

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. 28 2022 Fasc. 2

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 (отв. ред. выпуска),
С. К. Егорова, Д. В. Кейер

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 Kündigungs-
frist 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, Alexander Verlinsky (verantw.)

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

ELENA ERMOLAEVA	
Odysseus as a Target in the <i>Odyssey</i> and Aeschylus' Fr. 179, 180 Radt (On the History of Greek Parody)	165
SALVATORE TUFANO	
With or without a <i>koinon</i> . The <i>Longue Durée</i> of Two Regional Festivals. I. The Pamboiotia and the Basileia from their Beginnings to the Fourth Century BC	176
NICHOLAS LANE	
A Conjecture on Pindar, <i>Pythian</i> 2. 81–82	196
GAUTHIER LIBERMAN	
Petits riens sophocléens : Antigone II (V. 162–169, 189–190, 203–204, 207–208, 241–242, 253–254, 289–290, 320–321, 370–375, 389–390, 392–393, 413–414, 444–445, 497–501) . .	203
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
What is Wrong with Nicostratus? (Ar. <i>Vesp.</i> 82–83)	228
GLEB L. KRIVOLAPOV	
Dionysus or Heracles: Mark Antony's Religious Policy in 41 BCE in the Light of <i>Epistula Marci Antonii Ad Koinon Asiae</i>	242
HEIKO ULLRICH	
Eine Konjektur zu Lukrez 3, 917	266
MIKHAIL SHUMILIN	
Unpublished Conjectures to the <i>Appendix Vergiliana</i> by F. Korsch, G. Saenger, and A. Sonny	276
HANAN M. I. ISMAIL	
The Date of <i>P. Alex.</i> Inv. 622, Page 28. A Papyrus from Herakleidou Meris in the Arsinoite Nome	289
GABRIEL ESTRADA SAN JUAN	
Pipa and Gallienus	299
Keywords	321

Elena Ermolaeva

ODYSSEUS AS A TARGET IN THE *ODYSSEY*
AND AESCHYLUS' FR. 179, 180 RADT
(ON THE HISTORY OF GREEK PARODY)

Despite its seeming simplicity, it is not easy to provide a clear definition of the concept of parody because of its mixing with reception, stylization and imitation. The important feature of a parody, as a secondary text, is the recognizability of the primary text.¹ Ancient Greek epic parody is characterized by the application of a sublime epic style to non-poetic matter: bath servants, tailors, cooks, thieves, gourmet catalogues, weasels, mice and frogs, etc. Epic parody was designed to be recognized for the most part as a parody of the Homeric poems, and its techniques, for all their diversity,² were essentially reduced to adapting Homeric verses, half verses or formulas in an unexpected context. Thus, Matron of Pitana (*HS* 534. 1) reworked the beginning of Homer's *Odyssey*, Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλά ..., in a symposial way with minimal touches: Δεῖπνᾶ μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροφα καὶ μάλα πολλά.

It is only logical that the study of epic parody in diachronicity leads to the question of where and when parodic elements first appear in Greek literature.

The earliest evidence that can be regarded as similar to parody is considered by Enzo Degani, an authoritative researcher of the genre, as an inscription from the late 8th century BC, the so-called *Nestor's Cup*, poems by Archilochus, Assius and Xenophanes (*Silloi*).³ A paradigmatic

¹ Ancient Greek epic parody became the subject of description as an independent genre in the 19th century, when it began to be taken more seriously than *furti genus*: Peltzer 1855; Brandt 1888; Murray 1891; and a subject of research in the 20th century, especially after the theoretical works of M. Bakhtin: Bakhtin 1929 [М. М. Бахтин, *Проблемы поэтики Достоевского*], id. 1965 [М. М. Бахтин, *Творчество Франсуа Рабле и народная культура средневековья и Ренессанса*]: Householder 1944, 1–9; Lelièvre 1954, 66–81; Koller 1956, 17–32; Pohlmann 1972, 144–156; Degani 1982; Rose 1993 (a general descriptive work); Cebrián 2008; Chambers 2010.

² Sens 2005, 225–227; Olson–Sens 1999, 5–12; 33–39.

³ Degani 1982, 24.

πρῶτος εὐρέτης of this genre is Hipponax (Athen. 9. 406 a – 407 e; 15. 697 f – 699 c), and the first professional parodist is considered to be Hegemon of Thasos (Arist. *Poet.* 1448 a 12). However, modern commentaries on the *Odyssey* repeatedly refer to “parody” in the *Odyssey* itself.⁴ Eduard Stemplinger in his book on plagiarism in Greek literature speaks of a parody of the *Iliad* in the *Odyssey*, comparing *Od.* 8. 248 and *Il.* 1. 177.⁵

Agamemnon on the character of Achilles, *Il.* 1. 177 (= Zeus on one of Ares, *Il.* 5, 891):

αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε

For you are always fond of strife, wars and battles.

Alcinous on the temperament of the Phaeacians, *Od.* 8. 248:

αἰεὶ δ' ἡμῖν δαίς τε φίλη κίθαρίς τε χοροὶ τε⁶

We always enjoy the feast, the cithara and the singing and dancing.

We would agree with Degani that in such cases in Homeric poems it is not a question of the poet imitating *suos ipse versus*, but of the formulaic style of epic language.⁷ Nevertheless, the effect that the *Iliad*'s “heroic” formulas had on the public in the non-heroic passages of the *Odyssey* may have been one of the impulses for the emergence of parody as a technique and, later, as a genre. Let us consider several such cases.

⁴ E.g., de Jong 2001, 456: on the Eurymachus scene (*Od.* 18. 394–398): “the heroic parody”; Steiner 2010, 158 about the fight between Odysseus and Irus (*Od.* 18. 9–100): “the motif also parodies Iliadic battlefield encounters; there dragging by the foot is the typical method of removing a dead enemy from the field (*Il.* 10, 490, 11, 258, 13, 383, 14, 477, 17, 289, 18, 537, 21, 120)”; Russo 1992, ad *Od.* 17, 300 on the *hapax* κυνοραιστέων, cf. θυμοραιστίης in *Il.* 13. 544; 16. 414. 580: “The suggestion of parody here was first made by V. Bérard in his note ad loc., *L'Odyssee*, III (Paris, 1924–5)” etc. In examining passages where the *Odyssey* contains “parodic” allusions to the *Iliad*, Burkert's approach seems to be the most productive: “Interpretation must try to work out individually for each case whether it is naïve-grotesque myth in the framework of matter-of-fact religious structures, or conscious poetic play taken to extremes, or subversive mockery” (Burkert 2008, 32).

⁵ Stemplinger 1912, 3.

⁶ Hainsworth 1988, 361 notes that the line *Od.* 8. 248 is clearly modelled on a verse from the *Iliad*, but he does not call it a parody.

⁷ Degani 1982, 23.

I. "Heroic" Formulas from the Fight Scenes in the *Iliad*

1. The spear regularly hits the right shoulder, obviously to disarm the right hand: ...**κατὰ δεξιὸν ὄμω**ν (at the end of the verse, *Il.* 5. 46, 98; 11. 507; 16. 343; 22. 133), **δεξιὸν ὄμω**ν (*Il.* 14. 450; 16. 289, 468).

2. The warrior falls down with a groan: **οἰμῶξας** (in 2–3 feet, *Il.* 16. 290; 20. 417; 21. 529).

3. A sound-pattern description of the helmet (or the brass spear point) falling to the ground with a clang (at the end of the verse, *Il.* 13, 530; 16, 118): ...**χαμαὶ / χαμάδις βόμβησε πεσοῦσα**.

4. "He fell backwards into the dust": ...**ὃ δ' ὕπτιος ἐν κονίῃσι** (at the end of the verse, *Il.* 13. 548; 15. 434; 16. 290); **ἐν κονίῃσι πεσών...** (at the beginning of the verse, *Il.* 14. 449–452, *al.*)

5. **Βάλε / ἔρριψε** (passim)

6. "Hit (usually – with a spear) and did not miss": **καὶ βάλε οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε** (*Il.* 11. 350; 13. 160; 21. 591; 22. 290); ... **οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε** (*Il.* 14. 403; 16. 322; 21. 171).

II. Three Scenes from the *Odyssey* 17, 18, 20, where the Suitors Throw Various "Missiles" at Odysseus

1. Antinous was the first to throw a footstool at Odysseus (*Od.* 17. 462–465):⁸

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ θρῆνυν⁹ ἐλὼν βάλε δεξιὸν ὄμω,
πρυμνότατον κατὰ νῶτον ὃ δ' ἐστάθη ἡύτε πέτρῃ
ἔμπεδον, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν σφῆλεν βέλος Ἀντινόοιο,
ἀλλ' ἀκέων κίνησε κάρη, κακὰ βυρσοδομεύων.

464 ἔμπεδον 206 Ω*: -δος P

So he said and, picking up the footstool, hit Odysseus straight in the back in the right shoulder, but he remained standing still like a rock,¹⁰ and Antinous' missile did him no harm, he only shook his head silently, plotting an unkind deed.

⁸ Here and below quoted from West 2017.

⁹ For the words θρῆνυς and σφέλας meaning "a footstool" ("Fußbank") see Laser 1968, 44–45.

¹⁰ It was Steiner who pointed out the similarity of the second half of the hexameter in *Od.* 18. 463 with the comparison with the rock in *Il.* 17. 434–436: ἀλλ' ὥς τε στήλη μένει ἔμπεδον (Steiner 2010, 137).

Let us compare it to *Il.* 14. 449–452, where the son of Panthous Polydamas killed Prothoënor by striking his right shoulder with a spear.

τῷ δ' ἐπὶ Πουλυδάμας ἐγγέσπαλος ἦλθεν ἀμύντωρ
 Πανθοΐδης, **βάλε** δὲ **Προθοήνορα** δεξιὸν ὦμον,
 υἱὸν Ἀρηιλύκοιο, **δι' ὦμου** δ' ὄβριμον ἐγχος ἔσχεν,
 ὃ δ' ἐν **κονίησι πεσὼν** ἔλε γαῖαν ἀγοστῶ.

In *Il.* 16. 287–290 Patroclus hit Pyraechmes in the right shoulder and he fell backwards with a groan (dropped dead): καὶ **βάλε** Πυραίχμην ... / ... **τὸν βάλε** δεξιὸν ὦμον ... / ὃ δ' ὕπτιος ἐν **κονίησι** / **κάππεσεν οἰμῶξας**.

2. Eurymachus was next to throw a bench at Odysseus (*Od.* 18. 396–398):

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας σφέλας ἔλλαβεν· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς
 Ἀμφινόμου πρὸς γοῦνα καθέζετο Δουλιχιῆος,
 Εὐρύμαχον δείσας· **ὃ δ' ἄρ' οἶνοχόον βάλε χεῖρα**
δεξιτερὴν· πρόχοος δὲ χαμαὶ βόμβησε πεσοῦσα,
 αὐτὰρ **ὃ γ' οἰμῶξας πέσεν ὕπτιος ἐν κονίησιν.**

So saying, he took the footstool, and Odysseus, in fear of Eurymachus, fell to the lap of Amphinomus of Doulichium. And so Eurymachus hit the cup-bearer in the right hand, the wine scoop fell to the ground with a clang, and the cup-bearer, groaning, fell over on his back (dropped dead).

Deborah Steiner observes¹¹ that the *Iliad* repeats scenes where the hero aims at a warrior of equal stature, but hits an inferior one, often a charioteer (e.g., *Il.* 8. 119, 311–312; 15. 430; 16. 466–468, 731–743). Eurymachus, instead of Odysseus, felled the cup-bearer.

To the allusions to *Il.* 16. 287–290 already mentioned the scenes of armor crashing to the ground are to be joined: in *Il.* 13. 527–530 Meriones struck Ascalaphus' arm with his spear so that his helmet fell from his hand and rattled to the ground:

¹¹ Steiner 2010, 216.

... Μηριόνης δὲ θεῶν ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ
 δουρὶ βραχίονα τύψεν ἐπάλμενος, ἐκ δ' ἄρα **χειρὸς**
αὐλώπις τρυφάλεια **χαμαὶ βόμβησε πεσοῦσα.**

And in *Il.* 16. 116–118 Hector cut off the tip of Ajax's spear with his sword, so that the brazen point fell to the ground with a clang far away from Ajax.

... τῆλε δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
αἶχμη χαλκείη **χαμάδις βόμβησε πεσοῦσα.**

3. At last, in *Od.* 20. 299–302 one of the suitors, Ctesippus, announces to the others that he has decided to treat a beggar (i. e. Odysseus) and throws a cow's foot at him taken from a basket containing food for those of lowest rank.¹²

ὥς εἰπὼν **ἔρριψε** βοὸς πόδα χειρὶ παχείῃ
 κείμενον ἐκ κανέοιο λαβών· ὃ δ' ἄλεΰατ' Ὀδυσσεύς
 ἦκα παρακλίνας κεφαλὴν, μείδῃσε δὲ θυμῷ
 σαρδάνιον μάλα τοῖον· ὃ δ' εὐδμητον **βάλε** τοῖχον.

So saying, he launched a powerful hand at the cow's foot, taking it from the basket. Odysseus dodged it, tilting his head slightly, and grinned sardonically in his heart. The blow hit a solid wall.

All three scenes reproduce formulas and vocabulary typical of the battle descriptions of the *Iliad*,¹³ the difference is that in the *Odyssey* the hero,

¹² Russo 1992, 121 writes about the “edibility” of the cow's foot thrown at Odysseus. On the difference between the roles of feasts and the scenes of treats in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* see Davies 1997, 97–107. The scenes of Odysseus being humiliated by the suitors, accompanied by their persistent laughter in *Od.* 17–20, prepare scenes of their slaughter. The word σαρδάνιον is a *hapax*. The etymology and meaning of this word is unclear; that the word was “dark” already in antiquity is evident from the different spellings in manuscripts, as well as in Eustathius and Pausanias: σαρδάνιον 28 tt* Z H Eust.: δόνιον Paus.^{vi} Ω* U^{2r} Eust.^{7p}, -δώνιον N (West). Clearly, at least, the word has nothing to do with Sardinia (Podosinov 2019 [A. B. Подосинов, “Сардонический смех от сардинских трав?”], *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология*], 866–871).

¹³ The similarity of the second half of the hexameter *Od.* 18. 463 with the comparison in *Il.* 17. 434–436 (ἀλλ' ὥς τε στήλη μένει ἔμπεδον) was pointed out by Steiner 2010, 137.

back from Troy, faces new, somewhat unexpected, risks: a fight with the notorious begger Irus; instead of spears, a footstool (σφέλας, θρήνυν) and a cow's foot (βοὸς πόδα) are thrown at Odysseus – life-threatening, but not overly heroic and worthy of the victor of Troy. The role of the mistakenly murdered charioteer is assumed by the cup-bearer, and the helmet rattling on the ground is the wine scoop. Bernard Fenik believes¹⁴ that this triad of throws in the *Odyssey*, in terms of textual coherence and gradation, shows that the effectiveness of the suitors is failing: Antinous hits Odysseus in the right shoulder, δεξιὸν ὤμον / πρυμνότατον κατὰ νῶτον – right in the back (he, as is typical of an anti-hero, behaves indecently, attacking from the back); Eurymachus hits the cup-bearer's right hand, οἰνοχόον χεῖρα δεξιτερήν; and Ctesippus misses and hits the wall, τοῖχον.

Joseph Russo in his commentary on *Od.* 18. 403–404 makes a lengthy digression on the parody of the *Iliad* in the *Odyssey*, in which the polemic is readily apparent: “Monro suggested that verses 18. 403–404, where one of the suitors says to the person next to him after the cup-bearer's death: ‘we quarrel over beggars and spoil the pleasure of supper’, is an imitation, or perhaps a parody, of the *Iliad* II. 1. 574–6, where Hephaestus, interrupting a quarrel between Zeus and Hera, says the same words, only instead of ‘because of the beggars’ he says ‘because of mortals’, θνητῶν. The language is definitely very close, but the deliberate imitation or parody belongs to written literature, referring to its prototype. Such refined allusions are alien to the oral tradition”.¹⁵

It is difficult to disagree with Russo, and the reappearance of the *Iliad*'s “heroic” formulas in a non-heroic context in the *Odyssey* is explained by the conventions of epic language and formulaic style and cannot be called a parody technique. However, the phenomenon, which in the *Odyssey* arises from the conventions of the epic genre, is used as a special device by the authors of parodies of Homer. As evidence that the allusion to the *Iliad* in the *Odyssey* may in turn have been the material for literary parody, we will refer to two fragments from Aeschylus' play, the *Ostologoi* (*Bone-Gatherers*), which have not previously been considered in connection with the history of ancient Greek parody.¹⁶

¹⁴ Fenik 1974, 182–187.

¹⁵ Russo 1992, 72.

¹⁶ The two fragments quoted from Athenaeus are all that remain of the drama *Ostologoi*, about the genre of which there is some debate, see e. g. Gantz 1980, 151–153; Radt 1985, 291–292. The *Ostologoi* are attributed to tragedy by such scholars as e.g. Wilamowitz 1894, 194, n. 36 (“Psychagogen, Penelope, Ostologen, Kirke σατυρική, also wol eine tetralogie”); Sommerstein 2009, 178–179; Grossardt 2003,

III. Odysseus in Aeschylus' *Ostologoi* (Fr. 179, 180 Radt)

Athenaeus (15. 667 c) reports: "And Aeschylus, in *The Bone-Gatherers*, says that when playing cottabus one sets aside his elbow". [*TGF* 179 Radt]:

1 Εὐρύμαχος †οὐκ ἄλλος† οὐδὲν ἦσσαν < – >
 2 ὕβριζ' ὕβρισμους οὐκ ἐναισίους ἐμοί·
 3 ἦν μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ †κότταβος ἀεὶ† τοῦμὸν κάρα,
 4 τοῦ δ' ἀγκυλητοῦ κοσσάβιος ἐστι σκοπὸς (?)
 5 < > ἐκτεμὼν (?) ἡβῶσα χεὶρ ἐφίετο

1 οὗτος ἄλλος G. Hermann; ἦσσονας Murusus; 3 σκοπὸς ἀεὶ Dobree;
 4 ἀγκυλητοῖς κοσσάβιος Schweighaeuser; ἐπίσκοπος Bothe.¹⁷

Here was another one – Eurimachus – who was just as shamelessly tormenting me. For he constantly used as a target (σκοπὸς ἀεὶ) my head, and the young man's arm (ἡβῶσα χεὶρ) with his elbow set back, as in a game of cottabus (ἀγκυλητοῖς κοσσάβιος) splashing out †ἐκτεμὼν†, spat out (ἐφίετο) <the wine> straight into the target.

158; to satyr play by G. Hermann 1828, 3, 40; Nauck 1889, 58–59. Seidensticker 1999, 205–207 admits that it is a satyr play, but is nevertheless careful to place the fragments in the category *unsicheres*. *The Bone-Gatherers* are to be understood as a chorus of the relatives of Penelope's suitors collecting the bones of the dead after being burned, in which case the person speaking in both fragments is Odysseus, addressing the imaginary suitors. Others believe they are fragments of a satyr play in which the satyrs begging in Odysseus' house are described as "gatherers of bones"; Odysseus tells them of the insults he has suffered at the hands of the suitors (on the literature see: Grossardt 2003, 155–156). The word ὀστολόγος appears in Athenaeus as the title of a drama by Aeschylus and only once more in the comedialographer Epilycus (5–4th cent. BC, see *Comic*. fr. 7. 1 Kock) without any context, so it is difficult to judge its meaning. Grossardt 2003, 155–158 derives the meaning of ὀστολόγοι "gatherers of bones" from the Homeric expression ὀστέα λευκὰ λέγειν (*Il.* 23. 239, 252 – on the burial of Patroclus; 24. 793 – on the burial of Hector). Assuming that composite words in -λογος ("collector of something") do not appear until the 5th century BC, he believes that the composite could be a neologism of Aeschylus.

¹⁷ < > an anceps is suggested. For a full, very extensive critical apparatus, see *TrGF* 1985 (Radt). Translated by the author according to the following reading of the text:

Εὐρύμαχος οὗτος ἄλλος οὐδὲν ἦσσονας
 ὕβριζ' ὕβρισμους οὐκ ἐναισίους ἐμοί·
 ἦν μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ σκοπὸς ἀεὶ τοῦμὸν κάρα,
 τοῦ δ' ἀγκυλητοῖς κοσσάβιος ἐπίσκοπος
 †ἐκτεμὼν† ἡβῶσα χεὶρ ἐφίετο

Athenaeus (1. 17 c) quotes another passage from Aeschylus [*TGF* 180 Radt] about a chamber pot flying into Odysseus' head. In both cases, it is the unanimous opinion of critics that Odysseus is speaking:

1 < × – > ὅδ' ἐστίν, ὅς ποτ' ἄμφ' ἐμοὶ βέλος
 2 γέλωτοποιόν, τὴν κάκοσμον οὐράνην,
 3 ἔρριψεν οὐδ' ἤμαρτε· περὶ δ' ἐμῷ κάρῃ
 4 πληγείσ' ἐναυάγησεν ὀστρακουμένη,
 5 χωρὶς μυρηρῶν τευχέων πνέουσ' ἐμοί

Here's someone who once threw a laugh-inducing missile at me, a foul-smelling chamber pot (οὐράνην), and did not miss. Having broken around my head, the pot was shipwrecked, <shattered> into tiny shards (ὀστρακουμένη), and breathed on me by no means a smell like pots of myrrh.

After the quotation, Athenaeus writes (1. 17 f): “In Homer, even when depicting drunken suitors, it never reaches the indecency invented by Sophocles¹⁸ and Aeschylus, but is limited to the cow's foot being thrown at Odysseus”.

The reference of the fragments of Aeschylus to the *Odyssey* is obvious, but the similarities with the *Iliad* should also be noted.

Aeschylus' verses resemble *Il.* 11, 349–353:

Ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἄμπεπαλὼν προΐει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος
 καὶ βάλεν, οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε τιτυσκόμενος κεφαλῇφιν,
 ἄκρην κὰκ κόρυθα· πλάγχθη δ' ἀπὸ χαλκόφι χαλκός,
 οὐδ' ἔκετο χροά καλόν·

So he said (Diomedes to Odysseus) and having lifted it up, let fly a spear with a long shadow and, aiming at the head, hit and did not miss the very helmet (the edge of the helmet): the copper bounced off the copper and did not reach the beautiful body.

Aeschylus has the same order as the Homeric verses: first the missile is named (Homer's “spear casting a long shadow”, δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος;

¹⁸ Athenaeus is referring to Sophocles' fr. 565 Radt, in which the chamber pot breaks over Odysseus' head as well. For a detailed comparative analysis of both fragments of Sophocles and Aeschylus, see Palutan 1996, 10–27.

Aeschylus' βέλος γελωτοποιόν,¹⁹ τὴν κάκοσμον οὐράνην), followed by a formula typical of battle scenes – ἔρριπεν οὐδ' ἤμαρτε "hit and did not miss";²⁰ after that, the target is indicated – "the head" (Homer's κεφαλῆφιν, Aeschylus' περὶ δ' ἐμῷ κάρῳ); finally, both passages are concluded by passives πλάγχθη – πληγεῖς from related verbs πλάζω and πλῆττω. Here Aeschylus has an obvious parody of the heroic verses from the *Iliad*, with an allusion to the triad of throws from the *Odyssey*, driven *ad absurdum*: to the Homeric footstool and cow's foot, the cottabus and the chamber pot are added.²¹ Katerina Mikellidou in her article "Aeschylus Reading Homer"²² notes Aeschylus' tendency to modify well-known passages from the *Odyssey* towards excessive realism. Thus, for example, in Homer's *Nekyia* (*Od.* 11. 134–137) Tiresias predicts to Odysseus a gentler death that will come from the sea, while in Aeschylus' *Psychagogoi* he promises that "A heron flying overhead will hit you with droppings from its belly, and then a sea creature's thorn will fester your old shabby skin" (fr. 275 Radt).

Thus, it would be incorrect to apply the notion of parody as a genre in the strict sense to the *Odyssey* itself. However, since already in the *Odyssey* there are scenes in which the 'heroic' formulae of the epic appear in a context far from heroic,²³ this phenomenon could be considered one of the techniques of the ancient Greek parody genre,²⁴ not only for *imitatio*, but also for *detorsio Homeri*.²⁵

Elena Ermolaeva

Saint-Petersburg State University

e.ermolaeva@spbu.ru,

elena.ermolaeva304@gmail.com

¹⁹ The adjective γελωτοποιός is perhaps a neologism of Aeschylus (LSJ s.v.; TLG).

²⁰ The expression ἔρριπεν οὐδ' ἤμαρτε was marked as a *formula epica* by Radt in his *apparatus criticus*.

²¹ The sequence of allusions to 'throws' in the *Odyssey* continues in the Lycophron's *Alexandra*: according to Sens, Lycophron's verse 778 (πληγαῖς... βολαῖσιν ὀστράκων) refers to Aeschylus' *Ostologoi* (Sens 2017, 385).

²² Mikellidou 2016, 331–341.

²³ Hainsworth 1968, 112: "flexibility of the Homeric formula".

²⁴ For example, Hipponax (fr. 73 W.) parodies Odysseus' duel with Irus (*Od.* 18. 28). On the reception of the scene with Irus in Greek poetry see Steiner 2010, 153–155 (with a bibliography). Margarita Alexandrou writes about allusions, including parodies, to the *Odyssey* in Hipponax (Alexandrou 2016, 32–44).

²⁵ The expression *detorsio Homeri* belongs to Degani 1983, 29.

Bibliography

- M. Alexandrou, "Hipponax and the Odyssey: Subverting Text and Intertext", in: A. Efstathiou, I. Karamanou (eds.), *Homeric Receptions Across Generic and Cultural Contexts*, Trends in Classics Suppl. 37 (Berlin–Boston 2016) 31–44.
- M. M. Bakhtin, *Problemy poetiki Dostojevskogo* [*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*] (Moscow 1929).
- M. M. Bakhtin, *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaja kul'tura Srednevekovja i Renessansa* [*Rabelais and His World*] (Moscow 1965).
- P. Brandt, *Parodorum epicorum Graecorum et Archestrati reliquiae* (Lipsiae 1888).
- W. Burkert, "The Songs of Ares and Aphrodite: On the Relationship between the Odyssey and the Iliad", in: L. E. Doherty (ed.), *Oxford Reading in Classical Studies. Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford 2008) 29–43.
- R. B. Cebrián, *Comic Epic and Parodies of Epic: Literature for Youth and Children in Ancient Greece* (Zurich – New York 2008).
- R. Chambers, *Parody: The Art that Plays with Art* (New York 2010).
- M. Davies, "Feasting and Food in Homer: Realism and Stylization", *Prometheus* 23 (1997) 97–107.
- E. Degani, *Poesia Parodica Graeca* (Bologna 1982).
- B. Fenik, *Studies in the Odyssey*, Hermes Einzelschriften 30 (Wiesbaden 1974).
- T. Gantz, "The Aeschylean Tetralogy: Attested and Conjectured Groups", *AJPh* 101 (1980) 133–164.
- P. Grossardt, "The Title of Aeschylus' 'Ostologoi'", *HSCPh* 101 (2003) 155–158.
- J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford 1968).
- J. B. Hainsworth, S. West, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. I. Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford 1988).
- G. Hermann, *Opuscula* III (Leipzig 1828).
- F. W. Householder, "Parodia", *CPh* 39 (1944) 1–9.
- I. J. F. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2001).
- H. Koller, "Die Parodie", *Glotta* 35 (1956) 17–32.
- R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, B. Seidensticker, *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt 1999).
- S. Laser, "Hausrat", *Archaeologia Homerica* II P (Göttingen 1968) 44–45.
- F. J. Lelièvre, "The Basis of Ancient Parody", *G&R* 1 (1954) 66–81.
- K. Mikelidou, "Aeschylus Reading Homer: The Case of the Psychagogoi", in: A. Efstathiou, I. Karamanou (eds.), *Homeric Receptions Across Generic and Cultural Contexts*, Trends in Classics. Suppl. 37 (Berlin–Boston 2016) 331–341.
- A. T. Murray, *On Parody and Paratragoedia in Aristophanes* (Berlin 1891).
- A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Lipsiae 1889).
- H.-G. Nesselrath, "Parody and Later Greek Comedy", *HSCPh* 95 (1993) 181–195.
- S. D. Olson, A. Sens, *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE. Text, Translation and Commentary*, American Philological Association. American Classical Studies 44 (Atlanta 1999).

- M. G. Palutan, "La parodia del cottabo nei *Σύνδειπνοι* di Sofocle e negli *Ὀστολόγοι* di Eschilo", *SIFC* 14: 1 (1996) 10–27.
- B. I. Peltzer, *De parodia Graecorum poesi et Hipponactis, Hegemonis, Matronis parodiarum fragmentis commentatio philologica* (Monasterii Typis Theissin-gianis 1855).
- A. V. Podosinov, "Sardonicheskiy smekh ot sardinskikh trav?" ["*Risus Sardonicus* from the Sardonic Herbs?"] *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philo-logy* 23 (2019) 866–871.
- E. Pöhlmann, "Parodia", *Glotta* 50 (1972) 144–156.
- S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* III. *Aeschylus* (Göttingen 1985).
- M. A. Rose, *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-modern* (Cambridge 1993).
- J. Russo, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* III. *Books XVII–XXIV* (Oxford 1992).
- A. Sens, "'ΤΙΠΙΤΕ ΓΕΝΟΣ ΤΟΥΜΟΝ ΖΗΤΕΙΣ;': Batrachomyomachia, Hellenistic Epic Parody, and Early Epic", in: F. Montanari, A. Rengakos (eds.), *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* (Genève 2005) 225–227.
- A. Sens, "Lycophron", in: D. Sider (ed.), *Hellenistic Poetry: A Selection* (Ann Arbor 2017) 369–385.
- A. Sommerstein, "Comic Elements in Tragic Language: The Case of Aeschylus' *Orestea*", in: A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2002) 151–168.
- A. H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Aeschylus. Fragments* III (London 2009).
- D. Steiner (ed., comm.), *Homer. Odyssey. Books XVII–XVIII* (Cambridge 2010).
- E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur* (Leipzig–Berlin 1912).
- M. L. West (ed.), *Homer. Odyssea* (Berlin–Boston 2017).
- U. von Wilamowitz Moellendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin 1884).

This paper reviews the cases in which the heroic formulae of the *Iliad* appear in the non-heroic passages of the *Odyssey*, namely in the fight scenes in the *Iliad*, which are repeated in the scenes where the suitors throw different "missiles" at *Odysseus* (*Od.* 17. 462–465; 18. 396–398; 20. 299–302). While it would be in-correct to apply the notion of parody as a genre to the *Odyssey* itself, these examples show that epic heroic formulas appearing not in a strictly heroic context could provide material for a future Greek parody.

В статье разбираются случаи появления героических формул *Илиады* в не-героических пассажах *Одиссеи*: это формулы из сцен поединков в *Илиаде*, которые повторены в сценах, где женихи бросают в Одиссея различные "сна-ряды" (*Od.* 17. 462–465; 18. 396–398; 20. 299–302). Хотя применять понятие пародии как жанра в строгом смысле слова по отношению к самой *Одиссее* было бы некорректно, тем не менее, эти примеры показывают, что героиче-ские формулы эпоса, появляясь в отнюдь не героическом контексте, могли послужить материалом для будущей древнегреческой пародии.

Salvatore 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

Introduction: The Games of Koroneia and Lebadeia
and their Geographical Horizon

Festivals played an important role in Boiotia from the earliest perception of a regional identity.¹ Between the Low Archaism and the early fifth century BC, a regional body was slowly developing in Boiotia: there was a boiotarch, a ‘leader of the Boiotians’, and people could on occasion meet at an assembly.²

In 447/6 BC, at Koroneia, the victory of the Boiotians over the Athenians marked the definite start of a new era: after this battle, probably through a process of progressive implementation, a new federal body was born, the ‘classical *koinon*’. Already in this period, it seems that the Boiotian League exploited the shared festivals “as a way of consolidating its own identity”. At Koroneia the ancient sanctuary of Athena Itonia saw, in the late fifth century BC, the dedication of a trophy and two cult statues;³ these acts made it a symbolic venue, and this aura was shared by the festivals which probably took place here already in this century.

A few decades later, in 371 BC, the Boiotians decided to establish another regional festival in Lebadeia, the Basileia. In Lebadeia, the oracle of Trophonios had offered valuable prophecies since at least the sixth century BC. The decision to increase the political value of the spot

¹ Schachter 2016, 179–180; Grigsby 2017.

² Boiotarchs in the 1st quarter of the 5th cent. BC: *SEG* 60. 509 (Aravantinos 2014). Assembly: Hdt. 5. 79. 1. On Boiotian ethnicity, see Kühr 2007; Larson 2007; Ganter 2014; Beck–Ganter 2015.

³ “[A]s a way ... identity”: Parker 2004, 15 (on the Hellenistic period). Trophy: Plut. *Ages.* 19. 2. Bronze statues: Paus. 9. 34. 1. See *infra* (Section 1) on the trophy.

with the addition of an agonistic dimension testifies to the awareness of the complex implications raised by the administration of these regional festivals.⁴

Recent years have seen an upsurge of studies in Boiotian festivals: these span from focuses on case studies, such as the Basileia,⁵ to broader overviews of the epigraphic evidence for specific festivals,⁶ the entire history of all the festivals⁷ or specific moments of their history.⁸ In particular, two topics attract the attention of the scholars more than others: on the one hand, the survival of the Basileia and their status in the first century BC;⁹ on the other hand, the relationship between the Pamboiotia and the development of Boiotian identity.¹⁰ No comparative study exists, however, of both the Pamboiotia and the Basileia, although these two regional festivals share two significant characteristics, namely their attachment to the celebration of regional identity and the very long celebration down to the imperial era.

These games remained ‘local’ – we lack positive evidence that they were ever granted ‘stephanitic’ status. Only in one case is it possible that the Boiotian *koinon* was trying to have Delphi declare ‘sacred’ the *agon* of Lebadeia, but this single piece of evidence does not explicitly refer to this festival.¹¹ It is hard to agree on a criterion to define as ‘local’ an agon in the sense of not-international. The Pamboiotia, for instance, were always restricted to Boiotian teams and athletes in the Hellenistic and the Roman period, but they might have hosted foreign dancers and athletes in the fifth century BC. Conversely, the Basileia changed name between the second and the first century BC; the new name, ‘Trophonia’, might depend on the decision not to stress unwanted dangerous links in the eyes of the Romans.¹²

Generally, the Basileia and the Pamboiotia can be read in the light of the recent acquisitions on the history of Hellenistic athletics: many of the new traditions predated the fourth and the third centuries BC.¹³

⁴ Establishment of the festival: Diod. 15. 53. 2 (see Section 3). See Section 1 on the earlier fame of Lebadeia.

⁵ Knoepfler 2008; Knoepfler 2020.

⁶ Manieri 2009.

⁷ Grigsby 2017.

⁸ See e.g. Müller 2020.

⁹ On this point, see Knoepfler 2020 and Matthaïou–Papazarkadas 2020.

¹⁰ See Kühn 2019.

¹¹ *IG* VII 4136, on which see Section 3 (Part II).

¹² Cf. Section 4 (Part II).

¹³ On the recent approach to the Hellenistic festivals, see Mann 2016.

In the third century BC, the appearance of *isolympic* and of *stephanitic* games added new labels and demands to pre-existing habits;¹⁴ initially, the central criterion underlying the request that a festival be accepted as *ισολύμπιος*¹⁵ or *στεφανίτης* is “that the prize money and other awards were to be paid by the home city, not by the festival city”.¹⁶ The dispatch of delegates (*θεωροί*) aimed at the recognition of the ‘panhellenic’ identity of a festival.¹⁷

Not even the prize represents an unambiguous hint of the status of a festival: *stephanitic* games could grant crowns of gold and lifelong pensions,¹⁸ but the information on these consequences is restricted to contests in Asia Minor and does not necessarily reflect the Boiotian case. As far as Boiotia is concerned, we only know of one contest that solicited the elevation of some of its *ἀγῶνες* to a *stephanitic* status in the last quarter of the third century BC, the *Mouseia* of Thespiiai (*I. Thespiiai* 155 = Manieri *Thes.* 12). It is legitimate to consider the Pamboiotia and the Basileia as ‘local’ festivals, despite the presence of international competitors,¹⁹ because we have no proof that the *koinon* actively sought an elevation of their status to a ‘panhellenic’ one.

Based on the catchment area of the winners, the Pamboiotia, the festival held in Koroneia for Athena Itonia, can be considered a local (regional) event, since only the Boiotians participated in this celebration. Most of our epigraphic evidence on the origin of the winners of this

¹⁴ On the continuity of these habits, see Parker 2004.

¹⁵ In the first document with the word *ισολύμπιος*, Ptolemaios II requests that the new festival in the memory of his father, the Ptolemaia (279/8 BC), be ‘isolympic’, i.e. “that the same prizes (*τὰ(?) ἴσα ἄθλα*) and honours be given to the winners of this festival as the ones given to those who won the Olympic games (*ὅσα περ καὶ τοῖς τὰ Ὀλύμπια νενικ[η]κόσι*)” (*CID* 4. 40. 18–21 and Remijsen 2014, 352–353). The practical dimension of these technical terms also emerges from the first document testifying the word *στεφανίτης*: the Aetolians sent ambassadors to have their *Soteria*, founded to commemorate the liberation of Greece from the Galatians, declared *stephanitic* (see *Syll.*³ 402. 13–18).

¹⁶ Slater 2012, 169.

¹⁷ I use the adj. “panhellenic” to refer to this wide recognition. The linguistic use was suggested by Robert 1984, but it was criticized because only the four main festivals of the Greek mainland (Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia, and Nemea) bore the status of ‘panhellenic’ (Funke 2003). I thank the anonymous reviewer for this suggestion and remain persuaded that the Hellenistic evolution of these local festivals allows for the label ‘panhellenic’ in this new, wider sense.

¹⁸ *I. Milet* 1. 3. 147. 18–21; *JÖAI* 8. 161 n. 1. Cf. Remijsen 2011, 99 and Pleket 2014.

¹⁹ On these international competitors, see Sections 3–4 (Part II).

contest dates to the third and the first century BC;²⁰ we never read the names or ethnic of foreign winners and the only exception might concern an Italian living in Boiotia (*IG* VII 2871: cf. Section 4). On the other hand, the *Basileia*, established in the fourth century BC, were open, during the third and the second centuries BC, to competitors from all over the Mediterranean Sea: this celebration attracted participants from Italy and Asia Minor.²¹

As suggested by Christel Müller, a form of ‘federal memory’ granted the survival of festivals such as the *Basileia* during the second century BC, despite the official dissolution of the Boiotian *koinon* in 171 BC.²² In this essay, I will concentrate on the very long history of the *Basileia* and the *Pamboiotia*, to understand the reason for the long success of these two festivals. When a *κοινόν* existed in Boiotia, it can be proved that both these festivals were organized by the *κοινόν*; at the same time, they predated the existence of federal ties and, through what Müller defined a ‘federal memory’, they acted as carriers of regional memory down to the latest documents on the Boiotian federal institutions in the third century AD.

The First Part (I) of this investigation will concentrate on the early stages of both festivals and show the paths through which *Koroneia* and *Lebadeia* began to exert a centripetal attraction that naturally granted their festivals a regional aura. This is evident from what happened in the fifth (Section 1) and the fourth century BC (Section 2). In the Second Part (II), I will focus on the Hellenistic fate (Section 3) of the festivals, when both were held and supervised by the *κοινόν*. A transition then occurred in the first century BC (Section 4), when the Boiotian federal institutions, dismantled by the Romans in 171 BC, were partially revived under new forms. The final section (5) will consider the sources about the two festivals under the Roman empire.

²⁰ The main epigraphic catalogues for the *Pamboiotia* are still Schachter 1978 and Schachter 1980; for the Hellenistic period, see Kalliontzis 2020, 90. On the later fate of the *Itonion*, see Knoepfler 1988, Müller 2014, 127–129 and Part II.

²¹ On the Italian participants and the international status of the festival, see Turner 1996 and Papazarkadas 2019, 209 and 218. Manieri 2009 lists 16 documents, of literary and epigraphic nature, related to the *Basileia*; Turner 1996 has a catalogue of 35 documents connected with the *Basileia*. In the absence of relevant new acquisitions, to this date, we possess thirty-three texts which document the origin of the athletes, from the mid. 4th cent. BC (*IG* VII 552; *IG* VII 2532; *FD* III 1. 510) to the mid. 3rd cent. AD (*LAG* 81; *IG* II² 3169–3170).

²² Müller 2014 and Müller 2020. See Kühr 2019, 83–85 on the role of the “emotional bond” in the history of the *Pamboiotia*.

A general conclusion will draw on the historical evolution outlined in the previous sections and argue that the festivals remained the socio-political backbone of the *koinon*, because they had always been perceived as a regional event with unparalleled continuity. It is exactly this unique link between these two festivals and the history of Boiotian identity that makes a combined study of their evolution particularly interesting.

1. The Fifth Century BC: Festivals in Koroneia, Oracular Cult in Lebadeia

In the early stages of the Pamboiotia, we only possess indirect literary sources down to the end of the fifth century BC. This first section will discuss these materials and introduce the parallel history of Lebadeia, where no regional festival existed in this period. However, it will be argued that the site already enjoyed regional fame, that later allowed its upgrade as a spot of national pride for all the Boiotians.

The available sources on the Pamboiotia are literary (Alcaeus, Bacchylides, Pindar, Plutarch) and material (vases of difficult interpretation). In the late seventh or the early sixth century BC, Alcaeus (F 325 Liberman) attests to the international fame of a sanctuary not far from Koroneia, when he mentions a warlike Athena:²³

Ὦνασσ' Ἀθανάα πολεμάδοκε,
ἃ ποι Κορωνήας <πεδίω> μέδ<ης>
ναύω πάροιθεν ἄμφι<
Κωραλίω ποτάμῳ παρ ὄχθαις.

At this stage, the goddess might either be Athena of Alalkomenion, situated in the western area of the *chora* of Koroneia (between Haliartos and Koroneia), or Athena of the Itonion, where the Pamboiotia were later celebrated. The Itonion was possibly inside the city, and the vague

²³ Alcaeus might have written the hymn for the inauguration of the temple of Athena Itonia in Koroneia (Mackil 2013, 159), and it has been argued that the 'warlike' goddess has the same traits as the Thessalian Athena Itonia, allegedly imported by the Boiotians during their migration southwards (Kowalzig 2007, 362 and n. 73). In light of the kinship relationships between Boiotians and Lesbians attested by Thucydides in the late fifth century BC (Hornblower 2010, 131–132 and Fragoulaki 2013, 110–111), it might not be coincidental that a Lesbian would choose to dedicate a hymn to a Boiotian goddess (cp. Schachter 2016, 180 n. 12).

indication of Alcaeus on the placement of the temple (Κορωνήας πεδίω μέδης)²⁴ would also seem to indicate this.²⁵

This ambiguity resurfaced in another instance, if we can judge from another discussed fragment by Bacchylides (F *15 Sn.):

Οὐχ ἔδρας ἔργον οὐδ' ἀμβολᾶς,
ἀλλὰ χρυσαίγιδος Ἰτωνίας
χρῆ παρ' εὐδαίδαλον ναὸν ἐλ-
θόντας ἀβρόν τι δεῖξαι.

An ancient scholar already wondered whether Bacchylides “meant the same (sc. Athena) as that of the Alalkomenion”.²⁶ The Alalkomenion and the Itonion were probably related at the beginning; in the absence of clear positive indications, we might prefer a reference, in Alcaeus, to Athena Itonia, because of the *absence* of strong military associations with the parallel cult of Athena of Alalkomenai. Neither Alcaeus nor Bacchylides explicitly mentions regional games for the goddess in these short fragments, but they are important to support a high chronology for the cult of the goddess.

Progressively, for reasons unclear to us, the rites in honour of Athena gained regional importance. This fame added to the profound local resonances of Koroneia for the Boiotians. Koroneia would only later become the focus of the Boiotian military identity, after the victory of 446 BC against the Athenians.²⁷ The liberation of the region was a seminal event in the history of Boiotia and in the history of the games held in Koroneia: the evolution of *agones* such as the Pamboiotia has a profound connection with the history of the κοινόν as a whole.²⁸

In Koroneia, the Boiotians placed a trophy which would signal their national pride (Plut. *Ages*. 19. 2):

πλησίον γὰρ ὁ νεῶς ἐστὶν ὁ τῆς Ἰτωνίας Ἀθηνᾶς, καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ
τρόπαιον ἔστηκεν, ὃ πάλαι Βοιωτοὶ Σπάρτωνος στρατηγοῦντος
ἐνταῦθα νικήσαντες Ἀθηναίους καὶ Τολμίδην ἀποκτείναντες ἔστησαν.

²⁴ Cp. Liberman 1999, 234 n. 265 on the restitution of v. 2.

²⁵ See Schachter 2016, 179–180 and Schachter 1981, 113 on the confusion between these two Athenas, that were both central to the nascent community of the Boiotoi. On Athena Itonia see Lalonde 2019 (87–166 on the Boiotian cult).

²⁶ Σ Stat. *Th*. 2. 721 = Bacchyl. F *15 A Sn. See Schachter 1981, 112 and n. 7.

²⁷ Cp. Beck–Ganter 2015, 135. Battle of Koroneia: *BNJ* 4 F 81; Thuc. 1. 113. 1; Diod. 12. 6; Plut. *Per*. 18. 2; *Ages*. 19. 2; Paus. 1. 27. 5, with Beck 2020.

²⁸ See Knoepfler 2008, 1462.

A second aspect of the monumentalization of memory was the erection, in the sanctuary, of two new bronze cult statues, realized by a pupil of Phidias, Agorakritos (Paus. 9. 34. 1). These statues represented Athena and Zeus and therefore identified the male *πάρεδρος* of the goddess once and for all, by replacing a theriomorphic mate probably represented by a snake.²⁹

Between Alcaeus and the elevation of Koroneia and of the Itonion to a momentous show of Boiotian identity, there are other indications that many regional activities took place on the spot. In the sixth century BC, there was a ritual procession for Athena and another god, who was later identified as Zeus: the scene is represented on a lekane of the middle sixth century BC.³⁰ These rites were part of a more complex organization, which shows in detail the participants to a sacrifice and the necessary instruments.

We have reasons to believe that, after Alcaeus, Pindar also helped enhance the international fame of the Itonion and of the activities which happened there. He offers an emic perspective on the *agon* and the status of these competitions, in his *daphnephorion* (F 94 b Sn.–M.) for Agasikles of Thebes, son of Pagondas.³¹ In the preserved verses, the victories at the Pamboiotia are listed together with those at Onchestos and at Pisa (vv. 44–48):

...ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων προ[λυ-
 γνώτοις ἐπὶ νίκαις,
 αἶψ ἐν αἰόνεσσιν Ὀρχ[ηστοῦ κλυ]τᾶς,
 ταῖς δὲ ναὸν Ἰτωνίας α[.....]α
 χαίταν στεφάνοις ἐκό-
 σμηθεν ἐν τε Πίσᾳ περιτ[.]

Maybe this song was written after the aforementioned battle of Koroneia.³² What matters the most here is the mention of victories in

²⁹ On the identity of Athena's *πάρεδρος* see Schachter 1981, 119–121.

³⁰ BMB 80. See Ure 1929, 167–171 and Schachter 1981, 122–123. The presence of a crow (κορώνη) on the lekane has been considered a reference to the city of Koroneia, but sometimes the bird is understood to be a raven (κόραξ): cf. the state of the art in Schmidt 2002, 51–62 and Connelly 2007, 168–169 on the reading of this procession as a *panegyris*.

³¹ This family tree was reconstructed by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1922, 435–436; see also Mackil 2013, 160–161; Schachter 2016, 259–260; Papazarkadas 2018.

³² See most recently Mackil 2013, 160–161 and Schachter 2016, 259–260. An important piece of information is the fact that the *daphnephoria* was led by a *παῖς ἀμφιθαλής*, a boy with both parents still living (Mackil 2013, 160 n. 54).

contests: these horse races must have belonged to this embryonal stage of the Pamboiotia. Pindar refers to victories of horse races (43: ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων) at Onchestos (46) and at the temple of Athena Itonia (47). Before this list of victories, Pindar recalls the proxenies obtained by Agasikles and his family (41): the combination of these aspects (agonistic victories and political career) might have consequences on the reading of the previous reference to the honours received by “those who dwell around” (41–43: τίμαθεν γὰρ τὰ πάλαι τὰ νῦν τ' ἀμφικτιονέσσιν). These people might impersonate an association or a regional body connected with the festival of the Pamboiotia and with the one held at Onchestos;³³ the regional character of the reference seems to depend on the Theban audience of the ode, which must have easily understood the reference. Therefore, this could be an indirect sign of a political organization, or even – assuming that the ode was very likely written in the later forties – one of the earliest witnesses to the new Boiotian *koinon*.

From a syntactic point of view, Pindar is referring not only to the Pamboiotia, but also (and firstly) to the festival of Poseidon.³⁴ Therefore, I would suggest that the Pamboiotia are presented by Pindar as part of the network of Boiotian regional festivals and not as a preeminent meeting of the Boiotians; moreover, their regional aura proves a local prestige which allowed Pindar to list this event together with the Olympic games. This is a curious elevation of a strictly local festival, through the lens of its regional impact, to an ‘almost panhellenic’ status.

As well as horse races, we may have hints of dance competitions at the Pamboiotia, if we accept Kowalzig’s suggestion of “Boiotian military dances staged as hunts based on some Thessalian model”.³⁵ In addition, the ritual procession on the aforementioned lekane may be the setting for contests of boxers and chariot races, and maybe concerts of aulos players, since such players can be seen on a series of black-figure vases found in Koroneia, considered to be the output of a “workshop of the Itonion” by Ure.³⁶

³³ Mackil 2013, 162–163.

³⁴ The last verse mentions Pisa (49: [...] ἐν τε Πισᾷ περὶ[]), but the lacuna, of eight to ten characters according to Snell and Maehler, might suggest warning against a “juxtaposition of the Itonion with the renowned sites of Olympia and Onchestos” (Larson 2007, 134). Maybe the final verse introduced a new verb, or a clearer distinction was made in the missing section.

³⁵ Kowalzig 2007, 364. See Bacchyl. F 15 and F 15a Sn. (*supra*). Cf. Kowalzig 2007, 363–364 on Pind. FF 106–107 Sn.–M. and Mackil 2013, 160 for this hypothesis, that remains highly speculative.

³⁶ Ure 1929, 167–170; Ure 1935; Larson 2000, 205 n. 57; Larson 2007, 134 and n. 24.

By the second half of the fifth century BC, the Pamboiotia also played a pivotal role in the ethnogenesis of the Boiotians. The celebration was connected with the memory of the alleged migration of the local inhabitants from Thessaly: Armenidas, a local historian who probably lived at the beginning of the fourth century BC, lingered on the etymology which explicitly states the origin of Itonian Athena from the Thessalian city of Iton (*BNJ* 378 F 1). Moreover, Boiotos, the national hero, was sometimes believed to be the son of an Itonos:³⁷ it is clear that the Boiotians slowly assigned a focal place to Athena Itonia. Once we recall this, we can understand that these games, despite being reserved for Boiotians, could be seen from the outside as a celebration worthy of recollection and memory: just as Alcaeus sang of Athena, so would travelling Bacchylides and Pindar refer to those competitions.

While the Pamboiotia were then a likely reality of Boiotian cultic and political life in the fifth century BC, possibly not yet under this name,³⁸ in the same century, Lebadeia was a much less significant city in terms of political power. Nonetheless, the literary sources indicate that Lebadeia was well known for the oracle of Trophonios, which was also popular abroad and particularly among the Athenians.³⁹

Herodotus (8. 134. 1) recalls, for instance, the visit of the Carian Mys, sent by Mardonius, but only mentions the descent of the man:

οὗτος ὁ Μῦς ἔξ τε Λεβάδειαν φαίνεται ἀπικόμενος καὶ μισθῷ πείσας
τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἄνδρα καταβῆναι παρὰ Τροφώνιον.

³⁷ On Armenidas' fragment, see Tufano 2019a, 131–138. On Boiotos and Itonos, see Ganter 2014, 237–238. On the connection of the festival with the tradition of the origin from Thessaly: Kowalzig 2007, 364. Maybe only after the battle of Koroneia of 446 was Athena Itonia given “a more explicitly ethnic, pan-Boiotian role” (Mackil 2013, 193).

³⁸ We have no way of knowing how old the denomination of ‘Παμβοιώτια’ was: as such, it firstly occurs in Polybius regarding the *panegyris* (4. 3. 5; cp. Schachter 1981, 123). As in the well-known case of the *πανελλήνες* in Homer (*Il.* 2. 530), *παν-* seems to mark an exclusion more than an inclusion: in other words, as is the case with the history of the ethnic *πανελλήνες*, the root *παν-* seems to confine the celebration to the Boiotians, while excluding other *ἔθνη* (on the existence of a “criterio di esclusione” behind the Homeric *πανελλήνες*, see esp. Antonetti 1996, 9–10. On the root *παν-* and its meanings, see Hall 2002, 132). At the same time, it is a sure sign of the circulation of the simple ethnic *Βοιωτίοι/Βοιωτοί*, since these forms with *παν-* can only be understood if the simple form pre-exists.

³⁹ On the oracle of Trophonios, and on the Trophonion in Lebadeia, see Schachter 1994, 66–89; 109–118 and Bonnechere 2003.

The Basileia were a later creation by Epameinondas, and the rites on the spot did not include games in the fifth century BC. It is however interesting how, by the first century BC, the mention, in Pindar (*Ol.* 7. 84), of the ἀγῶνες τ' ἔννομοι Βοιωτίων, could be interpreted by the Augustan grammarian Didymus (F 13 Braswell = 116 Coward–Prodi) as Βασίλεια καὶ Ἀμφιάρεια καὶ Δήλια ἐπὶ Δηλῷ καὶ Τροφώνεια ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ.⁴⁰

Pindar is listing the other victories achieved by Diagoras of Rhodes, and this is the only occasion⁴¹ where he does not specify the name of the city. Diagoras was a *περιοδονίκης*,⁴² since he won at the Isthmus, at Nemea, at Delphi, and at Olympia. Pindar sent him the *Seventh Olympian Ode*, which was probably performed in Rhodes.

This victory ode, probably written ca. 464 BC, is a witness of the fame of a Boeotian competition abroad, although it remains uncertain whether these seasonal games are among the suggestions listed by Didymus (F 13 Braswell), who also ignores that the Trophonia in Lebadeia cannot have been an additional game different from the Basileia.⁴³ The Pamboiotian trait⁴⁴ makes the identification of these ἀγῶνες ἔννομοι with the festival of Koroneia likely: not incidentally, it should be noted how the mention of the mere ethnicity, Βοιωτίων, is not accompanied by the significant root *παν-* which will be used for the name of the festival in the Hellenistic period.⁴⁵

To sum up: the Boiotians performed gymnastic contests in Koroneia, in the archaic period, which soon gained an international reputation. These contests cannot be reconstructed in detail due to the absence of complete surveys of the program of the early Pamboiotia; yet, the external fame of this cult and the activities involved must not have escaped the foreigners, who associated the Boiotians with this lively cult.

This external fame was further enhanced by the military victory of 446 BC, which added a flair of national pride to the city and enhanced the interest in the new κοινόν. Even if we ignore the name of the celebration at this stage, it was so well-known that a mere mention in the form of

⁴⁰ See Prodi 2020 for a useful study of Didymos' profound knowledge of Pindar's poetry.

⁴¹ Cf. the less unclear mention of Thebes at v. 83.

⁴² Giannini in Gentili 2013, 167–173.

⁴³ On this double name, see Part II.

⁴⁴ On the ethnic value of this identification, see Grigsby 2017, 9.

⁴⁵ I agree with the suggestion of the anonymous referee that “ἀγῶνες ἔννομοι Βοιωτίων could well be a poetical transformation of the name Pamboiotia known to the audience”.

‘Βοιωτίων ἀγῶνες’ could make the association clear. The Basileia were a later creation, but Lebadeia was already an internationally renowned Boiotian spot. Both Koroneia and Lebadeia, therefore, possessed by the late fifth century BC the potential to represent abroad the Boiotian regional activities, as well as, in the case of Lebadeia, attracting also foreigners interested in the local cult.

2. The Fourth Century BC

The situation described in the previous section is reversed in the following century. While the birth of the Basileia in 371 BC is luckily witnessed by an important literary source and followed by a good number of inscriptions, we lack sources on the history of the Pamboiotia in the fourth century BC. In the final part of this section, we will comment on this specific situation.

After the suppression of the Boiotian *koinon* in 386 BC and its re-foundation after 379 BC, Thebes was successful in establishing a regional and international hegemony that is now believed to have survived the death of one of its great men such as Epameinondas (362 BC).⁴⁶ Epameinondas was instrumental in the victory against the Spartans at Leuktra (371 BC) and took the chance to celebrate the event with the decision to establish a new festival at Lebadeia (Diod. 15. 53. 4 = Manieri 2009 Leb.1):

ἄλλον δὲ κατέστησεν ὡς ἀπὸ Τροφωνίου προσφάτως ἀναβεβηκότα
καὶ λέγοντα, διότι προστέταχεν ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς, ὅταν ἐν Λεύκτροις
νικήσωσιν, ἀγῶνα τιθέναι Διὶ βασιλεῖ στεφανίτην· ἀφ’ οὗ δὴ Βοιωτοὶ
ταύτην ποιοῦσι τὴν πανήγυριν ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ.

The Basileia were designed by Epameinondas to commemorate the Theban victory at Leuctra: the ἀγών is dedicated to Zeus Basileus, “protecteur attitré de la nation béotienne”.⁴⁷ The choice of Lebadeia marked a strategic stronghold on the road between Thebes and Delphi. On the one hand, the site occupied the *chora* of the then-destroyed Orchomenos, which had once controlled Lebadeia. Since Lebadeia was in the “Einflußbereich von Orchomenos”, it was not a neutral place:

⁴⁶ Cf. Schachter 2016, 112–132.

⁴⁷ Knoepfler 2008, 1436.

Epameinondas' choice signalled the Theban lead of the Boiotian League in 371 BC,⁴⁸ because the new festival was established in a place internationally renowned as Lebadeia, and in a site which recalled the Theban opposition to Orchomenos.

On the other hand, the Spartans had plundered Lebadeia only twenty-five years before, in 395/4 BC (Plut. *Lys.* 28. 1). The new importance given to this area also marked a new beginning, for a spot which was to honour Zeus through a new festival. The Thebans wanted to make the most of this new federal venture when they detached the name of the festival from the underground oracular god, Trophonios, who had been presiding over the site until then. In the same context of activities at Lebadeia, just like the battle of Koroneia (447 BC) had prompted a redefinition of the cult at the Itonion, a new cult statue for Trophonios was made in the sanctuary by Praxiteles (Paus. 9. 39. 4).

Zeus had symbolically presided over the victory of the Boiotian army against Sparta and, despite the certain fictitious character of these *ex-post* tales, there are several traditions that developed around the battle of Leuctra and emphasised the devotion of Epameinondas towards this god. Diodorus connects the festival to the celebration of the victory: the god has directed Epameinondas and he institutes the contest.⁴⁹ Diodorus' very good knowledge of Boiotian history is a fact we should not dismiss: not only is his fifteenth book indebted to Ephorus, who had perused Daimachus of Plataiai (a universal historian of the fourth century BC well-versed in Boiotian history), Anaximenes and Callisthenes. Diodorus also knew the work of two other universal historians of the fourth century BC, Dionysodorus and Anaxys.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ "Einflußbereich von Orchomenos": Kühr 2007, 284. The advantages of choosing Lebadeia over Leuctra for a festival indirectly confirm the predominant role of Thebes in the post-378 *koinon* (Schachter 2016, 115 n. 7 on Lebadeia as "a flagship for the Theban-led Boiotoi"). On the value of Lebadeia, see Beck 1997, 191–192; Farinetti 2011, 89; Mackil 2013, 208–210; Schachter 2016, 117 and 187.

⁴⁹ A different path was followed by Callisthenes (*BNJ* 124 FF 22 a–b). In his *Histories*, Callisthenes reported about the good signs that had foretold the Theban victory. Cicero, the source of the fragment (*De div.* 1. 74. 9), does not repeat the version of Diodorus on the institution of the *agon*; this inauguration is also absent in the third source on Epameinondas and the *omina* of Lebadeia, Polyaeus (*Strat.* 2. 3. 8); on these traditions, see Tufano 2023, 76–82.

⁵⁰ On Ephorus' plagiarism of Daimachus, see *BNJ* 65 T 1 and Tufano 2019a, 325–333. Dionysodorus and Anaxis: *BNJ* 67 and 68 (= Diod. 15. 95. 4).

The dedication of the festival to Zeus Basileus, not the most common epithet of Zeus in Boiotia,⁵¹ aimed to give at least a regional acknowledgment to the institution: the new term was immediately successful, and we have three inscriptions, from the middle fourth century BC, mentioning athletes from Tanagra, Thebes and Delphi.⁵² In the first two cases, the restitution of the name Βασίλεια is certain: the Theban winner, Timokles, raced with the horses at the Basileia and at the Herakleia of Thebes.⁵³ His epitaph was written under a statue of Polykleitos and the city decided to restore the statue after the destruction of 335 BC:

οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδέν τέρμα βίου θνητῶν ἐπινοίαις,
 ἀλλὰ τύχη κρείσσων ἐλπίδος ἐξεφάνη,
 ἧ καὶ Τιμοκλέην Ἀσωπίχου ἠφάνισ' υἱὸν
 πρόσθε πρὶν ἐνδείξασθ' ἔργα πρέποντα φύσει,
 ὃς Βασίλεια Διὸς καὶ ἐν Ἡρακλέους τρισ<ι>ν ἄθλοις
 ἵπποις νικήσας δώματ' ἐπηγλάῃσεν.
vacat
 Πολύκλειτος ἐπόεισε [*sic*].

This text almost inaugurates the Theban tradition to focus on the pride of these young victors.⁵⁴ It is not clear whether Timokles' victories in horse-racing were only won at the Herakleia or jointly refer to both Basileia and Herakleia. In any case, the epigram is an early sign of the fact that Thebes recognized the victory at the Basileia as a definitive glory to remark. In this dedication, moreover, we note that it is sufficient to refer to the contest by specifying the god, at least in Thebes.

The later epigraphical evidence suggests that the Basileia included – possibly already in the fourth century BC – gymnastic and equestrian competitions:⁵⁵ we lack a specific program of the contest, but victories are attested in running contests, in the wrestling (πάλη), in the παγκράτιον,

⁵¹ See Schachter 1994, 111 on the novelty of the choice of this epithet.

⁵² *IG* VII 2532; 552. *SEG* 23. 332, a list of victories from Delphi: *FD* III 1. 510 = Ebert 42 = *CEG* II 803; cp. Knoepfler 2008, 1426 and n. 17, where the scholar recalls Robert's support for the identification of the Zeus σκηπτοφόρος of the inscription with Zeus Basileus. Cf. also *IG* VII 530 (from Tanagra, early 3rd cent. BC: καλὸν ἀγῶνα Διός), with Knoepfler 2008, 1436 n. 46 and Manieri 2009, 152.

⁵³ *IG* VII 2532, ll. 5–6; *CEG* II 630. See on this text Grigsby 2017, 95–97.

⁵⁴ On this tradition: Scharff 2016.

⁵⁵ For a broad introduction to the Basileia, see Schachter 1994, 85–86 and 116–118; Turner 1996; Knoepfler 2008.

in the boxing, in the πένταθλον and the race with arms, the ὀπλίτης (δρόμος).⁵⁶ Since the festival was never interrupted (see Part II), it can be assumed that the competitions recorded on in the first century BC inscriptions can be traced back to the first years.

It was a festival for individual athletes, and not for groups;⁵⁷ the almost complete absence of a military trait marks a difference from the Pamboiotia.⁵⁸ The Basileia were celebrated during the month of Panamos, the ninth Boiotian month, between August and September; based on the accounts delivered and published in the first century BC, the account rendering occurred in Pamboiotos, the tenth month. The frequency of this festival is controversial.⁵⁹

This predominantly local festival included a procession for Zeus. Until recently, this event could only be hypothesized thanks to a later text: the procession for Zeus Basileus is mentioned in an imperial text which might describe a Hellenistic setting. The first *Love Story* ascribed

⁵⁶ Running contests: e.g. in the stadion (ca. 600 m: *LAG* 45, 2–3: 200–180 BC; *SEG* 14. 478a, 3: 100 BC); δίαυλος (equivalent to two stadia: *SEG* 14. 478a, 3: 100 BC); δόλιχος (long course on a distance between 7 and 20 stadia: *IG* V 2. 142. 40: 3rd cent. BC ex.). Πάλη: *IG* IV 428, 2: 240–220 BC; Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020 (1st half of the 1st cent. BC). Παγκράτιον: e.g. *SEG* 3. 367 (= Manieri 2009, Leb. 12, 40–30 BC [see Müller 2014, 129 on the date]) and Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020. Πυγμή: e.g. *IG* VII 47 (early 1st cent. BC? [cf. Knoepfler 2008, 1455–1456 n. 119]) and Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020. Πένταθλον: e.g. *SEG* 3. 367. The armed race probably had different origins in the different places where it occurred (Patrucco 1972): in Boiotia, the ὀπλίτης was also part of the Eleutheria of Plataiai (Philostr. *Gymn.* 8). For the Basileia, we have evidence that the ὀπλίτης was part of the contest in the 1st cent. BC (*SEG* 3. 367 and *SEG* 14. 478a, from Potidaia: the indication of the Basileia forces us to postdate the inscription after the institution of the Boiotian *koinon* and the change of name, but this might have happened immediately after 86 BC; however, see Grigsby 2017, 192–193 for the possibility that Sulla awarded Lebademia, for the good omens which he had received from the oracle). This evidence is the only one with a military reminiscence, and thus the late attestation does not allow us to consider it present from the beginning. For the horse races, see a list of documents in Turner 1996, 122, nos. 19–24. From the lists on *SEG* 3. 367 and on the new *apologia* (Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020), we learn that the contests included the ἀπόβασις, a race on a chariot where one of the two men on it had to complete the distance on foot, the horseback race (κέλης), and the two-horse chariot race (συνωρίς).

⁵⁷ The previous list draws on Turner 1996, 109 and 121–122.

⁵⁸ Cp. Knoepfler 2008, 1440–1441 and Knoepfler 2020, 222.

⁵⁹ On the month, see Roesch 1982, 37–41 and Turner 1996, 109.

to Plutarch⁶⁰ concerns a girl who is contended by two men, and finally dies in the quarrel which occurs between the suitors. In the narrative, the maiden is presented as a *κνηφόρος*, “carrier of a basket”, for Zeus Basileus in Lebadeia.⁶¹ The story also proves that the festival was visited by foreigners: in order to perform these rites, the girl came to Lebadeia from Haliartos, and was seen there by one of the two pretenders, Straton of Orchomenos. The publication of a new *ἀπολογία* from the first century BC now confirmed the practice of a *πομπή* during the festival.⁶²

Although relatively few in number (few inscriptions, one literary reference), we have seen that some sources allow a relatively complete picture of the early celebrations of the Basileia in the fourth century BC, testifying also to the impact of these celebrations on the consolidation of the regional networks and on the Theban control (at least possibly until 335 BC, when the city was destroyed). Nonetheless, it was necessary to complete the direct witnesses with an eye to later inscriptions. A different situation, with few exceptions, is typical for the history of the Pamboiotia in the same fourth century BC.

There is a significant gap in our documentation on the Pamboiotia after the end of the fifth century BC: a possible late echo of the classical *ἀγῶνες*, so far neglected, is a curious anecdote reported by Diodorus (14. 11. 5). Retelling the events of 404 BC, he reports that in that same year Lasthenes, a Theban and Olympic winner, had also won against a racehorse (*πρὸς ἵππον ἀθλητὴν δραμόντα νικῆσαι*), on a route from Koroneia to Thebes. The distance, roughly thirty miles (more than 44 400 meters), does not correspond to any of the known race competitions, and the anecdote has no parallel among the extant sources. I would suggest that the city of Koroneia, in the final years of the Peloponnesian War, might still be the setting of local games, even if the singularity of the episode must be taken with due prudence.

After this episode, we only have Polybius, who refers to the *panegyris* of the Boiotians on the spot, and epigraphic documents of the third century BC attest that the entire Hellenistic *koinon* performed, in these competitions with a strong military character, the military prowess and skills of the

⁶⁰ Linguistic reasons prevented Ziegler from ascribing the essay to Plutarch, even if the peculiarities of style might depend on the genre of the short stories, as outlined by Giangrande 1991. For a recent overview of the *status quaestionis* see de Jesus 2009 and Tufano 2019b. The prenuptial character of the short story is underlined by Bonnechere 2003, 310.

⁶¹ Plut. *Am. narr.* 770 F: ἐμελλε γάρ τῳ Διὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ κνηφορεῖν.

⁶² Matthaiou–Papazarkadas 2020, A 32–33.

Boiotians: it was now a way, as we will see in the next section (3, Part II), to check the military training of the subunits of the federal army.⁶³

Therefore, the long period of silence approximately coincides with the fourth century BC. Before the Hellenistic *κοινόν* born in 287 BC, we have a treaty (*IG IX² 1. 170*), signed between the Boiotians and the Aetolians around 270 BC, sworn also by Athena, probably Itonia.⁶⁴ A possible *argumentum ex silentio* against the continuity of the Pamboiotia might be the decision itself, by Epameinondas, to establish the Basileia as a festival of national pride, with all the aforementioned strategic advantages, in the apparent oblivion of an eventually pre-existing festival of the Boiotians in Koroneia.

For these reasons, it could be that the first organization of the festival of the Pamboiotia only occurred in the second quarter of the third century BC;⁶⁵ however, it seems better to think of a reorganization in connection with the new needs of the Boiotian League. Perhaps the Pamboiotia had not been institutionalised and fully given a program and an organization before Epameinondas created the Basileia. The first relevance of this new competition contributed to the temporary eclipse of the regional celebrations at Koroneia, which could only be reprised under new circumstances, namely after the re-foundation of Thebes in 316 BC and the rebirth of the Boiotian League.

To be continued.

Salvatore Tufano
Sapienza University of Rome
salvatore.tufano@uniroma1.it

Bibliography

- C. Antonetti, “I Panhellenes dalla Grecia arcaica al tardo impero: l’unità irrealizzabile”, *Ostraka* 5: 1 (1996) 9–14.
V. Aravantinos, “The Inscriptions from the Sanctuary of Herakles at Thebes: An Overview”, in: Papazarkadas 2014, 149–210.
H. Beck, *Polis und Koinon. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Stuttgart 1997).

⁶³ Polyb. 4. 3. 5 and 25. 2; 9. 34. 11. Military character of the Pamboiotia: Olivieri 2010–2011; Mackil 2013, 224–225; Kalliontzis 2020, 89–90; Section 3 (Part II).

⁶⁴ On this date, see Knoepfler 2007, 1250 and Müller 2020, 58 and n. 1.

⁶⁵ So Schachter 1981, 124 and n. 1.

- H. Beck, "From Regional Rivalry to Federalism: Revisiting the Battle of Koroneia (447 BC)", in: H. Beck, F. Marchand (eds.), *The Dancing Floor of Ares*, AHB Suppl. Vol. I (Calgary 2020) 46–62.
- H. Beck, A. Ganter, "Boiotia and the Boiotian League," in: H. Beck, P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 2015) 132–157.
- P. Bonnechere, *Trophonios de Lébadée. Cultes et mythes d'une cité béotienne au miroir de la mentalité antique* (Leiden–Boston 2003).
- J. B. Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece* (Princeton–Oxford 2007).
- C. A. M. de Jesus (ed.), *Plutarco. Obras Morais. Diálogo sobre o Amor. Relatos de Amor* (Coimbra 2009).
- E. Farinetti, *Boeotian Landscapes: A GIS-based Study for the Reconstruction and Interpretation of the Archaeological Datasets of Ancient Boeotia* (Oxford 2011).
- M. Fragoulaki, *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative* (Oxford 2013).
- P. Funke, "Gli ombelichi del mondo. Riflessioni sulla canonizzazione dei santuari 'panellenici'", *GeogrAnt* 12 (2003) 57–65.
- A. Ganter, "Ethnicity and Local Myth", in: J. McInerney (ed.), *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Malden–Chichester–Oxford 2014) 228–240.
- A. Ganter, "Federalism Based on Emotions? Pamboiotia in Hellenistic and Roman Times", in: H. Beck et al. (eds.), *Ethnos and Koinon. Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism* (Stuttgart 2019) 83–98.
- B. Gentili (ed.), *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche*. Introduzione, testo critico e traduzione a cura di B. Gentili. Commento a cura di C. Catenacci et al. (Milan 2013).
- G. Giangrande (ed.), *Plutarco. Narrazioni d'amore* (Naples 1991).
- P. R. Grigsby, *Boiotian Games: Festivals, Agōnes, and the Development of Boiotian Identity*. PhD Thesis (University of Warwick 2017).
- J. Hall, *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago, IL – London 2002).
- S. Hornblower, *Thucydidean Themes* (Oxford – New York 2010).
- 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, "De Delphes à Thermos: un témoignage épigraphique méconnu sur le trophée galate des Étoliens dans leur capitale", *CRAI* 151 (2007) 1215–1253.
- 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, "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).
- A. Kühr (Ganter), *Als Kadmos nach Boiotien kam. Polis und Ethnos im Spiegel thebanischer Gründungsmythen* (Stuttgart 2007).
- G. Lalonde, *Athena Itonia: Geography and Meaning of an Ancient Greek War Goddess* (Leiden 2019).
- S. Larson, “Boiotia, Athens, the Peisistratids, and the *Odyssey*’s Catalogue of Heroines”, *GRBS* 41 (2000) 193–222.
- S. Larson, *Tales of Epic Ancestry. Boiotian Collective Identity in the Late Archaic and Early Classical Periods* (Stuttgart 2007).
- G. Liberman (ed.), *Alcée. Fragments II* (Paris 1999).
- 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).
- C. Mann, “Sport im Hellenismus: Forschungsstand und Forschungsperspektiven”, in: C. Mann *et al.* (eds.), *Athletics in the Hellenistic World* (Stuttgart 2016) 17–31.
- A. P. Matthaiou, N. Papazarkadas, “Apologia agōnothētou tōn Basileiōn ek Lebadeias” [“A New Account of the agonothes of the Basileia from Lebadeia”], *Horos* 26–31 (2014–2019 [2020]) 159–192.
- 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 civique, pambéotienne, fédérale ou panhellénique?”, *REG* 133 (2020) 57–88.
- 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 ΜΟΙΣΑ (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, “Pindaric Reverberations: An Unpublished Inscription from the Museum of Thebes”, in: F. Camia *et al.* (eds.), *Munus Laetitiae. Studi miscellanei offerti a Maria Letizia Lazzarini* (Rome 2018) 19–32.
- 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. Parker, “New ‘Panhellenic’ Festivals in Hellenistic Greece”, in: R. Schlesier, U. Zellmann (eds.), *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Münster 2004) 9–22.
- R. Patrucco, *Lo sport nella Grecia antica* (Florence 1972).

- H. W. Pleket, "Sport in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor", in: P. Christesen, D. G. Kyle (eds.), *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Malden–Oxford–Chichester 2014) 364–375.
- E. E. Prodi, "Didymus and Lyric", in: E. E. Prodi, T. Coward (eds.), *Didymus and Graeco-Roman Learning* (London 2020) 21–33.
- S. Remijsen, "The So-Called 'Crown-Games': Terminology and Historical Context of the Ancient Categories for *Agones*", *ZPE* 177 (2011) 97–109.
- S. Remijsen, "Greek Sport in Egypt. Status Symbol and Lifestyle", in: P. Christesen, D. G. Kyle (eds.), *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Malden–Oxford–Chichester 2014) 349–363.
- L. Robert, "Discours d'ouverture", in: *Praktikà tou H' Diethnous Sunedriou Ellēnikēs kai Latinikēs Epigraphikēs, Athēna, 3–9 Oktōbriou 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).
- P. Roesch, *Études béotiennes* (Paris 1982).
- A. Schachter, "La Fête des Pamboiotia: le dossier épigraphique", *CEA* 8 (1978) 81–107.
- A. Schachter, "La Fête des Pamboiotia: le dossier épigraphique", *CEA* 11 (1980) 81–107.
- A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*. I. *Acheloos to Hera* (London 1981).
- 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).
- S. Scharff, "Improving the Public Image Through Athletics: Young Victors in Hellenistic Thebes", *CHS Research Bulletin* 5 (2016) <https://research-bulletin.chs.harvard.edu/2017/04/17/victors-in-hellenistic-thebes/> [last visit: 8.11.2022].
- G. Schmidt, *Rabe und Krähe in der Antike. Studien zur archäologischen und literarischen Überlieferung* (Wiesbaden 2002).
- W. Slater, "Stephanitic Orthodoxy?", *ZPE* 182 (2012) 168–178.
- S. Tufano, *Boiotia from Within. The Beginnings of Boiotian Historiography* (Münster 2019a).
- S. Tufano, "An Indirect Fragment of Boiotian Historiography in Plutarch? A Historical Defence of the *Love Stories*", *Vichiana* 56 (2019b) 51–63.
- S. Tufano, *Epaminonda di Tebe. Vita e sconfitte di un politico di successo* (Milan 2023).
- L. A. Turner, "The Basileia," in: 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) 105–126.
- A. D. Ure, "Boeotian Geometricising Vases", *JHS* 49 (1929) 160–171.
- A. D. Ure, "More Boeotian Geometricising Vases", *JHS* 55 (1935) 227–228.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).

The paper offers the first half of a comprehensive historical survey of the two most important Boiotian regional festivals, i.e. the Basileia of Lebadeia, for Zeus Basileus, and the Pamboiotia of Koroneia, for Athena Itonia. The author contends that these festivals had a regional impact and were performed independently of the existence of a federal government in Boiotia. Part I, in particular, addresses the origins of the two festivals and their status in the fourth century BC. Until the end of the fifth century BC (Section 1), the Pamboiotia are not attested with this name, but indirect evidence of literary and archaeological nature suggests that ritual processions and contests were held in Koroneia for Athena Itonia. The Basileia were only established in 371 BC, but in the sixth and the fifth centuries BC Lebadeia gained a wide reputation as an oracular site, also abroad. Section 2 concentrates on the fourth century BC, which marks the actual beginning of the Basileia. The literary and epigraphic evidence of the fourth century BC on this festival is discussed, but needs to be integrated with later sources: this is possible because of the continuity of the Basileia throughout the Hellenistic and the Republican periods. The Basileia were an individual competition and, although Theban in its first initiative, the festival became a national venture of the Boiotians. The fourth century BC marks a gap in the extant evidence on the Pamboiotia. The author contends that this was a moment of minor fortune for the festival and that the Basileia, at first, substituted the Pamboiotia as an occasion of self-celebration in Boiotia.

Публикуется часть I статьи, в которой автор дает всесторонний исторический обзор двух наиболее важных беотийских празднеств – Басилей в Лебадее в честь Зевса Басилевса и Памбеотий в Коронее в честь Афины Итонии. Автор доказывает, что они имели региональное значение и проводились вне зависимости от существования в Беотии федерального органа управления. В части I рассматривается предыстория этих праздников и их статус в IV в. до н. э. Вплоть до конца V в. (раздел 1) не засвидетельствовано название “Памбеотии”, но косвенные письменные и литературные свидетельства позволяют предположить, что в Коронее проводились процессии и состязания в честь Афины Итонии. Басилеи были учреждены только в 371 г. до н. э., но и в VI и V вв. Лебадея была известна за пределами Беотии благодаря своему оракулу. В разделе 2 автор обращается к IV в. до н. э., когда начали проводиться Басилеи. Обсуждаются письменные и археологические свидетельства IV в., но многие предположения делаются на основании более поздних источников, что обоснованно благодаря непрерывности существования Басилеев в эллинистическое и римское время. Басилеи предусматривали индивидуальные состязания. Учрежденные по инициативе Фив, они затем стали национальным праздником всех беотийцев. Для IV в. до н. э. нет свидетельств существования Памбеотий. Автор полагает, что в это время они были в упадке – как повод продемонстрировать этническую идентичность их заменили Басилеи.

Nicholas Lane

A CONJECTURE ON PINDAR,
PYTHIAN 2. 81–82

ἀδύνατα δ' ἔπος ἐκβαλεῖν κραταιὸν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς
δόλιον ἀστόν· ὁμῶς μὲν σαίνων ποτὶ πάντα ἄ-
ταν πάγχυ διαπλέκει.

82. ἄταν Heyne: ἄγαν MSS: ἄγαν Boeckh

The deceitful citizen cannot utter an effective word among good men,
but nonetheless he fawns on all and weaves his utter ruin.¹

Modern editors generally print Heyne's ἄταν for the MSS' ἄγαν.² Gentili's retention of the paradosis, notwithstanding Cingano's attempt to justify it,³ is metrically improbable. Iambic full base is rare in Pindaric glyconics.⁴ Everywhere else in *Pythian* 2 the base in s2 is occupied by a spondee. The juxtaposition of ἄγαν and πάγχυ is at best clunky and the sense not easy and with ἄγαν the verb is left, unexpectedly,

¹ The text is that printed by Snell–Maehler 1987, 59. The apparatus is my own. The translation is from Race 1997, 241.

² In addition to Snell–Maehler 1987, 59, Turyn 1952, 84, Race 1997, 240, Bremer 2003, 124, Liberman 2004, 70 (“Nombreuses autres corrections moins plausible”) and Ferrari 2018, 92 all print ἄταν. Most 1985, 113 n. 82 says that ἄταν is “preferable” but does not explain why. Schroeder 1900, 191 originally obelized ἄγαν, but at 1908, 96 he “returned” to Heyne's ἄταν (noted by Schroeder at 1923, 515). The exception is Gentili 1995, 70, who “by deviating from the consensus on metre among modern scholarship, keeps ἄγαν” (Itsumi 2009, 214).

³ Cingano in Gentili et al. 1995, 399–400.

⁴ As Itsumi 2009, 214 explains, “According to his [Gentili's] colometry, a pherecratean which ends with a short syllable can be followed by a glyconic which starts with an iamb (– ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ –)!” See further Itsumi 2009, 25 (“while the notation × – can be used [sc. for ◡ ◡] for tragedy and elsewhere, it is not appropriate for Pindar”) and 34–35. Understandably, editors since Gentili have declined to follow his lead.

without an object.⁵ ἄγαν is far more likely to be an error arising from scribal anticipation of πάγχυ, whether because of its nearly similar sense (‘entirely’/‘very much’), its appearance (because of the following -αγ-), or both.

Heyne’s ἄταν has also been doubted. Burton observes that ἄταν διαπλέκειν is a difficult phrase to parallel.⁶ According to Lloyd-Jones, “Heyne’s ἄταν ... gives the verb a most unusual object”.⁷ Carey notes that the agency of ἄτη “is usually divine, not human”.⁸ Kirkwood comments that ἄταν “to some extent contradicts the preceding sentence”, but suggests that it may be justifiable as “hyperbolic”.⁹ He also notes that ἄταν would have been an instance of *lectio faciliior* because it is “hard to see how [ἄταν] would have been corrupted”.¹⁰ Kirkwood concludes that the text “must be regarded as uncertain”.

The main difficulties with ἄταν are that it is rather an incongruous object for διαπλέκει. The verb seems to demand an intricate rather than a cataclysmic object. It is also difficult to imagine a human “weaving destruction”. One could imagine the Μοῖραι, or perhaps some other god or goddess, doing something like that, but not a mortal. At v. 78 Pindar asks ἥ κέρδει δὲ τί μάλα τοῦτο κερδαλέον τελέθει; (“But what profit really results from that cunning?”),¹¹ clearly indicating that while slanderous

⁵ In the active διαπλέκω invariably takes an accusative object, including in Pindar (*Pyth.* 12. 8; *Nem.* 7. 99).

⁶ Burton 1962, 130. The closest parallel I could find using a *TLG* proximity search was ἐπλεκες ἄτην at Apollinar. *Met. psalm.* 49. 44 (4th century AD). Carey 1981, 58 responds to Burton’s point about the use of διαπλέκω (although he does not specifically address the difficulty of finding parallels for the phrase ἄταν διαπλέκειν), arguing that Burton takes too limited a view of the potential figurative uses of the verb.

⁷ Lloyd-Jones 1973, 125 n. 97 (= 1990, 134 n. 97).

⁸ Carey 1981, 58. Carey does not consider whether this could be an argument against ἄταν (I think it is). He claims that ἄταν means ‘self-delusion’. But if ἄταν meant that here, it would trump the expectation that the deceitful citizen should try to deceive the person whom he is flattering. His argument also relies on a meaning of ἄτη which, according to Braswell 1998, 86 (n. on 21, ἄταν), is not the predominant one in the 5th century (which was ‘ruin’ or ‘calamity’).

⁹ Kirkwood 1982, 158.

¹⁰ Farnell 1930–1932, 2. 133, who considered ἄταν “bad”, had complained that it does not “explain the MS. corruption”, but without stating why.

¹¹ Tr. Race 1997, 239. Huschke’s conjecture κερδοῖ in v. 78, which gives a reference to a crafty vixen, does not perhaps follow the pl. ἄλωπέκων (77) neatly (a problem felt by Boeckh and Kayser, see Schroeder 1922, 22 [n. on 78]; reading dat. κερδοῖς would only raise the question whether the dat. of such a noun is plausible,

people cause problems (at least for their targets), they do not ultimately profit from them themselves. But ἄταν, as the ruin of one's enemy, could be understood as a kind of profit to the deceitful citizen and therefore as contradicting v. 78. More generally, Pindar's envious slanderers do not normally deal in ἄτη. They deploy words behind their targets' backs aimed at denting their reputations. Words deceive (*Ol.* 1. 29). They are an ὄψον ... φθονεροῖσιν, 'a tasty morsel for the envious' (*Nem.* 8. 21). Bowra observes that φθόνος is closely associated with ψόγος, μῶμος and κακαγορία.¹² ἄστοί and πολῖται talk. That is why in Pindar a hope is sometimes expressed that the victor or the singer will meet with good-will / lack of envy from townsfolk (*Ol.* 6. 7, 7. 89–90; *Nem.* 8. 38, 11. 17–18). The latter are branded as κακολόγοι (*Pyth.* 11. 28). Envious neighbours start malicious rumours on the sly (*Ol.* 1. 47–51: ἐννεπε κρυφᾷ [47]). In *Pythian* 2, Pindar says that he must avoid the δάκος ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν (53), the 'powerful bite of calumnies'. ὅμως μάν (82) suggests a contrast between the ἔπος ... κραταιόν (81) and some other kind of utterance that might be damaging.¹³ If there had been a lacuna in the transmitted text instead of the corrupt ἄγαν, it would have been quite natural to supply an object for διαπλέκει that has something to do with words. Lastly,

at least for this era), but it is certainly an attractive conjecture (especially in a fable-like context) and it is printed by Kirkwood 1982, 146, Gentili in Gentili et al. 1995, 70 and Liberman 2004, 68. Carey 1981, 56 thinks it preferable. However, I agree with Lloyd-Jones 1973, 124 (= 1990, 133) that "the best editorial procedure would be to mention Huschke's conjecture, but to place a crux against κέρδει in the text".

¹² 1964, 187, citing *Nem.* 7. 61 (ψόγος); *Ol.* 6. 74; *Pyth.* 1. 82; fr. 181 Maehler (μῶμος); *Ol.* 1. 53; *Pyth.* 2. 53, 11. 28 (κακαγορία). One may add chatter, τὸ λαλαγῆσαι (*Ol.* 2. 97), and πάρφασις (*Nem.* 8. 32), 'misrepresentation'. Pi. calls the latter the companion of the kind of words which the fawning deceiver can be expected to have used here at *Nem.* 8. 33 (αἰμύλων μύθων ὁμόφοιτος); for discussion see Bulman 1992, 48–50.

¹³ σαίνων (82) may and probably does here imply an utterance, but flattery is harmless unless accompanied by a more dangerous kind of utterance. It is unlikely that Pindar is suggesting that slander can simply be ignored just because it does not benefit slanderers personally. Otherwise, why describe it as an ἄμαχον κακόν (76), devote time and space to its discussion here (and elsewhere) or indeed attack a slanderous enemy like a wolf (84)? Most 1985, 113–114 argues that "this sentence does not oppose any kind of success on the part of the tricky citizen to the futility asserted in the previous sentence" and therefore that Wilamowitz' ὁμῶς should be read instead of the transmitted ὅμως. But Most also asserts that "it contrasts the kinds of means which are available to [the tricky citizen]" and thereby undermines his argument. Whichever way one looks at it, there is a contrast and no need to tamper with ὅμως.

Kirkwood's point about ἄταν being *lectio facilior* is a valid one. In the face of all this,¹⁴ it is surprising that ἄταν has become the preferred text.

A different solution would be to read ὁμως μὲν σαίνων ποτὶ πάντας ἄρὰν πάγχυ διαπλέκει, i.e. 'nonetheless while fawning on all he is tightly weaving a curse'.¹⁵ The groundwork for a reference to a curse is laid in the chain of thought that starts with mention of the ape (72). Apes always appeal to children because children are naive. Not so the Underworld judge Rhadamanthys, who is immune to deceptions (ἀπάταισι, 74). However, for a mortal deceit is an ever-present danger posed by ψιθύρων παλάμαις (75) and it is impossible to fight because those who deceive do so like foxes, on the quiet or under their breath, as is clear from ψιθύρων (75) and the preposition in the compound ὑποφάτις (76).¹⁶ What, it is then asked, is the benefit to the fox (78)? In truth there is none. The sort of scheme the fox deploys remains low like a fisherman's net at sea, but Pindar will float above the surface like a cork (79–80). In other words, he will avoid being ensnared. It is impossible for a deceitful citizen to say out loud in polite society a word that has the power to harm a noble person (81–82). Nonetheless, while the deceitful citizen praises everyone in polite society, in less polite society, he is privately weaving a tight curse (82). Both πάγχυ and the δια- of διαπλέκει underline the care taken over the curse. In διαπλέκει the δια- may reinforce the variance between open flattery and private curses, while -πλέκει has connotations of

¹⁴ I have not mentioned the earlier editors and commentators who rejected Heyne's ἄταν in favour of Boeckh's ἀγάν, including Schneidewin, Mezger, Gildersleeve, Fennell, Christ, Farnell, Sandys and Bowra. LSJ s.v. διαπλέκω I also accept it ("ἀγὰν πάγχυ δ. to try every twist, wind all ways"). But both sense ("weave a bend" is a strange locution) and the prosody of the first syllable (Schroeder 1923, 191: "de genuine vocis mensura [Choerob. I 308, 14 Hlg] dubitari licet") are doubtful.

¹⁵ Gerber 1976, 67 does not record it, but Pauw 1747, 135 suspected that σαίνων ποτὶ παντὰς ἀρα should be read. It is not entirely clear what Pauw meant (his failure to use accents does not help), but e.g. Heyne 1824, I. 179 and Mommsen 1864, 156 understood Pauw to mean ἄρα. ἀρά cannot at any rate be the subject of the masculine σαίνων. I wonder whether there has been some misunderstanding. Pauw himself added "α in ἀρα est anceps, ut nemo nescit", which might indicate that he meant ἀρά rather than ἄρα. The initial *alpha* in ἄρα cannot be described as "anceps". Strictly, it is not properly anceps in ἀρά either since it is long in Epic (and Doric) and short in Attic. If Pauw meant ἀρά, it is strange that he did not propose ἀράν.

¹⁶ The emphasis on the "stealthy" slanderers is noted by e.g. Lee 1978, 281 (with n. 3), who treats ψιθύρων and ὑποφάτις as "virtually synonymous".

trickery.¹⁷ This then supplies something consisting of words that might be dangerous to Pindar's patron and which contrasts with the unavailable ἔπος ... κραταίον (81).¹⁸ Unable to utter a strong or reliable word in public, the deceitful citizen must resort to a private curse. While it is difficult to provide a precise parallel for the phrase ἀρὰν διαπλέκειν, 'weave [i.e. compose] a curse',¹⁹ the metaphor "weaving words" (or things that consist of words) is a common one²⁰ and the idea that the deceitful citizen should quietly (as may be inferred from the emphasis on stealth in ψιθύρων and ὑποφάτιες [75, 76]) weave a curse is, while bold, a variation on that metaphor. A poorly formed *rho* would account for the transmitted ἄγαν.²¹

One might object that mention of a curse is alien to Pindar's high style, but it has often been observed that in the "epilogue" or "coda" of this ode (following χαῖρε [67]) he uses popular images and phrases.²² Certain features associated with ἀραί may lend further support. Curses are sometimes invoked in desperation, when the person making the curse lacks other means of redress.²³ ἀδύνατα (81) suggests this as the motive

¹⁷ See e.g. *CGL* s.v. πλέκω 5: "(pejor., of persons) devise, contrive – *trickery*, *plots*".

¹⁸ As is required for metre, the initial *alpha* of ἀρά is long (as at *Isthm.* 6. 43).

¹⁹ I take the verb to mean 'compose', as at θρήνον διαπλέξαις (*Pyth.* 12. 8, of Athena), with ἀρὰν the product woven by the deceitful citizen (presumably from words). On the early and classical use of διαπλέκω, see the survey by Held 1998, 382–384, who concludes that it "most frequently means to weave a product, not to interweave material".

²⁰ *Ol.* 6. 86–87 πλέκων | ποικίλον ὕμνον, *Nem.* 4. 94 ῥήματα πλέκων, *Pae.* 3. 12 (= fr. 52 c. 12 Maehler) αἰοδαῖς ἐν εὐπλε[κέσσιν] and fr. 179 Maehler ὑφαίνω δ' Ἀμυθαιονίδαισιν ποικίλον | ἄνδημα; cf. also [Eur.] *Rhes.* 834 πλέκων λόγους (with the commentaries ad loc. of Fantuzzi 2020, 569, Fries 2014, 428 and Liapis 2012, 292) and Pl. *Hp. mi.* 369 b.

²¹ In MS B (98 recto) the top of the *gamma* has some damage and there is no clear loop underneath (it is filled in). It therefore differs little from the *rho* in ἐχθρός (four lines below in the MS). This illustrates how slight the change proposed is. At Men. *Sam.* 477 the papyrus has ἐγώ, but Kassel's ἐρῶ may be right.

²² E.g. Wilamowitz 1922, 291 n. 1: "Auf Fabeln geht es nicht zurück, wenn Pindar hier Affe, Fuchs und Wolf einführt, sondern er greift einmal nach volkstümlichen Bildern und Ausdrücken, sehr verschieden von seinem sonstigen Style". Even in less overtly "popular" contexts, Pindar occasionally refers to magical practices, for instance at *Pyth.* 4. 213–219 where Faraone 1993, 6 has argued convincingly that the imagery of burning, flagellation, madness and bondage seems to reflect "the language, the goals and the social context of traditional Greek erotic incantations"; see also Graf 1999, 92–93.

²³ See Watson 1991, 6–7 ("[Curses] are also typically resorted to by persons who have no other means of redress") and 38 (with n. 182).

for a curse. The thoroughness with which the deceitful citizen weaves the curse (emphasized, as suggested above, by *πάγχν* and *διαπλέκει* [82]) may also reflect another feature of curses. It has been observed that “it is usual for persons uttering a magic spell to express their wishes in the fullest possible terms, in order to avoid any misapprehension on the part of the demons or spirits who will execute it”.²⁴ It is, lastly, accepted that *defixiones* may have originated in Hieron’s native Sicily²⁵ and Pindar would presumably have been aware of the practice.

Nicholas Lane
Ealing, London
njglane@yahoo.com

Bibliography

- C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964).
 B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*, Texte und Kommentare 14 (Berlin – New York 1988).
 D. Bremer (ed., tr.), *Pindar, Siegeslieder* (Dusseldorf–Zürich 2003).
 P. Bulman, *Phthonos in Pindar*, University of California Publications: Classical Studies 35 (Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1992).
 R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar’s Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford 1962).
 C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8* (New York 1981).
 E. Eidinow, *Oracles, Curses, and Risk among the Ancient Greeks* (Oxford 2007).
 S. Eitrem, “Die rituelle ΔΙΑΒΟΛΗ”, *Symb. Osl.* 2 (1924) 43–61.
 M. Fantuzzi (ed.), *The Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Cambridge 2020).
 C. A. Faraone, “The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells”, in: C. A. Faraone, D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic & Religion* (New York 1991).
 C. A. Faraone, “The Wheel, the Whip and Other Instruments of Torture: Erotic Magic in Pindar *Pythian* 4.213–19”, *CJ* 89 (1993) 1–19.
 L. R. Farnell (ed., tr.), *The Works of Pindar I–III* (London 1930–1932).
 F. Ferrari (ed., tr.), *Pindaro, Pitiche* (Milan 2018).

²⁴ Watson 1991, 12.

²⁵ The earliest evidence dates to the early 5th or late 6th century; see Eidinow 2007, 141–142, who suggests that the Athenians may have adopted the practice of writing curses on tablets from Sicily. Watson 2019, 58 is more categorical that the practice came to Athens from Sicily. For curses in an “agonistic” context, see Faraone 1991, 10–17.

- A. Fries (ed.), *Pseudo-Euripides: Rhesus*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 114 (Berlin–Boston 2014).
- B. Gentili, P. A. Bernardini, E. Cingano, P. Giannini (eds.), *Pindaro, Le Pitiche* (Milan 1995).
- D. E. Gerber, *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972* (Amsterdam 1976).
- F. Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World*. Tr. F. Philip (Cambridge, MA – London 1999).
- G. F. Held, “Weaving and Triumphal Shouting in Pindar, *Pythian* 12.6–12”, *CQ* 48 (1998) 380–388.
- C. G. Heyne (ed.), *Pindari carmina cum lectionis varietate et adnotatiobus* I–III (London 1824).
- K. Itsumi, *Pindaric Metre: The ‘Other Half’* (Oxford 2009).
- G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar*, American Philological Association, textbook series 7 (Chico, CA 1982).
- H. M. Lee, “Slander (δισβολή) in Herodotus 7, 10, η, and Pindar, *Pythian* 2, 76”, *Hermes* 106: 2 (1978) 279–283.
- V. Liapis (ed.), *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford 2012).
- G. Liberman (éd., tr.), *Pindare, Pythiques* (Paris 2004).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, “Modern Interpretations of Pindar: The Second *Pythian* and Seventh *Nemean Odes*”, *JHS* 93 (1973) 109–137 (= *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Hugh Lloyd-Jones* [Oxford 1990] 110–153).
- G. W. Most, *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar’s Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*, *Hypomnemata* 83 (Göttingen 1985).
- J. C. de Pauw, *Notae in Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia* (Utrecht 1747).
- W. H. Race (ed., tr.), *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes* (Cambridge, MA – London 1997).
- O. Schroeder (ed.), *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig 1900).
- O. Schroeder (ed.), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis selectis* (Leipzig 1908).
- O. Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig–Berlin 1922).
- O. Schroeder (ed.), *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig–Berlin 1923).
- B. Snell, H. Maehler (eds.), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis* I (Leipzig 1987).
- A. Turyn (ed.), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis* (Oxford 1952).
- L. Watson, *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity*, *ARCA* 26 (Leeds 1991).
- L. Watson, *Magic in Ancient Greece and Rome* (London – New York – Dublin 2019).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).

Heyne’s conjecture at *Pythian* 2. 82 has become the modern vulgate. This note argues that there are reasons why editors should resist it and instead proposes a new solution to the crux.

Конъектура Хейне к *Pyth.* 2. 28 стала издательской вульгатой. В статье приводятся аргументы против этой конъектуры и предлагается новое решение проблемы.

Gauthier Liberman

PETITS RIENS SOPHOCLEÉENS : *ANTIGONE* II*
(V. 162–169, 189–190, 203–204, 207–208, 241–242,
253–254, 289–290, 320–321, 370–375, 389–390,
392–393, 413–414, 444–445, 497–501)

Κρ. ἄνδρες, τὰ μὲν δὴ πόλεος ἀσφαλῶς θεοὶ
πολλῷ σάλῳ σείσαντες ὄρθωσαν πάλιν·
ὕμᾱς δ' ἐγὼ πομποῖσιν ἐκ πάντων δίχα
ἔστειλ' ἰκέσθαι, τοῦτο μὲν τὰ Λαΐου 165
σέβοντας εἰδῶς εὖ θρόνων ἀεὶ κράτη,
τοῦτ' αὖθις, ἥνίκ' Οἰδίπους ὄρθου πόλιν,
κάπει διώλετ', ἀμφὶ τοὺς κείνων ἔτι
παῖδας μένοντας ἐμπέδοις φρονήμασιν.

Créon rend hommage à la fidélité du chœur aux trois générations de Labdacides que les choreutes ont connues, celle de Laïos, celle d'Œdipe et celle d'Étéocle, qui est naturellement aussi celle de Polynice, d'Antigone et d'Ismène. C'est nécessairement Œdipe et Jocaste que κείνων vise ou plutôt devrait viser, car, en l'état du texte, c'est impossible. Mais le texte est fautif, comme le prouve une autre difficulté : si la séquence ἀμφὶ τοὺς κείνων ἔτι | παῖδας μένοντας ἐμπέδοις φρονήμασιν répond à la proposition κάπει διώλετ' et (je tiens cela pour un fait incontestable) à elle seule, il manque la séquence qui devrait correspondre à ἥνικ' Οἰδίπους ὄρθου πόλιν. La conclusion inévitable, à laquelle Müller 1967 et Lloyd-Jones–Wilson se sont rendus tandis que Jebb et Griffith s'y sont, aux

* « On obtiendrait donc, ai-je écrit (*Hyperboreus* 28 : 1 [2022] 42) à propos des vers 29–30, οἰωνοῖς | γλυκὺν ἔρμαιον εἰσορμῶσι πρὸς χαρὰν βορᾶς, “douce bonne fortune pour les oiseaux qui s’y précipitent en vue d’un jouissif repas” : il est difficile de nier qu’un tel vers soit digne de Sophocle ». Pour que le vers soit digne de Sophocle, il faut lire οἰωνοῖς γλυκὺ | ἔρμαιον εἰσορμῶσι πρὸς χαρὰν βορᾶς. Je prie donc le lecteur de bien vouloir noter la correction. Dans la même observation (43 n. 62), il nous échappé que notre suggestion sur *Iliade* 1, 5 se rapproche d’une conjecture inédite d’A. Heubeck publiée par W. Burkert dans P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, N. J. Richardson (edd.), *Hesperos. Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford 2007) 59–60.

dépens de leurs lecteurs et de Sophocle, soustraits, est qu'il manque un vers après le vers 167 (W. Dindorf). Ce vers devait aussi mentionner Jocaste et donner ainsi à κείνων le référent qui lui manque. Tout cela, Lloyd-Jones–Wilson le voient, mais ils supposent la perte de deux vers.¹ L'hypothèse de l'omission d'un seul vers suffit ; ce vers a dû avoir à peu près le sens de celui que je forge « exempli gratia » et qui contient la ou les causes de son accidentelle omission, στέργοντας αὐτὸν καὶ δάμαρθ' ὁμόσπορον.² Lachmann³ attribue à Créon 294 vers ($6 \times 7 \times 7$) répartis en 105 (15×7) prises de parole. L'ajout d'un vers à la rhèse détruit la computation de Lachmann, mais il s'agit d'un ajout indispensable. Si le principe lachmannien est juste, il doit y avoir une unité en trop dans les vers attribués à Créon par la tradition ou par l'illustre érudit.⁴

Κρ. ἥδ' ἐστὶν ἡ σφύζουσα καὶ ταύτης ἔπι
πλέοντες ὀρθῆς τοὺς φίλους ποιοῦμεθα. 190

Créon vient d'afficher son intention de ne laisser personne perturber l'ordre de la cité : il ne fait aucun cas de celui pour qui il existe plus important que sa propre patrie, μεῖζον⁵ ὅστις ἀντὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ πάτρας |

¹ Deux trimètres sont proposés « exempli gratia » dans l'apparat critique et chez Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 122.

² J'emprunte à Lloyd-Jones–Wilson l'idée d'utiliser cette épithète (*Oed. rex* 260).

³ Lachmann 1822, 46 et, pour le détail, 70. Il considère le rôle de Créon comme dévolu au protagoniste, malgré le témoignage d'Eschine (voir Pickard-Cambridge 1996, 188–190) selon lequel il revenait au tritagoniste (cf. Sommerbrodt 1876, 68). Le pionnier (cf. Lachmann 1841, 457–458) n'a jamais cessé d'être convaincu d'avoir découvert avec le chiffre sept et ses multiples un principe de composition et de distribution des parties parlées de la tragédie (principe que Lachmann constate sans pouvoir en expliquer la raison) et, au moins pour Sophocle – auteur présumé de l'élévation du nombre de douze choreutes attesté par une scène célèbre de l'*Agamemnon* d'Eschyle (Wilamowitz 1914b, 175) – et Euripide, des parties chantées par deux demi-chœurs de sept choreutes auxquels s'ajoute le coryphée (Lachmann 1819, 123–137). Il avait même deviné qu'on marcherait dans ses pas sans se référer à lui (voir les travaux particuliers réunis dans Irigoien 2009).

⁴ On verra nos observations sur le v. 776.

⁵ Leçon de L^{ac} K et conjecture de Wakefield, que, en compagnie de Nauck (entre autres), je préfère à μεῖζον' des autres témoins. Jebb a la naïveté de penser que la paraphrase de Démosthène, *De falsa legatione* 248, suggère que l'orateur « lisait » μεῖζον', comme si Démosthène lisait Sophocle dans un texte muni de signes diacritiques. Je ne crois d'ailleurs pas que sa paraphrase suppose que Démosthène ait entendu μεῖζον'.

φίλον νομίζει (182–183), et il ne considérera pas comme son ami un ennemi de la patrie, οὐτ' ἂν φίλον ποτ' ἄνδρα δυσμενῆ χθονός | θείμην ἑμαυτῷ (187–188), car « c'est la cité qui assure notre conservation et c'est en étant à bord d'une cité bien pilotée que nous nous faisons nos amis ». Griffith trouve que τοὺς φίλους ποιοῦμεθα « neatly redeploys » φίλον (v. 183, 187). Mais quel rapport entre se faire ses amis et être à bord du vaisseau bien piloté qu'est la cité bien gouvernée ? « It seems to be illogical to speak of one's friends in this context », remarque Ehrenberg.⁶ Et le grec dit-il τοὺς φίλους ποιεῖσθαι pour dire « se faire ses amis » ? Le tour φίλους ποιεῖσθαι ne semble attesté qu'au sens de « se concilier l'amitié » de gens qui forment le COD dont φίλους est l'attribut. J'oppose οὐ γὰρ πάσχοντες εὖ ἀλλὰ δρῶντες κτώμεθα τοὺς φίλους chez Thucydide (2, 40, 4).⁷ Jebb et Griffith observent à juste titre qu'un passage du « dernier discours » de Périclès chez Thucydide (2, 60, 2) fait écho au passage de Sophocle.⁸ Nul ne s'étonnera que rien chez Thucydide ne fasse écho au saugrenu τοὺς φίλους ποιοῦμεθα. Loin que les occurrences précédentes de φίλον préparent τοὺς φίλους, elles suggèrent une faute par persévérance. La bonne gouvernance garantit, selon Créon, le salut des citoyens comme le bon pilotage d'un vaisseau garantit le bon déroulement de la traversée : ἀεὶ καλὸς πλοῦς ἔσθ', ὅταν φεύγῃς κακά, dit Philoctète (641) ;⁹ « una nauis est iam bonorum omnium, quam quidem nos damus operam ut rectam teneamus, utinam prospero cursu ! », écrit Cicéron à son frère (*Fam.* 12, 25, 5). On voit où je veux en venir : Sophocle a dû écrire ταύτης ἔπι πλέοντες ὀρθῆς

⁶ Ehrenberg 1954, 147. Bruhn 1913 cite avec à-propos Démocrite fr. 252 Diels, πόλις γὰρ εὖ ἀγομένη μεγίστη ὀρθωσίς ἐστι, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάντα ἔνι, καὶ τούτου σφωζομένου πάντα σώζεται καὶ τούτου διαφθειρομένου τὰ πάντα διαφθείρεται.

⁷ L'explication de Wex 1829, « eos amicos, quos quisque sibi conciliare studet, quibus carere non potest in gubernanda republica », ne résout pas le problème. Reinhardt 1933, 81 explique τοὺς φίλους ποιοῦμεθα par τοὺς φίλους κτώμεθα, sans référence explicite à Thucydide, et rapporte aussi cette « amitié » à l'« Anhängerschaft », « das Band politisch Gleichgesinnter » (p. 90).

⁸ Loin que Thucydide s'inspire de Sophocle (ce qui, du reste, n'est pas impossible), Sophocle et Thucydide s'inspirent peut-être chacun de son côté d'un propos déjà tenu par Périclès avant la composition de l'*Antigone*.

⁹ Dans *Phil.* 1450–1451, ὅδ' ἐπείγει γὰρ καιρὸς καὶ πλοῦς κατὰ πρύμνην (ainsi Schein 2013 d'après Burges et Hermann ; texte transmis καιρὸς καὶ πλοῦς ὅδ' ἐπείγει γὰρ κατὰ πρύμναν), il faut, je crois, lire non πλοῦς mais πνοῦς, mot rarissime (attesté maintenant chez Posidippe 72, 1 Austin–Bastianini), certes, mais dont Thucydide 2, 97, 1, ἥν αἰεὶ κατὰ πρύμναν ἰστίηται τὸ πνεῦμα, prouve la justesse.

πλοῦς καλοὺς ποιούμεθα – ou peut-être πλοῦν καλὸν.¹⁰ Le mérite de cette belle émendation revient à Siegfried Mekler,¹¹ et il est proportionnel à l'inadvertance des commentateurs et éditeurs, excepté Nauck,¹² qui recommanda cette correction ensuite négligée. Sophocle paraît employer le pluriel πλοῖ (*Phil.* 304, οὐκ ἐνθάδ' οἱ πλοῖ τοῖσι σῶφροσιν βροτῶν),¹³ et l'expression πλοῦν ποιεῖσθαι traverse toute la grécité depuis Thucydide (4, 3, 1). La correction a aussi l'intérêt de mettre en exergue l'arrogance de Créon : comme il l'apprendra, un bon pilotage ne suffit pas à garantir une bonne traversée. Il faut la faveur divine, suspendue au respect des dieux : δὸς γενέσθαι πλοῦν νεῶν ἀπήμονα, demande à Artémis le fils de Pélée qui lui offre un sacrifice (Euripide, *Iph. Aul.* 1575) ;¹⁴ « utinam prospero cursu ! », prie Cicéron. Or l'importance du respect du sacré et du divin pour le bon exercice du pouvoir, si solidement conceptualisé et efficacement exercé ce pouvoir soit-il, est un des thèmes fondamentaux de la pièce : la correction que je défends rétablit une illustration de ce thème. Démosthène (*De falsa leg.* 247) cite les vers 175–190 et son texte porte aussi τοὺς φίλους, mais il n'est pas interdit de penser que le texte de Sophocle cité par Démosthène a été revu d'après le texte courant de l'*Antigone*. Ainsi, στείχουσιν ἀστοῖς (186) est la leçon de la tradition manuscrite de Démosthène et de la tradition de Sophocle, mais la paraphrase de Démosthène dit στείχουσιν ὁμοῦ, ce qui suggéra à Dobree que Démosthène lisait ἄσσον. On lit τοὺς λόγους ποιούμεθα chez Stobée (3, 39, 16), qui cite les v. 187–191 : c'est une faute par anticipation du vers 389 des *Phéniciennes* d'Euripide, dont est tirée la citation qui suit.

¹⁰ Opposer *Ajax* 1081–1083, ὅπου δ' ὑβρίζειν δρᾶν θ' ἃ βούλεται παρῇ, | ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν χρόνῳ ποτὲ | ἐξ οὐρίων δραμοῦσαν εἰς βυθὸν πεσεῖν (voir Finglass 2011, 443–444 ; le répertoire de Radtke 1867, 12 omet *Ant.* 189–190 !).

¹¹ Mekler 1885, LXIII : « τοὺς φίλους ποιούμεθα, quibus uerbis imaginis uim non posse non infringi Gomperzius monet, dubium insuper est an post οὐτ' ἂν φίλον ποτ' ἄνδρα δυσμενῆ χθονὸς θεῖμην ἐμαντῶ circulum quem dicunt uitiosum efficiant : licet incerta sit correctio, πλοῦς καλοὺς ποιούμεθα ad traditam scripturam proxime accedit ». L'objection de la circularité de l'argumentation est intéressante.

¹² Nauck 1886, 159 : « τοὺς φίλους ist schwerlich statthaft ».

¹³ Dawe supprime, d'après une idée de Bergk, le vers apparemment superfétatoire. On rapproche Xénophon, *An.* 5, 7, 7, λέγεται, ὅταν βορρᾶς πνέῃ, ὡς καλοὶ πλοῖ εἰσιν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

¹⁴ Voir aussi Pind. *Ol.* 6, 103–105 et Hutchinson 2001, 424 ; Soph. *Phil.* 779–781.

Κρ. τοῦτον πόλει τῇδ' ἐκκεκήρυκται τάφω 203
 μήτε κτερίζειν μήτε κωκῦσαί τινα...

203 ἐκκεκήρυκται τάφω Musgrave : ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι τάφω codd. :
ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι λέγω Nauck.

Des deux émendations mentionnées, Jebb, Dawe 1979, Lloyd-Jones–Wilson et Griffith ont choisi la mauvaise, car κτερίζειν frappe d' inanité¹⁵ l'étrange contre-rejet τάφω, très gauchement extrait du syntagme μήτε κτερίζειν. Il s'agit en fait d'une glose insérée qu'inspirèrent les v. 27–28, ἀστοῖσί φασιν ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι τὸ μὴ | τάφω καλύψαι μηδὲ κωκῦσαί τινα. C'est une chance que l'infinitif ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι ait survécu dans la tradition ; il appelle naturellement λέγω, qu'il faudrait restituer même si Nauck 1886 ne s'était pas avisé de la parodie de Carnéade citée d'après Favorinus par Diogène Laërce, 4, 64 p. 341 Dorandi, τοῦτον σχολῆς τῆσδ' ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι λέγω. Cette parodie administre la preuve que la vraie leçon est ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι λέγω chez Sophocle.

Κρ. τοιόνδ' ἐμὸν φρόνημα, κοῦποτ' ἐκ γ' ἐμοῦ
 τιμῇ προέξουσ' οἱ κακοὶ τῶν ἐνδίκων. 208

208 τιμῇ Linwood : τιμὴν codd. | προέξουσ'] προσ- KRZf.

Le datif « de point de vue » τιμῇ semble un progrès si on lit προέξουσ',¹⁶ mais le texte comporte encore une difficulté sérieuse, car ce que Créon refuse, c'est non d'accorder aux méchants des honneurs supérieurs à ceux qu'ils donneraient aux bons mais de leur accorder les mêmes honneurs qu'aux bons : comparer 516, εἴ τοί σφε τιμᾶς ἐξ ἴσου τῷ

¹⁵ Le verbe n'équivaut plus qu'à θάπτειν (cf. par ex. Hermias, *In Platonis Phaedrum scholia* p. 163, 25 Lucarini–Moscherini, κτερίσαι γὰρ τὸ θάψαι, et voir Debrunner 1922, 110). Il n'est jamais suivi d'un complément de moyen ! Le sens primitif était beaucoup plus large, puisqu'il s'agissait de rendre au mort ce qui avait appartenu au vivant : voir Bruck 1926, 75–94. Bruck, 77–86 rattache à la même famille κτέρας et κτάομαι (voir là-contre Latte 1968, 325, en raison de la différence de vocalisme ; Pott 1867, 486 admet la parenté de κτέανον et de κτέρας et évoque les difficultés liées au vocalisme). « No etymology » déclare Beekes 2010 au mot κτέρας.

¹⁶ Toutefois ἐκ γ' ἐμοῦ semble meilleur avec τιμὴν (προ)έξουσ' : rapprocher 209–210, θανάων | καὶ ζῶν ὁμοίως ἐκ γ' ἐμοῦ τιμῆσεται.

δυσσεβεῖ ; ¹⁷ 520, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ χρηστὸς τῷ κακῷ λαχεῖν ἴσος.¹⁸ On se demande comment, en admettant qu'il le voulût, Créon pourrait, en lui accordant la sépulture, conférer à Polynice qui en est privé des honneurs supérieurs à ceux qu'il est censé octroyer à Étéocle en le pourvoyant d'une sépulture.¹⁹ Hermann 1830, à qui la difficulté n'a pas échappé et qui vitupère l'hiatus προέ-,²⁰ se contente d'adopter la variante τιμὴν προσέξουσ' sans dire comment il interprète le passage. Wunder 1846 croit savoir que Hermann entendait τιμὴν προσέξουσ' ἐκ τῶν ἐνδίκων, ce qui semble absurde, et il lui reproche l'explication qu'il lui attribue. Hermann n'a guère pu entendre le passage comme le dit Wunder ; il

¹⁷ Brown 1991, 330–331 défend la variante δυσμενεῖ, que Lloyd-Jones–Wilson ne mentionnent pas.

¹⁸ Je discuterai ce passage dans le prochain jeu de ces « Petits riens sophocléens ».

¹⁹ Voir Willink 2010, 683–689. Il corrige les v. 24–25 afin que n'apparaisse pas comme un fait advenu – ce qui est en contradiction flagrante et inescamotable avec les v. 196–197 – la collation des honneurs funèbres à Étéocle. Nauck 1852, 238 avait déjà évoqué le problème et suscité de la part d'Ullrich 1853, 51–58 une réponse plus convaincue que convaincante. Ullrich a toutefois raison de nier la possibilité de mettre sur le compte d'une rumeur fausse (ὥς λέγουσι) l'accomplissement du rite funèbre au bénéfice d'Étéocle. Willink veut lire Ἑτεοκλέα μέν, ὥς λέγουσι, σὺν δίκη κρίνας (χρησθεῖς mss.) δικαιοῖ (δικαία mss.) καὶ νόμῳ κατὰ χθονὸς κρύψαι σφε (ἔκρυψε mss.) τοῖς ἔνερθεν ἔντιμον θεοῖς (νεκροῖς mss., corr. Brunck d'après 1070, τῶν κάτωθεν ἐνθάδ' αὐθιγῶν). Le style est affreusement embarrassé. Le vers 24 contient au moins deux anomalies, χρησθεῖς (pour χρησάμενος ? ; défendu par Allan 2006, 121–123) et (σὺν δίκη) δικαία (« iusto iure » Tite-Live 21, 3, 4 ; grec tardif et byzantin δικαία δίκη « la juste peine »), qui suggèrent que Wunder 1846 peut avoir raison de reconnaître une interpolation et donc que toute correction du v. 24 risque d'équivaloir à un cautère sur une jambe de bois. Je tente σὺν δίκη | ἔθηκε τοῖς ἔνερθεν ἔντιμον θεοῖς. En faisant connaître (ὥς λέγουσι et v. 32–34) son intention de mettre Étéocle en terre, Créon lui ouvre le droit d'être τοῖς ἔνερθεν ἔντιμος θεοῖς. L'aoriste exprime une anticipation semblable à celle de προτίσας ἔχει (v. 22). Croyant que ἔθηκε implique que le rite a déjà été accompli, un diorthote aura cru bon d'exprimer clairement cette idée : de là ἔκρυψε, qui n'est pas le verbe le plus approprié à Ἑτεοκλέα (COD) ἔντιμον (attribut du COD), et la supplétion du v. 24, effectuée « crassa Minerua » (en admettant que l'interpolation ne soit pas elle-même altérée).

²⁰ Wunder oppose αὐτοέντην (*El.* 272, cf. *Oed. rex* 107) à la remarque de Hermann (« hiatum etiam in media uoce uitant tragici », Hermann 1830, 331). Jebb ajoute προεῖπας (*Oed. rex.* 351), qui est une correction de Reiske pour προσεῖπας. Hermann l'accepte, et pour cause : l'hiatus y est différent. On dira que προέξουσ' peut être excusé par l'impossibilité de la crase due à l'esprit rude (opposer *Ant.* 80, προῦχοι ; voir Kühner–Blass 1890, 222). L'hiatus demeure ; s'y ajoute la difficulté de sens.

joignait peut-être τῶν ἐνδίκων à τιμὴν, « les méchants (n’obtiendront pas) de moi les honneurs des bons » – mais προσέξουσ’ ne peut avoir le sens que requiert cette interprétation. Wunder tente de neutraliser la difficulté vue par Hermann au moyen d’un raisonnement captieux.²¹ Le vers 520 réfuterait, s’il était besoin, l’argument voisin et non moins captieux de Jebb selon lequel le même honneur est plus grand conféré à un ennemi de la patrie qu’à un patriote. La vérité est que ni προσέξουσ’ ni προσέξουσ’, corruption de προέξουσ’, ne conviennent. La correction la plus obvie est (τιμὴν) καθέξουσ’ (cf. par exemple 502–503, καίτοι πόθεν κλέος γ’ ἂν εὐκλέεστερον | κατέσχον...). J’explique le changement du préverbe par la mécompréhension du génitif τῶν ἐνδίκων, que pro-permettait au diorthote de comprendre à sa façon.

Kp. εὖ γε στοχάζη κάποφάργνυσαι κύκλω 241
τὸ πρᾶγμα. δηλοῖς δ’ ὥς τι σημανῶν νέον.

241 εὖ γε στοχάζη] τί φροιμάζει; Aristt. *Rhet.* 1415b, quod re uera ad locum Sophocleum uix pertinere docuit Kassel 1976, 184–185.

Le garde prend ses sûretés : il affirme n’avoir pas commis l’infraction et n’avoir pas été témoin de sa commission. « Well, you are certainly doing a good job of figuring <me> out and getting your defences up around this whole matter » dit Griffith, marchant sur les pas de Jebb, « you take your aim well ». Même si l’on admet la supplétion arrangeante du COD, on partagera l’objection de Seyffert 1865 : « quid sit illud *bene collineas* aut quomodo cum iis, quae sequuntur, quae nihil dissimulationis habent, re cohaereat uix ac ne uix quidem intellegi potest ». Toute la question est, à mon avis, de savoir si στοχάζη peut exprimer l’idée que Wilamowitz²² rend ainsi, « du stellst deine Netze gut und umwallest rings die Sache », en en appelant au témoignage capital d’une section de Pollux relative aux filets de chasse : καλεῖται

²¹ « Fingit autem habere aliquid praecipui uiros improbos, si non solum scelerum suorum poenas non expendant, sed adeo eundem quem boni honorem consequantur ».

²² Wilamowitz 1962, 456–457. Voir déjà Schneidewin 1852, 56. Nauck 1886 a nui à la bonne intelligence du passage en éliminant, dans ses révisions du Sophocle de Schneidewin, l’explication de ce dernier au profit de la pseudo-variante aristotélécienne. Brown 1991, 329–330 défendrait la conjecture de F. Jacobs στεγάζη « you are covering yourself » s’il ne préférerait admettre une interpolation. Je rejette les deux suppositions.

τῶν ἀρκύων ἡ στίχη στοῖχος καὶ στόχος καὶ στοχὰς καὶ στοχασμός καὶ στοιχισμός (5, 36). Wilamowitz appelle « Verwechselung » la substitution prétendue, chez Aristote,²³ de τί φροimiάζη; à εὖ γε στοχάζη. Wilamowitz procède lui-même à une « Verwechselung », car le texte de Pollux (I, 271, 2–4 Bethe) porte non καλεῖται τῶν ἀρκύων ἡ στίχη mais καλεῖται δ' αὐτῶν ἡ στάσις, où αὐτῶν renvoie aux filets. Que veut donc dire ἡ στίχη ? S'agit-il d'un *lapsus calami*, d'un « sphalma typothetarum »? Wilamowitz avait-il conjecturé ἡ στάλιξ ou ἡ σχαλῖς ?²⁴ En tout cas, la pose de piquets de bois rangés στοιχηδόν ou στιχηδόν et destinés à soutenir les filets de chasse est bien connue.²⁵ Le στοχάζομαι de Sophocle serait à peu près l'équivalent du στοιχίζω de Xénophon (*Cyn.* 6, 8), « disposer en rang les piquets de bois destinés à soutenir les filets » et par extension « disposer les filets », « indagine cingo » comme traduit le *TGL*. Il paraît inutile de recourir à une forme στιχίζη (conjecture citée par Jebb et Lloyd-Jones–Wilson et que Pearson 1924 mit dans le texte), « tu disposes en rangée », présente dans la *Septante* (*Ez.* 42, 3, ἐστιχισμέναι ἀντιπρόσωποι στοαὶ τρισσαί).²⁶ Il est en effet beaucoup plus plausible d'admettre deux sens du verbe στοχάζομαι, comme on admet deux sens du substantif στοχασμός, « conjecture » et « fixation de filets de chasse sur des piquets ». On pourrait être tenté de rapporter στοιχίζω et στοχάζομαι à une origine commune, celle de

²³ *Lapsus memoriae* d'Aristote selon Griffith, qui cite Euripide, *Iph. Taur.* 1162, τί φροimiάζη νεοχμόν; ἐξαύδα σαφῶς. « Clearly an interpolation in Aristotle's text », prononce Brown 1991, 329. Kassel 1976, 184–185 donne une explication plus subtile, dont il ressort que τί φροimiάζη; n'a rien à voir avec l'*Antigone* et ne devrait plus être citée comme variante du texte des mss. de cette pièce.

²⁴ Voir Pollux 5, 31, στάλικες δὲ καὶ σχαλίδες καὶ σχαλιδώματα ξύλα ὀρθά, ἐξ ἄκρου διττά, ιστάμενα μὲν κατὰ τῆς γῆς, τοῖς δὲ δίκροισι ἀνέχοντα τοὺς τῶν δικτύων βρόχους τε καὶ περιδρόμους ; Xénophon, *Cyn.* 6, 7 et 9 ; E. Pottier *DAGR* IV, 851. Cet aspect est omis dans l'exposé de West 1979, 108.

²⁵ La note de Bethe indique les textes pertinents.

²⁶ West 1979, 107–108 allègue, en faveur du texte et de l'interprétation ici défendus, Eschyle, *Ag.* 1382–1383, ἄπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον, ὥσπερ ἰχθύων, | περιστοιχίζω, πλοῦτον εἵματος κακόν, οὐ περιστοιχίζω, impeccablement formé, est sa correction des variantes περιστιχίζω (lu par Fraenkel 1950) et περιστοιχίζω (non métrique). Voir aussi West 1990, 218–219. On pourrait lire chez Sophocle στοχίζη, mais West a raison de dire que la leçon στοχάζη, sous cette forme et dans le sens requis, se défend très bien. Il est toutefois une difficulté que West ne voit pas : comment, chez Eschyle, concilier avec un filet à attraper les poissons les piquets du filet de chasse terrestre que paraît impliquer περιστοιχίζω ? On dira que la notion de piquets est ici neutralisée. West 1998 lui-même cite la conjecture intelligente περιστολίζω (Needham).

στείχω, στίξ ; le latin *collineo* (cf. français « ligne de mire ») montre qu'un verbe dérivé d'un mot qui signifie « ligne » (cf. στίξ, στιχηδόν / στοιχηδόν) peut signifier « viser », στοχάζομαι. Mais cette tentation se heurte à « die Unvereinbarkeit des Vokales », comme le remarque Pott,²⁷ entre στείχω, στίξ, στοιχηδόν, d'un côté, et, de l'autre, στόχος, « alles Aufgerichtete, Aufgestellte, gew. das aufgestellte Ziel 2. übertr. das Zielen, Vermuthen, Muthmassen ». Le mot στόχος (« pilier », inscription attique de 307–306 av. J.-C.,²⁸ « piquet »²⁹) explique l'équivalence approchée de στοχάζομαι et de στοιχίζω, puisque la rangée (στοῖχος) qui soutient les filets est formée de piquets. Une confusion des deux familles de mots était pratiquement inévitable. Au sens de « viser », στοχάζομαι n'apparaît pas avant Hippocrate et, dans le sens de « conjecturer », pas avant Platon. Le mot est absent de la poésie. Je crois que le στοχάζη de Sophocle devrait faire son entrée dans les lexiques, les commentaires et ailleurs, pourvu de son vrai sens, indiqué par Pollux, intrinsèquement possible et parfaitement adapté au contexte, « tu installes tes filets », « bene rem tuam indagine cingis et circumsaepis ».³⁰ Je finis par où j'aurais commencé si je n'avais voulu éviter de donner à croire que l'interprétation du passage de Sophocle dépend de cette considération. Sophocle paraît combiner deux métaphores eschyléennes qui ornent la rhèse de Clytemnestre, *Ag.* 1375–1376, *πημονῆς ἀρκύστατ' ἄν | φάρξειεν ὕψος κρεῖσσον ἐκπηδήματος*, et, passage qu'on vient de discuter, 1382–1383, *ἄπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον, ὥσπερ ἰχθύων, | περιστοιχίζω*.

Φυ. ὅπως δ' ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῖν ἡμεροσκόπος 253
 δείκνυσι, πᾶσι θαῦμα δυσχερὲς παρήν.

La raison d'être principale de cette note est le fait que les commentateurs de Sophocle³¹ ne paraissent pas saisir d'une manière suffisamment

²⁷ Pott 1871, 723.

²⁸ *IG II²* 463 + *Agora XVI* 109.

²⁹ Voir Harpocraton Π 62 (Περιστοιχίζεται), κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἐκδρομὰς τῶν θηρίων ὀρθὰ ξύλα ἰστᾶσιν, ἃ καλοῦσι στοίχους ἢ στόχους.

³⁰ Contrairement à mon rendu latin, je ne rapporte τὸ πρᾶγμα (COD) qu'au second verbe. Brown 1991, 330 rapporte τὸ πρᾶγμα aux deux verbes en tant qu'accusatif de relation. C'est l'adoption de la conjecture fautive de Jacobs στεγάζη qui l'amène à cet expédient. Il déclare ensuite les deux métaphores « weak ».

³¹ Bradshaw 1962 y compris, bien qu'il explique que le pronom ἡμῖν vise les gardes de nuit, les νυκτοφύλακες ou, comme on dit en grec byzantin, les νυκτοσκόποι. Comme l'*Agamemnon* d'Eschyle, la pièce commencerait donc la nuit

précise le sens de *πρῶτος*. Il convient de distinguer deux moments : (1) le moment où les gardes, qui s'étaient endormis (le locuteur n'ose pas le dire explicitement), ont appris par le truchement du *πρῶτος ἡμεροσκόπος* la commission du crime (l'accomplissement partiel³² du rite funéraire ou l'accomplissement total d'un succédané symbolique de rite funéraire) ; (2) le moment où les gardes découvrent la coupable qui, pourrait-on croire, s'apprêtait, à la faveur d'une tempête de poussière survenue à midi (415–421),³³ à consommer le crime en terminant le rite funéraire seulement commencé. L'idée communément reçue qu'Antigone, privée du concours d'Ismène, a une première fois accompli l'intégralité d'un rite funéraire extrêmement limité et symbolique amène à se demander pourquoi elle revient auprès de la dépouille de son frère.³⁴ Selon notre passage, le « premier garde de jour » – ni « le premier, le garde de jour » ni « le garde du premier

(le célèbre dialogue initial d'Antigone et d'Ismène serait nocturne, cf. Wilamowitz 1923, 346) et il serait juste de dire que « the span of the play » est « apparently a few hours » (Griffith 1999, 16) si et seulement si l'on prend « a few hours » dans une acception généreuse. L'opinion commune, conforme au canon aristotélicien, est que « the action begins at or about the time of dawn » et que *ἐν νυκτὶ τῇ νῦν* (16) signifie que « the night has barely ended » (Willink 2010, 684–685) ou, autrement dit, possède le sens de « last night », interprétation forcée, note Bradshaw.

³² Telle est l'opinion de Bradshaw 1962.

³³ Les mots désignant ce en quoi les commentateurs voient une tempête de poussière (*κονιορτός* en langage non poétique) sont *καὶ τότε' ἐξαίφνης χθονός | τυφῶς ἀγείρας σκηπτόν* (417–418). On admet que *σκηπτόν* seul désigne cette « colonne de poussière ». Je soupçonne que *χθονός* (« raising from the ground », Griffith) s'est substitué à *κόνεως*, dissyllabique comme *πόλεως* à la fin du vers 289 ; *κόνεως σκηπτός* signifie littéralement « carreau de poussière ». Pour le génitif, comparer, malgré la différence, *λοιμοῦ σκηπτός* chez Eschyle, *Pers.* 715.

³⁴ Wecklein 1878, 45 ne s'est pas épargné le ridicule de suggérer qu'Antigone revient parce qu'elle craint que la tempête n'ait dispersé la terre déposée sur la dépouille de son frère. Drachmann 1908, 68–69 ; Wilamowitz fils 1917, 31 et Wilamowitz père 1923, 347–348 admettent que Sophocle a totalement négligé de motiver le retour d'Antigone. Elle se rend compte sur place (v. 423–428) que les gardes ont défait son travail (cf. Ribbeck 1875, 484) ; elle n'était donc pas revenue pour le refaire. Pourquoi est-elle revenue ? Le mystère se dissipe si c'est dans le but d'accomplir d'autres parties du rite. Hélas, quoi que prétende Bradshaw 1962, 208–209, cela semble contredit par le propos du garde v. 247, *κόνιν παλόνας κάφαγιστεύσας ᾗ χρή*. Drachmann 1908 et 1909 fonde sur, entre autres, le défaut qu'il croit pointer l'hypothèse « analytique » d'un remaniement de la part du poète. Mais ces incohérences n'impliquent pas nécessairement le remaniement : elles peuvent être originelles !

jour »³⁵ – montre à ses collègues que le corps de Polynice a été l’objet des soins interdits. Chez Hérodote 7, 219, 1, οὔτοι μὲν ἔτι νυκτὸς ἐσήμηναν, τρίτοι δὲ οἱ ἡμεροσκόποι καταδραμόντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἄκρων ἤδη διαφαινούσης ἡμέρης, l’adjectif τρίτοι, autrement placé que πρῶτος chez Sophocle, a une valeur adverbiale, « dans un troisième temps, dans une troisième étape ». Le jour hellénique est, comme la nuit, normalement réparti en trois « veilles »³⁶ et, au moment de l’action tragique de l’*Antigone*, les jours ne sont pas courts, car on n’est pas en hiver : le cadavre de Polynice, mort la veille au combat, se décompose rapidement (410–412). L’odeur qui s’en dégage était susceptible d’incommoder les gardes le matin suivant, peu après que, ayant fait part (249–277) à Créon de l’échec de leur mission, ils ont reçu du roi l’ordre de trouver le coupable. Pour éviter l’odeur tout en surveillant le corps, ils se sont placés de manière à recevoir le vent qui souffle des hauteurs des collines (καθήμεθ’ ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων ὑπήμενοι, 411)³⁷ vers le flanc de colline où se trouve le corps.³⁸ Chacun maintient l’autre éveillé (413–414) ; puis survient la fameuse tempête de midi. L’épithète πρῶτος marque qu’on est à la première « veille » mais n’indique pas par elle-même qu’on est au petit matin. « Auf das Schlachtfeld (...) ist früher Morgen. Noch schlafen die übrigen, als sie der erste Tageswächter weckt, um ihnen die an der Leiche des Polynices vollzogene Bestattung zu zeigen ».³⁹ Ribbeck rapporte à notre passage ces vers de l’*Antigone* d’Accius (fr. IV R., III Dangel), « Heus uigiles, properate expergite | pectora tarda sopore, exurgite ! ».⁴⁰ L’épithète πρῶτος serait-elle une faute pour πρῶτος ? Cette épithète marquerait qu’on est dans la première partie de

³⁵ Les deux explications écartées sont de Schneider 1826.

³⁶ Renvoyons à l’étude justement célèbre de Dissen 1839. Il discute le problème, laissé de côté par Fries 2014, des cinq veilles nocturnes que suppose [Euripide], *Rhes*. 543 et 562. Voir aussi Mommsen 1883, 13–16; Sethe 1920, 114 et 125–128.

³⁷ « <Facing down> from the hill-top(s), out of the wind », explique Griffith erronément. Selon Barrett 2007, 468–469, l’adjectif ὑπήμενος, auquel s’oppose προσήμενος, signifie « (to) leeward », « sous le vent », et « you are to leeward of an object when the wind is blowing from it to you ». D’où ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων ὑπήμενοι. Dictionnaires (s. v. ὑπήμενος) et commentateurs de Sophocle se fourvoient mutuellement.

³⁸ On verra notre note au vers 1110.

³⁹ Ribbeck 1875, 484.

⁴⁰ Contreposer le νυκτοφύλαξ de l’*Agamemnon* d’Eschyle, 12–17, avec le texte et le commentaire de Wilamowitz 1914b, 193–194 (car les éditeurs et commentateurs, dont en dernier lieu Medda 2017, qui gardent εὐτ’ ἄν au v. 12 ruinent non seulement la construction mais également le sens du passage).

la matinée,⁴¹ mais l'expression « technique » ὁ πρῶτος ἡμεροσκόπος (on dit aussi ἡμεροφύλαξ), c'est-à-dire le garde de la premièreφυλακή diurne, est bien plus plausible.

Κρ. ἄλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ πάλοι πόλεως
ἄνδρες μόλις φέροντες ἐρρόθουν ἐμοί... 290

Griffith observe l'obscurité de ταῦτα ; selon lui, il apparaît au bout du compte que le mot désigne « his edict, even his rule » et est le régime de φέροντες. Jebb ne dit pas autre chose. Griffith allègue ταῦτα v. 33, qui est parfaitement clair, et τάδε v. 219, qui, en tant que régime de τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν, ne saurait guère être, dans la bouche de Créon, obscur. Il faut peut-être envisager de lire τακτὰ, qui exprime clairement le sens attendu. Rapprocher 734, πόλις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀμὲ χρὴ τάσσειν ἐρεῖ; On a plus d'une fois été amené à soupçonner que cette erreur affectait nos textes. Madvig suggère la même correction, au sens, précise-t-il, de « ad constitutam mensuram », chez Platon, *Politeia* 543c, μισθὸν τῆς φυλακῆς δεχομένους εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν τὴν εἰς ταῦτα τροφὴν παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων. Pourtant ταῦτα (« uictum ad custodiae officia exsequenda necessarium », F. Ast⁴²) semble plutôt moins obscur dans ce passage que dans celui de Sophocle. Comparer Pseudo-Phocylide 224, δούλῳ τακτὰ νέμοις, ἵνα τοι καταθύμιος εἴη, « assigne à ton esclave la charge fixée de travail (et pas plus) ». Fraenkel⁴³ a raison de considérer comme gâté ταῦτα chez Eschyle, *Ag.* 551–553, εὖ γὰρ πέπρακται. ταῦτα δ' ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ | τὰ μὲν τις ἂν λέξειεν εὐπετῶς ἔχειν, | τὰ δ' αὖτε κἀπίμομφα. Ni πολλά ni πάντα ni ταῦτα⁴⁴ ne conviennent ; il faut plutôt, ce semble, un participe substantivé : serait-ce τακτὰ, « ce qui circonscrit notre destin au long

⁴¹ Pour la portion du jour visée, voir Dissen 1839, 143. Rapprocher *Il.* 8, 530 = 18, 277 = 18, 303, πρῶϊ δ' ὑπηῶσι σὺν τεύχεσι θωρηχθέντες. L'hypothèse de Pott 1859, 558 (πρῶϊ > πρὸ ἡοῖ, « 'in früher Morgenstunde' (primo mane), und erst übertragen überhaupt : 'frühzeitig' » ; comparer *Oed. Col.* 477, πρὸς πρώτην ἔω) est isolée. « Griech. πρῶϊ 'frühe', vermutlich identisch mit ahd *fruo* 'frühe' » (Brugmann 1911, 708). – Rappelons (Liberman 2020, 173) qu'une erreur courante, consistant à ne pas reconnaître πρωτός sous πρῶτος, compromet l'intelligence de Sophocle, *Oed. Col.* 144–145.

⁴² Ficini, il est vrai, ne traduit pas εἰς ταῦτα et Bernhardt rapportait à tort ταῦτα à μισθὸν (remarque de C. E. C. Schneider).

⁴³ Voir Fraenkel 1950, II, 278. West 1998 et Medda 2017 acceptent ταῦτα.

⁴⁴ Je me limite aux conjectures citées par West 1998. Ahrens 1860, 540–541 critique à juste titre les deux dernières mais son εὖ γὰρ πέπρακται ταῦτα γ'. ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ ne paraît pas heureux.

cours » ? Comparer 1025–1027, εἰ δὲ μὴ τεταγμένα | μοῖρα μοῖραν ἐκ θεῶν | εἴργε μὴ πλέον φέρειν, « si le lot circonscrit des dieux n’empêchait le lot des mortels de recevoir d’eux davantage » (explication de H. L. Ahrens⁴⁵). La séquence τὰ μὲν... τὰ δέ constitue une apposition partitive, le tout subdivisé (τακτά) étant idiomatiquement exprimé non au génitif mais au même cas que ses parties.⁴⁶

Κρ. οἶμ’ ὥς λάλημα δῆλον ἐκπεφυκὸς εἶ. 320
 Φυ. οὐκουν τό γ’ ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας ποτέ.

320 λάλημα] ἄλημα legisse aut intellexisse uidetur Σ || 321 τό γ’
 Reiske : τόδ’ codd.

« Oh, how you were born (to be) an obvious chatterbox! », entend Griffith. La note de Jebb est très vague. Contrairement à Griffith, il ne relève pas que le genre de λάλημα⁴⁷ a exercé une attraction sur celui du participe ;⁴⁸ elle permet au tétrasyllabe ditrochaïque d’occuper la place qui est la sienne dans le vers et qui excluait d’emblée ἐκπεφυκὸς. Mais « obvious » n’est pas une épithète bien plausible de λάλημα et l’on comprend qu’on ait suggéré d’autres adjectifs, plus ou moins heureux (par exemple δεινὸν Burges ; ἀλγεινὸν Lloyd-Jones–Wilson) mais dans tous les cas fourvoyés. Lloyd-Jones–Wilson⁴⁹ se sont prononcés en faveur d’une incise extrêmement artificielle et peu adaptée à l’exclamation : οἶμ’ ὥς λάλημα, δῆλον, ἐκπεφυκὸς εἶ. La vérité, toute simple, est qu’on a là un cas de construction personnelle de δῆλος : δῆλον εἶ ἐκπεφυκὸς

⁴⁵ Ahrens 1860, 606–607 suivi par Wilamowitz 1885. C’est la seule interprétation qui satisfasse à toutes les exigences du contexte. Fraenkel 1950, II, 463–464 entend autrement et Medda 2017, 128–130 encore autrement le passage énigmatique.

⁴⁶ Voir Jebb à *Ant.* 21–22. Je tiens pour fourvoyée la correction de Henry 2005, 110 ἀμερᾶν chez Pindare, *Nem.* 10, 55–56, μεταμειβόμενοι δ’ ἐναλλάξ ἀμέραν τὰν μὲν παρὰ πατρί φίλῳ | Δὶ νέμονται, τὰν δ’ ὑπὸ κεῦθεσι γαίας ἐν γυάλοις Θεράπνας. Un passage que cite Henry montre qu’il a tort, *Ag.* 445–447, στένουσι δ’ εὔ λέγοντες ἄνδρα τὸν μὲν ὥς μάχας ἴδρις (il faut ἴδριν !), | τὸν δ’ ἐν φοναῖς καλῶς πεσόντ’.

⁴⁷ Sur « the application to persons of verbal nouns in -μα », voir Bruhn 1899, 139 § 236 ; Barrett 2007, 352 ; Collard 2018, 131.

⁴⁸ Voir Krüger–Cooper 1998, 1023 (1. 63. 6. 1 A ; ne mentionne pas notre passage). Selon Heindorf 1810, 637, à Platon, *Protagoras* 359 d, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἥττω εἶναι ἑαυτοῦ ἡυρέθη ἀμαθία οὕσα, « frequenti nec tamen constanti sermonis usu participium hoc praegresso proxime nomini accommodari solet ».

⁴⁹ Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 123.

λάλημα, « il est évident que tu es né moulin à paroles », comme on a δῆλος δὲ καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν ἀλγεινῶς φέρων (*Phil.* 1011). Il faut entendre le v. 321 ainsi : « il est du moins évident que je ne suis pas le coupable », οὐκουν... ποιήσας <δῆλός εἰμι>. Les vers 320–321 méritent une place de choix dans une grammaire idéale à plus d'un titre, d'abord à celui de l'attraction générique (λάλημα ἐκπεφυκὸς δῆλον εἶ pour λάλημα ἐκπεφυκὸς δῆλος εἶ), dont c'est un exemple non moins remarquable qu'incontestable.

...
 ὑπίπολις· ἄπολις ὅτω τὸ μὴ καλὸν ξύνεστι τόλμας χάριν. 370–371
 μήτ' ἐμοὶ παρέστιος γένοιτο μήτ' ἴσον φρονῶν ὃς τάδ'
 [ἔρδοι. 372–375

370 de uocis ὑπίπολις uero significatu, uide sis Sommer 1948, 174 ||
 375 ἔρδοι Λ, rec. Lloyd-Jones–Wilson : ἔρδει cett., rec. Griffith.

Antistrophe du second couple strophe / antistrophe du premier « stasimon ». Mentionnons l'hypothèse oubliée mais suggestive de Kaibel⁵⁰ selon laquelle les v. 370–371 visent Thucydide fils de Mélèsias, dont l'ostracisme (442 d'après Kaibel)⁵¹ est censé avoir précédé de peu la première représentation de l'*Antigone*. La suite met en œuvre le *topos* « puisse celui qui se conduit mal ne jamais avoir l'occasion de me porter malheur en partageant avec moi foyer, navire, sacrifice et c. ». ⁵² Je trouve à redire à la mise sur un pied d'égalité de « partager le foyer » et de « partager la même opinion » : celui qui se conduit mal porte malheur

⁵⁰ Kaibel 1897, 27. Je reproduis sa « colométrie », que j'interprète comme suit (comparer Wilamowitz 1921, 516). Premier vers : trois mètres trochaïques en synaphie syllabique avec deux crétiques apparents (deux mètres trochaïques « syncopés »). Second vers : trois mètres trochaïques en synaphie syllabique avec un crétique apparent (un mètre trochaïque syncopé), un mètre trochaïque. En somme, 2 × 5 mètres trochaïques. Noter le « pendant ending » du dernier vers de la strophe / antistrophe et le contraste avec le « blunt ending » du premier vers. C'est limpide. Que l'on compare chez Griffith (184) la colométrie et l'analyse des vers d'après le système de notation et d'interprétation qui s'est imposé aujourd'hui.

⁵¹ C'est non 442, datation de G. Busolt, mais 443 selon la démonstration de Carcopino 1935, 168–177. À en croire S. Brenne chez Siewert 2002, 70, cette date de 443, généralement acceptée, est douteuse ; il tendrait (93–94) à accepter une date postérieure de quelques années.

⁵² Voir Kiessling–Heinze 1917 à Horace, *Carm.* 3, 2, 27–29 et Hopkinson 1984, 171–172 à Callimaque, *In Cererem* 116–117.

si l'on est dans le même bateau que lui, non si – hypothèse d'ailleurs problématique, puisque, contrairement à celui que l'on condamne, on ne se conduit pas mal – on pense la même chose que lui. Griffith tente de tirer ἴσον φρονῶν, dont Nauck 1886 critique l'« Undeutlichkeit », du côté de « political association » (et donc de la communauté d'hétairie ?). Heidegger⁵³ constate aussi l'ambiguïté du passage et suppose l'affirmation par le chœur de l'existence d'un savoir autre, « ein dichtendes Wesen », contreposé au savoir de l'individu exclu. Il actionne les moteurs de sa philosophie pour remplir de sens le φρονεῖν d'un texte transmis en réalité problématique. Schneidewin 1852 compare, entre autres, Euripide fr. 852, 3–5 Kannicht, ὅστις δὲ τὸν φύσαντα μὴ τιμᾶν θέλῃ, | μὴ μοι γένοιτο μῆτε συνθύτης θεοῖς | μῆτ' ἐν θαλάσῃ κοινόπλουον στέλλοι σκάφος. Ce passage permet deux suggestions : μῆτε συμπλέων⁵⁴ ou μῆτε συνθύων.⁵⁵ Cette dernière alternative n'est pas moins plausible que sa concurrente : rapprocher *Trach.* 655–659, μὴ σταίῃ πολύκωπον ὄχημα ναὸς αὐτῶ, πρὶν τάνδε πρὸς πόλιν ἀνύσειε, νασιῶτιν ἐστίαν ἀμείψας, ἔνθα κλήζεται θυτήρ. L'influence du mot ἀμφίνοω (376) et éventuellement une mécoupure (μῆτε-εσυν-) pourraient être à l'origine de la faute. Je subodore que si Sophocle écrit παρέστιος et non ξυνέστιος, c'est parce qu'il avait employé un composé en συν- là où la tradition est fautive : il avait très naturellement opté pour la « uariatio » des préfixes.⁵⁶

Φυ.

ἐπεί

σχολῇ ποθ' ἥξειν δεῦρ' ἂν ἐξηύχουν ἐγώ 390

390 ποθ'] γ' ἂν t, puto ex *Oed. rege* 434. Probauit, non coniecit (dico propter Lloyd-Jones–Wilson) Erfurdt 1809, sed confer Plat. *Soph.* 233 b, 241 e ; *Politicum* 295 b. Pertinet autem illud σχολῇ ποτέ ad sermonem cotidianum (uide Collard 2018, 141).

⁵³ Heidegger 1993, 137–138 et plus largement 137–152.

⁵⁴ Voir Euripide, *El.* 1354–1355, οὕτως ἀδικεῖν μηδεὶς θελέτω | μηδ' ἐπιόρκων μέτα συμπλείτω et Sophocle, *Phil.* 1032–1033, πῶς θεοῖς ἔξεσθ', ὁμοῦ (v. l. ἐμοῦ, Schein 2013, à tort) | πλεύσαντος, αἴθην ἱερά; πῶς σπένδεν ἔτι; – Conjecture anticipée par Schmidt 1886, 496.

⁵⁵ Van Herwerden 1887, 61 conteste le texte transmis et son συνθύτης anticipe ma correction.

⁵⁶ Wilamowitz 1914, XXX réemploie pour stigmatiser le mauvais goût d'un adversaire non nommé (F. Blass) la séquence μῆτ' ἐμοὶ παρέστιος γένοιτο μῆτ' ἴσον φρονῶν en substituant involontairement, je présume, ξυνέστιος à παρέστιος.

« Car je croyais que je ne me retrouverais au grand jamais ici ».⁵⁷ Telle est l'interprétation que je défends. Griffith réhabilite l'infinitif futur avec ἄν, dont ce serait le seul exemple chez Sophocle. Raeder⁵⁸ suggère que Sophocle recourt ici à cet usage « plebeisch » pour faire ressortir l'aspect correspondant du garde. Dans le petit nombre de passages d'auteurs attiques allégués par Griffith se trouvent deux textes de Thucydide (2, 80, 1 et 80, 8) où, au moyen de variantes,⁵⁹ l'auteur de la plus récente édition critique de Thucydide, G. B. Alberti, élimine ce en quoi beaucoup de philologues éminents de jadis (C. G. Cobet en première ligne) voyaient une incorrection. Plus d'un Moderne préfèrent, hélas, marcher dans les pas de l'ennemi juré de Cobet, Ludwig Herbst, objet d'un sanglant sarcasme de Wilamowitz et défenseur justement oublié du futur avec ἄν. Collard⁶⁰ allègue un passage du *Pirithoüs* attribué à Critias, fr. 7, 12–14 Snell–Kannicht : Εὐρυσθέα γὰρ πῶς δοκεῖς ἄν, ἄσμενον | εἰ μοι πύθοιτο ταῦτα συμπράξαντά σε, | λέξειν ἄν ὥς ἄκραντος ἤθληται πόνο; Selon lui, cet extrait d'un fragment de tradition directe transmis sur papyrus (P. Oxy. 2078, II^e s. ap. J.-C.) « would seem to confirm this long-disputed usage for Tragedy », pour lequel il cite le passage de Sophocle et un autre passage contesté, Euripide, *Hel.* 448. Mais la correction infime λέγειν⁶¹

⁵⁷ Le verbe ἐξηχούην signifie non « vowed » (« I could have vowed » Jebb, « I vowed » Moorhouse 1982, 216), mais « croire », « imaginer » : voir Fraenkel 1950, III, 708 à Eschyle, *Ag.* 1497. La traduction de Griffith « I was insisting » semble participer de l'erreur que relève Fraenkel et qui consiste à reconnaître dans le verbe intéressé un « uerbum dicendi ». Notre vers est donc différent d'Eschyle, *Ag.* 933, ἡὔξω θεοῖς δέισας ἄν ὧδ' ἔρξειν (ἔρδειν TF, corr. Headlam) τάδε; « would you in some fearful crisis have vowed that you would do the thing I am now inviting you to do ? » (Fraenkel 1950, II, 422 ; West 1998 et Medda 2017 gardent ἔρδειν, à tort). Une transposition commencée par Hermann et parachevée par Wilamowitz 1914 donne à ἄν une position plus orthodoxe et améliore la facture du vers, δέισας ἄν ἡὔξω θεοῖς<ιν> (mot trochaïque) ὧδ' ἔρξειν τάδε; Mais c'est peut-être corriger Eschyle.

⁵⁸ Raeder 1953, 11.

⁵⁹ Dans le premier cas, la variante est la leçon des mss. C G : on ne saurait imaginer source plus « autorisée ». Dans le second, ἄν n'est pas dans C et le futur est corrigé par G² J². Raeder 1953 ne se risque pas à défendre l'infinitif futur avec ἄν dans ces deux passages.

⁶⁰ Collard 2018, 170–171.

⁶¹ L' « editio princeps » d'A. S. Hunt (1927) publie le futur transmis sans le révoquer en doute ; λέγειν est une correction de Housman 1972, 1147, qu'imprime, sans autre indication, Page 1942, 124 (voir Boschi 2021, 161, qui approuve l'intervention). Snell–Kannicht 1985 ne la mentionnent pas, se contentant de renvoyer à une note de Kannicht 1969, 134 qui affirme mais ne prouve pas la légitimité de l'usage contesté.

suffit à rendre caduc le témoignage du *Pirithoüs* ! Moorhouse⁶² refuse de construire ἄν avec ἐξηύχουν au motif que « the references to oaths in 388 and 394 oblige us to take ἐξηύχουν as an unmodified indic. Compare too the guard's earlier remark in 329, that he would not be seen returning ». Mais Moorhouse aurait dû envisager ici un usage de l'imparfait avec ἄν itératif qu'il admet dans le *Philoctète*.⁶³ Dans sa somme sur la syntaxe du verbe grec classique, Stahl⁶⁴ accepte la correction de Meineke ἤκειν (sc. ἄν) ; elle est si légère⁶⁵ qu'on pourrait hésiter entre les deux solutions, pour peu que l'on fût sceptique sur le retour en grâce de l'infinitif futur avec ἄν. La position de cette particule, que les commentateurs ne considèrent pas, semble néanmoins en faveur de son rattachement au verbe recteur, car, si la particule porte sur le seul infinitif, sa place contrevient très fortement à la « loi de Wackernagel », tandis que la position de la particule, rapportée au verbe recteur, peut se justifier par l'habitude de faire bloc avec un verbe de ce type.⁶⁶

Φυ. ἄλλ' ἢ γὰρ ἐκτὸς καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδας χάρα 392
 ἔοικεν ἄλλῃ μῆκος οὐδὲν ἡδονῇ...

Le garde exulte d'avoir mis la main sur Antigone. Griffith expose la difficulté de ἐκτὸς mais écarte εὐκτὸς, conjecture de Bothe et de Dawe 1979 qu'adoptent Lloyd-Jones–Wilson,⁶⁷ au motif que « normally the event, not the « joy », would be expressly 'wished-for' ». L'objection est, malgré les excentricités typographiques de la phrase de Griffith,

⁶² Moorhouse 1982, 216. Voir la discussion de Cavallin 1875, 183–185 à *Phil.* 869–871, οὐ γὰρ ποτ', ὃ παῖ, τοῦτ' ἄν ἐξηύχῃς ἐγὼ | τλῆναι σ' ἐλαινῶς ὥδε τὰμὰ πῆματα | μείναι παρόντα καὶ ξυνωφελοῦντά μοι. Sans affronter l'objection de Moorhouse et en se méprenant sur le sens du verbe, Wakker 2006, 174 entend « I could/would have vowed that I should not soon be here again ».

⁶³ Bruhn 1899, 65 § 117 ; Moorhouse 1982, 189 ; Wakker 2006, 169 ; Collard 2018, 127. Selon Pearson 1917, 254 au fr. 314, 227 (*Limiers*), il y a là un exemple de cet usage. Le scrupuleux Poppo 1831, 756 niait le caractère correct de l'imparfait avec ἄν itératif dans une subordonnée, mais voir Liberman 2017, 52.

⁶⁴ Stahl 1907, 208.

⁶⁵ Même correction chez Eschyle, *Ag.* 619, où elle est rigoureusement nécessaire, adoptée par Wilamowitz 1914, Fraenkel 1950, Denniston–Page 1957, West 1998 mais rejetée par Medda 2017.

⁶⁶ Comparer Cavallin 1875, 183–184 et Fraenkel 1950, II, 422–423.

⁶⁷ Voir Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 125 ; Dawe 2007, 239 et 356–357. West 1980, 366 qualifie la conjecture de « clever, at least ».

fatale. Jebb écarte comme « very improbable substitutes » les conjectures ἄτοπος (Seyffert 1865), ἄλογος (Gleditsch) et εἰκὸς (Pallis), c'est-à-dire παρ' εἰκὸς καὶ ἐλπίδας. Je suggère, en tant que plus « vraisemblable » du point de vue « paléographique », ἡ γὰρ εὐθύς καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδας χαρά, « en intensité, la joie qui vient soudainement et contre les attentes ne ressemble en rien à un autre plaisir ». On trouve chez Élien (*Var. hist.* 12, 57) la locution ἄφρων καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδα.

Φυ. ἐγερτὶ κινῶν ἄνδρ' ἀνὴρ ἐπιρρόθοις 413
κακοῖσιν, εἴ τις τοῦδ' ἀφειδήσοι πόνου.

Les gardes, qui avaient mission de surveiller le corps de Polynice, s'empêchaient les uns les autres de relâcher leur vigilance. À l'inverse de Jebb et Dawe 1979, Lloyd-Jones–Wilson,⁶⁸ suivis par Griffith, écartent ἀκηδήσοι, correction de Hermann Bonitz,⁶⁹ qui croit relever chez Apollonios de Rhodes 2, 98, Οὐδ' ἄρα Βέβρυκες ἄνδρες ἀφείδησαν βασιλῆος, la même faute que chez Sophocle, corrigée, en l'occurrence, grâce à la tradition indirecte (Choiroboscus), que, contrairement à R. Merkel, ni H. Fraenkel ni F. Vian n'ont suivie.⁷⁰ Vahlen⁷¹ consacre neuf pages fines et intelligentes d'un latin élégant à établir l'emploi de ἀφειδέω au sens de « immemor sum », « non curo », « neglego », « se désintéresser de, ne pas se soucier de qc. ou de qn., négliger ». Il semble en effet qu'on ait glissé du sens de « non parcere »⁷² (cf. *El.* 980, ψυχῆς ἀφειδήσαντε⁷³), « ne pas être avare de qc. », « être généreux », « ne pas y regarder », à celui de « prendre ses aises vis-à-vis de qc. ou de qn. », « ne pas se soucier de », « se désintéresser de ». Vahlen emprunte à Apollonios de Rhodes la plupart des passages qu'il étudie ; un passage, 2, 869–870, Αἰακίδη, πῶς καλὸν ἀφειδήσαντας ἀέθλων | γαίῃ ἐν ἄλλοδαπῇ δὴν ἔμμεναι, se rapproche de celui de Sophocle. Mais aucun des textes allégués par Vahlen n'est antérieur à l'époque hellénistique et il convient de se demander si le glissement de sens que j'ai évoqué s'est déjà produit à l'époque de Sophocle, voire chez lui. Tel semble bien être

⁶⁸ Voir Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 125.

⁶⁹ Bonitz 1857, 48–49. Voir aussi Boissonade dans le *TGL* II 2621–2622.

⁷⁰ Wackernagel 1953, 896 prend au sérieux la correction chez Sophocle et, chez Apollonios, la variante de Choiroboscus.

⁷¹ Vahlen 1908, 171–179.

⁷² Voir Pott 1873, 553–554.

⁷³ « Ohne ihr eignes gefährdetes Leben zu schonen » (Kaibel 1896, 222).

le cas.⁷⁴ Lorsqu'un génitif détermine le verbe ἀκηδέω et l'adjectif ἀκηδής,⁷⁵ il ne s'agit, antérieurement à l'ère chrétienne, que d'une personne et non d'un objet tel que πόνου. Le *DGE* allègue bien Apollonios 3, 596–597, ὄφρα ἐ τιμῆς | καὶ σκήπτρων ἐλάσειαν ἀκηδέες, mais c'est une erreur : les génitifs dépendent de ἐλάσειαν. Il suit que la conjecture de Bonitz est une « Verschlimmbesserung ». Le vers de Sophocle pourrait néanmoins souffrir d'un défaut réel ; on attendrait, si je ne m'abuse, non le redondant ἐπιρρόθοις κακοῖσιν, « des injures invectives »⁷⁶ mais ἐπιρρόθοις λόγοισιν, « des mots invectifs, des paroles invectives »,⁷⁷ comme κερτομίοις γλώσσαις au v. 961 : voir la scholie ἐπιρρόθοις· λαιδόροις, ὕβριστικοῖς ; Hésychios E 5131 ἐπιρρόθητα· ἐπίσσογα, et rapprocher *Trach.* 263, πολλὰ μὲν λόγοις (αὐτὸν) ἐπερρόθησε.⁷⁸ Si l'on objecte que λόγοι δ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐρρόθουν κακοί (*Ant.* 259) soutient κακοῖσιν, je réponds que ροθέω « bruire » n'est pas ἐπιρροθέω « invectiver » (« inueho, inuehor » expriment la force du préverbe) et que c'est ἐπιρρόθοις λόγοισιν et non ἐπιρρόθοις κακοῖσιν qui correspond à λόγοι ἐρρόθουν κακοί.

Κρ. σὺ μὲν κομίζεις ἂν σεαυτὸν ἢ θέλεις
ἔξω βαρείας αἰτίας ἐλεύθερον· 445

444 ḥ] oĩ Zo, coni. Meineke.

Créon congédie le « garde » qu'innocentent les aveux d'Antigone. On rapporte à ἐξω le génitif βαρείας αἰτίας, mais le génitif dépend peut-être de ἐλεύθερον, que l'on trouve construit avec le génitif à valeur ablative,⁷⁹

⁷⁴ Si ce n'est pas nécessaire, il n'est toutefois pas impossible de pressentir ce glissement dans un passage (2, 51, 5) de Thucydide extrait de la description de la peste, αἰσχύνῃ γὰρ ἡφείδουν σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐσιόντες παρὰ τοὺς φίλους, « ils n'avaient cure de leur propre vie ». Hobbes traduit « out of shame they would not spare themselves, but went unto their friends ». Curieusement Vahlen 1908, 179 commente bien 2, 43, 5 mais non ce passage.

⁷⁵ On cite, comme si ce n'était pas un supplément aléatoire, [φί]λων ἀκηδ[ή]ς chez Sophocle fr. **208, 10 Radt (suppl. Hunt).

⁷⁶ Ὅψοις *Phil.* 374–375, καὶ γὰρ χολῶθεις εὐθὺς ἤρασσον κακοῖς | τοῖς πᾶσιν, « avec tous les sarcasmes possibles ».

⁷⁷ Le sens de « qui porte secours à » résulte, selon Schwyzer 1983, 471–472, d’une confusion (ancienne) avec ἐπιάρροθος.

⁷⁸ Voir fr. 583, 10 Radt, δώμαθ' (...) ἐπίρροθα, « des maisons non irréprochables », avec Pearson 1917, 229 *ad loc.*

⁷⁹ Voir par exemple Eschyle, *Choe.* 1060.

et ἔξω complète peut-être κομίζοις ἄν σεαυτὸν ἢ θέλεις. Créon, qui est lui-même sorti du palais, ordonne au garde de quitter les lieux et peut-être « la scène ». On peut prendre ἔξω au sens imprécis de « geh' mir aus den Augen ». ⁸⁰ Un sens plus précis impliquant un renvoi du texte aux réalités matérielles du théâtre ⁸¹ pourrait surprendre, mais Griffith remarque qu'il se trouve un tel renvoi au v. 1293, ὁρᾶν πάρεστιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐν μυχοῖς ἔτι, si l'« ekkyklema » donnait à voir le corps d'Eurydice. ⁸² Que la tragédie sophocléenne ne s'interdit pas de telles allusions, c'est ce que prouve ce fait souvent remarqué : au début du second « épisode » de l'*Œdipe à Colone*, Créon fait mention τῆς ἐμῆς ἐπεισόδου (730). ⁸³

Av. θέλεις τι μεῖζον ἢ κατακτεῖναι μ' ἐλόν;
 Κρ. ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδέν· τοῦτ' ἔχων ἅπαντ' ἔχω.
 Av. τί δῆτα μέλλεις; ὥς ἐμοὶ τῶν σῶν λόγων
 ἀρεστὸν οὐδέν, μηδ' ἀρεσθείη ποτέ, 500
 οὔτω δὲ καὶ σοὶ τᾶμ' ἀφανδάνοντ' ἔφω.

Jebb hésite à considérer ἀρεσθείη (500) comme véritable passif, analyse admise par Griffith, « plaise aux dieux que rien de ce que tu dis ne me plaise jamais » ⁸⁴ ou (et c'est plus plausible) comme médio-passif (ainsi Kühner–Blass, ⁸⁵ *LSJ*, *DGE*). Hermann 1830 est fondé

⁸⁰ Exemples tragiques chez Bodensteiner 1893, 652. Le cas de Sophocle, *El.* 75, νὸς δ' ἔξιμεν, qui indiffère les commentateurs d'aujourd'hui, l'inquiète. Lui et Kaibel 1896, 80 entendent « aus dem Bereiche des Hauses fort ».

⁸¹ Bodensteiner 1893, 652 n'admet pas dans la tragédie un tel renvoi, dont il reconnaît l'existence dans la comédie (cf. Droysen 1868, 9–14). Pourtant il allègue lui-même (653) le passage de l'*Œdipe à Colone* que je vais citer. Voir Plutarque, *Marcellus* 20, 8, ἡμίγυμνος ἀναπηδήσας ἔθεε πρὸς τὴν ἔξοδον τοῦ θεάτρου, avec la remarque de Müller 1886, 60 n. 4 ; West 1990, 21–22.

⁸² Voir Müller 1847, 533–534 ; Bodensteiner 1893, 661 et 742 ; là-contre, Dörpfeld–Reisch 1896, 241.

⁸³ Voir Bodensteiner 1893, 653 ; Aichele 1971, 48 ; West 1990, 22 n. 42.

⁸⁴ Même analyse chez Allan 2006, 122. L'équivalence posée par L. Dindorf (*TGL* II 1924BC) ἀρέσκομαι passif = « placeo » est des plus douteuses. Jebb, qui semble s'inspirer de Dindorf, et Griffith, qui s'inspire de Jebb, admettent des passifs chez Hérodote 9, 79, 2 ἐγὼ δ' ὦν τούτου εἴνεκα μήτε Αἰγινήτησι ἄδοιμι μήτε τοῖσι ταῦτα ἀρέσκεται, et aussi 6, 128, 2, μάλιστα τῶν μνηστήρων ἡρέσκοντο <οἱ> οἱ ἅπ' Ἀθηναίων ἀπιγμένοι. Ce sont des moyens, comme l'entend Powell 1938, dont on admirera la sûreté de classification des sens et usages du verbe. Brève mais claire présentation de l'étymologie et des emplois principaux du verbe chez Pott 1869, 80–81. Les articles des dictionnaires laissent à désirer.

⁸⁵ Kühner–Blass 1892, 373, avec un double point d'interrogation.

à trouver « *facilius* » ἀρεσθείην, « plaise aux dieux que je ne sois jamais satisfaite », mais cette « facilité » est acquise au détriment de la symétrie « rien ne m'agrée dans tes propos » / « puisse jamais rien ne m'agréer dans tes propos ». Jebb moque l'élégant et, selon moi, très plausible ἀρέστ' εἶη d'Elmsley et blâme le passage d'une construction personnelle à une construction impersonnelle,⁸⁶ mais, si Elmsley⁸⁷ ne dit pas comment il comprend sa correction, il n'en reste pas moins qu'elle n'implique nullement une construction impersonnelle : un neutre pluriel sujet se tire aisément de τῶν σῶν λόγων οὐδέν : comparer *Phil.* 446–447, ἐπεὶ οὐδέν πω κακόν γ' ἀπώλετο | ἀλλ' εὖ περιστέλλουσιν αὐτὰ δαίμονες, et voir *Oed. rex* 1096–1097, σοὶ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀρέστ' εἶη.⁸⁸

Les vers suivants contiennent une difficulté négligée. En effet, selon toute vraisemblance, comme Schneider 1826 l'a compris, ὥς introduit non une proposition causale justifiant ce qui précède mais la protase de la comparaison dont οὕτω δὲ ouvre, comme au v. 426, l'apodose. Faut-il introduire δ' après ὥς pour éliminer l'asyndète ou faut-il éviter le « horror asyndeti » caractéristique des copistes ?⁸⁹ Griffith adopte la ponctuation de Lloyd-Jones–Wilson, reproduite ci-dessus, mais interprète un texte (celui de Jebb) qui implique une ponctuation forte après ποτέ. Cette ponctuation ruine la véritable construction du passage et altère son sens.

À suivre.

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

⁸⁶ « As if one said, 'not one of your words pleases me; and never may I feel pleasure': without, 'in them' ».

⁸⁷ Elmsley 1821, 79.

⁸⁸ Cité par L. Dindorf. J'en conclurais qu'il a mieux compris que Jebb la correction d'Elmsley.

⁸⁹ Voir Lloyd-Jones – Wilson 1990, 281 s.v. « asyndeton ». Seemann 1882 a consacré un excellent essai à cette figure chez Sophocle. Notre passage s'y rangerait, je crois, dans la sous-section « § I. Asyndeton, quod propre dicitur, causale », 22–27. Radt 1999 attire l'attention du lecteur sur le « nouveau » cas des *Limiers*, fr. 314, 166.

Bibliographie

- H. L. Ahrens, « Studien zum Agamemnon des Aeschylus », *Philologus, Erster Supplbd.* (Göttingen 1860) 213–304, 477–640.
- K. Aichele, « Das Epeisodion », in: W. Jens (ed.), *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich 1971) 47–83.
- R. J. Allan, « Sophocles' Voice. Active, Middle, and Passive in the Plays of Sophocles », in: I. J. F. De Jong, A. Rijksbaron (edd.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language* (Leyde–Boston 2006) 111–126.
- W. S. Barrett, *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism* (Oxford 2007).
- R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leyde 2010).
- E. Bodensteiner, *Szenische Fragen über den Ort des Auftretens und Abgehen von Schauspielern und Chor im griechischen Drama* (Leipzig 1893).
- H. Bonitz, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Sophokles II* (Vienne 1857).
- 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.
- A. Brown, « Notes on Sophocles' *Antigone* », *CQ* 41 (1991) 325–339.
- E. F. Bruck, *Totenteil und Seelgerät im griechischen Recht* (Munich 1926).
- K. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen II 2* (Strasbourg 21911).
- E. Bruhn, *Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck. VIII. Anhang* (Berlin 1899).
- E. Bruhn, *Sophokles. Antigone* (Berlin 11913).
- J. Carcopino, *L'ostracisme athénien* (Paris 21935).
- C. Cavallin, *Sophoclis Philocteta* (Lund 1875).
- C. Collard, *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy* (Stuttgart 2018).
- R. D. Dawe, *Sophocles. Tragoediae II* (Leipzig 1979).
- R. D. Dawe, *Corruption and Correction. A Collection of Articles* (Amsterdam 2007).
- J. D. Denniston, D. Page, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1957).
- L. Dissen, *Kleine lateinische und deutsche Schriften* (Göttingen 1839).
- W. Dörpfeld, E. Reisch, *Das griechische Theater* (Athènes–Leipzig 1896).
- A. B. Drachmann, « Zur Composition der Sophokleischen Antigone », *Hermes* 43 (1908) 67–76.
- A. B. Drachmann, « Zur Composition der Antigone », *Hermes* 44 (1909) 628–630.
- E. Droysen, *Quaestiones de Aristophanis re scaenica* (Bonn 1868).
- V. Ehrenberg, *Sophocles and Pericles* (Oxford 1954).
- P. Elmsley, *Sophoclis Oedipus Tyrannus* (Leipzig 1821).
- K. G. A. Erfurdt, *Sophoclis Antigona* (Leipzig 1809).
- E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950).
- A. Fries, *Pseudo-Euripides. Rhesus* (Berlin – New York 2014).
- M. Griffith, *Sophocles. Antigone* (Cambridge 1999).
- M. Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1923–1944. Bd. 53: Hölderlin's Hymne « Der Ister »* (Frankfurt 21993).
- L. F. Heindorf, *Platonis dialogi tres, Phaedo Sophistes Protagoras* (Berlin 1810).

- W. B. Henry, *Pindar's Nemeans. A Selection* (Munich–Leipzig 2005).
- G. Hermann, *Sophoclis Antigona* (Leipzig ³1830).
- H. van Herwerden, *Lucubrationes Sophocleae* (Utrecht 1887).
- N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge 1984).
- A. E. Housman, *The Classical Papers* (Cambridge 1972).
- G. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford 2001).
- R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments III. The Antigone* (Cambridge ³1900).
- G. Kaibel, *Sophokles. Elektra* (Leipzig 1896).
- G. Kaibel, *De Sophoclis Antigona* (Göttingen 1897).
- R. Kannicht, *Euripides. Helena, Band II, Kommentar* (Heidelberg 1969).
- R. Kassel, *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica* (Berlin – New York 1976).
- A. Kiessling, R. Heinze, Q. *Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden* (Berlin ⁶1917).
- K. W. Krüger, G. L. Cooper, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* (Ann Arbor 1998).
- R. Kühner, F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache I. Elementar- und Formenlehre I–II* (Hannovre 1890–1892).
- K. Lachmann, *De choricis systematis tragicorum Graecorum libri quattuor* (Berlin 1819).
- K. Lachmann, *De mensura tragoediarum liber singularis* (Berlin 1822).
- K. Lachmann, rec. C. F. Hermann, *Disputatio de distributione personarum...* (Marburg 1840), *NJPP* 31 (1841) 456–460.
- K. Latte, *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1968).
- G. Liberman, *Les préliminaires de la guerre. Prolégomènes à la lecture du premier livre de Thucydide* (Bordeaux 2017).
- G. Liberman, « Petits riens sophocléens : *Ædipe à Colone* », *Hyperboreus* 26 (2020) 26–43 et 173–198.
- 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).
- E. Medda, *Eschilo. Agamennone* (Rome 2017).
- S. Mekler, *Sophoclis tragoediae ex recensione G. Dindorfii* (Leipzig ⁶1885).
- A. Mommsen, *Chronologie. Untersuchungen über das Kalenderwesen der Griechen, insonderheit der Athener* (Leipzig 1883).
- A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leyde 1982).
- A. Müller, *Griechischen Bühnenalterthümer* (Fribourg-en-Brisgau 1886).
- G. Müller, *Sophokles. Antigone* (Heidelberg 1967).
- K. O. Müller, *Kleine deutsche Schriften I* (Breslau 1847).
- A. Nauck, rec. Schneidewin 1852, *NJPP* 65 (1852) 233–253.
- A. Nauck, *Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin. Antigone* (Berlin ⁹1886).
- D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri I* (Londres – Cambridge, Mass. 1942).
- A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles I–III* (Cambridge 1917).
- A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Le feste drammatiche di Atene*. Seconda edizione riveduta da J. Gould e D. M. Lewis, traduzione di A. Blasina, aggiunta bibliografica a cura di A. Blasina e N. Narsi (Florence 1996).

- E. F. Poppo, *Thucydidis de bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo... Pars III. Commentarii, Vol. I. Annotata ad librum I* (Leipzig 1831).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen I* (Lemgo–Detmold 1859).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen II* 3 (Detmold 1869).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen III* (Detmold 1871).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen IV* (Detmold 1873).
- J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Oxford 1938).
- S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta IV. Sophocles* (Göttingen ²1999).
- G. Radtke, *De tragicorum Graecorum tropis II. De metaphoris ex uerbis nauticis et ex uenaticis petitis* (Ostrowo 1867).
- H. Raeder, *Ein Problem in griechischer Syntax. Die Verbindung der Partikel äv mit Futurum* (Copenhagen 1953).
- O. Ribbeck, *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik* (Leipzig 1875).
- S. Schein, *Sophocles. Philoctetes* (Cambridge 2013).
- F. W. Schmidt, *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern II. Zu Euripides* (Berlin 1886).
- G. C. W. Schneider, *Sophokles. Antigone* (Weimar 1826).
- F. G. Schneidewin, *Sophokles IV. Antigone* (Leipzig 1852).
- E. Schwyzer, *Kleine Schriften* (Innsbruck 1983).
- H. Seemann, *De asyndeto Sophocleo quaestiones* (Wrocław 1882).
- K. Sethe, « Die Zeitrechnung der alten Ägypter im Verhältnis zu der der andern Völker. III. Einteilung des Tages- und des Himmelskreises », *NAWG* 1920: 2, 97–141.
- M. Seyffert, *Sophoclis Antigonæ* (Berlin 1865).
- P. Siewert (ed.), *Ostrakos-Testimonien I* (Stuttgart 2002).
- B. Snell, R. Kannicht, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta I* (Göttingen ²1985).
- F. Sommer, *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Nominalkomposita* (Munich 1948).
- J. Sommerbrodt, *Scaenica* (Berlin 1876).
- J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit* (Heidelberg 1907).
- F. W. Ullrich, *Über die religiöse und sittliche Bedeutung der Antigone des Sophokles mit einigen Beiträgen zur Erklärung einzelner Stellen derselben* (Hambourg 1853).
- J. Vahlen, *Opuscula academica II* (Leipzig 1908).
- J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften I–II* (Göttingen 1953).
- G. Wakker, « ‘You could have thought’: Past Potentials in Sophocles? » in : I. J. F. De Jong, A. Rijksbaron (edd.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language* (Leyde–Boston 2006) 163–180.
- N. Wecklein, *Sophoclis tragoediae, recensuit et explicauit E. Wunderus, Vol. I. Sect. IV. continens Antigonam, editio quinta* (Leipzig 1878).
- M. L. West, « Tragica III », *BICS* 26 (1979) 104–117.
- M. L. West, compte rendu de R. D. Dawe, *Studies in the Text of Sophocles*, vol. 3 (Leyde 1980), *CPh* 75 (1980) 364–367.
- M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990).
- M. L. West, *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Stuttgart ²1998).

- K. Wex, *Sophoclis Antigona* I (Leipzig 1829).
 T. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Berlin 1917).
 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aeschylos. Agamemnon* (Berlin 1885).
 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Berlin 1914).
 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aeschylos. Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914b).
 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921).
 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Tragödien. Vierter Band* (Berlin 1923).
 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften IV. Lese Früchte und Verwandtes* (Berlin 1962).
 C. W. Willink, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Leyde–Boston 2010).
 E. Wunder, *Sophoclis Tragoediae I. IV. Antigona* (Gotha–Erfurt ³1846).

This is the second 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 other works of Sophocles or of other writers (e.g. Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*) are also dealt with.

Статья представляет собой вторую 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 (например, из *Агамемнона* Эсхила).

Vsevolod Zeltchenko

WHAT IS WRONG WITH NICOSTRATUS? (AR. *VESP.* 82–83)

The beginning of *Wasps*¹ is structured similarly to the beginnings of the earlier *Horsemen* and later *Peace*, following the three-part scheme of Aristophanes' prologues as formulated by Paul Mazon: *parade* – *boniment* – *scène*.² The audience first observes a funny sketch involving two slaves engaged in some burdensome but incomprehensible activity (in *Wasps* they are on a night watch around the house, with their master, Bdelycleon, on the roof); finally one of them steps forward and addresses the audience directly to explain what is going on. In *Wasps*, however, as in *Peace*, this clarification (*boniment*) is preceded by a discussion of incorrect guesses that the spectators make and the actors comment on. The technique itself appears to be traditional for ancient comedy:³ in addition to *Pax* 43 ff.,⁴ we have fragments by Cratinus (342 K.–A., from an unknown play) and Pherecrates (154 K.–A., from *Pseudherakles*) that also suggest the situation “Now one of the audience, who thinks himself too clever, must be saying...”. But only in *Wasps* is it uniquely deployed as a self-contained episode, with the audience asking for an answer to the question “What is the sickness of our master's father?”, whereupon the

¹ In the autumn of 2018, while teaching *Wasps* to my class at St Petersburg Classical Gymnasium, I reached the lines 82 ff. and, with no second thoughts, presented their traditional interpretation – only to be immediately grilled by the students about its weakness. In a lively discussion that ensued, I came up with the explanation offered below. It is thus my pleasure to dedicate this paper to the *studiosa cohors* of my former pupils: Valeria Aganina, Daria Artemieva, Xenia Biriukova, Vera Garmanova, Stanislava Khizhniakova, Ivan Lapikov, Alexander Sverdlin, and Sergei Zhikharev. The time is out of joint, my friends, and you are born to set it right.

² Mazon 1904, 170–172; 177.

³ Whittaker 1935, 181–183.

⁴ It is, however, worth noting the close relationship between *Peace* and *Wasps*, which is not limited to the similar structure of their prologues and includes textual borrowings in the *parabasis* (Moulton 1981, 84).

named Athenians shout out their versions like children at a matinee, and the slaves reject them one by one while simultaneously ridiculing their authors (71 ff.):

νόσον γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ἀλλόκοτον αὐτοῦ νοσεῖ,
 ἦν οὐδ' ἂν εἷς γνοίη ποτ' οὐδὲ ξυμβάλοι,
 εἰ μὴ πύθοιθ' ἡμῶν· ἐπεὶ τοπάζετε.
 – Ἀμυνίας μὲν ὁ Προνάπους φήσ' οὕτοσι
 εἶναι φιλόκυβον αὐτόν.
 – ἀλλ' οὐδὲν λέγει, 75
 μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ἄφ' αὐτοῦ τὴν νόσον τεκμαίρεται.
 – οὐκ, ἀλλὰ “φιλο-” μὲν ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ.
 ὁδὶ δέ φησι Σωσίας πρὸς Δερκύλον
 εἶναι φιλοπότην αὐτόν.
 – οὐδαμῶς γ', ἐπεὶ 80
 αὕτη γε χρηστῶν ἐστὶν ἀνδρῶν ἡ νόσος.
 – Νικόστρατος δ' αὖ φησιν ὁ Σκαμβωνίδης
 εἶναι φιλοθύτην αὐτόν ἢ φιλόξενον.
 – μὰ τὸν κύν', ὦ Νικόστρατ', οὐ φιλόξενος,
 ἐπεὶ καταπύγων ἐστὶν ὃ γε Φιλόξενος. 85
 ἄλλως φλυαρεῖτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐξευρήσετε...

The answer is then given: the old man is φιληλιαστής (a *hapax legomenon* and, apparently, a coined word).⁵

Before getting to the point, I will have to briefly address three issues. The first is how this amazing scene could have played out in the theatre. Indeed, unlike the mentioned passage in *Peace*, which requires no stage tricks (there, as in Cratinus' and Pherecrates' fragments, the audience reactions are introduced via *optativus potentialis*: “Some young clever boy must now be saying..., and, I guess, the Ionian sitting next to him replies...”), here a reference to theatrical convention is not sufficient: the names of the Athenians “giving voice” are accompanied by the deictic pronouns ὁδὶ, οὕτοσί, and the address ὦ Νικόστρατε, which means that actors had to point at them – that is, not only to be sure of their presence, but to know exactly where they sit, with Sosias and Dercylus necessarily

⁵ By the way, the character's comic name itself also begins with Φίλο-. The audience does not yet know this, but when they soon do (at the very end of the same explanatory monologue of the slave, v. 133), they will undoubtedly relate it to the list of “φιλο- infirmities” (Kanavou 2011, 81; Biles–Olson 2015, 128; Nicoletta Kanavou also notes that in v. 270 the chorus calls Philocleon φιλοδόξος).

having to be near each other. C. F. Russo suggests that Aristophanes arranged this in advance with “several friends”:⁶ this is hardly plausible, since the jokes made further about Amynias and the others are by no means friendly. In formulating this objection, Douglas MacDowell puts forward another explanation: all four of those named were officials and therefore enjoyed the right of *proedria*, so the actor was sure in advance which places of honour in the front row they would end up in.⁷ This hypothesis gives MacDowell support for the controversial identification of Nicostratus and Amynias, which I shall briefly discuss further below. One could give scope for directorial imagination here – for instance, to suppose that special people were seated around the theatre who took turns shouting the appropriate φιλο- words, and that the actor “identified” these shouts with certain Athenians, so to speak, not by face but by content.

The second difficulty has to do with the distribution of the lines in the episode. The manuscript tradition is contradictory, and the scholiast of the Ravenna codex (ad v. 74) testifies to the hesitation of the early interpreters: τινὲς ἀμοιβαῖα· χαριέστερον δὲ λέγεσθαι αὐτὰ συνεχῶς πρὸς ἑνός (“some see dialogue here, but it would be better if the whole were spoken by one character”). As for the editors, some do give the whole text to Xanthias (though, as MacDowell observes, in that case his monologue 54–135 would prove exceptionally long for Aristophanes); others divide it between Xanthias and Sosias, suggesting that one slave remains at the house door, while the other walks along the edge of the orchestra and reports the audience’s remarks to his colleague; this division has been done in several different ways, none of which has distinct advantages over the others. I have no fresh arguments on this point, and for my purpose the question is not crucial; so I simply ask the readers to keep in mind that the distribution of the lines is debatable, and I will try not to use the names Sosias and Xanthias any longer. The only thing I would like to strongly object to is the lacuna after v. 76 that was postulated by Bergk⁸ and adopted by Meineke, Starkey, MacDowell *et al.* Bergk drew attention to οὐκ at the beginning of v. 77 and regarded it as a negative response to some other diagnosis that had fallen out between ‘lover of gambling’ and ‘lover of drinking’ (MacDowell even hypothesized what might have stood in the lacuna: ‘lover of women’, ‘lover of boys’, etc.). Two things, however, seem to militate against this. Firstly, as some commentators have rightly pointed out, the slave’s clue, “Yes, this disease does begin with φιλο-,”

⁶ Russo 1962, 195.

⁷ MacDowell 1965, 49–50 (and n. 4 in p. 50); MacDowell 1971, 138–139.

⁸ Bergk 1852, XV.

should have been uttered after the first attempt to solve the riddle, i.e. after φιλόκυβος.⁹ Secondly, all of the slave's responses to the assumptions of the audience contain some poignancy, and in Bergk's version v. 77 would stand out as disappointingly flat.¹⁰ As for οὐκ, as Wilamowitz has already explained, it must be regarded as a response to Amynias' remark.¹¹

Finally, a few words should be said about the identification of the five Athenians mentioned. Philoxenus and Amynias are the *bêtes noires* of comic poets;¹² about Sosias and Dercylus we can say virtually nothing.¹³ As for Nicostratus of the deme Scambonidae, his identification with the son of Dietrephes (whose deme is unknown), a rather important Athenian politician and *strategos* (including in 423/2) who fell in 418 in the battle of Mantinea, was proposed in 1877 by Gustav Gilbert, got into *RE*, *LGPN*,

⁹ Gilula 1983, 359; Biles–Olson 2015, 110.

¹⁰ Sider 1975 made a sophisticated attempt to deal with both of these difficulties at once: if the lacuna contained the diagnosis φίλαρχος, the answer οὐκ, ἀλλὰ “φιλο-” μέν ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ would make a pun with the double meaning of ἀρχή.

¹¹ Wilamowitz 1911, 515 (= Wilamowitz 1935, 333–334); Gilula 1983, 359; Biles–Olson 2015, 110.

¹² Philoxenus, “ispiratore, intorno alla seconda metà degli anni Venti del quinto secolo, di una vera e propria *vogue* tra i commediografi dell’*archaia*” (Stama 2014, 264), is made fun of as an effeminate καταπύγων and πόρνος also in *Nub.* 685–687, Eupolid. fr. 249 K.–A., and Phrynich. fr. 49 K.–A.; see further: Storey 1995; Chronopoulos 2017, 306–307. Amynias “seems <...> to be enjoying a comic vogue c. 423/2” (Storey 2003, 216). According to the scholia to *Wasps*, he was mocked by Cratinus (fr. 227 K.–A.) as ἀλαζών, κόλαξ, and συκοφάντης. In our play, he is mentioned twice more, as an aristocrat and supporter of oligarchy (466 ff.) and as a member of the embassy to Pharsalos who is ruined despite his wealthy friends (1267 ff., where the scholiast quotes an obscure and corrupted fragment from Eupolis’ *Poleis*, fr. 222 K.–A.; cf. also *Com. adesp.* fr. 244 K.–A., where Amynias’ name was introduced by Meineke: there he (?) is called πτωχαλάζων). Last not least, in *Clouds* he is derided alongside Philoxenus as an *effeminatus* unfit for military service (690–692). MacDowell (1965, 50–51), trying to reinforce Kaibel’s interpretation of Hermipp. fr. 5 West by means of the *argumentum ad proεδρίαν*, argues that Amynias was a *strategos* in 423/2. See Storey 2003, 225–226; Chronopoulos 2017, 302–303 (with further bibl.).

¹³ The scholiast notes *ad loc.*: “there were two Sosiae, the son of Pythis and the son of Parmenon”, while he gives two references at once about Dercylus: according to one, he was a comic actor, and according to the other, a drunkard or innkeeper (οὗτος ὡς κάπηλος ἢ μεθυστὴς κωμωδεῖται). Although this last definition will be of some use to my point (v. *infra*), it is obviously composed *ad hoc* to explain φιλοπότης; as for the actor, this suggestion is probably because one of the slaves in *The Wasps* is called Sosias (MacDowell 1971, 140). See further Chronopoulos 2017, 303–305 (with bibl.).

and *PAA* (but not into *PA*),¹⁴ became the subject of a special paper by MacDowell (who proceeded, as we recall, from the ‘*proedria* argument’) and is accepted by most modern commentators of *Wasps*.¹⁵ It will not matter to us whether this is in fact that particular Nicostratus, or some other bearer of this very common name (over 200 entries in *PAA*); what will matter to us is that we know absolutely nothing about the character, way of life, or personal habits of Nicostratus the *strategos*: Thucydides, our almost sole source about his fate, gives not the slightest clue in this respect. Indeed, Gilbert, Starkie, and Lutz Lenz, trying to prove that the epithets φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος from the prologue of *Wasps* fit the *strategos* well, are forced to refer to the piety and generosity of... Nicias, and then transfer them to Nicostratus, since they were acting in concert and were likeminded.¹⁶

Now we can come to the main problem. Those who guess what an “unusually severe disease” (ἀλλοκότος νόσος) afflicts Philocleon make, one by one, four assumptions, each of which somehow compromises the person who offers it: in other words, “the tongue ever turns to the aching tooth”. This is explicitly expressed in the slave’s response to Amynias (v. 76): “he judges illness by his own example”, i.e. he himself is subject to the love of gambling. But while the first two of these diagnoses indisputably point to real ailments, gambling addiction and drunkenness, the next two, φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος, suggested by Nicostratus, are of a very different kind. How could they get on the list of “diseases” and how do they characterize Nicostratus?

This difficulty has already been confronted by the scholiasts. The solutions they offer are markedly heterogeneous, so that one can speak of two ways of explanation, originally going back to different interpreters:

Schol. ad 81: ἐπτόητο δὲ οὗτος περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ μαντείας. 82a: φιλοθύτην αὐτόν· φιλοθύται εἰσὶν οἱ δεῖσιδαίμονες, καὶ θύουσιν ἀεὶ τοῖς θεοῖς νομίζοντες ἐκ τούτου ἀβλαβεῖς ἔσσεσθαι. 82b: ἡ φιλόξενον· ὁ μὲν πρὸς τὸν ἀγαθὸν τρόπον εἶπε τὸ φιλόξενος, ὁ δὲ ὡς κύριον ἤρπασεν· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Φιλόξενος ἐκωμωδεῖτο ὡς πόρνος.

¹⁴ Even before Kirchner, Julius Beloch rejected it as “eine ganz unbegründete Vermuthung” (Beloch 1884, 334).

¹⁵ Gilbert 1877, 144–145; Lang 1890, 103 (“möglichlicherweise”); Starkie 1897, 123–124; van Leeuwen 1909, 18; MacDowell 1965; MacDowell 1971, 138–139; Sommerstein 1983, 159; Lenz 2014, 81; Biles–Olson 2015, 111 (“probably”); Chronopoulos 2017, 305–306; etc.

¹⁶ Charles Fornara (1970) found an unexpected argument for establishing the identity: based on an *ostrakon* bearing the name of Dietrephes, son of Euthoinos, he promptly pointed out that Aristophanes’ φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος could be an allusion to the literal meaning of the name of the *strategos*’ grandfather (εὐθόινος).

As we can see, the scholion finds the possibility of a pejorative understanding for φιλοθύτης (it would mean ‘superstitious’: people of this kind tend to sacrifice strenuously to protect themselves from the wrath of the gods, and such was Nicostratus), but not for φιλόξενος: instead, it is suddenly claimed that Nicostratus himself uses the epithet *in bonam partem* (but then why is it a disease?), and the slave understands it as a proper name joking about Philoxenus the καταπύγων. Nevertheless, this inherently contradictory construction found support among many commentators prior to 1900.¹⁷ Following the scholia, they interpret φιλοθύτης *in malam partem* as δεισιδαίμων, regarding superstition as a property of Nicostratus himself,¹⁸ while in φιλόξενος they see a positive characteristic: “the joke appears to be exhausted with the epithet φιλοθύτης”, says Rogers,¹⁹ and Aristophanes needs φιλόξενος only as a springboard for a witticism about Philoxenus.

This explanation, however, is unsatisfactory for several reasons. Firstly, as we shall see, nowhere else does the rather common word φιλοθύτης denote the superstitious man, and our scholion is not fit for the role of *classicus testis* because he is merely trying to solve *ad hoc* the problem posed by Aristophanes’ text. Secondly, as van Leeuwen rightly pointed out, φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος must denote naturally related qualities, for Nicostratus refers to them as symptoms of the same disease, i.e. as virtual synonyms;²⁰ ‘superstitious or hospitable’ do not go together. We are left, therefore, either with two vices or with two virtues.

The second option has been chosen by H. Müller-Strübing and MacDowell: “Aristophanes introduced them not because he seriously regards such activities as faults, but simply to provide an opportunity for comic comment on Nikostratos and Philoxenos”.²¹ It is a capitulation: the whole line is recognized as having no independent meaning. Moreover, do we really have any comic comment *on Nicostratus* here? Why are the words φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος put into the mouth of this man, with an indication of his deme, which suggests a personal invective?

¹⁷ Without going further back than the second half of the 19th century, we can mention Richter 1858, 188; Rogers 1875, 16; Lang 1890, 101; Merry 1893, 9 (2nd pag.); van Leeuwen 1893, 15; Graves 1894, 88; Starkie 1897, 184; etc.

¹⁸ Lang (1890, 101) and Starkie (1897, 184) assume that the euphemistic oath in v. 84 (μὰ τὸν κύν’, ὃ Νικόστρατ’, οὐ φιλόξενος) “is a reflexion of the superstition of Nicostratus”; but cf. Chronopoulos 2017, 161 n. 158.

¹⁹ Rogers 1875, 16.

²⁰ Van Leeuwen 1909, 19.

²¹ MacDowell 1971, 141; cf. Müller-Strübing 1880, 90 n. 3 (“ganz harmlos”).

On the contrary, the first option – i.e. turning φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος into vices – has proved much more popular. This is not an easy task. Let's start with Dwora Gilula's hypothesis²² on the meaning of φιλόξενος, as it shows just how scholars have to twist the arms of the Greek dictionary to postulate the pejorative meaning of the epithet. Gilula draws attention to the servant's reply: "No, Philocleon is not φιλόξενος, because Philoxenus is καταπύγων", from which she deduces that "being a καταπύγων excludes the possibility of being a φιλόξενος". Then she refers to K. J. Dover's *Greek Homosexuality*: according to the law attributed to Solon, male prostitution in Athens was punishable by partial *atimia*, and thus the business was most likely kept by the metics. So, φιλόξενος, 'lover of foreigners', would be a designation of a regular client of these καταπύγωνες. This construction seems to be based on a misinterpretation of the joke about Philoxenus, which means simply "Are you mad to call my master's old father Philoxenus who is a καταπύγων!"²³ As for φιλοθύτης, beginning with a fair critique of "the superstitious" ("one's man superstition is another's religion"), Gilula comes to conclude that the word means 'glutton', since any sacrifice involves the eating of meat. As we shall now see, this latter suggestion was also made much earlier and in a different context.

Indeed, the point of contact between φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος was found in 1896 by Carl Wilhelm Volgraff, then a twenty-year-old student, whose short note published in a Brussels university journal might have gone unnoticed had it not been supported by Carl von Holzinger in *Bursians Jahresberichte* and then by van Leeuwen in the second edition of his commentary.²⁴ According to Volgraff, it is the feast accompanying any sacrifice that brings the two qualities together. Since then, most commentators and translators have preferred to understand both words in Volgraff's way,²⁵ but exaggeratedly: Nicostratus is an *excessive* lover of sacrifices and pleasing guests, a *maniac* of offerings and receptions. For the last hundred years, this is an *opinio communis*.²⁶ It is only the reason

²² Gilula 1983, 361–362.

²³ This incongruence was noticed by S. Chronopoulos (2017, 161–162 n. 159).

²⁴ Volgraff 1896/7; Holzinger 1903, 225–226; van Leeuwen 1909, 19.

²⁵ Thanks to the acclaimed works of M. P. Nilsson and Paul Veyne, the over-generalized statement "As every time that a beast was killed at home the form was that of a sacrifice, it became nothing but a form; *lover of sacrifice* (*philothytes*) means no more than *hospitable*" (Nilsson 1948, 12; cf. Nilsson 1940, 75; Nilsson 1955, 145; Veyne 1987, 196) has spread wide, despite the sober objections of Casabona 1966, 143 and Renchan 1975, 198.

²⁶ However, "the superstitious man" was recently resurrected by Orth 2014, 453 and Lenz 2014, 81.

for such an exotic vice that varies: Nicostratus does so either because of his zest for life, willing to eat heartily and to indulge his friends,²⁷ or because of his unbridled generosity that is next to wastefulness and causes damage to his household.²⁸ Only John Vaio and, following him, Stylianos Chronopoulos managed to get rid of the overly sympathetic image of Nicostratus (for it still should be a disease!):²⁹ as they presume, his love for sacrifices and feasts is the kind of demonstrative consumption typical of the aristocracy and asserting its social status.³⁰

To assess these hypotheses, let us turn to the analysis of the two epithets. Φιλοθύτης has strictly positive connotations, denoting not even an ambivalent or neutral feature, but precisely a virtue. Pollux (1. 20) defines it as ὁ θεοὺς νομίζων ἀνὴρ (in explicit opposition to δεισιδαίμων!) and offers εὐσεβής, ὅσιος, θεῶν ἐπιμελής, etc. as its synonyms.³¹ Sometimes a connotation of ‘well-versed, experienced in the *Opferpraktik*’ can be picked up in it;³² in other cases, the meaning seems to be rather general (‘religious’ without specific references to the sacrifices).³³ More interesting are the ‘social’ contexts in which φιλοθυσία appears as unconditionally approved behaviour and is associated not so much with personal piety

²⁷ Volgraff 1896/7; van Leeuwen 1909, 19.

²⁸ Sommerstein 1983, 159–160; Biles–Olson 2015, 111.

²⁹ In van Leeuwen’s description, Nicostratus is quite a nice chap: “Amat Nicostratus [...] bovis recens mactati carnibus cum familiaribus vesci” (van Leeuwen 1909, 19).

³⁰ Vaio 1971, 338–339; Chronopoulos 2017, 161–162.

³¹ The word appears also in Poll. 7. 188 (θύται, φιλοθύται, μάγοι, γόητες, ἐξηγηταί, καθαρταί, τελεσταί, ἀπομάκται, ἀπομάκτριαι...), which is not, *pace* Orth 2014, 453, “eine Liste von Wörtern für religiöse Charlatane”, but an unordered medley of *nomina agentium* related to rites and magic. Φιλοθύτης equals δεισιδαίμων only for a Christian soul (Socr. Schol. 3. 20).

³² DL 2. 56 (on Xenophon): εὐσεβής τε καὶ φιλοθύτης καὶ ἱερεῖα διαγνῶναι ἱκανός; Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 631 A: ὁ δ’ εὐσεβής καὶ φιλοθύτης, διηγηματικὸς ὄνειρῶν καὶ ὅσα χρῆσάμενος ἡ φήμαις ἡ ἱεροῖς θεῶν εὐμενεία κατάρθωσεν, ἡδέως ἂν καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐρωτῶτο; Rom. 7. 2: τοῦ δὲ Ῥωμύλου πρὸς τινα θυσίαν ἀποτραπομένου (καὶ γὰρ ἦν φιλοθύτης καὶ μαντικός)...; Aem. Paul. 17. 10: ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ πολὺν νέμων, καὶ φιλοθύτης ὢν καὶ μαντικός, ὡς εἶδε πρῶτον τὴν σελήνην ἀποκαθαιρομένην, ἑνδεκα μόσχους αὐτῇ κατέθυσεν; Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* 4. 19: τὴν μὲν δὴ πρῶτην διάλεξιν, ἐπειδὴ φιλοθύτας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους εἶδεν, ὑπὲρ ἱερῶν διελέξατο.

³³ Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* 5. 21: “τί δὲ ἄλλο γε”, ἢ δ’ ὁ Κάνος “ἢ τὸν λυπούμενον μὲν κοιμίζεσθαι αὐτῷ τὴν λύπην ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐλοῦ, τὸν δὲ χαίροντα ἰλαρώτερον ἑαυτοῦ γίγνεσθαι, τὸν δὲ ἔρῶντα θερμότερον, τὸν δὲ φιλοθύτην ἐνθεώτερόν τε καὶ ὑμνώδην;” Eunap. *Vita soph.* 10. 6. 3: τυχὼν δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοτιμίαν τύχης ἀξίας (τὸ γὰρ καλούμενον Ἰλλυρικὸν ἐπετέτραπτο), καὶ φιλοθύτης ὢν καὶ διαφερόντως Ἑλλήν...

as with a willingness to spend for the common good and for the joy of others.³⁴ Philosophical or quasi-philosophical reasoning about stinginess, generosity, and extravagance often emphasizes that abundant spending on sacrifices, as well as on other social needs, can never be excessive and unjustified; Aristotle discusses this in the 4th book of *EN*, while constructing one of his usual triads (μεγαλοπρέπεια / μικροπρέπεια / βαναυσία): Ἔστι δὲ τῶν δαπανημάτων οἷα λέγομεν τὰ τίμια, οἷον τὰ περὶ θεοῦς, ἀναθήματα καὶ κατασκευαὶ καὶ θυσίαι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον (1122 b 19 sqq.). Even in a difficult passage by Theophrastus, touching precisely on questions of excessive spending for sacrifices (fr. 523 Fortenbaugh [= Stob. 3. 3. 42]: χρή τοίνυν τὸν μέλλοντα θαυμασθήσεσθαι περὶ τὸ θεῖον φιλοθύτην εἶναι, μὴ τῷ πολλὰ θύειν ἀλλὰ τῷ πυκνὰ τιμᾶν τὸ θεῖον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ εὐπορίας, τὸ δ' ὀσιότητος σημεῖον), φιλοθύτης, as it seems, is used in a positive sense. The desire to arouse admiration for one's piety, which requires being φιλοθύτης, is not itself reprehensible for Theophrastus; however, as he points out, it must not be a one-time luxurious action for which nothing but money is needed, but regular devotional activity. Thus, the very possibility of a "compulsive" or "manic" φιλοθυσία turns out to be seriously compromised.

Here I shall have to issue a caveat. Metagenes, one of the last poets of the ἀρχαία, wrote a play called Φιλοθύτης; its few extant fragments (13–16 K.–A.) give no information on either the plot or the main character. August Meineke, referring to the cited scholium to *Vesp.* 82, suggested that he was comically superstitious;³⁵ although, as we have seen, in the interpretation of *Vesp.* 82 the 'superstition' idea was almost abandoned after Volgraff, it has survived among Metagenes' editors as far as Kassel–Austin and Chr. Orth.³⁶ Accordingly, too, the commentators of *Wasps* from time to time mention Metagenes' play to prove that the φιλοθυσία, when excessive, may also have been regarded as a weakness.³⁷ It should be emphasized, however, that among the numerous titles of Greek

³⁴ Antiph. *Tetr.* 1. 2. 12: ἐμὲ δὲ ἔκ γε τῶν προειργασμένων γνώσεσθε <...> πολλὰς μὲν καὶ μεγάλας εἰσφοράς εἰσφέροντα, πολλὰ δὲ τριηραρχοῦντα, λαμπρῶς δὲ χορηγοῦντα, πολλοὺς δὲ ἐρανίζοντα, μεγάλας δὲ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐγγύας ἀποτίνοντα, τὴν δὲ οὐσίαν οὐ δικαζόμενον ἀλλ' ἐργαζόμενον κεκτημένον, φιλοθύτην δὲ καὶ νόμιμον ὄντα; Plut. *Themist.* 5. 1: σύντονον δ' αὐτὸν γεγονέναι χρηματιστὴν οἱ μὲν τινὲς φασὶ δι' ἐλευθεριότητα· καὶ γὰρ φιλοθύτην ὄντα καὶ λαμπρὸν ἐν ταῖς περὶ τοὺς ξένους δαπάναις, ἀφθόνου δεῖσθαι χορηγίας ...

³⁵ Meineke 1839, 221.

³⁶ Orth 2014, 453.

³⁷ E.g. Biles–Olson 2015, 111.

comedies containing a composite of the φιλοτοιούτος type (according to the lists drawn up by Alfred Körte and Andreas Bagordo, there are a total of 38, including 20 different ones),³⁸ alongside negative characteristics like Φιλοκλίνης and Φυλάργυρος, there are definitely positive ones: e.g. Φιλέταιρος³⁹ (-οι) by Philonides (ἀρχαία), Antiphanes, Amphis, Hegiochus, Alexis, Philemon, and Hegesippus; Φιλάδελφοι (-ος) by Amphides, Menander, Diphilus, Philippides, Apollodorus, and Sosicrates; Φιλοπάτωρ by Antiphanes; Φιλομήτωρ by Antiphanes and Posidippus; Φιλοδέσποτος by Theognetes, Timostratus, and Sogenes; Φιλαθήναιος by Alexis and Philippides; etc.⁴⁰ Of course, we cannot rule out that in the course of Metagenes' play the hero's φιλοθυσία led to some undesirable consequences (say, ruining him), but the characteristic in itself in no way suggests a vice.

I have no need to analyze φιλόξενος, a far more frequent epithet, in as much detail.⁴¹ Since the time of Homer (cf. the formula that Odysseus repeats when reaching an unknown place [ζ 119 etc.]: ὦ μοι ἐγὼ, τέων αὖτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἰκάνω; / ἦ ῥ' οἷ γ' ὕβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι, / ἦε φιλόξενοι καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεοῦδής;), hospitality is an unquestionable virtue, both private and public, a duty towards men and gods. The whole of Euripides' *Alcestis* (where the servant speaks of Admetus: ἄγαν ἐκεῖνός ἐστ' ἄγαν φιλόξενος [v. 809]) is an extended

³⁸ Körte 1938, 123–124; Bagordo 2014, 167–168.

³⁹ Hardly a proper name or the lover of *hetairai*; cf. Arnott 1996, 156–157.

⁴⁰ It is edifying for our purpose that Körte, facing [ανθρώποις Διφί(λου)] in a didascalic inscription, prefers to restore Φιλ[ανθρώποις] instead of Μισ[ανθρώποις] of the *editio princeps* (Körte 1938, 123–124).

⁴¹ This word cannot mean a 'foreign agent'. It is instructive to trace the story of an *ostrakon* APXENOS ΦΙΛΟΣΣΕΝON (6th/5th century BC) found in the Athenian agora in 1938. Its first editor (Vanderpool 1949, 395) suggested an error instead of APXENOS ΦΙΛΟΣΣΕΝO (*gen. sing.*); then Mabel Lang interpreted ΦΙΛΟΣΣΕΝON as a pejorative φιλοξενῶν, 'Archenus, a lover of foreigners', i.e. most probably a μηδίζων (Lang 1990, 33–34, no. 18). However, Stefan Brenne rightly rejected this assumption (shared by Masson 1992, 113, Giugni 2001, 12, and Surikov 2018a [И. Е. Суриков, "Прозвища у греков архаической и классической эпох. III. Прозвища политиков"], *Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры*], 102, who immediately changed his mind: v. Surikov 2018b [И. Е. Суриков, "Прозвища у греков архаической и классической эпох. IV. Афины: От 'великих остракизмов' до 'великих демагогов'", *Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры*], 173) and returned to the misspelled patronymic, arguing, *inter alia*, that "φιλοξενέω ist sonst allerding's nicht mit dieser negativen Konnotation behaftet; das Gegenteil ist der Fall, da nur so die Häufigkeit des Namens Philoxenos spätestens seit den sechziger Jahren des 5. Jhs. zu erklären ist" (Brenne 2002, 81; cf. Brenne 2001, 108; 271–272).

statement that there are no limits to φιλοξενία and it cannot be excessive, even if in some circumstances we think otherwise.

I come to my point. All interpreters assume that the three jokes about Amynias, Sosias/Dercyllus, and Nicostratus are of the same kind: people name the vices that they themselves indulge in. Meanwhile, already the second of these jokes (v. 78 ff.) does not necessarily mean “Sosias and Dercylus are φιλοπόται”: this is well understood by the scholiast, who suggests that Dercylus could be not only a μεθυστής but also a κάπηλος.⁴² The third diagnosis is also self-defeating to the one who puts it forward, but self-defeating in a slightly different way. Both φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος are unequivocally positive traits,⁴³ and only Nicostratus, unlike everyone else in the audience, paradoxically considers them symptoms of a dangerous mental disease; only he is convinced that φιλοθύται and φιλόξενοι are *fous à lier*. Nicostratus is neither superstitious nor prodigal: he is greedy.⁴⁴

Vsevolod Zeltchenko
Matenadaran, Yerevan;
Bibliotheca classica Petropolitana
vsevolodzelcenko@gmail.com

Bibliography

- W. G. Arnott (ed., comm.), *Alexis. The Fragments: A Commentary* (Cambridge 1996).
A. Bagordo (ed., comm.), *Leukon – Xenophilos*, Fragmenta comica 1, 2 (Heidelberg 2014).
J. Beloch, *Attische Politik seit Perikles* (Leipzig 1884).

⁴² Other versions are also possible: Sosias and Dercylus could be ἀγαθο-δαιμονισταί, or the drunkard son and his austere father, etc. etc.

⁴³ Palmira Cipriano argues that the unusual understanding of φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος in *Vesp.* 83 as terms of blame is supported by the overall context of the episode (Cipriano 1990, 38–39; on the “importance of the context”, cf. also Casabona 1966, 143; Biles–Olson 2015, 111). However, the situation where the slave encourages the audience to name diseases beginning with φιλο- suggests a kind of ‘zero context’, as in a dictionary or crossword puzzle.

⁴⁴ It is well known that, in Greek literature, saving on sacrifices and hospitality are the constant features of an avaricious person: it suffices to say that all four chapters on misers in Theophrastus’ *Characters* refer to some petty manipulations in distributing sacrificial meat to guests (9. 3; 10. 11; 22. 4; 30. 4). Cf. also Plut. *Themist.* 5. 1 (cit. *supra*, n. 34), where φιλοθύτης and λαμπρὸς ἐν ταῖς περὶ τοῦς ξένους δαπάναις go together as qualities requiring vast expenditure.

- Th. Bergk (ed.), *Aristophanis Comoediae* I (Leipzig 1852 [21884]).
- Z. P. Biles, S. D. Olson (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Wasps* (Oxford 2015).
- St. Brenne, *Ostrakismos und Prominenz in Athen: Attische Bürger des 5. Jhs. v. Chr. auf den Ostraka*, Tyche Supplbd 3 (Vienna, 2001).
- St. Brenne, “Die Ostraka (487 – ca. 416 v. Chr.) als Testimonien (T 1)”, in: P. Siewert (ed.), *Ostrakismos-Testimonien: Die Zeugnisse antiker Autoren, der Inschriften und Ostraka über das athenische Scherbengericht aus vorhellenistischer Zeit (487–322 v. Chr.)* I, *Historia Einzelschriften* 155 (Stuttgart 2002) 36–166.
- J. Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec, de l’origine à la fin de l’époque classique*. Thèse (Paris 1966).
- S. Chronopoulos, *Spott im Drama: Dramatische Funktionen der persönlichen Verspottung in Aristophanes’ Wespen und Frieden*, *Studia comica* 6 (Berlin 2017).
- P. Cipriano, *I composti greci con ΦΙΛΟΣ* (Viterbo 1990).
- C. W. Fornara, “ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΔΙΕΤΡΕΦΟΥΣ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ”, *CQ* n. s. 20 (1970) 41.
- G. Gilbert, *Beiträge zur innern Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter des Peloponnesischen Krieges* (Leipzig 1877).
- D. Gilula, “Four Deadly Sins? (Arist. *Wasps* 74–84)”, *CQ* n. s. 33 (1983) 358–362.
- E. Giugni, *I nuovi ritrovamenti di ostraka nell’agorà e nel Ceramico* (Florence 2001).
- C. E. Graves (ed., comm.), *The Wasps of Aristophanes* (Cambridge 1894).
- C. von Holzinger, “Bericht über die Literatur zur griechischen Komödie aus den Jahren 1892–1901”, *JAW* 116 (1903) 159–328.
- N. Kanavou, *Aristophanes’ Comedy of Names: A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*, *Sozomena* 8 (Berlin – New York 2011).
- A. Körte, “Bruchstücke einer didaskalischen Inschrift”, *Hermes* 73 (1938) 123–127.
- M. L. Lang, *Ostraka*, *The Athenian Agora* 25 (Princeton 1990).
- R. Lang (transl., ann.), *Die Wespen des Aristophanes*. In den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt (Schaffhausen 1890).
- J. van Leeuwen (ed., comm.), *Aristophanis Vespae* (Lugduni Batavorum ¹1893, ²1909).
- L. Lenz (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Wespen* (Berlin–Boston 2014).
- D. MacDowell, “Nikostratos”, *CQ* n. s. 15 (1965) 41–51.
- D. MacDowell (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Wasps* (Oxford 1971).
- O. Masson, “Nouvelles notes d’anthroponymie grecque”, *ZPE* 91 (1992) 107–120.
- P. Mazon, *Essai sur la composition des comédies d’Aristophane* (Paris 1904).
- A. Meineke (ed., comm.), *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum* I (Berlin 1839).
- W. W. Merry (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. The Wasps* (Oxford 1893).
- C. Moulton, *Aristophanic Poetry* (Göttingen 1981).
- H. Müller-Strübing, “Protagorea. Zu den Vögeln des Aristophanes”, *NJPP* 121 (1880) 81–106.
- M. P. Nilsson, *Greek Popular Religion* (New York 1940).

- M. P. Nilsson, *Greek Piety* (Oxford 1948).
- M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion I* (Munich 1955).
- Chr. Orth (ed., comm.), *Aristomenes – Metagenes*, *Fragmenta comica* 9, 2 (Heidelberg 2014).
- R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes: A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones* (Göttingen 1975).
- I. Richter (ed., comm.), *Aristophanis Vespae* (Berlin 1858).
- B. B. Rogers (ed., comm.), *The Wasps of Aristophanes. Acted at Athens at the Lenaeon Festival, BC 422* (London [1875]).
- C. F. Russo, *Aristofane autore del teatro* (Florence 1962).
- D. Sider, “Aristophanes *Wasps* 74–77: The Missing Vice”, *CP* 70 (1975) 125–126.
- A. Sommerstein (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Wasps* (Warminster 1983).
- F. Stama (ed., comm.), *Frinico*, *Fragmenta comica* 7 (Heidelberg 2014).
- I. C. Storey, “Philoxenos... of Doubtful Gender”, *JHS* 115 (1995) 182–184.
- I. C. Storey, *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford 2003).
- I. E. Surikov, “Prozish’a u grekov arhaicheskoy i klassicheskoy epoh. III. Prozish’a politikov” [“Greek Nicknames of the Archaic and Classical Periods. III. Nicknames of Archaic and Early Classical Politicians”], *Problemy istorii, filologii, kul’tury* 1 (2018a) 89–113 (in Russian, summary in English).
- I. E. Surikov, “Prozish’a u grekov arhaicheskoy i klassicheskoy epoh. IV. Afiny: Ot ‘velikih ostrakizmov’ do ‘velikih demagogov’” [“Greek Nicknames of the Archaic and Classical Periods. IV. Athens: From the ‘Great Ostracisms’ to the ‘Great Demagogues’”], *Problemy istorii, filologii, kul’tury* 3 (2018b) 170–197 (in Russian, summary in English).
- J. Vaio, “Aristophanes’ *Wasps*: The Relevance of the Final Scenes”, *GRBS* 12 (1971) 335–351.
- E. Vanderpool, “Some Ostraka from the Athenian Agora”, *Hesperia* Suppl. 8 (1949) 394–412; 493–496.
- P. Veyne, “The Roman Empire”, in: P. Veyne (ed.), *A History of Private Life. I. From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*. Transl. by A. Goldhammer (Cambridge, Mass. – London 1987) 5–234.
- W. Volruff, “Note sur un vers d’Aristophane (*Vesp.* 82)”, *Revue de l’Université de Bruxelles* 2 (1896/7) 713–715.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, “Über die *Wespen* des Aristophanes”, *SB Berlin* 1911, 460–491; 504–535 (= *Kleine Schriften I* [Berlin 1935] 284–346).
- M. Whittaker, “The Comic Fragments in their Relations to the Structure of Old Attic Comedy”, *CQ* 29 (1935) 181–191.

In *Vesp.* 71 ff. two slaves invite the audience to guess what dangerous disease, beginning with φίλο-, their master’s father is ill with. The named Athenians make their assumptions, each of which somehow compromises the person who offers it: first φιλόκυβος, then φιλοπότης, and finally a certain Nicostratus shouts out the strange φιλοθύτης ἢ φιλόξενος. The scholia, followed by old commentators, understand φιλοθύτης as δεισιδαίμων (which has no parallel); modern *opinio*

communis suggests that φιλοθύτης ἢ φιλόξενος means an *over-hospitable amphitryon*, i.e. a careless spender or a boastful aristocrat: Nicostratus attributes these qualities to Philocleon because he himself is one. The present paper stresses that φιλοθύτης and φιλόξενος are unconditional virtues, both private and public, and it is impossible to give them any pejorative meaning. Aristophanes' joke is that only Nicostratus, and no one else, paradoxically considers spending on sacrifices and guests to be vices, and that all φιλοθύται and φιλόξενοι are dangerous madmen who must be guarded by their household. In other words, Nicostratus, whoever he was, is ridiculed by Aristophanes as a miser.

В прологе *Ос* (71 слл.) два раба предлагают публике угадать, какой опасной болезнью, начинающейся на φιλο-, болен отец их хозяина. Называемые по имени афиняне выдвигают версии (которые, очевидно, как-то компрометируют их самих): сперва φιλόκυβος, затем φιλοπότης и, наконец, некий Никострат выкрикивает странное φιλοθύτης ἢ φιλόξενος. Схолиаст, за которым последовали многие старые интерпретаторы, понимает φιλοθύτης как δεισιδαίμων (что не находит параллелей); современная *opinio communis* предполагает, что слова φιλοθύτης ἢ φιλόξενος означают *чрезмерно* гостеприимного хозяина, т. е. беспечного мота или хвастливого аристократа: Никострат приписывает эти качества Филоклеону, потому что сам таков. В статье подчеркивается, что φιλοθύτης и φιλόξενος – это безусловные добродетели, не только частные, но и общественные, и придавать им сколько-нибудь пейоративное значение невозможно. Шутка Аристофана состоит в том, что только Никострат, и больше никто, парадоксально считает траты на жертвоприношения и гостей пороками, а всех φιλοθύται и φιλόξενοι – опасными безумцами, которых их домашние должны стеречь. Иначе говоря, Никострат, кто бы он ни был, высмеивается Аристофаном как скупец.

Gleb L. Krivolapov

DIONYSUS OR HERACLES:
MARK ANTONY'S RELIGIOUS POLICY
IN 41 BCE IN THE LIGHT OF
EPISTULA MARCI ANTONII AD KOINON ASIAE

1. Introduction

After the Battle of Philippi, triumvir Mark Antony spent the winter in Athens. In the spring of 41 BCE, he marched through the central part of Greece, Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace to the Bosphorus at the head of a significant army, eventually crossing to Bithynia.¹ According to Plutarch (*Ant.* 24. 3 f.),

εἰς γοῦν Ἐφεσον εἰσιόντος αὐτοῦ γυναῖκες μὲν εἰς Βάκχας, ἄνδρες δὲ καὶ παῖδες εἰς Σατύρους καὶ Πᾶνας ἡγοῦντο διεσκευασμένοι, κιττοῦ δὲ καὶ θύρσων καὶ ψαλτηρίων καὶ συρίγγων καὶ αὐλῶν ἢ πόλις ἦν πλέα, Διόνυσον αὐτὸν ἀνακαλουμένων Χαριδότην καὶ Μειλίχιον. ἦν γὰρ ἀμέλει τοιοῦτος ἐνίοις, τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς Ὠμηστής καὶ Ἀγριώνιος.

at any rate, when Antony made his entry into Ephesus, women arrayed like Bacchanals, and men and boys like Satyrs and Pans, led the way before him, and the city was full of ivy and thyrsus-wands and harps and pipes and flutes, the people hailing him as Dionysus Giver of Joy and Beneficent. For he was such, undoubtedly, to some; but to the greater part he was Dionysus Carnivorous and Savage.²

¹ Buchheim 1960, 11 f. For Antony's stay 41–40 BCE in the East in details, see App. *BCiv.* 5. 15–44; Joseph. *AJ.* 14, *BJ.* 1. 12; Plut. *Ant.* 24–30; Dio 48. 24–27; *SB* I 4224, as well as the following studies: Tarn 1934a, 31–40; Magie 1950, 427–430, 1278–1281; Rossi 1959, 119–128; Buchheim 1960, *passim*; Bengtson 1977, 161–165; Huzar 1978, 151–154; Chamoux 1986, 238–248; Roberts 1988, 179–185; Hekster–Kaizer 2004; Pelling 2008, 9–13; Halfmann 2011, 110–129, 237–239; Van Wijlick 2021, *passim* etc.

² Transl. Perrin 1959. For Νέος Διόνυσος as an official title, see Śnieżewski 1998, 133 f.

In Ephesus, Antony was probably persuaded to grant extensive privileges and immunities to “the Association of Wreath-Bearers and Victors in the Sacred Games from the Inhabited World” (Σύνοδος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν), mainly consisting of athletes. Representatives of this association had in all likelihood previously enjoyed broad privileges officially granted by Roman senators.³ However, the resumption of civil wars in the Roman republic gave rise to doubts about the inviolability of honors and privileges granted earlier. Concerned about their status and also wishing to obtain additional rights, association members sent to Antony a certain priest, a native of Ephesus and representative of the *Koinon* of the Greeks from Asia. The priest came to the triumvir, enlisting the support of Antony's “friend”, the gymnastics teacher Artemidoros, as evidenced by the letter of Antony to the *Koinon* of the Greeks from Asia concerning the privileges of ἱερωνῖκαι and στεφανῖται (*PLond* 137v = *SB* I 4224).⁴

Previous scholars have not paid close attention to this letter in the context of Antony's 41 BCE sojourn in the East,⁵ especially in the context of his religious policy.⁶ Thus, the connection between *Epistula Marci Antonii ad Koinon Asiae* and Antony's religious policy in the East in 41 BCE requires further consideration, as it might shed light on some very significant features of the triumvir's eastern policies at that time.

2. Antony's religious policy in 41 BCE

There is a disagreement as to whether Antony was guided to some extent by his Dionysian policy or Herculean one in the East after the Battle of

³ For the person who could grant these privileges, see Fauconnier 2016, 79.

⁴ For Antony's stay in Ephesus in 41 BCE, see *RDGE* 57; Rogers 1991, 7 f.; id. 2012, 95 f.; Knibbe 1998, 107 f.

⁵ Cf. Magie 1950, 428 and 1279 n. 4; Roberts 1988, 180; Pelling 2008, 11; Halfmann 2011, 120 and 238 n. 2.

⁶ The exception was my article: Krivolapov 2021 [Г. Л. Криволапов, “Epistula Marci Antonii triumviri ad Koinon Asiae как источник по изучению пребывания Марка Антония на Востоке в 41 г. до н. э.”, *Античный мир и археология*]. Nevertheless, that study has incorrectly linked granting privileges to the Association with Antony's Dionysian policy (*ibid.* 136 f.). This paper makes an argument in favor of Heracleism based on Antony's origin from Heracles.

Philippi.⁷ Since scholars pay most attention to Antony's Dionysianism in the context of his religious policy in 41 BCE, let us consider this issue in more detail at first. Antony's opting for Dionysus as a deity with whom he would later be identified seems to have been intentional.⁸ The inception period of his Dionysian policy has been a topic of serious discussion among scholars.⁹ The first mention of the link between Antony

⁷ Some scholars believe that Antony's stressing his mythical ancestor Heracles influenced, at least subliminally, his political decisions in the East (e. g., Kienast 1969, 441–444; Felten 1985, 136 f.; Huttner 1995, 108; Perez 2009, 182). However, most scholars are inclined to believe that Antony was guided to some extent by his Dionysian policy rather than Herculean one beginning in 41 BCE (e. g., Weippert 1972, 200 f.; Śnieżewski 1998, 133; Hekster 2004, 174; Beacham 2005, 154 f.; Rogers 2012, 95 f.). H. Halfmann, in turn, believes Antony, already during the first sojourn in the East as a triumvir, appealed to both Heracles and Dionysus in his eastern policies (Halfmann 2011, 110–112). As K. Erickson concludes, the propaganda of Antony's political opponents made it almost impossible to trace his connection with Heracles after rapprochement with Cleopatra (Erickson 2018, 261 f.).

⁸ See Poloczec 2021: "On the one hand, Mark Antony clearly adapted a peculiar element of Hellenistic monarchic ideology, thus introducing himself as the successor of Ptolemies – the notion of Νέος Διόνυσος – but on the other hand, he also created a quite new model of 'personal relationship' to the god based on the political aspirations to be the conqueror, benefactor and true Lord of the East".

⁹ A number of scholars believe that the starting point of Antony's Dionysian policy was his stay of 41 BCE in the East and the events that took place in Ephesus and Tarsus (e. g., Jeanmaire 1924, 243 f.; Taylor 1931, 108 ff.; Täger 1957, 90 ff.; Weippert 1972, 201 f.; Huzar 1978, 195; Cresci Marrone 1993, 16 f.; Hekster 2004, 174; Beacham 2005, 155 f.; Halfmann 2011, 110–112, 120). Other scholars argue that the Ephesian manifestation was just a sporadic episode that had no practical consequences, and that a stable political line for identification with Dionysus begins only from the time of Antony's second stay in Athens and marriage to Octavia (e. g., Craven 1920, 57; Tarn 1932, 148 f.; id. 1934a, 33; id. 1934b, 69; Pelling 1988, 179; id. 2008, 10; Buchheim 1960, 15, 100 n. 24; Osgood 2006, 240 f. and n. 138). R. F. Rossi stands apart, asserting that the beginning of Antony's interest in Dionysus dates back to the time of his first stay in Athens in the winter of 42–41 BCE (Rossi 1959, 112, 161). Developing this idea, E. V. Smykov suggested that in this city Antony was initiated into the mysteries, organized to a large extent by the Athenian community of Dionysian Technites (τεχνίται). Then the triumvir arrived in Asia, which was the area of responsibility for other representatives of this religious community – Dionysiac Technites of Asia and Hellespont. The members of this union took over the responsibility for greeting him and were behind the organization of Asian celebrations and magnificent ceremonies during Anthony's procession to Ephesus, in the provincial capital itself, and later in Tarsus (Smykov 2002 [Е. В. Смыков, "Антоний и Дионис (из истории религиозной политики триумвира М. Антония)"], 85–87).

and Dionysus dates back to the spring of 41 BCE, when, according to Plutarch, he was greeted in Ephesus as Θεὸς Νέος Διόνυσος.¹⁰ Plutarch then reports a rumor spread during the meeting of Antony and Cleopatra in Tarsus the same year “that Venus was come to revel with Dionysus for the good of Asia”.¹¹

Since we have no other references to Antony's Dionysianism in 41 BCE except for Plutarch's previously-mentioned testimonies, the situation seems to be quite obvious. There is no doubt that Antony's appeal to the cult of Dionysus, his notorious “Dionysianism”, was not a homogeneous phenomenon; rather, it manifested differently at different stages of his career. And even if Antony had participated in the dedication into the mysteries of the Dionysian cult in Athens (as E. V. Smykov assumes¹²), he evidently did not place much political value on it throughout his first stay in the East as a triumvir in 41–40 BCE. Most scholars rightly believe that Antony viewed the divine honors paid to him, namely his initiation into the Dionysian mysteries in Athens and his role in the Ephesian procession and in Tarsus, as a matter of course, which seems consistent with his character. In any case, these festivities could not have had a significant impact on his policy, as scholars have remarked that the colorful descriptions of these occasions, teeming with detail, are found only in Plutarch, who is not considered the most reliable source due to his tendency toward excess. Appian and Cassius Dio did not even mention the events in passing. They were, in all likelihood, only minor episodes in the kaleidoscope of events in 41 BCE for everyone, including the triumvir himself.¹³

Thus, the Dionysianism of Antony in 41 BCE can hardly be called a full-fledged religious policy. In this regard, Cassius Dio's testimony is more accurate. Some shocking features of Antony's behavior that did not correspond to *mos maiorum*, including his identification with Dionysus, became apparent during his stay in Athens in the winter of 39–38 BCE (Dio 48. 39. 2).¹⁴

¹⁰ Cf. above n. 2.

¹¹ Plut. *Ant.* 26. 3: καὶ τις λόγος ἐχόρει διὰ πάντων ὡς ἡ Ἀφροδίτη κωμάζοι παρὰ τὸν Διόνυσον ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ τῆς Ἀσίας.

¹² Smykov 2002, 85–87.

¹³ See inter alios Buchheim 1960, 15, 100 n. 24; Weippert 1972, 201 f.; Pelling 1988, 179 ff.; id. 2008, 10; Smykov 2002, 86 f.; id. 2017 [E. В. Смыков, “Марк Антоний в мире эллинистических монархий: государь или магистрат?”], 92–94; Osgood 2006, 240 f. and n. 138; Tisé 2006, 175 f.; Pfeiffer 2019, 310–312 etc.

¹⁴ See Socr. Rhod. *FGrH* 192 F 2; Sen. *Suas.* 1. 6; *IG* II/III² 1043 ll. 22–24 (esp. l. 23: Ἀντῶν[?]νίου θεοῦ νέου Διονύσου).

Other information regarding Antony's religious policy deserves greater attention. First is Plutarch's message that Antony was initiated into the mysteries during his stay in 42–41 BCE in Athens (*Ant.* 23. 2):¹⁵

τὸ παῖζον αὐτοῦ **πρὸς** ἀκροάσεις φιλολόγων καὶ θεὰς ἀγώνων καὶ **μυήσεις** ἔτρεπε...

...for his entertainment he was content to listen to the discussions of scholars, watch the games, and **be initiated into the mysteries**.

Although many scholars considered this as a reference to the Eleusinian Mysteries,¹⁶ Smykov and W. J. Tatum have suggested that in this phrase of Plutarch the word “initiations” (μυήσεις) should be understood to mean Lesser Mysteries.¹⁷ Lesser Mysteries “were founded in order to purify Heracles and lead him on to his initiation at Eleusis”,¹⁸ said Tatum. At the same time, as is well known, Antony traced his ancestry from Heracles.¹⁹ Thus, the triumvir stressed his mythical ancestor Heracles through participation in Lesser Mysteries, as well as his deeply respectful, deeply Hellenic attitude to Athens by establishing ties of συγγένεια.²⁰

¹⁵ Plutarch was the only one who talked about Antony's stay in Athens after the Battle of Philippi in the winter of 42–41 BCE (Plut. *Ant.* 23. 2–4). For Anthony's pastime activities in Greece and in particular Athens at this time, see inter alios Craven 1920, 20 f.; Rossi 1959, 107–108; Bengtson 1977, 155 f.; Pelling 1988, 175 f.; Kienast 1995, 193 f.; Habicht 1997, 360; Fontani 1999, 194 f.; Halfmann 2011, 105–106; esp. Tatum 2020, 456–460.

¹⁶ So e. g. Craven 1920, 20; Bengtson 1977, 155; Pelling 1988, 176; Kienast 1995, 193 n. 14; Habicht 1997, 360. Cf. Fontani 1999, 194 f. n. 4. For detailed information about the Eleusinian Mysteries, see Parker 2005, 344–346.

¹⁷ The scholars noted that the time of Antony's stay in Athens did not allow him to be initiated into the Greater Mysteries, and it can therefore be assumed that he was initiated into the Lesser Mysteries (Smykov 2002, 85; Tatum 2020, 462–464). For detailed information about the Lesser Mysteries, see Parker 1996, 188 ff.; id. 2005, 341 ff.

¹⁸ Tatum 2020, 464 and n. 50. See in more detail Parker 1996, 98–100.

¹⁹ Plut. *Ant.* 4. 1, 36. 4, 60. 2–3; App. *BCiv.* 3. 60, 72; *RRC* 494/2. For an overview of Antony's Heracleian origins and his supposed relationship with Heracles, see inter alios Michel 1969, 114–125; Weippert 1972, 197–200; Huttner 1995; Cresci Marrone 1993, 18 f.; Hekster 2004; Perez 2009; Erickson 2018.

²⁰ Tatum 2020, 464. For the establishment ties of συγγένεια in the Greek world and the political significance of mythical kinship in antiquity, see Musti 1963, esp. 225 f. and 230–235; Schmitt 1988, esp. 539 f.; Elwyn 1993, esp. 262–267; Lücke 2000, esp. 29 and 119–122; Erskine 2003; Papazarkadas, Thonemann 2008, esp. 82; Kuhn 2014, esp. 83–87.

According to U. Huttner, Antony also established ties of *συγγένεια* with Ptolemaic Egypt and Cleopatra. Similar to the Hellenistic kings, Alexander the Great was an important role model for the triumvir. Alexander was also a Heraclide, bound to his progenitor by intensely strong ties, and the Ptolemies, who felt themselves to be Alexander's successors and represented themselves accordingly, thereby derived from Heracles (*OGIS* 54; *Satyr. FGrH* 631 F 1) as well. Their common descent from Heracles created a family relationship between Antony and Cleopatra, *συγγένεια*, after all.²¹

In my opinion, this circumstance played a significant role during the meeting of the triumvir and the Egyptian queen in Tarsus in August–September 41 BCE.²² Cleopatra, whose goal was to preserve the *status quo* for Egypt, sought to depict herself as an independent and all-powerful ruler by appearing in the guise of Aphrodite or Venus. The political meaning of Cleopatra's diplomatic reception for Antony on her ship in Tarsus was also most understandable. The Egyptian queen sought to emphasize her closeness to the triumvir in both divine and political contexts, which should have been conducive to a close and mutually beneficial union (*Plut. Ant.* 26).²³ In this regard, appealing to their common origin and emphasizing their kinship with Heracles seems a natural step.

When Antony in 41 BCE provided support to Sisinna, who had been in contention for power in Cappadocia against Ariarathes X (*App. BCiv.* 5. 31), the triumvir was probably strengthened in this decision by the fact that Sisinna claimed to be a Heraclide. Flavius Josephus described the heritage of Archelaus (Sisinna). According to the ancient author, Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus, trying to derive her nobility and genealogy from great people, claimed to descend from Temenus on her father's side and from Darius I the Great on her mother's side.²⁴ At the same

²¹ Huttner 1995, 108. W. J. Tatum agrees with him (Tatum 2020, 464 n. 52). H. Bengtson also does not disregard this aspect, but does not present it clearly (Bengtson 1977, 166 f.). For the link of Ptolemaic dynasty both to Alexander and Heracles, see in details Palagia 1986, 143 f.

²² The story of this meeting is contained, in addition to Plutarch, in Socrates of Rhodes (*Socr. Rhod. FGrH* 192 F 1), as well as briefly mentioned in Appian (*BCiv.* 5. 1, 32), Cassius Dio (48. 24. 2) and Josephus (*AJ.* 14. 13. 1, *BJ.* 1. 12. 5). For this meeting, see inter alios Buchheim 1960, 22–25, 102–103; Lindsay 1971, 155–163; Grant 1972, 115–120; Hölbl 2001, 240–241; Huß 2001, 729–730; Osgood 2006, 182–183; Tisé 2006, 172 f.; Pfeiffer 2019; Van Wijlick 2021, 126–128 etc.

²³ Buchheim 1960, 23; Huß 2001, 730; Osgood 2006, 183; Egorov 2012 [А. Б. Егоров, *Антоний и Клеопатра*], 188.

²⁴ Joseph. *BJ.* 1. 24. 2: ...Γλαφύρα γενεαλογοῦσα τὴν ἑαυτῆς εὐγένειαν ... κατὰ πατέρα μὲν ἀπὸ Τημένου, κατὰ μητέρα δὲ ἀπὸ Δαρείου τοῦ Ὑστάσπεως οὔσα. For Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus I Ktistes, see Sullivan 1980, 1161–1166.

time, Temenus himself claimed to be a great-great-grandson of Heracles.²⁵ Archelaus began declaring his Heracleian heritage soon after the death of Antony, even issuing hemidrachms with the hero's head on the reverse.²⁶ Thus, mythical συγγένεια is a factor that cannot be underestimated in the relations between Antony and Sisinna in 41 BCE.²⁷

The analysis of several developments taking place in 41 BCE indicates that Antony consciously saw himself to a greater extent as a descendant of Heracles rather than a manifestation of Dionysus at that time. The question of whether Antony did practice a full-fledged religious policy rooted in ties to his mythical ancestor Heracles is at least debatable. However, several indirect pieces of evidence discussed herein show that several features of Heracleism were at least present in Antony's religious policy during his stay in the East in 41 BCE.

3. *Epistula Marci Antonii ad Koinon Asiae*

We will focus further on the triumvir's letter to the *Koinon* of the Greeks from Asia. The copy of Antony's rescript is written at the back of cols. 6–7 on the *recto* of a medical papyrus in the Greek papyri collection of the British Museum (*PLond* 165).²⁸ This papyrus of unknown provenance (generally believed to be from Hermopolis, in Middle Egypt) is traditionally referred to as “London Anonymous” and dated to the second half of the first century CE. It is the longest Greek medical papyrus known to date, being approximately 336.5 cm long by 23.5 cm high, for 39 columns of text.²⁹

The letter of Antony was discovered by Frederick George Kenyon in 1892.³⁰ It consists of 33 lines of text, given in a single column (18.5 × 10 cm) and written in a fairly large, semi-cursive print. The rescript is almost completely preserved, with the exception of a few letters

²⁵ For Temenus, see Mayer 1934, 437–458.

²⁶ *BMC Cappadocia*, 45, nos. 3–4; Head 1911, 752; Simonetta 1961, 48, nos. 7–8; id. 1977, 46, nos. 7–8.

²⁷ Cf. Huttner 1995, 108 f. For Antony's policy towards Cappadocia in 41 BCE, see Craven 1920, 29 f.; Levi 1933, vol. II, 101 f. n. 3, 132; Tarn 1934a, 34; id. 1934b, 69; Jones 1937, 176, 430 n. 3; Magie 1950, 435, 1286 n. 26; Buchheim 1960, 55 f., 110 f. n. 123; Simonetta 1961, 19, 47; id. 1977, 45; Hoben 1969, 176 ff. and n. 163, 181 n. 177; Sullivan 1980, 1147 ff.; id. 1990, 182 f., 397 n. 129, 131 etc.

²⁸ Ricciardetto 2016, CXXVI.

²⁹ Ricciardetto 2012, 43 f.

³⁰ Kenyon 1893.

at the end, and the orientation of the writing is upside-down as compared with the text on the *recto*.³¹ Although its presence on the papyrus is thought-provoking, there is no indication of what motivated the owner of the medical work to record Mark Antony's edict.³²

The opening lines of this rescript (ll. 1–7) were also preserved on a white marble stele found at Tralles (second–third century CE), though in a distorted form.³³ The corresponding fragment of the inscription is as follows (with matching fragments highlighted in bold):

(...)

- A.10 [—] ἐπιστολὴ [— Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου —]
 [Μᾶρκος Ἀν]**τώνιος αὐτοκρά**[τωρ τριῶν ἀνδρῶν δημοσί]-
 [ων πραγμάτων]**ων ἀπὸ καταστά**[σεως τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀ]-
 [σίας Ἑλλήνων]γ καὶ τοῖς προέδ[ροις .c.6.. χαί]-
 [ρειν· καὶ πρότε]**ρον ἐντυχόν**[τος μοι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ Μάρκου]
 15 [Ἀντωνίου Ἀρτεμιδώρου τοῦ ἐμοῦ φίλου —].³⁴

³¹ Ricciardetto 2012, 45 f.; id. 2014, LVI n. 417; Saumell 2018, 139.

³² Kenyon 1893, 476. In the opinion of A. Ricciardetto, the letter of Mark Antony could have a relationship with the medical world and its practices which might have been a reason for recording the triumvir's edict on the reverse side of a medical papyrus (Ricciardetto 2012, 60). Later, Ricciardetto gave a new interpretation by linking Mark Antony's letter with the existence in Ephesus of a Mouseion, in which an association of doctors organized competitions in honor of Asclepius (id. 2016, CXXX–CXXXVIII). Developing this idea, J. C. Saumell suggested that the owner of the papyrus may have been one of the participants in the medical competition, who recorded the decree of Antony on the *verso* of this papyrus in order to remind the jury about the privileges he could acquire after winning (Saumell 2018, 156). However, these assumptions are criticized by D. Manetti (Manetti 2019, 39), who noted that “sia l'interpretazione del testo della lettera di Marco Antonio sia la sua presenza sul verso di P. Lond. inv. 137 non abbiano ancora trovato una soluzione soddisfacente e continuano a suscitare dubbi” (*ibid.*, 40). See also Fauconnier 2016, 78 f.

³³ Keil 1911 = *I. Tralleis* 105 = *PHI* 262861 = *AGRW* 13181. Only two fragments (A and B) that formed part of a larger monument containing several documents have been preserved. The inscriptions are too fragmentary to translate. Fragment A mentions the letter of Mark Antony (ll. 10–15). Fragment B, which appears to be part of this letter, notes a “synod” (ll. 11 and 14) and probably provides a reference to the ἱερονῖκαι and στεφανῖται in the opening lines (l. 2). Both fragments were stored for a long time in the museum of the Evangelical School of Smyrna after their discovery in the 70s of the 19th century. They disappeared during the fire of this school in 1922. See in more detail Keil 1911, 123 ff.; Ebert 1987, 41 f.; Ricciardetto 2012, 46 f.; *AGRW* 13181.

³⁴ The Greek text is taken from the following edition: *AGRW* 13181.

The rescript of Mark Antony itself dates from 41 or 33/32 BCE.³⁵ The paleographical comparison demonstrates that the part of the copy of Antony's rescript concerning the second request to him from M. Antonius Artemidoros (ll. 24–33) cannot be dated earlier than the last quarter of the first century CE. The copy of the rescript itself is definitely later than the writing on the *recto*. That is how we discover *terminus ante quem* of the medical papyrus itself, namely the second half of the first century CE.³⁶

³⁵ There are only two possible dates for this decree (41 or 33/32 BCE), since Antony only visited Ephesus twice after having become triumvir: after the Battle at Philippi in the spring of 41 (Plut. *Ant.* 24. 3; App. *BCiv.* 5. 15; 28; Joseph. *AJ.* 14. 12. 2–4) and in the company of Cleopatra shortly before the final war with Octavian in the winter of 33/32 BCE (Plut. *Ant.* 56. 1). F. G. Kenyon believed that the rescript of Mark Antony was written in 41 BCE (Kenyon 1893, 477). C. Brandis, on the other hand, suggested that honors and privileges granted to the *Synodos* by Antony should be associated with the triumvir's visit to Ephesus in 33/32 BCE. His conclusion is based on the grounds that the concessions to "the Association" would have had particularly great value in the 30s BCE (Brandis 1897, 516–518). This viewpoint prevailed in historiography until the middle of the 20th century (e. g., Ziebarth 1900, 518; Poland 1909, 150; Oehler 1913, 1535; Klaffenbach 1914, 8; Gardiner 1930, 107; Forbes 1955, 239). Later the same belief was shared by Br. Le Guen and L. Del Corso (Le Guen 2001, 32; Del Corso 2008, 44). Nevertheless, as D. Magie pointed out in 1950, it seems more likely that privileges granted by the triumvir were more relevant before the inevitability of a new civil war; i. e. during Antony's visit to Ephesus in 41 BCE (Magie 1950, 1279 n. 4). As a result, most historians were skeptical about the dating proposed by C. Brandis until the late 20th century (e. g., *RDGE*, 292 f. and n. 4; Millar 1973, 55, no. 4, id. 1977, 456). However, another version based on linguistic analysis of the text of the letter (to be more precise, ll. 18–19) was suggested in 1987. According to J. Ebert, the first appeal to Antony by Artemidoros and Charopeinos occurred in 41 BCE, while the second (by Artemidoros only) took place in 33/32 BCE, since there seemed to be a considerable time lapse between these events. The letter itself summarizing both of these meetings should be dated by 33/32 BCE (Ebert 1987, 39 f.). Thus, most modern scholars recognize the possibility of both dates (e. g., Pleket 1973, 201; Cugusi 1979, pt. 2, 289; West 1990, 84; Manetti 1994, 57; ead. 2019, 38; Pelling 2008, 11 n. 31; Ricciardetto 2012, 45, 51 n. 26; id. 2016, CXXVI; Fauconnier 2016, 78 and n. 28). For instance, Saumell writes: "the position taken by these two authors [Kenyon and Brandis] seems reasonable considering that in ll. 11–12 the rescript makes allusion to some grants already conferred on the association, allegedly in 42–41 BCE" (Saumell 2018, 139 and n. 55). D. S. Potter even favors the higher date, i. e. 43 BCE (Potter 1998, 271 n. 34).

³⁶ Saumell 2018, 139 f. Saumell summarizes the established view on the dating of the copy of Anthony's rescript and "London Anonymous" itself. See Manetti 1994, 57; Andorlini 2010, 44; Ricciardetto 2012, 45 and n. 13; id. 2014, LV and n. 408, LVI n. 416; id. 2016, CXXVI f. n. 408, CXXIX n. 416–417; Dorandi 2016, 200 n. 9 etc. As for the paleographical comparison of Antony's rescript and two papyri from the first century CE, see Saumell 2018, 139 n. 56.

As for the events mentioned in Antony's decree, I guess the meeting between Antony, Artemidoros and Charopeinos (ll. 1–23) described in the first part of the letter could have taken place more likely in 41 BCE. Several arguments support this point of view. First is D. Magie's statement, with which I am inclined to agree, that triumvir-conferred privileges were more relevant when a new civil war was not imminent.³⁷ Second is the fact that the triumvir hosted numerous embassies (πρεσβεΐαι) in Bithynia and Ephesus in 41 BCE (Joseph. *AJ.* 14. 12. 2, *BJ.* 1. 12. 4; Plut. *Ant.* 24. 1), creating both the political context and opportunity for Artemidoros and Charopeinos's appeal to him.³⁸ Finally, as A. Raggi revealed, "there is clearly a documentary vacuum in the period of Antonius' effective government in the East, after his final departure from Italy in 37 BCE".³⁹

Actually, the bulk of Antony's Eastern decrees – which he wished to have ratified in Rome – are dated 41–39 BCE, a period in which they were necessary in the light of various threats to the triumvirs but Antony had not yet lost his political power due to the actions of Octavian.⁴⁰ Thus, the proposed argumentation does not contradict the proposal put forward by J. Ebert.⁴¹

At the same time, we admit that both dates of the first appeal to Antony by Artemidoros and Charopeinos (41 and 33/32 BCE) are beyond proof; the arguments advanced here are not conclusive. Nevertheless, the first date is much more preferable.

This is what the content of *Epistula Marci Antonii ad Koinon Asiae* reads:

Μάρκος Ἀντώνιος αὐτοκράτωρ
 τριῶν ἀνδρῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων
 ἀποκαταστάσεως τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἀ-
 πὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλλήνων χαίρειν. Καὶ
 5 πρότερον ἐντυχόντος μοι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ
 Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Ἀρτεμιδώρου, τοῦ
 ἐμοῦ φίλου καὶ ἀλείπτου, μετὰ τοῦ ἐ-
 πωνύμου τῆς συνόδου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς

³⁷ Magie 1950, 1279 n. 4.

³⁸ Cf. Raggi 2020, 433. With regard to the privileges granted earlier (ll. 11–12: τοῦ (τὰ) προῦπάρχοντα), they could have been officially provided by some of the Roman politicians preceding Antony (see, for example, two letters of Sulla concerning the Dionysiac Artists, written approximately in 84 and 81 BCE – *RDGE* 49). See also Fauconnier 2016, 79.

³⁹ Raggi 2020, 443.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 443–447.

⁴¹ Ebert 1987, 39 f.

- οἰκουμένης ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφανι-
 10 νιτῶν ἱερέως Χαροπείνου Ἐφεσίου,
 περὶ τοῦ <τὰ>⁴² προϋπάρχοντα τῇ συνό-
 δῳ μένειν ἀναφαίρετα, καὶ περὶ τῶν
 λοιπῶν ὧν ἡτεῖτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τιμίων
 καὶ φιλανθρώπων τῆς ἀστρατευσίας
 15 καὶ ἀλειτουργεσίας πάσης καὶ ἀνεπι-
 σταθμείας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν πανή-
 γυριν ἐκεχειρίας καὶ ἀσυλίας καὶ
 πορφύρας, ἵνα † συνχωρησῇ γραψαὶ †
 παραχρῆμα πρὸς ὑμᾶς συνχωρῶν,
 20 βουλόμενος καὶ διὰ τὸν ἐμὸν φί-
 λον Ἀρτεμίδωρον καὶ τῷ ἐπώνυ-
 μῳ αὐτῶν ἱερεῖ εἰς τε τὸν κόσμον τῆς
 συνόδου καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν αὐτῆς χα-
 ρίσασθαι. Καὶ τὰ νῦν πάλιν ἐντυ-
 25 χόντος μοι τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου ὅπως
 ἐξῆι αὐτοῖς ἀναθεῖναι δέλτον χαλ-
 κὴν καὶ ἐνχαράξαι εἰς αὐτὴν περὶ
 τῶν προγεγραμμένων φιλανθρώπων,
 ἐγὼ προαιρούμενος ἐν μηδενὶ καθ-
 30 υστερεῖν τὸν Ἀρτεμίδωρον περὶ τῶν
 30a < >
 ἐντυχόντος ἐπεχώρησα τῇ[ν ἀνά-]
 θεσιν τῆς δέλτο(υ) ὡς παρακαλεῖ [± 3].
 ὑμῖν δ(ἐ) γέγραφα περὶ τούτων.⁴³

Marcus Antonius imperator, triumvir for the state's organizing, to the *Koinon* of the Greeks from Asia, greetings! Earlier I was petitioned in Ephesus by Mark Antony Artemidoros, my friend and gymnastics teacher, along with the eponymous priest of the Association of Wreath-Bearers and Victors in the Sacred Games from the Inhabited World,

⁴² <τὰ> Kenyon, addition adopted by all publishers except P. Cugusi (Cugusi 1979, pt. 1, 262); according to Ebert, π(άντα τὰ π)ροϋπάρχοντα would also be possible.

⁴³ The Greek text follows the most authoritative edition of the letter of Mark Antony by Ricciardetto: Ricciardetto 2016, 66 f. The most important editions of this rescript are: Kenyon 1893, 477; Brandis 1897, 509 f.; Ehrenberg–Jones 1949, 123, no. 300; Vandoni 1964, 114 f.; *RDGE*, 290, no. 57; Cugusi 1979, pt. 1, 261–263; Ebert 1987, 38 f.; Ricciardetto 2012, 48 f.; id. 2014, LXII; id. 2016, CXLVIII; Saumell 2018, 137 f. For a detailed commentary on the rescript, see Ricciardetto 2016, CXXV–CXXXVIII, CXLVIII, 66–67, 187–188.

Charopeinos of Ephesus, for previously existing [privileges] of the Association, that they remain inalienable, as well as for the rest of what it asked of me honors and privileges: exemption from military service, exemption from every liturgy, exemption from billeting, and during the festivals [the right of a] truce, inviolability, [wearing] purple raiment;⁴⁴ [asking] that I agreeing [with this petition] agree to write immediately to you [about it]. I agree with that, wishing because of my friend Artemidoros and [in the favor of] their eponymous priest both for the decoration of the Association and for its prosperity to shew [them] this favor. And now again I was petitioned by Artemidoros in order that they be allowed to set up a bronze tablet and to engrave on it previously written privileges. I, preferring that Artemidoros, who petitioned for it, would not have any delay, gave my consent for setting this tablet up in public, as he asks me. That is what I have written to you.⁴⁵

The rescript of Mark Antony belongs to a broad epistolary genre known as “official letters” and includes only the triumvir’s response to the request concerning the granting of privileges.⁴⁶ In the letter, Antony mentions two appeals to him by Artemidoros and Charopeinos.

The first was the request made in Ephesus to grant “the Association” certain honors and privileges they had previously held, which resulted in Antony reinstating the previously-granted privileges and agreeing to bestow some new ones. The second appeal occurred when Artemidoros asked permission to fix the privileges on a bronze tablet, which could then be hung up in a prominent place to make it official. The letter itself was written to notify the members of the *Koinon* about the triumvir’s decision, and as an additional guarantee for preserving “the Association’s” privileges.⁴⁷

Lastly, let us turn to the individuals mentioned in Mark Antony’s letter. The triumvir was approached in Ephesus with a request from M. Antony Artemidoros and Charopeinos of Ephesus. Antony describes

⁴⁴ For the possible meaning of this particular privilege, see Saumell 2018, 138 n. 50. Cf. Sherk 1984, 86 n. 4.

⁴⁵ This is my own translation of the letter of Antony with an eye on English translation by R. K. Sherk (Sherk 1993, 105 f.) and French translation by Ricciardetto (Ricciardetto 2012, 49 f.).

⁴⁶ Saumell 2018, 140. For a general typology of letters in the Graeco-Roman World, see Sarri 2018, 65–70. For the types specifically of Greek letters on papyrus (as well as letters itself), see Hutchinson 2007; Luiselli 2008 (esp. 678). For official letters from the Roman period, see Luiselli 2008, 690 f.; Sarri 2018, 170–176.

⁴⁷ Cf. Millar 1973, 55; Ebert 1987, 39 f.; Saumell 2018, 140; Raggi 2020, 443.

Artemidoros as his friend and gymnastics teacher, but his given name suggests that Artemidoros or one of his ancestors was a freedman of Mark Antony's family. M. Antony Artemidoros is also mentioned in one Ephesian inscription in a list of officials honoring emperor Hadrian in 123–124,⁴⁸ which implies that the triumvir's ἀλείπτης had direct descendants in the second century CE. In this inscription Artemidoros is characterized by the epithet πυθιονίκης, i. e. as winner at the Pythian Games.⁴⁹

As for Charopeinos of Ephesus, he was ἐπώνυμος ἱερεὺς τῆς συνόδου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερονικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν. At the head of the Association under consideration was ἀρχιερεὺς, who held this post for life. However, the organization's priest was elected only to a one-year term and was called ἱερεὺς ἐπώνυμος. The duties of this priest were apparently performed in 41 BCE by Charopeinos.⁵⁰ He is also mentioned in the inscription from Ephesus dated to the twenties of the first century BCE (27–25 BCE) as one of the officials, mainly other priests, responsible for establishing the worship of Augustus.⁵¹ His full name is as follows: “Perikles, son of Heracleides, by birth of Charopinos, Charopinos, hieronica, member of the *Synodos*”.⁵²

4. “The Association of Wreath-Bearers and Victors in the Sacred Games from the Inhabited World”

The next point concerns the organization to which Antony's letter was addressed. The name of this *Synodos* (ll. 8–10: Σύνοδος τῶν ἀπὸ

⁴⁸ *IEph* 276: (...) οἱ τὸν | [χρὺ]σεον κόσμον βαστά[[ζον]τες τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς | [Ἀρτέ]μιδος πρὸ πόλεως ἱερεῖς | [καὶ] ἱερoneῖται ἐπὶ ἀνθυπά[[το]υ Πομπηίου Φάλκωνος | ψηφισαμένου Ἀρτεμιδώρου | [τ]οῦ Ἀσκληπιάδου τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου | γραμματέως αὐτῶν | ἐργεπιστατήσαντος Μάρκου | Ἀντωνίου Ἀρτεμιδώρου πυθιο|νείκου ἱερέως. Cf. Engelmann 1977, 202–203, no. 2; Højte 2005, 449 f., no. 318. See also J. Robert, L. Robert 1977, 404 f., no. 438. Date: Q. Pompeius Falco was governor in 123/124 (Eck 1970, 237).

⁴⁹ See Kenyon 1893, 477; West 1990, 87. As suggested by R. K. Sherk, “he had received Roman citizenship through the auspices of Marcus Antonius” (Sherk 1993, 106 n. 2). However, our available sources do not confirm this claim.

⁵⁰ Kenyon 1893, 477.

⁵¹ *IEph* 902. See also J. Robert, L. Robert 1977, 393, no. 416. Charopinos indicated here can with confidence be identified with the Charopeinos from Antony's letter, as clearly demonstrated by W. C. West (West 1990, 87 and n. 8).

⁵² *SEG* XXXVI. 1020 ll. 8–10: Περικλῆς Ἡρακλείδου φύσει δὲ Χαροπίνου Χαροπῖνος, ἱερoneίκης | ἀπ[ὸ] συνόδου.

τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν) is similar to that of other synods found in different inscriptions. Some of them were recorded on papyri, others were preserved in inscriptions on stones and objects of monumental architecture. Was there any connection between these organizations? Who were the members of the Association mentioned in the triumvir's rescript? These questions have been the subject of lengthy discussion by scholars.⁵³

W. C. West was the first to suggest that "the Association of Wreath-Bearers and Victors in the Sacred Games from the Inhabited World" was a well-known and respected brotherhood of ἱερωνῖκαι and στεφανῖται in Ephesus devoted to Herakles. The organization's members were athletes who won the sacred contests and received the right of χρυσοφορία.⁵⁴

The essence of his theory is approximately as follows. These "sacred victors" (ἱερωνῖκαι) were members of the χρυσοφόροι at Ephesus, a corporation (συνέδριον). They shared this high status with particular priests "in behalf of the city". They had the privilege of carrying Artemis' golden crown in processions in her honor. The

⁵³ Some scholars saw them as Dionysian artists (τεχνῖται), comprising poets, musicians and actors (e. g., Klaffenbach 1914, 8 f.; Magie 1950, 428, 1279 n. 4; Mileta 2008, 108). Others considered them as exclusively athletes (e. g., Gardiner 1930, 107; Pleket 1973, 200–202; Fauconnier 2016, 78 f.). However, most scholars agreed that the Association included both athletes and the winners of poetry, music and theater contests (Brandis 1897, 521; Ziebarth 1900, 518 f.; Poland 1909, 150 f.; Oehler 1913, 1535 f.; Amelotti 1955, 133 f.; Forbes 1955, 240, 250 n. 10; Sherk 1969, 293; Pelling 2008, 11; Le Guen 2010, 228 n. 56; Raggi 2020, 443 et al.). A. Pickard-Cambridge and H. W. Pleket were among the first to point out that although the presence of athletes in this Association is almost certain, since ἀλείπτῃς (the triumvir's friend Artemidoros) is mentioned in the letter of Antony, nothing indicates the presence of Dionysian artists (Pickard-Cambridge 1991, 297; Pleket 1973, 200 ff.). Besides that, according to H. W. Pleket, at the time when Mark Antony wrote his letter, these athletes did not even represent a permanent association (Pleket 1973, 203 f.). In the view of F. Millar (who analyzed different inscriptions mentioning other synods), it is extremely difficult to determine whether we are dealing with different associations, branches of the same organization, or, finally, with a single union that used different honorary titles (Millar 1977, 456). For a detailed analysis of all surviving references to similar associations, see *ibid.*, 456–463.

⁵⁴ West 1990, 84 ff. The scholars' position was accepted to different extents in many studies on the topic (e. g., Le Guen 2001, 32 f.; Ricciardetto 2012, 52 f. and n. 39; Fauconnier 2017, 450 and n. 49). Χρυσοφορία is "a privilege to bear gold in a procession or ceremony in honor of a divinity granted by decree of a city to eminent benefactors, or enjoyed by ex-officio by certain priesthoods and magistracies" (West 1990, 88 n. 9).

Association had its permanent headquarters at Ephesus, which made it possible for ἱερονῖκαι to enjoy the right of χρυσοφορία. The Mark Antony papyrus represents an early document of this athletic *Synodos* which moved its headquarters to Rome in the second century on the initiative of M. Ulpius Domesticus.⁵⁵ This *Synodos* had the formal title as the originator of official correspondence, which is given in letters of Hadrian and Antonius Pius,⁵⁶ as well as in a variation form as the dedicator of a statue with honorary inscription for M. Ulpius Domesticus, in which the *Synodos* names itself.⁵⁷ Thus, according to West, “the official title of the organization, ἡ ἱερὰ ξυστική σύνοδος τῶν ἀθλητῶν περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἱερονεικῶν στεφανειτῶν, combines all the elements of athletes and sacred victors”.⁵⁸

By extension of this theory, A. Ricciardetto linked Mark Antony’s letter with the existence in Ephesus of a Mouseion,⁵⁹ in which an association of doctors organized competitions in honor of Asclepius,⁶⁰ which J. C. Saumell supported.⁶¹ C. Samitz, by contrast, opposed West’s theory, noting that the city’s privileged treatment of the ἱερονῖκαι was not uncommon and not unique to Ephesus, so the evidence West relies on does not imply the location of “the Worldwide Association of Athletes” headquarters.⁶² While the association of the Dionysiac τεχνῖται, i. e. the participants in musical agons, has been attested from the early Hellenistic period, worldwide athletes’ association appears for the first time in presumably the honorary inscription from Erythrae dated to the first century BCE (*I.Erythrai* 429). There we find among other wreath-bearers οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀθληταὶ and οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερονεῖκαι. Thus, at least

⁵⁵ West 1990, 89. See also Rogers 1991, 56 ff.; Le Guen 2001, 33; Golden 2003, 171; Hervás 2017, 85 ff.

⁵⁶ *IG* XIV.1054, letter of Hadrian dated 134: συνόδῳ ξυστικῇ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀθλητῶν ἱερονεικῶν στεφανειτῶν. *IG* XIV. 1055, letter of Antonius Pius dated 143: συνόδῳ ξυστικῇ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀθλητῶν ἱερονεικῶν στεφανειτῶν.

⁵⁷ *IG* XIV.1110, honorary inscription for M. Ulpius Domesticus: ἡ ἱερὰ ξυστική σύνοδος τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀπὸ καταλύσεως ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι Πρώμῃ κατοικούντων.

⁵⁸ West 1990, 86. “The Sacred *Xystic Synodos* of athletes who are Victors in the Sacred Games and Wreath-Bearers dedicated to Heracles”.

⁵⁹ For the Mouseion in Ephesos, see Holder 2020, 96 ff.

⁶⁰ Ricciardetto 2016, CXXX–CXXXVIII. *Contra* Fauconnier 2016, 78 f.; Manetti 2019, 39–40.

⁶¹ Saumell 2018, 156.

⁶² Samitz 2018, 391. For skepticism towards West’s theory, see Pleket (*SEG* XL. 1003); Lehner 2004, 69 f.

in this early period, there might have been two associations of athletes: one only for ἱερωνῖκαι and one open to all athletes.⁶³ The mention of the first of these two associations (τῆς συνόδου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφανειτῶν), according to C. Samitz, can also be found in Antony's letter.⁶⁴

To sum up, today there is no way to know precisely to which association ἱερωνῖκαι and στεφανῖται mentioned in Anthony's letter belonged. It can be only argued with high probability that this association consisted exclusively of athletes since nothing indicates the presence of Dionysian artists, winners of poetry, music and theater contests, or doctors.

Another probable assumption is that *Synodos* mentioned in the letter had some connection to Heracles. The inscription dated 27–25 BCE, where Charopeinos (ἐπώνυμος ἱερεὺς τῆς συνόδου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν) is listed as the son of Heracleides (*IEph* 902), indirectly indicates it. The letters of Hadrian and Antonius Pius (as well as the honorary inscription for M. Ulpius Domesticus), where Σύνοδος τῶν ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν is called to be τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, also confirm this idea (*IG* XIV. 1054–1055 and 1110). Nevertheless, the alleged cult of Heracles was not documented before the imperial period.

5. Conclusion

The triumvir's motivation when granting privileges to the Association remains a mystery. It might have been influenced by a desire to show favor to Artemidoros and Charopeinos.⁶⁵ Or perhaps, by bestowing privileges upon this organization, Antony provided broad honors and rights to the

⁶³ Cf. Keil 1910 70 f.; Forbes 1955, 238 ff. (esp. 239); Pleket 1973, 199 f.; Samitz 2018, 381 f. H.W. Pleket assumes, in contrast to established opinion, that the process of awarding with a wreath mentioned in this inscription did not concern a permanent organization but a particular group of athletes or ἱερωνῖκαι present in Erythrae (Pleket 1973, 199 f.). However, we agree with C. Samitz that the terminology used concerning these athletes alludes to the fact that they saw themselves as part of an existing, full-fledged organization (Samitz 2018, 381 n. 56).

⁶⁴ Samitz 2018, 381 f.

⁶⁵ It is indicated by the triumvir's other actions during his time in the East in 41 BCE as described by Plutarch (*Ant.* 24. 1–6). See also cases with Anaxenor (Plut. *Ant.* 24. 1–2; Strab. 14. 1. 41; *SIG*³ II 766) and Boëthus (Boeth. *FGrH* 194 F 1; Strab. 14. 5. 14).

city of Ephesus and its citizens.⁶⁶ It cannot be ignored, however, that Antony simply acted in accordance with the existing Philhellenic policy of the Roman Republic in the East, because such rescripts were part of everyday Roman diplomacy.⁶⁷ All these reasons had some influence on the triumvir's decision.

However, be that as it may, we cannot discount the religious component of Antony's eastern politics. The triumvir's bestowal of rights and privileges on "the Association", if it has already been under the special patronage of Heracles, can be considered as indirect evidence of another manifestation of Antony's religious policy, which, as the examples highlighted earlier show, might be linked to his origin from Heracles. There is no doubt that this conclusion includes two assumptions, which are believed to be reasonable but have not been proven completely yet:

1) the meeting between Antony, Artemidoros and Charopeinos (ll. 1–23) described in the first part of the letter is dated 41 BCE;

2) the Association described in the letter had already been under the special patronage of Heracles at the time of Antony's 41 BCE sojourn in the East.

The subject under research requires further consideration since available data concerning Antony's religious policy is fragmentary and confusing. However, several indirect pieces of evidence in the sources would be interpreted as manifestations of Heracleism, which can be attributed to Antony's religious policy rooted in ties to his mythical ancestor Heracles. While Antony apparently did not place much political value on activities relating to his role as Νέος Διόνυσος at this time, he did practice a religious policy, which at least contained some features of Heracleism. The influence of Antony's Herculean policy on his relations with Sisinna (the future Cappadocian king Archelaus) and Cleopatra in Tarsus can only be assumed. Still, the triumvir's participation in Lesser Mysteries in Athens may be solid evidence supporting this hypothesis. The granting of privileges to the Σύνοδος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν can also be considered as an argument for moving in this direction, albeit with certain reservations.

Gleb L. Krivolapov

Moscow Lomonosov State University
glkrivolapov@gmail.com

⁶⁶ So, Antony doubled an area of refuge provided by the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus. For the privileges granted by Antony to Ephesus in 41 BCE, see App. *BCiv.* 5. 15; Strab. 14. 1. 23. The connection between the triumvir's bestowal of rights and privileges on the Association and his policy towards Ephesus is emphasized, for example, by F. G. Kenyon (Kenyon 1893, 477).

⁶⁷ See Eckhardt 2019, 131–135.

List of Abbreviations

- AGRW* = R. S. Ascoug, P. A. Harland, J. S. Kloppenborg, *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook* (Berlin–Waco 2012).
- BMC Cappadocia* = W. Wroth (ed.), *Catalogue of the Greek coins of Galatia, Cappadocia and Syria*, A Catalogue of the Greek coins in the British Museum X (London 1899).
- IEph* = H. Engelmann, H. Wankel, R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos I–VIII* (Bonn 1979–1984).
- I.Erythrai* = H. Engelmann, R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai I–II* (Bonn 1972–1973).
- I.Tralleis* = F.B. Poljakov, *Die Inschriften von Tralleis* (Bonn 1989).
- OGIS* = W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae I–II* (Leipzig 1903–1905).
- PHI* = Packard Humanities Institute numbers for Greek inscriptions. The Greek texts are available online at: <<http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/>>
- PLond* = *Greek Papyri in the British Museum I–VII* (London 1893–1974).
- RDGE* = R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969).
- RRC* = M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage I–II* (Cambridge 1974).
- SB I* = F. Preisigke et al. (eds.), *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten I* (Strasbourg 1915).
- SIG³ II* = W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum II* (Leipzig 1915).

Bibliography

- M. Amelotti, “La posizione degli atleti di fronte al diritto romano”, *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris* 21 (1955) 124–156.
- I. Andorlini, “La ricetta medica dell’Anonimo Londinese (P. Brit. Libr. inv. 137v = Suppl. Arist. III 1, p. 76 Diels)”, *Galenos* 4 (2010) 39–45.
- R. Beacham, “The Emperor as Impresario: Producing the Pageantry of Power”, in: K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (2005) 151–174.
- H. Bengtson, *Marcus Antonius: Triumvir und Herrscher des Orients* (Munich 1977).
- C. Brandis, “Ein Schreiben des Triumvirn Marcus Antonius an den Landtag Asiens”, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 509–522.
- H. Buchheim, *Die Orientpolitik des Triumvirn M. Antonius* (Heidelberg 1960).
- F. Chamoux, *Marc Antoine: dernier prince de l’Orient grec* (Paris 1986).
- L. Craven, *Antony’s Oriental Policy until the Defeat of the Parthian Expedition* (Columbia 1920).
- G. Cresci Marrone, *Ecumene Augustea: Una Politica per il consenso*, Problemi e ricerche di storia antica XIV (Rome 1993).
- P. Cugusi, *Epistolographi Latini Minores II* (Torino 1979).
- L. Del Corso, “L’Athenaion Politeia (P. Lond. Lit. 108) e la sua biblioteca: libri e mani nella chora egizia”, in: D. Bianconi, L. Del Corso (eds.), *Oltre la scrittura. Variazioni sul tema per Guglielmo Cavallo* (Paris 2008).

- T. Dorandi, “Elementi ‘diarectici’ nella sezione iniziale dell’Anonymus Londiniensis (P.Br.Libr. inv. 137 I–IV 17)”, in: A. Casanova, G. M. Savorelli, R. Pintaudi (eds.), *E sì d’amici pieno: omaggio di studiosi italiani a Guido Bastianini per il suo settantesimo compleanno I* (Firenze 2016).
- J. Ebert, “Zum Brief des Marcus Antonius an das κοινὸν Ἀσίας”, *APF* 33 (1987) 37–42.
- W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian. Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluss der Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter* (Munich 1970).
- B. Eckhardt, “Associations Beyond the City: Jews, Actors and Empire in the Roman Period”, in: B. Eckhardt (ed.), *Private Associations and Jewish Communities in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (Leiden 2019) 115–156.
- A. B. Egorov, *Antoniĭ i Kleopatra [Antony and Cleopatra]* (St Petersburg 2012).
- V. Ehrenberg, A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford 1949).
- S. Elwyn, “Interstate Kinship and Roman Foreign Policy”, *TAPhA* 123 (1993) 261–286.
- H. Engelmann, “Inschriften aus Ephesos”, *ZPE* 24 (1977) 201–204.
- K. Erickson, “Sons of Heracles: Antony and Alexander in the Late Republic”, in: K. R. Moore (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Alexander the Great* (Leiden–Boston 2018) 254–274.
- A. Erskine, “Distant Cousins and International Relations: Syngeneia in the Hellenistic World”, in: E. Chrusos (ed.), *The Idea of European Community in History: Conference Proceedings* (Athens 2003) 205–216.
- B. Fauconnier, “Athletes and Artist in an Expanding World. The Development of Transregional Associations of Competitors in the First Century B.C.”, in: C. Mann, S. Remijsen, S. Scharff (eds.), *Athletics in the Hellenistic World* (Stuttgart 2016) 73–93.
- B. Fauconnier, “The Organisation of Synods of Competitors in the Roman Empire”, *Historia* 66 (2017) 442–467.
- F. Felten, “Römische Machthaber und hellenistische Herrscher. Berührungen und Umdeutungen”, *JÖAI* 56 (1985) 109–154.
- E. Fontani, “Il filellenismo di Antonio tra realtà storica e propaganda politica: le ginnasiarchie ad Atene e ad Alessandria”, *Studi ellenistici* 12 (1999) 193–210.
- C. A. Forbes, “Ancient Athletic Guilds”, *CPh* 50 (1955) 238–252.
- E. N. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (Oxford 1930).
- M. Golden, *Sport in the Ancient World from A to Z* (London 2003).
- M. Grant, *Cleopatra* (London 1972).
- C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge 1997).
- H. Halfmann, *Marcus Antonius* (Darmstadt 2011).
- B. V. Head, *Historia nummorum: A Manual of Greek Numismatics* (Oxford 1911).
- O. Hekster, “Hercules, Omphale, and Octavian’s ‘Counter-Propaganda’”, *BABesch* 79 (2004) 171–178.
- O. Hekster, T. Kaizer, “Mark Antony and the Raid on Palmyra: Reflections on Appian, *Bella Civilia* V, 9”, *Latomus* 63 (2004) 70–80.

- R. G. Hervás, "Trajan and Hadrian's Reorganization of the Agonistic Associations in Rome", in: E. M. Grijalvo, J. M. C. Copete, L. Gomez (eds.), *Empire and Religion. Religious Change in Greek Cities under Roman Rule* (Leiden 2017) 84–97.
- W. Hoben, *Untersuchungen zur Stellung kleinasiatischer Dynasten in den Macht-ämpfen der ausgehenden Republik* (Mainz 1969).
- G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (London – New York 2001).
- J. M. Højte, *Roman Imperial Statue Bases: from Augustus to Commodus* (Aarhus 2005).
- S. Holder, *Bildung im kaiserzeitlichen Alexandria: 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Historia-Einzelschriften 253 (Stuttgart 2020).
- W. Huß, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit, 332–30 v. Chr.* (Munich 2001).
- G. O. Hutchinson, "Down among the Documents: Criticism and Papyrus Letters", in: R. Morello, A. D. Morrison (eds.), *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography* (Oxford 2007).
- U. Huttner, "Marcus Antonius und Herakles", in: C. Schubert, K. Brodersen, U. Huttner (eds.), *Rom und der griechische Osten: Festschrift für Hatto H. Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart 1995) 103–112.
- E. Huzar, *Marc Antony: A Biography* (Minneapolis 1978).
- H. Jeanmaire, "La Politique religieuse d'Antoine et de Cléopâtre", *RArch* 19 (1924) 241–261.
- A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford 1937).
- J. Keil, "Die Synodos der ökumenischen Hieroniker und Stephaniten", *JÖAI* 14 (1911) 123–134.
- J. Keil, "Forschungen in der Erythraia I", *JÖAI* 13 (Beibl.) (1910) 6–74.
- A. Kenyon, "Rescript of Marcus Antonius", *CR* 7 (1893) 476–478.
- D. Kienast, "Antonius, Augustus, die Kaiser und Athen", in: D. Dietz, D. Henning, H. Kaletsch (eds.), *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum, Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet* (Würzburg 1995) 191–222.
- D. Kienast, "Augustus und Alexander", *Gymnasium* 76 (1969) 430–456.
- G. Klaffenbach, *Symbolae ad historiam collegiorum artificum Bacchiorum* (Berlin 1914).
- D. Knibbe, *Ephesus: Geschichte einer bedeutenden antiken Stadt und Portrait einer modernen Grossgrabung im 102. Jahr der Wiederkehr des Beginnes österreichischer Forschungen (1895–1997)* (Frankfurt am Main – New York 1998).
- G. L. Krivolapov, "Epistula Marci Antonii triumviri ad Koinon Asiae kak istochnik po izucheniyu prebyvaniya Marka Antoniia na Vostoke v 41 g. do n.e." ["Epistula Marci Antonii triumviri ad Koinon Asiae as a Source for the Study of Mark Antony's Stay in the East in 41 BCE"], *Antichnyj mir i arkheologiya* 20 (2021) 125–142.
- A. B. Kuhn, "The chrysophoria in the Cities of Greece and Asia Minor in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods", *Tyche* 29 (2014) 51–87.
- Br. Le Guen, "Hadrien, l'Empereur philhellène, et la vie agonistique de son temps", *Nikephoros* 23 (2010) 205–239.

- Br. Le Guen, *Les associations de Technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique* I (Nancy 2001).
- M. Lehner, *Die Agonistik im Ephesos der römischen Kaiserzeit* (München 2004).
- M. A. Levi, *Ottaviano capoparte. Storia politica di Roma durante le ultime lotte di supremazia* I–II (Firenze 1933).
- J. Lindsay, *Cleopatra* (New York 1971).
- S. Lücke, *Syngeneia: epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie* (Frankfurt 2000).
- R. Luiselli, "Greek Letters on Papyrus, First to Eighth Centuries: A Survey", *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 62 (2008) 677–737.
- D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ* I–II (Princeton 1950).
- D. Manetti, "Autografi e incompiuti: Il caso dell'Anonimo Londinese P. Lit. Lond. 165", *ZPE* 100 (1994) 47–58.
- D. Manetti, "Riconsiderazioni sull'Anonimo Londinese: progressi e punti ancora irrisolti", in: N. Reggiani (ed.), *Greek Medical Papyri: Text, Context, Hypertext* (Berlin–Boston 2019) 35–45.
- M. Mayer, "Temenos 2", *RE* 5 A (1934) 437–458.
- D. Michel, *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und Marcus Antonius: archäologische Untersuchungen* (Bruxelles 1967).
- C. Mileta, "Die offenen Arme der Provinz: Überlegungen zur Funktion und Entwicklung der prorömischen Kultfeste der Provinz Asia (erstes Jahrhundert v. Chr.)", in: J. Rüpke (ed.), *Festrituale in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Tübingen 2008) 89–114.
- F. Millar, "Triumvirate and Principate", *JRS* 63 (1973) 50–67.
- F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC–AD 337)* (London 1977).
- D. Musti, "Sull'idea di *συγγένεια* in iscrizioni greche", *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* 32 (1963) 225–239.
- J. Oehler, "*Ἱερὸν καὶ*", *RE* 8 (1913) 1535–1536.
- J. Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge 2006).
- O. Palagia, "Imitation of Herakles In Ruler Portraiture: A Survey From Alexander to Maximinus Daza", *Boreas* 9 (1986) 137–151.
- N. Papazarkadas, P. J. Thonemann, "Athens and Kydonia: Agora I 7602", *Hesperia* 77 (2008) 73–87.
- R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford 1996).
- R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford 2005).
- C. B. R. Pelling (ed.), *Plutarch: Life of Antony* (Cambridge 1988).
- C. Pelling, "The Triumviral Period", in: A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, A. Lintott (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* X (Cambridge 2008) 1–69.
- P. I. Perez, "La Familia Antonia Descendiente de Anton, Hijo de Heracles: La Manipulacion de Un Mito", *Studia Histocia Historia Antigua* 27 (2009) 177–186.
- B. Perrin (tr.), *Plutarch's Lives* IX (London 1959).

- St. Pfeiffer, "Kleopatra und Marcus Antonius in Tarsos: Plutarchs Mythos um die Verweiblichung eines römischen Feldherren und sein Bild der ptolemäischen Königin", in: A. Bencivenni, A. Cristofori, F. Muccioli, C. Salvaterra (eds.), *Philobiblos: scritti in onore di Giovanni Geraci* (Milano 2019).
- A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford 1991).
- H. W. Pleket, "Aspects of the History of the Athletic Guilds", *ZPE* 10 (1973) 197–227.
- F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig 1909).
- S. Poloczek, "Dionysus and Legitimation of Imperial Authority by Myth in First- and Second-Century Rome: Caligula, Domitian and Hadrian", in: F. Doroszewski, D. Karłowicz (eds.), *Dionysus and Politics: Constructing Authority in the Graeco-Roman World* (London – New York 2021) 124–141.
- D. S. Potter, "Entertainers in the Roman Empire", in: D. S. Potter, D. J. Mattingly (eds.), *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor 1998) 256–325.
- A. Raggi, "Triumviral Documents from the Greek East", in: F. Pina Polo (ed.), *The Triumviral Period: Civil War, Political Crisis and Socioeconomic Transformations* (Zaragoza 2020) 431–449.
- A. Ricciardetto, "La lettre de Marc Antoine (SB I 4224) écrite au verso de l'Anonyme de Londres (P.Brit. Lib. inv. 137 = MP³ 2339)", *APF* 58: 2 (2012) 43–60.
- A. Ricciardetto, *L'Anonyme de Londres. Édition et traduction d'un papyrus médical grec du Ier siècle* (Liège 2014).
- A. Ricciardetto, *L'Anonyme de Londres. P.Lit.Lond. 165, Brit. Lib. inv. 137. Un papyrus médical grec du Ier siècle après J.-C.* (Paris 2016).
- J. Robert, L. Robert, "Bulletin épigraphique", *RÉG* 90 (1977) 314–448.
- A. Roberts, *Mark Antony: His Life and Times* (Upton-upon-Severn 1988).
- G. M. Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos. Cult, Polis, and Change in the Graeco-Roman World* (New Haven – London 2012).
- G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (London – New York 1991).
- R. Rossi, *Marco Antonio nella lotta politica della tarda Repubblica Romana* (Trieste 1959).
- C. Samitz, "Neue agonistische Inschriften aus Ephesos", *JÖAI* 87 (2018) 373–400.
- M. Sarri, *Material Aspects of Letter Writing in the Graeco-Roman World: C. 500 BC – C. AD 300*, *Materiale Textkulturen* 12 (Berlin–Boston 2018).
- J. C. Saumell, "A Critical Assessment of the Anonymus Londiniensis Papyrus", *BASP* 55 (2018) 129–156.
- H. H. Schmitt, "Forme della vita interstatale nell'antichità", *Storica Critica* 25 (1988) 529–546.
- R. K. Sherck, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* (Cambridge 1993).
- B. Simonetta, "Notes on the Coinage of the Cappadocian Kings", *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 1 (1961) 9–50.
- B. Simonetta, *The Coins of the Cappadocian Kings* (Fribourg 1977).

- E. V. Smykov, “Antoniyy i Dionis (iz istorii religioznoy politiki Triumvira M. Antoniyya)” [“Antony and Dionysus (From the History of the Religious Policy of the Triumvir M. Antony)”], *Antichnyy mir i arkheologiya* 11 (2002) 80–106.
- E. V. Smykov, “Mark Antoniyy v mire ellinisticheskikh monarkhiy: gosudar’ ili magistrat?” [“Mark Antony in the World of Hellenistic Monarchies: Sovereign or Magistrate?”], *Gumanitarnyye i yuridicheskie issledovaniya. Nauchno-teoreticheskiy zhurnal* 3 (2017) 100–106.
- S. Śnieżewski, “Divine Connections of Marcus Antonius in the Years 43–30 BC”, *Grazer Beiträge* 22 (1998) 129–144.
- R. D. Sullivan, *Near East Royalty and Rome: 100–30 BC*, Phoenix Suppl. 24 (Toronto–Buffalo–London 1990).
- R. D. Sullivan, “The Dynasty of Cappadocia”, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II. 7. 2 (1980) 1125–1168.
- F. Täger, *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes* I (Stuttgart 1957).
- W. W. Tarn, “Alexander Helios and the Golden Age”, *JRS* 22: 2 (1932) 135–160.
- W. W. Tarn, “The Triumvirs”, in: S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, M. P. Charlesworth (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* X (Cambridge 1934a) 31–65.
- W. W. Tarn, “The War of the East against the West”, in: S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, M. P. Charlesworth (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* X (Cambridge 1934b) 66–111.
- W. J. Tatum, “Antonius and Athens”, in: F. Pina Polo (ed.), *The Triumviral Period: Civil War, Political Crisis and Socioeconomic Transformations* (Zaragoza 2020) 451–473.
- L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown 1931).
- B. Tisé, “M. Antonio tra ellenismo e romanità”, *Rudiae* 18 (2006) 155–195.
- H. Van Wijlick, *Rome and Near Eastern Kingdoms and Principalities, 44–31 BC: A Study of Political Relations During Civil War* (Leiden–Boston 2021).
- M. Vandoni, *Feste pubbliche e private nei documenti greci* (Milan 1964).
- O. Weippert, *Alexander-Imitatio und römische Politik in republikanischer Zeit* (Augsburg 1972).
- W. C. West, “M. Oulprios Dorneslikos and the Athletic Synod at Ephesus”, *The Ancient History Bulletin* 4 (1990) 84–89.
- E. Ziebarth, “Zu den griechischen Vereinsinschriften”, *RhM* 55 (1900) 501–519.

In 41 BCE, following the Battle at Philippi (October 42 BCE), the triumvir Mark Antony toured the eastern provinces of the Roman Republic. During this trip, he restored the authority of Rome, levied contributions upon the cities, and appointed several rulers. The analysis of several developments after the Battle of Philippi (the triumvir’s participation in Lesser Mysteries in Athens, as well as his relations with Sisinna and Cleopatra) indicates that Antony stressed his mythical ancestor Heracles several times. It follows that while Antony did not place much political value on activities relating to his role as Νέος Διόνυσος at this time, he did practice a religious policy, which at least contained some features of Heracleism

based on Antony's origin from Heracles. In Ephesus (spring 41 BCE), Antony was persuaded to grant broad privileges and immunities to the Association of Wreath-Bearers and Victors in the Sacred Games from the Inhabited World, as evidenced by his letter to the Κοινὸν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλλήνων on the privileges of the συνόδου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερονικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν. What emerges is that the letter may shed light on Antony's religious policy during his stay in the East in 41 BCE since the association of athletes mentioned there could have some connection to Heracles. Thus, the events mentioned in the letter of Mark Antony are, with certain reservations, additional evidence in favor of the existence of Antony's religious policy rooted in ties to his mythical ancestor Heracles during his visit to the East in 41 BCE.

После битвы при Филиппах (октябрь 42 г. до н. э.) триумвир Марк Антоний в 41 г. до н. э. совершил поездку по восточным провинциям Римской республики. Во время этой поездки он восстановил власть Рима, обложил города налогами и назначил нескольких правителей. Анализ ряда событий после битвы при Филиппах (участие триумвира в Малых мистериях в Афинах, а также его отношения с Сисинной и Клеопатрой) свидетельствует о том, что Антоний несколько раз открыто подчеркивал свою связь с мифическим предком Гераклом. Из этого следует, что, хотя Антоний в то время не придавал большого политического значения деятельности, связанной с его ролью "Нового Диониса", он проводил религиозную политику, которая, по крайней мере, содержала некоторые черты гераклидизма, основанного на происхождении Антония от Геракла. В Эфесе (весна 41 г. до н. э.) Антония убедили предоставить широкие привилегии и иммунитеты "Союзу победителей священных игр и обладателей венков со всего обитаемого мира", о чем свидетельствует его письмо к Κοινὸν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλλήνων о привилегиях συνόδου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερονικῶν καὶ στεφανιτῶν. В статье делается вывод, что данное письмо может пролить свет на религиозную политику Антония во время его пребывания на Востоке в 41 г. до н. э., поскольку упомянутая в письме ассоциация спортсменов могла находиться под покровительством Геракла. Таким образом, события, упомянутые в письме Марка Антония, являются, с некоторыми оговорками, дополнительным свидетельством в пользу существования у Антония во время его визита на Восток в 41 г. до н. э. религиозной политики, уходящей корнями в связь Антония с его мифическим предком Гераклом.

Heiko Ullrich

EINE KONJEKTUR ZU LUKREZ 3, 917

Im dritten Buch seines Lehrgedichts *De rerum natura* widmet Lukrez sich einem zentralen Thema der epikureischen Philosophie: dem Nachweis, dass der Tod nicht zu fürchten sei. In diesem Zusammenhang wendet der Sprecher sich gegen Klagen, wie er sie zumal in der melancholischer Stimmung eines späten Gastmahles gehört haben will, wenn die Kürze des Lebens und die Unendlichkeit des Todes – ein Thema, das zur gleichen Zeit etwa auch Catull. 5, 4–6 behandelt – einander gegenübergestellt werden (Lucr. 3, 912–915). Den sarkastischen Kommentar des ebenso epischen wie epikureischen Sprechers, der in dieser Klage maliziös die Angst vor dem Verlust der gegenwärtigen Möglichkeit zum hemmungslosen Weingenuss zu sehen vorgibt, entstellt jedoch ein gravierendes textkritisches Problem, das auch die erneute Sichtung des Sachverhalts in der *Editio Teubneriana* durch Marcus Deufert nicht hat befriedigend lösen können, weshalb Deufert schließlich bei der Setzung von *cruces* bleibt (Lucr. 3, 916–918):¹

tamquam in morte mali cum primis hoc sit eorum,
quod sitis exurat miseros atque arida †torrat†,
aut aliae cuius desiderium insideat rei

atque arida torrat *QO*^{corr.rec.} : atque arida torret *O* : ac torreat arda
C. Müller : ac torreat arens *Butterfield* : atque aridus terror *Housman*
: atque arida torres *Lachmann* : atque arida tortet *Romanes*

Die Emendationsversuche für allen Rettungsversuchen zum Trotz wohl unhaltbares *torrat*² beschränken sich bislang auf die Ersetzung der

¹ Deufert 2018, 129; vgl. zur Begründung Deufert 2019, 183 f.

² Zur Widerlegung der von Ernout 1926, 144 und Kenney 1971, 104, vorgebrachten Argumente für eine Synizese bei *torreat* vgl. die stichhaltige Argumentation bei Deufert 2019, 183. Zwar finden sich etliche Belege für die Synizese *ea*, die etwa bei Vergil (*aurea*, *Aen.* 1, 698 sowie *Aen.* 7, 190; *una eadeamque*, *Aen.* 10, 87), Horaz

anderweitig nicht belegten Verbform durch ein anderes Verb³ oder ein Substantiv⁴ sowie auf minimale Umstellungen, die den Daktylus *torreat*

(*cerea*, Sat. 1, 8, 43; *ostrea*, Sat. 2, 2, 21) oder Ovid (*aurea*, Am. 1, 8, 59) auftritt, auch bei Lukrez – Ernout 1924, 144 nennt *anteacta* (Lucr. 3, 672), zu vergleichen wäre etwa auch *eadem* (Lucr. 3, 1038) –, doch für die Endungen der Verbformen verweist Deufert 2019, 183 lediglich auf das in Lucr. 1, 1034 überlieferte *floreat*, das mit der Synizese als *constructio ad sensum* verteidigt werden könnte, aber aufgrund des doppelten Anstoßes vielleicht doch mit den humanistischen Handschriften zu *floreat* zu emendieren ist; als weitere Belege führt Kenney 1971, 104 die bei Plautus und seltener auch bei Terenz auftretende Synizese von *eamus* an, während Deufert 2019, 183 zusätzlich auf *ebulliat* (Pers. 2, 10) verweist, das aber textkritisch ebenfalls nicht unumstritten ist. Das *prohibeant* in Ter. *Ad*. 275 und *Heaut*. 1038 ist mit Gratwick ²1998, 88 wohl als *pro(hi)beant* zu lesen, zumal Ernout 1926, 144 zu Recht auf die entsprechende Synizese bei *prohibet* (Lucr. 3, 864) verweist. Die Möglichkeit einer Zuordnung des Verbs zur konsonantischen Konjugation erwägen Bailey 1947, 85 f. und Kenney ²2014, 198; auch hier fehlen allerdings Vergleichsstellen, die die schwankende Zuordnung zu verschiedenen Konjugationsklassen gerade auch für dieses Verb belegen könnten.

³ Das von Romanes 1934, 25, vorgeschlagene *tortet* begegnet in der Beschreibung einer verwundeten Schlange: *omnia iam sorsum cernes ancisa recenti / uolnere tortari et terram conspargere tabo* (Lucr. 3, 660 f.), wo die übertragene Bedeutung ‚gequält werden‘ aber noch deutlich von der eigentlichen ‚sich winden‘ überlagert wird. Zwar scheint Deufert 2019, 183 f., diese Konjektur mit dem Hinweis auf die Seltenheit des Verbs in der Dichtung etwas vorschnell verworfen zu haben; was aber dennoch gegen *tostet* spricht, ist die Tatsache, dass es zum handelnden Subjekt einer *sitis arida* nicht wirklich gut passt: Der akute Schmerz der verwundeten Schlange ruft eine Reaktion bei derselben hervor, der Durst dagegen quält seine Opfer zwar, verurteilt sie aber an unserer Stelle auch zu völliger Passivität und Hilflosigkeit, gegen die ein energisches Aufbäumen wie dasjenige der Schlange, die sich selbst verwundet, um dem Schmerz zu entgehen (*uolneris ardenti ut morsu premit icta dolore*, Lucr. 3, 662), nur in dem einen konjizierten Verb ausgedrückt würde.

⁴ Das von Lachmann 1850, 192, vorgeschlagene und durch den Hinweis auf parallele Bildungen wie „*labes, tabes, pubes, torques, saepes, moles, nubes, sedes, ambages, compages, contages, rupes*“ gerechtfertigte *torres* stellt aus paläographischer Sicht einen unschlagbar eleganten Minimaleingriff in den Text dar, der – wie Lachmann selbst betont – zugleich die allerdings vielleicht etwas zu harsch als „tam absurde“ charakterisierte Stellung des Attributs *arida* (die zudem Kenney 1971, 104, mit dem Hinweis auf Verg. *Aen*. 2, 565 f. verteidigt hat) beseitigt. Dennoch stellt das völlige Fehlen von Belegen außerhalb des *Glossarium Cyrilli* das entscheidende Problem von Lachmanns Argumentation dar, die seine Konjektur zu einer Art Notlösung für degradiert. Die von Housman 1897, 237 f. vorgeschlagene Emendation *aridus terror* weist dagegen die Schwachstelle auf, dass sie von einer nachträglichen generischen Angleichung des Attributs *aridus* an *sitis* ausgehen muss, dessen maskuline Endung durch die Herstellung des korrupt – und insbesondere schnell als korrupt zu erkennenden – unmetrischen *torreat*,

in den vorletzten Versfuß setzen, um das von dort verbannte *arida* dann in synkopierter Form⁵ oder als zweisilbiges Synonym⁶ im Versschluss unterzubringen – wirklich befriedigend ist, wie Deufert zu Recht bemerkt, keine dieser Lösungen.⁷

Und tatsächlich legt ein Blick auf die Überlieferung nahe, dass hier ein Umdenken in der Herangehensweise notwendig sein dürfte, um das Problem zu beheben. Denn die Tatsache, dass der Vers bis zum letzten Wort metrisch glatt aufgeht, dieses vom Sinn her durchaus erwünschte Wort dann aber eine unlösbare metrische Herausforderung darstellt, deutet nicht nur auf die Entstehung der Korruptel am Versende, sondern auch auf einen (in Relation zum einzelnen Vers) massiven Verlust hin, der einer umtriebigen Emendationstätigkeit bereits vor dem Einsetzen unserer Überlieferung den nötigen Spielraum eröffnete, um durch die Umstellung der überlieferten Wortreihenfolge eine zweite Lösung des Puzzles zu erarbeiten, bei der dann auf unerklärliche Weise nur der letzte Stein nicht passte: Die beiden Notlösungen einer spekulativen Nebenform *torrat* und eines syntaktisch kaum erklärlichen Indikativ *torret* zeigen, dass man

ungrammatischen *torrat* oder syntaktisch sinnlosen *torret* nun isoliert dastand. Dass hier nicht eher an der evidenten Verderbnis am Versende herumkonjiziert worden sein soll, ist relativ unwahrscheinlich, weshalb das von Deufert 2019, 184 gefällte Urteil („paläographisch unbefriedigend und stilistisch fragwürdig“) vielleicht etwas zu hart formuliert, in der Sache aber richtig ist.

⁵ Gegen die von Müller 1974, 760, vorgeschlagene Umstellung *ac torreat arda*, die sich für die Synkope von *ardus* neben von Müller selbst angeführtem *postus* bei Lukrez selbst (etwa in Lucr. 1, 35. 52. 1059 u.ö.) nach Deufert 2019, 184 auf verschiedene Belege für die Form *ardus* bei Lucilius, Plautus und der Inschrift *CIL* I² 577 berufen kann, spricht insbesondere die Tatsache, dass man auch hier als Auslöser der Korruptel die Herstellung des unmetrischen, aber der Regelgrammatik entsprechenden *arida* annehmen muss, die durch die Umstellung der beiden Wörter ja nur dann einen Platz im Vers finden kann, wenn man gleichzeitig eine der beiden überlieferten und nicht weniger problematischen Formen *torret* oder *torrat* ans Versende setzt und so letztlich den Fehler lediglich verschiebt, was zwar nicht ausgeschlossen, aber auch nicht sehr wahrscheinlich ist.

⁶ Butterfield 2009, 49–51, vermeidet die Synkope gänzlich, indem er Müllers *ac torreat arda* durch *ac torreat arens* ersetzt; abgesehen vom Fehlen der Belege für *areo* bereits bei Lukrez, auf das Deufert 2019, 184 hinweist, gestaltet sich die paläographische Herleitung der Verderbnis in diesem Fall noch etwas schwieriger als bei Müller, da nun reguläres und metrisches *arens* nach (teilweisem) Verlust entweder durch unmetrisches *arida* oder zunächst durch das synkopierte *arda* ersetzt oder aus einem unerfindlichen Grund direkt per Konjekture zu *arida* gemacht worden sein müsste, um die postulierte folgende Umstellung aufzulösen.

⁷ Deufert 2019, 184.

kurz vor der vermeintlich schon am Horizont sichtbaren erfolgreichen Restitution des Verses schließlich doch noch in Uneinigkeit und Aporie verfallen ist.

Es soll daher im Folgenden der Versuch unternommen werden, die mutmaßlich recht gravierenden Eingriffe, Umstellungen und Ergänzungen der spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Korrektoren durch notgedrungen ebenso schwere Eingriffe wieder rückgängig zu machen und den folgenden als ursprünglich postulierten Wortlaut von Lucr. 3, 917 wiederherzustellen:

quod miseros sitis torr<e>at exurat[]que <inhiantis>

Im Zentrum der folgenden Überlegungen stehen dabei zum einen die Beobachtung, dass die überlieferte Form des Verses die übliche Reihenfolge einer semantischen Steigerung von *torrere* zu (*ex*)*urere* gerade umkehrt (vgl. *aut pereunt res exustae torrentibus auris*, Lucr. 5, 410 und insbesondere *tam soleat torrere atque urere quam genus omne / uisceris in terris quodcumque et sanguinis extet*, Lucr. 5, 902 f.), und zum anderen die These, dass gerade das scheinbar durch die schlagende Parallele *insedabiliter sitis arida, corpora mersans, / aequabat multum paruis umoribus imbrem* (Lucr. 6, 1175 f.) geschützte *arida*⁸ in Wahrheit nicht die Worte des Lukrez überliefert, sondern den wichtigsten Versuch eines spätantiken oder frühmittelalterlichen Korrektors zur Heilung des sich ihm bereits in defekter Form präsentierenden Verses darstellt.

Der Auslöser für die Korruptel waren vermutlich zwei der häufigsten Überlieferungsfehler überhaupt, die wohl gleichzeitig oder kurz nacheinander auftraten: Der Verlust des letzten Wortes durch einen Abschreibebefehler oder mechanischen Verlust und die Dittographie *atque* nach *exuratque*,⁹ die diesen Verlust bei abgesetzter Zeilenschreibung zumindest für das Schriftbild notdürftig kaschierte:

quod miseros sitis torreat exuratque atque

⁸ Das betont v.a. Deufert 2019, 184.

⁹ Vgl. zum Textverlust am „Versende [...], wo in der Lukrezüberlieferung so häufig Verderbnisse begegnen“ – so Deufert 2019, 82 – insbesondere den Fall Lucr. 4, 321 f. und dazu die Analyse bei Deufert 2019, 222; die Dittographie wird etwa von Deufert 2019, 377 und 441 mit Gewinn zur Erklärung evidenter Korruptelen (*sint* nach vorangegangenen *fuert* in Lucr. 6, 49 bzw. *tenentes* nach vorangegangenen *t(a)ed(a)equ* in Lucr. 6, 899) herangezogen.

Leider erkannte der Korrektor, dem die Verstümmelung des Verses wohl alsbald auffiel, die eigentlich relativ offensichtliche Dittographie seines Vorgängers nicht als solche und hielt *atque* für einen Teil des originalen Textes – damit aber hatte er sich in eine Situation hineinmanövriert, die bis heute die Emendationsversuche unter die falsche Prämisse stellt, dass *atque* die Verbindung zwischen den beiden Prädikaten *exurat* und *torreat* bilde und folglich zwischen den beiden Wörtern zu stehen habe. Als verheerend erwies sich außerdem die möglicherweise von dem unbewussten Bestreben, in dem chronisch unterfüllten Vers nicht noch mehr (lange) Silben zu verlieren, diktierte Entscheidung, das aus syntaktischer Sicht überflüssige angehängte *-que* dennoch mechanisch mitzuschleppen. Schließlich ging es dem Korrektor ja darum, zu ergänzen, nicht zu tilgen, und bei ersterem Unterfangen fiel sein Blick geradezu zwangsläufig auf das Attribut *aridus*, das den Durst ja auch in Lucr. 6, 1175 so trefflich charakterisiert. Der Korrektor griff also beherzt zu und ein, stellte *torreat* hinter *atque*, ergänzte dazwischen noch das sich für den Daktylus im fünften Fuß geradezu anbietende *arida* und gelangte zu folgendem Vers:

quod miseros sitis exuratque atque arida torre(a)t

Wie dieser Korrektor das bis heute virulente Problem des letzten Wortes im Vers vorerst ruhigstellte, ob er gegen die Metrik ursprüngliches *torreat*, als Vorläufer von Q morphologisch falsches *torrat* oder als Vorläufer von O syntaktisch unmögliches *torret* schrieb, ist für die weiteren Überlegungen zunächst einmal unerheblich; jedenfalls fiel entweder ihm selbst oder einem Nachfolger beim nochmaligen Überlesen des Verses zunächst einmal das aus syntaktischer Sicht störende, aus metrischer Sicht aber unentbehrliche *-que* auf, das nun nicht mehr vor dem Hintergrund des ursprünglichen Verses, sondern auf der Grundlage des bislang vermeintlich so erfolgreich konjizierten Bestandes betrachtet wurde. Und hier bot sich eine relativ einfache Möglichkeit zur Tilgung des störenden Anhängsels an: Man versetzte *miseros* aus seiner ursprünglichen Position in diejenige zwischen endlich von *-que* befreitem *exurat*, dessen Silbe nun durch einen konsonantischen Anlaut des folgenden Wortes gelangt wurde, und *atque*, wodurch der Vers seine überlieferte Form erhielt:

quod sitis exurat miseros atque arida †torrat/torret†

Man mag gegen die hier präsentierten Überlegungen einwenden, dass der als ursprünglich angenommene Vers (*quod miseros sitis torreat*

exuratque inhiantis) gleich zwei metrische Lizenzen beinhaltet: die fehlende Berücksichtigung des auslautenden -s bei der Bildung von Positionslängen (*sitis torreat*) und die nur sehr notdürftige Herstellung einer zweiten Verszäsur durch die Tmesis von Präfix und Wortstamm (*ex-uratque*). Doch beide Lizenzen sind für Lukrez gut bezeugt: Die Vernachlässigung des auslautenden -s haben zuletzt Butterfield und Deufert ausführlich analysiert;¹⁰ zur Herstellung einer zweiten Zäsur in Versen, die lediglich die Trithemimeres aufweisen, können die Ausführungen von Dubois und Deufert verglichen werden:¹¹ Analog zu den dort präsentierten Beispielen, die der Trithemimeres jeweils dadurch eine Penthemimeres zur Seite stellen, dass ein Präfix durch Tmesis vom Simplex des Verbs getrennt wird (*dissolui. quod si in-mortales nostra foret mens*, Lucr. 3, 612; *sic animas intro-duxerunt sensibus auctas*, Lucr. 3, 630; *haud erit ut merito in-mortalis possit haberi*, Lucr. 3, 715; *desiperest. quid enim in-mortalibus atque beatis*, Lucr. 5, 165; *complerunt magno in-dignantur murmure clausi*, Lucr. 6, 197), könnte im vorliegenden Fall eine Hephthemimeres angesetzt werden: *quod miseros sitis torreat ex-uratque inhiantis*.

Es gibt allerdings durchaus Verse, in denen auf diese Art und Weise sowohl die Pent- als auch die Hephthemimeres hergestellt werden können:¹² *portat ouans; ducis ex-emplum e-uentumque secuti* (Verg. *Aen.* 11, 758); *an tu reris eum oc-cisa in-sanisse parente* (Hor. *Sat.* 2, 3, 134); *quem modo felicem in-uidia ad-mirante ferebant* (Prop. 2, 17, 11); auch wenn zumindest in den beiden letzteren Fällen die Herstellung der Penthemimeres metrisch ‚notwendiger‘ ist als diejenige der Hephthemimeres, zeigen die Verse doch, dass letztlich beides möglich ist, was die Tmesis auch im folgenden, dem hier vorgeschlagenen Vers metrisch noch genauer entsprechenden Fall wahrscheinlich macht: *inuiti quoque auaritiam ex-ercere iubentur* (Iuv. 14, 108).

¹⁰ Vgl. bei Butterfield 2008, 189 insbesondere die Zusammenstellung der Verse sowie Deufert 2017, 224–226. Für *sitis* ist bei Lukrez zwar nur ein Fall mit regulärer Herstellung der Positionslänge bezeugt: *sic igitur tibi anhela sitis de corpore nostro* (4, 875), zu vergleichen wären aber insbesondere *quid dubitas quin omnis sit haec rationis potestas* (2, 53) und *quare etiam atque etiam, ut dico, est communis uoluptas* (4, 1207), außerdem *totius umorem saccatum corporis fundunt* (4, 1028) und *nec molles opus sunt motus uxoribus hilum* (4, 1268).

¹¹ Vgl. die Zusammenstellung der entsprechenden Verse bei Dubois 1933, 22, sowie die weiteren Überlegungen bei Deufert 2019, 416.

¹² Vgl. neben der Aufstellung bei Christ ²1879, 181 f., der sich wiederum auf die (anders erklärte) Sammlung bei Lachmann 1850, 413 f. beruft, insbesondere auch Weber 1975, 192 f.

Der Vergleich mit Lucr. 6, 1175 f. legt darüber hinaus nahe, *arida* in Lucr. 3, 917 aus semantischen Gründen als nachträgliche Einfügung in Analogie zu eben dieser Stelle im sechsten Buch zu identifizieren: Während das Attribut dort den brennenden Durst und die daraus resultierende Austrocknung (*ardentia*, 6, 1172; *sitis arida*, 6, 1175) zahlreichen Wörtern gegenüberstellt, die Wasser in verschiedener Form bezeichnen (*fluuios*, *undas*, *lymphis putealibus*, *mersans*, *umoribus*, *imbrem*, Lucr. 6, 1172–1176), ist das Adjektiv neben den Verben *torreat* und *exurat* an unserer Stelle reichlich tautologisch und verrät so seine Herkunft als aufgrund der Parallelstelle herbeigezogenes, thematisch verwandtes, aber letztlich überflüssiges Füllwort.

Das Bild des gierig Mundes dagegen ist bei Lukrez geradezu topisch mit dem Durst verbunden: In 6, 1174 (direkt vor *sitis arida* im Folgevers) erscheint *ore patente*, in 4, 876 ist von *anhela sitis* die Rede, in 6, 1264–1266 sterben die zunächst als *siti prostrata* [...] / *corpora* eingeführten Pestkranken *nimia ab dulcedine aquarum*, was die aufgerissenen Münder zumindest impliziert, in 4, 1024 f. schließlich wird die Gier des *sitiens* in ein besonders krasses Bild umgesetzt, wenn es heißt: *totum prope faucibus occupat amnem*. Auch wenn der Durst nur im übertragenen Sinne – und in von Giussani und Deufert wohl zu Unrecht athetierten Versen¹³ – verwendet wird, erscheint diese Veranschaulichung: *et sitis aequa tenet uitae semper hiantis* (3, 1084).

Neben der Tatsache, dass das Partizip in derselben Position (und wesentlich allgemeinerer Bedeutung) noch einmal bei Lukrez erscheint, wenn über Pan als Musiker gesagt wird: *unco saepe labro calamos percurrit hiantis* (4, 588), spricht auch die weniger moralisch gefärbte, in erster Linie eine emotionale Bindung bezeichnende Verwendung des Kompositums *inhiare*, die gut zu dem fröhlich-melancholischen Gewohnheitsgenießer aus 3, 912 f. passt und sich bei Lukrez an prominenter Stelle findet, wenn Mars seine Geliebte Venus anschmachtet (1, 35–37):

atque ita suspiciens tereti ceruice reposta
pascit amore audios inhians in te, dea, uisus
eque tuo pendet resupini spiritus ore

Die hier von Lukrez verwendete Konstruktion mit *in* und dem Akkusativ wird von Vergil in ähnlicher Bedeutung wieder an die häufigere mit dem direkten Objekt angeglichen: *nec uarios inhiant*

¹³ Vgl. zur Begründung neben Giussani 1897, 136 f., insbesondere Deufert 2019, 198–200.

pulchra testudine postis / inlusasque auro uestis Ephyreia aera (Verg. *Georg.* 2, 463 f.). Plautus verwendet den Begriff zunächst eher im Sinne materieller Gier (*inhiat aurum ut deuoret*, *Aul.* 194; *bona mea inhiant*, *MG* 715, *inhiat quod nusquam est miser*, *MG* 1199); eine übertragene Bedeutung, hinter der die Herkunft der Metapher aus dem Bereich der oralen Nahrungsaufnahme aber stets sichtbar bleibt (*nam illic homo tuam hereditatem inhiant, quasi esuriens lupus*, *Stich.* 605) und die schließlich ebenfalls bereits in die Richtung affektiver Zuneigung tendiert, die in Vergils *Georgica* und Lukrezens Proöm zum ersten Buch vorliegt (*Truc.* 337–340):

illum student iam; quasi uolturii triduo
 prius praediinant, quo die esuri sient:
 illum inhiant omnes, illi est animus omnibus;
 me nemo magis respiciet, ubi is huc uenerit,
 quasi abhinc ducentos annos fuerim mortuos.¹⁴

Vor diesem Hintergrund darf die Annahme, bei dem am Ende von *Lucr.* 3, 917 ausgefallenen Wort könne es sich um das als Simplex in derselben Position in 3, 1084 und 4, 588 belegte Partizip *inhiantis* handeln, vielleicht doch einige Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich beanspruchen, wobei für das Verb die Grundbedeutung ‚den Mund öffnen‘ etwa im Sinne des *ore patente* in 6, 1174 auch in ihrer negativ konnotierten, in erster Linie durch den Vergleich mit einem hungrigen Wolf im *Stichus* verbürgten Unterart ‚gierig das Maul aufsperrn‘ anzusetzen und die für das Simplex gut bezeugte absolute Verwendung kaum von derjenigen des Kompositums mit direktem Objekt zu unterscheiden ist – wenn der Durst diejenigen ausdörft und verbrennt, die gierig das Maul aufsperrn, ist das Objekt von deren Gier nur allzu leicht aus dem Zusammenhang zu ergänzen.

Für die Interpretation dürften der Verlust des früh konjizierten *arida* und die Gewinnung von *inhiantis* ebenfalls einen Vorteil darstellen: Dem nüchtern-abstrakten Ton des folgenden Verses 3, 918 wird keine in dieser Zuspitzung nur als übertrieben ironisch aufzufassende *sitis arida* etwa im Sinne von ‚der ach so dörrende Durst‘ zugemutet; umgekehrt verweist die anschauliche Charakterisierung der kritisierten am Leben hängenden Genießer als unersättliche Gierschlunde (*inhiantis*) direkt auf das *desiderium* des folgenden Verses voraus (3, 916–918):

¹⁴ Alle genannten Stellen finden sich *ThLL* 7, 1, 1595, 3–12.

tamquam in morte mali cum primis hoc sit eorum,
 quod miseros sitis torr<e>at exurat[]que <inhiantis>
 aut aliae cuius desiderium insideat rei.

Als ob es im Tod eines ihrer dringlichsten Probleme wäre, dass der Durst die Armen ausdörren und ihren offenstehenden Mund verbrennen oder die Gier nach irgendeiner anderen Sache sie bedrängen könnte.

Die Stilistik des Verses wiederum profitiert von der nun mit 5, 410 und 5, 902 f. übereinstimmenden Reihenfolge der beiden Prädikate *torreat* und *exurat*, von denen das zweite sowohl von der Bildebene her als auch aufgrund der Verstärkung des zweiten Verbs durch das (mithilfe der Tmesis eigens betonte) Präfix eine deutliche Steigerung des ersten darstellt und so die erwartbare Klimax an die Stelle der höchstens um eines komischen Effektes willen sinnvollen Antiklimax setzt; die Annahme einer solchen ironischen Wirkungsabsicht scheint aber zu den beiden Lucr. 3, 917 rahmenden, eher abstrakt-nüchtern formulierten Versen nicht recht zu passen.

Heiko Ullrich

Bruchsal

heiko.f.ullrich@web.de

Bibliographie

- C. Bailey (Hg.), *Titi Lucreti Cari ‚De rerum natura‘ libri sex. With Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford 1947).
- D. Butterfield, „Four Lucretian Emendations“, *Cambridge Classical Journal* 55 (2009) 49–56.
- D. Butterfield, „Sigmatic Echthipsis in Lucretius“, *Hermes* 136 (2008) 188–205.
- W. Christ, *Die Metrik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig 21879).
- M. Deufert, *Prolegomena zur Editio Teubneriana des Lukrez* (Berlin–Boston 2017).
- M. Deufert, *Kritischer Kommentar zu Lukrezens ‚De rerum natura‘* (Berlin–Boston 2018).
- M. Deufert (Hg.), *Titus Lucretius Carus, ‚De rerum natura‘* (Berlin–Boston 2019).
- C. Dubois, *La Métrique de Lucrèce comparée à celle de ses prédécesseurs Ennius et Lucilius* (Straßburg 1933).
- A. Ernout (Hg.), *Lucrèce ‚De rerum natura‘. 2. Livres III et IV. Commentaire exégetique et critique* (Paris 1926).
- C. Giussani (Hg.), *T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex. 3. Revisione del testo, commento e studi introduttivi* (Turin 1897).

- A. S. Gratwick (Hg.), *Terence, 'The Brothers'* (Warminster 1999).
- A. E. Housman, „Lucretiana“, *Journal of Philology* 25 (1897) 226–249.
- E. J. Kenney (Hg.), *Lucretius 'De rerum natura' Book III* (Cambridge 1971, 2014).
- K. Lachmann, *In T. Lucreti Cari 'De rerum natura' libros commentarius* (Berlin 1850).
- K. Müller, „Rez. Kenney 1971“, *Gnomon* 46 (1974) 756–764.
- N. H. Romanes, *Notes on the Text of Lucretius* (Oxford 1934).
- C. W. Weber, *Tmesis, Sandhi, and the Two Caesurae of the Hexameter in Virgil's 'Aeneid'*. Diss. (Berkeley 1975).

In Lucr. 3. 917 the paradoxos offers the otherwise unattested **torrat** which can be restored to regular *torreat* by reversing the ancient conjectures and accepting two metrical licenses.

Рукописное чтение в пассаже Lucr. 3, 917 содержит незасвидетельствованную форму глагола **torrat**. Можно восстановить здесь обычную форму *torreat*, изменив античные конъектуры и приняв две метрические вольности.

Mikhail Shumilin

UNPUBLISHED CONJECTURES
TO THE *APPENDIX VERGILIANA*
BY F. KORSCH, G. SAENGER, AND A. SONNY

Drafts and letters of pre-revolutionary scholars of the Russian Empire, in particular those preserved in the archives of Grigory E. Saenger (1853–1919, based in St Petersburg from 1901), contain numerous conjectures to classical authors that have not been published so far. A particularly vivid discussion, involving proposals by Fyodor E. Korsch from Moscow (1843–1915) and Adolf I. Sonny from Kyiv (1861–1922),¹ concerned the text of the *Appendix Vergiliana*, one of the ancient texts in the case of which conjectural approach seems to be particularly welcome.² While it would naturally be rash to expect each of the “guesses which we all jot down in our margins”³ to be of great value, it can be argued that in certain cases future editors might profit from these conjectures. At *Catal.* 5. 2, Sonny (see below) anticipated K. Münscher’s conjecture *rhoezo*,⁴ almost universally accepted in modern editions.⁵ At *Ciris* 79, Saenger proposed in a letter to read the line as *piscibus est canibusque maris uallata repente* (itself a modification of Korsch’s proposal; see below), that is, exactly as it is now printed in B. Kayachev’s edition who treats this version as a new combination of conjectures, one of them his own.⁶

¹ On Saenger, see Shilov 2003 [Д. Н. Шилов, “Министр поневоле: творчество и карьера в судьбе Г. Э. Зенгера”], Smyshlyaeva 2021 [В. П. Смышляева, “Зенгер Григорий Эдуардович”]; on Korsch and Sonny, respectively Smyshlyaeva 2015 [В. П. Смышляева, “Российские филологи-классики XIX века: ‘Германовское’ направление (материалы для биографического словаря)”], 213–217 and 426–429.

² See e.g. Kayachev 2021; contrast the ardent debates on the appropriateness of Saenger’s age-long conjectural work on Horace outlined in Smyshlyaeva 2021, 293–294.

³ Housman 1972, 46.

⁴ Münscher 1912.

⁵ See e.g. Westendorp Boerma 1949–1953, 1. 95; Salvatore 1963, 198; Richmond 1966, 135; Dolç 1982–1984, 2. 170, Fairclough–Goold 2000, 488; it was recommended by Housman 1972, 1170 as “excellent”.

⁶ Kayachev 2020, 49.

On a more general note, in a letter to be published soon A. E. Housman approves of one of Korsch's conjectures to Statius,⁷ and D. R. Shackleton Bailey in his edition of Statius' *Silvae*⁸ accepts eleven emendations proposed by Saenger, which is incidentally a higher number than that of Housman's conjectures accepted in the same edition, however unfair this count is. Hopefully other conjectures by the same scholars (some of them clearly not just first drafts but rather second thoughts on the already published proposals) might turn out to be also deserving attention.

In the present article, I propose to publish a collection of conjectures to the *Appendix* by the three scholars preserved in Fund 504 of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), the main archive of Grigory Saenger's documents related to textual criticism, and Fund 558 of the same archive, containing documents connected with the scholarly activities of Fyodor Korsch. The following units are involved:

F. 504. Inv. 1. Unit 196 – a large collection of offprints of Saenger's papers with marginal notes in his hand, apparently to be dated after the corresponding papers. In particular, I quote from foll. 336v (notes on an offprint of Saenger 1901; conjectures must antedate Saenger 1911, where a related conjecture *Ciris 5 tum mea quaeret eo dignum sibi] cum mihi Gargetto dignum stet* was published on p. 157–158), 428v (notes on an offprint of Saenger 1905; conjectures must antedate Saenger 1910, where related conjectures *Catal. 13. 6 adsim] mors sim* and *as<pis> sim* were published on p. 538–539), 440v–441r (notes on an offprint of Saenger 1906), 676r–683r and 687r (notes on an offprint of Saenger 1911), 685v (undated separate piece of paper, perhaps related to the second thoughts on Saenger 1911), 754v–755v (notes on an offprint of Saenger 1910);

F. 504. Inv. 4. Units 130 and 131 – letters from Korsch to Saenger. I specify the date every time I quote from a leaf for the first time;

F. 504. Inv. 4. Unit 241. Fol. 4–5 – a letter from Sonny to Saenger dated April 8, 1911. When quoting Sonny's conjectures, I simply specify the page of this letter;

F. 558. Inv. 4. Unit 100 – letters from Saenger to Korsch. I specify the date every time I quote from a leaf for the first time.

⁷ Shumilin 2022.

⁸ Shackleton Bailey 2003.

Like Saenger's handwritten notes in margins of his articles, the letters in question react to his published conjectures; they contain discussions provoked by offprints of his works which he used to send to various scholars.⁹ Saenger's letters to Korsch that I quote continue the same discussions.

In the following list, I use shortened references to unit numbers (e.g. 558.4.100.12r instead of F. 558. Inv. 4. Unit 100. Fol. 12 r). For the lemmata, I try to use what Saenger considered the *paradosis* (whether it is given explicitly in his papers or implied); I have accepted only those changes against it which Saenger treats as unquestionably right. The punctuation also follows Saenger's one wherever possible.

Aetna 80–81:

Hi [sc. uates] Tityon poena strauere in iugera foedum,
sollicitant illi te circum, Tantale, poena...

80 *poena strauere... foedum] strauere nouena* (Haupt)... *praedam*
Saenger (558.4.100.12r, in a letter to Korsch from October 26, 1903)

81 *illi] alui* Saenger (558.4.100.12r)

Catal. 3. 9–10:

Tale deae numen, tali mortalia nutu
fallax momento temporis hora dedit.

9–10 *nutu... hora] flatu... aura* Saenger (504.1.196.440v), *nocti... aura*
Saenger (504.1.196.441r), *luctu... aura* Saenger (*ibid.*)

10 *dedit] rapit* Korsch (504.4.130.22v, in a letter to Saenger from December 11, 1906), *tulit* Saenger (504.1.196.440v), *necat* Saenger (*ibid.*); *hora dedit] ausa necat* Saenger (*ibid.*), *orsa necat* Saenger (*ibid.*), *heu domuit* Saenger (*ibid.*), *interimit* Saenger (*ibid.*), *externat* Saenger (*ibid.*)

Catal. 5. 1–2:

Ite hinc, inanes, ite, rhetorum ampullae,
inflata rhoso non Achaico uerba.

⁹ Including even those who did not speak Russian: see Shumilin 2022, 276 n. 14; cf. perhaps Shumilin–Kostyleva–Rezvykh 2022, 256 n. 5.

2 *rhoso*] *rhoeso* or ροῖζω Sonny (4v), *rho sed* Korsch (504.4.131.8r, in a letter to Saenger from May 9, 1911); *inflata rhoso*] *fucata rho sed* Saenger (504.1.196.676r; the same variant is written in Saenger's hand in the margin of Korsch's letter quoted above)

Catal. 9. 15–16:

...carmina quae prciū,¹⁰ saeculis accepta futuris,
carmina, quae pilium uincere digna senem.

15 *prcium*] *superent* Korsch (504.4.131.8r)

15–16 *quae prcium*... | *carmina quae pilium*] *Maeonium*... *carminaque Ascraeum* Saenger (504.1.196.754v)

Catal. 9. 29–32:

non defensa diu multum certamine equorum,
obtabant grauidae quod sibi quaeque manus,
saepe animam generi pro qua pater impius hausit,
saepe rubro similis sanguine fluxit humus.

30 *grauide quod sibi quaeque*] *profugam quam* (Pomponius Laetus) *sibi Graia* Saenger (504.1.196.755v); *quaeque manus*] *quisque polus* Saenger (*ibid.*), *quisque probus* Saenger (*ibid.*)

32 *rubro similis*] *rubens Isthmi* Korsch (504.4.131.8r)

Catal. 13. 5–6:

ualent ualent mihi ira et antiquus furor
et lingua qua adsim tibi...

6 *qua adsim*] *quam stringo* Korsch (504.4.130.11v, in a letter to Saenger from March 9, 1906), *quam uibrem* Saenger (504.1.196.428v), *qua mussem* Saenger (*ibid.*), *qua trux sim* Saenger (*ibid.*), *qua crux sim* Saenger (*ibid.*), *qua falx sim* Saenger (*ibid.*), *proscindens* Saenger (*ibid.*), *succensens* Saenger (*ibid.*), *crudelis* Saenger (*ibid.*), *fatalis* Saenger (*ibid.*), *mortalis* Saenger (*ibid.*, later cancelled by his own hand)

¹⁰ This is how Saenger represents the paradosis in Saenger 1910 [Г. Э. Зенгер, “Заметки к латинским текстам”], 534; in particular, this is the text of B².

Catal. 13.30–32:

obesam ad uxorem redis
et aestuantes docte soluis pantes
osiculisque lambis suaui.

31 *docte*] *glande* Korsch (504.4.131.8r)

Ciris 1–11:

Etsi me uario iactatum laudis amore
irritaque expertum fallacis praemia uulgi
Cecropius suaui expirans hortulus auras
florentis uiridi sophiae complectitur umbra
tum ea queret eo dignum sibi quaerere carmen 5
longe aliud studium atque alios accincta labores
altius ad magni suspendit sidera mundi
et placitum paucis ausa est ascendere collem,
non tamen absistam coeptum detexere munus,
in quo iure meas utinam requiescere musas 10
et leuiter blandum liceat deponere morem.

Sonny (4v–5r) argues for Saenger's text of these lines,¹¹ but without parenthesis,¹² sc. (with Saenger's conjectures italicized):

¹¹ According to Saenger 1911 [Г. Э. Зенгер, "Заметки к латинским текстам"], 157.

¹² His argument, clarifying his understanding of the text, is the following: "Ваше восстановление начала этой поэмы кажется мне превосходным; особенно удачным представляется мне ст. 4 *Gargetto dignum* и ст. 7 *mens tendit*. Но парентеза мне не по вкусу. Она имела бы смысл, если бы в ней содержалось объяснение предыдущего или возражение, а не простое продолжение начатой в предыдущем мысли. Нельзя ли обойтись без парентезы, сохраняя предложенные Вами исправления? Тогда *cum mihi Gargetto dignum stet quaerere carmen* указывало бы на причину, почему автора *sophiae complectitur umbra*. Απόδοσις же начиналась бы со слов *longe aliud*" ("I find your reconstruction of the beginning of this poem excellent; particularly successful are, in my view, v. 4 *Gargetto dignum* and v. 7 *mens tendit*. But the parenthesis [in lines 5–8] is not to my liking. It would be sensible if it contained an explanation of the preceding phrase or an objection to it, not just a continuation of the thought begun there. Can we do without the parenthesis, retaining the corrections you propose? *Cum mihi Gargetto dignum stet quaerere carmen* would then point to the reason why *sophiae umbra complectitur* the author. As for the apodosis, it would then begin with the words *longe aliud*").

Etsi me uario iactatum laudis amore
 irritaque expertum fallacis praemia uulgi
 Cecropius suauis expirans hortulus auras
 florentis uiridi sophiae complectitur umbra,
cum mihi Gargetto dignum stet quaerere carmen, 5
 longe aliud studium atque alios accincta labores
 altius ad magni *mens tendit* sidera mundi,
 et placitum paucis ausa est ascendere collem;
 non tamen absistam coeptum detexere munus,
 in quo iure meas utinam requiescere musas 10
 et leuiter blandum liceat deponere morem.

5 *tum ea queret eo dignum sibi quaerere carmen]* *cum mens*, Corycio
dignum si quid ferat antro Korsch (504.4.131.9v, in a letter to Saenger
 from May 9, 1911); *tum ea queret eo]* *iustum est Gargetto* Saenger
 (504.1.196.336v), *fas ita Gargetto* Saenger (*ibid.*), *uolt dea Gargetto*
 Saenger (*ibid.*), *uolt lyra Gargetto* Saenger (*ibid.*), *cui mens Gargetto*
 Saenger (*ibid.*), *sueta ea Gargetto* Saenger (*ibid.*)

7 *ad magni]* *acta animi* Saenger (504.1.196.336v), *aucta animi* Saenger
 (*ibid.*); *suspendit]* *se expandit* Korsch (504.4.131.9v)

Ciris 12–18:
 quod si mirificum genus omnes
 mirificum sedi modo sit tibi uelle libido,
 si me iam summa patientia pangeret artes
 quattuor antiquis heredibus est data consors, 15
 unde hominum errores longe lateque per orbem
 despicere atque humilis possim contemnere curas,
 non ego te talem uenerarer munere tali...

12 *omnes]* *o Mes[salla, uirorum]* Korsch (504.4.131.9v)

13 *sedi... uelle]* *saecli* (ρ)... *nulla* Korsch (504.4.131.9v)

after line 13 [*doctrinae praestare suae mihi lumina uellet]* Korsch
 (504.4.131.9v)

14 *artes]* *arce* Saenger (504.1.196.677v)¹³

¹³ This variant was already printed in the 1517 Aldine edition, but this fact apparently escaped Saenger's notice, as he does not mention it in his apparatus in Saenger 1911, 158.

Ciris 46–51:

accipe dona meo multum uigilata labore,
promissa atque diu iam tandem
impia prodigiis ut quondam exterruit amplis
Scylla nouos auium sublimis in aere coetus
uiderit et tenui conscendens aethera penna
caeruleis sua tecta super uolitaueit ales...

47 *promissa atque... tandem*] *promissaque... tandem* [*perlege carta*] Korsch (504.4.131.9v), *promissasque... tandem* [*perlege cartas*] Saenger (504.1.196.678v)

48 *exterruit amplis*] *exterrita* (Schrader) *sompnis* Korsch (504.4.131.9v), *exterrita sanctis* Saenger (504.1.196.678v), *exterrita flendi* Saenger (*ibid.*), *exterrita apertis* Saenger (*ibid.*), *exterrita missis* Saenger (*ibid.*), *exterrita obortis* Saenger (*ibid.*), *exterrita triplis* Saenger (*ibid.*), *exterrita noctis* Saenger (*ibid.*)

Ciris 62–63:

sed neque Maeoniae patiuntur credere chartae,
nec malus istorum dubiis erroribus auctor.

63 *malus istorum*] *Metamorphoseon* Korsch (504.4.131.9v, with a synzesis, referring to Parthenius of Nicaea); *malus*] *meus* Saenger (504.1.196.678v)

Ciris 70–79:

siue etiam iactis speciem mutata uenenis	70
infelix uirgo – quid enim commiserat illa?	
ipse Pater timidam seu complexus harena	
coniugium castae uiolauerat Amphitritae,	
at tamen exegit longo post tempore poenas,	
ut, cum cura tuae ueheretur coniugis alto,	75
ipsa trucem multo misceret sanguine pontum;	
seu uero, ut perhibent, forma cum uinceret omnes	
et cupidos quaestu passim popularet amantes,	
piscibus et canibusque malis uallata repente...	

70 *iactis*] *diris* Sonny (4v)

72 *seua*] *suda* Sonny (4v), *tecta* Saenger (504.1.196.679r)

75 *cura tuae... coniugis alto*] *curua freto... nauis in arto* Korsch (504.4.131.10r, in a letter to Saenger from May 9, 1911)

76 *ipsa... multo] illa... inmerito* Korsch (504.4.131.10r); *ipsa trucem] inmeritum* Saenger (504.1.196.679v), *uirgineum* Saenger (*ibid.*), *litoreum* Saenger (*ibid.*), *perspicuum* Saenger (*ibid.*), *frigidulum* Saenger (*ibid.*), *S[c]yllaeum*¹⁴ Saenger (*ibid.*)

79 *piscibus et canibusque maris uallata repente est] pristibus et canibus maris est uallata repente* Korsch (504.4.131.10r), *piscibus est canibusque maris uallata repente* Saenger (558.4.100.26v, in his response from May 17, 1911 to Korsch's letter quoted above); *canibusque malis] canibus querulis* Sonny (4v)

Ciris 133–141:

sed malus ille puer, quem nec sua flectere mater
 iratum potuit, quem nec pater atque auus idem
 Iuppiter (ille etiam Poenos domitare leones 135
 et ualidas docuit uires mansuescere tigris,
 ille etiam diuos homines –, sed dicere magnum est),
 idem tum tristes acuebat paruulus iras
 Iunonis magnae, cuius periuria diuae
 olim se meminere diu, periura puellae 140
 non nulli liceat uiolauerat inscia sedem...

137 *homines] homini* Korsch (504.4.131.10r; Saenger in his response from May 17, 1911, 558.4.100.26v, finds this suggestion “brilliant” (“Блестяще”), but proposes to connect this text with what follows, *homini sed discere magnum est*, and to put an aposiopesis before it, not after it, as Korsch did)

139 *cuius] quamuis* Korsch (504.4.131.10r)

140–141 *olim se... puellae | non nulli liceat] offensae* (Saenger)... *puella* (H²) | *non ulli* (ed. Ascens. 1501) *licitam* (Mähly) Korsch (504.4.131.10r)

Ciris 174–176:

saepe etiam tristis uoluens in nocte querelas
 sedibus ex altis caeli speculatur amorem
 castraque prospectat crebris lucentia flammis...

175 *caeli... amorem] callem... amorum* Korsch (504.4.131.10r)

¹⁴ The manuscript actually says *Syllaeum*, which is obviously a mistake.

Ciris 184–188:

fertur et horribili praeceps impellitur oestro,
 ut patris, a! demens, crinem de uertice serum 185
 furtimque arguto detonsum mitteret hosti.
 namque haec condicio miserae proponitur¹⁵ una
 siue illa ignorans...

185 *serum*] *ferro* Korsch (504.4.131.10r)

after line 187 [*siue uolens prudensque illi dat pignora regni*] Saenger (504.1.196.682r, a modification of the supplement suggested in Saenger 1911 which had *duci* instead of *illi*)

Ciris 212–219:

tum suspensa leuans digitis uestigia primis
 egreditur ferroque manus armata bidenti
 euolat, at demptae subita in formidine uires.
 caeruleas sua furta prius testatur ad umbras; 215
 nam qua se ad patrium tendebat semita limen,
 uestibulo in thalami paulum remoratur et alti
 suspicit ad caeli nictantia¹⁶ sidera mundi,
 non accepta piis promittens munera diuis.

214 *euolat*] *ambulat* Saenger (504.1.196.685v)

217 *alti*] *ante* Korsch (504.4.131.10r, comparing 215 *prius*)

Ciris 225–227:

non tibi nequiquam uiridis per uiscera pallor
 aegrotas tenui suffudit sanguine uenas,
 nec leuis hoc faceret (neque enim pote) cura subegit...

227 *hoc faceret*] *ut*¹⁷ *fugeret* Korsch (504.4.131.10r)

¹⁵ *Miserae proponitur* ed. Ald. 1517 (treated as an uncontested standard reading in Saenger 1911, 167): *nisi ereptae ponitur* A¹: *nisi creptae ponitur* R: *nisi erepto ponitur* H: *nisi rpto opponitur* ρA².

¹⁶ *Nictantia* Scaliger (treated as an uncontested standard reading in Saenger 1911, 168): *nutantia* AH²ρ: *mutantia* RH¹.

¹⁷ *Vt* was already proposed by Greene 1780, but Korsch apparently did not know that (this conjecture was not mentioned in Saenger 1911).

Ciris 244–249:

si concessus amor noto te macerat igni,
per tibi Dictynnae praesentia numina iuro, 245
prima deum quae dulce mihi te donat alumnam,
omnia me potius digna atque indigna laborum
milia uisuram, quam te tam tristibus istis
sordibus et seonia patiar tabescere tali.

244 *noto*] *casto* Korsch (504.4.131.10v)

247–248 *laborum* | *milia uisuram*] *libenter* | *officia ausuram* Korsch
(504.4.131.10v)

248 *milia uisuram*] *auxilia ausuram* Saenger (504.1.196.683r), *commenta ausuram* Saenger (*ibid.*), *exempla ausuram* Saenger (*ibid.*), *mandata ausuram* Saenger (*ibid.*), *portenta ausuram* Saenger (*ibid.*)

Ciris 349–350:

postera lux ubi laeta diem mortalibus alnum
et gelida ueniente mihi quatiebat ab Oeta...

350 *et gelida ueniente mihi*] *egelida* (Saenger) *reuehens ignem* (G, Haupt) Korsch (504.4.131.10v); *ueniente mihi*] *ueniens* (ed. 1507) *genius* Saenger (504.1.196.687r), *ueniens diuus* Saenger (*ibid.*), *ueniens Phaethon* Saenger (*ibid.*)

Ciris 411–413:

illa ego sum Nisi pollentis filia quondam,
certatim ex omni petiit quam Graecia regno,
quam curuus e terris amplectitur Hellespontus.

413 *quam curuus e terris*] *quamque grauis Graeis* Korsch (504.4.131.10v)

Elegia in Maec. 1. 37–38:

marmora minaei, uincent monumenta libelli:
uiuatur ingenio, cetera mortis erunt.

37 *minaei*] *membranae* Korsch (504.1.196.758r, ascribed to Korsch in a note in Saenger's hand)

Priap. 2. 10–15:
 meis capella delicata pascuis
 in urbem adulta lacte portat ubera
 meisque pinguis agnus ex ouilibus
 grauem domum remittit aere dext<e>ram¹⁸
 teneraque matre mugiente uaccula
 deum profundit ante templa sanguinem.

14 *teneraque*] *tremensque* Korsch (504.4.131.8r)

Mikhail Shumilin

RANEPa;

A. M. Gorky Institute of World Literature, RAS;

National Research University Higher School of Economics

mvlshumilin@gmail.com

Bibliography

- M. Dolç (ed.), *Apèndix Virgiliana* (Barcelona 1982–1984).
 H. R. Fairclough, G. P. Goold (eds.), *Virgil: Aeneid VII–XII, Appendix Vergiliana* (Cambridge, MA 2000).
 E. B. Greene, “The Ceiris of Vergil”, in: E. B. Greene (ed.), *The Argonautic Expedition I* (London 1780) 261–303.
 A. E. Housman, *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge 1972).
 B. Kayachev (ed.), *Ciris: A Poem from the Appendix Vergiliana* (Swansea 2020).
 B. Kayachev, “Conjectural Emendation in the *Appendix Vergiliana*: The Case of the *Moretum*”, in: B. Kayachev (ed.), *Poems without Poets: Approaches to Anonymous Ancient Poetry* (Cambridge 2021) 187–202.
 K. Münscher, “Zu Vergil Catalepton V”, *Hermes* 47 (1912) 153–154.
 J. A. Richmond (ed.), “Priapea et Catalepton”, in: W. V. Clausen, F. R. D. Good-year, E. J. Kenney, J. A. Richmond (eds.), *Appendix Vergiliana* (Oxford 1966) 127–146.
 G. E. Saenger, “Zametki k latinskim tekstam” [“Notes on Latin Texts”], *ZhMNP* 335 (June 1901, Classical section) 118–131.
 G. E. Saenger, “Zametki k latinskim tekstam” [“Notes on Latin Texts”], *ZhMNP* 362 (November 1905, Classical section) 481–508.

¹⁸ *Dexteram* ed. Ald. 1517 (treated as an uncontested standard reading in Saenger 1910, 531): *dextram* B.

- G. E. Saenger, “Zametki k latinskim tekstam” [“Notes on Latin Texts”], *ZhMNP* 6 (December 1906, Classical section) 533–595.
- G. E. Saenger, “Zametki k latinskim tekstam” [“Notes on Latin Texts”], *ZhMNP* 41 (December 1910, Classical section) 523–569.
- G. E. Saenger, “Zametki k latinskim tekstam” [“Notes on Latin Texts”], *ZhMNP* 32 (April 1911, Classical section) 155–194.
- A. Salvatore (ed.), *Appendix Vergiliana: Epigrammata et Priapea* (Naples 1963).
- D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Statius: Silvae* (Cambridge, MA – London 2003).
- D. N. Shilov, “Ministr ponevole: tvorchestvo i karera v sudbe G.E. Zengera” [“A Minister against his Own Will: Creative Work and Career in the Life of Grigory E. Saenger”], in: R. S. Ganelin (ed.), *Iz istorii russkoy intelligentsii* (St Petersburg 2003) 484–502.
- M. Shumilin, “An Unpublished letter by A. E. Housman Related to the Textual Criticism of Statius’ *Silvae*”, *Philologus* 166 (2022) 272–281.
- M. Shumilin, T. Kostyleva, P. Rezykh, “An Unpublished Letter from Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Grigory E. Saenger”, *Aristeas* 26 (2022) 255–263.
- V. P. Smyshlyaeva, *Rossiyskie filologi-klassiki XIX veka: “Germanovskoe” napravlenie (materialy dlya biograficheskogo slovary)* [19th Century Russian Classical Philologists: ‘Hermann’s Trend’ (Materials for a Biographical Dictionary)] (St Petersburg 2015).
- V. P. Smyshlyaeva, “Zenger Grigoriy Eduardovich” [“Saenger, Grigory E.”], in: A. K. Gavrilov (ed.), *Slovar peterburgskikh antikovedov XIX – nachala XX veka I* (St Petersburg 2021) 291–296.
- R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis libellus qui inscribitur Catalepton* (Assen 1949–1953).

The paper is dedicated to the publication of a set of previously unpublished conjectures to the so-called *Appendix Vergiliana* (the corpus of works ascribed to Vergil other than the three canonical ones) by three scholars of the Russian Empire, Fyodor E. Korsch (1843–1915), Grigory E. Saenger (1853–1919), and Adolf I. Sonny (1861–1922). The conjectures probably all date between 1901 and 1919 and are extant in the correspondence of the three scholars and Saenger’s marginal handwritten notes on the offprints of his papers, both types of sources preserved in the scholarly archives of Saenger and Korsch in the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow (Funds 504 and 558 respectively).

В статье публикуется ряд не появлявшихся ранее в печати конъектур к т. н. *Appendix Vergiliana* (корпусу произведений, приписывавшихся Вергилию помимо трех канонических) трех ученых, работавших в Российской

империи: Федора Евгеньевича Корша (1843–1919), Григория Эдуардовича Зенгера (1853–1919) и Адольфа Израилевича Сонни (1861–1922). Вероятно, все конъектуры датируются между 1901 и 1919 гг.; они сохранились в переписке трех ученых и в рукописных записях Зенгера на полях оттисков его собственных работ в научных архивах Зенгера и Корша (Архив Российской Академии Наук, Москва, фонды 504 и 558 соответственно).

Hanan M. I. Ismail

THE DATE OF *P. ALEX. INV. 622*, PAGE 28.
A PAPYRUS FROM HERAKLEIDOU MERIS IN
THE ARSINOITE NOME

Despite the gaps and missing lines that hinder a full reading and make the text too fragmentary to be translated, *P. Alex. inv. 622* preserves precious information, in particular a Roman *tria nomina* formula that was attested once in another papyrus (*P. Gen. II 97*). Moreover, it is possibly attested in the third one, which is a fiscal register, recently published in *P. Stras. X*; there the cognomen is abridged, which leaves room for discussion whether it is the same one or not. The same is true for the epitaph from Misenum, *CIL X 3385*, that does not contradict with their date. Thus, the paper makes a contribution to the prosopography of Roman Egypt.

It is of great importance that *P. Alex. inv. 622* preserves two geographical sites in the Arsinoite Nome. One of them, vaguely, was no longer mentioned in the sources since the second quarter of the third century AD. Additionally, the papyrus' handwriting was described by the editor as neat and cursive, and it was written down in a document classified as a small size official document 4 × 9.5 cm, in 8 lines. These palaeographical details must be considered to establish the date of the papyrus and to reedit it.¹

P. Alex. 622, page 28 (I–IV AD, Arsin.):

[3 lines missing]

4 [- ca.? -] Μάρκου Ἀγτωνίου Ἀπολλιναρίου ἀποκεχώρηκεν .
[- ca.? -]

5 [- ca.? - Ἡρακ]λείδου μερίδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοΐτου νομοῦ ἐν
μεγτέ[- ca.? -]

6 [- ca.? -] . . . ἀπὸ ἀρουρῶν τεσσάρων . . . ὑπὲρ ἐνε . . . [- ca.? -]

7 [- ca.? - τέ]ταρτον καὶ ἐν πεδίῳ Ψεναρψεννήσεως ἐν το . [- ca.? -]

8 [1 line missing]

¹ Alexandria's Greco-Roman Museum was closed since 2005 till now (2022) for development. So, its holdings of papyrus were stored in Alexandria's National Museum. During this long period the museum's holdings of papyrus had been already subject to modern techniques of restoration to provide the papyrologists, after reopening, with better readable texts.

There is a discrepancy of dates in both of the published editions as well as in digital databases. According to *Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis*, the document dates back to the first four centuries AD, while according to *DDbDP* it is dated from 30 BC to AD 323, and according to *Trismegistos* – AD 1–299.² On the other hand, Giuseppe Botti, in 1901, registered the fragment as a piece of the holdings of Alexandria's Greco-Roman Museum, which was preserved in Sale no. 6, in one of the furthest vitrines (F, G etc.). He classified it as “papyrus, dont le déchiffrement n'est pas définitif”,³ and dated it to the Byzantine period.⁴ In 1964 Anna Swiderek and Mariangela Vandoni published it as a document from the Arsinoite Nome. They classified it as a contract without giving a date.⁵

For adjusting the papyrus' date from a historical perspective, the following considerations are crucial:

First, line 4 preserves the *tria nomina* Marcus Antonius Apollinarius, in the genitive case, Μάρκου Ἀγτωνίου Ἀπολλιναρίου ἀποκεχώρηκεν. So, it is most likely to imply his son. The personal name of Marcus Antonius could be adopted in two ways: (1) since the second half of the first century BC, it was generally the result of recruiting in the east by Mark Antony during the second Triumvirate (43–33 BC),⁶ as soldiers who received Roman citizenship adopted the praenomen and nomen of their general;⁷ (2) it was also given to the freedmen of Antonia Minor (35 BC – AD 37), the daughter of Mark Antony and Octavia. Later she became the mother of Emperor Claudius.⁸ In dating the papyrus back to 30 BC as *terminus post quem* the scholars from *DDbDP* presumably base on the first option. However, does it match with the other attestations of these *tria nomina*?

² See Papyri info: [https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.alex;;inv622?rows=3&start=213&fl=id,title&fq=collection:ddbdp&fq=\(ddbdp_series:p.alex+OR+hgv_series:p.alex+OR+dclp_series:p.alex\)&sort=series+asc,volume+asc,item+asc&p=214&t=227](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.alex;;inv622?rows=3&start=213&fl=id,title&fq=collection:ddbdp&fq=(ddbdp_series:p.alex+OR+hgv_series:p.alex+OR+dclp_series:p.alex)&sort=series+asc,volume+asc,item+asc&p=214&t=227).

³ Botti 1901, 340.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 339.

⁵ Swiderek 1964, 23 (B. Contrats).

⁶ Groebe 1894, 2611 ff.

⁷ Mclean 2002, 8; Zoumbaki 2008, 167.

⁸ Oost 1958, 113–139; Zager 2014, 67–75.

The same personal name, Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος], is attested in *P. Gen. II 97. 14* dating from the second half of the first century AD.⁹ It is part of the tax register in alphabetical order (letter M).¹⁰ The provenance of *P. Gen. II 97* is unknown.¹¹ Nevertheless, three Roman citizens' names are attested among the documents from Arsinoite in the papyrus from Geneva.

The son of Μᾶρκος Οὐαλέριος Βερνε[κιανός] (*P. Gen. II 97. 18*)¹² and a son or grandson of Μᾶρκος Πετρώνιος Κέλερ (*P. Gen. II 97. 22*), bearing the *duo nomina*, are mentioned together in a document from the Arsinoite nome.¹³ Additionally, [Οὐαλέριος] Λόγγος, most likely the son or grandson of Μᾶρκος Οὐαλέριος Λόγγος (*P. Gen. II 97. 3*), was attested in the Arsinoite nome.¹⁴ Furthermore, the second attestation of Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος] (*P. Gen. II 97. 14*) is *P. Alex. 622. 4*: Μάρκου Ἀγτωνίου Ἀπολλιναρίου, which evidently comes from the Arsinoite nome. So there is enough evidence that Arsinoite is the provenance of *P. Gen. II 97*. In the light of this evidence *P. Alex. inv. 622* also originates from Arsinoite.

Four more documents from Egypt mention Roman citizens with *nomen gentile* Marcus Antonius and a *cognomen* beginning with Apol():

P. Gen. II 97. 14 (AD 50–99): the *tria nomina* Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος].

P. Stras. X 902, col. 8. 2 (AD 100–101, Herm.): the *tria nomina* Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιο(ς) Ἀπολ().

O. Claud. II 390. 9 and *388. 6* (AD 100–150): the *duo nomina* Ἀντ(ώνιος) Ἀπολ(λινάριος).

⁹ *P. Gen. II 97* (AD 50–99), l. 14–15: ¹⁴ Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος] - ca.? -] ¹⁵ προσδιαγραφομένων (ἡμιωβέλιον) χ(αλκ) [- ca.? -].

¹⁰ Martin 1932, 549–553.

¹¹ Martin 1932, 549: “Rien ne permet de déterminer à quelle region de l'Égypte appartiennent ces propriétaires”.

¹² *P. Diog. 7* (26 Mai – 3 August AD 142, Arsin.), l. 30: Οὐ[α]λέριον Βερνικιαγόν. Valerius Bernicianus is mentioned along with the son of Marcus Petronius Celer, l. 31: Πετρώνιον Κέλερα, in a cession of a katoikic land.

¹³ *P. Diog. 6. 27–30* (26 Mai – 3 August AD 142, Arsin.): Οὐαλέριον Βερνικι/ανόν, together with Πε[τρ]ώ[νιον] Κ[έ]λερα, in a cession of a katoikic land, cf. Schubert 2000, 182–184, no. 62.

¹⁴ *BGU I 69. 1–2*: [Οὐαλέριος] Λόγγος [ι]π[πεύς] εἵλης Ἀπριανῆ[ς] τ[ύ]ρ[μ]ης Τρανιανῆς (22 June AD 120, Arsin.).

This evidence shows that such a combination of names could appear since the mid-first till the mid-second centuries AD.

Nevertheless, one should not disregard that Roman families used to bequeath names over generations, and the same *tria nomina* could emerge in the third generation or after. For instance, veteran Marcus Valerius Turbo, belonging to the second century AD,¹⁵ gave his *praenomen* and *nomen gentile* to his two sons, who were called Marcus Valerius Longinus and Marcus Valerius Montanus.¹⁶ So we can argue that this veteran was the son of Marcus Valerius Turbo in *P. Gen.* 97,¹⁷ as they bequeath the personal name Marcus Valerius over generations. Additionally, Marcus Antonius Longus was the father of Marcus Antonius Serinus.¹⁸ Another Marcus Antonius set a gravestone up to his father, Marcus Antonius Valens.¹⁹ Moreover, two siblings were named Marcus Antonius Heliodorus and Marcus Antonius Aper.²⁰

Accordingly, in view of the probability that the same *tria nomina* might appear in the third or fourth generation, the *terminus ante quem* for *P. Alex.* 622 should be prolonged to the end of the second century AD. This result matches well with the date of the epitaph, the second century AD,²¹ to a gubernator called M(arcus) Antoni(us)

¹⁵ *BGU VII* 1565 (28 Oct. AD 169, Philadelphia, Arsin.), cession of 6 arourai of katoikic land, ll. 4–5: παρὰ Μάρκου Ουαλερίου Τούρβωνος στρατιώτου περὶ Φιλαδέλφειαν σειτικὰς; 1574 (AD 176, Philadelphia), his will to his children, ll. 3–4: Μάρ[κω Ουαλερίω] Τούρβωνι ἐνωπίω, 10, 21; *BGU VII* 1662 (29 Sept. AD 182, Ptolemais Euergetis, Arsin.), ll. 2: ὁμολογεῖ Κυρίλλα θυ[γά]τηρ Μάρκου Ουαλερίου Τούρβ[ωνο]ς ἀστή, 6, 12.

¹⁶ *BGU VII* 1662 (29 Sept. AD 182).

¹⁷ *P. Gen.* II 97. 9–10: Μάρκος Ουαλέριος Τούρβω[v - ca.? -] ναυβίου (δραχμή) α προσδιαγ[ραφομένων].

¹⁸ *P. Hamb.* I 97. 2 (29 Aug. AD 104 – 28 Aug. AD 105, Philadelphia, Arsin.), ll. 1–2: [ὁ δεῖνα] Μάρκω Ἀντωνίω [Σ]ερήνω ἀφήλεις[ι] [- ca.12 -][διὰ τ]οῦ πατρὸς Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Λόγγου [.][χαίρειν.

¹⁹ *CIL VIII* 3405 (not dated, Numidia): *D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Antoni/us Valens vi/xit an(nos) XXIII / M(arcus) Antonius / f(ilius) pio fecit.*

²⁰ *PSI XIII* 1325 (AD 172–175), ll. 1–2: Νεμεσίωνι γυμ(νασιαρχήσαντι) βιβλ(ιοφύλακι) ἐνκτή(σεων) Ἡρακλεοπ(ολίτου) [παρὰ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Ἡλιοδώρου καὶ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Ἄπερος - ca.? - περὶ τῆς διαθήκης] λελυμ(ένης) ἐπὶ σφρ(αγιστῶν), τ[ῆ]ς μετηλλαχ(υίας) ἡμῶν μητρὸς Σαβί[ν]ιας Ἀπολλωναρίου.

²¹ This is an approximate date (AD 150/250), offered by *EDR*, depending only on the text formula and palaeography.

Apol[], in the fleet of Misenum, which was rife with marines from Egypt.²²

Second, another phrase that is important for determining the date of *P. Alex. 622* is ἐν πεδίῳ Ψεναρψεννήσεως in line 7. The plain of Psenarpsennesis²³ was not a village, but rather a region, which bordered the territory of Karanis and was cultivated with wheat, date palms and especially olive trees.²⁴ The late papyri that mention the plain and in the same time dated by the Egyptian regnal year of Emperors are undoubtedly the best to rely on. Thus, the latest two pieces of evidence are:

1) *P. Mich.* VI 372, an assessment list from Karanis, Arsinoite nome, dates back to 30 Aug. AD 179 – 28 Aug. AD 180 or 30 Aug. AD 211 – 28 Aug. AD 212, depending on col. ii. 3: ἐν κδ (ἔτει), which is followed by tax charges, evidently, pertaining to the 19th year of the Emperor's reign, col. ii. 6: ιθ (ἔτους). Accordingly, the papyrus was written in an Emperor's reign that lasted at least twenty-four years. Thus, the date at which this document was compiled is restricted to the reigns of Commodus (27 November AD 176 – 31 December AD 192) and Caracalla (28 January AD 198 – 8 April AD 217), because the reign of Emperor Commodus ran to thirty-three Egyptian regnal years,²⁵ and Emperor Caracalla to twenty-five Egyptian regnal years (Year 1 = AD 192/3); the latest dating by Caracalla from the Arsinoite, which is the second latest from Egypt, dated year 25, Epeiph 6 = June 30 AD 217.²⁶

2) *P. Gen.* III 145, a receipt for the payment of τέλος καταλοχισμῶν from the Arsinoite nome, ll. 8–11: (ἔτους) ιδ Λουκίου Σεπτιμίου

²² CIL X 3385: *D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Antoni Apol[(?)] / gubernato[ris] / centur(ia) Ar[ri(?)]---*; Hopkins 2014, 79 n. 332; Fiebigier 1894, 416 n. 161. He classified *Centuria Arrii* among the seven uncertain naval centuriae.

²³ The name appears chiefly in papyri in the form Ψεναρψενήσις, more rarely as Ψεναρσενήσις, Ψεναρψεννήσις, Ψιναρψενήσις. There are also different ways of abbreviation of the name in the documents. Cf. Selim 2016, 1974.

²⁴ Selim 2016, 1973–1974.

²⁵ BGU XIII 2289 (Aug. 29 AD 192 – Aug. 28 AD 193, Ptolemais Nea, Arsinoites), ll. 1–4: ἔτους λγ Λουκίου Αἰλίου Αὐρηλίου Κομ[μόδου] Καίσαρος τοῦ κυ[ρίου] - ca.? -] κδ.; BGU I 270 (29 Dec. AD 192, Soknopaiu Nesos, Arsinoites), ll. 1–3: ἔτους λγ Λουκίου Αἰλίου Αὐρηλίου Κομ[μόδου] Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Τυβί γ. BGU II 651 (May 9 AD 192, Karanis, Arsinoites), ll. 12–14: (ἔτους) λβ Λουκίου Αἰλίου Αὐρηλίου Κομ[μόδου] Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Παχὼν ιδ.

²⁶ SB XII 10913. 6–8: (ἔτους) κε Ἐπίφ ἕκτη ς; Rathbone 1986, 105.

Σεουήρου [Ε]ψεβοῦς Περτίνακος Ἀραβικοῦ Ἀδιαβηνικοῦ Παρθικοῦ Μεγίστου καὶ Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου [Ἀν]τωνί[νου] Εὐ[σε]βοῦς Σεβαστῶν καὶ Πουβλίου Σ[ε]πτιμίου [Γέ]τα Καί[σα]ρος Σε[βαστο]ῦ Τ[ῦ]βι κε. Thus, the document was written down on the 25th of Tybi, the 14th year of Emperor Septimius Severus' reign, which corresponds to the 20th of January AD 206. Accordingly, one could conclude that the latest evidence for the Plain Psenarpsennesis is AD 212, and it does not appear in the documents from the second quarter of the third century AD. What could be the cause for this?

Huebner suggests that such cases of abandoning the areas that hitherto were prosperous with agriculture are due to climate change alongside irrigation problems that arose simultaneously in several villages at the outer edge of the Fayum depression, which led to the progressive desertification of land, as well as a series of below-average Nile floods in the 240s and 260s. Furthermore, climate proxies which record a general shift in African monsoon patterns at the source areas of the Nile and consecutively lower Nile flood levels from the middle of the third century on, corroborate this impression.²⁷ Huebner's view matches well with the low level of the Nile attested in AD 221.²⁸

On the other hand, Lippert suggests that the initial element Pse-/Psi-corresponds to *P3-šy-* that in Demotic means “the lake”, which is plausible phonetically. She links the appearance of Pedion Psenarpsennesis with the body of water called μικρὰ λίμνη,²⁹ or “small lake”, that existed once in the Herakleidou meris. When the water level of the Fayum Lake fell after the New Kingdom (c. 1539–1075 BC), it was only attested in Greek texts of the third cent. BC and disappeared by the Roman period, when the water level in the “lake” fell by another 40 meters.³⁰ Thus, Lippert believes that the plain of Psenarpsennesis took its name from this former lake, “the lake of Harpsenesis” (*P3-šy-Hr-p3-šr-n-Ġs.t*),³¹ in the middle of which was a sanctuary of Harpsenesis, and which by slowly shrinking towards the south had left behind a fertile agricultural plain in the north; the “small lake” no longer existed in the Roman period, but there still was

²⁷ Huebner 2020, Abstract.

²⁸ Swiderek 1971, 31–44.

²⁹ Bonneau 1993, 53 n. 426, 54.

³⁰ Lippert 2020, 153–157.

³¹ Selim 2016, 1974 n. 7: “The second part of the name which is *Hr-p3-šr-n-Ġs.t* (Harpsenesis) means in Demotic ‘Horus son of Isis’”.

a canal. She concluded that this region was exposed to geomorphological changes over centuries.³² Moreover, Fayum was not insulated from the variability of the Nile, and relied on flood-recession deposits of silt just as other arable areas did.³³

On the other hand, *P. Alex. inv. 622* attests in line 7 the word τέ]ταρτον, which refers to a fraction of land area,³⁴ or even of a tax in kind.³⁵ Therefore, the plain of Psenarpsennesis was still in its thriving cultivated period, and under the concern of the Roman administration. So, the verb ἀποκεχώρηκεν (l. 4) should not be explained by fleeing from paying dues because of poverty. The holder of the *tria nomina* and his son were Roman citizens, not Egyptians who were forced to flee due to their inability to meet the exactions of the state.³⁶ Furthermore, a Roman citizen was exempted from liturgies, which might be burdensome enough to push men to leave their property.³⁷ Motivation for abandoning this land could be the lack of security, as some complaints of robbery accidents in Pedion Psenarpsennesis are attested around the proposed date of the document under study.³⁸

³² Lippert 2020, 154–155.

³³ Adams 2019, 235.

³⁴ *P. Brook.* 8 (AD 177, Arsinoe), ll. 25–26: ἐλαιῶνος ἀρούρης τέταρτον κα[ι] [ἄλλην περι κόμην Κ]ερκεσοῦχα σιτικὴν ἄρουραν; *P. Cair. Mich.* III 8 (1) (AD 82–96, Karanis), l. 19: κόμης τε[τέταρτ]ον ἀρούρ[ης] κα[ι] τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν; *P. Lond.* II 141 (3 Jun. AD 88, Karanis), ll. 6–7: τ]ὸ νέοφυ[τον περι] δὲ Ψε[ν]αρψενῆσιν τ[ῆς] αὐτῆς μερίδος ἀρουρῶν τριῶν Ἡρακοῦλιδος λεγομένων [τ]ῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀρουρῶν δεκαδύο ἡμίσεις τετάρτου ἢ ὅσων; *P. Mich.* IX 539 (23 June AD 53, Karanis), ll. 13–16: καὶ περὶ Ψεναρψενῆσιν τ[ῆς] αὐτῆς μερίδος ἐλαιῶνος 15 ἄρουραι τρεῖς ἡμισὺς τέταρτ[ον] δυτριάκος[τόν]; *P. Mich.* IX 554 (before AD 93, Karanis), ll. 9–10: καὶ περὶ 10 [Καρανίδα κλήρου κατοικικοῦ ἄρου]ραι δύο τέταρτον; *SB IV* 7379 (26 April AD 177, Ptolemais Eurgetis), l. 18: καὶ ἐν τόπῳ Κεντεκὲμ σιτικὰς ἀρούρας τέσσαρες τέταρτον.

³⁵ *P. Mich.* VI 395 (8 Jun. AD 183, Karanis), ll. 11–13: γίνονται (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) θ β', ἐπιβῶλ() ὁ α(ὐτὸς) δύο τέταρτον, (γίνονται) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) β δ'.

³⁶ Wallace 1938, 191, 460.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 115.

³⁸ A number of veterans held lands in Domitian's reign ἐν πεδίῳ Ψεναρψενῆσεως, cf. *SB XX* 15346 (AD 88–89). But complaints of robbery accidents, and need for urgent security, grew from the end of the 1st cent. to the 1st half of the 2nd cent. and on, cf. *SB XIV* 12022 (AD 100); *SB XX* 15779 (AD 100); *SB XXII* 15781 (AD 158/9); *SB XXIV* 16252; *P. Cair. Mich.* II 17 (AD 156/9, Karanis).

To sum up, the evidence presented in this paper indicate that *P. Alex.* inv. 622 dates back to the first two centuries AD. No evidence supports 30 BC to be the *terminus post quem*, or the third and fourth centuries AD to be the *terminus ante quem*. There is no bar against considering its *terminus post quem* to be AD 50, as it is the case for *P. Gen.* II 97. Accordingly, it can be argued that *P. Alex.* inv. 622, page 28 dates back to AD 50–200.

Hanan M. I. Ismail

Ain Shams University, Cairo

hanan.ismail@art.asu.edu.eg

Bibliography

- C. Adams, “Stimuli for Irrigation, Agriculture and Quarrying”, in: K. Vanderpe (ed.), *A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Medford 2019) 233–250.
- D. Bonneau, *Le régime administratif de l’eau du Nil dans l’Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine*, *Probleme der Ägyptologie* 8 (Leiden 1993).
- G. Botti, *Catalogue des Monuments exposés au Musée Gréco-Romain d’Alexandrie* (Alexandria 1901).
- O. Fiebiger, “De classium Italicarum historia et institutis”, in: O. Ribbeck et al. (eds.), *Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie* 15: 2 (Leipzig 1894) 275–462.
- P. Groebe, “Antonius 30”, *RE* 1 (1894) 2595–2614.
- L. Hopkins, *Fleets and Manpower on Land and Sea: The Italian “classes” and the Roman Empire 31 B.C. – A.D. 193*, PhD Thesis (Oxford 2014).
- S. R. Huebner, “Did Shifts in the African Monsoon Lead to the Decline of the Roman Fayum from the Third Century CE?”, in: *Climate Change in the Breadbasket of the Roman Empire. Reconstructing Nile Floods for the Roman Period*, *Studies in Late Antiquity* 4/4 (Basel 2010) 486–518.
- S. L. Lippert, M. Schentuleit, “Agreements and Accounts. On-going Research on Economic Activities of the Temple of Soknopaiou Nesos according to the Demotic Texts”, in: A. Jördens, U. Yiftah-Firanko (eds.), *Accounts and Bookkeeping in the Ancient World: Question of Structure (Legal Documents in Ancient Societies. Conference VIII: Schwetzingen, 24–26.9.2016)*, *PHILIPPIKA: Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen / Contributions to the Study of Ancient World Cultures* 55/ 2 (Wiesbaden 2020) 141–157.
- V. Martin, “Propriétaires romains en Égypte sous l’Empire”, in: *Mélanges Glotz* II (Paris 1932) 549–553.

- B. H. McLean, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Konya Archaeological Museum*, The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph Series 29 (Ankara 2002).
- S. I. Oost, “The Career of M. Antonius Pallas”, *AJPh* 79: 2 (1958) 113–139.
- D. W. Rathbone, “The Dates of the Recognition in Egypt of the Emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus”, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 101–131.
- P. Schubert, *Vivre en Egypte greco-romaine*, Éditions de l’Aire (Vevey 2000).
- E. A. Selim, “Where was Psenharsenes?” in: T. Derda, A. Łajtar, J. Urbanik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology, Warsaw 29 July – 3 August 2013*, JJP suppl. 28, III (Warsaw 2016) 1973–1980.
- A. Swiderek, M. Vandoni, *Papyrus grecs du Musée gréco-romain d’Alexandrie (P. Alex.)*, Travaux du Centre d’Archéologie Méditerranéenne de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences sous la direction de K. Michalowski 2 (Warsaw 1964).
- A. Swiderek, “The Land Register of the *φερνουφίτου* Toparchy in Mendesian nome”, *JJP* 16–17 (1971) 31–44.
- S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, Princeton University Studies in Papyrology 2 (Princeton 1938).
- I. Zager, *The Political Role of Women of the Roman Elite with Particular Attention to the Autonomy and Influence of The Julio-Claudian Women 44 B.C. – 68 A.D.*, PhD thesis, University of South Africa (Pretoria 2014).
- S. Zoumbaki, “The Colonists of the Roman East and their Leading Groups: Some Notes on their Entering the Equestrian and Senatorial Ranks in Comparison with the Native Elites”, *Tyche. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, Papyrologie und Epigraphie* 23 (2008) 159–179.

This paper endeavors to determine the proper date of *P. Alex. inv. 622*, page 28, a papyrus from the holding of Alexandria’s Greco-Roman Museum. In “Catalogue des Monuments exposés au Musée Gréco-Romain d’Alexandrie” (1901) it was registered as a papyrus from the Byzantine period. In the publication of 1964 it was undated, and in online databases it is dated differently. As a result, this document has not properly been taken into account in scholarly research.

The study of the document from a historical perspective (onomastic and prosopographic analysis of the name Μάρκος Ἀγτώνιος Ἀπολλινάριος and considerations on the toponym πεδίων Ψεναρψεννήσεως) allows to date the papyrus from 50 to 200 AD and draw attention to its potential historic value.

В статье ставится задача уточнить датировку папируса *P. Alex.* инв. 622, с. 28 из собрания Греко-Римского музея Александрии. В каталоге 1901 г. он значился как папирус византийской эпохи, в публикации 1964 г. датировка не приводилась, а в электронных базах данных данные расходятся. Как следствие, документ практически не учитывался в научных исследованиях.

Изучение папируса в исторической перспективе (ономастический и просопографический анализ имени Μάρκος Αὐτῶνιος Ἀπολλινάριος и соображения о топониме Псенарпсеннесида) позволяют датировать его между 50 и 200 г. н. э. и привлечь внимание исследователей к его потенциальной исторической ценности.

Gabriel Estrada San Juan

PIPA AND GALLIENUS*

I. Introduction

It is no secret that emperor Gallienus was as unfortunate in his reign as in the Latin historiographical tradition that succeeded him. An animosity began to take shape at the end of the third century as a result of the separation of Gaul and the East during his tenure,¹ and it seems to have its greatest exponent in the source known as the *Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte* (*EKG*), a hypothetical lost work postulated by A. Enmann in 1884, dating after Constantine's death.²

In these literary sources, this attitude towards Gallienus enhances the contrast between the “bad prince” and the *princeps optimus*, a very common rhetorical device in ancient historiography which, in this case, has an impact in favour of Claudius Gothicus, the ancestor of the Constantinian dynasty. The heir works to the *EKG* certainly denote notable Constantinian propaganda. Curiously, in the Greek tradition this contrast is seen in the opposite direction: Valerian, celebrated by Trebelius Pollio in the *HA*, is the object of sharp judgement in Zosimus (1. 36), while Gallienus is treated in a neutral light (1. 37–40) or even praised in Zonaras (12. 25) and Malalas (12. 27), both of whom describe him as magnanimous and kind towards the needy.³

* *Grup de Recerques en Antiguitat Tardana* (University of Barcelona). This study was undertaken within the framework of the research project PID2019-104448GB-I00 (Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness) and the group 2017 SGR211 of AGAUR (Agència de Gestió d'Ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca).

¹ *Pan. Lat.* 8[4]. 10. 1, from 297, where his neglect or bad fortune is lamented, as opposed to the restoration of the borders by the Tetrarchs.

² Enmann 1884, proposing a date slightly later than 284. This date has been moved to a period normally between 337 and 357: Barnes 1970; Bird 1973; Burgess 2005 and 1995, as used by Chastagnol 1970, 10; Syme 1980, 260 (= 1983, 151); 1971a, 221 f.; 1971b, 40.

³ The Christian literature is also favourable, for obvious reasons. Emperor Julian is an exception, since his opinions on Gallienus, despite writing in Greek, are founded on the tradition from the *EKG* (*Caes.* 313 c). A good resume is available in Wickert 1926, 366.

In any case, no hypothesis is exclusive or changes the fact that the portrait of Gallienus' reign in Latin tradition offers a litany of deadly sins: from the neglect of the government (Aur. Vict. 33. 3; Eutr. 9. 8; 11; SHA *Gall.* 4. 3; 5.7; 6. 3–7; Hier. *Chron.* 304 i) and his idleness and gluttony (Aur. Vict. 33. 15; SHA *Gall.* 3. 6–7; 9. 3; 16. 1–3; 17. 4–6; *Tyr. Trig.* 29. 1), to the fiercest cruelty (SHA *Gall.* 11. 2; 18. 1; *Tyr. Trig.* 9. 3–9; 26. 1–2, 5) or contempt for his captive father (SHA *Gall.* 1. 1–2; 3. 8–9; 9. 2, 7; 10. 2, 5; 17. 1), and ending with a liking for taverns (Aur. Vict. 33. 6; Amm. Marc. 14. 1. 9; SHA *Gall.* 21. 6; *Tyr. Trig.* 3. 4; 9. 1; 23. 1; 29. 1) and women (Aur. Vict. 33. 6; SHA *Gall.* 17. 7–9; 21. 3; *Tyr. Trig.* 3. 4; 9. 1; 29. 1; Oros. 7. 22. 13). This final excess will be the object of our attention: the account of Pipa, or Pipara, Gallienus' barbarian concubine. This is an outstanding and unique episode which encompasses several scholarly fields, especially the Empire's diplomatic dealings in response to the border pressure issues in the north. The sources are scarce and at the same time both complementary and contradictory, so it is necessary to sift the information and determine the certainties and possibilities before making use of them.

II. Princess Pipa in Historiography

Indeed, the misgovernment of this “bad emperor” is illustrated by the account that refers to a certain barbarian princess, Pipa by name (*PIR*² P 317; *PLRE* I Pipa), with whom Gallienus kept concubinage, which is presented as nefarious.

Three documents refer to this woman. They all take from Enmann's common source, and despite the obvious similarities, some notable differences can be observed.

In the first place, Aurelius Victor (*c.* 360) reports the following (*Caes.* 33. 6–7):

Inter haec ipse popinas ganeasque obiens lenonum ac vinariorum amicitii haerebat, expositus Saloninae coniugi atque amoris flagitioso filiae Attali Germanorum regis, Pipae nomine; qua causa etiam civiles motus longe atrociores orti. Namque primus omnium Postumus, qui forte barbaris per Galliam praesidebat, imperium ereptum ierat.⁴

⁴ Pichlmayr–Gruendel 1966, 109. Henceforth we will use the Teubner edition for the four quoted passages.

Meanwhile, (Gallienus) kept visiting dens and taverns and befriended pimps and wine-drinkers, while abandoned to his wife Salonina and his scandalous love towards the daughter of the Germanic king Attalus, Pipa by name. Because of that, more dreadful wars started. Indeed, Postumus, who was ruling the Gaul against the barbarians by chance, was the first of all to take the power.

This passage presents the relationship between the princess and the emperor as part of the vices of the latter, on the same level as drinking and frequenting dens of ill repute. Although Pipa's father is identified as a Germanic king named Attalus⁵ (*PIR*² A 1328; *PLRE* I Attalus), the data remains anecdotal and irrelevant, the result of copying the base source for the text.

In addition to associating this “love affair” with other vices of the emperor, it is also explicitly denigrated as “shameful” (*flagitioso*), an adjective not applied to his consort, Cornelia Salonina,⁶ whose mention seems to confirm the “affair” was contemporary to the marriage. Indeed, there is no record that the Augusta Salonina died or lost her rank at any time during her husband's reign. She is placed in Milan in 268, shortly before her husband's death, by Zonaras (12. 25).⁷

Finally, the consequences of this grievance transcend the family realm and, like all Gallienus' vices, affect the stability of the State as the cause of new civil wars, for example the uprising in Gaul led by Postumus. The causality is not specified so it should not go beyond rhetoric. Nevertheless, the statement is useful to give an *ante quem* date to the beginning of the

⁵ The name is a Latin adaptation of the Germanic root *Adl* found in names like “Albert” or “Alphonse”, which in turn recalls the Greek, unrelated name of the kings of Pergamon. A similar case is that of one of the sons of Zenobia, *Hairan* or *Haeranes* (*PIR*² S 329), altered to form *Herodes* (*PLRE* I Herodes 1), *Herodianus* (*PLRE* I Herodianus 3) and *Herennianus* (*PIR*² H 95; *PLRE* I Herennianus 1); or another of her sons *Wahballath*, adapted as *Vabalathus* and translated as *Athenodorus* (*PIR*² S 347; *PLRE* I Athenodorus 2); a summary of this series of names can be found in Stoneman 1992, 114 f.

⁶ Although it may not be referred to as *flagitiosus*, Gallienus “abandoned” (*expositus*) to his wife Salonina also offers an obvious negative connotation. This has a place in the negative treatment we find in Aurelius Victor towards the female characters who engaged in politics, such as Messalina (4. 5), Plotina (13. 13), Julia Domna (21. 3) and Victoria (33. 14), Callu 1996, 143, contrasting with the sympathies they occasionally receive in the *HA* (especially *Tyr. Trig.* 30–31). See Estrada San Juan 2021.

⁷ She is not named but is called βασιλίσσα. See also King 1873, 307.

relationship with the princess at least according to the disposition of events in the *EKG*: the Gallic secession took place in mid-260.⁸

More neutral is the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (c. 400) with the following account (33. 1):

Gallienus quidem in loco Cornelii filii sui Salonianum, alterum filium, subrogavit, amori diverso pellicum deditus Saloninae coniugis et concubinae, quam per pactionem concessa parte superioris Pannoniae a patre, Marcomannorum rege, matrimonii specie suscepit Pipam nomine.⁹

In fact, Gallienus replaced his son Cornelius with his other son Salonianus (sic), devoted to the different love of his lovers: his wife Salonina and his mistress, Pipa by name, whom he took up from her father, King of the Marcomanni, in the guise of a marriage after granting a part of Upper Pannonia by a treaty.

Gallienus' chapter in the *Epitome* (33) stands out for not containing negative criticism of him, not even an explicit negative characterization. In J. Schlumberger's opinion, the text employed by the epitomator as source, despite following a Latin source, uses assessments from the Greek tradition, which is more thoughtful towards the figure of Gallienus.¹⁰ This circumstance conveys some historical interest to the chapter since it does not share the destructive criticism of the *EKG* but focuses only on Princess Pipa and Gallienus' ultimate fate in Milan.

The passage possibly suggests some kind of plot on the part of the two ladies, if we connect the appointment of Saloninus to the romance.¹¹

⁸ Lafaurie 1964, 99; cf. De Blois 1976, 6, who places Saloninus' death in the winter of 259–260.

⁹ Pichlmayr–Gruendel 1970, 160.

¹⁰ Schlumberger 1974, 151 f.: “Seine Quellen scheinen hauptsächlich lateinische gewesen zu sein. Seine Urteile aber stützen sich oft auf die griechische Tradition”. See also Festy 2002, who proposes, at the end of the biographies of Marius Maximus in 222 and of the work of Cassius Dio in 229, the use of Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*, who in turn would have employed Dexippus for the reign of Gallienus, pp. xxvii–xxxi. See also Barnes 1976, 264.

¹¹ The Latin text seems to connect both ideas. A different opinion is found in the translation by Festy 2002, 36: “Gallien cependant nomma à la place de son fils Cornélius son cadet Salonin; il abandonnait à des passions contraires pour des maîtresses”. On the contrary, Banchich 2009: “Gallienus, in fact, substituted another son, Salonianus, in place of his own son Cornelius, eager for the separate love of Salonina, his wife, and of a concubine”.

These alleged intrigues which are the only negative point amid otherwise neutral information are connected with the emperor's love (*amori*) for his two lovers (*pellicum*), who later become a wife (*coniugis*, Salonina) and a concubine (*concubina*), remarking the different categories. However, as it is explained below, this was not a normal concubinage but rather "the appearance of a marriage" (*matrimonii specie*). That apparent marriage also involved a dowry, the concession of Roman territory to the princess's father,¹² Attalus, whose name is not given, just the title: the king of the Marcomanni, a unique detail from this document.

Like Victor, the author of the *Epitome* and its source confirm the coexistence of Pipa and the Augusta Salonina. Therefore, if Pipa's was an actual marriage, it would be bigamous. The law could not allow two wives let alone a marriage to a non-citizen. In case we assume that an alliance cannot be sealed by concubinage, as the epitomator seems to imply, the simplest solution is not to discard the report but to admit it to the letter: that *matrimonii specie* would have been arranged in keeping with the Germanic custom, whereas under Roman law Pipa's condition would be that of a concubine.¹³

¹² We will see below this must not be seen as an abandonment of Roman territory.

¹³ Solution accepted by Geiger 2015, 333 f.; Goltz–Hartmann 2008, 239 ("nach römischem Recht irrelevant, aber als symbolischer Akt möglicherweise für die Markomannen"); Speidel 2006, 76; Bray 1995, 31 and 123; Brauer 1975, 124; and Homo 1913, 8; Bray and Speidel recall the passage from Tacitus on the marriage between the Germans (*Germ.* 18. 1), to which it is usual to add that of the two wives of King Ariovistus, the second one being the result of a political alliance (*Caes. Bell. Gall.* 1. 53). Somewhere between is Van Berchem 1956, 13, who refers to Pipa as "maîtresse en titre", maybe with Versailles in mind. An alternative interpretation, beyond qualifying the data as a mere invention to defame Gallienus (Kuhoff 1979, 18), comes from Den Boer 1972, 80, who proposes Pipa as a splitting up of the Augusta Julia Cornelia Salonina and so identifying both women as a single Germanic princess: Gallienus supposedly would have practised Germanic habits and hence his wife stood for another slander in the aggressive tradition against the emperor. However, we are not aware of any philo-Germanic attitude on the part of the probably Greek Salonina (*Salonina Chrysogone* in eastern minted coins, *PIR*² C 1499; *PLRE* I Salonina), in addition to the absence of matching dates, R. Friedl 1996, 174 f. n. 127. Finally, the idea that Attalus' daughter was decisive in the alliance not as a concubine or wife but as a hostage is suggestive (Goltz–Hartmann 2008, 239; Kehne 2001, 299; Bird 1994, 138; Hornsby 1952, 39, elevated to the status of lover or wife only to degrade Gallienus; Kuhoff 1979, 18, although "Gallienus was not in a position to demand any hostages"; De Blois 2019, 118 n. 357). Indeed, Attalus must have had the upper hand.

On the other hand, the notice is preceded by Valerian II being succeeded by Saloninus (misspelt “Salonianus”, like the son of Cato the Elder)¹⁴ as Caesar, which is cited as related to the desire or the manoeuvres of both his wife and his lover.¹⁵ The death of Valerian Caesar could have been overlooked in summarizing the account. In that case, perhaps it was told as a consequence of the intrigues between the two women in the original source, which brings to mind the Caesar Crispus incident. It would be logical to think that the mention of the Caesars in this context comes from the Greek tradition instead of the *EKG* due to their absence in Victor’s account, but the next passage will lead us to rethink that.

Finally, the *Historia Augusta* (*HA*, c. 400) presents two passages in which the Marcomannic princess makes an appearance. The first of them, from Gallienus’ biography, undoubtedly draws from the same sources as Victor and the *Epitome* (*Gall.* 21. 3–4):

Tam variae item opiniones sunt de Salonini nomine, ut, qui se verius putet dicere, a matre sua Salonina appellatum esse [dicat], quam is perdit dilexit. [Et dilexit] Piparam nomine, barbaram regis filiam [Attali]. Gallienus cum suis semper flavo crine<m> condit.¹⁶

There are many opinions about Saloninus’ name, though the author who believes himself more correct [says] he was named after his mother Salonina,¹⁷ whom Gallienus loved very much. [He also loved] some barbarian woman, Pipara by name, a daughter of the king [Attalus]. Gallienus always dyed his hair blond when he was with his people.

¹⁴ Plut. *Cato M.* 24. 9: “Cato had a son from this marriage, whom they named Salonianus, derived from the mother’s name”; and Gell. *NA* 13. 20. 8: “(Cato) married the daughter of his client Saloniun, from whom Marcus Cato Salonianus was born, whose name derived from Saloniun, his mother’s father”. A simple mistake made by the copyist according to Festy 2002, 155, since Salonina’s name is correct.

¹⁵ Den Boer 1972, 86 understands from this passage that Saloninus, in the source of the *Epitome*, is the son of Pipa (similar reasoning is found in King 1873, 311). If so, *SHA Gall.* 21. 3 (next passage) would be amending that source by specifying that his name comes from Salonina. This kind of correction is not uncommon in the *HA*, although the biographer’s reactions tend to be exaggerated: see below n. 26.

¹⁶ Hohl 1965, 98, except lacunas restorations.

¹⁷ False erudition by the author, since the name of the Augusta Salonina already appeared in the base text of the *EKG*, see *infra* the table. This false debate, moreover, had already taken place shortly before in the same book (*Gall.* 19. 3), which could indicate he had found the same topic when changing the source.

This passage is abruptly inserted in the work – as it is frequent – towards the end of the *Vita Gallieni*, when the next book had already been introduced (*Gall.* 19. 7; 21. 1–2). This is the result of the messy, hasty way of writing admitted by the author himself (*Tyr. Trig.* 33. 8).¹⁸ We can assume that, once the book was finished, the biographer realized he had not included this notice from his source, as well as the years of Gallienus' reign and some brief anecdotes, which are added with hardly any attention to the style or the textual coherence (*Gall.* 21. 5–6).¹⁹

First of all, it can be noted that it is a lacunary passage. There are two lacunas postulated in the Teubner edition, indicated by Peter and Hohl: *esse ... quam* and *filiam ... Gallienus*. The popular edition by Magie proposes restoring them with *dicat* and *quare* respectively, and assumes a third lacuna, *dilexit ... Piparam*, filled in with *et dilexit*, in addition to exchanging *quamvis* for *quam is*, which is the reading chosen here.

Without the lacuna introduced by Magie, the text already makes sense (*quamvis perdit dilexit Piparam*, “although he loved Pipara very much, excessively”), but we can see that the change (“he also loved”) brings us closer to the source, since it also reports that Gallienus loved both the empress and the princess, as Victor and the *Epitome* point out in the previous passages (“abandoned to his wife Salonina and his scandalous love towards the daughter of the Germanic king Attalus, Pipa by name”; “devoted to the different love of his lovers”).

Nevertheless, we disagree with Magie's restitution at the end of the passage (*quare*), which is intended to link the following sentence to the notice. Undoubtedly, the presence of a connector like *quare* lends more coherence to the text, but coherence is what is lacking at the end of the *vita*, in which ideas without a thematic relationship appear constantly. The statement about Gallienus' blond hair is probably unrelated to the princess; it is rather a plain description of one of the elements of imperial pageantry that began to take hold throughout the third century: the assimilation of the monarch with the solar divinity.²⁰

¹⁸ Otherwise Syme 1971b, 24: “yet too might be a literary artifice”.

¹⁹ And he apologizes for it at the end of the work (*Car.* 20. 2–3). This makes it very difficult to distinguish possible interpolations, especially in the second half of the work, where the prose is more careless; the author acknowledges more than once his poverty of style (*Prob.* 1. 6; 2. 7; *Quadr. tyr.* 15. 10).

²⁰ Idea repeated in *Gall.* 16. 4. The same ritual appears previously in another biography from the *HA*: emperor Lucius Verus, says the author, took pride in his blond hair and dusted it with gold powder to make it shine (*Ver.* 10. 7). It should not be surprising to find such an element of the imperial ceremonial, which our

Instead, we propose to restore this last lacuna with the name of the Germanic leader.²¹ Firstly because it appears in Victor, and therefore it is logical to suppose that it is provided also by the main source; and secondly, because the author of the *HA*, led by his – feigned? – obsession with onomastics, does not miss an opportunity to provide names, real or invented, for his characters. In that sense, he would hardly remove the name “Attalus” from the passage he is copying: where the epitomator summarizes his sources, the *HA* biographer devotes himself to a verbose *amplificatio* in all sort of details.

Regarding the content, the chapter starts with a brief mention of Saloninus, just like the *Epitome*. It may be a coincidence, or it may be that the biographer also alternated between the *EKG* and the same Greek source of the epitomator. He acknowledges not infrequently that he is resorting to the Greek tradition, either in the form of fictitious authors (e.g. *Diad.* 7. 4; *Aur.* 27. 6) or known authors like Herodian or Dexippus (*Gord.* 2. 1; *Max.* 15. 3; *Claud.* 12. 6, etc.). In any case, the information provided does not allude to any intrigue to put the diadem of Caesar on Saloninus (not *Salonianus*). It revolves around the biographer’s onomastic interests, which are present throughout the work and make it difficult to distinguish between humorous erudition and genuine curiosity on the part of the anonymous author.

Then, the name of Salonina is given, as in Victor and the *Epitome*, and her husband’s love for her is mentioned, as well as – through the restoration – his love for princess Pipara, daughter of the barbarian king. The most striking feature of the text is the name *Pipara*, which differs from that given by the other two authors. This name, if it is not a copyist’s mistake, has led scholars in two directions: from pointing out wordplay like many other examples that these biographies abound with to looking for onomastic similarities outside the work, as we will elaborate on later.

late biographer would know well, out of context. Similarly, we find Elagabalus possibly alluding to Constantine covering the ground over which he would be passing with golden sand (*Hel.* 31. 8), described as another extravagance, like Verus’ and Gallienus’ hair, while the author being fully aware of the meaning of this gesture and critical of it as Synesius of Cyrene was (*De regn.* 16 c–d, a. 400). This kind of intentional decontextualization is intended as mockery. Other examples in the work include *proskýnesis* in *Maximin.* 28. 7 or eastern ceremonial in *Alex.* 18. 3.

²¹ Also suggested by Barnes 1972, 148.

Finally, we find that the *HA* is the only text that reuses the character of Pipa/Pipara, in recycling the same passage. It is common for the author to reuse material from the so-called *vitae maiores* in writing the *minores*' biographies,²² as in this case, the biography of the usurper Postumus (*Tyr. Trig.* 3. 4):²³

‘Quo interfecto ab omni exercitu et ab omnibus Gallis Postumus gratanter acceptus talem se pr<a>ebuit per annos septem, ut Gallias instauraverit, cum Gallienus luxuriae et popinis vacaret et amore barbarae mulieris consenesceret.²⁴

‘When he (Saloninus) was killed, Postumus was accepted willingly by all the army and by all the Gauls, and for seven years he acted in such a way that he restored the Gauls, while Gallienus spent his time in rankness and taverns and aged in love with a barbarian woman.

This chapter goes back to Aurelius Victor. In it, the “flagitious” relationship between Gallienus and the barbarian princess is associated again with dens and personal carelessness, and it is also related to the Postumus rebellion in Gaul, in a less explicit way. This confirms that it is a simple reuse of the same Latin source.

A comparative table of the four accounts about Pipa:

	Aur. Vict. 33. 6–7	<i>Epit. Caes.</i> 33. 1	<i>SHA Gall.</i> 21. 3–4	<i>SHA Tyr.</i> <i>Trig.</i> 3. 4
Linkage between Gallienus and Pipa's concubinage and other vices	×			×
Cause of Postumus' uprising in Gaul	×			×
Gallienus is in love with both women	×	×	×?	
Saloninus precedes the account		×	×	×

²² Categorization at the proposal of Mommsen 1890, 246, already with a first listing.

²³ This passage is ignored in the princess's entry in both *PLRE I* Pipa and Stein 1950, 1718.

²⁴ Hohl 1965, 101.

	Aur. Vict. 33. 6–7	<i>Epit. Caes.</i> 33. 1	<i>SHA Gall.</i> 21. 3–4	<i>SHA Tyr.</i> <i>Trig.</i> 3. 4
Granting of Pannonian territory		×		
Daughter of a barbarian or Germanic king	×		×	×
Daughter of a Marcomannic king		×		
Daughter of Attalus	×		×?	
Pipa as a concubine, lover	×	×	×	×
Pipa as a wife		×		

At this point, it is easy to distinguish the two traditions. On the one hand, for the report on Pipa the author of the source of the *Epitome* preferred to stick to the Greek source before the Latin *EKG*, probably finding the former more reliable.

On the other hand, it is not certain if the *HA*, despite having authors such as Herodian or Dexippus in its repertoire, has resorted here to the Greek source of the *Epitome*, since one of the coincidences, the simple mention of Saloninus and for a different purpose, may be accidental. As for the emperor's love towards both women, shared by the three sources although uncertain in the *HA* due to being the result of the restoration of a lacuna, it must have its origin in the common *EKG*.

For all these reasons, I suggest the following reconstruction for the two traditions:

<i>KG tradition</i>	<i>Second tradition</i>
In a negative evaluation of the figure of Gallienus, amid excesses such as frequenting carousals and places of ill repute, the emperor began a relationship of concubinage/love affair with Pipa, daughter of the Germanic king Attalus, not ignoring at the same time his wife Salonina, because he loved them both. This was cause for the Postumus rebellion.	Gallienus began concubinage, arranged through a certain marriage, with Pipa, daughter of the Marcomannic king. By this marriage, the emperor granted a territory in Pannonia to his new father-in-law.

Another solution for the textual tradition has been proposed for the account. According to J. Schlumberger, the *HA* biographer would have read Aurelius Victor but not his source, the *EKG*, which would share all

the details in Victor and the *Epitome*, thus undervaluing the unique details in the epitomator. In this way, they would all be summaries from the same source.²⁵ Nevertheless, we consider the uniqueness of details in the *Epitome*, and the absence of an invective, as sufficient to claim a second source, presumably Greek.

III. Pipa or Pipara

On the issue of the name of the Marcomannic princess, “Pipa” has commonly been accepted as the name in use (and thus it appears in prosopographic dictionaries), and “Pipara” as the distortion, due to verifying the former in the larger number of documents (two versus one) and the latter in a source that is otherwise prone to playing with names.

Nevertheless, paucity of evidence does not allow these arguments to be taken for granted. Just as Victor and the *Epitome* draw, at least in part, from the *EKG*, there are cases where the *HA* solves onomastic issues after consulting other sources.²⁶

In order to explain the departure from tradition, it has been claimed that “Pipara” was the result of silly wordplay by the anonymous biographer,²⁷

²⁵ Schlumberger 1974, 152: “Die Epitome kennt insgesamt mehr Details: ‘per pactionem concessa parte superioris Pannoniae a patre’; aber auch Victor ist um den Namen des Markomannenfürsten Attalus reicher als die Epitome”. Similarly, Syme 1980, 260 f. (= 1983, 151 f.) gives the *EKG* as the sole source for Pipa’s story.

²⁶ Thus, for example, the entire biographical account of the emperors Pupienus and Balbinus is dotted with the author’s constant doubt about “Pupienus” and “Maximus” being the same person or not, correcting himself (*Maxim.* 33. 3–4; *Max.* 1. 2; 15. 4–6; 16. 6–7; 18). He also reacts indignantly when correcting his Latin sources (Victor, Eutropius, the *EKG*) about the number of Gordians after having read in Greek authors that they were three (*Gord.* 2. 1) and not two, as he had previously assumed (*Macr.* 3. 5; *Diad.* 6. 3). However, when testimony to corroborate these digressions is absent, the author tends to resort to a pretence of erudition with humorous overtones and there is certainly an ‘érudition de grammaticus’ (Chastagnol 1970, 35). An example analogous to that of Pipara is that of *Vitruvia vel Victoria*, mother of emperor Victorinus (*Tyr. Trig.* 5. 3; 6. 3; 24. 1; 31. 1, *PIR*² 430; *PLRE* I Victoria), known only as “Victoria” in Aurelius Victor (33. 14).

²⁷ It may come from the word *piper* (pepper) and the *piperatum* sauce according to Syme 1980, 261 (= 1983, 152), one more example of the author’s lame puns and jokes which sometimes lead to the formation of fictitious names. For some examples, see Chastagnol 1970, 17 and 36. Nevertheless, “Piper” is overlooked as an attested name, see below n. 31.

thus ruling out the historical validity of the name. At the same time, however, the onomastic resemblance to the name of a soldier attested by epigraphy in Germania has been put into play,²⁸ as well as that of a Dacian king in Rome.²⁹ The observation did not have effect, even though outside of Germany “Piper” is a root found in inscriptions throughout the Empire, especially in the West.³⁰ Accordingly, we will highlight a certain *Victoria Piperia* in Thugga who was presumably married to a *Gaius Egnatius Victor* (*IL Afr* 588. 89).

On the other hand, the only other testimony to the “Pipa” form is in a highborn Syracusan lady from the first century BC (*Cic. Verr.* 3. 77–79; 5. 31; 5. 81).³¹ It is noteworthy that this *Pipa*, a lover of the infamous governor Gaius Verres, is described as greedy and manipulative in collusion with another woman, *Tertia*, also Verres’ lover (3. 78–79. 83; 5. 31; 5. 40; 5. 81). Undoubtedly, it is an excellent parallel to draw with the story of Pipa and Salonina. Hence it is possible that “Pipa” is the corrupted name, presumably in the *EKG*, with Cicero’s *In Verrem* in mind.

The name “Pipara” therefore does not seem to be a joke or an unclear allusion to pepper or a spicy sauce (n. 27), while the name “Pipa” does evoke certain doubts. However, the contempt towards the *HA* as a source has led to discard the former.

So, if the biographer did not manipulate the princess’s name, the question of its origin in the historical tradition returns to us. Since Victor and the *Epitome* give us the form “Pipa”, an alternative source for “Pipara” should be sought out. If so, it could be a breviary or a chronicle which did not differ in the rest of the story from the other two traditions mentioned above.

The biographer, in the book dedicated to Gallienus and Saloninus, quotes two spurious authors, as he usually does throughout the work. The first one is *Annius Cornicula* (*PIR*² A 641), who is described as a flatterer

²⁸ *Lucius Piperacius Optatus*, soldier of the *Legio XV Primigenia* in Bonn (*CIL* XIII, 8080), Syme 1980, 261 (= 1983, 152).

²⁹ *Pieporus*, king of the Costoboci married to a Dacian woman (*CIL* VI, 1801), Migliorati 2016, 250.

³⁰ Just to name a few examples, we have a *Lucius Valerius Piperclus* in Bolonia (*CIL* XI, 6680, etc.), a *Sextus Spurius Piperolus* in Nîmes (*CIL* XII, 3333), or an *Aulus Mineius Piper* in Brindisi (*CIL* I, 3173) which turns “pepper” into a real name, with extensive evidence. Even in the Danubian *limes* itself, like a *Marcus Aquilius Piperas* in Augsburg (*CIL* III, 5837) or another *Piper* on the riverbank in Dacia (*AE* 1959, 307).

³¹ Also adduced in Syme 1980, 260 (= 1983, 151).

(*Gall.* 17. 2) – perhaps a panegyrist? –,³² and the second is *Palfurius Sura* (*PIR*² P 47; *PLRE* I Sura), who allegedly wrote some ‘ephemerides’ about Gallienus’ life. The author’s criticism against Cornicula is similar to that of the bad historian often embodied in the bogus person of *Aelius Iunius Cordus* (*PIR*² A 198, ‘ridicule ac stulte’ in *Gord.* 21. 3) in *Junius Capitolinus*’ biographies.³³ Following the rules that the author imposes on himself to maintain the farce of multiple authorship, he could not turn to Cordus’ character again in the *Vita Gallieni*, since that book was signed by *Trebellius Pollio*. Instead, Sura’s ephemeris is more like the chronicle we seek for.³⁴ We could also add the *libri auctorum* by a third author, *Acholi* (*PIR*² A 36), a ‘magister admissionum Valeriani principis’ mentioned in the *Vita Aureliani* (*SHA Aur.* 12. 4), who is involved in obviously false reports.³⁵

Unfortunately, speculation cannot be taken further. We will add that perhaps it is not the correct path to decide which of the two names has been manipulated or corrupted when the root amply attested in epi-

³² Rohrbacher 2016, 61 f.

³³ Mentioned interchangeably as Junius Cordus or Aelius Cordus, the peak of a bad biographer, whose bad practices the *HA* author himself also commits; ‘a splendid and cynical performer’, Syme 1971a, 15; 1971b, 25–29, cf. 74 f.

³⁴ Sura’s name is possibly fictitious, perhaps inspired by another *Palfurius Sura* (*PIR*² P 46), a senator who was executed after Domitian’s death under the accusation of the Senate, according to the Scholiast of Juvenal (4. 53) and Marius Maximus (says the scholiast) in his lost *Vita Nervae*; after all, Maximus was the main source for the first half of the *Historia Augusta*. Towards the end of the work, Syme 1971a, 9 considers the name of the brigand *Palfuerius* (*Prob.* 16. 4, *PIR*² P 45; *PLRE* I Palfuerius) a ‘perverted name’ for *Palfurius*; cf. Rohrbacher 2016, 25. For a historical treatment of this supposed author as a possible source of Aurelius Victor, see Cizek 1994, 134 and 288, with a *stemma* on 139.

Regarding the name of Annius Cornicula, it is not known to be reflected in another character but does derive from one of the biographer’s practices, the invention of names reminiscent of emperors. Thus this case is compared by Syme with Annius Severus, father-in-law of Gordian (*Gord.* 6. 4–5, *PIR*² A 690); with Aurelian’s freedman and also historian Aurelius Festivus (*Quadr. tyr.* 6. 2, *PIR*² A 1504; *PLRE* I Festivus), and with Trajan’s biographer *Aurelius Verus* (*Alex.* 48. 6, *PIR*² A 1630). However, the latter is a clear reference to Aurelius Victor, mentioned along with his colleagues *Fabius Marcellinus* (*PIR*² F 44) and *Stattius Valens* (*PIR*² S 643) (i.e. Ammianus Marcellinus and Eutropius, Schlumberger 1974, 130).

³⁵ As a possible source for the *EKG* in Cizek 1994, 134–136, 139, 207 and 288. He is usually suggested to be related to a homonym ὑπαρχος in Sardes known by an inscription (*IGR* IV, 1510; *PLRE* I Acholi). See Estrada San Juan 2022.

graphy is none other than “Piper”. Just as “Adl” becomes “Attalus”, both “Pipa” and “Pipara” can go through adaptations of “Piper” in some local spelling.³⁶

IV. Date and Nature of the Alliance

Regardless of onomastic issues, there are still open questions about the reported event and its historical context, as other scholars have ventured before: first of all, the date.

This alliance, resulting in the settlement of the Marcomannic people on Pannonian territory, necessarily had to take place after the Marcomannic invasion of the province at the beginning of the reign,³⁷ which was probably the first reason for the treaty, to be sealed with the betrothal. As we have seen, Victor and the *HA* date the concubinage or marriage shortly before the usurpation of Postumus in 260, and the *Epitome* cites it as already established when Saloninus was chosen as the new Caesar.³⁸

Therefore, the hypothetical Greek tradition gives the end of 258 as the date *ante quem*, and the Latin one sets the date before the middle of 260. So, according to the *Epitome*, the marriage alliance was sealed shortly after Gallienus arrived at the Danubian front, which leads us to think that the proposal would already have been formalized before, either by Gallienus or by Attalus. Nevertheless, from the information given by Victor and the *HA*, the pact can be imagined as a solution agreed upon *in situ*.³⁹

³⁶ See nn. 28–31. As a note of curiosity, the German language preserves the word in different forms and its meanings include an onomastic use in the surname *Pieper*, *Pfeiffer* or *Pfeuffer*. See Grimm 1971, c. 1633–1635, 1641–1645, 1652 f. for different etymologies.

³⁷ Homo 1913, 8.

³⁸ After Ingenius’ rebellion on the Danube, which was triggered by the death of Valerian II in middle or late 258, Fitz 1966, 24. It tempts to place *Ulpus Crinitus* on the scene as *dux* of the Illyricum (*PIR*² V, 547), a position attributed by the *HA* in 258 (from the consulate of *Nummius Tuscus*, *Aur.* 13. 1). However, the scene with Crinitus and Tuscus is fictitious, a clear piece of Theodosian propaganda, and the existence of Crinitus himself is questioned.

³⁹ It is hard to imagine it otherwise without invalidating the account entirely, like Hornsby 1952, 39, who denies the concubinage or marriage as well as the dates given by the sources but does validate the alliance with the Marcomannic people, from which he extracts that “Gallienus himself need not have appeared in Pannonia”.

Both versions of the account thus match the most accepted historical reconstruction of events: the pact with the king of the Marcomanni had to take place after the defeat of the usurper Ingenuus at the hands of Gallienus and Aureolus in 258,⁴⁰ with the legitimate emperor displaced to the Danube, where he would have been present between the end of 258 and the beginning of 259.

The pact, as seen, took place after Ingenuus and Regalianus' uprisings. Here we find a reason for the emperor to trust the defence of the Pannonian frontier not to a third *dux* but to a local chieftain linked to him personally by both vassalage and kinship.⁴¹

In spite of this, the pact between Gallienus and the Marcomanni lasted in time beyond the death of the emperor. This is evidenced by Ammianus Marcellinus when he includes these people in the Danubian defensive line (31. 4. 2), and also by the *Notitia Dignitatum*, in which we find the name of the Marcomanni in many military units (Occ. 5. 49–50, 198–199; 6. 22. 65; 7. 38. 183) as well as a *tribunus gentis Marcomannorum* under the command of the *dux* of Pannonia Prima (Occ. 34. 24). We should guess that *Fritigil, regina Marcomannorum* at the end of the fifth century (*PLRE* I Fritigil) attested by Paulinus of Milan (*V. Ambr.* 36), belonged to this *gens Marcomannorum* too.⁴²

This procedure, the settlement of client nations on Roman territory so as to strengthen the *limes* or rather to make up for its deficiencies, had been used previously in the same reign of Gallienus, with an Alamannic or Frankish chief on the Rhine (Zos. 1. 30. 3).⁴³ It should be noted that

⁴⁰ Bird 1994, 138; De Blois 1976, 4; 34; Fitz 1966, 11; 36 f.; Mennen 2011, 219; Mócsy 1974, 206 f.

⁴¹ Migliorati 2016, 252: “quella della fedeltà vassallatica dei Germani al proprio signore”.

⁴² Van Berchem 1956, 15 supposes the reduction of an autonomous Marcomannic kingdom within the Empire to a simple auxiliary corps under Aurelian or Diocletian as the origin of the tribune mentioned in the *Notitia Dignitatum*. However, it could be that this tribunate was the dignity granted to each leader of the Marcomanni such as Fritigil's husband just like the patriarch of the Jews held the dignity of prefect.

⁴³ Alamannic, before the end of the Frankish raid in 257, in order to take care of the invasion “entschlossener”, Manni 1972, 966 f.; 1949, 21 n. 2; also Festy 2002, 155 f.; Migliorati 2016, 251; Frankish, maybe in 257 (so after the invasion), with the emperor on the Rhine, Geiger 2015, 332; Germanic, in 256, De Blois 1976, 34. See too Fitz 1966, 36 f.; Homo 1913, 15. Coexistence of both treaties, the one on the Rhine recounted by Zosimus and Pipara's on the Danube, in Manni 1949, 21 f.; Drinkwater 1987, 58.

the Marcomanni themselves were already part of the sphere of Roman influence and politics after the end of the Marcomannic Wars at the end of the second century. They probably joined Septimius Severus at the beginning of the civil war (Herodian. 2. 9. 12), with Roman citizenship being granted to a *rex Germanorum* as a result (*CIL* III, 4453).⁴⁴ This relationship changed after the barbarian invasions from the reign of Severus Alexander (Herodian. 6. 7) until the betrothal pact with Gallienus.

After this emperor, this policy⁴⁵ became more common in the periods of absence of troops, either due to the continuous civil wars or the need to nurture the *comitatus*.⁴⁶ The two Gothic invasions of Greece under the reigns of Gallienus and Claudius II proved the weakness of the Roman defensive system and the need for innovation. The best-known example is the Eastern border, which was entrusted to Odaenathus, exarch of Palmyra, under the title of *corrector totius Orientis* (*PIR*² S 339; *PLRE* I Odaenathus).

The marriage probably must have involved not only the defence of a section of the Danubian *limes* and the settlement in the part of Pannonia “granted” to king Attalus, but also the provision of troops attached to Gallienus’ *comitatus*, led by a Marcomannic chieftain with a close connection to the emperor’s military staff. This procedure will become an increasingly common practice during the second half of the third century.

Thus, for example, we have evidence of two, possibly three Herulian leaders in the literary sources at this time: *Naulobatus* (*PIR*² N 35; *PLRE* I Naulobatus), who received, as Odaenathus once did, the *ornamenta consularia* from Gallienus (Syncell. 717 Bonn); and *Bibulus*

For similar events, Fitz 1966, 36 f. and Altheim 1938, 204 trace the practice back to Marcus Aurelius, cf. however Van Berchem 1956, 13 f. Nevertheless, it is with Gallienus when we can truly speak of a “policy” as it becomes a recurring strategy: Geiger 2015, 332; 335 f. describes it as novel due to it being a long-term plan instead of temporary and circumstantial solutions (see next footnote). For a list of barbarian settlements in the Roman territory from Tiberius to Honorius, see Williams–Friell 1994, 190 f.

⁴⁴ See Schmidt 1939, 179–181 for a history of the Marcomannic people in the third century.

⁴⁵ Literary sources, as is common, do not explain or imply any policy but rather “incidental and independent” cases, De Blois 1976, 34 n. 53.

⁴⁶ Geiger 2015, 335; Speidel 2006, 74 f.; Altheim 1938, 204. Pannonia itself was the setting for another barbarian settlement not long after: that of the Carpiian people (Amm. Marc. 28. 1. 5) at the initiative of Diocletian after a military victory over that nation (*Pan. Lat.* 8[4]. 10. 4).

and *Andonnoballus* (*PIR*² A 581; *PLRE* I Andonnoballus), both in service of Claudius II (Petr. Patr. F 188–189 Banchich).⁴⁷ Similarly, we know of a certain *Pompeianus* “*cognomento Francus*”, general under Aurelian during his campaign against Zenobia who finally settled in Antioch (Hier. *Chron.* 306 e; *PIR*² P 439; *PLRE* I Pompeianus 1),⁴⁸ as well as a usurper of Frankish roots, Bonosus, who had his support bases in this nation (SHA *Quadr. tyr.* 13. 4).⁴⁹ Other more spurious passages point to other Germanic and Eastern peoples.⁵⁰

The repeated application of this policy with client states suggests that it was a successful strategy. The fact that we do not have more evidence of campaigns on the *Marcomanni* implies this.⁵¹ Nevertheless, in none of the mentioned cases is there an explicit granting of territory or, more correctly,

⁴⁷ “Bibulus”, despite the name, is deduced as such from his interaction with Andonnoballus in the cited passage; “Bibulus must refer to some German”, Banchich 2015, 126. The Latin name, if not another adaptation, is reminiscent of that of the Cheruscan princes *Flavus* and *Italicus*, Segimer’s son and grandson respectively (Tac. *Ann.* 2. 9–10; 11. 16–17), as well as another *Italicus*, king of the Suebians (Tac. *Hist.* 3. 5; 3. 21), and *Septimius Philippus* and *Septimius Heliodorus*, king Aistimodius’ brothers (*CIL* III, 4453), from which it could be inferred that he was a second-generation philo-Roman aristocrat. Another example is the Frankish Pompeianus.

⁴⁸ Where his offspring proliferated, among whom Jerome mentions the priest *Evagrius* (*ibidem*; Lib. *Ep.* LXX 251; *PLRE* Evagrius 6). On the credibility of the testimonies regarding the Frankish people before the reign of Probus, see Barnes 1994, who however does not resolve the notice about Pompeianus, 18; cf. Watson 1999, 168, who does not doubt his barbarian condition. We will add that the name of one of Evagrius’ brothers, *Miccalus* (*PLRE* I Miccalus), recalls the name *Micca*, the alleged Gothic father of Maximinus the Thracian (*Maximin.* 1. 5; *PIR*² M 586).

⁴⁹ The source, however, could not be more dubious, see Barnes 1994, 15: “The Quadrigae Tyrannorum is virtually total fiction and nothing can be presumed authentic beyond the bare names of the usurpers Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus and Bonosus”.

⁵⁰ Examples are the four Gothic-named generals entrusted by Valerian to a young Aurelian (SHA *Aur.* 11. 4) or the Persian auxiliary troops in the field army of some emperors, Altheim 1938, 188 f. In a different approach, Hartmann 2006, 116 f. does not see a political continuity under Gallienus’ successors but a rupture, with barbarian diplomacy being one of the grievances among the generals who plotted against the emperor in 268. Although we do not share this position, we must say it coincides with the data provided by Aurelius Victor and the *HA* that the concubinage with Pipara was a trigger for the Postumus’ uprising in Gaul.

⁵¹ With the only exception of the Germanic invasion of Italy attributed by the *HA* to these people under Aurelian (*Aur.* 18–21), wrongly, Syme 1980, 263 f. (= 1983, 154 f.); Schmidt 1938, 180.

a settlement on Roman territory beyond Zosimus' account and still less a marriage alliance. If the handing over of territory as a "dowry", as the *Epitome* suggests, was the condition for such a union in Pannonia, why did not Gallienus or a relative marry a Frankish or Alamannic princess?

It is logical to affirm that the marriage proposal had to arise on the part of the barbarian king, therefore putting him in a position of equality, if not superiority.⁵² Whether Alamannic or Frankish, we can say the same for Zosimus' unnamed Germanic chieftain. That is why we cannot include political marriage within this new border policy, continued by Gallienus' successors throughout the second half of the third century. Instead, the marriage or concubinage between the princess and the emperor must remain anecdotal, probably driven by specific circumstances that are unknown to us. The brevity and sometimes unreliability of the literary sources preserved for the period of the military anarchy are to be blamed. They are unreliable not only because of the animosity against Gallienus in the Latin historiographic tradition but also because none of the authors who opened the article – Aurelius Victor, the Epitomator and the *HA*'s biographer – were close in time to the events they describe, and certainly they or their sources could have had other marriages in mind, such as that of Arcadius and the Frankish Eudoxia.⁵³

V. Conclusion

To sum up, we can state that the testimonies on Pipa or Pipara, concubine or wife of Gallienus, combine a broader defence policy with the circumstantial and anecdotal detail of a marriage alliance with the daughter of a foreign leader. Parallels can only be found in some spurious notices. The most similar is perhaps the case of the anonymous daughters of queen Zenobia, settled in Rome after their mother's defeat in 272 and married to illustrious Romans, one of them being emperor Aurelian himself, according to Zonaras (12. 27). Nevertheless, we cannot infer another bigamous marriage in the account because the author does not mention the known wife of Aurelian, the Augusta Ulpia Severina (*PIR*²

⁵² See n. 13 on the hypothesis of Pipara as a hostage.

⁵³ See Estrada San Juan 2021 for how Pipara and Gallienus' notice could have been drawn by historians, as a literary device and more than a century after the event, after other marriages between Romans and barbarians, aside from its historical background which is the matter that has occupied us here. See also Bleckmann 1992, 258 f., esp. n. 146.

V 586; *PLRE* I Severina 2). Also, unlike Gallienus, in this case it is the emperor who was in an advantageous position after defeating Zenobia. A reminiscence of Alexander the Great is quite plausible.

Furthermore, the episode is too succinct and largely biased. The lack of clarity among scholars is due in part to the three sources being heirs to the *EKG*, wrongly assuming a single tradition, among which is the *HA*, probably the most reviled literary text of Latin historiography (not without reason). We have no doubt that if the passage which upgrades Pipa's concubinage to marriage were not given by the *Epitome* but by the *HA*, it would have been refuted and forgotten; and, in fact, the most striking discrepancy in the biographer's account, which is the name "Pipara", has been mercilessly condemned.

So, as we have attested, there is no need to immediately discard any striking contrast nor to hold a prejudice concerning this specific issue between the three sources (or, more aptly, the two traditions we have distinguished). After all, the two dates provided by them do match the most accepted historical record. And the divergence regarding the name of the princess is not an intentional modification or degradation from "Pipa" to "Pipara" or vice versa but probably two derivatives of the same root.

Gabriel Estrada San Juan
Universitat de Barcelona,
 gestrada@ub.edu

Abbreviations

*PIR*² = E. Groag, A. Stein, L. Petersen (eds.), *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I, II, III* (Berlin 1933–2015).

PLRE I = A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris (eds.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I. A.D. 260–395* (Cambridge 1971).

Bibliography

- F. Altheim, *Die Soldatenkaiser* (Frankfurt 1938).
 T. M. Banchich, *A Booklet about the Style of Life and the Manners of the Imperatores* (New York 2009) = <http://www.roman-emperors.org/epitome.htm>.
 T. M. Banchich, *The Lost History of Peter the Patrician: An Account of Rome's Imperial Past from the Age of Justinian* (London 2015).
 T. D. Barnes, "The Lost Kaisergeschichte and the Latin Historical Tradition", in: J. Straub (ed.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1968/69* (Bonn 1970) 13–43.
 T. D. Barnes, "Some Persons in the Historia Augusta", *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 140–182.

- T. D. Barnes, "The Epitome de Caesaribus and its Sources", *CPh* 71: 3 (1976) 258–268.
- T. D. Barnes, "The Franci before Diocletian", in: G. Bonamente, F. Paschoud (eds.), *Historiae Augustae: Colloquium Genevense* (Bari 1994) 11–18.
- H. W. Bird, "Further Observations on the Dating of Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte*", *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973) 375–377.
- H. W. Bird, *Aurelius Victor. De Caesaribus* (Liverpool 1994).
- B. Bleckmann, *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spätantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung. Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des Johannes Zonaras* (Munich 1992).
- G. C. Brauer, *The Age of the Soldier Emperors: Imperial Rome, A.D. 244–284* (New Jersey 1975).
- J. J. Bray, *Gallienus: A Study in Reformist and Sexual Politics* (Kent Town 1995).
- R. W. Burgess, "On the Date of the *Kaisergeschichte*", *CPh* 90 (1995) 111–128.
- R. W. Burgess, "A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the Epitome de Caesaribus between 358 and 378, along with Further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the *Kaisergeschichte*", *CPh* 100 (2005) 166–192.
- J. P. Callu, "Aurélius Victor et l'Interrègne de 275", in: G. Bonamente, M. Mayer (eds.), *Historiae Augustae: Colloquium Barcinonense* (Bari 1996) 133–145.
- A. Chastagnol, *Recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste: Avec un rapport sur les progrès de la Historia Augusta* (Bonn 1970).
- E. Cizek, *L'Empereur Aurélien et son temps* (Paris 1994).
- L. De Blois, *The Policy of the Emperor Gallienus* (Leiden 1976).
- L. De Blois, *Image and Reality of Roman Imperial Power in the Third Century A.D.: The Impact of War* (London 2019).
- W. Den Boer, *Some Minor Roman Historians* (Leiden 1972).
- J. F. Drinkwater, *The Gallic Empire: Separatism and Continuity in the North-Western Provinces of the Roman Empire A.D. 260–274* (Stuttgart 1987).
- A. Enmann, "Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch De viris illustribus urbis Romae", *Philologus* Supplbd. 4 (Leipzig 1884) 335–501.
- G. Estrada San Juan, "Princess Pipa as a Taste of a Literary Model", in: M. C. Chiariatti, R. Villegas Marín (eds.), *Mujeres imperiales, mujeres reales. Representaciones públicas y representaciones del poder en la Antigüedad Tardía y Bizancio* (Paderborn 2021) 3–15.
- G. Estrada San Juan, "History and Fantasy on Acholius, the Biographer", *Scholia* 16 (2022) 482–492.
- M. Festy, *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor: Abrégé des Césars* (Paris 2002).
- J. Fitz, *Ingenuus et Régalien* (Brussels 1966).
- R. Friedl, *Der Konkubinat im kaiserzeitlichen Rom: Von Augustus bis Septimius Severus* (Stuttgart 1996).
- M. Geiger, *Gallienus* (Frankfurt 2015).
- A. Goltz, U. Hartmann, "Valerianus und Gallienus", in: K. P. Johne (ed.), *Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235–284) I* (Berlin 2008) 223–295.

- J. Grimm, W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* XIII (Leipzig 1971).
- U. Hartmann, "Der Mord an Kaiser Gallienus", in: K. P. John, T. Gerhardt, U. Hartmann (eds.), *Deleto paene imperio romano: Transformationsprozesse des römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert und ihre Rezeption in der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart 2006) 81–124.
- E. Hohl, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* II (Leipzig 1965).
- L. Homo, "L'Empereur Gallien et la crise de l'Empire romain", *Revue Historique* 113 (1913) 1–22.
- R. A. Hornsby, *Studies in the Reign of Valerian and Gallienus* (Princeton 1952).
- P. Kehne, "Markomannen", *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 19 (2001) 290–302.
- C. W. King, *Early Christian Numismatics and Other Antiquarian Tracts* (London 1873).
- W. Kuhoff, *Herrschart und Reichskrise der römischen Kaiser Valerianus und Gallienus (253–268 n. Chr.)* (Bochum 1979).
- J. Lafaurie "La chronologie des empereurs gaulois", *Revue numismatique* 6 (1964) 91–127.
- E. Manni, *L'Impero di Gallieno: Contributo alla storia del III secolo* (Roma 1949).
- E. Manni, "Gallienus", *RLAC* 8 (1972) 962–984.
- I. Mennen, *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, A.D. 193–284* (Leiden 2011).
- G. Migliorati "La morte di Gallieno e il suo contesto politico (268 D.C.)", *Aevum* 90: 1 (2016) 239–255.
- A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia: A History of the Middle Danube Provinces of the Roman Empire* (London 1974).
- Th. Mommsen, "Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae", *Hermes* 25 (1890) 228–292.
- F. Pichlmayr, R. Gruendel, *Sextus Aurelius Victor, Liber de Caesaribus* (Leipzig 1966).
- F. Pichlmayr, R. Gruendel, *Epitome de Caesaribus* (Leipzig 1970).
- D. Rohrbacher, *The Play of Allusion in the Historia Augusta* (Winsconsin 2016).
- J. Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus: Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Munich 1974).
- L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgange der Völkerwanderung: Die Westgermanen* (Munich 1939).
- M. P. Speidel, "Gallienus and the Marcomanni", in: K. P. John, T. Gerhardt, U. Hartmann (eds.), *Deleto paene imperio romano: Transformationsprozesse des römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert und ihre Rezeption in der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart 2006) 73–76.
- A. Stein, "Pipa 2", *RE* 20 (1950) 1718.
- R. Stoneman, *Palmyra and its Empire: Zenobia's Revolt against Rome* (Ann Arbor 1992).
- R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1971a).
- R. Syme, *The Historia Augusta: A Call of Clarity* (Bonn 1971b).

- R. Syme, "The end of the Marcomanni", in: A. Alföldi (ed.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1977/78* (Bonn 1980) 255–265 (= *Historia Augusta papers* [Oxford 1983] 146–155).
- D. Van Berchem, "Les Marcommans au service de l'Empire", in: E. Swoboda (ed.), *Carnuntina* (Graz 1956) 12–16.
- A. Watson, *Aurelian and the Third Century* (London 1999).
- S. Williams, G. Friell, *Theodosius: The Empire at Bay* (London 1994).
- L. Wickert, "Licinius 84 Gallienus", *RE* 13 (1926) 350–369.

Princess Pipa of the Marcomanni, alleged wife or concubine of emperor Gallienus, is a character known to us through four references in three late sources. The information they provide is scarce and difficult to interpret, despite the fact that she is an important part of the alliance formed between these Germanic people and the Empire. In this article, these passages are interpreted in detail, while trying to reconstruct the historiographical tradition and relating the contribution of modern scholars regarding the historical setting of the alliance and the possible bigamous marriage implied by one of the sources.

О Пипе, принцессе маркоманнов, предположительно супруге или наложнице императора Галлиена, сохранилось четыре упоминания в трех поздних источниках, которые сообщают скудные и трудные для истолкования сведения. Между тем, Пипа играла важную роль в заключении союза этого германского народа с Римской империей. В статье дается по возможности полный комментарий к дошедшим пассажам, предпринимается попытка реконструировать историографическую традицию и оценить вклад современных ученых в вопросы об исторической обстановке при заключении союза и возможности двоеженства Галлиена, на которое намекает один из источников.

KEYWORDS

ERMOLAEVA

Aeschylus' *Ostologoi*; ancient Greek parody; epic formulas; *Ilias*; *Odyssey*
древнегреческая пародия; *Илиада*; *Одиссея*; *Собиратели костей* (*Ostologoi*) Эсхила; эпические формулы

ESTRADA SAN JUAN

Gallienus; *Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte*; *limes*; Marcomanni; marriage; *Pipa*
бракосочетание; Галлиен; маркоманны; *Puna*; *Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte*; *limes*

ISMAIL

P. Alex. inv. 622; *P. Gen.* II 97; the Plain Psenarpsennesis; Roman Egypt
равнина Псенарпсеннезида; римский Египет; *P. Alex.* inv. 622; *P. Gen.* II 97

KRIVOLAPOV

Ephesus; Heraclidism; Mark Antony, Roman eastern politics, Synodos of athletes
восточная политика Рима; гераклидизм; Марк Антоний; синод атлетов; Эфес

LANE

Greek Literature; Pindar; *Pythian* 2. 81–82; Textual Criticism
греческая литература; критика текста; Пиндар; *Пифийские оды* 2, 81–82

LIBERMAN

Greek grammar and language; Greek meter; Greek tragedy; Sophocles; textual criticism
греческая грамматика; греческая метрика; греческая трагедия; Софокл; критика текста

SHUMILIN

Appendix Vergiliana; conjectures; F. Korsch; G. Saenger; A. Sonny
конъектуры; Ф. Е. Корш; Г. Э. Зенгер; А. И. Сонни; *Appendix Vergiliana*

TUFANO

ancient sport; Basileia; Boiotia; federalism; Pamboiotia
античный спорт; Басилеи; Беотия; Памбеотии; федерализм

ULLRICH

ancient conjectures; Lucretius; metrical licenses; regular verb form
античные конъектуры; Лукреций; метрические вольности; правильная
форма глагола

ZELTCHENKO

Aristophanes; Nicostratus; *Wasps*; φιλοθύτης; φιλόξενος
Аристофан; Никострат; Осы; φιλοθύτης; φιλόξενος

Научное издание

HYPERBOREUS:
Классическая филология и история
Vol. 28 2022 Fasc. 2

Ответственный редактор тома *С. К. Егорова*
Компьютерная верстка *А. Б. Левкина*

Учредители журнала *А. К. Гаврилов, Д. В. Панченко*
Регистрационное свидетельство № 0111029 от 27 августа 1993 года

Подписано в печать 25.06.2023. Формат 70 × 100 ¹/₁₆. Печать офсетная.
Усл. печ. л. 13,29. Тираж 250 экз. Заказ № 120.

Отпечатано в типографии издательско-полиграфической фирмы «Реноме»,
192007 Санкт-Петербург, наб. Обводного канала, д. 40.
Тел./факс (812) 766-05-66. E-mail: book@renomespb.ru
www.renomespb.ru

