EOS XCIII fasc. 2
2006

E O S

COMMENTARII
SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE
POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

EDITOR PRIMARIUS
JACOBUS PIGOŃ

EDITORES
CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA
GEORGIUS AXER
MARGARITA BOROWSKA

Volumen XCIII 2006
Fasciculus 2

WRATISLAVIAE–CRACOVIAE–VARSOVIAE
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE –
OŚRODEK BADAŃ NAD TRADYCJĄ ANTYCZNĄ UW
2006

ISSN 0012-7825

EOS

COMMENTARII SOCIETATIS PHILOLOGAE POLONORUM

EDUNTUR INDE AB ANNO MDCCCXCIV

EDITOR PRIMARIUS

JACOBUS PIGOŃ

EDITORES

CHRISTOPHORUS NAWOTKA
GEORGIUS AXER
MARGARITA BOROWSKA

Volumen XCIII 2006
Fasciculus 2

WRATISLAVIAE–CRACOVIAE–VARSOVIAE
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE –
OŚRODEK BADAŃ NAD TRADYCJĄ ANTYCZNĄ UW
2006

EOS

ORGAN
POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA
FILOLOGICZNEGO

UKAZUJE SIĘ OD ROKU 1894

REDAKTOR NACZELNY

JAKUB PIGOŃ

REDAKTORZY

KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA
JERZY AXER
MAŁGORZATA BOROWSKA

Rocznik XCIII 2006
Zeszyt 2

WROCŁAW–KRAKÓW–WARSZAWA
POLSKIE TOWARZYSTWO FILOLOGICZNE –
OŚRODEK BADAŃ NAD TRADYCJĄ ANTYCZNĄ UW
2006

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

SILVESTER DWORACKI, POSNANIAE
SOPHIA GŁOMBIOWSKA, GEDANI
CASIMIRUS KORUS, CRACOVIAE
LESCUS MROZEWICZ, POSNANIAE
HENRICUS PODBIELSKI, LUBLINI
GEORGIUS STYKA, CRACOVIAE
MARIANUS SZARMACH, TORUNII

COMMENTARII EDUNTUR ADMINISTRANTUR

PL-50-139 WROCŁAW, UL. SZEWSKA 49
INSTYTUT FILOLOGII KLASYCZNEJ I KULTURY ANTYCZNEJ
UNIWERSYTETU WROCŁAWSKIEGO
e-mail: eos@uni.wroc.pl

COMMENTARIORUM PAGINA DOMESTICA
www.eos.wroclaw.pl

EDITORUM ADIUTOR

SLAVOMIRUS TORBUS

Wydano ze środków Komitetu Badań Naukowych
przy wsparciu finansowym Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego
oraz Fundacji *Instytut „Artes Liberales"*
we współpracy wydawniczej z Ośrodkiem Badań nad Tradycją Antyczną

© Copyright by Polskie Towarzystwo Filologiczne, Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa 2006

EDITORUM CONSILIUM

SILVESTER DWORACKI, POSNANIAE
SOPHIA GŁOMBIOWSKA, GEDANI
CASIMIRUS KORUS, CRACOVIAE
LESCUS MROZEWICZ, POSNANIAE
HENRICUS PODBIELSKI, LUBLINI
GEORGIUS STYKA, CRACOVIAE
MARIANUS SZARMACH, TORUNII

COMMENTARII EDUNTUR ADMINISTRANTUR

PL-50-139 WROCŁAW, UL. SZEWSKA 49
INSTYTUT FILOLOGII KLASYCZNEJ I KULTURY ANTYCZNEJ
UNIWERSYTETU WROCŁAWSKIEGO
e-mail: eos@uni.wroc.pl

COMMENTARIORUM PAGINA DOMESTICA
www.eos.wroclaw.pl

EDITORUM ADIUTOR
SLAVOMIRUS TORBUS

Wydano ze środków Komitetu Badań Naukowych
przy wsparciu finansowym Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego
oraz Fundacji *Instytut „Artes Liberales"*
we współpracy wydawniczej z Ośrodkiem Badań nad Tradycją Antyczną

© Copyright by Polskie Towarzystwo Filologiczne, Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa 2006

define it. Thus, no wonder that establishing the essence of Aristotle's concept of πτῶσις, and especially πτῶσις ὀνόματος, has become the subject of numerous analyses and studies. Also this article discusses this issue in the hope that the proposed interpretative solutions will seem – to some extent at least – convincing and inspiring to further studies on this problem, which is so crucial for the history of Greek linguistics.

We will start the review of the passages in which Aristotle talks about the topic of our interest from the *Hermeneutics* (*De interpretatione*), being a work where the author is thought to have explained his general theory of the language in the most mature and complete way. In this treatise the passage regarding πτῶσις ὀνόματος appears in the context of the definition of ὄνομα as a specific class of words (part of speech) and constitutes a kind of its supplement:

> *De interpretatione* 2, 16a 19–20:
> Ὄνομα μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ φωνὴ σημαντικὴ κατὰ συνθήκην ἄνευ χρόνου, ἧς μηδὲν μέρος ἐστὶ σημαντικὸν κεχωρισμένον.
>
> A noun is a sound having meaning established by convention alone but no reference whatever to time, while no part of it has any meaning, considered apart from the whole[2].
>
> *De interpretatione* 2, 16a 32–16b 5:
> τὸ δὲ *Φίλωνος* ἢ *Φίλωνι* καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα οὐκ ὀνόματα ἀλλὰ πτώσεις ὀνόματος. λόγος δέ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, ὅτι δὲ μετὰ τοῦ *ἔστιν* ἢ *ἦν* ἢ *ἔσται* οὐκ ἀληθεύει ἢ ψεύδεται – τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἀεί –οἷον *Φίλωνός ἐστιν* ἢ *οὐκ ἔστιν*· οὐδὲν γάρ πω οὔτε ἀληθεύει οὔτε ψεύδεται.
>
> 'Of Philo', 'to Philo', and so on are cases of nouns and not nouns. Otherwise we define all these cases as the noun in itself is defined; but when 'is', 'was' or 'will be' is added, they do not then form propositions, which either are true or are false, as the noun itself always does then. For 'of Philo is' cannot by itself constitute a true or false proposition. Nor yet can 'of Philo is not'.

Hence, in passage 2, 16a 19–20 Aristotle defined ὄνομα as a conventional[3] and indivisible[4] semantic unit realised in the phonetic plan, which has no reference to time. In turn, in passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 singular forms in oblique cases (genitive and dative) of the anthroponym Φίλων 'Philo' (obviously treated as examples: καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα) were identified just as πτώσεις ὀνόματος. And

---

[2] All quoted passages from the *Hermeneutics* translated by H.P. Cooke, Cambridge, Mass.–London 2002 [first publ. 1938] (The Loeb Classical Library).

[3] Cf. *De interpr.* 2, 16a 26–29: τὸ δὲ κατὰ συνθήκην, ὅτι φύσει τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐδέν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ὅταν γένεται σύμβολον· ἐπεὶ δηλοῦσί γέ τι καὶ οἱ ἀγράμματοι ψόφοι, οἷον θηριῶν, ὧν οὐδέν ἐστιν ὄνομα.

[4] Passages 2, 16a 21–26 and 4, 16b 30–33 of the *Hermeneutics* refer to semantic indivisibility of ὄνομα.

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

ARISTOTLE'S πτῶσις ὀνόματος: A PREDICATIVE VARIANT OF ὄνομα?

By

HUBERT WOLANIN

ABSTRACT: The aim of this paper is to establish the essence of Aristotle's concept of *ptosis onomatos*. From the analyses carried out it seems that within the frameworks of the terminological apparatus created by the Philosopher the term *ptosis onomatos* denotes all word forms with no reference to time, which are, however, used (or perceived) as co-exponents of a predicative content and which are given the status of secondary word variants (or secondary textual representations) of the *onoma* as a class of lexemes (part of speech). In this respect they differ from primary word variants of this class of lexemes, i.e. exponents of the subject of predication, which are, in turn, classified as *onomata*. The status of a *ptosis onomatos* may result from specific inflexional characteristics of a given word form (e.g. nouns in oblique cases), as well as from its morphological (derivational) structure (e.g. adjectival and adverbial derivatives), and even exclusively from the context in which that form is used (e.g. predicate nominatives). Thus, *ptosis onomatos*, being a predicative variant of *onoma*, may be defined only in functional (logical or syntactical) terms and constitutes a concept going beyond the limits determined not only by the opposition: flexion vs. word formation, but also by the concept of word morphology.

We know that within the frameworks of the notional and terminological apparatus developed in the ancient Greek grammar, the term πτῶσις, morphologically depending on the verb πίπτειν 'to fall', acquired the status of a technical term denoting the grammatical case[1]. It is also known that this term was applied for the very first time in the linguistic context by Aristotle, who used it with reference to two different classes of words (parts of speech), i.e. ὄνομα and ῥῆμα. However, what still remains the problem is the meaning the term had in the linguistic theory created by the Philosopher himself. The connection of πτῶσις with ῥῆμα, i.e. the verb, obviously excludes the possibility of identifying its meaning with the concept of the grammatical case. Yet, what is more, it is also difficult to ascribe it the meaning of the case when used with reference to ὄνομα, since the contexts in which Aristotle uses the phrase πτῶσις ὀνόματος, point to its much wider semantic range, and in the same way make it more difficult to grasp and

---

[1] See e.g. Dionysii Thracis *Ars Grammatica* (G.G. I 1) 31, 5–32, 1; 67, 3–6; Apollonii Dyscoli *De Constructione* (G.G. II 2) 15, 10; 73, 8; 85, 13.

'the just man' is 'the man of knowledge'; but if one of these things is not true, none of the rest is true either.

Topica I 15, 106b 29–107a 2:
Ἔτι δ' ἐπὶ τῶν πτώσεων ἐπισκεπτέον. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ δικαίως πλεοναχῶς λέγεται, καὶ τὸ δίκαιον πλεοναχῶς ῥηθήσεται. [...] Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ εἰ τὸ ὑγιεινὸν πλεοναχῶς, καὶ τὸ ὑγιεινῶς πλεοναχῶς ῥηθήσεται. [...] Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅταν αὐτὸ πλεοναχῶς λέγηται, καὶ ἡ πτῶσις ἡ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πλεοναχῶς ῥηθήσεται, καὶ εἰ ἡ πτῶσις, καὶ αὐτό.

> Futher, you must examine the inflected forms of words. For if 'justly' can be used in several senses, 'just' will also be used in several senses [...]. Likewise if 'healthy' has several meanings, so also will 'healthily' [...]. Similarly in every other case, when the word itself is used in several senses, the inflexion formed from it will also be used in several senses, and *vice versa*.

It seems that the application of the term πτῶσις in the quoted passages[14] to adverbial forms stems just from the fact that the linguistic status of those forms, similarly to noun forms in oblique cases, predisposes them to constitute a co-exponent of the predicate in a statement (proposition). In other words, the adverb 'justly' (δικαίως) presents the idea of "justice" not as the (possible) subject of predication, but as something said of someone or something else, e.g. of someone who acts in this way. As the subject of predication, the idea of "justice" is expressed rather by the form 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη), i.e. by the noun in nominative, and thus by ὄνομα. Moreover, adverbial forms such as 'justly', 'courageously', 'healthily' etc. fully fulfil the criteria of both ὄνομα as a class of lexemes (formulated in passage 2, 16a 19–20 of the *Hermeneutics*: φωνὴ σημαντικὴ κατὰ συνθήκην ἄνευ χρόνου, ἧς μηδὲν μέρος ἐστὶ σημαντικὸν κεχωρισμένον) and πτώσεις ὀνόματος as secondary representations of those lexemes (formulated in passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of *Hermeneutics*: μετὰ τοῦ *ἔστιν* ἢ *ἦν* ἢ *ἔσται* οὐκ ἀληθεύει ἢ ψεύδεται).

When commenting on the above-quoted passages from the *Topics*, it is worthwhile emphasising that the terms σύστοιχα and πτώσεις occurring in them do not oppose each other directly, i.e. they are not disjunctive. The term σύστοιχα relates to the possibility of ascribing identical attributes, e.g. goodness, evil, nobleness, etc. to specific concepts, and thus it concerns inherent features of those concepts, whereas the term πτώσεις, as we try to prove, relates to the way in which the given concepts are linguistically expressed, which determines (potentially) their location on the part of the predicate within the structure of the statement. Aristotle uses the term πτώσεις (and not σύστοιχα) and thus refers to adverbial word forms, since their referents' status as σύστοιχα (towards

---

[14] See also e.g. *Topica* III: 3, 118a 34–39; 6, 119a 36–38; V, 7, 136b 15–33; VI, 10, 148a 10–13; VII: 1, 151b 27–32; 3, 153b 25–33; 4, 154a 13; *Rhetorica* I, 7, 1364b 34–37; II, 23, 1397a 20–23.

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE

COMMENTATIONES

WALTER LAPINI, Peloponnesian Ships in Ionia (Thuc. VIII) 185–196
HUBERT WOLANIN, Aristotle's πτῶσις ὀνόματος: A Predicative Variant of ὄνομα? 197–225
MACIEJ MILCZANOWSKI, Caesarion in Cleopatra's Politics 227–238
MARIUSZ PLAGO, Lucan VII 192–194: An Example of *Arte Allusiva*? 239–250
THOMAS GÄRTNER, Zu den erotischen Epigrammen des Rufinus 251–265
GIUSEPPE RUSSO, Sull'autenticità dei titoli doppi in Luciano 267–273
AGATA A. KLUCZEK, Le monde des barbares dans la propagande impériale au siècle d'or des Antonins et pendant la période de la crise du III[e] siècle 275–296
MATEUSZ ŻMUDZIŃSKI, Recherches sur l'artisanat en Dacie romaine 297–301
ANNA LASEK, Nonnos' Spiel mit den Gattungen in den *Dionysiaka* (dargestellt anhand von I 362–534) 303–316
JACEK WIEWIOROWSKI, *Qaestor Iustinianus Exercitus* – A Late Roman Military Commander? 317–340
ROBERT K. ZAWADZKI, Motive der Natur in der lateinischen Dichtung Martin Kromers 341–355

SUMMARIA DISSERTATIONUM INAUGURALIUM

ANNA SZCZEPANIAK, Bacchylides' Dactylo-Epitrites against the Background of Early Greek Colometry 357–367

CENSURAE LIBRORUM

Curits Runnels, Priscilla M. Murray, *Greece Before History. An Archaeological Companion and Guide*, Stanford 2001 (DARIUSZ MALISZEWSKI) 369–370
Adriaan Rademaker, *Sophrosyne and the Greek Rhetoric of Self-Restraint. Polysemy & Persuasive Use of an Ancient Value Term*, Leiden–Boston 2005 (JOANNA KOMOROWSKA) 371–373
W.W. Fortenbaugh, *Aristotle on Emotion. A Contribution to Philosophical Psychology, Rhetoric, Poetics, Politics and Ethics*, London [2]2002 (ROBERT ZABOROWSKI) 373–377
Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Jan Felix Gaertner, Oxford 2005 (ANNA MARIA WASYL) 377–381
Walter Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, Bd. V: *Kleine Topik und Hermeutik der mittellateinischen Biographie. Register zum Gesamtwerk*, Stuttgart 2004 (JERZY STRZELCZYK) 381–382

COMMENTARII

Międzynarodowa konferencja naukowa „Finds and Results from the Swedish Cyprus Expedition: A Gender Perspective", Medelhavsmuseet, Sztokholm, 31 marca – 2 kwietnia 2006 (DARIUSZ MALISZEWSKI) 383–386

concerned with Thucydidean commentaries have failed to notice up to now that ἐς γὰρ πέντε ναῦς καὶ πεντήκοντα is a formally unusual expression for Thucydides, who very seldom separates the two figures of a number with the insertion of a common word. We can list only the following exceptions:

I 55, 1 πεντήκοντα δὲ καὶ διακοσίους
I 96 τετρακόσια τάλαντα καὶ ἑξήκοντα
I 116,1 τεσσαράκοντα δὲ ναυσὶ καὶ τέσσαρσι
II 2, 1 τέσσαρα μὲν γὰρ καὶ δέκα
II 13, 8 ἑξακοσίους δὲ καὶ χιλίους
III 17, 4 ἑξακόσιοι δὲ καὶ χίλιοι
III 79, 2 τρεῖς δὲ καὶ δέκα
III 87, 3 τετρακοσίων γὰρ ὁπλιτῶν καὶ τετρακισχιλίων
III 98, 4 εἴκοσι μάλιστα καὶ ἑκατόν
IV 38, 5 εἴκοσι μὲν ὁπλῖται διέβησαν καὶ τετρακόσιοι οἱ πάντες
IV 39, 2 ἑβδομήκοντα ἡμέραι καὶ δύο
IV 70, 1 ἑπτακοσίους μὲν καὶ δισχιλίους
IV 93, 4 πέντε μὲν καὶ εἴκοσι
VI 43, 1 πεντακόσιοι μὲν καὶ χίλιοι
VII 22, 1 πέντε μὲν καὶ τριάκοντα
VII 34, 3 τριάκοντα ναυσὶ καὶ τρισίν
VII 53, 3 δυοῖν δὲ δεούσαις εἴκοσιν
VII 60, 4 δέκα μάλιστα καὶ ἑκατόν.

But, if we put the cases aside, in which the insertion of a common word between two figures is represented by μέν or δέ or γάρ (I 55, 1; II 2, 1; II 13, 8; III 17, 4; III 79, 2; IV 70, 1; IV 93, 4; VI 43, 1; VII 22, 1; VII 53, 3)[24], or by μάλιστα (III 98, 4 and VII 60, 4), and if exclude also the cases of separate numbers in which the higher figure precedes and the lower follows somewhat epiphrastically (I 116, 1; IV 39, 2 and VII 34, 3), we have only very few examples (I 96; III 87, 3 and IV 38, 5) that can be paralleled with that of VIII 29, 2. Two of these have more than a word inserted, the third has τάλαντα inserted, a word that could be abridged as well[25].

Now it can be easily objected that the figure 55 is confirmed by VIII 26, 1 where *the* 55 Peloponnesian and Sicilian ships are announced to be arriving: πέντε καὶ πεντήκοντα ναῦς ὅσον οὐ παρεῖναι (see above). The presence of τάς should imply that these 55 have been previously mentioned, but actually

---

[24] An example of inserted μέν is found in the 'Thucydidean' section of Xenophon's *Hellenika*; cf. I 6, 35: ἑπτὰ μὲν καὶ τετταράκοντα.

[25] As for contiguous figures belonging to different numbers (here πεντήκοντα τριάκοντα) cf. III 50.

they have not, and this difficulty has been stated by the most accomplished Thucydidean interpreters. The hypothesis of a textual disease seems to me preferable to Andrewes' sophistic interpretation: "The most likely explanation is that Thucydides had it in mind to insert earlier some reference to the preparation of this force". Classen–Steup print the *crux*, but observe (*ad loc.*) that the τάς should be bracketed. Conversely, I think that πέντε καὶ πεντήκοντα, not τάς, is to be bracketed[26]; I see no reason for a scribe to insert an article creating an evident non-sense, whereas πέντε καὶ πεντήκοντα can easily be explained as a gloss drawn from an already corrupt ch. 29. I bracket seven syllables instead of one, but I hope that there is no doubt that, in such a case, the slightest deletion is not the most 'economic' one. Thus, if the fleet of Therimenes actually numbered 50 ships instead of 55, the 99 which we have reckoned above drop to 94, i.e. precisely the same figure provided by Thucydides.

From these emendations we obtain the following advantages: (1) our reckoning of ships correspond *ad unguem* to the Thucydidean information[27]; (2) the *ratio* of Tissaphernes' payment is arranged in a simple and logical way as regards both grammar and arithmetic; (3) both Miletos and Knidos result to have been protected by guard-ships all along the Ionian war; (4) the ships of Chalkideus are saved from a complete disappearance; (5) the παρά of παρὰ πέντε ναῦς is restituted to its normal meaning.

University of Genua

---

[26] As for numeric glosses penetrated into the text see also my papers *Tucidide rimpatriato*, RFIC CXIX 1991, pp. 9–51, and *Tucidide e il sistema numerale acrofonico (proposta di correzione a 6.31.5)*, Prometheus XVII 1991, pp. 19–28, containing a review of several problems raised up by numerical uncertainties.

[27] I hope to demonstrate, in a forthcoming paper, that Thucydides is precise, and very coherent with himself, also in his reckoning of the Athenian ships; of course, demonstrating one historian's exactness in recording numbers does not demonstrate *ipso facto* a historical truth, but simply a textual one.

Πάλιν εἰ ὁμοίως τὰ πρός τι κατὰ τὰς πτώσεις λεγόμενα μὴ ὁμοίως ἀντιστρέφει, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ διπλασίου καὶ τοῦ πολλαπλασίου. Ἑκάτερον γὰρ τούτων τινὸς καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀντιστροφὴν λέγεται· τινὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ τὸ πολλοστημόριον. Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιστήμης καὶ τῆς ὑπολήψεως· αὗταί τε γάρ τινος, καὶ ἀντιστρέφει ὁμοίως· τό τε ἐπιστητὸν καὶ τὸ ὑπολητὸν τινί. Εἰ οὖν ἐπί τινων μὴ ὁμοίως ἀντιστρέφει, δῆλον ὅτι οὐ γένος θάτερον θατέρου.

Again, you must see whether the genus and species are used in the same manner in respect of the inflexions which follow them, for example, as pertaining 'to' something, or predicated as being 'of' something, or in the other possible ways. For, as the species is predicated, so also is the genus, as, for example, in the case of the double and its higher genera; for both the double and the multiple are predicated 'of' something. Similarly, too, in the case of 'knowledge'; for both 'knowledge' itself and its genera, for example, 'disposition' and 'state', are said to be 'of' something. It may be objected that sometimes this is not true; for we say 'alien *to*' and 'contrary *to*', but when we use 'different', which is a genus of these terms, we add '*from*', not '*to*'; for we say 'different *from*'.
Again, you must see whether terms which are used in the same manner in respect of the inflexions which follow them do not take the same cases when they are converted, as in the case with 'double' and 'multiple'; for each of these is said to be '*of*' something both in its original and in its converted form; for one thing is both 'a half of' and 'a fraction of' something else. Likewise with 'knowledge' and 'conception'; for these are followed by the genitive, and in the converted form 'knowable' and 'conceivable' are both alike followed by the dative. If, therefore, in any instance the converted forms do not take the same case, clearly that one is not the genus of the other[9].

As can be noted, in both arguments above we have to do with the question of the case government of nouns (substantivised nominal forms), being exponents of relative notions. The term πτώσεις refers here to noun forms in oblique cases, which denote correlates of analysed relative notions and depend syntactically on the nouns denoting those relative notions. This time, however, Aristotle points to the value of the category of case by means of an indefinite pronoun, i.e. τινός, τινί, etc. From the formal perspective, the expressions under consideration do not constitute propositions, but nominal phrases where the term πτώσεις is used with reference to attributive determiners characterising the notions expressed by the elements being determined. And thus, also in this case, the term πτῶσις applies to word forms, whose *designata* are located on that side of the contents of the whole expressions, which determines notions expressed by nominative forms (ὀνόματα), and thus on the side of something attributed to those notions or predicated of them. And it seems that it is just the status of contents expressed by word forms within the structure of the statement that constitutes the basic criterion for the division of the said forms into ὀνόματα and πτώσεις ὀνόματος.

---

[9] All quoted passages from the *Topica* translated by E.S. Forster, Cambridge, Mass.–London 2004 [first publ. 1960] (The Loeb Classical Library).

C O M M E N T A T I O N E S

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

PELOPONNESIAN SHIPS IN IONIA (THUC. VIII)

By

WALTER LAPINI

ABSTRACT: This article examines the account reported by Thucydides in his eight book concerning the Peloponnesian navy manoeuvres in Ionia in 413/412 BC. Such account, as we know, is incoherent, as if Thucydides mingled up several different sources. The author infers a textual corruption in VIII 29, 2 where, just amending ἐς γὰρ πέντε ναῦς καὶ πεντήκοντα with ἐς γὰρ πέντε ναῦς ἐς πεντήκοντα, any incoherence disappears.

According to the treaty stipulated at Sparta in winter 413/412, the Lacedaemonians accepted to send a fleet to Ionia, and Tissaphernes promised τροφὴν παρέξειν (Thuc. VIII 5, 5) to this fleet. The amount of the τροφή[1] is not specified, but from ch. 29 (see below) we deduce that the satrap had engaged himself with a payment of 1 talent monthly per ship. Therefore the Lacedaemonians decided to send 40 ships. We do not know whether 40 was the exact number agreed on in the contract; we can only say that (1) even before Tissaphernes appeared on the scene, the Lacedaemonians had already in mind to build 100 ships[2], and that (2) the decision (ἐψηφίσαντο) of sending the 40 ships to Ionia came about only after they had made sure that the Chians had (or were able to build) ± 60 ships. These figures, 40 and 60, cannot be fortuitous: perhaps 100 ships were the minimum number that the Lacedaemonian authorities considered necessary in order to fight against Athens at sea. As for the relation money / ships, we may recall e.g. VI 8, 1, where the ambassadors of Segesta offered 60 talents for 60 ships. One talent monthly per ship was therefore a standard amount. We may observe that Tissaphernes could not have obtained the Lacedaemonian intervention by means of vague and elusive promises, but by

---

[1] B has ἱκανήν before τροφήν: *glossema manifestum*.

[2] Thuc. VIII 3, 2, and cf. P.A. Brunt, *Spartan Policy and Strategy in the Archidamian War*, Phoenix XIX 1965, p. 261. It can be an hyperbolic number. Another exaggerated number is in II 7, 2 where the Lacedaemonians are said to have in mind to build a fleet of 500 (!) ships.

however, is not identifiable with φωνὴ σημαντικὴ κατὰ συνθήκην ἄνευ χρόνου (cf. 2, 16a 19–20) any more, but – as it results from the context – with a noun in the nominative, while the basis of the opposition is that fact that, unlike the form in the nominative, πτώσεις ὀνόματος do not form true or false propositions when coupled with ἔστιν, ἦν or ἔσται. The Philosopher referred to the relation in which the forms in oblique cases (πτώσεις ὀνόματος) remain towards the forms in nominative (ὀνόματα) by saying that – except for the already characterised difference – the definition of a form in an oblique case is the same as the definition of the nouns in the nominative case (λόγος δέ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατὰ τὰ αὐτά). Thus, πτώσεις ὀνόματος and ὀνόματα are shown as language units fulfilling certain common definitional criteria. Obviously, those common definitional criteria must refer to the definition of ὄνομα as a class of words (lexemes), presented in passage 2, 16a 19–20 (φωνὴ σημαντικὴ κατὰ συνθήκην ἄνευ χρόνου, ἧς μηδὲν μέρος ἐστὶ σημαντικὸν κεχωρισμένον). It is confirmed by the fact that the reservation formulated with regard to πτῶσις ὀνόματος, stating that in combination with the forms of the verb 'to be' it does not form a true or a false proposition, regards a property which is not included in the scope of this definition.

Therefore, in the passages being compared (2, 16a 19–20 and 2, 16a 32–16b 5), we have to do with the use of the term ὄνομα in two slightly different meanings: the first of them (2, 16a 19–20), which is wider and more general, covers each semantically indivisible word form which does not connote the idea of time; the other one (2, 16a 32–16b 5), being narrower, identifies only nominatives and contrasts them with non-nominative forms. Thus, ὄνομα, in the wider meaning, is close to a generic notion covering a specific class of lexemes (or lexemes belonging to a specific class), whereas both ὄνομα in the narrower meaning and πτώσεις ὀνόματος acquire the status of terms each of them denoting a specific kind of word forms (or word forms of a specific kind) being textual representations of those lexemes and presented as their functional variants realised in the logical plan.

However, Aristotle does not seem to attach identical importance to both kinds of those textual (functional) variants. One can deduce it from the adopted nomenclature, which identifies, in terms of terminology, one kind of those variants with the generic notion of the whole class of lexemes. It clearly proves that Aristotle considered the form in the nominative case to be the most representative for lexemes included in that class. It seems from the arguments presented by the Stagirite that the primariness of the form in the nominative case relates to the fact that it presents the denoted object in such a way that it is always possible to make a true or a false statement about it – contrary to πτώσεις ὀνόματος, which present the denoted object in a way not allowing to make a true or false statement about it. So, an obvious conclusion can be drawn that any object denoted by πτώσεις ὀνόματος constitutes exclusively an element of something said – truly

the concepts denoted by respective noun forms in the nominative) is only the subject of considerations in the course of the argument, and more exactly, is the postulate or a motion put forward in this argument (δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς πτώσεις σύστοιχα εἶναι).

The idea of interpreting πτῶσις ὀνόματος as a predicative variant of ὄνομα enables us also to account for the fact that Aristotle used this term not only with respect to adverbial derivatives, but also with respect to adjective formations derived from nouns. Such use of the term πτῶσις is exemplified in the passage from the *Categoriae* quoted below, in which Aristotle states that such forms as γραμματικὸς and ἀνδρεῖος differ from the names they are derived from, i.e. γραμματική and ἀνδρεία, just τῇ πτώσει, that is – in our understanding – they differ in the fact that they constitute a specific (different)[15] predicative variant of those names:

> *Categoriae* I 1a 12–15:
> Παρώνυμα δὲ λέγεται, ὅσα ἀπό τινος διαφέροντα τῇ πτώσει τὴν κατὰ τοὔνομα προσηγορίαν ἔχει, οἷον ἀπὸ τῆς γραμματικῆς ὁ γραμματικὸς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνδρείας ὁ ἀνδρεῖος.
>
> Things are 'derivatively' named that derive their own name from some other, that is given a new verbal form, as, for instance, 'grammarian' from 'grammar', from 'heroism', 'hero', and so on.

In the passage from the *Rhetorics* quoted below, in turn, while discussing the issue of similarities in particular clauses of the period, Aristotle talks about (two) variants of the same name (τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματος πτώσεις), where one of them turns out to be a derivative adjective form (in the nominative), and the other one, a noun form in the genitive:

> *Rhetorica* III 9, 1410a 24–33:
> ... παρομοίωσις δὲ ἐὰν ὅμοια τὰ ἔσχατα ἔχῃ ἑκάτερον τὸ κῶλον. Ἀνάγκη δὲ ἢ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἢ ἐπὶ τελευτῆς ἔχειν. Καὶ ἀρχὴ μὲν ἀεὶ τὰ ὀνόματα, ἡ δὲ τελευτὴ τὰς ἐσχάτας συλλαβὰς ἢ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματος πτώσεις ἢ τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα. [...]
> Πτώσεις δὲ ταὐτοῦ "ἄξιος δὲ σταθῆναι χαλκοῦς, οὐκ ἄξιος ὢν χαλκοῦ".
>
> ... the similarity of the final syllables of each clause [is] *paromoiosis*. This must take place at the beginning or end of the clauses. At the beginning the similarity is always shown in entire words; at the end, in the last syllables, or the inflexions of one and the same word, or the repetition of the same word. [...]

---

[15] It seems that one may assume that the form ἀνδρεῖος constitutes a πτῶσις (and thus a predicative variant) of ἀνδρεία, the latter having undoubtedly the status of an ὄνομα. However, the status of the form γραμματική seems to be more disputable, since it alone can be perceived as a πτῶσις (of γράμμα?); thus we allow the possibility of interpreting the form of γραμματικός as another πτῶσις (different from γραμματική).

had become suspect to Sparta. Astyochos moves to join these 27, but during the voyage he clashes with an Athenian contingent (VIII 42, 3) and loses 3 ships; other ships suffer some damages. The joining happens at Knidos (VIII 42, 4). So 52 + 5 + 20 + 10 + 6 + 27 make 120 ships at Knidos. And it is at Knidos that a disputation arises between Lichas and Tissaphernes. Now, though their alliance remains formally alive, the friendship between Tissaphernes and the Lacedaemonians comes to an abrupt end. So the Lacedaemonians move against Rhodes "with 94 ships" (VIII 44, 2), an unexpected figure. Andrewes, recalling that "from 61.2 it appears that he [Astyochos] left at least nine of his ships at Miletos", argues that the real amount of the ships concentrated at Knidos should be either 111 (120 - 9, if the 20 Chian were still included) or 91 (120 - 9 - 20, if they were not). Thus he is forced to state a "discrepancy" between our expectations and the fact that "the fleet that moved to Rhodes in 44.2 numbered 94". As usual, this "discrepancy" is explained by reference to unrecorded circumstances and extra-textual data: "Thucydides might have missed out some reinforcement, or some local ships might have been recruited (the ships left at Miletos included one from Miletos and one from Anaia)". But there are some notable oversights in these statements of Andrewes. First, it cannot be true that Astyochos *left* 9 ships at Miletos, because these 9 (see VIII 61, 2) include 5 Syracusan and 4 Thourian, the latter being part of Hippokrates' fleet, which no doubt Astyochos first met at Knidos. Moreover, the Peloponnesian ships "left" at Miletos numbered also a tenth ship, that of Leon, Lichas' ἐπιβάτης: so this tenth ship was one of the 27, which Astyochos met at Knidos as well. No 9 ships were *left* at Miletos (by Astyochos), but 10 ships were *sent* (after Astyochos' departure from Miletos) to Miletos, presumably from Knidos (and presumably by disposition of Lichas, the highest commander of the concentrated forces). Thus, the number of the fleet at Knidos must be decreased by 10, not 9 ships: Andrewes ought not to speak of 111 or 91, but of 110 or 90 ships. The origin of Andrewes' oversight is easily recognizable: he does not admit that Astyochos, when moving from Miletos, has left the town totally denuded, and so argues that he has left there some of *his own* ships. But, on one hand, the contingent of the 10 guard-ships which are mentioned in VIII 61, 2 could have been formed *only at Knidos*; on the other, we must remember that the 5 ships of Chalkideus had never departed from Miletos. Accordingly, Miletos was never totally denuded at all.

Furthermore, seeing a discrepancy between the 111 or 91 and the 94 implies the presumption that these 94 constitute the whole of the Peloponnesian fleet. But the text seems to suggest the contrary, for Thucydides does not speak either of "*all* the (94) ships" nor of "*the* (94) ships", but simply of "94 ships". I think that Andrewes, who found it unpalatable to admit that Miletos was left totally denuded, ought consistently to refuse also the idea that the Lacedaemonians have denuded Knidos, especially if there was a Persian *praesidium* on place. Classen–

of Astyochos. Then, if we suppose that Hippokrates remained at Knidos with 6 ships, it is to be assumed that the Peloponnesians sailed towards Rhodes with 99 ships (52 [65 - 10 - 3] + 20 + 27); Thucydides says 94: five less.

In a paper that Andrewes was not in time to acknowledge, L. Pernée[19] maintained that the words ὅμως δέ... ὡμολογήθησαν are to be taken in the sense that Tissaphernes accepted to pay the more-than-3-obols rate on the condition that the Peloponnesians provided a fleet of 55 ships, a condition that they were not able to fulfil at the moment. This involves an entirely different interpretation of παρὰ πέντε ναῦς: "Il s'en fallut de cinq navires que plus de trois oboles pour chaque homme ne fussent accordées" (p. 118). Accordingly, "s'il est vrai d'une part qu'il manque cinq navires pour voir Tissapherne accorder plus de trois oboles à chacun, montant des subsides qu'il aimerait étendre à tous; d'autre part qu'il est prêt, pour apaiser les exigences d'Hermocrate, à verser une aide proportionelle au nombre des navires, passé les cinquante-cinq, cela signifie qu'au moment des négociacions, les Péloponnésiens disposent de *cinquante navires*" (*ibidem*). As evidence of this, Pernée refers to ch. 26, where K alone reads πεντήκοντα (against the πέντε καὶ πεντήκοντα of the cett.), rejected by the editors "contre toute logique". This view is only one of the many absurdities of Pernée's theory[20], that I omit to discuss at length. I just observe that K, Ultraiectinus Graecus 13, XV cent., though being a very interesting MS., never gives the right reading when alone. The lack of reliability of this cod. results as clear as possible from the most recent inquiry devoted to the Thucydidean tradition, i.e. from the introduction to the first two books of Alberti's *Historiae*, that was already available when Pernée wrote his paper[21]. Besides, this erroneous variant is recorded only by Weil–De Romilly (Budé) among the current editors I too think that the real number of Therimenes' ships was 50, but for very different reasons.

As for παρὰ πέντε ναῦς, I believe that the interpretation provided by the scholium has been unfairly neglected up to now by the scholars: παρὰ πέντε ναῦς: πλὴν ε νεῶν πλεῖν. Notably, this gloss is not even quoted in the great commentaries of Poppo–Stahl, Classen–Steup, and Gomme–Andrewes. But παρά = πλήν is a good meaning for this passage, and the πέντε ναῦς, in my opinion, are to be intended as the 5 Peloponnesian that sailed to Ionia before (and independently from) the fleet formally fixed by the treaty of ch. 8. After Chalkideus' death, these ships remained without commander (VIII 24, 1); moreover, they were somehow a *quid medium*; they come from Peloponnesos,

---

[19] L. Pernée, *Des subsides à taux fixe ou/et à la proportionelle. Thuc. VIII 29*, RPh LIV 1980, pp. 114–121.

[20] Cf. e.g. the interpretation of ἐντελῆ: " 'En fin de compte' (ἐντελῆ en construction attributive, de ἐν et de τέλος, qui est au terme – cf. οἱ ἐν τέλει, les autorités, ceux qui sont au terme du cursus des honneurs)" (p. 117), or that of τάλαντα as 'pesées', not talents. The proposal of changing τρία τάλαντα in κατὰ ταὐτά is astonishing.

[21] I.B. Alberti, *Thucydidis Historiae I–II*, Romae 1972.

but their crews now are Chian. It is obvious that Tissaphernes had tried to exclude them from the more-than-3-obols (or even from the 3-obols) rate.

As for ἐς γὰρ πέντε κτλ., we should remark that no interpretation is possible without previous emendation of the text (Pernée is alone in preserving the MS. πεντήκοντα τρία, but his exegesis of the passage is really outrageous)[22]. But, since no emendation proposed has solved all the problems presented by our passage, I think that another way of correction is to be tempted. I would retain the MSS. τρία and emend ἐς γὰρ πέντε ναῦς καὶ πεντήκοντα in ἐς γὰρ πέντε ναῦς ἐς πεντήκοντα: "He gave 3 talents per 5 ships up to 50 ships". With this new reading, the 55 ships of Therimenes would drop to 50, which is the figure actually requested by the reckoning of the ships; these 50 were paid with the more-than-3-obols rate, while the other were paid κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον τοῦτον, i.e. with the 3-obols rate fixed by Tissaphernes.

In this ch. 29 we have just a similar example of an ἐς corrupted into καί, i.e. ἐς δραχμήν cett.: καὶ δραχμήν E. But our corruption of ἐς πεντήκοντα in καὶ πεντήκοντα certainly should be explained on a different base. After the drop of ἐς (a very frequent loss in the Thucydidean MSS.: III 15, 1 ἐς *om.* M; IV 79, 1 ἐς *om.* M; IV 80, 4 ἐς *om.* M; IV 89, 1 ἐς *om.* M; IV 121, 2 ἐς *om.* E; V 2, 3 <ἐς> Bekker; V 17, 2 <ἐς> Poppo; V 49, 1 <ἐς> Shilleto; V 56, 1 ἐς *om.* B; V 105, 1 δ' ἐς ABCFGMΠ[11]: δὲ EZ; VII 19, 3 ἐς B: *om. cett.*), the 5 and the 50 will have been considered as members of a same figure, and summed up by means of the 'editorial' addition of καί. This should have been a very frequent type of addition, provided that Thucydides wrote his numbers by figures, not by letters. So there has been a moment of the tradition in which the editors or the scribes had to supply something when transposing the figures into letters. We may recall I 13, 4 ἑξήκοντα καὶ διακόσια codd.: δ[ιακό]σι[α ἑ]ξή[κ]οντα Π[19], without connective particle. Moreover, the semantic allotropy of two contiguous prepositions (ἐς... ἐς = '*per* 5 ships *up to* 50') frequently occurs in Thucydides[23]. Finally, the scholars

---

[22] I find acceptable only this statement: "τρία apparaît comme une nécessité organique et logique, après τριώβολον et τρεῖς ὀβολοί. Sa présence parachève l'idée que le satrape a obtenu gain de cause, sans avoir à démordre du 3" (p. 119).

[23] Cf. I 63, 1: ξυναγαγόντι τοὺς μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ὡς ἐς ἐλάχιστον χωρίον δρόμῳ βιάσασθαι ἐς τὴν Ποτείδαιαν; I 89, 2: οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου ξύμμαχοι ἤδη ἀφεστηκότες ἀπὸ βασιλέως; I 115, 4: ἐπικούρους τε ξυλλέξαντες ἐς ἑπτακοσίους διέβησαν ὑπὸ νύκτα ἐς τὴν Σάμον (note the numeral); II 77, 4: ἤδη γὰρ ἐν ὄρεσιν ὕλη τριφθεῖσα ὑπ' ἀνέμων πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπὸ ταὐτομάτου πῦρ καὶ φλόγα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνῆκεν; II 86, 1: οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ Κυλλήνῃ Πελοποννήσιοι ἐν τούτῳ κτλ.; II 97, 2 τὰ μὲν πρὸς θάλασσαν τοσαύτη ἦν, ἐς ἤπειρον δὲ ἀπὸ Βυζαντίου ἐς Λαιαίους καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Στρυμόνα (ταύτῃ γὰρ διὰ πλείστου ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἄνω ἐγίγνετο) ἡμερῶν κτλ.; III 114, 4: ἐς τὴν Ἀμπρακίαν ἀπέστειλαν ἐς τριακοσίους ὁπλίτας (note the numeral), etc. Strict proximity: I 54, 1 ἐν τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ Συβότοις... ἐν τοῖς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Συβότοις; I 58, 1: ἔκ τε Ἀθηνῶν ἐκ πολλοῦ; I 138, 5: ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ ἐστὶ τῇ Ἀσιανῇ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ; II 76, 4: καὶ δοκοὺς μεγάλας ἀρτήσαντες ἁλύσεσι μακραῖς σιδηραῖς ἀπὸ τῆς τομῆς ἑκατέρωθεν ἀπὸ κεραιῶν κτλ., etc.

ἀγαθοῦ ἢ ἐπαινετοῦ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα δεδειγμένα ἔσται, οἷον εἰ ἡ δικαιοσύνη τῶν ἐπαινετῶν, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος καὶ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ δικαίως τῶν ἐπαινετῶν. Ῥηθήσεται δὲ τὸ δικαίως καὶ ἐπαινετῶς κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πτῶσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπαινετοῦ, καθάπερ τὸ δικαίως ἀπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

Again you must look at the case of the co-ordinates and inflected forms of words both in destructive and constructive argument. By 'co-ordinates' are meant such terms as 'just actions' and 'just man', which are co-ordinate with 'justice', and 'courageous acts' and 'courageous man', which are co-ordinate with 'courage'. Similarly also things which create or preserve something are co-ordinate with that of which they are creative or preservative, for example 'healthy things' are co-ordinate with 'health', and 'things which produce a good condition' are co-ordinate with 'good condition', and so with the other cases. Such things, then, are usually described as 'co-ordinates'; 'inflected forms' are such words as 'justly', 'courageously' and 'healthily' and other words formed in this way. Inflected forms are usually regarded also as co-ordinates, for example, 'justly', as co-ordinate of 'justice' and 'courageously' of 'courage'. All words which are in the same co-ordinate series are called co-ordinates, for example, 'justice', 'just man', 'just action' and 'justly'. It is obvious, therefore, that when any one member of the co-ordinate series has been shown to be good or praiseworthy, all the rest will have been shown to be so also. For example, if 'justice' is something praiseworthy, then 'the just man' and 'the just action' and 'justly' will be something praiseworthy. And 'justly' will denote 'praiseworthily', this being the same inflexion of 'praiseworhy' as 'justly' is of 'justice'.

The subject of the above considerations are terms (concepts) which are logically co-ordinate (σύστοιχα), i.e. characterised by the fact that the same attribute can be ascribed to all of them, e.g. the attribute of goodness or praiseworthiness. In this context, Aristotle claims that, for instance, such terms as τὰ δίκαια or ὁ δίκαιος are considered to be co-ordinates with the term δικαιοσύνη. However, the Philosopher postulates to include also in the group of co-ordinates such terms which are referred to as πτώσεις, i.e. such as δικαίως, ἀνδρείως or ὑγιεινῶς, which would be co-ordinates with δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρία, etc., respectively. And these terms are not, as can be seen, inflexions (oblique cases) of words constituting terms which are to be – in Aristotle's intention – their co-ordinates, but adverbial derivatives of those words. The situation is similar in other cases, including the following:

Topica IV 3, 124a 10–14:
Πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν πτώσεων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν συστοίχων, εἰ ὁμοίως ἀκολουθοῦσι, καὶ ἀναιροῦντι καὶ κατασκευάζοντι· ἅμα γὰρ ἐνὶ καὶ πᾶσιν ὑπάρχει ἢ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, οἷον εἰ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐπιστήμη τις, καὶ τὸ δικαίως ἐπιστημόνως καὶ ὁ δίκαιος ἐπιστήμων· εἰ δὲ τούτων τι μή, οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν οὐδέν.

Again, you must take the inflexions and the co-ordinates and see if they follow similarly, both in destructive and constructive argument. For whatever belongs or does not belong to one, at the same time belongs or does not belong to all; for example, if justice is a kind of knowledge, then also, 'justly' is 'knowingly', and

syntagmas – both ὄνομα and πτῶσις ὀνόματος causes, in turn, that the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος goes beyond the limits set by the opposition system (*grammar*) vs. text and therefore it cannot be described in terms of the word flexion[13].

The opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος goes beyond the frameworks of flexion also because many times Aristotle uses the term πτῶσις when referring not to specific case forms of a given lexeme, but to forms which are its derivatives, mainly adverbial ones. This is, for example, a situation occurring in the passage from the *Topics* quoted below:

> *Topica* II 9, 114a 26–b 8:
> Πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν συστοίχων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πτώσεων, καὶ ἀναιροῦντα καὶ κατασκευάζοντα. Λέγεται δὲ σύστοιχα μὲν τὰ τοιάδε οἷον τὰ δίκαια καὶ ὁ δίκαιος τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τὰ ἀνδρεῖα καὶ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος τῇ ἀνδρίᾳ. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ ποιητικὰ ἢ φυλακτικὰ σύστοιχα ἐκείνου οὗ ἐστὶ ποιητικὰ ἢ φυλακτικά, οἷον τὰ ὑγιεινὰ ὑγιείας καὶ τὰ εὐεκτικὰ εὐεξίας. Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων. Σύστοιχα μὲν οὖν τὰ τοιαῦτα εἴωθε λέγεσθαι, πτώσεις δὲ οἷον τὸ δικαίως καὶ ἀνδρείως καὶ ὑγιεινῶς καὶ ὅσα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον λέγεται. Δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς πτώσεις σύστοιχα εἶναι, οἷον τὸ μὲν δικαίως τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, τὸ δὲ ἀνδρείως τῇ ἀνδρίᾳ. Σύστοιχα δὲ λέγεται τὰ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν συστοιχίαν ἅπαντα, οἷον δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος, δίκαιον, δικαίως. Δῆλον οὖν ὅτι ἑνὸς ὁποιοῦν δειχθέντος τῶν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν συστοιχίαν

[13] On the basis of the passage from the *Analytica priora* quoted above, some scholars equate the concept of πτώσεις ὀνόματος with all formal and functional variants (inflexional forms) that a given noun (ὄνομα) may assume in a sentence. In other words, πτώσεις ὀνόματος are to be understood – in their opinion – as all textual representations of a given lexeme (ὄνομα), which are formally and functionally determined in a sentence. Such interpretation is favoured, for instance, by Thorp (1989). By virtue of the following phrase included in the quoted passage: ... ἢ εἴ πως ἄλλως πίπτει τοὔνομα κατὰ τὴν πρότασιν, this scholar defines the meaning of the term πτῶσις as "the way a given noun (or verb) happens to turn out, to fall out, in a sentence" (p. 330). Primavesi (1994) also equates πτῶσις with every word form perceived, however, first of all, as a unit functionally determined in the sentence: "Die Metapher πτῶσις bezeichnet also [...] den Eintritt eines isolierten Nominalbegriffs in einen Satz und die damit verbundene Festlegung der jeweiligen *Funktion* des Nomens im Satzzusammenhang. Die in dieser Metapher zum Ausdruck kommende Vorstellung deckt sich mit dem *funktionalen* Aspekt des modernen Kasusbegriffs" (p. 97). Therefore, he understands the term πτῶσις itself as "Fall des Unbestimmten in die Bestimmtheit" (ibidem). Also Pagliaro (1955) perceives πτῶσις ὀνόματος as every textual representation of a specific lexical unit (ὄνομα): "... il nome cessa di essere vero e proprio ὄνομα, ma è πτῶσις ὀνόματος, quando si trova nella proposizione" (p. 24). However, the passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of the *Hermeneutics* is contrary to that interpretation; we read there: [πτῶσις ὀνόματος] μετὰ τοῦ ἔστιν ἢ ἦν ἢ ἔσται οὐκ ἀληθεύει ἢ ψεύδεται – τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἀεί. This statement makes us equate πτώσεις ὀνόματος not with all textual realisations of ὄνομα, but only with those which do not constitute the exponent of the subject of predication in a true or false sentence. At the same time, this statement suggests that Aristotle used the term ὄνομα not only in the sense of functionally uncharacterised lexeme, but also in the sense of a concrete text unit constituting – in combination with the verb 'is', 'was' or 'will be' – an element (scil. the exponent of the subject) of a true or false sentence. In other words, this statement suggests that Aristotle used the term ὄνομα also in the sense of the word form being primary textual representation of a lexeme belonging to the class of ὄνομα.

It can be clearly seen in the passage from the *Analytica priora* below:

> *Analytica priora* I 36, 48b 39–49a 5:
> Ἁπλῶς γὰρ τοῦτο λέγομεν κατὰ πάντων, ὅτι τοὺς μὲν ὅρους ἀεὶ θετέον κατὰ τὰς κλήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων, οἷον *ἄνθρωπος* ἢ *ἀγαθόν* ἢ *ἐναντία*, οὐκ *ἀνθρώπου* ἢ *ἀγαθοῦ* ἢ *ἐναντίων*, τὰς δὲ προτάσεις ληπτέον κατὰ τὰς ἑκάστου πτώσεις· ἢ γὰρ ὅτι *τούτῳ*, οἷον τὸ *ἴσον*, ἢ ὅτι *τούτου*, οἷον τὸ *διπλάσιον*, ἢ ὅτι *τοῦτο*, οἷον τὸ *τύπτον* ἢ *ὁρῶν*, ἢ ὅτι *οὗτος*, οἷον *ὁ ἄνθρωπος ζῷον*, ἢ εἴ πως ἄλλως πίπτει τοὔνομα κατὰ τὴν πρότασιν.
>
> For we maintain as a general rule which applies without exception to all examples that whereas the terms must always be posited in the nominative case (e.g., 'man' or 'good' or 'contraries', not 'of man' or 'of good' or 'of contraries'), the premisses must be understood in accordance with the case of each term: either in the dative, e.g., 'equal to this', or in the genitive, e.g., 'double of this', or in the accusative, e.g., 'that which strikes or sees this', or in the nominative, e.g., 'man is an animal'; or in any other way in which the noun occurs in the premiss[10].

In the passage quoted above, Aristotle postulates that premises (προτάσεις) in syllogisms should be understood κατὰ τὰς ἑκάστου (ὀνόματος) πτώσεις. Among the premises that are to be understood κατὰ τὰς ἑκάστου (ὀνόματος) πτώσεις he singles out premises expressed in the dative (ἢ [...] ὅτι τούτῳ), genitive (ἢ ὅτι τούτου), accusative (ἢ ὅτι τοῦτο), and... the nominative case: ἢ ὅτι οὗτος. The latter is illustrated with the example ὁ ἄνθρωπος ζῷον, where the word ζῷον functions as a premise. And thus, a premise expressed in the nominative case was treated as the premise expressed κατὰ τὴν (ὀνόματος) πτώσιν as well. It confirms the fact that the concept of πτῶσις (ὀνόματος) is very closely related to the logical and syntactic function of the word in a particular statement and that it is not univocally determined by specific inflexional characteristics (i.e. the value of the case category) of that word[11]. It becomes more obvious when one takes into account the fact that in the passage under consideration the premises understood (or expressed) κατὰ τὰς ἑκάστου (ὀνόματος) πτώσεις are contrasted with terms (ὅροι), about which it is said, in turn, that they should always be expressed κατὰ τὰς κλήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων, οἷον ἄνθρωπος ἢ ἀγαθόν ἢ ἐναντία, οὐκ ἀνθρώπου ἢ ἀγαθοῦ ἢ ἐναντίων. The expression κλήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων refers here, as results from the attached examples, to nouns in the nominative. The concept of κλῆσις τοῦ ὀνόματος corresponds thus exactly to the concept

---

[10] Translated by H. Tredennick, Cambridge, Mass.–London 2002 [first publ. 1938] (The Loeb Classical Library).

[11] Montanari (1988), who is a consistent and decisive advocate of interpreting the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος in strictly inflexional categories, i.e. as opposition of the nominative case (ὄνομα) with the oblique cases (πτώσεις ὀνόματος), when commenting the passage under discussion does not perceive any other possibility of defending his thesis than proposing to make a correction in this text (I 36, 49a 1–2): ... τὰς δὲ προτάσεις ληπτέον [καὶ] κατὰ τὰς ἑκάστου πτώσεις (p. 173).

The Chians sent 13 ships to Lesbos – which was the "second objective" of the alliance – and presumably lost 9 (VIII 23, 3). Astyochos arrived at Lesbos with 5 ships, including 1 Chian, and then sailed to Methymna (VIII 23, 4) with 8 ships, 5 of his own + 3 surviving Chian, i.e. with 4 Peloponnesian and 4 Chian. It is likely (if not sure at all) that these 4 Peloponnesian came from the 20 at Kenchreai; so, after the detaching of other 6 (VIII 23, 5), only 10 remained at Kenchreai. As for the Chians, the 13 from Anaia + the 1 of Astyochos made up another 14 ships, and brought the total Chian to 54 (including the lost ones). In VIII 24, 6, Astyochos sailed to Chios from Erythrai with 4 ships, αἳ παρῆσαν αὐτῷ. Andrewes[8] is right in assuming that these 4 ships should be the same 4 with which Astyochos sailed in for Ionia. But also *other* 6 Peloponnesian and 4 Chian ships were under his command[9].

VIII 24, 1: 55 ships, commanded by Therimenes, arrive at Miletos. Thucydides says that 20 are Syracusan and 2 Selinuntian; this means 33 Peloponnesian. But, if you add the 10 Peloponnesian remained at Kenchreai and the 18 of the second of the two squadrons into which the 39 had been divided, the result is 50, not 55 (28 + 22 = 50). Nevertheless, the exactness of the figure 55 is confirmed by chs. 26 and 29:

> VIII 26, 1: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ περὶ δείλην ἤδη ὀψίαν ἀγγέλλεται αὐτοῖς τὰς ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσου καὶ Σικελίας πέντε καὶ πεντήκοντα ναῦς ὅσον οὐ παρεῖναι. τῶν τε γὰρ Σικελιωτῶν, Ἑρμοκράτους τοῦ Συρακοσίου μάλιστα ἐνάγοντος ξυνεπιλαβέσθαι καὶ τῆς ὑπολοίπου Ἀθηναίων καταλύσεως, εἴκοσι νῆες Συρακοσίων ἦλθον καὶ Σελινούντιαι δύο, αἵ τε ἐκ Πελοποννήσου, ἃς παρεσκευάζοντο, ἑτοῖμαι ἤδη οὖσαι.
>
> VIII 29, 1 f.: καὶ μηνὸς μὲν τροφήν, ὥσπερ ὑπέστη ἐν τῇ Λακεδαίμονι, ἐς δραχμὴν Ἀττικὴν ἑκάστῳ πάσαις ταῖς ναυσὶ διέδωκε, τοῦ δὲ λοιποῦ χρόνου ἐβούλετο τριώβολον διδόναι, ἕως ἂν βασιλέα ἐπέρηται· ἢν δὲ κελεύῃ, δώσειν ἔφη ἐντελῆ τὴν δραχμήν. Ἑρμοκράτους δὲ ἀντειπόντος τοῦ Συρακοσίου στρατηγοῦ (ὁ γὰρ Θεριμένης οὐ ναύαρχος ὤν, ἀλλ' Ἀστυόχῳ παραδοῦναι τὰς ναῦς ξυμπλέων μαλακὸς ἦν περὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ), ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πέντε ναῦς πλέων ἀνδρὶ ἑκάστῳ ἢ τρεῖς ὀβολοὶ ὡμολογήθησαν. ἐς γὰρ πέντε ναῦς καὶ πεντήκοντα τριάκοντα τάλαντα ἐδίδου τοῦ μηνός· καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὅσῳ πλείους νῆες ἦσαν τούτου τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἐδίδοτο.

---

[8] In: A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, K.J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. V: *Book VIII*, Oxford 1981, ad loc.

[9] Why then did he go to Chios with only 4? And why in 31, 1 he is said to have 10 ships at Chios, not 4? Compare the following passages and note the emphasized items: VIII 23, 1: Ἀστύοχος δὲ ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος ναύαρχος τέσσαρσι ναυσίν, ὥσπερ ὥρμητο, πλέων ἐκ τῶν Κεγχρειῶν ἀφικνεῖται ἐς Χίον; VIII 23, 5: καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Κεγχρειᾷ ξυμμαχίδων Πελοποννησίων νεῶν ἀφικνοῦνται αὐτοῖς ἓξ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐς τὴν Χίον; VIII 24, 6: Ἀστύοχον δὲ ἐξ Ἐρυθρῶν τὸν ναύαρχον μετὰ τεσσάρων νεῶν, αἳ παρῆσαν αὐτῷ, κομίσαντες κτλ.; VIII 31, 1: ὁ δ' Ἀστύοχος... λαβὼν δὲ ναῦς τάς τε Πελοποννησίων δέκα καὶ Χίας δέκα ἀνάγεται. Possibly, VIII 24, 6 τεσσάρων is to be emended in δέκα, i.e. Δ = 10 was solved as Δ = 4.

or falsely – about something else (i.e. about the subject), e.g. (ὁ δόμος) Φίλωνός (ἐστιν). And hence, the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος consists first of all in the fact that ὄνομα, as a word form showing the denoted thing in the most direct way, constitutes the exponent of the subject of predication in a true or a false proposition, whereas πτώσεις ὀνόματος, by presenting their referents in a less direct (i.e. relational) way, constitute co-exponents of predication in such a proposition. Taking into consideration the primariness of ὄνομα towards πτώσεις ὀνόματος, indicated by the very nomenclature adopted by Aristotle, one can claim that the Philosopher attributed to ὄνομα as a class of lexemes first of all the function of being an exponent of the subject of predication in a sentence stating something about something[7].

Also other Aristotle's works confirm the use of the term πτῶσις ὀνόματος with reference to word forms in oblique cases. Two passages below provide a good example.

Categoriae 7, 6b 28–36:
Πάντα δὲ τὰ πρός τι πρὸς ἀντιστρέφοντα λέγεται, οἷον ὁ δοῦλος δεσπότου δοῦλος λέγεται, καὶ ὁ δεσπότης δούλου δεσπότης· καὶ τὸ διπλάσιον ἡμίσεος διπλάσιον, καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ διπλασίου ἥμισυ· καὶ τὸ μεῖζον ἐλάττονος μεῖζον, καὶ τὸ ἔλαττον μείζονος ἔλαττον. Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων, πλὴν τῇ πτώσει ἐνίοτε διοίσει κατὰ τὴν λέξιν, οἷον ἡ ἐπιστήμη ἐπιστητοῦ λέγεται ἐπιστήμη, καὶ τὸ ἐπιστητὸν ἐπιστήμῃ ἐπιστητόν, καὶ ἡ αἴσθησις αἰσθητοῦ αἴσθησις, καὶ τὸ αἰσθητὸν αἰσθήσει αἰσθητόν.

All relatives have their correlatives. 'Slave' means the slave of a master, and 'master', in turn, implies slave. 'Double' means the double of its half, just as 'half' means the half of its double. By 'greater', again, we mean greater than this or that thing which is less, by 'less' less than that which is greater. So it is with all relative terms. On occasions, however, the case or grammatical inflexion will differ. Knowledge is thus *of* the knowable; the knowable is knowable *by* knowledge. Perception is *of* the perceptible, which is perceived *by* perception[8].

Topica IV 4, 124b 36–125a 15:
Πάλιν εἰ ὡσαύτως λέγεται τὸ γένος καὶ τὸ εἶδος κατὰ τὰς πτώσεις, οἷον εἰ τινὶ ἢ τινὸς ἢ ὁσαχῶς ἄλλως. Ὡς γὰρ τὸ εἶδος, καὶ τὸ γένος, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ διπλασίου καὶ τῶν ἐπάνω· τινὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ διπλάσιον καὶ τὸ πολλαπλάσιον. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιστήμης· τινὸς γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ τὰ γένη, οἷον ἥ τε διάθεσις καὶ ἡ ἕξις. Ἔνστασις ὅτι ἐνιαχοῦ οὐχ οὕτως· τὸ μὲν γὰρ διάφορον καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον τινί, τὸ δ' ἕτερον, γένος ὂν τούτων, οὐ τινὶ ἀλλὰ τινός· ἕτερον γάρ τινος λέγεται.

---

[7] Cf. Weidemann 1994: 172: "Das im Nominativ stehende Substantiv ist für [Aristoteles] das Nennwort *par excellence*, weil er sich vorwiegend an einfachen Aussagesätzen mit einem einstelligen Prädikat von der Art des als Existenzverb gebrauchten Wortes 'ist' orientiert, in denen nur Substantive im Nominativ die dem Nennwort zukommende Rolle des Satzsubjekts spielen können".

[8] All quoted passages from the *Categories* translated by H.P. Cooke, Cambridge, Mass.–London 2002 [first publ. 1938] (The Loeb Classical Library).

means of precise engagements[3]: the ch. 29 (1 talent per ship) and the ch. 6 (the Lacedaemonians decide to send 40 ships) lead us to conclude that the sum to be paid by Tissaphernes was exactly 40 talents: "The original offer was evidently the good one of 1 drachma per day per man"[4].

But these 40 ships were never sent *all together*, because the Lacedaemonians, with their usual slowness, first decided to send 10, than the 10 dropped to 5, and these 5 arrived at Chios (VIII 16, 1) when the Chians had already given up any hope of seeing them. These 5 ships, commanded by Chalkideus (VIII 12, 3)[5], will have a special rule in the following operations; they should have been part of the 40, but in fact they remained independent; the group of the 40 is clearly recognizable in that of the 39 in ch. 7. There is no possibility of including the 5 in the 39, because the 5 leave for Ionia as *temporary substitutes* of the 39, that for a long time are not able to break the Athenian blockade in the waters of Corinth. In fact, the 5 and the 39 are separate, even if in VIII 6, 5 we can argue, *sur le papier*, that the 5 are part of the 10 that again are part (δέκα τούτων) of the 40.

But why 39 instead of 40? And what is the composition of these 39? I leave out the first question as unsolvable[6]; as for the second, it is likely that the 39 include the 10 that Agis had promised to Lesbos (VIII 52), but it is not sure whether or not they include the other 10 Boeotian as well (*ibidem*). However, these 39 were divided into two parts, the first of 21, the second of (evidently) 18 ships.

Then, the 5 of Chalkideus and 20 Chian ships sailed towards Miletos and drove the town into rebellion (VIII 17, 1); the crews of the 5 were replaced with Chian mariners; the Chians sent 10 ships to Anaia, and lost 4 (VIII 19, 3); so now they had 26 ships at sea. On the other side, the 21 Peloponnesian lost 1 and dropped to 20, but succeeded in breaking the Athenian blockade and landing at Kenchreai (VIII 20, 1). The command of these 20 was committed to Astyochos, ᾧπερ ἐγίγνετο ἤδη πᾶσα ἡ ναυαρχία (*ibidem*)[7].

---

[3] Among other things, they had to win the concurrence of Pharnabazos' ambassadors Kalligeitos and Timagoras, who offer 25 talents (VIII 8, 1).

[4] D.M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia*, Leiden 1977, p. 88.

[5] The command was committed to Alkamenes, who was replaced with Chalkideus; cf. VIII 8, 2; 10, 2; 11, 3.

[6] Perhaps there is a latent stratification here; Thucydides uses the round and the precise number (40 and 39) as regards the same group, and does not seem to notice the contradiction. Similarly, he speaks of 21 ships, stating that they are half (ἡμισείας) of 39 (see immediately below) with perfect *nonchalance*. Maybe Thucydides knew of ± 40 ships that had been divided into two squadrons roughly equivalent in number, i.e. ± 20 and ± 20 (so each of them had ἡμισείας ships). Afterwards he might have heard of the precise figures (39, 21, 18), and inserted them without adapting the context, i.e. failing to excise the disturbing ἡμισείας. I think that something anologous happened in III 113. See my paper *Tucidide tragico: noterella su 3.113.1–6*, Sileno XVII 1991, pp. 121–138.

[7] As for this imperfect (we expect the aorist) cf. W.E. Thompson, *Thucydides 8.20.1: Astyochos' Office*, CQ XXXIII 1983, pp. 293 f., who says that Thucydides "seems to mean that Astyochos took over the ships at Kenchreai and had the right to command the rest of the Peloponnesian navy, but could not exercise that right until he arrived off the coast of Asia".

Barnes 1995: Jonathan Barnes (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*, Cambridge 1995.
Bonitz 1870: Hermannus Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus*, in: *Aristotelis Opera*, ed. Academia Regia Borussica, vol. V, Berolini 1870.
Colaclidès 1968: Pierre Colaclidès, *Note sur la définition du verbe par Aristote*, Glotta XLVI 1968, pp. 56–58.
D'Avino 1975: Rita D'Avino, *Il posto del 'numero' nella economia della πτῶσις aristotelica*, Helicon XV–XVI 1975, pp. 118–129.
Delamarre 1980: Alexandre J.-L. Delamarre, *La notion de πτῶσις chez Aristote et les Stoïciens*, in: P. Aubenque (éd.), *Concepts et catégories dans la pensée antique*, Paris 1980, pp. 321–345.
Gallavotti 1974: Carlo Galavotti (a cura di), Aristotele, *Dell'arte poetica*, Roma 1974.
Gallavotti 1986: Carlo Gallavotti, 1986, *La flessione di nome e verbo nella "Poetica" di Aristotele*, in: *Energeia. Études aristotéliciennes offertes à Antonio Jannone*, Paris 1986 (Centre internationale d'études platoniciennes & aristotéliciennes, Sér. Recherches I), pp. 240–248.
Koller 1958: Hermann von Koller, *Die Anfänge der griechischen Grammatik*, Glotta XXXVII 1958, pp. 5–40.
Maroscia 1982: Antonio Maroscia, *Alcune note sul verbo in Aristotele*, Aevum LVI 1982, pp. 33–43.
Montanari 1984: Elio Montanari, *La sezione linguistica del "Peri hermeneias" di Aristotele*, vol. I: *Il testo*, Firenze 1984.
Montanari 1988: Elio Montanari, *La sezione linguistica del "Peri hermeneias" di Aristotele*, vol. II: *Il commento*, Firenze 1988.
Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1967: Guido Morpurgo-Tagliabue, *Linguistica e stilistica di Aristotele*, Roma 1967.
Pagliaro 1955: Antonino Pagliaro, *Il capitolo linguistico della "Poetica" di Aristotele*, Ricerche Linguistiche III 1955, pp. 1–55 [also in: idem, *Nuovi saggi di critica semantica*, Messina–Firenze 1956, pp. 79–151].
Pecorella 1962: Giovan Battista Pecorella (a cura di), Dionisio Trace, *TEXNH GRAMMATIKH. Testo critico e commento*, Bologna 1962.
Primavesi 1994: Oliver Primavesi, *Casus – Πτῶσις. Zum Aristotelischen Ursprung eines umstrittenen grammatischen Terminus*, A&A XL 1994, pp. 86–97.
Scarpat 1950: Giuseppe Scarpat, *Il discorso e le sue parti in Aristotele*, Milano 1950.
Tanner 1969: R.G. Tanner, *Aristotle as a Structural Linguist*, TAPhA 1969, pp. 99–164.
Thorp 1989: John Thorp 1989, *Standing up Falling down. Aristotle and the History of Grammar*, EMC XXXIII 1989, pp. 315–331.
Weidemann 1994: Hermann Weidemann (übers. und erl.), Aristoteles, *Peri hermeneias*, in: *Aristoteles, Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, Bd. 1, Tl. 2, Berlin 1994.

with the main narrative of ch. 44, and by assuming that the Lacedaemonians, before breaking openly with Tissaphernes, had sent some ships to Rhodes in order to secure their positions. This hypothesis could be right only if you imagine that the Lacedaemonian forces parted into two, one of these remaining at Knidos, the other moving towards Rhodes[18].

As for the composition of the 10 guard-ships sent to Miletos, the following reconstruction is possible: before moving to join the 27 ships of Antisthenes, Astyochos leaves the 5 of Chalkideus at Miletos, and takes away the 65, i.e. the 55 of Therimenes + the 10 (6 + 4) of his own. As seen above, these 65 join the 6 of Hippokrates and the 27 of Antisthenes at Knidos. At the moment of starting southwards, the Peloponnesian authorities could have thought that the 5 of Chalkideus were eventually insufficient to withstand an attack of the overwhelming Athenian fleet. And so *now* they could have decided to send a reinforcement of 10 ships to Miletos. It is self-evident that the ξύμβουλος Lichas could have been a little afraid of choosing these 10 from those belonging to the untrustworthy Astyochos; the 10 guard-ships include 5 Syracusan (from Hermokrates' group), 4 Thourian (from Hippokrates' group) and 1 from the 27 – as we can see, none of these 10 has ever been directly under the command

---

[18] I agree with Wilamowitz, *o.c.* (n. 16), p. 593: "Was passend wäre, 'der Zwist war nämlich schon eingetreten und die Peloponnesier schon in Rhodos', kann in diese Worte mit keinen Mitteln hineingebracht werden". In short, I think that the subject of ἐγεγένητο is not the διαφορά, but the αἴσθησις τῆς διαφορᾶς. Alkibiades, in pleading his own cause, justifies his slowness in attempting to win Tissaphernes' alliance in favour of Athens by saying that he had become aware of this διαφορά too late. It is impossible to provide here further details about my interpretation; I only say that the subject of ἐγεγένητο can be deduced from ᾔσθετο, according to the linguistic possibility – not unusual in Greek as well as in Thucydides himself – of extrapolating a term in a clause from another term implicit in the preceding clause. Cf. e.g. Dem. *Cor.* 278: ἐν οἷς τῶν ὅλων τι κινδυνεύεται τῇ πόλει καὶ ἐν οἷς πρὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐστὶ (*scil.* ὁ κίνδυνος) τῷ δήμῳ ("When all our national interests are imperilled; when the issue lies between the people and their adversaries", *Demosthenes*, vol. II, ed. by C.A. Vince, J.H. Vince, London–Cambridge, Mass. 1971; no note in *Demosthenes. Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, Bd. II, hrsg. von H. Wankel, Heidelberg 1976); Xen. *Hell.* I 2, 16: ἐδίωκεν ἔχων τούς τε ἱππέας καὶ τῶν ὁπλιτῶν εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατόν, ὧν ἦρχε Μένανδρος, μέχρι σκότος ἀφείλετο (*scil.* τὴν δίωξιν), and Plat. *Symp.* 195b: μετὰ δὲ νέων ἀεὶ σύνεστί τε καὶ ἔστιν (*scil.* νέος), but especially Thuc. I 91, 1: κατηγορούντων ὅτι τειχίζεταί τε καὶ ὕψος λαμβάνει (*scil.* τὸ τεῖχος); we can compare I 90,2: ἠξίουν τε αὐτοὺς μὴ τειχίζειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἔξω Πελοποννήσου μᾶλλον ὅσοις εἰστήκει [*scil.* τὰ τείχη (?)] ξυγκαθελεῖν μετὰ σφῶν τοὺς περιβόλους. W. Krüger, *Θουκυδίδου συγγραφή*, Berlin 1846, ad loc., adduces the interpretation of the scholium, ξυνειστήκει, περίβολος δηλονότι (also Krüger prefers ξυνειστήκει to εἰστήκει), and adds: "Oder τείχη aus τειχίζειν". Classen – Steup (n. 14): "ὅσοις εἰστήκει: nämlich τὰ τείχη aus dem voraufgehenden τειχίζειν". It is to be noted that both Gomme and Maddalena (*Thucydidis Historiarum liber primus*, II, a c. di A. Maddalena, Firenze 1952) are silent on these passages. Cf. also I 22, 1: ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες (*scil.* τῷ πολέμῳ), and II 49, 5: ἥδιστά τε ἂν ἐς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ῥίπτειν. καὶ πολλοὶ τοῦτο τῶν ἠμελημένων ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἔδρασαν (*scil.* τὴν ῥίψιν) ἐς φρέατα. Note also VIII 40,3: τειχιζομένου τοῦ Δελφινίου καὶ ἀτελοῦς ὄντος (it is a τεῖχος that is ἀτελές, obviously not Delphinion).

In the latter passage, Thucydides describes how Tissaphernes paid the Greek fleet: the agreements provided for 1 drachma daily *per month*; but such a rate is given *only for one month*. As to the future, the pay would have been only 3 obols per day (i.e. 1/2 drachma). In my opinion, it is possible that Tissaphernes has based his fraud on a captious linguistic argument (τοῦ μηνός = 'for each month', μηνός = 'for only one month'; curiously enough, both expressions occur in our ch. 29). In any case, the entire daily drachma *for one month* is paid to the crews of *all* ships. But it is debatable whether πάσαις ταῖς ναυσίν is to be interpreted as "to all the 55 ships" or "to all the (allied) ships that were present at the moment in the waters of Miletos". It is not the same thing, because Thucydides says that the 55 of Therimenes, before landing at Miletos, were joined by the 20 Chian ships that had taken part in the revolt of this town (VIII 28, 1), and because *other* νῆες are mentioned in ch. 29 apart from the 55; moreover, we know that the Peloponnesian fleet will lose some *Chian* ships at Cynossema. So it is highly probable that at least 75 ships, not only 55, are to be taken in consideration here. Finally, we have to deal also with the 5 ships of Chalkideus, which seem to have never moved from Miletos. Andrewes is certainly right in speaking of "ninety at Miletos" (p. 29) (55 + 20 + 5 + 10 [i.e. the 10 arrived with Astyochos] = 90), but afterwards he soon completely forgets the 5 of Chalkideus in his further reckoning, and overlooking this distorts the results of his calculations.

Though Tissaphernes pretends to pay less than he had promised, Hermokrates succeeds in obtaining *more* than 3 obols per day per man for the whole allied forces (cf. the parallel narrative of VIII 45, 3: τούτων δὲ Ἑρμοκράτης στρατηγὸς ὢν ἠναντιοῦτο μόνος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παντὸς ξυμμαχικοῦ)[10]. It seems clear that "the whole allied forces" are the 55 ships, because the other (20 Chian) νῆες are excluded from this treatment as well as, we can argue, the 5 of the deceased Chalkideus. Apparently, Hermokrates had no claim for interceding also for ships which he had nothing to do with.

The ch. 29 is an ancient *crux* of the Thucydidean criticism, for the words παρὰ πέντε ναῦς still need a convincing explanation, and the subsequent ἐς γὰρ πέντε ναῦς καὶ πεντήκοντα τρία τάλαντα ἐδίδου τοῦ μηνός are no doubt to be emended in some way. The codd. have τρία, not τριάκοντα (*par acquit de conscience*, I have printed τριάκοντα above, according to the current editions), but 3 talents for 55 ships is an impossible figure, and so we have either to delete καὶ πεντήκοντα or to change τρία in τριάκοντα[11]. The former solution "gives an

---

[10] A similar episode of bargaining occurs in Xen. *Hell.* I 5, 3–7 between Kyros and Lysandros; the former promises a 3-obols rate per man, but the latter asks for, and obtains, the addition of an obol: ἐκ δὲ τούτου τέτταρες ὀβολοὶ ἦν ὁ μισθός, πρότερον δὲ τριώβολον.

[11] This correction was proposed by M. Meibom, *De fabrica triremium*, Amstelodami 1671, pp. LI f.

on the one hand, those forms are contrasted with ὀνόματα (οὐκ ὀνοματα ἀλλὰ πτώσεις ὀνόματος), whereas on the other, further on, are made equivalent with them in any other respect (λόγος δέ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ (*scil. Φίλωνος, Φίλωνι* etc.) τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατὰ τὰ αὐτά [*scil.* ὀνόματα]), except for one (ὅτι δὲ)[5], namely, that in combination with appropriate forms of the verb 'to be' they do not form either a true or a false proposition (μετὰ τοῦ *ἔστιν* ἢ *ἦν* ἢ *ἔσται* οὐκ ἀληθεύει ἢ ψεύδεται), whereas ὄνομα, when coupled with the forms of the verb *to be*, always forms such a proposition (τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἀεί).

Thus, it can be noted that the term πτώσεις ὀνόματος conveys the concept which undoubtedly has a close link with the inflexional category of case. However, the meaning of this term cannot be fully identified with the concept of "cases of the noun" adopted in modern grammar, since Aristotle regarded as πτώσεις ὀνόματος only forms representing oblique cases. These forms are contrasted with ὄνομα, which – based on the presented characteristics[6] – should be, in turn, identified with a noun in the nominative case. And thus, a noun in the nominative is not one of πτώσεις ὀνόματος. Besides, the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος has been shown here as strictly functional and defined in entirely logical terms: a noun in the nominative case (= ὄνομα) when coupled with a form of the verb 'to be' constitutes a true or false proposition (e.g. Φίλων ἔστιν – 'Philo is [= exists]'), whereas nouns in oblique cases (= πτώσεις ὀνόματος) do not form such propositions (e.g. Φίλωνός ἐστιν – 'of Philo is'). Therefore, the concept of πτώσεις ὀνόματος, characterised in an exclusively negative way, is put here in a purely logical context, i.e. as a concept including forms in oblique cases which coupled with the (forms of the) verb 'to be' do not constitute true or false propositions.

A crucial element of the passage under analysis is the fact that the concept denoted by the term πτώσεις ὀνόματος, i.e. the concept of forms in oblique cases, is contrasted here with the concept denoted by the term ὄνομα, which,

---

[5] The expression λόγος δέ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, ὅτι δὲ... comes most probably from a phrase based on an ellipse and characteristic for the Attic political and legal jargon. That phrase was used while adopting laws by the people's assembly. According to Ammonius (*In Aristotelis "De interpretatione" commentarius* [ed. A. Busse, Berlin 1897] 46, 29 ff.), it was used when one person moved to adopt several laws: namely, while reading the first of them, apart from an appropriate introductory address, a full name, *patronimicum* and a *demos* represented by an applicant were listed, whereas while introducing others, all of those preliminaries were disregarded and referred to by means of that phrase. On the other hand, Stephanus (*Stephani in librum Aristotelis "De interpretatione" commentarius* (ed. H. Hayduck, Berlin 1885) 12, 14 ff.) speaks about using that formula while making amendments to some law during a discussion. That law was not read then in whole, but the discussion participants limited themselves (in order to save time) only to read fragments subject to modifications, using the formula under consideration in order to confirm the so-far reading of the other parts of the text. See Montanari 1988: 164 f.; Scarpat 1950: 77.

[6] I.e. on the basis of the fact that it makes a true or false proposition when coupled with the forms of the verb 'to be'.

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

CAESARION IN CLEOPATRA'S POLITICS

By

MACIEJ MILCZANOWSKI

In September 48 BC Caesar arrived in Alexandria in pursuit of Gnaeus Pompeius. Soon after his arrival, he met Cleopatra, who was brought to him rolled in a carpet – as a trick to deceive her enemies[1]. At the beginning of 47 BC, after the "Alexandrine War", Cleopatra, the queen of Egypt, and Caesar, the dictator of the Roman Empire had an enchanting trip along the River Nile[2]. One of the results of their passionate romance was a son who was born on 23rd June 47 BC[3]. Cleopatra named him Caesar[4] after her powerful lover, which was an act of great risk, considering her position, as it was a manifestation of her dishonourable relationship, especially in the eyes of the Greeks and Macedonians[5], and also showed her ambitions in Rome. From Cleopatra's perspective giving birth to Caesar's son was her political success – from now on she was the mother of the dictator's only son. With each passing year, the boy gradually became more meaningful in the queen's politics[6]. Alexandrians named

---

[1] According to Plutarch, *Caes*. 49.

[2] Suet. *Caes*. 52; App. *BC* II 90; *CAH*², vol. IX: *The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 143–44 B.C.*, ed. J.A. Crook (and others), Cambridge 1994, p. 66 (C. Pelling); E.R. Bevan, *The House of Ptolemy: A History of Egypt under Ptolemaic Dynasty*, Chicago 1968, pp. 363, 366. About uncertainties concerning this trip, see T. Grabowski, *Ptolemeusze i Rzym. Przyjaźń czy zależność*, Kraków 2005, p. 296, n. 84.

[3] There are some doubts about Caesar's fatherhood and the exact date of the child's birth, see Grabowski, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 296, nn. 84 f.

[4] On the stela of "the good musician" Kheredankh both Ptolemy Caesar and his mother "Lady of the Two Lands Cleopatra" are named (the stela from the Cairo Museum, JE 45702). Even Cicero named Cleopatra's son Caesar in one of his letters (*Att.* XIV 20, 2): "de regina [...] atque etiam de Caesare illo". Nicolaus of Damascus states that Cleopatra named her son Cyrus: *FGrHist* 90 (Nic. Damasc.) F 130, 20. See A.E.P.B. Weigall, *The Life and Times of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt, A Study in the Origin of the Roman Empire*, London–Edinburgh 1914, pp. 130 f.; H. Volkmann, *Cleopatra: A Study in Politics and Propaganda* (English transl.), New York 1958, p. 74.

[5] Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 366.

[6] Volkmann, *o.c.* (n. 4), p. 75; D.E.E. Kleiner, *Cleopatra and Rome*, London 2005, p. 85.

which in passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of the *Hermeneutics* was linked with the term ὄνομα. We can presume that Aristotle used here the term κλήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων to make his argument more explicit, since the phrase: τοὺς μὲν ὅρους ἀεὶ θετέον κατὰ τὰ ὀνόματα would be unclear, especially because the definitional criteria established for ὄνομα (as a class of lexemes) are fulfilled by πτώσεις ὀνομάτων as well. Thus, the opposition: κλήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων (= ὀνόματα) – πτώσεις ὀνομάτων coincides exactly with the opposition: ὅροι – προτάσεις. So, πτώσεις ὀνομάτων are not so much the forms in oblique cases as the forms occurring in premises, i.e. forms constituting (co)exponents of predication and in this way differing from κλήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων (= ὀνόματα), i.e. forms being exponents of terms, that is, exponents of the subject of predication.

The passage quoted above confirms, as we have already pointed out, mainly functional (i.e. determined by syntagmatic relations) character of the concept of πτῶσις ὀνόματος[12]. Its relationship with inflexional features of a word form (i.e. with the case) is only indirect and hence ambiguous. With reference to this we may say that forms in oblique cases always constitute πτώσεις, since they always (i.e. in every expression) constitute only an exponent of something said about the subject or characterising the subject. The nominative may constitute πτῶσις provided that it also constitutes the exponent of the predicative content in a given expression, whereas a nominative form being the exponent of the subject of predication is classified as ὄνομα. Therefore, πτώσεις ὀνόματος may be constituted by inflexional forms in all cases, while the ὄνομα only by the nominative form. It seems that the very fact that forms in oblique cases always constitute only πτώσεις (and not the ὄνομα) made Aristotle choose just them to illustrate the concept of πτῶσις in the clearest way in passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of the *Hermeneutics*, since by referring to them one can easily and unambiguously point to the essential criterion for this concept, namely that of not constituting the exponent of the subject of predication (μετὰ τοῦ *ἔστιν* ἢ *ἦν* ἢ *ἔσται* οὐκ ἀληθεύει ἢ ψεύδεται) – contrary to the nominative form, which is ambivalent in this respect. Perhaps this is also why in this passage Aristotle does not refer to the nominative form of Φίλων – as the opposite of the forms of Φίλωνος and Φίλωνι constituting πτώσεις – but only to the concept of ὄνομα, which, indeed, implies the nominative form, but is not identical with that form as such, since it may also constitute πτῶσις ὀνόματος in the specific expressions (contexts). In conclusion we should state then that particular word forms constitute πτώσεις ὀνόματος inasmuch as they are exponents of predicative contents, and, analogically, they constitute ὀνόματα inasmuch as they are exponents of the subject of predication. The fact that the nominative form may constitute – depending on particular

---

[12] With reference to this place, Primavesi (1994: 95) says: "Πτῶσις ist hier also für Aristoteles ein reiner Funktionsbegriff, der das Nomen als Satzteil bezeichnet".

Steup[15] argue that Knidos remained guarded, but allege that the contingent of the 10 guard-ships has been formed at Rhodes, though without providing any ground in order to justify such an oddity. On my part, I find it hardly reasonable that the Lacedaemonians sent the guard-ships to Miletos not from the near Knidos, but from the far Rhodes, and not immediately, but after a certain time, in which this important Aegean base could easily fall into the hands of the near Athenian fleet. Classen–Steup add: "Daß Thukydides über ihre Absendung [*scil.* of the 10 ships] von Rhodos, wo alle peloponnesische Schiffe bis auf sechs vereinigt gewesen waren, nichts berichtet hat, ist zu den Spuren des unfertigen Zustandes des 8. Buch zu rechnen". But this *Absendung* does not fit the words of Thucydides himself, who says that the Peloponnesians, after their arrival at Rhodes, drew their ships on shore and τὰ δ' ἄλλα ἡσύχαζον. Classen–Steup's reconstruction has been strongly vitiated by their own way of reckoning; they number 100 ships at Knidos, including the 5 of Chalkideus, but excluding the 20 Chian; if the Peloponnesians had sent the 10 guard-ships from there, they could not have sailed towards Rhodes with 94 ships. But it is illogical to exclude the presence of the 5 of Chalkideus at Miletos and suppose their presence at Knidos.

Furthermore, the attempt of identifying the 94 ships with the whole of the fleet prevents Andrewes from getting a decisive argument in support of the interpretation provided by Delebecque about the harsh ch. 52 – an interpretation which seems untenable to me, but to which Andrewes, for want of something better, pays a certain attention:

> μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο Ἀλκιβιάδης μὲν Τισσαφέρνην παρεσκεύαζε καὶ ἀνέπειθεν ὅπως φίλος ἔσται τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, δεδιότα μὲν τοὺς Πελοποννησίους, ὅτι πλέοσι ναυσὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων παρῆσαν, βουλόμενον δὲ ὅμως, εἰ δύναιτό πως, πεισθῆναι, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἐν τῇ Κνίδῳ διαφορὰν περὶ τῶν Θηριμένους σπονδῶν ᾔσθετο τῶν Πελοποννησίων (ἤδη γὰρ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ ὄντων αὐτῶν ἐγεγένητο).

From the parenthesis ἤδη ... ἐγεγένητο it looks as if the διαφορά between Tissaphernes and the Lacedaemonians had taken place when the latter (αὐτῶν) were *already* at Rhodes. Which is not true, for this διαφορά had broken out in Knidos, as actually did (cf. ch. 44), and as Thucydides has correctly recorded here (τὴν ἐν τῇ Κνίδῳ διαφοράν). So "Thucydides cannot be saying that what happened at Knidos happened at Rhodes" (Andrewes). Wilamowitz bracketed ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ ὄντων αὐτῶν[16], Classen–Steup the whole sentence. Delebecque[17] defends the received text by holding this parenthesis to be a little contradiction

---

[15] Classen, Steup, *o.c.* (n. 14).
[16] U. von Wilamowitz, *Thukydides VIII*, Hermes XLIII 1908, pp. 578–618.
[17] E. Delebecque, *Thucydide et Alcibiade*, Aix-en-Provence 1965, pp. 117 f.

arithmetically easy result for the monthly pay per ship (forty minas in place of the thirty required for the three-obol rate) and per man (18 dr. in place of 15 dr.; the daily pay is a more awkward fraction at 3 3/5 ob., but that does not matter if payment was by the month); and it allows Thucydides to state the agreement in straightforward and intelligible form. The intrusion of καὶ πεντήκοντα is easily accounted for as due to a reader who thought that the second clause should refer to the 55 ships of Therimenes" (Andrewes); the latter seems to be softer, but implies "an arithmetical absurdity"[12] in the reckoning. *Ceteris paribus*, the deletion is far preferable, provided also that τριάκοντα instead of τρία looks as if it is – but is not – an easy correction[13]. Though – alas – the following τούτου τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ cannot be referred to only *five* ships, and so the emendation τριάκοντα has been generally accepted in spite of the "arithmetical absurdity". As for παρὰ πέντε ναῦς, the commentators generally adopt Madvig's interpretation, that I quote at full extent: "Triginta talenta stipendium menstruum erat sexaginta navium, si bini oboli in diem darentur; cum igitur hoc in quinquaginta quinque naves darentur, nautae παρὰ πέντε ναῦς plus accipiebant (um fünf Schiffe mehr), id est, tanto plus, quantum adiiciebat quinque navium stipendium in reliqua quinquaginta quinque distributum. Cum excidisset τριάκοντα post πεντήκοντα, id mendum in Vaticano relictum est, in ceteris occultatum, addito infeliciter τρία"[14]. But I find no parallel for πέντε + acc. = 'um ... mehr'; moreover, the "arithmetical absurdity" remains.

In ch. 35, another 12 Peloponnesian ships, commanded by Hippokrates, are sent to Ionia: 10 Thourian + 1 Siracusan + 1 Laconian. Hippokrates reaches Knidos (VIII 35, 1) and loses 6. Presumably, the extant 6 are left on place. In ch. 39, a Peloponnesian squadron of 27 ships sails to Ionia; Antisthenes is the formal commander, but Lichas and another ten ξύμβουλοι seem to be the highest authorities on board; they have the power of dismissing Astyochos, who

---

[12] See W.E. Thompson, *Tissaphernes and the Mercenaries at Miletos*, Philologus CIX 1965, pp. 294–297, and Andrewes (in Gomme, Andrewes, Dover, *o.c.* [n. 8], ad 29, 2, p. 71): "30/35 T, or $3272^{8}/_{11}$ dr., per ship per month, $17^{3}/_{11}$ dr. per man per month".

[13] In the old system, 3 was abridged III, 30 ΔΔΔ; in the recent one, 3 Γ and 30 Λ. In the *scriptio plena*, the reverse error would have been easier because of the influence of the preceding πεντήκοντα. Indeed, the Γ and the Λ were probably of similar shape in the handwriting used by Thucydides (as it can be demonstrated by the emendation of διελέλυντο in διεγένοντο [V 1] proposed by L. Canfora, *Sulla scrittura dell'autografo tucidideo*, RhM CXVII 1974, pp. 219 f.), but such a similarity could cause confusion only within the new numerical system, which Thucydides perhaps did not use.

[14] I.N. Madvig, *Adversaria critica ad scriptores Graecos et Latinos*, Hauniae 1871, vol. I, p. 333. Of course, we must read *trini oboli* instead of *bini oboli*. Therefore, the explication of the error is not persuasive: why τρία and not e.g. ἱκανά (see n. 1) or even the right τριάκοντα? Classen–Steup's (J. Classen, J. Steup, *Thukydides*, vol. VIII, Berlin 1922, p. 72) paraphrase "um 5 schiffe mehr als *wirklich vorhanden waren*" (my italics) is arbitrary: Madvig might have had in mind the *real* 5 ships of Chalkideus.

πτῶσις ὀνόματος shows its referent, allows, in turn, this form to be perceived as a word variant, which is – as well as πτῶσις ῥήματος – semantically marked, and thus different from ὄνομα, presenting its referent in a neutral and most direct way.

Thus, it seems that a semantic factor is the common basis of both oppositions. The criterion identifying πτώσεις as such, i.e. word forms perceived as secondary text variants of both classes of lexemes (ὄνομα and ῥῆμα), turns out to be some kind of semantic surplus or semantic markedness of those forms. Despite those common semantic roots, πτώσεις ὀνόματος and πτώσεις ῥήματος are not, however, fully parallel concepts. Semantic markedness distinguishing πτώσεις ῥήματος from ὀνόματα implies functional differentiation of both kinds of word forms at the logical level (a co-exponent of the predicate vs. an exponent of the subject of predication), whereas semantic surplus distinguishing πτώσεις ῥήματος from ῥήματα does not imply such logical consequences, which allowed Aristotle to present the predicative function (i.e. being always "signs of something said of something else") as one of the definitional criteria of ῥῆμα as a class of lexemes (parts of speech). Apart from that, semantic basis underlying the opposition between ῥῆμα and πτώσεις ῥήματος makes it possible to identify both subjects of that opposition with word units which can be defined in terms of their grammatical (inflexional) characteristics, whereas semantic difference being the basis of the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος, stemming from non-predicative / predicative presentation of the referent by a given word form, does not permit identification of πτώσεις ὀνόματος in purely inflexional (grammatical) terms. The status of πτῶσις ὀνόματος may result from specific inflexional characteristics of a given word form (e.g. nouns in oblique cases), as well as from its morphological (derivational) structure (e.g. adjectival and adverbial derivatives), and even exclusively from the context in which that form is used (e.g. predicate nominatives). That is why πτῶσις ὀνόματος, being a predicative variant of ὄνομα, may be defined only in functional (logical or syntactical) terms and constitutes a concept going beyond the limits determined not only by the opposition flexion vs. word formation, but also by the concept of word morphology.

Jagellonian University, Kraków

REFERENCES

Arens 1984: Hans Arens 1984, *Aristotle's Theory of Language and its Tradition. Texts from 500 to 750 (Selection, Translation and Commentary)*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 1984.

If we want to establish the exact meaning of Aristotle's πτῶσις ὀνόματος, we cannot, of course, disregard the meaning ascribed by Aristotle to the parallel term πτῶσις ῥήματος. The concept denoted by this term obviously stands in a certain relation to the concept of ῥῆμα. That relation, similarly to the relation between ὄνομα and πτώσεις ὀνόματος, was determined in the initial chapters of the *Hermeneutics*, where we read:

De interpretatione 3, 16b 6–11:
Ῥῆμα δέ ἐστι τὸ προσσημαῖνον χρόνον, οὗ μέρος οὐδὲν σημαίνει χωρίς· καὶ ἔστιν ἀεὶ τῶν καθ' ἑτέρου λεγομένων σημεῖον. λέγω δὲ ὅτι προσσημαίνει χρόνον, οἷον *ὑγίεια* μὲν ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ *ὑγιαίνει* ῥῆμα· προσσημαίνει γὰρ τὸ νῦν ὑπάρχειν. καὶ ἀεὶ τῶν καθ' ἑτέρου λεγομένων σημεῖόν ἐστιν, οἷον τῶν καθ' ὑποκειμένου ἢ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ.

A verb is a sound which not only conveys a particular meaning but has a time-reference also. No part by itself has a meaning. It indicates always that something is said or asserted *of* something. Let me explain what I mean by 'it has a time-reference also'. Now, 'health' is a noun, for example, 'is healthy' is a verb, not a noun. For the latter conveys its own meaning but also conveys that the state signified (namely, health) now exists. Then, a verb was an indication *of* something asserted of something; I mean, of a something predicated of a subject or found present in it[21].

De interpretatione 3, 16b 16–18:
ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ *ὑγίανεν* ἢ τὸ *ὑγιανεῖ* οὐ ῥῆμα, ἀλλὰ πτῶσις ῥήματος· διαφέρει δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος, ὅτι τὸ μὲν τὸν παρόντα προσσημαίνει χρόνον, τὰ δὲ τὸν πέριξ.

'He was healthy' or 'he will be healthy' I likewise should not call a verb. I should call it the tense of a verb. Verb and tenses in this respect differ: the verb indicates present time but the tenses all times save the present.

In passage 3, 16b 6–11 we find the definition of ῥῆμα. According to this definition ῥῆμα is characterised – similarly to ὄνομα – by semantic indivisibility, however, it differs from ὄνομα in two other features: it is a unit carrying the notion of time (τὸ προσσημαῖνον χρόνον) and it is always a sign of something said about something else (ἔστιν ἀεὶ τῶν καθ' ἑτέρου λεγομένων σημεῖον). As far as the first feature is concerned, i.e. carrying the notion of time, on the basis of presented exemplification we can conclude that Aristotle does not refer to the lexical meaning of words included in this class, but the meaning stemming from the fact that they take into account a grammatical category of time. As a result, we may identify those words with verbs. The other definitional feature attributed

---

[21] In the opinion of commentators (see Arens 1984: 46 f.; Montanari 1988: 194–199; Weidemann 1994: 174 f.) 'something predicated of a subject' (τὰ καθ' ὑποκειμένου) should be identified with genus or species features, which are essential for a given thing, whereas 'something found present in a subject' (τὰ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ) should be identified with its accessory, i.e. non-definitional, additional features.

sible in case of the definition of ὄνομα as a class of lexemes, since word forms representing this class (i.e. ὀνόματα and πτώσεις ὀνόματος) are functionally (logically) diverse. Therefore, the definition of ὄνομα as a class of lexemes, put forward in the passage 2, 16a 19–20 of the *Hermeneutics*, does not include any functional characteristics.

The question arises why Aristotle regarded forms in the present tense as primary and the most representative variants of the verb (as a class of lexemes), whereas forms in the past and future tenses as its secondary variants, i.e. πτώσεις ῥήματος. Another question is: what links the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος with the other one, i.e. ῥῆμα vs. πτώσεις ῥήματος? In other words: what is the common conceptual criterion for πτώσεις as such, i.e. as secondary word variants? What is the common feature of both πτώσεις ὀνόματος and πτώσεις ῥήματος, which makes them just πτώσεις, scil. secondary word variants? In what way do the πτώσεις differ from word forms qualified as primary word variants, i.e. from ὀνόματα and ῥήματα, respectively. Before we try to answer those questions, we will quote one more passage, this time from the *Poetics*:

> *Poetica* 20, 1457a 18–23:
> Πτῶσις δ' ἐστὶν ὀνόματος ἢ ῥήματος, ἡ μὲν κατὰ τὸ τούτου ἢ τούτῳ σημαῖνον καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἑνὶ ἢ πολλοῖς, οἷον ἄνθρωποι ἢ ἄνθρωπος, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά, οἷον κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἢ ἐπίταξιν· τὸ γὰρ ἐβάδισεν; ἢ βάδιζε πτῶσις ῥήματος κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ εἴδη ἐστίν.
>
> An inflection is the feature of a noun or verb which signifies case ('of him', 'to him', etc.), or singular and plural (e.g. 'man', 'men'), or aspects of delivery, such as question or command ('did he walk?' or 'walk!' are verbal inflections in this classification)[25].

As can be seen, in this passage Aristotle presents the issue of πτῶσις, including word forms of both classes of lexemes, i.e. ὄνομα and ῥῆμα, which were identified and defined in the previous passages of the *Poetics*, namely in 20, 1457a 10–11 and 20, 1457a 13–18, respectively. Some interpretative difficulties arise from the fact that – unlike in the case of analogical passages in the *Hermeneutics* – particular word variants referred to as πτώσεις (ὀνόματος or ῥήματος), are not contrasted here explicitly with word variants constituting ὄνομα or ῥῆμα, respectively. Apart from that, syntactic structure of that passage does not allow to point a clear dividing line separating this passage into a part concerning ὄνομα (and πτώσεις ὀνόματος) and another one regarding ῥῆμα (and πτώσεις ῥήματος). All this poses some problems with establishing the exact

---

[25] All quoted passages from the *Poetics* translated by S. Halliwell, Cambridge, Mass.–London 2005 [first publ. 1995] (The Loeb Classical Library).

Caesar's gardens on the other side of the Tiber Cleopatra demonstrated that she was closer to Caesar than any other woman. Romans did not hold her in high esteem[14], but by showing Cesarion as their legitimate son the queen could cherish hopes to groom him for some political importance in the future. As we learn from Suetonius, Caesar "accitam in urbem [*scil.* Cleopatram] non nisi maximis honoribus praemiisque auctam remisit filiumque natum appellare nomine suo passus est"[15]. It seems that if the queen named her son Caesar just after his birth, then during her visit to Rome the dictator most probably allowed her to use his name officially. We can conjecture that it was a kind of demonstration of his son's legitimacy. Under such circumstances, the small boy had become involved in Roman politics.

During this time the temple of Venus was being built in the new forum – *Forum Iulium*. The temple, although unfinished, was consecrated on 26th September 46 BC[16]. Such ceremonies were usually held during games, and it was so in this case. Sculptures of Venus as well as a golden statue of Cleopatra stood in the temple, which may suggest that Caesar purposely linked Cleopatra to Venus, in order to increase her popularity[17]. If so, then their son could become divine in the future, and could epitomize hopes for a new age. We can surmise that during the ceremony the honoured Egyptian queen was seating with her son together with Caesar.

All the facts mentioned above become even more significant when we realize that all this happened in a very short period of time. It seems that Caesar really had decided to introduce the Egyptian queen to Rome as someone who would assume some political importance in that city. Bevan's remarks sound very convincing – that Caesar wanted to establish a Hellenistic kingdom[18] jointly with Cleopatra, a kingdom to be ruled by the Roman conqueror and the queen of Egypt, the "surviving representative of the Macedonian empire of the house of Ptolemy"[19]. The vast majority of Romans were unenthusiastic towards such a mixture of blood. They were very suspicious about anyone from outside who wanted to gain power in their city, especially about people from the East, where monarchy was

---

[14] Cicero wrote in a letter to Atticus (*Att.* XV 15): "reginam odi".

[15] Suet. *Caes.* 52.

[16] Cass. Dio XLIII 22, 2; LI 22, 3; App. *BC* II 102; III 28.

[17] Grabowski, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 297.

[18] Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 368. Paul Zanker states that because of Caesar's fascination with Egypt, he even wanted to convert Rome into a more Hellenistic city: P. Zanker, *August i potęga obrazów* (Polish transl.), Poznań 1999, p. 159. Some of Caesar's actions show that he might have had the idea of introducing monarchy in Rome. Note using a golden throne during the ceremonies, attempts to put a golden diadem on his head and later on his statue: Cic. *Phil.* 2, 85; *FGrHist* 90 (Nic. Damasc.) F 130, 20 f.; Suet. *Caes.* 76 and 79; Plut. *Caes.* 61; App. *BC* II 106; Cass. Dio XLIV 11, 2 f. See S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, Oxford 1971, pp. 272 f.; L. Canfora, *Giulio Cesare, Il dittatore democratico*, Roma 2005, pp. 310–315.

[19] Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 368.

οὐκέτι βαστάζω, μὰ τὰ σ᾽ ὄμματα, τὴν φιλέραστον
κοίτην μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίῃ.

„Ich ertrage es – bei deinen Augen – nicht mehr, daß mein liebessehnsüchtiges Bett durch die Trennung von dir zu einem einsamen Lager wird". Zu τὴν φιλέραστον / κοίτην vgl. Philod. *AP* V 4, 5 f. = Garland 3164 f.: σὺ δ᾽, ὦ *φιλεράστρια κοίτη* (J.G. Schneider: κοίτης cod.),/ ἥδη τῆς Παφίης ἴσθι τὰ λειπόμενα. Das Adjektiv φιλέραστος begegnet insbesondere öfters bei Meleager, *AP* V 136, 5 = *HE* 4226; 144, 3 = *HE* 4158; 147, 4 = *HE* 4239; 163, 5 = *HE* 4252.

Rufin. 3 P. = *AP* V 14:

Εὐρώπης τὸ φίλαμα, καὶ ἢν ἄχρι χείλεος ἔλθῃ,
ἡδύ γε, κἂν ψαύσῃ μοῦνον ἄχρι στόματος ·
ψαύει δ᾽ οὐκ ἄκροις τοῖς χείλεσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐρίσασα
τὸ στόμα τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξ ὀνύχων ἀνάγει.

Das zweite ἄχρι, welches neben ψαύσῃ viel schlechter paßt als das erste neben ἔλθῃ, ist als Influenzfehler anzusehen und mit Jacobs in ἄκρου zu verbessern (Jacobs vergleicht Eur. *Hec*. 242: οὐ γὰρ ἄκρας καρδίας ἔψαυσέ μου). Die Wendung im zweiten Distichon ψαύει δ᾽ οὐκ ἄκροις τοῖς χείλεσιν kombiniert mit formaler Sorgfalt die Ausdrücke ἄχρι χείλεος ἔλθῃ und ψαύσῃ μοῦνον ἄκρου στόματος im ersten. Dabei wird jedoch inhaltlich die Perspektive gewechselt: Es geht nicht mehr darum, wie weit die Küsse der Europa gehen, sondern mit welcher Technik sie küßt. Dementsprechend wird ψαύειν jetzt nicht mehr mit dem Zielgenitiv, sondern mit dem instrumentalen Dativ verbunden; χείλεα bzw. στόμα bezeichnen die Körperteile nicht des Geküßten, sondern der Europa selbst.

Unter diesen Voraussetzungen kann man sich jetzt dem Problem in ἐρίσασα zuwenden. Page S. 41 ist geneigt, diesen grotesken, die Quantität eines zum Verbalstamm gehörenden Diphthongs ignorierenden Schnitzer hinzunehmen. Er weist darauf hin, daß ἐρείδειν begrifflich allen vorgeschlagenen Konjekturen vorzuziehen ist. Aber es ist doch fraglich, ob das Simplex ausreicht in einem Satz, wo kein relativer Bezugspunkt des Verbalvorgangs genannt ist. τὸ στόμα ἐρείδειν heißt ja nicht mehr als „seinen Mund stützen bzw. stemmen", und der lokale Bezugspunkt dieses Vorgangs bleibt unerwähnt im Gegensatz etwa zu Paul. Sil. *AP* V 232, 1: Ἱππομένην φιλέουσα νόον *προσέρεισα* Λεάνδρῳ; 250, 3 f.: *ἐγκλιδὸν ὤμῳ* / ἡμετέρῳ κεφαλὴν δηρὸν ἐρεισαμένη; Opp. *Hal*. II 110: ὄμματ᾽ ἐπιμύει, *σὺν* δὲ στόμα πάμπαν ἐρείδει oder Nonn. *Dion*. XI 109: *περὶ στόμα* χεῖλος ἐρείσας; vgl. auch Marcus Argent. *AP* V 128: στέρνα περὶ στέρνοις, μαστῷ δ᾽ ἔπι μαστὸν *ἐρείσας* / χείλεά τε γλυκεροῖς χείλεσι *συμπιέσας* / Ἀντιγόνης καὶ χρῶτα λαβὼν πρὸς χρῶτα, τὰ λοιπὰ / σιγῶ, μάρτυς ἐφ᾽ οἷς

in correspondence with the queen, but even if he was, it had to be the worst time for her. When they finally met, just before his expedition against Parthia in 36 BC, Cleopatra, after such a long period of experiencing real terror, was even more possessive.

The situation became more complicated after Antony's expedition against the Parthians, which was meant to be the crucial moment in his rivalry with Octavian. He believed that having conquered Parthia, he would resemble Caesar more than Octavian did, who only used the former dictator's name[33]. Such success would have created a much better situation for Cleopatra's claims for the young Ptolemy Caesar as the natural son and heir to Julius Caesar, who had dreamed of becoming, like Alexander the Great, a ruler of the East. Unfortunately, the conquest of Parthia ended in a complete disaster.

This loss could have changed Antony's plans, which posed a great threat to Cleopatra and her son. Octavian sent his sister, Antony's wife, with supplies and some troops to gain his alliance once again. A little earlier he had cut off recruitment for Antony from Italy. He sent Antony's ships back to him, instead of lending him four promised legions[34]. This way Octavian displayed to Antony the potential risk of his being alienated from Rome; he also did not want to reinforce a possible opponent, but on the other hand he offered reconciliation by sending Octavia. Cleopatra knew Antony well enough and having foreseen Octavian's plan, she did everything to prevent her lover from meeting his wife[35]. He did not meet Octavia and ordered her to go back to Rome. This decision to stay only with Cleopatra[36] was her success, especially after such stressful experiences, but it also became her greatest mistake to make him cut off from his supporters in Rome. Antony, from that moment, acted irresponsibly and did not pay enough attention to his interests in Rome[37]. Especially after Antony's success in conquering weak Armenia, Cleopatra won his attention completely, although this success did not help at all to change for the better the image of this couple in the West.

The conflict between Antony and Octavian in 34 BC, after the end of Antony's consulship, came to the final moment which caused the break between the East and West. At first, Rome ignored his victory over Armenia[38]. Then Antony made a triumphal entrance into the city of Alexandria, without any debate in the senate. During the triumph (which was not much different from those in Rome), Antony presented the conquered kings to Cleopatra and her eldest son, the co-ruler

---

[33] *CAH*[1], vol. X: *The Augustian Empire, 44 B.C.–A.D. 70*, ed. by S.A Cook, F.E. Adcock, M.P. Charlesworth, Cambridge 1934, p. 66 (M.P. Charlesworth).

[34] Ibidem, p. 76 (Charlesworth).

[35] Plut. *Ant.* 53.

[36] Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 376.

[37] Plut. *Ant.* 28 f.

[38] *CAH*[1], vol. X, p. 79 (Charlesworth).

> Inflexions of the same word: 'worthy of a bronze statue, not being worth a brass farthing'[16].

We can see from the presented exemplification that the forms: χαλκοῦς, i.e. nominative singular masculine of the adjective χαλκοῦς, -ῆ, -οῦν 'bronze', and χαλκοῦ, i.e. genitive singular of the noun ὁ χαλκός, -οῦ 'bronze' have been treated as τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματος πτώσεις. This exemplification documents at the same time predicative character of the two forms under the syntagmas co-created by them.

When analysing the passages quoted above, we can easily note that they lack any references to formal characteristics of word forms identified as πτώσεις ὀνόματος. This, in turn, involves the question of the way Aristotle perceives the issue of diversity and identity of πτώσεις of a given ὄνομα, and thus involves the question of the criterion of differentiating the πτώσεις. In this respect, the passage from the *Sophistici Elenchi* quoted below, in which the concept of πτῶσις appears in the context of considerations on apparent solecism and is additionally connected with the issue of the grammatical gender, is of interest to us:

> *Sophistici Elenchi* 14, 173b 26–174a 6:
> Εἰσὶ δὲ πάντες σχεδὸν οἱ φαινόμενοι σολοικισμοὶ παρὰ τὸ *τόδε*, καὶ ὅταν ἡ πτῶσις μήτε ἄρρεν μήτε θῆλυ δηλοῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸ μεταξύ. [...] Τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἄρρενος καὶ τοῦ θήλεος διαφέρουσιν αἱ πτώσεις ἅπασαι, τοῦ δὲ μεταξὺ αἱ μὲν αἱ δ' οὔ. Δοθέντος δὴ πολλάκις *τοῦτο*, συλλογίζονται ὡς εἰρημένου *τοῦτον*· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἄλλην πτῶσιν ἀντ' ἄλλης. Ὁ δὲ παραλογισμὸς γίνεται διὰ τὸ κοινὸν εἶναι τὸ *τοῦτο* πλειόνων πτώσεων· τὸ γὰρ *τοῦτο* σημαίνει ὁτὲ μὲν *οὗτος* ὁτὲ δὲ *τοῦτον*. Δεῖ δ' ἐναλλὰξ σημαίνειν μετὰ μὲν τοῦ *ἔστι* τὸ *οὗτος*, μετὰ δὲ τοῦ *εἶναι* τὸ *τοῦτον*, οἷόν "ἔστι Κορίσκος", "εἶναι Κορίσκον". Καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θηλέων ὀνομάτων ὡσαύτως, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λεγομένων μὲν σκευῶν, ἐχόντων δὲ θηλείας ἢ ἄρρενος κλῆσιν. Ὅσα γὰρ εἰς τὸ ο καὶ τὸ ν τελευτᾷ, ταῦτα μόνα σκεύους ἔχει κλῆσιν, οἷον *ξύλον, σχοινίον*, τὰ δὲ μὴ οὕτως ἄρρενος ἢ θήλεος, ὧν ἔνια φέρομεν ἐπὶ τὰ σκεύη, οἷον *ἀσκὸς* μὲν ἄρρεν τοὔνομα, *κλίνη* δὲ θῆλυ. Διόπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὡσαύτως τὸ *ἔστι* καὶ τὸ *εἶναι* διοίσει.
>
> Almost all apparent solecisms occur owing to the word 'this' or 'it' (τόδε) and when the inflexion denotes neither the masculine nor the feminine but the neuter. [...] The case-forms of the masculine and feminine are all different, but some of those of the neuter are different and others not. Often, therefore, when 'it' (τοῦτο) has been granted, people argue as if 'him' (τοῦτον) has been used, and they similarly use another case in place of some other. The false reasoning arises because 'it' (τοῦτο) is common to more than one case; for it signifies sometimes 'he' (οὗτος) and sometimes 'him' (τοῦτον). It ought to signify them alternately; with the indicative 'is' (ἔστι) it ought to signify the nominative 'he' (οὗτος); with the infinitive 'to be' (εἶναι) it ought to signify 'him' (τοῦτον), for example, 'It is Coriscus', '[I believe] it to be Coriscus'. So likewise with feminine nouns and with so-called articles of use, which can have either a masculine or a feminine designation; for only those which end in -ον have the designation which belongs to an article of use, e.g., ξύλον (log), σχοινίον (rope). Those which

[16] Translated by J.H. Freese, Cambridge, Mass.–London 2000 [first publ. 1926] (The Loeb Classical Library).

καὶ τοῦ θήλεος διαφέρουσιν αἱ πτώσεις ἅπασαι, τοῦ δὲ μεταξὺ αἱ μὲν αἱ δ' οὔ). However, we also have Aristotle's statement, in which the term πτώσεις refers to word variants constituted by substantivised adjective forms used predicatively, which oppose each other with respect to the represented value of the grammatical category of gender:

> *Topica* V 4, 133b 36–134a 3:
> Ἔτι δὲ θεωρητέον ἐστὶ παρὰ τὰς πτώσεις, λέγοντα διότι οὔθ' ὁ ἐπιστήμων ἔσται τὸ ἀμετάπειστον ὑπὸ λόγου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀμετάπειστος ὑπὸ λόγου, οὔθ' ἡ ἐπιστήμη τὸ ἀμετάπειστον ὑπὸ λόγου, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀμετάπειστος ὑπὸ λόγου.
>
> Further, you should look at the inflexions, maintaining that the scientist is not 'that which' but 'he who' is proof against the persuasion of argument, while Science is not 'that which' but 'she who' is proof against the persuasion of argument.

When writing about πτώσεις "you should look at," Aristotle had in mind different gender variants of substantivised adjectives (τὸ ἀμετάπειστον, ὁ ἀμετάπειστος, ἡ ἀμετάπειστος) used depending on the grammatical gender of the noun (subject), which they create syntagma with. The use of the term πτῶσις with regard to those adjective forms stems, as one may guess, from their predicative function in the context of syntagmas, in which the Philosopher referred to them. In consequence, we have to do here with differentiation of πτώσεις, which oppose each other not in terms of the category of case, but the category of gender. At the same time, let us note that the form ἀμετάπειστος, similarly to τοῦτο, is shown as representation of two different (homonymic) πτώσεις, which seems to confirm the thesis about the concept of πτῶσις as a not clearly formal word variant, but first of all a functional one, identifiable on the grounds of its distributive and context features.

Therefore, based on the analyses conducted so far we may draw a conclusion that the concept of πτῶσις ὀνόματος covers all predicatively used word forms perceived as (secondary) textual variants (representations) of a specific basic lexical noun unit (ὄνομα) and thus fulfilling the criteria of conventionality of meaning, semantic indivisibility and lack of reference to time, specified in passage 2, 16a 19–20 of the *Hermeneutics*. From the morphological point of view, those variants can be constituted by (predicatively used) particular inflexional forms of that lexical noun unit and also by (predicatively used) word forms representing adverbial and adjectival derivatives of that unit. Their status as secondary text variants (representatives) of ὄνομα stems from the predicative character of their function, since the function, which as the primary one was attributed to lexical units fulfilling the criteria of ὄνομα, was the function of the subject of predication, and this function, in turn, is realized by word forms having the status of primary text variants of those units, and hence by ὀνόματα in the narrower sense specified in passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of the *Hermeneutics*.

was specifically loaded with propaganda, aimed at a different group of recipients. Ptolemaios, with the number XV, showed the continuation of the traditional line of Ptolemy from the times of Alexander the Great's leading general – Ptolemy, son of Lagos. The following two names showed his deep respect for his father and mother. These two names placed together also connected symbolically his mother and father – Cleopatra and Caesar. The last part of his throne name directly proved that he was the son and the heir of Julius Caesar. Caesarion's rights to be accepted as Caesar's heir were even more politically justified than Octavian's, because he was the only one natural son of the dictator. From that moment, Caesarion and Cleopatra became co-rulers[29], a fact well attested in Egyptian sources such as a stela of Fayum[30] and an inscription found at Heracleopolis, belonging to the year 11 of Cleopatra's reign[31].

This fact could not become widely known in Rome because of the civil war that was still raging there, but it was without doubt well remembered by Octavian. Soon after Philippi things changed when Antony had the famous meeting with Cleopatra in Tarsus, where she enchanted him completely[32]. Antony was much more under the queen's influence than Caesar had been a few years earlier.

After the winter of 41/40 BC spent together, Antony left Cleopatra to take care of things in Rome. After his wife Fulvia died, he married Octavia, Octavian's sister, and for about five years he did not visit Egypt. We do not know if he was

---

king of the kings. This inscription runs: "[REGEM?] REGU[M CLEO]PATRAE · F.". In fact there are missing parts of the text but the letter *F* in Latin inscriptions was used as an abbreviation for the word *filius*. In that case the translation, including supplemented parts, should read: "King of the kings, son of Cleopatra...". After that should be placed the name of Ptolemy Caesar. Moreover, Caesarion is described as a pharaoh in a stela from Serapeum (Louvre 335).

[29] About their joint rule, see A.E. Samuel, *The Joint Regency of Cleopatra and Caesarion*, EPap IX 1971, pp. 73–79; as co-rulers they are depicted on the wall of Hathor's temple in Dendera (where Caesarion is shown in front of his mother) and on that of Cleopatra's temple in Armantis (Greek name Hermonthis): Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), pp. 366–369; S. Cauville, *L'oeil de Rê. Histoire de la construction du temple d'Hathor à Dendera (du 16 juillet 54 av. J.-C. au printemps 64 ap. J.-C.),* Paris 1999, pp. 151–158; J. Ray, *Cleopatra in the Temples of Upper Egypt: The Evidence of Dendera and Armant*, in: *Cleopatra...* (n. 11), pp. 9–11; Ashton, *o.c.* (n. 11), p. 27; R. Bianchi, *Images of Cleopatra VII Reconsidered*, in: *Cleopatra...* (n. 11), pp. 14 f.

[30] *Annales du Service des Anitiquités de l'Egypte* 1908, p. 241; Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), pp. 369–371; A. Bernand, *Alexandrie des Ptolémées*, Paris 1995, p. 87.

[31] G. Lefèvre, *Le dernier décret des Lagides*, in: *Mélanges Holleaux: recueil de mémoires concernant l'antiquité grecque offert à Maurice Holleaux...*, Paris 1913, pp.103–108; M.T. Lenger, *Corpus des ordonnances des Ptolémées (C. Ord. Ptol.)*, Bruxelles 1964, pp. 75 f., 1964; Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), pp. 371 f.; P. van Minnen, *A Royal Ordinance of Cleopatra and Related Documents*, in: *Cleopatra...* (n. 11), pp. 36–38, 43 f.

[32] Cass. Dio XLVIII 24, 2: "Meanwhile he fell in love with Cleopatra, whom he had seen in Cilicia, and thereafter gave not a thought to honour but became the Egyptian woman's slave and devoted his time to his passion for her"; Plut. *Ant.* 26; Syme, *o.c.* (n. 22), p. 274: "it was Aphrodite meeting Dionysus, for the blessing of Asia".

Caesar did his son a great favour by not putting even a small clause about him in his last will, and because of this Cleopatra had the best opportunity to withdraw with her son from the main political scene and to wait in Egypt watching in what direction would the situation evolve. "Now she held the trump card in her hands in the person of her little boy, who was by all natural laws the rightful heir to the throne of the earth"[24].

This period was the queen's first attempt to elevate Caesarion's rights to the position of some importance in Rome. After that she had to step aside for a while, waiting for the next opportunity to gain power.

During the struggle between the republicans and Caesarians, until the battle of Philippi, Cleopatra attempted to stay neutral, or if it was impossible – she tried to show her readiness to send help to both sides, although it was not her real aim to be truly involved in this war, in which she saw enemies on both sides. During this period of time, the situation for Cleopatra must not have been easy, since the republicans knew well that she had friends among Caesarians, and in the Caesarian camp there was Octavian, who by reason of his claims to the heritage of Caesar appeared to be a natural enemy of Cleopatra and her son[25]. Antony, being an ally of Octavian, did not adopt one firm attitude in relations with the Egyptian queen. She remained as cautious as possible so that whichever party won, she would be in a position to set up a dialogue with the winners, and to discuss with them the status of herself and that of her kingdom. Without any doubt, her priority was Egypt and keeping the rule of the Ptolemy line in Caesarion, who at the same time was always her hope for domination of the whole empire. Just before the battle of Philippi, she managed to succeed in one of her crucial aims connected with Caesarion and her plans for the future. It was the permission from Rome to name her son the King of Egypt[26]. This act had a special meaning also for the Romans, because Caesarion, as the son of Caesar, had begun to become an important player in the closest vicinity of the Roman Empire. She obtained this decision from Cornelius Dolabella who at that time, as a Roman consul, was fighting against Cassius and counted on some help from Cleopatra. Although she did not in fact help Dolabella, her aim was fulfilled[27].

We can suppose that from that moment Caesarion used his full name as the king of Egypt: Ptolemaios XV Philopator Philometor Caesar[28]. Each of these names

---

[24] Ibidem, p. 199.

[25] Ibidem, p. 206.

[26] M. Milczanowski, *Filippi 23 X 42 p.n.e.*, Zabrze 2006, p. 61.

[27] Cass. Dio XLVII 31, 5.

[28] *IGP* 157, *OGIS* 194: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ ΚΛΕΟΠ]ΑΤΡΑΣ ΘΕ[ΑΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΑΤΟΡ[ΟΣ ΚΑΙ Π]ΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΚΑ[Ι]ΣΑΡΟΣ [Θ]ΕΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΜΗ[ΤΟΡΟΣ. Most probably this inscription was made during the years 43–42 BC, which would put it not long after the agreement of Dolabella for establishing the Caesarion as the king: Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 370, n. 1. Also an inscription from Delos (*CIL* III 7232, *IGP* 158) probably describes Caesarion as the

Caesarion. To the Romans this looked as if a Roman commander was parading in front of a barbarian queen. Octavian's propaganda implied to the Romans that it was an attempt to transfer the old Roman tradition of triumph to Alexandria or even that by such an action the main city of the empire, its capital, was intended to be shifted by Antony to the northern coast of Egypt[39]. Even such rumours had to be a real shock for the citizens of Rome[40].

The second act of that spectacle was made probably a few days later, when during the so-called Alexandrian donations[41] Antony made a declaration to the eastern subordinates, yet his intention was that this declaration would be heard in Rome as well. "Cleopatra and her children sit by his side; also in the course of his [*scil.* Antony's] address to the people he commanded that she should be called Queen of Kings, and Ptolemy, whom they named Caesarion, King of Kings"[42]. Again Cleopatra – this time with Antony and her children – had golden thrones placed on a silver podium at a tribune in the gymnasium. This ceremony was the beginning of the last stage for building political authority especially in the East but also with the little underestimated Roman allies, thus creating real power for the Egyptian successor of Caesar. Antony and Cleopatra also distributed provinces among their children, but first of all they showed how important a role Caesarion played. He was always closely associated with Cleopatra and as co-ruler he possessed: "Egypt and Cyprus in addition; also Antony declared that in very truth one was the wife and the other the son of the former Caesar, and he professed to be taking these measures for Caesar's sake"[43]. Antony, by declaring that Cleopatra was the wife and Caesarion the son of Caesar, proclaimed that they were the closest family of the dictator; as a result, Octavian was marginalized with this kind of rhetoric. Positioning one Caesar against another so officially, sounded like an invitation to open conflict with Octavian[44]. In this way, Antony together with Cleopatra tried to establish Caesarion as the probable ruler of the whole new Roman empire[45], including the united eastern kingdoms which until

---

[39] Ibidem, pp. 79 f. (Charlesworth); *CAH*[2], vol. X: *The Augustian Empire, 43 B.C.–A.D. 69*, ed. by A.K. Bowman, E. Champlin, A. Lintott, Cambridge 1996, p. 40 (C. Pelling).

[40] Cass. Dio XLIX 39.

[41] Cass. Dio XLIX 41, 1–3; Plut. *Ant.* 54; *CAH*[1], vol. X, pp. 79–81 (Charlesworth); J. Dobiaš, *La donation d'Antoine à Cléopâtre en l'an 34 av. J.-C.*, in: *Mélanges Bidez*, Bruxelles 1934, pp. 289–314; Syme, *o.c.* (n. 22), p. 271; D.E.E. Kleiner, *Politics and Gender in Pictorial Propaganda of Antony and Octavian*, EMC XXXVI 1992, p. 364.

[42] Cass. Dio XLIX 41, 1.

[43] Cass. Dio XLIX, 41, 2; *CAH*[1], vol. X, p. 80 (Charlesworth).

[44] Cass. Dio XLIX 41, 2.

[45] If Cassius Dio is right, Cleopatra's ambitions could be seen in this phrase: "she [*scil.* Cleopatra] conceived the hope of ruling even the Romans; and whenever she used an oath her strongest phrase in swearing was by her purpose to dispense justice on the Capitol" (Cass. Dio L 5, 4); see Syme, *o.c.* (n. 22), p. 293.

referents of the term πτῶσις, which denotes different kinds of word variants throughout the passage. However, identification of the word variants (πτώσεις) referred to by means of the phrase ἡ μὲν (scil. πτῶσις) κατὰ τὸ *τούτου* ἢ *τούτῳ* σημαῖνον καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, does not raise any doubts, since that phrase certainly refers to the variants of ὄνομα based on the category of case, and more exactly to the variants representing oblique cases. In their essence, these variants are identical to πτώσεις ὀνόματος distinguished in the passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of the *Hermeneutics*. The only difference lies in a linguistic means through which Aristotle referred to them, namely, instead of the oblique cases of the anthroponym Φίλων (i.e. Φίλωνος, Φίλωνι), the exemplification is made here by means of the paradigm of a demonstrative pronoun.

The following statement, i.e. ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἑνὶ ἢ πολλοῖς[26], οἷον ἄνθρωποι ἢ ἄνθρωπος, undoubtedly refers to inflexions standing in opposition within the grammatical category of number. The attached exemplification (οἷον *ἄνθρωποι* ἢ *ἄνθρωπος*) is usually interpreted as a premise proving that the word variance referred to in this statement concerns lexemes belonging to the class of ὄνομα. That would suggest that diversity of πτώσεις ὀνόματος is based not only on the inflectional category of case but also on that of number. This conclusion should not surprise us in the light of the fact that in another place (*Topica* V 4, 133b 36–134a 2, see above) the Philosopher paid attention to the diversity of πτώσεις ὀνόματος based on the category of gender. Clarity of the passage under analysis is obscured, to some extent, since the author exemplified the kind of word variance identified here with two noun forms in the nominative (ἄνθρωποι ἢ ἄνθρωπος) taken out of any context which would show them as predicative variants of ὄνομα (and thus taken out of such a context as e.g. οἱ φιλόσοφοι ἄνθρωποί εἰσιν, ὁ φιλόσοφος ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν). One may suppose that Aristotle chose the nominatives (and not forms in oblique case, as, for instance: ἀνθρώπου – ἀνθρώπων), since they can be perceived as the most neutral (unmarked) word forms as to the criterion distinguishing πτώσεις κατὰ τὸ *τούτου* ἢ *τούτῳ* σημαίνοντες, specified directly before, and thus they seem to illustrate in the most clear way the essence of πτώσεις distinguished just on the basis of the category of number (κατὰ τὸ ἑνὶ ἢ πολλοῖς). In other words, in order to emphasise the diversity of predicative variants of ὄνομα in terms of the category of number, Aristotle used the example of the pair of word forms unmarked in terms of the category of case, trying in this way to avoid a kind of interference of criteria differentiating particular kinds of πτώσεις[27]. Apart from that, the tendency

---

[26] On the meaning of the dative forms ἑνί and πολλοῖς see D'Avino 1975: 119.

[27] Cf. D'Avino 1975: 128: "L'uso del nominativo serve a rilevare la nozione del 'numero' disimpegnandola da quella di 'caso' ". However, this researcher refers the variance of word forms characterised in this section not only to ὄνομα but to ῥῆμα as well (cf. pp. 120 f.).

> A verb is a compound, significant sound with a temporal force, but no part of which is independently significant (as with nouns): 'man' or 'white' does not signify time, but 'is walking' or 'has walked' additionally signify present and past time, respectively.

It is easy to see that the definition emphasises very strongly that the verb signifies time and, what is more, it shows explicitly that the verb may express the idea of time in different ways. Therefore, while identifying particular kinds of πτώσεις ῥήματος it is no longer necessary to characterise again the very kind of word variance which is based on the way of carrying the notion of time, but it is enough to refer to it only by means of examples. The phrase τὸ γὰρ ἐβάδισεν ἢ ἐβάδιζεν πτῶσις ῥήματος κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ εἴδη ἐστίν may thus be understood in the following way: "... since obviously [each of such forms as] 'walked' or 'was walking' constitutes [also] a verb variant on the basis of those characteristic features [i.e. stemming from definitional carrying of the notion of time by the verb]"[36]. As a result, πτώσεις κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά would not be exemplified here by particular word forms, but only by indicating the kinds of statements or communicative situations (i.e. asking questions and giving orders – οἷον κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἢ ἐπίταξιν), which imply such word forms. The presented interpretation makes the concept of πτώσεις ῥήματος emerging from the analysed passage wider, but not conflicting with the one that results from a respective passage in the *Hermeneutics*[37]. This concept covers all verb forms with marked values of the category of time, mood and person, and contrasts them with the forms of the third person present indicative, which constitute primary text variants of the verb (as a part of speech), i.e. ῥήματα (in the narrower sense referred to in the passage 3, 16b 16–18 of the *Hermeneutics*). The problem of the general criterion differentiating all verb forms classified as πτώσεις ῥήματος from word forms classified as ῥήματα, still remains to be solved.

The definition of ῥῆμα as a class of lexemes (part of speech), presented in the passage 3, 16b 6–11 of the *Hermeneutics*, excludes the possibility that the logical status of verb forms is the basis for the ῥῆμα vs. πτώσεις ῥήματος opposition, since both kinds of verb forms are always "signs of something said of something

---

[36] According to D'Avino 1975: 128, in the discussed paragraph Aristotle not only referred to πτώσεις ῥήματος based on the category of tense, but – by selecting two verb forms of the past tense, one connoting momentariness and the other one durativity – he paid attention to the phenomenon of aspect as well.

[37] Differences occurring in the way of accounting for πτώσεις ῥήματος in the *Poetics* and the *Hermeneutics* may, at least to some extent, stem from the difference in general character of both works. It seems natural that πτώσεις κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά, i.e. word variants related to pragmatic functions of speech and characteristic of such communicative situations as asking questions or giving orders, were distinguished only in the *Poetics* and avoided in the *Hermeneutics*, which is a logical treatise. The same factor may account for disregarding the criterion of being the sign of a thing said of something else in the above-quoted definition of ῥῆμα included in the *Poetics*.

very much the norm. Yet Romans appreciated very much Hellenistic culture and were amazed by the wonderful career of Alexander the Great. So Caesarion, having inherited not only Caesar's and Cleopatra's personalities but also the heritage of Alexander the Great, could, with the wise and gradual politicization provided by his protectors, become, as a descendant of the greatest powers in the ancient world, an ideal heir to the position of a ruler of a united empire[20].

Unfortunately for Cleopatra, all those plans were cut by the daggers of assassins who murdered Caesar in 44 BC. It happened at the moment when it was too soon to raise any claims to his decline, but too late to stay safe in Rome. She had to leave the city and return to Alexandria. The queen of Egypt could reasonably expect her son to be placed in Caesar's last will. In the East small children frequently became rulers of kingdoms, but being assisted by so-called regents until they reached maturity. Possibly because of such expectations, Cleopatra stayed in Rome a few more days, not leaving immediately, despite the fact that the situation in the city was becoming more precarious by the minute. Also she could have had some hope for a proposal of co-operation from Mark Antony[21]. In theory, Caesarion could have become quite a strong argument in the political struggle after Caesar's death, when it transpired that people were missing the dictator very much. At that time Octavian was not yet in Rome, and even Cicero favoured Antony, so he had quite a wide range of possibilities. We also know from Suetonius that Antony officially declared before the senate that Caesarion had been confirmed by Caesar as his son, and he called "C. Matium et C. Oppium reliquosque Caesaris amicos"[22] to witness this. Unfortunately, we do not know when he made such a statement, but the most likely possibility is that it happened during this short period of his domination in Rome. In fact, Romans missed Caesar but at the same time they were very sensitive to matters of foreign influences on Rome. So despite all the advantages, it was not the right moment to raise any claims of the Egyptian boy. Even if Caesar had in fact put his son's name in his testament, it would not have helped Cleopatra's aspirations in Rome at the time; it could even have made things much worse. Arthur Weigall states in his book that Caesar had warned the queen that in the event of his death, her high aimed claims could rouse a great threat to her. The author recalls the example of the death of Alexander's son during the wars of the Diadochi[23]. It would seem that

---

[20] Ibidem, pp. 368 f.; Ashton, *o.c.* (n. 11), p. 29; J. Williams, *Imperial Style and the Coins of Cleopatra and Marc Antony*, in: *Cleopatra...* (n. 11), p. 91; Canfora, *o.c.* (n. 18), p. 230.

[21] Weigall, *o.c.* (n. 4), p. 196 f.

[22] Suet. *Caes.* 52; R. Syme, *Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939, p. 277.

[23] Weigall, *o.c.* (n. 4), p. 185. This example seems to be highly appropriate, because it is well known that Caesar was fascinated by the life of the great Macedonian, and we can be sure that he used his history in his own experiences. Caesar in that moment could not have foreseen how similar the fate of Caesarion would be to that of Alexander's son. They were both killed a short time before they became adult and could become independent kings.

in the above passage to ῥῆμα, i.e. being always (ἀεί) a sign of something said about something else, points to the obligatorily predicative character of words belonging to that class.

Passage 3, 16b 16–18, where the concept of πτῶσις ῥήματος is introduced and characterised, starts with the word ὁμοίως 'similarly', which points to the earlier part of the text, i.e. the one that concerns πτώσεις ὀνόματος (see *De interpr.* 2, 16a 32–16b 5 above); in this way the symmetry of the argumentation and analogy of the issues treated in both places is emphasised. Then, it is said here that such forms as ὑγίανεν 'he was healthy' or ὑγιανεῖ 'he will be healthy' are not a ῥῆμα, but each of them is just a πτῶσις ῥήματος . Further on in the argument the difference is indicated between ῥῆμα and πτῶσις ῥήματος, namely, ῥῆμα carries the notion of the present time (τὸ μὲν τὸν παρόντα προσσημαίνει χρόνον), whereas πτώσεις ῥήματος (τὰ δὲ) carry the notion of the time "surrounding" the present one (τὸν πέριξ), i.e. the past or the future. It stems from the above that similarly to the passages 2, 16a 19–20 and 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of the *Hermeneutics*, where Aristotle used the term ὄνομα in two different meanings, also in the statements concerning the verb the Philosopher uses the term ῥῆμα in two slightly different meanings: in passage 3, 16b 6–11 the term means every word unit carrying the notion of (any) time (ῥῆμα δέ ἐστι τὸ προσσημαῖνον χρόνον)[22], whereas in passage 3, 16b 16–18 that term denotes only word forms carrying the notion of the present time (τὸ μὲν [*scil.* ῥῆμα] τὸν παρόντα προσσημαίνει χρόνον). And therefore, also in this case we can talk about one wider and more general meaning of the term ῥῆμα, identifiable with a specific class of lexemes (i.e. with the verb as a part of speech), and about the second, narrower meaning encompassing only a certain kind of word forms, i.e. verb forms in the present tense. And similarly to the term ὄνομα (in the narrower meaning), which was put in opposition (in passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5) to the term πτώσεις ὀνόματος, also the term ῥῆμα (in the narrower meaning) is put here in opposition to the term πτώσεις ῥήματος.

When characterising πτώσεις ὀνόματος and ὄνομα, juxtaposed in passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5, Aristotle emphasised *expressis verbis* their common definitional properties (λόγος δέ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ [*scil.* Φίλωνος, Φίλωνι etc.] τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατὰ τὰ ἀυτά [*scil.* ὀνόματα]). In case of πτώσεις ῥήματος and ῥῆμα, set against each other in passage 3, 16b 16–18, there is no such direct declaration concerning meeting common definitional criteria by them. However, there are no doubts that both ῥῆμα, defined in this passage as a verb form in the present tense, and πτῶσις ῥήματος, i.e. the form in the past or future tense, constitute language units meeting all definitional criteria specified (in the passage 3, 16b 6–11) for ῥῆμα as

---

[22] The statement included in this passage: τὸ δὲ ὑγιαίνει ῥῆμα· προσσημαίνει γὰρ τὸ νῦν ὑπάρχειν, obviously is not an element of the definition of ῥῆμα, but only an example and a comment to it.

that "semantic surplus" characteristic for all πτώσεις ῥήματος would consist in indicating the subject of predication (cf.: Ῥῆμα δέ ἐστι [...] ἀεὶ τῶν καθ' ἑτέρου λεγομένων σημεῖον). It means that forms of the 3rd person (treated in isolation) do not indicate (positively) the subject connoted by them, whereas the forms in the 1st and 2nd person identify it with the speaker and listener, respectively. In other words, the forms of the 3rd person only connote a subject, whereas the forms of the 1st and 2nd person denote it, showing in this way an additional semantic component in them.

Thus, πτώσεις ῥήματος would be constituted by verb forms showing their lexical content as something not actual (i.e. past or future), unreal (i.e. hypothetical, probable, etc.) and determined subjectwise (i.e. as characteristic of the speaker or listener) – in opposition to verb forms being ῥήματα, showing denoted content as something actual, real and undetermined from the subject point of view. From the grammatical perspective, πτώσεις ῥήματος would be identifiable with verb forms marked as regards the category of time, mood and person, and thus with all verb forms other than forms of the 3rd person present indicative, which, in turn, should be identified with ῥήματα. At this point, the question of the relation between the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος and the opposition ῥῆμα vs. πτώσεις ῥήματος is back, i.e. the question regarding general criterion of πτῶσις as such, i.e. as a secondary text variant of a specific class of lexemes.

It results from the analysis conducted before that the opposing terms ὄνομα and πτῶσις ὀνόματος denote semantically indivisible word forms with no reference to time (and thus word forms fulfilling the criteria of ὄνομα as a class of lexemes), which are, however, different from each other in that respect that ὄνομα does perform the function of the exponent of the subject of predication, while πτῶσις ὀνόματος does not, which implies that the latter serves the function of the (co) exponent of the predicate. Both kinds of those word forms were presented as just such functional variants in the passage 2, 16a 32–16b 5 of the *Hermeneutics* reading that πτῶσις ὀνόματος "in combination with the words 'is', 'was' or 'will be' does not form a true or false proposition, whereas ὄνομα always forms such a proposition" (μετὰ τοῦ *ἔστιν* ἢ *ἦν* ἢ *ἔσται* οὐκ ἀληθεύει ἢ ψεύδεται, τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἀεί). The above-quoted statement from the *Hermeneutics* implies, however, also specific semantic characteristics of both ὄνομα and πτῶσις ὀνόματος. It shows, namely, ὄνομα as a linguistic unit which presents its referent in a way making it possible to form a true or false proposition about it, while πτῶσις ὀνόματος as a linguistic unit which presents its referent in a way making it impossible to form such a proposition. That impossibility of presenting the referent in a way allowing to form a (true or false) proposition about it underlies a certain semantic difference which distinguishes πτῶσις ὀνόματος from ὄνομα. The difference consists in the fact that πτῶσις ὀνόματος, as a co-exponent of predication, shows its referent not directly, but in a kind of "relational perspective", i.e. as something which is said of something else. And that "relational perspective", from which

all definitional criteria of ῥῆμα as a class of lexemes, i.e. they are semantically indivisible, they carry the notion of time and are always signs of things said of something else. At the same time, it is also worth noting that the formula of being signs of something said of something else does not determine a logical status of statements co-constituted by those signs, which makes it possible to include into πτώσεις ῥήματος not only forms (of the third person) in the indicative of the past and future tenses (which are indicated in the passage 3, 16b 16–18 of the Hermeneutics and which may co-form true or false propositions), but also forms in the imperative, conjunctive and optative (which co-form statements, which do not have the status of propositions)[35].

Acceptance of the suggested above interpretation of πτώσεις κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά allows also to accept the better attested reading of the last part of the passage under analysis, i.e. τὸ γὰρ ἐβάδισεν ἢ ἐβάδιζεν πτῶσις κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ εἴδη ἐστίν. The two forms in the indicative of the past tenses included in it should be, however, interpreted not as exemplification of πτώσεις κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά, but as exemplification of πτώσεις based on the category of tense. This kind of πτώσεις has not been listed or characterised here side by side with all other πτώσεις (i.e. by means of another ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ…), but in some respect contrasted with them as the one which results directly from the very definition of ῥῆμα (as a class of lexemes), immediately preceding the analysed passage:

> *Poetica* 20, 1457a 13–18:
> Ῥῆμα δὲ φωνὴ συνθετὴ σημαντικὴ, μετὰ χρόνου, ἧς οὐδὲν μέρος σημαίνει καθ' αὑτό, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων· τὸ μὲν γὰρ *ἄνθρωπος* ἢ *λευκόν* οὐ σημαίνει τὸ πότε, τὸ δὲ *βαδίζει* ἢ *βεβάδικε* προσσημαίνει τὸ μὲν τὸν παρόντα χρόνον τὸ δὲ τὸν παρεληλυθότα.

---

[35] Montanari (1988), who perceives the phrase πτῶσις κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά as a reference to the vocative of the noun, admits (pp. 231 f.) that he cannot clearly answer the question whether verb forms marked in terms of the category of mood could be – disregarding the value of the tense category represented by them – regarded by Aristotle as separate πτώσεις. In his opinion, a negative answer to this question is equivalent to putting forward a hardly acceptable thesis that Aristotle did not take into account at all moods of the verb. On the other hand, a positive answer leads – according to him – to attributing to Aristotle the view which cannot be accepted either, namely that also a verb in a different mood than indicative may be a part of a proposition. In this respect, the Italian scholar quotes passage 17a 9 from the *Hermeneutics*: Ἀνάνκη δὲ πάντα λόγον ἀποφντικὸν ἐκ ῥήματος εἶναι, ἢ πτώσεως ῥήματος. However, in our opinion, the cited passage does not lead to the conclusion presented by Montanari at all, since that passage is not equivalent to saying that an affirmative sentence must consist of ῥῆμα or <u>any</u> πτῶσις ῥήματος. Aristotle claims here only that an affirmative sentence must consist of ῥῆμα or πτῶσις ῥήματος and has in mind (as clearly indicated later on in this passage) indicative forms both in the present (ῥῆμα) and past or future tenses (πτῶσις ῥήματος). The Italian scholar assumes a more decisive position as far as the category of person is concerned, and he excludes it as possible basis of the opposition ῥῆμα / πτῶσις ῥήματος ("... la flessione per [...] persona non rientra nell'opposizione verbo / caso di verbo", p. 233).

Various functions of the 'error' in the periphrasis of Patavium's vicinity complement each other. But, I think, bringing Jupiter's speech back was probably the most important reason behind this device. The text of the *Aeneid* juxtaposing Antenor's legend with the Jupiter's words enabled Lucan to refer, right before the augury of the Patavian Cornelius, to the prophecy in which there is no place for the battle of Pharsalus, at least on the surface[30].

University of Wrocław

[30] Lucan seems either to "supplement" the *Aeneid* with what has been omitted in this poem or to bring to light what is hidden. Modern scholars attempt to point out the pessimism and various ambiguities of this text. For such interpretation of Jupiter's prophecy, see esp. J.J. O'Hara, *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*, Princeton–New Jersey 1990, pp. 132–163; for the opposite view, see Enenkel, *o.c.* (n. 29).

else", i.e. they are always exponents of the predicate. We have already pointed to this fact, when referring to verb forms in the past and future tenses classified as πτώσεις ῥήματος in the passage 3, 16b 16–18 of the *Hermeneutics*. The basis of the opposition ῥήματα vs. πτώσεις ῥήματος should thus be seen in the difference of semantic properties of both kinds of verb forms. It seems that the basis for granting the status of πτώσεις ῥήματος (and hence the status of secondary textual representations of ῥῆμα) to specific verb forms is their semantic markedness, i.e. a specific "semantic surplus", which distinguishes them from forms classified as ῥήματα, i.e. from primary word variants of the verb. In case of forms in the past and future tenses, the above-mentioned semantic surplus would consist in indicating that the thing signified is not actual, i.e. in showing the content denoted as located outside time in which it is communicated – contrary to the forms in the present tense presenting their referents more directly, i.e. as given "here and now", *hic et nunc*, and thus as actual as the (act of) communication itself. In other words, forms of the past and future tenses are classified as πτώσεις ῥήματος owing to the fact that – contrary to the forms constituting ῥήματα – they additionally express time remoteness of their referents from the *hic et nunc* constituted by the very act of speech[38].

In turn, semantic markedness of imperative, conjunctive and optative forms would result from expressing specific modality, i.e. from the fact that unlike the forms in the indicative, they also show their referents not straightforwardly, but in a modal perspective, i.e. as something postulated, desirable, possible, probable, hypothetical, and the like. Finally, in case of forms of 1st and 2nd person,

---

[38] Also Montanari 1988: 223 f. opts for such a strictly linguistic interpretation of the opposition ῥῆμα – πτώσεις ῥήματος, accentuating its relationship with the act of speech itself; he refers in this respect to the position of Colaclidès (1968) and Peccorella (1962). On the other hand, Delamarre 1980: 33 perceives the opposition of tenses represented by ῥῆμα and πτώσεις ῥήματος in ontological categories. That scholar interprets Aristotelian ῥῆμα as a form that shows the time expressed by it as really existing, unlike πτώσεις ῥήματος, presenting the time expressed by them as non-existent; he thus interprets the variance ῥῆμα / πτῶσις ῥήματος as a kind of "jump" from the existence into non-existence ("Le verbe signifiant le temps présent, le temps de maintenant, il signifie tout simplement le temps en tant qu'il est, puisque tout l'être du temps réside, semble-t-il, dans le seul maintenant. Les flexions du verbe signifieront donc le temps en tant qu'il n'est pas. Aussi la flexion marque-t-elle, pour le verbe et relativement au temps, une chute de l'être vers le non-être"). Tanner 1969: 118, in turn, relates the privileged position of a verb in the present with the reality where Aristotle's teachings took place, i.e. with the situation of a lesson or a lecture given to students by a teacher: "... the third person singular present alone can describe an act under observation during the lecture or one contemplated as in progress for the sake of the argument. However, *past* and *future* verbal actions cannot be *observed*, for memory or anticipation is required to envisage them. Moreover, if the effort of visualization is successful, they seem *present* to the *imaginer*. Hence such tenses are mere grammatical transforms of the *real* present". See also Scarpat 1950: 59, according to whom "il verbo indica l'azione e la passione nel suo svolgersi (*in actu*)". On the opinion of Arens (1984), who interprets the opposition ῥῆμα – πτώσεις ῥήματος in logical terms, see above, n. 24.

him Caesarion[7], meaning 'the little Caesar'. According to Suetonius, about Caesarion "nonnulli Graecorum similem quoque Caesari et forma et incessu tradiderunt"[8]. To commemorate and to establish the first act of propaganda connected to her son, Cleopatra issued a coin[9]. On the averse she was represented with the infant son in her arms. She was depicted, in the royal diadem, in the shape of the Egyptian goddess Isis, who in Rome was worshipped as Venus and in Greece as Aphrodite. Her son was little Eros, who in Egypt became Horus. The reverse of the coin showed images of the future joint rule of the mother and her son. There were also two *cornucopiae*, filled with goods. Officially, in the East, it was the symbol connected to Ptolemy's dynasty, but it also symbolized the beginning of a new age and pledge that, if they rule, there would be common happiness[10]. The infant child with his mother as a protector placed on the coin demonstrates that from the very beginning of his life Caesarion played a valid role in the politics of the Egyptian queen[11]. The coin was minted in Cyprus – the island transferred by Caesar into the kingdom of Egypt[12] and the most probable year of its issue is 46 BC. The fact that the coin showed a living person is highly significant. In the East it was a common practice to put such images on coins, but as far as Cleopatra's aspirations in Rome were concerned, the fact became much more meaningful. Up to that time, only Julius Caesar portrayed himself on coins during his lifetime. After his death, this practice was continued by Antony[13] and others – even defenders of the republic among them.

Cleopatra showed on the coin the dictator's heir during his rule, so we can assume that Caesar had permitted this, which gave a special meaning to that issue. In fact, Cleopatra inscribed only her name on the coin, without the name of her son, as at that time only she played an official political role. Moreover, she could not go too far with this kind of symbolism. The reason for this was probably the fact that Cleopatra was not a single monarch during that time, but had her brother, Ptolemy XIV as a co-ruler.

In the same year as the coin was issued, Cleopatra arrived in Rome with her infant child. She began to appear in public together with Caesar, and most probably little Caesarion was usually seen with them. Romans could speculate whether or not the baby was theirs, but by coming to Rome and setting up residence in

---

[7] Plut. *Caes.* 49; J.C. Grenier, *Deux documents au nom de "Cesarion"*, in: *Hommages à J. Leclant*, Le Caire 1994, vol. III, pp. 247–254.

[8] Suet. *Caes*. 52.

[9] *BMC* Cleopatra VII 2, a bronze coin, weight: 16.37 g.

[10] Volkmann, *o.c.* (n. 4), p. 76.

[11] S.-A. Ashton, *Cleopatra: Goddess, Ruler or Regent?*, in: *Cleopatra Reassessed*, ed. by S. Walker, S.-A. Ashton, London 2003, p. 27.

[12] P.J. Bicknell, *Caesar, Cleopatra and Cyprus*, Latomus XXXVI 1977, pp. 325–342.

[13] P.V. Hill, *Coin-Symbolism and Propaganda during the Wars of Vengeance (44–36 BC)*, NAC IV 1975, p. 158.

question and command: οἷον κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἢ ἐπίταξιν. One may assume that the adjective ὑποκριτικός, substantivised in neuter plural (i.e. τὰ ὑποκριτικά), means all possible communicative situations, characteristic for delivering speeches or acting, and thus just such as, for example, asking questions or giving orders. The phrase (πτώσεις) κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά would mean, then, word variants particularly adapted or suitable for such situations, and thus used, for instance, when asking a question or giving an order. Different word forms come into play, e.g. the vocative of the noun[31], but first of all probably all verbal forms expressing marked values of the category of person (i.e. first and second person)[32] and mood (i.e. imperative, conjunctive and optative)[33]. It seems that one is allowed to postulate that such a wide range of verb forms fulfil the criteria for πτώσεις κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά, since asking a question and giving an order do not exhaust the list of communicative situations (or pragmatic functions) those πτώσεις are related with, but constitute only their examples (οἷον)[34]. It is also worth pointing out that the mentioned marked values of the category of person and mood form a feature which significantly distinguishes verb forms expressing those values from verb forms identified – both in the *Hermeneutics* and in the *Poetics* (see below) – as ῥήματα, which occur always in the third person indicative. On the other hand, those forms, i.e. forms in the imperative, conjunctive and optative (all persons) and the forms of the first and second person (all moods), fully meet

---

[31] See e.g. Montanari 1988: 231.

[32] See Pagliaro 1955: 38–40. According to that scholar, also the fact that in later grammatical tradition that category was referred to with the term πρόσωπον, and hence the word meaning the stage mask, whose form depended on the role played by an actor (ὑποκριτής), indicates the link between the Aristotelian expression κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά and the verb category of person. Semantic development of the term πρόσωπον, leading to its technical and grammatical meaning, would thus have its beginning just in the Aristotelian phrase κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά and would be based on the parallel between the role played by an actor in a performance, identified by means of the mask worn by him, and the role played by an interlocutor under the act of speech, identified by the grammatical category of person of the verb.

[33] See Pecorella 1962: 145; D'Avino 1975: 123–125; Maroscia 1982: 41. Also the passage 19, 1456b 8–19 of the *Poetics* seems to suggest such a possibility. In this passage Aristotle, just in the context of such forms of utterance (σχήματα τῆς λέξεως), as e.g. an imperative (ἐντολή), request (εὐχή), question (ἐρώτησις) etc., refers to Protagoras' objections related to Homer's use of an imperative form of the verb (instead of the optative one) in the initial invocation in the Iliad (μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά).

[34] Koller 1958: 35 identified the discussed πτώσεις with all forms of a statement, which do not constitute a proposition: "Die πτώσεις ῥήματος werden ausdrücklich den ὑποκριτικά gleichgestellt, d. h. alles, was nicht zum ἀποφντικὸς λόγος, zum ὁριστικὸς λόγος gehört, alle Satzarten überhaupt außer dem definitorischen, wahrheitsaussagenden Satz, sind πτώσεις, und zwar πτώσεις ῥηματικαί". In our opinion, this conclusion is too far-fetched, since πτώσεις pointed out by Aristotle were not made equal ("gleichgestellt") with τὰ ὑποκριτικά, but distinguished as κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά – similarly to πτώσεις κατὰ τὸ τούτου ἢ τούτῳ ὑποκριτικά, distinguished earlier; and the distinguishing of πτώσεις κατὰ τὸ τούτου ἢ τούτῳ for obvious reasons does not constitute any basis for saying that they are identical with pronoun forms τούτου and τούτῳ, but rather with all nominal inflectional forms those pronouns indicate, i.e. with forms of oblique cases.

to condense the content of the text, noticeable throughout the passage and stemming from the esoteric nature of preserved Aristotle's writings (which constitute, as we know, a kind of working drafts), seems to have influenced considerably the wording of the passage as well[28].

The aforementioned tendency is also clearly seen in the last section of the passage under analysis, i.e.: ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά, οἷον κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἢ ἐπίταξιν· τὸ γὰρ ἐβάδισεν; ἢ βάδιζε πτῶσις ῥήματος κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ εἴδη ἐστίν. In addition, this section creates some problems relating to the reading of the text. In this respect, as is well known[29], the *codex Parisinus* 1741 (coming from the 11th century and marked by editors as A) and the *codex Riccardianus* 46 of the 14th century (representing an independent tradition and marked as B) are of highest importance. The problem is that in both codices the exemplifying part of that passage reads as follows: τὸ γὰρ ἐβάδισεν ἢ ἐβάδιζεν. So, apart from the form of *indicativus aoristi* ἐβάδισεν, we have there another form of *indicativus*, i.e. *imperfecti*: ἐβάδιζεν. The form of *imperativus praesentis* βάδιζε (instead of *indicativus imperfecti* ἐβάδιζεν) is attested only in more recent codices, which depend on the *Parisinus* (A) and thus any discrepancies between them and the *Parisinus* one obviously have to be regarded as conjectures. In the most common interpretative tradition, both verb forms are thought of as exemplifications of πτώσεις ῥήματος distinguished κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά and are identified with verb forms being exponents of a question and order[30]. However, in this way the exemplifying character of both verb forms attested in the best codices, i.e. A and B, becomes problematic, since it is difficult to assume that both forms in the indicative, i.e. ἐβάδισεν and ἐβάδιζεν, illustrate a question and order straightforwardly. In this situation, the most frequently used solution is to insert a question mark after ἐβάδισεν and to accept the reading of more recent codices with the imperative βάδιζε in place of indicative ἐβάδιζεν.

Obviously, such a solution raises some reservations. They stem, first of all, from the fact that it implies intervention in the text, i.e. rejection of the unanimous tradition of the best manuscripts. Apart from that, such a solution would imply that the concept of πτῶσις ῥήματος presented in the *Poetics* has no references whatsoever to the category of tense and is based there exclusively on the criterion of the modal functions of the verb. This, in turn, raises a question regarding the absence of word forms in the conjunctive or the optative (given as examples), instead of which we have there the indicative form, or even – if we accept the most reliable sources – two forms of the indicative.

In order to interpret the passage under analysis, it is crucial to establish the sense of the phrase (πτώσεις) κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικά, illustrated by reference to the

---

[28] See e.g. Barnes 1995: 12–22; Arens 1984: 17 f.
[29] See e.g. Gallavotti 1986: 240 ff.; Pagliaro 1955: 1 f.
[30] See e.g. Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1967: 64.

masculine forms of the pronoun οὗτος, which are not homonymic in this respect, and the verb σημαίνειν, so e.g.: τὸ γὰρ *τοῦτο* σημαίνει ὁτὲ μὲν *οὗτος* ὁτὲ δὲ *τοῦτον*, or: δεῖ δ' ἐναλλὰξ σημαίνειν [τὸ *τοῦτο*], μετὰ μὲν τοῦ *ἔστι* τὸ *οὗτος*, μετὰ δὲ τοῦ *εἶναι* τὸ *τοῦτον*.

The above-quoted passage confirms once again functional character of the concept of πτῶσις by emphasising that word forms put in different contexts may represent different πτώσεις of a given ὄνομα (i.e. its distinct predicative text variants), even if the formal shape of those word forms is the same. Thus, the criterion for stating about the diversity (or the sameness) of πτώσεις of a given ὄνομα (as its distinct (or the same) predicative text variants) is not constituted (exclusively) by the diversity (or sameness) of their formal shape. Identification of particular πτώσεις of a given ὄνομα requires taking into account formal and functional relations characterising word variants (πτώσεις) not only of that specific ὄνομα, but also of other lexemes that may appear in the same contexts, i.e. that constitute its functional equivalents. Linking the homonymy of the specific πτώσεις ὀνόματος (i.e. the nominative and the accusative) with the specific value of the gender category, i.e. the neuter, is a separate issue. In this respect, it is worth underlining that in the passage under analysis Aristotle was probably the first to distinguish correctly the words in the neuter (μεταξύ) as a strictly grammatical class of words by pointing to this particular homonymy as its formal indicator[19]. At the same time he disproved the division made by Protagoras into masculine (ἄρρενα), feminine (θήλεα) and inanimate names (σκεύη)[20] by showing irrelevance of the semantic criterion adopted within this division. The Philosopher noticed, namely, that only some inanimate names (σκεύη) are characterised by the said homonymy of the nominative and accusative, whereas others, referred to by Aristotle as "the so-called inanimate names, which have, however, the form of a feminine or masculine name", are characterised by the lack of such homonymy, and the very lack of such homonymy is a feature characteristic for masculine and feminine names (... οἷον "ἔστι Κορίσκος", "εἶναι Κορίσκον". Καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θηλέων ὀνομάτων ὡσαύτως, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λεγομένων μὲν σκευῶν, ἐχόντων δὲ θηλείας ἢ ἄρρενος κλῆσιν. [...] ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὡσαύτως τὸ *ἔστι* καὶ τὸ *εἶναι* διοίσει).

The issue of diversity of πτώσεις discussed in the above-quoted passage, although it relates to the category of gender, it concerns, in fact, functional and formal word variance based on the category of case (τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἄρρενος

---

[19] However, he did not limit himself only to this criterion, but also tried to link particular gender values of nouns with the formal shape of their endings in the nominative singular. Those attempts could not obviously bring satisfactory results. With reference to this issue, apart from the passage in question, see also *Poet.* 21, 1458a 9–17.

[20] Cf. *Rhet.* III 1407b 7: Πρωταγόρας τὰ γένη τῶν ὀνομάτων διῄρει, ἄρρενα καὶ θήλεα καὶ σκεύη.

On les nomme en fonction du contexte, par exemple: barbares, voisins, étrangers ou ennemis.

Cette problématique, considérée sous l'approche comparative de ces deux périodes de l'histoire de l'Empire romain, peut être définie au mieux sur la base de l'analyse des sources numismatiques. Les autres approches de témoignages historiques restent des commentaires importants mais complémentaires. Les sources numismatiques créent notamment un ensemble au caractère unilatéral pour les deux périodes; elles sont officielles dans leur genèse et leur fonction; elles commentent les évènements et leurs cadres de manière officielle. Elles rendent compte parfaitement de l'essence et du contenu de la propagande impériale. On retire des recherches de Nicole Méthy sur la propagande dans l'Empire romain que la littérature antique, n'étant ni l'instrument de la volonté politique des empereurs, ni une manifestation de celle-ci, mais seulement dans certaines circonstances son écho faible et très lointain, ne montre que les éléments de la propagande officielle, et de plus sous l'angle subjectif d'un auteur antique[5]. La sélection de matériaux d'études proposée relève de sources directes et officielles. Les monnaies impériales, qui ont été émises sous le contrôle étatique dans les ateliers monétaires impériaux, et qui avaient un droit de circulation dans tout l'Empire romain, propageaient réellement les préférences et les raisons politiques de tel ou tel empereur ou de l'élite de pouvoir qui l'entourait, par son potentiel géographique et d'influence sociale, constituaient un moyen d'informations parfait, et remplissaient son rôle de propagande[6].

---

[5] N. Méthy, *Littérature et propagande politique au second siècle de notre ère*, AFLD XIII 1983, pp. 117–139.

[6] Cf. p.ex. L. Morawiecki, *Propagandowe aspekty mennictwa starożytnego*, Wiadomości Numizmatyczne XXIV 1980, pp. 1–21; J. Hiernard, *Une source de l'histoire romaine: la monnaie impériale de Septime Sévère à Constantin*, dans: *L'Empire romain de 192 à 325*, Paris 1997, pp. 93–125. Les références seront données d'après les catalogues les plus importants, comportant des matériaux de base pour les deux époques: H. Mattingly et al. (éds), *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, London 1968 (abrégé en *RIC*); F. Gnecchi, *I medaglioni romani*, Milano 1912 (cité ici Gnecchi). Pour une réactualisation et une correction des données concernant l'époque des Antonins voir les éditions: P.L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1931, 1933, 1937 (cité ici Strack); W. Szaivert, *Die Münzprägung der Kaiser Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus und Commodus (161–192)*, Wien 1986 (cité ici Szaivert); et pour le monnayage de certains souverains de la période de la crise du III[e] siècle, les éditions: B. Schulte, *Die Goldprägung der gallischen Kaiser von Postumus bis Tetricus*, Aarau–Frankfurt /M.–Salzburg 1983 (cité ici Schulte); M. Alram, *Die Münzprägung des Kaisers Maximinus I Thrax (235/238)*, Wien 1989 (cité ici Alram); R. Göbl, *Die Münzprägung des Kaisers Aurelianus (270/275)*, Wien 1993 (désigné par l'abréviation Göbl 1993); idem, *Die Münzprägung der Kaiser Valerianus I, Gallienus, Saloninus (253/268), Regalianus (260) und Macrianus Quietus (260/262)*, Wien 2000 (désigné par l'abréviation Göbl 2000); H.-J. Schulzki, *Die Antonianianprägung der Gallischen Kaiser von Postumus bis Tetricus (AGK). Typenkatalog der regulären und nachgepgrägten Münzen*, Bonn 1996 (cité ici Schulzki). Ces travaux on ajoutera ponctuellement. Cf. le tableau des concordances dressé dans les catalogues. D'autres travaux, ainsi que des articles traitant des nouveaux types monétaires et leurs variantes seront cités uniquement dans certains cas. Une plus grande exploitation de ces derniers

> do not take this form have a masculine or a feminine termination, and some of these we apply to articles of use; for example, ἀσκός (wine-skin) is masculine and κλίνη (bed) is feminine. Therefore, in such cases there will be the same difference when the indicative 'is' (ἔστι) is used and the infinitive 'to be' (εἶναι)[17].

As can be seen, the issues discussed here related to πτῶσις concern word variance based on the case category. The fundamental intention of that passage is to demonstrate that apparent solecisms discussed here stem from the fact that some contexts co-creating predicative expressions (ἔστι... and εἶναι...), although they are equivalent in terms of the formal shape of some word forms supplementing them (e.g. ἔστι τοῦτο and εἶναι τοῦτο), they are not equivalent with respect to the πτῶσις represented by those word forms. The argument proving that the word forms occurring in those two contexts do not represent the same πτῶσις is that there are such lexemes (e.g. Κορίσκος) for which those contexts are not equivalent as regards the formal shape of word forms representing them (ἔστι Κορίσκος, but εἶναι Κορίσκον). The indicated difference (Κορίσκος vs. Κορίσκον) is supposed to prove that also all other word forms occurring in those contexts (including τοῦτο) do not represent the same πτῶσις. Thus, we have to do here with an indication that the same word form (e.g. τοῦτο) may represent (two) different πτώσεις (κοινὸν εἶναι τὸ *τοῦτο* πλειόνων πτώσεων). In this way, Aristotle recognizes the phenomenon of syncretism (homonymy) of specific πτώσεις based on the category of case. The Philosopher presents that phenomenon using his own means of expression. Since this syncretism concerns the nominative and the accusative, in order to refer to those πτώσεις[18] he uses

---

[17] Translated by E.S. Forster, Cambridge, Mass.–London 2000 [first publ. 1955] (The Loeb Classical Library).

[18] As mentioned earlier, Montanari (1988) believes that when pointing to the forms which are different in terms of the case category, Aristotle applies the term πτώσεις ὀνόματος exclusively to oblique cases. When commenting the passage under consideration, the Italian scholar admits, on the one hand, that "il passo dei *Sophistici elenchi* appare infatti rubricare un 'nominativo' come 'caso' " (p. 172); however, on the other hand, he questions the value of that passage as the source providing knowledge about the semantic scope of the term πτώσεις ὀνόματος in Aristotle's writings saying: "...si tratta infatti qui di un pronome preso in sé, nella sua propria funzione grammaticale, e non come espediente per indicare i 'casi' " (p. 172). However, it is difficult to agree with his statement that the pronoun τοῦτο discussed here cannot be an "espediente per indicare i casi", since Aristotle *expressis verbis* refers just to its "casi" (πτώσεις) when writing about drawing false conclusions διὰ τὸ κοινὸν εἶναι τὸ *τοῦτο* πλειόνων πτώσεων, and the attached exemplification (τὸ γὰρ *τοῦτο* σημαίνει ὁτὲ μὲν *οὗτος* ὁτὲ δὲ *τοῦτον*) does not leave any doubts as to the fact that the expression πλειόνων πτώσεων refers exactly to the (formally identical) case variants of that pronoun, i.e. the nominative and the accusative. Similarly, we cannot share Montanari's opinion when he writes: "In realtà non possiamo dire nemmeno se, ad esempio, ζῷον (acc.) sia da Aristotele considerato caso di ζῷον (nom.), o se nell' eventualità dei 'neutri' l'opposizione si annulli" (p. 172). In our opinion, the intention of the interpreted passage is just to show that the same neuter form may represent two different πτώσεις, and thus putting forward the thesis that for Aristotle the opposition nominative / accusative (neutr.) may be subject to neutralisation, seems totally groundless.

a class of lexemes, i.e. they are semantically indivisible units, carrying the notion of time and being always signs of things said of something else[23]. Therefore, we may interpret ῥήματα (in the narrower meaning from the passage 3, 16b 16–18) and πτώσεις ῥήματος again as two kinds of text variants of lexemes defined in the passage 3, 16b 6–11.

As far as the status and mutual relations between those variants are concerned, the applied terminology points this time to the forms in the present tense as primary text representations of verb lexemes (ῥήματα), and to the forms in the past and future tenses as secondary representations (πτώσεις ῥήματος) of those lexemes. The way both kinds of verb variants signify time (presence vs. past / future) is, in turn, shown here as the basis for their oppositional nature. Thus, the criterion differentiating ῥῆμα from πτώσεις ῥήματος seems to significantly differ from that one the opposition ὄνομα vs. πτώσεις ὀνόματος was based on. That discrepancy can be noted first of all in the fact that ὄνομα and πτώσεις ὀνόματος were set apart as functional variants of ὄνομα, opposing each other at the logical level (exponent of the subject of predication vs. (co)exponent of predication), whereas the logical status of ῥῆμα and πτώσεις ῥήματος is identical, since both the verb form in the present tense and the form in the past or future tense constitute exclusively exponents of predicative contents[24]. In consequence, that functional equivalence of both kinds of verbal word forms has allowed to present the predicative function as one of definitional features of the verb as a class of lexemes in passage 3, 16b 6–11 (ἔστιν ἀεὶ τῶν καθ' ἑτέρου λεγομένων σημεῖον). Such a functional description was, in turn, impos-

---

[23] Cf. Montanari 1988: 218: "Competerà dunque al caso di verbo [...] l'adsignificazione temporale intesa in assoluto, ma competerà altresì anche la cosidetta 'funzione predicativa', che il Filosofo non ricorda [...] solo perchè non vi è necessità alcuna di ripetersi".

[24] Cf. Montanari 1988: 218: "... nel discorso verbi e casi di verbo sono funzionalmente del tutto equivalenti". Arens (1984) has, in turn, another opinion on that matter and interprets the opposition ῥῆμα vs. πτώσεις ῥήματος in logical terms. He believes that ῥῆμα differs from πτώσεις ῥήματος in that respect that only it may co-create statements subject to the qualification true / false, and this is because only verbs in the present tense express timelessness or omnitemporariness characteristic for judgments (statements) which are universal in character ("... only the present tense is recognised as the proper tense of the *rhema*, that is: as the expression of timelessness required in a general judgment", p. 45). Therefore, the scholar shows his surprise that in other places (e.g. 5, 17a 10–22 or 2, 16a 32–16b 5) Aristotle points to a possibility of co-creating statements (judgments) also by means of πτώσεις ῥήματος, i.e. verbs in the past and future tenses ("But the striking fact is that he [*scil.* Aristotle] admits propositions in the past and future tenses as stating something true or false, while in 3, 16b 16–18 he will exclude these tenses from the rhema proper just because a valid judgment can only be given in the present tense", p. 44). In connection with that Arens finds some difficulties with reconciling the sense of paragraph 3, 16b 16–18 with those statements of the Philosopher in which he confirms the participation of πτώσεις ὀνομάτων in expressing judgments. However, he interprets such difficulties as a result of weakness or inconsistency of Aristotle's theory, and with reference to paragraph 2, 16a 32–16b 5 he simply postulates to correct the text by removing the words: ἢ *ἦν* ἢ *ἔσται* (pp. 44 f.).

Rufin. 7 P. = *AP* V 21:

οὐκ ἔλεγον, Προδίκη, γηράσκομεν; οὐ προεφώνουν
„ἥξουσιν ταχέως αἱ διαλυσίφιλοι“;
νῦν ῥυτίδες καὶ θρὶξ πολιὴ καὶ σῶμα ῥακῶδες,
καὶ στόμα τὰς προτέρας οὐκέτ᾽ ἔχον χάριτας.
μή τίς σοι, μετέωρε, προσέρχεται ἢ κολακεύων
λίσσεται; ὡς δὲ τάφον νῦν σε παρερχόμεθα.

Die Konzinnität zum folgenden parallelen Glied erfordert, am Anfang eine analoge *oratio recta* herzustellen: οὐκ ἔλεγον, Προδίκη, „γηράσομεν“; [...]. Die seltene aktive Futurform von γηράσκειν verweist auf das Vorbild von Rufinus' Kontrastimitation, in welchem dem Menschen die vom Sprecher in Anspruch genommene Voraussicht gerade abgesprochen wird (Simonides fr. eleg. 20, 5–12):

θνητῶν δ᾽ ὅφρά τις ἄνθος ἔχει πολυήρατον ἥβης,
κοῦφον ἔχων θυμὸν πόλλ᾽ ἀτέλεστα νοεῖ ·
οὔτε γὰρ ἐλπίδ᾽ ἔχει *γηρασέμεν* οὔτε θανεῖσθαι,
οὐδ᾽, ὑγιὴς ὅταν ἦι, φροντίδ᾽ ἔχει καμάτου.
νήπιοι, οἷς ταύτηι κεῖται νόος, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν
ὡς χρόνος ἔσθ᾽ ἥβης καὶ βιότοι᾽ ὀλίγος
θνητοῖς. ἀλλὰ σὺ ταῦτα μαθὼν βιότου ποτὶ τέρμα
ψυχῆι τῶν ἀγαθῶν τλῆθι χαριζόμενος.

Vgl. auch Plat. *Resp.* III p. 393 e 8: ἔφη γηράσειν.

Rufin. 9 P. = *AP* V 27:

ποῦ σοι κεῖνα, Μέλισσα, τὰ χρύσεα καὶ περίοπτα
τῆς πολυθρυλήτου κάλλεα φαντασίης;
ποῦ δ᾽ ὀφρύες καὶ γαῦρα φρονήματα καὶ μέγας αὐχὴν
καὶ σοβαρῶν ταρσῶν χρυσοφόρος σπατάλη;
νῦν πενιχρὴ ψαφαρή τε κόμην, περὶ ποσσὶ παχεῖα·
ταῦτα τὰ τῶν σπαταλῶν τέρματα παλλακίδων.

5 κόμην, περὶ *Jacobs*: κόμη παρὰ *cod.* παχεῖα *Meineke*: τραχεῖα *cod.*

Page akzeptiert die Konjekturen von Jacobs und Meineke und verweist auf Archil. fr. 206: περὶ σφυρὸν παχεῖα μισητὴ γυνή. Aber der Anschluß nach oben wie nach unten (*ταῦτα* τὰ τῶν σπαταλῶν τέρματα παλλακίδων) scheint besser, wenn nicht Eigenschaften der Frau, sondern Körperteile mit bestimmten Attributen aufgezählt werden. Vielleicht sollte man κόμη unangetastet lassen und einfach παρά in **σφυ**ρά ändern. Zur asyndetischen Aufzählung vgl. 26 P. = *AP* V 70, 1 f.: κάλλος ἔχεις Κύπριδος, Πειθοῦς στόμα, σῶμα καὶ ἀκμὴν / εἰαρινῶν

Es folgen einige Bemerkungen zu Straton-Imitationen bei Rufinus. Dabei wird an Pages These der Priorität Stratons (entgegen der umgekehrten Ansicht Alan Camerons) festgehalten.

Rufin. 6 P. = *AP* V 19:

οὐκέτι παιδομανὴς ὡς πρίν ποτε, νῦν δὲ καλοῦμαι
θηλυμανής, καὶ νῦν δίσκος ἐμοὶ κρόταλον,
ἀντὶ δέ μοι παίδων ἀδόλου χροὸς ἥρεσε γύψου
χρώματα καὶ φύκους ἄνθος ἐπεισόδιον ·
βοσκήσει δελφῖνας ὁ δενδροκόμης Ἐρύμανθος
καὶ πολιὸν πόντου κῦμα θοὰς ἐλάφους.

In diesem Programmgedicht bekundet Rufinus seinen „Wechsel" von der homosexuellen zur heterosexuellen Liebe. Mit einem solchen poetologischen Paradigmenwechsel steht er in der Tradition von Meleager *AP* XII 41 = *HE* 4504–4507. Hält man sich diesen „Wechsel" vor Augen, so erscheint es übrigens fraglich, ob man in 8 P. = *AP* V 22:

σοί με λάτριν γλυκύδωρος Ἔρως παρέδωκε, Βοῶπι,
γαῦρον ὑποζεύξας εἰς πόθον αὐτόμολον
αὐτοθελῆ, πάνδουλον, ἑκούσιον, αὐτοκέλευστον,
αἰτήσοντα πικρὴν μήποτ᾽ ἐλευθερίην,
ἄχρι φίλης πολιῆς καὶ γήραος · ὄμμα βάλοι δὲ
μήποτ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ἡμετέραις ἐλπίσι βασκανίη

(zur Beibehaltung von γαῦρον gegenüber Bruncks Konjektur ταῦρον vgl. H. White, MPhL VI 1984, S. 103–107) tatsächlich αὐτόμολον in der seltenen Bedeutung „coming of one's own accord" (Page) als Synonym zu den Adjektiven im folgenden Hexameter verstehen und nicht vielmehr die Junktur εἰς πόθον αὐτόμολον auf den im Programmgedicht thematisierten „Paradigmenwechsel" beziehen sollte, der dann mit militärischer Metaphorik als ein „Überlaufen" beschrieben würde.

In jedem Fall scheint Rufinus seine homoerotische Vergangenheit intertextuell durch deutliche Bezüge auf homosexuelle Gedichte, insbesondere auf die Epigramme des Straton zu bekunden.

Rufin. 1 P. = *AP* V 9:

Der einfache Ausdruck der Verlassenheit bei Straton AP XII 226, 6 μουνολεχεῖς κοίτας οὐκέτ᾽ ἀνεξόμεθα wird entfaltet zu

οὐκέτι βαστάζω, μὰ τὰ σ᾽ ὄμματα, τὴν φιλέραστον
κοίτην μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίῃ,

Zur Krasis vgl. 16 P. = *AP* V 43, 5 χεὐρήσομεν, zur Antithese Solon fr. 4, 35: αὐαίνει δ᾽ ἄτης ἄνθεα φυόμενα *scil.* εὐνομίη. Allgemein zum Motiv Platon *AP* V 80:

μῆλον ἐγώ· βάλλει με φιλῶν σέ τις. ἀλλ᾽ ἐπίνευσον,
Ξανθίππη· *κἀγὼ καὶ σὺ μαραινόμεθα.*

Rufin. 29 P. = *AP* V 75:

γείτονα παρθένον εἶχον Ἀμυμώνην, Ἀφροδίτη,
ἥ μου τὴν ψυχὴν ἔφλεγεν οὐκ ὀλίγον.
αὐτή μοι προσέπαιξε καί εἴ ποτε καιρὸς ἐτόλμων.
ἠρυθρία. τί πλέον; τὸν πόνον ᾐσθάνετο.
ἤνυσα πολλὰ καμών. παρακήκοα νῦν, ὅτι τίκτει.
ὥστε τί ποιοῦμεν; φεύγομεν ἢ μένομεν;

1 Ἀφροδίτη *Scaliger*: Ἀφροδίτην *cod.* 3 αὐτή *Bothe*: αὕτη *cod.*

Die Wendung εἴ ποτε καιρός *scil.* ἦν im Zusammenhang einer bestimmten, schließlich ergriffenen Gelegenheit (προσέπαιξε P, nur Pl hat προσέπαιζε) wirkt höchst sonderbar, zumal man εἴ ποτε καιρός ἐτόλμων leicht im Sinne eines Iterativs der Vergangenheit mißverstehen kann („immer wenn sich irgendwann eine Gelegenheit ergab, wagte ich"). Der benutzte καιρός kann doch wohl nur in dem προσπαίζειν seitens des Mädchens gelegen haben:

αὐτή μοι προσέπαιξε καί, εἴ ποτε, καιρῷ ἐτόλμων.

(καιρόν Chardon [mit gleicher Bedeutung, vgl. Jebb zu Soph. *Ai.* 34 und Kannicht zu Eur. *Hel.* 479], καίρι᾽(α) Brunck) „wenn jemals, wagte ich bei passender Gelegenheit". Zum Motiv vgl. Polyb. I 44, 1: ἐντειλάμενοι μὴ καταμελλῆσαι, *χρησάμενον δὲ σὺν καιρῷ τῇ τόλμῃ* βοηθῆσαι τοῖς πολιορκουμένοις, zur Verwendung von καιρῷ im Sinne von ἐν καιρῷ vgl. Jebb zu Soph. *Oed.* 1516, zur Hiatkürzung an dieser Stelle Rufin. 14 P. = *AP* V 41, 1.

Das Imperfekt ἐτόλμων ist *de conatu* gesetzt in Hinblick auf das folgende ἤνυσα πολλὰ καμών. Dieses Verhältnis wird wesentlich deutlicher, wenn man den auf das Erröten des Mädchens gehenden zweiten Pentameter als Parenthese interpungiert. In dieser Parenthese wird ein möglicher Einwand gegen die günstige Beurteilung der Situation durch den Sprecher (καιρῷ ἐτόλμων) abgefertigt.

* * *

λύχνος ἐπεγράφετο. Bei [Mosch.] *Epit. Bion*. 55 f.: Πανὶ φέρω τὸ *μέλισμα*; τάχ᾽ ἂν καὶ κεῖνος ἐρεῖσαι / τὸ στόμα δειμαίνοι μὴ δεύτερα σεῖο φέρηται ist zumindest das den Bezugspunkt bildende Musikinstrument im unmittelbaren Kontext genannt. Hier dagegen erwartet man nicht ein „den Mund pressen", sondern vielmehr „den Mund *auf*pressen".

Das Problem lösen könnte ein (von Page verworfener) Versuch Stadtmüllers:

Εὐρώπης τὸ φίλαμα, καὶ ἦν ἄχρι χείλεος ἔλθῃ,
ἡδύ γε, κἂν ψαύσῃ μοῦνον ἄκρου στόματος ·
ψαύει δ᾽ οὐκ ἄκροις τοῖς χείλεσιν, ἀλλ᾽ **ἐπιθεῖσα**
τὸ στόμα τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξ ὀνύχων ἀνάγει.

Rufinus imitiert in der metrischen Struktur des Vierzeilers deutlich Meleager *AP* V 171 = *HE* 4182–4185:

τὸ σκύφος ἡδὺ γέγηθε, λέγει δ᾽, ὅτι τᾶς φιλέρωτος
Ζηνοφίλας ψαύει τοῦ λαλιοῦ στόματος.
ὄλβιον · εἴθ᾽ ἐπ᾽ (Herwerden: ὑπ᾽ *cod.*) ἐμοῖς νῦν χείλεσι χείλεα θεῖσα
ἀπνευστὶ ψυχὰν τὰν ἐν ἐμοὶ προπίοι.

Rufin. 5 P. = *AP* V 18:

μᾶλλον τῶν σοβαρῶν τὰς δουλίδας ἐκλεγόμεσθα,
οἱ μὴ τοῖς σπαταλοῖς κλέμμασι τερπόμενοι.
ταῖς μὲν χρὼς ἀπόδωδε μύρου, σοβαρόν τε φρύαγμα,
καὶ μέχρι κινδύνου † ἑσπομένη σύνοδος ·
ταῖς δὲ χάρις καὶ χρὼς ἴδιος καὶ λέκτρον ἕτοιμον,
† δώροις ἐκ σπατάλοις † οὐκ ἀλεγιζόμενον.
μιμοῦμαι Πύρρον τὸν Ἀχιλλέος, ὃς προέκρινεν
Ἑρμιόνης ἀλόχου τὴν λάτριν Ἀνδρομάχην.

Zunächst zu der Schwierigkeit in Vers 6. Pages Kommentarbemerkungen hierzu gehen aus von der fragwürdigen Voraussetzung, daß ἀλεγιζόμενον ein (sonst nirgends belegtes) Medium im Sinne des Aktivs ist, ebenso die Behandlung der Stelle bei H. White, *New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, Amsterdam 1985, S. 43–46, an deren Ende die Konjektur καὶ λέκτρον ἕτοιμον / δώροις, ἐκσπατάλης οὐκ ἀλεγιζόμενον steht („a bed [...] which does not care [...] for excessive luxury"). Selbst wenn diese mediale Auffassung sprachlich möglich wäre, wäre ein „Sich-nicht-um-etwas-Kümmern" schwerlich das, was man von einem λέκτρον sagen würde. Man käme kaum um eine Änderung der Endung herum (οὐκ ἀλεγιζομέναις Hecker).

Besser versteht man οὐκ ἀλεγιζόμενον als Passiv. Auf diese Weise gewinnt man ein negativ formuliertes Pendant zu ἕτοιμον. Die epischen Verben ἀλέγειν,

gloria Teucrorum...
(*Aen.* II 324–326)

are Panthus' reply to the question asked by Venus' son (322): "quo res summa loco, Panthu? quam prendimus arcem?" Apollo's priest is, by the way, the first Trojan whom Aeneas met after Greeks had invaded the city. For both of them "venit summa dies" is the doomsday. However, Panthus' words imply other meanings too, although the characters of the presented world are not aware of them. For the reader the fall of Troy marks the beginning of Aeneas' journey as a result of which, one day, Rome will be founded. "Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium..." becomes almost a semantic equivalent of "erimus Romani, erit Roma". This journey is also subtly signalled in Book II, before Panthus' words. The encounter with the priest is preceded by Aeneas' dream in which the fallen Hector appears calling him to escape from Troy (II 288–295). Homeland entrusts its sanctities to Aeneas and pleads him to look for a new seat ("sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penatis / [...] his moenia quaere / magna", II 293 ff.). This anticipates Aeneas' wanderings (of which he is still unaware) as well as the arrival of Panthus. When he arrives, "sacra manu victosque deos parvumque nepotem / ipse trahit" (II 320 f.). He undoubtedly knows nothing of the dream and the future mission of Aeneas[26]. Austin notices that Panthus' grandson, never mentioned again, "is a pathetic prolepsis, as it were, of Iulus"[27]. The background to this passage of the *Aeneid*, referred to in line VII 195 of the *Civil War*, is, undoubtedly, Jupiter's prophecy from the preceding book of the poem (I 257–296), the first extensive forecast in Vergil of the future glory of Rome, given, significantly, by the supreme lord of gods and men himself. It is from the angle of this scene that the audience of the *Aeneid* (and thus the audience of the *Civil War* too) interprets Aeneas' dream and his meeting with Panthus[28].

---

[26] Servius Auctus, who has paid attention to the connection between lines 293 and 320, also gives the following rational explanation (ad v. II 321): "per quod et religio eius laudatur et virtus".

[27] R.G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus*, with a Commentary by..., Oxford 1964, ad v. 320.

[28] Complementing Guillemin's conclusion (*o.c.* [n. 1]) that Lucan's Book VII is an antithesis of the *Aeneid*, von Albrecht (*Roman Epic...* [n. 1], p. 237) remarks that "In Book 7 there is not only 'imitation by contrast', but Lucan also adopts Virgilian description in the same sense and tries to surpass them". He provides "venit summa dies" as an example: "This quotation [...] no longer pertains to Troy alone, but to the Roman world as a whole". Indeed, but at the same time in this phrase in the *Civil War* the day of the fall of Troy (being the beginning of the wanderings of Aeneas and thus of Rome's history presented by Vergil in a specific, optimistic way) coincides with Caesar's victory the consequences of which are interpreted by Lucan also in a specific, but not optimistic way. Explicit and implicit meanings complement each other right in this place.

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

ZU DEN EROTISCHEN EPIGRAMMEN DES RUFINUS

Von

THOMAS GÄRTNER

ABSTRACT: In dem vorliegenden Aufsatz werden einige textkritische Probleme besprochen, die sich in den von Denys L. Page gesammelten erotischen Rufinus-Epigrammen der *Anthologia Palatina* (*The Epigrams of Rufinus*, Cambridge 1978) ergeben. In einem Anhang wird, teilweise im Lichte der neugewonnenen Ergebnisse, das Verhältnis des Rufinus zu den homoerotischen Epigrammen des Straton von Sardeis diskutiert. Dabei wird an Pages These der Priorität Stratons festgehalten.

Rufin. 1 Page [ferner P.] = *AP* V 9:

Ῥουφῖνος τῇ ᾗ γλυκερωτάτῃ Ἐλπίδι πολλὰ
χαίρειν, εἰ χαίρειν χωρὶς ἐμοῦ δύνασαι.
οὐκέτι βαστάζω, μὰ τὰ σ᾽ ὄμματα, τὴν φιλέρημον
καὶ τὴν μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίην,
ἀλλ᾽ αἰεὶ δακρύοισι πεφυρμένος ἢ ᾽πὶ Κορησσὸν
ἔρχομαι ἢ μεγάλης νηὸν ἐς Ἀρτέμιδος.
αὔριον ἀλλὰ πάτρη με δεδέξεται, ἐς δὲ σὸν ὄμμα
πτήσομαι, ἐρρῶσθαι μυρία σ᾽ εὐχόμενος.

Der Nominalausdruck τὴν φιλέρημον / καὶ τὴν μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίην mit dem zweifachen Artikel befremdet, zumal weder φιλέρημος noch μουνολεχής wirklich zu διαζυγίη paßt. Insbesondere φιλέρημος widerspricht dem ganzen Zusammenhang geradezu schreiend: Der Sprecher liebt die ἐρημία eben überhaupt nicht. Pages Erklärung „the φιλ- element signifies that ἐρημία is dear to διαζυγίη“ wirkt äußerst gezwungen.

In Anbetracht von Straton *AP* XII 226, 6: μουνολεχεῖς κοίτας οὐκέτ᾽ ἀνεξόμεθα (Jacobs: οὐκέτι μουνολεχεῖς κοίτας ἀνεξόμεθα cod.) erwägt Page die in der Tat naheliegende Herstellung von κοίτην aus καὶ τήν. Dann soll μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίην Apposition sein zu τὴν φιλέρημον / κοίτην, eine Konstruktion, die für sich nicht befriedigt und überdies die bei Straton verwendete Junktur μουνολεχεῖς κοίτας aufbricht.

Einen befriedigenden Text, in dem attributives und praedikatives Adjektiv deutlich voneinander geschieden sind, erhält man mit etwas stärkeren Eingriffen:

Page bezeichnet Boissonades οὐ ῥόδον als „an elegant conjecture", akzeptiert aber letztlich die befremdliche Disjunktion „the beauty or the rose of your merry cheeks". Letztlich kann die „Rose" als Symbol der Vergänglichkeit aber doch wohl nur ein (gut zu den Wangen des Mädchens passender) Vergleichsgegenstand sein. Ein ähnlicher Vergleich wird in Gedicht 28 P. = *AP* V 74 zur Schlußpointe eines Epigramms. Hier wird man schreiben müssen

... οὐδὲ τὸ καλὸν
τῶν ἱλαρῶν μήλων ὡς ῥόδου ἐξέφυγεν

(Hecker ἢ ῥόδου). Vgl. Straton *AP* XII 195, 5–8:

ἔξοχα δ' ἐν τούτοις Μιλήσιος ἠνίδε θάλλει
ὡς ῥόδον εὐόδμοις λαμπόμενον πετάλοις.
ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδεν ἴσως, ἐκ καύματος ὡς καλὸν ἄνθος,
οὕτω τὴν ὥρην ἐκ τριχὸς ὀλλυμένην,

ferner dens. *AP* XII 234:

εἰ κάλλει καυχᾷ, γίνωσχ', ὅτι καὶ ῥόδον ἀνθεῖ ·
ἀλλὰ μαρανθὲν ἄφνω σὺν κοπρίοις ἐρίφη.
ἄνθος γὰρ καὶ κάλλος ἴσον χρόνον ἐστὶ λαχόντα ·
ταῦτα δ' ὁμῇ φθονέων ἐξεμάρανε χρόνος.

Zur Hiatkürzung an dieser Versstelle vgl. Vers 2 desselben Epigramms, ferner 14 P. = *AP* V 41, 2.

<u>Rufin. 28 P. = *AP* V 74:</u>

πέμπω σοι, Ῥοδόκλεια, τόδε στέφος, ἄνθεσι καλοῖς
αὐτὸς ὑφ' ἡμετέραις πλεξάμενος παλάμαις.
ἔστι κρίνον ῥοδέη τε κάλυξ νοτερή τ' ἀνεμώνη
καὶ νάρκισσος ὑγρὸς καὶ κυαναυγὲς ἴον.
ταῦτα στεψαμένη, λῆξον μεγάλαυχος ἐοῦσα ·
ἀνθεῖς καὶ λήγεις καὶ σὺ καὶ ὁ στέφανος.

Die Wiederholung von λήγειν in völlig verschiedenem Sinne empfindet Stadtmüller zurecht als anstößig und diagnostiziert einen Influenzfehler. Aber anstatt von Stadtmüllers Vorschlägen, λήγεις durch φθίνεις bzw. τήκῃ zu ersetzen, erwartet man einen Begriff, der als Antithese zu ἀνθεῖν praeziser auf den Kranz paßt, welcher den Gegenstand des ganzen Gedichts bildet:

ἀνθεῖς χαὐαίνῃ καὶ σὺ καὶ ὁ στέφανος.

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

LUCAN VII 192–194: AN EXAMPLE OF *ARTE ALLUSIVA*?

By

MARIUSZ PLAGO

In Book VII of the *Civil War*, before the battle of Pharsalus and immediately before what is probably the poem's most important apostrophe (205–213) and an artistic and political creed of the poet, thus at the very climax of the work, we read about an augury which took place near Patavium:

> Euganeo, si vera fides memorantibus, augur
> colle sedens, Aponus terris ubi fumifer exit
> atque Antenorei dispergitur unda Timavi,
> 'venit summa dies, geritur res maxima", dixit,
> 'inpia concurrunt Pompei et Caesaris arma',
> (VII 192–196)

The lines draw the attention of scholars mainly due to the words "venit summa dies" (194) – a striking example of an intertextual game of negating in the *Civil War* the optimistic view of history given in the *Aeneid*[1]. For we are in this very

---

[1] On this hemistich and its intertextual and thus polemical dimension, see esp. E. Narducci, *Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero. Interpretazione della Pharsalia*, Roma–Bari 2002, pp. 80–82; G.B. Conte, *I giorni del giudizio: Lucano e l'antimodello*, in: idem, *La 'Guerra Civile' di Lucano. Studi e prove di commento*, Urbino 1988, pp. 33–39 (Conte also discusses other similar phrases in Lucan's poem). The most comprehensive study on lines VII 185–213 is M. Leigh, *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*, Oxford 1997, pp. 6–40; commentaries: D. Gagliardi, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis liber septimus*, Introduzione, testo critico e commento a cura di..., Firenze 1975; O.A.W. Dilke, *Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, De bello civili liber VII*, Revised from the Edition of J.P. Postgate by..., Bristol 1978; For Lucan's Vergilianism (mostly, but not always, anti-Vergilianism) see, among many others, A. Guillemin, *L'inspiration virgilienne dans la Pharsale*, REL XXIX 1951, pp. 214–227; L. Thompson, R.T. Bruère, *Lucan's Use of Virgilian Reminiscence*, CPh LXIII 1968, pp. 1–21; W.D. Lebek, *Lucans Pharsalia. Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug*, Göttingen 1976 (Hypomnemata 44), dealing esp. with structural patterns upon which Books I–VII are constructed; E. Narducci, *La provvidenza crudele. Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei*, Pisa 1979; idem, *Ideologia e tecnica allusiva nella Pharsalia*, *ANRW* II 32, 3 (1985), pp. 1538–1564; M. von Albrecht, *Roman Epic. An Interpretative Introduction*, Leiden–Boston–Köln 1999 (Mnemosyne Supplementum 189), pp. 236–242; A. Rossi, *The Aeneid Revisited: The Journey of Pompey in Lucan's Pharsalia*, AJPh CXXI 2000, pp. 571–559.

who wrote: "Not a good thing were a Caesar too many"[70]. We can imagine how Cleopatra must have influenced her beloved son so that he would always keep in mind the fight for his lost kingdom.

* * *

Caesarion, as the only son of Julius Caesar, played a decisive role in Cleopatra's politics. She knew how valuable the name Caesar was in Rome, and wanted to prepare the basis for raising the aspirations of Caesar's heir. Firstly, Ptolemy Caesar, thanks to Cleopatra, reached the highest positions in Egypt. But to prepare the ground for introducing Caesarion as a new ruler of a joint empire of Rome and Egypt she needed a politician of Julius Caesar's calibre. Unfortunately Mark Antony was too unpredictable, and his inclination towards pleasure and fun, together with her distrust of him, resulted in losing all their chances for a good support in Rome in their struggle for power. Caesarion was not only the son of the dictator of Rome, Caesar, and the queen of Egypt, Cleopatra, but he was also related to Alexander the Great. Everybody knew that Cleopatra was Macedonian, and that Ptolemy Caesar could become the second Alexander who could, perhaps, even unite the whole known world into one huge empire. This was extremely exciting for the Romans and also Antony raised hopes (especially immediately after the Ides of March) that this empire would preserve Roman character, a character strongly influenced by Hellenistic culture.

Rzeszów

---

[70] Plut. *Ant*. 81.

Ὡρῶν, φθέγμα δὲ Καλλιόπης und 35 P. = *AP* V 94, 1 f. ὄμματ᾽ ἔχεις Ἥρης, Μελίτη, τὰς χεῖρας Ἀθήνης, / τοὺς μαζοὺς Παφίης, τὰ σφυρὰ τῆς Θέτιδος.

Rufin. 11 P. = *AP* V 35, 1 f.:

πυγὰς αὐτὸς ἔκρινα τριῶν · εἵλοντο γὰρ αὐταὶ
δείξασαι γυμνὴν ἀστεροπὴν μελέων.

Daß die Frauen sich erst entblößten und erst dann Rufinus bzw. das dichterische Ich zum Schönheitsschiedsrichter wählten, erscheint sonderbar. Man sollte statt δεῖξασαι lesen δεῖξαί μοι oder δεῖξαι ἐμοί (zur Hiatkürzung an dieser Versstelle vgl. Vers 4 desselben Gedichts). Vgl. 12 P. = *AP* V 36, 3: καί με κριτὴν εἵλοντο.

Rufin. 14 P. = *AP* V 41:

τίς γυμνὴν οὕτω σε καὶ ἐξέβαλεν καὶ ἔδειρεν;
τίς ψυχὴν λιθίνην εἶχε καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπεν;
μοιχὸν ἴσως ηὗρηκεν ἀκαίρως κεῖνος ἐσελθών;
γινόμενον · πᾶσαι τοῦτο ποοῦσι, τέκνον.
πλὴν ἀπὸ νῦν, ὅταν ἐστὶν ἔσω, κεῖνος δ᾽ ὅταν ἔξω,
τὸ πρόθυρον σφήνου, μὴ πάλι ταὐτὸ πάθῃς.

An der Möglichkeit, γινόμενον in dem Sinne „it is the usual thing“ zu verwenden, zweifelt Page z. St. sehr zurecht. Als einzigen konjekturalen Vorschlag nennt er Heckers **κλι**νόμενον, wobei jedoch das Partizip Praesens befremdet. Die Junktur μοιχὸν εὑρίσκειν ist auch in 16 P. = *AP* V 43, 1 (ἐπὴν εὕρῃ ποτὲ μοιχόν) ohne partizipialen Zusatz verwendet.

Eher bedarf πᾶσαι einer Einschränkung: Nicht grundsätzlich alle Frauen verhalten sich so, sondern nur alle Frauen, nachdem sie eine Eheschließung hinter sich gebracht haben:

γημάμεναι πᾶσαι τοῦτο ποοῦσι, τέκνον.

Rufin. 23 P. = *AP* V 62:

οὔ πώ σοι τὸ καλὸν χρόνος ἔσβεσεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι πολλὰ
λείψανα τῆς προτέρης σῴζεται ἡλικίης,
καὶ χάριτες μίμνουσιν ἀγήραοι, οὐδὲ τὸ καλὸν
τῶν ἱλαρῶν μήλων ἢ ῥόδον ἐξέφυγεν.
ὢ πόσσους κατέφλεξε τὸ πρὶν θεοείκελον †κάλλος†
<.....>

If the poet was right the great part of the East joined the Egyptian side. The problem was that all these spectacles were taking place in Egypt, but in Rome things looked quite different.

The most damaging aspects were powered by Octavian's propagandists and very often by Octavian himself[54]. Antony, his queen and her son were seen as dangerous enemies awaiting to take possession of Rome and destroy Roman traditions. Also old republican ideas were still important to Roman citizens. Octavian had never dared to declare himself king, and although he acted like one, he still supported the illusion of the senate as a real centre of power.

Cleopatra with Caesarion were absolute monarchs and were seen as gods in Egypt. Of course in the East Antony was also seen in very much the same way. All the riches of royal and god's court, was something usual for Egyptians but completely alien to Romans. Citizens of Rome did not want any new experiments – especially with a monarchy. After such a long period of wars and struggles they finally just wanted peace[55]. They saw Octavian as a continuator of policy started by Caesar, as a guarantor for the realization of their hopes. Antony had a large group of supporters, but to introduce Caesarion in a more positive (for Romans) way, his greater participation in Roman politics was necessary. However, he did not do enough to make a stand and to push for Caesarion's rights against those of Octavian in the propaganda war in the city of Rome. It seems that Cleopatra's desire to exert total influence on Antony prevented him from seeing things with enough "sharpness". Additionally she alienated him from his most reasonable supporters, being afraid mostly that they would make him change his mind and draw him again into peace with Octavian[56].

Most important for Cleopatra was to keep the Ptolemies[57] (the closest to her) on the throne. Further aim was to rule the Roman world[58], and also prevent the incorporation of Egypt into the Roman empire merely as one of its territories[59]. In the future the new united kingdom was to be inherited by Caesarion. An important indication of what they planned was, as described above, the huge ceremony after the eastern conquests of the triumvir.

Continuous celebration, amusements and reckless behaviour caused Antony to take his eyes off matters in Rome[60], which despite the fact that this behaviour

---

[54] Plut. *Ant.* 55.

[55] A.J.E. Bell, *Cicero and the Spectacle of Power*, JRS LXXXVII 1997, p. 2.

[56] Cass. Dio. L 13, 8; Plut. *Ant.* 59.

[57] J. Bingen, *La politique dynastique de Cléopâtre VII*, CRAI 1999, fasc. 1, pp. 46–66.

[58] Florus II 21, I; Eutr. VII 7; *CAH*[1], vol. X, p. 76 (Charlesworth).

[59] Canfora, *o.c.* (n. 18), p. 230.

[60] Cass. Dio XLVIII 27, 2: "[Antony] joined Cleopatra and the Egyptians in general in their life of luxurious ease until he was entirely demoralized"; XLIX 34, 1: "As for Antony, he became more than ever a slave to the passion and the witchery of Cleopatra".

In spite of all that the phrase "si vera fides memorantibus" stands out from the preceding comments which view sources and thus details given by them with suspicion – firstly because it is set in the passage the essence of which are intertextual references, secondly because we have here, instead of *fama* or *vetustas*, the verb *memoro*. Such a move of the poet may astonish his addressee (this verb occurs once more in an interjected comment of the poet, in IX 512 ff.: "Stat sortiger illic / Iuppiter, ut memorant, sed non aut fulmina vibrans / aut similis nostro..."[14], but this passage appears much later in the poem). Taking into consideration the context, the change seems to be meaningful. As a supplement to this remark, where no particular author is mentioned, there are three lines – the one where the comment is placed and two lines following it – giving a periphrasis of the surroundings of Patavium. Not only do they give more details of the prophecy – who and where (the time is determined by the whole scene of which the augur's prophecy is a part, and obviously by the prophecy itself), but also, for the same reasons, they direct to Livy, a historian from this city. Even superficial knowledge of geography, literature and mythological tradition would be sufficient for the audience to decipher this circumlocution and relate it to *memorantibus*[15]. Apart from that the verb *memoro* is characteristically used by historians when speaking of their predecessors[16]. So, the phrase arousing the interest of the reader is meant to invite them to identify the text or texts the poet refers to. What is important here is the intertextual dimension of the prophecy. The conditional interjection "si vera fides...", a metatextual signal[17] of intertextual relation, encourages to reflect for a moment on the passage in order to compare the versions of the augur's words

---

[14] *Ut memorant* occurs in Ov. *Met*. XIII 47; XV 414; *Trist*. IV 4, 65; F. Bömer (*P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen, Kommentar. Buch XII–XIII*, Heidelberg 1982, ad v. XIII 47) notes: "...er [*scil*. der Sprecher] (und mit ihm Ovid) denkt bei den *silvestria antra* [...] an die aus der Literatur [...] bekannte Höhle des Philoktet...".

[15] The legend about Antenor's founding of Patavium must have existed long before Vergil and Livy (I 1, 1). Livy's *satis constat* begining the account of Antenor seems to confirm that his readers knew the legend well. According to R.M. Ogilvie (*A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5*, Oxford 1965, ad I 1, 1), this phrase implies consulting more than one authority (but for a different interpretation see K. Zelzer, *Iam primum omnium satis constat... Zum Hintergrund der Erwähnung des Antenor bei Livius 1, 1*, WS C 1987, pp. 117–124). The late-Augustan poet Largus wrote shortly after Vergil a work concerning Antenor's journey (which is mentioned by Ovid *Pont*. IV 16, 17 f.: "ingeniique sui dictus cognomine Largus, / Gallica qui Phrygium duxit in arva senem"); on this poem see L. Braccesi, *La leggenda di Antenore, da Troia a Padova,* Padova 1984, pp. 106 f.; and M. Leigh, *Sophocles at Patavium (fr. 137 Radt)*, JHS CXVIII 1998, pp. 92 ff. Leigh supposes that Largus' epic was "a Paduan micro-*Aeneid* [...] consciously reproducing the tropes and themes of Virgil's foundation myth" (p. 97).

[16] See examples in *OLD*, s.v. 3a–d.

[17] The term of M. Głowiński (*O intertekstualności*, in: idem, *Prace wybrane*, vol. V: *Intertekstualność, groteska, parabola. Szkice ogólne i interpretacje*, ed. by R. Nycz, Kraków 2000, pp. 19 f.), who notes that intertextual references frequently appear together with metatextual statements.

here and in the source text, to perceive differences between them and, as a result, to ponder on the changes introduced in the *Civil War*[18] and, obviously, on their role. In other passages of this sort the reader usually does not know what really lies under the words *fama* and *vetustas*, or even under the verb *memorant* in line IX 513 (poetry, historiography or ethnography, folk tales, a legend, an ancient people[19] or perhaps – in those passages where the presented fact appears to be a part of common knowledge – just people in general?). The sources are not clearly defined and the context does not help to find them out unambiguously. The fact is that this is not important. There is only one exceptional passage in the *Civil War*, the description of the Tritonian lake and its vicinity in lines IX 348–367; in this description there occur the above quoted remarks (348 and 356) and also a following comment: "invidus, annoso qui famam derogat aevo, / qui vates ad vera vocat" (360 f.). However, here we may only arrive at a conclusion about what kind of sources is meant by *fama*, whereas the verb *memoro* in the passage from Book VII is much more specific. It appears to indicate one particular work.

As a matter of fact, Lucan prompts his reader, giving him additional indications. Commenting upon line VII 194 Dilke says (Dilke, *o.c.* [n. 1]): "The Timavus, where Antenor is said to have landed, flows into the Adriatic near the modern Trieste, a long way from Patavium: Lucan's geography is inexact...". The source of this geographical inaccuracy must be the lines from Book I of the *Aeneid*:

> Antenor potuit mediis elapsus Achivis
> Illyricos penetrare sinus atque intima tutus
> regna Liburnorum et fontem superare Timavi,
> unde per ora novem vasto cum murmure montis
> it mare proruptum et pelago premit arva sonanti.
> hic tamen ille urbem Patavi sedesque locavit
> Teucrorum et genti nomen dedit armaque fixit
> Troia, nunc placida compostus pace quiescit.
> (I 242–249)

---

[18] Dilke (*o.c.* [n. 1] ad v. 192 f.) compares the preserved versions of Cornelius' augury and reconstructs his words in Livy's account as "res geritur; concurrunt viri; vincis, Caesar"; see also Dilke's note ad v. 195 f. I hope to deal with various aspects of intertextual play in lines VII 195 f. in another paper.

[19] Compare III 406 and IV 590 (quoted above) with the end of a Libyan inhabitant's speech: "hinc, aevi veteris custos, famosa vetustas, / miratrixque sui, signavit nomine terras. / sed maiora dedit cognomina collibus istis / [...] / Scipio", IV 654–648. The speech is introduced by (591 f.): "nominis antiqui cupientem noscere causas / cognita per multos docuit rudis incola patres" (on those passages with *vetustas* from Book IV see Narducci, *La provvidenza...*, *o.c.* [n. 1], pp. 72 ff.). Cf. also Acoreus' 'lecture' (X 175–331), in which antiquity (*vetustas*) is also referred to (239 f., 323, and 219 with *fides veterum*). Besides, the audience of the *Civil War* have met with statements like "ut fama" in secondary narration of Lucan's predecessors., e.g.: Verg. *Aen.* III 121, 551, 578; Ov. *Met.* XII 197. Looking rationally, while Lucan's Caesar and Acoreus know literature (cf. X 181 ff.), in case of Aeneas it is rather doubtful. The ontological status, so to speak, of those persons is quite different. But it is important that the audience might know (cf. Bömer's comment quoted in n. 14 above).

ἀλεγίζειν und ἀλεγύνειν sind keineswegs auf die (geläufige) negative Bedeutung „sich nicht bekümmern um etwas“ beschränkt. Formal erfordert diese Bedeutung ein Genitivobjekt, was aus der korrupten ersten Vershälfte kaum zu gewinnen ist. Inhaltlich aber paßt der Gedanke „das Liebesbett schert sich nicht um etwas“, wie bereits angedeutet, genausowenig.

Bereits im archaischen Epos werden die genannten Verben auch im Sinne von „sich um etwas kümmern, etwas besorgen“ mit Akkusativobjekten verbunden. Zu ἀλέγειν vgl. *Od.* VI 268 f.: ἔνθα δὲ νηῶν ὅπλα μελαινάων ἀλέγουσι, / πείσματα καὶ σπείρας, zu ἀλεγύνειν die gängige epische Junktur δαῖτ᾽ ἀλεγύνειν („sich um das Essen kümmern“), die mit beachtlichem semantischem Spielraum sowohl vom Essenbereitenden als auch vom Speisenden verwendet werden kann. ἀλεγίζειν in dieser Verwendungsweise „besorgen“ begegnet bei dem etwas obskuren „Musaios“ (DK 2 B 3): ὃς (sc. ἀετός) τρία (sc. ᾠά) μὲν τίκτει, δύο δ᾽ ἐκλέπει, ἕν δ᾽ ἀλεγίζει.

Also spricht nichts dagegen, die Worte λέκτρον [...] ἀλεγιζόμενον zusammenzunehmen im Sinne eines „Beischlafs, der (vom Mann oder von der Frau) besorgt wird“. Insofern οὐκ ἀλεγιζόμενον, wie gesagt, negativ formuliertes Pendant zu ἕτοιμον ist (welches Adjektiv eindeutig auf den männlichen Partner hingerichtet ist), wird es sich um die Art handeln, wie der Beischlaf vom Mann „besorgt“ bzw. „arrangiert“ wird. Bei der Sklavin kann er auf luxuriöse Geschenke verzichten. Das Mittel, durch welche der Beischlaf herbeigeführt bzw. nicht herbeigeführt wird, muß naturgemäß im instrumentalen Dativ stehen. Die Praeposition ἐκ ist nichts als eine grotesk verkehrte Interpolation. Man verbessert leicht zu δώροισι σπατάλοις (δώρ**ων** ἐκ σπατάλ**ων** wäre wesentlich aufwändiger). Vgl. den homerischen Halbvers *Il.* IX 113: δώροισίν τ᾽ ἀγανοῖσιν und zu den langen Dativformen bei Rufinus 1 P. = *AP* V 9, 5 und 30 P. = *AP* V 76, 3.

Das „Liebesbett“ der Sklavin steht dem Mann stets „bereit“ und ist „durch luxuriöse Geschenke nicht zu besorgen“. Die etwas ungewöhnliche späte Stellung der Negation (statt vor δώροισι σπατάλοις, vgl. Kuehner–Gerth Bd. II, S. 179) erklärt sich wohl durch das Bedürfnis, mit οὐκ ἀλεγιζόμενον einen praezisen begrifflichen Gegensatz zu ἕτοιμον zu gewinnen. Vgl. Straton *AP* XII 183, 1 f.: εἴ με λάβροισιν / χείλεσι μὴ φιλέεις ἀντιβιαζόμενος.

Mit diesen „luxuriösen“ Geschenken, die zum „Erwerb“ der Sklavin nicht erforderlich sind, wohl aber zu demjenigen der hoffärtigen Freien, hat man auch den Schlüssel zum Verständnis der Junktur τοῖς σπαταλοῖς κλέμμασι im zweiten Vers, wo Page κλέμμασι nur sehr mühsam im Sinne von „furtive love“ belegen kann. In Wirklichkeit geht es um tatsächlichen „Diebstahl“, nämlich denjenigen, mit dem die freien Frauen ihren Liebhabern die „luxuriösen Geschenke“ aus der Tasche ziehen. Der mit δώροισι σπατάλοις bezeichnete Vorgang wird einfach aus der Perspektive der Frauen beschrieben. Das vorliegende Gedicht richtet sich an den Adressatenkreis derjenigen Männer, „die an solchem luxuriösen Diebstahl keine Freude finden“ (οἱ μὴ τοῖς σπαταλοῖς κλέμμασι τερπόμενοι).

Seemingly, the reader should not be surprised by this interjection. Although in other segments of narration also based, due to the poem's subject, on earlier texts we do not have any similar statements, Lucan fairly often discloses the fact that he used some, not precisely defined, sources, either written or oral. He does it in various digressions, catalogues, descriptions, even in a comparison, so in passages which interrupt a sequence of events. In the first book, in a parallel passage about signs (I 522–695), he somewhat perversely uses the verb *accipimus* when listing extraordinary phenomena. This is aptly summed up by Feeney:

> With an artfully postponed *accipimus* ('our sources tell us', 1. 559), he carefully gives authority for the more standard manifestations, such as might be found in the historians [...], while the more bizarre and poetical prodigies are not given as a report, but described as events[5].

Usually, however, he uses the noun *fama* either distancing himself, similarly as in VII 192, from the given information, or giving credence to extraordinary events, or sometimes just talking about facts that are well-known to anyone: II 672 f.: "talis fama canit tumidum super aequora Persen / construxisse vias..."; III 215: "et felix, sic fama, Ninos"; III 220 f.: "Phoenices primi, famae si creditur, ausi / mansuram rudibus vocem signare figuris"; III 417 f.: "iam fama ferebat / saepe cavas motu terrae mugire cavernas"[6]; VI 378: "hunc fama est Stygiis manare paludibus amnem". These examples occur in Books I–VI, thus making the reader, by the beginning of Book VII, quite 'familiar' with such remarks. Besides, Lucan's audience might have found similar phrases in earlier works, notably in Vergil and Ovid; e.g. Verg. *Georg*. IV 42 "si vera est fama"; *Aen*. IV 179: "ut prohibent"; VI 14: "ut fama est"; VI 173: "si credere dignum est"[7]. They occur, of course, in later books of the *Civil War* too; e.g. IX 348: "hanc [*scil*. the lake of Triton], ut

---

[5] D.C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1991, p. 271.

[6] On these lines see V.J.Ch. Hunink, *M. Annaeus Lucanus, Bellum Civile Book III. A Commentary*, Amsterdam 1992, ad loc. But he rather wrongly interprets "sic fama" in III 215 as expression of *diffidentia* too. See the fragment of Callimachus quoted in the next note below.

[7] On various forms of similar phrases and its functions (*diffidentia*, giving credence, Alexandrian ἀμάρτυρον οὐδέν ἀείδω [Callimachus fr. 612 Pf.], intertextual games, and so on) in Latin poetry, see esp. E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI*, erkl. von..., Leipzig–Berlin ²1916 (and later editions) ad v. 14 (where many examples are listed, also references to remarks of this sort in Greek poetry); M. von Albrecht, *Die Parenthese in Ovid Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*, Diss. Würzburg 1963, pp. 209–215; N. Horsfall, *Virgil and the Illusory Footnote*, Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar VI 1990, pp. 49–63; and T.C.W. Sinton, *'Si credere dignum est': Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others*, PCPhC XXII 1976, pp. 60–89, who also discusses some Latin examples (pp. 64–66). Sinton shows how those remarks are often misinterpreted as "expressions of scepticism or disbelief"; discussing *Aen.* VI 173, he states that it "is a story-teller's device for heightening the discourse" (p. 65).

Es bleibt die Schwierigkeit in Vers 4: Der Hiat in der Pentameterfuge ist auch nach dem von Page S. 31 zusammengetragenen Material eingestandenermaßen fragwürdig. Page hält ἑσπομένη mit Recht für nicht unbedenklich, verwirft aber die Konjekturen κλεπτομένη (Duebner) und τερπομένη (Desrousseaux) und erwägt am Ende καὶ μέχρι κινδύνου <θ'> ἑσπομένη σύνοδος „and (θ') intercourse following even (καί) to the point of peril". Man fragt sich jedoch sowohl bei Pages Vorschlag wie auch bei den von ihm verworfenen Konjekturen, mit welcher „Gefahr" dieser Beischlaf behaftet sein soll. Wenn diese Gefahr entweder im Erwischtwerden (so Jacobs z. St.: „pericula, quibus moechi se vitamque suam exponunt", obwohl in dem Epigramm nichts auf Ehebruch hindeutet) oder in der Überbeanspruchung der Liebenden bestehen sollte (eine dritte Möglichkeit ist schwerlich denkbar), so würde der Gedanke „Beischlaf bis zur äußersten Gefahr" zwar vielleicht die Geilheit der freien Frau ins Licht setzen, den entscheidenden Punkt, ihre Hoffart (vgl. das Attribut σοβαρός), aber nicht berühren. Insofern genügt es auch nicht, mit Reiske für κινδύνου den ungewöhnlicheren Plural κινδύνων einzusetzen.

Im Lichte des ersten und dritten Distichons kann es bei μέχρι κινδύνου † ἑσπομένη σύνοδος nicht um den exzessiven Liebesgenuß, sondern nur um die exzessiven Geschenkforderungen der hoffärtigen Frau gehen. Diesen Gedanken suchten bereits Sternbach und Stadtmüller anstelle von κινδύνου in den Text zu bringen: Sternbach schrieb μέχρι κερδαίνουσ', was Stadtmüller wiederum zu μέχρι κεν συλῶσ' bzw. zu μέχρι σ' ἐκδύσουσ' modifizierte. Aber „Geschlechtsverkehr, bis sie Gewinn machen" bzw. „Geschlechtsverkehr, bis sie dich arm machen" bringt den entscheidenden Gedanken nicht richtig heraus, daß die freien Frauen ihre Liebhaber erst *nach* exzessiven Schenkungen zum Zuge kommen lassen. Zudem sollte man das an sich unanstößige μέχρι κινδύνου belassen und stattdessen den Hiat durch Verbesserung des problematischen ἑσπομένη beseitigen.

Die freie hoffärtige Frau „bietet ihren Beischlaf bis zur (finanziellen) Risikogrenze (des Liebhabers) feil":

ταῖς μὲν χρὼς ἀπόδωδε μύρου, σοβαρόν τε φρύαγμα,
καὶ μέχρι κινδύνου περναμένη σύνοδος.

Die Frau reizt ihren „Wert" bis zum letzten aus. Erst so erhält σοβαρόν τε φρύαγμα eine passende Fortführung. Zugleich findet der im folgenden hergestellte Partizipialausdruck λέκτρον [...] / δώροισιν σπατάλοις οὐκ ἀλεγιζόμενον sein positives Pendant. Das passive Partizip von πέρνημι ist durch Hom. *Il.* XVIII 291 f.: πολλὰ δὲ δὴ Φρυγίην καὶ Μῃονίην ἐρατεινὴν / κτήματα περνάμεν' ἵκει geläufig. Erst so gewinnt μέχρι seinen quantitativen Vollsinn (Hecker wollte stattdessen καὶ μετὰ κινδύνου, F.G. Schmidt κοὐ δίχα κινδύνου). Zur Verwendung von μέχρι neben Verben des Verkaufens vgl. Harpocr. p. 91, 5 f.: ἀπὸ ποίας ἀρχῆς *μέχρι πόσου πέρατος πιπράσκεται*.

of the Augustan poet and is sensitive to all, even the smallest references to it. Geographical inaccuracy in this case relates this audience to a particular place in the text of the predecessor. In the *Aeneid* Antenor is referred to twice – in the lines quoted above and, only indirectly, in Book VI, where Aeneas sees in the underworld the heroes fallen in the battle of Troy, among them "Glaucumque Medontaque Thersilochumque, / tris Antenoridas" (483 f.), the Timavus appears once (I 244 of the quoted passage)[23], Patavium, as a matter of fact, also once (I 247 of the quoted passage). We should also take into consideration that the passage about Antenor in the *Aeneid* is a part of a very important scene in the poem, the conversation between Venus and Jupiter; thus it is quite easy for the reader to 'localize' the lines.

So line 194 refers the reader first to the *Aeneid*, and through it (247 f.: "hic tamen urbem Patavii sedesque locavit / Teucrorum") to Patavium, thus putting them very close to Livy, Lucan's source. Apart from this, certainly, this allusion – due to the fact that the prophecy, having as its source the *Ab Urbe condita*, contains also the quotation from the *Aeneid* – facilitates the reverse process, from Livy to Vergil. Lucan plays a game with his addressee, relating them from one text to the other. The fate of Antenor is similar to the fate of Aeneas, they are both fugitives from the falling Troy who after numerous hardships reached Italy and settled there down[24] – this escape from Troy starts in Book II. It is also worth comparing two lines – *Aen.* I 242 ("Antenor potuit mediis elapsus Achivis") and *Aen.* II 318 where Aeneas' account of Panthus, the 'author' of Lucan's quotation (see below), begins ("ecce autem telis Panthus elapsus Achivum"). The form *elapsus* appears in the *Aeneid* seven times but only twice it is coupled with Achives, precisely in these two lines – as a matter of fact, these are the first two instances of the use of *elapsus* in the poem.

But is this geographical error motivated only by the intention to refer the reader, apart from the very periphrasis of Patavium, to the lines of Lucan's predecessor where the name Patavium appears explicitly, and even more directly to Livy and his version of the prophecy? Or is it necessary to evoke the *Aeneid* immediately before the quotation from that poem in order to point to the source

---

[23] Apart from the Aeneid, before the *Civil War*, the Timavus and Antenor (and also Patavium) appear close to each other only in Mela II 60 f. (however, it does not mean that they are connected): "urbium quae procul a mari habitantur opulentissimae sunt ad sinistram *Patavium Antenoris*, Mutina et Bononia, Romanorum coloniae, ad dextram Capua a Tuscis, et Roma quondam <a> pastoribus condita, nunc si pro materia dicatur alterum opus. at in oris proxima est a Tergeste Concordia. *interfluit Timavus* novem capitibus exsurgens, uno ostio emissus; dein Natiso non longe a mari ditem adtingit Aquileiam". The place of the river is geographically correct and the whole description is quite clear and unambiguous (esp. "urbium quae procul a mari..." ~ "at in oris...").

[24] Note that this parallelism between the legends about Aeneas and Antenor is also highlighted by Livy (I 1, 1 ff.).

fortunate situation that we know this hemistich is a quotation from Vergil (*Aen.* II 324) embedded within the poet's account of a prophecy which was first related by Livy (the part of his history where the event was described has not been preserved, but Plutarch recounts it in his *Life of Caesar* [47], mentioning Livy as his source)[2].

What is most important in the above passage is the prophecy itself although the words of introduction to the augur's prediction deserve some attention. To begin with, the poet, by interjecting the remark "si vera fides...", stresses that what will be said is not necessarily true since the sources of information are, in this case, perhaps not exactly credible. In this way he undoubtedly highlights the uniqueness of the event and emphasises the opposition between the augur and the rest of Romans. The augury closes the catalogue of the prodigies which were seen by soldiers of both sides right before the battle (the first part of the catalogue, 151–184)[3] and, in this case, all over the world during the battle (the second part, 185–204). Here, in this latter part, we have a juxtaposition of Romans gripped, for reasons unknown to them, by fear and the augur and his prophecy (a juxtaposition additionally completed and stressed by the poet's comments, lines 197–204)[4].

---

[2] Having described the battle, he provides a passage concerning prodigies of Caesar's victory including: ἐν δὲ Παταβίῳ Γάϊος Κορνήλιος, ἀνὴρ εὐδόκιμος ἐπὶ μαντικῇ, Λιβίου τοῦ συγγραφέως πολί της καὶ γνώριμος, ἐτύγχανεν ἐπ' οἰωνοῖς καθήμενος ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν. καὶ πρῶτον μέν, ὡς Λίβιός φησι, τὸν καιρὸν ἔγνω τῆς μάχης, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας εἶπεν ὅτι καὶ δὴ περαίνεται τὸ χρῆμα καὶ συνίασιν εἰς ἔργον οἱ ἄνδρες. αὖθις δὲ πρὸς τῇ θέᾳ γενόμενος καὶ τὰ σημεῖα κατιδών, ἀνήλατο μετ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ βοῶν· "νικᾷς ὦ Καῖσαρ." ἐκπλαγέντων δὲ τῶν παρατυχόντων, περιελὼν τὸν στέφανον ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐνώμοτος ἔφη μὴ πρὶν ἐπιθήσεσθαι πάλιν, ἢ τῇ τέχνῃ μαρτυρῆσαι τὸ ἔργον. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ Λίβιος οὕτως γενέσθαι καταβεβαιοῦται ("Moreover, at Patavium, Caius Cornelius, a man in repute as a seer, a fellow citizen and acquaintance of Livy the historian, chanced that day to be sitting in the place of augury. And to begin with, according to Livy, he discerned the time of the battle, and said to those present that even then the event was in progress and the men were going into action. And when he looked again and observed the signs, he sprang up in a rapture crying: 'Thou art victorious, O Caesar!'. The bystanders being amazed, he took the chaplet from his head and declared with an oath that he would not put it on again until the event had borne witness to his art. At any rate, Livy insists that this was so" [transl. by B. Perrin]). These words indisputably prove that Livy, presumably driven by his local patriotism, was the first one to describe the augury of Cornelius, his fellow countryman and acquaintance. We known from the *Periochae* that the account of the battle was in Book CI. Taking into consideration some differences between the known accounts of this event, it is most probable that it was described also by other historians after Livy (Gell. XV 18, 1–3; Cass. Dio XLI 61, 4 f.; Julius Obsequens 65; *Commenta Bernensia* ad v. 192; Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 9, 194–196). All of these accounts are quoted by Leigh, *o.c.* (n. 1), pp. 7–9 with n. 1.

[3] Lines 151–167 describe the prodigies occurring to the Pompeians, but 172–184 (the catalogue is split by an apostrophe to Caesar, 168–171) must be referred to both sides (so Dilke (*o.c.* [n. 1], ad v. 172), against the editors referring these lines either to the Pompeians or to the Caesarians).

[4] This passage is also closely connected with the apostrophe 205–213 and constitutes its starting point. Thus lines 185–213 as a whole are also organised by juxtapositions: (1) the Romans contemporary with the battle and knowing nothing about it against the Romans living after the described events who would become the audience of the battle; (2) the augur and the poet. See above all Leigh (*o.c.* [n. 1], pp. 6–27) who analyses this apostrophe closely connecting it with the story about Cornelius and discusses in detail the latter juxtaposition.

was very fruitful for gaining sympathy in the East, finally led to his and the queen's disaster. The decisive moment was just before the battle of Actium, when most of Antony's supporters deserted him[61]. It proved that the key to success was in the support of Roman soldiers and that even the best alliances in the East could not be a substitute. Cleopatra's idea of defeating the Romans by the Romans under her control[62] could end probably with success, but there was too much distrust between each other. Antony needed more independence to operate in the West, but Cleopatra could not have agreed to this. After the tragic defeat in the sea battle in the vicinity of Actium, the situation of the defeated became critical. They still had quite strong forces at their disposal, but were very much demoralized. They could not count too much on their legionaries who did not want to fight to protect Egypt against Rome. One of the last acts of desperation was a declaration to the people of Alexandria that Ptolemy Caesar together with Antyllus (the eldest son of Antony from Fulvia) would be the leaders of the army and country if something happened to Antony and Cleopatra. Dio states that in this manner Antony and Cleopatra wanted to "arouse the enthusiasm of the Egyptians, who would feel that they had at last a man for their king"[63].

After losing the sea battle and breaking the morale of the army, it was impossible to win in Egypt, and Antony's legions one by one went over to the enemy side, a process which in fact had started before Actium. Apart from the legions, he was abandoned by his god protector Dionysus-Bacchus[64]. All his hopes were lost.

Octavian after the victory in the war against Cleopatra (in fact against Antony)[65] knew well how important Caesarion could be. Also he knew of the measures undertaken by Antony and Cleopatra just before their defeat, so he decided to kill not only Caesarion but also Antyllus[66], whom their parents had made co-rulers in Egypt[67]. Killing Caesarion was the proof of how important the boy was. Octavian chased him as he fled to Ethiopia and used a trick to catch and kill him[68], because this boy as the real leader of Egypt and heir to the heritage of Julius Caesar[69] could cause a real problem in the future. Another explanation of Octavian's desire to kill Caesarion may be found in the words of Plutarch

---

61 Syme, *o.c.* (n. 22), p. 296.

62 *CAH*[1], vol. X, p. 76 (Charlesworth).

63 Cass. Dio LI 6, 1.

64 Plut. *Ant.* 75; *CAH*[1], vol. X, p. 108 (Charlesworth).

65 Canfora, *o.c.* (n. 18), p. 231.

66 Suet. *Aug.* 17.

67 Cass. Dio LI 6, 1 f.

68 Plut. *Ant.* 81; Cass. Dio LI 15, 5.

69 Which Antony unfortunately included into his last will and left in Rome. When this document fell into Octavian's hands it became a strong argument against his opponent: Suet. *Aug.*17; Cass. Dio L 3, 4 f.

La symbolique des représentations monétaires sera traitée comme un commentaire autonome de la propagande impériale, caractérisant les composantes du monde environnant l'*Imperium Romanum* aux II et III siècles. L'empereur romain demeure cependant le point central iconographique et discursif de ces créations[7]. Les éléments du monde extérieur n'étaient pertinents que dans la mesure où ils servaient à définir les valeurs du souverain romain ou encore à exposer ses qualités et réalisations. Il semble que justement cette caractéristique principale de la propagande impériale permet de comparer les différentes initiatives de propagande pendant ces deux périodes de l'histoire romaine évoquées. Les configurations existantes évoquant les différences et les ressemblances de nombreuses trames de propagande à des époques différentes de l'Empire – et même changeantes à différents points de vue – retrouvent ainsi une base idéologique commune dans le mythe national en relation avec la création de l'empereur comme chef et dirigeant idéal de l'État romain. D'un point de vue théorique, dans le cadre des ressemblances, le motif du barbare dans le monnayage à ces deux époques incarnait un monde extérieur à l'Empire romain. Dans la pratique cependant, compte tenu des différences des méthodes et des types de pouvoir représentant les deux époques, ce symbole peut être perçu différemment.

En réfutant la première considération pour se pencher sur la création de la propagande de l'image du souverain romain, nous pouvons procéder à une tentative de reconstruction de la vision du monde barbare en tant qu'objet d'analyse *quasi*-indépendant dans son aspect structural. Les émissions monétaires sur lesquelles apparaissent des éléments textuels ou graphiques faisant référence à des peuples et des pays «extérieurs à l'Empire» feront l'objet de notre analyse. En définissant ainsi le cadre de nos recherches, nous nous intéresserons exclusivement aux monnaies représentant les conquêtes de certains territoires, les guerres ainsi que les traités concordés avec les communautés extérieures. Leurs représentations font allusion au monde des barbares. Nous avons donc l'intention de montrer combien il y a de concepts conventionnels et communs, et de modèles originaux particuliers de la propagande à chacune de ces deux époques. Il importe de souligner que cette «réalité» que l'on retrouve sur ces représentations monétaires n'est qu'une création de l'époque et que reprenant des ordonnances de propagande impériale, elles ne peuvent refléter que certains aspects bien choisis du monde réel.

---

n'aurait pas changé les idées développées dans l'article mais auraient simplement élargi les présentes notes. Pour cette même raison, les remarques sont appuyées dans l'article à travers des références aux exemples de monnaie; ce qui suffit à l'établissement d'un motif de propagande donné.

[7] A. Kunisz, *Rola źródeł numizmatycznych w badaniach nad ideologią i propagandą w państwie rzymskim*, dans: A. Kunisz (éd.), *Rzym antyczny. Polityka i pieniądz*, t. I, Katowice 1993, pp. 54–67; E.A. Arslan, *Simbolo del potere. Potere del simbolo. Appunti per l'analisi di una strategia della comunicazione da Augusto imperatore agli Ottoni*, NAC XXXII 2003, pp. 337–341, traitent de la relation entre la représentation de la monnaie et la symbolique du pouvoir politique.

Dans tous les cas cités jusqu'à présent, l'iconographie monétaire comportait un élément caractérisant l'identité des peuples voisins de l'*Imperium Romanum*. Le plus souvent – aussi bien dans les concepts numismatiques de l'époque des Antonins que ceux des années de la crise du III siècle – il s'agissait de la personnification d'un peuple, d'un pays ou du représentant d'un pays barbare présenté comme un prisonnier ou un ennemi. Ils étaient rarement symbolisés par un tas d'armes. Les trois trophées dans le monnayage de Lucius Verus et de Marc-Aurèle, symbolisant « la triple défaite » de l'Arménie, des Parthes et des Mèdes, constituent une variante iconographique particulièrement arbitraire et non conventionnelle[32].

Il arrive également, que l'on rencontre des monnaies impériales provenant des deux périodes historiques comportant comme seul signe distinctif le nom du peuple en question, sans une représentation graphique pour le caractériser; d'habitude le personnage standard de la déesse Victoire est dans leur iconographie. En poussant l'analyse sur de telles représentations on retrouve pour l'époque des Antonins des thèmes tels que: *victoria Dacica*[33], *victoria Parthica*(*e*)[34], *victoria Germanica*[35], *victoria Britannica*[36] et *Britannia*[37], et pour l'époque de la crise du III siècle: *victoria Germanica* (*maxima*)[38], *victoria Carpica*[39], *victoria Gotthica*[40] et *victoria Part(h)ica*[41]. Par ailleurs, un slogan particulier – parce qu'intervenant dans le contexte d'un accord de paix qui met terme à la période d'activité militaire – désigne les Perses: *PAX FVNDATA CVM PERSIS*[42].

---

[32] *RIC* III *Lucius Verus*, n° 1464–1465; *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 947; Szaivert, n° 153. Cf. G.Ch. Picard, *Les trophées romains. Contribution à la histoire de la religion et de l'art triomphal de Rome*, Paris 1957, p. 440.

[33] Strack I, n° 373; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 527–531.

[34] Gnecchi II, p. 33, n° 48, pl. 62, 9; p. 33 et suiv., n° 54–55, pl. 63, 5 et 64, 1; *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 160–163a, 922, 934–935; *RIC* III *Lucius Verus*, n° 562–566, 571, 436, 1460, 1456–1459; Szaivert, n° 141–142, 152, 156, 1041.

[35] Gnecchi II, p. 34, n° 57–58, pl. 63, 7–8; *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 240, 256–257, 1000–1002, 1029–1032, 1090–1093; Szaivert, n° 228, 236, 262–263, 1056, 1059.

[36] *RIC* III *Commodus*, n° 451–452; Szaivert, n° 665.

[37] Strack III, n° 123, 928, 939; *RIC* III *Antoninus Pius*, n° 113, 719, 732.

[38] P.ex. *RIC* IV/2 *Maximinus I*, n° 74; *RIC* IV/3 *Trajan Decius*, n° 43; *RIC* IV/3 *Hostilian*, n° 185; *RIC* IV/3 *Herennius Etruscus*, n° 154; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Joint Reign*, n° 2, 39–43, 176, 196, 451–452; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, 122, 377; *RIC* V/1 *Valerian II*, n° 53; Göbl 2000, n° 875, 891, 1603, 1607; *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 355; Göbl 1993, n° 314; *RIC* V/2 *Postumus*, n° 14–15, 91, 97, 102, 177; Schulzki *Postumus*, n° 98–99; Schulte *Postumus*, n° 72, 74–76.

[39] *RIC* IV/3 *Philip I*, n° 66. Le titre *Carpicus maximus* est porté par les deux Philippes, *P.Oxy.* 1276; et par Aurélien, *P.Oxy.* 1455 et 1633; *P.Strasb.* 263; cf. *HA Aur.* 30, 4–5.

[40] *RIC* V/1 *Tacitus*, n° 171–173, 199–200: *VICTORIA GOTTHI.*

[41] *RIC* V/1 *Valerianus*, n° 291; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Joint Reign*, n° 453; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° 309–310; *RIC* V/1 *Valerian II*, n° 54; Göbl 2000, n° 1604; *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 240; Göbl 1993, n° 208.

[42] *RIC* IV/3 *Philip I*, n° 69, 72. Cf. *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° 652; Göbl, n° 1635, les monnaies du type *PAX FVNDATA*, dans l'iconographie un trophée flanqué à sa base par des captifs ainsi qu'à l'Est comme cela se découle de la chronologie et de la répartition géographique de cette emission.

Here we have Antenor who crosses the Timavus (*per ora novem* in Vergil ~ *dispergitur* in Lucan) and founds Patavium. This is how Austin comments on *hic* from line 247 of the quoted passage:

> 'in these parts', quite vague and rather odd, as if Venus was showing a map. Virgil leaves us to imagine the final stages of Antenor's journey, and shows him safe on the site of Padua, in spite of (*tamen*) all dangers. Later poets were misled by *hic*: Lucan puts the Timavus near the Euganean hills above Padua...[20]

This error does not necessarily stem from insufficient knowledge of geography and, consequently, misunderstanding of Vergil[21]. It is rather a deliberate device on Lucan's part and not a result of his ignorance or *licentia poetica* which has no impact on the meaning of the passage[22]. It can invite the reader to think why the Timavus does not flow where it should. This is the second time in only three lines when the poet makes the addressee of the narration stop and have a closer look at the passage. The audience to whom Lucan refers knows well the work

---

[20] R.G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*, with a Commentary by..., Oxford 1971, ad loc. However, *collis Euganeus* should rather not be identified with hills contemporarily given the same name – the Colli Euganei (see Ch. Hülsen, *Euganei*, *RE* VI [1909], col. 985, 1–5).

[21] In his Introduction Dilke states (*o.c.* [n. 1], p. 33): "In history, geography, mythology, and science as it was then understood, he was well-read [...]. But this learning was undigested and often inexact. [...] The river Timavus is not near Patavium" (although he has emphasized earlier that Lucan was writing a poem and not a history, p. 30). However, Patavium and its vicinity is not a distant land, but a part of Italy. It is hardly likely that Lucan knew little or nothing about the geography of this region. Apart from that, in Verg. *Georg*. III 475 ("Iapydis arva Timavi") and *Ecl.* 8, 6 the Timavus is placed imprecisely but certainly on the right coast and far from Patavium; see comments of R.A.B. Mynors (*Virgil, Georgics*, Edited with a Commentary by..., Oxford 1990, ad loc.) and W. Clausen (*Virgil, Eclogues*, with an Introduction and Commentary by.... Oxford 1994, ad loc.).

[22] Cf. B. Zlobec, *L'Adriatico settentrionale nella Pharsalia di Lucano: Tra scienza e mito*, ŽA XLIX 1999, p. 138; discussing lines VII 192–204 (pp. 133–138), she also gives an explanation of geographical inaccuracies (p. 138) which is however quite different from that presented below. For Lucan's use of geographical inaccuracies as a poetical device (also as an allusion technique), see e.g. Masters (*o.c.* [n. 10], pp. 150–178) and S. Tzounakas, *Oraeque malignos / Ambraciae portus: Lucan's Geography Transfigured*, Maia LVI 2004, pp. 331–337. Tzounakas discusses lines V 651 f. where a harbour widely known as a convenient one is qualified as *malignus*. Masters analyses the Thessalian excursus and, among other things, also notices that this excursus is framed by references to the gigantomachy (VI 333–336 ~ VI 410–412). She claims that the geographical error at the beginning of the excursus (Ossa and Pelion, the first two mountains mentioned in the opening catalogue of the mountains which surround Thessaly, are sited in a wrong place – they have swapped places) is purposeful and suggests piling Pelion upon Ossa in the Giants' attempt to reach Olympus, which is mentioned directly in lines 410 ff. (pp. 150–155). Extensive selection of studies dealing with Lucan's various inaccuracies is listed by Tzounakas (p. 331, n. 1); for geography see esp. A. Bourgery, *La géographie dans Lucain*, RPh LIV 1928, pp. 25–40; there is also a paper on Lucan's use of rivers: C.W. Mendell, *Lucan's Rivers*, YCS VIII 1942, 3–22.

fama, deus quem toto litore pontus / audit ventosa perflantem marmora concha, / hanc et Pallas amat..."; IX 356: "[Lethon] infernis, ut fama, trahens oblivia venis"; IX 411 f.: "tertia pars rerum Libye, si credere famae / cuncta velis"[8].

Line III 406 (without *fama*) from a description of a grove near Massilia seems to bear a very close resemblance to the passage under discussion here: "siqua fidem meruit superos mirata vetustas" (whereas in line IV 589 f. we read "rupes,/ Antaei quas regna vocat non vana vetustas")[9]. The striking authorial interference implying some sources is not only intended to lend credibility, in a somewhat perverse way, to an extraordinary place (the grove is, most probably, the poet's own invention and only its particular elements may have a poetical origin)[10], but also underlines the exceptional holiness of the trees to be cut down by Caesar and his soldiers and induces the reader to examine this description (the remark III 417, quoted above, also comes from it). The grove is a meaningful and important part of the whole Massalian episode, fulfilling various literary functions. Among other things, it symbolises, as has been shown by Rowland[11], Pompey and the destruction of his troops by Caesar. The elements of the grove's description refer the reader to the famous comparison of Pompey to an oak-tree (I 136–143)[12]. This symbolism is maintained in 433 ff. where Caesar is the first to cut down the oak of imposing height, so the reference to the comparison becomes explicit. Besides, Rowland also notes in connection with lines 408 ff. ("nec ventus in illas / incubuit silvas excussaque nubibus atris / fulgura...") that Lucan often compares Caesar with winds and a lightning[13].

---

[8] On these remarks, see C. Wick, *M. Annaeus Lucanus, Bellum civile Liber IX*, Kommentar von ..., Leipzig 2004, ad vv. 348 and 411(with numerous parallels from Latin poetry and prose); and, in the context of Lucan's poetics, J.-Ch. De Nadaï, *Rhétorique et poétique dans la Pharsale de Lucain. Le crise de la representation dans la poésie antique*, Louvain–Paris 2000, pp. 54 ff.

[9] Cf. Hunink, *o.c.* (n. 6), ad v. 406.

[10] See Hunink, *o.c.* (n. 6), pp. 167–170 (with extensive bibliography) and E. Fantham, *Religio ... dira loci: Two Passages in Lucan de Bello Civili 3 and their Relation to Virgil's Rome and Latium*, MD XXXVII 1996, pp. 148–150. For the device of giving credence to the invented (as far as we know) episodes in previous poems, see e.g. Verg. *Aen.* X 792 ("si qua fidem tanto est operi latura vetustas") with S.J. Harrison's comments (*Vergil, Aeneid 10*, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by..., Oxford 1991) ad loc. and ad vv. 789–832; *Georg.* IV 318 ("ut fama"); Ov. *Met.* I 400: "quis hoc credat, nisi sit pro teste vetustas".

[11] R.J. Rowland, *The Significance of Massilia in Lucan*, Hermes XCVII 1969, pp. 206 f. On literary functions of this grove see also: O.C. Phillips, *Lucan's Grove*, CPh LXIII 1968, pp. 296–300; J.A. Rosner-Siegel, *The Oak and the Lightning. Lucan, Bellum Civile 1.135–157*, Athenaeum LXI 1983, pp. 175 f.; J. Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, Cambridge 1992, pp. 25–29; C.M.C. Green, *"The Necessary Murder": Myth, Ritual, and Civil War in Lucan, Book 3*, ClAnt XIII 1994, pp. 214–233. Fantham, *o.c.* (n. 10), pp. 147 ff.

[12] Rosner-Siegel, *o.c.* (n. 11), p. 176.

[13] Rowland, *o.c.* (n. 11), p. 206; See also Green, *o.c.* (n. 11), pp. 221–223, and Rosner-Siegel, *o.c.* (n. 11), devoted entirely to that topic.

then had been separated from Rome. Caesarion was becoming a new kind of ruler – as a descendant of Caesar, as well as a monarch of wealthy Egypt which had to be equal to Rome[46] with promises of even further conquests in the East. All Caesar's eastern sympathies now stood Antony and Cleopatra in good stead. Caesar's dream of a Roman-Hellenistic empire was once again very close to being realized[47].

To commemorate these acts, Antony issued a coin showing on the obverse himself with an Armenian tiara behind, symbolizing the conquest of that kingdom (and the legend: *ANTONI. ARMENI-A. DEVICTA*). On the reverse, there was Cleopatra and the legend: *CLEOPATR[AE REGINAE] REGVM FILIORVM REGVM*[48]. This legend showed the close connection between Cleopatra and her sons, and although it was not apparent on this coin, from other documents[49] we can see that the eldest son, Caesarion, became most important here.

Moreover, the queen of Egypt presented her son in visual propaganda in ways other than it was done on coins, in traditions much closer to Egypt and the East. Sculptures of Ptolemy Caesar appeared in Egypt, which have been found on the sea bed in the vicinity of the Alexandrian shores in recent times[50]. We can also find one of the most famous images of the reigning couple in the temple of Dendera[51]. Cleopatra and Ptolemy Caesar are shown there, and their names are written in hieroglyphs, surrounded by cartouches. It proves that they were regarded as a pair, the joint rulers of Egypt. Thanks to Vergil we may get the picture of how the spectacle of declaration of power over the East, together with the promises concerning the West, with Ptolemy Caesar in one of main roles, struck the eastern clients of Antony and Cleopatra:

> Hinc ope barbarica variisque Antonius armis ...
> Aegyptum viresque Orientis et ultima secum
> Bactra vehit, sequiturque (nefas) Aegyptia coniunx[52],

and further:

> Actius haec cernens arcum tendebat Apollo
> desuper: omnis eo terrore Aegyptus et Indi,
> omnis Arabs, omnes vertebant terga Sabaei[53].

---

[46] M. Hamer, *Disowning Cleopatra*, in: *Cleopatra...* (n. 11), p. 126.

[47] Bevan, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 377; Canfora, *o.c.* (n. 18), p. 231.

[48] Denarius (3.54 g), Alexandrian mint: E.A. Sydenham, *The Coinage of Roman Republic*, London 1952, 1210; M.H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974, 543/1; about this coin also Williams, *o.c.* (n. 20), p. 90.

[49] Those documents are enumerated in notes 28, 30 and 31.

[50] See in W. La Riche, *Alexandria: The Sunken City*, London 1996, pp. 84–94.

[51] Described in n. 29.

[52] *Aen.* VIII 685–688.

[53] *Aen.* VIII 705–707.

This whole scene from the first book of the *Aeneid* taking place in heaven, Panthus' speech (evoked by a direct quotation), and the account of Aeneas' arrival in Italy from Book VII (alluded to in lines VII 131 f. of the *Civil War*) complement each other. In them we find a short but complete history of Rome – from the fall of Troy to the new Golden Age at the times of Augustus, a descendant of Venus, to the *pax Augusta* – the crowning element of this history, the final goal for all efforts made by Venus' son. What had been started by Aeneas was later completed by his descendant. It is with him that all wishes of the goddess came true. Under the surface of the augur's prophecy in the *Civil War* there lie all three of these scenes – the whole optimistic view of the history of Rome is presented in them. It is thanks to this that the reader of Lucan's poem may read the words of the prophet (placed in a new context) as a polemic with the vision of Rome given in Vergil's work.

Because of the fact that Jupiter's speech is so important for the intertextual game between the two works, Lucan also refers his audience to this speech in his description of the event taking place near Patavium. I think that line VII 194 not only refers the reader to the very history of Antenor's founding Patavium, it also, although indirectly, refers them to the whole scene of which this *exemplum* is only a part. First the poet activates the speech of Venus (I 229–253), and through this also Jupiter's prophecy (I 257–296) – the father's reply to the reproach made by his angry daughter who mentions the good fate of Antenor only to highlight, by means of contrast, the misfortune of her son, and who accuses the greatest of gods of not keeping his promises. Just like the goddess' speech with the example of Antenor influences Jupiter to uncover the fate of Aeneas and his descendants, so the mention of Antenor's Timavus refers the reader to the words of Venus and activates Jupiter's prophecy. This device is facilitated not only by a certain parallel between the fates of Antenor and Aeneas, but also by a certain parallel between the fate of the former and the history of Rome in general, as presented in Jupiter's speech. The history of the founder of Patavium anticipates – certainly only on a very small scale – its basic plots (overcoming difficulties by Antenor ~ the war in Italy fought by Aeneas; founding Patavium ~ founding Lavinium by Venus' son, Alba Longa by Ascanius and at last Rome by Romulus; [Antenor] "genti nomen dedit" [I 248] ~ [Romulus] "Romanosque de suo nomine dicet" [I 277]; "armaque fixit / Troia nunc placida compostus pace quiescit" [I 248 n.] corresponds with Aeneas' deification, and with the end of the prophecy – Caesar's deification and the closing of Janus' gates, marking the beginning of the period of peace)[29].

---

[29] K.A.E. Enenkel (*Epic Prophecy as Imperial Propaganda? Jupiter's First Speech in Virgil's Aeneid*, in: *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity. A Collection of Case Studies*, ed. by K.A.E. Enenkel, I.L. Pfeijffer, Leiden–Boston 2005 [Mnemosyne Supplementum 261], pp. 176–181) especially stresses that the selection of facts and their presentation in Jupiter's prophecy are dictated by Venus' speech.

of the quotation? To indicate Livy, it would be enough to mention his hometown or to give a periphrasis of it without committing the geographical inaccuracy. Besides, the reader should recognize from which text the phrase "venit summa dies" comes without any help from the poet, just like in the beginning of the whole section set between the speech of Pompey (giving his decision to fight) and the battle: "advenisse diem qui fatum rebus in aevum / conderet humanis..." (Luc. VII 131 f.) ~ "advenisse diem quo debita moenia condant" (*Aen.* VII 145). Conte (*o.c.* [n. 1], pp. 33 f.) pays attention to the connection between lines II 324 and VII 145 of the *Aeneid*, thus also between lines VII 131 f. and VII 195 of the *Civil War*. The reader who has identified the first lines as an allusion will have no problem to recognize this exact quotation. These functions are of a somewhat secondary importance.

Firstly, the parallelism of Antenor's and Aeneas' legends which is explicitly expressed in *Aen.* I 242 ff. and which is evoked in Lucan by the geographical 'error' alluding to this very passage (and additionally, by the exact quotation reminding of Aeneas' fate) builds a suitable stage for the augury. The words "venit summa dies", which were spoken in the falling Troy, are spoken once more, near Patavium founded by a refugee from Troy, thus in the city being in some ways a continuation of Troy – and refer to Rome founded by the descendant of the Trojan Aeneas. Patavium evidently plays the role of Rome on this stage. This leads the reader directly to the appropriate identification of the quotation as a negation of the overall view of Rome's history emerging from Vergil's poem. Mentioning Antenor without the Timavus would be probably enough to evoke his legend. But in the case of a parallelism established by alluding only to the well-known legend, not to the specific passage in the text of the predecessor, the stage would be without scenery, that is to say without a background formed by the section where the *exemplum Antenoris* comes from. This background is the key to the problem of the error in the periphrasis of Patavium.

Let us take a closer look at line II 324 of the *Aeneid*. In fact the intertextual game consists essentially in measures leading first to decontextualisation and then to recontextualisation[25]. The words "venit summa dies" are set in Vergil's poem in a particular context and apart from their literal meaning they somehow take on a new one, which is also transferred to the other text where a different context again gives them yet another meaning. But although the new setting is of primary importance, the quotation does not lose the meaning it had in the predecessor's text. In Vergil the words:

> venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus
> Dardaniae. fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens

---

[25] See Głowiński, *o.c.* (n. 17), pp. 17 f. (the terms are taken from S. Stewart, *Nonsense. Aspects of Intertextuality in Folklore and Literature*, Baltimore–London 1979).

ἄχρι τίνος ταύτην τὴν ὀφρύα τὴν ὑπέροπτον,
Μέντορ, τηρήσεις μηδὲ τὸ „χαῖρε“ λέγων,
ὡς μέλλων αἰῶνα μένειν νέος ἢ διὰ παντὸς
ὀρχεῖσθαι πυρίχην; καὶ τὸ τέλος πρόβλεπε.
ἥξει σοι πώγων, κακὸν ἔσχατον, ἀλλὰ μέγιστον ·
καὶ τότ᾽ ἐπιγνώσῃ, τί σπάνις ἐστὶ φίλων.

Einem hochmütigen Knaben kann man gut vorrücken, daß der Bart seinem Hochmut bald eine natürliche Grenze setzen wird. Aber bis eine junge Frau zur unattraktiven Greisin wird, muß man etwas länger warten. Daher modifiziert Rufinus das bei Straton vorgegebene Motiv in der Richtung, daß er der Dame anwünscht, das natürliche Alter möge „schneller als gewöhnlich“ (θᾶσσον) über sie kommen.

Universität zu Köln

Durant les deux périodes, les Germains, habitants de *Germania ferox* qui est restée au-delà des frontières de l'Empire romain, sont les plus souvent mentionnés. Les auteurs antiques et particulièrement Tacite, évoquent plusieurs peuplades occupant ces territoires[43]. Les Germains étaient, en effet, divisés en plusieurs tribus. Dans la propagande impériale cette variété ethnique a disparu. Sans égard par rapport à la diversité linguistique et culturelle tous les peuples barbares vivant au-delà du Rhin ont été assimilés à des Germains[44]. Ils figuraient toujours comme des ennemis des Romains à travers les représentations monétaires. Le propos de Tacite – «tam diu Germania vincitur» (*Germ.* 37, 2) – fut d'actualité aussi bien du temps des Antonins qu'à l'époque de la crise du III siècle et le Germain a continuellement désigné un type du barbare qui reviennent sans cesse. L'exemple des Quades, le peuple germain habité à la rive gauche du Danube est très intéressant. À l'époque des Antonins, le thème de *rex Quadis datus* apparaît dans la propagande d'Antonin le Pieux comme l'effet de l'amitié que les Quades contractent avec les Romains[45]. De même qu'à l'époque de la crise du III siècle, les Quades apparaissent sur le médaillon mentionné de Numérien, du type *TRIVNFV*(*s*) *QVADOR*(*um*). Ils reprennent cependant le rôle d'ennemi vaincu. En règle générale, cependant, la diversité des peuples habitants au-delà du Danube est minimalisée par la propagande impériale et réduite à quelques noms seulement. Par exemple, le cas des habitants de la *Sarmatia* que Claude Ptolémée reprend scrupuleusement[46], se retrouve uniquement avec l'inscription: *DE SARM(ATIS)* dans le monnayage se rapportant au règne de Marc-Aurèle.

Dans toutes les légendes des monnaies impériales et aux deux époques étudiées, on note une absence totale de référence aux tribus africaines, bien que les combats provoqués par l'opposition des nomades à l'asservissement de leurs pays eurent duré[47]. Les émissions monétaires comportent exclusivement les noms des ennemis européens et asiatiques de l'Empire romain. Néanmoins, la propagande impériale était insensible aux changements politiques qui touchaient le *Barbaricum* européen. Les représentations monétaires se rapportant aux caractéristiques structurales de ce monde-là se déterminaient par une schématisation. Cette schématisation est d'autant plus frappante que les changements de la

---

[43] Voir J. Kolendo, *Zróżnicowanie ludów Germanii w świetle analizy dzieła Tacyta*, Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Prace Archeologiczne XXII 1976, pp. 39–50.

[44] Voir A. Chastagnol, *La signification géographique et ethnique des mots Germani et Germania dans les sources latines*, Ktèma IX 1984, pp. 97–101; Dauge, *o.c.* (n. 2), pp. 468–481.

[45] Strack III, n° 852; *RIC* III *Antoninus Pius*, n° 620, 1059. Sur les contacts à caractère amical, Tac. *Germ.* 42, 2. Pour le temps du règne d'Hadrien, *HA Hadr.* 12, 7.

[46] Cl. Ptol. *Geogr.* III 5, 1–11; V 8, 1–12. Cf. aussi Plin. *NH* IV 25, 80–81; Pomp. Mela, *Chorogr.* III 3, 26 et 33–35; Amm. XXII 5, 5.

[47] Cf. p.ex. M. Rachet, *Rome et les Berberes. Un problème militaire d'Auguste à Dioclétien*, Bruxelles 1970; M. Christol, *Regards sur l'Afrique romaine*, Paris 2005, pp. 11–29, 40–49.

Antonins», et pour la cinquantaine de 235 à 284 comme «la crise du III^e siècle»[1]. Ces deux périodes peuvent s'opposer si on les juge du point de vue de l'état de l'Empire romain face au monde des barbares. Envisageant les années qui comprennent ces deux périodes dans des intervalles temporels plus vastes, et sous l'angle de l'analyse du phénomène dénommé «barbarologie historique», Yves Albert Dauge confronte la première, pendant laquelle l'Empire romain vit son âge d'or et repousse victorieusement toutes les forces barbares extérieures, avec la deuxième dans laquelle l'État romain, face au grand nombre d'envahisseurs barbares, se trouve poussé à la défensive[2]. Nous voudrions dans cet article étudier de manière comparative comment le monde barbare apparaît dans la propagande impériale sous ces deux périodes. Selon Emilienne Demougeot, le portrait officiel des barbares sous cette propagande est l'image d'un peuple extérieur, conquis et vaincu par l'empereur[3]. Cette définition est indubitablement fondée. Néanmoins, dans les réflexions qui vont suivre, nous nous intéresserons moins à la signification du motif des barbares dans la propagande impériale qu'à l'image du monde des voisins de l'*Imperium Romanum*. Ceux-ci sont tous classés dans le monde barbare indépendamment de la proximité ou de l'éloignement de la frontière avec l'État romain ou encore du contact direct ou indirect avec lui[4].

---

[1] Cf. p.ex. L. Homo, *Le siècle d'or de l'Empire romain. Les Antonins (96–192 ap. J.-C.)*, Paris 1947; T. Kotula, *Kryzys III wieku w zachodnich prowincjach cesarstwa rzymskiego*, Wrocław 1992.

[2] Y.A. Dauge, *Le Barbare.. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation*, Bruxelles 1981, pp. 54 et suiv.

[3] E. Demougeot, *L'image officielle du barbare dans l'Empire romain d'Auguste à Théodose*, Ktèma IX 1984, pp. 123–143. Cf. p.ex. P. Bieńkowski, *De simulacris barbararum gentium apud Romanos*, Cracoviae 1900; A. Caló Levi, *Barbarians on Roman Imperial Coins and Sculpture*, New York 1952; K. Christ, *Antike Siegesprägungen*, Gymnasium LXIV 1957, pp. 509–529; R. Pera, *Riferimenti a stranieri e barbari sulle monete romane*, dans: M.G. Angeli Bertinelli, A. Donati (éd.), *Il cittadino, lo straniero, il barbaro, fra integrazione ed emarginazione nell'antichità*, Roma 2005, pp. 327–343. À propos du motif de la victoire romaine voir aussi T. Kotula, *Barbarzyńcy i dworzanie. Rzym a barbarzyńcy w dworskiej literaturze późnorzymskiej*, Kraków 2004, pp. 34–112.

[4] Cf. P. Trousset, *La frontière romaine, concepts et représentations*, dans: P. Bruun, S. van der Leeuw, C.R. Whittaker (éds), *Frontières d'empire. Nature et signification des frontières romaines*, Nemours 1993, pp. 115–120; H. Inglebert, P. Gros, G. Sauron, *Histoire de la civilisation romaine*, Paris 2005, pp. 38–41, *limes* et *ripa* étaient frontière *de facto;* mais pour les Romains la frontière était non une ligne mais une zone: il y avait la frontière invisible des peuples plus ou moins vassaux, ces *fines imperii* faisaient le limite insaisissable et flottante à la périphérie de l'*orbis Romanus*. Selon le slogan idéologico–propagandiste les limites de l'*imperium populi Romani* se confondaient avec celles de l'*orbis terrarum*, puisque le destin de Rome était de soumettre l'univers par un *imperium sine fine*. Sur la vision de «l'autre» dans le monde romain voir p.ex. K. Christ, *Römer und Barbaren in der hohen Kaiserzeit*, Saeculum X 1959, pp. 277–280; J. Gaudemet, *L'Étranger dans le monde romain*, StCl VII 1965, pp. 37–47; idem, *Les Romains et les « autres »*, dans: *La nozione di « romano » tra cittadinanza e universalità*, Napoli 1984, pp. 7–37; E. Cizek, *L'image de l'autre et les mentalités romaines du I^er au IV^e siècle de notre ère*, Latomus XLVIII 1989, pp. 360–371; Y. Perrin, *À propos de Sénèque. Modernité de la question de l'étranger à Rome au Haut-Empire*, dans: *Le barbare, l'étranger: images de l'autre*, textes réunis et présentés par D. Nourisson et Y. Perrin, Saint-Etienne 2005, pp. 123–136.

Dans certains cas, les silhouettes des souverains de pays voisins, amis des Romains, sont représentées sur les monnaies les distinguant à travers un système axiologique des autres barbares pas seulement à travers la légende *rex datus*, qui exprime *in extenso* leur dépendance de l'Empire, mais aussi à travers l'image. Par exemple, sur les monnaies d'Antonin le Pieux évoquées précédemment, le roi des Quades porte un manteau drapé en toge sur ses épaules. Il se peut que ce soit là une fugace trace du processus qu'évoque Tacite concernant un autre peuple: « Inde etiam habitus nostri honor et frequens toga » (*Agr*. 21, 3). Par ailleurs, Partamaspatès, souverain des Parthes avec le consentement des Romains, a été représenté sur les monnaies dans une tenue militaire romaine, il porte une cuirasse et un *paludamentum*. Ce n'est plus un simple barbare, il a adopté les détails de la tenue romaine, ce qui souligne sa fidélité à l'*Imperium Romanum*. En se rapportant aux remarques de Pierre Gros, on peut constater avec une certaine prudence qu'il s'agit là, d'un reflet à travers la propagande monétaire d'une trace d'assimilations de certains habitants du monde des barbares par les Romains[56]. Ils deviennent alors semi-civilisés et semi-barbares. Cependant, il n'y avait que quelques représentants du monde extérieur qui étaient désignés comme des amis/alliés des Romains et qui étaient munis dans les représentations de monnaies avec des éléments vestimentaires qui soulignait leur proximité de civilisation avec les Romains. On retrouve ce type de solutions exceptionnellement dans la propagande monétaire des Antonins.

La caractéristique des barbares à travers les représentations monétaires en tant qu'individus soumis à l'influence de l'Empire (dépendants et amis) ou en tant qu'individus qui restent étrangers et hostiles (ennemis et captifs) entraîne une certaine diversité au-delà de l'État romain. La distinction des cultures des habitants du *Barbaricum* reste cependant très vague dans ces représentations. Les tailles de leurs silhouettes limitées par les dimensions de la pièce mais aussi la convention qui ressort des prémisses idéologiques, font que les détails ethnographiques permettant d'identifier le voisin barbare comme le représentant d'un peuple particulier soient réduits à leur minimum. Dans d'autres cas, la silhouette du barbare est représentée d'une manière très ébauchée. On peut cependant constater que malgré cette disposition très limitée dans la caractéristique des barbares de façon subtile en procréant leurs portraits « individuels », on retrouve néanmoins certaines conceptions très stéréotypées de leur apparence physique

---

[56] P. Gros, *Le Barbare humanisé ou les limites de l'humanitas*, dans: C. Auvray-Assayas (éd.), *Images romaines*, Paris 1998, pp. 143–160. Cf. Dauge, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 486–494, à propos des phases de la barbarie. Voir Y. Perrin, *Iconographie et société: mise en signe et mise en scène du pouvoir. En guise d'introduction*, dans: *Iconographie impériale, iconographie royale, iconographie des élites dans le monde gréco-romain*, textes réunis et présentés par Y. Perrin, avec la collaboration de Th. Petit, Saint-Etienne 2004, pp. 10–14, de la reconnaissance des images comme documents historiques.

The latest preserved summary of 41st novel was written by Theodoros Scholastikos, most probably after 575 (572–602?)[26]. He was a lawyer from Hermoupolis in Thebaid (Egypt) and apart from the index of the Justinian Code he prepared the summary of 168 novels called by modern scholars *Theodori epitome Novellarum*. Theodoros underlined the military functions of the *quaestor exercitus* similarly as Athanasios did:

Περὶ τῆς ἐπαρχότητος τῶν ε΄ ἐπαρχιῶν
Ἴσμεν πρῴην θείαν πεποιημήνοι.
Ἡ Κύπρος καὶ ἡ Ῥόδος, ἤγουν καὶ Κυκλάδες νῆσοι
πᾶσαι, ὁμοίως δέ καὶ ἡ Καρία καὶ ἡ Μυσία καὶ Σκυθία,
ἰδικὴν ἐχέτωσαν διοίκησιν ὑπὸ Ἰουστινιανὸν οὖσαι κοι-
έστωρα EXERCITου, ἔχοντα τάξιν ἐπάρχου, καθεζόμε-
νον ἐκ Ὀδύσσῳ, καὶ ἄρχοντα τῶν ἐν ταῖς εἰπημέναις
ἐπαρχίας στρατιωτῶν.
Ὁ ἔπαρχος τῶν νήσων τὰς ἐκλήτους αὐτῶν δεχέ-
σθω. Ὁμοίως φησὶν ἡ ν΄ νεαρά. Ἐξεφωνήθη μηνὶ
Ἰουνίῳ μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Βελισαρίου.

About the eparchotetos of five eparchias.
We are aware of sacred law we have already used.
Cyprus and Rhodos and all the Cyclades Islands,
and also Caria, and Mysia, and Scythia
have special administration under the Iustinianus quaestor
exercitus, who has the position of eparchos
[and] the seat in Odessos, and [is] archon of the soldiers
in those eparchias.
Eparchos of the Islands shall accept the appeals.
Similarly says Novel 50, issued on June,
After the Consulate of Belisarius.

At first sight it is not clear if the general term ἄρχων ('ruler, lord, commander'; cf. e.g. Du Cange 1943: coll. 134–136, 327 f.; *TGL*, vol. I, coll. 2130–2134; Sophocles 1896: 259 f.; Hanton 1927/1928: 67 f.; LSJ, p. 254; Frisk 1960: 159; Chantraine 1968: 119–121; Mason 1974: 111–113), applied directly to κοιέστωρ EXERCITου (*quaestor exercitus*), and the term ἔπαρχος τῶν νήσων were both used to denote the same officer. It looks however that Theodoros' sentence καὶ ἄρχοντα τῶν ἐν ταῖς εἰπημέναις ἐπαρχίας στρατιωτῶν ("and [is] archon of the soldiers in those eparchias") concerned the *quaestor exercitus*, who is called ἔπαρχος τῶν νήσων (prefect of the Islands; see also below). If so, also Theodoros' version of the 41st novel confirms that the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* commanded the army units. We should also remember that the epitome of Theodoros was a kind of manual for practising lawyers and

[26] About Theodoros see Kübler 1934; Wenger 1953: 672, 688, 691; Schminck 1991.

2) Die zweite Gruppe beinhaltet dann die ziemlich selbstständigen Abschnitte des Werkes, die aber nicht direkt mit der Handlung der *Dionysiaka* verbunden sind. Diese Passagen weisen weniger Merkmale der bukolischen Gattung auf als die der ersten Gruppe (Nikaia und Hymnos XV 169–422).

3) In der dritten Gruppe befinden sich die Stellen des Nonnosepos, wo einzelne bukolische Motive und Anknüpfungen an die Hirtendichtung zu finden sind (Echoen der bukolischen Dichtung[18], einzelne bukolische Motive[19] und längere Passagen mit bukolischer Färbung[20]).

Im vorliegenden Beitrag wurden die Verse I 409–534 der *Dionysiaka*, die der ersten der obenerwähnten Textgruppe zuzurechnen sind, näher analysiert. Wie es auf den ersten Blick scheint, trägt dieser Text alle charakteristischen Merkmale einer Idylle.

Es ist bekannt, dass die *Dionysiaka* mit der Beschreibung der Entführung Europas durch Zeus beginnen. Kurz danach wird ihr Bruder Kadmos vom Vater Agenor auf die Suche nach der verschwundenen Schwester geschickt. Während der Wanderung kommt Kadmos in das Arimerland, in die Nähe einer Höhle, wo Typhon mit dem Himmelskönig kämpfen wird. Zur gleichen Zeit hat der verliebte Zeus wieder eine Liebesaffäre, diesmal mit Pluto, der Mutter Tantals. Für die Stunden, die er mit der Geliebten verbringt, versteckt Zeus leichtsinnigerweise seine himmlischen Waffen – Blitz und Donner – in dieser Höhle. Diesen Moment nutzt Typhon, der Sohn der Erde, aus. Er gehorcht dem Befehl der Mutter, die sich an Zeus für das Bestrafen ihrer Söhne, der Titanen, rächen möchte, und raubt die Waffe des Zeus. So beginnt der lange Kampf zwischen dem Himmelskönig und Typhon um die Weltherrschaft. Das Monster plant detailliert und stellt in langer Rede die neue Weltordnung dar, die kommen soll, sobald er Herrscher sein wird. In dieser dramatischen Situation[21] muss Zeus alleine gegen Typhon kämpfen, weil die anderen Götter, ergriffen von Angst, für die Kampfzeit nach Ägypten fliehen. Es kommt sogar so weit, dass der große Zeus sich angesichts der Gefahr (I 398 ff.) seine Hilflosigkeit eingestehen und den Gott Pan und den sterblichen Kadmos um Hilfe bitten muss.

Kadmos[22], wie uns Nonnos ihn darstellt, ist ein sehr hinterlistiger Mensch, wie Odysseus bei Homer, und hat keine Bedenken, zu lügen und zu betrügen, um

---

[18] Chamberlayne, *o.c.* (Anm. 5), S. 48 weist II 80; III 154; XI 261; XII 157; 224; 247; XIX 187 als Echoen des Bions Epitaphium in den *Dionysiaka* aus.

[19] Als bukolischer Abschnitt wurde z. B. II 110–117 bezeichnet: so S.G. Braden, *Nonnos' Typhon. Dionysiaca Books I and II*, Texas Studies in Language and Literature XV 1974, S. 858.

[20] Besonders interessant sind die Stellen, an denen bukolische Elementen dazu dienen, einen Kontrast zwischen der durch eine Katastrophe zerstörten Welt und der vorher existierenden Natur zu bauen, z. B. II 20–163; VI 261–274; VI 302–324.

[21] Der Angriff Typhons auf den Himmel wird ausführlich von J. Komorowska, *A Vision of Chaos: Nonnos, Dionysiaca I 163–257*, Eos XCI 2004, S. 294–312, dargestellt.

[22] Zur Rolle von Kadmos in der Bukolik hat sich schon A. Risi, *Egloga. Studi sulla poesia antica di Nonno di Panopoli, Virgilio, Teocrito e Silio Italico*, Milano 2003, S. 3–23, geäußert.

commentaires: *De Sarmatis*[23] ou *De Germanis*[24]. Lors des années de la crise du III siècle, la caractéristique des peuples et des pays voisins se fait différemment; elle s'effectue avant tout, à partir d'adjectifs. Dans le monnayage de cette époque-là le monde des barbares-voisins des Romains est défini – même s'il s'agit de son système structurel – strictement à travers le prisme des succès de l'*imperator* et de l'Empire romain. Les informations portant sur l'identité des pays voisins étaient inscrites comme attribut au surnom vainqueur de l'empereur: *Germanicus* (*maximus*)[25] ou *Germanicus maximus et Carpicus maximus*[26]. On peut retrouver également le nom relatif au peuple barbare dans l'adjectif qualifiant la victoire de l'armée romaine et de son dirigeant: *victoria Germanica* (*maxima*)[27], *victoria*(*e*) *Go*(*t*)*thica*[28], *victoria Partica*[29]. Parfois, ces légendes référant aux triomphes de l'empereur permettent d'identifier le peuple contre lequel la victoire a été emportée: *triumfum Gotthicum*[30]. Les Quades sont identifiés cependant nominativement par leur nom dans un substantif et constituent ainsi une exception par rapport à l'attribution d'adjectifs en rigueur. Ils apparaissent sur le médaillon de Numérien, du type *TRIVNFV*(*s*) *QVADOR*(*um*) comme ceux contre lesquels le triomphe a été mené[31].

---

[23] P.ex. *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 340–342, 364–367, 608–609, 630, 634–635, 1185–1191, 1221, 1533, 1557, 1571–1577; Szaivert, n° 353, 371–373, 388–389, 399–400, 411.

[24] P.ex. *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 337, 339, 362–363, 605–607, 629, 632–633, 1179–1182, 1162, 1184, 1532, 1554–1556, 1565, 1569–1570; Szaivert, n° 335, 351–352, 356, 368–370, 385–386, 387, 396–398.

[25] P.ex. *RIC* V/1 *Valerianus*, n° 9–9a; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Joint Reign*, n° 17–19, 60, 141–142, 382–383; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° 200; Göbl 2000, n° 93, 840, 872, 883; *RIC* V/2 *Postumus*, n° 63, 129, 198–199; Schulzki *Postumus*, n° 118.

[26] Gnecchi II, p. 97, n° 4, pl. 109, 1.

[27] P.ex. *RIC* IV/2 *Maximinus I*, n° 23, 70–73, 90–94, 115–116; Alram, n° 18–5/C, 6/C, 19–6/C, 26–5 et 7, 27–1–7, 32, 47–11; *RIC* V/1 *Valerianus*, n° 129–130, 132, 181, 203, 263–265; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Joint Reign*, n° 3, 46–52, 61, 95–98, 173–175, 180–180a, 194–195, 245, 283–285, 404, 406, 429–430; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° 307, 400–402, 436–437; Göbl 2000, n° 35, 37, 78–82, 116–118, 146–147, 187–188, 307, 415, 429, 442, 447, 451, 454, 793, 845, 848, 873–874, 892, 960–961; *RIC* V/1 *Claudius Gothicus*, n° 108; *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 141–142, 149, 217–223, 254–259, 268–269, 272–278, 299–300, 425; *RIC* V/2 *Carinus*, n° 319–320; *RIC* V/2 *Tetricus I*, n° 38; Schulte *Tetricus I*, n° 1–2.

[28] *RIC* V/1 *Claudius Gothicus*, n° 251–252; *RIC* V/1 *Quintillus*, n° 87; *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 339–340; Göbl 1993, n° 295–296; *RIC* V/1 *Tacitus*, n° 110; S. Estiot, *L'or romain entre crise et restitution, 270–276 ap. J.-C., II: Tacite et Florien*, JS juillet–décembre 1999, Catalogue, Tacite, n° 92–94; Florien, n° 9, 18 (*VICTORIA GHOTTICA*); *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 10; S. Estiot, Ph. Gysen, *Probus Invictus Augustus: bustes inédits ou rares de l'empereur Probus*, BSFN LIX 2004, p. 84, n. 37 (*VICTORIA GVTTHICA*).

[29] *RIC* V/1 *Valerianus*, n° 22, 262; Göbl 2000, n° 846–847, 881.

[30] E. Pegan, *Ein Bronzemedaillon des Probus auf den Triumph über die Goten im Jahr 278 in Pannonien*, Numizmatičar III 1980, pp. 47–56; Estiot, Gysen, *o.c.* (n. 28), pp. 82–84.

[31] Gnecchi II, p. 123, n° 11, pl. 123, 8; K. Pink, *Die Medaillonsprägung unter Carus und seinen Söhnen*, dans: H. Ingholt (éd.), *Centennial Publication of the American Numismatic Society*, New York 1958, p. 558, n° 12.

Luciano stesso o da grammatici posteriori (naturalmente, questo non vale per i primi 10 titoli doppi di questo gruppo, cioè per quelli indicanti i due elementi principali presenti nei rispettivi libelli). Del resto, titoli alternativi erano talvolta concepiti da poeti comici e tragici per redazioni successive (e rivedute) di una medesima opera, ma, sebbene Luciano stesso ammetta la possibilità di sottoporre a revisione opere già circolanti (vd. *Pr. Im.* 14), ignoriamo se egli abbia mai rimaneggiato propri scritti già editi e, qualora lo abbia fatto, se ne abbia mai alterato o sostituito i titoli. Il confronto, dunque, fra i doppi titoli lucianei di questo gruppo e quelli attestati nella commedia e nella tragedia non reca alcuna prova a favore o contro l'autenticità dei primi.

Gruppo 3) Titoli doppi formati da nome proprio o comune del protagonista + nome comune o aggettivo esplicativo del ruolo da lui svolto nel libello lucianeo. Essi sono: Ψευδοσοφιστὴς ἢ σολοικιστής (18): la prima parola del titolo, estremamente rara (altrove, ricorre solo nello *schol. ad titulum* [36, 5 Rabe], in *Cyranides* I 12, ed è ripristinata in Thom. Mag. 49, 1 e 364, 4, dove si legge il *monstrum* Ψευδοσολοικιστῆ, risultante da conflazione, forse mnemonica, di Ψευδοσοφιστής e σολοικιστής), è spiegata dal sottotitolo (ma la paternità dell'opera è dibattuta)[29]; Ἰκαρομένιππος ἢ ὑπερνέφελος (24): Ἰκαρομένιππος è *hapax legomenon* (evidente conio lucianeo) e ὑπερνέφελος ('oltre le nubi') ne chiarisce il significato[30]; Τίμων ἢ μισάνθρωπος (25): qui μισάνθρωπος è il soprannome del protagonista (vd. c. 44) e pone in luce il tratto caratteriale di Timone che è oggetto del dialogo[31]; Ἀέξανδρος ἢ ψευδόμαντις (42): il secondo titolo impedisce al lettore di attendersi una storia sul più famoso Alessandro Magno, specificando che il protagonista è il 'falso profeta'[32]. Purtroppo, nulla di certo si può dire sull'autenticità del secondo elemento delle coppie qui elencate, dal momento che esso può ben essere stato aggiunto da tardi grammatici per le medesime esigenze di chiarezza che giustificano altri titoli doppi già esaminati nel gruppo 1 e nel gruppo 2.

---

applicano al doppio titolo di Theoc. *Id.* 26 (Λῆναι ἢ Βάκχαι: vd. P. Groeneboom, *Les Mimiambes d'Hérodas*, Groningue 1922, p. 36; O. Vox, *Carmi di Teocrito e dei poeti bucolici greci minori*, Torino 1997, p. 356, n.*). Diogene Laerzio, nel suo elenco degli scritti di Antistene (VI 15–18), cita numerose opere con titoli evidentemente alternativi, per es.: Περὶ λέξεως ἢ περὶ χαρακτήρων, Αἴας ἢ Αἴαντος λόγος, Ὀδυσσεὺς ἢ περὶ Ὀδυσσέως, Περὶ νόμου ἢ περὶ πολιτείας, Περὶ παιδείας ἢ περὶ ὀνομάτων, ecc.

[29] In Johann. Argyropul. *Epist. ad Georg. Trapez.* 3 (86, 17 s.) = Constantin. Ivanc. *Epist. ad Simon. Athonit.*, r. 80, compare solo il primo titolo.

[30] Il titolo doppio è noto a Tommaso Magistro (146, 19–147, 1), che però cita il solo primo titolo in 219, 3.

[31] Tommaso Magistro, però, cita il libello sempre come Τίμων (42, 9; 48, 14; 167, 3; 192, 17; 208, 3; 218, 3; 218, 10; 366, 11 s.; 367, 1). Così Tim. 988b, 12. Il titolo doppio è invece in *Suda*, κ 1978.

[32] In Thom. Mag. 35, 3 e 114, 2 il libello è citato come Ἀλεξάνδρου βίος.

è difficile capire perché non ne siano stati apposti di analoghi ad altri titoli singoli non più perspicui di quelli attestati con un secondo elemento (vd. per es. il Περὶ τοῦ οἴκου [10] e l'Εὐνοῦχος [47]).

Eccettuato il titolo del Περὶ παρασίτου ἢ ὅτι τέχνη ἡ παρασιτική (33), formalmente atipico (in quanto il nome comune del protagonista è espresso con περί + genitivo e non in nominativo), è evidente la somiglianza fra questi titoli doppi e quelli presenti nel *corpus* di Platone, uno degli autori più imitati da Luciano[9]. In Platone, però, le numerose varianti in tradizione diretta e indiretta lasciano supporre che i sottotitoli siano stati aggiunti da esponenti dell'Accademia, spesso in disaccordo tra loro sullo *skopós* di ciascun dialogo[10], mentre la tradizione diretta dei titoli doppi in Luciano risulta pressoché unanime[11].

Più solida appare la relazione fra i titoli doppi di questo gruppo e quelli delle opere satiriche di Varrone, cioè delle *Satire Menippee* e dei *Logistorici*[12], al cui genere letterario si possono ascrivere molti dei libelli lucianei qui elencati: un ulteriore indizio a favore dell'autenticità dei sottotitoli di questi ultimi[13].

Gruppo 2) Titoli doppi indicanti i due elementi principali (persone, temi, cose, ecc.) trattati con estensione pari nei rispettivi libelli lucianei. Dei due elementi, nei casi seguenti, non avrebbe avuto senso citare nel titolo uno solo: Περὶ τοῦ ἠλέκτρου ἢ τῶν κύκνων (6): Luciano interroga alcuni barcaioli sul mito dell'ambra e su quello dei cigni; Φιλοψευδεῖς ἢ ἀπιστῶν (34): gli amanti delle menzogne e l'in-

---

[9] Per la precisione, i titoli dei dialoghi di Platone sono accompagnati da *due* sottotitoli, il primo indicante il tema, il secondo il carattere del dialogo. Per es.: Εὐθύφρων ἢ περὶ ὁσίου, πειραστικός; Κρίτων ἢ περὶ πρακτέου, ἠθικός; Κρατύλος ἢ περὶ ὀρθότητος ὀνομάτων, λογικός, ecc. Un titolo doppio formato da nome proprio del protagonista + tema del dialogo è anche quello, *e.g.*, del Σάθων ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἀντιλέγειν di Antistene, opera polemica rivolta contro Platone, o quello dell'Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ ὑπὲρ ἀποίκων di Aristotele, del quale si conosce pure un titolo in cui il nome del protagonista è posposto al tema dell'opera (Περὶ ῥητορικῆς ἢ Γρῦλος).

[10] Vd. H. Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon*, Paris 1915, pp. 124–134.

[11] La tradizione diretta lucianea annovera un solo papiro (*P. Lit. Lond.* 194, IV sec. d. C.), contenente un frammento del c. 47 dell'*Asinus seu Lucius* (39) ma non il titolo dell'opera.

[12] Benché i sottotitoli delle *Satire Menippee* siano ora generalmente ritenuti spuri, non sembrano sussistere seri dubbi sull'autenticità di quelli presenti nei *Logistorici*. Sui titoli doppi delle *Satire Menippee* (per es.: *Aborigines* περὶ ἀνθρώπων φύσεως, *Caprinum proelium* περὶ ἡδονῆς, *Marcopolis* περὶ ἀρχῆς, *Octogessis* περὶ νομισμάτων, *Tithonus* περὶ γήρως, ecc.), vd. L. Mercklin, *Die Doppeltitel der Varronischen Menippeae und Logistorici*, RhM n. F. XII 1857, pp. 372–398; E. Bolisani, *Varrone menippeo*, Padova 1936, pp. XXVIII s.; J.-P. Cèbe, *Varron, Satires Ménippées*, Édition, traduction et commentaire, vol. I, Rome 1972, p. XIV. Sui titoli doppi dei *Logistorici* (per es.: *Catus de liberis educandis*, *Curio de cultu deorum*, *Marius de fortuna*, *Messala de valetudine*, *Tubero de origine humana*, ecc.), vd., oltre al già citato Mercklin, anche E. Bolisani, *I Logistorici varroniani*, Padova 1937, p. 11.

[13] Non sarà un caso che titoli doppi di questo tipo appartengano anche ad alcuni scritti di Dione Crisostomo di carattere affine a quello delle opere varroniane e lucianee qui ricordate: vd. per es. le orazioni 6 (Διογένης ἢ περὶ τυραννίδος), 8 (Διογένης ἢ περὶ ἀρετῆς), 10 (Διογένης ἢ περὶ οἰκετῶν), 56 (Ἀγαμέμνων ἢ περὶ βασιλείας).

Bei Straton ist dieser Ausdruck völlig unproblematisch, da der Haarwuchs ja einleuchtenderweise die „Blüte“ eines Knaben beendet. Aber im heterosexuellen Zusammenhang des Rufinus kann es ja nicht um Haare als Zeichen der Geschlechtsreife gehen, sondern nur speziell um *ergraute Haare* als Zeichen des Alters. Dies macht den Ausdruck Rufins, zumal kein πολιαί unmittelbar vorausgeht, einigermaßen verschroben. Zudem hat Rufinus Stratons Allerweltsadjektiv φθονερός wieder durch einen erlesenen, wohl von ihm selbst geprägten Ausdruck (διαλυσίφιλος) ersetzt.

Als zweites Vorbild Rufins hinzuzunehmen ist Straton *AP* XII 176:

στυγνὸς δὴ τί, Μένιππε, κατεσκέπασαι μέχρι πέζης
ὁ πρὶν ἐπ᾽ ἰγνύης λῶπος ἀνελκόμενος;
ἢ τί κάτω κύψας με παρέδραμες οὐδὲ προσειπών;
οἶδα, τί με κρύπτεις· *ἦλυθον, ἃς ἔλεγον.*

Hier ist mit dem Imperfekt der Rückgriff auf einen früheren Ausspruch des dichterischen Ichs vorgegeben, wie er in Rufins Ausdruck οὐ προεφώνουν; vorliegt. Rufin hat mit οὐ προεφώνουν / „ἥξουσιν ταχέως αἱ διαλυσίφιλοι“; gewissermaßen πρὶν ἐλθεῖν / τὰς φθονεράς und ἦλυθον, ἃς ἔλεγον kombiniert zu einer kleinen *oratio recta*.

Rufin. 11 P. = *AP* V 35 und 12 P. = *AP* V 36:

πυγὰς αὐτὸς ἔκρινα τριῶν · εἵλοντο γὰρ αὐταὶ
δεῖξαι ἐμοὶ γυμνὴν ἀστεροπὴν μελέων.
καί ῥ᾽ ἡ μὲν τροχαλοῖς σφραγιζομένη γελασίνοις
λευκῇ ἀπὸ γλουτῶν ἤνθεεν εὐαφίῃ ·
τῆς δὲ διαιρομένης φοινίσσετο χιονέη σὰρξ
πορφυρέοιο ῥόδου μᾶλλον ἐρυθροτέρη ·
ἡ δὲ γαληνιόωσα χαράσσετο κύματι κωφῷ,
αὐτομάτῃ τρυφερῷ χρωτὶ σαλευομένη.
εἰ ταύτας ὁ κριτὴς ὁ θεῶν ἐθεήσατο πυγάς,
οὐκέτ᾽ ἂν οὐδ᾽ ἐσιδεῖν ἤθελε τὰς προτέρας.

ἤρισαν ἀλλήλαις Ῥοδόπη Μελίτη Ῥοδόκλεια,
τῶν τρισσῶν τίς ἔχει κρείσσονα μηριόνην,
καί με κριτὴν εἵλοντο · καὶ ὡς θεαὶ αἱ περίβλεπτοι
ἔστησαν γυμναί, νέκταρι λειβόμεναι.
καὶ Ῥοδόπης μὲν ἔλαμπε μέσος μηρῶν πολύτιμος
<.....
.....>
οἷα ῥοδῶν †πολιῷ† σχιζόμενος ζεφύρῳ ·
τῆς δὲ Ῥοδοκλείης ὑάλῳ ἴσος ὑγρομέτωπος
οἷα καὶ ἐν νηῷ πρωτογλυφὲς ξόανον.
ἀλλὰ σαφῶς, ἃ πέπονθε Πάρις διὰ τὴν κρίσιν, εἰδὼς
τὰς τρεῖς ἀθανάτας εὐθὺ συνεστεφάνουν.

determinabile). Essa si dimostra peraltro spesso inaffidabile e contempla vari casi di citazione abbreviata.

Per queste ragioni, uno studio sui titoli doppi in Luciano può basarsi soltanto sul confronto fra i singoli titoli e le strutture compositive dei relativi libelli.

Tralasciando 3 casi (Προμηθεὺς ἢ Καύκασος [23][2], Ἀπολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων [65], Νέρων ἢ περὶ τῆς ὀρυχῆς τῆς Ἰσθμοῦ, εἰ γνήσιος [84])[3], in cui il secondo elemento risulta aggiunto da tardi copisti o dai curatori di alcune fra le prime edizioni a stampa delle opere di Luciano, ed è quindi certamente spurio, i titoli doppi lucianei possono essere divisi in tre gruppi:

Gruppo 1) Titoli doppi formati da nome proprio o comune del protagonista + tema del libello. Essi sono: Ἱππίας ἢ βαλανεῖον (3), Περὶ παρασίτου ἢ ὅτι τέχνη ἡ παρασιτική (33)[4], Ἀνάχαρσις ἢ περὶ γυμνασίων (37)[5], Μένιππος ἢ νεκυομαντεία (38)[6], Ψευδολογιστὴς ἢ περὶ τῆς ἀποφράδος (51)[7], Τόξαρις ἢ φιλία (57)[8], Ἑρμότιμος ἢ περὶ αἱρέσεων (70), e i titoli di due libelli spuri: Χαρίδημος ἢ περὶ κάλλους (83) e Τιμαρίων ἢ περὶ τῶν κατ'αὐτὸν παθημάτων (86).

Nei titoli di questo gruppo, il solo primo elemento non sarebbe sufficiente ad esprimere chiaramente il contenuto dell'opera, e il sottotitolo sarà dunque probabilmente autentico (anche se non si può escludere del tutto che esso sia stato aggiunto da tardi grammatici per informare il lettore sul contenuto dell'opera). Un'aporia rimane in ogni caso insoluta: sia che i sottotitoli di questo gruppo risalgano a Luciano stesso, sia che vadano attribuiti a grammatici posteriori,

---

[2] Fra parentesi è il numero d'ordine del libello secondo l'*akolouthia* della *recensio* γ, seguita nell'edizione di M.D. Macleod (4 voll., Oxford 1972–1987) e in quella, ancora in corso di pubblicazione, di J. Bompaire (Paris 1993–; finora ne sono apparsi solo i primi 3 volumi, comprendenti i primi 25 opuscoli).

[3] Προμηθεὺς ἢ Καύκασος (23): il secondo titolo si trova solo in un manoscritto del XV secolo (Paris. Gr. 2957), dove è un'aggiunta di un tardo correttore, e in alcune antiche edizioni a stampa (Thom. Mag. 406, 3 cita un luogo ἐν Προμηθεῖ *tout court*); Ἀπολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων (65): il sottotitolo è apposto da Areta nel suo manoscritto lucianeo (Londra, British Library, Harley 5694), forse per distinguere l'*Apologia* di Luciano da quella di Platone; Νέρων ἢ περὶ τῆς ὀρυχῆς τῆς Ἰσθμοῦ, εἰ γνήσιος (84): il sottotitolo è attestato solo nelle edizioni aldine del 1503 e del 1522 e, senza la clausola εἰ γνήσιος (ovviamente redazionale), nell'edizione di Basilea del 1555.

[4] Sulla questione dell'autenticità di questo dialogo, vd. H.-G. Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog. Untersuchungen und Kommentar*, Berlin–New York 1985, pp. 1–8 (*Die Echtheitsfrage*).

[5] Il papiro Pack² n° 2087 (III sec. d. C.?) cita il titolo Ἀνάχαρσις, senza sottotitolo, in un elenco di titoli letterari, ma si ignora se si tratti dell' Ἀνάχαρσις ἢ περὶ γυμνασίων (37) di Luciano.

[6] In questo caso, si può ragionevolmente propendere per l'autenticità del doppio titolo: avrebbe Luciano mai scelto come titolo di un proprio scritto il solo nome di un personaggio che figura come protagonista anche in altre sue opere, come l'*Icaromenippus* e i *Dialogi Mortuorum*? In Thom. Mag. 97, 2 e 194, 4 il dialogo è citato con il titolo doppio, in 2, 13 con il solo secondo titolo (ἐν νεκυομαντείᾳ).

[7] Il sottotitolo è attestato da un tardo scolio *ad titulum* (*Lucianus* ex recensione C. Iacobitz, vol. IV, Lipsiae 1841, p. 235), che ne fornisce una spiegazione. Lo scolio a Lucian. 25, 43 (117, 25 Rabe) cita il libello con l'espressione ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμάρχου λόγῳ, dal nome del bersaglio polemico di Luciano.

[8] Il titolo doppio è anche in Thom. Mag. 291, 12.

credulo sono i due poli del dialogo, l'uno indispensabile all'altro[14]; Λούκιος ἢ ὄνος (39): Lucio e l'asino sono le due fasi della metamorfosi del protagonista, e la fase 'animale' è troppo caratteristica della storia per essere omessa nel titolo (l'autenticità dell'opera, però, è oggetto di discussione)[15]; Ἡρόδοτος ἢ Ἀετίων (62): allo storico Erodoto e al pittore Aezione (attivo verso la metà del IV sec. a. C.), che si esibivano dinanzi ad un pubblico panellenico (il primo pronunciando discorsi, il secondo esponendo dipinti), Luciano paragona se stesso, che declama dinanzi ad un pubblico 'pan-macedone'[16]; Ζεῦξις ἢ Ἀντίοχος (63): Zeusi e Antioco sono rispettivamente il pittore di Eraclea (vissuto nella seconda metà del V sec. a. C.) e il re di Siria (Antioco I Sotere) ai quali Luciano si confronta perché ammirato solo per la sua originalità e non anche per la maestria di cui egli darebbe prova nella sua arte; Σκύθης ἢ πρόξενος (68): lo Scita (ovvero Anacarsi) rappresenta Luciano, il prosseno (Solone) i protettori cui Luciano domanda aiuto per ottenere serenità economica in Macedonia; Πλοῖον ἢ εὐχαί (73): è la storia di un gruppo di amici che visitano una nave; sulla via del ritorno, rivolgono preghiere agli dèi; alla fine, uno di essi (Lykinos/Luciano) sorride della vanità delle preghiere dei compagni (in questo dialogo, le preghiere, richiamate dal secondo titolo, svolgono un ruolo persino più cruciale della nave, menzionata come primo titolo)[17]; Φιλόπατρις ἢ διδασκόμενος (82): entrambi gli elementi del titolo si riferiscono al protagonista Crizia, il quale, come osserva M.D. Macleod, dapprima appare bisognoso di spiegazioni sulla Trinità (διδασκόμενος), in seguito si dimostra un patriota (Φιλόπατρις)[18]; perciò, il sottotitolo può essere attribuito all'autore stesso del dialogo, un ignoto imitatore bizantino di Luciano attivo dopo la metà del X secolo[19].

Questi doppi titoli possono dunque essere considerati autentici con sufficiente probabilità. Il criterio qui impiegato non giova invece alla discussione dell'autenticità dei rimanenti titoli doppi compresi in questo gruppo, che si riferiscono a: elementi presenti con estensione impari nel relativo libello lucianeo ancorché entrambi indispensabili alla sua economia (Συμπόσιον ἢ Λαπίθαι [17][20],

---

[14] Tommaso Magistro cita il titolo doppio in 22, 4 e 79, 11 s., il solo primo titolo in 366, 15 s.

[15] Nella forma Λοῦκις ἢ ὄνος, il titolo è noto a Fozio (*Bibl.* 129, 96b 26).

[16] Il titolo doppio è testimoniato da Thom. Mag. 301, 12 s.

[17] Il titolo doppio trova riscontro in Thom. Mag. 45, 6 s. e 373, 3.

[18] Vd. M.D. Macleod, *Lucian*, with an English Translation, vol. VIII, London–Cambridge (Mass.) 1967, p. 414.

[19] Un titolo doppio di questo tipo è quello dell'orazione 60 di Dione Crisostomo (Νέσσος ἢ Δηϊάνειρα).

[20] Se il secondo titolo si deve ad un grammatico, questi potrebbe aver inteso distinguere il *Simposio* di Luciano da quello, per es., di Platone; ma i Lapiti sono elemento costitutivo della vicenda narrata, nonché del carattere cinico dello scritto: vd. R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, vol. II, Leipzig 1895, p. 312. Il doppio titolo è attestato dallo *schol. ad titulum* (29, 7–12 Rabe), la cui età, per quanto più alta di quella dei manoscritti più antichi recanti la nota marginale (Vindob. Philol. Gr. 123, X/XI sec.; Marc. Gr. 454, X/XI sec.), non si può comunque stabilire con certezza e da Thom. Mag. 45, 11. Lo scolio a Lucian. 29, 33 (146, 24 Rabe) menziona invece il dialogo con il solo primo titolo.

situation au niveau du *Barbaricum* européen n'ont pas été remarqués où – au III siècle à la différence du II siècle – suite à des regroupements significatifs, les barbares ont renforcé leur organisation interne en s'unifiant en tribus et en fédérations; alors que le tableau dressé par les représentations monétaires témoigne du sérieux et de l'intérêt que portaient les Romains pour les barbares, sous le règne des Antonins. Les Romains estimaient leur pouvoir et cela se traduisait par cette «nominalisation» ou cet emploi de «substantif» ou même de «sujet» qui accompagnaient leur évocation dans les légendes monétaires. Cependant, on ne peut pas expliquer l'absence de tels éléments pendant les années de la crise du III siècle par le contexte du développement de l'idéologie de la victoire romaine. Cela est également dû à une volonté résolue de minimiser l'insécurité et à une politique réfléchie de rabaissement de l'ennemi.

Les sources numismatiques signalent dans une perspective très étroite les questions qui se rapportent à l'organisation politique des habitants du *Barbaricum*, d'autant plus qu'elles ne constituent qu'un élément de l'information de premier ordre: la glorification de l'Empire romain. Le langage symbolique de la numismatique souligne uniquement le fait que certains voisins barbares ont des rois[48]. Ces derniers sont avant tout représentés comme des *reges amici* – les rois amis, néanmoins dépendants de l'*Imperium Romanum*. Mais, dans le cas de Parthamasiris, placé par Chosroès sur le trône arménien, l'inscription *REX PARTH(ic)VS* sur les monnaies de Trajan renvoie à une attribution du pouvoir qui ni n'émane de l'initiative, ni ne bénéficie de l'approbation des Romains[49]. Sur d'autres monnaies, la formule *rex datus* traduit l'instauration d'un pouvoir dépendant. Dans ce même contexte, la légende *REX ARMENIIS DATVS* qui figure sur les émissions de Lucius Verus rappelle l'élection de Sohaemus, roi des Arméniens[50]. Une inscription identique sur les monnaies d'Antonin le Pieux, se

---

[48] La littérature antique et l'épigraphie offrent plusieurs indices sur les rois barbares élus et reconnus par les Romains, pour les périodes évoquées, p.ex. *HA Hadr.* 6, 8; 12, 7; Cass. Dio LXIX 9, 5; *CIL* V 32 (= *ILS* 852); *CIL* V 33 (= *ILS* 853). Cf. plus largement J. Klose, *Roms Klientel-Randstaaten am Rhein und an der Donau. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und rechtlichen Stellung im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Breslau 1934; J. Gagé, *L'empereur romain et les rois. Politique et protocol*, RH CCI 1959, pp. 221–260; W. Will, *Römische «Klientel-Randstaaten» am Rhein? Eine Bestandsaufnahme*, BJ CLXXXVII 1987, pp. 1–61. Sur cette iconographie monétaire et une investiture voir R. Göbl, *REX...DATVS. Ein Kapitel von der Interpretation numismatischer Zeugnisse und ihren Grundlagen*, RhM CIV 1961, pp. 70–80.

[49] Strack I, n° 209, 220, 450, 465; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 263a, 310–312, 669. Cf. Eutrop. VIII 3, 1; Cass. Dio LXVIII 19, 2–20, 4.

[50] *RIC* III *Lucius Verus*, n° 511–513, 1370–1375; Szaivert, n° 91–92. Cf. Cass. Dio LXXI 3, 1; C.H. Dodd, *Chronology of the Eastern Campaigns of the Emperor Lucius Verus*, NC S. 4, XI 1911, pp. 232 et suiv.; P. Lambrechts, *L'Empereur Lucius Verus. Essai de réhabilition*, AC III 1934, pp. 196–199. Sur cette représentation voir R. Brilliant, *Gesture and Rank in Roman Art. The Use of Gestures to Denote Status in Roman Sculpture and Coinage*, Copenhagen 1963, pp. 153 et suiv.

dove i Lapiti compaiono solo a partire dal c. 45 su un totale di 48, e Ἀναβιοῦντες ἢ ἁλιεύς [28][21], dove il pescatore è nominato solo dal c. 47 su un totale di 52: paradossalmente, proprio la presenza più 'discreta' del secondo elemento nell'opera fa supporre che un tardo grammatico non si sarebbe dato pensiero di dedicare ad esso un sottotitolo); oggetto della narrazione + nome comune del protagonista (Κατάπλους ἢ τύραννος [19][22], e Ὄνειρος ἢ ἀλεκτρυών [22][23]); nome proprio del protagonista + ruolo svolto da tutti i personaggi del libello, protagonista compreso (Χάρων ἢ ἐπισκοποῦντες [26][24]); nome comune del protagonista + situazione del dialogo (Δὶς κατηγορούμενος ἢ δικαστήρια [29]: ma in una parte dei manoscritti più antichi il sottotitolo non è attestato[25]). Fra questi titoli si può includere il Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου ἤτοι βίος Λουκιανοῦ (32), formato da situazione + contenuto della narrazione (qui βίος Λουκιανοῦ è probabilmente un'aggiunta di qualche grammatico, indicante che il Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου è l'opera lucianea da cui si possono attingere informazioni sulla vita dell'autore)[26].

Si può essere tentati di confrontare i titoli doppi lucianei di questo gruppo con i titoli doppi (o alternativi) della commedia e della tragedia, il secondo elemento dei quali è stato probabilmente aggiunto in età alessandrina per distinguere drammi omonimi; ma, per ovvie ragioni cronologiche, le opere di Luciano non furono mai oggetto di studio da parte dei grammatici di Alessandria, e molti titoli lucianei a noi noti con un sottotitolo (per es.: Ψευδολογιστὴς ἢ περὶ τῆς ἀποφράδος [51]) ben difficilmente saranno stati condivisi da altre opere (ora perdute) di altri scrittori[27]. Non si può escludere che alcuni sottotitoli di questo gruppo siano stati aggiunti come elementi esplicativi o titoli alternativi (caso, questo, frequente nella commedia, nella tragedia e in altri generi letterari)[28] da

---

[21] Così il dialogo è citato in Thom. Mag. 148, 18; 156, 11; 318, 3; 399, 9 s.

[22] Il titolo doppio ricorre in Thom. Mag. 331, 15 s.

[23] In Anon. *in* Arist. *EN*, *CAG* XX 156, 13, il titolo diventa Μίκυλλος, nome di uno dei personaggi del dialogo. Il titolo doppio trova invece conferma in Thom. Mag. 363, 12 s. Altrove, lo stesso Tommaso Magistro cita il dialogo con l'ibrido Μίκυλλος ἢ ἀλεκτρυῶν (30, 15; 72, 12 s.; 145, 7; 255, 13 s.; 388, 9).

[24] Il titolo doppio è in Thom. Mag. 156, 2 s. e 409, 14.

[25] Il sottotitolo manca pure in Thom. Mag. 21, 7; 74, 16 s.; 144, 6; 161, 1 s; 163, 1.

[26] In Thom. Mag. 162, 12 s. il libello è citato con il solo primo titolo, ridotto a ἐν τῷ ἐνυπνίῳ in 48, 6 e 102, 13.

[27] Si verifica cioè nel caso di Luciano la stessa situazione per cui W.G. Arnott sostiene che la funzione dei sottotitoli apposti dai grammatici alessandrini ai titoli di alcune opere teatrali "can no longer be detected with certainty" (W.G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary*, Cambridge 1996, p. 51).

[28] Vd. per es. il Δάφνις ἢ Λιτυέρσης di Sositeo (*TrGF* I 99 F 1a): nessuno dei due elementi del titolo è in comune con altre opere teatrali, dunque il doppio titolo potrebbe essere attribuito a Sositeo stesso (vd. Terzaghi, *o.c.* [n. 1], p. 314). Nel caso della Προκυκλὶς ἢ μαστροπός di Eronda, il secondo titolo spiega il primo, più raro: secondo G. Puccioni, *Herodae Mimiambi*, Firenze 1950, pp. 2 s., questo doppio titolo può essere ritenuto d'autore. Le stesse considerazioni si

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

SULL'AUTENTICITÀ DEI TITOLI DOPPI IN LUCIANO

Di

GIUSEPPE RUSSO

ABSTRACT: The article deals with the problem of the genuineness of the double titles (and more precisely of the subtitles) in Lucian's works: some of them are almost certainly genuine, others are likely to be so, others are dubious, others are definitely spurious.

Nonostante l'alto numero di scritti lucianei dotati di titoli doppi (ben 31), gli studi sulla tradizione manoscritta delle opere di Luciano non hanno mai affrontato specificamente la questione dell'autenticità di tali titoli (e più precisamente dei sottotitoli), questione che, come si vedrà, interseca quella dei rapporti fra Luciano e i generi letterari da lui frequentati[1].

L'esame dell'autenticità dei titoli doppi nelle opere dello scrittore di Samosata è complicato da alcuni fattori oggettivi: a) Luciano non cita mai titoli di propri scritti; b) le sue opere non sono citate da alcuno dei suoi contemporanei; c) le citazioni più antiche da Luciano sono tarde (Lactant. *Div. inst.* I 9, 8, Isidor. Pelus. *PG* LXXVIII 1106C, Eunap. *VS* 454: in questi luoghi, comunque, non sono menzionati titoli lucianei); d) la tradizione indiretta non attesta titoli doppi ignoti alla tradizione diretta, ed è, rispetto a questa, sostanzialmente recenziore (ad eccezione degli scolii, di età comunque quasi sempre difficilmente

---

[1] In assenza di lavori complessivi sui titoli doppi nella letteratura greca e latina, si consulteranno utilmente alcuni contributi (a volte non più che cenni) sui titoli doppi attestati presso specifici autori o generi letterari. Vd. per es.: É. Littré, *Œuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, vol. I, Paris 1839, pp. 150–153; W. Bender, *De Graecae comoediae titulis duplicibus*, Diss. Marburg 1904; N. Terzaghi, *Fabula. Prolegomeni allo studio del teatro antico*, vol. I: *Questioni teatrali*, Milano–Palermo–Napoli 1911, pp. 23–142; A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus*, edited with a Translation and Commentary, vol. I, Cambridge 1950, pp. lxix–lxxi; W. Luppe, *Die Hypothesis zu Kratinos' Dionysalexandros*, Philologus CX 1966, pp. 169–193, in part. 185 s.; O. Taplin, *The Title of Prometheus Desmotes*, JHS XCV 1975, pp. 184–186, in part. 185; J.G.F. Powell, *Cicero, Cato maior de senectute*, edited with Introduction and Commentary, Cambridge 1988, pp. 93 s. Sui titoli in genere nella letteratura greca vd. M. Caroli, *Titoli letterari greci*, Diss. Bari 1999. Appare opportuno chiarire che, in questo lavoro, un titolo doppio è definito 'autentico' quando i suoi due elementi sono attribuibili al medesimo autore, senza alcuna implicazione circa l'autenticità del' opera cui il titolo appartienne.

Riassumendo: su un totale di 31 titoli doppi, in 3 casi (Προμηθεὺς ἢ Καύκασος [23], Ἀπολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων [65], Νέρων ἢ περὶ τῆς ὀρυχῆς τῆς Ἰσθμοῦ, εἰ γνήσιος [84]), il secondo elemento è certamente spurio. Solo 8 titoli doppi (cioè una parte dei titoli del gruppo 2: Περὶ τοῦ ἠλέκτρου ἢ τῶν κύκνων [6], Φιλοψευδεῖς ἢ ἀπιστῶν [34], Λούκιος ἢ ὄνος [39], Ἡρόδοτος ἢ Ἀετίων [62], Ζεῦξις ἢ Ἀντίοχος [63], Σκύθης ἢ πρόξενος [68], Πλοῖον ἢ εὐχαί [73], Φιλόπατρις ἢ διδασκόμενος [82]) possono ragionevolmente essere considerati autentici. 9 titoli doppi (tutti quelli compresi nel gruppo 1: Ἱππίας ἢ βαλανεῖον [3], Περὶ παρασίτου ἢ ὅτι τέχνη ἡ παρασιτική [33], Ἀνάχαρσις ἢ περὶ γυμνασίων [37], Μένιππος ἢ νεκυομαντεία [38], Ψευδολογιστὴς ἢ περὶ τῆς ἀποφράδος [51], Τόξαρις ἢ φιλία [57], Ἑρμότιμος ἢ περὶ αἱρέσεων [70], Χαρίδημος ἢ περὶ κάλλους [83] e Τιμαρίων ἢ περὶ τῶν κατ'αὐτὸν παθημάτων [86]) sono probabilmente, benché non certamente, autentici, sulla base del confronto con la produzione satirica varroniana. Quanto ai restanti 11 titoli doppi (ossia i rimanenti del gruppo 2: Συμπόσιον ἢ Λαπίθαι [17], Κατάπλους ἢ τύραννος [19], Ὄνειρος ἢ ἀλεκτρυών [22], Χάρων ἢ ἐπισκοποῦντες [26], Ἀναβιοῦντες ἢ ἁλιεύς [28], Δὶς κατηγορούμενος ἢ δικαστήρια [29], Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου ἤτοι βίος Λουκιανοῦ [32], e tutti quelli del gruppo 3: Ψευδοσοφιστὴς ἢ σολοικιστής [18], Ἰκαρομένιππος ἢ ὑπερνέφελος [24], Τίμων ἢ μισάνθρωπος [25], Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ ψευδόμαντις [42]), non si dispone di elementi per valutare la loro autenticità.

Bari

Rufin. 29 P. = *AP* V 75:

γείτονα παρθένον εἶχον Ἀμυμώνην, Ἀφροδίτη,
ἥ μου τὴν ψυχὴν ἔφλεγεν οὐκ ὀλίγον.
αὐτή μοι προσέπαιξε καί, εἴ ποτε, καιρῷ ἐτόλμων
(ἠρυθρία – τί πλέον; τὸν πόνον ᾐσθάνετο) ·
ἤνυσα πολλὰ καμών. παρακήκοα νῦν, ὅτι τίκτει.
ὥστε τί ποιοῦμεν; φεύγομεν ἢ μένομεν;

Rufinus kombiniert zwei Epigramme Stratons über Liebesverhältnisse in der Nachbarschaft: Die Anbahnung der eigentlichen Affaire folgt *AP* XII 205:

παῖς τις ὅλως ἁπαλὸς τοῦ γείτονος *οὐκ ὀλίγως με*
κνίζει· πρὸς τὸ θέλειν δ᾽ οὐκ ἀμύητα γελᾷ ·
οὐ πλεῦν δ᾽ ἐστὶν ἐτῶν δυοκαίδεκα. νῦν ἀφύλακτοι
ὄμφακες · ἢν δ᾽ ἀκμάσῃ, φρούρια καὶ σκόλοπες.

Dagegen folgt die dubitative Frage am Gedichtschluß, ob der Sprecher bereit ist, die gegenwärtigen Konsequenzen der eingegangenen Verbindung zu tragen und sich als der geliebten Person loyal zu erweisen, *AP* XII 250:

νυκτερινὴν ἐπίκωμος ἰὼν μεταδόρπιον ὥρην
ἄρνα λύκος θυρέτροις εὗρον ἐφεσταότα,
υἱὸν Ἀριστοδίκου τοῦ γείτονος· ὃν περιπλεχθεὶς
ἐξεφίλουν ὅρκοις πολλὰ χαριζόμενος.
νῦν δ᾽ αὐτῷ τί φέρων δωρήσομαι; οὔτ᾽ ἀπάτης γὰρ
ἄξιος ἔσπερος ἦν οὔτ᾽ ἐπιορκοσύνης.

6 ἔσπερος ἦν *scripsi*: ἐσπερίης *cod.*

Gemeinsam ist mit diesem Gedicht auch die triptychische Struktur (1. Distichon: erotischer Kontakt, 2. Distichon: Verführung, 3. Distichon: gegenwärtige Konsequenzen).

Rufin. 33 P. = *AP* V 92:

ὑψοῦται Ῥοδόπη τῷ κάλλει, κἢν ποτε „*χαῖρε*"
εἴπω, ταῖς σοβαραῖς ὀφρύσιν ἠσπάσατο ·
ἦν ποτε καὶ στεφάνους προθύρων ὕπερ ἐκκρεμάσωμαι,
ὀργισθεῖσα πατεῖ τοῖς σοβαροῖς ἴχνεσι.
ὦ ῥυτίδες καὶ γῆρας ἀνηλεές, *ἔλθετε θᾶσσον*,
σπεύσατε · *κἂν ὑμεῖς πείσατε* τὴν Ῥοδόπην.

Der Wunsch, die hoffärtige Geliebte möge schnell altern, folgt Straton *AP* XII 186:

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

LE MONDE DES BARBARES DANS LA PROPAGANDE IMPÉRIALE AU SIÈCLE D'OR DES ANTONINS ET PENDANT LA PÉRIODE DE LA CRISE DU III^E SIÈCLE*

Par

AGATA A. KLUCZEK

ABSTRACT: In the imperial propaganda the barbarian world was represented from the point of view of its relations with the Roman Empire. There was no great difference between ideology and propaganda in the golden age of the Antonine monarchy and in the times of the third century crisis. However, the monetary images of the world of barbarians, although grown on the same foundation, were far from identical.

In the first period there were ten structures defined within the barbarian world. They were: *Dacia*, *Britannia*, *Germania*, *Arabia*, *Armenia*, *Parthia*, *Mesopotamia*, *Scythia*, the Quadi and the Sarmatians. There occurred "portrait-like" representations of the "civilized" barbarians. An agreement between the barbarians and the Romans was possible, but its prerequisite was the barbarians' submitting to the Roman authority. Frequently there were "historical" representations on the coins, with legends identifying the barbarian in question and stating some of his ethnographic features. In the second period *Barbaricum* was limited in its structural dimension to the German peoples, the Carpi, the Quadi, the Goths and the Parthian-Persian empire. The barbarian was an anonymous member of a larger group and his predominant stereotyped image was that of a barbarian-enemy. The prevailing representations of barbarians were "abstract", lacking in individualized ethnic features.

In the golden age of the Antonine dynasty the motif of a barbarian in the imperial propaganda was aimed at emphasizing particular achievements of the Roman external policy. The majority of the monetary representations of that period may be defined as "historical". The propaganda of the third century crisis, though apt to adapt to circumstances, depicted barbarians in rather abstract terms. In the mintage of many rulers of that time the archetypical model of Barbarian serves to contribute to the myth of the omnipresent threat to the *Imperium Romanum*.

Les deux périodes de l'*Imperium Romanum* évoquées dans le titre comportent en elles-mêmes beaucoup de différences et une grande diversité. Elles sont traditionnellement désignées pour les années de 96 à 192 comme «le siècle d'or des

---

* Les matériaux qui ont servis de base à cet article ont été recueillis lors de mon séjour à Rome, à l'occasion du stage de la Fondation Lanckoroński en 2006. J'adresse mes remerciements les plus chaleureux à la Fondation pour cette possibilité qu'elle m'a offerte de mener à bien mes recherches.

– par un élément du costume national – dans la représentation au cours des années de la crise du III siècle se retrouve par exemple dans le monnayage de Gordien III. Sur ses monnaies frappées pendant son expedition orientale, le captif porte un bonnet phrygien[63]. La personnification de la Dacie (ou d'un Dace) est caractéristique dans l'iconographie des monnaies de Trajan. Traitant de l'évolution des représentations de la Dacie dans le monnayage impérial et parlant de ces émissions à la période du règne de Trajan qui a conquis la Dacie, Iudita Winkler a souligné le réalisme de ces représentations[64]. Dans ce cas, les représentations des reliefs de la colonne de Trajan à Rome et des métopes du monument d'Adamklissi aident à l'identification de la Dacie; leurs détails sont, en effet, mieux réalisés et la valeur artistique est plus grande[65]. Pourtant, au-delà de ces différences, on retrouve sur les monnaies de Trajan, la Dacie représentée par une femme coiffée d'une sorte de béret (*pileus*), vêtue des braies et d'une tunique qui tombe jusqu'à ses genoux, avec des manches, assise sur un bouclier et à côté d'elle, tantôt une épée recourbée (*sica*) ou un coutelas courbe beaucoup plus court (*falx*), qui sont incontestablement l'arme éminemment spécifique aux Daces, et tantôt un bouclier ovale ou hexagonal[66]. Parfois, ces détails iconographiques – des boucliers en sautoir devant un sabre courbe dace – interviennent seuls comme éléments identificateurs des adversaires – habitants de la Dacie vaincus[67]. Par ailleurs, les barbares des pays du Nord sont identifiés sur les monnaies impériales par une barbe longue, plus rarement par des longs cheveux et parfois leur nudité[68]. On peut remarquer ce type de représentations des voisins barbares du Nord de l'Empire romain dans le monnayage de Gallien[69], Claude II le Gothique[70] et Probus[71]. Cependant, on retrouve sur les monnaies de Numérien une

---

[63] Gnecchi II, p. 92, n° 44–47, pl. 105, 9–10, 106, 1.

[64] I. Winkler, *Personificarea Daciei pe monedele romane imperiale*, StCl VII 1965, pp. 223–234.

[65] À propos de l'équipement militaire dace et du costume national des Daces voir Bieńkowski, *o.c.* (n. 3), pp. 31, 35, 55, 71; Picard, *o.c.* (n. 32), p. 403; R. Vulpe, *Les Germains du trophée de Trajan à Adamclissi*, Archeologia XIV 1963, pp. 57 et suiv.; F.B. Florescu, *Monumentul de la Adamklissi. Tropaeum Traiani*, Bucureşti 1961, pp. 569–624; idem, *Die Trajanssäule. Grundfragen und Tafeln*, Bonn–Bukarest 1969, pp. 85–99; Rossi, *o.c.* (n. 10), pp. 121–126; A.S. Stefan, *Les guerres daciques de Domitien et de Trajan. Achitecture militaire, topographie, images et histoire*, Rome 2005, pp. 508–515. Cet auteur (p. 508) souligne qu'une image des Daces munis d'épées et de boucliers et dépourvus de la protection des casques et des cuirasses est conventionnelle, et est dictée à la fois par le désir de souligner la supériorité de l'armement romain et par le souci d'offrir au spectateur «une clé de reconnaissance immédiate et constante» des adversaires des Romains.

[66] Strack I, n° 70, 84–85, 365; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 89, 216–223, 560–566.

[67] Strack I, n° 98, 138–141, 382; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 147–147b, 225–227, 585–587.

[68] Cf. Mart. XIV (*Apoph.*) 176 (*Persona Germana*); *HA Verus* 10, 6; Bieńkowski, *o.c.* (n. 3), p. 35.

[69] P.ex. Gnecchi II, p. 106, n° 1–2, pl. 113, 4–5; Göbl 2000, n° 301–302, 771.

[70] P.ex. *RIC* V/1 *Claudius Gothicus*, n° 9, 119, 170; Ph. Gysen, *À propos des ateliers de Smyrne et de Cyzique sous Claude II le Gothique*, CENB XXXVI 1999, pp. 31 et suiv., fig. 3–4.

[71] P.ex. Gnecchi II, p. 115, n° 1, pl. 119, 1; p. 120, n° 43–44, pl. 121, 10; K. Pink, *Die Medaillonsprägung unter Kaiser Probus*, NZ LXXVI 1955, p. 17, n° 1; p. 24, n° 38.

L'ensemble des représentations monétaires qui recèlent des informations sur le monde des barbares peut s'avérer très fructueux si on prend en considération l'iconographie et les légendes de revers des monnaies impériales. Ce monde a été représenté de différentes manières. On y trouve des caractérisations scripturales permettant d'identifier des peuples et des pays au-delà du *limes;* ainsi que des dessins comportant des éléments iconographiques symbolisant le monde des barbares en relation avec le côté romain. Le plus souvent, il s'agissait d'une personnification de pays étrangers et de représentants de barbares prisonniers, ennemis ou parfois encore «amis» des Romains. Les disproportions sont caractéristiques. Elles mentionnent, cependant, davantage de représentations qui reflètent des contacts à caractère militaire plutôt qu'à caractère amical entre l'Empire romain et le monde extérieur. À la lumière de ce matériel numismatique, c'est la guerre qui constitue, en effet, une relation et un moyen d'identification des peuples voisins ainsi que l'interprétation des circonstances essentielles expliquant et limitant à la fois la présence de ces peuples étrangers dans la propagande impériale[8]. Une telle relation entre la connaissance de la géographie politique du *Barbaricum* et les actions militaires des Romains, a déjà été établie par les auteurs antiques[9]. Dans les représentations monétaires cette dépendance entre la parution d'un peuple donné dans la propagande impériale et les actions militaires est à la fois perceptible au niveau du contenu des légendes et des dessins que comportent les monnaies, et de la chronologie de la frappe de l'émission donnée. D'où vient l'importance des émissions forgées en relation avec les peuples barbares frappées au temps des guerres daciques et des batailles orientales de Trajan[10] ou encore des guerres d'outre-Danube contre les Marcomans au temps du règne de Marc-Aurèle[11]. On souligne également l'apparition de l'image répétitive

---

[8] Voir les remarques de T. Hölscher, *Images of War in Greece and Rome: Between Military Practice, Public Memory, and Cultural Symbolism*, JRS XCIII 2003, pp. 1–17. Cf. aussi N. Hannestad, *Rome and her Enemies: Warfare in Imperial Art*, dans: T. Bekker-Nielsen, L. Hannestad (éds), *War as a Cultural and Social Force*, København 2001, pp. 146–154.

[9] P.ex. Plin. *NH* V 10, 51; Pomp. Mela, *Chorogr.* III 6, 49; Tac. *Germ.* 1, 1; Vell. II 106, 1. Cf. S.P. Mattern, *Rome and the Enemy. Imperial Strategy in the Principate*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1999, pp. 26–41. Mais voir Kotula, *Barbarzyńcy*... (n. 3), pp. 18–25, à propos d'autres sources de la connaissance du *Barbaricum*.

[10] L. Rossi, *Trajan's Column and the Dacian Wars*, London 1971, pp. 42–48; R. Scheiper, *Bildpropaganda der römischen Kaiserzeit unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Trajanssäule in Rom und korrespondierender Münzen*, Bonn 1982, pp. 212–224; O. Richier, *Les thèmes militaires dans le monnayage de Trajan*, Latomus LVI 1997, pp. 594–613; E. Oberländer, *Le emissioni monetarie dell'imperatore Traiano connesse alle guerre daciche*, dans: G.A. Popescu (éd.), *Traiano ai confini dell'Impero*, Milano 1998, pp. 166–179; G. Migliorati, *L'idea di guerra nella propaganda di Traiano*, dans: M. Sordi (éd.), *Il pensiero sulla guerra nel mondo antico*, Milano 2001, pp. 225–241.

[11] W. Zwikker, *Studien zur Markussäule*, Amsterdam 1941, pp. 120–149; G. Schindler–Horstkotte, *Der « Markomannenkrieg » Mark Aurels und die kaiserliche Reichsprägung*, Köln 1985; W. Szaivert, *Die Markomannenkriege in der römischen Münzprägung der Kaiserzeit*, dans: H. Friesinger et al. (éds), *Markomannenkriege. Ursachen und Wirkungen*, Brno 1994, pp. 497–505.

wo einem die Disposition des Sprechers bezeichnenden attributiven Ausdruck (τὴν φιλέραστον / κοίτην) mit dem Praedicativum μουνολεχῆ die Entfremdung entgegengestellt wird. Zudem wird der Standardausdruck οὐκέτ' ἀνεξόμεθα ersetzt durch das singuläre οὐκέτι βαστάζω.

(Al. Cameron, CQ XXXII 1982, S. 164–166, plädiert für die Priorität des Rufinus-Epigramms, freilich ohne auf das hier thematisierte sprachliche Detail einzugehen; er will die konkretere lokale Szenerie bei Rufinus nicht aus der beliebig wirkenden Anspielung auf Ephesos bei Straton ableiten.)

Rufin. 7 P. = *AP* V 21:

οὐκ ἔλεγον, Προδίκη, „γηράσομεν"; οὐ προεφώνουν
„ἥξουσιν ταχέως αἱ διαλυσίφιλοι";
νῦν ῥυτίδες καὶ θρὶξ πολιὴ καὶ σῶμα ῥακῶδες
καὶ στόμα τὰς προτέρας οὐκέτ' ἔχον χάριτας.
μή τίς σοι, μετέωρε, προσέρχεται ἢ κολακεύων
λίσσεται; ὡς δὲ τάφον νῦν σε παρερχόμεθα.

Page 24 notiert nur die Übereinstimmung des Schlusses mit Straton *AP* XII 229 χοὶ θέραπες νῦν σε παρερχόμεθα.

(Cameron, *o.c.*, S. 166 f., vertritt die Priorität des Rufinus-Epigramms; allerdings ist seine Ausdeutung von θέραπες bei Straton als „Nemesis-worshippers" kaum richtig, genausowenig wie seine Polemik gegen R. Keydell, Hermes LXXX 1952, S. 499, der den Schluß von Stratons Epigramm richtig verstand in dem Sinne χοὶ [*scil.* πρίν] θέραπες νῦν σε παρερχόμεθα; auch Camerons Ausstellungen gegen Stratons Verwendung von παρερχόμεθα treffen nicht zu: Man kann die Metaphorik leicht verstehen, wenn man etwa an ein Götterbild denkt, welches von seinen früheren Verehrern ignoriert wird; diese Vorstellung wird bei Rufinus durch die Grabmetaphorik grob übersteigert. Zum Motiv vgl. Maked. Hyp. *AP* V 271, 3–5: οἱ δὲ φιληταί, / οἵ ποτε τριλλίστως ἀντί ον ἐρχόμενοι, / νῦν μέγα πεφρίκασι.)

Darüber hinaus bildet aber auch die Wendung ἥξουσιν ταχέως αἱ διαλυσίφιλοι, die einen elliptischen femininen Verbalausdruck mit einem die sozialen Folgen des Alters beschreibenden Attribut und einem Praedikat „sie kommen" verbindet, eine überaus jargonartige Wendung, die sich aus Straton *AP* XII 21 herleitet:

κλέψομεν ἄχρι τίνος τὰ φιλήματα καὶ τὰ λαθραῖα
νεύσομεν ἀλλήλοις ὄμμασι φειδομένοις;
μέχρι τίνος δ' ἀτέλεστα λαλήσομεν, ἀμβολίαισι
ζευγνύντες κενεὰς ἔμπαλιν ἀμβολίας;
μέλλοντες τὸ καλὸν δαπανήσομεν · ἀλλὰ, πρὶν *ἐλθεῖν*
τὰς φθονεράς, Φείδων, θῶμεν ἐπ' ἔργα λόγοις.

À l'époque des Antonins, le motif du barbare dans l'iconographie monétaire ainsi que les légendes concernant le monde des barbares portaient sur des acquis particuliers et des moments forts de la politique romaine. Cela se reflète dans la possibilité de reconnaître la majorité des représentations monétaires de l'époque comme étant « historiques ». Dans la propagande des années de la crise du III siècle, sans écarter parfois ce genre de solutions et leur ajustement aux événements, les représentations montrent souvent les barbares avec un certain type d'abstraction, qui recèle une connotation idéologique particulière. Et cette construction prête est exploitée comme matériel pour appliquer. Cela signifie que dans le monnayage de nombreux empereurs de l'époque le Barbare a été coupé de son réalité pour devenir un élément du mythe du mal omniprésent et de la menace entourant l'Empire romain. D'une manière général, on peut constater que les fondements idéologiques de la propagande qui portent sur le monde des barbares à l'âge d'or des Antonins et pendant les années de la crise du III siècle ne différaient pas excessivement l'une de l'autre. Les portraits de ce monde à travers les représentations monétaires ont été dressés sur ces fondements, mais ils n'étaient cependant pas identiques.

Université de Silésie à Katowice

rapporte à la nomination d'un autre dirigeant arménien[51]. Par la suite, l'inscription *REX PARTHIS DATVS* dans le monnayage de Trajan, rappelle que celui-ci a attribué le diadème des Arsacides à Parthamaspatès qui est ainsi devenu roi du «pays marionnette»[52]. À l'Est, à la frontière romano-Parthe, on peut également situer les *regna adsignata* évoqués à travers les monnaies de Trajan[53]. Parmi les peuplades du *Barbaricum* européen, le fragment adéquat de la propagande impériale remonte au règne d'Antonin le Pieux. Ses émissions monétaires avec l'inscription *REX QVADIS DATVS*[54] signifient que les Quades avaient des rois. L'iconographie monétaire montre que, comme l'a souligné Tacite, «vis et potentia regibus ex auctoritate Romana» (*Germ*. 42, 2). Les représentations monétaires, mentionnaient le roi ainsi que l'empereur romain consolidant par là l'autorité du premier. Dans aucun cas des émissions décritées ci-dessus, le nom du souverain barbare élu par les Romains n'avait été mentionné.

Pendant les années de la crise du III siècle, des représentations des monnaies d'Edesse témoignent d'une acceptation de ce genre que Gordien III concédait au roi allié[55]. Dans la propagande lancée par les émissions impériales de cette époque-là, on ne retrouvera pourtant aucun exemple de soutenir du dirigeant de peuples voisins et de l'acceptation de sa position politique par les Romains. Comme cela a été mentionné ci-dessus, le principal élément des représentations monétaires renvoyant à un ordre des peuples barbares reste le nom du peuple en question encodé dans un adjectif.

---

[51] Strack III, n° 851; RIC III Antoninus Pius, n° 619. Son nom reste incertain (Sohaemus ou Pacorus), cf. M.-L. Chaumont, *L'Arménie entre Rome et l'Iran. I. De l'avènement d'Auguste à l'avènement de Dioclétien*, *ANRW* II 9, 1, 1976, pp. 146 et suiv.; B. Rémy, *Antonin le Pieux (138–161). Le siècle d'or de Rome*, Paris 2005, p. 248.

[52] Strack I, n° 476; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 667–668. Cf. Cass. Dio LXVIII 30; Malal. XI 352, 357; J. Guey, *Essai sur la guerre parthique de Trajan (114–117)*, Bucarest 1937, pp. 133 et suiv.; M.G. Angeli Bertinelli, *I Romani oltre l'Euphrate nel II secolo d. C. (le province di Assiria, di Mesopotamia e di Osroene)*, *ANRW* II 9, 1, 1976, p. 21; J. Bennett, *Trajan, optimus princeps. A Life and Times*, London 1997, pp. 200–203.

[53] *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 366–367, 666; Strack I, n° 240, 250, 475. Les sources indiquent plusieurs actes de ce type qui stipulant la supériorité des Romains, à différentes étapes de l'expédition de Trajan, p.ex. Eutrop. VIII 3; Fest. XX 2; Arr. *Peripl*. 11, 2; Cass. Dio LXVIII 18, 2; 19, 2; 28, 3–4.

[54] *RIC* III *Antoninus Pius*, n° 620, 1059; Strack III, n° 852. Cf. E. Swoboda, *REX QVADIS DATVS*, dans: *Carnuntum-Jahrbuch 1956*, Wien 1957, pp. 5–12; M.-R. Alföldi, *Nochmal: REX QVADIS DATVS*, NZ CVI/CVII 1999, pp. 91–94; Rémy, *o.c.* (n. 51), p. 244. Cf. M.P. Speidel, *Commodus and the King of the Quadi*, Germania LXXVIII/1 2000, pp. 193–197, du diadème comme «ornement» du roi des Quades.

[55] Elles se rapportent au fait de la reconnaissance du roi Abgar par l'empereur, voir R. Martini (éd.), *Monetazione provinciale romana II. Collezione Winsemann Falghera*, Milano 1992, pars IV, *Gordianus Pius*, n° 2241–2247; S.K. Ross, *Roman Edessa. Politics and Culture of the Eastern Fringes of the Roman Empire, 114–242 CE.*, London–New York 2000, pp. 72–78, 145–158 et Appendix, fig. 1–2.

suchenden Kadmos und fasste mit diesem, voll Hinterlist, einen klüglichen Plan, ein Moirengespinst, dem Typhon zum Unheil. Und der Begleiter des Allherrschers Zeus, der Hüter der Ziegen, Pan, gab Kadmos Rinder und Schafe, auch Ziegen mit stolzen Hörnern, errichtete ihm auch schilfenem Flechtwerk ein Häuschen fest auf dem Boden verankert, und hüllte in Hirtengewänder schließlich ihn ein, verwandelte ihn durch täuschende Kleidung völlig zum Viehhüter. Niemand vermochte ihn mehr zu erkennen. Dann überreichte er Kadmos, dem Meister des Flötenspiels, eine tückische Syrinx: Sie sollte Verderben bringen dem Typhon[24].

Man kann kaum zweifeln, dass Typhon die oben dargestellte Situation als eine bukolische wahrnimmt. Den Augen des Monsters erscheint doch ein auf der Flöte spielender Hirte, der in einer wunderschönen, ländlichen Gegend neben dem aus Schilf geflochtenem Häuschen[25] an die Eiche gelehnt sitzt. Kadmos[26] – er ist nämlich der Hirte (I 369) – hütet seine aus Ziegen, Schafen und Vieh bestehende Herde (I 409–420):

... ὀξὺ δὲ τείνων
Κάδμος ὁμοφθόγγων δονάκων ἀπατήλιον ἠχώ,
κλίνας γείτονι νῶτον ὑπὸ δρυΐ φορβάδος ὕλης
καὶ φορέων ἄγραυλον ἀληθέος εἶμα νομῆος,
πέμπε Τυφαονίῃσι δολοπλόκον ὕμνον ἀκουαῖς
οἰδαλέῃ φύσημα παρηίδι λεπτὸν ἰάλλων.
ἔνθα Γίγας φιλάοιδος ἐχιδναίῳ ποδὸς ὁλκῷ
ἄνθορεν εἰσαΐων δόλιον μέλος· ἔνδοθι δ' ἄντρου
ὅπλα Διὸς φλογόεντα λιπὼν παρὰ μητέρι Γαίῃ
τερψινόου σύριγγος ἐδίζετο γείτονα μολπὴν
ἑσπόμενος μελέεσσιν· ἰδὼν δέ μιν ἐγγύθι λόχμης
Κάδμος, ἅτε τρομέων, ὑπὸ ῥωγάδι κεύθετο πέτρῃ.

Kadmos indessen begann durchdringend sein Spiel auf der Flöte
fügsam dem listigen Auftrag, gelehnt in der Waldtrift an einen
Eichenstamm, glaubhaft ein Hirte in seiner ganzen Erscheinung,
sandte zum Ohre Typhons die tückisch bezaubernde Weise,
blies in das schmächtige Rohr mit aufgeplusterten Backen.

---

[24] Nonnos, *Werke im zwei Bänden*, aus dem Griechischen übertragen von D. Ebener, Berlin–Weimar 1985, S. 15 f. Alle folgenden Nonnos-Übersetzungen stammen aus diesem Buch.

[25] In seinem Kommentar zur Stelle unterstreicht F. Vian (*Les Dionysiaques*, texte établi et traduit par..., T. I: *Chants I–II*, Paris 1976, S. 158), dass solche Häuschen von den Hirten in Kilikien, wo der Kampf zwischen Zeus und Typhon stattgefunden haben soll, wirklich benutzt wurden.

[26] Diese Haltung ist für einen Hirten in der bukolischen Dichtung typisch, s. F. Tissoni, *Nonno di Panopoli, Le Dionisiache II (Canti 13–24)*, Milano 1999, S. 170 (Kommentar zur St.): „Si tratta di un atteggiamento tipico del pastore nella poesia bucolica, vd. ad es. Theocr. 1.12 sg. E 21; 3.38; 7.132–4 e Long. Soph. 1.13"; Vian, *o.c.* (Anm. 25), S. 160: „Attitude traditionelle du Berger musicien: cf. Théocr., 1, 12s., 21; 3, 38; 7, 132–134 ; Virg., Buc., 1, 1; 8; Longus 1,13,4; 1,27, 2; 2, 5, 3; 2, 38, 3".

one. There is also a problem with the interpretation of bull-leaping, but finally R.–M. suggest some form of human sacrifice (pp. 84, 93). The wall paintings, especially the famous one of the New Palace period, as well as ivory artefacts of the acrobatic bull, may depict rituals possibly linked with the God of Storm, a hypothesis supported, to some extent, by written and iconographical evidence recovered in the neighbouring Hittite Anatolia. "What evidence is there [...] for royalty" (p. 93) in Crete prior to 1450 BC, except for palaces and Homeric poems? It seems that still mainly the type of palace calls for the existence of a monarch of some sort. This structure indicates the activity of officials of higher and lower rank, who administrated on behalf of the king. This is also known, *inter alia* thanks to the Linear B script, from the Mycenaean "palace states". Additionally, the Hittite Kingdom and pharaonic Egypt can be used as reliable analogies. "No one knows" (p. 95) whether the Mycenaeans were autochthons or intruders. It seems that the Indo-European Mycenaeans arrived in the area of Greece at the end of the Early Bronze Age and/or in the course of the 2nd millennium BC. They spoke early Greek language (so-called Achean dialect); from around the middle of the 2nd millennium BC the Linear B syllabic script was used to write it down. However, a problem still unsolved is how many waves of migration there were and from where the Mycenaeans came. There is also a tendency to call the Mycenaean civilization barbaric and the Mycenaeans barbarians (p. 95, 107). It is hard to agree with this, even if one compares the Mycenaean world with the more sophisticated cultures of Crete, the Near East and Egypt; in my opinion, contrary to the authors' standpoint, due to the lack of a script Troy did not reach a higher level of development than the Mycenaeans. However, any comparisons of the level of development are of secondary value; more important are the originality, separateness and achievements of the Mycenaean civilization. These people, who for instance created fortified citadels, irrigation systems, terraces, roads and bridges, monumental sepulchral architecture furnished with magnificent goods, art, handicrafts, well organized state and administration, as well as the Linear B script, cannot be regarded as barbarians. Obviously, these innovations resulted from, *inter alia*, access to the existing hinterland with its resources (water, arable land, wood, stone, metals, clay, etc.) and they were proportional to it. The Treasury of Atreus at Mycenae has been classified as a *tholos* tomb (pp. 104, 108). However, such a structure, built partly into the slope of the hill, is named a domed tomb. *Tholoi* (Gr. 'round buildings') are free standing community vaulted tombs known, for instance, from the Mesara Plain in Crete. Also, the opinion that "Heinrich Schliemann [...] discovered the legendary site of Troy" (p. 163) is far from the truth. At least one individual, namely Frank Calvert, dug the Hissarlik hill earlier than Schliemann with full consciousness that this was Troy. The German explorer was the first to excavate the site, thanks to his huge fortune, on a much larger scale.

Chapter 7 (pp. 139–149) contains very useful comments first of all on the Palaeolithic and Neolithic sites and artefacts kept also at the local museums. This contribution is especially valuable since access to many of these sites is usually more difficult than to the classical ones. Second, they are often laconically mentioned in guides dominated mainly by the Greek monuments. However, there are no precise maps, site plans or detailed directions for reaching sites off the main tourist routes.

The text also contains several minor inconsistencies and errors. The abbreviation BC as "before the common era" (p. XIII) is odd since in all dictionaries known to me it stands for "before Christ", but later (p. 161) there is "BC or BCE (before Christ or before the common era)". The number of surviving Neolithic *magoules* in the eastern part of Thessaly is differently stated, at one place as nearly 400 (p. 43), at another as more than 350 (p. 52). Instead of "the cultivation of [...] sheep, goats" (p. 88) should be the breeding, and Pausanius (p. 104) should be replaced by Pausanias.

The book seems popular and addressed mainly to non-archaeologists, but this does not exempt it from responsibility for expressed facts and views. On the contrary, by reaching a broad readership, it influences the knowledge and consciousness of the public. If this was the authors' intention, one would expect a more straightforward presentation of the topic.

Dariusz Maliszewski
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

RECHERCHES SUR L'ARTISANAT EN DACIE ROMAINE

Par

MATEUSZ ŻMUDZIŃSKI

La conquête de la Dacie par les Romains et les énormes changements qu'elle a entraînés ont ouvert cette nouvelle province aux immigrants comme une terre de grandes opportunités. Jusqu'à un certain point, on peut comparer la Dacie de cette époque à l'Eldorado qui, plusieurs siècles plus tard, allait lui aussi déplacer de nombreux audacieux pionniers. L'armée romaine fut bientôt suivie sur le territoire dace par des civils, marchands, paysans et artisans, qui comptaient y trouver un sort meilleur et une amélioration de leur statut social. Ils espéraient, à raison d'ailleurs, que les armées cantonnées dans ce pays représenteraient pour eux un important marché, et que les nouvelles villes fondées leur offriraient la possibilité de compter parmi les meilleurs spécialistes de leur secteur d'activité. Ils espéraient aussi que leur initiative leur apporterait la richesse. Malgré le climat austère et les montagnes inhospitalières, on vit donc arriver sur ces terres des immigrants des régions parfois les plus éloignées de l'empire. Ils amenaient avec eux non seulement leurs outils, mais aussi leurs qualifications et les traditions de leur métier. C'est ainsi que la Dacie romaine devint une sorte de creuset dans lequel se mêlèrent les ressources humaines les plus diverses correspondant à toute la panoplie des métiers. Depuis le tout début des recherches sur l'artisanat romain en Dacie, on s'est penché sur un ensemble d'inscriptions, d'ateliers, d'outils, de matériel de production mis à jour par les archéologues, ainsi que de produits préfabriqués et de produits finis (Christescu 1929: 58–95). Ces sources se complètent mutuellement, et grâce au long travail patient et minutieux des chercheurs roumains, on peut aujourd'hui essayer d'esquisser une image de ce secteur de l'activité économique sur le territoire qui nous intéresse. Étant donné l'ampleur de la question et le nombre impressionnant d'objets découverts, je les présenterai en me limitant à quelques exemples choisis plus significatifs. Une publication comprenant l'inventaire complet de ces découvertes et leur commentaire dépasserait largement le cadre de ce bref article.

La métallurgie est l'une des branches les mieux connues de cet artisanat. Les fouilles archéologiques ont permis entre autres de localiser plusieurs ateliers

it corroborates the view that *quaestura* probably existed as late as the end of the sixth century.

Apart from legal sources there is also other evidence that Justinian's quaestor did not performed civil duties only, but also military ones.

The first quaestor of the army, Bonus (Hartmann 1899a; Stein 1919b: 167; *PLRE* III a: *Bonus* 1), was later a military commander in Italy in 552?–553, as testified by the Byzantine historian Agathias Scholastikos (Agath. *Hist.* I 19, 1][27]. Agathias calls Bonus στρατήγος ἐκ Μύσιας and describesd him as a man who was experienced in civil and in military matters. Therefore Bonus was, in the eyes of Agathias, a military officer, commander of forces in Moesia, which was not simply his homeland as the expression ἐκ Μυσίας can also be understood. The term στρατηγός was in the sixth century a Greek equivalent for the Latin term *magister militum* (master of soldiers)[28]. There was no officer called *magister militum per Moesiam* in the Roman army and therefore most scholars are convinced that Bonus had been quaestor of the army before he was sent to Italy[29]. We can doubt, however, if Bonus *quaestor exercitus* in 536–537 and Bonus, στρατήγος in 552?–553 were the same person. Taking into consideration the small number of the Roman officials, the standpoint that Bonus in 536–537 and Bonus in 553 were identical can be correct[30]. However it is not excluded that in the period of almost twenty years there were two στρατηγοί ἐκ Μυσίας bearing the same name[31]. What is more, high Roman officers – and the *quaestor exercitus* was one of them – were not appointed for a long time in general (e.g. Kelly 2004: 44 ff.). So, the long quaestorship of Bonus between 536 and 552

---

[27] About Agathias see e.g. Cameron 1970; Baldwin 1977.

[28] Hanton 1927/1928: 126 f.; Guilland 1967b: esp. 385 ff.; Guilland 1976b; Demandt 1970: esp. 750; Durliat 1979: esp. 320; Zahariade 1988: 45; Kazdhan 1991b. About military terminology in Agathias see Müller 1912.

[29] For the post of *magister militum per Moesiam* argued Diehl 1901: 225. His opinion was first followed by Stein 1919a. But contrary and correctly Stein 1919b: 166. He proved that Bonus was a *quaestor exercitus* and his opinion is generally accepted. See also J. Martindale, in: *PLRE* III b: 240 f.: "He [Bonus] was in Italy in 553 and apparently still held this office [*quaestura exercitus*]". J.D. Frendo in his translation of Agathias contrary to the Greek text even: "Bonus, the *quaestor* of Moesia" (p. 27). More correct is M.V. Levčenko in his Russian translation of Agathias: "Бона – стратига из Мезии ("Bonus – strategos of Moesia", p. 30). Torbatov 1997: 84 translated the passage: "strategus Bonos from Mysia". He stressed that the passage does not render evidence about the functioning of *quaestura exercitus* in 553 but only that Bonus could have been the former quaestor.

[30] According to Jones 1964: 594 there were about 100 imperial officers in each province. Ausbüttel 1998: 160 f. points out that their numer increased to about 230 in the fifth century. Total number of emperor's officers in the beginning of the sixth century could be more than 30,000–35,000. See Kelly 2004: 111.

[31] We know also another Bonus from the same period who was not a quaestor of the army for sure (see below).

einen Platz am Himmel als Gestirn schenken wird. Der Hirte als Genosse des Typhon am Himmel könnte auch, wenn er möchte, eine der alten jungfräulichen Göttinnen als Gemahlin nehmen. Die einzige, die ihm nicht gegeben werden kann, ist Hera, die von Typhon genommen wird. Das Monster geht in seinen Versprechungen noch weiter: Er ist willig dem Hirten den Ziegenfellschild des Kroniden zu schenken und auch seine Familie (z. B. den Bruder) reich zu beschenken (I 445–480).

In seiner Rede vermag der Typhon noch eine weitere Textebene zu gestalten. Das Monster schafft nämlich in seinen Wünschen und seiner Vorstellungskraft ein zukünftiges Königreich, in dem eine ganz neue, von ihm in der Rede zu Kadmos detailliert dargestellte Weltordnung herrschen sollte (I 445 ff.).

Die Leser sind sich selbstverständlich dessen bewusst, dass dieser ‚freundschaftliche' Agon nur in Typhons Bewusstsein möglich ist. In der Realität tritt der Agenorsohn zwar in den Wettbewerb mit Typhon, hat aber ganz andere Hintergedanken. Auch die Preise sind ganz anders als sie das Monster darstellt. Die Belohnung ist nicht ein schöner Becher, wie bei Theokritus (Idylle 1), und auch nicht die Ehre auf dem Firmament zu wohnen, wie es Typhon vorschlägt, sondern das Lenken des gesamten Weltalls. Es muss auch ein anderer interessanter Aspekt dieses Wettgesanges unterstrichen werden: der ‚gefälschte Hirte' kämpft nicht, um einen Preis für sich selbst zu gewinnen, sondern für einen anderen – für Zeus. Bemerkenswert ist auch, dass Nonnos hier ein Mittel benutzt, das an das bekannte *qui pro quo* aus der neuen Komödie erinnert. Einer der Wettgesangsteilnehmer – Typhon – tritt im Wettbewerb um das eigene Leben an, obwohl er davon überzeugt ist, dass gerade er im Wettbewerb die Preise verteilt und über die Regeln entscheidet. Die Leser sehen diese Diskrepanz natürlich von Anfang an. Es muss noch gesagt werden, dass der dritte, ganz versteckte Kampfteilnehmer Eros ist. Gerade er ermöglicht mit seiner Macht, dass sich Ζεὺς νόθος (I 295) – Zeus-Bastard (so wird Typhon von Nonnos bezeichnet) – überhaupt nicht von der süßen Melodie bezaubern lässt. Diesem Thema werde ich etwas später genauer nachgehen.

Über den Agon wird noch einmal später gesprochen, wenn Kadmos vor Typhon damit prahlt, dass er in einem Musikwettstreit Apollo besiegt hat (I 489 ff.). Diese Prahlerei hat nur einen Zweck – das Monster dazu zu bringen, die Sehnen von Zeus an Kadmos weiterzugeben. Ein weiterer Gesangswettbewerb zwischen Kadmos und Apollo soll nach Typhons Sieg über Zeus stattfinden. Zeus' Helfer versprechen dann, dem Erdensohn einen Lobgesang zu singen, um ihn von seinen ‚guten' Absichten zu überzeugen.

Die Leser wissen jedoch sehr genau, dass die oben erwähnten Wettstreite nur eine Phantasieerfindung sind – eine Lüge, um das Monster zu überlisten. Typhon aber glaubt an diesen Musikwettbewerb, womit er sich selbst ins Verderben stürzt. Man muss noch unterstreichen, dass in der besprochenen Idylle auch die Hirtengötter Pan und Eros eine Rolle spielen. Pan hilft Kadmos, sich in einen

Eos XCII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

NONNOS' SPIEL MIT DEN GATTUNGEN IN DEN *DIONYSIAKA* (DARGESTELLT ANHAND VON I 362–534)

Von

ANNA LASEK

Schon der deutsche Philologe Wolfgang Fauth sagte es sehr treffend: „Die klassischen Philologen haben mit dem Riesenepos des Nonnos seit jeher ihre liebe Not gehabt“[1]. Es fehlen jegliche äußeren Zeugnisse zu Nonnos' Biographie und Werk. Fast alle Informationen, die wir über den Dichter und sein immenses Epos besitzen, wurden aus seinen Werken gewonnen. Alles spricht jedoch dafür, dass Nonnos in Panopolis, heute Achmin, in Oberägypten geboren wurde und Anfang des 5. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. in Alexandria zuerst ein Heldengedicht mit dem Titel *Dionysiaka* und später eine Umdichtung des Johannesevangeliums in Hexametern schuf[2]. Die in 48 Büchern verfassten *Dionysiaka* – eine epische Darstellung des Lebens, der Taten und der Apotheose des Dionysos – wird mit Recht das letzte große Epos der altgriechischen Literatur genannt. Nonnos hat die *Dionysiaka* nicht vollendet; ob der Tod oder andere Umstände (z. B. Übertritt zum Christentum) den Dichter daran hinderten, wissen wir nicht[3].

Bemerkenswert ist auch die Arbeitsweise des Epikers: als *poeta doctus* zog er in sein Werk direkt oder indirekt Anleihen und Anregungen aus nahezu

---

[1] W. Fauth, *Eidos Poikilon. Zur Thematik der Metamorphose und zum Prinzip der Wandlung aus dem Gegensatz in den Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis*, Göttingen 1981 (Hypomnemata 66), S. 11.

[2] Zu dem hochumstrittenen Thema der Chronologie äußerten sich z. B. P. Friedländer, *Die Chronologie des Nonnos von Panopolis*, Hermes XLVII 1912, S. 43–59, und H. Wójtowicz, *Studia nad Nonnosem*, Lublin 1980, S. 23.

[3] H. Bogner, *Die Religion des Nonnos von Panopolis*, Philologus XCIX 1934, S. 320 f.: „Wenn man also an eine Konversion des Nonnos glaubt, so muß man annehmen, daß er bei seiner Hinwendung zum Christentum das große Epos unvollendet liegen ließ; wenn man ihn von vornherein als einen Christen betrachtet, so bleibt die Möglichkeit, daß er gleichzeitig an beiden Werken arbeitete“, oder V. Stegemann, *Astrologie und Universalgeschichte. Studien und Interpretationen zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis*, Leipzig–Berlin 1930, S. 209: „Ich teile die allgemeine Ansicht, daß der Dichter Christ geworden ist“.

propagandiste avec une caractéristique ou un commentaire d'événements joint à la symbolique de l'image et à la brève inscription, ne permet pas de mener une étude analytique de la réalité des barbares, de la barbarie et de « la barbarologie » comme l'a par exemple fait Y.A. Dauge dans son livre sur le contenu des sources littéraires. Il souligne l'essence de la notion de *barbarus*. À partir de l'analyse de qualifications étroites et de descriptions plus larges, il élabore cinq caractéristiques de base: *feritas*, *vanitas*, *ferocia*, *belli furor*, *discordia*[82]. Il serait difficile d'établir un tel catalogue de caractéristiques de ces ennemis de l'Empire romain sur la base des portraits de barbares dans l'iconographie monétaire. Leurs représentations ne sont mis en relief qu'à travers un contraste entretenu avec les représentants du côté romain. Autant l'analyse des sources écrites révèle une description des barbares dans les détails – Michel Dubuisson constate que la représentation de leurs traits négatifs intensifie, par le contraste, les traits positifs des Romains[83] – autant, dans le cas des sources numismatiques, il faudra constater le contraire. Les représentations monétaires caractérisent la *virtus* du souverain romain, son combat et ses effets; à savoir une victoire militaire contre les représentants du monde extérieur. Ces mêmes représentations de la propagande impériale montrent des ennemis se défendant maladroitement et inefficacement face à l'action de l'empereur. Leur combativité s'avère de moindre valeur que les qualités militaires des Romains[84]. L'arme des barbares, inutile à présent, repose par terre devant le combattant vaincu, ou alors elle est placée sous le trophée. Même quand les barbares sont représentés en plus grand nombre que les Romains, comme par exemple à six contre deux empereurs romains sur les médaillons de Numérien, du type *VIRTVS AVGVSTORVM*, cela n'exprime pas leur courage[85]. Dans la dialectique de la confrontation Barbare/Romain les qualités guerrières sont bien entendu attribuées au profit de Rome. C'est l'empereur qui est *invictus*[86] et *victoriosus semper*[87]. En concluant, nous pouvons établir que l'antithèse de *virtus Romana* est le monde des barbares dans lequel la *virtus* est inexistante.

On constate la cristallisation d'une nouvelle conception de « la barbarie » exprimée dans l'œuvre d'art officielle des Romains, du temps du règne de Marc-Aurèle. En analysant les scènes reproduites sur la colonne de Marc-Aurèle et

---

[82] Dauge, *o.c.* (n. 2), pp. 413–449.

[83] Dubuisson, *o.c.* (n. 57), pp. 92–95.

[84] Ainsi que dans les écrits antiques, même si les auteurs remarquent la v*irtus* des barbares, ils dédaignent sa signification, du reste, leurs caractéristiques négatives sont plus importantes; cf. Dauge, *o.c.* (n. 2), pp. 247–266, 534–544; Salmon, *A propos du refus...* (n. 57), pp. 73–78; Mattern, *o.c.* (n. 9), pp. 202–206.

[85] Gnecchi I, p. 11, n° 1, pl. 4,7; II, p. 123, n° 12; *RIC* V/2 *Numerianus*, n° 401; Pink, *Die Medaillonsprägung unter Carus*... (n. 31), p. 559, n° 14.

[86] *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 451–456; *RIC* V/2 *Victorinus*, n° 9; Schulte *Victorinus*, n° 28.

[87] *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 143–144, 224.

Benea 2004: D. Benea, *Die römischen Perlenwerkstätten aus Tibiscum*, Timişoara 2004.
Benea, Crînguş, Regep-Vlascici, Stefănescu 2006: D. Benea, M. Crînguş, S. Regep-Vlascici, S. Stefănescu 2006, *Arta şi tehnica emailului în Dacia Romană*, Timişoara 2006.
Benea, Petrovszky 1987: D. Benea, R. Petrovszky, *Werkstätten zur Metallbearbeitung in Tibiscum im 2. und 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Germania LXV 1987, pp. 228–239.
Cociş 1986: S. Cociş, *Fibulele emailate din Dacia romană*, Apulum XXXII 1986, pp. 159–168.
Cociş 1995: S. Cociş, *Ateliere de bronzieri din Dacia romană*, Acta Musei Napocensis XXXII 1995, pp. 383–391.
Cociş 2004: S. Cociş, *Fibulele din Dacia romană*, Cluj-Napoca 2004.
Ciugudean 1997: D. Ciugudean, *Obiecte din os, corn şi fildeş de la Apulum*, Alba Iulia 1997.
Christescu 1929: V. Christescu, *Viaţa economica a Daciei romane*, Pitesti 1929.
Gramatopol 1973: M. Gramatopol, *Romula et la gliptique du bas Danube*, Apulum XI 1973, pp. 177–184.
Grec 1988: M. Grec 1988, *Materialul tegular militar din Dacia Porolissensis*, Cluj-Napoca 1988 (tapuscrit).
Gudea 1984: N. Gudea, *Import und Erzeugung von TS-Keramik in den dakischen Provinzen*, Acta RCRF XXIII–XXIV 1984, pp. 81–98.
Isac, Cociş 1995: D. Isac, S. Cociş, *Fibulele din castrele romane de la Gilău şi Caşeiu. O analiză de context stratigrafic*, Ephemeris Napocensis V 1995, pp. 103–127.
Jude 1972: M.M. Jude, *Monumentele funerare de la Potaissa*, Acta Musei Napocensis IX 1972, pp. 497–489.
Lipovan 1984: I.T. Lipovan, *Officina caramistului Gaius Iulius Proclus la Ampelum*, Annarul Institutului de Istorie şi Arheologie Cluj-Napoca XXVI 1984, pp. 301–317.
Milea, Bărbulescu 1972: Z. Milea, M. Bărbulescu, *Capiteluri romane din Potaissa*, Acta Musei Napocensis IX 1972, pp. 437–483.
Mitrofan 1996: I. Mitrofan, *Le centre céramique de Micasăsa*, Cluj-Napoca 1996.
Mrozek 1966: S. Mrozek, *Stosunki społeczne w rzymskich kopalniach złota w Dacji w II wieku naszej ery*, Toruń 1966.
Pantazi 1998: A. Pantazi, *Aspecte gliptici din Dacia romană*, Ziridava XXI 1998, pp. 43–51.
Pop 1999–2000: C. Pop, *Arta provincională a Daciei romane. Particularităţi novatoare*, Ephemeris Napocensis IX–X 1999–2000, pp. 169–178.
Radeanu, Cociş 1999–2000: V. Radeanu, S. Cociş, *Un nou atelier de fibule din Dacia romană: Micia*, Sargetia XXVIII–XXIX 1999–2000, 1, pp. 205–209.
Rusu-Bolineţ 2001: V. Rusu-Bolineţ, *La céramique estampillée de Napoca*, Acta RCRF XXXVII 2001, pp. 177–190.
Schulz-Falkenthal 1974: H. Schulz-Falkenthal, *Handwerkkollegien und andere Berufsgenossenschaften in den römischen Rhein-Oberdonauprovinzen*, Altertum XX 1974, pp. 25–33.
Stănescu 2003: A. Stănescu, *Monumentul funerar: text şi imagine*, dans: *Funeraria Dacoromana. Arheologia funerară a Daciei romane*, éd. M. Bărbulescu, Cluj-Napoca 2003.
Stoicovici 1978: E. Stoicovici, *Atelier de sticlă rubin la Dierna (Orşova)*, Acta Musei Napocensis XV 1978, pp. 245–250.
Timoc 1998: C. Timoc, *Un tipar pentru turnat lingouri de metal de la Porolissum*, Ziridava XXI 1998, pp. 50–54.
Tudor 1967: D. Tudor, *Pietre gravate descoperite la Romula*, Apulum VI 1967, pp. 223–229.
Ţeposu-Marinescu 1977: L. Ţeposu-Marinescu, *Probleme de artă provincională romana (I). Edicule funerare din Dacia*, Muzeul Naţional IV 1977, pp. 13–22.
Ţeposu-Marinescu 1982: L. Ţeposu-Marinescu, *Funerary Monuments in Dacia Superior and Dacia Porolissensis*, Oxford 1982 (British Archaeological Reports, International Series 128).
Wollmann 1996: V. Wollmann, *Mineritul, metalifer, extragerea sării şi carierele de piatră în Dacia romană*, Cluj-Napoca 1996.

In der irrealen Fallsetzung, mit welcher das erste Gedicht endet, bekundet sich deutliche Imitation von Straton *AP* XII 207:

ἐχθὲς λουόμενος Διοκλῆς ἀνενήνοχε σαύραν
ἐκ τῆς ἐμβάσεως τὴν Ἀναδυομένην.
ταύτην εἴ τις ἔδειξεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τότ' ἐν Ἴδῃ,
τὰς τρεῖς ἂν ταύτης προκατέκρινε θεάς.

Die charakteristische motivische Gemeinsamkeit besteht vor allem darin, daß bestimmte Körperteile (eine σαύρα bzw. drei πυγαί) mit den Göttinnen beim Parisurteil verglichen werden. Bei Straton evoziert der situationsbedingte Anblick dieser σαύρα eine Assoziation mit dem Parisurteil: Dem „Richter" wird unterstellt, er hätte diese gegenüber den drei von ihm zu beurteilenden Göttinnen praeferiert. Damit wird ein punktuell einwirkender Eindruck durch eine mythologische Reflexion entfaltet. Diese Reflexion empfängt ihre Würze besonders dadurch, daß dem Schönheitsrichter Paris die homosexuelle Disposition von Stratons Ich einfach untergeschoben wird.

Im ersten ausgeschrieben Gedicht des Rufinus ist die Situation ungleich komplexer: Nicht der zufällige Anblick einer oder mehrerer weiblicher πυγαί evoziert eine mythologische Reflexion, sondern der Sprecher findet sich in einer Parallelsituation zum mythischen Paris: Er ist zum Schiedsrichter einer Schönheitskonkurrenz bestimmt worden. Damit fehlt zunächst einmal notwendig die besondere Pointe bei Straton, die darin besteht, daß Paris zum Knabenliebhaber gemacht wird. In der Schlußaussage „Wenn Paris diese πυγαί gesehen hätte, so hätte er sie den göttlichen vorgezogen" wird die Schlußpointe des Straton-Epigramms reproduziert, die freilich bei drei πυγαί matter wirkt als bei einer σαύρα. Vor allem aber hat der Dichter offenbar vergessen, daß er sein Ich nicht nur als Bewunderer weiblicher πυγαί, sondern als Schönheitsrichter in einer bestimmten Konkurrenz eingeführt hat. Damit, daß die πυγαί der drei Damen denen der Göttinnen vorzuziehen wären, wird ihnen zwar ein hübsches Kompliment gemacht, aber der Leser kann daraus nicht ableiten, wie sich das dichterische Ich in der anfangs exponierten Situation der Schönheitskonkurrenz verhalten hat.

Dieses „Defizit" des ersten Gedichts hat Straton in dem folgenden offenbar korrigiert: Hier wird am Ende nicht gesagt, was Paris in der Rolle dieses neuen Schiedsrichters getan hätte, sondern das Verhalten des dichterischen Ichs wird als eine kluge vom Schicksal des mythischen Paris abgeleitete Lehre dargestellt (wohl nach einer anderen Quelle: Page z. St. verweist auf Diog. Laert. II 67). Indem sich Rufinus hier deutlich von seinem Vorbild Straton (das nur noch im jeweils mit τὰς τρεῖς beginnenden Schlußpentameter spürbar ist) entfernt, gelingt es ihm (anders als im ersten Gedicht) endlich, der von ihm selbst exponierten neuen Rolle des dichterischen Ichs als Schiedsrichter in einer Schönheitskonkurrenz gerecht zu werden.

processus consularis[77]. Et plus souvent encore, comme un fond anonyme sur lequel s'accomplie la *victoria Augusti*[78] ainsi que la *virtus Augusti*[79]. Ces représentations, surtout à la deuxième moitié du III siècle, sont devenues presque omniprésentes.

La présentation des barbares comme ennemis est symptomatique. Aussi bien à l'époque des Antonins que pendant les années de la crise du III siècle, il importe de souligner l'absence de représentations monétaires qui signaleraient des exemples de bravoure guerrière des barbares et leurs traits positifs. Leur portrait est très schématisé et comporte exclusivement des caractères négatifs. Il en est de même pour les descriptions des barbares dans la littérature romaine[80], ou leurs représentations dans les œuvres d'art officielles[81]; les représentants du monde extérieur à l'Empire sont exposés comme des ennemis des Romains sur la base d'un contraste qui fait ressortir les traits et les caractéristiques de chacun des deux côtés. Cette spécificité des sources numismatiques qui répond à une volonté idéologico-

---

[77] P.ex. *RIC* IV/3 *Philip II*, n° 237; *RIC* V/1 *Valerianus*, n° 231; Gnecchi II, p. 105, n° 5–6, pl. 112, 8; Göbl 2000, n° 813, 839; *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 245–246; *RIC* V/2 *Postumus*, n° 3; Schulte *Postumus*, n° 43–46.

[78] P.ex. *RIC* V/1 *Valerianus*, n° 21, 260, 288–290; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Joint Reign*, n° 38; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° 80, 85, 399, 520, 526; Göbl 2000, n° 113, 842, 953–955, 1565; *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 55, 72–73, 96, 354; Göbl 1993, n° 126, 139, 135A, 321; S. Estiot, *L'or romain entre crise et restitution, 270–276 ap. J.-C., I. Aurélien*, JS janvier–juin 1999, n° 50, 54–57, 62–64; *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 11, 271, 291, 423–424, 599–600, 898; *RIC* V/2 *Carus*, n° 18–19, 23–26; *RIC* V/2 *Carinus*, n° 204; *RIC* V/2 *Numerianus*, n° 358, 443; *RIC* V/2 *Tetricus I*, n° 33–34; Schulte *Tetricus I*, n° 19.

[79] P.ex. *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Joint Reign*, n° 38, 53–55, 64; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° nr 88, 149, 312–315, 323, 378, 403, 529–530a, 538, 589–593, 674–675; Göbl 2000, n° 779, 890, 896, 965–969, 1405–1406, 1450, 1555; *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 15, 99, 181–183, 210, 316–318; Göbl 1993, n° 127, 164–166, 252, 337A; Estiot, *L'or*... (n. 78), n° 51, 58–60, 90–91, 98, 102, 125–136, 160; *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 12–13, 54–56, 225, 233, 235, 243, 283–287, 312, 319, 446–450, 602–605, 803–822, 877–889, 899–900, 912–913; Pink, *Die Medaillonsprägung unter Kaiser*... (n. 71), p. 24 et suiv., n° 38–41; *RIC* V/2 *Carinus*, n° 169–170, 287; *RIC* V/2 *Numerianus*, n° 398–399; *RIC* V/2 *Postumus*, n° 94, 181–182, 185, 252, 331–332; Schulzki *Postumus*, n° 104–105; Schulte *Victorinus*, n° 56.

[80] Par exemple, Tacite était convaincu de la supériorité des Romains, il a lancé l'idéologie de la dominance des meilleurs, cf. p.ex. *Ann.* XIII 56, 1; G. Walser, *Rom, das Reich und die fremden Völker in der Geschichtsschreibung der frühen Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Tacitus*, Basel 1951, pp. 67–160. Dans la question de l'opposition de *virtus* des Romains/*ferocia* des Germains, K. Christ, *Germanendarstellung und Zeitverständnis bei Tacitus*, Historia XIV 1965, pp. 62–73.

[81] Voir p.ex. R. Vulpe, *Prigionieri romani suppliziati da donne dacie sul rilievo della Colonna Traiana*, RSA III 1973, pp. 109–125; I.M. Ferris, *Enemies of Rome, Barbarians Through Roman Eyes*, Stround 2000; idem, *The Hanged Men Dance: Barbarians in Trajanic Art*, dans: S. Scott, J. Webster (éds), *Roman Imperialism and Provincial Art*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 53–68; J. Coulston, *Overcoming the Barbarian. Depictions of Rome's Enemies in Trajanic Monumental Art*, dans: L. De Blois et al. (éds), *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power*, Amsterdam 2003, pp. 389–424.

dem gesamten poetischen Reservoir der griechischen Dichtung von Homer, Kallimachos, Apollonios bis zu Oppian und Claudian hinein[4]. Trotz allem blieb Nonnos durchaus ein sehr origineller Autor.

Mit dieser Arbeit möchte ich einen Beitrag zum Verständnis der breit diskutierten Frage der Komposition der *Dionysiaka* des Nonnos von Panopolis leisten[5]. Das wichtigste Ziel dieses Beitrages ist es, Nonnos' Spiel mit den literarischen Gattungen in seinem Epos zu verdeutlichen.

In der heutigen Literaturwissenschaft gibt es einen gewissen Grundkonsens darüber, dass die literarischen Gattungen eine gewisse Dynamik zeigen und jede Gattung einer permanenten Mutation unterworfen ist. Man spricht sogar von ‚Ordnungsrahmen', in denen Gattungen als komplexe Zeichensysteme stehen[6]. Es ist also klar, dass jeder Autor, der innerhalb der Tradition einer bestimmten Gattung seine Werke verfasst, zu ihrer Weiterentwicklung beiträgt, weil er den bisherigen Rahmen der Gattung verändert und erweitert, indem er neue, oft unerwartete Elemente mit traditionellen Motiven vermischt[7]. Auf diese Weise wird jedes neue Werk zur Aktualisierung einer bestimmter Gattung und entwirft immer wieder aufs Neue ihre Grenzen.

Dieses Phänomen lässt sich besonders deutlich in Nonnos' *Dionysiaka* nachweisen[8]. Schon beim flüchtigen Lesen wird deutlich, dass die Bezeichnung

---

[4] Die Quellen der *Dionysiaka* analysieren z. B. Wójtowicz, *o.c.* (Anm. 2), S. 34–74; R. Keydell, *Nonnos* 15, *RE* XVII 1 (1936), Sp. 906, sowie Stegemann, *o.c.* (Anm. 3), S. 6 ff.

[5] Mit diesem Problem haben sich bereits viele Wissenschaftler beschäftigt, nennenswerte Hypothesen haben u. a. P. Collart, *Nonnos de Panopolis. Études sur la composition et le texte des Dionysiaques*, Le Caire 1930; L.P. Chamberlayne, *A Study of Nonnus*, SPh XIII 1916, S. 40–68; Stegemann, *o.c.* (Anm. 3), S. 209–230; Keydell, *o.c.* (Anm. 4), Sp. 906, aufgestellt.

[6] S. K.-H. Stanzel, *Mimen, Miniepen und Minijamben – Theokrit, Herondas und die Kreuzung der Gattungen*, in: M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, Groningen 1998, S. 143: „In der modernen literaturwissenschaftlichen, vornehmlich komparatistisch orientierten Diskussion scheint ein gewisser Grundkonsens darüber erzielt, dass man literarischen Gattungen, will man ihnen nicht jede Existenzberechtigung absprechen, eine gewisse Dynamik zugestehen und bei jeder Gattung von einer permanenten Mutation ausgehen muss". W. Reible, *Was sind Gattungen? Eine Antwort aus semiotischer und textlinguistischer Sicht*, Poetica XII 1980, S. 320–349, hat die Gattungen als ein „komplexes System von Zeichen interpretiert, durch das ein gewisser Ordnungsrahmen aufgestellt wird". J. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics*, London 1975, S. 145–148, zitiert nach D.M. Halperin, *Before Pastoral, Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*, New Haven–London 1983, S. 77, gibt folgende Definition der literarischen Gattung: „Current view of genre as a system of conventions, or literary norms, which determine the form, content, style and diction of a work [...] (and) function as a code according to which the work is to be read and through which it becomes meaningful"; über das Phänomen der Kreuzung der Gattungen siehe auch das so betitelte Kapitel in: W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur,* Stuttgart, 1924, S. 202–224.

[7] S. Stanzel, *o.c.* (Anm. 6), S. 143.

[8] Vgl. B. Abel-Wilmanns, *Der Erzählaufbau der Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis*, Frankfurt a. M. 1977, S. 91. Für das Auftreten verschiedener Gattungen in den *Dionysiaka* siehe

> Als der Gigant, ein Freund der Musik[27], die schmeichelnden Klänge
> hörte, da bäumte er kriechend sich auf, ließ in der Höhle
> liegen die Waffen des Zeus bei Gaia, der göttlichen Mutter,
> suchte, den Klängen folgen, die Stelle, von der aus die Syrinx
> ihn durch ihr Spielen erfreute. Schon sah ihn, ganz nahe dem Walde Kadmos.

Von einem gut gebildeten Leser konnten in dem analysierten Text sicherlich noch mehr für die Hirtendichtung charakteristische Elemente wahrgenommen werden als von Typhon. Man kann sagen, dass für ihn die von Nonnos benutzte Gattungskonvention in dem besprochenen Text ziemlich eindeutig ist, weil er noch weitere für die Gattung typische Merkmale wahrnimmt:

1) Diese Epospassage wurde in einem daktylischen Hexameter verfasst. Der antiken Theorie nach gehört sie zum *genus mixtum*[28], weil es in ihr sowohl die Erzählung des Autors (I 362–377; 409–426; 481–485; 507–534) als auch Dialoge der Teilnehmer (Rede des Zeus I 378–408; Rede des Typhons I 427–480; Rede des Kadmos I 486–506) gibt.

2) Der besprochene Text erwähnt die für die bukolische Gattung typische schöne Landschaft (I 411). Es fehlen auch nicht andere charakteristische Genuselemente: ein Hirte mit seiner Herde (I 368 ff.; 427; 376; 513; interessant ist, dass sich Zeus selbst auch einen Hirten der Welt nennt I 389), Liebesmotive (I 525 ff.), Wetten im Flöten[29] und in Donnerspielen (vorgeschlagen von Typhon in I 439 ff). Es treten auch die Hirtengötter Eros und Pan (I 364; 378) auf.

Obwohl die Gattungskonvention scheinbar ganz erhalten bleibt, wird bei genauerer Textanalyse klar, dass der Dichter mit dem Leser ein Spiel spielt und ihn auf Abwege führt. Vor allem muss man merken, dass die besprochene Bukolik in der Wirklichkeit zwei Klassen von Adressaten hat, nämlich die innerhalb des Epos und die außerhalb des Epos. Es sind Typhon und andere in den *Dionysiaka* vorkommende Charaktere und die Leser. Jeder dieser Adressaten nimmt die oben dargestellte Situation unterschiedlich wahr. Es besteht eigentlich kein Zweifel, dass diese Idylle nur von dem Monster als eine wahre Idylle empfunden wird.

---

[27] So wurde das Adjektiv φιλάοιδος (I 415) übersetzt. Dieses Wort tritt sehr häufig in bukolischer Dichtung auf, wie Tissoni, *o.c.* (Anm. 26), S. 224, sagt.

[28] Nach der antiken Literaturtheorie, die wir dank der Scholiasten kennen, beinhaltet die Idylle die Elemente der drei Arten *diegematikon*, *dramatikon* und *mikton* und ist am einfachsten nach der heiteren Stimmung und beinhalteten Beschreibungen der ländlichen Gegend von anderen literarischen Gattungen zu unterscheiden. S. Ławińska-Tyszkowska, *o.c.* (Anm. 10), S. 34 ff.

[29] Dieses traditionelle, bukolische Motiv wird hier allerdings zu einem parodistischen Zweck verwendet, worauf F. Tissoni im seinem Kommentar zur St. aufmerksam macht: Tissoni, *o.c.* (Anm. 26), S. 225: „Tifone, oltre di essere ‚amatore del canto', si presenta ora addirittura come musicista [...] proponendo a Cadmo una vera e propria sfida musicale. Ne nasce così una divertente parodia di un topos caratteristico del genere bucolico: Tifone si atteggia come un pastore teocriteo che, incontrato per via un collega, non resiste alla tentazione di sfidarlo per dimonstrare la propria superiorità nel canto (cfr. Teocrito 6, 5; 8, 1; passim)".

Gesänge und Kommentare des Autors. Die dramatischen Komponenten – Dialoge und Monologe – überwiegen jedoch in den ‚wahren Bukoliken'[13].

In der Antike war die Idylle meistens ein kurzes, etwa 100 Verse langes Werk. Zu den charakteristischen Elementen der Bukolik gehören Liebesmotive und der Agon (Wettgesang) zwischen zwei Sängern[14] (zu den beliebten Themen gehören die unglückliche Liebe des Polyphems zu Galatea und die Daphnisgeschichte)[15].

Es ist bekannt, dass die Bukolik aus Volksliedern in engster Verbindung mit dem Artemiskultus entstanden sind[16], jedoch dienen die Gesänge, die in den literarischen Bukoliken zu finden sind, keinem Kultus mehr, obwohl die Sänger in beiden Fällen die gleichen Götter nennen (Dichtergötter: Apollo, Musen; Hirtengötter: Pan, Nymphen, Satyren; Liebesgötter: Aphrodite und Eros).

Die Passagen der *Dionysiaka*, die bukolischen Charakter aufweisen, sind nicht schwer im Epos zu finden[17]. In dem Werk Nonnos' befinden sich sowohl Stellen, die alle, oder beinahe alle für die Hirtendichtung charakteristischen Elemente beinhalten (Liebe, Agon, Gesänge, Hirten), als auch Stellen, wo nur einzelne bukolische Motive auftreten.

Die Passagen des Nonnosepos, die an die Hirtendichtung anknüpfen, können in drei Gruppen eingeteilt werden, wenn als entscheidendes Kriterium sowohl die Zahl der bukolischen Motive als auch die Stärke der Verbindung jeder analysierten Stelle mit der Hauptaktion der *Dionysiaka* genommen wird.

1) Zu der ersten Gruppe werden die Passagen der *Dionysiaka* gezählt, die alle oder fast alle die oben erwähnten für die Hirtendichtung charakteristischen Merkmale aufweisen. Diese Abschnitte sind außerdem ziemlich selbstständig, das heißt, sie sind deutlich von dem Epos zu trennen und sie wären auch außerhalb des *Dionysiaka*-Kontextes verständlich, obwohl sie sehr eng mit der Eposhandlung verbunden sind. Diese Passagen könnte man Idyllen nennen (I 462–534).

---

[13] Ibidem. Man muss aber dazu sagen, dass bei den Nachfolgern des Theokrit der Anteil der epischen Elemente zunimmt (Moschos), es erscheinen auch lyrische Komponenten wie Strophen, Refrains und Gesänge (Bion).

[14] E.G. Schmidt, *Bukolik*, *KlP* I (1964), Sp. 964: „Als lit. Gattung ist B. erst bei Theokrit nachweisbar. Sprecher und Handlungsträger innerhalb der einen Umfang von 150 Hexametern [...] kaum überschreitenden Gedichte sind Rinder- und Ziegenhirten. Wettgesänge und Lieder sind z. T. von Rahmenhandlung umgeben. Ziemlich konstant bleiben im Laufe der Gattungsgeschichte die Hirtennamen...".

[15] Z. B. Theocr. 1 und 7.

[16] G. Knaack, *Bukolik*, *RE* III 1 (1899), Sp. 998 ff.; Ławińska-Tyszkowska, *o.c.* (Anm. 10), S. 43 ff.

[17] Vgl. N. Hopkinson in der Einleitung zum Sammelband *Studies...* (Anm. 8), S. 3: „Pastoral is one of several easily recognisable elements in Nonnus' compendious epic"; Chamberlayne, *o.c.* (Anm. 5), S. 48: „More numerous and pervasive than the motives from any other author (except Homer) [*scil.* in den *Dionysiaka*] are those from the bucolic poets".

de l'ennemi/prisonnier dans le monnayage impérial référant à la crise du III siècle et dont l'origine remonte aux incessantes guerres menées contre les peuples barbares[12]. Par conséquent, les représentations monétaires comportaient avant tout les noms et les effigies de ces peuples, de leurs représentants et des pays avec lesquels les Romains étaient en guerres ou qui étaient engagés dans des guerres menées par ces derniers. En guise de compléments modestes à ces représentations monétaires, on retrouve des peuples qui dépendaient de l'*Imperium Romanum*, d'autres avec lesquels des pactes avaient été établis ou d'autres encore qui se sont placés sous la protection de l'Empire romain.

Les légendes des monnaies impériales définissaient parfois les habitants du *Barbaricum* en leur attribuant une «nominalisation». Les noms des peuples et des pays étrangers à l'Empire apparaissent cependant rarement seuls sur les monnaies émises à ces deux époques de l'histoire romaine. On remarquera néanmoins des différences notables. En effet, à l'époque des Antonins, on souligne l'apparition de dénominations dans les substantifs référents aux territoires habités par les peuples en question. Cela est réalisé de deux manières. Dans le premier modèle, on retrouve uniquement certains noms: *Armenia*[13], *Parthia*[14] ainsi que *Scythia*[15], alors que dans le deuxième, le nom est accompagné d'une épithète qui caractérise la dépendance et l'appartenance les territoires nouvellement acquis: *Dacia capta*[16], *Parthia capta*[17], *Germania subacta*[18], *Arabia adquisita*[19], *Armenia et Mesopotamia in potestatem pR redactae*[20]. Ainsi, à l'époque des Antonins, des *cognomina devictarum gentium* de l'empereur (surnoms de peuples vaincus) servaient d'identificateurs aux territoires du monde extérieur, à l'occasion de conquêtes et de batailles romaines: *Dacicus*[21] ou *Germanicus*[22], ou encore dans les

---

[12] A.A. Kluczek, *Empereur invaincu et barbares. Les représentations des barbares dans le monnayage romain de l'époque impériale (235–284 apr. J.-C.)* (sous presse).

[13] Gnecchi II, p. 45, n° 2–7, pl. 72, 2, 4–6; Strack III, n° 777; *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 78–86, 121–122a; *RIC* III *Lucius Verus*, n° 498–501, 507–509, 1364–1369; Szaivert, n° 61–62, 68–70, 89–90, 107, 1015, 1020–1021, 1042.

[14] Strack III, n° 791–792; *RIC* III *Antoninus Pius*, n° 586.

[15] Strack III, n° 795; *RIC* III *Antoninus Pius*, n° 588.

[16] Gnecchi III, p. 15, n° 7, pl. 143, 13; Strack I, n° 117, 156–158; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 96–99, 585, 620.

[17] Strack I, n° 247; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 324–325.

[18] Gnecchi II 27–28, 78, pl. 59, 9–10; *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 1021–1026, 1049–1057, 1094–1095; Szaivert, n° 241–242, 253–254, 271, 1055.

[19] Strack I, n° 174, 408–410, 422–423; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 94–95, 244–245, 465–468, 610–615. Pour A. Blanchet, *La figure de l'Arabie dans les monnaies de Trajan*, CRAI 1944, p. 230, l'épithète *adquisita* «est certainement moins forte que les adjectifs *capta et devicta*».

[20] Strack I, n° 472–474; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 642.

[21] Strack I, n° 64–67; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 73–76, 78.

[22] Gnecchi II, p. 28, n° 10; *RIC* III *Marcus Aurelius*, n° 1058–1062; Szaivert, n° 255.

sein angestrebtes Ziel zu erreichen. Kadmos betrügt von Anfang an viel. Angezogen wie ein Hirte betört er Typhon mit einer wunderschönen Melodie (I 415 ff.) und auch mit Hilfe des Eros, um Zeus das Wiedergewinnen der Weltherrschaft zu ermöglichen. Außerdem gewinnt Kadmos mit einer hinterlistigen Rede das Vertrauen des Monsters, um die von ihm geraubten Sehnen[23] des Zeus zu erheucheln. Diese List gelingt – Typhon gibt Kadmos diese Sehnen als Freundschaftsbeweis. Der gefälschte Hirt untersucht sie genau, als ob er sie wirklich für Leiersaiten nehmen wollte.

Später spielt er Syrinx, was Typhon so ablenkt, dass der Himmelskönig es schafft, seine himmlische Waffe zurückzugewinnen. Gerade in diesem Moment wird der Helfer des Zeus von einer Wolke zugedeckt, wodurch er vor der Rache des Monsters geschützt wird. Auf diese Art und Weise gewinnt der Götterkönig mit Kadmos' Hilfe wieder die Herrschaft über die Welt, wofür Kadmos mit der Hand von Harmonia, der Tochter von Ares und Aphrodite, belohnt wird.

Nonnos baut die analysierte Bukolik (I 362–534) in die Darstellung des Streits von Typhon und Zeus so ein, dass sie nicht nur zu einem unverzichtbaren, sondern sogar zum Hauptelement der Aktion wird. Der Dichter greift in dem von uns besprochenen Text ganz deutlich auf die bukolische Konvention zurück und häuft in einer relativ kurzen Beschreibung beinahe alle denkbaren mit der pastoralen Tradition in Verbindung stehenden Elemente, um für Typhon eine anscheinend vollkommene bukolische Umgebung zu schaffen (I 362–376):

οὐδὲ Τυφωεὺς
μέλλεν ἔτι κρατέειν Διὸς ἔντεα· τοξοφόρῳ γὰρ
Ζεὺς Κρονίδης σὺν Ἔρωτι πόλον δινωτὸν ἐάσσας
φοιταλέῳ μαστῆρι δι' οὔρεος ἤντετο Κάδμῳ
πλαζομένῳ, ξυνὴν δὲ πολύτροπον ἤρτυε βουλὴν
ῥαψάμενος Τυφῶνι δυσηλακάτου λίνα Μοίρης.
καὶ Διὶ παμμεδέοντι συνέμπορος αἰγίβοτος Πὰν
δῶκε βόας καὶ μῆλα καὶ εὐκεράων στίχας αἰγῶν·
πλέξας δ' ἐκ καλάμων καλύβην ἑλικώδει δεσμῷ
πῆξεν ὑπὲρ δαπέδοιο, καὶ ἀγνώστῳ τινὶ μορφῇ
ποιμενίην ἐσθῆτα καθαψάμενος χροΐ Κάδμου
εἵμασι μιμηλοῖσι νόθον χλαίνωσε νομῆα·
καὶ δολίην σύριγγα φέρων εἰδήμονι Κάδμῳ
δῶκε Τυφαονίοιο κυβερνήτειραν ὀλέθρου.
ψευδαλέον δὲ βοτῆρα καὶ ἡνιοχῆα γενέθλης

Typhon indessen
sollte nicht länger den Speer des Kroniden behalten – verließ doch
Zeus, von dem Schützen Eros begleitet, den Rundpol des Himmels.
Dabei begegnete er im Gebirge dem immer noch ruhlos

---

[23] Mehr zum Thema der Sehnen des Zeus siehe: M. Rocchi, *I „neura" di Zeus*, SMEA XXI 1980, S. 353–375.

et vestimentaire[57]. Cela concerne particulièrement les monnaies du siècle des Antonins, sur lesquelles on procédait à de telles techniques de personnification et représentation de certains peuples ou certains pays, surtout ceux de l'Est. À l'époque de la crise du III siècle ce type de caractéristique à travers des éléments ethnographiques était plus rare.

On procéda dans l'iconographie monétaire à la caractéristique du voisin de l'Est dotant sa silhouette par exemple de tiare, d'arc, de carquois[58]. L'Arménie est l'un de ces pays orientals, distingué par son «icône» représentée par une femme vêtue d'un pantalon, d'un chiton et d'une chemise à manches resserrée, coiffée d'une tiare. Parfois, elle est identifiée encore par un arc et un carquois. De tels détails permettent d'identifier le captif/ennemi arménien, un personnage assis sous le trophée ou attaqué par le souverain dans l'iconographie des médaillons de Lucius Verus; pourtant, cette identification n'est pas toujours mise en évidence par une légende[59]. De même dans le cas des émissions de Trajan, une représentation de femme portant un chiton court et une tiare évoque sans doute l'Arménie[60]. Dans le cas d'autres émissions encore de Trajan, une femme symbolisant la Parthie est représentée dans un chiton et un himation, avec un pantalon court et coiffée du bonnet conique[61]. De même que dans les émissions d'Antonin le Pieux – et malgré des manières idéalistes de représenter des personnifications géographiques dans son monnayage, on personnifie l'Arménie avec un diadème, une femme représentant la Parthie – avec *braccae*, un chiton, un arc et un carquois alors que la Scythie – avec *braccae*, un chiton et une arme évoquant une épée, ce qui semble-t-il fait allusion à la religion et aux traditions des habitants de la Scythie[62]. Ce type de différenciation

---

[57] À propos des stéréotypes des portraits étrangers dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine cf. P. Salmon, «*Racisme» ou refus de la différence dans le monde gréco-romain*, DHA X 1984, pp. 75–97; idem, *À propos du refus de la différence: l'image des peuples d'Asie Mineure à Rome*, Latomus LVI 1997, pp. 67–82; M. Dubuisson, *La vision romaine de l'étranger: stéréotypes, idéologie, mentalités*, Cahiers de Clio LXXXI 1985, pp. 83–90. Voir aussi J.P.V.D. Baldson, *Romans and Aliens*, London 1979, pp. 214–222; Mattern, *o.c.* (n. 9), pp. 66–80.

[58] Bieńkowski, *o.c.* (n. 3), pp. 33, 35; J.A. Garzón Blanco, *Iconografia numismática de las provincias asiáticas y africanas en Trajano, Adriano y Antonino Pio*, dans: *VIII Congreso Nacional de Numismática, Avilés 1–4 abril 1992*, Madrid 1994, p. 174; R.M. Schneider, *Die Faszination des Feindes. Bilder der Parther und des Orients in Rom*, dans: J. Wiesenhöfer (éd.), *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse*, Stuttgart 1998, pp. 95–146.

[59] P.ex. Gnecchi II, p. 45, n° 4–7, pl. 72, 4–6; p. 46, n° 13, pl. 72, 10; pp. 47 et suiv., n° 23–24, pl. 74, 8; p. 48, n° 28–30, pl. 75, 2–3; p. 49, n° 34–35, pl. 75, 6; p. 49, n° 39, pl. 75, 8–9; *RIC* III *Lucius Verus*, n° 502–506, 539–542, 547–548, 1429–1435, 1440–1447; Szaivert, n° 50–60, 112–114, 122–123, 1013, 1015, 1017–1018, 1026, 1029, 1042, 1044. Cf. Caló Levi, *o.c.* (n. 3), pp. 20 et suiv., n. 32; J.M.C. Toynbee, *The Hadrianic School, a Chapter in the History of Greek Art*, Roma 1967, p. 17.

[60] Strack I, n° 472–474; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 642. Por. Caló Levi, *o.c.* (n. 3), p. 20, n. 32; J.A. Ostrowski, *Personifikacje prowincji w sztuce rzymskiej*, Kraków 1985, pp. 76 et suiv.; Toynbee, *o.c.* (n. 59), p. 16; *contra* Strack I, pp. 223 et suiv.: c'est Mésopotamie.

[61] Strack I, n° 476; *RIC* II *Trajan*, n° 667–668.

[62] Amm. XXXI 2, 23. Cf. Toynbee, *o.c.* (n. 59), p. 151.

représentation de deux barbares: l'un avec la tête couverte constituant un élément oriental typique et l'autre portant une longue barbe identifié à un habitant des pays du Nord. La légende *VND(I)QVE VICTORES*, indique qu'il faut chercher le pays de ces protagonistes «partout»[72].

Deux types principaux de barbares se cristallisent ainsi dans l'iconographie monétaire impériale: le représentant du Nord – belliqueux, sévère, sauvage, ce qui est désigné symboliquement par une arme, mais aussi une longue barbe, de longs cheveux et sa nudité – et le représentant de l'Est – une complaisance au combat et un certain faste, ce qui est symbolisé par une arme et des éléments vestimentaires riches. Les détails ethnographiques sont pourtant peu nombreux ou alors la dimension trop petite de la silhouette du barbare met dans l'impossibilité de retrouver ces détails permettant une identification plus exacte. D'ordinaire – et surtout à la période de la crise du III siècle – les silhouettes des captifs ou des ennemis sont représentées sur les monnaies impériales d'une manière schématisée et on leur confère un caractère anonyme. Cela constituait une norme dans la représentation des barbares qui s'est largement respectée tout au long de l'histoire numismatique des Romains[73]. Dépourvus de traits ethniques individualisés, les barbares représentés dans le monnayage impérial perdent une certaine dimension historique et deviennent un symbole universel de l'ennemi ou du captif, symbole de la *victoria aeterna*[74].

On peut distinguer deux modèles sémantiques élémentaires de la représentation des barbares à travers l'iconographie des monnaies impériales. Dans le premier modèle, certains habitants de pays étrangers à l'Empire romain sont représentés comme des amis/dépendants, cela correspond à la période des Antonins; à l'époque de la crise du III siècle, la mention du «bon» voisin est absente. Dans le deuxième modèle, les habitants du *Barbaricum* sont représentés comme des ennemis, comme des prisonniers déjà vaincus ou encore comme faisant l'objet d'une agression romaine. Ils apparaissent au côté d'un trophée ou d'un monceau d'armes. Ils sont représentés comme un ennemi attaqué par l'empereur. Ils figurent à travers des scènes dans lesquelles l'*imperator* reçoit une couronne ou un globe de la divinité pour les avoir vaincus. Ils apparaissent comme des captifs dans la représentation d'un événement comme *adlocutio*[75], *adventus*[76] ou

---

[72] *RIC* V/2 *Numerianus*, n° 422–423. Cf. Caló Levi, *o.c.* (n. 3), p. 45.

[73] Voir p.ex. Bieńkowski, *o.c.* (n. 3), p. 5; G.G. Belloni, *Figure di stranieri e di Barbari nelle monete della repubblica romana*, dans: M. Sordi (éd.), *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell'antichità*, Milano 1979, p. 206.

[74] *RIC* IV/3 *Gordian III*, n° 154–156, 165–166, 337–338; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° 291. Cf. Picard, *o.c.* (n. 32), p. 469.

[75] P.ex. Gnecchi I, p. 9, n° 1; *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 320–322, 580–581.

[76] P.ex. Gnecchi I, p. 55, n° 1, pl. 27,10; Gnecchi II, p. 100, n° 3, pl. 109,10; *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, n° 551; Göbl 2000, n° 1422; *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 42–43; Göbl 1993, n° 108; *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 2, 19–20, 63–64, 133, 154–167, 624–636, 836–837, 903–904.

Baziór 1995; Curta 2002: 13 f.). Also numerous amphoras from Mediterranean provinces were discovered in the Lower Danube region, which were possibly used as containers for military *annona* transported by late Roman freighters[74].

As we can see, in the light of various data it still cannot be excluded that the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* was in fact not only a civil officer but also a military commander in the Lower Danube zone. In the beginning he was a real fourth praetorian prefect to whom military power was also given, in spite of the fact that the *praefectus praetorio* in later Roman empire was a civil officer[75]. The civil duties of the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* were probably gradually diminished[76], while his military prerogatives – maybe not very broad in the matter of command – were maintained in the course of the sixth century. The case of the quaestor of the army also points out that the "rules" applied in late Roman administration were much more flexible than some modern scholars, comparing them directly with the bureaucratic machinery of modern state and its legal system, are inclined to assume[77].

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

ABBREVIATIONS:

C.: *Codex Iustinianus* (P. Krueger [ed.], *CIC*, vol. II, , Berlin 1954).
CFHB: *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*.
CIC: *Corpus Iuris Civilis*.

α_το_/ [---] _νέ-/ [στησαν ---]/ ---. [---π]ππρ Νήσω[ν---]/ =. See here also Bresson, Drew, Bear 1997; Tatcheva 1999: 122; Sarnowski 2005. About late Roman *primipilares* cf. Dobson 1978: 139–145; Horstkotte 1988: 45–52. About *Dacia Ripensis* see Vetters 1950.

[74] See Karagiorgou 2001: esp. 133, 139, 146, 154; Curta 2001b: 186; 2002: 12 f., esp. n. 10–15 with bibliography about late Roman amphorae. Most common late antiquity freighters had around 75 tons cargo capacity. See e.g. Mc Cormick 2001: 95 f.

[75] See here also the case of the military officer called by modern scholars *ad hoc praefectus praetorio*, who was for sure a military commander. Cf. Jones 1964: 628; Kaegi 1981: 309–311; Mac Geer 1991.

[76] On the contrary the position of *praefecus praetorio per Orientem* was strenghtened. So Stein 1919 b: 167 f., 175. According to Szádeczky-Kardoss 1985 the quaestor was still a military and civil officer at the turn of the seventh century. Also Moniaros 2003 stresses the civil duties of the quaestor in the course of the sixth century. Turtledove 1977: 393 f. says only that the novels 148 (AD 566) and 166 (AD 575) confirm "the fact that an interesting governmental experiment initiated by Justinian [*quaestura exercitus*] was continued by his successors" because it suited his opinion that "the structure of the Byzantine provincial network underwent no major shifts during the reigns of Justin [II] and Tiberius [Constantinus]". Also Zahariade 2006: 191 for the maintaining of the *quaestura exercitus* as the military structure well into the 7th century, in spite of some doubts expressed on pp. 59 f.

[77] See about the problem recently Kelly 2004.

Dichters wird klar, dass gerade die Vielfalt, ποικιλία, das Kompositionsprinzip des Werkes ist[38]. Die Vorliebe des Nonnos für die *varietas* lässt sich in den *Dionysiaka* in dem Synonymreichtum seiner Dichtersprache, im Streben nach Abwechselung im Darstellen der Gegenstände und Situationen[39] und auch in der Struktur des Werkes[40] beobachten.

Dieses Streben nach Vielfalt wird sichtbar nicht nur durch das Auftreten der verschiedenen literarischen Gattungen in Nonnos' Epos, sondern auch dadurch, dass eine Passage, die aus den traditionellen, auf unerwartete Weise zusammengesetzten Elementen der einen Gattung entstand, oft in einen höchst ungewohnten Kontext eingesetzt wird und so eine ganz neue, überraschende Ganzheit bildet. Die durchgeführte Analyse ist nur ein Beispiel dieses raffinierten Spieles mit den Gattungen in den *Dionysiaka*. Sowohl die Mannigfaltigkeit der in den *Dionysiaka* auftretenden literarischen Gattungen als auch das literarische Spiel mit diesen sind ein Teil der nonnianischen Poetik mit ihrem Prinzip der ποικιλία, das der Dichter sehr konsequent in seinem Werk realisierte.

Adam-Mickiewicz-Universität Poznań

---

[38] R. Faber, *The Description of Staphylos' Palace (Dionysiaca 18.69–86) and the Priciple of „poikilia"*, Philologus CXLVIII 2004, S. 246: „It has been demonstrated in several examinations of the poem of Book One that ποικιλία is the unifying principle of the *Dionysiaka*".

[39] M. String, *Untersuchungen zum Stil der Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis*, Diss. Hamburg 1966, insbesondere Kapitel 3: „Ποικιλία als Stilprinzip", S. 33 ff.

[40] R. Shorrock, *The Challenge of Epic. Allusive Engagement in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*, Leiden 2001, S. 21: „By containing Proteus within the poem Nonnus makes an open declaration, and demonstration, of his poetic principles: like Proteus, the *Dionysiaca* will have a transformative, and ποικίλος, nature"; S. 22: „I would suggest that Nonnus' epic is neither clearly structured, nor clearly unstructured; rather, it is a coordination of single story; it is constructed out of a series of different frames (epyllionic, astrological, encomiastic etc.), which all intersect, and overlie one another".

Dans de nombreux cas cependant, en l'absence de traces de leurs produits ou de leurs ateliers, la présence de ces artisans et de leurs corporations dans la plupart des villes est attestée par les inscriptions (Cf. Ardevan 1998: 288 suiv.). Ces corporations existaient aussi dans d'autres provinces romaines, et grâce à elles, on connaît aujourd'hui l'existence de métiers complètement oubliés (*CIL* III 944; Schulz-Falkenthal 1974: 25 suiv.). Grâce à des représentations funéraires occasionnelles, et bien qu'elles soient généralement assez schématiques, on peut s'imaginer à quoi ressemblaient ces gens dont les œuvres parviennent aujourd'hui encore à susciter notre véritable admiration (Stănescu 2003: 110). Ces images nous présentent un vaste panorama de la société en Dacie romaine (Cf. Ţeposu-Marinescu 1982: 64 suiv.).

Pour conclure, les exemples que nous avons choisi de présenter nous permettent de constater que l'artisanat était très développé en Dacie romaine, à travers tout un ensemble de métiers. La qualité de leurs produits n'était pas en reste par rapport aux autres provinces romaines, et certains produits étaient exportés de Dacie. Dans certaines catégories d'œuvres, on a pu observer des particularités stylistiques locales permettant de distinguer certains groupes d'artisans qui ont su créer leur propre style. Ceci nous permet de reconnaître que dans cette province, l'artisanat était l'une des branches les plus intéressantes de l'économie romaine, et que les artisans de l'époque furent souvent capables de se distinguer par l'originalité de leur invention artistique.

Université de Wrocław

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Alicu, Pop, Cătăş 1976: D. Alicu, C. Pop, V. Cătăş, *Ateliere de piatra de la Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa*, Acta Musei Napocensis XIII 1976, pp. 125–140.

Alicu, Nemeş 1982: D. Alicu, E. Nemeş, *Obiecte de os descoperite la Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa*, Acta Musei Napocensis XIX 1982, pp. 345–365.

Ardevan 1998: R. Ardevan, *Viaţa municipală în Dacia romană*, Timişoara 1998.

Bălută 1997: C.L. Bălută, *Tipar trivalv pentru oglizi cu rama din plumb descoperit la Apulum*, Acta Musei Napocensis XXIV 1997, pp. 559–565.

Bărbulescu 1977: M. Bărbulescu, *Capitelurui romane din Dacia intracarpatica*, Sargetia XIII 1977, pp. 229–243.

Bărbulescu 1994: M. Bărbulescu, *Potaissa. Studiu monografic*, Turda 1994.

Benea 1983: D. Benea, *Die Glaswerkstätten von Tibiscum und Perlenexport ins Barbaricum im 2. bis 4. Jh.*, Apulum XXI 1983, pp. 115–120.

Benea 2002: D. Benea, *Römische Werkstätten in Dakien (I) (mit Bezugsnahme auf die Herstellung von Schmuckstücken und militärische Ausristungsgestände aus Bronze)*, dans: *Zwischen Rom und Barbaricum. Festschrift für Titus Kolnik zum 70. Geburtstag*, Nitra 2002, pp. 31–54.

Benea 2003: D. Benea, *Istoria asezărilor de tip vici militares din Dacia romană*, Timişoara 2003.

durchführte. Deswegen muss man bei der Analyse der Kromers Dichtung auch diese Werke berücksichtigen.

Er war kein genialer Dichter, aber trotzdem muss man sagen, dass er auf jeden Fall ein episches Talent hatte. Wie ich es schon angedeutet habe, nahm er in seiner Dichtung antike Poeten zum Vorbild, ihren Werken entnahm er Gedanken, Motive und bediente sich der Mythologie sowie gab seinen Gedichten antike Metrikformen (hier geht es vor allem um Hexameter, elegisches Distichon und Jambus). Er schrieb seine Werke nach der damals überall bekannten und herrschenden Regel[5], welche von den Schriftstellern eine Kunstdichtung verlangte, die eine möglichst treue und genaue Nachahmung der antiken Poeten sein sollte. Kromer war aber kein blinder Nachahmer der antiken Muster, weil er nicht nur aus der antiken Literatur seine Inspiration schöpfte, sondern auch aus Neuem Testament sowie aus den damaligen aktuellen Ereignissen. In einem der längsten Poeme lobte er den auferstandenen Christus, in anderen Gedichten aber wendete er sich an den polnischen König und seine Freunde. Dank diesen Themen gewinnt seine Dichtung christliche und zugleich polnische Dimension.

Der Inhalt lateinischer Gedichte Kromers ist auf jeden Fall interessant, aber auch die Sprache und Ausdrucksweise ist durch eine gewisse Kunst charakterisiert. Eine der Eigenschaften seines Stils sind dichterische Bilder von Natur[6], durch die Kromer die Vision von der von sich geschaffenen Welt plastisch prägte. Das poetische Bild – obwohl der Name selbst Malassoziationen erwecken kann – beschränkt sich bei Kromer nicht nur auf Schilderung plastischer Elemente. Es hat vor allem eine metaphorische Funktion, dient den Zielen des Dichters, der eine Botschaft formulieren will. Und gerade für diese Botschaft versucht er, ein spezifisches Klima zu schaffen und will beim Leser bestimmte Gefühle auslösen. Eine solche Rolle des dichterisch konstruierten Bildes ist im 1543 in Krakau veröffentlichten wunderschönen Poem Kromers: *De splendidissimo Christi Jesu triumpho carmen*[7] deutlich zu erkennen. Der Inhalt dieses Werkes bezieht sich

---

[5] J.Z. Lichański, *Retoryka od średniowiecza do baroku. Teoria i praktyka,* Warszawa 1992.

[6] Über die Funktion der Bildhaftigkeit siehe: E. Balcerzan, *Przez znaki*, Poznań 1972; H. Pustkowski, *Gramatyka poezji*, Warszawa 1974; J. Sławiński, *Wokół teorii języka poetyckiego*, w: *Problemy teorii literatury*, Wrocław 1967, S. 76 ff.; J. Kleiner, *Rola podmiotu mówiącego w epice, liryce i w poezji dramatycznej*, in: idem, *Studia z zakresu teorii literatury*, Lublin 1956.

[7] Das Gedicht ist im Verlagshaus Hieronim Wietors erschienen. Später fertigte Kromer einen Nachdruck des Werkes an und gab im Band heraus: *Martini Cromeri Sermones tres synodici cum adiunctis aliquot aliis et Carmine iuvenili de resurrectione Christi*, Coloniae: Apud Maternum Cholinum, 1566. Diese und andere Werke Kromers gab Franz Hipler gegen Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts heraus. Neulich: Marcin Kromer, *Carmina Latina*, wydali, wstępem i przypisami opatrzyli J. Starnawski, R. Turasiewicz, Kraków 2003 (im Rahmen der Serie: Corpus antiquissimorum poetarum Poloniae Latinorum usque ad Ioannem Cochanovium). Auf diese Ausgabe habe ich mich im vorliegenden Artikel gestützt.

would be an unusual exception. However, we have an example of such a long command during Justinian's era – the case of the famous eunuch Narses[32]. As it is generally known, the state of affairs in the Danube zone was important for the defense of Constantinople itself. It looks reasonable that the command in such a region could have been given to Bonus (who was described by Agathias as an experienced officer) for a long time. Also, Bonus could have been appointed *quaestor exercitus* twice; first in 536–537 and then before 552[33].

But much more important for the main issue is Agathias' statement that the *strategos* Bonus of Moesia was experienced in civil and military matters. We should ask what kind of officer ἐκ Μυσίας could acquire such experience? One of the most characteristic features of late Roman administration was the division of powers (see below). Apart from some exceptions in the East in the fifth and sixth centuries civil officers were not given military command (cf. e.g. Barnish, Lee, Whitby 2000: 200 ff.). Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that no Roman officer of Moesia – of course apart from the quaestor of the army – could acquire experience as civil and military officer there.

There is some more evidence to support the opinion that the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* was also a military commander.

According to another Byzantine historian, Menander the Guardsman (Menander Protector fr. 5)[34], Justinus, the famous Roman military commander in the middle of the sixth century[35], put forward an idea how to deal with the Avars who tried to settle down in Scythia Minor around 561. Justinus persuaded the palace officials to arrest the Avar envoys who came to Constantinople. Meanwhile Justinus, called by Menander simply στρατηγός, enforced Roman units in the frontier area and his majordomus, Bonus (sic!), fought there against the Avars[36]. When envoys of the khan were released, Justinus captured them once again and disarmed.

In the light of Menander's relation Justinus was a military commander in the Lower Danube region and his military forces were strong enough to protect it.

---

[32] He was military commander in chief in Italy between 551 and 561. See about Narses his biography written by Faubert 1990.

[33] As is generally known, there were no strict rules concerning the appointments in the later Roman administration. See e.g. Noethlichs 1981: 59 ff.

[34] About Menander e.g. Baldwin 1978; Janiszewski 1999: 54–56.

[35] See about him Barnea, Vulpe 1968: 430 f.; *PLRE* III a: *Fl. Mar. Petr(us) Theodor(us) Valent(inus) Rust(ic(i)us) Boraid(es) Germ(anus) Iust(inus) 4*, esp. 753; Faubert 1990: 67 f.; Gluschanin 1991: 216 f.; Browning 1996: esp. 215–217, 220 f. He could have also been mentioned by two inscriptions from Bulgaria: Beševliev 1964: No. 173, 119 f. and No. 246, 177 f. See here also Velkov 1977: 278; *PLRE* III a: *Alziola*. Justinus' case was neglected by Torbatov 1997.

[36] This Bonus was later also a military commander in the Balkans. See Hartmann 1899b; Stein 1919b: 10–13, 32; Bury 1923: 315 (he wrongly identified Bonus of this passage of Menander with Bonus, the quaestor of the army); Stein 1949: 475, n. 1, 544. nn. 1, 2; Pohl 1988: esp. 45; *PLRE* III a: *Bonus 4*. See also Labuda 1949: 156 f.; Kollautz 1979: 461.

and the most significant example of Egypt)[54] and therefore the opinion that "Justinian did not invent the fusion of powers; he expanded its usage" (Kaegi 1977: 1) is correct. The titles of Justinian's new governors sometimes had an old republican tradition – among them we can find e.g. praetors, moderators and proconsuls[55]. The question of titles should be seen in the light of Justinian's propaganda which presented him as the *renovator imperii*, the successor of ancient tradition and, at the same time, the efficient ruler of the empire[56]. The goal of Justinian's reforms was, first of all, to simplify the administration and to cut the never ending disputes between military and civil officials. Besides, the emperor wanted to diminish corruption among provincial civil governors and to centralize the administration in eastern provinces[57]. However, Justinian was not consequent[58]. In some eastern regions he abolished the new system after a few years and introduced the division of powers once again (Galatia I; Phrygia in 548; Lykaonia; Phisydia in 553 [*Ed. Iust.* 8 and *Nov. Iust.* 145]; Thrace[59]). In other provinces Justinian mantained the division of military and civil powers (Armenia IV [*Nov. Iust.* 31, 1, 3 – AD 536]; Lydia [*Nov. Iust.* 145 – AD 553]; Arabia [*Nov. Iust.* 102 – AD 536], Palaestina [*Nov. Iust.* 103 – AD 536]). Also after the recovery of western provinces the division of powers was introduced there in the beginning[60].

---

[54] Mauretania: *Not. Dig. Occ.* XXX 1, 11, 20; Isauria: *Not. Dig. Or.* XXIX 6; Arabia: *Not. Dig. Or.* XXXXVII 36, 43; Tripolitania: *CTh* XII 1, 133 (AD 393); XI 36, 33 (AD 406); Sardinia: *CTh* IX 27, 3 (AD 382) = *C.* IX 27, 1; Egypt: *Not. Dig. Or.* 28 (see here also other sources: Karayannopulos 1959: 61). For other sources see Hoffmann 1974: 386, n. 35. We know even one *dux et praeses*: *C.* VII 62, 32, 1a (AD 426–450).

[55] *Comes Phrygiae Pacatianae*, *Comes Galatiae Primae*, *Comes Orientis*: *Nov. Iust.* 8, 2, 3, 5; *Praetor Pisidiae*, *Praetor Lyconiae* (later: *dux aut biocolyta Lydiae et Lycaonie*: *Nov. Iust.* 145, AD 553), *Praetor Thraciae*: *Nov. Iust.* 24–26; *Comes Isariae*: *Nov. Iust.* 27; *Moderator Helenoponti*, *Praetor Paphlagoniae*, *Proconsul Cappadociae*: *Nov. Iust.* 27–30; *Proconsul Armeniae Primae* and *Ordinarius Armeniae Secundae*, *Comes Armeniae Tertiae* and *Ordinarius Armeniae Quartae*: *Nov. Iust.* 31, 1; *Moderator Arabiae*, *Proconsul Palestinae*: *Nov. Iust.* 102 f.; *Moderator Phoeniciae*: *Ed. Iust.* 4, *Augustalis* and *dux duae Thebaidae* in Egypt; *dux Libyae*: *Ed. Iust.* 13, 1, 2, 19, 23 (after 534 – beetwen 538/539 or in 554; cf. Malz 1942/1943; Hendy 1985: 179, n. 139; Demichelli 2000).

[56] Mass 1986; 1992: 38 f. with amendments of Roueché 1998.

[57] See e.g. Gelzer 1909: 21–28; Roueché 1998: 83.

[58] Haase 1994: 133: "Es scheint, daß Justinian über eine Zusammenlegung oder Trennung der beiden Verwaltungen von Fall zu Fall je nach dem praktischen Bedürfnis hat entscheiden wollen". For a similar view see Atkinson 2000: esp. 23 f.

[59] The restoration of vicarius in Thrace took place probably by the mid-sixth century. See e.g. Stein 1949: 747; Jones 1964: 294, 374.

[60] *C.* I 27, 1 f. (Africa, AD 534); *Nov. Iust.* 75 = 104, 1 (Sicily, AD 537). See about the administration in Africa still current Diehl 1896: esp. 14–23, 117–118 and, from among recent studies, e.g. Pringle 1981: esp. 55 ff.; Puliatti 1980; Prostko-Prostyński 1998; Zuckermann 2002.

(Buciumi, Samum, Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa, Romula, Dierna, Napoca, Tibiscum) et de mettre à jour leurs outils (Cociş 1995: 383–391). Beaucoup ont été découverts à l'intérieur de camps fortifiés ou sur le territoire de *vici* situés dans le voisinage de ceux-ci (Benea, Petrovszky 1987: 228–239; Benea 2002: 31–54; 2003: 159). Parmi les objets découverts à Porolissum, on peut notamment mentionner un fragment de moule à couler des barres métalliques, ce qui indique que ce genre d'objet était fabriqué à cet endroit (Timoc 1998: 50–54). Un ensemble de statuettes inachevées découvertes sur plusieurs sites archéologiques signalent aussi que celles-ci faisaient l'objet d'un artisanat local. Elles indiquent en outre que des objets de ce type étaient fabriqués même à des endroits où on n'a repéré aucun atelier ou aucune trace de production. On fabriquait aussi des cadres de miroirs en plomb. Leur production est attestée à Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa, Buciumi, Sucidava, Drobeta et Slăveni, mais la découverte la plus intéressante dans ce cas provient d'Apulum, où on a mis à jour des moules servant à les fabriquer (Bălută 1997: 559–565). La bijouterie était un artisanat à rattacher à la métallurgie. Selon S. Mrozek, la fabrication d'objets en or devait vraisemblablement être interdite dans la région des mines d'or d'Alburnus Maior (Mrozek 1966: 25). Mais cette interdiction ne concernait pas toute la province. Par exemple, la découverte d'un petit marteau de bijoutier à Gilău témoigne de l'existence de cet artisanat à cet endroit (Isac, Cociş 1995: 11). À Tibiscum, on a localisé de manière hypothétique un atelier où auraient été fabriquées un grand nombre des fibules émaillées découvertes en Dacie (Cociş 1986: 167; Benea, Crînguş, Regep-Vlascici, Stefănescu 2006: 154). La découverte de fibules inachevées témoigne d'une production locale de ces objets en plusieurs endroits, comme par exemple Micia (Radeanu, Cociş 1999–2000: 205–209; Cociş 2004: 35 suiv.). Divers gemmes faisaient également l'objet d'une production locale, comme le prouvent des pierres découvertes sur le territoire dace, qui servaient à les fabriquer (Tudor 1967: 223–229). Les différences de style de ces pierres ont permis de déterminer que, selon toute vraisemblance, il y avait un atelier de fabrication à Romula, et que des gemmes étaient probablement aussi fabriqués à Sucidava, Apulum et Tibiscum (Gramatopol 1973: 193). Selon A. Pantazi, des pierres semi-précieuses exploitées sur place devaient vraisemblablement subir un premier traitement à Tibiscum, Marisia et Sucidava, mais les ateliers de gravure où étaient exécutées leurs décorations se trouvaient à Romula et Porolissum (Pantazi 1998: 43–51). On fabriquait aussi certains bijoux et divers objets utilitaires à base de corne ou d'os. Ces objets sont assez courants sur plusieurs sites, comme par exemple à Apulum (Ciugudean 1997: 17) ou à Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa (Alicu, Nemeş 1982: 345–365). Un atelier de production où on les fabriquait a été identifié à Tibiscum (Benea 2003: 223–235). La province de Dacie était également spécialisée dans la fabrication de très nombreux bijoux de verre. Tibiscum a produit une quantité énorme de perles de verre qui ont été exportées vers le Barbaricum (Benea 1983: 115–120; 2004:

248–250). Pour le marché local en revanche, on produisait plutôt des récipients de verre. Un atelier de verrier a été identifié à Dierna (Stoicovici 1978: 245–250). La plupart des produits de pierre étaient également destinés à rester sur place; on extrayait la pierre dans de nombreuses carrières de Dacie (Wollmann 1996: 272 suiv.). Il s'agit notamment d'ornements architecturaux, de sarcophages, de stèles funéraires et d'objets utilitaires. On les retrouve pratiquement sur tous les sites archéologiques, et leur riche variété témoigne du dynamisme de ce secteur artisanal (Cf. Jude 1972: 484–489; Milea, Bărbulescu 1972: 437–483; Bărbulescu 1977: 229–243). Les ateliers de travail de la pierre étaient habituellement situés à proximité des carrières (Bărbulescu 1994: 105 suiv.) ou des chantiers de construction. On en a par exemple découvert un à Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa (Alicu, Pop, Cătăş 1976: 125–140). On a aussi pu observer que les artisans locaux faisaient preuve d'esprit créatif, à tel point qu'on peut parler véritablement d'un style propre à la Dacie (Ţeposu-Marinescu 1977: 13–22). Il transparaît dans un ensemble de monuments aux fonctions les plus diverses (Pop 1999–2000: 169–178). À l'occasion, des informations se sont aussi conservées sur le prix des produits. Ainsi, on sait que les pierres tombales et les autels étaient généralement vendus pour un prix variant de 50 à 400 deniers (Mrozek 1966: 51, 82). Après le travail de la pierre, la poterie était également un artisanat très répandu. On rencontre ici très nettement des traditions locales et importées. À côté de la poterie dace traditionnelle qui était réalisée dans les villages locaux, on rencontre divers types de produits, et même parfois de la céramique de luxe comme par exemple la *terra sigillata* (Gudea 1984: 81–98). Il semble que pratiquement chaque localité avait son potier, et que celui-ci avait dans la plupart des cas son propre style de décoration (Gudea 1984: 81–98; Rusu-Bolineţ 2001: 177–190). Mais il y avait aussi de grands ateliers (comme à Tibiscum, Micasăsa et Apulum) qui produisaient pour un marché couvrant toute la province ainsi que pour les troupes cantonnées en Dacie (Cf. Mitrofan 1996). Ce secteur artisanal a laissé une quantité innombrable d'éclats de poteries, mais aussi des outils de production, des formes à mouler les lampes, des fours de poterie. Parfois, grâce aux marques de poinçons conservées, on peut identifier l'auteur des produits (Cf. par exemple Lipovan 1984: 301–317). Outre la poterie, la briqueterie et la fabrication d'autres matériaux de construction en terre cuite étaient également très importantes. On installait généralement les briqueteries à proximité des chantiers. On peut en déduire qu'il devait y en avoir près de chaque ville et ouvrage fortifié, et qu'il devait s'agir de briqueteries respectivement civiles ou militaires (Cf. Grec 1988: 19 suiv.). A côté de toutes les activités artisanales que nous venons de mentionner, il devait encore y en avoir d'autres en Dacie romaine. Malheureusement, les conditions climatiques difficiles n'ont pas permis la subsistance de produits fabriqués en matières organiques comme le bois, le cuir ou les textiles. C'est ainsi que l'on ne peut s'attendre à découvrir de traces de l'activité des menuisiers, des fourreurs, des maroquiniers ou des vignerons.

‚Epos' für dieses Poem nicht ausreichend ist, weil in den *Dionysiaka* zahlreiche Elemente anderer Gattungen verborgen sind. In manchen Passagen des Epos sind gewisse Merkmale, die als spezifisch für eine konkrete Gattung empfunden werden, so gehäuft, dass man diese Abschnitte fast bedenkenlos als Hymnus, Idyll, Epigramm und so weiter identifizieren kann (dieses Phänomen ließ sich schon in der hellenistischen Epoche, z. B. in Kallimachus' *Aitia* beobachten)[9]. Nonnos geht meiner Meinung nach noch weiter und schließt in sein Poem seit Jahrhunderten bekannte literarische Gattungen und ihre Elemente auf solche Art und Weise ein, dass eine ganz neue und für den Leser überraschende Ganzheit aus ihnen entsteht. Der Weg, auf dem Nonnos dies erreicht, wird am Beispiel jener Passagen der *Dionysiaka* veranschaulicht, die bukolischen Charakter haben.

Wie die moderne Wissenschaft unterstreicht, kann „die Bukolik als literarische Gattung [...] nicht genau definiert" werden[10], weil sie vom Prinzip her zwischen den Gattungen steht und innovativ ist. Sie wurde nämlich an der Grenze zwischen den drei großen literarischen Gattungen – Epik, Lyrik und Drama – angesiedelt. Die polnische Literaturwissenschaftlerin Janina Ławińska-Tyszkowska hat dieses Phänomen so ausgedrückt: „Die Bukolik [ist] eine Gattung, die zwischen den Gattungen steht, und die Bezeichnung ‚Bukolik' oder ‚Idylle' bezieht sich nicht selbst auf die Gattung, sondern auf die Szenerie und Stimmung des literarischen Werks"[11]. Diese Ansicht entspricht den Feststellungen der Gelehrten der Antike, die gerade die ländliche Landschaft und die heitere Stimmung für ein charakteristisches Merkmal der bukolischen Gattung hielten[12].

An dieser Stelle möchte ich die Art und Weise näher betrachten, in welcher die Bukolik aus anderen literarischen Gattungen geschöpft hat. Die Idylle wurde normalerweise in daktylischen Hexametern geschrieben, was dazu beigetragen hat, dass diese Gattung zur Epik gerechnet wurde, nicht aber zu der auf Homer, sondern zu der auf Hesiod zurückgehenden. Als epische Elemente gelten hier

---

P. Collart, *Nonnos épigrammatiste*, RPh XXXVII 1913, S. 133–144 (über das Epigramm); F. Braun, *Hymnen bei Nonnos von Panopolis*, Diss. Königsberg 1915 (über den Hymnus); Chamberlayne, *o.c.* (Anm. 5) (u. a. über die Bukolik); Wójtowicz, *o.c.* (Anm. 2), S. 52 ff.; N. Hopkinson (ed.), *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*, Cambridge 1994, besonders der Artikel von B. Harries, *The Pastoral Mode in the Dionysiaca*, S. 63–85.

[9] So z. B. M.A. Harder, *‚Generic games' in Callimachus' Aetia*, in: *Genre...* (Anm. 6), S. 101: „Callimachus was not taking over the generic forms slavishly: the generic forms seem to have provided a kind of framework which Callimachus used as a starting point for a great deal of sophisticated play and experiment".

[10] J. Ławińska-Tyszkowska, *Bukolika grecka*, Wrocław 1981, S. 5.

[11] Ibidem, S. 41: „Bukolika [jest] gatunkiem międzyrodzajowym, a nazwa ‚bukolika' czy ‚sielanka' określa nie tyle gatunek, ile scenerię czy nastrój utworu". Vgl. S. Sierotwiński, *Słownik terminów literackich,* Wrocław 1970, S. 288.

[12] Ławińska-Tyszkowska, *o.c.* (Anm. 10), S. 34 ff.

soulignent et symbolisent avant tout le côté romain. Les silhouettes de l'empereur et des barbares, les gestes qu'ils accomplissent, différents accommodements des barbares et symboles de force des Romains reflètent l'arrangement bipolaire: *Imperium Romanum/Barbaricum* et un couple antithétique Romain/Barbare. Cette dichotomie de structures engage avant tout la guerre. C'est elle qui oppose un groupe à l'autre ou une unité à son ennemi. Elle permet de découvrir à travers la propagande les traits les plus essentiels des deux côtés. En caractérisant et en glorifiant le monde romain elle souligne ce qu'il y a de pire dans le monde extérieur.

Ces représentations monétaires reflètent en réalité un caractère unilatéral des relations réciproques entre les Romains et les habitants du monde extérieur qui sont par définition des ennemis de l'Empire. Dans le contexte des confrontations guerrières dans la propagande impériale, la supériorité absolue des Romains est contrastée avec l'infériorité des barbares.

Sur cette base, il sera aisé de différencier la propagande liée au monde des barbares à travers les deux époques. Le changement est tout de suite notable au niveau de la communication se rapportant à l'exposition de la structure du monde extérieur. Dans cette sphère de matériaux, on retrouve plusieurs noms référents au *Barbaricum* dans son aspect territorial, politique ou symbolique. À la première époque, certains éléments se rapportant au monde des barbares sont mentionnés de façon *explicite* à travers les légendes de revers monétaires; cependant, à la deuxième époque, ils sont exprimés par l'intermédiaire de métaphores se rapportant aux victoires «éclatantes» des Romains.

À l'époque des Antonins, à travers les représentations monétaires on mentionne de différentes manières, des territoires particuliers, l'identité d'un peuple ou le nom d'un pays. On a retrouvé dans le monde barbare dix structures: *Dacia*, *Britannia*, *Germania*, *Arabia*, *Armenia*, *Parthia*, *Mesopotamia*, *Scythia* ainsi que les Quades et les Sarmates. Avec les habitants de ce *Barbaricum*, les Romains ont mené des guerres, contracté des accords ou manifesté une volonté de protectorat sur eux. Le territoire de la Scythie qui est le plus éloigné géographiquement de l'Empire – et non soumis aux Romains – se retrouve sur les monnaies d'Antonin le Pieux. Dans ce cas, ce n'est pas la guerre qui a conduit à cette représentation exotique dans la propagande impériale (il y a de même pour l'Arménie et la Parthie) mais un programme idéologico-politique plus vaste: la présentation du monde comme un ensemble homogène où la majesté de l'empereur romain est reconnue au delà des frontières de l'Empire[98]. Dans la propagande des années de la crise du III siècle, le monde des barbares dans sa dimension structurelle se limite aux Ger-

---

[98] Toynbee, *o.c.* (n. 59), pp. 145–152; N. Méthy, *La représentation des provinces dans le monnayage romain de l'époque impériale (70–235 ap. J.-C.)*, NAC XXI 1992, pp. 284–286. *Contra* C. Foss, *Roman Historical Coins*, London 1990, pp. 124 et suiv.

The establishment of the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* seems to be another step of Justinian's reforms of administration. The emperor tried to introduce the new officer who would exercise both military and civil powers on a stage wider than that of a province[61]. The quaestor of the army was independent not only from the powerful *praefectus praetorio per Orientem* but also from the *magister militum per Thracias*, the chief commander of army forces in the Balkan Peninsula, and also from the *praetor Thraciae*. The quaestor was given the highest senatorial title of *illustris*, while other new governors were only *spectabiles*[62], and he was probably equal in rank to the high palace official *quaestor sacri palatii*[63].

As it was pointed out before, the quaestor of the army was superior to the governors of five provinces – Moesia Secunda, Scythia Minor, Caria, Cyprus and the Cyclades. His headquarter was situated in Odessos (Varna) on the Black Sea coast in Moesia[64]. The setting of the seat of *quaestura* in Odessos helped quaestors to perform their duties towards the army units, also in the matter of command: this city had strategic importance for army supplies from southern provinces of the Roman empire and was situated close to an important frontier of the empire[65].

The introduction of the *quaestor exercitus* could diminish the power of the *praetor Thraciae*, who had then the civil and military prerogatives in the other part of the old Thracian diocese (provinces of Europe, Rhodope, Thracia and Haemimontus)[66]. However, the establishment of *quaesturae* was mainly a step to diminish the power of the praetorian prefect of the East (Stein 1919: 166) and generally to rationalize the administration in the Lower Danube area. In this way Justinian wanted to strengthen the defense of the Balcan Peninsula. With the same aim in mind he started a defense building program in the area[67]. Therefore

---

[61] Maybe that is why John Lydus described the quaestor before other officers established by Justinian (Lydus, *De mag.* II 28, 1 *in fine*). So did also Mazal 2001: 320 f.

[62] See about them still current Koch 1903 and, from among more recent studies, Guilland 1967 a; 1976 a; Löhken 1978. About *illustres* and *spectabiles* see also Berger 1914; Hanton 1927/1928: 116 f.; Enßlin 1929; Kazhdan 1991a.

[63] See about the quaestors studies cited in n. 24.

[64] The clerks in *quaesturae* could be at least two persons known from inscriptions and some persons known from lead seals. Wiewiorowski 1999: 407 f., 433; Curta 2001b: 186; 2002: 15 f. About seals from the sixth and seventh centuries discovered in Scythia see e.g. I. Barnea 1960b; 1969; 1985; 1992.

[65] The importance of Odessos was marked by its economic development in the first half of the sixth century. Cf. e.g. Velkov 1960; 1977: 62 f., 244 f.; 1980.

[66] So Bury 1923: 338 f. About the meaning of the term "Thrace" in the period: Ditten 1981. According to him *praetor Thraciae* governed only the province of Thrace (p. 161 f.).

[67] Maybe in the late fifties of the sixth century, as contended by Torbatov 1997: 83 f. He followed the opinion of S.A. Ivanov 1983: 27 ff. (and also 1984). There are many studies about these works and some authors deduce that at least some buildings attributed by Procopius in Περὶ κτισμάτων (*De aedificiis*) to Justinian were constructed already by Anastasius I. See e.g.; I. Barnea 1960; Patoura-Hatzopoulos 1980; Biernacka-Lubańska 1982: 215 f.; A. Barnea 1991: 178–208, esp. 204–208, 267–279; Curta 2001b: 155 f.

mains, aux Carpes, aux Quades, aux Goths et aux Parthes-Perses. La référence aux nouveaux voisins dangereux constitue un *novum:* les Carpes sur les monnaies de Philippe l'Arabe, ainsi que les Goths sur les émissions impériales depuis le temps Claude II le Gothique et jusqu'à Probus. La représentation des Quades différait de celle qui était exécutée du temps des Antonins. Par ailleurs, par rapport aux affaires de l'Est, on peut, au III siècle, noter un appauvrissement des représentations en comparaison avec la période des Antonins. La question de l'Arménie a disparu, et la propagande exploite essentiellement des adjectifs construits à partir du terme *Part*(*h*)*ia*, ce qui rend frappant l'emploi d'un aussi petit nombre de tels rapports.

Dans la propagande impériale de l'époque des Antonins le monde des barbares est plus riche. Au niveau des composantes: il y a plus de peuples et de pays en comparaison avec la propagande de l'époque de la crise du III siècle. Les représentations du II siècle de l'intérieur du *Barbaricum* étaient, elles aussi, plus variées. On y retrouve parfois, aux côtés des représentations des étrangers ennemis, des barbares «civilisés» par les Romains. Il se peut qu'il y ait eu entre ces deux côtés une entente établie sous la condition que les barbares se soumettent à la volonté des Romains. À l'époque de la crise du III siècle la représentation de cet aspect est beaucoup plus pauvre. Elle se limite uniquement au portrait du barbare-ennemi. Cela ne contredit la résolution ni du mot d'ordre *PAX FVNDATA CVM PERSIS*, ni l'apparition des captifs sous le trophée sur les émissions propageant l'idée *pax fundata.* Dans les deux cas, la paix évoquée est née d'un acte de guerre.

Ce n'est qu'à l'époque des Antonins qu'on retrouve une notion de «portrait» de représentants choisis du monde extérieur; mais les images des barbares symbolisent plus souvent une tribu ou un pays. Dans la propagande des années de la crise du III siècle, des habitants du monde extérieur à l'Empire romain sont représentés associés à toutes les structures, et il n'y a dans celle-ci aucune place pour les individus. Le barbare est un membre anonyme appartenant à un groupe plus large, et les traits qui lui sont attribués qualifient tous ceux qui appartiennent à ce groupement.

Entre l'époque des Antonins et les années de la crise du III siècle, il y a une différence essentielle dans la représentation des éléments vestimentaires caractéristiques d'un certain peuple, ou d'une spécificité des armes et la légende qui identifie la tribu en question. À la première période, il s'agit de représentations «historiques» qui sont complétées par des légendes qui renvoient à l'identité du voisin et qui le différencient par un quelconque détail ethnographique dans l'iconographie monétaire. À la deuxième période cette hétérogénéité disparaît. Des représentations «abstraites» dominent dans lesquelles on note une absence de traits ethniques individualisés des barbares et des marques propres qui les différencient. Cela conduit à une polarisation du portrait barbare dans la propagande impériale, à l'élaboration d'un modèle archétypique du Barbare universel.

Der zweite Adressat, der Leser, weiß nämlich von Anfang an genau, dass die ganze bukolische Atmosphäre reiner Betrug und eine Illusion ist, weil sie in Wirklichkeit doch eine kalt kalkulierte Kriegslist ist. Ähnlich ist es mit der bukolischen Hauptfigur – dem falschen Hirten Kadmos. Er wird nur von einem Blickpunkt und von einer Person – Typhon – als wahrer Hirte angesehen. Dem Leser ist ganz bewusst, wer „der falsche Hirte", wie selbst der Dichter ihn oft bezeichnet (I 376: ψευδαλέον ... βοτῆρα), wirklich ist und was er vorhat. Vom Standpunkt des Erdensohnes gibt es im analysierten Text andere, wahre Hirtengestalten: der Ziegenhirte Pan (I 368: αἰγίβοτος Πὰν) und der Hirte der Welt – Zeus (I 389: ποιμένα κόσμου).

Die oben erwähnten Liebesmotive sind im Text ebenso auf zwei sich gegenseitig durchdringenden Ebenen sichtbar. Nonnos führt nämlich zwei Charaktere ein, die unter der Macht des Eros stehen. Es sind der Erdensohn Typhon und der verliebte junge Mann, der in einem langen, homerähnlichen Vergleich auftaucht (I 525–534):

... καὶ ὡς νέος ἡδέι κέντρῳ
ἁβρὸν ἐρωμανέων ἐπιθέλγεται ἥλικι κούρῃ,
καὶ πῇ μὲν χαρίεντος ἐς ἄργυφα κύκλα προσώπου,
πῇ δὲ βαθυσμήριγγος ἀλήμονα βότρυν ἐθείρης
δέρκεται, ἄλλοτε χεῖρα ῥοδόχροον, ἄλλοτε μίτρῃ
σφιγγομένην ῥοδόεντος ἴτυν μαζοῖο δοκεύει
αὐχένα παπταίνων γυμνούμενον, ἀμφὶ δὲ μορφῇ
θέλγεται ἀλλοπρόσαλλον ἄγων ἀκόρητον ὀπωπὴν
οὐδὲ λιπεῖν ἐθέλει ποτὲ παρθένον· ὣς ὅ γε Κάδμῳ
θελγομένην μελέεσσιν ὅλην φρένα δῶκε Τυφωεύς.

Und wie ein verliebter Junge, köstlich gestachelt,
dem Reiz der Gespielin anheimfällt,
bald auf die glänzenden Augen im lieblichen Antlitz des Mädchens,
bald auf die üppig herniederwallenden Locken die Blicke
richtet, dann wieder die rosige Hand, dann die von der Binde
eng umschlossene Rundung der blühenden Brüste betrachtet,
auf den entblößten Nacken jetzt starrt, unaufhörlich die Augen
allseits am Anblick des ganzen Körpers weidet und niemals
ablassen möchte von seiner Geliebten: so widmete Typhon
voll dem Genuss sich der schmeichelnden Weisen, die Kadmos ihm vorblies.

In diesem Vergleich stellt Nonnos in einer raffinierten Weise die von Typhon gezeigte Faszination an der Musik[30] und die Bezauberung eines jungen Mannes

[30] Diese faszinierende Musik wurde sogar mit der Kraft des Sirenengesang (II 9–19) von Nonnos verglichen. Zur Kraft der Musik s. auch M.-C. Fayant, *La musique dans les Dionysiaques de Nonnos de Panopolis*, in: G.-J. Pinault (éd.), *Musique et poésie dans l'antiquité, Actes du colloque de Clermont-Ferrand, Université Blaise Pascal, 23 mai 1997*, Clermont-Ferrand 2001, S. 74: „Il s'agit en somme qu'Éros donne à la musique de Cadmos un povoir magique". D. Gigli Piccardi, *Nonno di Panopoli, Le Dionisiache (Canti 1–12)*, Milano 2003, S. 180 f., sieht in dem Vergleich des Monsters mit dem Jüngling auch komische Elemente.

senie Morza Śródziemnego w epoce brązu. Już w 1982 r. na sympozjum poświęconym wczesnej metalurgii cypryjskiej poszukiwano odpowiedzi na to pytanie, ale dopiero późniejsze analizy porównawcze izotopu ołowiu przeprowadzone w Oksfordzie wykazały, że sztaby miedzi pochodzące z Cypru występowały nie tylko we wrakach statków odkrytych u wybrzeży południowej Turcji, ale docierały także do odległej Sardynii. Poza tym w drugiej połowie lat dziewięćdziesiątych XX wieku przebadano czterdzieści siedem przedmiotów z brązu będących w posiadaniu Medelhavsmuseet, które pochodzą ze stanowisk cypryjskich (Nitovikla, Ayios Iakovos, Paleoskoutella, Pera) datowanych na okres środkowego i późnego brązu. Jak się okazało, ok. 40% przedmiotów zawierało miedź pochodzącą nie ze złóż cypryjskich, lecz z rejonu na północ od Mersin w Górach Taurus. Poza tym na przykład narzędzia i broń z miedzi, ciężarki do sieci z ołowiu oraz wyroby ze srebra znane z wraku Ulu Burun wskazują także na miejsce pochodzenia złóż tych metali w Górach Taurus. Natomiast znalezione we wraku sztaby miedzi nie zostały odlane z rud wydobywanych w tym rejonie. Zaprezentowane wyniki badań rzucają więc nowe światło na słabo rozpoznaną eksploatację miedzi, a także srebra i być może cyny w południowej Anatolii oraz na handel tymi metalami w Egei w epoce brązu.

Północno-zachodni Cypr, pomimo odkrycia ważnych centrów antycznych Marion i Arsinoe oraz badań powierzchniowych ich zaplecza, jest nadal archeologicznie słabo rozpoznany na tle innych rejonów wyspy. Zainspirowało to Dariusza Maliszewskiego do podjęcia pierwszej próby skatalogowania najwcześniejszego osadnictwa w tym rejonie, głównie na podstawie opublikowanej (w różnym stopniu) ceramiki, pochodzącej zarówno z badań wcześniejszych, jak i z nowszych, przeprowadzonych w ramach zorganizowanego przez niego Polis-Pyrgos Archaeological Project (PAP). W sumie udało się zarejestrować 74 stanowiska archeologiczne, w tym 9 osad datowanych prawdopodobnie na neolit preceramiczny, 5 osad z okresu późnego neolitu, 28 stanowisk chalkolitycznych (ok. 25 osad, 3 cmentarzyska) oraz 32 stanowiska funkcjonujące w epoce brązu (ok. 12 osad, ok. 19 cmentarzysk, 1 grota). Należy dodać, że badania PAP zarejestrowały 10 stanowisk datowanych na okres chalkolitu (7 osad, 3 cmentarzyska) oraz 11 na epokę brązu (5 osad, 6 cmentarzysk), co stanowi 28,4% wszystkich skatalogowanych stanowisk. Zaproponowana lista nie jest kompletna i wymaga uzupełnień. Dalsza prospekcja terenowa powinna objąć stanowiska datowane dotąd na neolit preceramiczny w celu weryfikacji ich chronologii. Podobnie należy przebadać wszystkie stanowiska zarejestrowane wcześniej przez inne niż Lemba Archaeological Project i PAP projekty, bowiem stan wiedzy, a także standardy dokumentacji oraz analizy stanowisk i materiałów archeologicznych były wówczas inne niż obecnie obowiązujące. Z tych samych względów także ceramikę i inne materiały z wcześniejszych badań, przechowywane głównie w muzeach cypryjskich, należy ponownie przestudiować. Proponowane prace należałoby jeszcze uzupełnić wynikami z prospekcji powierzchniowych rejonów dotąd nieprzebadanych (okolice wsi Lysos, Melandra, Zacharia, Kio, Filousa, Meladeia, Neo Chorio, część Półwyspu Akamas). Dopiero wówczas zarysuje się szansa opracowania w miarę kompletnej mapy wczesnego osadnictwa północno-zachodniego Cypru.

Referat Nancy Serwint poświęcony plastyce terakotowej z Marion zasługuje na szczególną uwagę z wielu względów, również dlatego, że ten interesujący materiał nie doczekał się dotąd publikacji. Badania amerykańskie prowadzone tam od 1983 r. odsłoniły, między innymi, dwa sanktuaria funkcjonujące od początku okresu cypryjsko-archaicznego do końca cypryjsko-klasycznego, w których znaleziono ponad 25 000 terakot wotywnych. Jest to największy tego typu zespół znany dotąd na Cyprze, a przy tym bardzo zróżnicowany stylistycznie i zawierający zabytki różnych rozmiarów – od miniaturowych do przekraczających wymiary człowieka. Nieliczne monumentalne fragmenty nawiązują stylem do tradycji wielkiej rzeźby egipskiej, zaś w drobnej plastyce dominują wpływy Nubii i Lewantu. Także anomalie zidentyfikowane w technice produkcji terakot z Marion wskazują na wpływy Lewantu. Chociaż wota produkowano na miejscu, to ich rozmiary i stylistyka mogą wskazywać na obce pochodzenie koroplastów, a z pewnością na zróżnicowanie etniczne zleceniodawców, którzy zamawiając je w bliskiej sobie estetyce nawiązywali do krajów swego pochodzenia i tym samym manifestowali przynależność kulturową. Ilość i zakres chronologiczny

les décorations des sarcophages contemporains, les chercheurs estiment que les représentations des barbares ne servent plus, comme c'était le cas avant, une mise en relief du contraste simple avec les Romains mais recèlent une signification plus profonde. Elles devient la manifestation de la puissance d'un mal qui prend une forme de forces sombres s'apprêtant à détruire le monde civilisé et qui nécessitent le combat. De plus, dans les confrontations des représentations précédentes, par exemple sur la colonne de Trajan, les chercheurs notent un distanciement par rapport à l'idéalisation des figures barbares; leurs visages sont comparés à ceux des singes et dans leur attitude, on a souligné une absence de dignité-générosité, quand ils combattent, s'enfuient ou meurent, ils dévoilent des traits de sauvagerie bestiale[88]. On retrouve cette même évolution de conception des barbares à travers les représentations monétaires, mais bien entendu pas de façon aussi claire. Et c'est justement à l'époque du règne de Marc-Aurèle qu'intervient ce changement dans le sens et la manière de représenter les barbares à travers l'iconographie monétaire. Depuis cette époque, la majorité des types de monnaie les représente avec une grande simplicité et une schématisation importante; ils sont également anonymes[89]. Ces représentations renvoient progressivement à des habitants du *Barbaricum* anonymes et symbolisent des forces non amicales des Romains. Pendant la période de la crise du III siècle ce processus s'est développé. Dans l'iconographie des monnaies impériales le voisin-barbare devient d'ordinaire un détail fonctionnant à peine dans le maintient du contraste avec les forces romaines. Il doit afficher d'une manière suggestive et même dramatique l'Empire romain encerclé par des forces étrangères ennemies et devient ainsi un l'élément d'une représentation dont le thème devient: la lutte contre le mal[90]. Les sources numismatiques montrent que la lutte contre les barbares attribue à l'empereur les épithètes: *restitutor Galliarum*[91], *restitutor saeculi*[92], *restitutor Orbis*[93], *restitutor Orientis*[94], *pacator Orbis*[95] ainsi que *pacator*

---

[88] Homo, *o.c.* (n. 1), p. 309; E. Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares. I: Des origines germaniques à l'avènement de Dioclétien*, Paris 1969, p. 228; Dauge, *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 220. Cf. aussi p.ex. P.G. Hamberg, *Studies in Roman Imperial Art, with Special Reference to the State Reliefs of the Second Century*, Uppsala–Koebenhavn 1945, pp. 78–93, 111–118, 177–181; F. Pirson, *Style and Message on the Column of Marcus Aurelius*, PBSR LXIV 1996, pp. 139–179; Ferris, *Enemies*... (n. 81), pp. 61–81, 86–98; et les articles publiés dans C. Caprino et al. (éds), *La Colonna di Marco Aurelio*, Roma 1955; J. Scheid, V. Huet (éds), *La colonne aurélienne. Autour de la colonne aurélienne. Geste et image sur la colonne de Marc Aurèle à Rome*, Turnhout 2000.

[89] P.ex. Szaivert, n° 198, 268, 282. Cf. Caló Levi, *o.c.* (n. 3), pp. 22–24, 27–40; Picard, *o.c.* (n. 32), p. 435.

[90] Picard, *o.c.* (n. 32), pp. 471–481; Dauge, *o.c.* (n. 2), pp. 297–303.

[91] *RIC* V/2 *Postumus*, n° 82; Schulzki *Postumus*, n° 71–74.

[92] *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 403–406.

[93] *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 349; Göbl 1993, n° 337.

[94] Göbl 1993, n° 365; Estiot, *L'or*... (n. 78), n° 159.

[95] *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 136, 591; *RIC* V/2 *Numerianus*, n° 390.

Maas 1986: M. Maas, *Roman History and Christian Ideology in Justinianic Reform Legislation*, DOP XL 1986, pp. 17–32.

Maas 1992: M. Maas, *John Lydus and the Roman Past. Antiquarianism and Politics in the Age of Justinian*, London–New York 1992.

Mac Geer 1991: E. Mac Geer, *Praefectus Militum*, *ODB* III, p. 1709.

Mason 1974: H.J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis*, Toronto 1974.

Malz 1942/1943: G. Malz, *The Date of Justinian's edict XIII*, Byzantion XVI 1942/1943, pp. 135–141.

Mazal 2001: O. Mazal, *Justinian I. und seine Zeit. Geschichte und Kultur des byzantinischen Reiches im 6. Jahrhundert*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2001.

Mc Cormick 2001: M. Mc Cormick, *Origins of the European Economy. Communication and Commerce A.D. 300–900,* Cambridge 2001.

Mitthof 2001: F. Mitthof, *Annona militaris. Die Heeresversorgung im spätaniken Ägypten. Ein Beitrag zur Verwaltungs- und Heeresgeschichte des Römischen Reiches im 3. bis 6. Jh. n. Chr.*, vols. I–II, Firenze 2001.

Mommsen 1908: Th. Mommsen, *Verzeichnis der römischen Provinzen aufgesetzt um 297*, in: idem, *Gesammelte Schriften,* vol. V, Berlin 1908, pp. 561–588.

Moniaros 2003: X. Moniaros, *E leitourgia kai ekselikse tes Quaestura Iustiniana Exercitus*, in: *3 Synantese Byzantinologon Ellados kai Kyprou, 20–22 Septembriou 2002, Aristoteleio Panepistemio Thessalonikes, Filosofike schole: Eisegeseis. Ereunetika – Metaptychiaka Programmata Perilepseis Anakoinoseon*, Thessaloniki 2003, pp. 123–125.

Morrison, Sodini 2002: C. Morrison, J.-P. Sodini, *The Sixth-Century Economy*, in: A.E. Laiou (ed.), *The Economic History of Byzantium from the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Washington 2002, pp. 171–220.

Müller 1912: A. Müller, *Das Heer Justinians. (Nach Procop und Agathias)*, Philologus LXXI 1912, pp. 101–138.

Noethlichs 1981: K.L. Noethlichs, *Beamtentum und Dienstvergehen. Zur Staatsverwaltung in der Spätantike*, Wiesbaden 1981.

Palanque 1933: J.-R. Palanque, *La préfecture du prétoire du Bas-Empire*, Paris 1933.

Patoura-Hatzopoulos 1980: S. Patoura-Hatzopoulos, *L'œure de reconstruction du 'limes' danubien à l'époque de l'empereur Justinien I^er^*, RESE XVIII 1980, 1, pp. 95–109.

Pohl 1988: W. Pohl, *Die Awaren*, München 1988.

Popescu 1977a: E. Popescu, *Praesides, Duces et episcopatus Scythiae im Lichte einiger Inschriften aus dem 4. bis 6. Jh.*, in: *Epigraphica. Travaux dédiés au VII^e^ congres d'épigraphie grecque et latine (Constanza 1977)*, Bucureşti 1977, pp. 255–282.

Popescu 1977b: E. Popescu, *Epigraphische Beiträge zur Organisation des skythischen Limes im 4.–6. Jh.*, in: J. Fitz (ed.), *Limes. Akten des XI. Internationalen Limeskongresses*, Budapest 1977, pp. 441–449.

Porena 2003: P. Porena, *La origini della prefettura del pretorio tardoantica*, Roma 2003.

Pringle 1981: D. Pringle, *The Defence of Byzantine Africa from Justinian to the Arabian Conquest: An Account of the Military History and Archaeology of the African Provinces in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries*, Parts 1–2, Oxford 1981 (British Archaeological Reports. International Series 99).

Prostko-Prostyński 1998: J. Prostko-Prostyński, *Zum Datum und Einrichtung der afrikanischen Prätorianpräfektur durch Kaiser Justinian I*, ByzZ XCI 1998, pp. 423–434.

Puliatti 1980: S. Puliatti, *Ricerche sulla legislazione regionale di Giustiniano. Io statuto civile e l'ordinamento militare della prefettura africana*, Milano 1980.

Purcell 1969: H.D. Purcell, *Cyprus*, London 1969.

Ravegnani 1988: G. Ravegnani, *Soldati di Bisanzio in età giustinianea*, Roma 1988.

Roueché 1998: C. Roueché, *Provincial Governors and theirTtitulature in the Sixth Century*, AntTard VI 1998, pp. 83–89.

But it is disputable if he was *quaestor exercitus* at all because he could have been *magister militum per Thracias* as well[37]. Justinus was one of the most important figures at the end of Justinian's reign. Because of his skills as a military commander he was appointed στρατηγός in the Lower Danube – in the 560's one of the most menaced fronts of the empire – and it looks reasonable that he could have been the master of soldiers. But when we discuss the affairs in which other *magistri militum per Thracias* were involved, we can notice that they conducted mainly major military campaigns and never stayed in the Lower Danube area as long as Justinus probably did (between 561 and 565/566; cf. Demandt 1970: coll. 743 f.; *PLRE* II, *fasti*, 1292; *PLRE* III b, *fasti*, 1501). Therefore it still cannot be excluded that he was in fact the quaestor of the army. The nature and duties of this officer fitted better the challenges appearing in the Lower Danube zone than the strict military and temporary nature of the *magister militum* missions.

The case of the next known *quaestor exercitus* is even more significant. There is no doubt that Ioannes, called by Menander the Guardsman ἄρχων τῶν νήσων ("archon of the Islands") was the quaestor of the army (Menander Protector fr. 48)[38]. Ioannes was sent by the emperor Tiberius II Constantinus (578–582) to Pannonia in 578. He organized there the transport of the Avar cavalry from the barbarian to Roman bank of the Danube under the command of the khan himself. Then Ioannes superintended the march of the Avars from Pannonia to Scythia Minor, where the Avars as Roman allies had to attack the Slavs on the barbarian river bank of the Danube with the help of the Roman fleet[39]. We cannot connect the title of Ioannes: ἄρχων τῶν νήσων with the officer called *praeses insularum* in the *Notitia dignitatum* (*Not. Dig. Or.* I)[40]. The emperor Justinian used the title ἔπαρχος τῶν νήσων as an equivalent of the term *quaestor exercitus* in the 69th novel published in 538. Similar titles were applied in other sources to hypothetical quaestors: Iulianus, who probably succeeded Ioannes (ὕπαρχος NSYWS)[41] and Theodorus (*praefectus Insularum*)[42].

---

[37] See about *m. m. per Thracias* e.g. Grosse 1920: 58, 91 f., esp. 186; Guilland 1967b: 381; Demandt 1970: 567 f., 714 f., esp. 720 f. and 743 f., 753–755; Kaegi 1981: 92 f.; Szádeczky-Kardoss 1985. See also below.

[38] He could be around 578 not only a quaestor but probably also *praefectus praetorio per Illyricum* (or *magister militum per Illyricum*). See Stein 1919: 167; Jones 1964: 307; *PLRE* III a: *Ioannes 91*; Zahariade 2006: 59 f. Contrary Torbatov 1997: 84 f.

[39] For E. Stein it was the last source about quaestors of the army (Stein 1919b: 167; 1949: 474–476). Zahariade 2006: 59 f. argued recently for the reorganization of *quaestura* and reestablishment of *duces* in Moesia Secunda and Scythia Minor at the end of the 6th cent.

[40] So Torbatov 1997. See bibliography of the works concerning *Notitia Dignitatum* at http://members.ozemail.com.au/~igmaier/notitia.

[41] Probably in 580 according to the Church history written by John of Ephesus. See *PLRE* III a: *Iulianus 20*. About John of Ephesus see e.g. Janiszewski 1999: 120–122.

[42] Known only thanks to a lead seal. See *PLRE* III b: *Thedorus 84*. The last term was used also in the *Epitome Iuliani* in a heading *De quaestoribus, id est praefectis insularum*.

Horstkotte 1988: H. Horstkotte, *Die "Steuerhaftung" im spätrömischen "Zwangsstaat"*, Frankfurt a. M. ²1988.

Isaac 1988: B. Isaac, *The Meaning of the Terms Limes and Limitanei*, JRS LXXVIII 1988, pp. 125–147.

R. Ivanov 1998: R. Ivanov, *Das römische Verteidigunssystem an der unteren Donau zwischen 'Dorticum' und 'Durostorum' von Augustus bis Maurikius*, BRGK LXXVIII 1998, pp. 467–640.

S.A. Ivanov 1983: S.A. Ivanov, *Oborona Vizantii i geografia barbarskich vtorozeni čerez Dunai v pervoi polovinie VI v.*, Viznatiski Vremennik XLIV 1983, pp. 27–47.

S.A. Ivanov 1984: S.A. Ivanov, *Oborona balkanskich provincii Vizantii i proniknovenie 'barbarov' na Balkany v pervoi polovinie VI v.*, Vizantiski Vremennik XLV 1984, pp. 35–53.

Janiszewski 1999: P. Janiszewski, *Historiografia późnego Antyku* ["The Historiography of Late Antiquity"], in: E. Wipszycka (ed.), *Vademecum historyka starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, vol. III, Warszawa 1999, pp. 7–220.

Jones 1964: A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire (284–602). A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, vols. I–III, Oxford–Cambridge, Mass. 1964.

Kaegi 1977: W.E. Kaegi, *Military Dilemmas*, in: *Byzantine Studies Conference, 3–5 December, 1977*, New York 1977 (Columbia University, New York, Abstracts of Papers, 1).

Kaegi 1981: W.E. Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest 471–843*, Amsterdam 1981.

Kaegi 1982: W.E. Kaegi, *Two Studies in the Continuity of Late Roman and Byzantine Military Institutions*, ByzF VIII 1982, pp. 87–113.

Kaiser 2004: W. Kaiser, *Die Epitome Juliani. Beiträge zum römischen Recht im frühen Mittelalter und zum byzantinischen Rechtsunterricht*, Franfurt am Main 2004.

Karayannopulos 1959: J. Karayannopulos, *Die Entstehung der byzantinischen Themenordnung*, München 1959.

Karagiorgou 2001: O. Karagiorgou, *LR2: a Container for the Military 'annona' on the Danubian Border?*, in: S. Kingsey, M. Decker (eds.), *Economy and Exchange in the East Mediterranean during Late Antiquity. Proceedings of a Conference at Somerville College, Oxford, 29th May, 1999*, Oxford 2001, pp. 129–166.

Kazdhan 1991a: A. Kazdhan, *Illustris*, *ODB* II, pp. 986 f.

Kazdhan 1991b: A. Kazdhan, *Strategos, ODB* III, p. 1964.

Kelly 2004: Ch. Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge Mass.–London 2004.

Klein 1999: R. Klein, *Dux. Dukat. I. Römische Kaiserzeit*, in: R.-H. Bautier et al. (eds.), *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Bd. III, Stuttgart 1999, coll. 1485 f.

Koder 1990: J. Koder, *Zur Bedeutungsentwicklung des byzantinischen Terminus Thema*, Jahrbuch der Österrechischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft XL 1990, pp. 155–165.

Kolb 1987: F. Kolb, *Diocletian und die erste Tetrarchie. Improvisation oder Experiment in der Organisation monarchischer Herrschaft*, Berlin–New York 1987.

Kollautz 1979: A. Kollautz, *Völkerbewegung an der unteren und mittleren Donau im Zeitraum von 558/562 bis 582 (Fall von Sirmium)*, Zeitschrift für Ostforschung XXVIII 1979, pp. 448 f.

Kuhoff 2001: W. Kuhoff, *Diocletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313 n. Chr.)*, Frankfurt a. M. 2001.

Kübler 1934: B. Kübler, *Theodoros Scholastikos 43*, *RE* XV (1934), coll. 1863–1866.

Labuda 1949: G. Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo słowiańskie – państwo Samona* ["The First Slavonic State – the Samon State"], Poznań 1949.

Lanata 1984: G. Lanata, *Legislazione e natura nelle novelle Giustinianae*, Napoli 1984.

Le Bohec 2006: Y. Le Bohec, *L'armée romaine sous le Bas-Empire*, Paris 2006.

Lipšic 1976: A.E. Lipšic, *Pravo i sud v Vizantii v IV–VIII vv.*, Leningrad 1976.

Löhken 1978: H. Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum. Untersuchungen zur formalen Konstituierung der spätantiken Führungschicht*, Köln–Wien 1978.

Orientis[96]. Ce sont eux, les barbares, qui sèment la destruction et le chaos dans la vie de l'*Imperium Romanum*, ils sont responsables de l'absence de paix et de la présence des guerres. Les Romains devaient mettre à contribution dans cette lutte contre les forces extérieures à l'Empire les dieux du panthéon romain[97].

* * *

La carte du *Barbaricum* déduite de l'analyse des légendes et de l'iconographie monétaire du siècle d'or des Antonins et des années de la crise du III siècle est très sommaire, générale, incomplète et plutôt simplifiée. Ce sont là, «des échos lointains» d'une connaissance réelle des barbares par les Romains de ces époques. Sans doute cela ne nous renseigne pas tout à fait sur la connaissance qu'ils avaient de leurs voisins, mais montre néanmoins que les représentations monétaires, soumises à des exigences de propagande impériale, comportaient une image et un contenu évoquant les barbares destinés à agrémenter le portrait de l'empereur et tout ordre établit en ces temps-là est un don et l'oeuvre des réalisations romaines. En réalité, *Barbaricum* apparaît dans la propagande monétaire uniquement à travers le prisme des rapports qu'ils entretiennent avec le monde romain. Il apparaît non pas dans un contexte événementiel, relatant les réalisations des barbares et de leurs souverains, mais comme un élément fonctionnant en toile de fond pour souligner les réalisations de l'empereur romain. Toutes les caractéristiques et les traits qui pouvaient se retrouver dans la structure réelle n'étaient donc pas importantes; seuls comptaient celles et ceux que la propagande avait choisis pour décrire un souverain romain donné et ses agissements. Cela ne constitue toutefois pas une exception. Dans des sources antiques appartenant aux autres catégories, des territoires habités par des barbares passe également au second plan, ils deviennent de ce fait à peine reconnaissables et peu importants.

En exposant les caractéristiques du monde des barbares à travers les représentations monétaires à l'époque des Antonins et pendant les années de la crise du III siècle, il importe de signaler que pendant ces deux périodes, il ne possède pas lui, une propagande indépendante. Son image se reflète à travers des configurations diverses de légendes et d'éléments iconographiques qui

---

[96] *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 231; Göbl 1993, n° 192.

[97] P.ex. *RIC* V/1 *Gallienus, Sole Reign*, 57, 238–239, 493; Göbl 2000, n° 628, 949; *RIC* V/1 *Aurelian*, n° 2–3, 66, 154, 185, 243, 257, 274–275, 283, 307–315, 353, 358–359, 372–373, 383–385, 390; Göbl 1993, n° 71, 73, 75, 217, 227, 232, 253, 255, 257–258, 336, 350, 366, 368 372, 374, 378–379, 389–390; Estiot, *L'or*... (n. 78), n° 151, 163, 165; *RIC* V/1 *Tacitus*, n° 112; Estiot, *L'or*... (n. 28), n° 30–33; *RIC* V/2 *Probus*, n° 5, 35.

seem to be well established. These are: *dactylo-epitrites*, the term proposed by Rossbach and Westphal (1856: 382)[1], and κατ' ἐνόπλιον-*epitriti*, the name postulated by Gentili and applied by many Italian scholars.

The compound term *dactylo-epitrites* suggests that we are dealing with a metre composed of dactyls and the so-called epitrites, that is (as they are usually interpreted) trochaic or iambic metra whose rhythm is slightly heavier and slower than those of trochees and iambics found, for instance, in aeolic structures. The slower movement of the epitrites is caused by the rarer admission of a resolution and a predominance of heavy syllables in places of an *anceps* element (long *anceps*). Let us take as an example the strophe of Bacchylides' *Ep.* 5[2]:

Εὔμοιρε̣ [Σ]υρακ[οσίω]ν
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⁞
ἱπποδινήτων στρατα[γ]έ,
– ◡ – – – ◡ – – ‖
γνώσηι μὲν [ἰ]οστεφάνω̣ν
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⁞
Μοισᾶν γλυκ[ύ]δωρον ἄγαλ̣μα, τῶν γε νῦν
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ – ◡ – |
αἴ τις ἐπιχθονίων,
– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⁞
ὀρθῶς· φρένα δ' εὐθύδικ[ο]ν
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ‖
ἀτρέμ' ἀμπαύσας μεριμνᾶν
– ◡ – – – ◡ – – ⁞
δεῦρ' ἄθρησον νόωι·
– ◡ – – ◡ – ‖
ἦ σὺν Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζώνοις ὑφάνας
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ – –
ὕμνον ἀπὸ ζαθέας
– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ‖
νάσου ξένος ὑμετέραν πέμ-
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – –
πει κλεεννὰν ἐς πόλιν,
– ◡ – – – ◡ – ‖
χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⁝
κλεινὸς θεράπων· ἐθέλει δὲ
– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡
γᾶρυν ἐκ στηθέ̣ων χέων
– ◡ – – – ◡ – |||

---

[1] The term is also used in my dissertation but not without serious reservations.

[2] I have restored the free responsions appearing in the papyrus *A* in lines: 8 (δεῦρ' ἄθρησον νόωι, Maehler's: δεῦρ' <ἄγ'> ἄθρησον νόωι), 11–12 ([11] νάσου ξένος ὑμετέραν πέμ- [12] πει κλεεννὰν ἐς πόλιν, in Maehler's edition with Maas' emendation: [11] νάσου ξένος ὑμετέραν [12] ἐς κλυτὰν πέμπει πόλιν), and 14 (κλεινὸς θεράπων· ἐθέλει δέ, where Maehler deletes the postpositive δέ).

the establishment of *quaestura* is rightly described as "Justinian's desperate attempt to protect the northern flank of Constantinople and the Balkan peninsula" (Morrison, Sodini 2002: 171)[68].

The new officer was superior to provincial civil governors (especially in the matter of justice) and a principal to army forces. The *quaestor exercitus* was first of all obliged to supervise the collection and distribution of taxes and army supplies[69]. However, as far as we can deduce from various independent sources, quaestors could also command army units in the case of local barbarian raids. The matter of special importance was to give him power over the Cyprus, the Cyclades and Caria where numerous vessels were constructed for the East Roman fleet and experienced sailors were recruited from – it should be remembered that fleet always had special value in protection and delivering supplies to the Lower Danube zone[70]. Taxes and supplies from wealthier Mediterranean provinces[71] also helped to keep Roman forces in much poorer Moesia Secunda and Scythia Minor in good condition. Those provinces had too small resources to maintain army units in a number which was indispensable for their defense[72]. As it has been correctly stated by John Haldon, "through the administrative linkage between the Aegean Islands and coastal regions concerned with the Danube zone the troops in that theatre could be supplied from relatively wealthy productive areas by sea and river transport" (Haldon 1997: 4 f.). What is more, the practice of delivering supplies from distant provinces to the middle and Lower Danube region was known already in the fourth century. It is attested not only by some inscriptions of army suppliers (*primpilares*)[73], lead seals and inscriptions of merchants (Barnea 1991: 250 f.;

---

[68] According to John Lydus Justinian wanted to keep the North for Rome and the establishment of the *quaestor exercitus* was the good idea (Lydus, *De mag.* II 28 f.). See here also Bury 1923: 338 f.; Stein 1949: 474; Jones 1964: 844; Barnea, Vulpe 1968: 426 f.; Haldon 1990: 209 f.; Treadgold 1995: 16.

[69] What was essential for the administration in all the provinces of the late Roman empire. See Kaegi 1977: 1.

[70] See already Stein 1919b: 167 f. and, from among more recent studies, Rubin 1995: 150; Torbatov 1997: 84 f.; Whitby 2000: esp. 293 f.; Zahariade 2006: 59. The naval forces were always crucial in Roman defence of the Lower Danube zone. Cf. Bonuegru, Zahariade 1996; R. Ivanov 1998: 529. I do not discuss the question what kind of vessels were under the command of the quaestor. However, I do not believe that they were only used to deliver army supplies (as suggested by Torbatov 1997: 78 f. and, with some amendments, R. Ivanov 1998: 536).

[71] According to Lydus they were the wealthiest provinces of the Empire (Lydus, *De mag.* II 29, 1).

[72] Cf. *C.* X 27, 2, 10 (491–505) for the conditions in the Balkans. See also *Nov. Iust.* 50. According to its text the travel to Odessos was too dangerous for inhabitants of Caria, the Cyclades and Cyprus because of bad climate conditions and the incursions of barbarians.

[73] From Moesia Secunda and Dacia Ripensis: *IGLN* No. 177, 179 f.; *SEG* XLIV: No. 641, 181 = *AE* 1994: 1525 = *AE* 1995: 1332 = *IGLN* No. 178, 180 f.; *AE* 1995: 1328–1330. See esp. *IGLN* No. 117: ---/ [---]+Λ ΙΙ[---]/ [--Α_ρ]ήλιος Συνή[σιος?---]/ [---π]ρρ Νήσω[ν---]["primipilares? from Islands"]/ [---]ιτες το_ σ[---]/ [---]τερον πε+[---]/ [---]οντας +++[---]/ [--- ---]τέρησαν/ [---]νων

materiału pozwalają wyjść poza spekulacje i wskazują na szerokie kontakty międzykulturowe mieszkańców antycznego Marion.

Yiannis Violaris, jedyny przedstawiciel Cypru na konferencji, zwrócił uwagę na niezwykle ciekawą i nową problematykę, tzn. obecność SCE w greckiej prasie cypryjskiej (dzienniki, periodyki). Projekt ten jest trudny do zrealizowania, ponieważ już na etapie kwerendy piętrzą się trudności; materiały są rozproszone i w całości niedostępne, nawet na Cyprze. Ostatnie lata pokazały, że ich analiza daje bardzo interesujące wyniki, a na przykład dla poznania historii Cypru pod rządami Brytyjczyków (1878–1960) są wręcz podstawową bazą źródłową. Także dla historii archeologii wyspy prasa jest cennym źródłem relacjonującym wykopaliska, wyrażającym opinie miejscowych grup i osób, a także zamieszczającym informacje będące poza zainteresowaniem historii oficjalnej. Działalność ekspedycji szwedzkiej jest relacjonowana dzień po dniu, od przybycia do opuszczenia Cypru, a nawet jeszcze później. Prasę interesują nie tylko same odkrycia, ale również reakcje miejscowej ludności na nie, podróże archeologów po wyspie oraz ich życie codzienne. Bardzo interesujące są zidentyfikowane w prasie artykuły Ejnara Gjerstada przetłumaczone na język grecki. Wprawdzie z tamtych czasów znane są również teksty autorstwa innych znakomitych archeologów i antykwariuszy, ale w przypadku SCE mamy do dyspozycji bogactwo informacji świadczące o świetności i znaczeniu jej badań. W świetle tego porównanie artykułów prasowych Ejnara Gjerstada z publikacjami naukowymi, a także konfrontacja dzienników badaczy z doniesieniami prasowymi mogłyby rzucić wiele nowego światła na prace oraz pobyt ekspedycji na wyspie.

Zaprezentowane uwagi zachęcają do lektury innych referatów, które – miejmy nadzieję – już wkrótce zostaną wydane i właściwie rozprowadzone, co przyczyni się do upowszechnienia, między innymi, niektórych aspektów studiów nad materiałami z wykopalisk SCE.

Dariusz Maliszewski
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

The establishment of *questurae* by Justinian has rightly been connected with his efforts to protect the Danube frontier against Barbarians[9]. The quaestor enjoyed an authority independent of both the praetorian prefect and the master of soldiers (*magister militum*). But opinions concerning the nature of this authority are still divided.

Most scholars regard the quaestor of the army as the chief military officer in the northern Balkans, a commander of the detachments of Roman army in the zone, especially of the Danube fleet. According to this opinion, the *quaestor exercitus* was really the fourth praetorian prefect but with military functions. Some scholars are convinced that the establishment of *quaesturae* must have been deliberately intended to diminish the position of the powerful prefect of the East; others think that the quaestor preceded the στρατηγός of the later Byzantine administrative unit: θέμα Καραβισιάνοι[10].

Torbatov, on the contrary, argues that the quaestor of Justinian was a purely civil officer, just like other praetorian prefects in late antiquity, and his duties concerning the army were limited to supplying army detachments of the Danube frontier (Torbatov 1997). As a matter of fact, Torbatov developed the theory of Jones, who already in 1964 had stressed the role of the quaestor in army provisioning (Jones 1964: 280)[11]. Torbatov's point of view is shared by Ivanov and, with some reservations, also by Curta[12]. The opinions put forward by Gkoutziou-kostas and Moniaros (Gkoutzioukostas 2003; Moniaros 2003) are also close to that of Torbatov. The first of them takes under consideration different titles applied to the quaestor in the sources and stresses the mainly civil nature of the *quaestor exercitus* as was the case with traditional Roman *quaestores militares*. The latter points out that it was the civil duties of the quaestor – especially in the matter of justice and army supply – that were underlined in the sources and, accordingly, this officer should be treated as a civil administrator, in fact the new *praefectus praetorio*, who in late antiquity was a purely civil officer.

In the present study I will argue that in the light of different sources it still cannot be ruled out that the *quaestor exercitus* was in charge of military forces at least from time to time.

---

[9] The condition of service was very hard there; the service in that area was even treated as a kind of punishment for soldiers. See Kaegi 1981: 111 f.

[10] It was done for the first time by Diehl 1905: 290 f. See elder studies cited in n. 4. Thus still Szádeczky-Kardoss 1985: 61 f. He argued – but without any direct evidence – for the existence of *quaestura exercitus* at the turn of the seventh century and treated quaestors as commanders of the Danube Fleet, independent from the chief military officer in the Balkans: *magister militum per Thracias*. Torbatov 1997 neglected his opinion. Also R. Ivanov 1998: 536 pointed out that *quaestura* seemed to exist till the creation of the thematic system. See below.

[11] The opinion of Jones was followed also in general by Haldon 1990: 12 and Barnish, Lee, Whitby 2000: 183 f.

[12] R. Ivanov 1998: 536; Curta 2001a: 66 f.; 2001b: 130 ff.; contrary 2001c: 208; 2002: 11 f.

Eos XCIII 2006
ISSN 0012-7825

QUAESTOR IUSTINIANUS EXERCITUS – A LATE ROMAN MILITARY COMMANDER?*

By

JACEK WIEWIOROWSKI

ABSTRACT: The paper concerns the question of military duties of the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* (quaestor of the army), the officer established by Justinian I in 536 (41st novel). According to the common opinion *quaestor exercitus* was not only the head of civil administration of the provinces Caria, Cyclades Islands, Cyprus, Moesia Secunda and Scythia Minor but also the most important military commander on the northern Balkans. This view was questioned in 1997 by Sergej Torbatov who maintained that the *quaestor exercitus* was nothing more than the new *praefectus praetorio* and his military duties were connected only with the delivering of army supplies.

The present author discusses in detail the preserved summaries of Justinian's 41st novel, written by Julian, Athanasios of Emesa and Theodoros Scholastikos (the whole text of the novel has been lost). Comparing them with other sources he comes to the conclusion that quaestors of the army commanded at least the provincial army detachments. The author also discusses the reasons why the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* was established. Among other causes there were also Justinian's reforms of provincial administration and abolition of the division of powers in most provinces of the eastern Roman empire. In conclusion the author states that it still cannot be ruled out that the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* was in fact not only the civil officer but also the military commander on the Lower Danube.

Quaestor Iustinianus exercitus (Justinian's quaestor of the army) was established by the emperor Justinian I in 536 (*Nov. Iust.* 41, May 18), while his duties were modified a year later (*Nov. Iust.* 50, September 1)[1]. Some information about this officer is also given by John Lydus, who called it ἔπαρχος ἐπόπτης τῶν Σκυθικῶν δυνάμεων ("the higher *praefectus* of the Scythian army") [Lydus,

---

* The first version of this paper was given at the conference on the contemporary Roman law studies in Poland, held in May 2004 at Kazimierz nad Wisłą (published: Wiewiorowski 2004). The second, enlarged version was presented in November 2005 at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. I would like to express my thanks to all who contributed their suggestions and criticism, especially to A. Baziór, W. Dajczak, A. Gkoutzioukostas, Th. Korres, X. Moniaros and L. Mrozewicz.

[1] About the dates of their issue and the relation between both novels see e.g. Biener 1824: 104–106, 448, 450; Lanata 1984: 249 f.

Also in the summary of the 41st novel written by the rhetor and lawyer Athanasios of Emessa we can find a statement which confirms the role of the *quaestor exercitus* as the army commander[25]. We possess the second, enlarged and amended version of Athanasios' work, called by modern scholars the *Novellensyntagma*. It was written in the last quarter of the sixth century in Antioch, most probably between 572–577, and consists of short summaries of Justinian's and Justin II's novels in 22 Titles, divided in five groups.

According to Athanasios' *Novellensyntagma* the constitution goes as follows:

> 4.12 LEX UT BONUS καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς
> Ὁ αὐτὸς [Justinian] βασιλεὺς Βόνον κουαέστορα EXERCITU
> RECTE NOBIS
> Περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν νήσων φησὶν ἡ διάταξις ὑποβάλλουσα τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἀρχῇ
> Κύπρον, Ῥόδον καὶ τὰς Κυκλάδας νήσους, Καρίαν, Μυσίαν, Σκυθίαν,
> τὸν τούτων ἡγούμενον Ἰουστινιανὸν QUAESTORA EXERCITU προσαγορεύουσα, καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἡγεισθαι τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπαρχιῶν κελεύουσα,
> καὶ τὰς ἐκ τούτων πεμπομένας ἐκκλήτους ἐξετάζειν αὐτὸν διατυποῦσα καὶ
> πρός γε τὴν ἴσην τάξιν αὐτῷ τῶν ἐπάρχων τῶν PRAETORION ἀπονέμουσα.
> Ἐγράφε πρὸ ιε΄ καλανδῶν Ἰουνίων μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Βελισαρίου.
>
> 4.12 Lex ut Bonus etc.
> The same emperor [Justinian] to Bonus, quaestor of the army.
> Recte nobis
> The constitution speaks about the authority over of the Islands [and] subordinates him
> the Cyprus, Rhodos and the Cyclades, Caria, Mysia, Scythia
> [and it] calls their governor Quaestor Iustinianus exercitus,
> and it also orders him to command the soldiers of the eparchias [those provinces]
> and to examine appeals which are coming from it and
> it [constitution] gives eparchos [= quaestor] the same rank as praetor [praefectus praetorio].
> Issued before 15 Kalends of June, after the Consulate of Belisarius.

The work of Athanasios was a kind of manual for practicing lawyers, such as Athanasios himself. His summary of the 41st novel is even more convincing in the matter of the quaestor's military leadership than a more extensive description of its text made by Julian. Athanasios wrote directly that the novel 41st τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἡγεισθαι τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπαρχιῶν κελεύουσα ("orders him [quaestor of the army] to command the soldiers of the eparchias"). Athanasios' *syntagma* also confirms that around 572–577 *quaestura exercitus* still existed. It is possible to assume that there was no need to put the summary of an invalid constitution in the book for practising lawyers.

---

[25] About Athanasios and his work see the edition of Athanasios, *Novellensynatagma*, prepared by D. Simon and S. Troianos, esp. pp. VII ff. with comprehensive bibliography.

die Auferstehung Christi auftauchen. Vorher wurde Diana (als Mondgöttin) erwähnt, jetzt ist vom Urchaos die Rede. Diese Mischung von mythologischen, philosophischen und christlichen Motiven, aber auch von antiken und modernen Begriffen, war das Merkmal der lateinischen Dichtung Kromers und der polnisch-lateinischen Dichtung überhaupt. Der polnische Dichter missbraucht aber diese für die Renaissance charakteristische Regel nicht. Obwohl er anstatt „Mond" „Diana" sagt, dennoch kann der Ausdruck „Urchaos" (*priscum chaos*) eine Metapher sein, die totale Unordnung, völlige Verwirrung bezeichnet, welche nach dem Tod des Erlösers auf der Welt zu herrschen anfingen. Diese Unordnung hatte statischen Charakter und zeichnete sich durch den Mangel an Bewegung aus. In einem gewissem Moment kam es zu einer Veränderung. Kromer bemühte sich, Veränderlichkeit der Naturzustände während der Auferstehung Christi zu zeigen. Das geschah am Morgen, direkt nach dem Sonnenaufgang (21 f.):

> Cum subito placidas roseo fulgore coruscans
> Extulit e tenebris faciem sol aureus almam.

Die Sonne, die in der griechischen Mythologie mit Apollo identifiziert wurde, ist hier zu dem Symbol Christi geworden. Der Erzähler ging bei der Beschreibung dieser der Grund des Lebens auf Erde seienden feurigen Kugel direkt auf die ganze Komplexität der Merkmale des Sternes ein, welche er sichtbar machen wollte. Diesem Ziel dient große Anzahl von Adjektiven und Substantiven, die verschiedene Farben zum Ausdruck bringen (*roseus*, *fulgor*, *coruscans*, *tenebrae*, *aureus*). Der Dichter versucht, eine klare Deutlichkeit des Ausdrucks und unmittelbare Bilder zu erreichen. Er will dem Leser geschildertes Geschehen näher bringen. Er möchte gerne dessen Wichtigkeit und Großartigkeit beweisen (23–25):

> Sol qui sidereis cursum lumenque ministrat
> Ignibus, et mentes superumque hominumque benigno
> Lumine collustrat, vitamque et tempore donat.

Bei der Aufzählung der Funktionen der Sonne beabsichtigte Kromer kein umfangreiches Wissen um die Sonne anzubringen, das übrigens der Erfahrung jedes Menschen zugänglich ist. Die Beschreibung schafft keine selbständige Struktur, sie steht in Verbindung mit den weiteren Äußerungen, bildet die Einführung in die Präsentierung des richtigen Helden des Poems. Die Zusammenstellung Christi mit der Sonne war keine originale Idee Kromers. Das Motiv funktionierte schon im Neuen Testament und wurde allen verständlich. Es diente vor allem der Charakteristik Christi, weil nur Er die Merkmale haben könnte, an welchen die Sonne erkannt wird, die für die ganze Welt wohltätige Pflichten erfüllt. Kromers Streben zielt darauf, die Individualisierung Christi hervorzuheben. Eines ihrer

Enßlin 1929: W. Enßlin, *Spectabilis*, *RE* III A 2 (1929), coll. 1552–1568.
Enßlin 1929: W. Enßlin, *Praefectus praetorio*, *RE* XXII 2 (1954), coll. 2391–2502.
Evans 1996: J.A.S. Evans, *The Age of Justinian, The Circumstances of Imperial Power*, London–New York 1996.
Faubert 1990: L. Faubert, *Narses. Hammer of the Goths. The Life and Times of Narses the Eunuch*, Gloucester–New York 1990.
Frisk 1960: H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I, Heidelberg 1960.
Gelzer 1909: H. Gelzer, *Studien zur byzantinischen Verwaltung Aegyptens*, Leipzig 1909.
Gkoutzioukostas 2001: A. Gkoutzioukostas, *O thesmos tou koiaistora tou ierou palatiou: e genese, oi armodioteses kai e ekselikse tou*, Thessaoloniki 2001.
Gkoutzioukostas 2003: A. Gkoutzioukostas, *Problemata schetika me ten eisagoge kai ten onomatodosia tou quaestor Iustinianus exercitus*, in: *3 Synantese Byzantinologon Ellados kai Kyprou, 20–22 Septembriou 2002, Aristoteleio Panepistemio Thessalonikes, Filosofike schole: Eisegeseis. Ereunetika – Metaptychiaka Programmata Perilepseis Anakoinoseon*, Thessaloniki 2003, pp. 107–109.
Gluschanin 1991: E.P. Gluschanin, *Der Militäradel des frühen Byzanz*, Barnaul–Dien 1991.
Grosse 1920: R. Grosse, *Römische Militärgeschichte von Galienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung,* Berlin 1920.
Guilland 1967a: R. Guilland, *La noblesse byzantine à la haute époque (IVe–Ve siècles). Observations diverses*, in: Guilland 1967 c, pp. 23–31.
Guilland 1967b: R. Guilland, *Les termes désignant le cammandant en chef des armées byzantines*, in: Guilland 1967 c, pp. 380–404.
Guilland 1967c: R. Guilland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, vol. I, Berlin–Amsterdam 1967.
Guilland 1976a: R. Guilland, *Egrège – perfectissime – clarissime*, Epéteris Etaireias Byzantinon Spoudon XXXV 1967, pp. 17–40 = Guilland 1976c, ch. I.
Guilland 1976b: R. Guilland, *Maîtres de la Milice*, in: Guilland 1976c, ch. V.
Guilland 1976c: R. Guilland, *Titres et fonctions de l'Empire byzantin*, London 1976.
Haase 1994: R. Haase, *Untersuchungen zur Verwaltung des spätrömischen Reiches unter Kaiser Justinian I (527 bis 565)*, Wiesbaden 1994.
Haldon 1990: J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. The Transformation of a Culture*, Cambridge 1990.
Haldon 1993: J. Haldon, *Military Service, Military Lands, and the Status of Soldiers: Current Problems and Interpretations*, DOP XLVII 1993, pp. 1–6.
Haldon 1997: J. Haldon, *Byzantium at War*, www.deremilitari.org/RESOURCES/ARTICLES/haldon1, pp. 4 f.
Haldon 2005: J. Haldon, *Economy and Administration: How Did the Empire Work?*, in: M. Maas (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge 2005, pp. 28–59.
Hanton 1927/1928: E. Hanton, *Lexique explicative du Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure*, Byzantion IV 1927/1928, pp. 53–136.
Harries 1999: J. Harries, *Law and Empire* in Late Antiquity, Cambridge 1999.
Hartmann 1899a: L.M. Hartmann, *Bonus 3*, *RE* III (1899), col. 714.
Hartmann 1899b: L.M. Hartmann, *Bonus 4*, *RE* III (1899), col. 714.
Hendy 1985: M. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c. 300–1450*, Cambridge 1985.
Hill 1949: G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, vol. I: *To the Conquest by Richard Lion Heart*, Cambridge 1949.
Hoffmann 1974: D. Hoffmann, *Der Oberbefehl des spätrömischen Heeres in 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, in: D.M. Pippidi (ed.), *Actes du IXe Congrès international d'études des frontières romaines, Mamaïa, 6–13 septembre 1972*, Bucarest–Köln–Wien 1974, pp. 381–397.

Rubin 1995: B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Justinians*, vol. II, Berlin–New York 1995.
Sahîd 1987: I. Sahîd, *Heraclius and the Theme System: New Light from the Arabic*, Byzantion LVII 1987, pp. 391–406.
Sahîd 1989: I. Sahîd, *Heraclius and the Theme System: Further Observations*, Byzantion LIX 1989, pp. 208–243.
Sargenti 1986: M. Sargenti, *Le strutture amministrative dell'impero da Diocleziano a Constantino*, in: idem, *Studi sul diritto del tardo impero*, Padova 1986, pp. 111–176.
Sarnowski 2005: T. Sarnowski, *Drei spätkaiserzeitliche Statuenbasen aus Novae in Niedermösien*, in: M. Mirković (ed.) *Römische Städte und Festungen an der Donau. Akten der regionalen Konferenz organisiert von Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung. Belgrad, 16–19 Oktober 2003*, Belgrad 2005, pp. 223–230.
Scharf 2001: R. Scharf, *Foederati. Von der völkerrechtlichen Kategorie zur byzantinischen Truppengattung*, Wien 2001.
Schminck 1991: A. Schminck, *Theodoros Scholasticos*, *ODB* III, pp. 2046–2047.
Scott 1932: S.P. Scott (ed.), *The Civil Law*, vols. I–XVII, Cincinnati 1932.
Sophocles 1896: E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, New York 1896.
Southern, Dixon 1996: P. Southern, K.R. Dixon, *The Late Roman Army*, London 1996.
Stein 1919a: E. Stein, *Justinus* 5, *RE* X 2 (1919), col. 1329.
Stein 1919b: E. Stein, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches vornehmlich unter Kaiser Justinus II. und Tiberius Constantinus*, Stuttgart 1919.
Stein 1922: E. Stein, *Untersuchungen über das Officium der Prätorianpräfektur seit Diokletian*, Wien 1922 (reprinted Amsterdam 1962).
Stein 1949: E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. II, Paris–Bruxelles–Amsterdam 1949.
Szádeczky-Kardoss 1985: S. Szádeczky-Kardoss, *Bemerkungen neben den "Quaestor Justinianus exercitus". Zur Frage der Vostufen der Themenvarfassung*, in: V. Vavrínek (ed.), *From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium. Proceedings of the Byzantinological Symposium in the 16th International Eirene Conference*, Praha 1985, pp. 61–64.
Tatcheva 1999: M. Tatcheva, *Les inscriptions grecques de Novae (Moesia Inferior)*, in: G. von Bülow, A. Milčeva (eds.), *Der Limes an der Unteren Donau von Diokletian bis Heraklios. Vorträge der Internationalen Konferenz Svištov, Bulgarien (1.–5. September 1998)*, Sofia, pp. 121–125.
Torbatov 1997: S. Torbatov, *Quaestura Exercitus: Moesia Secunda and Scythia under Justinian*, Archaeologia Bulgarica I 1997, 3, pp. 78–87.
Treadgold 1995: W.Treadgold, *Byzantium and Its Army, 284–1081*, Oxford 1995.
Tsirpanlis 1974: C.N. Tsirpanlis, *John Lydus and the Imperial Administration*, Byzantion XLIV 1974, pp. 479–501.
Turtledove 1977: H.N. Turtledove, *The Immediate Succesors of Justinian: A Study of the Persian Problem and of Continuity and Change in Internal Secular Affairs in The Later Roman Empire during the Reigns of Justin II and Tiberius II Constantinus (A.D. 565–582)*, London 1977 (diss.).
Vasiliev 1928: A.A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol. I, Madison 1928.
Velkov 1960: V. Velkov, *Odessos-Varna. Kürze historische Bemerkungen*, in: V. Beševliev, J. Irmscher (eds.), *Antike und Mittelalter in Bulgarien*, Berlin 1960, pp. 339–344.
Velkov 1977: V. Velkov, *Cities in Thrace and Dacia in Late Antiquity (Studies and Materials)*, Amsterdam 1977.
Velkov 1980: V. Velkov, *Das Schicksal einer frühbyzantinischen Stadt zur Zeit der Völkerwanderung (Odessos-Varna am Schwarzen Meer)*, in: idem, *Roman Cities. Collected Studies*, Amsterdam 1980, pp. 245–250.
Vetters 1950: H. Vetters, *Dacia Ripensis*, Wien 1950.
Vinsky 1975: K. Vinsky, *Justinian für Rechtseinheit in den Provinzen*, RIDA XXII 1975, pp. 355–373.

von seiner Braut nebeneinander. Das Ungeheuer gibt unter dem Einfluss dieser Gefühle sein Herz ganz dem Kadmos hin.

Der Poet berücksichtigte auch ein anderes unverzichtbares Element der bukolischen Gattung – den Wettgesang. Auch dieser lässt sich auf mehreren Textebenen interpretieren. Wie schon erwähnt wurde, kann man in unserer Passage zwei Klassen der Adressaten feststellen. Es ist aber bemerkenswert, dass es auch unter den Charakteren innerhalb des Epos Personen gibt, die sich wesentlich durch ihr Wissen und ihre Einschätzung der Situation unterscheiden. Es sind einerseits die Gegner Typhons und andererseits der Erdensohn selbst. Man kann bei der Analyse des Agonmotivs drei Textebenen finden.

Auf der ersten, äußersten Ebene befinden sich die Leser, denen Nonnos die Möglichkeit gegeben hat, die in den *Dionysiaka* dargestellte Welt von außen zu beobachten. Die zweite Ebene bilden die Gegner des Typhon, die im Gegenteil zu ihm wissen, dass es in Wirklichkeit keinen Hirten gibt, und dass die ganze idyllische Atmosphäre und die süßen Melodien nur dazu dienen, den Erdensohn zu Fall zu bringen. Die dritte Textebene existiert durch Typhon, in dessen Phantasie – und nur dort – wo es eine ruhige, schöne Landschaft und einen für ihn spielenden Hirten gibt. Das wird besonders deutlich durch den absurden Vorschlag des Ungeheuers, sich mit Kadmos in einem freundschaftlichen (sic!) Wettgesang zu messen. Typhon möchte als Musikinstrument den Donner spielen und der Hirte sollte die Flöte blasen (I 439–447):

> στήσω δ', ἢν ἐθέλῃς, φιλίην ἔριν· ἀλλὰ σὺ μέλπων
> πέμπε μέλος δονακῶδες, ἐγὼ βρονταῖον ἀράσσω·
> πνεύματι μὲν σφριγόωσαν ἔχων προβλῆτα παρειὴν
> φυσιάᾳς στομάτεσσιν, ἱμασσόμενοι δὲ Βορῆος
> ἄσθματι φυσητῆρος ἐμοὶ βρομέουσι κεραυνοί.
> βουκόλε, μισθὸν ἔχεις σέο πηκτίδος οὐράνιον γὰρ
> ἀντὶ Διὸς σκηπτοῦχος ὅτε θρόνον ἡνιοχεύσω,
> ἑσπόμενον μετὰ γαῖαν ἐς αἰθέρα καὶ σὲ κομίσσω
> αὐτῇ ὁμοῦ σύριγγι καί, ἢν ἐθέλῃς, ἅμα ποίμνῃ·
>
> Wollen wir, bitte, in freundlichem Wettstreit uns messen! Du spiele
> ruhig dein Lied auf dem Blasrohr, ich lasse mein Donnerlied krachen.
> Während mit aufgeblasenen Backen du angestrengt pustest,
> werden, gepeitscht vom stürmischen Fauchen des Gottes Boreas,
> meinen Befehlen gehorsam, zuckende Blitzstrahlen dröhnen.
> Lohnen auch soll sich für dich dein Spielen, mein Rinderhirt, Steige
> *ich* mit dem Zepter anstelle des Zeus auf den himmlischen
> Thronsitz, will ich mit mir von der Erde hinauf zum Himmel dich leiten,
> dich und dein Blasrohr, und, wenn du es möchtest, zugleich auch die Herde.

Es fällt auf, dass der Dichter aus Panopolis noch ein anderes traditionelles Element aufführt: das Monster will Kadmos für das Lied zu Ehren des neuen Weltherrschers bezahlen. Typhon verspricht nämlich Kadmos, dass er als neuer Himmelskönig ihn nicht vergessen, und ihm sogar mitsamt seinen Herden

Van der Wal 1964: N. Van der Wal, *Manuale Novellarum Justiniani. Aperçu systématique du contenu des novelles de Justinien*, Groningen–Amsterdam 1964.

Wenger 1953: L. Wenger, *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*, Wien 1953.

Wesener 1963: G. Wesener, *Quaestor exercitus*, *RE* XXIV (1963), coll. 824 f.

Whitby 2000: M. Whitby, *The Army, c. 420–602*, in: *CAH*² vol. XIV: A. Cameron, B. Ward-Perkins, M. Whitby (eds.), *Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425–600,* Cambridge, pp. 288–314.

Wiewiorowski 1999: J. Wiewiorowski, *Moesiae Secundae et Scythiae Minoris exempla prosopographica*, in: B. Lapis, L. Mrozewicz, K. Ilski (eds.), *Scripta Minora III, Aetas imperatoria*, Poznań 1999, pp. 347–461.

Wiewiorowski 2001: J. Wiewiorowski, *The Legal Status of the Roman Army Commanders in Moesia Secunda and Scythia Minor*, Eos LVIII 2001, pp. 351–360.

Wiewiorowski 2004: J. Wiewiorowski, *Quaestor Iustinianus exercitus i jego kompetencje wobec wojska* ["*Quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* and his Competences as Regards the Army"], in: A. Dębiński, M. Wójcik (eds.), *Współczesna romanistyka prawnicza w Polsce*, pp. 301–322.

Williams 1985: S. Williams, *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*, London 1985.

Wipszycka 1999: E. Wipszycka, *Źródła normatywne świeckie* ["The Secular Juridical Sources"], in: eadem (ed.), *Vademecum historyka starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, vol. III, Warszawa 1999, pp. 585–617.

Zahariade 1988: M. Zahariade, *Moesia Secunda, Scythia şi Notitia Dignitum*, Bucureşti 1988.

Zahariade 2006: M. Zahariade, *Scythia Minor. A History of a Later Roman Province (284–681)*, Amsterdam 2006.

Zuckermann 2002: C. Zuckermann, *La haute hiérarchie militaire en Afrique Byzantine*, AntTard X 2002, pp. 169–175.

des Gedichtes selbst ist sehr interessant. Der Dichter versucht nämlich zu Beginn des Poems, die Zeit genau zu bestimmen, in der sich die Ereignisse abspielten. Das Ganze geschah also, als (*De adversa valetudine serenissimi Princips et Domini Sigismundi*, 1 f.):

Fervidus Herculei rutilantia brachia cancri
Lustrabat niveis sol pharetratus equis.

Auf diese, muss man sagen, sehr eindrucksvolle Weise zeichnete Kromer den Lauf der Zeit, in der die geschilderten Ereignisse stattfanden. Die mythologischen Anknüpfungen lassen fast genau ihr Datum bestimmen. „Die Handlung" des Gedichtes kann innerhalb eines Monats vom 22. Juni bis 22. Juli gespielt haben. Es handelt sich also um die Jahreszeit, in der die Natur gerade den größten Blütezustand erlebt. Die folgenden Verse bestätigen diese Vermutung (3–8):

Vernabant blando nitidissima prata virore,
Gaudebatque opibus culta Napaea suis.
Gaudebant umbris Dryades, densisque superbae
Saltibus et volucrum cuncta hilarante sono.
Omnia ridebant oculis, mentesque tenebant.
Cuncta iocos, veneres deliciasque dabant.

Im zitierten Abschnitt stoßen wir wieder auf das Spezifikum der lateinischen Dichtung Kromers, welches in der Nachahmung der antiken Schriftsteller und in der Übernahme der von ihnen verwendeten rhetorischen Figuren zum Ausdruck kommt. Um den vorgestellten Text verstehen zu können, muss man nicht nur die Mythen über die Nymphen, die Wälder, Täler, Waldhöhlen bewohnen, kennen, sondern auch wissen, dass sie in der antiken Literatur zu Volks- und Hirtengedichten gehören. Deshalb sind Napäa und Driaden Gestalten, die mit dem Geruch der Felder, Wälder, Wasser und überhaupt der ganzen Natur umgeben sind, die natürliche Fruchtbarkeit und Schönheit versinnbildlichen. Als Bewohnerinnen der ruhigen und milden Öde, die mit der Wolke des nicht irdischen Glücks verhüllt ist, sind sie zum Symbol des menschlichen Strebens nach einem ruhigen Leben, nach der Erholung nach der Arbeit in einer idyllischen Umgebung, im Grünen geworden. Die Frühlingslandschaft, wo die Nymphen spazierten, sind zu einem Ideal, zu einer Sehnsucht geworden, die jedem Stadteinwohner zuteil wurde. Wie passend klingen die folgenden Worte Kromers (9 f.):

Sola erat urbanae species tunc squalida vitae,
Quae iucunda fere plus tamen esse solet.

De mag. II 28 f.][2]. The *quaestor exercitus* is mentioned also – under different names – by another novel of Justinian, two constitutions of his successors and some other literary and nonliterary sources, among them lead seals[3].

There are not many modern works concerning the *quaestura Iustinianus exercitus*[4]. In 1997 almost a complete list of studies was compiled by a Bulgarian scholar Sergej Torbatov (Torbatov 1997). Since then only few other works concerning the quaestor were published. The most comprehensive among them are a study by Rumen Ivanov (Ivanov 1998: 536), observations made by the authors of the sketch concerning the reforms of Justinian in the 14th volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* and remarks of Otto Mazal, Ralf Scharf, Wolfram Brandes and John Haldon (Barnish, Lee, Whitby 2000: 174, 183 f., 717; Mazal 2001: 187, 316, 321, 359 f.; Scharf 2001: 70, 99–101; Brandes 2004: 59–61; Haldon 2005: 50). Also worth mentioning is the article of the Romanian scholar Florin Curta, published in 2002 (Curta 2002)[5]. In the same year, during the 3rd Congress of Greek and Cypriot Byzantinists, two young Greek scholars, Andreas Gkoutsiokoustas and Xenofon Moniaros, presented analyses concerning the title of the *quaestor exercitus* and his duties (Gkoutziukostas 2003; Moniaros 2003)[6].

The view that quaestor of the army was a kind of special officer who administrated the frontier provinces of Moesia Secunda and Scythia Minor, which were associated with Caria, the Cyclades, and Cyprus is generally accepted[7]. The seat of the quaestor was Odessos (nowadays Varna) on the Black Sea coast in Bulgaria[8].

---

[2] Maybe therefore for Tsirpanlis (1974: 493) [the *quaestor exercitus* was] "nothing new but the office of *praefectus praetorio* of Scythia". About praetorian prefects in late antiquity see Stein 1922; Palanque 1933; Enßlin 1954, esp. coll. 2462–2502, and recently Porena 2003.

[3] *Nov. Iust.* 69 (*epilogus*) of AD 538 (about the broader jurisdiction of provincial governors); remarks in the novels of Justin II (AD 566) and Tiberius Constantinus (AD 575) (in: *CIC* vol. III, p. 148, 1 and p. 163, 2). See Van der Wal 1964: 26. Other sources are discussed further or quoted in works cited in notes 4–7.

[4] Bury 1923: 340 f., 360 f.; Stein 1919b: 165–168; Stein 1949: 439 f., 474 f.; Bréhier 1949: 110; Wesener 1963; Jones 1964: 280, 371, 482 f., 661, 844; Ahrweiler 1966: 12, n. 2; Barnea, Vulpe 1968: 426 f.; Vinsky 1975: 367 f.; Turtledove 1977: 393 f.; Velkov 1977: 62 f.; Patoura-Hatzopoulos 1980: 96; Velkov 1980: 245–250; Caimi 1984: 336 f., 338 f.; Hendy 1985: 294–296; Szádeczky-Kardoss 1985; Ravegnani 1988: 104; A. Barnea 1991: 243 f.; Treadgold 1995: 16 f.; Evans 1996: 213.

[5] He cited other less important sources concerning *quaesturae* and its possible staff. Only one lead seal could be possibly attributed to a quaestor (ibidem, p. 15, Appendix: No 16). See also his former studies: Curta 2001a; 2001b: 130 ff., esp. n. 107; 2001c: 208. About lead seals concerning quaestors see also Brandes 2004: 61, n. 263.

[6] A. Gkoutzioukostas and X. Moniaros are preparing a longer study concerning the *quaestura exercitus*.

[7] I omit the studies concerning those provinces in which *quaestura exercitus* was only mentioned (e.g. Hill 1949: 258 f.; Purcell 1969: 109).

[8] According to the summary of 41st novel of Theodoros Scholastikos (see fruther). About Odessos see e.g. Velkov 1960; Danov 1979: 267–281.

Irigoin 1993: Bacchylide, *Dithyrambes – Épinicies – Fragments*. Texte établi par J. Irigoin, Paris 1993.
Koster 1953: W.J.W. Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine*, Leyde ^{2}1953.
Maas 1972: P. Maas, *Greek Metre*. Transl. by H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1972.
Maehler ^{11}2003: Bacchylides, *Carmina cum fragmentis*, ed. H. Maehler, München–Leipzig, ^{11}2003.
Maehler 2004: Bacchylides, *A Selection*, ed. H. Maehler, Cambridge 2004.
Masqueray 1899: P. Masqueray, *Traité de métrique grecque*, Paris 1899.
Parker 1997: L.P.E. Parker, *The Songs of Aristophanes*, Oxford 1997.
Rossbach–Westphal 1856: C. Rossbach, R. Westphal, *Griechische Metrik nach den einzelnen Strophengattungen und metrischen Stilarten*, Leipzig 1856.
Schroeder 1903: O. Schroeder, *Die enoplischen Strophen Pindars*, Hermes XXXVIII 1903, pp. 202–243.
Snell–Maehler ^{10}1970: *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*. Post B. Snell ed. H. Maehler, Leipzig ^{10}1970.
West 1973: M.L. West, *Greek Poetry 2000–700 B.C.*, CQ XXIII 1973, pp. 179–192.
West 1982: M.L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982.
Wilamowitz 1921: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921.

Elemente war auch die Unterstreichung des Triumphes, der über den Tod errungen worden ist (26–31):

> Qui nova fert miseris amissae munera vitae
> Victor adest Erebi, devicta morte triumphans,
> Laetitiam ferens vultu, quo cuncta serenat.
> Agmine quem laeto superum comitata caterva
> Spirituum, nigras niveo fulgore tenebras
> Illustrat.

Dieser Triumph wurde, wie wir es lesen, auch in der irdischen Dimension sichtbar. Die Natur, die bis zu diesem Zeitpunkt eine nicht näher bestimmbare Trostlosigkeit und Trauer empfand, bekam jetzt Farben und ihre Freude wieder. Die Erde, das Wasser und die Luft zusammen mit den auf ihnen und in ihnen lebenden Pflanzen und Tieren waren voll von Freude, was der Dichter auf dieser Weise auszudrücken versuchte (57–73):

> Mox alia est rerum facies, iam clara coruscat
> Cynthia, iam fulgent hilari vaga sidera flamma,
> Sol properat celeri auroram praevertere cursu,
> Aer, aquae pariter gaudent, ignisque solumque
> Mitibus aethra micat flammis, tonitruque remugit
> Innocuo, et Zephiris respirat mollibus aer,
> Roreque pergrato squalentes irrigat agros.
> Itque reditque hilarum placidis anfractibus aequor,
> Flumina decurrunt leni delata susurro.
> Laeta tremit tellus, mugit, patefactaque fundit
> Foecundo e gremio vario distincta colore
> Gramina, multiplicesque herbas, florumque nitorem
> Purpureum, et suaves affatim effundit odores
> Cernere erat volucres coeli per aperta volantes
> Tempore non solito, et dulci modulamine magna
> Gaudia testantes, pecudesque virentibus arvis
> Ludentes, minime memores somnique cibique.

Die zitierte Schilderung, die an die idyllische Welt von Vergil und *aurea aetas* von Ovid[10] erinnert, beinhaltet die ganze Reihe von Einzelheiten, die die Frühlingslandschaft betreffen – der fröhliche Mond und die Sonne, die Morgenröte, Flüsse, Wiesen, Pflanzen, Vögel. Der Dichter versammelte Farben und stellte sie einander gegenüber, was die Vorstellungskraft des Lesers provoziert, welcher ein Bild „sehen" kann. Die Phantasie aktivieren auch solche Verben, Substantive und Ausdrücke wie: *tremere*, *mugire*, *Zephyrus*, *tonitrus*.

---

[10] Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 5 und 7, wo die Natur auch ihren psychischen Zustand enthüllt. Siehe auch Ovid. *Met.* I 89–150. Vgl. M. Cytowska, *Przyroda w poezji Klaudiana,* in: *Cognoscere causas. Człowiek a natura w cywilizacji starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Gdańsk 1998 (Studia Classica et Neolatina III), S. 108–114.

Man könnte sogar die kühne Behauptung riskieren, dass Nonnos im Moment der Überlistung des Typhons zugleich eine Falle für die Leser stellt. Zu diesem Zweck benutzt der Dichter alle möglichen bukolischen Motive, spricht eine sehr unpräzise Sprache und ist sehr inkonsequent indem er ständig andere Hirtenmusikinstrumente erwähnt. Dadurch lenkt er die Aufmerksamkeit der Leser und lässt sie für einen Moment den andauernden Kampf vergessen.

Wie Byron Harries[34] richtig beobachtet hat, spielt θέλγειν (bezaubern) eine wichtige Rolle in der Bukolik, also das Bezaubern, das durch Musik erfolgt. Kadmos rettet mit Hilfe von seiner Musik die Welt vor dem totalen Chaos, wenn er mit seiner Flöte Typhon bezwingt. Zugleich scheint Nonnos durch die Niederlage des Monsters und das kurz erwähnte Motiv der Sirenen aus der *Odyssee* (II 11–19) auch die Leser vor der Falle zu warnen. Die Falle, die er vorbereitet hat, um die Leser zu überführen. Plötzlich offenbart die schöne Hirtenwelt ihre dunkle und zerstörerische Kraft, die in den süßen Melodien versteckt war (I 410–413). Vielleicht wollte Nonnos die Adressaten auf Irrwege führen, damit sie selbst die ganze Kraft der Dichtung spüren können.

Am Ende sollte man sich vielleicht die Frage stellen, was Nonnos mit seinem Text beabsichtigt hatte. Wollte er einfach die Vorgeschichte des Dionysos erzählen, oder eher mit der bukolischen Gattungskonvention und zugleich mit den Erwartungen der Leser spielen?

Schon diese kurze Textanalyse einer bukolischen Passage aus den *Dionysiaka* zeigt, dass das Einflechten von verschiedenen literarischen Gattungen[35] und Anspielungen an sie ein charakteristisches Merkmal dieses Epos[36] sind. Auf den ersten Blick könnte man denken, dass diese Anspielungen nur dazu dienen, die große Belesenheit und das literarische Wissen Nonnos' zu beweisen. Nach der genaueren Untersuchung wird aber klar, dass die traditionellen Genera ihre ursprüngliche Funktion verloren haben und jetzt eine ganz neue Ganzheit bilden[37].

Schon am Anfang seines Werkes sagt Nonnos selbst, dass er einen „bunten Hymnus" (I 15: ποικίλον ὕμνον) singen möchte. Schon aus diesen Worten des

---

[34] Vgl. ibidem, S. 68.

[35] Der Dichter hat in sein Werk auch Hymnen (z. B. Athene XXXVII 320–323; Herakles XL 369–410; Beroe XLI 143–154; Selene XLIV 191–216); Epigramme (z. B. II 625–630; XI 476 f.; XV 358–362; XVII 310–314; XXXVII 101 f.; XLVI 318 f.) und Lamentationen (z. B. XL 112–152; 167–193; 197–211) eingeflochten.

[36] G. D'Ippolito, *Studi nonniani. L'epillio nelle Dionisiache*, Palermo 1964 (Quaderni dell'Istituto di Filologia Greca della Università di Palermo 3), S. 41, schreibt: „Il retaggio alessandrino nel poema nonniano si appalesa soprattutto nella confusione dei generi che da quell'età à avuto inizio. La definizione di epica mitologica non coglie certo nella sua interazza la forma delle *Dionisiache*: esse sono per molti aspetti anche epica didascalica o epica bucolica o inno o encomio epico".

[37] Harder, *o.c.* (Anm. 9), S. 95 ff.

Diese düstere Vorstellung von Natur, die stirbt, wenn der Winter kommt, spielt hier keine selbständige Rolle, sondern ist ein Beispiel für die Ansicht, dass alles, was auf der Welt existiere, sein Ende habe. Aus der Beobachtung der Natur ergibt sich die Überzeugung von der Veränderlichkeit des Schicksals. Diese Reflexion stützt sich auf charakteristisch ausgewählte Antithesen. In der Semantik der hier auftauchenden Bilder sieht man zunächst Elemente von diesen Empfindungen, die man bereits gut kennt. Es geht also um Schönheit der Natur und Freude, des Frühlings und Sommers: glänzende Wiesen, schimmernde, rote Früchte. Und in diese idyllische Szenerie dringt unerwartetweise der Tod ein, der durch realistische Bilder von nackten Baumästen, leeren Wiesen und verfaulten Früchten, mit denen sich stinkende Schweine beschmieren, konkretisiert wird. Bemerkenswert ist es hier die poetische Abkürzung, die Hässlichkeit des Materieabbaus exponiert. Metaphorische Konstruktionen und syntaktische Parallelismen verdeutlichen noch die gleiche Wahrheit vom Leben jedes Menschen.

Kromer zeigt in seinen Werken die Natur noch von einer anderen Seite. Jene Natur wird unheimlich, gefährlich, Tod und Untergang bringend. Dieses Motiv verwendet der Dichter zur Veranschaulichung der These, dass sich der Mensch in dieser Welt nicht sicher fühlen solle, weil er nicht wisse, wann und unter welchen Umständen er sein Leben einbüße. Eine reale Bedrohung sind Naturkräfte, Erdbeben, Wasserfluten und andere Naturkatastrophen (32–36):

Mille viae leti, mille pericla patent.
Aspera vis venti hinc, illinc violentior unda
Ingruit, haec ignis, Mars rapit illa ferus.
Quid memorem terrae motus ? Quid fulmina ? Quidve
Coeli intemperiem? Quid mala mille super?

Die Naturwelt ist hier der Hintergrund für die philosophische Problematik, die die Nichtigkeit des menschlichen Lebens betrifft. Kromer zählt hier Naturerscheinungen auf, gegen die man keinen Widerstand leisten kann, die alles vernichten. Die Macht der Naturkräfte betont das hier häufiger auftauchende Zahlwort *mille*, das auf unbegrenzte Zahl von Arten und Weisen, derer sich die Natur bedienen kann, hinweist. Mit Sicherheit wirkt dieses Bild plastisch auf die Vorstellungskraft des Lesers ein, aber auf der anderen Seite ist es ein Versuch, die formulierte Überzeugung zu beweisen. Der gleiche Gedanke taucht noch einmal auf (61):

Enecat hos aestus, multos fera frigora brumae.

Diese kurze Aussage macht den Eindruck eines gefühllosen Objektivismus. In der Tat stellt Kromer nicht nur die Wahrheit von der Funktionierung der Natur dar, sondern auch signalisiert seine Stellung auf eine mehr geheimnisvolle

CONSPECTUS MATERIAE EUS XCIII 2006 UTRIUSQUE FASCICULI

PIIS MANIBUS

KAZIMIERZ KORUS, *Sophrosyne* i *philiai* Profesora Romualda Turasiewicza (11.10.1930–31.1.2005) 11–25

COMMENTATIONES

JERZY DANIELEWICZ, Poetic Quotations and Discourse Strategies in Athenaeus 116–131
THOMAS GÄRTNER, Zu den erotischen Epigrammen des Rufinus 251–265
RICHARD KLEIN, Die römische Herrschaft in der kaiserzeitlichen griechischen Literatur .. 83–115
AGATA A. KLUCZEK, Le monde des barbares dans la propagande impériale au siècle d'or des Antonins et pendant la période de la crise du III^e^ siècle 275–296
WALTER LAPINI, Peloponnesian Ships in Ionia (Thuc. VIII) 185–196
ANNA LASEK, Nonnos' Spiel mit den Gattungen in den *Dionysiaka* (dargestellt anhand von I 362–534) 303–316
GODO LIEBERG, Caesar cum ceteris scriptoribus comparatus, qui et ipsi pugnam cum Nerviis commissam (*Gall.* II 16–28) narraverunt 55–64
MACIEJ MILCZANOWSKI, Caesarion in Cleopatra's Politics 227–238
MARIUSZ PLAGO, Lucan VII 192–194: An Example of *Arte Allusiva*? 239–250
GIUSEPPE RUSSO, Sull'autenticità dei titoli doppi in Luciano 267–273
JACEK WIEWIOROWSKI, *Qaestor Iustinianus Exercitus* – A Late Roman Military Commander? 317–340
MAREK WINIARCZYK, Das Werk *Peri Hyperboreon* des Hekataios von Abdera (*FGrHist* 264 F 7–14). Forschungsgeschichte (1848–2006) und Interpretationsversuch 26–54
HUBERT WOLANIN, Aristotle's πτῶσις ὀνόματος: A Predicative Variant of ὄνομα? 197–225
ROBERT K. ZAWADZKI, Motive der Natur in der lateinischen Dichtung Martin Kromers 341–355
MATEUSZ ŻMUDZIŃSKI, Recherches sur l'artisanat en Dacie romaine 297–301

NOTAE ET DISCUSSIONES

MIKOŁAJ SZYMAŃSKI, Lucretius' O, Q, L, F: Doing Justice to Manuscripts 132–134

SUMMARIA DISSERTATIONUM INAUGURALIUM

RAFAŁ BUTOR, Gaius Pescennius Niger, the Civil War of AD 193–197, and the Historiography 143–153
PRZEMYSŁAW DYRLAGA, The Emperor Macrinus and the Modern Historiography 154–170
TOMASZ ŁADOŃ, The Influence of the Sertorian Conflict on the Situation of the Roman Republic in the Seventies of the First Century BC 135–142
ANNA SZCZEPANIAK, Bacchylides' Dactylo-Epitrites against the Background of Early Greek Colometry 357–367

5, 28 M. (str. 13): λεπτότριχα σὺν ζεφύρου πνοι- (αῖσιν) (pap.: …πνο-)

– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ‘x̄’

9, 44 M. (str. 9): ἵστορες κοῦραι διωξίππο̣ι’ Ἄρηος (pap.: ...κόραι...)

– ◡ – ‘x̄’ – ◡ – – – ◡ – – |||

15, 63 M. (ep. 7): Γᾶς] παῖδας ὤλεσσεν Γίγαντας (pap.: ...ὤλεσεν...)

– – ◡ – ‘x̄’ – ◡ – – |||

etc.

None of the above lines raises any other questions than the metrical ones. But are these kinds of corrections necessary? Is it really so unusual for dactylo-epitrites to admit short *ancipitia*? We may take as an example the scheme of Bacchylides' *Ep*. 13, in which such *ancipitia* are quite numerous:

	ΣΤΡ		ΕΠ
			58, 91
1	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⋮	1	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏑ – ◡ – |
	47, 68, 134, 146		
2	⏑ – ◡ – – ||	2	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ –
	102, 81		60
3	– – – ◡ ◡ – ⏑ |	3	⏑ – ◡ – – |
	148, 169, 202		
4	– ◡ – ⏓ – ◡ – – ||	4	– ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ –
5	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – ||	5	– – ◡ – – – ◡ – ||
			195, 228
6	– ◡ – – – ◡ – ⋮	6	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏑ ⋮
			64? 64, 130, 229 97, 163, 196
7	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⋮	7	⏓⏓ ◡ – ⏓ – ◡ – ⏓ – ◡ – ||
	86, 152, 185, 206		98, 131, 164
8	⏓ – ◡ – – ||	8	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏓ ⋮
			66, 132?
9	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – ||	9	– ◡ – ⏓ – ◡ – – |||
	55, 121, 142, 154?, 187		
10	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏓ |		
11	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⋮		
	123, 156		
12	– – ◡ – ⏓ – ◡ – – |||		

A different example of equating the length of an *anceps* can be found in Bacchyl. 19 (= *Dith*. 5). Koster (1953: 135) analysed the metre of this poem as dactylo-epitrite in nature, although γένος διπλάσιον (iambics and trochaics) is never epitrite in form here. Similarly, Maehler in his latest selection from Bacchylides

Sie bewirken, dass die geschilderte Situation nicht nur gesehen, sondern auch gehört oder sogar mit Hilfe der Berührung, des Geruchs und Geschmacks quasi gespürt werden kann. Die Bildhaftigkeit endet nicht mit unmittelbarer visueller und sensueller Wirkung, weil sich der zitierte Abschnitt nicht nur auf sinnliche Eindrücke bezieht. Diese Schilderung, wie die anderen, hat bei Kromer immer eine mit dem Thema des ganzen Gedichtes zusammenhängende tiefere Bedeutung: das Poem sollte nämlich in diesem Fall den auferstandenen Christus besingen. Die Schilderungen, die die Natur betreffen, wirken also auf zwei Ebenen ein. Einerseits lösen sie verschiedene Reaktionen der menschlichen Sinne aus. Andererseits bewegen sie den Leser durch alles, was das Bild mit sich trägt, was mit dem semantischen Bereich verbunden ist.

Denselben Zielen dienen auch herrliche, manchmal sehr ausgebaute, Vergleiche, in denen der erste Teil zu einem durchaus kunstvoll konstruierten Bild von Natur wird. Eine solche stilistische Figur wird häufig als homerischer Vergleich bezeichnet. Zur Veranschaulichung des Ganzen sei ein Beispiel gebracht (37–42):

> Ac veluti (si fas parvis componere magna)
> Suavisonae liquidum remigantes aera pennis
> Cantillant volucres, resonat nemus omne Camoenis,
> Cum ver intepuit solis fulgore benigno.
> Sic illi plaudunt, sic victoremque salutant.

Wörtliche Interpretation des ersten Teils des vorgestellten Vergleichs hat einen deutlichen Sinn. Fliegende Vögel, Frühling, der mit den Nymphenstimmen singende Wald sind Zeichen, die eine allgemein bekannte und bestimmte Bedeutung haben. Jedes von ihnen, isoliert betrachtet, aktiviert, im Grunde genommen, die gleichen Assoziationen: Freude und Frische. Wenn sie alle aber auf einmal nebeneinander stehen, unterstreichen sie noch mehr die fröhliche Stimmung. Das Verhalten der Himmelsgeister wurde also mit der Frühlingsspontaneität der Natur verglichen. Durch diesen Vergleich wollte der Dichter eine gewisse Vorstellung von der Stimmung übermitteln, die unter den an Christus Glaubenden nach seiner Auferstehung herrschte.

Man muss feststellen, dass Frühling das Lieblingsmotiv Kromers war. Ein Bild von Frühling, oder eigentlich von frühem Sommer stellt der Dichter in seinem nächsten großen Poem dar, das er wegen der Krankheit des Königs Sigmund I. schrieb. Der Herrscher erkrankte während einer Jagd in den rudnischen (auf polnisch: Rudniki) Wäldern in Litauen, nachdem er aufgrund der Müdigkeit seine Brust entkleidet und sich der Wirkung eines starken Windes ausgesetzt hatte. Das ganze Geschehen fand also während einer Jagd statt; deshalb bereicherte Kromer sein Gedicht mit den Bildern von Natur und Landschaft. Ähnlich wie im vorherigen Poem ist die geschilderte Natur der Hintergrund, der den Sinn der Ereignisse hervorhebt und die Aufmerksamkeit des Lesers fesselt. Der Anfang

Therefore we can deduce that the text of Menander demonstrates directly that Ioannes, as the quaestor of the army, commanded forces strong enough to control the march of the Avars across the Roman territory and the vessels of the Roman fleet were subordinated to him[43].

The quaestor's duties toward the army were also underlined by two novels of Justinian's successors which called him ἐνδοξότατος Ἰουτινίανος ἔπαρχος τῶν ἐπὶ Μυσίας καὶ Σκυθίας στρατιωτικῶν καταλόγων ("most glorious Iustinian prefect of the army units of Moesia and Scythia") or ἄρχων τῶν νήσων καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ Σκυθίας καί τε Μυσίας στρατιωτικῶν ταγμάτων ("archon of the Islands and the military forces of Moesia and Scythia") [*Nov. Iust.* 148 and 163]. Those constitutions concerned mainly the civil matters (the exemption of some provinces from taxes) and unfortunately their texts said nothing about the problem of the quaestor's military duties.

There are other arguments to corroborate the hypothesis that the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus* was also a military commander.

After the death of the brave *magister militum per Thracias* Chilbudios in 533 and the beginning of Justinian's *reconquista* of the West, the emperor had to change his policy toward the Danubian frontier[44]. There was still a need for the defense consolidation against barbarians raids across the Danube. But the question was how to deal with them when most of army forces had been dispatched to the West. The most important issue was that of army supplies and the quaestor's office was established mainly to maintain it. However, the question of command in the region of high strategic importance for the defence of Constantinople itself was equally important. Therefore in 535 Justinian established the office of *praetor Iustinianus Thraciae* in the Balkans, responsible for the civil and military questions in the part of the old Thracian diocese[45]. The praetor of Thrace was certainly not only a civil official but also a military officer and it is justified to assume the same in the case of the *quaestor Iustinianus exercitus*[46]. When we put forward the argument that quaestors were always civil officers according to Roman tradition (Torbatov 1997: 80 f.), we have to remember that the same was true in the case of praetors.

There is also another explanation. After the establishment of *questura exercitus* we have no information concerning the regional army commanders:

---

[43] For Stein 1919b: 167 he was an admiral.

[44] Torbatov 1997: 81 f. See also about Chilbudius with bibliography Wiewiorowski 1999: 372 f.

[45] *Nov. Iust.* 26. See also below. About the importance of the Balkans see recently Mazal 2001: 182–194.

[46] Also Haldon 2005: 50 connect both reforms, but without detail discussion.

glücklich, freut sich über sein Schicksal, tut sich niemals etwas Böses an (*Ex Menandro*, 3–6):

> Primumque asellum istum licet videre quem
> Cuncti misellum confitentur, hic tamen
> Adsciscit ipse nil sibi unquam incommodi,
> Sed quae dedit natura ei, sola haec habet.

Das Bild vom Esel bestätigt natürlich die vom Dichter angenommene These, dass man auf große Forderungen verzichten soll, um glücklich zu sein. Im zitierten Abschnitt – im seinen lateinischen „Gewand" – verdient besondere Beachtung die von Kromer angewandte Instrumentation. Es handelt sich um die Zusammenstellung der ähnlich klingenden Diminutivwörter: *asellum – misellum*, die die Verwandtschaft von zwei verschiedenen Formulierungen zum Ausdruck bringen. Dieses gewisse Wortspiel sollte geheime Verbundenheit zwischen dem Esel und seinem angeblich elenden Schicksal erscheinen lassen.

Bei der Vorstellung von Natur bemühte sich Kromer um eine gewisse Originalität, die gleichzeitig über den Wert seiner lateinischen Werke entscheidet. Bei der Konstruierung seiner Gedichte gab der Schriftsteller nicht nur die damals herrschenden literarischen Normen, die aus den antiken Zeiten stammen, wieder. Im Grunde genommen, verwendet Kromer sehr selten bereits existierenden Schemen, Ausdrücke, die der antiken Dichtung entnommenen Formulierungen, obwohl sich einige Motive ohne Zweifel auf bestimmte Werke der römischen Poeten besonders auf die von Vergil, Ovid und Horaz stützen können. Bemerkenswert ist es, dass Kromer niemals bei der Formulierung seiner Vorstellung von Natur nach unmittelbaren und offensichtlichen Entlehnungen von diesen Autoren griff. Der antiken Tradition entnahm er nur gewisse Begriffe, Modelle, Empfindungsweise, Gedanken. Seine Erfindungsgabe beruhte auch darauf, dass er gewissen gängigen mythologischen Motiven, die mit der bukolischen Tradition verbunden sind, eine gewisse polnische und patriotische Dimension gab. Auf kunstvolle Weise konnte er seine persönliche emotionale und ästhetische Einstellung gegenüber den geschilderten Landschaften durch bestimmten Wortschatz, durch phonetische Gestalt und syntaktische Konstruktionen, durch Farben und Laute hervorbringende phraseologische Verbindungen zum Ausdruck bringen. Diesen ganzen Individualismus, die Suche nach eigenen Formen und künstlerischen Lösungen drückte er aber im Rahmen der Schemas und Normen aus, die ihm die damalige Epoche, die sich so häufig auf die antike Kultur berief, aufzwang.

Jan-Długosz-Akademie, Częstochowa

auf die Auferstehung Christi und seinen Sieg über den Tod. Die ganze Handlung des Poems beginnt nach der Beisetzung Christi. Der Dichter zeigt diejenigen, die „den barmherzigen Erlöser" folterten und schlugen, diejenigen, die sich, nachdem sie grausames Verbrechen begangen hatten, freuten, die beim Grab des Herrn Wache ließen, und die mit einem großen Stein den Eingang schlossen, damit „der Herr der Erde und des Himmels nicht auferstehe" (5–12). Durch diese Tat bewiesen sie natürlich nur ihre Dummheit (*excors*, 10). Deshalb stellt der Dichter fest, ihre Freude werde sich ganz gewiss in die ewige Trauer verwandeln[8]. Am Anfang könnten sie scheinen, Christus besiegt zu haben. Beim Grab Christi gab es niemanden, der Ihm Mitgefühl zeigte, der Ihn beweinte. Lediglich die Natur drückte ihre Trauer aus. Der Dichter war nicht nur in der Lage, die Atmosphäre der Ruhe wunderbar zu wiedergeben, sondern auch eine gewisse Spannung und Erwartung, welche die Landschaft durchdrangen (13 f.):

> Nox erat[9] et coelo radiabant fusca sereno
> Sidera.

Die Redewendung „verdunkelte Sterne" (*fusca sidera*) deutet darauf hin, dass nicht alles in der Natur in Ordnung war, weil die Sterne normalerweise mit hellem Schein am klaren Himmel brennen. Der Ausdruck muss in diesem Kontext wörtlich interpretiert werden. Ohne dass er seine zugrunde liegende Bedeutung verliert, bereitet er die Grundlage für eine düstere und finstere Stimmung vor. Die folgenden Verse zeigen noch besser den Zustand, welcher der Natur zuteil wurde (14–17):

> … et exigua, pleno licet orbe, coruscans
> Luce, poli medium nocturna Diana tenebat.
> Arva, homines, volucres, animantia cuncta silebant,
> Moesta sui indignaque et acerba morte parentis.

Kromer stattet die Natur mit menschlichen Eigenschaften und Fähigkeiten aus, indem er eine solche Schilderung einführt, die gewissermaßen die Erlebnisse der Natur vor Augen stellt. Ähnliche anthropomorphische Züge bekommen folgende Elemente, die Bestandteile der materialischen Welt sind (17–19):

> Reflexus tenuere vago tunc aequora moesta,
> Squalebant elementa suum lugentia regem,
> Inque chaos priscum commixta redire parabant.

Interessant ist es auch, dass Götter- und Heldengestalten der griechischen und römischen, also heidnischen, Legenden im Kontext der Überlegungen über

---

[8] Vgl. 8: „mutanta aeterno peragebat gaudia luctu".
[9] Vgl. Hor. *Epod.* 15, 1, Verg. *Aen.* III 147.

INDEX AUCTORUM

Thomas Gärtner (Chiloniae) 251
Agata A. Kluczek (Catoviciae) 275
Joanna Komorowska (Cracoviae) 371
Walter Lapini (Genuae) 185
Anna Lasek (Posnaniae) 303
Dariusz Maliszewski (Posnaniae) 369, 383
Maciej Milczanowski (Resoviae) 227
Mariusz Plago (Wratislaviae) 239
Giuseppe Russo (Barii) 267
Jerzy Strzelczyk (Posnaniae) 381
Anna Szczepaniak (Catoviciae) 357
Anna Maria Wasyl (Cracoviae) 377
Jacek Wiewiorowski (Posnaniae) 317
Hubert Wolanin (Cracoviae) 197
Robert Zaborowski (Allenstenii) 373
Robert K. Zawadzki (Cestochoviae) 341
Mateusz Żmudziński (Wratislaviae) 297