

SCRIPTA
CLASSICA

VOL. 13

2016



WYDAWNICTWO
UNIwersytetu śląskiego
KATOWICE 2016

Scripta Classica

Vol. 13

Scripta Classica

Vol. 13

Edited by

Anna Kucz and Patrycja Matusiak

Editor of the Series: Filologia Klasyczna
Tadeusz Aleksandrowicz

Referees

Remo Bracchi
Adam Goldwyn
Nicholas V. Sekunda
Jerzy Styka
Marian Szarmach

Contents

Introduction (<i>Anna Kucz, Patrycja Matusiak</i>)	7
<i>Marta Tymoshenko</i>	
Shaping the Goddess' Image: The Role of Epithets in the Homeric Hymn to <i>Gaia</i>	9
<i>Bogdan Burliga</i>	
τὸν ναὸν ὃν Παρθενῶνα ὀνομάζουσιν: Pausanias (1.24.5) and Other Ancient Accounts of the Greek Most Sumptuous Temple	17
<i>Joanna Pyplacz</i>	
The Appropriate Goddess. The Role of Erichtho in Lucan's <i>Pharsalia</i>	41
<i>Julia Krauze</i>	
I volti della pazzia. Un viaggio tra sacro, superstizioni e tabù	51
<i>Lukasz Berger</i>	
Escenas de bienvenida en las comedias de Plauto	65
<i>Patrycja Matusiak</i>	
<i>Socrates the Half-dog</i> as a comics reading of a 'first-class Greek tragedy'	85
<i>Edyta Gryksa</i>	
Valerius Maximus, <i>De dictis factisque memorabilibus</i> 1.5.1–9	93
<i>Tomasz Labuk</i>	
Preliminary remarks on Byzantine Literary Perception(s) of Fatness (11 th to 12 th Centuries)	101
<i>Thomas Sapota, Romanus Sosnowski</i>	
Lanfranci Mediolanensis <i>Chirurgia parva</i> prima editione Latina anni MCDXCVIII nonnullis aliis comparata	115

Introduction

The new, thirteenth volume of “Scripta Classica” contains nine articles on a variety of topics. There are texts on poetry from Homeric hymns to linguistic aspects of Plautus’ language and the role of Erichtho in Lucan. Prose is represented by Pausanias’ story of Parthenon, the translation of Valerius Maximus’ collection and remarks on Byzantine literature. A Latin text called *Chirurgia parva* from *editio princeps* of 1498 is ideally complemented by linguistic analysis of terms relating to madness. A few remarks on mythology in comics that depict the reception of antiquity complete this wide array of themes.

We are sincerely hoping that this *varietas* will delight our readers.

Anna Kucz and Patrycja Matusiak

Marta Tymoshenko

Ukrainian Catholic University

Department of Classical, Byzantine and Medieval Studies

Shaping the Goddess' Image: The Role of Epithets in the Homeric Hymn *to Gaia*

Abstract: The article considers the poetical function of epithets in the short Homeric hymn “*to Gaia* (XXX)”. The primary objective was to determine whether epithets could convey a deity's image within the span of a brief narrative, since, as is often the case, Homeric hymns, owing to their brevity, do not contain a protracted mythological story. Furthermore, the article examined images of the goddess Gaia in the Greek literary tradition after Homer and Hesiod.

Key words: Homeric epithets, Homeric hymn, goddess Gaia, mythological image.

It is not particularly easy to answer the question when images of the Greek gods first began assuming shape and form. We may suppose that this process commenced in prehistoric, pre-archaic times – i.e. during the Minoan and Mycenaean civilizations – even before the appearance of any myths or stories. Russian scholar Irina Kovaliova has presented a logical scheme for the development of mythological structures¹: from the mythological name of a deity to his/her mythological image (at first, only imaginary) and, finally, from the image to the mythological narrative as presented in early archaic epics and also evident from iconographic artifacts. During the time of Homer and Hesiod, images of the gods already existed, there being “Homeric gods” or “Hesiodic gods”, all anthro-

¹ И. Ковалева: “Миф: повествование, образ и имя”, *Литературное обозрение* 1995, Vol. 3, pp. 92–94.

pomorphic and each deity with his/her own or common characteristic features and genealogy. As J.B. Hainsworth has pointed out, “the gods appear to be a fairly fixed feature of epic stories...”². On the basis of poetical epithets, which ancient Greek poets used generously and which are cast in Homeric formulas³, one can obtain an impression about what the Greek gods must have looked like and what characteristics they may have possessed. Their appearance was easily visualized by the authors: e.g. Homer’s Athena is “grey- or bright-eyed”, “whose shield is thunder”, Persephone is “august”, “dreaded” or “a daughter of Zeus”; Poseidon is “an earth-shaker”, “a dark-haired god” and “a powerful lord”, “who encircles the Earth”; Thetis is “lovely-haired” or “silver-footed” etc.

Since Milman Parry’s identification of the Homeric formulae, most studies of epithets in ancient Greek poetry have focused on the metrical noun-epithet combinations that build the epic formulaic system⁴. There is, however, another point of view regarding this topic: Paolo Vivante concentrated on semantic features of Homeric repetitions, but more in a poetical than in a lexical sense⁵. He was rather more interested in the mode of their representation in poetry than in demonstrating their narrative function. For Vivante, epithets are not an instrument used in building the epic narrative; they can signify a thing: designate a color or quality, evoke a feeling, bring about a sharper focus etc.

Whereas, from the oral theory standpoint, poetical epithets can be regarded as an instrument for the poet in his creation of an epic narrative, some scholars have focused on their meaning and have studied epithets as poetical instruments. Epithets can have different functions in epics: from ornamental to metric and from poetic to aesthetic. But, as our analysis concerns the genre of Greek poetry known as the Homeric hymns, one cannot forget about the real purpose of their use here: the various epithets are aimed not primarily at presenting a story of the gods’ lives or deeds but more at pleasing the addressee and, with a particular deity’s help, obtaining personal benefit. the more praise and glorification heaped upon the deity, and the more carefully chosen the words, the greater the likelihood of the request being granted.

In longer Homeric hymns, there is always a mythological story connected with a deity from which we can find out about specific features; such hymns can also

² J.B. Hainsworth: “Good and Bad Formulae”. *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Ed. by Bernard C. Fenik. Leiden 1978, p. 43.

³ I.e. the Homeric formula, a terminus discovered by Milman Parry, creator of the theory of oral epic composition.

⁴ M. Parry: “Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I: Homer and Homeric Style”. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 1930, Vol. 41, pp. 73–143. Other studies on Homeric formulas in epics and in the Homeric hymns: J.B. Hainsworth: *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford 1968; J.H. Gaisser: “Noun-epithet Combinations in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter”. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 1974, Vol. 104, p. 113–137. On the history of studying formulae see M.E. Edwards: “Homer and Oral Tradition: the Formula, Part II”. *Oral Tradition* 1988, Vol. 3/1–2, pp. 11–60.

⁵ P. Vivante: *The Epithets in Homer: A Study in Poetic Values*. Yale University Press 1982.

provide the etiology for the foundation of the deity's cult in Greece⁶. Therefore epithets play a very important role in the hymnal narrative. A thorough analysis of the context of epithets in the Homeric hymn *to Demeter* reveals images of two principal goddesses that can be identified in the ensuing literary tradition: Demeter as a mother mourning the loss of her daughter and Demeter as the founder of Eleusinian Mysteries⁷. In the author's opinion, such key images of the Greek gods, with their main features clearly portrayed, can be observed in any longer Homeric hymn and have an evident mythological narrative⁸. These images can be unique, as in the case of Demeter, or partly imitative of Greek epics, such as the hymn presented below.

But what about short hymns where, oftentimes, there is no mythological story? Are the epithets embedded in the narrative chaotically or rather logically? Another interesting question is whether the poetical epithets shape any new mythological image of the god or whether the hymn's author is presenting an existing belief. The following analysis of the short Homeric hymn *to Gaia* (XXX) aims to answer these questions and to reveal the essence of epithets in the literary tradition after Homer and Hesiod, i.e. to trace the evolution of meaning of concrete epithets diachronically and synchronically in the analyzed context.

The main problem concerning this goddess, according to Stella Georgoudi, relates to the complexity of the Earth figure in Greek religion. A clear distinction should be drawn between: (a) the goddess Earth, with her individuality and her own history since the time of Hesiod's *Theogony*; (b) the Earth, understood as a substance, as a cosmic entity, therefore an element of nature; (c) and finally, the Earth as a city's territory – where Gaia is seen as a mother – i.e. Earth, a native patria⁹ – and is revered by its citizens. Let us examine which of the images the poet chooses for his hymn.

The hymn *to Gaia* belongs to the shorter Homeric hymns; it contains only 19 verses, though it is not the shortest one in the collection¹⁰. This hymn can be

⁶ For example, the Homeric hymn to Apollo (III) or to Demeter (II). See more on the topic of longer Homeric hymns A. Faulkner: *The Homeric Hymns. Interpretative Essays*. Oxford 2011; *Hymnes De La Grèce Antique: Approches Littéraires Et Historiques – Actes Du Colloque International De Lyon, 19–21 Juin 2008*. Ed. par R. Bouchon, P. Brillet-Dubois, N. Le Meur-Weissman. Lyon 2013.

⁷ M. Tymoshenko: "Rola epitetów Demeter w kształtowaniu się sylwetki bogini na podstawie hymnu homeryckiego *In Cererem*". *Littera antiqua* 2011, Vol. 3, p. 4–9.

⁸ An interesting survey on the functions of the poetical epithets in longer Homeric hymn one can find in E.S. Green: "Revising Legitimacy: The Use of Epithets in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*". *Classical Quarterly* 2005, Vol. 55.2, pp. 343–349.

⁹ See more on this topic S. Georgoudi: "Gaia/Ge. Entre mythe, culte et idéologie". In: *Myth and Symbol I: Symbolic phenomena in ancient Greek culture*. Ed. S. des Bouvrie. Bergen 2002, pp. 114–134.

¹⁰ The hymn *to Ares* (VIII) comprises 17 verses, *to Aphrodite* (X) – 6 verses; the shortest one in the entire collection is the hymn *to Demeter* (XIII), it contains only 3 verses.

related to those in which Aoidos sang of gifts (δῶρα) and works (ἔργα) of Greek gods, the hymn recipients, in detail. The author and the date of hymn remain obscure, Richard Janko has stated that: “Unfortunately *Hymn 30* holds no clues as to its origin”¹¹, though his language-historical analysis situates it between 645 and 630 BC¹².

Εἰς Γῆν μητέρα πάντων¹³

Γαῖαν παμμήτειραν αἰέισομαι ἡϋθέμεθλον
πρεσβίστην, ἥ φέρβει ἐπὶ χθονὶ πάνθ’ ὅποσ’ ἐστίν·
 ἡμὲν ὅσα χθόνα διὰν ἐπέρχεται ἡδ’ ὅσα πόντον
 ἡδ’ ὅσα πωτῶνται, τάδε φέρβεται ἐκ σέθεν ὄλβου.
 ἐκ σέο δ’ εὐπαιδές τε καὶ εὐκαρποὶ τελέθουσι
πότνια, σεῦ δ’ ἔχεται δοῦναι βίον ἡδ’ ἀφελέσθαι
 θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισιν ὁ δ’ ὄλβιος ὃν κε σὺ θυμῷ
 πρόφρων τιμήσης· τῷ τ’ ἄφθονα πάντα πάρεστι.
 βρίθει μὲν σφιν ἄρουρα φερέσβιος, ἡδὲ κατ’ ἀγρούς
 κτήνεσιν εὐθηνεῖ, οἶκος δ’ ἐμπίπλαται ἐσθλῶν·
 αὐτοὶ δ’ εὐνομήσι πόλιν κάτα καλλιγύναικα
 κοιρανέουσ’, ὄλβος δὲ πολὺς καὶ πλοῦτος ὀπηδεῖ·
 παῖδες δ’ εὐφροσύνη νεοθηλεῖ κυδιόωσι,
 παρθενικαὶ τε χοροῖς φερεσανθέσιν εὐφροني θυμῷ
 παῖζουσαι σκαίρουσι κατ’ ἄνθεα μαλθακὰ ποίης,
 οὓς κε σὺ τιμήσης σεμνὴ θεὰ ἄφθονε δαῖμον.
 Χαῖρε θεῶν μήτηρ, ἄλοχ’ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
 πρόφρων δ’ ἀντ’ ᾧδης βίοτον θυμήρε’ ὅπαζε·
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοδιῆς.

Having titled the hymn “Εἰς Γῆν μητέρα πάντων” (“To Earth, Mother of All”), it seems the author, from the very outset, has adopted the Hesiodic vision of the goddess in his poem¹⁴. From the title, the recipient can expect a story about the genesis of the gods and mythological creatures, borrowed from Hesiod’s *Theogony* (117, 126, 135, 176, 184, 232 ff), in which Gaia took a direct part, being also in opposition to Zeus for casting her sons, the Titans, into the Tartaros (*Th.* 462, 617, 687, 881 ff). This position also could announce the start (*prooimion*) of the hymn with its tradition of introducing epithets, where, after the god’s name, framed in a formula and the invocation verb, Γαῖαν παμμήτειραν αἰέισομαι ἡϋθέμεθλον /

¹¹ R. Janko: *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*. Cambridge 1982, p. 275, n. 12.

¹² Ibidem, p. 200.

¹³ The original and a translation of hymn fragments from: *Anonymous. The Homeric Hymns and Homerica* with an English Translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, London 1914.

¹⁴ The same formula, γῆ πάντων μήτηρ, and makes use of Hesiod in *Opera et dies* 563, though his Gaia is not a goddess, but a natural embodiment of the Earth, i.e. soil.

πρεσβίστην, (1–2) a relative clause usually follows: ἥ φέρβει ἐπὶ χθονὶ πάνθ' ὅπως ἐστὶν [...] (2). Apart from the epithets, a relative sentence becomes a supplement to the hymn's introduction, explaining more precisely the meaning of the hymn's opening epithet *παμμήτειρα*.

The first epithet *παμμήτειρα*, 'mother of all', for the most part announcing the further content of the hymn, supplies another Hesiodic vision of the goddess¹⁵. Now Gaia appears as a nourishing power, 'which feeds everything in the world' (2), and as the Aoidos explains later, "all that go upon the goodly land, and all that are in the paths of the seas, and all that fly" (3–4). Then, for the first time in the literary tradition, there appears such an extensive commentary concerning Gaia. It explains more clearly why she is considered the mother of all and what benefits she brings to the people.

The next epithet in the hymn's invocation, ἡυθέμεθλος – "well-founded" (1), refers us to the *Theogony*, where Hesiod speaks of Gaia as a: πάντων ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ ἀθανάτων – "the ever-sure foundation of all immortals" (117–118). But the goddess' function as the mother of the Olympians is not mentioned here, and she should be considered as the foundation of all beings in a broad sense. Allen, Halliday and Sikes¹⁶, commentators on the Homeric hymns, note that this epithet occurs only here and is therefore *hapax legomenon*. It is interesting that it consists of a prefix εὖ- and Homeric τὰ θέμεθλα noun – "foundations" (*Il.* 14.493 etc.). As one can see, the author of the hymn also knows and uses the works of Homer when describing the goddess and devising epithets for her.

The third epithet in the introduction, *πρεσβίστη* – "the eldest of all beings" (2), closes the laudation of the goddess' attributes. Using it, Aoidos emphasizes Gaia's place, her high status as being the oldest, self-sufficient power and giving life to everything.

Due to its brevity, the aforementioned hymn does not contain the central aretalogical part, in which the exploits of the deity are usually eulogized¹⁷. By contrast, Gaia's benefits are enumerated, and her δύναμις is depicted in a most naturalistic form, like in Homer and in Aeschylus. The Homeric hymn describes the various functions of Gaia: as a giver of fruit and bearer of beautiful children (5–6); she is also responsible for bringing and taking lives – her chthonic function is quite evident here (6–7).

In verses 9–15 Aoidos artistically portrays fruitful fields and meadows with grazing cattle, joyful dancing youth, life full of abundance and prosperity, and the reason for all this is Gaia, the source of fertility, grace and happiness (16). It

¹⁵ Cf. γῆ πάντων μήτηρ – Hes. *Op.* 563; *παμμήτορ τε γῆ* – Aeschyl. *Pr.* 90.

¹⁶ T.W. Allen, W.R. Halliday, E.E. Sikes: *The Homeric Hymns*. Amsterdam 1980, p. 430.

¹⁷ Richard Janko divided all the hymns into those comprising a central mythological part and those in which the poet describes the attributes of the deity. After the Introduction, he calls them *Attributive hymns*; see R. Janko: "The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre". *Hermes* 1981, Vol. 109, pp. 11–12.

is striking that in the description of this idyll¹⁸ the author actually does not use laudatory epithets for the goddess. In portraying the anthropomorphic image of the deity, which differs from her naturalistic characterization as Earth (i.e. omnipotence), epithets play a very important role. For example, the conventional Homeric epithet πότνια – “mistress” (6) clearly glorifies her as a goddess, and, at the end of the idyllic picture, the author explains that all good things come from Gaia, because she appears as σεμνή θεά – “august, holy goddess” (16). When the gods are called *semnoi*, this, in Greek poetry, often means that they are not only “holy” but “worthy of honor, special veneration and belong to heaven, to the Olympians”¹⁹. The addressee’s favor towards the people is revealed in the author’s words to her as ἄρθονε δαῖμον (Voc.) – “bountiful daemon” (16) i.e. a daemon who generously sends so many goods. One can find here the formula ἄρουρα φερέσβιος – “fruitful land” (9), synonymous to the Hesiodic γαῖα φερέσβιος (*Th.* 693), representing Gaia in epics in the role of bearing soil and the deity who gives life to all creatures.

In the final part of the hymn (*eksodion*), Aoidos comes to the *Theogonical* image of Gaia. Only in the greeting (this hymn part starts with a salutation χαῖρε) his Gaia appears as the ‘mother of the gods’ – θεῶν μήτηρ²⁰, and the wife of a starry Uranus – ἄλοχ’ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος (17). Even Homer tells us about this cosmic couple²¹. Thus, the author closes his hymn with the goddess’ mythological image. Finishing his story, the singer addresses his request to Gaia to give him ‘a delightful life’ – βίον θυμήρε (18). One finds the same formula in the Homeric hymn to *Helios* (XXI): πρόφρων δὲ... βίον θυμήρε ὅπαζε – “give me a delightful life, you gracious (god)” (17)²². These requests have rather general character; the author ends the hymn with words that are standard for this genre²³: he promises the goddess to remember her and the other song.

Notwithstanding the small number of epithets in the Homeric hymn to *Gaia*, it is indeed possible to discern the deity’s main features. She appears less as a Hesiodic divine being, a mother of the gods, and more as a personified naturalistic

¹⁸ There are other artistically portrayed sceneries in the Present tense or Past tense in hymns, now with the gods in the main role: Artemis, going in a chariot up and down the hills (Hy IX and XXVII), merrily wandering Pan with a crowd of nymphs (Hy XIX) as well as Dionysus (Hy XXVI).

¹⁹ For example, the hymn to Demeter (Hy II, 1), Demeter and Persephone (Hy II, 486), Hecate (Pi. *Py.* 3.79), Apollo (A. *Th.* 800).

²⁰ Though, in Greek mythology, Rhea was regarded as the mother of gods – sister of Gaia and Uranus, who gave birth to the majority of the Olympians (the XIV Homeric hymn, dedicated to *the Mother of Gods*, could be addressed to Rhea).

²¹ Cf. *Il.* 15. 36–38 etc.; *Od.* 5. 184–186.

²² The scholars state that the Homeric hymns XXX, XXI and XXXII are works of the one author due to many similarities between them, both in language and in structure – see T.W. Allen, W.R. Halliday, E.E. Sikes: *The Homeric Hymns...*, p. 430.

²³ The last two verses of the hymn to *Gaia* completely coincide with the final part of the hymn to Demeter, 494–495; for other similarities between the two hymns see N. Richardson: *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford 1974, p. 69.

element, *Protogenos*, for she is the eldest and the main foundation of the whole world. The goddess' epithets clearly show the complexity of her figure in Greek literature and religion, as underscored by Stella Georgoudi, although it seems that the nourishing mother's function is more important for the poet. He emphasizes that real human happiness largely depends on Gaia, and "happy is the man whom she delights to honor (7–8)". This earth-man connection is very noticeable in the poem. The poet also skillfully transforms the lack of a mythological story into a naturalistic idyll in the middle part of the hymn, which bears witness to its high literary value. Another important conclusion should be mentioned here: the analysis of poetical epithets shows the direct correlation of the author's use of the goddess' functional attributes during his narration with the final request to the goddess, i.e. "to give him a life" as she is "the Mother of all" in the title and invocation of the hymn.

Bogdan Burliga

Gdańsk University
Faculty of Philology

τὸν ναὸν ὃν Παρθενῶνα ὀνομάζουσιν: Pausanias (1.24.5) and Other Ancient Accounts of the Greek Most Sumptuous Temple

for A. K.
– τοῦ εἶναι ἔνεκεν

Abstract: The Parthenon is nowadays perceived commonly as a masterpiece of Greek art, indeed an architectonic symbol of *beaux arts* at all. This was not the case in antiquity, however, when various factors contributed to the fact that it was occasionally treated, even by intellectuals, with indifference, to list only the names of Pausanias the Periegete, and earlier – Thucydides.

Key words: Pausanias, Plutarch, Thucydides, the Parthenon, art, temple, reception

Today

It is trivial to state that one thing is to learn about ancient Greek monuments, sites or landscapes from books, and quite another to see them, to be near of them, and experience them. In antiquity autopsy was considered relatively better than other people's accounts, and already Herodotus knew this perfectly when gathering the data stated that eyes offer better knowledge than ears (2.99.1). A similar phenomenon is described by Professor Mary Beard in her study of the Parthenon. She reminds there the impressions of Freud who could not stop won-

der if what up to this moment existed only in his imagination and thought (due to his classical education), exists *really*.¹ This is, I think, everyone's experience who – coming from the west entrance now – climbs the steep staircase of the monumental Propylaea,² and to whom when passing through the entrance of the (still) enormous gateway the (still) lavish remains of the temple of Ἀθηνᾶ Παρθένος suddenly appear on the right side of the Athenian *acropolis*:³ to use (but not to abuse, I hope) great words, what the modern *Wanderer* is experiencing at this moment is a real touch of history and past ages.⁴ In our imagination we see, for a while at least, Pericles walking with Phidias and/or Ictinus⁵ and Callicrates;⁶ the hanging of the 300 Persian armours, captured at Granicus BC by the king Alexander of Macedon and sent to Athena in 334 BC;⁷ the Macedonian dynast Demetrius Poliorcetes banqueting inside the shrine with his *hetairai* (Plutarch, *Comp. Demetr. Ant.*, 4. 4);⁸

¹ *The Parthenon*. London 2002, p. 1; cf. M. Galli: "Pilgrimage as Elite *Habitus*: Educated Pilgrims in Sacred Landscape during Second Sophistic". In: *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity. Seeing the Gods*. Eds. J. Elsner & I. Rutherford. Oxford 2005, pp. 259–260.

² See G.P. Stevens: "Concerning the Impressiveness of the Parthenon". *American Journal of Archaeology* 66 (1962), p. 338; also J.M. Barringer: *Art, Myth, and Ritual in Classical Greece*. Cambridge 1998, p. 60; cf. generally M.B. Hollinshead: "Monumental Steps and the Shaping of Ceremony". In: *Architecture of the Sacred. Space, Ritual, and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium*. Ed. B.D. Wescoat and R.G. Ousterhout. Cambridge 2012, pp. 27f. There is an excellent modern reproduction how could they look like: P. Connolly and H. Dodge: *The Ancient Greek City. Life in Classical Athens and Rome*. Oxford 1998, pp. 64–65.

³ Pausanias, as R.E. Wycherley observes (*Pausanias, Description of Greece V. Companion Volume*. London–Cambridge Mass. 1955, p. 33), approached the acropolis from the east side; also M. Beard: "Parthenon". In: *The Classical Tradition*. Eds. A. Grafton, G.W. Most and S. Settis. Cambridge Mass.–London 2010, p. 693; see G.P. Stevens: *the Setting of the Periclean Parthenon* [Hesperia Supplements 3]. Princeton 1940, p. 5.

⁴ Cf. K. Arafat and C. Morgan: "Architecture and Visual Art". In: *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Ancient Greece*. Ed. P. Cartledge. Cambridge 2002, p. 269.

⁵ Who, according to Vitruvius (*De archit.* 7, *praef.* 11–12), was an author of a book on the Parthenon; cf. Strabo, 9.1.12: Ἰκτίνος [...] ὃς καὶ τὸν παρθενῶνα ἐποίησε τὸν ἐν ἀκροπόλει τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ, Περικλέους ἐπιστατοῦντος τῶν ἔργων; see W.B. Dinsmoor: *The Architecture of Ancient Greece. An Account of Its Historic Development*. New York 1928, p. 148; cf. K. Lapatin: "The Materials and Techniques of Greek and Roman Arts". In: *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Art and Architecture*. Ed. C. Marconi. Oxford 2015, p. 203.

⁶ In the manner of Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema's vision, materialized in his famous 1868 painting *Phidias Showing the Frieze of the Parthenon to his Friends*; cf. J.G. Frazer: *Pausanias' Description of Greece II*. London 1898, pp. 306–307; see M. Andronicos: *The Acropolis*. Athens 2007, p. 25.

⁷ Arrian, *Anab.* 1. 16. 4: ἀποπέμπει δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἀθήνας τριακοσίας πανοπλίας Περσικὰς ἀνάθημα εἶναι τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ἐν πόλει. However, Plutarch, *Alex.* 16. 17, writes of shields: ἰδίᾳ μὲν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἔπεμψε τῶν αἰχμαλώτων τριακοσίας ἀσπίδας; cf. M.L. Bernhard: *Sztuka grecka V wieku p.n.e.* Warszawa 1991³, p. 350.

⁸ οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἱστορικοὶ φασὶ καὶ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ὅλης εἶργεσθαι τὰς κύνας διὰ τὸ τὴν μεῖζιν ἐμφανὴ μάλιστα τοῦτο ποιεῖσθαι τὸ ζῶον· ὁ δ' ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Παρθενῶνι ταῖς τε πόρναις συνῆν καὶ τῶν ἀστῶν κατεπόρνευσε πολλάς.

a fire damaging its interior in the 2nd century BC;⁹ the Ottoman Muslims praying in the mosque constructed within the old Greek sanctuary (from the fifties of the XVth century onwards, when the long period of the Τουρκοκρατία began);¹⁰ one hears also the bang of the cannonballs of Morosini's and Königsmark's Venetian artillery during the attacks on the defending Ottomans in September 1687 – with the final, fatal and destructive blow, 26th;¹¹ we also see Lord Elgin's collaborators, setting off and gathering the slabs of the frieze; and lastly, we admire Isadora Duncan photographed in 1920 between the columnade, or Nikolska's sensual dance in 1929.

The emotional reaction the Vienna psychiatrist has expressed when seeing the Parthenon may serve as an exemplary case but before him there were many generations of 'pilgrims', visitors and explorers, to recall Jacob Spon and Sir George Wheler,¹² Stuart and Revett from the Society of Dilettanti,¹³ Lord Byron (who immortalized his admiration in *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, 1812), and the eminent Polish poet, Zbigniew Herbert, with his excellent, evocative essay *Akropol*.¹⁴ Also Joan Connelly in her 2014 monograph reminds personal memories of Virginia Woolf which may be seen as typical: imbued in a recollection of *le temps irrémédiablement passé* and filled with nostalgic return to the past,

⁹ Cf. R. Browning: "The Parthenon in History". In: Ch. Hitchens: *The Elgin Marbles. Should They Be Returned to Greece?* London–New York 1997, p. 6.

¹⁰ Cf. B. Graziosi: *The Gods of Olympus. A History*. New York 2014, pp. 8–9; also S.E. Alcock: *Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*. Cambridge 2002, pp. 3–5.

¹¹ See E. Beulé: "Les frontons du Parthénon". *Revue Archéologique* 1854, Vol. 11, p. 24; A. Michaelis: *Der Parthenon*. Leipzig 1871, pp. 245–247; also T.E. Mommsen: "The Venetians at Athens and the Destruction of the Parthenon in 1687". *American Journal of Archaeology* 1941, Vol. 45, pp. 544f. It ought to be stressed out that the monument stood essentially intact until that gruesome September day; cf. J. Travlos: *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. New York 1980, p. 445; M.L. Bernhard: *Sztuka grecka V wieku...*, p. 350; see R. Osborne: *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*. Oxford 1998, p. 174, and J.B. Connelly: *The Parthenon Enigma. A New Understanding of the West's Most Iconic Building and the People Who Made It*. New York 2014, pp. xvi–xvii.

¹² G. Wheler & J. Spon: *Journey Into Greece*. London 1682, pp. 360–363 (an English abridgment of the fourth-volume original edition in French: *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce et du Levant*. Lyon 1678), who gained the opportunity to see the shrine undamaged by the Venetians yet. the same in 1674 was the privilege of the Flemish royal artist Jacques Carrey who travelling in the company of the Marquis de Nointel, the French ambassador to the High Porte, made the priceless drawings of the metopes; see W.M. Leake: *The Topography of Athens with Some Remarks on Its Antiquities*. London 1821, pp. 215f.

¹³ J. Stuart and N. Revett: *The Antiquities of Athens* II. London 1787, pp. 1f.; cf. F.C. Penrose: *An Investigation of the Principles of Athenian Architecture*. London 1888, ch. II, pp. 10f.; also M. Silk, I. Gildenhard and R. Barrow: *The Classical Tradition. Art, Literature, Thought*. Malden–Oxford 2014, p. 114.

¹⁴ In a highly acclaimed book *Labirynt nad morzem (Labyrinth at the Sea)*. Warsaw 2000, pp. 93–131 Herbert recalls also another important figure whom the temple impressed so enormously – François-René Chateaubriand; cf. M. Llewellyn Smith: *Athens. A Cultural and Literary History*. Oxford 2004, p. 60.

the 50-years old woman looks back in 1932 to 1906, when she – then at the age of 23 – for the first time visited the *acropolis* and saw the Minerva's shrine, that astonishing, mute witness of history.¹⁵

Indeed, the modern eye cannot stop looking at the Parthenon as *the* masterpiece of art that, although heavily damaged and surrounded actually by scaffolding, efficiently spoiling the impression of beauty of the monument, still stubbornly persists. In some sense such way of perceiving the legendary edifice remains inescapable because our assumption (unconscious, in many cases) is that we admire an iconic example belonging to the 'Fine Arts' *per se*; not so much a perfect realization of the 'classical' style of Greek architecture but a quintessence and peak of architectonic art itself.¹⁶ In consequence, to the thousands of onlookers and visitors the looking at this construction in the way called by a modern scholar "the politics" of architecture' is certainly less important, if not irrelevant.¹⁷ When in 429 BC Pericles stood for the last time before the Athenian citizens, he foretold in his brave speech that memory of the Athenian power will be everlasting (Thuc. 2.64.5). Modern students doubt if he had in mind the Acropolean οἰκοδομήματα, or if it was the *acropolis* buildings that contributed to Athens' everlasting glory, being – to use Herodotus' words (1.1) – its ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά.¹⁸ I think Pericles alluded them, yet be that as it may, the modern visitor gazes at the monument in a way as famous European predecessors of a few last centuries did: full of devotional admiration and feelings, we share the impressions of Freud, Woolf and so many other eminent personalities.

So, although there is something true in the modern verdict that the Parthenon remains recently 'a noble ruin',¹⁹ by the same token, we feel, however, deeply and emotionally, that it remains *our* ruin, embedded in *our* 'cultural landscape'.²⁰ Given that it is possible to express such emotions at all, after almost 2,500 years, we are prone (no wonder) to take Pericles visionary words from his last speech

¹⁵ *Parthenon Enigma*, Epilogue, p. 331. See the preliminary remarks by M. Rossholm Lagerlöf: *The Sculptures of Parthenon. Aesthetics and Interpretation*. New Haven–London 2000, pp. 1–2.

¹⁶ So K. Estreicher: *Historia sztuki w zarysie*. Warszawa–Kraków 1982, pp. 126–127; cf. R. Lane Fox: *The Classical World. An Epic History of Greece and Rome*. London–New York 2005, p. 135.

¹⁷ The remarks of D. Milne: "Architecture, Politics and the Public Realm". *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 1981, Vol. 5, p. 131, are worth quoting here: 'For, in whatever antique condition they come to us and from whatever time and place, these buildings almost all betray a political or "stately" character, easily recognisable whether in the palaces of Versailles or Schoenbrun, the tombs of the ancient Pharaohs, the temples of the Acropolis, or the Gothic cathedrals of mediaeval Europe. Indeed, because of this intimate connection between architecture and the state's order architects have themselves argued that in the buildings of past ages we have the most reliable guides to the "life" of each civilization'.

¹⁸ So S. Hornblower: *A Commentary on Thucydides I*. Oxford 1991, p. 339.

¹⁹ H. Osborne: *The Oxford Companion to Art*. Oxford 1970, p. 816.

²⁰ D.R. Stewart: "'Most Worth Remembering': Pausanias, Analogy, and Classical Archaeology". *Hesperia* 2013, Vol. 82, p. 231.

as really prophetic: ἐς τὸ ἔπειτα δόξα αἰείμνηστος καταλείπεται (2.64.5).²¹ For us the Parthenon, as one approaches it today, still seems to breathe and live its own life, as if existing imbued in-, and surrounded by its own mythology. Standing before the monumental columns today, with the gaze directed upward and the beaming, azure sky above the head, one cannot resist to think that all this is *real* and is happening, as if across-, and against the time, to paraphrase Horace, *tempus edax* (C. 3.30.3), although in the last years – fortunately – with the financial support of the modern governmental institutions.²²

In 1676 George Wheler, Esq., travelling in the company of Jacob Spon, wrote poignantly on view of the Parthenon, not yet damaged by the Venetian barbarians:

We could hardly stay there, to make all the Observations we might have done, we were so impatient to go to the temple of Minerva, the chief Goddess of the Athenians, which is not only still the chief Ornament of the Citadel, but absolutely, both for Matter and Art, the most beautiful piece of Antiquity remaining in the World. I wish, I could communicate the Pleasure I took in viewing it, by a Description, that would in some proportion express the Ideas I had then of it: which I cannot hope to do, but shall give you the Figure I took of it there, with its Dimensions, and so much of the Sculpture, as I can remeber. This temple is called by Pausanias Parthenion.²³

After almost 350 years since writing these words were written, the modern wayfarer's appealing experiences are by no means different.

Distant Voices: Then

This being so, an interesting question arises: what about the ancients? What was the attitude of many visitors and *connoisseurs*, men of letters, kings, and,

²¹ See J. de Romilly: *Thucydides and the Athenian Imperialism*. Oxford 1963, p. 149.

²² There is still in realization the program of the restoration of the hill and the monuments – a great undertaking of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture, known as Acropolis Restoration Service. A part of these works is the Parthenon Restoration Project under the direction of Professor Manolis Korres.

²³ Wheler & Spon: *Journey...*, p. 360; cf. D.S. Robertson: *A Handbook of Greek & Roman Architecture*. Cambridge 1943, p. 113; see especially a splendid study by Fani Mallouchou-Tufano: "The Parthenon from Cyriacus of Ancona to Frédéric Boissonas: Description, Research and Depiction". In: *The Parthenon and Its Impact in Modern Times*. Ed. P. Tournikiotis. Athens 1996, pp. 167–168; also R. Stoneman: *Land of Lost Gods. The Search for Classical Greece*. London–New York 2010, pp. 56–83.

finally, average rovers? The simplest dilemma that occurs may be formulated thus: was the Periclean masterpiece a subject of equal delight and pride then, as it was for the next generations and is now? Were ancient visitors of the *acropolis* equally unanimous in their judgment as we are? A rhetorical question, of course: what can be said of the thousands of visitors who through all these centuries left no trace of their impressions? Was a Theban peasant, a Thessalian landowner, or a Cretan seafarer of the fourth century BC under an overpowering allure of the temple of Minerva – given that they ever saw it at all?²⁴ What about the Peloponnesians: the Spartans or the Corinthians – Athens' stubborn enemies in the fifth and fourth centuries BC? What did think, *exempli gratia*, the Macedonian Antipater? Were the Romans fascinated, too? Apparently, these and alike questions must thus remain unanswerable. Yet, reading the rare voices that came to us from distant antiquity it is clear that the monument of the Athenian pride was not so attractive as we might suppose, not to mention of its rather functional role in the middle ages.²⁵ Obviously, many different factors played important role in evaluating the Parthenon.

As you can see in the title of this paper,²⁶ I took as the point of departure the remark of the man who may be considered the most suitable personality in this respect: Pausanias, an author of the famous and priceless 'guide' to the places and monuments of the Greek mainland. It is his words that in the following will be the starting point of what did the ancient observers think of the Parthenon.

²⁴ A recent perceptive study of J. Ma, who tries to show how the Athenian empire was viewed from the perspective of small *poleis*, may equally be helpful in assessing how the Athenian art was regarded: J. Ma: "Empire, Statues and Realities". In: *Interpreting Athenian Empire*. Eds. J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas and R. Parker. London 2009, pp. 125f.

²⁵ In her study Connelly (*Parthenon Enigma*..., pp. 154–156) gives a valuable overview of the late medieval reports of the temple. It is sometimes omitted that when after 1204 the Parthenon has passed down into the hands of the French crusaders, it was called 'Notre-Dame d'Athènes'. There is an absorbing book that collects the impressions of the late medieval Europeans about the temple: J.M. Paton: *Chapters on Mediaeval and Renaissance Visitors to Greek Lands*. Princeton 1951. Among them was Niccolo da Martoni (reminded also by Connelly) who saw the Parthenon in 1394 and wrote (I quote after Paton, p. 33):

Postea accessimus ad maiorem ecclesiam sitam intra dictum castrum, vocabuli Sancte Marie, que ecclesia est fabricata lapidibus marmoreis et magnis, omnibus implumatis, et est ipsa ecclesia magna sicut ecclesia Capuana. In circuitu ipsius ecclesie extra ecclesiam sunt columnae magne LX. Quelibet ipsarum alta plus de scalis de vendemiando, et grossa quantum possent attingere quinque homines, brachiis expansis. Et supra ipsas columnas sunt traves de marmore longe et grosse. Supra quas est atrium ipsius ecclesie. Impossibile videtur menti hominis quomodo ipsa tam magna edificia construi potuerunt.

²⁶ *In eo vero templo, quod Parthenona appellant* – in the Renaissance translation of Romolo Amaseo (Romulus Amasaeus), appended to the G. Xylander and F. Syllburgius': *Pausaniae accurata Graeciae descriptio/Pausaniae de veteris Graeciae regionibus commentarii luculentissimi*. Francofurti 1583, p. 20.

Pausanias, who saw the noble sanctuary about AD 150, almost six hundred years after its erection, has used an austere, tantalizing and exceptionally restrained, if not chilly phrase: ‘the temple called Parthenon’ (1.24.5).²⁷ It seems obvious that he was not especially interested in-, or excited by the splendour of κάλλος and εὐρυθμία of the shrine,²⁸ its lavishness,²⁹ ‘grandeur’ and ‘magnificence’.³⁰ If the temple was for him a marvel of human spirit, he failed to share with his enthusiasm with his Greek and Roman readers.³¹ He too remains silent on the political context of erecting the temple, omitting also the fact that the monument was ‘an *anathema* of victory’.³² What more, he never calls the sanctuary ‘worth seeing’,³³ as he does elsewhere many times, depicting other monuments (1.5.4: θεάς ἄξιος; 2.27.5: Ἐπιδανυρίους δέ ἐστι θεάτρον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ μάλιστα ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν θεάς ἄξιον; 4.31.10: θεάς μάλιστα ἀγάλματα ἄξια; 8.26.7: ἔργον, θεάς ἄξιον μεγέθους τε ἔνεκα καὶ ἐς τὴν τέχνην; 9.2.7: Πλαταιεῦσι δὲ ναός ἐστιν Ἥρας, θεάς ἄξιος μεγέθει τε καὶ ἐς τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τὸν κόσμον).³⁴ The opposite is rather true: in this case the learned traveller seems to treat the magnificent witness of the Periclean era with an outsider’s typical reserve,³⁵ without

²⁷ J.G. Frazer’s translation: *Pausanias’ Description of Greece* I. London 1898, p. 35. This may be compared with Strabo’s equally unemotional and purely descriptive phraseology (*Geogr.* 9.1.16): Τὸ δ’ ἄστὺ αὐτὸ πέτρα ἐστὶν ἐν πεδίῳ περιουκούμενη κύκλῳ· ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ πέτρᾳ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν ὃ τε ἀρχαῖος νεῶς ὁ τῆς Πολιάδος ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἄσβεστος λύχνος, καὶ ὁ παρθενῶν ὃν ἐποίησεν Ἰκτινός, ἐν ᾧ τὸ τοῦ Φειδίου ἔργον ἐλεφάντινον ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ; see A. Powell: *Athens and Sparta. Constructing Greek Political and Social History from 478 B.C.* London 1988, p. 59; also S. Psarra: “The Parthenon and the Erechtheion: the Architectural Formation of Place, Politics and Myth”. *Journal of Architecture* 2004, Vol. 9, p. 99.

²⁸ Cf. n. 62, below.

²⁹ In a clear contrast to his eulogy of the Propylaea gate: 1.22.4; see J. Elsner: “Image and Ritual: Reflections on the Religious Appreciation of Clasiscal Art”. *Classical Quarterly* 1996, Vol. 46, p. 520.

³⁰ A typical voice of delight, expressed by one of the XVIIIth-century European travellers, Julien-David Le Roy in his: *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce* II. Paris 1758, p. 8.

³¹ M. Beard: *Parthenon...*, p. 25. It is difficult to restraint from observation that his mention resembles a definition – a dictionary entry, in fact – as found in the later ancient glossaria: *Lexica Segueriana* (Coislin 345, p. 283): <Νεῶς>: ὁ Ἀθήνησι παρθενῶν; p. 288: <Παρθενῶν>: ὁ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεῶς οὕτω καλεῖται, ἐπεὶ ἔστι παρθένος ἢ θεός), or *Lexicon Patmense* (p. 143, 1.7): <Οἱ τὰ Προπύλαια καὶ τὸν Παρθενῶνα οἰκοδομήσαντες ἐκεῖνοι.> Παρθενῶν· τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν.

³² Andrew Stewart’s term: *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration* I. New Haven–London 1990, p. 150. Yet, Pausanias’ silence is telling as we shall see, see the last subsection, below.

³³ Regarding this phrase see Stewart: “‘Most Worth Remembering’...”, pp. 231f.

³⁴ Others, however, did: Heraclides Criticus, *Descriptio Graeciae*, F1. 1: Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν πολυτελές, ἀπόψιον, ἄξιον θεᾶς, ὁ καλούμενος Παρθενῶν (cited by Beard: *Parthenon*, as motto); on this passage see J. McInerney’s remarks in: *Brill’s New Jacoby*. Editor-in-chief I. Worthington [www.brillonline.nl].

³⁵ On this cf. J. Elsner: “From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monument, Travel and Writing”. In: *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Eds. S. Goldhill and R. Osborne. Cambridge 1994, pp. 226–227.

a trace of enthusiasm.³⁶ In his report one cannot detect – to use Sir John Boardman’s memorable phrase – ‘an archaeology of nostalgia’.³⁷ Behind Pausanias’ exceptionally brief statement a distance is perceptible rather – apparently the Parthenon was not *his* sanctuary, that’s, it was not a Panhellenic monument; it remained (still) *theirs*, the Athenians’ visible monument of magnificence.³⁸ A temporary distance from the ‘glory’ times when the temple has been erected goes thus side by side with the traveller’s emotional reserve,³⁹ if not with a certain amount of indifference, or apathy. For Pausanias the Parthenon is only among innumerable monuments in a true Hellenic kaleidoscope of shrines, buildings, stoas, tombs, statues, paintings, reliefs, and other *erga* and *memorabilia*.⁴⁰ The same is true with Pausanias’ mentioning of the famous Periclean edifice elsewhere, at 1.1.2 and 8.41.9. Anyhow, the latter remark resembles that of 1.24.5: καὶ <Ἰκτίνο> ὁ ἀρχιτέκτων τοῦ ἐν Φιγαλία ναοῦ γεγονῶς τῇ ἡλικίᾳ κατὰ Περικλέα καὶ Ἀθηναίους τὸν Παρθενῶνα καλούμενον κατασκευάσας which W.S.H. Jones in his Loeb edition renders as ‘what is called the Parthenon’. Professor Wycherley (*Pausanias, Description of Greece V...*, p. 34) is thus quite right in observing that ‘Pausanias ignores it architecturally’,⁴¹ being interested rather in the decorations and

³⁶ He came probably from Lydia. K.W. Arafat calls him ‘an educated native of Asia Minor’ (*Pausanias’ Greece. Ancient Artists and Greek Rulers*. Cambridge 1996, p. 76); cf. S. Swain: *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250*. Oxford 1996, p. 331; also W. Hutton: *Describing Greece. Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*. Cambridge 2005, p. 9, and A. Spawforth: s. v. “Pausanias”. In: *The Oxford Classical Dictionary. Fourth Edition*. Eds. S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth and E. Eidinow. Oxford 2012, p. 1097.

³⁷ J. Boardman: *The Archaeology of Nostalgia. How the Greeks Re-created Their Mythical Past*. London 2002, p. 8. To be sure he writes that ‘We can see from their literature that to the Greeks the past was all-important; it was not for them a foreign country’, yet Pausanias’ attitude towards the Parthenon seems to indicate otherwise.

³⁸ The working on the Parthenon has begun in 447 (cf. IG I². 352; R. Meiggs and D. Lewis: *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Oxford 1969, no. 59, pp. 162–165; cf. Ch.W. Fornara: *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War* [Translated Documents of Greece & Rome]. Cambridge 1986, no. 94) and ended in 332, see Plutarch, *Per*. 12.1 and 13.7, with P.A. Stadter: *A Commentary on Plutarch’s Pericles*. Chapel Hill–London 1989, pp. 157f. and 168; cf. R. Meiggs: *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford 1972, pp. 154–155; also T. Hölscher: “Images and Political Identity: the Case of Athens”. In: *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Eds. D. Boedeker & K.A. Raafaub. Cambridge Mass.–London 1998, pp. 167–168. Pausanias might have referred to another, earlier name of the shrine – ἑκατόμπεδος – ‘hundred-foot long’ (used by Plutarch, *Per*. 13.7; *Cat. Mai*. 5.3); cf. Frazer: *Pausanias’ Description II...*, p. 307; also J.M. Hurwit: *The Athenian Acropolis. History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge 1999, p. 161.

³⁹ In his excellent study Ch. Habicht discusses Pausanias’ use of the phrase ‘in my times’: *Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1985, pp. 176–180.

⁴⁰ On variety of such monuments see A. Stewart: *Classical Greece and the Birth of Western Art*. Cambridge 2008, p. 125.

⁴¹ For example, no comment is devoted to the fact that it had eight columns on each of ends, cf. J.M. Cook: “Classical Art: the Beginning of the European Tradition”. In: *The Greek World*.

mythological narratives both in ‘the so called’ pediments of the temple (ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις ἀετοῖς),⁴² as well in the ornaments of the goddess’ chryselephantine statue inside the ναός.⁴³ What then? Did the author of the *Description of Greece* (Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις) not know how to appreciate the value and beauty of the Periclean architectural masterpiece as it deserved?⁴⁴ Or, is it only *our* appreciation,

Classical, Byzantine and Modern. Ed. R. Browning. London 1985, p. 144. No word is issued that it was the first temple constructed from marble (cf. J.J. Coulton: “Cities and Architecture”. In: *The Cambridge Ancient History. Plates to Volumes V and VI. New Edition*. Ed. J. Boardman. Cambridge 1994, p. 56). Nor is it stated, as it is in Plutarch, *Per.* 12, that the marble used in construction was transported from the Mt. Pentelicon, 20 kilometers on wooden rollers; cf. R.E. Wycherley: “Rebuilding in Athens and Attica”. In: *The Cambridge Ancient History. Second Edition V*. Eds. D.M. Lewis, J. Boardman, J.K. Davies and M. Ostwald. Cambridge 1992, p. 220; cf. J. Whitley: *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge 2001, p. 347; see M.D. Stansbury O’Donnell: *A History of Greek Art*. Malden–Oxford 2015, p. 248.

⁴² On which see the valuable commentary by Jane Ellen Harrison in her *Myths and Monuments of Ancient Athens*. London 1890, p. 431 (she adds, at p. 445, that ‘The image of Athene Parthenos is described with a detail rare for Pausanias’); cf. O. Palagia: “Architecture and Sculpture”. In: *Greek Civilization. An Introduction*. Ed. B.A. Sparkes. Oxford–Malden 1998, p. 206; cf. S. Woodford: *The Art of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge 2005², pp. 27–32; also B.A. Sparkes: *Greek Art* [Greece & Rome New Surveys in Classics 22]. Oxford 1991, p. 29. Surprisingly, for some reasons Pausanias totally omitted the metopes and the famous frieze which the Polish scholar, S. Parnicki-Pudelfko (*Architektura starożytnej Grecji*. Warsaw 1985, p. 205), understands as the result the viewer’s impossibility to see it from below; cf. R. Osborne: “The Viewing and Obscuring of the Parthenon Frieze”. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1987, Vol. 107, pp. 98–105; C. Marconi: “The Parthenon Frieze: Degrees of Visibility”. *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 2009, Vol. 55/56, p. 157. ‘Guardian of memory’ as Pausanias certainly was, he remembered selectively, though (the term in the inverted commas is that of J.I. Porter: “Ideals and Ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic”. In: *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Eds. E.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner. Oxford 2001, p. 67).

⁴³ Here I am using this noun in a broader sense. Technically, *naos* was an inner shrine within the outer colonnade (portico) that was called by this term. There was another technical word in use – σῆκος (Latin: *cella*), cf. W. Burkert: *Greek Religion*. Cambridge Mass. 1985, p. 91; see also Thucydides, 2.13.5; Aristotle, *Resp. Ath.* 47. 1; Pliny, *NH*, 36. 18; see F. Brommer: *The Sculptures of the Parthenon. Metopes, Frieze, Pediments, Cult Statue*. London 1979, pp. 69–71; also O. Palagia: *The Pediments of Parthenon*. Leiden–Boston–Köln 1998²; and her: “Architectural Sculpture”. In: *A Companion to Greek Art I*. Eds. T.J. Smith and D. Plantzos. Malden–Oxford 2012, pp. 157–159. Pausanias’ interest in the statues may be compared with the famous reaction the Roman consul Emilius Paulus showed on the view of one of the seven wonders of the world (Hyginus, *Fab.* 233) – the statue of Zeus the Olympian by Phidias (Polybius, 30.10.5–6; also Pausanias, 5.11). In a similar vein, however, Polybius, who informs of this monument, does not depict the temple as such; cf. F.W. Walbank: *A Historical Commentary on Polybius III*. Oxford 1979, p. 433.

⁴⁴ With regard to Pausanias’ selectivity, his silence and omissions of many other monuments and elements of architecture (for example, when describing the Erechtheum he does not mention the Caryatids at all), see Clemente Marconi’s excellent study “Pausanias and the Figural Decoration of Greek Sacred Architecture”. *RES* 2014/2015, Vol. 65/66, pp. 180–181; cf. Arafat: *Pausanias’ Greece...*, p. 75; see also M. Pretzler: *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece*. London 2007, pp. 105–106 – she says that the traveller’s ‘descriptions are often surprising and at times disappointing’. Concerning the Parthenon various explanations were given but perhaps the most

after over the two and half millennia, which made the Parthenon a true symbol of Greek art at all?⁴⁵ Is it only *we* to whom the building has become an emblem, mainly because we, the moderns, have a privilege to track an astonishing odyssey of this relic – from ‘temple, church,’⁴⁶ mosque’ to ‘ruin, reconstruction, and icon’, to quote Beard’s suggestive summary?⁴⁷

To make generalizing statements about the ancients’ attitude toward the Periclean masterpiece from Pausanias’ highly reserved and laconic notice would be of course highly dangerous (his motives for silence or including *ekphraseis* of numerous monuments varied and in particular cases depended on different factors). A more vital question would be rather: how common among Greek elites was Pausanias’ attitude? Is it possible to affirm this in any way?

First, a more general, preliminary issue – the problem of ‘art’. It may be often read now that it is very doubtful to assert whether works of architecture, painting or sculpture were perceived by the ancients in the way they are viewed recently. There is still an ongoing dispute on that matter but majority opinion makes us believe that in the eyes of ancient thinkers ‘art’ was not a separate category – con-

influential was offered by O. Regenbogen in his learned article on Pausanias in: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Supplementband VIII. Hrsg. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus und K. Ziegler. Stuttgart 1956, col. 1089. He maintained that Pausanias did not bother to present here a more detailed because the shrine was universally known to everyone acquainted with Greek tradition. Regenbogen is followed by Swain: *Hellenism & Empire...*, p. 332, citing Pausanias, 8.42.4: here the Greek visitor explains his reason for omitting the description of how the wooden image of Demeter looked like. He does not insert it, confining himself to the statement that it is well known ‘to any intelligent man who is learned in tradition’ (tr. W.H.S. Jones). This would agree with the modern expert’s observation that the Acropolis ‘like some other masterpieces of nature or art, is so familiar that it is hard to see it with fresh eyes (S. Hornblower: *The Greek World 479-323 BC*. London–New York 1983, p. 108). But Regenbogen’s explanation does not tell the whole truth, I believe, see below, the section: ‘Some Scepticism’.

⁴⁵ Cf. B.A. Barletta: “The Architecture and Architects of the Classical Parthenon”. In: *The Parthenon. From Antiquity to the Present*. Ed. J. Neils. Cambridge 2005, pp. 67–100. On the popularity of the Parthenon in modern Greek literature see L. Giannakopoulou: “Perceptions of the Parthenon in Modern Greek Poetry”. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 2002, Vol. 20, pp. 241f.

⁴⁶ At the end of the sixth century AD; cf. A. Kaldellis’ excellent chapter in his: *The Christian Parthenon. Classicism and Pilgrimage in Byzantine Athens*. Cambridge 2009.

⁴⁷ In: *Classical Tradition...*, p. 692; see A. Stahr: “The Fate of the Parthenon”. *Crayon* 1859, Vol. 6, pp. 10–13, and H.R. Goette: *Athens, Attica and the Megarid. An Archaeological Guide*. London–New York 2001, pp. 44–46; with N.L. Klein: “The Architecture of the Athenian Acropolis before Pericles: Life and Death of the Small Limestone Buildings”. In: *Cities Called Athens. Studies Honoring John McK. Camp II*. Eds. K.F. Daly and L.A. Riccardi. Lanham (MD) 2014, p. 139. To these functions of the Parthenon one may add also that it was used by the Ottomans, unfortunately, as an ammunition store; cf. R.A. Tomlinson: s. v. “Parthenon”. In: *Oxf. Class. Dict. Fourth Ed...*, p. 1085; see Ch. Mee & A. Spawforth: *Greece. An Oxford Archaeological Guide*. Oxford 2001, p. 54. At this point it is necessary to remind, as did D. Harris, claiming that with the destruction of the interior the shrine has changed completely its appearance (*The Treasures of Parthenon and Erechtheion* [Oxford Monographs in Classical Archaeology]. Oxford 1995, p. 1).

trary to its modern status and autonomy.⁴⁸ Accordingly, the Greeks and Romans allegedly did not appreciate *technai* for their aesthetic value.⁴⁹ Various additional arguments were (and are) given on this occasion to confirm this thesis, yet I think one should be not too dogmatic in claiming that there was no such understanding among ancient addresses and viewers. The same is true in the case of the Parthenon. The voices the ancients expressed about this shrine – scanty, sparse and occasional as they are – all the same prove that there was in antiquity variety of opinions and approaches: from emotional delight of this architectural colossus to its mere tolerance and ‘cold’ indifference – otherwise a natural phenomenon, given that speaking of ‘antiquity’ one is thinking of the period stretching for a thousand years. This said, it therefore would be better to avoid thinking that the temple (as well other works of architecture) could not be *occasionally* the object of aesthetic contemplation and delight as such; sometimes it certainly was.⁵⁰ In the case of the Parthenon this may be observed right after its construction; it was then when

⁴⁸ One may quote here D. Schaps’ words (*Handbook for Classical Research*. Milton Park–New York 2011, p. 277): “‘Art for art’s sake’ was an idea of the nineteenth-century Romantics; it was unknown to the Greeks and the Romans. the temples, sculptures and paintings that captivate the modern viewer were produced not by starving artists with dreams of aesthetic grandeur, but by workmen hired by the state or by wealthy patrons and presumably given clear instructions about what they were to produce. Many of these workmen, particularly those whose reliefs adorn the temples, are unknown to us, and were not famous in their time; others won fame and sometimes even fortune, but they nevertheless produced their art on commission, not under the inspiration of an entirely untrammelled Muse’.

⁴⁹ See discussion in R. Scruton: *The Aesthetics of Architecture*. London 1979, pp. 3f.; cf. D. Konstan: *Beauty. The Fortunes of an Ancient Idea*. Oxford 2015, pp. 1–24.

⁵⁰ Despite of these objections the problem is more complicated: already in Plutarch’s times there was in use the term καλλιτεχνία or *hedone* (Plutarch, *Per.* 13.1; 12.1), and it is doubtful if it was invented in the Roman era. Similarly, it was Plato himself who used the term *kala erga* when saying of Phidias’ works which means that the ancient observers expressed occasionally an aesthetic judgment. True, the ancients did not know something like the concept *beaux arts*, yet one cannot too easily refuse the Greeks a taste and sense of beauty or enchantment that had less or nothing to do with ‘politics’, ‘religion’ and ‘ideology’, rather than with formal aspects of the works of architecture, sculpture or painting (so Plato, *Phil.* 56b). It seems that modern treatments of this problem are too rigoristic, paying too much weight to the (lack of) terminology; see for example an influential paper by P.O. Kristeller: “The Modern System of the Arts: A Study in the History of Aesthetics Part I”. *Journal of History of Ideas* 1951, Vol. 12, esp. pp. 498–506; cf. W. Tatarkiewicz: “Classification of Arts in Antiquity”. *Journal of History of Ideas* 1963, Vol. 24, p. 231, who thinks that by ‘art’ the Greeks thought of ‘production’. This is of course true, yet by no means excludes a narrower understanding of what is artistically beautiful. Even if we follow Grażyna Zakrzewska who in her excellent paper: “Wyrażenia techniczne z dziedziny sztuk plastycznych u Pauzania periegety”. *Meander* 1979, Vol. 34, p. 359, concluded that it was only the Hellenistic times when a sculptor began to be regarded as ‘an artist’, this cannot be a proof that objects of everyday production could not be viewed as ‘beautiful’. Kristeller’s standpoint has been criticized by J.I. Porter: *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece: Matter, Sensation, and Experience*. Cambridge 2010, pp. 28f.; cf. R. Carpenter: *The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Bryn Mawr–New York 1921, pp. 153f.

the sanctuary began *also* to be regarded as a work belonging to καλλιτεχνία⁵¹ – together with other buildings on the Athenian *acropolis*.

I repeat again and again ‘sometimes’, or ‘occasionally’, as, on the other hand, in the further course of my argument I would like to suggest that it remains equally true that *most often* the ancients’ aesthetic judgment and evaluating of the Parthenon was deeply connected with political context (or/and political interpretation of this context). That such statement is of course by no means something new, rather than an acknowledgement of broad and almost universal phenomenon, is the point recalled by Professor Porter (*Origins of Aesthetic Thought...*, p. 34). While not denying that it is possible to find out in ancient reflection (as well in later ages) the examples of pure aesthetic joy when viewing monuments, we must add that the case of the Parthenon and its evaluation had (again) usually much in common with a viewer/writer’s judgment of Athens herself, a product of politics this *polis* realized since the end of the Persian wars. Now, we are leaving Pausanias for a while in order to look at the account of a writer who provided the most detailed description of this historical context in which the Parthenon has been constructed: we mean naturally Plutarch of Chaeronea.

Plutarch’s relatively detailed report of the famous (or: notorious) Periclean building programme,⁵² featured in his *Life of Pericles* (chapters 12–14), raised many controversies. A fundamental difficulty is as follows: how much and to which extent his report of this landmark Athenian enterprise (important both for Greek political history as the history of the European art) is his own interpretation of the events of the second half of the fifth century BC; or, conversely, should we assume that his account remains essentially faithful, as he repeated what has been found in the source material. Writing about 50 years before Pausanias, the Platonic

⁵¹ Regarding the Parthenon, there are ancient testimonies saying of καλὸς ὁ Παρθενών (*Comica Adespota* (CAF), *Fragmenta incertorum poetarum*, fr. 340. 3); ὁ παρθενὼν ὑπὸ τινῶν ἑκατόμπεδος ἑκαλεῖτο διὰ κάλλος καὶ εὐρυθμίαν: Harpocration, *Lex. in X or. Att.*, p. 106, 1.8; Menecles, F6; cf. Aelius Aristides, *Panath.* 352–354 [Lenz & Behr] who was delighted both by the Acropolis as its temples but does not mention them by the name). In other cases the temple was regarded as lavish (ὁ Παρθενὼν οὗτος, εὖπινος καὶ πολυτελής: Bion, F17.16; Teles, *Περὶ αὐταρκείας*, p. 8, 1.4; Stobaeus, *Anth.* 3.1.98). It was also mentioned only in a definiton-like form (cf. n. 31, above): καὶ τὰ Προπύλαια ἔχειν καὶ τὸν Παρθενῶνα καὶ τὰς στοὰς καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ: Dio Chrysostomus, or. 48.12; <Προπύλαια ταῦτα, ὁ Παρθενών: Ps.-Aelius Aristides, *Rhet.* 1.3.1; εἰς ταυτηνὴν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀποβλέψαι κελεύω καὶ τὸν Παρθενῶνα: Aelius Aristides, *Λευκτρικὸς α*, p. 425, 1.3 Jebb; παρθενὼν ναὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει παρθένου Ἀθηνᾶς περιέχων τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς θεοῦ, ὅπερ ἐποίησεν ὁ Φειδίας ὁ ἀνδριαντοπλάστης ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἐλέφαντος: *Scholia in Demosth. vet.*, or. 22, sect. 45; see too Plutarch, *De exilio*, 599aff.; Claudius Aelianus, *NA*, 6.49; Zosimus, 4.18.3; Suidas, A. 3797, 1.3). Some of these testimonies were collected by the famous French archaeologist, Ernest Beulé, in his book *L’Acropole d’Athènes* I. Paris 1853, pp. 51f. (see n.11, above). It was him who discovered the late Roman entrance to the *acropolis*, called now in his honor – Beulé Gate.

⁵² See W. Ameling: “Plutarch, Perikles 12–14”. *Historia* 1985, Vol. 34, pp. 47–63; G. Gruben: *Die Tempel der Griechen*. München 1976², p. 178; cf. K.A. Raaflaub: *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece*. Chicago–London 2004, pp. 118f.

thinker from Chaeronea,⁵³ gives a highly encomiastic account of the splendour of the Athenian hill, its slopes and the monuments of the whole Athenian *acropolis* have impressed on their (some) onlookers,⁵⁴ being a material equivalent of the ‘Selbstdarstellung der Athener’ – to use Strasburger’s memorable words,⁵⁵ and the monument to ‘impérialisme artistique d’Athènes’.⁵⁶ In *Life of Pericles*, 13.1, the biographer informs that:

Ἀναβαινόντων δὲ τῶν ἔργων ὑπερηφάνων μὲν μεγέθει, μορφῇ δ’ ἀμιμήτων καὶ χάριτι, τῶν δημιουργῶν ἀμιλλωμένων ὑπερβάλλεσθαι τὴν δημιουργίαν τῇ καλλιτεχνίᾳ, μάλιστα θαυμάσιον ἦν τὸ τάχος. ὧν γὰρ ἕκαστον ὄντο πολλαῖς διαδοχαῖς καὶ ἡλικίαις μόλις ἐπὶ τέλος ἀφίξεσθαι, ταῦτα πάντα μίας ἀκμῇ πολιτείας ἐλάβανε τὴν συντέλειαν.⁵⁷

⁵³ K. Lapatin: “Art and Architecture”. In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles*. Ed. L. Samons II. Cambridge 2007, pp. 125–126; see P.J. Rhodes: *A History of the Classical Greek World 479–323 BC*. Malden–Oxford 2006, pp. 62–65.

⁵⁴ Cf. G.M.A. Richter: *A Handbook of Greek Art*. London–New York 1969⁶, p. 113; see L. Kallett: “Accounting for Culture in Fifth-Century Athens”. In: *Democracy, Empire & Arts...*, pp. 49–50. At the same time Plutarch recalls the criticism of the building policy, containing a famous comparison of Athens to an *aladzona gynaike* (*Per.* 12.12): ταύτην ἀνῆρχε Περικλῆς, καὶ δοκεῖ δεινὴν ὕβριν ἢ Ἑλλὰς ὑβρίζεσθαι καὶ τυραννεῖσθαι περιφανῶς, ὁρῶσα τοῖς εἰσφερομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἡμᾶς τὴν πόλιν καταχρυσοῦντας καὶ καλλωπίζοντας ὥσπερ ἀλαζόνα γυναῖκα, περιπτομένην λίθους πολυτελεῖς καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ ναοὺς χιλιοτάλαντους. ταύτην ἀνῆρχε Περικλῆς, καὶ δοκεῖ δεινὴν ὕβριν ἢ Ἑλλὰς ὑβρίζεσθαι καὶ τυραννεῖσθαι περιφανῶς, ὁρῶσα τοῖς εἰσφερομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἡμᾶς τὴν πόλιν καταχρυσοῦντας καὶ καλλωπίζοντας ὥσπερ ἀλαζόνα γυναῖκα, περιπτομένην λίθους πολυτελεῖς καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ ναοὺς χιλιοτάλαντους; cf. n. 38, above. L. Kallet-Marx: “Did Tribute Fund the Parthenon?”. *Classical Antiquity* 1989, Vol. 8, pp. 252f., shows that the case of the financing the construction of the temple was more nuanced and complicated than one is usually used to think. The shrine, partially, was funded from the money paid by the allied cities of the Delian League, yet she reminds that it was the treasury of Athena that was the main source of its financing; see also H.T. Wade-Gery: “Thucydides the Son of Melesias. A Study of Periclean Policy”. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1932, Vol. 52, pp. 207–208 and 222–223; with Rhodes: *Athenian Empire...*, p. 26.

⁵⁵ H. Strasburger: “Thukydides und die politische Selbstdarstellung der Athener”. *Hermes* 1958, Vol. 86, pp. 17–40 (=“Thucydides and the Political Self-Portrait of the Athenians”. In: *Thucydides* [Oxford Readings in Classical Studies]. Ed. J.S. Rusten. Oxford 2009, pp. 191–219).

⁵⁶ The term of J. Charbonneau, R. Martin and F. Villard: *Grèce classique (480–330 avant J.-C.)*. Paris 1969, p. 137; see J.J. Pollitt: *Art and Experience in Classical Greece*. Cambridge 1972, p. 9; cf. esp. A. Corso: *Monumenti Periclei. Saggio critico sulla attività edilizia di Pericle*. Venice 1986.

⁵⁷ On this passage see S.L. Martin-Mcauliffe and J.K. Papadopoulos: “Framing Victory: Salamis, the Athenian Acropolis, and the Agora”. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 2012, Vol. 71, p. 340. However, as Stadter has remarked (*Comm. Plut. Per...*, p. 163), the adjective ὑπερηφάνων ‘is almost always pejorative’. On the role of this Plutarchan passage for our classification of the fifth-century in Greece as representing ‘classical’ period of her history cf. U. Walter: “The Classical Age as a Historical Epoch”. In: *A Companion to the Classical Greek World*. Ed. K.H. Kinzl. Malden–Oxford 2009, p. 2.

Later he adds the following eulogy of the monuments themselves (*Per.* 13.5):

ὅθεν καὶ μᾶλλον θαυμάζεται τὰ Περικλέους ἔργα, πρὸς πολὺν χρόνον ἐν ὀλίγῳ
γενόμενα. κάλλει μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστον εὐθὺς ἦν τότε ἄρχαϊον, ἀκμῇ δὲ μέχρι νῦν
πρόσφατόν ἐστι καὶ νεουργόν· οὕτως ἐπανθεῖ καινότης αἰεὶ τις, ἄθικτον ὑπὸ
τοῦ χρόνου διατηροῦσα τὴν ὄψιν, ὥσπερ ἀειθαλὲς πνεῦμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀγήρω
καταμειγμένην τῶν ἔργων ἐχόντων.

We cannot say, if what we read here is Plutarch's own assessment, or did he just follow the reports that were friendly oriented toward Pericles and his path-breaking project, repeating hereby laudatory tradition about this eminent politician, as it can be learned from other sources.⁵⁸ Both suggestions are probably justified. But Plutarch's tale from *Life of Pericles*, 12–14, remains exceptionally important inasmuch as it shows that political context of the Parthenon seem to have prevailed over purely aesthetic judgments – insofar as the sources allow to state this: at that time the temple was to be a mark of the Athenian power and triumph of civic religion; if a pure delight of its form and *Baukunst* was expressed it was less important. In most cases, as we can infer, a high appreciation of the beauty of the Acropolean monuments became thus logically inseparable from the beauty of Athens herself as an emblematic *paideusis tes Hellados* (Thucydides, 2.41.1), and, logically, from political power of this *polis*, with its leading statesman, the Thucydidean *protos aner* (2.65.9).

Be that as it may, such political appreciation of the Athenian monuments agrees with other testimonies by the other Athenians of the fourth-century BC like Isocrates and Demosthenes, the two great *laudatores temporis acti*. For instance, the hard-bitten enemy of Philip of Macedon wrote emphatically (or. 22.76, in *Androktionem*, ca. 357–354)⁵⁹ that ἀφ' ὧν κτήματ' ἀθάνατ' αὐτῷ περίεστιν, τὰ μὲν τῶν ἔργων ἡ μνήμη, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἀναθημάτων τῶν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις σταθέντων τὸ κάλλος, προπύλαια ταῦτα, ὁ παρθενῶν, στοαί, νεώσοικοι, οὐκ ἀμφορίσκοι δύο οὐδὲ χρυσίδες τέτταρες ἢ τρεῖς, ἄγουσ' ἐκάστη μνᾶν, ἅς, ὅταν σοι δοκῇ, σὺ πάλιν γράψεις καταχωνεύειν.⁶⁰ The same sentiment appears in a speech he

⁵⁸ Some experts (e.g. A.W. Gomme: *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* I. Oxford 1945) doubt in Plutarch's real capacity to understand the remote political situation from 500 years ago, pointing instead out his slavish repeating of the opinions he has read in the sources (in this case in Plato and Thucydides); against such a view see A. Powell: "Athens' Pretty Face: Anti-Feminine Rhetoric and Controversy over the Parthenon". In: *The Greek World*. Ed. A. Powell. London 1995, pp. 245f. As he says, there is 'the virtual silence on the Parthenon of surviving fifth-century literature'; also T. Spawforth: *The Complete Greek Temples*. London 2006, p. 140.

⁵⁹ On the chronology see J. Ober: *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens. Rhetoric, Ideology and the Power of the People*. Princeton 1989, p. 344.

⁶⁰ Among the ancient sources that came to us Demosthenes is, in fact, the first who uses the name παρθενῶν; cf. G. Roux: "Pourquoi le Parthénon?". *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1984, Vol. 2, pp. 301–317; see J. Tréheux: "Pourquoi le Parthénon?". *Revue des Études Grecques* 1985, Vol. 98, p. 233. See Ch.W. Fornara and L.J. Samons II: *Athens from Cleisthenes to Pericles*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1991, p. 93.

had delivered against Timocrates in 353 (or. 24.184). Here we learn that ἀφ' ὧν κτήματ' ἀθάνατ' αὐτῷ περίεστιν, τὰ μὲν τῶν ἔργων ἢ μνήμη, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἀναθημάτων τῶν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις σταθέντων τὸ κάλλος, προπύλαια ταῦτα, ὁ παρθενῶν, στοαί, νεώσοικοι, οὐκ ἀμφορίσκοι δύο οὐδὲ χρυσίδες τέτταρες ἢ τρεῖς, ἄγουσ' ἐκάστη μᾶν, ἄς, ὅταν σοι δοκῇ, πάλιν γράψεις καταχωνεύειν. Isocrates was equally proud of *his* (that's, Athenian) temple when in the *Areopagiticus* (or. 7.66) wrote:⁶¹

Καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ τάδε τίς οὐ μνημονεύει τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν τῶν ἐμῶν, τὴν μὲν δημοκρατίαν οὕτω κοσμήσασαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τοῖς ὁσίοις ὥστ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς ἀφικνουμένους νομίζειν αὐτὴν ἀξίαν εἶναι μὴ μόνον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄρχειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων, τοὺς δὲ τριάκοντα τῶν μὲν ἀμελήσαντας, τὰ δὲ συλήσαντας, τοὺς δὲ νεωσοίκους ἐπὶ καθαιρέσει τριῶν τάλαντων ἀποδομένους, εἰς οὓς ἡ πόλις ἀνήλωσεν οὐκ ἐλάττω χιλίων τάλαντων.

The merit of Pericles is eulogized by the same thinker in the *Antidosis* (or. 15.234). Here the famous politician is called δημαγωγὸς ὢν ἀγαθὸς καὶ ῥήτωρ ἄριστος – a verdict that agrees with Thucydides' renowned judgment of this politician in the so-called 'Pericles' obituary' (Thuc. 2.65).⁶² Thus a very deep, say, intrinsic connection between democracy, art, and the maintaining of the sea empire emerges also as clear:

οὕτως ἐκόσμησε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ὥστ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς εἰσαφικνουμένους εἰς αὐτὴν νομίζειν μὴ μόνον ἄρχειν ἀξίαν εἶναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν οὐκ ἐλάττω μυρίων τάλαντων ἀνήνεγκεν.

In a similar vein the talented politician and speaker Lycurgus said of the beauty and proportions of the shrine called *Hekatompedos* too: ὁ Παρθενῶν ὑπὸ τινῶν Ἑκατόμπεδος ἐκαλεῖτο διὰ κάλλος καὶ εὐρυθμίαν, οὐ διὰ μέγεθος, ὡς Μενεκλῆς ἢ Καλλικράτης ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἀθηνῶν.⁶³

One can call all these and alike voices 'political' (or: 'ideological'), provided that we take not this term in its narrow sense but treat it in a more general way (see note 50, above). These 'classical' voices, echoed by later writers, have a common, visible trait: the reflection on the temple of Athena was the result of living memo-

⁶¹ See J. Neils: *The Parthenon Frieze*. Cambridge 2001, pp. 25–26.

⁶² See L. Samons II: *Pericles and the Conquest of History. A Political Biography*. Cambridge 2016, p. 4; also T.L. Shear Jr.: *Trophies of Victory. Public Building in Periklean Athens*. Princeton 2016, pp. 2–3.

⁶³ *Orat. fragmenta* (or. 1 F3 Conomis), citing a lost work on Athens (*FGrH* 370 F3); the same formula was in later use, as the example of the above mentioned Harpocration proves (*Lex. in X or. Att.*, p. 106, l.8: ὁ παρθενῶν ὑπὸ τινῶν Ἑκατόμπεδος ἐκαλεῖτο), also literally repeated in the *Suda Lexicon*: Suidas, E', 368, l.2 (ὁ παρθενῶν ὑπὸ τινῶν Ἑκατόμπεδος ἐκαλεῖτο διὰ κάλλος καὶ εὐρυθμίαν, οὐ διὰ μέγεθος) and E, 368, l.1 (<Ἑκατόμπεδος νεώς>: ὁ Ἀθήνησι παρθενῶν).

ries of the political circumstances in which it has been constructed,⁶⁴ although ‘a moment that produced the Parthenon was fast being eclipsed’.⁶⁵ This was clear to Sir Erich H. Gombrich who in his seminal *The Story of Art* wrote about the flourishing of the Athenian arts under the bellicose, imperial democracy,⁶⁶ in which masses of the citizens were actively engaged in the politics (a famous Athenian ‘meddlesomeness’ – πολυπραγμοσύνη).⁶⁷ On this interpretation the Parthenon must have been a visible triumph of civic, communal values, rather than of religion;⁶⁸

⁶⁴ See B. Ashmole: *The Architect and Sculptor in Ancient Greece* [The Wrightsman Lectures]. New York 1972, p. 90; J.J. Coulton: *Ancient Greek Architects at Work. Problems of Structure and Design*. Ithaca (NY) 1982, p. 20; see R. Kousser: “Destruction and Memory on the Athenian Acropolis”. *Art Bulletin* 2009, Vol. 91, pp. 275–278. A.B. Bosworth: “The Historical Context of Pericles’ Funeral Oration”. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1995, Vol. 115, p. 11, wonders why Gomme (*Hist. Comm. Thuc.* II..., pp. 119–120) took *euteleia* in a pejorative sense. Yet, if for the historical Pericles the term bore certainly a proud meaning, it is not inconceivable that for Thucydides (I assume for certain that he faithfully repeated Pericles’ line of thought), it might have ringed ironically, given that he looked from the perspective of 404 that for the generation meant the failure of the Periclean dreams about the Athenian leadership in Greece. On the occasion of ‘the political implication of the Parthenon’ (cf. R. Meiggs’ title of the paper: “The Political Implications of Parthenon”. In: *Parthenos and Parthenon* [Greece & Rome Suppl. 10]. Ed. G.T.W. Hooker. Cambridge 1963, pp. 36–45, followed by W. Schuller: “Der attische Seebund und der Parthenon”. In: *Parthenon-Kongreß Basel. Referate und Berichte 4. bis 8. April 1982*. Ed. E. Berger. Mainz 1984, pp. 20–25), an intriguing issue appears whether the Persian apadana at Persepolis palace was in any sense a pattern or conceptual inspiration for the Panathenaic Frieze; see A.W. Lawrence: “The Acropolis and Persepolis”. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1951, Vol. 71, pp. 111f.; M. Cool Root: “The Parthenon Frieze and the Apadana Reliefs at Persepolis: Reassessing a Programmatic Relationship”. *American Journal of Archaeology* 1985, Vol. 89, pp. 103–120: at p. 104 she says of ‘similarities’ that ‘imply not only Athenian awareness, but also conscious emulation, of the Persian programmatic vision’.

⁶⁵ Joan Breton Connelly’s fine words (*Parthenon Enigma*..., p. 118).

⁶⁶ In the Polish edition: *O sztuce*; tr. M. Dolińska, Warsaw 1997, p. 82. In claiming this Gombrich was preceded by nobody else as Johann Winckelmann himself in his *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* I, Dresden 1764, p. 26–27. See generally K.A. Raaf laub: “The Transformation of Athens in the Fifth-Century”. In: *Democracy, Empire & Arts*..., pp. 37–38; cf. Meiggs & Lewis: *GHI*..., p. 164. Gombrich’s accent laid on democracy as an ‘environment’ for a rapid development of art, is quoted by Nigel Spivey in his *Understanding Greek Sculpture. Ancient Meanings, Modern Readings*. London 1997, p. 27; see T.J. Galpin: “The Democratic Roots of Athenian Imperialism”. *Classical Journal* 1983, Vol. 79, pp. 105–106; cf. J. Boersma: *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.* Groningen 1970, p. 68; also Samons II: *Pericles and Conquest*..., pp. 91–92.

⁶⁷ Cf. Gruben: *Die Tempel*..., p. 178; see R. Osborne: “Democracy and Imperialism in the Panathenaic Procession: the Parthenon Frieze in Its Context”. In: *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* [Oxbow Monographs 37]. Eds. W.D.E. Coulson, O. Palagia, L.T. Shear Jr., H.A. Shapiro and F.J. Frost. Oxford 1994, p. 143.

⁶⁸ See R. Osborne: “Urban Landscape and Architecture”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*. Eds. G. Boys-Stones, B. Graziosi and P. Vasunia. Oxford 2009, p. 244. The Parthenon was perceived, to recall the words of Diane Harris (*Treasures of Parthenon and Erechtheion*..., p. 10), ‘the house of the goddess of Athena, rather than a place for congregational worship’; cf. also R. Parker: *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford 1996, p. 141. As he adds, p. 187, citing

it remained the most spectacular evidence confirming the phenomenon that has been called recently by Professor Ober ‘efflorescence’.⁶⁹ This civic aspect was also clearly taken for granted by Aristotle who in his *Constitution of the Athenians* (ch. 47.1) describes the duties of the treasurers of the goddess Athena,⁷⁰ as in the second half of the fifth century they constituted a vital part of the democratic civic machinery.⁷¹ On this occasion modern scholars try sometimes to see the Parthenon in its ideological terms: for example, Professor Green in his stimulating, challenging and revisionist essay, has called once the Parthenon ‘that insidiously all-pervasive symbol’.⁷² By this he meant that there is much of intrinsic, irremovable idealism in *our* modern perception of this monument.

But very often the modern discussions of the ‘political’ aspect of the Parthenon and other temples on the *acropolis* steer into another direction: they just deal with the religious meaning of the sanctuary and the whole *acropolis*.⁷³ In the chapter 8 (§9) of his *Life of Pericles* Plutarch preserves one of his hero’s famous ἔπεα πτερόεντα. The example is taken from Stesimbrotus of Thasos (*FGrH* 107 F109). This time Pericles’ *aureum dictum* came from his epitaph in honour of the Athenians killed in the Samian war. There the speaker has argued that although men cannot see the gods, the divinities nevertheless exist and are immortal since men

Demosthenes, 22.13, in the fourth century BC the shrine was taken as ‘a kind of memorial to the victory’; see esp. R.F. Rhodes: *Architecture and Meaning on the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge 1995, pp. 89f.; also Kousser: “Acropolis”..., p. 275; see too J.J. Pollitt: “Art, Ancient Attitudes to”. In: *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization. Second Edition*. Eds. S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth and E. Eidinow. Oxford 2014, p. 83. See, however, M. Robertson: “Greek Art and Religion”. In: *Greek Religion and Society*. Eds. P.E. Easterling and J.V. Muir. Cambridge 1985, pp. 155f.

⁶⁹ J. Ober: *The Rise and Fall of Classical Greece*. Princeton 2015, pp. 2–3; cf. Ch. Ratté: “Athens: Recreating the Parthenon”. *Classical World* 2003, Vol. 97, p. 52 who stresses out that today it may be ‘associated with imperialism, oppression, and extravagance’.

⁷⁰ See the notes of P.J. Rhodes: *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford 1993, pp. 549–551.

⁷¹ But Alison Burford rightly argues that the role of the temple was ‘twofold’, ‘a monument to power, prosperity and piety’ (“The Builders of the Parthenon”. In: *Parthenos and Parthenon...*, p. 23); see especially C.J. Herrington: *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias*. Manchester 1955, pp. 48–68; with N. Spivey and M. Squire: *Panorama of the Classical World*. London 2004, p. 188; see too J.R. Senseney: “Greek Public and Religious Architecture”. In: *A Companion to Science, Technology, and Medicine in Ancient Greece and Rome I*. Ed. G.L. Irby. Malden–Oxford–Chichester 2016, p. 642.

⁷² P. Green: “The Shadow of the Parthenon”. In: his *The Shadow of the Parthenon. Studies in Ancient History and Literature*. Berkeley–Los Angeles 1972, p. 17.

⁷³ A point stressed out by Connelly: *Parthenon Enigma...*, pp. 113f. She rightly draws attention to the fact that since Enlightenment it was customary to emphasize ‘civic’ and secular dimension of the Parthenon, but it is clear that religious aspect was fundamental, albeit not always appreciated correctly by the moderns (an old problem with the understanding of the Greek beliefs and ‘religion’); cf. Stansbury O’Donnell: *A History of Greek Art...*, p. 252.

are benefited from them.⁷⁴ So is, Pericles' argument ran, with the fallen at war for the country: we longer do not see them, yet they remain immortal too. This argument perfectly links 'politics' with 'religion', making in fact the two 'spheres' an inseparable unity in ancient Greek thinking about politics and gods:⁷⁵ patriotism and piety were by no means conflicting attitudes, for the gods were perceived as 'the stronger' ones, whose feature is power and force. As a *credo* of the men who decided to build the Parthenon, Pericles' words might have been inscribed on, say, its stylobate, too. They explain well ideological and religious dimension of the temple and architecture,⁷⁶ which might have been much more important than pure 'aesthetic appreciation'.⁷⁷

Some Scepticism: Thucydides and (again) Pausanias

As I have mentioned above (cf. note 44, above), Pausanias' Olympian silence on the Parthenon was taken by Otto Regenbogen as the proof of the writer's reluctance to waste the time writing once again about what was then known to everyone. The German expert concluded: 'Anderes, was war der modern Beurteiler vermißt, mag wiederum andere Gründe haben. Beispielsweise die Vernachlässigung des Parthenon bei der Schilderung der Akropolis von Athen: es scheint mir klar, daß P. das fast beiseite ließ, weil es für seine Zeitgenossen allbekant und nicht, wie für den heutigen Reisenden, mit einem Schimmer versunkener Größe umgeben war, die es nötig machte von Selbstverständlichem überhaupt des weiteren, und vor Augen Stehendem viel zu reden' (*RE. Suppl.* VIII, col. 1029).

⁷⁴ On which S.V. Tracy: *Pericles. A Sourcebook and Reader*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 2009, p. 30; Stadter: *Comm. Plut. Per....*, p. 110.

⁷⁵ See T. Hölscher: "Art, Architecture, and Spaces in Greek Participatory Communities". In: *A Companion to Greek Democracy and the Roman Republic*. Ed. D. Hammer. Malden–Oxford–Chichester 2015, p. 466; cf. V. Azoulay: *Pericles of Athens*. Princeton–Oxford 2014, p. 107.

⁷⁶ As Robin Osborne shows in his studies, one of the goals of monumental architecture was to impress the viewer and display the superiority of the divine (e.g.: "Archaic and Classical Greek Temple Sculpture and the Viewer". In: *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*. Ed. B.A. Sparkes. Edinburgh 1997, p. 235).

⁷⁷ The term of A. Sheppard: *Aesthetics. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Art*. New York–Oxford 1987, p. 64. As O.V. Bychkov and A. Sheppard remind (*Greek and Roman Aesthetics*. Cambridge 2010: p. xi): 'aesthetics as a separate branch of philosophy with a distinctive subject matter (questions about beauty, the nature of fine art, forms of aesthetic judgement, etc.) which admits of a systematic but unitary treatment, is hardly older than the eighteenth century'; but see n. 50, above.

I believe this explanation is insufficient, and only partly correct, at best. Above all, Pausanias was a very careful observer.⁷⁸ If he determined not to tell what is commonly known, why did he decide to do so in other cases elsewhere, inserting, *exempli gratia*, a very detailed description of the equally famous temple of Zeus in Olympia? The traveller was aware of πολλὰ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα ἴδοι τις ἂν ἐν Ἑλλήσιν, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀκούσαι θαύματος ἄξια (5.10.1), so there must have been another reasons for his silence. Regenbogen's assumption may thus be supplemented by another explanation, yet in order to bring it forth, it would be useful to recall an another astute observer with whom Pausanias had much in common when regarding the Periclean Ἐκατόμπεδος.

It appears that Pausanias' reluctant attitude ('a transient account' – so rightly Stuart & Revett: *Antiquities* II. . . , p. 4) was by no means exception in antiquity. His reserved standpoint may be explained, as it seems, if we turn out to the writer who was witness how the Parthenon was constructed: the historian Thucydides. Starting his tale just after the ending of the construction of the sanctuary (in 332) – on the eve of the Peloponnesian war (in 331)⁷⁹ – it can rightly be expected of him that he will mention the lavish shrine. To be sure at 2.13.2 he lists the Propylaea gate and others monuments of Pericles' path-breaking building venture (τὰ προπύλαια τῆς ἀκροπόλεως καὶ τᾶλλα οἰκοδομήματα),⁸⁰ yet in Pericles' famous funeral oration, a great praise of the Athenian citizenry, state and its eternal achievements,⁸¹ no open statement is issued and no sentence is devoted to the Parthenon and other masterpieces at the *acropolis*,⁸² which Professor Gomme, a great expert in Thucydides, has explained as irrelevant to the historian's main theme which was the conflict itself.⁸³ Such an interpretation, cannot, however, be accepted as sufficient. If Thucydides' reserved voice is to be inferred from his silence, a famous statement Φιλοκαλοῦμέν τε γὰρ μετ' εὐτελείας (2.40.1) may equally contain, thus,

⁷⁸ W. Gurlitt: *Über Pausanias*. Graz 1890, pp. 21f.

⁷⁹ See J.M. Hurwit: "The Parthenon and the Temple of Zeus at Olympia". In: *Periklean Athens and Its Legacy. Problems and Perspectives*. Eds. J.M. Barringer and J.M. Hurwit. Austin 2005, p. 135.

⁸⁰ Meiggs and Lewis: *Selection...*, pp. 162–166, nos. 59 and 60 = Fornara: *Translated Documents...*, no. 118 A and B; cf. R. Osborne: *The Athenian Empire* [LACTOR 1]. London 2000⁴, no. 66, pp. 41 and 127–128. On Pericles as 'the moving spirit' see B.S. Ridgway: *Prayers in Stone. Greek Architectural Sculpture (ca. 600 – 100 B.C.E.)*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1999, p. 200; cf. L. Kallet: "Demos Tyrannos: Wealth, Power, and Economic Patronage". In: *Popular Tyranny. Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece*. Ed. K.A. Morgan. Austin (TX) 2003, p. 128.

⁸¹ Cf. I. Jenkins: *Greek Architecture and Its Sculpture*. Cambridge (Mass.) 2006, p. 73.

⁸² Unless the confession of national pride at 2.41.4 (μετὰ μεγάλων δὲ σημείων καὶ οὐ δὴ τοι ἀμάρτυρόν γε τὴν δύναμιν παρασχόμενοι τοῖς τε νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἔπειτα θαυμασθησόμεθα) should be extended to the city's physical monuments too, although a general interpretation preferred by the modern experts is that for Thucydides political power of Athens was at stake only.

⁸³ Gomme: *Hist. Comm. Thuc. I...*, pp. 25–26; see also S. Hornblower: *Comm. Thuc. I...*, p. 308, on 2.41.1 (τὴν τε πᾶσαν πόλιν τῆς Ἑλλάδος παίδευσιν εἶναι); cf. N. Loraux: *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge (Mass.)–London 1986, pp. 230–235.

a bit of irony.⁸⁴ First, such interpretation would go along with the tradition of the hostile reception of the Pericles' boastful building policy in the forties of the fifth century BC, as preserved in Plutarch's *vita* (*Pericles*, 12.2; 14.1–2).⁸⁵ Here we are told that some representatives of the then elite, politically opposed to the visionary statesman, criticized his general course of aggressive, 'imperialistic' politics, including the wasting of allies' money – removed in 454 from the treasure at Delos and transferred then to Athens⁸⁶ – on a thorough rebuilding of the *acropolis*,⁸⁷ burnt and destroyed by the Persians in 480.⁸⁸ Secondly, there is a fascinating passage in Thucydides, 1.10.4, where the historian asserts that an impression of greatness of external architectonic forms does not indicate in fact a true power and power. So is the case of Athens – if judging from her external appearance, Thucydides argues, one might erroneously claim about her magnitude and strength which *seemed* to someone greater than it *was* in reality. Contrary to Sparta: her buildings and architecture were modest, yet her military and political importance turned out to be far more greater.⁸⁹ Accordingly, at 1.10.2 we are told that Sparta is not known of her lavish ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκευαῖς πολυτελέσι – an apparent al-

⁸⁴ On the meaning of the difficult phrase cf. Kallet: "*Demos Tyrannos*"..., pp. 131–132. Thucydides' irony may be compared with the Spartan popular thinking about Athens where all was beautiful – *panta kala* (Plutarch, *Mor.* 236b–c).

⁸⁵ Boersma: *Athenian Building Policy*..., pp. 65–81; R.E. Wycherley: *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton 1978, p. 113, and D. Castriota: *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality. Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens*. Madison 1992, pp. 137–138; also T. Hölscher: "The City of Athens: Space, Symbol, Structure". In: *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*. Eds. A. Molho, K. Raaflaub and J. Emlen. Ann Arbor 1991, pp. 368–375, and K.A. Raaflaub: "Democracy, Power, and Imperialism in Fifth-Century Athens". In: *Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction of American Democracy*. Eds. J.P. Euben, J.R. Wallach and J. Ober. Ithaca–London 1994, pp. 119–120.

⁸⁶ Perhaps as the consequence of Athens' failure in the Egyptian expedition and the fear of the Persian attack. Anyway, the transferring of the League's treasury was a remarkable political decision which marked – in the opinion of the majority of modern scholars – the decisive step from 'the panhellenic Delian league' to 'the Athenian empire'; see H.T. Wade-Gery, B.D. Merritt and F.M. McGregor: *The Athenian Tribute Lists* III. Princeton 1950, p. 263; also J.E. Lendon: *Song of Wrath. The Peloponnesian War Begins*. New York 2010, pp. 74–76.

⁸⁷ See J. Onians: *Classical Art and the Cultures of Greece and Rome*. New Haven–London 1999, p. 46. the authenticity of this story was called into question by an eminent British scholar, A. Andrewes: "The Opposition to Pericles". *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1978, Vol. 98, pp. 1–8. His suggestion that the Plutarchan report is fictitious was rightly criticized by Powell: *Athens and Sparta*..., p. 60, and P.J. Rhodes: *Athenian Empire* [Greece & Rome New Surveys in Classics No. 17]. Oxford 1985, p. 29; see also D. Kagan: *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca–London 1969, pp. 140–148, and A. Giovannini: "The Parthenon, the Treasury of Athena and the Tribute of Allies". In: *The Athenian Empire*. Ed. P. Low. Edinburgh 2008, p. 164.

⁸⁸ J. Bousquet: "Athen". In: *Die griechische Kunst*. Hrsg. K. Papaioannou und J. Bousquet. Freiburg–Basel–Wien 2002, p. 495.

⁸⁹ A. Parry: "Thucydides' Historical Perspective". In: his *Language of Achilles and Other Essays*. Oxford 1989, p. 294.

lusion to Athens that does.⁹⁰ So, Thucydides' conclusion – whichever his motifs were – seems to be simple: it follows that one should appreciate a real power of *poleis* and communities,⁹¹ not a (misleading) physical shape of their public buildings.⁹² Also at 2.64.5 the historian has Pericles to mention of Athens' 'wealth and greatness' which may point to material resources of this city. It is not inconceivable that here we have an echo of the authentic thinking of this statesman. Despite of Hornblower's reserved voice that 'Nothing here is said about the cultural and artistic greatness for which she is actually remembered' (*Comm. Thuc* I..., p. 395; see note 18, above), it seems highly probable that Pericles alluded to the importance of Athens as 'artistic' centre of Greece. Such allusion would be adequate and understandable to the then audience of the speaker (see Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 243.375b Bekker: Περικλεῖ μὲν Προπύλαια πρὸς φιλοτιμίαν ἥρκει καὶ Παρθενών).⁹³

All this points to a subtle criticism of Pericles: if not his general line of politics at all, his overstated and somewhat boastful optimism before the outbreak of the conflict is under the historian's fire which finds a reasonable assumption in the fact that Thucydides looked at the decision of the really sumptuous and expensive plan of the reconstruction of the *acropolis* hill from some perspective. His reservation corresponds thus with the then criticism of some influential politicians, recorded by Plutarch in his *vita Periclis* (but not shared by the biographer).

So, having indicated (I hope) Thucydides' some reserve and restraint towards the Periclean decision of spending the state's resources on buildings, so seriously

⁹⁰ Cf. Gomme: *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* I..., p. 113; Hornblower: *Comm. Thuc.* I..., pp. 33–34. the adjective *polyteles*, although used by Thucydides ironically (as I believe), might have pointed to the Greeks' fondness of luxury which must have been, as K. Lapatin reminds in his recent study, something usual in Athens: *Luxus. The Sumptuous Arts of Greece and Rome*. Los Angeles 2015, p. 2; cf. E. Foster: *Thucydides, Pericles and Periclean Imperialism*. Oxford 2010, p. 168. That similar voices of reservation have been sometimes expressed confirms Cicero citing Demetrius of Phalerum's criticism of the Pericles' extravagant idea of the creating the complex architectonic center (*De off.* 2.60).

⁹¹ S. Hornblower: *Thucydides*. London–Baltimore 1987, pp. 32 and 183–184.

⁹² Cf. Stadter: *Comm. Plut. Per.*..., p. 145, *ad* 12.1. Let us observe that Aristotle did not even mention Pericles' building plan and the splendid οἰκοδομήματα where one might expect it: in the chapter 27 of the *Respublica Atheniensium*, devoted to the personality of this visionary statesman. Equally, Platon in his *Gorgias*, 519a, has no warm words for Pericles and other eminent Athenian politicians, their achievements, and the Athenians' 'love of prestige' – the famous *philotimia*, on which see the commentary of E.R. Dodds: *Plato, Gorgias*. Oxford 1959, pp. 365. According to the Platonic Socrates, it is no harbors, ports and walls that make a state a good and just one. The allusion is too clear to be not taken as a reference to the Periclean building policy of the second half of the fifth-century. By an obvious implication the glamour buildings must be included to this list too.

⁹³ Cf. H.R. Immerwahr: "Ergon: History as Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides". *American Journal of Philology* 1960, Vol. 81, p. 263; Ch.W. Hedrick Jr.: "The Meaning of Material Culture: Herodotus, Thucydides, and Their Sources". In: *Nomodeiktēs. Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Eds. R.M. Rosen and J. Farrell. Ann Arbor 1993, p. 22.

burdening the Athenian finances, I shall return to Pausanias and his extremely brief note at 1.24.5. I have already suggested that his reticence about the Parthenon (which did not go unnoticed already by Stuart & Revett⁹⁴) has much in common with Thucydides. But if the later was witness, so lively interested in what happened later, is it really a solid reason to hold such a claim as justifiable in the case of Pausanias too? It is possible to argue that he, a newcomer from Asia Minor, could be really ‘engaged’ in a judicious evaluation of the monument that stood already a few hundred years, in an epoch when the Athenian ‘days of glory’ are already long gone, and given especially if his travelling through Roman Greece occurred in a totally different political circumstances?

As suggested above, the answer must be naturally: yes. Pausanias, a *connoisseur* and man of taste, was not an objective ‘tourist’, ‘cool’, dispassionate, and ‘politically correct’; he had his own political preferences, even ‘bias’ (e.g., he disliked tyranny); he did not hesitate to give a personal comment on political events, decisions and personalities. To him, as to many Greek *pepaideumenoi* of the second century AD, the old Hellas inevitably has changed into ‘a museum’, yet it never became a Dickensian-like ‘old curiosity shop’ with plenty of *Sehenswürdigkeiten* for which no one cares yet. It still was a museum filled with priceless artefacts and monuments whose meaning was actual and valid. Pausanias’ attitude towards particular politicians and events of bygone times was finely clarified by Professor Habicht in his indispensable book (n. 39, above).⁹⁵

Habicht (*Pausanias’ Guide...*, p. 109) calls the Greek writer ‘the Greek patriot’ who ‘has no love for those who tormented or weakened Greece’. Powerful men who harmed Greek community (Philip II, Cassander, Philip V) are despised by him, while its benefactors (the Seleucids, the Ptolemies, the Attalids) deserve praise. Habicht perceptively reminds, too, that for the *periegetes* a great calamity was the Peloponnesian war – that bloody and long conflict that torn Greece apart for almost ‘three decades’ (*Pausanias’ Guide...*, p. 112). For Pausanias it was exactly this war that later enabled Philip of Macedon the conquest of Greece – a country devastated, weak and exhausted by interstate feuds. A crucial passage, reminded by this scholar, is the chapter 52 from the book VIII of the *Periegesis*. Here Pausanias lists the personalites he thinks to have benefited the *wholy* Greece, and accuses both Greek leaders as commanders from the times of the Peloponnesian war of ‘assasination of Greece’. Accordingly, the eminent men who did not contribute to prosperity of whole Greece, were by him also excluded. Welfare of the whole Greece was thus for Pausanias a fundamental criterion by which he judged politicians, notwithstanding an apparent anachronistic assumption about

⁹⁴ Cf. n. 13, above; also H. Hitzig und H. Blümner: *Des Pausanias Beschreibung von Griechenlands I*. Berlin 1896, p. 271.

⁹⁵ See also V.A. Champion-Smith’s excellent PhD dissertation: *Pausanias in Athens: an Archaeological Commentary on the Agora of Athens* [University College London 1998], pp. 15f.

the political unity of Greece in the fifth-century BC. In this context it goes without a surprise that Pericles is ‘the great absent’ from Pausanias’ guide.

So far, so good. Yet, the silence about Pericles is not only coincidental in Pausanias’ story. It is rather telling and meaningful, and I suggest that it had something in common with the writer’s restrained remark of the Periclean representative monument of the Athenian ἀρχή: as I have observed above, for Pausanias the Parthenon, lavish and beautiful in many respects as it was, remained a tangible evidence of the fateful and arrogant – again from the viewpoint of the whole Hellenic community – Athenian politics. In result, in all probability, the perspective Pausanias had adopted yielded the inclusion of Pericles – by implication – to the group of men who eventually harmed Greece (αὐτόχειρας καὶ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα καταποντιστὰς εἶναι σφᾶς τῆς Ἑλλάδος – a very strong censure).⁹⁶ To be sure Pericles is not mentioned by name, yet if we remember that Aristides who had organized the Delian League has been excluded from the ‘benefactors’ as responsible for ‘[...] imposition of tribute on the island Greeks’ (8.52.2; tr. Jones, Loeb), the line of thought along which Pausanias deduced becomes more understandable.⁹⁷

All of all, if such interpretation is correct, Pausanias’ pungent rebuke of the eminent politicians of the ‘classical’ times must have influenced his view of the Parthenon too. The Athenian masterpiece of architecture and sculpture as it was – ‘der bezeichnete berühmte Marmorbau des Perikles’⁹⁸ – to some of the Greeks of the second century AD still remained a vivid symbol of mistaken ambitions that ruined that half-mythical dreamland, old Hellas, irrespective of the fact that there was no political unity in the fifth-century Greece.

‘After centuries of study and admiration, the Parthenon remains, in so many ways an enigma’ – summarized recently Professor Connelly her remarkable ‘biography’ of this monument.⁹⁹ An exceptionally accurate observation: truly, we cannot solve and untie all the questions and uncertainties connected with this

⁹⁶ To be sure Pausanias uses the phrase ‘those who took part in the Peloponnesian war against Athens’ (τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους πολέμου) – which may suggest that he adopted Athenian point of view – but this cannot mean that he has exculpated the Athenians. It is possible that, as Plutarch, he had a dilemma what about Pericles. Eventually, his silence may be the consequence of his problem with evaluation of this statesman, so praised in the sources.

⁹⁷ Consciously or not, Pausanias is repeating here old arguments the adversaries of Pericles and his democratic policy have adduced before the Peloponnesian war; see K.A. Raaf laub: “Contemporary Perceptions of Democracy in fifth-Century Athens”. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 1990, Vol. 40, p. 68.

⁹⁸ Wilhelm Dörpfeld’s term (“Parthenon I, II und III”. *American Journal of Archaeology* 1935, Vol. 39, p. 497).

⁹⁹ *Parthenon Enigma...*, p. ix.

construction, perception and meaning of this masterpiece which too, at the same time, must always mean an effort to understand the men themselves,¹⁰⁰ not so much the Greeks, but the Athenians rather.¹⁰¹ By the same token, the riddle of the Parthenon has its additional source in another, very simple fact – ‘the jewel in the crown’ of the Greek architecture (although Pausanias would say: ‘Athenian’) remains inapprehensible, or even inconceivable, also because of the fact of its mere persistence and existence – with serious physical injuries, though. To every modern observer, sensitive enough and endowed with a gift of some imagination, such existence of the Parthenon must contain something of mystery (if not generate a sense of wonder or ‘miracle’). Old political controversies and quarrels of the fifth century BC, all that political context in which the temple has been constructed, have irreversibly disappeared or are treated as a historical curiosity. What remains now is the fact of persistence itself, making the sanctuary ‘a cultural ideal’, in the accurate words of Savas Kondaratos.¹⁰² Therefore, it is the Parthenon’s astounding durability in time that makes a serious, impenetrable, and fathomless challenge to disentangle the secrets of this vintage relic. Although one cannot hope to explain in a sufficiently satisfactory manner all the doubts appearing to anyone who looks at the magnificent sanctuary, it is only to be hoped that to modern tourists, visitors and men devoted to ancient Greek culture, the monument will never cease to be a source of unfading inspiration.

‘We shape our buildings and afterwards our buildings shape us’, Sir Winston Churchill once acutely has observed, and – except the Flavian amphitheater at Rome, perhaps – this is true especially of the Parthenon. In the last case also fortunately because of that simple and fortunate fact that – to use the words of the great Polish poetess – ‘Kamień jak był tak jest z kamienia’.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ R. Scruton: *Beauty*. Oxford 2009, p. 123.

¹⁰¹ See T. Cahill: *Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea. Why the Greeks Matter*. New York 2003, pp. 235f.; also R. Waterfield: *Athens. A History from Ancient Ideal to Modern City*. New York 2004, pp. 87–105; see too E. Hall: *Introducing the Ancient Greeks. From Bronze Age Seafarers to Navigators of the Western Mind*. New York–London 2014, esp. pp. 127–158. It may be observed that the famous Thucydidean characteristic of the Athenian spirit and character before the Peloponnesian war the Corinthian envoys present at the council in Sparta (1.69–71) provides an excellent ‘commentary’ on the astonishing building activity on the *acropolis* in the years preceding the outburst of the pan-hellenic conflict, see K.A. Raaflaub: “Thucydides on Democracy and Oligarchy”. In: *Brill’s Companion to Thucydides*. Eds. A. Rengakos and A. Tsamakidis. Leiden–Boston 2006, pp. 195–196; on this see R.F. Rhodes: “The Periclean Acropolis”. In: *A Companion to Greek Architecture*. Ed. M.M. Miles. Malden–Oxford–Chichester 2016, p. 157.

¹⁰² “The Parthenon as Cultural Ideal: the Chronicle of Its Emergence as a Supreme Monument of Eternal Glory”. In: *Parthenon and Its Impact...*, pp. 19–52; cf. T.R. Martin: *Pericles. A Biography in Context*. Cambridge 2016, p. 20.

¹⁰³ E. Lipska: *Wolny przekład z Szekspira*.

Joanna Pyłacz

Jagiellonian Library
Jagiellonian University

The Appropriate Goddess The Role of Erichtho in Lucan's *Pharsalia*

Abstract: Unlike classic war epics such as the *Iliad* or Virgil's *Aeneid*, whose heroes fight against external enemies, Lucan's *Pharsalia* tells the story of a civil conflict. This circumstance makes it virtually impossible to include any gods in the action of the poem, as doing so would require them to take sides in the conflict, which would be highly inappropriate. Therefore, inspired perhaps by Aristophanes (or drawing on his own powers of invention), Lucan substituted the 'traditional' Graeco-Roman deities with the Thessalian necromancer Erichtho – who, though human, turns out to be more powerful than the gods themselves. Endowed with qualities that mirror those of the Civil War itself – as well as supernatural powers and a sinister kind of creativity (by means of which she destroys life in order to create death) – Erichtho proves to be the only appropriate 'divine' patron for an epic about civil conflict and – in effect – may be seen as an allegorical 'goddess' of the Civil War.

Key words: Lucan, *Pharsalia*, Erichtho, goddess, religion, necromancer, allegory

Much has been said and written about the Thessalian witch Erichtho – one of the most intriguing characters of Lucan's *Pharsalia*. Although her presence in the epic is limited to one particular episode – and one which does not influence the course of events (apart from delaying them) – the highly intertextual character and shocking aesthetics of the so-called 'Thessalian excursus' automatically endows her with a certain kind of protagonism.¹

¹ Cf. R. Nicolai: "La Tessaglia lucanea e il rovesciamento del Virgilio augusteo". *Materiali e discussioni* 1989, Vol. 23, pp. 113–134; Ch. Martindale: "Lucan's Nekuia". In: *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*. Ed. by C. Deroux. Bruxelles 1980, pp. 367–377.

A frightful mixture of Virgil's Sibyl,² Horace's Canidia³ and Virgil's Allecto,⁴ Erichtho is the second of the *vates* in the epic, coming after the weak and cowardly Phemonoe.⁵ While Phemonoe plays the role of protagonist in the fifth book of Lucan's epic – where, together with the grotesque anti-Aeneas Appius Claudius, she acts as an equally grotesque anti-Sibyl⁷ – Erichtho takes over this function in the sixth book, which corresponds to the second part of the Virgilian *katabasis*.⁸ Together with the 'Sibyl', Lucan also changes the 'Aeneas' by replacing Appius with the equally undeserving Sextus Pompey.⁹

As Jamie Masters has rightly observed, the main motive that drives Appius to go to Delphi is fear.¹⁰ In order to avoid the risk of getting killed in battle, he decides to visit the ancient shrine on the pretext of consulting the famous oracle:

solus in ancipites metuit descendere Martis
Appius eventus, finemque expromere rerum
sollicitat superos multosque obducta per annos
Delphica fatidici reserat penetralia Phoebi.
(5.67–70)

Sextus is also terrified because he is extremely anxious about the future:

Qui stimulante metu fati praenoscere cursus,
inpatiensque morae venturisque omnibus aeger,
non tripodas Deli, non Pythia consulit antra,
nec quaesisse libet primis quid frugibus altrix

² Cf. J. Masters: "Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's 'Bellum Civile'". Cambridge 1992, pp. 179–205.

³ Cf. Ch. Walde: "Canidia and Erichtho: Snapshots from their Postclassical Life". In: *Ancient Magic and the Supernatural in the Modern Visual and Performing Arts*. Ed. by F. Carlà and I. Berti. London–New York 2015, pp. 119–134, at 122.

⁴ Cf. P. Hardie: "The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition". Cambridge 1993, pp. 77, 108; L. Fratantuono: "Madness Triumphant. A Reading of Lucan's *Pharsalia*". Lanham 2012, p. 242.

⁵ Cf. E. Narducci: "Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero. Interpretazione della *Pharsalia*". Roma–Bari 2002, p. 129.

⁶ Cf. J. Pyplacz: "When Legends Come Alive. A Reading of Lucan's *Pharsalia*". Kraków 2015, p. 115.

⁷ Cf. E. Narducci: "La provvidenza crudele. Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei". Pisa 1979; Idem: "Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero...", p. 129; J. Masters: "Poetry and Civil War...", pp. 118–132; On Lucan's peculiar travesty of Virgil's divination scene see: J. Pyplacz: "When Legends Come Alive...", pp. 15–50.

⁸ Cf. L. Paoletti: "Lucano magico e Virgilio". *Atene e Roma* 1963, Vol. 7, pp. 25–26; M.P.O. Morford: "The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic". Bristol 1996, p. 66; J. Masters: "Poetry and Civil War...", pp. 179–215.

⁹ Cf. J. Masters: "Poetry and Civil War...", pp. 192, 209.

¹⁰ Cf. *ibidem*, p. 182.

aere Iovis Dodona sonet, quis noscere fibra
 fata queat, quis prodat aues, quis fulgura caeli
 servet et Assyria scrutetur sidera cura,
 aut siquid tacitum sed fas erat. Ille supernis
 detestanda deis saevorum arcana magorum
 noverat et tristes sacris feralibus aras,
 umbrarum Ditisque fidem, miseroque liquebat
 scire parum superos. [...]

(6.423–434)

The word *aeger* suggests that Pompey's son is literally *sick* with fear.¹¹ However, while Appius – his predecessor in the role of anti-Aeneas – chooses to visit Delphi, Sextus – who rejects traditional religion – heads towards the realm of witches and, surprisingly, the realm of 'detestable' superstition (*detestanda ... arana magorum*) – which proves to be far more effective than traditional religion.

The Thessalian witch is depicted as the exact opposite of the Delphic priestess, not only as regards her character and physical appearance, but also in the matter of her relations with the gods. Although it remains a mystery whether the death of Pheomonoe was actually caused by Apollo or was rather the result of her general weakness, one thing is certain: she dies while she is performing her sacred duties.

By contrast, the fearless Erichtho despises the gods and considers herself to be more powerful than them. Moreover, she bends them to her will:

Nec superos orat nec cantu supplice numen
 auxiliare vocat nec fibras illa litantis
 novit: funereas aris inponere flammās
 gaudet et accenso rapuit quae tura sepulchro.
 Omne nefas superi prima iam voce precantis
 concedunt carmenque timent audire secundum.

(6.523–528)

The 'traditional' gods for their part turn out to be weak, corrupt and vulnerable. Their deplorable state resembles that of the Senate of the decaying Roman Republic.¹² They therefore hardly ever refuse to comply with Erichtho's demands (*omne nefas superi ... concedunt*). Intimidated by the necromancer's magical chants (*carmenque timent audire secundum*), they do her every bidding without question.

¹¹ Cf. E. Narducci: "La provvidenza crudele...", p. 98; L.A. Mackay: "The Vocabulary of Fear in Latin Epic Poetry". *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 1961, Vol. 92, pp. 308–316, at 312; H. Schnepf: "Untersuchungen zur Darstellungskunst Lucans im 8. Buch der *Pharsalia*". In: *Lucan*. Ed. by W. Rutz. Darmstadt 1970, pp. 380–406, at 391.

¹² Cf. R. Gordon: "Lucan's Erichtho". In: *Homo Viator (Studies for J. Bramble)*. Ed. by M. and M. Whitby, P. Hardie. Bristol 1987, pp. 231–241, at 234; N. Lévi: "La Pharsale de Lucain: un monde sans providence?". *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 2006, Vol. 2, pp. 70–91.

Like Phemonoe, Erichtho is also *impia* (*et nobis meritas dabis, impia, poenas*, 5.158; *impia laetatur*, 6.604). However, she is much more than a mere *impia vates*. In the second part of Lucan's version of the Virgilian divination scene, the roles are reversed.¹³ The Sibyl figure – i.e. the person who is supposed to be possessed by a divinity – becomes a possessor herself.¹⁴ By means of her occult art, she comes into possession of the soul of a dead Pompeian soldier and forces him to utter a prophecy (6. 717). Thus, as a human being who assumes a role that has hitherto been reserved for the gods,¹⁵ she acquires a semi-divine status.¹⁶

Not only is she stronger than the gods, but she is also superior to all her evil colleagues inhabiting the Thessalian plains:

Hos scelerum **ritus**, haec dirae crimina gentis
effera damnat nimiae pietatis Erichtho
inque novos **ritus** pollutam duxerat artem.
(6.507–509)

The word *ritus* – which is used in this passage in order to refer to Erichtho's necromantic practices – is normally associated with a religious context. Here it refers to the 'polluted art' (*pollutam ... artem*) of the witch, which is a sinful alternative to religion (*detestanda deis saevorum arcana magorum*). Interestingly, Lucan has used the word *ritus* twice in one and the same sentence, as if to underline Erichtho's status as a rival of the gods or even to render it more 'official'. Her obscure magical rites become an evil alternative to the rites of traditional religion.

Erichtho's version of the *scelerum ritus* is different, being more advanced and more dangerous than that practised by her colleagues. This is because she is a perfectionist. She performs her criminal deeds with 'an exaggerated effort' (*nimiae pietatis*, line 6.508)¹⁷ and thus takes the art of witchcraft to a higher level.¹⁸ The word *pietas* is here used in its opposite meaning, as what we are really witnessing is not *nimia pietas*, but *nimia impietas*.

By using terms which are traditionally associated with religious practices in order to describe magical rites which are openly hostile to 'normal' religion, Lucan underlines the fact that what Erichtho offers is actually an evil alternative to *pietas*. Like her rituals, the witch's everyday habits are also at odds with what is normal and what is socially acceptable:

¹³ Cf. J. Masters: "Poetry and Civil War...", p. 193; J. Young: "Deathly Erichtho as Vital to Lucan's *Bellum Civile*. The Necromancer Hero of the Neronian Anti-Epic". Saarbrücken 2012, p. 26.

¹⁴ Cf. J. Young: "Deathly Erichtho...", p. 26.

¹⁵ Cf. *ibidem*, p. 27.

¹⁶ Cf. Ch. Martindale: "Three Notes on Lucan VI". *Mnemosyne* 1977, Vol. 30, 4, pp. 375–387, at 180; J. Young: "Deathly Erichtho...", p. 29.

¹⁷ Cf. L. Fratantuono: "Madness Triumphant...", p. 242.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

Illi namque nefas urbis summittere tecto
aut laribus feralis caput, desertaque busta
incolit et tumulos expulsis obtinet umbris
grata deis Erebi. Coetus audire silentum,
nosse domos Stygias arcanaque Ditis operti
non superi, non vita vetat. [...]

(6.510–515)

To Erichtho, what is good for normal human beings is evil (*illi ... nefas*). Thus, she never goes anywhere near towns and human abodes (*urbis summittere tecto aut laribus ... caput*), dwelling instead in places of burial – from where she expels the souls of the dead (*expulsis ... umbris*). While the Olympians are terrified of her, the deities of Erebus treat her as a good friend (*grata deis Erebi*). She is a frequent guest in the gloomy realm of Pluto (*nosse domos Stygias arcanaque Ditis operti*). Even the Olympian gods cannot prevent her from making these visits (*non superi*). Moreover, whereas it is virtually impossible for a human being to go down into the Underworld and then come back to Earth, Erichtho does so with complete impunity, untroubled by any concerns about the potential risk to her own life (*non vita vetat*).

A person who can afford to ignore Olympian proscriptions and who – being a frequent guest in Pluto's subterranean palace – is allowed to commute at will between the Earth and the Underworld is certainly no ordinary human being. This is not the portrayal of a mortal woman, but that of a woman who enjoys semi-divine status and who treats the gods not just as her equals, but even (at least in the case of the Olympians) as her inferiors.

In the Thessalian episode, not only has Lucan inverted the roles of the witch and the gods, but he has also inverted the general concept of *nekuia*.¹⁹ In this he might possibly have been inspired by his uncle Seneca, who successfully transformed the Virgilian *katabasis* in his play entitled *Oedipus*, where the dead come up to the Earth instead of going down to the Underworld, as they do in the *Aeneid*.²⁰

In accordance with Seneca's peculiar 'aesthetics of disgust',²¹ Lucan depicts Erichtho as a revolting and at once frightening creature who burns crops by trampling on them (*semina fecundae segetis calcata perussit*, 6.521), who poisons the air with her deadly breath (*et non letiferas spirando perdidit auras*, 6.522), who desecrates funeral pyres (*accenso rapuit quae tura sepulchro*, 6.526) and

¹⁹ Cf. B. Rochette: "Néron et la magie". *Latomus* 2003, Vol. 62, 4, pp. 835–843, at 841.

²⁰ Cf. J. Pypłacz: "The Aesthetics of Senecan Tragedy". Kraków 2009, p. 51; F. Ahl: "Lucan: An Introduction". Ithaca–London 1976, p. 143; J. Young: "Deathly Erichtho...", p. 14.

²¹ Cf. R. Snell: "The Comedy of Hyperbolic Horror: Seneca, Lucan and 20th Century Grotesque". *Neohelicon* 1984, Vol. 11, 1, pp. 277–300; J. Pypłacz: "The Aesthetics of Senecan Tragedy", pp. 75–91.

who does not even stop at murdering people in order to pervert their funeral rites:

Viventes animas et adhuc sua membra regentes
infodit busto, fatis debentibus annos
mors invita subit; perversa funera pompa
rettulit a tumulis, fugere cadavera letum.

(6.529–532)

Erichtho inverts and perverts all that is good, normal or generally acceptable. She harms Society in the same manner as the Civil War harms the Roman Republic. Like the Civil War, she turns things upside down, transforming the place where she happens to be into a realm of frightening absurdity. The inverted *nekuia* symbolises the transformation of the Roman State into a hell on earth,²² as do the inversions of *fas* (6.510), *pietas* (6.508) and ultimately nature itself: Erichtho murders the living (*viventes animas ... infodit busto*) and brings corpses back to life (*fugere cadavera letum*).

All these inversions mirror the changes caused by the Civil War: instead of attacking their enemies, the Romans have turned against themselves, perverting the ‘natural’ course of history. What the hideous necromancer does to nature, the equally hideous fratricidal conflict does to Rome.²³ The landscape of Erichtho’s microcosm mirrors that of the macrocosm, i.e. the represented world of the Republic, which has been virtually destroyed by the conflict.

Erichtho’s relationship with other people is similar to her relationship with nature and the gods: being utterly corrupt herself, she corrupts her surroundings. Her criminal conduct disintegrates Society, tainting it with savagery and cannibalism.²⁴ In order to perform her necromantic practices, she violates funeral pyres and graves, severely mutilating the bodies of the dead as she does so:

Ast, ubi servantur saxis, quibus intimus umor
ducitur, et tracta durescunt tabe medullae
corpora, tunc omnes avide desaevit in artus
inmergitque manus oculis gaudetque gelatos
effodisse orbes et siccae pallida rodit
excrementa manus. [...]

(6.538–543)

²² For Lucan’s frightening landscapes see: K. Niemczewska: “Przestrzeń strachu w *Bellum civile* Lukana”. *Meander* 2007, Vol. 3–4, pp. 265–270.

²³ Cf. R. Nicolai: “La Tessaglia lucanea...”, p. 134.

²⁴ Cf. Ch. Tommasi Moreschini: “Lucan’s Attitude Towards Religion: Stoicism vs. Provincial Cults”. In: *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*. Ed. by Ch. Walde. München–Leipzig 2005, pp. 130–154, pp. 130–154, at 149.

She performs her abominable practices with a beastly eagerness (*avida*) and with evident pleasure (*gaudetque*), behaving more like a bloodthirsty predator (*desaevit*) than a sophisticated necromancer.²⁵ She also maintains a symbiosis with wild animals, which do the hardest part of the job for her by tearing open the bodies with the aid of their claws and teeth:

Et, quodcumque iacet nuda tellure cadaver,
ante feras volucresque sedet; nec carpere membra
volt ferro manibusque suis, morsusque **luporum**
expectat siccis raptura e faucibus artus.

(6.550–553)

It is significant that in this passage the wolf – the mention of which immediately brings to mind the Capitoline She-Wolf who saved the lives of Romulus and Remus – scavenges on the corpses of Romulus's progeny.²⁶ This is yet another inversion: in Erichtho's microcosm, the protector animal of the Romans turns against them. Instead of feeding their living bodies, it feeds on their corpses. Yet another reversal. Yet another absurdity. Yet another historical and mythological oxymoron.

The witch spends most of her time in cemeteries, battlefields and any other places that are tainted with death and decay. The macabre aesthetic of the Thesalian excursus corresponds logically with what Lucan considers the Civil War to be – the funeral of the Republic and even that of the entire world (*Inpendisse pudet lacrimas in funere mundi*, 7.617).²⁷

Another important attribute of the necromancer is her creative prowess. Whenever she needs a ghost, she simply creates one for herself (*ipsa facit manes*. *Hominum mors omnis in usu est*, 6.560). Lucan reveals that she accomplishes this by means of murder (*nec cessant a caede manus*, 6.554). Thanks to this sinister creativity, Erichtho assumes a semi-divine status in the epic, being a monstrous replacement for the traditional deities. Paradoxically, she is at one and the same time a destroyer and a creator: she needs to kill living people in order to create ghosts. Like the Civil War, she annihilates life and produces death.

²⁵ For Lucan's handling of the subject of necromancy see: L. Fahz: "De poetarum Romanorum doctrina magica". Giessen 1904; A. Bourgery: "Lucaïn et la magie". *Revue des Études Latines* 1928, Vol. 6, pp. 299–313; J. Volpilhac: "Lucaïn et l'Égypte dans la scène de nécromancie de la *Pharsale*, VI, 413–830 à la lumière des papyri grecs magiques". *Revue des Études Latines* 1978, Vol. 56, pp. 277–288.

²⁶ Cf. J. Pypłacz: "When Legends Come Alive...", p. 212.

²⁷ Cf. For Lucan's obsession with death and the funerary aesthetics of his poem see G. Pfligersdorffer: "Lucan als Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes". *Hermes* 1959, Vol. 87, pp. 344–377; W. Rutz: "Amor mortis bei Lucan". *Ibidem*, pp. 462–475; C.A. Barton: "The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans. The Gladiator and the Monster". Princeton 1996, p. 59.

Everything about the necromancer is perverse and unnatural. Moreover, she is even capable of perverting the surrounding world and bending it to her mad desires. In this respect, Erichtho is the living image of the Civil War. In her realm, destruction becomes creation and lawlessness becomes law; sacrilege becomes piety and death becomes life. Even a kiss becomes a bite:

Saepe etiam caris cognato in funere dira
 Thessalis incubuit membris atque oscula figens
 truncavitque caput conpressaque dentibus ora
 laxavit siccoque haerentem gutture linguam
 praemordens gelidis infudit murmura labris
 arcanumque nefas Stygias mandavit ad umbras.
 (6.563–568)

The perverse kiss which Erichtho gives to a dead young man during his funeral can be viewed as a symbolic kiss of death given to the ‘dead’ Roman Republic by the Civil War. The expression *truncavitque caput* might even foreshadow the beheading of Pompey, which in turn mirrors the metaphorical ‘beheading’ of the Roman Republic.²⁸

The inversion of the *nekuia* motif is also imbued with a profound metaphorical significance: by transforming the Roman Republic into a nightmarish, barren landscape strewn with the rotting bodies of dead soldiers and infested with angry ghosts, the Civil War in effect allows the Underworld to govern the Earth. Similarly, Erichtho’s superiority over the gods is not without a deeper meaning. The weak and corrupt ‘traditional’ deities symbolise the laws of the Republican *ancien régime* which are overthrown by the sacrilegious actions of ambitious leaders.

The *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* both tell the story of rival nations fighting amongst themselves. In the *Iliad*, the gods take sides. Some, like Athena, ally themselves with the Greeks, while others, like Apollo, support the Trojans. Virgil continues this tradition in his own epic, in which Venus uses her divine powers to enable her human son Aeneas achieve all his goals, whereas Juno – on the contrary – continuously plots against him.

The main difference between the *Pharsalia* and the *Iliad* (or the *Aeneid*) is that in Lucan’s epic there is only one nation – one political entity – which is fighting against itself. It would therefore be logically impossible to include the traditional Graeco-Roman *apparatus divinus* in such a poem. In order to follow the epic tradition, the poet would have to divide the Roman pantheon into two factions and decide which god supported which faction. Apart from being totally illegitimate, this would also be totally artificial. Furthermore, throughout the epic Lucan continually stresses that the Civil War is a suicidal war in which Rome is pitted against Rome. And Rome has but one pantheon. Even at the beginning of the epic

²⁸ Cf. J. Pyplacz: “When Legends Come Alive...”, p. 130.

the narrator says that Caesar 'attacks his own temple' (*in sua templa furit*, 1.155). Later on in the first book he mentions that the statues of the gods are weeping, while the Lares are bathed in perspiration:

Indigetes flevisse deos, urbisque laborem
testatos sudore Lares, [...]

(1.556–557)

By making the represented world of his epic virtually free of gods, Lucan has taken the same attitude as Aristophanes: in a society racked by civil conflict (both the Athenians and the Spartans being Greeks, after all) there is no place for gods. In Aristophanes' comedy entitled *Peace*, which is set in the times of the Peloponnesian War, the Greek gods decide to leave Mount Olympus, while in the *Acharnians* the poet introduces a new divinity – Polemos – who is no more than a very expressive allegory of war.²⁹

In the Athenian context, of course, the figure of Polemos might have had a real-life prototype (as some scholars argue).³⁰ Erichtho herself is almost certainly a product of Lucan's imagination. However, the general concept remains the same: as it is inappropriate for the 'official' gods to take part in a civil conflict, they must not be involved in the plot. In the *Acharnians* they are replaced by Polemos, who is not only the god of war, but also a savage usurper.

In the *Pharsalia*, the gods have also been replaced by a usurper, i.e. Erichtho, whose name – like that of Polemos – is also lexically associated with war. The word *tellus* is the Latin translation of the Greek *χθών*, while the name of Mars, the god of war, can be freely translated as *ἔρις*. The necromancer's name – written in Greek as *ἐρι-χθών* – can therefore be translated into Latin as *Martis tellus*, which means "The Earth of Mars" or "The Soil of Mars". In this respect, the witch is a chthonic monster. Her similarity to Virgil's Allecto brings her nearer to the status of a chthonic goddess, as the Furies – and Allecto is one of them – are also chthonic goddesses.

It is impossible to say with complete certainty whether Lucan consciously embraced Aristophanes' brilliant idea or whether he just decided for himself that – from a logical point of view – it would be inappropriate to have the traditional epic *apparatus divinus* in a poem about civil conflict. The fact remains, however, that in works dealing with the subject of civil conflict both Aristophanes and Lucan decided to replace the 'traditional' Greek gods with a personification of war.

The figure of Erichtho, whose characteristics correspond exactly with those of the Civil War itself, may be viewed as a personification of the conflict. How-

²⁹ More about Lucan's possible Aristophanean inspirations in: J. Pypłacz: "When Legends Come Alive...", pp. 24–26.

³⁰ Cf. K. Sidwell: "Aristophanes the Democrat. The Politics and Satirical Comedy during the Peloponnesian War". Cambridge 2009, p. 211.

ever, by underlining her superiority over the ‘traditional’ gods – for whom she is in effect treated as a replacement – and also by endowing her with spectacular supernatural powers and a sinister creativity (by means of which she destroys life in order to ‘create’ death), Lucan fashioned the necromancer not only as the allegory of a fratricidal (and even cannibalistic) conflict, but also as an evil goddess – an appropriate goddess for a poem about the Civil War.

Julia Krauze

*Università Cardinale Stefan Wyszyński di Varsavia
Facoltà di Scienze Umanistiche
Dipartimento di Lingua e Cultura Italiana*

I volti della pazzia Un viaggio tra sacro, superstizioni e tabù

Abstract: Etymologies of various world languages present “insanity” as unexplainable feelings of heterogeneous psycho-somatic coloring; they contain a certain kind of inner emptiness, yet over-filled with a strange force that drives into unknown. Some times this enigmatic power carries away body and soul, causing fear and respect. There is a need to define, even in a general way, some aspects of such a large topic as “insanity”, namely: *sacrum*, superstition, taboo.

Key words: myth, madness, sacred, superstition, taboo

Nei dizionari etimologici dedicati alle diverse varietà linguistiche disseminate lungo tutte le frontiere, la follia è descritta come una sensazione inspiegabile, tratteggiata da diverse sfumature, che contiene una specie di vuoto interiore e, allo stesso tempo, un totale abbandono a qualche strana forza che trascina verso una meta sconosciuta. Una forza misteriosa, che s’impadronisce in modo assoluto dell’anima e del corpo dell’uomo e si impone prepotentemente alla sua esperienza. In qualche modo la follia raffigura un viaggio, un passaggio dal mondo reale a quello irreale. Per questo suscita paura¹ e rispetto, che a sua volta spingono a inventare appellativi e rituali concernenti le sue più svariate manifestazioni.

La cautela dei nostri antenati nei confronti dell’ignoto e delle forze della natura si spiega facilmente con il timore. Al loro manifestarsi, essi cercavano di decifrar-

¹ Cf. A. Nocentini: *L’etimologico. Vocabolario della lingua italiana*. Milano 2010, p. 842.

ne l'essenza, definendone i lineamenti attraverso un nome. Dato che non era possibile spiegare, al livello delle loro conoscenze, come naturale ogni episodio colto dall'esperienza quotidiana, facilmente veniva presupposto oltre il visibile qualcosa di sacro. Ciò che rientrava in qualche misura nel rapporto tra l'umano e il divino, come testimoniano le fonti antiche, era sempre protetto da un velo di misteriosi divieti e osservanze. Nel tentativo di rendersi propizi gli dei, per essere da loro protetti dalle forze oscure, o per essere favoriti in qualche impresa importante, i nostri avi ricorrevano ai canti (in-canti), ai riti e alle formule magiche, alcune delle quali conservate in modo frammentario fino ai nostri tempi. Molte di queste sopravvivono nelle filastrocche o nei detti popolari, benché abbiano perso la loro valenza originale e non di rado la stessa trasparenza del loro contenuto. Eppure, anche dopo profonde metamorfosi, esse rimangono sempre un patrimonio culturale, a qualsiasi civiltà appartengano e in qualunque parte del mondo ritornino alla luce. Forse può sembrare inverosimile, ma la loro discreta influenza continua a riverberarsi nella storia.

Si impone quindi un bisogno spontaneo di definire, o almeno di illuminare in qualche misura alcuni aspetti del tema in questione, ossia della grande nebulosa della pazzia. A chi non ha mai riflettuto esplicitamente sui fenomeni che la caratterizzano, potranno forse all'inizio apparire sorprendenti, ma il più delle volte risulteranno dettati da una logica che non si discosta di molto da quella comune.

* * *

Per rendere comprensibili le nozioni concernenti il sacro, superstizione e tabù, occorre prima di tutto premettere un'introduzione alla struttura dell'antica società indoeuropea. Si presuppone, ovviamente, che si ammetta la teoria indoeuropea. Avanzata due secoli fa da W. Jones, progressivamente portata avanti da vari ricercatori nei secoli scorsi, l'ipotesi ha acquisito di mano in mano diritto di esistere grazie ai celebri lavori di É. Benveniste² e, prima di tutto di G. Dumézil.³ Su molti punti la discussione è ancora aperta, ma non è possibile trascurare la rilevanza dell'aspetto linguistico. Da un capo all'altro dell'Europa e fino alle lontane regioni asiatiche, alcuni popoli, apparentemente così diversi, utilizzano tuttavia

² É. Benveniste: *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes, II, Pouvoir droit, religion*. Paris 1969 (trad. it., *Vocabolario delle istituzioni indo-europee, II. Potere, diritto, religione*. Torino 1976, 2000). Nel suo saggio *Profanus e profanare*, lo scienziato fa un'analisi dettagliata dell'antica società romana, esaminando il rapporto tra sacro e profano (cf. *Profanus et profanare*. in *Hommages à G. Dumézil*. Coll. Latomus XLV, Bruxelles 1960, pp. 46–53).

³ Georges Dumézil (1898–1986), linguista e filologo francese, noto universalmente per le sue teorie sui popoli indoeuropei, ha sviluppato una visione della società indoeuropea, ripartita in tre principali funzioni: sacrale, guerriera e produttiva. Tra le sue opere principali sono: *Introduction à la grammaire comparée des langue caucasiennes du Nord* (1933), *Les dieux indo-européens* (1952), *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens* (1957), *Mythe et épopée II. Types épiques ind-européens: un héros, un sorcier, un roi* (1971).

un vocabolario comune, conoscono grammatiche affini, si attengono a strutture sintattiche simili. Fino a qualche tempo fa la supremazia della civiltà Greca era indiscutibile. Però, come recentemente aveva scritto M. Detienne:

Le grandi nazioni europee, ciascuna a modo suo, non dubitano che le loro storie abbiano un'uguale origine, e nel migliore dei modi, nei valori della Grecia, e che i Greci siano ovviamente incomparabili. Vengono prontamente emarginati gli antropologi grecisti che hanno tentato di comparare la mitologia e il pensiero dei Greci con le scabrose storielle dei selvaggi americani e polinesiani.⁴

La teoria che prevede appunto per i popoli indoeuropei una storia compressa in alcuni millenni e postulando il loro arrivo nelle sedi stanziali storiche, Grecia inclusa, in epoca troppo bassa nel senso cronologico, lascia indefinite le loro fasi preistoriche, come se esse fossero differenti da quelle degli altri popoli.⁵

Così, mediante comparazioni, confronti e riduzioni progressive, gli specialisti sono pervenuti alla consolidazione dell'ipotesi, attraverso una documentazione imponente. La ricostruzione di un'ipotetica lingua originaria è stata definita indoeuropea, poiché abbraccia quasi tutte le parlate delle etnie comprese fra i due estremi del sanscrito (ora superato dalla scoperta del tocharico), e dell'islandese. Alla ricostruzione della grammatica, del lessico e della sintassi, è stata sempre più urgentemente avvertita come indispensabile la ricostruzione di un formulario comune (il cosiddetto linguaggio poetico ricavato dalla comparazione dei testi antichi) e della civiltà (strutture familiari, sociali e religiose confluenti).

In questo modo innovative ricerche intraprese da G. Dumézil in tempi piuttosto recenti, (pur accettando con cautela le genericità e le semplificazioni di alcune teorie), in cui sfrutta le connessioni fra i nomi delle divinità e il parallelismo dei miti nelle aree indoeuropee, hanno dato inizio a una svolta nello studio della società indoeuropea. Il punto centrale del quadro presentato dallo studioso si basa sulla ricostruzione della società indoeuropea, composta secondo i tre principi di *sovranità*, *forza* e *fecondità*, che in altri termini corrisponde alle tre classi sociali: sacerdoti, guerrieri e agricoltori.

Sacro

Il concetto di sacro nella cultura indoeuropea non comporta nessuna connotazione d'ordine soggettivo o sentimentale, ma si manifesta come un rapporto di tipo

⁴ M. Detienne: *Les Grecs et nous*. Paris 2005, p. 182.

⁵ G. Costa: *La sirena di Archimede. Etnolinguistica comparata e tradizione preplatonica*. Alessandria 2008, pp. 74–75.

oggettivo. Tuttavia, nell'indoeuropeo comune non esiste una radice che indica in maniera precisa "il sacro". L'avvicinamento dell'uomo al sacro non è espressione di un'esigenza profonda e reale, tuttavia si configura a tutte le altre esigenze della vita, concretamente esprimibili in richieste di protezione nei confronti della salute, dell'economia, della famiglia, o dà assicurazione di prestigio personale o sociale.

Le influenze reciproche tra sacro, superstizione e linguaggio si avvertono già all'alba della preistoria con le credenze elementari e i tabù dei popoli primitivi. Gli antropologi hanno osservato impressionanti somiglianze sussistenti presso le più lontane razze, dell'idea di tabù, del miscuglio di divieti, di pericoli e contaminazioni che si accompagnano al compimento predeterminato di certi atti o alla pronunzia rituale di determinate parole. Si parla dunque dell'invenzione non solo dei simboli, ma di veri e propri modelli mitologici.

La simbologia mitologica si rivela in grado di toccare e di mettere in scompiglio l'emotività collettiva più profonda, influenzando tutti i popoli e le civiltà. Però, la ricerca di un approccio scientifico alla mitologia era assai difficoltosa, fino alla fine del XIX secolo, a causa soprattutto dell'ampiezza dell'argomento e del carattere dispersivo delle testimonianze.

Alla fine del XIX secolo si giunse a una comprensione più ampia delle origini delle civiltà, dovuta principalmente a una massa di informazioni completamente impreviste, provenienti dai pionieri dell'archeologia. Più recentemente ancora si tende a relativizzare gli approdi alle popolazioni indoeuropee da parte delle civiltà circostanti nel tempo storico, e a rimandarle invece a un sottofondo per lo meno paleolitico. E mentre in precedenza la questione sembrava essere quella del "soprannaturale" contrapposto al "naturale", ora, con la scoperta della pluralità di quei temi mitologici che erano stati considerati prove dell'origine divina delle religioni più elevate, veniva portato a superare, secondo Tommaso d'Aquino, «la conoscenza naturale dell'uomo», si dimostrava pertanto che «Dio è molto più al di sopra di tutto ciò che l'uomo può pensare di Dio» (*Summa contra Gentiles*, 5). Inoltre, con la scoperta che questi motivi soprannaturali non erano tipici a qualche singola tradizione ma comuni all'intero patrimonio religioso dell'umanità, la tensione fra "ortodosso" e "pagano" semplicemente si dissolveva.

Come aveva intuito Thomas Mann: «Il mito è fondamento della vita, lo *sche-ma* senza tempo, la formula secondo cui la vita si esprime, quando fluisce al di fuori dell'inconscio». Ma, come può osservare qualsiasi etnologo, archeologo o storico, i miti delle diverse civiltà si sono notevolmente trasformati attraverso i secoli e i luoghi di residenza degli uomini e che il "pregio" di una mitologia è stato spesso il "difetto" di un'altra. Le comunità, che un tempo erano sicure della bontà delle loro mitologie, ora scoprono all'improvviso che esse appaiono malvagie agli occhi dei loro vicini.⁶

⁶ J. Campbell: *Mitologia primitiva*. Milano, pp. 28–30.

Su un altro versante F.W. von Schelling lo controbatteva così:

La mitologia [...] non ha altro senso se non quello che esprime [...]. Data la necessità con la quale nasce anche la sua forma, essa è interamente propria, vale a dire che bisogna comprenderla così come si esprime, e non come se essa pensasse una cosa e ne dicesse un'altra. La mitologia non è allegorica: essa è autentica [...]. Per essa, gli dei sono esseri che esistono realmente; invece di essere una cosa e di significarne un'altra, non significano se non ciò che sono.⁷

Bisognerebbe capire se queste affermazioni siano vere. Quindi, occorre esplorare tutti gli aspetti della vita umana, per scoprire qualche indizio che ci possa riportare alle origini della mitologia, del sacro e dei tabù e che ci possa rivelare quali sono state le prime nozioni concernenti la pazzia. Poiché sotto il primo livello di profondità, quello delle prime civiltà, che costituiscono soltanto il primo piano della lunga preistoria della nostra razza, si trovano i secoli, i millenni dell'uomo primitivo.⁸ Joseph Campbell nella sua *Mitologia primitiva* ci invita a scendere più a fondo, nelle caverne e più oltre ancora, per esaminare gli enigmatici resti scheletrici calcarei di quelli che ora sembrano fossero stati pigmei cacciatori. Forse in questo modo si possono trovare segreti non soltanto delle culture più sviluppate dell'Oriente e dell'Occidente, ma anche delle attese più misteriose, delle reazioni spontanee e delle paure ossessive dell'uomo.

Tabù

L'idea del tabù non è certo nuova, ma forse conviene spiegare un po' le origini di questo termine che deriva dal polinesiano *tapu* e indica un forte divieto riguardante comportamenti e azioni considerate "sacre".⁹ Una ricca e dettagliata ricerca sull'argomento in questione è stata fatta dal noto studioso James Frazer nel suo

⁷ F.W. Von Schelling: *Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 1, pp. 195–196.

⁸ *Assai profondo il pozzo del passato. Forse dovremmo definirlo senza fondo [...]. Più a fondo scandagliamo, più indaghiamo e frughiamo nel mondo del passato, e più scopriamo che i primi fondamenti dell'umanità, la sua storia e la sua cultura, si rivelano impenetrabili*, T. Mann: *Giuseppe e i suoi fratelli* (trad. it., Milano 1954).

⁹ *Il cosiddetto tabù – parola polinesiana adottata dagli etnografi – è precisamente la condizione delle persone, degli oggetti e delle azioni, isolate e vietate per il pericolo rappresentato dal loro contatto. In generale, sono o diventano tabù tutti gli oggetti, azioni o persone che recano, in virtù del modo di essere loro proprio, o acquistano, per rottura di livello ontologico, una forza di natura più o meno incerta*, M. Eliade: *Trattato di storia delle religioni*. Ed. Universale Bollati Boringhieri, pp. 17–18.

Ramo d'oro, in cui passa in rassegna diversi tipi di tabù nelle varie civiltà antiche e moderne attribuendole un nome adeguato.

Proprio riguardo alla scelta del nome, Ernst Cassirer, grande filosofo e storico della filosofia, osservava:

The notion that name and essence bear a necessary and internal relation to each other, that the name does not merely denote but actually is the essence of its object, that the potency of the real thing is contained in the name – that is the one of the fundamental assumptions of the mythmaking consciousness itself.¹⁰

Non a caso in molte culture “primitive” scoprire il nome del nemico equivale a catturarne l'essenza, ad averlo magicamente in proprio potere. Ovviamente, sopravvivenze archetipiche di questo schema non mancano anche nella nostra cultura, in aree che vanno dalla tradizione popolare alla finzione artistica.

La scelta del nome, la definizione (o *tabuizzazione*) dello stesso concetto in un modo nuovo che allo stesso tempo conservi la sua validità non fu facile per gli antichi e non lo è neppure oggi, soprattutto se si tratta di questioni di grande importanza culturale, sociale o religiosa. Attribuire un nome vuol dire organizzare il mondo e costruire coppie oppositive. Infatti, ricorrenti sono le opposizioni di domestico / selvatico, utile / inutile. Nel momento in cui ci sono due specie, una buona, l'altra “neutra”, o meglio inutile, il determinativo aggettivale della seconda segnala il carattere negativo con indicazioni di questo genere: *matto*, *selvatico*, *bastardo*, *falso*. C'è una specie che è considerata la “vera”, l'autentica (la commestibile in genere, o la più usuale, la domestica) mentre le altre simili (silvestre o straniera) che ricevono lo stesso nome per economia, per comodità, esigono un caratterizzante di segno negativo. Oltre al negativo, all'“altro”, al diverso, gli stessi referenti citati segnalano anche la rarità. È normale, quando la specie è rara, indicarla come proveniente da fuori, da un paese straniero. In ogni caso è difficile stabilire in modo categorico se a causare il nome sia la rarità, o la stranezza della “variante”, la sua originalità morfologica.

L'attività linguistica della denominazione è un mezzo che aiuta l'uomo a ordinare il mondo esterno fenomenico, ma nello stesso tempo lo può condizionare. Spesso non sappiamo bene se si parta dalla “cosa” per arrivare alla “parola” con la quale si nomina, o dallo stesso lemma per arrivare alla cosa, se è più forte la lingua, o è più forte l'iniziativa del soggetto; se i nomi dipendano dalle idee che gli uomini si fanno della natura, oppure se sia la lingua già strutturata, già predisposta all'uso, che getta la sua rete sul mondo. È tutto nelle mani dell'inventiva e dell'esperienza del parlante, o invece è la libertà nell'assegnare il nome a essere limitata? In altre parole: è l'uomo una sorta di vittima della lingua? La lingua

¹⁰ E. Cassirer: *Language and Myth*. New York 1946, p. 64.

come tale è capace di imporsi sulla realtà e può dirigere il pensiero dell'uomo. Secondo alcuni comparatisti del XIX secolo (Adalbert Kuhn e Max Müller¹¹), il mito sarebbe una conseguenza di un'autoillusione linguistica, un'apparenza, un inganno verbale; una mera conseguenza del linguaggio, un suo prodotto. Basti pensare alle note analisi dei nomi degli dèi nel *Cratilo* platonico, o alle tesi del filosofo Herbert Spencer, il quale ha sostenuto che la venerazione mitico-religiosa di manifestazioni naturali ha come base un'errata interpretazione dei nomi.¹²

E proprio dell'attribuzione e dell'interpretazione dei nomi che designano vari compiti svolti nel passato da una sorta di mediatori del sacro e delle divinità, si parlerà nelle pagine successive sia dal punto di vista storico-culturale sia quello etimologico.

Sacerdoti, poeti, sciamani

La sopravvivenza di un patrimonio ideologico attraverso i millenni, anche dopo la dissoluzione dell'unità indoeuropea, richiedeva uno strumento efficace e specifico; ed esso fu rappresentato da una classe di persone istruite che lo conservarono e lo tramandarono oralmente nel tempo. Nella struttura tripartita dell'antica società indoeuropea questo ruolo importante era svolto da sacerdoti e veggenti, i quali, in base alla loro provenienza culturale e religiosa, assumevano nomi, ruoli e mansioni differenti. In generale, essi gestivano e conservavano tutto il patrimonio culturale della popolazione fondato sulla parola e, dunque, anche l'attività religiosa e culturale.¹³

Questi sacerdoti, poeti o sciamani di stampo indoeuropeo, trovano le loro più antiche attestazioni anche in Gallia, e le fonti classiche ci parlano più volte di *druidi*, *bardi* e *vati* (tutte e tre queste categorie appaiono in Lucano 1,447 ss.). Autori classici come Strabone (4,4,4) alludono all'esistenza di tre categorie di uomini colti, che si distinguevano per cultura e sapienza. Questa triplice suddivisione è convalidata dalla tradizione letteraria irlandese che parla di *druídh*, *filídh*, e *baird* (i bardi). Invece le testimonianze riguardo al fatto che i *druídh*¹⁴

¹¹ Adalbert Kuhn (1812–1881) è stato un linguista e filologo tedesco, studioso della mitologia, della preistoria e delle antichità indoeuropee. È considerato il fondatore della mitologia comparata. Max Müller (1823–1900) era filosofo, filologo, linguista e orientalista tedesco, il fondatore della disciplina della religione comparata. Tra le sue pubblicazioni compare l'imponente *Sacred Books of the East* in 50 volumi, una raccolta di traduzioni in inglese di testi sacri orientali.

¹² Herbert Spencer, filosofo inglese, sostenitore della teoria evoluzionista. Cf. E. Cassirer: *Il linguaggio e il mito*. Milano 1961, pp. 10–11.

¹³ Cf. Erodoto 7,191; Plutarco, *De Iside* 369e–f.

¹⁴ Il termine *druída*, nominato nelle fonti greche δρῦδαί, e in quelle latine *druidae* come corrispettivi del gallico **druis*, sono in irlandese *druí*, in gallese *derwydd*, e in bretone *drouiz*, e derivano

fossero una potente casta sacerdotale provengono soprattutto dai commenti degli autori classici sui Celti della Gallia, come dal *De Bello Gallico* 6,13–14 di Cesare, ed è la fonte che ci interessa di più. Egli divide gli appartenenti ai ranghi più alti della società celtica in cavalieri e druidi, e dichiara, che questi ultimi controllavano il culto e tutti i sacrifici, e prendevano decisioni riguardo a tutte le questioni religiose. Da queste informazioni appare chiaro che i druidi dovevano regolare o dominare le forze soprannaturali e che ciò avveniva prima di tutto attraverso la ‘divinazione’.

Bisogna precisare che, mentre i testi greci e latini opponevano in categorie autonome e separate, in coerenza con la loro tradizione culturale, poeta, filosofo, sacerdote, giurista, storico e non riconoscevano più la figura dell’intellettuale complessivo, nella realtà celtica esisteva ancora un’unica figura, che poteva pure assumere nomi diversi.

Spesso il *vate*,¹⁵ lo *sciamano* o il *bardo*, si identifica con una persona che viaggia, si sposta continuamente, che viene da lontano.¹⁶ Testimonianze di tale genere si trovano anche negli ambienti non indoeuropei. M. Nicoletti, che recentemente ha fatto ricerche etnolinguistiche sullo sciamanismo himalayano, aggiunge a questo elenco altri sintagmi. La figura dello sciamano, “uomo del confine”, apre uno spiraglio tra due mondi e «li tiene aperti per tutta la durata del rito», facendo un viaggio attraverso confini e realtà.¹⁷

Lo sciamano viaggia tra i mondi [...] sulla soglia tra la veglia e il sonno, tra la ragione e la follia; oltrepassa i limiti che separano gli uomini comuni dal

tutti verosimilmente da un **dru-wid-* ‘colui che ha conoscenza sicura’. Gli esiti moderni delle due radici di *bardo* e di *vates*, il gallese moderno *barddiau* e l’irlandese moderno *fèithian*, mostrano entrambe il significato di ‘cercare’, che gli avvicina alla sfera semantica di trovatore romanzo, un derivato del provenzale *trobar* che significa ‘comporre’, ma anche ‘trovare’. Secondo G. Alessio, che sostiene che **tropare* (la base di *trovare*, *trouver*, *trobar*) sarebbe un adattamento locale del greco τροπῶ ‘faccio il giro’, da τρόπος ‘giro’ (F. Benozzo: *La tradizione smarrita. Le civiltà europee dal Paleolitico all’Età dei Metalli e le origini non scritte delle letterature romanze*. Roma 2007, pp. 70–71).

¹⁵ La base ie. **ueH₂t-eH₁-* ha dato **wātis* ‘poeta’, prototipo del lat. *vātēs* e *vātis* ‘oracolo, veggente, poeta, indovino, sibilla, cantore’: *Delius vates* ‘il vate di Delio (= Apollo, Virgilio, *Aen.* 6,12). Un altro significato è ‘poeta, ispirato dalla divinità, vate, cantore’: *coturnatus vates* ‘il poeta dai coturni’ (= tragico, Ovidio, *Am.* 2,18,18), ma anche ‘autorità, oracolo’ (Plinio: *Nat.* 11,219; G.B. Conte – E. Pianezzola – G. Ranucci: *Il dizionario della lingua latina*. Firenze 2000, p. 1307).

¹⁶ In ambito anglosassone il nome dello sciamano *widsith* significa ‘lungo viaggio’. Va ricordato anche l’ambito romanzo e trobadorico in cui si parla di ‘lontananza’. Ad esempio, il nome del trovatore occitanico *Marcabru* (XII sec.), deriverebbe dal composto celto-germanico **marka* ‘confine’ e *brunn* ‘sorgente’ secondo (cf. W. Paden: “The Etymology of the Name Marcabru”. *Medioevo Romano* 28 (2004), pp. 169–188).

¹⁷ M. Nicoletti: *Vertigini in carne viva: sciamanesimo, estasi e follia in Himalaya*. Napoli 2002.

mondo invisibile, varca i confini del mondo dei vivi e quello dei morti, e poi torna da lontano, al suo corpo che è il centro del mondo dove gli spiriti e gli dei convergono, perché lui stesso è costretto tra i confini degli inferi e quelli del cielo, perché lo sciamano è il confine, e al contempo, il cantore di se stesso al confine.¹⁸

La conoscenza sciamanica, secondo C. Severi «*suppone una certa trasformazione dell'enunciatore che da semplice individuo [...] assume il ruolo di un rappresentante della tradizione, diventa una voce di un sapere condiviso: quel che [è stato] chiamato un io-memoria*». ¹⁹ Tali esempi si possono riscontrare nel mondo greco, celtico e germanico,²⁰ ma non solo. Anche nelle culture non indoeuropee esistono molteplici esempi di canti degli sciamani che iniziano con “io so, io conosco”. Nella tradizione della poesia europea, l'uso di tale formula giunge fino alla lirica romanza e trobadorica.

Un importante ruolo assume il sonno incubatorio che produce conoscenza, il canto rituale, l'uso delle droghe, la follia e la malattia come modelli di sapere superiore. Si parla quindi di raggiungere uno stato di mancanza di senno, per entrare in contatto con divinità o poter viaggiare nel mondo immateriale. F. Benozzo su questo argomento aggiunge:

La malattia, spesso manifestata in termini della follia, è parte integrante del fenomeno sciamanico [...]. Figura della morte simbolica, si associa spesso alla follia come conseguenza del viaggio estatico dell'anima: il ‘ritorno’ dello sciamano significa la restituzione alla società di una persona irrecognoscibile, contrassegnata appunto dai sintomi della follia.²¹

Forti legami dell'estasi rituale con la divinazione, ma anche con la poesia e la musica sono diffusi in tutto il mondo indoeuropeo. A questo proposito, vanno ricordati i Preplatonic, e soprattutto Empedocle²², che dà una particolare importanza al precordio (o diaframma)²³. Ma come era stato detto prima, queste pratiche erano diffuse anche nella cultura celtica, irlandese, gallese. L'usanza di comporre poesie nel sonno (incubazione rituale) persisteva in alcune aree fino al tardo Medioevo. Nelle civiltà del passato e nella tragedia classica i fenomeni onirici garan-

¹⁸ G. Costa: *op.cit.* pp. 118–119.

¹⁹ C. Severi: *Il percorso e la voce. Un'antropologia della memoria*. Torino 2004.

²⁰ G. Buti: *Mantica e mito nell'antica poesia germanica*. Bologna 1993.

²¹ F. Benozzo: *La tradizione smarrita. Le civiltà europee dal Paleolitico all'Età dei Metalli e le origini non scritte delle letterature romanze*. Roma 2007.

²² C. Gallavotti (cur.): *Empedocle. Poema fisico e lustrale*. Milano 1975.

²³ *Tale tecnica dà a coloro che la posseggono [...] il potere di rendere libera la loro psiche, di farle abbandonare il corpo giacente senza respiro e senza vita in un sonno catalettico, per un viaggio nell'aldilà, donde essa porta con sé la conoscenza del passato*. (J.-P. Vernant: *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs. Études de psychologie historique*. Paris 1971², trad. it. Torino 1978).

tivano la trascendenza dell'agire soggettivo perché ponevano l'uomo di fronte a una scelta decisiva per la sua esistenza. In virtù della sua sapienza l'esperto poteva fornire delle indicazioni sul simbolismo onirico, un accesso personale al linguaggio universale dei simboli, ma solo attraverso il sognatore si poteva attualizzare il sogno.²⁴

M. Eliade ci dà questa definizione dello sciamano: «*Lo sciamano difende la vita, la salute, la fecondità, il mondo della 'luce', contro la morte, le malattie, la sterilità, la sciagura e il mondo delle 'tenebre'*».²⁵ Tuttavia, è difficile precisare come e dove abbia avuto origine lo sciamanismo. Per molto tempo si è pensato che a provocare lo sciamanismo fosse stata una sorta di malattia mentale, una patologia psichica, o epilessia, con l'epicentro nell'Asia centrale, che si era diffusa nel resto del mondo con le popolazioni tartaro-mongole. Principalmente si diventava sciamani o per 'elezione' divina, o per trasmissione ereditaria, ed era prevista un'adeguata istruzione. Alla fine di tale istruzione, lo sciamano diveniva una guida, un insieme di mansioni: il medico, il divinatore, il sacerdote, il mistico, il poeta, il cantore, il filosofo, insomma, "colui, che tutto conosce".²⁶ Difatti, lo sciamano unisce in sé le funzioni ancora non distanziate nel mondo antico, di mago, poeta e filosofo, predicatore, guaritore e pubblico consigliere. Dopo di lui tutte queste funzioni diventeranno autonome. D'ora in poi i filosofi non furono più né poeti né maghi.

Da tutto ciò risulta chiaro, che la tradizione dello sciamanismo e la trasmissione delle credenze e delle tecniche magico-religiose è antichissima, ma ovviamente non ci si può limitare alle ricostruzioni storico-culturali suggerite solo dal punto di vista etimologico.²⁷ Infine, non si possono escludere le influenze reciproche non solo tra i popoli di lingue indoeuropee, ma anche quelle del mondo orientale.

²⁴ Cicerone in *De divinatione* (1,62), traduce ἡσυχία come «*tranquillitas mentis*». Invece nella tradizione pitagorica questa voce descriveva l'idea di serenità dell'animo per ottenere lo stato dell'incubazione, necessaria per i sogni (di saggezza, di divinazione o di guarigione).

²⁵ M. Eliade: *Le chamanisme et les techniques arcaïques de l'extase*. Paris 1967², trad. it., Roma 1974, p. 538.

²⁶ U. Marazzi: *Testi dello sciamanismo*. Torino 1984, p. 16.

²⁷ *Sciamano*, dal russ. *šaman* (adattamento dal tunguso *šaman*) che secondo l'opinione più autorevole rimanda all'ant. ind. *śramaṇa*- 'asceta, mendicante religioso', pali e pracrito *samaṇa*-, successivamente passato per il sogdiano *šmn*-, o per il tocharico A *šāmam* / B *šamāne* dei testi buddisti, nel cinese *cha-men*, e alla fine nel tunguso (cf. turco e iuguro), rimanda più a monte un lessema IE (ant. ind. *kavi*- 'veggente, mago, sapiente, poeta'), attestato pure nell'avestico *kava*, nel gr. *κοῖης*, dove è il nome di un sacerdote dei Cabirii responsabile delle purificazioni, e nel lidio *kaveš*, ed è connesso verosimilmente alla radice del verbo *κοέω* 'percepire, comprendere' e del lat. *caveo* 'stare in guardia, fare attenzione' (G. Costa: *op.cit.* p. 117).

Sacrificio (o patto con la divinità)

Come è stato già detto, nel mondo antico, uno dei modi per assicurarsi i favori della divinità era certamente il sacrificio. L'uomo offre al dio un dono e in questa maniera lo obbliga a contraccambiare secondo le sue necessità. In altre parole, il sacrificio è un'anticipazione ma anche una promessa alla quale il dio non può sottrarsi. Come in una specie di contratto bilaterale, è governato da una catena di regole formali, che, se trasgredite, lo farebbero diventare vano.

Che nel mondo indoeuropeo si praticassero sacrifici umani è dimostrato da differenti studi e numerose testimonianze, che nel mondo greco vanno dai sacrifici di Achille in onore della morte di Patroclo, e arrivano quasi fino al VI sec. d. C., documentati ancora nelle colonie ioniche dell'Asia Minore.²⁸ Anche a Roma, per ingraziarsi i favori degli dei, nei momenti di grave pericolo collettivo si facevano sacrifici umani. Secondo Erodoto (7,114), anche i Persiani praticavano questo genere di sacrifici, e presso i popoli baltici tali pratiche avvenivano ancora nel medioevo.²⁹

Perciò, i sacerdoti romani,³⁰ da un lato, ritenevano che le azioni sacrificali costituissero i riti più idonei per attrarre la benevolenza divina sulle vicende umane, volgendo in tal modo a beneficio degli uomini l'immensa potenza degli dei; d'altro lato, consideravano i sacrifici indispensabili per la sopravvivenza delle stesse divinità. Di questa concezione romana del sacrificio, una prova sicura rappresenta l'uso linguistico del verbo *mactare*. Come insegnano i linguisti, tale verbo, dal significato originario di 'accrescere', 'fare più grande' (derivato dalla stessa radice di **magis*), ha acquisito il senso predominante di 'sacrificare', 'immolare' (cfr. Virgilio, *Aen.* 4,57).³¹ Queste nozioni sulle usanze religiose concernenti quell'epoca sono giunte a noi grazie alla letteratura epico-eroica.

²⁸ Cf. *Iliade* 18,366 ss.

²⁹ Cf. O. Schrader – A. Nehring: *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*. Berlin–Leipzig, 1917–1922, 2,57 ss.

³⁰ Una radice comune **sak-* (cf. J. Pokorny: *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Berna 1959, p. 448), il cui significato è incerto, ma che funge da base alle parole latine *sacer* e *sanc-tus*. Queste due parole esprimono nozioni risalenti al periodo arcaico del latino. La sanzione *sacer esto* (dall'arcaico *sakros esed*) è stata attestata dall'iscrizione del *lapis niger*, che è la più antica iscrizione in lingua latina. Invece l'equivalenza *sacer-tabù* è stata suggerita da R.R. Marett: *The Threshold of Religion*. London 1914², pp. 90–92.

³¹ É. Benveniste: *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Vol. 2, p. 225: «Ainsi le présent dénomiatif *mactare* signifie 'rendre grand, accroître', c'est l'opération qui met dans l'état *mactus*. Les emplois les plus anciens, tel *mactare deum extis*, comportent le nom du dieu à l'accusatif et le nom du sacrifice à l'instrumental. C'est donc rendre le dieu plus grand, l'exalter, et en même temps le renforcer par l'offrande. Puis, par un changement de construction analogue à celui qu'on connaît dans *sacrare*, s'est établie l'expression *mactare victimam* 'offrir en sacrifice une victime'».

Superstizione

Appare molto intrigante poter aggiungere qualcosa che ci parli della superstizione. In ogni caso, anche nella parola “superstizione”, per quanto riguarda il significato etimologico, si può trovare non molta chiarezza. Uno studio approfondito dell’argomento lo ha fatto Walter Belardi nella sua monografia *Superstitio*,³² evidenziando l’antitesi tra *religio* e *superstitio*, e tra i concetti affini.

La prima attestazione di *superstitio* si trova in Cicerone, e l’etimologia formale vi appare piuttosto chiara. La prima impressione indicherebbe che *superstitio* appartenga esclusivamente all’ambito latino. Un gruppo di vocaboli formato da *superstitio*, *superstitiosus*, *superstes*, *supersto*, era diventato un campo di battaglia tra alcuni studiosi, che dibattevano sulla sua antichità e un suo probabile significato arcaico.³³

In un saggio pubblicato da É. Benveniste, si propose un test di “ammissibilità” tra alcune nozioni di ‘presenza’, di ‘chiaroveggenza’ e di ‘testimonianza’, senza manipolare i fatti, ma non spiegando in modo sufficiente le sfumature tra i significati. S. Calderone aveva in seguito ripreso la questione, indagando sulle possibilità di una derivazione semantica di *superstitiosus* dal gr. ἀναθηματικός, quale sacerdote addetto a un oracolo per le spiegazioni dei responsi.³⁴ Questa sua presupposizione è stata disapprovata da L.F. Janssen, anche se bisognerebbe aggiungere che in Euripide si trova la voce ἀνάθημα proprio nel senso di “servus sacer”; tuttavia in questo caso mancano le probabilità del calco linguistico. Secondo W.F. Otto, *superstitio* è invece analogo al gr. ἑκστασις (τῆς ψυχῆς), giudicato infine come una “abalienatio mentis” («Darüberstehen oder Hinaustreten».)³⁵ Il significato più antico condurrebbe a *superstitiosus* ‘profetico’, che è sinonimo di *vātes*.

Nonostante tutte le indagini fatte sull’argomento, Pisani per primo porta la questione sul piano comparativo indoeuropeo. Egli propone di collegare *superstitio* al sans. *stuti-* ‘preghiera di lode, inno celebrativo degli dei’ e all’avestico *štuiti-* ‘lode (rituale)’, che trovano corrispondenza nell’osseto, nel digorico *stud* e nel tagaurico *stīd* ‘lode, gloria’.³⁶

Per l’origine remota di *superstitio* risulta decisiva la semantica di *superstitiosus*, che è documentata in Plauto e nella lingua dei tragici. Questo termine secondo gli autori tragici significa ‘indovino, veggente’, o ‘profetico’. Risulta da

³² W. Belardi: “Superstitio”. *Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche* 5. Roma 1976.

³³ Cf. V. Pisani: “Lat. ‘superstitio’”. In: *Ricerche linguistiche* 2 (1951), pp. 208–209.

³⁴ S. Calderone: “Superstitio”. In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. p. 385; D. Grodzynski: “Superstitio”. In: *Revue des Études Anciennes* 76 (1974), pp. 36 ss.

³⁵ W.F. Otto: “Superstitio”. In: *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 12 (1909), pp. 548.

³⁶ «L’equazione *super-stitiō*: sans. *stuti-s*, av. *stūiti-* ci offre un nuovo esempio di parole di carattere sacrale conservatesi solo nelle lingue arie e in lat. (possibilmente anche in celtico)» (V. Pisani: “Lat. ‘superstitio’”. In: *Ricerche linguistiche* 2 (1951), pp. 208–209).

Plauto che *superstitiosus* è colui che ha un potere di conoscenza dell'oscuro e di penetrazione nell'invisibile, che non possiedono i comuni mortali. La semantica del periodo arcaico cambia nell'età classica. A cominciare da Ennio, il quale nel *Telamone* si esprime esplicitamente contro le pratiche divinatorie.³⁷

Il senso peggiorativo di *superstitio* rispetto alla *religio*, e al paventato e venerato oracolo di Delfi, prende inizio con trasformazioni avvenute nella società romana del II sec. a.C., interessata di più ai progressi civili che ai poteri extrasensoriali. Così Cicerone nel *De divinatione* dice: «*Certe, igitur, ignoratio futurorum malorum utilior est quam scientia*».³⁸

In tal modo si può osservare che ogni nuova religione nel corso dei secoli, sovrapponendosi a un'altra, sostituisce il nome del referente senza allontanarsi però dal nucleo del simbolo e della funzione. Superstizioni e credenze hanno lasciato sedimentare parole-tracce appassite, segni allo stato attuale inespressivi e privi della sua motivazione originaria. Ma nel corso del tempo la parola ha acquisito il carattere di un'irrazionale convenzione, che riesce però a trasmettere simboli ed echi di miti e di riti antichi. Quello che pensiamo e nominiamo è sempre il prodotto di lontane esperienze e credenze dei nostri antenati, ed è legato a definizioni, miti, riti ormai impenetrabili che tuttavia rimangono uno dei punti fermi della nostra cultura e del nostro stare al mondo.

Così nulla è veramente cambiato nel corso dei secoli. Gli antichi schemi si tramandano da generazioni, cambiando solo la facciata, indossando una maschera nuova, che, infine, è soltanto una versione riverniciata dell'originale primitivo.

³⁷ Ennio, *Telamone* 332–336.

³⁸ Cicerone, *De divinatione* 2,9,23.

Łukasz Berger

Universidad Silesiana de Katowice
Cátedra de Filología Clásica

Escenas de bienvenida en las comedias de Plauto

Abstract: The article describes the home-coming scene in Plautus focusing on the linguistic aspects of the social ritual. It is stated that welcoming the interlocutor who has returned from a long travel consists – as far as the face-to-face interaction is concerned – of several communicative steps: summons, two-part greeting, ‘small talk’ question, invitation to dinner. Special attention is given to the formula *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo*, its interactional meaning and contextual variability. Finally, the mechanisms of typical Plautine humour are explained through particular realizations of the home-coming scene. By way of conclusion, the results of the study are contrasted with the same phenomenon in the comedies by Terence.

Key words: Plautus, home-coming scene, greeting, *salvom te advenire gaudeo*, humour

El presente trabajo se centra en los límites de la interacción interna (entre los personajes) en las comedias de Plauto o, más precisamente, en las convenciones de índole sociopragmática que marcan el paso de la no-comunicación a la comunicación. La iniciación del diálogo constituye un complejo procedimiento multimodal (proxémico, gestual, verbal, etc.) que señala la disposición de los actantes para entablar una conversación. Durante el habitual intercambio de saludos, además, el hablante negocia y adopta su propia imagen social, ratificando (y negociando), a la vez, la correspondiente imagen del interlocutor. Dicho de otro modo, la “apertura dialógica” sirve para (re)crear la base interpersonal, un punto de partida para el resto de la conversación¹. Los recursos empleados durante este

¹ J. Laver: “Communicative function of phatic communion.” In: *Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction*. Ed. A. Kendon, R.M. Harris, M.R. Key. The Hague 1975, pp. 215–238.

procedimiento varían, claro está, según los parámetros sociolingüísticos de los participantes y el contexto *sensu lato* en que se produce el encuentro.

Uno de los factores decisivos parece ser el tiempo transcurrido desde la última interacción mantenida entre los interlocutores. Así, debe distinguirse entre saludar (acto de habla de carácter cotidiano y no marcado) y dar la bienvenida² (es decir, expresar un recibimiento después de un tiempo de separación entre los interlocutores). El material facilitado por la comedia romana demuestra claramente que estos dos tipos de apertura dialógica difieren tanto a nivel de la estructura secuencial (sintagmáticamente), como en cuanto a las unidades lingüísticas empleadas (paradigmáticamente)³. Sirva como ejemplo más emblemático una escena de *Amph.* en la que se produce un desajuste entre los dos tipos de la apertura dialógica: Alcmena está convencida de que no es su primer encuentro con su marido después de que este haya vuelto de una misión militar, de ahí que esté sorprendida por la elaborada y efusiva *salutatio* con la que Anfitrión inicia el diálogo nada más llegar a casa:

ALC. Obsecro ecastor, quid tu me deridiculi gratia / sic salutas atque appellas,
quasi dudum non videris / quasi qui nunc **primum recipias** te domum huc
 ex hostibus, / **atque me nunc proinde apellas quasi multo post videris?**
 (*Amph.* 682–685)

Toda la tensión dramática (y cómica) de esta escena consiste precisamente en las diferentes maneras de saludar, puesto que Alcmena ya ha dado a quien creía su marido (en realidad Júpiter transformado) la bienvenida esperada en este contexto. Sin embargo, su incumplimiento de la la convención comunicativa es interpretada por su marido como un síntoma de desenamoramiento (*Amph.* 680: Sos. [...] *expectatum eum salutat magis hau quicquam quam canem*). Así pues, en este trabajo nos proponemos analizar los recursos lingüísticos que sirven a los personajes de la *palliata* plautina para cada uno de los dos tipos de apertura dialógica que hemos señalado. Con este fin, en las páginas que siguen se analizarán las escenas de bienvenida como un ejemplo de una práctica conversacional que ha sido incluida, de manera creativa, en la empresa artística del sarsinate.

² El latín, según parece, no tiene esta distinción léxica, siendo las expresiones *salutare*, *salutem dicere* o *salvere iubere* aplicables tanto a un saludo no marcado como a la bienvenida después de un largo tiempo transcurrido (compárense, por ejemplo, *Amph.* 715, 800 con *Poen.* 752, *Pseud.* 968). No significa esto, no obstante, que los dos rituales interpersonales fueran percibidos de la misma manera, dadas las diferencias en sus “guiones”.

³ Cf. A. Duranti: “Universal and Culture-Specific Properties of Greetings”. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 1997, Vol. 7.1, pp. 68–69: “[...] the more formal—or the more institutionally oriented—the encounter, the more delayed the greeting, and that the more delayed the greeting, the more elaborate the language used. Thus we would expect brief and casual opening salutations to occur simultaneously with or at least very close to mutual sighting and long and elaborate greetings to occur after the parties have had a chance to previously recognize each other’s presence in some way”.

Secuencias de *salutatio* después de un largo viaje

Los personajes viajeros de la *palliata* vuelven a casa, después de muchas peripecias, con trofeos de guerra, nuevas amantes, la herencia familiar despilfarrada o con grandes ganancias de sus negocios en el extranjero. En todo caso, viajan por el mar, siendo la nave el medio de transporte más común tanto en la comedia nueva como en la *palliata*. Es aquí donde reina la diosa Tyche-Fortuna, que decide sobre el feliz retorno de los viajeros. De hecho, el mar se asociaba, con mayor frecuencia, con el lugar de una irrevocable pérdida y desaparición bien de los objetos, bien de las personas⁴. La popularidad del motivo del naufragio en el arte antiguo⁵ indica lo afortunados que debían sentirse quienes consiguieran volver del misterioso dominio marítimo arribando sanos y salvos. En el mundo plautino, los personajes que más se acercan a la muerte en el mar son los de *Rudens* (162–177, 485–490), pues sobreviven, a duras penas, a la gran tempestad que precede la acción de la comedia⁶. En todo caso, el mar en la comedia es un espacio de lo imprevisto, de la aventura, que casi siempre conlleva un cambio de la condición social⁷.

También los otros viajeros –aunque no compartieran la suerte de náufragos– mencionan, nada más llegar del puerto, los peligros que arrostraron lejos de casa. De este modo, estos monólogos en forma de oración gratulatoria constituyen el primer elemento de la convención dramática con la que el sarsinate prepara la escena de la bienvenida⁸. El personaje, recién llegado a casa, expresa su agradecimiento a las divinidades marítimas (sobre todo a Neptuno) por haberle permitido

⁴ A. Lindenlauf: “The Sea as Place of no Return in Ancient Greece”. *World Archeology* 2003, Vol. 35, pp. 416–433. Numerosos testimonios arqueológicos y literarios sugieren que el mar servía a los antiguos griegos al menos como un lugar donde se deshacían de todo lo innecesario o indeseado, como los residuos, la basura, la gente exiliada o los condenados a morir.

⁵ Cf. B. Dunsch: “*Describe nunc tempestatem*: Sea Storm and Shipwreck Type Scenes in Ancient Literature.” In: *Shipwreck in Art and Literature*. Ed. C. Thompson. New York–London 2013, pp. 42–59, donde el autor traza, brevemente, el desarrollo de la escena del naufragio desde Homero hasta la Antigüedad tardía. Es interesante notar que, a pesar del significado económico y militar que representaba navegar para los antiguos, tanto en el mundo romano como en el griego predominaba la imagen negativa del mar como un lugar intransitable, sin regreso y lleno de monstruos. Recuérdese que, acorde con el mito de la Edad de Oro, la gente no necesitaba navegar: las primeras embarcaciones, igual que el comercio y la guerra, fueron invento de épocas posteriores.

⁶ Cf. R. Raffaelli: “Il naufragio felice e le funzioni del mare”. In: Idem: *Esercizi Plautini*. Urbino 2009, pp. 270–272.

⁷ R. Raffaelli: “Il naufragio felice...”, p. 254.

⁸ La oración gratulatoria del personaje que consigue volver de un largo viaje aparece ya en el teatro clásico ateniense (Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 503–537, Aristoph. *Plut.* 771–781), está presente en la *nea*, pero no se explota por Terencio.

poner los pies en tierra firme (*Most.* 431–437; *Stich.* 402–415; *Trin.* 820–839). Asimismo, se saluda a la patria o a sus dioses protectores (*Bacch.* 170–173, 347; *Stich.* 534, 623; cf. *Ter. Ph.* 311–312), intentando reestablecer, simbólicamente, el contacto con el lugar de su origen. Entre los actos religiosos, encontramos también en ocasiones la realización de una ofrenda votiva prometida a los dioses antes de partir (*Amph.* 946–948)⁹. Los seres queridos que lo reciben en casa también expresan su gratitud a las divinidades por medio de diferentes ritos religiosos (*Capt.* 922–927; *Stich.* 396; *Epid.* 314–316) o con una suntuosa cena de bienvenida (*Bacch.* 185–186; *Most.* 1004–1007; *Stich.* 470–482)¹⁰. A veces, es el recién llegado quien quiere recibir a sus amigos y vecinos en su propio hogar (*Stich.* 415–416, 510–517; cf. *Merc.* 949–950), lo cual presenta un aliciente, sobre todo, para los nunca saciados parásitos (*Stich.* 484–496, 589–631; cf. *Capt.* 843–879)¹¹.

El tono elevado y la ceremoniosidad marcan la manera en que los amigos y familiares saludan al recién llegado: en estos casos, la secuencia de la *salutatio* resulta ser particularmente elaborada y compleja¹², constituida por los siguientes actos:

- a) establecimiento del contacto (llamada) e identificación,
- b) saludo bipartito¹³,
- c) invitación a cenar,
- d) intercambio tipo *small talk*.

Si bien no en cada escena de bienvenida que se ha recogido en el *corpus* plautino aparecen representados todos estos actos¹⁴, se puede concluir con ciertas garantías que este es el esquema canónico de la rutina conversacional en cuestión. En el comienzo de *Epidicus*, donde un esclavo recibe a un compañero que acaba de regresar de una expedición militar, encontramos un ejemplo de la secuencia completa:

⁹ Cf. *Hor. Carm.* I 5. 13–16.

¹⁰ Dido, recibiendo en su palacio a Eneas, también celebra ritos religiosos (*Verg. Aen.* I 632) y organiza una cena de bienvenida (I 637–642).

¹¹ Cf. Ch. Knapp: “Travel in ancient times...”, p. 302.

¹² La secuencia de la apertura dialógica en unos contextos no marcados ha sido estudiada por M. Hoffmann: “Conversational Openings in the Comedies of Plautus”. In: *Latin Linguistics and Linguistics Theory*. Ed. H. Pinkster. Amsterdam–Philadelphia 1983, pp. 217–226. Cf. L. Berger: “Starzec i grzeckość językowa w komediach Plautusa”, *SPhP* 2014, 24.1, pp. 65–72.

¹³ P. Poccetti: “Greeting and farewell expressions as evidence for colloquial language: between literary and epigraphical texts”. In: *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Ed. E. Dickey, A. Chahoud. Cambridge 2010, pp. 101–103 trata como un saludo bipartito (ing. *two-part greeting*) la secuencia de *salve + quid agis?* lo cual parece poco preciso puesto que su segundo elemento ha de considerarse, en muchas ocasiones, una forma de introducir *small talk* (cf. *Pseud.* 457; *Rud.* 310–312; *Ter. Ad.* 803–804, *Eun.* 270–271). En este trabajo se entiende el saludo bipartito como dos actos comunicativos consecutivos con el mismo significado interaccional (el de saludar), cuyo empleo suele ser dictado por razones de la cortesía verbal.

¹⁴ Los más completos parecen *Bacch.* 182–195; *Stich.* 582–612; *Trin.* 1068–1077.

EPI. Heus, adulescens. THES. Quis properantem me reprehendit pallio? /	a₁: llamada (+ respuesta)
EPI. Familiaris. THES. Fateor, nam odio es nimium familiariter. / EPI. Respice vero. THES. Oh, / Epidicumne ego conspicio? EPI. Satis recte oculis uteris. /	a₂: identificación
THES. Salve. EPI. Di dent quae velis. / venire salvom gaudeo.	b₁: saludo principal (+ respuesta) b₂: saludo subsidiario
THES. Quid ceterum? EPI. Quod eo assolet: / cena tibi dabitur. THES. Spondeo— EPI. Quid? THES. —Me accepturum, si dabis. /	c: invitación a cenar (+ respuesta)
EPI. Quid tu agis? Ut vales? THES. Exemplum adesse intellego. EPI. Eugae! / Corpulentior videntior atque habitior. [...] EPI. Quid agis? perpetuen valuisti? THES. Varie. (<i>Epid.</i> 1–17)	d: intercambio tipo <i>small talk</i> (x2)

Tras establecer el contacto entre los interlocutores (a₁: *heus, adulescens*) y su identificación recíproca (a₂: *Epidicumne ego conspicio?*), ambos siervos pasan a saludarse. Es importante notar, sin embargo, que el par adyacente de *salutatio* (saludo-saludo) no es del todo simétrico, teniendo la respuesta de Epídico un carácter más elevado, al estar compuesta por dos actos consecutivos: la fórmula desiderativa con carácter religioso (b₁: *di dent quae velis*) y la fórmula expresiva (b₂: *venire salvom gaudeo*). Esta última se trata con más atención en el siguiente apartado. Por otro lado, Tesprión, el personaje que regresa sano y salvo, parece tener ciertas expectativas respecto a la manera en que debería ser recibido por el otro esclavo. Los comentarios metapragmáticos del tipo *quid ceterum?* indican claramente que la iniciativa en la interacción ha de estar de parte de quien da la bienvenida. El carácter convencional y ritual de toda esta secuencia viene confirmado, asimismo, por la respuesta de Epídico (*quod eo assolet...*). Este acepta seguir el guion acostumbrado en esta forma de apertura dialógica: invita a su interlocutor a cenar (c: *cena tibi dabitur*) y pregunta por su estado de salud (d: *quid agis tu? ut vales, etc.*)¹⁵, que ha pasado mucho tiempo lejos de casa.

¹⁵ Como se puede ver, en el pasaje citado la pregunta por la salud del recién llegado aparecen dos veces (*Epid.* 9,17), si bien la fórmula en pasado (*perpetuen valuisti?*) está más vinculada de manera convencional a la bienvenida (cf. *Amph.* 679; *Epid.* 129; *Merc.* 387, 948; *Most.* 449; *Persa* 23; *Stich.* 467, 586). E. Fraenkel: *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. Trad. T. Drevikovsky, F. Muecke. New York 2007, p. 82 sugiere que es una señal de la extensión plautina del diálogo respecto a su original griego. El comediógrafo repite las fórmulas y prolonga la fase inicial de la conversación (antes de introducir el tema principal), para explotar su potencial cómico y dotar al fragmento de su típico tono de farsa.

Ahora bien, uno podría constatar que sus escenas de bienvenida pueden ser únicamente fruto de seguir una larga (al igual que ajena al mundo romano) convención teatral. Atendiendo a este problema, Wright utiliza esta microestructura dramática como material idóneo para la comparación entre varias tradiciones literarias¹⁶. Según los resultados de su investigación, los elementos añadidos o específicamente plautinos son la presencia de los portadores en el escenario y la invitación a cenar, que ni se encuentran en lo que nos ha llegado de la comedia nueva ni fueron explotados por Terencio¹⁷.

Tabla 1. Secuencias de dar la bienvenida en Plauto

	establecimiento del contacto (a)	saludo bipartito		invitación a cenar (c)	secuencia de <i>small talk</i> (d)
		(b ₁) <i>salve!</i>	(b ₂) <i>salvom...</i>		
<i>Amph.</i> 676-85	+	+	–	–	+
<i>Bacch.</i> 451-7	+	+	+	–	–
<i>Curc.</i> 303-7	+	+	+	–	–
<i>Epid.</i> 1-18	(+)	+	+	(+)	(+) (+)
<i>Epid.</i> 126-9	+	+	(+)		(+)
<i>Most.</i> 446-9	+	+	+	–	+
<i>Most.</i> 804-6	+	–	+	–	–
<i>Most.</i> 1128-30	+	+	+	+	–
<i>Poen.</i> 683-8	+	+	+	–	–
<i>Stich.</i> 458-86	+	–	–	(+)	+
<i>Stich.</i> 582-91	+	+	+	(+)	+
<i>Trin.</i> 1068-74	+	+	(+)	–	–
<i>Trin.</i> 1094-8	+	+	+	–	–
<i>Truc.</i> 358-61	+	+	–	(+)	–
<i>Truc.</i> 503-4	+	+	(+)	–	–

De acuerdo con los datos recogidos en la Tabla 1, parece que la extensión estructural de la escena de bienvenida ha facilitado al sarsinate más oportunidades para la reelaboración cómica (marcada con paréntesis) de lo que se presenta como una actividad rutinaria exigida por la trama. Si bien no en todas las realizaciones se da la cadena completa de subactos comunicativos (a–d), la supresión de un elemento del ritual suele servir como mecanismo para dar a entender las prisas de los hablantes

¹⁶ J. Wright: *Dancing in chains: the stylistic unity of the comoedia palliata*. Rome 1974, pp. 138–151. Cf. J. Barsby: *Plautus. Bacchides*. Warminster 1986, pp. 111, 114.

¹⁷ Únicamente en Ter. *Hec.* 415–429 aparecen portadores en el escenario, mientras que el resto de viajeros llevan sus maletas por sí mismos (cf. J. Wright: *Dancing in chains...*, pp. 148–149).

y el ritmo acelerado de la acción. Cuando Cármides interrumpe a su siervo Estásimo, informa al mismo tiempo de que elige conscientemente omitir los siguientes pasos (*sed omitto alia*) de la bienvenida, puesto que hay asuntos más urgentes:

STA. Salvom te—

CHAR. Scio et credo tibi. / sed omitto alia, hoc mihi responde: liberi quid agunt mei. (*Trin.* 1073–1074)

Con todo, el saludo bipartito ha de considerarse el elemento central de la secuencia que no puede ser suprimido salvo en raras ocasiones¹⁸. La fórmula *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* que sigue a la primera *salutatio* llega a constituir un rasgo distintivo de este tipo de apertura dialógica. Ahora bien, en algunas escenas como *Stich.* 458–486, que no recurren a las fórmulas de saludo esperadas, se transmite ese significado interaccional con recursos no tan idiomatizados (465: *Epignome, ut ego nunc te conspicio lubens!* / *ut prae laetitia lacrumae prosiliunt mihi!*), con lo que se consigue una mayor espontaneidad y emotividad (cf. 506–507). En segundo lugar, la rutinaria invitación a cenar no acompaña a los inicios de diálogos en las circunstancias no marcadas. La pregunta por la salud del interlocutor, a su vez, aunque corriente en contextos cotidianos (*ut vales?*), asume en la escena de bienvenida una forma algo más especializada, con orientación retrospectiva (*vaulistin? benene usque valuisti?*, etc.).

En esta forma de apertura dialógica, los subactos comunicativos presentados son deber de quien recibe al viajero: el recién llegado, por lo general, simplemente se limita a responder a cada elemento del ritual verbal. De esta manera, la bienvenida de Anfitrión parece aún más inoportuna y chocante. Es al pobre marido cornudo a quien toca preguntar primero por la salud de su mujer y quien enfáticamente expresa alegría al volver a verla sana, salva y encinta:

AMPH. Amphitruo uxorem salutat laetus speratam suam, [...] / valuistin usque? exspectatun advenio? [...] / et quom [te] gravidam et quom te pulchre plenam aspicio, gaudeo. (*Amph.* 676–679)

De tal modo, al cambiar los papeles de sus personajes, Plauto hace hincapié en lo irregular de esta *salutatio* desde la misma apertura dialógica para poner aún más en ridículo al desdichado Anfitrión.

En las páginas que siguen, se tratará de completar el análisis de la escena de bienvenida con una aproximación de índole pragmalingüística. Asimismo, mere-

¹⁸ Es curioso el caso de la escena de bienvenida en *Trin.* 1180–1181 entre Cármides y su hijo, Lesbónico: la secuencia consiste solamente de un inmediato establecimiento del contacto y de un emotivo intercambio de saludos (1180: LES. *O pater, pater mi salve.* CHAR. *Salve multum gnate mi.*). La fórmula *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* aparece, no obstante, unos versos más arriba pronunciada por el amigo del adolescente, quien lo informa del regreso de su padre (1078: LYS. [...] *tuom patrem rediisse salvom peregre gaudeo.*) antes de que éste apareciera en el escenario.

cerán atención algunas realizaciones cómicas de esta práctica conversacional, que se analizarán para evidenciar ciertos mecanismos del humor plautino.

Fórmula de saludo:
*salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo**

La fórmula conversacional *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* no ha llamado mucho interés por parte de los estudiosos que se limitaron simplemente a recoger todos los pasajes de su empleo¹⁹ o la obvian en los trabajos con más enfoque (pragma)-lingüístico²⁰. Parece, sin embargo, que dicha expresión dispone tanto de diferentes realizaciones formales como de varias interpretaciones matizadas por el contexto de la interacción. Ante todo, el saludo *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* presenta en el *corpus* plautino una cierta variabilidad paradigmática y sintagmática, es decir, tanto de sus características formales como de su posición dentro de la cadena dialógica. En todas sus variantes, no obstante, no deja de ser perceptible el significado idiomático y el uso rutinizado.

Tabla 2. Variabilidad paradigmática de la fórmula *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo*

variantes léxicas	<i>advenire</i> (8), <i>venire</i> (4), <i>redire</i> (1)
variantes morfológicas	<i>-ire</i> (7), <i>-isse</i> (5)
variantes sintácticas	AcI (13), oración con <i>cum</i> (1)
variantes con modificadores	sin modificadores (8), + <i>peregre</i> (3), + <i>in patriam</i> (1), + <i>huc</i> (1)

Al comparar todas las variantes de la fórmula en cuestión (véase Tabla 2)²¹, se llega a la conclusión de que la variante básica y más extendida (la “archifórmula”)

* Una primera versión de los apartados que siguen, aquí traducidos, ampliados y revisados, fue publicada como L. Berger: *Otwarcie dialogowe w komediach Plauta*. Poznań 2016, pp. 138–145. Asimismo el autor expresa su suma gratitud al Prof. Luis Unceta Gómez por todos los valiosos comentarios y correcciones que se incluyeron en la redacción final.

¹⁹ Ch. Knapp: “Travel in ancient times...”, p. 301.

²⁰ P. Poccetti: “Greeting and farewell...” la omite por completo, al igual que R. Müller en su monografía sobre la lengua de Terencio, *Sprechen und Sprache. Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg 1997.

²¹ En la Tabla 2 se han tomado en consideración incluso las formulaciones inacabadas o reconstruidas por los editores (*Epid.* 126–128; *Truc.* 503–504; *Trin.* 1072–1074), siempre y cuando estas aporten inequívocamente alguna información sobre la variante empleada (p. ej. el verbo). Por otro lado, no se han incluido las intervenciones incompletas en el cómputo de las variantes sintácticas diferenciadas en cuanto al uso de los modificadores.

sería *salvom te advenire gaudeo*, siendo sus modificaciones y extensiones fruto de la actitud innovadora del emisor o motivadas por razones intratextuales (p. ej. variabilidad *metri causa*).

Como acto expresivo, *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* constituye, en mayoría de los casos, un movimiento subsidiario que acompaña a los actos optativos, núcleos de la *salutatio*. Esta compleja construcción de saludo insiste en la benevolencia del emisor: retrospectiva (“¡me alegro de que hayas llegado con buena salud!”) y prospectiva (“¡salud!”). De acuerdo con este modelo, la fórmula aparece en siete aperturas dialógicas, donde es empleada justo después del saludo principal (*salve, salvos sis* etc.). Tal como se ha dicho, la secuencia más elaborada de la *salutatio* implica que la expresión *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* vaya seguida de una pregunta que permite entablar *small talk* (*Most.* 447–449) o de la habitual invitación a cenar (*Most.* 1128–1130; cf. *Bacch.* 183–186, *Epid.* 6–8, *Truc.* 358–360).

Ahora bien, tan solo en una ocasión la fórmula en cuestión es empleada como réplica al saludo (*Epid.* 6–8), pese a que, incluso en este caso, ocupa la segunda posición de la intervención. Puede plantearse, por tanto, que se trata de un movimiento conversacional con una posición muy marcada.

THES. Salve.

EPI. Di dent quae velis. / **venire salvom gaudeo.**

THES. Quid ceterum?

EPI. Quod eo adsolet: / cena tibi dabitur. (*Epid.* 6–8)

Según parece, tampoco lo niegan los intercambios en los cuales la *salutatio* se desarrolla en tres turnos: la iniciación, la réplica y un acto complementario de la primera, una pseudoiniciación que –como se aprecia en los ejemplos que siguen– no requiere de una reacción.

PHAE. O mea opportunitas, / Curculio exoptate, salve.

CUR. Salve.

PHAE. **Salvom gaudeo / te advenire.** cedo tuam mi dexteram. ubi sunt spes meae? / eloquere, obsecro hercle. (*Curc.* 305–308)

EPI. [...] advenientem peregre erum suom Stratippoclem / impertit salute servos Epidicus.

STRA. Ubi is est?

EPI. Adest. / **salvom huc advenisse** –

STRA. Tam tibi istuc credo quam mihi. (*Epid.* 126–128)

STAS. [...] o mi ere exoptatissime, / salve.

CHAR. Salve, Stasime.

STAS. **Salvom te** –

CHAR. Scio et credo tibi. / sed omitto alia. (*Trin.* 1072–1074)

Desde el punto de vista funcional, pues, *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* puede ser considerado, en estos intercambios, como una parte del primer saludo, demorada dentro de la cadena dialógica a causa de la interrupción del destinatario (véase el par adyacente ‘pregunta-respuesta’ incrustado en *Epid.* 126–128)²². Así, la fórmula sigue teniendo un papel secundario como una complementación del saludo principal: de ahí que Fédromo (*Curc.* 305–308) ni siquiera espere de su interlocutor una respuesta a *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo*. Por otro lado, la expresión de alegría en las escenas de bienvenida es tan habitual y esperable que, ocasionalmente, los destinatarios no dudan en interrumpirla (*Epid.* 126–128; *Trin.* 1072–1074; *Truc.* 503–504; cf. *Ter. Ph.* 254–256). De este modo, se da a entender a quien da la bienvenida (y al público) que las circunstancias del argumento urgen más que el cumplimento de una trillada rutina conversacional²³. En esta línea, asimismo, hay que interpretar la intervención de Crísalos (*Bacch.* 183–186), quien, para ahorrar el tiempo, sintetiza todos los actos en nombre de su interlocutor.

La fórmula *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* adquiere significados adicionales en los pocos casos en que es empleada en la intervención inicitativa propiamente dicha, donde, sin lugar a dudas, funciona como saludo principal. Disponemos únicamente de tres intercambios de este tipo:

PER. [...] **venire salvom mercatorem gaudeo.** / quid fit?

AP. Di deaque te adiuvant. (*Epid.* 395–396)

PAL. [...] **venire salvom gaudeo**, lepide hercle ornatus incedis. /

PER. Bene opportuneque obviam es, Palaestrio. (*Mil.* 897–898)

TRA. Senex illic est. em, tibi adduxi hominem. /

SI. **Salvom te advenisse peregre gaudeo**, Theopropides. /

THEO. Dei te ament.

SI. Inspecere te aedis has velle aiebat mihi. (*Most.* 804–806)

Cabe apuntar, no obstante, que estas no son escenas prototípicas de bienvenida a un personaje que acaba de volver después de una larga ausencia. Perífanos utiliza *venire salvom mercatorem gaudeo* (*Epid.* 395) para saludar a su amigo Apécides, al cual, tan solo 90 versos antes (303–305), ha mandado comprar a una lirista en el foro. La intervención de Palestrión (*Mil.* 897–898) aparece en un contexto similar: el esclavo expresa su alegría al ver que el anciano Periplectómeno trae a dos

²² Cf. S.C. Levinson: *Pragmatyka*. Trad. T. Ciecierski, K. Stachowicz. Warszawa 2010, p. 353.

²³ Ahora bien, en el caso de *Epid.* 126–128, la fórmula “me alegro de que hayas llegado sano y salvo”, más que aumentar la impaciencia de Estratípocles, lo que ocasiona es que –a sus ojos de joven aquejado de mal de amores (véase 129: *Epi. Benene usque valuisti?* STRA. *A morbo valui, ab animo aeger fui*)– asuma cierto carácter irónico. De ahí que Estratípocles no deje a Epídico terminar la fórmula rutinaria de bienvenida.

bellas mujeres (la cortesana y su sirvienta); la “expedición” del viejo también es resultado de un encargo previo, en este caso, del *servus callidus* (803–805), que, de este modo, está desarrollando su estratagema. En ambas comedias el empleo de la fórmula de bienvenida, inseparablemente relacionada con el feliz regreso de un personaje de un largo y peligroso viaje, pasa a ser una cómica exageración de las formas expresivas. Por otro lado, sin embargo, no se puede negar que las exitosas “expediciones” de Apécides y de Periplectómeno son de suma importancia para el desarrollo de la intriga, por lo cual, desde el punto de vista de la trama, también se merecen alguna forma de ritual votivo.

Es algo diferente el caso de *Most.* 804–806, donde Teoprópides sí ha vuelto, hace poco, de un viaje de negocios (431 ss.), pero su bienvenida “oficial” ya tuvo lugar, nada más llegar a la ciudad el anciano (447–449). Ahora Teoprópides, manipulado por su ingenioso esclavo Tranión, está visitando la casa de su vecino. En estas circunstancias, sobraría una elaborada *salutatio*: el anfitrión Simón tan solo comunica a su interlocutor que no ignora su larga ausencia, pero, con el fin de economizar la conversación, recurre a un único saludo. Desde el punto de vista del engaño, es importante subrayar que, en este momento de la trama, los dos ancianos no se han visto durante un largo intervalo de tiempo: de ahí todos los malentendidos. Por lo demás, no obstante, a Plauto no le interesa representar un ritual de bienvenida completo, con su estructura habitual²⁴. En consecuencia, se constata que la irregular posición de la fórmula *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* se debe a que, en este contexto, la rutina conversacional funciona *pars pro toto*, un signo de sí mismo. La fórmula en sí constituye por tanto el elemento distintivo de este tipo de interacción (véase *supra*, Tabla 1).

Tal como se ha dicho antes, la apertura dialógica que inaugura la escena de bienvenida asume forma ceremonial con mayor o menor grado de desarrollo emocional. El anciano Teoprópides, a su regreso de una expedición mercantil, es saludado con *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* hasta en tres ocasiones: por su esclavo (*Most.* 447–449), por su vecino (804–806) y por el amigo de su hijo (1128–1130). Cármides pasa por una serie de *salutationes* muy similar, cuando le dan la bienvenida su sirvienta (*Trin.* 1072–1074) y su colega anciano (1097–1098). El esclavo Tranión emplea la misma fórmula tanto con su amo (*Epid.* 126–128) como con el sirvienta (6–8) que acompañaba al joven en una misión militar. Asimismo, el *senex* Filóxeno saluda con *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* a un amigo de su hijo (*Bacch.* 456–457), quien regresa a la patria después de pasar dos años en Éfeso. Con todo, el más cordial y emocionado parece el parásito (*Stich.* 583–585) a la hora de saludar a su patrón, cuyo regreso ha esperado con mucha ilusión y poca esperanza durante mucho tiempo. Y viceversa: un joven enamorado puede dirigir

²⁴ El feliz regreso de Teoprópides, por añadidura, pasa a un segundo plano en dicha escena, donde mucho más importante (dramatúrgica y argumentalmente) parece el desarrollo de la intriga de Tranión.

la misma fórmula a un parásito (*Curc.* 305–308) expresando su alegría al verlo volver de Caria, adonde lo envió para pedir dinero prestado. La sirvienta de una cortesana (*Truc.* 503–504) recurre a esta ceremoniosa variante de la *salutatio* para entablar un diálogo con el amante de su ama, mientras que el *leno* se sirve de *salvom de (ad)venire gaudeo* (*Poen.* 685–687) para atraer a un nuevo cliente que acaba de llegar del extranjero.

En suma, en todos estos casos está presente en el contexto un largo viaje, unos negocios a distancia y un regreso, impacientemente esperado por los amigos y los familiares. Las circunstancias del encuentro, por otro lado, prevalecen claramente sobre el tipo de hablantes. Sobre la base de este significado interaccional, Plauto ha sabido utilizar el cliché lingüístico para modificar el tono de otras escenas en las que falta la larga ausencia de uno de los interlocutores. Es significativo que todos los usos de *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* cuya posición inicial en la cadena dialógica las aleja del modelo prototípico (intervención reactiva, acto subsidiario), pertenecen a un tipo de interacción diferente. De ahí que se ponga en evidencia la técnica dramática del sarsinate, quien ora representa lo que parece ser una práctica conversacional (modalidad naturalista), ora emplea, muy ágil y creativamente, sus elementos para enriquecer semánticamente otras escenas (modalidad farsesca)²⁵. En ambos casos, no cabe duda de que, como comediógrafo, Plauto disponía no solamente de un buen oído lingüístico (en el estilo), sino también de una innegable sensibilidad conversacional (en la construcción del diálogo). Esta última característica del sarsinate quedará más de manifiesto tras analizar algún ejemplo de la modificación cómica del ritual que se ha comentado hasta ahora.

Tratamiento cómico del ritual: invitación a cenar

En la parte introductoria del presente trabajo ya se ha señalado el trasfondo religioso y cultural de la bienvenida a un personaje que, después de un peligroso viaje, regresa a casa. La alegría de ver al interlocutor sano y salvo demostrada por el hablante debía de ser proporcional al respeto que sentían los antiguos hacia los riesgos inherentes a una larga estancia fuera de casa. Consecuentemente, cumplir con el complejo ritual de la *salutatio* es una señal para el viajero de que su inter-

²⁵ Los conceptos de la modalidad naturalista y farsesca son empleados por K. McCarthy: *Slaves, masters, and the art of authority in Plautine comedy*. Oxford 2000, pp. 3–6. Tiene razón la autora al recalcar que estas dos caras de la comedia plautina en vez de excluirse mutuamente están en un constante y dinámico diálogo. El presente análisis de las rutinas conversacionales, según parece, puede servir como argumento adicional a favor de esta interpretación.

locutor reconoce su buena fortuna. Ahora bien, si uno falla conscientemente en la ejecución de la ceremonia lingüística de bienvenida, su comportamiento comunicativo puede ser considerado un serio agravio a las reglas de la convivencia social o, incluso, al deber religioso. Veamos un ejemplo de ello.

Después de su regreso, Cármides encuentra en casa a un desconocido sospechoso, que sostiene que ha traído dinero de parte de un tal... Cármides. El anciano en seguida se da cuenta de que se las tiene con un impostor que, para colmo, ni se imagina con quién está hablando. Decide, no obstante, seguirle el juego antes de revelar su verdadera identidad. Al final, el sicofanta se entera de que el único engañado es él mismo, de modo que quiere retirarse, eso sí, maldiciendo a su interlocutor. Puesto que el impostor sabía que Cármides acababa de volver de un largo viaje, no duda en “profanar” el ritual de bienvenida:

CHAR. Ipsus, inquam, Charmides sum.

SYC. Ergo ipsusne es?

CHAR. Ipsissimus. / abin hinc ab oculis?

SYC. Enim vero serio, **quoniam advenis**... / vapulabis meo arbitratu et novorum aedilium. /

CHAR. At etiam maledicis?

SYC. Immo, **salvos quandoquidem advenis**... / **di te perdant**, si te flocci facio an periisses prius.

ego ob hanc operam argentum accepi, te macto infortunio: / [...] ego abeo. male vive et vale. / **qui te di omnes advenientem peregre perdant**, Charmides. (*Trin.* 988–997)

La intervención que incluye marcas discursivas de sinceridad (990–991: *enim vero serio*) y que, además, comienza con la consabida invitación a cenar (*quoniam advenis*...)²⁶, se convierte súbitamente en una amenaza (*vapulabis*...). Acusado de ser abiertamente descortés (992: CHAR. *At etiam maledicis?*), el sicofanta supuestamente intenta resarcir a su interlocutor: corrige su intervención anterior (*immo*) de modo que parezca que va a introducir la fórmula de bienvenida (*salvos quandoquidem advenis* [**gaudeo*])²⁷, pero, en seguida, la convierte en una maldición (993: *di te perdant*). Incluso en la parte final de este agresivo intercambio, la despedida del impostor contiene una clara alusión a los clichés lingüísticos de la *salutatio* (997: *qui te di omnes advenientem peregre perdant*)²⁸.

²⁶ Cf. *Bacch.* 536–537: PIST. **Salvos quom peregre advenis**, / *cena detur*; *Truc.* 359: PHRO. *Salve. hicine hodie cenas, salvos quom advenis?*

²⁷ Cf. *Most.* 1128–1129: CALL. [...] *iubeo te salvere et salvos cum advenis*, *Theopropides*, / *peregre, gaudeo*.

²⁸ Compárese el empleo de las fórmulas sacrales (*di te ament*, *di tibi dent quae velis*) en bienvenidas: *Bacch.* 456–457: PHIL. *Salvos sis, Mnesiloche, salvom te advenire gaudeo*. / MNE. **Di te ament**, *Philoxene*; *Epid.* 6–7: THES. *Salve. EPI. Di dent quae velis*. / *venire salvom gaudeo*; *Most.* 805–806: SIMO. *Salvom te advenisse peregre gaudeo, Theopropides*. / THEO. **Di te ament**; 1128–

Así, en una breve secuencia, el sicofanta logra contravenir todas las reglas de la bienvenida. Promete a Cármides una paliza en lugar de la habitual cena en su honor y, en vez de alegrarse de su afortunado regreso, lo maldice sin escrúpulos. Además, las maldiciones del impostor (*di te perdant*) parecen incluso más potentes si se tiene en cuenta que su ejecución está en manos de los mismos dioses que, supuestamente, han traído a Cármides sano y salvo de vuelta a casa. De ahí que este pasaje pueda ser considerado una inversión cómica del ritual de bienvenida.

Cabe esbozar la técnica de la cual se sirve Plauto al modificar las prácticas conversacionales. En primer lugar, hay que constatar que la conversación, como fenómeno social, contiene numerosos mecanismos que determinan de una manera casi automática gran parte de la construcción del diálogo. Parece ser que las rutinas conversacionales están compuestas de los elementos predeterminados por las mutuas expectativas de los hablantes y las convenciones comunicativas, estando ambas fuerzas en una constante interrelación e interacción. Es interesante notar al respecto que, según la famosa teoría del humor de Bergson, este automatismo de las actividades humanas puede funcionar como fuente de comicidad:

The comic is that side of a person which reveals his likeness to a thing, that aspect of human events, which, through its peculiar inelasticity, conveys the impression of pure mechanism, of automatism, of movement without life.²⁹

Esta regla se puede aplicar fácilmente a la estructura conversacional: demasiada automatización trae a un primer plano las fuerzas motrices inculcadas en forma de nuestras competencias comunicativas. Consecuentemente, la teoría bergsoniana parece explicar el efecto cómico del siguiente pasaje de Plauto, quien hace a su personaje sintetizar el guion de todo el ritual de bienvenida:

CHRY. Compendi verba multa iam faciam tibi. / **venire tu me gaudes**: ego credo tibi; / hospitium et cenam pollicere, ut convenit / peregre advenienti: ego autem venturum adnuo. (*Bacch.* 183–186)

Así, Crísalo pone de manifiesto lo mecánico de esta práctica conversacional que parece negarles a los participantes del diálogo una oportunidad para innovar. Implícita en las palabras del esclavo aparece, pues, la idea de que la convención de la *salutatio*, una vez puesta en marcha toda la secuencia de intercambios (*ut convenit*), domina sobre las intenciones individuales de los hablantes, que son meros sujetos-actores.

1130: CAL. [...] *iubeo te salvere et salvos cum advenis, Theopropides, / peregre, gaudeo. hic apud nos hodie cenes, sic face.* / THEO. *Callidamates, di te ament.*

²⁹ H. Bergson: *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*. Trad. C. Brereton, F. Rothwell. London 1913, p. 87.

Si bien Bergson hablaba de una máquina que —por la revelación de su constante funcionamiento en el fondo de las acciones humanas— llama la atención sobre lo artificial y repetitivo de nuestras vidas, Cicerón describe más bien los fallos de este mecanismo. Una de las estrategias del humor que explica en su obra retórica debía de referirse al mismo concepto de la automaticidad, que usado *praeter expectationem* (gr. *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*)³⁰ genera la perplejidad del interlocutor:

Sed scitis esse notissimum ridiculi genus, cum aliud exspectamus, aliud dicitur: hic nobismet ipsis noster error risum movet. (Cic. *De orat.* II 255)³¹

Pese a que el gran orador romano no menciona explícitamente la estructura de la conversación, el *corpus* plautino nos ofrece múltiples pruebas de que el mecanismo de las expectativas defraudadas parece aplicarse mejor tanto a la fraseología como al nivel de los intercambios dialógicos. Es aquí donde con cada acto o intervención el hablante pretende suscitar una determinada reacción en su interlocutor. En la conversación entre Cármides y el sicofanta, este mecanismo falla en la propia formulación del acto comunicativo, alterándose no ya la concatenación de sus distintos elementos, sino su propia efectividad: el “fraude” operaba en la misma fórmula rutinaria, siendo el elemento inesperado (B') el segundo segmento de la unidad fraseológica (Tabla 3).

Tabla 3. Mecanismo *praeter expectationem* en las fórmulas conversacionales

(A)	(B)	(B')
salvos quandoquidem advenis...	gaudeo (ej. <i>Most.</i> 1128–1129)	di te perdant (<i>Trin.</i> 992–993)
[salvos] quoniam advenis...	apud me cenabis (ej. <i>Most.</i> 1128–1130)	vapulabis (<i>Trin.</i> 989–990)

Puesto que, como resultado, un cliché lingüístico pierde su carácter convencional e irreflexivo, proponemos denominar este fenómeno como “desautomatización”.

³⁰ El concepto de las expectativas defraudadas se menciona también en el tratado retórico de Aristóteles (Arist. *Rh.* 1412a20, 1412a21), si bien no parece funcionar allí como un término técnico. C. Dance: *Literary Laughter in Augustan Poetry: Vergil, Horace, and Ovid*, Columbia University 2014 [tesis doctoral accesible en línea: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7916/D81R6NP1>], pp. 59–60. Como *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* no tiene una acepción cierta en los tiempos anteriores a Cicerón, el autor sugiere que es el arpinate quien popularizó esta noción en su posterior labor teórica. Cf. nota 31.

³¹ Cf. Cic. *De orat.* II 284 y *Rhet. Her.* I 10. La teoría de las expectativas defraudadas es repetida después por Quintiliano (Quint. *Inst.* VI 3.24: *in decipiendis expectationibus, dictis aliter accipiendis*), pese a que son los filósofos Kant y Schopenhauer quienes, con posterioridad, la desarrollaron tal como la entendemos ahora. S. Attardo: *Linguistic theories of humor*. Berlin–New York 1994, pp. 47–48; véase también B. Dziemidok: *O komizmie. Od Arystotelesa do dziś*. Gdańsk 2011, pp. 20 ss. Las fuentes antiguas de las teorías modernas del humor, más recientemente, han sido localizadas y reivindicadas por L.G. Perks: “The Ancient Roots of Humor Theory.” *Humor* 2012, Vol. 25.2, pp. 119–132.

Véase otro ejemplo del mismo mecanismo en el diálogo entre el soldado Terapontigono y el lenón Capadocio:

THER. Iusseram salvere te. /

CAP. Therapontigone Platagidore, salve; **salvos quom advenis** / in Epidaurum, **hic hodie apud me**... numquam delinges salem.

THER. Bene vocas, verum **locata res est**... ut male sit tibi. (Curc. 560–563)

De manera muy parecida a la escena ya analizada con el anciano y el sicofanta, Plauto ha reelaborado *praeter expectationem* dos fórmulas conversacionales que realizan los siguientes actos de habla: una invitación (*salvos quom advenis ... hic hodie apud me *cenēs*)³² y un rechazo a través de una excusa (... *verum locata res est ut *cenem alibi*)³³. Si ahora se compara los dos pasajes plautinos comentados en este apartado, salta a la vista la predilección del comediógrafo no solamente por el efecto de las expectativas defraudadas, sino también por su acumulación en un mismo diálogo. Además, escenas de bienvenida como estas ponen de relieve la posibilidad de compaginar la teoría bergsoniana con el mecanismo *praeter expectationem*. Paradójicamente, pues, las desautomatizaciones consiguientes llegan a funcionar de manera casi sistemática: la ruptura con las convenciones conversacionales en boca de estos personajes acaba constituyendo otra convención de la comunicación plautina. La desautomatización, por decirlo de alguna manera, en estos casos peculiares “se automatiza”, aumentando y acumulando el efecto cómico.

Ahora bien, debemos considerar aún algunos ejemplos en los cuales la expectativa defraudada pertenece al nivel del intercambio dialógico, es decir, cuando (B') resulta ser la réplica del interlocutor. He aquí la escena en la que la *meretrix* Fronesia da la bienvenida a su enamorado, el joven Diniarco. Después del intercambio de saludos, la mujer cumple con la convención de invitar a su interlocutor a cenar con una fórmula habitual (Truc. 359: *hicine hodie cenas, salvos cum advenis?*). La invitación, así, constituye el primer segmento del llamado par adyacente, al cual debe seguir convencionalmente o bien una aceptación (la respuesta preferible), o bien un rechazo (la respuesta no preferente)³⁴. Cuando Diniarco responde que ya tiene un compromiso (360: *promisi*), Fronesia interpreta su réplica como un acto de habla indirecto, en el cual las reglas de cortesía dictan sustituir un rechazo explícito con una excusa³⁵:

³² Cf. Bacch. 536–537: *cena detur*; Truc. 359: *hic hodie cenas*.

³³ Cf. Stich. 471–472: EPI. *Cenem illi apud te?* GEL. *Quoniam salvos advenis*. EPI. **Locata est opera nunc quidem; tam gratia est**.

³⁴ E.A. Schegloff, H. Sacks: “Opening up closings”. *Semiotica* 1973, Vol. 8.4, p. 295 ss. Cf. S.C. Levinson. *Pragmatyka*..., p. 357.

³⁵ R. Ferri: “How to Say No in Latin: Negative Turns, Politeness and Pragmatic Variation”. In: *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin*. Ed. M. Leiwo, H. Halla-aho, M. Vierros. Helsinki 2012, pp. 123–124: “Excuses, even when incredible, attest to a speaker’s at least formal adherence to the ritual of politeness, and in some cases at least are a proof of respect for his interlocutor.”

DIN. Salva sis, Phronesium. /
 PHRO. Salve. **hicine hodie cenas, salvos cum advenis?** /
 DIN. **Promisi.**
 PHRO. Ubi cenabis?
 DIN. **Ubi tu iusseris.** /
 PHRO. Hic me lubente facies.
 DIN. Edepol me magis. (*Truc.* 358–361)

Acto seguido, no obstante, resulta que el jocosos enamorado quería decir que no está comprometido con nadie más que con ella: ha cambiado la respuesta esperada (y preferible) a la invitación *promitto* por una referencia temporal pasada (*ὑστερον πρότερον*): “ya lo he prometido; ni siquiera tienes que pedírmelo”. En este caso la expectativa defraudada de Fronesia —que pregunta por los detalles del supuesto compromiso con otro anfitrión— pasa a ser una esperanza recuperada. El efecto sorpresa, en cualquier caso, conlleva cierta comicidad y, lo que es más importante, constituye una estrategia de cortesía ágil, que convierte *praeter expectationem* un aparente rechazo en una declaración de absoluta obediencia (360: DIN. *Ubi tu iusseris*).

El efecto sorpresa provocado por las modificaciones del guion de la bienvenida, puede aplicarse también a toda una serie de intercambios. Cuando el joven Epignomo regresa después de un largo viaje de negocios, es recibido efusivamente por Gelásimo, su parásito. Tras la secuencia de *salutatio* sigue la acostumbrada invitación a cenar, según las conjeturas de los editores, iniciada por Gelásimo en un verso no conservado³⁶:

GEL. *** /
 EPI. **Cenem illi apud te?**
 GEL. **Quoniam salvos advenis.** /
 EPI. Locata est opera nunc quidem; tam gratia est. [...]
 GEL. [...] quando quidem tu ad me non vis promittere / vin ad te ad cenam veniam? (*Stich.* 470–486)

De ser acertada esta lectura del fragmento, parece explicable la reacción extrañada del joven (470: EPI. *Cenem illi apud te?*), quien solía más bien hospedar al gorrón que ser su invitado. Pese a que ofrecer una cena forma parte del ritual de bien-

No toda excusa, sin embargo, forma parte de una estrategia de cortesía, sobre todo si está teñida de ironía. Mnesíloco, por ejemplo, rechaza la invitación de su interlocutor (*Bacch.* 536–539), explicando que comer en su casa le sentará mal, aludiendo así a que sospecha de su infidelidad como amigo.

³⁶ H. Petersmann: *T. Maccius Plautus: Stichus*, Einleitung, Text, Kommentar. Heidelberg 1973, p. 167. Casi todos los editores modernos (salvo Leo) indican una laguna que se puede reconstruir como *Stich.* 470: GEL. *Illi apud me cenas, quoniam salvos advenis*. También la más reciente edición de las comedias de Plauto incluye el verso no conservado, si bien no se propone ninguna conjetura – cf. W. De Melo: *Plautus...*, Vol. 5, p. 66.

venida, el mismo acto ejecutado por un parásito consigue un efecto *praeter expectationem* que hace imprescindible una repetición-confirmación (GEL. *Quoniam salvos advenis.*). Epignomo, acto seguido, rechaza cortésmente la propuesta del parásito explicando que ya tiene planes para cenar en casa. En lo que sigue, Gelásimo intenta convencer a su interlocutor de que cambie su decisión (473–483). Pronto resulta, no obstante, que su insistencia no era sino un subterfugio para, abusando de la situación, forzar una invitación del joven³⁷. Otro cambio de papeles de los hablantes restituye la esperada relación entre los personajes de la *palliata*: el parásito vuelve a ser el (auto)invitado, mientras que el joven es un resistente anfitrión.

Por razones de espacio, se han analizado reelaboraciones cómicas, sobre todo, de un segmento del ritual lingüístico de bienvenida: la invitación a cenar. Fenómenos muy similares a los aquí presentados podrían ser fácilmente identificados, además, en la realización escénica de otros elementos de esta rutina conversacional (el par adyacente de saludos³⁸, la secuencia de *small talk*³⁹) o cualquier otra convención comunicativa. La comparación del material ha resultado suficiente, no obstante, para hacer hincapié en varios mecanismos empleados por Plauto para llevar al escenario una práctica de la vida cotidiana.

A modo de conclusión: Plauto y Terencio

Muchos de los pasajes cómicos tienden a la exageración y acumulación, mecanismos perceptibles también en la estructura secuencial de la apertura dialógica. En este trabajo se ha propuesto denominar este fenómeno “automatización”. Por otro lado, Plauto muestra una evidente predilección por el efecto sorpresa. El humor basado en las expectativas defraudadas, tal como se ha visto en los ejemplos, puede obrar tanto al nivel fraseológico (p. ej. una fórmula conversacional), como en los límites de un par adyacente o incluso de una serie de intercambios. El procedimiento comunicativo *praeter expectationem* –la llamada desautomatización de las formas y las reglas con las que se construye un diálogo coloquial– pasa a ser, en boca de los personajes más cómicos, una nueva convención de la comunicación en las obras de Plauto. Las manipulaciones plautinas del lenguaje, con todo, van más allá de la mera parodia del ritual social. En primer lugar, el sarsinate suele servirse de la variante más extensa de la escena de bienvenida, sin renunciar

³⁷ El parásito Ergásilo se sirve de una táctica similar para autoinvitarse a cenar en casa de Hegión: cf. *Capt.* 172 ss.

³⁸ *Trin.* 991–992, 997; *Stich.* 465–468. Para la fórmula sin acabar por la intervención del interlocutor, cf. *Epid.* 128; *Trin.* 1073.

³⁹ *Epid.* 9–11, 129; *Most.* 447–449.

a cualquier elemento (lingüístico o extralingüístico) que, luego, podrá ser reelaborado de forma cómica, muchas veces, a costa de su verosimilitud.

Para realizaciones más costumbristas y psicológicamente convincentes habrá que recurrir a las comedias de Terencio, cuyo arte dramático, como es bien sabido, daba prioridad a otros efectos artísticos. Baste tan solo con dos ejemplos que permiten establecer la comparación:

So. O mi gnate! /

PAM. Mea mater, salve.

So. **Gaudeo venisse salvom.** salvan / Philumenast

PAM. Meliusculast. (Ter. *Hec.* 352–354)

CL. Salve, anime mi.

AN. O mi Clinia, salve.

CL. Ut vales? /

AN. **Salvom venisse gaudeo.**

CL. Teneone te, / Antiphila, maxume animo expectatam meo? (Ter. *Heaut.* 406–408)

De acuerdo con lo que se ha dicho anteriormente, en las escenas de bienvenida terencianas falta la ceremonialidad del regreso del personaje: no encontraremos aquí ni formales saludos a la patria, ni oraciones a los dioses, ni un grupo de esclavos portadores. El foco recae en la relación entre los personajes que llevaban mucho tiempo extrañándose mutuamente: de ahí la identificación emotiva (*o mi / mea + Voc.*) y la secuencia de apertura bastante acortada. Si bien el intercambio de saludos aparece acompañado –igual que en el *corpus* plautino– por un acto subsidiario de *salvom te (ad)venisse gaudeo*⁴⁰, es curioso notar que nunca va seguido de una invitación a cenar. Tampoco se aprovecha la pregunta por la salud ahora y durante la estancia fuera (ej. *ut vales? valuistin?*): la única fórmula pronunciada por Clinia (*ut vales?*) parece tan idiomatizada que ni siquiera necesita respuesta.

Como resultado, Terencio nos ofrece unas bienvenidas muy simplificadas en cuanto a los actos realizados y con un número limitado de recursos lingüísticos, lo cual no quiere decir, desde luego, que estas escenas fallen en su impresión de naturalidad. Todo lo contrario, frente a los elaborados rituales de Plauto y toda su variabilidad e ingeniosa comicidad, el más joven de ambos comediógrafos consigue captar la emotividad y espontaneidad propias del añorado (o inesperado) regreso de otro personaje. Una vez más se confirma la diferencia básica entre los dos mejores autores de la *palliata* conservados.

⁴⁰ En las comedias de Terencio la fórmula *salvom te (ad)venire gaudeo* aparece o bien como segundo acto en la intervención –después de *salve* (Ter. *Ph.* 286–288) o de la interjección *ehem* (*Eun.* 976–978)–, o bien como una complementación del primer saludo (*Heaut.* 406–408; *Hec.* 352–354, *Ph.* 254–256). Solamente en un caso ocupa la primera posición de la iniciación (*Ad.* 78–82).

El presente análisis de una práctica conversacional ha pretendido demostrar cómo Plauto reelaboraba creativamente un complejo ritual interpersonal. Si bien su arte dramático consiste en la mayoría de los casos en exageraciones *ad libitum* (automatización) o bufonadas *praeter expectationem* (desautomatización), ninguno de estos dos recursos podría existir sin basarse (por extensión o por negación) en unas convenciones comunicativas reconocibles. En este sentido, por último, Plauto, el maestro de lo farsesco, llega a constituir una valiosísima fuente para estudiar, con toda seriedad, el habla de su época.

Este trabajo se inserta en el marco del proyecto de investigación „Pragmatics of dialogue in the comedies by Plautus”, financiado por el Narodowe Centrum Nauki (NCN) – PRELUDIUM 5, Ref. 2013/09/N/HS2/02221.

Patrycja Matusiak

University of Silesia, Katowice
Faculty of Philology

Socrates the Half-dog as a comics reading of a ‘first-class Greek tragedy’

Abstract: The comics *Socrates the Half-dog* tells a story of Heracles, accompanied by a dog called Socrates who has tendency to philosophize. The both of them also encounter a blind cyclops Homer, who is a songwriter, Ulysses, running away from Penelope, and a young Oedipus.

Key words: mythology, Heracles, Ulysses, Oedipus, comics, reception of antiquity, Joann Sfar, Christophe Blain

Towards the end of 2015 Wydawnictwo Komiksowe made all us fans of antiquity really happy by publishing a collection of stories about Socrates the half-dog. They were created by well-known French authors, Joann Sfar and Christopher Blain, whose other works had been published in Poland many times before¹. Sfar, an extraordinarily prolific artist and illustrator, the author of *The Rabbi's Cat*, republished in Poland three times and of *The Vampire*, this time was responsible for the story while Blain took care of the graphics and the colour scheme

¹ Joann Sfar: *Kot Rabina* series (vol. 1–2 Post, 2004–2006; collected edition vol. 1–5 Wydawnictwo Komiksowe, 3 editions: 2013, 2014, 2015; vol. 6 Wydawnictwo Komiksowe, 2015); series on Ferdinand the vampire: *Mały świat Golema* (Mroja Press, 2009), *Wampir* (timof i cisi wspólnicy, 2014), *Aspirine* (timof i cisi wspólnicy, 2015), *Ostatki* (timof i cisi wspólnicy, 2016); *Profesor Bell* series (vol. 1–3 Mroja Press 2010–2013); *Klezmerzy* series (vol. 1 Kultura Gniewu, 2009); *Mały Książę* (Znak 2009, 2015). Sfar is also a story creator of series *Merlin* (vol. 1–2 Znakomite, 2015). Christophe Blain: *Pirat Izaak* series (vol. 1–3 Egmont Polska, 2008); *Reduktor prędkości* (Egmont Polska, 2009); *Kroniki dyplomatyczne* (with Abel Lanzac: timof i cisi wspólnicy, 2015).

of the final volume. The authors had collaborated before on the series “Donjon”, in particular on the volume called *Donjon Potron-Minet*, created by Sfar and Lewis Trondheim in 1998.

The series *Socrates the Half-dog* (*Socrate le demi-chien*) was originally published by a French publishing house Dargaud and consists of three volumes: *Heracles* (*Héraclès*, 2002), *Ulysses* (*Ulysse*, 2004) and *Oedipus in Corinth* (*Œdipe à Corinthe*, 2009). The last volume announces the arrival of a next one called *Oedipus Rex*, which has not come out yet. Before Polish the series had been translated into English, German and Spanish. The main character is Heracles’ talking dog Socrates, who claims to be half-dog, half-philosopher. He is a half-dog or more appropriately a demidog because he is the son of Zeus’ dog and as Heracles, the son of Zeus is a demigod thus Socrates must be a demidog. The name itself is very meaningful and far from accidental – in pursuit of the truth Socrates uses the techniques of his namesake, testing his Socratic methods on Heracles, who, however, frequently recommends a simple ‘woof, woof’ instead of sophisticated conversation. Moreover, apart from being a talking dog, Socrates is also a dog who can read. The concept of a talking and philosophizing animal is nothing new for the readers of Sfar’s works. His brilliant book called *the Rabbi’s Cat* tells a story of a cat who talks, has frequent discussions with rabbis and also reads the Torah, Talmud, Mishna and Gemara. In another series *the Vampire* we meet a shy vampire Ferdinand and his cat, who does not talk but rather is a quiet companion of his master. Yet, he voices his objections to another reading of collected works by Proust.

Reading of *Socrates the Half-dog* is a strange experience. On the one hand what we are dealing here with is a funny story based on mythology, on the other, mythological motifs are mixed if not distorted. Surprisingly, these rediscovered ancient motifs despite being pulled away from ‘sacred’ classical contexts make Sfar’s and Blaine’s story more interesting, not at all annoying for the lovers of antiquity. I do not know the educational hazards of such mix-up, but since the comics is written for adult readers, not for children, the risk of being led astray is not very high.

The three volumes introduce us to the protagonists who are very significant for the mythology and ancient literature: Heracles, Ulysses and Oedipus. Socrates is the narrator of the story and the companion of Heracles (has been since Heracles’ childhood), their relationship is warm although Heracles occasionally forgets to wake up his dog and sets off without him.

Socrates’ philosophy, as he claims himself, is based on a dialogue. Just as his namesake did, the dog pretends not to know anything and by asking his interlocutor numerous questions tries to guide him to answer the question he asked himself. Unfortunately, maieutics does not work very well as Heracles is a difficult conversationalist and he does not ask himself many questions. They do not talk much, sometimes the divine hero suggests some conversations to his dog,

which consist of a simple 'woof, woof'. Consequently, Socrates talks mainly to women who are adored by his master. The dog quite often assists his master in their seduction as 'women go crazy for little dogs' – he is then extra friendly and playful although in fact he is gloomy and quiet by nature. Socrates shares his observations and reflections regarding the role of women and their distinctness. He observes, for example, that his master, when talking to women tries to sound intelligent while actually all he does is stare at their bodies. Socrates is very blunt in his assessment of male-female relationships; he claims that while talking to women Heracles does not talk in his usual manner because he cannot hear what he is saying. He is shy by nature, and fortunately, the women falling prey to monsters he can kill with his bare hands saves him from conversation. At times the philosopher in the dog wins and then he calls women who play in water 'shallow bipedes' and 'unstable antropoids of streamlined shapes'. The divine hero gives his dog a secret mission – he is supposed to eavesdrop on women's conversations and report to his master.

Heracles is shown as a free man with no home or wealth, who likes solitary walks and does a lot of exercise. Since he grew up and manned up he has almost turned into Atlas supporting the weight of the world on his shoulders. He is extremely busy – all he thinks about is fighting and love. The image of a muscular Heracles with a club dressed in lion skin is compatible with the ancient imagery, although he does not have a beard as Farnese Hercules, a Roman copy of a Greek statue, probably by Lysippos², nor does he have curly hair – in the comics his hair is short and straight, quite often ruffled. The comics shows a few of Heracles' labours: the slaying of Nemean Lion, Lernaean Hydra and the capture of Cretan Bull, chasing Ceryneian Hind and stealing Mares of Diomedes³, but also the scuffles with centaurs and all the armed men approaching his camp thus seen as potential aggressors, and last but not least with cuckold husbands. The first volume closes with Heracles setting off for adventure. He intends to sail to see Ulysses and Penelope to find out what true love is.

In volume two, titled *Ulysses*, our protagonists arrive in Ithaca and there in the port they meet an old man in a hooded robe, who of course is Ulysses pretending to be someone else. The scene evokes the return of the sailor home before dealing with Penelope's suitors, this time, however, it is not the end of a journey but the beginning of another, the running away from home. Penelope, the symbol of marital loyalty and faithfulness, ends up being consoled by Heracles, who does not waste any time taking the relationship to the next level. They are discovered by a youth with a sword who Heracles kills, as he did before with all aggressors carrying swords (possibly jealous husbands). The youth turns out to be Telemach,

² K. Marciniak: *Mitologia grecka i rzymska*. Warszawa–Bielsko-Biała 2010, p. 258.

³ R. Graves: *Mity greckie*. Transl. from English H. Krzeczkowski. Warszawa 1991, pp. 396–413.

Penelope's and Ulysses' son, one of many facts simply unknown to Heracles. Our protagonists escape from the palace and sail away in a fishing boat, where they meet Ulysses, who is completely unaware of the murder of his son and still pretending to be an old man. Yet, he is not the only interesting character there; when a storm breaks out at night another passenger reveals himself. It is Jonas, who at his own wish is thrown into the sea in the hope that this may calm the tempest. And just as in the biblical story, a giant fish appears and swallows Jonas, but to no avail, the storm continues. The old man announces his real identity to the passengers and jumps into the water. Heracles breaks the mast and tries to save the drowning Ulysses but the mast hits the sailor in his head and he almost drowns. Seeing this Heracles throws himself into the sea trying to help while the boat sails away and the storm calms. Fortunately, they are rescued by a pirate ship, whose owners meet a tragic end fighting the divine heroes, who eventually reach Corinth. There they visit a temple where young girls practise religious prostitution. The authors are a bit ironic here depicting an ugly woman, who, having spent six months in the temple, was not wanted by anyone, and also a beautiful one, chosen by Heracles, but she is unable to climax, which makes him both depressed and deeply in love with her at the same time. Sadly, after fulfilling her religious duty the woman wants to come back to her husband, which drives Heracles to slit both of their throats.

Ulysses is depicted as a slim man with a mane of auburn hair and a beard, with a pinch of suffering. After coming back to his beloved wife and many years of adventures he gets bored with everyday life at his palace. What is more, 'after being married with three children, having had twenty mistresses and experiencing a world war' he discovers that what he appreciates is the company of men. And because Socrates witnessed the intimacy between the two men (Heracles and Ulysses) he is cast away on a small volcanic island, where a cyclops pastures his sheep, to make sure that he never breathes a word of this relationship to anyone. It is not an ordinary cyclops, however, it is a cyclops with his eye poked out and his name is Homer. There is no coincidence in the choice of the name here, as Homer the cyclops used to sing poems to the public but when he grew over six metres tall Socrates the philosopher announced that he posed a threat to Athens, at which point Homer was given a choice: exile or hemlock. On hearing the story Socrates the dog cannot reveal his name nor can he admit to being a philosopher. He does not even confess that he is a dog. He becomes a nameless ram and befriends Homer who spends his evenings humming stories to the sound of his lyre. Although the stories feature the well-established protagonists and themes – the impossible love leading up to war that spread over the whole of the Mediterranean, they are slightly changed every evening. As it turns out, Homer himself was a cyclops by accident – in his family everyone has just one eye. They suffer from monophthalmia which makes it difficult to read the scrolls.

Homer finds out from Socrates that it was Ulysses who poked out his only eye. So he goes to his marine father – Poseidon, also depicted with one eye – to

ask him for help finding the runaways. The god is not very willing as he does not want to start a fight with his older brother Zeus, Heracles' father. It turns out, however, that the latter with the help of his mercenaries besieged Ithaca defended by Ulysses. Penelope locked herself in a tower and spends her days weaving and her nights unravelling her work. It is an interesting reversal of the chronology of events as well as of the person Penelope shies away from. According to the myth, she was hiding away from her suitors, in the comics she avoids Ulysses. After the fight between Homer and Heracles the former frees Ithaca and consequently becomes the king of the city and the latter, free at last, finally is 'a nobody' and sails away. The authors plant some jokes here and there, they make the blind cyclops stretch a bow and unwittingly kill the minister of economy and finance⁴. Meanwhile Ulysses gets involved with a girl called Circe, marries her, they have three children, he grows fat, organises an army to defend the island and soon becomes the leader of the community. So, in fact he ends up where he started – with the duties of a leader but, as the narrator puts it, without the former glory. At that moment the narrator – Socrates – decides to leave Ulysses. And that is the end of volume two.

In volume three, called *Oedipus in Corinth* we meet Oedipus right after he was born. His future has been prophessed just like in the myth; he is supposed to kill his father and marry his own mother so the father hands the boy over to a guard so that he kills him somewhere in a remote place. But, as it happens in stories and in this particular myth as well, the guard is far too kind-hearted and he just abandons the boy in the forest hanging him upside down on a tree. That is where the roads and the lives of the child and Socrates meet. Socrates trying to save the child takes him off the tree when he gets shot by the king of Corinth. He manages, however, to persuade the king to employ him as the boy's teacher. From time to time the philosopher gets visions of Zeus in the form of eyes (as Zeus-tree, Zeus-stone, Zeus-bird, Zeus-leaf, Zeus-water and Zeus-stone-fish-dog reflection, although he also appears as a suitor in the form of a cloud, a bull, a swan and golden rain) and has conversations with him where the god warns him of Oedipus. He says 'if you save him we are in for a first-class Greek tragedy'. Socrates argues with the god, asks him about free will, does not accept determinism and believes in the role of education. These are all very crucial philosophical questions and the fact that they are asked or rather rediscovered here is the great value of the comics – the book whose function is merely to entertain not educate.

In his nightly conversation with the king of Corinth Socrates suggests the solution which will save Oedipus from his fate and prophessed madness, violence

⁴ One may speculate whether the character of the minister is at all significant. I personally am inclined to think that it is yet another joke of the authors. Between June 2002 and March 2004, which was when the second part of the series was being written and which was also the term of the second cabinet of PM Jean-Pierre Raffrain, a reform of pension system was proposed (in 2003), which sparked protests in the street and resulted in the general discontentment of the society.

and sexual conduct. The dog believes that the boy must be rid of all sexual desires and the predilection to violence by growing up amongst women, in a temple. As he will get there everything he needs, he will not fight, will not go mad and instead he will just read. The king of Corinth agrees, since he prefers a goof adept at the art of love to a frustrated bully. The childless wife of the king does not accept that, however, which results in Socrates being exiled and Oedipus kidnapped together with one of the women from the temple to take care of the child. Socrates is rescued from the armed search party formed by the king by no other than Heracles himself, who he manages to convince that it is the wish of Zeus to assign his son the thirteenth labour, which is to help bring up young Oedipus. Thanks to the cow's milk supplied by Heracles the boy shoots up, the passage of time can be seen only when looking at the greying hair of the woman from the temple. When it comes to appearance, Heracles and Socrates are like Egyptian pharaohs – timeless. Heracles is overjoyed. He assumes that Oedipus is his reincarnation and he treats him like a son, while the woman from the temple acts as his stepmother. Teenage Oedipus has long, ruffled hair and looks and behaves like a typical rebellious teenager, who eventually fulfills in part the prophecy connected with his mother, although in this case it is just a strange woman claiming to be his stepmother. She meets her tragic end by Heracles' hand – as all cuckold husbands who crossed him before did. Oedipus is banished into a cave where he must have a right of passage fight with wolves. The authors decided to finish the last volume with a cliffhanger, but, since they already announced the next one, also telling a story of Oedipus we may rest assured that he survives the ordeal.

The mythological story by Sfar and Blaine is also a story of creating, storytelling and the role of poetry. Heracles does not like poets, he thinks them cowards who spin their stories as they are too afraid to stand up and fight. That is why, whenever he meets one he provokes him to fight in order to give him some material. He himself thinks that the only thing worth talking about are his adventures – 'real stories with some action, scuffles and love'. And when Socrates, knowing how much Heracles enjoys a good story, starts embellishing his tales of women who he supposedly observed, Heracles realises the lie and points out to the dog that his story goes flat like a national dish of the authors of the series – *sufflet* – which apparently is not an ancient dish but one originating from mere 18th century. Such inconsistency should easily be forgiven, however, as it illustrates perfectly what happens to a story whose tellers have exaggerated. In another passage, after Heracles kills Telemach, Socrates says that his master has probably just killed a very important literary character. In the second volume he is outraged by the fact that two literary characters (Heracles and Ulysses) are mocking him for having a really ugly wife. This remark puts him not so much in the role of the omniscient narrator but rather of the modern reader approaching the text equipped with the knowledge of all canonical texts. Similarly Zeus, warning Socrates against saving Oedipus and saying that 'we are in for some

first-class Greek tragedy' expresses an opinion of someone who is well-read and aware of the literary tradition.

The scene where Socrates meets Homer, who every evening tells the same story but on every occasion in a slightly different way, poses questions about the nature of storytelling. For Homer, telling a true story and a made-up one makes no difference, just like there is no difference between comedy, drama, a story for children and the one for adults. It is the telling that is important. The characters in the comics know that they have creative powers. Homer himself claims that he would like to play a role in a tragedy (the tragedy of Ulysses). And when he becomes the king of Ithaca he realises that being king entails some serious obligations and that his duties will leave him with no time to create new stories. He also manages a self-reflection that blindness does not hinder him as a poet, on the contrary, it helps create distance to things. It would have been much worse, had he been an illustrator not a poet. During a duel between Homer and Heracles the poet bitterly states that he pities people as they do not distinguish between theatre and circus, that they have lost the sense of tragedy. He adds that gods do not love them anymore – before they looked at people, now they turn their eyes away, thus expressing one of the major problems in modern philosophical thought – the absence of God in today's world.

Fittingly for a true philosopher, Socrates also comments on war. Captured together with Homer and tied to a mast whispers a request that Homer sing a song, break the chains, call his father who could put an end to it all. According to dog the philosopher, war is nothing good, 'war is poo'. What we learn from many comments scattered all over the book is that Socrates is also against individual acts of violence, moreover, he simply fails to understand it. This quite forceful remark on war is hardly surprising given that the second volume of the comics was finished in July 2004, when the war in Iraq was still going on, and that merely four months previously there had been a terrorist attack in Madrid.

The ancient costume of the story is present but not overwhelming, there are no details jumping out of a frame and blurring the story. Many scenes take place outside, in nature. The artists correctly drew the monuments, temples, boats or outfits of the characters. All this, however, does not seem to be very significant – the story is set at some moment in ancient history, it may well be the antiquity of the mythological heroes but the stories of love in its broad sense and of war as well as the themes of Homer's songs are universal.

The postmodern take on the myths, consisting in their mix-up and completion with new elements is designed to entertain. The story told by the French authors combines comic and dramatic elements, true stories (in the sense of literary canon) with the made-up ones and although it is not a tale for children but for adults it is – according to Homer the cyclops and I'd like to think the readers would agree – a good story, which is universal, gripping, entertaining and beautifully drawn. Aristotle defined a poet as someone whose task is not to present real events

but those that might have happened⁵. Even though the authors are not poets, they showed us a fragment of an alternative mythological universe. Even if the story is not strictly educational it may spark some interest in ancient literature. *Socrates the Half-dog* is a story one wants to return to, especially if, or when the authors make the fourth volume on Oedipus Rex promised seven years ago.

⁵ Arist. *Poet.* 1451b.

Edyta Gryksa

Uniwersytet Śląski, Katowice
Wydział Filologiczny

Valerius Maximus, *De dictis factisque memorabilibus* 1.5.1–9

Abstract: The aim of the article is to translate the fragment of Valerius Maximus' *Memorable Deeds and Sayings*. The significant emphasis was put on the interpretation of the particular fragments as well as on working out the precise commentary in the notes.

Key words: Valerius Maximus, omens, Roman believes.

Nota od tłumacza

Prezentowany fragment dzieła Waleriusza Maksymusa *De dictis factisque memorabilibus*¹, będącego kartoteką pouczających, umoralniających przykładów różnorodnej tematyki, poświęcony jest omenom. Pojmowane najczęściej jako ostrzeżenie, opisane zostały przez wielu autorów antycznych².

¹ V. Maximus, *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem*. Ed. J. Briscoe. Lipsiae 1998, (V. Maximus, *Memorable doings and sayings*. Ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. London 2000).

² Zob. Var. *L.* 6.7.76: Oro ab ore et perorat et exorat et oratio et orator et osculum dictum. Indidem omen, ornamentum; alterum quod ex ore primum elatum est, osmen dictum; alterum nunc cum propositione dicitur vulgo ornamentum, quod sicut olim ornamenta scaenici plerique dicunt. Hinc oscines dicuntur apud augures, quae ore faciunt auspicium;

Cic. *Div.* 1.45.102: Neque solum deorum voces Pythagorei observitaverunt, sed etiam hominum, quae vocant omina. Quae maiores nostri quia valere censebant, idcirco omnibus rebus agendis

Przypadkowe wypowiedzi i wydarzenia – mające miejsce szczególnie w przypadku niepokojących sytuacji – były uznawane za złowieszcze. Grecka κληδών czy rzymskie *omen* od *dictum fortuitum* (od przypadkowego powiedzenia) różniły się celowym działaniem nadprzyrodzonych sił oraz ludzką skutecznością w przywoływaniu ich pomocy³. Rzymianie odczytywali znaki boskie z incydentalnych słów i działań podczas ceremonii, kiedy to ostrożność i precyzja pozwalały im na usłyszenie pomyślnych, sprzyjających słów w odpowiednim czasie⁴. Z biegiem czasu rozwój systemu interpretacji znaków wróżebnych stał się na tyle skomplikowany, że konieczne było powołanie kolegium ekspertów (tzw. *Augures*) do odgadywania woli bogów⁵.

[O wszystkim, co przyjęli Rzymianie]

Praefatio: Ominum etiam obseruatio aliquo contactu religioni innexa est, quoniam non fortuito motu, sed diuina prouidentia constare creduntur.

[Obserwacja znaków również wiąże się w jakiś sposób z religią. Wiadomo bowiem, że wszystko dzieje się z boskiej opatrności, a nie wynika z przypadku.]

Quae effecit ut urbe a Gallis disiecta, deliberantibus patribus conscriptis utrum Veios migrarent an sua moenia restituerent, forte eo tempore praesidio cohortibus redeuntibus centurio in comitio exclamaret ‘signifer, statue signum, hic optime manebimus’: ea enim uoce audita senatus accipere se omen respondit e uestigioque Veios transeundi consilium omisit. quam paucis uerbis de domicilio futuri summi imperii confirmata est condicio! credo indignum diis existimantibus prosperrimis auspiciis Romanum nomen ortum

“quod bonum, faustum, felix fortunatumque esset” praefabantur, rebusque divinis, quae publice fierent, ut “faverent linguis” imperabatur, inque feriis imperandis ut “litibus et iurgiis se abstinere”. Itemque in lustranda colonia ab eo qui eam deduceret, et cum imperator exercitum, censor populum lustraret, bonis nominibus qui hostias ducerent eligebantur. Quod idem in dilectu consules observant, ut primus miles fiat bono nomine;

Quint. *Inst.* 5.7.35: His adicere si qui uolet ea quae divina testimonia vocant, ex responsis oraculis ominibus, duplicem sciat esse eorum tractatum: generalem alterum, in quo inter Stoicos et Epicuri sectam secutos pugna perpetua est regaturne prouidentia mundus, specialem alterum circa partis divinationum, ut quaeque in quaestionem cadet.

³ Zob. D. Latiner: “Signifying Names and Other Ominous Accidental Utterances in Classical Historiography”. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2005, Vol. 45, p. 35.

⁴ Zob. J.H. W.G. Liebeschuetz: *Continuity and change in Roman Religion*. Oxford 1979, pp. 25–27.

⁵ Zob. M. Cary, H.H. Scullard: *Dzieje Rzymu. Od czasów najdawniejszych do Konstantyna*. Warszawa 1992, T. 1, p. 103.

Veientanae urbis appellatione mutari inclitaeque uictoriae decus modo abiectae urbis ruinis infundi.

[One (*sc.* znaki) sprawiły, że gdy po zburzeniu miasta przez Galów senatorzy zastanawiali się, czy przenieść się do Wejów, czy też odbudować swoje mury, w czasie powrotu kohort ze straży centurion na komicjum krzyknął: “Chorąży, wbij chorągiew, najlepiej tutaj pozostaniemy”. Senat, usłyszawszy te słowa, uznał je za znak i natychmiast porzucił decyzję o przeniesieniu się do Wejów⁶. Jakież wspańnię potwierdzenie dla siedziby przyszłego, wielkiego imperium było w tych kilku słowach. Wierzę, że było to niegodne w opiniach bogów, aby pod pomyślnymi auspicjami⁷ imię Rzymian miało się zmienić i aby sławne zwycięstwo mogło być przekazane ruinom dopiero co zdobytogo miasta⁸.]

Huius tam praeclari operis auctor Camillus, cum esset precatus ut, si cui deorum nimia felicitas populi Romani uideretur, eius inuidia suo aliquo incommodo satiaretur, subito lapsu decidit. quod omen ad damnationem, qua postea oppressus est, pertinuisse uisum est. merito autem de laude inter se uictoria et pia precatio amplissimi uiri certauerint: aequae enim uirtutis est et bona patriae auxisse et mala in se transferri uoluisse.

[Sprawcą słynnego dzieła był Kamillus⁹. Modlił się on, aby zazdrość – w przypadku gdyby któremuś z bogów wydawało się, że narodowi rzymskiemu sprzyja nadmierna pomyślność – zaspokojona została jego osobistą klęską. Wówczas poślizgnął się i upadł, co uznano za zapowiedź skazującego wyroku, który w przyszłości go pogrążył. Słusznie natomiast współzawodniczyły ze sobą o chwałę

⁶ Przypadkowe wypowiedzi padające z ust mężczyzny były niejednokrotnie kojarzone z okolicznościami, w jakich je usłyszano, i uznawane za oznaki przyszłych wydarzeń [zob. F.B. Krauss: *An interpretation of the omens, portents, and prodigies recorded by Livy, Tacitus and Suetonius*. Philadelphia 1930, p. 165]. W 390 roku p.n.e. senatorowie, zgromadzeni w *Curia Hostilia*, rozważali opcję przeniesienia ludności do Wejów. Marek Furiusz Kamillus, wygłaszając mowę odwołującą się do ich zdecydowanego i wprawnego podejścia do skrupułów religijnych, starał się ich odwieść od takiej decyzji. Wydarzenie to dokładnie opisuje Liwiusz [5.51–54].

⁷ Kiedy to Romulusowi ukazało się 12, a Remusowi 6 sępów [Liv. 1.7; Flor. *Epit.* 1.1.6].

⁸ Rzymianie zdecydowali się na próbę ponownego podbicia Wejów około roku 405 p.n.e. Kampania ta zapisała się jako pierwszy zdecydowany krok Rzymu na drodze do światowej hegemonii i punkt zwrotny w historii militarnej Imperium. Trudne do zdobycia ze względu na swe położenie (skaliste wzgórze, skarpy i opływająca je rzeka) Weje stawiały skuteczny opór przez dziesięć lat. W roku 396 p.n.e. armia rzymska dowodzona przez Marka Furiusza Kamillusa zdobyła miasto. Rzym wzbogacił się wówczas ogromnymi łupami i zyskał nowe żyzne terytoria [zob. M. Cary, H.H. Scullard: *Dzieje Rzymu. Od czasów najdawniejszych do Konstantyna*. Warszawa 1992, T. 1, pp. 150–151].

⁹ Kilka miesięcy po zdobyciu Wejów Marek Furiusz Kamillus został oskarżony o ukrycie części zdobytych tam łupów i skazany na wygnanie. Został z niego odwołany w roku 390 p.n.e. po klęsce nad Allią i zdobyciu Rzymu przez Galów [zob. B. Mineo: *A companion to Livy*. Chichester 2015, p. 106].

zwycięstwo i pobożna modlitwa tak wspianalego człowieka: równa jest bowiem *virtus* tego, kto chce pomnożyć dobra ojczyzny, i tego, który to, co złe, zwraca ku sobie.]

Quid illud, quod L. Paulo consuli euenit, quam memorabile! cum ei sorte obuenisset ut bellum cum rege Perse gereret et domum e curia regressus filiolam suam nomine Tertiam, quae tum erat admodum paruula, osculatus tristem animaduerneret, interrogauit quid ita eo uultu esset. quae respondit Persam perisse. decesserat autem catellus, quem puella in deliciis habuerat, nomine Persa. arripuit igitur omen Paulus exque fortuito dicto quasi certam spem clarissimi triumphi animo praesumpsit.

[Jakże godne wzmianki jest to, co przydarzyło się Lucjuszowi Paulusowi¹⁰. Po tym jak przypadło mu w udziale prowadzenie wojny z królem Perseuszem, wrócił do domu z kurii. Ucałowawszy swoją małą córkę o imieniu Tertia, zauważył, że jest smutna. Zapytana o powód odpowiedziała, że Persa nie żyje. Zmarł bowiem szczeniak o imieniu Persa, którego dziewczynka bardzo kochała. Paulus uznał to za znak i odtąd cieszył się nadzieją wspianalego triumfu.]

At Caecilia Metelli, dum sororis filiae, adultae aetatis uirgini, more prisco nocte concubina nuptiale petit omen, ipsa fecit: nam cum in sacello quodam eius rei gratia aliquamdiu persedisset nec [aliqua] ulla uox proposito congruens esset audita, fessa longa standi mora puella rogauit materteram ut sibi paulisper locum residendi adcommodaret. cui illa 'ego uero' inquit 'libenter tibi mea sede cedo'. quod dictum ab indulgentia profectum ad certi ominis processit euentum, quoniam Metellus non ita multo post mortua Caecilia uirginem, de qua loquor, in matrimonium duxit.

[Cecylia, żona Metellusa, kiedy dawnym zwyczajem, wczesną nocą prosiła o znak weselny dla dorosłej córki swojej siostry, uczyniła go sama. Siedząc od dłuższego czasu w świątyni, gdzie nie słyszała żadnego głosu właściwego dla swojego celu, wyczerpana poprosiła ciotkę, aby pozwoliła jej na moment usiąść. Zgodziła się, mówiąc: "Chętnie oddam Ci moje miejsce". Te słowa, wypowiedziane z życzliwością, stały się zapowiedzią przyszłych wydarzeń. Niebawem po śmierci Cecylii Metellus poślubił dziewczynę, o której mówię.]

¹⁰ *Lucius Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus* – w roku 181 p.n.e. jako konsul pokonał liguryjski szczep Ingaunów. W roku 168 p.n.e. odniósł zwycięstwo nad macedońskim królem Perseuszem, skutkujące upadkiem Macedonii i dalszym wzrostem potęgi Rzymu. W bitwie pod Pydną zginęło 20 tysięcy Macedończyków, 11 tysięcy zostało wziętych do niewoli. W szeregach rzymskich, zgodnie z przekazem Liwiusza [44.42.7–8], zginęło zaledwie sto osób. Po zwycięstwie nad Perseuszem Lucjusz Paulus odbył triumf, który początkowo – ze względu na niezadowolenie żołnierzy, wynikające z utrzymywania surowej dyscypliny – spotkał się ze sprzeciwem ze strony społeczeństwa rzymskiego [zob. V. Paterculus: *The Roman History: From Romulus and the Foundation of Rome to the reign of the Emperor Tiberius*. Trans. J.C. Yardley, A. Barrett. Cambridge 2011, p. 3].

C. autem Mario observatio ominis procul dubio saluti fuit, quo tempore hostis a senatu iudicatus in domum Fanniae Minturnis custodiae causa deductus est. animadvertit enim asellum, cum ei pabulum obiceretur, neglecto eo ad aquam procurrentem. quo spectaculo deorum providentia quod sequeretur oblatum ratus, alioquin etiam interpretandarum religionum peritissimus, a multitudine, quae ad opem illi ferendam confluxerat, inpetrauit ut ad mare perduceretur ac protinus nauiculam conscendit eaque in Africam peruectus arma Sullae uictricia effugit.

[Obserwacja znaków bez wątpienia uratowała życie Gajuszowi Mariuszowi. Po tym jak został wskazany przez senat jako wróg publiczny i zabrany dla ochrony do domu Fannii¹¹ w Minturne¹², zauważył osła. Kiedy przyniesiono mu jedzenie, ów zlekceważywszy je, pobiegł ku wodzie. Sądząc, że to boża opatrność wskazała mu znak do naśladowania, Gajusz Mariusz – niezwykle biegły w interpretowaniu znaków religijnych – z pomocą tłumy, który zebrał do wykonania tego zdania, pomyślnie został zaprowadzony do morza, gdzie natychmiast wsiadł na łódź. Odpłynąwszy na niej w kierunku Afryki, uciekł zwycięskiej armii Sulli.]

Pompeius uero Magnus in acie Pharsalica uictus a Caesare, fuga quaerens salutem cursum in insulam Cyprum, ut aliquid in ea uirium contraheret, classe direxit adpellensque ad oppidum Paphum conspexit in litore speciosum aedificium gubernatoremque interrogauit quod ei nomen esset. qui respondit Κατωβασίλεια uocari. quae uox spem eius [quae] quantulamcumque [restabat] conminuit, neque id dissimulanter tulit: auertit enim oculos ab illis tectis ac dolorem, quem ex diro omine ceperat, gemitu patefecit.

[Pompejusz Wielki, pokonany przez Cezara w bitwie pod Farsalos, szukając ocalenia w ucieczce, podążył z flotą na wyspę Cypr, aby tam pozyskać dodatkowych ludzi. Przybivszy do miasta Pafos¹³, dostrzegł na brzegu okazałą budowlę. Kiedy zapytał rządcę o to, jak się nazywa, ten odrzekł: *Katabasilea*¹⁴. Słowo to pomniejszyło i tak już jego nikłą nadzieję. Nie krył swych uczuć: odwrócił oczy od owej budowli i cierpienie, wynikające ze złowieszczego omenu, ujawnił, szlochając.]

¹¹ *Fannia* – żona Gajusza Tituniusza [V. Max. 8.2.3], który po rozwodzie w roku 100 p.n.e. zażądał zatrzymania jej posagu. Swoje stanowisko tłumaczył, powołując się na niemoralny charakter małżonki. Spór rozstrzygnąć miał Gajusz Mariusz, nakładając grzywnę na Fannię i zobowiązując Tituniusza do zapłaty sumy stanowiącej równowartość jej posagu. W roku 88 p.n.e. kobieta odwodziła się Gajuszowi Mariuszowi, ukrywając go w swoim domu [zob. R.A. Bauman: *Women and politics in Ancient Rome*, London 1994, pp. 49–51].

¹² *Minturnae* – miasto na granicy Lacjum i Kampanii nad rzeką Liris.

¹³ *Pafos* – miasto na południowo-zachodnim wybrzeżu Cypru. Według mitologii greckiej u wybrzeży Pafos z piany morskiej zrodziła się Afrodyta.

¹⁴ Pałac krainy umarłych [zob. V. Maximus: *Memorable deeds and sayings. One thousand tales from ancient Rome*. Ed. H.J. Walker. Cambridge 2004, p. 19].

M. etiam Bruti dignus admissio parricidio euentus omine designatus est, si quidem post illud nefarium opus natalem suum celebrans, cum Graecum uersum expromere uellet, ad illud potissimum Homericum referendum animo tetendit:

ἀλλά με Μοῖρ' ὅλοῃ καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν υἷος,
qui deus Philippensi acie a Caesare et Antonio signo datus in eum tela conuertit.

[Omen przestrzegł również Marka Brutusa po dokonanych zabójstwie¹⁵. Kiedy dokonawszy tego nikczemnego czynu, świętował swoje urodziny i zapragnął wypowiedzieć grecki wers, na myśl przyszło mu to konkretne homeryckie zdanie: “Lecz mnie los zgubny i syn Latony zabił”. Podczas bitwy pod Filippi ten właśnie bóg, wybrany przez Cezara i Antoniusza, zwrócił przeciwko niemu broń.]

Consentaneo uocis iactu C. Cassii aurem fortuna peruellit, quem orantibus Rhodiis ne ab eo cunctis deorum simulacris spoliarentur, Solem a se relinqui respondere uoluit, ut rapacissimi uictoris insolentiam dicti tumore protraheret abiectumque Macedonica pugna non effigiem Solis, quam tantummodo supplicibus cesserat, sed ipsum solem re uera relinquere cogeret.

[Fortuna wykręciła również ucho należytych słowem Gajuszowi Kasjuszowi¹⁶. Proszony przez Rodyjczyków, aby nie pozbawiał ich wszystkich podobizn bogów, odrzekł, że pozostawi Słońce. Poprzez wyniosłą wypowiedź Fortuna ujawniła arogancję zachłannego zwycięzcy i pokonanemu w bitwie w Macedonii nie tylko posąg Słońca, który odstąpił błagającym, lecz w rzeczywistości i samo słońce nakazała pozostawić.]

Adnotatu dignum illud quoque omen, sub quo Petilius consul in Liguria bellum gerens occiderit: nam cum montem, cui Leto cognomen erat, oppugnaret interque adhortationem militum dixisset ‘hodie ego Letum utique capiam’, inconsideratius proeliando fortuitum iactum uocis leto suo confirmauit.

[Wart wspomnienia jest również znak, pod jakim podczas walk w Ligurii zmarł konsul Petiliusz¹⁷. Kiedy zdobywał górę zwaną *Letum*, zachęcał żołnierzy takimi

¹⁵ *Marcus Iunius Brutus* – przyłączył się do spisku przeciwko Cezarowi, zamordowanemu w dniu 15 marca 44 r. p.n.e. Został pokonany w bitwie pod Filippi w 42 r. p.n.e. przez Augusta i Antoniusza. Bo bitwie popełnił samobójstwo [zob. S. Sheppard: *Philippi. The death of the Roman Republic*. Oxford 2008, p. 76].

¹⁶ *Gaius Cassius Longinus* – splądrował wyspę Rodos celem uzupełnienia wyposażenia armii przed bitwą pod Filippi. Podczas bitwy popełnił samobójstwo [zob. M. Cary, H.H. Scullard: *Dzieje Rzymu. Od czasów najdawniejszych do Konstantyna*. Warszawa 1992, T. 1, p. 567].

¹⁷ *Quintus Petillius Spurius* – zginął podczas walk z Ligurami w pobliżu Mutiny. Nie zdawał sobie sprawy, że rozpoczyna wojnę pod niepomyślnymi auspicjami [zob. D.S. Potter: *Life, death and entertainment in the Roman Empire*. Michigan 1999, pp. 130–131]. Jego *impietas* wynikała

słowami: “Dziś z pewnością zdobędę *Letum*¹⁸”. Walcząc nierozważnie, przypadkiem potwierdził rzucone słowa własną śmiercią.]

z faktu zlekceważenia niepomysłnych znaków wywrózonych z zachowania świętych kurczaków, które Klaudiusz Pulcher rozkazał wrzucić do wody, by piły, skoro nie chciały jeść [zob. I.S. Gilhus: *Animals, Gods and Humans: Changing Attitudes To Animals in Greek, Roman and early Christian ideas*. London 2006, p. 26; Cicero, *On the nature of gods* 2.3.7]. Przyczyn niepowodzenia dopatrywano się również w innych niepomysłnych wróżbach [Liv. 41.14.7; 41.15.1–4; 41.18.9–16; V. Max. 2.7.15; Fron. *Str.* 4.1.46].

¹⁸ *Letum* – śmierć, zniszczenie.

Tomasz Labuk

University of Silesia, Katowice
Faculty of Philology

Preliminary remarks on Byzantine Literary Perception(s) of Fatness (11th to 12th Centuries)¹

Abstract: The article discusses various ways in which fat body was represented and used as a means of social, religious and political critique in Byzantine literature from eleventh to twelfth century. The analysis is put within a broader context and traces the sources of the discourse of overindulgence to ancient Greek tradition (Plato, Aristophanes, Athenaeus), as well as to Christian frameworks (Old and New Testament, Church Fathers).

Key words: Byzantium, fatness, gluttony, ancient literature.

We live in a world of striking paradoxes. As Martín Caparrós has shown in his recent and disturbing bestseller entitled *Hunger (El Hambre)*, every ninth inhabitant of the Earth is starving. At the very same time the obesity rates in the “first-world” countries are peaking. In the social realities of the industrialised West, food is omnipresent. Eating has become a modern-day obsession to such a point that there has even emerged an interdisciplinary scholarly field of fat studies which aims to challenge and undermine prevalent negative stereotypes associated to fatness.²

¹ This article is a part of project funded by the National Science Centre Poland within the scheme of the Programme “Sonata-Bis 3”, project title: “Intellectual History of 12th-Century Byzantium – Adaptation and Appropriation of Ancient Literature”, grant number: UMO-2013/10/E/HS2/00170.

² See e.g. *Fat Studies. An Interdisciplinary Journal of Body Weight and Society*; *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Obesity*. Ed. J. Cawley. Oxford 2011. E.D. Rothblum: *The*

Eating in Byzantium

Nonetheless, there is nothing new about this modern obsession with consumption. Indeed, eleventh- as well as twelfth-century Byzantine literati seem to have been equally obsessed with what and how others ate, and reproaching individuals for their gluttony, drunkenness or obesity was a literary *topos* widely explored by the authors of the period.

Historical and archaeological scholarship on Byzantine foodstuffs and dietary prescriptions is prolific. The seminal and widely quoted study of Koukoules, still remains the most wide-ranging scholarly analysis of Byzantine food culture.³ The vast work of Johannes Koder has brought new insights into the provision of fresh food products in Constantinople, Byzantine eating habits and Byzantine cuisine.⁴ Of no less value is the work of Ilias Anagnostakis, who enriched scholarly perspective on Byzantine food consumption with many insights.⁵ Andrew Dalby's *Siren Feast* and *Flavours of Byzantium* offered some pioneering insights into Byzantine cuisine⁶, while Ewald Kislinger added significant contributions to the field.⁷

Fat Studies Reader. New York 2009. For the definition of the field see E. Rothblum: *Fat Studies*. In: *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Obesity...*, p. 174. The applicability of this theoretical framework to Medieval literature is highly questionable. The scholars within the field perceive themselves as a part of what they call as "fat pride community" or the "size acceptance movement", which are social concepts that are totally alien to any Medieval society. Moreover, even though one of the aims of the field is to understand the sources of modern perceptions of fatness, vast majority of the publications within the field is concerned only with modern societies and cultures. In this sense, it seems that rather medievalists might contribute to the fat studies, not the other way round.

³ P. Koukoules: *Βυζαντινὸν βίος καὶ πολιτισμός, τ. Ε'. Αἱ τροφαὶ καὶ τὰ πότα*. Athens 1952.

⁴ E.g.: J. Koder: "Η καθημερινή διατροφή στο Βυζάντιο με βάση τις πηγές". In: *Βυζαντινὸν Διατροφή καὶ Μαγειρεία*. Ed. D. Papanikola-Bakirtzi. Athens 2005, pp. 17–30. J. Koder: "Stew and Salted Meat – Opulent Normality in the Diet of Every Day?". In: *Eat, Drink and Be Merry (Luke 12:19). Food and Wine in Byzantium*. Eds. L. Brubaker, K. Linardou. Aldershot 2007, pp. 59–72. J. Koder: "Everyday Food in the Middle Byzantine Period". In: *Flavours and Delights. Tastes and Pleasures of Ancient and Byzantine Cuisine*. Ed. I. Anagnostakis. Athens 2013, pp. 139–156.

⁵ I. Anagnostakis: *Byzantinos oinikos politismos*. Athens: Ethniko Idryma Erevnon 2008. I. Anagnostakis, T. Papamastorakis: "...And Radishes for Appetizers. On Banquets, Radishes and Wine". In: *Βυζαντινὸν Διατροφή*, pp. 147–174.

⁶ A. Dalby: *Siren Feasts: A History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*. London: Routledge 1996. Idem: *Flavours of Byzantium: The Cuisine of a Legendary Empire*. Devon: Prospect 2003.

⁷ E.g.: E. Kislinger: "Christians of the East: Rules and Realities of the Byzantine Diet". In: *Food. Culinary History from Antiquity to the Present*. Eds. J.-L. Flandrin, M. Montanari. New York 1996, pp. 194–206. E. Kislinger: "Being and Well-Being in Byzantium: The Case of Beverages". In: *Material Culture and Well-Being in Byzantium (400–153)*. Eds. M. Grünbart, E. Kislinger, A. Muthesius, D. Stathakopoulos. Wien 2007, pp. 147–154.

Last but not least, one could not omit a series of studies on Byzantine diet conducted by a Polish Byzantinist Maciej Kokoszko.⁸

Copious though it may seem, the field lacks almost completely in literary analyses of various uses of food, cuisine-related terms, literary representations of physical acts of consumption as well as the meaning of fat bodies – the area on which I intend to focus in the second part of this article.⁹ Although Byzantine literary texts form the core of the studies mentioned above, Byzantine food scholarship, for the major part, has paid almost no attention to literary tradition within which they emerged, their complex intertextual allusiveness, or has even ignored the very fact that the Byzantines produced and read literature chiefly for pleasure.¹⁰

Such approach leads sometimes to baffling results. Jonathan Harris, commenting on the realities of 12th-century Constantinople, quotes a passage from Niketas Choniates' *Chronike Diegesis*, which derides John of Poutza, a gluttonous official from the retinue of emperor Manuel Komnenos.¹¹ In the scene, John cannot curb his appetite for his beloved meal and, on his way back home, he has to stop by in a roadside tavern to have his fill of the soup. He gulps it down, paying two obols to the tavern keeper. Harris, taking what is written at face value, concludes that the price of a bowl of soup equalled to two bronze coins in the 12th-century Constantinople. Yet, as I argue elsewhere, the entire episode might be as well a literary fiction, which, through subtle intertextual hints, refers the reader to Aristophanes' comedies.¹²

Similarly, E. Kislinger, discussing another portrait of a drunken imperial official, John Kamateros, depicted by Choniates,¹³ concludes that some officials, inspired by the introduction of new extravagant customs in the twelfth century, went as far as drinking seven litres of water directly from a huge vase. Once again, such

⁸ See for example: *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.). Część II: Pokarm dla Ciała i Ducha. [Dietetics and Culinary art of Ancient and Early Byzantine Period (2nd–7th Century). Part II: Nourishment for the Body and the Soul]*. Ed. M. Kokoszko. Łódź 2014.

⁹ Significant exceptions to this trend are the following studies: M. Alexiou: *The Poverty of Écriture and the Craft of Writing: "Towards a Reappraisal of the Prodic Poems"*. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 1986, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 1–40. Idem: *"Ploys of Performance: Games and Play in the Ptochoprodromic Poems"*. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 2009, Vol. 53, pp. 91–109. Also: *Eat Drink and Be Merry...* Eds. E. Broubaker, K. Linardou: *Feast, Fast or Famine. Food and Drinks in Byzantium*. Eds. W. Meyer, S. Trzcionka. Brisbane 2005.

¹⁰ On the pleasure of reading in Byzantium see e.g.: *Plotting with Eros: Essays on the Poetics of Love and the Erotics of Reading*. Ed. I. Nilsson. Copenhagen 2009.

¹¹ J. Harris: *Constantinople, Capital of Byzantium*. London 2007, p. 112. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*. Ed. J.-L. van Dieten. New York–Berlin 1970, 57.53–63 (hereafter referred to as vD). The passage is discussed thoroughly in T. Labuk: *"Aristophanes in the service of Niketas Choniates – Gluttony, Drunkenness and Politics in the Χρονική Διήγησις"*. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 2016, Vol. 66, pp. 127–152 (forthcoming).

¹² E. Kislinger: *"Being and Well-being..."*, p. 153; T. Labuk: *"Aristophanes..."*.

¹³ vD 113.87–114.10.

a reading ignores the fact that Choniates operates here with well-known literary *topoi* which stemmed from the comedic tradition – such as drinking wine from huge “breathless” cups or engaging in drunken wagers.¹⁴ As I, again, argue elsewhere, the wording used by Choniates in the passage seems to refer the reader to Athenaeus and Aristophanes, adding layers of additional covert meanings. Such a reading is all the more possible if we consider that both of these ancient authors were widely read and studied by the Byzantines.¹⁵ The episode, once again, might as well never have happened at all, but its historical veracity was, in my opinion, not a chief aim of Choniates.¹⁶

Still, the most extreme example of such a word for word reading has been recently proposed by a Polish scholar, Anna Kotłowska.¹⁷ Quoting one of the letters composed by a twelfth-century intellectual, Michael Italikos, to Theodore Prodromos, Kotłowska concludes that the Byzantines disliked cheese and incorrectly linked the Greek word for a tyrant (τύραννος) with a noun which denoted cheese (τυρός). What Kotłowska seems to ignore, is the fact that Italikos, an accomplished scholar and a thoroughly educated author, might be simply poking fun at Prodromos – a polymath and an author of numerous witty literary satires.¹⁸

Byzantine “fat savages”

Sadly enough, this seeming lack of interest in deeper meanings pertains to the co-related field of literary depictions of fatness in Byzantine literature.¹⁹ Ex-

¹⁴ See the discussion of this passage in: T. Labuk: “Aristophanes’ and R. Maisano’s commentary in *Niceta Coniata. Grandezza e Catastrofe di Bisanzio*, Vol. I. Ed. A. Pontani. 1994, p. 594, n. 42.

¹⁵ See for example: A. Markopoulos: “De la structure de l’école byzantine. Le maître, les livres et le processus éducatif”. In: *Lire et écrire à Byzance*. Ed. B. Mondrain. Paris 2006, pp. 85–96.

¹⁶ Warren Treadgold has unconvincingly argued that the anecdotes about John of Poutze and John Kamateros are “trivial exaggerations” which Choniates “must have heard from someone”. However, such a claim is not only unsubstantiated by the internal evidence from the *Chronike Diegesis*, but also (again) it depreciates Choniates’ literary talent and tradition within which he operated: W. Treadgold: “The Unwritten Rules for Writing Byzantine History”. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Belgrade 22–27 August 2016*. Belgrade 2016, pp. 277–292 at 286. Cf. T. Labuk: “Aristophanes...”.

¹⁷ A. Kotłowska: *Zwierzęta w kulturze literackiej Bizantyńczyków – Αναβλέψατε εις τα πετεινά. [Animals in the Byzantine literary culture – Αναβλέψατε εις τα πετεινά...]*. Poznań 2014, p. 160.

¹⁸ Michel Italikos. *Lettres et discours*. Ed. P. Gautier. Paris 1972, pp. 237–238. On the joke itself see n. 5 on p. 237: “Italikos s’est amusé à forger une étymologie les anciens avouaient leur ignorance”.

¹⁹ For the most recent analysis of the late antique discourse on bodily temperance see: M. Puijula: *Körper und christlichen Lebensweise. Clemens von Alexandria und sein Paidagogos*. Berlin and New York 2006.

cept from Alexander Kazhdan's and Simon Franklin's study of different accounts of the revolt of John Komnenos the Fat, as well as Liz James' and Anthony Eastmond's article on the consequences of gluttony,²⁰ the topic of representation of fat body in the middle and late Byzantine periods seems to be practically untouched. While some additional insights can be added to both of the quoted studies, my aim in the subsequent part of this article will be to suggest some additional methods of literary representations of fatness within Byzantine literature.

Undoubtedly, Byzantine discourse of obesity and gluttony stemmed on the one hand from ancient Greek tradition, on the other, from Christian frameworks, both of which have been finally blended into a uniform system of thought. It is hard not to discern Platonic threads within the discourse itself. In his *Timaeus* Plato speaks of the lower mortal soul, which is the seat of "fearful and necessary passions" (δεινὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα ἐν ἑαυτῷ παθήματα), among which there is a desire for pleasure, "the greatest attraction to evil" (μέγιστον κακοῦ δέλεαρ). As Plato argues, the gods mixed all other irrational sensations along with this urge (αἰσθήσει δὲ ἀλόγῳ καὶ ἐπιχειρητῇ παντὸς ἔρωτι συγκερασάμενοι).²¹ Accordingly, the lowly mortal soul was placed by the gods in another part of the body (i.e. the chest), to prevent the defilement of the immortal and godly soul, which was situated in the human head. The lowest part of the mortal soul (which is close to a *savage creature* – ὡς θρέμμα ἄγριον), responsible for the intake of food and drink, was situated as far as possible from the rational immortal soul, that is in the belly (γαστήρ). Such a solution ensured that the rational soul was distanced maximally from the inescapable bodily appetites (70d–e). But, as Plato argues further on, since the body must be fed in order to continue to live, the appetite for food and drink cannot be simply subdued and the rational soul must exert constant control over the mortal soul. When it fails to do so, the basest desires take charge of a human being.²²

Analogous frameworks, imbued with additional Christian connotations, can be gleaned from numerous passages from the Church Fathers, chiefly John Chrysostom and Clement of Alexandria. I would not like to engage in a detailed analysis of their outlooks on bodily overindulgence; hence I shall limit the discussion only to a number of representative quotations. Gluttony, according to both John and Clement, leads inevitably to fatness (πολυσαρκία), and to the utter perdition of one's soul. The very term used frequently to denote obesity, πολυσαρκία, bears strong connections with animality and savagery. Chrysostom uses this noun in his *Ninth Homily on the Hexaemeron* where, in his description of the elephants,

²⁰ A. Kazhdan, S. Franklin: *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the 11th and 12th Centuries*. Cambridge 1984, pp. 242–255. A. Eastmond, L. James: "Eat, Drink ... and pay the price". In: *Eat, Drink and be Merry...*, pp. 175–189.

²¹ *Platonis opera*, vol. 4. Ed. J. Burnet. Oxford 1902 (repr. 1968), 69c–d.

²² See the discussion by S.E. Hill: *Eating to Excess. The Meaning of Gluttony and Fat Body in the Ancient World*. Santa Barbara 2011, pp. 43–61.

he calls them “the mountains of flesh” (βουνοὶ τινες σάρκινοι).²³ Further, in his *Sermo Against the Jews*, he discerns:

But what is the source of this hardness? It come from gluttony and drunkenness. Who say so? Moses himself. “Israel ate and was filled and the darling grew fat and frisky”. When brute animals (τὰ ἄλογα) feed from a full manger, they grow plump and become more obstinate and hard to hold in check; they endure neither the yoke, the reins, nor the hand of the charioteer.²⁴

It is clear from the passage that living by one’s stomach renders one closer to a wild animal. In the *Paedagogus* Clement openly declares that those who live with the sole intention to eat are like irrational animals, for whom life is nothing more than their belly.²⁵ According to Clement, the proper name for those who live to eat is a “savage tribe of parasites” (II.1.7.3: ἄγρια τῶν παρασίτων φύλα), for they live “wallowing on their bellies” (II.1.7.6: ἐπὶ γαστέρας ἔρποντες). After the image of their father, himself a gluttonous beast (II.1.7.6–7: κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν τοῦ λίχνου θηρίου), they resemble rather wild beasts clothed in the form of men (θηρία ἀνδρεῖκελα).²⁶ Last, but not least, in the 35th *Homily on the Acts of the Apostles* Chrysostom compares the fat to the seals who drag their bodies along,²⁷ commenting further that eating from dawn until dusk is the property of an irrational beast.²⁸ A fat glutton spends his life in idleness, he has nothing manly in his appearance and resembling rather a savage beast in the shape of a man, and is unable to rise from his bed due to the elephant-like weight of his body.²⁹

As can be seen from this brief summary, overindulgence in corporeal delights, along with fatness which stems from it, perceived as emblems of savagery

²³ Basile de Césarée. *Homélies sur l’hexaéméron*. Ed. S. Giet. Paris 1968, IX.5.45–51.

²⁴ PG 48 col.846.B: Ἀλλὰ πόθεν αὕτη γέγονεν ἡ σκληρότης; Ἀπὸ ἀδηφαγίας καὶ μέθης. Τίς τοῦτο φησιν; Αὐτὸς ὁ Μωϋσῆς: Ἐφαγεν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη καὶ ἐλιπάνθη, καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαπημένος. Καθάπερ γὰρ τὰ ἄλογα, ἐπειδὴν δαψύλους ἀπολαύσει φάτνης, εἰς πολυσαρκίαν ἐκβάνα, φιλονεικότερα καὶ δυσκάθεκτα γίνεται, καὶ οὔτε ζυγοῦ, οὔτε ἡνίας, οὔτε ἡνίοχου χειρὸς ἀνέχεται. Translation by William Wilson. *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2*. Ed. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, A. Cleveland Coxe. New York 1885. Source: <<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/02091.htm>>, retrieved on 09/05/2016>.

²⁵ II.1.1.4 Οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι ζῶσιν, ἵνα ἐσθίωσιν, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα, οἷς οὐδὲν ἄλλ’ ἢ γαστήρ ἐστιν ὁ βίος.

²⁶ I am using the following edition of the text: *Clément d’Alexandrie vol. II. Le pédagogue, 3 vols*. Ed. Harl, H.-I. Marrou, C. Matray, C. Mondésert. Paris 1965.

²⁷ PG 60.256 col. B: Τίτι δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀηδὴς ἄνθρωπος πολυσαρκίαν ἀσκῶν, φώκης δίκην συρόμενος.

²⁸ Ibidem.

²⁹ PG 60 col.256.G: οὐδὲν ἔχων ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ πάντα θηρίου ἀνθρωπομόρφου· οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ δύνγροι, οἶνου τὸ στόμα ἀπόζον, ἡ ταλαίπωρος ψυχὴ καθάπερ ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένη ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμέτρως ἐγχεομένης ἐωλοκρασίας, τὸ μέγεθος τῶν σαρκῶν περιφέρουσα καθάπερ ἐλέφας.

(ἀγριότης, θηριότης). As Anthony Kaldellis has shown in his recent study, barbaric appetite for food (such as raw meat) and drinking was also a motif of ancient pedigree, and was repeatedly used in Byzantine ethnographical discourse.³⁰ Hayden White has moreover argued, wildness or savagery is a complex of symbols applied by social groups “to designate an area of sub-humanity that was characterized by everything they hoped they were not.”³¹ Following Foucault, White has discerned that such concepts can be filled with diverse contents depending on changing social context wherein they are used.³² Adapting this argument, I would like to contend that fatness-savagery had three essential facets in the eleventh and twelfth-century Byzantine literature. It pointed to *political savagery* (that is: using state’s resources to satisfy one’s personal whims), *social savagery* (that is: living at the expense of others, breaking the rules of commensality) and *religious savagery* (that is: living ungodly). From this perspective then, fatness and gluttony can be perceived as a means of differing oneself as a civilised/socialised man from the ones who break the norms prevalent in society.

Michael Psellos in his *Chronographia* famously portrayed the Emperor Constantine VIII (1025–28), as a man of enormous size (εὐμεγεθής τὸ σῶμα) and of constitution more robust than what is natural (ῥωμαλέωτερον εἶχε τῆς φύσεως). Constantine was a slave of his own lust and stomach, (ἡττητο δὲ καὶ γαστρὸς· καὶ ἀφροδισίων) and his belly possessed a specious ability of receiving foodstuffs of every kind.³³ As a result, Psellos writes, Constantine demonstrated an extraordinary ability to prepare rich sauces, and “subjected his entire nature to appetency” (καὶ πᾶσαν φύσιν πρὸς ὄρεξιν ἐκκαλούμενος).³⁴ Overcome by his bodily desires, he was moreover suffering from gout (τὰ ἄρθρα ἀλγῆμα), so that after his ascension to the throne he had to be carried by his servants.³⁵ Politically “savage” Constantine, who turned his full attention to horse races, beast-fighting shows and gambling, completely neglected the affairs of the state.³⁶

³⁰ A. Kaldellis: *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*. Philadelphia 2013.

³¹ H. White: “The Forms of Wildness”. In: Idem. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore 1978, p. 152.

³² Ibidem.

³³ In the original: ‘ἔρρωτό τε αὐτῷ ἡ γαστήρ’. The verb ἔρρωτό seems to suggesting that emperor’s only physical strength was an enormous capacity of his own stomach.

³⁴ *Michaelis Pselli Chronographia*. Ed. D.R. Reinsch. Berlin–Boston 2014, II.7.5.

³⁵ Psell. *Chron.* II.7.6–8. Gout was a traditional disease of the gluttons: J. Lascaratos: “‘Arthritis’ in Byzantium (AD 324–1453): Unknown Information from Non-Medical Literary Sources”. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 1995, Vol. 54, pp. 951–957. Cf. gout of Alexios III Angelos, mentioned by George Tornikes: J. Darrouzès: “Les discours d’Euthyme Tornikès (1200–1205)”. *Revue des études byzantines* 1968, Vol. 26, No. 9.I, pp. 63–64. For other instances of gout resulting from gluttony, see e.g. Michael Ducas on John V Palaiologos’ podagra: Ducas. *Istoria Turco-Bizantina (1341–1462)*. Ed. V. Grecu. Bucharest 1958, XIII.4.7–12

³⁶ Psell. *Chron.* II.8.1–5.

The argument, goes along the traditional lines which were expounded by Plato, Chrysostom and Clement (among others). The equation of the belly (γαστήρ) to sexual appetite is a motif as old as the Old Testament, where one of the frequent meanings of the above mentioned noun is “female womb”. Plato notoriously ascribes rationality to men and masculinity, while femininity is equalled by him to the lowest of bodily urges, including appetite for food. Similar insights are present in numerous Byzantine literary works. After all, it was Eve who incited Adam to eat the forbidden apple and, in its only extant Byzantine depiction, gluttony is illustrated as a woman, who is carrying an apple in one of her hands.³⁷ By extension, gluttony came to be inextricably connected to sexual lust, as, for instance, John Climacus explicitly states in his *Scala Paradisi*: γαστριμαργία ἐστὶν ... πορνείας πατήρ.³⁸

These are the sources of the equation mark in Psellos’ portrayal of Constantine between being a slave both to one’s stomach (γαστήρ) and lasciviousness (ἀφροδισία). Gambling and frequenting spectacles, mentioned by Psellos, were also standard *topoi* of the discourse of luxury.³⁹ What is interesting, nevertheless, is Constantine’s bestial stature – Psellos in fact does not use the standard term fat (e.g. εὔσαρκος, πολύσαρκος), but the adjectives which point to unnatural, bestial constitution of the Emperor. He is large, unnaturally robust and of nine feet height. Just as other savage animals he is overcome by his appetite and can eat anything – his entire life is given to bodily pleasures.

As numerous studies have shown, the Byzantines were fond of laughing at bodily deformations and disabilities⁴⁰, and fatness was perceived as another occasion to deride an individual. This, along with other traditional lines of discourse on fatness, was widely explored by an anonymous writer of a twelfth-century satire *Timarion*. It has already been noticed that the characters in the dialogue are ostensibly obsessed with food – and this is true especially of Theodore of Smyrna,

³⁷ For Plato in this respect see Ch.G. Allen: “Plato on Women”. *Feminist Studies* 1975, Vol. 2, No. 2/3, pp. 131–138. Ch. Harry, R. Polansky: “Plato on Women’s Natural Ability: Revisiting Republic v and Timaeus 41e3–44d2 and 86b1–92c3”. *Apeiron* 2015, pp. 1–20. The depiction of gluttony has been discussed by J.R. Martin: *Illustrations of the Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus*. Princeton 1954, p. 68.

³⁸ Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, PG.88 col. 864.C. On gluttony and femininity in antiquity see S.E. Hill: *Eating to Excess*, pp. 87–88. For the Ancient Greek identification of consumption and sexual fulfilment see: J.N. Davidson: *Courtesans and Fishcakes. The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. London 1997.

³⁹ F.H. Tinnefeld: *Kategorien der Kaiserkritik in der Historiographie von Prokop bis Niketas Choniates*. Munich, 1971.

⁴⁰ L. Garland: “The Mockery of the Deformed and Disabled in Graeco-Roman Culture”. In: *Laughter Down the Centuries. Vols. 1–3*. Eds. S. Jaekel, A. Timonen. Turku 1995, pp. 71–84. Idem: ““And His Bald Head Shone Like a Full Moon...”: An Appreciation of the Byzantine Sense of Humour as Recorded in Historical Sources of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries”. *Parergon. Bulletin of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 1990, Vol. 8, pp. 1–31.

the teacher of the main protagonist of the satire.⁴¹ Fatness becomes an incentive not only to expound Theodore's animal appetite but also, to mock his foolishness. When Timarion meets him in Hades, Theodore's stature is already skeleton-like (κατεσκληκώς). In addition, he is full of "wordiness/silly talk" (στομυλίας μεστός)⁴² and he blows up his mouth while talking (τὸ στόμα διογκῶν).⁴³ Not recognised by the protagonist of the satire, Theodore introduces himself, perhaps jokingly, as "the biggest sophist" (τὸν λαμυρώτατον σοφιστήν). The adjective λάμυρος encapsulates the multi-layered meaning of obesity in Byzantium. *LSJ* notes its meanings of full of abbyssness, but also gluttonous and wanton. The lexicon of pseudo-Zonaras moreover equates it with the adjective φλύαρος which carries the meanings of foolery, silly banter and nonsense.⁴⁴ Hence, Theodore's "fullness of words", his unnatural "puffing up" of his cheeks seem to be pointing to the fat body which he possessed during his life on the Earth *as well as* his actual lack of ability as a teacher of rhetoric. Timarion, upon recognising his teacher, is unable to understand how this healthy in vigorous body (ὕγειαν καὶ εὐεξίαν τοῦ σώματος) could possibly belong to Theodore of Smyrna, who was once famous mainly for the enormous size of his body (σώματος εὐμεγεθείαν). As a result of his gluttony and fatness, during his earthly life, Theodore was crippled by gout to such a point that had to be carried in front of the kings to deliver speeches (ἐξήρθρωτο τῇ ἀρθρίτιδι) – a motif present already in Psellos' *Chronographia*.⁴⁵ Theodore's current "lean" stature stands in stark contrast to his previous εὐμεγεθία; but even now some degree of monstrosity remains in the sophist, for in Hades he looks like a skeleton (κατεσκληκώς).

Theodore continues to explain to Timarion the reasons for his skinny silhouette. In the course of his earthly life, he earned a lot of gold which he squandered on extravagant meals (ἐστιάσεις πολυτελεῖς) and Sybaritic feasts (Συβαριτικά δεῖπνα).⁴⁶ Just as other tyrants, he lived "by the table".⁴⁷ All of these caused arthritis and exhausted Theodore's body and soul⁴⁸ – it is only in Hades that he

⁴¹ D. Krallis: "Harmless Satire, Stinging Critique: Notes and Suggestions for Reading the Timarion". In: *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*. Ed. D. Angelov, M. Saxby. Aldershot 2013, pp. 221–246. M. Alexiou: "Literary Subversion and the Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: A Stylistic Analysis of the Timarion (ch. 6–10)." *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 1982–83, Vol. 8, pp. 29–45. M. Alexiou: *After Antiquity: Greek Language, Myth and Metaphor*. New York 2002, pp. 96–148.

⁴² For στομυλία see: *Suda* σ.1152.

⁴³ Pseudo-Luciano "Timarione". Ed. A. Romano. Naples 1974, 23.575–576.

⁴⁴ *Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis, vol. II*. Ed. J.A.H. Tittmann. Leipzig 1900, Α.1282. Also see the entry on λάμυρος in *Etymologicum magnum*. Ed. T. Gaisford. Oxford 1848, 555.56–58.

⁴⁵ Similarly: *Timarion*, 24.606–10.

⁴⁶ *Timarion*, 24.601–4.

⁴⁷ *Timarion*, 24.607.

⁴⁸ See the twelfth-century *Life of St. Cyril Phileotes*, penned by Nicolaus Kataskepenos. According to the text, a fat body (*polusarkes*) stuffed with food is just like a vessel loaded with cargo

“stopped his maddened stomach” (μαργῶσαν γαστέρα κατέπαυσα), by living on healthy and restrictive diet.⁴⁹ Interestingly enough, the verb μαργαίνω, put into the “mouth” of Theodore in the passage, is a constituent of one of the Greek nouns which denote gluttony (γαστριμαργία), and it has close links with animality and irrationality.⁵⁰

Still, one of the most famous accounts of fat body from twelfth century Byzantium, is known from at least four sources: Niketas Choniates, Nikephoros Chrysoberges, Georgios Tornikes and Nicholas Mesarites – the accounts have already been compared and juxtaposed by A. Kazhdan.⁵¹ Their imagery, as Kazhdan has, perhaps too generally, pointed out, is quite similar. Tornikes, following well-worn literary *topoi*, refers indirectly to John as corpulent (full-of-meat, κρεωβαρής) or monstrous (ἀποφώλιος).⁵² Although gluttony is not named explicitly, direct Biblical quotations clearly associate John to the deadly sin: for instance 12.7–8 quotes *Deuteronomy* 32.15: “Jeshurun grew fat and kicked; filled with food, they became heavy and sleek.” Other terms employed by Tornikes, which clearly point to John’s fatness are: σὰρξ πεφυσημένος, ὑπέρογκος, μέγα σῶμα, ὄλκον τοῦ σῶματος.

John is also indirectly called an apostate (ἀποστάτης), a term which refers not only to his seditious nature, but also to his ungodliness. It must be borne in mind that in the Greek and Byzantine tradition the very area of the bowels (γαστήρ, ἔντερα), especially its upset and deformation, was traditionally linked with blasphemous heretics. This link can be gleaned for instance from Joseph Flavius’ account of Herod’s gastric illness and his subsequent death, or in the popular narrative of Arius’ death in Socrates’ *Hist. Eccles.*⁵³ Seen from this perspective, the epithet associated by Tornikes to John – ἀποστάτης – the obesity of the defector might be alluding to comparable meaning of religious transgression.

In addition, just as in the case of Theodore and Constantine VIII, John’s fatness is an indication of weak physical health. He breathes hard (ἀσθμαίνοντα),

– it cannot be guided and is easily wrecked. *La Vie de Saint Cyrille le Philéote Moine Byzantin*. Ed. E. Sargologos. Bruxelles 1964, 40.6.21 ff. Kataskepenos quotes here Basil’s *Commentary in Isaia*, 2.93.

⁴⁹ *Timarion*, 24.615.

⁵⁰ *LSJ*, cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.882.

⁵¹ A. Kazhdan, S. Franklin: “Nicephorus Chrysoberges and Nicholas Mesarites: a Comparative Study”. In: Idem: *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Cambridge 1984, pp. 224–255. Also: Nicholas Mesarites, *Die Palastrevolution des Johannes Komnenos*. Ed. A. Heisenberg. Wurzburg 1907.

⁵² Tornikes, *Or.* I.12.19–20.

⁵³ According to Flavius, Herod died because of intestinal inflammation *Flavii Iosephi opera* vol. 6. Ed. B. Niese. Berlin 1895, I.656–658. Arius’ intestines supposedly burst out after his dissimulated confession of Orthodox faith, *Historia Ecclesiastica* I.38. In: *Socrate de Constantinople, Histoire ecclésiastique (Livres I–VII)*. Ed. P. Maraval, P. Périchon. Paris 2004–2007, I.38.7. For the extensive discussion of the story see: S. Muehlberger: “The Legend of Arius’ Death The Legend of Arius’ Death: Imagination, Space and Filth in Late Ancient Historiography”. *Past and Present* 2015, Vol. 227, No. 1, pp. 3–29.

the enormous weight of his body (ὕπὸ τοῦ βαρέος ἐκείνου καὶ νοθροῦ) causes the throne to break – an image with which adds additional comic force to the scene.⁵⁴ John's body is moreover "blown out" (φυσῶδες),⁵⁵ which might be yet another pun on his gluttony – in the Greek *Materia Medica* the adjective was used to denote the gas-producing food.⁵⁶ John is depicted moreover an Empedoclean monster (τὰ ἐμπεδόκλεια τέρατα), or a gorgon, whose head was to be cut off (and indeed: John was finally decapitated). Kazhdan is certainly right to notice that the portrayal dwells upon deconcretisation, and not many factual details are present in the text. However, what the speech points to at literary level is a complex web of opposite pairs of meanings of good and evil, savage and civilised, beastly and manly, abnormal and ordinary – all of which are conveyed by the references to gluttony and fatness. All of these motives, once again, equate fatness with savagery on the social, religious and political levels.

Yet, the account of Niketas Choniates appears as somewhat more intricate than that of Tornikes. Choniates describes John as possessing large stomach and as a jar-like man: προκοίλιος, πιθώδης.⁵⁷ The jar, πίθος is, of course, a traditional wine-jar, thus the term might potentially point to John's drunkenness, another moral vice endemic to the gluttons.⁵⁸ John's stupidity (or sloth) is alluded to as well – he did not care either to set guards or to reinforce the gates pulled down by his accomplices.⁵⁹ Fatness (and gluttony) and silliness went hand to hand in ancient Greek tradition – for Plato, gluttony meant delving into utter irrationality of base bodily impulses, while Herakles and Odysseus in their popular fat guises were presented as complete fools.⁶⁰ Choniates, just as Tornikes, does not miss the chance mock John's corpulent posture. Animality is present as well in Choniates' portrait – because of his obesity, John "poured out gushes of water just like a dolphin,"⁶¹ and evaporated litres of sweat. Due to this sickly excessive perspiration John is portrayed emptying the entire vessels of water (ὕδατος ὅλα κεράμια

⁵⁴ Tornikes, *Or.* I.13.19–20. Ὁ δὲ γε θῶκος οὐκέτι θῶκος μείναι πάλιν ἠνέσχετο· κατεάγη γὰρ ἐς τὸ παντελὲς ὑπὸ τοῦ βαρέος ἐκείνου καὶ νοθροῦ σώματος.

⁵⁵ An aspect which is present in other accounts of the revolt. A. Kazhdan, S. Franklin: *Studies...*, pp. 244–245.

⁵⁶ As *TLG* search indicates, a vast majority of instances of uses of this adjective is restricted to medical sources.

⁵⁷ vD 526.14–15: προκοίλιος δ' ὦν καὶ πιθώδης. Trapp translates προκοίλιος as "mit vorge-wölbtem Bauch" (*LBG*).

⁵⁸ Correspondingly, Psellos in his canon (Psell. *Poem.* XXX) against the drunken monk Jacob, who "squeezes wine into the *pithos* of his stomach" (XXII.11–12: ἀποθλίβει τὸν οἶνον ὥσπερ εἰς πίθον τὸν στόμαχον); XXII.30 and 70: ἐν τῇ τοῦ πίθου γαστρί. Jacob is otherwise presented as an unsatiated animal (XXII.13 ζῶον ἀκόρεστον) with a "broad stomach (XXII.23: πλατεῖαν γαστέρα) which is familiar only to the business of drinking (XXII.67: τῇ ἐργασίᾳ τῆς μέθης). I am referring to the following edition: *Michaelis Pselli Poemata*. Ed. L.G. Westerink. Leipzig–Stuttgart 1992.

⁵⁹ vD 527.47–48.

⁶⁰ See the discussion in: S.E. Hill: *Eating to Excess*, pp. 81–102.

⁶¹ vD 527.50: κατὰ δέλφιναν ἀναφυσών.

ἐκκενῶν). Finally, John, the enormous beast, fails in his revolutionary attempt and is killed in a beastly manner: his head is cut off and, still spilling blood, suspended on the arch in the agora. In one of the last scenes of the episode, the emperor Alexios III stares at John's corpse which appears to him to be larger than a swollen gigantic bull (ὕπερ βοῦν διωδηκότι μεγαλόπλευρον).⁶²

One more fat "savage" can be found in Choniates' *Chronike Diegesis*. This is a man by the name of Thomas who arrives from Venice as a Patriarch of Constantinople, who is fatter than a well-fed swine (τὴν δὲ σωματικὴν πλάσιν λακκευτοῦ συὸς εὐτραφέστερος).⁶³ His gluttonous effeminacy and lasciviousness is only confirmed by his smoothly-shaved (thus feminine or barbarous)⁶⁴ face (λεῖος) and head, while his chest is "as smooth as a pitch-plaster" (καὶ τὰς ἐνστηθίους παρατετιλμένος τρίχας ἀκριβέστερον δρώπακος). Even his attendants are as closely shaved and as effeminate as their master. The very word λακκευτός (lit. cistern-like, hence also cavernous) seems to be a pun on Thomas' boundless greed.⁶⁵ The term not only points to Thomas' effeminacy, but again it introduces his barbarity and bestiality. Just after this introduction Choniates describes how the Latins, whose love of riches is innate, plundered and defiled Constantinople in 1204.⁶⁶

The abyss of an insatiable belly, a theme which so frequently recurs in the above portraits of the fat, is also widely discussed in the ninth oration of Eustathios of Thessalonike.⁶⁷ In one of the paragraphs which dwells on the idea of fasting and which censures living in luxury, Eustathios leaves a number of remarks which connect fatness with luxury, waste, animality and perdition.⁶⁸ The life of an over-indulgent man, led in between the table and his flesh, is as ungodly as possible. For the chasm of the belly (τὸ τῆς γαστρὸς χάος) can never be filled.⁶⁹ The belly is a cistern, a pit, or even an abyss (which Eustathios describes in the familiar terms:

⁶² vD 528.74–75. Μεγαλόπλευρον: lit. with big flanks (LBG). Cf. Tornikes, *Or.* I.15.23 ff Εἶπεν ἄν τις, ἐπισκώπτων τῷ πτόματι, βοῦν εἶναι τοῦτον, οἷον οἱ ἐκ μακέλλης φυσῶσιν, ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνωσιν.

⁶³ vD 647.8–9. See also the description of fat George Dishypatos in: vD 266.17–18.

⁶⁴ vD 647.9: ἦν δὲ καὶ λεῖος ξυρῶ τὸ τοῦ προσώπου ἔδαφος. On a general discussion of beard and its meaning in Byzantium see the entry "beards" in *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. I. Eds. A.P. Kazhdan, A.M. Talbot, A. Cutler, T.E. Gregory, N.P. Sevcenko. New York–Oxford 1991, p. 274.

⁶⁵ LBG notes the meaning "gemästet" (battered). In the tradition of Old Comedy, known to Choniates through Aristophanic comedies, *lakkos*-derivatives were used as the cognomens of prostitutes and sexual pathics. *Lakkos* denotes a cistern and the metaphor points to enormous capacities for the intake of food and semen of the ones who are cistern-like. See: J.N. Davidson: *Courtesans and Fishcakes*, pp. 176–177. Choniates might be pointing to such a meaning here.

⁶⁶ vD 647.19 ff.

⁶⁷ I am following the newest edition of the speech: *Eustathii Thessalonicensis opera minora (magnam partem inedita)*. Ed. P. Wirth. Berlin 1999.

⁶⁸ Eust. *Or.* 9.165.47 ff.

⁶⁹ Eust. *Or.* 9.165.52–3.

λάκκος, βόθρος, φρέαρ) into which one can so easily fall, but out which it is not easily to recover.⁷⁰ It is a wild animal, a beast (έρπετόν), for it is omnivorous, gluttonous and insatiable.⁷¹ It is like a boundless sea which cannot be sailed through and, as Eustathius continues, “one must refrain from the waters of this sea in order that the wild beasts are not multiplied, and so that the deceiving serpent might not triumph in it.”⁷² This destructive pit (φρέαρ ἀλλότριον) was dug out under ourselves, it violates symmetry, it is always engrossed by living in opulence.⁷³ The mouth of this cistern, therefore, must be necessarily closed – if not completely (as it is simply impossible), it must be reduced through the intake of little nourishment to the size of the tiniest hole.⁷⁴ Only in this way might a man slip from the utter destruction. The passage, in short, summarizes the ideas conveyed by the above-mentioned texts – gluttony is a bestial urge and the individual who serves his stomach becomes a savage animal. The stomach is a chasm which can never be filled to the full. Attempts to fill this beastly abyss will simply end up in one’s utter destruction and downfall to Hades (Hell).⁷⁵

Concluding remarks

Although there is vast amount of work yet to be conducted, this preliminary sketch shows that the Byzantine perceptions of fatness, as represented in the literary sources, show common features in a number of points. Obesity was regularly used by the Byzantine authors as an element of the discourse of luxury, which was founded both on ancient Greek themes (e.g. Plato) and Christian *topoi* (e.g. Biblical tradition; Church Fathers). Since the ancient times fatness seems to have been an emblem of animality, irrationality and beastly living “with one’s mind concentrated on flesh” (νοῦς σάρκινος). Following Hayden White, I have been attempting to suggest that fatness-gluttony can be read as “savagery”, understood as heuristic

⁷⁰ Eust. *Or.* 9.165.53–54: λάκκος αὕτη καὶ βόθρος, εἰς ὃν κύψας τις (μὴ γὰρ γένοιτο κατακυλισθῆναι τίνα εἰς αὐτόν).

⁷¹ Eust. *Or.* 9.165.57–60: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐρπετὰ εἶναι εἶπη τις περὶ αὐτήν ... οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἂν ἔχοι τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπάδειν διὰ τὸ παμφάγον καὶ λίχνον καὶ βορὸν τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν ὀρέξεως.

⁷² Eust. *Or.* 9.165.62–64: Ταύτης τῆς θαλάττης ἐπισχετέον τὰ ἐπιρρέοντα, ἵνα μῆτε τὰ ἐρπετὰ πληθύνωνται μῆτε ὁ ἐμπαίκτης δράκων καταχορεύῃ αὐτῆς.

⁷³ Eust. *Or.* 9.165.64–65: φρέαρ καὶ ἡ γαστήρ ἀλλότριον ὑπὸ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ὀρυσσόμενον, ὀπηνίκα πρὸς τρυφῆς πλατύνεται καὶ τὴν συμμετρίαν παραβιάζεται.

⁷⁴ Eust. *Or.* 9.165.66–69. Similarly, Climacus, *Scala Paradisi* PG 88 col. 868.B: Μαλασσόμενοι ἄσκοι ἐπιδιδούσι τῇ χωρήσει, περιφρονούμενοι δὲ οὐ τοσοῦτον δέχονται· ὁ καταναγκάζων γαστέρα αὐτοῦ, ἐπλάτυνεν ἔντερα· ὁ δὲ ἀγωνιζόμενος πρὸς αὐτήν, συνέσφιγξε ταῦτα· τούτων δὲ συσφιγθέντων, οὐ πολλὰ δέχονται· καὶ τότε λοιπὸν γινόμεθα φυσικῶς νηστεύοντες.

⁷⁵ Eust. *Or.* 9.165.70–72.

tool which differentiates the civilised and socialised “us” from barbaric, unsocial, immoral and blasphemous “others”.

I have commenced this article with some remarks on historical analysis of literary sources, analysis which is still much-needed in the area of Byzantine cuisine and diet, but which has its limitations. The field, will not be fully comprehended if we limit our efforts to extrapolating raw data from the texts and ignoring literary artistry, complexity and cultural milieu of their authors. Yet, as Stanley Fish in his much-debated theory of “interpretive communities” has stressed, the immense significance of cultural context on our interpretation of a literary text. According to Fish, the individuals who participate in common educational system, share similar set of social values, perceptions of both the reality and the self become also the members of the interpretive communities and “share interpretive strategies” for understanding the written works.⁷⁶ These strategies therefore deeply influence the understanding of what is read by the individuals within a given cultural context.⁷⁷ Following these lines, I would like to conclude with a remark that Byzantine representations of consumption need be considered within their specific and complex background so that their hidden meaning can be uncovered, at least to some degree.

⁷⁶ S.E. Fish: “Interpreting the ‘Variorum’”. *Critical Inquiry* 1976, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 465–485.

⁷⁷ For similar issues regarding contextual reading of 10th- to 11th-century Byzantine military compendia see: C. Holmes: “Political Culture and Compilation Literature in the Tenth and 11th centuries: Some preliminary Inquiries”. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 2010, Vol. 64, pp. 55–80.

Thomas Sapota

*Litterarum Graecarum et Latinarum
Cathedra Universitatis Silesiae Catoviciae*

Romanus Sosnowski

*Litterarum Romanicarum Institutum
Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviae*

Lanfranci Mediolanensis *Chirurgia parva* prima editione Latina anni MCDXCVIII nonnullis aliis comparata

Abstract: This paper presents the first modern edition of Lanfranc of Milan's *Chirurgia parva* based on its *editio princeps* together with introductory notes in Latin.

Key words: history of medicine, Lanfranc of Milan, *Chirurgia parva*, Latin medieval medical treatises.

De editionis consilio ac ratione

Hoc fasciculo foras dare intendimus librum medicinalem a Lanfranco chirurgo Mediolanensi scriptum, Medio Aevo late celebratum, *Chirurgia parva* quae vocatur. Quamquam opusculum illud in vernaculas linguas versum plurimum arti chirurgicae progrediendae necnon sermoni medicinali variarum gentium florescendo profuit¹, tamen ad hunc diem moderna scriptura in medium

¹ C. De Tovar: «Les versions françaises de la “Chirurgia parva” de Lanfranc de Milan: Étude de la tradition manuscrite». *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, Fasc. 12–13, 1983 1982, pp. 195–262.; Annika Asplund, *A middle English version of Lanfranc's Chirurgia parva: the surgical part*. Stockholm, University of Stockholm, 1970; S. Scholle: «Lanfranks “Chirurgia parva” in mittelniederfränkischer Übertragung». Diss., Würzburg, Würzburg 1978; J. Tyrkkö: «“Halles Lanfranke” and its most excellent and learned expositive table». *Words in Dictionaries and History: Essays in*

non est prolatum, licet illo historiae artis medicinalis intenti atque litterarum docti studiis suis uti possint^{II}.

Textus Latinus editione principi anni MCDXCVIII^{III} constat aliquibus aliis, quae annis MCDXCIX^{IV}, MDXIII, MDXIX ac MDXLVI in lucem prolatae sunt, perlectis ac illi comparatis nullisque gravioris momenti variationibus inventis. Cautissimi ac timidissimi editores id egimus, ut quam minimum archetypum mutaremus, sed textus explicandi causa censuimus opus esse punctuationem modernam introduceremus ac abbreviationes expanderemus.

De Lanfranci vita et operibus

Lanfranci nomen clarius fuit foras quam in Italia, de qua originem suam duxit. Inter medicos celeberrimae academiae chirurgicae Parisii fundatae versatus est et medicos quinto decimo saeculo illustrissimos, e.g. Henricum de Mondeville et Guidonem de Cauliaco, doctrina erudit gloria artis suae in fines Hispanorum, Germanorum, Batavorum ac Anglorum perveniente. Mediolani natus^V circa annum MCCXLV, Bononiae apud Gulielmum de Saliceto studiis incubuit. Deinde Mediolani arti medicinali exercendae se totum dedit, sed labori fructuosissimo, ut de eius opere praecipuo, *Chirurgia magna* quae vocatur, disci potest, finem Matthaeus Visconti fecit, qui ira partium dissensione inducta Lanfrancum circa annum MCCXC urbe expulit. Is Lugdunum primum venit, deinde, circa annum MCCXCV, Parisii sedem petivit, ubi medicinae exercendae atque institutioni studiosorum operam dabat.

Qui medicinae historiae periti sunt, Lanfranci libros non tam ad rationem ac viam artis renovandam, quam ad chirurgos Francogallos, qui illo tempore minoris Italicis aestimati sint, rebus recentioribus imbuendos valuisse censent. Lanfrancus

honour of R.W. McConchie. Ed. O. Timofeeva, T. Säily. Berlin–New York, John Benjamins, 2011, pp. 17–40.

^{II} Cf. R. Sosnowski: *Volgarizzamento della Chirurgia parva di Lanfranco da Milano nel manoscritto Ital. quart. 67 della collezione berlinese, conservato nella Biblioteca Jagellonica di Cracovia*. Kraków, Wydział Filologiczny Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2014.

^{III} «Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke», Database, 2003, <http://www.Gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/>, par. 11696; 1498 (impens. Octaviani Scoti, Venetiis: Bonetus Locatellus, 21 novembre, 1498). Editio princeps in Bibliotheca Virtual de Andalucia: <http://www.bibliotecavirtualdeandalucia.es/> inveniri potest. Editio anno 1499 confecta impensis Andreae Torresani per Simonem de Luere, in Bayerische Statsbibliothek servatur: http://daten.digital-e-sammlungen.de/bsb00053985/Image_1.

^{IV} «Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke», Database, 2003, [.Gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/](http://www.Gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/), cpv. 11696.

^V S. Alleori: *Lanfranco da Milano: vita ed opere*. Roma 1967; *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Vol. lxiii. Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 2004, s.v. Lanfranco da Milano.

ipse hoc modo in sua *Chirurgia magna* de honoribus, quibus Parisii lautus esset, scripsit:

Ubi tantam et talem habui comitivam qualis et quante centesimo non sum dignus. Ubique rogatus a quibusdam dominis et magistris, et specialiter a viro venerando domino magistro Joanne de Passavanto magistrorum medicine nec non a quibusdam valentibus bachalariis omni dignis honore, quod ea que de rationibus chirurgie legendo dicebam et meum operationis modum et experimenta quibus utebar, in scriptis ad comunem utilitatem et recordationem perpetuam compilarem, ipsorum petitionem admittens onus assumpsi iamdudum in mente propositum, quod non modicum extimavi.^{VI}

De vita sua paucissima, quae ipse libris suis implicuit, conici possunt, quin etiam, quo anno mortuus sit, incertum videtur et intra MCCCVI ac MCCCXV^{VII} ponitur. Dubitari tamen non potest, quin duo opera sua *Chirurgia magna* et *Chirurgia parva* quae vocentur Medio Aevo clara fuerint et laudibus elata.

Chirurgia parva hoc modo dividitur:

Prologus

- I. De intentione cyrurgici
- II. De vulnere facto cum puncta alicuius instrumenti ut gladio vel sagitta
- III. De vulnere facto cum ense vel alia re incidente
- IV. De incisione nervi
- V. De fluxu sanguinis ex vena vel arteria
- VI. De vulnere in carne cum osse
- VII. De vulnere capitis cum fractura cranei
- VIII. De omni vulnere sine fractura cranei
- IX. De morsu canis rabidi
- X. De apostematibus
- XI. De curis apostematum omnium
- XII. De ulceribus differentia
- XIII. De algebra sive restauratione
- XIV. De fractura ossis
- XV. De egritudinibus oculi
- XVI. De antidotis

Ultimum quidem caput in quattuor partes disponitur, quibus diversae species medicamentorum describuntur: medicinae repressivae, maturativae, mundificativae, conglutinativae, regenerativae, consolidativae, mollitivae et ulcerantes. In toto opere Lanfrancus id egit, ut rationem et usum artis aequo modo exponeret:

^{VI} Lanfrancus Mediolanensis, «Chirurgia magna». Venezia 1498, fol. 210v.

^{VII} DBI, *op.cit.*, vol. lxiii, s.v. Lanfranco da Milano.

ambo etiamsi medico adiumento essent, solum tamen experimentum rationem redderet efficacior. Qui ita in *Chirurgiae parvae* capitulo XIV scripsit:

Scias, quod ad omne opus cyrurgie multum est utile, imo necessarium, quod medicus viderit operari bonum cyrurgicum ultra scientiam, quam invenerat in scriptis et specialiter in algebra. Nam omnis scientia, que dependet ab operatione, multum corroboratur per experimentum.

Traditio

Plurima sunt *Chirurgiae parvae* codices, quorum Keil XLVIII numerat^{VIII}, at nos sine metu, ne in errorem labamur, dicamus unaquaque universitate Medio Aevo florescente licet unum illius tractatus manuscriptum inveniri posse videri, e.g. intra Codices Palatinos Bibliotheca Vaticana asservatos quattuor: Pal. Lat. 1165 (ff. 131va-137vb), Pal. Lat. 1179 (f.158r-167v), Pal. Lat. 1260 (f. 304 ra-313vb), Pal. Lat. 1305 (ff. 1r-18r), quibus duo Palatinis non inclusi adduntur: Reg. Lat. 1345, Reg. Lat. 1963. In Iagellonica Bibliotheca Cracoviae, ut nostrorum et proximorum mentionem faciamus, codex 849 ambas *Chirurgiam parvam* atque *magnam* continens asservatur. Quia traditio codicum tam copiosa et multifaria opus quam celerrime recentiore scriptione *Chirurgiae parvae* edendae, ut usui viris ac feminis doctis esset, impedivit, visum est nobis editionem principem sequi pro certum habentibus Lanfrancum non, ut delectaret, sed ut doceret, scripsisse. *Chirurgia parva* in collectionem artis medicae tractatum annis MCDXCVIII, MCDXCIX, MDXIII, MDXIX, MDXLVI inserta^{IX} est. Quia tenuis, maioribusque operibus pressa facile omitti potest, quamquam quippe ipsa in sermones vernaculos versa tam universe celebrata est, in medium eam proferimus, ut doctis et rebus medicinae ac linguarum historiae studentibus subsidio sit.

^{VIII} G. Keil: «Lanfrank von Mailand». *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1985, col. 563.

^{IX} Collectio chirurgica Venetiana, qua opera Guidonis de Cauliaco, Theodorici, Bruni Longoburgensis, Rolandi Parmensis, Rogerii Frugardi, Leonardi de Bertapalia et Lanfranci Mediolanensis continentur.

Editio (1498: 161r–166r):

Incipit Parva Chirurgia Magistri Lanfranci Mediolanensis

Intendens, venerabilis amice Bernarde, componere librum, in quo tradam omnium concedente deo datore plenam doctrinam ad instrumentum cyrurgicum pertinentem, non propono in presenti opusculo tradere tibi nisi pauca levia et probata. Que licet brevia, tamen propter magnam utilitatem eam non vilipendas, sed de his proponas plenarie considerare. Pono namque summarie, secundum tuam petitionem, probatas medicinas et modum curationis brevem vulnerum et apostematum, ulcerarum, cancrorum et fistularum et quasdam oculorum curas, et de algebra parum, secundum quod me ratio docuit operari et experimento sunt per me longo tempore roborata. Confido namque adeo de subtilitate tui intellectus, quod per illa pauca, tamen tuo ingenio, ad magnum opus poteris pervenire et quod inde nomen magni medici consequeris. Coniuro te tamen, per deum et nobilitatem tuam, ne aliquibus ydiotis tradas illud, ne per ignorantiam eorum opus meum noceat alicui, quod ad communem utilitatem est tibi caritate collatum.

De intentione cyrurgici. Cap. I.

Attende, quod in omni opere medicus debet supponere certam intentionem et uti rebus, que ipsum adiuvent ad intentionem. In vulneribus vero curandis intentio prima est vera consolidatio, que quidem fieri non potest nisi in vulnere simplici facto in carne, nam alia membra consimilia, scilicet ossa, nervi, cartilagines, panniculi cutis non consolidantur vera restauratione vel consolidatione, quia eorum materia fuit sperma parentum. Sed loco rei ex eis perditae restauratur aliquid, quod supplet vicem eius quodam erat amissum; licet de nervis, venis et arteriis diversa sit opinio. Nam aliqui credunt, quod consolidentur vera consolidatione. Alii dicunt quod non, sed restaurantur. Sed ego dico, quod non consolidantur vera consolidatione, quando eorum sectio est magna et consolidantur vera consolidatione, si est parva. Sed caro cuius materia est sanguis, qui quotidie in corpore generatur, bene recipit veram restaurationem. Unde in vulnere facto in carne semper sit tua intentio consolidare, nisi una septem rerum tibi contradicat. Prima est, si fuerit punctus nervus. Secunda, si vulnus fuerit usque ad os. Tertia, si cum vulnere fuerit apostema. Quarta, si fuerit ibi mala discrasia. Quinta, si in vulnere sit equa concavitas. Sexta, si vulnus fuerit cum contusione. Septima, si vulnus factum fuerit ab aliquo animali venenoso. Que omnia ex necessitate ducunt medicum ad aliam intentionem, secundum quod aperte docebo et primo.

De vulnere facto cum puncta alicuius instrumenti ut gladio vel sagitta. Cap. II.

Incipiam ergo a vulnere simplici carente predictis rebus VII. Illud ergo vulnus vide, utrum sit factum cum puncta alicuius instrumenti sicut cum cultello, lancea vel sagitta, vel alio simili. Et illud omnibus citius consolidatur, quia, si non tetigit nervum nec panniculum, nec chordam, nec musculus tegentem os suppositum, cuius rei signum est doloris carentia, non est tibi necessarium nisi ponere tentam infusam in oleo rosato, quod teneat cutim apertam per unum diem et facere infirmum quiescere ab omni opere illius membri. Et si caret omni dolore et tumore, permittas vulnus claudi. Et facis ipsum quiescere per duos dies. Et erit sanus. Si autem dolorem haberet, signum est nervi, panniculi, chorde vel musculi puncti. Et tunc necesse est, quod infundas totum vulnus de oleo rosato calido et facias tentam non nimis grossam nec longam, sed talem, quae non constringat nervum et quae nullum faciat dolorem.

Et infunde eam in oleo rosato et vitello ovi calido et suprapone repercussivum de eadem medicina et circuminunge membrum de medicina facta de uncia I olei rosati et unciis II aceti et unciis 5 boli armeni. Hoc fac, donec sedatus sit omnis dolor et vulnus faciat saniem, quia tunc est securum ab apostemate et spasmo. Postea pone in vulnere tentam siccam de panno, molli tamen, et supra mundificativum, quod fit de unciis III mellis rosati colati et uncia I subtilissime farine hordei et unciis 5 terbentine lavate insimul parum bullitis ad perfectionem emplastri non duri. Et sic ad finem curabitur. Et nota, quod terbentina non debet decoqui cum aliis, sed debet poni in fine decoctionis.

Si per infusionem olei rosati et defensionem boli armeni supradicti non cessaret dolor, facias egrum flobotomari, si est fortis, ex parte contraria. Si est debilis, fac scarificari et facias ipsum assellare per suppositorium omni die. Et iniunge ei dietam strictam usque ad sedationem apostematis doloris et inflationis. Et inunctio facta de bolo armeno et oleo rosato et aceto circa vulnus semper continuetur, ut dictum est. Nec aliquo modo propter inflationem factam ex punctura nervi ponas aliquod emplastrum de herbis et axungiis vel aliquibus marcentibus nec propter dolorem tangat membrum aqua calida, quia omnia ista sunt causae putrefactionis et perditionis membri.

De vulnere facto cum ense vel alia re incidente. Cap. III.

Si vero vulnus factum fuerit cum ense vel alia re incidente secundum longum, vide, si est ita parvum, quod sola ligatura cum plumaceolo possit tenere partes coniunctas. Sufficit tibi coniungere partes et ponere supra plumaceolum de stuppa infusum in albumine ovi et ligare cum binda et non indiges altra medicina. Si vero est tam magnum, quod ligatura non sufficiat, sue vulnus cum acu quadrata et filo

equali incerato et semper fiant puncti impares, si possibile sit, incipiendo in una extremitate vulneris, postea in alia, postea in medio et postea ex utraque parte medii puncti. Et fac ibi tot punctos, quot sunt necessarii elongando unum punctum ab alio per quantitatem unius uncie I digiti minoris vel medii dimittens inferiori parte orificium apertum, per quod immittas unam tentam, per quam expurgetur vulnus. Super suturam pone pulverem factum de parte I thuris et II sanguinis draconis et III calcis vive et aliquando sola calx facit opus. Super pulverem ponatur petiola panni intincta in albumine ovi. Postea ligetur cum binda et plumaceolis et conservetur sutura et sic inungatur vel mutetur, ut consolidetur usque ad finem.

Si autem isto tempore vulnus mutaretur ab aere et faceret saniem, et solverentur puncti, mundificetur cum medicina facta ex una parte farine tritici et II mellis et III aque simul bullitis ad modum pultis usque ad finem. In fine ponantur supra vulnus stuppe infuse in vino calido.

De incisione nervi. Cap. IIII

Attende hic, quod, si ex vulnere ensis vel similis nervus in brachio vel manu, crure, collo vel pede incideretur ex transverso. Quod licet Theodoricus et multi alii dicant contrarium, quod bonum est et utile suere nervum cum acu, quando suis vulnus in superficie utriusque capitis nervi incisi, et cum sutura continuare capita nervi ad invicem. Et supra talem suturam nervi pone oleum rosatum, in quo bullierint vermes terrestres longi, qui dicuntur lumbrici, et conserva suturam tam propter consolidationem nervi quam propter consolidationem vulneris exterioris. Ex hac enim sutura fit nobilior consolidatio et melior reparatio. Ita, quod aliquando, specialiter in corpore pueri et re vera per talem suturam recuperatur motus membri, cui serviebat nervus incisus, qui non recuperaretur, si sutura non fieret in nervo. Nec timeas de dolore, qui dicitur fieri propter suturam acus in nervo, quia talis dolor mitigatur incontinenti per oleum predictum nec talis dolor potest inducere spasmus propter totalem incisionem nervi.

De fluxu sanguinis ex vena vel arteria. Cap. V.

Si fluxus sanguinis egredientis ex vena vel arteria te impedit, stringe eum sic. Recipe thuris partem I, aloe partes 5 et pulveriza et incorpora cum albumine ovi usque ad spissitudinem mellis et pilos leporis minutissime incisos intus incorpora. Pone digitum tuum in loco et tange pulsum, unde exit sanguis.

Et tene per horam, et suppone de illa medicina abundanter. Et cave, ne in hora mutationis illam medicinam vi auferas. Sed, si adheret firmiter loco, appone de eadem medicina magis liquida supra ipsam medicinam predictam, donec cadat

a vulnere sine violentia, quia tunc erit consolidata vena vel arteria. Et huic medicine non est par in restringendo sanguinem et consolidando venam.

De vulnere in carne cum osse. Cap. VI.

Quando autem cum vulnere carnis est vulnus in osse, non oportet, ut consolides vulnus carnis ante restaurationem ossis. Restaurationem dico, quoniam os nunquam consolidatur vera consolidatione, sed loco ossis oritur quedam caro callosa, que vocatur porus sarcoydes vel caro poroydes, que stat loco ossis, que quidem reparatio debet expectari, antequam consolidetur vulnus, quod est in carne. Alioquin non fieret reparatio, quia humiditas carnis impediret, cum reparamentum non posset fieri, nisi locus ultimo desiccretur, ossa namque sunt siccissima et materia reparamenti est ossium nutrimentum, quod naturaliter est siccum. Nutrire non est aliud quam nutrimentum cum nutritio assimilare, quare nutritio sit per similia sicut diminutio per contrarium. Et quia inter cetera ossium vulnera periculosiora sunt vulnera ossium capitis, quia in vulneribus capitis cum fractura cranei fieret consolidatio carnis ante reparamentum ossis, esset causa mortis propter nobilitatem cerebri et accidentia pessima, que sequuntur, ab illis in curis ossium capitis incipiam.

De vulnere capitis cum fractura cranei. Cap. VII.

Cum vulnus sit in capite et cum fractura cranei, considera, si fractura transit ad interiora, quod potest sciri multis modis, scilicet per perseverationem vomitus et doloris, parvitatem oculi cum lachrymis et curvitatem aspectus, et incensionem, et circuitionem oculorum. Et per experimenta, que non fallunt, scilicet, quod ponas in dentibus egri filum bistortum inceratum et teneat illud eger firmiter cum dentibus, et tunc incipias apud os cum unguibus tuis.

Et duc ungues stringendo filum et faciendo sonum usque ad aliud caput fili, quod distabit per cubitum ab ore et facies hoc pluribus vicibus, si patiens potest sustinere sonum et non sentiat dolorem, non habet fractum craneum. Si autem fractum esset, nullo modo posset sustinere confricationem unguium super filum. Item percutiatur caput cum levi baculo sicco de salice vel de pino et pone aurem tuam apud caput. Et si sanum est os, tunc audies sonum sanum. Si fractum aut scissum, audies sonum mutum secundum comparisonem factam a campana sana ad campanam scissam. Neque confidas in expectando signa bene comedendi, dormiendi, assellandi et similibus, de quibus Rolandus et Rogerius dicit, quod sunt fallibilia. Sed aliquando est manifesta tibi per tactum ipsius cranei. Cum ergo certus es de fractura cranei penetrante, vide, si vulnus cutis est minus quam fractura ipsius cranei et amplia illud, dummodo non videas signa mortis, quia tunc nihil est de novo faciendum. Ampliato vulnere tantum, ut oportet, detegatur tota fractura cranei.

Inde, si pars fracta subintravit sanum os aut si sit ibi aliquod frustum, a quo pungatur dura mater, quia in his duobus casibus oportet te remove partem ossis suppositam cum instrumentis et frustula omnino remove; et tunc removeas. Vide, ubi pars supposita se teneat craneo et erit ibi aliquantulum plicata et aliquando erit circumferentialiter tota depressa. Tunc infunde totum craneum lesum cum oleo rosato calido per unum diem vel duo. In vulnere supra craneum pone stuppas vel pecias panni vetusti et infusas in oleo rosato et vitello ovi calidi. Secundo vel tertio die labora cum instrumentis leviter ad removendum os et remove, quod est removendum, levissime operando, ne tangas duram matrem vel aliquod principium nervi. Similiter remove frustulum pungens duram matrem. Remoto osse habeas pannum subtilem et intinge in melle rosato colato, parte I, et olei rosati partibus II et pone intus craneum et duram matrem caute et leviter. Et imple totum vulnus cranei leviter de illis pannis sic intinctis. In vulnere carnis ponas pecias cum vitello ovi et oleo rosato, postea habeas plumaceolum de stuppa subtilem, qui comprehendat totum vulnus cutis et prius intinctum in eadem medicina.

Ad ultimum habeas plumaceolos magnos seu stuppas magnas madefactas in aqua frigida in estate et in hyeme in calida. Et bene exprimas, quas madefacias in medicina facta de unciiis II olei rosati et unciiis 5 aceti et uncia I boli armeni, quas pecias supra capite prius raso pone. Et sic fac, donec vulnus abundanter emittat saniem, et tunc incipe ponere supra duram matrem de pulvere subtilissimo facto ex thure, quod descendit per cribrum, et supra pulverem pannum intinctum in melle rosato et oleo predicto calido. Sed tunc pannus melius exprimatur, de quo panno impleatur totum vulnus, quod est in craneo. In vulnere autem cutis pone fila sicca et imple adeo, quod non permittas carnem cooperire craneum, donec fractura sit reparata. Et supra vulnus cutis ponas mundificativum superius dictum de melle rosato et farina hordei tantum, quod teneat vulnus.

Et ultra circum quaquam per latitudinem digiti circa illud semper ponas defensivum de bolo armeni. In fine pone consolidativum seu cicatrizativum, de quo tibi faciam doctrinam in fine operis. In omnibus aliis scissuris cranei et fracturis, ubi neuter predictorum casuum est, sufficit tibi ponere super os fractum medicinam de melle rosato et oleo rosato calido et imple totum vulnus cutis de oleo rosato calido et vitello ovi usque ad generationem saniei et supra et circa defensivum boli armeni. Et, facta sanie, pone supra craneum peciam intinctam in ipso melle rosato et oleo et imple vulnus cutis filis siccis et supra vulnus mundificativum de melle rosato et farina hordei. Et circa vulnus defensivum boli usque ad perfectam curam.

De omni vulnere sine fractura cranei. Cap. VIII.

Regimen omnium aliorum vulnerum, que sunt sine fractura cranei, potest fieri per suturam et per pulverem de calce dictum et secundum supra proxime dictam doctrinam.

Sed non oportet in illis uti melle rosato colato et oleo rosato, nisi vitello ovi cum oleo rosato usque ad generationem saniei et postea mundificationem de melle rosato et farina hordei et defensivo boli circa vulnus. Nam defensivum boli est optimum in omnibus vulneribus corporis propter evitacionem apostematis, quia nihil utilius egro et honorabilius est medico, quam ne membra vulnerata in tumore veniant apostematum. Nam ipse superveniens vulnere capitis est causa alienationis et mortis. Et si accidat membris nervosis, est causa spasmi ex repletionem et mortis vel corruptionis membri et mortis. Ad cuius apostematis evitacionem multum valet regimen bone diete.

Et ideo ponam dietam, ut sit tibi doctrina comunis in omnibus vulneratis in capite et nervosis locis. Specialis dieta; a principio sit mica panis lavata quinquies cum aqua calida in hyeme et postea ter in frigida, et post ultimam lavationem ponatur de zuccaro rosato, albo. In estate lavetur cum aqua frigida pultes rarefacte de hordeo prius mollificato et postea pistato et colato. Et colatura coquatur et condiatur cum penidiis vel zuccaro rosato, vel cum lacte amigdalorum in omnibus vulneribus, preterquam in vulnere capitis, ubi non approbo. Amigdale habent nam quandam proprietatem fumosam nocentem capiti. Si autem eger esset nimis debilis aut naturaliter haberet debilem stomachum, posset parvos pullos conditos cum agresta sumere et carnes heduli, et pedes porcorum, omnia condita cum agresta vel vino granatorum acetosorum.

Potus eorum et specialiter vulneratorum in capite et locis nervosis sit vinum de granatis cum decuplo eius de aqua frigida vel agresta cum aqua clara frigida vel iste potus optimus confortans stomachum et prohibens vapores ascendere et non constipat et extinguit calorem. Recipe hordei mundi uncias II, mice panis unciam I, zuccari rosati unciam I, granorum granatorum unciam I, prunorum siccorum decem numero. Omnia coquantur in decem libris aque, usque ad medietatem coletur. Et servetur in vase vitreo et administretur frigidum; nihil actu calidum detur. Si autem eger iuvenis fuerit et sanguineus, et parum sanguinis exivit ex vulnere, flobotometur ex parte contraria, si est fortis, vel ventosetur, si est debilis, ut dictum est. Et omni die assellet una vice cum suppositoio, si per se non assellasset. Nam omnia ista cum defensivo boli defendunt vulnus et membrum a receptione superfluitatum. Cum autem omnis cursus humorum cessaverit, tunc securus es, quod non superveniet apostema. Et non subito, sed paulatim, fac egrum transire ad grossiorem dietam et ad usum vini, salvo quod in vulneribus capitis et nervorum non des licentiam vini, nisi propter necessitatem debilitatis stomachi vel virtutis. Et tunc, sit vinum leve, acerbum et bene limphatum, quia non est aliquid, quid ita percutiat caput et nervos sicut vinum, et propter hoc in illis vulneribus non concedatur usque ad finem. Et quando vulnus ceciderit super ossa alia et fracta fuerint, illa ossa curabis secundum doctrinam, que tibi dabitur in capitulo de algebra.

Quando autem cum vulnere est apostema, quod est, quia medicus non scivit defendere vel quia tenta est nimis grossa, vel unguentum calidum fuit semper po-

situm, vel alteratio aeris, vel debilitas membri recipientis. Quod quidem, si accidit non obstantibus remediis apposis, erit pravum signum, scilicet signum magne debilitatis membri lesi. Tamen si tale apostema fuerit in membro nervoso, iam dicta est cura.

Si vero fuerit in membro carnoso, facies pultes de IV partibus aque et I olei olivarum maturarum et farina tritici.

Et pone supra apostema factum cum vulnere et illud tandiu ponas, donec removeatur totus tumor et dolor et quod vulnus emittat abundanter saniem. Et tunc pone mundificativum de melle, farina et aqua usque ad perfectam mundificationem, quia non potest neque debet consolidari vulnus, in quo est apostema, quia omnia consolidativa nocent, ubi apostema est, nisi prius maturetur et dolor sedetur, et postea mundificetur, et ad ultimum consolidetur. Item, si fuerit mala discrasia, prius curetur cum suo contrario, calida cum frigido et sic de aliis. Et remota discrasia redi ad curam principalem.

Item, si fuerit in vulnere aliqua concavitas, carne debita repleatur, quia, si consolidaretur superficies et concavitas remaneret, ex necessitate in concavitate remaneret putredo, que putrefaceret locum et cogeret medicum iterum aperire vulnus et esset labor ultimus maior priore. Repleatur ergo primo cum mundificativo superius dicto, posito supra vulnus, et cum pulvere thuris facto, posito intra, vel cum alio unguento regenerativo ex dicendis in fine, postea consolidetur. Item, si factum est vulnus cum contusione, scilicet casu vel percussione lapidis, vel ligni, vel alicuius rei non acute, non debes in principio ponere consolidativum, quia in omni contusione contunduntur necessario caro et nervi, si membrum est nervosum, et necessario putrefit locus. Unde consolidativum esset causa constringendi putredinem in membro. Et sic aut membrum totum corrumpetur aut oporteret te iterum aperire et esset labor multo maior et tibi et egroto, quia longa debilitas alicuius membri ducit totum corpus ad corruptionem. Est ergo prius maturandum, postea mundificandum, et si remanet concavitas, ibi est regenerandum, ad ultimum consolidandum. Salvo, quod si contusio esset parva, cito firmaretur locus unguendo circa vulnus de oleo rosato et supra iuncturam pulverizando pulverem mirtilorum et vulnus mundificando cum mundificativo de melle, postea consolidando.

De morsu canis rabidi. Cap. IX.

Ceterum, si factum fuerit vulnus a cane rabido, cuius signum, quod gallina non sumit panem infusum vel infectum in vulnere et, si sumpserit, moritur. Hoc iterum prohibet, ne medicus intendat ad consolidationem. Sed dimittatur vulnus apertum per XI dies ad minus. De melioribus localibus est cauterizare locum cum ferro calido et ponere medicinam calidam sicut sal et sinapis cum melle supposita. Et fiant remedia physicalia, quorum melius est: recipe cineris cancrorum fluvialium adustorum partes V, gentiane partes III, terre sigillate partes VI, fiat pulvis.

Da bibere uncias II omni die usque ad mensem, cum aqua in qua cocti sunt cancri, per XI dies consolidetur. His omnibus consideratis secure potest in curis vulnorum procedere relicto residuo tue discretioni.

De apostematibus. Cap. X.

De apostematibus scias, quod eorum causa est duplex, scilicet extrinseca ut ex percussione, casu vel vulnere alterato vel similibus, vel intrinseca, scilicet ex abundantia interiorum superfluitatum. Materialis causa est sexcupla, nam aut est humoralis sanguinea vel flegmatica, colerica vel melancolica aut aquea, aut ventosa. Et hoc aut simpliciter, aut composite, licet rarissime invenias apostema ex uno humore solo factum. Sanguis namque si superabundat super totum corpus et calefiat calore inflammante cor et sic corpus non tamen putrefit, sic fit febris continua synocha. Si autem putrefit fit synochus continuus.

Si autem non super totum corpus, sed aliquem locum occupaverit et sanguis est tenuissimus in substantia et fluens in qualitate, facit inflationem rubeam latam sparsam per membrum in superficie, que vocatur erisipila nota, quia fit de sanguine reducto quasi ad naturam colere. Si autem sanguis est grossus naturalis in substantia et calidus in qualitate, fit carbunculus, cuius color est fuscus et tactus durus et in superficie est sicut color cineritius, quod venit ex adustione.

Et si sanguis est naturalis, tamen nimius in quantitate, facit flegmonem, cuius signa sunt: subrubedo propter similitudinem, durities propter lenitatem, rumor profundus propter materiam in profundo membri, scilicet carnis, contentam, pulsus propter inundationes, que fiunt calore agente in materia, calor ex caloris multiplicati presentia, aliquando febris efficitur effimera, specialiter circa generationem saniei. In quo tempore omnia predicta accidentia sunt maiora quam facta sanie.

Colera vero, si corpori dominatur, aut putrefit, aut non. Que non putrefit, aut est in toto corpore et facit icteritiam, aut in uno loco et facit serpiginem seu tyriam. Putrefacta autem aut intra venas et facit tertianam continuam, si continetur in omnibus venis, aut causionem, si specialiter circa cor et os stomachi, aut extra venas et facit tertianam interpolatam. Et si talis colera non putrefacta a natura destituta congregatur in aliquo membro exteriori, faciet erisipilam veram, cuius sunt signa: rubor mixtus citrino colori propter similitudinem materie, tumor pineatus propter levitatem et igneitate materie ascendentis, durities propter siccitatem materie et calor pungitivus mordens palmam tangentis propter acuitatem materie.

Flegma similiter dominans corpori aut est putrefactum aut non putrefactum. Aut intra vasa et facit ansimerinam continuam sine rigore, aut extra vasa et facit interpolatam quotidianam cum rigore. Non putrefactum aut super totum corpus et facit leucoflegmaticam, que est una species ydropisis, aut in uno loco et facit apostema, quod dicitur zimia vel undimia, cuius signa sunt: albedo propter similitudinem materie, mollities, ut si digitum impresseris, facies quasi foveam, nam hoc fit

propter humiditatem, frigiditas tactus propter frigiditatem materie, parvus vel nullus dolor, quia non est ibi pugna caloris. Tamen istud apostema plus dolet facta sanie quam ante, quia omne apostema, quod etiam si fuerit ex materia frigida, postquam illa materia putrefit, iam recipit caliditatem extraneam. Et sic omnis exitura, scilicet apostema saniosum, iudicatur calida, licet materia sit frigida, sicut febres quotidiane et quartane iudicantur egritudines calide, licet sint ex materia frigida.

Et melancolia superabundans est putrefacta aut non putrefacta; vero aut totum corpus occupat aut unum locum. Si totum corpus occupat aut ab extra et facit lepram, aut ab intra et tunc aut materia est intra venas et facit quartanam continuam, aut extra venas et facit quartanam interpolatam, aut in uno loco tamen et facit cancerum.

Et si non est putrefacta aut est super totum corpus et facit melanchiron, id est icteritiam nigram, aut in uno loco et facit apostema durum, quod vocatur sclyrosis, cuius signum est durities propter siccitatem et grossiciem materie et sine dolore propter absentiam caloris et compactionem materie occupantis locum quasi insensibilem et color est similis colori corporis vel parum tendens ad livorem, quia, licet melancolia sit nigra, tamen propter eius gravitatem non presentatur calor eius ad superficiem corporis, scilicet cutem. In his differt a cancro. Cancer, qui est de melancolia putrefacta, quia acquisivit calorem ratione superius assignata, calet et dolet, et vene circumdantes sunt varie, quia materia, licet sit melancolia, tamen in sui putrefactione acquisivit lenitatem et calorem extraneum, unde calor venarum imbibentium illum cancerum. Sunt varii coloris adeo, ut assimilentur egritudini. Et ob hoc dictus fuit cancer, quia tenet formam canceri marini, qui est rotundus et habet multos pedes.

Apostema aquosum sit ex dominio frigiditatis super epar generantis multam aquositatem, quod est de natura yposarce. Tamen ista aqua congregatur aliquotiens in uno solo loco corporis et specialiter circa umbilicus. Et enim signa sunt, quod color eius est similis colori totius corporis. Quod si palpaveris illud cum duobus digitis duarum manuum ponendo digitum semotum aliquantulum ab alio, tu senties inundationem sub digitis ita, quod unus digitus impellit undam sub alio. Et est cum pondere sine dolore. Et ego curavi istud apostema cum incisione et desiccatione illius aque in vulnere, que habebat circa umbilicum ad magnitudinem panis duarum librarum.

Apostema autem ventosum generatur ex vapore vel vento, vel aliqua frigida materia, resoluta per actionem debilis caliditatis dissolventis et non valentis consumere. Qui quidem vapor locatur inter tunicas membrorum et specialiter locatur libenter in regione oris stomachi et in inguinibus itaque, quod multi credunt, quod sit crepatura. Et eius signa sunt, quod est durum cum extensione repugnante tactui sine lesione et sicut uter vento plenus. Si percutitur, sonat et non mutatur color loci a colore corporis. Et scias, quod istud apostema valde assimilatur apostemati duro supradicto de melancolia putrefacta. Sed qui scit discernere inter duritiem lapidis et duritiem vesice porci plene vento et, si scit discernere inter durum et extensum,

bene sciet discernere inter hec duo apostemata. Et similiter assimilatur apostemati aquoso, sed differentia est undositas, que est in aqueo, et carentia undositatis, que est in apostemate ventoso.

Est quoddam aliud apostema frigidum, quod vocatur botium, quod locatur sepe in gula. Quod fit duobus modis: aut per saniem generatam ex apostematibus calidis vel ex diverso flegmate putrefacto, quorum quoddam habet intus materiam, que similatur caseo coagulato, alia luto, alia que est fex olei, alia sicut pultes, alia sicut iuncata granosa, quorum aliud est mobile et in superficie membri subcutanea sub cute tantum, aliud immobile infiltratum in profundo membri, nullum tamen habet colorem.

Preterea, per ea, que dicta sunt, de apostematibus simplicibus possunt haberi notitie compositorum, de quibus scias, quod aliquando componitur in generatione apostematum colera cum sanguine et si fuerit maior pars de sanguine, dicitur flegmon erisipiliades et, si fuerit maior pars colere, dicitur erisipila flegmonides et cognoscuntur per signa distincta superius.

Item componitur sanguis colera et melancholia et faciunt antracem, cuius signa sunt durities, color circumdans varius et in hoc communicat cum cancro, sed differt, quia in eo est maior inflatio et debilitas cordis, aliquando sincopis et tremor cordis et somni profunditas, non somnus verus, sed abusive dictus. Et in superficie quedam vesica cinericii coloris, que videtur trahi ad interiora, quasi traheretur cum filo. Et poteris cognoscere, quod sit ex diversis humoribus, si notaveris diversitatem materie, que purgabitur tempore mundificationis post maturationem, quia reperiens in medio de materia dura, grossa, tenaci, que a laycis dicitur pes egritudinis, qua remota remanet locus concavus et postea non eget nisi regeneratione carnis et cura vulnerum. Et istud apostema propter admixtionem contrariorum ad invicem est de malitiosis.

Item componitur melancholia cum flegmate. Et si vincit flegma, facit glandulas, si vincit melancholia, facit scrophulas, quorum signa sunt: absentia caloris et forma in modum amigdale et quia moventur quasi natando et in plurimum sunt plures numero in unum colorem. Et fiunt et in subassellis, et in gula, et in inguine. Quicquid dictum est de apostematibus, est dictum de eis, que fiunt ex humoribus naturalibus.

Restat dicere de his que fiunt ex humoribus innaturalibus, quorum aliqua sunt multum prava et periculosa. Et qui vellet scire naturam apostematum provenientium ex humoribus non naturalibus, procuret scire generationem humorum in corpore tam naturalium, quam non naturalium. Et postea videat frequenter apostemata ex eis orta et eorum formas et colores et accidentia, que ea sequuntur. Et materias, que ex eis egrediuntur et sic per bonam notitiam theoreticalem et longum experimentum poteris scire et aliter non. Et cum hoc laudet deum, qui est bonus medicus circa hoc. Multum esset necessarium prolongare verba in isto tractatu et docere, quomodo generatur quisque humor naturalis et innaturalis et materia humorum, tamen, quia intentio huius libri, qui erit preambulus ad maiorem, si

deus concesserit, est brevisitas, scias, quod apostematum natorum ex humoribus non naturalibus aliud est frigidum, aliud calidum. Frigida sunt nodi, qui sunt in forma rotundi, qui ut plurimum sunt in fronte, in dorso manuum et pedum, et iuncturis. Et eorum materia est flegma vitreum a calore destitutum, admiscetur etiam aliquotiens flegma dulce cum scrophulis et glandulis, de quibus facta est mentio. Et fiunt scrophule et glandule, que veniunt ad maturitatem et tunc dicuntur squamose, quarum mundificatio est difficilis.

Ex colera adusta et ex ea cum admixtione melancolie aduste fiunt diversa apostemata. Secundum diversam quantitatem illius humoris et secundum diversitatem loci et secundum diversitatem fortitudinis et debilitatis membri recipientis sunt timorosa. Quorum etiam periculum est maius et minus secundum diversitatem nobilitatis loci possessi. Nam nascuntur inde ulcera mala crustosa ex malis humoribus adustis, que, si sint in superficie membri et specialiter cruris, dicuntur cancrene ab Avicenna. Si occupant profunditatem membri, non tamen totum membrum, dicuntur ab eo ascachilos. Si totum membrum, dicitur herpes vere, quia herpes fit a malis ulceribus, ad que multa materia venenosa iam corrupta descendit. Et etiam, ut vult Avicenna et verum est, sicut aliquos homines vidi, quando aliquod membrum debilitatum et inflatum exponitur aeri frigido, quia tunc mortificantur extremitates, cum calor vivicans non possit ad eas transire, et extremitates mortificate corrumpunt membrum, nisi refrenetur, adeo, ut aliquando oportuit me totum incidere pedem in iunctura, ut salvarem crus.

Fiunt etiam ex admixtione humorum corruptorum predictorum vesice, formica miliaris, pruna sive ignis persicus, que quidem omnia sunt diversa secundum diversitatem compositionis et de istis omnibus est diversitas apud auctores. De qua diversitate non cures, sed cura coloribus et accidentiis. Et fere omnium cura est una, secundum quod tu videbis in sequentibus. Vesice tamen fiunt ex materia predicta acuta levi petente superficiem carnis propter eius levitatem. Formica est etiam pustula, sed est profundior in carne et ambulat magis ad profundum et cito ulcerat. Miliaris sit ex eadem materia, sed magis incinerata per adustionem et facit pustulas parvas ad modum milii cum magno fervore et pruritu. Pruna etiam sunt pustule subnigre dure habentes in circuitu citrinum colorem, que fiunt ex maiori parte colere aduste et minori melancolie aduste.

De curis apostematum omnium. Cap. XI.

Dictis breviter de intentione huius libelli, differentiis apostematum veniemus, secundum propositum, ad curas sequentes auctorum doctrinam et longum usum nostrum. Cura apostematis facti ex causa extrinseca sicut ex vulnere dicta est, sed, si est ex contusione casu aut lapidis, aut ligni percussione, melior cura, si patiens est iuvenis et fortis, est flobotomia contrarie partis vel ventosatio, si est debilis. Inunge locum cum oleo rosato calido et pulveriza locum lesum et unctum cum

pulvere fructuum mirtilorum, quia hec cura firmat locum, si non sit nimis magna contusio. Si per istam medicinam non defenditur locus ab apostemate, sed venit ad exituram scilicet ad generationem saniei, maturetur et cito aperiatur locus, ubi materia magis dependet, et mundificetur locus cum mundificativo facto de melle, farina tritici et aqua. Postea incarnetur et consolidetur cum incarnativis ponendo semper circa locum lesum defensivum de bolo, oleo rosato et aceto ad conservationem sani loci, ne corrumpatur. De incarnativis et consolidativis fiet tibi mentio.

De apostematibus autem, que fiunt ex interiori causa, scias, quod aut resolvuntur, si reperiuntur, aut indurantur, aut veniunt ad saniem vel putrefactionem. Verum, quod resolutio aliquando fit per repercussionem, sicut aliquando maturatio, tamen nec hoc, nec illud proprie fit, sed improprie. Et si cura istorum deberet notari ad unguem, iam esset necessarium multiplicare verba et ponere curam uniuscuiusque specialiter. Sed quia propositum et promissum est tibi tradere breviter curas notiores et breviores propter brevitatem libri, non longabimus in sermone. Scias ergo, quod potes reducere curas omnium apostematum ad unam brevem divisionem, scilicet ad curam apostematis calidi et frigidi. Apostematis autem calidi proprium est reperiui aut resolvi, aut maturari. Frigidum vero per calorem extraneum maturatur, resolvitur et induratur, raro autem reperiuitur.

Incipe ergo curam apostematum calidorum cum flobotomia, si patiens est fortis, et hoc per partem oppositam in principio ante confirmationem apostematis. Confirmatio autem per eadem vel cum ventosatione. Si est debilis, iniunge dietam strictam et frigidam secundum tolerantiam, quia omnia apostemata ex causa intrinseca sunt cum plenitudine.

Deinde, post evacuationem, incipe repercutere materiam et confortare membrum, ne recipiat superfluum, nisi una VII rerum tibi contradicat, que prohibent repercussionem fieri. Prima, si apostema fiat in puero, secunda, si fiat in sene, tertia, si fiat in convalescente, quarta, si materia est valde multa, quinta, si est furiosa, sexta, si est in emuntoriis, que sunt gula, subasselle et inguina, septima, si apostema fiat per viam derivationis et membrum mandans nobilius est membro recipiente. Nulla istarum causarum impediens et reperiuit cum succis herbarum frigidarum ut solatri, qui reperiuit cum quadam occulta resolutione portulace silvestris, umbilici veneris cum oleo rosato et paucis aceto, et paucis bolo armeno vel cum aliquo ex unguentis reperiuit bonis ex dicendis.

Si autem materia non reperiuitur aut quia ad aliquam quantitatem tendit vel quia est aliquantulum grossa, purgato corpore incipias dissolvere administrando aliquid de melle cum illo medicamine reperiuitivo. Et postea resolve fortiter, secundum quod videas. Quidem cursus materiae cessat et dolor et acuitas cum aliqua ex medicinis resolutivis dicendis. Si autem materia tenderet ad saniem tempore repercussionis, quod aliquando fit per viam accidentis et non proprie aut tempore resolutionis, festina maturationem cum aliquo maturativo ex ponendis in fine. Facta sanie aperiatur locus magis maturus et magis dependens faciendo magnis exituris magnas apertiones et parvis parvas. Et sanies tota suaviter exprimatur salvo, quod

si materia esset valde multa, non debet tota in una vice extrahi, sed successive, maxime si eger sit debilis, aperto loco et evacuata materia ex tota vel in parte, pone superius de uno mundificativorum dicendorum, donec mundificetur bene et plene. Et regenera carnem et ultimo consolida cum medicinis habentibus hoc facere secundum doctrinam in fine tradendam. Hoc prenotato, quod non festines incidere apostema ante perfectam maturationem, nisi esset prope nobilia membra vel sit prope anum, vel prope iuncturas, vel esset materia parata ad corruptionem membri, quia in his casibus oportet vos ante perfectam maturationem incidere et tunc ponendum est emplastrum, quid mundificet cum maturatione residui. Et cave tempore resolutionis et maturationis, ne emplastra resolutive, maturativa et mundificativa sint nimis calide nature nec nimis dura, sed temperata. Nam ista aliquotiens faciunt apostema furiosum. Item scias, quod apostemata calida sanguinea minori indigent percussione et maiori resolutione. Collerica autem maiori percussione et minori resolutione. Et sicut convenit in sanguineis flobotomia, ita colericis convenit purgatio colere. Illa autem, que fiunt ex humoribus adustis, ante ulcerationem indigent solum percussione. Et post ulcerationem non apponas aliquid frigidum in loco ulcerato, sed circaponas defensivum de bolo ad defendendum deambulationem vel corrosionem.

Antrax et carbunculus, quia unus ex diversis est humoribus, alius ex sanguine grosso, ut dictum est, post flobotomiam et purgationem indigent emplastris et cibis, et potibus confortantibus cor propter eorum malitiam. Specialiter antrax, quod commune est omnibus aliis venenosis apostematibus. Da ergo egro dietam frigidam et strictam sicut malagranata, poma, pira, citonia, vinum de granatis cum decuplo aque frigide; abstineat a carnibus pro posse. Si vero non potest, carnes parvorum pullorum cum agresta vel vino granatorum conditas. Utiliter etiam datur eis tyriaca maior. Et si patiuntur stuporem, qui est sincopis, que vocatur alicis somnus, excitentur cum magnis sonis tubarum et timpanarum et vocentur fortiter propriis nominibus. Ponatur ergo super cor emplastrum frigidum cum rosis rubris et sandalis, citri ana uncia I, farine hordei uncie II, camphore dracme II, distemperetur cum aqua rosata vel succo pomorum agrestium. Si egritudo esset in parte anteriori circa mamillas vel pectus, ponatur illud emplastrum inter duas spatulas. Aliquis posset admirari de exhibitione tyriace materia, quia calida est, sed, quamvis non pertineat ad brevitatem libri disputare de singulis, quia de hoc fuit inter antiquos diversa opinio et adhuc est, quia quidam approbaverunt et approbant et quidam non, et scias, quod quamvis tyriaca calida sit, tamen ex eius nobilitate et utilissima compositione resultat quidam spiritus dignissimus adeo amicus complexioni humane, quare invenimus eam valere contra venenum calidum et frigidum et contra venenum contrarium humane complexioni a tota specie. Invenitur etiam movere ventrem et stringere fluxum. Ita, quod secure dico, quod sicut quelibet res in rebus generatis, complexionem communem, que vocatur complexio elementalís et naturam habet occultam propriam, que est a tota specie. Sic tyriaca ultra complexionem, quam acquisivit elementalem, in actione et passione rerum ad invicem

intransium eius compositionem habet ultra proprietatem occultam contra omnia genera venenorum humano corpori contraria. Et propter hoc valet contra omne apostema venenosum. Et ego dico, quod ad me venit in civitate Mediolanensi iuvenis cum antrace in partibus faciei, cuius malicia adeo augmentata erat, quod totum caput et facies, et collum erat ultra credibile inflatum. Quem adduxerat ad me quidam apothecarius amicus egri et eger iam erat in signis mortis, quia non erat in eo pulsus et sincopazabat iam. Ita quod dixi apothecario, quod duceret eum ad domum suam, quia moritur. Et apothecarius dixit: non est in eo amplius remedium? Et ego parum cogitans dixi: Certe, si tu haberes de optima tyriaca et tu dares ei in magna quantitate forte posset adhuc vivere, sed non credo, nisi valde dubitanter. Apothecarius duxit eum in domum suam vix euntem et dedit ei tyriaca approbata circa dracmas II et posuit eum in lecto et cooperuit eum. Et incontinenti arripuit eum sudor incipiens circa caput et locum egritudinis et post paululum fuit sudor universalis, et redit in eo pulsus, et confortatus est. Et post exiccationem sudoris, apothecarius dedit ei proprio motu iterum dracmam I eiusdem tyriace in eodem die. Et sanus factus est, nisi quod remansit in eo quoddam ulcus vesicosum, quod postea leviter est curatum. Et ego numquam vidi alium qui, postquam fuit in sincopi et tremore cordis et specialiter sine pulsu, qui evaderet. Sed de his, qui loquentes et quasi nullum malum sentientes iudicati sunt ad mortem per me et, qui mortui sunt, admirantibus multum amicis de pronosticatione, vidi ego infinitos. Hec dicta sunt tibi de tyriaca, quia forte aliquem posses adhuc per ista verba liberare a morte et ut deus omnipotens, qui sit benedictus, concedat mihi peccatori per suam misericordiam, quod iste libellus meus valeat ad honorem eius et utilitatem facture sue. Post confortationem cordis et evacuationem materie maturabitur carbunculus et antrax propriis eorum maturativis, de quibus fiet tibi mentio in operis fine. Omnia alia apostemata furiosa curantur per eadem remedia, scilicet confortatione cordis et confortatione membri et, post ulcerationem, cum cura, que tibi dabitur in tractatu ulcerum. Apostemata frigida curentur cum mundificatione corporis ad quod est specialis trosciscus de turbith, qui fuit magistri nostri dicendus in fine. Et post mundificationem resolutio vel maturatio, si resolvo, non potest fieri. Medicinas autem resolventes et maturantes facta apostemata et scrophulas, et glandulas, et nodos, et mundificantes botia, requies in fine libri.

De ulceribus differentia. Cap. XII.

De ulceribus autem scias quo differunt a vulnere, nam vulnus est plaga ex novo tempore facta. Et ulcus est plaga putrida vel antiqua. Quamvis aliquotiens inveniatur in medicina, quia plaga antiqua nominatur a quibusdam vulnus. Tamen ibi vulnus sumitur pro plaga et non proprie. Iterum differt a cancro et fistula sicut genus a specie, quoniam omnis cancer ulceratus et fistula ulcus est. Sed non convertitur et in hoc manifestabitur error Rogerii et Rolandi qui dicunt quod omne

vulnus post quam transierit per duos vel tres menses incuratum iam non vulnus, sed cancer vel fistula nuncupatur, quoniam omnes plage supervenientes ex pustulis ulcerantibus vel ex frigore aeris vel aliqua corruptione, vel incisione apostematis proprie loquendo et omnis plaga putrefacta et putrida sunt ulcera. Nec tamen sunt canceri nec fistulae proprie, quoniam fistula et cancer habent proprias differentias, quibus ab ulceribus differunt, sicut patebit. Est ergo in ulceribus aliquid virulentum cum multa putredine liquida. Et illa putredo, si est colorata tendens ad citrinum vel ad rubeum, lavatur cum lavationibus frigidis et stipticis ut cum aqua, in qua resolvitur alumen, et aqua hordei et lenticularum, et balaustie, compositis et simplicibus. Et si non est colorata, lavatur cum aqua mellis. Et si membrum fuerit bene frigidum, cum melle et vino, que loture ponuntur in ulcere aut iniiciuntur per clistere, donec exeant tales, quales ponuntur. Et si ulcus esset crustosum vel haberet carnem corruptam vel mixtam cum sanie, mundificetur cum pulvere affodilis et unguento apostolorum, et unguento viridi dicendis in fine. Et si ulcus est fraudulentum vel corrosivum, reprimatur eius fervor ponendo circa de medicina boli dicta sepe et supra aliquid stipticum corrosivum de dicendis. Facta perfecta mundificatione cum predictis et cum emplastris mundificativis dictis et dicendis regenera carnem et cicatriza cum medicinis hoc facientibus, de quibus habebis copiam. Hoc prenotato, quia multum valet mundificatio corporis per vomitum, si ulcera mala sunt in partibus inferioribus, et per farmaciā, si sint in superioribus. Hec enim causa certa est, quia materia, que currebat ad ulcera, movetur de loco ulceris et tenet ad iter, per quod ulcus melius mundificatur.

Scias quod cancer aut est ulceratus, aut non. Non ulceratus fit aut nascendo ab ipso principio de melancolia putrefacta, sicut in cura apostematis diximus, et tunc incipit apparere in modum lupini et crescit aliquando ut magnus melon, aut fit convertendo ex apostemate duro facto ex melancolia naturali non putrefacta cum emplastretur cum rebus calidis inflammantibus vel ducentibus ad locum per attractionem aut per aliam medicinam calidam aliquando. Et iste ulceratus provenit ex dicto cancro cum ulceratur et aliquando ex vulneribus indiscrete curatis. Cancer non ulceratus in principio sue nativitatis omnino de levi non cognoscitur, sed perfecta signa dicta sunt. Ulcerati autem signa sunt, quod habet labia grossa, dura, reversa intus glandulosa et fetet multum. Et signum infallibile est, quod si laveris cum lixivio, exhibunt ab eo superfluitates sicut bave viscose.

Cura: regula prima generalis est in cura canceri, quod nunquam curatur, nisi penitus cum omnibus suis radicibus auferatur. Ideoque nascitur ex ista regula secunda regula necessaria, quod numquam debet ferro vel igne, medicina corrosiva curari, nisi sit in loco, ubi possit penitus extirpari. Si ergo non ulceratus est in loco intricato nervis, venis, musculis et arteriis ut in collo, mamilla et in aliis locis similibus, non presumas illum nec maturare, nec corrumpere, nec incidere, nec cauterizare, sed evacua corpus per medicinam purgantem coleram adustam. Et iniunge ei regimen temperatum prohibens omnem cibum ingrossantem et adurentem sanguinem sicut lentes, caules, caseum, carnes bovinas, leporinas, anserinas,

anatinas, piper et omnia alia acuta. Et ungas locum circa et supra cum unguento refrenante eius malitiam et defendente eum ab ulceratione. Quod sic fit. Recipe tucie lavate et ceruse partes equales. Ista supradicta cum oleo rosato et succo portulace vel alterius herbe frigide incorpora modo ponendo de oleo rosato, modo de succo ad perfectionem unguenti et ex illo unguento locum inunge. Si autem est in loco, ubi possit penitus extirpari, incide illum cum omnibus radicibus et permitte multum exire de sanguine ex venis circumdantibus illum. Et etiam illas exprime, ut totus sanguis melancolicus exprimatur. Et demum cauteriza cum ferro calido vel cum medicina post cauterium vel medicinam comburentem. Ponas pultes de succo apii, mellis et farina tritici usque ad mundificationem. Postea regenera et consolida. Si vero cancer ulceratus est in loco nutritato, ubi non potest penitus extirpari, non curari melius est, scilicet cum ferro calido vel medicina comburentem. Sed potest palliari cum unctione unguenti supradicti de tucia et cum regimine supradicto, ut eger habeat vitam longiorem.

Fistula est ulcus profundum, cuius est os strictum et fundus amplus habens duritiem callosam sicut penna avis in circuitu interius. Et in hoc differt ab ulcere profundo, quia ulcus profundum, quod Rogerius et Rolandus, et magna pars modernorum vocant fistulam, non habent duritiem callosam interius sicut fistula. Et propter hoc fistula non mundificatur perfecte cum lotionibus sicut ulcus, sed requirit post lotiones dictas in cura ulcerum ut cum medicina combustiva acuta vel cauterio mundificetur et removeatur, quicquid callosum et durum est interius.

Et post cauterium vel medicinam comburentem ponantur unctuosa: butyrum vel aliqua, que faciunt cadere crustam vel escaram factam a cauterio vel medicina. Postea mundificetur et cum lavationibus, et emplastris mundificativis, incarnetur cum regenerativis seu cicatrizativis vel sigillativis; quod idem est.

Nota tamen commune remedium tam in fistulis, quam in ulceribus profundis: quod bonum est cum novo vulnere, si fieri potest, reducere materiam ad locum magis dependentem, ut virus vulneris vel fistule possit competentius exicari vel preparare membrum taliter, quod orificium sit semper dependens. Medicine autem cauterizantes et corrodescentes, que in fistula et cancro corrodi et cauterizari debent, dicuntur inferius. Et similiter medicine unctuose facientes cadere escaras seu crustas. Et nota, quod crusta, que fit ex cauterio vel medicina acuta nunquam vi est auferenda, sed adeo dimittenda, quod per se cadat.

De algebra sive restauratione. Cap. XIII.

Intentio algebre est restauratio dislocationis et fracture ossium. Propter quod scias, quod deus omnipotens cuius nomen sit benedictum, in secula fecit humano corpori multa ossa propter diversam operationem membrorum humano corpori necessaria, per quam necesse erat unum membrum sine alio moveri. Et scias, quod coniunctio unius ossis cum alio fit modis X. Uno modo per viam inseritionis unius

cum alio precedentis in modum duarum serrarum coniunctarum, ita quod dentes unius serre cadant in vacuitate alterius et e converso sicut faciunt aliquotiens incisores tabularum sicut ossa capitis, que sunt VI. Alius modus est appodiatio seu congregatio unius ossis ad aliud sicut ossa VII pectoris. Tertius modus est fixio ossis in osse sicut dentium in mandibulis. Quartus est coniunctio ossis cum osse mediantibus ligamentis sicut in iunctura humeri cum adiutorio et sicut in omnibus iuncturis. Nam in iuncturis fit coniunctio ossis cum osse mediante quodam corpore duro insensibili, flexibili, quod ex una extremitate ossis egreditur et aliam intrat ligante ossa ad invicem. Tamen eius flexibilitas obedit lacertis moventibus membrum, ita quod potest plicari membrum, secundum quod illi membro convenit ad actiones proprias conficiendas. In omnibus aliis modis coniunctionum non est motus naturalis nec voluntarius. Sola ergo dislocatio fit in iuncturis. Apertio autem et segregatio seu motio bene potest fieri aliquotiens in coniunctionibus aliorum ossium.

Si ergo dislocatio fit in iuncturis, primo iunge os cum osse, secundum quod erant in principio. Post coniunctionem pone super locum peciam grossam de lino vel canapo infectam in medicina facta de farina cicerum distemperata cum albumine ovi vel volatica farina tritici volante per molendinum. Et ligetur ligatura suavi tenente locum firmum in sua iunctura. Attende hoc, quod multi modernorum tempore reductionis fomentant membrum cum aqua calida, quod est pessimum. Ex hoc enim debilitatur et rarificatur membrum et preparatur ad recipiendum superflua, scilicet apostemationem. Sed, si times de doloribus, unge locum de oleo rosato calido. Verum, si tu non fuisti a principio et iam pretereunt dies, quod stetit dislocatus, sic induratus est locus et humores iam cessarunt currere, tunc bonum est fomentare non solum cum aqua calida simplici, sed cum aqua calida decoctionis camomille, fenugreci, seminis lini, malve et bismalve, ut per hec locus melius restaurari possit.

De fractura ossis. Cap. XIII.

Si os aliquid fractum est, primo reducas in loco suo, postea habeas peciam infusam in oleo rosato, quam ponas immediate supra membrum. Et postea ponatur pecia infusa in medicina supradicta in cura dislocationis. Super peciam imponantur faldelle de stuppa infuse in albumine ovi, super faldellas ponantur astelle cum hordantia, quod membrum fractum non possit se movere. Et sic dimittatur usque ad X dies, nisi una trium rerum te cogat illum mutare, scilicet dolor nimius, qui provenit ex nimia strictura vel cursu humorum ad apostema faciendum, vel nimius pruritus. Quod si dolor nimius aut humorum cursus fuerit in causa, solve et unge membrum cum oleo rosato et flobotoma patientem ex contrario.

Et stringe dietam et expecta donec fluxus humorum cessaverit, postea liga. Si vero nimius pruritus, solve et salva cum aqua calida, postea liga. Et sic permitte,

donec consolidatus fuerit. Ponam etiam in fine tibi inter medicinas consolidativas medicamen optimum in fracturis et dislocationibus. Scias, quod ad omne opus cyrurgie multum est utile, imo necessarium, quod medicus viderit operari bonum cyrurgicum ultra scientiam, quam invenerat in scriptis et specialiter in algebra. Nam omnis scientia, que dependet ab operatione, multum corroboratur per experimentum.

De egritudinibus oculi. Cap. XV.

Scias, quod non est egritudo in aliquot membro officiali in corpore, que ita sit ignota apud medicos, sicut egritudines oculorum propter subtilitatem artis compositionis ipsius oculi, quoniam mirabiliter est compositus ex tribus humoribus et septem tunicis, que omnia perveniunt ad eius compositionem. Et omnia illa corpora sunt subtilissima et quasi incomprehensibilia sensu visus, sed intellectu optime comprehenduntur et compositio, et utilitas. Et ad oculum tam nobiliter compositum veniunt vene insensibiles fere portantes eius nutrimentum. Et arterie fere iterum insensibiles portantes eius vitam. Et primo pari nervorum venientium ad proram capitis, que sunt paria VII, venit nervus egrediens cerebrum per partem anteriorem cranei. Quod quidem par facit unam coninctionem concavam, antequam exeat craneum in hunc modum XXX et in exitu cranei iterum bifurcatur, ut vides, qui portat spiritum visibilem ad humorem cristallinum, qui est instrumentum visus. Tamen iuvatur ab albugineo et vitreo humore et a tunicis septem, ut actio visibilis fiat. Una tamen tunica, hec, que est uvea, est perforata. Et foramen illud dicitur pupilla, per quod portantur colores proprie et forme, et figure spiritui visibili mediante aere claro. Fiunt etiam exterius palpebre habentes lacertos eas moventes, que eorum clausura defendunt oculos a lesionibus exterioribus et a laboribus. Pausat et via parva facit suas actiones, que sunt videre videnda. Multum esse utile prolongare verba super anathomiam oculi et notare ad unguem omnes eorum egritudines, que sunt valde multe. Sed, si hoc fieret, transirem metas huius libelli. Dabo ergo tibi curas egritudinum, que sepius eveniunt ad manus cyrurgicorum. Nota tamen omnium sed quarundam tantum longiores et notiores egritudines sunt sicut obtalmia, pruritus, lachryme, scabies, ulcera, macule, ungula et cataracta que omnia sepe eveniunt ad manum cyrurgici.

Obtalmia est apostema seu inflatio vel cursus humorum ad oculus que aliquando est parva, aliquando magna, aliquando maxima et aliquando pessima. Parva ex paucis fit humoribus et aliquando ex sola mala complexione calida propter calorem solis vel pulverem, fumum vel vigilias. Que cito solvitur cum temperamento diete et cum albumine ovi agitato et despumato, quod mittitur in oculis vel iniicitur. Et hec medicina valet calori, ardori, parvo rubori et multis egritudinibus oculi calidis eo, quod albumen ovi est frigidum, lavativum, colirativum habens congelatinositatem quandam, que applicatur oculo quam non habent

alie simplices medicine. Magna vero obtalmia est quando oculus est dolens et conjunctiva rubea et ibi calor, et acuitas, et lachryme. Maxima autem et omnibus deterior est illa, in qua non apparet de conjunctura, sed est supra magna carnositas rubea et palpebre sunt inflatæ et quasi reverse. Et oculus totus inflatus et ista cito ulcerat oculum. In magna et maxima secundum magis et minus necessaria est flebotomia de cephalica et purgatio humorum calidorum ac subtilitatio, ultima diete sicut in patientibus continuam. Omnia cibaria actu frigida dentur et omnia actu frigida ponantur in oculo et cum calefiunt renoventur. Et collirium album in oculo distemperatum cum lacte mulieris puellam nutrientis et emplastrare oculum usque ad renovationem inflationis cum emplastro facto ex rosis albis et rubeis et santalo rubro ana uncie I, farine ordeï uncie II, camphore dracme I distemperatis cum aqua rosata cessante cursu humorum et dolore. Fiat fomentatio cum aqua decoctionis rose cum pauco sale. Si autem per hoc non liberatur, necesse est, ut ponas collirium de thure ad maturandum et postea pulverem citrinum ad mundificandum. Si autem post obtalmiam vel per obtalmiam fieret ulcus in oculo, cuius signum est, quod in conjunctura est rubens punctus et in cornea est punctus albus, tunc iterum pone collirium album ad sedationem doloris. Vel si ulcus esset ita magnum, quod timeres de egressu uvee et quod fieret egritudo, que vocatur bothor, quoniam sit quedam eminentia, que assimilatur grano uve eminens in oculo, tunc necessarium erit helesir, quod est dicere penetrativum. Et si de hoc non times, sed vis consolidare ulcus, utere collirio de plumbo. Si autem post consolidationem ulceris remanet albula id est cicatrix, cura eam cum collirio de stercore lacerte. Collirium album sic fit. Recipe ceruse ablute dracme X, sarcocolle grosse dracme III, amidi dracme II, dragaganti dracma I, opii dracme 5. Terantur omnia optime et incorporentur cum aqua pluviali munda et ducatur medicina tua multum supra marmor. Et fiant forme similes lenticulis. Et cum opus fuerit una distemperetur cum lacte mulieris puellam nutrientis et administretur cum penna. Confectio collirii de thure maturantis apostema oculi. Recipe thuris dracme X, antimonii, sarcocolle ana dracme V, croci dracme II. Conficiatur cum aqua fenugreci et fiat collirium. Confectio pulveris citrini. Recipe sarcocolle dracme X, aloes dracme II, croci dracme II, mirre dracma I, licii dracme II. Hec omnia tere et utere. Confectio collirii de plumbo mundificans et consolidans ulcera oculi. Recipe plumbi suti, antimonii, tucie ablute, eris usti, gummi arabi, dragaganti ana dracme VIII, opii dracme 5. Confectio helesir, quo est utendum, quando times, quod ex ulcere fluat eminentia uvee et fiat in oculo bothor. Recipe antimonii, ematidis ana dracme X, acatie dracme IIII, aloë dracma I. Terantur et fiant forme similes piperi cum succo verbene vel corrigiole. Et, cum necesse fuerit, una distemperetur cum albumine ovi et administretur.

Pruritus curatur cum vino albo, in quo iaceat petia, in qua fuerit aloes succotrinum pulverizatum lavando oculum mane et sero.

Scabies levis et nova curatur lavando oculum cum vino, in quo iacuit cuperosa sive vitriolum romanum.

Lachryme curantur cum collirio de mirabolano, quod recipe tucie dracme X, coralli ossium mirabolanorum et aloes succotrini ana dracme II, piperis dracme 5. Fiat pulvis subtilissimus et ponatur paulatine cum festuca incisa in angulo oculi.

Macula removetur cum collirio de stercore lacerte, quod recipe de raspatura vasorum terreorum vitriatorum, id est massacunia, que venit de ultra mare, spume maris, et est una species spongie, que est dura, stercoreis lacerte viridis, baurach, id est salgemme, zuccari rubei ana. Fiat ex his pulvis subtilissimus supra marmor, postea coque in libra I aque decoctionis acori et celidonie ana dracme X, usque ad medietatem. De aqua illa tempera predictum pulverem et fac colliria, unum ex his solve cum aqua ruthe vel feniculi et utere vel pone pulverem siccum.

Ungula in principio curatur cum collirio quod etiam est commune scabiei antique et inversione palpebrarum, quod recipe flores eris dracme III, vitrioli romani usti dracme VI, auripigmenti rubei, baurach, spume maris ana dragma I, salis armoniaci dracme II, dissolvatur sal armoniacum cum succo ruthe et cetera pulverizata incorporentur et fiant colliria. Unum solvatur cum vino albo et administretur. Si vero est grossa et firmata auferatur, quod auferri potest cum instrumento. Postea curetur cum collirio.

Cataracta confirmata non curatur nisi cum manu et ad hoc necesse est, quod medicus didicerit videndo opus fieri ab homine sciente remove seu deponere cum instrumento facto ad formam acus, quod imprimitur in coniunctiva scilicet albedine figendo intus ex transverso, donec acus, quam semper videbit operator, quando erit sub cornea, erit ad aquam, que est locata ante foramen pupille, que prohibet visum. Et tunc debet deprimere inferius, donec videat eger. Et postea stet in domo obscura per X dies in silentio. Et ligetur supra oculum emplastrum de bolo armenico distemperato cum albumine ovi ponendo inter duas petias. Tamen scias, quod iste modus est valde deceptibilis, quoniam raro stat, quin iterum redeat, tamen ego vidi non redire. Non confirmata curatur cum sepiissima purgatione capitis cum pillulis cochiis et pigra et cum abstinencia a vino forti et rebus facientibus fumum ad caput et nauseam, et indigestionem, et cum collirio de felibus, quod recipe fellis aquile vel alterius avis, vel avium de rapina viventium dracme X. Et sint fella sicca, euforbii, colloquintide serapini ana dragma I. Fiant colliria cum succo extremitatum feni. Non intendas habere plenam doctrinam de egritudinibus oculorum per istum libellum, quoniam non continet, sed habes aliqua bona, que in suis casibus tibi erunt utilia. Sed, si desideras plenam habere doctrinam, anhela ad videndum tractatum, quod ego intendo post istum perficere, si potero pertingere ad notitiam dominationis Serenissimi Regis Francorum, ibi enim, si deus me perduxerit, intendo tamen altius et plenius de cyrurgia tractare, quanto locum illum isto loco debemus dicere digniorem. Sis ergo sollicitus rogare deum, ut mihi det locum et spatium, quo possim illud meum propositum adimplere, interim tamen secundum doctrinam contentam in hoc libello non timeas operari.

De antidotis. Cap. XVI.

Suscipe utique antidotarium medicinarum, quod tibi in huius libelli fine in locis pluribus est promissum. Et sunt medicine pauce, que per me infinitis vicibus sunt probate. Et primo de reperiussivis, secundo de resolutivis et maturativis, tertio de mundificativis, quarto de conglutinativis et regenerativis, et consolidativis, quinto de mollificativis duritiem, sexto de facientibus opus cauterii. Scias, quod, quotiens intendis repercutere, bonum est in principio corpus evacuare.

Propter hoc evacua materiam calidam. Si est fortis, cum flobotomia vel scarificatione, si debilis. Et cum hac secura medicina. Recipe pruna X, violarum siccarum, que debent poni in fine decoctionis, dracmam I. Fiat decoctio in libra I aque usque ad libras 5 et in illa buliant duabus undis tamarindorum, manne, medulle, cassie, fistule ana uncie 5, que coletur et fortiter manibus exprimatur. Colature in sero misceantur et addantur corticum mirabolani, citri pistatorum in pulverem dracme 5 et sic stet per totam noctem. In mane summo diluculo iterum coletur et calefiat, et exhibeatur. Vel cum pillulis, que sic fiunt. Recipe mirabolani, citri, rosarum rubrarum ana dracmam I, aloes succotrini dracmas II, scamonee dracmas 5. Fiant pillule et sunt doses III.

Evacuata vel minorata materia, utere medicinis simplicibus vel bis compositis. Medicine simpliciter reperiussive sine opilatione pororum sunt oleum rosatum et solatrum.

Et reperiussiva cum pauca conclusione pororum sunt umbilicus veneris, crassula minor, endivia, cicorea et virga pastoris. Reperiussiva cum opilatione sunt portulaca domestica, cucurbita scilicet eius caro, semperviva, crassula, malva, fabaria. Reperiussiva stuporem facientia, quibus non est utendum, nisi in magna necessitate intolerabilis doloris: succum lactuce hortulane, mandragore, papaveris, cassilaginis, opii. De rebus, que teruntur, sunt reperiussive bone: rosa, omnes sandali, spodium, bolus armenus et terra sigillata. Et his ergo simplicibus et compositis potest uti. Sed, si uteris succo et vis, quod magis penetret, adde aliquantulum aceti. Compositum bonum est de succo alicuius herbe de supra dictis dracme II, olei rosati uncia I, aceti uncie 5. Item olei rosati uncie II, boli armeni dracme 5, aceti uncie 5. Si tu timueris membri corruptionem, adde terre sigillate dracmas II. Istud reperiussivum et defensivum membri potest adhiberi supra quodlibet membrum, ad quod tu timeres cursum materie pervenire. Et si iam pervenerit et est confirmata ad apostema vel est ulceratus locus, non ponas aliquod reperiussivi supra, sed circa prope principium loci doloris.

Verbi gratia, si fuerit dolor circa iuncturas pedis, pone medicamen supra iuncturas aliquantulum in tibia. Si vis plenioram doctrinam habere reperiussivorum et defensivorum, quere librum sacrum Rasis de iuncturis vel expecta librum nostrum venturum. Materia frigida proprie non reperiussitur, sed aliquando in principio cum evacuatione materie, confortatione membri prohibetur, quod non fiat materie collectio. Ad quod multum valet exhibitio troscisci, que fuit magistri mei

bone memorie, Gullielmi de Saliceto. Quod recipe turbith albi carnosi et gummosi dracmam I, hermodactilorum alborum dracmas 5, diazinziberis dracmam I. Fiat trociscus unus cum paucis sirupo violarum. Diazinziber, cum quo fit trociscus, est optimum, cum sumitur simplex omni mane pro preparativo ad consumendum residuum materie. Sic fit. Recipe zinziberis albi mundati unciam I, liquiricie rase dracmas II, granorum paradisi, cardamomi, cubebe gariofilate ana scrupulos II, zuccari albi panis libras II.

Confortativa membri, ne recipiat materiam frigidam, sunt absinthium, squinantum, abrotanum, spica, mastix rose et oleum rosatum, quia oleum rosatum calefacit membrum infrigidatum, nisi ultra modum fuerit infrigidatum, et calidum refrigerat. Ista bulliuntur in oleo in duplici vase et ex illo oleo fiat inunctio vel bulliuntur in vino et emplastrantur vel pulverizantur et distemperantur cum oleo et vino et fit epithima. Et sufficiant ista de reperiensivis.

Scias, quod, quamvis resolutiva et maturativa magnam habeant affinitatem in qualitatibus, quia sunt temperate calida, tamen in hoc differunt, quia resolutiva habent suam substantiam et caliditatem temperatam cum subtilitate, quare aperiunt poros et temperate attrahunt materiam, et confortant calorem et naturam ad expellendum. Verum tamen, si inveniunt materiam multam et grossam, ita quod pori non sufficiunt in excludenda materia, aliquando maturant.

Maturativa vero cum eo, quod habent temperatam caliditatem, habent substantiam viscosam, qua opilando poros conservant calorem naturalem in loco et sic maturant. Verum si inveniunt materiam paucam et subtilem, resolvunt illam. Quare invenitur, quod unum et idem emplastrum aliquando resolvit, aliquando maturat.

Resolutiva sunt: camomilla, que resolvit confortando membrum, melilotum et flos eius et oleum anetinum et semen eius, malva silvestris, paritaria et sulphur, pinguedo anseris, galline et anatis, et omnis pinguedo. Secundum magis et minus, sambucus, branca ursina, caules et semen eorum, storax liquida, laudanum, mastix, ysopus humida, lana succida et multa alia. Ysopus humida sic fit. Recipe lanam ovium. Stet in aqua per noctem. Postea bene decoquatur. Illud, quod exprimitur, est bonum resolutivum. Emplastrum resolutivum bonum. Recipe malve silvestris, folia caulium, flores camomille ana manipulum I. Coquantur in aqua et pistentur. Postea fiat pulvis de parte I seminis aneti et parte I seminis caulium et partibus duabus furfuris et fiat emplastrum. Unguentum ad idem. Recipe olei camomellini vel aneti dracmas VI, cere dracmas II, pinguedinis anatis et galline ana dracmam I, seminis aneti et florum camomille pulverizate ana dracmas II. Fiat unguentum. Item diaquilon bonum resolvens materias frigidas et mollicans duras. Recipe litargiri triti et cribellati libram I, olei camomille, anetini, liliacei et yrini ana dracmas VIII, mucillaginis malvavisci, seminis lini et fenugreci, ficuum siccatarum, passularum, enucleatarum, succi yreos, succi squille, ysopi humide et colle de corio ana dracmas XII, terbentine uncias III, resine albe, cere citrine ana uncias II. Decoquantur tum, quod sit durius unguento et minus durum emplastro.

Nota tamen, quod aliquando resolvendo materiam quamquam minuatur, tamen residuum nimis induratur.

Et tunc oportet te aliquando mollificare, quod optime facies lavando membrum leviter et parum cum aqua calida usque ad rubedinem et postea ungere membrum cum unguento facto ex partibus IIII olei antiqui et una cere.

Item aliud optimum ad hanc intencionem mollificans scrophulas et glandulas et preparans eas resolutioni. Recipe olei antiqui libras II, pone in fiala vitrea cum radicibus malvavisci et cucumeris asinini mundatis ana unciam I et pone fialas cum oleo et radicibus in alio vase aque, et permitte bullire oleum per bullitionem aque, donec radices sint aliquantulum arse. Postea cola et in colatura illa pone uncias III cere in estate, in hyeme II. Et habebis optimum mollificativum, de quo uno die vel II, vel III mollificabis. Alio die resolves, secundum quod tibi videtur necessarium. Et si posueris X partem euforbii, erit optimum contra spasmus.

Maturativa sunt: malva hortulana pinguis, radix malvavisci, radix lapatii acuti, radix lilii albi, allium, cepe, rapa, baucia et multe radices alie, et herbe, semen lini, fenugreci, medulla tritici, fermentum, pinguedo porci et omnia composita habentia caliditatem temperatam cum viscositate. Compositum bonum maturans apostemata sanguinea et omne apostema cum admixta caliditate, et omne apostema paratum ad saniem. Recipe folia malvae hortulane et violarie ana manipulum I et duas radices bismalve. Coque in aqua perfecte et pista fortiter de aqua huius decoctionis. Recipe libram I olii antiqui vel axungie veteris porcine non salite uncias III, farine seminis lini et fenugreci ana unciam I, farine tritici subtilissime uncias II. Omnia incorporentur cum herbis et fiat emplastrum mediocriter spissum et liquidum. Nota, quod non ponas fenumgrecom, si times de inflatione materie. Materias frigidas maturabis cum emplastro quodam. Recipe cepe I et unam testam alii et II ova, omnia cocta sub cineribus et pista, et tantum de fermento bene acri, quantum est tota medicina. Et distemperentur cum oleo antiquo et fiat emplastrum. Antrax, carbunculus, quia fiunt ex materia grossa, ut dictum est, et utriusque tactus est durus et ambo parati sunt ad inflammationem materie, non maturabuntur, nisi cum medicina incisiva cum maturitate, quod non invenitur in una re simplici, nisi in fermento. Fermentum vero, quia est dulce et acetosum, et viscosum, gratia dulcedinis et viscositatis maturat, acetositatem incidit et divellit materiam ita, quod equaliter maturat. Quare in quacumque dura materia fuerit, est basis et materia emplastrorum. Fiat etiam compositum optimum aggregans has intenciones, id est maturationem cum incisione ad carbunculum et antracem. Recipe ficuum siccarum pinguium numero XII, uve passe unciam I, piperis, salis nitri ana uncias 5, fermenti acri quantum omnes, olei antiqui, aceti fortissimi, quantum sufficit ad conficiendum emplastrum. Item scabiosa pilosa, que habet folia aliquantulum lata prope terram et fustem ad mensuram cubiti, et florem celestem, et quanto magis ascendit, tanto folia sunt magis subtilia trita cum axungia, sicut milies probavi, miraculose maturat antracem et carbunculum.

Mundificativorum quedam mundificant cum maturatione residui. Et illa sunt necessaria, quando cogimur incidere apostema ante perfectam maturitatem. Et quando materia est in parte grossa non obediens maturationi, et in parte leni cito maturat, ut in scrophulis et glandulis squamosis, et in bubonibus. Alia sunt mundificativa simpliciter. Mundificativum bonum apostematum bene maturatorum et ulcerum novorum, quod mundificat et dolorem sedat, et incarnat. Recipe vitellos ovorum crudos et incorpora cum subtili farina tritici ad modum pultis, et distende super peciam, et pone supra. Aliud de melle et farina equaliter. Si tu velles plus desiccativum, tunc pone farinas hordei loco farine tritici.

Aliud mundificativum optimum et generale mundificans cum maturatione et viarum apertione speciale ad mundificandum apostemata ante tempus aperta, et specialiter proprium ad mundificationem antracis et carbunculi, et omnium ulcerum. Recipe mellis albi boni uncias II, farine tritici subtilissime uncias II. Illa prius distempera, postea adde succi apii uncias IIII et fac bullire ad lentum ignem semper movendo ad perfectionem. Si vis mundificare vulnera fraudulenta, quorum times malitiam et mutationem in cancrum, pone loco succi apii succum absinthii. Et si vis maturare duritiem ut in scrophulis et bubonibus, adde medicine de apio, quantum est medietas totius, de cepa lilii albi cocta in aqua et optime pistata.

Mundificativum cum confortatione loci de unciis III mellis rosati collati et uncia I subtilissime farine hordei. Et si indiges isto mundificativo ad vulnera, que sunt in locis nervosis, adde, quantum est quarta pars totius, terbentine lavate.

Si iterum vis, ut fortius mundificet, adde sarcocolle et myrre, quantum est sexta pars totius. Hoc notato, quod medicine regenerative, de quibus fiet hic mentio, non carent aliqua mundificatione, tamen magis sunt desiccative. Unguentum apostolorum mundificativum fistularum mortificatarum et ulcerum habentium crustas, et fere omnium ulcerum antiquorum.

Recipe cere albe, picis, resine, armoniaci ana dracmas XIII, myrre, galbani ana dracmas III, opoponaci dracmas II, bdellii dracmas VI, litargiri dracmas IX, aristologie longe, thuris ana dracmas VI, floris eris dracmas III. Fiat sic. Infundantur gumme in aceto, que non possunt teri, et postea fundantur in cacia, et fundatur cera et resina cum II libris olei, et omnia colentur. Postea addatur pulvis terendum et fortiter ducatur cum spatula.

Scias, quod medicine aggregative et conglutinative, que sunt, idem differunt a regenerativis et incarnativis, que sunt eedem. Item tam iste, quam ille, differunt a consolidativis et cictrizativis, et sigillativis, que similiter sunt eedem. Medicine ergo conglutinative sunt, que aggregant labia vulneris, in quo non est facta substantie deperditio et sunt desiccative cum quadam conglutinositate sive abstersione. Et sunt quedam simplices, que faciunt hoc mirabiliter, sicut calx, folia segetis silvestris et folia lilii albi, folia plantaginis, folia malorum, folia cypressi et multa alia. De compositis autem medicamen est de calce, quod dictum est. Aliud medicamen commune in conglutinatione labiorum et consolidatione. Recipe rasure panni linei veteris albiissimi ad libitum. Deinde accipe oleum rosatum et funde in

eo parum galbani, et incorpora cum his rasuram ad modum unguenti. Et si addatur parum corticum thuris et aristologie aduste, fortius operabitur.

Medicine regenerative seu facientes nasci carnem, quod idem est, necesse est, ut habeant abstersionem cum exiccatione et abstergant superfluitatem grossam, et exsiccent subtilem. Que due superfluitates sunt superfluitates tertie digestionis, que ex necessitate generatur in quolibet vulnere concavo, sed differenter hoc faciunt. Quia in vulnere existente in corpore humido, ut mulieris, pueri et eunuchi, et naturaliter pinguis, necessaria est medicina parum desiccativa, ut thus, vernix, fenugrecum, litargirum, mastix, myrra, aloes, farina fabarum et similia. Corporis autem sicci vulnere necesse est adhibere medicinam siccantem ut aristologiam, yreos, farinam orobi et lupinorum. Et maxime, si adurantur, sunt sicciore. Item, si vulnus habet multam saniem, fortiori indiget exiccatione, si paucam – debiliori. De compositis bonus pulvis. Recipe thuris unciam I, vernicis, fenugreci ana uncias II. Fiat pulvis subtilissimus et abundanter ponatur in vulnere. Item litargirum nutritum optime bonam carnem generat et malam corrodit, et removet scabiem de palpebris oculorum. Nutritur autem sic. Recipe litargirum ad libitum et pulveriza. Postea pone de oleo rosato, postea de aceto semper pistando, donec valde augmentetur et recipiat formam unguenti. Illud valde rectificat ulcera antiqua calida. Item ex dictis rebus simplicibus facies unguentum ponendo de pulvere predictarum rerum unciam I, olei uncias III et cere unciam I in estate. In hyeme uncias 5.

Medicine consolidative, sigillative et cicatrizative seu facientes pellem sunt: litargirum, centaurea minor, ossa combusta, cerusa, cortices pini, resina sicca, abrotanum assatum, cortices olibani, galle, nuces cypressi, curcuma et multa alia. De compositis in estate est optimum unguentum Rasis de cerusa, quod valet ad pellem faciendam et ad combustionem ignis et calide aque, et olei ad omnem excoriationem et omnes pustulas calidas ulcerantes, ad alterationem cuiuslibet calefacti et multa alia. Recipe olei rosati uncias IIII, cere, cerule ana unciam I. Omnia incorporentur. In fine addantur duo albumina ovorum et dragma I camphore. Aliud: recipe resine albe, bulliat in aceto acerrimo et proiciatur cum aceto in bacino aque frigide colando cum stamegna. Postea sumatur inter manus inunctas oleo rosato et diu manibus malaxetur et servetur usui. Sed in estate admisce cum resina, quantum est medietas cere.

Item de predictis rebus simplicibus, si sumatur pars una bene pulverizata et de cera, et resina ana pars media, et de oleo rosato partes IIII, fiet bonum unguentum sigillativum. Medicamen optimum ad consolidationem ossium fractorum et firmationem dislocationum, que sunt reducta per medicum. Recipe farine cicerum vel volatice molendini libras 5, masticis dragaganti, gummi arabici ana unciam I, mumie, boli armenici ana uncias 5. Pulverizentur et cum ipsa farina incorporentur cum albumine ovi ad spissitudinem mellis.

Cum autem aliquod membrum, quod fuerit fractum vel dislocatum, vel ulceratum et est sanatum, sed habet durum motum, medicamina mollitiva et nervorum confortantia, et materie in nervis imbibite consumptiva sunt necessaria,

quorum unum bonum, quo sepiissime usus sum. Recipe bdelii, oppoponaci ana unciam I vel mollifica in vino. Postea liquefac pinguedinis porci uncias III, pinguedinis anseris, anatis et galline ana unciam I et admisce cum gummis. Item cere, terbentine ana unciam I, postea adde farine fenugreci, seminum lini ana unciam I, thuris, masticis ana uncias 5. Item unguentum de adipibus valde bonum ad mollificandum duritiem. Et valet pthisicis, si ungatur pectus, et tussientibus ex siccitate. Recipe pinguedinis anseris, anatis, galine, porci, omnium recentium sine sale et cere citrine ana. Omnia liquefiant et colentur, et infrigidata – erit unguentum resumptivum bonum valens ad multa. Item coquantur radices bismalve et cucumeris asinini in oleo in duplici vase cum partibus tribus olei et parte una cere. Fit mollificativum bonum. Et si addatur pars XII euforbii, erit unguentum bonum ad membrum spasmatum. De mollificativis sufficiat hoc notato, quod quotiens vis mollificare cum his unguentis, prius fomenta membrum cum aqua calida decoctionis radicum bismalve et foliorum malve, et florum camomille, fenugreci, et seminum lini. Et postea fiat unguentum.

Medicine ulcerantes et cauterizantes simplices sunt cortices viticelle, apium emoroydarum, pes milvi, tapsia, cantarides, allia mundata, cepe, squille, mel anacardi, alumen fecum, realgar, calx viva, vitriolum, viride es, flamula, apium, risus et multa alia. De compositis aperientibus apostemata sine ferro est quodam. Recipe mellis anacardi et picis navalis ana. Mel anacardis cum non habes, potes facere. Si posueris anacardos in tenaculis fabrorum calidis et strinxeris eos, emanabit ex eis mel, que est medicina cauterizans. Item, recipe saponis nigri liquidi et incorpora cum calce viva et habebis unguentum ruptorium. Item incorpora ventres cantaridarum cum fermento et pauco aceto et habebis bonum ulcerativum. Item medicamen, quod potenter et non violenter carnem superfluum corrodit et minuit. Recipe hermodactilorum, floris eris, aristologie, rose ana. Fiat pulvis. Item medicamen corrodens fortius et est optimum in vulneribus antiquis, crustulis, fistulis et cancris aliquibus. Recipe succum affodilorum uncias VI, calcis vive uncias II, auripige unciam I. Fiant trocisci et siccentur in umbra. Et isti trocisci melius fiunt in mense Augusti, et servantur. Et cum necesse est carnem putridam et ulcera crustosa mundificare, pulverizetur unus et supraponatur pulvis. Nota, quod quandocumque uteris istis medicinis, numquam est medicamen inde auferendum, sed dimittatur, donec medicina cum tota crusta, quam fecit, per se cadat. Et tunc, si bene ablatum est totum, quod erat corruptum, aut factum est sufficiens foramen, bene quidem et mudificetur. Si autem medicamen non compleverit intentionem tuam, itera, salvo, quod medicamen, quod secundo ponis, habeat minorem virtutem vel sit minus in quantitate. Multa alia medicamina huius generis et aliorum generum supradictorum scimus, sed parentes longitudini non posuimus, nisi pauca levia et probata, secundum quod in principio libri tibi rettulimus promississe. Suscipies ergo gratanter istud opusculum et per doctrinam eius operare secure, quia in eo quamvis brevis sit, plura bona secuta, probata et utilia continentur. Si vero ad perfectionem huius scientie pervenire desideras, principia medicine,

que sunt scientia rerum naturalium, non naturalium et earum, que sunt contra naturam. Et disce anatomiam, que docet formas, naturas compositionum corporis totius et membrorum omnium et iuvamentum ipsorum scilicet officia, que habent in corpore, et ad quam utilitatem creavit deus omnipotens illa membra talia. Et cum hoc frequenta apud locum, in quibus est egrorum multitudo et ipsorum opera exquisita perpendas. Et nota finem, ad quem pervenerunt egritudines et accidentia ipsorum in principio, statu et declinatione. Et sic per bonam rationem et longum experimentum potes optimus fieri medicus. Aliter autem non, nisi deus omnipotens hoc faceret, infundendo tibi gratiam specialem, qui tibi donet gratiam suam, mihi autem veniam peccatorum, qui sit benedictus in secula seculorum. Amen.

Explicit Cyrurgia parva Lanfranci Mediolanensis

Executive Editor

Agata Sowińska

Cover Design

Lucjan Dyląg

Technical Editor

Małgorzata Pleśniar

Proofreaders

Joanna Aleksandrowicz

Edyta Gryksa

Claudio Salmeri

Computer-generated forms

Grażyna Szewczyk

Copyright © 2016

by Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego

All rights reserved

ISSN 1732-3509

(print edition)

ISSN 2353-9771

(digital edition)

Published by

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego

ul. Bankowa 12B, 40-007 Katowice

www.wydawnictwo.us.edu.pl

e-mail: wydawus@us.edu.pl

First impression. Edition 60 + 50 copies. Printed sheets: 9.25.

Publishing sheets: 11.0. Offset paper, III grade, 90 g

Price 20 zł (+ VAT)

Printing and binding: "TOTEM.COM.PL Sp. z o.o." Sp.K.

ul. Jacewska 89, 88-100 Inowrocław

More about this book



PRICE 20 ZŁ	ISSN 0208-6336
(+ VAT)	ISSN 1732-3509