

HYPERBOREUS

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὗροις
ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν
(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29–30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA
DENIS KEYER ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

Vol. 29 2023 Fasc. 1

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
VERLAG C.H. BECK MÜNCHEN

HYPERBOREUS: Классическая филология и история

Выходит два раза в год

Редакция: Н. А. Алмазова, А. Л. Верлинский, С. К. Егорова,
Д. В. Кейер (отв. ред. выпуска)

Редакционный совет: Михаэль фон Альбрехт, Пэт Истерлинг,
А. К. Гаврилов, Вальтер Лапини, Карло Лукарини,
Дуглас Олсон, Д. В. Панченко, Штефан Ребених,
Юрген Хаммерштедт

Адрес редакции и издателя: 197198, С.-Петербург, ул. Красного Курсанта, д. 6/9
Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana (HYPERBOREUS)

Факс: (812) 274-3395, (812) 235-4267
E-mail: hyperbicl@gmail.com
bibliotheca-classica.org/hyperboreus

По вопросам подписки обращаться по адресу редакции.

HYPERBOREUS: Studia Classica

HYPERBOREUS wurde im Jahre 1994 durch die Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana gegründet. Der Vertrieb außerhalb Rußlands erfolgt durch den Verlag C. H. Beck (Oskar Beck), Wilhelmstr. 9, D-80801 München, Postfachadresse: Postfach 400340, D-80703 München. Die Zeitschrift erscheint ab 1996 in zwei Halbjahresschriften. Abonnementpreis jährlich ab Vol. 2 € 34,90 (in diesem Betrag sind € 2,28 Mehrwertsteuer enthalten), für das Einzelheft € 19,50 (Mehrwertsteueranteil € 1,28), jeweils zuzüglich Vertriebsgebühren; die Kündigungsfrist des Abonnements beträgt sechs Wochen zum Jahresende. Preis für Vol. 1, 1994/5, auf Anfrage bei dem Verlag C. H. Beck.

Herausgeber: Nina Almazova, Sofia Egorova,
Denis Keyer (verantw.), Alexander Verlinsky

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat: Michael von Albrecht, P. E. Easterling, Alexander Gavrilov,
Jürgen Hammerstädt, Walter Lapini, Carlo M. Lucarini,
Douglas Olson, Dmitri Panchenko, Stephan Rebenich

Alle für die Redaktion bestimmten Manuskripte und Einsendungen sind zu richten an:
Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana (HYPERBOREUS)

ul. Krasnogo Kursanta 6/9
197198 St. Petersburg, Russia
Fax: (812) 274-3395, (812) 235-4267
E-mail: hyperbicl@gmail.com
bibliotheca-classica.org/hyperboreus

Die Publikationssprachen im HYPERBOREUS sind Russisch, Englisch, Französisch, Deutsch, Italienisch und Lateinisch; den Beiträgen wird jeweils eine Zusammenfassung auf Englisch und Russisch hinzugefügt.

Entgegnungen werden im HYPERBOREUS nur ausnahmsweise aufgenommen. Eingegangene Druckschriften werden nicht zurückgeschickt. Mit Namen gezeichnete Artikel geben die Auffassung des Verfassers, nicht der Redaktion wieder. Alle Nachrichten werden nach bestem Wissen, aber ohne Gewähr gegeben.

CONSPECTUS

NINA ALMAZOVA	
The Myth of Inventing the Many-Headed Nome	5
GAUTHIER LIBERMAN	
Petits riens sophocléens : <i>Antigone</i> III (v. 513, 517–521, 527–530, 577–581, 594–602, 611–619, 666–667, 696–698, 703–704, 728–730) ...	29
SALVATORE TUFANO	
With or without a <i>koinon</i> . The <i>Longue Durée</i> of Two Regional Festivals. II. The Pamboiotia and the Basileia from the Hellenistic to the Imperial Period	50
CARLO M. LUCARINI	
Per una nuova edizione critica delle <i>Antiquitates rerum humanarum</i> di Varrone	78
SOFIA LARIONOVA	
Mathematical Education in Early Christian Authors	109
SOPHIA GOLOVATSKAYA	
The “Jewish Sibyl” in Clement of Alexandria’s <i>Protrepticus</i>	124
S. DOUGLAS OLSON	
Philological Notes on the Letter <i>lambda</i> in a New Greek-English Dictionary. I. λαβάργυρος – λάσθη	143
Keywords	167

Nina Almazova

THE MYTH OF INVENTING THE MANY-HEADED NOME

The twelfth Pythian ode of Pindar, dedicated to the victory of Midas the aulos player from Acragas (490 BC¹), is our earliest direct evidence of the νόμος as a certain type of musical piece.² In a poetic text, Pindar changes the name νόμος πολυκέφαλος, known from elsewhere (*Sch. Pind. Pyth.* 12. 39, vol. II p. 268. 9 Dr.; Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 7. 1133 D–E; Hesych. s. v. πολυκέφαλος), into κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμος (v. 23) and tells an etiological legend about it: after the killing of Medusa by Perseus, Athena created this instrumental aulos piece to imitate the woeful and terrible weeping of the two other gorgons and the hissing of the snakes on their heads (v. 6–12, 18–21). Apart from Pindar, this story can be found only in Nonnus of Panopolis (*Dionys.* 40. 227–233; 24. 36–38), who calls the invention by Athena θρηῆνος πουλυκάρηνος. Let us recollect the texts of both poets.

Pindar introduces the story of Athena’s musical invention in a narration of the myth of Perseus (*Pyth.* 12. 6–12, 18–27):³

- 6 ... αὐτόν τε νιν Ἑλλάδα νικάσαντα τέχνα, τάν ποτε
Παλλὰς ἐφεῦρε θρασειᾶν <Γοργόνων>
οὔλιον θρηῆνον διαπλέξαις Ἀθάνᾃ·
τὸν παρθενίοις ὑπὸ τ’ ἀπλάτοις ὀφίων κεφαλαῖς
10 ἅϊε λειβόμενον δυσπενθεῖ σὺν καμάτῳ,
Περσεὺς ὁπότε τρίτον ἄῤυσεν κασιγνητᾶν μέρος
ἐνναλία Σερίφῳ λαοῖσί τε μοῖραν ἄγων.

...and (receive) him (sc. Midas) as well, who surpassed Greece in an art that Pallas Athena once invented, having weaved⁴ the murderous

¹ See Schroeder 1922, 110.

² Dornseiff 1933, 27.

³ The text is cited from Snell–Maehler 1987.

⁴ Held 1998, 382–384 convincingly proves that the meaning of διαπλέκω does not presuppose the combination of two sources of sound, but governs an inner accusative and means ‘produce’, in this case ‘reproduce’.

lament of the insolent <gorgons>. She heard it⁵ as it poured out with direful toil⁶ through the maidens' and the unapproachable serpents' heads, when Perseus gave a shout, bringing the third portion of the sisters as a doom to marine Seriphus and its population.

- ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ τούτων φίλον ἄνδρα πόνων
 ἐρρύσατο παρθένος, αὐλῶν τεύχε πάμφωνον μέλος,
 20 ὄφρα τὸν Εὐρύαλας ἐκ καρπαλιμᾶν γενύων
 χριμφθέντα σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ' ἐρικλάγκταν γόον.
 εὔρεν θεός· ἀλλὰ νιν εὐροῖς' ἀνδράσι θνατοῖς ἔχειν,
 ὠνύμασεν κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον,
 εὐκλεᾶ λαοσσόων μναστῆρ' ἀγώνων,
 25 λεπτοῦ διανισόμενον χαλκοῦ θαμὰ καὶ δονάκων,
 τοὶ παρὰ καλλίχορον ναίοισι πόλιν Χαρίτων
 Καφισίδος ἐν τεμένει, πιστοὶ χορευτᾶν μάρτυρες.

But after the virgin (sc. Athena) had saved her favourite man from these toils, she created the pipes' melody of every sound to imitate with the instrument the loud wailing of Euryale forced from her violently moving jaws. A goddess invented it; but, having invented it for mortal men to have, she called it “a nome of many heads” – that glorious tune concerned with man-driving contests, frequently passing through thin bronze and reeds, which, the dancers' trusty witnesses, dwell by the fair-dancing town of the Graces⁷ in the sacred domain of Cephisis.

Nonnus describes the funeral ceremony held by Dionysus after the conquest of India. Among various kinds of mournful music, there is an aulos piece (*Dionys.* 40. 227–233):⁸

⁵ Making Perseus the subject of ἤε (Sandys 1915, 309; Hummel 1993, 336–337; see *contra* Shevtsova 2008 [Е. В. Шевцова, “Pind. Pyth. 12, 9–12”, *Материалы XXXVII Международной филологической конференции. Классическая филология. 11–15 марта 2008 г.*], 8–9) seems a pointless complication of the text: since it was Athena who set the threnos of the gorgons to aulos music, it is substantial what *she* heard.

⁶ Köhnken makes the words δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ governed not by λειβόμενον, but by the verb in v. 11 (he accepts the reading ἄνυσσεν in Köhnken 1971, 122 n. 28 and 1976, 259–263, but ἄϋσεν in 1978, 92–93), so that they should qualify the actions of Perseus. See *contra* Radt 1974, 117–118; Angeli Bernardini 1995, 674.

⁷ I.e. Orchomenus, cf. *Ol.* 14. 1–4.

⁸ The text is cited from Keydell 1959.

καὶ Κλεόχου Βερέκυντες ὑπὸ στόμα δίζυγες αὐλοὶ
 φρικτὸν ἐμυκήσαντο Λίβυν γόον, ὃν πάρος ἄμφω
 Σθεννώ τ' Εὐρύαλη τε μῆ πολυδειράδι φωνῇ
 ἄρτιτόμῳ ῥοιζηδὸν ἐπεκλαύσαντο Μεδούσῃ
 φθεγγομένων κεφαλῇσι διηκοσίησι δρακόντων,
 τῶν ἅπο μυρομένων σκολιὸν σύριγμα κομᾶων
 θρήνον πουλυκάρηνον ἐφημίζαντο Μεδούσῃς.

230

And the double Berecynthian pipes in the mouth of Cleochus droned an awesome Libyan lament, with which long ago both Sthenno and Euryale loudly wept over newly gashed Medusa with one voice from many throats: their snakes producing sounds from two hundred heads, they (sc. the gorgons) uttered wriggling hissing out of their grieving hairs – a many-headed dirge for Medusa.

Apparently, the same myth is meant by Nonnus in *Dionys.* 24. 35–38, where the river Hydaspes asks Dionysus for mercy:

μὴ δόνακας φλέξειας, ὅθεν σέο Μυγδόνες αὐλοί,
 μὴ ποτέ σοι μέμψαιτο τεῇ φιλόμολπος Ἀθήνη,
 ἥ ποτε Γοργείων βλοσυρὸν μίμημα καρήνων
 φθεγγομένων Λίβυν εὔρεν ὁμοζυγέων τύπον αὐλῶν.

Do not burn the reeds of which your Mygdonian pipes are made, so that you are never reproached by your song-loving Athena, who once invented the Libyan buzzing of conjugated pipes as a dreadful imitation of the gorgons' heads producing sounds.

Investigating the many-headed nome, it is curious to learn when the legend of its divine origin came into being: was Pindar the inventor of this story, or did he transmit an already present mythological tradition?

I. Mythological Tradition

A definite kind of musical piece is not a typical object of an etiological legend. It lacks the general cultural significance to become an object of a folklore myth, which would rather ascribe a divine invention to such things that seem to accompany human life from time immemorial and are essential for it, such as a musical instrument or genre. A story of inventing the νόμος πολυκέφαλος is most likely a figment of just one poet's fantasy.

The αἵτιον of the many-headed nome as reported by Pindar and Nonnus is a unique connection of two myths, which are well attested independently of each other: Perseus' victory over the gorgons and the invention of the aulos. The element they have in common is Athena's participation.

The association of Athena with the story of Medusa is not an occasional detail: a version is attested that makes the goddess herself destroy the monster (Eur. *Ion* 991; Ps.-Apollod. 2. 46; Euhemerus ap. Hygin. *Astron.* 2. 12. 2).⁹ The variant with Medusa killed by Perseus instead of Athena must have originated in Argos: Perseus is a local hero,¹⁰ grandson of the Argive king Acrisius. In the latter story, Athena (together with Hermes) becomes his tutelary goddess (Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3 F 11 ap. *Sch. Ap. Rhod.* 4. 1515a, p. 320. 12; 21–22 Weldel; Paus. 2. 21. 6; Ps.-Apollod. 2. 37; 41; 46; Hygin. *Astron.* 2. 12). The first representations of this plot in the visual arts date back to the seventh century BC;¹¹ the presence of Athena is frequent, beginning from the earliest monuments.¹² Pindar mentions her helping Perseus also in *Pyth.* 10. 45.

⁹ Roscher 1993a, 677; Rocher 1993b, 1696. Already in the *Iliad*, Athena can wear the aegis with the gorgon's head (*Il.* 2. 446 sqq. without mentioning the gorgoneion; 5. 738–742), but it belongs to Zeus (e.g. in *Il.* 21. 420 Athena is called αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς τέκος), who lends it to Apollo as well (*Il.* 15. 229). Among the epithets of Athena in later poetry are γοργοφόνη (Eur. *Ion* 1478; Orph. *Hymn.* 32. 8) and γοργῶπις (Soph. *Ai.* 450; fr. 760. 2 N. = 844. 2 *TrGF*; Eur. *Hel.* 1316).

¹⁰ Kuhnert 1993, 2018; 2019 (“So reiche Erinnerungen an Perseus wie die argolische Landschaft hat keine andere aufzuweisen”); 2021–2025.

¹¹ Protoattic neck amphora, Eleusis, Archaeological Museum 544, ca. 670 BC (*LIMC* IV s.v. Gorgo, Gorgones no. 312); Cycladic amphora with a relief, Paris, Louvre CA 795, ca. 670 BC (*LIMC* *ibid.* no. 290, Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 1, pl. 1. 1); ivory relief, Samos, Archaeological Museum E 1, 625–600 BC (*LIMC* *ibid.* no. 291).

¹² Krauskopf 1988, 316. Scenes from the seventh century that include Athena are indicated in the previous footnote (*LIMC* IV s.v. Gorgo, Gorgones no. 312 and 291). For the sixth century, see *LIMC* IV s.v. Gorgo, Gorgones no. 292 (= Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 5, pl. 2, 3), 294 (= *BAPD* 320045; Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 9, pl. 4, 2), 307 (= Athena no. 12), 314 (= Athena no. 7; *BAPD* 300055), 315 (= *BAPD* 32480), 320 (= *LIMC* II s.v. Athena no. 504; *BAPD* 300468); *LIMC* VII s.v. Perseus no. 100 (= *BAPD* 350225), 152 (= *BAPD* 300028), 154 (= *BAPD* 8210); *BAPD* 11102, 28004, 300488, 300793, 302168, 302926, 310144, 320090, 350226. For the first half or the middle of the fifth century, see *LIMC* IV s.v. Gorgo, Gorgones no. 298 (= Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 11, pl. 6, 1), 299 (= *BAPD* 275462; Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 13, pl. 8, 1–3), 300 (= *BAPD* 209561; Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 14, pl. 9, 1–2); 301 (= *BAPD* 213438; Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 15, pl. 10, 1–2), 333+338 (= *BAPD* 215959), 337 (= *BAPD* 214401); *BAPD* 17065, 29855, 202629, 205773, 206339, 206702, 206718, 207171, 207172 (= Serfontein 1991, cat. no. 12, pl. 7, 1–2), 209561, 213438, 214401.

As regards the cultural myth of inventing the aulos, we know nothing about the tradition earlier than Pindar. Most our sources ascribe it to Athena, but prove aware of the version in which the goddess threw the instrument away and Marsyas the satyr picked it up.¹³ Evidence of the story of Athena and Marsyas first appears in the mid-fifth century BC.¹⁴ Those sources that, like the twelfth Pythian ode, do not refer to the myth of Marsyas and depict Athena calmly possessing and using her invention, are very few and do not antedate Pindar:¹⁵ in Epicharmus, the goddess accompanied the military dance of the Dioscuri;¹⁶ in Corinna, she taught Apollo to play the aulos;¹⁷ besides, Diodorus Siculus includes producing both the instrument and the music for it in the list of her benefactions to mankind – but his wording does not exclude the version with Marsyas.¹⁸

Alternatively, our sources name the Phrygian aulos players Hyagnis, Marsyas, and Olympus as *πρῶτοι εὐρευταί* of the aulos.¹⁹ This is evidently

¹³ For detailed accounts, see Hygin. *Fab.* 165; Ov. *Fast.* VI, 695–710; Plut. *De cohibenda ira* 6, 456b–c; Ps.-Apollod. 1. 24; Tzetzes *Chil.* 1. 353–384. For a further list of sources depicting Athena as the inventor of the aulos, see Burckhardt 1930, 1992; Schauenburg 1958, 42 n. 42.

¹⁴ A statue group by Myron on the Athenian Acropolis, ca. 457–447 BC: Paus. 1. 24. 1; Plin. *NH* 34. 57; *LIMC* VI s.v. Marsyas I no. 10–12. Athena and Marsyas on Attic vases of the fifth century: *LIMC* VI s.v. Marsyas I no. 9 (Athens, Acropolis 632, a replica of Myron's statue), ca. 450–440 BC; *LIMC* II s.v. Athena no. 618 (Berlin, Staatl. Mus. F2418), 450–445 BC. Melanippides, *Marsyas* fr. 758 *PMG* (ap. Athen. 14. 7. 616 e).

¹⁵ On a black-figure amphora from ca. 520–510 BC, that depicts Athena playing an aulos and Heracles playing a cithara (Basel, market, *LIMC* II s.v. Athena no. 617), Athena is probably represented as the goddess of the Panathenaia rather than the inventor of the pipes.

¹⁶ Epicharm. fr. 92 K.–A. ap. *Sch. Pind. Pyth.* 2. 127: ὁ δὲ Ἐπίχαρμος τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν φησι τοῖς Διοσκούροις τὸν ἐνόπλιον νόμον ἐπαυλῆσαι.

¹⁷ Corinna fr. 668 Page ap. Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 14. 1136 B: ἡ δὲ Κόριννα καὶ διδασθῆναι φησι τὸν Ἀπόλλω ὑπ' Ἀθηνᾶς αὐλεῖν.

¹⁸ Diod. Sic. 5. 73: εὐρεῖν δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν αὐλῶν κατασκευὴν καὶ τὴν διὰ τούτων συντελουμένην μουσικὴν.

¹⁹ Alexander Polyhistor, *FGrHist* 273 F 77 ap. Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 5, 1132 F: Ὑαγνὶν δὲ πρῶτον αὐλῆσαι, εἶτα τὸν τούτου υἱὸν Μαρσύαν, εἶτ' Ὀλυμπον (cf. Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 7, 1133 D–E). Only Hyagnis is mentioned in Aristox. fr. 78 Wehrli; *Marm. Par.* A 10. 19; *AP* 9. 340 (Dioscurid.); Nonn. *Dionys.* 41. 374. See Semenchenko 2019 [Л. В. Семенченко, “Марсий, Олимп, Гиагний и миф об изобретении авлоса”], 914–924 for an attempt to trace three separate traditions regarding Marsyas, Olympus, and Hyagnis. – Standing apart is the evidence of Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 14, 1135 F, who has his Soterichus claim that Apollo invented both the

a rationalization of the myth, turning legendary heroes into historical characters.²⁰ However, the idea of the Phrygian origin of this instrument is much earlier than Pindar's time: Athenaeus (14. 18, 624 b) confirms his report that many aulos players had Phrygian names and were scornfully called "Phrygian slaves" with references to Alcman (*PLG*⁴ III. 69) and Hipponax (*PLG*⁴ II. 492).²¹

In all probability, originally two alternative legends were current, one ascribing the invention of the aulos to Athena, another to Marsyas (or some other Phrygian character), and the story of how Athena rejected the instrument and Marsyas found it is a conflation of two traditions.²² Evidence at our disposal allows us to admit with caution that they merged in Athens in the middle of the fifth century BC.²³ It is often assumed that the hybrid myth originated (or at least was applied) as an attack upon

aulos and the cithara (referring to ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἀλκαῖος, fr. 3 Bgk = 307 c Liberman), and of Duris of Samos (*FGrHist* 76 F16 ap. Athen. 14. 9. 618 b–c), who ascribes the achievements usually associated with the Phrygians to a Lydian man named Seirites (see below part IV).

²⁰ Barker 2018, 8.

²¹ Chuvin 1995, 122.

²² Preller–Robert 1894, 223; Reinach 1912, 390–391; Burckhardt 1930, 1987; 1992; Weis 1992, 367; Semenchenko 2019, 923. – Hardly convincing is the hypothesis of Chuvin 1995, shared by Steiner 2013, 195–196, that Pindar had at his disposal a version with Athena making her discovery in Phrygia, and was the first to transfer it to Boeotia, consciously omitting any mention of the aulos' foreign origin. To the best of my knowledge, each time the *invention* of the instrument is localized in Phrygia, it is ascribed to Marsyas (Metrodorus of Chios ap. Athen. 4. 82. 184 a: ἐν Κελαιναῖς) or Hyagnis (*Marm. Par.* A 10. 19: ἐγ Κ[ελ]α[ι]ναῖ[ς] τῆς Φρ[υγίας], add. Palmerius), but not to Athena. Since Marsyas bears the name of a local river, the story of him challenging Apollo and being punished for the defeat naturally takes place near Celaenae, and Strabo (12. 8. 15, p. 578) notes on this point that the lake that is the source of the rivers Marsyas and Maeander produces reeds appropriate for the mouthpieces of auloi. If Marsyas was initially a river god (Jessen ²1993, 2439; 2445; Reinach 1912, 394; Burckhardt 1930, 1988), dealing with pipes is understandable for him. After the conflation of two myths, in order to explain why it happened to be a Phrygian satyr who picked up the aulos rejected by Athena, the goddess had to be imagined as *throwing the instrument away* in this region: thus, in Hygin. *Fab.* 165, after being ridiculed by other gods in Olympus, she left for the mountain Ida; in Prop. 2. 30. 16–18, she threw the pipes into Maeander; in Claud. *In Eutrop.* 20. 255–256, the *tibia* made of a Libyan plant was thrown away in Phrygia.

²³ It has even been conjectured that Melanippides, with his dithyramb "Marsyas" (see above n. 14), was responsible for this conflation: Boardman 1956, 19–20; Wüst 1967, 82 n. 6.

neighbouring Boeotia,²⁴ which was famous for aulos playing,²⁵ and/or because of the opposition to wind music²⁶ among Athenian intellectuals.²⁷ This version later prevailed, likely due to the cultural authority of Athens.

Out of prudence, let us see if the νόμος πολυκέφαλος itself (as heard by Pindar) can be regarded as evidence ascribing to Athena the creation of the aulos and of the nome that was its own prototype. In fact, both Pindar's description and the analogy with the instrumental Pythian nome depicting the victory of Apollo over Python²⁸ clearly show that this was a kind of programmatic aulos music with a narrative mythical subject and sound mimicry. The appearance of Athena in this piece seemed so evident to some scholars that they proposed to identify it with Ἀθηνᾶς νόμος (known from Plat. *Cratyl.* 417 e; Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 33. 1143 B; Poll. 4. 77).²⁹ However, the data we possess make this hypothesis improbable.

In his list of auletic nomes, Pseudo-Plutarch indicates that the many-headed nome was dedicated to Apollo (*De mus.* 7, 1133 D: νόμον αὐλητικὸν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα τὸν καλούμενον πολυκέφαλον). Of course, this can be put into question if we suppose that its belonging to Apollo was inferred by someone who lived when the νόμος πολυκέφαλος no longer

²⁴ Böttiger 1837, 12–16; Gildersleeve 1895, 366; Farnell 1896, 316; Van der Kolf 1927, 31; Wegner 1949, 155–156; Demand 1983, 88–89; Kasper-Butz 1990, 184; Papadopoulou–Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 54; Wallace 2003, 89. See *contra* Boardman 1956, 19.

²⁵ Poll. 7. 88 (κρουπεζοφόρους δ' εἶπε τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς Κρατῖνος διὰ ἐν αὐλητικῇ κρούματα); Dio Chrys. 7. 212 = *AP* 16. 28 (Ἑλλὰς μὲν Θῆβας νικᾶν προέκρινεν ἐν αὐλοῖς, an inscription claimed to be already extant by 335 BC); Plut. *Alc.* 2 (αὐλείτωσαν οὖν, ἔφη, Θηβαίων παῖδες); *Pelop.* 19. 1 (τὸν αὐλὸν εἰς τιμὴν καὶ προεδρίαν ἄγοντες). Note that the fame of Boeotian aulos players is not attested earlier than the 2nd half of the 5th century BC (Demand 1983, 186; Roesch 1989, 206). For a considerable list of Boeotian aulos players of the 5th and the 4th century, see Huchzermeyer 1931, 47–48; Roesch 1989, 205–213; West 1992, 366–367 with n. 39.

²⁶ On the negative attitude toward the aulos in Athens after 450 BC, see Wilson 1999, 85–95; Wallace 2003, 82–90.

²⁷ Böttiger 1837, 17–19; Huchzermeyer 1931, 60–61; Lasserre 1954, 32; Weis 1992, 367; LeVen 2014, 105–106; Semchenko 2019, 923.

²⁸ There are four extant descriptions of the Pythian nome: Strabo 9. 3. 10, p. 421–422; Poll. 4. 84; *Schol. Pind. Pyth.* hyp. a, vol. II p. 2. 8–15 Dr. (without mentioning the name νόμος Πυθικός), and Demetrius Laco, *De poematis* 2. 11 (*PHerc.* 1014, col. XLVIII; for the reconstruction of the text, see Romeo 1988a, 286; Romeo 1988b, 119, col. LII). The musicians had to depict, on aulos or cithara, the encounter of Apollo with Python, the death of the serpent, and the celebration of the god's victory.

²⁹ Schroeder 1904, 317–320; Schroeder 1922, 112; Gamba 1938, 243–246; Barker 1984, 240 n. 210; Phillips 2013, 39.

existed, but knew (or assumed, e.g., proceeding from the twelfth Pythian ode) that it was performed at the Pythian games.³⁰ Yet this information does not look unreliable in the context of Pseudo-Plutarch. His data dealing with the νόμος πολυκέφαλος originate in earlier sources, including Pratinas (1133 E), an author of the fifth century BC.³¹ Besides, his words seem believable since the dedication of only one nome is reported: the author did not undertake the task of ascribing each of them to a certain divinity. Therefore, this passing reference appears as a given fact rather than a debatable question or a result of investigation, and it seems that Pseudo-Plutarch's source was sure of it. Now, if the dedication to Apollo is maintained by some of the nome's listeners, it follows that Athena was hardly represented in this piece, even as only a patron goddess of Perseus. Pindar's words do not contradict this conclusion.

Moreover, another attribution of the many-headed nome is attested: already at the time of Pratinas, it was considered a creation of the legendary aulos player Olympus (the elder or the younger) or his pupil, a certain Crates.³² Of course, there is nothing unusual in ascribing the same invention to both a mythical and a "historical" author, and it has been justly indicated that for ancient historians such versions did not contradict one another.³³ Still the opposition of Athena to Olympus does look contrasting: if the story of inventing the many-headed nome by Athena had been reproduced in the nome itself, the alternative version would have involved a rationalist polemical fervour usually absent from the catalogues of inventors. Besides, in the classical period, Olympus was considered a pupil of Marsyas. Until the "historization" of the Phrygian aulos players came to a definite rupture with mythology, it would have been difficult to ascribe to Marsyas and his followers (who notoriously took possession of the instrument due to Athena's aversion to it) a piece that would depict Athena composing aulos music. Therefore, it seems most plausible that the many-headed nome used musical means to tell only the story of Perseus killing Medusa and escaping from the other gorgons, whereas the role of Athena was not represented in it.

³⁰ Guhrauer 1890, 443–444; Gamba 1938, 246; Phillips 2013, 39 n. 13.

³¹ The identity and date of this Pratinas is a matter of discussion: he might have been active in the early (Garrod 1920, 132) or late 5th century BC (Lloyd-Jones 1966, 228–230), but at any rate in the period when the nomes mentioned by Pseudo-Plutarch were still performed.

³² Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 7, 1133 D–E; *Sch. Pind. Pyth.* 12, 39 c, p. 268. 14–15 Dr.: ὁδῇ ... ἣν λέγουσι τὸν Ὀλυμπὸν πρῶτον εὐρηκέναι.

³³ Barker 2018, 8.

II. Pindar

Pindar does not display acquaintance with the story disparaging the aulos.³⁴ It is hardly possible to say whether he does not know or simply disregards it.³⁵ Anyway, the version with Marsyas will not concern us

³⁴ Attempts by some scholars to prove that Pindar knew the version discrediting the aulos on the basis of the text of *Pyth.* 12 itself are not cogent. A hint at this is seen in the words *νιν εὐροῖς ἀνδράσι θνατοῖς ἔχειν* (Boeckh 1821, 345; Dissen 1847, 374; Gildersleeve 1885, 366; Christ 1896, 233; Papadopoulou–Pirenne–Delforge 2001, 45). Yet the *inf. finalis* governed by *εὐροῖσα* shows, rather, that the tune invented by the goddess was destined for the mortals from the very beginning (just like any invention by gods and cultural heroes), so Pindar only exploits a typical cult motif underlining the benefaction of the goddess to mankind (see Furley–Bremer 2001, I, 58). Still less convincing is an assumption that such a hint may be read out of Medusa’s epithet *εὐπάρειος* (v. 16). Its interpretation as ‘of fair cheeks’ is sometimes rejected (Frontisi-Ducroux 1994, 256–257 with n. 40) on the grounds that a beautiful female face instead of a fearful or grotesque archaic mask is not attested for the gorgons in the iconography of the early 5th century BC. In fact, the earliest extant images of a fair Medusa can be found (alongside the monstrous one) in mid-fifth-century vase painting depicting Perseus’ story (Serfontein 1991, 17; 75; see a pelike by Polignotus, New York, Metropolitan Museum 45.11.1, 450–440 BC, *LIMC* IV s.v. Gorgo, Gorgones no. 301). However, already from the early classical period we have anthropomorphous images of Medusa, although they retain such features as a broad nose and a tongue hanging out of an open mouth (Serfontein 1991, 17; 37; 74–75). The alternative understanding of the epithet is ‘with fat cheeks’, and Papadopoulou–Pirenne–Delforge 2001, 44–45 claim that it hints at the cheeks of Athena, which became similar to the ugly swollen cheeks of the gorgons as she played the aulos (this similarity is postulated by Vernant 1991, 125–126). However, neither in Pindar nor in any other ancient text is there a shred of association of the gorgons’ cheeks with that of aulos players – this is entirely a twentieth-century invention. Besides, the meaning ‘of fair cheeks’ is firmly backed up by calling the gorgons’ heads ‘maidenly’ (*παρθενίους*, v. 9), which means that the poet imagined their appearance as anthropomorphous rather than monstrous.

³⁵ It is erroneous to claim (like Wilamowitz 1922, 145; Wüst 1967, 84) that Pindar would have necessarily voiced his disagreement with the traditional story *expressis verbis*. In *Ol.* 1. 46–53 the poet explicitly denies a widespread version of myth, but e.g. in *Isthm.* 4. 63, he substitutes it with a more decent variant without mentioning the alternative one. Chuvin 1995, 125–126 underlines on this point that Pindar might have been consciously omitting shocking details more frequently than we can recognize with certainty. – An extant fragment (fr. incert. 157 S–M: ὁ γὰρ Πίνδαρος διαλεγόμενον παράγων τὸν Σεληνὸν τῷ Ὀλύμπῳ τοιούτους αὐτῷ περιέθηκε λόγους / ὃ τάλας ἐφάμερε, νήπια βάζεις / χρήματά μοι διακομπέων) proves that Pindar had heard of Olympus and probably of Marsyas (if it is he who is called Σεληνός), but does not enable us to understand what exactly he had heard.

here. However, Pindar evidently relies on his audience's familiarity with the legend of Athena inventing the aulos. It is no mere chance that he does not offer a detailed narration³⁶ and even gives no explicit indication of the instrument's invention, but says that the goddess created a μέλος passing through bronze and reeds and called it the nome of many heads. Only the expression τέχνη, τάν ποτε Παλλὰς ἐφεῦρε (v. 6–7) can imply αὐλητική τέχνη as a whole, but even this is debatable, since (a) the meaning 'work of art' is evidenced for the word τέχνη,³⁷ and (b) a more special 'art' could be implied, such as that of performing the many-headed nome or συριγμός – a special effect in aulos playing (Poll. 4. 83, Xen. *Symp.* 6. 5), most probably suitable for imitating hissing. To my mind, it would be odd of Pindar to assert that Athena designed the new instrument capable of producing all kinds of sounds³⁸ only to imitate the terrible wailing of the gorgons. At most it can be argued that the poet implied two inventions made in succession: observing Perseus' feat, Athena conceived both the aulos and one of the pieces for it.³⁹ The text of the epinician allows no definite solution of this problem, which itself proves that in the twelfth Pythian ode Pindar was not interested in giving a general view of how the aulos and the art of playing it were invented.

Likewise, in this ode the poet was evidently less concerned about the heroic deed of Perseus than about inventing the many-headed tune. More lines are dedicated to the nome (14: v. 6–10 and 19–27) than to Perseus'

³⁶ See Wüst 1967, 85–87 for a detailed analysis of references to the myths known to everyone (as contrasted to the narration of a new legend) in *Pyth.* 12.

³⁷ LSJ s.v. τέχνη IV: = τέχνημα 'work of art', 'handwork': Soph. *OC* 472 (κρατῆρές εἰσιν, ἀνδρὸς εὐχειρος τέχνη); fr. 156 *TrGF* (ὁ δ' ἐνθ' ὅπλοις ἀρρῶξιν Ἥφαιστου τέχνη).

³⁸ Pind. *Pyth.* 12. 19 αὐλῶν πάμφωνον μέλος, cf. *Ol.* 7. 12 παμφώνοισι τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν, *Isthm.* 5. 27 ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὁμοκλαῖς.

³⁹ This is the interpretation preferred by most scholars. Dissen 1847, 371; 373 (cantum); 374 (tibiam); Gildersleeve 1885, 364; 365; Graf 1889, 6 ("primus igitur tibiarum cantus est nomus polycephalus"); Guhrauer 1890, 440; Christ 1896, 231; Schroeder 1922, 110 ("die Erfindung des νόμος πολυκέφαλος"); 112 ("der neuen Flötenweise"); 113 ("die Kunst", sc. Flötenspiel); Farnell 1932, 234; Dornseiff 1933, 27; Gamba 1938, 236; Wegner 1949, 154; Burton 1962, 26 ("melody"); 27; 28 ("the art"); Wüst 1967, 78–79, 88; Frontisi-Ducroux 1994, 240; 257; Angeli Bernardini 1995, 309–310; Chuvin 1995, 121 ("On ne peut pas, me semble-t-il, dissocier la flute et l'art du flûtiste. Seulement Pindare a voulu insister ici sur le jeu et non sur l'assemblage de l'instrument. Mais il s'agit bien de la première apparition de l'aulos parmi les hommes, sur une mélodie particulière"). Cf. a compromising proposal (Pöhlmann 2010–2011, 281): "Pindar's ode ... attributes to the goddess the invention of imitative aulos-playing".

story (8: v. 11–18). Addressing the well-known myth of Perseus, Pindar merely reminds the listeners of the familiar plot with several vivid details, as is typical of him.⁴⁰ Meanwhile, he gives a consecutive and extensive account of the invention of the νόμος πολυκέφαλος, which makes one suppose that *this* story was not common knowledge.

Thus, Pindar cited a myth of Athena helping Perseus to defeat the gorgons and at the same time knew her as the inventor of the aulos. I believe that the legend of composing the many-headed nome was his own creation.⁴¹ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff finds it uncharacteristic of Pindar to invent new mythical stories – rather, he could insert a new detail, a variation.⁴² This is true, but here we are not dealing with a completely new story. Pindar only had to connect two existing myths adding a single peculiarity: watching Perseus' feat inclined Athena toward music-making.⁴³ Moreover, the poet had evident reasons to recollect both myths:⁴⁴ in an ode in honour of Midas the aulos player, it was natural to mention that his art was granted to mankind by Athena; as for Perseus defeating the gorgons, his story formed the plot of the many-headed nome – a piece that Midas most probably performed.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Burton 1962, 28; Wüst 1967, 72; Papadopoulou-Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 39. Cf. Schadewaldt 1928, 308 n. 1 (on the ring composition in *Pyth.* 12): “Pindar geht zunächst zum Wichtigsten, demjenigen was seinem Zwecke am nächsten liegt, gelangt von da aus Schritt für Schritt in den Bereich des Mythos hinein, und auf gleichem Wege wieder zu seinem Zweck zurück”.

⁴¹ The same is the opinion of Guhrer 1890, 440 (Pindar engaged in poetic license when saying that the many-headed nome was the first piece played by Athena); Wüst 1967, 82–87.

⁴² Wilamowitz 1922, 145: “Wäre Pindar ein Dichter wie Euripides, so könnte man ihm zutrauen, die Deutung aus der Perseussage selbst erfunden zu haben. Aber das lag ihm fern: wohl werden wir ihn wiederholt auf die Umänderung einer Genealogie oder einer Geschichte ertappen, aber dann macht er uns selbst darauf aufmerksam”.

⁴³ *Pyth.* 1. 1–24 can serve as a parallel: both Zeus' eagle and the music of Apollo and the Muses sounding at the Olympus are traditional images, but it must be Pindar's invention to make the eagle fall asleep at the sounds of Apollo's lyre.

⁴⁴ Wüst 1967, 86.

⁴⁵ Boeckh 1821, 345; 546; Dissen 1847, 371; 374; Guhrer 1890, 440; Christ 1896, 234; Wilamowitz 1922, 144 (“Es ist ein unmöglicher Einfall, daß er etwas anderes als diese Weise [sc. νόμος πολυκέφαλος] geblasen hätte; das ganze Gedicht würde sinnlos”; Gamba 1938, 237; Burton 1962, 26 (“We are nowhere told in the text that Midas won his victory for a performance of the νόμος πολυκέφαλος, but it gives more point to the poem to assume that this was the case”); Wüst 1967, 86; Gentili-Luisi 1995, 8; Angeli Bernardini 1995, 309–310.

III. Nonnus

It is natural to assume that Nonnus borrowed the myth of inventing the νόμος πολυκέφαλος from Pindar.⁴⁶ He calls the great Theban poet by name in *Dionys.* 25. 18–21, and several more passages probably based on Pindar's verse can be found in his work.⁴⁷ Mentions of the many-headed nome in both poets resemble each other so closely – and at the same time without parallels in other sources – that the connection between them is beyond doubt.

However, there is a nuance: Nonnus both times calls the aulos piece “Libyan” (40. 228 Λίβυν γόον, 24. 38 Λίβυν τύπον αὐλῶν), whereas in Pindar the nome passes through the reeds that grow in Boeotia, near Orchomenus, at Lake Copais. It must be admitted that Nonnus' epithet corresponds to the most common localization of the gorgons, Libya⁴⁸ (shared by Nonnus himself, *Dionys.* 25. 59; 30. 264; 31. 14), so it looks especially appropriate to the whole story (whereas the scholiast of Pindar has to invent the episode that Medusa's sisters pursued Perseus up to Boeotia, as he tries to explain the mention of Cephisis⁴⁹). Hence Wilamowitz concluded that Pindar and Nonnus had a common source: the story of creating the many-headed nome in Libya formed part of the Argive version of the Perseus myth, and Pindar slightly changed it to please his countrymen by making Boeotia the site of Athena's invention⁵⁰ (implying that the goddess left for Boeotia after helping Perseus to return safely from Libya to Seriphus).

⁴⁶ Farnell 1932, 234; Vivante 1990, 125.

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Chuvin 1992, 64 n. 36; Gigli Piccardi 2006, 49–50.

⁴⁸ The gorgons are located in Libya in Hdt. 2. 91. 6; Aesch. *Phorcydes* fr. 262 *TrGF*; Eur. *Bacch.* 991; Aristoph. *Ran.* 477; *Sch. Pind. Pyth.* 10. 72 b; Diod. Sic. 3. 55. 3; Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1513–1517 with *sch.* 1515 a; Lucian. *Dial. mar.* 14. 2; on some vases beginning from the 5th century BC, the gorgons have Negroid features: Attic white ground pyxis, Paris, Louvre MNB 1286, 460–450 BC; Attic red-figure crater, Catania, Museo Biscari 1677, ca. 460 BC (Serfontein 1991, cat. nos. 14; 21). Otherwise, they are sometimes placed in the West, at the Ocean (*Cypria* fr. 32 Bernabé; Hes. *Th.* 274–275, 282; Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3 F 11 ap. *sch. Ap. Rhod.* 4, 1515a; Ps.-Apollod. 1. 39; Q. Smyrn. 10. 195; Strab. 7. 6. 3 p. 299), or in the Northeast (Aesch. *PV* 790–800, cf. Perseus visiting the Hyperboreans during his journey to the gorgons in *Pind. Pyth.* 10. 45).

⁴⁹ *Sch. Pind. Pyth.* 12. 31, p. 267. 19 Dr.: ἐπεδίωξαν γὰρ τὸν Περσέα μέχρι Βοιωτίας.

⁵⁰ Wilamowitz 1922, 145.

However, this point is arguable. It should be specified that in *Pyth.* 12 there is actually no statement that Athena's invention took place in Boeotia.⁵¹ The poet only makes it clear that, since mortal men obtained the νόμος πολυκέφαλος, they performed it at the contests using bronze and Boeotian reeds. Likewise, the characteristic of the nome as an agonistic piece (μναστήρ ἀγώνων, v. 24)⁵² is of course no reason to imagine that Athena herself had ever competed in aulos playing. A conclusion that, according to Pindar, the goddess invented the aulos near Orchomenus does not look better founded.

As for Nonnus, in both passages he calls the tune, not the instrument, "Libyan", which makes perfect sense since it imitated the wailing of the Libyan gorgons. Such a geographical indication is absent from Pindar's ode, but nor does the ode contradict the Libyan location. Moreover, Nonnus both times combines this characteristic of the nome with defining the aulos itself as Phrygian (Βερέκυντες αὐλοὶ *Dionys.* 40. 227; Μυγδόνες αὐλοὶ 24. 35).⁵³ These epithets might be seen as referring to the myth that this instrument was invented in Phrygia, but not necessarily. Nonnus is not consistent on this point. In 41. 374 he ascribes the invention to Hyagnis only; however, he also knows of Marsyas (son of Hyagnis, 10. 232–233), who was flayed by Apollo (1. 39–44; 10. 233)

⁵¹ Cf. Schauenburg 1958, 42 n. 2: "Wenn das Ereignis [sc. inventing the aulos] lokalisiert wird, dann meist in Phrygien <...>. Pindar verlegt es dagegen nach Libyen". – In *Dionys.* 13. 77–78, Nonnus explained the name of the Boeotian town of Mycalessus as an onomatopoeic imitation of Euriale's howling (Γραΐης θ' ἱερὸν ἄστν καὶ εὐρυχόρου Μυκαλησσοῦ, / Εὐρύαλης μίμημα φερώνυμον ἀνθερεῶνος). Chuvín 1995, 124 indicates this passage as a borrowing from Pindar, arguing that only in Pindar did the gorgons chase Perseus up to Boeotia. However, a notion that the pursuit took place over continental Greece as well had probably existed independently of Pindar and was not connected with aulos playing: Ctesias derives the name of Μυκῆναι from the μυκηθμός of the gorgons who followed Perseus up to that city (Κτησίας Ἐφέσιος ἐν α' Περσηίδος, ap. Ps.-Plut. *De fluv.* 18. 6, 1161 C).

⁵² The meaning of μναστήρ in this passage is 'one who records, cures, considers', cf. *Nem.* 1. 16 (πολέμον μναστήρα ... λαόν); *Isthm.* 2. 5 (Ἀφροδίτας ... μνάστειραν ... ὁπώραν); fr. 20 Snell (ἀγών ... μναστήρ στεφάνων). The meaning 'suitor', which also occurs in Pindar (*Ol.* 1. 80; *Pyth.* 9. 106), is less suitable.

⁵³ 'Mygdonian' (25 cases in Nonnus) and 'Berecynthian' (5 cases in Nonnus, among them *Dionys.* 13. 508 and 20. 305 referring to the aulos) are diffused poetic epithets indicating 'Phrygian' and, interchangeably, 'Lydian' (for the former, see *Il.* 3. 186 mentioning Mygdon, a Phrygian ally of Priam, and Paus. 10. 27. 1; for the latter, Strab. 10. 3. 12; 12. 8. 21): Chuvín 1992, 100.

for playing “the aulos of Athena” (10. 234), but still affirms elsewhere (24. 35–38) that Athena would be upset by the burning of the reeds used for aulos making. Evidently, neither variant of the “Phrygian” legend (with or without Athena) is compatible with the story of the goddess inventing the νόμος πολυκέφαλος. It follows that Nonnus rather used the “geographical” characteristics of the aulos mechanically, as traditional *epitheta ornantia*⁵⁴ that could imply that the instrument was popular in the said region, or historically associated with it, or simply made there (the last option fits well the aulos players accompanying Dionysus, who was brought up in Phrygia). Nonnus’ acquaintance with the old poetic tradition is a sufficient explanation why he used this specification of the aulos.

Therefore, the two poets do not contradict each other about the place of invention, since neither of them actually indicates it. Instead, an additional argument for Nonnus depending on Pindar can be offered: it seems that his idea of the νόμος πολυκέφαλος is based on misinterpretation of the twelfth Pythian ode. By the lifetime of Nonnus, classical nomes had long since vanished. He imagines the many-headed nome as entirely mourning music, which to my mind is erroneous. First, this was a piece performed at the contests of aulos players, most probably including the Pythian games, and a pure lament would be inappropriate for such a performance model.⁵⁵ Second, its entirely mournful character is disproved by a parallel with the Pythian nome,⁵⁶ which also depicted hissing in a scene of Python’s agony, but nevertheless reproduced the whole story of Apollo’s combat with the monster and ended with celebrating the victory of the god. Third, grieving gorgons (as well as expiring Python) could hardly have stirred compassion in the audience.⁵⁷ If there had existed a myth previous to Pindar, it could not have described νόμος πολυκέφαλος as exemplary mourning. However, it is clear how such an idea occurred to Nonnus

⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. Strab. 10. 3. 17, p. 471 (...ὁ δὲ τοὺς αὐλοὺς Βερεκυντίους καλεῖ καὶ Φρυγίους) and *Berecynthia tibia* in Hor. *Carm.* 3. 19. 18–19; 4. 1. 22–23; Ov. *Met.* 11. 16; *Fast.* 4. 181.

⁵⁵ Cf. the embarrassment expressed on this point by Farnell 1932, 234. The inappropriateness of lamenting music to the contests is confirmed by a report in Pausanias (10. 7. 5–6, probably not true, see West 1974, 5) on how αὐλοδία, which was allegedly of mournful nature, was excluded from the program of the Pythian games.

⁵⁶ See above n. 28.

⁵⁷ Cf. Pozdnev 2007 [M. M. Позднев, “Об одном мотиве застольной поэзии: Theogn. 1041 sq.”], 28: “Νόμος πολυκέφαλος вызывал какие угодно чувства, кроме скорби”.

while reading the twelfth Pythian ode: it is said twice there that Athena was inspired by the wailing (θρῆνος, γόος) of the gorgons. Actually, Pindar's attention to this detail can be explained by admitting that the mimicry of sounds produced by the gorgons and the serpents on their heads formed the most impressive element of the nome⁵⁸ and the reason for giving it a name.⁵⁹

IV. The “Libyan Lotus”

The hypothesis that Pindar already knew a myth that located the invention of the aulos in Libya linking it with the victory over the gorgons was advanced by A. Barker, as well.⁶⁰ Unlike Wilamowitz, he did not take Nonnus into consideration, but proceeded instead from the fact that the aulos is called the “Libyan lotus” in poetry and its explanation by Duris of Samos. However, I shall try to demonstrate that the poetic epithet could arise regardless of the gorgons' story and on the whole irrespectively of mythology, whereas the words of Duris are rather an argument against the existence of a “Libyan” version of the myth.

In the cases of Λιβυς λωτός referring to the aulos, λωτός is apparently not a lotus flower, but a tree identified with *Zizyphus lotus*, one of several species of the plant called jujube in the buckthorn family (*Rhamnaceae*).⁶¹ According to Theophrastus, it thrives in Libya (*Hist. plant.* 4. 3. 1 Ἐν Λιβύῃ δὲ ὁ λωτὸς πλεῖστος καὶ κάλλιστος), and its wood, dark, solid and beautiful (4. 2. 5), is used to make auloi, statues, furniture, and many other things (4. 3. 4 τῷ ξύλῳ δὲ [sc. χρῆσθαι] εἰς τε τοὺς αὐλοὺς καὶ εἰς ἄλλα πλείω; 4. 2. 5 ὁ λωτὸς, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ κλινία καὶ τραπέζια καὶ τὰλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιοῦσιν).

In the texts at our disposal, the association of the wind instrument with the lotus occurs for the first time in Pindar (*Parth.* 2, fr. 94 b, 14 S.–M.: αὐλίσκων ὕπο λωτίνων).⁶² It then proves to be Euripides' favourite way

⁵⁸ Guhrer 1890, 442; id. 1904, 8: “pièce de résistance”; Pöhlmann 1960, 71: “Glanzstück der Tonmalerei des Nomos”.

⁵⁹ Christ 1896, 234; Guhrer 1904, 441–442; Gamba 1938, 239. Pindar himself apparently follows this explanation of the name πολυκέφαλος.

⁶⁰ Barker 2018, esp. 10.

⁶¹ https://uses.plantnet-project.org/fr/Noms_grecs_de_Théophraste (consulted 08.03.2022).

⁶² This passage slipped the attention of A. Barker, who considered it important for his argument that Euripides was the first to call the aulos the “Libyan lotus” (Barker 2018, 3–4).

of naming the aulos over the entire course of his career (13 cases): he uses Λίβυς λωτός 4 times (*Tro.* 544, *Hel.* 170, *IA* 1036, *Erecht.* fr. 370, 8 K.); simply λωτός 7 times (*HF* 11, *Heracl.* 892–893, *El.* 716, *Phoen.* 787, *Ba.* 160 and 587, *IA* 438); Λίβυς αὐλός 2 times (*Alc.* 346–347, *HF* 684), whereas αὐλός without a geographical specification occurs 6 times (*Alc.* 430, *Tro.* 126, *Ion* 108, *Hel.* 1351, *Ba.* 380, *Oedip.* fr. 556. 2 *TrGF*), and Φρύγιος αὐλός 2 times (*Ba.* 127–128, *IA* 576–577). As proved by Barker, neither the qualities nor the occasions of performance distinguish λωτός from a common aulos in poetry; moreover, in Eur. *Tro.* 544–545, the “Libyan lotus” accompanies the “Phrygian songs” (Λίβυς τε λωτὸς ἐκτύπει / Φρύγιά τε μέλεα).⁶³ After Euripides, this definition was still current: it occurs in Delphic paeans to Apollo (Athenaeus, 138 BC – λωτὸς βρέμων αἰόλοις μ[έ]λεσιν;⁶⁴ Limenius, 128 BC – Λίβυς ... [λωτός?]⁶⁵), ten times in *Anthologia Palatina* (only λωτός/λωτοί, two times with a reference to the story of Athena and Marsyas),⁶⁶ in Hermesianax (λωτός: fr. 7. 37; 70 *CA*, ap. Athen. 13. 71, 597–598), in Orphic poetry (λωτοί: Orph. *Arg.* 1286), and finally in Nonnus, who is similar to Euripides in mixing the Libyan and the Phrygian together, as he mentions an aulos (*Dionys.* 15. 58–59: someone put λωτόν to his lips and played ἀρμονίην ... Μυγδόνοσ αὐλοῦ).⁶⁷

The simplest and most plausible explanation of this poetic word usage is to suppose that it reflects the realities of everyday life: auloi can be made from the lotus tree (through an analogous metonymy, syrinx is called [Πανὸς] κάλαμος/κάλαμοι, Eur. *IT* 1126, *El.* 702, and the cymbals, χαλκός, Eur. *Hel.* 1346⁶⁸), and the best lotus comes from Libya’s Cyrenaic region (Theophr. *Hist. plant.* 4. 3. 4: ξύλον δὲ κάλλιον

⁶³ Barker 2018, 4–5.

⁶⁴ Pöhlmann–West 2001 (= *DAGM*), no. 20 = Furley–Bremer 2001, II, 85–86 v. 12.

⁶⁵ *DAGM* no. 21 = Furley–Bremer 2001, II, 92–94 v. 13.

⁶⁶ *AG* 6. 94. 4 λωτούς and 9. 253. 4 λωτοῖς (Philippus of Thessalonica); 7. 182. 4 λωτοί (Meleager); 7. 186. 2 λωτός (Philippus); 7. 223. 3 λωτῶ (Thyillus); 9. 266. 1 λωτῶν and 16. 220. 1 λωτούς (Antipater); 9. 409. 1 λωτοῦ (Antiphanes); 9. 517. 3–4 λωτούς (Antipater of Thessalonica: οὐ κεν Ἀθήνη / ἔρριπεν λωτούς τοῖα μελιζομένη); 16. 8. 7 λωτοί (Alcaeus, cf. 1–4: the satyr will never more take Τριτωνίδος ἔργον Ἀθάνας into his hands).

⁶⁷ Cf. *Dionys.* 10. 230–233 (as Ampelus played αὐλὸν ... Λιβυστίδος ὄργανον ἡχοῦς, Dionysus imagined hearing Marsyas, “Mygdonian aulos player, son of Hyagnis”) and both Nonnus’ passages dealing with the many-headed nome (*Dionys.* 40. 227 and 228; 24. 35 and 38: playing a Libyan lament on a Phrygian instrument).

⁶⁸ Barker 2018, 3.

τὸ ἐν τῇ Κυρηναίᾳ). It does not seem coincidental that no poet connected the definition of the aulos as a Libyan lotus with a hint at its mythological justification, whereas its combination with a reference to Marsyas the Phrygian is possible.

Thus, calling the aulos Λίβυς λωτός does not prove that there was a story that localized its invention in Libya. Yet, I must admit, nor does it exclude its existence, and, in fact, two sources demonstrate that such an idea occurred to ancient commentators while resolving the same problem as concerns us here: explaining a popular poetic epithet of the aulos.

The scholia on Euripides propose two explanations of this definition: either the aulos is made of the Libyan lotus (of which the scholiast did not have a clear idea, since he wrote λωτίνων καλάμων), or it was invented in Libya.⁶⁹ Hesitation between two versions seems to show that the African origin of the aulos was at least not a firmly established belief – rather, it looks like an *autoschediasma*.

On the same occasion, Duris of Samos (late fourth or early third century) gives a unique version of the instrument's origin (Duris *FGrHist* 76 F 16 ap. Athen. 14. 9. 618 b–c⁷⁰):

“Λίβυν δὲ τὸν αὐλὸν προσαγορεύουσιν οἱ ποιηταί”, φησὶ Δοῦρις ἐν β’ τῶν περὶ Ἀγαθοκλέα, “ἐπειδὴ Σειρίτης δοκεῖ πρῶτος εὐρεῖν τὴν αὐλητικὴν, Λίβυς ὢν τῶν Νομάδων, ὃς καὶ κατηύλησεν τὰ μητρῶα πρῶτος”.

“The poets call the aulos Libyan”, says Duris in the second book about Agathocles, “because the first inventor of aulos playing seems to be Seirites, a Libyan, one of the Nomades, who was also the first to play the hymns to the Mother on the aulos”.

If a myth of Athena inventing the aulos in Libya was current, it would perfectly suit Duris to back up his claim.⁷¹ Instead, he ascribed the creation of a Libyan instrument to a local man (most probably contrived

⁶⁹ *Sch. Eur. Alc.* 346: Λίβυν τὸν αὐλὸν φησιν· ἐκ γὰρ τῶν ἐν Λιβύῃ λωτίνων λεγομένων καλάμων ὁ αὐλὸς γίνεται. ἢ ὅτι ἐπὶ Τρίτωνι, τῷ ποταμῷ τῆς Λιβύης, εὐρέθη.

⁷⁰ Athenaeus is further cited by Eustath. *Comm. ad Hom. Il.* 4, p. 502. 14–15.

⁷¹ Discussing poetry, Duris probably would not mind speaking of a supernatural being as the inventor of the instrument. Cf. mythological subjects he treats in the same work, *FGrHist* 76 F 17 and 21.

by Duris himself⁷²), and in doing so he plainly had Seirites substitute for one of the Phrygian *πρῶτοι εὐρεταί*, rather than Athena: the Great Mother is apparently a Phrygian goddess, and *μητρῶα* are regularly associated with the Phrygians in the extant tradition⁷³ – their author is said to be Marsyas (Paus. 10. 30. 9), Olympus (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 19. 1137 d; 29. 1141 b) or Hyagnis (*Marm. Par.* A 10. 20). Therefore, the very fact that Duris resorted to a “Phrygian” myth, as he created his *ad hoc* explanation, proves that he had no “Libyan” myth about the invention of the aulos (and still less of the many-headed nome) at his disposal.⁷⁴

In an etiological myth that ascribed the creation of the aulos to Athena, there could be no localization at all, and if there was one, it was probably the most variable part of the legend: any place associated with Athena and/or raising material of high quality for aulos making would do. Localization at Lake Copais would be a natural choice, since the best reeds were known to grow there (Theophr. *Hist. plant.* 4. 10. 1; 11. 8–9). It is possible (even if not as evident as sometimes claimed) that this myth was a Boeotian invention.⁷⁵ Some scholars supposed that the local school of aulos players considered Athena their patron goddess,⁷⁶ although evidence to back up this hypothesis is not profuse.⁷⁷ As we

⁷² Σερίτης does not occur elsewhere as a name of a person, but the land of Seir (Σηίρ, in the Sinai Peninsula and not in Libya) is mentioned several times in the *Old Testament* (*Gen.* 14:6 et al.), so, according to Barker 2018, 7, Duris could make the personal name Σερίτης out of an ethnonym. The exoticism of this name suggests that it was an *ad hoc* fabrication.

⁷³ Barker 2018, 7–8.

⁷⁴ Interestingly, one more historian, Dionysius Scytobrachion from Alexandria (ap. Diod. Sic. 3. 52–74), probably a contemporary of Duris (Barker 2018, 11: judging by *PHib* 2. 186, some of Dionysius’ work was written not later than the mid-third century BC, whereas Duris died ca. 260 BC), is known to transfer to Libya achievements commonly located elsewhere. He took it upon himself to compose the history of Libya by reinterpreting myths, and there are some tales closely associated with Phrygia (the ones dealing with the Argonauts, the Amazons, Dionysus, and the Great Mother) that he transferred to North Africa and ascribed to the Atlanteans, whom he placed in the West of Libya, close to the gorgons. In particular, he interweaved the Mother of Gods with a Phrygian (according to his own words) story of Athena, Marsyas, and Apollo (Diod. Sic. 3. 58–59). See Barker 2018, 10–12.

⁷⁵ Böttiger 1837, 16; Gruppe 1906, 278–279; Reinach 1912, 390; Farnell 1932, 234; Bowra 1964, 285; Wüst 1967, 82.

⁷⁶ Farnell 1896, 315–316; Schroeder 1904, 320; Angeli Bernardini 1995, 310.

⁷⁷ Van Keer 2004, 25 draws attention to the fact that Athena is never shown playing the aulos in Boeotian visual arts.

have already seen, two of the three authors who have Athena practice aulos playing are Boeotians: Pindar and Corinna.⁷⁸ Besides, Βομβυλεία, a Boeotian epiclesis of the goddess (Hesych. β 791 s. v.), could be related to the sounds of wind instruments.⁷⁹ Karl Otfried Müller⁸⁰ argued that the mythical tie of Athena to Lake Tritonis was of Boeotian origin: initially the goddess was associated with the river Triton, which empties into Lake Copais, and later this association was transferred to the Tritonis in Libya. In this case, mentioning Boeotia in the twelfth Pythian (if one admits that it had anything to do with localizing Athena's invention altogether) would not mean that Pindar changed the myth for patriotic reasons, but, on the contrary, that on this point he followed a legend native to his homeland – however, this legend dealt with the invention of the aulos and not of the many-headed nome.

Even if we assume that, in a myth earlier than Pindar, the invention of the aulos by Athena took place in Libya (an admission rendered improbable by Duris' *modus operandi*, as argued above), enough reasons for this idea can be given without resorting to the alleged association with the gorgons: Libya was famous for the lotus tree, and Athena was traditionally connected with Libya, particularly with the surroundings of the Τριτωνίς λίμνη (Hdt. 4. 188–189; Paus. 1. 14. 6; 2. 21. 6; Hesych. τ 1444 s.v. Τριτογενής; cf. Nonn. *Dionys.* 13. 345: Λιβυστίδος ... Ἀθήνης).⁸¹

Thus, we have no grounds to assume that some source before Pindar ascribed the invention of the many-headed nome to Athena as a witness of the event it reproduced, that is, slaying Medusa. This was likely Pindar's own addition to the myth of Athena inventing the aulos, and Nonnus later borrowed this detail from the twelfth Pythian ode.⁸²

Nina Almazova

Saint Petersburg State University

n.almazova@spbu.ru

⁷⁸ Occurrence of this myth in Boeotia does not exclude its being known in other regions of Greece, in particular in Sicily, the native land of Epicharmus and Midas.

⁷⁹ Farnell 1896, 315; id. 1932, 234. However, this epiclesis is connected with the name of a Boeotian town in *Sch. Lycophr.* 786 (Βομβυλία δὲ καὶ Βομβύλιον πόλις καὶ ὄρος Βοιωτίας ... τιμᾶται δὲ ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ Βομβυλεία).

⁸⁰ Müller 1844, 349–350.

⁸¹ Cf. Claud. *In Eutrop.* 20. 255–256: *Libycis iactata paludibus olim / tibia.*

⁸² I am grateful to Prof. A. Verlinsky for helpful discussion.

Bibliography

- P. Angeli Bernardini, "Pitica XII" [introduction and commentary], in: B. Gentili, P. Angeli Bernardini, E. Cingano, P. Giannini (eds.), *Pindaro. Le Pitiche* (Milan 1995) 307–323; 671–684.
- A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings. I. The Musician and his Art* (Cambridge 1984).
- A. Barker, "Migrating Musical Myths. The Case of the Libyan Aulos", *GRMS* 6 (2018) 1–13.
- J. Boardman, "Some Attic Fragments: Pot, Plaque, and Dithyramb", *JHS* 76 (1956) 18–25.
- A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt* II, 2 (Leipzig 1821).
- C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964).
- K. Böttiger, "Pallas Musica und Apollo, der Marsyasstödtter" [1796], in: J. Sillig (ed.), *C. A. Böttiger's kleine Schriften archäologischen und antiquarischen Inhalts I* (Dresden–Leipzig 1837) 3–60.
- G. Burckhardt, "Marsyas 6", *RE* 14 (1930) 1986–1995.
- R. W. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes, Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford 1962).
- W. von Christ, *Pindari Carmina, prolegomenis et commentariis instructa* (Lipsiae 1896).
- P. Chuvin, *Mythologie et géographie dionysiaque. Recherches sur l'œuvre de Nonnos de Panopolis*, Vates 2 (Adosa 1992).
- P. Chuvin, "Un éloge paradoxal de l'aulos dans la douzième Pythique", in: L. Dubois (ed.), *Poésie et lyrique antiques. Actes du colloque organisé par Claude Meillier à l'Université Charles-de-Gaulle Lille III du 2 au 4 juin 1993* (Villeneuve d'Ascq 1995) 119–127.
- N. Demand, *Thebes in the Fifth Century. Herakles Resurgent* (London 1983).
- L. Dissen (ed.), *Pindari carmina quae supersunt cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis*. Editio altera auctior et emendatio. Curavit F. G. Schadewaldt. Sect. 2. *Commentarium* (Gothae–Erfordiae 1847).
- F. Dornseiff, *Die archaische Mythen-erzählung* (Berlin–Leipzig 1933).
- L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States I* (Oxford 1896).
- L. R. Farnell, *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar* (London 1932 [repr. Amsterdam 1965]) 233–236.
- F. Frontisi-Ducroux, "Athéna et l'invention de la flûte", *Musica e Storia* 2 (1994) 239–267.
- W. D. Furley, J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns I–II* (Tübingen 2001).
- O. Gamba, "Il nomos policefalo", *Dioniso* 6 (1938) 235–252.
- H. W. Garrod, "The Hyporcheme of Pratinas", *CR* 34: 7/8 (1920) 129–136.
- B. Gentili, F. Luisi, "La Pitica 12 di Pindaro e l'aulo di Mida", *QUCC* 49 (1995) 7–31.
- D. Gigli Piccardi (ed.), *Nonno di Panopoli. Le Dionisiache, introduzione, traduzione e commento, vol. i: canti i–xii, testo greco a fronte*, BUR-Classici greci e latini (Milano 2006 [2003]).
- B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, with an Introduction, Essay, Notes, and Indexes (London 1885).

- E. Graf, *De Graecorum veterum re musica quaestionum capita duo*. Diss. (Marburg 1889).
- O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* I (München 1906).
- H. Guhrauer, “Νόμος πολυκέφαλος”, *Verhandlungen der 40. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Görlitz vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1889* (Leipzig 1890) 438–445.
- H. Guhrauer, “Altgriechische Program-Musik”, *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Programm des Melanchton-Gymnasiums* (Wittenberg 1904).
- G. F. Held, “Weaving and Triumphal Shouting in Pindar, Pythian 12.6–12”, *CQ* 48: 2 (1998) 380–388.
- H. Huchzermeyer, *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit* (Emsdetten 1931).
- P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Paris–Louvain 1993).
- O. Jessen, “Marsyas”, in: W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* II. 2 (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1993 [Leipzig ¹1894–1897]) 2439–2460.
- I. Kasper-Butz, *Die Göttin Athena im klassischen Athen: Athena als Repräsentantin des demokratischen Staates* (Frankfurt a. M. 1990).
- R. Keydell (ed.), *Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca* I–II (Berlin 1959).
- A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar. Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 12 (Berlin – New York 1971).
- A. Köhnken, “Perseus’ Kampf und Athenes Erfindung (Bemerkungen zu Pindar, Pythien 12)”, *Hermes* 104 (1976) 257–265.
- A. Köhnken, “Two Notes on Pindar”, *BICS* 25 (1978) 92–96.
- I. Krauskopf, “Gorgo, gorgones”, *LIMC* IV. 1 (Zürich–München 1988) 285–330.
- E. Kuhnert, “Perseus”, in: Roscher W. H. (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* III. 2 (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1993 [Leipzig ¹1902–1909]) 1986–2060.
- F. Lasserre (ed.), *Plutarque. De la musique* (Olten–Lausanne 1954).
- P. A. LeVen, *The Many-Headed Muse. Tradition and Innovation in Late Classical Greek Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge 2014).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, “Problems of Early Greek Tragedy: Pratinas and Phrynichus” [1966], in: *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: the Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 1990) 225–237.
- K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos und die Minyer*. Zweiter, nach den Papieren des Verfassers berichtigte und vermehrte Ausgabe von F. W. Schneidewin (Breslau 1844).
- Z. Papadopoulou, V. Pirenne-Delforge, “Inventer et réinventer l’aulos : de la XIIe Pythique de Pindare”, in: P. Brule, C. Vendires (eds.), *Chanter les dieux: musique et religion dans l’antiquité grecque et romaine* (Rennes 2001) 37–58.
- T. Phillips, “Epinician Variations: Music and Text in Pindar, Pythians 2 and 12”, *CQ* 63: 1 (2013) 37–56.
- E. Pöhlmann, *Griechische Musikfragmente* (Nürnberg 1960).

- E. Pöhlmann, “Pythikos and Polykephalos Nomos. Compulsory and Optional Exercise in the Pythian Contest”, in: D. Castaldo, F. G. Giannachi, A. Manieri (eds.), *Poetry, Music and Contests in Ancient Greece. Proceedings of the IVth International Meeting of MOISA* (Galatina 2012) = *Rudiae. Ricerche sul mondo classico* 22–23 (2010–2011) vol. I, 273–282.
- E. Pöhlmann, M. L. West (eds.), *Documents of Ancient Greek Music: The Extant Melodies and Fragments* (Oxford 2001).
- M. M. Pozdnev, “Ob odnom motive zastol’noj poezii: Theogn. 1041 sq.” [“A Motif of Symposial Poetry: Theogn. 1041 sq.”], *Phil. Class.* 7 (2007) 25–37.
- L. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie I. Theogonie und Götter*. Bearb. v. C. Robert (Berlin 41894).
- S. Radt, Rez.: Köhnken 1971, *Gnomon* 46 (1974) 112–121.
- S. Reinach, “Marsyas”, *Revue Archéologique* 19 (1912) 390–405.
- P. Roesch, “L’aulos et les aulètes en Béotie”, in: *Boiotika. Vorträge vom Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Prof. Dr. Siegfried Lauffer, 13–17 Juni 1986* (München 1989) 203–214.
- C. Romeo, “La testimonianza di Demetrio Lacone sul nomos pitico (PHerc. 1014 col. XLVIII)”, in: *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986* (Athens 1988a) 283–289.
- C. Romeo (ed.), *Demetrio Lacone. La Poesia (PHerc. 188 e 1014)*, La scuola di Epicuro 9 (Napoli 1988b).
- W. H. Roscher, “Athene”, in: W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie I. 1* (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1993a [Leipzig 1884–1886]) 675–687.
- W. H. Roscher, “Gorgones und Gorgo”, in: W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie I. 2* (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1993b [Leipzig 1884–1886]) 1695–1701.
- J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar including the Principal Fragments* (London 1915).
- W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*, Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse Jg. 5, Heft 3 (Halle 1928).
- K. Schauenburg, “Marsyas”, *MDAI (R)* 65 (1958) 42–66.
- O. Schroeder, “Πολυκέφαλος νόμος”, *Hermes* 39 (1904) 315–320.
- O. Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig–Berlin 1922).
- L. M. Semenchenko, “Marsij, Olimp, Giagnid i mif ob izobretenii avlosa” [“Marsyas, Olympos, Hyagnis, and the Myth of the Invention of the Aulos”], *VDI* 79: 4 (2019) 905–926.
- S. M. Serfontein, *Medusa: From Beast to Beauty in Archaic and Classical Illustrations from Greece and South Italy* (Hunter College of the City University of New York 1991). <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/4420426/medusa-from-beast-to-beauty-in-archaic-weltevreden> (consulted 15.09.2021).
- E. V. Shevtsova, “Pind. Pyth. 12, 9–12”, in: *Materialy XXXVII Mezhdunarodnoj filologicheskoy konferenzii. Klassicheskaja filologija. 11–15 marta 2008 g.* (St Petersburg 2008) 8–13.

- B. Snell, H. Maehler (eds.), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis I. Epinicia* (Leipzig 1987).
- D. Steiner, “The Gorgons’ Lament. Auletics, Poetics, and Chorality in Pindar’s Pythian 12”, *AJPh* 134 (2013) 173–208.
- M. C. Van der Kolf, *Quaeritur quomodo Pindarus fabulas tractaverit quidque in eis mutaverit* (Rotterdam 1924).
- E. Van Keer, “The Myth of Marsyas in Ancient Greek Art: Musical and Mythological Iconography”, *Music in Art* 29: 1–2 (2004) 20–37.
- J.-P. Vernant, “Death in the Eyes: Gorgo, Figure of the *Other*”, tr. Th. Curtley, revised and completed by F. I. Zeitlin, in: J.-P. Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals. Collected Essays* (Princeton 1991) 111–138 [original publication: J.-P. Vernant, *La mort dans les yeau. Figures de l’Autre en Grèce ancienne. Artémis, Gorgô* (Paris 1985)].
- P. Vivante, “Pindar Pythian XII”, in: A. Schachter (ed.), *Essays in the Topography, History and Culture of Boiotia*, Teiresias suppl. 3 (Montreal 1990) 125–127.
- R. W. Wallace, “An Early Fifth-Century Athenian Revolution in Aulos Music”, *HSCPh* 101 (2003) 73–92.
- M. Wegner, *Das Musikleben der Griechen* (Berlin 1949).
- A. Weis, “Marsyas I”, *LIMC* VI. 1 (1992) 366–378.
- M. L. West, *Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14 (Berlin – New York 1974).
- M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 1992).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).
- P. Wilson, “The *aulos* in Athens”, in: S. Goldhill, R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 58–95.
- E. Wüst, *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter. Interpretationen der 12 vor-sizilischen Siegeslieder, des 6. Pääns und der 10. Ol. Ode* (Pforzheim 1967).
- https://uses.plantnet-project.org/fr/Noms_grecs_de_Théophraste (consulted 08.03.2022).

Among extant sources, only Pindar (*Pyth.* 12) and, about 9 centuries later, Nonnus of Panopolis (*Dionys.* 40. 227–233; 24. 36–38) tell the story of the inventing of the many-headed nome (an instrumental aulos piece depicting with musical means the victory of Perseus over the gorgons): it is said to have been created by Athena to imitate the wailing of the gorgons over decapitated Medusa, of which she was an eyewitness. It is argued that Pindar himself was the author of this etiological legend: he proceeded from two already current myths, that of Perseus patronized by Athena and that of Athena inventing aulos playing, and combined them to please his client, Midas the aulos player, who most probably won the Pythian victory performing exactly the many-headed nome. Nonnus borrowed the myth from Pindar. Geographical specifications, which are different in Pindar and Nonnus, do not contradict this conclusion.

Только у Пиндара (*Pyth.* 12) и, примерно 900 лет спустя, у Нонна Панополи-танского (*Dionys.* XL, 227–233; XXIV, 36–38) можно найти мифическую историю создания многоглавого нoma (инструментального произведения для авла, изображавшего музыкальными средствами победу Персея над Медузой): его сложила Афина в подражание воплям горгон, на ее глазах потерявших сестру. В статье доказывается, что эту этиологическую легенду создал сам Пиндар на основе уже существовавших мифов о Персее и об изобретении авла Афиной, чтобы угодить клиенту – авлету Мидасу, который, скорей всего, одержал победу, играя именно многоглавый ном. Нонн же заимствовал ее у Пиндара. Наличие у двух поэтов не совпадающих географических отсылок не противоречит этому выводу.

Gauthier Liberman

PETITS RIENS SOPHOCLEÉENS : *ANTIGONE* III*
(v. 513, 517–521, 527–530, 577–581, 594–602, 611–619,
666–667, 696–698, 703–704, 728–730)

Av. ὅμαιμος ἐκ μιᾶς τε καὶ ταύτου πατρός. 513

Jebb considère l’authenticité du texte transmis comme certifiée par le parallèle platonicien qu’allègue Schneidewin, πολλοὶ ἀδελφοί που γένοιντ’ ἂν ἐνὸς ἀνδρός τε καὶ μιᾶς ὑεῖς (*Leg.* 627 c), mais l’usage sophocléen suggère que πατρός pourrait bien être, comme déjà Tournier¹ l’avait supposé, une glose substituée à γεγώς, que Sophocle met à la fin du vers, et là seul, quinze fois, et au moyen de quoi il aime exprimer la filiation. Le participe met vivement en relief la symétrie dans la dissymétrie de ἐκ μιᾶς τε καὶ ταύτου ; le passage de Platon diffère par le substantif et surtout par l’absence de la « uariatio » μιᾶς / ταύτου.

Av. οὐ γάρ τι δοῦλος, ἀλλ’ ἀδελφὸς ὄλετο.
Κρ. πορθῶν δὲ τήνδε γῆν· ὁ δ’ ἀντιστάς ὕπερ.
Av. ὅμως ὃ γ’ Αἰδῆς τοὺς νόμους τούτους ποθεῖ.
Κρ. ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὁ χρηστὸς τῷ κακῷ λαχεῖν ἴσος. 520
Av. τίς οἶδεν εἰ κάτω ’στιν εὐαγὴ τάδε;

518 δὲ¹ LR : γε cett. || 519 τούτους] ἴσους L^{yp} || 520 λαχεῖν] λαβεῖν **zt** |
ἴσος LSVRa : ἴσον **zt**.

Griffith (après Seyffert 1865 et Lloyd-Jones–Wilson²) paraît défendre justement ἴσος (v. 520), « mais il ne se peut que le bon soit égal au mauvais quant à l’obtention <de ce que les lois prescrivent de donner aux morts> »,³ contre le faiblard et oiseux ἴσους sc. νόμους ποθεῖ (Nauck)

* *Hyperboreus* 28 : 1 (2022) 29–52; 28 : 2 (2022) 203–227.

¹ Tournier 1875, 49 n. 121.

² Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 126.

³ Usage sophocléen de l’infinitif « limitatif » : voir Wunder 1846 au v. 439 ; Moorhouse 1982, 239. Le passage ne se trouve pas (nous verrons pourquoi) dans les chapitres riches mais mal distribués que Bruhn 1899, 67–73 consacre à l’infinitif.

adopté par Jebb, « but the good man does not (desire) to receive only the same rights as the wicked ». Le changement de sujet de ποθεῖ est problématique.⁴ Le vers précédent fait difficulté : « none the less, Hades at least craves these rites (sc. 'for everyone') ». L'élément à mon avis capital « pour tous » ou un équivalent devrait figurer dans le texte et non seulement dans l'exégèse. La variante (L^{7p}) τοὺς νόμους ἴσους, adoptée par Brunck 1788 et Erfurdt 1809 mais rejetée par Schneider 1826, Hermann 1830 et Seyffert 1865, est certainement une correction (Schneider) et, à mon avis, une correction insatisfaisante, malgré le *topos* de l'« isotimie infernale », que fait valoir Erfurdt. La conjecture κοινοὺς (Seyffert) paraît souffrir du même défaut que ἴσους : elle formule maladroitement, me semble-t-il, une idée juste et nécessaire. L'adjectif (ἴσους ou κοινοὺς) ne devrait-il pas être intercalé entre l'article et le substantif ? « What matters to her is the duty to a brother, not an equal duty to both brothers », dit justement Ehrenberg,⁵ qui défend τοὐτοὺς sans suppléer « for everyone ». Mais, sans la notion de validité universelle des « nomoi », la phrase ne se tient pas : s'il ne s'agissait que d'exprimer une nouvelle fois les obligations d'Antigone à l'égard de Polynice, Sophocle se serait exprimé d'une manière toute différente. La réflexion d'Ehrenberg met en relief un défaut de ἴσους, qui, dans le contexte, peut paraître ambigu et n'exprime pas assez clairement l'idée de validité universelle.⁶ C'est elle en effet qu'Antigone, qui a fait valoir (v. 513) les obligations des liens du « sang », oppose maintenant à Créon. La jeune femme met

⁴ Bruhn 1913 lit d'après Bergk ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ χρηστὸς τῷ κακῷ λαχεῖν ἴσα (sc. ποθεῖ), texte et interprétation contre lesquels vaut la critique formulée contre la correction λαχεῖν ἴσους. Cette objection ne vaut pas contre le texte conjectural de Dawe (cf. Dawe 2007, 357–358), ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ χρηστὸν τῷ κακῷ λαχεῖν ἴσα (sc. ὁ Ἄιδης ποθεῖ). Mais la réponse de Créon est plus forte s'il affirme le principe « le bon et le méchant n'ont pas les mêmes droits » sans le présenter comme une exigence de l'Hadès. En effet, si je ne m'abuse, la réponse d'Antigone (521) a plus de force si elle oppose encore une fois (cf. 519) l'exigence de l'Hadès à Créon, qui l'ignore.

⁵ Ehrenberg 1954, 29. La correction de Semitelos (précédé par Wex 1829, 181) vantée par West 1981, 526, ὁμοὺς (« potuit ὁμῶς » West) ὁ γ' Ἄιδης τοὺς νόμους τοῦτοις ποθεῖ, se heurte à cette objection.

⁶ « Das Gesetz der Toten und damit das Grundgesetz der Lebenden », selon la formule de Heidegger 1993, 126. « Ein Gesetz Solons [F 151 Ruschenbusch, fr. 151 Leão–Rhodes], rappelle opportunément Ullrich 1853, 18 en reprenant la formulation de W. Wachsmuth, gebot, einen unterwegs gefundenen Leichnam, wenn man nicht im Stande sei, ihn ganz zu bestatten, doch mit Erde zu bewerfen ». Voir Schulze 1934, 206–207.

en exergue la portée générale de l'argumentation du roi, qui évoque les cas d'Étéocle et de Polynice : les morts n'ont pas les mêmes droits. La formulation de la réponse de Créon (v. 520) montre qu'il a bien compris le plan universel de l'argument d'Antigone. Que τοὺς νόμους seul est excellent, c'est ce que suggère Libanios, *Decl.* 44, 1, 31, τυραννουμένης πόλεως ἀπερριμμένος ποθεῖ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν ἰσηγορίαν καὶ ταῦτα ἐπανάγειν πειρᾶται. Le premier progrès à accomplir est, si je ne m'abuse, ὁμῶς (Mekler,⁷ cf. *Aiix* 1372–1373, οὗτος δὲ κάκει κἀνθάδ' ὦν ἔμοιγ' ὁμῶς [v. 1. ὁμῶς] | ἔχτιστος ἔσται), ce qui n'est pas une conjecture mais une autre interprétation de la leçon transmise. Le second progrès, plus audacieux, je n'en disconviens pas, et néanmoins le complément peu dispensable du premier, est la restitution de πᾶσιν, disparu devant ποθεῖ, τούτους étant un bouche-trou prosaïque.⁸ La locution πᾶσιν ὁμῶς est déjà dans la *Théogonie* (670) et dans l'*Illiade* (15, 98 ; cf. 17, 421–422, εἰ καὶ μοῖρα παρ' ἀνέρι τῷδε δαμῆναι | πάντας ὁμῶς ; Sophocle, *El.* 860, πᾶσιν θνατοῖς ἔφν μόρος ; *Ant.* 1023–1024, ἀνθρώποισι γάρ | τοῖς πᾶσι κοινόν ἐστι τοῦξαμαρτάνειν). On songe à la prescription μηδὲ ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ νόμον ἐξεῖναι θεῖναι ἐὰν μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίους.⁹

⁷ Mekler 1885, LXVI, reprenant une suggestion évidente elle-même faite « strictim » par J. Kvíčala et bien avant par Wex 1829, 181. Dans *Phil.* 46–47, ὡς μᾶλλον ἂν | ἔλοιτ' ἔμ' ἢ τοὺς πάντας Ἀργείους λαβεῖν, la variante μολεῖν (a) résulte peut-être non, comme le voulait Boissonade, de μ' ἐλεῖν (cf. *Phil.* 347) mais de la *conflatio* de λαβεῖν et de ὁμοῦ. La leçon véritable serait-elle en effet μᾶλλον ἂν | ἔλοιτ' ἔμ' ἢ τοὺς πάντας Ἀργείους ὁμοῦ, « il me prendrait moi plutôt que tous les Grecs ensemble » (cf. *Aiix* 722, *Trach.* 761) ? La leçon λαβεῖν, intrinsèquement irréprochable, proviendrait alors de la mésentente de ἔλοιτο, pris au sens non de « il prendrait » mais de « il préférerait », qui réclame un infinitif.

⁸ Je m'interroge sur le caractère sophocléen du retour de sonorité τοὺς νόμους τούτους, séquence qu'on trouve dans la prose attique ; contreposer 449, καὶ δῆτ' ἐτόλμας τοῖσδ' ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους ; 452, τοιούσδ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ὥρισεν νόμους (ou bien οὐ τοῖσδ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ὥρισαν νόμους, selon le texte éloquentement défendu par Austin 2006) ; 1113, τοὺς καθεστῶτας νόμους et même *Oed. Col.* 907, νῦν δ' οὐσπερ αὐτὸς τοὺς νόμους εἰσῆλθ' ἔχων. Dans le fr. 861, 2 Radt, οὐ Ulysse évoque les Sirènes, Φόρκου κόρας, θροοῦντε τοὺς Ἄιδου νόμους, l'expression τοὺς Ἄιδου νόμους signifie « their fatal strains » (Pearson 1917) .

⁹ Andocide, *Myst.* 87 (cf. *Lois de Solon* F 100 a–b Ruschenbusch, fr. 100 a–b Leão–Rhodes). Voir Wilamowitz 1880, 51 et tout l'exkursus « Die Herrschaft des Gesetzes ». La citation complète est Μηδὲ ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ νόμον ἐξεῖναι θεῖναι ἐὰν μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίους, ἐὰν μὴ ἐξακισχυλίους δόξῃ κρύβδην ψηφίζομένοις. Wilamowitz supprime la première occurrence de ἐάν, mais je soupçonne que l'indiscutable gaucherie de la reprise résulte non de l'interpolation de ce premier ἐάν, mais de l'ajout de la seconde proposition conditionnelle.

Χο. καὶ μὴν πρὸ πυλῶν ἦδ' Ἰσμήνη,
 φιλάδελφα κάτω δάκρυ' εἰβομένη·
 νεφέλη δ' ὀφρύων ὕπερ αἱματόεν
 ῥέθος αἰσχύνει, τέγγουσ' εὐῶπα παρειάν. 530

527 εἰβομένη t (cf. Dindorf 1873, 102b s. v. εἰβομαι) : λειβομένη
 (uel -α) cett., quo recepto δάκρυ (Wex 1829, VII) debes ||
 529 ὑπεραιματόεν crassa Minerua Seyffert 1865 coll. Eurip. *Hipp.*
 172 ὀφρύων νέφος.

Je doute que, dans ce système anapestique,¹⁰ le chœur dise¹¹ que le visage incarnat d'Ismène est défiguré, enlaidi par le nuage de larmes qui mouille ses belles joues. Le mot αἱματόεν, mal entendu,¹² semble avoir entraîné la substitution, peut-être par un simple lapsus (favorisé par la présence de οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι v. 540, dans la bouche d'Ismène ?), de αἰσχύνει (abusivement expliqué par Jebb « overcasts its sunny beauty »¹³) au rare ἀγλύνει,

¹⁰ « The use of anapaests to accompany new characters' entries is a recurrent device in this play » (West 1990, 24).

¹¹ « Mit unschöner Ausführlichkeit », selon Wilamowitz 1909, 446 dans une note érudite sur l'emploi métaphorique des mots signifiant « nuage ».

¹² Sur le sens véritable, voir Boeckh 1884, 205–206.

¹³ Du moins cette traduction atteste-t-elle que son auteur a senti (avec raison, je crois) la difficulté de αἰσχύνει. Le passage de l'*Iliade* (18, 23–24) qui décrit les gestes d'Achille confronté à la mort de Patrocle montre toute la force du mot : ἀμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἐλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν | χεῦατο κακὰ κεφαλῆς, χαρίεν δ' ἦσχυνε πρόσωπον. Défendra-t-on αἰσχύνει en arguant de l'« intertexte » homérique ? On se gardera aussi de défendre αἰσχύνει au moyen du célèbre fragment de Sophocle (659 Radt) qui décrit Tyro toute honteuse de la perte de sa chevelure et dont voici un texte à mon avis nettement préférable à, entre autres, celui de Radt et bien plus encore à celui de Diggle 1998, 75 : κόμης δὲ πένθος λαγχάνω πώλου δίκην, | ἦτις συναρπασθεῖσα βουκόλων ὕπο | μάνδραις ἐν ἱππείαισιν ἀγρία χερί | θέρος θερισθῇ ξανθὸν αὐχένων ἄπο, | σπάσσοσα (σπασθεῖσα, corr. Hermann) δ' ἐν λειμῶνι ποταμίων ποτῶν | ἴδη, σκιᾶς εἶδωλον αὐγασθεῖς ὕγρον (ὕπδ, corr. Weil), | κουράς (κουραῖς, corr. Weil) ἀτίμους (ἀτίμως, corr. Lib., ἀτίμοις Wakefield) διατετιλμένης φόβης. | φεῦ, κἄν ἀνοικτίρμων τις οἰκτίρειέ νιν | πτήσσοσαν αἰσχύνησιν οἷα μύρεται (μαίνεται, corr. Weil) | πενθοῦσα καὶ κλαίουσα τὴν πάρος χλιδήν. La faute σπασθεῖσα semble déjà avoir figuré dans le texte lu par Plutarque (cf. Pollux cité par R. Kassel chez Radt 1999, 764), qui paraphrase le passage et croit qu'on amène la cavale au bord de l'eau pour qu'en s'y voyant, de honte, elle s'assagisse. La correction de Hermann, admise par Weil, donne le sens le plus satisfaisant : la cavale s'apprêtait à boire (*ductura, bibitura e flumineis laticibus*) quand, se voyant dans l'eau, elle contemple les dégâts causés par la mutilation qu'elle a subie et en est effondrée. D'après le texte transmis, « Properce » (1, 18, 15–16) ne veut pas faire pleurer Cynthie au point que les larmes déforment ses yeux, *tua flendo | lumina*

« assombrit » : rapprocher la formule homérique (*Il.* 18, 22 par ex.) τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα et Euripide, *Hipp.* 172, στυγνὸν δ' ὀφρύων νέφος αὐξάνεται, « un sombre nuage superciliaire s'amoncelle », qui s'oppose au v. 178, τόδε σοι φέγγοις, λαμπρὸς ὅδ' αἰθήρ.¹⁴ Dans la poésie épique et celle qu'elle inspire, ἀχλύς¹⁵ peut être le brouillard qui aveugle l'homme sur le point de mourir.¹⁶ Il est associé au malheur chez Critias (?) fr. 4 a, 17–19 p. 350 Snell–Kannicht (*Pirithoüs*), πέπτατ[αι... | ἀχλὺς πάροιθε τῶν ἐμῶ[ν ὅσσαν¹⁷... | ἄθλους ἐρωτᾷς τοὺς ἐμοῦ[ς... On ne trouve le verbe transitif ἀχλύνω que chez Quintus de Smyrne (ἡχλύνθη et ὑπηχλύνθη, 2, 550 et 8, 446 ; 1, 67), mais ἀχλύω intransitif est dans l'*Odyssée* (12, 406 ; 14, 304) : ἤχλυσε δὲ πόντος ὑπ' αὐτῆς (sc. κυανέης νεφέλης). Le contraste -ύω / -ύνω répond, dans ce dénominatif tiré d'un substantif en -ύς (avec ū long), à l'opposition ū bref (-ύω) / ū long (-ύνω) et à l'opposition intransitif / transitif (le sens factitif caractérise les verbes en -ύνω), bien que l'on trouve ἀχλύω transitif dans la poésie épique tardive et que l'opposition intransitif / transitif n'existe pas pour certains dénominatifs (ainsi κορθύνω / κορθύω) dans la poésie épique ancienne.¹⁸ Chez Sophocle fr. 718 Radt, κύναρος ἄκανθα πάντα πληθύει γύην, « l'églantier emplit tout le champ », il faut sans doute corriger πληθύνει avec W. Dindorf, quoi qu'en ait Fraenkel.¹⁹ On peut raisonnablement, je crois, attribuer l'emploi du verbe ἀχλύνω à Sophocle,²⁰ qui l'utiliserait ici en renouvelant

deiectis turpia sint lacrimis. Liberman 2020, 260 défend *turpia* contre la correction *turgida* ; le passage de Properce diffère de celui de Sophocle, en ceci (entre autres) que là il s'agit des yeux, et non, comme chez Sophocle, du visage.

¹⁴ Voir Wilamowitz 1891, 197.

¹⁵ Schmidt 1876, 610 étudie le mot et la famille. Cavallin 1875, 173 et Gleditsch 1883 present la conjecture de Reiske ἀχλὺν (spondaïque) dans *Phil.* 830–831, ὄμμασι δ' ἀντίσχοις | τάνδ' αἶγλαν, ἃ τέταται τανῦν. La correction de Reiske convient tout à fait au « voile » (cf. Porzig 1942, 105) que répand Hypnos sur les yeux de Philoctète endormi. Jebb 1898 et Schein 2013 dissimulent la difficulté de αἶγλαν, qu'aperçoit Manuwald 2018, même s'il garde et tente de justifier la leçon transmise.

¹⁶ Voir là-dessus Schulze 1897, 889 n. 2.

¹⁷ Voir, sur ce passage, Boschi 2021, 122–123.

¹⁸ Voir Fraenkel 1906, 32–33 et l'ensemble du chapitre (I, ii) consacré aux verbes en -ύνω. Son répertoire omet ἀχλύνω !

¹⁹ Fraenkel 1906, 65.

²⁰ Il emploie ἀβρύνω, ἀδρύνω, αἰσχύνω (ailleurs ; voir Porzig 1942, 247), ἀλγύνω, ἀμβλύνω, ἀμύνω, βαρύνω, βραδύνω, ἐπεντύνω (cf. Fraenkel 1906, 60) ou ἐπευθύνω, εὐθύνω et ἀπευθύνω, ἐπιθύνω et παρευθύνω, θηλύνω, θρασύνω / θαρσύνω, ἰθύνω, καλλύνω (*Antigone* 496 ; S. fournit les premières attestations de ce verbe), κρατύνω, λαμπρύνω, μηκύνω, μολύνω, ὀξύνω, ὀτρύνω et ἐποτρύνω, παλύνω, πληθύνω, πορσύνω, πραῦνω, ταχύνω.

qu'elles soient des femmes », c'est-à-dire « qu'elles se tiennent dans le gynécée »²³), semble, bien que plus d'un en aient douté, correct tel qu'il est transmis, il reste que le vers 581, « même les hardis prennent la fuite dès qu'ils voient Hadès s'approcher de leur vie », recèle une difficulté peu aperçue.²⁴ On dirait que le texte transmis mêle deux versions différentes de la même phrase et pourvues du même sens, ὅταν πέλας ἤδη τελευτήν εισορῶσι τοῦ βίου²⁵ et ὅταν πέλας ἤδη τὸν Ἄϊδην εισορῶσι κείμενον. Chacune de ces versions est correcte mais le panachage ὅταν πέλας ἤδη τὸν Ἄϊδην εισορῶσι τοῦ βίου fait difficulté. On pourrait supposer une sorte de « conflatio » des deux versions ; cependant τὸν Ἄϊδην s'est peut-être plus simplement substitué à τελευτήν par une manière d'anticipation du v. 777, κάκεϊ τὸν Ἄϊδην, ὃν μόνον σέβει θεῶν, | αἰτουμένη που τεύζεται τὸ μὴ θανεῖν.

ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν οἴκων ὀρῶμαι
 πῆματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πῆμασι πίπτοντ', 595
 οὐδ' ἀπαλλάσσει γενεὰν γένος, ἀλλ' ἐρείπει
 θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν.
 νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὅπερ
 ῥίζας ἐτέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις, 600
 κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία
 θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων ἀμᾶ κόνις,
 λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἑρινύς.

595 φθιτῶν Hermann metri causa (cf. Seebass 1880, 53–54) : φθιμένων codd. || 599 ὅπερ K necnon, ut uid., schol. L ; coni. Hermann : ὑπὲρ cett., rec. Lloyd-Jones–Wilson, qui grauius post δόμοις distinxerunt || 600 ἐτέτατο Brunck : τέτατο codd. || 601 κατ' L^{pc}KSV^{act} : κᾶτ' uel κᾶτ' aZf | φοινία] φονία Ra || 602 τ'] γ' Willink 2010, 358 frustra me iudice.

à l'économie de la tragédie. Il y a quand même, dans la « néantisation » d'Ismène aux yeux du chœur (599–600, où il n'est question que d'Antigone) et aux yeux de sa sœur (847, φίλων ἄκλαντος ; 895, λισθία ᾿γὼ ; 941, τὴν βασιλειδῶν μούνην λοιπὴν avec la note de Muff 1877, 111–112) une difficulté, qui s'explique si Sophocle était confronté à une légende qui faisait mourir Ismène. Selon Wilamowitz 1914b, 93 et 1923, 348, dans la « bonne vieille légende » Ismène mourait avant Antigone durant le siège de Thèbes (Reinhardt 1933, 260 suggère que dans un modèle épique perdu les deux sœurs mouraient, les deux ou l'une d'entre elles suivant les deux frères dans le tombeau). Ismène refait surface dans *Œdipe à Colone*.

²³ Voir Dörpfeld–Reisch 1896, 266.

²⁴ Dawe 1996 supprime les v. 580–581 et suppose l'omission d'un vers.

²⁵ Rapprocher Euripide, *Alcest.* 24, ἤδη δὲ τόνδε Θάνατον εισορῶ πέλας.

Antistrophe, notoirement difficile, du premier couple strophe / antistrophe du deuxième « stasimon ». « There seems, observe Willink²⁶ à propos du v. 595, to be no parallel in tragedy for elision at the word-division D – : ... ». ²⁷ Il remplace donc πίπτοντ' par πίπτει et ponctue après πῆματα en entendant ἀρχαῖα « predicative, sc. ὄντα ». C'est un remède bien pire que le mal. J'admets la synaphie métrique des deux colons 595–596. Les colons correspondants de la strophe (584–585), en synaphie prosodique, sont unis par la synaphie « grammaticale » que crée le contre-rejet du dissyllabe ἄτας (en responsion avec πίπτοντ') : οἷς γὰρ ἂν σεισθῇ θεόθεν δόμος, ἄτας | οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει γενεᾶς²⁸ ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἔρπον. Mais il y a une difficulté de sens, « anciens sont les malheurs de la maison (pluriel poétique) des Labdacides que je vois succéder aux malheurs des morts ». Il manque en effet la mention des vivants : le chœur voit les malheurs des vivants succéder à ceux des morts. Le pluriel οἰκῶν,²⁹ qui est superflu,

²⁶ Willink 2010, 355.

²⁷ La colométrie différente de Lachmann 1819, 151 maintient l'irrégularité prétendue. Mais en réalité, il faut, à mon avis, envisager la chose différemment, c'est-à-dire sous le rapport du phénomène de synaphie. Je prends, au hasard d'une lecture, l'exemple d'Eschyle, *Ag.* 241–242, tel que le lisent Wilamowitz 1885, Fraenkel 1950 (non sans hésitation) et Denniston–Page 1957 : ...φιλοῖκτω, | πρέπουσά θ' ὥς ἐν γραφαῖς = 251–252 ... τὸ μέλλον <δ'> | ἐπεὶ γένοϊτ' ἂν κλύοις. Le mètre, iambique, est différent, mais le phénomène est le même : tantôt la synaphie, « verbale », emporte une élision ; tantôt elle n'est que « prosodique ». Schroeder 1916 et West 1998 admettent <δ'> mais adoptent une autre colométrie, qui joint au colon suivant φιλοῖκτω et τὸ μέλλον δ', l'ajout de la particule étant alors indispensable. Mais introduire en position initiale un mètre iambique de forme bacchique qui, dans cette strophe / antistrophe, figure en position finale de colon ou de vers n'est peut-être pas une bonne idée. Le refus de l'ajout <δ'> (Wilamowitz 1914a, Medda 2017) dans la colométrie de Wilamowitz 1885, de Fraenkel et de Denniston–Page implique « syllaba brevis in elemento longo » et donc fin de vers, non de colon. Le contre-rejet τὸ μέλλον et l'asyndète, qui mutile le balancement μὲν / δέ, forment une fin de vers peu attrayante. Si je comprends bien, Galvani 2021, 82–83 fait de φιλοῖκτω / τὸ μέλλον un petit vers indépendant.

²⁸ Il me paraît presque certain qu'il faut le pluriel, γενεᾶν (ainsi déjà Blaydes), « un grand nombre de générations », à quoi γενεᾶν fait écho dans l'antistrophe (voir Muff 1877, 102).

²⁹ La séquence οἰκῶν ὁρῶμαι forme une penthémimère iambique qui correspond à ἄγευστος αἰὼν (582, strophe), avec, au temps faible du premier pied iambique, une « impureté » de responsion non problématique (cf. Seebass 1880, 53). Gleditsch 1883, 105 et 247 fut beaucoup plus audacieux que moi : il lit ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν φθιτῶν ὁρῶμαι | πῆματα ζώντων (noter l'allongement de la finale du substantif dactylique) ἔτι πῆματα τίκτοντ'. Dans *Phil.* 180–181, οὗτος πρωτογόνων ἴσως | οἰκῶν οὐδενὸς ὕστερος, Toup me semble voir juste en substituant οὐκ ὦν à οἰκῶν, qui, n'en déplaise à Jebb 1898, non seulement est inutile mais nuit au sens.

s'est peut-être substitué à ζώντων, c'est-à-dire ζώντων πήματα, deux substantifs, Λαβδακιδᾶν et ζώντων, déterminant πήματα, comme plus bas (v. 795–796), selon une des interprétations possibles d'un passage ambigu, βλεφάρων et νύμφας déterminent chacun ἥμερος.³⁰ La difficulté du double génitif,³¹ « les malheurs des Labdacides qui échoient aux vivants », a peut-être eu raison de ζώντων.

Lloyd-Jones–Wilson³² me paraissent avoir raison d'adopter la correction κοπίς (Askew, Jortin, Reiske) pour l'étrange κόνις, malgré Griffith, qui reproche à la correction de ne pas être le mot approprié :³³ la faux des dieux d'en bas (je paraphrase) coupe, ensanglantée, la dernière branche de l'arbre des Labdacides. Tel que lu par Griffith, le texte parle de « la lumière de la dernière racine qui s'étendait dans la demeure d'Œdipe ». Malgré l'énergie et l'érudition que Wex 1829 met à l'illustrer et la notoriété du sens figuré qui le fait équivaloir à σωτηρία, le mot φάος surprend. La difficulté que crée le renvoi de viv à φάος par le truchement de ὅπερ amène Griffith à mettre en exergue l'incertitude du sens du verbe καταμάω.³⁴ La correction oubliée θάλος (Blaydes 1859 dubitativement ;

³⁰ « La désirabilité de la fiancée qui émane de ses yeux » – autrement dit, pour employer un tour sophocléen évoqué chez Liberman 2021, 686 et illustrant la fonction du regard dans la transmission du charme et la suscitation du désir chez le récepteur, νύμφας ὀμμάτειος πόθος. « Charme qui émane des yeux de la fiancée » est bien sûr possible. Sur le sens « objectif » de ἥμερος, voir Bühler 1960, 134 à Moschos, *Europa* 84.

³¹ Sur cette figure, voir Bruhn 1899, 24 § 33 ; Wilamowitz 1909, 255–257.

³² Voir Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 129, sans oublier Welcker 1829, 209–211 et Wilamowitz 1909, 383.

³³ « Why should the gods below be wielding a 'bloody scimitar' ? ». Griffith oppose le fr. 534, 7 Radt (*Rizotomoi*), χαλκείος ἥμα (sc. ρίζας) ὄρεπάνοις. Mais (1) l'adjectif φοινία est proleptique ; (2) κοπίς est dans le principe un instrument qui κόπτει ; or ce verbe peut signifier « couper », « faucher », et le *TGL* V 1811–1812, qui adopte ici κοπίς et traduit « gladius » (cf. Stace, *Theb.* 632–633, *Mors fila sororum | ense metit*) cite Quinte-Curce 8, 14, 29, *Copidas uocabant gladios leuiter curuatos, falcibus similes*. Rien ne s'oppose à ce que κοπίς désigne poétiquement une « faux ». Selon Welcker 1829, 209, il s'agit de « irgend eine Haue, welche zum Durchschneiden der Wurzeln sich schickt ». Souvenir de la leçon κοπίς dans la glose du Laurentianus (κατ'... ἁμῶ) : θερίζει καὶ ἐκκόπτει ? C'est ce que croit Welcker. Le verbe ἐκκόπτω est le mot juste pour dire « abattre un arbre ».

³⁴ Voir *LSJ* s. v. καταμάω II, « if κόνις is retained, καταμᾶ must be rendered *covers over* ». Jebb 1900, 253–254 fait justice de cette explication, qui repose sur une confusion entre deux mots clairement distingués depuis Schulze 1892, 365–366, ἁμάω « moissonner » apparenté au latin *meto* et ἀμάω « recueillir » d'origine disputée (cf. *AP* 7, 241, 3–4 = Antipater de Sidon XXV Gow–Page, χερσὶν ἀμήσας | ἀνδρομάχοις δνοφερὰν κρατὸς ὕπερθε κόνιν).

Kock,³⁵ suivi par Seyffert 1865 et Gleditsch 1883) filerait la métaphore : il s'agirait de faucher la nouvelle pousse (cf., au sens propre, Théocrite 11, 73, θαλλὸν ἀμάσας) qui s'était développée et s'étendait dans la demeure d'Œdipe,³⁶ rejeton (Antigone³⁷) de la dernière racine (Œdipe, avec Jocaste) de l'arbre des Labdacides. Le mot³⁸ n'apparaît pas chez Sophocle, qui n'a que θαλλός, mais Euripide (*Phoen.* 88) l'emploie à propos d'Antigone : ὦ κλεινὸν οἴκοις Ἀντιγόνη θάλος πατρί. Pindare (*Ol.* 2, 42–47) l'utilise à propos du fils de Polynice, Thersandre, dans un passage qu'il vaut la peine de citer en entier, puisque Pindare y file la métaphore végétale et présente le fils de Polynice d'une façon analogue à celle dont Sophocle évoque la progéniture d'Œdipe, précisément Antigone :³⁹ λείφθη δὲ Θέρσανδρος ἐριπέντι Πολυνείκει, νέοις ἐν ἀέθλοισι | ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου | τιμώμενος, Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἄρωγόν δόμοις | ὅθεν σπέρματος ἔχοντα ρίζαν πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου ἐγκωμίων τε μελῶν λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν. Les scholies anciennes expliquent à deux reprises ἀμᾶ par καλύπτει : νῦν γάρ, φησίν, ὅπερ ἦν λείψανον γενεᾶς, τοῦτο μέλλει καλύπτειν ἢ κόνις ;⁴⁰ (κατ'... ἀμᾶ) : θερίζει καὶ ἐκκόπτει· ἢ καλύπτει. Griffith laisse de côté cette interprétation mais il garde φάος et κόνις. Il rejette à juste titre la leçon ὑπὲρ ρίζας, mais, si l'on y réfléchit, cette leçon est beaucoup plus adaptée à φάος (« la lumière s'étendait sur... ») que la correction qu'il adopte, ὅπερ ρίζας ἐτέτατο, laquelle cadre beaucoup mieux avec θάλος (« la pousse, le rejeton de la dernière racine »). Nauck 1886 trouve φάος plus approprié à ἐτέτατο, et il compare *Phil.* 830–831, ὄμμασι δ' ἀντίσχοις | τάνδ'

³⁵ Kock 1864, 16–19. La scholie confuse explique ὅπερ ἔβλασταν ἄνω τῆς ρίζης et τὸ καταλειφθέν φησιν ἀπὸ Οἰδίποδος βλάστημα, ce qui semble garder trace d'une leçon qui fut θάλος mais est plutôt une interprétation très libre du mot φάος.

³⁶ Rapprocher, dans les *Limiers* (fr. 314, 281–282 Radt), cette présentation d'Hermès par sa nourrice Cyllène : κάξορμενίζει κούκετι σχολάζεται | βλάστη· τοιόνδε παῖδα θησαυρὸς στέγει.

³⁷ Keck 1882, 6 préfère rapporter θάλος à toute la progéniture d'Œdipe et de Jocaste, au motif (à mon avis non décisif) que, s'il était question de la seule Antigone, (ἐ)τέτατο ferait difficulté.

³⁸ « θάλος (X 87, ζ 157, h. cer. 66. 187, h. Ven. 278), eigtl. „*Schöbling“, aber immer übertragen gebraucht für junge Menschen » (Porzig 1942, 244).

³⁹ Nous avons, dans la discussion des v. 580–581, relevé la disparition d'Ismène dans le drame et sa « néantisation » aux yeux du chœur et de sa propre sœur.

⁴⁰ Kock veut lire κοπίς, à tort.

αἶγλαν ἃ τέταται τανῶν.⁴¹ Mais le verbe est évidemment aussi approprié à un végétal ou à une métaphore végétale : voir Eschyle, *Ag.* 966–967, ῥίζης γὰρ οὐσης φυλλὰς ἔκετ' ἐ<ι>ς δόμους | σκιὰν ὑπερτείνασα Σειρίου Κυνός.⁴² Clytemnestre utilise cette image, parmi d'autres dont l'ensemble constitue un panégyrique « orientalisant »,⁴³ pour louer le roi Agamemnon, qui revient au foyer. Le rapport de la métaphore de Sophocle avec l'image d'Eschyle me paraît, « mutatis mutandis », assez étroit (il ne faut pas oublier qu'Antigone est une princesse) pour suggérer que le premier se souvient du second ; si c'est exact, le passage d'Eschyle corrobore encore davantage θάλος.⁴⁴ Rapprocher aussi, avec le commentaire de Kaibel,⁴⁵ la relation du songe de Clytemnestre chez Sophocle, *El.* 421–423, ἔκ τε τοῦδ' (σκήπτρου) ἄνω | βλαστεῖν βρύοντα θαλλόν, ᾧ κατάσκιον | πᾶσαν γενέσθαι τὴν Μυκηναίων χθόνα. Je gagerais que la faute très aisée κόνις a entraîné la mésintelligence de ἀμᾶ (« recouvre ») et la faute φάος, l'idée n'étant plus celle de la poussière recouvrant un mort mais celle de la poussière voilant la lumière.⁴⁶ On est d'ailleurs fondé à dire que dans le texte de l'antistrophe imprimé ci-dessus φάος καλύπτει κόνις ! Bien qu'ils adoptent la correction κοτίς, le texte de Lloyd-Jones–Wilson, supérieur en cela à celui de Griffith, est

⁴¹ Voir toutefois plus haut la note 15. On se souvient de τοῖος ἀμφὶ νῶτ' ἐτάθη πᾶταγος Ἄρεος, *Ant.* 124–125.

⁴² Rapprocher *AP* 9, 220, 1–2 = Thallos 5, 1–2 Gow–Page, Ἄ χλοερὰ πλατάνιστος ἴδ' ὥς ἔκρυσσε φιλεύντων | ὄργια τὰν ἱερὰν φυλλάδα τεινομένα.

⁴³ West 1997, 570–572.

⁴⁴ Paley 1861, 395 cite le passage de Sophocle (avec φάος !) dans sa note à celui d'Eschyle. Le rapprochement des deux passages semble échapper à la plupart des commentateurs des deux tragiques. Les mots de Sophocle ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις paraissent corroborer la leçon transmise ἐς δόμους contre ἔκετο στέγης de Wilamowitz 1914a (« platanus umbram extendit supra tectum, in quo Graecae mulieres degebant. Duplex genetivus maxime Aeschyleus ») ; il y a cependant en φυλλὰς ἔκετ' ἐς δόμους une difficulté que les commentateurs post-wilamowitziens minorent. Le texte de Wilamowitz 1885 porte la ponctuation ἔκετ', ἐς δόμους σκιὰν ὑπερτείνασα. Ahrens 1860, 589–590 suppose une corruption plus grave du passage.

⁴⁵ Kaibel 1896, 136–137.

⁴⁶ Exemple magnifique de faute en ayant entraîné une autre : Eschyle, *Ag.* 1371, τρανῶς Ἀτρεΐδην εἰδέναι κυροῦνθ' ὅπως. La faute par persévérance εἰδέναι (cf. v. 1369) a entraîné le remaniement monstrueux κυροῦνθ' ὅπως : Eschyle avait probablement écrit ἐκμαθεῖν ὅπως κυρεῖ. La séquence non métrique εἰδέναι ὅπως κυρεῖ fut corrigée. P. Maas (*ap.* Denniston–Page 1957, 195) a – West 1998 et Medda 2017 l'oublie – vu que le sens requerrait ἐκμαθεῖν. La solution découle naturellement de ce constat.

néanmoins peu satisfaisant.⁴⁷ Je termine par cette illustration du texte de Sophocle restitué : Euripide fr. 757, 924–925 Kannicht (*Hypsipyle*), ἀναγκαίως δ' ἔχει | βίον θερίζειν ὥστε κάρπιμον στάχυν, traduit par Cicéron fr. 42 Blänsdorf, *tam (tum codd., corr. Seyffert) uita omnibus | metenda ut fruges : sic iubet necessitas*.

τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον
καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει
νόμος ὅδ'· ἴουδὲν ἔρπει
θνατῶν βίῳτῳ πάμπολις† ἐκτὸς ἄτας.

ἀ γὰρ δὴ πολὺπλαγκτος ἐλπίς 615
πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνασις ἀνδρῶν,
πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων·
εἰδότει δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει,
πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῷ πόδα τις προσάυση.⁴⁸

616 ὄνασις Brunck (cf. Willink 2010, 359) : ὄνησις codd. ||
619 προσάυση L : προσψαύση a : προσψαύσει R : προσαίρει uel
-η L^{sl} sch. : προσάρη Kzt.

⁴⁷ Sur ce texte, voir, dans l'apparat ci-dessus, l'unité critique relative au v. 599. Le texte de Kock est supérieur en ceci également qu'il lit ὑπὲρ ρίζας ὁ τέτατο, ce qui lui évite d'avoir à mettre une ponctuation forte après δόμοις et de ruiner ainsi – quoi qu'en aient Boeckh 1884, 210 n. 1 et Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1997, 74 – la construction du passage. Mais ὅπερ ρίζας ἐτέτατο paraît de loin supérieur. « The trouble about ὅπερ, and also about Hermann's ὁ τέτατο, objectent Lloyd-Jones–Wilson, is that neither of these readings accords with *viv*, which must surely refer to ρίζας ». C'est vrai si on lit φάος, ce ne l'est plus si on lit θάλος ! Sur le renvoi de *viv* à un neutre singulier, voir Hense 1880, 30.

⁴⁸ Le sens est non « to burn against / on » (LSJ, Griffith) mais, malgré les dénégations de Jebb 1900, 255 et en dépit des divers dictionnaires y compris étymologiques, « admouere » (cf. Properce 1, 5, 5 avec la note de Liberman 2020) : voir Lobeck 1866, 297 ; Osthoff 1884, 490 ; Ahrens 1891, 228 (antérieur à Osthoff). À en croire Ahrens, le mot n'a rien à voir avec αὔω « prendre du feu ». Rien n'empêche pourtant προσάυση, comme Osthoff l'a vu, dans une étude non moins oubliée qu'admirable, à la fois de se rapporter à αὔω apparenté à *haurio* et de signifier « admoueo » : la notion de feu n'appartient pas au sens primitif, que l'on trouve dans d'autres composés (voir Osthoff, 484–493, en ajoutant Bacchylide 5, 142 restitué par Wackernagel 1979, 1634–1635). Sur le passage du sens de « prendre » à celui d'« allumer » par le truchement de l'expression « prendre du feu », voir Schulze 1934, 190–194 (complétant, de son propre aveu, Osthoff). Pour une restitution conjecturale de ἐξαύω au sens (attesté par ailleurs) d'« aviver », voir notre discussion du v. 857 dans le prochain jeu de *Petits riens sophocléens*.

Fin de la strophe et début de l'antistrophe du second couple strophe / antistrophe du deuxième « stasimon ». Je reproduis le texte de Griffith.⁴⁹ Les autres difficultés du passage sont telles qu'on passe sur celle de τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον καὶ τὸ πρὶν, censé signifier « for now, and the future, as well as the past ». Griffith allègue *Ajax* 34–35, πάντα γὰρ τὰ τ' οὖν πάρος | τὰ τ' εἰσέπειτα σῆ κυβερνώμαι χερσί, mais il est évident que là τὰ εἰσέπειτα ne peut impliquer le présent que parce que πάρος précède. Jebb se montre plus rigoureux en rapportant τὸ ἔπειτα à « what will immediately follow the *present* moment » et τὸ μέλλον à « the more *distant* future », mais on ne comprend guère pourquoi le présent ne figure pas dans ce qui formerait, s'il y était, une trinité canonique : τὸ παρόν τε καὶ τὸ μέλλον καὶ τὸ πρὶν. Le futur ἐπαρκέσει, qui ne s'accorde en toute rigueur qu'avec τὸ μέλλον, a peut-être amené le changement de τὸ παρόν τε en τό τ' ἔπειτα.

Griffith me paraît avoir raison de rejeter le texte adopté par Lloyd-Jones–Wilson, οὐδέν' ἔρπει θνατῶν βίोटος πάμπολυς ἐκτὸς ἄτας (« to no human creature comes vast abundance without disaster »), que critique également Willink.⁵⁰ Des deux corrections que Willink propose, la plus plausible me paraît être οὐδέν' ἔρπειν θνατῶν βίोटον πάμπολυν ἐκτὸς ἄτας, « qu'aucune vie de mortel ne s'écoule longtemps (litt. « en grande partie ») sans entrer dans le malheur ». L'indicatif présent me semble cependant préférable : οὗ τις ἔρπει θνατῶν βίोटος πάμπολυς⁵¹ ἐκτὸς ἄτας.

Il me paraît hors de doute que Seyffert 1865, précédé par Hermann 1830,⁵² et Wilamowitz⁵³ ont raison de rattacher εἰδότι δ' οὐδέν ἔρπει au

⁴⁹ Mais la colométrie des v. 615–616 est celle de Lachmann 1819, 163 et de Willink 2010, 358–359.

⁵⁰ Willink 2010, 361–362.

⁵¹ Correction de Musgrave et « adiectivus aduerbiacens » (Ellendt 1872, 642 B au mot πολὺς), comme dans fr. 567 Radt, ὃ πάντα πράσσων, ὡς ὁ Σίσυφος πολὺς | ἔνδηλος ἐν σοὶ πάντα χῶ μητρὸς πατήρ, avec la note de Pearson 1917. Jebb trouve certaine la correction de Heath οὐδέν ἔρπει θνατῶν βίότῳ πάμπολύ γ' ἐκτὸς ἄτας, « nothing that is vast... ». Elle viole la « loi de Wackernagel » (1892), que la troisième édition de Jebb (1900) ne connaît pas. Wilamowitz 1962, 348 (anticipé par L. Lange et recommandé par West 1981, 526) est très content de son οὐδέν ἔρπει θνατῶν βίότῳ παντελὲς ἐκτὸς ἄτας, mais, si le quelque peu lointain παντελὲς (= « complètement », παντελῶς, je présume) est très bon, οὐδέν ἔρπει θνατῶν βίότῳ, que garde aussi Jebb, paraît peu satisfaisant. C'est du moins le texte transmis.

⁵² Il lit οὐκ εἰδόσιν ἔρπει = 607 οὗτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν (vers de Reiz, avec synzèse dans θεῶν).

⁵³ Wilamowitz 1962, 347. C'est sur la base de la correction de Wilamowitz εἷ εἰδόσιν οὐδέν (avec suppression de ἔρπει) que Liberman 2020, 118 propose

vers précédent, grâce à deux corrections infimes, dont une de Δ en Ν : πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων εἰδόσιν οὐδὲν ἔρπει πρὶν..., « nombreux sont les hommes vers qui s'avance l'illusion des vains désirs sans qu'ils se rendent compte de quoi que ce soit jusqu'à ce que... ». Le texte transmis et, hélas, couramment édité exprime, entre l'espoir comme source de délectation « pour beaucoup d'hommes » et l'espoir comme illusion « pour beaucoup d'hommes », une opposition insatisfaisante et il paraît établir, à tort, un contraste entre deux classes d'hommes. En réalité, ce qui s'oppose à la délectation n'est pas l'illusion comme telle, mais le fait que l'illusion mène les hommes à la ruine sans qu'ils s'en rendent compte jusqu'au moment de la chute, et les hommes que l'espoir délecte sont ceux que son caractère illusoire trompe et mène à leur perte. Il est donc indispensable de rattacher le participe (εἰδότη, en réalité εἰδόσι) à πολλοῖς δέ. Wilamowitz remarque avec pénétration que τις (619) surprend avec le singulier εἰδότη alors qu'il est naturel avec le pluriel. Je ne trouve rien à redire à la reprise de ἔρπει. Il y a une ressemblance très frappante, à mes yeux, entre ce passage d'une pièce représentée en 442 ou 441 et la fin de la XI^e *Néméenne* de Pindare, peut-être composée en 446 ou un peu après :⁵⁴ δέδεται γὰρ ἀναιδεῖ | ἐλπίδι γυῖα, προμαθείας δ' ἀπόκειται ῥοαί. | κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν· | ἀπροσίκτων δ' ἐρώτων ὀζύτεραι μανίαι. Ce texte me paraît corroborer l'interprétation du passage de Sophocle ici exposée.

Κρ.	ἀλλ' ὃν πόλις στήσειε, τοῦδε χρὴ κλύειν	666
	καὶ σμικρὰ καὶ δίκαια καὶ τὰναντία.	667

Lloyd-Jones–Wilson⁵⁵ acceptent la suppression de ces vers proposée par Dawe 1979 (et retenue par Dawe 1996), mais Griffith a peut-être raison

οὐκ εἰδόσιν οὐδὲν. Mais il faut un verbe. Dans la strophe, Wilamowitz garde οὔτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν (607). Lloyd-Jones–Wilson font se correspondre οὔτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν (télésillien, avec θεῶν dissyllabique) et εἰδότη δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει (aristophanien), ce qui fait problème. Griffith adopte et Willink 2010, 360 approuve la conjecture brillante οὔτ' ἐτέων ἄκματοι (Schneidewin et, pour ἄκματοι, Hermann).

⁵⁴ Voir Liberman 2017, 149 et, pour l'exégèse du passage délicat de Pindare, les pages qui suivent. Il n'y a qu'en apparence opposition entre les liens de l'espoir chez Pindare et l'errance de l'espoir chez Sophocle, car, comme je l'explique (153), Pindare veut dire que les ailes de l'espoir, qui promène les hommes, sont en fait des chaînes. À sa manière, Sophocle ne dit pas autre chose.

⁵⁵ Voir Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 132. Günther 1996, 53 étend avec Blaydes le soupçon aux vers 663–667.

de les garder.⁵⁶ Cependant ils ne peuvent guère être attribués tels quels à Sophocle.⁵⁷ Le neutre substantivé σμικρὰ forme avec δίκαια un couple improbable et semble parasiter l'opposition proverbiale καὶ δίκαια καὶ τάναντία illustrée par Griffith. C'est un défaut que πικρὰ (van Eldik) laisse subsister. Le verbe κλύειν signifie « obéir », d'où il suit que les adjectifs neutres substantivés doivent être des « accusatiui respectus ». Wunder 1846 compare le v. 64, καὶ ταῦτ' ἀκούειν ἅτι τῶνδ' ἀλγίονα, « obéir en cela et en encore pire que cela », mais là et dans *El.* 340, τῶν κρατούντων ἐστὶ πάντ' ἀκουστέα, « il faut obéir en tout point à ceux qui ont le pouvoir », ταῦτα et πάντα sont des accusatifs de relation beaucoup plus aisés.⁵⁸ La correction ἅπαντα καὶ δίκαια καὶ τάναντία, « en toutes choses justes et non justes », réglerait la difficulté ; l'omission de ἅπαντα (que le plus souvent Sophocle place en position initiale du trimètre) devant tous ces mots comportant un *alpha* aura été réparée au moyen d'un bouche-trou malheureux.

Αι. ἦτις τὸν αὐτῆς αὐτάδελφον ἐν φοναῖς
πεπτῶτ' ἄθαρτον μῆθ' ὑπ' ὠμηστῶν κυνῶν
εἷας' ὀλέσθαι μῆθ' ὑπ' οἰωνῶν τινος· 698

698 μῆθ' KSaZo : μηδ' cett.

Polynice ne courait aucun risque de périr du fait des chiens mangeurs de chair crue ou d'aucun oiseau : il était déjà mort. Une confusion d'onces, qui, si incroyable cela soit-il, semble passer inaperçue, est responsable de la substitution de ὀλέσθαι à ἔδεσθαι, comme le montrent les v. 205–206 : ἔαν δ' ἄθαρτον καὶ πρὸς οἰωνῶν δέμας | καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἔδεσθόν

⁵⁶ Griffith suit Seidler en transposant 663–667 après 671. La double numérotation adoptée par Griffith pour aider le lecteur est un facteur de confusion.

⁵⁷ Il n'y a pas lieu de mettre en doute l'optatif στήσῃ, « tout homme qu'une cité peut avoir mis à sa tête » : Seyffert 1865 lui-même, dont Lloyd-Jones–Wilson citent la correction dubitativement proposée στήσῃ γε, défend l'optatif et Hermann 1830, dont Seyffert aurait dû se souvenir, a montré pourquoi l'optatif est juste et le subjonctif faux. Voir également Bruhn 1899, 78 § 143.

⁵⁸ Mais il est regrettable qu'éditeurs et commentateurs n'écrivent pas παντεπιστήμης au v. 721 en suivant la suggestion Hermann 1830 (« pro uno uocabulo »), φήμ' ἔγωγε πρεσβεύειν πολὺ | φῶναι τὸν ἄνδρα πάντ' ἐπιστήμης πλέων. Le cas de πάντ' ἀριστεύσας (πανταριστεύσας Bergk) au v. 195 est moins clair (comparer la rubrique de Bruhn 1899, 37 § 62 en retirant *Trach.* 338, sur quoi on verra Davies 1991, 119, et la notice de Collard 2018, 138). Les éditeurs n'écrivent pas πᾶν κάκιστε au v. 741 !

αἰκισθέν τ' ἰδεῖν.⁵⁹ Cette correction ne change rien à l'incohérence que releva jadis Drachmann :⁶⁰ « ihre 'Bestattung' [effectuée par Antigone] des Polyneikes konnte weder Hunde noch Vögel von seiner Leiche abwehren ». ⁶¹

Αι. τί γὰρ πατὴρ θάλλοντος εὐκλεία τέκνοις
ἄγαλμα μεῖζον ἢ τί πρὸς παίδων πατρί; 704

703 εὐκλεία Johnson, rec. Lloyd-Jones–Wilson⁶² : εὐκλείας codd.

Jebb et Griffith écartent εὐκλεία, qui restitue la construction propre de θάλλω et celle de toute la séquence, car il est évident que « quel motif de fierté plus grand qu'un père éclatant de bonne réputation ? » est plus satisfaisant que « quel motif de fierté plus grand que la bonne réputation d'un père florissant (!) ? ». Jebb et Griffith font valoir que εὐκλεία rend « the construction with πρὸς παίδων in the second element (...) much harsher ». Mais la difficulté existe aussi avec le génitif : « car quel motif de fierté plus grand que la bonne réputation d'un père florissant pour ses enfants et, de la part d'enfants, pour leur père ? ». C'est le génitif παίδων, sur le même plan que πατὴρ, qui est attendu : « car quel motif de fierté plus grand que des enfants <éclatants de bonne réputation> pour un père ? ». La préposition πρὸς ruine la construction. Je suggère qu'elle a chassé le mot αἶ, « inversement », qui peut faire hiatus avec τί, comme

⁵⁹ On pourrait ajouter [Eschyle], *Sept.* 1035–1036, τοῦτου δὲ σάρκας οὐδὲ κοιλογάστορες | λύκοι πάσσονται, μὴ δοκησάτω τινί, si West 1998 n'y adoptait la variante σπάσσονται en invoquant Sophocle, *Ant.* 258 σπάσαντος. West admet aussi après σάρκας l'omission de deux hémistiches dont le premier commençait par οὐ (« non uolucres, non canes »), mais « pas même des loups » (cf. Barrett 2007, 338) me paraît se tenir sans qu'il y ait besoin de supposer d'omission. La présence du mot σάρκας et la nécessité de restituer un moyen (σπάσσονται) et non un actif (cf. σπάσαντος) me feraient pencher pour πάσσονται (voir la remarque portant sur le v. 30 chez Liberman 2022, 43 n. 62). Toute la fin interpolée des *Sept.*, inspirée de l'*Antigone* de Sophocle, est mal écrite.

⁶⁰ Drachmann 1908, 69. La réfutation de Bradshaw 1962, 204 ne me convainc pas.

⁶¹ C'est sans voir que cette incohérence se trouve déjà chez Sophocle que Barrett 2007, 340 propose une interprétation d'un vers (1038) de la fin interpolée des *Sept* contre *Thèbes* qui libère le passage de la même incohérence. En effet, l'interprétation traditionnelle du passage des *Sept* implique qu'en jetant un peu de terre sur le corps de Polynice Antigone le protège des loups.

⁶² Voir Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 133.

chez Aristophane, *Thes.* 852, τί αὖ σὺ κυρκανᾶς; ou, assez fréquemment, dans la prose attique. Ellendt 1872, 101 B – 102 A cite d’assez nombreux exemples de αὖ employé avec τίς, τί. Que l’interrogatif τί puisse admettre l’hiatus dans des formules stéréotypées, c’est ce que prouvent les occurrences de τί ἔστιν; *et sim.* chez Sophocle (*Phil.* 733,⁶³ 753 ; fr. 314, 105 et 220 Radt [*Limiers*]).

Αι. εἰ δ’ ἐγὼ νέος,
οὐ τὸν χρόνον χρὴ μάλλον ἢ τᾶργα σκοπεῖν.
Κρ. ἔργον γάρ ἐστι τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας σέβειν; 730

Les éditeurs ne se formalisent pas du passage du pluriel τᾶργα au singulier ἔργον et, si un critique objectait que τοῦργον rend plus incisive la reprise du mot par Créon sous la forme ἔργον, on crierait à l’arbitraire ou on chercherait à montrer que la reprise du pluriel par le singulier est beaucoup plus subtile. Mais on paraît ignorer que τᾶργα σκοπεῖν est une des rarissimes violations chez Sophocle de cette règle de Hilberg :⁶⁴ « Im iambischen Trimeter und Choliambus dürfen vocalisch auslautende Endsilben trochaischer Wortformen keine Hebung bilden. Aufgeschlossen sind die freien Wörter ». Les deux autres violations mentionnées par Hilberg sont *Oed. rex* 981–982, πολλοὶ γὰρ ἦδη κὰν ὀνείρασιν βροτῶν | μητρὶ ξυνηνύασθησαν, et le fr. 498 Radt, ἡδὺ ξανῆσαι καὶ προγυμνάσαι χέρα. Photios et la Suda citent ce seul vers en précisant qu’il est dit par Hector déterminé à se battre avec les Achéens : une faute de transmission ne peut être exclue et Radt 1999 est disposé à l’envisager. Quant au vers de l’*Œdipe roi*, sur l’infraction duquel à la règle de Hilberg les commentateurs ne disent mot, il appartient à un ensemble de quatre vers que personne ne supprimera volontiers en suivant Deventer et Hilberg,

⁶³ Voir Brunck 1788 *ad loc.* ; Cavallin 1875, 26 et Schein 2013, 138 à *Phil.* 100 ; Kühner–Blass 1890, 196–197. Jebb 1898, 24 à *Phil.* 100 rappelle que Porson refusait à la tragédie l’hiatus après τί. Lui-même a tort de corriger τί εἴπας dans *Phil.* 917.

⁶⁴ Hilberg 1879, 206 ; Maas 1979, 105. Pour un examen et une lecture des « lois » de Hilberg selon la grille de la métrique verbale et du point de vue de la linguistique (phénomène du *sandhi*) mais sans tenir suffisamment compte de la rythmique (durée des syllabes), voir Baechle 2007, 55–76. On sait qu’en poésie latine classique c’est pratiquement une loi qu’une syllabe finale ouverte brève ne puisse pas être allongée par le groupe consonantique initial du mot suivant. On y évite aussi de se servir comme de syllabe brève d’une syllabe finale ouverte brève suivie de deux consonnes initiales dont la seconde n’est pas une liquide.

surtout quand il est possible de substituer τροφῶ à μητρὶ.⁶⁵ La présence de ce mot v. 980 enlève toute ambiguïté à τροφῶ : comparer *Aiax* 849, γέροντι πατρὶ τῇ τε δυστήνῳ τροφῶ. Il est vrai que c'est seulement dans le passage de l'*Antigone* que la violation de la règle de Hilberg s'accompagne d'un problème d'une autre nature.

À suivre.

Gauthier Liberman
 Paris, École Pratique des Hautes Études ;
 Bordeaux, Université Michel de Montaigne
 gauthier.liberman@orange.fr

Bibliographie

- H. L. Ahrens, « Studien zum Agamemnon des Aeschylus », *Philologus, Erster Supplementband* (Göttingen 1860) 213–304, 477–640.
 H. L. Ahrens, *Kleine Schriften. Erster Band. Zur Sprachwissenschaft* (Hannovre 1891).
 C. Austin, « The Girl who Said “No” (Sophocles’ *Antigone*) », *Eikasmos* 17 (2006) 103–115.
 N. Baechle, *Metrical Constraint and the Interpretation of Style in the Tragic Trimeter* (Lanham 2007).
 W. S. Barrett, *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism* (Oxford 2007).
 F. H. M. Blaydes, *Sophocles, with English Notes I* (Londres 1859).
 A. Boeckh, *Sophokles Antigone griechisch und deutsch. Neue vermehrte Ausgabe* (Leipzig 1884).
 A. Boschi, *Crizia tragico. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Tivoli 2021).
 A. T. von S. Bradshaw, « The Watchman Scenes in the *Antigone* », *CQ* 16 (1962) 200–211.
 E. Bruhn, *Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck. Achtes Bändchen : Anhang* (Berlin 1899).
 E. Bruhn, *Sophokles. Antigone* (Berlin ¹¹1913).
 R. Brunck, *Sophoclis tragoediae septem* (Strasbourg 1788).
 W. Bühler, *Die Europa des Moschos* (Wiesbaden 1960).
 C. Cavallin, *Sophoclis Philocteta* (Lund 1875).

⁶⁵ Éliminant l'une des deux violations qu'il observe chez Eschyle, Hilberg substitue πόσιν à ἄνδρα dans *Eum.* 740, ἄνδρα κτανούσης δωμάτων ἐπίσκοπον. Il laisse en l'état *Ag.* 1627, ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ (cf. ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ *Thuc.* 8, 98, 3) τόνδ' ἐβούλευσας μόρον;. Fraenkel 1950 ne relève pas l'anomalie, alors qu'il avait noté ἦρπασε στρατοῦ (627), excusé par le fait qu'il s'agit de l'avant-dernier mot « plus que dissyllabique » du vers (Hilberg 1879, 218).

- C. Collard, *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy* (Stuttgart 2018).
- M. Davies, *Sophocles. Trachiniae* (Oxford 1991).
- R. D. Dawe, *Sophocles. Tragoediae* II (Leipzig 1979).
- R. D. Dawe, *Sophocles. Antigone* (Stuttgart–Leipzig ³1996).
- R. D. Dawe, *Corruption and Correction. A Collection of Articles* (Amsterdam 2007).
- J. D. Denniston, D. Page, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1957).
- J. Diggle, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta selecta* (Oxford 1998).
- W. Dindorf, *Lexicon Aeschyleum* (Leipzig 1873).
- A. B. Drachmann, « Zur Composition der Sophokleischen Antigone », *Hermes* 43 (1908) 67–76.
- V. Ehrenberg, *Sophocles and Pericles* (Oxford 1954).
- F. T. Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Berlin ²1872).
- K. G. A. Erfurdt, *Sophoclis Antigona* (Leipzig 1809).
- Eduard Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950).
- Ernst Fraenkel, *Griechische Denominativa in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und Verbreitung* (Göttingen 1906).
- G. Galvani, *Agamennone, I canti* (Rome–Pise 2021).
- H. Gleditsch, *Die Cantica der sophokleischen Tragoedien* (Vienne ²1883).
- M. Griffith, *Sophocles. Antigone* (Cambridge 1999).
- H.-G. Günther, *Exercitationes Sophocleae* (Göttingen 1996).
- M. Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1923–1944, Band 53, Hölderlin's Hymne « Der Ister »* (Francfort-sur-le-Main ²1993).
- O. Hense, *Studien zu Sophokles* (Leipzig 1880).
- G. Hermann, *Sophoclis Antigona* (Leipzig ³1830).
- I. Hilberg, *Das Princip der Silbenwaegung und die daraus entspringenden Gesetze der Endsilben in der griechischen Poesie* (Vienne 1879).
- R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments, Part IV. The Philoctetes* (Cambridge ²1898).
- R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments, Part III. The Antigone* (Cambridge ³1900).
- G. Kaibel, *Sophokles. Elektra* (Leipzig 1896).
- H. Keck, *Ein kleiner Beitrag zur Erklärung und Verbesserung von Sophokles' Antigone* (Husum 1882).
- T. Kock, *Exercitationes criticae* (Memel 1864).
- R. Kühner, F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Erster Teil, Elementar- und Formenlehre, Erster Band* (Hannovre 1890).
- K. Lachmann, *De choricis systematis tragicorum Graecorum libri quattuor* (Berlin 1819).
- G. Liberman, « L'elogio pindarico di Teosseno (fr. 123) rivisitato », in: S. Caciagli (ed.), *Eros e genere in Grecia arcaica* (Bologne 2017) 125–170.
- G. Liberman, *Cynthia. Monobiblos de Sextus Propertius* (Huelva 2020).
- G. Liberman, « La philologie, les rais perçants et l'arc du regard érogène (Pindare fr. 123 Maehler et Sophocle fr. 474 Radt) : autour d'une *uox lexicis addenda*, λίγξ » in: M. Simon, É. Wolff (edd.), *Mélanges Charles Guittard* (Paris 2021) 683–698.

- G. Liberman, « Petits riens sophocléens : Antigone I », *Hyperboreus* 28 : 1 (2022) 29–52.
- H. Lloyd-Jones, N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford 1990).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclis fabulae* (Oxford ²1992).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, N. G. Wilson, *Sophocles: Second Thoughts* (Göttingen 1997).
- C. A. Lobeck, *Sophoclis Ajax* (Berlin ³1866).
- P. Maas, *Metrica greca. Traduzione e aggiornamenti di A. Ghiselli* (Florence ²1979).
- B. Manuwald, *Sophokles. Philoktet* (Berlin–Boston 2018).
- E. Medda, *Eschilo. Agamennone* (Rome 2017).
- S. Mekler, *Sophoclis tragoediae ex recensione G. Dindorfii* (Leipzig ⁶1885).
- A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leyde 1982).
- C. Muff, *Die chorische Technik des Sophokles* (Halle 1877).
- A. Nauck, *Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin. Antigone* (Berlin ⁹1886).
- H. Osthoff, *Zur Geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Griechisch und Lateinisch* (Strasbourg 1884).
- F. A. Paley, *The Tragedies of Aeschylus* (Londres ²1861).
- A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles I–III* (Cambridge 1917).
- W. Porzig, *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen* (Berlin 1942).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen II 1* (Lemgo–Detmold 1861).
- K. Reinhardt, *Sophokles* (Francfort-sur-le-Main 1933 [²1941, ³1947]).
- S. Schein, *Sophocles. Philoctetes* (Cambridge 2013).
- J. H. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache. Erster Band* (Leipzig 1876).
- G. C. W. Schneider, *Sophokles. Antigone* (Weimar 1826).
- O. Schroeder, *Aeschyli cantica* (Leipzig ²1916).
- W. Schulze, rec. O. Hoffmann, *Die griechischen Dialekte, 2. Band, GGA* 159 (1897) 870–912.
- W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae* (Gütersloh 1892).
- W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen 1934).
- J. Seebass, *De uersuum lyricorum apud Sophoclem responsione* (Leipzig 1880).
- M. Seyffert, *Sophoclis Antigona* (Berlin 1865).
- E. Tournier, *Exercices critiques de la conférence de philologie grecque* (Paris 1875).
- F. W. Ullrich, *Über die religiöse und sittliche Bedeutung der Antigone des Sophokles mit einigen Beiträgen zur Erklärung einzelner Stellen derselben* (Hambourg 1853).
- J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften. Dritter Band* (Göttingen 1979).
- F. G. Welcker, « Ueber einige Stellen in Chorliedern der Antigone des Sophokles », *Allgemeine Schulzeitung* 6 (1829) col. 203–214, 217–221.
- M. L. West, compte rendu de Dawe 1979, *Gnomon* 6 (1981) 522–528.
- M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990).
- M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford 1997).
- M. L. West, *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Stuttgart ²1998).

- K. Wex, *Sophoclis Antigona. Tomus prior* (Leipzig 1829).
 F. Wieseler, « Zu Sophokles und Euripides », *Philologus* 7 (1852) 746–748.
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Aus Kydathen* (Berlin 1880).
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Berlin 1885).
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Euripides. Hippolytos griechisch und deutsch* (Berlin 1891).
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Euripides. Herakles* (Berlin ³1909).
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Berlin 1914a).
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Aeschylus. Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914b).
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Griechische Tragödien. Vierter Band* (Berlin 1923).
 U. von Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften IV. Lese Früchte und Verwandtes* (Berlin 1962).
 C. W. Willink, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Leyde–Boston 2010).
 E. Wunder, *Sophoclis Tragoediae, recensuit et explanavit E. W., Vol. I. Sect. IV. continens Antigonam* (Gotha–Erfurt ³1846).

This is the third of five sets of text-critical, exegetical and sometimes metrical remarks on *Antigone*. These **Sophocleuncula* are not only minute philological notes but they involve broader issues having a bearing on the interpretation and meaning of the drama as a whole. These remarks were composed with a view to drawing attention to a number of forgotten or unseen difficulties and to trying to address a number of seen but unsolved problems more efficaciously. The text and meaning of not a few other passages from works of Sophocles or of other writers are also dealt with.

Статья представляет собой третью из пяти последовательных публикаций, содержащих замечания о критике текста, экзегетических и метрических сложностях в *Антигоне* Софокла. **Sophocleuncula* посвящены не только частным филологическим проблемам, но и более общим вопросам, значимым для интерпретации драмы в целом. Заметки призваны привлечь внимание к ряду забытых или упущенных из виду сложностей и предложить более действенные решения осознаваемых, но нерешенных проблем. К анализу привлекается также немало пассажей из других произведений Софокла и других авторов.

Salvatore Tufano

WITH OR WITHOUT A *KOINON*.
THE *LONGUE DURÉE*
OF TWO REGIONAL FESTIVALS.
II. THE PAMBOIOTIA AND THE BASILEIA
FROM THE HELLENISTIC TO
THE IMPERIAL PERIOD

3. The Third and the Second century BC: The Rise of
the Pamboiotia and the Explosion of the Basileia¹

At the end of the fourth century BC, there is no evidence on the fate of Pamboiotia, whereas the creation of Epameinondas, the Basileia, survived its creator. The third century BC sees the Pamboiotia coming to rise as national games of the Boiotians and the Basileia attracting competitors from further distances. As in the early beginnings of this combined story, both these festivals returned to represent Boiotia abroad. This degree of representativity lasted until the second century BC. We will now address first the fate of the Pamboiotia and then proceed to consider the explosion of the Basileia.

The evidence on the Pamboiotia in the Hellenistic period is only indirectly literary and mostly epigraphic. Historians concentrate on the importance of Koroneia and its festival. An important source as Polybius recalls the fierce reproaches of the Boiotians against the Aetolians, in 220 BC, at the meeting of the Hellenic League (4. 25. 2: ἐγκαλούντων δὲ Βοιωτῶν μὲν ὅτι συλήσαιεν τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Ἰωνίας ἱερὸν εἰρήνης ὑπαρχούσης). The Aetolians had attacked the Itonion in Koroneia, between 224 and 227 BC,² and this εἰρήνης ὑπαρχούσης, despite the peace (probably a sacred truce).

During the First Macedonian War, Flamininus had to move against Akraiphia and Koroneia in 196 BC. Here, some Roman soldiers had been killed and Flamininus asked for the guilty parties and a fine. Yet (so Livy 33. 29. 8–9):

¹ See Part I (Tufano 2022b), Section 2.

² Walbank 1957 *ad* 4. 3. 5.

(8) quorum cum fieret neutrum, uerbis tantum ciuitates excusarent nihil publico consilio factum esse, missis Athenas et in Achaïam legatis qui testarentur socios iusto pioque se bello persecuturum Boeotos, (9) et cum parte copiarum Ap. Claudio Acraephiam ire iusso, ipse cum parte Coroneam circumcidit, uastatis prius agris [...].

In 191 BC, the consul M. Acilius Glabrio attacked Koroneia, when he saw there a statue of Antiochos III (Liv. 36. 20). He then stopped the pillaging, since such a decision could not depend on the sole Koroneians: the erection of the statue had been a common decision of the Boiotians (*cum communi decreto Boeotorum posita esset statua*).³ These anecdotes explain how relevant, from the outside, the Pamboiotia might look, since the Boiotians decided to place here a momentuous dedications as the statue of Antiochos, although Thebes was the actual ‘capital’ of the *koinon* (Liv. 33. 1).

The Pamboiotia were the festival held in the spot where most of the federal decisions were made, in the third century BC. This situation might explain why the temple of Athena Koroneia might have sought ἀσυλία in the sixties of the third century BC (*FD IV 358, 266/262 BC*):⁴

[...][ἔδο-]
 ξε τοῖς Ἀμφικτί]οσιν τὸ ἱερὸ[ν]
 [τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς] Ἰτωνίας τὸ
 [ἐν Κορωνείᾳ ἄσυ]λον εἶναι.

The collocation of the Itonion in the inscription is an integration. Yet, Polybius (4. 25. 2), with the reference to a sacred truce, supports the view that the sanctuary enjoyed this inviolability between the third and the second centuries BC.⁵ Only in the third century BC, therefore, one sees a renewed interest in this sanctuary and, apparently, in the festival.

As anticipated in the Introduction (Part I), preserved lists of victors show that only Boiotians participated in the Pamboiotia. We can now

³ On this episode, see Müller 1996a, 134 and Thornton 2014, 112–113.

⁴ *SEG* 18. 240 = *FD IV 358, 266/262 BC*. Cf. Schachter 1981, 123 and n. 6. It was assumed (Kowalzig 2007, 362 n. 70) that the ἀσυλία preexisted the 3rd cent. BC, since in 394 BC a few Boiotians took refuge in the temple (Xen. *Hell.* 4. 3. 20; Plut. *Ages.* 19. 2; Polyaen. 2. 1. 5; Paus. 3. 9. 13). However, only Pausanias calls these defeated Boiotian ἰκέταις. All the other sources report that Agesilaus let them leave the temple, without forcing it. If so, it was more a royal decision than the actual technical status of ἀσυλία which acted at this stage.

⁵ See Rigsby 1996, 55–59 and Mackil 2013, 224.

add that these lists are actually lists of teams and that their composition goes parallel to those of the military subunits which were training in these decades. There was a “unified system of military organization and training for the *poleis* of the Boiotian League”:⁶ the participation of teams was a means of displaying their effective capacity.

In the late third century BC, a victorious team of Koroneians made a dedication to unknown deities (*SEG* 3. 354, 230–200 BC):

τὸ ἄγειμα κὴ τὸ πελταφόρη κὴ τὸ ἐπίλε[κτο] κὴ τὸ
φαρετρίτη κὴ τὸ σφενδονᾶτη Κορωνείων
τῷ τέλειος νικάσαντες τὰ Παμβοιώτια τῆς θεῆς.

This group was led by the first mentioned subunit, the ἄγειμα: the noun ἄγειμα normally defines an infantry formation of attack, especially the Macedonian ἄγημα. However, it could also describe a specific elite group, similar to the Theban ἱερὸς λόχος.⁷ Both readings might coexist: the Macedonian derivation of the infantry corps could explain the commemoration of other local elite units, renamed now after the Macedonian model. The other Koroneian victorious subunits were the πελτοφόροι (boiot. πελταφόροι), a group of light infantry, the ἐπίλεκτοι, whose vague denomination might indicate another elite formation, possibly on constant call, and two specific subunits: the archers (φαρετρίται) and the slingers (σφενδονῆται).

In a similar way, the “Great Stele of Thespiiai” (*IThesp* 84_{20–29}, 210 BC),⁸ a magistrate list, records the following infantry regiments:

λοχαγὸς τῷ ἀγείματος Κλέων Αὐτον[ό]μου·
[ἀ]γεμόνες πελτοφόρης Δαμόκ[ρ]ιτος Ἀρισ[τ]ο-
[μ]άχῳ, vac.
vac. ἐφείβαρχος Πουθίων Πουθίωνος· ἀγεμόνε[ς]
ἐπιλέκτους Πειλεκλίδας Εὐκλείους, Στρότω[ν]
Ἀπολλοδώρῳ· φαρετρίτης Ἀγίας Ἀγα[θ]οκλείους·
σφενδονάτης vac. ἀρχικ[ου]ναγὸν
Ἐράτων Εὐτούχῳ, Πράξων Σωστράτῳ, Λοχαγ[ό]ς
Ἄφη[στιών]ος(?), Φιλώνδας Σωκλείους, ν λοχαγὸν ὀπλί-
της Εὐθύνοιο Τίμωνος vac.

⁶ Cf. Grigsby 2017, 121 and Kalliontzis 2020, 89–95.

⁷ Relationship with the Macedonian unit: Feyel 1942, 201–202; Kalliontzis 2020, 92. Connection with the Theban Sacred Band: Schachter 2016, 208.

⁸ See Kalliontzis 2020, 93 on the leaders in this list.

Some elements as the ἄγεια (l. 20) and the light infantry (l. 21) are in common with the aforementioned dedication, whereas others only mentioned here, as the leader of the mandatory military education (l. 23, ἐφείβαρχος) and the chief-huntsman (l. 26, ἀρχικούναγος), suggest occasional variations in the formation of these units which participated to the Pamboiotia.

Among the extant inscriptions of this period, we find the same pattern ἄγεια–ἐπίλεκτοι–πελτοφόροι–φαρετρίται in another dedication of a victorious team at the Pamboiotia from Thespiiai (*IThesp* 201, ca. 230 BC), which lists the single leaders of these subunits: here, however, the slingers are substituted by simple soldiers (l. 13: τὸ πεδδύ).

The few surviving dedications confirm the participation of teams and a close connection between these and the different τέλη of the Boiotian army, whose composition reflected the seven τέλη of the Hellenistic *koinon*.⁹ The relationship between these teams and their place of origin is always remarked: sometimes, as in the aforementioned inscription from Koroneia (*SEG* 3. 354), the whole τέλος takes pride in the victory; on other occasions, for unknown reasons, single poleis of the τέλος (Lebadeia, Koroneia, and Thisbe) chose to make explicit the different contributions of these subunits of the geographical τέλος.¹⁰

A single polis could also participate, perhaps independently of its τέλος, as in the case of Lebadeia, whose horsemen made their own dedication, after the horse-race won at the Pamboiotia (*IG* VII 3087, 255–250 BC):

τοὶ ἱππότη Λεβαδειῶν ἀνέθιαν Τρεφώνιοι,
νικάσαντες ἱππασίη Παμβοιώτια, ἱππαρχίοντος
Δεξιπίπῳ Σαυκρατείῳ, φιλαρχιόντων Μύτωνος
Θρασωνίῳ, Ἐπιτίμῳ Σαυκρατείῳ.

The Hellenistic Pamboiotia distinguish themselves for this collective organization, in contrast with the individual participation of the Classical period.¹¹ In the third century, the new military character of the games allowed them to dwell on the national memory of the Boiotians: Koroneia, as a federal sanctuary, had survived the dissolution of the Boiotian League (338–287 BC).

⁹ On the τέλη of the Hellenistic κοινόν, see Knoepfler 2001; Müller 2011; Mackil 2013, 225. On the link with the festival, see now Kalliontzis 2020, 89–90.

¹⁰ See e.g. *SEG* 26, 551, from Koroneia, where we find these three ethnics at ll. 14–16.

¹¹ See Section 1 (Part I).

The local teams of military units had to exhibit their training. The aforementioned horsemen of Lebadeia (*IG* VII 3087), for instance, won the ἵππασίη at the Pamboiotia: this race could consist of a spectacular exhibition of horses, of a fake tournament and performance of complicated moves, not very different from the ἐπίδειξις described by Xenophon (*Hipp.* 3. 10–13).¹² Perhaps there was a form of historical performance, in such a competition, as in the contemporary historical carousel of the *carabinieri* in Italy: this exhibition of grandiose manoeuvres of horses was established during fascism (1933) to celebrate the army and each of the units wears a uniform of the victorious units in specific moments of the past. Could it be that the ἵππασίη had the task of combining sport with history, in Boiotia, a land well-known for its horses¹³ – in other words, that it was an agonistic form of thinking about the past?

Even simple soldiers could participate in the Pamboiotia,¹⁴ which also included a specific competition for armed men, the εὐοπλίη:¹⁵ this military performance of the horsemen was similar to the εὐανδρία included in the contests of the Athenian Panathenaia.¹⁶

Performances of *poetae vagantes* could also occur at the Pamboiotia. Zotion of Ephesus, an otherwise unknown tragic poet, was honoured sometime in the middle of the second cent. BC (*SEG* 57. 443₁₋₆):

[..... ἄρχοντος] ἔδοξε τῷ συνένδρῳ κῆ τῷ δάμῳ τῶν
[Κορωνίων· ἐπιδεῖ Ζ]ωτίων Ζωτίωνος Ἐφέσιος, τραγαῶδι-
[ων ποιεῖτὰς κῆ σατο]ύρων, κῆ πρότερον μὲν ἐπιδαμείσας ἐν
[τὰν πόλιν ἀμίων τ]ὰν ἀναστροφὰν ἐποείσατο εὐσχεῖμονα κῆ καθί-
[κωσαν τῇ πόλιν κῆ αὖσαντ]ῷ, κῆ κατὰ τὸν παριόντα κηρὸν ἀκροάσις
[ποισάμενος τῶν πε]πραγματευμένων αὐτῷ διὰ τὰς ποείσεις

¹² See Olivieri 2010–2011, 89–90. The parallel helps our understanding of the agones, but we should always remember Robert's remark: "on combat pour vaincre, pour être déclaré et proclamé le premier et, plus souvent, il n'y a même pas du second. [...] Cet effort agonistique est le contraire d'une activité ludique. L'agôn, le concours, se distingue radicalement aussi de l'épideixis, récital, représentation, sans concurrent" (Robert 1984 [in: *Πρακτικά του Η' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής και Λατινικής Επιγραφικής, Αθήνα, 3–9 Οκτωβρίου 1982*], 36 = Robert 2007, 268).

¹³ Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 9. 146; Herakleides Kritikos *JCV* (*FGrH* V) 2022 F 13 A and Arenz 2006, 203; Kalliontzis 2020, 93–94.

¹⁴ *SEG* 3. 355.

¹⁵ Moretti, 1953, 102–103.

¹⁶ Suggestion: Pappadakis 1923, 230–231, with Lalonde 2019, 162 n. 300. Other equestrian contests occurred at the Athenian Theseia: on this festival, see Parke 1977, 81–82, Kyle 1993, 40–41; Kennell 1999.

The proxeny decree suggests that, by the time this text had been produced, the *koinon* had already been dissolved.¹⁷ I doubt that the Pamboiotia in their traditional form continued after 171 BC: Zotion is honoured for performing his pieces in Koroneia, and it is highly possible that the festival only continued as a local one. Possibly they were now managed by a group of *ναποιοί*, as two victors' lists of the first century BC confirm.¹⁸ In other words, the proxeny decree for Zotion does not explicitly allow us to argue for a continuity of the festival, unless we postulate a reduction of the agonistic element.

The Pamboiotia might seem more dangerous, from the outside, than the Basileia. Koroneia was one of the Boiotian cities more constantly and vehemently aligned with the Macedonians during the Macedonian Wars.¹⁹ After 171 BC, i.e. after the dissolution of the Boiotian Hellenistic *koinon*,²⁰ there are no more federal archons, and the survival of games could only apply to specific games where “a sublimation of the militaristic self-expression” would be limited to specific cases: the Basileia included an armed race, but it was nothing like the open field competition among teams of soldiers at the heart of the Hellenistic Pamboiotia.²¹

The Boiotians could keep a sense of regional identity through the festivals, in the period between the end of the Third Macedonian War and the re-emergence of the *koinon*. The Basileia survived, in a local form, with a new name (see Section 4). The exception of the Pamboiotia could depend on the strong military connotations of the festival, as it had been rethought and reorganised in the third century BC: Boiotia had displayed an ambiguous position during the Macedonian Wars, and the energies of the cities (and a Roman prohibition?) might have warned against a continuation of a festival where military units showed their military training.

While the Pamboiotia were a festival open to teams, the Basileia remained individual competitions in the third and second century BC; there are isolated mentions of musical contests, which might have

¹⁷ See Schachter–Slater 2007.

¹⁸ *IG VII* 1764 (ca. 60 BC; Schachter 1981, 125–126 and Müller 2014, 128) and *IG VII* 2871 (late 1st cent. BC; see Section 4): on these texts and their value for the theory of a reorganization of the Pamboiotia in the 1st cent. BC, see Knoepfler 2020, 202–206.

¹⁹ See esp. Müller 1996a.

²⁰ On this episode, see now Müller 2021.

²¹ Quotation: Grigsby 2017, 137. Cf. Müller 2014, 122 and 136.

occurred on an irregular basis.²² Once again, the difficulty to give a full and detailed program of the Basileia depends on the selective materials, exclusively epigraphical for the period under consideration (third and second centuries BC).

Most information on the origin of the winners at the Basileia and at the later Trophonia actually dates to the second and to the first century BC: until the third century BC, which represents a turning point in the organization of this festival, a growing number of athletes celebrating their victory at the Basileia often came from other Greek cities.²³

Zeus Basileus and Hera Basileia became two of the four representative Boiotian gods in the external self-presentation of the Boiotians,²⁴ and this will have raised the interest of the other Greeks for the context: in 281/0, the Athenian taxiarchs could claim that visiting the Basileia at Lebadeia equated a foreign embassy to the Boiotian League (*IG* II/III³ 1. 4. 882₉₋₁₁: *περὶ ὧν λέγουσιν οἱ ἀποσταλέντε|ς τῶν ταξιάρχων εἰς τὰ Βασίλεια ὑπὲρ τῆ|ς θυσίας ἧς ἔθυσαν*).²⁵

Between the early third and the beginning of the second century BC, we have eight documents on the catchment area of the Basileia.²⁶ Apart from a chronologically slippery text from Klazomenai (*IG* VII 3102),

²² In the case of the Basileia, a musical competition in the 3rd cent. BC might be inferred from *IG* II² 3779: this is a list of victories of the κῑθαρωδός (so Paus. 1. 37. 2) Nikokles of Tarentum. The man won in three contests named Basileia: one in Macedonia, one in Alexandria, and one not specified and possibly in Lebadeia, but the inscription would be the only witness for this period (Knoepfler 2008, 1439). The presence of heralds, in this period (*IG* VII 530, ca. 250 BC), later in time (*IG* II² 3158a, 1st cent. AD), and in the imperial celebrations (see Section 5), does not imply that the Basileia were an ἀγὼν μουσικός, as correctly underlined by Knoepfler (2008, 1456 n. 120).

²³ The reference epigraphic catalogue for the Basileia is Turner 1996. A turning point was represented by Knoepfler 2008; further indications on the epigraphic dossier of the Basileia are in Müller 2014.

²⁴ See *IG* IX² 1170 (ca. 270 BC), with Schachter 2016, 188 and n. 31.

²⁵ On this document as proof of the good relationship between Athens and Boiotia, see Kalliontzis 2020, 112.

²⁶ Ariston of Plataea: *IG* VII 1711 = *Leb.* 4 (early 3rd cent. BC: Manieri 2009; 2nd cent. BC: Schachter 1994). Kallistratos of Sicyon (*MAFAS* 578): *IG* IV 428 (260–220 BC). Damatrios of Tegea (*MAFAS* 276): *IG* V 2. 142 (late 3rd cent. BC). Two winners from Thebes: an anonymous man, *IG* VII 2487 (late 3rd / early 2nd cent. BC: see Knoepfler 2008, 1443 and n. 74) and Athanichos, *IG* VII 4247 = Ebert 70 (late 3rd / early 2nd cent. BC). Anonymous from Argos: *SEG* XI 338 (200–180 BC). Anonymous from Klazomenai: *IG* VII 3102 (probably ‘Hellenistic’: Turner 1996). Anonymous from Lebadeia: *IG* VII 3079 (‘Hellenistic’: Turner 1996).

other two victories are by Theban athletes (*IG* VII 2487 and 4247), whereas two cases must be signalled: Kallistratos of Sicyon (*MAFAS* 578) and Damatrios of Tegea (*MAFAS* 276) record their victories at the Basileia of Lebadeia in a long record of victories at stephanitic as well as at local contests.²⁷ These were extremely successful men, like the Theban Athanichos (*MAFAS* 223; *IG* VII 4247₁₋₄) who died during a military campaign:

[πάμμα]χος ἐν Νεμ[έ]αι νικῶ καὶ τρις Βασίλεια
 [π]αῖς καὶ ἀνήρ. καὶ πῦξ τὸν τ[ρίτ]ον [ά]μ[φ]εθ[έ]μην
 [θν]ήισκω δ' [έ]μ [π]ρομάχοις Ἄρεως δορὸς ἡγεμονεύων
 [κλ]εινὸς Ἀθάνιχος, ὃν θοῦρος Ἄρης δ[ά]μ[α]σεν.

The data on the catchment area document a festival with federal management and a still narrow impact beyond its region. The situation can be better understood if we concentrate on what had happened in Lebadeia in the second half of the third century BC, with the plan to erect a new sanctuary for Zeus Basileus. We have eight *συγγραφαί* on the construction, never finished, of this temple.²⁸ One of these contracts indicates the names of two archons of the Boiotian League, Andronikos and, probably, Potidaichos (221/220 BC).²⁹ These names appear in a context which refers to an advanced stage of the project and therefore represent a *terminus ante quem* for the decision to start the construction of this new temple, located on the hill of Prophitis Ilias near modern Livadia.

A *ναοποικὸς νόμος*³⁰ lists the architects, the boiotarchs and the financial board of the *κατόπται* who worked with the newly established college of the *ναοποιοί*. These people oversaw the erection of the new sanctuary of Zeus Basileus as a federal venture: it will remain the only federal institution, after the dissolution of the *koinon* in 171 BC, despite the abrupt end to the works on the temple.

The intervention of the Boiotian League in Lebadeia also concerned other aspects, such as the request of *ἀσυλία* for the new project of the temple. The proof of this is a document (*IG* VII 4136) describing

²⁷ An overview of these winners s. in Knoepfler 2008, 1440–1441.

²⁸ *IG* VII 3073–3076; *AM* 22 (1897) 179; *BCH* 20 (1896) 318; *BCH* 64/65 (1940/41) 37 n. 23; *JHS* 15 (1895) 92.

²⁹ See the new edition of the text by Pitt 2014. On Potidaichos, cf. Kalliontzis 2020, 23–24 and 173 (Inscr. 13).

³⁰ *IG* VII 3073_{87–89}. See Schachter 2016, 389 and n. 39.

a consultation of the oracle of Trophonios and found in a dossier with two other texts concerning the Ptoia of Akrephia:

Καλλικλείδας Λοκρὸς ἐς Ὀπόεντος καταβάς ἐν Τρεφώ-
νιον ἀνάγγειλε Λεπάδειαν τῷ Διὶ τῷ Βασιλεῖ ἀνθέμεν
κῆ τῷ Τρεφωνίῳ κῆ Ἀκρήφια τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Πτωίῳ κῆ μὲν
ἀδικῶμεν μειδένα οὕτως. οὕτως δὲ ἀγίρεμεν ἀμφοτέ-
ρως τὰ ἱερὰ χρεῖματα κυνῇ ἐφ’ οὐγὴ κατὰ πᾶσαν χώ-
ραν, κῆ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἱερὸν καταγγελλέμεν. ὅστις δὲ κα τῷ
Διὸς τῷ Βασιλεῖος ἐπιμελειθεῖται τῷ ναῷ, τὸν στέφανον
ὑσέτη.³¹

This text raises several questions that cannot be fully addressed here;³² for our understanding of the historical evolution of the Basileia of Lebadeia, however, it is important to stick to the letter of this document. The man, probably paid by the Boiotian League,³³ descended to the cave on matters related to the Ptoia of Akrephia and the temple of Zeus in Lebadeia. The sacred funds are to be solicited ‘throughout every land’ (ll. 5–6) and the cities have to proclaim ‘the sacred agon’. The singular form of this expression and the fact that the text was found in a dossier with the decree of the Amphiktyony confirming this *καταγγελία* (IG VII 4135) are sure evidence that the agon here alluded to are the Ptoia. The descent of Kallikleidas was not related to a reform or a change of the festival of the Basileia: the word to be spread regarded the *ἀσυλία* of the temple of Zeus Basileus.

We anticipated that other Greek communities were aware of the existence of the Basileia during the third century BC, before the new works at the sanctuary. The documents between the late third and the first century BC do not challenge this relatively narrow catchment area

³¹ See Schachter 2016, 381–396. The area of the temple of Zeus Basileus is unfortunately poorly published: see Gadolou 2008 [A. Γκαδόλου, “Ἡ πρόσφατη αρχαιολογικὴ ἐρευνα στο ναὸ τοῦ Διὸς Βασιλέως στη Λιβαδειά”, in: B. Αραβαντινός (ed.), *Επετηρὶς τῆς Εταιρείας τῶν Βοιωτικῶν Μελετῶν: Δ’ Διεθνὲς Συνέδριο Βοιωτικῶν Μελετῶν (Λιβαδειά, 9–12 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000)*] and Kanellou-Partida 2021. On the dossier (IG VII 4135–4137), see Müller 2020, 65–66 on its importance for the Ptoia.

³² To the points addressed in the text, one may add the unconventional choice to credit the reestablishing of the cult to a foreigner, Kallikleidas from Opous. The current understanding is that Opous did not belong to the Boiotian *koinon* at this stage (see Kalliontzis 2020, 101–144).

³³ See Schachter 1984.

of the winners:³⁴ the winners come from Athens, Delphi, Rhodes, Larisa, Potidaia, and Megara. Only in one highly fragmentary inscription from Chaeronea (*SEG* 3. 368, early second century BC) there is a winner from Antiochia ad Pyramum (l. 6)³⁵ and a Χρυσαιορεύς (l. 13).

The variety of the contests, as anticipated in Section 2 (Part I), includes gymnastic contests that cannot easily be presented in their program.³⁶ The only innovation was the choice of an ἀγωνοθέτης from any city of the confederation. This figure is better known for his duties thanks to documents of the first century BC: the task of managing the festival with the sacred funds might have implied a personal intervention.³⁷ Before the late third century BC, we have the salient ἀγωνοθεσία of the Theban Neon, son of Askondas (*IG* VII 3091):³⁸

Νέων Φασκόν[δαο]
ἀγωνοθετεί[σας]
τὰ Βασίλεια
τὸ ἐληοχρίσ[τιον]
ἀνέθεικε τοῖ [Δι]
τοῖ Βασιλε[ῖ] κ[ῆ] τῇ
πόλι.

This act recalls the similar introduction of an ἀγωνοθέτης in the organization of the Ptoia after 221 BC:³⁹ the Boiotians were willing to transform a successful regional festival into a better organized, federal organization of this event.

³⁴ *SGDI* II 2961 (170–130 BC); *IG* XII 1. 78 (2nd cent. BC); *IG* IX² 614a (2nd–1st cent. BC); *SEG* 14. 478a (100 BC); *ID* 1957 = *MAFAS* 695 (120 BC); *IG* VII 47 (196–86 BC); *SEG* 3. 368 (2nd cent. BC). *ID* 1957 and *IG* VII 47 are listed among the ‘Trophonia Monuments’ by Turner 1996 because they refer to the Trophonia. In light of the interpretation followed in this text, however, it is legitimate to consider these texts in the same context.

³⁵ On this winner, see Manieri 2009, 154 and Kalliontzis 2020, 38.

³⁶ See Robert 1936, 22. The three categories of age attested for the Basileia are παῖδες (“boys”), ἀγένειοι (“beardless youths”), and ἄνδρες (“men”). They probably ran different distances in the running contests, but it is not certain whether Plato’s description of these distances (*Leg.* 8. 833 c) applied to all the festivals (see Schöpsdau 2011 *ad* Plat. l. c.).

³⁷ See Migeotte 2006 and Section 4.

³⁸ See Knoepfler 2008, 1441 on this figure.

³⁹ Müller 2020, 66–67.

4. The First Century BC

The first century BC sees a profound renewal of the *Basileia*, which will be addressed in the first place, and the reprise of the *Pamboiotia*. Both these innovations are connected with the new Boiotian κοινόν, no more a federal institution, but an organization that recovered most of the previous regional legacies and used the festivals as carriers of this antiquarian project.

Since a series of documents from the late second and the early first century BC, and to the full third century AD, report the existence of *Trophonia* in *Lebadeia*, it was once believed that the *Basileia* and the *Trophonia* were two different, and possibly coterminous, festivals: the issue has now lost most of its pregnancy, after the new studies of the inscriptions on the festival of *Lebadeia* of the second and the first century BC. A reappraisal of a series of notes by Louis Robert allowed Denis Knoepfler to link the evolution of the *Basileia* with the history of the κοινόν, which was dissolved by the Romans in 171 BC and would only re-emerge in the first century BC, after the Battle of Chaeronea (86 BC).⁴⁰ This survival is in line with the redating of the *Amphiareia Rhomaia*: by antedating *I. Oropos* 521 to 149–146 BC, Kalliontzis showed the continuity of this festival and its precocious ‘Romanization’.⁴¹ In the case of the *Amphiareia*, the likely establishment of the festival in honour of Rome in 148 BC was how *Oropos* reacted to the historical events; in the same decades, the inhabitants of *Lebadeia* were opting for an alternative, by renaming their previous contest.

From the end of the second century BC, the *Basileia* of *Lebadeia* are mentioned under the name of “*Trophonia*”: a telling document of this stage is the prize list of Menodoros of Athens (*MAFAS* 695) who won around 120 BC (*ID* 1957, a₁₋₂; b³_{26; 29, 5}):⁴²

Μηνόδωρον Γναίου Ἀθηναῖον, νικήσαντα τὴν περίοδον καὶ τοὺς
ἄλλους ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας,

Δημήτριος Ἀπολλοδότου Ἀντιοχεύς, Ἀπόλλωνι. [...]

Τροφώνια

τὰ ἐν

Λεβαδεΐα

ἄνδρας

πάλην [...]

παγκράτιον.

⁴⁰ Knoepfler 2008 and 2020.

⁴¹ Kalliontzis 2016.

⁴² On the date, see Knoepfler 2008, 1430–1432. The prize list is preserved on two copies, from Delos (*ID* 1957 = *LAG* 51) and from Athens (*IG* II/III² 3147).

Only in the first century BC did the Trophonia reappear as Basileia. Whereas the Pamboiotia, with their strong political semantics, had not been celebrated in full in the years between 171 BC and the birth of the new *koinon*, we can postulate a different situation for the Basileia that continued under a more local lead. It was only in the first century BC, with the new Roman *koinon*, that the Basileia could be systematically reorganised by a regional board. For a period, the festival appears under a different name, but was still celebrated in Lebadeia.⁴³

To an external observer, nothing had changed, in the daily life of the Basileia: writing in the forties of the first century BC, Diodorus asserts that the festival introduced by Epameinondas is the one carried out in his own times (15. 53. 4: ταύτην ποιοῦσι τὴν πανηγύριν). A contemporary of Diodorus, Didymus, in commenting on Pindar's Βοιωτίων ἀγῶνες ἔννομοι, seems to juxtapose Basileia and Trophonia.⁴⁴ The juxtaposition, however, can only emerge from the point of view of a scholar who is aware of the existence of the two names (no variation is attested by Diodorus): Knoepfler observes that the two games were never celebrated together.⁴⁵

One can only speculate on the reason for the change of name: a possible indication are the imperial inscriptions, in which the Basileia, once again, are replaced by the Trophonia. It might be that the Basileia, after the dissolution of the *koinon*,⁴⁶ sounded too 'monarchic', under the Roman government. The last document falls shortly before the Roman measure of 171.⁴⁷ The ambiguous echoes of the name of the festival made it an uneasy cultural thorn for the Romans. A possible

⁴³ *IG* VII 3078 = *Leb.* 11 (80–51 BC); *SEG* III 367 = *Leb.* 12 (mid. 1st cent. BC); *BE* (1973) 213 (1st cent. BC); *IG* VII 3095 (first half of 1st cent. BC); *IG* VII 1764 and 2871 (1st cent. BC). This further low-dating by Müller 2014 is however doubted by Knoepfler (*BE* 2015 n. 249).

⁴⁴ F 13 Braswell, on which see Section 1 (Part I).

⁴⁵ Knoepfler 2008, 1462.

⁴⁶ Müller 1996a and 2002.

⁴⁷ *SGDI* II 2961, late 170s BC. For a discussion of this document, see Knoepfler 2008, 1443–1445. The last winner, Eudokos of Delphi, was the grandson of Praxo, a woman who granted hospitality to Evander of Crete and to three Macedonians, vested by Perseus with the mission to kill Eumenes of Pergamon (Liv. 42. 15–17: on the entire plan, see Thornton 2014, 145–146). Two other possibly coterminous documents are a stele for Agasias of Chalkis (*BE* 1979 n. 116) and a dedication of a Messenian boxer, considered earlier by Knoepfler (2008, 1445 n. 80) and later by the editors of the *SEG* (59. 417).

survival or re-appearance of the contest could only happen under a new, less compromised term. The exact relationship between the local hero Trophonios and Zeus Basileus⁴⁸ remains unexplained, but the decision of Epameinondas, in 371, to call this agon the ‘Basileia’ must not have sounded irrational to the attendants of the site. Conversely, the original fame of Lebadeia as an oracular site might explain the choice of the local organizers to adopt a more locally coloured name (Trophonia), in the period between, roughly, 146 BC and the first quarter of the later century, to adopt a more locally coloured name. The focus on the local hero might have been an idea of the ναοποιοί, the board which survived the dissolution of the *koinon*: the change of administration, in other words, coincided with the decision to return to focus on a local deity. It was always the same festival, but the different dedicant gave it a new allure and diminished its political implications.

Only after the resurrection of the political federation could the Basileia regain their original name and a federal administration. The ἀπολογίαι of the first century BC record the activity of ἀγωνοθέται who declare their expenses and are managers of a festival which is once again a regional event.

The Basileia were organised, on behalf of the college of the ναοποιοί, by an ἀγωνοθέτης, who was presumably chosen by a body representing all the Boiotian cities and elected at a local level. The ἀγωνοθέτης remained in office from the end of the previous edition of the Basileia, during the month of Panamos, to the month Pamboiotios of the next year, when he declared his expenses (ἀπολογία).⁴⁹

We have three ἀπολογίαι of ἀγωνοθέται of the first century BC: one by Xenarchos of Lebadeia,⁵⁰ the second by Prokles,⁵¹ and the third by Sostratos of Tanagra.⁵² Here are three relevant lines of this last inscription (A₂₆₋₂₉):

⁴⁸ See esp. Schachter 1994, 88–89 and Bonnechere 2003.

⁴⁹ The noun ἀπολογία is common in Boiotia to indicate the list of expenses of a magistrate at the end of his mandate; the corresponding Attic word is ἀπολογισμός (Rougemon–Rousset 2005, 123).

⁵⁰ *IG* VII 3078 = *Leb.* 11: see Knoepfler 2020, 194–195.

⁵¹ *SEG* 3. 367 = *Leb.* 12. A new fragment belonging to this ἀπολογία was published by Knoepfler 2020, 215–216.

⁵² Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020 [A. Π. Ματθαίου, Ν. Παπαζαρκάδας, “Ἀπολογία ἀγωνοθέτου τῶν Βασιλείων ἐκ Λεβαδείας”].

Ἀπολογία ἀγωνοθέτου τῶν Βασιλείων [Σ]ωστράτου Ἑροτίωνος
Ταναγραίου·
Πανάμου· λῆμμα παρὰ τῶν πόλεων ὃ εἰσήνεγκαν ἀφ' ἑκάστου τέλους
εἰς τὰ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι ἀλώματα· πα[ρ]ὰ Λεβαδέων ἀργυρίου|
Λευκολλείου ΙΓC-XF [...]

These documents probably represent an abridged version of the actual sums involved in the organization of the festival; moreover, the ἀπολογία of Xenarchos (*Leb.* 11) is preceded by an agonistic catalogue of winners and followed by a list of delegates sent by the Boiotian cities and by an account of the procedure raised by Xenarchos against his predecessor Platon (*Leb.* 11 C₄₂₋₄₆):⁵³

[...][εἰσαχθεῖ-]
σης τῆς κατ[ὰ Πλάτωνος]
ζημίας, ἐπέ[κριναν οἱ ἀ-]
πὸ τῶν πόλ[εων παραγε-]
γονότες ἐ[γκριταί].

The last published fragment of the ἀπολογία of Prokles⁵⁴ and the new ἀπολογία of Sostratos⁵⁵ confirm the relevance of the ἐγκριταί. These jurors were three from each town and some towns provided twice this number, as Orchomenos.⁵⁶ The ἐγκριταί were sent to Lebadeia to judge the competitions in the first place and the further need to govern other trials confirms the tie between this festival and the supervision by the *koinon*. The provenance of the judges attests to a “pattern of widespread representation”.⁵⁷

From the ἀπολογίαι we learn that the financial administration mostly rested on the rental of sanctuary lands and on the εἰσφοραί of the Boiotian cities which decided to participate.⁵⁸ Xenarchos (*Leb.* 11)

⁵³ See Manieri 2009 *ad loc.* and Rougemont–Rousset 2005 n. 22. On the restitution ἐ[γκριταί] (l. 46), see Knoepfler 2020, 224 n. 140.

⁵⁴ Knoepfler 2020, 216₅₋₈: οἱ ἀπὸ τῶ[ν πό-]|λεων παραγενέμενοι ἐγκριταί.

⁵⁵ Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020 B₁₈₋₁₉: παρεγε<v>ήθησαν ἐν-|κριταί εἰς τὰ Βασίλεια.

⁵⁶ Orchomenos: Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020 B₂₂₋₂₇. On the ἐγκριταί, see Rougemont–Rousset 2005, 124; Papazarkadas 2019, 208–209; Knoepfler 2020, 227–228; Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020, 181–182.

⁵⁷ Papazarkadas 2019, 209.

⁵⁸ On the administrative aspects of the festival during the 1st century BC, see Knoepfler 1988; Fröhlich 2004, 469; Müller 2014, 126–127; Schachter 2016, 189–190; Knoepfler 2020.

recalls renting the hippodrome and the stadion (l. 21) and managing the sums for games that did not occur (l. 22); moreover, he took care that all the Boiotian cities delivered their εἰσφορά (l. 23) and ‘personally’, as an act of euergetism, paid for the sacrifices and the agon (25). In the same document, we also learn that the people who rented these spaces were from Lebadeia.

Despite the richness of details on the festival, these ἀπολογίαι do not make mention of any attempt to commemorate previous winners or to claim an alignment with the big games of the περίοδος. At the same time, the agonistic catalogues of the first century BC and the other contemporary documents shed light on a sensibly wider catchment area. On the one hand, we have athletes from Rome in two ἀπολογίαι (*Leb.* 11 and 12);⁵⁹ on the other hand, others came from Greece, Asia Minor, and the Near East.⁶⁰

The presence of a Ptolemy, identified with Ptolemy XII Theos Philopator Neos Dionysos (80–51 BC),⁶¹ is an interesting chapter in the history of a local festival that had long been attended mainly by Boiotians and by other Greeks. According to Papazarkadas, this wide international catchment area may depend on kinship ties sought by the Boiotians, since every city or region outside Greece may be linked to different episodes of mythical history of Boiotia.⁶² If this scenario were true, one could recognize here a further aspect of the political implications of the Basileia. The Boiotians were probably using such a festival – where two regional boards, the ναοποιοί and the ἐγκριταί, coexisted⁶³ – to look for an external confirmation of this antiquarian revival. Based on the preserved ἀπολογίαι, it is hard to claim when exactly the new *koinon* was born: the current certain points are that this must have been after the Mithridatic

⁵⁹ The presence of P. Licinius in the apology of Prokles (*Leb.* 12) may help postdate this inscription to the last third of the first century BC (Müller 2014, 127). On the expansion of the community of the Romans in Boiotia in this period, see Müller 2002.

⁶⁰ Epidamnos: *IG* VII 3078A, 1. Anthedon: *IG* VII 3078A, 11. Opous: *AD* (1971) n. 34–40, 7. Nicaea of Bithynia: *IG* VII 3078A, 3; *AD* (1971) 34–40, 19. Bargylia: *SEG* 3. 367, 11. Tyre: *IG* VII 3078A_{23, 27}; *AD* (1971) 34–40, 5. Seleucia on the Tigris: *AD* (1971) 34–40, 9. 11. 13. 15. Cf. also the chart by Papazarkadas 2019, 211. The new ἀπολογία of Sostratos (Matthaiaou–Papazarkadas 2020) only includes winners from Boiotia.

⁶¹ See Manieri 2009 *ad Leb.* 11.

⁶² Papazarkadas 2019.

⁶³ The two bodies possibly performed different tasks (Knoepfler 2020, 230).

wars (86 BC), possibly in the first years of the diffusion of the silver coins known as ἄργυριον Λευκολλείου mentioned in the ἀπολογία of Sostratos (Matthaïou–Papazarkadas 2020 A_{28–29}).⁶⁴

While the kind of competitions performed at the Basileia did not change – not even now, it seems, did it include a musical section, – in the first century BC the Pamboiotia underwent a new change: there were not the previous military τέλη, whereas there were now athletic and equestrian contests. The first century BC is also the last period when the Pamboiotia reappear in our epigraphic evidence. The reorganization was part of this more general “antiquarian revival”:⁶⁵ the same body of ναοποιοί, which had been created at a federal level in the late third century BC to oversee the construction of the temple of Zeus Basileus, now organised both the Basileia and the Pamboiotia.⁶⁶

While the Basileia, however, had survived the shock of the Roman dissolution of the *koinon*, through a period of local management under a different name, the Pamboiotia are not attested between the end of the Third Macedonian War and the years of Sulla and Lucullus. It is unlikely that it is a matter of pure lack of evidence, despite the general inferiority of documents related to the Pamboiotia, in contrast with those on the Basileia/Trophonia.

For the period under consideration here (first century BC), we have only three, possibly two documents on the Pamboiotia.⁶⁷ Among these, it is worthwhile to recall one attesting a Roman participant such as Aulus Castricius (*IG* VII 2871_{1–4; 14–15}):⁶⁸

⁶⁴ As summarized by Knoepfler 2020, 242–243, it is hard to tell whether these coins refer to M. Terentius Varro Lucullus (cos. 73 BC: *MRR* II 109) or his brother L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74 BC: *MRR* II 100–101). The latter has been endorsed, in light of Plut. *Luc.* 2. 1–2 and of the actual responsibility for these emissions (cf. Marsura 2015 and Assenmaker 2017), but there are still doubts and the former option is defended by Grandjean 2023, that is also currently the best and fullest account on the *nummi Luculliani*. Since the preserved ἀπολογίαι date from 58/7 BC and 40 BC, a slightly later date for the reinstitution of the *koinon* and the Basileia in the 60s, rather than in the immediate aftermath of the Mithridatic Wars, should be preferred (see Müller 2020, 80).

⁶⁵ Schachter 2016, 189.

⁶⁶ See Mueller 2014, 125–126a.

⁶⁷ *IG* VII 1764 (2nd/1st cent. BC, but the festival is unclear: see Grigsby 2017, 195–196); *SEG* 28. 456 (Koroneia, single winners); *IG* VII 2871.

⁶⁸ The list presents single winners from different Boiotian cities (Thebes, Orchomenos, Thespiiai), as well as a group (l. 17: τέλος) from Thespiiai (see Papazarkadas 2019, 209 and Matthaïou–Papazarkadas 2020, 166–167 on the

ἄρχοντος ἐν Ἀκραϊφίοις Ἴππονίκου,
 γραμματεύοντος τῶν ναοποιῶν
 Μνασάρχου τοῦ Χαρίτωνος, τοῦ δὲ αὐτοῦ
 κ]αὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ τῆς πανηγύρεως, οἶδε ἐνείκ[ων]
 [...] Αὔλος Καστρίκιος Αὔλου υἱός
 τελέφῳ δίαυλον.

This final document also allows us to move to the next period with two preliminary observations: first, the re-foundation of the Boiotian *koinon* coincided with the reprise of the Basileia and the Pamboiotia and they were both managed by the new regional *koinon*; secondly, the fate of the Basileia, that were only temporarily substituted by the Trophonia in the first decades of the Roman government of Greece, sheds light on the abandonment of the Pamboiotia in this same period. While the Basileia had survived as a local festival, the Pamboiotia were perhaps perceived as unequivocally regional in their nature and were possibly only restarted when the *koinon* was re-founded.

5. The Boiotian κοινόν and its Festivals after Augustus

The Roman Boiotian κοινόν was “an institution with religious overtones”.⁶⁹ The Itonion became its heart, and an ἐπιμελετῆς τῆς πανηγύρεως (*IG* VII 2871₄) signalled the different fate of the Pamboiotia in contrast with the Basileia. A possible precedence of the reorganization of the Basileia over the Pamboiotia might be posited: the epigraphic documents related to the Pamboiotia – despite the risks of any argument based on documents preserved and not preserved – are slightly later than the documents on the Basileia.⁷⁰ Moreover, Diodorus (15. 53. 4), in the forties, knows that

secretary of the board of the ναοποιοί in this inscription). The document was dated by Gossage to around 75 BC, but Müller (2014, 128–129) placed it in the first decades of the 1st cent. AD. Her main arguments are the similarity between this text and two other texts which mention the Pamboiotia (*SEG* 38. 380 and *IG* VII 2711), and the fact that the family of the single non-Boiotian winner recorded by *IG* VII 2871, Aulus Castricius, belongs to a family well-attested in Thespiiai in the early 1st cent. AD. This Aulus, the sole non-Boiotian winner ever attested at the Pamboiotia, might be the same Aulus Castricius of *CIL* III 7301 (14 AD). The Castricii appear in Thespiiai at the end of the 1st cent. BC and might have been *negotiatores* previously living in Delos (Müller 1996b, 162–163).

⁶⁹ Müller 2014, 129.

⁷⁰ Müller 2014, 129–130.

the Basileia are still carried out. Strabo (9. 2. 29), instead, says about Koroneia that ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τὰ Παμβοιωτία συνετέλουν. Strabo seems to have lived after Diodorus and maybe he was just copying a source.⁷¹ It is not impossible, however, that Strabo did not know of the new Pamboiotia yet, or maybe the festival was still in the process of being re-organised.

The name of the new Boiotian body, τὸ κοινόν, is reflected in sources that show how it was seen from an emic perspective. The first occurrence (33/2 BC)⁷² is in striking line with all those documents where the κοινόν is linked with the administration itself of the Roman Pamboiotia. Expressions such as τὸ συνέδριον Βοιωτῶν⁷³ or τὸ κοινόν Παμβοιωτῶν συνέδριον⁷⁴ confirm how the Boiotian body viewed the agonistic dimension as an indissoluble part of the new union.⁷⁵ Besides, the dossier of Epameinondas of Akraiphia (37 AD), an εὐεργέτης who lived under the Julio-Claudian dynasty, locates the choice to collocate the record of a collective decision in the sanctuary of Athena Itonia to the first imperial period.⁷⁶ The Boiotians still met there in Pausanias' time (Paus. 9. 34. 1–2.) One wonders whether the historical scenario of another *Love Story* by Plutarch (4) also refers to an imperial setting.⁷⁷ Here, a girl joins the celebration of the Pamboiotia (*Am. narr.* 774 E: τὴν τῶν Παμβοιωτίων ἑορτήν), because she is looking for justice against thirty violent pretenders: the Boiotians on the spot listen to her and are furious with the men. Despite the fictitious nature of the story, the idea that the Itonion could act as a central spot to present one's allegations is in line with the notion that, in the second century AD, Boiotians routinely met at Koroneia. The fact that she presents herself as Ἰκέτις might corroborate the fact that at this stage the sanctuary still enjoyed *asylia*, but we lack further evidence on this.

⁷¹ Schachter 1981, 124 n. 4. Among modern editors of Strabo, only Meineke (1877 *ad loc.*) corrects the unanimously transmitted συνετέλουν in συντέλουν. The passage of Strabo is reprised, with the same verbal tense, by Eustathius (*Il.* 410, 11 van der Valk). Strabo is here commenting on the Boiotian places in the Homeric *Catalogue of the Ships* and a Hellenistic commenter would have already been wrong in considering the Pamboiotia a past event. It remains therefore likelier that Strabo was responsible for the choice of the verbal tense.

⁷² *IG* II² 4114.

⁷³ *IG* VII 2711.

⁷⁴ *IG* VII 2712.

⁷⁵ See also *IG* VII 2878, with Knoepfler 2012, 240–246.

⁷⁶ On this dossier, see Oliver 1971; Chaniotis 2008, 67–87; Grigsby 2017, 207–213; Tufano 2022a, 80–81.

⁷⁷ Schachter 1981, 124 n. 3.

The Pamboiotia lost their military dimension in the first two centuries of the Roman empire, but regained a political meaning, insofar as such a meaning could be had under the Roman administration.⁷⁸ While the Pamboiotia became a fossil of the ethnic imagery of the Boiotians, the Basileia were still celebrated.

In the early imperial period, the herald Onetor dedicates golden apples to Apollo in Delphi:⁷⁹

Σοὶ τὰδ' Ὀνήτωρ μῆλα, πατρώιε, σήματα νίκης
 Πυθώης ἱερῆς τ' ἀντίθεμ' εὐεπίης,
 τὸν Νεμέη Θήβη τε καὶ εὐρύχορος Λε[βάδεια]
 [...]

The herald won crowns at Nemea, at Thebes and at εὐρύχορος Λε[βάδεια] (l. 3). If there were certain proof that the Basileia included a contest for heralds, we might consider this in the record.⁸⁰ All we can claim is that Onetor was proud of a victory at Lebadeia. The mention of the name of the city sufficed to refer to a prestigious contest.

Between the second and the third century AD, the Basileia are called once again Trophonia.⁸¹ Perhaps there had been a previous transitional phase in which both names were used, although the story of the agon hinders the likelihood of this possibility. The board of the ναοποιοί and the activity of the *koinon* are certain facts for the second century, and it is therefore unlikely that the conditions for the existence of the Basileia were lacking.

⁷⁸ The Boiotian *koinon* of the Roman times had boiotarchs, well attested in the 2nd cent. AD, for instance in a letter of Hadrian to Naryka recently published (*SEG* 51. 641: cf. Knoepfler 2012, 224–228). The date and number of the imperial boiotarch(s) are uncertain: see Knoepfler 2012 and Tufano 2022a.

⁷⁹ *IG* II² 3158₁₋₃ = *Leb.* 14 in Manieri 2009 and *Delph.* 81 in Della Bona 2017.

⁸⁰ So Manieri 2009 (= *Leb.* 14). The victory of a herald at the ‘agon of Zeus’ mentioned by a previous inscription may refer to the Basileia: *IG* VII 530, mid. 3rd cent. BC (see *IAG* 38 for the view that these are the Olympia). Before *Leb.* 14, therefore, only *ID* 2552 = *Delph.* 79 (1st cent. BC; see Knoepfler 2008, 1456–1457) seems to confirm the participation of a herald to a festival in Lebadeia, although the absence of the exact name on this document makes its use quite tricky. The chronology of the inscription is not clear: Peek (1941, 416) noted that the imperial date of *I.Délos* may be anticipated to the 1st cent. BC, which is now accepted also by Della Bona (2017, 201).

⁸¹ Cf. *SEG* 26. 258 and 263, both from Athens and dated to the 2nd cent. AD.

In the early third century, Flavia Laneika is defined ἀρχιερεία κοινοῦ Βοιωτῶν τῆς Ἰτωνίας Ἀθηνᾶς;⁸² a procession might still take place in Koroneia, but there is not positive evidence that the Pamboiotia were still taking place. On the contrary, a few decades later, we have again epigraphic attestations of victories at the Trophonia.⁸³ Two of the four extant documents are for heralds (*Delph.* 119–120), but there is no proof on the program of the Trophonia at this stage. Since the four documents are for single winners, one can only suggest that individual competitions happened, but only for a winner, Valerius of Sinope (*Delph.* 120; 253–257 AD), we know that the man was active as an athlete (*Delph.* 121).

What can we make of this new change of name at Lebadeia? So far, we have tried to link the history of the Basileia and the Pamboiotia with the history of the Boiotian region. Is it possible, then, that the *koinon* was once again dissolved, in the third century, and that Lebadeia decided to continue the old festival, under a more parochial name? We lack positive evidence that the *koinon* was once again dissolved in this century. On the whole, the idea of a shift of the festival from the exhibition of regional identity to a return to local celebrations might hold;⁸⁴ a good hint in this direction is the composition of the *Panhellenion* created by Hadrian and the success of the civic identities in the second century AD.⁸⁵ The particularism of the third century AD might be part of the explanation, while Boiotian identity resurfaced in other forms, such as the curious occurrence of a βσιώταρχος active in the 250s.⁸⁶

The situation is maybe more complex than what a single explanation can offer: the ναοποιοί disappear together with the festivals, but it is likely that their original function was inherited by the boiotarch(s).⁸⁷ An often-mentioned document in relationship with the Basileia, in fact, does not record the name of the festival, but can be included in their dossier. This text mentions Drusus, Tiberius' son (*IG* VII 3103, 14–23 AD):

⁸² *IG* VII 3426; On this document, see Knoepfler 2012, 237–240 and Tufano 2022a, 101–103.

⁸³ *FD* III 1. 550 = *Delph.* 108 (early 3rd cent. AD); *IG* VII 49 = *Delph.* 119 (post 242 AD), *IG* II² 3169/3170 = *Delph.* 120 (ca. 253–257 AD); *FD* III 1. 555 (ca. 250 AD). Cf. Grigsby 2017, 239.

⁸⁴ Cf. Grigsby 2017, 238–239.

⁸⁵ Cf. Gordillo 2012.

⁸⁶ See Tufano 2022a.

⁸⁷ Disappearance of the ναοποιοί and loss of documentation: Schachter 2016, 145 n. 25.

Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβα-
 στοῦ Γερμανικοῦ υἱὸν Καίσαρα
 Δροῦσον Γερμανικὸν
 Σκύλαξ Σωσικράτους Λεβαδεὺς
 ἀγωνοθετήσας Καισαρήων καὶ
 [-----]

The ἀγωνοθέτης of the text cared about the Καισάρεια καὶ [...] another festival, which is not preserved. Very likely, the name of the festival at this stage had to be still Basileia.⁸⁸ The cult of the emperors was quite popular in Boiotia and, in the case of the Ptoia, the noun Καισάρεια substituted the original name of the festival, Ptoia: the re-foundation by Epameinondas of Akraiphiai of τὰ μεγάλα Πτώια καὶ Καισάρηα⁸⁹ was a renovation of a festival no longer held for economic problems.

We have evidence for the imperial cult in Lebadeia; elsewhere in Boiotia more than one festival was rebranded in favour of the emperors during the first century AD.⁹⁰ We should wonder why the Trophonia still bear this name in the third century AD, while the Basileia had been subsumed under the Kaisareia. In the absence of explicit indications of the name of the festival for the period of the first two centuries, I suggest that the Basileia had been subsumed in the imperial cult, and that the festival could only re-emerge as Trophonia in the third century AD: the Lebadeian Kaisareia are attested in the first century AD and between the second and the third century AD.⁹¹

It could be that the imperial denomination had elicited an obliteration or that the double name (Καισάρεια [καὶ] Βασίλεια) was simply shortened or not recorded. This seems a specific strategy to grant the survival of an agonistic tradition while realizing that historical conditions demands a change; in other words, “the horizontal action of these festivals, in bringing these cities together, was combined with the vertical action of positioning them in relation to their new rulers”.⁹²

A further hint of this overlapping of the Basileia and the Kaisareia might be the ambiguity of the status of Cn. Curtius Dexippus, the son of Flavia Laneika who had dedicated a statue to his mother (*IG* VII 3426₂₋₆):

⁸⁸ So Knoepfler 2008, 1457–1458.

⁸⁹ *IG* VII 2712₅₆₋₅₉ and Müller 2020, 88.

⁹⁰ On the imperial cults in Boiotia, cf. Camia 2011b, 125–128.

⁹¹ *IG* VII 3103, *IG* VII 3106; on the date of *IG* VII 3106, and the imperial festivals in Lebadeia, see Camia 2011b, 127 and n. 527.

⁹² Van Nijf–Williamson 2015, 108.

Φλαβίαν Λανείκαν τὴν ἀρχιέριαν
διὰ βίου τοῦ τε κοινοῦ Βοιωτῶν τῆς
Ἰτωνίας Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ Φω-
κέων ἔθνους καὶ τῆς Ὀμονοίας τῶν
Ἑλλήνων παρὰ τῷ Τροφονίῳ [...].⁹³

Her son Dexippos was a βοιωτάρχης (l. 9), a λογιστής of Chaeronea (l. 11), and ἀρχιερεὺς διὰ βίου τῶν Σεβαστῶν (l. 9–10). These ἀρχιερεῖς could work at the same time for the imperial cult and for local demands (thence, the nexus with Athena Itonia):⁹⁴ even if the current example only refers to the imperial cult of Chaeronea, it remains likely that it was this overlapping of local and imperial festivals that caused the apparent oblivion of the local festivals in our documentation.

Conclusion

The study of the Pamboiotia and the Basileia continues to suffer from a limit of documentation that often only allows hypotheses: “we are very much at the mercy, not only of what has or has not survived, but also of what may or may not have been inscribed in the first place”.⁹⁵ These two festivals were able to unify and represent the Boiotian region to a point that Didymos’ confusion on the identification of Pindar’s ἀγῶνες ἔννομοι Βοιωτῶν as either the Basileia or the Pamboiotia does not seem completely unsound.

The Pamboiotia were the perfect stage to exemplify why Epameinondas would call his land ‘the dancing floor of Ares’:⁹⁶ their location at Koroneia in the fifth century BC linked forever the festival with a capital victory of Boiotian history. No wonder that the later redesigning of the Hellenistic period could transform the religious meeting into a military venue and that, from then on, the athletes would be marching under a national agenda. This was not a celebration that the Romans could accept or like, or, more probably, the dissolution of 171 BC made their survival completely impossible, in light of the strong

⁹³ On this woman, see Siekierka *et al.* 2021, 309.

⁹⁴ On these ἀρχιερεῖς, see Camia 2011b, 165–166 and 166 nn. 746–747; Knoepfler 2012, 237–240.

⁹⁵ Schachter 2016, 350 n. 17.

⁹⁶ Plut. *Marc.* 21. 3 and *apophth.* 193A; on the Boiotian military culture of the 3rd cent. BC, cf. Ma 2005.

federal administration of the event. Only under the new *koinon* of the late republic could the Boiotians regain this regional manifestation and place of public decision-making: maybe the games were still held under the first three centuries of the empire, but now the meeting had a more religious aspect.

The Basileia were, at first, the festival of the golden years of the Theban hegemony: for a long time, it remained a regional event. The catchment area of the winners sensibly expanded only in the first century BC. Under the Hellenistic κοινόν the recollection of that great time of effective power, however short-lived, probably inspired the implementation of the site, with the beginning of the construction of that never completed Temple of Zeus Basileus. Trophonios, with his oracle and his sacred shadow over the competition, had always been there and the fame of the oracle will have helped the contextual success of the festival; besides, the ναοποιοί, initially designed to oversee the constructions, became an ideological weapon when the new *koinon* of the first century BC was born. Had such a plan remained in their hearts? The short season of the Trophonia, between the last two centuries BC, suggests that Lebadeia alone had organised the festival, in the first decades after the Roman expansion in Greece; but now, after Sulla's arrival – and Trophonios' good oracles for the *dictator*,⁹⁷ – the ναοποιοί could certainly be seen as a befitting body of Boiotians who could also care for the reorganization of the Basileia.

From the age of Augustus, the story of the Basileia and of the Pamboiotia, combined for a few years, diverges again: the Pamboiotia probably remained popular, thanks to the link with the Itonion, whereas the Basileia might have been hidden by the contextual cult and festival for the emperor. What happens between the first and the third century AD can only remain in the realm of the hypothesis, but no one will doubt that the strength of the *koinon* lay on other grounds by now.

Salvatore Tufano
Sapienza University of Rome
 salvotufano@gmail.com

⁹⁷ Plut. *Sull.* 17, with Grigsby 2017, 192–193. Sulla might have assigned the tax revenues to the temple of Zeus and this could be a sign of special treatment, but this has not necessarily consequences on the festival in itself (on the possible assignment of tax revenues, see Larsen in Frank 1938, 307–308 and Rigsby 1996, 83).

Bibliography

- P. Assenmaker, “La frappe monétaire syllanienne dans le Péloponnèse durant la première guerre mithridatique : retour sur les monnaies luculliennes”, *Obolos* 10 (2017) 411–424 (*BCH Suppl.* 57).
- P. Bonnechere, *Trophonios de Lébadée. Cultes et mythes d’une cité béotienne au miroir de la mentalité antique* (Leiden–Boston 2003).
- F. Camia, “Spending on the *agones*. The Financing of Festivals in the Cities of Roman Greece”, *Tyche* 26 (2011a) 41–76.
- F. Camia, *Theoi Sebastoi. Il culto degli imperatori romani in Grecia (provincia Achaia) nel secondo secolo d.C.* (Atene 2011b).
- A. Chaniotis, “Konkurrenz und Profilierung von Kultgemeinden im Fest”, in: J. Rüpke, *Festrituale in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Tübingen 2008) 68–87.
- M. E. Della Bona, *Agoni poetico-musicali nella Grecia antica. II. I Pythia di Delfi* (Pisa–Roma 2017).
- M. Feyel, *Polybe et l’histoire de Béotie au III^e siècle avant notre ère* (Paris 1942).
- J. M. Fossey, P. J., Smith, J. Buckler (eds.), *Boeotia Antiqua. VI. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities* (Loyola University of Chicago, 24–26 may 1995) (Amsterdam 1996).
- T. Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. IV (Baltimore, MD 1938).
- P. Fröhlich, *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.–C.)*. (Geneva 2004).
- A. Gadolou, “Ἐν προσφάτῃ ἀρχαιολογικῇ ἐρευνᾷ τοῦ τοῦ Διὸς Βασίλειος στῆς Λιβάδειας” [“The Temple of Zeus Basileus at Lebadeia”], in: V. Aravantinos (ed.), *Επετῆρις τῆς Ἐταιρείας τῶν Βοιωτικῶν Μελετῶν: IV Διεθνὲς Συνεδριὸν Βοιωτικῶν Μελετῶν (Livadeia, 9–12 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000)* (Athens 2008) 547–565.
- R. Gordillo, *La construcción religiosa de la Hélade Imperial: El Panhelenion* (Florence 2012).
- C. Grandjean, “À propos des monnaies luculliennes”, *Romana Res Publica* 2 (2023) 165–176.
- P. R. Grigsby, *Boiotian Games: Festivals, Agōnes, and the Development of Boiotian Identity*. PhD Thesis (Warwick 2017).
- Y. Kalliontzis, “La date de la première célébration des Amphiareia–Romaia d’Oropos”, *REG* 129 (2016) 85–105.
- Y. Kalliontzis, *Contribution à l’épigraphie et à l’histoire de la Béotie hellénistique : De la destruction de Thèbes à la bataille de Pydna* (Athens 2020).
- D. Knoepfler, “L’intitulé oublié d’un compte des naopes béotiens”, in: D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque* (Neuchâtel–Geneva 1988) 263–294.
- D. Knoepfler, “La fête des Daidala de Platées chez Pausanias: une clef pour l’histoire de la Béotie hellénistique”, in: D. Knoepfler, M. Piérart (eds.), *Éditer, traduire et commenter Pausanias en l’an 2000* (Geneva 2001) 343–374.
- D. Knoepfler, “Louis Robert en sa forge : ébauche d’un mémoire resté inédit sur l’histoire controversée de deux concours grecs, les Trophônia et les Basileia à Lébadée”, *CRAI* 152 (2008) 1421–1462.

- D. Knoepfler, “L’exercice de la magistrature fédérale béotienne par des ‘étrangers’ à l’époque impériale : conséquence de l’extension du koinon en dehors des frontières de la Béotie ou simple effet d’une multi-citoyenneté individuelle?”, in: A. Heller, A. V. Pont (eds.), *Patrie d’origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d’époque romaine* (Bordeaux 2012) 223–247.
- D. Knoepfler, “Le financement des *Basileia* et l’histoire du *Koinon Boiôtôn* à la basse époque hellénistique : à propos de la nouvelle apologia de Lébadée et d’un fragment resté inédit”, *Horos* 26–31 (2014–2019 [2020]) 193–270.
- B. Kowalzig, *Singing for the Gods. Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (New York 2007).
- J. Ma, “The Many Lives of Eugnotos of Akraiphia”, *Studi Ellenistici* 14 (2005) 141–191.
- E. Mackil, *Creating a Common Polity. Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon* (Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 2013).
- A. Manieri, *Agoni poetico-musicali nella Grecia antica. I. Beozia* (Pisa–Rome 2009).
- S. Marsura, “Nummi luculliani: Lucio. Licinio Lucullo, *quaestor* di Silla”, in: T. M. Lucchelli, F. Rohr Vio (eds.), *VIRI MILITARES. Rappresentazione e propaganda tra Repubblica e Principato* (Trieste 2015) 43–59.
- A. P. Matthaiou, N. Papazarkadas, “Apologia agōnothetou tōn Vasileiōn ek Leva-deias” [“A New Account of the agonothetes of the *Basileia* from Leba-deia”], *Horos* 26–31 (2014–2019 [2020]) 159–192.
- A. Meineke, *Strabonis Geographica* III (Leipzig 1877).
- L. Migeotte, “Le financement des concours dans la Béotie hellénistique”, *AncW* 37 (2006) 14–25.
- L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (Rome 1953).
- C. Müller, “Le comportement politique des cités béotiennes dans le premier tiers du II^e s. a.C.: le cas d’Haliarte, Thisbé et Coronée”, in: Fossey–Smith–Buckler 1996a, 127–141.
- C. Müller, “Les *nomina romana* à Thespies du II^e siècle à l’édit de Caracalla”, in: A. D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects. Proceedings of the International Colloquium [...] (Athens, 7–9.9.1993)* (Athens 1996b) 157–166.
- C. Müller, “Les Italiens en Béotie du II^e s. av. J.-C. au I^{er} s. ap. J.-C.”, in: C. Müller, C. Hasenohr (eds.), *Les Italiens dans le monde grec. II^e siècle av. J.-C. – I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. Actes de la Table ronde des 14–16 mai 1998 (Paris, EFA/ENS)* (Paris 2002) 89–100.
- C. Müller, “La dissolution du koinon béotien en 171 av. J.-C. et ses conséquences territoriales”, in: P. Rodriguez (ed.), *Pouvoir et territoire. I. Antiquité et Moyen-Âge* (St. Étienne 2007) 21–46.
- C. Müller, “ΤΙΕΠΙ ΤΕΑΩΝ: Quelques réflexions autour des districts de la confédération béotienne à l’époque hellénistique”, in: N. Badoud (ed.), *Philologos Dionysios: Mélanges offerts au Professeur Denis Knoepfler* (Geneva 2011) 261–282.

- C. Müller, “A *Koinon* after 146? Reflections on the Political and Institutional Situation of Boeotia in the Late Hellenistic Period”, in: Papazarkadas 2014, 119–146.
- C. Müller, “Le concours des *Ptoia* à l’époque hellénistique : une affaire civile, pambéotienne, fédérale ou panhellénique?”, *REG* 133 (2020) 57–88.
- C. Müller, “Mort d’une confédération. Qu’est-il (vraiment) arrivé au *koinon* béotien en 172/171 av. J.-C. ?”, *Ktèma* 46 (2021) 149–169.
- O. M. van Nijf, C. G. Williamson, “Re-inventing Traditions: Connecting Contests in the Hellenistic and Roman World”, in: D. Boschung *et al.* (eds.), *Re-inventing “The Invention of Tradition”? Indigenous Pasts and the Roman Present* (Paderborn 2015) 95–111.
- J. H. Oliver, “Epameinondas of Acraephia”, *GRBS* 12 (1971) 221–237.
- O. Olivieri, “Sotto l’*egida aurea* di Atena Itonia: i *Pamboiotia*, festa agonistico-militare, nelle fonti poetiche ed epigrafiche”, in: D. Castaldo *et al.* (eds.), *Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica. [...] Atti del IV convegno internazionale di MOISA (Lecce, 28–30 ottobre 2010)* I (Bari 2010–2011) 79–95.
- N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia. New Finds, New Prospects* (Leiden–Boston 2014).
- N. Papazarkadas, “Festival Networks in Late Hellenistic Boiotia: From Kinship to Political Rejuvenation”, in: M. Dana, I. Savalli-Lestrade (eds.), *La cité interconnectée dans le monde gréco-romain (IV^e siècle a.C. – IV^e siècle p.C.). Transferts et réseaux institutionnels, religieux et culturels aux époques hellénistique et impériale* (Bordeaux 2019) 205–221.
- R. Patrucco, *Lo sport nella Grecia antica*, Arte e archeologia 1 (Florence 1972).
- W. Peek, “Delische Weihepigramme”, *Hermes* 76 (1941) 408–416.
- R. Pitt, “Just as It Has Been Written: Inscribing Building Contracts at Lebadeia”, in: Papazarkadas 2014, 373–394.
- K. J. Rigsby, *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1996).
- L. Robert, “Recherches épigraphiques”, *REA* 38: 1 (1936) 5–28.
- L. Robert, “Discours d’ouverture”, in: *Praktika tou I Diethnous Synedriou Ellēnikēs kai Latinikēs epigraphikēs, Athēna, 3–9 Oktōvriou 1982* I (Athens 1984) 35–45.
- L. Robert, *Choix d’écrits*. Édités par D. Rousset avec la collaboration de Ph. Gauthier et de I. Savalli-Lestrade (Paris 2007).
- G. Rougemont, D. Rousset, *Nouveau choix d’inscriptions grecques* (Paris 2005).
- A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*. I. *Acheloos to Hera* (London 1981).
- A. Schachter, “A Consultation of Trophonios (*IG* vii.4136)”, *AJPh* 105 (1984) 258–270 (= Schachter 2016, 381–392).
- A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*. III. *Potnia to Zeus. Cults of Deities Unspecified by Name* (London 1994).
- A. Schachter, *Boiotia in Antiquity. Selected Papers* (Cambridge 2016).
- A. Schachter, W. Slater, “A Proxeny Decree from Koroneia, Boiotia, in Honour of Zotion Son of Zotion, of Ephesos”, *ZPE* 163 (2007) 81–95.
- K. Schöpsdau (ed.), *Platon. Nomoi (Gesetze). Buch VIII–XII* (Göttingen 2011).

- P. Siekierka, K. Stebnicka, A. Wolicki, *Women and the Polis. Public Honorific for Women in the Greek Cities from the late Classical to the Roman Period* (Berlin–Boston 2021).
- J. Thornton, *Le guerre macedoniche* (Rome 2014).
- S. Tufano, “An Indirect Fragment of Boiotian Historiography in Plutarch? A Historical Defence of the *Love Stories*”, *Vichiana* 56 (2019) 51–63.
- S. Tufano, “La beotarchia in età imperiale”, *Historikà* 12 (2022a) 79–118.
- S. Tufano, “With or without a *koinon*. The *longue durée* of Two Regional Festivals. I. The Pamboiotia and the Basileia from their Beginnings to the Fourth Century BC”, *Hyperboreus* 28: 2 (2022b) 176–195.
- L. A. Turner, “The Basileia”, in: Fossey–Smith–Buckler 1996, 105–126.

The paper offers the second half of a comprehensive survey of the two most important Boiotian regional festivals, i.e. the Basileia of Lebadeia and the Pamboiotia of Koroneia. The author contends that these competitions had a regional impact and were performed independently of the existence of a federal government in Boiotia. This article, in particular, addresses the Hellenistic and Roman periods of these festivals. The third and the second centuries BC (Section 3), before the dismantlement of the Boiotian *koinon* in 171 BC, saw the great success of both the Basileia and the Pamboiotia. The Basileia were an individual competition and the federal government decided, around 221/0 BC, to declare this a sacred festival. The Pamboiotia became, from the early third century BC, a military event, because there were contests for military units and these could perform their training. This difference explains why, after 171 BC, the Pamboiotia disappeared and the Basileia continued as a local festival with a new name, Trophonia (Section 4). The first century BC saw a new regional organization, in Boiotia, with the reprise of a *koinon*. The Roman *koinon* was not a political body but could manage regional festivals and the Boiotians as a whole decided to rename the Trophonia with their original name and to re-start the Pamboiotia. The author claims that the Roman government strongly influenced the choice to abandon the military aspects of the Pamboiotia. The external influence also explains why, in the imperial period (Section 5), the Basileia were probably renamed Kaisareia and substituted by the imperial cult in Lebadeia. The late, short fate of the new Trophonia in the third century AD is exceptional and could indicate that the Boiotian *koinon* now chose to focus more on the Pamboiotia as a regional festival. The cult in Koroneia is still important in the imperial period; the last clear signs of individual contests in Koroneia date to the first century AD and in the II Century AD Koroneia was mostly a meeting point for the Boiotians. The study demonstrates that the *longue durée* of the Pamboiotia and the Basileia (fifth/fourth cent. BC – third cent. AD) depends on the Boiotian use of these regional festivals as carriers of collective memory.

Статья представляет собой всесторонний исторический обзор двух наиболее важных беотийских региональных празднеств – Басилей в Лебадее и Памбеотий в Коронее. Автор утверждает, что эти состязания имели региональное

значение и проводились вне зависимости от существования в Беотии федерального правительства. Вторая часть посвящена эллинистическому и римскому периоду существования празднеств. III–II вв. до н. э. (раздел 3), до упразднения Беотийского союза в 171 г., – время расцвета как Басилей, так и Памбеотий. Басилей, на которых проводились индивидуальные соревнования, федеральные власти ок. 221/220 г. решили провозгласить священными. Памбеотии с начала III в. становятся военным празднеством, на них соревнуются воинские отряды, показывая результаты своих тренировок. Этим различием объясняется, почему после 171 г. Памбеотии исчезли, а Басилей продолжили свое существование как локальный праздник под новым именем – Трофонии (раздел 4). В I в. до н. э. вновь возрождается Беотийский союз. Это объединение римского времени не имело политического значения, но могло организовывать региональные празднества, и беотийцы как единое целое решили вернуть прежнее название Трофониям и снова начать проводить Памбеотии. По мнению автора, исчезновение военных черт в праздновании Памбеотий объясняется влиянием римских властей. Такое же внешнее влияние объясняет, почему в эпоху империи (раздел 5) Басилей, вероятно, были переименованы в Кесареи и поставлены на службу культу императора в Лебадее. Существование новых Трофоний в III в. н. э. продолжалось совсем недолго, и это позволяет предположить, что Беотийский союз предпочел сосредоточиться скорее на Памбеотиях как региональном празднике. Культ в Коронее сохраняет свое значение в эпоху империи; последние недвусмысленные свидетельства индивидуальных состязаний там относятся к I в. н. э., и во II в. Короней – преимущественно место собраний беотийцев. В статье доказывается, что необычайно длительное (с V/IV в. до н. э. по III в. н. э.) существование Памбеотий и Басилей связано с тем, что для беотийцев они стали носителями коллективной памяти.

Carlo M. Lucarini

PER UNA NUOVA EDIZIONE CRITICA DELLE
ANTIQUITATES RERUM HUMANARUM
DI VARRONE

Mentre le *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* sono state oggetto di vari tentativi di ricostruzione e di molteplici edizioni, parziali o totali, le *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*¹ sono state edite criticamente dal solo P. Mirsch.² La nostra conoscenza della struttura generale delle *Antiquitates* di Varrone si basa su un passo di Agostino (*Civ. Dei* 6, 3 = **F 1** Lucarini), il quale ci insegna che esse si dividevano in *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* e *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, composte rispettivamente di 25 e 16 libri. A noi interessano solo le *res humanae*, la cui struttura era la seguente:³ a un libro introduttivo ne seguivano 6 (libri 2–7) dedicati agli uomini (*qui agant*), 6 (libri 8–13) dedicati ai luoghi (*ubi agant*), 6 (libri 14–19) dedicati al tempo (*quando agant*), 6 (libri 20–25) alle cose stesse (*quid agant*).

¹ Per la forma completa ed esatta del titolo cfr. Aug. *De civ. Dei* 6, 3 (= **F 1** Lucarini). Le *Antiquitates* (sia *divinae* che *humanae*) sembrano essere state composte prima del 45 a. C. (**T 43–46** + **T 89** Lucarini; cfr. anche **T 37**). Qui e nel seguito faccio riferimento alla numerazione delle testimonianze e dei frammenti quali appariranno nella mia raccolta *Geographi veteres*, cfr. *infra*.

² Mirsch 1882; quest'edizione fu giudicata assai severamente da Reitzenstein 1885 (cfr. anche Ranucci 1972, 110) e, in effetti, nel corso di questo lavoro ne vedremo insufficienze e arbitri. Per le *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* cfr. Cardauns 1976, con riferimenti alle edd. parziali precedenti. Per le edizioni complessive dei fr. varroniani cfr. n. 91. Cfr. anche Salvatore 1999.

³ La struttura di base delle *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* fu per la prima volta riconosciuta e ricostruita, sulla base del passo di Agostino e delle altre testimonianze a disposizione, da Krahner 1834, 13 sgg., seguito nella sostanza dagli studiosi successivi. Agostino è prezioso per ricostruire la struttura generale delle *Antiquitates humanae*, ma il Santo non ci dà altro aiuto per la nostra opera, che egli sembra non aver letto. Ben diversa la situazione per le *Antiquitates divinae*, lette e discusse ampiamente da Agostino, cfr. Hagendahl 1967, 601 e Frick 1886. Il disinteresse per le *Antiq. hum.* è tipico anche di altri padri della chiesa, come Tertulliano, Arnobio, Minucio Felice: cfr. Schwarz 1888.

All'interno della mia raccolta *Geographi veteres vel minores vel quorum fragmenta exstant* ho deciso di ripubblicare le intere *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* varroniane, poiché i libri 8–13 avevano contenuto geografico e, dopo la dimostrazione di Reitzenstein (1885), pare certo che essi abbiano influenzato profondamente i libri geografici della *Naturalis historia* (3–6) di Plinio. In questo contributo intendo dare conto della disposizione che i fr. avranno nella mia edizione.

Circa il contenuto del libro 1, che aveva carattere generale e 'filosofico',⁴ riusciamo a farci un'idea solo vaga. All'inizio si trovava un riferimento al pittore Prassitele (Gell. 13, 17, 3 = **F 2**): Varrone iniziava anche il *De vita populi Romani* con un riferimento alla pittura (fr. 1 Pittà), ma, lì come qui, lo stato frammentario del testo non consente la contestualizzazione.⁵ Da Prisciano (*Inst. gramm.* 10, 6, 32 = **F 3**) sappiamo che si diceva come gli abitanti della zona di Pario e gli Psilli in Africa non subissero danni dal morso dei serpenti: la notizia ricorre anche in Plin. (7, 13–14 = **F 204**), che cita Varrone a proposito dei Pariani: il fatto che anche Plinio citi insieme Pariani e Psilli mostra che tutta questa sezione pliniana deriva da Varrone e che dunque anche il § 14 con la citazione da Agatarchide deriva dal Reatino: è dunque in errore Mirsch (I, 4), che non include la citazione di Agatarchide nel fr. di Varrone (si osservi che la prova della fedeltà della moglie attraverso il morso dei serpenti occorre nel fr. varroniano citato da Prisciano e in quello di Agatarchide presso Plinio);⁶ tuttavia fra quanto Prisciano attribuisce a Varrone e quanto leggiamo in Plinio ci sono anche alcune differenze, poiché in Plinio–Agatarchide si afferma che gli Psilli sottoponevano tutte le persone appena nate alla prova del serpente (non solo i figli di sospette adultere) e anche la prova viene descritta in maniera un po' diversa. Per questo motivo e poiché Plinio non specifica l'opera varroniana cui attinge (cosa che del resto mai fa), preferisco porre il fr. pliniano fra i *Varroniana* di opera incerta (**F 204**).

Nel primo libro si parlava anche dell'uso della *murrata potio* nella Roma più antica (cfr. Festo, p. 150, 36 – 152, 3 Thewrewk–Lindsay = **F 5**):⁷

⁴ Cfr. Augustin. *De civ. Dei* 6, 3 (*sed unum singularem, qui communiter prius de omnibus loqueretur, in capite posuit*); Cic. *Academ.* I 8 (*in his ipsis "Antiquitatum" prooemiis philosophiae <more> scribere voluimus*).

⁵ Cfr. Pittà 2015, 68.

⁶ Bene, invece, su questo punto Münzer 1897, 122, ma non ci sono ragioni cogenti per attribuire a Varrone anche il § 15 di Plinio sui Marsi.

⁷ Dal momento che le cose dette circa i Pariani e gli Psilli sembrano avere portata più generale rispetto agli usi romani, nella mia edizione pongo questi ultimi fr. dopo i primi.

questo può far pensare che da questo contesto derivi anche Plin. 14, 88 (F 154),⁸ ove leggiamo che, secondo Varrone, Mezenzio avrebbe aiutato i Rutuli contro i Latini per avere in cambio del vino; c'è il ragionevole sospetto che anche quanto si legge nelle righe precedenti derivi da Varrone, poiché, in Plinio come in Festo, “wird ein Satz aufgestellt, dass ein Getränk im ältesten Rom üblich oder nicht üblich gewesen sei, und wird der Beweis dafür geliefert erstens durch einen noch in der Gegenwart bestehenden Gebrauch beim Opfer und zweitens durch eine alte Gesetzschrift über Leichenbestattung; sogar derselbe formelhafte Ausdruck *indicio est* verbindet in beiden Fällen Behauptung und Beweis”.⁹ D'altra parte, anche in questo caso non c'è modo di avere la certezza che Plinio attinga alle *Antiquitates humanae* e ho pertanto preferito porre il fr. genericamente fra i *Varroniana incerti operis* (F 154). Colloco in quest'ultima sezione anche i F 184, 198, 199, 200, 201 e 197, che Mirsch attribuisce al libro 1 (I, 5–10): si tratta di fr. quasi esclusivamente pliniani (solo F 184 deriva da Servio) che trattano di *mirabilia*, che Mirsch colloca nel primo libro delle *Antiquitates humanae* solo per la somiglianza di argomento coi fr. sui Pari e gli Psilli. A favore di questa collocazione si può certo addurre anche il fatto che Plinio, nella *Naturalis historia*, come vedremo, ha fatto ampio uso delle *Antiquitates humanae*, ma bisogna anche ricordare il *Logistorico* varroniano *Gallus Fundanius de admirandis*,¹⁰ che non abbiamo alcun modo di escludere sia stato usato da Plinio. E proprio da un *Logistorico* sembra derivare l'ultimo fr. che Mirsch attribuisce al primo libro delle *Antiquitates humanae* (I, 13): Servio (*In Aen.* 7, 601) ci informa che secondo Varrone il *mos* è il *communis consensus omnium simul habitantium, qui inveteratus consuetudinem facit*; questo ricorda da vicino quanto Macrobio (3, 8, 9) attribuisce all'opera *De moribus* dello stesso Varrone: *morem esse in iudicio animi, quem sequi debeat consuetudo*. Pare che quest'opera *De moribus* appartenesse ai *Logistorici*,¹¹ e non sembra avere nulla a che vedere con le *Antiquitates*, che Macrobio non suole citare con sottotitoli (cfr. tuttavia la nota 69). Credo dunque che il fr. I, 13 M. vada escluso dalle *Antiq. hum.*

⁸ Cfr. Münzer 1897, 187. Mirsch include solo in parte il nostro passo nella sua raccolta e lo colloca nel libro 2 (II, 17) a causa del legame di Mezenzio con la storia del Lazio antichissimo.

⁹ Münzer 1897, 187.

¹⁰ Cfr. Bolisani 1937, 56–61.

¹¹ Cfr. Bolisani 1937, 74–75.

I libri sugli uomini e la storia (2–7)
e l'influenza di Varrone sulle *Antiquitates Romanae*
di Dionigi di Alicarnasso

I libri 2–7, come abbiamo visto, trattavano degli uomini; purtroppo, non c'è modo di farsi un'idea chiara su come la materia si articolasse al loro interno. Alcuni indizi lasciano immaginare che ci fosse una sequenza cronologica, poiché nel libro 2, probabilmente, aveva ampio spazio la migrazione dei Troiani nel Lazio (**F 8 a e c**,¹² **F 9 a**, **F 10**), mentre nei libri 6–7¹³ sembra si parlasse dei re di Roma (**F 27**, **F 30**). D'altra parte, nel libro 3 sembra si parlasse dell'arrivo in Italia di altri eroi del tempo della guerra di Troia (**F 24**) e questo fa pensare che anche l'ordine geografico giocasse un ruolo, nel senso che Varrone prima parlava delle cose romane (libro 2), poi di quelle che riguardavano le altre parti dell'Italia (libro 3). A parte questo, non è possibile dire nulla di certo circa la disposizione della materia di questi libri: è attraente l'ipotesi di Mirsch che fra il libro 3 e 6 si parlasse delle origini di Roma, ma non abbiamo indizi concreti che la supportino; tanto meno è possibile supportare l'idea dello studioso tedesco, secondo cui il libro 4 avrebbe parlato *De urbis Romae conditoribus et primis incolis* e il 5 *De civibus Romanis*.¹⁴ Ancor più arbitraria è l'ipotesi di Mirsch, secondo cui il libro 7 avrebbe trattato *De magistratibus*.

Anche la disposizione dei fr. all'interno dei singoli libri è del tutto incerta: all'inizio del libro 2 pongo, come Mirsch (II, 1 = **F 6 a**), un

¹² Rispetto a Mirsch (II, 8) aggiungo (nel mio **F 8 b**) al fr. varroniano anche la citazione di Cassio Emina, cfr. Münzer 1897, 184: lo studioso tedesco crede che Plinio conosca Cassio Emina solo attraverso Varrone. L'ipotesi non è priva di fondamento (cfr. Santini 1995, 38 sgg.), ma non è sufficiente ad attribuire a Varrone tutti i passi in cui Plinio cita Emina.

¹³ Non è certo se **F 30** derivi dal libro 6 o dal libro 7, poiché la tradizione ms. di Plinio è divisa fra *VI* (scelto da Mirsch, VI, 3) e *VII* (scelto dagli ultimi editori di Plinio, Mayhoff e Ernout, che io seguo, senza che tuttavia ci siano argomenti esterni alla tradizione di Plinio in supporto di tale scelta). Sulla tradizione di Plinio cfr. Reeve 2021.

¹⁴ Quintiliano (1, 6, 12 = **F 31** = IV, 3 Mirsch) parla di un libro in cui Varrone *initia Romanae urbis enarrat*: Mirsch pensa al libro 4, ma non c'è modo di escludere che si trattasse del 5, se non addirittura del 6 o del 7 (supponendo che la storia della fondazione fosse unita a quella dell'età regia), o invece del 2 (se la fondazione veniva narrata insieme all'arrivo dei Troiani nel Lazio): brancoliamo davvero nel buio, anche se un'attribuzione alle *Antiquitates humanae* pare anche a me pressoché certa.

fr. sulla genealogia dei re ateniesi (*Schol. Bob. in Cic. Pro Sestio* 48, p. 131, 10–17 Stangl). Non è certo il motivo per cui Varrone trattasse tale argomento: si è ipotizzato che Varrone parlasse di una parentela fra la genealogia di Enea e la casa regnante ateniese,¹⁵ ma pare più attraente l'idea di collegare Eretteo a quanto leggiamo in *Origo gentis Romanae* 2, ove la figlia di Eretteo, Creusa, genera Giano che, divenuto adulto, lascia la Grecia per il Lazio, ove si stabilisce sul Gianicolo e diviene re. Al fr. tramandato dagli scolii a Cicerone, già presente in Mirsch, aggiungo un fr. tratto da Lido (*De mens.* 4, 147, p. 165, 11–22 Wuensch = **F 6 b**): sebbene lo stato frammentario del testo di Lido non consenta di ricostruire il contenuto del fr., la menzione del sacrificio della prole di Eretteo, cui segue a brevissimo il nome di Varrone, non può non ricordare il passo degli *scholia Bobiensia*; pare inoltre certo che a Lido sia giunto, sebbene per via indiretta, materiale dalle *Res humanae* di Varrone.¹⁶

Un problema di cui è spesso discusso è l'influenza di Varrone sulla *Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία* di Dionigi d'Alicarnasso: che quest'ultimo abbia usato Varrone è certo e le citazioni non lasciano dubbi che l'opera che egli ha avuto in mano siano proprio le *Antiquitates*.¹⁷ Si è supposto che lo storico di Alicarnasso abbia fatto un ampio uso dell'opera di Varrone nel primo libro della *Ἀρχαιολογία*, ma un esame accurato ha mostrato che Varrone non è fra le fonti principali di Dionigi.¹⁸ Lo stesso Dionigi non lo cita fra gli autori che egli ritiene più autorevoli (cfr. *Ant. Rom.* 1, 6, 1–2; 1, 7, 3; 1, 11, 2), probabilmente perché troppo recente. Tuttavia, alcune parti non irrilevanti del primo libro della *Ἀρχαιολογία* derivano senz'altro dalle *Antiquitates* varroniane. I capp. 14–15 (= **F 14**), che descrivono i luoghi in cui vivevano gli Aborigeni, derivano da tale opera per esplicita ammissione di Dionigi. Inoltre, quanto Macrobio (**F 13 a**) attribuisce a Varrone circa la partenza dei Pelasgi dalla Grecia, il loro arrivo in Italia sul lago di Cutilia, il loro incontro con gli

¹⁵ Cfr. Strabo 604–605 C e Kiessling 1859, 41; *contra* Jacobson 1895, 8–10; Poucet 1989, 73.

¹⁶ Cfr. da ultimo Lucarini *sub prelis*.

¹⁷ Come mostrano le citazioni esplicite: 1, 14, 1 = **F 14** (ὡς Οὐάρρων Τερέντιος ἐν Ἀρχαιολογίαις γράφει); 2, 21, 2 = *Antiq. div.* p. 62 Cardauns (ἃ Οὐάρρων ἐν Ἀρχαιολογίαις γέγραπεν); 4, 62, 6 = *Antiq. div.* fr. 60 Cardauns (ἃ Τερέντιος Οὐάρρων ἱστόρηκεν ἐν τῇ θεολογικῇ πραγματείᾳ).

¹⁸ A favore di un'ampia utilizzazione di Varrone si era espresso soprattutto Kiessling 1858, ma venne confutato con argomenti convincenti da Jacobson 1895. Cfr. anche Fischer 1934; Musti 1970, 26; Della Corte 1978, 120 sgg.; Poucet 1989; Poucet 1993; Fromentin 1998, 55–56.

Aborigeni e i Siculi, nonché le successive riforme dei riti sacri da parte di Eracle, trova corrispondenza strettissima nei capp. 17–38 del primo libro di Dionigi (F 13 b).¹⁹ Tuttavia, il racconto di Dionigi è assai più dettagliato di quello di Macrobio e certo non tutto quanto leggiamo in *Ant. Rom.* 1, 17–38 deriva da Varrone, tanto più che in più punti in Dionigi è visibile la tendenza a dimostrare che tutti i popoli da cui derivano i Romani sono di origine greca, tendenza notoriamente tipica di Dionigi stesso, che non abbiamo alcun motivo di attribuire a Varrone. I punti di corrispondenza certa sono i seguenti: come Macrobio, così Dionigi dice (17, 1–2) che i Pelasgi partono dalla Grecia per necessità e si dirigono in direzioni diverse; sia Macrobio che Dionigi (18, 2; 19, 3) dicono che la maggior parte dei Pelasgi arriva a Dodona, ove riceve un oracolo (di cui viene citato il testo) che dice loro di andare in Italia sul lago di Cutilia. Il viaggio verso l'Italia non è facile (Dion. 18, 3), ma alla fine una parte dei Pelasgi giunge sul lago di Cutilia, ove stringe alleanza cogli Aborigeni contro i Siculi (Dion. 19, 2 – 20, 2).²⁰ Anche la riforma dei riti sacri da parte di Eracle si trova in Dionigi (38, 2). Tutto il resto dei capp. 17–38 di Dionigi non trova corrispondenza in Macrobio e alcune cose sono certamente tratte da fonte diversa da Varrone: così i capp. 23–24, sulla decadenza dei Pelasgi, sono tratti, per esplicita ammissione di Dionigi, da Mirsilo di Metimna (*FrGrHist* 477 F 8); Varrone (F 15) riconduceva il nome del colle Palatino a Evandria, figlia di Evandro, mentre di tale etimologia in Dionigi (31, 4 – 32, 1–2) non c'è traccia.²¹ Per l'origine del nome "Italia" Varrone si rifaceva a Timeo,

¹⁹ È una grave omissione di Mirsch non aver incluso nulla di questo passo di Dionigi.

²⁰ Il fatto che in Macrobio gli Aborigeni non compaiano è probabilmente dovuto all'estrema sintesi dell'autore latino; lo stesso dicasi degli Umbri. Il ruolo centrale che nel racconto di Dionigi circa i rapporti dei Pelasgi con gli Aborigeni (1, 20) gioca l'oracolo di Dodona, che caratterizzava anche il racconto di Varrone, non lascia dubbi sul fatto che anche Dionigi, come Macrobio, qui dipenda da Varrone. Non attribuisco, invece, a Varrone l'etimologia di *Velia* (Dion. 1, 20, 3), poiché nel *De ling. Lat.* 5, 54 ne leggiamo un'altra, sebbene Varrone stesso ammetta l'esistenza di più etimologie e non sia da escludersi che, da un'opera a un'altra, egli ne preferisse etimologie diverse, cfr. n. 21.

²¹ Cfr. anche Varro *De ling. Lat.* 5, 53, dove si leggono altre etimologie di Palatino (il testo è purtroppo incerto), le quali differiscono parzialmente dal fr. tramandato da Servio (F 15), ma non trovano corrispondenza nemmeno in Dionigi, cfr. Samter 1891, 27 sgg. In linea di principio, non si può escludere che da un'opera all'altra Varrone offrisse etimologie diverse e fra loro incompatibili, cfr. Mirsch 1882, 51.

Dionigi ad Antioco ed Ellanico.²² Le *laudes Italiae* dei capp. 36–37 di Dionisio non trovano corrispondenze significative in Varrone.²³ Dionigi (cap. 40) riconduce l'uso delle corone di alloro durante i sacrifici presso l'Ara Massima ai tempi di Eracle ed Evandro, mentre Varrone (Macr. *Sat.* 3, 12, 3–4 + Serv. Dan. *In Aen.* 8, 276 = **F 7 a–b**) polemizza contro tale idea, affermando che tale uso nacque solo dopo la fondazione di Roma. Anche le vicende di Enea dalla distruzione di Troia fino al suo arrivo nel Lazio e alla sua morte quali narrate da Dionigi (cap. 46–64) non hanno nulla che faccia pensare a un uso di Varrone: a parte le coincidenze che derivano da una saga in più punti già fissata, Dionigi sembra preferire Ellanico e altre fonti greche a Varrone.²⁴ Nemmeno la genealogia di Enea (cap. 61–62) sembra avere a che fare con Varrone: è vero che Varrone (**F 16**), come Dionigi, riconduce l'origine di Dardano all'Arcadia, ma noi sappiamo che anche alcuni scrittori greci dicevano questo (Serv. Dan. *In Aen.* 3, 167, p. 77 l. 23 edit. Harvardiana). Andando avanti nel primo libro di Dionigi, non ci si imbatte in materiale che sembri derivare da Varrone.

In sostanza, l'impressione è che l'influenza di Varrone sia limitata alla prima parte del libro, mentre, andando avanti, essa scompaia.²⁵ Vediamo dunque più da vicino i primi capitoli. Dopo la parte introduttiva, Dionigi parla degli Aborigeni, che egli ritiene di origine ellenica e identifica cogli Enotri (capp. 9–13). In questi capitoli non ci sono ragioni per postulare alcuna dipendenza da Varrone,²⁶ mentre essa diventa certa, come lo stesso Dionigi ammette, nei capp. 14–15. Anche il capitolo 16 potrebbe

²² Cfr. Varro, *Res rust.* 2, 5, 3; Gell. 11, 1, 1 (= Timaeus, *FrGrHist* 566 F 42 a–b); Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 1, 35 (= Antiochus *FrGrHist* 555 F 5; Hellan. *FrGrHist* 4 F 111).

²³ Varro *Res rust.* 1, 2, 3–7; Jacobson 1895, 12–13.

²⁴ Cfr. Jacobson 1895, 14–16; Poucet 1989. La differenza più lampante è che Dionigi non sa nulla del soggiorno di Enea a Cartagine, che invece figurava in Varrone (Serv. Dan. *In Aen.* 4, 682 = **F 21**).

²⁵ Così Fromentin 1998, 56.

²⁶ Cfr. Jacobson 1895, 4; cfr. anche Briquel 1993. Si è supposto che Varrone sia all'origine dell'etimologia *Aberrigines* > *Aborigines* (Dion. 1, 10, 2; *Origo gentis Rom.* 4, 2; Paulus ex Festo 17, 19–21 Thew.–Lind.). Richard 1983 cita a sostegno dell'origine varroniana gli *errores plurimi* di cui parla Varrone (**F 13 a**), ma il Reatino si riferisce ai Pelasgi, non agli Aborigeni. D'altra parte, anche altri proponevano questa etimologia (cfr. Festus 328, 10 Thew.–Lin.). Della Corte 1978, 114 crede addirittura che Varrone respingesse tale etimologia (anche se non vedo argomenti in tal senso). È piuttosto la coincidenza fra Dionigi, *Origo* e Festo che potrebbe far pensare a Varrone, dato che il Reatino è utilizzato da tutti e tre questi autori.

benissimo derivare da Varrone:²⁷ esso si lega in maniera strettissima al precedente e come esso presuppone che gli Aborigeni risiedano in Sabina, idea sostenuta da Varrone; per questo motivo lo inserito fra i *fortasse Varroniana* (F 214). Col cap. 17 inizia la narrazione sulle peregrinazioni dei Pelasgi e del loro arrivo nel Lazio: abbiamo già visto prima che tale storia è parzialmente identica a quella narrata da Varrone (F 13 a) come riferita da Macrobio: sebbene si sia cercato di mostrare che il pensiero varroniano quale riferito da Macrobio presenti molte contraddizioni con quanto narra Dionigi,²⁸ a me pare che la maggior parte delle presunte contraddizioni siano imputabili solo alla maggiore brevità della versione macrobiana. Solo su un punto mi pare ci sia reale contraddizione: Macrobio fa arrivare i Pelasgi dal mare sulla costa laziale (*cum Latium post errores plurimos appulissent*), mentre Dionigi (capp. 18–19) li fa arrivare sulla costa adriatica. È molto difficile giudicare sull'origine di questa divergenza: può darsi che nel racconto di Macrobio (cultore di Virgilio) abbia giocato un ruolo l'analogia con l'arrivo di Enea nel Lazio. Si osservi anche che il racconto di Dionigi che fa sbarcare i Pelasgi sulla costa adriatica dell'Italia li fa comunque, alla fine, arrivare nella zona di confine fra Aborigeni e Umbri (19, 1), dato che avevamo già incontrato in 16, 1 (passo di probabile origine varroniana). In considerazione anche della contiguità fra il cap. 16 (probabilmente varroniano) e il cap. 17 sarei incline a pensare che Dionigi abbia qui seguito per un pezzo abbastanza lungo Varrone e che quindi sia stato Macrobio (probabilmente suggestionato da Virgilio) a modificare il luogo di approdo in Italia dei Pelasgi.

Un'inserzione di Dionigi mi pare sia riconoscibile a 17, 1: Dionigi si chiede il motivo dell'alleanza fra Aborigeni e Pelasgi e dice che essa forse era dovuta alla semplice mutua utilità, ma che egli preferisce credere che fosse dovuta alla comune origine greca di due popoli:²⁹ il fatto che Dionigi affermi esplicitamente che si tratta di una sua opinione e che essa rispecchi la tendenza fondamentale della sua opera, secondo cui i popoli che hanno fondato Roma sono greci, non lascia dubbi che qui abbiamo a che fare con un pezzo di Dionigi stesso. Nel pezzo successivo (17, 2–3) Dionigi descrive l'origine greca dei Pelasgi e la loro migrazione da Argo

²⁷ Così Gabba 1991, 115.

²⁸ Poucet 1993.

²⁹ Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 1, 17, 1: ἐδέξαντο δὲ αὐτοὺς [scil.: Πελασγοὺς] οἱ Ἀβοριγῖνες ἴσως μὲν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀφελθῆσεσθαι ἐλπίδα, ὥς δ' ἐγὼ πείθομαι κατὰ τὸ συγγενὲς μάλιστα.

alla Tessaglia; difficile dire se qui Dionigi segue Varrone o un'altra fonte: il fatto che egli poco prima si richiami alla sua opinione personale significa poco, poiché essa potrebbe riguardare semplicemente il fatto che l'alleanza fra Aborigeni e Pelagi avvenne per motivi etnici e non per pura utilità. Purtroppo, noi non sappiamo cosa Varrone pensasse dell'origine dei Pelasgi: siamo informati che egli citava l'opinione di coloro che li identificavano coi Tirreni,³⁰ opinione combattuta da Dionigi (capp. 25–30); per questo motivo è meglio rinunciare ad attribuirgli i §§ 2–3 del cap. 17. Il cap. 18 è invece assai probabile che derivi da Varrone: come già dicevo, l'approdo dei Pelasgi sulla costa adriatica dell'Italia è probabile fosse già in Varrone e certo quest'ultimo affermava che la maggior parte dei Pelasgi (τὸ πλεῖον αὐτῶν μέρος, § 2) era andata a Dodona. Di certo è di origine varroniana il cap. 19 così come l'inizio di 20, ove si parla dell'alleanza fra Aborigeni e Pelasgi. Da 20, 3 in poi la presenza di Varrone si attenua decisamente e, per tutto il primo libro, se ne hanno solo tracce sporadiche (cfr. p. 84). Questo è quanto mi pare si possa dire sull'utilizzo delle *Antiq. hum.* da parte di Dionigi.

Il **F 15** (= VIII, 1 M., tratto da Serv. + Serv. Dan. *In Aen.* 8, 51, p. 206, 15 – 207, 1 Thilo) lo dò in forma più ampia rispetto a Mirsch: già l'editore tedesco ha attribuito a Varrone la notizia secondo cui Evandro sarebbe venuto in Italia costretto e non per libera scelta. Sebbene Servio non attribuisca esplicitamente l'affermazione al Reatino,³¹ anch'io ritengo assai probabile che Varrone dicesse questo e che in questo modo si opponesse a un'altra versione, per cui Evandro veniva in Italia spontaneamente.³² A favore di questa idea si osservi nel testo di Servio il parallelismo fra *exsilio, non sponte, compulsus venit in Italiam* ed *exsules confugerunt* (espressione dello stesso Varrone) e si ricordi che il Reatino anche a proposito dei Pelasgi parlava di movimenti forzati (**F 13 a**). Inoltre, nel pezzo che in Servio precede immediatamente queste notizie, leggiamo che

³⁰ Serv. Dan. *In Aen.* 8, 600 (= **F 12**): dal fr. non si deduce che Varrone approvasse tale opinione, ma solo che la menzionava; diversamente Musti 1970, 26 n. 10.

³¹ Probabilmente Servio non conosceva direttamente Varrone (Vallat 2017, 101), ma il Reatino era ben presente nelle sue fonti; si osservi che il Servio genuino non cita mai esplicitamente le *Antiq. hum.*, mentre esse vengono citati più volte nel Servio *auctus*. Sulla presenza delle *Antiq. hum.* in Servio cfr., oltre a Vallat, Lloyd 1961; Holford-Strevens 2015, 151; Canetta 2016. In generale, sulla presenza di Varrone in Servio vale sempre la pena di vedere Samter 1891, ma le attribuzioni a Varrone proposte da Samter, sebbene spesso basate su argomentazioni brillanti, di rado superano la suggestione.

³² Cfr. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1, 31, 2 (ἐκούσιος ὑπεξῆλθεν).

gli Arcadi sarebbero vissuti fino a trecento anni, notizia che compariva anche in Varrone (cfr. **F 60**): a differenza di Mirsch, attribuisco anche la notizia sulla lunga vita della madre di Evandro e degli Arcadi a Varrone.

I libri geografici (8–13) e le fonti geografiche di Plinio il Vecchio

Molto difficile è fare ipotesi anche circa l'ordinamento dei libri geografici (*de locis*, 8–13).³³ Vediamo subito i pochissimi fr. che vengono assegnati dalle fonti antiche a un libro determinato: il libro 8 parlava di certo della città di Roma (**F 32**), il libro 11 dell'Italia (**F 33, 34**),³⁴ il libro 12 dell'isola spagnola Eritea (**F 35 a–b**), nel libro 13 veniva citato il Tanai (**F 36**). Si è immaginato che Varrone partisse con Roma, cui faceva seguire l'Italia, il resto dell'Europa, poi alla fine l'Asia, che egli forse considerava un tutt'uno con l'Africa.³⁵ Un ordinamento del genere troverebbe corrispondenza in Solino, che parte con Roma, cui fa seguire l'Italia e poi il resto dell'ecumene. Tuttavia, mi fa difficoltà credere che Roma e l'Italia potessero occupare quattro libri su sei: Plinio, che nei libri geografici (3–6) ha fatto largo uso di Varrone, non suggerisce certo nulla del genere. Accettato che Roma fosse posta all'inizio indipendentemente dalla posizione geografica, la sequenza Italia (libro 11) – Spagna (libro 12) fa pensare a un andamento E–W; questo è confermato dal fr. su Reggio (**F 34**), ove si parla di sei fiumi *iuxta Rhegium*, i quali si trovavano a W della città, il che fa pensare che Varrone arrivasse a Reggio dal litorale ionico per procedere poi a quello tirrenico.³⁶ Si potrebbe dunque immaginare che Varrone, dopo Roma (libro 8), partisse dall'estremo E dell'Europa e che i libri 9–10 fossero occupati dal Mar Nero, la Grecia e la zona balcanica.

³³ Cfr. soprattutto le fondamentali argomentazioni di Reitzenstein 1885, 545–551.

³⁴ Mirsch assegna il mio **F 34** (X, 11 M.) al libro 10, per un errore ereditato dalle edizioni a stampa dei fr. varroniani: questo portò lo studioso a un errore gravido di conseguenze per l'intera disposizione dei libri 8–13: cfr. Reitzenstein 1885, 515 n. 1.

³⁵ L'unione di Africa e Asia potrebbe essere desunta da *Schol. in Lucan.* 9, 411 (p. 301, 9–11 Usener) = **F 99**: *quidam diviserunt orbem in duas partes, ut Varro, id est Asiam et Europam, quidam in tris...* Cfr. anche Varro *De ling. Lat.* 5, 31.

³⁶ A un andamento E–W nel Mediterraneo settentrionale pensano anche Reitzenstein 1885, 550; Klotz 1906, 124 sgg.

Mentre l'articolazione interna di questi libri delle *Res humanae* è destinata a rimanere del tutto incerta, si possono fare osservazioni produttive sull'utilizzo di quest'opera in Plinio.

Il problema della presenza di Varrone nella geografia di Plinio è capitale per capire le fonti geografiche di Plinio: l'utilizzo di Varrone è certo e probabilmente di larga portata. Poiché esso si lega strettamente all'utilizzo da parte di Plinio dell'opera di Augusto, è opportuno dire qualcosa sul problema nel suo insieme. Plinio stesso, all'inizio della descrizione dell'Italia (3, 46), ci dà un'indicazione preziosissima:

nunc ambitum eius urbesque enumerabimus, qua in re praefari necessarium est auctorem nos Divum Augustum secuturos discriptionemque ab eo factam Italiae totius in regiones XI, sed ordine eo, qui litorum tractu fiet; urbium quidem vicinitates utique oratione propria servari non posse, itaque interiore parte digestionem in litteras eiusdem nos secuturos, coloniarum mentione signata, quas ille in eo prodidit numero.

Ora descriveremo l'aspetto geografico dell'Italia e ne elencheremo le città; è necessario anticipare che seguiremo il Divino Augusto e la sua divisione dell'Italia in undici regioni, ma che procederemo secondo il litorale. Dato che la nostra descrizione sarà succinta, non indicheremo le posizioni reciproche delle città e per questo nella parte interna le disporremo in ordine alfabetico come Augusto, curandoci di indicare quali città Augusto indichi come coloniae.³⁷

Da questo passo, che è stato molto discusso, risultano con chiarezza alcune cose: Augusto aveva diviso l'Italia in undici regioni³⁸ e aveva dato una lista delle città in ordine alfabetico, indicando quali di esse fossero colonie. Plinio segue l'ordine alfabetico solo nelle zone interne, perché egli non può fare di meglio, dal momento che non saprebbe come fare a indicare l'ubicazione delle località dell'interno. Sul litorale, invece, egli non segue l'ordine alfabetico, ma segue la costa (che, evidentemente, offre un punto di riferimento per collocare le città). Tutto questo corrisponde perfettamente a quanto leggiamo nel seguito, ove l'ordine alfabetico viene

³⁷ Mi pare che *vicinitas* indichi qui i rapporti di vicinanza fra le varie città, vale a dire la loro posizione reciproca: sulla costa essi vengono definiti facilmente dalla posizione relativa, ma nell'interno Plinio non può indicarli e per questo (*itaque*) si deve accontentare della disposizione alfabetica.

³⁸ Plinio è l'unica fonte a servare ricordo di questa divisione.

usato per l'interno, mentre le località litoranee vengono descritte secondo il loro ordine sulla costa e di molte località viene ricordato che si tratta di colonie.

Tuttavia da Plin. 3, 46 non si deduce con chiarezza donde derivino le località della costa: a una prima lettura si potrebbe pensare che anch'esse derivino da Augusto e che Plinio si sia limitato a disporle in ordine geografico e non alfabetico, ma ci sono ottime ragioni per pensare che le località della costa derivino non da Augusto, ma da un'altra fonte.³⁹ Un indizio in questo senso è che alcune località vengono ripetute due volte, sia nella descrizione del litorale che in quella dell'interno;⁴⁰ inoltre, Plinio enumera anche le foci dei fiumi lungo la costa ed esse di sicuro derivano da un'opera geografica, non certo da Augusto, che non sembra desse notizie di carattere strettamente geografico.

Nello scritto augusteo si indicavano i nomi dei popoli, non delle località: questo è dimostrato dalle lunghe serie di nomi di popoli dell'interno disposti in ordine alfabetico, cosa del tutto inusuale per Plinio, che altrove preferisce sempre il nome delle località. Plinio ha certamente, in molti passi, cambiato il nome del popolo con quello della località, ma a volte ha commesso degli errori, ricostruendo male il nome della località.⁴¹ L'impressione è che egli avrebbe preferito dare sempre i nomi delle località, ma che questo gli creasse difficoltà e per questo abbia lasciato gli etnonimi.⁴² Nella maggioranza delle regioni dell'Italia Plinio segue uno schema fisso e ben riconoscibile: all'inizio descrive i popoli che la hanno abitata nel corso del tempo, poi viene descritta la costa.⁴³

³⁹ Su questi problemi informa bene Sallmann 1971 e 2003, sebbene egli raggiunga conclusioni forse troppo scettiche.

⁴⁰ *Arpi* (3, 104 e 105); *Larinum* (3, 103 e 105); *Venusia* (3, 104 e 105); *Nuceria / Alfaterni* (3, 62–63): cfr. Beloch 1880, 4.

⁴¹ 3, 52 (*Hortanum* invece di *Horta*); 3, 63 (*Calenum* invece di *Cales*): Bormann 1884, 37; Cuntz 1888, 18.

⁴² Così Bormann 1884, che osserva come a 3, 63 (prima regione augustea) e 3, 116 (ottava regione augustea) Plinio inizi con toponimi, per poi passare a etnonimi, probabilmente perché la conversione dei secondi nei primi era faticosa e non priva di insidie.

⁴³ Così avviene per la settima regione (Etruria: 3, 50–52), per la prima (Campania e Lazio: 3, 59–64), per la terza (Lucania e Bruzio: 3, 71–74, 95–98), per la seconda (Apulia e Calabria: 3, 99–105), per la quinta (Piceno: 3, 110–111), per la sesta (Umbria: 3, 112–114). Nella quarta (Sannio: 3, 106–109) manca la parte iniziale sui popoli, di cui si dice qualcosa dopo la descrizione dell'interno, mentre nell'ottava (Emilia: 3, 115–116) e nella decima (Venezia: 3, 126–130)

Spesso seguono, alla fine, le città scomparse.⁴⁴ Plinio cita Augusto solo a proposito dell'Italia; tuttavia, lunghi elenchi alfabetici compaiono anche altrove e se ne è ragionevolmente dedotto che lo scritto augusteo sia stato utilizzato da Plinio non solo per l'Italia.⁴⁵ Considerato che lo scritto augusteo forniva solo elenchi alfabetici di etnonimi (aggiungendo talvolta l'indicazione che si trattava di colonie), si è posto il problema di quale altra fonte Plinio abbia usato, dalla quale avrebbe tratto la descrizione delle zone costiere, le notizie sulle popolazioni e i loro spostamenti, nonché altre notizie assenti dallo scritto augusteo. Si è pensato che tale fonte siano state le *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* di Varrone, autore presente negli *indices* pliniani di tutti i libri geografici (3–6):⁴⁶ di certo alcune notizie non augustee di Plinio derivano da Varrone, ma non c'è alcun modo di mostrare che tutto quanto non è augusteo sia varroniano. Un'ampia presenza varroniana nella geografia di Plinio è dunque altamente probabile (anche perché mancano alternative credibili al Reatino), ma è difficilmente dimostrabile e non accade quasi mai, sulla base di ragionamenti combinatori, di recuperare nuovi fr. varroniani.

Un caso in cui tocchiamo con mano la presenza di Varrone è Plin. 4, 120 (F 35 b),⁴⁷ a proposito dell'isola di Eritea: *Erythea dicta est, quoniam Tyri aborigines earum orti ab Erythro mari ferebantur*. Da Carisio (Charis. *Ars gramm.* 1, p. 75, 21–25 Barwick) sappiamo che nel libro 12 delle *Antiquitates humanae* si leggeva (F 35 a): *ab Erythro mare orti*. Dunque qui Plinio copiava pressoché alla lettera Varrone. Eritea non è lungi dalla costa spagnola e da Detlefsen in poi si è più volte affermato

dei popoli non si dice nulla. Si staccano dallo schema perché non hanno l'elenco alfabetico la nona (Liguria: 3, 47–49) e l'undicesima (Transpadana: 123–124); i motivi per cui in queste due regioni mancano gli elenchi alfabetici non sono affatto chiari. Si è supposto che qui Plinio disponesse di una fonte che già congiungeva gli elenchi augustei con una descrizione geografica (Klotz 1906, 97), ma cfr. anche Cuntz 1888, 15.

⁴⁴ Etruria (52); Lazio e Campania (68–70); Lucania e Bruzio (98); Sannio (108); Umbria (114); Emilia (116); Transpadana (125); Venezia (131).

⁴⁵ E. g. Gallia Narbonese (3, 36–37); Sicilia (3, 91); Illirico (3, 139–142); Lusitania (4, 117–118); Africa (5, 29–30); Galazia (5, 146): cfr. Cuntz 1888, 6.

⁴⁶ Reitzenstein 1885, 530 sgg. Già in precedenza si era fatto il nome di Varrone, ma si era pensato che quest'ultimo avesse composto un periplo e non si era capito di quale opera varroniana si trattasse, mentre Reitzenstein ha dimostrato convincentemente che si tratta delle *Antiquitates* e che in esse venivano descritte anche le regioni dell'interno e le vicende dei popoli.

⁴⁷ Reitzenstein 1885, 530–531. Mirsch non inserisce il brano pliniano nella sua raccolta, poiché egli scrive prima di Reitzenstein.

che l'intero periplo della penisola iberica deriverebbe da Varrone.⁴⁸ Plinio attribuisce esplicitamente a Varrone una serie di misure (4, 115 = **F 49**): 200 miglia dal Minio all'Eminio, altrettante dal Durio al Tago, 160 m. dal Tago al Promontorio Sacro, 1400 m. dal Promontorio Sacro ai Pirenei,⁴⁹ 126 dal Promontorio Sacro all'Anas, 102 dall'Anas a Gades. Da queste distanze possiamo affermare con certezza che per Varrone da Gades al Durio c'erano 588 m. (102 + 126 + 160 + 200). Plinio cita anche altre distanze, senza però attribuirle a nessun autore: Pirenei–Castulone 607 m. (3, 29 = **F 220**), Castulone/Murgi–Gades 275 m. (3, 17 = **F 219**), 60/90 m. l'*excursus* del Promontorio Magno (4, 114 = **F 221**), Promontorio Magno–Pirenei 1250 m. (4, 114 = **F 221**). Il periplo complessivo della Spagna viene fissato a 2924 ovvero a 2600 m. (4, 118 = **F 222**) e anche per queste due misurazioni non viene indicato alcun autore.

Secondo Detlefsen la misura 2600 deriverebbe da Varrone e tutte le distanze che Plinio cita senza nominarne l'autore deriverebbero da Varrone. In effetti, se sommiamo le distanze citate otteniamo una cifra che oscilla fra 2580 e 2610 m.:⁵⁰ 607 (Pirenei–Castulone) + 275 (Castulone/Murgi–Gades) + 102 (Gades–Anas) + 126 (Anas–Promontorio Sacro) + 160 (Promontorio Sacro–Tago) + 60/90 (*excursus* del Promontorio Magno) + 1250 (Promontorio Magno–Pirenei) = 2580 / 2610. Fra queste distanze, Plinio attribuisce a Varrone solo quelle Gades–Anas, Anas–Promontorio Sacro, Promontorio Sacro–Tago, ed è ovvio che a questo proposito non si può avere alcuna certezza, poiché sappiamo troppo poco delle distanze varroniane circa la Spagna. Tuttavia pare probabile che anche la distanza fra il Promontorio Magno e i Pirenei derivi da Varrone. Da quanto dice Plinio (4, 115 = **F 49**) si deduce che Varrone credeva che il Promontorio Sacro (Cabo de S. Vicente) si trovasse a metà della *frons Hispaniae*;⁵¹ dunque Varrone credeva che il Promontorio Magno (ovvero *Olisponense*, cfr. Plin. 4, 113, cioè Cabo de Roca) segnasse il confine fra il lato occidentale e quello settentrionale della Spagna. Questo rende verisimile che la distanza fra il Promontorio Magno e i Pirenei risalga al Reatino, perché è ovvio che menzionare tale distanza ha molto più senso per chi crede che sia il Promontorio Magno (Cap de Roca), e non il Promontorio Celtico (Cap Finisterre), a segnare il confine fra il lato

⁴⁸ Detlefsen 1877; Reitzenstein 1885, 531.

⁴⁹ Si tratta qui, a quanto pare, di un itinerario terrestre (cfr. *ad Pyrenaeum medium*).

⁵⁰ A seconda che si misuri l'*excursus* del Promontorio Magno 60 o 90 m.

⁵¹ *Promuntorium Sacrum e media prope Hispaniae fronte prosilit*.

occidentale e quello settentrionale. Se davvero Varrone faceva di Cab de Roca il confine fra lato W e lato N della Spagna, è probabile che egli abbia influenzato Plinio, la cui descrizione della Spagna si basa su questo errore geografico: Plinio, infatti, non attribuisce alcuna importanza al Promontorio Celtico (4, 111), mentre fa del Promontorio Magno il confine tra *oceanus Gallicus* e *oceanus Atlanticus* (4, 114). Un altro indizio a favore della presenza di Varrone in Plinio è che quest'ultimo sottolinea l'origine greca di molte stirpi della Spagna (4, 112), tipica idea varroniana (cfr. i **F 38–39** da San Girolamo).

È probabile che anche il § 3 della *Divisio orbis terrarum*, opera che per il resto deriva per lo più da Agrippa, derivi da Varrone:⁵² la longitudine dell'intera Spagna, dalle Colonne d'Ercole ai Pirenei, di 900 m. non è conciliabile con quella di Agrippa, che pone la longitudine della Betica a 475 m. (Plin. 3, 16 = Agrippa fr. 4 Klotz) e quella della *Citerior* a 535 (*Dimens. provinciarum* 22 = Agrippa fr. 6 Klotz), mentre potrebbe esserlo con quella di Varrone, se le distanze fra Gades–Castulone/Murgi e Castulone–Pirenei citate da Plinio (3, 17; 3, 29) derivano davvero da Varrone (come abbiamo supposto), poiché la loro somma (275 + 607 = 882) non è lontana da 900. La latitudine viene detta uguale alla longitudine, ma di 300 m. nel punto all'estremo settentrione, ove la penisola si restringe: questa cifra è probabilmente da mettere in relazione con quella fornitaci da Plinio (3, 29 = **F 220** lo stesso passo in cui si dice che la distanza Castulone–Pirenei è di 607 m.), ove la latitudine della Citeriore è fissata a 307: se questa cifra (CCCVII) è un'assimilazione dal precedente (DCVII) e in origine era stato scritto CCC la coincidenza fra fra Pl. 3, 29 (forse Varrone) con *Div.* 3 sarebbe perfetta.

In seguito a queste considerazioni ho inserito fra i *fortasse Varroniana* i passi pliniani sulla Spagna che potrebbero derivare dal Reatino (**F 219–222**).

L'Italia di Plinio deve senza dubbio qualcosa a Varrone e forse le distanze costiere dell'Italia derivino da lui.⁵³ L'unica distanza che Plinio (3, 95 = **F 43**) attribuisce esplicitamente a Varrone è quella fra Locri e il Lacinio, tratto che Plinio definisce *frons Italiae*; questo è inesatto, poiché Locri si trova sul lato orientale dell'Italia. Lo stesso Plinio pare confondere qui più fonti, poiché egli colloca in questa *frons Italiae* tre *sinus* che non ci sono, e questo pare derivare da una confusione di fonti

⁵² Cfr. Klotz 1931, 52–53.

⁵³ Klotz 1906, 114–121; Sallmann 1971, 261–262; cfr. già Oehmichen 1880, 27–31.

(in Plinio o qualcuno prima di lui).⁵⁴ Comunque sia, questo errore circa la posizione di Locri non è isolato nella descrizione pliniana, ma si inserisce in un periplo complessivo dell'Italia in cui Locri era in posizione rilevante, come mostra il fatto che venga data la distanza da Locri al Lacinio (3, 95) e da Locri al Silero (3, 74). Si tratta altresì di un periplo dell'Italia senza interruzioni o lacune, sicché sembra naturale sia tratto tutto dalla stessa fonte; questa non può essere Agrippa (come pure si è supposto),⁵⁵ mentre è ben possibile sia Varrone, come mostra il fatto che come confine nord-orientale dell'Italia venga indicato il Formio e non l'Arsia, come diverrà abituale da Augusto in poi. Tuttavia, in mancanza di indizi che colleghino singoli tratti del periplo a Varrone, non ho ritenuto opportuno inserire fr. da questa sezione pliniana, ove egli non citi Varrone.

Il lessico di Pompeo Festo (che deriva, come è ben noto, da Verrio Flacco, erudito di età augustea) contiene numerose glosse di carattere etnico-geografico. Una di esse presenta una somiglianza tale con un fr. varroniano, che è lecito dedurre che essa derivi da Varrone,⁵⁶ un'altra deriva esplicitamente dal Reatino.⁵⁷ Tuttavia è eccessivo dedurre, con Reitzenstein, che tutte le glosse etnico-geografiche derivino da Varrone,⁵⁸ poiché nessuno può escludere l'utilizzo di altre fonti. Alcune delle citate glosse etnico-geografiche trovano corrispondenze nei libri geografici di Plinio: dato il significativo utilizzo di Varrone da parte di Plinio nei libri geografici, non è improbabile che qui la fonte comune di Festo e Plinio sia, in ultima analisi, Varrone.⁵⁹ Osservando che alcune di queste glosse si riferiscono a località non della costa, ma dell'entroterra, Reitzenstein ne trasse la giusta conclusione che l'opera geografica di Varrone non poteva essere un semplice periplo, ma doveva descrivere anche le zone interne.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ Detlefsen 1886, 251–252.

⁵⁵ Partsch 1875, 36–45; Detlefsen 1901, 17–23, confutati da Klotz 1906, 111 sgg.

⁵⁶ Si confronti Ps.-Probus, *In Buc.* 6, 31, p. 336, 18 – 337, 10 Hagen (= **F 24 a**) con Festus p. 440, 10–13 Thew.-Lin. e Paulus ex Fest. p. 441, 3 Thew.-Lin. (**F 24 b**).

⁵⁷ Festus 464, 18–20 Thew.-Lin. = **F 45 b**.

⁵⁸ Reitzenstein 1885, 532 sgg. Si consideri che Verrio / Pompeo, mentre ha senza dubbio usato le *Antiquitates*, non sembra conoscere il *De ling. Lat.*: cfr. Kriegshammer 1903; Riposati 1939, 19 n. 1.

⁵⁹ Cfr. **F 45, 215, 216, 217** (questi ultimi tre da me collocati fra i *fortasse Varroniana*); cfr. Reitzenstein 1885, 536–538.

⁶⁰ Reitzenstein 1885, 538 (cfr. **F 45, 215, 216**): nel 1885 era diffusa l'idea che Varrone avesse scritto un periplo. La linea di Reitzenstein venne ripresa da Samter 1891, 63 sgg. Sul problema cfr. anche Sallmann 1971.

In un punto riusciamo a recuperare un brano abbastanza esteso di Varrone: Festo (464, 18–20 Thew.–Lin.= **F 45 b**) dà un’etimologia di Sabini che trova riscontro in Plin. 3, 108–109 (= **F 45 c**): in questo passo Plinio descrive la particolare fecondità della zona attorno al lago Velino; un’analoga notizia si trova in Serv. *In Aen.* 7, 712 (**F 45 a**), il quale cita Varrone; considerando anche l’origine reatina di Varrone e che Plinio dice (3, 1) di voler seguire in ciascun luogo gli autori che ne erano originari, credo si possa dire con certezza che in 3, 108 Plinio dipende da Varrone (a conferma cfr. Varro *Res rust.* 1, 7, 10).

Uno dei punti in cui la mia edizione diverge più radicalmente da quella di Mirsch riguarda le porte di Roma: Mirsch inserisce tutti i passi che circa tali porte si trovano in Festo fra i fr. del libro 8 delle *Antiq. hum.* (VIII, 5–19), poiché egli crede che Verrio Flacco avesse tratto tutte le informazioni sulle porte di Roma, che noi leggiamo in Festo, dall’opera in questione, ma a me pare che tale ipotesi manchi di solido fondamento. Punto di partenza di Mirsch è la glossa sulla porta *Raudusculana*, poiché egli (VIII, 5) in Festo (338, 28 Thewr.–Linds) legge *Varro ait in libris Antiquitatum*. Tuttavia, un’integrazione del genere sul solo *tatum* è imprudente;⁶¹ inoltre l’etimologia di *Raudusculana* di Festo–Paolo (339, 11–12 Th.–L.) diverge assai da quella accolta da Varrone nel *De ling. Lat.* (5, 163). Anche le etimologie di Festo–Paolo circa la porta *Laverna*, *Romana* e *Mugonia* divergono da quelle del *De ling. Lat.*⁶² Non è escluso che Varrone nelle *Antiquitates* a volte proponesse etimologie diverse da quelle che forniva in altre opere,⁶³ ma manca qualsiasi indizio serio che mostri che Verrio/Festo ha tratto le notizie sulle porte di Roma da Varrone.

I libri 14–19 e la presenza di Varrone in Censorino

I libri 14–19 trattavano del tempo. La disposizione del materiale al loro interno non è certa, ma si possono fare, come vedremo tra poco, più che in tutto il resto delle *Antiquitates humanae*, alcune ragionevoli congetture. Dal grammatico Diomede sappiamo che nel libro 15 della nostra opera

⁶¹ Di tale integrazione non c’è traccia nell’apparato di Thewrewk–Lindsay.

⁶² Cf. Paul. 104, 28 – 105, 3 Th.–L. e Varr. *De ling. Lat.* 5, 164; Fest. 318, 25–32 Th.–L. e *De ling. Lat.* 5, 164; Paul. 131, 15–16 Th.–L. e *De ling. Lat.* 5, 164.

⁶³ Cfr. *supra* note 20–21.

compariva l'espressione *mortuos sallant*.⁶⁴ Un passo di un'opera fondamentale per la ricostruzione dei libri varroniani in questione, il *De die natali* di Censorino (17, 14 = **F 52 a**), passo che Censorino dice esplicitamente di trarre da Varrone, sembra derivare proprio dal brano citato da Diomede.

Censorino divide l'ultima parte della sua opera (cap. 16–24) in sei sezioni: sull'*aevum* (16), sul *saeculum* (17), sull'*annus magnus* / *lustrum* (18), sull'*annus vertens* (19–21), sul *mensis* (22), sul *dies* (23–24). Considerando che in questi cap. Varrone viene più volte citato (Censor. *De die nat.* 17, 6; 17, 8; 17, 11; 17, 14; 17, 15; 20, 2; 21, 1; 21, 5; 22, 10) e che una divisione del tempo in *mensis* / *lustrum* / *saeculum* / *aevum* si trova in Varrone (*De ling. Lat.* 6, 1–11), un'ampia presenza del Reatino in questa parte dell'opera di Censorino appare probabile. In effetti, un'analisi dell'opera di Censorino conferma un uso assai ampio di Varrone.⁶⁵ Ad eccezione dell'*aevum*, le altre unità temporali sono divise da Censorino in una sezione *naturalis* e una *civilis*: questa divisione, fondamentale nell'esposizione di Censorino, si trova in Varrone (*De ling. Lat.* 6, 12). Per quanto concerne la sezione sul *saeculum*, la stessa definizione di quest'ultimo, che in Censorino si trova all'inizio della sezione, trova un'eco in Varrone.⁶⁶

Seguono in Censorino alcune righe circa la definizione di γενεά, poi una parte sulla durata massima della vita umana: sebbene qui Censorino non faccia il nome di Varrone, è probabile che egli, nella sezione sulla lunghezza massima della vita umana, dipenda dal Reatino. Lattanzio (*Div. inst.* 2, 12, 21–22 = **F 60 f**), infatti, ci informa che Varrone diceva che la credenza secondo cui gli uomini erano vissuti mille anni derivava dal fatto che presso gli Egizi un singolo mese veniva considerato un anno. Questo stesso pensiero si incontra in Plinio (7, 155 = **F 60 a**) e Giovanni

⁶⁴ Diom. *Ars gramm.* 1, p. 375, 21–22 Keil: *idem* [scil. Varro, praecedit *De ling. Lat.* 5, 110] «*Antiquitatum humanarum*» quinto decimo: «*mortuos sallant*» (= **F 52 b**).

⁶⁵ Cfr. Hahn 1905, 17 sgg.; Franceschi 1954. Mirsch non ha compreso quanto Censorino debba a Varrone, il che lo ha portato a omettere dalla raccolta varroniana molti passi censoriniani che risalgono con ogni verisimiglianza al Reatino (cfr. **F 52 a**, **53**, **60 b e d**, **65 a**, **67 b**, **68 b**, **69 a**).

⁶⁶ Cens. 17, 2: *saeculum est spatium vitae humanae longissimum partu et morte definitum*; Varro *De ling. Lat.* 6, 11: *saeculum spatium annorum centum vocarunt, dictum a sene, quod longissimum spatium senescendorum hominum id putarunt*. Cfr. Franceschi 1954, 394.

Lido (*De mens.* 3, 5 = **F 60 g**); sebbene Censorino non formuli il pensiero così, il passo di cui stiamo discutendo (17, 3–4 = **F 60 b**) presenta impressionanti somiglianze con Plin. 7, 155 ed è evidente che essi derivano dalla stessa fonte.⁶⁷ Nel nostro passo Censorino non parla del mese egizio che corrisponde all'anno: tuttavia egli ne parla più avanti (19, 4), nella sezione sull'*annus vertens*. È evidente che tutto questo deriva dalla stessa fonte ed essa non può essere che Varrone, come dimostra Lattanzio.⁶⁸

Segue in Censorino una sezione sui *saecula* degli Etruschi: qui non solo Censorino fa il nome di Varrone (17, 6 = **F 53**), ma una citazione

⁶⁷ Cfr. Münzer 1897, 105–108; Hahn 1905, 34–36. Censorino (17, 3–4) è più breve di Plinio (7, 153–155; 160), ma la somiglianza sono evidentissime: entrambi iniziano coi poeti, cui seguono gli storici, poi si passa agli astronomi, in quanto più affidabili (Cens.: *verum haec ut fabulosa praetereo; sed inter ipsos astrologos*; Plin.: *poscere videtur locus ipse sideralis scientiae sententiam*). In entrambi si afferma che i singoli luoghi possono incidere sulla durata massima della vita (Cens. § 4 verso la fine; Plin. § 153 all'inizio). Il fatto che circa Argantonio Censorino citi Erodoto e Plinio Anacreonte, è dovuto al fatto che nella fonte comune comparivano entrambi, come mostra Ps.-Lucian. *Macrob.* 10 (cfr. Münzer 1897, 107, che sostiene anche, a ragione, l'impossibilità della derivazione di Censorino da Plinio).

A Censorino e Plinio si aggiunge Valerio Massimo (8, 13 = **F 60 c**): in 8, 13 ext. 5–7 egli dipende dalla stessa fonte di Censorino e Plinio, dunque da Varrone. La sezione romana di Valerio ed ext. 1–4 trovano corrispondenza in Plin. 7, 156–158: dal momento che Valerio Massimo è nell'elenco degli autori utilizzati da Plinio nel libro 7 (cfr. l'*index* pliniano) e che questa sezione non trova corrispondenze in Censorino, viene da supporre che Plinio dipenda qui da Valerio. Münzer 1897, 109 osserva, tuttavia, che in alcuni casi Plinio offre particolari assenti da Valerio e ne deduce che anche qui deve esserci stata una fonte comune fra Valerio e Plinio, che lo studioso tedesco identifica ancora una volta con Varrone (secondo Münzer l'unica sezione che Plinio avrebbe attinto direttamente da Valerio sarebbe stata quella sulle donne, Val. Max. § 6, Plin. § 158). Tuttavia, dato che questa sezione non trova alcuna corrispondenza in Censorino, preferisco non inserirla fra i fr. di Varrone e ritengo più probabile che Plinio la abbia attinta direttamente da Valerio, integrandola qua e là. — Si noti che, se la nostra ricostruzione è corretta, l'ultimo autore, in ordine cronologico, citato da Varrone in questa sezione è Alessandro Poliistore (Val. Max. ext. 7; Plin. § 155): per il possibile influsso di quest'ultimo sul Reatino, cfr. F. Jacoby, commento a Alex. Pol. (*FrGrHist* 273), p. 258.

⁶⁸ Ci si chiede in che parte dell'opera Varrone parlasse di quest'argomento, dal momento che Censorino (che riproduce abbastanza fedelmente la disposizione varroniana) parla della durata massima della vita umana nella sezione sul *saeculum*, mentre l'anno egizio viene citato nella sezione sull'*annus vertens*. Dal momento che Lattanzio (l'unico a citare esplicitamente Varrone) non parla del *saeculum*, ho inserito i fr. nel libro sull'*annus vertens*, ma è evidente che non si possono avere certezze.

di Servio Danielino (*In Aen.* 8, 526 = **F 54**), che il commentatore dice di trarre da un'opera varroniana *de saeculis*, sembra tratta dallo stesso contesto. Poiché anche altrove singoli libri delle *Antiq. hum.* vengono citati con un titolo particolare,⁶⁹ si deduce che la citazione del Danielino derivi dal libro delle *Antiq. hum.* che trattava dei secoli: d'altra parte, abbiamo visto poc'anzi come un passo della sezione censoriniana sui secoli (17, 14 = **F 52 a**) derivi dal libro 15 delle *Antiq. hum.* È dunque lecito ipotizzare che il libro 15 delle *Antiq. hum.* fosse dedicato al *saeculum*.

Abbiamo già visto come Censorino divida il tempo in sei sezioni, dall'*aevum* al *dies*: considerando che le sezioni censoriniane del tempo sono sei, esattamente come i libri dell'esade varroniana (14–19), colpisce che il libro sui secoli (15) si trovasse in seconda posizione, proprio come il secolo si trova in seconda posizione se cominciamo a calcolare le divisioni del tempo a partire dall'*aevum*. Questo fatto ha portato a ipotizzare che la distribuzione della materia nei libri 14–19 delle *Antiquitates humanae* fosse la seguente:⁷⁰ 14 *de aevo*, 15 *de saeculis*, 16 *de annis magnis sive de lustris*, 17 *de annis vertentibus*, 18 *de mensibus*, 19 *de diebus*: se così è, i capp. 16–24 di Censorino rispecchiano in maniera fedele Varrone. È una ricostruzione brillante ed è certo l'unica che dia un filo conduttore per disporre il materiale di questi libri; essa troverà un'ulteriore conferma in un fr. del libro 17 sull'*annus vertens*.⁷¹

Tornando all'analisi del testo di Censorino, alla parte sui secoli degli Etruschi, ne segue una sui secoli dei Romani, in particolare sui *ludi saeculares* (17, 7–13). Qui, a parte due citazioni esplicite (17, 8; 11), Varrone non sembra la fonte, come mostra anche il fatto che Censorino

⁶⁹ Cfr. Gell. 1, 25, 1 (= **F 93**); 3, 2, 2 (= **F 66**). Cfr. anche Vallat 2017, 97. Una cosa del genere si ha anche per le *Antiq. div.*, di cui alcuni libri vengono chiamati da Macrobio (1, 16, 19) *augurum libri*: cfr. Cardauns 1976, 41.

⁷⁰ Gruppe 1876; Hahn 1905, 44; Willemsen 1906, 4; *contra* Mirsch 1882, 36 sgg. La tesi di Mirsch è inficiata dal fatto che egli nega il collegamento fra Serv. *In Aen.* 8, 526 (= **F 54**) e le *Antiquitates*; Mirsch suppone l'esistenza di un'opera varroniana autonoma dal titolo *De saeculis* (di cui non resta altrove traccia), che nulla aveva a che fare con le *Antiquitates*, ma è un'inutile complicazione.

⁷¹ Censorino (17, 15 = **F 63**) dice che nel libro 18 delle *Antiquitates* Varrone narra che l'augure Vettio dall'augurio dei 12 *vulturi* al momento della fondazione di Roma traeva la conclusione che, dal momento che Roma aveva passato i 120 anni, sarebbe arrivata almeno a 1200 anni. Se seguiamo la proposta di Gruppe, il libro 18 trattava specificamente dei mesi e non è difficile immaginare che la discussione sui mesi potesse portare a menzionare l'augurio di Vettio (Gruppe 1876, 53–54; Hahn 1905, 37).

fa riferimento a eventi di età augustea e a scrittori successivi a Varrone. Censorino chiude poi la sezione sul secolo affermando che il numero di 100 anni non è affatto arbitrario e riporta la profezia di Vettio su Roma (17, 13–15 = **F 52 a** + **F 63**): tutta questa parte deriva senza dubbio dalle *Antiq. hum.* di Varrone, come mostrano le due citazioni esplicite di Varrone, entrambe tratte senza alcun dubbio dalle *Antiq. hum.* Il capitolo successivo (18) sull'*annus magnus* / *lustrum* a prima vista non sembra influenzato da Varrone, anche se si è cercato di mostrare che Varrone sarebbe comunque presente.⁷² Nei tre capitoli successivi (19–21), dedicati all'*annus vertens*, l'influenza di Varrone è ampia e ben dimostrabile: la prima sezione (19, 1–3), in cui vengono citate le opinioni di alcuni filosofi circa la lunghezza dell'anno naturale, non è dimostrabile che derivi da Varrone, ma l'influenza del Reatino diventa chiara fin dall'inizio della parte sull'anno civile (= **F 60 d**): si dice subito dell'anno egizio che durava un mese, notizia di sicura origine varroniana (cfr. Lact. *Inst. div.* 2, 12, 21–22 = **F 60 f**). Gran parte delle notizie di questa sezione trova uno strettissimo parallelo in Macrobio (*Sat.* 1, 12, 2 = **F 60 e**) e Solino (1, 34 sgg.), e non c'è dubbio che Censorino, Macrobio e Solino dipendano, in ultima analisi, dalla stessa fonte: come ho cercato di mostrare altrove,⁷³ la fonte comune che tutti e tre questi scrittori hanno avuto sott'occhio è il perduto *De anno Romanorum* di Svetonio, il quale a sua volta attingeva a piene mani dalle *Antiq. hum.* varroniane. In tale contributo ho anche cercato di dimostrare che, mentre Macrobio e Solino avevano davanti solo Svetonio, Censorino, oltre che da Svetonio, attingeva direttamente anche da Varrone, come mostra già il fatto che egli abbia diviso il tempo in 6 sezioni, secondo la disposizione dei libri 14–19 delle *Antiquitates*, disposizione di cui Macrobio e Solino non conservano traccia.⁷⁴

La mediazione di Svetonio deve renderci cauti nell'attribuire a Varrone tutto quel che è comune a Censorino, Macrobio e Solino, poiché alcune cose possono risalire a Svetonio: per questo motivo, mentre includo fra i fr. varroniani Censor. 19, 4–7 (= **F 60 d**), non includo Censor. 20, 1,

⁷² Franceschi 1954, 397; *contra* Hahn 1905, 37–39.

⁷³ Lucarini *sub prelis*.

⁷⁴ Cfr. Lucarini *sub prelis*. Già Gruppe 1877, 545 osservava che Censorino riproduce il pensiero di Varrone in maniera più fedele di Macrobio, ma lo studioso tedesco, inspiegabilmente, nega una conoscenza diretta di Varrone da parte di Censorino. Cfr. anche Hahn 1905, 20 sgg. Si è supposta un'ampia influenza del neoplatonico Cornelio Labeone su Macrobio (Mastandrea 1979, seguito da Kaster 2011), ma essa non è verosimile: cfr. Lucarini *sub prelis*.

nonostante lo stretto parallelo con Solin. 1, 34:⁷⁵ nello scritto citato ho infatti cercato di dimostrare, attraverso alcuni indizi stilistici, che qui le coincidenze fra Censorino e Solino derivano da Svetonio.

Da Varrone deriva, invece, con tutta probabilità la parte, che, in Censorino, segue immediatamente (20, 2–5) quella discussa, ove si parla dell'anno più antico dei Romani (di dieci mesi) e della riforma di Numa / Tarquinio (F 59 a): lo mostra non solo l'esplicita menzione di Varrone (20, 2), ma anche la citazione di M. Fulvio Nobiliore e M. Giunio Graccano, autori in generale assai poco letti, ma citati dallo stesso Varrone a proposito del calendario romano (*De ling. Lat.* 6, 33); non si vede proprio da quale altro autore Censorino potesse attingere la conoscenza dei due scrittori citati. Segue una sezione sulla riforma del calendario fatta da Cesare, che ovviamente non può derivare da Varrone: probabilmente la sezione non varroniana inizia con 20, 6, ove si comincia a parlare dei problemi legati all'utilizzo del calendario di Numa / Tarquinio, anche se non è da escludere che Varrone stesso trattasse di questo argomento.⁷⁶ Segue una sezione sulla cronologia universale, dall'origine del mondo ai tempi di Censorino (cap. 21): tutta la prima parte di questa sezione (§§ 1–6) sembra derivare da Varrone (F 57), come mostrano le due citazioni dei §§ 1 e 5. Il § 2 parla del diluvio dei tempi di Ogigio: Gellio (1, 16, 3 = F 58) ci informa che nel libro 17 delle *Antiq. hum.* Varrone scriveva *ad Romuli initium plus mille et centum annorum est*, mentre da Arnobio (5, 8) sappiamo che Varrone (nel *De gente populi Romani*, fr. 20 Fraccaro) affermava che dal diluvio di Ogigio al consolato di Irzio e Pansa non fossero ancora passati 2000 anni e si è supposto che *ad Romuli initium* di F 58 si riferisca al diluvio di Ogigio.⁷⁷ Comunque sia, il fatto che Censorino parli del diluvio di Ogigio nella sezione sull'*annus*

⁷⁵ Solin. 1, 34: *tunc ergo primum cursus anni perspecta ratio, quae a rerum origine profunda caligine tegebatur. nam ante Augustum Caesarem incerto modo annum computabant, qui apud Aegyptios quattuor mensibus terminabatur, apud Arcadas tribus, apud Acarnanas sex, in Italia apud Lavinios tredecim.* Censor. 20, 1: *sed ut hos annos omittam caligine iam profundae vetustatis obductos, in his quoque, qui sunt recentioris memoriae et ad cursus lunae vel solis instituti, quanta sit varietas, facile est cognoscere, si quis vel in unius Italiae gentibus, ne dicam peregrinis, velit inquirere. nam ut alium Ferentini alium Lavinii itemque Albani vel Romani habuerunt annum...*

⁷⁶ Da Varrone credo derivi quanto sulle prime intercalazioni dice Macrobio (*Sat.* 1, 13, 20–21 = F 61): lo mostrano, oltre alla menzione dello stesso Varrone, la presenza di Giunio Graccano e Fulvio Nobiliore, nonché di Licinio Macro, usato da Varrone in questa sezione (Censor. 20, 2).

⁷⁷ Sul problema cronologico cfr. Gruppe 1876, 57; Frick 1886, 51–52.

vertens e che Gellio tramandi un fr. che pare riferirsi a tale diluvio dal libro 17, conferma la ricostruzione proposta sopra dei libri 14–19, che attribuisce al libro 17 proprio la trattazione dell'*annus vertens*.

Nella sezione sui mesi (cap. 22) i §§ 9–15 sembrano derivare da Varrone (= **F 62 a**), come mostra la citazione di Fulvio Nobiliore e di Giunio Graccano (cfr. quanto detto *supra*), nonché la menzione dell'opinione del Reatino; alla sezione varroniana seguono, esattamente come nella trattazione sull'anno, i cambiamenti introdotti da Cesare e Augusto (22, 16–17). Macrobio (*Sat.* 1, 12, 12–28 = **F 62 b**) ha conservato⁷⁸ materiale varroniano assente da Censorino: dal § 13 apprendiamo che Varrone citava con consenso l'opinione di Cingio circa l'origine del nome Aprile e, dal momento che Macrobio non sembra conoscere direttamente l'opera, assai rara, sui fasti di Cingio, è evidente che anche la citazione di Cingio del § 12 non può che derivare da Varrone.⁷⁹ La presenza di Fulvio Nobiliore, Giunio Graccano e Cingio mostra che anche i §§ 16–18 derivano da Varrone. Anche la citazione di Cingio al § 30 deriva da Varrone, come mostra anche l'osservazione che il nome del mese di giugno derivi dai Latini:⁸⁰ sembra che, nella disputa sull'origine del nome dei mesi romani, Varrone abbia citato l'opinione di Cingio e che a essa si sia attenuto.

Anche gli ultimi due capp. di Censorino (23–24), che trattano del giorno, sono profondamente influenzati da Varrone: dopo aver diviso il giorno naturale dal giorno civile (divisione, come già abbiamo visto, di origine varroniana),⁸¹ Censorino definisce il giorno naturale come spazio

⁷⁸ Credo tramite Svetonio, poiché, come ho già detto, non c'è il minimo indizio che Macrobio abbia, in questa sezione, avuto davanti le *Antiq. hum.*

⁷⁹ È dunque in errore Mirsch (fr. XVII, 2), che fa iniziare il fr. varroniano col § 13: in generale, Mirsch non ha compreso che le citazioni di Fulvio Nobiliore, Giunio Graccano e Cingio arrivano a Macrobio solo attraverso Varrone.

⁸⁰ Cfr. Censor. 22, 10 (= **F 62 a**): *Varro autem Romanos a Latinis nomina mensum accepisse arbitratur*. Ho aggiunto in questa sezione tre testimonianze di Festo (**F 62 c**), che mi pare evidente derivino in ultima analisi da Varrone e che erano sfuggite a Mirsch.

⁸¹ Questa distinzione occorre anche in Lyd. *De mens.* 2, 2: nel seguito (come in Censorino 23, 1 sgg.) si parla di come intendano il giorno vari popoli e ci sono somiglianze fortissime con Gellio/Varrone (**F 67**); tuttavia, confrontando Lido con Gellio (**F 67 a**) e Censorino (**F 67 b**), ci si accorge facilmente che il primo diverge sensibilmente dai due scrittori latini e certo questi ultimi due rispecchiano più fedelmente il pensiero di Varrone (Gellio ne dipende direttamente ed esplicitamente, mentre è probabile che Lido sia stato influenzato da Porfirio: cfr. Lucarini *sub prelis*). Mirsch non cita la testimonianza di Lido; io la ho citata, poiché mi pare certo che qualcosa di Lido risalga in ultima analisi a Varrone.

fra il sorgere e il tramontare del sole, il che trova corrispondenza in *De ling. Lat.* 6, 4 (sebbene il testo non sia sicuro). Anche la parte sulle varie definizioni del giorno presso i vari popoli deriva senza dubbio da Varrone, come mostra Gellio 3, 2, 2 sgg. (= **F 66 e 67 a**). Anche la sezione censoriniana sugli orologi solari deriva da Varrone (= **F 68 b**), come mostra Plin. 7, 214 (**F 68 a**). L'ultima parte dell'opuscolo censoriniano (cap. 24) è dedicata alle parti del giorno, che viene diviso in *de media nocte, gallicinium, conticium, ante lucem / diluculum, mane, ad meridiem, meridies, de meridie, suprema, vespera, crepusculum, luminibus accensis / prima face, intempesta, ad mediam noctem, media nox*. Nel *De ling. Lat.* (6, 4–7) compaiono alcune di queste suddivisioni ed è notevole come anche qui (§ 5), a proposito della *suprema*, si faccia riferimento, come in Censorino (24, 3), alla *lex Plaetoria*. Anche il fatto che Censorino (24, 4) citi la forma plautina di *vesperugo* (cfr. *Amph.* 275), esattamente come Varrone (§ 6), mostra che il Reatino è la fonte dello scrittore più recente; anche l'etimologia di *crepusculum* è la stessa. Dunque, sembra che anche la sezione censoriniana sul giorno derivi da Varrone (**F 69 a**). Inserisco in questo libro anche il già citato passo di Plinio (7, 214–215) sugli orologi solari (**F 68 a**): Mirsch, che non considera a questo proposito il passo di Censorino, lo pone in un libro diverso rispetto a quello sui giorni (XV, 3), ma Censorino suggerisce invece di collocarlo nel libro *de diebus*.

I libri 20–25 e altri fr.

I libri 20–25 erano dedicati alle *res*, ma purtroppo, come nel caso della prima e della seconda esade, per quanto concerne l'ordinamento interno del materiale non è possibile fare alcuna ipotesi fondata. Possediamo numerosi fr. del libro 20 tramandati da Nonio⁸² e si è ipotizzato che questo libro, che sicuramente trattava di antichità pubbliche, ne trattasse in modo più generale rispetto a quelli successivi.⁸³ È curioso il **F 70**, poiché qui Varrone fa riferimento alla divisione fra *homines, loca, tempora, res*: essa è alla base dell'ordinamento esadico delle *Antiq. hum.*, ma dal tono del fr. si ha l'impressione che di tale divisione Varrone parli qui per la prima volta, cosa di difficile spiegazione. A magistrature romane si riferiscono anche alcuni fr. del libro 21 tramandatici da Gellio (**F 85, 86, 87**) e non

⁸² Se Nonio abbia conosciuto direttamente le *Antiq. hum.* ovvero solo attraverso glossari a lui precedenti è dubbio, cfr. Piras 2016, 161; Marshall 2016, 189.

⁸³ Ranucci 1972, 134.

si riesce a stabilire una differenza di contenuto rispetto ai fr. del libro 20, che getti luce sulle differenze di fondo dei due libri. Sul contenuto dei libri 22–25 non abbiamo la minima indicazione: abbiamo solo un paio di fr. dal libro 22 (F 88, 89), ma di natura meramente grammaticale, sicché essi nulla ci dicono sul contenuto di questo libro.⁸⁴ Gellio (1, 25, 1 = F 93) ci informa che un libro delle *Antiq. hum.* trattava *de bello et pace*: esistono una serie di fr. che sembrano, per il loro argomento, derivare da questo libro, che Mirsch suppone fosse il 22, ma manca qualsiasi indizio a supportare tale identificazione. D'altra parte, pare certo che il libro *de bello et pace* facesse parte dell'ultima esade, poiché sarebbe più difficile collocarlo in una delle esadi precedenti (su questo punto credo Mirsch avesse ragione).

Dal libro *de bello et pace* potrebbero forse derivare alcuni corposi fr. che si riferiscono alle corone militari:⁸⁵ la nostra fonte più copiosa (Gell. 5, 6 = F 167 a) sembra avere come fonte immediata Masurio Sabino (fr. 17 Huschke–Seckel–Kuebler), ma quest'ultimo pare proprio aver usato Varrone e da Varrone paiono dipendere anche Verrio–Festo (F 167 b)⁸⁶ e Plinio (F 170–172). Di recente è stato messo in dubbio che questo materiale sulle corone militari derivi dal Reatino,⁸⁷ ma a me pare che la cosa sia pressoché certa. Nessuno può ragionevolmente dubitare che Gellio e Verrio–Festo derivino dalla stessa fonte;⁸⁸ che anche Plinio derivi

⁸⁴ Mirsch li attribuisce al libro 23. Il problema nasce dalla tradizione ms. di Nonio Marcello, che è divisa: pare sia meglio leggere, con Lindsay, XXII: cfr. Ranucci 1972, 107.

⁸⁵ Cfr. Mercklin 1859, ancora fondamentale e giusto nella sostanza.

⁸⁶ Come subito vedremo, Gellio e Verrio–Festo hanno una fonte comune. Gellio cita Masurio Sabino, ma quest'ultimo non può essere stata la fonte di Verrio Flacco per ragioni cronologiche.

⁸⁷ Salvatore 1999, 6.

⁸⁸ Cfr. Paulus *Excer. ex Festo* p. 504, 25–27 Thew.–Linds.: *triumphales coronae sunt quae imperatori victori aureae praeferuntur; quae temporibus antiquis propter paupertatem laureatae fuerunt*. Gell. 5, 6, 5–7: *triumphales coronae sunt aureae, quae imperatoribus ob honorem triumphi mittuntur*. 6 *id vulgo dicitur aurum coronarium*: 7 *haec antiquitus e lauro erant, post fieri ex auro coeptae*. – Festus p. 188, 3–5 Di Marco: *obsidionalis corona est quae datur imperatori ei, qui obsidione liberavit ab hostibus obsessos. ea fit ex gramine viridi fere ex eo loco decerpto, in quo errant inclusi*. Gell. 5, 6, 8–9: *obsidionalis est quam hi, qui liberati obsidione sunt, dant ei duci, qui liberavit*. 9 *ea corona graminea est, observarique solitum ut fieret e gramine, quod in eo loco gnatum esset, intra quem clausi erant qui obsidebantur*. – Paulus *Excer. ex Festo* p. 49, 25–26 Thew.–Linds.: *castrensis corona donabatur qui primus hostium castra pugnando introisset, cui insigne erat ex auro vallum*. Gell. 5, 6, 17: *castrensis est corona qua donat imperator eum, qui primus hostium castra pugnans introivit*:

dalla stessa fonte è mostrato da una serie di coincidenze fra quest'ultimo e Festo, coincidenze che trovano riscontro anche in Valerio Massimo (**F 169 a**).⁸⁹ Quest'ultimo, a differenza degli altri scrittori menzionati, cita la propria fonte, ed essa è Varrone. D'altra parte, che Varrone parlasse delle corone militari è noto anche da Plin. (16, 7 = **F 172**; 22, 13 = **F 171**); pare anche assai probabile che la notizia di Plin. (16, 7), secondo cui Varrone avrebbe avuto la *corona rostrata* da Pompeo, si trovasse anche in Verrio-Festo (p. 156, 16–20 Thewr.–Lind.). Insomma, la fonte che pare alla base di tutte le coincidenze fra Gellio, Verrio-Festo, Plinio e Valerio

ea corona insigne valli habet. – Paulus Excer. ex Festo p. 213, 8–10 Thew–Linds.: ovalis corona est murtea quam habebat qui ovantes introibant, cum bella non errant indicta aut sine sanguine confecta. Gell. 5, 6, 20–21: ovalis corona murtea est; 21 ea utebantur imperatores, qui ovantes urbem introibant; ovandi ac non triumphandi causa est, cum aut bella non rite indicta neque cum iusto hoste gesta sunt aut hostium nomen humile et non idoneum est, ut servorum piratarumque, aut deditione repente facta inpulverea, ut dici solet, incruentaque victoria obvenit. – Paulus, Excer. ex Festo p. 211, 4–5 Thew.–Linds.: oleagineis coronis ministri triumphantium utebantur, quod Minerva dea belli esse putabatur. Gell. 5, 6, 4: est item postrema oleaginea, qua uti solent, qui in proelio non fuerunt, sed triumphum procurant.

⁸⁹ Festus p. 188, 3–13 Di Marco: *quae corona* [scil. obsidionalis vel graminea] *magnae auctoritatis fuit: nam et P. Decio datae duae sunt, una ab exercitu universo, altera ab is qui fuerunt in praesidio obsessi; et L. Sicius Dentato, qui Achilles Romae existimatus est ac fertur centies et vicies pro republica depugnasse, coronis donatus XXVI, in his aureis VIII, civicis XIII, muralibus tribus, obsidionali una. inter obsidionalem et civicam hoc interest, quod altera singularis salutis signum est, altera universorum civium servatorum. Plin. 22, 9–10: donatus est ea* [scil. coronea graminea vel obsidionali] *L. Siccus Dentatus semel, cum civicas quattuordecim meruisset depugnassetque centiens viciens semper victor: tanto rarius est servatorem unum a servatis donari. quidam imperatores et saepius donati sunt, veluti P. Decius Mus tribunus militum ab exercitu. Val. Max. 3, 2, 24: sed quod ad proeliorum excellentem fortitudinem attinet, merito L. Sicci Dentati commemoratio omnia Romana exempla finierit, cuius opera honoresque operum ultra fidem veri excedere iudicari possent, nisi ea certi auctores, inter quos M. Varro, monumentis suis testata esse voluissent: quem centies et vicies in aciem descendisse tradunt, eo robore animi atque corporis utentem, ut maiorem semper victoriae partem traxisse videretur; sex et triginta spolia ex hoste rettulisse, quorum in numero octo fuisse cum quibus inspectante utroque exercitu ex provocatione dimicasset, quattuordecim cives ex media morte raptos servasse, quinque et quadraginta volnera pectore excepisse, tergo cicatricibus vacuo; novem triumphales imperatorum currus secutum, totius civitatis oculos in se numerosa donorum pompa convertentem: praeferebantur enim aureae coronae octo, civicae quattuordecim, murales tres, obsidionalis una, torques octoginta tres, armillae centum sexaginta, hastae octodecim, phalerae quinque et viginti, ornamenta etiam legionis, nedum militi, satis multa.*

Massimo è Varrone.⁹⁰ D'altra parte, non c'è alcuna certezza sull'opera in cui Varrone trattava di tale argomento; per questo motivo ho preferito collocare i fr. sulle corone militari fra quelli di collocazione incerta (F 167–172).

Fin qui ho trattato di quei fr. che possono essere collocati in punti precisi delle *Antiq. hum.* o che mostrano legami tematici sicuri con quest'opera. Una gran massa di fr. (F 98–213), sebbene sia di sicura origine varroniana, potrebbe derivare dalle *Antiq. hum.*, dal momento che con esse mostra affinità tematica e non viene attribuita dalle fonti antiche ad alcuna altra opera, ma non è attribuibile con certezza a nessuna opera di Varrone. Mirsch ha inserito un certo numero di questi fr. nelle *Antiq. hum.*; io sono più cauto e non ho attribuito alle *Antiq. hum.* nulla sulla base della sola affinità tematica: all'interno della sterminata produzione di Varrone, i fr. in questione potevano trovarsi in molte opere. La mancanza di una raccolta complessiva affidabile dei fr. varroniani⁹¹ complica notevolmente il lavoro e, in mancanza di altri criteri, ho deciso di dividere i fr. di incerta collocazione con criteri tematici, iniziando con quelli geografi ed etimologici (F 98–129), cui seguono quelli storici e relativi alle antichità sacre e alla storia dell'arte (F 130–196) e quelli che riguardano i *mirabilia* (F 197–213). Ho invece escluso quelli di natura puramente grammaticale, che non c'è alcun indizio che possano derivare dalle *Antiq. hum.* e che sono reperibili nei *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta* di Funaioli.

Per quanto concerne il primo gruppo tematico da me individuato (geografia ed etimologie), si ricordi che la geografia occupava la seconda esade delle *Antiq. hum.*; non ho ovviamente inserito tutti i fr. etimologici di Varrone, ma solo quelli che si collegassero ad argomenti geografici e storici che potevano comparire nelle *Antiq. hum.* Per quanto concerne il secondo gruppo tematico, è ovvio che le *Antiq. hum.* trattassero di svariati argomenti storico-antiquari; si potrebbe obiettare che le antichità sacre dovessero essere trattate per lo più nelle *Antiq. div.*, ma basta pensare ai fr.

⁹⁰ Mercklin 1859, 8 attribuisce a Varrone anche quanto Plinio dice nei capp. 6–8 del libro 22: in effetti, l'idea che la *corona graminea / obsidionalis* si caratterizzi per essere data dai soldati al comandante e non *vice versa* si incontra sia in Plinio (22, 8) che in Festo (p. 188, 3–13 Di Marco), ma Plinio, nei capp. 6–8, dice una serie di cose che non trovano corrispondenza nelle fonti parallele (particolare eccellenza della *corona graminea / obsidionalis* e collegamento con le situazioni di estrema disperazione, inserimento delle *coronae gemmatae*), sicché preferisco fare iniziare il fr. varroniano (F 170) con 22, 9.

⁹¹ Le raccolte di Popma ²1601, Berewout 1619 e Brunetti 1874 sono molto antiche.

sui Penati e gli usi sacri dei popoli dell'Italia antica dei primi libri, o ai fr. sui nomi dei mesi nel libro 18, per rendersi conto come anche le *Antiq. hum.* dovessero trattare temi sacri. Anche la storia dell'arte e *mirabilia* venivano di sicuro trattati nelle *Antiq. hum.* (basti pensare al libro 1).

A spingermi a inserire i fr. sulla storia dell'arte (**F 187–196**) e sui *mirabilia* è stato anche un altro criterio, che ho sempre tenuto presente nel raccogliere i fr. varroniani: i suddetti fr. sono tramandati per la stragrande maggioranza dalla *Nat. hist.* di Plinio: pare altresì che l'opera varroniana cui Plinio ha maggiormente attinto siano le *Antiquitates*⁹² (motivo per cui ho inserito le continue menzioni di Varrone negli *indices* pliniani fra le testimonianze che probabilmente si riferiscono alle *Antiquitates*: **T 91**).

Fra le numerosissime citazioni varroniane da parte di Plinio, ho omesso quelle di natura agricolo-medico-naturalistica.⁹³ Non ho accolto nemmeno il fr. XXII, 11 Mirsch, trādito da Servio, poiché mi pare certo che esso derivi non dalle *Antiquitates*, ma dagli *Aitia*. L'esistenza di quest'ultima opera varroniana è resa probabile proprio da Servio⁹⁴ e il passo da cui Mirsch trae il suo fr. XXII, 11 è, come abbiamo detto, proprio Servio (*In Aen.* 8, 128): qui la tradizione è divisa fra *in aetiis* (**A S M**) / *in oetiis* (**R L H**) da una parte (preferito da Thilo) e *antiquitatis libris* (**F**) dall'altra: sembra proprio che l'ultima variante sia una correzione banalizzante di chi non capiva il titolo greco e dunque *in Aetiis* va accolto come *lectio difficilior*.⁹⁵

Carlo M. Lucarini
Palermo

carlo.lucarini@unipa.it

⁹² Per la sezione geografica di Plinio questo fu mostrato da Reitzenstein 1885; per altre sezioni cfr. Gruppe 1877, il quale osserva come, invece, Plinio non abbia fatto largo uso del *De vita populi Romani*. Recentissimamente (Verdura 2022) è stato proposto di attribuire il famoso **F 182** sull'uso scrittoria del papiro all'opera *De bibliothecis*, ma la cosa è assai dubbia.

⁹³ Plin. 18, 285–289; 18, 294; 20, 218; 20, 43; 20, 152; 22, 114; 22, 141; 25, 24; 26, 14; 28, 57; 29, 65; 29, 106; 33, 85; 36, 135; 36, 202. Il passo di 29, 65 non può derivare dalle *Antiq.*, poiché Varrone (che era nato nel 116 a. C., cfr. **T 1**, e ha pubblicato le *Antiq.* non dopo il 45, cfr. n. 1) lo ha scritto *LXXXIII vitae anno*.

⁹⁴ *In Aen.* 1, 408, p. 196 ed. Harv. (cfr. Schanz–Hosius, 283). Tuttavia, non è certo che qui Servio alluda al titolo di un'opera varroniana (τὸ αἴτιον, *id est causam*, Varro, *Callimachum secutus exposuit*).

⁹⁵ Cfr. Vallat 2017, 97; Lloyd 1961, 310.

Bibliografia

- R. Bedon, "Les sources mises à contribution par Solin dans ses *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* et dans leur réédition revue et augmentée, le *Polyhistor*", *REL* 97 (2019) 127–150.
- K. J. Beloch, *Der italische Bund unter Roms Hegemonie. Staatsrechtliche und statistische Forschungen* (Leipzig 1880).
- J. L. Berewout, *Marci Terenti Varronis Opera omnia quae exstant* (Dordrecht 1619).
- E. Bolisani, *I Logistorici varroniani* (Padova 1937).
- E. Bormann, *Bemerkungen zum schriftlichen Nachlasse des Kaisers Augustus* (Marburg 1884).
- D. Briquel, "Denys d'Halicarnasse et la tradition antiquaire des Aborigènes", *Pallas* 39 (1993) 17–39.
- F. Brunetti, *M. Terentii Varronis Libri de lingua Latina et fragmenta* (Venetiis 1874).
- I. Canetta, "Una fonte per il commentario di Servio a Virgilio: le *Res humanae* di Varrone", in: A. Garcea, D. Vallat (eds.), *Fragments d'érudition. Servius et le savoir antique* (Hildesheim 2016) 17–29.
- B. Cardauns, *M. Terentius Varro, Antiquitates rerum divinarum* (Wiesbaden 1976).
- O. Cuntz, *De Augusto Plinii geographicorum auctore* (Bonnae 1888).
- F. Della Corte, "L'idea della presitoria in Varrone", in: F. Della Corte, *Opuscula VI* (Genova 1978) 231–256.
- D. Detlefsen, "Varro, Agrippa und Augustus als Quellenschriftsteller des Plinius für die Geographie Spaniens", in: *Commentationes philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommseni* (Berolini 1877) 23–34.
- F. Franceschi, "Censorino e Varrone", *Aevum* 28 (1954) 393–418.
- C. Frick, *Die Quellen Augustins im XVIII. Buche seiner Schrift De civitate Dei* (Höxter 1886).
- E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley 1991).
- O. Gruppe, "Über die Bücher XIII bis XVIII der *Antiquitates humanae* des Varro", *Hermes* 10 (1876) 51–60.
- O. Gruppe, "Die Überlieferung der Bruchstücke von Varros *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*", in: *Commentationes philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommseni*, (Berolini 1877) 540–554.
- H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* (Göteborg 1967).
- A. Hahn, *De Censorini fontibus* (Ienae 1905).
- L. Holford-Strevens, "Varro in Gellius and Late Antiquity", in: D. J. Butterfield (ed.), *Varro Varius. The Polymath of the Roman World* (Cambridge 2015) 143–160.
- A. Jacobson, *Das Verhältnis des Dionys von Halicarnas zu Varro in der Vorgeschichte Roms* (Dresden 1895).
- R. Kaster (ed.), *Macrobii Ambrosii Theodosii Saturnalia* (Oxford 2011).
- A. Kiessling, *De Dionysii Halicarnasei Antiquitatum auctoribus Latinis* (Lipsiae 1858).
- A. Klotz, *Quaestiones Pliniana geographicae* (Lipsiae 1906).

- A. Klotz, "Die geographischen *Commentarii* des Agrippa und ihre Überreste", *Klio* 24 (1931) 38–58, 386–466.
- L. H. Krahner, *Commentationis de M. Terenti Varronis Antiquitatum rerum humanarum et divinarum libris XLI specimen* (Halis 1834).
- R. Kriegshammer, *De Varronis et Verri fontibus quaestiones selectae* (Lipsiae 1903).
- R. B. Lloyd, "Republican Authors in Servius and the *Scholia Danielis*", *HSClPh* 65 (1961) 291–341.
- C. M. Lucarini, "Suetons Schrift *De anno Romanorum*", in: *Studi in onore di R. M. D'Angelo e A. Milazzo, sub prelis*.
- R. M. A. Marschall "'Bi-Marcus'?: The Two Varrones of Augustine and Nonius Marcellus", *Res publ. litt.* n. s. 19 (2016) 180–203.
- P. Mastandrea, *Cornelio Labeone, un neoplatonico latino* (Leiden 1979).
- L. Mercklin, *De Varrone coronarum militarium interprete praecipuo quaestiones* (Dorpati 1859).
- P. Mirsch, "De M. Terenti Varronis *Antiquitatum rerum humanarum libris XXV*", *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 5 (1882) 1–144.
- F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (Berlin 1897).
- D. Musti, "Tendenze nella storiografia romana e greca su Roma arcaica: studi su Livio e Dionigi d'Alicarnasso", *QUCC* 10 (1970) 1–159.
- G. Oehmichen, *Plinianische Studien zur geographischen und kunsthistorischen Literatur* (Erlangen 1880).
- J. Partsch, *Die Darstellung Europas in dem geographischen Werke des Agrippa* (Breslau 1875).
- G. Piras, "Sulle citazioni di Varrone in Nonio: alcune osservazioni", *Res publ. litt.* n. s. 19 (2016) 140–166.
- A. Pittà (ed., comm.), *M. Terenzio Varrone, De vita populi Romani* (Pisa 2015).
- A. Popma (ed.), *M. Terentii Varronis operum quae exstant* (Lugduni Batavorum 21601).
- J. Poucet, "Denys d'Halicarnasse et Varron. Le cas des voyages d'Énée", *Mél. de l'École Fran. de Rome* 101 (1989) 63–95.
- J. Poucet, "Varro, Denys d'Halicarnasse, Macrobe et Lactance: l'oracle rendu à Dodone aux Pélasges", *Pallas* 39 (1993) 41–69.
- G. Ranucci, "Il libro XX delle *Res humanae* di Varrone", *Studi noniani* 2 (1972) 107–137.
- M. D. Reeve, *The Transmission of Pliny's Natural History* (Roma 2021).
- R. Reitzenstein, "Die geographischen Bücher Varros", *Hermes* 20 (1885) 514–551.
- J.-C. Richard, "Varron, l'*Origo gentis Romanae* et les Aborigènes", *RPh* s. n. 57 (1983) 29–37.
- B. Riposati (ed., comm.), *M. Terenti Varronis De vita populi Romani* (Milano 1939).
- K. G. Sallmann, *Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro. Versuch einer Quellenanalyse* (Berlin – New York 1971).
- K. G. Sallmann, "Quellenangaben und Namenszitate in der plinianischen Geographie", *Hyperboreus* 9 (2003) 330–354.

- M. Salvatore (ed.), *M. Terenti Varronis fragmenta omnia quae supersunt. Pars I: supplementum* (Hildesheim 1999).
- E. Samter, *Quaestiones Varronianae* (Berolini 1891).
- C. Santini (ed., comm.), *Cassio Emina. I frammenti* (Pisa 1995).
- E. Schwarz, “De M. Terentii Varronis apud Sanctos Patres vestigiis capita duo”, *NJhPhPaed*, Suppl. 16 (1888) 405–499.
- M. Simon, “Zur Abhängigkeit spätrömischer Enzyklopädien der *artes liberales* von Varros *Disciplinarum libri*”, *Philologus* 110 (1966) 88–101.
- D. Vallat, “Varro in Virgilian Commentaries: Transmission in Fragments”, *BICS* 60 (2017) 92–107.
- U. Vedula, “Note sul *De bibliothecis* di Varrone”, *Boll. st. lat.* 52 (2022) 89–115.
- H. Willemsen, *De Varronianae doctrinae apud Fastorum scriptores vestigiis* (Bonnae 1906).

The aim of this paper is to support my reconstruction of the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* of Varro offered in the forthcoming Teubner edition, *Geographi veteres vel minores vel quorum fragmenta exstant*. The last edition of this work was published by P. Mirsch in 1882 and was affected by several misconceptions and omissions. One of my efforts is to show that Censorinus’ *De die natali* is an invaluable aid in reconstructing the structure of the books 14–19 of the *Antiquitates rer. hum.*, since Censorinus structured the last part of his work on Varro’s model. Also the dependence on Varro of Plinius’s *Nat. hist.* (especially in the geographical books) and of Dionysius’ *Antiquitates Romanae* is studied.

В статье излагаются принципы реконструкции *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* Варрона в тойбнеровском издании *Geographi veteres vel minores vel quorum fragmenta exstant*, которое автор готовит к печати. Предыдущее издание этого произведения (P. Mirsch, 1882) содержит некоторые ошибки и упущения. Одна из задач настоящего исследования – показать, что существенную помощь в реконструкции книг 14–19 *Antiquitates rer. hum.* может оказать Цензорин, который строил заключительную часть своего труда *De die natali* по модели Варрона. Исследуется также зависимость от Варрона *Естественной истории* Плиния и *Римских древностей* Дионисия Галикарнасского.

Sofia Larionova

MATHEMATICAL EDUCATION IN EARLY CHRISTIAN AUTHORS*

Arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and harmonics – the four subjects of what later came to be known as quadrivium – were first perceived as kindred (ἀδελφεά) by a Pythagorean mathematician Archytas of Tarentum (47 B 1 DK).¹ These subjects quickly bridged the gap between professional and non-professional education and became a subject of heated debates over the usefulness of such studies. Some, like Protagoras, argued that certain sophists “maltreat the young” by forcing the mathematical studies onto them (Plat. *Prot.* 318 d–e).² Others took the middle ground: they acknowledged certain benefits that come along with mathematical education, but advised against dwelling on these subjects for too long. According to Xenophon, Socrates thought it wise to limit the study of mathematics to what is practically applicable, like knowing the principles of land measurement, while more fundamental studies, like the study of complicated geometrical figures, were quite useless, according to him. On top of that, Socrates considered these subjects extremely demanding to learn, which makes them “enough to occupy a lifetime, to the complete exclusion of many other useful studies” (Xen. *Mem.* 4. 7. 2–3).³

Quite common was the view that μαθήματα should serve as a part of preparatory studies leading to the actual goal of an educational curriculum, be it rhetoric, philosophy, dialectics, or, in Christian authors, the study of the Scripture. Thus, Isocrates, responding to the claims that there is nothing in mathematical studies “but empty talk and hair-spitting; for none of these disciplines has any useful application either to private

* This article was prepared within the framework of Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) research project No 20-011-00-509.

¹ Huffman 2005, 64.

² He is alluding to a Sophist Hippias of Elis. Another person, who is known to have been teaching mathematics around the same time is a Pythagorean Theodore of Cyrene (Plat. *Theaet.* 145 a).

³ Translations of Isocrates here and further are from Marchant 1923, 349.

or to public affairs” (Isoc. *Ant.* 262),⁴ argued that these studies “do not injure but, on the contrary, benefit” the students (*ibid.* 261) by sharpening their mind and preparing it for further, more useful and important studies (*ibid.* 265). Academic Xenocrates said “to someone who had never learnt music, geometry, or astronomy, but nevertheless wished to attend his lectures: ‘Go your ways, for you offer philosophy nothing to lay hold of’” (D.L. 4. 10).⁵

Plato’s educational philosophy is unparalleled in its influence on both pagan and Christian tradition. The education of the guardians in the *Republic*, though never implemented in practice,⁶ served as a reference point for many authors writing on education. Where mathematics is concerned, Plato’s curriculum famously included ten years of rigorous mathematical studies that served as προπαιδεύματα to the ultimate study goal, i.e. dialectics (*Resp.* 521 c, 532 b–c).

According to Plato, studying mathematics brings various benefits: first, arithmetic and geometry are useful when it comes to the conduct of war (522 d–e, 526 d), while astronomy is serviceable to agriculture, navigation and again, to the martial art (527 d); second, mathematical studies make one quicker in other studies (526 b) to the point that “there will be an immeasurable difference between the student who has been imbued with geometry and the one who has not” (527 c);⁷ third, μαθήματα help in “acquiring sobriety and righteousness together with wisdom” (591 b–c). Still, the ultimate aim of mathematical studies is, in Plato’s eyes, the knowledge of the Good (*Resp.* 526 d–e, 530 e, 531 c, 532 c). Mathematics familiarizes one with ‘unqualified beings’, i.e. facts that always remain true and are independent of external factors. Thus, arithmetic “strongly directs the soul upward and compels it to discourse about pure numbers, never acquiescing if anyone proffers to it in the discussion numbers attached to visible and tangible body” (525 d). Moreover, it is “indispensable for us, since it plainly compels the soul to employ pure thought with a view to truth itself” (526 b). Geometry

⁴ Tr. Norlin 1929.

⁵ Tr. Hicks 1925, 385.

⁶ There is no evidence to suggest that this curriculum was implemented even at the Academy itself. In fact, the educational practices of the Academy remain shrouded in mystery. See Krämer, 5. V. contra: Cherniss 1945, 66–67 on mathematical education at the Academy. For the theory that the subject that was actually taught at the Academy was metaphysics, see Zeller ⁵1921, 416–117; Burnet 1914, 220–221; Natorp 1921, 434–435; Field 1948, 30–48.

⁷ Translations of Plato here and further are from Shorey 1935.

is “the knowledge of that which always is, and not of something which at some time comes into being and passes away” (527 b). In general, mathematical studies “purify and kindle afresh <...> an organ or instrument of knowledge in every soul” (527 d–e). This way, to Plato, the study of mathematics becomes truly irreplaceable, because no other subject is able to draw the mind πρὸς οὐσίαν (523 a).⁸

Plato’s student Philip of Opus authored a treatise called the *Epinomis*, where he further expands on these ideas.⁹ According to him, the number was given to us by god in order to save us (*Epin.* 976 e: θεὸν δ’ αὐτὸν μᾶλλον ἢ τινα τύχην ἡγοῦμαι δόντα ἡμῖν σφῶζειν ἡμᾶς). Those who cannot count, can never attain wisdom, and, as a consequence, virtue (977 c–d). The *Epinomis*, while retaining the anagogical function of mathematics, opens up new possibilities for the theological one as well (978 a–b):

<...> ἀριθμὸν <...> ἀγαθὸν ὡς πάντων αἴτιον, ὅτι δὲ κακῶν οὐδενός, εὖ τοῦτο γνωστέον, ὃ καὶ τάχα γένοιτ’ ἂν. ἀλλ’ ἡ σχεδὸν ἀλόγιστος τε καὶ ἄτακτος ἀσχήμων τε καὶ ἄρρυθμος ἀνάρμοστός τε φορά, καὶ πάνθ’ ὅποσα κακοῦ κεκοινώνηκέν τινος, ἐπιλέλειπται παντὸς ἀριθμοῦ, καὶ δεῖ τοῦθ’ οὕτω διανοεῖσθαι τὸν μέλλοντα εὐδαίμονα τελευτήσῃν· καὶ τό γε δὴ δίκαιόν τε καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ καλὸν καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐδεὶς ποτε μὴ γινώσκων, ἀληθοῦς δόξης ἐπιλαβόμενος, διαριθμήσεται πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτὸν τε καὶ ἕτερον πείσαι τὸ παράπαν.

<...> number <...> is the cause of all good things; and that it is the cause of no evil thing is a point that must be well understood, as it may be quickly enough. Nay, the motion that we may call unreasoned and unordered, lacking shape and rhythm and harmony, and everything that has a share of some evil, is deficient in number altogether; and in this light must the matter be regarded by him who means to end his life in happiness. And no one who does not know the just, the good, the honorable and all the rest of such qualities, with a hold on true opinion, will number them off so as fully to persuade both himself and his neighbor.¹⁰

⁸ On Platonic ‘unqualified beings’ in mathematics and on the benefits of studying mathematics in general, see Burneyat 2000, 1–81.

⁹ The identity of the author was a subject of debate already in Antiquity. The dialogue was read as a continuation of Plato’s *Laws* and many believed in Plato’s authorship of the text, including Aristophanes of Byzantium, Thrasyllus of Mendes, Nicomachus and Iamblichus. Clement of Alexandria also mentions Plato as the author of the *Epinomis* (*Strom.* 1. 25).

¹⁰ Tr. Lamb 1927.

This outlook was adopted by Philo of Alexandria and some Christian authors: mathematics are a godsend, they bring order and equality, while the works of the devil are deprived of number.¹¹

In this paper, I will look at how early Christian authors adopted the pagan attitudes towards studying mathematics, what arguments they used when writing about mathematical education, and whether there is evidence of actual educational practice among early Christians. The education in question is the so-called “liberal education”, i.e. post-school non-specialized education in *artes liberales* (or their Greek counterpart, ἐγκύκλια). This education was intended for free well-to-do citizens, aiming to introduce them to a more or less set number of subjects (usually these subjects were grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and harmonics, i.e. mathematical theory of music).¹² The overview of the state of Christian education during the first centuries CE is provided by Henri Marrou in his classic *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*. Still, when it comes to mathematical education, he does not go into much detail, only mentioning the fact that mathematical disciplines were a part of a curriculum at a Christian School of Alexandria when it was headed by Origen.¹³ Ilsetraut Hadot in her *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* touches upon the way Philo, Clement and Origen all view ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία as προπαιδεύματα to the study of the Scripture, but she tends to exaggerate Platonic influences, while disregarding all other factors when it comes to mathematical education.¹⁴ A more recent survey by Alain Bernard et al., while providing a great general overview of different kinds of mathematical education in Antiquity up to the fifth century CE, completely forgoes Christian authors.¹⁵

There is one Jewish author that we must pay attention to, before turning to the Christian writers. Philo of Alexandria had an enormous influence on some Christian authors, such as Clement and Origen.¹⁶ We know that Philo had first-hand experience in following a liberal arts curriculum.

¹¹ See for example Cass. *Inst.* 2 intr. 3, where he states that “the Lord, maker of things, arranged the universe by number, weight and measure” while “the evil works of the devil are not defined by weight, measure and number, since the result of injustice is always the opposite of justice”.

¹² On ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία see Rechenauer 1994, 1160–1185; Kühnert 1961; Fuchs 1962. For mathematical education in Greek and Roman Antiquity see Bernard et al. 2014, 27–53.

¹³ Marrou 1964, 469.

¹⁴ Hadot 1984, 282–289.

¹⁵ Bernard et al. 2014, 38–51.

¹⁶ Van den Hoek 1997, 59–87; Runia 1993; id. 1995; van den Hoek 1988.

In an autobiographical account, he recalls having studied grammar, geometry and harmonics (*Congr.* 74–76). In *Som.* 1. 205 he describes post-school education as the one consisting of the study of poets and history, arithmetic, geometry, harmonics, rhetoric and philosophy. Philo's writing reveals certain knowledge of mathematics, that he also expected from his readers. Oftentimes, he turns to arithmology when elucidating the text of the Scripture.¹⁷

Much like Plato, Philo views μαθήματα, along with the subjects of trivial, as a stepping stone on the way to the aim of the curriculum. For Plato it is dialectics, for Philo μαθήματα are handmaidens of philosophy, which in its turn is handmaiden of wisdom, i.e. the knowledge of all divine and human things (*Congr.* 79). Reflecting on the benefits of mathematical education, Philo seems to place the greatest emphasis on the virtues that derive from it. According to Philo, “all encyclical learning reproduces in itself and imitates genuine virtue” (*Quaest. in Gen.* 3. 21).¹⁸ People “who are instructed have many more opportunities of prayer than those who are destitute of teachers, and those who are well initiated in encyclical accomplishments have more opportunities than those who are unmusical and illiterate, inasmuch as they from their childhood almost have been imbued with all the lessons of virtue, and temperance, and all kinds of excellence” (*Mut.* 229). Each mathematical subject has potential to turn the reader's soul to virtue: certainty and freedom from deception derive from arithmetic and geometry, as they both deal with proportions and calculations (*Som.* 205), therefore geometry is meant to implant an admiration of justice (*Congr.* 16). In its turn, harmonics “will guide what was previously discordant to concord” (*Congr.* 16) by healing “whatever in us is deficient in rhythm or in moderation, or in harmony, by giving us rhythm, and moderation, and harmony, by means of a polished system of music” (*Cher.* 105).

To Philo it was obvious that μαθήματα deal with the nature of number itself, which is “the most useful of all things” (*Op.* 60). He was a firm believer that God created this world according to certain mathematical laws, arranging it “in perfect order, both as to the proportions of its numbers, and the harmony of its periods” (*Op.* 78). In *Who Is the Heir of Divine Things* Philo, commenting on the creation of the world, portrays God as using different categories of equality: number, magnitude, power, measure, weight and proportion (141–156). This way God “made every

¹⁷ On arithmology in Philo see Arndt 1967, Berchman 2013, Moehring 1995, Robbins 1931.

¹⁸ Translations of Philo here and further are from Yonge 1993.

single existing thing perfection, the Creator employing all numbers and all the ideas which tend to perfection” (156). Equality is opposed by inequality, which is “the parent of two wars, foreign and civil war, as on the other hand equality is the parent of peace” (162).¹⁹

In Philo’s time, Alexandria was a vibrant and bustling city, home to many religious groups. One of them was young Christian community. According to Eusebius, a certain Christian “school of sacred words” was thriving there at that time (*HE* 5. 10. 1). This school supposedly met the needs of the followers of Christian doctrine to provide them with the necessary guidance leading up to their conversion. Still, the origins of the school are unclear. Allegedly, the school was founded by Mark the Evangelist in the middle of the first century (*HE* 5. 10). There is, however, a gap left by Eusebius between Mark and the next head of the school, Pantenus, a converted Stoic philosopher (d. 210/212), who in his turn was succeeded by Clement of Alexandria (159–215). Thus, the actual existence of the school as an institution before the time of Clement is debated, along with the type and the content of education provided there.²⁰

At that time, many Christians felt aversion to pagan education as it inevitably introduced students to false deities. This led to much opposition towards the pagan learning among the Christians. “What use is there in knowing the causes of the manner of the sun’s motion, for example, and the rest of the heavenly bodies, or in having studied the theorems of geometry or logic, and each of the other branches of study? – for these are of no service in the discharge of duties, and the Hellenic philosophy is human wisdom, for it is incapable of teaching the truth” – are the words of Clement’s imaginary opponent (*Strom.* 6. 11).²¹ This opinion was shared not just by the poorly educated: Irenaeus and Tertullian thought that pagan philosophy was the source of heresies (Iren. *Adv. haer.* 2. 14; Tert. *De praescr. haer.* 7); Tertullian thought that a Christian should not work as a teacher in a pagan school (*De idol.* 10).

Clement was trying to defend secular learning, appealing to its many benefits.²² In line with the Platonic tradition, where liberal studies are perceived as a gateway to dialectics, Clement views them as preparation

¹⁹ Cf. 47 B 3 DK: According to Archytas, the invention of counting put an end to discord (στάσις) and increased concord (ὁμόνοια).

²⁰ Van den Hoek 1997, 59–87; van den Broek 1995, 39–47; Scholten 1995, 16–37.

²¹ Wilson 1882, 357. Translations of Clement here and further are from Wilson, unless stated otherwise.

²² On the term ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία in Clement see Camelot 1931, 41–44.

to the study of Christian theology and to the exegesis (1. 5). These studies “exercise the mind, rouse the intelligence, and beget an inquiring shrewdness” (*Strom.* 1. 5), “in such studies, therefore, the soul is purged from sensible things, and is excited, so as to be able to see truth distinctly” (*Strom.* 1. 6). Even though secular education is not a must for a believer – one can attain virtues without having received education – but informed faith is still better, because education, first, speeds up the way to virtue, and second, helps one interpret difficult places in the Scripture that are incomprehensible without the knowledge of secular subjects (1. 6, 6. 10). Furthermore, the Gnostic²³ should not shy away from dialectics and even from pagan philosophy. On the contrary, he is to use this knowledge as a defense against sophists (1. 6, 6. 10) and heretics (6. 10).²⁴ A truly learned person “brings everything to bear on the truth; so that, from geometry, and music, and grammar, and philosophy itself, culling what is useful, he guards the faith against assault” (1. 9). To a teacher providing education to catechumens (especially when they were Greek), Clement advised “not to abstain from erudition, like irrational animals; but he must collect as many aids as possible for his hearers. But he must by no means linger over these studies, except solely for the advantage accruing from them; so that, on grasping and obtaining this, he may be able to take his departure home to the true philosophy, which is a strong cable for the soul, providing security from everything” (6. 11).

So, what exactly was, according to Clement, the place of mathematics in the education of a Christian and to what goal these studies were beneficial? Much like Philo, Clement turns to arithmology and uses number symbolism for the Biblical exegesis (6. 11).²⁵ But there is more to mathematics than arithmology. Influenced by Plato both directly and through Philo, Clement views quadrivium as preparation for dialectics. He stresses the potential of mathematics to teach students to ascent to the world of being. This ability, in his eyes, will make one see through the lies

²³ The Clement’s Gnostic is “an ideal Christian who has been educated properly” (Glenn 2017, 8). Other interpretations of this term can be found in Ferguson 1976, 79; Kovacs 2001, 5.

²⁴ On the other hand, dialectic and rhetoric, the way they are exploited by the Sophists, have nothing to do with the truth (*Strom.* 1. 39. 87; 2. 7). See Camelot 1931, 53–58. Cf. Plat. *Philebus* 16 d – 17 a, where number helps distinguishing the dialectic and the eristic methods of discussion.

²⁵ Oftentimes he also uses Philonic allegories to support the argument in favor of liberal education (see the Hagar analogy in *Strom.* 1. 30–32, cf. Phil. *Congr. passim*; the Jacob analogy in *Strom.* 1. 31, cf. Phil. *Sacrif.* 2).

of sophists and heretics, while also allowing them access to unqualified truths. Through geometry (6. 10) and arithmetic (11. 1) Abraham (and the Gnostic) arrives at the knowledge of God himself (*Strom.* 6. 10):

For to him (i.e. the Gnostic) knowledge (γνῶσις) is the principal thing. Consequently, therefore, he applies to the subjects that are a training for knowledge, taking from each branch of study its contribution to the truth. Prosecuting, then, the proportion of harmonies in music; and in arithmetic noting the increasing and decreasing of numbers, and their relations to one another, and how the most of things fall under some proportion of numbers (τὰ πλεῖστα ἀναλογία τινὶ ἀριθμῶν ὑποπέπτωκεν); studying geometry, which deals with οὐσία itself (οὐσίαν αὐτὴν ἐφ’ ἐαυτῆς θεωρῶν), he perceives a continuous distance, and an immutable essence which is different from these bodies (ἐθιζόμενος συνεχές τι διάστημα νοεῖν καὶ οὐσίαν ἀμετάβλητον, ἑτέραν τῶνδε τῶν σωμάτων οὔσαν). And by astronomy, again, raised from the earth in his mind, he is elevated along with heaven, and will revolve with its revolution studying ever divine things, and their harmony with each other; from which Abraham starting, ascended to the knowledge of Him who created them. Further, the Gnostic will avail himself of dialectics, fixing on the distinction of genera into species, and will master the distinction of existences, till he come to what are primary and simple.²⁶

Mathematics helps to ascend to the knowledge of God not just because of its anagogical function and its potential for developing abstract thinking. God himself is closely connected with mathematical categories of number, measure and weight. In fact, when discussing *Deut.* 25, 13–15, Philo and Clement both refer to God as to “weight, and measure, and number of all things”.²⁷

Phil. Somn. 2. 192–194:²⁸

<...> ἐπειδὴ τυφλὸν καὶ ἄγονον καλῶν ἀφροσύνη, ὅφ’ ἦς ἀναπεισθέντες τινὲς μετρεῖν καὶ σταθμᾶσθαι καὶ ἀριθμεῖν πάντα καθ’ αὐτοῦς ἤξιώσαν· 193. Γομόρρα <γὰρ> μεταληφθέν ἐστὶ μέτρον. Μωυσεῖς δὲ

²⁶ Tr. Wilson 1882, 349–350 with modifications.

²⁷ Here Clement is quoting from Philo, which was noted by van Winden 1978, 208–209. Note, however, that his quotation of Philo contains a mistake (Μωυσεῖς δὲ στάθμην καὶ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ὅλων <...> instead of Μωυσεῖς δὲ στάθμην καὶ μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ὅλων <...>).

²⁸ Tr. Yonge 1993 with modifications.

στάθμην καὶ μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ὅλων ὑπέλαβεν εἶναι τὸν θεόν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον νοῦν. δηλοῖ δὲ διὰ τούτων φάσκων· “οὐκ ἔσται ἐν μαρσίπῳ σου στάθμιον καὶ στάθμιον, μέγα ἢ μικρόν· οὐκ ἔσται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου <μέτρον καὶ μέτρον>, μέγα ἢ μικρόν· στάθμιον ἀληθινὸν καὶ οἰκία σου <μέτρον καὶ μέτρον>, μέγα ἢ μικρόν· στάθμιον ἀληθινὸν καὶ δίκαιον ἔσται σοι”. ἀληθὲς δὲ καὶ δίκαιον μέτρον τὸ τὸν μόνον δίκαιον θεὸν ὑπολαβεῖν πάντα μετρεῖν καὶ σταθμᾶσθαι καὶ ἀριθμοῖς καὶ πέραςι καὶ ὅροις τὴν τῶν ὅλων περιγράψαι φύσιν, ἄδικον δὲ καὶ ψευδὲς τὸ νομίσαι κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον νοῦν ταῦτα συμβαίνειν.

<...> folly is a thing which is blind, and also barren of all good things; though, nevertheless, some people have been so greatly influenced by it as to measure, and weigh, and count everything with reference to themselves alone. 193. Gomorrah, being interpreted, means ‘measure’; but Moses conceived that God was weight, and measure, and number of all things, not the human mind. He explains it saying: “There shall not be in thy sack one weight, and another weight, a great and a small; there shall not be in thy house one measure, and another measure, a great and a small; thy weight shall be a true and just one” (*Deut.* 25, 13–15). But a true and just measure is, to conceive that it is the only just God alone who measures and weighs everything, and who has circumscribed the nature of the universe with numbers, and limits, and proportions. But it is unjust and false to imagine that these things are regulated in accordance with the human mind.

Clem. *Protr.* 6. 69. 1–4:²⁹

Τίς οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν πάντων; Θεὸς τῆς τῶν ὄντων ἀληθείας τὸ μέτρον. Ὡςπερ οὖν τῷ μέτρῳ καταληπτὰ τὰ μετρούμενα, οὕτως δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῆσαι τὸν θεὸν μετρεῖται καὶ καταλαμβάνεται ἡ ἀλήθεια. Ὁ δὲ ἱερὸς ὄντως Μωυσῆς “οὐκ ἔσται”, φησίν, “ἐν τῷ μαρσίπῳ σου στάθμιον καὶ στάθμιον μέγα ἢ μικρόν, οὐδὲ ἔσται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου μέτρον μέγα ἢ μικρόν, ἀλλ’ ἢ στάθμιον ἀληθινὸν καὶ δίκαιον ἔσται σοι”, στάθμιον καὶ μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ὅλων ὑπολαμβάνων τὸν θεόν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄδικα καὶ ἄνισα εἰδῶλα οἴκοι ἐν τῷ μαρσίπῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ῥυτίδι ψυχῇ κατακέκρυπται· τὸ δὲ μόνον δίκαιον μέτρον, ὁ μόνος ὄντως θεός, ἴσος αἰεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχων, μετρεῖ τε πάντα καὶ σταθμᾶται, οἷονεὶ τρυτάνῃ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἀρρεπῶς περιλαμβάνων καὶ ἀνέχων φύσιν.

²⁹ Translation is mine.

Who, then, is the king of all? God, who is the measure of the truth of all existing things. As, then, the things that are to be measured are attained by the measure, so also the truth is measured and comprehended by apprehending the God. And the truly holy Moses said: "There shall not be in thy sack one weight, and another weight, a great and a small; there shall not be in thy house one measure, and another measure, a great and a small; thy weight shall be a true and just one" (*Deut.* 25, 13–15), conceiving the God to be weight, and measure, and number of all things. For the unjust and unrighteous idols are hid at home in the bag, and, so to speak, in the polluted soul. But the only just measure is the only true God, always just, continuing the self-same; who measures all things, and weighs them by righteousness as though with a balance, encompassing and sustaining universal nature without leaning to either side.

Despite the benefits that come with studying mathematics, it is not clear whether any of it was taught at the catechetical school of Alexandria when it was headed by Clement. The fact that it was later taught under his successor, Origen, might be an indicator that Origen was following an already established curriculum, but there is no direct evidence to support this claim.

According to Eusebius, Origen was educated in liberal arts, well-read in Plato, and studied the writings of Numenius, Cronius, Apollophanes, Longinus, Moderatus and Nicomachus (*HE* 6. 19. 8). In *Against Celsus* 3. 49, probably feeling the same need as Clement to defend secular education, he expresses an opinion that education is the way to virtue and no hindrance to the knowledge of God. In his *Letter to Gregory* (1), Origen advises him to study, among other things, geometry, music and astronomy, and take from them "what will serve to explain the Sacred Scripture". Similar to Clement, he sees liberal arts as preparatory to philosophy, while philosophy itself is preparatory to Christianity.

As a teacher, he chose different curricula for his students based on their abilities: those with superior intelligence were instructed in "geometry, arithmetic and other preparatory studies, and then advanced to the systems of the philosophers" (Euseb. *HE* 6. 18. 3).

In around 231, Origen left Alexandria and took up permanent residence in Caesarea, where he established a Christian school. His teachings at this school are documented in an *Oration and Panegyric Addressed to Origen*, written by one of his students.³⁰ His students followed a demanding

³⁰ The *Oration* was transmitted under the name of Gregory Thaumaturgus in *Vaticanus Graecus* 386, but the attribution was called into question by Nautin 1977, 83–85.

curriculum, consisting of logic, physics, geometry, astronomy, ethics, Greek philosophy, Jewish and Christian texts. The study of mathematics is described this way (*Oration* 8):³¹

Τί δεῖ λέγειν τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων, γεωμετρίαν μὲν τὴν πᾶσι φίλην καὶ ἀναμφισβήτητον, καὶ ἀστρονομίαν τὴν μετεωροπόρον; ἃ δὴ ἕκαστα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐνετυποῦτο, διδάσκων, ἢ ἀναμνησκων, ἢ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι χρὴ λέγειν· τὴν μὲν ὡς ὑποβάθραν πάντων ἀπλῶς ποιησάμενος οὖσαν ἄσειστον, τὴν γεωμετρίαν, καὶ κρηπιδά τινα ἀσφαλῆ· ἀγάγων δὲ καὶ μέχρι τῶν ἀνωτάτω διὰ τῆς ἀστρονομίας, ὥσπερ διὰ κλίμακός τινος οὐρανομήκους, ἐκατέρου τοῦ μαθήματος, βατὸν ἡμῖν τὸν οὐρανὸν παρασκευάσας.

And what is there to say about sacred mathematics (τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων), i.e. geometry, pleasant to all and undisputed, and astronomy, traveling through the air? These studies he carved onto our souls, teaching us, or recalling them to our mind, or doing something which I cannot describe. But geometry he considered the unmovable pedestal and the unshakable foundation of all, and with these sciences he lifted us towards the utmost heights, as if with a sky-high ladder, making the heavens accessible to us.³²

Here we come across the same reasons to study mathematics: (1) mathematics is “undisputed”, i.e. it helps one to ascend to the knowledge of unqualified truths; (2) mathematics is described as “sacred”. Much like Clement before him, referring to the creation, Origen refers to God creating all things by number and measure (*De prin.* 4. 35). Therefore, studying mathematics is a means of both understanding God’s creation and ascending to the knowledge of the God himself.

Around the same time, the followers of Theodotus the Cobbler (fl. late second century) were also known for studying mathematics. As heretics, they are criticized by Eusebius, because “being of the earth and speaking of the earth, they are ignorant of him who comes from above, they abandon the holy Scriptures and devote themselves to geometry. Euclid is laboriously studied by some of them (Εὐκλείδης γοῦν παρά τισιν αὐτῶν φιλοπόνως γεωμετρεῖται)” (Euseb. *HE* 5. 28. 14).³³ Given the brevity of

³¹ Translation is mine.

³² Cf. Nicomachus also comparing these sciences to ladders (κλίμαξι) leading from perceptible and opinable to intelligible and knowable, and from corporeal to those more akin to our souls (*Intr.* 1. 3. 6).

³³ Translation is mine.

this fragment, it is difficult to tell what exactly their reasons for studying geometry were, but I would suggest that they, “being of the earth”, used geometry as a means for understanding God’s creation.

Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea (early third century – 283) was well versed in various mathematical disciplines (Euseb. *HE* 7. 32. 6). He authored *Introduction to Arithmetic* in ten books. The surviving fragments belong to the opening part of the book and cover the topics of what mathematics is, what its parts are, and what the famous discoveries in the field of mathematics were. Among the reasons for studying mathematics he mentions the fact that nothing can be understood without prior knowledge of mathematics. Mathematics gives access not only to the incorporeal and intelligible, but to the corporeal and sensible as well (*Patrologia Graeca* 10. 231–236). Moreover, Anatolius made important contributions to the so-called *computus paschalis* by inventing a 19-year Paschal cycle.³⁴

Thus, there were some important intrinsic reasons that connected mathematics to the God himself that could encourage mathematical studies among Christians and, as we have seen, it was indeed studied by some of them in the second and the third centuries CE. It was not simply the ability of mathematics to exercise the mind, and not just the Platonic anagogical function of mathematics that allows one to access unqualified truths, that encouraged mathematical education, but, more importantly, it was the fact that God himself was connected with mathematical categories of number, measure and weight, which made room for theological interpretations of mathematics.

Sofia Larionova

Saint Petersburg State Pediatric Medical University

salamandrina-na-na@mail.ru

Bibliography

- O. Arndt, “Zahlenmystik bei Philo – Spielerei oder Schriftauslegung?”, *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 19: 2 (1967) 167–171.
- R. M. Berchman, “Arithmos and Kosmos: Arithmology as an Exegetical Tool in the *De Opificio Mundi* of Philo of Alexandria”, in: K. Corrigan (ed.), *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World* (Leiden 2013) 167–198.
- A. Bernard et al., “Mathematics Education in Antiquity”, in: A. Karp, G. Schubring (eds.), *Handbook on the History of Mathematics Education* (New York 2014) 27–53.

³⁴ McCarthy 1995, 285–320.

- R. van den Broek, "The Christian "School" of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries", in J. W. Drijvers, A. A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-modern Europe and the Near East* (Leiden 1995) 39–47.
- J. Burnet, *Greek Philosophy. I. Thales to Plato* (London 1914).
- M. F. Burnyeat, "Plato on Why Mathematics is Good for the Soul", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 103 (2000) 1–81.
- P. Camelot, "Les idées de Clément d'Alexandrie sur l'utilisation des sciences et de la littérature profane", *Recherches de science religieuse* 21 (1931) 38–66.
- H. Cherniss, *The Riddle of the Early Academy* (Berkeley 1945).
- J. Ferguson, "The Achievement of Clement of Alexandria", *Religious Studies* 12: 1 (1976) 59–80.
- G. C. Field, *Plato and his Contemporaries. A Study in Fourth-Century Life and Thought* (London 1948).
- H. Fuchs, "Enkyklios Paideia", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962) 365–398.
- J. C. Glenn, *The Educational Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria in the Stromata*. Thesis (Louisville, KY 2017).
- I. Hadot, *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* (Paris 1984).
- R. D. Hicks (tr.), *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers I* (Cambridge 1925).
- A. van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and his Use of Philo in the Stromateis: An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model* (Supplement to *Vigiliae christianae*) (Leiden 1988).
- A. van den Hoek, "The 'Catechetical' School of Early Christian Alexandria and its Philonic Heritage", *The Harvard Theological Review* 90: 1 (1997) 59–87.
- C. Huffman, *Archytas of Tarentum. Pythagorean, Philosopher and Mathematician King* (Cambridge 2005).
- J. L. Kovacs, "Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria", *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9: 1 (2001) 3–25.
- H. J. Krämer, "Die Ältere Akademie", in: H. Flashar (ed.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie: Die Philosophie der Antike* 3 (Basel 1983) 1–173.
- F. Kühnert, *Allgemeinbildung und Fachbildung in der Antike* (Berlin 1961).
- W. R. M. Lamb (tr.), *Plato, Charmides, Alcibiades I and II, Hipparchus, The Lovers, Theages, Minos, Epinomis* (Cambridge 1927).
- E. C. Marchant, *Xenophon IV* (Cambridge 1923).
- H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité* (Paris 1964).
- D. McCarthy, "The Lunar and Paschal Tables of *De ratione paschali* Attributed to Anatolius of Laodicea", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 49: 4 (1995) 285–320.
- H. R. Moehring, "Arithmology as an Exegetical Tool in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria", in: J. P. Kenney (ed.), *The School of Moses: Studies in Philo and Hellenistic religion in memory of Horst R. Moehring* (Atlanta 1995) 141–176.
- P. Natorp, *Platos Ideenlehre. Eine Einführung in den Idealismus* (Leipzig 21921).
- P. Nautin, *Origène: sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris 1977).

- G. Norlin (tr.), *Isocrates II* (London 1929).
- G. Rechenauer, "Enkyklios Paideia", *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik II* (1994) 1160–1185.
- F. E. Robbins, "Arithmetic in Philo Judaeus", *CPh* 26 (1931) 345–361.
- D. T. Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers* (Leiden 1995).
- D. T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Assen 1993).
- C. Scholten, "Die alexandrinische Katechetenschule", *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 38 (1995) 16–37.
- P. Shorey (tr.), *Plato, Republic II* (Cambridge 1935).
- J. C. M. van Winden, "Quotations from Philo in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus*", *Vigiliae christianae* 32 (1978) 208–213.
- C. D. Yonge (tr.), *The Works of Philo* (Peabody, MA 1993).
- W. Wilson, *The Writings of Clement of Alexandria II* (Edinburgh 1882).
- E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung 2* (Leipzig 1921).

When mathematical sciences started their advancement into non-professional education, it became necessary to explain why these sciences should be studied by those who are not going to become professional mathematicians. The ancients found various arguments in favor of studying mathematical sciences. For example, there were arguments of an utilitarian nature: the benefits of mathematics were seen in its application in trade, navigation, managing one's estate, etc. There were also those who prioritized the benefits of mathematics for the development of intelligence: mathematics is useful because it exercises the mind. According to others, the main benefit of studying mathematics is that it promotes the acquisition of various virtues (for example, justice and moderation), and also serves as a preparation for the study of dialectics (and later, Holy Scripture).

This argument was borrowed in one form or another by Christian authors from pagans. The article traces how Philo of Alexandria and the following Christian authors (namely, Clement and Origen) justify the need to study mathematics, how their argumentation correlates with the ancient pagan tradition, and also what conclusions about the practice of teaching mathematical disciplines and their content follow from their testimonies. The article shows that, according to the views of the above-mentioned authors, there were important internal reasons linking mathematics with the concept of God, which could encourage the study of mathematics among Christians. It was not just about the ability of mathematics to exercise the mind, or about the important role of mathematics in gaining access to the unconditional truths of the Platonic tradition, but, more importantly, God himself is connected with the mathematical categories of numbers, measures and weights, which made theological interpretations of mathematics possible.

С появлением математических наук возникла потребность в объяснении, зачем эти науки следует изучать тем, кто не собирается становиться профессиональным математиком. Древние находили разные аргументы в пользу

изучения математических наук. Например, существовали доводы утилитарного характера: польза от математики виделась в ее применении в торговле, навигации, управлении своим имением и т. п. Существовали и те, кто во главу угла ставил пользу математики для развития интеллекта: математика полезна, поскольку она упражняет ум. Согласно другим, главная польза от занятий математикой заключается в том, что она способствует приобретению разных добродетелей (например, справедливости и умеренности), а также служит подготовкой к изучению диалектики (а позднее – Священного писания).

Эта аргументация была в том или ином виде заимствована христианскими авторами у язычников. В статье прослеживается, как Филон Александрийский и следующие за ним христианские авторы (Климент, Ориген) обосновывают необходимость изучения математики, как их аргументация соотносится с античной языческой традицией, а также какие из их свидетельств позволяют сделать выводы о практике преподавания математических дисциплин и об их содержании. В статье показано, что, согласно представлениям вышеназванных авторов, существовали важные внутренние причины, связывавшие математику с концепцией Бога, которые могли поощрять изучение математики среди христиан. Речь идет не просто о способности математики упражнять ум, или о важной роли математики для получения доступа к безусловным истинам платоновской традиции, но, что более важно, сам Бог оказывается связан с математическими категориями числа, меры и веса, что делало возможными теологические интерпретации математики.

Sophia Golovatskaya

THE “JEWISH SIBYL” IN CLEMENT OF
ALEXANDRIA’S *PROTREPTICUS*¹

In chapters 6 and 7 of Clement of Alexandria’s *Protrepticus*, devoted to the statements of Greek philosophers and poets about God the Creator, the biblical books, namely the Old Testament, are called the main source of true knowledge. In *Protr.* 69. 1–2, Clement hints that Plato’s teaching may have a connection with the Old Testament law: citing the words of Moses about God being the criterion for truth, he compares them with the same thought in Plato’s *Laws* (715 e 7 – 716 a 3). A bit further (70. 1–2), he says openly that Plato owes his “true laws and the view of God” to the Jews and cites the verses from the third book of the *Sibylline Oracles* (586–588; 590–594) on pious people, whom Clement identifies with the Jews. Then, in *Protr.* 71. 1, Clement stresses the same thought, giving it a more general form: Greek philosophers borrowed knowledge of God from the Jews. By showing that prominent representatives of Hellenic culture depended on the Scriptures, Clement develops an idea of plagiarism. According to this topos, Greek philosophers and poets who said something true about God the Creator are not independent in their maxims, as they borrowed them from the Jews. However, Clement mentions another source besides Moses from which the “son of Gryllus” (Xenophon) acquired true knowledge. He quotes a paraphrase of Socrates’ monologue about the obviousness of God’s power and the invisibility of his image² from *Memorabilia* (*Protr.* 71. 4):

¹ Clement’s writings are quoted from the following editions: the *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus*, ed. by M. Marcovich (1995; 2002) and the *Stromateis*, ed. by O. Stählin and L. Früchtel (1985; 1970). The text of the *Sibylline Oracles* is cited according to the edition by J. Geffcken (1902b).

² This passage is an extended paraphrase of Xen. *Mem.* 4. 3. 14, modified in a monotheistic spirit (Xenophon speaks not of God, but of the gods).

Πόθεν ἄρα ὁ τοῦ Γρύλλου σοφίζεται ἢ δηλαδὴ παρὰ τῆς προφήτιδος
τῆς Ἑβραίων θεσπιζούσης ὧδέ πως;

Τίς γὰρ σὰρξ δύναται τὸν ἐπουράνιον καὶ ἀληθῆ
ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν θεὸν ἄμβροτον, ὃς πόλον οἰκεῖ;
Ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ἀκτίνων κατεναντίον ἡελίοιο
ἄνθρωποι στήναι δυνατοί, θνητοὶ γεγαῶτες.

Where does the wisdom of the Gryllus’ son come from, if not from a Jewish prophetess foretelling: “What flesh can see with its eyes the true immortal God who dwells in the firmament? People – those who were born mortal – are not able to withstand even the rays of the sun”.

The passage is quite unusual. Christian literature mostly considered the *Sibylline Oracles* to be pagan prophecies, although in reality the collection of oracles that has come down to us, which was used by Christian writers, consists of pseudepigrapha – works written by Jewish and Christian authors on behalf of pagan prophetesses. Such works preach monotheism and contain multiple elements of the Old and New Testament teachings and prophecies that have already “come true”, combined with pagan motifs.³ However, it seems that Clement presents a correct view on the origin of the *Sibylline Oracles*: Xenophon, unlike Plato, did not have access to the Scriptures, but he was familiar with the “Jewish” Sibyl, who speaks Greek.⁴

In academic literature, the question of Clement’s “Jewish Sibyl”, first noted in a study by Nicole Zeegers-Vander Vorst,⁵ is still a matter of controversy. Zeegers-Vander Vorst had no doubt that Clement implied the Jewish origin of the Sibyl. She suggested that Clement was influenced by the third book of the *Sibylline Oracles*, in one of the passages of which the Sibyl speaks of herself as a relative of Noah, who migrated from Babylon to Greece and there became known as the Sibyl from Erythrae in Asia Minor (*Or. Sib.* 3. 809–829).⁶ However, R. Buitenwerf believes

³ For valuable surveys of the pagan, Jewish, and Christian traditions of the Sibyls, see Parke 1992; Schürer 1986, 618–654; Lightfoot 2007.

⁴ The same combination of Xenophon’s paraphrase and the passage from the Sibyl’s prophecy also appears later in the selection of monotheistic quotes from pagan philosophers in the *Stromateis* (5. 108. 5). However, it is not mentioned that Xenophon borrowed his wisdom from the Sibyl, although Clement may have implied the same thing.

⁵ Zeegers-Vander Vorst 1972, 203–205.

⁶ Zeegers-Vander Vorst 1972, 204.

that one piece of evidence (*Protr.* 71. 4) is insufficient to suggest that Clement considered the Sibyl to be a prophetess of Jewish origin, for in other cases Clement identifies the Sibyl as Greek.⁷ Buitenwerf supposes that, in *Protr.* 71. 4, he calls her a Jewish prophetess, not because she belongs to the Jews by birth, but because she gives oracles concerning that nation.⁸ Such a solution seems unfortunate from the linguistic point of view⁹ and is not quite convincing in the context. It was hardly important to Clement to mention the Sibyl making prophecies *about* the Jews while telling that Xenophon learned from her the doctrine of divine incomprehensibility, which has universal significance. On the contrary, mentioning the Jewish origin of the Sibyl was appropriate to the context in order to emphasize the divinely revealed nature of her teaching. In addition, in other passages, Clement's judgements about the Sibyl are not so straightforwardly in favour of her gentile origin as Buitenwerf assumes (more on this later).

J. L. Lightfoot is thus quite right to regard Buitenwerf's interpretation as implausible. She claims that Clement sees the Sibyl in *Protr.* 71. 4 (and elsewhere in the *Protrepticus*) precisely as a Jewish prophetess, "who makes prophecies for the Jews and whose revelations are on the same level as the Holy Scripture". She believes that Clement's attitude towards the Sibyl changes from treatise to treatise: while in the *Paedagogus* the prophetess appears to be a part of Greek culture, in the *Stromateis* her figure is ambiguous. More often she appears there belonging to paganism, but in one passage her testimony is cited along with *Deuteronomy* against

⁷ Buitenwerf 2003, 77–78.

⁸ Buitenwerf wants to confirm his interpretation by mentioning that, earlier in *Protr.* 70. 1, without naming his source, Clement quotes *Or. Sib.* 3. 586–588; 590–594 and relates a description of the pious life of some people to the Jews, although this does not directly follow from the text. Buitenwerf therefore thinks that it was precisely because of this quotation that further in the text Clement called the Sibyl (a pagan but) Jewish in the sense of "prophesying about the Jews". Zeegers-Vander Vorst, in contrast, believes this passage to be a confirmation that Clement perceives the Sibyl as a Jewish prophetess. It seems that the passage cannot serve as an argument in favour of either point of view. The identification of the pious people with the Jews was more or less obvious for Clement from the description itself, but this identification does not shed light on the origin of the Sibyl: it was usual for Christian authors to ascribe the revealed truth to Sibyls, when referring to any people, including Jews; but Sibyls remained gentile prophetesses for the Jews.

⁹ Words in the genitive that depend on προφήτης / προφῆτις may refer to the event about which the prophecy is given, but there are no known examples of the genitive that would denote the person to whom these events will occur.

the testimony of a pagan author.¹⁰ Lightfoot cites Zeegers-Vander Vorst (in connection with the views of Pseudo-Justin) that Christian literature was influenced by dual perception of the Sibyl being of Jewish origin, but later becoming one of the pagan Sibyls (viz. in the view of the author of the third book of the *Sibylline Oracles*). Nevertheless, Lightfoot appears not to trace Clement’s “Jewish Sibyl” to the third book of the *Oracles*, as Zeegers Vander-Vorst did. Moreover, she does not make any assumptions about the sources of this view at all. She limits herself to pointing out that, in his interpretation of the Sibyl as a Jewish prophetess, Clement is alone among Christian authors both before and after him. For the most part, they considered Sibyl to be pagan, but believed that she did not borrow true knowledge from the Old Testament literature as other pagans did according to the “plagiarism theory”. On the contrary, she had her own privileged access to the truth and thereby confirmed the truth of the divine revelation. Lightfoot explains the exceptional position of the Sibyl as a Jewish prophetess by the fact that Clement keeps the characteristics he inherited from Jewish literature.¹¹

Lightfoot’s interpretation of Clement’s concept of the Jewish Sibyl seems generally correct, yet it still needs some clarifications. They relate to (1) interpretation of the Sibyl in various writings by Clement; (2) the origins of the Jewish Sibyl’s image; (3) the attitude towards the Sibyl in the Christian tradition – Clement’s view of Sibyl as Jewish is not as unique in the tradition as Lightfoot believes.

There is little evidence on the Sibyl’s origin in the gentile authors. Until the Hellenistic period, only a few references to her name can be found: in the famous fragment of Heraclitus (fr. 75 Wehrli) and in the comedies of Aristophanes (*Pax* 1095); the Sibyl and the “others who have prophetic inspiration” (μαντικῇ χρώμενοι ἐνθέῳ) were also mentioned once in Plato’s *Phaedrus* (244 b).¹² Initially, there probably was only one Sibyl. Heraclides Ponticus, however, already knows two Sibyls: the Erythraean (Herophile) and the Marmessian from the Troad, whose name is not mentioned (fr. 130–131 Wehrli). Apparently, this is the time when cities began claiming to be the birthplace of the prophetess one

¹⁰ Lightfoot 2007, 82–84.

¹¹ Lightfoot 2007, 84–85.

¹² Lightfoot 2007, 4. The Platonic motif of divine ecstasy or madness was taken up by Jewish writers, including Philo of Alexandria, who presents the prophet’s behaviour as ecstatic, incompatible with the ordinary state of mind (Philo, *Quis Here.* 249; 258–266).

after another. Thus, the name “Sibyl” gradually began to move into the category of a generalized designation of an inspired propheticess.¹³ Lists of the Sibyls start to arise afterwards. The most significant of them was compiled by Varro: he mentions ten propheticesses in *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* named in accordance with the geographic principle (Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1. 6. 8–12 = Varro, *Ant. Rer. Div.* fr. 56 a Cardauns). The earliest mention of the Jewish Sibyl in pagan literature can be found in Pausanias. It is a part of a story about the connection of individual Sibyls with various cities. Pausanias (10. 12) was familiar with four Sibyls. He notes that the fourth Sibyl – Sabba – was born in Judea and was the daughter of Berossus and Erimantha. He also adds that others call her the Babylonian and Egyptian Sibyl.¹⁴ There is no doubt that in this case Pausanias follows the Jewish tradition directly or through some intermediary. However, before considering Clement’s attitude towards the version of Pausanias, we should first elaborate on the image of the “Jewish Sibyl” in the Hellenistic Jewish literature itself. The mention of the Jewish Sibyl appears at about the same time in Aelianus (*Var. Hist.* 12. 35), who mentions two alternative lists of the Sibyls. The first one consists of four names but does not include the Jewish Sibyl. The second one consists of ten names and does include her. Sure enough, Pausanias and Aelianus rely on different sources (their lists of Sibyls have considerable discrepancies), but there can hardly be any doubt that, in the end, the idea of the Jewish Sibyl goes back to the Hellenized Jewish tradition. Repercussions of Pausanias’ version were found in other pagan and Christian authors: the closest is the judgement about the Sibyl made by the unknown author of the *Exhortation to the Greeks*, which was erroneously attributed to Justin Martyr (see below).

Addressing the Sibyl’s image for exhortation purposes was a common technique in Jewish literature, especially during the Hellenistic period. The Jews, who, just like the Greeks, gave much importance to prophecies as a method of foretelling the future, composed them by themselves,

¹³ Stanley–Potter 2012, 1360.

¹⁴ Paus. 10. 12. 9: ἐπετράφη δὲ καὶ ὕστερον τῆς Δημοῦς παρ’ Ἑβραίοις τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς Παλαιστίνης γυνὴ χρησμολόγος, ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῇ Σάββη· Βηρόσου δὲ εἶναι πατὴρ καὶ Ἑρμάνθης μητρός φασι Σάββην· οἱ δὲ αὐτὴν Βαβυλωνίαν, ἕτεροι δὲ Σίβυλλαν καλοῦσιν Αἰγυπτίαν. With “Palestine”, Pausanias means Syria, that is, the coastal strip of the Mediterranean Sea, as far as to Egypt; ὑπὲρ τῆς Παλαιστίνης is commonly thought to mean Judea, either as it is on a plateau *above* the coastal strip (see Hitzig–Bluemner 1910, 704) or as being “*outside* of Palestine” (see Bultrighini–Torelli 2017, 71; 322).

putting maxims about God the Creator into the mouth of the pagan Sibyl. Pseudo-epigraphs and prophecies written in Greek became their favourite tool for proselytising or converting pagans to Judaism, as later to Christianity. One of the most striking works of this kind are the *Sibylline Oracles*. A part of the collection that stands apart is Book 3 of the *Oracles*, in which the Sibyl clearly speaks of herself as a Jewish prophetess. This book is undoubtedly of Jewish origin,¹⁵ as well as being the oldest book in the collection. Researchers agree that it was written in Egypt in the 1st–2nd century BC.¹⁶ At the end of the book, the Sibyl (the prophecies are given on her behalf) speaks of herself as a relative¹⁷ of Noah, who was sent to the Greeks from Babylon by the gods, it seems, in association with the destruction of the Tower of Babel and the separation

¹⁵ The Jewish origin of Book 3 is generally recognized among scholars, starting from the first decades of the 19th century. However, some Christian additions were allowed, which cannot be called indisputable. The surviving quotations from this book belong to Christian authors only; the earliest of them is Theophilus of Antioch (Buitenwerf 2003, 124–126). The 829 verses that make up Book 3 can be called one of the most extensive works of Hellenistic Judaism after the writings of Philo of Alexandria (Collins 2005, 82).

¹⁶ Book 3 has been attracting the attention of researchers more than any other book of the collection. By the beginning of the 20th century, there was a prevailing opinion about the dating of its main part: it was agreed on the middle of the 2nd century BC. The reason for this was primarily the mention of the “young” seventh king of Egypt, that is, Ptolemy VI or Ptolemy VIII; some parts of the book may belong to the 1st century BC, see primarily the work of J. Geffcken: Geffcken 1902a, 5–7; Collins 1974, 30–33. However, there are a number of scholars who argue that the expression “the seventh king” was used in its literal meaning. They date the whole book to the 1st century BC (see Buitenwerf 2003, 126–130: between 80–40 BC). The Egyptian origin of the book was never put under dispute, due to the significant role it assigns to Egypt and its rulers.

¹⁷ *Or. Sib.* 3. 827 f.: τοῦ μὲν ἐγὼ νύμφη καὶ ἀφ’ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐτύχθην, τῷ τὰ πρῶτ’ ἐγένοντο· τὰ δ’ ἔσχατα πάντ’ ἀπεδείχθη. We find a similar self-identification of the Sibyl in *Or. Sib.* 1. 283–306, where the prophetess speaks of herself as the wife of one of Noah’s sons who escaped on the ark and became a witness to the life of the sixth, happy generation after the flood. It is probable, but not certain, that νύμφη has the same “daughter-in-law” meaning in 3. 827 f. (cf. LSJ s.v. 3), see Lightfoot 2007, 412. This version of Book 3 is generally considered older than one of the Books 1 and 2 (Buitenwerf 2003, 300), cf., however, Waßmuth 2011, 178 f. (The Sibyl as Noah’s daughter-in-law is an innovation of the author of Books 1 and 2; 3. 823–829 is a later addition, made under the influence of Books 1 and 2). The idea that Sibyl was the daughter-in-law or relative of Noah appears repeatedly in subsequent literature: *Schol. Plat. Phaedr.* 244 b; Suda s.v. Σιβύλλα Χαλδαία, etc.

of languages. Living among the Greeks, she was given the name Sibyl from Erythrae in Asia Minor, that is, the most famous of the pagan Sibyls (3. 809–829).¹⁸

Jewish authors, putting statements about God into the mouth of the famous pagan prophetess, have probably striven to show the Greeks that their own prophetic authority has been calling to preserve monotheism since ancient times. The Sibyl from Book 3 predicts that only the Jews will remain faithful to the true religion, thereby asserting their religious authority over other nations.¹⁹ Buitenwerf, following I. Vossius, thinks that later some of the Jews themselves began to believe in the authenticity of the Sibylline predictions compiled by the Jews. For example, there was a prophecy popular among Egyptian Jews during the period when Romans seized and took control of Egyptian land. It was told in the prophecy that the Messiah would come when three men would reign in Rome and the Empire would seize the land of Egypt. Taking the capture of Egypt as a fulfilment of the prophecy, the Egyptian Jews expected the speedy arrival of the Messiah.²⁰

Information about how later Jewish authors used and perceived the *Sibylline Oracles* is scarce. According to excerpts from the writings of Eusebius, Aristobulus does not quote the prophetess at all; Josephus Flavius refers to her once (*AJ* 1. 118). Lightfoot believes that the Jews of the Hellenistic era no longer perceived the Sibyl as a pagan figure and in their view she had a deeper connection with Enoch than Pseudo-Sophocles. In contrast, in Christian literature the Sibyls were understood mainly as pagan prophetesses.²¹ This judgement, however, seems a bit exaggerated: we are only aware of two direct references to the Jewish origin of the Sibyls in the Jewish literature itself, that is, the Sibyl's self-identification as a relative of Noah (*Or. Sib.* 3. 809–829) and the Sibyl's own characterization of herself, which depends on the forementioned text, as Noah's daughter-in-law, who escaped with him and his family on the ark during the flood (1. 283–306). In the first case, the Sibyl identifies herself with the pagan Sibyl from Erythrae, that is, she does not act as a *Jewish* prophetess, but only as a pagan of Jewish origin. That is exactly why in later Christian literature she is determined dually – either as Jewish, or as Babylonian, then as Erythrean.

¹⁸ Buitenwerf 2003, 371–372; Lightfoot 2007, 5.

¹⁹ Buitenwerf 2003, 33.

²⁰ Buitenwerf 2003, 20.

²¹ Lightfoot 2007, 79–80.

Subsequently, Christian authors began to adopt texts of the Jewish oracles as well as a tendency to refer to the Sibyl as a pagan authority. The earliest mention of the Sibyl in Christian literature can be found in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, a treatise from the first half of the 2nd century AD.²² In one of the visions (that make up the whole work) the hero crosses paths with an old woman in luminous clothes holding a book. Hermas receives long prophecies and instructions (*Herm.* 1. 2–3; 6–7) from her. Then a beautiful young man appears to the hero to interpret what has been said: at first, he asks Hermas if he knows who the elderly lady was. Hermas replies that this woman is the Sibyl, and the young man refutes him, arguing that in reality this is the Church of God.²³ Thus, the authority of the Sibyl in the *Shepherd* is somewhat diminished – as the very first creation of God and the highest source of revelation, the Church is opposed to her.²⁴ At the same time, the Sibyl was the first to be associated with the highest wisdom by Hermas, so it cannot be excluded that the author of the *Shepherd* thus indicates the high authority of the Sibyl in Christian circles.

Afterwards, the image of the Sibyl became widespread among Christian apologists as well. The first to repeatedly quote the *Sibylline Oracles* was Theophilus of Antioch in the work *To Autolycus*, which is usually dated shortly after 180 AD.²⁵ He mentions only one Sibyl and quotes *Or. Sib.* 3. 97–103; 105 and 8. 5 (*Ad Autolyc.* 2. 31), as well as three passages from the *Oracles* that have no correspondence in the surviving collection (fr. 1 and 3 Geffcken = *Ad Autolyc.* 2. 36; fr. 2 Geffcken = *Ad Autolyc.* 2. 3). In all these cases, Theophilus cites the Sibyl as an indisputable authority, separating her from pagan authors who stole the truth from the Scriptures (2. 37) or who sometimes express true judgements about the gods, because they are released (apparently, due to their own efforts) from the influence of demons, who had earlier mastered them. Most pagan authors, however, still speak what is dictated by the demons (2. 8).²⁶ Theophilus contrasts these contradictory statements of pagan poets with the inspiration of the Jewish prophets and puts them on a par with the Sibyl who prophesied among the Hellenes (*Ad Autolyc.* 2. 9):

²² Parke 1992, 152–173.

²³ The Sibyl mentioned in the *Shepherd* is often identified with the Cumaean Sibyl, as the action takes place not far from the Cumae (Parke 1992, 154).

²⁴ Parke 1992, 156.

²⁵ On the dating of the work, see Engberg 2014, 106.

²⁶ Lightfoot 2007, 82.

καὶ οὐχ εἷς ἢ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονες κατὰ χρόνους καὶ καιροὺς ἐγενή-
θησαν παρὰ Ἑβραίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ Ἑλλησιν Σίβυλλα καὶ πάντες
φίλα ἀλλήλοις καὶ σύμφωνα εἰρήκασιν, τὰ τε πρὸ αὐτῶν γεγεννημένα
καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς γεγονότα καὶ τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς νυνὶ τελειούμενα·

And not one or two, but many (prophets) appeared at different times among the Jews, like the Sibyl among the Hellenes, and they all expressed agreement with each other about what happened before them, what will happen after, and what is happening in our time right now.

In 2. 36 he speaks of her as a prophetess “among the Hellenes and other pagans”. These statements are usually understood in such a way that Theophilus, considering the Sibyl divinely inspired, locates her entirely within Greek culture.²⁷ Nevertheless, it cannot be categorically excluded that Theophilus had in mind the Sibyl from the third book of the *Sibylline Oracles*, who acted in the Greek world as the Erythrean Sibyl, but was originally from the family of Noah and came to the gentiles from Babylon.

As for other representatives of apologetics, they rarely turned to the image of the Sibyl, referring to her antiquity for argumentative purposes. Thus, Tatian, one of Clement’s predecessors, mentioned the Sibyl in order to prove the chronological antiquity of Moses in relation to Homer. Claiming that before Homer there existed not only Moses, but also other poets, he cites Orpheus and the Sibyl as examples (*Or.* 41), just as Clement does in the *Stromateis* (1. 2. 108).

Thus, in the early Christian tradition before Clement, the attitude towards the Sibyl and her prophecies differed. Some authors did not give her much interest and rarely referred to her as an authoritative figure; others, in contrast, emphasized the divine inspiration of the Sibyl and put her on the same level as the Jewish prophets. The source of her inspiration is nowhere named clearly, but it is undoubtedly a direct divine inspiration, which Theophilus distinguishes both from plagiarism from the Holy Scriptures and from the contradictory attempts to approach the truth on their own by pagan poets. We have not encountered direct statements about the Sibyl as a Jewish prophetess, but there is nothing that would exclude her Jewish origin.

As we do not know of any statements made by Christian authors before Clement about the Sibyl as a Jewish prophetess, a question arises whether Clement came to this idea under the influence of Hellenized

²⁷ Lightfoot 2007, 82: “for Theophilus Sibylla is Greek”.

Jewish literature (where, as in *Or. Sib.* 3 and 1, it was said that the prophecies belonged to the Jewish Sibyl) or indirectly, through the works of pagan authors that (most likely under the influence of the same Jewish literature) contained references to the Jewish Sibyl just like the writings of Pausanias and Aelian (see above).²⁸ The choice between these possibilities is not easy, but we will try to show that a solution is possible.

Let us dwell on Clement’s own attitude towards the Sibyl in more detail. Lightfoot notes that Clement interprets this figure in different ways. In the *Protrepticus*, Clement speaks of the Sibyl only in the singular and also refers to her as an absolute authority: having a poetic and prophetic gift, she acts as a mentor, contrasting her prophecies with the prophecies emanating from Apollo; she proclaims herself a prophetess of the true God and heralds the death of pagan sanctuaries (*Protr.* 50. 1–3); she refutes polytheism and calls for enlightenment (27. 4–5); she is also quoted next to the books of *Exodus* and *Deuteronomy* in the denunciation of the deity’s images (62. 1–2). Moreover, she expresses true maxims about God, sings a “song of salvation” (74), and by inspiration (ἐνθέως) likens deceit to darkness and knowledge to the sun and light (77). In 70. 2, the *Sibylline Oracles* (3. 586–588, 590–594) are quoted anonymously: these lines depict just and pious people (Jews, from whom Plato borrowed his ideal laws, according to Clement, see above). As already mentioned, the Sibyl is called the “Jewish prophetess” in only one case (71. 4 – the monotheistic teaching that Xenophon borrowed from her), but it is likely that this name applies to her in other references, since Clement means only one Sibyl everywhere in the *Protrepticus*. In *Protr.* 50. 4 Clement

²⁸ The dependence of the pagan authors who tell us about the Jewish Sibyl on the Jewish *Sibylline Oracles* is strongly rejected by Buitenwerf (Buitenwerf 2003, 122) on the grounds that (1) this evidence only appears in the 2nd century AD, much later than *Or. Sib.* 3 (dated not later than the 1st century BC); (2) that the author of *Or. Sib.* 3 presents his work not as Jewish, but as belonging to the Erythrean Sibyl; and (3) forgeries of the pagan oracles were fabricated starting from the 2nd century BC, but before Pausanias and Aelian no one mentions the Sibylline books written by the Jews. These arguments are not convincing: (1) Pausanias and Aelian are independent of each other and each go back to different sources, so that the very version of the existence of the Jewish Sibyl could have arisen long before their lifetimes; (2) the Jewish origin of the Erythrean Sibyl who claims to be the author of *Or. Sib.* 3 is obvious from this book; (3) the sources of Pausanias and Aelian (they themselves do not mention the *Oracles of the Sibyls*), which have not come down to us, were, for one reason or another, inclined to accept the existence and, probably, the authority of the “Jewish Sibyl”; therefore, they had no reason to doubt the indication in the *Or. Sib.* 3 that the author of this work is a Jewish prophetess.

invites a pagan not willing to listen to the Sibyl to hear the words of “his philosopher, Heraclitus of Ephesus”. That is, Clement makes it clear that the Sibyl does not belong to the pagan world. In chapter 77, Clement moves from the grains of truth that are available to pagan poets to the writings of the prophets, showing a clear path to the truth and denouncing all misbeliefs. The “prophetess” Sibyl opens a series of quotations from the Old Testament prophets (*Or. Sib.* fr. 1. 28–35) with her song. “Much divinely inspired”, comparing misbelief with darkness and knowledge with the sun and divine light, she guides to the right choice. As we can see, in the *Protrepticus* there is nothing that would contradict the understanding of the Sibyl as a one-of-a-kind prophetess, originally belonging not to Greek, but to Jewish culture, although she prophesied to the gentiles. For Clement the source of the truth contained in the prophecies of the Sibyl undoubtedly springs from her divine inspiration.²⁹

In Clement’s *Paedagogus*, the Sibyl is quoted only twice. In the passage 2. 10. 99. 3, her condemnation of vices (*Orac. Sib.* 5. 166–168; 4. 33–34) is quoted after the quotation from *Sir* 26:22, and she herself is contrasted with the text of the Holy Scripture as ἡ παρ’ ὑμῶν ποιητική, “our poetess”.³⁰ At first glance, Clement has the pagan Sibyl in mind here,³¹ but if we assume that the Jewish Sibyl of Clement is the Sibyl of the third book of the *Oracles*, then she could well be called “our poetess” not because of her origin, but because of the place she acts in (Clement also repeatedly makes it clear that the Sibyl makes prophecies for the pagans in the *Protrepticus*).³² The second mention, the quotation from

²⁹ Lightfoot also notes that, in four out of five citations from the *Oracles* in the *Protrepticus*, Clement calls the Sibyl προφητις, a word that he does not use for her elsewhere (Lightfoot 2007, 83 n. 130). It is not easy to interpret this fact: on the one hand, this word is definitely associated with the Old Testament prophets and the prophecy of Christ in the New Testament; on the other hand, Theophilus already uses it in relation to the Sibyl. Apparently, this word implies the inspiration and authority of the Sibyl herself, rather than speaking directly about her Jewish origin.

³⁰ The substantiated οἱ ποιητικοί in the rare meaning of “poets” (not mentioned in the LSJ and Lampe) occurs in Clement (*Protr.* 26. 4).

³¹ Lightfoot 2007, 83.

³² It might be assumed that ποιητική here means poetry in the collective sense, as Clement often uses this word, especially in cases where the source of the passage he quoted was unknown to him (see *Protr.* 73. 1; *Paed.* 2. 2. 28. 2; 6. 50. 4; *Strom.* 5. 5. 27. 6). In such a case, Clement may have borrowed the quotation from the *Oracles* from the florilegium, in which the words of the Sibyl were quoted among the pagan poets. However, this understanding is refuted by *Protr.* 24. 5, where the Sibyl is called ἡ προφητική καὶ ποιητική Σίβυλλα.

Or. Sib. 4. 154–155 (*Paed.* 3. 3. 15. 2–3) where the Sibyl is mentioned directly, testifies to her unconditional authority for Clement, but does not give any hint at her identification.

As Lightfoot correctly points out, in the *Stromateis* the Sibyl appears in a double light. She is repeatedly mentioned in the context of pagan beliefs: Clement willingly gives various versions of the Sibyl’s origin, as well as reports that there were several of them (1. 15. 70. 3–4; 21. 108. 1–4). He also provides a list of nine Sibyls, in connection with the story of the Hellenic soothsayers (1. 21. 132. 3). The “Jewish” Sibyl is absent here. She could be hiding behind the Erythrean Sibyl, the one that the Sibyl from the third book of the *Oracles* identifies herself with. However, the source used here by Clement is definitely not familiar with such an identification. Probably none of these passages are connected with quoting the fragments of the *Oracles*.

At the same time, there is also an idea of the sole Sibyl present in the *Stromateis* – a prophetess proclaiming the doctrine of the true God, reminiscent of the *Protrepticus*. In one case, Clement cites evidence from a certain pseudo-epigraph containing the words of St. Paul the Apostle.³³ Clement argues that God singled out prophets not only from the Jews, but also from the Greeks. Therefore, according to Clement, St. Paul advises the pagan audience to familiarize themselves with the books of the Sibyl (*Strom.* 6. 5. 43. 1):

ἐπεὶ, ὅτι καθάπερ Ἰουδαίους σῶζεσθαι ἠβούλετο ὁ θεὸς τοὺς προφήτας διδούς, οὕτως καὶ Ἑλλήνων τοὺς δοκιμωτάτους οἰκείους αὐτῶν τῇ διαλέκτῳ προφήτας ἀναστήσας, ὡς οἱοί τε ἦσαν δέχεσθαι τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐεργεσίαν, τῶν χυδαίων ἀνθρώπων διέκρινεν, δηλώσει πρὸς τῷ Πέτρου Κηρύγματι ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγων Παῦλος· “λάβετε καὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς βίβλους. ἐπίγινωτε Σίβυλλαν, ὡς δηλοῖ ἓνα θεὸν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσσεσθαι...”

For, in addition to *Peter’s Sermon*, Paul the Apostle will also make it clear that just as God wanted to save the Jews by giving them prophets, so did he among the Greeks, having raised the most glorious prophets (who spoke) in their own language, so that they could

³³ O. Stählin, the editor of the *Stromateis*, suggests that the quotation is borrowed from the apocryphal *Acts of Paul*. Parke erroneously refers the quotation from Paul to *Peter’s Sermon* (Parke 1992, 156). In fact, Clement says that *in addition* to Peter in the *Sermon* (see 6. 5. 39. 1), Paul also speaks about the availability of the truth to the Gentiles.

receive God's beneficence, and separated them from ordinary people. Paul says, "Take the Greek books as well. Find out how Sibyl points to the One God and to what is to come..."

It is worth noting that Clement did not call the prophets acting in Greece Greeks, but οἰκεῖοι αὐτῶν τῇ διαλέκτῳ, that is, those who are involved in the language of Greeks. This may imply not belonging to the Greek language and culture by origin, but familiarizing oneself with it consciously. Therefore, it is possible that Clement is referring to the Erythrean Sibyl, who, according to the third book of the *Oracles*, came from the family of Noah but prophesied in Greek.

Only on five occasions does Clement quote passages from the collection of the *Sibylline Oracles* in the *Stromateis*. Leaving aside the cases in which quotations are given without reference to the Sibyl or are reminiscences of the *Oracles*,³⁴ there are only three passages in which Clement quotes the *Oracles*, naming the Sibyl in the singular and finding the true teaching in her words:

Strom. 3. 3. 14. 3: *Or. Sib.* fr. 1. 1 (pessimistic statements about the life of pagan poets and philosophers);

Strom. 5. 14. 108. 6: *Or. Sib.* fr. 1. 10–13 (cf. *Protr.* 71. 2);

Strom. 5. 14. 115. 6: *Or. Sib.* fr. 1. 28 (cf. *Protr.* 77. 2).

It is noteworthy that all three quotations go back to fr. 1 of the *Oracles*, which is quoted in full by Theophilus (*Ad Autol.* 2. 36 = *Or. Sib.* fr. 1 Geffcken). On two occasions, Clement himself had already used the quotations earlier in the *Protrepticus* (see above). There is no doubt that in this case, just as in the *Protrepticus*, what he has in mind is the Sibyl, the prophetess of the true God. It is very probable that in all three cases she represents for Clement the Jewish Sibyl, as in *Protr.* 71. 4.³⁵

³⁴ *Strom.* 3. 5. 45. 3 (a paraphrase of *Or. Sib.* 2. 163–164); 5. 14. 125. 2 (from Orpheus, close to *Or. Sib.* 8. 430–436).

³⁵ *Strom.* 3. 3. 14. 3 present a more complicated case: a line from the *Oracles* (*Or. Sib.* fr. 1. 1) is quoted here among the pessimistic sayings about the life of pagan poets and philosophers. Yet this does not necessarily mean that Clement traces the Sibyl to a pagan tradition, since the origin of the saying does not play any role here.

The origin of *Or. Sib.* fr. 1 is an old and intricate problem that continues to be the subject of controversy. Some scholars believe that this fragment, like fr. 2 and 3 quoted in their fullest form by Theophilus, originally belonged to the third book of the *Oracles* and were in the place of the present verses 1–96 of this book. Geffcken challenged this assumption, arguing that verses 1–45 of Book 3 are authentic and that the passages quoted by Theophilus are, in fact, a Christian forgery.³⁶ Despite his objections, the majority of scholars still think of the surviving introduction as interpolation.³⁷ The fragments of Theophilus are also, albeit cautiously, recognized as the original version of the introduction to the third book (contrary to Geffcken, their Jewish origin is not in doubt).³⁸ In any case, there are good reasons to believe that at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century, fragments of Theophilus belonged to the third book of the *Oracles*. In his *Divinae institutiones* (written after AD 303), Lactantius cites Varro’s list of ten Sibyls (1. 6. 7–12). He further mentions, no longer following Varro, that there are books of various Sibyls, which (since each is attributed to a Sibyl) are considered to be the prophecies of only one Sibyl, but can be attributed to any of them. The exception is the Erythrean Sibyl, who inserted her real name into the text of her song and said that she would be called Erythrean, although she comes from Babylon (1. 6. 13):

et sunt singularum singuli libri; quos, quia Sibyllae nomine inscribuntur, unius esse credunt[ur], suntque confusi nec discerni ac suum cuique adsignari potest nisi Erythraeae, quae et nomen suum uerum carmini inseruit et Erythraeam se nominatuiui praelocuta est, cum esset orta Babylone.

This unmistakably points to *Or. Sib.* 3. 809–829, where the Sibyl characterizes herself in this particular way. After that, Lactantius quotes fr. 1. 7; 3. 3–5; 1. 15–16 as belonging to the Erythrean Sibyl (1. 6. 15–16). In addition, in *Inst.* 4. 6. 5 Lactantius quotes fr. 1. 5–6 Geffcken and refers to these lines as the beginning of the song of the

³⁶ Geffcken 1902a, 15–16, 69–75.

³⁷ See Collins 1974, 24–25; Buitenwerf 2003, 72 (3. 1–92 is the ending of the original Book 2 of the *Oracles*, which is not preserved).

³⁸ Grant 1979, 89 n. 1; Schürer 1986, 638: both extensive fragments (eighty-four verses in all) given by Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* 2. 36 (ed. Grant, pp. 86–89, 90–93), also belong either to the original Book 3 or to the lost original Book 1; Merkel 1998, 1068–1069; Buitenwerf 2003, 73–75.

Erythrean Sibyl (he cites immediately after that *Or. Sib.* 3. 775 as the end of the same song).

There is no doubt that in his attribution of fragments 1 and 3 to the third book of the *Oracles* (and probably in quoting the verses themselves), Lactantius is independent of Theophilus, who does not mention that the parts of the quoted *Oracles* belong to the third book. Nor does he provide the name of the Sibyl. Lactantius obviously relies on his own knowledge of the third book of the *Oracles*, from which he borrowed this information.³⁹ In addition, Lactantius testifies that in the edition of the third book that he used, fr. 1 and 3 belonged to this particular book.⁴⁰

If fr. 1 belonged to the third book in the time of Clement (which seems quite probable), then it is safe to say that the designation of the Sibyl as a “Jewish prophetess” in *Protr.* 71. 4, where Clement quotes vv. 10–13 of this fragment, goes back to the Sibyl’s characterization of herself as a relative of Noah, who came from Babylon from the same book. It is difficult to tell whether Clement was influenced by Theophilus’ use of fr. 1–3 of the *Oracles*.⁴¹ But there can be no doubt that naming the Sibyl the “Jewish prophetess” is in no way connected with Theophilus and, most likely, goes back to a direct acquaintance with the third book of the *Oracles*.⁴²

³⁹ See Buitenwerf 2003, 81–82.

⁴⁰ Buitenwerf 2003, 83–84.

⁴¹ *To Autolytus* (shortly after 180 AD) was probably written earlier than the *Protrepticus*, which is dated to approximately AD 195–197; the *Stromateis* date back to AD 194–202 (Hyldahl 2014, 140). Supposed quotations from Theophilus are found in the *Protrepticus* (see the index of quotations in Marcovich 1995), but we cannot tell for certain if Clement knew his writings.

⁴² Clement’s acquaintance with this book is evidenced by quotations in the *Protrepticus* (70. 1): *Syb. Or.* 3. 586–588, 590–594. He also repeatedly quotes passages from fr. 1 and 3 Geffcken: in addition to *Protr.* 71. 1, see *Protr.* 27. 4–5 (fr. 1. 23–25, 27); 62. 1–2 (fr. 3. 29); 77. 2 (fr. 1. 28–35); see also the already mentioned quotations in *Stromateis*: 3. 3. 14. 3: (fr. 1. 1); 5. 14. 108. 6 (fr. 1. 10–13, cf. *Protr.* 71. 2); and 5. 14. 115. 6 (fr. 1. 28, cf. *Protr.* 77. 2). It is usually assumed that Clement was not directly familiar with the *Sibylline Oracles*, but used this collection through some kind of florilegium, in the first place, since he (unlike Lactantius) does not indicate the book numbers of the *Oracles* and since in *Protr.* 74. 6 he erroneously attributes to Orpheus a quote from the *Oracles* (Buitenwerf 2003, 76–77). But neither case excludes the possibility that Clement could use the *Oracles* in some cases directly and in other cases through intermediate sources. His reference to the “Jewish Sibyl” when quoting fr. 1 of the *Oracles* speaks in favour of the fact that he, like Lactantius, knew the entire third book of the *Oracles*.

The Babylonian Sibyl, who speaks from divine inspiration, is also mentioned in the *Exhortation to the Greeks*, which was erroneously attributed to Justin ([Iust.] *Cohort.* 37. 1). This work was written between AD 221 (or 217) and 311–312.⁴³ According to Pseudo-Justin, the Sibyl came from Babylon: she is the daughter of Berossus, who arrived in Campania by unknown means and proclaimed prophecies there, in the city of Cumae. This version is the closest to that reported by Pausanias (see above). Most likely, it penetrated into Christian literature from the pagan tradition and has nothing to do directly with the Jewish Sibyl of Book 3 of the *Oracles*, except for the Babylonian origin of the Sibyl, her resettlement in a pagan environment and identification with the pagan Sibyl. Although Pseudo-Justin knows the verses from fr. 1 and 3 as well as from the third book of the *Oracles*, he either does not know or ignores the version of the Jewish origin of the Sibyl.

Let us summarize. Based on the statements of Lactantius about the Sibyl from Babylon, related to the fragments of the *Oracles* that he traces back to the third book of the collection, we can state with a high degree of certainty that the “Jewish Sibyl” of Clement goes back to the same source. This Sibyl is a prophetess of Jewish origin, a relative of Noah, who settled in Babylon after the flood and then, having moved to Asia Minor, proclaimed prophecies as the Sibyl from Erythrae. The divinely inspired nature of her prophecies is associated with her direct connection with the Jewish people. Other references to the Sibyl in the *Protrepticus* do not contain direct indications of her Jewish origin, but do not contradict it either, since they imply the authority and inspiration of the Sibyl. The same applies to the *Paedagogus*. There is, however, some ambiguity here as to whether the Sibyl belongs to the Jewish or pagan tradition; this is connected, perhaps, with her original duality: for the third book of the *Oracles* she is a Jewish Sibyl by origin, but prophesizing among the gentiles. In the *Stromateis*, Clement often draws on pagan Sibyl information that is not characteristic of earlier writings, but still recognizes the sole authoritative Sibyl that is mentioned in connection with the citation of fr. 1 of the *Oracles* and may therefore refer to the Jewish Sibyl of the third book of this collection.

The ambivalent attitude of Clement towards the Sibyl is associated with his characteristic dependence on sources. Probably, the idea of the Sibyl from the Jewish environment (which is contrary to the prevailing

⁴³ Marcovich 1990, 3–4 (dating between 260 and 302 is probable, but disputable).

views of her as pagan) arose in the third book of the *Oracles of the Sibyls*, in order to elevate the authority of this book over other works of this kind. This came into conflict with the original and prevailing tendency to preach monotheism on behalf of pagan soothsayers: in most such writings, the Sibyl is a pagan prophetess endowed with divine inspiration, whose authority confirms the truth of the Scriptures from afar, as it were, from an autonomous source; the author of Book 3, in contrast, directly connects the Sibyl with biblical tradition. Perhaps Clement was guided by similar considerations, drawing on the image of the “Jewish Sibyl” from Book 3 of the *Oracles*: referring to her, he made it clear that the truth about God was inaccessible to the Greeks. In other cases, speaking of anticipation of the truth by the pagans, he is inclined to prove that it was revealed to them to some extent.

Sophia Golovatskaya
State University of St Petersburg
 st078550@student.spbu.ru
 sofya.golovatskaya@gmail.com

Bibliography

- R. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting*, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 17 (Leiden 2003).
- U. Bultrighini, M. Torelli, *Pausania, Guida della Grecia, Libro X: Delfi e la Focide* (Milan 2017).
- J. J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Montana 1974).
- J. J. Collins, *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture*, *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 100 (Leiden–Boston 2005).
- J. Engberg, “Theophilus”, in: J. Engberg, A.-C. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich (eds.), *In Defence of Christianity: Early Christian Apologists* (Frankfurt am Main 2014) 101–124.
- J. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 23 (= Neue Folge 8), 1 (Leipzig 1902a).
- J. Geffcken, *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig 1902b).
- R. M. Grant, *Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autolycum* (Oxford 1970).
- H. Hitzig, H. Bluemner, *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio* III 2 (Leipzig 1910).
- J. Hyldahl, “Clement of Alexandria: Paganism and its Positive Significance for Christianity”, in: J. Engberg, A.-C. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich (eds.), *In Defence of Christianity: Early Christian Apologists* (Frankfurt am Main 2014) 139–158.
- J. L. Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles: With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books* (Oxford 2007).

- M. Marcovich, *Pseudo-Iustinus. Cohortatio ad Graecos, De Monarchia, Oratio ad Graecos* (Berlin – New York 1990).
- M. Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* (Leiden 1995).
- M. Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus* (Leiden 2002).
- H. Merkel, *Sibyllinen*, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit V, 8 (Gütersloh 1998).
- H. W. Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity* (London 1992).
- E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, eds. G. Vermes et al. 3. 1 (London 2014=1986).
- O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, *Clemens Alexandrinus, Bd. 24–32. Stromata* (Berlin 1985; 1970).
- A. Stanley, D. Potter, “Sibylla”, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford 2012) 1360–1361.
- O. Waßmuth, *Sibyllinische Orakel 1–2. Studien und Kommentar*, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 76 (Leiden 2011).
- N. Zeegers-Vander Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du IIe siècle* (Louvain 1972).

The article examines passage 71. 4 of the *Protrepticus* by Clement of Alexandria, in which the pagan Sibyl is called a “Jewish prophetess”. The passage appears unique, because no other known Christian text before Clement addresses the Sibyl as a Jewish prophetess. Moreover, the “Jewish Sibyl” of the *Protrepticus* contradicts the opinion prevailing among Christian apologists that the Sibyl was a divinely inspired, but still pagan prophetess, the view Clement himself shares in some passages of the *Stromateis*. There was an attempt to explain away this extraordinary idea by supposing that Clement has in view the pagan Sibyl who makes prophecies about Jews (R. Buitenwerf). Other scholars rightly rejected this attempt. It was also proposed, albeit without detailed argumentation, that Clement was influenced by Book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles*, where the Sibyl speaks of herself as a relative of Noah who settled in Babylon after the flood, but later migrated from Babylon to Greece and became known there as the Sibyl from Erythrae in Asia Minor (N. Zeegers-Vander Vorst). By examining various works by Clement as well as texts by ancient and Christian authors, the author of the present paper attempts to endorse this latter proposal. Relying on the statements of Lactantius about the Sibyl from Babylon, which are connected with his quotations of fragments from the *Sibylline Oracles*, attributed by him to the third book, one can infer that fragment 1 of the *Oracles* belonged to the third book in the time of Clement. Therefore, it can be stated with sufficient certainty that Clement’s designation of the Sibyl as a Jewish prophetess in *Protr.* 71. 4, where he quotes just vv. 10–13 of this fragment, goes back to the Sibyl’s characterization of herself as a relative of Noah in Book 3 of the *Oracles*. This also makes it probable that Clement was familiar with this book of the *Oracles* directly, without any mediators.

В статье рассматривается пассаж 71, 4 из *Протретики* Климента Александрийского, в котором языческая Сивилла названа “еврейской пророчицей”. Уникальность этого фрагмента состоит в том, что прямых высказываний христианских авторов о Сивилле как о еврейской пророчице до Климента нам не известно. Более того, еврейская Сивилла *Протретики* противоречит господствующему среди апологетов представлению о Сивилле как боговдохновенной, но все же языческой пророчице. Высказывалось предположение, что Климент имеет в виду не еврейское происхождение Сивиллы, но то, что она пророчествует о евреях, однако оно было справедливо отвергнуто. Предполагалось также, хотя и без развернутой аргументации, что на Климента оказала влияние III книга собрания *Оракулов Сивилл*, в которой Сивилла говорит о себе как о родственнице Ноя, поселившейся после потопа в Вавилоне, но затем переселившейся в Грецию, где она пророчествовала как Сивилла из Эритр в Малой Азии (Н. Зегерс-Фандер Форст). Автор статьи стремится обосновать это второе предположение, исследуя различные произведения Климента, а также тексты античных и христианских авторов. Опираясь на высказывания Лактанция о Сивилле из Вавилона, связанные с цитируемыми им фрагментами *Оракулов*, которые он относит к 3-й книге, можно полагать, что фрагмент I принадлежал 3-й книге во времена Климента. Это позволяет с достаточной уверенностью утверждать, что именование Сивиллы “еврейской пророчицей” в *Protr.* 71, 4, где Климент цитирует как раз ст. 10–13 этого фрагмента, восходит к характеристике Сивиллой себя в 3-й книге *Оракулов* как родственницы Ноя, пришедшей из Вавилона. Это позволяет в свою очередь считать, что Климент был прямо знаком с 3-й книгой, а не пользовался ею через посредников.

S. Douglas Olson

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES ON THE LETTER
LAMBDA IN A NEW GREEK-ENGLISH
DICTIONARY*

I. ΛΑΒΑΡΓΥΡΟΣ – ΛΑΣΘΗ

Comprehensive new lexica of the ancient Greek language rarely appear. This is a consequence of the enormous scale of such projects, on the one hand, and of the extraordinary breadth of learning and intellectual competence required to produce one, on the other. Because expectations are rightly so high – standard lexica must be as wide-ranging, precise, and accurate as possible, since almost all the rest of our work as classicists depends upon them – enormous amounts of secondary effort must also be invested in ensuring that every reference and cross-reference is accurate, that every gloss of a word is true to the original context in which it occurs, that definitions are clear and unambiguous, that translations are clear and idiomatic but also as faithful as possible to the original, and the like. Philological work of this type is in one sense never complete, but goes on constantly across linguistic, political, and cultural boundaries, with new material added to the corpus and new understandings developed of what we already have. But lexica are significant points of inflexion in this process, and their enormous authority and influence depend on the care with which they are constructed, reviewed, and used.

Two generations ago, Robert Renehan published a series of articles expanding, refining, and correcting entries in the 9th edition of the monumental Liddell–Scott–Jones *Greek-English Lexicon* (1940) as supplemented by Barber and his fellow editors (1968).¹ In his Foreward to

* Thanks are due Benjamin Millis, David Sansone and Denis Keyer for comments on earlier drafts of this paper. In addition, I gratefully acknowledge support for my research in 2021–2023 carried out under an agreement for the provision of grants from the federal budget of the Russian Federation in the form of subsidies No. 075-15-2021-571, project “Digital commentaries to classical texts: Greek comedy” (IWL RAS, Moscow, Russia).

¹ Renehan 1968; 1969; 1970; 1971; 1972a; 1972b. These articles were subsequently collected and combined with further, similar contributions in Renehan 1975 (slightly less than three full pages devoted to words beginning with *lambda*). See

the latter work, Renehan acknowledges his enormous respect for LSJ and the manner in which it was produced.² He nonetheless scrutinizes its entries carefully, the implicit thesis being that high-quality intellectual work can not only stand up to such examination, but is strengthened by it, and that the good of the common enterprise requires that weaknesses be identified and corrected. In the end, the general quality of the *Lexicon* is apparent in how seldom Renehan catches outright errors, most of his notes being concerned with adding attestations of words or identifying overlooked senses of them.³ The following notes on the letter *lambda* in the new *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (Leiden–Boston 2015), edited by Franco Montanari and translated into English from the 3rd edition of the Italian version (2013) by a team of scholars associated with Harvard’s Center for Hellenic Studies and led by Gregory Nagy, Leonard Muellner, Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder, are offered in a similar spirit.⁴

also Renehan 1982. A Revised Supplement by P. G. W. Glare and A. A. Thompson was added to the 9th edition of LSJ in 1996; I refer to it in what follows simply as “LSJ Supplement”. The new *Dictionary* seems to take little or no account of the nine pages of the LSJ Supplement devoted to *lambda*, not only ignoring numerous corrections, supplemental citations, and the like, but also omitting from the first two pages alone the following additional lemmata: λαβέλλιον, λάβριχος, λάγγουρος, λαγκίον, λαγυνάριος, λάη, λάθησις, λαίδας, λαϊϊνουργός, λαίω, λακάνιον, λάκες, λάκησις, λακίνιον, λάκκος (B), λακχάινος, λαλαθάνατος, λαλαχός, λαλοῦ, Λαμιώδης, λαμπηροῦχος, λαμυρόω, λαμψανώδης, λανάριος, λάξιον, Λαοδικέων, λαοκρίσιον, Λάπατος, Λαπηθιασταί, λαργιτωνάλια, λαργιτίων, λαργιτιωναλικός, Λασαῖος, λατίδιον.

² “The present collection has arisen, in good part, from a desire to refine my own knowledge of the diction appropriate to each several genre, rather than from a love of lexicography for its own sake. ... And lest there be any misunderstanding, let me state it plainly. *LSJ*, the product of generations of scholarly cooperation and selfless labor, is the most useful aid to Classical Greek lexicography ever published. Were anyone to think that these supplements are offered in a spirit of disrespect for that fine work, no one would be more unhappy than I” (Renehan 1968, 8).

³ Lexica are products of human hands and human minds, and thus inevitably include both errors and misjudgments. How many of the former in particular ought to be regarded as acceptable in e.g. every ten printed pages in a work of such general intellectual significance, is an interesting question. The obvious – if numerically not very precise – answer would seem to be “very few”.

⁴ I have restricted myself to *lambda* because this makes the number of entries, and thus the number of pages in the *Dictionary* (63 out of 2431, approximately 4%), to be covered manageable. There is no reason to think that similar examination of other portions of the work would produce a notably different type or quantity of comments. The appearance of the new *Cambridge Greek Lexicon* allows for an interesting triangulation of perspectives; one hopes that reviewers both inside the

S.v. **λαβάργυρος**, Timo Phliasius is cited – following LSJ s.v. – by the out-dated Wachsmuth number,⁵ rather than as *SH* 792. The word is defined as a noun (“*person who receives or takes money*”) but is in fact an adjective (thus LSJ s.v. “*taking money*”).

λάβαρων/λάβουρον/λάουρον/λάβωρον (glossed “*banner, standard, insignia*”) is merely a Hellenized form of Latin *labarum* – hence the variant spellings – and is expressly identified as such at e.g. Eus. *VC pref.* 1. 31 ὅπερ νῦν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι λάβαρον καλοῦσιν (“which the Romans today refer to as a *labaron*”). Cf. below on **λαβρᾶτον/λαυρᾶτον**.

Λάβδαλον at Th. 6. 97. 5 etc. is not a “*fortress at Syracuse*” but an elevated spot near Syracuse upon which the Athenians constructed a fort (φρουρίον ἐπὶ τῷ Λαβδάλῳ ὠκοδόμησαν).

The **λαβή** of the φορμογραφίς (“needle for stitching rush-mats”) referenced at Aen. Tact. 18. 10 is not the needle’s “*eye*”, as the text of the *Poliorcetica* itself (ἡ δὲ λαβὴ ἦν κοίλη ὥσπερ στυρακίον, “the *labē* was hollow, like the butt-end piece of a spear”) makes clear. Instead, the *λαβή* is the part of the needle that is “taken” by a wooden extension (reducing the amount of metal needed to produce the tool), and the extension presumably contained the eye. As a second meaning, the word is glossed “*hold, grip* in boxing, in wrestling”; delete “in boxing”. The translation of Plu. *Thes.* 5. 4 τὰ γένεια ..., ὡς λαβὴν ταύτην ἐν ταῖς μάχαις οὔσαν προχειροτάτην as “(he thought) that beard offered a very easy hold in battle” (*sic*) is garbled; read “(he ordered his generals to shave the Macedonians’) beards, since this was the most convenient thing to grab hold of in battle”. Pl. *Phdr.* 236 c εἰς τὰς ὁμοίας λαβὰς ἐλήλυθας does not mean “you have come to offer me a similar (foot)hold” but “you have

Press and out will see it as their responsibility to give its entries a similarly close reading. In what follows, bold-face lemmata appear in the *Dictionary*; omission of bold-face signals that the word is not glossed there but ought perhaps to have been. Italicized glosses within quotation marks represent the *Dictionary*’s definition of words (bold-face in the original), as opposed to its comments, clarifications, and the like (italicized in the original). I use LSJ’s abbreviations for authors and works throughout. Occasional references to standard commentaries, etymological handbooks and the like are treated as self-explanatory. References to minor typographical errors and the like in the *Dictionary* are mostly confined to footnotes.

⁵ Omitted – rightly – at p. liv from the list of editions supposedly cited, where *SH* and Diels, *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta* (1901), in which this is fr. 11, are both referenced.

come to equal handholds”, i.e. “you have put yourself as much under my power (*sc.* in our verbal wrestling bout), as I am under yours”. At LXX *Numbers* 4:9 (etc.), λαβίδες – part of the apparatus surrounding sacred lampstands associated with the Ark of the Covenant within the Tabernacle – renders the Hebrew לְהַרְגִּיל, which comes from a root that means “take” (i.e. ~ λαμβάνω). Although translators sometimes render the word “candle snuffers”, there is no obvious reason to do so, and the etymology makes clear that it refers to tongs of some sort, perhaps for holding coals to light wicks, as certainly at LXX *Isaiah* 6:6 καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ εἶχεν ἄνθρακα, ὃν τῇ λαβίδι ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (“and in his hand he held a coal, which he took from the altar with a set of tongs”, Hebrew לְהַרְגִּיל בְּלֶחֶם). This is the same word that appears in the section heading ἐπτὰ λύχνοι, λαβίδες, ἐπαρυστρίδες (“Seven lamps, *labides*, oil-pouring vessels”; from another discussion of the Tabernacle) at Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*⁶ 5.33; the nonsensical λάβρες (not a v.l. but the manuscript reading, corrected by Montfaucon, *PG* 88 col. 209) ought not to have been lemmatized.

At *Mir. Georg.* p. 69. 14 Aufhauser, communion is offered by means of a λαβίς. While the object in question may in fact be a liturgical “spoon”, the term used for it reflects the history of the Mass, in which “tongs” were long used by the priest to offer the communicant the wafer representing the body of Christ.

The text of Pratin. *PMG* 712 b 2–3 = *TrGF* 4 F 6. 6–7 – cited as fr. “5b.2”, from the 19th-century Bergk edition of the lyric poets, following LSJ s.v. – is insecure, with both Page and Snell printing πᾶσιν ἀοιδολαβράκταις (“for all those who are greedy for song”) in verse 2 = 6. Even if Bergk’s ἀοιδὰ λαβράκταις is adopted instead, as in the *Dictionary*, however, the words cannot be taken together and translated “boastful song”.⁷

λαβράκιον and λάβραξ are both glossed “(sea) bass”. The former is formally a diminutive of the latter, but since λαβράκιον appears in appreciative culinary contexts where the fish seems to be of larger than average size (Amphis fr. 35. 2–3 λαβρακίου / τεμάχια, “*labrakion* steaks”;

⁶ A work that combines deep learning with enormous and deliberate ignorance, advocating vigorously in favor of the theory of a flat earth against what the author is well aware was the established general belief in his time that it is a sphere.

⁷ LSJ Supplement calls for deletion of the lemma.

Antiph. fr. 221. 2–3 (A.) τὸ δὲ λαβράκιον; / (B.) ὀπτᾶν ὅλον, “(A.) The *labrakion*? (B.) Roast it whole”), it is most likely hypocoristic (“a nice little sea bass”).

λαβρᾶτον/λαυρᾶτον (glossed “*standard, insignia decorated with laurel*”) is a Hellenized form of Latin *laureatum* (“object decked with laurel, *laurus*”), hence the variation in the spelling. Cf. above on **λάβαρων/λάβουρον/λάουρον/λάβωρον**.

At both Muson. fr. 18b (p. 100. 3 Hense; of lions and pigs) and Ath. 7. 310 f (= Arist. fr. 218 Gigon; of a sea bass), **λαβρότης** (glossed “*avidity, intemperance*”) means specifically “greed” in reference to the voracious consumption of food.

The claim that a **λαβρώνιος** (a drinking vessel of some sort) is “of Persian origin” appears to represent a misunderstanding of Ath. 11. 783 f βατιάκιον, λαβρώνιος, τραγέλαφος, πρίστις· ποτηρίων ὀνόματα. Περσικὴ δὲ φιάλη ἢ βατιάκη (“*batiakion, labrónios, tragelaphos, pristis*: names of cups. The *batiakê* is a Persian libation bowl”; from the *Epitome* and seemingly in origin a gloss on Diph. fr. 81. 1).

Erot. fr. 35 – cited but otherwise ignored – referring to **λαγανίζει** at Hp. *Morb. Sacr.* 13. 12, takes the word to mean χρωματίζει· λάγανον γὰρ εἶδος πλακοῦντος (“gives color to; because a *laganon* is a type of cake”, and specifically one that was fried in oil, meaning that it turned brown as it cooked; cf. s.v. below). The correct reading is γαλινίζει (hence the comment “uncertain significance, perhaps *to have calm winds*”), and the lemma should be struck.

Perhaps a **λάγανον** – some sort of fry-bread (e.g. Matro *SH* 538. 3 = fr. 5. 3 Olson–Sens⁸), mistransliterated *lagana* – was made of honey, as well as of flour and oil, as the *Dictionary* asserts. But there appears to be no ancient evidence to that effect; cf. LSJ s.v. “*a thin broad cake, of meal and oil*”, following the ancient authorities (e.g. Hsch. λ 36). The diminutive **λαγάκιον** (glossed “*small cake*”) at Ath. 14. 648 a (quoting Chrysippus of Tyana’s *Art of Baking*) is actually a sheet of fruit-nut-honey paste used to produce a Cretan cake called a γάστρις.

⁸ Unhelpfully cited as fr. 4 (= the old Brandt number).

Antiph. fr. 39 offers not future tense λαγγάσει but present tense λαγγάζει (glossed “*relax, grow lazy*”). Antiatt. λ 4 (which preserves the fragment) comments ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνδίδωσιν (“in place of ‘relents’”). For the future, cf. A. fr. 112 λογγάσω (seemingly the same verb; no cross reference).

Trapp in the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität* s.v. assembles a number of examples of λαγγάς in Medieval texts that suffice to show that the word is not a “measure of length”, but means “bay” or perhaps “bank (overlooking a body of water), shore”, including at Johannes Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale* 158 ἀπ’ αὐτῶν σημείοις ἕξ, περὶ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης, ὡς ἐπὶ λαγγάδα (“six miles away from them, around the edge of the Dead Sea, as if on a *laggas*”; the location of a monastic community’s garden).

The *scholia* to Lyc. 1333 – fancifully or not – identify the Λάγμος (described as a “river of Pontus”), along with the Ἐρις and the Τήλαμος,⁹ as rivers in Scythia (ὀνόματα ποταμῶν Σκυθίας), i.e. in the vast stretch of territory that lay north and northeast of the Black Sea. When the Amazons leave there, they accordingly cross the Istrus (i.e. the Danube), moving from what is today Romania into Bulgaria in order to invade Greece and avenge the theft of Hippolyte’s belt (Lyc. 1336–1338). Pontus, by contrast, is what is today roughly the eastern half of Turkey’s Black Sea coast (*sc.* on the southern shore of the Black Sea) and was not Scythian territory. The *Dictionary*’s note seems to reflect *inter alia* confusion resulting from the fact that Greek Πόντος can also be used to mean the Black Sea.

Aristotle uses λαγνεία to refer in a seemingly neutral fashion to sexual intercourse at *HA* 575 a 21 in reference to bulls. When he says a few lines earlier ἥκιστα δὲ τῶν ἀρρένων λάγνον ἐστὶ βοῦς (“the bull is the least *lagnos* of male animals”), therefore, he apparently uses the adjective to mean not “*lewd, dissolute*” (as if the animal’s degree of moral culpitude was in question), but simply “motivated to have intercourse”. Cf. the similarly non-judgmental *HA* 575 b 30–31 (both mares and stallions are extremely λάγνοι), 579 a 6 (deer are λάγνοι).

⁹ The Ἐρις is omitted in this sense. The Τήλαμος is described as a “river in the Pontus (perhaps = Tanais)”, i.e. the Don, which exits into the Sea of Azov from the north.

S.v. **λαγχάνω**, *Od.* 5. 311 κ' ἔλαχον κτερέων describes an unreal situation (hence the presence of the modal particle) and thus means not “I shall have obtained funeral honors” but “I would have obtained funeral honors”. D. 30. 34 ἤδη τούτῳ ταυτησὶ τῆς δίκης εἰληγμένης means not “once this man had already been brought to trial” but “when the present suit” – i.e. the one being tried at the moment – “had already been accepted (*sc.* by the relevant magistrate) against this man”. At D. 23. 76 τούτοις ἐνταῦθα λαγχάνεται, the reference is to suits brought before the Prytaneion court against inanimate objects that are responsible for a human being's death, and the text thus means not “the charges are brought against these men” but “he” – i.e. the person pursuing the matter – “institutes proceedings against these objects”.

Individuals who could afford to do so hunted hares in an organized fashion with dogs, nets, and a minimum two-man team to handle the different ends of the operation (e.g. X. *Cyn.* 6). **λαγωβολία** (glossed “*hunt for hares*”; better “hare-hunting”, as in LSJ Supplement) seems to be a much less organized, fundamentally rustic practice, carried out with a boomerang-like stick – the **λαγωβόλον**, glossed “*club for striking hares*” and “*shepherd's staff*”, with reference in the latter case to Theoc. 4. 49, where a throwing stick is clearly in question¹⁰ – by herdsmen who unexpectedly came upon an animal and tried to kill it. Cf. Theoc. *ep.* 2. 3 (a **λαγωβόλον** dedicated to Pan by a cowherd); D. H. 14. 4. 4 οἷα φέρουσι βουκόλοι καὶ νομεῖς ..., οἱ δὲ λαγωβόλα καλοῦντες (“the sort of objects that cowherds and shepherds carry ..., which some refer to as *lagôbola*”). At Leon. *AP* 6. 296. 2 (a fowler's dedication of the tools of his trade to Hermes), the word seems to be used in the form **λαγωβοβόλον** for the same object used for hunting birds.

λαγῶδιον (formally a diminutive of **λαγῶς**) at Ar. *Ach.* 520 is glossed “*leveret*” (i.e. “baby hare”). But this is a list of market-goods being absurdly denounced as contraband imported from enemy territory, and the sense is thus more likely “a simple little *λαγῶς*”.¹¹

¹⁰ αἴθ' ἤς μοι ῥοικόν τι λαγωβόλον, ὥς τυ πάταξα (“If only I had a crooked *lagôbolos*, so I could strike you with it!”). The “crooked club made of wild-olive wood” (ῥοικᾶν ... ἀγριελαίω / ... κορόνῳ) that Lycidas is carrying at Theoc. 7. 18–19 is also a throwing stick (hence its shape), even if it comes to stand in at the end of the poem for the rhapsode's staff offered to Hesiod by the Muses.

¹¹ See Petersen 1910, 237.

λαγῶς (glossed “*pertaining to hares*”) is cited at Ar. *Ach.* 1006 as if the word were somehow used differently from τὰ λαγῶα – glossed “*flesh of hares*”, which would be λαγῶν κρέας, what is said actually being “*chunks of hare-meat*” – at e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 1193. The expression is identical in both cases. So too with Plu. *Mor.* 138 f θριξὶ λαγῶαις (“*hare fur*”), which would better have been cited alongside Hp. *Mul.* 84 λαγωῇσι θριξί.

λαγωφόνος is lemmatized as an adjective but glossed as a noun (“*hare-killer*” rather than “*hare-killing*”), as are **λαθροδάκνος** (glossed “*one who bites in secret*” rather than “*secretly biting*”), **λαθροκακοῦργος** (glossed “*hidden malefactor*” rather than “*one doing evil secretly*”), and **λαθροφάγος** (glossed “*one who eats or is gluttonous secretly*” rather than “*secretly gluttonous*”). **λαθροφονευτής**, on the other hand, is rightly treated as a noun but glossed as an adjective (“*secretly murderous*”).

The point of Posidipp. Com. fr. 28. 9 is that a mercenary commander who looks like Briareus (i.e. a fearsome monster) may turn out to be a **λαγῶς** (normally “*hare*”, but here glossed “*rabbit*”) when the fighting starts. Rabbits create burrows, in which they seek shelter when danger threatens, whereas hares have nests and therefore cower and run – hence the constant references in Greek literature to hunting them with dogs (already at *Il.* 10. 360–362).¹² The latter is the standard characterization of the coward (e.g. Macho 241–243) and must be the animal in question in Posidippus, as well as at D. 18. 263 λαγὼ βίον ἔξης δεδιὼς καὶ τρέμων καὶ ἀεὶ πληγῆσθαι προσδοκῶν (“*you lived the life of a lagōs, afraid and trembling and always expecting to be cudgelled*”) and Str. 1. 2. 30 δειλότερον δὲ λαγὼ Φρυγός (“*more cowardly than a Phrygian hare*”). This is particularly so since rabbits are not native to Greece, but were introduced from Spain;¹³ Strabo accordingly puts them in Iberia (3.

¹² Cf. Timae. *FGrH* 566 F 3 ap. Plb. 12. 3. 7 ὁ δὲ κύνικλος πόρρωθεν μὲν ὁράμενος εἶναι δοκεῖ λαγῶς μικρός, ὅταν δ’ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας λάβῃ τις, μεγάλην ἔχει διαφορὰν ... γίνεται δὲ τὸ πλεῖον μέρος κατὰ γῆς (“*when seen from a distance, the rabbit appears to be a small hare; but when you get one in your hands, there is a considerable difference. It lives by and large underground*”).

¹³ Rabbits are easily domesticated (as hares are not), and part of the process by which they came to Greece can be traced at Posidon. *FGrH* 87 F 61 = fr. 52 Edelstein–Kidd (late 2nd/early 1st century BCE), a reference to an island near Puteoli – on the merchant route from Spain to Italy – that was overrun with rabbits, *sc.* after they escaped from a passing ship (cargo? food supplies?). Cf. Varro *RR* 3. 12. 7 in *Hispania annis ita fuisti multis, ut inde te cuniculos*

2. 6, 3. 53) and refers to them as γεώρυχοι **λαγιδεῖς** (literally “earth-digging leverets” = “baby hares”), in reference to the combination of their diminutive size relative to a hare and their burrowing. κύνικλος/κόνικλος/κούνικλος is a Hellenized version of whatever the Iberians called them, via Latin *cuniculus* (e.g. Varro *RR* 3. 12. 6 *Tertii generis est, quod in Hispania nascitur, similis nostro lepori ex quadam parte, sed humile, quem cuniculum appellant*, “belonging to the third type, which is native to Spain, is the one that in part resembles our hare, but is set lower to the ground, which is referred to as a *cuniculus*”; Gal. VI. 666.10–11 K.; cf. British English *coney*; Italian *coniglio*).

If **λαεργέω** is “work stone”, **λαεργής** is presumably not just “made of stone” (thus also LSJ s.v.) but “made of worked stone”, i.e. “chiseled out of stone” *vel sim*.

λαέρκινον (a *hapax* at Gal. XIV. 72. 8 K.) is treated as a neuter second-declension noun and glossed “*valerian*, used in Pamphylia for καρπήσιον (see)”. What Galen actually says is that there are two varieties of καρπήσιον available in Side in Pamphylia; that one of them is called λαέρκινον, while the other (and superior) sort is called πικρόν; and that both get their name from the mountain where they are harvested (ἐκατέρου δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους ἢ ἐπωνυμία καθ’ ὃ φύεται). λαέρκινον must thus actually be the adjective Λαέρκινος -η -ον (“from Mount Laerkos”) used substantively. Perhaps the other mountain was called Πικρός or the like (originally a word in some indigenous language).¹⁴

persecutos credam (“you were in Spain for so many years, that I am confident that rabbits followed you from there”; 1st century BCE); Catullus 37. 18 (Egnatius is a *cuniculosae Celtiberiae fili*); Plin. *NH* 8. 217–218, who describes how agriculture on the Balearic Islands (off the coast of Spain) was badly damaged by what appear to have been newly introduced rabbits during Augustus’ time. Hegesander of Delphi fr. 42 (*FHG* iv. 421) reports that the island of Astypalaea (in the Dodecanese) was overrun by hares sometime in the middle of the 3rd century BCE, after someone introduced a single pair there. 6000 were supposedly caught in a single year with the use of dogs. This is too early for rabbits in Greece, and dogs are for hunting hares, not rabbits. But the basic ecological phenomenon – introduction of an exotic species that rapidly overwhelms its new home and becomes a pest – is the same in any case. Cf. the proverb ὁ Καρπάθιος τὸν λαγῶ (lit. “The man from Carpathos [nom.] the hare [acc.]”, attested already at Arist. *Rhet.* 1413 a 19 and alluded to by Archilochus (fr. 248), referring to someone who brings ruin upon himself (Zenob. 4. 48).

¹⁴ If so, what Galen wrote must have been not τὸ δὲ ἕτερον τὸ πικρόν but τὸ δὲ ἕτερον Πικρόν.

λάθρη γυῖα βαρύνεται at *Il.* 19. 165 means not “my limbs become heavy” but “his limbs become heavy”, in reference to a man who tries to fight all day long without eating or drinking. **λάθρη** ἐπὶ πύργον κατῖσε at *Hdt.* 4. 79. 5 means not “he secretly brought them on the tower” (*sic*) but “he secretly seated them (< = καθίζω) on top of a tower”.

λαθριδίη at *Orph. A.* 888 ὅτε δὴ Μήδεια λίπεν δόμον Αἰήταο / **λαθριδίη** καὶ νηὸς ἐφ’ ἡμετέρης ἐπελάσθη is described as an “adverbial dative” (glossed “*surreptitiously*”), but is more easily understood as a substantive use of the adjective **λαθριδῖος** with an implied ὁδῶ, “when Medea left Aetes’ house by a clandestine route and approached our ship”.

λαιαί are obscurely glossed “*stones*, used as weights or for other purposes”. As *LSJ* s.v. makes clear, the stones in question are loom weights or weights used to make automata run (in the same way that weights suspended from a chain make a traditional mechanical clock function).

Although *Theognost. Can.* 27. 7 defines **λαῖγμα** (glossed “*temple*”) as τὸ ἱερόν, more expansive notes at *Hsch.* λ 119 λαίγματα· πέμματα. οἱ δὲ σπέρματα. ἱερὰ ἀπάργματα (“*laigmata*: cakes. Others (take the word to mean) seeds. Sacred first-fruits”), *Phot.* λ 19 λ†άγ†ματα· ἱερὰ ἀπάργματα (“*l†ag†mata*: sacred first-fruits”), and *Zon.* p. 1288. 3 **λαῖγμα**. τὸ ἱερόν θῦμα (“*laigma*: a sacred offering”) show that what is meant there is “sacred object”, i.e. “offering”.

λαίθαργος (glossed “*wicked, insidious*”) is cited from a mock oracle at *Ar. Eq.* 1068, but is attested already at *Hippon.* fr. 66 West², as well as at *S.* fr. 885. The word is used all three times in an unfavorable fashion of a dog, and *Suet. Blasph.* 4. 52 claims that it means specifically **λαθροδέκτης** (lit. “that bites secretly”, i.e. “that bites without warning”). The lines from *Aristophanes* (**λαίθαργον**, **ταχύπουν**, **δολίαν κερδῶ**, **πολύιδριν**, “*laithargos*, fast-footed, a treacherous fox, cunning”) and *Sophocles* (**σαίνεις δάκνουσα καὶ κύων λαίθαργος εἶ**, “you wag your tail as you bite, and you are a *laithargos* dog”) count strongly against the attempt to assimilate the adjective to **λήθαργος** (“lazy, slow, forgetful”).

λαϊκάζω is “*practice fellatio*” (*Ar. Eq.* 167 (passive); *Th.* 57) but not “*irrumate*”, which means to force another person to perform fellatio on

oneself.¹⁵ A **λαικαστής** is accordingly not a “prostitute” but “a man who gives blow jobs”, while a **λαικάστρια** is not a “prostitute” but “a woman who gives blow jobs” (esp. Pherecr. fr. 159 (A.) δώσει δέ σοι γυναῖκας ἑπτὰ Λεσβίδας. / (B.) καλόν γε δῶρον ἔπ’ ἔχειν λαικαστρίας, “(A.) He’ll give you seven Lesbian women. (B.) That’s a nice gift, to have seven *laikastriai*”; see below on **Λεσβιάζω**). The Pherecrates fragment (omitted) is probably earlier than Ar. *Ach.* 529, 537, and note also *IG* I³ 1402. 3–5 Πολυτίμη : λαικ[άσ]τ[ρια] (“Polytime is a *laikastrai*”; from Piraeus, c. 450 BCE).¹⁶ By extension, the middle voice of the verb – a distinction ignored by the *Dictionary* – is used in impolite colloquial speech to mean in the first person “Suck me!” (Cephsid. fr. 3. 5 λαικάσομ’ ἄρα; not “I’d even prostitute myself”) and in the second person, sometimes – but despite the *Dictionary*, not necessarily – in combination with a supplemental participle, in a sense ~ English “fuck off” (Men. *Dysc.* 892 οὐ λαικάσει φλυαρῶν; lit. “Suck me with your chattering!”, i.e. ~ “Fuck off with your chattering, Stop fucking chattering!”, blandly translated “Will you stop talking nonsense?”), ignoring the idiomatic use of οὐ + future = imperative; Strato Com. fr. 1. 36–37 οὐχὶ λαικάσει¹⁷ / ἔρεῖς σαφέστερόν θ’; lit. “Suck me and say more clearly!”, i.e. ~ “Fucking say more clearly!”).

λαῖλαψ is glossed “gale, storm, hurricane” (following LSJ s.v. “furious storm, hurricane”), while **λαίλαπίζω** is glossed “devastate by a hurricane”. But a hurricane is specifically an enormous, rotating, multi-day ocean storm, of a type the Greeks were unfamiliar with, and the noun – poetic – seems to mean simply “gale, windstorm” (with no suggestion of rotation, except that Arist. *Meteor.* 395 a 7 unexpectedly treats it as something like a technical term for “tornado, whirlwind”).

Λαιμοκύκλωψ is not “the sender of the Letters of Alkiphron” but the supposed author (a parasite) of Alciph. 3. 15 only.

λαιμοπέδη – literally “neck-shackler” – means “dog collar” at Leon. *AP* 6. 35. 6 (in reference specifically to a choke collar), but is glossed “trap for birds” at Archias *AP* 6. 16. 2–4 (a dedication to Pan by three brothers

¹⁵ The *irrumator praetor* at Catullus 10. 12–13 does not offer blow jobs, but figuratively requires others to offer them to him. See in general Jocelyn 1980; Bain 1991, 74–77.

¹⁶ *IG* IV 313. 3 (cited as an early attestation of the word) reads simply Λα.[– –]. Whether the word is to be restored is λα[ικάστρια], is anyone’s guess.

¹⁷ Kassel–Austin insert an impossible comma at this point in the text.

with different occupations, one of whom offers πετηνῶν / λαιμοπέδας). LSJ s.v. λαιμοπέδη II glosses the word “*springe*”, i.e. “noose”, at Antip. *AP* 6. 109. 8 ἄρκυν τε κλαγερῶν λαιμοπέδαν γεράνων (“a net for catching clamorous cranes by the neck”), where it seems to function as an adjective, and a noose-trap of the sort used for walking birds may well be in question there. In the Archias poem, on the other hand, “*laimopedai* for birds” are presented along with nets for hunting game (δίκτυα ... θηρῶν) and catching fish (εἰναλίφοιτα λίνα) as three examples of λινιστασίη (“net-setting”), and are said to be placed “among thickets” (κατὰ δρυόχους), while in a separate version of the same dedication at Arch. *AP* 6. 179. 4 they are described as δειραχθὲς ἐϋβροχον ἄμμα πετανῶν (“an effectively noosing knot, heavy on the neck,¹⁸ used for birds”). In the Archias poem at least, therefore, these appear to be mist nets (νεφέλαι; cf. Ar. *Av.* 194), into which birds fly or are driven and then choke to death, like the unfaithful maid-servants at *Od.* 22. 468–469, who are executed by hanging ὡς δ’ ὅτ’ ἂν ἥ κίχλαι τανυσίπτεροι ἢ ἐπέλειαι / ἔρκει ἐνιπλήξωσι, τό θ’ ἐστήκη ἐνὶ θάμνῳ (“as when long-winged thrushes or doves become caught in a netting that someone sets up in a thicket”). Cf. S. fr. 431 κάτω κρέμονται, σίζα τὼς ἐν ἔρκεσιν (“they hang down, like chaffinches in netting”).

λαῖφος (poetic; no etymology) at *Od.* 13. 399, 20. 206 is glossed “*ragged or threadbare garment*”; cf. LSJ s.v. “*shabby, tattered garment*”. But all the word obviously means in the two Homeric passages is “piece of cloth, garment” (cf. LSJ Supplement s.v. “*blanket or sim., used as a cloak*”), the negative sense being added by the context (λαῖφος / ... ὃ κεν στυγέησιν ἰδὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔχοντα, “a *laiphos* which would cause revulsion in anyone who saw you wearing it”, in the former case, and τοιάδε λαίφε’, “*laiphea* such as these”, in the latter). This helps explain the fact that the word is used elsewhere of the sail of a ship (e.g. *hAp.* 406; *A. Supp.* 723), a baby’s swaddling cloths (*hHerm.* 152), and by extension the pelt of a lynx (*hHom.* 19. 23), all instances in which the idea of being shabby or tattered would seem odd or inappropriate.

Despite LSJ s.v. “probably *bird-cherry*, *Prunus avium*” – seemingly a garbled reference to *Prunus cerasus*, what an American would call a “sour cherry” or “pie cherry”, the fruit of which is a κερασός (whence English “cherry”) – there is no obvious reason to believe that the **λακάρα** or **λακάρη** mentioned at Thphr. *HP* 3. 3. 1, 3. 6. 1 is a “cherry tree” of

¹⁸ Better Brunck’s δειραγχές, “neck-strangling”.

any sort. Herodian, *Grammatici Graeci* III. 2 p. 542. 3 and Hesychius λ 181 know only that it is δένδρον τι, “a tree of some kind”. The manuscripts of Theophrastus offer **λακάθη** (specifically described by LSJ s.v. as a “f.l.”) and πευκάρα (not “λευκάρα”) as variants, while Hesychius offers λακάρτη. Only the first of these is lemmatized, and it too would better have been omitted.

λακαταπύγων (an abusive nonce-word at Ar. *Ach.* 664) means not “incorrigible pederast” but “incorrigible pathic”; Elmsley took it for a blend of λακκόπρωκτος and καταπύγων.¹⁹ **λακκαταπύγων**, by contrast, is not a Greek word nor even a manuscript variant in *Acharnians*, and the lemma should be struck.

Λακεδαιμονιάζω (Ar. fr. 97) is merely a comic nonce-form of **Λακωνίζω**, and like it means not “take the side of Sparta” but more broadly “act like a Spartan, play the Spartan”, like e.g. Αἰγυπτιάζω (“play the Egyptian”), Κορινθιάζω (“play the Corinthian”), and Λεσβιάζω (below).²⁰

λακερός (a *hapax* at Hsch. λ 188) is glossed εἰκάϊον there, which would appear to mean “random, purposeless” rather than “common, vulgar”. What **λακέρυζα** (glossed “shouting”; cf. LSJ s.v., treating the word as a noun, “one that screams or cries”) means and whether it is < λακερός (as asserted in the *Dictionary*) is unclear;²¹ LSJ s.v. takes both words and their cognates to be < λάσκω (“cry out, scream”). But the uses of λακέρυζα at Stesich. *PMG* 209 col. i. 9; Ar. *Av.* 609; and A. *R.* 3. 929 are all deliberate, specific echoes of Hes. *Op.* 757 λακέρυζα κορώνη, and it is tempting to think the phrase rapidly came to mean in the first instance simply “a raven of the Hesiodic sort”.

Despite the slight variation in spelling, it is difficult to believe that the **Λακετανῶν** ἔθνος (glossed “*Lacetani*, Spanish people”) mentioned at

¹⁹ The word is traditionally explained as beginning with an ill-attested emphatic particle λα. Gavrilov 1999 [А. К. Гаврилов, “λα ἐπιτατικόν”, in: *Linguistica et philologica. Сборник статей к 75-летию проф. Юрия Владимировича Откупникова*] argues that the particle is merely a product of ancient scholarly etymologizing.

²⁰ S.v. **Λακεδαίμων**, read not “*Lakedaimonia*” but “*Lakedaimon*”, and add “i.e. Sparta” *vel sim.*

²¹ S.v. **λακερύζω**, read [λακερός] for [λακερόν].

Plu. *Cat. Ma.* 11. 2 (defeated and brutalized by Cato the Elder at the end of his campaign in the mid-190s BCE) should not be taken to come from the **Λακητανία** to which Sextus withdrew from Corduba (in Baetica) in 44 BCE (D. C. 45. 10. 1). Why the *Dictionary* locates the latter area “near the Pyrenees” is unclear, since it ought in any case to be at precisely the other end of Hispania Citerior.

λακίς (glossed “*tear, rip*”; poetic) is attested already at Alc. fr. 208 a 8, at least a century before A. *Pers.* 125; *Supp.* 120, etc. The basic sense of Ar. *Ach.* 423 **λακίδας αἰτεῖται πέπλων** is “he asks for tattered clothes”, but the Greek actually says “he asks for rents of garments”, a bit of high-style blather put in the mouth of the comic Euripides; cf. **πέπλων λακίσματ(α)** at E. *Tr.* 497 a decade later and **ἐν τεύτλου λακιστοῖς κρύπτεται στεγάσμασιν** (“hidden in lacerated coverings of beet”, i.e. “in grated beet-root”) in a mock-dithyrambic description of the handling of a slice of tuna at Antiph. fr. 179. 2. At Luc. *Pisc.* 2, **λακιστὸν ἐν πέτραισιν εὐρέσθαι μόρον** is expressly presented as a version of the fate of Pentheus or Orpheus (**καθάπερ τινὰ Πενθέα ἢ Ὀρφέα**), and the words thus mean not “to meet his death smashed against the rocks” but “to meet his fate torn to shreds among the rocky places” (= adesp. tr. fr. 291).

πρωκτός is a crude colloquial term (“asshole”, not “*anus*”),²² and a **λακκόπρωκτος** – glossed “*who has an ass like a cistern*” – is accordingly more precisely someone “who has an asshole like a cistern”, i.e. a sexually passive man who has been used many times and hard by other men; first attested at *Agora* XXI C 23. 1 (a generation or two before Aristophanes). The word does not mean “*inveterate pederast*”, i.e. someone who has active sex with boys as often as possible. Likewise, **λακκοπρωκτία** is properly not “*passive pederasty*”, but “the practice of letting other men convert one’s asshole into a cistern”, although in the sole attestation of the word, at Eup. fr. 385. 4, it is used figuratively to mean ~ “disgusting behavior”. See below on **λάκκος**.

λάκκος is variously glossed “*pond*, as breeding ground for aquatic birds”, “*pit, well*”, and “*cistern, reservoir*”. At least in the 5th and 4th centuries (when it is common), the word never means “*well*” and is instead consistently an artificial pit used to store water or other liquids, i.e. a “*cistern*”, seemingly a standard feature of any free-standing house or

²² Cf. Part II s.v. **λευκόπρωκτος**.

farmstead (e.g. D. 29. 3; Aeschin. 1. 84). That ducks and the like could be raised in a *λάκκος* if necessary (Hdt. 7. 119. 2) does not suggest that the word means “pond”.²³

The manuscripts of Aristophanes and Hesychius agree on *Λακρατίδη* (dative) at Ar. *Ach.* 220. Bentley corrected to *Λακρατεΐδη*, which is the proper form of the name; see *LGPN* II. This is a trivial error, and there is no point in lemmatizing it. If it was to be lemmatized, however, it should have been described as as a f.l., with a cross-reference to the proper spelling, which should also have been given a lemma.

Λάκων (normally “Spartan”) is glossed “point in a game of dice” at Eub. fr. 57. 3. Plural *Λάκωνες* there is actually a “throw of dice” (thus LSJ s.v.), i.e. a combination of values that somehow suggested “Spartans”.²⁴ A *λάμπων* is another such throw.

For *λαλάζω* (cited at Anacr. *PMG* 427. 2, of a person compared to the surf), glossed “babble, prattle, make noise”, note also Call. fr. 191. 11 (of an old man talking blasphemous nonsense); onomatopoeic (“go la-la-la”, i.e. “blah-blah-blah”).

λαλέω is attested already at Cratin. fr. 6. 3 οὐ μέντοι παρὰ κωφὸν ὁ τυφλὸς ἔοικε λαλῆσαι (“the blind man does not appear, however, to be speaking to the deaf man”), which is obscure but seems to be proverbial a theater-generation before Aristophanes; note also Pherecr. fr. 2. 3 (also ignored). Thphr. *Char.* 24. 8 ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς πορευόμενος μὴ λαλεῖν τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι is translated “do not speak with those you encounter on your way”, as if this were an imperatival infinitive, but actually means “(the proud man is the sort of person) not to speak with those he encounters in the streets”. Neither Ar. *Lys.* 627 λαλεῖν ... χαλκῆς πέρι nor Men. *Dysc.* 797 περὶ χρημάτων λαλεῖς is an example of the verb used with ὑπέρ + gen. to mean “speak about something” (cf. Men. *Mis.* 791 Arnott, where ὑπὲρ ταύτης λαλεῖς; means “Are you speaking on her behalf?, Are you taking her side?”). For the construction with περί, note already Pherecr. 2. 3 λαλεῖτε περὶ σισυμβρίων κοσμοσανδάλων τε. Although *λαλέω* πρὸς + acc. is treated as a New Testament construction, it is attested already at

²³ The word is carefully discussed in LSJ Supplement s.v., which glosses “*pit, tank, cistern, vat* used for storing water, wine, or other things”.

²⁴ S.v. *Λακωνικός*, for “Spartan conciseness” as a gloss of βραχυλογία *Λακωνική* at Pl. *Prt.* 343 b, read “Spartan concision”.

e.g. Ar. *Pax* 538 πρὸς ἀλλήλας λαλοῦσιν. For the verb + acc. of the thing discussed + dat. of the person spoken to, cited from Philo of Alexandria, note already e.g. Ar. *Ec.* 16 ταῦτα συνδρῶν οὐ λαλεῖς τοῖς πλησίον (where the acc. pl. is to be taken with both the participle and the main verb).²⁵ At Theoc. 20. 29 αὐτῷ λαλέω and Arist. *Aud.* 801 a 29 διὰ τούτων λαλῇ, the verb means not “*play* an instrument” but “*produce* a sound, *produce* music” + dat. of means or a prepositional phrase, respectively.

λάλημα is “*chatter*”, but **λάλησις** (Ar. fr. 949; note also A. fr. dub. 485; S. fr. **1130. 16) is the equivalent of a gerund – i.e. it refers to the action itself, not the result it produces – and ought therefore to be not “*chatter*” again but “*chattering*”. Cf. **λάμψις** (< λάμπω), which means not “*shine*” but “*shining*”.

λαλητέος is a verbal adjective and thus means not “*that which must be spoken of*” (as if the word were a noun) but “*which must be discussed*”. The form might better have been included under the lemma **λαλέω**.

λαλητικός (a comic nonce-word at Ar. *Eq.* 1381) is glossed “*chatty*”, but means instead “*acquainted with chatting, well-versed in chatting*”, hence the -ικός ending. As the context makes clear, it is intended to poke fun at what appears to have been a fashion among aspiring contemporary intellectuals for coining such words.²⁶

“*Chatter*” is loose, pointless talk, “*talkativeness*” a tendency to indulge in it. **λαλιά** at Aeschin. 2. 49 ἀποδιατρίβωσι τὴν ὑπερόριον λαλιὰν ἀγαπῶντες ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις πράγμασιν (“they are wasting time in regard to domestic affairs by indulging in chatter about external matters”) has the former sense, not the latter.

λαλοβαρυναμελορρυθμοβάταν is the reading of the *Epitome* manuscripts at Ath. 14. 671 e = Pratin. *PMG* 708. 12. This is metrically impossible, and the lemma should be deleted. A (the *codex unicus* of the full text) offers instead †λαλοβαρυναμελορρυθμοβάταν†, which

²⁵ θεῖῳ πνεύματι λαλήσαντες (“speaking with a divine spirit” or “with divine inspiration”) at Justin. *Dial.* 7. 1 is a simple dative of means unconnected with the peculiarities of the proper use and meaning of λαλέω and ought accordingly not to have been included here. The same is true of e.g. the garbled “ἐν or ἀπό + gen. λανθάνω ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν τινοῦς” s.v. **λανθάνω**.

²⁶ See Peppler 1910; Dover 1968 on Ar. *Nu.* 15, 318.

Bergk emended to **λαλοβαρύο(πα)** παραμελορυθμοβάταν (printed by Page). Despite LSJ (followed by the *Dictionary*), this is not comedy but dithyramb (or perhaps satyr play).

λαλίστατος, the superlative form of **λαλός**, is attested already at E. *Cyc.* 315, while the comparative form **λαλίστερος** is attested already at Ar. *Ra.* 91, in both cases over a century before Menander (frr. 129. 1 and 309, respectively).

S.v. **λαμβάνω**, S. *Ph.* 675 σε ξυμπαραστάτην λαβεῖν (“to take you as an ally”²⁷) is not appropriately described as an example of the verb used “with two accusatives”: σε is in apposition to ξυμπαραστάτην. The same is true of the various examples of expressions such as “to take as one’s wife” cited from the *Septuagint*. Expressions such as ὁρμήν λαμβάνω (~ “set forth”), πείραν λαμβάνω (~ “attempt”), and ἀρχὴν λαμβάνω (~ “begin”), meanwhile, are examples not of “abstract objects” (*sic*), but of internal accusatives. A. *Pers.* 366 κνέφας δὲ τέμενος αἰθέρος λάβη means not “(when) darkness had overtaken the sacred precinct of the ether” but “(when) darkness overtakes etc.” Ar. *Nu.* 1123 λαμβάνων οὔτ’ οἶνον οὔτ’ ἄλλ’ οὐδὲν ἐκ τοῦ χωρίου (a threat directed at anyone who fails to support the chorus and their playwright in the contest) means not “not obtaining wine or any other product from the region” but “not obtaining wine or any other product from his farm”, while Ar. *Pax* 1253 λάβοιμ’ ἂν αὐτ’ ... ἑκατὸν τῆς δραχμῆς means not “I could have a hundred of them for a drachma” but “I would buy them at a hundred per drachma”. LXX *Prov.* 11:21 ὁ δὲ σπείρων δικαιοσύνην λήμψεται μισθὸν πιστόν means not “He who sows righteousness will obtain his just desserts” but “He who sows righteousness will get a reliable wage”, i.e. “can be certain he will be rewarded for his efforts”. Th. 4. 69. 2 αἱ οἰκίαι ... ἐπάλξεις λαμβάνουσαι (“the houses, which had battlements added to them”) is obscurely described as an example of “subject of thing” (*sic*); this seems to mean that the subject of the verb in the sense “receive, have, accept, admit” need not always be a person (an uncontroversial point). X. *Cyr.* 1. 4. 3 (ὅσοι νέοι ὄντες) μέγεθος ἔλαβον is obscurely glossed “(the kids) have grown”; the Greek means “those who were still young but reached adult stature physically”. The text at E. *Ba.* 1312 reads not δίκην ... ἄξιαν ἐλάμβανε but δίκην ... ἄξιαν ἐλάμβανε, and the sense is not “he was punished as he deserved” but “you extracted a just punishment (for any slight)”.

²⁷ Not “as a savior”.

Jesus' supposed ancestor **Λάμεχ** is not just mentioned at *Luke* 3:36, but also appears at *LXX Gen.* 4:18–26 and elsewhere as a son of Methusaleh who lived to be 777.

Λαμία is not precisely a “monster who fed on human flesh” but a Libyan queen who lost her own children as a result of Hera’s wrath and (transformed into a bogey monster) began to snatch and kill the children of others; see Biles–Olson on *Ar. V.* 1035.

[λανπάδαρχ]οι is probably to be restored already at *IG* I³ 83. 33 (421/0 BCE); note also [τὲ]ν λανπαδ[εδρομίαν or λαμπαδο[δρομίαν in line 32 = *SEG* XXV 35. 32 (following LSJ s.v., cited s.v. **λαμπαδηδρομία** – glossed “torch race” – only from *Σ Ar. Ra.* 131). The spelling with *nu* – very common in inscriptions – is ignored. **λαμπαδαρχία** at [Arist.] *Plt.* 1309 a 19 is glossed “superintendence of the torch race”; better “service as **λαμπαδάρχης**” (a liturgy) *vel sim.* Cf. [Arist.] *Rhet. Al.* 1437 b 2, where a young man speaking in public justifies his willingness to do so because the matter involves λαμπαδαρχία. **λαμπαδιστής** is glossed “torchbearer” with reference to *D. L.* 9. 62, where it must mean instead “torch-race competitors” (and thus refers to a description of a victory monument). For the word in the same sense several generations earlier, *FD* III 3: 328. 10, 17 (160/59 BCE), and note e.g. *IG* XI, 2 531. 26 παῖδας λαμπαδιστάς (late 1st BCE / early 1st CE). **λαμπαδηφόρος** at *A. Ag.* 312 and *Ar. fr.* 459 is glossed “torchbearer”; in both cases, the reference is actually to a participant in a torch-race (called **λαμπαδηφορία** at *Hdt.* 8. 98. 2); cf. *IG* II² 1250 (a honorary decree for the tribal gymnasiarch associated with what must be a successful torch-race team repeatedly referred to as λαμπαδηφόροι; post 350 BCE); 2311. 77 (a prize-catalogue for the Panathenaic Games, referring to the tribal victor in the torch race as λαμπαδηφόρῳ νικῶντι; 400–350 BCE). So too at *Σ Ar. Ra.* 1087, **λαμπαδουχικός** ἄγών – oddly translated “competition of the torches” – refers to a festival “pertaining to a torchbearer” only to the extent that a participant in a torch-race can be called a “torch-bearer”. At *Σ Ar. Ra.* 131, the reference is similarly to the torch-race (here called the λαμπαδοῦχος ἄγών), and **λαμπαδίζω** there means “participate in the torch race” not “participate in the procession of torches”.

At *Pl. R.* 328 a, the reference is to a novel horseback relay race in honor of the goddess Bendis, and **λαμπάδιον** means “something like a torch”²⁸ –

²⁸ Petersen 1910, 112.

the point is that this resembles a normal torch-race, but on horseback, clearly with appropriate adaptations – rather than “*small lamp, torch*”. At Ar. *Ach.* 1177 λαμπάδιον περὶ τὸ σφυρόν (“a *lampadion* about his ankle”; part of the medical attention to be given to the wounded Lamachus), λαμπάδιον means not “gauze, swab” but “bandage” *vel sim.*; see Olson *ad loc.* Poll. 4. 151 mentions a theatrical mask for a young woman called a λαμπάδιον (this sense ignored), which got its name from the fact that the word was also used for a hair-style that involved arranging the hair so that it ended in a point (ιδέα τριχῶν πλέγματός ἐστιν εἰς ὃς ἂν ἀπολήγοντος), i.e. apparently so that it resembled the wick of a lamp sticking out of the funnel.

Pi. N. 7. 66 ὄμματι δέркоμαι λαμπρόν is an example not of an “adverbial neuter” but of an internal accusative used adverbially (“I cast a bright (glance) with my eye”, i.e. “I glance brightly with my eye”). λαμπρὰ κηρύσσει at E. *Heracl.* 864 is also an internal accusative (“he proclaims clear (proclamations)”, i.e. “he proclaims clearly”), as is λαμπρὸν ἀνωλόλυξε²⁹ at Plu. *Mor.* 258 b. λαμπροὶ γάμοι at Euangel. fr. 1. 3 are not “magnificent weddings” but “magnificent wedding celebrations, magnificent wedding feasts”. Th. 8. 75. 2 λαμπρῶς ἦδη ἐς δημοκρατίαν βουλόμενοι μεταστῆσαι τὰ ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ does not mean “openly willing to transform the constitution of Samos into a democracy”; the reference is to the situation in the Athenian fleet stationed at Samos, which had up to this point been dominated by the city’s oligarchic faction, but is now taken over by the democrats.

Eust. p. 391. 24 = I. 616. 25 describes Iris not as λαμπρόχρους (glossed “*shining, bright*”) but as λαμπρόχρους (lit. “with brilliant skin”, Iris being the rainbow incarnate).³⁰

ἵππον λαμπρύνειν at X. *Hipp.* 10. 1 (what some people think they accomplish by pulling at the bridle, whipping the animal, and the like) means “*make splendid*” (i.e. “make look splendid”), but not “*make proud*” (the feelings of the horse not being in question).

²⁹ Not λαμπρὸς ἀνωλόλυξε. Note that at Ar. *Eq.* 430 λαμπρὸς ἦδη καὶ μέγας καθιεῖς refers not to Cleon but to the Paphlagonian (who is merely an onstage avatar of Cleon).

³⁰ The error has been taken over from the Italian edition, despite the notice of it at *WiP* (De Gruyter’s online *Words in Progress*) s.v.

Although **λαμπτηροκλέπτης** at Lyc. 846 means literally “*lamp thief* (epithet of Perseus)”, the scholia *ad loc.* make clear that the point is that Perseus stole the one eye (figurative “lamp”) the Gorgons shared in common, allowing him to escape after he beheaded Medusa.

λαμπτηρουχία (obscurely glossed “*holding a torch*: -ίαι signal fires”) at A. Ag. 890 is an abstract noun that means “maintenance of fires” in reference to the beacon-system Clytemnestra set up to relay news home from Troy.

That a **λαμπυρίς** is specifically a “*firefly*” is made clear at Cyran. 3. 26 **λαμπυρίς** σκόληξ ἐστὶ πτερωτός, τῷ θέρει ἰπτάμενος· καὶ λάμπει ὥσπερ ἀστήρ τὴν νύκτα. ἔχει δὲ ἐν τῷ σφυγκτῆρι τὴν λαμπάδα (“a *lampyris* is a winged worm that takes to flight in the summer, and it shines like a star during the night. It has its light in its aperture”, presumably meaning that it can make it blink on and off).

S.v. **λάμπω**, the general sense of Il. 13. 474 ὀφθαλμῷ δ’ ἄρα οἱ πυρὶ λάμπετον is “his eyes send forth flashes of light”, but what the Greek actually says is “his two eyes flash with fire”. At S. Ant. 1007 Ἥφαιστος οὐκ ἔλαμπεν, on the other hand, the literal sense is “Hephaestus did not shine forth”, but the sense intended is “the fire did not catch”.

S.v. **λανθάνω**, Th. 4. 32. 1 λαθόντες τὴν ἀπόβασιν (described “with acc. of relation” and translated “their landing having been unobserved”) and E. IA 516 λάθοιμι τοῦτ’ ἄν (described “with neuter pronoun” and translated “I might go unobserved in this”) are treated as different constructions. Both are simply accusatives of respect (“unobserved in regard to their disembarking” and “unobserved in regard to this”, respectively). Hp. Aer. 2 οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸν λανθάνοι means not “he will not be unaware” but “he would not be unaware”. Ar. Eq. 465 οὐκ οὔν μ’ ... οἷα πράττεις λανθάνει means not “what you are doing does not escape me” but “the sort of things you are doing does not escape me”.

λάξις is used at Hdt. 4. 21 to refer to the territory belonging to individual barbarian peoples; that the word is < λαγχάνω (“get by lot” = LSJ s.v. I but also simply “come to have possession of” = LSJ s.v. V, cf. II, IV) leaves no doubt that the basic sense is not “*plot of land, territory*” but ~ “*portion (of land) that falls under one’s control*”. Cf. Miletus I, 3 133. 36–37 μοίρης λάξις (cult regulations having to do with the distribution of sacrificial meat; 5th c. BCE).

If the sense of the second word in S. fr. **212.6 κοινόθακα λάξοα (lyric, hence the Doric forms) is “*sculpted from stone*” or “*hewn from stone*” (LSJ s.v.), the accent ought to be on the first element, i.e. λάξοος, not **λαξόος** = “stonecutter”, as at Timo *SH* 799. 1, of Socrates (ignored). Cf. λαοδόκος (an adjective, but glossed as a noun, “*one who greets the people*”; rightly LSJ s.v. “*receiving the people*”), not **λαόδοκος**.³¹ Α θήκη is a “*tomb, sepulchre*” (cf. LSJ s.v. “*grave, tomb*”), and κοινόθηκος ought accordingly to mean “connected with burials”, i.e. with ancestral tombs or the like (thus LSJ Supp. s.v.) not “*of a common seat*”. In that case, λάξοος must refer not to sculpting a statue or the like but to hewing a burial cave out of living rock.

Menander Rhetor p. 359. 26, 31 is our only source for **λαοκρατέομαι** (glossed “*be subject to government by the people*”) and **λαοκρατία** (glossed “*government by the people*”). But he says expressly that these words have a negative coloring closer to “*mob-rule*” (thus LSJ s.v.) and that one would refer to such a situation as a δημοκρατία only as part of an effort to flatter.

Hsch. ο 1350 uses **λαοξοϊκός** to mean not “*of carved stone*” but “*having to do with stone-cutting*” (ὄρυξ· λαοξοϊκὸν σκεῦος, “pick: a stone-cutting implement”).

S.v. **λαός**, the Athenian public announcement formula ἀκούετε λεῷ (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1000) is misunderstood as meaning “to the people: listen!”, as if λεῷ were a dative singular rather than a nominative plural of the Attic declension serving as a vocative (“People – listen!”). Cf. Ar. *Pax* 298 δεῦρ’ ἴτ’, ὦ πάντες λεῷ; *An.* 1275 οἱ πάντες λεῷ.

τρέφω is not simply “feed” but “nourish, maintain, support, care for” generally, and **λαοτρόφος** (decorative Pindaric vocabulary) is therefore not simply “*that feeds the people*” but “*that tends the people, cares for the people*”.

λαοφόρος is “*bearing people*” (LSJ s.v.), i.e. “*traffic-bearing*” (of roads), and thus only by extension “*busy*”.

³¹ The second element in the word is not δόκος but δέχομαι.

λαπίζω at S. fr. 1062 is supposed to mean **συρίζω** (lit. “play the Pan-pipe”; thus Eustathius, citing Aristophanes of Byzantium). How and when the verb came to mean “*boast, brag*” (as at Cic. *Att.* 9. 13. 4 = 180. 4 Shackleton Bailey) is unclear.

Agatharchides (101) – the only author other than Strabo to use **λάβριμναν/λάβριμνον** (some type of frankincense, meaning the resinous gum of an Arabian tree) and a few hundred years earlier than him – tells us specifically that this was not a Greek word but an Arabic one (**ἀραβιστὶ δὲ λέγεται λάβριμναν**), i.e. it was the word Arab traders used for the substance, having themselves apparently taken it over from whatever people sold it to them.

Λαρισσοποιός is a nonce-word at [Arist.] *Plt.* 1275 b 30: in response to a logical puzzle having to do with how hereditary citizenship is created (since the first group of people to enjoy it *cannot* have inherited it), Gorgias half-seriously suggests that just as there are ὄλμοι (“mortars”) because there are ὀλμοποιοί (“mortar-makers”), so there can only be Λαρισαῖοι (“citizens of Larissa”) because there are Λαρισσοποιοί (glossed “*Larissa-makers*”, but the sense intended is “makers of citizens of Larissa”).³²

Although the *hapax* **λαρκίδιον** (glossed “*a small basket, hamper for coal*”³³) at Ar. *Ach.* 340 is formally a diminutive of **λάρκος** (some type of transport basket), this is actually a wheedling hypocoristic (“dear little basket”) applied to the same object referred to as a λάρκος by the same speaker at 333.

λαρός (glossed “*pleasant to the taste, delicate, sweet*”) is epic vocabulary (outside of Homer at Hes. fr. 315 [corrupt]) and is accordingly picked up by Apollonius Rhodius (e.g. 1. 456), Euphorion (fr. 92. 4, p. 46 Powell), Moschus (92) and Oppian (e.g. *Hal.* 1. 115), on the one hand, and by the epigrammatic poets (e.g. [Simon.] *AP* 7. 24. 10; [Pl.] *APL* 16. 210. 7), on the other.

³² Camerarius suggested Λαρισ(αι)οποιοί.

³³ Actually “charcoal” (as also in the glosses of the cognate words **λαρκαγωγός** and **λαρκοφορέω**), an entirely different commodity basic to the fuel-economy of Attica and the ancient world as a whole; see in general Olson 1991. Theophrastus knows coal (*Lap.* 16), but only as a curiosity. Nothing suggests that λάρκος means “*crate*”.

λάρυγξ appears to have been used no more precisely than “throat” (meaning both “windpipe” and “esophagus”) is in colloquial English. S.v. **λαρυγγίζω**, it is suggested that Ar. *Eq.* 358 λαρυγγιῶ τοὺς ῥήτορας may mean not “I’ll shout down the (other) speakers” but “I’ll throttle the other speakers”. But D. 18. 291 ἀλλ’ ἐπάρας τὴν φωνὴν καὶ γεγηθὼς καὶ λαρυγγίζων ᾤετο μὲν ἐμοῦ κατηγορεῖ (“he raised his voice and bellowed and shouted, imagining that he was accusing me”) – the only other attestation of the verb in the classical period – makes it clear that the former interpretation is correct (and cf. Poll. 4. 114; Luc. *Lex.* 19; [Luc.] *Am.* 36; Harp. λ 6).

λάσανον – better λάσανα, as in LSJ, since the word is only attested in the plural – is glossed “tripod supporting a pot” (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 893) and “chamber pot” (e.g. Hp. *Fist.* 9). In the first sense, the word actually means “cookpot supports, props”,³⁴ while in the second it means “toilet stool” (i.e. the thing on which one sat to make use of a chamber pot; see Olson on Eup. fr. 240, and cf. Latin *lasanum*). **λασανοφόρος** is treated as a noun (glossed “slave who carries the chamber pot”) but is better understood as an adjective (“toilet stool-carrying”) used substantively.

λάσθη at Hdt. 6. 67. 2 ἐπὶ γέλωτί τε καὶ λάσθη (“with an eye to laughter and *lasthē*”) is not “joke, insult, offense”, i.e. the means one uses to create rough, hostile humor, but “mockery, insult” (thus LSJ s.v.), i.e. the result achieved when one treats another person this way. Cf. Aeschylus *AP* 7. 345. 4 χλεύην τε ποιεῖν καὶ γέλωτα καὶ λάσθην (“produce jesting and laughter and *lasthē*!”); Ael. fr. 155 ἐκ τῆς ὕβρεως καὶ λάσθης (“out of hybris and *lasthē*”).

To be continued.

S. Douglas Olson
University of Minnesota
sdolson@umn.edu

³⁴ See Morris 1985.

Bibliography

- D. Bain, "Six Verbs of Sexual Congress", *CQ* NS 41 (1991) 51–77.
- K. J. Dover (ed.), *Aristophanes. Clouds* (Oxford 1968).
- A. Gavrilov, "λα ἐπιτατικόν", in: *Linguistica et philologica* (St Petersburg 1999) 23–44 [in Russian].
- H. D. Jocelyn, "A Greek Indecency and its Students: ΛΑΙΚΑΖΕΙΝ", *PCPS* NS 26 (1980) 12–66.
- S. P. Morris, "ΛΑΣΑΝΑ: A Contribution to the Ancient Greek Kitchen", *Hesperia* 54 (1985) 393–409.
- C. W. Peppler, "The Termination -κός, as Used by Aristophanes for Comic Effect", *AJP* 31 (1910) 428–444.
- W. Petersen, *Greek Diminutives in -iov; a Study in Semantics* (Weimar 1910).
- R. Renehan, "Some Greek Lexicographical Notes", *Glotta* 46 (1968) 60–73.
- R. Renehan, "Greek Lexicographical Notes: Second Series", *Glotta* 47 (1969) 220–234.
- R. Renehan, "Greek Lexicographical Notes: Third Series", *Glotta* 48 (1970) 93–107.
- R. Renehan, "Greek Lexicographical Notes: Fourth Series", *Glotta* 49 (1971) 65–85.
- R. Renehan, "Greek Lexicographical Notes: Fifth Series", *Glotta* 50 (1972a) 38–60.
- R. Renehan, "Greek Lexicographical Notes: Sixth Series", *Glotta* 50 (1972b) 156–181.
- R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes: A Critical Supplement to the Greek–English Lexicon of Liddell–Scott–Jones*, *Hypomnemata* 45 (Göttingen 1975).
- R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes, Second Series*, *Hypomnemata* 74 (Göttingen 1982).

Two generations ago, Robert Renehan published a series of articles expanding, refining, and correcting entries in the 9th edition of the monumental Liddell–Scott–Jones *Greek–English Lexicon* (1940) as supplemented by Barber and his fellow editors (1968). These notes on the letter *lambda* in the new *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* are offered in a similar spirit.

Полвека тому назад Роберт Ренеган опубликовал ряд дополнений, уточнений и поправок к девятому изданию монументального словаря Liddell–Scott–Jones *Greek–English Lexicon* (1940), дополненного группой издателей во главе с Барбером (1968). Настоящие заметки к леммам на букву *лямбда* призваны сыграть аналогичную роль по отношению к новому *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*.

KEYWORDS

ALMAZOVA

ancient Greek music; Nonnus; Pindar; πολυκέφαλος νόμος
древнегреческая музыка; Нонн; Пиндар; πολυκέφαλος νόμος

GOLOVATSKAYA

Clement of Alexandria; Jewish pseudepigrapha; *Protrepticus*; Sibyl; *Sibylline Oracles*

иудейские псевдоэпиграфы; Климент Александрийский; *Оракулы Сивиллы*; *Протрентик*; Сивилла

LARIONOVA

ancient mathematical education; Christian education; Clement of Alexandria; Origen; the quadrivium

античное математическое образование; квадривиум; Климент Александрийский; Ориген; христианское образование

LIBERMAN

Greek grammar and language; Greek meter; Greek tragedy; Sophocles; textual criticism

греческая грамматика; греческая метрика; греческая трагедия; Софокл; критика текста

LUCARINI

ancient antiquarian; Censorinus; Dionysius of Halicarnassos; Varro
античный антиквар; Варрон; Дионисий Галикарнасский; Цензорин

OLSON

definition; dictionary; lexicography; lexicon; philology
лексикография; лексикон; определение; словарь; филология

TUFANO

Ancient sport; Basileia; Boiotia; federalism; Pamboiotia
античный спорт; Басилеи; Беотия; Памбеотии; федерализм

Научное издание

HYPERBOREUS:
Классическая филология и история
Vol. 29 2023 Fasc. 1

Ответственный редактор тома *Д. В. Кейер*
Компьютерная верстка *А. Б. Левкина*

Учредители журнала *А. К. Гаврилов, Д. В. Панченко*
Регистрационное свидетельство № 0111029 от 27 августа 1993 года

Подписано в печать 12.09.2023. Формат 70 × 100 ¹/₁₆. Печать офсетная.
Усл. печ. л. 13,6. Тираж 250 экз. Заказ № 210.

Отпечатано в типографии издательско-полиграфической фирмы «Реноме»,
192007 Санкт-Петербург, наб. Обводного канала, д. 40.
Тел./факс (812) 766-05-66. E-mail: book@renomespб.ru
www.renomespб.ru