Incontri di Filologia Classica

XIX – 2019/2020

EUT

Incontri di Filologia classica
Rivista annuale - Classe di valutazione ANVUR: A

ISSN: 2464-8752 – eISSN: 2464-8760
http://www.openstarts.units.it/dspace/handle/10077/3528

Gli articoli pubblicati sono sottoposti a valutazione di referee interni ed esterni. I contributi di questo volume sono liberamente disponibili su https://www.openstarts.units.it/handle/10077/32048.

Registrazione del Tribunale di Trieste n. 1218 (21.04.2010)

INCONTRI DI FILOLOGIA CLASSICA

XIX
2019-2020

EUT
Edizioni Università di Trieste
2021

INDICE

PREMESSA

Questo fascicolo degli Incontri di filologia classica *presenta una sezione tematica in cui sono raccolte le relazioni discusse in occasione del seminario internazionale* Etymology and Literary Culture in Greco-Roman Antiquity, *organizzato da Gianfranco Agosti e Athanassios Vergados presso la School of History, Classics and Archaeology dell'Università di Newcastle il 16-17 dicembre 2019, insieme con altri contributi programmati a integrazione degli argomenti discussi.*

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32049 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 1-20*

ENRICO CERRONI

Il 'doloroso' tra medicina e poesia: usi e frequenza dell'aggettivo ἀλγεινός da Ippocrate al Tardo Antico

Questo lavoro si propone di analizzare l'importanza stilistica dell'aggettivo greco ἀλγεινός, *'doloroso', e la sua fortuna in parte condivisa con* ἄλγος, *il sostantivo poetico da cui deriva. Legato al precedente omerico* ἀλεγεινός, *forse attraverso la paretimologia, in origine* ἀλγεινός *era abbastanza comune nella tragedia e raro in medicina e prosa, ma nel corso del tempo ha acquisito importanza in alcune formule ricorrenti. Come nel caso di* ἄλγος, *è registrato nella poesia ellenistica (ad esempio come utile alternativa ad* ἀλεγεινός), *mentre fino alla Tarda Antichità fu evitato dai medici post-ippocratici, che preferivano aggettivi privi di connotazioni poetiche o sentimentali. A partire dal IV secolo d.C. il quadro delle attestazioni di* ἀλγεινός *nei testi letterari ed epigrafici risulta molto complesso: si passa dalla rinascita nell'opera di Quinto di Smirne alla totale scomparsa nella poesia epica di Nonno di Panopoli.*

This paper aims to analyze the stylistic import of the Greek adjective ἀλγεινός, *'painful', and the fortunes it partially shared with* ἄλγος, *the poetic noun from which it derives. Bound to the Homeric precedent* ἀλεγεινός, *possibly through paretymology,* ἀλγεινός *was initially quite common in tragedy and rare in medicine and prose, but gained prominence in set phrases over time. As is the case for* ἄλγος, *it is preserved in Hellenistic poetry, for instance as a useful alternative to* ἀλεγεινός, *but was shunned as a last resort by post-Hippocratic physicians, who - until Late Antiquity - preferred adjectives devoid of poetic or sentimental connotations. Starting from the fourth century, a tally of literary texts and epigraphs yields a very complex picture: from a resurgence in the work of Quintus of Smyrna, to its total disappearance in the epic poetry of Nonnus of Panopolis.*

La lingua della medicina costituisce un interessante bacino di indagine delle potenzialità espressive e stilistiche del greco, caratterizzato dall'esigenza di dare un nome a un inventario sempre più sfaccettato – e necessariamente aperto alle novità – di sindromi, sintomi e terapie.

Un capitolo affascinante della vicenda è rappresentato da quelle voci del più antico lessico medico, che vuol dire *de facto* ancora epico perché risalenti a Omero, le quali furono destinate al dileguo perché con il tempo superate da formazioni nuove e di maggior successo. Esempio noto è quello di ἄλγος 'dolore', di cui si registra la progressiva rarefazione tra V e IV sec. a.C. e che ebbe un recupero nei medici successivi come voce poetica o come testimonianza di aderenza a una tradizione[1].

Per certi versi analoga al caso di ἄλγος è la storia dell'aggettivo ἀλγεινός 'doloroso'[2], la cui utilità in un registro medico sarebbe inconfutabile, almeno in linea

[1] «L'aristocratica primazia di ἄλγος è destinata a crollare: l'imbarazzante poetismo sopravvive, quale pretensioso flosculo letterario» (Marzullo 1999, 126). Sulla descrizione del dolore in Ippocrate, vd. Marzullo 1999 e Villard 2006; su ἄλγος e i suoi usi in prosa e in poesia, vd. Cerroni 2019. Una introduzione di ampio respiro al rapporto tra dolore e medicina nel mondo antico si trova in Harris 2018; per l'età imperiale, vd. King 2017.

[2] La forma corrente in Omero era ἀλεγεινός, che sembra derivata dalla radice del verbo ἀλέγω (*Iliade*: 21x, *Odissea*: 9x), anche se non si può escludere si tratti di una paraetimologia

di principio, se non avesse a partire dalle origini una prevalente caratura poetica. Sulla scia del nome corradicale, anche l'aggettivo conobbe una scarsa fortuna nei testi medici, preludio di una progressiva scomparsa dalla produzione post-ippocratica – che gli avrebbe preferito sinonimi meno connotati – a fronte della sua conservazione nella lingua poetica, non senza inevitabili infiltrazioni nella prosa letteraria, di cui cercherò di dar conto in questo studio[3].

1. *Il IV secolo a.C.: Ippocrate e non solo*

Punto di partenza della ricerca è il *Corpus Hippocraticum*, nel quale l'aggettivo era evidentemente di uso molto raro. L'*Index Hippocraticus* ne documenta due soli casi, più ancora di ἄλγος (appena 14x)[4]. Il primo tratta del dolore delle mestrua-

---

secondaria utile a spiegare una forma nata per ragioni metriche: ἀλγεινός costituisce infatti un molosso, non adatto all'esametro, al contrario ἀλεγεινός è una comoda clausola esametrica (*Iliade*: 17x, *Odissea*: 5x per un totale di 22x su 30; in 20 casi sui 22 individuati l'epiteto segue il nome cui si riferisce). Cf. anche Seiler s.v. *ἀλεγεινός* in *LfgrE*; Szemerényi 1964, 148; Frisk, *GEW*, s.v. *ἄλγος*; Chantraine, *DELG*, *s.v. ἄλγος* «il prend dans l'épopée le sens général de 'terrible', s'applique à des personnes, et arrive à signifier dangereux». La spiegazione della forma ἀλεγεινός come caso di ἐπέκτασις a partire da ἀλγεινός è già nel grammatico Trifone (*Περὶ παθῶν* 1,15 Schneider). Quanto agli usi e al significato di ἀλεγεινός in Omero, per cui vd. anche la più ampia trattazione di Mawet 1979, 229-236, il suo valore è attivo, nel senso di 'ciò che causa dolore', a differenza di quello del più tardo ἀλγεινός. Mi limito a riferire la spiegazione che davano i filologi antichi a proposito dei cavalli di Achille (*Il.* X 402, XVII 76), difficili (ἀλεγεινοί) a domarsi: οἳ δ' ἀλεγεινοὶ / ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι δαμήμεναι. Se Apollonio interpreta con δυσχερεῖς (*Lex.* Bekker p. 22), Esichio si diffonde di più: ἀλεγεινοί· ἀλγεινοί. χαλεποί. δυσχείρωτοι. ἢ μὴ δυνάμενοι χωρὶς ἀλγηδόνος ὑπὸ θνητοῦ δαμασθῆναι (α 2822 Latte - Cunningham). Una buona spiegazione è anche in Porfirio: ἀλεγεινόν οὖν ἐστι τὸ μετὰ τῆς δεούσης καὶ μεγίστης φροντίδος γινόμενον (*Quaest. Hom.* ad *Il.* XVI 152).

[3] Rispetto alla caratura di poetismo, notata per es. da Smith 1916, 25 a proposito di Tucidide (II 39, II 43, VII 75), mi limito qui a segnalare alcuni dati dalla letteratura di V sec. a.C., in cui sono contemplati anche il comparativo ἀλγίων e il superlativo ἄλγιστος oltre alle forme di comparativo e superlativo in -τερος e -τατος: Eschilo (3x), Sofocle (10x), Euripide (7x), Erodoto (0x), Tucidide (4x). Da notare il silenzio della lirica arcaica. La più antica attestazione di ἀλγεινός risulta, dunque, riconducibile a Eschilo.

[4] Già nel *Corpus Hippocraticum* «il crollo [di ἄλγος] è inevitabile, nello scontro con ὀδύνη (772x, ὀδύνημα 5x, ὀδυνᾶν 51x, ὀδυνώδης 54x, ἀνώδυνος 44x): un lessema tuttavia arcaico, di contenuto generalmente oggettivo» (Marzullo 1999, 126), infrequente in tragedia. Quest'ultima, invece, a ὀδύνη preferiva ancora l'arcaico ἄλγος e il più recente λύπη, «le terme central de la douleur en grec post-homérique» (Mawet 1979, 399-400), caratterizzato da maggior caratura sentimentale.

zioni e si trova al termine di una successione, quasi una *climax*, che impiega anche il concorrente πονηρός, aggettivo di gran lunga preferito dai medici ippocratici (*Mul.* II 146 Littré, ἢν ὑποπτυχθῇ τι τῶν στομάτων, τὰ ἐπιμήνια οὐ γίνονται, ἢ ὀλίγα καὶ πονηρὰ καὶ ἀλγεινά, καὶ ὁκόταν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ξυνεύδῃ, ἀλγέει, καὶ οὐ θέλει ψαύεσθαι). Il secondo testo, invece, si riferisce genericamente alla condizione dolorosa del malato, ma proviene da uno scritto perlopiù datato al I sec. d.C. come i *Praecepta* (9 Littré, οἱ νοσέοντες διὰ τὴν ἀλγεινὴν διάθεσιν ἀπαυδέοντες ἑωυτούς τε μεταλλάσσουσι τῆς ζωῆς)[5]. I medici ippocratici iniziavano a preferire aggettivi dotati di maggior oggettività e minori ascendenze poetiche: come su ἄλγος cominciavano a prevalere il tecnico ἄλγημα o i più comuni πόνος, ὀδύνη, λύπη, così ἀλγεινός veniva soppiantato da πονηρός (170x), ἐπώδυνος (53x), ἐπίπονος (51x), in misura decisamente maggiore di λυπηρός (3x) e ὀδυνηρός (2x).

Nel IV sec. a.C. una situazione simile si riscontra in Aristotele, che era peraltro figlio di un medico e non estraneo al gergo tecnico della medicina. Il lessico curato da Radice restituisce solo due passi: *EN* 1117b 4 e *HA* 522a 9 (cui bisogna aggiungere *Pr.* 887a, 890a, 967b). Il primo brano, tratto dal terzo libro dell'*Etica Nicomachea*, si trova all'interno della lunga trattazione del tema del coraggio (ἀνδρεία), virtù che è in un certo senso dolorosa (διὸ καὶ ἐπίλυπον ἡ ἀνδρεία) perché richiede molti sacrifici per il suo conseguimento. Per esemplificare il discorso, il filosofo ricorre al mondo delle competizioni sportive, in particolare del pugilato: il *boxeur* sa di ambire all'onore della vittoria, ma è anche consapevole del fatto che il prezzo sia alto, perché il ricevere colpi e ferite è doloroso: τὸ δὲ τύπτεσθαι ἀλγεινόν. In un brano in cui spesseggiano derivati di λύπη come λυπηρός (6x) e ἐπίλυπος (1x), il desueto ἀλγεινός serve probabilmente ad evitare una spiacevole ripetizione. Quanto al passo citato della *Historia animalium*, vi si tratta di una curiosa abitudine praticata dai pastori della regione del monte Eta che vede coinvolte le capre che rifiutano l'accoppiamento (κνίδην τρίβουσι τὰ οὔθατα βίᾳ διὰ τὸ ἀλγεινὸν εἶναι)[6].

È interessante constatare che nella letteratura di IV sec. a.C., a fronte dell'esiguità di esempi offerti da Ippocrate e Aristotele, l'autore più prodigo risulti Platone. Il filosofo, che usa con discreta frequenza il sostantivo ἀλγηδών (28x) e ignora la neoformazione ippocratica ἄλγημα, ricorre spesso (20x) all'aggettivo caro ai tragici, considerando anche le forme comparativali ἀλγεινότερος e il superlativo ἀλγεινότατος (*Leg.* 735d 8, *Gorg.* 476c 5, 476c 8, 477d 4, 479b 1, 479b 6, 480c 8, *Resp.* 584a 8 -2x-, *Phlb.* 32c 2, *Ti.* 64a 3, 64d 1, 77b 6, 81e 1, 81e 3, 84e 1, *Crat.* 419 c 4, *Symp.* 218a

[5] Per una datazione del trattato, vd. Ecca 2016, 26-27, con rimandi a ulteriore bibliografia.

[6] Essi prendono delle ortiche e con esse sollecitano le mammelle degli animali, che iniziano a secernere dapprima un liquido simile a sangue, poi del pus, infine del latte che non ha nulla da invidiare a quello delle compagne che hanno subito la monta.

2, 218a 3, *Phaed.* 60c 6). Talora lo si può spiegare evocando il bisogno di evitare ripetizioni[7] oppure può servire a una resa enfatica, come nel brano citato del *Simposio*[8]. Di là da questi casi, tale fortuna presso Platone si deve sì all'ampiezza tematica della sua analisi filosofica e alla propensione all'analisi dell'animo umano, ma anche al personale stile dell'autore, che non era restio a tentare vie meno percorse o poetiche: con lui si tratta, dunque, soprattutto di una questione di *parole*[9].

Un riscontro della relativa liricità di Platone, rispetto al greco dei medici ippocratici e dello stesso Aristotele, viene dal confronto con un altro autore vissuto a cavallo tra V e IV sec. a.C., come Senofonte, decisamente più parco di poetismi: nel caso di ἀλγεινός offre appena tre impieghi[10]. Il primo proviene dalle *Elleniche* (I 7,27) e fa riferimento a quanto sia ἀλγεινὸν καὶ ἀνωφελές un ripensamento dopo aver inflitto una condanna a morte; il secondo passo si trova all'interno del dialogo tra Ciro e Crisanta in *Cyr.* III 3,52: Ciro afferma la necessità dell'esistenza di leggi tali da garantire agli onesti una vita onorata e ai malvagi una meschina e *travagliata*[11]; il terzo, invece, in *Mem.* III 12,2 si riferisce a coloro che si salvano con infamia da una battaglia e sono fatti prigionieri, costretti a dura schiavitù op-

---

[7] Un esempio di tale uso dovuto a necessità di *variatio* dopo un λυπηρός (60b) si trova nel passo citato del *Fedone* (ἐπειδὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ ἦν ἐν τῷ σκέλει τὸ ἀλγεινόν, ἥκειν δὴ φαίνεται ἐπακολουθοῦν τὸ ἡδύ).

[8] Stenzel 1966, 240. Si tratta del noto passaggio in cui Alcibiade confessa di aver tentato di conquistare Socrate: ἐγὼ οὖν δεδηγμένος τε ὑπὸ ἀλγεινοτέρου καὶ τὸ ἀλγεινότατον ὧν ἄν τις δηχθείη. «Ora, anch'io sono stato morsicato, e da un morso più doloroso nel punto in cui è più doloroso essere morsi» (trad. G.Reale).

[9] Nella prospettiva di Dionigi di Alicarnasso, il suo errore «consisteva proprio nell'introdurre la τροπικήν τε καὶ διθυραμβικὴν φράσιν nei discorsi filosofici, a imitazione di Gorgia (*ad Pomp.* 2, U.-R. II, 230 sg.)» (Nicolai 1992, 244). Sul rapporto tra Platone e la poesia, in termini filosofici più che meramente stilistici, cf. Giuliano 2005, che ha anche indagato le funzioni delle citazioni poetiche nei dialoghi platonici: «Platone non si è sottratto al fascino della poesia e, di fatto, non vi ha rinunciato» (Giuliano 2005, 334) ed è stato notato che la stragrande maggioranza delle citazioni poetiche siano fatte da Socrate (Rottger 1960, 68).

[10] Uno studio della rappresentazione delle emozioni nelle *Elleniche* di Senofonte si trova in Tamiolaki 2013.

[11] È da segnalare nel passo l'uso di αἰών, che è altro termine poetico in un contesto eticheggiante adatto a un lessico solenne: ἆρ᾽ οὐκ, ἔφη, εἰ μέλλουσι τοιαῦται διάνοιαι ἐγγραφήσεσθαι ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἔμμονοι ἔσεσθαι, πρῶτον μὲν νόμους ὑπάρξαι δεῖ τοιούτους δι᾽ ὧν τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς ἔντιμος καὶ ἐλευθέριος ὁ βίος παρασκευασθήσεται, τοῖς δὲ κακοῖς ταπεινός τε καὶ ἀλγεινὸς καὶ ἀβίωτος ὁ αἰὼν ἐπανακείσεται; «Tali pensieri, - continuò, - devono essere scolpiti in maniera indelebile nella mente dell'uomo; ma dovrebbero esistere in primo luogo leggi tali, da garantire agli onesti una vita onorata e libera, imporre ai disonesti una esistenza meschina e travagliata al punto da non meritarne neppure il nome» (trad. C.Carena).

pure a vita grama perché ridotti nelle più *dolorose* necessità (εἰς τὰς ἀνάγκας τὰς ἀλγεινοτάτας).

L'impressione che si ricava da questo sondaggio è che per Aristotele, come per Ippocrate, al pari di ἄλγος l'aggettivo derivato doveva costituire ormai una scelta ricercata, residuo di un lessico epico ionico mantenuto solo dalla tragedia (e all'occorrenza dal 'tragico' Platone).

2. *L'età ellenistica e imperiale*

Prima di considerare l'uso dei medici post-ippocratici, vorrei circoscrivere il registro stilistico in cui ἀλγεινός ricorre prevalentemente nella letteratura ellenistica. Per quel che può significare in considerazione dell'esiguità dell'opera conservata, Callimaco vi ricorre solo in un caso (*Del.* 239), poco valorizzato nei commenti: Iride, messaggera degli dèi, ha appena annunciato a Era che l'isola di Asteria ha offerto ospitalità a Latona consentendole di partorire. La dea, allora, risponde contrita (ἀλεγεινόν) e arrabbiata, come recita la formula di attacco del discorso diretto: ἡ δ'ἀλεγεινὸν ἀλαστήσασα προσηύδα «e quella, dolorosamente adirata, parlò» (trad. G.B. D'Alessio)[12].

Così Apollonio Rodio (III 582, 692, 764, 1103; IV 11, 191, 377)[13] e Arato di Soli (*Phaen.* 291) hanno solo la forma epica ἀλεγεινός, mentre Teocrito, che pure conserva ἄλγος (5x), non fa propri gli aggettivi corradicali; nel trimetro giambico Licofrone mantiene ἀλγεινός a proposito dei dolori del parto (*Alex.* 942 ὠδῖνας ἀλγεινάς).

È interessante notare, piuttosto, che l'epigramma con Antipatro di Sidone accolga la forma tragica ἀλγεινός (*AP* VII 711,7; VII 745,4; XVI 131.8 sul mito di Niobe), a scapito di quella epica[14]. L'uso di Antipatro non è che la spia di uno sviluppo ormai

---

[12] «The adjective is Homeric, cf. *Il.* 13, 569 (-ος), but the adverb is not found elsewhere» (Mineur 1984, 202; vd. anche Mawet 1979, 234).

[13] La dislocazione nel verso è un esempio di *presqu'homérique* in Apollonio: in 3 attestazioni su 4 di ἀλεγεινός, la sede è la clausola esametrica, mentre per gli altri tre casi, rappresentati dal superlativo ἀλεγεινότατος, la posizione è l'inizio del verso, subito dopo il *primum longum* (III 764, 1103; IV 11).

[14] In *AP* VII 711 Antipatro rievoca la morte improvvisa della giovane Clinàreta, sposa di Pìtane, occorsa nel giorno stesso delle nozze, in posizione incipitaria di esametro: ἀλγειναὶ δ'ἐκάμοντο συνάλικες, οὐχὶ θυρέτρων, / ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἀίδεω στερνοτυπῆ πάταγον «chiasso non fecero amiche dolenti dinanzi alle porte, ma con percosse al petto per la morte» (v. 7-8, trad. F.M.Pontani). Nel secondo epigramma (VII 745), dedicato alla morte violenta del poeta Ibico, è declinato invece il concetto di ἄλγιστον θάνατον: ἀλλ'ἐπιβωσάμενον γεράνων νέφος, αἵ τοι ἵκοντο μάρτυρες ἄλγιστον ὀλλυμένῳ θάνατον

ampiamente diffuso, come testimonia la documentazione epigrafica. Otto iscrizioni, datate tra l'epoca ellenistica e i primi secoli d.C., restituiscono un distico elegiaco divenuto piuttosto frequente in iscrizioni funerarie, all'occorrenza con piccole variazioni[15]. Lo riporto nella versione meglio conservata, che si può leggere alla fine di un'epigrafe di Caristo, datata alla prima età romana (*SEG* XXXI 810,5-6)[16]:

[ο]ὐ τὸ θανεῖν ἀλγεινόν, ἐπείπερ Μοῖρ' ἐπέκλωσεν,
[ἀλ]λὰ πρὶν ἡλικία[ς, μ]ητρὸς ἐμῆς πρότερον

Diversamente declinato, con la modifica del secondo emistichio, è dato riscontrare un testo simile in una breve iscrizione di Rodi (*IG* XII,1 146), costituita dal semplice distico[17]:

[οὐ τὸ θανεῖν ἀλγ]ειν́ον, ὅπερ καὶ <π>ᾶσ[ι πρό]κειται,
[ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἡλικία]ς καὶ γονέων πρότερον

Una controprova della sopravvivenza selettiva di ἀλγεινός viene dalla prosa di età ellenistica e imperiale. I *Septuaginta*, che pure all'occorrenza in testi più stilisticamente raffinati sfoggiano l'aristocratico ἄλγος (*2 Ma*. 3.17; *Ps*. 68/69.26; *Si.* 26.6; *La.* 1.12 e 1.18), hanno solo il nuovo ἀλγηρός, formato con il suffisso aggettivale *–ro*, nel libro di *Geremia* (10.19; 37.12-13) e mai i vecchi ἀλεγεινός o ἀλγεινός; questi ultimi si trovano una sola volta, rispettivamente, in una citazione in Polibio

---

«ma quella nube di gru che chiamasti arrivò testimone, proprio nel punto della cruda morte» (v. 3-4, trad. F.M.Pontani). In *AP* XVI 131 invece è rappresentato il dolore straziante di Niobe, la Tantalide, i cui figli furono addotti a triste sepoltura anzitempo (ἐς ἀλγεινοὺς πάντες ἄγοντο τάφους). Lo stesso epigrammista, noto per «uno stile ricco e sontuoso» caratterizzato da un uso spiccato dell'attributo esornativo (Argentieri 2003, 64), si compiace peraltro di variare adottando altrove la forma già esiodea ἀλγινόεις (ἀλγινόεσσα νόσος, 'morbo penoso' necessario a creare parallelismo con κυκλόεσσαν ἴτυν 'tondo scudo', in *AP* VII 232,3). Per la formazione di ἀλγινόεις, vd. Chantraine 1933, 271.

[15] In aggiunta, si registrano altre cinque attestazioni epigrafiche di ἀλγεινός, perlopiù in contesti esametrici (per es. *Smyrna* 277).

[16] Sull'iscrizione, vd. anche Peek 1981, 289-290. Il medesimo distico si trova anche in un'iscrizione funebre cretese di I sec. a.C. (*IC* I xvi 150), in una di Eritre, di cronologia incerta (*Erythrai* 160), ma vd. anche *IMT Kyz Kapu Dağ* 1709 (II-I sec. a.C.), *IK Prusa ad Olympum* 55 (II-III sec. d.C.).

[17] In questa variante, ulteriormente modificata, il testo ritorna nell'incipit di un'iscrizione del 260/261 d.C., proveniente dalla Lidia (*TAM* V,1 481), che riporto di seguito: [— — — — — — —]ον |οὐ τὸ θαν-[εῖν ἀλγεινόν, ἐ]π̣ὶ τόδε πᾶσιν [πέπρωτ]ε, | ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἡλικίης [καὶ γον]έων πρόταιρον. Altro caso analogo in *MAMA* X *App*. I 186,31.

(XII 27,11)[18] e nella lettera di Aristea a Filocrate (253)[19]. In una prosa sentimentale (*Amat. narr.* 28) un poeta di I sec. a.C. come Partenio raccontava la storia infelice di Clite, affranta per la sorte dell'amato, morto nella spedizione degli Argonauti, motivo di ἀλγεινὸν πόθον per lei e per i compagni[20].

Nel I sec. d.C. Filone ricorre al patetico ἀλγεινός (3x) in due passi del grandioso *Commentario allegorico alla Bibbia*, facendone un uso piuttosto raro nella prosa filosofica, fatta eccezione per il precedente platonico. Nel terzo libro delle *Legum Allegoriae* (4,402) il filosofo alessandrino riconduce alla sensazione la genesi del dolore, come quella del piacere, e paragona l'uomo perspicace all'atleta che contrasta tutti i dolori (ἀλγεινά); a lui Dio ha accresciuto ogni genere di sofferenze (di nuovo ἀλγεινά, in 4.203), destinandolo alla sensazione, non senza riservare una sovrabbondante ricchezza di beni all'anima virtuosa. Nel trattato *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* (66), invece, trattando dei rimedi dolorosi con cui i medici salvano un paziente, scrive κἂν ἀλγεινότατα ᾖ τὰ σῴζοντα «per quanto dolorosi siano i mezzi con cui verrà salvato» (trad. C.Mazzarelli).

Le attestazioni nella prosa di età imperiale non sono numerose e sembrano confermare il quadro sin qui tracciato: per citare i nomi più illustri, Dionigi di Alicarnasso (2x, di cui una dovuta alla citazione di Thuc. II 39 in *Amm. II* 12), Giuseppe Flavio (4x), Plutarco (13x, soprattutto nei *Moralia*), Dione Crisostomo (1x), Pausania (2x), Luciano (6x con tre ulteriori nell'*Asinus*), Massimo di Tiro (3x), Elio Aristide (1x), Cassio Dione (1x), Alcifrone (1x), Dexippo (3x); sembrano fare eccezione, almeno relativamente, solo Sesto Empirico (8x), Origene (8x) ed Eliano (14x).[21] L'impressione è che si tratti ormai di uno di quegli aggettivi 'patetici' (in italiano basti pensare a 'sventurato', 'penoso'), di qualche pretesa stilistica, che spesso entrano a far parte di un uso comune della lingua anche a livelli medi, con il richiamo implicito a un originario registro alto e tragico, più titolato a occuparsi con profondità dei grandi temi della vita umana.

Se poi volgiamo lo sguardo al romanzo, genere che prestò necessariamente attenzione verso un lessico sentimentale, anche qui la frequenza resta curiosamente molto bassa[22], ma maggiore nell'autore più erudito, Eliodoro. Si ha così la seguente distribu-

---

[18] Si tratta di *Od.* VIII 183.

[19] Il contesto è relativo ai poteri di Dio e si segnala per il nesso ἀνωφελὲς καὶ ἀλγεινόν 'inutile e doloroso', già senofonteo (*HG* I 7,27): ὅπερ ἀνωφελὲς καὶ ἀλγεινόν ἐστιν, εἰ τὸ ζῆν ἀφελεῖται πολλῶν, διὰ τὸ κύριον εἶναι.

[20] È dato osservare un solo altro caso in Partenio (*SH* 626,9).

[21] Sulla rappresentazione del dolore nella prosa greca di età imperiale, cf. King 2017, in part. 116-150 (con attenzione a Plutarco, Luciano e Elio Aristide).

[22] «L'espressione della gioia è meno comune al romanzo greco, come del resto quasi ad ogni specie di romanzo, che l'espressione del dolore» (Calderini 1987, 31).

zione: Achille Tazio (1x: II 29,5)[23], Senofonte di Efeso (1x: V 8,5), Eliodoro di Emesa (7x: I 2,9; I 3,1; II 6,4; II 15,1; V 4,1; V 29,5; VI 7,2)[24] e nessun caso in Longo Sofista.

Contrariamente a ogni aspettativa, scarne informazioni di stile si possono desumere dalla lessicografia atticista di II sec. d.C. Una indicazione sommaria viene da Polluce, che si limita ad attribuire all'uso della medicina una serie di termini relativi all'area semantica del dolore, tra cui ἀλγεινός: τάχα δ' ἂν τοῖς ἰατρικοῖς προσήκοι τὸ ἀλγεῖν, ἀλγεινόν ἐπαλγές, ὀδυνᾶσθαι ὀδυνηρόν ἐπώδυνον (IV 189 Bethe) e a indicare ἀλγεινῶς tra i sinonimi di λυπηρῶς (III 99 Bethe).

Se andiamo, tuttavia, a controllare l'uso dei medici post-ippocratici, sia pur negli enormi limiti della letteratura effettivamente conservata, il bilancio resta decisamente a sfavore della famiglia di ἄλγος. In età ellenistica e imperiale, infatti, la nozione di dolore era preferibilmente resa con il ricorso a una molteplicità di termini, tra i quali i più generici πόνος, λύπη, ὀδύνη o il più tecnico ἄλγημα, ma non più ἄλγος[25]. L'unica opera medica ellenistica pervenutaci integra, il commento al trattato ippocratico *De articulis* curato da Apollonio di Cizio, infatti, sembra disdegnare l'intera famiglia lessicale, compresi ἀλγεινός e ἄλγημα, a vantaggio di ὀδύνη (4x). L'ippocratico Areteo di Cappadocia e Rufo di Efeso restituiscono un solo caso di ἀλγεινός ciascuno[26], mentre Sorano declina i nomi ἀλγηδών (6x) e ἄλγημα (14x), usa ἐπίπονος (3x), ma mai il nostro aggettivo.

La testimonianza più importante resta, tuttavia, quella di Galeno, al quale dobbiamo il maggior numero di attestazioni (11x, di cui due all'interno del poema *De antidotis* del medico Andromaco, che Galeno riporta per intero)[27]. Galeno, infatti, dice qualcosa in più in termini di stile, anche rispetto allo stesso Polluce. In un passo del *De symptomatum causis* I 6 (VII 118 Kühn), che prende le mosse da una nota sentenza di Platone richiamata poco prima (VII 115 Kühn)[28], si esprime

[23] Sulla rappresentazione del dolore in *Leucippe e Clitofonte*, cf. King 2017, 187-205.

[24] Un esempio di ἀλγεινός in Eliodoro è in una delle consuete massime, tanto care all'autore, posta a commento del primo episodio del romanzo, che vede protagonisti i giovani Teagene e Cariclea: l'amore sincero si estrania da tutto ciò che di bello o di brutto accade intorno (I 2,9 τῶν μὲν ἔξωθεν προσπιπτόντων ἀλγεινῶν τε καὶ ἡδέων πάντων ὑπερφρονεῖ). È il caso, inoltre, di notare l'uso, piuttosto stereotipico, di ἀλγεινός in rapporto antonimico con ἡδύς.

[25] I dati di Galeno che ricavo dal *TLG* sono illuminanti in tal senso: ὀδύνη (1025x), πόνος (625x), ἄλγημα (361x), λύπη (178x).

[26] Areteo lo usa per definire doloroso, ma salutare, il trattamento delle incisioni delle vene con il carbonato di sodio (*De curatione acutorum morborum* I 10,13). Sul dolore in Areteo vd. anche King 2017, 50-67. Per Rufo vd. *De renum et vescicae morbis* 3,9 ed. Daremberg - Ruelle.

[27] Su Andromaco, il medico di corte dell'imperatore Nerone, e sulla scelta di trasmettere in forma poetica testi di medicina, rimando a Cassia 2012, 27-28.

[28] *Ti.* 64d 1. Il filosofo istituiva una contrapposizione tra un'affezione innaturale, vio-

chiaramente sull'indifferenza semantica tra le voci più comunemente impiegate per indicare il dolore (πάθος, ἀνία, λύπη, ὀδύνη, πόνος o ἀλγηδών): οὐδὲν γὰρ διοίσει λέγειν ἀνιαρὰν ἢ λυπηρὰν ἢ ἀλγεινὴν ἢ ὀδυνηρὰν ἢ ἐπίπονον αἴσθησιν· ὥσπερ οὐδὲ αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος, ἀνίαν ἢ λύπην ἢ ὀδύνην ἢ πόνον ἢ ἀλγηδόνα[29].

Se il senso resta all'incirca lo stesso, tuttavia, la comparazione della frequenza tra i sinonimi basta a esemplificare le preferenze stilistiche del Pergameno: ὀδυνηρός 93x, ἀνιαρός 75x, ἐπώδυνος 52x, ἐπίπονος 26x, λυπηρός 25x contro gli 11 casi del vetusto ἀλγεινός e gli appena 2 del prefissato ἐπαλγής richiamato da Polluce. Dal confronto tra questi dati e i sondaggi precedenti risulta che Galeno si mantiene perlopiù fedele a una terminologia ippocratica, della quale conserva ἐπώδυνος e ἐπίπονος, ma non manca di innovare, come dimostra l'impiego di ἀνιαρός e la grande fortuna di ὀδυνηρός. La nota polemica ingaggiata con Archigene di Apamea, medico di età traianea[30], spiega bene le prospettive stilistiche dell'autore. In una lunga sezione del secondo libro *Del locis affectis*, dedicato alla descrizione dei sintomi diagnostici, Galeno rimprovera ad Archigene, di cui riporta e commenta un brano sui diversi tipi di dolore (VIII 90-92 Kühn = 330,2-24 Gärtner), il ricorso a un lessico troppo oscuro e metaforico, rispetto al quale rivendica la necessità della chiarezza, dimostrata dai medici prima di lui che hanno usato espressioni comuni, ascoltate dai racconti dei pazienti[31]. A fronte di tale professione di metodo e di stile, negli scritti galenici il raro e poetico ἀλγεινός si conservava solo in *iuncturae* come πάθος ἀλγεινόν o in opposizione antonimica con ἡδύς, laddove l'autore richiamava o parafrasava il citato passo platonico[32].

---

lenta e dolorosa e il ritorno alla condizione naturale, in confronto, piacevole: τὸ μὲν παρὰ φύσιν καὶ βιαίως γιγνόμενον ἀθρόως ἐν ἡμῖν πάθος, ἀλγεινόν· τὸ δὲ εἰς φύσιν ἀπιὸν αὖ πάλιν ἀθρόον, ἡδύ. Sulla concettualizzazione del dolore e del piacere in Galeno, rimando a Boudon-Millot 2018, in part. 40-42 sul commento alla teoria del *Timeo*.

[29] «When he reflects on the role of sensation at the beginning of *On the causes of symptoms*, Galen remarks that it makes little difference whether one describes a sensation of 'distressing, grievious, ardous, painful or stressful' (ἀνιαρὰν ἢ λυπηρὰν ἢ ἀλγεινὴν ἢ ὀδυνηρὰν ἢ ἐπίπονον αἴσθησιν), just as it is irrelevant to refer to a disease by the terms 'affliction, grievance, pain, suffering, or distress' (ὥσπερ οὐδὲ αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος, ἀνίαν ἢ λύπην ἢ ὀδύνην ἢ πόνον ἢ ἀλγηδόνα)» (Boudon-Millot 2018, 39).

[30] Suda, s.v. *Archigenes*, α 4107. Su Archigene rimando a Mavroudis 2000.

[31] *De locis affectis* II 9,12 (VIII 116 Kühn = 358,27-360,11 Gärtner). Per una dettagliata analisi del passo di Archigene, anche in relazione alle discusse scelte terminologiche, rimando a Gärtner 2015, 732-750. Sul problema della verbalizzazione del dolore in Galeno, vd. anche Roselli 2015 e King 2017, 73-100.

[32] Per es. in un passo del quinto libro del *De locis affectis* (VIII 337,14 Kühn) si tratta di un πάθος ἀλγεινόν allo stomaco: ἥ γε μὴν ὀδύνη πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν στομάχῳ τι πάθος ἀλγεινὸν ἔχουσι κατὰ τὸ μετάφρενον διασημαίνει. Quanto al richiamo di *Ti.* 64d 1, vale a spiegare

3. *Il Tardo Antico*

La letteratura tardoantica offre un quadro sotto certi aspetti più diversificato, a causa delle varie operazioni arcaizzanti messe in atto da alcuni autori, limitatamente ai generi letterari a maggior vocazione conservatrice. Quando si tratta di voci erudite ormai stereotipate, poi, è molto facile vederle declinate anche in contesti stilistici medi e bassi[33].

Un caso interessante è l'epica e, in generale, la poesia esametrica. Per trovare ἀλγεινός invece di ἀλεγεινός in un poema esametrico, almeno tra quelli a noi conservati, infatti, bisogna aspettare il II sec. d.C. con la poesia scientifica e didascalica, rappresentata dal medico e poeta Marcello di Side, in un frammento del *de piscibus* (v. 91)[34], e da Oppiano (*Hal.* 4.172)[35]. Si tratta di un orizzonte cronologico posteriore alle prime attestazioni epigrafiche che abbiamo prima documentato – che rimandano invece all'età ellenistica – ma è da dire che sono casi non molto frequenti, tra i quali si inscrive il poeta epico Trifiodoro (2x nella *Presa di Ilio*, 472 e 582)[36].

Il più conservatore Quinto di Smirne, infatti, sotto questo aspetto si mantiene fedele alla lingua omerica con la seguente distribuzione: ἄλγος (74x), ἀλεγεινός

---

altre occorrenze dell'aggettivo in Galeno, per es. nel *De tremore, palpitatione, convulsione et rigore* (VII 619,12 Kühn), *In Timaeum commentaria* (fr. 2 Schröder). Per una valutazione dello stile di Galeno, moderato atticista che rifugge dai poetismi, rimando al fondamentale studio di Deichgräber 1956. L'argomento è ripreso da Swain 1996, 56-64 e Vela Tejada 2009. Per il rapporto di Galeno con la lingua poetica, vd. De Lacy 1966.

[33] Del resto, questo vale anche per ἄλγος, recuperato in prosa da vari autori desiderosi di innalzare lo stile. «Malgrado la caratura irrinunciabilmente poetica, ἄλγος sembra trionfare in tutta la letteratura greca» (Marzullo 1999, 124).

[34] Si può leggere nell'edizione di Heitsch 1964, 16-22. Su Marcello di Side, cui è dedicato un noto epitafio trasmessoci in *AP* VII 158, rimando agli studi recenti di Arena - Cassia 2016 e Arena 2018.

[35] Nella fattispecie, Oppiano ascrive al cossifo la peculiarità, tra i pesci, di provare un ἀλγεινὸν ἔρωτα (ἔξοχα δ' ἐκ πάντων νεπόδων ἀλγεινὸν ἔρωτα / κόσσυφος ἀθλεύει). È da aggiungere, anche in questo caso con la difficoltà della cronologia, verosimilmente posteriore ai due autori precedenti, Manetone con gli *Apotelesmatica* (3x), in cui la forma tragica coesiste in relativo equilibrio con l'epicismo ἀλεγεινός (4x), che invece è la sola forma attestata negli *Oracoli Sibillini* (6x).

[36] Nel secondo passo l'autore conia una *iunctura* insolita, il 'duro vino' (καί τινες ἀλγεινῷ κραδίην βεβαρηότες οἴνῳ), all'interno di una ripresa omerica da *Od.* III 139. Un commento ai due contesti in Miguélez-Cavero 2013, 371 e 429. Rispetto al lessico, Trifiodoro è omerizzante, con ben 1061 parole omeriche su un totale di 1556 (Gerlaud 1982, 51-52), ma non senza innovazioni: tra queste, sarà da annoverare anche la preferenza per il tragico ἀλγεινός sull'epico ἀλεγεινός.

(77x), ἀλγεινός (0x), ma varia con l'inserto esiodeo ἀλγινόεις (22x). Si tratta di dati interessanti per una serie di motivi. Anzitutto, nell'uso di Quinto è dato riscontrare un aumento della frequenza dell'omerico ἀλεγεινός (81x di cui 4 attestazioni dell'avverbio in -ως), rispetto alla somma delle attestazioni dell'*Iliade* e dell'*Odissea* (30x), e contestualmente il rifiuto della variante più recente, già tragica, ἀλγεινός. Se i referenti dell'aggettivo in Omero erano perlopiù specialità sportive, come la lotta (παλαισμοσύνη), o il pugilato (πυγμαχίη), le onde marine all'interno di una formula (*Il.* XXIV 8, *Od.* VIII 183, XIII 91, 264), sostantivi generici come μάχη (in un verso formulare: *Il.* XVIII 248, XIX 46, XX 43) o ἀγγελίη, fino all'espressiva *iunctura* ἐν νηπιέῃ ἀλεγεινῇ di *Il.* IX 491, in genere tradotta 'nell'infanzia difficile'[37], in Quinto tale repertorio muta sensibilmente, a tutto danno delle antiche formule e a vantaggio di un originale sperimentalismo[38].

Tra i molti possibili esempi, vi si può leggere di una 'dolorosa sciagura' (ἀλεγεινὸν ὄλεθρον, I 381), di uno 'strepito penoso' (ἀλεγεινὸν ῥοῖζον, I 250-51), oppure della dolorosa necessità che debbano combattere anche le donne (οὔτ' ἀλεγεινὴ / γίνετ' ἀναγκαίη καὶ θηλυτέρῃσι μάχεσθαι, I 473-74)[39]. Ma nel mondo di Quinto anche la polvere che si leva durante una mischia può essere ἀλεγεινή (II 477), così come i piatti della bilancia in occasione della topica *psychostasìa* (τάλαντα ὑσμίνης ἀλεγεινά, II 540-41)[40], che Zeus delega a Eris per decidere il destino di Achille e Memnone. Fin qui, probabilmente, nulla di radicalmente innovativo. Ha del barocco, invece, la figura etimologica ἀλεγεινὸν ἄλγος in III 584 (πάσῃσιν δ' ἀλεγεινὸν ὑπὸ κραδίην πέσεν ἄλγος)[41] con cui il poeta descrive la disperazione delle Nereidi per la morte di Achille, così come è indubbiamente a effetto l'immagine vivida di VI 637-39, che restituisce la morte del guerriero greco Cleolao (τοῦ δὲ δαμέντος / ἔνδον ὑπὸ στέρνοισιν ἔτι κραδίη ἀλεγεινὴ / ταρφέα παλλομένη πτερόεν πελέμιξε βέλεμνον)[42]. Ciò che rimane di omerico in Quinto Smirneo è la dislocazione dell'aggettivo in clausola, riscontrabile in 52 casi sugli 81 complessivi.

---

[37] Vi si può aggiungere la problematica μαχλοσύνη 'lascivia' di *Il.* XXIV 30, passo discusso da Sonnino 2015.

[38] Tale aspetto, che porta Quinto a differenziarsi da Omero non solo mediante l'uso di forme non omeriche, ma anche attraverso la reinterpretazione originale di aggettivi omerici, è stato colto da Vian 1959, 182. L'omericità di fondo dell'autore, comunque, resta chiaramente indicata dalla scelta del materiale lessicale: della totalità degli aggettivi attestati nei *Posthomerica*, ben 720 sono omerici contro i 220 non omerici.

[39] «E non c'è la dolorosa / necessità di combattere anche per le donne».

[40] L'immagine si ripresenta, variata, in VIII 282.

[41] «A tutte cadde nel cuore un dolore straziante».

[42] «Ma, una volta sopraffatto, il cuore ancora dolorante nel petto con rapidi balzi fece oscillare l'alato dardo».

Il restante quadro di IV e V sec. offre prevedibilmente una molteplicità di soluzioni individuali: la *Metafrasi dei Salmi* riprende omericamente ἀλεγεινός, ma in un rapporto di 9 a 1 con ἀλγεινός.[43] Solidale nell'omerismo con il Metafraste salmico fu l'imperatrice Eudocia. Negli *Homerocentones* sono recuperate due formule omeriche con clausola incardinata su una forma declinata di ἀλεγεινός, per un totale di 4 attestazioni[44].

Il quadro muta sensibilmente con l'innovatore Nonno di Panopoli, che conserva, sia pur con una frequenza minore, ἄλγος (16x nelle *Dionisiache*, una volta nella *Parafrasi*), ma depenna sia l'omerico ἀλεγεινός sia il tragico ἀλγεινός[45]. Mi limito a offrire alcuni *specimina*: la dura lotta (παλαισμοσύνη), che nell'*Iliade* occhieggia solo nella sezione dei giochi funebri per Patroclo (*Il.* XXIII 701 Πηλεΐδης δ' αἶψ' ἄλλα κατὰ τρίτα θῆκεν ἄεθλα / δεικνύμενος Δαναοῖσι παλαισμοσύνης ἀλεγεινῆς), agli occhi di Nonno è semmai 'giocosa' in X 332 (ἀμφὶ παλαισμοσύνης φιλοπαίγμονος εἶχον ἀγῶνα) o 'dolce' in X 345 (ἀμφὶ παλαισμοσύνης μελιηδέος). Un referente più generico come ἀγγελίη, che in Omero poteva essere ἀλεγεινή (2x), in un passo delle *Dionisiache* è veritiera (XXI 238 ἀγγελίης… ἀληθέος).

Sicuramente in Nonno non giocavano a favore dell'omerismo fattori ineludibili di *Wortstellung*: nell'opera del poeta egiziano quattro quinti degli epiteti precedono i nomi cui si riferiscono[46], diversamente da Omero, e ἀλεγεινός, come abbiamo visto, era inizialmente un'ottima clausola esametrica (in ben 22 casi su un totale di 30 nei poemi omerici). Da questo punto di vista, come ha dimostrato Wifstrand, Nonno è il punto di arrivo della tendenza, consolidata nella poesia post-omerica, di collocare l'epiteto prima del nome, soprattutto alla fine del verso. Se in Omero si osserva una clausola 'nome + epiteto' all'incirca ogni dieci esametri (includendo casi di separazione tra i due elementi), in Quinto la frequenza è già ridotta a una ogni venti[47]. Nell'esametro nonniano i dati ricavati da Wifstrand sono ancora più chiari: del vecchio *ordo verborum* omerico, pospositivo, si ravvisano

[43] Altre considerazioni metriche, come la percentuale di esametri olodattilici, confortano una collocazione cronologica della *Metafrasi* più vicina a Nonno (Agosti - Gonnelli 1995, 311 e 373).

[44] Per la precisione, in I 38, I 757, I 1535, II 1158. Sul classicismo e il tradizionalismo di Eudocia, vd. Cameron 1982, 284; per un'analisi formale dello stile dei centoni omerici, vd. anche Usher 1998.

[45] Sull'architettura dell'esametro tardo-antico e nonniano, rimando agli studi di Whitby 1994 e Agosti - Gonnelli 1995. Sul rinnovamento del patrimonio formulare epico in Nonno, vd. D'Ippolito 2016.

[46] Wifstrand 1933, 126-127.

[47] Wifstrand 1933, 84-93.

solo 135 esempi in tutte le *Dionisiache*, poema di circa 22000 versi[48]. Insomma, prima ancora di chiamare in causa questioni di *parole*, con buona probabilità la condanna dell'arcaico ἀλεγεινός, per tradizione omerica legato perlopiù alla clausola del verso, era preliminarmente condizionata da quegli importanti fattori di novità formale che caratterizzano l'architettura dell'esametro nonniano.

La scelta di Nonno dovette fare scuola, almeno su quanti continuarono a cimentarsi con l'esametro dopo di lui. Ha tutto il sapore di un recupero dotto il riuso della clausola omerica οἱ δ' ἀλεγεινοί[49] in un epigramma di Agazia dedicato ai vantaggi dell'eterosessualità (*AP* X 68,7 οἱ δ' ἀλεγεινοὶ / ἄνδρες ἐς ἀλλήλους ξεῖνον ἄγουσι γάμον), unico caso nell'*Antologia Palatina*, che sarà da annoverare tra le ultime, ormai decisamente rare, attestazioni dell'epicismo, che precedono un lungo silenzio rotto secoli dopo dai lessici bizantini e da qualche autore di *hochsprachliche Literatur*.[50]

Di là dai confini dell'epica e dell'epigramma, una particolare attenzione meritano, piuttosto, gli autori di prosa di IV e V sec., pagani e cristiani, accomunati da una magistrale παιδεία classica. I cristiani attuarono una rifunzionalizzazione del lessico greco del dolore in una prospettiva religiosa e nel compiere questa operazione recuperarono spesso generosamente tessere dotte di un lessico antico, epico e tragico, proprio come ἄλγος e ἀλγεινός[51]. I più fedeli al più antico lessico greco del dolore si rivelarono proprio i padri della Cappadocia e della Siria. Rispetto a questi ultimi, la distribuzione di ἀλγεινός risulta la seguente: Gregorio di Nazian-

[48] Wifstrand 1933, 93-98. A tali considerazioni sintattiche si potrebbe aggiungere aggiunta una notazione prosodica, in realtà meno cogente: l'esametro riformato di Nonno si chiude perlopiù con una lunga (90%) e con un accento sulla penultima (72%), preponderante sulla clausola tronca (ossitona o perispomena) offerta dalle forme flesse di ἀλεγεινός. Vd. in proposito Keydell 1959, 37*; Vian 1976 LIII-LIV; Agosti - Gonnelli 1995, 329-330 e 389.

[49] *Il.* X 402, XVII 76: in entrambi i casi si tratta della già citata descrizione dei cavalli di Achille. Prima di Agazia, la clausola omerica fu ripresa da Arato (*Phaen.* 291) e in QS (VII 458) all'interno della raffinata similitudine degli Achei, sollevati dall'arrivo di Neottolemo, con marinai felici dopo la tempesta.

[50] È il caso di fare due nomi, di cui uno prevedibile, cioè il commentatore omerico Eustazio di Tessalonica, l'altro meno: si tratta di Teodoro Metochite. A differenza di altri casi di citazioni o riusi dotti, il μεσάζων di Andronico II Paleologo omerizza sistematicamente con ben 82 attestazioni di ἀλεγεινός in poesia.

[51] Non ebbe la stessa sorte la forma epica ἀλεγεινός. Tra i pochi a conservarla furono Gregorio di Nazianzo, nella produzione in versi (3x), e Sinesio (1x), che arriva a definire la blasfemia ἀλεγεινή (*ep.* 41,265 Garzya).

zo (11x, in prosa e in poesia)[52], Gregorio di Nissa (32x)[53], Basilio di Cesarea (29x), Eusebio di Cesarea (4x), Giovanni Crisostomo (18x), Teodoreto di Cirro (50x). Alcuni dei loro contemporanei pagani non sono da meno: mi riferisco all'imperatore Giuliano (8x) e al retore Libanio (20x). La ricerca di uno stile elegante, aperto a poetismi, è uno dei tratti caratteristici della prosa letteraria del periodo.

E i medici? Furono sicuramente più coerenti con la linea ippocratica, poco incline alle parole poetiche, e che di fatto era stata anche quella galenica. Oribasio, il medico dell'imperatore Giuliano, ci offre un quadro in cui al primo posto viene ἐπώδυνος (17x), seguito da λυπηρός (12x), ἐπίπονος (9x), ὀδυνηρός (7x), ἀνιαρός (6x), infine ἀλγεινός (2x). Nel V secolo a ἀλγεινός (1x) e λυπηρός (2x) Aezio di Amida continuò a preferire ὀδυνηρός (7x) sulla scia di Galeno, seguito da ἐπαλγής (6x), ma un secolo dopo nell'opera di Alessandro di Tralles non si dànno più attestazioni di ἀλγεινός a vantaggio di ἐπώδυνος (9x), ἀνιαρός (7x), ὀδυνηρός (4x). Quando ormai Alessandria era caduta in mano araba, il medico Paolo di Egina ricorreva ai vari ἄλγημα, ἀλγηδών, al verbo ἀλγέω, ma evitava sia ἀλγεινός sia ἄλγος, a tutto favore di ἐπώδυνος (10x), ὀδυνηρός (4x) e λυπηρός (4x).

4. *Conclusioni*

Da questo spoglio lessicale si evince con sufficiente chiarezza che l'ambito semantico del dolore e del doloroso in greco, almeno in origine appaltato soprattutto a due mondi, molto distanti in linea teorica, come la poesia e la medicina, dal V sec. a.C. conobbe una forte specializzazione che portò presto a una differenziazione tra generi letterari.

La medicina ippocratica si emancipò presto dall'arcaico e aristocratico ἄλγος, unitamente al suo aggettivo corradicale ἀλγεινός, alla ricerca di un lessico più tecnico e meno poetico, focalizzato sulla pluralità e varietà degli ἀλγήματα e sull'oggettività fisica del πόνος con le sue qualificazioni (di qui gli aggettivi ἐπίπονος e

[52] Nel caso di Gregorio, l'omerismo rappresenta solo uno degli elementi dell'originale sintesi linguistica realizzata dall'autore. «The language of Homer and Callimachus is not unskillfully merged with expressions drawn from Greek philosophers or the Septuagint or the New Testament, the result being what might be expected of competent didactic verse which had always shown itself amenable to the incorporation of diction taken from diverse, and even apparently alien sources. With Gregory we may feel that this is not simply a matter of literary ability, but that it represents an overt claim to be, as an educated Christian, a legitimate inheritor of the full tradition of the classical world» (Sykes 1982, 1127). Vd. anche Simelidis 2009, 47-54.

[53] Sulla predilezione per parole rare o poetiche in Gregorio di Nissa, cf. Silvas 2007, 63.

πονηρός), oppure di ὀδύνη e dei suoi derivati. Così, già all'epoca di Ippocrate, e a maggior ragione dopo di lui, doveva probabilmente suonare un poco antico e *démodé* in un quadro clinico ricorrere a una qualificazione come ἀλγεινός, ormai adatta a un contesto metaforico e sentimentale, non senza una vena poetica o erudita.

La medicina di età ellenistica e imperiale, fino al Tardo Antico, non fece che prendere atto di tale orientamento, promuovendo altri sinonimi meno connotati in senso sentimentale, come ὀδυνηρός e ἐπώδυνος, λυπηρός e ἐπίπονος, nella ricerca di un'oggettività descrittiva evidentemente non meno importante della precisione diagnostica e dell'efficacia terapeutica.

La poesia di età ellenistica e imperiale, invece, mostra diverse possibilità, che vanno dalla conservazione e dalla ricerca di soluzioni originali con Quinto di Smirne, fedele a un omerismo formale, a Nonno di Panopoli, che invece archivia definitivamente il poetismo, sia nella forma epica ἀλεγεινός, ormai decisamente antiquata, sia in quella tragica ἀλγεινός. Quest'ultima era destinata, invece, anche sulla scorta dell'esempio degli autori cristiani di IV sec.d.C., a una lunga tradizione letteraria nel Medioevo bizantino fino al neogreco, ben oltre l'orizzonte lessicale della medicina.

Università degli Studi 'G. d'Annunzio' Chieti – Pescara
enrico.cerroni@yahoo.it

Parole chiave: ἀλγεινός, Ippocrate, medicina greca, Tarda Antichità
Keywords: ἀλγεινός, Hippocrates, Greek medicine, Late Antiquity

RIFERIMENTI BIBLIOGRAFICI

Erythrai
Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai, hrsg. von M.Engelmann – R.Merkelbach I-II, Bonn 1972-1973.
IC I
Inscriptiones Creticae I. *Tituli Cretae mediae praeter Gortynios*, cur. M.Guarducci, Roma 1935.
IG XII,1
Inscriptiones Graecae, XII. *Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum*, 1. *Inscriptiones Rhodi, Chalces, Carpathi cum Saro, Casi*, ed. F.Hiller von Gaertringen, Berlin 1895.
IK Prusa ad Olympum
Die Inschriften von Prusa ad Olympum, I-II, hrsg. von Th. Corsten, Bonn 1991-1993.
IMT Kyz Kapu Dağ
Inschriften Mysia & Troas. Mysia, hrsg. M.Barth – J.Stauber, «Kyzikene, Kapu Dağ», Los Altos, CA 1996. https://inscriptions.packhum.org
LfgrE
B.Snell (ed.), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, I-IV, Göttingen 1955-2010.
MAMA X *App*. I
Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, ed. B.Levick – S.Mitchell – J.Potter – M.Waelkens, X. *Monuments from Appia and the Upper Tembris Valley, Cotiaeum, Cadi, Synaus, Ancyra, and Tiberiopolis*, by C.W.M.Cox – A.Cameron – J.Cullen, London 1993. Appendix I, *List of Published Inscriptions. Cadi, Synaus, Ancyra Sidera, and Tiberiopolis*, 181-187.
SEG XXXI
Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, XXXI, ed. H.W.Pleket – R.S.Stroud, Amsterdam 1981.
SH
Supplementum Hellenisticum, ed. H.Lloyd-Jones – P.Parsons, Berlin 1983.
Smyrna
Die Inschriften von Smyrna, I-II, hrsg. G.Petzl, Bonn 1982-1990.
TAM V,1
Tituli Asiae Minoris. V. *Tituli Lydiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti.* I, *nos. 1-825, Regio septentrionalis, ad orientem vergens*, ed. P.Herrmann, Vindobonae 1981.

Agosti – Gonnelli 1995
G.Agosti – F.Gonnelli, *Materiali per la storia dell'esametro nei poeti cristiani*

greci, in M.Fantuzzi – R.Pretagostini (ed.), *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, Roma 1995, I, 289-434.

Arena 2018
G.Arena, *Marcello di Side: protomedico urbano o archiatra imperiale?*, «Ὅρμος» n.s. X (2018), 1-20.

Arena – Cassia 2016
G.Arena – M.Cassia, *Marcello di Side. Gli imperatori adottivi e il potere della medicina*, Acireale-Roma 2016.

Argentieri 2003
L.Argentieri, *Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri*, Bari 2003.

Bekker 1833
I.Bekker, *Apollonii Sophistae lexicon Homericum*, Berlin 1833.

Bethe 1900
Pollucis *Onomasticon*, I (libri I-IV), ed. E.Bethe, Lipsiae 1900.

Boudon-Millot 2018
V.Boudon-Millot, *Must We Suffer in Order to Stay Healthy? Pleasure and Pain in Ancient Medical Literature*, in W.V.Harris (ed.), *Pain and Pleasure in Classical Times*, Leiden-Boston 2018, 36-54.

Calderini 1987
A.Calderini, *Gli elementi costitutivi del romanzo greco di prosa*, in P.Janni (ed.), *Il romanzo greco. Guida storica e critica*, Roma-Bari, 27-77, 1987.

Cameron 1982
Al.Cameron, *The Empress and the Poet*, «Yale Classical Studies» XXVII (1982), 217-289 [rist. in Id., *Literature and Society in the Early Byzantine World*, London 1985].

Cassia 2012
M.Cassia, *Andromaco di Creta: Medicina e potere nella Roma neroniana*, Acireale-Roma 2012.

Cerroni 2019
E.Cerroni, *Prose and Poetry of Pain: A History of ἄλγος*, in E.Passa – O.Tribulato (ed.), *The Paths of Greek: At the Crossroads Between Literature, Linguistics and Epigraphy*, Berlin-New York 2019, 217-237.

Chantraine 1933
P.Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris 1933.

Deichgräber 1956
K.Deichgräber, *Parabasenverse aus Thesmophoriazusen II des Aristophanes bei Galen*, Berlin 1956.

De Lacy 1966
Ph.De Lacy, *Galen and the Greek Poets*, «Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies» VII (1966), 259-266.

D'Ippolito 2016
G.D'Ippolito, *Nonnus' Conventional Formulaic Style*, in D.Accorinti (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Nonnus of Panopolis*, Leiden 2016, 372-401.
Ecca 2016
G.Ecca, *Die hippokratische Schrift Praecepta*, Wiesbaden 2016.
Gärtner 2015
F.Gärtner, *Galeni de locis affectis I–II*, Berlin-Boston 2015.
Gerlaud 1982
Triphiodore, *La Prise d'Ilion*. Texte établi et traduit par B.Gerlaud, Paris 1982.
Giuliano 2005
F.M.Giuliano, *Platone e la poesia: teoria della composizione e prassi della ricezione*, Sankt Augustin 2005.
Harris 2018
W.V.Harris, *Pain and Medicine in the Classical World*, in W.V.Harris (ed.), *Pain and Pleasure in Classical Times*, Leiden-Boston 2018, 55-82.
Heitsch 1964
E.Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II, Göttingen 1964.
Keydell 1959
Nonni Panopolitani *Dionysiaca*, rec. R.Keydell, Berlin 1959.
King 2017
D.King, *Experiencing Pain in Imperial Greek Culture*, Oxford 2017.
Latte – Cunningham 1953-2018
Hesychii Alexandrini *Lexicon*, I: A-Δ, ed. K.Latte – I.C.Cunningham, Berlin -Boston 1953-2018.
Marzullo 1999
B.Marzullo, *Il dolore in Ippocrate*, «Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica» LXIII (1999), 123-128.
Mavroudis 2000
A.Mavroudis, *Αρχιγένης Φίλιππου Απαμεύς. Ο βίος και τα έργα ενός ἑλληνα γιατρού στην αυτοκρατορική Ρώμη*, Αθήναι 2000.
Mawet 1979
F.Mawet, *Recherches sur les oppositions fonctionnelles dans le vocabulaire homérique de la douleur (autour de πῆμα-ἄλγος*), Bruxelles 1979.
Miguélez-Cavero 2013
L.Miguélez-Cavero, *Triphiodorus. The Sack of Troy. A General Study and a Commentary*, Berlin-Boston 2013.
Mineur 1984
Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos.* Introduction and Commentary by W.H.Mineur, Leiden 1984.

Nicolai 1992
R.Nicolai, *La storiografia nell'educazione antica*, Pisa 1992.
Peek 1981
W.Peek, *Revisis revidendis*, «Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik» XLII (1981), 289-291.
Radice 2005
R.Radice (ed.), *Lexikon III: Aristoteles*, Milano 2005.
Roselli 2015
A.Roselli, *Come dire il dolore: Galeno e il linguaggio dei medici e dei malati*, «Antiquorum Philosophia» IX (2015), 55-68.
Rottger 1960
J.Röttger, *Das Zitat bei Platon*, diss. Tübingen 1960.
Schneider 1895
R.Schneider, *Excerpta* Περὶ παθῶν, «Beilage zu dem Jahresbericht des Königl. Gymnasium zu Duisburg», Leipzig 1895.
Schrader 1880-1882
Porphyrii *quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae*, I-II, ed. H.Schrader, Leipzig 1880-1882.
Schröder 1934
Galeni *in Platonis Timaeum commentarii fragmenta*, ed. H.O.Schröder, Leipzig 1934.
Silvas 2007
Gregory of Nissa, *The Letters,* ed. A.M.Silvas, Leiden-Boston 2007.
Simelidis 2009
Ch.Simelidis, *Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus: I.2.17; II. 1.10, 19, 32: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary*, Göttingen 2009.
Smith 1916
C.F.Smith, *Thucydides vii, 75*, «Studies in Philology» XIII (1916), 22-30.
Sonnino 2015
M.Sonnino, *PSI 1463.4 (= Hom. Od. 22.423): ΔΟΥΛΟ]ΣΥΝΗΣ ΑΠΕΧΕΣΘΑΙ o altro? Una lectio 'eccentrica' prearistarchea in un papiro perduto*, «Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik» CXCVI (2015), 1-12.
Stenzel 1966
J.Stenzel, *Platone educatore*, Bari 1966 [ed. or. *Platon der Erzieher*, Leipzig 1928, 1961[2]].
Swain 1996
S.Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*, Oxford 1996.
Sykes 1982
D.A.Sykes, *The Bible and Greek Classics in Gregory Nazianzen's Verse*, in «Studia Patristica» XVII (1982, 3), 1127-30.

Szemerényi 1964
O.Szemerényi, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-european and the Nature of Indo-european Accent*, Napoli 1964.
Tamiolaki 2013
M.Tamiolaki, *Emotions and historical representation in Xenophon's 'Hellenika'*, in A.Chaniotis – P.Ducrey (ed.), *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture*, Stuttgart 2013, 15-52.
Usher 1998
M.D.Usher, *Homeric Stitchings: the Homeric Centos of the Empress Eudocia*, Lanham, MD. 1998.
Vela Tejada 2009
J.Vela Tejada, *Koiné y aticismo en Galeno, De antidotis: datos para un estudio lingüístico*, « Cuadernos de filología clásica (G)» XIX (2009), 41-61.
Vian 1959
F.Vian, *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne*, Paris 1959.
Vian 1976
Nonnos de Panopolis, *Les Dionysiaques. Chants I-II*, ed. F.Vian, Paris 1976.
Villard 2006
L.Villard, *Vocabulaire et représentation de la douleur dans la Collection hippocratique*, in F.Prost – J. Wilgaux (ed.), *Penser et représenter le corps dans l'Antiquité.* «Actes du Colloque international de Rennes, 1-4 septembre 2004», Rennes 2006, 61-78.
Whitby 1994
M.Whitby, *From Moschus to Nonnus: the Evolution of the Nonnian Style*, in N.Hopkinson (ed.), *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*, Cambridge 1994, 99-155.
Wifstrand 1933
A.Wifstrand, *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos*, Lund 1933.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32050 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 21-52*

LORENZA SAVIGNAGO

Sui testimoni della *diple* 'metrica'*

Il presente contributo esamina le fonti teoriche greche e latine che testimoniano l'impiego di differenti tipi di διπλαῖ *con valore metrico, in relazione alle loro forme e alle funzioni da esse assunte a corredo dei testi drammatici. Oggetto di indagine è anche il rapporto tra le definizioni (antiche e bizantine) delle* διπλαῖ *e i disegni trasmessi a loro illustrazione, che nel corso della tradizione si è senz'altro corrotto, con riflessi ancora evidenti sulla non univoca terminologia adottata dagli studiosi moderni.*

The present work examines the Greek and Latin theoretical sources that testify to the use of different types of διπλαῖ *with metrical value, in relation to their shapes and the functions they assume in the layout of dramatic texts. This investigation also includes the relationship between the definitions of the* διπλαῖ *(both ancient and byzantine), and the drawings that illustrate them in MS sources. This relationship has undoubtedly been corrupted during the process of transmission, a fact which is reflected in the modern non-univocal terminology.*

1. *Panoramica generale*

Nella prassi ecdotica dei papiri letterari greci i segni di ausilio alla lettura si prestano a un impiego versatile[1] e perciò stesso non di rado ambiguo agli occhi dell'interprete moderno. Pare opportuno citare, al proposito, l'autorità di E.G.Turner: «sarebbe errato supporre che tutti i dotti si servissero dei segni nello stesso modo, o che i segni avessero sempre lo stesso significato in tutti i generi letterari»[2]. L'asserzione di Turner ribadisce quanto già affermato da un illustre predecessore: che la variabilità d'uso operasse in funzione del genere poetico è infatti l'accorta osservazione che apre il breve trattato di Efestione dedicato ai segni colometrici: τὰ σημεῖα τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἄλλως παρ' ἄλλοις κεῖται (*De signis*, p. 73, 12-13 Consbr.); di seguito l'antico trattatista andrà precisando le peculiarità ecdotiche dei poeti lirici, tragici e comici. Quanto alla prima affermazione di Turner, essere errata l'ipotesi che tutti i dotti si servissero dei segni nello stesso modo, Efestione testimonia, come è noto, la coesistenza presso gli Alessandrini di criteri ecdotici alternativi; le due *ekdoseis* di Alceo, rispettivamente di Aristofane di Bisanzio e di Aristarco, annettevano all'asterisco funzioni diverse: il secondo vi ricorreva per segnalare la transizione da un componimento al successivo, il primo lo apponeva a fine componimento solo se il successivo presentava mutamento di metro (p. 74, 11-14 Consbr.)[3].

---

* Esprimo gratitudine a Lucio Cristante e ai *referees* anonimi per le utili osservazioni e segnalazioni bibliografiche.

[1] Cf. *e.g.* McNamee 1992, 11; un'indagine su permanenza ed evoluzione del significato di alcuni segni nei papiri letterari greci fino alla tarda antichità è condotta da McNamee 2017 (per la *diple* cf. in part. 128-131). Sul versante latino cf. Nocchi Macedo 2017, 204-205 e 213.

[2] Turner 1984, 132, n. 31.

[3] Sull'impiego dell'asterisco nelle edizioni antiche cf. Nocchi Macedo 2011.

Anche la *diple* può assumere valori variabili in ragione del contesto: alla funzione critico-filologica, le cui attestazioni intersecano diversi generi letterari, si affianca nel libro di poesia lirica e drammatica una funzione metrico-strutturale[4].

Tale bipartizione d'uso, pur non essendovi esplicitata, trova un riflesso nelle fonti teoriche greche superstiti, che mai trattano congiuntamente i due segni.

> Vari sono i testimoni che rendono conto dell'utilizzo critico-filologico della *diple*, di cui i dotti del Museo si sarebbero serviti, al pari di altri *semeia*, *in primis* nella critica omerica[5]: oltre agli scolii del *Venetus A*[6], che contengono materiale risalente al cosiddetto *Viermännerkommentar* (e quindi, pur indirettamente, al sistema semiografico aristarcheo), vanno almeno menzionati gli *Anecdota Romanum*, *Venetum* e *Harleianum*[7], ai quali si aggiungono, tra le fonti latine, l'*Anecdoton Parisinum*[8] e Isidoro di Siviglia[9]. L'introduzione della *diple* tra i segni della critica omerica è fatta risalire ad Aristarco, che se ne serviva nella forma semplice (>) per marcare passi notevoli, nella variante *periestigmene* (⸐) in riferimento a scelte ecdotiche divergenti da quelle zenodotee. Un sistema di segni analogo, pur rimaneggiato con gli opportuni aggiustamenti, sembra essere stato adottato anche per le cure filologiche al testo di Platone, come attestano Diogene Laerzio (III 65-66)[10], il PSI 1488, II s. (*CPF* Plat. 142 T), e, sul versante latino, l'*Anecdoton Cavense* (XI s.)[11]: la *diple*

[4] Il ricorso al *semeion* nei testi letterari non è limitato ai papiri: per il suo impiego nelle iscrizioni metriche si veda Garulli 2019, 106s., 118-139, e Garulli 2020, 233-235.

[5] Per le testimonianze di *diplai* usate in funzione critico-testuale nei papiri omerici cf. McNamee 1992, Table I.

[6] Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, *Marc. gr.* Z. 454 (coll. 822), X *ex.*

[7] Rispettivamente trasmessi dai mss. Roma, Biblioteca Nazionale, *gr.* 6, X *in.* (Nauck 1867, 271-273; Dindorf 1875, XLII-XLIV; Montanari 1979, 43–49, 54–55), Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, *Marc. gr.* Z. 483 (coll. 677), XIV s. (Nauck 1867, 274-276, Dindorf 1875, XLIV-XLV), London, British Library, *Harl.* 5693, XV s. (Nauck 1867, 277; Dindorf 1875, XLVI).

[8] Trasmesso dal codice Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, *Par. lat.* 7530, VIII *ex.* (il ms. 1086 della Biblioteca Casanatense di Roma, IX *in.*, che pure trasmette l'*Anecdoton*, è mutilo della porzione che qui interessa).

[9] I due repertori di *Notae*, composti rispettivamente da ventuno e ventisei segni, registrano otto *semeia* senz'altro riconducibili alla filologia alessandrina (*obelus*, *asteriscus*, *asteriscus cum obelo*, *diplen aperistikton* [così nell'*Anecdoton*; diversamente in Isidoro, su cui cf. Schironi 2001, 19-21], *diple periestigmene*, *antisigma*, *antisigma cum puncto*, *ceraunion*): «les explications données à ces signes convergent en grande partie avec celles données par les sources grecques» (Nocchi Macedo 2017, 209).

[10] Sui rapporti tra il sistema di segni diogeniano e la tradizione in età ellenistica e imperiale del testo platonico cf. Lucarini 2011, 358ss.

[11] Cava dei Tirreni, Abbazia di S. Trinità, ms. 3 (edito da Reifferscheid 1868), su cui cf.

semplice vi ricorrerebbe con la funzione del tutto peculiare di segnalare i *dogmata* specificamente platonici. Un lacerto di testimonianza dell'uso di quattro *semeia* tra cui la *diple* in un'*ekdosis* di Arato si trova infine nell'epistola del *Laur. Plut.* 87.10 (XIV s.)[12] e in una forma degradata nell'Arato latino[13]. Un sistema semiografico di derivazione alessandrina ma adattato alla differente finalità fu anche quello utilizzato da Origene; la *diple* tuttavia non vi è compresa, verosimilmente proprio per via del suo valore plurivoco[14].

Testimonianze teoriche, pur scarne, dell'uso dei segni colometrici[15] sono trasmesse, come si è anticipato, da fonti greche del tutto distinte, gli scolii 'eliodorei' ad Aristofane (I sec.) – residuo di un più ampio commentario alla metrica del poeta comico – e il *De signis* di Efestione (II sec.), cui andrà ad aggiungersi, in epoca comnena, la sezione dedicata ai *semeia* nel *De metris Pindaricis* di Isacco Tzetzes, un poemetto che traspone in versi politici gli *scholia metrica vetera* a Pindaro, rilevante soprattutto perché, a differenza di altre parti dell'opera, non si direbbe dipendere *in toto* da Efestione[16] né dagli scolii pindarici che quei segni ignorano. In epoca paleologa i *semeia* metrici riaffioreranno sia nella prassi ecdotica che negli scolii di Demetrio Triclinio, il cui contatto con il sistema semiografico antico è senz'altro avvenuto grazie allo studio di Efestione, che egli poteva leggere nel *Marc. gr.* 483; di qui saranno infine recepiti nella *princeps* di Aristofane allestita da Musuro (1498) e nel Sofocle di Adrien Tournebus (1553)[17].

Va inoltre ricordata, sul versante latino, l'enigmatica testimonianza contenuta nel *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (II 120) di Marziano Capella (fine IV – V

Pernigotti 2004, che offre anche un elenco di papiri platonici con evidenze d'uso di tali *semeia* (329), e Nocchi Macedo 2017, 218-222. Si noti che il codice di Cava trasmette inoltre un *excerptum* del *De notis sententiarum* di Isidoro.

[12] Maass 1898, 140-141, e Martin 1974, V-VI, 1-5.

[13] In sintesi: «Dans le manuscrit Laur. Plut. 87.10 (xive siècle) et dans l'Aratos latin [...] on trouve une épître d'introduction d'une édition savante d'Aratos, qui utilisait les signes critiques de la philologie alexandrine. […] Il s'agit de matériel exégétique qui remonte en dernière analyse au moins à l'édition alexandrine de Théon, même s'il a été conservé sous une forme très fragmentaire et surtout dans une version latine complètement défigurée» (Manetti 2006, 167). Sull'Arato latino cf. Le Bourdellès 1985.

[14] Origene infatti si limitò ad usare *obelos* e asterisco, i soli segni «that have a rather unequivocal meaning and can be understood even without a *hypomnema*» (Schironi 2012, 103).

[15] Che d'ora innanzi definiremo 'metrici' per comodità (ma la loro funzione è da intendere come strettamente connessa con l'articolazione delle sezioni meliche).

[16] Cf. *infra*, n. 82.

[17] Sia Musuro che Tournebus attingono da materiali tricliniani: si veda da ultimo Tessier 2020, 126-129 (per Musuro), 150ss. (per Tournebus).

sec.) che parrebbe adombrare l'utilizzo di tre *semeia*, tra cui la *diple*, come marcatori colometrici[18].

Testimonianze cumulative – nelle quali cioè tra i *semeia* critico-testuali di ascendenza alessandrina ne figurano altri peculiari dei testi drammatici e ricondotti a una funzione metrica – si trovano invece in un compendio di segni illustrati con sintetica descrizione in lingua latina, circolante per lo meno dalla Tarda Antichità e che nel Medioevo godette di un'ampia diffusione, comprovata dall'esistenza di più redazioni superstiti[19], tra le quali figurano l'*Anecdoton Parisinum*

[18] Cristante 2008a e Cristante 2008b, 62. Nell'inno con cui le Muse celebrano le virtù metrico-musicali di Filologia ricorrono i termini *linea iacens/iugata*, *trigonus*, *circulus*, un'apparente descrizione di figure geometriche (così la critica fin dai commentatori medievali) del tutto incoerente rispetto al contesto, ma con esso perfettamente armonizzabile se si accolga l'interpretazione avanzata da Cristante, che negli enigmatici segni 'geometrici' è incline a riconoscere *paragraphos*, coronide e *diple* nella loro funzione colometrica. Di opinione diversa Moretti 2015, 564, n. 18, secondo cui non sarebbe plausibile «l'assimilazione che Cristante fa fra il *trigonus* e la *diple*, dato che quest'ultima fa riferimento fin dal suo nome a un segno 'doppio'. Per di più [...] non esistono descrizioni antiche di questo tipo riguardo alla forma dei segni cui Cristante si riferisce»: ma andrà notato, almeno, che il ricorso alla figura geometrica del triangolo per descrivere la *diple* non è un *unicum*, potendosi trovare nello *schol. rec.* Ar. *Plut.* 253c. 5-6 (p. 72 Chantry), dove la forma del *semeion* è analogamente descritta come un triangolo, nella formulazione dello scolio privo della base e orientato orizzontalmente: ὅπερ τριγώνου πλαγίου σχήματι ἔοικε, τῆς βάσεως μόνης λειπούσης (per quanto non sia dato individuarla, non è da escludere che il bizantino attingesse da fonte antica; il seguito dello scolio, nel quale Triclinio va precisando il sistema semiografico adottato nella sua *ekdosis* aristofanea, si basa sull'autorità di Efestione). Sullo scolio cf. Koster 1927, 53-54, Lamagna 1996, 236-237, e *infra*, p. 42. In ambito latino una descrizione per così dire eccentrica del *semeion*, pur con diversa funzione, si può rinvenire nell'illustrazione dei segni della critica platonica trasmessa dall'*Anecdoton Cavense* (su cui cf. *supra*, n. 11 e *infra*, p. 38), che assimila la *diple* a un *labda graecum iacens* (*lambda* Reifferscheid 1868); descrizione, quest'ultima, improntata a una *ratio* non priva di analogie con quella dello scolio tricliniano: in entrambi i casi il segno scelto a modello ('triangolo privo di base' nella fonte greca, un più economico 'lambda' in quella latina) si traduce in *diple* grazie a una rotazione di 90° attorno al proprio asse verticale, che dà luogo a una disposizione orizzontale del segno originario (πλαγίου/*iacens*). Si può infine osservare una convergenza fra la «iacens … linea» con cui l'*Anecdoton Cavense* illustra l'*obelos* - nei testimoni latini generalmente descritto come «virgula iacens» - e la «iacente … linea» che in Marziano si direbbe corrispondere alla *paragraphos* (segno che, quanto a forma, è senz'altro assimilabile a un *obelos*).

[19] Si tratta di differenti rielaborazioni di materiale comune, per le quali si veda ora l'esauriente trattazione di Steinová 2019, che vi dedica l'intero capitolo 2 («The 21-sign treatise: inherited classical *doxa* in the early medieval Latin West»).

(*Notae XXI quae versibus apponi consuerunt*, *GL* VII, p. 533-536), la cui compilazione andrà verosimilmente collocata nel II sec.[20], e, con una formulazione non troppo divergente, il *De notis sententiarum* (*Etym.* I 21,16-17 Lindsay) di Isidoro di Siviglia (560-636)[21].

Alle due distinte funzioni della *diple* sono correntemente fatte corrispondere anche differenze formali: il segno adottato nella critica testuale è la *diple* semplice (>), mentre quello con valore metrico sarebbe un *semeion* più articolato – per lo più chiamato *diple obelismene* o, in ambito anglosassone, 'forked *paragraphos*'[22] – nel quale a una *diple* semplice fa da complemento un tratto orizzontale (>–)[23]. Ai due *semeia* sono riservate collocazioni differenti[24]: il segno critico-filologico viene per lo più tracciato nell'intercolumnio sinistro *in corrispondenza del rigo* che ospita la pericope di testo su cui si focalizza l'attenzione o oggetto del rinvio; il segno separativo con funzione metrico-strutturale viene viceversa inserito *tra due righi* di scrittura, palesando in tal modo la sua finalità di discriminare sezioni di testo

[20] «Ou peu de temps après» (Nocchi Macedo 2017, 208).

[21] Cf. *supra*, n. 9. Rispetto ai ventuno segni trasmessi dall'*Anecdoton*, Isidoro ne registra cinque ulteriori, due dei quali (*lemniscus* e *antigraphus cum puncto*) specificamente destinati all'esegesi biblica (cui Isid. riconduce, scostandosi dall'*Anecdoton*, anche l'uso della *diple* semplice). I ventisei segni presenti in Isidoro figurano inoltre in un trattato trasmesso dal codice monacense BSB Clm 14429 (X s.), su cui cf. Fontaine 1959, 74, n. 2, che vi riconosce «le résultat d'un mélange, postérieur à Isidore, entre le chapitre des *Origines*, un texte semblable à celui de l'*Anecdoton* de Paris […] et quelques passages d'auteurs chrétiens (Jérôme en particulier)», e Nocchi Macedo 2017, 206ss. (con riproduzione integrale dei testi dei tre repertori: 223-227). Una peculiarità dell'anonimo trattato monacense è la presenza di una definizione alternativa della *diple* (destinata, come in Isidoro, a un uso nelle Sacre Scritture), che vi viene registrata anche come 'antilabda', *i.e.* «lambda pivoté ou inversé» (Nocchi Macedo 2017, 210, e n. 36); per la *diple* come 'lambda coricato/disposto in senso orizzontale' cf. *supra*, n. 18. Sulle fonti dei repertori di *Notae* e sui rapporti che intercorrono fra Isidoro e l'*Anecdoton Parisinum* cf. Fontaine 1959, 74-75, Jocelyn 1985, Nocchi Macedo 2017, 206ss., Spevak 2020, LIIss.

[22] In uno studio dedicato specificamente a questo segno di lettura, cui nella letteratura precedente erano state attribuite almeno cinque definizioni divergenti ('paragraphos uncinata', 'diple cum paragrapho', 'forked paragraphus', ma anche 'coronis' o 'paragraphos' *tout-court*), Barbis 1988, sulla scorta di Turner 1987, 12 (= E.G.Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Princeton 1971, 14-15), suggeriva di adottare in via definitiva la denominazione 'diple obelismene'.

[23] La *diple obelismene* «ha una funzione metrica e va distinta dalla diplè semplice»: così Turner 1984, 136, n. 45, che tuttavia fa ricorso alla più curiosa - in quanto, a nostra conoscenza, priva di riscontro nelle fonti - denominazione di «diple epobelismene» (ma «obelismene» in Turner 1987, 12).

[24] Come correttamente puntualizzato da Esposito 2008, 588-589.

contigue. Poiché è la collocazione, più che la forma, che consente di determinare se si tratti di un segno critico o metrico, anche il *semeion* semplice andrà ricondotto alla seconda funzione quand'esso ricorra in posizione interlineare; ciò vale altresì per le più rare varianti speculari (< e –<), cui pure sarà da attribuire valore metrico-strutturale se collocate fra i righi di scrittura anziché nel margine.

Negli studi recenti il *semeion* metrico più diffuso, ovvero la *diple obelismene* con il vertice rivolto verso la colonna di scrittura, è di norma fatto coincidere con la διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα/βλέπουσα menzionata nel *De signis* di Efestione, tanto che le due denominazioni – quando non si ricorra a un più cauto '*diple*' privo di ulteriori attributi – sono in genere usate come sinonimi[25]. Ciò tuttavia comporta una inevitabile semplificazione rispetto a quanto prescritto dall'antico trattatista che, come si preciserà in seguito, nei contesti drammatici prevedeva l'impiego di quattro distinte *diplai*, due semplici e due composite, verosimilmente coincidenti, quanto a forma, con i quattro segni attestati nei *dramata* papiracei, ma le cui specifiche applicazioni trovano in quegli stessi papiri un riscontro solo parziale[26]. La distanza che intercorre fra teoria e prassi va con ogni probabilità ricondotta alla nota flessibilità con cui nel libro antico venivano impiegati i segni critici, ma non è da escludere che la stessa indubbia complessità del sistema semiografico illustrato nel *De signis,* e forse la concorrenza di modelli ecdotici alternativi[27], siano state di ostacolo a una sua puntuale adozione.

Si registrano di seguito esempi delle quattro *diplai* rintracciabili, con la funzione che qui interessa, nei papiri di poesia drammatica. Un asterisco segnala i testimoni in cui coesistono due forme differenti.

- *Diple* 'semplice' con il vertice rivolto verso la colonna di scrittura (>): P.Oxy. 2162 (Aesch. *Theor. vel Isthm.*, II d.C. = fr. 78c R.); P.Oxy. 2245 (Aesch. *Prom. Pyrc.*, II d.C. = fr. 204c R.).
- *Diple* 'semplice' con il vertice rivolto verso l'intercolumnio (<): P.Tebt. 692 (Soph. *Inach.*, II a.C. = fr. 269c R.).
- *Diple* 'composita' (*i.e. obelismene*) con il vertice rivolto verso la colonna di scrit-

[25] L'equiparazione dei due *semeia* è esplicitata da Haslam 1986, 132s. (su cui vd. *infra*, n. 28), e in maniera più circostanziata da Ercoles 2009, in particolare 56-59.

[26] Cf. McNamee 1992, 16.

[27] Ciò che rimane dell'antico commentario metrico alle commedie di Aristofane, che si usa far risalire a Eliodoro, attivo intorno alla metà del I s. (Hense 1912), testimonia l'adozione di un diverso sistema semiografico nel quale ricorre una sola forma di *diple* (così definita senza ulteriori specificazioni), a fronte di una maggiore complessità nella *mise en page* del testo comico (aspetto, questo, eluso dai trattati efestionei a noi pervenuti, ma puntualmente testimoniato nei papiri drammatici).

tura (>–): P.Oxy. 2369 (Soph. *Inach.*, I a.C. *ex.* – I *in.* = fr. 269a R.); P.Oxy. 1174 (Soph. *Ichn.*, II d.C. *ex.* = fr. 314 R.); P.Oxy. 1175* (Soph. *Euryp.*, II d.C. *ex.* = frr. 210, 211, 213 R.); P.Oxy. 3716 (Eur. *Or.* 941-51, 973-83, II-I a.C.); P.Oxy. 3216 (*Trag. adesp.*, II d.C. = fr. 654 K.-Sn.); PSI 1212* + P.Brux. inv. E 6842 (Crat. *Plut.*, Oxyrhynchus II d.C. *in.* = fr. 171 K.-A.); P.Oxy. 2743 (*Com. adesp.*, II d.C. = fr. 1105 K.-A.); P.Oxy. 2806 (*Com. adesp.*, II-III d.C. = fr. 1109 K.-A.).

- *Diple* 'composita' con il vertice rivolto verso l'intercolumnio (–<): P.Oxy. 1175* (Soph. *Euryp.*, II d.C. *ex.* = fr. 211 R.); PSI 1212* (Crat. *Plut.*, Oxyrhynchus II d.C. *in.* = fr. 171 K.-A.)[28].

Analogo elenco di papiri con *diplai* 'metriche' (ma più ampio perché vi sono inclusi anche esempi di poesia lirica) è fornito da Ercoles 2009, 56-57, che offre inoltre un'utile suddivisione dei testimoni sulla base del tipo di transizione metrica marcato dal *semeion* (1. passaggio da coppia strofica a sezione eterometrica, 2. da trimetri giambici a sezione melica, 3. da sezione melica a trimetri giambici)[29]. Dal confronto tra le due differenti classificazioni – per forma del segno e per contesto metrico in cui esso ricorre – non si lasciano isolare intersezioni tali da suggerire una regolarità: il tipo che conta il maggior numero di occorrenze (>–) è infatti attestato in tutti i contesti individuati da Ercoles, mentre le forme di uso più limitato si suddividono tra i contesti 2 (P.Tebt. 692: <, P.Oxy. 2162: >) e 3 (P.Oxy. 1175: –<). Va comunque osservato che la *diple* di foggia più rara (–<) ricorre esclusivamente in testimoni nei quali compare anche la più diffusa forma speculare (PSI 1212 e P.Oxy. 1175)[30].

---

[28] Fra i papiri elencati l'unico a trasmettere un dramma conservato è il P.Oxy. 3716, un frustulo di epoca tolemaica che su col. II reca l'*incipit* dei v. 973-983 dell'*Oreste*. Fra i rr. 9/10 (v. 981-982) è apposta una *diple* di forma >– a chiudere una coppia strofica cui segue «a long solo epode» (Willink 1986, 240). Mentre i manoscritti assegnano l'intero canto (v. 960-1012) a Elettra, a partire da Weil si è ipotizzata l'attribuzione al coro dei v. 960-981. Poiché nel papiro non compare alcuna *nota personae* a sinistra di v. 982, Haslam ritiene che esso assegnasse l'intero canto a Elettra, come nei mss. medievali, così motivando: «a simple paragraphus would be ambiguous […], but the addition of the diple gives it exclusively metrical significance» (Haslam 1986, 133). L'editore del papiro rileva che l'uso della *diple* posta a segnalare la fine dell'antistrofe è in accordo con quanto previsto da Efestione, p. 75, 8-14 Consbr. (il noto passo sugli amebei), e conclude identificando il *semeion* papiraceo tanto con la διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω βλέπουσα efestionea quanto con quella *obelismene* dell'*Anecdoton Parisinum*. Se tuttavia si ammette tale l'equivalenza, in corrispondenza dei v. 981-982 il papiro sembrerebbe viceversa prevedere sia una metabola metrica (per così dire segnalata dalla parte angolare del segno), sia un'alternanza di *persona canens* (segnalata dal tratto orizzontale), e quindi la verosimile attribuzione dei v. 981ss. a Elettra e di quelli precedenti al coro.

[29] In Ercoles rispettivamente (b), (c), (d).

[30] Quest'ultimo (Soph. *Euryp.*) è stato vergato nello stesso ambiente scrittorio e quasi certamente a opera dello stesso scriba del satiresco P.Oxy. 1174 (Soph. *Ichn.*), nel quale

Si dovrà infine ricordare che nei papiri il più immediato marcatore di eterometria è rappresentato dall'attribuzione di margini concorrenti alle diverse sezioni (*3ia* e *lyr.* vengono collocati rispettivamente ἐν ἐκθέσει e ἐν εἰσθέσει, secondo la terminologia trasmessa dal commentario metrico *vetus* ad Aristofane ma di cui non si trova traccia nei superstiti testi efestionei).

Di seguito si affronteranno due questioni a tutt'oggi indagate solo cursoriamente:

- i termini della relazione tra le *diplai* efestionee e quelle trasmesse dalle più scarne fonti latine, per il cui migliore rappresentante, l'*Anecdoton Parisinum*, si ipotizza una cronologia pressoché coeva al metricologo di età antonina[31] e, almeno per i segni metrici, una derivazione da matrice greca(§ 2-3)[32];
- lo spinoso rapporto tra forma e definizione delle *diplai*, che nel corso della filiera tradizionale sembra essere andato incontro a corruzione: nelle testimonianze manoscritte, tanto delle fonti teoriche (Efestione e Isacco Tzetzes)[33] quanto della loro applicazione ai testi drammatici (edizioni tricliniane con relativi scolii metrici), le denominazioni delle *diplai* e i segni posti a loro illustrazione non presentano unanime corrispondenza, con riflessi ancora evidenti sulla terminologia adottata dai moderni, pure non univoca (§ 4-7).

2. *Hephaest.* De signis (*p. 73, 12 – 76, 16 Consbr.*)[34]

(1) τὰ σημεῖα τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἄλλως παρ' ἄλλοις κεῖται· λέγω δέ, ὁποῖά ἐστιν ἥ τε παράγραφος καὶ ἡ κορωνὶς καὶ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ καὶ ὁ ἀστερίσκος, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτον. (2) παρὰ μὲν τοῖς λυρικοῖς, ἂν μὲν

---

però, a dispetto delle numerose *diplai* conservate, mai figura la forma più rara. Sui due manoscritti vd. Johnson 2004, 29, e McNamee 2007, 696-698.

[31] Come pare potersi ricavare da elementi interni al testo (che l'estensore dell'*Anecdoton* presenti Probo in opposizione con gli «antiqui nostri» induce a ritenere le due figure pressoché coeve: Nocchi Macedo 2017, 208).

[32] «The Latin account may [...] be considered to derive without Latin additions from one which attempted to describe marginally annotated Greek texts» (Jocelyn 1985, 157).

[33] Poiché in essi, come si è anticipato, si ricorre *tout court* al termine *diple* senza distinzioni di forma o di orientamento, si escludono dal presente esame gli scolii 'eliodorei' ad Aristofane, che pure costituiscono la più antica fonte del *semeion* metrico (al di là delle incertezze di datazione, è assodato che Eliodoro fosse antecedente a Efestione poiché l'autore dell'*Enchiridion* ne fa menzione diretta: p. 6, 16 Consbr.).

[34] Si omettono tre brevi sezioni che trattano dell'asterisco (p. 74, 8-14), della coronide (p. 75, 1-4) e dell'uso della *paragraphos* nella parodo anapestica (p. 75, 15-18), non rilevanti per la discussione.

μονόστροφον τὸ ᾆσμα ᾗ, καθ᾽ ἑκάστην τίθεται στροφὴν ἡ παράγραφος, εἶτα ἐπὶ τέλους τοῦ ᾄσματος ἡ κορωνίς. ἐὰν δὲ κατὰ περικοπὴν τὰ ᾄσματα ᾗ γεγραμμένα, ὥστε εἶναι στροφὴν καὶ ἀντίστροφον καὶ ἐπῳδόν, ἡ παράγραφος ἐπὶ μὲν τῷ τέλει τῆς τε στροφῆς καὶ ἀντιστρόφου κεῖται, ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ἐπῳδῷ ἡ κορωνίς· — καὶ οὕτως ἡ παράγραφος, ἣ διορίζει τά τε ὅμοια καὶ τὰ ἀνόμοια. — ἐπὶ μέντοι τῷ τέλει ὁ ἀστερίσκος τίθεται, γνώρισμα τοῦ τετελέσθαι τὸ ᾆσμα, ἐπεὶ ἡ κορωνὶς ἐπὶ πασῶν τίθεται τῶν ἐπῳδῶν.
[…]
(4) ἡ δὲ διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω βλέπουσα παρὰ μὲν τοῖς κωμικοῖς καὶ τοῖς τραγικοῖς ἐστι πολλή, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς λυρικοῖς σπανία· παρὰ Ἀλκμᾶνι γοῦν εὑρίσκεται· γράψας γὰρ ἐκεῖνος δεκατεσσάρων στροφῶν ᾄσματα [ὧν] τὸ μὲν ἥμισυ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρου ἐποίησεν ἑπτάστροφον, τὸ δὲ ἥμισυ ἑτέρου· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ταῖς ἑπτὰ στροφαῖς ταῖς ἑτέραις τίθεται ἡ διπλῆ σημαίνουσα τὸ μεταβολικῶς τὸ ᾆσμα γεγράφθαι. (5) τούτοις τοῖς σημείοις τοῖς προειρημένοις πλὴν τοῦ ἀστερίσκου καὶ ἑτέροις τισί, περὶ ὧν λέξομεν, <καὶ> ἐν τοῖς δράμασι χρώμεθα.
[…]
(7) τῇ δὲ παραγράφῳ ἤτοι κατὰ πρόσωπα ἀμοιβαῖα, ἔν τε τοῖς ἰαμβικοῖς καὶ τοῖς χορικοῖς, <ἢ> μεταξὺ τῆς ἔν τε τοῖς ἰαμβικοῖς καὶ τοῖς χορικοῖς, <ἢ> μεταξὺ τῆς τε στροφῆς καὶ τῆς ἀντιστρόφου. (8) ἐὰν μέντοι ἡ στροφὴ ἐξ ἀμοιβαίων τυγχάνῃ συγκειμένη, οὐκ ἐξαρκεῖ πρὸς τὸ δηλῶσαι, ὅτι πεπλήρωται ἡ στροφή, ἡ παράγραφος ἐπιφερομένης ἄλλης στροφῆς, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστου κώλου οὐδὲν ἧττον τίθεται· ἀλλὰ κεῖται καὶ ἡ ἔσω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ· τοῦτο δέ, ἐὰν ἀντίστροφος ἐπιφέρηται· ὡς ἐάν γε μεταβολὴ μόνον ᾗ στροφῶν, ἡ ἔξω βλέπουσα τίθεται.
[…]
(10) τῆς δὲ παραβάσεως μερῶν ὄντων ἑπτά, ἐπὶ ἓν ἕκαστον τῶν ἀπολελυμένων τριῶν τίθεται ἡ παράγραφος, τοῦ κομματίου καὶ τῆς παραβάσεως καὶ τοῦ μακροῦ· οὐδὲν ἧττον δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλους καὶ τοῦ ἐπιρρήματος, ἂν μηδὲν ἀνταποδιδῶται. ἐὰν δὲ ἐνῇ τὰ ἀνακυκλούμενα, τό τε ἀντίστροφον τοῦ μέλους καὶ τὸ ἀντεπίρρημα, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπιρρήματος τίθεται ἡ ἔσω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ ὑπὲρ τοῦ δηλῶσαι ὅτι ἔστι τὰ ἀνταποδιδόμενα, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀντεπιρρήματος ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα. (11) εἰώθασι τοίνυν αὐτοὶ οἱ δραματοποιοὶ μεταξὺ ἰαμβείων τινῶν γράφειν ἑτέρῳ μέτρῳ ὁποσασοῦν στροφάς· εἶτα πάλιν περάναντες δι᾽ ἰαμβείων τὸ προκείμενον κατὰ διέχειαν ἀνταποδιδόναι τὰς στροφάς. ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστης μὲν οὖν στροφῆς τίθεται παράγραφος· ἐν δὲ ταῖς προτέραις στροφαῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ τελευταίου κώλου δύο τίθενται διπλαῖ, ἡ μὲν κατ᾽ ἀρχὰς ἔξω βλέπουσα, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ τέλος ἔσω νενευκυῖα, δηλούντων ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἔσω βλεπούσης, ὅτι ἀνταποδίδοταί τινα αὐτοῖς· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀνταποδιδομένοις πάλιν μὲν ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστης στροφῆς παράγραφος, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τελευταίου κώλου δύο διπλαῖ, ἡ μὲν κατ᾽ ἀρχάς, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ τέλος, ἀμφότεραι μέντοι ἔξω νενευκυῖαι, διὰ τούτων δηλούντων ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἀνταποδέδοται.

Il quadro che emerge dal noto passo efestioneo è, in sintesi, il seguente.

A. Poesia lirica

L'uso della *diple* è raro nella poesia lirica, dove viceversa si ricorre a *paragraphos*, coronide e asterisco.

1. Se il canto è monostrofico,
   a. la transizione da una strofe all'altra è demandata alla *paragraphos*;
   b. alla fine del canto si appone la coronide.

2. Se i canti presentano forma triadica,
   a. tra strofe e antistrofe viene apposta la *paragraphos*;
   b. la *paragraphos* si colloca anche tra l'antistrofe e l'epodo;
   c. alla fine dell'epodo (e quindi di ciascuna triade) si appone la coronide;
   d. per indicare la fine del componimento si ricorre all'asterisco.

3. Un esempio di *diple* nei lirici si trova in Alcmane, in componimenti di quattordici strofe il cui ritmo subisce un cambiamento esattamente alla metà.

B. Poesia drammatica

1. La *paragraphos* ha quattro ambiti di impiego:
   a. discrimina la strofe dall'antistrofe;
   b. nei dialoghi in trimetri giambici e nei canti amebei segnala il cambio di personaggio;
   c. indica «le suddivisioni interne [...] tra loro non eguali [...] della parodo anapestica»[35];
   d. nelle strutture responsive κατὰ διέχειαν delimita ciascuna strofe (vd. *infra*, B.3);
   e. nella parabasi comica distingue le sezioni non responsive (vd. *infra*, B.4).

2. Negli amebei, dove la *paragraphos* è già impiegata per la *persona canens*, viene introdotta anche la *diple*:
   a. se l'amebeo è κατὰ σχέσιν, la distinzione tra strofe e antistrofe è demandata alla *diple* rivolta verso l'interno;
   b. se l'amebeo è composto da sezioni non κατὰ σχέσιν, si ricorre alla *diple* rivolta verso l'esterno per indicare la metabola metrica.

3. Le *diplai* sono inoltre apposte nei canti strofici κατὰ διέχειαν, per segnalare, appunto, la responsione a distanza; i *semeia* vengono utilizzati a coppie, in corrispondenza dell'ultimo *colon* di ciascuna sezione. In questi casi, mentre l'ambito di ogni strofe è indicato dalla *paragraphos*, la *diple* assume la specifica funzione di marcatore della responsione, con i seguenti distinguo:

[35] Gentili - Lomiento 2003, 56.

a. due *diplai* ricorrono in corrispondenza dell'ultimo *colon* della strofe, quella all'inizio rivolta verso l'esterno, quella alla fine verso l'interno; quest'ultima, precisa Efestione, viene apposta a segnalare la presenza di responsione;
b. due *diplai* ricorrono in corrispondenza dell'ultimo *colon* dell'antistrofe, entrambe rivolte verso l'esterno, la seconda delle quali segnala la responsione.

Analoga *ratio* è sottesa anche al sistema semiografico relativo alla parabasi comica.

4. La *paragraphos* indica le sezioni non responsive della parabasi: *kommation*, *parabasis*, *makron*, *melos*, *epirrhema* (le ultime due laddove non siano κατὰ σχέσιν).

5. Qualora vi sia responsione,
   a. l'*epirrhema* viene marcato da una *diple* rivolta verso l'interno, per chiarire che c'è una responsione,
   b. l'*antepirrhema* da una *diple* rivolta verso l'esterno.

La sezione che qui maggiormente interessa è quella dedicata ai segni che corredano i testi drammatici, il cui sistema semiografico, se raffrontato con quello adottato nella poesia lirica, è reso più complesso dalla necessità di segnalare anche i rapporti di interlocuzione e le partizioni metriche peculiari del dramma. Solo in questo ambito, inoltre, si può ravvisare un'intersezione fra le *diplai* efestionee e i segni metrici trasmessi dalle testimonianze latine, le quali, pur nella loro concisione, fanno esplicito riferimento a un contesto drammatico.

3. *Anecdoton Parisinum* (GL *VII p. 536, 4-5*) ~ *Isid.* etym. *I 21,16-17 Lindsay*[36]

>– diple obelismene ad separandas in comoediis vel tragoediis periodos.

–< obelus cum aversa, quotiens strofae antistrofos infertur.

Le fonti latine annettono ai due segni funzioni differenti[37]: la *diple obelismene*

[36] La testimonianza di Isidoro è per entrambi i segni coincidente con quella, per altri versi discordante, dell'elenco trasmesso dal ms. München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14429, *f.* 122*r-v*, X s. (Weber 1903, 8-13, Nocchi Macedo 2017, 226-227).

[37] Se la descrizione delle *diplai* offerta dal *De notis sententiarum* di Isidoro si scosta di poco da quella dell'*Anecdoton* (*diple ὀβολισμένη interponitur ad separandos in comoediis vel tragoediis periodos. aversa ὀβολισμένη, quotiens strophe et antistrophus infertur*, secondo il testo costituito da Lindsay 1911), i disegni dei *semeia* che quelle descrizioni accompagnano sono invece trasmessi in una forma senz'altro degradata: cf. Spevak 2020, 95 (nel cui apparato sono riprodotte le varianti grafiche dei *semeia* con maggior dettaglio rispetto a Lindsay 1911), e *e.g.* il *Par. lat.* 7530, miscellanea di testi grammaticali che, oltre all'*Anecdoton Par.*

(>–) sembra essere presentata come generico marcatore di articolazione metrica (*ad separandas in tragoediis et comoediis periodos*), mentre la *diple* di forma più rara, *obelus cum aversa* (*scil. diple:* –<), è destinata alla segnalazione di sezioni responsive (*quotiens strofae antistrofos infertur*). Se ne può in primo luogo dedurre, pur non trattandosi di novità[38], che la definizione oggi invalsa per la *diple* con valore metrico – *diple obelismene* – trae origine non da testimonianze teoriche greche ma da fonti latine[39]. Non si direbbe inoltre casuale che nell'*Anecdoton Parisinum* e in Isidoro, gli unici testimoni che registrano congiuntamente i segni metrici e quelli della critica omerica, il tratto orizzontale della *diple* metrica sia illustrato ricorrendo a voci peculiari della filologia omerica (*obelus*/ὀβελίζω), forse indizio di un'ibridazione terminologica tra le due serie di *semeia*, avvenuta in modi e tempi che non è dato precisare[40].

Come si è anticipato, la *diple obelismene* menzionata dalle fonti latine è ritenuta la forma canonica del *semeion*, e ne viene comunemente postulata l'identificazione con la διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα efestionea. Poiché tuttavia nella fonte greca essa non figura in maniera esplicita (il termine *obelismene*, giova ripeterlo, è trasmesso con l'accezione che qui interessa solo da testi latini), e vanamente si cercherebbe un'esatta corrispondenza tra le articolate funzioni annesse ai *semeia* efestionei e quelle, ben più sintetiche, delle *diplae* latine, la presunta equivalenza fra i due segni richiede qualche ulteriore precisazione.

(*f.* 28*r-v*), reca anche estratti isidorei (ciò che qui interessa è al *f.* 155*r*) e consente quindi immediata evidenza delle differenze formali dei segni, il primo dei quali nei testimoni isidorei presenta una foggia piuttosto inconsueta, con il tratto orizzontale che spicca dal vertice del tratto angolare come sua bisettrice, a guisa di freccia. Per il disegno dei segni ci si attiene pertanto all'*Anecdoton Parisinum*, le cui *diplai* presentano un tratto angolare accostato a un'appendice orizzontale (nella *descriptio* ricondotta a *obelus*), di fatto coincidendo, quanto a forma, con i segni metrici più frequentemente adottati nella prassi papiracea.

[38] Cf. Barbis 1988, 473, 476.

[39] Che i *semeia* di ascendenza alessandrina fossero noti nel mondo romano emerge anche da altre testimonianze: per i segni aristarchei cf. Cic. *fam.* IX 10,1; per la *diple* come segno di attenzione vd. Cic. *Att.* VIII 2,4; la *διπλῆ aversa* (assimilata al *sicilicus*) figura invece come indicatore di pausa sintattica in Mar. Vict. *GL* VI p. 23, 2-7; sulla possibile presenza di *semeia* metrici nell'ecdotica plautina vd. Questa 1984, 66. Per l'uso della *diple* nei papiri latini cf. Nocchi Macedo 2017, 204, 213.

[40] Sulla composizione dell'elenco cf. Jocelyn 1985, 158: i ventuno segni trasmessi dall'*Anecdoton Parisinum* sarebbero esito di assemblaggio e traduzione in latino di tre distinti elenchi di *semeia* greci («most of the discussion of the first twelve/thirteen signs is taken from a Greek account of the signs used by Aristarchus in editing Homer, […] the discussion of the next four signs relates entirely to Greek scenic texts and [...] the final five signs stand apart»).

Dubbio, anzitutto, è il valore da attribuire a *periodus*. Si noti, *per incidens*, che secondo gli interpreti di Isidoro il termine indicherebbe l'avvicendamento delle battute[41]; ma essendo tale funzione demandata alla *paragraphos* sia nelle prescrizioni efestionee che nell'uso manoscritto, pare senz'altro più appropriato al contesto attribuirvi un valore metrico[42]. D'altro canto la formulazione con cui l'*Anecdoton* e Isidoro assegnano alla *diple obelismene* la funzione di distinguere, limitatamente ai testi drammatici, le diverse *periodi* metriche non consente, nella sua concisione, di determinarne l'esatta natura. Nemmeno l'esame delle occorrenze di περίοδος/ *periodus* in altri contesti metrici soccorre, poiché nella teoria antica (sia greca che latina) il termine era usato con svariate accezioni: esso per lo più indicava sequenze eccedenti lo *stichos* ed estese fino alla strofe nelle strutture κατὰ σχέσιν, ma era anche utilizzato per designare sezioni di strutture non κατὰ σχέσιν[43]. Nel *De signis*, come si è visto, la funzione di distinguere le diverse *periodoi* metriche[44], siano esse responsive (A.1.a; A.2.a; B.1.a; B.1.d) o meno (A.2.b; B.1.c; B.1.e)[45], è assolta eminentemente dalla *paragraphos*, mentre la διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα viene introdotta in contesti più specifici[46]. È solo alla luce del meno vago (in quanto circoscritto alle strutture responsive) compito di marcare il passaggio dalla strofe all'antistrofe, dalle

[41] Cf. Barney *et Alii* 2006, 51: «The diple ὀβολισμένη is interposed to separate the speeches in comedies and tragedies»; Spevak 2020, 94: «La diple obélisée est intercalée pour séparer les répliques dans les comédies ou dans les tragédies»; analogamente l'*An. Par.* prescriverebbe il ricorso alla *diple obelismene* «pour la séparation des discours dans les tragédies et comédies» (Nocchi Macedo 2017, 213). È stata invece ipotizzata (Jocelyn 1985, 156 e n. 113), seppur non unanimemente accolta (cf. Spevak 2020, 96 e 297, n. 3), una interpretazione metrica per un altro segno composito ricompreso negli elenchi latini, dato dall'associazione di due *diplai* sormontate da *obelos*, che, nella formulazione trasmessa da Isidoro (l'*An. Par.* è qui lacunoso), indicherebbe l'avvicendamento di strofe in componimenti monostrofici. Un'integrazione del testo dell'*Anecdoton* conforme a questa interpretazione è stata proposta da Keil (*GL* VII p. 536, *app. ad l.* 8).

[42] Nelle fonti latine *periodus* ricorre con accezione sia retorica che metrica; entrambi i valori sono offerti da Festo, p. 236, 32 Lindsay, che tuttavia limita il primo alla prosa: *perihodos dicitur et in carmine lyrico pars quaedam et in soluta oratione verbis circumscripta sententia* (cf. Pace 2002, 27). Quanto al valore specificamente metrico, cf. Pace 2002, *passim*.

[43] Oltre ad assumere un valore ancora diverso nella teoria ritmica (cf. Pace 2002, 40ss.).

[44] Fermo restando che il termine περίοδος non vi compare.

[45] La *paragraphos*, infatti, precisa Efestione, «distingue sia le parti uguali sia quelle diseguali» (p. 74, 3-4 Consbr.).

[46] Queste in sintesi le sue applicazioni secondo Efestione: negli amebei, per segnalare una metabola metrica (B.2.b); nelle responsioni a distanza, sia nella strofe - ma in quest'ultimo caso congiuntamente alla *diple* di orientamento opposto - (B.3.a), sia nell'antistrofe - assieme a un'altra *diple* con identico orientamento - (B.3.b); nell'antepirrema della parabasi (B.5.b).

fonti latine attribuito all'*obelus cum aversa* –<, che si può ragionevolmente supporre una convergenza tra il metricologo greco e il compendio di segni latino: tanto l'*obelus cum aversa* quanto la διπλῆ ἡ ἔσω νενευκυῖα efestionea (B.2.a, B.3.a, B.5.a) trovano infatti applicazione nei soli contesti responsivi. È poi l'aspetto formale del segno che consente di precisare ulteriormente i termini dell'equivalenza: nei canti a voci alterne, dove la sola *paragraphos* sarebbe ambigua in quanto già utilizzata per l'avvicendarsi delle *personae canentes*, il metricologo informa che, in aggiunta a quel segno, si appone *anche* (p. 75, 12 Consbr.) la *diple* per chiarire che si è conclusa una sezione (sia essa strofica o priva di responsione). Da questa giustapposizione di *semeia* si sarebbe formato il segno composito tràdito dalle fonti latine.

La convergenza fra i due testimoni – ovvero l'identificazione della *diple obelismene* con la διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα efestionea – pare pertanto limitata alle evenienze di amebei, nei quali Efestione prescrive appunto l'uso della *diple* rivolta verso l'interno qualora si dia responsione (ἐὰν ἀντίστροφος ἐπιφέρηται: *quotiens strofae antistrofos infertur*), della *diple* con opposto orientamento se si avvicendano sezioni eterometriche (ἐάν γε μεταβολὴ μόνον ᾖ στροφῶν: *ad separandas in comoediis et tragoediis periodos*). Si precisa inoltre in tal modo il valore assunto da *periodos*, che designerebbe sezioni eterometriche, nello specifico entro un amebeo[47].

Ciò comporta, di fatto, la contestuale presenza nel sistema semiografico efestioneo di quattro *semeia*, due 'semplici' (ἔσω/ἔξω) e due 'compositi' – questi ultimi generati da ciascuno dei segni semplici giustapposti a una *paragraphos* –[48], cui sono attribuite funzioni distinte: due *semeia* semplici, costituiti da due tratti convergenti ad angolo acuto e impiegati (a coppie) nelle responsioni a distanza (strutture κατὰ διέχειαν nella tragedia ed epirremi responsivi nella commedia), e due *semeia* compositi, nei quali la componente angolare risulta abbinata a una appendice orizzontale, peculiari dei contesti amebei; solo in questi ultimi si potrà riconoscere la caratteristica forma con *obelos* tràdita dalle fonti latine e largamente testimoniata nei papiri di poesia drammatica.

4. *Ancora su Efestione: i testimoni manoscritti*

A proposito delle *diplai* menzionate da Efestione si rende necessario un ulte-

[47] Se ne può trovare una concreta testimonianza nel P.Oxy. 3716, dove un segno del tutto analogo alla *diple obelismene* dell'*Anecdoton* si direbbe testimoniare la presenza contestuale, in corrispondenza dei r. 9-10 (Eur. *Or.* 981-982), di un cambio di personaggio e della transizione da una coppia strofica a una sezione eterometrica (si tratterebbe cioè di un caso di metabola metrica in amebeo): cf. *supra*, n. 28.

[48] Tale distinzione sarà evidente in Tzetzes: vd. *infra*, p. 39s.

riore chiarimento, non trovandosi unanime corrispondenza tra nome e orientamento del segno né nei codici medievali che ne trasmettono definizioni e disegni (si tratta dei mss. del *De signis*, del *De metris Pindaricis* di Isacco Tzetzes e delle edizioni drammatiche tricliniane corredate da scolii metrici), né negli studi correnti che recepiscono la terminologia efestionea. Prendiamo le mosse da questi ultimi, per illustrare di seguito il più intricato quadro offerto dai manoscritti.

Se fino alla metà del secolo scorso il *semeion* con il vertice rivolto verso destra (>) era comunemente designato ἔσω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ, mentre con ἔξω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ si intendeva il segno speculare, con il vertice rivolto verso sinistra (<)[49], si può per contro osservare che negli studi successivi sono prevalse le denominazioni antitetiche[50]. Poiché, come è noto, nella prassi ecdotica antica i *semeia* metrici venivano apposti in corrispondenza del margine sinistro della colonna di scrittura, nel primo caso sarebbe il vertice dei due segmenti di cui la doppia linea (διπλῆ, *scil.* γραμμή) si compone a indicare l'orientamento verso l'esterno (ἔξω <) o l'interno (ἔσω >) della colonna di scrittura, mentre nell'interpretazione oggi invalsa la stessa funzione sarebbe assolta dall'apertura dei due tratti divergenti che spiccano dal vertice (ἔξω >; ἔσω <).

> A sostegno dell'interpretazione corrente, oltre alle fonti latine di cui già si è detto, si può addurre un argomento che emerge con evidenza dal confronto tra testo efestioneo e testimonianze papiracee. Là dove afferma che il *semeion* è usato raramente nei lirici ma di frequente nei comici e nei tragici (p. 74, 15-17 Consbr.), Efestione fa preciso riferimento alla διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα, nella quale andrebbe dunque riconosciuta la forma canonica del segno, da identificare con il *semeion* che, tanto nella più rara variante semplice quanto in quella *obelismene*, gode senz'altro di un maggior numero di attestazioni papiracee rispetto al segno speculare. A deporre per il primato della ἔξω sulla ἔσω è inoltre l'omissione di quest'ultima dall'elenco dei segni che apre il trattato, dove, assieme a *paragraphos*, coronide e asterisco, è menzionata unicamente ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ (p. 73, 14 Consbr.)[51].

I *semeia* metrici sono riprodotti nelle principali edizioni efestionee precedenti Consbruch[52], tutte basate su mss. afferenti a due (Y, Z) delle tre classi individuate da Hoerschelmann[53], mentre l'edizione corrente del *De signis* (Consbruch, Leipzig

[49] Cf., tra gli altri, Hense 1870, 64, Gudeman 1922, col. 1919, Pfeiffer 1958, 7, n. 1, Koster 1962, 16.

[50] Cf. Turner 1987, 12, n. 58, Haslam 1986, 133, McNamee 1992, 16, Ercoles 2009, *passim.*

[51] Omissione che, tuttavia, potrebbe forse essere revocata in dubbio: cf. *infra*, p. 37.

[52] Dalla *princeps* (Firenze 1526) a Tournebus (Parigi 1553), fino a Gaisford (Oxford 1855) e Westphal (Leipzig 1866).

[53] Hoerschelmann 1881.

1906), che tiene conto di un'ulteriore classe (X), li omette, limitandosi a segnalare in apparato la presenza dei disegni nell'*Harl.* 5618 (**H**[54], XV s.).

Alla classe X, ignota agli editori prenovecenteschi, appartengono l'*Ambr.* I 8 sup. (**A**, XIII-XIV s.)[55], il *Marc. gr.* 483 (**K**, XIV *in.*)[56] e il *Cantabr.* Dd.XI.70 (**C**, XV-XVI s.); **K** e **C** sono entrambi *descripti* dell'Ambrosiano, ma recano porzioni efestionee in esso andate perdute. Quanto al Marciano, si tratta del celebre codice grazie al quale Triclinio poté accostarsi all'*opus* di Efestione, verosimilmente durante i suoi studi su Pindaro, e che fu da lui stesso annotato[57]; alla mano del tessalonicense sono stati attribuiti i *semeia* metrici assenti nell'antigrafo ma vergati in margine al *f.* 45*r* del *De signis* marciano[58]. Al foglio successivo (46*v*) è riportato anche l'*Anecdoton Venetum*, che trasmette due compendi di segni della critica omerica, la cui stesura si deve a Nicola Tricline[59], «a close relative of Demetrius Triclinius»[60], mentre quest'ultimo vi avrebbe apposto una annotazione di suo pugno[61]. Ai *ff.* 99*r*-144*v* è inoltre conservato il *De metris Pindaricis* di Isacco Tzetzes, la cui sezione περὶ σημείων, al *f.* 106*r*-*v* (p. 25, 18 – 27, 2 Drachm.), è corredata di segni metrici[62] vergati nel margine non dal copista ma da uno dei due correttori (**M³** in Drachmann), nella cui mano si è potuto di nuovo riconoscere quella di Demetrio Triclinio[63].

La classe Y è rappresentata dal *Par. gr.* 2676 (**I**, XV *in.-med.*) e dal suo gemello – ma «paulo deterior»[64] – Bodl. Auct. T.2.13, XV *ex.* - XVI *in.*, il cosiddetto *Meermannianus* (**M**), corretto da una seconda mano utilizzando un esemplare della classe Z.

Quest'ultima classe, i cui principali rappresentanti sono due codici oggi conservati presso la British Library, *Harl.* 5618 (**H**, XV s.) e *Arund.* 517 (**N**, XV *med.*-

---

[54] Se non altrimenti specificato, si fa ricorso ai *sigla* adottati da Consbruch 1906.

[55] *Codex optimus* per l'*Enchiridion* (Consbruch 1906, VI). Il ms. trasmette il *De signis* incompleto, terminando in corrispondenza di p. 76, 6 Consbr.

[56] Corretto da una seconda mano sulla base di un ms. della classe Y (Consbruch 1906, VIII).

[57] Cf. da ultimo Tessier 2020, 101.

[58] Turyn 1957, 231, n. 213. Queste brevi annotazioni, comprensive dei *semeia*, si possono leggere in Studemund 1886, 152 (dove sono attribuite a **K²**, il correttore del Marciano in cui sarà poi riconosciuta la mano di Triclinio).

[59] Smith 1975, 69, n. 42. Ma vd. ora Bianconi 2005, 126s., che al *f.* 46*v* è incline a identificare la mano di Nicola Tricline alle l. 2-11, quella dello 'scriba C' (lo stesso responsabile del testo efestioneo) alle l. 12-28.

[60] Turyn 1957, 233. Sull'attività di Nicola vd. ora Bianconi 2005, 127-136.

[61] ταῦτα εὕρηται ἔν τινι παλαιῷ βιβλίῳ (Smith 1975, 69, n. 42).

[62] Riprodotti in calce all'edizione di Drachmann.

[63] Ada Adler *ap.* Drachmann 1925, 7. Cf. Turyn 1972-1973, 411 n. 1.

[64] Consbruch 1906, X.

ex.)[65], testimonia la presenza *in linea* dei *semeia*. Su un codice afferente alla classe Z si fonderebbe la *princeps* di Efestione (Firenze 1526)[66], mentre Tournebus (Parigi 1553) avrebbe fatto ricorso ad almeno due codici della classe Y[67].

Va osservato che nei mss. superstiti di tutte e tre le classi l'elenco dei *semeia* presente in apertura del *De signis* parrebbe difettoso di un'unità, essendovi citata, assieme a *paragraphos*, coronide e asterisco, solamente la διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα. Se i codici che trasmettono anche i disegni introducono il segno della διπλῆ ἡ ἔσω νενευκυῖα solo successivamente (la sua prima occorrenza è a p. 75, 12 Consbr.), le principali edizioni a stampa, a partire da quella di Tournebus ma con l'esclusione di Consbruch, provvedono a integrare il cenno al segno mancante, comprensivo di disegno, in corrispondenza della prima menzione della *diple* (p. 73, 14 Consbr.): τὰ σημεῖα τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἄλλως παρ' ἄλλοις κεῖται· λέγω δέ, ὁποῖά ἐστιν ἥ τε παράγραφος — καὶ ἡ κορωνὶς ϛ καὶ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ < καὶ ἡ ἔσω > καὶ ὁ ἀστερίσκος ※, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτον. Assente invece l'integrazione nella Giuntina, il cui testo – invero piuttosto curioso[68] – potrebbe recare traccia seppur degradata della presenza, in un antenato del ms. che è alla base della *princeps* (si ricordi che per la Giuntina si ipotizza il ricorso a un codice della classe Z), della menzione del *semeion* mancante tra διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα e asterisco, benché non si possa ovviamente escludere che la presunta pericope investita da corruzione sia dovuta a congettura recenziore[69].

I mss. della classe X non sono corredati di segni metrici. Fa eccezione il *Marc. gr.* 483, dove tuttavia i *semeia* – collocati nel margine e non *in linea* come invece avviene nell'altro ramo della tradizione – si devono, come si è anticipato, a un intervento tricliniano. Dei due principali mss. della classe Y, il *Par. gr.* 2676 non reca *semeia*, li trasmette invece il *Meermannianus*[70]; sappiamo però che il codice è stato corretto da una seconda mano ricorrendo a un esemplare della terza classe

[65] Si tralascia il *Darmst.* 2773 (per cui vd. Consbruch 1906, XI-XII), che non trasmette il *De signis*.

[66] Consbruch 1906, XII.

[67] Consbruch 1906, XXIV-XXV. È altresì opportuno ricordare che Tournebus, nello stesso torno di tempo in cui attendeva all'edizione dell'*Enchiridion*, poteva rinvenire i *semeia* metrici di matrice efestionea nel *Par. gr.* 2711 (XIV *med.*) contenente l'*ekdosis* sofoclea di Triclinio (le edizioni tournebiane di Sofocle e di Efestione vedono entrambe la luce nel 1553).

[68] Questo il testo della *princeps* nella porzione che qui interessa: λέγω δὲ ὁποῖα ἐστὶν ἥ τε παράγραφος —. καὶ ἡ κορωνὶς ϛ. καὶ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ <. καὶ ἔξω ὁ ἀστερίσκος ※ καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτον.

[69] Si osservi, ad es., che la *diple* omessa figura invece nella trasposizione in versi politici del *De signis* composta da Isacco Tzetzes (cf. *infra*, p. 39s.).

[70] Il suo gemello **I** ne è privo. Sul ms. cf. Cataldi Palau 2011, 267-269.

ed è pertanto verosimile che anche i *semeia* in esso apposti siano esito di aggiunta seriore, come indurrebbe a ritenere anche il fatto che il codice bodleiano li reca *supra lineam* e non *in linea*, dove invece li colloca il resto della tradizione.

Per quanto attiene alla forma delle *diplai*, i manoscritti efestionei attribuiscono alla ἔξω il disegno < e alla ἔσω il disegno >; così anche la Giuntina, Tournebus e i successivi editori, ad esclusione di Consbruch, su cui avranno verosimilmente gravato le riserve sulla bontà delle lezioni trasmesse dalla classe Z, a giudizio dell'editore teubneriano inficiate da massicci interventi bizantini[71]. Di diversa opinione è però Koster, secondo cui nelle *bonae lectiones* tràdite da questa famiglia di mss. sarebbe da ravvisare non tanto l'attività congetturale bizantina quanto una recensione molto distante da quella ambrosiana[72].

> Questa associazione nome-disegno, che, come si vedrà, è almeno parzialmente confortata dalla pratica semiografica delle *ekdoseis* drammatiche di Demetrio Triclinio, potrebbe trovare qualche elemento di conferma, seppure non decisivo, anche in considerazioni di carattere lessicale.
> Il verbo νεύω, che in alternanza con βλέπω è impiegato da Efestione per indicare l'orientamento del segno 'verso l'esterno' o 'verso l'interno' (*scil.* della colonna di scrittura), designa nella trattatistica tecnica l'orientazione di una linea verso un punto[73] o, con un'accezione più adeguata al caso in questione, la convergenza di due segmenti verso lo stesso punto (cf. *e.g.* Hero *Metr.* III 5, p. 150, 18 Schöne), mentre non sarebbe utilizzato per indicare segmenti che spiccano da un vertice. Si può inoltre addurre, traendola da un ambito senz'altro più vicino al nostro contesto, anche la testimonianza del già citato *Anecdoton Cavense*: in esso la *diple* viene descritta come *labda graecum iacens purum quam ipsa Graecitas a duabus lineis convenientibus diplen nominat*[74]. A indicare l'orientamento del segno sarebbe, anche in questo caso, il vertice verso cui convergono i due segmenti («lineae convenientes») della *diple*, e non la sua apertura; che poi la fonte della definizione sia *ipsa graecitas* non è ovviamente dimostrabile, ma pare almeno ciò che l'estensore dell'*Anecdoton* tenta di suggerire.

Tra i testimoni manoscritti efestionei l'unico che reca i disegni dei *semeia* a orientamento invertito – ma li sappiamo apposti in un secondo momento da Triclinio – è dunque il *Marc. gr.* 483. Questo stesso codice conserva anche il *De metris*

---

[71] Consbruch 1906, XI. Cf. anche Hoerschelmann, *ap.* Studemund 1886, 96.

[72] Koster 1945, in part. 265.

[73] Cf. Mugler 1958, 296 s.v. νεύειν.

[74] Reifferscheid 1868, 131, Pernigotti 2004, 328. Si tratta, ovviamente, della descrizione dell'analogo segno filologico (che il ms. di Cava, scostandosi dalle altre fonti dei *semeia* critico-filologici, offre nella forma <).

pindaricis di Isacco Tzetzes, vergato da una mano differente da quella responsabile dei trattati efestionei e dell'*Anecdoton Venetum*[75]. In apertura del poemetto, che traspone in versi politici gli *scholia vetera* a Pindaro, viene offerta una sintesi del *De signis* (p. 25, 21 – 27, 2 Drachm.), in margine alla quale (*f.* 106*r-v*) sono state apposte, nuovamente da Triclinio[76], le raffigurazioni dei *semeia*; pur non coincidendo precisamente con quelle che affiancano la porzione efestionea[77], esse risultano anche in questo caso a orientamento invertito rispetto ai manoscritti di Efestione che le recano[78].

5. *Is. Tzetzes,* De metris Pindaricis (*p. 25, 21 – 26, 11 Drachm.*)

σημείων τοίνυν τῶν ἁπλῶν ὄντων τῶν πάντων πέντε
τῆς παραγράφου καὶ δυοῖν διπλῶν τῶν διαφόρων,
τῆς ἔσω νενευκυίας τε, τῆς ἔξω νενευκυίας,
τοῦ ἀστερίσκου, πάλιν δε πρὸς τούτοις κορωνίδος,
ἥνπερ κἀν ταῖς συναλοιφαῖς γραμματικοὶ τιθεῖσιν, (25)
ἐκ παραγράφου καὶ αὐτῶν διπλῶν συντίθενταί πως
ἕτερα εἴδη γραμμικὰ τὰ σημειώδη πέντε·
ἐκ παραγράφου καὶ διπλῆς τῆς ἔξω νενευκυίας, (p. 26, 1)
ἐκ παραγράφου καὶ διπλῆς τῆς ἔσω νενευκυίας,
ἐκ παραγράφου καὶ διπλῶν τῆς ἔξω καὶ τῆς ἔσω,
ἐκ παραγράφου καὶ διπλῶν, ἀλλ' ἀμφοτέρων ἔσω,
ἐκ παραγράφου καὶ διπλῶν, ἀλλ' ἀμφοτέρων ἔξω. (5)
ἐξ ὧν σοι παραθήσομεν οἷσπερ λυρικοὶ χρῶνται·
χαίρουσι γὰρ καὶ τραγικοὶ καὶ κωμικοὶ σημείοις.
δεῖ τοίνυνγε γινώσκειν σε τῶν παλαιῶν τὸ ἔθος,
ὡς οὔποτε προσέγραφον εἰς ᾆσμα ἐξωτέρω
στροφήν τε καὶ ἀντίστροφον καὶ ἐπῳδὸν σὺν τούτοις, (10)
ἀλλὰ σημείοις τοιοισδὶ ἐσήμαινον τὴν κλῆσιν.

[75] Smith 1975, 69, n. 42; Bianconi 2005, 126.

[76] Cf. *supra*, n. 63.

[77] Che difetta di un *semeion*, ma la ragione della discrepanza sarà presto chiarita (cf. *infra*, n. 81).

[78] Estendendo l'esame agli altri codici che trasmettono il poemetto tzetziano - *Par. gr.* 2881 (nella porzione efestionea gemello di **C**), *Ambr.* 661 (*olim* Q 5 sup., XV s.), *Barb. gr.* 19, XV-XVI s. - si può osservare che essi recano segni del tutto identici a quelli del Marciano. È quanto si è potuto verificare su due dei tre codici (*Par. gr.* 2881 e *Barb. gr.* 19), mentre in relazione all'Ambrosiano si deve prestar fede a ciò che afferma Drachmann 1925, 7: i segni metrici (*notae* presso Drachmann) «sunt […] in omnibus codicibus simillimae».

La sezione sui segni del *De metris Pindaricis* riproduce, almeno in parte pedissequamente, il dettato del *De signis* efestioneo: vi si ritrova infatti tanto l'affermazione che dei *semeia* metrici fanno uso sia i poeti lirici (p. 25, 19 e 26, 6 Drachm.) che quelli drammatici (p. 26, 7), quanto la puntuale descrizione del loro impiego (p. 26, 12 – 27, 2), limitato a Pindaro e agli altri lirici coerentemente con la finalità del poemetto (la *diple* ne è pertanto esclusa). È anche presente, nella parte iniziale, l'elenco dei *semeia* (p. 25, 21-25) che, pur non in conflitto con quello offerto da Efestione, parrebbe d'altro canto esorbitarne il contenuto in quanto vi si aggiunge sia la menzione della *diple* omessa dai mss. superstiti del *De signis* (p. 25, 22-23), sia un uso specifico della coronide (p. 25, 25) di cui non si trova traccia nel trattato efestioneo. Vi è un altro breve passo (p. 26, 8-11) che pure non trova riscontro nel *De signis*: in esso Tzetzes afferma che l'uso dei segni metrici da parte degli antichi era dovuto all'assenza (evidentemente inconsueta per il bizantino) di indicazioni per strofe, antistrofe ed epodo poste in margine ai *lyrica* nei loro manoscritti. Ma la divergenza più palese fra i due testi riguarda la menzione, di seguito all'elenco dei *semeia* efestionei, da Tzetzes definiti semplici (ἁπλῶν, p. 25, 21), di altri cinque segni compositi (cf. συντίθενται, p. 25, 26)[79] di cui non è esplicitata la funzione, derivanti dalla combinazione della *paragraphos* con ciascuna delle *diplai* prese singolarmente (p. 26, 1-2) e della *paragraphos* con due *diplai* identiche o con entrambe (p. 26, 3-5)[80]. Se i primi due casi (*paragraphos* e διπλῆ ἡ ἔξω νενευκυῖα, *paragraphos* e διπλῆ ἡ ἔσω νενευκυῖα) trovano corrispondenza nella sezione efestionea relativa agli amebei (p. 75, 8-14 Consbr.), rimane invece non meglio precisabile da dove derivino le altre combinazioni di segni[81]. Come è noto, nel corso

[79] Αἱ συγκείμεναι (*scil.* διπλαῖ) nella breve nota che Triclinio appone a illustrazione dei *semeia* compositi da lui riprodotti in margine al *De signis* marciano (*f.* 45*r*).

[80] Nella descrizione di quest'ultima associazione (p. 26, 3), cui si adegua il disegno corrispondente (>—<), la *diple* definita ἔξω νενευκυῖα precede la ἔσω; assente, invece, la combinazione opposta (del resto non prevista dal *De signis* efestioneo, nemmeno al netto della *paragraphos*) in cui sarebbe la ἔσω a precedere l'altra (dando luogo, secondo l'orientamento dei segni adottato negli scolii marciani, alla combinazione <—>). Se, come atteso, Triclinio la omette anche nei disegni in margine alla sezione efestionea del Marciano, andrà osservato che questa associazione di *diplai* gode viceversa di numerose attestazioni nella prassi semiografica adottata nelle sue edizioni finali: cf. *e.g.* Soph. *El.* 250 al *f.* 46*r* del *Par. gr.* 2711, <τ' εὐσέβεια θνητῶν>, che lo scolio tricliniano a *El.* 236a (p. 34, 18 Tessier) descrive come δύο διπλαῖ ἔξω νενευκυῖαι, secondo un sistema semiografico che parrebbe improntato a differente *ratio* (ma cf. *infra*, p. 42ss.).

[81] Anche ipotizzando che, per analogia con gli amebei, alle associazioni di due *diplai* previste da Efestione sia andata ad aggiungersi la *paragraphos* (ciò che avrebbe dato luogo alle combinazioni terza e quinta trasmesse da Tzetzes: p. 26, 3 e 5 Drachm.), rimarrebbe comunque escluso il *semeion* composto da *paragraphos* e due *diplai* entrambe ἔσω

del suo poemetto Tzetzes richiama più volte le proprie fonti teoriche, tuttavia circoscrivendole al solo Efestione e ai relativi scolii[82].

6. *Demetrio Triclinio*

Se ignota è anche la fonte da cui Triclinio avrebbe tratto i segni apposti di suo pugno nel *Marc. gr.* 483, pare ragionevole supporre che il bizantino sia entrato prioritariamente in contatto con quelli tzetziani, poiché tra i *semeia* che affiancano il testo efestioneo egli acclude anche i segni composti da *paragraphos* e due *diplai*[83] di cui Efestione, a differenza di Tzetzes, non fa menzione, limitando l'uso congiunto di due *diplai* alle responsioni κατὰ διέχειαν, a marcare le quali non è però previsto intervenga anche la *paragraphos*.

> Pur senza addentrarsi nella questione delle fonti da cui il bizantino avrebbe attinto le proprie conoscenze metriche e, nello specifico, le tecniche ecdotiche alessandrine, andrà ricordato che l'approccio di Triclinio al sistema semiografico antico è senz'altro avvenuto grazie allo studio di Efestione[84], che egli poteva leggere nel *Marc. gr.* 483, ma non solo: oltre a conoscere e annotare il *De metris Pindaricis* di Isacco Tzetzes, trascritto nel medesimo manoscritto, e gli scolii metrici antichi ad Aristofane, il bizantino avrebbe avuto accesso a una fonte ulteriore, come è parso suggerire uno scolio al *Pluto*, che trasmette «la più ampia e completa esposizione della teoria dell'uso dei segni di Triclinio»[85]. Questo il testo dello scolio tricliniano

---

νενευκυῖαι (p. 26, 4 Drachm. = <—<), quello appunto che Triclinio omette dai disegni dei *semeia* in margine alla sezione efestionea.

[82] Cf. Irigoin 1958, 58-63. La discrepanza tra il testo di Efestione e la rielaborazione tzetziana era già stata notata da Drachmann 1925, 9, n. 1: «Non inveni unde sumpserit quae p. 22,17–23,4 huius editionis leguntur; quae quamquam ex Hephaestione facile colligi poterant, tamen ita perspicue et recte exposita sunt, ut ipsius Tzetzae labori tribui vix possint. Nec descriptio notarum criticarum qualem p. 25–26 legimus quomodo ex Hephaestionis capite περὶ ποιημάτων ultimo hauriri potuerit video».

[83] Ma ne omette uno (<—<): vd. *supra*, n. 81.

[84] Si veda al proposito quanto afferma Irigoin trattando dei *semeia* trasmessi dai papiri di Bacchilide e Pindaro, quindi inabissatisi per poi riaffiorare nell'edizione tricliniana: «Ce système de signes paraît être sorti de l'usage lors de la copie des plus anciens manuscrits du poète thébain, aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles. Il est repris et fonctionne avec une grande rigueur dans l'édition des *Épinicies* établie par Démétrios Triclinios dans les années 1320-1330 […]; il faut voir là non pas un effet de la continuité, mais une innovation tirée du traité Περὶ σημείων, *Des signes*, du métricien Héphaestion» (Irigoin 1984, 93).

[85] Lamagna 1996, 236.

nella porzione che qui interessa (*schol. rec.* Ar. *Plut.* 253c. 1-7, p. 72 Chantry)[86]:

> ἐκ τοῦ Ἡφαιστίωνος περὶ τῶν σημείων.
> ἰστέον ὅτι, ὅτε τίθεται ἐν τοῖς ἀμοιβαίοις τῶν ὑποκριτῶν προσώποις, ἐν ἐκθέσει, κῶλά τινα μετὰ τὴν περίοδον τῶν στίχων τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρου ὄντα, ἢ καὶ ἑτέρου — εὕρηται γὰρ καὶ οὕτως—τοιοῦτος σχηματισμὸς καλεῖται "διπλῆ", διὰ τὸ μετὰ τὴν συμπλήρωσιν τούτων τὸ σημεῖον ἐκτὸς τίθεσθαι τῆς διπλῆς, ὅπερ τριγώνου πλαγίου σχήματι ἔοικε, τῆς βάσεως μόνης λειπούσης. μεθ' ἣν οὐδὲ χοροῦ πάροδος ἀεὶ γίνεται, ἀλλὰ σπανίως. > **Co**[87]

Considerandolo nella sua interezza, lo scolio risulta ripartito in due parti, come già rilevava Koster: «prior […] de usu duplicis et coronidis nomine auctoris omisso docet, altera Hephaestionem secutus de usu paragraphi, asterisci, coronidis, paragraphi cum duplice ἔσω et cum duplice ἔξω νενευκυίᾳ»[88]. Vale a dire che, mentre nel seguito dell'esposizione (18-30, p. 73 Chantry) Triclinio si appella all'autorità di Efestione, di cui cita un ampio passo (p. 74, 12-13; p. 75, 1-14 Consbruch), sia l'illustrazione della *diple* sopra riportata, sia quella, a seguire, della coronide (8-12, p. 72 Chantry) si direbbero di derivazione non efestionea[89], a dispetto peraltro di quanto dichiarato in apertura di scolio. Nel caso della *diple* il commento tricliniano si discosta dalla testimonianza efestionea sia nell'uso che nella descrizione formale del *semeion*, qui ricondotto a «triangolo privo della base e orientato orizzontalmente»; va comunque osservato che, mentre nella porzione di matrice efestionea lo scolio cita entrambe le *diplai* (ἔσω ed ἔξω), la prima sezione si limita a una menzione generica del segno, priva di ragguagli sul suo orientamento, come avviene nei lacerti del commento 'eliodoreo' ad Aristofane.

Va inoltre segnalato che Triclinio, passando poi alla concreta applicazione dei *semeia* metrici nelle edizioni dei tragici, sembra attenersi a un rapporto tra disegno e denominazione non esattamente congruente con quello esibito dalle *diplai* da lui stesso apposte nel *Marc. gr.* 483. Si veda *e.g.* Eur. *Or.* 1310 nell'*Angel. gr.* 14[90], *f.* 88*v*, dove due *diplai*, definite ἔξω νενευκυῖαι dallo scolio tricliniano *ad l.*

---

[86] Lo scolio è tradotto e commentato da Lamagna 1996, 236-238.

[87] Nel *Coisl.* 192, XIV-XV s. (**Co** in Chantry 1996), un manoscritto a soli scolii che al *f.* 176*r* trasmette il passo che qui interessa, ciascun *semeion* è illustrato dal relativo disegno posto nel margine: quanto alla *diple*, essa vi figura solo nella forma >. Si osservi però che altrove il ms. riporta entrambe le *diplai*, a racchiudere i lemmi comici là dove lo preveda il relativo scolio, secondo il sistema adottato da Triclinio nelle sue *ekdoseis* finali (cf. *e.g. f.* 177*v* <μασώμενος τὸ λοιπὸν οὕτω τῷ κόπῳ ξυνεῖναι > = Ar. *Plut.* 316).

[88] Koster 1927, 53.

[89] Cf. Lamagna 1996, 237.

[90] L'edizione tricliniana definitiva della triade bizantina euripidea, parzialmente autografa.

(*schol.* Eur. *Or.* 1302-1310a, p. 72 de Faveri), assumono la forma <*αβγ*>, mentre negli scolii marciani (*f.* 106*v*, r. 9) il bizantino associa alle due ἔξω νενευκυῖαι (più *paragraphos*)[91] il disegno >—>. Analogamente nell'edizione finale sofoclea (*Par. gr.* 2711, *f.* 10*r*[92]) i due *semeia* che affiancano *Ai.* 232, definiti il primo ἔξω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ, il secondo παράγραφος καὶ ἔσω νενευκυῖα διπλῆ dallo scolio tricliniano *ad Ai.* 245a (p. 7, 8-10 Tessier), assumono la forma <*αβγ*—<, laddove negli scolii marciani (*f.* 106*v*, r. 7) il bizantino attribuisce alla stessa coppia di *diplai* il disegno >—<[93].

Se una valutazione complessiva del rapporto tra disegni e definizioni delle *diplai* nel sistema semiografico del bizantino esorbita gli obiettivi del presente lavoro, il sondaggio non più che episodico qui tentato indurrebbe a ritenere che l'incongruenza tra i *marginalia* marciani e le edizioni finali di Sofocle ed Euripide sia solo apparente. Va infatti rilevato che, fin dalla sua *ekdosis* pindarica, Triclinio era solito apporre i segni colometrici nel margine destro, discostandosi dalla prassi antica che, come è noto, ne prevedeva una collocazione in corrispondenza dell'*incipit* dei righi di scrittura[94]; ciò pare tanto più rilevante se si consideri che il lavoro tricliniano su Pindaro (che, si badi, non prevede il ricorso alle *diplai*) è generalmente ritenuto precedere quello sui tragici ed essere all'incirca coevo al contatto del tessalonicense con l'opera di Efestione[95]; non è dunque da escludere che a monte dell'orientamento delle *diplai* da Triclinio apposte al Marciano vi sia la consuetudine, certo erronea se rapportata alla prassi antica, di apporre i segni colometrici nel margine destro[96]; solo quando si troverà ad affrontare il più complesso impianto ecdotico della poesia drammatica, il bizantino dovrà viceversa ricorrere anche al margine sinistro come possibile sede della *diple*. Se quindi si osservi il sistema

[91] Si tratta dell'ultimo esempio di *semeia* compositi enunciato da Tzetz. p. 26, 5 Drachm.

[92] «Un esemplare né autografo né idiografo […] ma pienamente 'tricliniano' nell'impianto» (Tessier 2020, 149-150), su cui vd. Bianconi 2005, 100-101, 172-173. È il codice che sta alla base dell'edizione sofoclea di Tournebus.

[93] Per l'impiego tricliniano dei segni metrici in Eschilo (scolii 'prototricliniani' ed edizione finale) cf. Smith 1975, 106-109, e Lamagna 1996. Si omettono in questa sede considerazioni sull'edizione tricliniana di Aristofane, per la quale il dotto bizantino poteva giovarsi del commentario metrico eliodoreo che non faceva distinzione fra due tipi di *diplai*.

[94] Cf. Koster 1941, 17, Irigoin 1958, 104.

[95] Un'utile messa a punto delle posizioni assunte dalla critica sulla cronologia dei lavori tricliniani è in Bianconi 2005, 98, n. 32.

[96] Si può infatti osservare che la divergenza tra i *marginalia* marciani e le edizioni tragiche tricliniane è limitata non solo all'uso congiunto di due *diplai*, ma unicamente alla prima delle due, per la quale, nel concreto del rigo poetico, è prevista appunto una collocazione in corrispondenza del margine sinistro.

semiografico adottato da Triclinio nelle edizioni finali dei tragici limitandosi alla sede privilegiata di impiego di tali segni, ossia il margine sinistro, l'unico in cui essi venivano apposti nella prassi antica testimoniata dai papiri, risulterà in conclusione evidente che le *diplai* 'tragiche' tricliniane presentano un rapporto tra forma e definizione coincidente con quello trasmesso dai mss. efestionei della classe Z (ἔξω νενευκυῖα = <, ἔσω νενευκυῖα = >); poiché infine per ciascun segno ricorrono i disegni opposti quando esso sia collocato in corrispondenza del margine destro (dove ἔξω νενευκυῖα = >, ἔσω νενευκυῖα = <), si può constatare che anche nelle edizioni tragiche del bizantino l'orientamento del segno rispetto alla colonna di scrittura è indicato non dall'apertura ma dal vertice della *diple*[97].

7. *Conclusioni*

Per riassumere: le testimonianze superstiti non consentono di individuare un'univoca relazione tra il nome e l'orientamento della *diple* metrica (ambiguità che si riflette anche nelle interpretazioni moderne). La corrispondenza ἔξω νενευκυῖα >, ἔσω νενευκυῖα <, attestata nei manoscritti del *De metris Pindaricis* di Tzetzes, pare essere sostenuta tanto dalle testimonianze latine (*Anecdoton Parisinum*, Isidoro di Siviglia), quanto dall'identificazione del *semeion* che nei papiri ricorre con maggiore frequenza con la *diple* cui Efestione annette un impiego preminente. La corrispondenza antitetica ἔξω νενευκυῖα <, ἔσω νενευκυῖα > è viceversa testimoniata dai manoscritti efestionei che recano i segni colometrici (classe Z), nonché dal sistema semiografico adottato nelle edizioni tragiche finali di Triclinio, e potrebbe trovare un pur fragile sostegno in rilievi terminologici e nella definizione della *diple* trasmessa dall'*Anecdoton Cavense*.

In definitiva si dà per assodato che a monte di una delle due tradizioni semiografiche si sia verificata un'erronea inversione nell'orientamento delle *diplai*; per quanto i dati a nostra disposizione ci costringano nel terreno incerto delle ipotesi, pare ragionevole ipotizzare che la sfuggente dialettica tra i due vettori di trasmissione, testi teorici (nei quali i segni illustrativi hanno un valore per così dire 'assoluto', in quanto irrelati al testo poetico) ed edizioni drammatiche (dove i segni viceversa assumono un valore 'relativo' alla colonna di scrittura), possa aver innescato un cortocircuito tra forma e definizione che avrebbe dato luogo

[97] Rimane senz'altro da approfondire la relazione che intercorre fra i disegni posti nel Marciano a illustrazione del *De metris Pindaricis* e quelli (del tutto somiglianti: cf. *supra*, n. 78) trasmessi dagli altri testimoni del poemetto tzetziano, il *Par.* 2881, l'*Ambr.* 661 (*olim* Q 5 sup.) e il *Barb. gr.* 19, tre mss. «apparentés de très près» che testimonierebbero una recensione diversa rispetto a quella del Marciano (Irigoin 1958, 84).

a quell'inversione terminologica da cui è stata senz'altro investita una parte della tradizione. Se poi dall'errore si sia generata l'associazione nome-disegno degli esemplari efestionei della classe Z, o quella testimoniata dai manoscritti tzetziani, allo stato attuale non è dato sapere.

Università degli Studi di Trieste
lsavignago@units.it

Parole chiave: *diple*, Efestione, *Anecdoton Parisinum*, Isidoro di Siviglia, Isacco Tzetzes, Demetrio Triclinio
Keywords: *diple*, Hephaestion, *Anecdoton Parisinum*, Isidore of Seville, Isaac Tzetzes, Demetrius Triclinius

MANOSCRITTI VISIONATI AUTOPTICAMENTE O SU RIPRODUZIONE
(questi ultimi segnalati con asterisco)

Papiri

P.Brux. inv. E 6842*
P.Oxy. IX 1174*
P.Oxy. IX 1175*
P.Oxy. XVIII 2162
P.Oxy. XX 2245
P.Oxy. XXIII 2369
P.Oxy. XXXV 2743*
P.Oxy. XXXVII 2806*
P.Oxy. XLV 3216*
P.Oxy. LIII 3716*
PSI XI 1212*
P.Tebt. III 692

Codici medievali

London, British Library
Arund. 517
Harl. 5618
Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana
I 8 sup.*
Oxford, Bodleian Library
Bodl. Auct. T.2.13
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale
Coisl. 192*
Par. gr. 2676
Par. gr. 2711
Par. gr. 2881
Par. lat. 7530*
Roma, Biblioteca Angelica
gr. 14*
Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
Barb. gr. 19*
Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana
Marc. gr. 483*

RIFERIMENTI BIBLIOGRAFICI

Barbis 1988
R.Barbis, *La diplè obelismene: precisazioni terminologiche e formali*, in B.G. Mandilaras (ed.), *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology. Athens 25-31 May 1986*, II, Athens 1988, 473-476.

Barney *et Alii* 2006
The Etymologies *of Isidore of Seville*, translated with Introduction and Notes by S.A.Barney – W.J.Lewis – J.A.Beach – O.Berghof, with the collaboration of M.Hall, Cambridge 2006.

Bianconi 2005
D.Bianconi, *Tessalonica nell'età dei Paleologi. Le pratiche intellettuali nel riflesso della cultura scritta*, Paris 2005.

Cataldi Palau 2011
A.Cataldi Palau, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts from the Meerman Collection in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 2011.

Chantry 1996
Scholia in Aristophanem, edidit edendave curavit D.Holwerda, Pars III. *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas; Ranas; Ecclesiazusas et Plutum.* Fasc. IVb continens *Scholia recentiora in Aristophanis Plutum* ed. M.Chantry, Groningen 1996.

Consbruch 1906
Hephaestionis *Enchiridion cum commentariis veteribus*, ed. M.Consbruch, Lipsiae 1906.

Cristante 2008a
L.Cristante, *Fra volumina e codices. Una testimonianza tardoantica sulla prassi colometrica* (*Mart. Cap. II 120; 137-138*), in P.Arduini – S.Audano – A.Borghini – A.Cavarzere – G.Mazzoli – G.Paduano – A.Russo (ed.), *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli*, I, Roma 2008, 351-362.

Cristante 2008b
L.Cristante, *La filologia come enciclopedia. Il De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii di Marziano Capella*, «Voces» XIX (2008), 51-69.

Dindorf 1875
Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem, ed. G.Dindorfius, I, Oxford 1875.

Drachmann 1925
Isaac Tzetzae *de metris Pindaricis commentarius*, ed. A.B.Drachmann, København 1925.

Ercoles 2009
M.Ercoles, *La διπλῆ ὠβελισμένη nel P. Louvre E 3320* (*Alcm. PMGF 1*), «Eikasmós» XX (2009), 47-59.

Esposito 2008
E.Esposito, rec. ad A.Romano, *I segni nel papiro ercolanese 1497* (*Philodemi* De Musica*, liber IV*), Napoli (Macchiaroli) 2007, «Eikasmós» XIX (2008), 586-589.
Fontaine 1959
J.Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, I-II, Paris 1959.
Gaisford 1855
Ἡφαιστίωνος *Ἐγχειρίδιον περὶ μέτρων καὶ ποιημάτων*. Hephæstionis Alexandrini *Enchiridion*, iterum ed. Th.Gaisford, Oxonii 1855[2] [1810[1]].
Garulli 2019
V.Garulli, *Lectional Signs in Greek Verse Inscriptions,* in A.Petrovic – I.Petrovic – E.Thomas (ed.), *The Materiality of Text – Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston 2019, 105-144.
Garulli 2020
V.Garulli, *Signes de lecture dans les inscriptions métriques grecques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, in N.Carlig – G.Lescuyer – A.Motte – N.Sojic (ed.), *Signes dans les textes. Continuités et ruptures des pratiques scribales en Égypte pharaonique, gréco-romaine et byzantine*. «Actes du colloque international de Liège (2-4 juin 2016)», Liège 2020, 223-240.
Gentili – Lomiento 2003
B.Gentili – L.Lomiento, *Metrica e ritmica. Storia delle forme poetiche nella Grecia antica*, Milano 2003.
Gudeman 1922
A.Gudeman, *Kritische Zeichen*, in *RE* XI/2 (1922), 1916-1927.
Haslam 1986
The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, LIII, ed. M.W.Haslam, London 1986.
Hense 1870
O.Hense, *Heliodoreische Untersuchungen*, Leipzig 1870.
Hense 1912
O.Hense, *Heliodoros der Metriker*, in *RE* VIII/1 (1912), 28-40.
Hoerschelmann 1881
W.Hoerschelmann, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Metriker. Die Composition der Hephaestio-Scholien*, «Rheinisches Museum für Philologie» XXXVI (1881), 260-301.
Irigoin 1958
J.Irigoin, *Les scholies métriques de Pindare*, Paris 1958.
Irigoin 1984
J.Irigoin*, Livre et texte dans les manuscrits byzantins de poètes: continuité et innovations,* in C.Questa – R.Raffaelli (ed.), «Atti del Convegno internazionale

"Il libro e il testo" (Urbino 20-23.IX.1982)», Urbino 1984, 85-102.

Jocelyn 1985
H.D.Jocelyn, *The Annotations of M. Valerius Probus (II),* «The Classical Quarterly» XXXV (1985), 149-161.

Johnson 2004
W.A.Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2004.

Koster 1927
W.J.W.Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanis Plutum et Nubes vetera, Thomae Magistri, Demetrii Triclinii nec non anonyma recentiora partim inedita*, Lugduni Batavorum 1927.

Koster 1941
W.J.W.Koster, *Studia ad colometriam poëseos Graecae pertinentia*, «Mnemosyne» IX (1941), 1-43.

Koster 1945
W.J.W.Koster, *De tribus codicibus Hephaestioneis*, «Mnemosyne» XII (1945), 258-312.

Koster 1962
W.J.W.Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine*, Leyde 1962[3] [1936[1]].

Lamagna 1996
M.Lamagna, *Segni diacritici in Demetrio Triclinio*, in F.Conca (ed.), *Byzantina Mediolanensia*. «Atti del V Congresso Nazionale di Studi Bizantini (Milano 19-22 ottobre 1994)», Soveria Mannelli-Messina 1996, 235-245.

Le Bourdellès 1985
H.Le Bourdellès, *L'Aratus latinus, étude sur la culture et la langue latines dans le nord de la France au VIIIe siècle*, Lille 1985.

Lindsay 1911
W.M.Lindsay (ed.), *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, Oxonii 1911.

Lucarini 2011
C.M.Lucarini, *Osservazioni sulla prima circolazione delle opere di Platone e sulle Trilogiae di Aristofane di Bisanzio (D. L. 3, 56–66)*, «Hyperboreus» XVII (2011), 346-361.

Maass 1898
E.Maass, *Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae*, Berolini 1898.

Manetti 2006
D.Manetti, *La terminologie du livre : à propos des emplois d'ὕφος et ἔδαφος dans deux passages de Galien*, «Revue des Études Grecques» CXIX (2006), 157-171.

Martin 1974
Scholia in Aratum vetera, ed. J.Martin, Stuttgart 1974.
McNamee 1992
K.McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri,* Bruxelles 1992.
McNamee 2007
K.McNamee, *Finding Libraries*, in J.Frösén – T.Purola – E.Salmenkivi (ed.), *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology* (*Helsinki, 1-7 August, 2004*), II, Helsinki 2007, 693-707.
McNamee 2017
K.McNamee, *Sigla in Late Greek Literary Papyri*, in G.Nocchi Macedo – M.Ch. Scappaticcio (ed.), *Signes dans les textes, textes sur les signes. Érudition, lecture et écriture dans le monde gréco-romain.* «Actes du colloque international (Liège, 6–7 septembre 2013)», Liège 2017, 127-141.
Montanari 1979
F.Montanari, *Studi di filologia omerica antica,* I, Pisa 1979.
Moretti 2015
G.Moretti, *Il sapere sullo stomaco e la dottrina rigettata: avventure letterarie di un motivo satirico*, «Maia» LXVII (2015), 559-602.
Mugler 1958
Ch.Mugler, *Dictionnaire historique de la terminologie géométrique des Grecs*, Paris 1958.
Nauck 1867
Lexicon Vindobonense, recensuit et adnotatione critica instruxit A.Nauck, Petropoli 1867.
Nocchi Macedo 2011
G.Nocchi Macedo, *Formes et fonctions de l'astérisque dans les papyrus littéraires grecs et latins*, «Segno e Testo» IX (2011), 3-33.
Nocchi Macedo 2017
G.Nocchi Macedo, *Textes sur les signes : les sources latines*, in G.Nocchi Macedo – M.Ch. Scappaticcio (ed.), *Signes dans les textes, textes sur les signes. Érudition, lecture et écriture dans le monde gréco-romain.* «Actes du colloque international (Liège, 6–7 septembre 2013)», Liège 2017, 203-228.
Pace 2002
G.Pace, *Il termine περίοδος nella dottrina metrica e ritmica antica*, «Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica» LXXI (2002), 25-46.
Pernigotti 2004
C.Pernigotti, *L'Anecdoton Cavense e la tradizione greco-latina dei segni critici*

platonici, in S.Bruni – T.Caruso – M.Massa (ed.), *Archaeologica pisana: scritti per Orlanda Pancrazzi*, Pisa 2004, 327-332.

Pfeiffer 1958
R.Pfeiffer, *Ein neues 'Inachos'-Fragment des Sophokles,* «Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften» VI (1958), 3-41.

Questa 1984
C.Questa, *Numeri innumeri. Ricerche sui cantica e la tradizione manoscritta di Plauto*, Roma 1984.

Reifferscheid 1868
K.W.A.Reifferscheid, *Mittheilungen aus Handschriften. I: Anecdotum Cavense de notis antiquorum*, «Rheinisches Museum für Philologie» XXIII (1868), 127-133.

Schironi 2001
F.Schironi, *L'Olimpo non è il cielo: esegesi antica nel papiro di Derveni, in Aristarco e in Leagora di Siracusa*, «Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik» CXXXVI (2001), 11-21.

Schironi 2012
F.Schironi, *The Ambiguity of Signs: Critical σημεῖα from Zenodotus to Origen*, in M.R.Niehoff (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, Leiden-Boston 2012, 87-112.

Smith 1975
O.L.Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I: The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius*, Lugduni Batauorum 1975.

Spevak 2020
Isidore de Séville, *Étymologies, Livre I, La grammaire*, texte établi, traduit et commenté par O.Spevak, Paris 2020.

Steinová 2019
E.Steinová, *Notam superponere studui: the Use of Annotation Symbols in the Early Middle Ages*, Turnhout 2019.

Studemund 1886
Anecdota varia Graeca musica metrica grammatica, ed. G.Studemund, Berolini 1886.

Tessier 2015
Demetrio Triclinio, *Scolii metrici alla tetrade sofoclea*, testo critico a cura di A.Tessier, Alessandria 2015[2] [2005[1]].

Tessier 2020
A.Tessier, *Una breve storia illustrata del testo tragico greco sino a Willem Canter*, Trieste 2020[2] [2018[1]].

Turner 1984
E.G.Turner, *Papiri Greci*, ed. it. a cura di M.Manfredi, Roma 1984 [ed. orig. *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, Oxford 1980[2] (1968[1])].
Turner 1987
E.G.Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, London 1987[2] [1971[1]].
Turyn 1957
A.Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*, Urbana 1957.
Turyn 1972-1973
A.Turyn, *Demetrius Triclinius and the Planudean Anthology*, «Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν» XXXIX-XL, 1972-1973, 403-450.
Weber 1903
P.Weber, *Quaestionum Suetonianarum capita duo*, diss. Halis Saxonum 1903.
Westphal 1866
Scriptores metrici Graeci, ed. R.Westphal, I. Hephaestionis *de metris Enchiridion et de poemate libellus cum scholiis et* Trichae *Epitomis*, *adjecta* Procli Chrestomathia *grammatica*, Lipsiae 1866.
Willink 1986
Euripides, *Orestes*, with Introduction and Commentary by C.W.Willink, Oxford 1986.

Etymology and Literary Culture
in Greco-Roman Antiquity

GIANFRANCO AGOSTI – ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS

Introduction

In recent years etymology and etymological wordplay in Greek and Latin literature has experienced a renewed interest. Several important books and articles have been published on this topic, exploring the presence of etymology in different literary genres and analyzing the engagement with the 'true' meaning of words and names by ancient authors. The organizers have been working for many years on etymology in archaic Greek literature, especially in Hesiod, and on etymological wordplays in late antique literature and epigraphy. Following this shared interest, they decided to organize a workshop on etymology and literary culture from the archaic age to late antiquity. The papers now gathered in this volume address a wide range of authors and genres, from early Greece to the Roman empire and the late antique/early Byzantine world. While a collection of essays such as this cannot exhaust the topic, we hope to have shown how vital it is to pay attention to the etymological practices inherent to Greco-Roman literature and to stimulate further research on this topic.

The collection opens with an article on Hesiod's *Theogony*. **Athanassios Vergados** revisits the section on monsters, creatures that depart from the usual anthropomorphic presentation of the gods and pose a double challenge: a political because they seek to undermine Zeus's organisation of the cosmos and a cognitive because language, as it turns out, is unable to grasp and express monstrosity adequately. While the first monstrous characters to appear in the *Theogony*, the Cyclopes, are given an etymologically 'correct' collective name that reflects the most prominent characteristic, the Hundred-Handers are 'not to be named'. In the section of monsters proper (270-336) etymological correctness decreases, with some names only partially capturing what is essential about these creatures, and some characters receiving generic names or no name at all. Finally, the narrative on Typhoeus misses an obvious opportunity for etymology, while it confounds terms for different types of voice, thus mirroring the monster's appearance. After Zeus's dispatching Typhoeus, however, etymological explanation returns. In her contribution **Ilaria Andolfi** explores etymology in the context of philosophical views on language, especially those of the Stoics and the Epicureans as well as the theory of the πάθη, before zooming in on early Greek mythography and genealogy where etymology was used to validate a particular account against several competing ones, a practice that is attested also in later mythographic sources (*e.g.*, Palaephatus, Heraclitus, Cornutus). It is particularly interesting that these authors reveal

an awareness of language change over time and its effect on the form of words. This approach is detected in two fragments of Andron of Teos (*FGrHist* 802F3) and Andron of Halicarnassus (fr. 8 *EGM*), both of which Andolfi argues should be attributed to Andron of Teos, where etymologies κατὰ φθοράν are proposed. Names, it turns out, can convey covert knowledge about a place or personality, which when uncovered enables us to unravel a compelling narrative about them. **Michael Paschalis** examines the etymology of the proper name Orestes in the *Cratylus* and in Greek tragedy and demonstrates how attention to semantic clusters is essential for detecting the implicit, context-specific etymologies (*e.g.*, at Pi. *N.* X 60-70). In the *Cratylus*, where Orestes means 'Mountain-Man' (< ὄρος), the name is embedded in the genealogy of the Pelopids. Paschalis detects two groups of etymologies in tragedy. The matricide plays link the name with ὁρᾶν ('to see') and words that belong to the semantic field of vision and light, especially in the climax of the recognition scene. In Euripides' *Orestes*, however, Ὀρέστης is associated with terms pointing to 'mountain' or 'wildness' (ὄρος, ἄγριος, τὸ θηριῶδες), which thus can be seen to function as a poetic antecedent of the etymology presented in the *Cratylus*.

Greek epigram is a genre particularly fond of etymology, as the following articles demonstrate. **Lucia Floridi** investigates (par-)etymological wordplay on proper names in epigram and what they can reveal about the poets' re-working their epigrams. By exploring poems which appear in different form, with proper names varied, within the *Greek Anthology* (or in the *Greek Anthology* and on papyrus) Floridi demonstrates that these epigrams may have been reused by their poets in a new context and that proper names were substituted not due to palaeographic error but in order to increase the efficacy of the poetic message. **Arianna Gullo**, on the other hand, explores etymological phenomena in a selection of funerary epigrams from Book VII of the *Greek Anthology*. These epigrams exhibit a profound interest in etymological puns and wordplays, which are frequently made to fit the context and lend an erudite tone to the epigram, often operating in clusters or networks of assonance, repetition, and/or engaging creatively with the image that may accompany the funerary epigram. Several cases illustrate engagement with Homeric philology, especially debates on the meaning of a rare Homeric word, with the epigrammatist making choices that reflect his position in the matter.

The following two contributions address topics in Latin literature. **Ioannis Ziogas** focuses on the interplay between etymology and law: both linguists and jurists share the concept of *ratio* ('reasoning') that indicates the rationale or the principles that determine juristic or linguistic realities, and the legal expert's *doctrina* parallels that of the poet. Etymology and legal reasoning are based on language, an idea that can be traced back to Plato's labelling the name-giver as νομοθέτης in the *Cratylus*.

Roman juristic writing shows a profound interest in etymology, and it is the merit of Ziogas' paper that it shifts attention to etymology in Roman jurisprudence, bridging institutional divides and paying attention to the social and cultural realities in which Roman law, along with literature and scholarship, thrived. Examples include Antistius Labeo who just like Nigidius Figulus was interested in the origins of words as a way to reveal the origins (*i.e.* the true nature) of law: positing a natural link between names and things enhances the authority of the law. This interplay between law and etymology is not present in legal sources alone but is reflected in literature as well. **Robert Maltby** demonstrates how attention to etymology can illuminate questions of authorship and structure of a poetry book. In particular, the author of the *Appendix Tibulliana* (*AT*) uses etymology of proper names and common nouns in a way that is reminiscent of the use of etymology in the great elegists of the past, especially Tibullus, and other poets of the golden era. The poet's etymological wordplays in the *AT* that have parallels in Tibullus, and what is more, they are found throughout the *AT*, which supports the thesis of a unified composition. Personal names (Lygdamus, Neaera, Cerinthus) recall etymologically charged names used in earlier elegists, as well as pointing, through literary associations, to earlier poets and thus lend depth to this unified composition.

The next two papers focus on Neoplatonism. **Robbert van den Berg** examines the term γλίσχρος ('sticky') that Platonists applied to the etymologies proposed by Stoics. This adjective derives from the *Cratylus* and helps establish a distinction between correct (Platonist) vs incorrect (Stoic) etymologising; it is later used by Neoplatonists with a critical attitude towards Stoic etymologising of divine names and early myth. While Neoplatonists continue etymologising divine names, as the Stoics had done, they show a different conception of the relation of these names to the context in which they occur. This is especially the case in their application of etymology to the proems of the Platonic dialogues that introduce ideas that contribute to the overall argument of the dialogue. In addition, names are etymologised without ignoring the context in which they occur and the σκοπός of the Platonic dialogue so as to fit with the allegorical reading of the myth as a whole and to propose a metaphysical (rather than physical) interpretation: the hidden truth must relate to the intelligible rather than the physical world. **Nicola Zito**'s paper focuses on the poem Περὶ καταρχῶν by the Neoplatonic Philosopher Maximus of Ephesus (mid-4th c. AD) that offers its audience advice on when to undertake particular tasks on the basis of the observation of astral movements. From Zito's analysis Maximus' poem emerges as a work imbued with Alexandrian erudition, which includes the use of etymological wordplays in his presentation of the advice, where not only the names of constellations matter but also the etymologically derived knowledge from the epithets accompanying these names. Maximus, in true Alex-

andrian spirit, alludes both to Hellenistic predecessors and to philological debates on the meanings of the words he is discussing, which presupposes a knowledgeable reader who is capable of detecting and appreciating these literary and scholarly references.

The thematic section concludes with three articles on late antique literature. **Anna Lefteratou** examines etymology and related phenomena in the Homeric centos. Particularly interesting are speaking (Homeric) names that are recast as theologically charged adjectives (Theoclymenos, for instance, is a case in point). Vocabulary derived from archaic hexameter poetry is reused (and is understood etymologically) to recast terms drawn from the New Testament, while the audience are often confronted with polysemous Homeric vocabulary which they need to interpret using their knowledge of Homeric criticism or Christian poetry. Centos are the product of a bookish culture, and their audience are expected to be familiar with scholarly and theological exegesis, whilst the poems themselves are read as exegetical works ancillary to the Christian canon. **Martina Venuti** turns her attention to etymology in late Latin authors. Using the name of Saturnus as her example, she illustrates how etymological knowledge and practice, including bilingual Latin-Greek etymologies, was transmitted from Varro, Cicero, and the Augustan poets to Fulgentius' *Mythologiae* via Tertullian, Lactantius, Servius, Augustine, and Macrobius, before finding its place in Isidor's encyclopaedic work. Finally, **Gianfranco Agosti** explores several cases of etymological phenomena involving proper names that reveal the 'true meaning' of the name in late antique and Byzantine inscriptions. While some of the wordplays may be easily detectable, a good number of them are more elaborate and subtle, sometimes displaying interlingual (Greek and Latin) puns. Their aim seems to be, accordingly, to challenge the audience's interpretive skills. No matter how complex, etymological wordplays draw the reader's or listener's attention to the qualities of the individuals praised. The degree to which these were recognised and appreciated by the audience varies, and there are several unknown factors that prevent us from forming a definitive view on this matter.

Many of the papers collected in this volume were presented at the international conference on *Etymology and Literary Culture in Greco-Roman Antiquity* held at Newcastle University on 16-17 December 2019. The conference was generously funded by the Leverhulme Trust, as the final joint activity of both organizers, in the framework of Gianfranco Agosti's Visiting Professorship at Newcastle. We would like also to thank the School of History, Classics and Archaeology of Newcastle University and the Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità, Sapienza University of Rome for their support. Our thanks go also to the anonymous reviewers for their critical and constructive feedback.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32051 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 59-85*

ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS

Hesiod's Monsters and the Limits of Etymological Signification

This paper explores the ways in which the presence of monstrous figures challenges etymologically 'correct' naming in Hesiod's Theogony. *By examining the section on the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers* (*139-153*), *the catalogue of monsters* (*270-336*), *and the Typhonomachy* (*820-880*), *I argue that the* Theogony*'s monstrous characters call into question the poet's ability to encapsulate adequately and clearly the hybrid essence of these beings by using a single, 'correct' name. Etymological 'correctness' increasingly recedes, the names of monsters sometimes capture only part of the nature of these characters, while some characters bear only generic names or no name at all. With the defeat of Typhoeus etymological 'correctness' returns to the narrative, thereby suggesting that Zeus's victory has both a political and a linguistic/cognitive effect.*

L'articolo esplora i modi in cui, nella Teogonia *di Esiodo, la presenza di figure mostruose sfida la denominazione etimologicamente 'corretta'. Esaminando la sezione sui Ciclopi e i Centimani* (*139-153*), *il Catalogo dei mostri* (*270-336*) *e la Tifonomachia* (*820-880*), *sostengo che i mostruosi personaggi della* Teogonia *chiamano in causa l'abilità del poeta nell'incapsulare in un nome, in modo adeguato ed evidente, l'essenza ibrida di questi esseri. La 'correttezza' etimologica si allontana progressivamente, i nomi dei mostri a volte esprimono solo una parte della natura di questi personaggi, mentre alcuni personaggi recano soltanto nomi generici o nessun nome. Con la sconfitta di Tifeo la 'correttezza' etimologica rientra nella narrazione, suggerendo così che la vittoria di Zeus ha un effetto sia politico sia linguistico-cognitivo.*

Hesiod's etymologizing of proper names in the *Theogony* is well-known and has been the subject of numerous studies[1]. In a recent monograph I argue that Hesiod's keen use of etymology is linked to his general vision of the nature of language and its potential to represent reality[2]. The *Theogony* that systematizes divine genealogies and the succession of the generations of gods adopts a genealogical perspective on language, and it is no wonder that it is in this poem that we find the greatest number of Hesiod's etymologies. These etymologies imply the existence of a 'correct'[3] or 'true' language whose words (names) effectively reflect something of great importance about the character named. To give just one example, in his

[1] On etymologising in Hesiod and early Greek literature see, for instance, Sulzberger 1926; Risch 1947; Rank 1951; Ferrante 1965; Gambarara 1984; Arrighetti 1987, 15-36; Kraus 1987; Salvadore 1987; Peradotto 1990; Curiazi 1994; Louden 1995; Tsitsimbakou-Vassalos 2007; Skempis and Ziogas 2009; Kanavou 2015; O'Hara 2015, 7-13; Sluiter 2015. See also the discussion in Genette 1976, 11-51.

[2] Vergados 2020.

[3] I use inverted commas to signal that these names are not correct in terms of scientific etymology that observes the sound laws formulated by modern linguists. They are 'correct' inasmuch as the poet posits a reason behind their coinage as instruments that reveal something of profound importance about the character named. In other words, they are exegetically 'correct' in the verbal cosmos of the poem.

presentation of Aphrodite's conception and birth (188-206) Hesiod etymologizes her name from ἀφρός, thereby revealing the circumstances of her conception and birth: she was reared in the foam that was formed around the severed member of Ouranos, cast by Cronus into the sea. The poet also provides the etymological explanations of several of her standard epithets: κυπρογενής because she first appeared on Cyprus; Κυθέρεια because Cythera was the first place she approached in her journey; ἀφρογενής because she was born out of the foam; and φιλομμηδής/φιλομμειδής ('fond of genitals') because she was born from Ouranos' genitals (μήδεα)[4]. All these attributes turn out to reflect important moments of her divine biography: they are related to the places that she approached before her birth and first epiphany, or again to the circumstances of her conception. Anticipating later developments in the theory of language, the name, thus, turns out to be a micro-narrative, a condensed narrative, which, if properly understood and expanded, reveals a lot about the character named[5].

This set of explicit etymological explanations achieves more than simply accounting for how Aphrodite acquired her name and epithets. They are also a strategy by which Hesiod justifies his choice of an alternative genealogy for the goddess. As we know from the *Iliad* (V 370-430) and the *Homeric Hymn* (V) dedicated to her, Aphrodite was also thought to be the daughter of Zeus, and in the *Iliad* Dione is said to be her mother[6]. Later authors will distinguish between two goddesses sharing the same name, one born of Ouranos, the other of Zeus[7]. For Hesiod, however, there is only one Aphrodite. Hesiod's Aphrodite is the daughter of Ouranos, and her birth and naming mark the conclusion of the first stage of the Succession Myth, soon to be punctuated by another explicit etymology, pronounced by Ouranos and concerning the name of the Titans (207-210). Aphrodite turns out to be older than Zeus and thus not immediately subject to his power, unlike the Aphrodite of the *Homeric Hymn*, the delimiting of whose power is one of the central issues in the *Hymn*[8].

---

[4] Hesiod plays here with the hexameter tradition: he adds a more traditional etymology of φιλομμηδής from φιλότης and μειδήματα at 205-206; see Vergados 2020, 83-84 with further bibliography.

[5] The Stoics will later speak of ἀνάπτυξις, 'unfolding' of a name; cf. Quilligan 1979, esp. 35-37; Dawson 1992; Sluiter 1997, 200-203.

[6] Note that Hesiod mentions Dione twice in the *Theogony* (17, 353) but does not associate her with Aphrodite.

[7] Cf. Orphica Fr. 189, 260 Bernabé, and the distinction between Aphrodite οὐρανία and πάνδημος in Plat. *Symp.* 180e.

[8] See Strauss Clay 1989, 152-201.

This is not to say, of course, that the *Theogony* provides us with a uniformly unambiguous view of the ability of human language to comprehend and explicate divine realities. Besides the explicit etymologies, which appear in the first third of the poem (Chrysaor and Pegasus are the last explicit etymologies), there are several implicit ones, whose perception depends on the audience's ability to grasp the connections established (or implied) by the poet. There is furthermore the much-discussed statement of the Muses in lines 27-28 in which the goddesses assert that they can tell many lies that resemble truths, but also truths, whenever they wish[9]. Significantly, they do not at any point claim to convey truths to Hesiod[10]. Thus, the truth status of his account of the creation of the divine cosmos and Zeus's ascending to power remains open: is it ἀληθές? or a ψεῦδος that resembles ἔτυμα? To these we should add the poet's claim to be unable to name all the river-gods and Oceanids in lines 362-370. There are three thousand of them, and only men who dwell near them are able to tell their names. Hesiod's *Theogony* is incomplete, then, as the opening of the *Works and Days* that introduces an additional goddess by the name Eris further confirms[11]. All of this has a profound epistemological import: if names encapsulate the divine past and can be unfolded through etymological analysis so as to offer knowledge about this past, then the lack of complete knowledge of the divine names and the possibility for etymological mis-interpretation[12] mean that the knowledge that the mortal poet can hope to achieve is limited, while his ability to convey it to his audience cannot be taken for granted. The knowledge about the divine past that the poet's language conveys must be subjected to constant re-evaluation, as Hesiod himself does at the beginning of the *Erga* in his account of Strife.

The monsters that make their appearance in Hesiod's *Theogony*, the topic of this paper, pose a further challenge to etymologically 'correct' naming, as they call into question the poet's ability to capture adequately and clearly the hybrid essence of the beings named. As scholars have often pointed out, monsters straddle categories without fitting comfortably in any of them and thus defy our taxonom-

[9] These lines have been heavily debated, and reproducing the entire discussion goes beyond the purview of this article. For an overview see West 1966 *ad l.*; Stroh 1976; Pucci 1977; Ferrari 1988; Strauss Clay 2003, 57-64; Pucci 2007 *ad l.*; Halliwell 2011, 13-15; Stamatopoulou 2017, 20-21; Tor 2017, 71-72; Ricciardelli 2018, XXX-XXXII and 105-108; Vergados 2020, 211-219.

[10] A point emphasized by Strauss Clay 2003, 60 and Tor 2017, 72-73.

[11] Hes. *Op.* 11-26; cf. Vergados 2020, 151-160.

[12] Cf. the etymology of Pandora's name at Hes. *Op.* 80-82 that shows that even when the etymon of a name is transparent, multiple and sometimes contradictory interpretations are possible; cf. Vergados 2020, 115-137.

ic efforts[13]. Indeed, some of Hesiod's monsters combine immortality with bestial form (*e.g.*, Kerberos, Echidna); others, both bestial and mortal (*e.g.*, Gorgo Medousa, the Lernaian Hydra, the Nemean Lion, Orthos), are later killed by heroes (Bellerophon, Heracles, Perseus). Incidentally, this fact draws attention to another kind of anomaly in the section on monsters, its temporal displacement: in the arrangement of the material in the *Theogony,* the section on monsters anticipates the narrative of Zeus's birth (468-500)[14]; nevertheless, the king of the gods and his sons who free the world of some of these monsters feature proleptically in this part of the narrative[15]. Finally, in some cases we encounter features of more than one animal combined in a single monster (*e.g.*, the Chimaera), or polycephaly (*e.g.*, Cerberus, Hydra, Geryon)[16]. In terms of their placement in the narrative fabric of the *Theogony*, the majority of Hesiod's monsters are contained in the section of the poem that catalogues the offspring of Pontus and are, appropriately, fenced off through ring-composition (270 ~ 333-336)[17]. But this is not to say that the 'monstrous' is confined to these lines: early on in the *Theogony* Hesiod introduces the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers, who exhibit monstrous characteristics, while after the Titanomachy Zeus will have to face Typhoeus, the ultimate monster that combines characteristics of several earlier monsters.

The defining characteristics often proposed in modern 'monster studies' cannot be uniformly applied to Hesiod's monsters, and some scholars have denied the applicability of the modern concept of the 'monstrous' in early hexameter literature[18]. For instance, although the monstrous is sometimes said to be confined to the margins, and indeed some of the *Theogony*'s monsters dwell in the margins of the world (*e.g.*, the Gorgons who dwell ἐν ἐσχατιῇ νυκτός [275], the home of the Hesperides, or Geryon πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεάνοιο [294]), in Hesiod's vision of the cosmos monsters and monstrosity are not entirely marginal: the Nemean Lion

[13] On monsters in antiquity and modern 'monster studies', see Sperber 1975; Mainoldi 1995; Cohen 1996; Atherton 1998; Kearney 2003; Li Causi 2003; Murgatroyd 2007; Beta - Marzari 2010; Cherubini 2012; Gevaert - Laes 2013; Lowe 2015; Carpi 2019; Del Lucchese 2019; Godden - Mittman 2019; Gloyn 2020. On Hesiod's monsters, see Costa 1968; Strauss Clay 1993; Visintin 1997; Strauss Clay 2003, 150-161; Baglioni 2017.

[14] Likewise, Orthos is killed at 293, but is born at 309.

[15] See Stoddard 2004, 162-201; see also Strauss Clay 2003, 152-153 who draws our attention to the similar collapse of chronology in the Prometheus episode.

[16] Cf. «Thesis III: The Monster is the Harbinger of Category Crisis» in Cohen 1996, 6-7.

[17] Strauss Clay 1993, 115-116 highlights the significance of the fact that this section is enclosed in ring-composition and its placement relatively early on in the poem despite the problems in chronology.

[18] Zanon 2016; Baglioni 2017.

and the Lernaean Hydra dwell in recognizable parts of the Greek landscape, and their presence vexes humans until they are dispatched by Heracles. On the other hand, the Hundred-Handers and the Cyclopes play a crucial role in supporting the poem's *telos*, the establishment of the reign of Zeus, with whom they engage in reciprocal exchange (655-663): they fight on his side in gratitude for his freeing them from the imprisonment imposed by Ouranos. The Hundred-Handers will later become guards of the imprisoned Titans in Tartarus, thus in a sense being relegated to the margins. But even so, they play an important role in Zeus's cosmos while one of them, Briareos, is given Kymopoleia as his wife and may no longer dwell in Tartarus with his brothers (817-819). This treatment of the Hundred-Handers is not reserved to 'monsters' alone: Styx, a powerful goddess who first joins the Olympian cause along with her children (383-403), is likewise honoured by Zeus by becoming the 'great oath of the gods,' which also means that she dwells in Tartarus as a river of the Underworld (775-806): while she assumes an important role in Zeus's arrangement of the divine cosmos, she dwells far away from Olympus, separated from her children, and thus cannot pose any challenge to Zeus[19]. We do not know where the Cyclopes dwell after Zeus frees them, but they too are integrated into Zeus's cosmos as the divine craftsmen who fabricate Zeus's weapon.

It is sometimes observed that monsters do not resemble their parents, an idea that derives from the use of Latin *monstrum*, which may designate offspring that markedly differs from their parents or any deformed or strange-looking being, and may even be used as a moral characterisation[20]. But even this is not entirely true of the *Theogony*'s monsters: for despite their abnormality, some of Hesiod's monsters do resemble their parents and inherit some of their characteristics (*cf.*, for instance, the repetition of canine or serpentine forms in the catalogue, or the quality of καλλιπάρηος that is inherited by some female members of the monster line). It has also been noted that the monster challenges the cultural paradigm by being "a liminal creature embodying the very boundaries humans have overreached" whose "place [is] outside and beyond social norms and values". A monster refers to what a given culture conceives as 'abnormal' or 'other,' which by challenging existing categories reinforces collective or individual identity in

[19] See Strauss Clay 2020a. Incidentally, Styx also straddles categories: while she is introduced as an Oceanid at Hes. *Th.* 361, she turns out to be a river of the Underworld in the *descriptio Tartari*.

[20] Cf. Gevaert - Laes 2013, 212-216; Lowe 2015, 11. On the basis of the assumed etymologies from *monere* and *monstrare* a *monstrum* could be a warning or sign from the gods that the religious order had been breached. Note that the birth of children that resemble their parents is a characteristic of the Just City at Hes. *Op*. 235.

opposition to that of the 'foreign' or 'other'[21]. Whilst such definitions may make sense in modern cultures, they do not work entirely when we examine Hesiod's monsters[22]. To be sure, these creatures depart from the anthropomorphism of the Olympian pantheon, often through their hybrid nature, but one cannot uniformly speak of all of them as promoters of chaos or transgression (*cf.* above, on the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers who conform to, rather than challenge, the normative divine society established by Zeus)[23]. The point of reference when examining Hesiod's monsters is the cosmos as created by Zeus and the poet's own programme of systematizing mythological traditions, rather than the identity or ethical values of a particular society with which the monsters are in conflict (humans have only marginal presence in the *Theogony*: they are harmed by some of the monsters, *e.g.*, the Nemean Lion, but they do not appear as moral agents or represent particular values in the action of the poem).

This survey shows just how diverse Hesiod's 'monsterscape' is, which makes it hardly surprising that a generic term that would designate them as a group, or at least reflect one of their chief shared characteristics, their hybridity, is absent. The terms that Hesiod sometimes uses to designate them (*e.g.*, πέλωρ) cannot be rendered 'monster' *tout court.* Echidna who resembles neither gods nor humans is called a πέλωρον (295), which is also the term used to describe one of her component parts, the snake (299). At 845 and 856 πέλωρον qualifies Typhoeus. Elsewhere in the *Theogony* πελώρη designates Gaia (159, 173, 479, 821, 858) and points to her prodigious size. Significantly, at 821 Γαῖα πελώρη gives birth to Typhoeus, a πέλωρον, which suggests a similarity between them in genealogical terms. Besides entities that we would characterise as hybrid[24] or monstruous[25], πέλωρ (and cognates) can refer to animals of different kinds[26], gods, heroes, or weapons, usually

[21] Capri 2019, 1-2, from whom I quote in the previous sentence.

[22] Cf. Thesis 2 in Cohen 1996, 4-6: «The monster always escapes». While monstrous creatures do return in retellings of their stories in literature and other artistic media, the *Theogony* gives a sense of closure and finality: Zeus and his heroic sons put an end to some of these monsters' lives, while others continue to dwell at the margins, conveniently away from humans.

[23] This is the reason why a category of monsters that includes the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers as well as Typhoeus, as proposed by Cherubini 2012, 139-140 cannot be admitted for the *Theogony*.

[24] On hybrid creatures, see Li Causi 2003, 184-189 and 2010, where he argues against the existence of our general category of 'hybridity' in antiquity.

[25] *E.g.*, Medousa at *Il.* V 741, Polyphemus at *Od.* IX 257, 427, Scylla at *Od.* XII 85-88, Pytho at *h.Apol.* 374.

[26] For instance, a serpent *Il.* XXII 202, lions and wolves at *Od.* X 219, a goose at *Od.* XV

belonging to gods or associated with the divine[27]. The term thus does not entirely overlap with what we might call 'monstruous' but designates entities or objects of enormous size[28], as well as signs sent from the gods, like the serpent that devours the nine fledglings of a sparrow as well as their mother before the serpent is transformed into a stone. Characteristically, this is viewed as a σῆμα (*Il.* II 308) but is later summed up as πέλωρα θεῶν (321) and subsequently designated as a τέρας by Calchas (324)[29] who interprets it.

What is important for our purposes is that these creatures are not just oddities of nature but represent an important political and cognitive challenge. By straddling categories through their mixed, hybrid nature, Hesiod's monsters challenge the progression of the cosmos which by the time of their appearance is already organised in clear lines of descent, with children that resemble their parents (*e.g.*, Night and her offspring, Nereus and the Nereids). The *Theogony* explains how the cosmos, the natural environment, comes into being, how individual gods emerge out of the general mass of natural forces at the initial stage, and their generations are organized, systematized, and hierarchized. Parthenogenesis yields to exogamous unions that produce offspring which, while different and individual, resembles its parents. Jenny Strauss Clay has argued that the monsters show us what a potential anti-cosmos might look like[30]. While some members of the line of Pontus are integrated into the line descending from Ouranos and Gaia, the self-contained catalogue of monsters indicates that an anti-cosmos would be in-bred and populated by disastrous creatures that defy clear categories. The birth of Typhoeus poses a challenge to the cosmos as established by Zeus. At lines 836-838 the poet clearly states his fear, cast in form of a contrafactual: everything could have

161, but also a dolphin, the form that Apollo assumes when he appears to the Cretan sailors at *h.Apol.* 401.

[27] *Il.* XV 594, VIII 424, X439, XVIII 83; *Od.* XI 594: the rock that Sisyphus pushes.

[28] See the discussion in Baglioni 2017, 19–21; *LfgrE* s.v. πέλωρ, πέλωρον; πελώρη; πελώριος; and Lowe 2015, 8-14.

[29] For τέρας as a sign sent by Zeus, cf. Hom. *Il.* IV 76 (a star), XI 28, XII 209 (a serpent), XVII 548 (the rainbow); *Od.* III 173, XVI 320, XX 101, 113, XXI 415; more generally, cf. the phrase (θεῶν) τεράεσσι πιθήσας at Hom. *Il.* IV 398, 408, VI 183, XII 256. Medousa's head on Athena's aegis is Zeus's τέρας at *Il.* V 742. At *Od.* XV 168 τέρας is a sign from gods involving an eagle holding a πέλωρον goose (XV 161); see Baglioni 2017, 13-16 on τέρας as a sign sent from the gods to convey a message, positive or negative, in early hexameter; thus, the term should not be automatically assumed to point to something 'monstrous'. At Hom. *Od.* XII 194 τέραα designates the pieces of meat from Helios' cows that move and low. τέρας occurs at *Th.* 744 (bracketed by West) where it designates the χάσμα μέγ(α) in Tartarus. See *LfgrE*, s.v. τέρας, τεῖρ(ας).

[30] Strauss Clay 1993, 115-116, and 2003, 161.

been undone and Typhoeus would have become king, had Zeus not kept watchful guard. The monsters thus pose a political challenge to Zeus's cosmos and the way in which it has been unfolding, its differentiation and organisation, as well as to the unfolding of important events of the heroic past.

Hand in hand with this political challenge goes a cognitive difficulty: how does one describe such creatures, and in particular how does one name them effectively? If names reveal the essential characteristic of their bearer and are an instrument that enables us to define these beings and their place in the cosmos[31], can ordinary names fully capture the mixed, confounded nature of these creatures? Just as with the names of Aphrodite discussed earlier, the names of the monsters are not Hesiod's invention: they belong to the mythological tradition and are found in other archaic texts. Yet Hesiod deploys them in a way that allows him to make an important point about the power and limits of 'correct' naming. Even though these creatures defy clear-cut categorization, Hesiod inserts them into his systematic understanding of language, as a sign that the system of etymologically 'correct' names reaches its limits when attempting to describe the monsters.

Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers

I begin my discussion not from the section of the *Theogony* that has the highest concentration of monsters (270-336), but from an earlier section in the *Theogony*, that concerning the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers. This passage emblematises well the tension between etymologically significant names and the poet's inability to name (which also means to define) the monsters adequately using the means with which language equips him (139-153):

γείνατο δ᾽ αὖ Κύκλωπας ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντας,
Βρόντην τε Στερόπην τε καὶ Ἄργην ὀβριμόθυμον 140
οἳ Ζηνὶ βροντήν τ᾽ ἔδοσαν τεῦξάν τε κεραυνόν.
οἱ δ᾽ ἤτοι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιοι ἦσαν,
μοῦνος δ᾽ ὀφθαλμὸς μέσσῳ ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ·
Κύκλωπες δ᾽ ὄνομ᾽ ἦσαν ἐπώνυμον, οὕνεκ᾽ ἄρά σφεων
κυκλοτερὴς ὀφθαλμὸς ἕεις ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ· 145
ἰσχὺς δ᾽ ἠδὲ βίη καὶ μηχαναὶ ἦσαν ἐπ᾽ ἔργοις.

ἄλλοι δ᾽ αὖ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο
τρεῖς παῖδες μεγάλοι <τε> καὶ ὄβριμοι, **οὐκ ὀνομαστοί**,

[31] Philippson 1936, 9-10; cf. the definition of the word (ὄνομα) as διδασκαλικόν τι ὄργανον καὶ διακριτικὸν τῆς οὐσίας at Plat. *Crat.* 388c.

Κόττος τε Βριάρεώς τε Γύγης θ', ὑπερήφανα τέκνα.
τῶν *ἑκατὸν μὲν χεῖρες* ἀπ' ὤμων ἀίσσοντο, 150
ἄπλαστοι, κεφαλαὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ πεντήκοντα
ἐξ ὤμων ἐπέφυκον ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσιν·
ἰσχὺς δ' ἄπλητος κρατερὴ μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἴδει.

Then again, she gave birth to the Cyclopes who have an exceedingly mighty heart, Brontes and Steropes and stout-hearted Arges, who gave Zeus the thunder and fashioned the thunderbolt for him. These were in every other respect similar to the gods, but a single eye was in the middle of their forehead; and they were called Cyclopes, a significant name, evidently because they had a single round eye on their forehead. Might and violence and contrivance were in their deeds.

Three other children were then born from Gaia and Ouranos, both great and mighty, not to be named, Kottos and Briareos and Gyges, overweening sons. One hundred arms moved mightily from their shoulders, untouchable, and fifty heads sprung out of their shoulders over their mighty limbs. An unassailable mighty strength was in their great form.

This section is marked off from the account of the children of Gaia and Ouranos, those who will later be named 'Titans', by means of ring-composition[32]. To be sure, the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers are similar to each other: both are monstrous, albeit in different ways; they are both imprisoned by Ouranos (and later kept imprisoned by Cronus) in the depths of Gaia; later they will be liberated by Zeus and they will both provide crucial aid in the Titanomachy. Their similarity is underscored by verbal parallels in their description: both groups introduced with the particle αὖ followed by a general comment about their might (ὄβριμος); then their names follow, the most important characteristics of their appearance, and a concluding verse that, while syntactically challenging, nevertheless presents similarities in both cases[33].

There are important differences, as well: the collective name of the first group is etymologized explicitly: the etymology is introduced through a naming formula (ἐπώνυμον, οὕνεκ' ἄρα)[34], and is repeated twice (first: ἕεις, then κυκλοτερής). Of the individual names Βρόντης is linked to βροντή, while Ἄργης is a proper name

[32] 126-137 (A) Gaia's offspring → 138 (B) δεινότατος παίδων, θαλερὸν δ' ἤχθηρε τοκῆα = Cronus → 139-153 (C) Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers → 154-155 (B') δεινότατοι παίδων, σφετέρῳ δ' ἤχθοντο τοκῆι (all of the Ouranids) → 156-166 (A') Gaia, her offspring and her plan. On this, see Vergados 2013.

[33] See Kirk 1962, 78; West 1966 *ad l.*

[34] Cf. Hom. *Il.* IX 562; Hes. *Th.* 282; *LfgrE*, s.v. ἐπώνυμ(ος) B1; ἐπώνυμος is one of the standard 'etymological signposts', as the examples in O'Hara 2015 show.

derived from the adjective used to describe κεραυνός, a word that is mentioned in the following line. The collocation Βρόντην τε Στερόπην τε, furthermore, is found in Hesiod three times in the same metrical position with common nouns instead of proper names, (appropriately) when Zeus uses his weapons (286, 707, 854): these names are thus embedded in the formulaic fabric of the poem. Thus, whilst the collective name is etymologized explicitly, the individual names are semantically transparent and reflect natural phenomena.

In the case of the Hundred-Handers, while the name of Βριάρεως may be implicitly etymologised through an etymological wordplay with ὄβριμος which expresses a shared characteristic of all three gods[35], the other two names are not explained in any way. At the same time, we are missing the collective name, Ἑκατόγχειρες, though it is suggested by ἑκατὸν μὲν χεῖρες (150) and is not unknown in early hexameter poetry. At *Il.* I 401-405 Achilles reminds Thetis of how she once saved Zeus when the other Olympians revolted against him, by summoning the Ἑκατόγχειρος Αἰγαίων.

> ἀλλὰ σὺ τόν γ' ἐλθοῦσα θεὰ ὑπελύσαο δεσμῶν,
> ὦχ' **ἑκατόγχειρον** καλέσασ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον,
> ὃν **Βριάρεων** καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δέ τε πάντες
> Αἰγαίων', ὃ γὰρ αὖτε βίην οὗ πατρὸς ἀμείνων·
> ὅς ῥα παρὰ Κρονίωνι καθέζετο κύδεϊ γαίων. 405

> But you, goddess, came and released him from his bonds, having quickly summoned to lofty Olympus the Hundred-Hander whom gods call Briareos but all men Aigaion, for he is superior to his father in strength. He, then, took his place next to the son of Cronus, exulting in his honour.

Interestingly, Αἰγαίων, a name on which Homer introduces an etymological play with (κύδεϊ) γαίων, is the name humans use for Βριάρεως which belongs to the language of the gods. Hesiod seems to avoid using the collective name here and while he hints at it in very clear terms, he considers these characters to be οὐκ ὀνομαστοί (not to be named), an expression that has caused some discussion among scholars. Why does Hesiod refrain from using a name that so obviously arises etymologically out of his narrative? One possibility is that, as Kathryn Stoddard has suggested, the poet is in control of his narrative and decides which details to reveal and which to withhold[36]. Through his use of οὐκ ὀνομαστοί, Hesiod, in Stoddard's view, draws attention to the act of naming, rather than on the mon-

[35] Cf. also 153 ἰσχὺς δ' ἄπλητος κρατερή which could be regarded as an explanation of Βριάρεως/ὄβριμοι through synonyms.

[36] See Stoddard 2004, 48-49.

strous nature of the Hundred-Handers alone, with the intention of making his audience aware of his narrative control. While the poet is certainly in control of his material, I wonder why he would exercise his control by withholding a name that he reveals in such an obvious way, in a section of the narrative which has already primed the audience to expect etymological connections. M.-C. Leclerc, on the other hand, has suggested that οὐκ ὀνομαστοί retains its literal meaning and that for Hesiod naming is a serious and sacred affair[37]. In her view, if Hesiod does not mention the collective name of these creatures, even though Homer applies ἑκατόγχειρον to one of them (Briareos) it is because the tradition has not disclosed it to him, and the poet does not hesitate to admit his lack of knowledge, as he does later at 362-370. But beside the fact that one cannot exclude Hesiod's knowledge of the term[38], the fact remains that the collective name is hinted at in line 150. A more plausible explanation might be that οὐκ ὀνομαστοί has two meanings: on a surface level, it points to creatures that are so monstrous that superstition requires that we avoid mentioning their name: in this sense, οὐκ ὀνομαστοί is an apotropaic expression[39]. At the same time, this phrase also points to the poet's inability to name them adequately: a name like Ἑκατόγχειρες reveals only part of their monstrosity, their having one hundred arms each, but it does not say anything about the other curious feature of this lot, their fifty heads. Rather than using an etymologically transparent name that ultimately fails to convey the totality of the Hundred-Handers' monstrosity, the poet then prefers at this point of the *Theogony* to abstain from attributing a collective name to the second set of Ouranian triplets.

These two divine groups, then, manifest a tension: on the one hand, the Cyclopes, *similar* to the gods in every other respect, receive a collective name that is explicitly etymologised. Their etymologically transparent name suffices as a collective designation that reveals the one characteristic that sets them apart from the gods. On the other hand, the Hundred-Handers are too monstrous to be captured by the term Ἑκατόγχειρες, even though this name would have an etymologically transparent meaning and the poet uses its two components so that the name can be reasonably assumed to be triggered in the audience's mind. Hesiod, then, presents programmatically his first explicit etymology of the *Theogony* while si-

[37] Leclerc 1996, 263-266; cf. Arrighetti 1987, 29-30.

[38] Cf. my earlier remarks on Hesiod's distancing himself from other traditions on Aphrodite's parentage.

[39] Cf. West 1966 *ad l.* who concludes that «the belief [*sc.* that by naming such a deity one might conjure him up] has faded, as is shown by the fact that the names are given in the very next line». One of the anonymous readers suggests that «perhaps the use of periphrasis or etymological allusion is exactly a kind of euphemism and does not contradict οὐκ ὀνομαστοί as apotropaic expression».

multaneously expressing indirectly his reservations concerning the effectiveness of etymologically transparent names.

More monsters (*270-336*)

This idea is relevant for the entire section on monsters (270-336) in which the 'correctness' of names, *i.e.* their efficiency in capturing the monsters' nature, appears limited. Among the monsters we find names that are etymologically accounted for adequately, others that are only partially correct, and others that are too generic to be of any use. Interestingly, the entry on the Harpies that precedes the section on monsters contains partial etymologizing (267-269):

> ἠυκόμους θ᾽ Ἁρπυίας, Ἀελλώ τ᾽ Ὠκυπέτην τε,
> αἵ ῥ᾽ ἀνέμων πνοιῇσι καὶ οἰωνοῖς ἅμ᾽ ἕπονται
> ὠκείης πτερύγεσσι· μεταχρόνιαι γὰρ ἴαλλον.

(she bore) the Harpies of the beautiful hair, Aello and Okypete, who as is known follow the blasts of wind and the birds with their swift wings; for they pounce as quickly as time.

The collective Ἅρπυιαι remains unexplained, but Okypete's name is explained by being placed near its first component ὠκείης, while -πέτη is played upon through πτερύγεσσι[40]. As for Ἀελλώ (the storm), this name is etymologised through a synonym (πνοιῇσι)[41]. The explanation of the collective name occurs in the case of the first set of offspring introduced in the section on monsters, the Graiai (270-273):

> Φόρκυι δ᾽ αὖ Κητὼ **γραίας** τέκε καλλιπαρήους 270
> ἐκ γενετῆς πολιάς, τὰς δὴ **Γραίας** καλέουσιν
> ἀθάνατοί τε θεοὶ χαμαὶ ἐρχόμενοί τ᾽ ἄνθρωποι,
> Πεμφρηδώ τ᾽ εὔπεπλον Ἐνυώ τε κροκόπεπλον,

Keto again bore to Phorkys old women with beautiful cheeks, grey-haired from their birth, which indeed both the immortal gods and the humans who walk on earth call Graiai (Old Women), Pemphredo of the beautiful robe and Enyo with a yellow robe.

[40] In this context ἕπονται may be thought of as containing an anagram that supports the etymological wordplay.

[41] A link to ἁρπάζω could be implied here, especially if one considers such passages as Hom. *Od.* I 241, XIV 371, XX 77 (Ἅρπυιαι ἀνηρέψαντο) or IV 727 (ἀνηρέψαντο θύελλαι).

The collective name of these entities is presented as accepted and used by both gods and men, which speaks to its validity and correctness[42]. The particle δή highlights that they are called Graiai *precisely* because they were born as old women[43]. This brief entry, furthermore, concludes with a verse characterised by *Klangmalerei*. Even though the poet is not as explicit here as in other cases, there is still the impression that the name is well-chosen since it is descriptive of their main characteristic. Their name, however, cannot fully capture the contradiction inherent in their existence: first, even though the Graiai are born as old women, they still are said to have beautiful cheeks, a feature which is in conflict with their collective name. Second, their name does not hint at their having a shared eye and tooth[44]. The individual names, as well, contribute to their contradictory existence: Πεμφρηδώ may call to mind πεμφρηδών, a kind of wasp, while Ἐνυώ is known elsewhere as a goddess related to war, especially with its most destructive aspects.

More promising are the names of Pegasus and Chrysaor. These two characters arise from the neck of the decapitated Medousa (280-283):

> τῆς ὅτε δὴ Περσεὺς κεφαλὴν ἀπεδειροτόμησεν,
> ἐξέθορε **Χρυσάωρ** τε μέγας καὶ Πήγασος ἵππος.
> τῷ μὲν ἐπῴνυμον ἦν, ὅτ' ἄρ' Ὠκεανοῦ παρὰ πηγὰς
> γένθ', ὁ δ' **ἄορ χρύσ**ειον ἔχων μετὰ χερσὶ φίλῃσι.

> When Perseus decapitated her, great Chrysaor and the horse Pegasus jumped out. The latter had a significant name, evidently because he was born by the springs of the Ocean, whereas the former (was born) with a golden sword in his hands.

In this last explicit etymology in the *Theogony* the etymological motivation of the proper names takes a different form for each character. Pegasus acquires a name that permanently points to the place of his birth beside the springs (πηγάς, which is embedded in Πήγασ-ος) of the Ocean, whereas Chrysaor's name calls to mind the object which he was born holding, a golden sword. The same technique, then, can reveal salient characteristics but of a different nature: physical aspects (Cyclopes), circumstances of birth and conception (either place as in the case of Aphrodite and Pegasus or other attendant circumstances, such as Chrysaor), or, finally, an important action committed in the past with its consequences in the future (Titans).

---

[42] Cf. Hes. *Th.* 195-197 on the universal use of the name Aphrodite.

[43] Cf. West 1966 *ad* 270 (p. 244).

[44] See Gantz 1996, 19-20 for the earliest evidence for this tradition (Aesch. *PV* 792-797, Pherec. fr. 11 *EGM*). It is likely that Hesiod was familiar with these stories, given that he immediately passes on to the Gorgons and Perseus' decapitating Medusa.

But with other monsters the situation is more complex. Take Echidna, for example, who makes her appearance at 295-300:

ἡ δ' ἔτεκ' ἄλλο πέλωρον ἀμήχανον, **οὐδὲν ἐοικὸς**
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐδ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,
σπῆι ἔνι γλαφυρῷ, θείην κρατερόφρον' Ἔχιδναν,
ἥμισυ μὲν νύμφην ἑλικώπιδα καλλιπάρηον,
ἥμισυ δ' αὖτε πέλωρον ὄφιν δεινόν τε μέγαν τε
αἰόλον ὠμηστήν, ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης. 300

And she gave birth to another insurmountable monster, in no way similar to mortal men nor to the immortal gods, in a hollow cave, the divine stout-hearted Echidna, half a quick-glancing maiden with beautiful cheeks, and half on the other hand a monstrous snake, both frightening and large, of changing hue and a raw-eater, in the depths of divine earth.

Echidna's name is partially accounted for through a reference to her appearance, but again this explanation is not as effective as other etymologized names. The poet emphasizes the creature's dissimilarity to both gods and men (contrast the Cyclopes), and it is only through the description, rather than the name, that the monster's contradictory, hybrid nature that combines the appearance of beautiful maiden with that of a raw-eating serpent becomes clear. Echidna's name reveals only part of her nature: it is etymologised by recourse to a synonym (ὄφις), hence in a way it is correct. What is more, Echidna too is καλλιπάρηος, a quality she shares with the Graiai and Keto who are members of the same line[45], as we saw earlier, but in her case this attribute seems to be more appropriate as she is, in part, a νύμφη ἑλικῶπις.

Even less revealing is the name of the Chimaera (319-322):

ἡ δὲ **Χίμαιραν** ἔτικτε πνέουσαν ἀμαιμάκετον πῦρ,
δεινήν τε μεγάλην τε ποδώκεά τε κρατερήν τε. 320
τῆς ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί· μία μὲν χαροποῖο λέοντος,
ἡ δὲ **χιμαίρης**, ἡ δ' ὄφιος κρατεροῖο δράκοντος.

And she gave birth to Chimaera who breathes irresistible fire, frightening and great and swift-footed and mighty. She had three heads: one of a fierce lion, the other of a goat, and the other of a snake, of a mighty serpent.

The Chimaera has a 'true' name that relates to her having the head of a she-goat. But this is just *one* aspect of this monster's nature, and her name is likewise only *partially* 'true' or 'correct' because it leaves two-thirds of her nature unac-

[45] Cf. *Th.* 238, 270; Strauss Clay 2003, 153.

counted for. It does not express her serpentine form, which she shares with other members of Keto's brood, or the fact that she also possesses the head of a lion. The true nature of the Chimaera is reflected actually in the structure of line 319, dubbed by Wilamowitz as Hesiod's worst hexameter[46]: with its metrical defects[47] it represents the tripartite nature of the Chimaera that combines elements of three different animals and breaths forth fire[48]. Together, the Echidna and the Chimaera, two creatures that share the description δεινός τε μέγας τε, show that names can sometimes be only partially correct and therefore unable to convey the entire set of essential characteristics of the name bearer.

Other names in Hesiod's monster roster confirm this conclusion, and 'correctness' is uneven and increasingly recedes to namelessness. Cerberus' physical appearance is described but no explanation is given as to his name which does not seem to reflect the monster's appearance or any essential characteristic. Instead, he is described as being οὔ τι φατειόν (310), a phrase that in view of the hound's role has its apotropaic function, unlike οὐκ ὀνομαστοί used earlier of the Hundred-Handers. Other monsters bear generic names: at 314 Hesiod introduces the Hydra, whose name denotes only that it is a water-serpent. Nothing is said of its many heads from whose necks two heads sprung for each head that was decapitated and that had to be cauterised in order to prevent them from being regenerated, nor does the name convey any hint that she possessed an immortal head. All of these are essential characteristics of this monster's nature which must have been known to the poet who links the monster with Heracles' Labours at 316-318. The same is true of the Nemean Lion (327-332): this monster too is linked to Heracles' labours, but nothing is said about the quality that made this lion so noteworthy: its impenetrable hide[49]. Finally, at 333-335 Keto and Phorkys give birth to another monster that Hesiod refers to simply as a frightening snake; this time the monster remains nameless, even though tradition knew of a name for it[50]. To grasp what is essential about these creatures, the audience need to go beyond names and supply their own knowledge of myth.

---

[46] See Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921, 8 n. 1.

[47] These are: the violation of Meyer's Law in Χίμαιραν; the violation of Hermann's bridge at πνέουσαν; πῦρ creates one of the few examples of monosyllabic verse-ending following a violation of Hermann's bridge; the combination of mute and nasal of πνέουσαν does not lengthen the ultima of ἔτικτε.

[48] This point has been argued by Solomon 1985; on Hesiod's use of a kind of language that reflects the contents of what is being narrated, see Strauss Clay (forthcoming), a chapter that focuses primarily on 'verbal bonds' in the *Theogony*, and Vergados 2013.

[49] The modifying adjective 'Nemean' is accounted for twice, however, at 329 and 331.

[50] The snake will be named Ladon at A.R. IV 1396-1398.

The decline of the degree in which names reveal the monsters' nature in its entirety is not an isolated phenomenon in this section. Even though some elements remain constant (*e.g.* hybridity, the presence of serpentine elements; animal shapes), it is sometimes impossible to decide with certainty precisely in which part of the genealogical tree these monsters belong. This is brought about through the ambiguous use, at three places in the monster catalogue, of the feminine pronoun (ἡ δ(ἑ)) whose referent has been an object of debate for ancient and modern scholars alike. At line 295 ἡ δέ designates the mother of Echidna, but leaves it open whether it refers to Callirhoe, mentioned at 288, or Keto of line 270, whose offspring the poet is now presenting[51]. Likewise, ἡ δέ of 319 (the mother of Chimaera) could be Echidna of 297 and 304 who is also mother of Orthos, Cerberus, and the Hydra, but it is conceivable that ἡ δέ may refer to the Hydra, the last creature mentioned immediately before the pronoun. Finally, the mother of the Sphinx at 326 (ἡ δέ again) could be Echidna, possibly implied at 319 and positively mentioned at 297 and 304: this would yield then another case of mother-son incest, a kind of union that was possible in the very early stages of the formation of the cosmos but has yielded to exogamous unions by now. But ἡ δέ of line 326 could also refer to Chimaera, a tripartite monster presented at 319ff. It is only at the end of the section on monsters that we return to certainty: at line 333 the mother of the last monster (the snake) is mentioned in unambiguous terms: Keto. Thus, in a neat ring-composition we begin and end with certain parentage, but within the section itself the ambiguity increases.

To this we should add another element with which the poet raises questions concerning his account in this section: at line 305 when Hesiod reports the mingling of Echidna with Typhaon, whose birth will not be narrated until line 820, he presents this part of the narrative as depending on φασι ('they say that . . .'). The use of φασι here may point to the existence of several traditions, of which the poet chooses to report only one. But it also implies that Hesiod does not commit himself to this version, but only reports what 'people say' without adding anything that confirms the validity of this idea[52].

---

[51] On the problem of the referents here see Strauss Clay 2003, 159-160 (and 1993, 113-114), and Ricciardelli 2018 *ad* 295, 319, 326 with earlier bibliography. As Strauss Clay 2003, 159-160 (and 1993, 113-114) observes, «Paradoxically, what is striking about all the proposed solutions is their reasonableness: in each case they depend on reasonable assumptions and normative rules [...] all these arguments rest on the unspoken assumption that the generation of monsters follows the patterns and norms laid out elsewhere in the *Theogony* and presupposed by its whole genealogical schema [...] It is, however, by no means clear whether, in the case of the monsters, such an assumption is warranted or whether the catalogue as a whole in fact presents such a progression».

[52] Cf. de Jong 2004, 48, 237-238 on a similar expression at Hom. *Il.* II 783; Stoddard 2004, 49-52. Cf. above p. 61 on Hes. *Th.* 27-28.

Typhoeus

The presentation of Typhoeus, the final monster of the *Theogony*, is not unlike what we encountered so far:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Τιτῆνας ἀπ᾽ οὐρανοῦ ἐξέλασε Ζεύς,
ὁπλότατον τέκε παῖδα **Τυφωέα** Γαῖα πελώρη
Ταρτάρου ἐν φιλότητι διὰ χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην·
οὗ χεῖρες † μὲν ἔασιν ἐπ᾽ ἰσχύι ἔργματ᾽ ἔχουσαι, †
καὶ πόδες ἀκάματοι κρατεροῦ θεοῦ· ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμων
ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος δεινοῖο δράκοντος, 825
γλώσσῃσι δνοφερῇσι λελιχμότες· ἐν δέ οἱ ὄσσε
θεσπεσίῃς κεφαλῇσιν ὑπ᾽ ὀφρύσι πῦρ ἀμάρυσσεν·
[πασέων δ᾽ ἐκ κεφαλέων πῦρ καίετο δερκομένοιο·]
φωναὶ δ᾽ ἐν πάσῃσιν ἔσαν δεινῇς κεφαλῇσι,
παντοίην ὄπ᾽ ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον· ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ 830
φθέγγονθ᾽ ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε δ᾽ αὖτε
ταύρου ἐριβρύχεω μένος ἀσχέτου ὄσσαν ἀγαύρου,
ἄλλοτε δ᾽ αὖτε λέοντος ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντος,
ἄλλοτε δ᾽ αὖ σκυλάκεσσιν ἐοικότα, θαύματ᾽ ἀκοῦσαι,
ἄλλοτε δ᾽ αὖ ῥοίζεσχ᾽, ὑπὸ δ᾽ ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά. 835
καί νύ κεν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἀμήχανον ἤματι κείνῳ,
καί κεν ὅ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἄναξεν,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

Then, after Zeus had driven the Titans from the Heavens, monstrous Gaia gave birth to her youngest son, Typhoeus, in the embrace of Tartarus because of golden Aphrodite. His hands (?)performed deeds of might(?) and the feet of the mighty god were untiring; from his shoulders sprang one hundred heads of a snake, of a frightening serpent, flicking their dark tongues; on his divine heads fire sparkled in his eyes, underneath his eyebrows. [Fire burned from his glances, out of all his heads.] Sounds were produced in all of his terrible heads, emitting all sorts of portentous voices. For sometimes they uttered a voice for gods to understand, at other times (they uttered the sound) of a loud-roaring bull, proud of voice, whose strength is unstoppable, and at others again that of a lion whose spirit is shameless, and at others again they resembled that of puppies, a wonder to hear, and at others again he whistled, and the lofty mountains resounded. And truly a deed beyond remedy would have occurred on that day and he would have ruled it over mortals and immortals, had the father of gods and men not perceived it keenly.

Scholars have in recent years commented on the sonic effects prevalent in this section of the *Theogony*, and especially the mixture of different qualities of voice and

sound that Typhoeus utters[53]. Owen Goslin has noted the multiplicity and confusing nature of the sounds produced by the monster, which he contrasts to the pleasant voice of the Muses who are ὁμόφρονες and sing in unison in the proem to the *Theogony* before the succession myth begins. Zeus's victory over Typhoeus does not only have political significance, in that he removes the last challenger and assumes his regal power, but also imposes order on the chaotic soundscape represented by Typhoeus: soon after his victory he will father the Muses whose delightful song the poet has made the centrepiece of the proem. Thus, Zeus's victory has a civilising effect as well, which is further underscored by the simile that punctuates the monster's destruction, comparing it with the art (τέχνη) of metallurgy (862-866).

Typhoeus' voice is a mix that confounds articulate with inarticulate sounds. He has one hundred serpentine heads that sometimes produce sounds that can be understood by gods (830-831), an important comment that implies the existence of a special divine language as opposed to that used by mortals. The existence of a separate divine and mortal language is known from Homer and other poetic traditions, but Hesiod has avoided any mention of such distinction in his poem (cf. above on Briareos). At times, however, Typhoeus bellows like a bull, a sound which Hesiod interestingly designates with the term ὄσσα, elsewhere reserved for the voice of the Muses[54]. Likewise, when we are earlier (830) told that Typhoeus' heads emit all sorts of voices, the term ὄπα is used, again elsewhere used of the voice of the Muses[55]. Besides the simultaneous presence of articulate and inarticulate sounds, that is, divine language and an admixture of animal sounds, the Typhoeus narrative confounds even the terms for voice[56]. The sound of puppies, of a lion, and the hissing of the serpent add to the confused soundscape of Typhoeus that mixes different animal types but also age groups, a feature we observed earlier in the case of the Graiai. What's more, the Typhoeus narrative abstains from marking an obvious etymology, even though it concludes with an interesting piece of aetiology.

ἐκ δὲ Τυφωέος ἔστ' ἀνέμων μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων,
νόσφι Νότου Βορέω τε καὶ ἀργεστέω Ζεφύροιο· 870
οἵ γε μὲν ἐκ θεόφιν γενεήν, θνητοῖς μέγ' ὄνειαρ.
αἱ δ' ἄλλαι μὰψ αὖραι ἐπιπνείουσι θάλασσαν·
αἳ δή τοι πίπτουσαι ἐς ἠεροειδέα πόντον,

[53] See Goslin 2010; further on the soundscape of the Typhoeus section see Brockliss 2018 and Passmore 2018. On the various terms for 'voice' in the proem and elsewhere in the *Theogony*, see Berlinzani 2002. On the Typhoeus episode, see Ricciardelli 2018, 174-176 and Strauss Clay 2020b.

[54] Hes. *Th.* 10, 43, 65, 67.

[55] Hes. *Th.* 41, 68; cf. the name Καλλιόπη at 79.

[56] A point argued by Goslin 2010.

πῆμα μέγα θνητοῖσι, κακῇ θυίουσιν ἀέλλῃ·
ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλαι ἄεισι διασκιδνᾶσί τε νῆας 875
ναύτας τε φθείρουσι· κακοῦ δ' οὐ γίνεται ἀλκὴ
ἀνδράσιν, οἳ κείνῃσι συνάντωνται κατὰ πόντον.
αἱ δ' αὖ καὶ κατὰ γαῖαν ἀπείριτον ἀνθεμόεσσαν
ἔργ' ἐρατὰ φθείρουσι χαμαιγενέων ἀνθρώπων,
πιμπλεῖσαι κόνιός τε καὶ ἀργαλέου κολοσυρτοῦ. 880

And from Typhoeus descends the might of the winds who blow moist, except for Notus, Boreas and brightening Zephyrus. A great boon for mortals, they hail their origin from the gods. The other gusts blow over the sea in vain. They indeed fall upon the misty sea, a great suffering for mortals, and blow with evil storm. They blow at different times and scatter the ships and destroy the seamen; and men have no protection against this evil, those who chance upon them on the sea. And they again destroy the lovely works of earth-born humans throughout the boundless, flowery earth, filling them with dust and painful rubble.

In lines 869-880 Hesiod transmits that with the exception of the Notos, the Boreas, and the Zephyrus, who are a great boon for men, the stormy and destructive winds descend from Typhoeus and harm men both at sea and on land. What is particularly interesting here is that Hesiod omits the term that would drive home this aetiology, *i.e.* the designation of the of these winds, τυφῶν or τυφώς, that is so close to Typhoeus' name[57]. Is this a case of something ominous that ought not to be named, such as Cerberus, a creature that is οὔ τι φατειόν? Or is the absence of an etymology rather a sign of the linguistic challenge that Typhoeus poses (in addition to the cosmic and political ones)?

Be that as it may, etymology as an instrument by which the poet explains the true meaning of names and unpacks hidden narratives reappears after the defeat of Typhoeus. By subduing Typhoeus Zeus does not only impose order in a confused soundscape nor does he only remove the last challenger in his way to power. He also reintroduces in the *Theogony* the notion of 'correct' names that the account of Typhoeus and other monsters had subverted. Shortly after Zeus's assuming the kingship of the gods, the poet concludes the Succession Myth by showing how Zeus avoided the fate of his predecessors, *i.e.* to be deposed by a son who is stronger than his father.

Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεὺς πρώτην ἄλοχον θέτο **Μῆτιν**,

[57] Cf. 846 πρηστήρων ἀνέμων. English typhoon seems to derive from the confluence of Portuguese (1) *tufão* < Urdu, Persian, Arabic *ṭūfān* ('violent storm of wind and rain') < Arabic *ṭāfa* or Greek τυφῶν and (2) Chinese *tai fung* (big wind); see *OED*, s.v. *typhoon*. Hesiod's Τῦφωεύς may be thought of as related to τῦφω (τῦφ- in other tenses), 'to raise a smoke': cf. 826-828 and 844-849.

πλεῖστα θεῶν εἰδυῖαν ἰδὲ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.
ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ ἄρ᾽ ἔμελλε θεὰν γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην
τέξεσθαι, τότ᾽ ἔπειτα δόλῳ φρένας ἐξαπατήσας
αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν ἑὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν, 890
Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος·
τὼς γάρ οἱ φρασάτην, ἵνα μὴ βασιληίδα τιμὴν
ἄλλος ἔχοι Διὸς ἀντὶ θεῶν αἰειγενετάων.
ἐκ γὰρ τῆς εἵμαρτο περίφρονα τέκνα γενέσθαι·
πρώτην μὲν κούρην γλαυκώπιδα Τριτογένειαν, 895
ἶσον ἔχουσαν πατρὶ μένος καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν,
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ᾽ ἄρα παῖδα θεῶν βασιλῆα καὶ ἀνδρῶν
ἤμελλεν τέξεσθαι, ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντα·
ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα μιν Ζεὺς πρόσθεν ἑὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν,
ὥς οἱ συμφράσσαιτο θεὰ ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε. 900

Zeus, king of the gods, made Metis his first wife, who knows most of the gods and mortal men. But when she was about to give birth to the goddess grey-eyed Athena, at that point he deceived her with trickery and, using wheedling words, he put her into his belly, following the advice of Gaia and starry Sky. For they had advised him in this way so that none of the other gods who are forever should have the kingly honour instead of Zeus. For it was fated that exceedingly clever children were to be born from her: first grey-eyed Tritogeneia whose might and thoughtful counsel were equal to her father's, but then she was destined to give birth to a son who would become king of gods and men, having an overweening heart. But Zeus put her down into his belly before that so that she can contrive with him both god and evil.

Instead of confining his children inside their mother (Ouranos) or swallowing them (Cronus), thus causing distress to the mother, Zeus ingests Metis who this 'contrives with him both good and evil'. In this way, the poet implicitly explains also the traditional epithet of Zeus μητίετα or μητιόεις, which Hesiod uses at *Th.* 56, 286, 457, 520, 904, 914: Zeus is truly full of Metis because he ingested the goddess Metis[58]. Likewise, Zeus's second marriage to Themis at 901-903 is marked by an implicit etymology: the offspring of this marriage are the *Horai* who attend to (ὠρεύουσι) the deeds of men. The removal of Typhoeus thus immediately brings back the etymological 'correctness' of names.

[58] See Vergados 2020, 95-96.

Conclusions

In this paper I have looked at the section on the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers, the catalogue of monsters, and the Typhoeus narrative in Hesiod's *Theogony*. As I hope it has emerged, the use of an etymologically 'correct' language is called into question. In the case of the monsters, some names turn out to be etymologically 'correct' (*e.g.* Cyclopes, Pegasus), but others are partially correct (*e.g.* Echidna, Chimaera), generic (Hydra, Lion), opaque (Cerberus), or even absent (the snake). Even the use of pronouns can be ambiguous, as we saw, and thus the place of some of these monstrous characters within the genealogical tree is unclear. With Typhoeus language appears confused, mixing articulate with a range of inarticulate sounds, and the poet refrains from providing an etymological aetiology even when its use would be obvious. All of this is important in a poem that consists to a large extent of catalogues of names and genealogies. Names are the instrument with which the poet imposes order on the manifold divine cosmos by organising it into classes and categories. Crucial in his endeavour is understanding which group of gods (or creatures) belongs where (*e.g.* the Cyclopes as personifications of the thunderbolt are sons of Ouranos and are born early on in the history of the cosmos, when the natural environment is being formed), while parents and offspring share common characteristics. Names and genealogies thus have a taxonomic function, as we see, for instance, in the catalogue of Nereids, in which the names of the daughters of Nereus reflect the characteristic qualities of their father, both in relation to the sea and his intellectual and moral qualities (cf. *Th.* 233-264). By limiting the correctness of names, the section on monsters questions the extent to which the tools which Hesiod uses in order to organise the increasingly more complex divine world are effective. His return, finally, to implicit etymologising after the defeat of Typhoeus adumbrates that while his human language cannot capture and express monstrosity to its full extent, Zeus's victory restores a kind of language that is 'correct' and motivated. But in contrast to earlier parts of the *Theogony*, etymologies are implicit and presuppose that the audience are now capable of discerning the etymological 'correctness' of names even if they are not accompanied by an explicit meta-language.

Newcastle University
athanassios.vergados@newcastle.ac.uk

Keywords: Hesiod, monsters, etymologies
Parole chiave: Esiodo, mostri, etimologie

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Arrighetti 1987
G.Arrighetti, *Poeti, eruditi e biografi. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa 1987.

Atherton 1998
C.Atherton (ed.), *Monsters and Monstrosity in Greek and Roman Culture*. «Nottingham Classical Literature Symposium», Bari 1998.

Baglioni 2017
I.Baglioni, *Echidna e i suoi discendenti. Studio sulle entità mostruose della teogonia esiodea*, Roma 2017.

Berlinzani 2002
F.Berlinzani, *La voce e il canto nell proemio della Teogonia*, «Acme» LV (2002), 189-204.

Beta – Marzari 2010
S.Beta – F.Marzari (ed.), *Animali, ibridi e mostri nella cultura antica*, Fiesole 2010.

Brockliss 2018
W.Brockliss, *Olympian Sound in the Theogony and the Catalogue of Women: Sweet Music and Disorderly Noise*, «The Classical Journal» CXIII (2018), 129-149.

Carpi 2019
D.Carpi, *Monsters and Monstrosity. From the Canon to the Anti-Canon: Literary and Juridical Subversions*, Berlin-Boston, 2019.

Cherubini 2012
L.Cherubini, *Mostri vicini, mostri di casa. Di alcune creature straordinarie del mito antico*, «I Quaderni del Ramo d'Oro» numero speciale (2012), 137-150.

Cohen 1996
J.J.Cohen (ed.), *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, Minneapolis-London 1996.

Costa 1968
C.Costa, *La stirpe di Pontos*, «Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni» XXXIX (1968), 61-100

Curiazi 1994
D.Curiazi, *L'etimologia' e i suoi presupposti arcaici* (*Omero, Esiodo, Inni 'omerici'*), «Museum criticum» XXIX (1994), 7-27.

Dawson 1992
D.Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley 1992.

de Jong 2004
I.J.F.de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, London 2004[2].

Del Lucchese 2019
F.Del Lucchese, *Monstrosity and Philosophy. Radical Otherness in Greek and Latin Culture*, Edinburgh 2019.
Ferrante 1965
D.Ferrante, *Immagini etimologiche nei poeti greci dell'età ionico-attica*, «Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo - Accademia di Scienze e Lettere» XCIX (1965), 453-489.
Ferrari 1988
G.Ferrari, *Hesiod's Mimetic Muses and the Strategies of Deconstruction*, in A.Benjamin (ed.), *Post-structuralist Classics*, London-New York 1988, 45-78.
Gambarara 1984
D.Gambarara, *Alle fonti della filosofia del linguaggio. 'Lingua' e 'nomi' nella cultura greca arcaica*, Roma 1984.
Gantz 1996
T.Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore 1996.
Genette 1976
G.Genette, *Mimologiques. Voyage en Cratylie*, Paris 1976.
Gevaert – Laes 2013
B.Gevaert – C.Laes, *What's in a Monster? Pliny the Elder, Teratology and Bodily Disability*, in C.Laes – C.F.Goodey – M.Lynn Rose (ed.), *Disabilities in Roman Antiquity. Disparate Bodies A Capite ad Calcem*, Leiden-Boston 2013, 211-230.
Gloyn 2020
L.Gloyn, *Tracking Classical Monsters in Popular Culture*, London 2020.
Godden – Mittman 2019
R.H.Godden – A.S.Mittman (ed.), *Monstrosity, Disability, and the Posthuman in the Medieval and Early Modern World*, London 2019.
Goslin 2010
O.Goslin, *Hesiod's Typhonomachy and the Ordering of Sound*, «Transactions of the American Philological Association» CXL (2010), 351-373.
Halliwell 2011
S.Halliwell, *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus*, Oxford-New York 2011.
Kanavou 2015
N.Kanavou, *The Names of Homeric Heroes. Problems and Interpretations*, Berlin-Boston 2015.
Kearney 2003
R.Kearney, *Strangers, Gods and Monsters. Interpreting Otherness*, London-New York 2003.

Kirk 1962
G.S.Kirk, *The Structure and Aim of the Theogony*, in K.v.Fritz et al. (ed.), *Hésiode et son influence*, Vandœvres-Genève 1962, 63-107.
Kraus 1987
M.Kraus, *Name und Sache: Ein Problem im frühgriechischen Denken*, Amsterdam 1987.
Leclerc 1993
M.-C.Leclerc, *La parole chez Hésiode: à la recherche de l'harmonie perdue*, Paris 1993.
Li Causi 2003
P.Li Causi, *L'invasione dei mostri e il dibattito sull'esistenza dei centauri*, in F.Gasti – E.Romano (ed.), *"Buoni per pensare." Gli animali nel pensiero e nella lettteratura dell'antichità*, Pavia 2003, 183-206.
Li Causi 2010
P.Li Causi, *Fra adulterio, eugenetica ed assimilazione: l'ibridazione animale nella cultura romana*, in Beta – Marzari 2010, 123-156.
Louden 1995
B.Louden, *Categories of Homeric Wordplay*, «Transactions of the American Philological Association» CXXV (1995), 27-46.
Lowe 2015
D.Lowe, *Monsters and Monstrosity in Augustan Poetry*, Ann Arbor 2015.
Mainoldi 1995
C.Mainoldi, *Mostri al femminile*, in R.Raffaelli (ed.), *Vicende e figure femminili in Grecia e a Roma.* «Atti del convegno di Pesaro, 28-30 aprile 1994», Ancona 1995, 69-92.
Murgatroyd 2007
P.Murgatroyd, *Mythical Monsters in Classical Literature*, London 2007.
O'Hara 2015
J.J.O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 2015[2] [1996[1]]
Passmore 2018
O.Passmore, *Typhoeus and Ty-phonics in Pindar, Pythian 1.26 and Hesiod, Theogony 834*, «Mnemosyne» LXXI (2018), 733-749.
Peradotto 1990
J.Peradotto, *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*, Princeton 1990.
Philippson 1936
P.Philippson, *Genealogie als mythische Form. Studien zur Theogonie des Hesiod: Die Zeitart des Mythos*, Oslo 1936.

Pucci 1977
P.Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*, Baltimore 1977.
Pucci 2007
P.Pucci, *Inno alle muse: Esiodo, Teogonia, 1-115*, Pisa 2007.
Quilligan 1979
M.Quilligan, *The Language of Allegory: Defining the Genre*, Ithaca-London, 1979.
Rank 1951
L.Ph.Rank, *Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus*, Assen 1951.
Ricciardelli 2018
G.Ricciardelli, *Esiodo Teogonia*, Milano 2018.
Risch 1947
E.Risch, *Namensdeutungen und Worterklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern*, in *Eumusia. Festgabe für Ernst Howald zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, Erlenbach/Zürich 1947, 72-91 [Reprinted in A.Etter – M.Looser (ed.), *Ernst Risch, Kleine Schriften zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Berlin-New York 1981, 294-313].
Salvadore 1987
M.Salvadore, *Il nome, la persona: saggio sull'etimologia antica*, Genoa 1987.
Skempis and Ziogas 2009
M.Skempis and I.Ziogas, *Arete's Words: Etymology, Ehoie-Poetry and Gendered Narrative in the Odyssey*, in J.Grethlein – A.Rengakos (ed.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin-Boston 2009, 213-240.
Sluiter 1997
I.Sluiter, *The Greek Tradition*, in W.van Bekkum – J.Houben – I.Sluiter – K.Versteegh (ed.), *The Emergence of Semantics in Four Linguistic Traditions: Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1997, 149-224.
Sluiter 2015
I.Sluiter, *Ancient Etymology: A Tool for Thinking*, in F.Montanari – S.Matthaios – A.Rengkalos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, II, Leiden/Boston 2015, 896-922.
Solomon 1985
J.Solomon, *In Defense of Hesiod's schlechtestem Hexameter*, «Glotta» CXIII (1985), 21-30.
Sperber 1975
D.Sperber, *Pourquoi les animaux parfaits, les hybrides et les monstres sont-ils bons à penser symboliquement*?, «L'Homme» XV (1975), 5-34.
Stamatopoulou 2017
Z.Stamatopoulou, *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry. Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE*, Cambridge 2017.

Stoddard 2004
K.Stoddard, *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*, Leiden-Boston 2004.
Strauss Clay 1989
J.Strauss Clay, *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*, Princeton, 1989.
Strauss Clay 1993
J.Strauss Clay, *The Generation of Monsters in Hesiod*, «Classical Philology» LXXXVIII (1993), 105-116.
Strauss Clay 2003
J.Strauss Clay, *Hesiod's Cosmos*, Cambridge 2003.
Strauss Clay 2020a
J.Strauss Clay, *How to Deal with Difficult Goddesses: Nyx, Styx and Hekate in Hesiod's Theogony*, in M.Tulli (ed.), *Graziano Arrighetti e la produzione letteraria dei Greci*, Roma 2020, 17-28.
Strauss Clay 2020b
J.Strauss Clay, *Typhoeus or Cosmic Regression*, in G.M.Chesi – F.Spiegel (ed.), *Classical Literature and Posthumanism*, London 2020, 133-140.
Strauss Clay (forthcoming)
J.Strauss Clay, *Ties that Bind: Verbal Fetters and Ring Composition in Hesiod's Theogony*, in J.Strauss Clay – A.Vergados (ed.), *Teaching through Images: Imagery in Greco-Roman Didactic Poetry*, Leiden-Boston (forthcoming).
Stroh 1976
W.Stroh, *Hesiods lügende Musen*, in H.Görgemanns – E.A. Schmidt (ed.), *Studien zum antiken Epos*, Meisenheim am Glan 1976, 85-112.
Sulzberger 1926
M.Sulzberger, Ὄνομα ἐπώνυμον. *Les noms propres chez Homère et dans la mythologie grecque*, «Revue des Études Grecques» XXXIX (1926), 385-447.
Tor 2017
S.Tor, *Mortal and Divine in Early Greek Epistemology: A Study of Hesiod, Xenophanes, and Parmenides*, Cambridge 2017.
Tsitsibakou-Vasalos 2007
E.Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, *Ancient Poetic Etymology. The Pelopids: Fathers and Sons*, Stuttgart 2007.
Vergados 2013
A.Vergados, *The Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers in Hesiod "Theogony" 139-53*, «Hermes» CXLI (2013), 1-7.
Vergados 2020
A.Vergados, *Hesiod's Verbal Craft. Studies in Hesiod's Conception of Language and its Ancient Reception*, Oxford 2020.

Visintin 1997
M.Visintin, *Di Echidna e di altre femmine anguiformi*, «Mètis: Anthropologie des mondes grecs anciens» XII (1997), 205-221.
West 1966
M.L.West, *Hesiod, Theogony, Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*, Oxford 1966.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921
U.v.Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921.
Zanon 2016
C.A.Zanon, *Onde vivem os monstros: criaturas prodigiosas na poesia hexamétrica arcaica*, Diss. São Paulo, 2016.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32052 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 87-109*

ILARIA ANDOLFI

«Etymologies through corruption»? Toponyms and Personal Names in Greek Mythography*

This paper shows that the etymological practice of adding, subtracting, substituting and transposing letters within a name, attested since Plato's Cratylus*, was already in use in Greek mythography. I discuss two mythographical passages, more or less coeval to the Cratylus, where the etymologies under examination involve an 'intermediary form', as words have a history of their own and may have undergone some modifications in the passage of time. These two cases of 'etymology through corruption'* (κατὰ φθοράν *or* κατὰ παραφθοράν) *are ascribed to Andron of Teos* (*FGrHist 802 F3*) *and Andron of Halicarnassus* (*fr. 8 EGM*) *respectively, and I incidentally suggest that both texts belong to Andron of Teos.*

Questo articolo vuole dimostrare come l'esercizio etimologico di aggiungere, sottrarre, sostituire e trasporre singole lettere all'interno di un nome, attestato nel Cratilo *di Platone, fosse in uso anche nella mitografia. A tal proposito discuto due frammenti mitografici, all'incirca contemporanei del* Cratilo*, nei quali si presuppone che le parole abbiano una loro evoluzione e possano pertanto essere state soggette a cambiamenti nel tempo. Questi due casi di 'etimologie per corruzione'* (κατὰ φθοράν *o* κατὰ παραφθοράν) *sono attribuiti ad Androne di Teo* (*FGrHist 802 F3*) *e Androne di Alicarnasso* (*fr. 8 EGM*)*, e discuto incidentalmente la possibilità che entrambi i frammenti appartengano ad Androne di Teo.*

1. The exploitation of etymologies in Greek literature as a powerful tool to disclose the words' true meaning is as old as Homer. Names of gods and heroes, if properly analysed, could well be exploited for narrative purposes, as they encapsulate the most salient features their fate: for example, Odysseus' etymological link with ὀδυσσάμενος, 'he who receives or gives hate' (Hom. *Od.* XIX 407), or Helen's with the root ἑλ-, 'destroy' (Aesch. *Ag.* 681-690). The gods' names were thus a target for etymological exercises, either with a narrative scope, as displayed also in Hesiod's *Theogony*[1], or with a religious one, like in the Derveni Papyrus some centuries later[2]. Etymology was definitely a pervasive practice among Greek poets, a means to validate their accounts. But were the Greeks aware of the time-gap between the coinage of words and their own time? Did they acknowledge that words have their own history and that they may have undergone some modifications from the emergence of Greek language? If yes, was this awareness a preserve of some specialists or was it more far-reaching?

It has been authoritatively argued that etymological practice in antiquity paid

* Translations, unless otherwise stated, are my own. I warmly thank Robert Fowler for his suggestions on a former draft.

[1] On Hesiod's etymologies, see now the comprehensive discussion by Vergados 2020, 147-220.

[2] On the earliest examples of etymological thinking, see the overviews in Reitzenstein 1896, Arrighetti 1987, 13-36, Levin 2000, 13-41, O'Hara 2017², 7-18, Vergados 2020, 7-20, with further literature. For ancient etymologising and the heroes' names, see Mirto 2007.

no heed to an historical perspective when dealing with words. On the contrary, ancient scholars used to leave out the diachronic dimension and to adopt a rigorously synchronic perspective[3]. However, they have also sometimes acknowledged that passage of time was responsible for linguistic changes. Suffice it to mention the movement of 'Atticism', which aimed at restoring the correct use of language and at preventing it from evolving further[4]. Moreover, as a study of the evidence provided by the ancient grammarians (Dionysius Thrax, Apollonius Dyscolus) has shown (Lallot 2011), they did not deny they did not deny the impact of time on the Greek language, but chose not to dwell on this[5]. Albeit acknowledged more or less explicitly, diachronicity was not taken into account to explain linguistic change: the road from 'a' to 'b' was not as important as 'a' and 'b' taken singularly. A convergent perception was also displayed in etymological exercises, which brook the possibility of linguistic alterations emerged during the passage of time. This statement can be easily put to the test by looking at Plato's *Cratylus*, the earliest text in our possession devoted to linguistic issues. Here, Socrates' proposed etymologies bring to the fore how the names have undergone changes that hide their original form. He claims that the essence of a name (δύναμις) is the relevant element, and not its current phonetic form, which, however, does not affect the ultimate meaning (393de-394ab)[6]. To this end, Socrates shows in the course of the central section of the dialogue that two names, made up by similar syllables, can signify the same, whilst a name can contain letters and syllables that do not affect its signification at all (393de)[7]. Letters may have been taken away or added, for the

[3] On this point, see the discussions by Peraki-Kyriakidou 2002, Lallot 2011, and Sluiter 2015, which all point out to the lack of a diachronic interest (but not of awareness!) in ancient etymologising. For ancient sensitivity to language corruption in the passage of time, fundamental is Müller 2003. For a more nuanced treatment that points to the a-chronic nature of ancient etymology, see the sophisticated approach by Vergados 2020, 10.

[4] For orientation and further literature on Atticism, see Erbse 1950, Schmid 1964, Alpers 1990, Probert 2008, Kim 2010, and Matthaios 2013. On the connected topic of 'analogy' and linguistic norms in and outside grammarian literature, see the selection of commented texts in Dickey 2019 with further literature.

[5] For example, Apollonius Dyscolus defines some unusual forms in Homer ἀρχαϊκώτερα (A.D. *Synt.* 2.90, 193.17 and *Pron.* 44.11-13).

[6] On δύναμις and its technical meaning 'to signify', see Peraki-Kyriakidou 2002, 480 and Zanker 2016, 65-67.

[7] I am not going to explore all the philosophical implications of this passage. For a full-blown interpretation, see Ademollo 2011, 163-78, with discussion of previous bibliography. On specific moments of the *Cratylus*' etymological section cf. also Sedley 1998, Sluiter 2015, 909-16, Hoenig 2019, and Hunter - Laemmle 2020, with mention of previous literature.

sake of euphony, to confer a solemn hue to the language and, as a result, names do not show their original façade any more (414cd; transl. Fowler 1921):

> {ΣΩ.} Ὦ μακάριε, οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτι τὰ πρῶτα ὀνόματα τεθέντα κατακέχωσται ἤδη ὑπὸ τῶν βουλομένων τραγῳδεῖν αὐτά, περιτιθέντων γράμματα καὶ ἐξαιρούντων εὐστομίας ἕνεκα καὶ πανταχῇ στρεφόντων, καὶ ὑπὸ καλλωπισμοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ χρόνου […] ἀλλὰ τοιαῦτα οἶμαι ποιοῦσιν οἱ τῆς μὲν ἀληθείας οὐδὲν φροντίζοντες, τὸ δὲ στόμα πλάττοντες, ὥστ' ἐπεμβάλλοντες πολλὰ ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα ὀνόματα τελευτῶντες ποιοῦσιν μηδ' ἂν ἕνα ἀνθρώπων συνεῖναι ὅτι ποτὲ βούλεται τὸ ὄνομα.
>
> My friend, you do not bear in mind that the original words have before now been completely buried by those who wished to dress them up, for they have added and subtracted letters for the sake of euphony and have distorted the words in every way for ornamentation or merely in the lapse of time […] I think that sort of things is the work of people who care nothing for truth, but only for the shape of their mouths: so they keep adding to the original words until finally no human being can understand what in the world the word means.

Thus, if one wants to get to the essence of a name, reconstructing its original form becomes a paramount step. Socrates also employs differences in pronunciation as evidence of linguistic change with regard to the sound η (418c). However, it should not be erroneously inferred that the debate hosted in the *Cratylus* is about the origins of names: as Ademollo (2011, 5-6) aptly warns, the speakers agree on the fact that names were set down by someone, but they disagree on whether the 'glue' connecting names and objects is a natural or conventional criterion. As it always happens with Platonic dialogues, scholars have agonized over all the possible linguistic theories referenced there. For instance, it is generally believed that the Sophists, with their interest in the rhetorical art, played a decisive role in making etymology a systematic field of study. In addition, Cratylus' conversion to Heracliteanism in the course of the dialogue (437a) and the concurrent appearance of the Heraclitean 'theory of flux' (401d-402d, 411bc-440a) have suggested that Heraclitus supported the naturalistic party in this dispute. Unfortunately, in the former case linguistic inquiries seem to have taken a rather different tack, whilst in the latter there is not enough evidence for Heraclitus' own views about language[8].

[8] It is tempting to ascribe to the Sophists an important role in this linguistic discussion, but there is not enough evidence to claim that their etymological theories are behind Socrates' verbal engagement in the *Cratylus*. Even if Prodicus and Protagoras supposedly dealt with the ὀρθότης τῶν ὀνομάτων, 'correctness of names' (esp. with Protagoras' ὀρ-

The dispute between naturalists and conventionalists will progress in a different direction in the Hellenistic age, where the Stoics championed the etymological practice and deemed it as ontologically meaningful, especially Chrysippus (who possibly invented the term 'etymology'). The Stoics' preoccupation with recovering the form of the first words, which sprang out at the beginning of human history, gave life to a complex approach to etymology and to language in general. To this end, the Stoics also adopted some criteria of linguistic purity, ἀρεταὶ καὶ κακίαι λέξεως, 'virtues and vices of speech', probably borrowed from Theophrastus' theory of diction[9]. By contrast, Epicurus' views on language seem to have been more nuanced, as he maintained that names came out spontaneously and naturally, but, at a second stage, an agreement became necessary to guarantee mutual understanding (Epic. *Hdt*. 75-6: cf. also Lucr. V 1028-1096)[10]. An awareness of the language evolution's incidence on etymologies is displayed also by the Derveni commentator (probably end of the fourth cent. BC): he maintains that the meaning of existing words can change as the referent changes (col. 14,6-9: Kronos did a great deed to Ouranos and he received the name Kronos after this action)[11]. The

---

θοέπεια: see Corradi 2012, 166-75), they seem to have done so in a different way than in the Platonic dialogue (Ademollo 2011, 33-36). Also, Prodicus, Diagoras, and Critias were charged by Epicurus with the attempt of changing the name of the gods as they were only the result of a convention (παραγραμμίζ[ουσι] τὰ ṭ[ῶ]ṇ θεῶν [ὀνόμα]τα, in Phld. *Piet.,* P.Herc. 1077, col. 19 Obbink). On Heraclitus in the *Cratylus*, see Ademollo 2011, 15-18 (cf. also Colvin 2007). For a positive appraisal of Heraclitus' philosophy of language, see Voigtlander 1995. It has been suggested that also Democritus' linguistic interests are referenced in the *Cratylus*, as he considered the names as conventional (68 B 26 DK) and discussed the relation between word and thing (68 B 142 DK). Aristotle touches upon the effects of the passing of time on language very briefly in *Poet.* 1457b1-4.

[9] On this point, see D.L. VII 55-59. For orientation on the Stoic's sophisticated etymological research, see Dawson 1992, 24-33, Long 1996, 58-84, and Allen 2005. More generally on the Stoics' contribution to grammar, see the overview in Blank - Atherton 2003. The fact that «a Stoic, philosophical, anomalist grammar, the creation of a Pergamene 'school', waged war on an Alexandrian, philological, analogist grammar» (Blank - Atherton 2003, 312) is a common scholarly misunderstanding and cannot be maintained any longer.

[10] For Epicurean views on language and etymology, see discussion in Verlinsky 2005 and Reinhardt 2008.

[11] The Derveni commentator employs the etymological tool especially for names that describe the gods, as they are not just set by convention (col. 22,7-8). See, for instance, the proposed etymology for Kronos, κρούω, 'to strike' + νοῦς, 'mind' (col. 14,2-14). On the sensitivity to language issues displayed by the Derveni commentator, see Henry 1986 and Obbink 2003. Anceschi 2007 has compared the divine etymologies in the papyrus with those in the *Cratylus*, arguing that they provide the key to Plato's attitude towards etymology.

Roman world shared a frame of references similar to the Greek one, as Varro's *De Lingua Latina* attests: the original roots of words could be difficult to detect, as during the lapse of time letters were subtracted, added or transposed (V 3; V 5-6; VI 1). As a consequence, Varro aims at uncovering the *voluntas impositoris*, the will of the early makers of names (VIII 1-2)[12].

Even though in antiquity there were manifold positions on language in general and on etymology in particular, they all seem to agree on one major point, namely that each investigation on words had to go back to an 'original' phase in order to bear significance, as we have seen. Within this frame, the earliest phases of the language history are hailed as the repository of truth, whereas the current stages are inevitably affected by a 'deterioration', a 'decay', a corruption. Socrates in the *Cratylus* (414cd), the Stoics, and Varro in *De Lingua Latina* referred to phonetical corruptions that have disguised an original word, by adding, subtracting, transmuting or transposing letters (*quadripertita ratio* according to Quint. *inst.* I 5,38). This kind of approach was further developed and 'systematised' in grammatical speculation and it goes under the name of 'pathology', i.e. the study and justification of linguistic variation on the basis of rational, recognized rules (πάθη). We find examples of this practice, for example, in Apollonius (see e.g. *Synt.* 107.18), Herodian (e.g. μον. λεξ. 909.12), and possibly in Didymus of Alexandria, who composed a (now lost) work Περί παθῶν. Deviation from the norm is thus explained with the πάθη, and dialectal forms can be normalized[13]. Furthermore, the awareness of such linguistic 'deterioration' was not a preserve of language specialists, but it was more widespread than one could imagine at first sight. Even illiterate men and women could detect the presence of words in the epics, in songs, and magical formulas that belonged to archaic language and were not comprehensible any longer. The effects of language deterioration were under ordinary people's eyes and could affect the sphere of everyday life. As reported in a speech by Lysias (10,20; transl. by Lamb 1930):

> Προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν. τὸ μὲν πεφασμένως ἐστὶ φανερῶς, πολεῖσθαι δὲ βαδίζειν, τὸ δὲ οἰκῆος θεράποντος. Πολλὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἄλλα ἐστίν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί. ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ σιδηροῦς ἐστιν, οἴομαι αὐτὸν ἔννουν γεγονέναι ὅτι τὰ

[12] On Varro's etymological method, see Romano 2003, 113-17, Blank 2005, and Piras 2017.

[13] Scholars see pathology as inspired by the Stoics and their ethical theory of διαστροφή: men can fall from a state a rationality and harmony when they are misled by external appearances. As a result, πάθη are in charge of their behaviour and not the rational. For an appraisal of how Stoic ethics affected pathology, see Sluiter 1990, 18-21. *Contra*, Wackernagel 1876, who, by contrast, denies any link with the Stoa and argues that pathology was invented by Trypho. For pathology in general, see also Blank 1992, 41-51, Lallot 1995, 114-118, Brucale 2003, 21-44, Nifadopoulos 2003, and Pontani 2011, 99-101.

> μὲν πράγματα ταὐτά ἐστι νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι, τῶν δὲ ὀνομάτων ἐνίοις οὐ τοῖς αὐτοῖς χρώμεθα νῦν τε καὶ πρότερον.
>
> Pay attention: 'overtly' is 'openly', 'ply about' is 'walk about', and a 'varlet' is a 'servant'. We have many other instances of the sort, gentlemen. But if he is not a numskull, I suppose he has realized that things are the same now as they were of old, but that in some cases we do not use the same terms now as we did formerly.

These lines claim that words have evolved whereas things have not – in judicial speech it could well have been the case that new institutions were implemented in the course of time. Even in this case, the solution to the problem does not change: the true meaning of the word does not fall away, it is only disguised behind some phonetic mutations.

This article presents two mythographical passages, more or less coeval with the *Cratylus*, which have not yet received scholarly attention and which showcase a similar process in a positive way, i.e. to make an etiological point. But before presenting this case-study, some words on the use of etymologies in mythographical discourse, from its emergence to its peak, are in order.

2. As already stated, etymological games have been employed as narrative devices since Homer, as they serve to disclose the essence of their referents' names. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise to see it at play in the prose counterpart of the epics, namely mythography. From the emergence of the genre in the sixth cent. BC to the later developments, genealogists and mythographers anchored their accounts to the interpretation of names and words. The validation provided by etymologies was needed since several competing accounts were available, either in poetry or in prose: a well-crafted etymology concurred in proving that the story told was worthwhile. From an anthropological viewpoint, etymology and genealogy have a lot in common, both in their past and present forms. In antiquity, they both served as 'anchoring practices': that means that individuals used them as a map to understand the current state of things. Etymology describes the meaning of a word among a given set of words, and so does genealogy by pointing to the position of an individual within society[14]. In modern times, this relationship is even stronger, as, all in all, etymologies are nothing else than families of words. As for ancient times, despite a shared obvious preoccupation with the past that inevitably informs them, etymologies and genealogies are fully effective with

[14] Sluiter 2015, 900. Anthropological debate on genealogies as social charters is especially vast: see Varto 2015 for modern literature on the subject.

regard to the present. In their anchoring action between two dimensions, the past and the present in the first case, and the *explanans* and the *explanandum* in the second, the point of arrival is a given and is relevant, whilst the point of departure is subjected to speculation. Etymology decrypts how our reality works by focusing on the language that we use to describe it, and so are family genealogies. Especially in preliterate societies, it has become widely appreciated, as Goody – Watt 1963 say, that the individual has a little perception of the past as it is, but s/he tends to consider it in relationship to the present. Consequently, in what has been successfully called «genealogical thinking» (Fowler 1999), one faces a «form of reverse engineering that will make it possible to read off that meaning from the surface of the word» (Sluiter 2015, 904).

Genealogical and, more generally, mythographical discourse has been especially keen on incorporating etymology as an aetiological device. For instance, one of the earliest prose-writers, Hecataeus of Miletus (fr. 22 *EGM*) claimed that Mycenae got its name after the cap of Perseus' scabbard, μύκης, that the hero lost there. Such etymological practice, however, reaches its peak in the fifth cent. BC. As Fowler notes (1996, 72), the master of this practice was without doubt Hellanicus of Lesbos, for whom adventurous etymologies became an actual «weapon of choice». To mention but one instance, according to Hellanicus, the Idaean Dactyloi were named this way because, when they met Rhea on Mount Ida and greeted her, they touched her fingers (fr. 89 *EGM*)[15]. From the two examples just quoted, it emerges how etymologies could well be the kernel of a mythographical account: at the same time, they inform and encapsulate a related story regarding a character or a toponym. Of course, the same name could call for multiple explanations. In this respect, the case of the Spartoi is emblematic: the etymological link with σπείρω could lead to both 'scattered' and 'sown' (see Conon 37.23-6; Androt. *FGrHist* 324 F60b; Palaeph. *Incred.* 3; Diod. Sic. XIX 53.4; Heracl. *Incred.* 19). But, as the *Cratylus* teaches us, for example in the section devoted to Apollo's etymology (405a-406a), multiple etymologies can be true at the same time and cooperate in decrypting the real meaning.

Moreover, etymology and genealogy can also cooperate to give birth to a twice-stronger anchoring practice. To this end, etymologies mainly involve personal names and toponyms. Quite interestingly, Hecataeus (fr. 15 *EGM*) displayed an uncommon sensitivity to the evolution of Greek language, when he maintained that the Aetolian hero Oeneus was named after the ancient denomination for the grape, οἴνη (fr. 15 *EGM* = Athen. *Deipn.* II 35ab):

[15] Full list of occurrences in early prose writers is in Fowler 1996, 72-73.

> Ἑκαταῖος δ᾽ ὁ Μιλήσιος τὴν ἄμπελον ἐν Αἰτωλίᾳ λέγων εὑρεθῆναί φησι καὶ τάδε· «Ὀρεσθεὺς ὁ Δευκαλίωνος ἦλθεν εἰς Αἰτωλίαν ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ, καὶ κύων αὐτοῦ στέλεχος ἔτεκε, καὶ ὃς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸ κατορυχθῆναι, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔφυ ἄμπελος πολυστάφυλος· διὸ καὶ τὸν αὑτοῦ παῖδα Φύτιον ἐκάλεσε. Τούτου δ᾽ Οἰνεὺς ἐγένετο, κληθεὶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμπέλων (οἱ γὰρ παλαιοί, φησιν,Ἕλληνες οἴνας ἐκάλουν τὰς ἀμπέλους)· Οἰνέως δ᾽ ἐγένετο Αἰτωλός».
>
> Hecataeus of Miletus states that the vine was discovered in Aetolia and adds this: «Orestheus, the son of Deucalion, came to Aetolia to obtain the kingship, and his bitch gave birth to a stump. He ordered it to be buried and from it a vine covered in grapes grew. For this reason, he named his son Phytios. Oeneus was his son, and he was named from the vines - for the ancient Greeks, he says, used to call the vines *oinai.* Aetolus was Oeneus' son».

From this example already, it emerges how etymology actually anchors a character to something that informs his/her identity. In Oeneus' case, the proposed etymology shows that *a*) he must have had something to do with grapes – and indeed he has, because he was king in an area famous for that – and that *b*) he lived in a remote time, where the noun οἴνη meant 'grape'. Therefore, Oeneus is a 'speaking' name alluding to plants, as it is his father's, Phytios[16]. In one move, Hecataeus anchored his story both to a given space, Aetolia, and to a time in history, that of the Calydonian boar hunt, which predates the Greek expedition against Troy (Hom. *Il.* IX 529-599). Without an awareness of how the past linguistic usages were in comparison to the current ones, his proposed etymology for the name Oeneus would not be tenable[17]. A partially similar approach to myth-telling informed by vocabulary is displayed again in fr. 17 *EGM*: according to Pausanias, Hecataeus' description of Cerberus as a most terrible snake was not at odds with Homer's κύων Ἀΐδαο, as it did not necessarily mean 'hell-hound', but simply 'guardian'.

From the Hellenistic age onwards, the relationship between etymology and

[16] For the narrative importance of such speaking names in the epics (and consequently in mythography) see Kanavou 2015, 17-23.

[17] For an analysis of this myth, see Fowler, *EGM* II: 135 and Andolfi 2017, 97-98. The linguistic inquiry here displayed has not been given the scholarly attention it deserved. However, it is important to acknowledge that Nenci in several works (e.g. 1951, 56-58 and 1967, 21-22) speaks of an «etymological criterion» in relation to Hecataeus' selection of one myth over the others. Nenci highlights how Hecataeus, like a modern textual critic, aimed at discerning the most ancient version of a story, for this was not affected by corruptions occurring in the course of transmission. This interpretation has had the merit of detecting a too often neglected feature, that is Hecataeus' awareness of diachronic evolution of language (and possibly of traditions and material culture).

myth intensifies, both within rationalistic and allegorical exegesis. Unsurprisingly, the Hellenistic poets were experts of etymologies, in an age when etymological studied flourished[18]. Etymology's power to disclose a hidden meaning could be well exploited in these two directions, as they both aim at validating an interpretation. For the rationalistic approach, the fourth-century BC mythographer Palaephatus and his work *On Incredible Things* offers plenty of evidence to consider. For instance, in its preface, Palaephatus maintains that, even though unbelievable accounts circulate, everything that has been reported must have happened somehow, because there cannot be names without any real story[19]. Palaephatus is very keen on using all the available etymological possibilities to detect the kernel of truth concealed in a myth. For example, in his treatment of the Sphinx's episode (§18), he resorts to a Theban local meaning for αἴνιγμα, 'ambush', or he acknowledges a twofold meaning for μῆλα, 'pome' and 'flocks' when describing the Hesperides' story. In a completely different way, allegorists too were fond of etymologies, which they exploited in a different direction to Palaephatus'. The most consistent evidence is from the first cent. CE, with the *Homeric Questions* by Heraclitus and the *Compendium of Greek Theology* by the Stoic philosopher Anneus Cornutus[20]. Here, the god's names were subjected to a thorough analysis pointing to the undisclosed truth. Cornutus, via the etymological analysis of the names Thetis ('she who disposes everything': διατιθέναι) and Briareos ('he who raises food': αἴρειν + βορά), was able to discern the scientific message conveyed by Homer (*Epidr.* 17, p. 27,7-18 Lang). In particular, Cornutus was aware of the temporal gap between the ancient poets and the modern interpreters and of how that could affect names: Prometheus modelled the human race from the earth, he whom was given the foresight of the universal soul, προμήθεια in the Greek of that time, but πρόνοια in the Greek of his time (*Epidr.* 18, p. 31,19-32,3).

But were mythographers as well aware of how the passage of time could 'corrupt' the Greek language? Did they regard the original phases of the language history as more trustworthy and correct? The next paragraph will submit some evidence that attests to an etymological sensitivity similar to that first showcased in the *Cratylus* and then systematized in the grammatical discussion.

3. The case-study I am referring to is that of etymology 'through corruption', κατὰ φθοράν or κατὰ παραφθοράν[21]. Not only this device focuses on unveiling the

[18] See the overview in O'Hara 2017², 21-42 with several examples by Callimachus, Apollonius of Rhodes, and other Hellenistic poets.

[19] On Palaephatus, see Santoni 2000, 9-43, Hawes 2014, 37-92, and Hunter 2016, 245-254.

[20] On allegory and etymology, see Dawson 1992, 23-52

[21] It is useful to read the definition of παραφθορά in the treatise *On the Method of Force-*

correct origin of a given word, but it also assumes that, in the light of the correct etymology, that same word must have been slightly different. Mispronunciations and misspellings, thus 'corruptions', have modified it, so words underwent a small phonetic change that makes it harder to detect the real meaning. The earliest use of the expression κατὰ φθοράν is to be found in scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes and is ascribed to Greek mythography[22]. The former occurrence comes from the text of the mythographer Andron of Teos, who, as far as we know, was trierarch of Alexander the Great's Indos fleet in 326 BC, the latter to that of his homonymous Andron of Halicarnassus, who presumably lived in the first half of the fourth cent. BC.

a. Andron of Teos *FGrHist* 802 F3 = Schol. Ap. Rh. II 946-954c, p. 196, 15 Wendel (cf. Hec. fr. 34 *EGM*)[23]:

πόλις τοῦ Πόντου ἡ Σινώπη, ὠνομασμένη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσωποῦ θυγατρὸς Σινώπης, ἣν ἁρπάσας Ἀπόλλων ἀπὸ Ὑρίας ἐκόμισεν εἰς Πόντον, καὶ μιγεὶς αὐτῇ ἔσχε Σύρον, ἀφ᾽ οὗ οἱ Σύροι […] ὁ δὲ Τήιος Ἄνδρων φησὶ μίαν τῶν Ἀμαζόνων φυγοῦσαν εἰς Πόντον γήμασθαι τῷ τῶν τόπων ἐκείνων βασιλεῖ, πίνουσάν τε πλεῖστον οἶνον ὀνομασθῆναι Σανάπην. {ἐπειδὴ} μεταφραζόμενον <δὲ> τοῦτο σημαίνει τὴν πολλὰ πίνουσαν, ἐπειδὴ αἱ μέθυσοι σανάπαι λέγονται παρὰ Θρᾳξίν, ᾗ διαλέκτῳ χρῶνται καὶ Ἀμαζόνες· <καὶ> κληθῆναι τὴν πόλιν <Σανάπην>, ἔπειτα **κατὰ φθορὰν** Σινώπην. ἡ δὲ μέθυσος Ἀμαζὼν ἐκ †τῆς πόλεως παρεγένετο πρὸς Λυτίδαν, ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος.

ful Speaking ascribed to the rhetorician Hermogenes of Tarsus (second cent. AD): (3) Τὰ ἁμαρτήματα κατὰ τὴν λέξιν κατὰ δύο τρόπους γίνεται, ἀκυρίαν καὶ παραφθοράν […] παραφθορὰν δέ, οἷον, ὃ καλοῦσι διάζωμα, ἐάν τις εἴπῃ διαζώστραν ἢ τὸ αἱμωδεῖν ἀμμωδεῖν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. Mistakes in word choice occur in two ways: failure to use the proper word and corruption […] it is an example of corruption if one says *diazōstra* for what they call a *diazōma* ('girdle') and say *ammōdein* for *haimōdein* ('to set teeth on edge') and the like (translation by Kennedy 2005). When it comes to effective communication, Hermogenes says, speakers' mistakes can fall into two categories, namely impropriety of language and corruption. In Hermogenes' use, (παρα)φθορά seem to indicate a mere trivialisation or slip of tongue, for example when one says διαζώστρα instead of διάζωμα. This is probably caused by a lack of full command of the language, but also due to a momentary lapse of concentration. See Patillon 2014, 43-46.

[22] As far as κατὰ παραφθοράν is concerned, see Arrian. *FGrHist* 156 F25 = Steph. Byz. α 246 Billerbeck; Athen. 90b Olson; Steph. Byz. α 4, δ 10, δ 111, κ 249 Billerbeck: Schol. Dion. *Per.* 348, *GG* 248, 9-21; Schol. Dion. Byz. 68,1 p. 39 Güngerich; Eust. *in Il.* I 456.20, *Il.* II 153.3, *Il.* II 492.18, *Il.* III 354.9, *Il.* III 753.5, *Il.* III 824.3, *Il.* IV 544.20 van der Valk.

[23] I cite the text as printed by Fowler, *EGM* I, on the basis of Wendel's edition. It is important to acknowledge that Cuypers, *BNJ*, has sometimes made different textual choices, which, however, do not affect the understanding of the passage.

> Sinope is a city on the Black Sea, named after the daughter of Asopos Sinope, whom Apollo brought to the Black Sea after having abducted her from Hyria. And through intercourse with her, he had Syros, after whom the Syrians were named [...] But Andron of Teos says that one of the Amazons, having fled to the Black Sea, married the king of that region; and that because she drank a lot of wine, she was called Sanape. Since this means, metaphorically speaking, 'she who drinks too much', since drunk women are called *sanapai* among the Thracians, whose dialect the Amazons use as well; and (he says that) the city was called after her Sanape, then through corruption Sinope. And the hard-drinking Amazon went † from this city to Lytidas, as Hecataeus says.

b. Andron of Halicarnassus fr. 8 *EGM* = Schol. Ap. Rh. II 711g, p. 182, 9 Wendel.

> ὠνομάσθη δὲ Παρνασσὸς ἀπὸ Παρνησσοῦ τοῦ ἐγχωρίου ἥρως, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος (fr. 196 *EGM*). Ἀνδρων δέ, ἐπεὶ προσωρμίσθη ἡ λάρναξ τοῦ Δευκαλίωνος· καὶ τὸ πρότερον Λαρνασσὸς ἐκαλεῖτο, ὕστερον δὲ **κατὰ φθορὰν** τοῦ λ στοιχείου Παρνασσός.
>
> Mount Parnassos was named after the local hero Parnassos, according to Hellanicus. But according to Andron since the chest of Deucalion landed there. And in the past, it was named Larnassos, and later Parnassos because of the corruption of the letter L.

The analogies between the two passages are striking. According to the scholia to book 2 of Apollonius of Rhodes, Andron of Teos and Andron of Halicarnassus developed sensitivity to the corruption of toponyms. The first case, that ascribed to Andron of Teos, displays a sophisticated approach to the issue: the most straightforward explanation for the name of the city Sinope, on the Black Sea, has one of Asopus' daughters, abducted by a the god Apollo, as a name-giver[24]. Such an account is rejected in favour of a much more complicated and (to us) unexpected aetiological story: here the Amazon is travelling by herself, without the intervention of any Greek god, and reached the Black Sea, where she became known for her taste for wine. The Thracians, who used to speak the same language as the Amazons, started calling her *sanape*, 'the drunk woman', and here we can see at play the sophisticated move of Andron, who could count on his erudition and show his knowledge of a 'mythical' foreign language[25]. This piece of information is partially

[24] See Ps. Scymn. fr. 27 Marcotte. By contrast, Sinope was Asopus' daughter according to Eumel. fr. 31 Tsagalis (= fr. 5 *EGM*), Corin. *PMG* 654, Aristot. fr. 581 Rose, Ap. Rh. II 946-54, Diod. Sic. IV 72. Pherecydes (fr. 144 *EGM*) knew Sinope as one of Odysseus' companions.

[25] Where *sana/sæn* means 'wine' and *pīt-* is 'drink' (Ivantchik 1997, 37). The interest in

supported by an Hesychian gloss (σ 158 σάναπτιν· τὴν οἰνιώτην. Σκύθαι). However, despite being charming, the result of this etymology is not the one expected, because the city is normally known as Sinope and not as Sanape. And here the 'etymology through corruption' comes into action and works this out for Andron: Sanape was corrupted into Sinope, an easy corruption to postulate[26].

To be credible, such a corruption has to be phonetically limited. This is also the case of the second occurrence, the one ascribed to Andron of Halicarnassus. Here the etymology is definitely more straightforward: the mount Parnassos took its name from the substantive λάρναξ, which in Greek means 'chest' and refers to the chest of Decaulion, which landed there after the deluge[27]. Of course, *larnax* is not **parnax*, and the etymology would not work this way, unless Andron has a card up his sleeve that he chooses to play, that is the corruption of the first consonant sound. In this passage, Andron (or the scholiast, we cannot say for sure) states that at the beginning the mount was indeed called Larnassos, but later on it became Parnassos, changing the first letter from L into P[28].

The reading of these two passages raises an important methodological question: is the expression κατὰ φθοράν to be referred to Andron or to the scholiast and/or his middle-source? There is no easy way to answer and no other evidence can be brought to bear. However, without a clear identification of a corruption occurring on the phonetic level, the above-described etymologies would not make any sense. So, even if one can well doubt that both Androns employed the expression κατὰ φθοράν as it stands in our texts, nevertheless they were of course aware of the fact that a phonetic change must have occurred between the first and the second form, otherwise their proposed etymologies would not have made any

---

foreign languages exists already in Hecataeus (fr. 22 *EGM* Δανᾶ was the Phoenician name for the heroine Danae) and, of course, in Herodotus (esp. IV 27, for the Arimaspians: *arima*, 'one', and *spou*, 'eye'; and IV 110 for the Amazons, called in Greek Οἰόρπατα: *oior*, 'man' and *pata*, 'kill', so 'those who kill men'): see discussion in Harrison 1998.

[26] Other later sources report the same story about the drunk Amazon, but here she was named *Sinope* since the beginning (*EtG* s.v. Σινώπη· […] ὁ δὲ Ἄνδρων φησὶ μίαν τῶν Ἀμαζόνων φυγοῦσαν εἰς Πόντον παρὰ τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ τόπου πίνουσάν τε πλεῖστον οἶνον προσαγορευθῆναι Σινώπην· μεταφραζόμενον δὲ τοῦτο σημαίνει τὴν πολλὰ πίνουσαν).

[27] For the most widespread accounts of the deluge, see Fowler, *EGM* II: 114-117.

[28] Different is the case of Pherecydes of Athens, fr. 32c *EGM* (= 145 Dolcetti), mentioned by Dolcetti 2019, 46 n. 12 with regard to the expression κατὰ φθοράν, where Medeas' brother Apsirtus is named Axirtus (possibly to describe his young age: cf. Fowler 2013, 228). In this case, as in many others that can be found in mythographical discussions, the simple fact that a peculiar name is attested does not say anything about the awareness of (in this case) Pherecydes, who does not motivate the choice of Axirtus via an 'etymology through corruption'.

sense. A similar instance, even if not identical, is registered again in early Greek mythography. Hellanicus (fr. 125 *EGM*) knew the Ionic festival of Apaturia with the former name Ἀπατηνόρια[29]. Since the second denomination mirrors the actual aetiology of the festival and thus expresses the essence of the institution better – the association with ἀπάτη harks back to the 'deceit' performed by the Attic hero Melanthus against Xanthus, king of Boeotia – there is no proper corruption here. Unfortunately, the scholiast that has handed this text down to us did not cite Hellanicus word-for-word and, in addition, there are no references to the make-up of the previous name Ἀπατηνόρια and its meaning[30]. However, what this text highlights is the occurrence of an intermediary form of which the mythographer is aware and that can be possibly used as part of the aetiological account.

Incidentally, I would also like to discuss briefly the possibility that texts **a** and **b** might belong to the same Andron. It is singular indeed that two prose-writers, who presumably lived in the fourth cent. BC, developed the exact same method of 'etymology through corruption' applied to ancient toponyms. To be more precise, I suspect that text **b**, ascribed to Andron of Halicarnassus, is better referable to his namesake Andron of Teos. In fact, in this case the scholiast mentions Andron without any further indication: modern editors have promptly ascribed the piece to Andron of Halicarnassus, but this surmise can well be challenged. When the scholiast quotes these 'etymologies through corruption', he refers once to Andron of Teos and once to a not-further-described Andron. The employment of the same peculiar etymological practice makes it the most economical solution to ascribe both fragments to the same author. Furthermore, a quick look at the extant fragments of both Andron of Teos and Andron of Halicarnassus provides us with other cases in which ascription to one over the other is not straightforward and are thus open to be reconsidered. Only three fragments in total (and one dubious) are ascribed to Andron of Teos, which all come from the scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes. In *FGrHist* 802 F 1 we find mention of Andron with his ethnic and his work Περίπλους, *Circumnavigation*, in F2 there is only Andron and the title of another work, Περὶ Πόντου, *About the Pont-Euxin* (which scholars have intended as a subsection of the *Periplus*), and in F3 there is mention of Andron of Teos without the title of the book. By contrast, if we consider the situation of Andron of Halicarnassus, one can reckon twenty-two fragments, of which sixteen are genuine according to Fowler's *EGM*. In this number, only two fragments are incon-

[29] Schol. T+ Plat. *Symp.* 208d […] ἑορτὴν ἄγειν, ἥν πάλαι μὲν Ἀπατηνόρια, ὕστερον δὲ Ἀπατουρία ἐκάλουν ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς γενομένης ἀπάτης.

[30] It has been suggested to me by one of the anonymous referees that, on the face of it, it would still be connected to ἀπάτη + ἀνήρ and that the epithet ἀπατήνωρ occurs in Euphorion (*SH* 418, 25) for Dionysus.

trovertibly ascribed to Andron of Halicarnassus. By contrast, in four cases there is mention of Andron and of works entitled Συγγένειαι / Συγγενικά, *Kinships* (x3), Ἱστορίαι, *Histories* (x1), and Περὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς βαρβάρους, *The War against the Barbarians* (x1)[31], and, consequently, ten cases where only the name Andron figures. It is striking thus that there is not even a single occurrence of the name Andron of Halicarnassus cited together with the title of his own work.

As for the topics treated in those fragments, despite his career as a navarch in Alexander's fleet, Andron of Teos displays precisely those interests typical of a bookish mythographer (Cuypers, *BNJ*, *Biographical Essay*). Fragments 1, 2, and 3 all deal with his explanation for the denomination of places on the Black Sea and the same applies to the dubious fr. 4. If Müller's (*FHG* 4.291) proposed emendation Ἄνδρωνα in this passage is correct and thus Andron's name has to be restored in the text, then we would have another case of etymologising practice in Andron of Teos, who discussed the origin for Bosporus' name, made up by βοῦς and πόρος, 'passage for the cattle'[32]. As for Andron of Halicarnassus, aetiological accounts frequently occur too. Frr. 5, 7, and 12 are about genealogies; frr. 11, 14, and 16a deal with toponyms and related mythographical stories; frr. 3, 6, 13, and 16A come from extensive accounts on the most famous mythical subjects; frr. 4 and 15 are examples of Homeric exegesis. Hence, the solution adopted by the editors in presence of an ambiguous citation was to ascribe to Andron of Teos only what was directly and exclusively referable to the Black Sea, even if the other title registered for his work is Περίπλους, *Circumnavigation*, which, theoretically, suggests a much wider scope than only the Black Sea area. Bearing all this in mind, scholars should perhaps question themselves about the attribution of those fragments 'generically' ascribed to Andron, as it has already happened with other homonymous authors, who worked on similar subjects, e.g. Pherecydes of Syros and Pherecydes of Athens, Hecataeus of Miletus and Hecateaus of Abdera, Asclepiades of Myrlea and Asclepiades of Tragilus, and so forth[33]. Ancient scholars

[31] This last title appears in P.Oxy. 1802 fr. 3, ii, 18-19, for which see Schironi 2009, 91-92, and is attributed to Andron, of course without further specifications. As for the title Αἱ πρὸς Φίλιππον Θυσίαι, *The Festivals for Philippus*, the fragment that reports it (fr. 19 Dolcetti) is considered spurious by Fowler, *EGM*.

[32] The transmitted text has Ἀκαρίωνα. Together with Müller's Ἄνδρωνα, scholars' proposed emendations include also other possibilities, such as Χάρωνα (Weichert), Αἰσχρίωνα (Schmidt) and Εὐφορίωνα (Reinesius).

[33] The case of the two Asclepiades is especially instructive. Asclepiades of Myrlea was a grammarian (second-first cent. BC), especially interested in Homer, but also in local history (Pagani 2007, 16-42). Asclepiades of Tragilus (fourth cent. BC) was a mythographer, known for the work *Tragodoumena*, where he discussed the contents of Greek tragedies

like Theon of Alexandria, an acknowledged source for the scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes, but also Apollodorus of Athens, Demetrius of Scepsis, Didymus, and Callimachus, displayed interests in the origins of toponyms, and their scholarly activity may be behind Andron's quotations in scholia[34].

4. The etymological practice of adding, subtracting, substituting and transposing letters within a name, attested since Plato's *Cratylus* and then often employed in Hellenistic and Roman grammar, was already in use in Greek mythography. Even if most of the theoretical discussion is lost and we cannot know who boosted this kind of etymological approach and how, mythographers, as well as poets and historiographers, found it a useful weapon to be employed in foundation stories and other etiological accounts. The two cases involving 'etymology through corruption' discussed in this paper make two points worthy of further discussion. The first one is straightforward: as highlighted by Socrates in the *Cratylus*, there is no need for words to look precisely like each other to be related. Therefore, it does not matter if in the Amazons' language the word is *sanape*, and not *sinope*. Andron could not reject such a trailblazing explanation for it when it does not perfectly match the city name Sinope. To make the equation work, the *explanandum* undergoes a modification, a corruption (mispronunciations, incorrect uses, and so on) that over time became the linguistic norm. The true nature of a word cannot

in a continuous narration. The scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes cite both of them: whereas Asclepiades of Myrlea is mentioned twice and with the ethnic, Asclepiades of Tragilus is cited five times and three times without the ethnic and the title of the work. In one of these cases, however, it is in my opinion controversial which Asclepiades was cited by the scholiast, namely in Schol. Ap. Rhod. I 156-160b, 20-21 Wendel = *FGrHist* 12 F 21, as the Homeric subject (i.e. Neleus' sons) could fit also Asclepiades of Myrlea's interests. Another fragment of controversial ascription is Asclepiades of Tragilus' F 32 (Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 3,14), for which see discussion in Pagani 2007, 24-27.

[34] Theon of Alexandria is one of the three grammarians mentioned in the subscription to Apollonius Rhodius' scholia (together with Lucillus of Tarrha and Sophocleius). Theon is without doubt very receptive when it comes to geographical and etymological issues. He developed a peculiar etymological practice, *ex indole rerum*: see Guhl 1962, 9-11, Bongelli 2000, 287-90 and Merro 2015, 15-19. According to Wendel 1935, 1362-1364, Theon must have had access to early Greek mythography's works like Pherecydes' and Hellanicus', a statement which Cameron 2004, 43, 95 has rightly challenged. Didymus, who could certainly cite word-for-word some lines by Acusilaus of Argos (fr. 1 *EGM*), is the second most likely candidate. Callimachus nurtured similar interests in toponymy, as the titles of some works of his suggest (Ἐθνικαὶ Ὀνομασίαι, περὶ ὀρνέων, κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων καὶ μετονομασίαι, περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ποταμῶν): cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 123-33 and Fraser 1972, 472, 761-763.

change, but its external façade, made of material sounds, can. The second one is not less appealing: as already acknowledged since Hecataeus of Miletus, language evolves in the course of time and it does not always leave traces for succeeding generations to discover what a word used to be and to what form it should be restored. However, indirect hints can be detected in personal names, for they were given a long time ago and are thus faithful witnesses of that past time – let's think of Oeneus in fr. 15 *EGM*, for example. In a language's vocabulary, those names have to encapsulate the key features of a place (toponyms) or of that family narrative they belong to. Therefore, if words are related to history, they are a piece of evidence, a trace from the past that shapes a plot and that can help tell a compelling story. Approached in this way, etymology as historical evidence can be hailed as an arrow in the historians' bow.

King's College London
ilaria.andolfi@kcl.ac.uk

Keywords: Andron of Teos, Andron of Halicarnassus, etymologies, Greek Mythography
Parole chiave: Androne di Teo, Androne di Alicarnasso, etimologie, mitolografia greca

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

BNJ
Brill's New Jacoby, ed. I.Worthington (http://www.brillonline.nl), 2007–.

EGM
Early Greek Mythography, ed. R.L.Fowler, I. *Text and Introduction*; II. *Commentary*, Oxford 2000-2013.

FGrHist
Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, ed. F.Jacoby, I. *Genealogie und Mythographie*, Leipzig 1923, Leiden 1957[2]; II. *Zeitgeschichte* (1926-1930, 1961-1963[2]); III. *Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)* (1940, 1955-1957[2]).

Ademollo 2011
F.Ademollo, *The Cratylus of Plato: a Commentary*, Cambridge 2011.

Allen 2005
J.Allen, *The Stoics on the Origin of Language and the Foundation of Etymology*, in D.Frede – B.Inwood (ed.), *Language and Learning. Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age. Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum*, Cambridge 2005, 14-35.

Alpers 1990
K.Alpers, *Griechische Lexicographie in Antike and Mittelalter*, in H.-A.Koch – A.Krup-Ebert (ed.), *Welt der Information: Wissen und Wissenvermittlung in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Stuttgart, 14-38.

Anceschi 2007
B.Anceschi, *Die Götternamen in Platons Kratylos. Ein Vergleich mit dem Papyrus von Derveni*, Frankfurt am Main 2007.

Andolfi 2017
I.Andolfi, *Hecataeus Milesius: a Textual Approach to Selected Fragments from the Genealogies*, in T.Derda – J.Hilder – J.Kwapisz (ed.), *Fragments, Holes and Wholes: Reconstructing the Ancient World in Theory and Practice*, Warsaw 2017, 91-108.

Arrighetti 1987
G.Arrighetti, *Poeti, eruditi e biografi. Momenti della riflessione dei greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa 1987.

Blank 1982
D.Blank, *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar. The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*, Chico 1982.

Blank 2005
D.Blank, *Varro's Anti-analogist*, in D.Frede – B.Inwood (ed.), *Language and Learning. Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age. Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum*, Cambridge 2005, 210-238.
Blank - Atherton 2003
D.Blank – C.Atherton, *The Stoic Contribution to Traditional Grammar*, in B.Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, Cambridge 2003, 310-327.
Bongelli 2000
P.Bongelli, *Frammenti del commento di Teone a Callimaco*, in: G.Arrighetti – M.Tulli (ed.), *Letteratura e Riflessione sulla letteratura nella cultura classica*, Pisa 2000, 281-290.
Brucale 2003
L.Brucale, *Norma e deviazione. La 'teoria patologica' nel Περὶ συντάξεως di Apollonio Discolo*, Palermo 2003.
Cameron 2004
A.Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, New York 2004.
Colvin 2007
M.Colvin, *Heraclitean Flux and Unity of Opposites in Plato's 'Theaetetus' and 'Cratylus'*, «Classical Quarterly» LVII (2007), 759-769.
Corradi 2012
M.Corradi, *Protagora tra filologia e filosofia: la testimonianza di Aristotele*, Pisa 2012.
Dawson 1992
D.Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford 2012.
Dickey 2019
E.Dickey, *What does a Linguistic Expert Know? The Conflict between Analogy and Atticism*, in S.A.Adams (ed.), *Scholastic Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras. Greek, Latin, and Jewish*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 103-118.
Dolcetti 2019
P.Dolcetti, *Androne di Alicarnasso. Testimonianze e Frammenti*, Alessandria 2019.
Erbse 1950
H.Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den Attizistischen Lexica*, Berlin 1950.
Goody - Watt 1963
J.Goody – I.Watt, *The Consequences of Literacy*, «Comparative Studies in Society and History» V (1963), 304-345.

Ivantchik 1997
A.I.Ivantchik, *Les légends de fondation de Sinope du Pont*, «Revue des Ètudes Anciennes» XCIX (1997), 33-45.
Fraser 1972
P.M.Fraser, *Ptoloemaic Alexandria*, Oxford 1972.
Fowler 1921
Plato, *Cratylus, Parmenides, Greater Hippias, Lesser Hippias*, with an English translation of H.N.Fowler Cambridge MA 1921.
Fowler 1996
R.L.Fowler, *Herodotus and his Contemporaries*, «The Journal of Hellenic Studies» CXVI (1006), 62-87.
Fowler 1999
R.L.Fowler, *Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue and the Creation of the Hellenes*, «Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society» XLIV (1999), 1-19.
Guhl 1969
C.Guhl, *Die Fragmente des Alexandrinischen Grammatikers Theon*, Hamburg 1969.
Harrison 1998
T.Harrison, *Herodotus' Conception of Foreign Languages*, «Histos» II (1998), 1-45.
Hawes 2014
G.Hawes, *Rationalizing Myth in Antiquity*, Oxford 2014.
Henry 1986
M.Henry, *The Derveni Commentator as Literary Critic*, «Transactions of the American Philological Association» CXVI (1986), 149-164.
Hoenig 2019
C.Hoenig, *Notes on the Etymologies in Plato's Cratylus*, «Classical Quarterly» LXIX (2019), 557-565.
Hunter 2016
R.Hunter, *'Palaephatus', Strabo, and the Boundaries of Myth*, «Classical Philology» CXI (2016), 245-261.
Hunter – Laemmle 2020
R.Hunter – R.Laemmle, *Pulling Apollo Apart*, «Mnemosyne» LXXIII (2020), 377-404.
Kanavou 2015
N.Kanavou, *The Names of Homeric Heroes. Problems and Interpretations*, Berlin-Boston 2015.
Kennedy 2005
Invention and Method. Two Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus. The Greek

Text, Edited by Hugo Rabe, Translated with Introductions and Notes by G.A.Kennedy, Atlanta 2005.

Kim 2010
L.Kim, *The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic*, in E.J.Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Malden MA-Oxford 2010, 468-482.

Lallot 1995
J.Lallot, *Analogie et pathologie dans la grammaire alexandrine*, «Lalies» XV (1995), 109-123.

Lallot 2011
J.Lallot, *Did the Alexandrian Grammarians have a Sense of History?*, in S.Matthaios – F.Montanari – A.Rengakos (ed.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, Berlin-New York 2011, 241-250.

Lamb 1930
W.R.M.Lamb, *Lysias*, Cambridge MA 1930.

Levin 2001
S.B.Levin, *The Ancient Quarrel between Philosophy and Poetry Revisited. Plato and the Greek Literary Tradition*, Oxford 2001.

Long 1996
A.A.Long, *Stoic Studies*, Cambridge 1966.

Matthaios 2013
S.Matthaios, *Pollux' Onomastikon im Kontext der attizistischen Lexicographie. Gruppen 'anonymer Sprecher' und ihre Stellung in der Sprachgeschichte und Stilistik*, in Ch.Mauduit (ed.), *L'Onomasticon de Pollux: aspect culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographique*, Lyon 2013, 67-140.

Merro 2015
G.Merro, *P.Oxy. XVII 2085: un 'nuovo' commentario di Teone?*, «Aegyptus» XCV (2015), 3-24.

Mirto 2007
M.S.Mirto, *Etimologia del nome e identità eroica: interpretationi umane e divine*, «Il nome nel testo» IX (2007), 221-229.

Müller 2003
R.Müller, *Konzeptionen des Sprachwandels in der Antike*, «Hermes» CXXXI (2003), 196-221.

Nenci 1951
G.Nenci, *Ecateo da Mileto e la questione del suo razionalismo*, «Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei» VI (1951), 53-58.

Nenci 1967
G.Nenci, *La storiografia preerodotea*, «Critica storica» VI (1967), 1-22.

Nifadopoulos 2003
C.Nifadopoulos, *Reconstructing Herodian's Pathology: in defence of the Principles of Ancient Etymology*, in C.Nifadopoulos (ed.), *Etymologia. Studies in Ancient Etymology*, Münster 2003, 89-102.

O' Hara 2017[2]
J.O'Hara, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay. Second and Expanded Edition*, Ann Arbor [1996[1]].

Obbink 2003
D.Obbink, *Allegory and Exegesis in the Derveni Papyrus: The Origins of Greek scholarship*, in G.R.Boys-Stones (ed.), *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition. Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*, Oxford 2003, 177-188.

Pagani 2007
Asclepiade di Mirlea, *I frammenti degli scritti omerici*, Introduzione, edizione e commento di L.Pagani, Roma 2007.

Patillon 2014
Corpus Rhetoricum. Pseudo-Hermogène. La Méthode de l'habilete. Maxime. Les Objections irréfutables. Anonyme. Méthode des discours d'adresse, texte établi et traduit par M.P.Patillon, Paris 2014.

Peraki-Kyriakidou 2002
H.Peraki-Kyriakidou, *Aspect of Ancient Etymologyzing*, «Classical Quarterly» LII (2002), 478-493.

Pfeiffer 1968
R.Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginning to the end of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.

Piras 2017
G.Piras, *Dicam dumtaxat quod est historicon: Varro and/on the Past*, «Bulletin of The Institute of Classical Studies» LX (2017), 8-20.

Pontani 2011
F.M.Pontani, *Ex Homero grammatica*, in S.Matthaios – F.Montanari – A.Rengakos (ed.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, Berlin-New York 2011, 87-104.

Probert 2011
Ph.Probert, *Attic Irregularities: their Reinterpretation in the Light of Atticism*, in S.Matthaios – F.Montanari – A.Rengakos (ed.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, Berlin-New York 2011, 269-290.

Reinhardt 2008
T.Reinhardt, *Epicurus and Lucretius on the Origins of Language*, «Classical Quarterly» LVIII (2008), 127-140.

Reitzenstein 1896
R.Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzant*, Leipzig 1896.
Romano 2003
E.Romano, *Il concetto di antico in Varrone*, in M.Citroni (ed.), *Memoria e identità. La cultura romana costruisce la sua immagine*, Firenze 2003, 99-107.
Santoni 2000
A.Santoni, *Palefato. Storie Incredibili*, Pisa 2000.
Schironi 2009
F.Schironi, *From Alexandria to Babylon: Near Eastern Languages and Hellenistic Erudition in Oxyrhynchus Glossary (P.Oxy. 1802 + 4812)*, Berlin-New York 2009.
Schmid 1964
W.Schmid, *Der Attizismus in seinen Hauptvertreten*, I-V, Stuttgart 1964.
Sedley 1998
D.Sedley, *The Etymologies in Plato's Cratylus*, «The Journal for Hellenic Studies» CXVIII (1998), 140-154.
Sluiter 1990
I.Sluiter, *Ancient Grammar in Context*, Amsterdam 1990.
Sluiter 2015
I.Sluiter, *Ancient Etymology: a Tool for Thinking*, in F.Montanari – S.Matthaios – A.Rengakos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, II, Leiden-Boston 2015, 896-922.
Varto 2015
E.Varto, *Stories Told in Lists: Formulaic Genealogies as Intentional Histories*, «Journal of Ancient History» III (2015), 118-149.
Vergados 2020
A.Vergados, *Hesiod's Verbal Craft. Studies in Hesiod's Conception of Language and its Ancient Reception*, Oxford 2020.
Verlinsky 2005
A.Verlinsky, *Epicurus and His Predecessors on the Origin of Language*, in D. Frede – B.Inwood (ed.), *Language and Learning. Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age. Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum*, Cambridge 2005, 56-100.
Voigtlander 1995
H.-D.Voigtländer, *Sprachphilosophie bei Heraklit*, «Hermes» CXXIII (1995), 139-155.
Wackernagel 1876
J.Wackernagel, *De pathologiae veterum initiis*, Diss. Basileae1876 [repr. In Id., *Kleine Schriften*, III, Göttingen 1979, 1427-1486].

Wendel 1935
C.Wendel, *Mythographie*, in *RE* XVI 2, (1935), 1352-1374.
Zanker 2016
A.Zanker, *Greek and Latin Expressions of Meaning. The Classical Origins of a Modern Metaphor,* München 2016.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32053 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 111-134*

MICHAEL PASCHALIS

Between Theory and Practice
Etymologizing Proper Names in Plato's *Cratylus* and Athenian tragedy

The present study compares the explicit etymology of the name Ὀρέστης *in Plato's* Cratylus *and its implicit etymology in 5th century Athenian tragedy. In* Cratylus *the etymology in question is included in the group of Pelopid names; the name is associated with* ὄρος (*'mountain'*) *and would have been given to* Ὀρέστης *by chance or some poet in order to indicate the 'wildness' of his nature* (τὸ θηριῶδες τῆς φύσεως καὶ τὸ ἄγριον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὀρεινὸν). *Differently from Plato, who probably based his etymology of* Ὀρέστης *on the 'savagery' he displayed in the murder of his mother, in the three matricide tragedies* (*Aeschylus'* Choephori, *Sophocles'* Electra *and Euripides'* Electra) *the etymological focus is placed on the event of recognition:* Ὀρέστης *is the person 'seen' again* (ὁρᾶν) *and 'recognized' by Electra and other characters. By contrast in Euripides'* Orestes *we encounter all the ingredients of the platonic etymology: Tyndareus compares Orestes to a snake, calls lawless revenge 'bestiality'* (τὸ θηριῶδες), *and condemns the 'wild rage'* (ἠγρίωσ') *which drove him to matricide; the Phrygian slave compares Orestes and Pylades, armed and threatening Helen with death, to 'wild mountain boars'* (ὡς κάπροι δ' ὀρέστεροι)*; and later Menelaus refers to them as 'twin lions'.*

Il contributo paragona l'etimologia esplicita del nome Ὀρέστης *nel* Cratilo *platonico con l'etimologia implicita dello stesso nome nella tragedia ateniese del V secolo a.C. Nel* Cratilo *l'etimologia di* Ὀρέστης *è compresa nel gruppo di nomi della stirpe dei Pelopidi; il nome è collegato a* ὄρος (*'montagna'*), *a suggerire la natura 'selvaggia' dell'eroe* (τὸ θηριῶδες τῆς φύσεως καὶ τὸ ἄγριον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὀρεινὸν). *Diversamente da Platone, il quale ha probabilmente basato la suddetta etimologia sulla ferocia che l'eroe aveva dimostrato nell'uccidere sua madre, le tre tragedie che trattano l'argomento del matricidio* (*le* Coefore *di Eschilo, l'*Elettra *di Sofocle e l'*Elettra *euripidea*) *mettono l'accento etimologico sul riconoscimento:* Ὀρέστης *sarebbe in principio la persona 'vista' di nuovo* (ὁρᾶν) *e 'riconosciuta' da Elettra e altri personaggi. Invece nell'*Oreste *di Euripide s'incontrano tutti i componenti semantici dell'etimologia platonica: Tindareo paragona Oreste a un serpente, chiama la vendetta senza legge 'bestialità'* (τὸ θηριῶδες) *e condanna la 'rabbia selvaggia'* (ἠγρίωσ') *che ha spinto l'eroe al matricidio; lo schiavo frigio paragona Oreste e Pilade, che sono armati e minacciano di uccidere Elena, a «cinghiali montanari»* (ὡς κάπροι δ' ὀρέστεροι)*; e più tardi Menelao descrive la coppia di amici come «due leoni».*

1. *Cratylian etymologies and the literary tradition*

Ancient etymologizing exploited primarily sound similarities between words both in theory (explicit) and in practice (explicit or implicit). Etymologies provided by philosophers, grammarians, scholiasts are limited in number and known to us, and the same applies to explicit or almost explicit etymologies (like Χάρυβδις ἀναρρυβδεῖ, Hom. *Od*. 12.104; Petr. 36.7 *Carpe Carpe*) embedded in literary texts[1]. By contrast, implicit etymologizing is unpredictable and virtually inexhaustible, because it is contextual and context interpretation changes over time. Thus there are always instances which become known only when a competent reader digs them up. Proper names in particular, which are the focus of this paper, constitute

[1] Etymological surveys like McCartney 1919, Sulzberger 1926, and Woodhead 1928 provide a good idea of this kind of etymologies.

a complex case: depending on the literary context they may unfold existing meanings or generate new ones and in addition these may change or evolve in the course of a narrative. If they are compound names, their semantic components may function independently of each other thus multiplying their generative potential[2].

Coincidence and interaction between etymological theory and practice was not uncommon: literature sometimes exploited the fruit of treatises on etymology and in other cases ancient etymologists constructed explanations out of literary texts, by observing the juxtaposition of similar-sounding words or various contextual features. Conflict between theory and practice was also not uncommon. The etymologies of Plato's *Cratylus*, the most prominent theoretical exposition on the meaning of names in Classical Greece, offer a substantial source of material for comparison with the preceding literary tradition. Platonic 'philosophical' etymologies of names of heroes and gods are in most cases not confirmed by earlier explicit or implicit 'literary' etymologies, in the sense that literary texts do not document them or provide / suggest different etymologies. Implicit etymologizing is far more widespread in poetry than explicit and provides valuable evidence for putting Cratylian etymologies to the test.

Cratylus is a dialogue on the 'correctness' of names, where two opposite views are represented: 'naturalism', according to which each thing has its own natural name, and 'conventionalism', according to which names are determined by convention and in an arbitrary manner. The former is held by Cratylus and the latter by Hermogenes. Though dedicating more space to the refutation of Hermogenes' conventionalism, Socrates criticizes both views and consequently his own view on the subject, if any, is still a debated issue. Another open issue is the character of Socrates's etymologies, whether they are seriously intended or are meant to undermine etymological practice[3].

What is the origin of Cratylian etymologies? According to Socrates, names were given in the past (and it is implied that they are still given) by an unspecified 'lawgiver' (νομοθέτης). As Ademollo points out, this 'lawgiver' is rather a 'species' than an individual: he is mostly anonymous and can be one or many, a poet, men, gods, chance, a divine force; or he can be identified with specific poets (like Homer and Hesiod) and even with 'thought' (διάνοια)[4].

As noted above Socratic 'philosophical' etymologies of proper names differ as a rule from 'literary' etymologies. A notable exception is the etymology of Ἀφροδίτη

[2] Paschalis 1997, 3-4; also Paschalis 2003, 2020.

[3] Typical exponents of the respective schools of interpretation are Sedley 2003 and Baxter 1992.

[4] Ademollo 2011, 122-123.

(406c7-d1), where Socrates accepts without question the Hesiodic etymology from ἀφρός (*The.* 195-197)[5]. Susan Levin has argued that in the etymological section of *Cratylus* (390e-427d) Plato consciously takes as a central opponent the literary tradition from Homer to Euripides. In this respect she has furthermore observed that Plato's terminology concerning the 'appropriateness' of names, and principally the adverbs ὀρθῶς, ἀληθῶς, δικαίως, καλῶς, parallels that employed in the literary tradition[6].

The present study compares the etymology of Orestes in *Cratylus* and in 5th century Athenian tragedy. In *Cratylus* the etymology in question is included in the group of Pelopid (Tantalid) names, the listing of which proceeds backwards from son to father: Orestes, Agamemnon, Atreus, Pelops, Tantalus, Zeus, Cronus, Uranus (394ε8-396c2). In order to give an idea of Socratic etymologizing I quote the etymologies of the Pelopids leaving out their divine ancestors[7]:

> Ὀρέστης means 'Mountain-man', a name given to him by chance (τύχη) or some poet in order to indicate the 'wildness' of his nature (τὸ θηριῶδες τῆς φύσεως καὶ τὸ ἄγριον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὀρεινὸν). Ἀγαμέμνων derives from ἀγαστὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐπιμονήν, 'admirable for holding his ground', because of 'the stay of his army in Troy and his perseverance'. Ἀτρεύς derives simultaneously from ἀτειρές 'stubborness', ἄτρεστον 'boldness', and ἀτηρόν 'destructivess', because of his murder of Chrysippus and his cruelty to Thyestes. Πέλοψ means 'near-sighted' (τὸν τὰ ἐγγὺς ὁρῶντα), because "according to legend, he didn't think about or foresee what the long-term consequences of murdering Myrtilus would be for his entire family, or all the misery that would overwhelm them; in his eagerness to win Hippodameia by any available means, he saw only what was ready to hand and on the spot – that is to say, what was nearby (πέλας)". Τάνταλος was so called because "in Hades, after his death, he had a stone 'suspended' (ταλαντεία) over his head, in wondrous harmony with his name. It's exactly as if someone had wished to name him 'Ταλάντατος' ('Most-weighed upon') but has disguised the name and said 'Τάνταλος' instead".

Is there a quality distinction between this kind of etymologies and literary ones? In Socrates' view names are encoded descriptions, which only the expert etymologist is able to 'extract' from the current form of the name. This is what he says about the meaning of Atreus: «the form of his name is slightly deflected and hidden, so that it does not make the man's nature plain to every one; but to those who understand about names it makes the meaning of Atreus plain enough»

[5] «As far as Aphrodite is concerned, there's no point in contradicting Hesiod […]».

[6] See Levin 1995, 1996, and 1997.

[7] Text by Duke et al. 1995; translation by Reeve 1998.

(395b5-9). The truth of the matter is that the above-mentioned etymologies do not suggest 'privileged' knowledge. They are evaluations of character or actions and events in the mythical accounts concerning these heroes, which were imposed upon the form of each name not by an original but by an a posteriori name-giver (Socrates). Thus the conception of etymologizing in the above-mentioned names does not differ substantially from what we find in earlier poetry. Furthermore Cratylian etymologies lack the consistency of philosophical thought, which would have set them at a level 'above' ordinary literary etymologizing. For instance, though in 394d-e Socrates argues that a son should have a name ascribing to him the same nature as his father's – unless he is some kind of monster – and though the names of the genealogy of the Pelopids are intended to confirm this rule, in fact each name is analyzed on its own[8]. In addition Socrates, having completed the presentation of these etymologies, in essence retracts what he had said about their 'correctness', when he admits that human names may be deceiving[9].

2. *A note on methodology*

In implicit poetic etymologizing there is no fixed 'correctness' of names. As I noted above, implicit meaning is strictly contextual. In platonic terms the 'law-giver' of etymological meaning is the poetic context, whether one believes that it conveys 'authorial intent' (*intentio auctoris*) or its own 'intent' (*intentio operis*) as understood and interpreted each time by the competent reader. In identifying implicit etymologies there cannot be (absolute) certainty as when the etymology is spelled out loud and clear: «His name shall be Aeneas (Αἰνείας), because I was seized by a terrible grief (αἰνὸν ἄχος), in that I fell into the bed of a mortal man» (*Hom. h.* 5.198-199). There always lurks the risk of mistaking sound similarity for etymological meaning. Furthermore one may be tempted to apply later, and especially allegorical, etymologies to early texts, thus causing readers to believe that they are reading Homer while in fact they are reading Heraclitus' *Homeric Problems* in disguise[10].

There is lesser risk when a name is found inserted in a 'semantic cluster', that is if it is grouped together with one or more semantically related words (synonyms,

[8] Ademollo 2011, 179.

[9] 397b «The names that heroes and men are said to have might perhaps deceive us. After all, as we saw at the beginning, they are often given because they are the names of ancestors, and some of them are wholly inappropriate. Many, too, are given in the hope that they will prove appropriate».

[10] Cf. Tsitsibakou-Vasalos 2007, with my review in *BMCR* 2008.07.58.

antonyms, hyponyms ad words which the poet tends to associate), which 'gloss', and more properly suggest or evoke, its meaning. When the name is 'transparent' (like 'Astyanax') it is relatively easier to identify its etymology. When it is partially or fully 'opaque' (like 'Sisyphus') any 'segment' of it (= part of a word not recognized by morphology) can 'acquire' meaning in the appropriate semantic environment[11]. In matters concerning the relation of etymology to morphology ancient views differed substantially from ours: in the platonic examples quoted above etymologizing involves arbitrary addition, subtraction or transposition of letters[12]. The same applies in varying degrees to literary etymologizing, with one major difference: Platonic etymologizing functions out of context; literary etymologizing, especially implicit, is context-dependent.

The following passage (Pindar *N*. 10.60-70), treating the mythical fight between the sons of Aphareus, Idas and Lynceus, and the Dioscuri, Castor and Polydeuces, is intended to illustrate the function and significance of semantic clusters in evoking nuances of meaning in the proper names Λυγκεύς and Ἀφαρ-ητίδαι[13]:

τὸν γὰρ Ἴδας ἀμφὶ βουσίν πως χολω-
    θεὶς **ἔτρωσεν** χαλκέας **λόγχας ἀκμᾷ.**
ἀπὸ Ταϋγέτου **πεδαυγά-**
    ζων ἴδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει
ἡμένους. κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων πάν-
    των γένετ' **ὀξύτατον**
ὄμμα. **λαιψηροῖς** δὲ πόδεσσιν **ἄφαρ**
ἐξικέσθαν, καὶ μέγα ἔργον ἐμήσαντ' **ὠκέως**
καὶ πάθον δεινὸν παλάμαις **Ἀφαρ**ητί-
    δαι Διός. **αὐτίκα** γὰρ
ἦλθε Λήδας παῖς **διώκων**· τοὶ δ' ἔναντα στάθεν τύμβῳ σχεδὸν πατρωΐῳ·
ἔνθεν ἁρπάξαντες ἄγαλμ' Ἀΐδα, ξεστὸν πέτρον,
ἔμβαλον στέρνῳ Πολυδεύκεος· ἀλλ' οὔ νιν φλάσαν,
οὐδ' ἀνέχασσαν· ἐφορμαθεὶς δ' ἄρ' **ἄκοντι θοῷ**,
ἤλασε **Λυγκέος** ἐν πλευραῖσι χαλκόν.

For Idas, somehow angry about cattle,
    wounded him with the point of his bronze spear.
Watching from Taygetus, Lynceus had seen them
    sitting in the hollow trunk of an oak tree,

[11] See Paschalis 1997, 4-5; and further Paschalis 2003, 2020.
[12] Sedley 2003, 80-81.
[13] Text and translation by Race 1997.

for of all mortals
    he had the sharpest
eyesight. The sons of Aphareus came at once
on swift feet and quickly devised a mighty deed,
and they suffered terribly
    at the hands of Zeus, for immediately
the son of Leda came in pursuit, while they took
    a stand against him beside their father's tomb.
From it they seized the grave marker of polished stone
and threw it against Polydeuces' chest, but they did not
    crush him
or drive him back. He attacked them then with his swift
    javelin
and drove the bronze into Lynceus' side.

The lines concerning Lynceus (ἀπὸ Ταϋγέτου […] ὄμμα) are organized around the notion of 'sight', highlighting specifically the 'sharpness' of his vision and thus suggesting the association of his name with 'lynx' (λύγξ), a wildcat with an eyesight so strong that enables it to spot a small animal from a long distance. Furthermore Lynceus' ὀξύτατον ὄμμα interacts semantically with the literal meaning of ὀξύς as applied to the 'point' of a weapon (as in Hom. *Il.* 10.335 ὀξὺν ἄκοντα) and suggested by λόγχας ἀκμᾷ, Ida's 'spearpoint' that killed Castor[14]. In the next section (λαιψηροῖς […] διώκων) the name 'Ἀφαρητίδαι' is surrounded by words indicating 'speed' and 'immediacy'. The latter include 'ἄφαρ' at the end of line 63, which 'glosses' a segment of 'Ἀφαρητί- /δαι' placed at the end of line 66, probably suggesting that the swift end of the sons of Aphareus is inherent in their patronymic. The end of 'Lynceus' (69-70) is highly ironic: the hero with the 'sharpest' eyesight that had spotted the Dioscuri from a great distance is killed 'ἄκοντι θοῷ', that is by the 'pointed head' of a spear that strikes him from afar, while his 'swift' death brings his earlier 'rush' to battle to a bitter conclusion. His end had been semantically 'prefigured' by the interaction of his ὀξύτατον ὄμμα with λόγχας ἀκμᾷ, the 'spearpoint' that killed Castor.

3. Ὀρέστης *in tragedy: Aeschylus'* Choephori, *Sophocles'* Electra, *and Euripides'* Electra

The myths relating to the Pelopids were a favorite theme of Athenian tragedy and it is obviously there that one should look for confirmation of relative Cra-

[14] Cf. the meanings of Latin *acies*, 'edge or point of a weapon'; 'vision'.

tylian etymologies, though Socrates does not mention any of the three tragedians and his pronouncements about tragedy are negative[15]. The most common of the Pelopid names is Orestes: he appears as a character in seven plays and is mentioned in two more[16]. The etymological treatment of the name is not, however, uniform. No explicit etymology is provided in any of them but there are probable or possible implicit etymologies. Taking into account what I believe to be the most significant instances[17], these plays can be divided into two groups. The first group contains the three matricide plays: Aeschylus' *Choephori*, Sophocles' *Electra* and Euripides' *Electra*; the second group includes only Euripides' *Orestes*.

I start with the first group. The most prominent and conspicuous semantic association of the name Ὀρέστης in this group, based on the semantic clusters in which it is found, is with the verb ὁρᾶν ('see'), cognates, synonyms and terms belonging to the semantic field of vision and light[18]. The grouping of the name with such terms in conjunction with the poetic context impart meaning to the segment Ὀρ- by exploiting the sound similarity with ὁρᾶν.

Here is the poetic context that explains this association. The secret return of Orestes to Argos (Mycenae) and his recognition by Electra is the pivotal prerequisite of the main event with which he became associated, the killing of his

[15] 408c5-9 «Well, the true part is smooth and divine and dwells among the gods above, while the false part dwells below among the human masses, and is rough and goatish (τραγικόν); for it is here, in the tragic life (τραγικόν), that one finds the vast majority of myths and falsehoods»; 425d5-7 «Unless you want us to behave like tragic poets, who introduce a *deus ex machina* whenever they're perplexed».

[16] He appears in Aeschylus' *Choephori* and *Eumenides*; in Sophocles' *Electra*; and in Euripides' *Electra*, *Orestes*, *Andromache*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*. He is mentioned in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*.

[17] I do not consider minor ancient and modern suggestions. In antiquity there was also Proclus' etymology, 47.22-24 Pasquali: καλείτω τοίνυν ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων τὸν παῖδα Ὀ ρ έ σ τ η ν μὴ διὰ τὴν ἀγριότητα τοῦ ἤθους, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ὁρμὴν καὶ τὴν εὐκινησίαν παρὰ τὸ ὀ ρ ο ύ ε ι ν («So let us suppose that Agamemnon calls his son "Orestes" not for his wildness of character but for his vigor and quickness of movement deriving his name from ὀρούειν [to rush forward]», tr. by Duvick 2007). I also leave out minor modern etymological suggestions, like: Fuochi 1898, 309 on Eur. *Or*. 1644, from ὅρος; Willink 1986, 140 on Eur. *Or*. 328, from ὀρεχθεὶς.

[18] Tsitsibakou-Vasalos 2007, 216-221, offers the most extensive modern discussion of the name Orestes but her treatment is unconvincing and somewhat chaotic from a methodological viewpoint: she takes into consideration, simultaneously and without distinction, all possible etymologies (including Proclus') and assigns to Orestes a multiple etymological identity derived from all the other Pelopids. Her discussion of 'vision' is unfocused and confusing, leaving out, except for a brief and marginal mention (218), the pivotal recognition scenes.

mother Clytemnestra (and Aegisthus) in revenge for his father's murder. The recognition of Orestes follows the same pattern in the three tragedians: Orestes makes offerings in secret at the tomb of Agamemnon; the tokens of his presence are noticed by Electra or a third party; Orestes is eventually recognized by Electra either directly or through the mediation of a third party. Unlike Plato, who most probably based his etymology of Ὀρέστης on an evaluation of the hero's 'savagery' displayed in the murder of his mother, the three tragedians became mainly interested in the event of recognition: Ὀρέστης is the person 'seen' again (ὁρᾶν) and 'recognized' by Electra[19].

Though the circumstances of recognition are different each time, the name Ὀρέστης is always inserted in clusters of verbs and nouns indicating 'sight' – *unlike* the mutual recognition of Orestes and Iphigenia in *Iphigenia in Tauris*[20]. Most importantly, Ὀρέστης and ὁρᾶν are always found at the climax of the recognition scene and thus in the three tragedians the identity and the etymology of Ὀρέστης are established at the same time. All things considered, the association of the name with ὁρᾶν is neither accidental nor self-evident; and thus it cannot be intended merely to exploit an acoustic similarity but very probably to create meaning.

3.1. *Aeschylus'* Choephori*:* Ὀρέστης *'recognized' as* τερπνὸν ὄμμα

In the first epeisodion of Aeschylus' *Choephori* (84-305) Electra, accompanied by the chorus of women, has come to the tomb of Agamemnon at Argos, close to the royal palace. She prays to Hermes to carry her message to her father and then calls upon him to have pity on herself and Orestes. In 131-139 she prays for her brother's return[21] using a striking metaphor: «kindle a light in your house in the shape of my Orestes» (φίλον τ' Ὀρέστην φῶς ἄναψον ἐν δόμοις)[22]. Having poured libations at Agamemnon's tomb she notices (and picks up) a lock of hair – previously placed there by her brother (7) – which resembles her own and could belong to «the person [she] most love[s] in the world, Orestes» (193-194 τοῦ φιλτάτου / βροτῶν Ὀρέστου). In a mental state of confusion and hope she makes another appeal to the gods (201). Then she notices «footprints that are similar to her own» (206). She follows the prints away from the tomb until she comes to Orestes'

[19] I am not concerned here with sporadic juxtapositions of Ὀρέστης with ὁρᾶν which occur in several tragedies.

[20] 725-901, esp. 827-933. In this play there is only an *after the fact* confirmation of the event by Pylades in 902-903 τὸ μὲν φίλους ἐλθόντας **εἰς ὄψιν** φίλων, / **Ὀρέστα**, χειρῶν περιβολὰς εἰκὸς λαβεῖν·

[21] 138-139 ἐλθεῖν δ' Ὀρέστην δεῦρο σὺν τύχῃ τινὶ / κατεύχομαί σοι, καὶ σὺ κλῦθί μου, πάτερ·

[22] On the text see Garvie 1986, 77-78.

hiding-place; she is in state of extreme anguish, when Orestes steps out from his hiding place and identifies himself (212-239)[23]:

ΟΡ. εὔχου τὰ λοιπά, τοῖς θεοῖς τελεσφόρους
εὐχὰς ἐπαγγέλλουσα, τυγχάνειν καλῶς.
ΗΛ. ἐπεὶ τί νῦν ἕκατι δαιμόνων κυρῶ;
ΟΡ. **εἰς ὄψιν ἥκεις** ὧνπερ ἐξηύχου πάλαι. 215
ΗΛ. καὶ τίνα σύνοισθά μοι καλουμένῃ βροτῶν;
ΟΡ. σύνοιδ᾽ Ὀρέστην πολλά σ᾽ ἐκπαγλουμένην.
ΗΛ. καὶ πρὸς τί δῆτα τυγχάνω κατευγμάτων;
ΟΡ. ὅδ᾽ εἰμί· μὴ μάστευ᾽ ἐμοῦ μᾶλλον φίλον.
ΗΛ. ἀλλ᾽ ἦ δόλον τιν᾽ ὦ ξέν᾽ ἀμφί μοι πλέκεις; 220
ΟΡ. αὐτὸς κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ τἄρα μηχανορραφῶ.
ΗΛ. ἀλλ᾽ ἐν κακοῖσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς γελᾶν θέλεις;
ΟΡ. κἀν τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἄρ᾽, εἴπερ ἔν γε τοῖσι σοῖς.
ΗΛ. **ὡς ὄντ᾽ Ὀρέστην** γάρ σ᾽ ἐγὼ προσεννέπω;
<ΟΡ.> αὐτὸν μὲν οὖν **ὁρῶσα** δυσμαθεῖς ἐμέ, 225
κουρὰν δ᾽ **ἰδοῦσα** τήνδε κηδείου τριχὸς
ἀνεπτερώθης κἀδόκεις **ὁρᾶν** ἐμέ,
ἰχνοσκοποῦσά τ᾽ ἐν στίβοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς
<. . . . . .>
σαυτῆς ἀδελφοῦ ξυμμέτρου τῷ σῷ κάρᾳ·
σκέψαι τομῇ προσθεῖσα βόστρυχον τριχός. 230
ἰδοῦ δ᾽ ὕφασμα τοῦτο, σῆς ἔργον χερός,
σπάθης τε πληγάς ἠδὲ θήρειον γραφήν –
[…]
ΗΛ. ὦ φίλτατον μέλημα δώμασιν πατρός,
δακρυτὸς ἐλπὶς σπέρματος σωτηρίου·
ὦ τερπνὸν **ὄμμα**, τέσσαρας μοίρας ἔχον
ἐμοί·

OR. Pray to the gods for continued success, proclaiming to them
that your previous prayers have been fulfilled!
EL. Why, what success have the gods now granted me?
OR. You have come face to face with the one you have long prayed for.
EL. How can you know who I've been crying for?
OR. I'm aware that you were very much extolling Orestes.
EL. And in what way, may I ask, have I now gained what I prayed for?
OR. I am he. Don't try to find one that's more your friend than I am.
EL. Look here, stranger, are you trying to weave some web of trickery around me?
OR. If I am, then I must be hatching plots against myself!

[23] Text by West 1998; translation by Sommerstein 2009 (slightly modified).

EL. What, will you laugh at my sufferings?
OR. If I'm laughing at yours, then I'm also laughing at my own.
EL. You mean —should I be addressing you as Orestes?
OR. So when you see me in person you're reluctant to recognize me
— whereas when you saw this cut lock of mourning,
your heart took wing and you imagined you could see me,
and when you were examining the tracks of my feet
< . . . . . >
it's your own brother's, and it matches that of your own head.
Put the lock of hair next to the place it was cut from,
and take a look. And look at this piece of weaving,
the work of your hands, the strokes of the batten
and the picture of a beast.
[…]
EL. Dearest one, treasure of your father's house!
The seed we wept for, in the hope it would sprout and save us!
O joyful light, you fill four roles for me[24].

Orestes identifies himself with an expression of vision: εἰς ὄψιν ἥκεις («you have come face to face», «you have before your eyes»), but Electra remains unconvinced and suspicious, even when her brother utters his own name (217). When she utters the name of Ὀρέστης herself (224), her brother replies using ὁρῶσα and ὁρᾶν. Next Orestes invites his sister to 'examine' (σκέψαι) his lock of hair and 'look' (ἰδοῦ) at a piece of cloth, which she had woven and embroidered long ago. Having recognized Orestes Electra addresses him as ὦ τερπνὸν ὄμμα (238).

Garvie takes ὄμμα (lit. 'eye') to refer to Orestes' beloved 'face' and metaphorically to the eye as a source of 'saving light'[25]. Beyond the poetic metaphor, the association of Ὀρέστης with ὄμμα may be etymologically significant: in the context of recognition he represents a beloved 'sight'. Furthermore, the eye functions by means of light (φῶς), with which Ὀρέστης was identified by Electra in 131. All things considered, in the recognition scene the name Ὀρέστης is firmly embedded in the semantic field of 'sight' and 'light'. To be noted that Orestes is also the person who in the eyes of the chorus is expected to «kindle fire and light for freedom» (863-864 πῦρ καὶ φῶς ἐπ᾽ ἐλευθερίᾳ / δαίων). According to Garvie, the literal reference is probably to a celebration sacrifice – to be offered after the success of his vengeance plans – and the metaphorical to «a signal-beacon that will carry the good news of liberation»[26].

[24] Those of father, mother, sister, and brother.
[25] 1986, 104.
[26] Garvie 1986, 282. In connection with this passage he also reminds the reader that «The

3.2. *Sophocles'* Electra

3.2.1. *Chrysothemis and 'the mental recognition' of* Ὀρέστης

In Sophocles' *Electra* the recognition of Orestes is split between Chrysothemis and Electra: the former notices the tokens of Orestes' visit to Agamemnon's tomb and Electra is involved in the actual recognition of Orestes. In the third epeisodion (871-1057) Chrysothemis has just come back from her visit to Agamemnon's tomb and announces to Electra in an excited and joyful mood that Orestes has returned to Mycenae (877-878)[27]:

> **πάρεστ᾽ Ὀρέστης** ἡμίν, ἴσθι τοῦτ᾽ ἐμοῦ
> κλύουσ᾽, ἐναργῶς, ὥσπερ **εἰσορᾷς** ἐμέ.
>
> He's here with us! Orestes! Listen to me:
> He's here, as sure as you're seeing me now.

This is a unique case of play on both segments of Ὀρ-έστης. It does not, however, create meaning but exploits sound similarity. Chrysothemis cannot announce that she has 'seen' Orestes because she has not. By contrast, the passage in which she reports to her sister the tokens of his presence at the tomb (886 σημεῖ᾽ ἰδοῦσα) creates a familiar and at the same time unexpectedly original semantic environment for Ὀρέστης. Here it is (892-906):

> καὶ δὴ λέγω σοι πᾶν ὅσον **κατειδόμην**.
> ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἦλθον πατρὸς ἀρχαῖον τάφον,
> **ὁρῶ** κολώνης ἐξ ἄκρας νεορρύτους
> πηγὰς γάλακτος καὶ περιστεφῆ κύκλῳ 895
> πάντων ὅσ᾽ ἔστιν ἀνθέων θήκην πατρός.
> **ἰδοῦσα** δ᾽ ἔσχον θαῦμα, καὶ **περισκοπῶ**
> μή πού τις ἡμῖν ἐγγὺς ἐγχρίμπτει βροτῶν.
> ὡς δ᾽ ἐν γαλήνῃ πάντ᾽ **ἐδερκόμην** τόπον,
> τύμβου προσεῖρπον ἆσσον· ἐσχάτης δ᾽ **ὁρῶ** 900
> πυρᾶς νεώρη βόστρυχον τετμημένον·
> κεὐθὺς τάλαιν᾽ ὡς **εἶδον**, ἐμπαίει τί μοι
> ψυχῇ σύνηθες **ὄμμα**, φιλτάτου βροτῶν
> πάντων **Ὀρέστου** τοῦθ᾽ **ὁρᾶν** τεκμήριον·

idea belongs to a recurring image of the trilogy, which develops from the beacons of Agamemnon and the fires of sacrifice to the torch-light procession at the end of Eumenides».

[27] Text by Lloyd-Jones - Wilson 1990; translation by Meineck - Woodruff 2007.

καὶ χερσὶ βαστάσασα δυσφημῶ μὲν οὔ, 905
χαρᾷ δὲ πίμπλημ᾽ εὐθὺς **ὄμμα** δακρύων.

All right, I'll tell you exactly everything I saw.
When I came to Father's tomb on the ancient mound,
I saw fresh streams of milk springing from the top,
And all the flowers that are in bloom
Were twisted in a wreath to crown Father's grave.
I saw this and I was amazed. I looked around,
Thinking someone else might be there with me.
But stillness was all I could find in that place,
So I crept up on the tomb, and at the edge I saw,
On the burial site, a freshly cut lock of hair.
Then immediately my poor soul was struck
With a long-familiar precious sight – the man I love
More than anyone, Orestes. This was evidence of him!
I took and felt it with my hands, not daring to say a word,
But joy immediately filled my eyes with tears.

As evidence of Orestes' visit to the tomb of Agamemnon, Chrysothemis lists the following tokens: a milk libation, a wreath of flowers, and a lock of hair. Her account reaches its climax with exactly the same terms of vision as in the respective *Choephori* scene: ὄμμα, Ὀρέστου, and ὁρᾶν. This is not, however, an actual recognition: unlike Electra, Chrysothemis does not see and recognize her brother in the flesh. What she does is recall a 'mental image' (ψυχῇ σύνηθες ὄμμα)[28] of her beloved Ὀρέστης, which is activated by the 'sight' (ὁρᾶν) of the freshly cut lock of hair.

3.2.2. *Electra and* Ὀρέστης*: the return of 'light' and 'life'*

The recognition of Orestes by Electra takes place in the fourth epeisodion (1098-1383) before the royal palace of Mycenae. Two factors are crucial for the evaluation of the recognition from a semantic viewpoint. First, Electra has the ultimate proof that her brother is dead: she is holding in her hands the urn supposedly containing the ashes of Orestes and has just mourned him with one of the most pathetic laments in Greek tragedy (1126-1170). The stranger (Orestes) insists that she give the urn back to him before he reveals the truth (1205-1206), but Electra passionately clings to it. It is not clear when she gives back or sets down (?) the urn, but obviously she cannot be holding it when she embraces him[29]. Sec-

[28] Cf. the scholia, *ad l.*: ὅραμα, ὃ ἀεὶ ἐφανταζόμην κατὰ ψυχήν.
[29] Cf. Dunn 1996, 150; Ringer 1998, 191-192.

ondly, the recognition occurs when the direction of gaze eventually shifts from Electra to Ὀρέστης. Before the recognition it was Electra who was 'seen' by the stranger (Orestes), in whose eyes she presented a pitiful and painful 'sight' (five occasions)[30]. Then the gaze is turned from Electra to the token of recognition: the stranger reveals that Orestes is living and identifies himself, Electra wonders if this is true (1222a ἦ γὰρ σὺ κεῖνος;), and then he invites her to 'have a look' (προσβλέψασα) at their father's signet ring as proof of his identity (1222b-1223). At the moment of recognition it is Ὀρέστης who becomes the object of Electra's joyful gaze as she exclaims «Oh my light» (1224 ὦ φίλτατον φῶς) and then invites the chorus of women to «look at Orestes» (1227-1231):

ΗΛ. ὦ φίλταται γυναῖκες, ὦ πολίτιδες,
ὁρᾶτ' Ὀρέστην τόνδε, μηχαναῖσι μὲν
θανόντα, νῦν δὲ μηχαναῖς σεσωμένον.
ΧΟ. **ὁρῶμεν**, ὦ παῖ, κἀπὶ συμφοραῖσί μοι
γεγηθὸς ἕρπει δάκρυον **ὀμμάτων** ἄπο.

EL.: Dearest women, women of the city,
Look, here's Orestes. It was only a trick
That he was dead, and that trick has kept him alive!
CH: We see him, dear child. Such good luck!
Joy brings tears to our eyes.

The exclamation ὦ φίλτατον φῶς varies ὦ τερπνὸν ὄμμα (*Cho*. 238) discussed above and identifies the 'sight' of Ὀρέστης with 'light'. Here the light metaphor probably involves also the more specific sense of 'life', which was common in poetry since Homer (*Il*. 18.61 ζώει καὶ ὁρᾷ φάος ἠελίοιο). The combination of 'sight' and 'life' is made explicit in Electra's elated 'recognition' not only of the 'sight' of Ὀρέστης but also of the sound of his voice (1225a ὦ φθέγμ', ἀφίκου;) and of his touch (1226a ἔχω σε χερσίν;). As in the previous instances the identity and the etymology of Ὀρέστης are established at the same time. In this particular case, however, Electra's jubilant and triumphant ὁρᾶτ' Ὀρέστην τόνδε marks the return of life as well.

3.3. *Euripides'* Electra*:* Ὀρέστης *'inspected'*

In Aeschylus it is Electra who pours libations on Agamemnon's tomb and spots the tokens of Orestes's visit and offerings, and the recognition is the outcome of a

[30] 1184 **ἐπισκοπῶν** στένεις; / 1187 **ὁρῶν** σε πολλοῖς ἐμπρέπουσαν ἄλγεσιν / 1188 καὶ μὴν **ὁρᾷς** γε παῦρα τῶν ἐμῶν κακῶν / 1189 καὶ πῶς γένοιτ' ἂν τῶνδ' ἔτ' ἐχθίω **βλέπειν**; / 1199 ὦ δύσποτμ', ὡς **ὁρῶν** σ' ἐπικτοίρω πάλαι.

conversation between her and Orestes. In Sophocles the event is split in two parts: the visit to the tomb is assigned to Chrysothemis, while the actual recognition is left as usual to Electra. In Euripides' *Electra everything* is done by the Old Man: it is he who visits the tomb and pours libations (second epeisodion, 509-512), discovers the tokens of Orestes' visit (513-515 a sacrificial lamb, locks of blond hair), and argues that only Electra's brother is likely to have made the offerings (516-519). It is also he who invites Electra to (visit the tomb and) compare the color of the shorn locks with her hair (520-523) and match her foot with a possible footprint (532-533), and furthermore to identify as her own a piece of cloth that Orestes may have been carrying (539-540). All Electra does is dispute the Old Man's assumptions and reject his suggestions. The most crucial modification vis-à-vis the earlier recognition scenes, is that the Old Man is the *only* person who could recognize Orestes[31], because he is Agamemnon's old *paidagogo*s, had known the boy while still in his father's palace and had rescued him from the hands of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. In other words Electra is a priori *excluded* from her key role as the sister who recognizes her brother. I quote lines 555-581 of the recognition scene[32]:

ΗΛ. οὗτος τὸν ἁμὸν πατέρ' ἔθρεψεν, ὦ ξένε. 555
ΟΡ. τί φῄς; ὅδ' ὃς σὸν ἐξέκλεψε σύγγονον;
ΗΛ. ὅδ' ἔσθ' ὁ σώσας κεῖνον, εἴπερ ἔστ' ἔτι.
ΟΡ. ἔα·
τί μ' **ἐσδέδορκεν** ὥσπερ ἀργύρου **σκοπῶν**
λαμπρὸν χαρακτῆρ'; ἦ προσεικάζει μέ τῳ;
ΗΛ. ἴσως **Ὀρέστου** σ' ἥλιχ' ἥδεται **βλέπων**. 560
ΟΡ. φίλου γε φωτός. τί δὲ κυκλεῖ πέριξ πόδα;
ΗΛ. καὐτὴ τόδ' **εἰσορῶσα** θαυμάζω, ξένε.
ΠΡ. ὦ πότνι', εὔχου, θύγατερ Ἠλέκτρα, θεοῖς.
ΗΛ. τί τῶν ἀπόντων ἢ τί τῶν ὄντων πέρι;
ΠΡ. λαβεῖν φίλον θησαυρόν, ὃν φαίνει θεός 565
ΗΛ. ἰδού· καλῶ θεούς. ἢ τί δὴ λέγεις, γέρον;
ΠΡ. **βλέψον** νυν ἐς τόνδ', ὦ τέκνον, τὸν φίλτατον.
ΗΛ. πάλαι **δέδορκα**· μὴ σύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖς;
ΠΡ. οὐκ εὖ φρονῶ 'γὼ σὸν κασίγνητον **βλέπων**;
ΗΛ. πῶς εἶπας, ὦ γεραί', ἀνέλπιστον λόγον; 570
ΠΛ. **ὁρᾶν Ὀρέστην** τόνδε τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος.
ΗΛ. ποῖον χαρακτῆρ' **εἰσιδών**, ᾧ πείσομαι;
ΠΡ. οὐλὴν παρ' ὀφρύν, ἥν ποτ' ἐν πατρὸς δόμοις
νεβρὸν διώκων σοῦ μέθ' ἡμάχθη πεσών.

[31] The only other exception is an elderly servant of Aegisthus (852-853).
[32] Text by Diggle 1981; translation by Kovacs 1998 (O.M. = 'Old man').

ΗΛ. πῶς φῄς; **ὁρῶ** μὲν πτώματος τεκμήριον. 575
ΠΡ. ἔπειτα μέλλεις προσπίτνειν τοῖς φιλτάτοις;
ΗΛ. ἀλλ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽, ὦ γεραιέ· συμβόλοισι γὰρ
τοῖς σοῖς πέπεισμαι θυμόν. ὦ χρόνῳ φανείς,
ἔχω σ᾽ ἀέλπτως ΟΡ. κἀξ ἐμοῦ γ᾽ ἔχῃ χρόνῳ.
ΗΛ. οὐδέποτε δόξασ᾽. ΟΡ. οὐδ᾽ ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤλπισα. 580
ΗΛ. **ἐκεῖνος εἶ σύ;**

EL. This is the man who reared my father, stranger.
OR. What? The man who spirited your brother away?
EL. This is the man who saved his life, if life he still has.
OR. What's this? Why is he staring at me as if he were looking
at the hallmark on silver? Does he think I look like someone else?
EL. Perhaps he is happy to see a man Orestes' age.
OR. The man we love. But why is he circling around me?
EL. I see this too and wonder at it, stranger.
O.M. Daughter Electra, my lady, offer prayers to the gods!
EL. For what? Something I lack or something I have?
O.M. Pray you may grasp the precious treasure the god is showing you!
EL. All right: I call on the gods. Or did you mean something
different, old man?
O.M. Then look, my daughter, at this man you love best.
EL. I have been looking for some time: have you gone mad?
O.M. Am I mad if I see your brother?
EL. What do you mean, old man, by this extraordinary claim?
O.M. That I see Orestes, Agamemnon's son.
EL. What mark have you seen that deserves my trust?
O.M. The scar next to his eyebrow: once in your father's house
he fell and cut it as you and he chased a fawn.
EL. What is this you say? I see the evidence of his fa11.
O.M. Then can you hesitate to fling yourself into your dear
brother's embrace?
O.M. I hesitate no longer, old man. My heart is persuaded
by the tally you point out.
O brother long in coming, I embrace you though
I no longer hoped to …
OR. And at long last I too embrace you!
EL. … and never thought this would happen!
OR. No, for not even I had hope.
EL. Are you the very man?

As in Aeschylus and Sophocles, Ὀρέστης is the person 'seen' and 'recognized', but here this is done by the Old Man, who had previously asked to 'see' Ὀρέστης

(547 βούλομαι εἰσιδών). Furthermore, Agamemnon's son is not just 'seen': the Old Man 'inspects' him carefully (558), by walking around him, as if he were a silver coin (558-559) and he had to establish if it were genuine or 'counterfeit' (cf. his comment on Orestes and Pylades in 550: ἀλλ' εὐγενεῖς μέν, ἐν δὲ κιβδήλῳ τόδε)[33]. The 'scar' (οὐλήν) on Orestes' forehead becomes the 'stamp' (572 χαρακτῆρ'), which proves that the 'coin' is a 'treasure' (565 θησαυρόν), Electra's 'genuine' brother (571 ὁρᾶν Ὀρέστην)[34]. Thus the identity and etymology of Ὀρέστης are once again established at the same time; but now this is done not by 'inspecting' objects, footprints or a lock of hair but by 'inspecting' Orestes himself. There comes a moment in intertextuality when the uses of a motif are exhausted and the search for innovation ends up in what looks like parody.

What about Electra? While the Old Man has been 'inspecting' Orestes carefully, her gaze has been turned elsewhere and it never actually focuses on Orestes. Initially she 'looks' in wonder at the Old man who is 'inspecting' Orestes (562). When next the Old man invites her to «look at the man he loves best» (567), she fails to 'recognize' her brother in the eloquent allusion: instead she replies that "she has been looking for some time" (568) and concludes that he has gone mad – apparently she had been 'looking' without 'seeing'. The Old Man retorts that he cannot be called mad for "seeing her brother" (569). When he becomes as specific as it gets by naming Orestes (571 ὁρᾶν Ὀρέστην), Electra questions his eyesight and asks for evidence (572 ποῖον χαρακτῆρ' ἐσιδών) in order to be convinced. Then the Old man points to the scar next to Orestes' eyebrow[35]: again Electra does not look at Orestes but strictly at the «evidence of the fall» (575), something which triggers what may be a mocking reply on the part of the Old Man[36]. Eventually Electra says that she is convinced and embraces her brother, but she never 'recognizes' Ὀρέστης with her own eyes: her final comment consists in the intriguing ἐκεῖνος εἶ σύ[37]; (581a). In the celebratory Ode that follows the reunion (585-595), the chorus compare Orestes' arrival to a torch that brings light to the city (585-587)[38], but Electra has not even 'seen' Ὀρέστης, let alone identify him with φῶς, as in Sophocles.

---

[33] «Well, they are gentlemen, to be sure, but that's a deceptive matter». The epithet κίβδηλος was literally used of 'adulterated' coin metal.

[34] On the coinage metaphor in the present recognition see Roisman - Luschnig 2011, 168-169; Baechle 2020, 106-114.

[35] That is next to one of his eyes, which are the source of vision.

[36] In replying to Electra's ὁρῶ πτώματος τεκμήριον, the Old Man invites her to 'embrace' her brother by using a cognate of πτώματος: προσπίτνειν ('fall upon a person's neck', 'embrace'), a poetic compound of πίπτω.

[37] For possible interpretations see Roisman - Luschnig 2011, 171.

[38] Cf. Aesch. *Cho*. 863-864 discussed above and further Roisman - Luschnig 2011, 172.

3.4. *Euripides'* Orestes: Ὀρέστης *and Pylades as* κάπροι ὀρέστεροι

> ΣΩ. Ὥσπερ γε καὶ ὁ "Ὀρέστης", ὦ Ἑρμόγενες, κινδυνεύει ὀρθῶς ἔχειν, εἴτε τις τύχη ἔθετο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα εἴτε καὶ ποιητής τις, τὸ θηριῶδες τῆς φύσεως καὶ τὸ ἄγριον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὀ ρ ε ι ν ὸ ν ἐνδεικνύμενος τῷ ὀνόματι. (394e8-11)
>
> SOCRATES: Thus the name 'Orestes' ('Mountain-man') is surely correct, Hermogenes, whether it was given to him by chance or by some poet, who displayed in his name the brutality, savagery, and ruggedness of his nature.

The platonic association of Ὀρέστης with ὄρος (mountain), attributed to his 'wild' character, was embraced by ancient grammarians, lexicographers and others[39]. It is furthermore endorsed by modern specialists in etymology, though not for the reasons adduced by Socrates[40]. From a modern perspective the meaning of his name has been explained as follows: «Like other ephebes, Orestes is exiled and remains outside the polis in the wilds wandering astray in the nature, a feature that may be referred to in his name».[41] Socrates suggests that the 'lawgiver' as regards the meaning of Orestes may have been 'chance'[42] or 'some poet'[43]. Is there any evidence in tragedy that confirms the platonic etymology?

The linguistic elements that 'construct' the Platonic etymology of Ὀρέστης (θηριώδης, ἄγριος) are either not mentioned in the tragedies of the first group (θηριώδης) or do not concern Orestes (ἄγριος)[44]; and furthermore there is no association of Ὀρέστης with ὄρος or derivatives. A probable association with a derivative of ὄρος occurs in the exodos of Euripides' *Orestes* (first part, 1366-1536). Orestes and Pylades have entered the palace of the Atreidae at Argos and have seized Hermione as hostage, in order to force Menelaus to rescue them from death (the penalty im-

---

[39] See e.g. *Lexicon quod Theaeteti vocatur*, 31 Pintaudi; Gregory of Corinth, *Commentarium in Hermogenis* περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος, vol. 7.2, p.1095.7-8 Walz; Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 11.6.21.4-5 Mras - des Places. Cf. also Phot. *Lex.* III.101.457 ὀρέστης: ἐν ὄρεσι διαιτώμενος («Orestes: he who dwells on mountains»); *Suid.* 784 Bekker.

[40] According to Frisk 1960, 426, and Chantraine 1999, 826, s.v. ὄρος, Ὀρέστης means 'mountain dweller'.

[41] Bierl, 1994, 86.

[42] Socrates makes τύχη the 'lawgiver' also in the case of Τάνταλος, 395e4-5 τοιοῦτόν τι καὶ τούτῳ τὸ ὄνομα ἔοικεν ἐκπορίσαι ἡ τύχη τῆς φήμης («In some such way, in any case, the chance of legend supplied him with this name»).

[43] Cf. e.g. on Hesiod and Aphrodite, 406c7-d1, mentioned above; also on Homer and Hector, 393a1-2 Ἀλλ᾽ ἆρα, ὠγαθέ, καὶ τῷ Ἕκτορι αὐτὸς ἔθετο τὸ ὄνομα Ὅμηρος; («But, my good friend, didn't Homer also give Hector his name?»).

[44] See further below.

posed on Orestes and Electra by the assembly); a Phrygian slave escapes from the palace and narrates in an excited song their assault against Helen (1454b-1472a)[45]:

Ἰδαία μᾶτερ μᾶτερ,
ὀβρίμα ὀβρίμα, αἰαὶ <αἰαῖ>
φονίων παθέων ἀνόμων τε κακῶν 1455
ἅπερ ἔδρακον ἔδρακον ἐν δόμοις τυράννων.
ἀμφιπορφύρων πέπλων
ὑπὸ σκότου ξίφη σπάσαν-
τες ἐν χεροῖν ἄλλοσ᾽ ἄλ-
λοθεν δίνευον ὄμ-
μα, μή τις παρὼν τύχοι.
ὡς κάπροι δ᾽ ὀρέστεροι 1460
γυναικὸς ἀντίοι σταθέν-
τες ἐννέπουσι· Κατθανῇ κατθανῇ·
κακός σ᾽ ἀποκτείνει πόσις,
κασιγνήτου προδοὺς
ἐν Ἄργει θανεῖν γόνον.
ἁ δ᾽ ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν·Ὤμοι μοι. 1465
λευκὸν δ᾽ ἐμβαλοῦσα πῆχυν στέρνα
κτύπησεν κάρα <τε> μέλεον πλαγάν,
φυγάδι δὲ ποδὶ τὸ χρυσεοσάμβαλον ἴχνος
ἔφερεν ἔφερεν· ἐς κόμας δὲ δακτύλους
δικὼν **Ὀρέστας**, Μυκηνίδ᾽ ἀρβύλαν 1470
προβάς, ὤμοις ἀρι-
στεροῖσιν ἀνακλάσας δέραν,
παίειν λαιμῶν ἔμελ-
λεν εἴσω μέλαν ξίφος.

Mother, mother of Ida,
mighty, mighty goddess, alas <alas>
for the murderous sufferings, the lawless woes
I have seen, have seen in the royal palace!
From beneath the concealment
of purple-bordered robes
they took swords in their hands
and whirled their glances from one side to the other
to see that no one was there.
Like wild boars of the mountain
they halted before the woman
and said, “You will die, you will die!

[45] Text and translation by Kovacs 2002.

Your slayer is your cowardly husband,
who abandoned his brother's son
to death in Argos".
And she cried out, cried out, "Ah, ah me!"
And plying her pale forearm she made
her chest <and> head resound with a pitiable blow,
then with fleeing foot her gold-sandaled step
she bore away, away. But Orestes
darted his fingers to her hair,
putting his Mycenean boot ahead,
and yanking her neck back to his left shoulder
meant to thrust his dark
sword into her throat.

In 1460 Orestes and Pylades, armed and threatening Helen with death, are compared to 'wild mountain boars' (ὡς κάπροι δ' ὀρέστεροι), and below (1470) Ὀρέστας is mentioned *by name* as he is pulling Helen's head back by the hair and is about to thrust his sword into her neck. The epithet ὀρέστεροι, a derivative of ὄρος, indicates boars 'living in the mountains'; the name Ὀρέστης, also a derivative of ὄρος, originally had the same meaning (cf. also ὀρεστιάδες, 'mountain nymphs'). It is true that ὀρέστεροι and Ὀρέστας stand eleven lines apart, but ὡς κάπροι δ' ὀρέστεροι is itself a reference to Ὀρέστης (and Pylades), considering that (a) it is a comparison, and (b) ὀρέστερος is a synonym of Ὀρέστης from an etymological viewpoint and thus it functions as a *substitute* of the proper name.[46] Furthermore, the Phrygian slave's narration abounds in pejorative comparisons of Orestes and Pylades with wild animals: they are also called 'twin lions' (1401ab λέοντες Ἕλλανες / δύο διδύμῳ <ῥυθμῷ>); and individually Pylades is referred to as a 'deadly snake' (1406 φόνιός τε δράκων) and Orestes as a 'matricidal snake' (1424b ματροφόντας δράκων). The epic flavor of these characterizations has been repeatedly recognized, especially as regards the intertextual association of Orestes and Pylades with the Iliadic pair Odysseus and Diomedes (cf *Il.* XI 324 twin boars; *Il.* X 297 twin lions).

There is a lot in the slave's song that sounds like epic and tragic parody and a 'comic' re-enactment of the Trojan war[47], and the reader might be inclined to

[46] On names as *substitutable* semantic units see Paschalis 1997, 4. It was first Mario Fuochi, 1898, 309, who associated ὀρέστεροι with Ὀρέστης, though without pointing to the occurrence of the name in 1470 and without any further comment. See also Biehl 1965, 157, independently of Fuochi: «In ὀρέστεροι wurde vermutlich die etymologische Beziehung zu Ὀρέστης […] empfunden»; Willink 1986, 322, on ὀρέστεροι: «possibly playing on the name 'Orestes' […]; but the 'mountain' point is routine».

[47] See e.g. Fuqua 1978, 22; Zeitlin 1980; Wolff 1983, 348-349.

dismiss the 'bestial' characterizations as exaggerated talk of a ludicrous character. It should be noted, however, that they coincide in part with what other characters of the play have to say about Orestes and Pylades. Commenting on their 'terrible actions', Menelaus will later refer to them as follows: «these twin lions: I do not call them men» (1555 δισσοῖν λεόντοιν· οὐ γὰρ ἄνδρ' αὐτὼ καλῶ); and earlier Tyndareus, upon catching sight of Orestes, had exclaimed in horror (479-480): «Here is a mother-killing snake before the palace, with sickness in his darting glance: how I loathe him!» (ὁ μητροφόντης ὅδε πρὸ δωμάτων δράκων / στίλβει νοσώδεις ἀστραπάς, στύγημ' ἐμόν.)

What is the significance of these characterizations? According to Christian Wolff, they describe «animal savagery, what Tyndareus, referring to lawless revenge, had called 'bestiality', τὸ θηριῶδες (524)»[48]. Here is the *Orestes* passage in question (518-524):

> Ἐγὼ δὲ μισῶ μὲν γυναῖκας ἀνοσίους,
> πρώτην δὲ θυγατέρ', ἣ πόσιν κατέκτανεν·
> Ἑλένην τε, τὴν σὴν ἄλοχον, οὔποτ' αἰνέσω
> οὐδ' ἂν προσείποιμ'· οὐδὲ σὲ ζηλῶ κακῆς
> γυναικὸς ἐλθόνθ' οὕνεκ' ἐς Τροίας πέδον.
> ἀμυνῶ δ' ὅσονπερ δυνατός εἰμι **τῷ νόμῳ**,
> **τὸ θηριῶδες** τοῦτο καὶ **μιαιφόνον**
> παύων, ὃ καὶ γῆν καὶ πόλεις ὄλλυσ' ἀεί.
>
> Now I hate ungodly women, and before all others
> my daughter who killed her husband.
> I shall never praise your wife Helen,
> never speak to her, and I pity you for going to Troy
> to get back such a wicked creature.
> But as far as in me lies I will come to the aid of the law
> by trying to curb subhuman and murderous conduct
> like this, which always bring countries and cities to ruin.

Tyndareus' target in the immediate context are his two daughters: Clytemnestra who started the series of killings by murdering her husband and his adulterous daughter Helen who caused the bloody Trojan war; but the overall argument is that bloodshed should be purified by exile not by retaliatory killing, which leads to a chain of killings; and the hypothetical example of Orestes getting killed by his wife and his son killing his mother in retaliation and his son's son seeking blood vengeance (508-511), suggests that Orestes is first and foremost in his mind.

[48] Wolff 1983, 348.

Tyndareus' τὸ θηριῶδες with reference to 'lawless killings' (τὸ μιαιφόνον) alludes to the 'feral' life of men before laws (νόμοι) were instituted[49]. The Phrygian slave will later use similar language in order to set the context for the comparison of Orestes and Pylades to wild mountain boars: «the murderous sufferings, the lawless woes» (1455 φονίων παθέων ἀνόμων τε κακῶν). Indeed the comparison appears at the moment when the pair are about to exact lawless revenge on Helen.

Of the three linguistic elements that 'construct' the platonic etymology of Ὀρέστης we have encountered ὀρέστερος (ὀρεινός is a prose term) embedded in a poetic context that illustrates what Tyndareus had earlier called τὸ θηριῶδες ('bestiality') with reference to retaliatory bloodshed. The epithet θηριώδης does not occur in poetry before Euripides. Ἄγριος and ἀγριόω occur four times in *Orestes*, *always* in reference to Agamemnon's son[50]: once in relation to his madness (34-35), twice in relation to his filthy hair (226-387), and once more to describe his 'wild rage' against his mother (615-617): «She [Electra] put you in a mad rage against your mother by always whispering stories in your ear to make you hate her» (μᾶλλον δ' ἐκείνη σοῦ θανεῖν ἐστ' ἀξία, / ἣ τῇ τεκούσῃ σ' ἠγρίωσ', ἐς οὖς ἀεὶ / πέμπουσα μύθους ἐπὶ τὸ δυσμενέστερον).

Putting together the pieces of the puzzle, the κάπροι ὀρέστεροι and Ὀρέστης, the wild beast metaphors used by Tyndareus, the Phrygian slave, and Menelaus to characterize Orestes and Pylades, Tyndareus' labelling of lawless revenge as τὸ θηριῶδες, and finally Orestes' 'wild rage' (ἠγρίωσ') which drove him to matricide, we have all the ingredients of the platonic etymology. To be specific, we do not have the etymology itself but *a poetic context* for it, a tragic antecedent. This does not necessarily mean that Plato 'extracted' his etymology of Orestes from Euripides' play[51].

University of Crete
michael.paschalis@gmail.com

Keywords: Plato, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Orestes, etymology
Parole chiave: Platone, Eschilo, Sofocle, Euripide, Oreste, etimologia

[49] Willink 1986, 524.

[50] By contrast, none of the three cases of ἄγριος and ἀγριόω occurring in the tragedies of the first group concerns Orestes. There is one occurrence of ἄγριος in the *Choephori* (280), none in Sophocles' *Electra*, and two occurrences of ἀγριόω (1031) and ἄγριος (1116) in Euripides' *Electra*.

[51] Tsibakou-Vasalos 2007, 221, believes that Plato's etymology «is in all probability modelled on the Euripidean», though she has not conducted a thorough study: she bases her conclusion solely on Tyndareus' τὸ θηριῶδες and the 'wild' appearance of Orestes' filthy hair (*Or.* 387 ὡς ἠγρίωσαι πλόκαμον αὐχμηρόν, τάλας).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Ademollo 2011
F.Ademollo, *The Cratylus of Plato: A Commentary*, Cambridge 2011.
Baechle 2020
N.Baechle, *Aesthetic Response and Traditional Social Valuation in Euripides' Electra*, Berlin-Boston 2020.
Baxter 1992
T.M.S.Baxter, *The Cratylus: Plato's Critique of Naming*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1992.
Biehl 1965
Euripides, *Orestes*, ed. W.Biehl, Berlin 1965.
Bierl 1994.
A.Bierl, *Apollo in Greek Tragedy: Orestes and the God of Initiation*, in J. Solomon (ed.), *Apollo: Origins and Influences*, Tucson-London 1994, 81-96.
Chantraine 1999.
P.Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris 1999.
Diggle 1981
Euripidis *fabulae. Tomus II*, ed. J.Diggle, Oxford 1981.
Duke et al. 1995
Platonis opera. *Tomus I, tetralogias I-II continens*, rec. E.A.Duke et al., Oxford 1995.
Dunn 1996
F.M.Dunn, *Sophocles' „Electra" in Performance*, Berlin-Heidelberg 1996.
Duvick 2007
Proclus, *On Plato's "Cratylus"*, Transl. by B. Duvick, Ithaca, NY 2007.
Frisk 1960
H.Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1960.
Fuochi 1898
M.Fuochi, *Le etimologie dei nomi propri nei tragici greci*, «Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica» VI (1898), 273-318.
Fuqua 1978
C.Fuqua, *The World of Myth in Euripides' "Orestes"*, «Traditio» XXXIV (1978), 1-28.
Garvie 1986
A.F.Garvie, *Aeshylus. Choephori*, Oxford 1986.
Kovacs 2002
D.Kovacs, *Euripides. Helen, Phoenician Women, Orestes*, Cambridge MA-London 2002.

Kovacs 1998
Euripides, *Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles*, ed. and transl. by D.Kovacs, Cambridge MA-London 1998.
Levin 1997
S.B.Levin, *Greek Conceptions of Naming: Three Forms of Appropriateness in Plato and the Literary Tradition*, «Classical Philology» XCII (1997), 46-57.
Levin 1996
S.B.Levin, *Platonic Eponymy and the Literary Tradition*, «Phoenix», L (1996), 197-207.
Levin 1995
S.B.Levin, *What's in a Name?: A Reconsideration of the Cratylus' Historical Sources and Topics*, «Ancient Philosophy» XV (1995), 91-115.
Lloyd-Jones – Wilson 1990
Sophoclis *fabulae*, rec. H.Lloyd-Jones – N.G.Wilson, Oxford 1990.
McCartney 1919
E.S.McCartney, *Puns and Plays on Proper Names*, «The Classical Journal» XIV (1919), 343-358.
Meineck – Woodruff 2007
Sophocles, *Four Tragedies*, Translated, with Introduction and Notes by P.Meineck – P.Woodruff, Indianapolis-Cambridge 2007.
Paschalis 2020
M.Paschalis, *Narratives of amor, arma and armenta in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, in E.Papadodima – A.Stefanis (ed.), *New Approached to Ancient Epic*, «Trends in Classics» XII/1, Berlin-Boston 2020, 154-171.
Paschalis 2003
M.Paschalis, *Names, Semantics, and Narrative in Ovid's Polydorus and Polyxena episodes and their intertexts* (*Euripides' Hecuba and Virgil's Aeneid*), «Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica» I (2003), 142-159.
Paschalis 1997
M.Paschalis, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, Oxford 1997.
Pasquali 1994
Procli Diadochi *in Platonis Cratylum commentaria*, ed. G.Pasquali, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994.
Race 1997
Pindar, *Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments*, ed. and transl. by W.H.Race, Cambridge MA-London 1997.
Reeve 1998
Plato, *Cratylus*, transl. by C.D.C.Reeve, Indianapolis 1998.

Ringer 1998
M.Ringer, *Electra and the Empty Urn: Metatheater and Role Playing in Sophocles*, Chapel Hill-London 1998.
Roisman – Luschnig 2011
H. M. Roisman – C.A.E.Luschnig, *Euripides Electra: A Commentary*, Norman OK 2011.
Sedley 2003
D.Sedley, *Plato's Cratylus*, Cambridge 2003.
Sommerstein 2009
Aeschylus, *Oresteia: Agamemnon. Libation-Bearers. Eumenides*, Ed. and transl. by A.H. Sommerstein, London 2009.
Sulzberger 1926
M.Sulzberger, *Ὄνομα ἐπώνυμον. Les noms propres chez Homère et dans la mythologie grecque*, «Revue des Études Grecques» XXXVII (1926), 381-447.
Tsitsibakou-Vasalos 2007
E.Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, *Ancient Poetic Etymology. The Pelopids: Fathers and Sons*, Stuttgart 2007.
West 1998
Aeschyli *Tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheo*, ed. M.L.West, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998.
Willink 1986
Euripides, *Orestes*, with Introduction and Commentary by C.W.Willink, Oxford 1986.
Wolff 1983
C.Wolff, *Orestes*, in E.Segal (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Tragedy*, Oxford 1983, 340–356.
Woodhead 1928
W.D.Woodhead, *Etymologizing in Greek Literature ftom Homer to Philo Judaeus*, Toronto 1928.
Zeitlin 1980
F.I.Zeitlin, *The Closet of Masks: Role-Playing and Myth-Making in the Orestes of Euripides,* «Ramus» IX (1980), 51-77.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32054 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 135-156*

LUCIA FLORIDI

Speaking Names, Variant Readings, and Textual Revision in Greek Epigrams*

Puns on proper names are common in Greek and Roman literature, and the Greek epigram, with its multiple subgenres, is no exception. The (par)etymology of names – be they real or fictitious – is exploited for a variety of purposes and in a variety of ways. The aim of this paper is to contribute to the discussion on the broad topic of proper names in Greek epigrams by offering some reflections on a thorny problem: textual variants involving proper names as evidence of the (authorial?) revision and reuse of texts. A new survey and critical discussion of the (scanty) existing evidence will be provided. Particular attention will be paid to the etymology of proper names, which, in some cases, might suggest a substitution for the purpose of increasing the efficacy of the poetic message.

Comunissimi, in letteratura greco-latina, i giochi di parole onomastici, e l'epigramma greco, nei suoi vari sottogeneri, non fa eccezione. La (par)etimologia dei nomi – reali o fittizi che siano – è sfruttata per i più diversi obiettivi e nei più diversi modi. Scopo dell'articolo è contribuire al tema della funzione e dell'uso dei nomi propri nell'epigramma greco ridiscutendo un problema spinoso: le varianti testuali negli antroponimi, come possibili spie della revisione (autoriale?) di un carme e del suo riuso in un contesto diverso da quello per cui era stato originariamente composto. Si procederà al riesame dei (pochi) epigrammi con varianti di questo tipo, concentrandosi in particolare sull'etimologia dei nomi, che può talora indurre a ipotizzare una sostituzione finalizzata ad accrescere l'efficacia del messaggio poetico.

Introduction

Puns on proper names are common in Greek and Roman literature. *Redende Namen* are regularly exploited in iambic poetry and comedy to create puns[1]. Nor are 'serious' genres, such as epic or tragedy, indifferent to the destiny inscribed in a character's name: Homer certainly had the etymology of Protesilaus in mind when he chose to represent him as νηὸς ἀποθρῴσκοντα πολὺ πρώτιστον Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* II 702), or that of Demodocos, when he defined him as Δημόδοκος, λαοῖσι τετιμένος (*Od.* XIII 28) – not to mention the fact that Odysseus managed to escape from the Cyclops through a pun on Οὖτις/οὔ τις (*Od.* XI 366-411). In tragedy, one of the most famous examples is provided by the folk etymology of Helen discussed by the chorus in Aesch. *Ag.* 681ff., where the name of the woman who was deemed responsible

* Thanks are due to Gianfranco Agosti and Athanassios Vergados for inviting me to take part in this project, to the anonymous referees, Francesca Maltomini and Ambra Russotti for commenting on an early draft of this paper, and to Federico Condello for discussing some individual points with me.

[1] The bibliography on the subject is large: on iambic *nomina ficta*, see *e.g.* Bonanno 1980; on speaking names in comedy, see *e.g.* Steiger 1888, Fröhde 1898, and Marzullo 1953. Among more general contributions on the vast topic of speaking names, see Calame 1988, 178-189.

for the Trojan War was connected to the radical ἑλ- in the famous tricolon ἑλέναυς, ἕλανδρος, ἑλέ-/πτολις (v. 689-690); but examples abound, especially in Euripides[2].

Ancient theorists were well aware of the potential of proper names: Plato's *Cratylus* – a dialogue on the 'correctness of names' (περὶ ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητος, 384a) – offers etymological discussions on the names of Olympian gods, such as Rhea, which is connected to ῥέω (402b), or Hades, for which a folk etymology from 'his knowledge (εἰδέναι) of all noble things' is argued (404b); Aristotle, in *Rhet.* II 23,28 (1400b), mentions puns on speaking names such as Thrasybulus, Thrasymachus, Polos, Drakon, Aphrodite and Pentheus, while in *Poet.* IX 3 (51b) he explains how proper names are differently used in comedy and tragedy. In Rome, the relationship between a name and its bearer is discussed by Cic. *De or.* II 257[3]. Quintilian VI 3,53ff. defines the practice of punning with proper names as 'frigid', and Cicero himself, in *De or.* II 247, had highlighted the dangers of jibes of this kind, criticising, for example, a pun on the name of Aulus Sempronius Musca, mocked as a 'buzzer' – *musca* being the name of an insect – because it was made just to get a laugh (*risum quaesivit*)[4].

The etymology of a proper name might be re-activated, or (par)etymologically re-interpreted for the sake of a given context, or specifically chosen for a character in order to focus the audience's attention on his/her narrative function or role[5].

Epigrammatic poetry, with its multiple subgenres, is obviously no exception: funerary poems may exploit the name of a deceased person to praise his/her qualities (*e.g.* Sim. *AP* VII 508 = 117 Sider, where Pausanias is defined as ἰητρὸν ἐπώνυμον, because he 'pauses' pain[6], or Antip. Thess. *AP* IX 517,2-3 = *GPh* 94-95 Γλάφυρε / οὔνομα καὶ τέχνης καὶ σώματος, for a piper; cf. *IG* XIV 400,5 οὔνομά μοι Γλάφυρος καὶ φρενὸς εἴκελον ἦν), or to lament his/her fate (Crinag. *AP* V

[2] A list of Euripidean passages involving etymological puns with proper names is provided by McCartney 1919, 348 (which is worth referring to, in general, for the richness of the collected material).

[3] For a discussion of names as indicators of characters in Rome, Corbeill 1996, 74-78.

[4] For a discussion of this passage, see *e.g.* Beard 2014, 120. On proper names in Latin literature, see *e.g.* Colburn 1912; Booth - Maltby 2006.

[5] While many names, in literature, are purposely chosen because of their meaning, in Antiquity as much as today (some examples in Petrone 1988, 34-36), a speaking name does not necessarily imply a *nomen fictum*, and this is true for praise as well as for satiric poetry: on this point, see Floridi 2014, 29.

[6] See Plat. *Symp.* 185c Παυσανίου παυσαμένου. In real life, Pausanias is well attested as a 'professional' name for doctors: see Samama 2003, 16ff. For ἐπώνυμος in the sense of 'true to his/her name', see already *Il.* V 962 (Alcyone); *Od.* VII 54 (Ἀρήτη = ἀρετή), XIX 409 (Ὀδυσσεύς = ὀδυσσάμενος).

108,5-6 = *GPh* 1845-1846 = 14,5-6 Ypsilanti Πρώτη σοι ὄνομ' ἔσκεν ἐτήτυμον· ἦν γὰρ ἅπαντα / δεύτερ' ἀμιμήτων τῶν ἐπὶ σοὶ χαρίτων)[7]. In a similar vein, erotic or scoptic epigrams can exploit the name of a character for a variety of purposes and in a variety of ways[8]: names may be either appropriate (*e.g.* Melissa is a true μέλισσα, 'bee': she drops honey from her lips, but she also has a sting[9]; Potamon is a 'torrential' poet[10], while Callistratos 'wages war' with his hexameters[11]) or inappropriate (*e.g.* Parmenis, 'Constance', is not true to her name)[12]. They can suggest paronomasias (Mel. *AP* V 154,2 = *HE* 4315 ἁ Τρυφέρα τρυφερά) or etymological puns (Rufin. *AP* V 47,1-2 = 18,1-2 Page Θάλεια, / … θαλερῇ), especially as far as sex is concerned (see *e.g.* Strat. *AP* XI 22 = 100 Floridi, who plays on the equivalence δράκων = ὄφις, to be taken as a slang for πέος[13], to express a pseudo-rationalistic doubt: how can a young man called Dracon let another 'snake' enter into his 'nest'?)[14]. They can present the audience with a kind of riddle, when the very meaning of a poem is based on the interpretation of speaking names (among the best examples are Rufin. or Pall. *AP* V 71, where four proper names variously related to war are used to describe how poor Zeno can free himself from his wife, a true Andromache, 'man-fighter'[15], or Fronto *AP* XII 174, which revolves around paretymological puns involving Persian names)[16]. Poets may play with their own

[7] Further examples of the exploitation of the correspondence between a person's name and his/her qualities in funerary epigrams in *e.g.* Ypsilanti 2018, 164-165.

[8] For the exploitation of speaking names in scoptic epigrams, see Conca 2004-2005; Floridi 2014, 27-30.

[9] Marc. Arg. *AP* V 32 = *GPh* 1307ff.

[10] Lucill. *AP* XI 131 = 40 Fl.

[11] Lucill. *AP* XI 136 = 45 Fl.

[12] Maced. *AP* V 247,1 = 13,1 Madden Παρμενὶς οὐκ ἔργῳ.

[13] See Ar. *Eccl.* 909-910 κἀπὶ τῆς κλίνης ὄφιν προσελκύσαιο / βουλομένη φιλῆσαι; Henderson 1991², 127; Adams 1982, 30-31.

[14] Other examples include puns on the names of mythological characters, such as the Homeric hero Meriones, paretymologically related to μηροί, 'thighs', and thus to homoeroticism (Floridi 2007, 382-383), in Antip. Sid. *AP* XII 97 = *HE* 632ff. and Strat. *AP* XII 247 = 89 Fl. (see also Rufin. *AP* V 36 = 12 Page, in a heterosexual context), or Astyanax/Astyages (privative α + στύω) in, respectively, Strat. *AP* XII 11 = 11 Fl. and Fronto *AP* XII 174, to mean impotence. For the pun on Meriones, cf. Livrea 1979; Steinbichler 1995; on Astyanax/Astyages, Floridi 2007, 153-154.

[15] Πρωτομάχου πατρὸς καὶ Νικομάχης γεγαμηκὼς / θυγατέρα, Ζήνων, ἔνδον ἔχεις πόλεμον. / ζήτει Λυσίμαχον μοιχὸν φίλον, ὅς σ' ἐλεήσας / ἐκ τῆς Πρωτομάχου λύσεται Ἀνδρομάχης.

[16] Μέχρι τίνος πολεμεῖς μ', ὦ φίλτατε Κῦρε; τί ποιεῖς; / τὸν σὸν Καμβύσην οὐκ ἐλεεῖς; λέγε μοι. / μὴ γίνου Μῆδος· Σάκας γὰρ ἔσῃ μετὰ μικρόν, / καί σε ποιήσουσιν αἱ τρίχες

names to 'sign' their poems, and to offer their audiences (ironic) self-presentations: Meleager owes his name to the fact that he loves boys both black, μέλας, and white, ἀργός (*AP* XII 165 = *HE* 4520ff.); Philodemos is so named because he sleeps with many Demos (*AP* V 115 = *GPh* 3196ff. = 10 Sider). In other cases too we seem to be dealing with puns on the name of a poem's author: the speaker in Strat. *AP* XII 11 = 11 Fl., for instance, sleeps for a whole night with a boy named Philostratos – and it is obviously tempting to take this as 'lover of Strato'[17].

A particular type of paretymological pun, to which little or no attention has been paid so far, concerns bilingual wordplays: I have suggested, for instance, that Strat. *AP* XII 196 = 37 Fl. – a poem entirely based on the theme of the brightness of the beloved's eyes – exploits the Latin etymology of *Lucinus*, Λυκῖνος being the name of the boy whose eyes are 'rays that shoot forth fire'[18]. While the Greek Λυκῖνος derives, properly, from λύκος (Chantraine, *DELG*, s.v., 633), Latin *Lucinus* is connected to *lux* (Ernout – Meillet, *DELL*, s.v., 372), and it is difficult to avoid the impression that the poet is here exploiting the Latin etymology for the sake of a pun (we can certainly presume that an audience of the imperial Greco-Roman world was able to catch such bilingual wordplays)[19]. A similar, yet reverse, example is provided by Maec. *AP* V 117 = *GPh* 2480ff. Θερμαίνει μ' ὁ καλὸς Κορνήλιος· ἀλλὰ φοβοῦμαι / τοῦτο τὸ φῶς, ἤδη πῦρ μέγα γινόμενον, where the Latin name of the beloved suddenly becomes appropriate for the theme of the poem, if one takes -ήλιος as the Greek word for 'sun'.

The topic is vast, and much has been written – although a comprehensive study, aimed at distinguishing and classifying the different ways in which Greek epigrammatists play with proper names, is still missing (to the best of my knowledge).

In this paper I will contribute to the discussion on proper names in Greek epigrams by offering some reflections on a thorny problem: textual variants involving proper names as evidence of the (authorial?) revision and reuse of texts.

Ἀστυάγην. Κῦρος probably involves a pun on κύριος, 'lord' (cf. Numenios *AP* XII 28); Καμβύσης is paretymologically linked to κάμνω; Μῆδος to μὴ δούς (cf. Marc. Arg. *AP* V 63 = *GPh* 1311ff., discussed below); Σάκας to σάκ(κ)ος, 'beard'; as for Ἀστυάγης, see above, n. 14.

[17] Obermayer 1998, 299 n. 225; Floridi 2007, 152.

[18] Ὀφθαλμοὺς σπινθῆρας ἔχεις, θεόμορφε Λυκῖνε, / μᾶλλον δ' ἀκτῖνας, δέσποτα, πυρσοβόλους. / ἀντωπὸς βλέψαι βαιὸν χρόνον οὐ δύναμαί σοι, / οὕτως ἀστράπτεις ὄμμασιν ἀμφοτέροις. See Floridi 2007, 239.

[19] In Latin literature, the etymology of Greek proper names is regularly exploited: see *e.g.* Vallat 2006 (on Martial). On Greco-Roman bilingualism, see at least Adams - Janse - Swain 2002 and Adams 2003.

1. *Textual variants involving proper names in Greek epigrams*

The substitution of a proper name with another, when there is no phonetic or graphical similarity, has often been taken as evidence of the reworking of a text for a different occasion and/or a different audience[20]. A case in point is Martial: in his epigrams there are variants involving proper names, and some scholars think that at least some of them may be due to the author himself – although the question is much debated and no consensus has been reached[21].

As regards Greek epigrams, we only have variant versions of the same poem in a few cases, either because a text appears twice in the *Greek Anthology*, in two (slightly) different versions, or because it is transmitted by both medieval manuscripts and papyri. A list of poems of this sort was provided by Peter Parsons[22], who noted, in passing: «Of a special interest is a tradition […] of replacing a proper name with another of the same metrical value. Various explanations have been canvassed: one proposes that the author adapted his poem to new topicalities between one circulation and another – or from a topical name to a speaking name for the general reader's convenience». In what follows, a new survey and critical discussion of the (scanty) existing evidence will be provided; particular attention will be paid to the etymology of proper names, which, in some cases, may suggest a substitution for the purpose of increasing the efficacy of the poetic message.

---

[20] As shown by Tarán 1979, 166ff., in the Hellenistic art of variation proper names are among the textual elements most frequently changed when an epigrammatist imitates another. The same is obviously true of inscriptional epitaphs: when a famous model is imitated, an obligatory change is determined by the insertion of the name of the deceased. A clear example is provided by the funerary inscriptions that readapt the famous epitaph for Homer, adesp. *AP* VII 3, discussed by Garulli 2012, 206ff. (see, in particular, *IGIN* II 91, second half of the 2nd cent. A.D., where Homer's name is replaced with that of the deceased, Alcibiades, ignoring all metrical rules).

[21] The first to propose that some of the variants in Martial's text might be explained as authorial variants was Schneidewin 1842, VII; the most enthusiastic supporter of this theory was Lindsay 1903a and 1903b (whose excesses were already criticised by Pasquali 1952², 419). Lists of proper names involving textual variants are provided, for instance, by Giarratano 1951², VI; Kay 1985, 4, n. 12 (who, however, explains the discrepancies in the manuscripts by positing the substitution of a common name for a rarer one - an explanation that can work in some cases, but not all). Considerable scepticism with regard to this theory is expressed, for example, by Citroni 1975, XLIII, LXXI-LXXII; Howell 1980, 14, 129-130; Fusi 2006, 75-76. In general, on the problem of authorial variants in Classical texts, see, after Pasquali 1952², XIX, 395-465, at least Mariotti 1985; Timpanaro 1997; De Nonno 1998; Dorandi 2007, 123-139; Losacco 2016.

[22] Parsons 2002, 106-107 (and n. 45).

1.1. *'Doublets' in the Greek Anthology*

1. Strato *AP* XI 21 = 83 Fl. and XII 242 = 84 Fl.

Πρῴην τὴν σαύραν Ἀγάθων ῥοδοδάκτυλον εἶχεν·
νῦν δ' αὐτὴν ἤδη καὶ ῥοδόπηχυν ἔχει.

Πρῴην τὴν σαύραν ῥοδοδάκτυλον, Ἄλκιμ'[23], ἔδειξας·
νῦν αὐτὴν ἤδη καὶ ῥοδόπηχυν ἔχεις.

This joke on the Homeric epithet ῥοδοδάκτυλος, which here takes on an obscene meaning[24], appears in both book XI and book XII with an attribution to Strato of Sardis[25]. The couplet is basically the same, the only differences being the shift from the third (εἶχεν/ἔχει) to the second person (ἔδειξας/ἔχεις) and the name of the character (Ἀγάθων/ Ἄλκιμ')[26]. Both Ἀγάθων and Ἄλκιμος are common names in real life[27], and neither of them occurs elsewhere in Strato's poems. The name may have been simply changed to address a different real person, and the two versions may be explained as the reuse of the same joke on two different occasions. But one should also note that while Ἀγάθων generically suggests the idea of excellence (and possibly of sophistication, and even effeminacy, if one thinks of the tragic poet ridiculed by Aristophanes in his *Thesmophoriazousai*[28]), Ἄλκιμος better fits

[23] Salmasius; the manuscript reads ανιμ'.

[24] It plays on both δάκτυλος and ῥόδον as euphemisms for - respectively - the *membrum virile* (Henderson 1991², 114-115) and the boy's anus (in pederastic contexts, the opposition ῥόδον/βάτος is common as a metaphor for two different moments of life: see Floridi 2007, 231-232). As I have suggested elsewhere (Floridi 2007, 372), an epithet used for Dawn, who 'rises' in the morning, may suggest the idea of the 'rising' of the 'lizard', *i.e.* the boy's *penis* (for σαύρα = πέος, see Adams 1982, 30). On the two epigrams, see also Giannuzzi 2007, 404-405 and 463.

[25] Theoretically, the possibility that one of the two versions of the poem may be due to interpolation cannot be ruled out, but this seems unlikely. Among Strato's epigrams, we find another pair where the poet experiments with different ways of expressing exactly the same idea: *AP* XI 225 = 51 Fl. and *AP* XII 210 = 52 Fl. (a *ménage à trois*). As in the case we are commenting, these two poems occur in two different books of the *Greek Anthology*, and this seems to suggest a different mode of circulation already in Antiquity: see Floridi 2007, 54.

[26] One should also note the omission, in the second version, of δ' at v. 2: is this a variant version or a scribal error? Given the textual evanescence of particles, the latter is certainly more probable.

[27] See *LGPN*, I-V, s.v.

[28] On such a characterization, see Pretagostini 1997; Austin - Olson 2004, 61-63, 119.

the context for three reasons: (1) it is a proper name that occurs both in the *Iliad* (XIX 392, XXIV 474 and 574), where, together with Automedon, he is Achilles' favourite companion after Patroclus's death, and in the *Odyssey* (XXII 235), where he is Mentor's father; so the name is particularly apt in the context of Homeric parody (especially if one thinks of the common post-Homeric homoerotic interpretation of the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus in Greek literature: see Strat. *AP* XII 217,5-6 = 60,5-6 Fl. ὦ μακαριστὸς ἐκεῖνος, ὅτις ποτέ, καινὸς Ἀχιλλεὺς / τοίῳ ἐνὶ κλισίῃ τερπόμενος Πατρόκλῳ, with my n. *ad l.*); (2) ἄλκιμος is also a Homeric adjective (*e.g. Il.* XI 483), whose meaning is 'stout, brave' (*LSJ*, s.v., I); (3) a proper name connected to ἀλκή, 'strength', suggests the idea of virility, on which the joke is based (through the opposition ῥοδοδάκτυλον/ῥοδόπηχυν, where the second part of the two compounds can also be taken as a measure of length, the couplet offers a description of the 'growth' of the character's penis).

It is thus possible that Strato changed the name to make it more suitable to the content of the epigram, when revising an old couplet for a new book – a new *libellus*, or a 'definitive' collection of his own poems[29]. A generic name, Ἀγάθων – be it real or fictitious – is replaced with a speaking name, Ἄλκιμος, which makes the joke more effective.

2. Diosc. *AP* V 53 = *HE* 1475ff. = 5 Galán Vioque and *AP* V 193 = *HE* 1479ff. = 6 Galán Vioque

Ἡ πιθανή μ' ἔτρωσεν Ἀριστονόη, φίλ' Ἄδωνι,
κοψαμένη τῇ σῇ στήθεα πὰρ καλύβῃ.
εἰ δώσει ταύτην καὶ ἐμοὶ χάριν, ἣν ἀποπνεύσω,
μὴ προφάσεις, σύμπλουν σύμ με λαβὼν ἀπάγου.

Ἡ τρυφερή μ' ἤγρευσε Κλεὼ τὰ γαλάκτιν', Ἄδωνι,
τῇ σῇ κοψαμένη στήθεα παννυχίδι.
εἰ δώσει κἀμοὶ ταύτην χάριν, ἣν ἀποπνεύσω,
μὴ προφάσεις, σύμπλουν σύν με λαβὼν ἀγέτω.

Both poems – which are almost identical in terms of wording, the most evident change being the name of the woman – are included in book V; *AP* V 53 = *HE* 1475ff. is attributed to Dioscorides by the lemma τοῦ αὐτοῦ, *AP* V 193 = *HE* 1479ff. by the lemma Διοσκορίδου, added by C, the 'Corrector' of **P**. The question

[29] Several elements suggest that Strato published more than one book: see Floridi 2007, 54-55.

whether C's ascription is reliable has been much discussed[30]: Stadtmüller 1894 thought the two poems could not be by the same author, and that one was an imitation of the other[31]. Waltz 1929, 88 explained *AP* V 193 as a *ridicula imitatio* of *AP* V 53, where «la pointe galante qui terminait l'épigramme de Dioscoride (si elle se montre nue à moi aussi, je consens à mourir ensuite) est remplacée par une 'charge': je veux bien mourir, mais à condition qu'elle m'enrôle d'abord dans son equipage (sur ce genre de métaphore, cf. V, 44, etc.)». This explanation, however, is hardly convincing: the slight variant in the last verse does not really change the tone of the poem, which is concluded, in both versions, by a nautical image common in erotic contexts[32]. And parody is usually more effective in hitting its targets: the couple Asclepiades *AP* VII 145 = *HE* 946ff. = 29 Sens/Mnasalces *HE* 2667ff., which leaves no doubts as to who is imitating whom, offers a telling parallel for how a 'serious' poem may be parodied so as to completely change its meaning and tone. Mnasalces humorously converts Asclepiades to a Stoic context, leaving the poem almost identical but for the names of – respectively – Ajax and Apate, which are replaced by Hedone and Terpsis[33]. While in Asclepiades Virtue sits in mourning by Ajax's tomb, in Mnasalces she sits by Hedone's side[34]. Even less convincing is the suggestion by Giangrande 1967, who reads *AP* V 193 as a parody of V 53 directed toward a *pathicus*, whose real name would be Κλέων (cf. the play on Μηνοφίλα / Μηνόφιλος in Marc. Arg. *AP* V 116,5-6 = *GPh* 1349-1350 and the mock grave epigram for Trygonion, a castrated Gallos, offered by Philod. *AP* VII 222 = *GPh* 3320ff. = 33 Sider)[35].

The best explanation for the relationship between the two poems is thus the one provided by Reitzenstein 1905, 1128 (and accepted by Gow – Page 1965, II,

---

[30] C is generally accurate when introducing additions and corrections (drawn from a copy of Cephalas's anthology produced by Michael ὁ χαρτοφύλαξ: see Cameron 1993, 103-120), but he is not exempt from errors: see Gow 1958, 35ff.

[31] *Alterutrum aut imitatoris est aut Asclepiadis*, «meaning presumably that we had either Asclepiades and an imitation by D., or D. and an imitation by an unknown» (Gow - Page 1965, II, 238).

[32] For nautical imagery in erotic literature, see Adams 1982, 167; Henderson 1991², 49, 161-164; Murgatroyd 1995.

[33] Here are the texts of the two poems: Asclepiades: Ἅδ' ἐγὼ ἁ τλάμων Ἀρετὰ παρὰ τῷδε κάθημαι / Αἴαντος τύμβῳ κειρομένα πλοκάμους, / θυμὸν ἄχει μεγάλῳ / βεβολημένα, εἰ παρ' Ἀχαιοῖς / ἁ δολόφρων Ἀπάτα κρέσσον ἐμεῦ δύναται; Mnasalcas: Ἅδ' ἐγὼ ἁ τλάμων Ἀρετὰ παρὰ τῇδε κάθημαι / Ἡδονῇ, αἰσχίστως κειραμένα πλοκάμους, / θυμὸν ἄχει μεγάλῳ βεβολημένα, εἴπερ ἅπασιν / ἁ κακόφρων Τέρψις κρεῖσσον ἐμοῦ κέκριται.

[34] Cf. Gow - Page 1965, II, 412; Sens 2011, 197.

[35] For a rejection of Giangrande's hypothesis, see Sider 1997, 179-180; Galán Vioque 2001, 155.

238; see also Galán Vioque 2001, 155): *AP* V 53 and 193 must be two alternative versions of a same quatrain by the same poet.

Both Aristonoe and Cle(i)o are attested as proper names in real life: we know, for instance, of a famous priestess of Nemesis bearing the name Aristonoe (*IG* II^2, 3462, 3rd cent. B.C.), whose statue is now at the National Archaeological Museum in Athens; more generally, feminine names in -νόη would appear to have been common in Hellenistic poetry (cf. *e.g.* Νικονόη in Hedyl. *AP* VI 292,3 = *HE* 1827 = 1,3 Floridi, or Πραξινόα and Εὐνόα in Theocr. 15). Cle(i)o was a notoriously bibulous woman in Alexandria (mentioned by both Phalaecus *HE* 2936 and Aelian *VH* II 41; the woman is probably to be identified with the gluttonous Cleio of Hedylus *HE* 1871 = 9,1 Fl.: see my n. *ad l.*, also for the spelling)[36]. The two names may thus refer to real persons, or at least may have been chosen for their topicality – although Aristonoe, 'fair mind', may have been a more promising name, in the speaker's view, than Cle(i)o for a girl one wishes to sleep with (cf. Ἀριστοδίκη, 'best justice', in Nicarch. *AP* XI 328,2, with a clear allusion to the woman's 'fairness' in sharing her charms with three different partners: see *infra*). We must admit, however, that here a specific connection between the women's names and the theme of the poems is difficult to find. A scribal error, by the way, can be ruled out, given the textual distance between Ἀριστονόη and Κλεώ and other differences between the two versions, such as v. 1 and the explicit of v. 2 (while it might account for other textual details, such as the inversions κοψαμένη τῇ σῇ/τῇ σῇ κοψαμένη at v. 2, ταύτην καὶ ἐμοί/κἀμοὶ ταύτην at v. 3, or the variant σύμ/σύν at v. 4). The couple thus seems to offer another example of how a poet could reuse his own verses and adapt them to different circumstances (and, in this case, to a different beloved), so as to produce two different versions of the same poem.

I will not discuss here Mel. *AP* V 215 = *HE* 4272ff. = Posidipp. *HE* 3190ff., an epigram on Heliodora which is repeated in book XII, after adesp. *AP* XII 19, with the variant Ἡλιωδόρου instead of Ἡλιωδόρας and an attribution to Μελεάτου (*sic*) or Ποσειδίππου: most probably, it is an interpolation caused by the need to adapt a heterosexual poem – after it was displaced – to the pederastic book[37].

---

[36] The name Κλ<ε>ιώ also appears in *CPR* XXXIII, col. V 19, but it is unclear whether it is used for a girl or for the Muse: see Parsons - Maehler - Maltomini 2015, 72.

[37] See Gow - Page 1965, II, 636-637. Gender misclassifications in books V and XII are notoriously common, and they are probably due to Cephalas: Gow - Page 1965, I, XIX-XX; Cameron 1993, 31. Another example of corrections aimed at resolving a similar problem is provided by Asclep. *AP* V 145 = *HE* 860ff. = 12 Sens, where C writes αὐτήν instead of αὐτόν (*contra metrum*) at v. 4 and κόρη instead of κόμη at v. 6. Parsons 2002, 106, n. 45 includes in his list Antip. Thess. *AP* IX 149 = *GPh* 441ff. and *AP* IX 150 = *GPh* 447ff., whose v. 3-6 coincide - except for a word - with Philip. *AP* IX 255 = *GPh* 2939ff.,

2. *Texts transmitted via the* Greek Anthology *and papyri*

1. Nicarch. *AP* XI 328 = P.Oxy. 4502,18-29

Τὴν μίαν Ἑρμογένης κἀγώ ποτε καὶ Κλεόβουλος
ἤγομεν εἰς κοινὴν Κύπριν Ἀριστοδίκην·
ἧς ἔλαχον μὲν ἐγὼ πολιὴν ἅλα ναιέμεν αὐτός·
εἷς γὰρ ἕν, οὐ πάντες πάντα, διειλόμεθα.
Ἑρμογένης δ᾽ ἔλαχε στυγερὸν δόμον εὐρώεντα, 5
ὕστατον, εἰς ἀφανῆ χῶρον ὑπερχόμενος,
ἔνθ᾽ ἀκταὶ νεκύων καὶ ἐρινεοὶ ἠνεμόεντες
δινεῦνται πνοιῇ δυσκελάδων ἀνέμων.
Ζῆνα δὲ θὲς Κλεόβουλον, ὃς οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβαίνειν,
τὸ ψολόεν κατέχων ἐν χερὶ πῦρ, ἔλαχεν. 10
γῆ δ᾽ ἔμενε ξυνὴ πάντων· ψίαθον γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ
στρώσαντες τὴν γραῦν ὧδε διειλόμεθα.

The poem, an obscene parody of the tripartite division of the cosmos between Zeus, Hades and Poseidon (*Iliad* XV 189-193), included in book XI of the *Anthology*, is also transmitted by P.Oxy. 4502,18-29 (1st/2nd cent. A.D.)[38]. The papyrus offers some variant readings: (1) Διδύμαρχος instead of Κλεόβουλος, at v. 1 and 9; (2) πνοιαῖς instead of πνοιῇ at v. 8; (3) possibly πηδάλ<ι>ον (R.A. Coles *apud* Parsons) instead of πῦρ ἔλαχεν at v. 10.

(3) is most probably a scribal corruption – the reading of the papyrus is very uncertain, but if Coles is right in suggesting πηδάλιον[39], one should note, with Parsons 1999, that «Zeus does not normally wield a rudder, and we miss the catch-word ἔλαχεν» (see ἔλαχον, v. 3, and ἔλαχε, v. 5). As regards (2), a passage from the plural to the singular (or vice versa) is an easy change and may have occurred at any stage of the transmission of the text (for a similar case, see Mel. *AP* XII 78, 1 = *HE* 4442 = *BKT* V 1,76, discussed below)[40]. Where the papyrus certainly offers a better reading, as unanimously recognised by scholars, is in the case of (1): the proper name Διδύμαρχος instead of Κλεόβουλος. As remarked by Parsons 1999, 53, the name (attested in real life: cf. *LGPN*, I-V, s.v.) alludes to δίδυμοι, a slang term for 'testicles' (cf. *e.g.* Marc. Arg. *AP* V 105,3-4 = *GPh* 1331-1332; Philod. *AP* V 126,4 = *GPh* 3337 = 31,4

---

but the case is different (see Gow - Page 1968, II, 72-73) and, in any case, proper names are not involved.

[38] Parsons 1999, 46-49, 52-53.

[39] The word can have an obscene meaning: see Henderson 1991², 123, n. 63.

[40] Magnelli 2005, 162 argues in favour of πνοιαῖς, on the basis of *Il.* XVII 55-56 τὸ δέ τε πνοιαὶ δονέουσι / παντοίων ἀνέμων.

Sider, with his n. *ad l.* for further parallels), and this is obviously appropriate in an obscene epigram. In addition, the second component, -αρχος, hints at the equation of the character with Zeus[41]. Didymarchos is thus preferable to Cleoboulos, a name not particularly appropriate to the context[42], where all the characters bear significant names. Hermogenes, who gets the (metaphorical) Underworld (*i.e.* the old woman's πρωκτός), has a name whose meaning is 'son of Hermes' the psychopomp[43], while Aristodike suggests the 'fair' division between the three participants in the *ménage*[44].

The phonetic and graphical difference between the two names rules out the possibility of textual corruption. A plausible explanation is that Κλεόβουλος was used to allude to a real person, in an *ad hoc* performance where Nicarchus's text was readapted to the needs of the moment[45]; and it is at least equally possible (see the case of Strato, and possibly Dioscorides, discussed above) that the poet himself used the name in a (first?) version of the poem addressed to a specific character, while Διδύμαρχος was a *nomen loquens* chosen to create a stronger connection between the role of the man in the epigram and his name for the benefit of a larger audience[46].

---

[41] Condello *apud* Magnelli 2005, 159, n. 36; Vergados 2010, 407, n. 2.

[42] A tentative explanation for the name has been proposed by Parsons 1999, 53: «Here one could argue that Kleoboulos puts the sage in an undignified condition» (see also Schatzmann 2012, 329-331). However, this would introduce quite a different joke in a poem where the other names are all speaking names.

[43] Rea *apud* Parsons. In addition, Magnelli 2005, 160 suggests the possibility of taking Hermogenes, 'son of Hermes', as a reference to Pan, a god often associated with sex.

[44] Schulte 1999, 69; Magnelli 2005, 159, n. 34; Schatzmann 2012, 331. A pun on ἀριστο- (or Ἀριστο-) and Ἀριστοδίκην possibly also occurred in the incipit preserved by *CPR* XXXIII, col. III 24 (see Parsons - Maehler - Maltomini 2015, 54).

[45] For the symposium as a setting for scoptic epigrams, see Floridi 2014, 25-27, with further bibliography. The papyrus seems to reflect an artistic design in the arrangement of the texts (Morelli 2015), but oral performances and books are not mutually exclusive (on this point, see *e.g.* Gutzwiller 2005; Magnelli 2005, 161-164; Floridi 2010, 34-37).

[46] Among the variant readings involving proper names in Martial, it is worth mentioning the (obviously accidental) parallel provided by *Gemellus/Venustus* in I 10,1 (as pointed out by Parsons 1999, 53), which is among the cases most often mentioned in support of the theory of authorial variants. According to Pasquali 1952², 425, «*Venustus* sarà la lezione migliorata, perché contrappone il bel marito alla brutta moglie» (the poem being on a man who marries a rich but ugly woman for her inheritance). On the contrary, Lindsay 1903b, 21 - the first to recognise the potential of *Venustus* as a speaking name in the context - argued for the recency of *Gemellus*, although he could not offer any explanation for the substitution: «there may quite possibly have been some reason, unknowable to us, which induced the poet to substitute *Gemellus* for the name which he had at first selected». A bilingual joke, based on the equivalence *Gemellus* = δίδυμος, is supposed by Vallat 2006,

2. Mel. *AP* XII 78 (= *HE* 442ff.) = *BKT* V 1,76[47]

Εἰ χλαμύδ' εἶχεν Ἔρως καὶ μὴ πτερὰ μηδ' ἐπὶ νώτων
τόξα τε καὶ φαρέτραν, ἀλλ' ἐφόρει πέτασον,
ναίχι τὸν ἁβρὸν ἔφηβον ἐπόμνυμαι, Ἀντίοχος μὲν
ἦν ἂν Ἔρως, ὁ δ' Ἔρως τἄμπαλιν Ἀντίοχος.

The epigram is both transmitted in book XII and in *BKT* V 1,76 (1st cent. A.D.)[48]. Small details apart (*e.g.* ἐπὶ νώτῳ at the end of v. 1 instead of ἐπὶ νώτων), the text of the papyrus differs from that of *AP* in the proper name only: Ἀντιγένης instead of Ἀντίοχος (v. 3-4).

The case is somewhat different from the others analysed so far, since there is an evident palaeographical affinity between the two names, and a scribal error based on homoeoarcton is a plausible explanation for the confusion. All the editors print the manuscript's readings, although in the *editio princeps* the choice between the two names is considered impossible, and Gow – Page 1965, II, 653 state that «the variants in the Berlin Papyrus […] may be original».

One element apparently in favour of Ἀντίοχος is the fact that the name appears in two other epigrams by Meleager, *AP* XII 54 = *HE* 4438ff. (on a similar theme: Kypris herself would deny that Eros is her son, should she see Antiochos) and *AP* XII 133 = *HE* 4446ff. (where an implicit parallel between the boy and another mythical character, Ganymedes, Zeus's beloved, occurs)[49], whereas the only erotic epigram in which Ἀντιγένης appears is Asclep. *AP* XII 162 = *HE* 912ff. = 23 Sens, a somewhat puzzling poem where the role of the character is not totally clear[50].

Ἀντιγένης, however, is not to be dismissed, not only for the principle of the *lectio difficilior*, or for the antiquity of the testimony that preserves it (which is

136. An alternative explanation, however, has been proposed: according to Tandoi *apud* Citroni 1975, 50, *Venustus* was influenced by *bellus* in the preceding epigram; further arguments in support of this view in Fusi 2013, 96-7, n. 88. On the whole question, see now Russotti 2020.

[47] This epigram is not included in Parsons's list (see above, n. 22).

[48] *BKT* V 1,75-76 + V 2,146 - all fragments from the same roll - preserve an erotic excerpt from Meleager's *Garland*; the papyrus has shown that in Meleager there was no distinction between homosexual and heterosexual epigrams: see Wifstrand 1926, 10-13; Cameron 1993, 11.

[49] And in Polystratos, *AP* XII 91; other instances of the name in the *Anthology* are Lucill. *AP* XI 315 = 119 Fl. and adesp. *AP* XIV 137.

[50] The 'spells of Philocrates' lisped by Eros probably aim to fill Antigenes with love for the speaker (see Sens 2011 *ad l.*). The name in the *Anthology* also appears in Antip. Thess. *AP* IX 96; Philod. *AP* IX 412; Bacch. or Sim. *AP* XIII 28.

obviously, *per se*, no guarantee of a more reliable text), but also in the light of the context: the poem is concluded by the idea of an 'exchange of identities' between the human beloved and Eros, that is, by a change in nature. Ἀντι-γένης may be taken to mean the one who 'swaps' (ἀντί) his birth (-γένης), who 'takes the place' of somebody else. As a parallel, we may consider the play on Ἀντιγόνη exploited by Marcus Argentarius in *AP* V 63 = *GPh* 1311-1312[51]: Ἀντιγόνη, Σικελὴ πάρος ἦσθά μοι· ὡς δ' ἐγενήθης / Αἰτωλή, κἀγὼ Μῆδος ἰδοὺ γέγονα. The theme of a change of nationality on the part of the woman, in a poem entirely based on paretymological puns[52], certainly also involves a play on the name Ἀντιγόνη, who is here, literally, 'the one who changes (ἀντί) her birth (-γόνη)' (from Sicilian to Aetolian, *i.e.* from a silent and consenting girl to a partner who asks for money)[53].

If the variant Ἀντιγένης is thus to be considered, how are we to explain the fluctuation Ἀντιγένης/Ἀντίοχος? Various scenarios are possible. (1) Ἀντιγένης is the original reading, and Ἀντίοχος intruded into the text either because of its similarity to the original reading, or under the influence of Meleager's epigrams on Ἀντίοχος, or both; (2) (partially overlapping with [1]) Ἀντιγένης is the original reading, Ἀντίοχος intruded into the text because of its similarity to the original reading, and the name should be looked at with suspicion also in the other epigrams by Meleager where the character is mentioned (their thematic similarities suggest that they may have been conceived as a series for the same boy); (3) Ἀντιγένης and

[51] Thanks are due to Federico Condello for drawing my attention to this example.

[52] While the meaning of Αἰτωλή and Μῆδος is clear (they come, respectively, from αἰτέω and μὴ δούς; cf. Front. *AP* XII 174, quoted above, n. 16), Σικελή has been variously explained. Gow - Page 1968, II, 168 takes it as factual, but this is improbable, as it would be the only ethnic name in the poem which does not hint at a secondary meaning. Keydell 1952, 497 suggests a bilingual pun on the Latin *sic* (she was Σικελή, *i.e.* she always said yes), but this is far-fetched when compared to the immediacy of the plays on Αἰτωλή and Μῆδος; Daniel 1988 argues for a pun on σίγλος, 'shekel' - the courtesan was cheap and then became pricey; but the fact that she has become Αἰτωλή implies that she did not ask for money before. Hughes - Notopoulos 1946 suggest the pun Σικελή-σιγηλή, and this is, to my mind, the most persuasive explanation so far.

[53] The name is paretymologically exploited by Marcus Argentarius, although in a very different way, also in *AP* XI 320 = *GPh* 1491ff. Ἀντιγόνην ἔστεργε Φιλόστρατος· ἦν δὲ παλαισταῖς / ὁ τλήμων Ἴρου πέντε πενιχρότερος. / εὗρε δ' ὑπὸ κρυμοῦ γλυκὺ φάρμακον· ἀντία γὰρ σχὼν / γούνατ' ἐκοιμήθη, ξεῖνε, μετ' Ἀντιγόνης (the pun here is based on the assonance γούνατ'/-γόνης, and the substitute for Antigone is masturbation; see Hendry 1991). Antigone also appears in Marc. Arg. *AP* V 128 = *GPh* 1361ff. Another interesting pun on a proper name in Argentarius appears in *AP* V 105 = *GPh* 1329ff.: Menophila, 'lover of the Moon (μήνη)', is a girl whose heaven (= mouth) keeps both *Canis* (both 'dog-star' and ἀνδρεῖον μόριον) and *Gemini* (both the constellation and ὄρχεις) hidden.

Ἀντίοχος are authorial variants; Ἀντιγένης creates a stronger relationship between the character's name and the context, and this would suggest an authorial revision aimed at improving the text. Since the papyrus preserves an extract from the *Garland*, this would imply that the anthology circulated in (slightly) different versions (or, possibly, that there were copies provided with marginal *variae lectiones*)[54].

Hypothesis (3) is admittedly the least probable, given the similarity between the two names, although it cannot be totally ruled out (in the process of revision of a text, an author may be inspired by the phonetic or graphical affinity between his first choice and a later improvement)[55].

3. Hegesippus *AP* VI 266 (= *HE* 1905ff.) = P.Köln V 204

Τάνδε παρὰ τριόδοις τὰν Ἄρτεμιν Ἀγελόχεια,
ἔτ' ἐν πατρὸς μένουσα παρθένος δόμοις,
ἔσσατο, Δαμαρέτου θυγάτηρ· ἐφάνη γάρ οἱ αὐτὰ
ἱστοῦ παρὰ κρόκαισιν ὡς αὐγὰ πυρός.

This poem by Hegesippus is also transmitted by P.Köln V 204, a fragmentary papyrus dated, on palaeographical grounds, to the middle of the 2nd century, and which preserves, under the heading Μ[ν]ασάλκου, (the remains of) 6 epigrams (one of which, *AP* VII 488 = *HE* 2635ff., is transmitted, in the *Anthology*, under Mnasalces's name)[56]. Little of the poem survives, but at v. 3 of this epigram, instead of Δαμαρέτου, the papyrus reads Νικαρέτ[.

Gronewald 1985, 30 put forward two possible explanations for the discrepancies between **P** and the text of the papyrus: (1) *AP* VI 266 is wrongly ascribed to Hegesippus in *AP*, and the poem is by Mnasalces; (2) this is a different poem, as Mnasalces *HE* 2667ff. (mentioned above) is different from Asclep. *AP* VII 145 = *HE* 946ff. = 29 Sens, from which it differs only as far as proper names are concerned.

[54] See, for two alternative readings involving proper names, the textual fluctuation *Caecilianus/Maecilianus* in three epigrams by Martial (I 73, IV 15, IX 70). Editors usually dismiss *Maecilianus* as a scribal error, but the possibility that it is to be maintained as a *lectio difficilior* cannot be ruled out: see Russotti 2020, 23-26.

[55] On this point, see Mariotti 1985, 105: «So bene che soprattutto scrittori particolarmente sensibili ai valori fonici possono trovare nella parola presente sulla loro pagina o nella loro mente il suggerimento per una variante simile per il suono e del tutto nuova per il senso». Among the modern examples he was able to provide, we find the replacement of «percotea» with «percorrea» in Leopardi's autograph of *A Silvia* (v. 22), a passage from Pavese's *Mestiere di vivere*, where «sfoghi» is an overwritten variant of «svaghi», and the substitution of «virgo» for «ergo» in Sannazaro's *De partu virginis* (II 45).

[56] On the arrangement of the texts in the papyrus, see Gutzwiller 1998, 31.

In the couple Mnasalces/Asclepiades, as we have seen, Mnasalces clearly offers a parody of Asclepiades's poem, and the differences he introduces, although minimal, are sufficient to completely change the tone and the meaning of the epigram. Here, on the contrary, the reasons for the replacement of Δαμαρέτου with Νικαρέτ[are difficult to account for: the papyrus only preserves the very beginning of each verse[57], so the possibility that the epigram developed in a different way cannot be ruled out[58]. The two forms of the name, however, are too similar not to think of a scribal error (and the etymologies, as far as we can judge, do not suggest any particular reason why one of the two names should be more appropriate to the context than the other). Therefore, it is at least a fair guess that the poem is the same as that transmitted in *AP*, and not a variation by a different author[59]; the variant reading concerning the name can most probably be explained, here, as a banal mistake.

Some final remarks

The number of cases available to us is too scanty to allow any general conclusion, but some considerations can be made. Poets could re-use an epigram and adapt it to different circumstances, by way of very slight changes, the most notable being the modification of the proper name of a character, either because a speaking name, more fitting in the context, is introduced, or because a different, real person is meant. This is shown by Strato, and possibly Dioscorides (if the two epigrams, as is likely, are both by him).

---

[57] As far as our poem is concerned, this is what the papyrus offers:

[..]νδε παρὰ τ[
ἔτ' ἐν πατ[
[…]ατο Νικαρέτ[
ἱστοῦ πα[

[58] As rightly observed by Gronewald 1985, 30, «Man könnte aber auch erwägen, daß das Epigramm des Mnasalkes auch in dem verlorenen Teil noch weitere Varianten aufgewiesen hat».

[59] It does not matter, for our purpose, to establish the poem's authorship. The attribution to Hegesippus may be wrong, as is often the case in our manuscript tradition, or a poem by a different author may have been introduced into a sequence by Mnasalces. The traces of letters written in a smaller script above the epigram are interpreted by Cameron 1993, 4 as traces of a different authorial lemma, possibly [Ἡγησί]ππου written in abbreviated form. «This exceptional interlinear lemma explained in some way the presence of a poem written by or adapted from another poet in an edition of Mnasalces».

If poets could slightly revise a poem, there is nothing strange in the idea that a papyrus might preserve a different, authorial version of an epigram transmitted by the medieval tradition in a slightly different form. Nicarchus' epigram, where one of the two names clearly improves the joke, is telling. Among the three cases we have considered, Nicarchus is the only one where the variant reading concerning a proper name cannot be explained on purely palaeographical grounds, and, as a consequence, where the hypothesis of a conscious reworking (possibly, on the part of the author himself) in view of a joke can be put forward with a certain degree of confidence. This, however, does not invalidate the general principle that poets revised and reused their own verses, and that some of their changes may have survived down to us (the pair Ἀντιγένης – Ἀντίοχος might offer another example).

Like many other genres of Greek poetry, the epigram, for much of its history, was a 'text in motion', owing to the performative contexts in which it was delivered and to the different editions in which it circulated – single-author collections or multi-author anthologies of some sort. This has certainly left some traces in the poems, although the specificity of the textual tradition of the *Greek Anthology*, which can be described as a series of progressive *reductiones ad unum* (from the *Garland* of Meleager to the anthology of Cephalas, every stage in the history of this genre has found its collector)[60], has determined a degree of textual standardization that has somewhat obscured and simplified a much more varied reality (of which we still catch a glimpse from time to time).

Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna
lucia.floridi2@unibo.it

Keywords: Greek epigram, *Greek Anthology*, (par)etymology, speaking names, puns, papyri
Parole chiave: epigramma greco, *Anthologia Graeca*, (par)etimologia, nomi parlanti, giochi di parole, papiri

[60] Cameron 1993.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Adams 1982
J.N.Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London 1982.
Adams 2003
J.N.Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2003.
Adams – Janse – Swain 2002
J.N.Adams – M.Janse – S.Swain (ed.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, Oxford 2002.
Austin – Olson 2004
C.Austin – S.D.Olson, *Aristophanes. Thesmophoriazusae*, Oxford 2004.
Beard 2014
M.Beard, *Laughter in Ancient Rome. On Joking, Trickling, and Cracking Up*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2014.
Bonanno 1980
M.G.Bonanno, *Nomi e soprannomi archilochei*, «Museum Helveticum» XXXVII (1980), 65-88.
Booth – Maltby 2006
J.Booth – R.Maltby (ed.), *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature*, Swansea 2006.
Calame 1988
C.Calame, *Il racconto in Grecia. Enunciazioni e rappresentazioni di poeti*, Roma-Bari 1988 [= Id., *L'antroponimo greco come enunciato narrativo: appunti linguistici e semiotici*, in *Mondo classico: percorsi possibili*, Ravenna 1985, 27-37].
Cameron 1993
A.Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993.
Citroni 1975
M.Citroni, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber I*, Firenze 1975.
Colburn 1912
G.B.Colburn, *What's in a Name?*, «The Classical Weekly» VI (1912), 66-69.
Conca 2004-2005
F.Conca, *Su alcuni epigrammi scoptici*, «Rendiconti della Accademia di Archeologia Lettere e Belle Arti» n.s. LXXIII (2004-2005), 323-334.
Corbeill 1996
A.Corbeill, *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*, Princeton 1996.
Daniel 1988
R.W.Daniel, *Petronius, Sat. 14,3 and Anth. Gr. 5,63*, «Studi Classici e Orientali» XXXVIII (1988), 347-351.

De Nonno 1998
M.De Nonno, *Testi greci e latini in movimento. Riflessi nella tradizione manoscritta e nella prassi editoriale*, in A.Ferrari (ed.), *Filologia classica e filologia romanza. Esperienze ecdotiche a confronto*, Spoleto 1998, 221-239.
Dorandi 2007
T.Dorandi, *Nell'officina dei classici. Come lavoravano gli autori antichi*, Roma 2007.
Floridi 2007
L.Floridi, *Stratone di Sardi. Epigrammi*, Alessandria 2007.
Floridi 2010
L.Floridi, *Rivisitazione delle convenzioni epigrammatiche nel sottogenere scoptico*, «Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici» LXV (2010), 9-42.
Floridi 2014
L.Floridi, *Lucillio. Epigrammi*, Berlin-Boston 2014.
Floridi 2020
L.Floridi, *Edilo. Epigrammi*, Berlin-Boston 2020.
Fröhde 1898
O.Fröhde, *Beiträge zur Technik der alten attische Komödie*, Leipzig 1898.
Fusi 2006
M. Valerii Martialis *Epigrammaton liber tertius*. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione e commento a cura di A.Fusi, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2006.
Fusi 2013
A.Fusi, *La recensio gennadiana e il testo di Marziale*, «Segno e Testo» XI (2013), 79-122.
Galán Vioque 2001
G.Galán Vioque, *Dioscórides. Epigramas*, Huelva 2001.
Garulli 2012
V.Garulli, *BYBLOS LAINEE. Epigrafia, letteratura, epitafio*, Bologna 2012.
Giangrande 1967
G.Giangrande, *Hellenistische Epigramme*, «Eranos» LXV (1967), 39-48 [= Id., *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, II, Amsterdam 1981, 367-376].
Giannuzzi 2007
M.E.Giannuzzi, *Stratone di Sardi. Epigrammi*, Lecce 2007.
Giarratano 1951[2]
M. Valerii Martialis *Epigrammaton libri XIV*, recensuit C.Giarratano, Augusta Taurinorum 1951[2].
Gow 1958
A.S.F.Gow, *The Greek Anthology. Sources and Ascriptions*, London 1958.

Gow – Page 1965
A.S.F.Gow – D.L.Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, I-II, Cambridge 1965.
Gow – Page 1968
A.S.F.Gow – D.L.Page, *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, I-II, Cambridge 1968.
Gronewald 1985
M.Gronewald, *Epigramme des Mnasalkes*, in M.Gronewld – K.Maresch – W.Schäfer (ed.), *Kölner Papyr*i 5, Opladen 1985, 22-32.
Gutzwiller 1998
K.J.Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1998.
Gutzwiller 2005
K.J.Gutzwiller, rev. G.Nisbet, *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire. Martial's Forgotten Rivals*, Oxford 2003, «Bryn Mawr Classical Review» 2005.01.19. [link: https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2005/2005.01.19/]
Henderson 1991[2]
J.Henderson, *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New York-Oxford 1991[2]
Hendry 1991
M.Hendry, *Figidus Lusus. Marcus Argentarius XXXIV G.-P. (A.P. 11.320)*, «Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies» XXXII (1991), 197-201.
Howell 1980
P.Howell, *A Commentary on Book I of the Epigrams of Martial*, London 1980.
Hughes – Notopoulos 1946
A.H.Hughes – J.A.Notopoulos, *Note on A.P. V, 62*, «American Journal of Philology» LXVII (1946), 150.
Kay 1985
N.M.Kay, *Martial Book XI. A Commentary*, London 1985.
Keydell 1952
R.Keydell, *Bemerkungen zu griechischen Epigrammen*, «Hermes» LXXX (1952), 497-500.
Lindsay 1903a
M.Val. Martialis Epigrammata, recognovit W.M.Lindsay, Oxford 1903 (II ed. 1929[2]).
Lindsay 1903b
W.M.Lindsay, *The Ancient Editions of Martial with Collations of the Berlin and Edinburgh Mss*, Oxford 1903.

Livrea 1979
E.Livrea, *Il piede di Eupalamo*, «Giornale Italiano di Filologia» XXXI (1979), 325-329 [= Id., *Studia Hellenistica*, I, Firenze 1991, 267-270].
Losacco 2016
M.Losacco, *«Delevit Cicero». Testimonianze antiche e riflessioni moderne sulle varianti d'autore nell'antichità*, in M.Capasso (ed.), *Sulle orme degli antichi. Scritti di filologia e storia della tradizione classica offerti a Salvatore Cerasuolo*, Lecce-Brescia 2016, 355-375.
Magnelli 2005
E.Magnelli, *Nicarco AP 11. 328: allusioni oscene e allusioni erudite (con osservazioni sulla trasmissione degli epigrammi scoptici*), «Seminari Romani» VIII (2005), 153-166.
Mariotti 1985
S.Mariotti, *Varianti d'autore e varianti di trasmissione*, in *La critica del testo. Problemi di metodo ed esperienze di lavoro*, «Atti del Convegno di Lecce, 22-26 ottobre 1984», Roma 1985, 97-111 [= Id., *Scritti di filologia classica*, Roma 2000, 551-63].
Marzullo 1953
B.Marzullo, *Strepsiade*, «Maia» VI (1953), 99-124.
McCartney 1919
E.S.McCartney, *Puns and Plays on Proper Names*, «The Classical Journal» XIV (1919), 343-358.
Morelli 2015
A.M.Morelli, *Il papiro di Nicarco (P.Oxy. LXVI 4502) e l'epigramma latino*, in L.Del Corso – A.De Vivo – A.Stramaglia (ed.), *Nel segno del testo. Edizioni, materiali e studi per Oronzo Pecere*, Firenze 2015, 41-60.
Murgatroyd 1995
P.Murgatroyd, *The Sea of Love*, «Classical Quaterly» XLV (1995), 9-25.
Obermayer 1998
H.P.Obermayer, *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche „Homosexualität" in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*, München 1998.
Parsons 1999
P.J.Parsons, *4502. Epigrams (Nicarchus II)*, *P.Oxy*, LXVI, London 1999, 43-57.
Parsons 2002
P.J.Parsons, *Callimachus and the Hellenistic Epigram*, in *Callimaque*, Entretiens Hardt XLVIII, Vandoeuvres-Genève 2002, 99-136.
Parsons – Maehler – Maltomini 2015
P.J.Parsons – H.Maehler – F.Maltomini, *The Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (G40611). Corpus Papyrorum Raineri 33*, Berlin-München-Boston 2015.

Pasquali 1952[2]
G.Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze 1952[2].
Petrone 1988
G.Petrone, *Nomen/omen: poetica e funzione dei nomi* (*Plauto, Seneca, Petronio*), «Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici» XX-XXI (1988), 33-70.
Pretagostini 1997
R.Pretagostini, *L'omosessualità di Agatone nelle Tesmoforiazuse di Aristofane e la figura del κελητίζειν* (*v. 153*), in *ΜΟΥΣΑ. Scritti in onore di G. Morelli*, Bologna 1997, 117-122.
Reitzenstein 1905
R.Reitzenstein, *Dioskurides*, in *RE* V/1 (1905), 1125-1128.
Russotti 2020
A.Russotti, *Presunte varianti d'autore in Marziale: osservazioni su due possibili tipologie del fenomeno*, in S.Ranieri – A.Roncaglia (ed.), *Ricerche a confronto. Dialoghi di Antichità Classiche e del Vicino Oriente, Bologna 2015*, Rende 2020, 15-33.
Samama 2003
E.Samama, *Les médecins dans le monde grec: sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps medical*, Genève 2003.
Schatzmann 2012
A.Schatzmann, *Nikarchos II. Epigrammata. Einleitung, Texte, Kommentar*, Göttingen 2012.
Schneidewin 1842
M. Val. Martialis *epigrammaton*, ed. F.G.Schneidewin, Grimae 1842.
Schulte 1999
H.Schulte, *Die Epigramme des Nikarchos. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Trier 1999.
Sens 2011
Asclepiades of Samos, *Epigrams and Fragments*, ed. A.Sens, Oxford 2011.
Stadtmüller 1894
Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea, I, ed. H.Stadtmüller, Lipsiae 1894.
Steiger 1888
H.Steiger, *Der Eigenname in der attischen Komödie*, Erlangen 1888.
Steinbichler 1995
W.Steinbichler, *Meriones, der ποιμὴν Κρητῶν, als Ἰδομενέως θεράπων. Zu AP 12, 97* (*Antipatros von Sidon*) *und 12, 247* (*Straton von Sardes*), «Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica» XLIX (1995), 81-90.
Tarán 1979
S.L.Tarán, *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden 1979.

Timpanaro 1997
S.Timpanaro, rec. *Decimus Magnus Ausonius, Technopaegnion, testo critico e commento a c. di C. Di Giovine*, Bologna 1996, «Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica» CXXV (1997), 228-234.
Ypsilanti 2018
M.Ypsilanti, *The Epigrams of Crinagoras of Mytilene*, Oxford 2018.
Vallat 2006
D.Vallat, *Bilingual Word-Play on Personal Names in Martial*, in Booth – Maltby 2006, 121-143.
Vergados 2010
A.Vergados, *Nicarchus AP 11.328 and Homeric Interpretation*, «Mnemosyne» LXIII (2010), 406-423.
Waltz 1929
Anthologie Grecque. *Anthologie Palatine*, II (livre V), texte établi et traduit par P.Waltz, en collaboration avec J.Guillon, Paris 1929.
Wifstrand 1926
A.Wifstrand, *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie*, Lund 1926.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32055 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 157-177*

ARIANNA GULLO

Etymology and Exegesis in Book 7 of the *Greek Anthology*

This paper deals with cases of etymological puns in the seventh book of the Greek Anthology*, from those commonly used by Greek poets of any age, attested in epigram as well, to others originating from toponyms and proper names. In the last part it also explores the relationship between etymology and philological exegesis, with a special focus on Homeric exegesis.*

*Il contributo riguarda casi di giochi etimologici nel settimo libro dell'*Antologia greca*, da quelli impiegati comunemente dai poeti greci di ogni epoca, attestati anche nell'epigramma, ad altri derivati da toponimi e nomi propri. Nell'ultima parte il lavoro prende inoltre in esame il rapporto tra etimologia ed esegesi filologica, con particolare attenzione all'esegesi omerica.*

1. *Introduction*

This paper, which stems from my forthcoming commentary on Book 7 of the *Greek Anthology*[1], deals with cases of etymological puns in that thematic book. Epigram is a broad form of ancient Greek poetry, characterized by remarkable versatility and variety in content, tone, and diction. That is why, as a formal construction and a genre dependent on sophisticated word design and taste for puns, letter and wordplay, it offers large scope for etymological investigation. More than the other thematic books, Book 7 in particular spans almost a dozen centuries, from the archaic and classical period until the rise of the Byzantine empire, giving a great overview of the genre's history and development across the centuries. Moreover, funerary epigrams represent a privileged thematic area if considered from the perspective of their idiosyncratic style, and hence this subgenre emerges as paradigmatic.

In the first section of my paper I will focus on common etymological puns used by Greek poets of any period, attested in epigram as well. The second section analyses cases of etymological puns originating from toponyms, whereas the third concerns etymology and proper names[2]. The last part, finally, is centered on etymology and philological exegesis, with a special focus on Homeric exegesis[3].

[1] See Gullo (forthcoming).

[2] On this topic, particularly productive in funerary epigrams, where the name of the dead may be exploited for praise, see also Lucia Floridi's contribution in this volume, with further bibliography.

[3] The texts of the Greek epigrams are those of Beckby 1967-1968, II. All translations are mine.

2. *Popular etymological puns*

In this section I am going to analyse etymological puns which are well-known in Greek literature and attested in several, different literary genres[4]. The epigrammatists exploit them by adapting the wordplays to the context. The main purpose of this usage is to give the poem a learned, erudite tone.

Let us start with Anon. *AP* VII 12 = *FGE* XXXIX 1222-1227 = Erinn. T 5 Neri, an epitaph for Erinna, and concentrate on l. 1 Ἄρτι λοχευομένην σε μελισσοτόκων ἔαρ ὕμνων, where the word ἔαρ stands out: a paretymological relationship is established between ἔαρ / ἦρ and Ἤριννα, evidence for which is attested in Byzantine glossaries (cf., *e.g.*, *EM* 437,21-22 = Erinn. T 2c Neri), as well as presumably between Erinna's name and ἔαρ ὕμνων. The association between Erinna and spring, determined by the 'myth' of the poetess's premature death at a young age, is justified by the fact that spring is a common image for youth[5].

D.L. *AP* VII 105,3-4 = Lacyd. T 1a Mette is an epitaph for Lacydes of Cyrene, Arcesilaus' successor in the leadership of the Platonic Academy in Athens:

(…) Διόνυσος ὅταν πολὺς ἐς δέμας ἔλθῃ,
λῦσε μέλη· διὸ δὴ μήτι Λυαῖος ἔφυ;

(…) When entering a body in great quantity,
Dionysus loosens the limbs: is not that the reason
[why he is Lyaeus?

At line 4 the expression λῦσε μέλη routinely etymologizes Dionysus' epithet Λυαῖος[6], in the same line: a similar etymological pun occurs in Hedyl. *AP* XI 414,1 = *HE* XII 1891 = 12,1 Floridi, where Dionysus is styled λυσιμελής[7].

Let us pass on to [Simon.] *AP* VII 508 = 'Emp.' *FGE* I 550-553 = 31 B 156 D.-K. = *GVI* 44:

Παυσανίαν ἰητρὸν ἐπώνυμον, Ἀγχίτεω υἱόν,
τόνδ' Ἀσκληπιάδην πατρὶς ἔθαψε Γέλα,
ὃς πλείστους κρυεραῖσι μαραινομένους ὑπὸ νούσοις
φῶτας ἀπέστρεψεν Φερσεφόνης θαλάμων.

[4] See Kwapisz - Petrain - Szymański 2013.

[5] See Neri 2003 *ad l.*, 190; Gullo (forthcoming) on Jul. Aegypt. *AP* VII 601, with further bibliography.

[6] The earliest occurrence of Λυαῖος as Dionysus' religious epithet is Leon. *AP* VI 154,1 = *HE* XCVII 2555 (see Gow - Page 1965, *HE*, II, *ad l.*, 394).

[7] See Floridi 2020 *ad l.*, 169f.

The physician Pausanias, who bears in his name the treatment
[against pain,
son of Anchites, pupil of Asclepius', was buried here by his
[fatherland, Gela,
he who kept away from Persephone's chambers many
men consumed by terrible illnesses.

The epigram etymologizes the name of the physician Pausanias («the one who puts an end to pain», cf. l. 1 ἐπώνυμον), who is the dedicatee of Empedocles' Περὶ φύσεως, as well as the philosopher's ἐρώμενος: cf. D.L. VIII 61 = Emp. 31 A 1 D.-K., who depends on ps.-Aristipp. fr. 8 Dorandi and Satyr. fr. 14 Schorn. One may compare the speaking name of the physician Ablabius in Theoseb. *AP* VII 559,3 καὶ νῦν Ἀβλαβίου γοερῷ περὶ σήματι κεῖται. Etymologizing the doctor's name recalls the 'names of art' taken by doctors for professional purposes[8]. At this point it is perhaps important to distinguish between the practice of etymologizing the name of the dead and, vice versa, that of etymologizing gods' and deities' names (see above the case of D.L. *AP* VII 105 with Dionysus' epithet Λυαῖος), which is certainly easier.

Let us see now Antip. Sid. *AP* VII 748 = *HE* XXXIII 410-417 = Merkelbach-Stauber, *SGO* II 09/11/01, an epigram probably praising a building in one of the towns named Heracleia, which has been misleadingly understood as a sepulchral poem for a woman bearing this name and, thus, included in Book 7, where it is clearly misplaced. At line 3 we read the expression χθονὸς υἷες (…) Γίγαντες, a hyperbolic, rhetorical ploy to stress how great the architectural construction to which the epigram is dedicated, appears, as though it was the amazing work of mythological creatures like the Giants. By using the *iunctura* χθονὸς υἷες Antipater resumes the ancient (and groundlessly made up) etymology which puts in relationship the word Γίγας with γῆ and the root of γίγνομαι = «born from Gaia/Gaea (the personification of the Earth)», according to the legend that the Giants were indeed Gaia/Gaea's children: cf., *e.g.*, Hes. *Th.* 185 (with West 1966 *ad l.*, 220); Eur. *Ph.* 128; Vian 1952, 283 (with detailed discussion of this ancient etymology).

Arch. Byz.? *AP* VII 68 = Arch. *GPh* XIV 3666-3673 = Diog. Sinop. *SSR* V B 115 Giannantoni, one of the fictitious funerary epigrams dedicated to Diogenes the Cynic, starts with an address to Charon:

Ἄϊδος ὦ νεκυηγέ, κεχαρμένε δάκρυσι πάντων

O ferryman of Hades conducting the dead, delighting in the tears of all

[8] See Samama 2003, 16ff.: there is plenty of evidence for Pausanias used as a professional name for 'real' doctors.

Diogenes speaks in the first person and begs Charon to welcome him in his boat, so that the philosopher could travel to Hades. Let us consider the vocatives νεκυηγέ, κεχαρμένε at line 1: the word νεκυηγός is rare – it is attested elsewhere only in *GVI* 2046,8 = Merkelbach-Stauber, *SGO* I 07/01/01 (Antandros, Troas, probably Hellenistic), where it is applied to Hermes. In Archias' epigram the compound is combined with a likely paretymological and paradoxical pun between Charon, the ferryman of the dead, and the perfect participle κεχαρμένε from χαίρειν, which indicates enjoyment, in addition to the standard greeting formula χαῖρε: this pun is rather ancient and widespread in popular culture (clearly made with an apotropaic purpose). It will be sufficient to mention Ar. *Ra.* 184 (with Dover 1993 *ad l.*, 214), in which the etymological perception is also confirmed by the famous, threefold paronomastic greeting (χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων) by which Charon is welcomed (whole quotation from Achae. *TrGF* I 20 F 11,1)[9].

3. *Etymology and names of the cities*

In this section I am going to look at two cases in which the name of a city gives the epigrammatist the chance to embed in his poem an etymological explanation for the toponym.

Antip. Thess. *AP* VII 705 = *GPh* L 343-348 is a lament for Amphipolis, once wealthy and powerful city now reduced to ashes and ruin:

Στρυμόνι καὶ μεγάλῳ πεπολισμένον Ἑλλησπόντῳ
ἠρίον Ἠδωνῆς Φυλλίδος, Ἀμφίπολι,
λοιπά τοι Αἰθοπίης Βραυρωνίδος ἴχνια νηοῦ
μίμνει καὶ ποταμοῦ τἀμφιμάχητον ὕδωρ·

[9] The same etymological feeling can be found in the *incipit* in the epitaph celebrating a doctor (?) named Charon (*GVI* 1384 = *GG* 41 = *CEG* 127 = 52 Samama, Tithronion, Phocis, ca. 500 BCE?: detailed study in Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 362ff.), who accidentally shares with the underworld character his name and is said to have 'freed' many men from labours. However, according to others, just by the power of onomastic mutuality, one may catch in the text a maliciously ironic allusion to the physician's ability to soothe the pain of the patients by sending them quickly to Hades (see the discussion in Samama 2003, 153 n. 13; on the satire against physicians and doctors, which is a widely attested theme in Greek and Latin literatures and particularly in epigram, see Floridi 2014 on Lucill. 35 = *AP* XI 112, 218f.; see also the case of the physician Agis in Hedyl. *AP* XI 123 = *HE* XI 1887 = 11 Floridi): thus, in this peculiar context, the paronomastic pun χαῖρε, Χάρο̄ν should «esorcizzare ogni possibile e persistente influenza malsana» (Albiani 1991, 188) of the dead.

τὴν δέ ποτ᾽ Αἰγείδαις μεγάλην ἔριν ὡς ἁλιανθὲς
τρῦχος ἐπ᾽ ἀμφοτέραις δερκόμεθ᾽ ἠιόσιν.

Amphipolis, tomb of the Thracian Phyllis,
placed on the Strymon and the great Hellespont,
all is left to you are the remains of the temple of Brauronian
Ethiopian Artemis and the much-contested water of the river;
we see now the city which was once a reason for fighting to Aegeus'
descendants as though it was a blood-red rag on the two banks.

Amphipolis stood on the eastern bank of the Strymon, upon a hill stretched on a cove in the flow of the river: hence its name, which hinted at the fact that the city was touched by the Strymon on both sides (cf. Th. IV 102,4); the etymological explanation is recalled at lines 5-6 through the image of the blood-red rag[10] – Amphipolis itself – between the two shores, and perhaps at line 4 as well through the epithet ἀμφιμάχητος (applied to the water of the river). The adjective ἀμφιμάχητος ('worthy of being fought for')[11] is a *hapax*: in Chaerem. *AP* VII 720,2 = *HE* II 1366 Thyreae or Thyreai, land for which Spartans and Argives competed, is similarly said ἀμφίλογος[12]; moreover, one may compare περιμάχητος = 'contended', 'longed for'. One may assume that here Antipater's etymological ploy displays his clever learning, but also his skills in weaving a thick plot of powerfully dramatic images providing a mental view of the tragic setting.

Christod. *AP* VII 697 = 1 Tissoni = *GVI* 1908 celebrates the consul and praetorian prefect in Illyricum John, probably a native of Lychnidos. Let us examine lines 5-8:

εἶχε δ᾽ ἀπ᾽ εὐσεβέων προγόνων ἐρικυδέα πάτρην
Λυχνιδόν, ἣν Φοῖνιξ Κάδμος ἔδειμε πόλιν·
ἔνθεν λύχνος ἔην Ἑλικώνιος, οὕνεκα Κάδμος
στοιχείων Δαναοῖς πρῶτος ἔδειξε τύπον.

From his pious ancestors he got a glorious fatherland,
Lychnidos, a city which was built by Phoenician Cadmus;
hence the Heliconian light came, since Cadmus first
taught the Greeks the signs of the letters.

[10] The adjective ἁλιανθές ('blood-red', 'tinged with red'), restored at line 5 by Boivin de Villeneuve 1736, 315 (on this figure see Hutton 1946, 518ff.), is found in Paul the Silentiary (*AP* V 228,3 = 48 Viansino; *S.Soph.* 771; *amb.* 215) and is Toup's emendation in Orph. *A.* 586.

[11] See *LSJ*, s.v.; *DGE*, s.v.

[12] See *LSJ*, s.v.; *DGE*, s.v., I.1.

Let us consider Λυχνιδόν (...) / (...) λύχνος at lines 6-7: in particular, at line 6 the name of the Illyrian city of Lychnidos[13], John's alleged hometown, is used for a paretymological pun with λύχνος, which allows Christodorus to praise John directly through his homeland[14]. Lychnidos is the place from where the 'Heliconian', that is, 'learned', light comes, – according to a metonymic employment of the adjective Ἑλικώνιος, which was rather common at the time[15] –, because (l. 7 οὕνεκα) it is there that its founder Cadmus invented writing[16], which made the word of the Muses, i.e. poetry, immortal and eternal. More generally, one may observe that the wordplay is inscribed in a network of terms related to light and shining, thus it cannot be considered an isolated phenomenon.

4. *Etymology and proper names*

Pisand. *AP* VII 304 = *FGE* I 293-296 = *GVI* 865 = Merkelbach-Stauber, *SGO* I 02/01/07 is an epitaph for Hippaemon, 'Thessalian from Crete, of Magnesian ancestry' (Strab. XIV 1,11 reports about people from Magnesia settled and dwelling in Crete and Thessaly, who founded the colony of Magnesia on the Meander):

> ᾿Ανδρὶ μὲν 'Ιππαίμων ὄνομ' ἦν, ἵππῳ δὲ Πόδαργος
> καὶ κυνὶ Λήθαργος καὶ θεράποντι Βάβης·
> Θεσσαλός, ἐκ Κρήτης, Μάγνης γένος, Αἵμονος υἱός·
> ὤλετο δ' ἐν προμάχοις ὀξὺν ἄρη συνάγων.
>
> The man's name was Hippaemon, the horse's Podargos,
> the dog was named Lethargos, whereas the servant Babes;
> Thessalian from Crete, of Magnesian ancestry, son of Haemon:
> he died while fighting in the first rows.

It is likely that the epigram alludes to a funerary monument which portrayed, along with the dead Hippaemon, the horse, the dog, and the servant[17]. Πόδαργος

[13] For which see *RE*, XIII/2, s.v. *Lychnidus* [1], 2111ff.

[14] Here the expression λύχνος [...] Ἑλικώνιος does not seem to refer to John as 'light of the Muses', *pace* Robert 1940-1965, IV, 17; 85 n. 3, and 93, or to the city of Lychnidos, *pace* Agosti 2005, 9.

[15] See Agosti 2005, 8.

[16] This detail is invented from scratch by Christodorus himself: Cadmus as founder of Lychnidos is not attested elsewhere.

[17] For dogs represented on funerary monuments see Gullo (forthcoming) on Anon. *AP* VII 64; in general, for animals sculpted or painted on tombs see *ibid.*, intr. on Anon. *AP* VII 62.

(l. 1) is the name of one of the four horses addressed by Hector in Hom. *Il.* VIII 185 (Aristarchus athetised the line, given the fact that in Homer the chariot dragged by four horses does not seem to be in use in battle, and Hector carries on his speech by using the dual; however, our epigrammatist may perhaps know the line)[18]. The name Πόδαργος probably means 'with white feet' or 'with swift feet': cf. Hsch. π 2662 Hansen ποδάργης· λευκόπους, ταχύς, with app. *ad l.*, 132; *LfgrE*, III, s.v. Ποδάργη and Πόδαργος, 1305 (and, naturally, *ibid.*, I, s.v. ἀργός, 1205f.); the first sense is presumably the most ancient one, already attested in Mycenean (*po-da-ko*) as the name of an ox in KN Ch 899, 1029+[19], but in this context it would be better to adopt the second meaning, although, in any case, both meanings could suit our passage if applied to horses: compare the name Λάμπος[20] in Hom. *Il.* VIII 185 (Hector's horse: see above) and *Od.* XXIII 246 (the horse of the Dawn) – or *Lampon* in Hyg. *Fab.* XXX 9 (Diomedes' horse) –, where there might be a reference to both the concept of brightness and shininess along with that of swiftness[21]. The name Π]όδαργος (attributed to a horse) occurs perhaps on one of the Attic olpai of the first half of the sixth century BCE from Louthraki and Caere[22]. From a morpho-lexical point of view πόδαργος can be compared in particular with ἀργίπος, ποδώκης, ποδήνεμος (for example it is applied to a horse in Mnasalc. *AP* VII 212,1 = 13 Seelbach = *HE* XI 2643) or ἀελλόπος and ὠκύπους[23]. More in general, in our epigram Πόδαργος could just be a typical (yet etymologically appropriate) name for a horse.

Passing on to line 2, the name Λήθαργος ('lazy', 'slow'?) is an emendation of the *corrector* C, accepted by modern editors, to θηραγρος (the transmitted reading in

[18] See Lehrs 1882, 193f.; West 2001, 202. It is also attested as the name of a horse belonging to Menelaus (Hom. *Il.* XXIII 295*) and of one belonging to the Thracian Diomedes (Hyg. *Fab.* 30, 9). Ποδάργη (Hom. *Il.* XVI 150*; XIX 400*; cf. also Stesich. *PMG* 178 = *PMGF* = fr. 2a Finglass Ποδάργας; Q.S. III 750*) is the name of the Harpy mother to Xanthos and Balius, Achilles' divine horses, Zephyrus' offspring, as well as that of a mare, daughter of Boreas and a Harpy called Σιθονίη, yoked by Erechtheus (Nonn. *D.* XXXVII 154-159*): for the association of Harpies and winds (West 1966 on Hes. *Th.* 266 ὠκεῖαν τέκεν Ἶριν and 267 Ἀελλώ, 242), which were connected in their turn with horses, see the evidence and documentation in Davies - Finglass 2014 on Stesich. fr. 2a Finglass Ἅρπαγον, 225.

[19] See Davies - Finglass 2014 on Stesich. fr. 2a Finglass ὠκέα τέκνα Ποδάργας, 226.

[20] See Baecker 1884, 74.

[21] In Hom. *Il.* XIX 404 πόδας αἰόλος ἵππος Edwards 1991 *ad l.*, 283, suggests the same implications, recognising «a connotation of shining hoofs as well as speed».

[22] See Wachter 2001, 93; 95; 322. For Πόδαργος as a dog's name see Baecker 1884, 56, and one may compare the Homeric κύνες πόδας ἀργοί (*Il.* XVIII 578; *Od.* II 11, where, nonetheless, the variant reading is also transmitted δύω κύνες ἀργοί, as in XVII 62).

[23] See Risch 1974, 213 and n. 27.

the *Palatine Anthology*, the *Planudean Anthology* and the indirect tradition, which looks like a corruption influenced by the fact that it is a hunting dog and, perhaps, induced by the following θεράποντι). A dog is usually praised for his zeal, therefore Λήθαργος, which suggests laziness and negligence, would seem an antiphrastic name[24]: this technique is rather common for names of human beings[25]. Page 1981, *FGE*, 81, prints the form Λαίθαργος ('perfidious', 'insidious', evidently associated with the root λαθ-/ληθ-, carrying the idea of a hidden action)[26], proposed by Masson 1962, 139 n. 4, which is the epithet of a dog in Hippon. fr. 66 W.^{2} = 32 Degani ('who feels envy'); the word is also found in Soph. *TrGF* IV F 885, where it is applied to a woman, compared to a λαίθαργος dog welcoming his owner warmly while biting, and in Ar. *Eq.* 1068, where the term is associated with the κυναλώπηξ (explicitly, the pimp Philostratus), a particular race of dogs, used for hunting, which was believed to be the product of the crossbreed between a dog and a fox and which then bore the mark of an unreliable kinship in its genetic inheritance[27]. Whatever relationship exists between Λήθαργος and Λαίθαργος (particularly in our epigram Λαίθαργος, altered by corruption into Λήθαργος, could perhaps be the correct reading), both words seem to be related to Ἄργος or ἀργός[28].

In Pisander's epigram some of the words, whether they are proper or common nouns, are linked with each other in a dense net of assonance and consonance as well as repetitions of word-parts (cf. l. 1 Ἱππαίμων ~ ἵππῳ; l. 1 Ἱππαίμων ~ l. 3 Αἵμονος; l. 1 Πόδ-αργος ~ l. 2 Λήθ-αργος), which is rather striking, if we consider that the poem possibly concerns an image portraying all of the characters.

5. *Etymology and philological exegesis*

The debate on Homeric language had been vital since the archaic age and essentially consisted in recovering Homeric words that were (and are) particularly interesting from a lexical point of view, as well as rare terms (the so-called *hapax* and *dis legomena*) and/or difficult ones, better known as *glossai*, interpreted in the light of the scholiographic tradition. In some cases, nonetheless, this reflection was not limited to the banal and passive re-use of these Homerisms, which were

[24] For the dog's name Λαίθαργος/Λήθαργος it is worth mentioning the lexicographic tradition: cf., *e.g.*, *Suid*. λ 410 and *EGen*. λ 14 (see also Marzullo 1975-1977, 331f.).

[25] See Floridi 2014, 27ff.

[26] For Λαίθαργος as the name of a dog see Baecker 1884, 72. Yet the connection with Λήθαργος remains unclear, even though it appears at least plausible.

[27] See Franco 2003, 271f. and n. 46-48.

[28] See above the discussion on Πόδαργος (l. 1).

often exhumed merely to show off one's erudition, which inscribed the poet in a precise exegetic tradition though. Attempts to explain the controversial or uncertain meaning of a Homeric *glossa* or *hapax* might also be embedded in the lines themselves; in such cases, these poets employed the *glossa* or *hapax* (especially an adjective) together with another word whose meaning was clearer. By putting the two terms next to each other, in a synonymic pair, they reproduced one of the interpretations debated by the Alexandrian philologists. The poet could also deviate from his contemporary and earlier fellow-epigrammatists by recovering the Homeric word as a rarity and employing it in its most uncommon meaning. Alternatively, they might take their own personal stand without directly using the Homeric rarity. In these cases, instead of the Homeric word, they used *one* of the lexical alternatives offered by the scholiographic tradition to explain the ambiguous meaning of that word itself. Moreover, if a poet wished to imitate or quote a Homeric passage that displayed textual differences, the Homeric *interpretatio* could result in a conscious choice between two or more versions (readings or variants) of the Homeric text. The Homeric reading or variant preferred by the late antique poet was then embedded in the texture of the verse[29].

Primarily epigrams in which a debated Homerism is used will be discussed here. Our first example comes from Asclep. *AP* VII 284 = *HE* XXX 950-953 = 30 Guichard = Sens, which is an epitaph for a shipwrecked man, buried on the shore: Eumares orders the sea, his murderer, to stay away from his tomb; as happens often in funerary epigrams for shipwrecked men, sea, winds and storms, like those places and settings which are particularly dangerous for ships and sailors, are personified; in this case specifically the sea is treated and addressed as though it was the passer-by:

Ὀκτώ μευ πήχεις ἄπεχε, τρηχεῖα θάλασσα,
καὶ κύμαινε βόα θ', ἡλίκα σοι δύναμις·
ἢν δὲ τὸν Εὐμάρεω καθέλῃς τάφον, ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν
κρήγυον, εὑρήσεις δ' ὀστέα καὶ σποδιήν.

Stay away from me and keep a distance of eight cubits, wild sea,
and swell up and shout with all your force;
if you kick down Eumares' tomb, you will find
nothing good, but only bones and ashes.

[29] See mainly Sistakou 2007 with regard to the re-use, on the part of the Hellenistic epigrammatists, of precious Homerisms, especially if featuring debated meanings, and, for a special focus on late antique epigram, Gullo 2021, with further bibliography (on the general topic of Homeric exegesis as well).

The term κρήγυος (l. 4) is a Homeric *hapax* found in *Il.* I 106 μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπες, where the meaning assigned by the lexicographers is 'good' (schol. A *ad Il.* I 106c)[30], although some sources interpret it as 'true' (Hsch. τ 1089; *EM* 537,23). The semantic value of the word was probably debated in the Hellenistic age[31]: in Asclepiades' epigram it is used with the sense 'good'[32], but κρήγυος can also occur in the meaning 'true'[33]. Its sense remains uncertain in Leon. *AP* VII 648,9 = *HE* X 2012 ᾔδει Ἀριστοκράτης τὸ κρήγυον (an epigram on regretting the choice of avoiding marriage and procreation): according to Gow – Page 1965, *HE*, II, *ad l.*, 321, here τὸ κρήγυον is employed as a noun ('what is true', 'the truth')[34]. Although in *AP* IX 335,2 = *HE* XXVI 2124 Leonidas himself uses κρήγυος as an adjective with the sense 'good', in my opinion in Leon. *AP* VII 648,9 = *HE* X 2012 both meanings are possible, especially because they tend to overlap (the truth known by Aristocrates, the protagonist of the epigram, concerns what is good for the mankind, so the two meanings almost coincide). Whatever its etymology, its uncertainty allows the poet to make a false attempt of providing it through a wordplay: he actually leaves it ambiguously answered in a context where both the attested, possible meanings of the word κρήγυος are suitable.

Leon. *AP* VII 657 = *HE* XIX 2062-2073 is an epitaph for Cleitagoras, adorned with bucolic motifs and opening with an address to his fellow-shepherds:

> Ποιμένες, οἳ ταύτην ὄρεος ῥάχιν οἰοπολεῖτε
> αἶγας κεὐείρους ἐμβοτέοντες ὄις.
>
> Shepherds, you who wander on your own (?) on the top
> of this mountain bringing to grazing goats and fleecy sheep.

Let us examine οἰοπολεῖτε at line 1: the verb is very rare and is also attested in Eur. *Cyc.* 74 (applied to Dionysus, not necessarily with the meaning 'alone', but

[30] See *LfgrE*, II, s.v., 1534: «gut, richtig, angemessen, erfreulich».

[31] See Sistakou 2007, 396.

[32] It is employed with the same meaning in, *e.g.*, Phoen. *CA* VI 4, 235 Powell; Cerc. *CA* VII 14, 209 Powell = III 10 Livrea = Lomiento; Herod. IV 46; VI 39; Leon. *AP* IX 335,2 = *HE* XXVI 2124; Theoc.? *AP* XIII 3,3 = 19 Gow = *HE* XIII 3432 = Hippon. test. 18 Degani = 7 Gerber; Damag. *AP* VII 355,4 = *HE* VIII 1414*; Nic. *Th.* 935. See also Sens 2011 *ad l.*, 205, with detailed analysis of parallel passages.

[33] It occurs in this meaning in, *e.g.*, [Theoc.] XX 19; Arch. *AP* V 58,1 = *GPh* I 3588; Paul. Sil. *S.Soph.* 933.

[34] So also Dübner in Dübner - Cougny 1864-1890, I, 398; Waltz 1960; Pontani 1978-1981, II, 323; Marzi in Conca - Marzi - Zanetto 2005-2011, I, 921.

perhaps 'separated from the θίασος'), but the passage is controversial[35]. The verb derives from οἰοπόλος, whose meaning is a disputed Homeric *quaestio*: the compound could mean 'lonely' (Hom. *Il.* XIII 473 = XVII 54; 24, 614; Id. *Od.* XI 574) or 'watching / grazing the sheep', 'pastoral' (Pi. *P.* IV 28; Colluth. 15 and, very likely, *h.Merc.* 314, but see Vergados 2013 *ad l.*, 449), but the sense is ambiguous in Hom. *Il.* XIX 377, as well as in A.R. IV 1322 and 1413, where perhaps the meaning is 'lonely'[36]. One should not be surprised to find exegetical attestations of such an equivocation: this double meaning is actually codified in schol. D on Hom. *Il.* XIII 473/Z[2] van Thiel and exploited by several poets for variation purposes (cf., *e.g.*, *h.Ven.* [*h.Hom.* 5] 79-80). In our case as well, given the suitable context, Leonidas may be using the verb ambiguously[37] or, at any rate, as a play on signifiers: in fact, in οἰοπολεῖτε / ὄις (l. 2) there might be a likely attempt at etymology, by connecting the verb with the noun ὄις ('sheep'); this would then allow the poet to 'choose' and use the word in the latter meaning ('watching / grazing the sheep', 'pastoral').

The final section of this paper discusses cases in which the epigrammatists challenge themselves to explain a linguistic rarity. In so doing, they state their own view and at the same time, take part in the ancient scholarly debate by either adopting one of the interpretations already recorded in the scholiographic tradition or proposing a new, original one.

In the following two cases, which come both from epitaphs for animals (Simm. *AP* VII 203 = *CA* 20, p. 115 Powell = *HE* I 3268-3271 and Mnasalc. *AP* VII 192 = 10 Seelbach = *HE* XII 2647-2650), the words discussed are etymologically debated; both terms can have different meanings according to the context in which they are used. However, their debated origin allows the poet to play with ambiguity, so that it is not always possible to determine the exact meaning case by case.

Let us start with Simm. *AP* VII 203 = *CA* 20, p. 115 Powell = *HE* I 3268-3271, a funerary epigram for a hunter partridge:

Οὐκέτ' ἀν' ὑλῆεν δρίος εὔσκιον, ἀγρότα πέρδιξ,
ἠχήεσσαν ἱεῖς γῆρυν ἀπὸ στομάτων,
θηρεύων βαλιοὺς συνομήλικας ἐν νομῷ ὕλης·
ᾤχεο γὰρ πυμάταν εἰς Ἀχέροντος ὁδόν.

[35] See Seaford 1984 *ad l.*, 116; Hunter - Laemmle 2020 *ad l.*, 111.

[36] See Livrea 1972, 238ff. = Id. 1991, I, 60f. (see also Id. 1968 on Colluth. 15 οἰοπόλοισιν, 68f.; Id. 1973 on A.R. IV 1322 οἰοπόλοι, 373f.); Rengakos 1994, 119 and 177 (see also *ibid.*, 154 and 166).

[37] At l. 2 ἐμβοτέοντες could rule out the latter meaning in favour of 'lonely' in order to avoid repetition, but, at the same time, the same participle could specifically suggest the sense 'watching / grazing the sheep' to the uncertain reader.

No longer, hunter partridge, in the shade-giving woods
you will emit your resounding voice from your throat,
chasing dappled fellows in the clearings;
you went on your last journey to the Acheron.

Let us focus on βαλιούς (l. 3): the adjective βαλιός (cf. also the paroxytone form βαλίος), first attested in Eur. *Alc*. 579 – yet the form Βαλίος is already found as the name of one of Achilles' horses in *Il*. XVI 149*; XIX 400*; in addition, the paroxytone form is conjectured as the name of one of Actaeon's dogs in Epic.Adesp. *CA* I 4, 71* Powell Βαλίος πόδας αἰνετός[38]. In some instances it means 'dappled'[39], whereas at other times it is understood as 'swift'[40]. The sense is uncertain in Leon. Alex. *AP* VI 326,4 = *FGE* V 1883; Nonn. *D*. XX 71; 258; XXXII 133[41] and, actually, in Eur. *Hipp*. 218 as well the meaning 'swift' would be perfectly suitable and consistent, just as in Call. *Aet*. III fr. 149,10 Massimilla. The fluctuation of the sense of βαλιός between the two semantic fields of color and velocity appears to be as ancient as that of ἀργός (Chantraine, *DELG*, s.v., βαλιός, 160, who believes that the sense 'swift' is applied «de façon artificielle»; Frisk, *GEW*, I, s.v., 214), and does not need to have arisen with Callimachus (*pace* Schmitt 1970, 53 n. 6)[42].

[38] See Baecker 1884, 33ff.

[39] See *LSJ*, s.v., 1.; *DGE*, s.v., 1.: cf. Eur. *Alc*. 579; Id. *Hipp*. 218, with Barrett 1964 *ad l.*, 202; Id. *Hec*. 90; Id. *IA* 222; Id.? *ibid*., 1081; Call. *Aet*. III fr. 149,10 Massimilla, if Maas's conjecture is correct; Opp. *H*. II 434*; IV 88; [Opp.] *C*. II 21; 314.

[40] See *LSJ*, s.v., II.; *DGE*, s.v., 2.: cf. [Eur.], *Rh*. 356; Call. *Aet*. IV fr. 110,53 Pf. = 213 Massimilla = 110 Harder, with Harder 2012, II, *ad l.*, 825; Tryph. 84*; Syn. *h*. I 77; Nonn. *D*. IX 156*; X 386; XIX 277; XXII 51; XXVIII 319; XXXVII 90; 372; 642; XLII 36*; XLIII 346*; Id. *P*. X 70*; it is likely that the adjective takes the same meaning in the Delphic oracle *ap*. Porph. fr. 309F,9 Smith = Eus. *PE* V 7,5. See Massimilla 2010 on Call. *Aet*. III fr. 149,10 βαλ]ιῆς (...) ἐλάφου, 268; *ibid*., on Call. *Aet*. IV fr. 213,53 = 110 Pf. βαλιὰ πτερά, 483 (cf. also Hsch. β 143; *Suid*. β 82).

[41] In these passages the adjective is applied to common names of animals (ἔλαφοι and λαγωοί) which can equally be either fast or dappled: unfortunately, the context does not help. However, in Nonn. *D*. XX 71, the meaning 'swift' is perhaps more suitable, given the fact that βαλιός is here attached to the hare, and so is as well at l. 258, where the adjective qualifies deer, physically marked with κεραός, too: this last epithet may suggest that βαλιός does not recall here another feature of these animals (like the dappled skin) from a strictly physical point of view – otherwise, there might be an effect of wordiness –, but it may point out to their agility or some related aspect.

[42] Through the fourth century BCE βαλιός is a word used only by Homer and Euripides and, in all of the Homeric and Euripidean passages in which the term occurs, interpreters usually apply the meaning 'dappled' but the sense of the adjective is not always unequivocally 'dappled' in all of these passages. The scholia on some of these Homeric and Eurip-

That in our epigram the adjective means 'dappled' seems to be confirmed by Mart. III 58,15 *picta perdix*[43], in addition to the fact that highlighting such a feature in a bird that is not generally famous at all for its swiftness seems more sensible: Si(m)mias seems to employ the term with the same semantic value ('dappled') also in *AP* XV 27,18 = *CA* XXVI, 119 Powell[44].

Let us continue with Mnasalc. *AP* VII 192 = 10 Seelbach = *HE* XII 2647-2650, which is an epitaph for a cricket:

Οὐκέτι δὴ πτερύγεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισιν ἀείσεις,
ἀκρί, κατ' εὐκάρπους αὔλακας ἑζομένα,
οὐδέ με κεκλιμένον σκιερὰν ὑπὸ φυλλάδα τέρψεις,
ξουθᾶν ἐκ πτερύγων ἁδὺ κρέκουσα μέλος.

No longer will you sing with your clear-voiced wings,
cricket, standing in the fertile furrows,
nor will you amuse me lying under the shady leaves,
by singing a pleasing tone through your shrill wings.

I understand ξουθᾶν (l. 4) as 'melodious', 'singing' (more precisely 'buzzing' or 'whirring'); the adjective ξουθός, first attested in 5th-century BCE poetry, may also be interpreted as 'swift', 'moving rapidly, quickly'[45] or 'reddish brown'[46] (cf. Hsch. ξ 90; Phot. ξ 309; *Suid*. ξ 81)[47]. However, the connotation of sound (*LSJ*, s.v., particularly 2. and 4.; see also *ibid*., 3.), which covers a wide range of noises from buzz-

idean passages, as well as schol. Opp. *H.* II 434 and [Opp.] *C.* II 314 frequently explain βαλιός with 'swift' or suggest both meanings. In particular, schol. Eur. *Hec.* 90, I, 21 Schwartz, distinguishes between βαλίος = 'swift' and βαλιός = 'dappled'. Moreover, schol. Eur. *Rh.* 356, II, 336, points out the contradiction with the whiteness of Rhesus' horses expressed at ll. 304 and 618, thus providing the following hypothesis: δύναται δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ταχείαις. Before Callimachus, the author of *Rhesus* may have made his own erudite choice between two meaning alternatives within which βαλιός already fluctuated.

[43] See Fusi 2006 *ad l.*, 383. Moreover, the presence of close synonyms in the turn of very few lines definitely points to that interpretive direction, ruling out any doubts: cf. *Numidicaeque guttatae* (l. 15); cf. also *gemmeique pavones* (l. 13).

[44] See Kwapisz 2013 *ad l.*, 135, who understands the word as «spotted».

[45] See *LSJ*, s.v., particularly 3. and 5.: *LSJ* warns that the shade of sound and that of velocity are close, so that in some cases they are put together under the same lemma.

[46] See *LSJ*, s.v., II.

[47] The etymology is unknown: see Chantraine, *DELG*, s.v., 766f.; Frisk, *GEW*, II, s.v., 337f. On the matter see Fraenkel 1950, II, on Aesch. *Ag.* 1142 ξουθά, 520f. (*contra* Medda 2017, III, *ad l.*, 189f.); Gow 1952, II, on Theoc. VII 142 ξουθαί, 166.

ing to chirping, from whistling to rustling, and which seems to be secured here by the *iunctura* πτερύγεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισιν (l. 1), which on its turn paraphrases ξουθᾶν ἐκ πτερύγων, seems preferable, for example, in Mnasalc. *AP* IX 333,4 = 8 Seelbach = *HE* XV 2662*, as well as in Ar. *Av.* 676[48]; [Theoc.] *AP* IX 437,11 = 4 Gow = *HE* XX 3484 (*incipit*)[49]; Nic. *AP* IX 564,2 = *HE* VI 2776*[50]; Anon. *AP* IX 373,4 = Tib. Ill. *FGE* V 2071; Lyr. Adesp. *CA* VII 1, 185 Powell, as well as in the compound ξουθόπτερος in Eur. *HF* 487[51]; Id. *TrGF* V.1 F 467,4; Lyr. Adesp. *CA* VII 13, 185 Powell[52].

Particularly in the ambiguous cases in which both βαλιός and ξουθός occur, what is most striking is the prevalence of the possible alternative between 'fast', 'swift', and another meaning: one may wonder whether this has to do with the intention of 'opposing' the steadiness of the ideal writing support – and of the dead – with images of swiftness and movement?

One may observe that in similar cases uncertain etymology is exploited on purpose in order to play with the reader's imagination, who can then decide case by case which meaning is more suitable to a given context. However, in some cases the ambiguity remains.

Finally, Antip. Sid. *AP* VII 75 = Antip. Thess. *GPh* LXXIV 483-486 = Stesich. test. 24 Campbell = *PMGF* TB6 = Tb39 Ercoles is an epitaph for Stesichorus:

Στασίχορον, ζαπληθὲς ἀμέτρητον στόμα Μούσης,
ἐκτέρισεν Κατάνας αἰθαλόεν δάπεδον,
οὗ, κατὰ Πυθαγόρεω φυσικὰν φάτιν, ἁ πρὶν Ὁμήρου
ψυχὰ ἐνὶ στέρνοις δεύτερον ᾠκίσατο.

The burning land of Catania bestowed funeral honors
to Stesichorus, rich and immeasurable mouth of the Muse,
in whose chest, according to Pythagoras' theory, the soul which belonged
previously to Homer settled down once again.

The adjective ζαπληθές (l. 1, 'rich', 'very full') is attested elsewhere only in Aesch. *Pers.* 316 (referred to a thick beard)[53] and, on the basis of the lexicographic sources, its etymology recalls the concept of immeasurable size, but it is not entirely

[48] See Dunbar 1995 on l. 214 ξουθῆς, 153 for further parallels.
[49] See Gow - Page 1965, *HE*, II, *ad l.*, 536.
[50] See Gow - Page 1965, *HE*, II, *ad l.*, 432.
[51] See Bond 1981 *ad l.*, 191.
[52] See also Douglas 1928, 110ff.
[53] See Garvie 2009 *ad l.*, 167.

clear. In *Suid*. ζ 20, where the first distich of our epigram is quoted, the adjective is glossed just with ἄμετρος, ἄπειρος: it seems as though Antipater, putting ζαπληθής and ἀμέτρητος (l. 1) next to each other in the first line as adjectives applied to the same noun (στόμα), meant to clarify the etymology and explain the meaning of the first adjective (ζαπληθής) through the following, commoner synonym, according to a standard practice among the early Alexandrian poets.

6. *Conclusions*

This paper can only give a sampling of the ways in which sepulchral epigram exploits etymology. Yet the few cases examined above provide a very good grasp of the great contribution research on etymology in epigram can make. First of all, the use of famous and well-attested etymological puns allows to inscribe epigram in a long-lasting literary tradition by establishing intertextual connections with other genres, from lyric and epic poetry to comedy, with which epigram is in continuous dialogue, adapting with flexibility to very different registers and degrees of formality. Embedding learned etymological explanations of names into epigrams concerning real events and characters offers their authors the opportunity to shed new light on historical, prosopographical and antiquarian details: Antipater of Thessalonica exploits erudite etymology to compose a highly imaginative and dramatic poem, which communicates very powerfully the horrifying scenery of war and death, according to the idea that the vivid, lively and highly emotional narration is preferred to the detached objectivity of the historical facts; on the other hand, Christodorus takes the opportunity to explain the origin of the name Lychnidos as a cue to reframe his poem completely with new narrative, escaping the bounds of truth and reality, history and time; in addition, etymology acts as a new, original tool to enhance and enrich late antique eulogy. Pisander gives each character an etymologically appropriate name that matches their status and identity, so that the dense network of lexical and phonetic affinities structuring the poem actually mirrors the tight bond which ties the master with his servant and his animals, no matter whether or not the epigram refers to an actual funerary monument and was originally inscriptional. Finally the use of etymology in connection with philological exegesis, which is a particularly fortunate combination in epigram, makes this genre into a privileged vantage point for investigating this still underexplored and problematic topic: epigram can make a valuable contribution to the study of philological exegesis by revealing effective methodologies for approaching very debated matters, especially in Homeric exegesis.

I hope to have shown that this research field is clearly rich and productive:

given the long life of epigram and its unique tendency to continuous and unpredictable experimentation, the same kind of investigation can be extended to all the subgenres of literary and inscriptional epigram more broadly, as well as to Byzantine epigram. In doing so, new responses to etymological features and patterns will be revealed by observing how philological exegesis is treated in epigram throughout the centuries.

Newcastle University
arianna.gullo@newcastle.ac.uk

Keywords: *Greek Anthology*, funerary epigram, exegesis
Parole chiave: *Anthologia Graeca*, epigramma funerario, esegesi

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Agosti 2005
G.Agosti, *Miscellanea epigrafica I. Note letterarie a carmi epigrafici tardoantichi*, «Medioevo Greco» V (2005), 1-30.

Albiani 1991
M.G.Albiani, *L'epitafio di Caronte* (GVI *1384 Peek* = CEG *127 Hansen*), «Eikasmos» II (1991), 185-189.

Baecker 1884
E.Baecker, *De canum nominibus Graecis*, Regimonti 1884.

Barrett 1964
W.S.Barrett, *Euripides. Hippolytus*, Oxford 1964.

Beckby 1967-1968
H.Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca. Griechisch-Deutsch*, I-IV, München 1967-1968.

Boivin de Villeneuve 1736
J.Boivin de Villeneuve, *Remarques historiques et critiques sur l'Anthologie manuscrite qui est à la Bibliothèque du Roy*, «Memoires de Litterature, tirez des registres de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres» II (1736), 279-320.

Bond 1981
G.W.Bond, *Euripides. Heracles*, Oxford 1981.

Chantraine 1968-1980
P.Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (*DELG*), Paris 1968-1980.

Conca – Marzi – Zanetto 2005-2011
F.Conca – M.Marzi – G.Zanetto, *Antologia Palatina*, I-III, Torino 2005-2011.

Davies – Finglass 2014
M.Davies – P.J.Finglass, *Stesichorus. The Poems*, Cambridge 2014.

Douglas 1928
N.Douglas, *Birds and Beasts of the Greek Anthology*, London 1928.

Dover 1993
K.J.Dover, *Aristophanes. Frogs*, Oxford 1993.

Dübner – Cougny 1864-1890
F.Dübner – E.Cougny, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*, I-III, Paris 1864-1890.

Dunbar 1995
N.Dunbar, *Aristophanes. Birds*, Oxford 1995.

Edwards 1991
M.W.Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume V: books 17-20*, Cambridge 1991.

Floridi 2014
L.Floridi, *Lucillio. Epigrammi*, Berlin-Boston 2014.
Floridi 2020
L.Floridi, *Edilo. Epigrammi*, Berlin-Boston 2020.
Franco 2003
C.Franco, *Senza ritegno. Il cane e il femminile nell'immaginario greco*, Bologna 2003.
Fraenkel 1950
E.Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*, I-III, Oxford 1950.
Frisk 1954-1972
H.Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (*GEW*), I-III, Heidelberg 1954-1972.
Fusi 2006
A.Fusi, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber tertius*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2006.
Garvie 2009
A.F.Garvie, *Aeschylus.* Persae, Oxford 2009.
Gow 1952
A.S.F.Gow, *Theocritus*, I-II, Cambridge 1952.
Gow – Page 1965
A.S.F.Gow – D.L.Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (*HE*), I-II. Cambridge.
Gow – Page 1968
A.S.F.Gow – D.L.Page, *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip* (*GPh*), I-II, Cambridge.
Gullo 2021
A.Gullo, *Late Antique Homeric Exegesis in the* Greek Anthology, in W.V.Harris – A.Hunnell Chen (eds.), *Late Antique Studies in Memory of Alan Cameron*, Leiden-Boston 2021, 85-103.
Gullo, forthcoming
A.Gullo, *Antologia Palatina. Epigrammi funerari* (*Libro VII). Introduzione e commento*, Pisa, forthcoming.
Hansen 1983-1989
P.A.Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* (*CEG*), I-II, Berolini et Nova Eboraci 1983-1989.
Harder 2012
A.Harder, *Callimachus. Aetia*, I-II, Oxford 2012.
Hunter – Laemmle 2020
R.L.Hunter – R.Laemmle, *Euripides. Cyclops*, Cambridge 2020.

Hutton 1946
J.Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800*, Ithaca, NY 1946.
Kwapisz 2013
J.Kwapisz, *The Greek Figure Poems*, Leuven-Paris-Walpole 2013.
Kwapisz – Petrain – Szymański 2013
J.Kwapisz – D.Petrain – M.Szymański, *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*, Berlin 2013
Lehrs 1882
K.Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*, Leipzig 1882.
Livrea 1968
E.Livrea, *Colluto. Il Ratto di Elena*, Bologna 1968.
Livrea 1972
E.Livrea, *Una «tecnica allusiva» apolloniana alla luce dell'esegesi omerica alessandrina*, «Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica» XLIV (1972), 231-243 (= Id. 1991, I, 55-64).
Livrea 1973
E.Livrea, *Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon liber IV*, Firenze 1973.
Livrea 1991
E.Livrea, *Studia Hellenistica*, I-II, Firenze 1991.
Marzullo 1975-1977
B.Marzullo, *L'esodo della Lysistrata*, «Museum Criticum» X-XII (1975-1977), 127-139.
Massimilla 2010
G.Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia, Libro terzo e quarto*, Pisa-Roma 2010.
Masson 1962
O.Masson, *Les fragments du poète Hipponax*, Paris 1962.
Medda 2017
E.Medda, *Eschilo. Agamennone*, I-III, Roma 2017.
Merkelbach – Stauber 1998-2004
R.Merkelbach – J.Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, I-V, Stuttgart-München-Leipzig 1998-2004.
Neri 2003
C.Neri, *Erinna. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Bologna 2003.
Page 1981
D.L.Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (*FGE). Epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek Anthology and other sources, not included in* Hellenistic Epigrams *or* The Garland of Philip, Cambridge 1981.
Peek 1955
W.Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften. Band I: Grab-Epigramme,* Berlin 1955.

Peek 1960
W.Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte* (*GG*), Berlin 1960
Pontani 1978-1981
F.M.Pontani, *Antologia Palatina*, I-IV, Torino 1978-1981.
Rengakos 1994
A.Rengakos, *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung*, München 1994.
Risch 1974
E.Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin-New York 1974.
Robert 1940-1965
L.Robert, *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, I-XIII, Paris 1940-1965.
Samama 2003
É.Samama, *Les médecins dans le monde grec: sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical*, Genève 2003.
Schmitt 1970
R.Schmitt, *Die Nominalbildung in den Dichtungen des Kallimachos von Kyrene*, Wiesbaden 1970.
Seaford 1984
Euripides, *Cyclops*, ed. R.A.S.Seaford, Oxford 1984.
Sens 2011
Asclepiades of Samos, *Epigrams and Fragments*, ed. A.Sens, Oxford 2011.
Sistakou 2007
E.Sistakou, *Glossing Homer: Homeric Exegesis in Early Third Century Epigram*, in P.Bing – J.S.Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram. Down to Philip*, Leiden-Boston 2007, 391-408.
Sourvinou-Inwood 1995
C.Sourvinou-Inwood, *'Reading' Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*, Oxford 1995.
Vergados 2013
A.Vergados, *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, Berlin-Boston 2013.
Vian 1952
F.Vian, *La guerre des Géants. Le mythe avant l'époque hellénistique*, Paris 1952.
Wachter 2001
R.Wachter, *Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions*, Oxford 2001.
Waltz 1960
Anthologie grecque. Première partie: Anthologie Palatine, Tome IV (livre VII, épigr. 1-363, texte établi par P.Waltz et traduit par A.M.Desrousseaux – A. Dain – P.Camelot – E.Des Places) et Tome V (livre VII, épigr. 364-748, texte

établi par P.Waltz et traduit par P.Waltz – E.Des Places – M.Dumitrescu – H.Le Maître-G.Soury, avec le concours de J.Irigoin et P.Laurens), Paris 1960.

West 1966

Hesiod, *Theogony*, ed. with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L.West, Oxford 1966.

West 2001

M.L.West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich-Leipzig 2001.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32056 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 179-200*

IOANNIS ZIOGAS

Etymological Law*

The origins of law coincide with the origins of language, as both Plato and Horace highlight. Thus, a systematic attempt to discover the etymological roots of words simultaneously reveals the source of legality. The article examines the etymological doctrina *('learning') of poets vis-à-vis the etymological reasoning of learned jurists. The Twelve Tables, Catullus, and Labeo engage in similar etymological pursuits. Ovid's Byblis responds to Labeo's etymologies. The jurist Ulpian echoes the poetics of Latin love elegy. Lawyers and poets meet on the common ground of etymology in their attempts to lay down the law.*

Le origini del diritto coincidono con quelle del linguaggio, come evidenziano sia Platone sia Orazio: ne consegue che scoprire le radici delle parole rivela simultaneamente le origini del diritto. Proprio su questa base comune l'articolo mette a confronto la dottrina dei poeti e la riflessione dei giuristi eruditi, mostrando che attività etimologiche affini si riscontrano nelle Dodici Tavole, in Catullo e in Labeone; alle etimologie di ques'ultimo risponde il Byblis di Ovidio; il giurista Ulpiano, a sua volta, riecheggia la poetica dell'elegia d'amore latina. Avvocati e poeti, nel loro tentativo di stabilire la legge, si incontrano sul terreno comune dell'etimologia.

The study and practice of etymologizing (ancient and modern) inevitably produces a set of rules that need to be followed in order to uncover the origins and true meaning of words. Every linguist needs a *lex etymologica*, an etymological law. The word *lex* ('law') has a technical and non-technical meaning: *lex* can refer to 'statutes' or 'the laws of the state' (technical meaning), but it can also refer to a 'rule', which is not technically the law in a strictly legal sense. Varro, for instance, in *De lingua Latina* VII 18 refers to 'poetic law' *lege poetica*, which, in this passage, is more about poetic licence. Poets, Varro says, are allowed to describe the whole (Aetolia) by referring to one part (Calydon) (Varro here describes what we call *pars pro toto*). Language, and poetic language in particular, follows specific rules or laws. More to the point, Varro explicitly compares the linguistic with the legal system in *De lingua Latina* IX 20 (*an non saepe ueteres leges abrogatae nouis cedunt?* 'Aren't old laws often repealed and replaced by old laws?)[1]. Varro is here discussing a variety of linguistic changes, including vocabulary and morphology, to illustrate historical change. A new word is legitimate and should be accepted, if it has been introduced according to a *ratio* ('reasoning' *LL* IX 20), a key term for both jurists and linguists in their aims to provide principles that govern linguistic or legal phenomena.

* Many thanks to Athanassios Vergados and Gianfranco Agosti for inviting me to the conference. I am also grateful to two anonymous referees for their constructive feedback.

[1] On this passage, see Duso 2017, 163-164; De Melo 2019, 1117. Translations are from the Loeb editions, often modified.

The interplay between the technical and non-technical meaning of *lex* can be a source of poetic inspiration. Horace's *Satire* II 1 revolves around this ambiguity. In this poem, Horace consults the famous jurist Trebatius Testa about the legal issue of writing satire, a genre in which freedom of speech is an indispensable requirement. While Horace uses the word *lex* to discuss the rules of the satiric genre, Trebatius is concerned about poetry which may break the law. As Michèle Lowrie puts it, the law in question has nothing to do with the legal sphere, but is the law of the genre. Roman law and the conventions of Latin poetry here intersect[2].

There is a similar interplay in the practice of etymologizing, an interplay between the linguistic rules of discovering the true meaning of words and the reasoning of Roman jurists. Etymologizing and legal reasoning may have more in common than it appears at first sight. The law is a discourse and thus language is its prerequisite. The birth of the legal system coincides with the origins of language, as in Horace's brief history of the beginnings of human civilization (Horace, *Satire* I 3,99-106):

> Cum prorepserunt primis animalia terris
> mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter
> unguibus et pugnis, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
> pugnabant armis, quae post fabricauerat usus,
> **donec uerba, quibus uoces sensusque notarent,**
> **nominaque inuenere; dehinc** absistere bello,
> oppida **coeperunt** munire et **ponere leges,**
> ne quis fur esset, neu latro, neu quis adulter.
>
> When living creatures crawled forth upon primeval earth, dumb, shapeless beasts, they fought for their acorns and lairs with nails and fists, then with clubs, and so on step by step with the weapons which need had later forged, until **they found words and names wherewith to give meaning to their cries and feelings. Thenceforth, they began** to cease from war, to build towns, and **to lay down laws** that none should be a thief or bandit or adulterer.

Language makes possible the transition from violence to justice or from animal brutality to human civilization. Once men have words to describe a 'thief' or an 'adulterer', they have the power to define a crime and punish the culprits. The 'invention of names' (*inuenere nomina*) results in the creation of a legal code. Thus, to discover the origins of words is to discover the foundations of the rule of law.

[2] See Lowrie 2005, 407.

In Plato's *Cratylus*, the lawgiver is essentially a namegiver, as in the following passage (Plato, *Cratylus* 389a):

> ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ. Οὐκ ἄρα παντὸς ἀνδρός, ὦ Ἑρμόγενες, **ὄνομα θέσθαι**, ἀλλά τινος ὀνοματουργοῦ· οὗτος δ᾽ ἐστίν, ὡς ἔοικεν, **ὁ νομοθέτης**, ὃς δὴ τῶν δημιουργῶν σπανιώτατος ἐν ἀνθρώποις γίγνεται.
> ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ. Ἔοικεν.
> ΣΩ. Ἴθι δή, ἐπίσκεψαι ποῖ βλέπων **ὁ νομοθέτης τὰ ὀνόματα τίθεται.**
>
> Socrates: Then it is not for every man, Hermogenes, **to give names**, but for him who may be called the name-maker; and he, it appears, is **the lawgiver**, who is of all the artisans among men the rarest.
> Hermogenes: So it appears.
> Socrates: See now what **the lawgiver has in view in giving names**.

In order to find out the etymology of words, Socrates and Hermogenes will be trying to discover the intention of the lawgiver throughout Plato's dialogue. In a masterful touch, Socrates here subtly etymologizes the word νομοθέτης from ὄνομα θέσθαι. The semantic relation between **ὄνομ**α and **ὁ νομ**οθέτης is one of the dialogue's recurring motifs (cf. 431e **ὁ νομ**οθέτης ἦν **ὄνομα**; 427c **ὄνομα** ποιῶν **ὁ νομ**οθέτης). To give a name (ὄνομα) is to create the law (ὁ νόμος). Socrates' etymological link lies behind Horace's transition from finding names (*nominaque inuenere*) to laying down the law (*ponere leges*).

Given the close links between the invention of names and laws, the Roman jurists' obsession with etymologies and the true meanings of words is not surprising[3]. Naming is a normative speech act and that is why it has the force of law. And that is why the art of etymologizing was not a tangential interest or a hobby horse of the Roman jurists, but an integral part of juristic reasoning and the education of a lawyer. The practice of coming up with the rules of etymologizing developed in parallel and in dialogue with etymologizing as a way of laying down the law. To discover the original meaning of words was to discover the intentions of the first lawgiver.

Etymologizing in the Roman world is often discussed in the context of ancient grammarians, antiquarians, and philosophers[4]. But it is rarely examined in the context of Roman jurisprudence, despite its prominence in legal reasoning and education. Why is this the case? One reason may be that literary scholars interested in ancient etymologies are more familiar with and more interested in ancient linguistic theories than with the world of Roman law. This may be one, but not the only rea-

[3] Ceci 1892 is a book length study of the etymologies of the Roman jurists.
[4] See, for instance, Blank 2008; De Melo 2019.

son– I think there are at least two more. From a modern perspective, the school of linguistics and the law school belong to different parts of the campus and have very little, if anything, to do with each other. When we think about etymologies, we may be forgiven not to think about the curriculum of law schools in the Roman world.

Another reason is the older view that the independence of Roman jurisprudence meant that the world of Roman law was culturally isolated[5]. Scholars recently argued against the traditional approach that divorces Roman jurists from their socio-historical context[6]. The jurists were in constant dialogue both with intellectual traditions and with changing social values and pressures. Grammar, myth, and poetry played a vital role in their legal reasoning. As Jill Harries puts it, «Lawyers, philosophers, grammarians, historians and men of general culture could meet on the common ground of etymology»[7].

The Augustan jurist M. Antistius Labeo is a good case study. Labeo founded a renowned school of law that emphasized the study of liberal arts. Semantics, dialectics, literary criticism, and etymological analyses were keys to interpreting the law in Labeo's school[8]. Aulus Gellius introduces Antistius Labeo by referring to his expertise in dialectic, literature, and the derivations of words (XIII 10):

> Quid 'sororis' ἔτυμον esse dixerit Labeo Antistius, et quid 'fratris' P. Nigidius. Labeo Antistius iuris quidem ciuilis disciplinam principali studio exercuit et consulentibus de iure publice responsitauit; ceterarum quoque bonarum artium non expers fuit et in grammaticam sese atque dialecticam litterasque antiquiores **altioresque penetrauerat Latinarumque uocum origines rationesque percalluerat, eaque praecipue scientia ad enodandos plerosque iuris laqueos utebatur.** Sunt adeo libri post mortem eius editi, qui *Posteriores* inscribuntur, quorum librorum tres continui, tricesimus octauus et tricesimus nonus et quadragesimus, pleni sunt id genus rerum **ad enarrandam et inlustrandam linguam Latinam conducentium**. Praeterea in libris

[5] Interestingly, the view that law is an independent discourse virtually divorced from its sociopolitical context, parallels Saussurian linguistics. The absolute autonomy of the juridical form is similar to grammatical rules of morphology that are internally regulated and evolve independently. The pure theory of law, which constructs a body of doctrines and rules totally independent of social constraints and pressures, resembles Saussure's pure theory of language, which excludes historical and social conditions from governing the functioning of language and its transformations. See Bourdieu 1987, 814.

[6] As Harries 2006, 12 puts it, the present separation of legal discourse from the rest is not reflected in the intellectual approach taken by the Roman elite. See also Howley 2013; Wibier (forthcoming).

[7] See Harries 2017, 105.

[8] See Bauman 1989, 47-48.

> quos *Ad Praetoris Edictum* scripsit multa posuit, partim lepide atque argute reperta. Sicuti hoc est quod in quarto *Ad Edictum libro* scriptum legimus: **«'Soror'» inquit «appellata est, quod quasi seorsum nascitur separaturque ab ea domo in qua nata est et in aliam familiam transgreditur».** 'Fratris' autem vocabulum P. Nigidius, homo inpense doctus, non minus arguto subtilique ἐτύμῳ interpretatur: «'Frater'» inquit «est dictus quasi 'fere alter'».
>
> The derivation of *soror*, according to Antistius Labeo, and that of *frater*, according to Publius Nigidius.
> Antistius Labeo cultivated the study of civil law with special interest, and gave advice publicly to those who consulted him on legal questions; he was also not unacquainted with the other liberal arts, and he had delved deep into grammar and dialectics, as well as into the earlier and more recondite literature**. He had also become versed in the origin and formation of Latin words, and applied that knowledge in particular to solving many knotty points of law.** In fact, after his death works of his were published, which are entitled *Posteriores*, of which three successive books, the thirty-eighth, thirty-ninth and fortieth, are full of information of that kind, **tending to explain and illustrate the Latin language.** Moreover, in the books which he wrote *On the Praetor's Edict* he has included many observations, some of which are graceful and clever. Of such a kind is this, which we find written in the fourth book *On the Edict*: **«A *soror*, or 'sister'» he says «is so called because she is, as it were, born *seorsum*, or 'outside,' and is separated from that home in which she was born, and transferred to another family».** Moreover, Publius Nigidius, **a man of prodigious learning**, explains the word *frater*, or 'brother', by a no less clever and ingenious derivation: «A *frater*» he says «is so called because he is, as it were, *fere alter*, that is, 'almost another self'».

Labeo's etymology of *soror* gives Gellius the opportunity to introduce the work of the renowned Augustan jurist. The jurist Labeo and Nigidius Figulus[9], a scholar as learned as Varro, as Gellius puts it (*NA* IV 9,1), appear in the same context and address similar issues, namely the origins of commonly used words. In Gellius, there seems to be no firewall separating the linguist from the jurist. In fact, Gellius (*NA* XVII 7) says that Nigidius Figulus discussed the ambiguities of the *lex Atinia* in his *Grammatical Notes*[10]. The legal issue of whether the law that forbids usucapion of stolen property is prospective or retrospective hinges upon the grammatical interpretation of *subruptum erit* (does it indicate both past and future?). Figulus' linguistic expertise is thus indispensable to the interpretation of the law.

Similarly, Labeo's foray into etymological derivations is not distinguished from

[9] On Nigidius Figulus, see Volk 2016, 45-49; Garcea 2019.

[10] See Garcea 2019, 94.

his legal expertise. The deep knowledge of etymologies is applied to solving the knotty points of law. Note how in the passage quoted above *origines* and *rationes* appear as a pair. While *origo* can mean etymology, *ratio* is the term that describes the reasoning of a jurist. Only in this context etymological and juristic analysis are united. In other words, etymological research is not the leisurely activity of a learned antiquarian, but is directly related to the origins of legality. The origins of words reveal the true nature of the law. Etymological and legal interpretation overlap.

Labeo's etymology of *soror* is a comment on an edict. While the details of this edict are unclear, it is likely that the etymology appears in the context of discussing family or marriage law. A sister, for Labeo, is someone who is separated from her home, because she marries into another family. It is possible that Labeo brings up this etymology, in order to point out that the very origin of the word *soror* encapsulates the incest taboo. A sister has to marry outside the family. This is what the word actually means. We may not know how close or far from the context this interpretation is, but we can be fairly certain that Labeo's etymology is a jurist's interpretation of the law.

Jurists were interested in the origins of words because etymologizing is often a way of discussing the link between the signifier and the signified[11]. Are names arbitrary conventions that have little, if anything, to do with entities they refer to or do signifiers reveal the truth about the nature of the entities they name? Is there a link between language and nature or not? It is not hard to see why these linguistic issues are relevant to legal theory and practice. What is law's relationship to nature? Is it a human convention or does it spring from a divine or natural source? The lawgiver (νομοθέτης) and the namegiver (ὀνοματοθέτης) are the origins of the debate about the relationship between the signifier (name or law) and the natural order. To give a name is to lay down the law. This law may be a custom or a convention, but it may be more than that; it may be the reflection of the rule of nature in the medium of human language.

In the passage from Gellius quoted above, the antiquarian Nigidius Figulus appears in the same context as the jurist Labeo. Figulus saw the meaning of the words not as human conventions, but as natural[12]. Etymology thus unlocks the truth of the universe[13]. It is not a big step to see why this approach would be appealing

[11] On the intricate relationship between the signifier and the signified in ancient etymologizing, see now Vergados 2020.

[12] On Figulus' naturalism, see Garcea 2019. On language and nature in the Roman world, see Pezzini and Taylor 2019.

[13] Lucretius' *De rerum natura* equates the nature of the universe with nature's general law (see Garani 2014, 130). Schiesaro 2007 argues that it was part of juristic discourse to construct a legal model for the universe. The first attested example of this practice is Lucretius.

to jurists. The law's authority is significantly boosted, if it does not appear as an arbitrary convention but as a projection of the universal laws of nature. From that perspective, Labeo's etymology of *soror* would not be a purely linguistic suggestion, but would contribute to an argument according to which incest is unnatural.

The legality of incest is hotly debated in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Byblis, who falls in love with her brother Caunus, and Myrrha, who falls in love with her father Cinyras, employ forensic rhetoric and allude to philosophical views (mainly Stoic) that justify incestuous liaisons[14]. Both heroines attempt to erase the family names (brother and sister, father and daughter) that signify the prohibition of incest. The name is the embodiment of the incest taboo. Ovid tells us that Byblis called Caunus master; she hated the name of brother and preferred to be called Byblis rather than sister (*Metamorphoses* IX 465-466 *iam dominum appellat, iam* ***nomina sanguinis*** *odit / Byblida iam maullt quam se uocet ille* ***sororem***).

The name is the law (ὄνομα νόμος) that prohibits Byblis and Caunus to be joined in love. At the beginning of her letter, Byblis first writes and then erases *soror* (*Met.* IX 528) in an attempt to eradicate the incest taboo. She confesses that she is ashamed to spell out her name (531 *pudet edere nomen*) and wishes she could plead her cause without a name (532-533 *sine nomine uellem / posset agi mea causa meo*). The diction (*agi mea causa*) describes a legal procedure. Byblis imagines that she is pleading her case in a court of love. In this forensic setting, the very name of sister would imply that she is breaking the law. In this case, the repeated use of *nomen* brings up the close relationship between the name and the norm. What is more, *nomen* is an etymological marker in Latin poetry[15]. Just as she first writes and then erases the name of *soror*, Byblis first refers to and then rejects its etymology in the juristic tradition (*Metamorphoses* IX 487):

> si liceat mutato nomine iungi
>
> If only I could change my name and be joined to you

The change of name would mean that Byblis will be free from the etymological association of *soror* with separation from her family. For Labeo, a sister is someone who is separated from the home she was born in. But if the name changes, then Byblis will be able to be united with her brother. The infinitive *iungi* right after the change of the name alludes to this etymological connection.

Byblis' forensic rhetoric becomes gradually more aggressive. In her letter to

[14] On Myrrha's and Byblis' legal arguments, see Gebhardt 2009, 321-334. On Myrrha and laws against incest, see also Ziogas 2021, 346-383.

[15] See Maltby 1993, 257, 260; Cairns 1996, 29-31.

Caunus, she argues that both the desires of the young and the practice of the gods do not prohibit incest (*Metamorphoses* IX 548-555):

> non hoc **inimica** precatur,
> sed quae, cum tibi sit **iunctissima, iunctior** esse
> expetit et **uinclo** tecum propiore **ligari**.
> **iura senes norint, et quid liceatque nefasque**
> **fasque sit, inquirant, legumque examina seruent.**
> con**ueniens Venus** est annis temeraria nostris.
> quid liceat, nescimus adhuc, et cuncta licere
> credimus, et sequimur **magnorum exempla deorum**

> It is **no enemy** who prays to you, but one who, though most **closely joined to you, seeks to be more fully joined** and **to be bound** by a still closer tie. **Let old men know the laws and talk of what is fitting, what is right and wrong, and preserve the nice discrimination of the laws**. But **love is compliant** and heedless for those of our age. What is allowed we have not yet discovered, and we believe all things allowed; and in this we do but follow **the example of the great gods**.

The main issue here is what is permitted and what is forbidden in love. The legality of a sister's passion for her brother is what Byblis is arguing for. She avoids the use of the word *soror* and points out that she is not *inimica*. The opposite of *inimica* is *amica* ('girlfriend, mistress') and this is precisely what Byblis would like to be in relation to Caunus[16]. Having already replaced *frater* with *dominus*, Byblis imagines her affair with her brother in elegiac terms. The code of the genre of Latin love elegy has the power to overrule the incest taboo.

Once the name *soror* has been subtly replaced by *amica*, Byblis creates a cluster of words that refer to bonding (*iunctissima, iunctior, uincla, ligari*). The besotted heroine argues that a sister is tightly joined to her brother and thus rejects Labeo's etymology. Note that Byblis specifically dismisses those who are learned in the law and examine what is right and wrong. She is clearly referring to the *iurisperiti*, learned jurists like Labeo, whose etymology of *soror* supports the prohibition of incest. Etymologies thus become a vital part in forensic rhetoric and juristic reasoning. What is permitted and what is forbidden is defined by means of etymologizing.

[16] Cicero employs the *inimica-amica* wordplay in his attack on Clodia; see *Pro Caelio* 32 *nec enim muliebris umquam **inimicitias** mihi gerendas putaui, praesertim cum ea quam omnes semper **amicam** omnium potius quam cuiusquam **inimicam** putauerunt,* «For indeed I never thought that I should have to engage in quarrels with women, still less with a woman whom everyone has always thought to be everyone's (girl)friend rather than anyone's enemy».

While rejecting Labeo's etymology, Byblis draws attention to alternative etymological links. The language of bondage refers to the etymology of Venus from *uincire* ('to bind')[17]. This etymology features prominently in Latin love elegy[18] and in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*[19]. Byblis appeals to the generic code of Latin love elegy in order to replace the legalism of old jurists[20]. In fact, Propertius suggests the etymology of Venus from *uincire* in a passage that conflates the bonds of elegiac love with contractual bonds and marriage legislation (III 20,15-25)[21].

Binding is a distinctive characteristic of both law and love in Latin elegy[22]. The law has the power to bind its subjects in knots. In the passage from Gellius quoted above, Labeo is said to have used his knowledge of the origins of words «to solve many knotty points of law» (*ad enodandos plerosque iuris laqueos utebatur*)[23]. Now Byblis argues that erotic bonds have the force of law and thus can legitimize incest. Her reference to the *Venus-uinclum-uincire* etymological nexus suggests the power of erotic desire to break old legal bonds and create new ones. This adds another dimension to the well-established etymological link between *Venus* and *uincire.* The bonds of Venus have the force of legal bonds. Byblis' aim is to restore what Peter Goodrich calls the 'law of first Venus'[24] and her etymological references should be interpreted in the context of her revisionist legal arguments.

Besides the *Venus-uincire* semantic link, Byblis alludes to the etymology of Venus from *uenire*[25]. Ovid is fond of this etymology[26] and Byblis' *conueniens Venus* is a particularly suitable etymological allusion in this context. Unrestrained love

---

[17] This etymology is already implied in Plautus, *Trin.* 658 *ita ui Veneris uinctus* («thus bound by Venus' force»). See also Varro, *LL* V 61-62 *et mas ignis, quod ibi semen, aqua femina, quod fetus ab eius humore, et horum uinctionis uis Venus. Hinc comicus: "huic uictrix Venus, uidesne haec?" Non quod uincere uelit Venus, sed uincire* («and fire is male, which the semen is in the other case, and water is female, because the embryo develops from her moisture, and the force that brings their "binding" is Venus. Hence the comic poet says, "huic Venus victrix …" – not because Venus wishes [or signifies] 'to conquer', but 'to bind'» (transl. Hinds 2006). On this etymological connection, see Hinds 2006.

[18] See Propertius III 24,13-14 and 20,19-23 with Hinds 2006.

[19] See *Met.* IV 182-184 with Michalopoulos 2001, 169.

[20] The *recusatio* of legalism for the sake of the novel laws of love is a distinctive characteristic of Latin love elegy; see Ziogas 2021, 27-68.

[21] See Keith 2008, 41-42; Gebhardt 2009, 139-141.

[22] See Ziogas 2021, 155-162.

[23] Cicero describes etymologizing in similar terms in *De natura deorum* III 62 *in enondanis autem nominibus.*

[24] See Goodrich 2006, 6-16.

[25] On this etymology, see Maltby 1991, 635; Michalopoulos 2001, 169-170; Hinds 2006.

[26] See Michalopoulos 2001, 169-170.

befits the young to whom everything is permitted. Byblis here uses Venus both as a metonymy for sex and as the name of the anthropomorphic goddess. Venus was married to her brother Vulcan, had an adulterous affair with her brother Mars, and a child with her brother Mercury[27]. Like a good jurist, Byblis here refers to divine precedent (the *exempla* of gods' incestuous marital and extramarital affairs) to justify and legalize her love for her brother. Her etymological wordplay is part and parcel of her forensic rhetoric and legal reasoning, and is thus employed to solve a particularly knotty point of law.

Redefining the meaning of words is how Ovid's heroines attempt to justify their incestuous desires. Byblis, Myrrha, and Phaedra attempt to cast *pietas* ('family duty') as synonymous to *amor* ('erotic desire'). Semantic shifts re-evaluate what is forbidden and what is permitted. Not unlike Byblis, Phaedra, in her love letter to her stepson Hippolytus, distinguishes old from new customs and refers to Jupiter as the divine precedent that legitimates incest (*Heroides* 4,131-134):

> ista uetus **pietas,** aeuo moritura futuro,
> rustica Saturno regna tenente fuit.
> **Iuppiter** esse **pium statuit**, quodcumque **iuuaret**,
> et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.
>
> Such old-fashioned piety, about to die in the age to come, was rustic even in Saturn's reign. Jupiter decreed that whatever brought pleasure was pious, and a sister married to a brother makes everything lawful.

Jupiter, the father god of justice, redefines *pietas* by marrying his sister. *Iuppiter statuit* implies that Jupiter lays down the law by means of giving *pietas* a new meaning. The verb *statuere* has a legal meaning; it describes the authoritative ruling of a jurist or a judge[28]. Once more, there is an etymological allusion in the context of legitimizing incest. *Iuppiter… iuuaret* frames the hexameter and points to the etymological connection of these words[29]. The etymology is at least as old as Ennius (see Varro, *LL* V 65) and features in Cicero's *De natura deorum* II 64 (*Iuppiter – id est iuuans pater quem conuersis casibus appellamus a iuuando Iouem* «Jupiter – the name means 'the helping father,' whom with a change of inflexion

[27] In Hesiod's *Theogony*, Aphrodite is born from the foam/semen of Ouranos' severed genitals, but in Homer's *Iliad* she is the daughter of Zeus. Ovid follows both the Hesiodic (e.g., *Met.* IV 536-538) and the Homeric traditions (e.g., *Met.* XV 807-808).

[28] Cf. Gebhardt 2009, 52.

[29] For the framing of a line as an etymological marker, see O'Hara 2017, 82-86.

we style Jove, from *iuuare* 'to help'»)[30]. Ovid is fully aware of this etymological link. In the *Amores*, for instance, Ovid's girlfriend shuts him out and the poet realizes that Jupiter's epic thunderbolt cannot help him to unbolt Corinna's door (*Amores* II 1,19-20):

> **Iuppiter**, ignoscas: nil me tua tela **iuuabant:**
> clausa tuo maius ianua fulmen habet.

> Jupiter, forgive me: your weapons could not help me: the closed door has a bolt greater than yours.

Latin love elegy is not only a disavowal of epic, but also a rejection of Jupiter's etymological connection with *iuuare*[31]. The supreme god and the symbol of epic *grauitas* cannot help the elegiac lover in his time of need.

While the *Iuppiter-iuuare* etymological link is well established, in *Heroides* 4,133 it involves a striking semantic shift. In the etymological explanations of Jupiter's name, *iuuare* means to 'help, to assist' (see Ovid, *Her.* 11,17-18; *Pont.* II 1,13 and 9,24-25), but in Phaedra's version of this etymology, it means 'to give pleasure, delight'. Phaedra both refers to a traditional etymology and gives a surprising twist to it. Once an etymological connection between two words is established, the game of coming up with various explanations begins. Phaedra combines her radical redefinition of *pietas* with her new interpretation of Jupiter's traditional etymology from *iuuare.* Semantic shifts change the nature of the law. The origins of words take us back to the birth of the law. Phaedra's etymologizing is a case in point. As the father of gods and men, Jupiter is the divine symbol of sovereignty. The name of the father stands for the prohibition of incest in Lacanian psychoanalysis[32], but Phaedra resorts to etymological wordplay in order to argue exactly the opposite, namely that Jupiter's name means that the father allows whatever is pleasing and sanctions incest by marrying his sister. Phaedra's redefinition of *pietas* and *Iuppiter* may strike us as perverse, but she may actually have something important to say about the origins of sovereignty. As Micaela Janan argues in her perceptive reading of Propertius IV 11, juridical reasoning comes to rest in the logical opacity of desire: something is made into law, because «it is the will of [the gods, Nature,

[30] See McKeown 1987, 49; Maltby 1991, 319; Michalopoulos 2001, 102-103.

[31] Cf. *Met.* I 274-275 with Michalopoulos 2001, 102. Here *iuuare* is transferred from Jupiter to Neptune.

[32] Lacan famously puns on *nom* ('name') and *non* ('no') in *le nom du père.* The name of the father signifies the prohibition of incest.

emperor, people, senate]»[33]. The desire of the sovereign legislator is the ultimate source of legality. The Romans were fully aware that the law is grounded on whatever pleases the sovereign legislative body. The legislative formula *senatui/principi placuit* ('it pleased the senate/prince') is in line with Phaedra's argument. Whatever pleases the sovereign legislator has the force of law. By interpreting the origins of Jupiter's name, Phaedra argues that the sovereign's desire is the source of legality.

Etymologizing in Latin poetry is commonly discussed in the context of the poet's *doctrina* ('learning'). James McKeown's compelling and influential discussion of etymology in Ovid's *Amores*, for instance, is part of his section on *doctrina*[34]. This *doctrina* is often related to the Alexandrian poetics of Latin poetry[35]. But note that *doctus* commonly describes a learned jurist. As Kathleen Coleman points out, *doctus* is the *uox propria* of a 'learned jurisconsult'[36]. Coleman makes this point in discussing Ovid's Tiresias in *Metamorphoses* III 322-323. Building on Coleman, Kathryn Balsley argues that Ovid brings together prophetic, poetic, and juristic discourse in an era that signals the emergence of the science of law[37]. The *doctrina* of the *uates* ('seer, poet') reflects the learning of the *iurisperitus*[38]. Etymological learning in Latin poetry should be examined in this context. Etymological *doctrina* is related to the poet's legal studies and to an educational tradition in which a learned lawyer needs to know about the origins of words. In other words, etymologizing is a means of establishing poetic and legal authority.

As we have already seen, the jurist Labeo is an eminent representative of a legal tradition from which many poetic etymologies derive[39]. For instance, the jurist etymologized *furtum* from *furuus*, a rare word that means 'swarthy' (*Digest* XLVII 2,1):

> furtum a furuo, id est nigro dictum Labeo ait, quod clam et obscuro fiat et plerumque nocte
>
> 'theft' derives from 'swarthy', which Labeo says means 'black', because it occurs secretly and in darkness and mostly at night.

Labeo etymologizes a term that concerns the law: 'theft.' The obscure word *furuus* reflects the darkness of theft. This is not only a subtle and self-reflexive comment

[33] See Janan 2001, 146-163.
[34] See McKeown 1987, 45-62.
[35] See O'Hara 2017.
[36] See Coleman 1990.
[37] See Balsley 2010.
[38] See Ziogas 2021, 245-300.
[39] See Cairns 1991, 444; cf. Howley 2013, 14-16.

worthy of a poet, but also highlights the interplay between signifier and signified. In fact, the semantic relation between *nox* and *furtum* is already attested in the Twelve Tables (8,12 *si* ***nox furtum*** *factum sit, si im occidit, iure caesus esto*, «if theft has been committed at night, if owner kills him, thief shall be held lawfully killed»). Macrobius (*Saturnalia* I 4,19) cites this passage from the Twelve Tables in order to comment on the unusual use of *nox* for *noctu*, but what looks like the nominative case of *nox* may draw attention to the semantic relation between *nox* and *furtum*: theft has become (*factum est*) synonymous to night. The emphatic *nox* further suggests an etymological link with *noxa* ('wrongdoing') and *nocere* ('to harm')[40]. Nightly theft is a crime (*noxa*) that will harm (*nocet*) the thief, if he is caught in the act.

The semantic relation between *furtum* and *nox* is not restricted to legal texts, but features prominently in Latin love poetry. We can find traces of this derivation in Catullus (68, 145-146):

> sed **furtiua** dedit muta **munuscula** nocte,
> ipsius ex ipso dempta uiri gremio.
>
> but she gave me in the silent night stolen gifts, taken from the very bosom of her husband himself.

The stolen gifts here occur at night, an allusion to the etymology of *furtum* from *furuus.* Note also the legal background of this wordplay. The learned etymological allusion appears in a context that describes adultery in terms of property theft. This legal context may point to the origins of this etymology in legal discourse.

The extramarital love affair is a theft and that is why it takes place at night. By pointing out that *furta* take place in the darkness of the night, Catullus alludes to an etymology that Labeo spells out (7,7-8):

> aut quam sidera multa, cum tacet **nox**,
> **furtiuos** hominum uident **amores**
>
> or as many as are the stars, when night is silent, that see the stolen loves of men

The stars here are the eyewitnesses of thefts committed by lovers at night. Ovid alludes to this etymology several times; in *Amores* I 11, the expert (2 *docta*) hairdresser Nape is known for her secret services (3-4):

[40] On these etymological links, see Varro, *De lingua Latina* VI 6 *quod nocet nox* with Maltby 1991, s.v *nox, noxa.*

inque ministeriis **furtiuae** congita **noctis**
utilis et dandis ingeniosa **notis**

[Nape], known for useful ministry in the stealthy night and skilled in the giving of the signal

Note also the wordplay *noctis/notis* highlighted by the position of the words in the end of two consecutive lines. Here *nota* functions as an etymological marker (cf. *Fasti* IV 61 *notatum*, discussed below); the secret signals that Nape communicates draw attention to the semantic link between *furtiuus* and *nox.* The darkness of the night supports the communication of secret signs[41]. The obscure semantics of the learned etymology reflect the secret communication of signals. There is an interplay between the literal darkness of the night and the figurative obscurity of the etymological derivation of *furtum* from *furuus*. From *doctus Catullus*[42] to *doctus* Labeo and from the learned jurisconsult to the elegiac Ovid, the etymology of *furtum* features prominently in poetic and juristic discourse.

Poets at times refer explicitly to an etymology (see, e.g., the etymology of Aprilis from Aphrodite at *Fasti* IV 61-62 discussed below), but more often than not their etymologizing is a learned allusion that the reader is invited to decipher. This is more than just a witty (or even nerdy) game of poets obsessed with recondite derivations of words. As we saw in the examples above, etymologizing can have a powerful rhetorical effect. Discovering the origins of words boosts the poet's authority[43]. Etymological wordplay can be simultaneously traditional and revisionist, as in the case of Phaedra's interpretation of Jupiter's etymology from *iuuare.* The practice of etymologizing in the juristic tradition is similarly a legitimizing force. And not unlike the poets, the jurists' etymologies can be explicit or implicit.

The reasonings (*rationes*) of jurists are often radical and unexpectedly progressive. Like Ovid's Phaedra, they employ etymology to drive a revolutionary point home. Ulpian's argument that affection legitimates gifts given to both friends and prostitutes is a case in point (*Digest.* XXXIX 5,5):

[41] Ovid alludes to the semantic relation between theft and darkness at *Her.* 19,55-56 *Sic ubi deceptae pars est mihi maxima* ***noctis*** / *acta, subit* ***furtim lumina*** *fessa sopor*, «When the greatest part of the night has gone by for me in such delusions, sleep steals upon my wearied eyes»; *Met.* XI 762 *Aesacon* ***umbrosa furtim*** *peperisse sub Ida* «she secretly gave birth to Aesacus under shady Ida».

[42] Catullus was known as *doctus* in Latin literature; see [Tibullus] III 6,4; Ovid, *Am.* III 9,62; Martial I 61,1.

[43] On wordplay and powerplay in Latin poetry, see Mitsis and Ziogas 2016.

> Affectionis gratia neque honestae neque inhonestae donationes sunt prohibitae, honestae erga bene **merentes amicos** uel necessarios, inhonestae circa **meretrices**.
>
> When they are made out of affection, neither honourable nor dishonourable gifts are prohibited. Honourable gifts are those made to deserving friends and relations; dishonourable ones are those made to prostitutes.

It is extraordinary that honourable and dishonourable affairs fall under the same category, provided that affection motivates giving[44]. It is even more revolutionary that *affectio*, a concept closely related to *affectio maritalis*, here appears in the context of gifts given to prostitutes[45]. The jurist applies a term which is key to marriage legislation to extramarital affairs, resembling the poetics of Catullus or Ovid. The radically different groups of *merentes amicos* and *meretrices* come together by means of the etymological link between *merentes* and *meretrices*. The difference between the reciprocal exchanges of *amicitia* and commodity transactions with prostitutes collapses; *merentes amici* and *meretrices/amicae* belong to the same category. The jurist relies on the semantic range of *merere*, in order to blur the distinction between worthy friends and mercenary courtesans, between value and price; the verb means «to earn money (by prostitution)» (see *OLD mereo* 1b) and «to have a merit, to deserve» (see *OLD mereo* 4). By bringing together deserving friends and prostitutes, Ulpian subtly implies a radical redefinition of the etymological link between *meretrix* and *merere.* Latin love elegy and juristic discourse may have more in common than we think. The etymologies they imply are often uncontroversial, but their innovative interpretations may radically change concepts of legality.

In Latin poetry, the origins of words are often discussed in legal contexts. A good example is Ovid's *Fasti*, a work in which the poet's interview of divine figures often resembles a client's consultation of a jurist. The pursuit of etymological derivations is embedded in a trial setting. Book V of the *Fasti*, for instance, features three speeches of the Muses, who dispute the etymology of May. Polyhymnia etymologizes *Maius* from *Maiestas*, Urania from *maiores* ('ancestors'), and Calliope from *Maia*. Ovid plays the role of a judge in this etymological dispute but is unable to give a verdict. There is a similar dispute about the etymology of June at the beginning of Book VI. In the *Fasti*, a work whose very title is a reference to legal action, the poet repeatedly casts his search for true causes and etymologies as legal

[44] For a discussion of this passage and its similarities with the poetics of Latin love elegy, see Ziogas 2021, 273-275.

[45] McGinn 1998, 336 is right to argue that *affectio* falls under the regime of gifts made between spouses.

disputes. Ulrich Gebhardt argues convincingly that in the *Fasti*, the search for true aetiologies is cast as a legal procedure[46].

Building on Gebhardt, I argue that there is a link between etymological search and legal procedure or consultation. The quasi-legal disputes of the etymologies of May and June at the beginnings of *Fasti* V and VI are the most prominent examples, but the legalistic dimension of etymologizing is both pervasive and underexplored. The etymology of April in *Fasti* IV is a case in point. While Ovid is noncommittal when it comes to pronouncing a judgment about the etymology of May and June, he makes clear right from the beginning which etymology of April he thinks is correct (61-62):

> sed Veneris mensem Graio sermone notatum
> auguror: a spumis est dea dicta maris.
>
> But I surmise that the month of Venus took its name from the Greek language: the goddess was called after the foam of the sea.

Ovid here says that Aprilis is from Aphrodite, whose name was etymologized from ἀφρός. The oldest and most authoritative source of this etymology is Hesiod and Ovid's grandiloquent *Graio sermone* alludes to the archaic Greek poet[47]. It is remarkable that Ovid presents his etymological explanation here as a performance of augury. The name (Aprilis in this case) is a sign (cf. *notatum*) laden with hidden meaning. The poet decodes its semantics by etymologizing it. He dissects its constituents and reads its true message. The phrase *nomen omen*[48] suggests that discovering the true meanings of words is an act of augury. It is not a coincidence that the augurs, the official interpreters of auspices, were tirelessly exploring antiquarian sources and etymologies. This is precisely Ovid's persona in the *Fasti* in general and in the couplet quoted above in particular. But the augurs were also authoritative interpreters of the law[49]. Quintus Mucius Scaevola Augur (c. 169-88 BCE), for instance, was a prominent Roman jurist. The name and the law are symbols decoded by a learned augur.

---

[46] See Gebhardt 2009, 283-303.

[47] For the etymology of Aphrodite from ἀφρός, see Hesiod, *Theogony* 190-200 (especially 190-191 ἀμφὶ δὲ λευκὸς / **ἀφρὸς** ἀπ' ἀθανάτου χροὸς ὤρνυτο, «a white foam rose up around them from the immortal flesh»). See also Cicero, *ND* III 59. For the ancient etymology of Aprilis, see Maltby 1991, 44.

[48] The earliest attestation of this wordplay seems to be Plautus, *Persa* 625 ***nomen atque omen*** *quantiuis iam est preti*, «The name and omen are already worth any price». Toxilus here etymologizes Lucris from *lucrum* ('profit').

[49] See, e.g., Linderski 1986.

After justifying his etymological preference, Ovid mentions an alternative etymology, which he ostensibly rejects (*Fasti* IV 85-94):

> Quo non Liuor abit? sunt qui tibi mensis honorem
> eripuisse uelint inuideantque, Venus.
> nam, **quia uer aperit** tunc omnia densaque cedit
> frigoris asperitas fetaque terra patet,
> **Aprilem** memorant **ab aperto** tempore dictum
> quem Venus iniecta uindicat alma manu.
> illa quidem totum dignissima temperat orbem,
> illa tenet nullo regna minora deo,
> iuraque dat caelo, terrae, natalibus undis,
> perque suos initus continet omne genus
>
> To what extremes does Envy not stray? There are those who grudge you the honour of the month, and would snatch it from you, Venus. For they say that April was named from the open (*apertum*) season, because spring then opens (*aperit*) all things, and the sharp frost-bound cold departs, and earth unlocks her teeming soil, though kindly Venus claims the month and lays her hand on it. She indeed sways, and well deserves to sway, the world entire; she owns a kingdom second to that of no god; she gives laws to heaven and earth and to her native sea, and by her inspiration she keeps every species in being.

The presence of Livor in Ovid is often associated with litigation. The most prominent example is *Amores* I 15,1-8, where Livor prosecutes Ovid for being sluggish and indifferent to a military or legal career. The mention of Livor in *Fasti* IV anticipates the legalistic setting. The periphrastic combination of *uelle* with the perfect infinitive (*eripuisse*) echoes the language of ancient laws. Ovid is fond of this legal idiom as Daube 1966 shows in his discussion of *Amores* I 4. Ovid's *Am.* I 4,38 *oscula praecipue nulla dedisse uelis* «above all, you had better not wish to have given him any kisses» is the rather rare form of decree *ne quis fecisse uelit*. In other words, Ovid uses legal diction to describe Livor's attempt to rob Venus of the etymological association of Aprilis with her name.

But Venus reclaims the etymology of April in a way that refers to reclaiming stolen property. There is a clear reference to the *manus iniectio* in line 90. The *manus iniectio* occurs before the praetor in the *uindicatio*[50]. According to this legal ritual, a person who claimed that another was withholding their rightful property would

[50] On this legal procedure in Propertius, see Cairns 2000; in Ovid, see Daube 1966, 227; Gebhardt 2009, 299.

seize the property and make a formal declaration that the *res* ('chattel') was his (see Gaius, *Inst.* 4.16; cf. Ulpian *Digest.* XI 7,14). This is what Venus does in order to seize the month of April from those who snatched it from her. It is remarkable that what Venus claims here is not a *res*, but a *nomen.* Ovid's legal procedure bridges the gap between the signifier and the signified. Note also that the legal drama of April's etymology is followed by Ovid's hymnic praise of Venus. In this hymn, the goddess is hailed as a universal legislator (*Fasti* IV 93-94). After she reclaims ownership of April in an act of *uindicatio* and trumps Livor's attempt to dispossess her of her rightful property, she features as the sovereign legislator. Etymological debate is thus subjected to legal procedure.

In other sources, the two etymological versions of Aprilis (from Aphrodite or from *aperire*) are sometimes quoted without the author making a judgment. Verrius Flaccus, for instance, in his monumental *Fasti Praenestini*, mentions both (Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XII 2,126-127):

> **[Aprilis a] V[e]n[ere],** quod ea [cum Anchisa iuxta mater fuit Aene]ae, regis [Latinor]um, a quo p(opulus) R(omanus) ortus e[st. **Alii ab Ape]ri[li]** q[uod]am i[n m]ense, quia fruges flores animaliaque ac maria ac terrae **aperiuntur**
>
> Aprilis from Venus, because she mated with Anchises and became the mother of Aeneas, king of the Latins, from whom the Roman people originates. Others from Aperilis, because crops, flowers, and creatures, in the sea and on the earth alike, 'spring' (*aperiuntur*) in this month.

Macrobius (*Saturnalia* I 12-13) attests that Cingius objected to the etymology of Venus from Aphrodite and calls those who offer this etymology ill-informed (*inperite quosdam opinari*). He argues that the Roman ancestors established not a single holy day nor any significant sacrifice to Venus in the course of this month. Macrobius adds that Varro agrees with Cingius[51]. In *De lingua Latina*, Varro first gives the etymology of Aprilis from Aphrodite (*LL* VI 33 *secundus mensis, ut Fuluius scribit et Iunius, a Venere, quod ea sit Aphrodite*, «the second month, as Fulvius and Iunius write, from Venus, because she is Aphrodite»)[52]. But then he promptly rejects it for the alternative derivation from *aperire* (*cuius nomen ego antiquis litteris quod nusquam inueni, magis puto dictum, quod uer omnia aperit, Aprilem*, «but I have nowhere found her name in the old writings about the month, and so think that it

[51] See Fantham 1998, 101-102.

[52] The old Roman calendar started with March, that is why April appears as the second month here.

was called April rather because spring *aperit* 'opens' everything»)[53]. Interestingly, Ovid attacks Varro, putting him in the camp of Envy for his etymological reasoning.

The sources that mention and discuss the etymologies of April often show a preference for one over the other. At times, there is a clear controversy (when Cingius, for instance, dismissed the proponents of the Greek etymology as ignorant). Verrius Flaccus does not take sides – at least not clearly. He first gives the etymology of Aprilis from Aphrodite, but note how he supresses any reference to the Greek name and emphasizes the role of Venus as the ancestress of all Romans. Verrius Flaccus, a scholar in Augustus' inner circle, foregrounds an etymology that would draw attention to the prince's claim that his family descend from Venus. Etymology in the monumental work of the *Fasti Praenestini* is subtly, but clearly political. The Roman etymology of Aprilis from *aperire* is vaguely attributed to 'others' and given second place. Interestingly, Ovid gives a similar genealogical explanation to justify the Romanness of his Greek etymology (see *Fasti* IV 63-81). The poet then quotes the second etymology from *aperire* and rejects it. In this section of the *Fasti*, Ovid seems to be magnifying the structure and message of the *Fasti Praenestini.*

But what is missing in Varro, Verrius Flaccus or Macrobius is the legal dimension of this etymological dispute that features prominently in Ovid. How can we explain this? There are two ways. One way is to say that Ovid dramatizes etymological debate by turning it into legal action. Legalese and legal procedure are not unpoetic in Ovid. Quite the contrary, they add some courtroom drama to dry antiquarian pursuits. Livor first snatched April from Venus. Venus then reclaimed the month in a legal procedure and is subsequently hailed as a sovereign legislator in a hymn. We may interpret all this as an Ovidian innovation related to his fondness of adding legal colour to pursuits and situations that have ostensibly nothing to do with the law. But I think we can do better than this. In my view, the legal dimension of Ovidian etymologizing is not another glib witticism of an endlessly playful poet. Ovid points out that searching for the origins of words is something that concerns the law. He thus engages with the tradition of etymologizing in the schools of law, in legal procedure, and in the juristic interpretations of statutes in the age of Augustus.

Durham University
ioannis.ziogas@durham.ac.uk

Keywords: incest, jurists, Labeo, law, Ovid, Varro
Parole chiave: incesto, giuristi, Labeone, legge, Ovidio, Varrone

[53] See De Melo 2019, 840. On Varro's etymological procedure, see Taylor 1975; Blank 2008; De Melo 2019, 36-45.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Balsley 2010
K.Balsley, *Between Two Lives: Tiresias and the Law in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, «Dictynna» VII (2010), 13-31 [https://journals.openedition.org/dictynna/189].

Blank 2008
D.L.Blank, *Varro and the Epistemological Status of Etymol*ogy, «Histoire Épistémologie Langage» XXX (2008), 49-73.

Bourdieu 1987
P.Bourdieu, *The Force of Law: Toward a Sociology of the Juridical Field*, «Hastings Law Review» XXXVIII (1987), 814-853.

Cairns 1991
F.Cairns, *Catullus 46, 9-11 and Ancient Etymologies*, «Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica» CXIX (1991), 442-445.

Cairns 1996
F.Cairns, *Ancient 'etymology' and Tibullus: on the Classification of 'Etymologies' and on 'Etymological Markers'*, «Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society» XLII (1996), 24-59.

Cairns 2000
F.Cairns, *Allusions to* hunc…meum esse aio *in Propertius?*, «Res Publica Litterarum» XXIII (2000), 168-181.

Ceci 1982
L.Ceci, *Le etimologie dei giureconsulti romani*, Torino 1982.

Coleman 1990
K.M.Coleman, *Tiresias the Judge: Ovid, Metamorphoses 3.322-38*, «The Classical Quarterly» XL (1990), 571-577.

Daube 1966
D.Daube, *No kissing, or else…* in L.Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, Ithaca NY, 222-231.

De Melo 2019
Varro, *De lingua Latina,* Introduction, Translation, Text, and Commentary by W.De Melo, I-II, Oxford 2019.

Duso 2017
M. Terenti Varronis *De lingua Latina I.* Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento a cura di A.Duso, Hildesheim 2017.

Fantham 1998
Ovid, *Fasti Book IV*, ed. by E.Fantham, Cambridge 1998.

Garani 2014
M.Garani, *The Figure of Numa in Ovid's Fasti*, in M.Garani – D.Konstan (ed.),

The Philosophizing Muse: The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry, Newcastle 2014, 128-160.

Garcea 2019
A.Garcea, *Nigidius Figulus' Naturalism between Grammar and Philosophy*, in Pezzini – Taylor 2019, 79-102.

Gebhardt 2009
U.Gebhardt, *Sermo Iuris. Rechtssprache und Recht in der augusteischen Dichtung*, Leiden 2009.

Goodrich 2006
P.Goodrich, *The Laws of Love: A Brief Historical and Practical Manual*, New York 2006.

Harries 2006
J.Harries, *Cicero and the Jurists: From Citizen's Law to the Lawful State*, London 2006.

Harries 2017
J.Harries, *Iurisperiti: Men Skilled in Law* in J.König – G.Woolf (ed.), *Authority and Expertise in Ancient Scientific Culture*, Cambridge 2017, 83-106.

Hinds 2006
S.Hinds, *Venus, Varro, and the Vates: Toward the Limits of Etymologizing Interpretation*, «Dictynna» III (2006) [https://journals.openedition.org/dictynna/206].

Howley 2013
J.Howley, *Why Read the Jurists? Aulus Gellius on Reading Across Disciplines*, in P.du Plessis (ed.), *New Frontiers: Law and Society in the Roman World.* Edinburgh 2013, 9-30.

Janan 2001
M.Janan, *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*, Berkeley 2001.

Keith 2008
A.Keith, *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*, London 2008

Linderski 1986
J.Linderski, *The Augural Law*, in *ANRW* II 16.3 (1986), 2146-2312.

Lowrie 2005
M.Lowrie, *Slander and Horse Law in Horace, Sermones 2.1*, «Law and Literature» XVII (2005), 405-431.

Maltby 1991
R.Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991.

Maltby 1993
R.Maltby, *The Limits of Etymologising*, «Aevum Antiquum» VI (1993), 257-275.

McGinn 1998
T.McGinn, *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1998.

McKeown 1987
Ovid, *Amores. Volume I: Text and Prolegomena* by J.McKeown, Leeds 1987.
Mitsis – Ziogas 2016
P.Mitsis – I.Ziogas (ed.), *Wordplay and Powerplay in Latin Poetry*, Berlin and Boston 2016.
O'Hara 2017
J.O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (New and Expanded Edition), Ann Arbor 2017[2] [1996[1]].
Pezzini – Taylor 2019
G.Pezzini – B.Taylor (ed.), *Language and Nature in the Classical Roman World*, Cambridge 2019.
Schiesaro 2007
A.Schiesaro, *Didaxis, Rhetoric, and the Law in Lucretius*, in S.J.Heyworth (ed.), *Classical Constructions: Papers in Memory of Don Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean*, Oxford 2007, 63-90.
Taylor 1975
D.J.Taylor, *Declinatio: A Study of the Linguistic Theory of Marcus Terentius Varro*, Amsterdam 1975.
Vergados 2020
T.Vergados, *Hesiod's Verbal Craft: Studies in Hesiod's Conception of Language and its Ancient Reception,* Oxford 2020.
Volk 2016
K.Volk, *Roman Pythagoras*, in D.Williams – K.Volk (ed.), *Roman Reflections: Studies in Latin Philosophy*, Oxford, 33-49.
Wibier, forthcoming
M.Wibier, *Legal Scholarship and the World of Learning: An Intellectual History of Roman Jurisprudence in the Early Empire*, Oxford, forthcoming.
Ziogas 2021
I.Ziogas, *Law and Love in Ovid. Courting Justice in the Age of Augustus*, Oxford 2021.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32057 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 201-225*

ROBERT MALTBY

Etymology and Identity in the *Appendix Tibulliana*

The paper investigates the use of etymologising in the Appendix Tibulliana *and concludes that its purpose to link the probably late first-century AD author of this work with the great elegists of an earlier generation, namely Propertius, Ovid and, in particular, Tibullus. This etymologising takes place at the level both of common nouns and of proper names, with plays on the fictitious character names Lygdamus, Neaera and Cerinthus. In both cases the practice is firmly anchored in the literary techniques of Tibullus and the other elegists. The manipulation of earlier elegiac etymologising and of the previous literary identities of these character names provides the whole work with a structural unity and a specific chronological focus, and so lends weight to arguments for a single unitary author.*

L'articolo indaga la ricerca e la proposta di etimologie nella Appendix Tibulliana*, concludendo che il loro fine è quello di collegare l'autore dell'opera (probabilmente della fine del I secolo d.C.) con i grandi poeti elegiaci della generazione precedente: Properzio, Ovidio e, in particolare, Tibullo. L'etimologizzazione si concentra sui nomi, sia propri sia comuni, e gioca su quelli dei personaggi fittizi Lygdamus, Neaera e Cerinthus. In entrambi i casi la pratica è saldamente ancorata alle tecniche letterarie di Tibullo e degli altri poeti elegiaci, ma nell'*Appendix *la precedente etimologizzazione di ambito elegiaco viene manipolata assieme alle identità letterarie di questi personaggi: ciò fornisce all'opera un'unita strutturale e uno specifico focus cronologico, tali da individuare un singolo autore unitario.*

1. *Introduction*

The premise of this chapter, based on my forthcoming commentary on the third book of the *Corpus Tibullianum* or *Appendix Tibulliana* (henceforth *AT*), is that this book was written by a single author (male or female) near the end of the first century AD. Within the book the author adopts different masks, Lygdamus (*AT* 1-6), a young writer of a panegyric for Messalla Corvinus (*AT* 7)[1], a companion of Sulpicia (*AT* 8, 10, 12), who sometimes writes in Sulpicia's name (*AT* 9 and 11), Sulpicia herself (*AT* 13-18) and Tibullus (*AT* 19), with the final short poem *AT* 20 remaining anonymous. The 'real' names involved here, Messalla Corvinus, Sulpicia and Tibullus are connected with the elegiac poets of the end of the first century BC and beginning of the first century AD. The pseudonym Lygdamus is chosen for its associations with a slave mentioned in the poetry of Propertius (III 6, IV 7, IV 8). Furthermore the birthdate Lygdamus gives himself at III 5,17-18 *natalem primo nostrum uidere parentes / cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari* [my parents saw my birthday for the first time when both consuls fell by the same fate] is couched in the same terms in which Ovid describes his own birthdate in *trist*. IV 10,5-6 *editus hic ego sum, nec non, ut tempora noris / cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari* [here (i.e. in Sulmo) I was born and, so that you should know the date, it

[1] In this poem Peirano 2012, 132-148 makes a good case for seeing our author as impersonating a young Tibullus, seeking Messalla's patronage at an early stage of his career.

was when both consuls fell by the same fate] and refers ostensibly to 43 BC. The many chronological problems this date has given rise to for commentators are a result of its being taken literally instead of being seen as a complete fabrication, intended by our late first century AD author to associate his invented character Lygdamus with the great age of Latin elegy, as represented by Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid. At the structural level the arrangement of the poems in book three has been likened to that of Tibullus' first book[2], with the Neaera poems *AT* 1-6 being based on the Delia poems of Tib. I 1-6; the *Messalla Panegyric AT* poem 7 on Tib. I 7 (Messalla's Aquitanian triumph); third party comments on the affair of Sulpicia and Cerinthus in *AT* poems 8, 10 and 12 mirror Tibullus' treatment of the Marathus and Pholoe affair in Tib. I 8 and 9. Even the birthday poems *AT* 11, 12, 14 and 15 have a Tibullan model in Tib. I 7 (to Messalla) and Tib. II 2 (to Cornutus). My aim in this chapter is to show that our author's use of etymology, both of common nouns and of proper names, is also intended to recall that of the great elegists of the past, in particular Tibullus, and to lend a further veneer of authenticity to its pseudo-epigraphic content.

2. *Evidence for a late first-century AD composition date*

Given the amount of Latin poetry which has been lost to us any attempt at dating particular stylistic features must remain an inexact science, but some tentative conclusions can be drawn about the date of some of our author's models[3].

If the Lygdamus birthdate at *AT* 5,17-18 is based, as seems likely, on Ovid *Tristia* IV 10,5-6 then this couplet must be dated to later than 11 AD, the date of *Tristia* 4, as the couplet fits much more naturally in the *sphragis*[4] at the end of Ovid *Tristia* 4 than it does in *AT* 5,17-18, where its presence seems somewhat forced. At *AT* 1,15-17 there seems to be an echo of [Virg.] *Culex* 11-19, dated to the middle of the first century AD, and at *AT* 2,3 the hexameter ending *tantum ferre dolorem* [to bear so much pain] perhaps echoes Val. Flacc. I 766, dated at 70-79 AD. At *AT* 1.19 the line *illa mihi referet si nostri mutua cura est* [let her tell me if her love is equal to mine] the second half of the hexameter could contain a verbal echo of Martial X 13,9 *si tibi mens eadem, si nostri mutua cura est* [if your mind is the same, if your love is equal to mine] since the syntax of *si* + indicative in a condi-

[2] Holzberg 2001, 98-109

[3] See Maltby 2010. However its conclusion that different parts of the work could have been composed at different times is now rejected by the author.

[4] A 'seal', giving biographical details of the author.

tional clause is regular in Martial, but would be unusual (though not unparalleled) in Lygdamus' indirect question (for the regular *num* or *utrum* + subjunctive). If this really is an echo of Martial this would push our author's date later to after 95 AD, the probable publication date of Martial book X[5]. Verbal echoes from two poets of the end of the first century AD are also apparent in the Messalla Panegyric (*AT* poem 7). So *AT* 7,144 the description of the Indian Pedaean as *impia … saeuis celebrans conuiuia mensis* [celebrating impious feasts on savage tables] seems to combine echoes of two poems from the last decade of the first century AD, namely Statius *Thebaid* I 246-47 *neque … / …saeuae periit iniuria mensae*[6] [and the wrong done at the cruel table has not died away] and Silius Italicus XI 271 *regifice exstructis celebrant conuiuia mensis* [they celebrate their feasts at tables piled royally high]. Similar echoes from Statius and Silius Italicus could also be claimed for poem *AT* 9 from the *Sulpicia Cycle*[7]. There are no particularly late echoes in the poems in the mask of Sulpicia, *AT* 13-18, and in the final two poems *AT* 19 (in the mask of Tibullus) and *AT* 20, though both show the influence of Ovid[8]. If a single author wrote the whole book then a date at the end of the first century AD seems the most likely date of composition. The political uncertainties of this period could well have caused our author to write anonymously or under pseudonyms. The argument for a single author and single date of composition are based on thematic links and similarities between poems from different groups and a collection of important intertexts, especially Hor. *Epod.* 15, and Ov. *Met.* VII 661-862, whose influence runs throughout the work. These are discussed in the forthcoming commentary[9] and lay outside the remit of the present paper, which is to examine the role of etymology in our author's presentation of himself as belonging to the great age of Roman elegy.

---

[5] Another possible echo from Martial occurs at *AT* 6,21 *conuenit iratus nimium nimiumque severos* [he confronts angrily the too, too severe]; cf. Mart. VIII 3,17 *scribant ista graues nimium nimiumque seueri* [let the too serious and the too severe write such things].

[6] With other possible Statian echoes at 7,1 *cognita uirtus* [well-known virtue], cf. Stat. *Theb*. IX 37; 7,36 *uincto pede … solute* [in verse or prose], cf. Stat. *Silu.* II 7,72; 7,70 *confinia mortis* [the confines of death], cf. Stat. *Theb*. IV 615; 7,96 *grauis impetus hastae* [the heavy spear's attack], cf. Stat. *Theb*. X 545.

[7] So 9,2 *deuia* + gen. *deuia montis* [trackless mountain places], cf. Stat. *Theb*. V 248 *deuia … urbis* [trackless city places] and 9,6 *deficiantque canes* [let hounds drop dead], cf. Sil. It. XIV 495 *deficiens … uolucris* [a dying bird].

[8] See Maltby 2010, 336-337.

[9] See Maltby forthcoming.

3. *Etymological play with Tibullan and other Elegiac Associations*

Of the etymologies used by our author to give substance to his adoption of masks from the age of the elegists pride of place is given to those influenced by Tibullus. An obvious example occurs in the opening of *AT* 2:

AT 2,1-4 qui primus caram iuueni carumque puellae
eripuit iuuenem, ferreus ille fuit.
durus et ille fuit qui tantum ferre dolorem,
uiuere et erepta coniuge qui potuit.

Iron-hearted was that man who first snatched from a youth his dear girl or from a girl her dear youth. And unfeeling too was he who could bear so much pain and live on with his wife snatched away.

Here the play on *ferreus* [iron-hearted] and *ferre* [to bear] clearly recalls the opening of Tib. I 10:

quis fuit horrendos primus qui protulit enses? 1
quam ferus et uere ferreus ille fuit … 2
an nihil ille miser meruit, nos ad mala nostra 5
uertimus in saeuas quod dedit ille feras? 6

Who was the man who first brought forth frightening swords? How fierce and truly iron-hearted was that man … Or was that poor man blameless? Do we turn to our own harm what he gave for use against wild beasts.

The connection is made clear by the echo in *AT* 2,2 of the pentameter ending *ferreus ille fuit* [iron-hearted was that man] from Tib. I 10,2. The association between *ferre* [to bear] and *ferreus* [iron-hearted] is obscured in Tibullus by his use of the perfect form of *profero* [I bring forth], namely *protulit* (1) [he brought forth]. However the fact that the *AT* author understood the etymological link is made clear by his use of the phonetically similar *ferre* (3) [to bear][10]. Although in both passages the adjective *primus* [first] is associated with the well-known πρῶτος εὑρετής [first inventor] figure, it is also a recognised marker or sign-post pointing

[10] Further poetical plays on *ferre* and *ferrum/ferreus* in Maltby 1993, 267-68, Michalopoulos 2001, 80-81.

up etymological play[11]. This hint had been further emphasised in Tibullus by the adverb *uere* (2) [truly], which also serves as an etymological marker[12]. In lines 2 and 6 Tib. introduces a further link in his etymological chain by adding the adjective *ferus* [fierce] and the related noun *fera* [wild beast] which were also to be associated with *ferreus* [iron-hearted] and *ferre* [to bear][13]. Our *AT* author does not develop this further link here, but it surfaces later at *AT* 4,73-74 in a dream warning from Apollo to Lygdamus:

> nescis quid sit amor, iuuenis, si ferre recusas
> immitem dominam coniugiumque ferum.

> You do not know what love is, young man, if you refuse to bear a ruthless mistress and a fierce marriage.

This emphasises once again our author's appreciation of the complete range of word-play in Tib. I 10,1-6 and lends credence to his own elegiac verbal learning.

One poem in particular that could be expected to reveal our author's interest in Tibullan etymological play is *AT* 19, in the central couplet of which (13-14) our author explicitly adopts the mask of Tibullus:

> nunc licet e caelo mittatur amica Tibullo,
> mittetur frustra deficietque Venus.

> Now though a mistress be sent down from heaven for Tibullus, she will be sent in vain and Love will fail

His argument here is that he (naming himself as Tibullus) will not desert his mistress and even if a girl were to be sent down to him from heaven, he would not be able to make love to her. The couplet not only names Tibullus but is also redolent of elegiac themes to be found in that author. Tibullus at I 3,90 describes

[11] See Cairns 1996, 14-24 and cf. Tib. I 4,59 *at tu, qui uenerem docuisti uendere primus* [and you, who first taught men to sell love] marking the etymological link between *uenus* [love] and *uendere* [to sell].

[12] Cf. Plaut. *Stich* 242, Virg. *Georg.* III 280, Ov. *Am.* III 9,4, *Fast.* II 859. The word *ueriloquium* [etymology, lit. true-speaking] was invented by Cicero (*Topica* 35,4) as an equivalent of the Greek *etymologia* [etymology] to bring out the idea of truth inherent in etymology, but was never really taken up by others who kept to the Greek technical term.

[13] For further poetical plays on the association of *ferus* and *ferrum/ferreus* see Cairns 1979, 99, Michalopoulos 2001, 80-81 and cf. especially Cic. *Ad Quint. Fr.* I 3,3 *ferus ac ferreus* [fierce and iron-hearted].

his own surprise arrival home to his mistress from abroad in the following terms: *sed uidear caelo missus adesse tibi* [but let me appear to be sent down from heaven for you]. Combined with this is another Tibullan theme, his desertion by Venus (used by metonymy for the ability to make love) when attempting to find satisfaction with other girls: I 5,40-41 *saepe aliam tenui, sed iam cum gaudia adirem, / admonuit dominae deseruitque Venus* [often I embraced another girl, but just as I was approaching love's joy, Venus reminded me of my mistress and deserted me]. The Tibullan themes here are combined with an idea from Ovid, namely where a lover proves his fidelity by not being tempted by divine beauty: Ov. *Met.* VII 802-803 (Cephalus of his young bride Procris), *nec me quae caperet, non si Venus ipsa ueniret, / ulla erat* [nor was there any girl who could captivate me, not even if Venus herself was to come].

The mention of Venus here in the central couplet of the poem (*AT* 19,13-14) picks up references to her in the opening and closing couplets of the elegy. So

AT 19,1-2 nulla tuum nobis subducet femina lectum:
hoc primum iuncta est foedere nostra Venus.

No woman shall steal from me your bed: with this agreement we first joined our love-tie.

AT 19,23-24 sed Veneris sanctae considam uinctus ad aras:
haec notat iniustos supplicibusque fauet.

But I shall sit bound at Venus' altars. She brands the unjust and favours suppliants.

AT 19, then, is a well-structured poem displaying intentional ring composition. Furthermore veneration of Venus as a protector of lovers which frames this poem is a typically Tibullan theme[14]. Mention of the goddess at the beginning, middle, and end of the poem is a good choice for a poet acting as a *Tibullus personatus* [an imitator of Tibullus]. At the etymological level a link is suggested in 19,23 between *Veneris* and *uinctus* [bound][15]. The image of being bound in chains at Venus' altar continues the *seruitium amoris* [slavery of love] theme of *AT* 19,22: *nec fugiam notae seruitium dominae* [nor shall I flee servitude to a mistress I know]. The idea of servitude to Venus, as opposed to servitude to a mistress originated with Tibullus; so, Tib. I 2,99-100 *at mihi parce Venus. semper tibi dedita seruit / mens mea* [but

[14] See Maltby 2002, 422 on Tib. II 4,23-26 and Maltby 2004, 119-20.
[15] See Maltby 1991, 635 *s.v.* Venus; Michalopoulos 2001, 169, 171; Hinds 2006, 2-15.

spare me, Venus. My mind has always been devoted to your service] II 3,33-34 *felices olim*, *Veneri cum fertur aperte / seruire aeternos non puduisse deos* [happy were men of old, when the immortal gods were not ashamed to serve Venus openly]. But *uinctus* [bound] also suggests the bonds of love, as at *AT* 11,13-14 (of the love of Sulpicia and Cerinthus) *nec tu sis iniusta*, *Venus*: *uel seruiat aeque / uinctus uterque*, *uel mea uincla*[16] *leua* [and you, Venus, be not unjust, either let both of us, equally bound, be your slaves, or take away my bonds]. Although common in the later elegists, Propertius and Ovid[17], this bonds of love theme, like that of servitude to Venus, is thought to have originated in Latin elegy with Tibullus: so I 1,55 *me retinent uinctum formosae uincla puellae* [the chains of a beautiful girl keep me bound][18]; Tib.I 2,92-93 *uidi ego*, *qui iuuenum miseros lusisset amores*, / *post Veneris uinclis subdere colla senem* [I have seen the man who had mocked poor lovers in his youth submit his neck to Venus' chains in his old age]; I 9,79 *cum me uinctum puer alter habebit* [when another boy will keep me bound]. This etymological link between *Venus* and *uinctus* [bound] along with its suggestion of the typically Tibullan theme of *seruitium amoris* [slavery of love], serves then to support the Tibullan identity assumed by our poet in this elegy. Two further Tibullan characteristics of this final couplet give added weight to the impersonation. First, the mention of Venus by name in the final couplet of a poem is typical of that author; so at Tib. I 2,99-100 and I 9,81-84. Second, the emphasis on Venus' ferocity towards wronged lovers is another typically Tibullan preoccupation: so, Tib. I 5,57-58 *sunt numina amanti*, / *saeuit et iniusta lege relicta Venus* [a divine power stands over the lover and Venus rages when abandoned by an unjust law], I 8,28 *persequitur poenis tristia facta Venus* [Venus pursues with punishment unkind deeds], I 9,20 *asperaque est illi difficilisque Venus* [to him (i.e. the man who accepts money for love) Venus is harsh and difficult], as is her protection of suppliants: Tib. I 4,71-72 *blanditiis uult esse locum Venus*: *illa querelis / supplicibus*, *miseris fletibus illa fauet* [Venus wants there to be a place for kindness; she listens with favour to the complaints of suppliants and to the tears of the afflicted].

Although Tibullan etymologies can be seen as performing a specific role of impersonation in *AT* 19, their presence in the rest of the corpus serves to lend authenticity to the voices adopted there as contemporaries of the elegists. We have already seen this with the *ferrum/ fero/ ferus* plays at *AT* 2,1-4 and 4,73-4 (in the

[16] Like *Venus* the word *uinclum* [chain] is, of course, also associated etymologically with *uincio* [bind]: see Maltby 1991, 646, Michalopoulos 2001, 177.

[17] E.g. Ov. *Her.* 20,86 (Acontius to Cydippe) *seruabor firmo uinctus amore tibi* [I will be kept bound to you by a firm bond of love] with Kenney 1996, 195 *ad l.* who sees the theme as Tibullan.

[18] Murgatroyd 1980, 64 *ad. loc.* sees the theme as a Tibullan invention.

voice of Lygdamus). At *AT* 11, a birthday poem in the voice of Sulpicia, the Tibullan etymologising on *Venus… uinctus… uincla* at 13-14 discussed above, in the context of *seruitium amoris*, is continued is continued in 15-16 by another Tibullan etymological play on *catena* [chain] from *teneo* [hold][19]:

AT 11,15-16 sed potius ualida teneamur uterque catena,
nulla queat posthac quam soluisse dies.

But rather let us each be held by a strong chain,
which afterwards no day can untie.

This recalls Tibullus' use of the same word-play in the same context of *seruitium amoris* at Tib. II 4,3[20]:

seruitium sed triste datur, teneorque catenis

But I am given sad slavery and am held by chains.

The same etymology, in a slightly different form and context, occurs also in the *Messalla Panegyric*:

AT 7,116-118 te duce, non alias conuersus Dalmata tergum
libera Romanae subiecit colla catenae.
nec tamen his contentus eris …

Under your leadership the Dalmatian, who never before turned his back (in flight) has submitted his free neck to the Roman chain. But you will not be content with these deeds.

Tibullan etymological play[21], then, is a feature which links all parts of the *AT* and adds weight to other arguments in favour of a single author for the whole work.

[19] See Maltby 1991, 114 *s.v. catena*, Michalopoulos 2001, 49-50. Literary play on this link also occurs at Hor. *Carm.* 3.11.44-5 and Ov. *Met.* IV 175-176.

[20] See Cairns 1979, 94.

[21] Of course other etymological play is found throughout the work, but this is not linked to specific passages the elegiac tradition: 4,10 *sal/salio*; 5.1-2 *unda/adeunda*; 7,14 *parua/mica*; 7,22 *igneus/aether*; 7,24-27 *Camena/ cano/carmen*; 7,61 *solus/Sol*; 7,72 *Scylla/canis*; 7,89 *celer/sagitta*; 7,113 *renouo/annus*.

Finally, another etymology of Venus, which is not specifically Tibullan, but has an important role to play in elegy in general, as well as in earlier Latin poetry[22], is that of *Venus* from *uenio* [come][23]. The most explicit statement of this etymology occurs in Cicero's *De natura deorum*: II 69 *quae… dea ad res omnes ueniret Venerem nostri nominauerunt* [since the goddess comes (*ueniret*) to all things our people called her Venus]; III 62 *Venus quia uenit ad omnia* [Venus because she comes (*uenit*) to all things]. We saw it above in Cephalus' words about Procris at Ov. *Met.* VII 802-803 *nec, me quae ceperat, non si Venus ipsa ueniret / ulla erat* [nor was there any girl who could captivate me, not even if Venus herself was to come (*ueniret*)]. It occurs in all three earlier elegists:

Tib. II 1,12-13 cui tulit hesterna gaudia nocte Venus.
casta placent superis: pura cum ueste uenite

(Keep away) you whom Venus granted joy last night.
The gods love purity: come (*uenite*) with clean clothes.

Tib. II 3,54 iam ueniant praedae si Venus optat opes.

Now let booty come (*ueniant*) if Venus wishes for wealth.

Prop. IV 7,18-19 alterna ueniens in tua colla manu.
saepe Venus triuiis commissa est…

Coming (*ueniens*) hand over hand to your embrace.
Often love (Venus) was made at the cross-roads.

Ov. *Am.* I 10,33 quae Venus ex aequo uentura est grata duobus.

The love (Venus) that will come (*uentura*) as equal joy to both.

In *AT* the etymology occurs only in those poems which concern Sulpicia. The Sulpicia Cycle, in which our author assumes the mask of a third-party observer on Sulpicia's affair with Cerinthus, begins with an address to Mars to come and admire Sulpicia on the occasion of the Matronalia:

[22] For examples in Plautus, Catullus, Lucretius and Horace see Michalopoulos 2001, 170.

[23] See Maltby 1991, 635 *s.v.* Venus, Michalopoulos 2001, 169-170, Hinds 2006, 17-18, 29-33. The play is particularly frequent in Ovid: *Am.* I 10,33, *Her.* 5,35-36, 16,139-140, *Ars* I 86-87, II 608-609, 716-717, *Rem.* 505-506, *Fast.* IV 13-14, *Trist.* II 295-296.

AT 8,1-4 Sulpicia est tibi culta tuis, Mars magne, Kalendis:
spectatum e caelo, si sapis, ipse ueni.
hoc Venus ignoscet. at tu uiolente caueto
ne tibi miranti turpiter arma cadant.

Sulpicia is adorned for you, great Mars, on your Kalends. Come (*ueni*) yourself, if you are wise, from heaven to see her. Venus will pardon this. But you, violent one, take care your arms do not shamefully fall to the ground as you wonder.

Here, though *ueni* [come] (2) and Venus (3) occur in close proximity, the verb which would normally refer to Venus is actually used of Mars, serving to remind the reader of the fact that Mars and Venus were lovers. We may contrast the opening of Sulpicia's own poem *AT* 13 which associates the arrival of love *AT* 13,1 *tandem uenit amor* [at last comes (*uenit*) love], with Venus' answering her prayers *AT* 13,5 *exsoluit promissa Venus* [Venus has fulfilled her promises]. Returning to *AT* 8 it is probable that the phrase *Venus ignoscet* [Venus will pardon] (3) contains another etymology of Venus from *uenia* [forgiveness][24] and in the same line *uiolente* [violent one], addressed to Mars, may recall an etymology of Venus from *uis* [force][25]. The classic passage which links Venus with both *uinctio* [joining] and *uis* is Varro *Ling.* V 61 *horum uinctionis uis Venus* [the force of their (i.e. male and female) joining is Venus]. As with *ueni* (3), an etymology of Venus is usurped by Mars. The violence of Mars is invoked where it would have been more appropriate to call upon the erotic *uis* of Venus. Mars, a god famous for his adultery with Venus, is asked to come and gaze upon Sulpicia (2), but to be careful not to fall in love with her (3). As a potential partner of Mars, Sulpicia usurps the role of Venus. This exchange of roles, a key theme in the whole book, is underlined later in the poem when etymologies suggesting Venus are applied to her.

AT 8,10-12 seu compsit, comptis est ueneranda comis.
urit, seu Tyria uoluit procedere palla:
urit, seu niuea candida ueste uenit.

If she combs her hair, she is adorable in combed hair. She enflames if she choses to walk in a Tyrian robe; she enflames if she comes (*uenit*) shining in a snow-white gown.

[24] Maltby 1991, 635; Hinds 2006, 33.

[25] Maltby 1991, 635; Hinds 2006, 31. This play between *Venus* and *vis* occurs in Latin poetry as early as Val. Aed. fr. 2, see Maltby 1997.

By applying *ueneranda* [adorable; lit. to be venerated] (10) to Sulpicia our author suggests her almost divine status. Although *ueneror* is not associated specifically with Venus in the grammatical tradition, it has been suggested, on the basis of Prop. III 5,1 *pacis Amor deus est, pacem ueneramur amantes* [Love is the god of peace, we lovers venerate peace] that such an etymological connection may have existed[26]. Certainly the use of *uenit* with reference to Sulpicia in 12 is a case of an etymology associated with Venus being applied to Sulpicia (as it had been to Mars in 2) and this would strengthen the case for *ueneranda* being used in the same way. Before leaving this etymology of Venus it is worth mentioning the final example of this association used by Sulpicia in an address to Cerinthus who is absent hunting boar in *AT* 9. There she argues that if she could lie with Cerinthus beside his snares the wild boar could approach Cerinthus' nets and escape unharmed:

AT 9,17-18 tunc <u>ueniat</u> licet ad casses[27], inlaesus abibit,
ne <u>Veneris</u> cupidae gaudia turbet, aper.

Then, though the wild boar come (*ueniat*) to the nets, he will go away unharmed, so as not to disturb the joys of eager Venus.

The aim in this section was to show how etymological play in the *AT* serves to anchor the work in the conceptual and semantic world of the earlier elegist. The fact that such plays are found throughout the work, whatever the mask adopted by our author, lends unity to the book as a whole. In moving next to the related topic of personal proper- names and their associations it will be shown that in this area too a deliberate effort is made to reflect earlier elegiac, and particularly Tibullan practice.

4. *Etymology and Identity in Personal Proper names*

a. *Lygdamus*

Plays on an author's proper name in his own verse, as a sort of *sphragis*, go back at least to the time of the fifth-century BC Greek philosophical poet Empedocles, who derives his name from a coinage such as ἐμπεδόκλειτος [ever in fame]

[26] Hinds 2006, 12.

[27] The fact that the boar could approach the nets but go away unharmed may reflect the etymology of Servius auctus on *cases* at *Aen*. II 85 *cassum est quasi cassum et nil continens …, unde et retia casses, quod multum in se uacui habeant.* The boar will escape and leave ceinrhus' nets empty.

and, more relevant to the Roman elegists, the Hellenistic epigrammatist Meleager, who derived his name form μέλας [black] and ἀργός [white][28]. Tibullus does not provide us with his *nomen gentilicium* Albius in his works, but Horace probably does[29], and plays on its significance in two poems:

Hor. *Carm.* I 33,1-4 Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor
immitis Glycerae neu miserabilis
decantes elegos, cur tibi iunior
laesa praeniteat fide

Albius, do not grieve too much as you think of cruel
Glycera and do not sing plaintive elegies asking why
a younger rival outshines you as she breaks her trust

Hor. *Epist.* I 4,1 Albi, nostrorum sermonum candide iudex

Albius, fair judge of my satires

where Albius is picked up by words suggesting brightness, *praeniteo* [outshine] and *candidus* [candid, fair].

Tibullus' reference at I 7,58 to *candidaque antiquo detinet Alba Lare* [and white Alba Longa detains with its ancient Lar] may contain a veiled reference to his own name, Albius, and to his own "pure" style, a reference which is trumped later in the poem (I 7,64) by an ironic reference to his patron Messalla Corvinus, whose cognomen suggests a "black" crow, as *candidior* [even purer in style]. This poem, which celebrates Messalla's birthday and his Aquitanian triumph in 27 BC, contains two more epithets which associate Messalla with brightness. At 7,8 in a couplet directly addressed to Messalla, there is reference to the *nitidis… equis* [shining horses] which will pull his triumphant chariot and at 7,51 there is mention of the *nitido… capillo* [shining hair] of Messalla's Genius at his birthday celebrations[30].

These plays on his own name and on that of his patron Messalla in Tibullus were not lost on the poet who speaks in poems 1-6 of the *AT* under the pseudonym

[28] Booth and Maltby 2005, 125 and cf. Empedocles F 77 (with Sedley 1998, 25 n. 91) and Meleager *Epigram* 98, 3-4 (G-P = *AP* XII 165,3-4).

[29] The identification Horace's Albius and the elegist Tibullus is questioned (in both passages) by Mayer 1994, 133 and 2012, 2001-2, but defended by Murgatroyd 1980, 6-7 and others. Tibullus' plays on the names Albius [White] and Messalla Corvinus [(Black) Crow], suggest it is true. The author of *AT* certainly seems to have believed it and based his own onomastic word-play on it.

[30] Full discussion in Booth and Maltby 2005, 126-28.

Lygdamus and who in *AT* 7, masquerading perhaps as a young Tibullus[31], addresses his patron Messalla on the occasion of his entry upon the consulship in 31 BC. In adopting the name Lygdamus for his mask in *AT* 1-6 our author choses a name which is not found in Greek mythology or literature. In Roman inscriptions it occurs as the name of freedmen[32]. It appears in Greek inscriptions from Southern Italy in the form Lygdamis[33]. The name, like that of Cerinthus discussed below, may be intended to suggest lowly origins and the composition of humble poetry. More importantly the fact that Lygdamus occurs as a slave name in Propertius (poems III 6, IV 7 and IV 8) could serve to associate his voice with the theme of "slavery of love", *seruitium amoris*, which acts as a linking theme throughout the work[34].

One of the etymological associations of the name Lygdmus is with the Greek λύγδος [white marble] and the adjective λύγδινος [marble-white, luminous][35]. Whereas the plays on *candidus* in Tibullus are based on its associations with a clear, lucid style (*OLD candidus* 9), in the case of Lygdamus the "white" associations of this pseudonym are associated with the pallor of death[36]. In the only two cases of *candidus* in *AT* with reference to Lygdamus, the adjective is applied to his bones after death:

AT 2,9-10 ergo cum tenuem fuero mutatus in umbram
candidaque ossa supra nigra fauilla teget

And so when I am changed into an insubstantial
shade and black ash covers over my white bones.

AT 2,17-18 pars quae sola mihi superabit corporis, ossa
incinctae nigra candida ueste legent.

Wrapped in black clothes let them gather my white
bones, the only part of my body that will remain.

The context is a description of Lygdamus' funeral, attended by mourning relatives

[31] Peirano 2012, 132-149.

[32] *CIL* VI 5327,2, VI 21744, IX 816, X 1403g, X 8059, XV 1418, XV 1419, *Inscr. It.* III (I) 286; cf. Hutchinson 2006, 178, Knox 2018, 139 n. 14.

[33] Fraser and Matthews 1987-, III. A s.v. Lygdamis.

[34] *AT* 4,66; 4,73-74; 6,14 ("Lygdamus"); 10,12; 11,3-4; 11,13-14; 12,10 (Sulpicia Cycle); 16,4 ("Sulpicia"); 19,22-25 ("Tibullus").

[35] First observed by Dissen 1835, XXXI.

[36] Navarro Antolín 1996, 21 suggests another association could be that of the traditional pallor of the lover.

and a grieving mistress. This is a characteristically Tibullan theme (cf. Tib. I 1,59-68, 3,5-10), found also in Propertius (Prop. I 17,19-20, II 13,17-58). It serves to associate the Lygdamus poems with the earlier elegiac tradition and etymological play in the Tibullan manner on the name of Lygdamus emphasises this generic affiliation. Whether the juxtaposition in both instances of *candida* with *nigra* harks back to earlier plays, discussed above, on the names of Meleager from "white" and "black", and, in Tibullus, Messalla Corvinus "black" (from the "crow", Corvinus, part of his name) but "white" *e contrario* is unclear. The latter is more likely given his interest in Tibullan plays on Messalla. It is clear that the use in relation to Messalla of adjectives implying brightness in Tib. I 7, as explained above (7,8 *nitidus*; 7,51 *nitido*; 7,64 *candidior … candidiorque*), is picked up and referenced by the author of the Messalla Panegyric:

AT 7,121-123 nam modo <u>fulgentem</u> Tyrio subtegmine uestem
indueras oriente die duce fertilis anni,
<u>splendidior</u> liquidis cum Sol caput extulit undis.

For you had just put on the robe that shone with Tyrian weave, as the day dawned that leads the fruitful year, when the a brighter Sun raised his head from the liquid waves.

On the day of Messalla's inauguration he donned a shining robe *fulgentem uestem* and the Sun shone brighter *splendidior* than usual. The comparative *splendidior* must contain an acknowledgement of Tibullus' *candidior* applied to Messalla's Genius at Tib. I 7,64. Furthermore, if Sulpicia is to be taken as a close relative of Messalla's, as the address to him as *propinque* [kinsman] in her voice at *AT* 14,6 suggests, then it can be no coincidence that the epithet *candidus* is twice applied to her in this book: 8,12 *urit si niuea <u>candida</u> ueste uenit* [she enflames if she comes shining in a snow-white gown] and, implying moral innocence and purity in her affair with Cerinthus, at 10,17-18 *at nunc tota tua est, te solum candida secum / cogitate* [but now she is all yours, of you alone does the pure girl think in her heart].

The ancients did not believe that each name had only a single etymology, but saw multiple etymological associations as elucidating multiple characteristics of the person or object named. In his model, Tibullus, the name Albius allowed of only one particular association, but our *AT* author takes this further in relation to Lygdamus' name and plays on other possible etymological links. These occur in the only context in which Lygdamus names himself, namely in the inscription which is to mark his epitaph at the end of *AT* 2, the poem on his own funeral, discussed above:

AT 2,27-30 sed tristem mortis demonstret littera causam
atque haec in celebri carmina fronte notet
LYGDAMVS HIC SITVS EST. DOLOR HVIC ET CVRA NEAERAE
CONIVGIS EREPTAE CAVSA PERIRE FVIT.

But let an inscription show the sad cause of my death and mark this epitaph on the frequented side: "Lygdamus is buried here. Grief and love for Neaera, the wife snatched from him, caused his death".

Here two further associations of Lygdamus' name become apparent. The first is a further Greek derivation of Lygdamus from the adverb λύγδην [with sobs], connected with the verb λύζω [to sob] and the noun λυγμός [a sob][37]. In this connection it may be significant that the word *dolor* [grief] in line 29 of the epitaph quoted above occurs mid-verse, between the two names *Lygdamus* and *Neaerae*. This word recurs frequently elsewhere in the poems spoken in the voice of Lygdamus (*AT* 2,3; 2,6; 2,13; 6,3; 6,43) and may well have been associated with his name. Words for elegy in Latin were, of course, associated etymologically with lamentation[38] making the name appropriate for an elegiac poet. The second element of Lygdamus' name, δᾶμος [people], Doric for δῆμος, could also be etymologically significant for the construction of his persona. The publication of his verse represents the theme of "making public" his elegiac sufferings. This theme is brought out in the couplet immediately before the epitaph quoted above (lines 27-28). Here *tristem* [sad] refers to the first "elegiac" element of his name (picked up in 29 by *dolor* [grief]), while *demonstret* [show], *celebri… fronte* [on the frequented side] and *notet* [mark] underline his desire to make public his experiences. That is to open them to the people δᾶμος. This desire had already been foreshadowed in line 7 of poem 2 *nec mihi uera loqui pudor est* [I am not ashamed to speak the truth]. The contrast between revelation and secrecy is one that dominates the whole collection, not just the Lygdamus poems, and could be used as further evidence that the poet who adopts the mask of Lygdamus was in fact the author of the whole book, writing in different sections of the book under different masks. The theme dominates the Sulpicia poems, which begin with the tension between hiding and revealing one's love (*AT* 13,1-2). Later in this poem she decides to reveal her love (5-6) and to remove the mask she wears for reputation's sake (9-10). In *AT* 18,5-6

[37] Ehrwald 1889, 6. Cf. *Schol. et Gloss in Nicand.* 81b,2 λύγδην ἀντὶ κατὰ λυγμόν [with sobs, for with a sob] and *Schol. in Soph. OC* 1621,1 (= Suda, *Lambda* 767,1, 789,5) λύγδην λύζοντες [with sobs, for sobbing].

[38] Maltby 1991, 201-202 *s.v. elegeus, elegia, elegiacus.*

Sulpicia regrets abandoning Cerinthus the previous night out of a desire to keep her passion secret. In *AT* 19, by contrast, the poet, who there takes on the mask of Tibullus, regrets his open confessions of love to his mistress (20) and wishes to keep his love to himself (8) and withdraw from society (9-10). This theme comes to its climax in the closural epigram *AT* 20 in which the final word *tace* [be quiet] (III 20,4) seeks total silence. Our author's use of etymological plays on the name Lygdmus, then, serves the dual purpose of acknowledging and imitating the use of such onomastic plays in Tibullus and of giving support to such unifying themes as *seruitium amoris* and revelation and secrecy which dominate the whole book.

b. *Neaera*

Whereas in traditional elegy the elegists speak of themselves using their real names, Tibullus, Propertius, and Naso (for Ovid)[39] and reserve pseudonyms for their mistresses, Delia, Nemesis, Cynthia and Corinna, in the case of Lygdamus and Neaera in *AT* poems 1-6, both names appear to be pseudonyms. In choosing Neaera as the name for Lygdamus' mistress our author again had a Tibullan precedent before him. Both Delia, the mistress of Tibullus' first book, and Neaera appear as Greek-based slave names for mistresses in Virg. *Ecl.* 3. Neaera is the faithless mistress of the master of the flock, whom he fears prefers Menalcas: *Ecl.* 3,3-4 *ipse Neaeram / dum fouet ac ne me sibi praeferat illa ueretur* [while your master courts Neaera and is afraid that she prefers me] and Delia at *Ecl.* 3,66-67 where Menalcas' lover Amyntas is better known to his dogs than is his slave *contubernalis* Delia: *at mihi sese offert ultro meus ignis Amyntas / notior ut iam sit canibus non Delia nostris* [but my love, Amyntas, offers himself to me of his own accord, so that he is better known to my dogs than Delia]. As the "bright" Delia is a suitable name for "Albius" Tibullus in his rustic idyll, so the faithless Neaera is a suitable name for the "grieving" Lygdamus' unfaithful wife[40]. But it in this case it is not Virgil or Tibullus who provides the important intertext for the Lygdamus/Neaera affair, but rather Horace. In *Epode* 15 Horace loses his faithless mistress Neaera (named in line 11) to a rich rival. This in my view provides the inspiration for Lygdamus' affair with Neaera, with Lygdamus suffering the fate predicted for his rival by Horace at *Epod.* 15,23 *eheu translatos alio maerebis amores* [alas, you will mourn for her love transferred to another]. This rival's interest in Pythagorean

[39] Tibullus at Tib. I 3,55 and I 9,83 (both in the context of inscriptions); Propertius at Prop. II 8,17, 14,27, 24b,35, 34,93, III 3,17, 10,15, IV 1b,71, 7,49; Naso at Ov. *Am.* I 11,27, II 1,2, II 13,25 and frequently outside the *Amores*.

[40] Neaera is described as Lygdamus' *coniunx* [wife] at *AT* 1,26-27, 2,4, 3,32 and their relationship is described as a *coniugium* [marriage] by Apollo in Lygdamus' dream at 4,74 and 4,79.

reincarnation: *Epod*. 15,21 *nec te Pythagorae fallant arcana renati* [nor do the secrets of reborn Pythagoras elude you] connect him further with the author of the Messalla Panegyric and his discussion of Pythagorean reincarnation at *AT* 7,204-211. Horace's search for a relationship based on mutual love at *Epode* 15,10 where Neaera swears to him that their *amorem mutuum* [mutual love] would last forever is picked up by Lygdamus at *AT* 1,19 where Neaera is to tell him whether their love is mutual *illa mihi referet si nostri mutua cura est* [let her tell me whether her love for me is equal to mine (for her)]. This theme also connects Lygdamus with the *Sulpicia Cycle AT* 11,5-7 *iuuat hoc, Cerinthe, quod uror / si tibi de nobis mutuus ignis adest. mutuus adsit amor* [it pleases me Cerinths, that I burn, provided a mutual fire for me enflames you] in the voice of Sulpicia and *AT* 12,8 *sed iuueni quaeso mutua uincla para* [but I beg you prepare mutual chains for the young man] in the voice of the *Amicus Sulpiciae*. Both Horace and Lygdamus make the mistake of wishing for a permanent and marriage-like relationship with a faithless Neaera, whose name connects her with the world of the *hetaira* [prostitute].

In both Greek and Latin literature the name had often suggested untrustworthy girls. A *hetaira* of this name is the target of pseudo-Demosthenes *Oratio* 59 and a wife named Neaera seduces her husband's friend in Parthenius *Erotika Pathemata* 18. Elsewhere in Greek literature the name is applied to several relatively innocent nymphs[41] as well as to characters in comedy[42]. In Latin literature the name always has associations of infidelity. It occurs first in a comedy by Licinius Imbrex, where the name connotes a girl of loose morals:

Licinius Imbrex *apud* Gell. XIII 23,16 = Ribbeck[3], Com. fr. 1

nolo ego Neaeram te uocent, sed Nerienem,
cum quidem Mauorti es in conubium data.

I do not want them to call you Neaera, but Nerienis (a consort of Mars), since indeed you have been given in marriage to Mars.

Perhaps the reference to her being given *in conubium* [in marriage] to Mars could refer in the play to her association with a *miles gloriosus* [glorious military] figure. I would hesitate to make any connection between this poem and *AT* 8,1-2 *Sulpicia est tibi culta… Mars magne… / spectatum e caelo… ipse ueni* [Sulpicia is adorned for you… great Mars… come yourself… from heaven to see her] dis-

[41] See *RE* XVI 2104, including the mother of Phaethusa and Lampetie in Hom. *Od*. XII 133.
[42] Timocles fr.25-26, Philemon fr. 49.

cussed above, where Mars is invited to take an erotic interest in Sulpicia, but such a connection cannot be ruled out. In Virg. *Ecl.* 3,3-5, as we saw above, Neaera is a girl whose affections are fought over by two shepherds. At Hor. *Carm.* III 14,21-22 she is a hired singing-girl invited by Horace to his symposium: *dic et argutae properet Neaerae / murreum modo cohibere crinem* [tell clear-voiced Neaera to hurry and put her chestnut locks in a knot]. Nisbet – Rudd's commentary here[43] quite plausibly suggests an association of Neaera's name with youth, cf. Gk. νέα [young girl], contrasting with the grey-haired Horace (*albescens… capillus* 25 [my whitenening hair]). At Horace *Epode* 15,11 *o dolitura mea multum uirtute Neaera* [o Neaera, who will suffer much at my manhood] we have already discussed how she is named as Horace's faithless mistress. Finally in Ov. *Am.* III 6,27-28 she is a beautiful nymph who ravages the river Xanthus:

> nondum Troia fuit lustris obsessa duobus,
> cum rapuit uultus, Xanthe, Neaera tuos.
>
> Not yet had Troy been besieged for two lustrums (ten years) when Neaera ravaged your eyes, Xanthus.

By the time of Prudentius (*Steph.* 10,240) the term *neaera* is used as a common noun to denote a prostitute. In Lygdamus these associations are clearly present, but I suggest there may also be a bilingual pun at work on Greek νέα [new] and Latin *era* [mistress] reflecting the idea that Neaera will be the subject of a different kind of elegy, centred upon the failing marriage of a couple of equal status. The book as a whole shows, as we have seen, a movement from openness at *AT* 2,7 *nec mihi uera loqui pudor est* [I am not ashamed to speak the truth] (Lygdamus) to secrecy and silence (*tace* [be quiet]) the final word of the book *AT* 20,4), from a new Lygdaman type of elegy as exemplified in his affair with Neaera to the traditional Tibullan form of elegy in *AT* 19 involving servitude to the well-known traditional mistress:

> nec fugiam notae seruitium dominae
>
> nor shall I flee servitude to a mistress known to me.

a thematic which, I would argue, lends unity and development to the whole collection.

The Greek pseudonyms Lygdamus and Neaera are, then, full of significance derived from their etymologies and from their past literary associations. Greek names had of course been used in pastoral for the shepherds who speak in Virgil's

[43] Nisbet - Rudd 2004, 189 *ad l.*

Eclogues, but a closer elegiac parallel for our author comes perhaps from Propertius' use of the Greek pseudonyms Arethusa and Lycotas in Prop. IV 3 where a Roman wife writes to her husband abroad on military service. Other Greek names occur elsewhere for minor characters in Roman elegy: in Tibullus there are Marathus in I 4 and I 8 and Pholoe in I 8 and in Propertius, in addition to his use of Lygdamus as a slave name, there are Panthus in II 21, Demophoon in II 22a and Lynceus in II 34. One further such name in *AT* remains to be discussed and that is the name of Sulpicia's lover, Cerinthus.

c. *Cerinthus*

Cerinthus, the name of Sulpicia's lover occurs six times in the *AT*[44]. Like Lygdamus the name is Greek, restricted on Greek inscriptions mainly to Italy[45], and occurring in Latin inscriptions mostly as a slave name (*ThLL Onom.* s.v.). There is one funerary inscription of a higher status Cerinthus, connected to the same *gens Valeria* as Messalla[46]. In Greek literature it occurs as a place name in Euboea in Theognis and in Homer[47]. Like Arethusa, Lycotas, Lygdamus and Neaera, the name is probably a pseudonym.

Etymologically the name has been connected with the Greek κήρινθος [bee bread], a mixture of pollen and honey made by bees to feed their young[48]. The connection between bees and poetry is widespread in Apolline poetics[49] and so a substance used for feeding bees is a good name for a character providing the poet/poetess with material for his/her poetry. Roessel 1990, 243-245 takes this idea further by suggesting that the connection between beeswax κηρός and Cerinthus' name could be connected with the wax tablets with which Sulpicia communicated with him, with Cerinthus again providing the medium for her epistolary epigrams. A suggestion by Knox 2018, 152 would associate the pallor of beeswax with the common image of the pallor of the lover, which would thus link Cerinthus with Lygdamus and his associations of pallor.

At Virg. *Georg.* IV 62-63 the poet recommends sprinkling the herb *cerintha* [honeywort] to attract bees: … *huc tu iussos adsperge sapores*, / *trita melisphylla et cerinthae ignobile gramen* [here spread the scents I prescribe, crushed balm and

[44] Five vocative addresses (*AT* 9,11, 10,15, 11,1, 17,1) and once in the abl. *sine Cerintho AT* 14,2.

[45] Fraser and Matthews 1987-, *s.v.* Cerinthus.

[46] *CIL* VI 6.4.3 39011 for an L. Valerius Cerinthus; see Fulkerson 2017, 31.

[47] Hom. *Il.* II 538, Theognis I 191,4.

[48] Aristotle *HA* 623b 23, Plin. *Nat.* XI 7,2, cf. Davies 1973.

[49] See Thomas 2011, 113 on Hor. *Carm.* IV 2,27-32.

the lowly herb, honeywort]. The plant, obviously connected the Greek κήρινθος [bee bread] occurs only here and at Plin. *Nat*. XXI 70. Servius *ad l.* comments on *ignobile gramen*: *uile*, *ubique nascens* [lowly herb: common, growing everywhere]. The suggestion could be that the status of Cerinthus, as an inspirer of verse, is lower than that of the poet/poetess cf. Sulpicia at *AT* 16.5-6 *solliciti sunt pro nobis quibus illa dolori est / ne cedam ignoto maxima causa toro* [Those are worried for me to whom it is the greates source of pain that I should submit to an ignoble bed-fellow]. It may be significant that Virg. applies the same adjective to his poetic leisure in the *sphragis* at the end of the *Georgics*: IV 564 *studiis florentem ignobilis oti* [rejoicing in the pursuits of lowly leisure].

Hints in the poems about Cerinthus' social status are confusing. His interest in hunting (*AT* 9) is a characteristic of the Roman elite, however, Sulpicia taunts him, as we have seen, at *AT* 16,5-6 with being of lower status, perhaps meaning only that he is not as noble as her own family, the Servii Sulpicii (see *AT* 3-4 below). Unlike Lygdamus, Cerinthus is not himself a poet, but simply a recipient of love poems from Sulpicia. In this sense the pseudonym, like Tib.'s Marathus (another Greek plant-derived name), would suggest Cerinthus belonged to the tradition of the *puer delicatus*[50], a low-status, effeminised young man, who is the object of erotic attention, in this case, unusually, from a woman[51]. If we accept that he is a literary creation, based, as was the case with Lygdamus and Neaera, on earlier Roman poetry, then these apparent inconsistencies can be better explained. As always in the *AT* we are dealing with a character who originates not in real life, but in poetry. The two literary sources for Cerinthus are a low class *puer delicatus* in Horace *Serm.* I 2,80-82 and a noble prospective husband (Cornutus) in Tib. II 2 and II 3. The apparent inconsistencies concerning the exact status of Cerinthus arise from the amalgamation of facets from both these characters. Both poems have clear textual links with the Cerinthus poems and clearly contributed to the establishment of his character. In the *Sermones* passage Horace advises the effeminate Cerinthus, who prides himself on his own beauty, that he should seek as a partner a readily available, toga-clad prostitute rather than a rich *matrona*:

Hor. *serm*. I 2,80-82 nec magis huic inter niueos uiridisque lapillos
sit licet, hoc, Cerinthe, tuo tenerum est femur aut crus
rectius, atque etiam melius persaepe togatae est.

Though entwined by white pearls and green emeralds

[50] For Marathus as the name of a *puer delicatus* from the Greek μάραθος "fennel" see Murgatroyd 1980, 9.

[51] But cf. Marathus' affair with a girl called Pholoe in Tib. I 8 and I 9.

> a lady's thigh is not softer or her leg straighter than yours, Cerinthus; and very often those of a toga-clad girl are even better.

The situation is clearly reflected in *AT* 16,3-4 *sit tibi cura togae potior pressumque quasillo / scortum quam Serui filia Sulpicia* [let your love for a toga-clad girl and for a strumpet weighed down by a wool-basket be preferable in your eyes to Sulpicia, daughter of Servius] where Sulpicia accuses Cerinthus of being more interested in a toga-clad slave-girl rather than he is in herself. The presence of the rare *quasillo* [wool-basket] here recalls the speech of Cynthia's ghost at Prop. IV 7,41 *et grauiora rependit iniquis pensa quasillis / garrula de facie si qua locuta meast* [and she unjustly assigns baskets with heavier loads to any chattering servant who has referred to my beauty]. This is the only other extant occurrence of this word in verse, suggesting that our *AT passage* clearly looks back to Propertius. Here Cynthia' ghost criticises Propertius' slave-girl mistress for punishing those who had formerly praised Cynthia's beauty with extra loads of wool.

The Horatian parallel here, suggesting a low-class Cerinthus with interests in a slave as a mistress in preference to the noble Sulpicia can be seen as a reversal of the Lygdamus-Neaera relationship in which Lygdamus looks for a respectable marriage arrangement with a character whose name suggests a low-class prostitute. This is just the kind of miss-matching that Horace in his Ode addressed to Albius Tibullus sees as the essence of elegiac love poetry, Hor. *Carm*. I 33,10-12: *sic uisum Veneri*, *cui placet imparis / formas atque animos sub iuga aenea / saeuo mittere cum ioco* [Thus it seems good to Venus, whose pleasure it is to send beneath her brazen yolk ill-matched bodies and minds].

This picture is then complicated by the suggestion, first made by Gruppe 1838, 27, that Cerinthus is to be identified with Cornutus, the addressee of Tib. II 2 and II 3, whose birthday and forthcoming marriage are the subject of Tib. II 2. The Cornutus referred to there was probably M. Caecilius Cornutus (*CIL* VI 32338), a member with Messalla of the Arval college (or possibly his son *CIL* VI 2023a). I would not concur with Hubbard 2004, that Cornutus and Cerinthus are the same person under different names, but rather I would argue that Tib.'s poem about Cornutus influences some aspects of the character of Cerinthus as presented in our poems. First, the names are metrically equivalent, share the same C R N T consonants and could provide an example of a bilingual pun (Greek κέρας [horn] and Latin *cornus* [horn]). Second, as pointed out by Hubbard 2004, numerous verbal echoes connect Tib.'s poem with those about Cerinthus. So the conjugal chains of Tib. II 2,18-19 are echoed in *AT* 11,13-16; the nod of the Genius at II 2,9-10 is echoed in *AT* 11,20 and 12,13; the offering of cake and wine to the Genius at II 2,8 is echoed in *AT* 12,14 with *libo* [cake] and *mero* [wine] in the same *sedes*.

The influence of Tib. II 2 is not restricted to the birthday poems; the sweet-smelling Arabian herbs of II 2,3-4 are those worthy to be offered to Sulpicia at the Matronalia in *AT* 8,17-18 and the gems from India and the Red Sea to be rejected in favour of love at 2,15-16 are a worthy gift for Sulpicia at *AT* 8,19-20. Other echoes between Tib.'s birthday poem and the Sulpicia poems are listed by Hubbard 2004. Our Cerinthus is not to be identified either with the Horatian Cerinthus or with the Tibullan Cornutus, but these poems clearly contribute to the construction of his character and its inconsistencies, just as Horace *Epode* 15 and poems III 6, IV 7 and IV 8 of Propertius contribute to the construction of Lygdamus and Neaera.

5. *Conclusions*

This chapter has shown how the author of the *Appendix Tibulliana*, although probably writing in the late first century AD, uses strategically placed etymological plays, both on common nouns and proper names to associate himself with the poets of the golden age of Latin elegy at the turn of the first centuries BC and AD. He combines etymological interpretations with earlier literary references to create a series of characters whose associations lend novelty and unity to the whole book. In my view this collection is the product of a single author, male or female, who adopts a series of masks throughout the work and whose manipulation of these characters and their previous literary identities provide thematic and structural unity to the whole.

University of Leeds
r.maltby@leeds.ac.uk

Keywords: etymology, *Appendix Tibulliana*, elegiac poetry
Parole chiave: etimologia, *Appendix Tibulliana*, poesia elegiaca

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Booth – Maltby 2005
J.Booth – R. Maltby, *Light and dark: Play on Candidus and Related Concepts in the Elegies of Tibullus*, «Mnemosyne» LVIII (2005), 124-131.

Cairns 1979
F.Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic poet at Rome,* Cambridge 1979.

Cairns 1996
F.Cairns, *Ancient 'Etymology' and Tibullus*: *on the Classification of 'Etymologies' and on 'Etymological Markers',* «Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society» XLII (1996), 24-49.

Davies 1973
C.Davies, *Poetry in the Circle of Messalla*, «Greece and Rome» XX (1973), 25-35.

Dissen 1835
Albii Tibulli *Carmina,* ex recensione Car. Lachmanni passim mutata expl. L.Dissen, Göttingen 1835.

Ehrwald 1889
R.Ehrwald, *Ad historiam carminum Ovidianorum recensionemque symbolae,* Gotha 1889.

Fraser – Matthews 1987-
P.M.Fraser – E.Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford 1987-.

Fulkerson 2017
L.Fulkerson, *A Literary Commentary on the Elegies of the Appendix Tibulliana*, Oxford 2017.

Gruppe 1838
O.F.Gruppe, *Die römische Elegie*, Leipzig 1838.

Hinds 2006
S.Hinds, *Varro, Venus and the* uates: *Towards the Limits of Etymologising*, «Dictynna» (on line) III. URL: http://journals.openedition.org/dictynna/2006.

Holzberg 2001
N.Holzberg, *Die römische Liebeselegie: Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 2001.

Hubbard 2004
T.K.Hubbard, *The Invention of Sulpicia*, «Classical Journal» C (2004), 177-194.

Hutchinson 2006
Propertius, *Elegies book IV*, ed. G.O.Hutchinson, Cambridge 2006.

Kenney 1996
Ovid, *Heroides XVI-XXI*, ed. E.J.Kenney, Cambridge 1996.

Knox 2018
P.Knox, *The corpus Tibullianum*, in H-C Günther (ed.), *A Short Companion to Tibullus* «Classica et Mediaevalia» XXII, 135-160, Nordhausen 2018.

Maltby 1991
R.Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991.
Maltby 1993
R.Maltby, *The Limits of Etymologising*, «Aevum Antiquum» VI (1993), 257-75.
Maltby 1997
R.Maltby, *The Language of Early Latin Epigram*, «Sandalion» XX (1997), 43-56
Maltby 2002
Tibullus, *Elegies.* Text, introduction and commentary by R.Maltby, Cambridge 2002.
Maltby 2004
R.Maltby, *The wheel of Fortune, Nemesis and the Central Poems of Tibullus I and II*, in S. Kyriakidis and F. De Martino (eds.), *Middles in Latin poetry*, Bari 2004, 103-122.
Maltby 2010
R.Maltby, *The Unity of* Corpus Tibullianum *Book 3*: *Some Stylistic and Metrical Considerations*, «Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar» XIV (2010), 319-340.
Maltby (forthcoming)
Corpus Tibullianum *Book 3*: Text, Translation, Introduction and Commentary by R.Maltby, Newcastle-on-Tyne 2020.
Mayer 1994
Horace, *Epistles Book I*, ed. R.Mayer, Cambridge 1994.
Mayer 2012
Horace, *Odes Book I*, ed. R.Mayer, Cambridge 2012.
Michalopoulos 2001
A.Michalopoulos, *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A commented Lexicon*, Leeds 2001.
Murgatroyd 1980
Tibullus, *Elegies I*, edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by P.Murgatroyd, Pietermaritzburg 1980.
Navarro Antolín 1996
Lygdamus, *Corpus Tibullianum III 1-6, Lygdami elegiarum liber*, Edition and Commentary by F.Navarro Antolín, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1996.
Nisbet and Rudd 2004
R.G.M.Nisbet – N.Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book III*, Oxford 2004.
Peirano 2012
I.Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake. Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context*, Cambridge 2012.
Roessel 1990
D.Roessel, *The Significance of the Name Cerinthus in the Poems of Sulpicia,*

«Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association» CXX (1990), 243-250.

Sedley 1998

D.N.Sedley, *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*, Cambridge 1998.

Thomas 2011

Horace, *Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, ed. R.F.Thomas, Cambridge 2011.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32058 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 227-247*

ROBBERT M. VAN DEN BERG

A Sticky (γλίσχρος) Affaire (Plato, *Crat*. 435c): Platonists versus Stoics on How (Not) To Do Etymology and Allegoresis

This paper discusses the use of the word γλίσχρος (*'sticky'*), *which Platonists use to disqualify certain, mostly Stoic, etymologies. I argue that the expression derives from Plato* Crat. *435c, a passage in which Socrates sets out a theory of word formation that informs Stoic etymologies. I furthermore suggest that when Neoplatonists use* γλίσχρος *to reject certain interpretations of Plato's texts as misguided, this is because these interpretations are reminiscent of Stoic exegetical practices.*

L'articolo discute l'uso del termine γλίσχρος (*'appiccicoso'*), *con cui i Platonici squalificano alcune etimologie, soprattutto stoiche. In questa sede si sostiene che l'espressione derivi da Plat.* Crat. *435c, dove Socrate espone una teoria della formazione delle parole che sarà alla base delle etimologie stoiche; ma quando i neoplatonici useranno* γλίσχρος *per rifiutare alcune letture fuorvianti dei testi di Platone, lo faranno proprio per discostarsi da interpretazioni fondate sul ricordo di pratiche esegetiche proprie dello Stoicismo.*

Platonists and Stoics, more than any other ancient philosophical school, were drawn to etymology as a means to disclose the philosophical intuitions of the ancients. To an impartial modern reader, it may seem that there were virtually no limits to their fanciful etymologies of divine names in particular. Yet Platonists will at times disqualify a certain etymology as γλίσχρος, a word that is usually rendered as 'sticky' in English. In this paper I shall discuss the origins of this term and the reasons why Platonists reject some etymologies and some allegorical interpretations, as 'sticky'. More in particular, I shall argue that they derive the word γλίσχρος from Plato's dialogue on etymology, the *Cratylus,* and that, initially at least, it is used to distinguish between correct ways of etymologizing as practiced by the Platonists themselves and incorrect ways as practiced by the Stoics. This distinction reflects Socrates' ambiguous attitude towards etymology in the *Cratylus*: whereas he appears to accept etymologies as a valid tool of philosophical research in the first part of the dialogue, he develops second thoughts in the second part, branding etymological research as γλίσχρος. Long after the Stoics had faded into the background, the Neoplatonists continued to use the expression γλίσχρος to criticize certain interpretations of Platonic passages that are reminiscent of the Stoic approach to divine names and ancient mythology.

In this paper, I shall first briefly discuss the ambiguous attitude of the *Cratylus* towards etymology and in particular the passages in which etymologies are called γλίσχρος in the second part of the dialogue. I shall then turn to the Stoic reception of the *Cratylus*. Stoic etymological practices are in particular informed by a theory about word-formation that Socrates had developed in the second part of the *Cratylus*. This theory holds that words are constituted of so-called primary names, which are themselves meaningful. Since Socrates uses this theory of first

names to discredit certain etymologies as γλίσχρος, Stoic etymological practices too are vulnerable to this criticism of being sticky. I will next provide two examples of Platonists criticizing Stoic etymology for being γλίσχρος: the Academic Cotta in Cicero's *On the Nature of the Gods* and the Middle Platonist Plutarch in *How to Listen to Poetry*. In the final part of the paper, I shall turn to examples of the term γλίσχρος in Neoplatonic commentaries on Plato's dialogues. While the Stoics don't play a role in these debates, one could argue that Neoplatonic commentators apply the term γλίσχρος to interpretations that have a thing or two in common with Stoic exegetical practices. In particular I shall focus on the case of Hermias' commentary on the prooemium of *Phaedrus*, in which the reader is offered both an example of 'sticky', i.e. Stoicizing, etymology and allegoresis and correct, i.e. Platonizing, etymology and allegoresis.

1. *Plato's* Cratylus*: Socrates' ambiguous attitude towards etymology*

Let us start by taking a brief look at Socrates' ambiguous appraisal of etymologies in the *Cratylus*. The dialogue begins with Socrates' examination of Hermogenes' position that the correctness of names is a matter of convention. According to Hermogenes, whatever we agree upon to call a thing will be its name. 'Horse' is the correct name of horses and 'donkey' that of donkeys for no other reason than that we have agreed to call horses and donkeys thus. If tomorrow we agree to call a horse 'donkey' and the other way around, these will from then on be their correct names. There is, according to this theory, no natural connection between names and things[1]. Socrates rejects this theory. He argues that there exists something like the natural correctness of names. As he points out, Hermogenes' theory implies that name-giving does not require any special knowledge or skill. Everybody could be a name-giver. According to Socrates, this is not the case. The function of names is to divide up the world in a natural way. Names are the instruments of the Platonic dialectician who, in his attempts to define each type of thing, carves up reality «at its joints» (cf. Plato, *Phaedr*. 265e). The skilled name-giver, at the instruction of the dialectician, next coins appropriate names that somehow reflect the dialectician's definitions. Hence the correctness of names is by nature, not by convention: names follow the natural divisions of reality and reflect the essential definition of their objects[2]. It is here that etymology comes in. Socrates claims that etymological analysis reveals the mind of the ancients. It is thus that we arrive at

[1] Cf. Plato, *Crat*. 383a-385a.
[2] Cf. Plato, *Crat*. 389d-390c.

the next part of the *Cratylus* (390e-427d), which consist of a long list of etymologies. Socrates produces these etymologies in order to demonstrate his previous point, i.e. that names are the product of a skilled name-giver and based on a careful philosophical analysis of the world. In the past, this seemingly endless series of etymologies was often seen as a sort of tedious joke on Plato's part. David Sedley (2003), however, has convincingly argued that Plato appears to have taken these etymologies perfectly seriously, as did subsequent Platonists. One need only think of the commentary of the *Cratylus* by the Neoplatonist Proclus, which focusses almost exclusively on the etymological section.

Whereas Platonists thus read the first part of the *Cratylus* as supportive of their own etymological activities, they turn to the last part of the dialogue when they wish to criticize Stoic etymology. In the last part of the dialogue, Socrates examines the position of Cratylus, according to which names have a natural correctness. On the basis of the discussion so far, one would assume that Cratylus' claim that names have a natural correctness would meet with Socrates' approval. This is not the case though. In the etymological section, Socrates had operated on the assumption that names consist of constitutive parts that are themselves condensed versions of words. When combined, these condensed words produce a definition of the object to which a name refers. In this way names may be said to be like their objects. But how about the constitutive elements of these meaningful parts of a name? Socrates now argues that these too have mimetic qualities. The sounds that we produce when we pronounce certain letters mimics certain qualities of the objects to which names refer. Socrates calls these primary names[3]:

> **T.1** ΣΩ. Ἃ μὲν τοίνυν ἐγὼ ᾔσθημαι **περὶ τῶν πρώτων ὀνομάτων** πάνυ μοι δοκεῖ ὑβριστικὰ εἶναι καὶ γελοῖα. τούτων οὖν σοι μεταδώσω, ἂν βούλῃ· σὺ δ' ἄν τι ἔχῃς βέλτιόν ποθεν λαβεῖν, πειρᾶσθαι καὶ ἐμοὶ μεταδιδόναι.
> ΕΡΜ. Ποιήσω ταῦτα. ἀλλὰ θαρρῶν λέγε.
> ΣΩ. Πρῶτον μὲν τοίνυν τὸ ῥῶ ἔμοιγε φαίνεται ὥσπερ ὄργανον εἶναι πάσης τῆς κινήσεως, [...] πρῶτον μὲν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ "ῥεῖν" καὶ "ῥοῇ" διὰ τούτου τοῦ γράμματος τὴν φορὰν μιμεῖται, εἶτα ἐν τῷ "τρόμῳ", εἶτα ἐν τῷ "τρέχειν", ἔτι δὲ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῖσδε ῥήμασιν οἷον "κρούειν", "θραύειν", "ἐρείκειν", "θρύπτειν", "κερματίζειν", "ῥυμβεῖν", πάντα ταῦτα τὸ πολὺ ἀπεικάζει διὰ τοῦ ῥῶ.
>
> Socrates Well, my impression about **primary names** seem to me to be entirely outrageous and absurd. Nonetheless, I'll share them with you, if you like. But if you have something better to offer, I hope you will share it with me.
> Hermogenes Have no fear, I will.
> Socrates First off, 'r' seems to me to be a tool for copying every sort of

[3] Plato, *Cratylus* 426b5-e4; tr. Reeve 1998

> motion (*kinesis*). [...] In any case, as I was saying, the letter 'r' seemed to the name-giver to be a beautiful tool for copying motion, at any rate he often uses it for this purpose. He first uses this letter to imitate motion in the names '*rhein*' ('flowing') and '*rhoe*' ('flow') themselves. Then in '*tromos*' ('trembling') and '*trechein*' ('running'), and in such verbs as '*krouein*' ('*striking*'), '*thrauein*' ('crushing'), '*ereikein*' ('rendering'), '*thruptein*' ('breaking'), *kermatizein* ('crumbling'), '*rhumbein*' ('whirling'), it is mostly 'r' he uses to imitate these motions.

As we will find below, it is precisely this theory of primary names that underlies the Stoic theory of word-composition and hence of etymology. In a somewhat unexpected move, Socrates now makes problems for Cratylus' position, and hence for that of the Stoics. As Socrates observes (*Crat*. 435a), in some cases words contain letters that are out of place. The Greek word for 'hardness', *sklêrotês*, for example, has as one of its first names the '*l*'-sound, which is said to imitate softness. If, notwithstanding the occurrence of such letters in certain names, we still understand what names refer to, we have to conclude that we do so on the basis of convention. It now follows that the correctness of names is both a matter of nature and convention[4]:

> **T.2** ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ αὐτῷ ἀρέσκει μὲν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ὅμοια εἶναι τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς πράγμασιν· ἀλλὰ μὴ ὡς ἀληθῶς, τὸ τοῦ Ἑρμογένους, **γλίσχρα** ᾗ ἡ ὁλκὴ αὕτη τῆς ὁμοιότητος, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ᾗ καὶ τῷ φορτικῷ τούτῳ προσχρῆσθαι, τῇ συνθήκῃ, εἰς ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητα.
>
> I myself too prefer the view that names should be as much like the things as possible, but I fear that that defending this view is like hauling a ship up a **sticky** ramp, as Hermogenes suggested, and that we have to make use of this worthless thing, convention, in the correctness of names.

As, we will find below, later Platonists will use the word γλίσχρος to condemn certain instances of etymology and allegoresis as wrong-headed. I take it that this pejorative use of the word γλίσχρος in such contexts goes back on this passage. Unfortunately, it is not at all clear what exactly Socrates means when he uses the word γλίσχρος. As Socrates indicates, Hermogenes had been the first to use the expression in response to Socrates' contorted etymology of the word τέχνη, from which it would follow that art is «the possession of understanding»[5]:

> **T.3** ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν τοῦτό γε ἕξιν νοῦ σημαίνει, τὸ μὲν ταῦ ἀφελόντι, ἐμβαλόντι δὲ οὗ μεταξὺ τοῦ χεῖ καὶ τοῦ νῦ καὶ <τοῦ νῦ καὶ> τοῦ ἦτα;

[4] Plato, *Cratylus* 435c2-7, tr. Reeve 1998.
[5] Plato, *Cratylus* 414b-c; tr. Reeve 1998.

> *ΕΡΜ.* **Καὶ μάλα γε γλίσχρως**, ὦ Σώκρατες.
>
> Socrates: If you remove the 't' and insert an 'o' between the 'ch' and the 'n' and the 'ê', doesn't it signify the possession of understanding (*hexis nou*).
> Hermogenes: Yes, Socrates, but getting it to do so is like trying to haul a boat up **a very sticky ramp**!

From this passage, it is clear that γλίσχρος here indicates Hermogenes' reservations about the suggested etymology of τέχνη. One of the primary meanings of γλίσχρος is 'sticky', both in the literal sense of the word and in the informal meaning of 'problematic'[6]. The quite wordy rendering by C. D. C. Reeve of Hermogenes' brief reply καὶ μάλα γε γλίσχρως as «getting it to do so is like trying to haul a boat up a very sticky ramp» takes its inspiration from the interpretation of the phrase γλίσχρα ὁλκή in **T.2** by Bernard Williams: «'sticky haul', like getting a ship to move over a gummy slip-way: one has to work hard to try to keep the resemblance theory moving»[7].

Ademollo, in his commentary on this passage, however, suggests that γλίσχρος and ὁλκή may have a figurative meaning independent of each other[8]. After all, as he rightly notes, Socrates borrows the expression γλίσχρος from Hermogenes and the latter uses it without any reference to a ramp or ὁλκή. Ademollo translates the phrase as follows: «But I fear that this power of similarity is actually 'poor', to use Hermogenes' expression»[9].

As we will find, the use of the term γλίσχρος in later authors in relation to etymology and allegoresis corroborates Ademollo's suggestion: whenever γλίσχρος is used to question the likelihood of an etymology or allegorical interpretation, it is used as Hermogenes does, i.e. without the addition of the noun ὁλκή. I do not, however, completely agree with Ademollo about the interpretation of γλίσχρος and ὁλκή. Ademollo claims that Hermogens does not use γλίσχρος in its literal meaning of 'viscous' or 'sticky'. Yet, when Socrates discusses the etymologies of the words γλίσχρον, γλυκύ, and γλοιῶδες in *Crat*. 427b, he calls attention to the 'power' of the first name gamma. The gamma stops the tongue and is hence an appropriate letter to use in the case of sticky things. As such it is the opposite of the primary name lambda: when the tongue pronounces this sound it glides. Lambda is thus an appropriate first name in the case of a word such as λεῖον, smooth. I thus take it that when Hermogenes (**T.3**) describes Socrates' convoluted etymology of τέχνη as «very sticky» (μάλα γλίσχρως), he means that Socrates' explanation of

[6] Ademollo 201, 416; Cf. Taillardat 1962, 168 for the French rendering «collant».
[7] Williams 1982, 93; cf. Sedley 2003, 141 n.26.
[8] Ademollo 2011, 415-417.
[9] Ademollo 2011, 413.

τέχνη as «the possession of understanding» does not flow smoothly from the actual word τέχνη, and hence is not very convincing. It is in this sense of 'sticky', i.e. problematic, unconvincing, that the word will be used by Platonists in relation to certain cases of etymology and allegory.

As for ὁλκή, Ademollo, following *LSJ*, takes it that ὁλκὴ τῆς ὁμοιότητος refers to the power of likenesses that joins names to their objects. To my mind it refers rather to Socrates' rather forced attempts to demonstrate how, because of their constitutive first names, names are like the objects they refer to. It is precisely such attempts that were disqualified by Hermogenes as «very sticky», i.e. unconvincing. Socrates' point, then, in **T.2**, would be that while he has demonstrated in the first part of the dialogue that names resemble their objects, the sticky (γλίσχρος) attempts to forcefully «draw out» the likeness of words (ὁλκὴ τῆς ὁμοιότητος) by means of etymologies based on primary names have made it sufficiently clear that the likeness-thesis should not be pushed too hard[10]. Names have many elements (first names) that do not contribute towards the likeness of a name to its object. Even so, such names perform their function of picking out their objects. From this, Socrates concludes that the correctness of names is as much a matter of nature (i.e. likeness) as of convention.

2. *The Stoic reception of the* Cratylus*: first names and etymology*

As has been observed, e.g. by A.A. Long, this theory, according to which names are the products of expert name-givers and which holds that names are made up of primary names that have mimetic qualities, strongly recalls the Stoic theory about the origin of language. See, for example the following passage[11]:

> **T.4** Λεκτέον δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο ὅτι ⸢ἐμπίπτει εἰς τὸ προκείμενον λόγος βαθὺς καὶ ἀπόρρητος, ὁ περὶ φύσεως ὀνομάτων· πότερον, ὡς οἴεται Ἀριστοτέλης, θέσει εἰσὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ἤ, ὡς νομίζουσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς, φύσει, μιμουμένων τῶν πρώτων φωνῶν τὰ πράγματα, καθ' ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα, καθὸ καὶ στοιχεῖά τινα τῆς ἐτυμολογίας εἰσάγουσιν, […].

[10] Cf. Dalimier 1998, 178: «this fishing for resemblance» («Moi aussi, je me plais à penser que les noms sont, autant que possible, semblables aux choses: mais, à vrai dire, cette pêche à la resemblance risqué d'être laborieuse - pour prendre le mot d'Hermogène»). For ὁλκή in the sense of a forced attempt to demonstrate the likeness of names, cf. *LSJ s.v.* ὁλκή A «drawing, trailing, dragging ... metaph. τοῖς δεινοῖς περὶ λόγων ὁλκήν skilled in *drawing* words *to a false meaning*, Plat. *Phlb*. 57d».

[11] Long-Sedley 1987, 32J (their translation) = Origen, *Against Celsus* I 24 (*SVF* 2.146).

> The foregoing matter is beset by the profound and mysterious issue of the nature of names. Are names, as Aristotle [*De Interpretatione* I] holds, the product of convention? Or, as the Stoics believe, of nature, the primary sounds being imitations of the things of which the names are said? This is the basis on which they introduce some elements of etymology.

We know that the *Cratylus* was an important text for the Stoics, and hence it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that this passage informs, at least in part, the Stoic theory about the formation of words and their etymological practices[12]. In keeping with the discussion of etymology on the basis of first names in the *Cratylus*, the Stoics assume that the names of the gods in particular are made up of meaningful first names to which other letters have been added that are of no consequence for the etymological explanation of the word. Stoic etymology focusses on divine names, rather than *onomata* (words/names) in general, because the Stoics assume that these divine names had been designed by the very first wise name-givers. These names corroborate the Stoic world-view. Since this is a physical one (the divine permeates the physical world), Stoic etymologies of divine names relate the divine to physical phenomena. Moreover, the Stoics assume that the wise men who coined the names of the gods predate the poets such as Homer and Hesiod who use the names in their mythical stories. The Stoics think little of the philosophical qualities of these later poets. This explains why Stoic readers of these poets tend to etymologize the divine names without paying too much attention to the poetical context in which these names occur, even though they may occasionally provide an allegorical interpretation of the mythical story in which a divine name appears[13].

In short, then, there are three particularities about Stoic etymology: (1.) Stoic etymology of divine names focusses on the so-called 'primary names', while disregarding the other letters and vowels that make up a name; (2.) Stoic etymology of divine names tends to disregard the context in which these names occur; (3.) Stoic etymology of divine names explains these names in physical terms. Platonists will

[12] Cf., e.g., Long-Sedley 1987, I, 195. On Stoic attempts to improve upon the Cratylean theory of first names, see Long 2005. On the influence of the *Cratylus* on Stoic theology, see also Ademollo 2012.

[13] Steinmetz 1986 and Long 1996 have gone so far as to argue that what we call Stoic allegoresis of poetical texts is nothing but etymology. They, however, appear to have overstated their case. As other scholars (e.g. Boys-Stones 2001, 54-59) have pointed out, the Stoics do not exclude the possibility that some of the mythical material in Homer and Hesiod goes back on the primeval sages who also coined the names of the gods. Hence, in those cases in which an allegorical reading of a passage from Homer or Hesiod is in concord with the etymologies of the divine names that occur in that passage, the Stoics assume that the passage goes back on the ancient sages and that, therefore, allegoresis is in order.

attack as γλίσχρος all three particularities of Stoic etymology, though not necessarily all three at the same time.

3. *Cicero,* De Natura Deorum *III.24, §§ 62-63: A Platonist critique of Stoic allegoresis and etymology*

It has sometimes been suggested that the early Stoa, precisely because they took up the theory of the primary names from the *Cratylus*, were aware of the sticky nature of etymology. Unlike later Stoics like, for example, Cornutus, the early Stoics would, for this reason, have been hesitant to practice etymological analysis[14]. Against this suggestion, it has been pointed out that we have solid evidence for the fact that even the founding fathers of Stoicism were given to etymologizing[15]. One of the passages comes from Cicero, who in *On the Nature of the Gods* I 36 has the Epicurean Velleius criticize Zeno's comments on Hesiod's *Theogony* and in particular on the names of Hesiod's gods[16]. Later on in the dialogue, the Academic skeptic Cotta joins forces with Velleius, when he pokes fun of the etymological enterprise of Zeno and other Stoics[17]:

> **T.5** Iam vero quid vos illa delectat explicatio fabularum et enodatio nominum? Exsectum a filio Caelum, vinctum itidem a filio Saturnum, haec et alia generis eiusdem ita defenditis ut ii qui ista finxerunt non modo non insani sed etiam fuisse sapientes videantur. In enodandis autem nominibus quod miserandum sit laboratis: "Saturnus quia se saturat annis, Mavors quia magna vertit, Minerva quia minuit aut quia minatur, Venus quia venit ad omnia, Ceres a gerendo". Quam periculosa consuetudo; in multis enim nominibus **haerebitis**: quid Veiovi facies, quid Volcano? quamquam quoniam Neptunum a nando appellatum putas, **nullum erit nomen quod non possis una littera explicare unde ductum sit**; in quo quidem magis tu mihi natare visus es quam ipse Neptunus.
>
> Another issue: why do you Stoics take such pleasure in explaining myths, and in pursuing the unpicking of names? You defend the castration of Caelus by his son, and the shackling of Saturn also by his son, and stories of this kind, so enthusiastically that those who originated them are regarded

[14] Cf., e.g., Long-Sedley 1987, I, 195.

[15] See, e.g., Tieleman 1996, 197 n. 6.

[16] On Zeno's etymologies of the names of Hesiod's gods (rather than his allegoresis of Hesiod's poem), see the seminal article by Steinmetz; cf. Algra 2001, who dispels the idea that Cicero here refers to a line-by-line commentary on Hesiod's *Theogony* by Zeno.

[17] Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* III 24, §§ 62-63; tr. Walsh 1997 (adapted).

> not merely as sound in mind, but even as wise! As for your unpicking of names, you have to strain yourselves in such ways that one can only feel sorry for you. "Saturn is so called because he is sated with years; Mars, because he overturns might (*magna vertit*); Minerva, because she diminishes (*minuit*), or alternatively, threatens (*minatur*); Venus, because she visits (*venit*) all things; Ceres, because she bears fruit (*gerere*)". What a hazardous procedure this is! In the case of many names, **you will get stuck**: what can you make of Veiovis, or of Vulcan? Mind you, bearing in mind that you think that Neptune gets his name from *nando*, swimming, **there will be no name for which you cannot offer a derivation based on a single letter**! You seem to me to be more at sea in this pursuit than is Neptune himself.

This passage provides a good illustration of the three particular characteristics of Stoic etymology and allegoresis: (1.) Stoic allegoresis («explaining myths») tends to focus on the etymology of names («the unpicking of names»); (2.) these etymologies are about uncovering the so-called 'first names' («there will be no name for which you cannot offer a derivation based on a single letter!»); (3) these etymologies equate the gods with physical entities (e.g. Ceres with fruits, Neptune with water). The Academic Cotta here attacks two of these characteristics, i.e. the dependence of Stoic etymology on the theory of first names and the physical nature of Stoic etymology. As befits a philosophical school which takes its name from Plato's Academy, these two attacks on Stoic etymology are informed by two of Plato's writings, the *Phaedrus* and the *Cratylus*.

Let us start with the physical nature of Stoic etymology. Already J.B.Mayor and J.H.Swainson in their edition of *De Natura Deorum* refer readers to a passage from the beginning of the *Phaedrus* (229c4-230a7)[18]. There, Socrates appears to have little sympathy for attempts to interpret myths in physical terms. When asked by Phaedrus what he thinks of the myth of how the god Boreas abducted Orithyia, the daughter of the mythological Athenian king Erechtheus, Socrates responds that «wise men» (Plato, *Phdr*. 229c6: οἱ σοφοί) try to rationalize such myths by equating the gods with physical powers: the myth would refer to the fact that a gust of the North Wind had one day blown poor Orithyia over the rocks. Socrates himself considers such attempts to rationalize myths as a waste of precious time[19]:

> **T.6** ἐγὼ δέ, ὦ Φαῖδρε, ἄλλως μὲν τὰ τοιαῦτα χαρίεντα ἡγοῦμαι, λίαν δὲ δεινοῦ καὶ ἐπιπόνου καὶ οὐ πάνυ εὐτυχοῦς ἀνδρός, κατ' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, ὅτι δ' αὐτῷ ἀνάγκη μετὰ τοῦτο τὸ τῶν Ἱπποκενταύρων εἶδος ἐπανορθοῦσθαι, καὶ αὖθις τὸ τῆς Χιμαίρας, καὶ ἐπιρρεῖ δὲ ὄχλος τοιούτων Γοργόνων καὶ Πηγάσων καὶ

[18] Mayor - Swainson 1880-1885, III, 140.

[19] Plato, *Phdr*. 229d2-e4; tr. Nehamas-Woodruff 1997 (slightly adapted).

> ἄλλων ἀμηχάνων πλήθη τε καὶ ἀτοπίαι τερατολόγων τινῶν φύσεων· αἷς εἴ τις ἀπιστῶν προσβιβᾷ κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἕκαστον, ἅτε ἀγροίκῳ τινὶ σοφίᾳ χρώμενος, πολλῆς αὐτῷ σχολῆς δεήσει. ἐμοὶ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰ οὐδαμῶς ἐστι σχολή.
>
> Now, Phaedrus, such explanations are amusing enough, but they are a job for a man I cannot envy at all. He'd have to be far too ingenious and work too hard – mainly because after that he will have to go on and give a rational account of the form of the Hippocentaurs, and then of the Chimera; and a whole flood of Gorgons and Pegasusses and other monsters, in large numbers and absurd forms, will overwhelm him. Anyone who does not believe in them, who wants to explain them away and make them plausible by means of some sort of rough wisdom, will need a great deal of time.

The passage from Cicero echoes Socrates' condemnation of such rationalizations. The observation that the Stoics consider those who engage in these activities as wise (*sapientes*) rather than as insane picks up Socrates' qualification of the wisdom of those in the business of producing rationalizing accounts of myths as wise persons, be it «some sort of rough wisdom». Cotta's ironical commiseration with the Stoic allegorists («As for your unpicking of names, you have to strain yourselves in such ways that one can only feel sorry for you») recalls Socrates' remark that he "cannot envy at all" those people who set out to rationalize myths.

Note, however, that Cotta in his attack on Stoic allegoresis not only draws on Plato's *Phaedrus* but also on the *Cratylus*. The rationalizers from the *Phaedrus*-passage, after all, did not necessarily resort to etymology of the Stoic kind which consist in an 'unpicking' of names in smaller elements, while it is especially the etymological nature of Stoic allegoresis that attracts the ridicule of Cotta. In many cases, he warns, it will be very difficult to come up with a proper explanation of the name. One risks to get stuck *in multis enim nominibus haerebitis*. While most translators gloss this phrase over, I suggest that we should take *haerebitis* as a reference to the qualification of etymologies as sticky, i.e. as γλίσχρος, in the *Cratylus*. All the more so, because Cotta's connects his point about how difficult the Stoics may find it to etymologize certain divine names such as Veiovis or Vulcan to the theory of primary names («there will be no name for which you cannot offer a derivation based on a single letter!»). As such, this recalls Socrates' reason for calling attempts to etymologize on the basis of first names as «sticky» in **T.2**.

4. *Plutarch,* On How to Study Poetry*: the rejection of Stoic etymology as sticky*

Corroboration for my claim that Cotta's criticism of Stoic etymological practices goes back on the sticky passage from the *Cratylus* is provided by Plutarch of

Chaironeia. In his treatise *On How to Study Poetry* Plutarch adopts Plato's critical attitude towards Homer and Hesiod. Plato had insisted in the *Republic* that Homer and Hesiod should not be mistaken for teachers. Their aim is to entertain their public, not to educate it. For this reason, their poems contain a lot of elements that may please their non-philosophical audiences, but that are offensive to the philosophically inclined. One may think for example of the blasphemous stories about gods behaving badly. Plato admonishes educators to purge existing poetry from such elements. He rejects the suggestion that such passages may be neutralized by means of allegoresis. Plutarch takes a similar approach to poetry. For this reason, he is critical of Stoic allegoresis, which, as we saw above, tries to give philosophical sense to such a blasphemous story as that of the castration of Ouranos/Caelus. Since Stoic allegoresis centers around etymology, Plutarch, not unlike Cicero's Cotta, targets in particular the Stoic fondness for strained explanations of divine names[20]:

> **T.7** Δεῖ δὲ μηδὲ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀμελῶς ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν Κλεάνθους παιδιὰν παραιτεῖσθαι· κατειρωνεύεται γὰρ ἔστιν ὅτε προσποιούμενος ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὸ
>
> Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἴδηθεν μεδέων
>
> καὶ τὸ
>
> Ζεῦ ἄνα Δωδωναῖε
>
> κελεύων ἀναγιγνώσκειν ὑφ᾽ ἕν, ὡς τὸν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀναθυμιώμενον ἀέρα διὰ τὴν ἀνάδοσιν ἀναδωδωναῖον ὄντα. **καὶ Χρύσιππος δὲ πολλαχοῦ γλίσχρος ἐστίν**, οὐ παίζων ἀλλ᾽ εὑρησιλογῶν ἀπιθάνως, καὶ παραβιαζόμενος εὐρύοπα Κρονίδην εἶναι τὸν δεινὸν ἐν τῷ διαλέγεσθαι καὶ διαβεβηκότα τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ λόγου.
>
> While it is also necessary not to pass over the words carelessly, yet one should eschew the puerility of Cleanthes; for there are times when he uses a mock seriousness in pretending to interpret the words,
>
> Father Zeus, enthroned on Ida,
>
> And
>
> Zeus, lord of Dodona,
>
> bidding us in the latter case to read the last two words as one [taking the word 'lord' as the preposition 'up'] as though the air exhaled from the earth were 'updonative' because of its being rendered up! **And Chrysippus also is often quite petty/sticky**[21], although he does not indulge in jesting, but wrests the words ingeniously, yet without carrying conviction, as when he

[20] Plutarch, *How to Study Poetry* 31E; tr. Babbitt 1927 (slightly adapted).

[21] Cf. Hunter - Russell 2011, 178: «**γλίσχρος** 'sticky', 'difficult', of someone given to pedantic problems, cf. 43a μικρὰ καὶ γλίσχρα προβλήματα».

> would force the phrase 'wide-seeing' son of Cronos to signify 'clever in conversation', that is to say, with a widespread power of speech.

Plutarch here opposes Cleanthes' supposedly youthful playfulness to Chrysippus' seriousness. If Cleanthes is just playing about, there is no reason to take his explanations of divine names, which apparently include both proper names and epithets, seriously. Interestingly, Cleanthes explains the phrase Ζεῦ ἄνα Δωδωναῖε in a physical manner that recalls the rationalizing account of the Boreas-myth from the *Phaedrus*. In both cases, the rationalizing accounts seeks to explain the myth or the divine name from physical causes, in particular from streams of air. We will come back to this type of physical explanation when we will discuss the relevant passage from Hermias' *Commentary on the Phaedrus* below (**T.11**).

If Cleanthes at least had the good sense to treat the convoluted Stoic etymologies as some sort of game, Chrysippus took them completely seriously. He is said to be γλίσχρος. As in the case with the forced attempts of Socrates to prove the likeness between names and their objects (the ὁλκὴ τῆς ὁμοιότητος), Plutarch here accuses Chrysippus of a forced reading of the text (cf. παραβιαζόμενος). It is because of the forced nature of Stoic allegoresis and etymology, that it comes across as sticky, i.e. «unconvincing» (ἀπιθάνως).

Plutarch is not alone in his critique of Chrysippus' etymologies as forced. Even the card-carrying Stoic Seneca complains about Chrysippus that he «twists around» (*deflectit*) the names of mythological characters such as the Graces[22]:

> **T.8** Horum nominum interpretationem, prout cuique visum est, deflectit et ad rationem aliquam conatur perducere, cum Hesiodus puellis suis, quod voluit, nomen imposuerit. […] Chrysippus quoque, penes quem subtile illud acumen est et in imam penetrans veritatem, qui rei agendae causa loquitur et verbis non ultra, quam ad intellectum satis est, utitur, totum librum suum his ineptiis replet, ita ut de ipso officio dandi, accipiendi, reddendi beneficii pauca admodum dicat.
>
> Each authority twists the interpretation of these names as it suits him, trying to reduce them to some orderly plan; in fact, though, Hesiod just assigned to the girls the names that he felt like giving them. … Chrysippus, who is famous for his sophisticated intellectual analysis that gets to the heart of the truth, and who only says what is needed to get the job done and never uses more words than he needs in order to be understood – Chrysippus, too, filled his entire book with this nonsense, leaving himself only a little bit of room to discuss the actual process of giving, receiving, and returning benefits.

[22] Seneca, *On Benefits* I 3,7-8; tr. Griffin and Inwood 2011.

All of this is not to say that Plutarch rejects allegoresis and etymology as such, nor the Stoic assumption that some myths may contain remnants of very ancient philosophical speculations. In this context, Plutarch makes a distinction between poetical myths, such as those of Homer and Hesiod, and religious ones. Unlike the former, religious myths are meant to be read allegorically. One example is Plutarch's discussion of the myth of Isis and Osiris, in which he happily combines allegoresis with etymology of divine names in a way reminiscent of the Stoics[23]. But even in this case, Plutarch discards some allegorical interpretations as too fanciful[24]:

> **T.9** καὶ μέντοι Ἡρακλείτου τοῦ φυσικοῦ λέγοντος, " Ἅιδης καὶ Διόνυσος ωὑτὸς ὅτεῳ μαίνονται καὶ ληναΐζουσιν," εἰς ταύτην ὑπάγουσι τὴν δόξαν. οἱ γὰρ ἀξιοῦντες Ἅιδην λέγεσθαι τὸ σῶμα τῆς ψυχῆς οἷον παραφρονούσης καὶ μεθυούσης ἐν αὐτῷ, **γλίσχρως ἀλληγοροῦσι**.
>
> Moreover, since Heraclitus the physical philosopher says, "The same are Hades and Dionysus, to honour whom they rage and rave," people are inclined to come to this opinion. In fact, those who insist that the body is called Hades, since the soul is, as it were, deranged and inebriate when it is in the body, **allegorize in an unconvincing manner**.

Once again, the word γλίσχρος is used as a negative qualification. It signals that the proposed allegorical interpretation lacks credibility. It may be no coincidence that Plutarch uses it in connection with «Heraclitus the physical philosopher», i.e. the early Greek philosopher by that name, who had been hailed by the Stoics as one of their intellectual ancestors[25].

5. *Hermias Commentary on the* Phaedrus*: sticky versus proper etymology*

Glenn Most has recently argued that even though there exist manifest affinities between ancient etymology and allegoresis, they do not seem to be correlated systematically in antiquity, except in the case of the Stoics (Most 2016, 70):

> Allegoresis is largely absent among most of the Pre-Socratics, Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus and is found prominently only in the Stoa and in Neo-

[23] On Plutarch's interpretation of this myth and its affinity with Stoic readings of myths, cf. Heath 2012, 125-127.

[24] Plutarch, *On Isis and Osiris* 362A-B, tr. Babbitt 1936 (adapted).

[25] Cf. Heraclitus D16 ed. Laks-Most (= DK 22B15); for the authority that Heraclitus enjoyed among the Stoics, cf. Long 2005, 39.

> platonism; etymology is lacking for the most part among the Pre-Socratics, Aristotle, Epicurus, and Neoplatonism and is attested above all only in Plato and the Stoa.

This claim needs to be modified. There are sufficient examples of Platonists, and in particular Neoplatonists, engaging in etymology. Above, we have already come across the example of the Middle Platonist Plutarch, who in his *On Isis and Osiris* enthusiastically etymologizes the names of Egyptian gods in order to demonstrate that the ancient Egyptians already subscribed to a Platonic world-view. Porphyry wrote a treatise *On Divine Names*, while Proclus, in his commentary on the *Cratylus*, focusses in particular on Socrates' interpretations of divine names and tries to square these with his own Neoplatonic theology[26]. However, whereas Neoplatonists were happy to continue the Stoic tradition of etymologizing divine and other names, they took a different view to the relation between those names and the context in which these names occur. As we have seen, the Stoics had accorded pride of place to etymology as an exegetical tool when reading Homer and Hesiod, while they paid far less attention to the context in which these divine names occurred. For the Platonists, the context matters as much as the etymologies of divine (and other) names. Most, then, is right to claim that the Neoplatonists did no longer put as much emphasis on etymology as an exegetical tool as the Stoics had done, yet this does not mean that etymology disappears all together from Neoplatonic hermeneutical toolbox.

One reason behind this downgrading of etymology is, I suggest, the fact that the Neoplatonists did not only focus their exegetical efforts on the myths of Homer and Hesiod, whom, unlike the Stoics, they considered as true sages, but also on the myths and the prooemia of Plato's dialogues. To Platonists, Plato is a perfect sage and we thus have to assume that all elements of his dialogues are of significance and in harmony with each other[27]. Thus, whereas the Stoics had been happy to focus their attention on divine names and to disregard the immediate context, Neoplatonists hold that the exegesis of one element of a Platonic text, e.g. the etymology of a name, should be in keeping with other elements, such as the context in which a given name occurs. Moreover, whereas the Stoics had maintained that god is in the physical cosmos, Plato had firmly located the divine in his intelligible realm. Hence, the Neoplatonists interpret Plato's myths and prooemia

[26] I discuss Porphyry's interest in etymologies in Van den Berg 2008, 73-76; on Proclus' commentary on the etymologies of divine names from the *Cratylus*, see Van den Berg 2008, 161-197.

[27] On the Neoplatonic conception of the Platonic dialogue as a unity in which all elements contribute to one single goal (σκοπός), see, e.g., Coulter 1976, 77-94.

metaphysically, not physically. It is in this vein, for example, that Plotinus, when discussing Plato's myth about the birth of Eros from the *Symposium*, rejects a rather physical interpretation of Eros as the cosmos as γλίσχρος, i.e. forced, and «being out of tune» (ἀπᾳδόντως) with the fact that Plato elsewhere refers to Eros as being «the guardian of beautiful boys» (*Phaedr*. 265c2–3) and being «without bed, without shoes, without a roof» (*Symp*. 203d1-2)[28]. The great French scholar Pierre Hadot renders γλίσχρος here as «subtilités forcées», citing both Plato *Crat*. 414c (**T.3**) and Plutarch, *On How to Listen to Poetry* 31e (**T.7**) as parallels for this use of the word in this sense[29].

In the final part of this paper, I will study the exegesis of the Neoplatonist Hermias of the prooemium of the *Phaedrus* as an illustration of this difference between Neoplatonic and Stoic approaches to etymology. Part of this prooemium is the myth about the rape of Orithyia by Boreas that played a role in the attack on Stoic etymological practices by Cotta in Cicero's *On the Nature of the Gods*. At the beginning of the *Phaedrus* (227b4-5), when Socrates runs into Phaedrus the latter informs Socrates that he had just encountered Lysias who, together with Epicrates, was staying at the house of one Morychus. Hermias comments[30]:

> **T.10** Τινὲς μὲν οὖν ἐπεχείρησαν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀναπτύξεως Ἐπικράτους καὶ Μορύχου καὶ Φαίδρου λέγειν τι, ὡς κρατουμένου τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐνύλου ὑπὸ τοῦ λαμπροῦ τοῦ Φαίδρου· ἐπειδὴ δὲ **γλίσχρον** εἶναι δοκεῖ, τό γε προσφυὲς μᾶλλον πᾶσι τοῖς λεγομένοις τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας λάβωμεν. Ἱστορεῖται τοίνυν ὁ μὲν Λυσίας καλλιεπείᾳ τῶν καθ' αὑτὸν ὑπερενεγκεῖν, ἐρᾶν δὲ τῶν παίδων τὸν ἀκόλαστον ἔρωτα, Φαῖδρος δὲ εὐειδὴς μὲν τὸ φαινόμενον, ἐπτοημένος δὲ περὶ τὸν ἔξω ῥέοντα λόγον· ὁ δὲ Μόρυχος γάστρις τις ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία αὐτὸν ὡς γαστρίμαργον διαβάλλει· τὸ οὖν τὸν ἀκόλαστον Λυσίαν ἐν τῇ τοῦ γαστριμάργου οἰκίᾳ παραδοῦναι μένοντα, πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ἀκολουθίαν.
>
> Some people have attempted to base something on an interpretation of the names Epikrates, Morychus and Phaedrus - along the lines that the dark (*to skoteinon*) and enmattered is overcome (*kratoumenos*) by the brightness (*to lampron*) of Phaedrus - but since this seems dubious (**sticky**), let us deal with what is anyway more germane to all that is said [here], the historical facts. Lysias, then, is reported to have surpassed his contemporaries in beauty of language and to have had a licentious passion for boys, and Phaedrus to have been beautiful in outward appearance and passionate about the spoken

[28] Plotinus, *Enn*. III 5 [50] 5, 18-21.

[29] Hadot 1990, 123.

[30] Hermias, *Commentary on Plato's Phaedrus* 19, 17-20, 2, tr. Baltzly - Share 2019.

> word. Morychus, for this part, was a certain gluttonous person and comedy denigrates him as a glutton. To have represented the licentious Lysias, then, as staying in the glutton's house is appropriate.

As for the proposed etymologies of these names: the name of Morychus is derived, not implausibly, from the adjective μόρυχος, which means something like 'dark' or 'obscure'. The name of Phaedrus means something like 'the shining one' (φαιδρός = bright, beaming). The name of Epikrates is derived from κρατέω, 'to overcome', 'to master'. Morychus thus represents matter, which the Neoplatonists standardly associated with darkness, that is overcome (Epikrates) by the divine intelligible (Phaedrus). The anonymous 'some' who have proposed this interpretation are evidently (Neo-)Platonists, not Stoics. Even so, Hermias lays the same criticism at their doorstep as Cotta and Plutarch did at that of the Stoics: their interpretations are 'sticky' in the sense that they are far-fetched and rather arbitrary (hence «dubious», as Baltzly and Share translate γλίσχρος). Hermias himself offers an alternative commonsensical interpretation that takes into account the historical facts and that thus is all the more convincing. Lysias was a renowned orator attracted to beautiful boys, Phaedrus a such a beautiful boy who was attracted to displays of rhetoric, and Morychos was a glutton, so it need not surprise us that the hedonistic Lysias ends up staying with the equally hedonistic Morychos, nor that there is some sort of attraction between Phaedrus and Lysias.

Above, we noted that Stoic allegories are physical in nature. Cleanthes, for example, had explained the epithet Dôdônaios, from the air that at Dodona exhales from the earth (**T.7**). Hermias rejects such physical interpretations as γλίσχρος. Discussing Socrates' reservations about the rationalizing interpretation of the myth of the rape of Orithyia by Boreas, according to which a gush of wind would have blown the girl from the rocks, Hermias writes[31]:

> **T.11** Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ ἀνάπτυξις ὡς ἀναπτύσσουσιν οἱ σοφοί, τουτέστιν οἱ περὶ τὰ φυσικὰ διατρίψαντες, **γλίσχρος** ἐστὶ καὶ **εἰκοτολογία**· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄντως ὄντα ἀνατρέχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ φύσεις καὶ πνεύματα καὶ ἀέρας καὶ δίνας, ὡς ἐν Φαίδωνι ἔφη. Τούτους οὖν τοὺς φυσικοὺς καὶ οὕτως ἀναπτύσσοντας διαβάλλει ὡς εἰς ἀοριστίαν καὶ ἀπειρίαν ἐκπίπτοντας, καὶ μὴ ἐπὶ ψυχὴν καὶ νοῦν καὶ θεοὺς ἀνατρέχοντας.
>
> For this interpretation – the kind of interpretation the scientists (*sophoi*), that is, those who waste their time on natural phenomena, produce – is **sticky** and

[31] Hermias, *Commentary on Plato's Phaedrus* 32, 25-33, 3 (Lucarini - Moreschini), tr. Baltzly - Share 2019 (adapted).

> **mere conjecture** (*eikotologia*). They do not have recourse to the truly real things but to natural phenomena (*physeis*) and winds and exhalations and vortices as Plato said in the *Phaedo*. So he reproaches these natural scientists and people who interpret [myths] along these lines for tumbling into the boundless and unlimited and for failing to have recourse to soul and intellect and gods.

Hermias here picks up on Socrates' remark that the rationalizers aim at producing plausible accounts (**T.6**: κατὰ τὸ εἰκός). Such accounts may be sticky in the sense that they are arbitrary, as was the case with the interpretations based solely on etymologies. Moreover, they are «mere conjectures» (εἰκοτολογία), since they take the physical world as their point of reference. For a Platonist the physical world, because of its instable nature, is not the object of knowledge and certainty, but of *doxa* and probability (*eikos*). Hence Plato in the *Timaeus* (29d, 59c, 68d) refers to the account of the creation of the material cosmos as a «likely myth» (εἰκὼς μῦθος) and not as a true account (ἀληθὴς λόγος).

Since Hermias holds that each element of a Platonic dialogue should be interpreted so as to be in line with the over-arching theme of that dialogue, he rejects a physical interpretation of the Boreas-myth as being inconsistent with the central message of the dialogue, i.e. that we ascend towards the contemplation of the intelligible. Hence Hermias provides his readers with the following alternative interpretation of the myth[32]:

> **T.12** Ὠρείθυια γὰρ εἴη ἂν ψυχὴ ἐφιεμένη τῶν ἄνω (ἀπὸ τοῦ 'ὀρούω' καὶ τοῦ 'θύω' κατὰ ἐπέκτασιν Ἀττικήν)· ἁρπάζεται τοίνυν ἡ τοιαύτη ψυχὴ παρὰ τοῦ ἄνωθεν καταπνέοντος Βορρᾶ· εἰ δὲ καὶ κατὰ κρημνοῦ φέρεται, καὶ τοῦτο ἁρμόδιον· τελευτᾷ γὰρ τὸν προαιρετικὸν θάνατον, τὸν φυσικὸν μὴ δεχομένη, καὶ ἀφίησι τὴν προαιρετικὴν ζωήν, τὴν φυσικὴν ζῶσα· καὶ ἡ φιλοσοφία οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἀλλ' ἢ μελέτη θανάτου. Ἔστω οὖν Ὠρείθυια καὶ ἡ τοῦ Φαίδρου ψυχή, ὁ δὲ Σωκράτης Βορρᾶς, ἁρπάζων αὐτὸν καὶ καταφέρων εἰς τὸν προαιρετικὸν θάνατον.
>
> For 'Orithyia' (Ôreithuia) would be a soul desiring the things from on high—[the name is] from *orouô* ['rush towards'] and *thuô* ['desire eagerly'] with Attic lengthening. Now such a soul is snatched up by Boreas blowing from on high. And if it is also carried down from a cliff, that too is appropriate. For it dies the voluntary death, not undergoing a natural one, and puts aside the voluntary life, living the natural one; and philosophy is nothing other than training for death. So let Orithyia also be the soul of Phaedrus, and Socrates be Boreas, snatching him and carrying him down to the voluntary death.

[32] Hermias, *Commentary on the Phaedrus* 31, 21-28; tr. Baltzly - Share 2019.

This passages nicely illustrates the integral approach of the Neoplatonists to allegoresis. Both the central event of the story and the etymology of the name Orithyia are taken into account. The name Orithyia is here etymologized in keeping with the fact that she died because she was thrown from a cliff. This event is next interpreted in Neoplatonic metaphysical terms: Orithyia represents the soul that wishes to ascend towards the intelligible realm and hence dies «a voluntary death», i.e. a soul that already in this life-time denounces the body through an ascetic way of life as recommended by Socrates in the *Phaedo*[33]. Next, Hermias even connects this story and its allegorical interpretation to the larger context of the *Phaedrus* as such. Orithyia is now associated with Phaedrus, and Socrates with Boreas. This is in line with the guiding heuristic principal of the Neoplatonic commentators that Plato's dialogues have one central aim (σκοπός), towards which all elements of that dialogue are directed, including the characters of the dialogue (in this case Phaedrus and Socrates) and seemingly less relevant passages, such as Socrates' brief discussion of the myth of Orithyia and Boreas.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, I have studied the use of the term γλίσχρος in the context of ancient etymology and allegoresis. I have argued that the use of this word in such contexts originates from a specific passage from Plato's *Cratylus*. There, Socrates claims that words consist of meaningful primary elements, yet rejects attempts to systematically etymologize words by dissolving them into these primary names as 'sticky' (γλίσχρος). It is for this reason, so I suggested, that this term later on became associated with Stoic etymology, because the Stoics sought to explain divine names from such primary elements. A first passage in which the sticky nature of Stoic etymology was criticized was provided by Cicero. We found that the critique of Stoic allegoresis and etymology by the Academic Cotta took its inspiration not just from the *Cratylus*, but also from Socrates' condemnation of attempts to rationalize myths in the *Phaedrus*. This combination of two Platonic passages suggests that this line of criticism was developed by the Platonic Academy – it may be relevant that the argument is put forward by the Academic Cotta – perhaps in an attempt to distinguish between Platonist and Stoic allegoresis and etymology. We

[33] According to the *Phaedo* 63e-64b, pure souls await a better destiny after death than impure ones after one's natural death. In order to become pure, a philosopher needs to distance himself as far as possible from the body and its pleasures, thus leading a life that other people may consider as some sort of premature, voluntary death.

do not know whether earlier Platonists combined a critique of the Stoics with a positive account of legitimate, i.e. Platonic, allegoresis and etymology. The Neoplatonists Hermias offers us a glimpse what such an account, if it existed, may have looked like. First of all, names should not be etymologized in isolation from the stories in which they occur, as the Stoic tended to do. Instead the etymological explanation of a name should somehow fit with in the allegorical reading of a myth as a whole. Moreover, these myths should not be interpreted in physical terms, as the Stoics had done, but in metaphysical ones. The reason for this is that if we assume that myths contain some hidden truth, they must refer to the intelligible, since one cannot have true knowledge and certainty about the physical world. Of the physical world, one can at best have *doxa* and probability (*eikos*).

University of Leiden
r.m.van.den.berg@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Keywords: Plato, Platonism, Stoicism, etymology, allegoresis
Parole chiave: Platone, Platonismo, Stoicismo, etimologia, allegoresi

BIBLIOGRAPHYCAL REFERENCES

Ademollo 2011
F.Ademollo, *The Cratylus of Plato. A Commentary*, Cambridge 2011.
Algra 2001
K.Algra, *Comments or Commentary? Zeno of Citium and Hesiod's* Theogonia, «Mnemosyne» LIV (2001), 562-581.
Algra 2012
K.Algra, *The Platonic Origins of Stoic Theology*, «Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy» XLIII (2012), 217-243.
Babbitt 1927
Plutarch, *Moralia* I, translated by F.C.Babbitt, Cambridge MA 1927.
Babbitt 1936
Plutarch, Moralia V, translated by F.C.Babbitt, Cambridge MA 1936.
Baltzly – Share 2019
D.Baltzly – M.Share, *Hermias: On Plato Phaedrus 227A–245E*, London 2019.
Boys-Stones 2001.
G.R.Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy. A Study of its Development from the Stoics to Origen*, Oxford 2001.
Coulter 1976
J.A.Coulter, *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists*, Leiden 1976.
Dalimier 1998
Platon, *Cratyle*. Présentation et traduction inédite par C.Dalimier, Paris 1998.
Griffin – Inwood 2011
Seneca, *On Benefits*. Transl. by M.Griffin – B.Inwood, Chicago 2011.
Hadot 1990
Plotin, *Traité 50 (III.5)*. Introduction, traduction, commentaire et notes par P.Hadot, Paris 1990.
Heath 2012
M.Heath, *Ancient Philosophical Poetics*, Cambridge 2012.
Hunter – Russell 2011
Plutarch, *How to Study Poetry*, ed. by R.Hunter – D.Russell, Cambridge 2011.
Long 1996
A.A.Long, *Stoic Readings of Homer*, in: A.A.Long, *Stoic Studies*, Cambridge 1996, 58-84.
Long 2005
A.A.Long, *Stoic linguistics, Plato's Cratylus and Augustine's De Dialectica*, in D.Frede – B.Inwood (ed.), *Language and Leaning. Philosophy of Language in*

the Hellenistic Age. Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum, Cambridge 2005, 36-55.

Long – Sedley 1987
A.A.Long – D.N.Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, 2 vol., Cambridge 1987.

Mayor – Swainson 1880-1885
Cicero, *De Natura Deorum Libri Tres*, with Introduction and Commentary, ed. by J.B.Mayor - J.H.Swainson

Most 2016
G.W.Most, *Allegoresis and Etymology*, in A.Grafton – G.W.Most (ed.), *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices*, *A Global Comparative Approach*, Cambridge 2016, 52-74.

Nehamas – Woodruff 1997
A.Nehamas – P.Woodruff, *Phaedrus*, in J.M.Cooper – D.S.Hutchinson (ed.), *Plato. Complete Works*, Indianapolis 1997, 506-556.

Reeve 1998
Plato, *Cratylus*, transl. by C.D.C.Reeve, Indianapolis-Cambridge 1998.

Sedley 2003
D.Sedley, *Plato's Cratylus*, Cambridge 2003.

Steinmetz 1986
P.Steinmetz, *Allegorische Deutung und allegorische Dichtung in der alten Stoa*, «Rheinisches Museum für Philologie» CXXIX (1986), 18-30.

Taillardat 1962
J.Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane. Études de langue et de style*, Paris 1962.

Tieleman 1996
T.Tieleman, *Galen and Chrysippus on the Soul: Arguments and Refutations in the De Placitis Books II-III*, Leiden 1996.

Van den Berg 2008
R.M.Van den Berg, *Proclus' Commentary on the Cratylus in Context. Ancient Theories of Language and Naming*, Leiden 2008.

Walsh 1997
Cicero, *The Nature of the Gods*. Ed. and transl. by P.G.Walsh, Oxford 1997.

Williams 1982
B.Williams, *Cratylus' Theory of Names and its Refutation*, in M.Schofield – M.Nussbaum (ed.), *Language and Logos*, Cambridge 1982, 83-93.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32059 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 249-256*

NICOLA ZITO

Etymologies and Puns in Maximus' Περὶ Καταρχῶν

The aim of this contribution is to offer an essay that investigates the different ways in which Maximus plays in his astrological poem with the (presumed) origin of the words used by him or with their meaning. We will first see how our astrologer is able to put etymology at the service of the composition of his predictions; then how he exploits the semantic ambiguity of certain terms, not only to show off his erudition, but also to make his poem more in keeping with the dictates of astrological literature; finally, how he implicitly succeeds in establishing what is for him the correct interpretation of a word susceptible to different and conflicting readings.

Lo scopo del presente contributo è quello di offrire un saggio che indaghi i diversi modi in cui Massimo gioca nel suo poema astrologico con la (presunta) origine delle parole da lui usate o con il loro significato. Vedremo dapprima come il nostro astrologo riesca a mettere l'etimologia al servizio della composizione delle sue predizioni; poi come egli sfrutti l'ambiguità semantica di certi termini, non solo per fare sfoggio della propria erudizione, ma anche in ossequio ai dettami della letteratura astrologica; infine, come egli riesca implicitamente a stabilire quale sia per lui la corretta interpretazione di una parola suscettibile di diverse e contrastanti letture.

The Περὶ Καταρχῶν is a short epic-didactic poem that treats an astrological subject[1]. Probably composed towards the middle of the 4th century AD by the Neoplatonic philosopher Maximus of Ephesus, who was a teacher and friend of the emperor Julian[2], the poem develops a particular branch of ancient astrology, that of the καταρχαί, or initiatives, in which the observation of the different astral configurations allows to establish the most appropriate moment to take a certain action: when to travel? when to get married? when to operate on a sick person? when to engage in agricultural activities? and so on[3]. The various sections into which Maximus' poem is divided are dedicated to questions of this kind: the astrologer analyzes the position of the Moon with respect to the zodiac signs and planets, each time dedicating a brief prediction to each of these configurations. In the prediction, he briefly evokes the result, satisfactory or unsuccessful, of the activity which one wants to start[4].

It is a refined text, with an exquisitely Alexandrine taste: in a poem that is already short in itself[5], the author proceeds by rapid sketches, in which he deeply and pro-

[1] Zito 2016, whose introduction and commentary should be referred to for a more complete and detailed bibliographic documentation.

[2] Zito 2016, VII-XXIII.

[3] Bouché-Leclercq 1899, 458-486; Zito 2016, XXIIIf.

[4] Zito 2016, XXV-XXIX.

[5] Due to a breakdown of the manuscript tradition, we now read only 610 hexameters of the approximately one thousand of which the poem was originally supposed to consist. See Zito 2016, XXIVf. and XXXIVf.

fusely communicates his literary erudition. There is practically no verse in the Περὶ Καταρχῶν that does not echo an author of the past, from the Homeric poems to Quintus of Smyrna: Maximus quotes, imitates, and, through his lexical choices, takes a position on *vexatae quaestiones* of philological, astrological or mythological argument[6].

It is therefore not surprising that a *poeta doctus* like Maximus is in possession of a solid wealth of knowledge in the etymological field as well, and I propose, with this brief contribution, to offer an essay that investigates the different ways in which Maximus plays from time to time with the (presumed) origin of the words used by him or with their meaning. We will first see how our astrologer is able to put etymology at the service of the composition of his predictions; then how he exploits the semantic ambiguity of certain terms, not only to show off his erudition, but also to make his poem more in keeping with the dictates of astrological literature; finally, how he implicitly succeeds in establishing what is for him the correct interpretation of a word susceptible to different and conflicting readings.

1. *Etymology and astrology*

The first example that I want to propose to the reader's attention is taken from the section περὶ γάμου. It is more specifically the prediction relating to the passage of the Moon in the sign of Gemini (lines 96-98):

> Εἰ δὲ Θεραπναίοισιν ἐπορνυμένη Διδύμοισιν
> δεύτερον ἦμαρ ἄγῃσι, γάμου μεμνημένος εἶναι·
> οἰκοσόον γὰρ ἄκοιτιν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κομίζοις.

> If it is towards the Therapnean Twins that (Selene) rushes on the second day, do consider marriage: in fact, you will welcome a bride into your home who will take care of it.

Gemini are here identified, in a traditional way, with Castor and Pollux[7]: Therapne, a town located a few kilometers from Sparta, was the main place of worship of the Dioscuri[8]. The link between the sons of Zeus and the name of their place of worship clearly emerges from the explanation of the toponym Θεράπναι that we can find in Stephanus of Byzantium (Θ 26)[9]:

[6] Zito 2016, XL-LVI.
[7] Bouché-Leclercq 1899, 135f.
[8] Zito 2016, 90.
[9] Billerbeck - Zubler 2011, 232f.

> Θεράπναι· πόλις Λακωνική, ἥν τινες Σπάρτην φασίν. Ἔστι καὶ τόπος ἔχων ναὸν τῶν Διοσκούρων, διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖσε τούτους τιμᾶσθαι. Θεραπεύειν γὰρ τιμᾶν σημαίνει καὶ <ναὸς> τὴν οἰκίαν. Τὸ ἐθνικὸν Θεραπναῖος καὶ Θεραπναία καὶ Θεραπναῖον.
>
> Therapne: city of Laconia, which some call Sparta. It is also a place that has a temple of the Dioscuri, due to the honor in which they are held there. Θεραπεύειν means in fact 'to honor' and <ναός> 'home'. The adjective indicating nationality is Θεραπναῖος, Θεραπναία, Θεραπναῖον.

In composing his short marriage prediction, Maximus seems to have had in mind an 'etymological' interpretation not unlike that provided by Stephanus. The bride whose character is quickly outlined in line 98 is in fact doubly linked to the domestic sphere (prefix οἰκο-, syntagma ἐνὶ μεγάροισι ~ ναός), on which she will certainly have a positive influence, by taking care of it (element -σόος ~ θεραπεύειν). This obviously makes it desirable to contract marriage (line 97 γάμου μεμνημένος εἶναι). Moreover, it is not improbable that this explanation of the toponym Θεράπναι overlaps here with another one, i.e. the one that related it to the noun θεράπνη, 'handmaid' but also 'dwelling'[10].

While this overlap may remain only a hypothesis, what is certain is that a link between what was believed to be the explanation of the adjective Θεραπναῖος and the auspicious prediction formulated by Maximus seems absolutely plausible. And it is interesting to see how the poet used his etymological skills to create one of those associations of ideas, usually very banal, which we often find at the basis of astrological predictions, for example the prohibition of marrying a virgin when Selene is in the sign of Virgo, the invitation to take care of the goats when the goddess occupies Capricorn, or the profit that she provides fishermen during her stay in the sign of Pisces[11]. In the example that I have just analyzed, which remains, to my knowledge, the only one of its kind within the Περὶ Καταρχῶν, the favorable outcome of the prediction is determined not by the name of the constellation (Δίδυμοι) as it usually happens, but, in a much more subtle and original way, by the very meaning of the epithet that the poet decided to attribute to it.

2. *Word games of Alexandrian taste*

But our passage allows us to highlight two other aspects of the way in which Maximus exploits the potential of the language.

[10] Chantraine, *DELG*, 430f.

[11] Zito 2016, XXVIIIf.

The first is lexical inventiveness: the adjective οἰκοσόος is probably Maximus' creation (of which Nonnus of Panopolis will be reminded a century later, as shown in his *Dionysiaca*, XXI 272 λάτριον ἔργον… οἰκοσσόον) and there are numerous *hapax legomena* and neologisms, including morphological and semantic ones, which we encounter in Περὶ Καταρχῶν[12].

The second aspect, more relevant for our perspective, is the predilection of our poet for words that often have very different meanings, which Maximus is pleased to bring together in the same context. Let's take οἰκοσόος: the ancient grammatical tradition was uncertain whether the element -σόος should be traced back to σῴζω 'to preserve' or to σεύω 'to shake'[13]. Not without a certain irony, therefore, Maximus introduces us to a wife who is perhaps not as recommendable as it seemed at first sight.

Formulations of this kind are relatively numerous in the poem, and they are not always original ideas of our astrologer, who sometimes draws them heavily from his predecessors.

The confusion between σῴζω and σεύω reappears for example in line 569 (section περὶ κλοπῆς), where Maximus predicts, about a stolen object, that σώεται ἂψ ἐς δῶμα καὶ ἐς χέρας εἶσιν ἄνακτος. Maximus is visibly inspired here by Apollonius of Rhodes, II 295-296 ὑπέστρεφον ἂψ ἐπὶ νῆα / σώεσθαι. And like Apollonius, Maximus lets the two interpretations of the verb σώω ('to save oneself' and 'leap forward'), both pertinent, conflate and merge in this context[14].

Not unlike this, in line 74 μὴ σύγε μοι μνώοιο πολυκτεάνων ὑμεναίων, the two values of the verb μνάομαι overlap: the verb is in fact constructed with the genitive as in the *Iliad*, II 686 πολέμοιο δυσηχέος ἐμνώοντο 'to think', 'to turn your mind'. However, the context – we are in the section περὶ γάμου – and the proximity of the *iunctura* πολυκτεάνων ὑμεναίων, cannot help but suggest the meaning of 'court' that the same verb can also assume, for example in the *Odyssey*, I 39 μνάασθαι ἄκοιτιν. This pun probably depends on a passage from Callimachus, *Hymns*, II 95 μνωόμενος προτέρης ἁρπακτύος, where the participle μνωόμενος appears at a short distance from the mention of the νύμφη of Apollo, the eponymous heroine Cyrene, and it is referred to the god in the act of remembering the courtship of his bride[15]. Once again, Nonnus of Panopolis will remember the passage of Maximus in the *Dionysiaca*, XXIX 337 (Athena) μνησαμένη νόθα λέκτρα πεδοτρεφέων ὑμεναίων[16].

More original is the case of lines 349-350 of Περὶ Καταρχῶν where, with regard

[12] Zito 2016, LIX.
[13] Livrea 2000, 198f.; Agosti 2003, 467.
[14] Zito 2016, 172.
[15] Williams 1978, 81.
[16] Agosti 2013, 327.

to a fugitive slave, Maximus takes into consideration the possibility that he leaves his master's house during the second day of the stay of the Moon in the sign of Leo: εἰ δέ γ᾽ ἐν ἠοῖ / δευτατίῃ αἴροιτο φυγήν… The form δευτάτιος used by Maximus is naturally equivalent to δεύτατος, the Homeric superlative of δεύτερος, whose meaning is always that of 'last'[17]. However, since Selene takes about two and a half days to cross a sign of the Zodiac[18], it is probable that Maximus, aware of this semantic 'incongruity', deliberately made the sense of the positive degree ('second') and that of the superlative of the adjective in question ('last') converge in the same expression.

A similar case seems to me to be represented by line 443 (section περὶ παίδων διδασκαλίας) in which the poet designates the constellation of Virgo through the periphrasis Κούρης… φιαρὸν δέμας Ἰκαριώνης. Before Maximus, the rare adjective φιαρός has only a handful of occurrences among the Alexandrine poets who, however, attribute a double meaning to it[19]. Callimachus, for example, uses it in the sense of λαμπρός 'luminous' or 'shining', said of the dawn in fr. 539 Pfeiffer φιαρὴ ... ἕως, while Nicander uses it in the sense of λιπαρός 'oily' or 'fatty', for example in the *Alexipharmaca*, 91 φιαρὴν δὲ ποτοῦ ... γρῆυν, in reference to the coat that forms on freshly milked milk.

As for line 443 of the Περὶ Καταρχῶν, it is clear that Maximus, always careful to emphasize the luminosity of the celestial bodies he mentions in his astrological poem[20], takes φιαρός in the sense of λαμπρός. However, he knows that φιαρός can also be λιπαρός, and we understand this thanks to the presence of the noun δέμας, referring to the body of Erigone, daughter of Icarius, the heroine identified here with the sign of Virgo[21]: since Homer λιπαρός appears in fact in relation to parts of the body, if not the body itself, of gods and heroes, for example in the *Iliad*, II 44 ποσσὶ δ᾽ ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσιν, which is said about Agamemnon, or in a passage from Hesiod, *Theogony*, 901 λιπαρὴν Θέμιν.

Maximus thus shows us not only that he knows a rare Alexandrine gloss like φιαρός, but also that he masters both its meanings. However, his display of erudition takes place via a great economy of means: it was enough for the poet to insert in his hexameter an apparently banal word such as δέμας to give the periphrasis in question all its semantic complexity[22].

---

[17] Zito 2016, 136.

[18] Bouché-Leclercq 1899, 474.

[19] Zito 2016, 153.

[20] Zito 2016, XLIIIf.

[21] Bouché-Leclercq 1899, 139f.; Zito 2016, 125 and 160f.

[22] There could be in Maximus' passage a latent play on Ἠριγόνη and Ἠώς, that is said to be ἠριγένεια in early hexameter, for example in the *Iliad*, I 477. If this is the case, it may then be a further pointer to Callimachus, fr. 539 Pfeiffer.

However, this exploitation of the potential of the vocabulary is not dictated solely by the poet's desire to exhibit his erudition, but it also responds to very specific formal requirements. We must not forget, in fact, that the Περὶ Καταρχῶν is a work dedicated to astrological topics, and that this kind of poetry is conventionally characterized by a certain obscurity of language, an aspect to which not only the abundance of *hapax legomena* and neologisms, but also the continuous use of deliberately ambiguous expressions, substantially contribute. By doing so, the poet-astrologer forges for himself a more hieratic allure and gives an undoubted solemnity to his text; his predictions will be at the same time more enigmatic and difficult to interpret correctly, thus protecting him from any criticism from readers in the case of erroneous predictions. This also happens in the oracular poetry, with which Maximus' Περὶ Καταρχῶν shares various formal aspects, such as the formular character or the repetitiveness of expressions in use[23].

3. *Etymology and philology*

Maximus also offers us several examples of the opposite phenomenon compared to the one we have just analyzed. If so far we have seen how he seems to ingeniously exploit the polysemy of certain words, it is just as ingeniously that our astrologer shows to be capable of taking sides in favor of only one of the various possible meanings assumed by a single word.

The most eloquent example of this semantic attitude is represented by a passage from the περὶ γάμου section, which opens with the prediction relating to Selene's permanence in the signs of Sagittarius, Pisces and Aquarius. After having outlined the portrait of the ideal bride, the poet invites the reader to lead her without hesitation into his own home, provided of course that he μονίην στυγέοι καὶ ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ (line 71).

Before Maximus, the noun μονίη is only attested in Empedocles, fr. 21,3 Wright, σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονίῃ περιηγέι γαίων, a passage in which the pre-Socratic mentions the One or Sphere, that is the condition of compact unity that distinguishes the elements, when Love prevails in the cosmos[24]. Our astrologer seems to refer to this line explicitly: he takes up the rare gloss in question, inserted not coincidentally in an 'erotic' context, and opposes the optative στυγέοι to the participle γαίων that we find in Empedocles.

In Empedocles' verse, the noun μονίη could allude both to the immobility of the

[23] Zito 2016, LVI-LVIII and LXI-LXIV.

[24] Reale 1992, I 156.

Sphere, and therefore depend on μένω, and to its solitude or uniqueness, and thus be traced back to μόνος. The correct interpretation of this word probably already divided the Ancients – Eudemus, for example, explained it as ἀκινησία – and the question remains open to this day, even if Empedocles has perhaps deliberately chosen to use an ambiguous word, susceptible to several interpretative levels[25].

However it may be, Maximus seems aware of the double problem – etymological and therefore philosophical – that is hidden in Empedocles' line, and he decides to take sides in favour of one of the two possible interpretations. We must not forget that Maximus of Ephesus is not only a *poeta doctus*, but also, and I would say primarily, a Neoplatonic philosopher, author of Aristotelian commentaries[26], and therefore he is probably used to this type of complex exegesis of the text of his predecessors. For him μονίη comes from μόνος, and he lets us grasp this, implicitly just as much as incontrovertibly, by inserting, next to the 'incriminated' word, the Homeric *iunctura* ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ to designate the celibacy, in other words the solitude, of the groom. In doing so, he suggests at the same time to the reader who is competent in the matter, and able to read between the lines, what the exact implications of Empedocles' passage describing the Sphere are for him.

In any case, despite the seriousness of the problem, even this time Maximus' line does not seem to be immune from a certain dose of irony: in Homer, in fact, the expression ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ always appears in relation to prisoners of war (*Iliad*, VI 455; XVI 831; XX 193). Is the wedding day rather a δούλιον ἦμαρ?[27].

Here we are at the end of this short contribution. Through the examples proposed, I hope I have managed to give a fairly exact impression of the erudition of Maximus, a refined poet who proves to have a broad, thorough, and philologically active knowledge of the production of his predecessors, not only poets but also philosophers. He masters the etymological and semantic peculiarities and does not hesitate to skillfully and diversely put them at the service of his literary activity, without ever taking himself too seriously[28].

Membre associé – Médecine grecque et littérature technique
(UMR8167 Orient et Méditerranée)
nicola.zito@icloud.com

Keywords: epic poetry, astrology, erudition, philosophy, Alexandrianism
Parole chiave: poesia epica, astrologia, erudizione, filosofia, alessandrinismo

[25] Wright 1981, 188.
[26] Zito 2016, LXXXIIf.
[27] Homer, *Iliad*, VI 463; *Odyssey*, XIV 340; XVII 323.
[28] Agosti 2019, 124.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Agosti 2003
Nonno di Panopoli, *Parafrasi del Vangelo di San Giovanni. Canto Quinto*. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione e commento di G.Agosti, Firenze 2003.

Agosti 2013
Nonno di Panopoli, *Le Dionisiache* (*Canti 25-39*). Introduzione, traduzione e commento di G.Agosti, Milano 2013[4].

Agosti 2019
G.Agosti, *Late Antique Poetry and Its Reception*, in W.Hörandner – A.Rhoby – N.Zagklas (ed.), *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, Leiden-Boston 2019, 115-148.

Billerbeck – Zubler 2011
M.Billerbeck – Chr.Zubler (ed.), Stephani Byzantii *Ethnica (Δ-I)*, Berlin-New York 2011.

Bouché-Leclercq 1899
A.Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque*, Paris 1899.

Chantraine, *DELG*
P.Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, I-II, Paris 1990[2].

Livrea 2000
Nonno di Panopoli, *Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni* (*Canto B*). Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento di E.Livrea, Bologna 2000.

Reale 1992
G.Reale, *Storia della filosofia antica*, I-V, Milano 1992[9].

Williams 1978
Callimachus, *Hymn to Apollo. A Commentary*, by F.Williams, Oxford 1978.

Wright 1981
Empedocles, *The extant fragments*. Edited with an Introduction, Commentary, and Concordance, by M.R.Wright, New Haven-London 1981.

Zito 2016
Maxime, *Des Initiatives*, texte établi, traduit et annoté par N.Zito, Paris 2016.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32060 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 257-286*

ANNA LEFTERATOU

Centonic Variations on a Biblical Theme
Preliminary Case-Studies of Semantic Discrepancies

This article is a preliminary semantic and etymological study of a selection of terms – from fake synonyms and speaking names to thoroughly Christianized and/or Platonizing reclaims of the epic vocabulary – from the I HC *and the* II HC *and its aim is twofold: on the one hand, it focuses on a selection of key semantic variations that result from the Christian semantic reception of archaic vocabulary and especially interpretations featuring in philological works, such as commentaries, scholia, and dictionaries; on the other hand, the analysis shows the influence of biblical exegesis in understanding the re-semanticized Homeric vocabulary in return and how this was employed so as to further the existing Christian interpretation. The analysis concludes that by the fifth century the interpretation of the Bible through biblical classicizing poetry reveals a strikingly positive stance towards the Homeric text as a cultural authority useful also for Christian exegesis.*

Il presente contributo si configura come uno studio preliminare, semantico ed etimologico, di una selezione di termini dalle redazioni I e II del Centone omerico*: falsi sinonimi, nomi parlanti, richiami cristianizzati o 'platonizzanti' al vocabolario epico. Lo studio ha una duplice finalità: da un lato si concentra sulle trasformazioni del significato di alcuni termini chiave, esito della ricezione semantica, in ambito cristiano, del vocabolario arcaico e delle relative interpretazioni in opere filologiche* (*commenti, scoli e dizionari*)*; dall'altro mette in rilievo l'influenza dell'esegesi biblica nella comprensione del vocabolario omerico, a sua volta risemantizzato e impiegato per promuovere l'ermeneutica cristiana. Dall'analisi emerge che, a partire dal V secolo, l'interpretazione della Bibbia attraverso la poesia biblica classicizzante rivela un giudizio fortemente positivo nei confronti del testo omerico, ritenuto un'autorità culturale utile anche per l'esegesi cristiana.*

The recomposing of Homer into a biblical poem requires a great deal of deliberate interpretative flexibility both from the virtuoso composer and the well-trained reader/audience. The *Homeric Centos* are poems composed of Homeric verses reused verbatim that narrate the main events from the Creation to the Fall and from Jesus' Incarnation to the Ascension. The first redaction of *Homeric Centos* (hereafter, *I HC*) is attributed to Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II, and is representative of late antique biblical poetry and in particular of Christian cento of which the other illustrative exemplary is Proba's *Virgilian Cento*. A second redaction (hereafter, *II HC*) seems to be a thorough revision of the first and is conceived as a new poem and not an epitome of the first redaction; however, authorship and date of *I* and *II HC* are contested[1]. Like other late antique poems, the *HC* although composed with the aid of writing could have been presented in an oral performance[2],

* I am grateful to Gianfranco Agosti, Athanassios Vergados and Fotini Hadjittofi for their comments.

[1] There are also three considerably shorter redactions. For the dating and the issues of authorship see the introduction in Schembra 2007a.

[2] For performance in Late Antiquity see Agosti 2006; like the epyllion-like composition of some episodes in the *Dionysiaca,* discussed by Agosti 2016. Similarly, the *I HC* are divided in

which entails that is audience ought to be well steeped in classical *paideia* in order to appreciate the poem's intertextual and etymological allusions.

Rocco Schembra, who undertook the Herculean task of editing the five redactions of *Homeric Centos*, has repeatedly shown that in reusing Homer cento poems make ample use of the ambiguity emerging out of crucial semantic discrepancies between the 'original' meaning of a word, namely its appearance in the Homeric epics, and its denotation in the Christian poem[3]. Although I disagree with Schembra on the interpretation of the technical term δοιάδες in the so-called *Apologia* as alluding to the semantic opacities pertaining to the Christianization of Homeric vocabulary[4], his observations about the poem's consistent use of 'semantic variations'[5] are extremely valuable for understanding the shift during the transformation of archaic epic into biblical poetry.

This analysis is a preliminary semantic and etymological study of a selection of terms – from fake synonyms and speaking names to thoroughly Christianized and/or Platonizing tinged reclaims of the epic vocabulary – from the *I HC* and the *II HC* and its aim is twofold: on the one hand, it will focus particularly on a selection of key semantic variations that result from the Christian semantic reception of archaic vocabulary and especially those featuring in philological works, such as commentaries, scholia, and dictionaries, from which the centos greatly benefited[6]; on the other hand, the analysis will show the influence of biblical exegesis in understanding the re-semanticized Homeric vocabulary and how Homeric vocabulary was employed so as to further the existing Christian interpretation.

Cento technique consists of extracting and, in our case, christianizing recognizable and content-wise recognizable Homeric lines and is illustrative of the cento poet's linguistic virtuosity and his/her audience's erudition[7]. The semasiological

---

self-contained episodes which would have allowed the performance of a part, or several parts of the poem. *Contra* see Usher 1998 who stresses more the oral, archaic-bard-like, composition of the poem. This, however, would not have been possible in late antique bookish culture.

[3] Schembra 1994a, Schembra 1994b, Schembra 2002, Schembra 2006, Schembra 2007a. The translations of the biblical cento are mine; for the translations of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* I have consulted Lamberton's text and occasionally adapted.

[4] I take δοιάδες to allude to Ausonius' *duos,* for which see Usher 1997. Ambiguity is an interpretative characteristic of any cento composition. See also Sandnes 2011, 190.

[5] Schembra 1994a, 317-319 differentiates between six types of semantic variations: (i) those that relate to the Christianization of the theme; (ii) those that concern the morpho-syntactic level; (iii) those that are by-product of a *lapsus memoriae* and mistaken; (iv) those that reflect various Homeric readings; (v) those that reflect on the metre; (vi) the so-called δοιάδες, a term which according to Schembra 1994a, 328 is taken to mean «ambiguità, doppiezze».

[6] Lefteratou 2019.

[7] For the poem's intertextual engagement with the Homeric 'original' see Bažil 2009,

ambiguities during the reclaim of the Homeric vocabulary, I will show, reveal the extent of the poem's engagement with the philological and especially with the lexicographic culture of Late Antiquity: etymology became a tool of the increasingly popular allegorical interpretation[8], and etymological puns and other word plays often feature across genres and levels of literariness[9]. Moreover, given that the Bible was a sacred text and even its words and its physical format as a book were thought to represent the Word[10], the centonization of the Incarnation required a broader understanding of faith in the Gospel as embodiment of the Logos: recomposing the Gospel in epic hexameters would either presuppose the Christianization of the archaic vocabulary in the process of re-claiming or accepting/tolerating the authority of the classicizing epic verse as being good enough for recasting the Gospel. The same readerly aptitude for re-cycling and re-interpreting the biblical and the Homeric texts is evident at the lexical level too: the choice and reuse of the archaic epic vocabulary is thoroughly reconsidered so as to express the poem's new theme. The subversion of the Homeric *Kunstsprache* then required a sensitive audience, both linguistically and poetically, that could easily grasp the cento variations. What kind of academic training do the *I HC* presuppose from an audience that would have heard the poem during a performance? How can ancient Homeric dictionaries and commentaries help clarify the ambiguous meanings of specific terms within a biblical *Homeric Cento*? And what is the influence of the biblical canon and ritual, which the audience would have known by heart, on the interpretative possibilities offered by convoluted and contested terms?

Fake synonyms: epic nouns as Gospel terms

An important step towards the Christianization of the Homeric vocabulary is

---

Bažil 2017. For late antique intertextuality and reader response see also the useful observations in Pelttari 2014.

[8] See Amsler 1989 and Dawson 1992, esp. 7-8. For the increased use of etymology within a general interest in symbolism and allegory see Struck 2004, 137-147. For an overview of imperial scholarship see now Matthaios 2020.

[9] On levels of style see Agosti 2008; on word plays and etymological puns in metrical inscriptions see Agosti 2019 and in this volume p. 311-333.

[10] *E.g.*, Amsler 1989, 87-95 and *passim*; even harmonizing the often contrasting narrative of the Four Gospels required a leap of faith, hence Gospel 'harmonies' were not so welcome; see, *e.g.*, O'Loughlin 2010. For Eusebius' attempt at a different kind of harmonization through his tables, see Crawford 2019 and Bausi 2020. For the scriptural context in Late Antiquity, see Stroumsa 2008.

seen in the reuse of nouns in the new context. At *I HC* 474 there is a word-play between the homophone words βασίλεια (the queen) and βασιλεία (kingship): the line used for Penelope's suitors who are called μνηστῆρες ἀγακλειτῆς βασιλείης («suitors of the famous queen») is reused to designate those disciples who shall partake of the Kingdom of Heaven, since Christian texts describe Jesus' followers as potential brides or bridegrooms of the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν[11]. Likewise, terms that evoke Christian martyrdom are appropriately modified: for example, we learn at *I HC* 1385 that Jesus' disciples μάρτυροι ἔσσονται καὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἁρμονιάων («shall become martyrs[12] and presbyters of the new covenant»), although in *Iliad* XXII 255 this line is used to describe the pagan gods as witnesses and guardians of human oaths. In this case then the Christian meaning of the word is so potent that replaces its archaic one. Accordingly, one needs to understand the noun ἀγών in relation to Jesus' ministry and martyrdom: *e.g.*, at *I HC* 464 the disciples are called upon ὄφρα οἱ αὐτόματοι θεῖον δυσαίατ' ἀγῶνα («so that they follow him in his holy fight»); or at *I HC* 1870 δήμιοι, οἳ κατ' ἀγῶνας ἐῦ πρήσσεσκον ἕκαστα («the assassins, who always attend everything properly during the executions»). In the Christian poem the noun should be understood in the Pauline sense: namely, an athletic competition that ends with the combatant's martyrdom[13]. Simple adjectives are reused and semantically adapted as well. In some cases, parallel evidence from the New Testament encourages their further semantic transformation: such is the case of the terms used to describe Jesus' followers and disciples as invited ones which allude to the New Testament description of Jesus' followers as κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοί, as «summoned and elected»[14]. In this case the selection process does not take place among humans but by God.

Even more astonishingly, as Schembra 1994a, 330 has already pointed out, the adjective δαιμόνιος, which in Homer is used to characterize the god-like or the wretched one[15], is reused in the Christian poem to characterize those possessed by

[11] Cf. Mt 22:2: ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὅστις ἐποίησεν γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ. Cf. *Caten.* 2 Cor 4:13; Schembra 2006, 228.

[12] For a loaded use of the term in Nonnus' *Paraphrasis of St. John's Gospel*, see also Vian 1997.

[13] Cf. 1Tim. 4:7: τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα («I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept faith»). Cf. Euseb. *HE* VIII 2,3; and in *I HC* 1864 the description of the cross with imagery from the chariot race from *Il.* XXIII 327: ἕστηκε ξύλον αὖον ὅσον τ' ὄργυι' ὑπὲρ αἴης. See also Thompson 2002.

[14] Mt 22:14: πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί; and esp. Apoc 17:14: καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί. Cf. Schembra 2006, 226. Cf. also *Or. Sib.* II 169: ἀνδρῶν ἐκλεκτῶν πιστῶν, and Lightfoot 2007, 476 *ad l.*

[15] Cf. *Schol. Genev. ad Il.* II 190: τὸ δαιμόνιε ποτὲ μὲν δηλοῖ τὸν ἀγαθόν, ποτὲ δὲ τὸν

the Satan as in *I HC* 957-958: δαιμόνιε, σχεδὸν ἐλθέ· τίη δειδίσσεαι οὕτως; | δαιμόνιε, φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος («Demon, come closer; why are you so scared? Demon, your might will destroy you»). In this case Jesus addresses Satan who dwells inside wicked men such as the demoniac of Gerasene and in other examples Judas[16]. In these instances, the audience of the poem is prompted to interpret the passages based on his/her knowledge of the language of the New Testament at the expense of the terms' archaic connotations.

Nomina loquentia*: from personal names to meaningful adjectives*

The poem, nonetheless, features other, more demanding cases where the precise knowledge of Homeric language is a prerequisite for deciphering the Christian narrative. One of the most striking transformations that scholars have long observed is the recasting of speaking names as eloquent and theologically loaded adjectives. This practice derives from a long tradition of etymologizing sacred and divine names and epithets[17]. Of these most characteristic is the typical cluster used to introduce Jesus across all redactions of *Homeric centos* as the θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής[18]. Whereas in the *Odyssey* Theoclymenus is the *nomen loquens* of a seer, whose knowledge obviously depends on divine inspiration, this interpretation cannot be accepted and applied straightforwardly in Jesus' case: Christ, being one with the Father, cannot learn the truth from God, and any divergence might have even raised theological issues concerning subordinationism, the heretic belief according to which Jesus and the Holy Spirit are second and not co-equal to

---

φαῦλον («the [word] *daimonie* on some occasions means the good man, on others the wretched man»). For its etymology from δαίμων see *Etym. Magn.* 251 s.v. δαιμόνιος, μακάριος, ἢ θαυμαστός· παρὰ τὸ δαίμων, δαίμονος […] δαιμόνιε, μακάριε· ἢ κακόδαιμον, φαυλότατε («*daimonios,* the blessed or the admired; from *daimon* […] *daimonie,* [means] the blessed one, or wretched, most evil»).

[16] *I HC* 957, 978, 1684, 1714.

[17] For the allegoric-etymological potential of sacred names see Ramelli 2011 on Origen, and Radice 2020. For speaking names in Homer see *e.g.* Kamptz 1982 and Kanavou 2015; for Aristophanes, Kanavou 2011; for Hesiod see Vergados 2020, esp. 6, 11, 122-124, with literature.

[18] And most often in the verse τὸν δ' αὖ γε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής at *I HC* 697, 719, 799, 892, 921, 1433, 1467, 1655, 2265, 2340. Cyr. Alex. often uses it to denounce the false vs the real prophets/evangelists, *e.g.*, *C. Jul.* 1.34. [on behalf of Moses]: θεοκλυτήσαντες γὰρ ἀληθῶς τὰ ἐξ ἑνὸς λαλοῦσι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος («having been truly taught by god they all speak in unison with the holy spirit»); *De Trinit.* 552 (Aubert) ὁ θεοκλυτήσας Παῦλος; *Epist. Pasch. PG* LXXVII 724: εἰ θεοκλυτεῖν οἴοιτό τις.

God-Father. In the biblical cento, θεοκλύμενος probably depicts him not as one who learns from God, as Eustathius already argued about the Homeric seer on the basis of etymology[19], but as someone whose opinion God takes into consideration and who is thus (co-)equal to him. It is in a similar vein that other speaking names, such as (κῆρυξ) Πεισήνωρ, become descriptive adjectives that contribute to the portrayal of the Christian characters, as in the case of Gabriel and John the Baptist, the two messengers *par excellence* whose mission is to convince reluctant audiences, Mary and the crowds respectively[20]. A further etymological twist is observed in Jesus' dialogue with Pilate where the governor is portrayed as a powerful and terrifying ruler, *I HC* 1837: ἔχετον βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων. The Homeric Echetus, king of Epirus, was a legendary bogeyman and tyrant, but the Christian poem retains here both the etymology of ἔχετος from the verb ἔχω, making Pilate a powerful man, and simultaneously reuses the savage reputation of Echetus to allude to the governor's likewise alleged irascible character too[21]. In these cases the etymological possibilities embedded in the word are slightly revisited in order to reflect the new Christian context.

---

[19] ~ *Od.* XV 356. For the etymology there are several options: θεοκλύμενος = (i) τὰ ἐκ θεοῦ κλύων (Eust. *ad Od.* II 97), the one who learns truth from god; (ii) θεὸς κλυτός, the glorious god; (iii) θεόκλυτος, the one whom God hears. In favor of this last meaning, see Rey 1996, 197, Schembra 2006, 266. For the same theological reason Nonnus' Jesus highlights the heavenly origin of his testimony as coming from God's bosom, *Par.* III 155-157: ὃς δὲ δι' αἰθερίου θεοδέγμονος ἵκετο κόλπου, | φθέγγεται οὐρανόθεν τόπερ ἔκλυεν, οὐδέ τις αὐτοῦ | μαρτυρίην ζαθέην ἐπιδέχνυται («but He who comes from the ethereal god-receiving bosom, utters what he knows from heavens above; yet nobody receives his divine testimony»), interpreting Jo 3:31: ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν. Cf. Orig. *In Jo* 46: εἰ γὰρ ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς ἔρχεται ὡς παντοκράτωρ, δῆλον ὅτι ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν («for if he comes from above and from the Father as all-sovereign, it means that he is atop of everything»).

[20] At *I HC* 228 and 264, only the first hemistich, κῆρυξ πεισήνωρ; and *I HC* 368, 373. See e.g. Schembra 1994c, 321. *Il.* VI 278: κῆρυξ Ἰδαῖος πεπνυμένα μήδεα εἰδώς; *Od.* II 38: κῆρυξ Πεισήνωρ, πεπνυμένα μήδεα εἰδώς. In the *I HC*, the proper *nomen loquens* Πεισήνωρ («the one that convinces the/his crowds») becomes an adjective. For John as messenger cf. Clem. Alex. *Protr.* I 10,1: ὁ μὲν Ἰωάννης, ὁ κῆρυξ τοῦ λόγου. See further parallels in Schembra 2006, 142.

[21] Cf. Aristonicus, *De sign. Od.* XVIII 115-116; [Plut.] *De Homero II* 2263 (Kinstrand); Ps.-Nonn. *Schol. Or.* IV 48. For the reception of Homeric Echetus, whose name in the Christian poem means 'powerful' (from ἔχω), see Schembra 2006, 486-488, who believes that in portraying Pilate as such a dangerous man the cento draws on historical sources relating to Pilate's irascibility, *e.g.*, Philo, *Leg. ad G.* 299-304: ἦν γὰρ τὴν φύσιν ἀκαμπὴς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ αὐθάδους ἀμείλικτος […] βαρύμηνις («for he was inflexible in his disposition and rude as well as merciless […] and irascible»).

A more complex case is the man who invites Jesus over at *II HC* 1319-1320: ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε γέρων ἥρως ἐχένηος, | ὃς μύθοις ἐκέκαστο, παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδώς («and finally spoke the old rich man, who knew many stories and many things past»). The Odyssean lines summarize the introduction of the old Phaeacian man Echeneos (Ἐχένηος, ἔχω + ναῦς) whose name is typical of the subject's identity as one who possesses ships, as it is indeed the case of the Phaeacian old man. The etymology at play here was noticed by ancient critics and could be hardly missed by the authors of centos. Phaeacian names, it was known, often were compound with sea-related vocabulary[22]. Schembra 2007b, 203 believes that it designates here Simon Peter, and not Simon the Pharisee because of the etymological connotations of the root: Simon-Peter, unlike Simon the leper and Simon the Pharisee, is a fisherman and thus has a boat[23]. The rest of the passage however transposes the anointing of Jesus by the Sinful Woman from Matthew 26 that takes place in the house of Simon the leper[24]. If there is an etymological witticism here, then this is probably in relation to the host who is emphatically described as a rich man who possesses a house, fields and even a wheat field[25], as ἐχένειος. For the feminine noun ἡ νειός, fallow land, was considered a sign of prosperity and good luck[26]. Hesychius associated the noun ἡ νειός with the ionic type of the adjective νέος (ὁ νεῖος) through *parechesis* and argued that it implied the new-looking land, namely once it has been ploughed[27]. The understanding of ἐχένειος as denoting the rich landlord then is indicative of Simon's wealth in this poem and probably also alludes to his metaphorical rejuvenation as well, as the former leper was 'rejuvenated' when healed by Christ.

---

[22] Cf. Ariston. *De sign. Od.* VII 155,2 and Eust. *ad Od.* I 271: ὅτι δὲ τὰ πλείω τῶν Φαιακικῶν ὀνομάτων ναυτικὰ ἔκ τε νηῶν καὶ θαλάσσης εἰλημμένα («that most of the Phaeacian names are nautical, inspired from the ships and the sea»).

[23] And in this light he proposes the following emendation: instead of reading and correcting the toponym *II HC* 1326 Βηθανίην, found in the poem, Schembra 2007b, 203 proposes to read Βηθσαιδά, which would make sense for Simon-Peter.

[24] Cf. *II HC* 1332: αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς translates Mt 26:7: κατέχεεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς.

[25] *II HC* 1326-1328: Βηθανίην, ὅθι ⌜τοῦ γε δόμοι καὶ κτήματ'⌟ ⌞ἔασιν, | ἵξον δ', ἐς πεδίον πυρηφόρον, ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα | εἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσί τε αἴθοπα οἶνον («to Bethany, where he owned a house and fields, and they arrived in a wheat field, where afterwards they ate and drunk red wine»).

[26] Cf. *Il.* XVIII 541, the ploughing scene of the fallow land on Achilles' shield and Hes. *Op.* 463.

[27] Hsch. ν 238: νειός· κυρίως μὲν ἡ νεωστὶ μεταβεβλημένη γῆ, τουτέστιν ἠροτριωμένη· νέα γὰρ φαίνεται. (ἀπὸ τοῦ νέα φαίνεσθαι) 'νειῷ ἐνὶ τριπόλῳ'. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ πᾶσα πληθύουσα χώρα, ἢ θάλλουσα. Cf. Schol. A *ad Il.* X 353.

Translations of biblical terms and periphraseis

In other cases, a New Testament term or its context is translated into an archaic near- synonym. For example, the adjective εἰνάλιος ('of the sea') used to describe the sea-bird κορώνη in Homer is used in the plural to substitute the *koine* ἁλιεῖς, Jesus' disciples as fishermen[28]. Another interesting case is the Christian reuse of the ethnic φοῖνιξ to describe the woman with the issue of blood at *I HC* 1000 as follows: ἔσκε δὲ πατρὸς ἑοῖο γυνὴ φοίνισσ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ («there lived in her paternal house a woman with an issue of blood»). Schembra 2006, 311 stresses the adoption of the lowercase φ, giving φοίνισσ', 'the crimson one', as the epithet for the woman with the issue of blood, instead of upper-case Φ, giving Φοίνισσ' the ethnic 'Phoenician'. This suggestion is correct and reflects contemporary exegesis regarding the woman's menorrhagia[29]. On the other hand, the capital-letter Φοίνικες still remains relevant for the poem: Phoenicians as the inhabitants of the Red Sea were related to dark red or black colour, which, among other, was also associated with blood but also with the murderous character of Phoenicians throughout antiquity[30]. Simultaneously, these connotations should be viewed within the context of the New Testament since Jesus performed miracles among the Phoenicians or the Syro-Phoenicians that were interpreted as an invitation to the Gentiles[31]. When all this information is evaluated together, it emerges that in the Christian poem the Phoenician woman of the *Odyssey* embodies the previously violent (maybe because of their ritual sacrifices) gentiles and their conversion.

A less obvious case is the negative reuse of a typical Achillean characteristic for Judas, who is described as swift-footed. According to ancient scholiasts, the adjective invited further comparisons between Achilles and the equally swift Dolon or

[28] Schembra 2006, 225.

[29] Cf. Orig. *Frag. in Lk* 125, *PG* XVII 337: «but she was gushing forth blood endlessly and suffered from the 'phoenician sin'». This echoes the famous Is. 1:18: «If your sins are as scarlet (ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν), as snow they shall be white». Cf. Cyr. Alex. *in Lk* (*in catenis*), *PG* LXXII 637. On the illness of the woman as φοινικὴν ἁμαρτίαν cf. also Greg. Naz. *Or.* XL 33 (*PG* XXXVI 405 = *SCh* 358, 272).

[30] Cf. *Etym. Magn.* 797 s.v. Φοίνικες: πρότερον οἱ Φοίνικες ᾤκουν πρὸς τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν αὐτοῖς τοὔνομα […] s.v. Φοῖνιξ: παρὰ τὸ φόνος· φόνιοι γὰρ οἱ Φοίνικες, καὶ λῃστρικοὶ τὸν τρόπον («previously the Phoenicians were dwelling towards the Red Sea, and thus how they got this name […] [also] Phoenix, from 'murder'; for the Phoenicians are bellicose and thuggish in their manners»). For the connotations of the adjective *phoinik-* in imperial Greek as meaning red, blood, date, palm, dye, Achilles' teacher, and much more, especially in Heliodorus, see Bowie 1998.

[31] E.g. Mk 7:26, and Doak 2019, 667.

Hesiod's Atalanta[32]. In Judas' case, the cento solves the ambiguity by reusing the verse describing Dolon's swiftness while emphatically stressing this association in the following line that describes Judas' machinations as reflecting the Homeric spy's proper name: after all he is someone who knew παντοίους τε δόλους[33]. For a Christian reader, however, there is an additional semantic layer at play. Jesus in the Fourth Gospel asks Judas (or Satan inside him) to act swiftly: Jo 13:27, ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον[34]. Speed was required according to some exegetes for the quick fulfilment of the plan of salvation, for which betrayal and crucifixion were unavoidable[35]. Likewise (and even more so) in the *I HC* Judas acts swiftly, as the poem includes a detailed digression on his conspiracies preceding his betrayal that are not found in the canonical sources. The poem presents Judas' nocturnal *Doloneia* and his betrayal in the Garden as driven by extreme haste[36]. In the Christian cento then the adjective ποδώκης has an additional exegetical and metaphorical function: although it is not used as an alternative option for a biblical term as in the previous cases (*e.g.*, κλητοί, δαιμόνιος), it interprets Judas' swiftness as being a catalyst in the plan of salvation.

Homeric etymologies for Christian exegetical re-use

On other occasions, the poem's audience is prompted to choose from a variety of meanings that were attached to an archaic term and attested in Homeric criticism. An interesting example of the poem's engagement with the interpretative potential of Homeric etymology is the explanation of Odysseus' name which in

[32] Cf. Eust. *ad Il* I 531. Herodian *Prosod.* III 2,37: παρὰ γοῦν τῷ Ἡσιόδῳ ἀνεγνώκασι «ποδωκὴς δῖ' Ἀταλάντη»; Dio Chrys. *Or.* LV 13: ὅταν μὲν διηγῆται περὶ Δόλωνος, ὅπως μὲν ἐπεθύμησε τῶν ἵππων τῶν Ἀχιλλέως … καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ὤνησε τὸ τάχος («when [Homer] narrates about Dolon, and how he desired Achilles' horses … and how his swiftness was not to his benefit»). On the fact that the adjective encouraged comparisons with Achilles, see the analysis of Atalanta in Hesiod's *Ehoiai* in Ziogas 2013164-168.

[33] *I HC* 1487-1488: ὃς δή τοι ἦτορ μὲν ἔην κακός, ἀλλὰ ποδώκης, | εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά («who was indeed evil in his heart, but swift-footed, and he knew all sorts of machinations and wicked thoughts»).

[34] After which Judas swiftly leaves the room, Jo 13:30: ἐξῆλθεν εὐθύς.

[35] Orig. *in Jo* 32.23: προκαλούμενος τὸν ἀνταγωνιστὴν ἐπὶ τὴν πάλην, ἢ τὸν προδότην ἐπὶ τὸ διακονῆσαι τῇ σωτηρίῳ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐσομένῃ οἰκονομίᾳ («he is provoking his rival to fight, or the traitor to act for the fulfillment of the plan of salvation in the world»). See also Cyr. Alex. *in Jo* 2.372 (Pusey).

[36] *I HC* 1517: αὐτίκα; 1527: μάλα δ ὦκα; 1530: αὐτίκα.

the Christian poem is reused to describe the woman with the issue of blood as a sufferer, *I HC* 1017-1018: πολλοῖσιν δ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ δὴ ὀδυσσαμένη τόδ' ἱκάνω («for I, cursed by many, have arrived here»). These famous words are pronounced at *Odyssey* XIX 407-408 by Autolycus, Odysseus' grandfather, and provide one of the etymologies of the hero's name. Modern interpreters have investigated thoroughly whether the etymology of ὀδυσσάμενος is to be understood as passive (the one who is hated) or middle (the one who is angered against someone) or both[37]. However, the ancient scholia show that the interpretation of ὀδυσσάμενος was multi-layered: it could mean 'the hated' or 'the one provoking the (divine) wrath', or 'having caused harm'[38]. In this sense Strauss Clay 1983, 60 is closer to the original meaning when she translates it as 'cursed'. This is precisely the etymology proposed by the *I HC* as the haemorrhaging woman, being a miasma, is both cursed (with this disease) and, as a result, hated by everyone[39]. This reuse is not representative of late antique interpretation of the adjective but of the particular meaning the audience of the *I HC* was prompted to conjure through the biblical context as its reuse in Christian verse varies: for example, in the *Metaphrasis of the Psalms* ὀδυσσάμενος is used in the middle sense to describe God's anger because of human transgressions[40]. What is more, in the case of the haemorrhaging woman the adjective is employed with an additional metaphorical touch: her long woes in search of a cure are a kind of metaphoric *Odyssey* for which Odysseus' name was an adequate characterization[41].

In the description of the Harrowing of Hell, Christ fights with Hades who is similarly cast as a negative Achillean character. In this context the immortal lord of the underworld, vanquished, expresses the wish to become an ordinary mortal man rather than serve the risen Christ, *I HC* 2140-2141: βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἐὼν θητευέμεν ἄλλῳ | ὅς κε θνητὸς ἔην («I would rather be a mortal man and work for another who is mortal»). According to the ancient scholia the word

[37] Strauss Clay 1983, 60-65 with an detailed discussion of older scholarship, Doherty 2009, 92-93, Peradotto 1990, 127-135.

[38] *Schol. V ad Od.* XIX 407: ὀδυσσάμενος, μισηθείς· ἢ ὀργὴν ἀγαγών· ἢ βλάψας. On etymological interpretation in Homer see Lamberton 1986, 38. See also Vergados 2020, 13-14.

[39] See further Lefteratou 2017.

[40] *Met. Pss.* II 26: μηδὲ παρακλίνειας ὀδυσσάμενος θεράποντι («do not forsake by being angered at your slave»); II 104-105: αὐτὰρ ὁ μήνιε πάμπαν ἄναξ κακοεργέι λαῷ | κλήρου ὀδυσσάμενος σφετέρου ὑπερήφανον ὕβριν («and the lord was thoroughly wroth against his evil-doing people and cursed the arrogant insolence of his inheritence»).

[41] Cf. the woman's supplication of Jesus at *I HC* 1030: γούνων ἅψασθαι· χαλεπὸν δέ με πένθος ἱκάνει («to touch your knees; for I am consumed by a great distress»), revisits Odysseus' supplication of Arete at *Od.* VI 169.

ἐπάρουρος could denote a keeper or guard, a ploughman, or one living on earth as synonym of ἐπίγειος (ἐπί + ἄρουρα/γῆ)[42]. It is this last sense that is reclaimed in the Christian poem and not the one used in Homer for Achilles who famously compares the glum posthumous heroic *kleos* as king among the dead to the happier and humble life of a ploughman[43]. In other words, the Christian poem here adopts one of the interpretations proposed by the scholiasts which is not necessarily the one related to the specific Homeric passage.

Other centonic reuses imply that the audience of the biblical poem was encouraged to consider various interpretations, including some that were not necessarily applied to the Homeric text. Ὑπερφίαλος, for example, which was often associated with Penelope's suitors, was an adjective that had negative connotations already in the Homeric poems[44]. It was etymologically associated with the verbs φῶ, a phantom version of the verb φαίνω[45], meaning the one who arrogantly attempts to overshadow the others[46]. Ancient scholiasts, however, observe that the adjective could also have a positive sense, since the suitors address their peers using it, and therefore it cannot be negative in such contexts[47]. When describing Jesus'

[42] The word θητευέμεν here in the broader sense of working for a wage and not as a serf, e.g. Ps. Zonaras, s.v. θ 1044: θητεύειν. ἐπὶ μισθῷ δουλεύειν. Suda s.v. θ 374.

[43] Cf. *Od.* XI 489-490: βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἐὼν θητευέμεν ἄλλῳ, | ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ βίοτος πολὺς εἴη, | ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν («I would rather follow the plow as thrall to another man, one with no land allotted him and not much to live on, than be a king over all the perished dead»). *Etym. Mag.* 353, s.v. ἐπάρουρος. In a similar sense it is used in Nonn. *Par.* VI 177; cf. Franchi 2013, 469, where it denotes the farmers who are expected to participate in the eucharistic banquet.

[44] The term was already used in oracular epic language to describe transgression, e.g. *Or. Sib.* I 105, III 73 and *passim,* and later for the Pharisees in Nonn. *Par.* XI 234; an amusing case is its parodic reuse for octopuses in Opp. *Hal.* II 590, on which see Kneebone 2020, 142.

[45] Phantom or 'ghost words', according to Reece 2009, 111, «were invented by lexicographers in their attempts to explain the meaning of what was to them an etymologically inexplicable» terms, and which are known only to scholiasts and glossographers.

[46] *Schol. A ad Il.* XV 94: ὑπερφίαλος. ὑπερήφανος, ἄδικος. ἀπηνής. χαλεπὸς, σκληρός. Orion *Etym.* s.v. υ 156: παρὰ τὸ φῶ, οὗ παράγωγον φαίνω. ὁ ὑπερφαίνειν τῶν ἄλλων ἑαυτὸν ἐπιχειρῶν δεῖξαι, ὅ ἐστιν ὑπερήφανος («derived from the verb to say [in the sense of revealing], a derivative of which is the verb to appear/show. For the one who attempts to show himself better than the others he is called the proud»); also in Ps.-Zonaras s.v. υ 1768 and in the *Etym. Mag.* 780 *s.v.*.

[47] Suda υ 385: ποτὲ μὲν ἐπὶ ψόγου· ὑπερφίαλος καὶ ἀπηνής. ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἔνσπονδος. ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ ἐπὶ ἐγκωμίου· ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ὑμῖν δαίνυσθαι (*Od.* II 310 and XXI 289). ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῖς («on some occasions it is used to express blame: for example, "arrogant and rough"

meekness and humility the negative associations of the term are signaled as still being a possibility, as for example at *I HC* 196: ὡς ἐμὸς οὔ ποτε θυμὸς ὑπερφίαλος καὶ ἀπηνής. The line is repeated at *I HC* 1551 in order to describe Judas for whom the negative connotations hold true[48]. On the other hand, when the adjective is used with respect to Jesus' μνηστῆρες, his disciples, the Homeric reader needs to work past the negative associations attached to Penelope's suitors in the *Odyssey.* Thus, at *I HC* 1415, ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ὑμῖν, Jesus holds the Last Supper with his brave disciples, and at *I HC* 2224 the angel tells Mary to report the resurrection to the μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισιν. These cases indicate that the etymology of the word was restricted and defined by its immediate context and thus open to scrutiny, inviting an engaged reader to ponder on the options. On the other hand, the banquet context in which these appear at *I HC* 1415, the Last Supper, is suggestive of a similar association of the adjective with the drinking cup, the φιάλη. Homeric scholiasts considered the possibility that the arrogant behaviour of the suitors might be related to their drinking habits, as they were drinking from the same bottle[49]. While this may or not be true for the suitors, it is nonetheless the case in the Last Supper where the disciples share wine from the same cup as a prefiguration of the communion[50], in which case the etymology may be used in *Kontrastimitation* and with eucharistic connotations[51].

A different approach is taken with respect to adjectives indicating human foolishness and disobedience, such as νηπύτιος and νήπιος. Νηπύτιος is employed in

---

used instead of "not gentle"; bot on other cases as praise: "to dine with your excellencies"»). Cf. Apollon. *Lex.* s.v. 158 (Bekker): οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἑαυτοὺς κακῶς ἔλεγον («for they would not be badmouthing themselves»). For the reuse of the adjective in Christian verse cf. Nonn. *Par.* XI 234 and Spanoudakis 2014, 356, argues that the adjective described all sort of transgressions, also hybris against the divine. Cf. its use in *Or. Sib.* 1.105, 3.73, in a similar sense.

[48] For Judas see *I HC* 1549-1550: σχέτλιος, αἰὲν ἀλιτρός, ἐμῶν μενέων ἀπερωεύς, | ἄγριος, οὔτε δίκας εὖ εἰδὼς οὔτε θέμιστας («the cursed, the always evil, the one who always rebuts my plans; a wild one, who knows of neither justice nor established laws»).

[49] *Schol. ad Od.* II 310e: ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς μὲν φιάλης ἤγουν ποτηρίου πίνειν ἐν συμποσίῳ τοὺς πάντας. τοὺς δὲ ἀναισχύντως καὶ ἀπαιδεύτως τῇ φιάλῃ προσκαθημένους ὑπερφιάλους ὠνόμαζον («it was a custom among men of old in banquets to drink all from one cup, i.e., from one cup. And those who were sitting next to the bottle shamelessly and boorishly they called them 'over-the-bottle'»). Also in Athen. *Deipn.* 11.24 (Olson = 90 Kaibel).

[50] Mt 26:27: καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου.

[51] Which is supported by the poem's allusions to food and drink at *I HC* 1452-1453: ὦ πόποι, ⌋ ⌊οὔ πως ἔστιν ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ὑμῖν | ⌈ἔσθ⌉ειν ⌈καὶ πίν⌉ειν, ⌋ ⌊ἔτι καὶ παρέκειτο τράπεζα («alas, it is not possible to dine and drink with your excellencies, although the table is set»).

the Christian poem for Judas at *I HC* 1687 and 1567[52] and its etymology is given by the very Homeric line used for it as at *Il.* XXI 441: νηπύτι' ὡς ἄνοον κραδίην ἔχες («imprudent; for you had a mindless heart»). In this verse νηπύτιος is taken as a synonym of ἄνοος[53]. In a similar vein ancient lexicographers derive the adjective from νη and πινυτός[54]. Likewise, νήπιος is used in the Homeric poems for the transgressive behavior of Odysseus' companions which is punished accordingly in *Od.* I 7-8: αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο, | νήπιοι («for they perished because of their own wickedness, fools»). The *Etymologicum Magnum* collects several of the ancient etymologies associated with the adjective: the ignorant, the fool, the gentle, the speechless (therefore the baby), or even the greasy one[55]. Among these the Christian cento retains the interpretation of foolishness as punishable transgression and uses it for the poem's villains, such as Herod. The king's arrogance and wickedness explicitly contrasts him to the innocents, whom he slaughters through a word-play between νήπιος and νηπιάχοις, the innocent babies of Bethlehem[56]. By contrast, when applying the adjective to Jesus on the cross

[52] Cf. also *II HC* 1567.

[53] This is the case of what Marzullo (1968) defined as the principle of «coppia contiguo». Namely, the case in which two terms found close to each other in a literary text are taken not as synonyms but as having identical meaning, or as *lemma* and *explicatio*.

[54] Cf. Ps.-Zonaras, s.v. νυ 1387: νηπύτιος. ἄφρων, ἀνόητος. παρὰ τὸ νη στερητικὸν καὶ τὸ πινυτὸν γέγονε νηπινύτιος, καὶ συγκοπῇ τοῦ ι καὶ τοῦ ν νηπύτιος («*nepytios*. The foolish, the mindless. From *ne* privative and the *pinyton* ('wise') it became *nepinytios*, and with shortening of *iota* and *nu, nepytios*»). On a different Christianized use of *nepytios* as indicating the uninitiated ones cf. Agosti (1989), 114, on *Orphica Lithica* (Halleux, Scharmp) 4.

[55] *Etym. Magn.* 604 s.v νήπιος: ἄφρων, ἀνόητος. παρὰ τὸ ἥπιος, πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ν, ὁ πρᾶος καὶ προσηνὴς, καὶ νήπια ποιῶν.Ἢ παρὰ τὸ ΝΗ στερητικὸν καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν γίνεται νηέπιος, καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν νήπιος, ὁ μὴ δυνάμενος λέγειν.Ἢ νήβιος, ὁ ἐστερημένος τοῦ βίου· καὶ νήπιον, τὸ ἐστερημένον τῶν βιωτικῶν φροντίδων.Ἢ παρὰ τὸ ΝΗ ἐπιτατικὸν καὶ τὸ πῖον, τὸ λιπαρόν.Ἢ ἥπιον, τὸ πρᾶον καὶ μὴ ἔχον ὀργὴν, μετὰ τοῦ ἐπιτατικοῦ.Ἢ νέον πῖον). πρᾶον καὶ μὴ ἔχον ὀργὴν, μετὰ τοῦ ἐπιτατικοῦ.Ἢ νέον πῖον («*nepios*: the ignorant; the fool. From the *hepios,* because of redundancy of *nu,* meaning the meek and gentle, and acting kingly. Or from *ne* privative and to say it becomes *nhepios* [νη + ἔπος], and after the syncope *nepios,* namely the one who cannot speak. Or *nebios,* the one who is deprived of life; and from *nepion*, the one which is deprived of the worries pertaining to life; or from the emphatic *ne* and *pion,* the fatty one. Or gentle, calm, the one without anger, with the emphatic [particle]. Or from new grease»).

[56] *I HC* I 313-315: πολλὰ δ' ἀτάσθαλ' ἔρεξε βίῃ καὶ κάρτεϊ εἴκων, | πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλων, πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν | νήπιος· ἦ τε πολέσσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα | νηπιάχοις («[Herod] did many wicked deeds, yielding to violence and power; for he wished to dominate everything, to rule everyone – the fool; for himself he robbed the life of many in-

the poem seems to play with a double interpretative outcome. At *I HC* 1992-1993 the good thief on Golgotha asks Jesus: νήπιός εἰς, ὦ ξεῖνε, λίην τόσον ἠὲ χαλίφρων, | ἦε ἑκὼν μεθιεῖς καὶ τέρπεαι ἄλγεα πάσχων («dear stranger, are you a fool, or are you such a thoughtless man? Or are you willingly giving up and taking pleasure in woes?»). Meekness was a particularly important Christian characteristic. The *I HC* in its introductory passage featuring God's dialogue with Christ about the Salvation had already highlighted Christ's aptitude for martyrdom as a *sine qua non* for his mission: Jesus can succeed if he remains soft tempered, pleasant, gentle, and kind even in hardship[57]. So when the etymological play between νήπιος-χαλίφρων is employed here, although it is intended ironically by the thief, it still highlights Christ's sublime sacrifice for the sake of humanity.

Semantic leaps, exegetical challenges

In some other cases the etymology of a particular word has to be discarded altogether or a significant semantic stretch is required in order to decode the Christian poem. A complex and exegetically confusing case is the description of the salve used to embalm Jesus' body in the entombment scene. The lines employed, albeit in reverse order, are those used for Thetis' balm with which she prevents Patroclus' body from decaying. These are reclaimed for the embalming of Jesus' dead body at *I HC* 2044-2246: ἐν λεχέεσσι δὲ θέντες ἑανῷ λιτὶ κάλυψαν | ἐς πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς, καθύπερθε δὲ φάρεϊ λευκῷ. | καί δ' ὠτειλὰς πλῆσαν ἀλείφατος ἐννεώροιο («and they placed him in a bier and covered him with fine linen, from feet to head, and atop they placed a white cloth; and filled the wounds with pricey balm»). In Patroclus' case Thetis[58], a goddess, provides a temporary solution to the issue of the dead body's exposure to decay and putrefaction before its burial. In the Iliadic context, ἐννέωρος was interpreted as meaning nine years (ἐννέα + ὥρος) and in a later interpretation the number nine might have been used to

fants»). For the association of ἀτασθαλίαι with foolishness in Christian poetry cf. also Juda's punishment at *I HC* I 1350; and also in *Or. Sib.* IV 38, IV 156 (μέγα νήπιοι), echoing here also Hesiod's portrayal of Perses. For the term in Hesiod, see Strauss Clay 1993, and Maravela 2019, who, nonetheless, does not consider in depth the Christian reception.

[57] *I HC* 109-110: οὐ γάρ τοι γλυκύθυμος ἀνὴρ ἦν οὐδ' ἀγανόφρων, | οὔτις ἔτι πρόφρων ἀγανὸς καὶ ἤπιος ἐστὶν. On the Christian notion of meekness cf. *2Tim.* 2:24: δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἤπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας, διδακτικόν, ἀνεξίκακον («and the Lord's servant must not be quarrelsome but must be kind to everyone, able to teach, not resentful»).

[58] ~ *Il.* XVIII 352, 353, and 351.

describe what was understood to be an oil that had been fermented for nine years and was consequently powerful because of its age[59]. While this etymology works for the *Iliad* and is also persuasive in the Christian poem, there is a danger of reading the passage too literally, as it might hint to a miaphysitic agenda[60]: Christ's is not a decaying cadaver after all but the body of the risen Theanthropos. It might still be worth investigating a possible Christian reading by emphasizing the associations with the number nine. In the Gospels it is a pricey aloe ointment that is used for Jesus' body, a plant that was not known in the Greek world before Alexander[61]. John's mention of the expensive aloe supports the etymology of ἐννεώροιο as old and/or costly oil. To this, Christian exegesis gives an additional twist: according to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus died on the ninth hour[62], a temporal precision also replicated in early Christian ritual. In a speech to the baptizands John Chrysostom compares the redemption of the good thief to that of the prospect Christian and stresses that their mutual confession, which, allegedly, happens on the ninth hour of the day[63]. Given the lack of relevant aloe-related centos, the reclaim of the verses about Thetis' balm may provide an an explanation concerning the hour of Jesus' death which, like the ointment, is also salvific, for humans. In this respect, potential and not strictly orthodox insinuations may be quelled as the balm, especially if this is considered to be an oil, is exegetically related to the hour of Jesus' death and thus symbolically foreshadows not a temporary but an eternal salvation from decay and death[64].

Another problematic passage which presupposed several semantic leaps on the part of the reader is the digression on Jesus' holy blood as prefiguring the Eucharist. When pierced by the soldier's spear Jesus' wound in the *I HC* pours forth a kind of liquid that has many affinities with Helen's famous drug-wine from *Odyssey* IV, in an eloquent description seen from the passage quoted below:

---

[59] *Schol. ex. ad Il.* XVIII 315a: ὡς φαρμακώδη δύναμιν ἔχοντος τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἐλαίου («because the medicinal power of the old ointment was so powerful»). And Eust. *ad Il.* IV 189.

[60] For the alleged monophysitism of Eudocia, see Livrea 1997, 51; also Holum 1982, 224.

[61] Jo 19:39: μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν. For the use of aloe after Alexander's campaign see Scarborough 1982.

[62] Jesus delivers his spirit on the ninth hour, ca 15:00, Mt 27:46: περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων; and Mk 15:34 and Lk 23:44.

[63] Jo Chrys. *Catech. ad bapt.* 117 (Papadopoulos-Kerameus): ὅταν οὖν μέλλῃς εἰσάγεσθαι καὶ σὺ κατὰ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν, ἀναμιμνήσκου καὶ σὺ τοῦ μεγέθους τῶν κατορθωμάτων («similarly then when you are about to be introduced around the ninth hour remember you too the magnitude of these miracles»).

[64] For oil in Christian ritual, especially the baptism see, *e.g.* Norderval 2011.

> εἶθαρ δ᾽ ἄμβροτον αἷμα κατάρρεεν ἐξ ὠτειλῆς, | 1969 ~ *Il.* V 870
> νηπενθές τ᾽ ἄχολόν τε κακῶν τ᾽ ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων. | 1970 ~ *Od.* IV 221
> τοῦτό νυ καὶ γέρας οἷον ὀιζυροῖσι βροτοῖσιν. | 1971 ~ *Od.* IV197
> οὔ ποτέ τοι θάνατον προτιόσσετο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ, | 1972 ~ *Od.* XIV 219
> ὃς τὸ καταβρώξειεν, ἐπὴν κρητῆρι μιγείη· | 1973 ~ *Od.* IV 222
> οὐκ ἂν ἐφημέριός γε βάλοι κατὰ δάκρυ παρειῶν, | 1974 ~ *Od.* IV 223
> οὐδ᾽ εἴ οἱ κατατεθναίη μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε, | 1975 ~ *Od.* IV 224
> ἠὲ κασίγνητος ὁμογάστριος ἠὲ καὶ υἱός. | 1976 ~ *Il.* XXIV 47
>
> Immediately there gushed forth from the wound immortal blood which quenches sorrows, bitterness, and all painful memories. This is the only boon for miserable mortals! For your brave soul will never look upon at death [in fear] if it consumes it, once mixed in a bowl. And no longer shall a mortal shed a tear even if his mother were to die or his father nor his uterine brother or even his son.

The Spartan queen used her Egyptian drugs to sooth Menelaus' and Telemachus' lamentations. According to a scholiast, as these were the cause of their sorrow and irritation, Helen «took incredibly upon herself the elimination of grief and anger, through which the other passions are quenched»[65]. Yet a rounded reading of the three adjectives – νηπενθές, ἄχολον, ἐπίληθον – is found in Eustathius who reports centuries of Homeric criticism as follows (*ad Od.* I 161):

> Νηπενθὲς δέ, οὐ μόνον τὸ ἐστερημένον πένθους, ἀλλ᾽ ἰδοὺ ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸ στερίσκον πένθους. Ὅ ἐστιν ἄλυπον. Ἄχολον δὲ, τὸ ἀόργητον. ἄλλως μέντοι, καὶ ἄχολα ζῷα τὰ μὴ ἔχοντα σωματικὴν χολήν. Τὸ δὲ ἐπίληθον, Ἀρίσταρχος μὲν προπαροξυτόνως γράφει, ὡς ὄνομα οὐδέτερον, ὃ δηλοῖ τὸ ἐπιληστικόν.
>
> Νηπενθές, not only the deprived of grief but in this case here the one that deprives of grief, namely the one that frees from pain. Ἄχολον now means the not irascible, for the docile animals don't have a bile. The word ἐπίληθον, Aristarchus writes it as a proparoxytone as a neutral noun, which means that which contributes to obliviousness.

Such an interpretation is in accordance with the use of Helen's magical drug for the temporal soothing of her distressed guests, but it would have been inappropriate for the eucharistic connotations associated with Christ's holy immortal blood

[65] *Schol. ad Od.* IV 206. Cf. Hsch. α 8890: ἄχολον· ἀποσκευαζόμενον τὴν ὀργήν. κωλυτικὴν ὀργῆς δύναμιν ἔχον («anger-less: the one that wards off anger; that has the power to rebut anger»).

which is also stressed in the poem (*I HC* 1969: ἄμβροτον αἷμα), a fascinating case of *Kontrastimitation*. In the Gospel the sacrifice is to be remembered as an eucharistic ritual that guarantees eternal life: λάβετε, πίετε, τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν[66]. In revising the passage, the centonist added lines in this digression on Helen's drugs which contribute towards the new intended interpretation. Line *I HC* 1972 (~ *Od.* XIV 219: οὔ ποτέ τοι θάνατον προτιόσσετο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ) provides an additional dimension to νηπενθές, as it shows death's lack of power, before resuming with the relevant lines from the *Odyssey* (*I HC* 1974 ~ *Od*. IV 223: οὐκ ἂν ἐφημέριός γε βάλοι κατὰ δάκρυ παρειῶν, including the hyperbole in lines 1975-1976). In this new rearrangement of Homeric lines, the verb προτιόσσετο (to forbode, foreshadow)[67] metaphorically makes of the blood a type of the eucharist for the mortals (ἐφημέριοι)[68].

In a similar vein the other three adjectives may be re-semanticized through the Christian canon. For example, ἄχολος, may echo the sour wine with gall that was offered to Jesus on the cross[69], which Jesus counters in his sacrifice by providing his blood a sweet brewage[70]. An erudite Christian reader like Clement reuses the Homeric line to describe the Leviticus as a soothing song and finds 'sweetness' in it, by presumably interpreting ἄχολον in the metaphorical medicinal sense as lacking in bile and, consequently, not bitter but sweet[71]. As a result, the traditional

[66] With variations in Mt 26:26, Mk 14:22, 1Cor 11:24.

[67] Cf. Porph. *Hom. quaest.* 98 (Sodano): προεμαντεύετο.

[68] Schembra 2006, 536 on the eucharistic associations; Schembra is puzzled about the lack of water appearing in the cento revision as opposed to Jo 19:34; but this is probably already hinted in the mixed drink at *I HC* 1973: ἐπὴν κρητῆρι μιγείη.

[69] Matthew 27:34: οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον; recalling Psalm 69:21 and with respect to the 'bitter cup' that he mentions in the Garden in Mt 20:22 and 26:39 and 42; cf. Mk 10:38, Lk 22:42, Jo 18:11.

[70] Cf. [Jo Chrys.] *In resurrect.* 91: ἐκεῖνοι ἔσφαξαν ἡμεῖς ὀψωνήσαμεν, ἐκεῖνοι τὴν πλευρὰν διώρυξαν ἡμεῖς τὸ μυστικὸν γάλα ἠντλήσαμεν, ἐκεῖνοι τὸ ὄξος ἡμεῖς τὸ αἷμα, ἐκεῖνοι τὴν χολὴν ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν γλυκύτητα, ἐκεῖνοι τὸν τάφον ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν οὐρανόν («they [the Jews] murdered [Christ] but we benefited from the trade; they opened his side, but we drew the mystic milk; they got the vinegar but we got the blood; they got the bile but we got the sweetness; they got death and we the heavens»). Didym. *in Ps.* 68:21, 7171a argues that the wine came from the sour Jewish vine. And *AAPhilippi* 141: καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἔχων τὴν γλυκύτητα, καὶ ἐνέπτυσαν αὐτὸν ποτίσαντες αὐτὸν χολήν, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τοὺς πικρανθέντας τῆς γλυκύτητος αὐτοῦ γεύσασθαι («and he is the one who is sweet/gratifying, and they spat upon him and poured him gall, so that the embittered ones may taste his sweetness»).

[71] Clem. Alex. *Protr.* I 2,3: ἀλλὰ τῆς καινῆς ἁρμονίας τὸν ἀίδιον νόμον, τὸν φερώνυμον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ καινόν, τὸ Λευιτικόν, «νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθες ἁπάντων»· γλυκύ τι καὶ ἀληθινὸν φάρμακον πειθοῦς ἐγκέκραται τῷ ᾄσματι («but the law

interpretation as gall-free and as a near synonym of sweet is a possibility within the new context. The case of ἐπίληθον is more challenging, as in the Gospel the re-enactment of the passion is important in the prefiguration of the eucharist during the Last Supper (εἰς ἀνάμνησιν). This parallel passage implies that in the Christian poem it is not the mortals who drink the eucharist those who are bound to forget but God; instead it is their sins that will sink into oblivion, a popular theme among biblical exegetes[72]. In this case the parallel texts from the New Testament expand on the Homeric connotations of the word and provide a new exegetical commentary for which Homeric etymology could not provide appropriate material.

Archaic terms in Christian and Platonic guise

The last case I want to examine deals with the intertextual influence of Christian poetry, and not the Bible, on the interpretation of key themes such as the poet's inspiration by the Holy Spirit, or an Angel, or in some cases by Christ in person, all of which substitute the classical *topos* of the invocation to the Muse[73]. In these occasions neither Homer nor the Bible and its exegesis are enough to explain the Christian revision which is better understood if seen through the lens of Graeco-Roman *paideia* altogether. When the cento poet appears to refer to her soul, or rather her *thymos* as the origin of her song, as seen below, she invokes several interpretative layers of the word:

> Κέκλυτε, μυρία φῦλα ⌜περικτιόνων⌟ ⌞ἀνθρώπων, | 1 ~ *Il.* XVII 220+*Od.* II 65
> ὅσσοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες, | 2 ~ *Od.* VIII 222
> ἠμὲν ὅσοι ναίουσι πρὸς ἠῶ τ᾽ ἠέλιόν τε, | 3 ~ *Od.*XIII 240
> ἠδ᾽ ὅσσοι μετόπισθε ποτὶ ζόφον ἠερόεντα, | 4 ~ *Od.*XIII 241
> ὄφρ᾽ εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει, 5 ~ *Il.* VII 68
> ὡς εὖ γινώσκητ᾽ θεὸν ἠδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα, | 6 ~ *Il.* V 128
> ὃς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσων | 7 ~ *Il.* XII 242

---

of the new harmonious eternal [covenant], the one named after God, the new song, Leviticus, "that averts sorrow, anger, and makes forget all"; for a sweet and true medicine of persuasion is mixed in the song»).

[72] Cyr. Alex. *Epist. PG* LXXVII 653: δεδώρηται τοίνυν ἡμῖν πλημμελημάτων ἄφεσιν, ἀνεξίκακον ἀγάπην. διασεσώσμεθα γὰρ, λήθην ὥσπερ τινὰ λαβόντος τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μικροψυχίας («for we have been granted remission of sins, a forbearing love. For we have been saved as if God had forgotten, as it were, about human pettiness»).

[73] On the Christianization of the Muses' role in Greek poetry, see Agosti 2015, 92-93, who argues that the Muses ultimately remained the personifications of poetic inspiration, but were increasingly represented in the guise of angels.

> Hearken you, myriad human clans who all around reside, you mortals who now dwell on the earth and feed yourselves with grain, and those who live towards the East and the Sun(rise) and all of you (who dwell) the last towards the misty darkness, |so that I tell of all those things that my heart inside compels me, so that you acknowledge doubtlessly the one who is god and human, the one who governs over all, mortals and gods alike.

The *I HC* in fact attests to several uses of θυμός as found in the *LSJ*[74]: it may indicate the soul as desire to do something (*I HC* 475: ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει; *I HC* 196: πέμψω δ' ὅππῃ σε κραδίη θυμός τε κελεύει); the disposition and temper (*I HC* 141: καὶ δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἵλαος ἔστω; 196: ὡς ἐμὸς οὔ ποτε θυμὸς ὑπερφίαλος καὶ ἀπηνής); the spirit/courage (*I HC* 608: ὣς εἰπὼν ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου); anger and (divine) wrath (*I HC* 149-150: μηδὲ μεγαλίζεο θυμῷ, | ὡς μὴ πάντες ὄλωνται ὀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο); the heart (*I HC* 1039: ἐν θυμῷ, γρηῦ, χαῖρε καὶ ἴσχεο); and the mind/thought (*I HC* 346: ἥδε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή, | Αἴγυπτόνδ' ἰέναι). In some cases, the Homeric term probably alludes to life in the physical sense: *e.g.*, several sufferers wish to die an ignoble death (*I HC* 847: βούλομ' ἅπαξ πρὸς κῦμα χανὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι; 1005: θυμὸν ἀποπνείουσ' ὥς τε σκώληξ ἐπὶ γαίῃ); or the infanticide Herod meets his doom (*I HC* 315 νήπιος· ἦ τε πολέσσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα); or the homicide Judas suicides (*I HC* 1476: θυμὸν ἀπὸ μελέων δῦναι δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω).

These uses correspond loosely to the basic Homeric uses of the noun[75], but the context had changed by Late Antiquity especially because of an interest in Plato's works. In the discussion at *Resp.* 439e Plato had defined the three parts of the soul as consisting of λογιστικόν, θυμικόν, and ἐπιθυμητικόν, a division inherited by the Christian Fathers, who adapted it, with variations, to their own anatomy of the soul[76], usually addressing particularly the emotional part[77]. Christian poets had also inherited the etymology of θυμός from θύω found in Plato's *Cratylus*[78], and its corresponding sacrificial imagery of the burning fume linking the earthly and the ce-

[74] Cf. *LSJ* s.v.

[75] In Homer *thymos* was not necessarily identified with the soul but it is one of the Homeric 'mental organs', such as *kardie* or *phren*; the classic study is Webster 1957; for *thymos* as part of the body-soul, see Bremmer 1983, 55-56 where it is also part of the soul and directs action. For an overview of the relevant literature, see Cairns 2014. For Stoic influence in later poets such as Quintus, see Maciver 2017.

[76] See Marmodoro Cartwright 2018 for an overview.

[77] Cf. Euseb. *PG* XXIII 1261,26, *In Ps.* 27.

[78] Plat. *Crat.* 419e: ἀπὸ τῆς θύσεως καὶ ζέσεως τῆς ψυχῆς («from the rage and the boiling of the soul»). For the Stoic association of *thymos* and *pneuma*, see Buffière 1956, 257-260. For Homer and allegorical Platonic interpretation, see Lamberton 1986.

lestial realms. Accordingly, Schembra 2006 rightly conjectures that in a Christian context such as the *I HC* 1 the word θυμός probably refers to the participation of the Holy Spirit that prompts the poem's poet-preacher to speak from the heart[79]. Adjunct to this evidence is also the parallel passages from the Septuagint where θυμός may be associated with God's πνεῦμα as source of miracles, as it is the case in the Exodus[80], and not only with his punitive wrath. It is in this sense that the poem uses the term in the proem, especially since in the other two occasions where a speaker addresses the *thymos* these words are placed in the mouth of Christ, in his first and last address to his disciples[81]. In this respect, the reuse of a similar formula to open the poem implies at the intratextual level a Christ-inspired narrative in which the narrator-poet is emotionally present and whose message is the revelation of the Theanthropos (6: θεὸν ἠδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα)[82]. In this occasion it is Platonic etymology that is used to replace the address to the Spirit or an Angel in order to maintain the cultural connotations related to the Christian *topos* of divine inspiration.

Another important case is the reuse of the adjective ἐτήτυμος, that appears four times in the *I HC,* including the *Apologia,* one of the poem's prefaces that is attributed to Eudocia[83]. Here I will discuss its function in the miracle of the Resurrection of Jairus' Daughter in both longer redactions, *I HC* and *II HC* respectively as the differences show that the reuse of the word by Eudocia seems to be a conscious reclaim. Jesus is invited to heal the girl when the messenger brings the news of her death. The reaction of Jesus is strikingly different in the two poems although in both cases his answer foreshadows her resurrection. In the *I HC,* what has been

[79] Cf. a similar use of the heart in Greg. Naz. *PG* XXXVII 1229B, 18-21: ἀλλ' ἔμπης τά με θυμὸς ἐποτρύνει καὶ ἀνώγει, (~ *Il.* VI 439 and XV 43) | φθέγξομαι, οὐκ ἐθέλων μὲν, ἀτὰρ λόγον ἔκτοθε ῥήξω | ψυχῆς, ὡς ὅτε κῦμα βιώμενον ἔνδοθι λάβρῳ | Πνεύματι («but still, what my soul urges and instructs me, that | will I speak, without my wish, but I will burst forth a speech | from my soul, just as the wave which is compelled from the inside by the violent Spirit»). Cf. the similar prompting of the Angel in the *Vis. D.* 340: ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀοιδήν. For the *I HC* see Schembra 2006, 80-81 with earlier literature.

[80] Cf. Ex.15:8: καὶ διὰ πνεύματος τοῦ θυμοῦ σου διέστη τὸ ὕδωρ. See also 2 *Reg.* 22:13: ἀπὸ πνοῆς πνεύματος θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ.

[81] *I HC*: 474-475: κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγακλειτῆς βασιλείης, | ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει, Jesus' first address to the disciples; and *I HC* 2347-2348: κεκλῦτε, φίλοι,⌟ ⌞καὶ μή τι θυμῷ ἀγάσησθε ἕκαστος, | ὄφρα ἔπος εἴποιμι τό μοι καταθύμιόν ἐστιν, his last address to his disciples at the Ascension.

[82] On the Theanthropos, see Schembra 2006, 87; for the involved narrator of the poem, see also Kuhn-Treichel 2017.

[83] *Apol.* 5 with respect to Patricius', her predecessors' combination of centos. Also, at *I HC* 1102, 1922 addressing Jesus' god-man identity, and at 770 that I discuss here. The adjective appears only once at *HC*$^{\gamma}$ 103.

said is dismissed with a moderate negation, *I HC* 770: ὥς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος, ὡς ἀγορεύεις («thus untrue is the word that you are telling»). The corresponding passage in the *II HC,* however, consists of an abrupt response *II HC* 555: ψευστήσεις, οὐδ' αὖτε τέλος μύθῳ ἐπιθήσεις («you will lie and will not tell the full truth»). The *II HC* option may seem more obvious ψευστήσεις is a Homeric word with an afterlife in later *koine*[84]: it was a word that the audience would have been familiar with and here also used for the sake of the effect of *parechesis/homoeoteleuton* (ψευστ-ήσεις, ἐπιθ-ήσεις). Given that the verse comes from Hera's speech as she tries to bind Zeus and trick him into ensuring Eurystheus' claim to the throne (*Il.* XIX 106-107), it is hard to understand why a centonist would have used a line that evokes this rather awkward and negatively received Iliadic context[85]. By contrast, Jesus' reply in *I HC* 770 has interesting intertextual and philosophical ramifications. The line is found in Penelope's reprimand of Eurycleia, who brings unexpected news of the suitors' death (*Od.* XXIII 62). Read against this Homeric context, the verse implies a *Kontrastimitation:* the suitors are in fact dead whereas the girl is not. Nevertheless, the line had a long afterlife, first through Stesichorus, who famously adapted it to assert Helen's innocence, and then through Plato's *Phaedrus*[86]. Eventually the recollection of the "truthful myth" (μῦθος ἐτήτυμος) was used to underscore the incompatibility between the real world and the world of ideas, between true vision and illusion for both pagans and Christians[87]. Consequently, its reuse in the *I HC* may well suggest a kind of spiritual blindness that affects the speaker and prevents him from seeing the truth thus adding one more philosophical layer to the negative formulation found in the *I HC* : death is no longer a 'reality' but a 'perception', which for the Christian believer tantamount to a confession of resurrection in the flesh. If interpreted in this manner then the required editing of Patricius' text – ἀλλ' ἔμπης οὐ πάγχυ ἐτήτυμα πάντ' ἀγόρευεν («he still did not preach everything entirely truthfully», *apol.* 5) – may also imply that the editing involved also issues pertaining to the orthodox doctrine. Such an

[84] Cf. the compounds with ψευδ- in Lampe s.v.

[85] Ancient readers were puzzled at the framing of Zeus as a liar and the text was thought to be corrupted here; see Hsch. ψ 133: ψευστήσεις· ψεύστης εἶ; by contrast see, *e.g.*, *Schol.* T *ad Il.* XIX 107: ψευστήσεις: ὑφ' ἓν Ἀρίσταρχος, ἀντικειμένως τῷ ἀληθεύσεις· ἄτοπον γὰρ τὸ διαιρεῖν ψεύστης εἶς.

[86] Stesich. *fr.* 192 *PMG* = 91a and c Finglass: οὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος, οὐδ᾽ ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσέλμοις [...] ; Plat. *Phaedr.* 243a. On Stesichorus' debt to Homer, see Beecroft 2006.

[87] *E.g.* Greg. Naz. *Carm. mor. PG* XXXVII 776,8: μῦθον ἐτήτυμον; *Met. Pss.*, *Proth.* 20: μῦθοι ἐτήτυμοι. Note that Nonnus uses the adjective only in the Christian poem: at *Par*. IV 174, XI 88: μῦθος ἐτήτυμος, IV 198, II 123, VIII 9, XI 88, XIX 127, in each case to endorse the veracity of the Christian message. Cf. Vian 1997.

interpretation is particularly tempting given that in the other two occasions in the poem ἐτήτυμος is used to describe Jesus as the Theanthropos[88].

Further questions

Did the Homeric text become Christian when transposed into biblical centos? The last example illustrates that the recasting of the biblical narrative into hexameters was particularily indebted to the models of Graeco-Roman *paideia* and its subsequent etymological, lexicographical and philological endeavors. All the examples above show that it would have been impossible to understand the composition and performance of works such as the *Homeric centos* in a milieu where dictionaries and commentaries were not available, especially as the converted epic text often entertained the possibility of variegated semantic possibilities. The centos are undoubtedly the product of a bookish literary culture and its audience was expected to be well-trained in Homeric language so as to understand the subtleties that occurred during its transposition in and performance as a Christian poem. That being said, the discrepancies from the biblical language, which was considered god-inspired and sacred, indicate that the poem could not have been read as substituting for the biblical canon but as an auxiliary and exegetical work that added its own interpretative and aesthetic imprint on the sacred narrative. Thus, Judas may be swift-footed like Dolon and Achilles as an indication of the nearing of Jesus' redeeming death; and Joseph of Arimathea's nine-year old fermented balm may be alluding to the ninth hour that bestowed salvation to humanity through death. The lexicographic knowledge that the *Homeric centos* require illustrates that Homeric language was as important as biblical language in composing this kind of poetry as a tool that enhanced Christian exegesis.

In this respect the Homeric centos mark a startling deviation from earlier Christian exegetical endeavours: the earlier Apologists and the Church Fathers used the interpretative tools of Graeco-Roman *paideia,* such as etymology, allegory, or philological criticism, to illuminate the Bible: the Septuagint in particular, as a work translated from Hebrew, raised several difficulties for a Greek monolingual reader which were often reflected in the debates regarding the work's capturing of the 'essence' of Hebrew sacred names. Earlier hexametric poetry too, such as the *Sibylline Oracles*, seems to partly reflect this exegetical tradition. In it, Adam's name, but not Eve's, is given an etymology: through alliteration that was possible

[88] *I HC* 1102: the Samaritan woman inquiries about his lineage; 1922: κείνου μέν τοι ὅδ' υἱὸς ἐτήτυμον («for he is truly his [god's] real son»). For the confessional character of the cluster μῦθος ἐτήτυμος, cf. Nonn. *Par.* V 123, VIII 9, XI 88, etc.

because of the *koine*-Hellenistic pronunciation for the words (Ἅιδης … Ἀδάμ), the protoplast is related to Hades, alluding to the standard exegetical interpretation of his name as the one made of clay, χοϊκός, the one predisposed to die[89]. Elsewhere the *Sibylline Oracles* even attempts other non-biblical inspired etymological puns, as for example when calling Adam naif (Ἀδάμ … ἀδαής) in the scene where Eve convinces him to consume the forbidden fruit: hence the verse exegetically aims to exculpate Adam, as opposed to the woman, for the Fall[90]. In contrast to this interpretation the biblical centos mention that Eve acted unknowingly (*I HC* 86: ἣ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν ἀϊδρείῃσι νόοιο), in a passage that evokes Epicaste's, Oedipus' mother, transgression.[91] In providing such interpretations the *Sibylline Oracles* apply the grammarian's tools on their hexametric biblical narrative – in other words they put Homer in the service of the Bible. By contrast the *Homeric Centos* uses the interpretative tools employed for Homer and Homeric semantics both to underscore and/or to subvert particular Homeric glosses and etymologies, in which case Homeric language is put on an equal pedestal with the biblical text.

This fascinating reuse of Homeric language towards a more or less Bible-bound exegetical approach needs further investigation across a variety of hexametric biblical corpora, which is beyond the scope of this preliminary study. The present analysis nonetheless shows that by the fifth century the interpretation of the Bible, using the philological tools traditionally employed for deciphering the Homeric text, displays a strikingly positive stance towards the Homeric text as a cultural authority for pagan and Christians alike: the examples above indicate that it was possible to offer biblical exegesis through the lens of Homeric language, without insinuating that Homer had to be converted in the process. While the editor of Proba's proem might have claimed that the poem offered an ameliorated Christianized version of Virgil in that acquired a further divine sense (*praef.* 4: *mutatum in melius*; 5: *sensu divino*)[92], the reuse and deciphering of archaic vocabulary in the *Homeric Centos* reveals that conversion was not a prerequisite in order for the epic language to be reused with a Christian focus. Homeric *Kunstsprache* and its late antique reception could be reclaimed to express even divine illumina-

[89] *E.g.*, the *Sib. Or.* I 81: Ἅιδης… Ἀδάμ, but not etymology for Eve, for which see Lightfoot 2007, *e.g.*, 205, 333-341. Cf. the more popular etymology is based on the etymology of Adam's name according *adamah,* in Paul's 1Cor 15:47: χοϊκός. For sacred names as prefiguration of Christ, see also van den Hoek 2004.

[90] *Or. Sib.* I 43: ἣ δῶκεν, τοῦτον ἀδαῆ πείθεσκεν ἁμαρτεῖν («she gave, and tempted the unknowing man to sin»); Lightfoot 2007, 345-346.

[91] *Od.* XI 272. On the supposedly puerile state of the protoplasts, which was one of the arguments in their favor, see Evans 1968, 80-85.

[92] Pelttari 2014, 33-37.

tion, as the analysis of *thymos* showed above, and offered exegetical possibilities that were not bound to the linguistic medium of the Bible. Thus, when exploring the Christian contribution to the development of etymological and lexicographic practice in Late Antiquity, the Centos offer material that both varies and contradicts the mainstream tendency: as opposed to the interpretation of sacred names that abound in the etymological analyses of the Church Fathers, the *Homeric centos* reuse Homer as an authority alongside the Bible; and instead of focusing on Biblical etymologies, the epic language allows for Homericizing interpretations that lay beyond the sacred scripts. In this sense the semantic variations did not obscure the meaning of a word but provided a different in-depth analysis of some key terms. Just as Apollinaris in his defence of Homeric hexameters justified his use of hexameter because of its authoritative appeal, so do the *Homeric centos* employ the epic language towards an exegetical aim, since Homer too was considered ἐκ παλαχῆς θεότευκτος[93].

DFG, Heidelberg - ECRAM, Strasbourg
anna.lefteratou@gmail.com

Keywords: cento poems, Homer, biblical poems, Homeric etymology
Parole chiave: centoni, Omero, poesia biblica, etimologia omerica

[93] *Praef.* 105-106. The authorship of the poem is very disputed and recently attributed it to Apollinaris by Faulkner 2020.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Agosti 1989
G.Agosti, *Alcuni Omerismi nella «Visio Dorothei» (P. Bodmer XXIX),* «Orpheus: Rivista di umanità classica e cristiana» n.s. I (1989), 101-116.

Agosti 2002
G.Agosti, *I poemetti del Codice Bodmer et il loro ruolo nella storia della poesia tardoantica*, in A.Hurst – J.Rudhardt (ed.), *Le codex des visions*, Genève 2002, 74-113.

Agosti 2006
G.Agosti, *La voce dei libri: dimensione performative dell'epica greca tardoantica,* in E.Amato (ed.), *Approches de la Troisième Sophistique: hommages à Jacques Schamp*, Bruxelles 2006, 35-42.

Agosti 2008
G.Agosti, *Literariness and Levels of Style in Epigraphical Poetry of Late Antiquity*, «Ramus» XXXVII (2008), 191-213.

Agosti 2015
G.Agosti, *Chanter les dieux dans la société chrétienne: les Hymnes de Proclus dans le contexte culturel et religieux de leur temps*, in N.Belayche – V.Pirenne (ed.), *Fabriquer du divin. Constructions et ajustements de la représentation des dieux dans l'Antiquité*, Liège 2015, 183-211.

Agosti 2016
G.Agosti, *L'epillio Nelle Dionisiache? Strutture dell'epica Nonniana e contesto culturale*, «Aetia» VI (2016), http://aitia.revues.org/1579?lang=en.

Agosti 2019
G.Agosti, *Giochi letterari nelle iscrizioni metriche tardoantiche e bizantine*, in V.Veronesi (ed.), *Il calamo della memoria VIII. Riuso di testi e mestiere letterario nella tarda antichità*, Trieste 2019, 305-326.

Amsler 1989
M. Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiqutiy and the Early Middle Ages*, Amsterdam (PA) 1989.

Bažil 2009
M.Bažil, *Centones christiani: métamorphoses d'une forme intertextuelle dans la poésie latine chrétienne de l'Antiquité tardive*, Paris 2009.

Bažil 2017
M.Bažil, *Elementorum varius textus: Atomistisches und Anagrammatisches in Optatians Textbegriff*, in M.Squire – J.Wienand (ed.), *Morphogrammata: The Lettered Art of Optatian. Figuring Cultural Transformation in the Age of Constantine*, Paderborn 2017, 341-368.

Bausi 2020
A.Bausi – B.Reudenbach – H.Wimmer (ed.), *Canones: The Art of Harmony. The Canon Tables of the Four Gospels*, Berlin 2020.
Beecroft 2006
A.J.Beecroft, *"This Is not a True Story". Stesichorus' Palinode and the Revenge of the Epichoric*, «Transactions of American Philological Association» CXXXVI (2006), 47-69.
Bowie 1998
E.Bowie, *Phoenician Games in Heliodorus*, in R.Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus,* Cambridge 1998, 1-18.
Bremmer 1983
J.Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton 1983.
Buffière 1956
F.Buffière, *Les mythes d'Homère dans la pensée grecque*, Paris 1956.
Cairns 2014
D.Cairns, *Ψυχή, Θυμός, and Metaphor in Homer and Plato*, «Études platoniciennes» XI [DOI : 10.4000/etudesplatoniciennes.566]
Crawford 2019
M.R.Crawford, *The Eusebian Canon Tables: Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2019
Dawson 1992
D.Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley (CA) 1992
Doak 2019
B.R.Doak, *Phoenicians in the Hebrew Bible*, in B.R.Doak – C.López-Ruiz (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Oxford 2019, 657-670.
Doherty 2009
L.E.Doherty (ed.), *Homer's Odyssey*, Oxford 2009.
Evans 1968
J.M.Evans, *Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition*, Oxford 1968.
Franchi 2013
Nonno di Panopoli, *Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni. Canto VI*. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di R.Franchi, Bologna 2013.
Faulkner 2020
A.Faulkner, *Metaphrasis Psalmorum*, Oxford 2020.
Holum 1982
K.G.Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley (CA) 1982.

Kneebone 2020
E.Kneebone, *Oppian's Halieutica: Charting a Didactic Epic*, Cambridge 2020.
Kamptz 1982
H.v.Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen: sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*, Göttingen 1982.
Kanavou 2011
N.Kanavou, *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names: A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*, Berlin/New York 2011.
Kuhn-Treichel 2017
T.Kuhn-Treichel, *Involved Narrating in Eudocia's Homeric Centos*, «Medievalia et Humanistica» XLIII (2017), 65-79.
Lamberton 1986
R.Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian. Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, Berkeley (CA) 1986.
Lefteratou 2017
A.Lefteratou, *From Haimorrhooussa to Veronica? The Weaving Imagery in the Homeric Centos*, «Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies» LVII (2017), 1085–1119.
Lefteratou 2019
A.Lefteratou, *Stitching with Homer. Contextualizing the Homeric Centos within the Quotation Habit in the Imperial and Later Periods*, «Byzantion» LXXXIX (2019), 331-358.
Lightfoot 2007
J.L.Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary of the First and Second Books*, Oxford 2007.
Livrea 1997
E.Livrea, *L'imperatrice Eudocia Santa?,* «Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik» CXIX, (1997), 50-54.
Maciver 2017
C.Maciver, *A Homeric Afterlife in Quintus Smyrnaeus' Posthomerica?*, in I.Tanaseanu-Döbler – A.Lefteratou – G.Ryser – K.Stamatopoulos (ed.), *Reading the Way to the Netherworld. Education and Representations of the Beyond in Later Antiquity*, Göttingen 2017, 120-135.
Maravela 2019
A.Maravela, *The Judgemental Narrator: Narratorial Nepios-Comments from Homer to Nonnus*, «Symbolae Osloenses» XCIII/1 (2019), 58-105
Marmodoro – Cartwright 2018
A.Marmodoro – S.Cartwright, (ed.), *A History of Mind and Body in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2018.

Marzullo 1968
B.Marzullo, *La 'coppia contigua' in Esichio,* «Quaderni Italiani di Filologia Classica» III (1968), 70–87.
Matthaios 2020
S.Matthaios, *Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity*, in F.Montanari (ed.), *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*, Leiden 2020, 260–372.
Norderval 2011
Ø.Norderval, *Simplicity and Power*, in D.Hellholm – T.Vegge – Ø.Norderval (ed.), *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, Berlin 2011, 947-792.
O'Loughlin 2010
T.O'Loughlin, *Harmonizing the Truth: Eusebius and the Problem of the Four Gospels*, «Traditio» LXV (2010), 1-29.
Pelttari 2014
A.Pelttari, *The Space that Remains: Reading Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca, New York 2014.
Peradotto 1990
J.Peradotto, *Man in the Middle Voice*, Princeton 1990.
Radice 2020
R.Radice, *I nomi che parlano. L'allegoria filosofica dalle origini al II sec. d.C.*, Brescia 2020.
Ramelli 2011
I.Ramelli, *The philosophical Stance of Allegory in Stoicism and Its Reception in Platonism, Pagan and Christian: Origen in Dialogue with the Stoics and Plato*, «International Journal of the Classical Tradition» XVIII (2011), 335-371.
Reece 2009
S.Reece, *Homer's Winged Words: The Evolution of Early Greek Epic Diction in the Light of Oral Theory*, Leiden 2009.
Rey 1996
A.-L.Rey, *Homerocentra et littérature apocryphe chrétienne: quels rapports?*, «Apocrypha» VII (1996), 123-134.
Sandnes 2011
K.O.Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil'. Cento and Canon*, Leiden 2011.
Scarborough 1982
J.Scarborough, *Roman Pharmacy and the Eastern Drug Trade: Some Problems as Illustrated by the Example of Aloe*, «Pharmacy in History» XXIV (1982), 135-143.

Schembra 1994
R.Schembra, *L'Omero 'cristiano'. Varianti di cristianizzazione e 'doiades' nella 'quarta' redazione degli Homerocentones*, «Sileno» XX (1994), 317-332.
Schembra 2002
R.Schembra, *Il riuso cristiano del modello omerico negli* Homerocentones, in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo*, Roma 2002, 505-510.
Schembra 2006
R.Schembra, *La prima redazione dei centoni omerici: traduzione e commento*, Alessandria, 2006.
Schembra 2007a
R.Schembra, *Homerocentones*, Turnhout 2007.
Schembra 2007b
R.Schembra, *La seconda redazione dei centoni omerici*, Alessandria 2007.
Spanoudakis 2014
K.Spanoudakis, *Nonnus of Panopolis, Paraphrasis of the Gospel of John. Book XI*, Oxford 2014.
Strauss Clay 1983
J.Strauss Clay, *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*, Princeton 1983.
Strauss Clay 1993
J.Strauss Clay, *The Education of Perses: From 'Mega Nepios' to 'Dion Genos' and Back,* «Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa Greco-Latina» XXXI (1993), 23-33.
Stroumsa 2016
G.G.Stroumsa, *The Scriptural Universe of Ancient Christianity*, Cambridge (MA) 2016.
Struck 2004
P.T.Struck, *Birth of the Symbol*, Princeton 2004.
Thompson 2002
L.L.Thompson, *The Martyrdom of Polycarp: Death in the Roman Games*, «The Journal of Religion», LXXXII (2002), 27-52.
Usher 1997
M.D.Usher, *Prolegomenon to the Homeric Centos*, «American Journal of Philology» CXVIII (1997), 305-321.
Usher 1998
M.D.Usher, *Homeric Stitchings: The Homeric Centos of the Empress Eudocia*, Lanham (MD) 1998.
van den Hoeck 2004
A.van den Hoek, *Etymologizing in a Christian Context: The Techniques of Clement and Origen*, «The Studia Philonica Annual» XVI (2004), 122-168.

Vian 1997
F.Vian, Μάρτυς *chez Nonnos de Panopolis: étude de sémantique et de chronologie*, «Revue des Études Greques» CX (1997), 143-160.
Vergados 2020
A.Vergados, *Hesiod's Verbal Craft. Studies in Hesiod's Conception of Language and its Ancient Reception*, Oxford 2020.
Webster 1957
T.B.L.Webster, *Some Psychological Terms in Greek Tragedy*, «The Journal of Hellenic Studies» LXXVII (1957), 149-154.
Ziogas 2015
I.Ziogas, *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women*, Cambridge 2015.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32061 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 287-309*

MARTINA VENUTI

The Hidden Truth behind Names: Saturnus in the Etymological Interpretation of Late Latin Authors

In the late Latin world, a crucial role in using etymology and in providing us information about etymologizing (and the general debate around this topic) is played by grammarians, commentators, teachers, mythographers, encyclopaedists, Neoplatonists, Christian apologists and writers, who developed these issues and whose influence on later approaches was enormous. Focusing on the etymology of Saturnus, the paper deals with the scope and purposes of etymologizing in late Latin authors.

Il lavoro si focalizza sul caso esemplare dell'etimologia di Saturnus *fornita in età tardoantica dagli autori latini: grammatici, commentatori, mitografi, apologeti, enciclopedisti rivestono un ruolo cruciale nel fornirci informazioni riguardo all'uso (e al riuso) dell'etimologia nel corso dei secoli. Le loro interpretazioni, estremamente influenti sugli sviluppi successivi, mostrano una chiara stratificazione di testi e approcci, che di volta in volta si adattano ai nuovi contesti culturali.*

> *Etymologia*, quae verborum originem inquirit, a Cicerone dicta est 'notatio', quia nomen eius apud Aristotelen invenitur *symbolon* (σύμβολον) [*De int.* 2], quod est 'nota'. Nam verbum ex verbo ductum, id est *veriloquium*, ipse Cicero qui finxit reformidat. sunt qui vim potius intuiti 'originationem' vocent. Haec habet aliquando usum necessarium, quotiens interpretatione res de qua quaeritur eget, ut cum M. Caelius se esse hominem frugi vult probare, non quia abstinens sit (nam id ne mentiri quidem poterat), sed quia utilis multis, id est fructuosus, unde sit ducta frugalitas. Ideoque in definitionibus adsignatur etymologiae locus [Quint. *inst.* I 6,28]

«In different times and at different places, etymology has meant slightly or entirely different things to the few or many people who, under varying sets of circumstances, have used that word, applying it to their own spheres of interests»[1]. Should we give today a generic definition of 'etymology', we could say that it is the origin of a word identified through a scientific study of its phonetic, morphologic, semantic history. In ancient times, the situation appears perhaps more complicated: the debate raised within what we can generally define as Language Studies (philosophy of language, science of language, grammar studies, rhetoric studies, commentaries, meta-poetic practices) shows that, in the Greek-Roman world, the definition of etymology itself and the practices of etymologizing assumed several meanings and uses, with a number of differing shades. «Etymology was a respected mode of philosophical argument […] practiced by Plato and Aristotle»[2]; «the

[1] Malkiel 1993, IX.

[2] Dyck 2003, 56. See *e.g.* Plato's *Cratylus*, a crucial work in this respect: O'Hara 1996, 17 and n. 65; Long 2005.

oldest Greek and Hebrew writings take for granted that proper names can conceal and reveal the character and fates of their bearers»[3]. In the sixth century B.C. Theagenes of Rhegium had applied the physical allegorism to the poetic text trying to 'save' Homer's gods[4]; the same exegetical approach was taken up later by Stoics with the support of etymology: «Stoic etymological thought exercised profound influence, both directly, through Stoic teachers and etymologists, and indirectly, through the impact of Stoic thought on the commentaries on the poets»[5]. This tradition had a great influence, *e.g.* on Alexandrian scholar-poets and, consequently, on later Roman authors: etymology was a refined tool of the poetic and rhetoric technique so that, thanks to their deep erudition, Latin poets offered in their lines effective wordplays, onomatopoeias, assonances and paronomasias based on a strong etymological consciousness. On the other hand, grammarians and teachers dealt with etymology as an important didactic, theoretical and exegetical tool: in this respect, Aelius Stilo and his pupils, Varro and Cicero, are some of the most important authors between the 2nd and 1st century BC, who deeply influenced the following generations of writers.

In the late Latin world and on the basis of this background, a crucial role in using etymology and in providing us information about etymologizing (and the general debate around this topic) is played by grammarians, commentators, teachers, Neoplatonists, Christian apologists and writers, mythographers, encyclopaedists, who developed these issues «in richness, strength and boldness»[6] and whose influence on later approaches was enormous[7].

The excerpt quoted above as a small hint of this fascinating topic reproduces a famous text taken from the first book of *Institutio oratoria* by Quintilian: in a passage clearly inspired by Cicero's *Topica*[8], he speaks about etymology and gives

---

[3] Barney 2006, 11; see also Opelt 1966, col. 797-844.

[4] Biondi 2015.

[5] Long 1992, 58-66; O'Hara 1996, 20-21; Ramelli 2004, 458-478; Allen 2005, 14-55.

[6] Gualandri 2017, 125; Maltby 2003, 104: «The works of the ancient grammarians and commentators provide our best source of explicit ancient etymologies in Latin». See also Marangoni 2007, XX-XXXIII.

[7] Some references: Curtius 1953, 495-500; Agozzino 1972, 7-14; Kaster 1988; Brunet 2016; Zetzel 2018.

[8] See Cic. *top.* 35 *Multa etiam ex notatione sumuntur. Ea est autem, cum ex vi nominis argumentum elicitur; quam Graeci* ἐτυμολογίαν *appellant, id est verbum ex verbo veriloquium; nos autem novitatem verbi non satis apti fugientes genus hoc notationem appellamus, quia sunt verba rerum notae. Itaque hoc quidem Aristoteles* σύμβολον *appellat, quod Latine est nota. Sed cum intellegitur quid significetur, minus laborandum est de nomine.* See also *GLK* VII [Ter. Scaur. *De orth.*] 12,6.

a definition of it as «the study that looks for the origin of the words» (*verborum originem inquirit*), but he also refers to different meanings. In particular, he mentions those who devise etymology and use it as a rhetoric tool for supporting their own interpretation of things or their own argumentation; he also underlines the importance of etymology as an essential element of the *ratio*, such as one of the constitutional features of the correct *sermo*[9]. Quintilian's text clearly shows that «the debate and contestation of etymologizing interpretation *was* an important activity for many Romans»[10]. So, before delving into late Latin examples of etymologizing practices and references, trying to understand their main attitudes and aims, it would be useful to enquire further into some of the most authoritative voices of that debate.

The loss of a significant portion of the *De lingua Latina* by Varro is of course a *vulnus* in this kind of studies, since this work has been rightly given credit for providing Augustan literature (prose and poetry) and later authors with a large amount of 'linguistic' information and a meaningful discussion about etymologizing. However, thanks to the extant section and later witnesses, we can access many examples and references given by Varro, generally based on a Stoic line, shared with his *magister* Aelius Stilo. At the beginning of *De lingua Latina* Book V[11], Varro announces the contents of that book, which will deal with *duae naturae uniuscuiusque verbi*, with particular attention to *cur et unde sint verba*: Greek authors call this ἐτυμολογία. Varro differentiates between this part and the second one (investigating *in qua re vocabulum sit impositum*), which is, according to Greek tradition, περ‹ὶ› σημαινομένων. Then, he provides his readers with an explanation of etymology, and «distinguishes four levels of etymologizing: one accessible to the ordinary person, one to the grammarian, one to the philosopher, and the fourth, where the text is corrupt and the thought almost mystical, that of the *ady-*

[9] Quint. I 6,1. See also Ax 2011, 230-232.

[10] Hinds 2006, 6. On the Quintilian's text, see Ax 2011, 273-275.

[11] Varro *ling.* V 1-2 *Quemadmodum vocabula essent imposita rebus in lingua Latina, sex libris exponere institui. De his tris ante hunc feci quos Septumio misi: in quibus est de disciplina, quam vocant* ἐτυμολογικήν*: quae contra ea‹m› dicerentur, volumine primo, quae pro ea, secundo, quae de ea, tertio. In his ad te scribam, a quibus rebus vocabula imposita sint in lingua Latina, et ea quae sunt in consuetudine apud populum et ea quae inveniuntur apud poetas. Cum unius cuiusque verbi naturae sint duae, a qua re et in qua re vocabulum sit impositum (itaque a qua re sit pertinacia cum requi‹ri›tur, ostenditur esse a perten‹den›do; in qua re sit impositum dicitur cum demonstratur, in quo non debet pertendi et pertendit, pertinaciam esse, quod in quo oporteat manere, si in eo perstet, perseverantia sit), priorem illam partem, ubi cur et unde sint verba scrutantur, Graeci vocant* ἐτυμολογίαν*, illam alteram* περ‹ὶ› σημαινομένων*. De quibus duabus rebus in his libris promiscue dicam, sed exilius de posteriore.*

tum et initia regis, which he hoped to reach»[12]. According to an effective definition given by Amsler in 1989, the aim of an etymologist like Varro is to «reverse the dynamic of *declinatio* and perform an archaeology in order to recover the immanent meaning»[13]. Varro enriches his argumentation with many examples taken from different authors: Aristophanes of Byzantium, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Antipater of Tarsus, Democritus and Epicurus, Apollodorus of Athens and others, defining a rich repository of information, spread and re-used by many following authors[14].

As everyone knows, Varro addressed a remarkable part of his *De lingua Latina* to Cicero, who, in turn, dedicated a great section of his *De natura deorum* to a treatise on Stoic allegorizing, set in Book II, where Balbus presents Stoic theology and a long series of allegorical etymologies of gods' names. Using etymology, myths and gods can be led back by allegorists to their original, true meaning, connected with the nature and the 'real world': so, a 'physical allegorism' was supported by etymological analysis[15]. Cicero's role in spreading this exegetical approach is really important, since he did not merely translate his Stoic sources, but he 'romanised' their content both by including Balbo's argument into the general architecture of *De natura deorum* – trying, this way, to be more effective in seeking for the favour of his readership – and by using Latin equivalents for a number of Greek gods' names (*e.g.* Uranus, Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Ares, Athena, Artemis, etc.), or even by using purely Roman deities. Cicero did not truly want to support the Stoic case – in fact, Cotta will be responding, sometimes strongly, against it within Book III – but he wanted to show how etymology can help in understanding the real nature of Roman gods[16]. This was the same cultural assumption that we find in Cornutus, the 1st century A.D. Stoic philosopher-etymologist who wrote an important and influent *Compendium* (Ἐπιδρομή) *of the Tradition of Greek Theology*, worth to be (at least) mentioned here[17].

Many years later, in early 6th century A.D., in his exegetical work about Greek mythology, the North African allegorist Fulgentius explicitly shows (and refers to) this approach as his model. Fulgentius is one of those authors who played a pivotal role in the transition from a mythological/pagan view to a moral/Christian one. Of course, the Stoic tradition of textual exegesis, integrated with Neoplatonic influences and apologetic aims, perfectly fitted the new purposes of his time: Fulgentius' *Mythologies* are a collection of fifty *fabulae* introduced to the reader

[12] O'Hara 1996, 49 referring to Varro *ling.* V 7-9.
[13] Amsler 1989, 29; Zetzel 2018, 31-46.
[14] O'Hara 1996, 48-49.
[15] Long 1992, 52-53.
[16] Dyck 2003, 56-63.
[17] Most 1989; Long 1992, 53-57; Ramelli 2004, 277-313.

through a moralizing interpretation predominantly based on a (para)etymologic decomposition of names. A wide and complex prologue introduces the fables[18].

From the specific point of view of the present paper, this prologue is particularly interesting because in it Fulgentius brings into play Cicero[19] and declares his didactic and philosophical goal: to show the inconsistency of the Greek *fabulosum commentum* and, as a consequence, to reveal the truth hidden behind words (especially divine and proper names) used in the mythological literature. In doing that, Fulgentius gives us a remarkable clue about his work, which is the result of a long stratification of other intermediate texts, most of them belonging to the tradition of late Latin commentaries, treatises, school-texts, where the etymological material flows like a river along a centuries-old path. So, let's give an example of this 'stratification': which etymology does Fulgentius provide, from where (from which kind of sources) does he likely derive it, and which is the final elaboration he proposes to his readership (and to us)?

I will take for this purpose a traditional and very popular mythological figure: Saturnus. Fulgentius tells the story at the beginning of *Mythologiae*'s first book: his exegetical technique consists in giving a short account of the myth (sometimes just few lines), often starting from genealogies or familiar relationships and mostly focusing on characters' proper names. Etymology applied to those names is the main tool through which he introduces the allegorical meaning (Fulg. *myth.* 17,10)[20]:

> Saturnus Polluris filius dicitur, Opis maritus, senior, velato capite, falcem ferens; cuius virilia abscisa et in mari proiecta Venerem genuerunt. […] Saturnus primus in Italia regnum obtinuit; hicque per annonae praerogationem ad se populos adtrahens a saturando Saturnus dictus est. Opis quoque eius uxor eo quod opem esurientibus ferret edicta est. Polluris etiam filius sive a pollendo sive a pollucibilitate quam nos humanitatem dicimus. Unde et Plautus in comedia *Epidici*[21] ait: 'Bibite, pergraecamini pollucibiliter'. Velato capite ideo fingitur, quod omnes fructus foliorum obnupti tegantur umbraculo. Filios vero suos comedisse fertur, quod omne tempus quodcumque gignat consumit; falcem etiam fert non inmerito, sive quod omne tempus in se revergat ut curvamina falcium sive fructuum propter; unde etiam et castratus dicitur, quod omnes fructuum vires abscisae atque in humoribus viscerum velut in mare proiectae, sicut illic Venerem, ita et libidinem gig-

[18] Wolff-Dain 2013; Venuti 2015, 307; Venuti 2018. For a general introduction to Fulgentius, see the up-to-date (2019) *online* bibliography edited by Gregory Hays (http://people.virginia.edu/~bgh2n/fulgbib.html).

[19] Fulg. *myth.* 4,4

[20] All references for Fulgentius' text are according to Helm 1898.

[21] Actually, Plaut. *Mostell.* 22, 24.

> nant necesse est. Nam et Apollofanes in epico carmine scribit Saturnum quasi sacrum nun - nus (νοῦς) enim Grece sensus dicitur - aut satorem nun quasi divinum sensum creantem omnia. Cui etiam quattuor filios subiciunt, id est primum Iovem, secundum Iunonem, tertium Neptunum, quartum Plutonem; Polluris quasi poli filium dicunt, quattuor elementa gignentem.

The author focuses on the genealogy of Saturnus (his father, Pollus; his wife, Ops; Venus, born from his genitals; his four sons: Jupiter, Juno, Neptune, Pluto). He underlines the iconographic representation of Saturnus as an old man, with covered head, carrying a sickle. The name 'Saturnus' is said to be etymologically derived from *saturare* ('to feed', 'to saturate'): he was the first ruler in Italy and pleased his people by distributing them the harvest. His wife is Ops, since she is the goddess of the harvest, the one who feeds people with her richness. Saturnus is said to have eaten his sons and therefore connected to Time. The two interpretations – Saturnus as the *saturator* and Saturnus as the Time – are linked by the attribute of the sickle, which is used both by the farmer, to reap the wheat, and by the Time, as its symbol. The story of the castration makes the figure of Saturnus overlapping Uranus (see *infra*); however, it is explained with an allegorical/physical interpretation: Saturnus genitals fell into the sea giving birth to Venus (allegory of the *libido*) as well as the properties of the fruits, cut and collected from the ground, go into the fluids of human belly and here generate the voluptuousness. Eventually, citing an 'Apollophanes *epicus*', Fulgentius adds a quotation supporting a different, Latin-Greek etymology: Saturnus as '*sacer* νοῦς' or '*sator* νοῦς', such as 'the divine intelligence creating and fulfilling everything'.

The rich explanation provided by this fable looks back to a long chain of previous texts, starting (at least) from Cicero and Varro[22] (Cicero *nat.* II 64):

> physica ratio non inelegans inclusa est in impias fabulas. caelestem enim altissimam aetheriamque naturam id est igneam, quae per sese omnia gigneret, vacare voluerunt ea parte corporis quae coniunctione alterius egeret ad procreandum. Saturnum autem eum esse voluerunt qui cursum et conversionem spatiorum ac temporum contineret, qui deus Graece id ipsum nomen habet: Κρόνος enim dicitur, qui est idem χρόνος id est spatium temporis. Saturnus autem est appellatus quod saturaretur annis; ex se enim natos comesse fingitur solitus, quia consumit aetas temporum spatia annisque praeteritis insaturabiliter expletur.

After mentioning a list of Greek references – such as Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysip-

[22] Philippson 1939, 1190-1191; Maltby 1991, 546-547.

pus, who have dealt with the *physica ratio non inelegans inclusa* within the mythological tales of Uranus and Saturnus – Cicero gives a double etymological explanation: *Saturnus* as *spatium temporis* since his Greek name is Kronos[23], whose etymology is connected with χρόνος[24]; *Saturnus* from *saturare*, since he *saturaretur annis*, perhaps meaning «the fact that [his] feast day was the 17th December, when the yearly cycle 'was completed' (*Saturnalia*)»[25].

On the other hand, in his *De lingua Latina* Varro etymologically connects the name *Saturnus* with *satus/satio* ('sowing'), even though this connection was originally to be meant as metaphoric[26]; Ops is also mentioned (Varro *ling.* V 64):

> Quare quo caelum principium, ab satu est dictus Saturnus, et quo ignis, Saturnalibus cerei superioribus mittuntur. Terra Ops, quod hic omne opus et hac opus ad vivendum, et ideo dicitur Ops mater, quod terra mater.

These interpretations met later with great success and were used and re-used by a number of important North African Christian authors, such as *e.g.* Tertullian and St. Augustine, who explicitly quoted these passages (and, more in general, Cicero and Varro) in their apologetic writings against pagan gods (Tert. *nat.* II 12,5; II 12,17-19):

> Ea origo deorum vestrorum Saturno, ut opinor, signatur. Neque enim si Var<ro>[27] antiquissimos deos Iovem, Iunonem et Minervam refert, nobis excidisse debet, omnem patrem filiis antiquiorem, tam Saturnum Iove, quam Caelum Saturno; de Caelo enim et Terra Saturnus…
> <Sed> eleganter quidam sibi videntur physiologice per allegoricam <argu>mentationem de Saturno interpretari, tempus esse, et ideo Caelum <et Terr>am parentes, ut et ipsos origini nullos, et ideo falcatum quia tempore <omnia> dirimantur, et ideo voratorem suorum quod omnia ex se edi-

[23] Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 159 ff.

[24] This equivalence was also attested for earlier authors; see Kaster 2011, 88-89: «first attested for Pherecydes of Syros (mid-6th cent. BCE), fr. 9.5-6 D.-K., cf. Arist. *On the Universe* 7 401a15, Cic. *On the Nature of Gods* 2.64 (citing Chrysippus)».

[25] Mastrocinque 2006.

[26] Guittard 1978, 55: «Varron explique le nom de Saturne non par l'idée concrète et technique de 'semailles' au sens propre, mais en fonction de l'idée plus générale de 'génération', 'paternité', 'source première' et même 'principe générateur'. Cela n'exclut pas, d'ailleurs, que cette fonction génératrice trouvé une application secondaire dans les semailles proprement dites; toutefois, dans la pensée de Varron, Saturne ne tire pas son nom des semailles, mais il le doit à ce qu'il est une 'source première' (*satus*)».

[27] Varro *ant. div.* fr. 207 Cardauns.

> ta <in semet>ipsum consumat. Nominis quoque testimonium compellunt: Κρόνον <dict>um Graece ut χρόνον. Aeque Latini vocabuli a sationibus rationem <deducu>nt, qui eum procreatorem coniectant, per eum seminalia caeli <in terra>m deferri. Opem adiungunt, quod opem videndi semina confe<rant, tum et> quod opere semina evadant.

Within the pagan pantheon, Saturnus is surely the most popular god in the Roman North Africa. He is associated with the ancient Punic Baal, connected with the Sky. Several sanctuaries and archaeologic monuments attest to his importance in the area[28]. The interpretation provided here by Tertullian refers to the allegoric explanations of Saturnus both as Time (therefore *falcatus* and *vorator suorum*) and as the god of sowing (Saturnus from *satio/satum*); concerning the god's name, the author recalls the double derivation, underlining the importance given to etymology by ancient authors (*nominis quoque testimonium compellunt*): Κρόνος, which has to be etymologically associated with χρόνος, and *Saturnus*, which derives *a sationibus*.

Tertullian was born in Carthage around 155; he studied law in Rome; thanks to his sympathy with Stoicism, he got close to Christian ideas; he converted around 193 and went back to Carthage where he composed the *Ad nationes* in 197. «Tertullian constitutes the major source (with Augustine) for our knowledge of Varro's lost researches into Roman religion. None will wish to deny that Tertullian had excerpted these works for himself»[29]. Actually, we can say the same for another important representative of this tradition, i.e. Arnobius, active around one century later, in the same geographic area[30]. Paucity of evidence renders a full biography of this author impossible[31]: he makes large use of Tertullian's writings, as well as Minucius Felix's[32]; we have some information by Hieronymus about his activity as a rhetor in Sicca, in modern Tunisia. He must have been active some years before Firmicus and Lactantius and one century before Augustine; he deals with topics very close to these Christian writers and appears to be a crucial reference for them, even though they do not mention him directly.

Arnobius offers the same apologetic/euhemerist attitude present in Tertullian, meant to ridicule pagan theology[33]. So, not surprisingly, Lactantius, said to have

---

[28] Leglay 1966.

[29] Barnes 1985², 197; Podolak 2006, 352-354.

[30] Fragu 2010, XXVI-XXVII.

[31] McCracken 1949; Laurenti 1962; Amata 2000.

[32] Fragu 2010, XXVI. Minucius Felix being perhaps the Latin apologist to be under the greatest obligation to Cicero's *nat. deor.*: see Pease 1955-1958, 54, n. 1.

[33] *E.g.* Arnob. *nat.* IV 9 [*Qui est enim qui credat*] *Saturnum praesidem sativis?* See Maltby 1991, 546.

been his pupil, some years later, at the beginning of his *Institutio divina*, speaking about *de falsa religione deorum*, relaunches the Stoic argument presented by Cicero and gives an enriched explanation of Saturnus' name (Lact. *inst.* I 12,3; 9-10):

> Sed homines respectu elementi quod dicitur caelum totam fabulam explodunt tamquam ineptissime fictam, quam tamen Stoici, ut solent, ad rationem physicam conantur traducere. Quorum sententiam Cicero *de natura deorum* [II 24,64] disserens, posuit […].
> Quid quod ipsi Saturno non divinum modo sensum, sed humanum quoque adimunt, cum adfirmant «eum esse Saturnum, qui cursum et conversionem spatiorum et temporum continet eumque Graece id ipsum nomen habere. Κρόνος enim dicitur, qui est idem χρόνος, id est spatium temporis. *Satur*nus autem est appellatus, quod *satur*etur annis». Haec Ciceronis verba sunt exponentis sententiam Stoicorum» [II 25,64]. Quae quam vana sit, cuivis intelligere promptissimum est. Si enim Saturnus Caeli est filius, quomodo potuit aut tempus e Caelo gigni aut Caelum a tempore abscidi aut postea tempus imperio spoliari a filio Iove? Aut quomodo Iuppiter natus ex tempore est? Aut quibus annis saturari possit aeternitas, cui nullus est finis? […]

Of course, Lactantius' aim is again to counter and confute the divine nature of pagan gods[34]: he concludes that the pagan view is completely inconsistent and without logic (*quae quam vana sit, cuivis intelligere promptissimum*). He then tries to find something true in the euhemerist argument. In order to do that, he tells the story of Saturnus given by Ovid and Vergil (Lact. *inst.* I 13,6-9):

> Fugit igitur expulsus et in Italiam navigio venit, cum errasset diu, sicut Ovidius in Fastorum libris refert [I 233-234]:
>
> Causa ratis superest. Tuscum rate venit ad amnem
> ante pererrato falcifer orbe deus
>
> Hunc errantem atque inopem Ianus excepit […]. Omnes ergo non tantum poetae, sed historiarum quoque ac rerum antiquarum scriptores, hominem fuisse consentiunt, qui res eius in Italia gestas memoriae prodiderunt: Graeci Diodorus et Thallus, Latini, Nepos et Cassius et Varro. Nam cum agresti quodam more in Italia viveretur [Verg. *Aen.* VIII 321-323],
>
> Is genus indocile ac dispersum montibus altis

[34] As the author says, he is looking for something true in the mythological tales; therefore, he first [I 11,55] mentions Minucius Felix's 'euhemeristic' explanation of Saturnus's history, included in the *Octavius* (XXIII 10-12); then, he quotes the 'physical' Stoic argument.

> composuit legesque dedit Latiumque vocari
> maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris.

Lactantius transmits here that Saturnus, *falcifer* as described in Ovid's text, escaped from his son Jupiter and came to Italy as an exile, where once settled he gave laws to the uneducated inhabitants. The author brings into play as *auctoritates* not only poets, but also *historiarum ac rerum antiquarum scriptores*: among them, Varro and Vergil. The latter tells us that Saturnus wanted his new region to be named *Latium*. This is one of those interesting cases where Vergil himself plays with etymology as a poetic and rhetorical tool: in fact, *Latium* is etymologically connected to the history of the god, and precisely to the verb *lateo* (l. 323): «Vergil (or Evander) derives the name *Latium* from the fact that Saturnus hid there (*latuisset*) […]. Here *vocari* is an etymological signpost, and *maluit*, as Servius [*ad l.*] notes, calls attention to the fact that Latium had other names»[35]. So, these Virgilian lines hide a stratification of etymological sense, elaborated by Ovid[36], included in the tradition of Christian authors[37], but also explained by Servius in his commentary:

> LATIVM QVE VOCARI MALVIT bene 'maluit': nam et Saturnia dicta est, ut [*Aen.* VIII 329] *et nomen posuit Saturnia tellus*. et Vergilius *Latium* vult dici, quod illic Saturnus latuit[38]. […] Varro autem Latium dici putat, quod latet Italia inter praecipitia Alpium et Apennini[39].

Of course, Servius' text is a crucial 'hub' for later authors, especially for those interested in commenting and using Virgilian poems as Fulgentius was[40]. Therefore, it could be useful to look at the occurrences of Saturnus within the whole commentary:

---

[35] O'Hara 1996, 207.

[36] See also the lines just following the two quoted by Lactantius [Ov. *fast.* I 235-238]: *Hac ego Saturnum memini tellure receptum* / [*Caelitibus regnis a Iove pulsus erat*]. / *Inde diu genti mansit Saturnia nomen; / dicta quoque est Latium terra latente deo*.

[37] Maltby 1991, 329.

[38] The same gloss is included in the commentary to *Aen*. I 6: *Latium autem dictum est, quod illic Saturnus latuerit.*

[39] O'Hara 1996, 207-208: see here the reference to the figure of *metonomasia* and further bibliographical information about *Latium*. Specifically, about Servius and etymology, see Brunet 2016.

[40] It is worth remembering here that Fulgentius was author of the so-called *Virgiliana continentia*, a short allegoric commentary to the *Aeneid*, extremely influent in later centuries: he surely was aware of and used scholiastic material to Vergil. See Agozzino 1972.

Serv. *georg.* I 336
Saturnus deus pluviarum est, unde etiam senex fingitur: nam senes semper novimus esse gelidos.

Serv. *georg.* II 406
ET CVRVO SATVRNI DENTE id est falce, quae est in eius tutela. nam Saturnus dicitur patri Caelo virilia falce amputasse, quae in mare cadentia Venerem creaverunt: quod ideo fingitur, quia, nisi umor de caelo in terras descenderit, nihil creatur. alii Saturnum deum esse temporum dicunt, quae, sicut falx, in se recurrunt. alii vero dicunt Saturnum in progressu nihil nocere, cum retrogradus est, esse periculosum; ideo que eum habere falcem in tutela, quod et ipsa protenta nihil valet, retro acta vero, quicquid ei occurrerit, secat.

Serv. *georg.* IV 150
Saturnus, ut diximus, temporum deus est, quae in se revolvuntur in aeternum.

Serv. *Aen.* III 104
IOVIS MAGNI sane nati Iovis fabula haec est: Saturnus postquam a Themide oraculo comperit, a filio se posse regno depelli, natos ex Rhea uxore devorabat […] ut autem fingatur Saturnus filios suos comesse, ratio haec est, quia dicitur deus esse aeternitatis et saeculorum. saecula autem annos ex se natos in se revolvunt: unde Graece Κρόνος quasi χρόνος, id est tempus, dicitur.

Serv. *Aen.* III 707
DREPANI PORTVS Drepanum civitas est non longe a monte Eryce, trans Lilybaeum, dicta vel propter curvaturam litoris, in quo sita est, vel quod Saturnus post amputata virilia Caelo patri illuc falcem proiecit, quae Graece δρεπάνη dicitur: quod verisimile putatur propter vicinitatem Erycis, consecrati Veneri, quae dicitur nata ex Caeli cruore et spuma maris.

Serv. *Aen.* VIII 356
MONUMENTA VIRORVM hoc sermone ostendit etiam Saturnum virum fuisse.

All these passages offer a rich image of Saturnus. In *Aen.* III 104 Servius gives a general short account of the story: Saturnus, father of Jupiter, is said to have eaten his sons since he is the god of Time according to the etymology of his Greek name (Kronos / χρόνος). In *georg.* II 406, the focus is on the sickle and Servius offers further details[41]: Saturnus used it to evirate Uranus and give birth to Venus. This has got a physical explanation since the moisture from the sky is needed to create life on the ground; after the emasculation, Saturnus threw the sickle into the sea, not far from Eryce, sacred to Venus: this is the origin of *Drepanum* harbor. Again, Servius uses an etymological explanation, since the Greek name of *falx* is

[41] See also Fest. 202 L.; 432 L.; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 42; Ov. *fast.* I 234; Macr. *sat.* I 7,24.

δρεπάνη[42]. The sickle, even though actually referred to Sabinus, appears in connection to Saturnus in another passage of Vergil, where the god is described as on old man, among the *effigies veterum avorum* (Verg. *Aen.* VII 177-180):

> Quin etiam veterum effigies ex ordine avorum
> antiqua e cedro, Italusque paterque Sabinus
> vitisator, curvam servans sub imagine falcem,
> Saturnusque senex…

This short *excursus* into Servius' work is useful to understand the approach of a teacher and a grammarian, and specifically of the influential commentator of Vergil's poetry, interested in allegory, rhetoric and language; an approach that in late Latin authors is unavoidably combined with the apologetic one: it is well-known how «most of those Christian writers and advocates […] were taught to read, write, interpret, and argue by Greek and Roman grammarians»[43]. So, let's turn now to another main passage in the chain that leads to Fulgentius, an author who certainly shared in both those 'souls': St. Augustine.

In his writings, Augustine shows a number of different attitudes towards etymologizing. In a famous passage of *dialect*. VI 20, he is skeptical (*ut somniorum interpretatio ita verborum origo pro cuiusque ingenio iudicatur*), but in fact he generally offers in his works a very long list of etymologies[44]. As far as Saturnus is concerned, we are interested specifically in two points of *de civitate dei* (VI 8):

> Multi enim et ipsa ad eundem modum interpretati sunt, usque adeo ut, quod ab eis inmanissimum et infandissimum dicitur, Saturnum suos filios devorasse, ita nonnulli interpretentur, quod longinquitas temporis, quae Saturni nomine significatur, quidquid gignit ipsa consumat, vel, sicut idem opinatur Varro, quod pertineat Saturnus ad semina, quae in terram, de qua oriuntur, iterum recidunt. Itemque alii alio modo et similiter cetera.

Of course, Augustine speaks against the inconsistency of myth. Pagan poets said that Saturnus ate his sons, and he tries to explain this *inmanissimum et infandissimum dictum* according to the two (already traditional) interpretations, presented as alternatives: an allegory for the consumption caused by the *longiquitas temporis* or (*vel, sicut opinatur Varro*) for the life-and-death agricultural cycle (*Saturnus*

[42] But see Fulg. *Verg. cont.* 94, 13 and Maltby 1991, 196.
[43] Amsler 1989, 58.
[44] Gualandri 2017, 128.

pertinet ad semina)[45]. Moreover, elsewhere Augustine adds further interesting details to the picture (Aug. *De consensu evangelistarum* I 23,34-35):

> [34] Quid dicunt de Saturno? Quem Saturnum colunt? Nonne ille est qui primus *ab Olympo venit* [Verg. *Aen.* VIII 320-324]
>
> > *Arma Iovis fugiens et regnis exsul ademptis*
> > *qui genus indocile et dispersum montibus altis*
> > *composuit legesque dedit, Latiumque vocari*
> > *maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris?*
>
> Nonne ipsum eius simulacrum, quod cooperto capite fingitur, quasi latentem indicat? Nonne ipse Italis ostendit agriculturam, quod falce demonstrat? Non, inquiunt; nam videris, si fuit ille homo et rex quidam, de quo ista narrantur; nos tamen Saturnum interpretamur «universum tempus», quod Graecum etiam vocabulum eius ostendit; vocatur enim Κρόνος, quod aspiratione addita etiam temporis nomen est, unde et Latine Saturnus appellatur, quasi saturetur annis. Quid iam cum istis agendum sit, nescio, qui conantes in melius interpretari nomina et simulacra deorum suorum, fatentur maiorem deum suum et patrem ceterorum tempus esse. Quid enim aliud indicant, quam omnes deos suos temporales esse, quorum patrem ipsum tempus constituunt?
> [35]. Erubuerunt hinc philosophi eorum recentiores Platonici, qui iam christianis temporibus fuerunt; et Saturnum aliter interpretari conati sunt dicentes appellatum Χρόνον, velut a satietate intellectus, eo quod Graece satietas κόρος, intellectus autem sive mens νοῦς dicitur. Cui videtur suffragari et latinum nomen, quasi ex prima Latina parte et Graeca posteriore compositum, ut diceretur Saturnus, tanquam satur esset, νοῦς. Viderunt quam esset absurdum, si filius temporis Iuppiter haberetur, quem deum aeternum vel putabant vel putari volebant. At vero secundum istam novellam interpretationem, quam veteres erorum si habuissent mirum si Ciceronem Varronemque latuisset, Saturni filium Iovem dicunt tamquam ab illa summa mente profluentem spiritum…

In this section of his work dedicated to the problem of the Gospels' texts, Augustine introduces the history of Saturnus and Jupiter as *fabulae interpretandae a sapientibus aut ridendae* (I 23,31), referring to euhemerist and Stoic cases (historic and physical explanations) and recalling Varro and Cicero (I 23,31-32). He largely uses Vergil's lines in order to explain how Pagans looked at these gods. Concerning Saturnus, Augustine introduces him by quoting, as an integrated part of his sentence, Vergil's *Aeneid* VIII 320-324: we have already met these lines in Lactantius' text and as the subject of the etymological comment by Servius (*Latium/latere*).

[45] The Varronian etymological connection of Saturnus with *seminatio* and *sero* is then mentioned again a little further in Augustine's work: *civ.* VII 3 and 13.

Augustine enriches the idea of a hiding Saturnus by referring to his iconography as a figure whose head is covered (*Nonne ipsum eius simulacrum, quod cooperto capite fingitur, quasi latentem indicat?*); then his connection to agriculture is explained by the image of the sickle (*Nonne ipse Italis ostendit agriculturam, quod falce demonstrat?*). Eventually, he calls into play Cicero's reference, underlining how the etymological derivation of the god's Greek name has been formed: *vocatur enim* Κρόνος*, quod aspiratione addita etiam temporis nomen est*. At the end, he recalls the Latin one: *Latine Saturnus appellatur, quasi saturetur annis.*

But what follows is even more interesting to us: in chapter 35, again in order to show the inconsistency of pagan theology, Augustine refers to the 'Platonists' (*Erubuerunt hinc philosophi eorum recentiores Platonici, qui iam christianis temporibus fuerunt; et Saturnum aliter interpretari conati sunt*…) and transmits a different etymology for Saturnus name: Saturnus as derived from *satietas*, which is κόρος in Greek. This derivation would be confirmed by the Latin name as well, composed by the first part from Latin, the second one from Greek: *satur* νοῦς ('fulfilled spirit'), such as 'someone full of spirit'. «This derivation is formed in analogy to Kronos = 'koros nus' and is already found in Plato's *Cratylus*»[46]; at this point, one more text has to be quoted here, and this is Macrobius (*Sat*. I 8,6-12)[47]:

> Est porro idem Κρόνος καὶ Χρόνος. Saturnum enim in quantum mythici fictionibus distrahunt, in tantum physici ad quandam verisimilitudinem revocant. hunc aiunt abscidisse Caeli patris pudenda, quibus in mare deiectis Venerem procreatam, quae a spuma unde coaluit ἀφροδίτη nomen accepit. [7] Ex quo intellegi volunt, cum chaos esset, tempora non fuisse: si quidem tempus est certa dimensio quae ex caeli conversione colligitur. [Tempus coepit] inde ab ipso natus putatur Κρόνος qui, ut diximus, Χρόνος est. [8] Cumque semina rerum omnium post caelum gignendarum de caelo fluerent et elementa universa quae mundo plenitudinem facerent ex illis seminibus fundarentur, ubi mundus omnibus suis partibus membrisque perfectus est, certo iam tempore finis factus est procedendi de caelo semina ad elementorum conceptionem, quippe iam plena fuerant procreata. Animalium vero aeternam propagationem ad Venerem generandi facultas ex humore translata est: ut per coitum maris feminaeque cuncta deinceps gignerentur. [9] Propter abscisorum pudendorum fabulam etiam nostri eum Saturnum vocitaverunt παρὰ τὴν

[46] Mastrocinque 2006; Plato *Crat*. 396b. For a short introduction to Augustine, etymology and (Neo)Platonists, Den Boeft 1979, 242-245. See also Amsler 1989, 31-56. The topic of hybrid etymological derivation is extremely interesting and would be worth pursuing both as a part of the general studies of bilingualism and as a specific practice of Latin authors. About hybrid compounding for nouns in Late antiquity, see Filos 2010, 221-252.

[47] Agozzino 1972, 7-9. Kaster 2011, XI-XLII.

> σάθην, quae membrum virile declarat, veluti Sathurnum: inde etiam satyros veluti sathyros[48], quod sint in libidinem proni, appellatos opinantur. Falcem ei quidam aestimant attributam quod tempus omnia metat exsecet et incidat. [10] Hunc aiunt filios suos solitum devorare eosdemque rursus evomere: per quod similiter significatur eum tempus esse, a quo vicibus cuncta gignantur absumanturque et ex eo denuo renascantur. [11] Eundem a filio pulsum quid aliud est quam tempora senescentia ab his quae post sunt nata depelli? Vinctum autem, quod certa lege naturae conexa sint tempora vel quod omnes fruges quibusdam vinculis nodisque alternentur. [12] Nam et falcem volunt fabulae in Siciliam decidisse, quod sit terra ista vel maxime fertilis.

Macrobius mentions the etymological equivalence between Kronos (Saturnus) and Chronos (Time) offered by Cicero, and states that he prefers the 'physical' interpretation of Saturnus' tale instead of the several versions offered by *mythici*. So, the idea of Time is connected to seeding since all the elements that fill the world took their start from seeds coming from Uranus' emasculation (*Cumque semina rerum omnium* [...]) and falling into the sea, from where Venus was born, with the Greek name of Aphrodite[49]: the process of bringing forth seeds from sky for the creation of the elements comes to an end at a fixed moment in time (*certo iam tempore finis factus est* [...]), being transferred from water to Venus (*animalium vero aeternam propagationem ad Venerem generandi facultas ex umore translate est* [...] *gignerentur*). After that, Macrobius adds a different etymology, based on the *abscisorum pudendorum fabula*: *nostri eum Saturnum vocitaverunt* παρὰ τὴν σάθην, *quae membrum virile declarant*: σάθη is 'penis' in Greek. The portrait of Saturnus is then completed with the reference to the sickle and to the story of eating his children and then vomiting them back again as symbol of Time, which cuts all things, but also creates them again. After a quite obscure reference to Saturnus' bondage, the sickle is connected with the fertility of Sicily, where it fell after the emasculation of Uranus[50].

So, it is time to go back to Fulgentius and to collect the different threads on etymologizing in these late Latin authors. As we have said, Fulgentius starts with the genealogy of Saturnus. One strange point is Saturnus' father, said here to be *Pollus*. No other sources mention this name or this fatherhood, but later writers, *e.g.* the so-called First and Second Vatican Mythographers, show the same text as Fulgentius does. According to Bode, editor of these late anonymous collections of

[48] The text is uncertain here: Kaster choses the proposal by Jan against the *concordia codicum*: Sathurnum [...] sathyros *Jan* : Sathunnum [...] sathunos ω. For the parallelism with the etymology of *satyrus* see Maltby 1991, 547 and Kaster 2011, 90, n. 127.

[49] ἀφρός is 'foam' in Greek: see Hes. *Theog.* 188-198.

[50] Kaster 2011, 91.

myths in 1834, Etienne Wolff, in his notes to Fulgentius' *Mythologiae*, says that «la forme doit s'expliquer par une faute de lecture imputable soit à Fulgence lui-même, soit à son modèle»[51]: in fact *Telluris* could have been read by Fulgentius as *Polluris* (in some cases banalized into *Pollucis*, as interlinear glosses of Fulgentian manuscripts point out)[52]. *Tellus* is the Latin name of Greek Gaia (Earth), mother of Kronos. This explanation is not unlikely and the mistake should have been introduced by Fulgentius himself, because two etymologic explanations of the corrupt name *Pollus* are integrated within two different sections of the text and transmitted by all manuscripts of *Mythologiae*: *Polluris etiam filius sive a pollendo sive a pollucibilitate quam nos humanitatem dicimus* (*myth.* 17,17-18) and *Polluris quasi poli filium dicunt, quattuor elementa gignentem* (*myth.* 18,12-13). Facing a non-existing name, Fulgentius does not lose heart and builds an etymology based on a hapax: *pollucibilitas*, on its turn deriving from a hapax, this time found in Plautus' *Mostellaria* (22-24): *dies noctesque bibite, pergraecamini,/ amicas emite, liberate: pascite/ parasitos: obsonate pollucibiliter*. *Pollucibiliter* such as 'richly', 'sumptuously' – from the verb *polluceo*, which means 'offer something to a deity on a sacred altar'[53]. Fulgentius translates *pollucibilitas* as *humanitas*, such as 'generosity', 'abundance'[54]. The second etymology for *Pollus* is instead a Greek one: Saturnus is *Polluris filius*, since *Pollus* comes from the genitive of Greek πολύς – and Saturnus is then 'son of abundance', as he generated altogether the four elements composing nature (Jupiter, Juno, Neptune and Pluto, his sons).

The last section of Fulgentius' fable is also interesting, since here the author – even though in this case without any evidence – applies a Greek-Latin etymology and calls into play a Greek *auctoritas*: Apollophanes, who, in his *epicum carmen*, is supposed to have offered a mixed etymology for Saturnus' name[55]: Saturnus as '*sacer* νοῦς' or '*sator* νοῦς', such as 'the divine intelligence creating everything'.

Needless to say, this process of 'mixed language etymological decomposition' is a crucial point, and recalls Augustine and the *Platonici recentiores* he mentioned (see *supra*), who tried to explain the name of Saturnus by offering an etymology based on the Greek word νοῦς in connection to 'satietas' (κόρος). Fulgentius does not mention Cicero's or Varro's etymologies, but, in some way, thanks to the stratification of all the previous tradition, he uses and takes them *both* for granted: *a sa-*

[51] Wolff - Dain 2013, 147, n. 110.

[52] *E.g.* ms. Erfurt, Forschungsbibliothek Erfurt/Gotha (Memb. I 55, XIII cent.), *ad l.*; the banalization also depending on the following explanation.

[53] Ernout - Meillet 1959, 519.

[54] *ThLL* VI/3 3083,55-56.

[55] About Apollophanes *epicus* we don't have any information; Tertullian quotes an Apollophanes Stoic philosopher: *anim.* XIV 2.

turando Saturnus dictus est; *Opis quoque eius uxor eo quod opem esurientibus ferret* (see Tertullian); *filios suos comedisse fertur, quod omne tempus quodcumque gignat consumit* (this interpretation being present in all the authors we read). The story of the Uranus' emasculation and of Venus' birth, which in Fulgentian text is developed into a more precise physiological sense (without any support of etymology), is already expressed *e.g.* by Servius and Macrobius (with support of etymology).

In this perspective, before coming to a conclusion, it is impossible not to mention finally an author, such as Isidore. His importance to our argument is crucial, not only because etymology takes pride of place in his work (*Etymologiae sive Origines*), but also because, as perhaps the last 'guardian' of Latin ancient knowledge, he collects and surpasses the earlier tradition (VIII 11,29-33):

> Quaedam autem nomina deorum suorum gentiles per vanas fabulas ad rationes physicas conantur traducere, eaque in causis elementorum conposita esse interpretantur. Sed hoc a poetis totum fictum est, ut deos suos ornarent aliquibus figuris, quos perditos ac dedecoris infamia plenos fuisse historiae confitentur. Omnino enim fingendi locus vacat, ubi veritas cessat.
> [30] Saturnus origo deorum et totius posteritatis a paganis designatur. Hunc Latini a satu appellatum ferunt, quasi ad ipsum satio omnium pertineat rerum, vel a temporis longitudine, quod saturetur annis. [31] Unde et eum Graeci Cronos nomen habere dicunt, id est tempus, quod filios suos fertur devorasse, hoc est annos, quos tempus produxerit, in se revolvit, vel quod eo semina, unde oriuntur, iterum redeunt. [32] Hunc Caeli patris abscidisse genitalia dicunt, quia nihil in caelo de seminibus nascitur. Falcem tenet, inquiunt, propter agriculturam significandam, vel propter annos et tempora, quod in se redeant, vel propter sapientiam, quod intus acuta sit. [33] In aliquibus autem civitatibus Saturno liberos suos apud gentiles inmolabant, quod Saturnum poetae liberos suos devorasse solitum tradiderunt.

Saturnus' tale is included in the 8th Book of *Etymologies*, the one dedicated to the Church and the sects. In this section, the author deals with pagan gods. The introduction of the fable (par. 29) is a theoretical statement, which synthesizes Isidore's thought and earlier tradition: pagan fables are empty stories, where gods' names are used to connect deities to the origin of the elements and to physical causes. Poets contribute to this by enhancing their gods with figures of speech and rhetorical ornaments, but the historical truth reveals their inconsistency. So, when truth is lacking, there is room for every kind of fiction.

Isidore explains the meaning of Saturnus' name according to the etymologies given by *Latini*: 'Saturnus' deriving *a satu* or *a saturando*. The two threads descending from Varro and from Cicero are again together, even though without any mention of them. The following explanation collects all the information com-

ing from ancient times, with a number of remarkable differences: the etymological interpretation of Saturnus' name is given without referring the Greek/Latin original word and something new is added to the symbolic image of Saturnus: the sickle is no more only the symbol of agriculture or Time, but it also represents the *falx sapientiae*, and this is a Christian metaphor taken from Ambrose[56]. «Isidore rewrites the pagan encyclopedia within the frame of Christian etymological grammar and so articulates a verbal ontology whereby the knowledge of things derives from the knowledge of words»[57].

In conclusion, what can we say about the etymological approach of these late Latin writers? I think that it is possible to see different lines merging together: an author like Fulgentius recovers the ancient idea of etymology as an instrument for philosophical (better: moral) argument, but this tool is trivialized and used by him as a didactic mode rather than in order to enact a real ontological inquiry. In fact, he uses etymologizing not specifically to explain words or names, but «in order to create focal points in *his* interpretation»[58]. Of course, he has been influenced by other interpretative approaches: the apologetic/Christian one, which used etymologizing as a tool against pagan theology; the Virgilian tradition with its commentaries, first of all Servius, where the rhetoric value of etymologizing is first emphasized by the poet and then amplified by the commentator for different purposes (in this category, we can perhaps count Macrobius as well, with his Neoplatonic view of Virgil's *Aeneid*)[59]; lastly – but maybe the most important one –, we can see the teaching/school/didactic practice of using a patchwork of sources and references in order to give the largest amount of information possible, reworked again and again, aiming at building a rich and bold explanation, no matter if cumbersome and incorrect: the «main purpose was to designate the range of meaning(s) a word possessed or the broadening of this space by relating it to other cluster(s) of meaning(s)»[60]. This means using mixed (wrong) etymologies, without any reference to the original words, or even applying them to a corrupted name. This path will lead to the encyclopedism of later authors like Isidore: «the core of the work [will be] not apologetic, but informational»[61].

---

[56] Ambr. *in psalm.* CXVIII 2,13 *quid est se noscere, nisi ut sciat unusquisque hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem dei factum, rationis capacem, qui terram suam excolere tamquam bonus agricola debeat aratro quodam et <u>falce sapientiae, ut uel dura findantur uel luxuriantia recidantur, qui inferiorem sui portionem animi imperio debeat gubernare</u>?*

[57] Amsler 1989, 134.

[58] Peraki-Kyriakidou 2002, 488 (not specifically speaking of Fulgentius).

[59] Agozzino 1972, 7.

[60] Peraki-Kyriakidou 2002, 487.

[61] Barney 2006, 19.

So, it is possible to say that, for these late Latin writers, etymologizing has been, at the same time, the research of the hidden truth behind names (especially gods' names), but also the disclosure of hidden lies, or even a way to build hidden truths – which of course were actually lies, but presented as based on authoritative sources and for high purposes.

By the way: no one of the several etymologies we have discussed for Saturnus' name seems today to be scientifically acceptable: «les philologues modernes ont fait justice de ces rapprochements et proposé, avec bien plus de vraisemblance, une origine étrusque»[62].

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
martina.venuti@unive.it

Keywords: *Saturnus,* Late Latin Literature, Etymology, Etymologizing
Parole chiave: *Saturnus*, letteratura tardolatina, etimologia, etimologizzazione

[62] Guittard 1978, 53. See also Herbig 1917, 446-459.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Agozzino 1972
Fabio Planciade Fulgenzio, *Expositio Virgilianae Continentiae*, a cura di T.Agozzino – F.Zanlucchi, Padova 1972.

Allen 2005
J.Allen, *The Stoics on the Origin of Language and the Foundations of Etymology*, in D.Frede – B.Inwood (ed.), *Language and Learning*, Cambridge 2005, 14-55.

Amata 2000
B.Amata (ed.), Arnobio, *Difesa della vera religione*, Roma 2000.

Amsler 1989
M.Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Amsterdam 1989.

Ax 2011
W.Ax, *Quintilians Grammatik (›Inst. Orat.‹ 1,4-8). Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Berlin-Boston 2011.

Barnes 1985[2]
T.D.Barnes, *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford 1985[2] [1971].

Barney 2006
S.A.Barney and Others (ed.), *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, Cambridge 2006.

Biondi 2015
F.Biondi, *Teagene di Reggio rapsodo e interprete di Omero*, Pisa-Roma 2015.

Brunet 2016
C.Brunet, *Servius et l'étymologie, une approche de la création lexicale*, in A.Garcea – M.-K.Lhommé – D.Vallat (ed.), *Fragments d'érudition: Servius et le savoir antique*, «Spudasmata» 168, 2016, 125-141.

Curtius 1948
E.R.Curtius, *Letteratura europea e Medioevo latino*, tr. it. Scandicci 1992 [ed. orig. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern 1948].

Den Boeft 1979
J.Den Boeft, *Etymologies in Augustine's De civitate Dei X*, «Vigiliae Christianae» XXXIII, 3 (1979), 242-259.

Dyck 2003
A.R.Dyck, *Etymologising the Gods: Cicero's Experiments at* N.D. *2.63-69*, in Ch.Nifadopoulos (ed.), *Etymologia. Studies in Ancient Etymology*. «Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference on Ancient Etymology, 25-27 September 2000», Münster 2003, 55-64.

Ernout – Meillet 1959
A.Ernout – A.Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, Paris 1959[4] [1932[1]].

Filos 2010
P.Filos, *Greek Papyri and Graeco-Latin Hybrid Compounds*, in T.V.Evans – D.D.Obbink (ed.), *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2010, 221-252.
Fragu 2010
B.Fragu, *Arnobe*, Paris 2010.
Gualandri 2017
I.Gualandri, *Words Pregnant with Meaning. The Power of Single Words in Late Latin Literature*, in J.Elsner – J.H.Lobato (ed.), *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, Oxford 2017, 125-146.
Guittard 1978
Ch.Guittard, *L'étymologie Varronienne de Saturne (Varr. LL. 5, 64)*, in J.Collart (ed.), *Varron. Grammaire antique et stylistique latine*, Paris 1978, 53-56.
Helm 1898
Fabius Planciadis Fulgentii V.C. *Opera*, rec. R.Helm, Lipsiae 1898.
Herbig 1917
G.Herbig, *Satre-Saturnus*, «Philologus» LXIV (1917), 446-459.
Hinds 2006
St.Hinds, *Venus, Varro and the vates: towards the limits of etymologizing interpretation*, «Dictynna» [online] 3, 2006: http://journals.openedition.org/dictynna/206.
Kaster 1988
R.A.Kaster, *Guardians of Language. The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkely and Los Angeles 1988.
Kaster 2011
Macrobii Ambrosii Theodosii *Saturnalia*, rec. R.A.Kaster, Oxford 2011.
Laurenti 1962
Arnobio, *I sette libri contro i pagani*, a cura di R.Laurenti, Torino 1962.
Leglay 1966
M.Leglay, *Saturne africain. Histoire*, Paris 1966.
Long 1992
A.A.Long, *Stoic Readings of Homer*, in R.Lamberton – J.J.Keaney (ed.), *Homer's Ancient Readers: the Hermeneutics of Greek Epics Earliest*, New Jersey 1992, 41-66.
Long 2005
A.A.Long, *Stoic Linguistics, Plato's Cratylus, and Augustine's De dialectica*, in D.Frede - B.Inwood (ed.), *Language and Learning: Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge 2005, 37–55.
Malkiel 1993
Y.Malkiel, *Etymology*, Cambridge 1993.
Maltby 1991
R.Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991.

Maltby 2003
R.Maltby, *The Role of Etymologies in Servius and Donatus*, in Ch.Nifadopoulos (ed.), *Etymologia. Studies in Ancient Etymology*: *Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference on Ancient Etymology, 25-27 September 2000*, Münster 2003, 103-118.
Marangoni 2007
C.Marangoni, *Supplementum Etymologicum Latinum I*, Trieste 2007.
Mastrocinque 2006
A.Mastrocinque, *Saturnus*, in *Brill's New Pauly*, consulted *online* on 11 July 2020 (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1102470); first published *online*: 2006.
McCracken 1949
Arnobius of Sicca, *The case against the pagans*, I-II, ed. G.E.McCracken, Westminster 1949.
Most 1989
G.Most, *Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis: A Preliminary Report*, in W.Haase (ed.), *Philosophie, Wissenschaften, Technik. Philosophie (Stoizismus)*, Berlin-Munich-Boston 1989, 2014-2066.
O'Hara 1996
J.J.O'Hara, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 1996 (See also the new and expanded edition, which I could not access: Ann Arbor 2017).
Opelt 1966
I.Opelt, *Etymologie*, «Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum» VI, 1966, 797-844.
Pease 1955-1958
A.S.Pease (ed.), M. Tulli Ciceronis *De natura deorum*, I-II, Cambridge Mass. 1955-1958.
Periaki-Kyriakidou 2002
H.Periaki-Kyriakidou, *Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing*, «Classical Quarterly» LII, 2 (2002), 478-493.
Philippson 1939
R.Philippson, *M.Tullius Cicero*, in *Pauly-Wissowa*, VII A, 1939, 827-1191.
Podolak 2006
Tertulliano, *Ad nationes*, ed. P.Podolak, in C.Moreschini – P.Podolak (ed.), *Tertulliano. Opere apologetiche*, Roma 2006, 339-467.
Ramelli 2004
G.Lucchetta – I.Ramelli (ed.), *Allegoria*. Vol. I. *L'età classica*, Milano 2004.
Venuti 2015
M.Venuti, *Spoudogeloion, Hyperbole and Myth in Fulgentius' Mythologiae,* in

P.Moretti – R.Ricci – Ch.Torre (ed.), *Culture and Literature in Latin Late Antiquity. Continuities and Discontinuities,* Turnhout 2015, 307-322.

Venuti 2018

M.Venuti, *Il prologus delle Mythologiae di Fulgenzio. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Napoli 2018.

Wolff – Dain 2013

Fulgence, *Mythologies*, traduit, présenté et annoté par E.Wolff – Ph.Dain, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2013.

Zetzel 2018

J.E.G.Zetzel, *Critics, Compilers, and Commentators*, Oxford 2018.

DOI: 10.13137/2464-8760/32062 *Incontri di filologia classica XIX (2019-2020), 311-333*

GIANFRANCO AGOSTI

Wordplays on Proper Names in Metrical Inscriptions of Late Antiquity

The paper deals with etymological wordplays on proper names in late antique metrical inscriptions, discussing some select examples from the 3rd to the 6th century AD, of both funerary and honorary epigrams. In most of the texts etymological puns on proper names are usually quite 'easy' to detect, but there are examples of more sophisticated wordplays that require a higher level of engagement from the reader. Their presence is a further evidence that metrical inscriptions were meant also to be read. If the targeted audience were primarily cultivated people, performative reading (perhaps accompanied by on-the-spot exegesis) probably also enabled less educated groups to appreciate etymological wordplays, which were after all extremely popular in antiquity.

L'articolo analizza la presenza di giochi etimologici sui nomi propri nelle iscrizioni metriche tardoantiche, discutendo alcuni casi esemplari (III - VI sec. d.C.) di epigrammi sia funerari, sia onorifici. I giochi etimologici sui nomi sono solitamente piuttosto 'facili' da riconoscere, ma non mancano esempi di giochi più sottili e sofisticati che richiedono una maggiore attenzione da parte del lettore. La loro presenza è una riprova ulteriore del fatto che le iscrizioni metriche erano concepite per essere lette e non solo osservate. Ovviamente i primi destinatari erano coloro che avevano ricevuto una sufficiente educazione, ma la lettura performativa (magari accompagnata dall'esegesi in loco) *permetteva probabilmente anche alle fasce meno colte di apprezzare i giochi etimologici, del resto estremamente popolari nell'antichità.*

1. *Introduction*

In this paper I will deal with a special category of etymology, exploring the presence, and meaning of wordplays related to proper names[1] in Greek metrical inscriptions of late antiquity[2]. Etymological puns on proper names (*lusus nominis*) are relatively frequent in late antique and early Byzantine inscriptions, even though not as frequent as in their Latin counterparts, at least judging by the rich documentation collected by Maria Teresa Sblendorio Cugusi in two important articles[3]. For classical and Hellenistic epigrams good, although far from being exhaustive, treatments are offered in the recent monographs by Bruss, Tsagalis and Garulli[4]. However, we still lack a systematic research on imperial and late antique

[1] A category well represented in literary poetry since Homer: see Louden 1995, Kanavou 2011 and the groundbreaking monographs by Paschalis 1997 and O'Hara 2017; further bibliography in Agosti 2018, 739-748.

[2] In what follows I continue my previous research on literary wordplays in late antique and early Byzantine poetry (see Agosti 2018 and 2019). There has been a renewal of interest about wordplays in literary poetry: an up-to-date bibliography in Kwapisz, Petrain, Szymański 2013 and Kwapisz 2019.

[3] Sblendorio Cugusi 1980, 257-281; 2007.

[4] Bruss 2005, 105, 107, 109, 115, 122, 128, 146 and n. 18; Tsagalis 2008, 281-285; Garulli 2012, 143-144, 264. The *locus classicus* for onomastic wordplays is Arist. *Rhet.* 1400b.

texts. It is not my ambition to fill this gap in a few pages. I would just like to provide some selected examples, taking into account both pagan and Christian inscriptions, and focusing on the possible functions attributed to, or presumed from, etymological wordplays. I will address the crucial questions of the audience response and other possible functions of «the often semantically exciting twists of sounds and words» in late metrical inscriptions[5].

Most of the examples I am dealing with belong to the realm of *paronomasia / adnominatio* rather than to that of «scientific etymology»[6], i.e. they display etymological wordplays strengthening the qualities of the *laudandus* or her/his achievements and often explicitly pointing them out to the attention of the beholder/readers through «etymological signposts»[7] (like τοὔνομα, ἐπώνυμον etc.).

As for genres, puns on the 'true meaning' of proper names are a traditional feature of funerary poems, showing in some cases a high level of sophistication. Late antique funerary inscriptions are no exception and display numerous examples of this kind of wordplay. What is even more intriguing, such wordplays appear also in honorary and dedicatory epigrams, notoriously the most innovative genre of late antique epigraphic habit.

2. *Does the name shape your destiny?*

I open my selection examining the metrical epitaph engraved on the funeral monument of the βιολόγος Eucharistos, from Patara (*SEG* 43.982 = *SGO* 17/09/01, Lycia, 3rd c. AD)[8]:

---

[5] An effective definition by Katz 2009, 86-87 (who also remarks that these twists «from the wider humanistic perspective have from the beginning of recorded history regularly engaged ordinary people, whose capacity for puns, spoonerisms, rebus writings, and the allegorization of language seems delightfully boundless»).

[6] For this distinction see the remarks by Den Boeft 1979, 275, who underscores that the main function of *adnominatio* «is not to provide arguments to prove a point, but, as one of the *figurae verborum*, to add *ornatus* to a text: *sunt orationis lumina et quodam modo insignia* (Cicero, *Orator* 135). *Adnominatio* is a stylistic technique, *etymologia* has an argumentative force». See also Ritti 1973-1974 on similar function of «onomastic images» in the Greek world. There is a renewed interest in ancient etymology, well represented by the recent volume on Hesiod by Vergados 2020 and the collection of essays by Zucker - Le Feuvre 2021, whose rich and up-to-date bibliography exempts me from providing further indications.

[7] For bibliography on this expression O'Hara 2017, 76 fn. 331.

[8] The monument is a late Hellenistic or early Imperial pedimental stele re-used in the 3rd c. AD. On the epigram (inscribed below a niche with representation of the bust of a bald man) see the fine analysis by Voutiras 1995, whose text is here reproduced. Ll. 1-5 hex-

Τὸ στόμα τῶν Μουσῶν, τῆς Ἑλλά|δος ἄνθος ἐπαινῶ{ν}, |
τῆς Ἀσίης ἀκρόαμα, κλυτῆς | Λυκίης προβίβασμα, |
Εὐχάριτον· ʻχαρίεν, σοφὸν οὔ|νομα, ἔξοχε μείμων, |
ὃς μόνος ἐν θυμέλαισι λέ|γων βιότου τὰ γραφέντα |
σκηνῇ καὶ φωνῇ θεάτροις | ὑπερῇρες ἅπαντας'· | 5
Εὐχάριστος Εὐχαρίστῳ τῷ | τέκνῳ μνείας χάριν |
vacat
Φιλιστίωνος πυκνὰ λέγων τὰ παίγνια
πολλάκις ἔλεξ̣α· ʻτ̣ὲ̣[λος] ἔχ̣ει τὸ παίγνιον'·
σειγῶ τὸ λοιπ̣[ὸν · τέλος ἔχω γὰρ] τ̣ο̣ῦ̣ β̣ί̣ου

I praise the mouth of the Muses, the flower of Hellas, the (best) player of Asia, pride of the famous Lycia, Eucharistos: 'lovely, (appropriately) wise name, most distinguished of mimes, who by depicting life alone on stage surpassed everyone with his performance and voice in the theatres. Eucharistos for Eucharistos his child to his memory. [*vacat*] 'I have often quoted the following sentence by Philistion: The game is finished. From now on I am silent; I am at the end of life'.

In line 3 the etymological wordplay on the name and the profession of the deceased is explicit and does not ask the reader for a particular exegetical effort. The addition σοφὸν οὔνομα, «clever name»[9], clarifies χαρίεν, and the periphrasis λέγων βιότου for βιολόγος is not particularly challenging, considering ἔξοχε μείμων (and in the last three trimeters the repetition of λέγ- and β̣ί̣ου at the end). The author and/or the patron wanted to be sure that the reader would catch the pun. However, as easy as it is, the wordplay between Εὐχάριτον and χαρίεν probably contains an additional meaning, for it explains the compound as «whose *charis* is excellent» and not simply «charming», emphasizing Eucharistos' extraordinary skills. The etymological pun somehow restores the 'original' meaning of the compound – a technique discussed by Aristotle[10], which is common to other late verse inscriptions.

ameters, l. 6 catalectic trochaic tetrameter, ll. 7-9 iambic trimeters. In the last three verses the deceased is speaking. Εὐχάριτον at l. 3 is due to metrical reasons. Translation mine.

[9] For the meaning cp. σοφὰ γράμματα in *I. Métr.* 168.33 Bernand, with Mairs 2017, 235.

[10] *Top.* II 112a32-38: «it can be argued that the original meaning of a word should be preferred to its current meaning. To its original meaning on the ground that it is more fitting to take it in this sense than in that now established. For example, 'stout-souled' can be used to mean not 'courageous,' which is its established meaning, but it can be applied to a man whose soul is in a good condition [εὔψυχον μὴ τὸν ἀνδρεῖον, καθάπερ νῦν κεῖται, ἀλλὰ τὸν εὖ τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχοντα]; […] and similarly 'fortunate' can be used of one whose fortune is good [εὐδαίμονα οὗ ἂν ὁ δαίμων ᾖ σπουδαῖος], as Xenocrates says "Fortunate is he who has a noble soul"; for his soul is each man's fortune» (transl. E.S. Forster).

Within this category the best represented pun is probably that of on Θεόδωρος/Θ̣εοδώρα - which is particularly common in Christian inscriptions, as is obvious[11]. Texts displaying this wordplay present a recurrent structure: the expression «gift of God» is put at the beginning, assuming the function of a *motto*, and the personal name comes out later, usually two or more lines below. I reproduce the first lines of an inscription (only partially metrical), from Diocletianopolis (Thrace, 5th-6th c. AD; *SGLIBulg* 224 = *ICG* 4282)[12]:

✠ **Θεοῦ δῶρον** προσεκομήσθη
τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ **θεοῦ** τηρήσας
Θεόδωρος τῆς λαμπρᾶς μνήμης
καὶ πρὸς **θεὸν** μέλλ<ω>ν ἀναλύειν
5 ἐπιποθήσας τε τὸ ἀείδιον οἰκητήριο(ν)
ἐν τῷ σεβασμίῳ τούτῳ οἴκῳ τοῦ ἁγίου
ἐνδόξου προτομάρτυρος Στεφάνου
τὴν κατάπαυσιν ἐνθάδε ηὕρατο

(As) a gift from God was offered, keeping God's commandments, Theodor with bright memory. And when he was willing to go to God and was wishing (to have) his eternal home in this venerable house of the holy glorious protomartyr Stephen, here he found comfort (trans. Prodanova).

In this case too we can reasonably assume that the beholder/reader had no difficulty in catching the pun; moreover, the repetition of Θεοῦ/Θεό-/θεόν in the first four lines emphasised the message displayed. Theodore was a true gift *from* God and has returned *to* God. The etymology at the outset provides the true meaning of the name of the deceased and a guide for interpreting the whole text, which is based on the implicit meanings of the name Theodore, who is a gift, a commandment, and a bright memory of God.

Similar considerations apply to a roughly contemporary funerary inscription from Beroia (Macedonia, 5th/6th c. AD) for a certain Theodora, probably the ab-

[11] Cp. Agosti 2018a, 757 with further bibliography. A nice example from the late Byzantine period is BGR 3 Rhoby, v. 5 (1428 AD) ἡ γὰρ Θεοδώρα τοὔνομα (καὶ) τῷ τρόπῳ.

[12] Text by Beševliev 1964, 155-156. M.Prodanova in *IGC* (http://www.epigraph.topoi.org/ica/icamainapp/inscription/show/4282), points out allusions to NT in l. 2 (Mt 19.17: εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς, and Jo 14,15: Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε) and in l. 5 (2Cor. 5.2 τὸ οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐπενδύσασθαι ἐπιποθοῦντες).

bess of a convent. The first two lines are trimeters/dodecasyllables, the rest flawed dodecasyllables (*I.Chr.Mac.* 60 = *ICG* 3070)[13]:

✠ ΧΜΓ **θεῖον δώρημα**, ἁγνίας διδάσκα|λος,
τὸν μακαρισμὸν Κ(υρίο)υ κτησαμένη, |
μήτηρ παρθένων εὐσεβῶν <κ>αθηγεμόν, |
λέγω <δ>ὴ Μυγδονίης κ(αὶ) Γρατισήμης,
5 ῥίζης ὁσίης| κλάδων ε<ὑγ>ε<ν>εστάτων, |
Θ̣εοδώρα τοὔνομ[α], |ἀειπάρθενος,
τὸ πν(εῦμ)α παρ[α]{φ}θεμένη τῷ θ(ε)ῷ | κ(αὶ) δεσπότῃ,
τύμβῳ τὸ σῶμα φρουρῖν καταλί|ψασα·
τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ποιεῖτε ἱκεσίας.

✠ Christ born of Mary (?). Divine gift, teacher of chastity, recipient of the blessing of the Lord, leading mother of the pious virgins, I speak of Mygdonia and Gratissima (?), noble offshoots of a holy root named Theodora, an eternal virgin, who entrusted her spirit to (her) God and Lord and left the keep of her body to the tomb. Make intercession for them (transl. Ogereau).

The structure is basically the same as in the previous text, with the etymology at the beginning and the *retardatio* of the proper name at l. 6 (Θ̣εοδώρα τοὔνομ[α]). However, the author of this inscription proves to be a little more skillful than the previous one: he combined the etymological explanation with the idea of purity (ἁγνίας διδάσκα|λος l. 1: then at l. 3 εὐσεβῶν <κ>αθηγεμόν, and 5 ῥίζης ὁσίης), and with the concept of maternity (μήτηρ παρθένων l. 3 and ῥίζης ὁσίης | κλάδων ε<ὑγ>ε<ν>εστάτων, l. 5). Through the emphasis on virginity (παρθένων εὐσεβῶν l. 3), he reached the climax of the praise with the paradoxical ἀειπάρθενος l. 6. We can say that the *motto* in the first line functions as an interpretive clue of the entire text, which aims at showcasing how much the initial statement is grounded and true. From this perspective, Θ̣εοδώρα τοὔνομ[α] can be read also as «she was a true gift of God».

These three inscriptions are nice examples of the widespread belief that names reflect the nature of things (although Augustine insisted on the danger of *signa pro rebus accipere*)[14] and that 'etymology' can hold the key to reveal the true meaning of names as well as the destiny of their bearers. A strong link between names, and the

[13] Ed. Feissel 1983, 64-66. I discussed at length this inscription in Agosti 2019, 306; transl. by J. Ogereau in *IGC* (http://www.epigraph.topoi.org/ica/icamainapp/inscription/show/3070).

[14] See Opelt 1966; Gualandri 2017, 125-128; Males 2018, 35-40.

nature and destiny of those who bear them is ubiquitous in late antique and Medieval culture[15]. Wordplays based on this kind of relationship are usually easy to grasp, because their function is to be effective and meaningful for any reader, like the one in *IGUR* 1351 (3rd/4th c. AD), for Φίλητος (v. 10) who was αἴσιος ἐμ φιλότητι (v. 3), «favorable, propitious in friendship»[16]. Or the long epitaph for Eugenios, a «presbyter of God» belonging to the Novatians, *SGO* 14/06/05 = *IGC* 52 = E10 Nowakowski (3rd/4th c. AD, area of Laodicea Combusta), who is praised for his nobility (εὐγενίη) at ll. 2-4 of the verse (more or less dactylic) section of the inscription[17]:

> **Εὐγενίου** θανεόν|τος πολλὴ μνήμη ἐπὶ | γέῃ·
> **Εὐγένιε**, νέος θάν|ες· ἠελίοιό σε γὰρ ἐγίνω|σκαν πάντες,
> ἀντολίη | τε δύσις τε με<ση>μβρία | τε κὲ ἄρκτος
> ὄλβῳ τε πλ|ούτῳ τε **εὐγενίῃ** τε κ|ὲ θάρσι·
>
> Of Eugenios dead (there is) much remembrance on the earth. Eugenios, thou didst die young. For all men under the sun knew thee: both east, and west, and north, and south, for thy prosperity, and wealth, and nobility, and courage (transl. Calder)

Even in honorific epigrams, as I mentioned before, it is possible to find this kind of wordplay. For instance, in the first inscription for the renovation of Hammat Gader baths (*SGO* 21/22/02 = 50 Di Segni, 491-518 AD)[18]:

> ὃν χρόνος ἠμάλδυνεν | ἑλισσόμενος κατὰ κύκλον|
> **στῆσεν Ἀναστάσιος** | βασιλεὺς μεγαλώνυμος ἥρως|
> σπουδῇ Ἀλεξάνδροιο | περίφρονος ἡγεμονῆος |
> Καισαρίης ναετῆρος ❦ ❦ | ὃς ἔλλαχεν ἡνία Νύσης.

[15] For examples from Latin poetry see Gualandri 2017, 130-131; Males 2018, 1-2 points out the wide dissemination of etymology in Medieval world and its importance to understand the relationship between language and knowledge.

[16] Cp. also one of the epigrams for Porphyrius the charioteer, *APl* 359,1-2 (Σῆς τόδε διφρελάτειρα τὸ χάλκεον ἄνθετο Νίκα / δείκηλον **μορφᾶς, Καλλιόπα, ζαθέας**, «Victory, the charioteer, dedicated to thee, Calliopas, this brazen image of thy divine form», transl. Paton), where the statue as image of Calliopas' (the other name of the charioteer) μορφᾶς […] ζαθέας alludes perhaps to the second part of the name (ὄψ).

[17] For a detailed commentary on the text see Nowakowski 2018, 630-632 (the text has a section in prose [ll. 1-8], followed by 8 verses). The same wordplay in *CLE* 1447.1 (Marseille, 6th c. AD) † ***Nobilis Eugenia*** *praeclari sanguinis ortu*, see Bolaños Herrera 2017, 17.

[18] Marble slab from the eastern wall of the Hall of Fountains. The text is organized on 8 lines divided at the main caesura. Two dots separate each word from the next.

> (This place) which Time crushed, revolving in its cycle, raised Anastasius, king-hero with a great name, under the care of Alexander, the thoughtful governor, dweller of Caesarea, who obtained the reins of Nysa (transl. Di Segni).

The *figura etymologica* on Anastasius' name is here particularly appropriate, since ἀνίστημι is a technical term for raising a building (it is often used, for example, in Procopius' *De Aedificiis*). The same wordplay occurs also once in a passage of the *Panegyric speech for Anastasius* 7 by Procopius of Gaza: καὶ τείχη τὰ μὲν γεγηρακότα νεάζει, τὰ δὲ νῦν πρῶτον ἀνίσταται[19]. Therefore, Anastasius is a true «building raiser» whose «great name» announces his extensive building program, attested by many inscriptions and literary sources[20].

Honorific inscriptions display also more sophisticated wordplays. Let us see a couple of examples. The first one is *IG* II/III^2 13293 = *ICG* 1877 celebrating the erection of the *bema* in the theatre of Dionysus by the archon Phaedrus son of Zoilus (end of the 4th – beginning of the 5th c. AD)[21]:

> σοὶ τόδε καλὸν ἔτευξε, φιλόργιε, βῆμα θεήτρου
> Φαῖδρος **Ζωί**λου **βιοδώτορος** Ἀτθίδος ἀρχός.

> For you, lover of passionate rites, this beautiful stage has been built by Phaedrus, son of Zoilus, archon of the livelihood-giving land of Attica (transl. Sironen).

The vocabulary of this short but not irrelevant poem is characterized by the presence of rare poetic terms like φιλόργιος and βιοδώτωρ (which belong to the highbrow poetic language of the 5th century)[22], and the 'technical' use of the Homeric ἀρχός as ἄρχων[23]. Βιοδώτορος, set next to the name of Phaedrus' father,

---

[19] Similar wordplays based on building terminology are frequent. For a nice example see *APl* 361,1-2 (for Porphyrius the charioteer) Οὗτος, **ἐγερσιθέατρε**, τεὸς τύπος, ὅν τοι **ἐγείρει** / ἑσμὸς ἀριζήλων, Καλλιόπα, στεφάνων («O Calliopas, thou who raisest applause in the theatre, this is thy portrait which a swarm of much envied crowns raises to thee», transl. Paton).

[20] E.g., Malalas 16,21, p. 335,60-63 Thurn ἔκτισεν δὲ καὶ εἰς ἑκάστην πόλιν τῆς Ῥωμανίας διάφορα κτίσματα καὶ τείχη καὶ ἀγωγούς, καὶ λιμένας ἀνακαθάρας καὶ δημόσια λουτρὰ ἐκ θεμελίων οἰκοδομήσας, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἐν ἑκάστῃ παρέσχε πόλει. Cp. Haarer 2006, 230-245.

[21] For an extensive discussion on the epigram see Sironen 1994, 43-45 and 1997, 117-118 (whose translation is here reproduced).

[22] For the occurrences see Agosti 2010, 347.

[23] Cp. Sironen 1994, 31. It appears also in *SEG* 63.797, epigram celebrating the construc-

Ζωίλου, functions as single-adjective gloss, implying that the act of «giving life» (Ζωί/ζωή) is a natural and intimate quality of Phaedrus' family[24]. In addition, we might also consider the possibility of a (more subtle) pun in the sequence Φαῖδρος Ζωίλου βιοδώτορος, since Φαῖδρος irresistibly reminds to light (φαιδρός) and the equivalence of light (φῶς) and life (ζωή) is ubiquitous in late antique texts. The *laudandus* has his destiny inscribed in his name.

Light imagery and vocabulary were well suited to etymological wordplays in dedicatory epigrams, in virtue of the idea of 'beauty' associated to brilliance and light in late antique aesthetics[25]. In one of the verse inscriptions celebrating the restoration of the bath complex called "Faustina's baths" in Ephesus, by mediation of a certain Hesychius - who is plausibly to be identified with the historian Hesychius *Illustris* of Miletus (sixth century AD), or with his homonymous father - there is a *paronomasia* with the honorific rank (*I.Milet*. VI.1 341 = *SGO* 01/20/19 = *ICG* 1797)[26]:

ο̣ὐδὲ σέθ̣[εν, Μί|λ]η̣τε, θεὸς λάθε, σῶν δ' [ἀ]|πὸ κόλπων
ἐνναέτης| βλάστησε φίλος κρατερῶι β|ασιλῆϊ
Ἡσύχιος, πατρ|ὸς μὲν ὁμώνυμος, ἐν δ' ἄρ'| ὑπάρχων
ἀστράπτων ρη|τῆρσιν, ἑῶν δ' ἠλλάξατο| δώρων
αἰτῆσαι βασιλ|ῆα φίληι θρεπτήρι̣α πάτ|[ρ]η̣[ι·]
ἔνθεν τοῦτο |λοετρὸν ἐτῶν ἑκ[α]τὸν| μετὰ κ̣ύκλα
ἀστοῖσιν ἀδ|όκητον ἐὴν πά̣[λι]ν̣ ἤ[γ]|αγε τέρψιν.

Nor has God forgotten you, Miletus; for a Milesian has sprung from your womb, a friend to the mighty emperor, Hesychius. He shares a name with his father, and among the prefects' orators he shines like lightning; and now, appealing to the emperor, he has requited his beloved homeland for the gifts he has received at her hands. Whence this bath-house, after the cycle of a hundred years, has again brought unexpected pleasure to the citizens of Miletus (transl. Thonemann)

---

tion of the frigidarium of the Forum Baths at Ostia (4th c. AD) by a Βίκτωρ ἀρχὸς ἐὼν κύδιμος Αὐσονίης (i.e., Flavius Aurelius Victor, praefect of the annona under Constantine).

[24] Similar wordplays are frequent in Latin inscriptions (e.g., *ICUR* 4225 *Verus, qui semper vera locutus*): see Sblendorio Cugusi 1980 and 2007, 205.

[25] Examples of the rich vocabulary related to light in ekphrastic inscriptions are collected in Leatherbury 2020, 54-56.

[26] Rehm 1928, no. 343, 5-6, and Herrmann 1997, 213-214; Busch 1999, 153-185; Thonemann 2011, 315.

This refined poem begins with the adaptation of a Homeric verse, *Il.* 4.127-8 οὐδὲ σέθεν Μενέλαε θεοὶ μάκαρες λελάθοντο / ἀθάνατοι. As already Rehm, the editor of the inscriptions from Miletus, suggested, ἀστράπτων at l. 4 is a pun on the honorific title *Illustris*: the verb has the double meaning of «shine» and of «be glorious»[27]. In fact, the wordplay cannot be coincidental, because another epigram from the same baths extols Hesychius' merits and the ὅλη […] πατρίδος **ἀγλαΐη**, the «whole beauty of the fatherland» (v. 2; *SGO* 01/20/20 = *LSA* 548 = *ICG* 1799).

Restoration/edification of baths was particularly suitable to this kind of wordplay (in many of them the light and the brightness are the main features of the renovated structure[28]). Another intriguing case is the epigram composed by a professional rhetorician, Eudemus of Laodikeia (who proudly calls himself «Roman sophist», perhaps the young talented rhetorician mentioned by Libanius in *epist*. 1493 F. or the Eudemus author or rhetorical treatises[29]), to celebrate the magnificence of Lampadius' baths (*SEG* 35.1055 = 105 Puech = p. 133 Busch, ca. 365 AD)[30]. Lampadius is the *signum* of C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, who was *praefectus urbi* in 365/66[31]. His rich epigraphic *dossier* includes a dedication of a statue of Dionysus in Ostia (*LSA* 2539), where he is recorded as *vir clarissimus* and former prefect *(Volusianus v(ir) c(larissimus) ex praefectis tauroboliatus d(ono) d(edit)*) The baths are probably the *thermae* of Aquae Albulae (ca. 8 km from Settecamini and 6 from Tivoli)[32].

Λαμπαδίου τάδε λουτρά | τί τοι φρένας ἐπτοιῆσθαι |
  τῶν μεγάλων πτολίων | ἔγγυθι δειμαμένου; |
πάντοθεν **ἀστράπτει** | χάρις ἄσπετος εἰς ὅ κε λεύσῃς, |
  ὕδατα Νυμφάων, | λουτρά, δόμοι, Χάριτες· |
οὗτος ‹τ›οῦ κλέος εὐρὺ | κατὰ χθόνα καὶ κατὰ πόντον, | 5
  ὁ κλυτὸς ὡς οὔτις | καὶ σοφὸς ὡς ὀλίγοι, |
γείτονας ἕδρας ἔχων βασιληΐδος | ἐγγύθεν αἴγλης |
  ἀνθ' ἑκατομβοίων | τὴν θέμιν ἠρέσατο |
Εὔδημος Λαδικεὺς | σοφιστὴς Ῥωμέων.

4. Χάριτες Moretti: χάριτες Busch 5. ‹τ›οῦ Moretti

[27] The whole expression means that Hesychius was not «un rhéteur quelconque mais un des avocats de la préfecture du prétoire», Feissel 2010, 268.

[28] See e.g., *AP* 9.35 and Busch 1999, *passim*.

[29] See Janiszewski - Stebnicka - Szabat 2014, *PGRSRE* # 336, 337 e 335.

[30] Moretti 1984-1985; Busch 1999, 133-146; Puech 2002, 236-237; Gregori 2013, 160-161; Agosti 2015b, 14-15].

[31] See *PLRE* s.v. Volusianus 5.

[32] Moretti 1984-1985, 239-240. Translation mine.

> Why is your soul amazed at these baths that Lampadius has built near the big city? Everywhere unspeakable grace sparkles, whatever you look at: waters of the Nymphs, baths, buildings, graces. This man, whose fame on land and at sea is vast, illustrious like no one and wise like few, he who, having his seat near the imperial splendour, preferred the justice to the sacrifices of a hundred oxen. *Eudemus of Laodicea, sophist of the Romans*.

In l. 3 ἀστράπτει might allude to the etymology of *Lampadius* (from λαμπάς/ *lampas*)[33]. Such a wordplay – once again, not particularly demanding for cultivated readers – fits well the general tone of the epigram, as well as the portrait Ammianus gives of the contemptuous Lampadius[34]. No doubt, Lampadius was pleased and flattered by the elegant and clever epigram Eudemus had composed for his baths.

Etymological wordplays between Latin and Greek[35] are well attested in other late antique epigrams. A nice example come from Trier, *IGTrev* 6 = *SEG* 30.1242 (5th c. AD)[36], a fragmentary text whose nature is debated (a dedication of a church of St Agnes, or a funerary epigram for a Christian woman), but which displays at least two etymological puns in the first four lines:

> **ἁγνὴν παρθ[ένον**------
> Εὐστόργιος θῆκ[ε-----
> σκηναῖς πάν[---]ρ̣π[---
> **ἀμνόν** τ᾽ ἀβρὰν ἐοῦ[σαν---

If the pun between the name of the deceased and the adjective in l. 1 is not certain (depending on the reading Ἁγνὴν or ἁγνὴν), in l. 4 ἀμνόν alludes to a

[33] See also in l. 7 the presence of αἴγλη (although not referred directly to Lampadius).

[34] XXVII 3,5 *urbis moderator Lampadius, ex praefecto praetorio, homo indignanter admodum sustinens, si etiam cum spueret non laudaretur, ut id quoque prudenter praeter alios faciens, sed non numquam severus et frugi* («Symmachus was succeeded as prefect of the city by) Lampadius, a former praetorian prefect, a man who took it very ill if even his manner of spitting was not praised, on the ground that he did that also with greater skill than anyone else; but yet he was sometimes strict and honest», transl. Rolfe).

[35] Several instances of wordplay between Greek and Latin are attested in Imperial and late antique inscriptions: see for example, *IGUR* III 1305 = EDR125560 (2nd c. AD), a Greek funerary epigram for Petronia Musa, celebrated as Μοῦσα καλή, and other cases collected in Sblendorio Cugusi 1980 and 2007, 203 and 205.

[36] Text according to D.Groß in Siede - Schwinden 2012, 55-65 (discussion on the etymology at 61-62).

current interpretation of the Greek name in Latin, as established for example by Augustine (*Serm.* 276,3 *Agnes Latine agnam significat; Graece castam*).

3. *Challenging the reader*

More sophisticated texts may contain complex wordplays. Since these latter are not immediately detectable, it is a reasonable assumption that they required a higher level of engagement from readers. In other terms, this kind of wordplays might have had the function of challenging readers' interpretative skills, in a way not too far from plays in literary poetry. The line separating challenge from over-interpretation is very thin, and it calls for caution, of course[37]. Needless to remind, metrical inscriptions are not (or not only) literary texts, but they have their own specific communicative functions, which depend on and interact with the cultural and social context where they are displayed. In many cases it is very difficult to decide if the wordplay was intentional or is the result of our too confident reading. I would like to clarify this point by discussing a not particularly sophisticated text, an inscription from Hawran, *SGO* 22/44/01 = *IGLS* XIII/2 9773 (4th c. AD) commemorating the erection of a family tomb by a certain Diomedes, where in the beginning the deceased is described as πινυτός[38]:

> Διομήδης πινυ[τ]ός με ἐδίματο τῷδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ
> αὐτῷ κὲ πέδεσιν καὶ ἐδύ<η> παρακύτι
> νηὸν Πλουτῆει κὲ ἐ̣πενῇ Περσεφονείῃ
> ἐσθ[λ]ῆς ἐγ γεωργείης· νῦ<ν> δ' οὐδενός εἰμι τάφος.
> < ---------- >· εἰ δ' ἄρα κὲ δεῖ,
> δεξέμιν γηράσκοντας, εὐδέμονας, τεκνώσαντας.
>
> The wise Diomedes built me here for himself, his children and his venerable wife, a temple for Pluto and the fearsome Persephone, thanks to the noble agriculture. Now I am no one's grave. [- - - - - - - - -] But if it is necessary, may I receive them old, happy and with children.

It would be tempting to suggest that Diomedes was «wise» because in his name were thoughts (worth) of Zeus. However, another epigram from the same region,

[37] Cp. O'Hara 2017, XVIII-XIX, whose remark and invitation to skepticism I find particularly welcome.

[38] Text according to M.Sartre in *IGLS* XIII/2 9773; translation mine.

from Rimea (Nabatea, *SGO* 22/23/01) displays the same incipit but with a different name (Caelestinus)[39]. Furthermore, the text of our epigram is reused *tel quel* for a different tomb in the same village of the Hawran (*SGO* 22/44/02). This points out that local epigraphic workshops had at their disposal a model suitable to be slightly adapted to the needs of the commissioners - nothing particularly surprising. In the light of this, it would be better to consider the pun on the name Diomedes as unintentional, although it is true that the name of the deceased combined with πινυτός fits perfectly with the content. Shall we assume that Diomedes' family (or the author) wanted the formula because it added something more to the praise?

Although clear-cut interpretations are often very difficult, nonetheless I think that we can confidently say that some texts display subtle etymological wordplays, especially high-quality texts. An intriguing example is offered by *IG* II/III^2 13281 = Puech 208 = *ICG* 1867 = *LSA* 134, honorary epigram for the sophist Plutarch (Athens, 408-410 AD):

δῆμος Ἐρεχθῆος βασιλῆα λόγων ἀνέθηκεν
  Πλούταρχον σταθερῆς ἕρμα σαοφροσύνης·
ὃς καὶ τρὶς ποτὶ νηὸν Ἀθηναίης ἐπέλασσεν
  ναῦν ἐλάσας ἱερήν, πλοῦτον ὅλον προχέας.

The people of Erechtheus dedicated (this statue of) Plutarchus, the king of words, the mainstay of firm prudence, who rowed the Sacred Ship three times in all near to the temple of Athena, spending all his wealth (transl. Sironen)[40].

Errki Sironen identified this Plutarch, sophist and rhetorician, with the author of another epigram in honor of the prefect Herculius, found on the left side of the original entrance to the Library of Hadrian (*LSA* 134). It is undoubtful that the pun on the name Plutarch from πλοῦτος is a very simple one, as Sironen already remarked (unnecessarily wondering also whether it was an unintended play). Nonetheless, I do not think that we should characterize this text as «not very brilliant»[41], because of the triviality of the etymological wordplay and the stock phraseology. The author has enough command of poetic language, I find, and I wonder if we can detect other, and much more subtle, wordplays. At l. 1

[39] Cp. also *SGO* 08/08/13.3 = D/BIT/02/01 Nowakowski (Hadriani ad Olympum, 4th/5th c. AD), Νικάτορις πινυτός.

[40] Transl. by Sironen 1997, 78. The stone at l. 1 reads δῆμος Cρεχθῆος βασιλῆΛ λόγων ἀνέθηκεν.

[41] Sironen 1997, 78.

βασιλῆ<α> λόγων is perfectly appropriate after δῆμος <Ἐ>ρεχθῆος: in the city of *king* Erechteus Plutarch can be no other than the *king of words*, as his name itself reveals (Πλούτ-αρχος). I wonder whether reusing the stock expression δῆμος <Ἐ>ρεχθῆος followed by ἔρμα at l. 2 the poet wanted to suggest a more sophisticated wordplay on the name Erechteus, linking its first part to ἔρ-υμαι «to keep off, protect, save» instead of the popular connection with ἐρέχθω «rend, break»[42]. Already Callimachus in a passage from *Hecale* (fr. 70.9 Hollis) explained Ἐριχθόνιος as ἔρυμα χθονός, suggesting an etymology of the name (known also under the rare form Ἐρυχθόνιος), as M. Skempis has brilliantly shown[43]. With all due caution, I suggest that the author of our epigram wanted to display the same idea. Athenians, the inhabitants of the city of wisdom and the δῆμος Ἐρ-εχθῆος, cannot but honor the generous Plutarch calling him ἔρ-μα σαοφροσύνης[44].

Likewise, puns on the names of the cities in honorific inscriptions are characterized sometimes by a certain level of subtlety[45]. For instance, in *LSA* 2636 = *BE* 2012.450, the dedicatory inscription for a statue of Justinian, who built the wall in the city of Cyrrhus (Syria Euphratensis), it is said that the city changed its name in *Iustiniana*, thanks to the mediation of Eustathius[46]:

Κῦρον Ἰουστινιανὸς ἄναξ | κακότητι καμοῦσαν |
νῦν πάλιν ἐξετέλεσσε πόλιν, | μέγα τ(ε)ῖχος ὀπάσας. |
Τοὔνεκα καὶ βασιλῆος ἐπώ|νυμον ἔλλαχε κῦδος |
Εὐσταθίου διὰ μῆτιν. Ἐπ' | ἀγλαΐῃ δ'ἀρετάων |
εἰκόνα σὴν φορέει, βασιλεῦ, | πόλις ἔρκος ἀνάγκης·

The emperor Justinian now raised again to the rank of city
Cyr(r)hus which had suffered badly through wickedness, by

[42] The correct etymology is from ἐρι-, see the dictionaries by Chantraine and Beekes s.v.

[43] Skempis 2006.

[44] One referee (whom I thank again) pointed out the implausibility of such a wordplay, which would have been too difficult to grasp, since: a) is based only on Ἐρ-; b) because of the different breathings between Ἐρ-ιχθόνιος and ἔρμα (this second argument seems to me less effective for to an audience of the 4th c. AD). It was not without hesitation that I decided to keep my suggestion in the text, although I am aware of the risk of an overinterpretation.

[45] For an effective example in literary epigram see Christodorus, *AP* VII 797,5-8.

[46] See Alpi 2011, who reminds to Proc. *De aed.* II 11,3 Προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου ἡ Κῦρος τά τε ἀλλὰ ὑπερώφθη καὶ ἀτείχιστος ὅλως μεμένηκεν. Ἀλλὰ βασιλεὺς Ἰουστινιανὸς […] πόλιν εὐδαίμονα καὶ λόγου ἀξίαν πολλοῦ, τείχους τε ἀσφαλείᾳ ἐχυρωτάτου καὶ φρουρῶν πλήθει καὶ οἰκοδομιῶν δημοσίων μεγέθει, καὶ τῆς ἄλλης κατασκευῆς τῷ ἐς ἄγαν μεγαλοπρεπεῖ, πεποίηται Κῦρον.

providing it with a large wall. Thereby she also gained the glory of bearing the emperor's name, through the wisdom of Eustathius. To [honour] the splendour of your virtues, the city carries your image, Emperor, as a defence against evil[47].

The beginning with Κῦρον, with one *rho*, is not due to corruption, nor to an engraver's fault, but it is an intentional wordplay on the name of the Persian king, which alluded to the ancient origins of the city, as F. Alpi suggested[48]. The emperor restored Cyrrhus to its ancient status of city (l. 2 πάλιν ἐξετέλεσσε πόλιν, a stock phrase); the ancient heritage expressed in the city's name remains and just left the place to a more powerful one, that of Justinian. The new name improves Cyrrhus' inborn royal destiny (note also the paronomasia Κῦρος /κῦδος).

A similar wordplay is attested in the last line of the Greek text of the funerary epigram in honour of an Egyptian physician (*GVI* 1907 = *SEG* 34.1003 = 495 Samama), written on a wide white marble board discovered under the floor of the basilica of the Holy Apostles in Milan (4th/5th c. AD)[49]:

τοὔνομα πατρὸς ἔχων Διόσκορος· ἦν δ᾽ ἀπὸ πάτρης
Αἰγύπτου ζαθέης, ἡ δὲ πό|λις τὸ **Γέρας**. 10

He had his father's name, Dioscorus. His fatherland was divine Egypt, his hometown Gerras.

In l. 10 the reading γέρας has been interpreted in different ways (although it cannot but mean «our city was his glory»), but Denis Feissel found the solution, acutely suggesting that γέρας is the name of Gerra/Geras, a small town not far from Pelusium[50]. Dioscorus, like many other skilled Egyptian physicians, made his career abroad and became a renowned physician in Milan. One could wonder, however, if local people, reading the inscription in the church, were able to recognize the name of the Egyptian hometown of the deceased. I am rather inclined to think that in ΓΕΡΑΣ the author put an intentional *double entendre* (*Geras* and glory), to emphasize the role Milan played in Dioscorus' fortunate career. In addition, Egypt is defined divine (ζαθέη), which is a standard feature of Egyptian

[47] Transl. by U.Gehn in *LSA*, adapted.

[48] In *LSA* U.Gehn prefers a different interpretation, «the emperor Justinian now raised again to supreme power (κῦρον) the city», but apart from the fact that we should restore κῦρος (the noun is neutral), such a text would sound much less effective, in my view.

[49] Text by Samama 2003; translation mine.

[50] Feissel 1984, 559.

Lokalpatriotismus, but could also be read as a subtle play on the name Διόσκορος (son of Zeus), suggesting how appropriate was a divine motherland for somebody who was the «son of Zeus».

An elegant epigram from Ephesus, in honor of the proconsul Isidorus, shows a wordplay on the Egyptian origins of the honorand: *LSA* 797 (410-435 AD):

> ☩ ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ· /
> ☩ ὄρχαμον Ἰσιόδω/ρον ὁρᾶις / Φαρίης / ἀπὸ γαίης /
> καὶ Νείλου γονόεντος, / ὃς ἀνθυπάτων / καὶ ὑπάρχων /
> θῶκον ἑλὼν κόσμη/σεν ἀγακλέα καὶ / πολιήταις /
> ἤνυσε καρποτόκου / Δημήτερος ὄμπνιον / ὄλβον.
>
> Good luck! The leader Isidorus, you are looking at. He, born from the land of Pharos and of the Nile, who, holding the office of proconsuls and prefects, managed famous events and for the citizens brought about the bountiful wealth of fruit-bearing Demeter (trans. Lenaghan, slightly modified)

The pun is on Nile's fertility and the abundance Isidorus (a true «gift of Isis, i.e. of Egypt») brought with himself and distributed when he was appointed to Ephesus[51].

A pun on the name of the city has been suggested, and widely accepted, for an intriguing inscription in rhythmic verse, reused as block in the wall of the mosque of Amaseia, but coming from the city of Euchaita (*SGO* 11/10/01, probably dated between 515 and 518 AD)[52]. The poem extols the erection of the church, thanks to the intercession of Mamas (possibly a bishop):

> ☩ ὁ τοῦ Χ(ριστο)ῦ ἀθλητὴς καὶ τῶν ἐπουρανίων πολί|της
> Θεόδωρος ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ πολίσματος ἔφορος |

[51] Incidentally, another epigram extolling the achievements of the same Flavius Anthemius Isidorus displays a wordplay on the part of his name (*SGO* 03/02/13 = *LSA* 662): ll. 4-5 ἄψ μ' Ἰσίδωρος ἔχειν χαρί/εν γέρας ὤπασεν ἥβης /καὶ μ' ἀνάειρε πεσόντα, ὁ/ρῶ δ' ἐμὰ ἔνπεδα γυῖα («Isidorus made me have the graceful gift of youth. And after I had fallen, he lifted me up and I can see my firm limbs», trans. Chaniotis). The text celebrates the restoration and re-erection of a statue to a certain Peison (Piso), probably Tiberius Claudius Piso, an imperial priest of the 2nd century and an ancestor of Isidorus. At l. 4 χαρίεν γέρας **ὤπασεν** ἥβης is an evident pun on the second part of the latter name Ἰσί-**δωρος**.

[52] See Mango - Ševčenko 1972, 382-385 (whose translation is reproduced); also Nowakowski 2018, 486-489 and *Cult of Saints, E00969* - http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E00969 (whose text I follow). I follow here Agosti 2019, 312-314, with some changes and improvements.

Ἀ̣γ̣α̣σ̣τ̣άσιο̣ν̣ π̣ίθ̣ε̣ι̣ τὸν εὐσεβῆ τροπεοῦχον |
εἰδρῦσ̣ε̣ θρόν̣ο̣ν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων ἐπώνυμον· |
ο̣ὗ̣περ λαχὼν Μάμα̣ς̣ ὁ̣ καθαρότατος μύστης |
κινεῖ μὲν ἀεὶ τοῖς θεοτεύκτοις ἄσμασιν τὴν | γλῶτταν,
πλ̣η̣ρῶν τῆς πνευματικῆς χορίας τό̣ν|δε τὸν τόπον,
ἕ̣λ̣κ̣ι̣ δὲ φιλοφροσύ̣γ̣η̣ν̣ ὡ̣ς | ἑ̣αυτὸν ἁπάν̣τ(ων)✠

✠ Christ's athlete, who is a citizen of Heaven – Theodore, the guardian of this town, has persuaded Anastasius, the pious triumphator, to found a throne bearing the name of the holy mysteries. Mamas, the most-pure priest has obtained it; he constantly moves his tongue in divinely composed song while he fills this place of spiritual congregation, and attracts to himself the good-will of all. ✠ (transl. Mango - Ševčenko)

The « throne bearing the name of the holy mysteries» in line 4 is clearly a signpost alluding to a proper name. Most of the editors followed Mango and Ševčenko who suggested an etymological wordplay on the name of the city of Euchaita connected to εὐχή[53], while a few others preferred to interpret the line as an obvious reference to the name of the saint, Theodore, who underwent martyrdom in Amaseia to become later patron of Euchaita[54]. The text looks suitable to both interpretations, and one might also solve the difficulty thinking of an intended ambiguity. However, one wonders if people reading the text displayed in the church of St Theodore really needed to see, and accept, a rather obscure etymological wordplay (not to speak of the *double entendre*) instead of the expected one connecting the line with the name of the saint[55]. In fact, a second inscription in prose (which is the summary of a letter of the emperor Anastasius) helps to dispel our doubts[56].

✠ ὁ ψήφῳ θ(εο)ῦ τῶν ὅλων κρατῶν Ἀναστάσιος εὐσεβὴς αὐτοκρά-
τωρ τόνδε τὸν ἱερὸν χῶρον πολίζι καὶ τὸ κάλλιον ἐνπνευσ-
θεὶς παρὰ τοῦ μάρτυρος ἐγίρει τῷ πολίσματει τεῖχος,
ἄσυλον μὲν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἣν πρῶτος αὐτὸν εἵδρυσεν

[53] A derivation from χαίτη would be more plausible, however: Euchaita the «well-wooded» city, see Haldon 2018, 212.

[54] On the cult of St Theodore at Euchaita see Haldon 2016, 13-14; 2018, 212-221.

[55] It would be an example of what O'Hara 2017, 79-80 calls «suppression», when the reader is implicitly invited to supply a missing word/name.

[56] Ed. Mango - Ševčenko 1972, 380-381; *Cult of Saints, E00969* - http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E00969.

ἀρχιερατικὴν καθέδραν τηρῶν, ἄξιον δὲ δῶρον θ(ε)ῷ προσ-
ενέγκας καὶ μάρτυρας τῆς εὐσεβίας τοὺς εὖ παθόν-
τας πτωχούς. τοῦτον φυλάττοι Τριὰς ὁμοούσιος ἐν
τοῖς σκήπτροις νικητὴν ἀναδικνῦσα. ✠

✠ The pious emperor Anastasius who rules the world by God's decree has made into a city this holy spot. Happily inspired by the Martyr, he has erected a wall for the city so as to preserve inviolate in all respects the archbishop's seat that he had been the first to found. He has offered God a worthy gift as well as a testimonial of his piety, namely the poor who have fared well (at his hands). May the consubstantial Trinity guard him and prove him victorious in his kingdom. ✠ (transl. Mango - Ševčenko)

Probably displayed in the church, this inscription appears to be the prose *Vorlage* of the poem. Textual links between the two inscriptions are evident[57]. In l. 5 δῶρον θ(ε)ῷ it is an obvious allusion to the name of Theodore and the preceding participle τηρῶν might allude to the denomination of Theodore, the Recruit (τήρων/*tiro*)[58], who had his martyrdom in Amaseia under Galerius and Maximinus Daia. In the light of this, it seems to me that l. 4 of the poem refers undoubtedly to the name of Theodore, not to an (alternative?) Christian etymology of the city. People looking at and reading both the texts (with whom they were well acquainted, frequenting the church) had no doubt, in my view.

4. *Conclusions*

In the examples we have discussed above etymological wordplays on proper names are clues used to emphasize the message displayed in the texts, and to call the viewer's/reader's attention on the qualities of people praised. The crucial question is to what extent the audience was able to read and grasp them. I have already remarked that metrical inscriptions are not only literary poems, and we cannot, in my submission, consider their communicative functions in the same way of literary poetry. In the epigrams discussed above most of the etymological word-

[57] L.1 Ἀναστάσιος εὐσεβὴς comes out in l. 3 of the first inscription Ἀ̣ν̣α̣σ̣τ̣ά̣σιον π̣ί̣θε̣ι̣ τ̣ὸν εὐσεβῆ. L. 3 τῷ πολίσματει τεῖχος is also in l. 2 of the first τοῦδε τοῦ πολίσματος ἔφορος. L. 5 καθέδραν occurs also l. 4 of the first inscription as θ̣ρόν̣ο̣ν.

[58] This name distinguished him from the later Theodore (according to IX c. sources), called στρατηλάτης.

plays are easily recognizable by the readers. Needless to remind, the definition of what is «easily recognizable» is highly debatable and ultimately depends on various and not always verifiable factors, ranging from the monumental aspect of the inscription, the appearance, and visibility of the letters, to the social and cultural context. Unlike other wordplays, like acrostics, that were graphically signaled to readers and could also be visually perceived, etymological puns required going through the text to be detected - primarily, but not exclusively, by literate people. Recent research on late antique inscriptions has dramatically shown that the texts were meant to be read, spoken aloud in a sort of performance, involving different modes of response[59]. From this perspective, we can confidently conclude that puns on names - as any other rhetorical devices - added new layers of meaning to the texts, securing an effective reception of them by the audience at any level. A performative reading could well emphasize the presence of the wordplays, if not explain them[60]. In some cases, the connection between etymology and proper names creates ambiguity[61], especially when the wordplay proves to be particularly sophisticated. Even in these cases, however, we should be cautious not to think exclusively of an educated readership, as the performative reading could clarify the puns for a less educated audience, as well.

Sapienza Università di Roma
gianfranco.agosti@uniroma1.it.

Keywords: etymologies, wordplays, metrical inscriptions, greek poetry, Late Antiquity
Parole chiave: etimologie, giochi di parole, iscrizioni metriche, poesia greca, Tarda Antichità

[59] See among others Papalexandrou 2007; Debiais 2009; Liverani 2014 and 2016, Agosti 2010, 2015a; Rhoby 2012 and 2017, Sitz 2017; Mairs 2017; Leatherbury 2019, 14-15, all with further bibliography on the topic.

[60] Cp. for ex. Mairs 2017, 229 on «literate companions who might 'perform' the riddle by reading it aloud and explaining the text».

[61] It would be worth to explore if subtle strategies of equivocation based on homophony were displayed in inscriptions, as later in Byzantine texts (Krausmüller 2006).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Agosti 2010

G.Agosti, *Saxa Loquuntur? Epigrammi epigrafici e diffusione della* paideia *nell'Oriente tardoantico*, «Antiquité Tardive» XVIII (2010), 149-166.

Agosti 2015a

G.Agosti, *La* mise en page *come elemento significante nell'epigrafia e nei libri tardoantichi*, in P.Orsini – M.Maniaci (ed.), *Scrittura epigrafica e scrittura libraria: tra Oriente e Occidente*, Cassino 2015, 45-86.

Agosti 2015b

G.Agosti, *Per una fenomenologia del rapporto fra epigrafia e letteratura nella tarda antichità*, in L.Cristante – T.Mazzoli (ed.), *Il calamo della memoria. Riuso di testi e mestiere letterario nella tarda antichità. VI,* Trieste 2015, 13-34.

Agosti 2018

G.Agosti, *Poesia sul gioco e giochi letterari nella poesia tardoantica e bizantina*, in *Il gioco nella società e nella cultura dell'alto medioevo.* «Atti della LXV Settimana di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto, 20-26 aprile 2017», Spoleto 2018, 727-763.

Agosti 2019

G.Agosti, *Giochi letterari nelle iscrizioni metriche tardoantiche e bizantine*, in V.Veronesi (ed.), *Il calamo della memoria. Riuso di testi e mestiere letterario nella tarda antichità. VIII,* Trieste 2019, 305-326.

Alpi 2011

F.Alpi, *Base de statue de Justinien ornée d'une inscription métrique*, «Syria» LVIII (2011), 341-349.

Beševliev 1964

V.Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlatinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien*, Berlin 1964.

Bolaños Herrera 2017

A.Bolaños Herrera, *Aproximación filológica al epitafio en verso de Eugenia* (*CLE, 1447*)*, ¿un ejemplo para las viudas cristianas de Marsella?*, «Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'histoire Anciennes» XCI (2017) 7-24.

Bruss 2005

J.S.Bruss., *Hidden Presences. Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram*, Leuven 2005.

Busch 1999

S.Busch, *Versus Balnearum. Die antike Dichtung über Bäder und Baden im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1999.

Debiais 2009

V.Debiais, *Messages de pierre. La lecture des inscriptions dans la communication médiévale* (*XIII-XIVe siècles*), Turnhout 2009.

Den Boeft 1979
J.Den Boeft, *Some Etymologies in Augustine's De Civitate Dei X*, «Vigiliae Christianae» XXXIII (1979), 242-259.
Feissel 1983
D.Feissel, *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de Macédoine du IIIe au VIe siècle*, Paris 1983.
Feissel 1984
D.Feissel, *Notes d'épigraphie chrétienne* (*VII*), «Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique» CVIII (1984), 558-563.
Garulli 2012
V.Garulli, *Byblos Lainee. Epigrafia, Letteratura, Epitafio*, Bologna 2012.
Gregori 2013
G.Gregori, *Le iscrizioni*, in S.Ceccarelli (ed.), *Villa Lontana. Una dimora nobilitata da Poniatowski, Canova e Thorvaldsen*, Torino 2013, 153-162.
Gualandri 2017
I.Gualandri, *Words Pregnant with Meaning. The Power of Single Words in Late Latin Literature*, in J.Elsner – J.Hernández Lobato (ed.), *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, Cambridge 2017, 125-147.
Haarer 2006
F.K.Haarer, *Anastasius I. Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, Cambridge 2006.
Haldon 2016
J.Haldon, *A Tale of Two Saints. The Martyrdoms and Miracles of Saints Theodore 'the Recruit' and 'the General'*, *Critical introduction, translation and commentary,* Liverpool 2016.
Haldon 2018
J.Haldon, *Euchaïta: From Late Roman and Byzantine Town to Ottoman Village*, in J.Haldon – H.Elton – J.Newhard (ed.), *Archaeology and Urban Settlement in Late Roman and Byzantine Anatolia. Euchaïta-Avkat-Beyözü and its Environment,* Cambridge 2018, 210-254.
Herrmann 1997
P.Herrmann, *Milet, VI.1. Inschriften von Milet, B. Nachtrage und Übersetzungen zu den Inschriften no 1-406*, Berlin-New York 1997, 155-217
Janiszewski – Stebnicka – Szabat 2014
P.Janiszewski – K.Stebnicka – E.Szabat, *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors & Sophists of the Roman Empire. Based on the Translation of Dorota Dzierzbicka*, Oxford 2014.
Kanavou 2011
N.Kanavou, *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names. A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*, Berlin-New York 2011.

Katz 2009
J.T.Katz, *Wordplay*, in S.W.Jamison et al (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th Annual UCLA Indo-European* Conference, Los Angeles, October 31–November 1, 2008, Bremen 2009, 79-114.

Krausmüller 2006
D.Krausmüller, *Strategies of Equivocation and the Construction of Multiple Meanings in Middle Byzantine Texts*, «Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik» LVI (2006), 1-11.

Kwapisz – Petrain – Szymański 2013
J.Kwapisz – D.Petrain – M.Szymański (ed.), *The Muse at Play. Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*, Berlin-Boston 2013.

Kwapisz 2019
J.Kwapisz, *The Paradigm of Simias. Essays on Poetic Eccentricity*, Berlin-Boston 2019.

Leatherbury 2020
S.V.Leatherbury, *Inscribing Faith in Late Antiquity: between Reading and Seeing. Image, Text, and Culture in Classical Antiquity*, London-New York 2020.

Liverani 2014
P.Liverani, *Chi parla a chi? Epigrafia monumentale e immagine pubblica in età tardoantica*, in S.Birk – T.M.Kristensen – B.Poulsen (ed.), *Using Images in Late Antiquity: Identity, Commemoration and Response*, Oxford-Philadelphia 2014, 3-32.

Liverani 2016
P.Liverani, *La 'fragranza dell'enunciazione' nell'epigrafia monumentale e nell'immagine pubblica tardoantica*, in «Semicerchio» LIV (2016), 17-30.

Louden 1995
B.Louden, *Categories of Homeric Wordplay*, «Transactions of the American Philological Association» CXXV (1995), 27-46.

Mairs 2017
R.Mairs, *'Proclaiming it to Greeks and Natives, along the Rows of the Chequer-Board': Readers and Viewers of Acrostich Inscriptions in Greek, Demotic and Latin*, «The Classical Quarterly» LXVII (2017), 228-246.

Males 2018
M.Males, *Etymology, Wordplay, and the Truth Value of the Linguistic Sign from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, in Id. (ed.), *Etymology and Wordplay in Medieval Literature*, Turnhout 2018, 15-43.

Mango – Ševčenko 1972
C.Mango – J.Ševčenko, *Three Inscriptions of the Reigns of Anastasius I and Constantine V*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» LXV (1972), 379-393.

Mondin 1995
Decimo Magno Ausonio, *Epistole*. Introduzione, testo critico e commento a cura di L.Mondin, Venezia 1995.

Moretti 1984/85
L.Moretti, *Due epigrammi greci inediti*, «Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia» LVII (1984/85), 233-241.
Nowakowski 2018
P.Nowakowski, *Inscribing the Saints in Late Antique Anatolia*, Warsaw 2018.
O'Hara 2017
J.O'Hara, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, New and Expanded Edition, Ann Arbor 2017.
Opelt 1966
I.Opelt, *Etymologie*, in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* VI (1966), 797–844.
Papalexandrou 2007
A.Papalexandrou, *Echoes of Orality in the Monumental Inscriptions of Byzantium*, in James 2007, 161-187.
Paschalis 1997
M.Paschalis, *Virgil's* Aeneid*: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, Oxford 1997.
Rehm 1928
A.Rehm, *Milet I 9. Thermen und Palaestren,* Berlin 1928, 143-195.
Puech 2002
B.Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*, Paris 2002.
Rhoby 2012
A.Rhoby, *The Meaning of Inscriptions for the Early and Middle Byzantine Culture. Remarks on the Interaction of Word, Image and Beholder*, in *Scrivere e leggere nell'alto medioevo.* «Atti della LIX settimana di studio di Spoleto, 28 aprile – 4 maggio 2011», Spoleto 2012, 731-753.
Rhoby 2017
A.Rhoby, *Text as Art? Byzantine Inscriptions and their Display*, in I.Berti – K. Bolle – F.Opdenhoff – F.Stroth (ed.), *Writing Matters. Presenting and Perceiving Monumental Inscriptions in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Berlin-Boston 2017, 265-284.
Ritti
T.Ritti, *L'uso di «immagini onomastiche» nei monumenti sepolcrali di età greca. Alcune testimonianze epigrafiche, archeologiche e letterarie*, «Archeologia Classica» XXV-XXVI (1973-1974), 639-660.
Sblendorio Cugusi 1980
M.T.Sblendorio Cugusi, *Un espediente epigrammatico ricorrente nei CE: l'uso anfibologico del nome proprio*, «Annali della Facoltà di Magistero dell'Università di Cagliari» 1980, 257-281.
Sblendorio Cugusi 2007
M.T.Sblendorio Cugusi – P.Cugusi, *Per un nuovo corpus dei* Carmina Latina

Epigraphica. *Materiali e discussioni* (*con un'appendice sull'*usus *anfibologico degli idionimi* a c. di M.T.Sblendorio Cugusi), *Atti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche, Memorie*, serie IX, vol. XXII, fasc. I (2007).

Siede – Schwinden 2012
M.Siede – L.Schwinden (Hsg.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Treverenses. Edition der spätantiken und frühchristlichen griechischen Inschriften in Trier mit Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Trier 2012

SGO
R.Merkelbach – J.Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus der griechischen Osten*, I-V, München-Leipzig 1998-2004.

Sironen 1994
E.Sironen, *Life and Administration of Late Roman Attica in the Light of Public Inscriptions*, in P.Castrén (ed.), *Post-Herulian Athens. Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens, A.D. 267-529*, Helsinki 1994, 15-62.

Sironen 1997
E.Sironen, *The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica*, Helsinki 1997.

Sitz 2017
A.Sitz, *"Great Fear": Epigraphy and Orality in a Byzantine Apse in Cappadocia*, «Gesta» LVI (2017), 5-26.

Skempis 2008
M.Skempis, *Ery-Chthonios: Etymological Wordplay in Callimachus Hec. Fr. 70.9 H*, «Hermes» CXXXVI (2008), 143-152.

Thonemann 2011
P.Thonemann, *The Maeander Valley. A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium*, Cambridge 2011.

Tsagalis 2008
C.C.Tsagalis, *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth Century Attic Funerary Epigrams*, Berlin-New York 2008.

Vergados 2020
A.Vergados, *Hesiod's Verbal Craft. Studies in Hesiod's Conception of Language and its Ancient Reception*, Oxford 2020.

Voutiras 1995
E.Voutiras, *τέ̣λος ἔ̣χ̣ει τὸ παίγνιον. Der Tod eines Mimus*, «Epigraphica Anatolica» XXIV (1995), 61-72.

Zucker – Le Feuvre 2021
A Zucker – C.Le Feuvre (eds.), *Ancient and Medieval Greek Etymology. Theory and Practice I*, Berlin-Boston 2021.

INDICE DEI NOMI ANTICHI, BIZANTINI, MEDIEVALI, RINASCIMENTALI, DEI POETI, DEGLI SCRITTORI E DELLE OPERE ANONIME

INDICE DEI MANOSCRITTI

INDICE DEI PAPIRI

INDICE DELLE EPIGRAFI