τεκμαίρεσθαι conclusions, which by means of

a piece of evidence arrive at a conclusion regarding something which

seems to have happened or which seems to happen but is not known.[18]

The combination of facts is one of the most important aspects

of the historian's work, but the word συμβάλλεσθαι does not occur af-

ter Herodotus.[19] There is no certain explanation for this; it is pos-

sible that συμβάλλεσθαι as an Ionian idiom disappeared from the his-

toriography.

---

18 A good example of such a conclusion is Herodotus' suggestion of
    the language of the Pelasgians in 1,57,1-2: ἥντινα δὲ γλῶσσαν
    ἵεσαν οἱ Πελασγοί, οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν· εἰ δὲ χρεόν ἐστι τεκ-
    μαιρόμενον λέγειν τοῖσι νῦν ἔτι ἐοῦσι Πελασγῶν τῶν ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν
    Κρηστῶνα πόλιν οἰκεόντων, οἳ ὅμουροί κοτε ἦσαν τοῖσι νῦν Δωριεῦσι
    καλεομένοισι - -, καὶ τῶν Πλακίην τε καὶ Σκυλάκην Πελασγῶν οἰκη-
    σάντων ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ, οἳ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίοισι, καὶ ὅσα
    ἄλλα Πελασγικὰ ἐόντα πολίσματα τὸ οὔνομα μετέβαλε, εἰ τούτοισι
    τεκμαιρόμενον δεῖ λέγειν, ἦσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ βάρβαρον γλῶσσαν ἱέντες.
    Herodotus first produces the evidence and then gives his opinion
    concerning their original language.
19 It is curious that the Byzantine historiographer Laonikos Chalko-
    kondyles (15th century) once again places great emphasis on συμ-
    βάλλεσθαι. In the programmatic section it is used in the sense 'to
    make (logical) conclusions': Ξυγγραφὴν δὲ τήνδε ἀποδεικνύμενοι
    ἐπιμνησόμεθα καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην γενομένων, οὐκ
    ἀμφὶ τόνδε τὸν ἐπ' ἐμοῦ χρόνον, οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρεγενόμην θεασάμενος,
    καὶ τἄλλα ἀπό τε τοῦ εἰκότος, μάλιστα δὲ συμβαλλόμενος, καὶ ὡς ἔτι
    παρὰ τῶν τὰ ἀμείνω φρονούντων ἐδόκουν πυθέσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἧ
    ἂν εἰς μάλιστα ἔχοι ὡς ἀσφαλέστατα ἐπὶ τὸ ἄμεινον ἀληθείας εἰρῆ-
    σθαι (p. 2,5-11, ed. E. Darkó, Budapest 1922). The reason may be
    due to Herodotus-imitation, which is a significant feature in Lao-
    nikos' work. As far as I can see the idea of σύμβολον has now dis-
    appeared and a few pages later there is a striking example of συμ-
    βάλλεσθαι used in a parallel function to the τεκμαίρεσθαι of Hdt.
    1,57,1-2 (cited in n.18). Laonikos writes: οἱ μὲν γὰρ Σκυθῶν ἀπογό-
    νους τοὺς Τούρκους οἴονται εἶναι, ὀρθότερον δὴ συμβαλλόμενοι περὶ
    αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ ἐς ἤθη οὐ πολὺ διεστηκότα καθισταμένους γλώττῃ σύνεγ-
    γυς μάλα διαχρῆσθαι ἔτι καὶ νῦν τῇ αὐτῇ. - - κἀκείνῃ δὲ ἔτι συμβάλ-
    λονται, ὡς Ἀσίας τὴν κάτω χώραν ἐνοικοῦντα βάρβαρα ἔθνη Τούρκων,
    Λυδίαν, Καρίαν, Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν, Σκύθαις τὴν ἀπὸ Ταναΐ-
    δος ἐπὶ Σαρματίαν χώραν ἐπινεμομένοις ὁμόγλωττά τε ἐστι καὶ ὁμό-
    σκευα.

WAHRHEIT UND TRUG
IN DEN DRAMEN DES EURIPIDES

Siegfried Jäkel

Wenn hier von Trug und Wahrheit in den Dramen des Euripides gehandelt wird, so geschieht das nicht auf dem Hintergrund der philosophischen Erkenntnis, für die alles menschliche Geschehen schicksalhaft trügerisch ist,[1] sondern die hier angestrebte Untersuchung richtet sich bewusst auf ein vordergründig bescheideneres Ziel: Es soll nämlich untersucht werden, wo das Handeln und Sprechen der Menschen im Drama des Euripides wahr - und wo es verlogen ist. Wir gehen davon aus, dass das Drama eine eigene Wirklichkeit vermittelt, in der es Lüge und Wahrheit gibt - wie im wirklichen Leben.[2]

Konkret gesprochen heisst das, dass sich Wahrheit in dieser Wirklichkeit des Dramas immer dort ereignet, wo das Handeln und Sprechen der Menschen übereinstimmt mit ihren wahren Gefühlen, Empfindungen und Überzeugungen, und dass Trug oder Täuschung immer nur dann vorliegt, wenn das nicht der Fall ist, also wenn die Menschen im Drama gegen ihre Gefühle, Empfindungen oder Überzeugungen handeln oder reden.

---

1 Dieser Ausgangspunkt liegt etwa der Arbeit von Hans Strohm zu Grunde, Trug und Täuschung in der euripideischen Dramatik, Würzburger Jahrbücher Bd. 4, Heft 1 (1949-1950) 140-156, der im existentiellen Sinne an diese Frage herangeht.
2 Die Dichtung als solche wird also hier nicht im solonischen Sinne pauschal als Lüge betrachtet.

Das Phänomen 'Trug' in der Tragödie ist unter dem Stichwort

'Intrigue' in der Philologie immer wieder behandelt worden, am ein-

gehendsten und gründlichsten in der Studie von Friedrich Solmsen.[3]

Solmsen kommt in diesem Aufsatz zu sehr wesentlichen Bedeu-

tungsunterschieden in der Motivation zur Intrigue bei Sophokles und

Euripides; er geht von ethisch-moralischen Kriterien aus und zeigt,

dass die Intrigue in den Dramen des Sophokles aus einer psychischen

Existenznot der Protagonisten resultiert (etwa bei Deianeira in den

Trachinierinnen) und insofern in ethischer Hinsicht in höherem Masse

gerechtfertigt ist als etwa in den späteren Dramen des Euripides,

in denen die Intrigue aus rein egoistischen Zwecken ins Werk gesetzt

sein soll und vom Menschen her eher kalkulierbar, d.h. manipulierbar,

ist.

Wir wollen hier zunächst einmal den ethischen oder moralisch

wertenden Aspekt ausser acht lassen, dafür aber wollen wir neben der

Erscheinung des Truges, der Intrigue - wie wir sie eben bestimmt hat-

ten - noch eine andere Erscheinung untersuchen, nämlich die der Wahr-

heit - ebenfalls im oben definierten Sinn - und zwar sollen beide

Phänomene immer im Hinblick auf den handelnden Menschen betrachtet

werden, gleichsam in der Brechung seines Wollens, seines Handlungs-

zieles.

Man könnte die Fragestellung, die hier zu Grunde liegt, auch

in folgender Weise deutlich machen: Welche Funktion und welchen Stel-

lenwert haben Trug und Wahrheit in der Struktur der euripideischen

---

3   Zur Gestaltung des Intriguenmotivs in den Tragödien des Sopho-
    kles und Euripides. Philologus 1932, 1-17. Vgl. auch in neuerer
    Zeit Ursula Parlavantza-Friedrich, Täuschungsszenen in den Tra-
    gödien des Sophokles, Berlin 1969.

Dramen, und in welchem Verhältnis stehen sie zum jeweiligen ΤΕΛΟΣ,

zu dem jeweiligen Ziel der Handlung.

In diesem Zusammenhang werden auch einige Dramenrekonstruk-

tionen von nicht erhaltenen Tragödien in diese Untersuchung mit ein-

bezogen, so zum Beispiel die ΜΕΛΑΝΙΠΠΗ ΣΟΦΗ, der ΑΙΟΛΟΣ und der

ΦΑΕΘΩΝ. Andererseits werden einige erhaltene Dramen nicht berück-

sichtigt, da in ihnen der Gegensatz von Trug und Wahrheit im hier

gemeinten Sinne nicht existiert, so etwa die Herakliden, die Hike-

tiden und die Phoenissen.

Wie auch sonst so nehmen die Bakchen hinsichtlich unserer

Fragestellung eine Sonderstellung ein, die am Schluss eingehender

erörtert wird.

Beginnen wir mit dem frühesten Drama des Dichters, das ganz

erhalten ist, mit der Alkestis.

Wie die meisten der euripideischen Dramen zerfällt die Al-

kestis auch in zwei Teile - und wie überall bei Sophokles und Euri-

pides steht am Anfang des Drama ein Leid, ein ΠΑΘΟΣ, gegen welches

das ΔΡΑΝ des Helden, das Handeln des Protagonisten, sich richtet.

Im Falle der Alkestis ist es der unmittelbar bevorstehende Tod der

Alkestis, die für Admet, ihren Mann, zu sterben bereit ist.

Die Darstellung dieser Leid-Situation in den ersten 475 Ver-

sen des Dramas ist vor allem durch die Abschiedsszenen gekennzeich-

net, Alkestis nimmt Abschied von ihren Kindern und von ihrem Mann.

Mit dem Auftritt des Herakles im Vers 476 beginnt der zweite Teil

des Dramas und hier ist auch die erste Täuschunsszene, der erste

Trug, zu finden: Admet verschweigt seinem Gast den Tod seiner Gat-

tin, um der heiligen Pflicht der Gastfreundschaft, der ΞΕΝΙΑ, ge-

nügen zu können. Dass hier der Trug dazu dient, das Ritual der Gast-
freundschaft zu vollziehen, das liegt nahe, wenn man sich den Inhalt
des Chorliedes vergegenwärtigt, das der Chor nach dem Abgang des
Admet (Vers 567) anstimmt. Es kann kein Zweifel bestehen, dass die
Verse 597-605 sich auf das Verhalten von Admet beziehen, eine Tat-
sache, die von den Kommentatoren auch immer wieder festgestellt wor-
den ist.

So wird denn in der Haltung des Admet hier eine geistige ΕΥ-
ΓΕΝΕΙΑ gesehen, die gekennzeichnet ist durch ΑΙΔΩΣ und ΣΟΦΙΑ, beides
Eigenschaften, die der Chor bewundert. Fragen wir nun, wem gegen-
über Admet in dem vorliegenden Fall ΑΙΔΩΣ entgegenbringt, so kann
die Antwort nur lauten: der ΞΕΝΙΑ, der heiligen Pflicht der Gast-
freundschaft, denn er nimmt den Gast auf, obwohl seine persönliche
Situation voll von Trauer und Tränen ist. Diese Haltung, die der Chor
bewundert (Vers 603), wird mit dem Adjektiv ΘΕΟΣΕΒΗΣ bezeichnet.

Aber als Herakles vom Diener den Trug erfährt (Vers 822),
und als er erkennt, dass Admet die ΑΙΔΩΣ vor der ΞΕΝΙΑ höher ge-
stellt hat als seinen persönlichen Kummer (823-824), da entschliesst
er sich, Alkestis zu retten und dem Tod wieder zu entreissen.

Am Schluss des Dramas steht wieder eine Trugszene: Herakles
übergibt dem Admet eine verschleierte Frau, hinter der sich Al-
kestis verbirgt, und will sie in die Obhut Admets geben. Dieser
aber weigert sich, weil er zunächst in der verschleierten Fremden
nicht Alkestis erkennt, und weil er nach dem Verlust seiner Gattin
keine andere Frau mehr haben will. Aber als er sie dann erkennt,
gibt Herakles zu verstehen, dass er die rettende Tat nur seiner
Gastfreundschaft zu verdanken hat (Vers 1119) und in den Versen

1147ff. ermahnt er ihn, auch weiterhin diese Pflicht der Gastfreund-
schaft zu erfüllen (καὶ δίκαιος ὢν/τὸ λοιπόν, Ἄδμητ᾽, εὐσέβει περὶ
ξένους.).

Wir haben in der Alkestis also folgendes Resultat: Um ein Ri-
tual, das der ΞΕΝΙΑ, einhalten zu können, wird ein Trug ins Werk
gesetzt. Die Entdeckung des Truges jedoch bewirkt die Rettung.

Auch die Medea ist ein Drama, das in zwei Teile zerfällt, und
hier ist es so, dass diese beiden Teile geradezu durch die Begriffe
Wahrheit und Trug bestimmt sind. Auch in diesem Drama steht am Be-
ginn das Leid, die ΠΑΘΟΣ-Situation: Iason ist im Begriff, Medea zu
verlassen, der er eigentlich alles verdankt, was er erreicht hat.
Zudem erklärt ihr Kreon, der künftige Schwiegervater von Iason, dass
sie mit ihren Kindern das Land zu verlassen hat (271-363).

In der ersten grossen Szene zwischen Medea und Iason (446-625)
tritt sie ihm mit der Offenheit ihres Hasses entgegen - also kein
Trug, keine Täuschung - vielleicht in der Hoffnung, ihn doch noch
für sich zu gewinnen, auf jeden Fall aber in der Absicht ihn zutiefst
zu beschämen und ihn auf diese Weise von dem Schritt zurückzuhalten,
sich mit einer anderen Frau zu verbinden. Aber das Gespräch führt
nicht zum Ziel, es endet unversöhnlich, und damit endet auch der
erste Teil des Dramas, in dessen Mitte das grosse ΕΡΩΣ-Chorlied
steht, das die beiden Teile der Tragödie verbindet.

Im zweiten Teil des Dramas betreibt Medea konsequent ihre
Rache: die Rückversicherung mit Ägeus, um sich einen Zufluchtsort
zu sichern (764-824), die Entwicklung ihres Racheplanes, der auf
Trug gebaut ist (764-824), die Ausführung des Truges, das zweite
Gespräch mit Iason, das ebenfalls ein Trug-Gespräch ist, also in

täuschender Absicht geschieht (866-975), und schliesslich das Ge-
lingen des Truges (Botenbericht 1116-1235).

So sind in der Medea die beiden Teile des Dramas gewisserma-
ssen dadurch gegenübergestellt,dass die Wahrheit in unserem Sinne
den ersten Teil des Dramas beherrscht, während sich der Trug im zwei-
ten Teil vollzieht. Und während Medea mit der Wahrheit im ersten Teil
nicht zu ihrem Ziel gelangt, ist sie im zweiten Teil dann mit ihrem
Trug erfolgreich.

In ähnlicher Weise ist auch der Hippolytos konzipiert, sowohl
der erste, verlorene, den wir annähernd aus der Phädra des Seneca
rekonstruieren können, als auch der zweite, uns überlieferte Hippo-
lytos aus dem Jahre 428. Auch hier gibt es zwei Dramenteile, und auch
hier steht am Anfang ein ΠΑΘΟΣ, ein Leid, das überwunden werden soll,
das ΠΑΘΟΣ der Liebe Phädras zu ihrem Stiefsohn Hippolytos. Und auch
hier gründet sich das Handeln, das ΔΡΑΝ, im ersten Dramenteil auf
Wahrheit und im zweiten auf Trug. Soweit es die Reste der Überliefe-
rung und die Fassung des Seneca erkennen lassen, vollzog sich im
ersten Dramenteil der ersten Hippolytosfassung das ΔΡΑΝ der Phädra,
das als Ziel die Erfüllung ihrer Liebesnot hatte, in einer Szene
zwischen Phädra und Hippolytos selbst. Phädra bekennt ihre Liebe zu
ihrem Stiefsohn diesem direkt. Nicht so in der uns erhaltenen zweiten
Fassung. Da bedient sich Phädra für ihr Liebesbekenntnis ihrer Amme,
die in einer Szene mit Hippolytos diesem das Liebesverlangen ihrer
Herrin vermittelt. Die gleiche Beobachtung lässt sich bei der Anwen-
dung des Truges in der zweiten Dramenhälfte machen: In der ersten
Fassung scheint ausser Zweifel zu sein, dass Phädra in einer persön-
lichen Begegnung mit Theseus ihren Stiefsohn verleugnet, diesem also

gleichsam ins Angesicht lügt, während in der zweiten, uns erhaltenen späteren Fassung dieser Trug sich indirekt durch Schriftzeichen auf der Wachstafel vollzieht, deren sich die bereits tote Phädra bedient. Beiden Fassungen aber ist eines gemeinsam: Das Bekenntnis der Wahrheit in der ersten Hälfte des Dramas führt nicht zum Ziel der begehrten Liebeserfüllung, jedoch erreicht die Anwendung des Truges im zweiten Teil die Erfüllung des Hasses, zu dem sich die Liebe Phädras inzwischen verwandelt hat.

Der uns überlieferte Hippolytos ist im Jahre 428 aufgeführt worden. Das Thema des Dramas aber gehört wohl noch in die dreissiger Jahre, in die ja auch die erste Fassung des Hippolytos fällt. Im wesentlichen aber sind die Jahre zwischen 430 und 420 gekennzeichnet durch die sogenannten 'Hikesie-Dramen', durch die Herakliden, die Andromache und die Hiketiden - wenigstens soweit man aus den überlieferten Dramen dieser Zeit schliessen kann. In all diesen Dramen aber hat die hier untersuchte Trug-Wahrheit -Problematik keine wesentliche Bedeutung. Dem ΠΑΘΟΣ, dem Leid, das auch hier am Anfang der Dramen steht, versuchen die Protagonisten zu begegnen, indem sie das Ritual der Hikesie üben. Trug und Wahrheit aber in der oben dargestellten Weise sind im Ablauf dieser Dramen keine handlungsbestimmenden Motive. Nur in der Andromache verwendet sie der Dichter: Andromache soll sich vom Altar der Thetis entfernen, damit sie ergriffen und getötet werden kann, denn immerhin scheuen sich die Verfolger, Hermione und Menelaos, ein offensichtliches Sakrileg zu begehen, indem sie eine Bittflehende ergreifen. So locken sie Andromache von diesem Altar hinweg mit einem trügerischen Versprechen; sie versprechen nämlich das Leben ihres Sohnes, Molossos, zu

schonen, wenn sie den Altar verlässt. Andromache geht auf diesen

Trug ein - aus Liebe zu ihrem Kind - aber kaum hat sie den Altar

verlassen, erklärt man ihr, dass natürlich auch ihr Sohn sterben

muss (310-463). Doch die Gestaltung dieses Trugmotives hat an die-

ser Stelle mehr episodischen Charakter und ist nicht wesentlich

handlungsbestimmend.

In gewisser Weise auch noch zu den Hikesie-Dramen ist die He-

cuba zu rechnen. Hecuba übt in diesem Stück zweimal die Hikesie,

einmal vor Odysseus, um ihre Tochter zu retten, und das zweite Mal

vor Agamemnon, um an Polymestor Rache zu nehmen. Im ersten Fall

scheitert Hecuba, denn Odysseus, dem sie einstmals das Leben ret-

tete, ist nicht bereit, ihr jetzt zu helfen, aber im zweiten Falle

hat sie Erfolg; ihre Rache an Polymestor gelingt, weil Agamemnon,

den sie in der Hikesie um Hilfe und Beistand gebeten hatte, ihr

verspricht, nicht gegen sie einzuschreiten, und weil sie selbst

gegen Polymestor einen Trug anwendet: sie lockt ihn unter dem Vor-

wand, dass ein neuer Goldschatz auf ihn warte, in ihr Zelt und blen-

det ihn. In diesem Drama hat der Trug also die Funktion, mit dazu

beizutragen, dass das durch die Hikesie erstrebte und auch passiv

zugesagte Ziel der Rache erreicht wird.

Neben diesen Hikesie-Dramen kann man aber in diesem Jahrzehnt

bei Euripides noch eine andere Dramenart finden, die als Dramen kon-

struiert gewesen sein müssen, in denen das Trug-Wahrheit -Motiv we-

sentlich die Handlung bestimmt haben muss. Leider sind wir hier auf

die Rekonstruktion zweier Dramen angewiesen, auf die Rekonstruktion

des Aiolos und der Melanippe Sophe. Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass

diese beiden Dramen auch um die Mitte dieses Jahrzehnts zwischen 430

und 420 aufgeführt worden sind.[4] Da beide Dramen nicht überliefert

sind, muss der Handlungsablauf dieser beiden Tragödien - soweit er

sich rekonstruieren lässt - kurz dargestellt werden:

Auch im 'Aiolos' steht am Anfang des Dramas ein ΠΑΘΟΣ, eine

Leidsituation: Die heimliche Liebe der Geschwister Makareus und Ka-

nake hat zu einer Schwangerschaft Kanakes geführt. Aber der Bruder

kann die Schwester nicht heiraten. Der erste Teil des Dramas scheint

den ersten Versuch darzustellen, den Makareus unternimmt, diesem ΠΑ-

ΘΟΣ zu begegnen. Er geht zu seinem Vater und versucht, diesen in ei-

ner allgemeinen Diskussion über das Problem der Geschwisterehe zu

überzeugen, dass eine Ehe unter Geschwistern aus rein ökonomischen

Gründen von Vorteil sei.

Der Vater lässt sich überzeugen, doch da er nicht weiss, dass

Makareus, sein Sohn, bereits eine bestimmte Schwester heiraten möch-

te, nämlich Kanake, schlägt er vor, dass das Los entscheiden soll,

welcher seiner sechs Söhne nun wen von seinen sechs Töchtern heira-

ten soll. Dieses erste ΑΝΤΙΔΡΑΝ des Makareus ist insofern auf Trug

gebaut, als er sein persönliches Anliegen hinter einer allgemeinen

Diskussion zu verbergen trachtet. Das muss der Inhalt des ersten

Dramenteiles gewesen sein. Zu Beginn des zweiten Teiles ist nun of-

fenbar eine neue Leidsituation entstanden: Makareus zieht das falsche

Los, nicht das der Kanake, seiner Geliebten, und ausserdem wird die

Geburt eines Kindes durch Kanake vom Vater entdeckt.

Hier, zu Beginn des zweiten Dramenteils setzt nun auch das

zweite ΑΝΤΙΔΡΑΝ des Makareus ein; er geht erneut zu seinem Vater

---

4   Zum Problem der Rekonstruktion dieser beiden Dramen vgl. den dem-
    nächst in den Grazer Beiträgen erscheinenden Artikel über den Ai-
    olos des Euripides.

und sagt ihm diesmal - gezwungen vom Druck der Verhältnisse- die

Wahrheit. Der Schluss des Dramas ist nicht mehr ganz sicher aus-

zumachen, aber fest steht immerhin, dass Makareus auch diesmal Er-

folg hat, dass er aber zu spät kommt mit seinem rettenden Wort, sei-

ne Schwester hatte sich mit dem Schwert, das ihr der Vater geschickt

hat, bereits getötet.

Für unser Thema ergibt sich daraus, dass Euripides hier das

Trugmotiv in rhetorisch-sophistischer Sicht darstellt. Der Trug

vollzieht sich hier nicht dadurch, dass man lügt, sondern dass man

mit Hilfe einer allgemeinen Diskussion ein ganz persönliches - ge-

wissermassen privates - Ziel erreichten will, das man aber ver-

schweigt, sodass nach aussen der Eindruck entsteht, dass es dem

Redner um die Sache geht - und nicht um seine persönlichen Wünsche.

Ähnlich muss es sich in der Melanippe Sophe verhalten haben:

Melanippe - von Poseidon vergewaltigt - hat Zwillinge zur Welt ge-

bracht, die sie aus Angst vor ihrem Vater aussetzt. Als dieser die

ausgesetzten Kinder entdeckt, will er sie töten lassen, weil er sie

für Ungeheuer hält.

Da setzt das ANTIΔPAN der Melanippe ein; sie beginnt zu argu-

mentieren, um das Leben ihrer Kinder zu retten - aber sie bekennt

sich nicht zur Wahrheit, sie bekennt sich nicht zur Mutterschaft,

sondern sie führt eine allgemeine Diskussion, worin sie den Vater

zu überzeugen versucht, dass die Kinder keine Ungeheuer sind. Sie

geht in dieser Argumentation sogar soweit, dass sie den wahren Sach-

verhalt, nämlich die Tatsache, dass sie selbst die Mutter ist, als

Hypothese annimmt und einer anderen Person unterschiebt, indem sie

sagt: nimm an, ein Mädchen - von einem Gott vergewaltigt - hätte

diese Kinder zur Welt gebracht, dann würdest du zu ihrem Mörder,
wenn du sie tötest.

Wie das Stück ausgeht, ist nicht klar auszumachen, auch nicht,
welch anderes Mittel Melanippe ergreift, als ihr erstes ANTIΔPAN
scheitert, wichtig in unserem Zusammenhang ist aber die Tatsache,
dass auch hier ein Trugmotiv in sophistisch-rhetorischem Gewande
auftritt - wie im Aiolos.

Das grosse Drama der Wende an der Schwelle vom dritten zum
zweiten Jahrzehnt des 5. Jhdts. ist der rasende Herakles.[5] Es ist
noch ein Hikesie-Drama, weist aber in gewisser Weise bereits voraus
auf die folgende Schaffensperiode des Dichters, die durch die so-
genannten Intrigendramen gekennzeichnet ist. Aber unser Trug-Wahr-
heit -Motiv ist im Herakles nicht handlungsbestimmend. Deshalb kön-
nen wir dieses Drama in unserer Betrachtung fallen lassen.

So wenden wir uns jetzt den sogenannten Intrigenstücken zu,
die in der Philologie schon von jeher als solche erkannt worden
sind, und die in das 2. Jahrzehnt des 5. Jhdts. fallen, also in die
Zeit zwischen 420 und 410. Da sind von den überlieferten Dramen vor
allem drei zu nennen: die Elektra, die Helena und die Iphigenie auf
Tauris. Auch diese Dramen gliedern sich in zwei Teile. Der erste
Teil ist gekennzeichnet durch den ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΜΟΣ. Das heisst, das zwei
Personen, die sich in einer ΠΑΘΟΣ-Situation befinden, sich nach lan-
ger Trennung wieder begegnen und vor allem auch sich wieder erken-
nen: Elektra und Orest in der Elektra, Helena und Menelaos in der
Helena und Iphigenie und Orest in der Iphigenie auf Tauris.

---

5 Vgl. dazu Vf., Gymnasium 1972, 50-61.

Ausgehend von unserer Fragestellung ist es naheliegend, in
diesen Anagnorismos-Szenen, die jeweils den ersten Dramenteil be-
stimmen, das Wahrheitsmotiv zu sehen. Demgegenüber vollzieht sich
im zweiten Teil dieser Dramen der Trug; darauf ist das ANTIΔPAN ge-
baut, das dem Anagnorismos der beiden Helden folgt. Und dieses ge-
meinsam unternommene ANTIΔPAN, das sich gegen die ΠAΘOΣ-Situation
richtet, bedient sich in allen drei obengenannten Dramen eines Ri-
tuals als Mittel zum Trug: In der Elektra benutzt Orest das Ritual
der Opferung, um Ägisth zu ermorden, und Elektra das vorgetäuschte
Ritual der Kindersegnung zum Mord an Klytämnestra, in der Helena
wird das Ritual des Totenopfers und in der Iphigenie auf Tauris wird
das Ritual des Sühneopfers als Vorwand benutzt, um die glückliche
Rettung der Vereinigten gelingen zu lassen.

Am Ende dieses Jahrzehnts steht als Abschluss dieser Art von
Intrigendramen der Ion. Wie Solmsen[6] bereits in seinem Aufsatz rich-
tig gezeigt hat ist in der Struktur des Ion das Anagnorismos-Motiv
beherrschend, hingegen das Intriguen-Motiv untergeordnet. Auf jeden
Fall aber unterscheidet sich das Drama in seiner Struktur wesentlich
von den drei reinen Intrigenstücken Helena, Elektra und Iphigenie
auf Tauris.Das Intrigenmotiv im Ion hat jedenfalls nicht den Stel-
lenwert wie in den drei eben genannten Dramen und es führt auch
nicht zum Erfolg, sondern es leitet einen zweiten Anagnorismos ein.

Wenn wir von unserer Fragestellung ausgehen, so dürfte das

---

6 Vgl. hierzu und im Folgenden die grundlegende Arbeit von Friedrich
  Solmsen, Euripides' Ion im Vergleich mit anderen Tragödien. Philo-
  logus 1934, seit kurzem auch in Friedrich Solmsen, Kleine Schrif-
  ten I, 158ff.

Element der Wahrheit in den Anagnorismos-Szenen zu sehen sein und

das Element der Lüge in den Intrigen der zweiten Dramenhälften.

Damit ergibt sich für die Struktur des Ion ein vielschichtige-

res Bild als bei den drei anderen Intrigendramen, die wir erwähnten.

Zunächst fällt auf, dass das Stück nicht ohne weiteres in zwei Teile

gegliedert werden kann:

Zu Beginn der Tragödie haben wir ein kinderloses Ehepaar, Xu-

thos und Kreusa, das sich Kinder wünscht, aber keine bekommen kann.

Gegen dieses ΠΑΘΟΣ der Kinderlosigkeit unternehmen nun beide ein

ΑΝΤΙΔΡΑΝ: Sie gehen zum Tempel Apolls, um den Gott um Kindersegen zu

bitten. Während Xuthos nun in den Tempel hineingeht, um den Gott zu

befragen, wartet Kreusa vor der Tempeltür und trifft bei dieser Ge-

legenheit mit ihrem Sohn Ion zusammen, von dem sie aber noch nicht

weiss, dass es ihr Sohn ist. Diesem nun offenbart sie ihr eigenes

Schicksal in indirekter Weise, indem sie es so darstellt, als wäre

es das Schicksal von einer Freundin. In dieser Szene wird die Wahr-

heit in verschlüsselter Form dargestellt.[7]

In der Zwischenzeit ist Xuthos im Tempel die Weissagung zuteil

geworden, dass derjenige, dem er nach dem Verlassen des Tempels als

erstem begegnen wird, sein Sohn sei. Hier haben wir den ersten Ana-

gnorismos in diesem Drama; Ion selbst ist natürlich zunächst sehr

verwundert, dass ein Fremder ihn einfach als Sohn anspricht, doch

als er von dem Orakel hört, ist auch er überzeugt, seinen Vater ge-

funden zu haben.

---

7 Dieses Motiv des Bekennens der Wahrheit in verschlüsselter Form
  war bereits in der Melanippe Sophe begegnet: auch dort spricht
  Melanippe von ihren eigenen Kindern wie von Kindern einer anderen
  Frau.

In diesem Anagnorismos wird aber - angeregt durch die Weisung
eines Gottes - eine Lüge als wahr dargestellt und von beiden Betei-
ligten für wahr gehalten. Deshalb hat man ihn in der Philologie im-
mer schon als einen Pseudo-Anagnorismos bezeichnet.[8] Was nun aber
ist die Wirkung dieses für wahr gehaltenen Truges auf das Ehepaar?
Xuthos will in der Freude über die Entdeckung der Existenz seines
Sohnes diesen sogleich zu seinem politischen Erben, zu seinem Nach-
folger, machen. Doch der junge Ion winkt ab, er hat Bedenken, er
fürchtet den Spott und das Gelächter der Öffentlichkeit und den Hass
Kreusas, wenn er als Fremder, als ΞΕΝΟΣ, die führende Rolle im Staat
übernehmen sollte. Das sieht nun auch Xuthos ein, und so plant er
eine Intrige, indem er vorschlägt, seinen angeblichen Sohn Ion zu-
nächst als ΞΕΝΟΣ in sein Haus einzuführen, da er die Gunst Kreusas
auch nicht ohne weiteres verlieren will.

Sehr viel schwerer ist Kreusa durch diesen für wahr gehaltenen
Trug getroffen. Als sie erfährt, dass ihr Mann einen Sohn hat, plant
sie nun ihrerseits mit dem alten Freund ihres Vaters eine Intrige.
Ihre Wut richtet sich in gleicher Weise gegen Apoll wie gegen Ion
und Xuthos. Es werden drei mögliche Reaktionen ihrerseits erörtert:
1. Den Tempel Apolls niederzubrennen. Das aber lehnt Kreusa ab aus
Furcht (Ion 975). 2. Ihren Gemahl Xuthos zu töten. Das lehnt sie
ebenfalls ab, und zwar aus ΑΙΔΩΣ (Ion 977). In den dritten Vorschlag
ihres Beraters willigt sie ein, nämlich Ion zu töten.

Die Intrige wird eingeleitet; Ion soll vergiftet werden, als

---

8 Man darf aber nicht übersehen, dass diese 'Wahrheit' für Xuthos bis
  über das Ende des Dramas hinaus noch eine subjektive Wahrheit bleibt.

er ein Trankopfer darbringt. Und wieder wird hier ein Ritual als Mittel zum Trug verwendet, wie in den drei reinen Intrigendramen, aber diesmal scheitert die Intrige und Ion wird gerettet. Der Inhalt des Bechers wird verschüttet und die Tauben, die sich Ion scheute zu töten - aus ΑΙΔΩΣ (!) - zu Beginn des Dramas, diese gleichen Tauben decken die Intrige auf, denn sie schlürfen von dem verschütteten Opfertrank und fallen tot um.

Nach dem gescheiterten Mordanschlag auf Ion wird Kreusa nun ihrerseits von ihm verfolgt. Sie nimmt ihre Zuflucht als Bittflehende (IKETIΣ) im Heiligtum Apolls, und Ion scheut davor zurück, sie im Zustand der Hikesie zu töten. In dieser höchsten Not wird durch die Prophetin, die aus dem Tempel tritt, der zweite Anagnorismos eingeleitet. Sie übergibt ihm das Körbchen, in welchem er als ausgesetzter Säugling gefunden wurde, und sie fordert ihn im Namen Apolls auf, nach seiner Mutter zu suchen. Dieser zweite Anagnorismos deckt nun endlich die Wahrheit auf und bewahrt den Sohn vor dem Muttermord.

Das sind etwa die Hauptstationen der Handlungsführung in diesem Drama, und es war notwendig, sich bei der Betrachtung des Ion die einzelnen Szenen des Dramas etwas ausführlicher zu vergegenwärtigen, nicht nur weil der Ion - wie bereits erwähnt - ein etwas vielschichtigeres Stück ist als die anderen hier behandelten Dramen, sondern vor allem auch deshalb, weil Euripides in diesem Drama alle von ihm bis dahin entwickelten Tragödienelemente in sehr kunstvoller Weise vereinigt hat. Zugleich gab er damit auch dem Trug-Wahrheit-Motiv eine neue Dimension.

Da ist zunächst das in der Alkestis vorgefundene ΑΙΔΩΣ-Motiv wiederzufinden: Dort war es Admet, der seiner ΑΙΔΩΣ vor der ΞΕΝΙΑ

die Rettung seiner Frau, Alkestis, verdankt - hier ist es Ion selbst,
der aus ΑΙΔΩΣ zu Beginn des Dramas die Tempeltauben verschont, d.h.
nicht tötet, dieselben, die ihm kurze Zeit darauf den Mordanschlag
aufdecken, der gegen ihn gerichtet war.

Dann ist das in den Jahren zwischen 430 und 420 immer wieder
dargestellte Hikesie-Motiv zu finden: Kreusa flüchtet vor Ion als
ΙΚΕΤΙΣ, als Bittflehende in das Heiligtum Apolls. Und schliesslich
findet sich im Ion auch das Trug-Wahrheit-Motiv wieder, das in den
Jahren nach 420 in der Form der Intrigendramen Ausdruck gefunden
hatte; nur ist im Ion dieses Motiv mit neuen, wesentlich anders-
artigen Akzenten versehen. Zwar wird das Ritual als Mittel zum Trug
auch hier noch verwendet (Ion soll beim Trankopfer umkommen), doch
der Anschlag misslingt, und die Intrige hat nicht mehr den zentralen
Stellenwert wie in den früheren Dramen.

Das zentrale Thema indes des Ion ist der Anagnorismos, der
hier eine neue Funktion übernimmt, denn wie bereits erwähnt gibt es
zwei Anagnorismoi in diesem Drama von unterschiedlicher Art. Der
erste ist ein Pseudoanagnorismos, dessen Scheinwahrheit aber bis
über das Ende der Tragödie hinaus gültig bleibt; der zweite ist der
wahre, der eigentliche Anagnorismos, und dieser hat im Handlungs-
ablauf die rettende Funktion übernommen, die in den Intrigendramen
das ΜΗΧΑΝΗΜΑ, das Trugelement, besass. In gewisser Weise aber er-
füllt der Pseudoanagnorismos ebenfalls eine rettende Funktion, in-
dem er das Glück des Xuthos - auf Rat der Göttin - über das Ende
des Dramas hinaus noch sichert. Aber dieses Glück des Xuthos ist
auf Trug gebaut.

Nach all dem ist es wohl nicht abwegig, im Ion ein Drama an

der Schwelle zu einer neuen Schaffensperiode des Dichters zu sehen,

die er vorbereitet und die sich im Phaethon und in den Dramen des

letzten Lebensjahrzehnt, vor allem in der Iphigenie in Aulis, ver-

wirklichen sollte.[9]

Wenden wir uns nun dem Phaethon zu.[10] Es hat den Anschein,

als sei der Phaethon wieder in zwei Handlungskomplexe geteilt. Die

Problematik des ersten Teils ergibt sich aus der für die Beteiligten

etwas undurchsichtigen Familiensituation, dadurch, dass weder der

Vater (Merops) noch der Sohn (Phaethon) über die wahre Vaterschaft

(Helios) Bescheid weiss. Am Anfang dieses Dramas stand also ein Trug,

der thematisch lebhaft an das Ende des Ion erinnert wo auch der

Stiefvater (Xuthos) sich für den Vater des Ion hält, wohingegen in

Wahrheit Apoll der Vater ist. So hatte auch die Klymene im Phaethon

- wie die Kreusa im Ion - die wahre Vaterschaft ihres Sohnes geheim

gehalten, bis eines Tages die Verhältnisse es notwendig machten, das

Geheimnis zu lüften. Denn Phaethon wollte oder sollte eine Tochter

des Helios heiraten, und Helios war ja sein Vater. So musste ihm die

Mutter die Wahrheit sagen, um eine Geschwisterehe zu verhindern. Und

insofern ist zu Beginn des Phaethon die 'pia fraus', die am Ende des

Ion gestanden hatte, zum Problem geworden. Die Lösung dieses Problems,

---

9   Ein Wort noch über die 'Troerinnen'. Als handlungstragendes Ele-
    ment sind hier weder Trug noch Wahrheit anzutreffen - es sei denn
    man würde in der Tatsache, dass die Sieger hier in gewisserweise
    auch als Besiegte dargestellt werden, den Trug sehen, der hinter
    der Wahrheit des Sieges steht. Doch die Handlungsführung selbst
    ist davon nicht berührt.
10 Vgl. hierzu den Kommentar und die Rekonstruktionsversuche von
    James Diggle, Euripides, Phaethon, Cambridge 1970.

d.h. die Aufdeckung der Wahrheit, leitet dann zum zweiten Handlungs-
teil des Dramas über, der damit ein Thema aufgreift, das für die
folgenden, die letzten Dramen des Euripides bestimmend gewesen ist:
die Aporie.

Diese aporetische Situation entsteht dadurch, dass Phaethon
von Helios als Beweis für dessen Vaterschaft den einzigen Wunsch
verlangt, von dessen Erfüllung Helios weiss, das sie für Phaethon
den Tod bedeuten wird: einen Tag den Sonnenwagen zu lenken. Somit
ist Helios vor die aporetische Alternative gestellt, entweder sein
Wort zu brechen, das er einstmals der Klymene gab, zum Zeichen und
zum Beweis seiner Vaterschaft jeden Wunsch des Sohnes zu erfüllen
- oder Phaethon wissend in den Tod zu schicken.

Für das Trug-Wahrheit -Motiv ergibt sich aus dieser Rekonstruk-
tion des Phaethon, dass am Anfang des Dramas ein Trug stand, dessen
Aufdeckung im zweiten Teil des Dramas zu einer Anagnorismos-Szene
führt, die den Untergang des Helden bedeutet.

Die nächsten beiden Dramen aus dem letzten Lebensjahrzehnt
des Dichters, in denen Trug und Wahrheit handlungsbestimmend sind,
sind der Orestes und die Iphigenie in Aulis. Beginnen wir mit dem
Orestes.

Der erste Teil des Dramas zeigt das Scheitern des Orest, der
vergeblich den Menelaos um Hilfe bittet, ihn vor der drohenden Stei-
nigung durch das Volk zu bewahren, und das ganze Ausmass der Hoffnungs-
losigkeit der Situation des Orest, die daraus folgt. Mit dem Auftre-

ten des Pylades (729) beginnt der zweite Teil des Dramas.[11] Hier

sind es nun drei Menschen, die sich zum gemeinsamen Handeln zu-

sammenfinden, Elektra, Orest und Pylades. Sie schmieden ein Komplott,

um Orest aus höchster Not zu befreien. Dabei sind sie in der Wahl

ihrer Mittel wesentlich unbedenklicher als die Protagonisten der

sogenannten Intrigendramen: sie beschliessen, Helena zu töten und

Hermione als Geissel in ihre Hände zu bekommen, um Menelaos zu

erpressen. Um dieses Ziel zu erreichen bedienen sich Orest und Py-

lades der Hikesie als Mittel zum Trug: sie nähern sich Helena unter

diesem Vorwand als Bittflehende, als IKETIΔEΣ, um die Rettung des

Orest zu erflehen - in Wahrheit aber in der Absicht, sie zu töten

(1414-1415 und 1331).

Vergleicht man nun den Funktionswert der Hikesie in der Struk-

tur des Orestes mit der Struktur früherer Dramen, so kommt man zu

folgendem Resultat: In den eigentlichen Hikesie-Dramen der 20ger

Jahre war das Ritual der Hikesie als solches noch in der Weise wirk-

sam, dass sich die Menschen an die Einhaltung dieser religiösen

Pflicht gebunden fühlten und den Bittflehenden Hilfe und Rettung

gewährten. In den Dramen nach dem Herakles, also in den sogenann-

ten Intrigendramen, wurde das kultische Ritual als Mittel zum Trug

benutzt, und das Gelingen dieses Truges bedeutete dann Rettung. In

den Dramen der letzten Schaffensperiode - nach dem Ion - wird das

Ritual der Hikesie - beispielsweise im Orestes - ebenfalls als Mit-

---

11 Die Wiederbegegnung der Freunde Orest und Pylades wird hier
   nicht in der Form einer Anagnorismos-Szene dargestellt, sondern
   sie vollzieht sich in direkter Form. Orest erkennt Pylades schon
   von weitem (725).

tel zum Trug verwendet, aber das Gelingen dieses Truges führt noch
keineswegs von selbst zur Rettung, sondern schafft erst jene apo-
retische Alternativ-Situation, die wir am Ausgang des Phaethon be-
reits angetroffen hatten, und die auch am Ende des Orestes steht:
Orest, auf den Zinnen des Palastes stehend, bedroht Hermione mit
dem Tode - und Menelaos muss sich entscheiden, er muss wählen zwi-
schen dem Verlust seiner Tochter und die Verkwirklichung seiner po-
litischen Pläne, in deren Interesse es sein würde, Orest auf diese
bequeme Art aus dem Wege zu schaffen.

Der erste Teil des Orestes ist also dadurch bestimmt, dass
der Protagonist auf dem Weg der Wahrheit vergeblich Hilfe in der
Not und Rettung anstrebt; deshalb wird im zweiten Teil der Trug nö-
tig, dessen Gelingen aber selbst noch keine Rettung bedeutet, son-
dern erst zu jener Entscheidungsituation führt, die aporetischen
Charakter hat.

Betrachten wir als nächstes Drama die Iphigenie in Aulis.
Hier hat das Trug-Wahrheit-Motiv ebenfalls handlungsbestimmenden
Charakter. Aber bereits in seinem ersten Teil treffen wir auf die
Darstellung jener aporetischen Alternativ-Situation, welches das
Handeln der Menschen wesentlich beeinflusst - ja eigentlich ihr Han-
deln auflöst, oder mindestens ihm seine Eindeutigkeit nimmt: Agamem-
non, der einen Brief an Klytämnestra abgeschickt hatte - mit trü-
gerischem Inhalt - schreibt gleich darauf einen zweiten Brief, der
den ersten widerrufen soll. Dieser zweite Brief aber wird von Mene-
laos abgefangen, der dem Bruder wegen seiner schwankenden Haltung
schwere Vorwürfe macht - bis wir denselben Menelaos einige Szenen
später selbst in dieser schwankenden Haltung erleben, als er seinem

Bruder vorschlagt, die Opferung der Iphigenie doch lieber zu ver-
hindern. So stellen die handelnden Personen bereits zu Beginn des
Dramas ihren eigenen Entschluss selbst in Frage, sodass ihr Handeln
an Eindeutigkeit und Zielstrebigkeit verliert und den Charakter der
Unsicherheit annimmt.[12]

Zugleich aber beherrscht das Trugmotiv den ersten Teil des
Dramas. Doch das Gelingen des Truges führt im zweiten Teil dann zu
einer Anagnorismos-Szene zwischen Achill und Klytämnestra, die die-
sen Trug entlarvt und die Wahrheit an den Tag bringt. Dieses Erken-
nen der Wahrheit nach der Anagnorismos-Szene führt im zweiten Teil
dann wieder zu einer Entscheidungsszene, in deren Mittelpunkt nun
Iphigenie, die Protagonistin, selbst steht. Diese Entscheidungssi-
tuation gewinnt dadurch aporetischen Charakter, dass Achill sich an-
bietet, Iphigenie notfalls mit Gewalt zu retten - und dadurch mögli-
cherweise sich selbst zu opfern. Doch dieser Konflikt wird hier nicht
- wie am Ende des Orestes - durch einen deus ex machina gelöst, son-
dern die Entscheidung trifft hier Iphigenie selbst, indem sie sich
freiwillig als Opfer stellt.

Es hat den Anschein, als habe Euripides, nachdem er um 410
dieses Thema von solch aporetischen Konfliktsituationen in seinen
Tragödien aufgegriffen hatte, nach und nach alle von ihm bis dahin
verwendeten Tragödienelemente für dieses neue Thema umgedeutet; je-
denfalls treffen wir in der Iphigenie in Aulis tatsächlich alle

---

12 Wie anders etwa vollzieht sich das Handeln des Helden im Agamemnon
   des Aischylos. Nachdem Agamemnon einmal seine Entscheidung getrof-
   fen hat, verfolgt er seinen Entschluss mit Zielstrebigkeit und zö-
   gert in keinem Augenblick mehr mit dessen Ausführung. Vgl. dazu
   auch Bruno Snell, Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama, Berlin 1926.

diese wieder. Da findet sich zunächst das Trug-Wahrheit -Motiv in

den Form der Intrige (MHXANHMA - ANAΓNΩPIΣMOΣ), wobei der Trug des

Hochzeitsrituals als Mittel zum Trug verwendet wird. Zugleich fin-

det sich auch das Hikesie-Motiv: Klytämnestra und Iphigenie flehen

vor Achill um Hilfe aus ihrer Not (855-1035).[13]

Wenden wir uns jetzt dem letzten erhaltenen Drama, den Bakchen,

zu. Zunächst fällt auf, dass sich unter den Personen des Dramas, die

wesentlich mit dem Handlungsablauf verflochten sind, ein Gott findet,

der in Menschengestalt auftritt: Dionysos. Ausgehend von unserer

Fragestellung scheint es nicht unwesentlich, festzustellen, dass in

der Person des Dionysos sowohl das Trugelement als auch das Wahr-

heitselement zusammenfliessen, denn der Gott ist zugleich er selbst

als auch sein eigener Diener - und er spricht von sich selbst in

Worten, die sowohl auf seine Eigenschaft als Gott als auch auf die

seines Dieners zutreffen (vgl. etwa Bakch. 500, 518 etc.).

Aber ausserdem haben wir unser Trug-Wahrheit -Motiv auch als

handlungstragendes Element in diesem Drama und zwar ebenfalls in der-

selben Reihenfolge im Handlungsablauf wie wir es bereits im Orestes

und in der Iphigenie in Aulis angetroffen hatten. Da ist zunächst

das Trugelement, die MHXANH, die darin besteht, dass Dionysos den

Pentheus in die Berge lockt unter dem Vorwand, unbemerkt das Trei-

ben der Bakchen zu belauschen. Der Trug gelingt, aber der daraufhin

fällige, rettende ANAΓNΩPIΣMOΣ, das Erkennen von Mutter und Sohn, das

---

13 In ähnlicher Weise hatte Euripides im Ion, dem Drama der Wende
   von den Intrigenstücken zu den Dramen der letzten Periode, alle
   von ihm benutzten Handlungselemente der Idee dieses Dramas dienst-
   bar gemacht.

von Pentheus in seiner Todesangst gesucht wird, gelingt nicht, je-
denfalls nicht rechtzeitig; es kommt für Pentheus zu spät, es voll-
zieht sich erst, als Agaue im Triumph das Haupt des Toten als Sie-
gestrophäe vorantragend in den Palast zurückgekehrt aus ihrem Wahn
erwachend die Züge ihres eigenen Sohnes erkennt. Und das Ritual ist
in diesem Drama nicht mehr als Mittel zum Trug verwendet, sondern
das blutig vollzogene Ritual ist hier die göttliche Wahrheit selbst,
die sich auf Geheiss des Gottes Dionysos vollzieht.

Es hat den Anschein, dass die Problematik der aporetischen
Konfliktsituation - wie wir sie im Orestes, im Phaethon und in der
Iphigenie in Aulis angetroffen hatten, hier in den Bakchen ihre
Auflösung in der essentiellen Ironie des Zugleichseins gefunden hat,
in der Ironie des Mensch gewordenen Gottes, der zugleich Mensch und
Gott ist, und der damit in gewisser Weise zugleich auch Trug und
Wahrheit verkörpert, indem er den Gegensatz von Trug und Wahrheit
in sich aufhebt. Das ist wohl auch der eigentliche Grund, weshalb er
die Menschen dazu bringen will, ihrem ΛΟΓΟΣ abzusagen, ihrem ΛΟΓΟΣ,
wonach die Welt eben in Trug und Wahrheit zerfällt, und es scheint,
als wolle er am Beispiel des Opfermordes an Pentheus einer neuen
Welt ans Licht verhelfen, in der es kein Kalkül der Menschen mehr
gibt, und in der paradiesische Zustände herrschen - wie eben in der
Welt der Bakchen, von der der Bote berichtete: er habe nie etwas
Schöneres gesehen.

Und so hat es den Anschein, als wolle Euripides mit diesem,
seinem vielleicht letzten Drama zum Ausdruck bringen, dass dieser
Zustand jenseits von Trug und Wahrheit, dieser Zustand jenseits der
Welt des ΛΟΓΟΣ für die Menschen nur möglich ist im religiösen Rausch.

Und deshalb mag er wohl auch - neben der Tatsache, dass Dionysos

der Gott der Tragödie war - diesen Gott als Gott des Rausches zum

Handlungsträger in den Bakchen gewählt haben.

Zusammenfassung der Ergebnisse

In das Jahrzehnt von 440-430 fällt die Produktion der Medea

und der ersten Fassung des Hippolytos. Im ersten Teil dieser Dra-

men scheitert der Protagonist, der den Weg der Wahrheit wählte, um

sein Ziel zu erreichen. Nach diesem Scheitern greift er dann im zwei-

ten Teil des Dramas zu einem anderen Mittel, zum Trug; dabei ist er

erfolgreich.

Das darauffolgende Jahrzehnt von 430-420 ist vor allem gekenn-

zeichnet durch die sogenannten Hikesie-Dramen. Hierin ist das Trug-

motiv nicht mehr von handlungstragender Bedeutung. Abgesehen von Ein-

zelszenen in der Hecuba und in der Andromache, auf die Bezug genom-

men wurde, und die mehr von partieller Bedeutung sind, wird das

Trugmotiv von Euripides in diesen Dramen nicht verwendet. Aber es

hat den Anschein, als habe Euripides in diesem Jahrzehnt eine neue

Spielart des Trugmotives entwickelt, wie wir sie aus der Rekonstruk-

tion des Aiolos und der Melanippe Sophe erschliessen konnten. Die-

se Art des Truges, die sophistisch-rhetorische Elemente enthält,

ist nicht mehr auf die direkte Lüge angewiesen - wie in den Dramen

der vorhergehenden Epoche, der Trug entsteht hier durch die Diskre-

panz, die zwischen dem Denken und der Rede des Helden selbst besteht:

Der Held versucht, das Ziel seiner Wünsche dadurch zu erreichen,

dass er diese verbirgt und auf der Ebene einer allgemeinen Wahr-

heit sachliches Interesse vortäuscht, das sich aber in Wahrheit mit

seinen privaten Absichten deckt.

In der folgenden Schaffensperiode des Dichters, wie wir sie

in den Jahren zwischen 420 und 410 erkennen konnten, finden die

Elemente der Wahrheit und des Truges einen neuen Ausdruck: Die Wahr-

heit begegnet im Anagnorismos und steht dem Trugelement in der Int-

rige gegenüber. Das Element der Wahrheit (Anagnorismos) bestimmt

jeweils den ersten Teil dieser Dramen, und ist eine Voraussetzung

für das Gelingen des Truges im zweiten Dramenteil. Somit scheint

Trug und Wahrheit hier in gleicher Weise - und mit gleichem Erfolg -

in den Dienst menschlichen Glückes gestellt zu sein.

Diese klare Gegenüberstellung von Trug und Wahrheit in den

Intrigenstücken wird im Ion aufgegeben. Denn hier haben wir neben

dem wahren Anagnorismos noch einen anderen, einen Pseudoanagnorismos,

bei dem sich das Trugelement indirekt in das Wahrheitselement ein-

schleicht. So wird denn auch mit dem Ion die letzte Schaffensperiode

des Dichters eingeleitet, für die es kennzeichnend ist, dass die

Anwendung von Trug und Wahrheit, ja selbst die erfolgreiche Anwen-

dung dieser beiden Verhaltensweisen - noch keine glückliche Lösung

bringt, sondern erst zu jener Konfliktsituation führt, die wir als

aporetische Entscheidungssituation bezeichneten.

Und es scheint, als habe der Dichter aus dieser aporetischen

Konfliktsituation der letzten Epoche in seinen Bakchen einen neuen

Weg gesucht, indem er das Element der Truges und das der Wahrheit

in der Gestalt des Gottes Dionysos zusammenfallen liess, wobei er

das Glück des Menschen auf nichts mehr bauen konnte, weder auf Trug

noch auf Wahrheit. Sicher haben zu dieser letzten Entwicklung des

Dichters nicht nur die niederdrückenden politischen Verhältnisse

seiner Zeit beigetragen, einer Zeit, in welcher die Menschen sich

auf nichts mehr verlassen konnten, weder auf Trug noch auf Wahrheit,[14]

sondern man kann davon ausgehen, dass das Denken des Euripides in

dieser Zeit auch von den philosophischen Diskussionen, wie sie etwa

zwischen Sokrates und den Sophisten stattgefunden haben, wesentlich

beeinflusst worden ist. Und wahrscheinlich hat in dieser späten Pha-

se seiner Dichtung eben auch diese in Philosophenkreisen immer wie-

der diskutierte Erkenntnis von der Unmöglichkeit des Erkennens sei-

nen Niederschlag gefunden. So leuchtet es ein, dass von daher gesehen

die geistigen Voraussetzungen verloren gingen für eine Differenzie-

rung von Trug und Wahrheit - und damit auch von der Eindeutigkeit

menschlichen Handelns.*

---

14 Auch in der Iphigenie in Aulis ist das Täuschungselement in der
   Anagnorismos-Szene enthalten: In den Intrigenstücken erkannten
   sich die Menschen als das, was sie in Wahrheit waren, als Bruder
   und Schwester (Elektra - Orest), oder als Mann und Frau (Helena -
   Menelaos), während sich die Helden in der Iphigenie in Aulis im
   Anagnorismos als das erkennen, was sie nicht sind und auch nicht
   sein werden, als Schwiegermutter und Schwiegersohn (Klytämnestra -
   Achill).

DATING IN THE LATIN INSCRIPTIONS
OF MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE ROME

Iiro Kajanto

The Latin inscriptions of medieval and Renaissance Rome have so far been little explored. There is no manual of medieval, not to speak of Renaissance epigraphy, no comprehensive lists of abbreviations,[1] very little preliminary work of the kind a classical epigraphist takes for granted.

We are somewhat better served with collections of inscriptions. V. Forcella's monumental Iscrizioni delle chiese ed altri edifici di Roma dal secolo XI fino ai giorni nostri I-XIV, 1861-1884, is indispensable for any work in this field. This is no place to discuss its inaccuracies and deficiences, which are palpable to any one who has been using the volumes. Even so, the material is there, to be exploited with due caution.

In editing the inscriptions of the area sacra del Largo Argentina, a considerable number of which were from the medieval, Renaissance

---

1 A. Cappelli, Dizionario di abbreviature latine ed italiane[6], 1973, has a chapter on sigle ed abbreviature epigrafice, 429-516, but the material from medieval and later epigraphy is scanty; cf. further P. Lehmann, Sammlungen u. Erörterungen lateinischer Abkürzungen im Altertum und Mittelalter , Abh. Bayr. Ak. Wiss. Phil. Hist. Kl., N.F. III, 1929.

and Baroque periods, we noticed that the many interesting problems
of this epigraphy had been largely ignored. The most intriguing of
them is certainly the change from the medieval epitaphic style to an
imitation of the structure and expressions of ancient epitaphs observ-
able since the mid-fifteenth century.

With a view of helping to fill a gap here, I have been collect-
ing material for an all-round analysis of the Latin epitaphs of Rome
from the early medieval age down to a. 1527. In this year, the famous
sacco di Roma, the savage looting of Rome by the troops of Charles V,
marked the end of High Renaissance in Rome. This does not mean that
the epitaphic style suddenly changed. The Counter Reformation, the
chief agent in the reshaping of the cultural field, was still in its
initial phases. Nevertheless, in epigraphy a. 1527 can be taken as
the end of the period in which Latin epigraphy passed from the Middle
Ages to the Renaissance. It is thus a convenient terminus for a study
of this kind.

In the present paper, I shall discuss a restricted problem, the
recording of dates in epitaphs. Unlike many other problems suggested
by the later Latin epigraphy, this has the advantage of being clear
and well-defined.

In Christian epitaphs, differently from their pagan equivalents,
the date of the death or of the burial was very often recorded. In an-
tiquity, especially in Rome, it was the burial, *depositio*, that was
registered on funeral slabs. The date normally given was the day of
the month, the true *natalis* of the defunct for eternal life.[2] The con-

---

2 Cf. F. Grossi Gondi, Trattato di epigrafia cristiana, 1920, 185ff.

sular year and/or *indictio* could be added, but was never indispens-
able.

Still in the Dark Ages, recording the day of *depositio* was usu-
al, to judge from the few Roman epitaphs that have survived to us,
a. 619;[3] a. 783;[4] a. 963;[5] a. 976;[6] in Papal epitaphs, Boniface IV
a. 615;[7] John XIII a. 972.[8]

In the epitaphs of medieval and Renaissance Rome, dating had
undergone considerable changes. First, the records of *depositio* were
all but unknown. In the material from Forcella, which begins at the
year 1000, I have found no more than three cases. Moreover, only one
of them was medieval, 11,10 a. 1299 (S. Maria Maggiore) *hic depositus*
fuit quonda(m) d(omi)n(u)s Gunsalvus ep(iscopu)s Albanen(sis) ann(o)
D(omi)ni MCCLXXXXVIIII . hoc op(us) fec(it) Io(hann)es mag(ist)ri
Cosme, civis Romanus. Even here, the significance of the expression
was different from that in the ancient epitaphs: Giovanni dei Cosma-
ti had sculptured a noble grave[9] to the bishop who some time before
had been as if stored away to await a proper sepulchre.

The other cases were plain imitation of ancient usages fashion-
able in Renaissance Rome, 2,26 a. 1462 (S. Maria Nuova) *depositus*
anno D(omini) MCCCCLXII III id(us) Ianuarii, and 4,179 a. 1468 (S.
Pietro in Vincoli) *deposit(us) id(ibus) Oct(obris) an(no) salut(is)*
MCCCCLVIIII. Both have the defunct's name in the dative, the latter
records the dedicator and gives the age of the departed. All this,

---

3 Silvagni, Monum. XII.2.
4 Ibid. XIV.6.
5 Ibid. XVI.3.
6 Ibid. XVI.4.
7 Montini 116 No. 67.
8 Ibid. 158 No. 234.
9 Cf. Forcella's description of the tomb.

as well as the total absence of distinctively medieval features,

such as *hic requiescit* at the beginning, the name of the defunct in

the nominative, *cuius anima requiescat in pace* at the end, argue im-

itation of the ancient epitaphic style. Moreover, the date was given

according to the classical system (*idus*). Even this suggests deliber-

ate imitation of ancient epigraphy (cf. p. 50). But whereas it was

normally the pagan epitaphs from which expressions were borrowed,

here the model had been taken from Christian epigraphy.

Instead of the day of *depositio*, it was the day of the death

that was registered. The ordinary verb used here was *obiit*. In antiq-

uity, the verb was chiefly found in the late Christian epitaphs of

Gallia.[10] In Rome, it was rare but not entirely unknown.[11] In the

Middle Ages, however, it rapidly became common. We find it in the

epitaph of Pope Adrian I a. 795;[12] in an epitaph a. 987,[13] and in

another a. 980-999.[14] During the following century, it was found in

seven epitaphs in Forcella.[15] Moreover, two epitaphs had *decessit*.[16]

The verb *obiit* was the usual expression throughout the medieval and

Renaissance periods. Many other words and phrases signifying 'dying'

were used. I shall discuss them in detail in my future work.

There is another and still more momentous change. In addition

to the day of the month, the medieval and Renaissance epitaphs al-

---

10 ILCV III p. 561; cf. especially 2888-2906.
11 ILCV 2886-2887.
12 Montini 134 No. 96.
13 Silvagni, Monum. XVII.5.
14 Ibid. XVII.7.
15 4,144 a. 1010, 7,726 a. 1005, 727 a. 1012, 728 a. 1034, 729 a.
   1035, all from SS. Bonifacio e Alessio; 8,1 a. 1003, 2 a. 1013,
   Papal epitaphs.
16 6,2 a. 1044 and 10,566 a. 1040.

most always registered the year of the death, too. In antiquity, on-
ly a minority of Christian epitaphs recorded years. The innovation
may have been due to a complex of reasons. One of them was no doubt
the new Christian method of counting the years. In the Christian
epitaphs from the end of antiquity, consular years were still used,
though increasingly supplemented with or - later on - replaced by
the fifteen year periods of *indictio*.[17] The disappearance of the
consular institution explains the resorting to *indictiones*, worth-
less though they were for recording the exact time. The modern Chris-
tian era, the creation of the monk Dionysios Exiguus towards the mid-
sixth century, came slowly into use during the early Middle Ages.[18]
In the inscriptions from Rome, it was not found until the 10th cen-
tury, *anno D(omi)nice incarnationis* - - *DCCCCLXIII*;[19] *ann(o) Dom(ini)*
DCCCCLXXVII;[20] *ann(o) D(omi)nic(ae) incarnat(ionis) DCCCCLXXXI*.[21]

In epitaphs, the usual expression was *anno Domini*. However,
a great variety of other expressions were used, especially in the
Renaissance period. The Humanists seem to have vied with each other
in the production of choice phrases, e.g. 1,524 a. 1466 *an(no) reli-*
gionis Christianae; 1,601 a. 1512 *ann(o) a natali liberatoris nostri*;
1,1227 a. 1490 *anno a Christianis natalibus*; 1,1262 a. 1507 *anno*
theogoniae; 1,1270 a. 1512 *post salutem reparatam*; 2,680 a. 1503 *an-*
no post corporatum Christum; 2,694 a. 1514 *anno a salutifera nativi-*

---

17 In Roman epitaphs, the first reliable cases of *indictio* are from
   a. 522, ICVR 266 and 4281.
18 Ginzel 178ff.
19 Silvagni, Monum. XVI.3.
20 Ibid. XVI.4.
21 Ibid. XVII.1.

tate; 3,287 a. 1524 *redentionis anno;* 3,805 a. 1503 *anno virbigene*
(=verbigenae); 3,1078 a. 1523 *an(no) a partu virg(inis),* etc. Many
of the expressions embodied important Christological ideas, *salus*
reparata, theogonia, corporatus Christus, verbigena.

    Indictio was also of a considerable frequency in medieval epi-
graphy, corresponding to its popularity in medieval literature.[22] The
last cases are from the fifteenth century, 1,1579 a. 1412 (S. Maria
sopra Minerva) *qui obiit an(n)o D(omi)ni MCCCCXII m(ense) Ianuarii*
die XI indictione quinta. Other cases, 1,1580 a. 1414 (ibid.); 1,1109
a. 1448 (S. Maria ad Martyres); 2,932 a. 1464 (S. Marcello), which
is the latest example in Forcella.

Designating the day

    The Roman system of naming the days by *kalendae, nonae* and *idus,*
was still in common use in the late Christian inscriptions of antiq-
uity. There is, however, sporadic evidence of the modern system of
counting the days of the month from one onwards. The first dated case
is as early as a. 345, ILCV 4422 (Tarracina, extant, cf. CIL X 6420
add. p. 1015) *Licineia Tertullinia - - d(e)p(osita) die VI m(e)nsi*
Iunii cons(ulatu) Amanti et [Albini]. Provided there is no confusion
in the text - cf. at any rate the unusual form of the word *mensis*[23] -
the epitaph must be accepted as genuine. However unique, the example
suggests that the new method was known in the fourth century.

----

22 For *indictio* in medieval literature, see Ginzel 148ff.
23 According to Diehl, ILCV III p. 552, this is a genitive. It is,
   however, more probably an ablative. The form *mensi* is rare but
   not unknown, three cases in Thes.l.Lat. VIII 746,22.

The next securely dated cases are from the early 6th century,

ILCV 1147A (Nola) a. 517 *req(uievit) in pace die XVIII Ianuari*; 3188a

(Capua) a. 517 *depositus duodecimus Decembris*. There is a little ear-

lier case in 46,25 (Lugudunum) a. 506, but it is from a verse epitaph,

iamque bis octona Septembrem luce movebat - - annus. But these, as

well as a few other inscriptions, remain of little consequence among

the great mass of classical dates.

There is one group of epitaphs which were consistently dated

according to the modern system. They were from the Gallia of the

Merovingian period, especially from Belgica.[24] The expression was

throughout of a similar type, e.g. ILCV 2845A *cum fecerit Octob(ris)*

dies VII.[25] Most of the epitaphs are datable to the 7th and 8th cen-

turies. The dating system was similar to that in the official docu-

ments of the Merovingian court.[26] In Charles the Great's time, how-

ever, the classical system was reinstated.[27]

In the literary documents of Middle Ages, the use of one or

the other system seems to have varied from one kind of writing to

another. The classical dating was most consistently adhered to in

official documents, especially in Papal bullas.[28] As far as I know,

epigraphical evidence has not been considered in discussing the de-

velopment of the dating system. In any case, inscriptions are valu-

able in revealing the semi-official dating methods of the period.

---

24 Cf. N. Gauthier, Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule
   I, 1975, 147 ll. 4-5, p. 383.
25 Other cases, ILCV III p. 310.
26 Ginzel 117.
27 Blatt 367.
28 Ginzel 115-116; Blatt 362. In the Magnum Bullarium Romanum I, 1727,
   classical dating prevailed during the period discussed in this pa-
   per. Only towards the turn of the sixteenth century, modern dates
   began to appear at less frequent intervals. Even then they, were
   in a minority.

In Roman inscriptions, the modern dating came slowly into use. In the poorly documented period a. 600-1000, the classical system still predominated. There were a few modern dates, a. 619 *depositus die quinta decima m(ensis) Aucusti*, but characteristically, the same epitaph also has a classical date, *et filius eius - - depositus idus Octo(b)ris*.[29] There are four other inscriptions with modern dates.[30] In a martyrology probably dating to a. 757-767, the system was throughout modern, *mense Ianuario die III, mense Febr(uario) die XI*, etc.[31] In Papal epitaphs, the first modern dating is from a. 984.[32] On the other hand, there are ten inscriptions, three of them from Papal graves, with classical dates.[33]

The material from Forcella, a. 1000-1527, is tabulated below. I have divided it into fifty-year periods:

DESIGNATION OF THE DAY OF THE MONTH IN ROMAN EPITAPHS a. 1000-1527

	classical dating	modern dating	total
1000-1050	6	5	11
1051-1100	1	6	7
1101-1150	2	1	3
1151-1200	1	—	1
1201-1250	5	3	8
1251-1300	8 = 35,0%	15 = 65,0%	23
1301-1350	3 = 4,8%	59 = 95,2%	62
1351-1400	2 = 2,9%	67 = 97,1%	69
1401-1450	6 = 5,2%	109 = 94,8%	115
1451-1500	114 = 29,8%	268 = 70,2%	382
1501-1527	129 = 40,2%	192 = 59,8%	321
TOTAL	277	725	1002

29 Silvagni, Monum. XII.2.
30 Ibid. XIV.4. a. 783; XVII.2. a. 984; XVII.4. a. 984; XVII.7. a. 980-999.
31 Ibid. XXXVII.1-2; cf. Silvagni's comment, p. 5.
32 John XIV, Montini 162 No. 137.
33 Silvagni, Monum. XIV.3. a. 755; XIV.6. a. 783; XVI.3. a. 963; XVI.4. a. 977; XVII.1. a. 981; XVII.5. a. 987; XVII.6. a. 994; Montini 116 No. 67 a. 615; 134 No. 96 a. 795; 158 No. 134 a. 972.

Before a. 1251, the material is too scanty to justify reliable
conclusions. On the whole, however, classical and modern dating seem
to have been of an equal frequency, fifteen examples of each. Their
chronological distribution is uneven in that modern dating was espe-
cially common a. 1051-1100. But this may equally well be due to sta-
tistical chance.

As the Middle Ages advanced, modern dating increased in fre-
quency, and the classical type all but disappeared. From the whole
14th century, there are only five cases of classical dating vs. 126
of the modern type. Moreover, both classical datings from the period
1351-1400 were found in inscriptions where this type was even other-
wise common or explicable. One was in a Papal bulla, 8,31 a. 1372
(S. Giovanni in Laterano), the other on the epitaph of Pope Urban VI
a. 1389, 6,32 (S. Pietro in Vaticano). In Papal bullas, classical
dating was normal throughout the medieval and Renaissance periods
(cf. p. 47). The dating system used at the *curia* may have affected
the Papal epitaphs, too.

The fourteenth century was the most unclassical period in the
history of Latin epigraphy in Rome. Gothic script had replaced the
lettering inherited from antiquity, and classical reminiscences and
imitations were even otherwise scarce. All this was no doubt at least
in part due to the fact that the Papal court was residing at Avignon
for the better part of the century, a. 1309-1377. Even after the Ba-
bylonian Captivity, the Great Schism reduced the importance of the
curia until Pope Martin V re-established Rome as the headquarters
of Papal government. In this period, Rome was thus deprived of the
repository of the age's classical learning represented by the clerks

of the *curia*.

Classical dating began to reappear in the fifteenth century.
The reappearance was part of the imitation of classical epigraphy,
a consequence of the Humanistic turning to and study of, things an-
cient. This will be evident from a review of the six cases from the
first half of the fifteenth century. One of them, however, seems to
bear a wrong date, 1,1181 (S. Maria del Popolo). The epitaph was com-
posed in imitation of classical models, the defunct's name being in
the dative, followed by a *laudatio funebris*. The inscription has not
survived. Forcella read it in a historian of the church "che però
falsamente lesse 1320, errore reso manifesto dal concetto dell'iscri-
zione." Forcella corrected the date to 1420. But in all likelihood,
even this is too early. Imitation of classical epitaphs is not at-
tested in Rome before the 1430s.[34] It is more credible that the num-
bers 3 and 5 had been confused in Forcella's source. A nearer guess
for the date would thus be 1520. This is one instance of the inade-
quate and often incompetent treatment of epigraphical problems which
a modern epigraphist does not fail to notice in Forcella (cf. p. 41).

The other epitaphs bearing classical datings are from a. 1432,
5,4 (S. Agostino); a. 1443, 11,40 (S. Maria Maggiore); a. 1447, 3,
1035 (S. Maria dell'Anima); a. 1488, 1,507 (S. Maria in Aracoeli);
a. 1449, 1,1186 (S. Maria del Popolo). Four of them are from the last
decade of the period, none is very early. Most of the epitaphs in
which the dates were found were clear imitations of classical epi-
taphs. Only 3,1035 and 1,1186 were more medieval than Renaissance

---

34 The first imitations found by me are 2,23 a. 1430 (S. Maria Nuova);
   1,1583 a. 1431 (S. Maria sopra Minerva); 12,573 a. 1431 (S. Lorenzo
   fuori le Mura), all of them read by Forcella.

in that neither records a dedicator or epithets. But the former is

fragmentary. Too much should not be made of its apparent medievality.

In the table below, the material is classified according to

the form of the month name, the genitive of a noun (*Ianuarii*), an

abbreviation (*Ian.*) or an adjective written out (*Kalendas Ianuarias*).

In ancient epigraphy, abbreviations were the standard form, the un-

derlying word being an adjective. The construction with a genitive

is thus unclassical. I have divided the material into three chrono-

logical groups, the first representing the early Middle Ages, the

second the Gothic age of Rome, and the last the Renaissance.

FORM OF THE NAME OF THE MONTH IN THE ROMAN EPITAPHS a. 1000-1527

	classical dating			modern dating		
	gen.	abbrev.	adj.	gen.	abbrev.	adj.
1000-1300	14	9	–	20	5	7
1301-1450	8	1	–	196	22	3
1451-1527	98	125	19	336	136	2
TOTAL	120	135	19	552	163	12

The tabulation reveals significant facts. In classical dating,

the unclassical form, the genitive of a noun, was found in a minori-

ty of the cases precisely in the period 1450-1527 when classical epi-

taphs were eagerly studied and imitated. Conversely, in modern dating

the unclassical construction predominated, even in the Renaissance

period.

Though the abbreviation was no doubt often chosen because of

its classical associations, this is not always certain. In the Goth-

ic period 1300-1450, when the imitation of classical models had

reached the low-water mark, abbreviations were still found in a num-

ber of cases.

The dates in which the name of the month had an adjectival
form were closest to the classical originals. Here we may notice
an intriguing difference in the chronological distribution between
modern and classical dating. In the former group, there were 10
adjectives before a. 1450, only two later ones, whereas all 19 ad-
jectives in classical dating were from the epigraphy of the Renais-
sance. This may require an explanation.

A few of the cases in the modern group are disputable, espe-
cially those in which only the final -s of the month name is lacking
and which were not read by Forcella. Thus 1,1632 a. 1494 (S. Maria
sopra Minerva) *mense Septe(m)bri die II*, from the sixteenth century
manuscript of Anonymo Spagnuolo, may be an incorrect copy of *Septe(m)-
bris*. The same may hold good for 6,1092 a. 1277 (S. Maria in Tras-
pontina) *mense Novembri die V*, and 6,1163 a. 1100 (S. Spirito in Sas-
sia) *m(ense) Decebri X*, both obtained from the same manuscript, as
well as 13,1307 a. 1313 (S. Francesco a Ripa) *mense Septembri die XX*,
from a sixteenth century manuscript. In these cases the choice bet-
ween a genuine adjective or an incorrect transcript must remain un-
decided. Moreover, 3,1 a. 1330 (S. Luigi de´Francesi) *meseiis Magio
die primo*, though seen by Forcella, is too Vulgar to be of any sig-
nificance here. *Magio* is of course an Italian word.

In the remaining cases, the adjective seems incontestable.
Two of them were from verse inscriptions, 8,4 a. 1072 (Laterano)
ánnus in Augustô currêbat m(énse) perhústo, and 8,8 a. 1217 (ibid.)
mensís dum Mártius íret / ímpius íntrantê septéna lúce per ôrbem

These and all save one[35] of the other cases are early.[36]

The substantive of the month name was found as early as Colu-
mella.[37] In classical literature and epigraphy the noun was, how-
ever, extremely rare. Still in the Dark Ages, the adjectival form was
common even though the date might be modern. Thus in the martyrology
mentioned on p. 48, the adjective was consistently used, *mense Ia-
nuario die III; mense Augusto die VIII*, etc.; cf. especially *mense
Septimbrio die X*: the adjective is quoted only once in Forcellini
from a *rescriptum* of Hadrian.

The tabulation of the material shows that by the early medie-
val age, a. 1000-1300, the genitive had become the ordinary form,
34 genitives vs. 14 abbreviations and 7 adjectives. The adjectives
should accordingly be considered occasional survivals of the older
construction. There was unlikely any imitation of ancient usages
here.

It is different with the adjectival forms of the period 1451-
1527. There can be little doubt that they were genuine imitations
of ancient models. Except for two cases, discussed or quoted above
(p. 52 and fn. 35), they were a peculiarity of classical dates, e.g.
1,536 a. 1475 (S. Maria in Aracoeli) *XIII k(a)l(endas) Septembres*;
1,588 a. 1507 (ibid.) *III nonas Februarias*; 1,605 a. 1515 (ibid.)
calendis Martiis; 1,1631 a. 1494 (S. Maria sopra Minerva) *p(ri)die*

---

35 3,809 a. 1504 (S. Maria in Camposanto) *die ultimo Augusto*, a mis-
    take for *Augusti*?
36 13,785 a. 1073 (S. Maria in Campitelli) *mense Iulio die VIII*; 8,5
    a. 1099 (Laterano) *m(ensis) Iuniu(s) d(ies) V*; 4,262 a. 1200 (S.
    Pietro in Carcere) *mense Martio XIX*; 13,787 a. 1332 (Campitelli)
    mense Maio die III.
37 J. Svennung, Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur Lat. Fach- und
    Volkssprache, 1935, 247-250.

idus Martias.

Humanistic imitation of classical dating was most evident in the cases in which the Imperial names of months, *Iulius* and *Augustus*, had been replaced by their republican equivalents, *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*. The former had been renamed a. 44 B.C. in honour of Caesar, the latter a. 8 B.C.[38] All the examples are from the very latest period, 6,1645 a. 1484 (Vaticano, epitaph of Sixtus IV) *obiit idib(us) Sextil(ibus) hora ab occasu quinta;* 2,461 a. 1500 (S. Ivo de'Brittoni) *quinto nonas Quintiles;* 6,113 a. 1501 (Vaticano) *obiit XVII kal(endas) Quintilis;* 1,1695 a. 1516 (S. Maria sopra Minerva) *esse desiit no(nis) Sextilib(us);* 3,1275 a. 1526 (S. Antonio de'Portoghesi) *interiit XII cal(endas) Sextil(es).* The Humanists' occasional use of these forms was due to imitation of the classical models in the strictest sense. Classical was only that which had been hallowed by Cicero's writings. Cicero naturally did not know the Imperial month names.

There are no examples of the complete classical formula *a(nte) d(iem),* which had become obsolete by the beginning of the Empire.[39] 3,288 a. 1525 (SS. Trinità de'Monti) certainly has *obiit ante XXI Septemb(ris).* But as *kalendae* is not recorded, this unlikely belongs to the classical type. Moreover, the inscription such as it has survived is a modern copy of the original.[40] In making the copy, there may have been some inaccuracy.

---

38 Censorinus 22,16; W. Kubitschek, Grundriss der antiken Zeitrechnung, 1928, 142.
39 H. Salonius, Zur römischen Datierung, 1922, 19ff.; for the disuse of the expression in medieval documents, Ginzel 116.
40 Forcella: "Questa memoria - - a lettere moderne ci presenta una copia dell'antica."

On the other hand, *pridie*, used throughout the pagan and Chris-
tian epigraphy of antiquity, gives 17 examples, 1,559 a. 1490 (Ara-
coeli) *prid(ie) k(a)l(endas) Ianuar()*; 1,1257 a. 1503 (S. Maria del
Popolo) *pridie nonas Septembris*; 1,1631 a. 1494 (s. Maria sopra Mi-
nerva) *p(ri)die idus Martias*; 2,681 a. 1505 (SS. XII Apostoli) *pri-
die idus Augusti*, etc. The Roman day names were abbreviated in all
but the three cases quoted above. 13,1287 a. 1527 (S. Maria del Popolo)
records *pridie nonis Maii*. Given the lateness of the epitaph, this
is hardly interpretable as a Vulgar confusion between the accusative
and the ablative. Unless there has been a contamination between two
constructions, *pridie* and *nonis Maii*, the case must be considered an
imperfect transcript of a correct original. Forcella read the in-
scription in an old manuscript.

Peculiarities in dating

In a number of cases, in addition to the normal date, the La-
tin name of the day of the week was also given. Except for Sunday,
all the days were represented, *dies Lunae* four cases,[41] *dies Martis*
four cases,[42] *dies Mercurii* once,[43] *dies Iovis* once,[44] *dies Veneris*

---

41 1,1109 a. 1448 (S. Maria ad Martyres); 3,496 a. 1465 (S. Giacomo
   de'Spagnuoli); 2,273 a. 1482 (S. Gregorio); 1,618 a. 1526 (S. Maria
   in Aracoeli): of the imitation type.
42 4,7 a. 1347 (SS. Silvestro e Martino); 13,1266 a. 1478 (S. Maria
   del Popolo); 1,1218 a. 1483 (ibid.); 2,693 a. 1514 (SS. XII Aposto-
   li).
43 13,1265 a. 1475 (S. Maria del Popolo).
44 10,571 a. 1526 (S. Agata alla Suburra).

four[45] and *dies Sabbati* three cases.[46] With one exception (see fn.

41), the epitaphs were medieval or, though later, of the medieval

type.

The day names derived from pagan mythology were a stumbling-

block to the ancient Church.[47] These names suggested astrological

ideas of a god as the Lord of a day or of an hour of a day. This was

an additonal reason for the Fathers to frown on them. Instead they

recommended, and used themselves, the word *feria*, obtained from the

plural word *feriae*, 'festival'.[48] But the planetary week was too

deeply rooted in the popular use to be eradicated by ecclesiastical

disapproval. The Church had finally to acknowledge defeat and to ac-

cept the pagan names of the days.

In the Christian epitaphs of antiquity, the pagan day names

were common, much commoner than in the funerary inscriptions of the

pagans.[49] But contrary to what has been argued, this was hardly due

to any particularly strong hold of astrology over the Christian

plebs.[50] If the influence of the stars had been alluded to, the day

and hour of the birth, not that of the death, still less that of *de-*

---

45 1,434 a. 1312 (S. Maria in Aracoeli); 4,265 a. 1315 (S. Nicola in
   Carcere); 10,355 a. 1456 (S. Martinello); 3,1045 a. 1465 (S. Maria
   dell'Anima).
46 2,1336 a. 1300 (S. Maria in Aquiro); 5,26 a. 1468 (S. Agostino);
   3,826 a. 1516 (S. Maria in Camposanto).
47 Cf. E. Schürer, Die siebentägige Woche im Gebrauche der christ-
   lichen Kirche der ersten Jahrhunderte, Zeitschr. für d. neutest.
   Wiss. 6(1905)1,66; A Ferrua, Dal giorno di Dio al giorno degli
   dei, Civiltà Catt. 1934, II, 128-143.
48 For the difficulties in explaining the derivation, see Ferrua, op.
   cit. 134f.
49 In ILCV, ICVR I[1] and I-VI, I have counted ca. 120 epitaphs in which
   the day of the week was mentioned.
50 Schürer, op. cit. (fn. 47) 44ff.

positio, should have been registered on the funeral slab. The in-
scriptions which clearly suggest astrological ideas were few.[51]

The frequency of the names of the days in Christian epitaphs
was due to two facts. Firstly, the seven-day week had been inherited
by the Christians from the Jews, who had long used it independent of
any astrological ideas. The week was consequently an important idea
for the Christians. Secondly, and more decisevely, the Christians
had more occasions than had the pagans to record the names of the
days on their epitaphs because of their practice of registering the
defunct's *depositio* .

Medieval epigraphy was to a considerable degree an inheritor
of the traditions of ancient Christian epigraphy in its latest phase.
The general structure of epitaphs as well as a number of stock ex-
pressions, such as *hic requiescit*, were common already in the 5th
and 6th centuries. It may have been the same with the recording of
the weekdays. If people wanted to date as exactly as possible the
event fateful for the defunct, in addition to the usual date, they

---

51 Only five Roman epitaphs out of a totality of 120 record the day
of the birth, ILCV 4402B (coem. Agnetis) *Pontice nata [- -] die Be-
neris;* ICVR 11757 a. 359 *nat] us XI Kal(endas) Iulias die Beneris;*
13324 a. 366 *nata est puella [- -] bana die Martis;* 10044 *natus idi-
bus Mart [iis] die Solis.* The most important of the epitaphs is
15587 a. 364, *puer natus - - ora noctis III IN VXIT VIII idus Madias
die Saturnis luna vigesima signo Apiorno (= Capricorno) nomine
Simplcius,* which suggests devotion to astrological lore. Even so,
the interpretation of the text is a little uncertain for the word(s)
printed in the capitals are plainly corrupt. For a full commenta-
ry, see De Rossi, ICVR I¹ 172. Moreover, two epitaphs record the
coincidence of the day of birth with the day of *depositio,* ICVR
479 a. 350 and 368, *natus est - - die Saturnis depositus in hac do-
mo aeterna - - die Saturnis,* and 15634 *depositus V idus Iulias
die Iovis quo et natus est.* There is unlikely any astrological
significance here.

recorded even the day of the week. In some cases, still more detail-
ed dating could be used (e.g. 10,571, see below). There was little

difference here between ancient and medieval epitaphs. On the other ⌄

hand, in the epitaphs from the Renaissance period which imitated

classical epigraphy, the names of the weekdays were almost unknown

probably because they were almost unknown even in ancient pagan epi-

graphy.

In my material, there are three cases of the word *feria*, un-

successfully advocated by the ancient Church and of some frequency

in medieval literature.[52] However, only one of the inscriptions is

funerary, 3,539 a. 1504 (S. Giacomo de'Spagnuoli) *feria VI hora III

i(n) passione D(omi)ni obiit.*[53] This is a very solemn and a very

Christian expression. The departed had died on the very same day

and at the very same hour that Our Lord was crucified. A pagan name,

especially *die Veneris*, was probably felt unbecoming here. For the

record of the hour, see below p. 58.

Instead of or - though more rarely - in addition to the desig-

nation of the day of the month, a few epitaphs were dated by Chris-

tian festivals. These cases were not particularly numerous, and were

almost without exception medieval, *obiit die Iovis penultima Maii in

festo corporis Chr(ist)i* 10,571 a. 1526 (S. Agata alla Suburra); *in

festo omnium sa(n)ctorum* 1,447 a. 1328 (S. Maria in Aracoeli); *in vi-

gilia assu(m)ptionis Mariae* 3,845 a. 1527 (S. Maria in Camposanto);

festo lactentum propter Cristum morientum 2,1041 a. 1370 (S. Maria

---

52 Ginzel 102.
53 The other cases are from official inscriptions, 7,591 a. 1248 (S.
   Sabina) *feria III quarte ebdomade in (Quadragesima)*; 7,592 a. 1263
   (ibid.) *i(n) tertia feria edomade s(an)c(t)e.*

in Trastevere); *die sancto Leonardi* 11,36 a. 1428 (S. Maria Maggiore), etc.[54] This type of dating was of considerable popularity in medieval literary documents north of the Alps.[55] In Italy it was never of a comparable frequency. The paucity of the epigraphical cases from Rome accords with this.

Finally, there are a few epitaphs which register even the hour of the death. Similar cases were found in ancient epigraphy, both pagan and Christian.[56] Between the ancient and the later *hora* there is, however, an important difference. In Italy, a 24-hour day of *horae aequales* had been in use since the late thirteenth century, the counting of the hours starting at sunset.[57] In antiquity, hours were *inaequales*, each 1/12 of the day or night.

In three epitaphs, the modern Italian system is beyond doubt, 1,1596 a. 1466 (S. Maria sopra Minerva) *qui obiit - - die quarto mensis Septemb(ris) hora XVI*; 2,668 a. 1483 (SS. XII Apostoli) *XV kal(endas) Octob() hor(a) XIII obiit*; 2,693 a. 1514 (ibid.) *requievit die Martis XVIII Iulii hor(a) XVII*. Considering that the counting of *horae* started at sunset, the following case also belongs here, 5,838 a. 1524 (S. Onofrio) *obiit die ultima Iulii ora quarta noctis*. Even so, the addition of *noctis*, which is of course superfluous, is

---

54 Other cases, 2,1495 a. 1286 (S. Prassede) *in die o(m)ni(um) s(an)c(t)o(rum)*; 2,1335 a. 1297 (S. Maria in Aquiro) *vig(i)lia S(ancti) Luc(ae)*; 11,16 a. 1323 (S. Maria Maggiore) *in festo S(an)c(t)i Luce*; 4,5 a. 1309 (SS. Silvestro e Martino) *in vigilia apostolorum Philippi et Iacobi*; 1,441 a. 1314 (S. Maria in Aracoeli) *in crastina Beati Francisci*; 1,1107 a. 1414 (S. Maria ad Martyres) *i(n) die Lucie*; cf. 3,539, quoted above.
55 Ginzel 117-120.
56 Cf. CIL VI 7.5 p. 2798 and ILCV III p. 315.
57 Ginzel 93-95.

suggestive of classical time-reckoning.

In two epitaphs, imitation of classical usage is still more
palpable. One of them, 3,539, has been quoted on p. 58. There is
here a reminiscence of the famous passage in Ev. Marc. 15,25, *erat
autem hora tertia: et crucifixerunt eum*, which makes it very prob-
able that the *hora tertia* in the epitaph corresponded to the *hora
tertia* of the Romans.

The other case is of considerable interest because it is found
in the epitaph of Pope Sixtus IV. The inscription has been quoted
on p. 54. The Humanistically educated person who wrote the epitaph
affected classical turns of expression not only in *Sextilibus* but
even in *ab occasu*. Clearly this was meant to evoke the ancients'
method of counting the hours of the night from sunset to sunrise.
But the artificiality of the imitation of things ancient when they
ran counter to contemporary practice is apparent from the fact that
hora ab occasu quinta in reality coincided with *hora quinta* in the
modern system. The whole expression was thus mere decoration.

ABBREVIATIONS

Forcella (see p. 41) is here quoted by giving only the number of
the volume, 11,10, etc. Other abbreviations:

Blatt = F. Blatt, Antike Züge im Mittellatein, in Mittellateinische
          Philologie, 1975, 359-371.

Ginzel = Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie III,
          1914, by F.K. Ginzel.

ICVR I[1] = Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae saeculo septimo
          antiquiores I, edited by De Rossi, 1857-1861.

ICVR I-VI = Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo
        antiquiores, Nova series, 1922-.

ILCV = Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae veteres I-III, edited by
        E. Diehl, 1925-1931.

Montini = Le tombe dei papi, by Renzo U. Montini, 1957.

Silvagni, Monum. = Monumenta epigraphica Christiana saeculo XIII
                antiquiora, edita curante Angelo Silvagni, I, 1943.

WEITERE BEMERKUNGEN
ZUM SPANISCHEN MITTELLATEIN[1]

Bengt Löfstedt

In dieser Untersuchung werden in erster Linie die folgenden Textausgaben ins Auge gefasst: A) Ángel Fábrega Grau, Pasionario Hispánico, Bd.1 Estudio und Bd.2 Texto, Madrid-Barcelona 1953-55.[2] B) Santos Padres Españoles, Bd.1 San Ildefonso de Toledo, La virginidad perpetua de Santa Maria, El conocimiento del bautismo, El camino del desierto, hrsg. und übersetzt v. V. Blanco - J. Campos, Madrid 1971; Bd.2 San Leandro, San Fructuoso, San Isidoro, Regulas monásticas de la España Visigoda, hrsg. und übersetzt v. J. Campos-I. Roca, Madrid 1971.

Zur Textgestaltung und Übersetzung

Fábrega Graus Ausgabe basiert auf zwei westgotischen Handschriften aus dem 10. Jh.: Brit. Mus. add. 25600 (L) und Paris BN nouv. acq. 2180 (P). In der ausführlichen Einleitung (etwa 300 Sei-

---

1 Vgl. meine Aufsätze Zum spanischen Mittellatein, Glotta 54(1976) 117ff. und Sprachliches zu Valerius von Bierzo, Cuadernos de filología clásica 10(1976)271ff. (der letztere Aufsatz wurde in Zusammenarbeit mit J. Gil verfasst).
2 Unter den Besprechungen dieser Ausgabe ist die von Díaz y Díaz, Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos 63(1957)453ff. besonders wertvoll.

ten) werden Überlieferung und Geschichte der Märtyrerlegenden in

Spanien untersucht, und in der Ausgabe werden die in Spanien ver-

fassten Legenden von den zahlreicheren nach Spanien aus anderen Län-

dern gebrachten durch den Druck unterschieden.[3] Der Text selbst ist

aber leider im wesentlichen nur ein Abdruck der Londoner Handschrift;

nur für die aus Spanien stammenden Legenden werden Varianten aus der

Pariser Handschrift notiert. Lesarten und Emendationen aus anderen

Editionen derselben Texte und Varianten aus nicht-spanischen Hand-

schriften fehlen ganz, und der Leser muss sogar selbst ausfindig ma-

chen, wo die Texte früher gedruckt sein mögen. Da es sich also im

Grunde um keinen kritischen Text handelt, gibt es sehr viel zu kor-

rigieren. Ich gebe einige Beispiele, füge aber den Vorbehalt hinzu,

dass die endgültige Entscheidung über die Richtigkeit einer Lesart

oder einer Emendation zumeist nur nach Kenntnisnahme des gesamten

handschriftlichen Materials getroffen werden kann. Ferner ist na-

türlich nicht an solchen Lesarten zu ändern, die eine besondere Ver-

sion darstellen können, sondern nur offenbare Kopisten- oder Druck-

fehler. Eine k r i t i s c h e Ausgabe der wahrscheinlich aus Spa-

nien stammenden Märtyrerlegenden bleibt ein dringendes Desideratum.

Aciscl. 13 (S.16) hat F. *oculis tuis cecis non uestro es ma-

gnalia Dei*. Das ist sinnlos; besser ist das von Flórez in seiner

Ausgabe desselben Textes, España Sagrada 10, 489, gebotene *vides*

statt *vestro es*. - Clem. 14(45) *fontem - - quo suo impetu euomens*

---

3 Oft ist es allerdings schwer zu entscheiden, woher eine Vita
   stammt, s. z.B. Philippart, Anal. Boll. 90(1972)142 über den fran-
   zösisch-spanischen Ursprung der von Fábrega Grau gedruckten Ver-
   sion der Acta Cypriani.

fluuium fecit; lies *qui* (so C. Narbey, Supplément aux Acta Sancto-rum 2, 1900, 335; B. Mombritius, Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum, 1910, 1,194^u; F.X. Funck, Opera patrum apostolorum 2, 2. Aufl. v. Diekamp 1913, 75). – Andr. 10(63) *Passio enim mea aut unius diei spatium occupat aut duorum multum;* füge vor *multum* ein *ut* hinzu (so Lipsius-Bonnet, Acta apostolorum apocrypha II 1, 1898, 23,4). – Steph. 11(80) *uir tribunicius – – super memoria martyris, quem suburbano eius est, – – posuit infantulum filium;* lies *que in* statt *quem.* – Eug. 12(87) *nulla poterant accipere consolationem;* lies *nul-lam.* – Quadr. mart. 4(145) *Que condicionis estis?;* lies *Cuius.* – Ib. 9(147) *(Paulus) qui externo* (= *hesterno;* vgl. ThLL 6, 2670, 6ff.) *persequtor, hodie apostolum;* lies *apostolus.* – Sebast.7(150) *uni-versa, que a filiis sepulture mee exhibenda paraueram, ego infelix filios sepulturos expendam;* lies *sepulturus* für *-os* (so Migne,PL 17, 1115, Mombritius 2, 251^u; Perseverationsfehler). – Ib. *excellentis-sime memorie et ingenio singularis;* lies *ingenii* (so Migne und Mom-britius aa.OO.). – Ib. 98(174) *Blasphemator deorum et reis atro-cium iniuriarum;* lies *reus* (so Mombritius 2, 261^r). – Thyrs. 5(203) *sacrificans falsi dii;* lies *falsis diis* (so Acta Sanct. Ian. II, 824). – Ib. 45(213) *Quur nos aut medicinam non sequitur aut sepul-tura negatur;* lies *medicina* (so Acta Sanct. a.O. 829). – Eulal. 3 und 4(234) ist *quod* statt *quo* zu drucken; ebenso Euph. 5(340). – Emeth. 2(238) *Etsi priscarum antiquitas passionum – – gestorum fidei uelamen obliterate obliuionis obducunt;* zu schreiben ist mit Flórez, Esp. Sagr. 33, 426 und Acta Sanctorum Mart. I, 231 *obducat.* – Ib. 3(239) *Seu igitur anteacte uite operibus proditi, quam principi omnium, Deo, – – militarunt, siue – –;* lies *quia* (so Flórez und Acta aa.OO.) oder *qui* statt *quam.*

Theod. 12(246) *Hoc scito, quia omnia parata est Dei famula pro Christo Domino omnia tolerare;* lies - - *per omnia parata* - -. - Euph. 17(343) *Perfectus est autem hoc opus;* lies *Perfectum* (so Mombritius 1, 257[u]). - Faust. 3(347) *maior est autem tua infelicitas, qui non Deum uiuum negare compellis;* lies *nos* statt *non* (so Narbey 2, 179). - Seru. 3(354) *membra multorum, diuerso fesso languore, curabant;* lies *fessa* (so Acta Sanct. Oct. X, 29). - Argent.2 (382) *cultoris mori;* lies *more* (so Flórez, Esp. Sagr. 10, 564).

An einigen der oben genannten Stellen mag es sich lediglich um Druckfehler handeln. Das gilt sicher für die folgenden Fälle: Valer. 29(34) *insipienter* für *-tes*. - Iul. 22(128) *degenere* für *degere* (mit der Glosse *uiuere;* P. Salmon, Le lectionnaire de Luxeuil, Rom 1944, druckt in seiner Edition dieses Textes, 38, *reteneri*). - Petr. 5(284) *es* für *est*.

Die Interpunktionsfehler sind sehr zahlreich, z.B. Valer. 12 (29) *mortuus omnia membra habet*<,>*flatum*[,] *tamen et uocem non habet*. - Ioh. 17(106) *loca plena*[,] *floribus inmarcescibilibus*. - Sebast. 14(152) *lumen ibi sine umbra*<,>*serenitas absque nubilo*<,> *et absque tenebris nocturnis die*[,] *oculi perfruuntur*. - Ib. 33(158) *Vno denique eodemque*[,] *penarum genere*. - Vinc. 27(195) *quod in plurimis locis refectio eius corporis fuit*<,>*hoc ad celebranda ipsius ampliora pertinet uota* (F. hat Punkt nach *fuit*). - Thyrs. 15(205) *sui portus*[,] *custodiat locum*. - Emeth. 7(241) *Vnde in castris secularibus militantes idonei uisi sunt esse martyrio, nisi prioris uite proderentur exemplo?* (F. hat Punkt nach *exemplo*).

Der Editor hat seiner Ausgabe leider keinen Quellenapparat beigefügt. Wie zu erwarten, sind die Bibelzitate sehr zahlreich

(vgl. z.B. Theod. 16 S. 248 *ut tamquam sponsus procedat de thalamo suo*: Psalm. 18, 6, und Alex. 13 S. 368 *tu es - - lucerna pedibus meis*: Psalm. 118, 105). Hier gibt es noch sehr viel zu tun.

* * *

Von den in den Santos Padres Españoles veröffentlichten Ausgaben ist die von Ildephonsus' De uirginitate die einzige, die im engen Sinne des Wortes kritisch genannt werden kann; es handelt sich hier auch um die zweite Auflage der von Blanco i.J. 1937 gedruckten Edition.[4] In den anderen Ausgaben sind nur ausnahmsweise handschriftliche Varianten notiert. Die Konstitution der Texte scheint aber, soweit man es ohne Kenntnis des handschriftlichen Materials beurteilen kann, recht sorgfältig zu sein, und es gibt nicht viele offensichtliche Fehler in den Texten der SPE.

Ild. uirg. 1260(Bd. 1, 124) ist zu schreiben: *temporalibus aeterna coniuncta sunt, imbecillibus robusta conser<t>a sunt, servilibus dominica copulata sunt.* In der Reg. Leandri 230(Bd. 2, 34) ist *E contrario* statt *Ecce contrario* zu drucken, ib. 239 S. 35 *tot filios* statt *toto filios* und ib. 723 S. 65 *erumpere* statt *erumpe.* Alles Druckfehler?[5]

Ild. uirg. 431ff. (Bd. 1, 72f.) lesen wir: *Nam si peritia pollens, si prudentia uigil, si acumine uiuax, si inquisitione strenuus, si sollicitudine minus iners uellem aut possem, dies mihi deficiet,*

---

4 Diss. Madrid 1937 (= Textos latinos de la edad media española, secc. 3).
5 In der ersten Auflage von Ild. uirg. S. 138,21 druckt Blanco *conserta*, so *consera* ist sicher ein Druckfehler.

momenta decrescent, horae lassabunt, mane ruet, meridies languescet,
uespere decidet, intempesta et gallicinia crepusculumque noctium
abundantiae, non cohaerent de talibus sacramentis aut fidei meae
congrua, aut perfidiae tuae discordantia et aduersa promere vel nar-
rare. Die Übersetzung lautet: "- - si con cuidado activo quisiese
o pudiese hablar sobre los testimonios - -, me faltaría la luz del
día, el tiempo decrecería, las horas pasarían, la mañana caería en
vano, la luz del mediodía decrecería, la tarde oscurecería; vendrían
las horas intempestivas, hasta la del canto del gallo y fin de la
noche, sin que pudiese conseguir mi propósito." Aber erstens ist
die vom Übersetzer angenommene Konstruktion *uellem aut possem - -*
promere uel narrare wegen der eingeschobenen Futura sprachlich un-
möglich; *si - - uellem aut possem* muss "wenn ich es möchte oder
könnte" bedeuten. Zweitens bedeutet *intempesta* nicht "las horas
intempestivas", sondern "Mitternacht"; Norberg, ALMA 22(1952) 7
behandelt mlat. Ausdrücke wie *intempesta noctis* (so auch in den
Vitas patrum Emeretensium 7, 5 ed. J.N. Garvin S. 178), *in tempes-*
tate noctis (so auch in der Pass. Argent. 9 S. 385) statt des klas-
sischen Ablativs *intempesta nocte,* aber unser substantiviertes *in-*
tempesta ohne unmittelbar folgendes *nocte* oder *noctis* hat er nicht
belegt. Drittens werden mit *intempesta, gallicinia* und *crepusculum*
(hier "Morgendämmerung") verschiedene Phasen der Nacht bezeichnet
(ebenso wie die des Tages durch *mane, meridies* und *uespere* gleich
vorher), und sie werden dann durch *noctium abundantiae* appositionell
zusammengefasst; m.E. ist also nach *crepusculumque* ein Komma hinzu-
zufügen und das Komma nach *abundantiae* zu streichen. Viertens muss
cohaerent korrupt sein; man braucht ein Prädikat vom Subjekt *abun-*

dantiae, und dieses Prädikat müsste wie die vorhergehenden Prädika-
te im Futur stehen und auch die Infinitive *promere uel narrare* re-
gieren; ich schlage *concedent* vor; eine Hs. bietet *suppetunt*, eine
offensichtliche, aber inhaltlich nicht schlechte Kopistenemendation.

Ild. uirg. 526f. (Bd. 1, 78) druckt Blanco: - - *quod, tem-
pore, olim esse completum et euentus et exitus docet.* Die Überset-
zung ist richtig: "- - que esto se cumplió en otro tiempo - -", die
Interpunktion zeigt aber, dass der Editor die Konstruktion nicht
verstanden hat: *olim* wird als Attribut von *tempore* gebraucht; vgl.
die gleichartigen Belege im ThLL 9:2, 562,1ff. sowie Hofmann-Szantyr,
Lat. Syntax 57 mit Lit.; vgl. auch den Ausdruck *statim hora* Pass.
Alex. 14 (S. 369). - Reg. Leandri 152ff. (2, 29f.) (Anrede an die so-
ror Florentina) - - *tu solatium meum, tu respiramentum meum; et
uindicta, quae mihi detur pro negligentia tua forte, castitate tua
sedabitur, intercessione defendens profecto mei reatum operis* " -
- y el castigo que acaso se me aplique por tus descuidos, será mi-
tigado gracias a tu castidad, alejando, sin duda por tu intercesión,
el reato de mis obras." Wegen falscher Interpunktion ist auch die
Übersetzung unrichtig; zu drucken ist: - - *uindicta, quae mihi de-
tur pro negligentia, tua forte castitate, tua sedabitur interces-
sione, defendens - -.* - Reg. Fruct. 393ff. (2, 159) ist zu schrei-
ben: *Conuersum de saeculo - - non suscipiendum in monasterio, nisi
prius experimentum sui in opere et penuria, opprobriis dederit et
conuiciis, quique decem diebus persistens ad ianuam coenobii ora-
tionibus et ieiuniis patientiae et humilitati operam dederit;* Blan-
co hat Punkt und sogar Absatz nach *conuiciis*.

Zahlreicher sind die Übersetzungsfehler, z.B. Ild. uirg. 32

(1, 45) - - *haec me ipsum adnuntiare quae adnuntianda docetis audi-*
re; his posse quo possum ueram oboedientiam dare, quibus posse toto
uniuersam ecclesiam decernitis oboedire. "- - y que con esto puedo
lo que puedo: prestar verdadera obediencia a aquellas verdades que
con todo poder decretáis que obedezca y siga sin excepción La Igle-
sia de Dios"; vielmehr: " - - dass ich mit all meiner Macht (deren
ich mächtig bin) den Sätzen gehorche, denen nach Ihrer Bestimmung
die katholische Kirche mit aller Kraft gehorchen soll". - Ild. itin.
661ff. (423) *omnes hic situs ad salutem suscipit, omnes hoc iter ad*
uitam mittit. Tantum est, ut qui religionis huius plagam ingressus
fuerit, innocentiae haereat - -. "- - Tan eficaz es, que quien hu-
biere ingresado por el camino de esta religión se entrega a la ino-
cencia - -." *Tantum est ut* steht vielmehr für *tantum ut* oder *dum-*
modo und bedeutet "wenn nur" oder "unter der Bedingung dass"; vgl.
Hofmann-Szantyr a.O. 641 mit Lit., auch Verf., IF 71(1966) 274; Be-
lege aus Braulio verzeichnet L. Riesco Terrero in seiner Ausgabe
von Braulios Briefen (Sevilla 1975) S. 50; derselbe Ausdruck steht
in der Pass. Thyrs. 27 (S. 208) und Pass. Fel. 10(323). - Reg. Fruct.
306 (2, 154) *si se emendare distulerit, tertio coram fratribus con-*
uenietur "si demorare la enmienda - -." Das Verb *differre* bedeu-
tet hier nicht "verschieben", sondern, wie häufig im späten Latein,
"unterlassen" (ThLL 5:1, 1074,65ff.).

Die Quellen und Parallelen sind in den SPE recht sorgfältig
notiert worden, aber Einiges lässt sich natürlich hinzufügen: Ild.
uirg. 218 (1, 58) *ne uerberatus aer uel infandissima uerba confor-*
met; zu *uerberatus aer* in der Definition von *uox* vgl. Donatus,
gramm. 4,367,5. - Ild. itin. 759(430) *Spes nonnisi bonarum rerum*

est nec nisi futurarum: vgl. Cic. Tusc. 4,80. - Reg. com. 557(2,

203) *canes ad uomitum reuocare*: vgl. Prou. 26, 11.

Zur Sprache[6]

Im ALL 3(1886)148f. hatte Haussleiter beobachtet, dass u.a.

in Hermae Pastor die Form *ab* in der Regel vor Vokalen steht, bei

Konsonanten dagegen nur vor *s impurum* begegnet; er erklärt dies rich-

tig durch den vor *s* + Kons. gesprochenen prothetischen Vokal; Bonnet

hatte gleichzeitig und unabhängig bei Gregorius von Tours dieselbe

Beobachtung gemacht (vgl. sein Le latin de Grégoire de Tours 147

Anm. 7). Auch in unseren Texten steht *ab* oft vor *s impurum*, z.B.

Pass. Eul. 4(69) *ab sceleratissimo*, Ild. uirg. 1363(1, 130) *ab sta-

tu*, Reg. Fruct. 8(2, 137) *ab spiritualibus*.

Die mehrmalige Schreibung *sedictio* statt *seditio* dürfte mit

der Assimilierung von *ct* nach *i* im Spanischen zusammenhängen, vgl.

Verf., Cuadernos 10,275: Pass. Clem. 10(44, nichtspan.), Andr. 8(62, nicht-

span.), Ioh. 20(107, nichtspan.), ib. 22(108) und 25(109).

Die Schreibung *uigintim* Eug. 41(97, zweimal, nichtspan.) und

Iul. 36(133, nichtspan.) erklärt sich durch Analogie von *undecim*

usw., die Schreibung *quinquem* Seb. 88(172, nichtspan.) ist von *sep-

tem, decem* beeinflusst, s. Cuadernos a.O.

---

6 Wie oben bemerkt, basiert die Ausgabe des Pasionario Hispánico
  auf zwei westgotischen Hss., aber viele der hier gedruckten Le-
  genden sind nicht in Spanien verfasst worden. Wenn im folgenden
  Belege aus solchen Texten angeführt werden, wird ihr nichtspa-
  nischer Ursprung ausdrücklich vermerkt; steht keine Angabe,
  stammt der Beleg aus einer wahrscheinlich in Spanien verfassten
  Legende. Wenigstens was Orthographie und Morphologie betrifft,
  dürften die meisten der unten besprochenen Besonderheiten sowie-
  so den spanischen Kopisten zuzuschreiben sein.

Die Schreibung *palfebras* statt *palpebras* (so Acta Sanct. Ian.
II, 825 und Mombritius 2, 330[r]) Thyrs. 11(204, nichtspan.) ist den

in meinem Aufsatz Zum spanischen Mittellatein, Glotta 54(1976)123,

angeführten Belegen für diese Form hinzuzufügen.

In der Pass. Iust. 4(297) findet sich die typisch spanische

Schreibung *monstruum* statt *monstrum* (so Narbey a.O. 2,246). Vgl.

auch den Gen. Plur. *peduum* Iul. 61(143, nichtspan.) und Geru. 4(280,

nichtspan.); an der erstgenannten Stelle haben wir die Verbindung

manuum ac peduum, die die Entstehung der Form leicht erklärt. Zu diesen

Schreibungen s. meinen erwähnten Glotta-Aufsatz 124f.

Bezüglich der Formenlehre erwähne ich den Nom. *Iouis* Theod. 15

(247, nichtspan.) und Vinc. 5(360); in der Ausgabe des letzteren

Textes in den Acta Sanct. Oct. XII, 204 steht *Iupiter*. Belege für

den Nom. *Iouis* aus archaischem und spätem Latein bei Neue-Wagener,

Formenlehre d. lat. Sprache 1, 293; Georges, Lexikon d. lat. Wort-

formen s.u. *Iuppiter* und Heraeus, Kleine Schriften 138.

Ild. uirg. 434(1, 72) *mane ruet, meridies languescet, uespere
decidet*. Hier steht *uespere* statt *uesper*. Die Verallgemeinerung der

Ablativform ist natürlich durch Beeinflussung von *mane* zu erklären;

sie begegnet mehrfach in der Vulgata, und zwar im ersten Kapitel

der Genesis: *factum est uespere et mane, dies unus*; hieraus stammen

die meisten Belege in christlichen Texten, z.B. Ambr. hex. 1,10,36

(CSEL 32:1 S. 38,9f.) - - *quod uespere finis diei sit et mane finis
noctis*; Eucher. form. 2 (CSEL 31, S. 13,8) *uespere: finis uitae*;

Cassiod. in psalm. 89,6 (Corp. Christ. 98 S. 824,147ff.) *mane signi-
ficat - - Vespere autem - - tempus dicit*; s. weiter Salonius, Vitae

Patrum (1920) 209ff.

Die in der Pass. Iul. 18(126, nichtspan.) auftretende Form

uim statt *uis* ist mehrfach belegt und besprochen worden, vgl. Nor-

berg, Beiträge z. spätlat. Syntax (1944) 51f., Verf., Arctos 8(1974)

84.

Die Form *neptam* Pass. Clem. 3(41, nichtspan.) dürfte auf ei-

nen spanischen Kopisten zurückgehen, vgl. span. *nieta;* in der Regel

wird *neptem* überliefert, s. Narbey a.O. 333, Mombritius a.O. 1,193^{u};

vgl. Verf., Glotta 54,124.

Die neutrale Form *dua* statt *duo* begegnet in der Reg. Leandri

539(2, 53), vgl. ThLL 5:1, 2241,81ff.[7] Gleichartig ist *ambis* statt

ambobus in der Inu. sanct. cruc. 11(Pas. Hisp. 264, nichtspan.), s.

Verf., Glotta 54,128.

In der Pass. Eul. 16(76) steht *dissicere* für *dissecare*. Der

Konjugationswechsel erklärt sich durch die für ein Verb der 1. Kon-

jug. unregelmässigen Formen im Perfektum und Supinum; man könnte

dissicere als eine Rückbildung aus *dissecui* oder *dissectum* betrach-

ten. Dementsprechend ist der Infinitiv *contrire* eine Rückbildung

aus dem Perf. *contriui* oder dem Sup. *contritum: contriret* (Imperf.

Konj.) steht in der Pass. Iust. 5(297; so cod. L, Fábrega Grau

druckt zu Unrecht *conteriret*); weitere Belege für *contrio, contrire*

bei Fr. Brender, Die rückläufige Ableitung im Lat.(Diss. Basel 1920)

76. Ganz gleichartig ist *prostratur* für *prosternitur* aus *prostraui,*

prostratum Ild. uirg. 1283(1, 126), s. Brender a.O. 76, wo u.a. ein

Beleg aus Isid. etym. 18, 56 angeführt wird. In der. Pass. Bab. 4

(196, nichtspan.) finden wir die Form *sinires* (*sineres* Acta Sancto-

---

7 Diese Form muss volkstümlich gewesen sein, denn sie lebt im Sar-
  dischen weiter: M.L. Wagner, La lingua sarda (1950) 327.

rum Ian. II 573) und in der Pass. Theod. 4(244, nichtspan.) *siniret;*

wie von Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre d. lat. Sprache 3, 252 bemerkt,

begegnet *siniret* schon in einer Vetus-Latina-Hs. Matth. 24,43, es

lassen sich aber weitere Belege für die Flexion dieses Verbs nach

der 4. Konjug. hinzufügen: I Macc. 12,40; II Macc. 6,13 und 13,11

(in einigen Hss., s. De Bruyne, Les anciennes traductions latines

des Machabées [1932]); Chiron 136; Chron. Fred. 38(MGH Mer. 2, 185,

9).

Was die Syntax betrifft, beschränke ich mich auf einige we-

nige Notizen.

Pass. inn. Caes. 13(377) *Gaudeat denique ipsa caput gentium*

nobilissimarum urbium, aurea Roma. Das fem. *ipsa* vor *caput* ist na-

türlich durch fem. *urbs* und *Roma* veranlasst, vgl. archaisches *mea*

Glycerium, spätlat. *ipse ecclesiae petra* (=*Petrus*) u.dgl.: Hofmann-

Szantyr a.O. 426, Verf., Italia medioevale e umanistica 16(1973)311.

Wir finden mehrere Belege für auffallende pronominale Ablati-

ve auf *-o,* z.B. Leg. Visig. 1,2,6 (ed. Zeumer S. 42,4) *tanto in*

externis spe fida uictorie, quanto nil erit, quod ex internis for-

midari ualeat; Ild. uirg. 774(1,94) *Tanto - - tui mei sunt, quanto tu*

a meis es alienus; ib. 984f.(107) *tanto essent admiranda cum uide-*

rentur, quanto et necessario praeuisum est, ut - -; ib. 1474(138)

tanto a se - - discordant. ut - - ; ib. 1536f.(141)(*uirginitatem*)

quam natiuitas Filii Dei tanto auctam gloria incorruptionis reliquit,

quanto singularem - - carnem - - inuexit; ib. 1598(145) *tanto - -*

maiestati eius cedunt, quanto et excellentiae prorsus adaequari non

potuerunt; Reg. Leandri 705f.(2,64) *tanto dives in Domino fuit, ut*

mater Domini esse mereretur; tanto rebus paupercula, ut - -; Ild.

uirg. 1101(1,114) *Iam nunc multo laetus, multo iucundus, multo ela-
tus, multo plaudens.* Hauptsächlich handelt es sich also um Belege
für *tanto - quanto* statt *tantum - quantum, tam - quam.* Es liegt ein
ursprünglicher Ablativus mensurae vor, der sich von korrespondie-
renden komparativen Ausdrücken (*tanto magis - quanto magis*) verbrei-
tet hat; es ist bekannt, dass in einem der Komparationsglieder *ma-
gis* ausgelassen werden (oder Positiv für Komparativ eintreten) konn-
te, nach dem Schema *tanto* + Komp. - *quanto* + Positiv: Hofmann-Szantyr
a.O. 169f. Von derartigen Konstruktionen aus lässt sich der Ge-
brauch von *tanto* und/oder *quanto* mit Positiv im Sinne von *tantum*
und/oder *quantum, tam* und/oder *quam* leicht erklären. *Multo* vor Po-
sitiv lässt sich auch als ein ursprünglicher Abl. mens. auffassen;
diese Konstruktion wird vom ThLL 8,1616,62ff. seit Apuleius belegt.
Vgl. über unsere Konstruktionen auch Hofmann-Szantyr a.O. 136.

Die Konstruktion von *adorare* mit dem Dat. Ild. uirg. 1621(1,
146) hat in der Vetus Latina Parallelen (ThLL 1, 819,83ff.), und
Ildefons dürfte in der Tat bei seiner Verwendung dieser Konstruk-
tion von der Bibel beeinflusst sein. *Comitor* mit dem Dat. begegnet
in der Pass. Leoc. 5(67: *cuius meritum nomini comitabatur suo;* so
auch in der Ausgabe von V. de la Fuente, Historia eclesiástica de
España 1 [1873] S. 336); der ThLL 3, 1810,75f. und 1812,66ff. gibt
einige weitere Belege, u.a. aus der Vet. Lat. und der Vulgata; vgl.
sequor c. dat.: Hofmann-Szantyr a.O. 89.[7a] Die uerba petendi werden im
Spät- und Mittellatein bekanntlich oft mit dem Dat. konstruiert (E.
Löfstedt, Syntactica 1, 204f.); die Konstruktion *petere ad alqm*
ist der analytische Ersatz von *petere alci:* Pass. Iul. 41(135, nicht-
span.) *quicquid ad eum petiero* (in P. Salmons Ausgabe dieses Textes

7a Auch CIL X 3659; XIV 1153.

in seinem Le lectionnaire de Luxeuil, 46 heisst es *quidquid eum peto)*.

Pass. Iac. 6(112,nichtspan.) *ligauerunt eum de restibus manus a tergo;*

die Konstruktion mit zwei Akkusativen fällt auf (in der Ausgabe von

Fabricius, Codices apocryphi noui testamenti 2(1719)519 steht der Dat.

Hermogeni statt *eum*); zu vergleichen sind Wendungen wie Chiron 386

defricabis eum manibus totum corpus; zu derartigen zwei Akkusativen

des äusseren Objekts, des Ganzen und des Teils, s. Hofmann-Szantyr

a.O. 44.

In der Pass. Cosm. 4(350, nichtspan.) lesen wir: *non formida-*

mus de tuis penis; die Konstruktion *formidare de alqa re* ist selten,

s. ThLL 6:1, 1094,62ff.

In einem Aufsatz in den IF 75(1970)123ff. habe ich die im Mlat.

häufige und in den rom. Sprachen weiterlebende Konstruktion *inter -*

et im Sinne von 'sowohl - als auch' vom reziproken oder zusammenfas-

senden *inter nos, inter se, inter illos* hergeleitet und darauf hinge-

wiesen, dass die Konstruktionen *inter nos* und *inter me et illum* "im

Lateinischen und im Romanischen parallel gelaufen sind und sich ge-

genseitig beeinflusst haben" (S. 125). Ich hätte in diesem Zusammen-

hang auch auf komparative Ausdrücke wie die folgenden verweisen kön-

nen: Sen. epist. 73,12 *inter duos bonos non est melior, qui locuple-*

tior; Ou. pont. 1,3,72 *inter quas dubium, quae prior esset, erat;*

Cypr. zel. 10(CSEL 3 S. 425,14) *interrogauerunt, quis inter illos*

maior esset. Diese Belege werden im ThLL 7:1, 2134,72ff. angeführt,

und hier steht auch, ohne von den anderen getrennt zu werden, die

folgende Stelle: Greg. M. epist. 7,29 *dum inter me et te quis sit*

superior ignores; die Wendung *inter me et te* ist hier mit einem *in-*

ter nos völlig gleichwertig. Ildefons bietet weitere Belege für die

Verwendung von *inter - et* bei Vergleichen: uirg. 1277ff. (1,125f.)
enarra, quid incorruptius - - inter uirginitatem maternam et condi-
tionem angelicam? inter uirgineam fecunditatem et angelicam forma-
tionem? inter incorruptibile uirgineum decus et angelorum exordium?
inter pudorem prole perauctum et angelicae nobilitatis initium? (so-
dann geht Ildefons in eine andere Konstruktion über: *Virginitas, quae*
fecundatur et non corrumpitur, an angelica celsitudo, cuius pars in
ruina prostratur - - ?).

In der Glotta 54(1976)137 gebe ich einige Belege für die Konstruk-
tion von *praeter* mit dem Nom. Ich füge hinzu: Pass. Clem. 14(45, nicht-
span.) *preter ipse alius non uideret* (in der Regel wird *ipsum* über-
liefert und gedruckt: Mombritius 1,194[u], Narbey 2,335, Funck, Opera
patrum apostolorum 2,75).

Ild. cogn. bapt. 588f. (1,273) *indicium ergo est propter cogni-*
tionem<,> conlatio propter inter multos unitae definitionis communita-
tem. Zum Zusammentreffen der Präpositionen vgl. Hofmann-Szantyr a.O.
217 und 693, wo in der Bibliographie H. Hirt, Indogermanische Gram-
matik 7,51 hinzuzufügen ist.

In vielen romanischen Sprachen hat der Infinitiv die Funktionen
des Imperativs übernommen, aber nicht im Spanischen, s. L. Löfstedt,
Les expressions du commandement et de la défense en latin (1966)202.
Es fällt demnach auf, dass wir in der Reg. Leandri viele Belege für
den Inf. statt des Imperativs finden: 54(2,24) *Cernere, dilecta so-*
ror, quantum profeceris; 176(31) *quis quam teneat uiam aestimare iam;*
527(53) *ingemiscere.* Weitere Belege aus dem span. Mlat. bei Gil, Mi-
scellanea Wisigothica (1972) 85 Anm., wo allerdings der Einfluss grie-
chischer Parallelen überschätzt wird. Dagegen wird Gil darin recht

haben, dass in gewissen Fällen hyperkorrekte Verwendung deponentialer

Imperativformen, die mit aktivischen Infinitiven homonym sind, statt

aktivischer Imperative vorliegen kann; in einem Fall wie Pass. Christ.

12(302, nichtspan.) *miserere tibi ipsi et nostri et sacrificare* ist die

Form *sacrificare* offenbar im Anschluss an das vorhergehende *miserere*

gebildet (in der Ausgabe in den Analecta Boll. 10,1891,398 steht *sa-*

crifica). Es ist aber daran festzuhalten, dass es sich bei dem Ge-

brauch von Infinitiven statt Imperative um einen im Lat. altererbten

und weitverbreiteten Sprachgebrauch handelt. S. weiter L. Löfstedt

a.O. 192ff. - In dieser Arbeit, S. 74ff., wird auch die Konstruktion

ne uelis + Inf. statt *noli* + Inf. besprochen; aus dem span. Mlat.

lassen sich mehrere Belege ergänzen: Reg. Leandri 686(2,63) *nec ue-*

lis aliis dici aut esse praelatior; Mart. Brac. sent. patr. 5 (ed.

C.W. Barlow S. 31) *Ne uelis aliquid super quod ualet uendere*; ib. 56

(S. 43) *Ne - - uelis aestimationem habere*. Interessant ist der fol-

gende Beleg aus Braulio, epist. 44 (ed. Riesco Terrero S. 180 Z. 281)

Ne, queso, uos ex eo contemtibiles uelle extimari, quod - -: hier

steht *ne uelle* statt *ne uelitis* gemäss dem oben besprochenen Gebrauch

von Inf. statt des Imp.

Reg. Leandri 66(2,61) *Quoad uero ad spei futurae munus adtinet - -*.

Es liegt hier eine Kontamination von *quoad spei futurae munus* und

quod ad spei futurae munus attinet vor. Weitere Belege für diese Kon-

tamination sind mir nicht bekannt, sie wurde aber sicher durch die

lautliche und semantische Annäherung von *quod* und *quoad* gefördert:

statt *quoad* steht in Inschriften und Handschriften oft *quod*, und in

der Formel *quod eius fieri potest* tritt früh *quoad* statt *quod* ein,

s. Hofmann-Szantyr a.O. 655.

Das im Spätlat. nicht seltene unpersönliche *debet* begegnet in der Reg. Leandri 618f.(2,58) *inualidam uero et imbecillem pro medicinam debet utere uinum*; Hofmann-Szantyr a.O. 416.

In der Glotta 54,147 habe ich mehrere Belege für die Verwendung von *mox* statt *mox ut* aus dem span. Mlat. angeführt; vgl. noch Reg. Fruct. 67(2,140) *mox ad locum consuetae meditationis peruenerint, - - meditantur*; Pass. Thyrs. 65(219, nichtspan.) *Mox Baudum uiderimus, uiuos nos terra suscipiet*; Iul. Tol. progn. praef. (ed. Hillgarth, CC Bd. 115 S. 12,58ff.) *- - ut haec ipsa - - mox datum mihi diuinitus otium persensissem, uno tota et breui uolumine complicanda congererem.*

Schliesslich einige lexikalische Notizen:

dare 'Schläge geben'. Pass. Iac. 5(101, nichtspan.) *dedit fortiter in capite eius.* Diese absolute Verwendung von *dare* wird im ThLL nicht notiert, ist aber durch Ellipse von *plagas* od. dgl. leicht erklärlich; zu *plagas dare* s. ThLL 5:1, 1674,33ff. Ganz ähnlich heisst es in Salimbenes Chronik (ed. Holder-Egger) S. 611,31 *Date latroni, date latroni!* E. Löfstedt, Coniectanea (1950) 39 zitiert aus einem Exemplum aus dem 12. Jh. *dedit in faciem eius cum pugno*, und wegen spätgriechischer Parallelen betrachtet er diese Wendung als einen "partiellen Gräzismus". M.E. liegt indessen gar kein griechischer Einfluss vor, sondern handelt es sich im Lat. und Griech. um parallele Entwicklung; entsprechende elliptische Ausdrücke kommen in vielen Sprachen vor, z.B. schwed. *ge honom*, dt. *gib's ihm*, engl. *give it*

to him, span. *dale*, it. *dàgli* (*le*).[8] A.O. behandelt E. Löfstedt etwas

ausführlicher elliptisches *accipere* 'Schläge bekommen', z.B. Caes.

Arel. reg. mon. 11 *statim de ferula in manus accipiat*. Aber nicht nur

accipere kann als ein passivisches Gegenstück von *dare* 'schlagen'

verwendet werden, sondern auch *habere* begegnet in einer derartigen

elliptischen Konstruktion: wenn ein Gladiator getroffen wurde, rie-

fen die Zuschauer bekanntlich *habet* "er hat's"(mit Ellipse von *pla-

gam* od.dgl.), vgl. Don. ad Ter. Andr.83 und zur Sache L. Friedlaen-

der, Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms 2(1920)74.[9]

    facere 'verbringen'. Pass. Fruct. 3(183) *fecerunt in carcere*

dies sex. Mehrere Belege im ThLL 6:1, 121,59ff. (der dortigen Beleg-

sammlung hinzuzufügen ist Aug. in psalm. 49,5 *fecit cum eis quadra-

ginta dies*). Diese Verwendung von *facere* wurde ins Romanische weiter-

geführt, s. etwa Littré, Dictionnaire de la langue française s.u.

faire 29.

---

8 Im älteren Italienisch heisst es *dàgli* (ohne *le*, vgl. S. Battaglia,
  Grande dizionario della lingua italiana 4,35f.), aber heute ist es
  üblich, ein pronominales *le* (scil. *botte*) hinzuzufügen. Die Ergän-
  zung eines inhaltsleeren pronominalen Objekts in den meisten moder-
  nen Sprachen hängt mit einer allgemeinen Tendenz der neueren Spra-
  chen zusammen, in jedem Satz Subjektswort, Prädikatswort und (bei
  transitiven Prädikaten) Objektswort zu haben. Zu dieser Tendenz vgl.
  Dressler, KZ 85(1971)19ff. (wo allerdings elliptische Ausdrücke von
  unserem Typus nicht behandelt werden). - Vgl. auch Petron. 45,12
  ad summam, omnes postea secti sunt; adeo de magna turba 'adhibete'
  acceperant.

9 Diese elliptische Verwendung von *habere* scheint im ThLL nicht ver-
  zeichnet zu sein. In diesem Zusammenhang sei auch die folgende Au-
  gustin-Stelle zitiert: in psalm. enarr. 26 II,6 *solemus loquentes*
  dicere uerbi gratia 'duas habes'; non dicimus 'duo'. Im ThLL unter
  duo verlautet über diese Stelle nichts, und sie ist überhaupt un-
  beachtet geblieben. R. Minuti (in seiner in Rom 1967 gedruckten
  Übersetzung von Augustins Psalmenkommentar) übersetzt *duas habes*
  durch "hai due cose", eine Auslassung von *res* ist aber kaum möglich
  (man hätte vielmehr den Neutr. Plur. *duo* gewählt: ThLL 5:1, 2246,
  66ff.). Ob *duas habes* für *duas plagas habes* 'du hast zwei Schläge
  bekommen' steht?

In der Reg. Leandri 521(2, 52) werden die Wörter *lacerator* und *detractor* mit bezug auf eine Nonne gebraucht. Das fem. Suffix *-trix* war nicht volkstümlich; im Italienischen und Spanischen werden in der Regel die *-tor*-Ableitungen moviert: ital. *pastore, -ora*, span. *conocedor, -ora*. Derartige Motionsbildungen lassen sich im Lat. kaum belegen, wohl aber begegnen *-tor*-Ableitungen mehrfach im Fem., vgl. z.B. ThLL 2, 1211,46ff. und Mlat. Wb. 1, 1167,26 zum fem. *auctor*, ThLL 3, 797,41f. zum fem. *censor* (Ambr. epist. 63,73 *fides prompta dura sui censor est*), ib. 5:1, 310,44 zum fem. *defensor* (Ulp. dig. 16,1,2,5 *si mulier defensor alicuius extiterit*), ib. 6:1, 389,78f. zum fem. *fautor* (Eugraph. Ter. Ad. 898 *multitudinem cogo fautorem*).

DID QUINTILIAN MENTION MYTACISM?

Martti Nyman

When discussing violations of ὀρθοέπεια, Quintilian makes the
following statement:

> *Et illa per sonos accidunt, quae demonstrari scripto non pos-*
> *sunt, uitia oris et linguae: iotacismus* (Bn) / *miotacismus* (A)
> *et labdacismus et ischnotetas et plateasmus feliciores fingen-*
> *dis nominibus Graeci uocant* (Instr. 1,5,32)

The manuscript tradition differs in a minimal, but nevertheless sig-
nificant, manner. While c. Bernensis (Bn; 9th c.) has *iotacismus* (a
kind of mispronunciation of *i*), the other equally reliable manu-
script, c. Ambrosianus (A; 9th c.), provides the reading *miotacis-*
mus (a frequent variant spelling of mytacism, i.e. a mispronuncia-
tion of *m*).

To account for the manuscript variation, Claussen (1873) pro-
posed the conjunct reading *iotacismus et miotacismus* on the grounds
that these terms tend to co-occur in the statements made by gramma-
rians: "Utraque lectione recepta haec scriptura efficietur: 'ἰωτα-
κισμούς *et* μυτακισμούς *et* λαβδακισμούς'. quae tria vitia iuncta ex-
plicare et vituperare grammatici solent." (327). Claussen's argu-
ment implies the prediction that any Textstelle attesting only two
members of the triad is likely to be corrupt. Indeed, this predic-

tion seems to be borne out quite well by the variation in the case

at hand.

Claussen's proposal has been accepted or supported by many

scholars: Meister (ed. 1886), Radermacher (ed. 1907), Niedermann

(1948), Pini (ed. 1966) and, hesitatingly, Hofmann in TLL 8:9 (1960)

1392,68. Note that also Winterbottom (ed. 1970) is inclined to accept

mytacism: In his critical apparatus he introduces Claussen's emen-

dation with the qualification "fort. recte".

The relatively wide acceptance of Claussen's proposal is no

wonder, since it is formally quite reasonable. Furthermore, no co-

gent argument has so far been advanced against it, despite the at-

tempts made by Colson (ed. 1924:61) and Cousin (ed. 1975:165). How-

ever, the conjunct reading can be shown to be unfounded by a simple

semantic argument: Mytacism would be conceptually impossible in this

context.

In Nyman (1977) it is shown that, as a grammatical term, my-

tacism was used to denote spelling pronunciation of the word-final

-m in prevocalic position.[1] This was judged as a barbarism typical

of semi-literates in the late Latin period (see Hoppenbrouwers 28-

33). According to the norm of correct pronunciation, the word-final

---

1 This definition is based on Aelius Melissus' instructions as to
   how mytacism can be avoided (reconstructable from Pompeius 5,287,
   7-20 and 298,19-30 Keil, and reflected in other grammarians, e.g.
   Consentius, Diomedes and Servius). The discrepancies between Nie-
   dermann (1948), whose definition is accepted by Hoppenbrouwers
   (1960), and myself result from the use of different paradigms of
   phonetic description. While Niedermann interpreted Melissus in
   articulatory terms, I am convinced that the correct key is the
   auditive one. - The definition given by Hofmann in TLL 8:9 (1960)
   1392,45 is due to a misinterpretation of Sacerdos' definition (6,
   454,22-28 Keil), which pertains to rhetoric (see Nyman 1977 §2).

-m had to be reduced to what was probably a bilabial nasal glide, i.e. [w̃] (for a more detailed formulation, see Nyman 1977). Cato symbolized this by means of an *M* on its side, i.e. Σ (Moore 1898), and Verrius Flaccus symbolized it with the first apex of the *M* i.e. Λ. Thus, both *FACIAΣ* and *FACIAΛ* served the purpose of emphasizing the intentional character of the reduction of /fakiam/ to [fakiaw̃] prevocalically. This phonetic process is described by Quintilian in Inst. 9,4,49: The final *-m* required by the orthography is pronounced very weakly; it is not dropped altogether, rather obscured to a *nouae litterae sonus*.

Now let us take a closer look at the passage which we have been discussing in the present paper. Quintilian states *expressis verbis* that it is the question of mispronunciations w h i c h c a n - n o t b e r e p r e s e n t e d i n s p e l l i n g (*"quae demonstrari scripto non possunt"*). While this statement puts certain constraints on how iotacism and labdacism are to be interpreted here (cf. Colson 61; Cousin 1936:91; ed. 1975:164-165), it clearly renders mytacism entirely unthinkable in this context. As a fault involving spelling pronunciation mytacism could of course very well have been character-ized by means of writing.

The above discussion makes it quite evident that Quintilian did not include mytacism in his list of faulty pronunciations. If he had done so, he would have been contradicting himself.[2]

---

2 I am obliged to Prof. J. Safarewicz for comments on an earlier
  version. Responsibility for any inadequacies is my own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Editions cited

    F.H. Colson, Cambridge 1924. (Book I).

    J. Cousin, Paris 1975. (Vol. I/Book I).

    F. Meister, Leipzig 1886. (Vol. I).

    F. Pini, Scriptores Latini 6. Roma 1966. (Grammatical chapters).

    L. Radermacher, Leipzig 1907. (Vol. I).

    M. Winterbottom, Oxford 1970. (Vol. I).

B. Second literature

    J.D.D. Claussen: Quaestiones Quintilianae. J.bücher f. class.
      Phil.6, Suppl.(1873)319-394.

    J. Cousin: Études sur Quintilien. T.I: Vocabulaire grec de la
      terminologie rhétorique dans l'Institution Oratoire. Paris
      1936.

    H. Hoppenbrouwers: Fonction euphonique du *m* final chez quelques
      auteurs paléochrétiens. Vigiliae Christianae 14(1960)15-16.

    C.H. Moore: Cato's final *m*: a Note to Quintilian Inst. Orat. I,
      7,23; IX,4,39. AJPh 19(1898)312-313.

    M. Niedermann: *Iotacismus, labdacismus, mytacismus*. RPh 74(1948)
      5-15.

    M. Nyman: Mytacism in Latin Phonology. Glotta 55(1977)111-120.

CITY AND COUNTRY
IN HORACE'S EPISTLE 1, 7 [1]

Hannu Riikonen

In 23 B.C. Horace published his three books of odes in a collected form. As far as we know, the publication did not prove a success nor did it bring with it such public recognition of his merits as a lyric poet as he had hoped (cf. carm. 1,1,35-36 *Quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres, / sublimi feriam sidera vertice*). The unfavourable reception (see epist. 1,19) did not, however, discourage Horace as a writer. It is true that for years he gave up writing lyrics, but instead he turned his attention to the composition of epistles on moral issues, and later on literary criticism. With characteristic humour Horace describes his transition from lyrics to more serious matters in his first epistle:

> *Est mihi purgatam crebro qui personet aurem:*
> *"solve senescentem mature sanus equum, ne*
> *peccet ad extremum ridendus et ilia ducat."*
> *nunc itaque et versus et cetera ludicra pono:* [2]
> *quid verum atque decens, curo et rogo et omnis in hoc sum:*
> *condo et conpono quae mox depromere possim.* (1,1,7-12)

2 *versus et cetera ludicra* refers here to lyric poems.

The originality of the epistles of Horace as a literary genre
in the poetry of antiquity has been compared to that of satire, which
Quintilian (Inst. Orat. 10,1,93-95) maintained was a product pecul-
iar to Roman literature.[3] Their aesthetic value lies partly in an
effective use of contrasts, of which the city - country antithesis
is probably the most obvious. The frequent use of this contrast in
the epistles also meant a return to Horace's favourite themes of the
30's (see especially satires 2,6 and 2,7 and the second epode), to
the time when from the urban confines of Rome he had longed for the
countryside and when his wishes were at last fulfilled by Maecenas,
who bestowed upon him the Sabine farm (*fundus Sabinus*; cf. sat. 2,
6,1-3 *Hoc erat in votis: modus agri non ita magnus, / hortus ubi et
tecto vicinus iugis aquae fons / et paulum silvae super his foret*).
While imposing structural coherence and unity on the epistles (this
applies to the satires, too, which would otherwise have a somewhat
loose structure), the antithesis is also useful for moral and mora-
listic purposes, in that city and country with their inhabitants
are used to represent various forms of life, different virtues and
vices, moral obligations etc.

In the first book of epistles the city - country antithesis
is most apparent in the seventh, tenth and fourteenth epistles, with
hints of it in several others (1,8; 1,11; 1,15; 1,16; 1,18; cf. also
epist. 2,2,65-80). The aim of this article is to concentrate on the
seventh epistle and to examine what relation this antithesis in the
seventh epistle bears to Horace's own personal views, i.e. to his

---

3 See also Eduard Fraenkel, Horace, Oxford 1957, 309.

attitude to city and country and to Maecenas, the donator of the

estate, in the light of his other poems which deal with this anti-

thesis.

Classical scholars have often discussed Horace's seventh epis-

tle in the first book as if it were an autobiographical document.

The poem has been seen as a result of a quarrel between Horace and

his patron and friend, Maecenas. The scholars are, however, not

agreed how deep this quarrel went; in the extreme view the poem has

been seen reflecting a crisis or even a deep rift between Horace and

Maecenas.[4] An argument in support of this theory states that the

fourth book of odes eschews any mention of *Sabinum*, and refers to

Maecenas only once (carm. 4,11,19).[5] On the other hand, some schol-

ars have denied the existence of any quarrel and have maintained that

it was only a question of Horace's wish to preserve his independence

as a poet and private citizen.[6]

It must, however, be admitted that the external evidence for

any conflict in the relations between Horace and Maecenas is very

meagre; the situation was rather the reverse, since Maecenas at

least acknowledged his friendship with the poet at the end of his life in

---

4 See e.g. H. Hommel, Horaz. Der Mensch und das Werk, Heidelberg
  1950, 58-60. "The theory of conflict" was already known in
  antiquity itself, beginning with Horace's commentator Porphyry,
  see C. Becker, Das Spätwerk des Horaz, Göttingen 1963, 25-27.
5 See J.H. Gunning, Der siebente Brief des Horaz und sein Verhältnis
  zu Maecenas, Mnem. III Ser., 10(1942)319-320.
6 See R. Heinze, Die augusteische Kultur, 2.ed., Leipzig-Berlin 1933,
  132; see also Fraenkel, op.cit. 339. Horace had the courage even
  to refuse to become Augustus' secretary, see Sueton., Vita Hor.

his will to Augustus: *Horati Flacci ut mei esto memor.*[7] Nor does the following analysis of Horace's attitude to city and country in this epistle support the theory of any deep rift in the friendship of Horace and his patron.

At the outset (lines 1-13) Horace gives an account of his activities to Maecenas, the addressee of the epistle. Although he had promised his friend to stay in the country for five days only, he has kept people waiting for him (*desideror*) for the whole of August; and now he says that he will not see Maecenas again until the following spring (*reviset cum Zephyris*). In some respects the situation recalls Horace's otherwise quite different ode 1,20, where the poet is in the country, on his Sabine farm, and Maecenas, the addressee of the ode, in the capital. The ode also states a clear antithesis: on the one hand, Horace and his modest Sabinian wine in the country, and on the other hand the Roman elite with their famous Caecuban and other fine wines (cf. also epist. 1,5, where Horace invites his friend, the lawyer Torquatus to come and partake of some wine and a modest dish of vegetables). So Horace also humorously emphasizes his own unimportance just as he does in the epistle, where with reference to himself he says: *parvum parva decent* (44; see below). Horace gives as his reason for staying in the country his fear of becoming ill in Rome (2-4) and describes very vividly the horrors of Rome in August and September, the time of *rabies Canis*, as he says in epist. 1,10,16 (see also epist. 1,16,15-16). Funerals and the unsealing of wills are then more numerous than usual:

---

7 Sueton., Vita Hor.

> *dum ficus prima calorque*
> *dissignatorem decorat lictoribus atris,*
> *dum pueris omnis pater et matercula pallet*
> *officiosaque sedulitas et opella forensis*
> *adducit febris et testamenta resignat.* (5-9)

In his descriptions of town life Horace has a keen eye for tragi-comic details,[8] as in the famous passus in the second epistle of the second book (line 74): *tristia robustis luctantur funera plaustris*. The vividness of the description of Rome in the seventh epistle also depends on the metrical scheme: the rapid dactyls in the eighth line are eminently suitable for the description of official affairs (*officiosaque sedulitas et opella forensis*).[9] In contrast to this passus (lines 8-9) Eduard Fraenkel has strikingly drawn our attention to sat. 2,6,18-19, where Horace mentions the troubles he can avoid on his Sabine farm: *nec mala me ambitio perdit nec plumbeus auster / autumnusque gravis, Libitinae quaestus acerbae*.[10] Living on his farm to safeguard his health is nothing new, either to Horace himself nor to other Roman authors. Horace's poems afford some parallel instances (e.g. epist. 1,16,15-16) as do other works, e.g. Cicero (epist. ad fam. 7,26,1) and Seneca (epist. ad Lucilium 104).

The dimension of time in this introductory part is also interesting and affords a key to the basic tone of the epistle. Horace's stay in the country has been prolonged from five days to a

---

8 Cf. Fraenkel, op.cit. 328: "The picturesque detail at 1,6, *dissignatorem decorat lictoribus atris*, is in the best parodic style of the *sermones*."
9 A. Kiessling - R. Heinze, Horaz: Briefe, 5.ed., Berlin 1957, ad loc.
10 Fraenkel, op.cit. 328.

whole month and finally he promises to return to Rome several months later. The poet is here exaggerating (humorously, as Maecenas probably understood it, although there is no external evidence of Maecenas' attitude to this epistle). This kind of exaggeration (from a few days to many months) puts the poem on a more fictional level, and a serious moral discussion (the problem of giving and receiving presents) also receives humorous treatment.[11] Moreover, bearing in mind Horace's former habits and judging by what he says in his satires, Maecenas knew that the poet could not be away from the capital for long (cf. below).

The rest of the epistle (lines 14-98) consists of four *exempla* (comprising short narrative pieces, an anecdote, 14-19, an Aesopian fable, 29-33, an *exemplum mythicum* taken from the Odyssey, 39-43, and a chat or essay, 46-95),[12] each being followed by general moral statements and personal views (lines 20-28, 34-39, 44-45 and 96-98).

By giving an account first of the Calabrian host, who behaves like a lout, Horace illustrates the moral dimensions connected with giving. The poet also wants to show how Maecenas did not make him rich in the same way as the Calabrian peasant gave pears to his guest. Such a lout does not know or understand the true claims of generosity or moderation. The expression *non quo more - - tu me fecisti locupletem* (14-15) hints at the donation of the farm to Horace by Maecenas, the very farm where Horace is now staying. The farm was

---

11 See G. Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry, Oxford 1968, 566. Cf. Becker, op.cit. 28 n.8.
12 Cf. Fraenkel, op.cit. 336: "No other Horatian satire or epistle contains, within so small a compass such variety of αἶνοι as does Epist. 1,7."

not the gift of a lout, for a *vir bonus* (22) like Maecenas knows the

difference between *aera* and *lupini* (23).

The latter part (25-28) of the statements belonging to the

first *exemplum* contains a kind of hypothesis: Maecenas desiring that

he never (*quodsi me noles usquam*) leave his patron and Rome. This

is again a kind of exaggeration as in the introductory part: Horace

knows very well that Maecenas would never make a proposal like this.

But Horace himself suddenly becomes a little melancholic; and such

a change of mood is very appropriate to epistles, which are not log-

ical expositions, although they deal with moral philosophy. We should

not demand any strict logic from Horace's epistles. In a way he was

aware of this himself when he wrote in the first epistle: *nunc agi-

lis fio et mersor civilibus undis / virtutis verae custos rigidusque

satelles, / nunc in Aristippi furtim praecepta relabor* (1,1,16-18).

Eduard Fraenkel has emphasized, how this passus (lines 25-28) in the

seventh epistle "reveals - - something of the inner life of the writ-

er. There is under the smiling surface a note of nostalgic longing

for the bygone days of his youth." This becomes more apparent when

one notices the strong anafora *reddes - - reddes - - reddes* (25-27),

anafora commonly being used by Horace to reveal deep emotions.[13] In

this connection we should also remember the expression *mihi non iam

regia Roma - - placet* in the third *exemplum* (44-45),[14] where Horace

expressis verbis confesses that he no longer enjoys life in Rome as

he used to. He also refers to the fact that he is growing older: he

is no longer the young man about town who drank a lot of wine and

---

13 Fraenkel. op.cit. 333.
14 Ibid. 336.

fascinated the famous courtesan Cinara. This is a favourite theme in
Horace's later works; in the fourteenth epistle he paints a vivid
picture of his youth (31-34), but says that now he wants to enjoy
a quiet life in the country: *cena brevis iuvat et prope rivum somnus
in herba; / nec lusisse pudet, sed non incidere ludum* (35-36) (cf.
also carm. 4,1,3-4 *Non sum qualis eram bonae / sub regno Cinarae*
and epist. 1,1,4 *non eadem est aetas, non mens*). From this viewpoint
it is interesting to consider Horace's other poems where he speaks
of his stay on his farm. In his earlier works, in the satires, he
speaks of his longing for the countryside. After receiving the farm,
although he constantly professes his devotedness to country life, he
cannot, however, be too long away from the pleasures of Rome (and
vice versa). The most famous example of this attitude is the seventh
satire of the second book, where Horace's slave Davus mocks his mas-
ter's longing for Rome while he is in the country and for the country
when he is in the capital: *Romae rus optas: absentem rusticus urbem/
tollis ad astra levis* (28-29). This can be compared to the second
epode, where *fenerator* Alfius speaks enthusiastically of the pleas-
ures of the countryside, although we soon find him hurrying to earn
more money in the city. We can, however, say that at the time of the
composition of the first book of epistles Horace was increasingly
willing to stay on his farm (simply because he was growing old and
because he wanted to concentrate on philosophy and writing). In the
tenth epistle he calls himself *ruris amatores* (2) in contrast to his
friend Fuscus, who is *urbis amator*. In the fourteenth epistle he
speaks to his bailiff and says: *rure ego viventem, tu dicis in urbe
beatum* (10). In the same epistle Horace also emphasizes his contempt

for the urban way of life in Rome: *me constare mihi scis et discede-re tristem, / quandocumque trahunt invisa negotia Romam* (16-17). This is in clear contrast to the information Davus had given in sat. 2,7. And in the sixteenth epistle the poet gives a charming and detailed account of his Sabine farm (1-16).

In the eighth epistle,[15] however, Horace again confesses to his own changing attitudes and moods: *Romae Tibur amem, ventosus Tibure Romam* (12). It cannot be mere coincidence that this thought appears in an epistle in such close proximity to the seventh, as if Horace wanted to remind Maecenas of his longing for Rome. At all events Maecenas can be sure that he need not wait for Horace until the following spring. Unfortunately we cannot know whether Maecenas received the epistles one by one (although they are not of course normal letters being written in an artistic verse-form), or all of them later in the form of a collection. Neither of these alternatives presupposes a conflict, but if the latter assumption is correct, the fictional character of the epistles becomes even more apparent and in that case the seventh and eighth epistles together merely provide proof of Horace's changing attitudes, and are not real attempts on the poet's part to apologize to Maecenas for lingering in the country.

The following two examples further illustrate the moral problems with regard to the giver, the recipient and the gift. The crucial statement in line 34 *hac ego si conpellor imagine cuncta resigno* is only a possibility, based on the example, and does not im-

---

15 On the contradictions between the seventh and the eighth epistles, see M.J. McGann, Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles, Latomus 100(1966)56-57.

ply that Horace is threatening to return the presents given him by

Maecenas.[16] Nor should we suppose that *cuncta* refers to Maecenas'

city favours alone.[17] It includes the Sabine farm as well, but, as

I have pointed out, the returning of all these gifts is only refer-

red to as a possibility.[18] The examples are closely related to the

practice of moral philosophical discussion in antiquity, and have

many parallels in the texts of Aristotle, the Stoics and Cicero.[19]

They are also in keeping with Horace's promise in the first epistle

to discuss what is right and proper (*quid verum atque decens*). The

latter of these two examples is closely connected with the city -

country antithesis. After telling of Telemachus, who had rejected

the present of horses from Menelaus, Horace says:

> *parvum parva decent: mihi iam non regia Roma,*
> *sed vacuum Tibur placet aut inbelle Tarentum.* (44-45)

The advantages that Maecenas could offer Horace in Rome are no long-

er necessary for the poet. On the contrary, Horace can fulfil the

moral requirements of the recipient best in the modest circumstances

of the countryside. If Maecenas were to offer him something more in

the city, it would be too much. Only in his contentment with his pre-

sent condition (on the farm presented to him by Maecenas) can he *do-*

---

16 R.S. Kilpatrick, Fact and Fable in Horace, Epistle 1,7. CPh. 68
   (1973)51, gives another interpretation, which depends on the mean-
   ing of the verb *resigno*: "So Horace's phrase could mean, *omnem*
   criminis fidem resigno, or *cuncta* (sc. *crimina*) *resigno*: 'If I am
   the man impunged in this fable, I refute it all!"
17 K.Büchner, Horaz. Studien zur römischen Literatur III, Wiesbaden
   1962, 152, thinks that *cuncta* refers to all presents given to Hor-
   ace by Maecenas except the Sabine farm.
18 Some scholars have supposed that Horace had another villa at Ti-
   bur, but this has been refuted by I. Troxler-Keller, Die Dichter-
   landschaft des Horaz, Heidelberg 1964, 137-140.
19 See Fraenkel, op. cit. 330-331.

nata reponere laetus, as he says in line 39. In the tenth epistle

(lines 42-43, also a moral drawn from a fable) Horace again empha-

sizes how important it is to be content with a fitting property.

Lines 44-45 in the seventh epistle contain great density of meaning

and are based on a manifold antithesis: Horace - Maecenas; *parvus,*

parva - regia Roma - vacuum Tibur, inbelle Tarentum; city - country.

Tibur and Tarentum,[20] it is true, are towns. They are, however, small

country towns and as resorts for the Roman upper class belong to the

category of countryside rather than that of the city; in any case,

they form a clear contrast to the capital. This category also in-

cludes Horace's Sabine farm. By using the adjective *regia* as an ep-

ithet for Rome, Horace may have (perhaps humorously) also hinted at

the royal ancestry of Maecenas, who is an inhabitant of Rome (cf.

carm. 1,1,1 *Maecenas atavis edite regibus*). Eduard Fraenkel, on the

other hand, has emphasized that typical Horatian irony is involved

in the words *parvus* and *parva*: "When Horace is resorting to his ha-

bitual expedient of semi-serious εἰρωνεία, *dissimulatio opis pro-*

priae, he readily uses the word *parvus*."[21]

The fourth example is based entirely on the contrast between

city and country. First, Horace paints a very vivid picture of life

in Rome, a picture comparable to the depiction of town life in his

satires. He tells how a man called Volteius Mena becomes a client

---

20 On Tibur and Tarentum in Horace's poetry, see Troxler-Keller, op.
   cit. 119-126 and 133-140.
21 Fraenkel, op.cit. 335. Fraenkel mentions the following parallels:
   carm. 4,2,31f., 4,15,1ff. and epist. 2,1,257ff.

of the lawyer Philippus.[22] One day Volteius accompanies his new pa-

tron to the Latin festivities in the country, where he sees *arvum*

caelumque,[23] a new experience for a town-dweller like him. He is

immediately attracted to country life, and a small farm is bought

for him with Philippus' money with the consequence that *ex nitido*

fit rusticus (83). In two lines the poet describes the urgent agra-

rian tasks Mena is now faced with:

> *sulcos et vineta crepat mera, praeparat ulmos,*
> *inmoritur studiis et amore senescit habendi.* (84-85)

But soon Mena also becomes acquainted with the drawbacks of life as

a farmer (86-87, cf. carm. 3,1,29-32 and epist. 1,8,4-6), which in

fact prove to be so great that he has to ask - in more or less pa-

thetic tones[24] - his patron's leave to return to Rome:

> *quod te per Genium dextramque deosque Penatis*
> *obsecro et obtestor: vitae me redde priori.* (94-95)

Volteius had first been quite happy in Rome:

> *- - notum*
> *et properare loco et cessare et quaerere et uti,*
> *gaudentem parvisque sodalibus et lare certo*
> *et ludis et post decisa negotia campo.* (56-59)

In his sudden enthusiasm to achieve greater happiness in unknown

circumstances in the country, Volteius finds himself in difficulties.

The city - country antithesis is emphasized with a motif which

Otto Hiltbrunner has paid special attention to. When living in town

---

22 On the historicity of Philippus and the origin of the name Mena,
   see O. Hiltbrunner, Volteius Mena. Interpretationen zu Hor. epist.
   1,7. Gymn. 67(1960)293-298. Knowing this does not, however, help
   us to interpret this poem.

23 Cf. Kiessling-Heinze, ad.loc.: "dem Volteius als echtem Grossstäd-
   ter sind die grünen Saaten und die erquickende Landluft etwas
   ganz Ungewohntes."

24 Fraenkel, op.cit. 338.

Volteius Mena was *adrasus* (50) and Philippus met him for the first time just *vacua tonsoris in umbra / cultello proprios purgantem leniter unguis* (50-51). But when he returns from the country after his failure as a farmer, he is *scaber* and *intonsus* (90).[25] The urbanity of the city is symbolized by the emphasis on care of the skin, hair and nails, but in the country all this is of lesser importance. The phrase *ex nitido fit rusticus*, describing Mena's transition from city to country, is closely connected with this motif. In the later descriptions of town life in Roman literature the talk about barbers and their customers became even more common, especially in the works of Juvenal and Martial (e.g. Juv. 3,186; 8,166; 10,225-226 and Mart. 2,29,9-10; 3,43; 6,55; 7,95,9-13; cf. also Hor. epist. 1,1,94-95).

This tale of Volteius Mena and Philippus is interesting because of its ambiguity. On the one hand, it has many biographical features and reminiscences of the life of Horace and Maecenas and their mutual relations;[26] on the other, and taken as a whole, it describes a situation which is quite different from that existing between Horace and Maecenas.[27] The description of Volteius' nature and his activities resembles the positive picture which Horace in his works gives of his own father (even their social status is similar, Volteius being a *praeco*, Horace's father a *coactor*). Volteius' and Philippus' first meeting resembles that of Horace and Maecenas (i.e. unsuccessful). The donation of a farm is also an autobiographical feature, and both farms, Horace's and Volteius', are situated in the Sabinian

25 Hiltbrunner, Gymn. 67(1960)296-297.
26 See Fraenkel, op.cit. 338; see also McGann, op.cit. 54.
27 I share the opinion of R.S. Kilpatrick, CPh. 68(1973)53: "The apparent resemblances to the events of Horace's and Maecenas' relationships are intended only to intensify the contrasts."

district (cf. line 77). Horace, however, did not like Volteius tire
of farming, for he is a real *ruris amator* and he does not ask Mae-
cenas for permission to return to Rome. He even enjoys himself, mov-
ing turf and stones, although the neighbours laugh at such an odd
gentleman (epist. 1,14,39). Horace's farm is also larger than that
of Volteius Mena and he has a *vilicus* and other people to help him
(epist. 1,14,1-3), while Volteius had to do everything himself. Nor
does Horace need to trust to such pathetic expressions as *te per Ge-
nium dextramque deosque Penatis / obsecro et obtestor* (94-95). Be-
sides, the tale also provides a contrast to sat. 2,7, where Horace
tells us about *mus rusticus* and *mus urbanus*, the former returning
to the country. If Horace himself returned to Rome he would notice
how what he has lost (the rural life on his Sabine farm) is prefer-
able to what he is striving for (the opportunities in Rome offered
by Maecenas) just as Volteius Mena noticed that urban life suits him
better. Horace also wishes to prove that he is not like Volteius who
only in a moment of enthusiasm (like Alfius in the second epode) de-
sired a country life. Here Carl Becker's words are appropriate: "Die
Geschichte von Volteius Mena (46-95) ist ein grosses, spielerisches
Gegenbild zu den beiden Teilen 14-28 und 29-45. Sie zeigt, was dabei
herauskommt, wenn bei einem solchen Verhältnis - das im völligen Ge-
gensatz zu der Freundschaft zwischen Horaz und Maecenas äusserlich,
durch Zufall zustande gekommen ist - der eine nicht in der rechten
Weise zu schenken, der andere nicht in der rechten Weise zu empfangen
(oder abzulehnen) versteht."[28]

---

28 Becker, op.cit. 35; cf. McGann, op.cit. 55.

It has become apparent that Horace's seventh epistle, although containing a large number of hints with regard to the poet's own life and experiences, especially to his attitudes to city and country and to his estate, cannot be interpreted at every point as an autobiographical document. It is not a question of facts, but rather of certain resemblances to Horace's life which provide a lively background for the discussion of moral and philosophical problems. The discussion for its part consists of examples which touch on Horace's biography at many points. The poet refers freely, sometimes even in contradiction, to statements in his other poems, both by exaggerating them and by giving examples *ex contrario*.

P R A E T O R S   O F   T H E   C O U N T R Y   T O W N S

E e v a   R u o f f - V ä ä n ä n e n

It has often been maintained that the highest administrative

magistrates were called *praetores, praetores duoviri* or *praetores*

quattuorviri in several colonies and *municipia,*[1] but so far no special

study has been devoted to this subject. The sources consist of in-

scriptions as well as of a few literary references. In regard to the

inscriptions the main difficulty lies in the interpretation of the

abbreviation *pr.* In the texts listing municipal magisterial titles

like *aedilis* and *questor* this abbreviation has invariably been read

praetor.[2] In some cases this interpretation is certainly correct; in

other cases it is doubtful and probably wrong. There were namely also

magistrates called *praefecti* in a large number of colonies and *muni-*

---

1 W. Liebenam, Städteverwaltung im Römischen Kaiserreich, Leipzig
  1900, 253ff.; K.J. Beloch, Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der
  Punischen Kriege, Weimar 1926, 492, 496; H. Rudolph, Stadt und
  Staat im Römischen Italien, Leipzig 1935, 143 n. 2; A.N. Sherwin-
  White, The Roman Citizenship, Oxford 1973, 83.; A. Degrassi, Quat-
  tuorviri in Colonie Romane e in Municipi Retti da Duoviri, Atti
  della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Ser. 8, vol. 2, fasc. 6(1949)
  305, 315f.; E. Klebs, Petroniana, Philologus Suppl. 6(1891-1893)672;
  E.T. Salmon, Roman Colonization under the Republic, London 1969,
  113, 190 n. 219, 180 n. 119; Wesenberg, Praetor VII, PW 22, 1604
  et alia.
2 See Beloch 489-492, Klebs 684-692 and the other works cited above.

cipia,[3] and, though this title was often abbreviated *praef.*, it is

quite possible that it can have been abbreviated plain *pr.* not only

as a military, but also as a magisterial title.[4] In the following

list only such places are given where at least one inscription re-

cording the longer abbreviation *praet.* or the full word *praetor* has

been found.

The Roman figures refer to the respective volumes of CIL, if

not otherwise stated.

Italia

? Abellinum X 1138. This inscription is lost and known only

from early epigraphic publications. It now reads - - *q. aed. praet.*

II vir q. aliment. - - in CIL, but this interpretation is not certain,

because some of the early scholars read the crucial word not *praet.*

but *prae.* and *praef.*, cf. loc.cit. Inscriptions recording only *pr.*

from Abellinum are: 1134f., 1137, 1140.

? Aletrium X 5832, from the Augustan Age or a little later.

The inscription reads: - - *praetori aed. IIII viro i. d. municipio*

---

3 There was a particularly large number of *praefecti* in the communi-
  ties of northern Italy, see E. Manni, Per la Storia dei Municipii
  fino alla Guerra Sociale, Roma 1947, 187, for references (N.B. his
  list is by no means complete), but there were *praefecti* also else-
  where in Italy as e.g. CIL IX shows: 422 v. 28 from Venusia, 800
  from Luceria, 1027 from Ager Compsinus, 2802 from Aufidena, 3160
  from Corfinium, 3385 from Aufinum, 4204 from Amiternum.
4 Cf. Salmon 186, n. 182. Note also how C. Oppius Bassus' title reads
  pr. Auximo in CIL IX 5839 where it has invariably been read *praetor
  Auximo*.Yet as he is titled *pr. i. d. Aux.* in another inscription,
  5840, the abbreviation *pr.* must obviously be read *praefectus* in
  both inscriptions. The word *praetor* namely never occurs with the
  designation *i(ure) d(icundo)*, which is a common attribute with the
  word *praefectus*, see E. Manni, loc. cit., for references.

Aletri. The appearance of the titles *praetor* and *IIII vir i. d.* to-
gether may mean that the *praetura* was possibly a sacral, not an ad-
ministrative magistracy at Aletrium, but the person in question may
also have been first an - administrative - *praetor* and later on a
IIII vir, when the quattuorviral system had been established at Ale-
trium.

? Anagnia X 5919. This *praetor* may have been a sacral magis-
trate, cf. Livy 9,43,24. The inscription dates from the second half
of the second century A.D. Inscriptions recording only *pr.*: 5920,
5925ff., 5929; AE 1924, 102.

Bantia, E. Vetter, Handbuch der Italischen Dialekte I, Heidel-
berg 1953, 16f., ll. 23, 27f.[5]

Canusium, Hor. Sat. 2,3,168-181.[6]

Capena XI 3876 a and NS 1953 p. 18ff., both from the year 198
A.D. An inscription recording *pr.*, XI 3873, dates from the year 193
A.D.

Cora I 1148 = X 6527, from the last century B.C.

Cumae X 3698, from the year 289 A.D. Inscriptions X 3685, NS
1898 p. 192 and 1913 p. 186 record the abbreviation *pr.*

Falerii XI 3081, 3156 a.

---

5 See also the new publication of the Tabula Bantina by H. Galsterer,
  Die Lex Osca Tabulae Bantinae - Eine Bestandsaufnahme, Chiron I
  (1971)191-214.
6 N.B. in another poem Horace seems to be speaking about a *praetor*
  of Fundi, Sat. 1,5,34ff., but obviously the reference was meta-
  phorical, because we know on the basis of other sources that Fundi
  was governed by a collegium of three *aediles*, not by *praetores*,
  CIL X p. 617. Most probably this Aufidius Luscus mentioned by Hor-
  ace was one of the *aediles* or one of the Roman *praefecti i. d.* sent
  to Fundi - which was a *praefectura*, Festus Gloss. Lat. p. 262,13 -
  who overplayed his role there so as to make Horace mockingly call
  him *praetor*.

Herdoniae IX 689.

Lavinium X 797, from the period 47-54 A.D., XI Suppl. 7555,

from the year 173 A.D., XIV 171f. and 2070.

*Nauna IX 10, from the year 341 A.D.

? Tibur.[7]

? Velitrae X 6554, Mommsen, loc. cit., considered the inscrip-

tion dubious.[8]

Provinces

Aquae Sextiae XII 517, 4409, from the beginning of the first

century A.D.

Bocchori II 3695, from the year 6 A.D.

Burdigala XIII 596f., 600, from the early Empire. These in-

scriptions record the same person.

Carcaso XII 5371, from the beginning of the first century A.D.

? Lucus Augusti XII 1586, and probably 1584, too. This *praetura*

may also have been a sacral magistracy, because the word *praetor*

appears together with the title *flamen* in these inscriptions.

? Setif AE 1930, 46, the inscription reads [pr]ae*tor*.

The above list shows that there are extremely few places where

the word *praetor* was indubitably used as a magisterial title. The

---

7 A. Rosenberg, Neue Zensoreninschrift aus Praeneste, Rh. Mus. 71.
  (1916) 125f., suggests on the basis of CIL XIV 3540 (*Fortunae prae-
  toriae sacrum* - -), cf. 3554, that there would previously have
  been *praetores* also in Tibur, though the surviving magisterial
  titles record only *IIII viri*.
8 Note also that according to A. Rosenberg, Zur Geschichte des La-
  tinerbundes, Hermes 54(1919)157, the local magistrates were orig-
  inally called *meddices*.

inscriptions demonstrate that there is no evidence for the existence

of the title *praetor quattuorvir*. It has evidently been created on

the basis of the abbreviation *pr.* occurring before the word *IIII vir*

on some inscriptions,[9] but they can perfectly well be read *pr(aetor)*,

IIII vir or rather *pr(aefectus)*,[10] *IIII vir*.[11] The existence of the

title *praetor duovir* is again based solely on a single, now lost,

inscription - CIL X 1138 from Abellinum - where the reading *praet.*

is questionable. Obviously the using of these two titles, *praetor*

quattuorvir and *praetor duovir*, which have been much used and the

significance of which has been much discussed in modern literature[12]

should be discontinued.

The distribution of the towns where inscriptions recording

praetores have been found shows that they fall geographically into

three groups with only a couple of towns lying further afield. Two

of these groups are in Italy, one in the neighbourhood of Rome con-

sisting of Aletrium, Anagnia, Capena, Cora, Falerii, Lavinium, Tibur,

and Velitrae, another in south-eastern Italy consisting of Bantia,

Canusium, and Herdoniae. The third group is in the South of France,

---

9 CIL X 3923, 4657, XI 5281, XII 3215, cf. Degrassi 305; Kornemann,
   Coloniae, PW 4, 585; Beloch 506.
10 See above n. 3.
11 In fact the word *bis* between the abbreviations *pr.* and *IIII vir* in
   the inscription XI 5281 (- - *cens. pr. bis IIII vir*) directly dem-
   onstrates that the magistracies designated with the abbreviations
   pr. and *IIII vir* were separate ones. As the *fasti* of Venusia - CIL
   IX 422 - show the *praefecti* were local magistrates and so there is,
   indeed, no reason to assume that the abbreviations *pr.* and *IIII vir*
   would ever have been used together to designate a single magistracy.
12 O. Hirschfeld, Gallische Studien, Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad. 103
   (1900)308 n. 3; Kornemann 585; Beloch 493f.; Liebenam 253f; A. Rosen-
   berg, Der Staat der Alten Italiker, Berlin 1913, 29; Rudolph, 143
   n. 2; Sherwin-White 88; Degrassi 305, 315; Salmon 182 n. 141 and
   190 n. 219.

and it consists of Aquae Sextiae, Burdigala, Carcaso and Lucus Augusti.

The towns lying in the neighbourhood of Rome have historically nothing in common. Lavinium was an old Latin town and a member of the Latin League.[13] Cora and Velitrae were colonies founded by the Latin League in 503 and 494 B.C.[14] Anagnia was a Hernican town, which became a *municipium sine suffragio* in the fourth century B.C.[15] Aletrium was another Hernican town, which remained federated until the Social War.[16] Tibur as an old Latin town entered Roman body-politic only after the Social War.[17] Falerii was destroyed by the Romans in 241 B.C., and its inhabitants were moved to another site.[18] Capena is last heard about in the early fourth century B.C.,[19] but very probably it became a *municipium* before the Social War.[20] In the light of these facts it does not seem likely that the inhabitants of these towns would have adopted from Rome the custom to call their magistrates *praetores*. The one thing that these towns had in common was the language: their inhabitants spoke Latin dialects. Obviously the word *praetor* was a common, indigenous designation among Latin speaking people that survived in these towns in spite of their different political fates.[21]

13 Dion.Hal. Ant.Rom. 5,61.
14 Livy 2,16,8 and 2,31,4, cf. 8,14,5ff.
15 Livy 9,43,24.
16 Beloch 417f.
17 Polyb. 6,14,8.
18 See A.J. Pfiffig, Die Ausbreitung des Römischen Städtewesens in
   Etrurien, Firenze 1966, 25ff. about its history.
19 Livy 5,27,10.
20 Pfiffig 19ff.
21 Thus Rosenberg, op.cit. in n. 12 above 72; Liebenam 252f.

The appearance of the title *praetor* in Bantia, Canusium, and Herdoniae is of greatest significance. Now that it has been securely established that the Oscan Tabula Bantina according to which Bantia was governed by *praetores* dates from the 80's or 70's B.C.,[22] it is evident that the quattuorviral system had not been invented, or that the Roman central government did not particularly insist on its being used in the *municipia* yet at that date. This view is also supported by the fact that in the 30's B.C. when Horace wrote his Satirae the title *praetor* was obviously still used in Canusium or had at least very recently been used there.[23] This means that the quattuorviral system, which has been believed to have been introduced immediately after the Social War,[24] seems not to have become momentous much before the year 51 B.C. when the *IIII viri* first appear in our sources.[25]

The early history of the towns of the third geographic group – Aquae Sextiae, Burdigala, Carcaso, and Lucus Augusti – is little known. The respective areas were conquered by the Romans towards the end of the Republic. In the first century A.D. Burdigala was the main city of the Bituriges, who were free.[26] Lucus Augusti was a town of the Vocontii who were a *civitas foederata*,[27] and Aquae Sex-

---

22 Galsterer 207f.

23 Sat. 2,3,168-181. Cf. also a metric inscription from Formiae, CIL X 6193, which mentions *praetores*. Petronius' reference, Sat. 65,4, to a *praetor* cannot be used as evidence one way or other, because it is not clear what kind of a *praetor* he meant and whether he chose this word factually or for a farcical effect.

24 Sherwin-White 68f.; Beloch 490-501; Klebs 672 et alia.

25 Cic. Att. 5,2,3. Two years later he mentions *IIII viri* in another letter to Atticus 10,13,1. The *Tabula Heracleensis* and the *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina* where the *IIII viri* are officially mentioned date most probably from the 40's B.C. as well, Riccobono, FIRA I 140ff. and 169ff.

26 Pliny, nat. 4, 108.

27 Ibid. 3,37.

tiae and Carcaso had been colonized before or during the Augustan

Age and ranked as *oppida Latina*.[28]

It is difficult to say whether the usage of the title *praetor*

in Aquae Sextiae and Carcaso had been fixed by the Roman Senate when

they were colonized, or whether it had been chosen by the colonists

themselves many of whom may have come from the Latin towns of Italy.[29]

Anyway, it is clear that the central government in Rome did not ob-

ject to the magistrates of the country towns using the title *praetor*.

The fact that the title *praetor* was used in Bocchori, Burdigala,

Lucus Augusti and possibly in Setif too, demonstrates again that the

occurrence of the word *praetor* as a magisterial title in a certain

community does not signify that its inhabitants would have been in

possession of the Roman citizenship or Latin rights.[30] It is also

noteworthy that Livy[31] and Cicero[32] called opponents of Rome, alien

leaders like Hannibal and Ismenias *praetores*. I.e. the word *praetor*

could signify any leader, it was not confined to people who were

Roman or Latin.[33] It is possible too, that in the Gallia Narbonensis

the word *praetor* can have been used about magistrates who had no

colleagues, which shows that a Roman magisterial title could be bor-

---

28 Ibid. 3,36.
29 Cf. Salmon, Roman Colonization from the Second Punic War to the
   Gracchi, JRS 26(1936)63-67 and op.cit. in n. 1 above 181 n. 121,
   see also Livy 10,21,10 and 34,42,5.
30 This has been an ubiquitous view, cf. e.g. Galsterer 205 and
   Pfiffig 20.
31 21,3,4; 21,12,7; 24,27,3 and 6; 32,25,2; 33,46,3; 42,43,9, etc.
32 Fin. 5,92; Inv. Rhet. 1,55.
33 This fact makes it questionable whether the leaders of the Latins,
   who are often called *praetores* by Livy, e.g. 8,3,9, really had
   that title or not and so Livy's references to Latin *praetores*
   cannot be used as evidence that the title *praetor* would have been
   indigenous among the Latins, thus e.g. Rosenberg, op.cit. in n.
   12 above 72.

rowed, though the Roman principle of magisterial collegiality was
not borrowed.[34]

The views that the Romans would have resented the usage of the
title *praetor* in the country towns and would have introduced the
quattuorviral system immediately after the Social War have been based
on the following passage of Cicero:

> *Et quoniam M. Bruti atque illius temporis feci mentionem,*
> *commemorabo id quod egomet vidi, cum venissem Capuam*
> *colonia iam deducta L. Considio et Sex. Saltio, quem ad*
> *modum ipsi loquebantur, 'praetoribus,' ut intellegatis quan-*
> *tam locus ipse adferat superbiam, quae paucis diebus quibus*
> *illo colonia deducta est perspici atque intellegi potuit.*
> *Nam primum, id quod dixi, cum ceteris in coloniis IIviri*
> *appellentur, hi se praetores appellari volebant.*
> (Leg. Agr. 2,92f.)

It is, indeed, quite clear that Cicero and his listeners thought
that the only proper title for the highest colonial magistrates was
duoviri, not *praetores*. How is this view then compatible with the
fact that the magistrates of Aquae Sextiae and Carcaso went on call-
ing themselves *praetores* long after Cicero's day, obviously with-
out check or hindrance on the part of the Roman central government? The
explanation is quite simple. Aquae Sextiae and Carcaso were Latin
colonies, whereas the colony of Capua which Cicero was here speaking
about was a Roman colony.[35] We may rest assured that Cicero was right
about the magisterial titles of the Roman colonies. There is, indeed,

---

34 Hirschfeld 310.
35 See Broughton MRR II 63 for references.

not a single certain inscription recording an administrative *praetor*[36]

from a Roman colony.[37] The highest administrative magistrates of

Roman colonies were called *duoviri*, those of Latin and alien towns

could call themselves *praetores* — or something else.[38]

So far so good, but one more question must be raised. Why

should the *duoviri* of the Capuan colony have tried to use the title

praetor? Did they suffer from the *superbia* as Cicero says, or was

the adoption of just this title somehow connected with the little

known municipal reforms that took place in Italy during the last

century B.C.? It is obvious that the magistrates of quite a large

number of Roman colonies had originally had no judicial authority.[39]

At an unknown date they were granted it, as the Imperial inscriptions

---

36 N.B. as the word *praetor* was also used about priests there can
   have been sacral *praetores* in Roman colonies like the *praetores
   sacris Volkani faciundis* of Ostia, CIL XIV p. 4, show.
37 Kornemann 585; Beloch 492; Liebenam 253; Degrassi 315f.; Salmon,
   op.cit. in n. 1 above 113, 180 n. 119, 182 n. 141, 186 n. 182;
   H. Galsterer, Herrschaft und Verwaltung im Republikanischen Italien,
   München 1976, 121, have maintained that there would have been
   praetores in the Roman colonies of Auximum, Castrum Novum (Pice-
   num), Narbo, and Potentia (Picenum), but the evidence cited in
   support of this view is questionable. Firstly, all the inscrip-
   tions referred to read *pr.* which can be read *pr(aefectus)* as well
   as *pr(aetor)* and in the cases of Auximum and Castrum Novum the
   respective inscriptions must very probably be read *praefecti*,
   see above n. 4 and below n. 45. Secondly, Auximum, Castrum Novum
   and Potentia may not have been Roman colonies at all. Thirdly, the
   inscription CIL IX 5763 was not found in Potentia but in Pausulae
   and there is no reason to ascribe it to Potentia as Beloch, 492,
   does. So Narbo is the only Roman colony where the reading *pr(aetor)*
   might be justified, but the above testimony of Cicero as well as
   the several *praefecti* from other Roman colonies, see notes 3 and
   46, speak against such an interpretation.
38 Cf. Rosenberg, op.cit. in n. 12 above 1-15, 71-79, and CIL I, 2²
   583 v. 78 (*Lex Acilia Repetundarum*): *sei quis eorum quei [nominis
   Latini sunt - - quei eorum in sua quisque civitate dicta] tor, prae-
   tor, aedilisve non fuerint - -*.
39 Salmon, op.cit. in n. 1 above 80.

recording *duoviri iure dicundo* from these colonies demonstrate. One wonders if this reform took place in the 80's B.C., when the Capuan colony was founded so that its magistrates knew they could exercise jurisdictional powers, but were still unaware of the proper title which they should have used. So they automatically adopted the title *praetor*, which was used in several towns and implied the right to use jurisdictional powers. I.e. the title *duovir i. d.* had not yet become fixed, and as the magistrates of the new colony wanted to avoid being called plain *duoviri*, they decided on the title *praetores*. Perhaps this might be the reason for their singular behaviour rather than the *superbia* of which Cicero accused them?

The appearance of the title *praetor* in Cumae and *Nauna remains to be discussed. Cumae was originally a Greek colony. In 338 B.C. its inhabitants received *civitas Romana sine suffragio*[40] and about a hundred years later it became a *praefectura*, which meant that the Roman *praetor urbanus* began to send his representatives, the *praefecti iure dicundo*, there yearly to take care of the judicial affairs of the area.[41] This custom came to an end under Augustus.[42] It is clear that the title *praetor* cannot have been used about the Cumaean magistrates as long as the town was jurisdictionally subjected to the Roman *praetor*. Indeed, at least in the 40's B.C. Cumae was governed by *IIII viri*, not by *praetores*.[43] It is, indeed, probable that the title *praetor* - which appears very late in Cumae - dates only from the Mid-Empire when the revival of interest in his-

---

40 Livy 8,14,11.
41 Festus Gloss.Lat. 262; Vell.Pat. 2,44,4; see also Ennslin, Praefecti Capuam Cumas, PW 22, 1284f.
42 Dio Cass. 54,26,6f.; cf. the references in the previous note.
43 Cic. Att. 10,13,1.

tory led to the adoption of 'unconstitutional' titles in general.[44]

The *praetura* of *Nauna, which was a minuscule settlement in the

Greek Southern Italy, was, in all probability, a nostalgic creation

of the Imperial Age, too.

Considering the towns where inscriptions recording the abbre-

viation *pr.* have been found,[45] there is little to be added. Most of

---

44 Cf. Aul.Gell. 16,13 and CIL X 52, 60, which record honorary cen-
   sors.
45 Italia:
   Aesernia IX 2664.
   Alba Fucens IX 6349.
   Auximum IX 5838, 5841, 5843, 5845(?), 5849, 6384, inscription
   No. 5840 records a *pr. i. d. Aux.*, cf. n. 4 above.
   Beneventum I, 2^2 1729 = IX 1635, 1547, 2240(?), AE 1930, 121 re-
   cords a *praef. i. d. bis,* cf. n. 4 above. Inscriptions recording
   pr. cer. i. d. are 1640ff., 1655, 1637 and NS 1913 p. 311.
   Cales X 4651, 4657, AE 1973, 135.
   Capitulum Hernicum XIV 2960.
   Capo Selce X 6320, place of origin unknown, used as a miliarium
   at the Via Appia already during the antiquity.
   ? Capua I, 2^2 1574 = X 3923, according to Mommsen, loc.cit., this
   inscription probably came from Cales.
   Casinum I, 2^2 1545 = X 5203. The abbreviation *pr.* in this inscrip-
   tion probably refers to a *praefectus* as inscriptions 5193f. from
   Casinum record the title *praef. Casinat.*
   Castellum ad Tricesimum AE 1923, 45.
   Castrum Novum IX 5145. This, now lost, inscription was found some-
   what outside Castrum Novum. If it recorded a magistrate of the
   colony at all it must probably be read *praefectus,* because IX 5016
   found in the neighbouring Hadria mentions a *pref. Cast. Nov.*
   Grumentum X 208, 221, 226f., AE 1972, 148.
   ? Hispellum XI 5281, found two miles from the town.
   Interamnia Praetuttianorum IX 5073.
   ? Interamnia Lirenas, Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica 5, fasc. 3-5
   (1921) 85.
   Lanuvium XIV 2117.
   Neapolis AE 1931, 99.
   Nuceria IV Suppl.3, 9951f., 9956f., 9961.
   Pausulae IX 5793.
   Praeneste XIV 2890, 2897(?), 2902, 2906, 2994, 2999.
   Setia X 6466.
   Signia X 5969.
   ? Spoletium XI 4822(?)
   Telesia IX 2220ff., 2225, 2227, 2234f., 2239, No. 2128 is possibly

them were old Latin or Hernican towns, Latin colonies or otherwise in possession of the Latin rights, which coincides with the conclusions presented above. Some of them are Roman colonies and in these cases the abbreviation *pr.* must obviously be read *praefectus*, not *praetor*.[46] The history of the rest of them is little known and the possibility that the abbreviation *pr.* may have denoted *praetor* in some of them adds nothing to the previous conclusions.

This short survey of the distribution of the title *praetor* in the country towns has shown that our sources are very scanty and that the conclusion that we can reach may therefore not be of permanent value. Nevertheless, there seems still to be much to be discovered within the subject of the pre-quattuorviral magisterial titles, which can help us towards a better understanding of the development of the Roman Commonwealth in Italy and abroad.

---

also from Telesia, see IX p. 194.
Gallia Narbonensis:
? Avennio XII 1028.
Narbo XII 4409, 4428f., 4431.
Nemausus XII 3215.
Vasio XII 1369, 1371. These inscriptions probably refer to *praefecti*, because XII 1375 records a *praef.* [*Va*]*siensium*.
46 Riccobono, FIRA I 172 (*praefectus* of Mutina), 177ff. c. 131 (*praefectus* of Colonia Genetiva Iulia), 400 (*praefectus* of Venafrum).

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

XL. JÜDISCHES IN BRESCIA?

D. Novellone veröffentlicht RAL 1973, 513-518 eine interessante

Grabinschrift aus Brescia. Nach der Herausgeberin soll es sich um

eine jüdische Inschrift handeln. Das ist unmöglich. Novellone ist

ein grobes Missverständnis unterlaufen in der Beurteilung des in der

Inschrift vorkommenden Begriffes und Ausdruckes *domus aeternalis*,

der ihr zufolge erst seit Mitte des 4. Jh. belegt und fast aus-

schliesslich christlich sei. Da die Zeit der Inschrift (2. Jh.) mit

der Verbreitung des Christentums in Brescia nicht im Einklang steht,

und da der Inschrift dem Heidentum fremde moralische Untertöne an-

haften, bleibe als einziger Ausweg übrig, die Inschrift als jüdisch

zu erklären. *Domus aeternalis* ist aber bezeugt in älterer Kaiser-

zeit und in unstrittig heidnischen Epitaphen, wie aus der neuen Zu-

sammenstellung über die Belege des Ausdruckes "ewiges Haus" bei Bar-

bieri, Quarta miscellanea greca e romana (1975) 343-348 leicht er-

sichtlich ist. Vor allem aber ist der Begriff des Grabes als ewiges

Haus im Grunde heidnisch und steht an sich im Widerspruch mit der

christlichen Theologie wie auch mit dem in römischer Zeit vorherr-

schenden Auferstehungsglauben der Juden. Dass der Begriff trotzdem

bei Juden und Christen für das Grab verwendet wird, ist eine andere

Sache und kann (auch im Fall der jüdischen Belege, denn das Vorkom-

men dieser Grabbezeichnung bei den Juden römischer Zeit kann in

keinem einzigen Fall mit den älteren Formen der israelitischen Jen-

seitsvorstellungen verbunden werden, die noch keine Unsterblichkeits-

und Auferstehungshoffnung kannten) nur auf der konventionellen Wei-

terverwendung der heidnischen Bezeichnung in jüdischen und christ-

lichen Grabinschriften beruhen. Der Begriff ist aber - wie gesagt -

heidnisch und passt vorzüglich zum Ton des Textverlaufes der In-

schrift. Unglücklich ist auch der Versuch der Editorin, aus dem

Cognomen des Verstorbenen *Dicaeus* auf jüdischen Charakter zu schlies-

sen. *Dicaeus* ist ein normaler griechischer Name, des öfteren in Rom und

sonst in Italien bezeugt (Novellone scheint die stadtrömische Ver-

breitung nicht zu kennen, der Name ist aber allein in Rom 18mal be-

legt) und fehlt gänzlich in jüdischen Urkunden. Wenn *Iustus* ein

Modename unter den Juden geworden war als Übersetzung des betref-

fenden hebräischen Begriffes, bedeutet das noch nicht, dass der be-

treffende griechische Name Δίκαιος es auch hätte werden sollen.

XLI. ZU NEUEN INSCHRIFTEN AUS DEN ABRUZZEN

A. Marinucci veröffentlicht, Epigraphica 38 (1976) 143-157, eine

Reihe neuer Inschriften aus den Abruzzen, darunter als Nr. 1 einen

interessanten Text aus Civita di Bagno im Gebiet der Vestini. Ma-

rinuccis Restitution ist aber sicher unrichtig. Anhand des Photos

kann man sich das Schriftbild in etwa vorstellen. Der rechte Teil

des Textes bietet keine Probleme: ohne Zweifel *Germanico / Caesari*

Ti. Augusti [f.] . Wenn aber die Anordnung des Textes auch nur annähernd symmetrisch war, hat Marinucci links mit [*Iuliae A]ugustae / [Drusi f. uxori divi Au]gusti* allzu viel ergänzt. Gestanden hat dort etwa [*Iuliae A]ugustae /[divi Au]gusti.* Aus Gründen der Symmetrie ist auch Marinuccis Ergänzung der letzten Zeile viel zu lang; ein ganzer Name und dann noch *sacerdos F]eroniae* ist einfach unmöglich. Ich vermute beispielshalber [*coll(egium) F]eroniae.*

Nr. 4 aus Vasto. Marinuccis Ergänzung *Splata[e Co]rnelianae* kann nicht richtig sein, denn erstens ist sie nach dem Photo zu schliessen zu kurz und zweitens ergibt sich daraus kein sinnvoller Name. Von dem Buchstaben nach *T* ist nur unten ein kurzer Strich erhalten, der nach dem Photo zu schliessen nicht unbedingt die Schräghaste eines *A* bilden muss; es mag der untere Teil eines beliebigen Buchstabens mit der Serife vorliegen. Ich vermute *Splatt[iae Co]rnelianae. Splattius* ist ein Gentilicium (Schulze, Zur Geschichte lat. Eigennamen 262) und kommt gerade in Vasto vor (in dieser Sammlung Nr. 6). - Die Konstruktion der Inschrift ist verdächtig, und es scheint nicht möglich, den richtigen Wortlaut zu ermitteln - der Editor hat die Schwierigkeiten ganz und gar verschwiegen und den Sinn nicht verstanden, wie seine Interpunktion und seine Ergänzungen zeigen. Der Sinn der Klauseln zwischen den Namen und der Altersangabe lässt sich jedoch einigermassen feststellen. Von *matri* an beginnt ein neues Kolon, die zwei Dative hängen irgendwie von dem Folgenden ab. Wie sich aber die Lücke nach QVOD·A (wohl von höchstens zwei oder drei Buchstaben) ergänzen liesse, ist nicht einzusehen, weswegen auch VT in der Luft hängt. Was folgt, ist klar: Der Name

der Mutter hätte in der Grabinschrift vor dem der Tochter gelesen werden müssen. Die Pentameterklausel *debuit ante legi* ist ein stehender Ausdruck, vgl. CLE 1479-1484, 2126-2129. Da *lege* deutlich für *legi* steht, kann auch mit anderen vulgären Schreibungen gerechnet Werden, was die Klärung des Anfangs noch erschwert. Videant fortunatiores.

Nr. 5, ebenfalls aus Vasto. *Siaphilus* ist ein falscher Name. Es muss sein *Staphilus = Staphylus*.

Nr. 8, auch aus Vasto. *Corinius* ist ebenfalls ein falscher Name: *Corintus*. P·P nicht *p(osuerunt)*, sondern entweder *p(arentes) p(ientissimi)* oder *p(arentes) p(osuerunt)*.

XLII. MINIMA NOMENTANA

C. Pala, Nomentum: Forma Italiae reg. I, vol. XII (1976) S. 34 Abb. 46. In dieser Namenliste ist für *Pom]peius Tylus* wohl *Ty[l]lus* zu lesen. C. *Acilius Hyl[arus* ist ein falscher Name: *Hya[cinthus*.

XLIII. ZU NEUEN TEXTEN AUS DER GEGEND VON COSENZA

Fs folgen einige kurze Bemerkungen zu Inschriften, die P.G. Guzzo, Epigraphica 38 (1976) 129-143, herausgegeben hat.

Nr. 1 schon von Catanuto, BullMusImpRom. 2 (1931) 81 herausgegeben, hat einen interessanten Wortlaut. Man hat so ergänzt und interpunktiert: - - *vix(it) an(nis) XIX. [Sine o]mine ullo florentes annos [mors s]ubita eripuit.* Es muss sein *vix(it) an(nis) XIX [sine cri]mine ullo. Florentes annos [mors s]ubita eripuit.* Zu *sine crimine*

ullo CIL VI 23282 und sonst. Der folgende Pentameter auch CIL VI

37337 = CLE 3140; vgl. auch CIL V 3403 = CLE 1004 ungeschickt mit

mors ipsa.

Nr. 8. In a 7 fehlen in der Transkription zwischen *cratuitam*

und *de* zwei Buchstaben. In seiner Majuskeltranskription RivFil.

103 (1975) 376 gibt Guzzo FR, was nach dem Photo zu schliessen nicht

ganz sicher ist. Auch PR könnte möglich sein. Wenn aber FR, dann

wahrscheinlich *fr(umentariam)*. PR wäre vielleicht etwa *pr(imus)* oder

pr(ivatus), *pr(ivata ratione)*.

XLIV. FALSCHE NAMEN

Cticus. CIL VI 6662, gesehen, wie es scheint, von Dressel, be-

ginnt verdächtig *Ti. Claudio Ctico*. Das Cognomen *Cticus* wird ohne

Erklärung und Fragezeichen in ThlL. Onom. II 737 wiedergegeben. Es

ist ein falscher Name, ich habe die Inschrift im Thermenmuseum ge-

sehen. Es muss heissen *Ti. Claudio Ectico*. *Hecticus* auch sonst in

Rom: CIL VI 26521, als Frauenname 18594; zur sonstigen Verbreitung

vgl. Arctos 7 (1972) 194f. Dazu kann ich im letzten Moment hinzu-

fügen *N. Vibius Hecticus* in einem Verzeichnis von Augustales in

Herculaneum aus flavischer Zeit (G. Guadagno, Cronache Ercolanesi

7 [1977] 116, Fragm. A, I 11; der Editor liest *Heclicus*, ich ändere

auf Grund des Photos).

Iaberosa. Die zweite Zeile von ICVR 1111 lautet in der Lesung

de Rossis und Silvagnis (anders andere) AVreI·IABEROSA. *Iaberosa*

(so von Silvagni im Index zu ICVR I aufgefasst) ist jedoch schwer

zu erklären. Deswegen vermute ich, trotz des Punktes, *Aurelia Berosa*.

Dieser Name wäre freilich neu für Rom, aber *Berusus* CIL VI 27020,

Berosos 25820, *Berossila* ICVR 4310.

Philites. In ICVR 7746 entsteht durch Ergänzung des Editors

ein falscher Name *Phi]lites*. Die Ergänzung scheint auf dem Namen der

Frau zu beruhen, die *Filite* hiess. Doch *Philites* kann nicht existie-

ren, die Form fügt sich nicht in die Wortbildungsregeln ein. Wohl

etwa *Po]lites*. Dieser Name sonst in Rom CIL VI 15212. 37648.

Polymnis. In Nr. 383 des Corpus jüdischer Inschriften aus Rom

ist der Name des Verstorbenen ΠΟΛΥ/ [± 2-3] ΝΙC überliefert. Man hat

hier seit jeher Πόλυ[μ]νις ergänzt. Krauss, Synagogale Altertümer 255,

vermutete darin *Volumnius*, während Frey an Πόλυμνις festhält, da der

Name gut bezeugt sei. Freilich ist Πόλυμνις ein alter griechischer

Name (Bechtel, Hist. Personennamen 378), doch ist er nur dürftig in

Griechenland verbreitet. Aus römischer Zeit kenne ich einen einzigen

Beleg, einen kretischen Senator L. *Flavius Sulpicianus Dorio Polymnis*

gegen Ende des 2. Jh. (ICret. III, III 20 aus Hierapytna = PIR^2 F

375), doch von hier ist ein weiter Weg bis zur römischen Judenge-

meinde. Ich ergänze ohne Zögern Πολυ[χρό]νις, einen Namen, der in

späterer Kaiserzeit in Rom verbreitet ist.

Samifilus. H. Thylander, Inscriptions du Port d'Ostie A 170,

hat folgendes Ineditum von der Isola Sacra veröffentlicht: *d.m./*

Maecenatiae / Crusopoli fecet / Samus Samifilus. Wie man an dem

Photo sieht, ist die Lesung sicher. Im Kommentar verliert Thylander

kein Wort über den merkwürdigen Namen *Samifilus* (er hat auch die

Nomenklatorischen Schwierigkeiten der Namensformel *Samus Samifilus*

nicht erkannt). Das ist ein Monstrum; es ist zweifellos *Sami fil(i)us*

zu verstehen. Der Punkt wird zwischen den Wörtern nicht regelmässig

gesetzt (wenn überhaupt: anhand des Photos zweifle ich etwas an dem

Punkt nach SAMVS). Die Inschrift ist auch sonst voll von Vulgarismen,

so dass *filus* für *filius* keine Schwierigkeiten bietet. *Samus Sami*

filius ist eine normale Namensformel von Peregrinen.

XLV. VERKANNTE NAMEN

Semiramis. Dieser Name findet sich wahrscheinlich in einer

stadtrömischen Inschrift BullCom. 43 (1915) 311 = NotScavi 1916, 99

Nr. 38. Die Inschrift ist wie folgt veröffentlicht worden: D M /

AMERAMI CO / IVGI BENEME / ENTI FECIT / MARCIVS / SIMVS. Lücken wer-

den nicht angegeben. Ich habe den Text anhand des Photos im Institut

für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik der Universität Rom ver-

glichen; aus dem Photo geht hervor, dass links einige Buchstaben

fehlen. So ergibt sich ziemlich natürlich folgende Restitution: *d.m./*

[S]amerami co/[n]iugi beneme/[r]enti fecit / [-] Marcius / [One?]simus.

Statt *Onesimus* wäre auch *C(h)resimus* möglich, aber noch besser wäre

für die Ergänzung der Lücke (denn es scheinen nur ein bis zwei Buch-

staben zu fehlen) *Aesimus*, was freilich ein seltener Name ist; ich

kenne aus römischem Westen nur CIL VI 21826. Der zum Namen der le-

gendären babylonischen Königin Semiramis gebildete Frauenname lässt

sich auch sonst belegen: *Simirami* (Dat.) CIL VI 35751; mit *Sam-*:

Claudiae Samiramidi CIL VI 15581. *Ragonia Sameramis* CIL XIV 1541

(Ostia). Diese Schreibung *Samiramis Sameramis* findet sich öfters in

Hss., auch guten, und spiegelt die semitische Urform wieder. In der

Literatur wird *Semiramin* und *Semiramid-* flektiert, so dass *Samerami*

völlig normal ist.

Hermonicus. So ist wohl das Cognomen eines Lucceius in einer

Namenliste aus Ravenna (A. Donati, Epigraphica 39 [1977] 31 II 17)

zu verstehen. Der Name wird von der Editorin *Lucc(eius) Hemonic(- -)*

wiedergegeben. Die Lesung ist sicher. Der Name *Hermonicus* scheint

bisher sowohl in griechischen als auch in römischen Quellen zu feh-

len, ist aber leicht postulierbar. Die *Hermo*-Vollnamen sind beliebt

in römischer Zeit, und -νικος ist nicht unbekannt als Hinterglied

theophorer Vollnamen.

XLVI. VERKANNTE IDENTITÄTEN

Es handelt sich diesmal ausschliesslich um stadtrömische

Inschriften. CIL VI 12926 in Abschrift von Bormann und Rocchi steht

auch (schlechter) 18183 aus Marini Cod.Vat.Lat. 9130 f. 195. Die

Identität hat soeben auch G. Geraci, La collezione Di Bagno: le

iscrizioni greche e latine, Faenza 1975, Nr. 42, bemerkt. Trotz der

Seltenheit des Gentiliciums *Avius* ist die Fassung in 12926 ohne wei-

teres vorzuziehen, wie man an dem von Geraci publizierten Photo se-

hen kann.

14564 aus Fabretti 502,91 ist in Wirklichkeit ein Ziegelstem-

pel: XV 2425.

16004 aus Muratori 1614,17 in Abschrift von Ficoroni wurde von

Mommsen und Reifferscheid gesehen und nach ihrer Abschrift besser

21469 publiziert. Der falsche Name *Collius* verschwindet also.

20604 aus Manutius Cod.Vat.Lat. 5241, p. 263 ist gleich 28954

aus Accursius Cod.Ambros. D, 420 f. 59' und Anonym. Cod.Ambros. A, 55.

Accursius las *d. manibus Viliae Philomelae. vix. ann. XXVIII. Vilia Flaccilla patron(a)*, Manutius davon abweichend *dis manibus Iuliae Philomelae - - Iulia Flaccilla.* Es ist schwer zu entscheiden, welche Lesart vorzuziehen ist. Die Zuverlässigkeit von Accursius und Manutius ist etwa gleich. Für den ersteren könnte sprechen, dass *Vilia* deutlich eine lectio difficilior ist; auch *d. manibus* stellt eine Art lectio difficilior dar.

21685 aus Ficoronis Abschrift bei Gori Cod.Marucell. A,6 f. 482 und Muratori 1786,41 ist von Hübner in London im British Museum gesehen und nach seiner Abschrift 27771 publiziert worden. Hübners *Turia* ist wohl Ficoronis *Luria* vorzuziehen.

26623 = 38923, durch Bangs Nachlässigkeit nochmal in seinem Supplement publiziert.

ICVR 26 = 4083 und 29 = 4084.

ICVR 49 = 3605, auch CIL VI 32297 wiedergegeben. Zu ergänzen ist ohne weiteres *Phil]otas.*

ICVR 340 liegt vollständig 3790 vor.

ICVR 898, von P. Sabinus und Accursius vor dem Carcer Tullianum am Fusse des Capitols gesehen, geriet später in die Peterskirche und wurde als von dort herstammend von Silvagni in ICVR 4194 nochmals herausgegeben. Silvagni hat den Stein gesehen, es muss also heissen 4 IRENE, aber die Inschrift selbst gehört in den ersten Band. 4194 muss also gestrichen werden.

Interessant ist die Zusammenstellung von ICVR 2662 und 17111. De Rossi, der die genauere Herkunft der Inschrift nicht kannte, hat 2662 in Bologna gesehen. Der Stein wurde aber im Jahre 1713 in der

Katakombe des Marcellinus und Petrus gefunden. Eine Abschrift des
Textes gelangte in die Regesta sacrarii pontificii, und von dort
ist die Inschrift in ICVR 17111 eingeflossen. Die Inschrift steht
also in 17111 an der richtigen Stelle, die flüchtige Lesung der Re-
gesta muss aber durch de Rossis zuverlässige Abschrift in 2662 er-
setzt werden.

ICVR 8755 = 12757. Nach der richtigen Erkenntnis, dass die In-
schriften, als deren Fundort etwa seit Boldetti bis in die Mitte des
19. Jh. die Kallistus-Katakombe angegeben wird, in Wirklichkeit in
die Katakombe der Domitilla gehören, hat Ferrua die Inschrift ICVR
8755, die nach den Acta lipsanothecae Card. Vicarii V 623 im Jahre
1816 "e coem. Callisti" weggeschleppt wurde, der Domitilla-Katakombe
zugewiesen; dieser Text findet sich auch in de Rossis Scheden. In
12757 wurde der Text von Ferrua im Kallistus-Band versehentlich
wiederholt, eben nach der Angabe de Rossis, die Inschrift sei aus
Kallistus ins Lateranmuseum gekommen. Die Inschrift steht aber 8755
an richtiger Stelle. - Vgl. Arctos 9 (1975) 105.

C. Carletti, Iscrizioni cristiane inedite del cimitero di
Bassilla "ad S. Hermetem" (MemPontAcc. ser. in 8° 2), Rom 1976, Nr.
19 ist nicht neu; schon von Marangoni, Acta Sancti Victorini S. 93
veröffentlicht.

XLVII. VARIA URBANA

1. CIL VI 29343 beginnt in der Abschrift von Marucchi *dis*
manibus Ulpiae Faustae. Die Inschrift ist seit Smetius bekannt, der
sie gesehen hat. Alle früheren Zeugen haben *Iuliae Faustae*, das CIL

druckt Marucchis Lesung, der sie 'lapide iterum inspecto confirma-
vit'. Die Inschrift befindet sich auf dem Hofe des Hauses Via
Quattro Fontane 20 und hat *Iuliae*. Ein an sich harmloses und amü-
santes Beispiel in der langen Reihe von Beobachtungen über die Zu-
verlässigkeit Marucchischer Lesungen.

2. CIL VI 27454 in Abschrift von Hübner beginnt *Sex. Titienus
D.l. Eros*. Die Inschrift befindet sich im Ashmolean Museum in Oxford,
wo ich sie gesehen habe; ich besitze davon ausserdem ein Photo. Es
muss heissen *Sex. Titienius*.

3. CIL VI 9842 (gesehen von Henzen) lautet *Agrimatio Statili-
aes Tauri f. Messalinae pumilio*. Die Richtigkeit der Lesung dürfte
über jeden Zweifel erhaben sein. Diehl, ThlL I 1428 notiert dazu
'cf. ἀγριματος?' Das ist ausgeschlossen. Ich vermute *Agalmatio*. Wenn
das Konzept in kursiver oder halbkursiver Schrift geschrieben war,
ist die Verwechslung von A und R und von L und I leicht verständlich.

4. Ein fragmentarischer Name liegt in CIL VI 17779 aus Citta-
dini Vat. 5253 f. 158 vor. 3 wird ......ETHERO FIL überliefert. Im
Cod.Marc.Lat. p. 24 bietet Cittadini dafür M·LETHERO. Henzen im
CIL vermutet *Philetaero*, was richtig sein kann, ebensogut ist aber
Ele(u)thero möglich. Doch ist das M des Marcianus nicht leicht ab-
zutun.

5. CIL VI 11443 aus Bianchini sched.Ver. 417 ist wie folgt
überliefert: Q·ALFIDIVS·Ɔ·L·PHILOGENES / DROPA / CONIVNX·FECIT.
Schwierigkeiten bereitet DROPA. ThlL Onom. III 254, 55 führt *Dropa*
als Frauennamen an (freilich ohne Erklärung), was wegen *coniunx* auch
naheliegend wäre. Doch was ist *Dropa*? Eine befriedigende Erklärung

kann dafür nicht gegeben werden. Es sei daher vorgeschlagen, in

DROPA die Berufsbezeichnung des Philogenes zu sehen, entweder *dro-*

pa(cista) oder *dropa(cator)*, die beide dieselbe Bedeutung 'Auszieher

der Haare' haben. S. ThlL V 1, 2069 und DizEpigr. II 2069f. Gerade

aus Rom ist ein Sklave *dropacator* bekannt (CIL VI 10229, 69).

     6. ICVR 610 (nach älteren Gewährsleuten) lautet *Melista* /

Beroniceni benemerenti. vixit annis XVI. Zu der Inschrift ist zwei-

erlei zu notieren. Erstens fragt man sich, warum sie hier steht,

denn ihre Herkunft ist bei früheren Zeugen deutlich angegeben; so-

wohl Marangoni, Acta Sancti Victorini 96 als auch Marini Cod.Vat.

Lat. 9074, 869,3 sch. 3457 vermerken, die Inschrift stamme aus dem

Coemeterium Thrasonis. Zweitens liegt in *Melista* ein falscher Name

vor. Marangoni und Marini haben beide *Melissa* (leider war es mir

trotz der Bemühungen der Beamten der Biblioteca Apostolica Vati-

cana nicht möglich, die von Silvagni in ICVR angeführten Vatika-

nischen Scheden von Emiliano Sarti zu finden, der nach Silvagni

die Inschrift ebenfalls haben soll). Durch freundliche Mitteilung

von A. Ferrua erfahre ich, dass de Rossi sch. 5321 M€LISTA schreibt,

woraus durch flüchtige Abschrift Silvagnis der falsche Name *Melista*

in ICVR entstand. Ein Name *Melista* wäre übrigens schwer erklärbar;

er könnte höchstens zu der seltenen Berufsbezeichnung μελιστής ge-

bildet sein. Doch von einem solchen Namen gibt es in der antiken

Namengebung keine Spuren.

     7. Einen falschen Namen bietet auch ICVR 572. Silvagni sah

vor der Inschrift, die in S. Maria in Trastevere aufbewahrt worden

ist (ich konnte den Stein im Juni 1977 nicht mehr wiederfinden),

nur den rechten Teil; den linken Teil fügte er aus Lupi Cod.Vitt.

Eman. fondo Gesuit. 532, c.38 hinzu. Lupis Text lautet *Schia Her-*

miati / |coniu]gi inconparabili, wovon Silvagni ERMIATI und CONPARA-

BILI noch vorfand. SCHIA ist aber nur Lupis nachlässige Lesung,

denn derselbe Lupi hat in Dissertazioni, lettere ed altre operette I,

Faenza 1785, 181, zweifellos dieselbe Inschrift mit folgendem Text-

verlauf veröffentlicht: *Eutychia Hermiati / coniugi incomparabili*

(mit ähnlichem Punkt am Ende). Diese Abschrift stammt von A. Lesley;

der Stein ist Lupi zufolge "copiato credo nel Cimitero di S. Erme-

te." Man kann kaum Zweifel darüber hegen, dass es sich beidemale um

Abschriften ein und derselben Inschrift handelt. In den wenigen

Jahren zwischen Lesleys und Lupis Abschriften ist also der Text

links etwas abgebrochen. So verschwindet der bizarre Name *Schia,*

der auch schwer erklärbar wäre; höchstens könnte der freilich et-

was eigentümliche Name *Scia* vorliegen, der aus Rom bekannt ist

(CIL VI 4651); dazu die besser verständlichen *Euscius* (CIL VI 7305)

und *Eyscia* (ICVR 16183).

8. G. Mennella hat soeben in Italia medioevale e umanistica

19 (1976) 389-412 ein bisher unbekanntes Apographon lateinischer

und griechischer Inschriften aus der Werkstatt von Bartolomeo Ca-

vaceppi herausgegeben; die Kopien stammen von der Hand eines Anto-

nio Rondoli. Unter den Inedita (Nr. 118) findet sich ein bizarrer

Text, dem Mennella (S. 407) folgenden Wortlaut gibt: *Deposita V n.*

De. Cimura laus benemerenti in pace. Verdächtig sind dabei die Na-

mengebung und die Abkürzungen, die ungewöhnlich sind. Wenn man die

Fehlerhaftigkeit der Abschriften bedenkt sowie den Umstand, dass

sie nicht direkt von den Steinen gemacht worden sind, ist die Mög-

lichkeit der Verlesungen besonders gross. Durch eine kleine Änderung

in Z. 2, unter der Annahme, dass K als R verlesen worden ist

(nach dem von Mennella beifügten Photo zu urteilen hat R die normale

Form, wobei die Verwechslung leicht erklärlich ist), entsteht ein

einwandfreier Text: *deposita undecimu Kal(endas) Au(gusta)s* usw.

Die Kontraktion AVS für *Augustas* findet sich auch sonst in Rom:

ICVR 1276. 9131. - Im ganzen gesehen, hat man keinen Grund, die In-

schrift als Fälschung zu betrachten.

9. Aus dem Coemeterium maius hat Lucas Holstenius einige

christliche Inschriften überliefert, die u.a. in die Sammlungen von

Aringhi und Gudio eingeflossen sind; s. Ferrua, VetChrist. 13 (1976)

267f., dem entgangen ist, dass die griechischen Texte in CIG von

Kirchhoff emendiert vorliegen. Nr. 15 (auch CIG 9561) ist überlie-

fert XPYCOΓONI TEYTYXIAN EN EIPHNH. Als Urtext ist Χρυσογόνη Εὐτυ-

χιανῷ usw. anzunehmen, wie auch Kirchhoff gesehen hat. Nr. 8 (CIG

9561) ist bei Holstenius (woraus Aringhi) überliefert XPYCOΓONIAN

EN EIPHNH. Aber dieselbe Inschrift steht auch bei Muratori IV, 1852,

1, der sie 'e schedis Ptolomeis' übernahm; bei Muratori steht es

XPYCOΓONHN EN EIPHNH. Kirchhoff meint, es soll heissen Χρυσογόνη

ἐν εἰρήνῃ, doch könnte vielleicht auch Χρυσογιαν(ῷ) ἐν εἰρήνῃ ver-

mutet werden.

10. ICVR 2463 heisst von Silvagni aus de Rossis Abschrift

herausgegeben *Uranie filie carissime Urbanius / pater et Eutolmius*

mater in pace. Ich habe die Inschrift in den Vatikanischen Museen

gesehen. *Uranius* statt *Urbanius*, wie auch wegen des Namens der

Tochter zu erwarten. Richtig schon Oderico, Dissertationes et ad-

notationes in aliquot ineditas veterum inscriptiones et numismata, Roma 1765, 261, 102. Zu korrigieren noch PATER·ET mit dem Punkt.

11. In Vet.Christ. 13 (1976) 255ff. hat Ferrua eine Reihe von Siegeln auf dem Wandverputz aus dem Coemeterium maius publiziert. Nr. 10 gibt er in folgender Form: GRANI CYRII. Verdächtig ist der Name *Cyrius*, von dem ich in der ganzen antiken Überlieferung nur einen sicheren Beleg kenne (CIL X 6565, Velitrae zwischen 364-375 n.Chr.). Äusserst zweifelhaft Κύριο[ς (?) ICVR 16885 b. Vermutlich *Cyril(li)*.

12. Hier einige Fälle, in denen sich fragmentarisch erhaltene Namen sicher ergänzen lassen, die Editoren aber versagen.

CIL VI 5143 *Th|imele* = *Thymele*

7137 *Cal]linico*.

7821 *A|ciles* = *Achilles*.

10798 *Am]phion*.

12606 *Polycr|honius*.

16482 gibt CIL *Euhe]mera* wieder. Dieser Name sonst in Rom nicht bezeugt. Weit besser *Cale]mera*.

19333 *Eleut]hero*.

25081 sehr wahrscheinlich *Mo]scho*.

30370,1 scheint *Pol]ybio* zu sein.

30553,26 wenn der erste Buchstabe V ist, dann wohl *E]uche*, wenn nicht *T]uche*.

32334 ohne weiteres *S]atyrus*.

33675 *Or]pheus*.

34745 *Eut]heniae*.

35452 *Di]dymiano*. Vgl. Arctos 10 (1976) 91.

38276 wohl *Ag]apome|ne*.

39197 *Ca]l]liope*.

XLVIII. CIL VII 296 = RIB 760

F]ortunae / [s]ervatrici / Anton[i]a Stratonis / ex viso. So
lautet die Inschrift in RIB. Wright übersetzt "Antonia, daughter
(or slave) of Strato". Die Inschrift ist seit langem verschollen,
schon Hübner konnte sie nicht sehen, aber die Textkonstitution
dürfte, aus dem Apparat von RIB zu schliessen, sicher sein; deswe-
gen ist Hübners *Stratoni[ce]* zu verwerfen. Der Text ist also in Ord-
nung, es ist aber besser, *Stratonis* als Cognomen der Antonia auf-
zufassen. *Stratonis* zu *Strato* wie etwa *Thrasonis* zu *Thraso*, *Iaso-
nis* zu *Iaso* usw.

XLIX. PROFIMUS?

Im letzten Moment füge ich als Blattfüllsel eine Beobachtung
zu einem falschen Namen hinzu. CIL VI 1057 VII,32 (210 n.Chr.) heisst
ein Soldat der siebenten Cohors vigilum *T. Aemili(us) Profim(us)*.
Profimus muss ein falscher Name sein, er ist unerklärlich. Ohne
Zweifel *Trofimus*. Ob P für T eine Verschreibung (etwa wegen der
Ähnlichkeit der zwei Buchstaben in der vielleicht kursiven oder
halbkursiven Vorlage) oder eine Verlesung seitens der modernen Edi-
toren ist, lässt sich nicht sicher entscheiden. Da jedoch die In-
schrift durch prominente Epigraphiker verglichen worden ist, darf
man annehmen, dass in der Inschrift wenigstens kein deutliches T
gestanden hat.

CLAUDIA INSONS

Why was a fine imposed
on Claudia Ap. f. in 246 BC ?

Jaakko Suolahti

Valerius Maximus relates (8,1 damn. 4) that a consul's sister, Claudia by name, was punished because, when returning in a crowd from an entertainment, she expressed the wish that her brother were still alive to suffer another defeat at sea, so that crowds in the city should be reduced. The same case is recounted in the Periochae of Livy (19), by Suetonius in his Tiberius biography (2,3) and by Aulus Gellius in his Noctes Atticae (10,6,2).

The accounts are consistent to the extent that they are obviously based on the same source or sources. Yet they contain divergent features which can hardly be considered due to a wish on the writers' part to colour their narratives, nor to differences of function. In the parallel presentation of the texts which follows, common features are shown in spaced type.

Liv. perioch. 19.

Val. Max. 8,1, damn. 4

Nunc, quo aequiore animo ancipites iudiciorum motus tolerentur, recordemur invidia laborantes quibus de causis aut absoluti sint aut dannati.

C l a u d i a, soror P. Claudi, qui contemptis auspiciis male pugnaverat,

Adiciatur his C l a u d i a, quam insontem crimine, quo accusabatur, votum impium subvertit,

a l u d i s r e v e r t e n s (r. divertens) cum t u r b a p r e m e r e t u r, dixit: u t i n a m f r a t e r m e u s

quia, cum a l u d i s d o m u m r e d i e n s t u r b a e l i - d e r e t u r, optaverat u t f r a t e r s u u s, maritimarum virium nostrarum praecipua iactura,

v i v e r e t;

r e v i v i s c e r e t saepiusque consul factus

iterum classem duceret.

i n f e l i c i d u c t u nimis magnam u r b i s f r e q u e n - t i a m m i n u e r e t

Ob e a m c a u s a m m u l t a

e i d i c t a e s t

Suet. Tib. 2,3   Gell. 10,6,2

Extant et feminarum   *Non in facta modo, sed in voces*
exempla diversa - -   *etiam, petulantiores publice vindi-*
                                        catum est: ita enim debere esse visa
                                        est Romanae disciplinae dignitas
                                        inviolabilis.

et quae novo more iudicium   *Appi namque illius Caeci filia*
maiestatis apud populum   *a l u d i s, quos spectaverat,*
mulier subiit,   *e x i e n s t u r b a undique con-*
                                        fluentis fluctuantisque populi
quod in conferta multitu-   *i a c t a t a e s t. Atque inde*
dine aegre procedente car-   *egressa, cum se male habitam doleret*
pento palam optaverat, u t   *"quid me nunc factum esset", inquit,*
                                        "quantoque artius pressiusque con-
f r a t e r s u u s   *flictata essem, si P. Claudius, f r a -*
P u l c h e r   *t e r m e u s, navali proelio*
r e v i v i s c e r e t   *c l a s s e m navium cum ingenti civium*
                                        numero non p e r d i d i s s e t ?
atque iterum classem amit-   *Certe quidem maiore nunc copia populi*
teret q u o m i n o r   *oppressa intercidissem. Sed u t i -*
t u r b a R o m a e   *n a m", inquit, "r e v i v i s c a t*
f o r e t   *f r a t e r a l i a m q u e c l a s -*
                                        s e m in Siciliam ducat atque istam
                                        multitudinem perditum eat, quae me
                                        nunc male miseram convexavit." O b
                                        h a e c mulieris v e r b a tam
                                        improba ac tam incivilia C. Fundanius
                                        et Ti. Sempronius, aediles plebei,
                                        m u l t a m d i x e r u n t ei
                                        aeris gravis vigintiquinquemilia. Id
                                        factum esse dicit Capito Ateius in
                                        commentario De Iudiciis publicis bel-
                                        lo Poenico Primo Fabio Licinio et Ota-
                                        cilio Crasso consulibus

In attempting a comparison one should bear in mind differences
of intention. Livy, who died in 17 AD, wrote a patriotic history
which was annalistic in arrangement and intended for a wide circle
of readers. That part of it which deals with the period 292-219, when
the case occurred, survives only in the form of a concise summary of
late antiquity. The description by Suetonius is from the early second
century AD at the opening of his biography of the Emperor Tiberius,
which tells of the Emperor's ancestors, the Claudii, and their char-
acteristics. Dicta ac facta memorabilia by Valerius Maximus in the
early half of the first century and Noctes by Aulus Gellius halfway
through the second century are popular collections of anecdotes
which were composed and read for entertainment and instruction. Al-
though the writers differ somewhat in their aims, all have certain
features which are typical of ancient historical description: con-
centration on the persons described and their characters, which are
illustrated by appropriate, colourful tales.

All four sources are unanimous that the main person in the
case was Claudia (RE No. 382) and that she was sister to the consul
P. Claudius Pulcher. All except Gellius have related a little ear-
lier that the same consul defied the omens, lost a sea battle and
was condemned to pay fines in Rome. Obviously the two events are so
connected in the sources that the second presupposes the first. At
least the anecdote concerning the consul contains a core of truth.
P. Clodius Pulcher (RE No. 304) was consul in 249 BC. Through care-
lessness he suffered crushing defeat in sea battle before Drepana,

Sicily, losing about 100 ships.[1] He was called back to Rome, where

the tribunes put him on trial for high treason (*perduellio*), and

when the trial was interrupted by a sudden rainfall he was fined

120 000 asses.[2]

Before this he had been urged to choose a dictator to conduct

elections of officials. When Claudius chose M. Claudius Glicia (RE

No. 166), his client of low birth, the Senate in annoyance compelled

the latter to resign and caused a new dictator to be elected.[3] Some

scholars surmise that Claudius committed suicide like his fellow-con-

sul L. Junius Pullus (RE No. 133).[4] In any case all four sources re-

lating to his sister presume his death before 246.

Further, our four sources[5] are unanimous that Claudia found

herself in a crowd when returning from an entertainment, and in anger

uttered the incautious words for which the plebeian aediles fined

her. Gellius mentions, though no other source confirms, that the

jurist Ateius Capito referred to the case in his book De iudiciis

publicis, which dealt with famous public trials. Capito was inter-

ested in historic trials,[6] and drew his examples mainly from the

works of Varro, where the story of Claudia may have originated.[7] The

work of Ateius Capito survives only in quotations.[8]

---

1 Polyb. 1,49-51; Münzer, RE III 2857f.; Broughton, MRR I 214; De
  Sanctis, Storia III 169-178.
2 Cf. page 148; Siber, Analogie 17f.; Bleicken, Volkstribunat 36.
3 Münzer, RE III 2858, 2724; Broughton, I 215; De Sanctis, III 177f.
4 Münzer, RE III 2858.
5 Suet. Tib. 2 only: *conferta multitudine aegre procedente carpento*.
6 Jörs, RE II 1904-1910; Ritschl, I 373.
7 Jörs, RE II 1909.
8 Bremer, Iurisprudentiae antehadrianae, 1908, 261-278.

It is obvious that Gellius, in the manner of the ancients, has recast his text in a far more rhetorical form. Strictly speaking, he says only that Ateius Capito has mentioned the precise time of the case. It is possible that he took from the jurist's account of the case mainly the time of its occurrence and the parts dealing with the punishment, using another source for more precise elucidation of the case itself. A jurist's account would have suited his literary purposes far less well than the anecdote - reverting perhaps to Varro - which had already assumed an established form. Here and there, at least, his account follows the Periochae of Livy, Valerius Maximus and Suetonius in its form of words, so that all must have had a common model or stories reverting to one. This could hardly have been Ateius Capito, whom Livy could not have used.

Possibly it was Varro or another of the collections of anecdotes which are suspected to have been among the sources of Valerius Maximus and others.[9] Or our writers came to know the tradition in various forms or used other sources in addition. Suetonius and Valerius Maximus, who used the account to exemplify, respectively, the good and bad deeds of the Claudii toward the State and the effect of hostility on legal judgements, add a form of introduction to their anecdotes; such was the practice of Gellius also. Verbally, too, the descriptions of Suetonius and Valerius are closest to each other.[10] In content, moreover, they only differ with regard to the punishment, as will appear later.[11] I think it possible, therefore,

---

9 C. Bosch, Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus, Stuttgart 1929, 109ff.
10 Cf. page 142.
11 Cf. page 139.

that they used a different version of the tradition or an additional

source.

Each writer, too, has added features or adapted his depiction

merely to suit his purposes: because Suetonius wished to include the

Claudia anecdote as proof of arrogant behaviour toward the common

people by ancestors male and female of Tiberius, he stressed the

unique character of the case[12] but reduced his actual description

of it to a minimum. Aulus Gellius inflates and colours his descrip-

tion without producing anything new apart from the names of the ae-

diles who imposed the fine and the exact time of the occurrence,

which he obviously obtained from Ateius Capito.

II

The sources differ especially on the subject of Claudia's

punishment. The law historian's task of interpretation is bedevilled

by the question of why they often discussed and quoted the Claudia

anecdote.[13] The Livy Epitome and Aulus Gellius relate that she was

fined, while Valerius Maximus contents himself with noting that she

was charged although innocent (*insons*). Finally Suetonius contends

that she received a new form of judgement for treason. The jurist

Ateius Capito, who was the source of Gellius, even knows the names

of the aediles who imposed the fine, also its amount - 25 000 *aeris*

gravis.

---

12 *et quae novo more iudicium maiestatis mulier subiit.*
13 Mommsen, RStR II³ 492 n. 4; Id., Strafr. 53 n. 1; Lange, Alter-
    thümer II, 1879, 135, 585; Siber 5-6, 41; Bleicken 36 n. 1; Kempf
    606f.; Kübler, Maiestas, RE XIV (1928) 542-559, 545; Brecht 297f.
    n. 4.

Ateius Capito's knowledge of the punishment can at once be accepted as the most reliable, for he was well acquainted with the history of law and with public law, which were his main subjects of discussion.[14] On the other hand Suetonius, as an imperial secretary, had a good knowledge of the administration of his time, but not of the history of law. As, moreover, his main purpose early in his bio- graphy of Tiberius was to illustrate the arrogance of certain of the Claudii (*Multa multorum Claudiorum egregia merita, multa etiam se- quius admissa in rem publicam extant*),[15] information gathered from him is less reliable: he paid no heed to the juridical accuracy of his piquant anecdotes, but to their narrative effect. Thus it is understandable that he said nothing of the fines imposed by the ae- diles, but confined himself to the novelty of the judgement.

Because treason was a common and notorious charge in the last years of Tiberius it is understandable that Suetonius, whether acci- dentally or on purpose - the latter is more likely - should relate that Claudia was charged with treason (*laesae maiestatis*), evidently against the Roman people, although such a crime did not exist before Augustus.[16]

The aediles fined Claudia in their capacity as magistrates because she uttered abusive words in a public place, the street. This was the opposite of good conduct and might also cause unrest among the mass of the people. Formally, therefore, the fines could have been based on a breach of public order and on morally unsuitable

---

14 F. Bremer 261-287; Jörs, RE II(1896)1904-1910; cf. page 137.
15 B. Mochova, Studien zu Kaiserbiographien Suetons, Praha 1968, 19f., 80.
16 Siber 25 n. 2, 41; Brecht 297.

conduct. In reality, of course, a strong political motive lay be-
hind them.[17]

Because the fines exceeded the limit of 3020 asses Claudia
could have appealed against them through her guardian to the popular
assembly.[18] This did not necessarily happen, as Claudia in her family
pride would hardly appeal to the populace, whom she knew to be deep-
ly unfriendly to herself and her deceased brother. Payment of a fine
amounting to 25 000 heavy asses would hardly have caused her diffi-
culty, because the value of money had fallen substantially since the
imposition of an upper limit for fines in 430 BC. The charge mention-
ed by Suetonius and Valerius Maximus certainly points to a lawsuit,
i.e. *provocatio*, which was possible for a woman,[19] but they were
merely able to conclude from the size of the fines that such had
happened; it added colour to their anecdote.

The Livy Epitome and Gellius say nothing of a trial, but of
fining. In Valerius Maximus the case is linked to several others
(8.1 abs.).[20] The three examples he mentions are actual legal pro-
ceedings. To these (8.1.1-3 damn.) he links the case of Claudia as
a fourth, stating that she was innocent of the charge brought against
her.[21]

Insons, the word used by Valerius or his source, means in the
first place innocent, blameless of the crime accused of or condemn-

---

17 Kunkel, Untersuchungen 34; Lange II 584.
18 Lange II 583; Siber 3 n. 2.
19 Lange II 585; cf. Siber 1-2.
20 *Nunc quo aequiore animo ancipites iudiciorum motus tolerentur,
   recordemur invidia laborantes, quibus de causis aut absoluti sint
   aut damnati - -. Percurremus nunc eos, quibus in causae dictione
   magis quae extra quaestionem erant nocuerunt quam sua innocentia
   opem tulit.*
21 *Adiciatur his* (L. Scipio, P. Furius, Sex. Titius) *Claudia quam
   insontem crimine, quo accusabatur, - - .*

ed for.[22] On the face of it the words of Valerius presuppose that

Claudia actually was accused of some crime. But they find a natural

explanation in the context of the anecdote. Valerius relates it as

one of the cases in which external circumstances affect the decision

more than the innocence of the person concerned. He mentions the

further examples of L. Scipio (RE No. 337), who was accused *de pecu-*

latu, C. Appuleius (RE No. 121) and Sex. Titius (RE No. 23), accused

de maiestate; all were innocent.[23] Claudia too was innocent, but her

impious wish influenced the decision. *Insons* was a suitable term for

Claudia, moreover, because her punishment was influenced mainly by

factors having no connection with the charge.

Valerius Maximus assumes, then, that Claudia was actually charg-

ed with something of which she was innocent. Suetonius, whose descrip-

tion is linguistically closest to the narration of Valerius Maximus,

speaks of *iudicium maiestatis*, and it is therefore possible that Va-

lerius too thought of this indictment. His previous example Sex. Ti-

tius (RE No. 23) was in fact condemned *de maiestate*.[24] It is possible,

of course, that Claudia was actually charged *de maiestate*.[25] Her

thoughtless words alone cannot have given reason for this, for those

of senatorial rank had great freedom of speech. More probably, the

aediles summoned to the spot found fault with Claudia's improper con-

---

22 Thes. 194 s.v.; cf. *insons punitus* (Val. Max. 1,7 ext.)
23 Val. Max. 8,1: Scipio: *non, puto, quod pretio corruptus fuerat;*
   Decianus: *spectatae integritatis viro vox sua exitium attulit;*
   Titius: *erat innocens.*
24 Broughton, II 3 n. 7.
25 Kübler, Maiestas 542-559, 545f.; cf. Gundel, Der Begriff Maiestas
   im politischen Denken der röm. Republik, Hist. 12(1963)283-320.

duct, which endangered public order. This would give rise to an
altercation which might have been maliciously interpreted as resist-
ance to the authority of the aediles, sufficient reason for a fine
or preferment of a charge. Because Livy and Gellius say nothing of
a charge, although it would certainly have added welcome colour to
the latter's narrative at least, we may presume that their source
had no knowledge of it. As the charge does not appear in Ateius Ca-
pito's De iudiciis publicis, which was used by Gellius, the aediles
presumably contented themselves with fining Claudia.

For some reason, therefore, the source used by Suetonius and
Valerius Maximus mistakenly supposed that a charge had in fact been
made. Because *laesae maiestatis* was a common accusation in the first
century of the Empire, it may be surmised that the source confused
a fine by authority of the aediles with an actual arraignment if both
referred to *minutae* or *laesae maiestatis*. If Claudia or her guardian
also appealed – or were thought to have done so – against the amount
of the fine, the error is more understandable still. Because Claudia
was fined by the aediles, not the tribunes, there could be no ques-
tion of an actual indictment – an official fine is the only possibil-
ity.

In any case Valerius Maximus was correct in the sense that
Claudia had done no actual harm to the Roman State and people – the
mob in question could hardly be regarded as such – or to the maiestas
of its officials. She was therefore *insons*, guiltless of a crime. Va-
lerius likens Claudia with good reason to Scipio, C. Appuleius Deci-
anus and Sex. Titius, who were condemned in innocence because certain
matters were known concerning them which did not please the popular

assembly. The case of Claudia, like that of Scipio, was apparently

non-political, but the popular assembly was also a political organ.

For this reason the political situation affected all its decisions,

a fact used skilfully by politicians to their own advantage. The

aediles who fined Claudia were not only officials safeguarding the

maiestas of the Roman people, but above all politicians seeking to

injure their opponents and increase their own popularity.

Claudia's unwise outburst was directly responsible for her

fining and perhaps for the failure of her appeal (*provocatio*).

Fining is understandable only in a specific political situa-

tion, external and internal.

Juridically Claudia was innocent of the crime for which she

was accused, but fines were imposed on her by her own politically

unwise words, which provided her dead brother's opponents with a

splendid opportunity to make him a scapegoat.

III

Juridically, then, Claudia was not guilty of a crime in utter-

ing her incautious words. But in many Roman trials, as mentioned

earlier, guilt was determined by the political situation. What was

it like in 246 BC, when Claudia was condemned?

Ever since Fr. Münzer published his basic study Römische Adels-

parteien und Adelsfamilien[26] students of the Republic have regarded

quarrels and friendships between powerful families of the aristo-

cracy as the foundation of Roman political life.[27] These matters are

26 Stuttgart 1920
27 M. Gelzer, Nobilität 49ff.; Scullard, Roman Politics 1ff.

revealed by chance references in the literary sources and by com-

binations of names in the consular rolls. It was former consuls who

ruled the State in the Senate and pursued the advantage of their

families.[28] Research here remains somewhat uncertain in its results,

as direct source information on groupings is rare: it is, in fact,

arcana imperii.

Especially difficult to examine is the period 292-219, for

which the sources are extremely scanty: Books 11-20 of Livy, for

instance, survive only as an abridgement. The Fasti give the names

of consuls, but do not enable us to conclude which of them directed

elections of officials.[29]

Münzer was able to show the existence of several family alli-

ances at this time. W. Schur traced the field of political power in

detail, but in a highly hypothetical manner.[30] The most certain re-

sults are crystallized by Scullard in his book Roman Politics 220-

150 BC.[31] In the internal politics of the later third century he

finds three groups prevailing: the Fabii, Aemilii and Claudii. Many

other powerful families were opposed to the Claudii in any case.

This fact is reflected in sources during the Empire which accused

the Claudii of arrogance toward the populace, though it was competing

elements of the nobility who in fact suffered most from pride.[32]

This scene, as Th. Mommsen showed over 100 years ago, did not

---

28 R. Syme, Roman Revolution 11-12.
29 Scullard 4ff., 30ff.
30 H. Schur, Fremder Adel im römischen Staat, Hermes 1924,450-473;
   Münzer, Adelsparteien 46ff.
31 Oxford 1951, 31-38.
32 Scullard 36; Syme 19; Tac. ann. 14; Suet. Tib. 1-2,1.

crystallize until the first century AD.[33] In truth the Claudii were

much in favour of reform, as the work of Ap. Claudius Caecus (RE No.

91), for instance, makes clear. One of his actions as censor was to

enter the names of the landless in *tribus* and to receive freedmen

into the Senate.[34] During his long life Ap. Claudius Caecus enjoy-

ed immense prestige which assisted his family and its supporters to

remain in power.[35] These supporting families were presumably con-

nected with Claudius by marriage, since he had five daughters and

four sons.[36] Three of these rose to the consulship in 268 (RE No.

317), 249 (RE No. 304) and 240 (RE No. 104), and from them descend-

ed the main branches of the Claudii: the Pulchri, Centones and Ne-

rones.[37]

The Sempronii at least are regarded as allies of the Claudii,

and this collaboration presumably continued from the time of Ap.

Claudius Caecus until the Gracchi.[38] To what degree this collabora-

tion extended to the Valerii Maximi, Sulpicii Saverriones, Volumnii,

Iunii Bruti and Marcii Philippi, as Schur surmises,[39] is difficult

to decide, because the names of families competing for official posts

might of course also appear adjacently or consecutively on the con-

sular rolls.[40]

In any case the Claudii had, besides allies, numerous competi-

---

33 Mommsen, RF I, 1864, 285-318, especially 317.
34 Scullard 36ff.; Suolahti, Censors 220ff.
35 Scullard 37; Suolahti 223.
36 Cic. Cato 37.
37 Münzer, RE III 91.
38 Scullard 37; Schur 470ff.; Münzer 270ff.
39 Schur 463ff.
40 Syme 13.

tors and enemies.[41] Particularly they were opposed by the conserva-
tive Fabii with their allies who included the Atilii, Manlii, Mar-
cii (?), Fulvii, Mamilii, Laetorii, Otacilii, Ogulnii and Licinii.[42]

In internal politics, however, an approximate balance of power
prevailed in the early third century. Counterbalancing Ap. Claudius
Caecus were another person of consequence, Q. Fabius Maximus Rullia-
nus (RE No. 114) and his son Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges (RE No. 112).
It is Schur's view that during the Third Samnite War the opponents
even agreed on a division of power.[43]

Halfway through the century, however, the situation changed.
In 265 came the death of Consul Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges the younger,[44]
and from the main branch no heads of state arose for a generation;
Q. Fabius Verrucosus (RE No. 116), the famous consul of 233, was
presumably a minor when his father died. Obviously, too, the younger
sons of Ap. Claudius Caecus could not aim at the consulship because
of their age, so that a kind of truce prevailed during the First
Punic War, as earlier in the so-called Third Samnite War. This equi-
librium seems to have benefited a third grouping led by the Aemilii
which included the Cornelii and Caecilii.[45]

In 250, when the consuls were two presumed supporters of the
Fabii, namely C. Atilius Regulus (RE No. 47) and L. Manlius Vulso
(RE No. 101), the second son of Ap. Claudius Caecus, P. Claudius
Pulcher (RE No. 304) and probably his supporter L. Iunius Pullus

---

41 Scullard 37ff.
42 Id. 38f.
43 Schur 463f.
44 Broughton, I 202.
45 Scullard 35f.

(RE No. 133) were elected consuls. A change of men may have been the popular wish, because the consuls of the previous year had suffered heavy defeats in Sicily. P. Claudius and L. Iunius had even poorer success, however.[46] The latter committed suicide, leaving Claudius as the sole scapegoat.[47] The next year's tribunes C. Fundanius Fundulus (RE No. 5) and Pullius (RE No. 1) brought a charge of treason (perduellio) against him, and when a storm interrupted the trial they caused fines of 120 000 asses to be imposed.[48] The Fabii may well have been involved, as the opportunity to harm an adversary was tempting. This may be indicated by the story that Claudius occasioned defeat by angering the gods when he ordered the sacred chickens which had provided an unfavourable omen to be thrown into the sea.[49] The rumour made Claudius a suitable scapegoat without defaming military honour. On his return from the unfortunate campaign Claudius appointed as dictator on the Senate's demand his client and perhaps freedman M. Claudius C.f. Glicia (RE No. 166), an action which presumably caused open dispute between the conservative Fabii and Claudii.[50] It was a question not of principle alone but also of balance of power, as Glicia would probably have held elections of officials. He was, however, induced to give up the office, to which he appointed the seasoned soldier and probable supporter

46 Broughton, I 213f.
47 Cic. nat.deor. 2,7; div. 1,29, 2,20, 2,71; Val. Max. 1,4,3; Min. Fel. 7,4, 26,2.
48 Schol. Cic. Bob. 90 St.; Polyb. 1,52,3; Cic. nat.deor. 2,7; Liv. perioch. 19; Val. Max. 8,1 abs. 4; Suet. Tib. 2; Gell. 10,6; De Sanctis, III 177; Broughton, I 215; RE III 257f.
49 De Sanctis, III 170f.; Münzer, RE III 2858; Broughton, I 214f.
50 De Sanctis, III 171.

of the Fabii A. Atilius Caiatinus (RE No. 36); as *magister equitum*

he selected L. Caecilius Metellus (RE No. 72), who may also have

been a supporter of the Fabii.[51] The following year's consuls C. Au-

relius Cotta (RE No. 94) and P. Servilius Geminus (RE No. 62) were

experienced soldiers and not, perhaps, supporters of the Aemilii.

Both tribunes who charged P. Claudius belonged to new families

who are not known to have produced officials earlier. The Pullii evi-

dently produced no officials later than the *viocurus*,[52] perhaps *IV-

vir viarum*, who lived in the third century, although this apparently

wealthy family is encountered often toward the end of the Republic

in central Italy. Our Fundanius, on the other hand, was elected ae-

dile of the *plebs* for the following year, and in 244 as the next

year's consul.[53] He did not succeed in war and remained the only

consul of his family, though officials of lower rank emerged later.[54]

Bleicken has regarded the time preceding the Second Punic War

as a new phase of activity for the tribunes: the accord following

lex Hortensia was at an end, and later opposition, led mainly by C.

Flaminius (RE No. 2), to old families of the nobility had started.[55]

In 249, of course, Flaminius was still too young to take part in po-

litical life, but it may be assumed that among the *plebs* of that

time, exhausted by war as they were, opposition arose to the aris-

tocratic military commanders who had suffered defeat. Advantage was

certainly taken of this by *homines novi* such as Fundanius and Pullius,

---

51 Scullard 32-34.
52 Ziegler, RE IXA(1961)156.
53 Münzer, RE VII 292f.; Broughton, I 216-217.
54 Münzer, RE VII 291ff.; Broughton, II 568.
55 Bleicken 27-37.

who were seeking a career. The opportunity was excellent, because

they could count on support from opponents of the mighty Claudii.

C. Fundanius Fundulus (RE No. 5)[56] at least may have been

seeking approval from the Fabii as aedile in 246 when, with his

colleague Ti. Sempronius (Gracchus) (RE No. 50), he fined the sis-

ter (RE No. 382) of P. Claudius (RE No. 304) for her improper words.

With the money thus received they built the temple of Libertas on

the Aventine, the hill of the *plebs*, where the temple of Ceres al-

ready stood.[57] At this time the Fabii succeeded in becoming consuls

for the third successive year (247-245), and even in 244 the consul

A. Manlius Torquatus Atticus (RE No. 87) was presumably an ally of

the Fabii.[58] Elected consul in 243 was C. Fundanius Fundulus, where-

as his colleague was obliged to wait a further five years till 238

for his consulship although he belonged to a consular family - not,

admittedly, to its main branch. Among his descendants were several

consuls.[59] Following generations of the Fundanii, on the other hand,

are known to have produced only an aedile of the *plebs* (RE No. 213)

during the ascendancy of the Fabii, and a tribune of the *plebs* in

195 (RE No. 3);[60] also, at a later period, one official of lower

rank(RE No. 1).[61] In the third century it was evidently still pos-

sible for upstarts with aristocratic support and wealth in addition

to rise to the consulship in exceptional cases, but great ability

was required if their descendants were to reach the same eminence.

---

56 Münzer, RE VII 2885; Broughton, I 217.
57 Liv. 24,16,19.
58 Broughton, I 216-217.
59 Münzer, RE IIA 1400-1401; Broughton, I 221, II 628-632.
60 Broughton, I 264, 340.
61 Id., II 138.

The external political situation - an exhausting war with heavy losses - aroused bitterness among the *plebs* against commanders of aristocratic family. Opponents of the Claudi used this to advantage by making P. Claudius Pulcher (RE No. 304) a scapegoat for the lost sea battle of Drepana. Their work was made easier by the reputation of the Claudii as radicals with no regard for custom, which was confirmed when Claudius made his unwise appointment of a dictator. Among tribunes at the outset of their career it was a simple matter to find those who brought a charge of *perduellio* and who, when this collapsed, ensured that a fine was imposed. Pursuit of the sister of Claudius continued, and the aedile C. Fundanius Fundulus (RE No. 5), who with his colleague was responsible for the fine, was rewarded with the rank of consul in 243.

The Fabii produced consuls for three successive years, but the balance was restored in 240, when the youngest brother of the Claudii (RE No. 104) became consul. But a new flowering for the Claudii starts only with the Second Punic War.

As Valerius Maximus states, therefore, Claudia was *insons*, innocent of the crime for which she was charged or at least fined. Valerius is thinking of the juridical, formal side of the case, but at the same time he refers to the political situation. Claudia, like her brother, was made a scapegoat, a victim of popular hatred and war-weariness. Opponents turned the situation to skilful advantage. At most she can be accused of thoughtlessness, if indeed she uttered the arrogant words attributed to her.

Claudia the innocent is one of the many anecdotes which afford us a flashing glimpse of the unending struggle for power among Rome's aristocracy and family alliances.

G R A P H I C   U S E   O F   T H E   P E R F E C T

I N   H O R A C E   O D E S   1, 1, 27 - 28

R o l f   W e s t m a n

Carm. 1,1,23-28

> *multos castra iuvant et lituo tubae*
> *permixtus sonitus bellaque matribus*
> 25   *detestata; manet sub Iove frigido*
> *venator tenerae coniugis immemor,*
> *seu visa est catulis cerva fidelibus*
> *seu rupit teretes Marsus aper plagas.*

When Horace started to describe the various occupations of men at the beginning of the poem he used a form of the verb *iuvare* (v. 4). He does so again here in connection with *castra* and *bella*. Now between vv. 23-25 and the following *exemplum* there is a sustaining semantic link, in the concern of the womenfolk back home. But what probably strikes the reader more is the difference between these two *exempla*. There is a shift from the plural (*multos*) to the singular *venator* (cf. the similar transition from vv. 3-6 to 7sqq.), and there is one aspect of the semantic contrast between *iuvant* and *manet* which also makes for greater particularization.

Iuvare meant permanent interest in the occupation described. *Manet*, on the other hand, although in form keeping up the smooth regular flow of the *exempla*, signifies a temporary act, subject to given

conditions. The hunter does not habitually leave his wife alone (pos-
sibly all night). He does so only when he has met with something out
of the ordinary. I repeat 'has met' - because what necessitates his
staying away from home is the aftermath of a hunting incident that
needs clearing up.

Horace gives us two examples of such hunting scenes (vv. 27
and 28), each forming a complete whole although consisting of only
six words (of which in both lines the first, *seu*, is merely formal).
The scenes are full of life, and both imply a follow-up for which
many of the men participating in the hunt will be needed. This im-
plication is brought about through the use of the perfect tense,
which opens up a perspective toward developments subsequent to the
action actually mentioned.[1]

The liveliness of the scenes is enhanced by two adjectives,
fidelibus and *teretes* (chiastically arranged in relation to their
nouns): in spite of his brevity, the poet finds time to dwell on the
close fellowship between the hunters and their dogs, and on the qual-
ity[2] of the trap that the boar - a stout male, well worth catching -
has broken.

Of course every reader sees that Horace's intention in verses
25-28 is to show a man as infatuated with hunting as men are with

---

1 These are the only instances of finite perfect in the poem, with
  the exception of *condidit* v. 9, which contains no such implication
  but simply expresses finality.
2 For *teretes* (the exact meaning of which is much debated but immate-
  rial to my point) see Nisbet and Hubbard, A Commentary on Horace:
  Odes Book I, 1970, p.13, with references. For comments on the whole
  passage (vv. 25-28) cf. also Schönberger, Gymnasium 73(1966)397 and
  Vretska, Hermes 99(1971)329 as well as Setaioli 1973(see L'année
  philol. 45, 160) 42 fin. and 45-48.

horse-racing or with military life in previous *exempla*. But the graphic detail which he employs to create this impression seemed worth calling attention to.[3]

Olof Gigon: Die antike Philosophie als Massstab und Realität. Zum 65.
   Geburtstag von *Olof Gigon* herausgegeben von *Laila Straume-Zimmermann.*
   Die Bibliothek der alten Welt, Reihe Forschung und Deutung.
   Artemis Verlag, Zürich und München 1977. 517 p. Fr. 88.-.
   Olof Gigon, professor of Classical Philology and Ancient Phi-
losophy in Bern, is one of the most intensely active and encyclo-
paedically productive classical scholars to-day. This collection of
ten of his recent studies (three of which have been published else-
where) revolves around the axis Aristotle - Cicero, with the centre
of gravity in the latter. Most of the studies are expanded lectures,
and some preserve the tone of oral delivery: so does the introduc-
tory essay, a wise and eloquent contribution to the literature of
the 'crisis of the classics'. Rather more philological in the large
sense of this term is the extensive piece of interpretation of Ci-
cero's De re publica (pp. 208-355) in which the different trends of
the preserved and the reconstructable parts of this work are sorted
out and discussed with some critical distance from Heck and Büchner.
The book includes a bibliography of Gigon (124 items) and a brief
Vita. - The title of the book corresponds to its contents, and also
to its author's conception of what is essential in the history of
ideas of Greece and Rome. Even if the reader does not always agree,
he is likely to follow Gigon's exposition with interest and often
with fascination.   *H. Thesleff*

Studi di storia antica offerti dagli allievi a *Eugenio Manni.* Giorgio
   Bretschneider, Roma 1976. 304 p., 12 plates. Lit. 30000.
   This festschrift in honour of Eugenio Manni, Professor of An-
cient History at the University of Palermo, was produced by Manni's
present and former pupils to celebrate the 25th anniversary of his
career as a teacher. The book contains the bibliography of Prof.
Manni during the period of 1933-1975 (114 publications) and four-
teen articles by his pupils; so it is a good survey of his career
both as a scholar and a teacher.
   Three of the articles deal with epigraphy, a field in which
Prof. Manni felt special interest, and many others make use of it.
A previously unknown inscription published by Livia Bivona contrib-
utes to our knowledge of the Roman officials at Thermae (Termini
Imerese). Antonietta Brugnone writes about *tabulae defixionis* dis-
covered recently at Selinunte, some of which date from the 6th cen-
tury. The Marsala epitaphs published by Maria Teresa Manni Piraino

provide a contribution to onomastics and palaeography.

Four articles deal with Greek history, another interest of
Manni's, particularly with source criticism. Margherita Giuffrida
examines the tradition of the Carians and Minos; Vincenzo La Bua
shows that Croesus died at the stake and the tradition of his par-
don mere Persian propaganda. Matia José Fontana attempts to white-
wash Alcibiades' reputation by proving that his policy before the
Sicilian expedition was sensible and consistent. Maria Jannetti's
new interpretation of the relations between Alexander the Great and
Chius is based on an inscription (SIG³ No. 283).

Half of the articles deal with Roman history, Manni's main
field of study, and are closely connected with his own research.
Most of them deal with the Republic and its sources. Giuseppe Mar-
torana presents a new theory of the origin of the Lupercalia, Mari-
lena Savagnone of Poseidonius' influence on Sallust and Francesco
Paolo Rizzo of his influence on Diodorus. Giovanna Bruno Sunseri
shows that Timagenes the historian was not anti-Roman. Manni's pu-
pils, like their master, are also interested in the development of
Roman administrative law. Marcello Leone studies Caesar's office as
flamen, Pietrina Anello Trajan's second and Rosalia Marino Commodus'
first *tribunicia potestas*.

The articles by Eugenio Manni's pupils reveal the influence
of their teacher both in their subject-matter and treatment. There
are many good observations and many cautious hypotheses. The care-
ful and critical use of sources is well worth mentioning. The pub-
lication does credit both to Manni and to his pupils.

Jaakko Suolahti

*

*Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana: Pindari
     carmina cum fragmentis*. Pars I: Epinicia. 1971. Pars II: Frag-
     menta. Indices. 1975. Post *Brunonem Snell* edidit *Hervicus Maehler*.
     XI, 191 & VIII, 219 p. M 14.- & 15.50. - *Sophoclis tragoe-
     diae*. Tom. I: Aiax. Electra. Oedipus Rex. Edidit *R.D. Dawe*.
     1975. XVI, 195 p. M 39.-. - BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesell-
     schaft, Leipzig.

The new, fifth edition of Pindar's Epinicia, re-edited by
Maehler, has been published admirably quickly to replace the fourth
edition by Snell, now out of print, with which it is virtually iden-
tical. As the new editor remarks in his preface, only few minor
changes and additions have been made to the text and overall criti-
cal apparatus. It can only be regretted that the corrections have
been made - apparently for economical and time-saving reasons - in
the inelegant and, for the reader, impractical way of changing the
text itself, and leaving the corrections of the apparatus to the
addenda et corrigenda at the end of the book - a clumsy system which
could well have been avoided, as is shown (by accident) in the ap-
paratus on p. 38 1. 5. - In the fourth edition of the fragments of
Pindar, the corrections and additions are more numerous; compared
with Snell's edition, there are three new fragments, one found and
published by Maehler here for the first time (PBerol 11677 = Paean

XXII (k), 1-10), one published by Maehler in ZPE 3 (1968) 97 (PBerol 21114 = Paean VVII (k), 10-19) and one published by Lobel as POxy 2622 (= fr. 346). But how long must we continue to use such references as Pind. Paean XXII = fr. 52w in order to follow Schroeder's numeration of fragments (fortunately the alphabet does not allow for many more new paeans), now with the additional inconvenience of having to look up fr. XXII (k) in the *addenda* in order to follow the numeration of pages inherited from Snell's edition? Moreover, the system of guiding the reader to the *addenda et corrigenda* by means of small squares in the margin at the places where a change is due does not function as it should, if, as happens, about 10 per cent of the squares are missing (e.g. p. 91,1; 31,10; 57,3; 106,3 and 10; 207).

There has been lively investigation of the manuscript tradition of Sophocles during the last two decades; the established views were challenged first by A. Turyn (Studies in the manuscript tradition of Sophocles, Urbana 1972), and Turyn's principles in the constitution of the text of Sophocles were in their turn seriously challenged by R.D. Dawe (Studies in the text of Sophocles, Vol. I, Leiden 1973). The editions prior to this revolution are thus, in spite of the indisputable merits of many of them, definitely out of date, and Dawe's studies render suspect the main lines of the text of the new Budé edition by Dain and Mazon (1955-1962). The edition of the triad Aiax, Electra, Oedipus Rex by Dawe - a sister volume to his Studies - is therefore especially welcome and important. The preface is very short and offers only the main lines found in the grouping of the nineteen manuscripts used as the basis of the text; a more detailed discussion is found in his Studies. The form of the text of the three plays found in this Teubner volume is discussed in detail in Part Two of the Studies. In addition to a short bibliography, the Teubner edition contains a *conspectus metrorum* of all the lyric passages of the plays.   *Maarit Kaimio*

Aristoteles. Privatorum scriptorum fragmenta. Recognovit *Marianus Plezia*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1977. XXV, 57 p. M 19.50.

This edition by the Polish scholar M. Plezia of the fragments and the testimonies relating to Aristotle's 'privata scripta' - the Poems, the Letters, and the Will - is in the best scholarly tradition of the Bibliotheca Teubneriana. A considerable amount of textual criticism is included which is, of course, particularly important in the case of the poetical fragments; the edition of the Letters is based upon fresh collations. In other respects, too, there are rather full references to ancient sources (also to some Arabic ones) and to modern discussions (up to 1974), and there is every kind of index that a user of the book could possibly desire. The fanciful and hitherto imperfectly known Arabic traditions concerning the Letters have been excluded for reasons given in the Preface (p. VIII). The exclusion of the supposedly Aristotelian

letters attached to the Rhet. ad Alex. and the Hist. Alex. Magni
(p. XI) is less well motivated since the edition includes obvious-
ly spurious letters anyway.   *H. Thesleff*

Wayne N. Thompson: Aristotle's Deduction and Induction: Introductory
    Analysis and Synthesis. Rodopi N.V., Amsterdam 1975. 114 p.
    Hfl. 20.-.
At the beginning of the Posterior Analytics Aristotle says
that all teaching and all intellectual learning is produced by al-
ready existing knowledge. In his introduction to the Aristotelian
ideas of deduction and induction W.N. Thompson has taken this ad-
vice seriously - for the most part the matter treated is such that
it can be found in any introduction to Aristotle's thought. The on-
ly exception is the attempt to clarify the methods of deduction and
induction in rhetoric and dialectic; this is often neglected in gen-
eral accounts.
    Much space has been devoted to the enthymeme. The writer crit-
icizes attempts to define it as an elided syllogism. After a survey
of the context, material, and form of the enthymeme Thompson char-
acterizes it as "any deductive argument employed to further the com-
municator's persuasive ends". In Chapter Four devoted to induction
example, analogy, and *a fortiori* are discussed as inductive forms.
    The book thus sheds some light on the relationships between
demonstrative, rhetorical and dialectical arguments in Aristotle.
The general characterization of the nature of Aristotle's scientif-
ic thought is not satisfactory, however. The writer has not suffi-
ciently consulted the modern discussion of Aristotle's methodology
(e.g., Barnes, Hintikka, Patzig). Thus he is not sensitive to the
highly problematic nature of his "succint explanations" of notions,
elementary to Aristotelian deduction and induction.
    When, for example, he characterizes the Aristotelian necessi-
ty as "true in every instance" (p. 54-55), he should have added an
explanation of how to distinguish between assertoric and apodictic
syllogism. As it is, the rules given on pages 35-37 remain problem-
atic. Clearly erroneous is the claim that there are far-reaching
exceptions to the Law of the Excluded Middle (one of the examples
mentioned on p. 31 is the Golden Mean). A strange philosophical in-
sight guides the author when he defends the existential presuppo-
sition present in Aristotle's methodology by maintaining that the
question *quod sit* is meaningful only if the answer to the question
an sit is affirmative (p. 49).   *Simo Knuuttila*

Plutarch's Moralia. Vol. XIII, Parts I-II: 999C-1086B. With an Eng-
    lish translation by *Harold Cherniss,* index compiled by *Edward N.*
    O'Neil. The Loeb Classical Library Nos. 427 & 470. Harvard
    University Press, Cambridge Mass. - William Heinemann Ltd,
    London 1976. XXVI & XXVI, 885 p. £ 2.95 & 3.40.
These new Loeb volumes represent the scholarly trend which is

now well-established in this series. Harold Cherniss, the eminent
specialist in Plato and the Platonic traditions, has produced a
critical text, comments and translation of Plutarch's 'Platonic
questions', 'On the generation of the soul' with its 'Epitome'
(XIII.1.), 'Stoic self-contradictions', 'Synopsis of "Stoics and
the poets"', and 'On common conceptions' (XIII.2). The result is
virtually a new edition which is partially based on new collations
and provided with very useful introductions, detailed notes, refer-
ences, and an *Index Nominum* (compiled by E.N. O'Neil). In the Pla-
tonic volume the text follows fairly closely, but not mechanically,
Hubert & Drexler (Bibl. Teubneriana, Moralia VI.1, 1959); the text
of the anti-Stoic tracts diverges somewhat more often, not always
convincingly, from that of Pohlenz & Westman (ibid. VI.2, 1959). At
any rate, this high-standard elaboration of a section of Plutarch's
work is an extremely important achievement.   *H. Thesleff*

Dorothei Sidonii Carmen astrologicum. Interpretationem Arabicam in
      linguam Anglicam versam una cum Dorothei fragmentis et Grae-
      cis et Latinis edidit *David Pingree*. Bibliotheca scriptorum
      Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlags-
      gesellschaft, Leipzig 1976. XX, 444 p. M 97.-.
The text contained in this publication is the work of a Hel-
lenistic astrologer who lived in the first century A.D. As the sub-
title of the book indicates, only fragments of the Greek text are
preserved in addition to Latin fragments, and the entire work or
rather an adaptation of it has survived only in an Arabic transla-
tion based on a Pahlavi (Middle Persian) original. The publication
contains the Arabic text established on the basis of two manuscripts,
an English translation of it and the extant Greek and Latin frag-
ments.
      In this short review we can only make some comments on the
Arabic text and translation. It appears that the editor is a spe-
cialist in astrological texts and their specific terminology, and
it is to be hoped that this aspect of the translation is correct.
In other respects the translation cannot be regarded as particular-
ly successful. It is scrupulously literal in a way that rather in-
dicates an incomplete command of Arabic than conscientiousness.
Expressions like "a master of women" (p. 229) or "a master of for-
nication" (p. 232) may give the English reader an approximately
correct idea of what is meant, but they are quaint in a way that is
not necessarily consistent with the Arabic. Many passages in the
translation make no sense at all, being invariably based on a de-
ficient understanding or misinterpretation of the Arabic text. P.
3 1. 17 *fa-yakūnu minhu l- ʿasalu ṭ-ṭayyibu* "and it produces good
honey" is translated (p. 161) "for from it there is the honey of
medicine" (as if written *aṭ-ṭibb*). P. 9 1. 11 *fa-ẓanna bihi ẓanna
s-sū'i* "and he has evil suspicions of him" is translated (p. 166)
"and believes in him a belief of misfortune". P. 9,13-14 we read:
fa-'innahu yaḫruǧu min manzilihi bi-ʿilmin min wālidaihi wa-hawāhumā

"and he will leave his home, his parents being aware of it and with their consent", which is translated (p. 166): "he departs from his house learning from his parents who they are". Moreover, the Arabic text often has to be emended to give a satisfactory meaning. If we read, for example p. 47 l. 16 *karīh* for *krbh* the translation is: "or a woman who has been blamed for some unpleasant thing" (instead of: "a woman who is deficient in the matter of caring about him" p. 201). P. 62 l. 11 *wa-yᶜl'yh 'ahlu baladihi* which is translated p. 215 "and the people of his city will elevate him" is impossible as a grammatical form and the translation does not suit the context; read *yuᶜādīhi* and translate: "the people of his city will treat him inimically and incite (*yuhayyiǧūna*) some of his powerful enemies against him." P. 73 l. 27, read *mumtali'an ǧadaban* "full of anger" for "be filled up forcibly" (p. 227). The word *muzǧiyan* occurs twice on p. 80 l. 9 and 27; it does not mean "insignificant" which would be *muzǧan*, but rather the opposite: "efficient". P. 100 l. 15 *hinzīrin barriyy* is of course simply "wild hog", not "hogs will vie (with him)". P. 106, 10-11, translation p. 262 is once again a good example of what the translator makes out of a completely natural and commonplace Arabic text: "He says in his book that he is follow-ing the tracks of the learned men who practised from among the learn-ed of Babylon and Egypt since they were the first who looked con-cerning the science of stars - -." Translate: - - that he is follow-ing the tracks of the ancient learned men of Babylon and Egypt since they were the first who investigated the science of astrology,- -."

This is just a small selection of the more obvious blemishes which mar the translation and in places the Arabic text, too. Of the text edition one can say that it can be used although with some caution, and the translation is also adequate for giving a general idea of the work, except for the inclusion of details which are very often misleading.   *Jussi Aro*

<div align="center">*</div>

Scriptorum Romanorum de re rustica reliquiae. Collegit recensuit
    Felicianus Speranza. Volumen prius. Editionis a. MCMLXXI prolatae
    impressio altera correctior. Biblioteca di Helikon, Testi e
    Studi 8. Università degli Studi, Messina 1974. XIX, 129 p. Lit.
    4900.

L'importanza di questo primo volume mi pare piuttosto limitata data la scarsità del materiale. Il primo capitolo, "Ab vetustissi-mis temporibus ad aetatem Catonianam", consiste in otto "scrittori" così disposti: Praecepta vetustissima (nessun esempio), Canticum rusticum (1 esempio), Oracula. Leges (8 esempi), Caesonius (nessun esempio), M. Atilius Regulus (nessun esempio), Minius Percennius (1 esempio - ma è difficile che si tratti di uno 'scriptor Romanus de re rustica'), Manlii (piuttosto agricoltori esemplari citati da Catone) e M. Porcius Cato stesso (16 esempi tra cui anche il famoso detto *nihil agendo homines male agere discunt*).

Il secondo capitolo, "Ab Karthagine capta ad aetatem Varronia-nam", è un po' più interessante del primo. Meraviglia comunque che

l'editore non si sia interessato del frammento 16 dei Sasernae (Varro, rust. 1,2,27) che a parere di tanti studiosi è così problematico. Sotto il No 17 l'editore cita *multa item alia miracula apud Sasernas invenies* (ibid. 28). Ma si tratta di un "frammento"?

La parte più importante consiste nei frammenti di Magone di Cartagine, in tutto 66, tra cui tuttavia molti incerti.

Nella sua prefazione l'editore ammette di aver avuto delle difficoltà con la scelta del materiale (VIII-IX). Secondo me o si doveva tener conto di tutti i frammenti che si collegano all'agricoltura o ci si doveva limitare ai casi più sicuri.   *Paavo Castrén*

Res publica. Texte zur Krise der frührömischen Tradition. Lateinisch/griechisch und deutsch. Ausgewählt, übersetzt und erläutert von *Rudolf Till.* Die Bibliothek der Alten Welt. Artemis Verlag, Zürich und München 1976. 396 p. Fr. 58.-.

If one happens to lose the dustcover of this book, where the contents are set out, the reader may be rather puzzled over the purpose of this collection, which is without any introductory comment and whose title can be understood in several ways. This work has collected fragments hitherto difficult of access and passages illustrating the cultural and political life in Rome especially in the second century B.C., for which time our direct historical sources are incomplete, and in which there occurred far-reaching influences on the development of Roman society.

Till has done excellent work in the selection, translation and commentary of the passages. One may be occasionally disappointed at first with the method of editing and with the commentary, but on a second reading, everything seems well deliberated and to the point. What is printed is clearly only the tip of the iceberg, of a vast and profound knowledge of literature, language and history. I would have preferred a few more inscriptions, perhaps also more Polybius, but I agree that the ease with which one can find a translated edition of Polybius is sufficient reason to omit many otherwise important passages. It would perhaps have been helpful if the commentary had given fuller references to other passages not included in the collection, but important for the questions raised.

My more serious criticism concerns the picture which the reader is given of second century Rome almost exclusively on the basis of literary , in other words idealizing, sources. Statesmen and generals, idealistically and authentically Roman, objects of the nostalgia in the following centuries, once again march by. But where is the economic revolution, where the social crisis, where the rise of imperialism, where the political controversies and murders. The cover promises: "Makabre Bilder vom Verfall römischer Lebensart beschliessen die Auswahl." I did not succeed in finding them.

Jorma Kaimio

Ovid: Ars amatoria. Book I. Edited with an introduction and commentary by *A.S. Hollis.* Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press 1977. XXIV, 171 p. £ 5.-.

Ovid's Ars amatoria is undoubtedly among the most suitable works of Latin poetry for inclusion in academic courses, not only because of its entertainment value, but also because of its interesting stratified structure and the colourful description of the life of Augustan Rome. Therefore, it is hard to understand why we have had to so long wait for the first commentary on the work. However, while we are greatly indebted to Hollis for fulfilling this desideratum, we should point out that commentaries on the two last books are still missing, and express our concern that Hollis does not indicate in his preface any intention of completing the work. Ars amatoria must be read as a whole, and one would perhaps have expected the commentary of the whole work to be published in a single volume.

The book itself is well worth recommending. It contains a clear and up-to-date introduction and an intelligent, even humorous commentary in the best traditions of English literary criticism. The text is taken from the still definitive Oxford edition of Kenney, no doubt a wise solution, although one would in this case have prefered an unaltered text; the few corrections make one wonder whether we must now refer to this as a Hollis edition. With regard to the commentary, the scarcity or even total lack of linguistic, partly also metrical, notes is obvious and hardly justifiable; in this respect, the work does not fulfil the needs of most students. There is an illustration of four plates, which I consider quite inadequate for a work of this length; alternative would have been to include only references to standard works, from which the reader could find the relevant pictures. *Jorma Kaimio*

<center>*</center>

M.S. Silk: Interaction in Poetic Imagery. With special reference to early Greek poetry Cambridge University Press 1974. XIV, 263 p. £ 7.-.

Although the author of this treatise is lecturer in Classics at King's College, London, his approach to poetic imagery is unconventional conforming rather to modern literary and linguistic theory. Potential readers with the classicists' traditional dislike of theory and abstractions should be warned that this is an extremely difficult book. But those who seriously try to grapple with it will find it rewarding in many respects. Its inter-disciplinary scope and the learning and precision with which its author deals with his task are worth special notice. Silk's main contribution is to the understanding of the nature and function of metaphor, simile and other forms of imagery, but his discussion touches upon a wide register of topics, from assonance to theory of style. His Greek material consists chiefly of lyric poetry from Archilochus to Aeschylus, a period exceptionally rich in imagery and hence suited for a concentrated study of its various kinds.

        Silk analyzes imagery in terms of the 'interaction' of what,
with a new application of an idea originally introduced by I.A.
Richards, he calls the 'tenor' and the 'vehicle' of metaphors -
broadly speaking the two aspects of characterization which are in-
herent in every kind of comparison. He is careful to move on the
linguistic ('terminological') and not the conceptual level, which
is of course an up-to-date and logically safer process, but one
which complicates the procedure considerably. It is an approach
which reveals different dynamic features of poetic imagery, but
the method will require much testing before its usefulness for lit-
erary criticism and philology can be fully appreciated.

H. Thesleff

Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry. Edited by *Tony Woodman & David West.*
        Cambridge University Press 1974. 166 p. £ 3.90.
        In their prologue the editors call this book a selection of
essays on the poetry of the Augustan age, with the objective of il-
lustrating various modern critical approaches to ancient literature.
According to them, the book is designed for both scholars and stu-
dents alike.
        Apart from the inclusion of a few interesting details, the se-
lection has, however, nothing particularly new to offer. Perhaps the
most fruitful contribution is Gordon Williams' attempt to interpret
Virgil's Fourth Eclogue in its historical context. Lyne's starting-
point in his essay on the Georgics is very similar but his conclu-
sions are correct only in part. Almost all contributors deserve
praise for their attempts to avoid the dangers inherent in subject-
ive criticism.
        For the rest, the value of the book is slight (the editors
themselves seem ready to admit this in their rather apologetic epi-
logue). For the scholar, there are few real stimulants; Cairn's
study of Catullus' Alexandrianism and to some extent Kenney's Lucre-
tius, too, are even boringly mechanistic. And the student who would
benefit by the book must combine a good basic knowledge of Augustan
poetry with a deep interest in it. - In brief, I find this method
of publication unprofitable.   *Marianna Tyni*

                                    *

Thesaurus linguae Latinae Vol. VII,2 fasc. X, *linearius - locus;*
        Vol. IX,2 fasc. V, *onocrotalus - oppugnatio.* BSB B.G. Teubner
        Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1976. Sp. 1441-1600; 641-800. Je
        Band M 29.-.
        Im Jahre 1976 sind vom lateinischen Thesaurus zwei Lieferungen
erschienen. Sie enthalten beide eine Menge hochwichtige Wörter und
sind deswegen eine sehr willkommene Bereicherung für die lexikogra-
phische Forschung. Wir möchten hier nebst einigen Einzelbemerkungen
kurz zwei generelle Gesichtspunkte anführen: 1) Unter Inschriften-
publikationen, aus deren Zitierweise die geographische Herkunft der
Inschrift nicht hervorgeht, wäre es gut, den Fundort anzugeben;

2) Am Ende der Wortartikel steht oft *cf. Onom.*, aber nicht konsequent, denn ich habe öfters das Fehlen dieses Verweises notiert, auch wenn das Wort als Eigenname bezeugt ist. Diese Angabe sollte also mehr Berücksichtigung erhalten.

    An Einzelheiten notiere ich diesmal Folgendes. Zu *lingo*: CIL IV 8898 ist in falscher Form zitiert, es muss sein *Tiopilus canis, cunnu lingere noli puellis in muro*; vgl. Epigraphica 30 (1968) 117. - Zu *lintearius*: CIL IV 2308 ist wohl *lintenarius* zu lesen (Verlesung des Editors der kursiven R und I durch N); für das Fem. wäre zu zitieren SEG XVII 531, auch wenn griechisch. - Zu *lintrarius* hinzuzufügen ein *navicularius lyntrarius* aus Ostia, RendAccLincei 1974, 314. - Das Wort *lirinus* scheint im Lateinischen doch belegt zu sein: ein Amphorengraffito aus der Lugdunensis trägt die Worte *c(ongios) lirini*, Gallia 1 (1943) 2,37 = AE 1945, 74 (an der Lesung ist kaum zu zweifeln). Hier erscheint *lirinum* sc. *oleum*. - Zu *littera*: 1516,56ff. füge ich hinzu AE 1971, 92 (Wachstafel aus Pompeji) *quod in litteras nesciret*, und 1517,16ff. könnte man AE 1967, 533 (Ptolemais) *claris litteris* anführen. Ausserdem vermisst man einen Hinweis auf die Akrosticha und anderes ähnliches, vgl. etwa Cic. div. 2,111f. und aus dem Leben RendAccLincei 1971, 728 (= AE 1972, 39, Rom) *primae dant litter(a)e nomen* (dort weitere Literatur); sonst sei ein interessantes Graffito aus Ostia erwähnt: *littera prima dolet, iubet altera, tertia mittit, quarta dolet, facti quinta habet invidiam*, nicht richtig in SDHI 27 (1961) 325 und ArchClass. 17 (1965) 261 publiziert. - Zu *loculus*, hinzuzufügen ist *loclu* ICVR 11951. - Zu *locus*: zu verschiedenen Schreibungen und epigraphischen Belegen ist zu vergleichen der ausführliche (auch allzu ausführliche) Artikel *locus* in Dizionario Epigrafico. - Zu dem wichtigen Wortartikel *operor*, wo das Verb zum ersten Mal in seiner ganzen Geschichte gründlich analysiert wird, ist inzwischen ein hochinteressanter Beleg aufgetaucht, ICVR 14057, dazu vgl. demnächst P. Flury (Verf. des Artikels) in Museum Helveticum.   *Heikki Solin*

Robert Renehan: Greek Lexicographical Notes. A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones. Hypomnemata Heft 45. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen 1975. 208 p. DM 54.-.

    The Greek lexicographical notes by Robert Renehan now contained in this single volume provide a welcome guide to the interpretation of Greek literary texts. Approximately half of the some 1500 entries were first published in a series of six articles in Glotta between the years 1968 and 1972, but many of them have now been expanded and revised. The entries are collected and published in alphabetical order, which makes reference to them much easier. The book contains additional instances and parallels, new meanings and stylistical observations, some new readings and grammatical interpretations. As such, the book is not only a lexicographical supplement illustrating the frequency of the several meanings of each word together with its history, but also contains philological interpretations of many passages in Greek literature and serves as

a commentary which is careful to distinguish single words and their
meanings among the various genres of the Greek literary language,
especially among the poetic languages with their traditions and
idioms. As regards the last consideration an index locorum would.
have been of great value.   *Jaakko Frösén*

*Johannes Kramer: Literarische Quellen zur Aussprache des Vulgär-
    lateins*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, herausgegeben
    von *E. Heitsch, R. Merkelbach* und *C. Zintzen*, 75. Verlag Anton
    Hain, Meisenheim am Glan, 1976. 73 p. DM 16.-.
    Pour restituer la prononciation du latin, on dispose de sources
directes de trois ordres: textes épigraphiques et autres non litté-
raires, données prosodiques des œuvres poétiques et témoignages
(observations, prescriptions, censures) de grammairiens anciens.
J. Kramer a eu l'heureuse idée d'inventorier la documentation des
deux derniers genres. Sont toutefois omises les notices de gram-
mairiens concernant l'alternance *b/v* et la prononciation de *l* (cf.
Sturtevant, The pronunciation of Greek and Latin, §§ 154 et 165-169).
En revanche, un exemple de prothèse, p. 46, est emprunté aux Ta-
blettes Albertini, document non littéraire. Les citations sont ac-
compagnées de traductions en regard, très soignées. D'ailleurs, il
ne s'agit pas que du latin dit vulgaire, soit, selon l'auteur, élé-
ments qui s'écartent de l'usage classique et passent pour apparte-
nir à un niveau inférieur du discours (Vorwort); mieux valait éviter
ce terme controversé et inutilement limitatif. Pour tout commentaire
linguistique (à quelques notes près), référence est faite aux para-
graphes respectifs de divers manuels ou traités. Dans la biblio-
graphie, font défaut les manuels de W.S. Allen, H. Lausberg et
A. Traina. Le texte des citations, nous avertit l'auteur, est celui
des "meilleurs éditions"; il aurait bien fait de les nommer. Pour
les grammairiens, il s'en tient au recueil de Keil; de Consentius,
souvent cité (sous forme "Cosentius"!), il existe pourtant une édi-
tion due à M. Niedermann, Consentii ars de barbarismis et metaplasmis
(nouv. éd. 1937). A propos de *i>ę*, est cité Cic. de or. 3,12,46
" - - *ut iota litteram tollas et E plenissimum dicas*" et traduit
"indem du den Buchstaben i abschaffst und stattdessen ein ganz brei-
tes e sprichst": cela est sujet à caution, cf. Sturtevant, o.c., §121.
                                               Veikko Väänänen

Åke Fridh: L'emploi causal de la conjonction ut en latin tardif.
    Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XXXV. Acta Universi-
    tatis Gothoburgensis, Göteborg 1977. 69 S. Sw.Cr. 35.-.
    Kausales *ut* hat bis jetzt bei den Gelehrten nur wenig Be-
achtung gefunden. Die bisherigen Ergebnisse sind in der Grammatik
von Hofmann-Szantyr 647f. kurz zusammengefasst. Danach ist der kau-
sale Gebrauch von *ut* mit Konj. (davon zu trennen ist der klassische
Typus *ut erat furiosus* mit Ind.) erst spätlateinisch und teils mit
den explikativen *quod*-Sätzen, teils mit den finalen *ut*-Sätzen ver-

wandt. Im vorliegenden Buch, das einen willkommenen und bemerkens-
werten Beitrag zu dieser Untersuchung bedeutet, zeigt der Autor u.a.,
dass sich diese Verwendung nur auf verhältnismässig wenige und genau
bestimmbare Ausdruckstypen begrenzt. Zuerst scheint sich der in der
christlichen Literatur oft vorkommende Typus *quis ego sum ut* teil-
weise unter hebräischem Einfluss mittels der Bibelübersetzungen ver-
breitet zu haben. Ferner erscheint dieses *ut* nach affektischen Aus-
rufssätzen, nach *verba affectuum* in elliptischen Ausdrücken, usw.
Es lassen sich für die Verwendung mehrere Ausgangspunkte nachweisen,
von denen final-konsekutives *ut* besonders hervorzuheben ist. Oft
handelt es sich dabei um Grenzfälle zwischen verschiedenen Gebrauchs-
weisen von *ut*; manchmal kann man von *ut* 'quasi-causale' sprechen.
Wichtig ist die Feststellung des Autors (S. 68), dass kausales *ut*
im Spätlatein die Stellung von *quod, quia, quoniam* nie bedroht hat.
Dies ist sicher richtig und ohne weiteres mit dem allgemeinen Zu-
rückdrängen von *ut* durch lautstärkere Synonyme in Verbindung zu
setzen. Nun kommt aber das an und für sich sehr reiche Material des
Buches trotz des "en latin tardif" im Titel so gut wie ausschliess-
lich aus den literarischen christlichen Texten. Kein Wort finden
wir über die Verhältnisse in Inschriften, in der grammatischen und
juristischen Literatur, in den Kaiserkonstitutionen, usw., die einen
beachtlichen Teil der spätlateinischen Texte ausmachen. Auch der
stilistische Aspekt ist in dieser Untersuchung gänzlich vernach-
lässigt. Das Literaturverzeichnis fehlt.   *Reijo Pitkäranta*

<div align="center">*</div>

The So-called Laudatio Turiae. Introduction, text, translation, com-
        mentary by *Erik Wistrand.* Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia
        XXXIV. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Göteborg 1976. 79 p.,
        7 plates. Sw.Cr. 50.-.
        Professor Emeritus Erik Wistrand has produced a new edition
of one of the most famous Latin epitaphs, the *laudatio funebris* of
a Roman lady from the Augustan period, traditionally but probably
erroneously identified as *Turia.* The inscription, unfortunately
damaged, has naturally often been discussed, firstly by Mommsen,
recently (1950) by M. Durry in a separate edition.
        Wistrand has been able to improve on Durry and others and to
propose new solutions to the many intriguing problems suggested by
the text. Moreover, his edition gives an up-to-date English trans-
lation of the *laudatio.* For fragments, W. has suggested a number
of new supplements, most of them acceptable. A few, however, may
fail to convince; for instance II2a *ornamentis |vitam meam instru-
xisti|,* which does not seem to harmonize with what follows, and
II6a-7a, where the interpretation is perhaps a little strained. But
the author himself admits that "the supplements in this section are
very uncertain".
        I am not competent to assess the quality of the English trans-
lation. Judging as a foreigner, it seems clear and accurate. I have
noticed only one point of disagreement: *facilitas,* immediately fol-
lowing *opsequium* and *comitas* perhaps suggests "obligingness" rather
than "reasonebleness".

In his comments, W. analyses linguistic problems as well as ideas. In both these fields, he is an expert. I note especially his subtle analysis of the expression *fortuna sollemnis*, which so far has not been adequately interpreted his comments on the significance of the idea of *fama* in the epitaph, and especially his interpretation of the crucial passage II51-53. W.'s proposal has the advantage of explaining why it was *filia* not *filius*, that was *mihi supstituta*. The theory of post-obit adoption of a child founders precisely on this. According to W., if the husband had died first, his wife would have been adopted in his will, a practice strange to modern ears but not unknown in ancient Rome. However, even W.'s solution may still raise doubts. Perhaps we shall never grasp the exact meaning of the passage. It is tantalizing to think that the whole meaning may depend on one missing letter, *orbitrat*[i] or *orbitat*[e]!

<div align="right">*Iiro Kajanto*</div>

<div align="center">*</div>

R.J.A. *Talbert: Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily 344-317 B.C.* Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge University Press 1974. 246 p., 3 tables. £ 5.-.

Timoleon has left his name to history as the pacifier and unifier of Sicily; he has been compared - and not without reason - to Garibaldi. His achievements were no doubt remarkable: in eight years, from 344 B.C. on, he overthrew tyrants, expelled the Carthaginians and restored order to the island. Prosperity continued into the next century.

Interest in Timoleon's person and career is, therefore, understandable, and it is further stimulated by his being one of the characters in Plutarch's Lives, paired with Aemilius Paullus. But the information one is able to gather of ancient persons will necessarily remain fragmentary, and Timoleon is no exception: it is not possible to reconstruct his whole *vita*, although new excavations in Sicily have increased our knowledge to some extent. Talbert has wisely refrained from writing a biography, although some hypotheses based on fairly solid evidence might well have tempted him to do so. In the present book he has confined himself to "those aspects of Timoleon's career for which there is some adequate evidence", although this provides only a part of the groundwork of the book; the history of the Sicily of the time is also examined. The result is a very welcome survey of the period in general. Talbert's book is methodically clear: it is an excellent example of how a careful and critical scrutiny of sources can deepen and clarify previous views. As a historian Talbert makes use of the most recent archaeological and numismatic research. He is cautious in his conclusions; the reader is allowed to make up his own mind. In most cases one is ready to agree with his opinions, even when they are presented as mere hypotheses; for instance, his chronology of the Sicilian expedition is well-founded.

The bibliography, most useful for the student of the history of Sicily, shows a profound familiarity with the subject. The list of archaeological works is the only one available on this period and therefore deserves a particular word of appreciation.

<div align="right">*Unto Paananen*</div>

James Bowen: A History of Western Education. Volume I. The Ancient
        World: Orient and Mediterranean 2000 B.C. - A.D. 1054. Uni-
        versity Paperbacks 552. Methuen & Co Ltd, London 1975. 395 p.
        £ 3.-.
        This is the first part of a three-volume enterprise which is
to cover the history of western education from the dawn of history
down to the present age. The author is not a classical scholar.
Nevertheless, he has made use of the original sources, usually in
translations. The chief merit of the book is in its presentation
of the general outline of the history of education in the Mediter-
ranean. For people with little knowledge of Antiquity, it may ren-
der considerable service. A classical specialist, however, cannot
fail to notice inaccuracies and even misrepresentations of evidence,
for example p. 177 that the Romans considered Varro their greatest
writer, p. 193 that a handbook was called *introductio* in Latin,
p. 196 that a *libertinus* could attain senatorial rank (his source,
Suet. Claud. 24 says *libertini filius*, which is a different thing).
These and others of a similar nature are perhaps minor blemishes.
More seriously, his discussion of the social prestige of teachers
during the Empire is confused and confusing. I am not competent to
judge his possible shortcomings in the chapters on oriental and
Greek education. Moreover, the author often dwells on irrelevant
issues, especially in the Christian section. Instead of a brief
outline of the history of Christianity and of Christian thought,
a more detailed analysis of the Christian attitude to schooling
would have been welcome.   *Iiro Kajanto*

Alan Cameron: Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzan-
        tium. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press 1976. 364 p.
        £ 16.50.
        Prof. Cameron's new book is a welcome contribution to our
knowledge of the religious, social, military and ceremonial role
played by the "circus factions" during the Late Roman and Byzantine
Empires. We have indeed no reason to doubt his interpretations of
the institutional terminology and the comprehensive primary mate-
rial concerning the heyday of the factions he deals with. He is
also quite convincing in correcting the traditional view that the
changes which took place during the five first centuries of the
Empire would have been a sign of growth of popular sovereignty.
        One might perhaps have expected that the origin of the "fac-
tions" and their role during the Republic and Early Empire would
have been treated in as great depth as the later stages. Unfortu-
nately this is not the case. There is no complete list of early
documents (quite a few new relevant inscriptions have been discover-
ed lately, for example, the interesting one published in Acta Inst.
Rom. Finlandiae VI (1973) No. 81). And perhaps on too many occa-
sions the author has based his comments on secondary sources such
as Balsdon's "Life and Leisure at Rome".
        "The story of the circus factions is long and complex, from

Romulus to the Crusades", as the author remarks (p. 309). The period from Romulus to Cassiodorus still remains open to further investigation, hopefully to be conducted by Prof. Cameron himself.

Paavo Castrén

*

Herbert A. Cahn: Kleine Schriften zur Münzkunde und Archäologie.
    Herausgegeben von *Hans Christoph Ackermann, Ernst Berger, Carmen Biucchi, Martha Rohde-Liegle.* Archäologischer Verlag, Basel, in Kommission bei Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1975. 172 p. DM 58.-.
    This handy volume, containing a number of reprinted studies and articles in various languages by Herbert Cahn (from the period 1929-1974), was published in honour of the author on his 60th birthday. Cahn belongs to the very limited group of highly educated traders in classical antiquities, mostly to be found in Swiss centers for monetary activities, where banking is combined with numismatics etc. These firms are well known from their printed catalogues, edited by serious experts on classical sculpture, "toreutike", bronzes, coins etc. Cahn is responsible for a number of such catalogues (of considerable value to students), which attest to the existence of important private collections of classical art objects, as well as for their circulation. - Trading in museal objects of this kind is practically unknown in Scandinavian countries.
    Cahn is a well-known scholar, who has produced a large number of learned works, but with a penetrant for numismatics, in evidence in the selection of studies presented here, never deviating, however, from the established patterns of art history. The stamped figures on coins are never monetary symbols alone, but miniature works of art, reflecting the contemporary full-sized art of the epochs in question.
    The author tackles the difficult question of Apollo's uncertain Eastern origin, and of the god's oldest manifestation, in a study on the lion as one of his earliest attributes. In the author's opinion the Anatolic sun-god, long before his transfer to Aegean Delos and to mountain-locked Delphi, and before the creation of his Greek name, was accompanied by lions. Evidence is provided by the often reproduced ivory sculpture of Ionian origin - excavated from the Holy Road in Delphi - and dating from the late 7th century, showing a man and a lion rampant. Cahn adds some bronze - *ex voto*? - lions of Phoenician origin (Tyros). Bow and arrows, respectively tripode and lyre, are all late attributes of the fully hellenized Phoebus Apollo.
    An analysis of attic vase-painting is carried out in two short studies, one of them dedicated to the late Gisela Richter.
    Of special interest are his comments on early Attic coinage where a series of archaic coins (owls) are presented in close relation to their respective parallels in contemporary sculpture and vase-painting. The pictures illustrating this instructive study are well chosen.
    The author's aptitude in the tricky field of numismatics is demonstrated in a study on little known early Tarentine coinage

(here 520-490 B.C.) for long a field of learned dispute. In the
author's opinion the extraordinary antiquated appearance of coinage
from Taras, in comparison with the neighbouring "poleis", was caused
by traditional Doric-Lacedaemonian antipathy to trade and monetary
arrangements in general. While trying to bring order to a confused
area od symbols, which includes issues sporting the famous dolphins
and hippocamps of opulent Taras/Tarentum, the author uses the year
510 B.C. - marking the devastation of glorious Sybaris - as a suc-
cessful pivot in his scheme of post - and ante-dating.

Of interest to both historians and art-historians is a study
of early Hellenistic coinage, covering the period of Alexander and
the diadochs. The issues discussed here are all well known and dated,
and the chronology more or less clear. This turbulent period of mili-
tary conflict, on a scale never seen before, fascinated the contempo-
rary world. The new coinage, ordered by Macedonian rulers, represent-
ed a new dynamic art with political and psychological functions. The
beauty of the classical coins from certain "poleis" had never been
equalled. The new issues, however, did not indicate artistic deca-
dence, but new ambitions which in fact constituted the final period
of Greek coinage, a period of first importance. The ancient mytho-
logical symbols were now replaced: exotic creatures - the Indian
war-elephant - or attributes such as the "horns of Ammon" or the
fancyful elephant helmet with tusks, borne by the new hard-faced
rulers, are introduced for one reason only: dynastic propaganda.
With few exceptions, the contemporary full-size works of art are
lost, early Hellenistic art surviving in these miniatures. Gone was
the serene beauty of an idealizing classical art, to be replaced by
god-like supermen winning their crowns on eastern battlefields. -
This is the most important of the articles reprinted.

Yet the author presents aspects of interest in a short study
on Diocletianus monetary reforms (294?), the basis for the Emperor's
famous measures to support the collapsing economic life of a decaying
Empire. In his sweeping reforms of the monetary system, the Emperor
designed a new trimetallic by reintroducing gold and silver, long
since corroded and abandoned. It was not only the creation of the
aureus, although important, which brought about a change, but the
farsighted use of new coins bearing devices which appealed to various
social groups within the still vast Empire: brass for the masses,
silver for the well-to-do, gold for the elite in a fast changing so-
ciety. - The author's interest in these unattractive issues, usher-
ing in a new barbaric age, is concerned with the symbols: the attributes
and the new titles of honour, created in a drastic attempt to stem
the immense catastrophe hanging over the ancient world. Numismatics,
usually a puzzle of minuscule components fitted together by experts,
turns out in Cahn's hands to be a fascinating complement to classi-
cal art-history.

The volume concludes with a number of obituaries by the author,
mostly on prominent Swiss and German scholars or collectors. Only a
few northern scholars are included, among them notably Sir John D.
Beazley († 1970), whose active life was spent in Oxford and the Ash-
molean Museum.   *Christoffer H. Ericsson*

Hans-Peter Bühler: Antike Gefässe aus Edelsteinen. Verlag Philipp
    von Zabern, Mainz 1973. 85p., 40 plates. DM 98.-.
    With the Hellenistic kingdoms conquered, and the enormous
wealth and treasures of the Eastern rulers in Roman hands, Repub-
lican Rome underwent a transformation. The ruling classes, already
accustomed to Greek civilisation, adopted a new style and a taste
for Eastern luxuries. The new situation transformed even wellbred
senatorial families into a category properly called "nouveau riches".
A typical expression of this was the interest in foreign marbles and
coloured building stones, in foreign precious stones to be cut into
cameos and gems, and ultimately in exotic minerals for luxury items,
such as cups, vessels and decorative pieces. The Roman elite imme-
diately took a strong liking to minerals such as agate, onyx, ame-
thyst, sardonyx and lapis lazuli, as well as to rock crystal already
familiar from the Alps and from the Iberic mountains.
    People were attracted not only by the colourful combina-
tions of layers, but also by magic properties, said to be contained
in the minerals: the wearing of an object made of onyx or sardonyx
safeguarded the owner against scorpions and dangerous snakes; an
object given to an attractive lady would arouse in her a love of
the donor; a supplicant carrying a rock crystal when entering a
shrine was certain of success. - No wonder that the precious miner-
als were so popular according to the Younger Pliny, our main source
for the so-called "chalcedons".
    Paying special attention to the influences of luxury on life
in the early Empire the German student H-P. Bühler has done a great
deal of work in this particular field, publishing his results in a
doctoral thesis in 1966 ("Antike Gefässe aus Chalcedonen"). Some
years ago (1973) the author published an illustrated catalogue "Antike
Gefässe aus Edelsteinen" with comments and a condensed presentation
of the theme. The book is pleasing to hold and to read, with illus-
trations of a high quality.
    There are only 121 objects listed - carved vessels, cups,
plates etc.,-with an additional 7 known from various sources but
now missing, which must be considered very limited material for se-
rious study. Many of them are fragments only. The inclusion of the
more important chalcedon gems and cameos alone would have made the
study more substantial, but only vessels are discussed.
    Of special interest are the author's comments on trade - and
trade routes - together with his account of these attractive mate-
rials, mined in the peripheries of an   world considerably
enlarged by Alexander. The advance on Western India also opened the
gates for luxuries of the kind earlier carried by caravans through
the deserts but soon to pass along the Periplus-route, from Indian
Barygaza to Hellenistic emporia along the Red Sea. Indian onyx was
named sardonyx after a mountain ridge, probably in the province of
Deccan? Strabon lists "Carthaginian stones" - carbuncles? - mined
in the country of the Garamantes, in the middle of the Sahara. Rock
crystal was explained as "frozen water" - mentioned by Diodorus -
turned into ice not by low temperatures but by "divine fire". Agate
was mined in Germania and fashioned into objects by local craftsmen,
as shown by archaeological evidence from the Cologne-area.

The author also covers the mysterious "*vasa murrina*", an enigma commented on by learned people, but yet not explained. Roman authors agree upon a Parthian origin, as well as on the immense interest in these "myrrha-scenting" luxuries. No less an aristocrat than Nero was mentioned as a passionate collector. The British Museum houses a goblet of this kind.

The limited number of objects listed indicates an equally limited body of artisans and of exclusive customers: there is no comparison with, for instance, the overwhelming mass of objects from Apulian Greek goldsmiths or Campanian silversmiths, both reflecting the brilliance of the late efflorescence of Hellenistic life. Yet the exclusive field of precious stones, including gems and cameos, had some affinities with everyday handicrafts. Glass manufacture within the Roman provinces in Imperial times no longer stood for luxury, but constituted a trade that supplied the average family. In spite of this, artisans working with glass were able to turn out brilliant things of beauty: vessels and amphoras in an applied two-coloured technique well-known from the famous "Portland vase" (resembling sardonyx), or drinking vessels in the advanced "*vasum diatretum*"-technique (copying cut rock crystal goblets). It is not the exclusive originals but the adaptions in a plastic material which must be considered the true examples of a refined applied art, to be duplicated for numerous customers. Oddly enough the later category - the moulded or blown Roman glass - speaks out more strongly as an expression of pure Hellenistic art. Related, but yet far removed from these capricious luxuries in stone, are, for instance, the two glass amphorae in blue and white from Pompeii (location: "Tomba del vaso di vetro di blu") now in Naples, where the Golden Age of Augustus, mixed with symbols from Alexandrian lyrics, sparkles in joyful beauty - these private comments by a student of art history, sticking to the old ideals of Hellenism, should not be understood as criticism. Bühlers documentation of a little-known subject is well executed and his comments are of value. Again a piece in the immense puzzle, the lost culture of late Antiquity at its height, is put in place by a devoted scholar.   *Christoffer H. Ericsson*

Ancient Art. The Norbert Schimmel Collection. Edited by *Oscar White Muscarella*. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1974. 265 items. DM 98.-.

This book, properly an illustrated catalogue of selected objects, introduces a first-rate collection of ancient and classical art recently built up by means of private resources. Today such collections are usually found in the U.S.A., while European (French and British) collections of long standing are reported as dispersed or "non-existent". In spite of current heavy taxation the U.S.A. remains the country where it is possible to accumulate vast wealth, a prerequisite if one wishes to indulge a taste in classical or Near-East antiquities of some quality. No doubt Swiss traders and dealers are important intermediaries in the creation of private collections of this kind, as well as the suppliers of public collections

and museums, as only a very limited number of objects can be moved
today. Private trading in classical, Mediterranean or Near-East an-
tiquities is a must for museums not situated within the actual areas,
with excavation activities in progress. The closing of national bor-
ders to works of art - as planned by UNESCO - aims at a status quo:
the cultural heritage must be kept where it is! Yet objects will be
smuggled out from under-developed areas, and prices will rise and
the owning of anything above the insignificant will be the privi-
lege of top industrialists and businessmen.

The Norbert Schimmel Collection reflects a strong interest in
Mediterranean and Near-East antiquities, and a taste for high quality
combined with artistic values. The collection is dominated by minia-
ture objects up to medium-sized Greek pottery and Roman portrait
sculpture below man size, a situation which indicates today's lim-
ited resources of supply even for serious clients.

The publication is a joint effort of a group of specialists,
mostly American scholars, with Oscar W. Muscarella of the Metropol-
itan Museum as co-ordinating editor. High-grade -anonym-photos (part-
ly in color) are commented on in concentrated texts with comprehen-
sive references to literature and public collections. A number of
such texts are in reality learned essays (for instance, the editor's
remarks on Near-East metal work).

The Greek pottery is skilfully dealt with, painted pottery
constituting an advanced and precise field thanks to first-rate
scholars like J.D. Beazley. Most impressive are (usually small-scale)
archaic bronze-sculptures of Greek, Etruscan or Umbro-Etruscan or-
igin. Some pieces of exquisite archaic armour, surpassing the best
items of the famous Olympia-collection, probably belong to recent
finds from illegal excavations.

The writer is not in a position to comment on the Near-East
or Egyptian antiquities dealt with.

Credit goes to Philipp von Zabern of Mainz as publisher and
printer for high-grade printing and a most pleasing volume.

Christoffer H. Ericsson

I N D E X