



ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE
PHILOLOGICA 2/2015
GRAECOLATINA PRAGENSIA XXV

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE

PHILOLOGICA 2/2015

GRAECOLATINA PRAGENSIA XXV

Editors

MARTIN BAŽIL and JÁN BAKYTA

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE
KAROLINUM PRESS
2015

Editors: Martin Bažil (Charles University in Prague)
Ján Bakyta (Charles University in Prague)

CONTENTS

Historica

Ivan Prchlík: The fiery eyes of Augustus and the <i>annales</i> of Nicomachus Flavianus	9
Pavel Nývlt: Notes on Velleius Book I (2, 1; 6, 1–2; 12, 7; 14, 2; 16, 5; 17, 2)	21
Gian Franco Chiaï: Eine fromme Familie aus Lydien und ihr Gott. Bemerkungen zu den Kommunikationsstrategien mit dem Göttlichen im ländlichen Kleinasien der Kaiserzeit	29

Linguistica et litteraria

Lucie Pultrová: The development of the intervocalic laryngeal in Latin	51
Marcela Andoková: <i>Fusca sum et decora</i> . The influence of Tyconius on Augustine's teaching of the <i>ecclesia permixta</i>	61
Anna Maria Lasek: The presentation and functions of selected bathing scenes in Nonnos' <i>Dionysiaca</i>	77

Mediaevalia et recentiora

Lucie Doležalová: <i>Sicut mel dulce</i> . The sweetness and bitterness of reading the Bible in the Middle Ages	93
Alena Bočková: From <i>sanctulus</i> to <i>sacer</i> . Suggested typology of Jesuit school plays featuring St. John of Nepomuk in the Bohemian province	113
Kateřina Bobková-Valentová, Magdaléna Jacková: Saint Francis Xavier on Jesuit school stages of the Bohemian Province	135

Existimationes librorum

Petr Kitzler: <i>Athletae Christi. Raně křesťanská hagiografie mezi nápodobou a adaptací</i> (Martin Bažil)	159
Kateřina Bobková-Valentová: <i>Consuetudines Assistentiae Germaniae I.</i> (Alena Bočková)	161
Daniel Škoviera: <i>Miloslav Okál – Prvý slovenský profesor klasickej filológie</i> (Marcela Andoková)	167
Βενετία Αποστολίδου, <i>Τραύμα και μνήμη. Η πεζογραφία των πολιτικών προσφύγων</i> (Pavína Šípová)	169

HISTORICA

THE FIERY EYES OF AUGUSTUS AND THE ANNALES OF NICOMACHUS FLAVIANUS*

IVAN PRCHLÍK (Praha)

ABSTRACT

The anecdote concerning the fiery eyes of Augustus is known from the *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Servius. The latter quotes Suetonius as its source, yet in Suetonius' extant works, the anecdote is missing. According to Jörg Schlumberger, its late antique source could have been the *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus, which, however, could not possibly be referred to at the time, due to the *damnatio memoriae* cast upon its author. Some observations seem to support this explanation, and in addition, the *annales* may even have been at least a partial cause to have brought about this *damnatio*.

Key words: Augustus; *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus; *Epitome de Caesaribus*; Servius; commentary on Aeneid; Suetonius; historians of late antiquity; Quellenforschung; correspondence of Symmachus; *damnatio memoriae*

The first emperor of the Roman Empire attracts scholarly attention any time, but the 2000th anniversary of his death invites even non-specialists to occupy themselves with the man, who made the epoch. In the present paper, however, Augustus will concern us in the capacity of a hero of the anecdote which might play some role in recent debate of students of late antiquity. In this debate, in my view, some relevant circumstances are overlooked as yet, so the goal of this paper is to consider whether they may cast some new light on what is at issue.

The anecdote in question is to be found in two late antique sources, the *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*. In the former, it occurs as an addition to a brief characteristic and description of the emperor, who is said to have enjoyed intimidating with them those dealing with him at the moment, wherefore one soldier allegedly even turned his face away from Augustus because of them, as he revealed when asked, why he had done so.¹ Servius mentions the anecdote while commenting upon Virgil's account of the battle of Actium as depicted on the shield of Aeneas, during which

* This paper arose from the activities of the University Centre for the Study of Ancient and Medieval Tradition of Charles University in Prague. Many thanks are due to the anonymous referees.

¹ Ps. Aur. Vict. *Epit.* 1, 20: *fuit mitis, gratus, civilis animi et lepidi, corpore toto pulcher sed oculis magis; quorum aciem clarissimorum siderum modo uibrans libenter accipiebat cedi ab intendendibus tamquam solis radiis aspectui suo. a cuius facie dum quidam miles oculos auerteret et interrogaretur ab eo cur ita faceret, respondit: "quia fulmen oculorum tuorum ferre non possum"*.

Octavian was standing on the stern of his ship with flames blazing from his temples. It is preceded with a shorter remark that it was impossible to withstand the gaze of these eyes; instead of the soldier, however, an equestrian appears, and in addition, Suetonius is quoted as the source.² In the extant *Lives of the Caesars* by this author, however, a mere allusion to Augustus' fiery eyes occurs, but not the anecdote itself.³ This was noticed already by 19th century scholars, who offered a variety of more or less acceptable explanations.

In his Teubner edition of Suetonius, Roth classified Servius' text as one of the fragments entitled "*sed male e libris de vita Caesarum afferuntur*".⁴ Wölfflin,⁵ rejecting explicitly any possibility of the anecdote's coming from one of the non-extant works by Suetonius, thought of several eventualities. According to him, Servius could have drawn directly upon the anonymously published *Epitome de Caesaribus*, and quoted Suetonius, since its first chapters indeed contain excerpts from this author. The name of Suetonius could also have become some kind of a nickname for a writer of imperial biographies.⁶ Or, Servius could simply have made a mistake when quoting by heart, or wanted to use Suetonius' reputation to boost his own credibility. The first two alternatives were rejected by Enmann, who considered more likely that both the *Epitomator* and Servius had drawn upon an abridged version of Suetonius' *Lives* containing some *dicta et facta memorabilia* of the emperors, which had also been enriched from other sources.⁷ Independently of

² Serv. Aen. VIII, 680: TEMPORA FLAMMAS LAETA VOMVNT *naturaliter enim Augustus igneos oculos habuisse dicitur, adeo ut obtutum eius nemo contra aspectare posset, denique quidam eques Romanus, interrogatus ab eo, cur se uiso uerteret faciem, dixerit "quia fulmen oculorum tuorum ferre non possum", sicut ait Suetonius.*

³ See Suet. Aug. 79, 2: *oculos habuit claros ac nitidos, quibus etiam existimari uolebat inesse quiddam diuini uigoris, gaudebatque, si qui sibi acrius contuenti quasi ad fulgorem solis uultum summitteret.*

⁴ Roth (1858: 287).

⁵ Wölfflin (1874: 301–302).

⁶ Including Caesar, which is, according to Wölfflin, proved by evidence of Sidon. *Epist.* IX, 14, where Suetonius is considered even the author of the *Commentarii de bello Gallico*. Yet the very Sidon. *Epist.* IX, 14, 7 illustrates only dimly this mistake: *imminet tibi thematis celeberrimi uotiuu redhibito, laus uidelicet peroranda, quam meditaris, Caesaris Iulii. quae materia tam grandis est, ut studentum si quis fuerit ille copiosissimus, nihil amplius in ipsa debeat cauere, quam ne quid minus dicat. nam si omittantur quae de titulis dictatoris inuicti scripta Patauinis sunt uoluminibus, quis opera Suetonii, quis Iuuentii Martialis historiam quisue ad extremum Balbi ephemeridem fando adaequauerit?* Lacking the context (and attaching no importance to *opera* in plural), Sidonius could be understood as having Caesar's biography by Suetonius in mind, and both recent editors of Sidonius' works probably comprehended his words in this manner: Loven (1970: 173 note 63) apparently so, although judging by his remark that "*n'a subsisté que l'œuvre de Suétone*" we cannot be sure, Anderson (1936: 587 note 3) certainly so, since in his footnote he refers to Suetonius as the author of the *Lives of the Caesars* and other non-extant works. Nevertheless, this misconception is more suitably illustrated with what Roth (1858: CI–CII) and Reifferscheid (1860: 471–472) refer to: in some manuscripts, Caesar's memoirs are directly credited to Suetonius, and Oros. *Hist.* VI, 7, 2 introduces his own summary of them with the remark: *hanc historiam Suetonius Tranquillus plenissime explicuit, cuius nos competentes portiunculas decerpimus.* Schlumberger (1974: 26 note 34) further refers to similar treatment of the name of Livy concerning the history of the Roman Republic reportedly mentioned by Wagener (1886: 513), but to me these instances do not seem to resemble one another, since Wagener had one particular epitome of Livy in mind as the source, instead of Livy himself, for all the authors of late antiquity, which nonetheless had been entitled with his name. Schlumberger indeed counts as well on one particular "*späterer Suetonsauszug*" which "*den Namen des berühmten Biographen als eine Art Gattungsname geführt hat*", but I think using the name of Suetonius in general is what Wölfflin rather had in mind.

⁷ Enmann (1884: 405–406), with a remark, if the lemma is authentic and Servius had not been mistaken, objected to Wölfflin that Caesar had been neither an author of imperial biographies, nor a writer of the period of the Empire, and that Servius' *eques* could hardly have evolved from *miles* of the *Epitomator*, since only the reverse process had been possible. By contrast, there are three extant abridgements of Suetonius' *Lives*, one of them, contained in the *Codex Lipsiensis*, supplemented from

him, Cohn envisaged what he had directly labelled *Suetonius auctus*: an exemplar of Suetonius enriched with supplements from other sources;⁸ he also rejected in advance the eventual origin of the anecdote in any of Suetonius' non-extant works.⁹ This was, in a dispute with Cohn, advocated by Armstedt,¹⁰ who once more rejected Wölfflin's thesis of Servius directly drawing upon the *Epitome* and applying the name of Suetonius to it, because its author had used his *Lives* as a source.¹¹

Another hypothesis of the day could give the impression of possibly being the solution to this problem, namely that of Suetonius' authorship of a historical treatise on the civil wars between Pompey and Caesar, and between Antony and Octavian. The possibility of the anecdote about the fiery eyes of Augustus occurring in such a source to my knowledge never came to mind; nevertheless as it presents itself, a brief summary of the development of this hypothesis may be useful for the eventual consideration of this possibility. It was first laid down in his edition of the Suetonian fragments by August Reifferscheid,¹² inspired on one hand by two further quotations of Suetonius, one by Aulus Gellius who had taken from him the information on the successes of Ventidius Bassus against Parthians and on his public funeral,¹³ and yet another one by Servius, concerning the distribution of estates

Orosius, although according to Möbius, these supplements had come from another source, upon which Orosius had drawn as well. Nevertheless, the effect of analogy between these instances misleads a bit. The description of this *Codex* by Möbius (1846: 636–639) himself reveals that in fact, the wording by Suetonius is occasionally only altered, so as to more closely resemble most often that of Orosius, but in no manner that it had been enriched, except for two supplements concerning Trajan and Iovinianus (sic!), which, however, only follow after the excerpts themselves.

⁸ Cohn (1884: esp. 60–67), who had come to this verdict following his study of the sources of Aurelius Victor and the first eleven chapters of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*. The Suetonian quotation by Servius, he considered an acknowledgement thereof, further validated through other quotations by Servius, John the Lydian, Eutropius, Festus, and the Scholiast to Juvenal, all drawing according to Cohn upon this source and conserving other hints represented by various details lacking in Suetonius himself, although often he is explicitly quoted, or by correcting his accounts. The very mention of the anecdote by Servius, Cohn considered evidence of it not having been fabricated by the author of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*. And he too noticed the discrepancy between the soldier of the *Epitomator* and Servius' equestrian, and ascribed it "*levitati Epitomatoris ... quam saepe iamprehendimus*".

⁹ Cohn (1884: 62) referred to *Lyd. Mag.* I, 12 fin., where according to him, the very biography of Augustus is quoted, although a detail is added lacking therein: καὶ τοῦτο Τράγκυλλος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Αὐγούστου διαμέμνηται. ἰδόντα γὰρ φησι τὸν Αὐγουστον ἐν τῷ ἵπποδρομίῳ τινὰς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐπὶ τὸ βαρβαρικὸν ἐσταλμένους ἀγανακτῆσαι, ὡς ἐν ἀκαρεῖ τοὺς καταγνώσθέντας ἀποβαλόντας τὸ βάρβαρον μόγις ἐπιγνώσθηναι τῷ Καίσαρι ≈ *Suet. Aug.* 40, 5: *etiam habitum uestitumque pristinum reducere studuit, ac uisa quondam pro contione pullatorum turba indignabundus et clamitans: "en Romanos, rerum dominos, gentemque togatam!" negotium aedilibus dedit, ne quem posthac paterentur in foro circae nisi positus lacernis togatum consistere*. Yet the discrepancy between the last sentences by John and by Suetonius had been explained differently by Schrader (1877: 16–17): either John or his source had quoted Suetonius by heart and therefore garbled his account.

¹⁰ Armstedt (1885: 30) considered it very unlikely that a source of such nature as supposed for the *Suetonius auctus* would have been henceforward still entitled with the name of Suetonius. Cohn's quotations of other alleged users of such a source could have referred to other Suetonius' writings, as in the case of the above (note 9) added quotation from John the Lydian, which Armstedt claimed to have originated in the non-extant Suetonius' *De genere uestium*. Furthermore, such writings could have served precisely John, Servius, and the scholiasts better as sources than imperial biographies, especially the first of the three, as some had apparently been written in Greek.

¹¹ According to Armstedt (1885: 30) as well, Servius could not have altered the *miles* of the *Epitomator* to *eques*, while the reverse process he considered easily possible, and the explicit reference to Suetonius excludes eventual error.

¹² Reifferscheid (1860: 469–472).

¹³ *Gell. Noct. Attic.* XV, 4, 4: *eundem Bassum Suetonius Tranquillus praepositum esse a M. Antonio prouinciis orientalibus Parthosque in Syriam introrumpentis tribus ab eo proelis fusos scribit eumque*

by Pompey following the pirate war;¹⁴ and on the other hand by Mommsen's postulation of an unknown historical writing, not yet ascribed to Suetonius, resulting from his inquiry into the sources of Jerome's additions to the *Chronicle* of Eusebius.¹⁵ Reifferscheid further pointed out that Suetonius is the only one among the sources of Jerome's additions referred to by name,¹⁶ which he explained by Suetonius' being the eldest among these sources.¹⁷ General approval, however, was not won by this hypothesis even in its time,¹⁸ and later it was challenged by Helm's theory of a single source for Jerome and Eutropius, covering the history of both the Republic and the Empire,¹⁹ advocated today as well.²⁰ And in fact, the

primum omnium de Parthis triumphasse et morte obita publico funere sepultum esse. Roth (1858: 283) classified this fragment among those of *Περὶ Ῥώμης καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ νομίμων καὶ ἡθῶν βιβλία β'* mentioned in *Suda* T 895, while according to Reifferscheid (1860: 436) these two books had been a part of Suetonius' broader work, the *Prata*. He himself (1860: 355–356 frag. 210) included this text among the fragments of the historical work in question, entitled *Historiae cuius titulus incertus est reliquiae*. Earlier on, Egger (1844: 266) had thought of the origin of the quotation in Suetonius' *De uiris illustribus*. Of these three, Pirogoff (1873: 86 with note 4) referred only to Roth, Schrader (1877: 30–33) considered Roth's suggestion more likely than that of Reifferscheid, while completely rejecting that of Egger, and Wagener (1886: 527–528) mentioned only Roth's suggestion, since to Reifferscheid he referred only in connection with his inclusion of the writing favoured by Roth into the *Prata*. At the same time, he rejected Pirogoff's and Schrader's opinion of the origin of Eutr. VII, 5, 2 in this less known Suetonian work, preferring rather the above (note 6) mentioned Livian epitome, a possible source for Suetonius too, or Livy himself, or an entirely unknown source. Recently, Marache (1989: 218 note 6 to p. 152) referred without anything further only to Reifferscheid.

¹⁴ Serv. Georg. IV, 127: *per transitum tangit historiam memoratam a Suetonio. Pompeius enim uictis piratis Cilicibus partim ibidem in Graecia, partim in Calabria agros dedit.* Roth (1858: 306) classified this among the fragments of the *Prata*, while Reifferscheid (1860: 355 frag. 209) similarly to the preceding one.

¹⁵ Mommsen (1850: 681 = 1909: 618), according to whom, however, this writing had covered a period only starting with the death of Pompey and reaching as far as the battle of Actium; besides Jerome, also Cass. Dio XLIII–XLVIII had drawn upon it, and it was characterised by “*Proprietät, Genauigkeit und Eleganz des Ausdrucks*”, wherefore Mommsen ascribed it “*einem römischen Autor guter Zeit*”. Reifferscheid (1860: 470–471) then pointed out that Cassius Dio had (according to him) demonstrably drawn upon Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars* (yet beginning with Schwartz [1899: 1714–1717 = 1957: 438–443], the opinion prevailed that both had followed common sources), while at the same time claiming that a writing containing the pirate war had to have a broader scope than that allowed for by Mommsen, he included therein also Jerome's mention of the birth of Pompey, sc. Hier. *Chron.* 148b, to which see Reifferscheid (1860: 354 frag. 208). Mommsen (1850: 676 = 1909: 613) considered this a piece of Cicero's biography in *De oratoribus*, since both Pompey and Cicero were born the same year.

¹⁶ See Hier. *Chron.* praef. p. 6 vers. 17–20 Helm: *a Troia usque ad uicesimum Constantini annum nunc addita, nunc admixta sunt plurima, quae de Tranquillo et ceteris inlustribus historicis curiosissime excerpti.*

¹⁷ With the work, in which also Caesar's activities in Gaul were supposed to have been described, Reifferscheid (1860: 471) linked also the above (note 6) mentioned mistaken ascription of Caesar's memoirs to Suetonius. Preferable explanation, however, is given by Roth (1858: CII).

¹⁸ Among the scholars referred to above in note 13, only Schrader allowed therefor. Subsequently, it was rejected by Haupt (1885), according to whom Jerome's additions had come from Livy or rather from some Livian epitome, and both Suetonian quotations from various books of the *Prata*. Schanz, Hosius, Krüger (1922: 62) mentioned another opponent and two followers, themselves watering down Schanz's initially negative stance to rather neutral. Nowadays, eventually, the hypothesis could perhaps be revived, as a special interest on part of Suetonius in the period in question is observed, as summarized by Birley (1984: 247; 249) and de Coninck (1991: 3699), but so far it is not the case yet.

¹⁹ See Helm (1927: esp. 303–306), who elsewhere (1927: 159 note 1) recognized Reifferscheid's observation that Suetonius had been the eldest of Jerome's sources, yet according to him, it need not have been a historical writing by this author which Jerome had drawn upon. Furthermore, Helm questioned (1927: 275–277) whether the two non-Jeromian fragments, which had formed the base for Reifferscheid's hypothesis, could not have come from other Suetonius' works, and argued, although rather unconvincingly, for Haupt's above (note 18) outlined view.

²⁰ See Burgess (2005: esp. 190).

assumption of a very circumscribed number of sources Jerome could have drawn upon,²¹ I approve of as well.

In the 20th century, Jörg Schlumberger once more came back to the question of the origin of the anecdote while involved in his comprehensive study of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*.²² As for the earlier explanations,²³ he objected to Armstedt that none of the known titles of Suetonius' non-extant works suggests an inclusion of such an anecdote therein.²⁴ His own explanation then resulted from the main output of his book: his detection of a no longer extant source used by the anonymous author of the *Epitome*, identified with the lost *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus, whose recovery, at least partial, in Schlumberger's opinion, the *Epitome* may have served, after Flavian had suffered the *damnatio memoriae* following his death during the battle of Frigidus.²⁵ The anecdote, according to Schlumberger, came into the *Epitome* from Flavian's *annales*; hence he suggested as the most acceptable possibility that Servius, having drawn upon these *annales* as well, but due to the *damnatio memoriae* kept from quoting Flavian directly, yet knowing he had drawn upon Suetonius abundantly, ascribed precisely to this author also the anecdote, which, however, Flavian himself had to have found elsewhere.²⁶

As a matter of course, Michel Festy in his recent edition of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, dealt with the anecdote as well. This scholar shares with Schlumberger the opinion that the so called *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus served the author of the *Epitome* as a source, yet not throughout the entire writing, but only starting with the chapter on Severus Alexander, since the 1st and the 2nd centuries had been, in Festy's view, treated only very briefly in the *annales*.²⁷ As for the origin of the anecdote, he thus looked elsewhere: in the so called *Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte* (hereafter *EKG*), with which he explicitly identified Cohn's *Suetonius auctus*.²⁸ There is, however, one detail slightly less favourable to this

²¹ To which see Helm (1927: esp. 138–139) and for a solid foundation of this assumption also Burgess (1995: 354–356).

²² Schlumberger (1974).

²³ More briefly than here summarized by Schlumberger (1974: 25–26).

²⁴ Schlumberger (1974: 26).

²⁵ For Schlumberger's conclusions concerning the *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus as the source for the *Epitome*, see Schlumberger (1974: 235–244). Competing views of *Epitome*'s sources as offered by Barnes (1976), Festy (1999: XII–XXXVIII), for whose partial agreement to Schlumberger's conclusions see below on this page, and Gauville (2005: 97–158, esp. 157–158, and 221–222) do not at all prove that of Schlumberger mistaken and are not preferable, since allowing for higher total of sources, some of them, such as Marius Maximus, Eunapius of Sardis, or rhetorical handbooks, hardly fitting the needs of the hastily working *Epitomator*. The largely different approach of den Boer as mirrored for example in his remarks towards Schlumberger (1979), is in my view untenable. Basic information about the *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus, a supposed source more cautiously also titled as *Leoquelle*, since its identification with the lost *annales* is only possible, and only according to some, including myself, likely, while according to others unfounded or even impossible, is to be found in the works referred to by Prchlik (2011: 313–314 note 17). For the deficiencies of Cameron's (2011: 627–690) declinatory exposition (the "final word" according to one of the anonymous referees to this paper) see Paschoud (2012: 369–380) and Brendel (2013: 1390–1391). The purpose of the *Epitome*'s having been composed mentioned here has been considered by Schlumberger (1974: 245–246) and Festy (1999: LV). As for eventual further circumstances concerning the impact of the *damnatio memoriae* with respect to other non-extant writings by Flavian, see Prchlik (2012: 59–60).

²⁶ See Schlumberger (1974: 61–62 with note 211; 243–244 note 52; 246 note 56).

²⁷ See Festy (1999: XV–XX, esp. XVIII–XX) and also Schlumberger (2000: 397–398) for some weak points of this approach. In this respect, I share the latter's view, see Prchlik (2011: 313 in note 17).

²⁸ Thus Festy (1999: 63–64 note 18). For only the basest information about this likewise supposed source postulated by Enmann (1884), and its identification with *Suetonius auctus* as postulated by

viewpoint. Augustus' fiery eyes are mocked by Julian, who is supposed to have known the tradition of the *EKG*,²⁹ but there is no sign at all of his eventual knowledge of the anecdote. What he actually says can very well be based only on the general characteristics known from Suetonius, and thus presumably also from the *EKG*. Although the cogency of an argument of this kind is obviously rather doubtful, in my opinion it cannot be omitted completely, when considering the suitability of the anecdote to Julian's sense of humour.³⁰

On the other hand, another circumstance may seem very compatible with Schlumberger's view, yet only if Jean-Pierre Callu's suggestion is approved of. His point is that the famous anonymous addressee of the letter in which Symmachus addresses a senator engaged in writing history,³¹ is to be identified as Flavian.³² I approve of this, even if other suggestions are at hand,³³ since with Flavian, also the opportunity is presented to think of the reasons for the omission of the letter from the original corpus edited by Symmachus' son.³⁴ At the time of its publication, he could have been afraid of any kind of allusion

Cohn, see Festy (1999: XIII–XV), for a more elaborate discussion, including a disputation with the opponents to this theory, see Burgess (1995: 349–354, disputation 352–354). And for the most recent hypothesis on this source see Burgess (2005: 187–190).

²⁹ See *Iul. Caes.* 4 [309b]: Ὀκταβιανὸς ἐπεισέρχεται πολλὰ ἀμείβων, ὥσπερ οἱ χαμαιλέοντες, χρώματα, καὶ νῦν μὲν ὠχρίων, αὐθις δὲ ἐρυθρὸς γινόμενος, εἶτα μέλας καὶ ζοφώδης καὶ συννεφής, ἀνιέτο δ' αὐθις πρὸς Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Χάριτας, εἶναι τε ἤθελε τὰς βολὰς τῶν ὀμμάτων ὁποῖός ἐστιν ὁ μέγας Ἥλιος· οὐδένα γὰρ οἱ τῶν ἀπαντῶντων ἀντιβλέπειν ἤξιον. Julian's knowledge of the *EKG* tradition has been considered by Alföldi (1968); clues to continually drawing upon it, however, were detected only in the passage from Gallienus to Diocletian, while the depiction of the earlier emperors Alföldi considered too general to allow for the identification of its source (1968: 5). Yet some items, among them Augustus' fiery eyes, he derived from the *EKG* tradition as well (1968: 6–7). According to Bleckmann (1992: 24 note 98), in the case of Julian, the *EKG* tradition need not have been exploited; Alföldi's conclusions, on the contrary, have been approved by Chastagnol (1994: LXX).

³⁰ Alföldi (1968: 6) even compared Julian's text to that of the *Építome de Caesaribus*, which he quoted with the anecdote included, but did not address anyhow its omission by Julian.

³¹ See *Symm. Epist.* IX, 110, 2.

³² Callu (1999: 95–96).

³³ Ammianus Marcellinus, identified as the addressee for a long time, is ruled out by Cameron (1964). Naucellius, Protadius, Eutropius, or Aurelius Victor suggested by Roda (1981: 241–245) seem to me ruled out as well by Callu (1999: 95 with note 44), and the first one also by Paschoud (2010: 318). The author of the *Építome de Caesaribus* touched on by Cameron (2011: 635 note 34) is ruled out, if approved of Schlumberger's (1974: 244 and 245) and Festy's (1999: XLIX) persuasion that in this author rather some scribe, secretary, or clerk is to be seen. Unlike that of Gauville (2005: 162 and 224), according to whom the *Építomator* belonged to the Latin educated elites, this persuasion is well grounded. On the contrary, Flavian was ruled out by Enßlin (1923: 8) and Cameron (2011: 635) owing only to their persuasion that all the letters addressed to him had been gathered in the book II of the Symmachian corpus, which need not be true, as pointed to in the following note. Moreover, as for Cameron, this persuasion contradicts his approval of Roda's suggestions referred to in the following note as well. Flavian, or the author of the *Leoquelle*, is further credited with the Sallustian style, to which see e.g. Schlumberger (1974: 238 with note 29), suitable to Symmachus' words: *senatorias actiones et Romanae rei monumenta limasti*. And likewise suitable to these words is Flavian's interest in senatorial interventions into history, to which see Schlumberger (1974: 178) and Bleckmann (1992: 401–402) and also numerous descriptions of the senate's actions in the *Historia Augusta*, to which Flavian's *annales* had served as a source too.

³⁴ Cameron's (2011: 366–370) notion of the three phase publication of the corpus by Symmachus himself (book I), Symmachus' son (books II–VII), and a later, unknown member of his family, incapable by then of supplying the missing headings (books VIII–X), seems acceptable. Among those additionally published, some letters were probably inserted whose addressees had been included in the original corpus, for which see Cameron's (2011: 366 note 62) approval of Roda's suggestions. As to the question of self-censorship in the original Symmachian corpus, see Prchlík (2012: 52 with note 15) and Cameron (2011: 370–371 and 381), whose exposition I understand as complementary to that

to Flavian's historical writing, and his motivation could thus have been similar to that considered by Schlumberger in the case of Servius.

There is, however, one obvious objection to this notion, namely the bizarreness of the circumstances under which Flavian himself is mentioned abundantly in the corpus, yet in connection with his historical writing, his name was to have been suppressed. An acceptable explanation, nevertheless, is at hand. Elsewhere, I have pointed out the possibility that the complete loss of Flavian's literary works could have been due to his *damnatio memoriae*, although the reason for this *damnatio* did not have to be these works themselves.³⁵ My opinion on the nature of his *annales*, namely that they were meant to prompt Theodosius, then in conflict with Ambrose, to placability towards the traditional cults, I have outlined yet elsewhere.³⁶ The matter mulled over here could, however, suggest that it was perhaps Flavian's literary works and the *annales* in particular, which had indeed brought about his *damnatio*.

Theodosius probably can be believed to have forgiven to all those who had stood against him at the Frigidus and to have been keen on pardoning Flavian as well.³⁷ And as his grandsons Theodosius II and Valentinian III, but more likely Flavian the Younger in fact,³⁸ in their imperial letter assure, the *damnatio* had been cast upon Flavian against the will of Theodosius himself, due to the envy of Flavian's enemies. Yet the reference to the *annales* occurs in the letter in this very connection, and so it seems as if it was this historical writing, which indeed provoked the hostile reaction of Theodosius' entourage, or at least escalated it.³⁹ Is it then possible that it may have been written in a manner

I advert against in mine, rather than a shift in opinion; but still, I consider that of mine valid. The absence of any allusion to Flavian's *annales* in the Symmachian corpus is seen by Cameron (2011: 633–635) as an indication of their poor standard, due to which Flavian himself supposedly disliked them to be remembered. By contrast, I gathered elsewhere several hints indicating their rather high standard, which in my opinion are more relevant, see Prchlik (2011: 315–316 note 22). Moreover, the *annales* were later commemorated by the members of Flavian's family, namely Symmachus' son (see *ibidem*), Flavian's son (see below on this page with note 39), and perhaps Cassiodorus (see below in note 41), whose respect for Flavian's legacy can hardly be questioned. Paschoud (2012: 373) explains this absence more reasonably, through Symmachus' lack of interest in history, especially in contemporary history. In my view, however, considering Symmachus' frequent allusions to the literary works of his addressees, it was rather self-censorship on part of the editor of the original corpus, while the later editor of the additional letters might not have been aware of having included such potentially dangerous material, or could have believed in eliminating the danger by the omission (then perhaps deliberate) of the heading to this letter.

³⁵ Prchlik (2012: 59–60).

³⁶ Prchlik (2011: 320–321).

³⁷ See CIL VI, 1783 = ILS 2948 vers. 16–17: EVM (sc. *Flavianum*), QVEM VIVERE NOBIS SERVARIQ(ue) VOBIS – QVAE VERBA EIVS (sc. *Theodosii*) APVT VOS FVISSE | PLERIQ(ue) MEMINISTIS – OPTAVIT, and further add Ambr. *Obit. Theod. 4: (Theodosius) qui etiam his, qui in se peccauerant, doliuit, quam dederat, perisse indulgentiam et ueniam denegatam*, and Socr. *H. E. V, 14, 4–9* for a similar earlier treatment of Symmachus. Theodosius' *clementia* towards the defeated is praised also by Claud. *Paneg. dictus Honorio cos. IV* 111–117. Treatment of the supporters of the deposed usurpers in general is discussed by Szidat (2010: 328–337), according to whom they were being put to death mostly if they had participated in murdering the legitimate emperor, which was not Flavian's case. Yet even so, his situation was in my opinion precarious, because of the religious component of the conflict, played down unduly by Szidat (1979) and Cameron (2011: 59–131), even if emphasized perhaps also unduly (and unfortunately, without direct disputing at least the former) by Ratti (2012a: 111–114). In this case, therefore, rather the personal ties, of which Szidat (2010: 143) is aware, played their role.

³⁸ Which is a very persuasive argument of Hedrick (2000: 222–225).

³⁹ See CIL VI, 1783 = ILS 2948 vers. 18–21: QVIDQVID IN ISTVM (sc. *Flavianum*) CAECA INSIMVLATIONE COMMISSVM EST, PROCVL AB EIVS | PRINCIPIS (sc. *Theodosii*) VOTO FVISSE IVDICETIS, CVIVS IN EVM

bearable to Theodosius himself, at the time of mutual respect during his sojourn to Rome, when he could have shown interest in the views of the followers of the traditional cults,⁴⁰ but unbearable to his entourage?

One aspect, however, could embarrass an affirmative answer. After his rehabilitation in 431, reasons to be afraid of mentioning Flavian's name in connection with his *annales* certainly diminished, if not ceased, and afterwards, he was indeed occasionally mentioned at least in connection with his other literary works.⁴¹ So the question is, when were the *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Servius' commentary published. As for the first one, the scope of the matter is quite clear, since there is quite secure *terminus post quem* here: Theodosius' funeral in Constantinople in November 395, and quite secure *terminus ante quem* as well: the death of Arcadius in May 408.⁴²

The date of the commentary is less clear, since the first decade of the 5th century, prior to the fall of Rome, is preferred only by a majority of scholars. Two kinds of clues are at hand, the internal hints in the commentary itself and those based on Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, in which Servius appears as one of the main characters, whereby an approximate *terminus post quem* is provided.⁴³ But otherwise, this second group of clues is conten-

EFFVSA BENIVOLENTIA ET VSQ(ue) AD AN|NALIVM, QVOS CONSECRARI SIBI A QVAESTORE ET PRAEFEC-
TO SVO VOLVIT, PROVECTA | EXCITAVIT LIVOREM IMPROBORVM.

⁴⁰ Pacat. *Paneg.* 47, 3 describes certainly exaggeratedly Theodosius' behaviour in Rome, but the fact remains that in two subsequently issued constitutions, Theodosius intervened against some negative impacts brought into the public life by the church, to which see *Cod. Theod.* XVI, 2, 27 and 3, 1, and perhaps he had even been inclined towards the restitution of the Altar of Victory in the senate, as suggested by Ambr. *Epist.* 57, 4.

⁴¹ Sidon. *Epist.* VIII, 3, 1 mentions Flavian's *Vita Apollonii*, to which see Prchlik (2012: 50–51). Cassiodorus could have perhaps mentioned Flavian even in connection with his *annales*, yet the extant excerpt of his *Ordo generis Cassiodororum* no more than does not exclude, but neither supports this possibility, to which see Cassiod. *Anecd. Hold.* vers. 6–9. The *De vestigiis sive de dogmate philosophorum* is quoted directly at least by Iohannes Saresber. *Policrat.* II, 26 [460b]; VIII, 11 [749a]; VIII, 11 [755a]; VIII, 12 [758a]; VIII, 12 [761a], which certainly testifies to that the writing could have circulated inscribed with Flavian's name from some time on. For its ascription to Flavian see provisionally Prchlik (2012: 51) and add Ratti (2012a: 132–136), whose exposition contains valuable observations, acceptable even if his central thesis – the attribution of the authorship of the *Historia Augusta* to Flavian – is not accepted. For other quotations of “Flavianus”, although uncertain or doubtful whether to be identified with Virius Nicomachus Flavianus, see Prchlik (2012: 58–59). Furthermore, it cannot be excluded that Flavian as an author of the literary works is mentioned in the *Historia Augusta*, to which see both Prchlik (2012: 53–54 and 55) and Paschoud (2012: 368–369), yet under a nickname, and at an undisclosed time, as the date of publication of the *Historia Augusta* is very contentious, although not a few favour some point during the period of Flavian's *damnatio*. For the suspicious absence of any mention in Symmachus' letters, see above in note 34; similar absence in Macrobius' *Saturnalia* I consider caused by reasons of the kind suggested by Schlumberger, as referred with objections by Cameron (2011: 634), but these objections are based only on unfulfilled expectations which Cameron himself lays on Macrobius, and disregard the *lacunae* in those sections of the *Saturnalia* in which Flavian appears. And moreover, Cameron forgets about his own persuasion of the source of Macrobius' information, the letters of Symmachus (which, however, to clarify my own opinion, certainly was not his only source).

⁴² For the general date see Schlumberger (1974: 245), Festy (1999: LIII–LVI and 237 note 28) and Gauville (2005: 13–14). Theodosius' funeral is mentioned in Ps.Aur. Vict. *Epit.* 48, 20, and Arcadius together with Honorius in Ps.Aur. Vict. *Epit.* 48, 19 without any indication of his not being alive at the time. Cameron's (2001) suggestion, accepted as far as his premise, but not the conclusion by Barnes (2002: 27), according to whom the *Epitome* could have been published during the year 395, after the death of Theodosius, but before his funeral, has been decisively refuted by Festy (2003).

⁴³ The point is, when at latest Servius must have been born, to allow Macrobius to use him, probably with some licence, as a character, with regard to the dramatic date of the *Saturnalia*, to which see different opinions of Marinone (1970: 185–188) and Cameron (2011: 239–241).

tious, since Macrobian Servius differs largely in his expositions from the real Servius;⁴⁴ yet neither Servius does in his commentary reflect in any way the eventual existence of the *Saturnalia*, so the question is, which one of these two published his work first.

As for the internal hints, Thilo pointed to Servius' remark, that even the ancients had considered the Getae, identified commonly with the Goths during late antiquity, to be ferocious, which he deemed to have been inspired by Alaric's campaigns in Italy.⁴⁵ According to Georgii, Servius would not have had been so laconic following the fall of Rome in 410, yet he adverted to the battle of Adrianople in 378 as to an equally relevant possibility.⁴⁶ The idea was further developed by Döpp, who thought of three possibilities: the battle of Adrianople, the battle of Pollentia in 402, and the fall of Rome. The first one, however, had occurred too early, and in a far too distant Thracia, while the third one he excluded on the same grounds as Georgii did. On the contrary, the outcome of the battle of Pollentia had been Roman victory, which in Döpp's view corresponds with the aloofness of Servius' remark.⁴⁷ Murgia was more sceptical as to the *terminus post quem*, which he considered impossible to be specified, but at the same time he supported the fall of Rome as the *terminus ante quem* with the observation that Servius in no manner reflects it even when mentioning the prophecy of the rule of Rome lasting as long as the altar of Terminus remains in its place.⁴⁸ Cameron disputed the significance of Servius' remark concerning the Getae, which he considered suitable for any time between 380 and 440, but was nevertheless convinced that at the time of publication of the *Saturnalia* after 430,⁴⁹ Servius had already been dead, and that the commentary on the *Aeneid* had been written by him as the first of his Vergilian commentaries.⁵⁰ Also Schlumberger,

⁴⁴ See esp. Marinone (1970: 198–203).

⁴⁵ Thilo (1881: LXXII) and see Serv. *Aen.* VII, 604: *Getarum fera gens etiam apud maiores fuit*.

⁴⁶ Georgii (1912: 523) further foisted on Thilo the opinion that the confusion Getae × Goths had appeared as lately as with Alaric, allegedly due to Claudian's *Bellum Geticum* (not mentioned in any way by Thilo himself). An earlier appearance was considered by Georgii as proven by a joke on Caracalla in Hist. Aug. *Carac.* 10, 6, which he, however, quoted under the name of Spartianus, which indicates that he had then not embraced the still fresh Dessau's hypothesis of the emergence of this work close to the date of Claudian's *Bellum Geticum*, which opinion nowadays prevails. Other clues used by Thilo and Georgii for the date of the commentary have lost their relevance lately.

⁴⁷ Döpp (1978: 630–631). Too early is meant in respect to his *terminus post quem*, seen by him in the publication of the *Saturnalia*, which he dated prior to the commentary, but after the death of Symmachus in 402, who had never mentioned it anywhere.

⁴⁸ Murgia (2003: 61–64 and 68); Serv. *Aen.* IX, 446. Although Murgia allows for the absence of the eventually actual polemic between pagans and Christians in the commentary to have been caused by Servius' intention solely to explain Vergil's text in which this polemic is of course lacking, the total absence of any allusion whatsoever to the fall of Rome having already occurred, he considers hardly plausible. And this, he also deemed more compelling than eventual suspicion of the emergence of the commentary in Servius' late years, as is the case of e.g. Quintilian's *Institutio*.

⁴⁹ As for this date, I consider Cameron's reasoning fully justified, *pace* Ratti (2012a: 183 = 2012b: 1214–1215): Türk's (1963: 336–337) argument was not too cogent even at the moment when presented, Flamant's (1977: 91–93) attempt to establish a possibility for an earlier dating does not seem persuasive, and Bruggisser (2010: 832) supplies sufficient reasons for refuting the earlier date, while below (2010: 835) only some particulars supporting the later date are disputed relevantly by him. Accepting the date, however, does not at all mean that I share also Cameron's overall view of the *Saturnalia*.

⁵⁰ Cameron (2011: 247–252). Elsewhere (1966: 30; 2011: 240) he attempted to date the publication of two minor Servius' writings, yet established only the *termini post quos*, at approximately 400 in the first case, and possibly, but not necessarily, 408 in the second. Only in the first case did he establish also the *terminus ante quem*, at approximately 405.

even if without giving any reason, counted with approximately the year 400 as the date of publication of the commentary.⁵¹

Contrary to this, those who accept Cameron's date for the *Saturnalia*, but disapprove of the priority of the commentary, such as Marinone,⁵² advocate a later date of emergence of the commentary, which is considerably less compatible with the above presented hypothesis concerning the *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus.

So, what conclusions can be drawn from these observations? Schlumberger's suggestion concerning the reason for Servius' false attribution of his Augustan anecdote seems slightly supported, yet of course it still remains only a possibility not to be excluded. Other consequences drawn here concerning the *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus are thus to be treated similarly, save that the *annales* may have been at least a partial cause to have brought about Flavian's *damnatio memoriae*. This hypothesis, as based on the reading of Flavian's rehabilitation inscription, seems to bear more considerable plausibility.

REFERENCES

- ALFÖLDI, A., 1968. Die verlorene Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte und die „Caesares“ des Julianus Apostata. In: A. Alföldi, J. Straub (eds.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1966/67* [= Antiquitas. Reihe 4. Bd. 4]. Bonn: Habelt, 1–8.
- ANDERSON, W. B., 1936. *Sidonius, Poems and Letters*. With an English Translation by W. B. Anderson. II. *Letters. Books III–IX*. London: William Heinemann Ltd / Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (reprint 1965).
- ARMSTEDT, R., 1885. Quae ratio intercedat inter undecim capita priora Sext. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Cäsaribus et Epitomes, quae dicitur. In: *Fürstliches Adolfinum zu Bückeburg Gymnasium und Realprogymnasium. Jahresbericht über das Schuljahr 1884/85*. Bückeburg: s.n., 1–30.
- BARNES, T. D., 1976. The Epitome de Caesaribus and Its Sources. *Classical Philology* 71, 258–268.
- BARNES, T. D., 2002. Rev. M. Festy (ed., trans.), Pseudo-Aurélius Victor, *Abrégé des Césars*. *Classical Review* 52, 25–27.
- BIRLEY, A. R., 1984. Rev. B. Baldwin, Suetonius; A. Wallace-Hadrill, Suetonius. The Scholar and His Caesars; L. De Coninck, Suetonius en de Archivalia. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 74, 245–251.
- BLECKMANN, B., 1992. *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spätantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung. Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen des Chronik des Johannes Zonaras*. München: tuduv-Verlagsgesellschaft.
- BRENDEL, R., 2013. Rev. A. Cameron, The Last Pagans of Rome. *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 16, 1385–1394. <http://gfa.gbv.de/dr.gfa.016,2013,r,48.pdf>.
- BRUGGISSER, Ph., 2010. Macrobius. In: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 23. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 831–856.
- BURGESS, R. W., 1995. Jerome and the Kaisergeschichte. *Historia* 44, 349–369.

⁵¹ Schlumberger (1974: 246 note 56).

⁵² Marinone (1970: 208–210), according to whom both works were being written simultaneously, which is approved of by De Paolis (1986–1987: 119 and 125). Marinone (1970: 183–184) suggests that Servius could have mechanically taken over from his source the remark concerning the Getae, as well as he had done elsewhere, to which see esp. Serv. *Aen.* III, 80: *unde hodieque imperatores pontifices dicimus*. The fall of Rome could allegedly have been already forgotten around 430, if as early as 412 Honorius with all the requisites needed visited the city, and most of the destroyed buildings were soon repaired, as insinuated by Oros. *Hist.* VII, 40, 1.

- BURGESS, R. W., 2005. A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the Epitome de Caesaribus between 358 and 378, Along with Further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the Kaisergeschichte. *Classical Philology* 100, 166–190.
- CALLU, J.-P., 1999. En amont de l'Histoire Auguste, 357–387 (Notes sur quelques réflexes politico-culturels de la génération de Symmaque). In: F. Paschoud (ed.), *Historiae-Augustae-Colloquium Genevense* [= *Historiae Augustae Colloquia*. Nova series VII]. Bari: Edipuglia, 87–107.
- CAMERON, A., 1964. The Roman Friends of Ammianus. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 54, 15–28.
- CAMERON, A., 1966. The Date and Identity of Macrobius. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 56, 25–38.
- CAMERON, A., 2001. The Epitome de Caesaribus and the Chronicle of Marcellinus. *Classical Quarterly* 51, 324–327.
- CAMERON, A., 2011. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford: University Press.
- CHASTAGNOL, A., 1994. *Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs romains des II^e et III^e siècles*. Édition bilingue latin-français. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- CIL = *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berolini, 1863–.
- COHN, A., 1884. *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et epitomes undecim capita priora fluxerint. Quaestio historica*. Berolini: Adolf Cohn Verlag & Antiquariat.
- DE CONINCK, L., 1991. Les sources documentaires de Suetone, “Les XII Césars”: 1900–1990. In: W. Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 33, 5. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 3675–3700.
- DE PAOLIS, P., 1986–1987. Macrobio 1934–1984. *Lustrum* 28–29, 107–254.
- DEN BOER, W., 1979. Rev. J. Schlumberger, Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. *Gnomon* 51, 165–171.
- DÖPP, S., 1978. Zur Datierung von Macrobius’ Saturnalia. *Hermes* 106, 619–632.
- EGGER, É., 1844. *Examen critique des historiens anciens de la vie et du règne d’Auguste*. Paris: Dezobry, E. Magdeleine et C^{ie}.
- ENMANN, A., 1884. Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch De viris illustribus urbis Romae. Quellenstudien. *Philologus. Supplementband* 4, 335–501.
- ENSSLIN, W., 1923. *Zur Geschichtsschreibung und Weltanschauung des Ammianus Marcellinus* [= Klio. Beiheft 16]. Leipzig: Dieterich.
- FESTY, M., 1999. Pseudo-Aurélius Victor, *Abrégé des Césars*. Texte établi, traduit et commenté par Michel Festy. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- FESTY, M., 2003. De l’Epitome de Caesaribus à la Chronique de Marcellin: l’Historia Romana de Symmaque le Jeune. *Historia* 52, 251–255.
- FLAMANT, J., 1977. *Macrobe et le néo-platonisme latin, à la fin du IV^e siècle*. Leiden: Brill.
- GAUVILLE, J.-L., 2005. *Abbreviated Histories: The Case of the Epitome de Caesaribus (AD c. 395)*. A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the degree of doctor in philosophy. http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/R/?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=85163&local_base=GEN01-MCG02.
- GEORGII, H., 1912. Zur Bestimmung der Zeit des Servius. *Philologus* 71, 518–526.
- HAUPT, H., 1885. Sueton’s angebliche Schrift über die Bürgerkriege. *Philologus* 44, 291–299.
- HEDRICK, Ch. W., 2000. *History and Silence. Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- HELM, R., 1927. Hieronymus und Eutrop. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 76, 138–170; 254–306.
- ILS = DESSAU, H. (ed.), 1892–1916. *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*. Berolini: apud Weidmannos.
- LOYEN, A., 1970. Sidoine Apollinaire. Tome III. *Lettres (livres VI–IX)*. Texte établi et traduit par André Loyen. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- MARACHE, R., 1989. Aulu-Gelle, *Les Nuits Attiques*. Tome III. Livres XI–XV. Texte établi et traduit par René Marache. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- MARINONE, N., 1970. Per la cronologia di Servio. *Atti della Accademia delle scienze di Torino, classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 104, 181–211.
- MÖBIUS, Th., 1846. Zur Kenntniss einiger Handschriften des Sueton. *Philologus* 1, 631–639.
- MOMMSEN, Th., 1850. Ueber die Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus. *Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 2, 1850, 669–693.
- MOMMSEN, Th., 1909. Ueber die Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus. In: Th. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften. Siebenter Band. Philologische Schriften*. Berlin: Weidmann, 606–632.
- MURGIA, C. E., 2003. The Dating of Servius Revisited. *Classical Philology* 98, 45–69.

- PASCHOUD, F., 2010. Chronique d'historiographie tardive. *Antiquité tardive* 18, 309–320.
- PASCHOUD, F., 2012. On a Recent Book by Alan Cameron: The Last Pagans of Rome. *Antiquité tardive* 20, 359–388.
- PIROGOFF, W., 1873. *De Eutropii Breuiarii ab u. c. indole ac fontibus. Part. I. Dissertatio inauguralis historica*. Berolini: Guil. Buexenstein.
- PRCHLÍK, I., 2011. Zosimus, Praetextatus, and Valentinian I. The Quellenforschung Note on Zosimus, *Historia nova*, IV,3,3, and the Possible Purpose of Annales of Nicomachus Flavianus. *Listy filologické* 134, 309–322.
- PRCHLÍK, I., 2012. HISTORICVS DISSERTISSIMVS, but What Else? Questions Regarding the Literary Work of Virius Nicomachus Flavianus. *Graecolatina Pragensia* 24, 49–63.
- RATTI, S., 2012a. *Polémiques entre païens et chrétiens*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- RATTI, S., 2012b. Rev. A. Cameron, The Last Pagans of Rome. *Latomus* 71, 1212–1217.
- REIFFERSCHIED, A., 1860. *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*. Edidit Augustus Reifferscheid. Lipsiae: Teubner.
- RODA, S., 1981. *Commento storico al libro IX dell'epistolario di Q. Aurelio Simmaco*. Pisa: Giardini editori e stampatori.
- ROTH, C. L., 1858. *C. Suetoni Tranquilli quae supersunt omnia*. Recensuit Carolus Ludovicus Roth. Lipsiae: Teubner.
- SCHANZ, M., HOSIUS, C., KRÜGER, G., ³1922. *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. Dritter Teil. Die Zeit von Hadrian 117 bis auf Constantin 324*. München: Beck.
- SCHLUMBERGER, J., 1974. *Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* [= Vestigia. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte. Band 18]. München: Beck.
- SCHLUMBERGER, J., 2000. Rev. M. Festy, Pseudo-Aurélius Victor, Abrégé des Césars. *Antiquité tardive* 8, 395–399.
- SCHRADER, C., 1877. *De scriptoribus rerum Augusti temporibus gestarum quaestiones selectae. Dissertatio inauguralis*. Monasterii: Formis Theissingianis.
- SCHWARTZ, E., 1899. Cassius Dio Cocceianus [= Cassius 40]. In: G. Wissowa (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* III. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlerscher Verlag, 1684–1722.
- SCHWARTZ, E., 1957. *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber*. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.
- SZIDAT, J., 1979. Die Usurpation des Eugenius. *Historia* 28, 487–508.
- SZIDAT, J., 2010. *Usurpator tanti nominis. Kaiser und Usurpator in der Spätantike (337–476 n. Chr.)* [= *Historia Einzelschriften* 210]. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- THILO, G., 1881. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Recensuerunt Georgius Thilo et Hermannus Hagen. Vol. I. *Aeneidos librorum I–V commentarii*. Recensuit Georgius Thilo. Lipsiae: Teubner.
- TÜRK, E., 1963. Les Saturnales de Macrobe, source de Servius Danielis. *Revue des études latines* 41, 327–349.
- WAGENER, C., 1886. Eutropius. *Philologus* 45, 509–551.
- WÖLFFLIN, E., 1874. Aurelius Victor. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 29, 282–308.

AUGUSTOVY OHNIVÉ OČI A ANNÁLY NICOMACHA FLAVIANA

Shrnutí

Autor *Epitome de Caesaribus* a Servius zmiňují tutěž anekdotu o Augustových ohnivých očích, Servius s odkazem na svůj zdroj, Suetonia, u nějž se ale tato anekdota nevyskytuje. Podle Jörga Schlumbergera mohly jejím skutečným pozdně antickým zdrojem být annály Nicomacha Flaviana, které ale nebylo možné citovat kvůli *damnatio memoriae* uvalené na jejich autora. Postřehy autora článku tuto domněnku podporují, a navíc samotné annály současně mohly uvalení této *damnatio* spoluzpůsobit.

NOTES ON VELLEIUS BOOK I**(2, 1; 6, 1–2; 12, 7; 14, 2; 16, 5; 17, 2)***

PAVEL NÝVLT (Praha)

ABSTRACT

The article deals with six passages in the first book of Velleius Paterculus. In I, 2, 1, Scaliger's emendation of *atavus* to *abavus* is defended; in I, 6, 1–2, it is suggested to read *omnino DXX* instead of the received *†ooLXX†*; in I, 12, 7, a conjecture *neque quicquam* is suggested; precision of some Velleius' statements in I, 14, 2 is defended; a new interpretation of the mention of Isocrates in I, 16, 5 is offered; and a correction *historicos* {*et*} in I, 17, 2 is suggested.

Key words: Velleius Paterculus; textual criticism; Latin; Roman historiography; Greek history and the Romans; Middle East history and the Romans

The historical work written by Velleius Paterculus has always attracted much attention of textual critics, given a sad situation of its preservation.¹ Especially in the 19th century, much effort was made to emend the text, sometimes with results of rather curious nature.² Authors of the two most copious modern commentaries on Velleius have therefore expressly resigned on suggesting emendations of their own,³ and the only modern editor who adopted a more liberal attitude to Velleius' text was strongly criticised for his toying with the text.⁴

Nevertheless, I believe that any quantity of ink spilt on Velleius' text cannot exhaust all possibilities of its improvement. If I dare to come forward with few suggestions of my own, it is because I am convinced that the situation of the textual critic is today much

* This study came to light thanks to the longterm institutional support provided by the Institute of Philosophy (RVO: 67985955). This article could not have come to being without Prof. B. Mouchová, to whom I would like to dedicate the text in order to express my gratitude for her kind help and encouragement. The journal's referees and redactors have also been of much help. Needless to emphasise, any inconsistencies and errors are exclusively my own.

¹ All preserved sources of Velleius' text stem from a *codex Murbacensis* which was lost soon after a publication of *editio princeps* by Beatus Rhenanus; worse still, it was swarming with errors and partially illegible (as Rhenanus tells us), see, e.g., Woodman (1977: 1–27); Hellegouarc'h (1982: lxxiii–xciv); Watt (1988: v–x); Elefante (1997: 1–16).

² Stegmann von Pritzwald (1933: v) numbered some 1,500 emendations of Velleius' text suggested between 1873 and 1932. It inspires modesty in anyone who dares to come with their own ideas, but should not, I believe, deter them.

³ Hellegouarc'h (1982: lxxvii), with several exceptions listed (*ibidem* note 1), and Elefante (1997: 13), referred to as "the commentators" below.

⁴ See Elefante's remarks on the edition of Watt (Elefante 1997: 11–12).

easier than ever before thanks to electronic databases, and because I hope that my suggestions will not be perceived as an insult to my giant predecessors, whose work inspired my journey in the labyrinth of Velleian scholarship.

Below, I would like to present my comments on a few passages, not confining myself to textual criticism alone, but also making a few suggestions as to how we could understand Velleius' words, as the number of commentaries on Velleius is still much lower than the sum of publications concerned exclusively with his text. All the passages will be taken from the first book of Velleius' work. The book dealt with a history of mankind from an uncertain point in the mythological past⁵ up to 146 BCE, with two appendices on Roman colonies and on a tendency of important figures of arts and literature to flock together. The great majority of the first book has fallen victim to *lacunae*: besides the beginning from the proem to the return of the Homeric heroes to their homelands, anything from between the rape of the Sabine women and the battle of Pydna is also lost to us, apart from one brief sentence about Cimon preserved by Priscian. Now let us turn to the text in the quest for its better understanding.

I, 2, 1: *Pelopis progenies, quae omni hoc tempore pulsus Heraclidis Peloponnesi imperium obtinuerat, ab Herculis progenie expellitur. Duces recuperandi imperii fuisse Temenus, Cresphontes, Aristodemus, quorum atavus fuerat.*

Thus the *editio princeps*. But since J. J. Scaliger⁶ it has been recognised that Heracles was not *atavus*, but *abavus* of the three Peloponnesian kings (sons as they were of Aristomachus, son of Cleodaeus, son of Hyllus, son of Heracles – cf. Paus. II, 6, 7; II, 18, 7; and III, 15, 10), and text was accordingly emended. The correction stood unshaken until Elefante⁷ protested it was unnecessary, because Velleius (we are told) had no interest in precise genealogy. She adduces the following evidence for his apparent negligence: *avus* at I, 8, 5 (on Romulus' relationship to Latinus, from whom he was of course separated by several generations);⁸ *nepos* (instead of *pronepos*) at II, 16, 2;⁹ and *avunculus* (instead of *magnus avunculus*) at II, 59, 5 and 60, 2.

Now the edge of the first two examples may, I believe, be blunted by understanding the words *avus* and *nepos* more generally, as "ancestor" and "descendant" respectively, as is common in Augustan poetry.¹⁰ As for *magnus avunculus*, Tacitus consistently avoids

⁵ The Trojan war was a popular suggestion – see Sumner (1970: 281); Brožek (1962: 125), who wavered between the Trojan war and the death of Heracles; Starr (1981: 166); or Hellegouarc'h (1982: xxii); Schmitzer (1997: 43–48) has suggested the creation of the world or Heracles' death; lastly, Wiseman (2010) opted for the battle of the Phlegrean plain. I agree with Kramer (2005: 144–148, 160) that the foundation of Niniveh, the earliest event mentioned (I, 6, 1), seems to be the most likely point of beginning.

⁶ Hellegouarc'h (1982: 2) and Elefante (1997: 58) credit Meurs with the emendation, but his work in question (Meursius 1687: 30) appeared 81 years after that of Scaliger (of whom I could see only the second edition: Scaliger 1658: 58). Watt (1988: 2) assigns the emendation rightly.

⁷ Elefante (1997: 158).

⁸ Hellegouarc'h (1982: 31) and Elefante (1997: 174) suggest that Velleius followed Dionysus of Chalcis (cited by D. H. I, 72, 6) in considering Romulus greatgrandson of Latinus. I feel another explanation is possible, see below.

⁹ Sumner (1970: 259) suggested *pro-nepos*. I believe it is not necessary to emend the text, see below.

¹⁰ For *avus*, see ThLL II, 1611.73; for *nepos*, see e.g. Verg. *Aen.* VI, 864; Hor. *Carm.* II, 13, 3; and perhaps Ov. *Pont.* III, 3, 62, where the mss. vary between *fratre nepos* and *fratre tuus*. The first possibility would be the only Augustan example of singular *nepos* in this sense.

it;¹¹ the first instance of the expression in a historical work appears as late as at the beginning of Aurelius Victor's *Liber de Caesaribus*, so it perhaps was not a phrase used by historiographers of the 1st century. What is more, we find *maior avunculus* with the same meaning at II, 59, 3, which could influence the word choice in both II, 59, 5 and 60, 2 and ensures that readers will not be misled.¹² I would suggest, then, that Velleius was rather avoiding cumbersome genealogical terminology than uninterested in genealogy itself.

Now *abavus* may bear the less precise meaning of "remote ancestor";¹³ *atavus* can, too, but all surviving examples of this usage are in the plural.¹⁴ Therefore, I think that whatever was in the *Murbacensis*, *abavus* is marginally more likely and should be preferred, especially as it is a very easy correction.

I, 6, 1–2: *Insequenti tempore imperium Asiaticum ab Assyriis, qui id obtinuerant annis †ooLXX†, translatum est ad Medos, abhinc annos ferme DCC·C·LXX. (2) Quippe Sardanapalum eorum regem ... tertio et tricesimo loco ab Nino et Semiramide, qui Babylona condiderant, natum ... †Pharnaces† Medus imperio vitaque privavit.*

This, putting aside the *cruces* and the extended numeral, is the text of the *editio princeps*.¹⁵ The extension of the second numeral from *DCCLXX* to *DCC·C·LXX*, suggested by Lipsius, is guaranteed by the context. Had Velleius thought that the Assyrian Empire ended in 740 BCE, he would have put this notice after the founding of Rome and it would be lost in the great lacuna. The strange first numeral was emended to *M·CC·XXX* by Lipsius; to *M·CC·LXX* by Berndt; and to *M·CCC·{LXX}* by Potter, who deleted *LXX* as a dittography caused by the following numeral.¹⁶ Of all these corrections, only the last one is grounded on ancient evidence, as far as I can see.

According to Herodotus (I, 95, 2), the Assyrian hegemony lasted for 520 years, until it was crushed by a rebellion of the Medes. Yet Ctesias (FGrH 688 F 1b/28.8) knew thirty Assyrian kings from Ninus to Sardanapalus, who ruled over 1.300 years, until they were defeated by Arbaces the Mede. Ctesias' account was followed by Diodorus Siculus (II, 22, 2), Nicolaus of Damascus (FGrH 90 F 2–3), Duris of Samos (FGrH 76 F 14) and Pompeius Trogus (see Justin. I, 2, 12). Yet another tradition was preserved by Castor of Rhodes (FrGH 250 F 1a, d), according to whom the Assyrians ruled Asia for 1280 years from the accession of their first king Belus.¹⁷

Velleius' number of 33 Assyrian kings is, as far as I know, without parallel,¹⁸ so he probably drew on some chronological account lost to us, neither on Ctesias nor on Cas-

¹¹ See *Ann.* II, 43, 5; II, 53, 2; IV, 3, 4; IV, 75; XII, 64, 2.

¹² See ThLL II, 1609.14–55.

¹³ See ThLL I, 48.61.

¹⁴ See ThLL I, 1014.44

¹⁵ The strange numeral *ooLXX* appears only in Elefante's edition; every other edition I have seen has *MLXX*. Yet Elefante is, I believe, on right lines.

¹⁶ See Potter (1997).

¹⁷ Of course, the Jews had their own tradition regarding the Assyrians (see e.g. Ios. *Ant.* I, 6, 4; I, 9 et al.), but it did not influence Velleius at all. Nor can any similarity be found with accounts of Christian chronographers: see Eusebius (p. 30, 2732, 15 Karst), who gives dates 2057–818 BCE (1239 years) for the first Assyrian Empire (the second one being destroyed in 623 BCE, that is 1434 years after its foundation, by Cyaxares the Mede), or Orosius (II, 3, 2), who gives 1164 years to the Assyrian Empire in order to correlate it with its Roman counterpart.

¹⁸ The somewhat similar number of 23 Assyrian kings can be found in Cephallion, a historian who lived under Emperor Hadrian – see Drews (1965: 135–136), from whose very useful article Velleius is sadly

tor. It does not seem impossible that this unknown source was somehow influenced by Herodotus.¹⁹ So, why could Velleius not have written *omnino DXX*? *Omnino* would be written *ōō* in the 8th century,²⁰ and it was not alien to Velleius, for it appears at II, 10, 2, admittedly unconnected with any date.²¹ Yet this use of *omnino* would not be without parallels in Velleius' time.²²

The name of the Mede who defeated Sardanapalus is commonly changed by the editors to *Arbaces* on the basis of Ctesias. It is quite bold emendation and has already been criticised as such.²³ Could not either a source of Velleius or the Roman historian himself have misunderstood Herodotus (I, 102–103), who records an unsuccessful attack on Assyria by *Phraortes* the Mede?²⁴ One can easily imagine a scribe who finds in a text such a strange name, which does not appear in preserved Latin literature, and mangles it to the better-known name of Caesar's enemy defeated in the battle of Zela (whose name, by the way, appears in II, 40, 1 and II, 55, 2).

I, 12, 7: *Neque se Roma iam terrarum orbi superato securam speravit fore, si nomen usquam stantis maneret Carthaginis: adeo odium certaminibus ortum ultra metum durat et ne in victis quidem deponitur, neque ante invisum esse desinit quam esse desiit.*

The end of this sentence is probably the most vexed passage of the whole first book. Iustus Lipsius, who believed that *nomen Carthaginis* could not be object of *desinit*, suggested *invisa*.²⁵ Gertz²⁶ suggested *neque ante invisum esse desinit* *quid*, *quam esse desiit* which, I believe, is on the right line, but the resulting word-order is exceedingly strange and surely without parallel in Velleius. One suggestion that has – in my book – received less attention than would be its due is that of Schöll, who understood *invisum esse* and *esse* as infinitives with substantive force (τὸ μισεῖσθαι πρὸ τοῦ εἶναι οὐ τελεῖ, might one be tempted to translate).²⁷ Yet if the text stands, the reader is theoretically free to understand it this way or to connect *invisum* with *odium* or *nomen*, which is in my opinion very confusing. Therefore, I find it rather surprising that both Hellegouarc'h and Elefante have found no fault with the text; Hellegouarc'h even called it a “*bel exemple de sententia*”. He was strongly criticised for it by Goodyear who wished to emend the ending boldly to *invisum*, *quod semel fuit invisum*, *esse desiit*. Watt followed Goodyear in putting a *lacuna* after *invisum*, but wished to complete the text by something like *id quod odimus*. Elefante suggested a brachyology as the solution,²⁸ but I have already noted why I think there is

absent. But according to Cephalion the Assyrian hegemony ended after 1.013 years, so he too does not represent the same tradition as Velleius.

¹⁹ For instance, Velleius agrees with the Halicarnassian about the origin of the Etruscans (compare I, 1, 4 with Hdt. I, 94, 3–7), the return of the Heraclidae (I, 2, 1 ≈ Hdt. VI, 52, 1) or the ancestry of Thessalus (I, 3, 1 ≈ Hdt. VII, 176, 4).

²⁰ See Capelli (1967: 251).

²¹ Pluygers suggested to emend *omnino* in II, 10, 2 to *omnes*, unnecessarily, I believe.

²² See ThLL IX/2, 599.20–37, esp. 31–37.

²³ See Goodyear (1984: 197): “How was Arbaces corrupted into Pharnaces? May not Velleius be in error?”

²⁴ One is reminded of Velleius' misinterpretation of Cato the Elder in I, 7, 2–4, for which see Hellegouarc'h (1982: 29–30) and Elefante (1997: 171).

²⁵ Lipsius (1591: 24–25); he was followed by Ruhnken (1779: 50).

²⁶ Gertz (1874: 106). I did not know about this emendation when I invented the one suggested above.

²⁷ Schöll (1898: 519–522).

²⁸ Elefante (1997: 184). It seems to me that she was rather unfair to Watt in criticising him for posing the lacuna there by maintaining (Elefante 1997: 12) that concerning the soundness of the text of the

something more hiding in here. I would tentatively suggest inserting «*quicquam*» after *neque*. *Quicquam* appears nine times in the extant part of Velleius' work, all in the second book (16, 2; 22, 5; 24, 4; 52, 4; 55, 2; 71, 1; 80, 3; 95, 3; 123, 2), and comparable constructions appear at I, 13, 3 (*Neque enim quisquam hoc Scipione elegantius intervalla negotiorum otio dispunxit*) or II, 22, 5 (*Nec quicquam videretur turpe, quod esset quaestuosum*).

I, 14, 2: *Post septem annos quam Galli urbem ceperant, Sutrium deducta colonia est et post annum Setia. Novemque interiectis annis Nepe, deinde interpositis duobus et triginta Aricini in civitatem recepti.*

Livy (VI, 30, 9) dates the foundation of Setia in 379 BCE, so it appears that Velleius believed that Sutrium was founded in 380 BCE (its foundation is not recorded by Livy) and that the Gauls captured Rome in 387.²⁹ I fail to understand why both the commentators count with the Gallic invasion date of 390³⁰ – which, of course, would mean that the first two data given by Velleius are imprecise.³¹ But what about Nepe? According to Livy (VI, 27, 4), it was founded in 383 BCE, whereas the Velleian dates as interpreted above would lead to 370 BCE. I would tentatively suggest that Velleius (or his source) was misled by some similar names in the list of eponymous magistrates of the years in concern. The similarities can be seen in bold type in the table below:

383 BCE (Livy VI, 21, 1)	370 BCE (Livy VI, 36, 3)
L. Valerius Poplicola	P. Valerius Poplicola
A. Manlius Capitolinus	A. Manlius Vulso
Ser. Sulpicius Rufus	Ser. Sulpicius Praetextatus
L. Lucretius Flavius Tricipitinus	C. Valerius Potitus
L. Aemilius Mamercinus	Ser. Cornelius Maluginensis
M. Trebonius	

Even if the above suggestion may not seem quite decisive, I am led to believe that Velleius dated the Gallic invasion in 387 BCE by the following mention of Aricia, for if we subtract 32 years from the date of 370 BCE, we arrive at 338 BCE – the date given to the grant of Roman citizenship to the inhabitants of Aricia by Livy.³²

I, 16, 5: *Quid ante Isocraten, quid post eius auditores eorumque discipulos clarum in oratoribus fuit?*

Coming to the end of his excursus on how the brightest stars of the Greek literature appeared in a short period of time, Velleius picks up just one of the canon of ten Attic orators. Why did he do so? The commentators present us with two complementary

sentence, “*gli editori precedenti non avevano mai dubitato o che avevano emendato in maniera accettabile.*”

²⁹ That would agree with the date given e.g. by Pol. I, 6, 1–2 or D. H. I, 74, 4.

³⁰ The date given, for instance, by Liv. V, 36, 11–38, 10.

³¹ See Hellegouarc’h (1982: 39) and Elefante (1997: 189): “*le indicazioni cronologiche sono imprecise.*”

³² Liv. VIII, 14, 3.

theorems: First, that of Della Corte, according to whom Velleius followed Apollodorus of Pergamum who declared Isocrates the best of orators; second, that of Gustin, that Velleius was led by his desire to achieve a strict parallel between Greek and Roman literature, Roman oratory being dominated by Cicero.³³ The commentators further argue that Isocrates could not see the *acme* of Antiphon, Andocides and Lysias, the last named being omitted because Velleius disproved of his Atticist style. I would like to present a different line of argument; but first we should look a bit closer to the birth dates of the abovementioned orators.

Isocrates, born in 436 BCE,³⁴ could well have been present at the famous trial where Antiphon was sentenced to death for his involvement in the 411 oligarchic *coup d'état* despite his brilliant defence speech.³⁵ Furthermore, Isocrates was the *younger* contemporary of both Andocides (who was over forty in 400/399)³⁶ and Lysias (whose birth date is uncertain and I hope to deal with it elsewhere, but his being Isocrates' elder is proved beyond reasonable doubt by comparing Plato's *Phaedrus* 227a with 278e–279a). Nor does it seem plausible that Velleius would omit Lysias because of his Atticism, since he does name Marcus Brutus among the greatest orators of Rome (II, 36, 2).³⁷

Why then does Velleius mention Isocrates only? I think it is because Isocrates, who lived to the age of 98 years, suits amazingly well Velleius' theory of important literary figures living to see each other. Sure, there is a good deal of parallelism between Greek and Roman literature in this passage of Velleius, but Cicero is by no means the only Roman *orator* mentioned here (see I, 17, 3), and had Velleius wished to create strict parallels, he could have adduced (say) three authors of tragedies and comedies, four orators and three historians from both the nations instead of making the parallels harder to find by mentioning six Greek comedigraphers and three philosophers for whom he obviously could find no adequate number of Roman counterparts.

I, 17, 2: *Historicos et, ut Livium quoque priorum aetati adstruas, praeter Catonem et quosdam veteres et obscuros minus LXXX annis circumdatum aevum tulit.*

Regrettably, the commentators say us nothing about text of this sentence. Hellegouarc'h follows Voss in emending *et* to *etiam*, as does Watt, among others, while Elefante retains the text of the tradition as printed above. Obviously, *et* could then only bear the sense of *etiam*, but its position would be very strange. I would suggest deleting it as dittography of the following *ut*. There begins a series of vexed passages: I, 17, 5, I, 18, 1 and I, 18, 3. It gives the impression that the copyist was quite tired and/or careless when writing the last lines of Book One. Such a minor slip is easily conceivable. As for the problems of the vexed passages cited just above, I prefer to leave them for greater scholars to solve.

³³ See Della Corte (1937: 154–155), Hellegouarc'h (1982: 45), Elefante (1997: 197). I regret being unable to see Gustin's 1944 dissertation *Les péripécies littéraires dans l'ouvrage de Velleius Paterculus*.

³⁴ See [Plut.] *Mor.* 836f.

³⁵ See Thuc. VIII, 68, 2.

³⁶ See [Lys.] VI, 46. The assertion of pseudo-Plutarch (*Mor.* 835a) that Andocides was born in 468/7, is manifestly false.

³⁷ For Brutus' Atticism, see e.g. Tac. *Dial.* 18, 5 or Plut. *Brut.* 2, 5–7.

REFERENCES

- BROŽEK, M., 1962. De Velleii Paterculi opusculo mutilato. *Eos* 52, 125–128.
- CAPELLI, A. (ed.), 1967. *Lexicon abbreviatarum. Dizionario di abbreviature Latine ed Italiane*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli.
- DELLA CORTE, F., 1937. I giudizi letterari di Velleio Patercolo. *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica* 16, 154–159.
- DREWS, R., 1965. Assyria in classical universal histories. *Historia* 14, 129–142.
- ELEFANTE, M., 1997. Velleius Paterculus, *Ad M. Vinicium consulem libri duo*. Curavit adnotavitque Maria Elefante. Hildesheim/Zürich/New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- FGRH = JACOBY, F. (ed.), 1923–1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung; Leiden: Brill.
- GERTZ, M. C., 1874. *Studia critica in L. Annaei Senecae dialogos*. Hauniae: Libraria Gyldendaliana.
- GOODYEAR, F. R. D., 1984. Not a very new Velleius. *Classical Review* 34, 196–197.
- HELLEGOUARC'H, J., 1982. Velleius Paterculus, *Histoire Romaine. Tome I. Livre I. Texte établi et traduit par Joseph Hellegouarc'h*. Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres.
- KRAMER, E. A., 2005. Book One of Velleius' *History*. *Historia* 54, 146–161.
- LIPSIUS, I., 1591. *Ad Velleium Paterculum animadversiones*. Lugduni Batavorum: F. Raphelengius.
- MEURSIUS, I., 1687. *De regno Laconico libri II*. Traiecti ad Rhenum: G. Vande Walter.
- POTTER, D., 1997. M. Elefante (ed.), Velleius Paterculus, *Ad M. Vinicium consulem libri duo*. Zurich: Hildesheim, 1997. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 97.9.19.
- RUHNKEN, D., 1779. *C. Vellei Paterculi quae supersunt ex Historia Romana voluminibus duobus tomus I*. Lugduni Batavorum: S. & I. Luchtmans.
- SCALIGER, I. I., 1658. *Animadversiones in Chronologica Eusebi*. Lugduni Batavorum: J. Janssonius.
- SCHMITZER, U., 1997. *Velleius Paterculus und das Interesse an der Geschichte im Zeitalter des Tiberius*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- SCHÖLL, F., 1898. Zum ersten Buch des Velleius Paterculus. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 53, 511–525.
- STARR, R. J., 1981. The Scope and Genre of Velleius' History. *The Classical Quarterly* 31, 162–174.
- STEGMANN de Pritzwald, C., 1933. *C. Vellei Paterculi ex Historiae Romanae libris duobus quae supersunt*. Post C. Halmium iterum edidit C. Stegmann de Pritzwald. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri.
- SUMNER, G. V., 1970. The Truth about Velleius Paterculus. Prolegomena. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74, 57–297.
- THLL = *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. Lipsiae; München; Berlin/New York, 1900–.
- WATT, W. S., 1988. *Vellei Paterculi Historiarum ad M. Vinicium consulem libri duo*. Recognovit W. S. Watt. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft.
- WISEMAN, T. P., 2010. Velleius Mythistoricus. In: C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, C. Pelling (eds.), *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts. Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 73–83.
- WOODMAN, A. J., 1977. Velleius Paterculus, *The Tiberian Narrative (2.94–131)*. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by A. J. Woodman. Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

POZNÁMKY K PRVNÍ KNIZE VELLEIA PATERCULA

Shrnutí

Článek se věnuje šesti místům první knihy díla Velleia Patercula. V I, 2, 1 obhazuje Scaligerovu emendaci *atavus* na *abavus*, v I, 6, 1–2 doporučuje číst dochované †*ooLXX*† jako *omnino DXX*, v I, 12, 7 navrhuje konjekturu *neque quicquam*, dále obhazuje přesnost některých Velleiových údajů v I, 14, 2, přináší novou interpretaci zmínky o Ísokratovi v I, 16, 5 a konečně navrhuje opravu *historicos* {et} v I, 17, 2.

**EINE FROMME FAMILIE AUS LYDIEN UND IHR GOTT
Bemerkungen zu den Kommunikationsstrategien mit
dem Göttlichen im ländlichen Kleinasien
der Kaiserzeit***

GIAN FRANCO CHIAI (Berlin)

ABSTRACT**A pious Lydian family and their God****Remarks on the strategies of religious communication in the imperial Asia Minor countryside**

Studying a sacral dedication for the Anatolian god Men Motyleites, this paper aims at reconstructing some aspects of the strategies of religious communication in the countryside in Roman times, where numerous local gods were worshipped. The gods were represented and imagined as omnipotent kings ruling a territory and protecting their worshipers, as e.g. the tales of the confessional inscriptions testimony reveal.

Tatiane and Glaukos, the ones dedicating, thank their god for protecting the birth of their adopted daughter, presenting and dedicating the child to Men. They define themselves as *philotheoi* (loving god) and emphasize that they have prayed only to the god Men Motyleites and no any other divinity, because he protects their home, family, property and health by using the adverb *aei*.

Key words: Anatolia; henotheism; ritual; worship; performance

Wie eine reiche und vielfältige epigraphische Dokumentation zeigt, lässt sich seit dem 2. Jh. n. Chr. im Bereich der religiösen Praktiken (besonders im griechischen Osten) eine Tendenz zum Glauben an einen henotheistischen oder monotheistischen Gott feststellen, der nicht nur als allmächtig, sondern in manchen Fällen auch als allgegenwärtig dargestellt wird. Diese Tendenz, die parallel zur Verbreitung und Entstehung der frühchristlichen Gemeinden im römischen Reich zu verlaufen scheint und allgemein von der Forschung als *pagan monotheism* bezeichnet wird,¹ hat unter anderem auch wichtige Veränderungen in der Sprache sowie in den Media der religiösen Kommunikation

* Meine Danksagungen gehen an Frau Dr. Renate Burri (HU Berlin) und Frau Daniela kleine Burhoff (FU Berlin) für sprachliche Korrekturen und interessante Beobachtungen, sowie an Herrn Dr. J. Curbra (Berlin- Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften), der mich auf einige Besonderheiten der epigraphischen Texte aufmerksam machte. Ich bedanke mich auch bei den zwei anonymen Gutachtern, die in verschiedenen Punkten zur Verbesserung dieses Aufsatzes beigetragen haben.

¹ Zu diesem Phänomen vgl. die Sammelbände Athanassiadi, Frede (1999); Mitchell, van Nuffelen (2010a; 2010b); vgl. dazu die Arbeiten von Sfameni Gasparro (2010); van Nuffelen (2012); Fürst (2013) mit umfassenden Literaturhinweisen zu diesem Thema.

bewirkt, indem traditionelle Epitheta wie z.B. ὕψιστος mit einem teilweise neuen Sinn verwendet und neue Ausdrücke, wie etwa εἰς θεός, eingeführt werden, um solche neuen sakralen Vorstellungen zum Ausdruck zu bringen. So sind interessante Konvergenzen in der Sprache religiöser Kommunikation der Juden, Christen und Heiden entstanden, die häufig die Zuweisung eines epigraphischen Textes ohne Kontext an eine bestimmte Glaubensrichtung erschweren.²

Aus den ländlichen Heiligtümern Phrygiens und Lydiens stammen zahlreiche Inschriften religiösen Inhalts (Gebete, Beichtinschriften, Weihungen usw.), welche das religiöse Leben zu rekonstruieren ermöglichen.³ Diese Inschriften dokumentieren, dass in diesen abgelegenen Winkeln des römischen Reiches zahlreiche lokale Gottheiten verehrt wurden, die als allmächtig und stark ortsgebunden imaginiert wurden. Sie wurden als omnipotente Könige angesehen, welche ihre sterblichen Untertanen schützten und durch ihre Eingriffe die Gerechtigkeit wiederherstellten, indem sie Verbrecher durch furchtbare Krankheiten bestraften, und kranke Menschen heilten.⁴

Diese Arbeit setzt sich zum Ziel, einerseits einen Beitrag zum besseren Verständnis einer Weihinschrift aus einem ländlichen Heiligtum Lydiens zu leisten, andererseits am Beispiel dieses Textes einige Aspekte der religiösen Kommunikation auf dem Land näher zu betrachten.

Der Text

Irgendwann in Lydien im Laufe des 2. Jhs. n. Chr. ließ ein gewisser Tatianos Glaukos zusammen mit seiner Frau Ammiane eine Stele im Heiligtum des Gottes⁵ Men Motyleites aufstellen, auf deren oberem Teil in Relief drei Adoranten – ein Mann, eine Frau und zwischen den beiden ein Mädchen mit erhobenen rechten Händen – abgebildet sind, während darunter folgende Inschrift steht:⁶

² Zu den lexikalischen Konvergenzen in der Sprache religiöser Kommunikation vgl. Chaniotis, Chiaï (2007); für den christlichen Wortschatz vgl. Merkelbach (1978). Diese Konvergenzen sind nicht nur auf den religiösen Wortschatz beschränkt, sondern sie lassen sich auch im Bereich der Bilderwelt ermitteln, vgl. dazu allgemein Mathews (1993).

³ Um ein Bild der ländlichen Kulte im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien gewinnen zu können, vgl. im Allgemeinen Petzl (1995); Mitchell (1993: 11–51); Dignas (2003: 77–91); Petzl (2003); für das Lydien vgl. De Hoz (1999); für das Phrygien Drew-Bear, Naour (1990); Gnoli, Thornton (1997); Chiaï (2008a; 2008b; 2010).

⁴ Zu dieser Vorstellung, welche das religiöse Leben auf dem Land in Phrygien charakterisiert, vgl. Petzl (1998); Chaniotis (1995; 1997; 2004a; 2004b); Belayche (2006); Chiaï (2009a). Allgemein zu den ländlichen Gemeinden Kleasiens vgl. Schuler (1998) mit einer wichtigen Zusammenstellung des epigraphischen Materials.

⁵ Zum Kult des Men in Lydien und Phrygien vgl. Pedrizet (1896); Drexler, s.v. „Men“ in LGRM: 2687–2770; Lane (1964) mit einer Auswertung der literarischen, epigraphischen und numismatischen Quellen; die Inschriften sind in Lane (1971) gesammelt und historisch bewertet; Hübner (2003), die den Akzent auf den lokalen Charakter der Gottheit auf dem Land in Phrygien und Lydien setzt. Zur Ikonographie des Gottes vgl. Lane (1976: 99–108); Van Haepereen-Pourbaix (1983).

⁶ Zu dieser Inschrift vgl. Buresch (1898: 79, Nr. 39); Pedrizet (1896: 58); Lane (1971: Nr. 41, wo jedoch in den letzten Zeilen der Inschrift folgender Text angegeben wird: Σαβιν/ῆς [...] ἥνπερ σώσεις σύ [...]); Horsley (1982: 99–101); Malay (1994: 168, Abb. 58, mit einer guten Abbildung des Reliefs); De Hoz (1999: Nr. 39.58); Chiaï (2008a: 153–154).

TAM V, 1, Nr. 457: [Ta]τιανὸς Γλαῦκος καὶ Ἀμμιανὴ φι/[λ]όθεοι Μηνὶ Μοτυλείτῃ εὐχαριστ/[ια]ν ἔθοντο εὐχόμενοι αἰεὶ ὑπὲρ / [θ]ρεπτῆς γένει πρώτης· Σαβεῖν[η] / [δ]ὲ κέκλῃται, ἥνπερ σώσεις συμ- [- -]

„Tatianos Glaukos und Ammiane, die den Gott lieben, stellten als Dankbarkeitszeichen (diese Stele) zu Ehre des Men Motyleites auf, indem sie immer um ihre Ziehtochter, erste von Geburt, beten. Sie ist Sabine genannt worden; du mögest sie retten...“

Der Text gliedert sich in zwei Sektionen: In der ersten stellen sich die Weihenden der Gottheit als Ehepaar vor, indem sie ihr durch die Aufstellung des Denkmals ihre Dankbarkeit erweisen, während sie im zweiten Teil ein Gebet an sie richten. Der Grund der religiösen Weihung ist wahrscheinlich in der erfolgreich verlaufenen Geburt der kleinen Sabine, der ersten Ziehtochter⁷ des Ehepaares, zu suchen,⁸ die dem Gott mit ihrem Namen vorgestellt und für deren *soteria* ein Gebet ausgesprochen wird. Die Inschrift stellt ein wichtiges Dokument für die Kommunikationsstrategien mit dem Göttlichen in einer ländlichen Kultstätte Kleinasien dar und soll, wie oben erwähnt, in dieser Hinsicht untersucht werden.

Die religiöse Kommunikation und die Gliederung der rituellen Handlungen

Eine berechtigte Frage betrifft die Textadressaten: Eine Weihung kann als Adressaten sowohl den Gott (vertikale Kommunikation), als auch die Menschen (horizontale Kommunikation) haben.⁹ Ersterem wird das geweihte Objekt vorgestellt und mitgeteilt,¹⁰ dass z.B. ein Gelübde erfüllt wurde, während den anderen Menschen, die den Text lesen, von der eigenen Erfahrung mit dem Numinosen erzählt wird. Im Falle der hier vorliegenden Inschrift hat das Ehepaar wegen der erfolgreichen Geburt ihrer ersten Ziehtochter ihre Dankbarkeit dem Gott gegenüber durch die Aufstellung einer mit Relief ausgestatteten Stele zum Ausdruck gebracht. Die *dynamis* von Men bekommt damit die gebührende Anerkennung und wird den anderen Besuchern der Kultstätte kundgetan.

Besondere Aufmerksamkeit ist zunächst auf die im Text eingesetzten verschiedenen Tempora zu richten, die uns die chronologische Gliederung der rituellen Handlungen in der Kommunikation mit dem Göttlichen zu erfassen ermöglichen. Hervorzuheben ist *in primis* der Ausdruck εὐχαριστ/[ια]ν ἔθοντο „sie stellten in Dankbarkeit auf“, der darauf

⁷ Zu den *threptoi* in den griechischen Inschriften aus Kleinasien vgl. MAMA IX: LXIV–LXVI; und ausführlich Ricl (2001: 156–157); Ricl, Malay (2005); Ricl (2009). Für eine Definition des juristischen Status der *threptoi* in Kleinasien kann die Betrachtung einer bei Plinius (*Ep.* X, 66) zu lesenden Stelle von Nutzen sein, welche lautet: *liberi nati expositi, deinde sublati a quibusdam et in servitute educati*. Dies bezeugt eine Inschrift, in der eine Frau namens Zotike, Mutter von sieben Kindern, erzählt, dass sie drei ihrer Söhne als Adoptivkinder in befreundete Familien gegeben hatte. Zu diesem wichtigen Dokument vgl. Merkelbach, Şahin (1983: 57–58).

⁸ In diesem Fall scheint die kleine *threpte* im Hause der zwei Weihenden geboren zu sein. Dies lässt die Vermutung zu, dass es sich vielleicht um die Tochter von Haussklaven handelte, die mit ihren Herren besonders vertraut waren und vielleicht selbst den Status von *threptoi* hatten.

⁹ Zu diesen von der Linguistik übernommenen Begriffen verweise ich auf Mörth (1993: 392–414). Im Allgemeinen für die Antike vgl. die Sammelbände Binder, Ehlich (1997); Brodersen (2001); Stavrianopoulou (2006); Frevel, Von Hesberg (2007); und jetzt auch Rüpke (2007: 35–43).

¹⁰ Zu den epigraphischen Weihungen aus der archaischen Zeit mit Beobachtungen zur religiösen Mentalität vgl. Lazzarini (1976: 1–89); dazu auch Guarducci (1978: 1–89).

hinweist, dass das Ehepaar den Gott um etwas gebeten und dieser die Bitte erhört hatte. Der Aorist bezieht die rituelle Handlung auf die Vergangenheit. Tatianos und Ammiane beten aber immer noch Men für ihre Ziehtochter an. Das Partizip *euchomenoi* deutet darauf hin, dass eine neue Bitte eingereicht wird, die mit dem Gebet „mögest du sie retten“ zur Sprache kommt (Bezug auf die Zukunft). Betrachtenswert ist auch das Adverb αἰεί, mit dem unterstrichen wird, dass die Weihenden „immer“ Men Motyleites und keinen anderen Gott im Gebet in Bezug auf die Geburt ihrer Ziehtochter angesprochen haben und außerdem immer noch dieselbe Gottheit für ihre kleine *alumna* anbeten. Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft sind in der religiösen Handlung miteinander verknüpft. Als Parallele kann eine Weihung aus Lydien für den Gott Men Axiottenos angeführt werden, welche lautet:¹¹ „Dem erhörenden Gott Men Axiottenos. Ich Trophimos habe (diese Stele) geweiht, nachdem ich den Gott angebetet hatte und erfolgreich war, indem ich meine Dankbarkeit zeige.“ Im Text sind von Interesse die Aorist-Partizipien εὐξάμενος und ἐπιτυχών,¹² welche sich jeweils auf das Beten und auf die Erfüllung des Anliegens beziehen, die in der Vergangenheit stattfanden, während die Form im Präsens εὐχαριστῶν¹³ unterstreicht, dass Trophimos nun der Gottheit die gebührende Dankbarkeit durch die Weihung einer Stele zeigt. Dasselbe Muster ist in einer anderen Weihung aus Lydien festzustellen,¹⁴ die ein Mann namens Philippikos auf einem als *ex voto* aufgestellten Altar anbringen ließ. Interessant sind wiederum die Partizipien εὐξάμενος, ἐπιτυχών und εὐχαριστῶν, welche chronologisch drei verschiedene Ereignisse von religiöser Bedeutung differenzieren: Ich betete, wurde erhört und zeige nun dem Gott meine Dankbarkeit.

All diese Dokumente zeigen, wie die zeitliche Abfolge der verschiedenen rituellen Handlungen in der Kommunikation mit dem Göttlichen zum Ausdruck gebracht wird, weil sie als Frömmigkeitszeichen gelten sollten. Die Gottheit und die Menschen, welche den Weihertext zur Kenntnis nahmen, wurden somit über die Abfolge der rituellen Handlungen sowie über die vom Weihenden erfüllten Pflichten informiert.

Eine Frage, die aufkommen kann, betrifft den Grund, warum es die Weihenden für wichtig hielten, ihre Geschichte zu erzählen und den anderen Besuchern des Heiligtums ihre (positive) Erfahrung mit der Gottheit mitzuteilen.

Die horizontale Kommunikation soll eine zentrale Rolle im Bereich der religiösen Praktiken gespielt haben. Denn die Götter selbst scheinen von ihren Anbetern zu verlangen, ihre Erfahrungen mit ihrer Macht zu erzählen. Eine verfehlte oder nicht angebrachte Bekanntmachung kann sogar den göttlichen Zorn erwecken und eine Strafe verursachen.

¹¹ TAM V, 1, Nr. 455: [θεῷ ἐπηκ]ῶν Μηνὶ Ἀξιτῇ/[νῷ Τ]ρόφιμος εὐξάμε/[νος] καὶ ἐπιτυχῶν εὐχα/[ρισ]τῶν ἀνέθηκα. Zum Kult des Gottes Men Axiottenos vgl. Herrmann (1978).

¹² Zu diesem Terminus, der die Erfüllung der eingereichten Bitte bezeichnet, vgl. Beobachtungen in Petzl (1994: 21, Nr. 12, 3–4). Hier seien einige Beispiele angeführt: SEG XXXIV, Nr. 1214: Θεοῖς Περυνδηνοῖς Φιλίππικὸς / εὐξάμενος μετὰ Βουνίου τοῦ / συντρόφου ὑπὲρ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ / ἐπιτυχῶν εὐχαριστῶν ἀνέθηκεν. / Ἔτους τλβ', μη(νὸς) Λῶου κ'; SEG XLIV, Nr. 977: Μητρᾶς Μητροδῶρου ἱερεὺς δι' ἃ γένους Διὸς / Δρίκτου καὶ τοῦ δήμου / τοῦ Θαμορειτῶν αἰτή/σάμενος πανήγυριν Ἀρλλή/νοις εὐξάμενοι Διὶ Δρίκτῃ / ἐπιτυχῶν ἀνέθηκα / τὴν στήλλην; SEG XXXIV, Nr. 1212, 13–15 = Petzl 1994: Nr. 17: δις ἡρώτῃσα / τοὺς θεοὺς, ἐπέτυχα καὶ / εὐχαριστῶ; SEG XXXVIII, Nr. 1230 = Petzl 1994: Nr. 66: Ἔτος σογ' μη(νὸς) ια'. Αἰλία/νῇ Θεῷ Ἀξιοτηνῷ / εὐχὴν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἁ/μαρτοῦσα ἐπέτυ/χεν ὑπὲρ Τιτιανῆς / θυγατρὸς.

¹³ Zu dieser Form, seit dem 3. Jh. n. Chr. in den religiösen Inschriften sehr verbreitet, vgl. Beobachtungen in Robert (1955: 55–58).

¹⁴ SEG XXXIV, Nr. 1214: Θεοῖς Περυνδηνοῖς Φιλίππικὸς / εὐξάμενος μετὰ Βουνίου τοῦ / συντρόφου ὑπὲρ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ / ἐπιτυχῶν εὐχαριστῶν ἀνέθηκεν. / Ἔτους τλβ', μη(νὸς) Λῶου κ'.

Paradigmatisch ist der Fall einer Frau namens Syntyche, welche von Men Axiottenos bestraft wurde, weil sie die Hilfe, welche der Gott bei der Restitution eines gestohlenen Steines geleistet hatte, aus familiären Gründen verschwiegen hatte.¹⁵ Besonders in Beichtinschriften wird häufig betont, dass die Eingriffe der Götter, welche die Gerechtigkeit in alltäglichen Streitigkeiten wiederherstellten, als exemplarisch gelten sollten. Aus diesem Grund müssen solche Geschichten erzählt werden, damit die anderen Menschen aus Angst vor einer göttlichen Strafe nicht dieselbe Verfehlung begingen.¹⁶ Neben diesem moralischen Aspekt soll jedoch auch die Konkurrenz unter religiösen Einrichtungen eine gewichtige Rolle gespielt haben. Die Zahl der aufgestellten Inschriften ist ein konkretes Zeugnis für die wirkende Macht einer in einem bestimmten Heiligtum (und nicht in einem anderem) verehrten Gottheit. Mit anderen Worten: Eine dort eingereichte Bitte hat höhere Chancen, erhört und erfüllt zu werden, als in einem anderen Heiligtum.¹⁷ Die Verbreitung des Christentums kann vielleicht auch als eine der möglichen Ursachen für die beeindruckende Produktion epigraphischer religiöser Texte in diesen Regionen in der Spätkaizerzeit angesehen werden.¹⁸ Die sakralen Einrichtungen konnten hiermit versuchen, die Menschen am Glauben der traditionellen Götter festzuhalten und ihren Übergang zum Christentum zu verhindern. Seit dem 2. Jh. n. Chr. werden jedenfalls Inschriften zum wichtigen Medium religiöser Kommunikation. Sie werden nicht nur dafür eingesetzt, die Macht der Götter gebührend zu preisen, sondern auch den anderen Menschen davon zu erzählen. Die Präzision und Sorgfalt, mit denen die Buchstaben dieser Inschriften häufig in den Stein gemeißelt wurden, könnten unter anderem als Hinweis darauf gedeutet werden, dass man wollte, dass diese Dokumente von den Besuchern des

¹⁵ Dazu vgl. Petzl (1994, 73–66, Nr. 59, 15–19): περικρυβούσης τε αὐτῆς τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ / θεοῦ διὰ τὸ ἡρωτῆσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς / τῆς παρθένου, ἵνα σειγῇσι, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ/το ἐνέμησε, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξεφάντευ/σε οὐδὲ ὕψωσε τὸν θεὸν ἢ Συντύχη. Und sie (d.h. Syntyche) verbarg gänzlich die Macht des Gottes, weil sie von der Mutter des Mädchens gebeten war zu schweigen; und der Gott nahm auch hierfür Rache, weil Syntyche dem Gott die (ihm gebührende) Publizität nicht hatte zuteil werden lassen und ihn nicht gepriesen hatte. Zu diesem Text vgl. auch Beobachtungen in Chaniotis (1990: 127–131, Nr. 1).

¹⁶ Hier einige Beispiele: Petzl (1994, Nr. 9, 10–13): Παραγγέλει / πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὅτι οὐ / δεῖ καταφρονεῖν το[ῦ] θε[ο]ῦ/οῦ. Ἀνέστησε δὲ τὸ μαρτ[ύ]ριον; Petzl (1994, Nr. 10, 10–12): Παραγγέλ/λω δέ, αὐτοῦ τὰς δυνάμεις μὴ / τίς ποτε κατευλῇσι καὶ κόψει δρῦν; Petzl (1994, Nr. 104, 14–17): παραγγέλλω μηδὲνα καταφρο/[νεῖν τῷ] θεῷ Ἡλίῳ / Ἀπ/[ό]λλωνος, ἐπεὶ ἔξει[] τὴν στήλ/[λ]ην ἐξεμπλάριον; Petzl (1994, Nr. 111, 5–8): διὰ τοῦτο οὖν πα/ραγγέλω πᾶσιν μ<η>δέ/να κα[τα]φ[ρο]νῖν τῷ θεῷ, ἐπὶ ἔξει τῇ[ν] σ[τήλ]ην ἐξον/πλάριον. In diesen Textauszügen unterstreicht die Verwendung der Termini μαρτύριον und ἐξονπλάριον (eine Entlehnung des lateinischen *exemplarium*) die starke moralische Instanz dieser Inschriften.

¹⁷ Zur religiösen Konkurrenz in diesen Regionen mit einer Zusammenstellung des epigraphischen Materials vgl. Chiaï (2008a). Zu diesem Phänomen, welche das religiöse Leben des griechischen Ostens in der Spätkaizerzeit charakterisierte, vgl. Beobachtungen in Chaniotis (2010).

¹⁸ Dazu vgl. Schnabel (2003: 178–190), der sich wie folgt äußert (S. 188): *It seems quite possible, however, that the vigorous Christian expansion provoked an increased use, or a focused consolidation of thus practices whose message would serve to solidify the presence of the traditional divine "rulers" in the village.* In diesem Zusammenhang kann die folgende Textstelle von Plinius dem Jüngeren herangezogen werden, in der die Verbreitung des Christentums auf dem Land in Bithynien wie folgt geschildert wird (Ep. X, 96, 9–10): *Ideo dilatata cognitione ad consulendum te decurri: Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum; multi enim omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabantur. neque civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est; quae videtur sisti et corrigi posse. certe satis constat prope iam desolata templa coepisse celebrari et sacra solemnia diu intermissa repeti passimque venire victimarum carnem, cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur. ex quo facile est opinari, quae turba hominum emendari possit, si sit paenitentiae locus.*

Heiligtums klar und ohne Probleme gelesen werden konnten. Die horizontale Kommunikation scheint stark im Vordergrund gestanden zu haben.

Der Terminus *philotheos*

Wir kehren zu unserer Inschrift zurück. Ferner ist Aufmerksamkeit auf den Terminus *philotheoi* zu richten,¹⁹ mit dem das Ehepaar seine besondere Beziehung zum Gott zum Ausdruck bringt.²⁰ Damit kommt unter anderem die persönliche Bindung der Menschen zum Göttlichen zur Sprache:²¹ Sie lieben den Gott, weil er wohl all ihre Bitten erhört und erfüllt hat²² und dies könnte auch der Grund sein, warum Tatianos und Ammiane wahrscheinlich immer dieselbe Gottheit vor und nach der Geburt ihrer kleinen *alumna* anbeten.

Bei der Entstehung eines solchen Begriffes haben vielleicht auch Adjektive wie *philosebastos* oder *philokaisar* gewirkt,²³ welche, in epigraphischen Dokumenten offiziellen Charakters belegt, die besondere (und bevorzugte) Beziehung einer Gemeinde oder auch einer Privatperson mit dem Kaiserhaus und mit Rom zum Ausdruck brachten.

Philia bezeichnete bei Juden und Christen den Zustand, in dem sich die Menschen, wenn sie sich der Gerechtigkeit entsprechend verhalten haben, vor Gott befinden.²⁴ Deswegen verwundert es nicht, dass nähere Parallelen in der Verwendung von Adjektiven wie *philotheos*, *philoteknos*, *philogynaios* usw. in christlichen Grabinschriften festzustellen sind, wo solche Attribute dafür eingesetzt werden, um die moralischen und spirituellen Tugenden der Verstorbenen auszudrücken.²⁵ In einem Text aus Rom²⁶ z.B. wird eine verstorbene Frau von ihrem Mann als μητρι ἀγαπήτη, φιλοθέω

¹⁹ Zu den Komposita auf *philo-* vgl. Cipriano (1990); Veligianni (2001).

²⁰ Vgl. dazu Cipriano (1990: 9–12 und 134–137), welche beobachtet, dass dieser Terminus besonders in den späteren Quellen sowohl als „*loving the god*“ als auch „*loved by the gods*“ ausgelegt werden kann; sie zieht eine Inschrift aus Ägypten in Betracht, in der das Adjektiv *theophilos*, das sich auf eine Stadt bezieht, mit den beiden Bedeutungen verstanden werden kann (vgl. Ägyptische Urkunden III, Nr. 924, 1: Ἡρακλέους πόλεως ἀρχαίας καὶ θεοφίλου ἢ <κρατίστη>; die Inschrift wird in die römische Zeit datiert). Im LSJ wird *philotheos* mit „*loving God*; *pious*“ übersetzt, und dies im Unterschied zu *theophilos* „*loved by the gods*“.

²¹ Zum wichtigen Begriff *personal religion* verweise ich allgemein auf Festugière (1954); vgl. nun die verschiedenen Beiträge in Rüpkе, Spickermann (2012).

²² Als Parallele kann der Text folgender Weihung aus Lydien herangezogen werden, in der sich ein Mann namens Apelles bei den Göttern Men, Plouton und Kore bedankt, weil sie all seine Gebete erhört haben: De Hoz (1999: Nr. 35.2): [Α]πελλῆς Ἀπελλήου[ος] / [Μ]ηνὶ Καμαρίτῃ καὶ / [Πλ]ούτωνι καὶ Κόρῃ εὐ/[χῇ]ν, ὅτι μοι ἐπήκουσαν / πάντα.

²³ Zu diesen Bezeichnungen vgl. die Beobachtungen von Veligianni (2001: 68–70).

²⁴ Beispiele dafür bei Lampe (1961: 1478). Zur negativen Konnotation des Kompositums *philanthropia* bei den Juden vgl. Hiltbrunner (1990).

²⁵ Für eine Zusammenstellung der epigraphischen Belege vgl. Tod (1951: 182–190); Lattimore (1942: 290–295); Guarducci (1974: 150–197).

²⁶ SEG II, Nr. 521: Γ. Ἀνκώτιος Ἐκαφόδοτος / Ἀνκωντία Ἰρήνη συνβίω / καὶ Γ. Ἀνκώτιος Ρούφος / καὶ Γ. Ἀνκώτιος Ρουφείνος / μητρὶ ἀγαπήτῃ, φιλοθέω καὶ / φιλοχήρῃ καὶ φιλάνδρῳ καὶ / φιλοτέκνῳ, / μνείας χάριν. Zu diesem Text mit einem reichen Kommentar und weiteren epigraphischen Parallelen vgl. Solin (2004: 206–208). Mein Kollege Herr Dr. J. Curbеra zieht die Möglichkeit in Betracht, das auf diese Frau bezogene Attribut ἀγαπήτῃ, als Eigennamen anzusehen. Dafür würde sowohl die Stellung neben dem Substantiv μητρὶ als auch die Tatsache, dass die anderen Adjektive durch καὶ getrennt sind, sprechen. Als Parallele kann man eine Grabinschrift aus Klaudiopolis (Becker-Bertau 1986: Nr. 77, 3) heranziehen, in der die folgende Wendung anzutreffen ist: σὺν σεμνῇ ἀλόχῳ Ἀγαπήτῃ.

usw. bezeichnet; aus dem Gebiet von Apameia (Phrygien) stammt die christliche Grabinschrift²⁷ eines Mannes namens Aurelios, in der die folgende Wendung zu lesen ist: *χαίρετέ μοι φι(λ)όθιοι / καὶ καλοὶ νεόθιοι*. Ebenfalls als *philothēoi* werden Christen aus dem Territorium von Laodicea Combusta²⁸ und von Phazemonitis²⁹ bezeichnet. So erweist sich der Begriff *philothēos* der lydischen Weihung als ein interessantes Beispiel für lexikalische Konvergenz in der Sprache religiöser Kommunikation. Sowohl eine heidnische Familie als auch Christen haben diesen Terminus verwendet, um ihre Nähe zu Gott, der ihre Gebete erhört und erfüllen kann, zum Ausdruck zu bringen.

Das Gebet für die *soteria*

Der zweite Teil des Textes ist ein Gebet, welches das Ehepaar an seinen Gott richtet, damit er ihr neugeborenes Kind schütze. Die Ansprache beginnt mit einem Perfekt „*sie ist Sabine genannt worden*“, wobei das Mädchen durch seinen Eigennamen dem Gott vorgestellt wird; dann wird ein Optativ Aorist in der zweiten Person Singular verwendet „*mögest du sie schützen*“.³⁰ Es handelt sich um zwei Stilmittel, welche eine gewisse Literarität und Vertrautheit mit der Literatursprache vorauszusetzen scheinen. Sie unterscheiden die Inschrift von vielen anderen Weihungen aus ländlichem Kontext, in denen oft Schreibfehler oder nicht korrekte grammatische Formen zu finden sind.³¹

Der Text ist ein in zweiter Person geäußertes Gebet für die *soteria* des kleinen Mädchens; ein derartiges Gebet lässt sich mit den besonders auf dem Lande in den Weihinschriften sehr verbreiteten Formeln *περὶ τῶν τέκνων σωτηρίας, περὶ τῶν ιδίων σωτηρίας* in Zusammenhang setzen, mit denen viele Eltern dieselbe Sorge und Bitte vor dem Göttlichen zum Ausdruck brachten. Im Folgenden nur einige ausgewählte Beispiele:

In einer Inschrift aus dem Territorium um Synnada³² hat ein Mann namens Klearchos zusammen mit seinen Brüdern Glykon und Appas auf Befehl des Gottes *περὶ τῶν τέκνων σωτηρίας* eine Stele aufstellen lassen.³³ In einem Text³⁴ aus dem Gebiet um Dorylaion

²⁷ MAMA VI, Nr. 227: *Αὐρ<ή>λιος Αὐξάνων δις ἐπ/οίησα τὸ ἥρῳον ἐμαυτῷ καὶ / τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου Δω<σ>ιτύχη δῶ/ρου χάριν σὺν τῇ γυν<α>ικί αὐτοῦ, / εἰς ὃ ἕτερος οὐ τεθήσεται, / εἴ τις δὲ <έ>τερος ἐπιτηδεύσει / ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τ<όν> θεόν· / χαίρετέ μοι **φι<λ>όθιοι** / καὶ καλοὶ νεόθιοι.*

²⁸ MAMA I, Nr. 237: *Ἀρητήρ ἐσθλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ κί/τε ἐνθάδε παίδων ἀρεσ/τὸς καὶ πρᾶνστος πάντων / καὶ τοῦνομα Ἀνίκητος / εἰερεὺς ὧν ἰδιοπραέω/ν **φιλόθεος** φιλέννο/μος ὁπάων Χριστοῦ / ἐγλεκτὸς δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ / τύνβον δὲ τούτου τέκνα / ἔτευξα[v].*

²⁹ St. Pont. III, Nr. 72: *Αὐ(ρ)ήλιον Δομνί/λον τὸν [φ]ιλό/θεον κὲ [φ]ιλό/[χ]ηρον ...*

³⁰ Als Parallele vgl. beispielsweise SGO 16/31/86: *ὅν σὺ, θεὰ Κύπρι, μοι φιλέοις σὺν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ Χαρίτεσσιν / τέκνα δέ μοι καὶ αὐτὸν σῴζοιτε ἱκετεύω.*

³¹ Zur Sprache der griechischen kaiserzeitlichen Inschriften aus Kleinasien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Texte aus Phrygien vgl. Brixhe (1987: 45–80; 2001; 2002: 246–266). Dazu auch Beobachtungen in Klauck (1996), der die Sprache der Beichtinschriften mit jener des Neuen Testaments vergleicht.

³² MAMA IV, Nr. 49a: *[Κλ]έαρχος καὶ οἱ (ἀ)δελφοὶ αὐτο[ῦ] / [Γλ]ύκων καὶ Ἀπ[π]ίας θεῷ προ(σ)τά[ξ]/[α]ντι ὑπὲρ τέ[κ]νων σωτηρία[ς].*

³³ Zu den häufig in den kaiserzeitlichen Weihungen vorkommenden Formeln *kata keleusin, kata prostagma* usw., welche den Vollzug einer religiösen Handlung auf einen von der Gottheit erteilten Befehl zurückführen, vgl. Van Straten (1976); Pleket (1981: 14–16); Veyne (1986: 267–269); Lazzarini (1989–1990: 852–853).

³⁴ MAMA V, Nr. 10: *Καρικὸς Φύ/βου Ὅσι[φ] / καὶ Δικ/αίφ εὐ/χὴν περὶ / τῶν ιδίω/ν πάντων / σωτηρίας.* Zu diesem Text vgl. Ricl (1991: 21, Nr. 39).

hat Karikos, Sohn von Phybos, περὶ τῶν ἰδίων πάντων als Gelübde zu Ehren der Götter Hosios und Dikaïos eine Stele geweiht. Aus derselben Region³⁵ stammt ein denselben Göttern gewidmeter Altar, auf dem die Formel ὑπὲρ τοῦ θρέψαντος καὶ ἑαυτ/οῦ καὶ τῶν ἰδίων πάντων σωτηρίας vorkommt.

Die oben angeführten epigraphischen Beispiele zeigen den starken familiären Charakter der meisten der auf dem Land zur Periode der Kaiserzeit belegten Kulte. Denn die ländlichen Kultstätten wurden zumeist von Familiengruppen besucht, die ihre Bitten an ihren Schutzgott, der häufig für alle Bereiche des menschlichen Alltagslebens zuständig war, richteten. Dafür spricht auch das Vorhandensein von Termini wie *synbios*, *adelphos*, *gyne* usw. in den Weihungen, mit denen die Menschen ihren Status als Familienmitglieder vor dem Göttlichen unterstreichen.³⁶ Dies ermöglicht unter anderem, die starke persönliche Bindung von Familiengruppen an die Gottheit zu erschließen. Gerade in diesem Punkt kann eine weitere Konvergenz mit den christlichen Inschriften (nicht nur aus diesen Gegenden) festgestellt werden, in denen der familiäre Charakter ebenfalls im Vordergrund steht. Dies scheint auch darauf hinzudeuten, dass diese Menschen von ihren Göttern Schutz in allen Angelegenheiten des Alltags erwarteten. Denn diese Gottheiten, mit denen sie eine starke persönliche Beziehung aufgebaut hatten, sollten dafür sorgen, dass ihr Leben, wenn sie keine sozialen und sakralen Normen verletzt hätten, sicher und problemlos lief.

Viele lokale Götter erhalten gerade auf Grund ihrer Schutzfunktionen das Attribut σωτήρ³⁷ oder σώζων, wie die folgenden Beispiele illustrieren.

Im Gebiet um Laodicea Combusta ist ein Altar gefunden worden,³⁸ den ein Priester Namens Longos als Gelübde ὑπὲρ καρπῶν zu Ehre eines unbekannten Gottes, dem die Attribute πανεπήκοος und σώζων zugewiesen werden, aufstellen ließ. Das Interessanteste am Text liegt gerade in den sakralen Epitheta, welche den Namen der Gottheit ersetzen, und insbesondere durch die Partizipialform σώζων³⁹ wird die aktiv schützende Macht dieser Gottheit zum Ausdruck gebracht. Das zweite Beispiel⁴⁰ stammt aus der Gegend von Ikonion. Es handelt sich um ein Gebet, in dem die Schutzgötter dieses Zentrums als θεοὶ σωτήρες angesprochen werden.

³⁵ MAMA V, Nr. 11: ... [ὑπὲρ το]ῦ θρέψαντο/[ς σωτηρί]ας καὶ ἑαυτ/[οῦ καὶ τῶ]ν ἰδίων πάν/[των] Ὁσίω Δικαίω εὐ/χὴν. Zu diesem Text vgl. Ricl (1991: 11, Nr. 21).

³⁶ Für eine Zusammenstellung der epigraphischen Belege vgl. Chiaï (2009d: 70–72).

³⁷ Zu diesem Epitheton vgl. Haerens (1948); Kasper (1961); Nock (1972: 720–35); zur Verwendung dieses Attributes bei den Juden vgl. Jung (2002).

³⁸ MAMA I, Nr. 8 (die Inschriften sind jeweils auf dem vorderen und auf dem hinteren Teil des Altars angebracht): a) Λόνγος Δ[ι]/ονυσίου ὑπὲρ καρ[ρ]/πῶν πανεπηκόω / θεῶ; b) Λόνγος / Διονυσίου[υ] / [ε]πρεὺς Σώζων/τι εὐχὴν.

³⁹ Hierbei einige epigraphische Beispiele einer solchen Praxis: MAMA IX, Nr. 57: Ἐτους τληῖ Ἄρτε[μ]ιδας / κὲ Ἀντιπᾶς κατὰ κ[έ]λευ[σιν] θεοῦ Σώζον[τος]; MAMA IX, Nr. 58: Σώζοντος; TAM III, Nr. 914: Οἷσας Ἐρ/μαίου πεν/τάκις, εἰρη/ναρχήσας, / θεῶ Σώζον/τι εὐξάμε/νος; SEG VI, Nr. 406: Μάρκος Αὐ/ρήλις Σώζοντι ὑπὲρ τέκνων εὐχὴν; SEG XVIII, Nr. 546: Σῶσος, Τ[ι]μῶ, Νέ/ων Σώζον[τι] / εὐχὴν. Sozon wird auch als eine eigenständige Gottheit betrachtet, die auf den Reliefs häufig als Reitergott abgebildet ist, dazu Höfer, s.v. „Sozon“ in LGRM: 1280–86; Delemen (1999: 39–45) mit weiteren Literaturhinweisen.

⁴⁰ MAMA VIII, Nr. 297: [εὐχομαι θε]οὺς σωτήρας τήν τε Ἀγγελιστίν καὶ τήν με[ρ]/[γάλην μητ]έρα Βοηθηνήν καὶ θεῶν τήν μητέρα καὶ τὸν / [...] τὸν Ἀπόλλων καὶ τήν Ἄρτεμιν ἱλαῶς καὶ εἰ[ς]/[νοῦς εἶναι τῇ] κολωνεῖαι Εἰκονίω.

Die beiden besprochenen Beispiele zeigen bei der Vorstellung dieser lokalen Götter, dass die Schutzfunktion stark im Vordergrund steht: Dies kann als ein Hinweis für die starke Bindung der Menschen an ihre Götter gedeutet werden, die als ständig präsent im Alltagsleben ihrer Verehrer wahrgenommen wurden.

Die Performanz

Im Text ist auch – wie zuvor erwähnt – der performative rituelle Akt der Vorstellung des kleinen Mädchens dem Gott gegenüber durch den eigenen Personennamen vorhanden, mit den Worten „*sie ist Sabine genannt worden*“. Die kleine Sabine wird dadurch unter den Schutz des Gottes gestellt; auch für sie, wie für den Rest ihrer Familie, soll Men Motyleites die Haupt- und Schutzgottheit darstellen. In der Zukunft soll sie vom Gott beschützt werden, ihre Bitten und Gebete an ihn richten und darf sich an ihn bei jedem alltäglichen Problem wenden. Mit anderen Worten: Sie wird auch *philotheos* des Men sein. Wir können vermuten, dass diese Vorstellung im Kontext einer rituellen Handlung erfolgte, in der dem Gott wahrscheinlich ein reiches Opfer dargebracht, Gebete vorgelesen, Hymnen gesungen wurden usw. Ein weiteres betrachtenswertes Element ist die in zweiter Person ausgedrückte Ansprache „*mögest du sie schützen*“. Es handelt sich um den Beginn eines Gebets, das im Rahmen des Rituals wahrscheinlich laut und mit einer gewissen Emotionalität vorgelesen wurde.⁴¹

In den religiösen Inschriften aus den ländlichen Heiligtümern Phrygiens und Lydiens sind solche Gebetsformeln, welche die Gottheit mit einem gewissen Pathos direkt ansprechen, keine Seltenheit. Ihr Vorhandensein in den Inschriften soll meines Erachtens auch als Hinweis dafür gedeutet werden, dass diese epigraphischen Dokumente, die im Kontext eines Heiligtums oder auch eines Grabdenkmals aufgestellt wurden, laut gelesen wurden.⁴² Hier seien einige epigraphische Beispiele einer solchen Praxis angeführt.

Aus der Umgebung von Thyateira kennt man eine auf das Jahr 276/5 v. Chr. anzusetzende Weihung an den Gott Apollon Pityaenos⁴³, die ein Mensch namens Argeios, Sohn des Phanokrites, der von den Galatern gerettet wurde, durchführt, indem er sowohl für die eigene Gesundheit und die seiner Frau, als auch für die Rettung seines Sohnes Phanokrites, betet. Der Weihung folgt ein im Optativ ausgesprochenes Gebet, das wahrscheinlich in einem höheren und emotionalen Ton laut vorgetragen wurde: *Möge Apollon immer für Argeios, seine Frau, seine Kinder und Brüder wohlwollend sein*. Die Wendung διὰ παντός scheint mit einem gewissen Pathos die besondere Beziehung zu

⁴¹ Zum lauten und leisen Beten existiert eine reiche Literatur, vgl. im Allgemeinen Versnel (1981b: 26–37); Aubriot-Sévin (1992: 146–171); Pulleyn (1997: 184–188); Van den Horst (1994); Scheer (2001: 45–46); zum leisen und lauten Lesen in der Antike vgl. nun Busch (2002); Burfeind (2002).

⁴² Dazu mit einer Zusammenstellung von Beispielen (meistens Epigrammen) Häusle (1980: 41–63); Busch (2002: 30–33) mit weiteren Beobachtungen.

⁴³ TAM V, 2, Nr. 881: Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ. / βασιλευόντων Ἀντιόχου / καὶ Σελεύκου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου / ἐβδόμου καὶ τριακοστοῦ ἔτους, μη/νὸς Ὑπερβερεταίου. Ἀπόλλωνι / Πιτυαηνῶι εὐξάμενος Ἀργεῖος / Φανοκρίτου ἀνέθηκε τὴν στή/λην ὑπὲρ τε τῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς / γυναικὸς ὑγείας καὶ τῆς τοῦ / υἱοῦ Φανοκρίτου σωτηρίας, ὅς ἀ/λοῦς ὑπὸ τῶν Γαλατῶν ἐσώθη. / εἴη οὖν ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἰλεως διὰ / παντός Ἀργεῖω καὶ τῇ γυναι/κί αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐγγόνοις καὶ / ἀδελφοῖς.

unterstreichen, die diesen Mann und seine Familie an den Gott bindet. Aus Galatien stammt eine Grabinschrift, welche mit dem folgenden Gebet um Gerechtigkeit⁴⁴ endet⁴⁵: *Frommer und Gerechter Gott und Herr Helios, rächet die Verstorbene und ihre Söhne, die noch leben*. Dieses Zeugnis lässt sich mit einem Text aus Phazemonitis in Verbindung bringen⁴⁶, in dem der allmächtige Gott wie folgt aufgefordert wird, den Mörder eines Jungen zu bestrafen: *Herr allmächtiger! Du hast mich erschaffen, ein schlechter Mensch hat mich getötet. Räche mich schnell* (Übersetzung von C. Marek). Dieses Gebet ist ebenfalls im Kontext einer Grabinschrift zu lesen und wird (metaphorisch) vom Verstorbenen selbst, der nach Gerechtigkeit sucht, ausgesprochen. Beide Texte scheinen die Allmächtigkeit des höchsten Gottes, der alles sieht, hört und weißt, auf eine gewisse Art und Weise unter Beweis zu stellen: Wenn er in der Tat alles sieht und weißt, muss er sich seinen Verehrern gegenüber verpflichtet fühlen, die Gerechtigkeit wieder herzustellen. Ferner kann man die Akklamationsformeln, wie z.B. „groß ist der Gott Axiottenos, der über Tarsi herrscht“, erwähnen, die an den Anfang einer Beichtinschrift gesetzt⁴⁷ und wahrscheinlich während des Rituals der Aufstellung und Weihung der Stele laut vorgelesen wurden, um den Gott gebührend zu preisen und somit seine Gnade auch für die Zukunft zu gewinnen.

Freilich können wir uns nach den Gründen fragen, warum es (im Kontext dieser ländlichen Heiligtümer oder vor den Grabdenkmälern) wichtig sein konnte, diese Inschriften laut vorzulesen. Alle oben behandelten Texte, wenn laut gelesen, konnten unter anderem Erstaunen, Gehorsamkeit und Ehrfurcht der Menschen vor dem Göttlichen zum Ausdruck bringen. Der Gott wurde mit einer gewissen Emotionalität⁴⁸ angesprochen, hiermit seine Aufmerksamkeit in Anspruch genommen und seine Macht auch unter Beweis gestellt. Dies ist wiederum mit der Bedeutung der horizontalen religiösen Kommunikation in Verbindung zu bringen. Die Menschen, welche die Inschrift lasen (oder ihren Inhalt hörten), konnten erfahren, ob eine Bitte erhört wurde, ein Verbrecher bestraft und somit die Gerechtigkeit wieder hergestellt wurde oder nicht. Diese Texte wurden für ein Publikum von Lesern und Zuhörern verfasst, die an die wirkende Macht dieser Götter glauben sollten.

⁴⁴ Zum Begriff Gebet um Gerechtigkeit vgl. Versnel (1991: 68–70; 2002: 48–50).

⁴⁵ RECAM II, Nr. 242: Ὅσιον Δίκεον / Ἦλιε Κύριε, ὑμεῖς ἐκ[δι]κήσατε τὴν νεκρὰν / καὶ τὰ τέκνα ζῶντα; vgl. auch *St. Pont.* III, Nr. 258: Ἦλιε ἐκδίκησον. / Μάξιμος Δαμᾶ / καὶ Στρατονίκη / τὴν στήλην / κατασκεύασαν / Μαξίμου καὶ Μαξίμου τέκνων.

⁴⁶ SEG L, Nr. 1233: Ἀργυρίων νέος / ἐνθάδε κεί/με· Κύριε Παντοκράτωρ· σὺ μὲ ἔκτισε, κακὸς μὲ ἄνθρωπος ἀπώλεσεν· ἐκδίκησόν με ἐν τάχι· ἔστη/σαν μου στήλην / γονεῖς Τέρτυλλος / καὶ Χρύσα εἶνεκεν / εὐσεβείας ζήσαντι / ἔτη ιε'· τελευτᾷ / ἔτους σμγ'· χαῖρε / παροδεῖτα. Zu diesem Text vgl. Marek (2000: 137–146); Chiai (2009d: 79–80).

⁴⁷ Vgl. Petzl (1994, Nr. 3, 1–2): Μέγας Μεις Ἀξιοττηνὸς Ταρσι βα/σιλευων. Hier weitere Beispiele von Akklamationsformeln in Beichtinschriften: Petzl (1994, Nr. 6): Διεὶ Ὁρεῖτη κὲ Μηνὶ Περκον βασιλεύοντα; Petzl (1994, Nr. 40, 1–2): Μὶς Λαβανας κ[αὶ] Μὶς Ἀρτεμιδώρου Δόρον κώμην βασιλεύοντα; Petzl (1994, Nr. 47, 1): Μεγάλοι θεοὶ Νέαν Κώμην κατέχοντες; Petzl (1994, Nr. 55, 1–2): Μὶς Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξιοττα κατέχων; Petzl (1994, Nr. 56, 1): Μηνὶ Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξιοττα κατέχοντι. Zu den Akklamationen als Medium religiöser Kommunikation vgl. Rouché (1984); Wiemer (2004); Chaniotis (2009a; 2009b).

⁴⁸ Zur Rolle der Emotionalität im antiken Ritual vgl. die verschiedenen Beiträge in Kneppel, Metzler (2003); dazu auch Chaniotis (2006; 2011; 2012).

Die Bilder als Medium

Unsere Stele ermöglicht uns, das Thema der Bilder als „Medium der religiösen Kommunikation“ aufzugreifen.⁴⁹

Denn im Denkmal sind auch die Reliefs in Betracht zu ziehen, in denen die zwei Erwachsenen der Gottheit die kleine Sabine vorzustellen scheinen: Die Kommunikation erfolgt sowohl auf einer visuellen als auch auf einer sprachlichen Ebene. Man braucht jedoch den Text, um die Botschaft der Bilder verstehen zu können. Eine derartige Interaktion zwischen Bild und Text in religiöser Kommunikation ist äußerst beachtenswert,⁵⁰ wenn wir bedenken, dass die Stele in einer lokalen Kultstätte im Binnenland Anatoliens aufgestellt wurde. Betende Menschen werden oft auf den Stelen dargestellt. Hier einige Beispiele:

Aus dem Gebiet von Kula kennt man eine Stele, auf der die Abbildung einer betenden Frau mit erhobener Rechten vorhanden ist. Dem begleitenden Text entnimmt man, dass eine Frau namens Meltine zusammen mit ihrem Mann Glykon das Denkmal den Göttern Men Tiamou und Anahitis geweiht hat.⁵¹ Aus derselben Gegend stammt eine weitere Stele, die denselben Göttern geweiht wurde. Darauf befindet sich die Abbildung von einem Mann und einer Frau, zusammen mit zwei Kindern, die mit der in der Inschrift erwähnten weihenden Familie in Verbindung zu setzen sind.⁵² All diese Menschen sind im Gebetsgestus dargestellt: Sie bringen ihre Frömmigkeit zur Gottheit auf einer visuellen Ebene zum Ausdruck. Eine Frau namens Tatiane hatte als Gelübde einen Stier dem Gott Men Axiottenos versprochen.⁵³ Da sie sich jedoch, nachdem ihre Bitte in Erfüllung ging, nicht leisten konnte, das Tier zu weihen, ließ sie mit dem Einverständnis des Gottes eine Stele weihen, auf der eine Abbildung des Stieres angebracht wurde, deren Vorhandensein auf dem Denkmal ebenfalls nur durch die Lektüre des Textes verständlich wird.

Betrachtenswerte Parallelen bieten auch die zahlreichen Stelen aus dem lokalen Heiligtum von Zeus Alsenos in Phrygien,⁵⁴ auf denen auf einer visuellen Ebene das Objekt des Schützens dargestellt und dem Göttlichen vorgestellt wird. Hierbei sei paradigma-

⁴⁹ Zu den Medien religiöser Kommunikation im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des epigraphischen Materials aus Phrygien vgl. Chiai (2008b; 2009d).

⁵⁰ Dazu mit einer Zusammenstellung des Materials Robert (1958); Frei (2001); Gordon (2004); zur Bildersprache dieser Regionen vgl. Wujewski (1991); zu den Weihreliefs als Mittel religiöser Kommunikation vgl. wichtige Beobachtungen in Schörner (2003: 29–40; 2006); Belayche (2008); Chaniotis (2012: 223–227).

⁵¹ Lane (1971, Nr. 60): Θεᾷ Ἀνάειτι καὶ Μηνὶ Τιάμου / Μελτίνῃ καὶ Γλύκων ἀπέδω/καν τὸ ἱεροποίημα εὐχαρισ/τοῦντες. Ἐτους τ', μη(νὸς) Ξανδικοῦ.

⁵² Lane (1971, Nr. 63): Ἀρτέμιδι Ἀνάειτι κ[αὶ] Μη[ν]ι Τιάμου Μουσᾶις β' [καὶ] / Καλλιγένεια ἡ σύμβ[ι]ρος αὐ[τοῦ] ὑπὲρ Μουσαίου το[ῦ] υἱοῦ / μαρτυροῦντες τὰς δ[υνάμ]εις τῶν θεῶν ἀπέδω[καν] / τὴν εὐχὴν. Ἐτους σπα', [μη(νὸς)] / Δείου ι'.

⁵³ Petzl (1994, Nr. 61): Μηνὶ Ἀξιοτήνῳ Τατιανῇ Ερ/που εὐξαμένη ταῦρον ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν καὶ ἀκουσ/θεῖσα, μὴ δυναθεῖσα δὲ / ἀποδοῦναι ταῦρον ἡρώτη/σε τὸν θεὸν καὶ συνεχώρησε / ἀπολαβεῖν στήλην στήλην. Ἐτους τκ', / μη(νὸς) Πανήμου ι'. *Tatiane, die Tochter des Hermippos, hatte für ihre Geschwister einen Stier gelobt und war erhört worden, konnte aber einen Stier nicht erstatten. Sie befragte (hierüber) den Gott, und er war damit einverstanden, (statt des Stiers) eine Stele entgegenzunehmen. Im Jahre 320, am 10. des Monats Panemos.* (Übersetzung von G. Petzl).

⁵⁴ Die Weihreliefs aus dem Heiligtum des Zeus Alsenos sind in PVS zusammengestellt worden. Zu den Reliefs und Werkstätten aus Phrygien mit einer wichtigen Sammlung und Auswertung des Materials vgl. Lochman (2003); zu einer Diskussion über diese Votivreliefs mit Literaturhinweisen vgl. Chiai (2009d: 362–363; 2010: 225–227).

tisch der Fall von einem gewissen Karmos erwähnt, welcher, als Gelübde, *περὶ παιδίου σωτηρίας* eine Stele aufstellen ließ,⁵⁵ auf der die mit Kapuzenmantel bekleidete Figur eines Kindes, das vor einem Tempel stand, abgebildet wurde. Die auf den Denkmälern dargestellten anatomischen Körperglieder (Beine, Arme, weibliche Brüste usw.)⁵⁶ deuten auf die Heilkompetenzen dieser Gottheit hin und verkünden den anderen Menschen gleichzeitig, da es sich meistens um Fälle von *ex voto* handelt, ihre Macht. Beiläufig sei auch gesagt, dass das Vorhandensein von anatomischen Votivgliedern (Beine, Arme usw.) auf den Votivstelen aus den lokalen Kultstätten von Zeus Alsenos, Zeus Petarenos usw. aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach auf einen Einfluss größerer Heiligtümer (wie z.B. die Asklepieia) zurückzuführen ist, wo solche Votivreliefs eine ältere Tradition hatten. Schließlich sei auch darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass die Anfertigung einer mit Relief und begleitender Inschrift ausgestatteten Stele jedenfalls eine finanzielle Leistung darstellt, die sich nicht alle erlauben konnten. Aus dieser Sicht können sich diese Denkmäler auch als eine gute Quelle für die Rekonstruktion des sozialen Lebens in den ländlichen Zentren erweisen.⁵⁷

Die Ortsgebundenheit und die Kompetenzen der lokalen Götter

Nun möchte ich auf die Ortsgebundenheit dieser Gottheit aufmerksam machen,⁵⁸ welche durch das Epitheton *Motyleites*⁵⁹ zum Ausdruck gebracht wird. Dadurch wird die besondere Beziehung des Gottes zum Ort hervorgehoben und damit seine Macht in Anspruch genommen. Die große Zahl der von den Ortsnamen abgeleiteten sakralen Beinamen legt die Vermutung nahe, dass jedes Dorf seine eigene Schutzgottheit besaß, die für alle Bereiche des menschlichen Alltagslebens zuständig war. Daran schließt sich die Vorstellung der Gottheit an, die, wie zuvor gesagt, ähnlich einem säkularen Herrscher, über ein Territorium und seine Einwohner herrscht:⁶⁰ „*Groß ist Men Axiottenos, der über Tarsi herrscht*“ lautet paradigmatisch eine zuvor erwähnte Akklamationsformel zu Beginn einer Beichtinschrift. Dies spricht unter anderem wiederum für die starke Territorialität der göttlichen *dynamis*. Ferner sei an die große Verbreitung von Machtepithe- ta wie *basileus*, *tyrannos*, *proestos*, *kyrios* usw., erinnert,⁶¹ welche die kommunikative Funktion erfüllen, die Macht der Götter auszudrücken und zu preisen. Bedauerlicherweise bleiben uns die lokalen Traditionen bzw. Mythen, welche diese Ortsgebundenheit erklärten, unbekannt.⁶²

⁵⁵ PVS Nr. 112: *Καρμος τῷ / Διὶ περὶ παιδίου / σωτηρίας / εὐχ/ῆς*.

⁵⁶ Vgl. dazu Hausmann (1948); Dillon (1994); Gladigow (1995); Forsén (1996), der eine Zusammenstellung und Auswertung der anatomischen Votivreliefs bietet. Dazu auch Chaniotis (1995) in Bezug auf die Beichtinschriften.

⁵⁷ Vgl. dazu Waelkens (1977).

⁵⁸ Zu diesem wichtigen Begriff vgl. Chiai (2013: 208–214); in Bezug auf die ländlichen Kulte Kleinasiens mit einer Zusammenstellung des epigraphischen Materials vgl. Chiai (2009c).

⁵⁹ Zum Ethnikon und zu Stadtnamen vgl. Zgusta (1984: 401); dazu auch die Beobachtungen von Robert (1964: 35–38) in Bezug auf eine Weihung für Men Motelleites.

⁶⁰ Zu dieser wichtigen Vorstellung vgl. Belayche (2006); Chiai (2009a).

⁶¹ Vgl. dazu Pleket (1981); Chiai (2009a; 2009d: 85–89).

⁶² Wir können nur vermuten, dass viele dieser Traditionen beispielsweise von der Geburt oder von der Offenbarung (mit betreffenden Wundertaten) der Gottheit in der Region erzählt. Pausanias (IV,

Der lokale Gott Men ist um die Rettung des kleinen Mädchens gebeten worden.⁶³ Wie die meisten der auf dem Lande verehrten Götter könnte, wie zuvor gesagt, jedoch auch Men Motyleites für mehrere Bereiche des menschlichen Alltagslebens zuständig gewesen sein. Ich kann in diesem Zusammenhang als paralleles Material die zahlreichen Weihungen an lokale Götter wie Zeus Bronton, Zeus Alsenos, usw. anfügen, in denen man sieht, dass diese Gottheiten sowohl für die Fruchtbarkeit der Äcker als auch für die *soteria* (Rettung, Gesundheit) der ansässigen Familien, sowie der Arbeitstiere und sogar (das ist der Fall von Ζεὺς βροντῶν) als Schützer der Seelen der verstorbenen Angehörigen⁶⁴ angerufen und verehrt wurden, wie wir den Anrufungsformeln ὑπὲρ καρπῶν, ὑπὲρ βοῶν, ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν usw. entnehmen können.⁶⁵ Dies lässt auch das Vorhandensein von Epitheta wie *panhypsistos*⁶⁶ oder *panepekoos* (MAMA I, Nr. 8) in den Weihinschriften erklären, welche betonen, dass der angebetete Gott, der allerhöchste, imstande ist, alle Bitten zu erhören und zu erfüllen. Das Präfix *pan-* bringt somit die Allmächtigkeit dieser göttlichen Wesen zum Ausdruck, die alle Erwartungen ihrer sterblichen Untertanen erfüllen konnten.

Die starke Territorialität bzw. Ortsgebundenheit dieser Götter soll in engem Zusammenhang mit ihrer Allmächtigkeit betrachtet werden, weil sie von ihren Anbetern als allmächtige Könige angesehen werden, die über ein Territorium und seine Einwohner herrschen. Wie allmächtige Könige waren diese Gottheiten auch zuständig für das Wohl ihrer sterblichen Untertanen, die jedoch die sozialen und sakralen Normen pflegen und respektieren mussten: Sie erweisen sich somit auch als Garanten für die soziale Ordnung des Dorfes und des Territoriums, wo sie ihre Macht ausübten bzw. herrschten.

All diese epigraphischen Zeugnisse zeigen eindeutig, wie der sogenannte *pagan monotheism* ein reales religiöses Phänomen war, welches das spirituelle Leben der Menschen, die in diesen Gegenden lebten, prägte, und mit dem sich die Christen und die christlichen Gemeinden auseinandersetzen mussten.

Schlussfolgerungen

Die in dieser Arbeit erforschte Inschrift kann als Paradigma der Religiosität auf dem Land betrachtet werden; daraus können wichtige Rückschlüsse sowohl über die Formen

33, 1) bemerkte z.B., dass eine Aufzählung der Geburtstraditionen des Zeus unmöglich ist, da fast jede Region der griechischen Welt für sich den Rang als Geburtsort des Gottes beanspruchte. Vgl. dazu Nollé (2003), der für das römische Kleinasien interessantes epigraphisches und numismatisches Material zu diesem Thema zusammenstellt.

⁶³ Zu den *soteria*-Weihungen vgl. mit einer Zusammenstellung der epigraphischen Zeugnisse (meistens aus Syrien) Moralee (2004); für das ländliche Kleinasien vgl. Chiai (2009d: 74–77).

⁶⁴ Zu den Kompetenzen von Zeus Bronton vgl. Cumont (1899); MAMA V: XLIII–XLIV; Haspels (1971: 202); Chiai (2009b).

⁶⁵ Zu den Kompetenzen von Zeus Alsenos als Heilgott vgl. die auf den Stelen abgebildeten anatomischen Glieder (Hände, Augen, Beine) in PVS Nr. 11–69; von Belang sind auch die dargestellten Pilger (PVS Nr. 70–75) und Haustiere (Ochsen und Pferde, PVS Nr. 297–300). Zu den kleinasiatischen Weihreliefs mit Inschriften vgl. die Beobachtungen von Robert (1983: 523–525 zu Zeus Orochoreites; 526–528; zu Zeus Thallos; 529–531 zu Zeus Ampelites; 543–545 zu Zeus Andreas).

⁶⁶ Vgl. PVS Nr. 364: Ζηνὶ πανυψίστῳ / Χαρίτων Δοκιμ[ε]ῖς / ἀνέθηκεν Εὐξά/μενος στήλην / αἰγυλαίας παλάμαις

der religiösen Kommunikation als auch über die alltägliche Mentalität in diesen abgelegenen Winkeln des römischen Reiches gezogen werden.

Religiöse Inschriften erweisen sich als wichtige Dokumente, um die Art und Weise zu rekonstruieren, wie die lokalen Götter von ihren Anhängern als allmächtig betrachtet wurden, aber auch wie die Menschen sich verpflichtet fühlten, den Anderen ihre Erfahrung mit dem Göttlichen zu erzählen, um dadurch die Macht ihres Gottes zu verkünden und zu vergrößern. Die Verehrer dieser Götter waren – wie angedeutet – Leute einfacher Herkunft, welche verstreut in den Dörfern auf dem Lande wohnten, die ihre kulturelle und soziale Einheit teilweise durch solche Kultformen demonstrierten und eine bescheidene Bitte an die Götter richteten. In den Weihungen wird nicht um sozialen Aufstieg oder Reichtum gebeten, denn diese Leute waren froh, wenn es ihren Angehörigen gut ging, wenn die Ochsen bei guter Verfassung waren oder wenn sie in der Saison eine gute Ernte hatten. Es handelt sich um eine agrarische Gesellschaft, wie sie heutzutage nur in den abgelegenen Dörfern in Süditalien, Griechenland und in der Türkei zu finden ist. Es ist auch bemerkenswert, dass alle Personen ohne geschlechtsspezifische oder soziale Differenzierungen freien Zugang zu den Kultstätten gehabt zu haben scheinen, denn sowohl Sklaven und Freigelassene als auch Frauen und Männer durften als Weihende in den Inschriften erscheinen.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- Ägyptische Urkunden = Ägyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892–1912.
- AHMED, L., FÜRST, A., GERS-UPHAUS, C., KLUG, S. (eds.), 2013. *Monotheistische Denkfiguren in der Spätantike*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- ATHANASSIADI, P., FREDE, M. (eds.), 1999. *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- AUBRIOT-SÉVIN, D., 1992. *Prière et conceptions religieuses en Grèce ancienne* [= Collection de la Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen 22]. Lyon: Boccard.
- BECKER-BERTAU, F. (ed.), 1986. *Die Inschriften von Klaudiu Polis* [= Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 31]. Bonn: Habelt.
- BELAYCHE, N., 2006. "Au(x) dieu(x) qui règne(nt) sur ...". Basileia divine et fonctionnement du polythéisme dans l'Anatolie impériale. In: A. Virgout, X. Lorient, A. Berenger-Badel, B. Klein (eds.), *Pouvoir et religion dans le monde romain. En hommage à Jean-Pierre Martin*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 257–269.
- BELAYCHE, N., 2008. Du texte à l'image. Les reliefs sur les stèles 'de confession' d'Anatolie. In: S. Etienne et al. (eds.), *Image et religion dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine*. Naples: Centre Jean Bérard, 181–194.
- BINDER, G., EHLICH, K. (eds.), 1997. *Religiöse Kommunikation. Formen und Praxis vor der Neuzeit*. Trier: Wissenschaftler Verlag Trier.
- BRIXHE, C., 1987. La langue comme critère d'acculturation. L'exemple du grec d'un district phrygien. In: R. Lebrun (ed.), *Acta Anatolica E. Laroche oblata* [= Hethitica 8]. Louvain/Paris: Peeters, 45–80.
- BRIXHE, C., 2001. Individu, langue et communauté sociale. À propos des confessions païennes du moyen Hermos. In: C. Consani, L. Mucciante (eds.), *Norma e variazione nel diasistema greco. Atti del IV Incontro Internazionale di Linguistica Greca, Chieti-Pescara, 30 settembre – 2 ottobre 1999*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 101–118.
- BRIXHE, C., 2002. Interactions between Greek and Phrygian under the Roman Empire. In: J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 246–266.

- BURESCH, K., 1989. *Aus Lydien. Epigraphisch-geographische Reisefrüchte*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- BURFEIND, C., 2002. Wen hörte Philippus? Leises und lautes Vorlesen in der Antike. *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93, 138–145.
- BUSCH, S., 2002. Lautes und leises Lesen in der Antike. *Rheinisches Museum* 33, 1–44.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 1990. Drei kleinasiatischen Inschriften zur griechischen Religion. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 15, 127–134.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 1995. Illness and cures in the Greek propitiatory inscriptions and dedications of Lydia and Phrygia. In: P. Van der Eijk, H. F. J. Hortsmanhoff (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 323–344.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 1997. Tempeljustiz im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Rechtliche Aspekte der Beichtinschriften. In: G. Velissaropoulos-Karakostas (ed.), *Symposion 1995. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*. Köln: Böhlau, 353–384.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2004a. Under the Watchful Eyes of the Gods. Aspects of Divine Justice in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor. In: S. Colvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East. Politics, Culture, Society* [= Yale Classical Studies 31]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–43.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2004b. Von Ehre, Schande und kleinen Verbrechen unter Nachbarn. Konfliktbewältigung und Götterjustiz in Gemeinden des antiken Anatolien. In: F. R. Pfetsch (ed.), *Konflikt* [= Heidelberger Jahrbücher 48], 233–254.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2006. Ritual between Norms and Emotions. Ritual as Shared Experience and Memory. In: Stavrianopoulou 2006: 211–238.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2009a. Ritual Performances of Divine Justice. The Epigraphy of Confession, Atonement, and Exaltation in Roman Asia Minor. In: H. Cotton (ed.), *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in Roman Near East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115–153.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2009b. Acclamation as a form of religious communication. In: Rüpke 2009: 199–218.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2010. Megatheism. The search for the almighty god and the competition of cults. In: Mitchell, van Nuffelen 2010a: 112–140.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2011. Emotional Community through Ritual. Initiates, Citizens, and Pilgrims as Emotional Communities in the Greek World. In: A. Chaniotis (eds.), *Ritual Dynamics in the Ancient Mediterranean. Agency, Emotion, Gender, Representation*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 264–290.
- CHANIOTIS, A., 2012. Staging and Feeling the Presence of God. Emotion and Theatricality in Religious Celebrations in the Roman East. In: L. Bricault, C. Bonnet (eds.), *Les mutations religieuses dans l'Empire romain*. Leiden: Brill, 169–189.
- CHANIOTIS, A., CHIAI, G. F., 2007. Die Sprache der religiösen Kommunikation im römischen Osten. Konvergenz und Differenzierung. In: J. Rüpke (eds.), *Antike Religionsgeschichte in räumlicher Perspektive*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 117–124.
- CHIAI, G. F., 2008a. Il villaggio ed il suo dio. Considerazioni sulla concorrenza religiosa nelle comunità rurali dell'Asia Minore in epoca romana. *Mythos. Rivista di Storia delle religioni* 1, 137–163.
- CHIAI, G. F., 2008b. Religiöse Kommunikation auf dem Land im kaiserzeitlichen Phrygien. Der Beitrag der Epigraphik. In: R. Häußler (ed.), *Romanisation et epigraphie. Études interdisciplinaires sur l'acculturation et l'identité dans l'Empire romain* [= Archéologie et histoire romaine 17]. Montagnac: Éditions Monique Mergoil, 351–374.
- CHIAI, G. F., 2009a. Königliche Götter und gehorsame Untertanen im Kleinasien der Kaiserzeit. Zur Funktion der Machtepitheta in religiöser Kommunikation. In: Rüpke 2009: 219–247.
- CHIAI, G. F., 2009b. Zeus Bronton und der Totenkult im kaiserzeitlichen Phrygien. In: J. Rüpke, J. Scheid (eds.), *Rites funéraires et culte des morts* [= Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 27]. Stuttgart: Steiner, 135–157.
- CHIAI, G. F., 2009c. Die Ortsgebundenheit des Religiösen. Das Paradigma der ländlichen Heiligtümer Phrygiens in der Kaiserzeit. In: C. Auffahrt (ed.), *Religion auf dem Lande. Entstehung und Veränderung von Sakrallandschaften unter römischer Herrschaft* [= Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 28]. Stuttgart: Steiner, 133–160.
- CHIAI, G. F., 2009d. Allmächtige Götter und fromme Menschen im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. *Millennium* 6, 61–102.
- CHIAI, G. F., 2010. Perché un dio è potente? Considerazioni sull'enteismo e sulla costruzione del divino in Asia Minore. *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 76, 187–230.

- CHIAI, G. F., 2013. Die Ortsgebundenheit des Göttlichen bei Macrobius. In: Ahmed, Fürst, Gers-Uphaus, Klug 2013: 208–235.
- CIPRIANO, P., 1990. *I composti greci con φίλος* [= Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche 27]. Viterbo: Università della Tuscia, Istituto di Studi Romanzi.
- CUMONT, F., 1899. Bronton. In: G. Wissowa (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* III. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlerscher Verlag, 891–892.
- DE HOZ, M. P., 1999. *Die lydischen Kulte im Lichte der griechischen Inschriften* [= Asia Minor Studien 36]. Bonn: Habelt.
- DELEMEN, I., 1999. *Anatolian Rider-Gods. A study on stone finds from the regions of Lycia, Pisidia, Isauria, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Lydia and Caria in the late roman period* [= Asia Minor Studien 35]. Bonn: Habelt.
- DIGNAS, B., 2003. Religious Centres in the Greek East. Worlds Apart? In: E. Schwertheim, E. Winter (eds.), *Religion und Region. Götter und Kulte aus dem östlichen Mittelmeerraum* [= Asia Minor Studien 45]. Bonn: Habelt, 77–91.
- DILLON, M. P. J., 1994. The didactic nature of the Epidaurian Iamata. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 101, 239–60.
- DREW-BEAR, T., NAOUR, C., 1990. Divinités de Phrygie. In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II, 18, 3, 1908–2044.
- FESTUGIÈRE, J., 1954. *Personal religion among the Greeks* [= Sather classical lectures 26]. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- FORSÉN, B., 1996. *Griechische Gliederweihungen. Eine Untersuchung zu ihrer Typologie und ihrer religions- und sozialgeschichtlichen Bedeutung* [= Papers and monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 4]. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-Instituutin Säätiö.
- FREI, P., 2001. Inschriften und Reliefs. Ein Beitrag zur lokalen Religionsgeschichte Anatoliens. In: S. Buzzi, D. Kach, E. Kistler, E. Mango, M. Palaczyk, O. Stefani (eds.), *Zona Archeologica. Festschrift für Hans Peter Isler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Bonn: Habelt, 135–158.
- FREVEL, C., VON HESBERG, H. (eds.), 2007. *Kult und Kommunikation. Medien in Heiligtümern der Antike*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- FÜRST, A., 2013. Die Rhetorik des Monotheismus im römischen Reich. Ein neuer Zugang zu einem zentralen historischen Konzept. In: Ahmed, Fürst, Gers-Uphaus, Klug 2013: 7–32.
- GLADIGOW, B., 1995. Anatomia sacra. Religiös motivierte Eingriffe in menschliche oder tierische Körper. In: P. Van der Eijk, H. F. J. Hortsmanhoff (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 345–361.
- GNOLI, T., THORTON, J., 1997. Σώζε τὴν κατοικίαν. Società e religione nella Frigia romana. Note introduttive. In: R. Gusmani, M. Salvini, P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio. Atti del I Simposio Internazionale (Roma 16–17 Ottobre 1995)*. Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, 153–200.
- GORDON, R., 2004. Raising a sceptre. Confession-narratives from Lydia and Phrygia. *The Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17, 177–196.
- GUARDUCCI, M., 1974. *Epigrafia Greca III*. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato.
- GUARDUCCI, M., 1978. *Epigrafia Greca IV*. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato.
- HAERENS, H., 1948. ΣΩΤΗΡ et ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑ. In: *Studia Hellenistica* 5, 57–68.
- HÄUSLE, H., 1980. *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Thematik eines Motivs in lateinischen Inschriften* [= Zetemata 75]. München: Beck.
- HASPELS, C. H., 1971. *The Highlands of Phrygia. Sites and Monuments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- HAUSMANN, U., 1948. *Kunst und Heilum. Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Asklepiosreliefs*. Potsdam: Stichnote.
- HERRMANN, P., 1978. Men, Herr von Axiotta. In: S. Şahin, E. Schwertheim, J. Wagnes (eds.), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasien. Festschrift für F. K. Dörner zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. Februar 1976* [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 66]. Leiden: Brill, 415–423.
- HILTBRUNNER, O., 1990. Warum wollten sie nicht φίλάνθρωποι heißen? *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 33, 7–20.
- HORSLEY, H., 1982. *New Documents illustrating Early Christianity II*. Sydney: S. R. Llewelyn.
- JUNG, F., 2002. Σωτήρ. Studien zur Rezeption eines hellenistischen Ehrentitels im Neuen Testament [= Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. N. F. 39]. Münster: Aschendorff.

- KASPER, H., 1961. *Griechische Soter-Vorstellungen und ihre Übernahme in das politische Leben Roms*. München: Mikrokopie GmbH.
- KLAUCK, H.-J., 1996. Die kleinasiatischen Beichtinschriften und das Neue Testament. In: H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberg, P. Schäfer (eds.), *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel III*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 66–86.
- KNEPPE, A., METZLER, D. (eds.), 2003. *Die emotionale Dimension antiker Religiosität* [= Forschungen zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte 37]. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- LAMPE, G. W., 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexikon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LANE, E., 1964. A Re-study of the God Men. *Berytus* 15, 5–58.
- LANE, E., 1971. *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis I. The Monuments and Inscriptions* [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 16]. Leiden: Brill.
- LANE, E., 1976. *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis III. Interpretations and Testimonia* [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 19]. Leiden: Brill.
- LATTIMORE, R., 1942. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- LAZZARINI, M. L., 1976. *Le formule delle dediche votive della Grecia arcaica* [= Atti della Accademia nazionale dei lincei 373. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Memorie. Ser. 8. Vol. 19. Fasc. 2]. Roma.
- LAZZARINI, M. L., 1989–1990. Iscrizioni votive greche. *Scienze dell'Antichità. Storia Archeologia Antropologia* 3–4, 845–859.
- LGRM = SOKOLOWSKI, F., 1955. *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris: de Boccard.
- LOCHMAN, T., 2003. *Studien zu kaiserzeitlichen Grab- und Votivreliefs aus Phrygien*. Basel: Skulpturhalle Basel.
- LSJ = LIDDELL, H. G., SCOTT, R., JONES, H. S., 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a revised supplement 1996*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MALAY, H., 1994. *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Manisa Museum* [= Ergänzungsbande zu den Tituli Asiae minoris 19]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- MAMA = *Monumenta Asiae minoris antiqua*. Manchester; London, 1928–1993.
- MAREK, C., 2000. Der höchste, beste, größte, allmächtige Gott. Inschriften aus Nordkleinasien. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 32, 129–146.
- MATHEWS, T., 1993. *The Clash of Gods. A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- MERKELBACH, R., 1978. Der griechische Wortschatz und die Christen. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 18, 101–148.
- MERKELBACH, R., ŞAHIN, S., 1983. Eine stolze Mutter von sieben Söhnen. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 1, 57–58.
- MITCHELL, S., 1993. *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Vol. II. The Rise of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MITCHELL, S., VAN NUFFELEN, P. (eds.), 2010a. *One God. Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.
- MITCHELL, S., VAN NUFFELEN, P. (eds.), 2010b. *Monotheism between Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity* [= Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 12]. Leuven/Walpole: Peeters.
- MÖRTH, I., 1993. Kommunikation. In: H. Cancik, B. Gladigow, K. H. Kohl (eds.), *Handbuch der religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe III*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 392–414.
- MORALEE, J., 2004. *“For Salvation’s Sake”. Provincial Loyalty, Personal Religion, and Epigraphic Production in the Roman Late Antique Near East*. New York: Routledge.
- NOLLÉ, J., 2003. Vielerorts war Bethlehem. Göttergeburten im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. *Antike Welt* 34, 635–643.
- PEDRIZET, P., 1896. Men. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 20, 56–106.
- PETZL, G., 1994. *Die Beichtinschriften Westkleasiens* [= Epigraphica Anatolica 22]. Bonn: Habelt.
- PETZL, G., 1995. Ländliche Religiosität in Lydien. In: E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Forschungen in Lydien* [= Asia Minor Studien 17]. Bonn: Habelt, 37–48.
- PETZL, G., 1998. *Die Beichtinschriften im römischen Kleinasien und der Fromme und Gerechte Gott*. Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- PETZL, G., 2003. Zum religiösen Leben im westlichen Kleinasien. Einflüsse und Wechselwirkungen. In: E. Schwertheim, E. Winter (eds.), *Religion und Region. Götter und Kulte aus dem östlichen Mittelmeerraum* [= Asia Minor Studien 45]. Bonn: Habelt, 93–101.

- PLEKET, H. W., 1981. Religious History as the History of Mentality. The "Believer" as Servant of the Deity in the Greek World. In: Versnel 1981a: 152–192.
- PULLEYN, S., 1997. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- PVS = DREW-BEAR, T., THOMAS, C. M., YILDIZTURAN, M. (eds.), 1999. *Phrygian Votive Steles*. Ankara: The Museum of Anatolian Civilisation.
- RECAM = *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor*. London, 1982–.
- RICL, M., 1991. Hosios kai Dikaïos. Première partie: Catalogue des inscriptions. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 18, 1–70.
- RICL, M., 2001. Donations of Slaves and Freeborn Children to Deities in Roman Macedonia and Phrygia. A Reconsideration. *Tyche* 16, 127–160.
- RICL, M., 2009. Legal and social status of *threptoi* and related categories in narrative and documentary sources. In: H. Cotton (ed.), *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in Roman Near East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 93–114.
- RICL, M., Malay, H., 2005. ANΘΡΩΠΟΙ ΘΕΙΤΙΚΟΙ in a New Inscription from Hypaipa. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 38, 45–52.
- ROBERT, L., 1955. *Hellenica X*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- ROBERT, L., 1958. Reliefs votifs et cultes d'Anatolie. *Anatolia* 3, 103–136.
- ROBERT, L., 1964. *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- ROBERT, L., 1983. Documents d'Asie Mineure. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 107, 497–599.
- ROUCHÉ, C., 1984. Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire. New Evidence from Aphrodisias. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 74, 181–199.
- RÜPKE, J., 2007. *Einführung in die historische Religionswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- RÜPKE, J. (ed.), 2009. *Die Religion des Imperium Romanum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- RÜPKE, J., Spickermann, W., 2012. *Reflections on Religious Individuality. Graeco-Roman and Judaeo-Christian Texts and Practices* [= Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 62]. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- SCHEER, T., 2001. Die Götter anrufen. Die Kontaktaufnahme zwischen Mensch und Gottheit in der griechischen Antike. In: K. Brodersen (ed.), *Gebet und Fluch, Zeichen und Traum. Aspekte religiöser Kommunikation in der Antike* [= Antike Kultur und Geschichte 1]. Münster: Lit, 31–56.
- SCHNABEL, E. J., 2003. Divine Tyranny and Public Humiliation. A Suggestion for the Interpretation of the Lydian and Phrygian Confession Inscriptions. In: *Novum Testamentum* 45, 160–188.
- SCHÖRNER, G., 2003. *Votive im römischen Griechenland. Untersuchungen zur späthellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Kunst- und Religionsgeschichte* [= Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 7]. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- SCHULER, C., 1998. *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien* [= Vestigia 50]. München: Beck.
- SEG = *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*. Leiden; Amsterdam, 1923–.
- SFAMENI Gasparro, G., 2010. *Dio unico, pluralità e monarchia divina. Esperienze religiose e teologie nel mondo tardo-antico* [= Scienze e Storia delle Religioni 12]. Roma: Morcelliana.
- SGO = MERKELBACH, R. et al. (eds.), 1998–2004. *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*. Stuttgart/Leipzig; München.
- SOLIN, H., 2004. Pagano e cristiano. In: M. G. Angeli-Bertinelli, A. Donati (eds.), *Epigrafia di confine. Confine dell'epigrafia*. Faenza: Lega, 197–221.
- ST. PONT. = *Studia Pontica*. Bruxelles: Lamertin, 1903–1910.
- STAVRIANOPOULOU, E. (ed.), 2006. *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World* [= Kernos. Supplément 16]. Liège: Centre International d'Etude de la Religion Grecque Antique.
- TAM = *Tituli Asiae minoris*. Wien, 1901–.
- TOD, M. N., 1951. Laudatory Epithets in Greek Epitaphs. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 46, 182–190.
- VAN DER HORST, P. W., 1994. Silent Prayer in Antiquity. *Numen* 41, 1–25.
- VAN HAEPEREN-PURBAIX, A., 1983. Recherches sur les origines, la nature et les attributs du dieu Men. In: R. Donceel, R. Lebrun (eds.), *Archéologie et religions de l'Anatolie ancienne. Mélanges en l'honneur du professeur Paul Naster* [= Homo religiosus 10]. Louvain-La-Neuve: Centre d'Histoire des Religions, 221–257.
- VAN NUFFELEN, P., 2012. Beyond Categorization. "Pagan Monotheism" and the Study of Ancient Religion. *Common Knowledge* 3, 451–463.
- VAN STRATEN, F. T., 1976. A votive relief from Kos, and some other kaṓnar dedications. *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 51, 1–38.

- VELIGIANNI, C., 2001. Philos und philos-Komposita in den griechischen Inschriften der Kaiserzeit. In: M. Peachin (ed.), *Aspects of Friendship in the Graeco-Roman World*. Portsmouth: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 63–80.
- VERSNEL, H. S. (ed.), 1981a. *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of the Deity in the Greel World* [= Studies in Greek and Roman religion 2]. Leiden: Brill.
- VERSNEL, H. S., 1981b. Religious Mentality in the Ancient Prayer. In: Versnel 1981a: 1–64.
- VERSNEL, H. S., 1991. Beyond the Cursing. The Appeal to Justice in Judicial Prayers. In: C. A. Faraone, D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 60–106.
- VERSNEL, H. S., 2002. Writing Mortals and Reading Gods. Appeal to the Gods as a Strategy in Social Control. In: D. Cohen (ed.), *Demokratie, Recht und soziale Kontrolle im klassischen Athen* [= Schriften des Historischen Kollegs. Kolloquien 49]. München: Oldenbourg, 37–76.
- VEYNE, P., 1986. Une évolution du paganisme gréco-romain. Injustice et piété des dieux, leurs ordres ou “oracles”. *Latomus* 45, 259–283.
- WAELEKENS, M., 1977. Phrygian Votive and Tombstones as Sources of the Social and Economic Life in Roman Antiquity. *Ancient Society* 8, 277–315.
- WIEMER, H.-U., 2004. Akklamationen im spätrömischen Reich. Zur Typologie und Funktion eines Kommunikationsrituals. *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 86, 55–73.
- WUJEWSKI, T., 1991. *Anatolian Sepulchral Stelae in Roman Times* [= Seria historia sztuki 21]. Poznań: Uniwersytet Im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- ZGUSTA, L., 1984. *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen* [= Beiträge zur Namenforschung. Beiheft 21]. Heidelberg: Winter.

ZBOŽNÁ RODINA Z LÝDIE A JEJÍ BŮH POZNÁMKY KE KOMUNIKAČNÍM STRATEGIÍM S BOŽSTVEM NA MALOASIJSKÉM VENKOVĚ CÍSAŘSKÉ DOBY

Shrnutí

Článek se zabývá jednou sakrální dedikací anatolskému božstvu jménem Mén Motyleitēs. Jeho cílem je rekonstruovat vybrané aspekty strategií náboženské komunikace na venkově římské doby, kde byla uctívána řada lokálních božstev. Tito bohové byli zobrazováni jako všemocní králové, kteří vládou nad určitým územím a chrání své uctíváče, jak vyplývá např. ze svědectví konfesionálních nápisů.

Dedikátoři Tatiané a Glaukos děkují svému bohu Ménovi za ochranu, poskytnutou jejich adoptivní dceři při narození, a dítě mu představují a zaslibují. Sami sebe označují jako *philotheoi* („milující boha“) a zdůrazňují za pomoci adverbia *aei*, že se modlí výhradně k Ménovi a k žádnému jinému božstvu, protože on je ochráncem jejich domu, rodiny, majetku i zdraví.

LINGUISTICA ET LITTERARIA

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVOCALIC LARYNGEAL IN LATIN

LUCIE PULTROVÁ (Praha)

ABSTRACT

The development of laryngeals in the traditional interpretation depends purely on their sound environment and at least in the development into Latin no role is ascribed to in what morpheme or morphemes and on what position within the morpheme the relevant sound sequence occurs. However, in the process of elimination of laryngeals the extra-phonetic factors evidently also come into play that complicate the well-arranged rules and that have not yet been systematically explained. The article is concerned with a partial problem of this complex issue, namely the question of development of intervocalic laryngeal on the morphemic boundary between the root and the suffix. In Latin there are examples where for semantic reasons the deletion of the laryngeal is not followed by the contraction of vowels, but where an epenthetic consonant occurs in its place.

Key words: Latin; historical linguistics; laryngeals; morpheme; intervocalic laryngeal; epenthetic consonant; epenthesis

Anyone making acquaintance with the laryngeal theory from the viewpoint of Latin or any other Indo-European language meets with the rules of the type of “a laryngeal in the position between two consonants (CHC) yields *a* (CaC)”, “in Latin, a laryngeal at the absolute beginning of the word before a consonant (HC-) drops”, and similar. The development of a sound, in this particular case the so called laryngeal,¹ is presented as being dependent on its sound environment, while no role is ascribed to in what morpheme or morphemes and on what position within the morpheme the relevant sound sequence occurs. But in fact, at least in Latin, in elimination of laryngeals there are evidently also other than phonetic factors stepping into play that complicate the rules. While working with Latin material we actually find instances of when as if the purely phonetic rules did not apply. Generally said, even after the elimination of the laryngeal took place, the structure of the word must remain clear – for semantic reasons, the root must remain at least partially intelligible; so does the suffix, if it is, from the synchronic point of view, a carrier of a distinct semantic information; while the endings must be retained so that the word does not deviate from the system of inflection. These rules, and the last one in particular, must be kept, and they prevail over the otherwise very strict phonological

¹ The term “laryngeal” is used throughout the text as a traditional term, regardless of the real phonetic nature of these sounds.

rules (even though, let us stress, in general it is naturally the syllable, not the morpheme that is phonetically relevant). Let us give as an example the root compounds in *-stes*, *-stitis*, the representatives of the same word-formative type as e.g. *artifex*, *obses*, etc. The root compound formed in a standard way from the root **steh₂*, “to stand”, should yield the gen. **-sth₂-(e)s* > ***.-stas*,² the dat. **-sth₂-ei* > ***.-stai* > ***.-stae* etc.; such compound would, however, completely deviate from the declension of its word-formative type (*ob-sid-is*, *ob-sid-i*, and similar). To solve this situation, a non-etymological consonant is inserted, in this case the *-t-*, which prevents the – from the functional point of view – undesirable merging of the two morphemes.

The examples of where in Latin the development of laryngeal does not simply follow the rules based purely on the sound environment are numerous: there are instances of the laryngeal dropping in the position where it should vocalize;³ or, on the contrary, it vocalizes even though it should totally disappear;⁴ or examples of various consonants having developed in the place of the original laryngeals that textbooks with no particular aim of interpreting describe *ad hoc* as various “stem enlargements”. The common denominator of all these “exceptions” is a specific position of the laryngeal within the morpheme and hence coming necessity, or, contrarily, nonnecessity to retain the phoneme within the frame of the higher unit – morpheme – with regard to the meaning that it carries. Systematic description of these various strategies used in the elimination of laryngeals is a very complex task, demanding the solution of many partial problems. I attempt to approach one of them in this article: the question of the development of intervocalic laryngeal in Latin.

In textbooks, Latin is classed with the languages with the most common development of the intervocalic laryngeal, i.e. the assumed elimination of the laryngeal and contraction of the vowels, while the timbre of the resulting long vowel is not quite predictable: it is generally assumed that the laryngeal prior to the deletion had coloured the preceding vowel; however, the resulting timbre of the vowel yielded by contraction of two vowels of different timbre does not follow quite clear rules in Latin. The reason for this unclearness is simple: there are only a few accounts in Latin where the intervocalic laryngeal may definitely be reconstructed. Schrijver (1991: 154) only lists the following possible instances: *flōs*, *lēnis*, *mās* + the forms of the inflection of the *-eh₂-* and *-eh₁-* stems.

flōs: Schrijver (1991: 131) cites Flobert (1973: 568), who says it is the *s*-stem, which means the same word-formative type as e.g. *calor*, that is **b^hleh₃-ōs* > *flōs*. Disregarding the substantial problems with interpretation of the whole word-formative type,⁵ it is true that, functionally, the subst. *flōs* indeed fits in there: it belongs with the verbs *flōrēre/*

² Two asterisks **** are used to denote the forms that should have developed from the reconstructions according to the generally accepted rules, but that do not in fact exist.

³ Such case can be found even in Schrijver's synthetic monograph on the laryngeal reflexes in Latin (1991: 330–333): in the place of the interconsonantal laryngeal in the position on morphemic boundary between the root and the suffix the vowel *a* does not develop, contrary to the common assumption of the development of interconsonantal laryngeal in Latin (CHC > CaC), but the laryngeal disappears without any substitution (e.g. *passim* < **pVth₂-ti-*).

⁴ For example **h₂g'-tōs* > **ag-tos* > *āctus*, **h₁d-tōs* > **ed-tos* > *ēsus* etc. (× general rule: HC- > C-, see e.g. Schrijver 1991: 15–25).

⁵ See Pultrová (2011: 108–110): this word-formative type has no apparent equivalents in other Indo-European languages and is semantically and formally inconsistent. It more often denotes the qualitative than action abstracts.

flōrēscere and the adj. *flōridus*, same as for example the mentioned *calor* – *calēre/calēscere* – *calidus* etc. The question might obviously be asked as to why in this noun in particular the nominative *-s* was retained and did not change through analogy into the *-r*, as was the case in the other nouns. This, however, is not the biggest problem: what is more problematic is that the forms of Latin weak cases do not correspond to this reconstruction (and they are, at least in Latin, more important for the reconstruction than the nominative): according to Schrijver **b^hlh₃-és*⁶ should yield **falos*-,⁷ i.e. the genitive should have the form of **falosis* > **faloris*, but in reality we have *flōris*. The Flobert's interpretation thus is not perfectly satisfactory.⁸

The adj. *lēnis*, for which Schrijver (1991: 154, 122) suggests as one of the possible reconstructions **leh₁-en-*, I leave aside since I consider this interpretation of the suffix absolutely improbable.⁹

mās: Schrijver (1991: 167) cites Adams (1985), who interprets this word as an original *s*-stem adjective from the base word **mas*, “penis”, i.e. **ma-es*, “having a penis” (similarly to *pūbēs*, *-eris* “having pubic hair [*pūbēs*, *-is*]”). Thus: nom. **mh₂-ēs*, gen. **mh₂-s-és*. Schrijver (1991: 168) himself disagrees with this being an original adjective, but he takes for granted that it is the *s*-stem. According to Schrijver, the nominative can be reconstructed either as **mēh₂-s* or **mēh₂-os* or perhaps also **mēh₂-ōs*. In this case, unlike in the previous *flōs*, the reconstruction is formally unproblematic, but we encounter a semantic problem: the similar agent *s*-stems are not reconstructed for the proto-language. Also with regard to a certain “basic character” of this noun we must consider another alternative, that is, that it is a root noun, i.e. of the same type as *dux*. Then the reconstruction could be as follows: nom. **mēh₂-s*, gen. **mh₂-és*. The nom. *mās* corresponds with this reconstruction absolutely, but the genitive, according to the rules, should yield **mas*. This, however, is completely out of the system (let us remember *-stes*, **-stas* × *-stitis*). In such case we would have to admit of the idea that what developed here – through analogy – is the form *ma-X-is* (as *ducis*: the root/stem ending in a consonant + identifiable ending *-is*), i.e. that an epenthetic consonant was inserted behind the root ending in a vowel in order to ensure that the ending was added to the consonant and the hiatus was prevented, and that in this case the epenthetic consonant is the *r*, or the *s* that subsequently rhotacized.

If we go back to *flōs* now, we could obviously apply the same approach here, considering a non-agent root noun with the following presumed form (acrostatic paradigm with

⁶ If this word-formative type (i.e. masculines in *-or*, *-ōris*) is inherited, then we must with regard to the form of the root of the absolute majority of its representatives reconstruct the weak cases with the zero-grade of the root (levelling in Latin goes from the weak cases to the strong ones). The question is, however, whether these really are primary derivatives, as commonly interpreted (see the previous note); if they are not, then the similar considerations would have no sense and classing the subst. *flōs* with this word-formative type would be definitely out of question.

⁷ Schrijver (1991: 205–215): *ClHV* > *CalV*.

⁸ Flobert supports this interpretation by citing the personal name *Flōra*, recorded in Oscan (Flobert himself nevertheless says it was in Umbrian) in the form *FLVVSAĪ*, which, in his opinion, is formed through the same word-formative process as *Aurōra* is from **aurōs*. This obviously would be a very important argument, if this derivational process could be deemed indisputable (which in my opinion it could not).

⁹ Schrijver's suggestion of the reconstruction with the complex suffix *-en-i-* is hard to understand for me. To my knowledge such suffix was not reconstructed for the PIE. The equivalents of this adjective in other languages have the suffix *-no-* (cf. Czech *líný*).

the *o*-grade in the root in the strong cases):¹⁰ nom. **b^hlôh₃-s*, gen. **b^hlêh₃-es*, which in both cases yields indeed the real form of the root *flô-*, i.e. nom. *flôs*, gen. *flô-X-is*.¹¹

There are some other formally similar substantives that are traditionally classed with the *s*-stems. In some, this interpretation has sense (neuters *fās*, *pūs*), in others less so. Unclear etymology is that of the masculine *mōs*, with no equivalents in other IE languages.¹² It is usually classed with the same word-formative type as *flôs*, but it does not fit in at all functionally, while formally it would again be difficult to explain long vowel *ô* in the indirect cases (**mH-ês-*).

Concerning the subst. *vīs*, de Vaan (2008: s. v. *vīs*) directly counts with that it is the root noun from the root **ueiH-* (LIV²: 668 **ueih₁-*), considering the forms of the plural *vīrēs* etc. to be secondary. Schrijver (1991: 232) gives only the nominative sg.: **uiH-s*. The consonant *r* on the boundary between the root and the ending in the indirect cases (some of them unrecorded) stands again in the place of the laryngeal: nom. **uēiH-s* > *vīs*, gen. **uēiH-es* or **uiH-ês* > **vī-X-is* > **vīris*.

The subst. *spēs* has, as is well known, a recorded form of the extra-paradigmatic accusative *spērem*. It is usually understood as secondary,¹³ but in fact it is the whole basic *ē*-stem paradigm that is secondary, since *spēs* is originally a root noun (cf. de Vaan 2008: s. v. *spēs*): nom. **sp^heh₁-s* (LIV²: 584) > *spēs*, gen. **sp^hêh₁-es* > **spēs*, or more likely again **spē-X-is* > **spēris*. Thus, the paradigm, which gives the recorded accusative *spērem*, is older, and it was only subsequently that the younger paradigm *spēs*, *speī* etc. developed according to the subst. *rēs*.¹⁴

Supposing that our explanation of the above mentioned substantives is correct, we meet in the case of the subst. *flôs*, *mōs*, *spēs* and perhaps also *vīs* (if it had a mobile accent, i.e. **uiH-* in the weak cases) with a non-standard development of intervocalic laryngeal: what occurs in its place in the given nouns is the *r*. Naturally, the question arises of the probability of such development from the phonetic point of view, which cannot be answered unless we make clear what phonetic entity the letter *r* in fact represents in Latin. The so called rhotic consonants, i.e. the group of consonants described by the letter *r*, are of very diverse nature and even in the closely related languages, even in the dialects of one language, we can meet with a very different articulation – cf. e.g. the alveolar trill in Italian × the so called alveolar tap or flap in Spanish × the uvular *r* in French. The

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Schindler (1972: 32–36).

¹¹ The existence of the diminutives *flōsculus* and *masculus* cannot serve as an argument for these words being the original *s*-stems. Diminutives in *-culus* are apparently relatively young, secondary, derived at least partially mechanically from the form of the nominative (e.g. *opusculum* etc.; cf. e.g. also apparently analogical *iecusculum*, *lacusculus* and others). What might be, however, seen as a distinctively more important argument is the already earlier, in the note 8, mentioned Oscan form *FLVVSAI*. I am not able to assess whether its interpretation (= Lat. *Flōra*) is indisputable. What, on the other hand, can hardly be regarded indisputable is that the substantive **Flōsa* is a secondary derivation from *flôs* (primary derivatives in *-so/ā-* do exist in IE languages, and with the corresponding, abstract meaning – see Brugmann 1906: 545). Untermann (2000: 291) says that the enlargement of the root **b^hleh₃-* by the *s*-suffix is not testified to outside the Italic languages.

¹² Cf. de Vaan (2008: s. v. *mōs*): either from the root **meh₁-*, “to measure” or possibly **meh₃-*, “to cause strain” (but in neither case the derivation is semantically straightforward, which it definitely should be, both in the *s*-stems and in the root derivatives).

¹³ Schrijver (1991: 380), de Vaan (2008: s. v. *spēs*).

¹⁴ The subst. *rēs* itself also belongs to the root with the structure *CeH* (**reh₁-* “to give”), but it is not a root substantive, it is derived by the suffix **-ei-* (i.e. nom. **rêh₁-i-s*, gen. **rh₁-êi-s*, dat. **rh₁-êi-ei* ...).

last mentioned type, the so called uvular *r*, is actually phonetically relatively very close to the presumed phonetic characteristic of the so called laryngeals, and it would thus be extremely tempting to bring forth a hypothesis that even the (pre-)classical Latin *r* could have been uvular. Unfortunately, this hypothesis is extremely improbable with regard to the unquestionable existence of the so called rhotacism, i.e. the change *s* > *r* in certain sound environments, which probably cannot be explained otherwise than as a transition between two alveolars¹⁵ (though, let us admit, we do not have a clear idea about the nature of the Latin sibilant, either). Nevertheless, the direct transition between a “laryngeal” and an alveolar is out of question. The possible development is then that the laryngeal had not disappeared completely, but it yielded a feeble phonetic element, which prevented the vowels from merging. Eventually, a non-etymological epenthetic *r*, or *s* that subsequently rhotacized, developed in its place.¹⁶ Of the remaining phonetic variants – *r* as the alveolar trill × *r* as the alveolar tap × *s* – the most probable is the second: the so called alveolar tap [ɾ] is the sound very close to alveolar occlusives [t] and, in particular, [d]. The proximity of the *r* and the *d* in Latin is well recorded (e.g. *meridiēs* < **medi-diēs*), and what is important, the phoneme *d* plays a very similar role of an epenthetic consonant, in the verbs such as *redimō* or *redeō* (*re-* + *V-*); with regard to the *r* in the preceding syllable it is only natural that the pronunciation here shifted towards [d].

Schrijver mentions as the last two examples of intervocalic laryngeal the inflection of *eh*₂- and *eh*₁-stems,¹⁷ where apparently the process described above did not take place.¹⁸ But here, it is a different case: the intervocalic laryngeal is on the boundary between the suffix and the ending. Their merging actually means no loss of semantic information,

¹⁵ Theoretically, we may consider also a temporary parallel existence of the potential uvular *r* and the alveolar *r* that would have eventually merged – this, however, would be a sheer speculation, absolutely unfounded.

¹⁶ As a counterexample of such development, we could cite the subst. *sūs* with the gen. *suis*. Schrijver (1991: 234) gives only the reconstruction of the nominative, and even that apparently invalid, since it does not contain the full grade: **suH-s*. It is generally assumed that this noun is derived from the root with the meaning “to give birth” (even though we may ask why the sow, of all animals, should be characterised by the fact that she gives birth), which has an uncertain reconstruction, but the full grade is apparently more likely **sueH-* than **seuH-* (see LIV²: 538, note 1 to **seuH-*). The agent root noun from this root should have the form of the nom. **suēH-s* > ***suēs*, gen. **suH-ēs* > **sues* > *suis* (i.e. the genitive would correspond to the reality, but the nominative would not). Alternatively, if we regarded animal as non-agent, the nominative should have the form **suóH-s* > **suós* (which could, with a shred of imagination, possibly yield *sūs*) and the gen. **suēH-(e)s* > ***suēs* or again more likely **suē-X-is*, which does not correspond to the real gen. *suis*, but could, on the other hand, explain the otherwise, regarding its word-formation, unclear form *suēris* as a denotation of a meal of pork meat recorded in Varro *ling.* V, 110. Nevertheless, uncertainty must be acknowledged here – and I personally would relate this uncertainty to the whole reconstruction, i.e. it is the very relation to the root with the meaning “to give birth” that I deem uncertain.

¹⁷ Let us leave aside the long-discussed question (the history of whose development is clearly outlined by Schrijver 1991: 366–372) whether any *eh*₁-stems actually existed, since we do not have a clear evidence of their existence in other branches of IE languages. Let us theoretically presume that they did.

¹⁸ The only instance where we actually could think about the similar development, i.e. the development of the *r* in the place of the original intervocalic laryngeal to prevent hiatus and merging of vowels, is the ending of the gen. pl. -*ārum*, -*ērūm*, i.e. **-eh*₂-*om*, **-eh*₁-*om* > **-ā-X-om*, **-ē-X-om* > -*ārum*, -*ērūm*. Nevertheless, such alternative interpretation of this case ending is pointless, since the transfer of **-som* from the pronoun declension, which is the usual explanation of this form, is well recorded in Greek. Embracing the hypothesis of the epenthetic *r*, however, may yield some other interesting consequences in morphology – see the following note.

nor it brings the same situation as the one we saw above in the case of **-stas* × *-sidis*, i.e. that the representatives of a single word-formative type would join different declension types: here simply one derivation type established an individual declension type (nom. **-éh₂-θ* > **-ā* > *-a*, gen. **-éh₂-es* > *-ās*, dat. **-éh₂-ei* > *-āi* > *-ae*, etc.). This development is thus standard: the contraction of vowels. After all, this also is the evidence of the elimination of laryngeal and only subsequent insertion of the consonant *r* (and not of the direct development of *r* from H) in the examples given above.¹⁹

However, the consonant *r* is not the only consonant that appears in Latin in the place of the original intervocalic laryngeals. Well known is the Martinet's (1953) theory concerning the origin of Latin *v*-perfect, which should allegedly have spread from the verbs *gnōvī* (< **gnāvī* < **g'neh₃-*) and *strāvī* (< **streh₃-*). This theory presumes that the consonant *-v-* is a reflex of a labialized laryngeal **h₃*. Martinet's suggestion, i.e. **-eh₃V-* > Lat. *-āvV-*, which he used also when giving the explanation of the suffix *-āvus* (e.g. *octāvus*) < **-eh₃-o-*, was not accepted as a sound law, and for a good reason. In spite of that we can admit of certain rational element, but only if we will understand *-v-* not as a direct reflex of a laryngeal, but as a non-etymological epenthetic consonant, whose function is to separate two morphemes ending and beginning in a vowel respectively, the merging of which is not desirable for semantic reasons. The bilabial *-v-* is, from the phonetic point of view, a perfectly suitable candidate for such function, i.e. as a "transitory" sound between the first and the second vowel, on the presumption that the first vowel is the rounded *o* or *u* (cf. e.g. subst. *fluvi-*us**, *pluvi-*us** etc.). Besides, that would also allow a more direct reconstruction of the earlier mentioned form *gnōvī* < **gnō-X-ī* < **g'neh₃-* (i.e. not through **gnāvī*) and, on the other hand, would mean a one-step more complicated reconstruction of the adjectives in *-āvus*: **-eh₃-os* > **-ō-X-os* > **-ōvus* > *-āvus*. In addition, it would be also one more piece of evidence, beside the existence of the Oscan form *FLVVSAĪ* (see above the notes 8 and 11), to support the legitimacy of classing the subst. *flōs* indeed among the *s*-stems, and not among the root nouns, since it is actually *-v-* that would be a more probable epenthetic consonant (supposing this hypothesis is correct) than *-r-*.

Martinet (1955) is also the author of another interesting (and likewise generally rejected) theory of the hardening of laryngeal to a velar in Latin in the position before *-s*, which he based on the interpretation of the subst. *senex* (< **-aks* < **-eh₂s*, gen. *senis* <

¹⁹ By adopting the hypothesis of the existence of the epenthetic *r*, we could offer a simpler explanation of some forms whose interpretation is still unsatisfactory:

1. The ending of **passive infinitives** of the 1st, 2nd and 4th conjugation *laudārī*, *monērī*, *audīrī* is usually explained suggesting that the *-ī* of the passive infinitive of the type *legī* was (let us add that absolutely non-systemically) transferred to the *-r-* of the active infinitive. Would it not be easier to assume a systemic adding of the *-ī* to the verb stem and the subsequent development of the *r* on the morphemic boundary (i.e. **laudā-X-ī*, **monē-X-ī*, **audī-X-ī* > *laudārī*, *monērī*, *audīrī*)?

2. In accord with the generally accepted view the form *serō* is the original reduplicated present **si-sō*. Nevertheless, the other IE languages do not form from the given root (**seh₁-*) a reduplicated present, but a simple *ie*-present (see LIV²: 517; reduplicated present is typically the form created secondarily in aorist verb, which definitely is not the case here). Our hypothesis would afford a solution for the Latin form: **se-X-i-s* > *seris*.

3. It may be said in general that many suffixes in *r* do not have a satisfactory explanation. For example the **deverbative adjectives in *-rus*** represent a semantically inconsistent group in Latin, many of them do not have any evident equivalents in other IE languages; it would be then worth verifying if at least some of them, derived from the roots ending in a laryngeal, do not semantically belong more likely among the adjectives in *-us*, and if the *r* here is not once again only non-etymological, epenthetic.

*-h₂-es), the Latin feminines in -īx (corresponding to the PIE *-ih₂-s), and the suffix -āx (type *capāx*), which could thus be reconstructed as *-eh₂-s, avoiding the need to give an explanation of an otherwise enigmatic velar element;²⁰ Martinet regards the adjectives of the given type as common masculine personal nouns in -a (type *scriba*) with the -s added to differentiate them from the feminines. Despite the objections raised against Martinet's theory by most scholars (the historical debate summed up by Schrijver 1991: 148–154), I believe it still deserves attention. Using the *k*-suffixes, the IE languages actually predominantly create denominatives, namely adjectives of appurtenance, diminutives, the *k*-suffixes are commonly used in denominating colours, animals and plants (cf. Brugmann 1906: 505); but as primary formants they are absolutely exceptional and difficult to interpret. The Latin feminines in -īx indeed so evidently correspond to the PIE feminines in *-ih₂-s, that it is necessary to afford a plausible explanation of their development from this PIE form. The adjectives in -āx likewise perfectly correspond semantically to the Martinet's reconstruction *-eh₂-s. Nevertheless, Martinet's theory has, in my opinion, one flaw in its very basis: the laryngeal and the *s* actually meet only in the nominative, not in other cases, and in fact it is not very likely that the whole noun paradigm assimilates formally to the singular nominative. On the contrary, analogical levelling usually works the other way: the form of the direct cases assimilates to the form of the indirect ones. We can thus offer the following modification of the Martinet's theory (see already Pultrová 2011: 52–54): both the word-formative types really belong with the PIE types in *-ih₂-s, resp. *-eh₂-s, but the hardening of the laryngeal occurs in the position between two vowels, i.e. *Vh₂V > VkV, and the form of the singular nominative is then the consequence of analogical levelling within the paradigm.

In my monograph (Pultrová 2011), which systematically covers the formation of the Latin deverbative nouns and adjectives, more such cases were identified where in Latin a semantically unmotivated velar stands on the boundary between the root ending in the first or the second laryngeal. It is, for example, the adjective *vacuus* (< *h₁uh₂-uós; or it could be a secondary adjective to the verb *vacāre*, but with the similarly unmotivated velar: present *h₁uéh₂-ie-, see LIV²: 254), *cōnflugēs* < *-b^hluH-, *cloāca* from the root *k^hleuH-; then a whole word-formative type – the adjectives in -cundus (*fācundus* < *b^héh₂-, *iūcundus* < *h₁éuH-, *fēcundus* < *d^héh₁-), which are traditionally, though quite unconvincingly interpreted as compounds whose final element is the participle from the root *k^hū- (LIV²: 339 *k^hueh₁-) = “bulge, swell” (thus Leumann 1977: 332 or Benveniste 1935: 141); then perhaps also the verbs *faciō*, *iaciō*, or, more probably, their aorist forms *fēc*-, *iēc*- (to which the presents are formed secondarily) from the roots *d^heh₁- and *Hieh₁-, whose velars have no equivalents in other IE languages. We can also consider the suffix -gō-, -ginis, which Olsen (2004: 240) interprets as a complex suffix consisting of, again, an unclear velar element and the so called Hoffmann's suffix (i.e. *-k-h₃onh₂-),²¹ which, if we accepted the possibility of the hardening of intervocalic laryngeal in Latin,

²⁰ This velar element has not been treated in more detail in any relevant work excluding Martinet himself and the works citing him, apart from Pokrowskij (1899: 228) and Rix (1981: 110) noting that it is a relatively young enlargement. Pinault (2001: 99–104) considers this velar element to be an enlargement of (unrecorded) abstracts and collectives that subsequently yielded corresponding adjectives and other word-formative types (e.g. subst. in -gō); however, he does not explain the origin of this *k*-enlargement.

²¹ See also Pinault (2001).

could do without that velar element at all. It is obviously all very uncertain and it would require that we admit of the double development of intervocalic laryngeal, the older hardening to a velar, and the younger deletion of laryngeal that would be in semantically motivated cases substituted by another, epenthetic consonant.

To sum up the contents of this article: In general it must be said that the elimination of laryngeals is not, at least not in Latin, to be reduced only to the rules of development of certain sound sequences, but that also some other, semantically motivated rules can be involved beside the purely phonetic ones. Concerning the intervocalic laryngeals it must be said that they do not always disappear and the vowels do not contract, as is traditionally claimed, but that on the morphemic boundary some consonants can occur in their place in Latin. While still regarding the process as standard when the intervocalic laryngeal colours the preceding vowel (or both vowels?) and subsequently drops, we suggest that on the boundary between the root and the suffix (more precisely, the ending, or a very productive derivational suffix) it leaves a certain phonetic entity due to which both the morphemes remain separated, and which thus prevents the vowels from merging. In the place of this weak phonetic element an epenthetic consonant is subsequently formed, in the instances treated here it is specifically the *r* (which is, in most probability, the so called alveolar tap or flap, since the phonetically very close *d* functions also as an epenthetic consonant between two vowels in Latin; purely theoretically it can also be a sibilant subsequently rhotacized, but this is only little probable phonetically) and, possibly, the *v* (in position following a rounded vowel). There are also some hints as to that in the older times the intervocalic laryngeal might have “hardened” to a velar.

REFERENCES

- ADAMS, D. Q., 1985. Latin *mas* and *masturbari*. *Glotta* 63, 241–247.
- BENVENISTE, E., 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- BRUGMANN, K., ²1906. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* II. *Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch* 1. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner.
- DE VAAN, M., 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- FLOBERT, P., 1973. *Môs*. *Latomus* 32, 567–569.
- LEUMANN, M., 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik I. Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: C. H. Beck.
- LIV² = RIX, H. (ed.), ²2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- MARTINET, A., 1953. Non-apophonic *o*-vocalism in Indo-European. *Word* 9, 253–267.
- MARTINET, A., 1955. Le couple *senex* – *senātus* et le „suffixe“ *-k-*. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 51, 42–56.
- PINAULT, G.-J., 2001. Le type latin *uorāgō*: un reflet d'un suffixe indo-européen. *Glotta* 77, 85–109.
- POKROWSKI, M., 1899. Beiträge zur lateinischen etymologie und stammbildungslehre. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 35, 226–253.
- PULTROVÁ, L., 2011. *The Latin Deverbative Nouns and Adjectives*. Praha: Karolinum.
- RIX, H., 1981. Rapporti onomastici fra il panteon etrusco e quello romano. In: *Gli Etruschi e Roma. Atti dell'incontro di studi in onore di Massimo Pallottino*. Roma: G. Bretschneider, 104–126.
- SCHINDLER, J., 1972. L' apophonie des noms-racines indo-européens. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 67, 31–38.
- SCHRIJVER, P., 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- UNTERMANN, J., 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

VÝVOJ INTERVOKALICKÉ LARYNGÁLY V LATINĚ

Shrnutí

Vývoj laryngál závisí podle běžného výkladu čistě na jejich hláskovém prostředí a minimálně v případě vývoje do latiny nebývá připisována žádná role tomu, v jakém morfému či v jakých morfémech a na jakém místě v rámci morfému se příslušná hlásková sekvence nachází. Ve skutečnosti však vstupují při eliminaci laryngál do hry evidentně i faktory mimofonetické, které přehledná pravidla komplikují a které nebyly dosud systematicky vyloženy. Článek se věnuje řešení jedné z dílčích otázek této komplexní problematiky, otázky vývoje intervokalicke laryngály na morfematickém švu mezi kořenem a sufixem. V latině existují případy, kde ze sémantických důvodů nedochází ke kontrakci vokálů po vypadnutí laryngály, ale kde se na jejím místě vyvíjí epentetický konsonant.

FUSCA SUM ET DECORA
THE INFLUENCE OF TYCONIUS ON AUGUSTINE'S
TEACHING OF THE *ECCLESIA PERMIXTA*

MARCELA ANDOKOVÁ (Bratislava)

ABSTRACT

The verse from the *Song of Songs*, “I am black and beautiful”, quoted by Tyconius in the *Rule II* of his work *Liber regularum*, represents a famous passage considered a characteristic of his concept of the bipartite church. The African Donatist lay theologian became famous mostly for his seven rules of the interpretation of Scriptures as well as for his arduous critique of the Donatists who denied the universality of the church and limited her exclusively to the territory of North Africa. The aim of the present article is to analyse to which extent Augustine had got use of Tyconius's book in the period of his polemic with the Donatists, and whether its reading could, eventually, have stood at the origin of his choice of biblical texts, the ones he commented on as a preacher between the years 406–407. In the selected texts I have observed a certain predilection for a particular set of scriptural quotations used both as an argument and as an illustration to support Augustine's and Tyconius's thought concerning the universality of the church. Despite the fact that we have no direct proofs about the inspiration sources of Augustine's anti-Donatist preaching between the years 406–407, the similarities in the use of scriptural citations used by both authors show that Tyconius's *Book of Rules* might have stood at the origin of Augustine's inspiration and argumentation. However, it does not prove a direct influence of Tyconius on Augustine's teaching on the *ecclesia permixta* and on the ecclesiastical tolerance since the bishop of Hippo, unlike Tyconius, does not see the church as a twofold body, rather he understands it as a mixture in which the good and the bad are in time mixed in together.

Key words: Tyconius; The Book of Rules; biblical hermeneutics; Saint Augustine; *ecclesia permixta*; ecclesiastical tolerance; the Donatist Church

“I am black and beautiful”¹ (Cant. 1, 5).² This verse from the *Song of Songs*, quoted by Tyconius in the *Rule II* of his work *Liber regularum*³, represents a famous passage

¹ Tycon. *Reg.* II, 18–19: *Fusca sum et decora*. In this article I use the bilingual Latin-English edition by Babcock (1989). I also refer to a more recent critical Latin-French edition of the *Book of Rules* by Vercruysse (2004).

² In accordance with the Septuagint and *Vetus Latina*, the conjunction *et* is used in this verse. It was the Vulgate which introduced an idea of *sed* to substitute this *et*. See more closely Gaeta (1985: 121).

³ A standard monograph devoted to the Tyconian rules of the biblical interpretation is Bright (1988). Three articles in Bright (1986a) concerning Tyconius's *Book of Rules* are of particular interest: Bright

considered a characteristic of his concept of the bipartite church (*ecclesia bipertita*)⁴. The African Donatist lay theologian⁵ became famous mostly for his seven rules⁶ of the interpretation of Scriptures as well as for his arduous critique of the Donatists who denied the universality of the church and limited her exclusively to the territory of North Africa. Although he never stopped being one of them, Tyconius did not refuse the idea of the church spread throughout the whole world. Moreover, he repeatedly insisted on the fact that the bad in the church should be tolerated among the good until the last judgement of the Lord. Together with the numerous biblical citations, both from the Old and the New Testaments, by which Tyconius supports his argumentation, these ideas find, to a certain degree, their echo in Augustine's understanding of the *ecclesia permixta*, and are also reflected in his teaching on ecclesiastical tolerance⁷, the topic which acquired its sharpest traits in the time of his controversy with the Donatists (400–411). This fact is clearly manifested in his polemic writings as well as in his sermons and exegetical homilies dating back to the same period.

Therefore, this article aims to examine to what extent the influence of Tyconius's vision of the bipartite church is present in Augustine's reflection on the relationship between the good and the bad within the church. At the same time, I ask myself whether the reading of Tyconius's *Book of Rules* could have exercised the influence on Augustine's selection of scriptural citations in his defense of the universality of the church vis-à-vis his Donatist opponents. For the purpose of the present article I will thus focus on Augustine's anti-Donatist preaching activity, in particular on his exegetical homilies delivered between the years 406/407⁸, i.e., on his *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 119–133, *Tractatus in Primam Epistolam ad Parthos* and *Tractatus in Iohannis Euangelium*, which represent a unique endeavour in Augustine's preaching career and, as being interdependent in the

(1986b); Kugler (1986); Kannengiesser (1986). In this connection see also another article by Kannengiesser (2002: 297–311) and by Ratzinger (1956: 173–185, mainly 185) who in his article emphasizes that although Tyconius refuted Donatist particularism of the African church, he nevertheless remained distant from the Catholic church by his theoretical positions. A thorough study of the influence of Tyconian seven rules on Augustine's hermeneutics in his work *On Christian Doctrine* offers Bochet (1997: 562–581). A huge bibliography on the topic is listed also in Vercruysse (2004: 117–128).

⁴ Tycon. Reg. II, 18–19: *Iterum breuiter bipertitum ostenditur Christi corpus*.

⁵ Tyconius (ca. 330–390) was an African Donatist writer about whom we have only little information. We know that in the year 380 he was excommunicated from the Donatist church; nevertheless he remained one of them and refused to become a Catholic. The *Book of Rules*, written probably in 383, is his major work presenting the first system of Christian hermeneutics. His *Commentary on the Apocalypse* (preserved only in fragments) was also of great importance. Donatist Parmenianus wrote a letter against him which is quoted by Aug. C. Parm. I, 1 (CSEL 51, 19–20). He also cites and explains the *Book of Rules* in his *On Christian Doctrine* and his authority gave it great importance for many centuries in the Latin West.

⁶ Seven rules, or keys, for the interpretation of the scriptures, listed at the end of Tyconius's Prologue, are as follows: 1. The Lord and His Body (*De Domino et corpore eius*); 2. The Lord's Bipartite Body (*De Domini corpore bipertito*); 3. The Promises and the Law (*De promissis et lege*); 4. The Particular and the General (*De specie et genere*); 5. Times (*De temporibus*); 6. Recapitulation (*De recapitulatione*); and 7. The Devil and His Body (*De diabolo et eius corpore*). See Tycon. Reg. prolog. 2–3.

⁷ The term tolerance (*tolerantia*) applied here has nothing to do with its modern connotation. For more details see for example Lichner (2011: 16–28) and Andoková (2011: 115–132).

⁸ Though there are certain indications which talk in favour of a later date (407–408), I am referring here to the opinion of La Bonnardière (1965: 51–53) who placed this series of homilies between the years 406–407.

discussed themes as well as in the use of biblical citations and images, they should be considered and treated as a whole.

Like other scholars⁹ I also ask myself why in this period Augustine explained systematically Psalms 119–133 and at the same time the first chapters on Saint John's gospel which he subsequently complemented by his commentary on the First Epistle of Saint John. What inspired him in his pastoral activity to take such an exceptional step? Was it merely a fortuitous event or should we say a deliberate intention of the author? In fact, never before the year 406 had Augustine commented on a series of scriptural texts verse by verse as he did in the case of these three homiletical series.¹⁰ Unfortunately, it is very difficult to give a satisfactory answer to this question because the author himself did not leave us any concrete indication which could enable us to elucidate in a clear way his intellectual step. Nonetheless, we might assume that in this situation he saw in the systematic teaching an efficient means of persuading the faithful to return to the Catholic church in a peaceful way¹¹ since his diplomacy in this matter turned out to be inefficient.¹²

In addition, a more detailed analysis of Tyconius's *Book of Rules* and Augustine's above-mentioned exegetical homilies from the period of his anti-Donatist controversy show certain similarities, both in the usage of particular scriptural citations (especially of certain biblical images used for illustration) as well as in their application in the argumentation of both authors respectively. Therefore I would like to demonstrate whether Tyconian work could be, to a lesser or higher degree, a source text which inspired Augustine's anti-Donatist preaching. However, to analyse all biblical quotations common to both Tyconius and Augustine would be a task far beyond the scope of the present work. I will thus concentrate only on those selected scriptural passages regarding the universality of the church which are common to both of these African authors.

At the same time, we should keep in mind that Augustine is an heir of the triple tradition: Firstly he knew the classical Graeco-Roman culture thanks to his study of rhetoric; then the tradition of the Holy Scriptures (*Veteres Latinae*); and finally, the Christian tradition of the first centuries. But in this article I am not going to deal with the theological differences concerning the ecclesiology of these two authors. These questions have already been treated at length by other scholars to whom I refer in the course of my argumentation. What interests me here more particularly is the question whether Augustine had had at hand Tyconius's book in the period of his polemic with the Donatists, and whether its reading could, eventually, have stood at the origin of his choice of biblical texts, the ones he commented on as a preacher between the years 406–407. Even a less detailed reading reveals that there are certain similarities in using the same or similar scriptural texts in the argumentation by both authors. But do these similarities suffice to prove that the *Book of Rules* was a possible source text in Augustine's argumentation?

⁹ Cf. La Bonnardière (1965: 46); Berrouard (1971: 119); Harmless (1995).

¹⁰ Cf. Fiedrowicz (1997: 430–439).

¹¹ Cf. Andoková (2013: 61).

¹² For more details see, e.g., Lancel (1999: 390).

Augustine's estimation of Tyconius's work

Before examining the texts themselves a preliminary question should be put forth: What was Augustine's view of the Donatist dissident Tyconius? We know, in fact, that when he worked on the third book of the *On Christian Doctrine*, Augustine did not incorporate Tyconian rules into it but returned to them only thirty years later in 426.¹³ Since Tyconius defended the idea of the universal church and claimed that "the righteous are not infected by the sins of others when they share with them in the sacraments"¹⁴, Augustine referred to him several times in his writings during his polemic with the Donatists. Let us recall briefly his *Letter* 249 to a deacon named Restitutus written some time between the years 395 and 411 concerning how one should tolerate bad Christians and scandals in the church. There Augustine urged him to read Tyconius and the Scriptures themselves:

Read Tyconius, therefore, whom you know well – not, of course, in order to approve of everything. For you know what must be avoided in him. I think, nonetheless, that I have thoroughly treated and resolved this question of how, while preserving the bond of unity, we must tolerate disorders and sins in the Church, if there should be any that we cannot correct or eliminate. And yet, once we have corrected only the intention in his writings, we must return to the very sources of the divine scriptures in order that we may see in them how few testimonies to opinions or examples of actions he cited and how no one could cite all of them except someone who was willing to copy nearly all the pages of the holy books into his writings.¹⁵

In this period Augustine speaks of Tyconius as of a man of sharp intellect and abundant eloquence¹⁶ whose conduct, however, it is hard to understand because

... though he says such things about the church spread throughout the whole world and claims that the sins of others stain no one in its unity, he removed himself from the contagion of the Africans, as if they were traditors, and become a member of the sect of Donatus.¹⁷

In addition to that, an interesting point regarding this topic is also raised in the third book of Augustine's treatise *Against Parmenianus* where we read that Parmenianus tried

¹³ Cf. Aug. *Doctr. christ.* III, 30, 42–37, 55 (CCSL 32, 102–115).

¹⁴ Aug. *Epist.* 93, 10, 37 (CCSL 31A, 194–195): ... *non contaminari iustos peccatis alienis, quando cum eis sacramenta communicant.* Transl.: WSA II/1, 399.

¹⁵ Aug. *Epist.* 249 (CSEL 57, 592): *Lege itaque Tyconium, quem bene nosti, non quidem omnia probaturus; nam quae in illo cauenda sint, bene nosti, hanc tamen quaestionem, quo modo in ecclesia Dei, si qua forte peruersa uel etiam scelerata corrigere aut extinguere non ualeamus, saluo unitatis uinculo toleranda sint, strenue mihi uidetur tractauisse atque soluisse. Quamquam in eius litteris tantum modo intentione correcta ad ipsos diuinarum scripturarum fontes recurrere nos oportet, ut ibi uideamus, quam pauca de hac re testimonia sententiarum uel exempla gestorum posuit et quam nemo possit omnia ponere, nisi qui paene omnes sanctorum librorum paginas in sua scripta transferre uoluerit.* Transl.: WSA II/4, 182.

¹⁶ Aug. *C. Parm.* I, 1 (CSEL 51, 19): *hominem quidem et acri ingenio praeditum et uberi eloquio.*

¹⁷ Aug. *Epist.* 93, 10, 44 (CCSL 31A, 199): ... *eum premit quod, cum talia diceret de ecclesia toto orbe diffusa et quod neminem in eius unitate macularent aliena peccata, ab Afrorum se tamen quasi traditorum contagione remouebat; et erat in parte Donati.* Transl.: WSA II/1, 402.

to refute Tyconius's view that the good should through the bond of love tolerate the bad in unity until the final separation at the last judgement.¹⁸ Furthermore, at the end of his letter he urged Tyconius to remain in the Donatist party and suffer persecution till the end.¹⁹ In fact, in Tyconius's view the church had always been penitent and suffering; she was at once *sine macula* (Eph. 5, 27) and the chaff among the wheat (Matth. 3, 12).²⁰ But why then did he remain a Donatist? This question perplexed Augustine so much that, when speaking of Tyconius in the last section of his *On Christian Doctrine* III devoted to Tyconian seven rules, he states:

There was a man called Tyconius, who wrote against the Donatists in a manner that it is quite possible to refute, and whose unwillingness to part company with them completely reveals the utter absurdity of his attachments. He composed what he called a book of Rules ...²¹

From the first two words *Tyconius quidam*²², until the end of Book III,²³ the citation and discussion of the *Book of Rules* is conducted in a decidedly depreciative and antagonistic spirit. Augustine's final observation about "all these rules" states that what the Tyconian rules have in common "is the characteristic of metaphorical diction, which is too broad a category to be embraced in its entirety by a single person".²⁴

Did the fact that Tyconius remained a Donatist even after his excommunication from the Donatist party disappoint Augustine so much? Many scholars today seem to be astonished at Tyconius's attitude towards the church and speculate over his reasons for remaining a Donatist.²⁵ Since Parmenianus encouraged him to stay in their party even with the risk of undergoing persecution, I am inclined to agree with M. Dulaey who explains that, in Tyconius's view, by persecuting the Donatists, the Catholics manifested that they were not Christ's disciples nor did they form the true church.²⁶ Obviously, Tyconius could not join them without hesitation. So it appears to me that it was not the question of inconsistency of Tyconius's conduct that urged him to remain in the Donatist party; just the contrary, it was probably easier for him to accept the suffering than to understand why the Catholics, whose stance he defended, persecuted so severely their brothers in the faith. He believed that there were *duae partes in ecclesia* and as the wheat and the weed grow together until the harvest (cf. Matth. 13, 30)²⁷, it had, in his eyes, no sense to quit the

¹⁸ Aug. *C. Parm.* III, 3, 17 (CSEL 51, 121).

¹⁹ Aug. *C. Parm.* III, 6, 29 (CSEL 51, 137–139).

²⁰ Cf. Aug. *C. Parm.* II, 21, 40 (CSEL 51, 95).

²¹ Aug. *Doctr. christ.* III, 30, 42 (CCSL 32, 102–103): *Tyconius quidam, qui contra Donatistas inuictissime scripsit, cum fuerit Donatista, et illic inuenitur absurdissimi cordis, ubi eos non omni ex parte relinquere uoluit, fecit librum ...* Transl.: WSA I/11, 187.

²² Cf. Aug. *Doctr. christ.* III, 30, 42 (CCSL 32, 102–103).

²³ Cf. Aug. *Doctr. christ.* III, 37, 55 (CCSL 32, 114–115).

²⁴ Kannengiesser (1986: 172).

²⁵ For the overview of different opinions concerning the Tyconian attitude towards the Catholics see a more detailed discussion in Vercruysse (2004: 375–381).

²⁶ Cf. Dulaey (1991: 1350); Cazier (1992: 128). See also Tycon. *Reg.* VI, 110f.

²⁷ Cf. Tycon. *Reg.* III, 52–53.

party of Donatus and join the camp of the Catholics. Rather, it was necessary to patiently put up with the evil Christians wherever he found himself.²⁸

Taking into account these Augustine's remarks concerning Tyconius, it comes out that, though Augustine took certain distance vis-à-vis Tyconius's biblical hermeneutics, he often appealed to him and especially to his view of the universal church mostly in the period of his anti-donatist controversy. Surely, he corrected, first and foremost, Tyconius's understanding of the bipartite body of the Lord which becomes evident from his words concerning the *Rule II* in his *On Christian Doctrine*:

The second one is "about the twofold body of the Lord". It should not in fact have been called that, because that which will not remain with him for ever in eternity is not really the body of the Lord; but it should have been called "about the true and the mixed body of the Lord", or "the true and pretended body", or something else like that; because it is not only in eternity but even now that hypocrites should not be said to be with him, even though they appear to be in his Church. Hence this rule could also have been given a name and title such as "about the Church as a mixture". [...] This from the Song of Songs, for example: "I am swarthy and beautiful as the camps of Kedar, as the tents of Solomon" (Cant. 1, 5). She did not say, you see, "I was dusky as the camps of Kedar, and I am beautiful as the tents of Solomon," but she said she was each of them at the same time because of the temporary unity within a single net of both good and bad fish together.²⁹

It is quite surprising that the cited verse *Fusca sum et decora*³⁰ is very rarely quoted by Augustine in his œuvre. We encounter it for instance in his *Exposition of Psalm 73* (delivered probably in 411/412)³¹ where he offers its slightly different interpretation which appears to be closer, for example, to that of Ambrose of Milan.³² When elucidating the verse: "You broke the dragon's head in pieces, you gave to Ethiopian peoples to eat" (Psalm. 73, 14), Augustine explains who Ethiopian peoples are by saying:

How am I to interpret Ethiopian peoples? Obviously as "all nations". Now Ethiopians are black, and it is fitting that black people should stand for the Gentiles. People who were formerly black, and they most especially, are called to faith, so that scripture can say to them, "you were darkness once, but now you are light in the Lord" (Eph. 5, 8). These black

²⁸ That is why I could hardly agree with Chadwick (1989: 54) who sees in Tyconius's attitude an œcumenic effort. In fact, in the time of both Tyconius and Augustine, we cannot yet talk about œcumenism because, as it was then believed, there was only one true church.

²⁹ Aug. *Doctr. christ.* III, 32, 45 (CCSL 32, 104–105): '*Secunda est de Domini corpore bipertito, quod quidem non ita debuit appellare; non enim re uera Domini corpus est, quod cum illo non erit in aeternum, sed dicendum fuit: de Domini corpore uero atque permixto aut uero atque simulato uel quid aliud, quia non solum in aeternum, uerum etiam nunc hypocritae non cum illo esse dicendi sunt, quamuis in eius esse uideantur Ecclesia. Vnde poterat ista regula et sic appellari, ut diceretur de permixta ecclesia. [...] Ad hoc pertinet in Cantico Canticorum: 'Fusca sum et speciosa ut tabernacula Cedar, ut pelles Salomonis'. Non enim ait: fusca fui ut tabernacula Cedar et speciosa sum ut pelles Salomonis, sed utrumque se esse dixit propter temporalem unitatem intra una retia piscium bonorum et malorum.* Transl.: WSA I/11, 189.

³⁰ In the time of Augustine, the Latin translation of this biblical verse offers different readings, which however express the same idea. I point to these different translations further in this article.

³¹ Cf. Fiedrowicz (1997: 434).

³² See for instance Ambr. *In psalm. 118* 18, 33 (CSEL 62, 415): *Sic et ibi: nigra sum superiore peccato, sed decora confessione peccati et correctionis studio atque amore uirtutis.*

people are called indeed, but not destined to remain black, because from them is formed the Church, of which scripture says, “who is this who comes up, made white?” (Cant. 8, 5 [LXX]). What of the black bride? She tells us: “I am dark-skinned and beautiful” (Cant. 1, 4).³³

Although this passage provides us with some interesting ideas concerning Augustinian ecclesiology, it becomes evident that it does not shed much light on the topic of possible Tyconian influence on Augustine’s choice of scriptural citations regarding the universality of the church.³⁴ Therefore I find it more useful now to take a detailed look at the occurrences of other scriptural passages regarding the present topic cited by Tyconius in his *Rule II* and reproduced by Augustine in his exegetical homilies.

A possible influence of Tyconius on Augustine’s anti-Donatist preaching

Firstly, we are interested in how Tyconius himself presented the famous passage on the bipartite body of the Lord:

Again, the bipartite character of Christ’s body is indicated in brief: “I am black and beautiful” (Cant. 1, 5). By no means is the church – “which has no spot or wrinkle” (Eph. 5, 27), which the Lord cleansed by his own blood – black in any part, except in the left-hand part through which “the name of God is blasphemed among the gentiles” (Rom. 2, 24). Otherwise it is wholly beautiful, as he says: “you are wholly beautiful, my love, and there is no fault in you” (Cant. 4, 7). And indeed she says why it is that she is both black and beautiful: “like the tent of Kedar, like the tent-curtain of Solomon” (Cant. 1, 5). She shows that there are two tents, one royal and one servile. Yet both spring from Abraham, for Kedar is Ishmael’s son. And furthermore, in another passage, the church groans that it has dwelt so long with this Kedar, i.e., with the servant descended from Abraham: “Woe is me that my sojourn has been so lengthy, that I have lived among the tents of Kedar. Too long has my soul been on sojourn. With those who hate peace, I was peaceful; when I spoke to them, they made war against me” (Psalm. 119, 5–7).³⁵

³³ Aug. In Psalm. 73, 16 (CCSL 39, 1014): *Quomodo intellego populos Aethiopes? Quomodo nisi per hos, omnes gentes? Et bene per nigros; Aethiopes enim nigri sunt. Ipsi uocantur ad finem, qui nigri fuerunt; ipsi prorsus, ut dicatur eis: ‘Fuistis enim aliquando tenebrae; nunc autem lux in Domino.’ Ipsi prorsus uocantur nigri; sed ne remaneant nigri; de his enim fit ecclesia, cui dicitur: ‘Quae est ista quae ascendit dealbata?’ Quid enim de nigra factum est, nisi quod dictum est: ‘Nigra sum, et speciosa?’* Transl.: WSA I/11, 189–190. In the English text of Cant. 1, 5 I differ from the official translation made by WSA, and propose a translation which follows more closely the Augustinian text.

³⁴ One of the possible reasons for Augustine not using this scriptural citation more often in his argumentation might be the fact that Tyconius employed it to defend his vision of the twofold body of the Lord. On the other hand, Augustine in the third book of his *On Christian Doctrine* clearly opposes Tyconius’s idea and states that since hypocrites cannot be part of the Lord’s true body, this Tyconian rule should be better called “about the true and the mixed body of the Lord”. Cf. Aug. *Doctr. christ.* III, 32, 45 (CCSL 32, 104).

³⁵ Tycon. Reg. II, 18–19: *Iterum breuiter bipertitum ostenditur Christi corpus: ‘Fusca sum et decora’. Absit enim ut Ecclesia ‘quae non habet maculam, aut rugam’, quam Dominus suo sanguine sibi mundauit, aliqua ex parte fusca sit nisi in parte sinistra per quam ‘nomen Dei blasphematur in gentibus’. Alias tota speciosa est, sicut dicit: ‘Tota speciosa es proxima mea et reprehensio non est in te’. Etenim dicit quae de causa sit fusca et speciosa: ‘Vt tabernaculum Cedar ut pellis Salomonis’. Duo tabernacula ostendit,*

The last verses cited in this passage from the Psalm 119 are echoed in Augustine's *Exposition of Psalm 119* where they are cited in practically the same form as in Tyconius's book. This homily is the first in Augustine's series of homilies on the *Psalms of degrees* which occupy a unique place in his anti-Donatist preaching activity. A thorough reading of Augustine's *Expositions of Psalms 119–133* has led me to a conclusion that the first impulse for explaining these psalms might have been the Psalm 119, and especially its verses 6 and 7: "My soul has been on pilgrimage for a long time. I dealt peaceably with those who hated peace (cf. Psalm. 119, 6–7)."³⁶ In fact, this theme is in different ways, more or less, present in all other homilies in the whole series. But what led Augustine to choose these psalms for systematic teaching within the context of his polemic with the Donatists? There are several factors that come at play.

First and foremost, these psalms concentrate on the Mount of Zion and on the Jerusalem temple which was for the Jews a privileged place of God's cult.³⁷ This temple was a place where the pilgrims were annually coming to celebrate main Jewish feasts. Since in the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries two churches existed in Africa (i.e. the Donatist and the Catholic church), it was necessary to establish the unity, so to speak "one privileged place of the cult," which was in Augustine's view the Catholic church. In this regard, it was probably the image of Jerusalem, symbol of spiritual unity, which attracted him a lot.³⁸

But in connection with Tyconius it is interesting to make a more detailed analysis of how Augustine cites the verse of Psalm. 119, 5: *Heu me quod incolatus meus longinquus factus est inhabitavi cum tabernaculis Cedar*.³⁹ For the translation of the expression "tents of Kedar" he uses the substantive *tabernacula*.⁴⁰ Apart from Augustine's text of the Psalter, the term used in this verse is not attested in any other old Latin Psalters.⁴¹ Even the Vulgate offers another reading: *cum habitationibus Cedar*.⁴² So it is likely that in this case Augustine was influenced by the Greek text of the Septuagint which he usually referred to in his revision of the Scriptures. There it is written:

οἵμοι, ὅτι ἡ παροικία μου ἐμακρύνθη,
κατεσκήνωσα μετὰ τῶν σκηνωμάτων Κηδάρ.
πολλὰ παρώκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.

regium et seruire: utrumque tamen semen Abrahae; Cedar enim filius est Ismahel. Alio denique loco cum isto Cedar, id est cum seruo ex Abraham, diuturnam mansionem sic ingemescit Ecclesia dicens: 'Heu me quoniam peregrinatio mea longinqua facta est, habitavi cum tabernaculis Cedar, multum peregrinata est anima mea. Cum odientibus pacem eram pacificus, cum loquebar illis debellabant me.' Non possumus autem dicere tabernaculum Cedar praeter Ecclesiam esse. Ipse autem dicit tabernaculum 'Cedar et Salomonis' unde 'fusca sum', inquit, 'et decora'. Non enim Ecclesia in his qui foris sunt fusca est.

³⁶ Aug. In Psalm. 119, 8–9 (CSEL 95/3, 53–57): *Multum peregrinata est anima mea. Cum his qui oderant pacem eram pacificus cum loquerer illis debellabant me gratis.* Transl.: WSA III/19, 507.

³⁷ Augustine is inspired by the text from Is. 2, 2 where the prophet presents the Jerusalem temple as the symbol of unity and of God's presence.

³⁸ Cf. Andoková (2013: 65).

³⁹ Aug. In Psalm. 119, 7.9 (CSEL 95/3, 53.55). Transl.: WSA III/19, 505–507: "Alas, how long-drawn-out is my exile! I have been dwelling among the tents of Kedar."

⁴⁰ We find this biblical verse cited in the same form also in Paulinus of Nola who says (Paul. Nol. Epist. 13, 6 [CSEL 29, 89]): *Causam uero gemitus et timoris sui hanc esse testatur, quod habitaret cum tabernaculis Cedar, id est in tenebris istius mundi.*

⁴¹ Cf. Weber (1953: 313): *cum habitantibus Cedar.*

⁴² I.e., the "dwellings of Kedar"; Psalm. 119, 5 (Vlg.): *Heu mihi quia incolatus meus prolongatus est habitavi cum habitationibus Cedar.*

μετὰ τῶν μισούντων τὴν εἰρήνην ἤμην εἰρηνικός
ὅταν ἐλάλουν αὐτοῖς, ἐπολέμουν με δωρεάν.
(Psalm. 119, 5–7 [LXX])

Hence the word *tabernaculum* is the Latin translation of the Greek word σκῆνωμα. However, I think that we might see also other than just a philological intention in Augustine's choice of the term. On a symbolic level, the expression *tabernaculum* (tent) can denote also something temporal and provisional, in contrast to a house (*domus, mansio*), being a symbol of stability and eternal dwelling as well as an object of contemplation.⁴³ On the other hand, it is not unlikely that while citing this text Augustine might have used Tyconius's *Book of Rules* as a source. Here are the two Latin texts:

*Heu me quoniam peregrinatio mea longinqua facta est, habitavi cum tabernaculis Cedar, multum peregrinata est anima mea. Cum odientibus pacem eram pacificus, cum loquebar illis debellabant me.*⁴⁴

*Heu me quod incolatus meus longinquus factus est inhabitavi cum tabernaculis Cedar. Multum peregrinata est anima mea. Cum his qui oderant pacem eram pacificus cum loquerer illis debellabant me gratis.*⁴⁵

In addition, on a spiritual level we all are pilgrims being on a way with an uncertain shelter and the goal of our pilgrimage is a permanent dwelling in the eternal Jerusalem. In many places of his homilies Augustine reminds his faithful that heavenly Jerusalem is our real homeland.⁴⁶ In the *Exposition of Psalm 125* he even calls her *mater nostra* when saying:

You know too that this psalm, like the others, is sung by people who are ascending. And to what other place can they be ascending but to the Jerusalem on high that is the mother of us all, the city in heaven? (cf. Gal. 4, 26; 2 Cor. 5, 1).⁴⁷

Besides the image of heavenly Jerusalem as the goal of our pilgrimage, the bishop of Hippo develops during his controversy with the Donatists another topic which is probably dearest to his heart, i.e. the *Ecclesia Mater, Una Catholica*. In the *Exposition of Psalm 121, 4* he explains to his audience the meaning of the Psalm verse: "Jerusalem that is being built like a city" (Psalm. 121, 3), and says that there Jerusalem should be understood as the church, the temple of God, like living stones built into a spiritual house (cf. 1 Petr. 2, 5)⁴⁸. Subsequently he adds:

⁴³ Cf. Poque (1975: 193).

⁴⁴ Tycon. *Reg.* II, 18–19. Transl.: "Woe is me that my sojourn has been so lengthy, that I have lived among the tents of Kedar. Too long has my soul been on sojourn. With those who hate peace, I was peaceful; when I spoke to them, they made war against me."

⁴⁵ Aug. *In Psalm.* 119, 6–9 (CSEL 95/3, 53–57). Transl.: WSA III/19, 505–509: "Alas, how long-drawn-out is my exile! I have been dwelling among the tents of Kedar. My soul been on pilgrimage for a long time. I dealt peaceably with those who hate peace. I have dealt peaceably with those who hate peace; when I spoke to them, they waged war on me without justification."

⁴⁶ Cf. Aug. *In Psalm.* 119, 6 (CSEL 95/3, 49–50).

⁴⁷ Aug. *In Psalm.* 125, 1 (CSEL 95/3, 162); see also 121, 3, 86: *Est autem, sicut nostis, uox ascendentium: quo, nisi ad illam supernam Ierusalem, matrem omnium nostrum, quae est in caelis?* Transl.: WSA III/20, 68.

⁴⁸ Cited by Aug. *In Psalm.* 121, 4 (CSEL 95/3, 87).

What is implied by “allow yourselves to be built, like living stones”? You are alive if you believe; and if you believe you are being made into God’s temple, for the apostle Paul teaches, “God’s temple is holy, and that temple is yourselves” (1 Cor. 3, 17). This is the city which is now a-building. Stones are hewn out of the mountains by the hands of those who preach the truth, and squared to fit into an everlasting structure.⁴⁹

The same biblical text is quoted also by Tyconius in his *Rule* VII where we read:

Peter calls the church stones: “and like living stones”, brothers, “be yourselves built up as a spiritual house” (1 Petr. 2, 5); God calls this a house of fire and says that it will burn against the evil brothers: “the house of Jacob will be a fire, the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau stubble” (Abd. 18).⁵⁰

In this connection, another interesting observation is worth mentioning: the use of Daniel 2, 34–35 and of the biblical image of the mountain closely linked with it. In his *Rule* I entitled *On the Lord and his body* Tyconius explains:

Daniel, too, calls the Lord “a stone cut from the mountain” and says that he “struck” the body of the kingdoms of the world and “ground it into dust”, but that his own body “became a mountain and filled the whole earth” (Dan. 2, 34–35). For it is not that the Lord filled the whole earth with his power rather than with the fullness of his body. Some make this claim – which I do not report without sorrow – to the dishonor of God’s kingdom and of Christ’s unvanquished inheritance. [...] If he had filled the whole earth not with his body but with his power, he would not be compared to a stone. Power is intangible; but a stone is a tangible body.⁵¹

Although Augustine does not refer to the same biblical text in his *Expositions of Psalms* 119–133, he makes use of it in his elucidation of the First Epistle of John when saying:

Isn’t Christ, who apart from sexual intercourse is from the kingdom of the Jews, the stone that was broken off from the mountain without hands? Didn’t that stone break up all the kingdoms of the earth – that is, all the ruling powers of the idols and demons? Didn’t that stone grow in size and become a great mountain and fill the whole world? (cf. Dan. 2, 34–35).⁵²

⁴⁹ Aug. In Psalm. 121, 4 (CSEL 95/3, 87–88): *Quid est: ‘lapides uiui coaedificamini?’ Viuis, si credis; si autem credis, efficeris templum Dei, quia dicit apostolus Paulus: ‘Templum enim Dei sanctum est, quod estis uos. Ipsa ergo modo ciuitas aedificatur; praeciduntur de montibus lapides per manus praedicantium ueritatem, conquadrantur ut intrent in structuram sempiternam.* Transl.: WSA III/20, 16.

⁵⁰ Tycon. Reg. VII, 140: *Lapides Ecclesiam dicit Petrus: ‘Et uos fratres tamquam lapides uiui coaedificamini domus spiritalis’, quam domum igneam esse et hanc in malos fratres ardere sic dicit Deus: ‘Erit domus Iacob ignis, domus autem Ioseph flamma, domus uero Esau stipula; et exardescunt in illos et comedent eos, et non erit ignifer in domo Esau, quoniam Dominus locutus est.’*

⁵¹ Tycon. Reg. I, 4–5: *Daniel quoque ‘lapidem de monte praecisum’ et ‘impegisse’ in corpus regnorum mundi et ‘in puluerem commoluisse’ Dominum dicit, ‘montem’ uero ‘effectum et impleuisse uniuersam terram’ corpus eius. Non enim – sicut quidam dicunt in contumeliam regni Dei inuictaeque hereditatis Christi, quod non sine dolore dico – Dominus totum mundum potestate et non sui corporis plenitudine occupauit. [...] Quod si potestate impleisset uniuersam terram non corpore, lapidi non compararetur. Potestas res est impalpabilis, lapis uero corpus palpabile.*

⁵² Aug. In epist. Ioh. 1, 13 (BA 76, 100): *Nonne lapis ille qui praecisus est de monte sine manibus, Christus de regno Iudaeorum sine opere maritali, nonne ille lapis confregit omnia regna terrarum, id est omnes*

In fact, he frequently uses Daniel's image of the stone that has grown into a mountain to symbolise Christ. In its having broken off from the mountain without the intervention of human hands it suggests his virginal conception.⁵³ In its growth into a great mountain which fills the whole world, however, it symbolises the Church in its universality.⁵⁴

In accordance with the biblical text, both Tyconius and Augustine explain that the mountains symbolise on a more general level either the proud people or Christ and his church. Tyconius expresses it in a clear way in his *Rule VII* called *On the devil and his body*:

"I will sit on the high mountain above the high mountains to the north, I will rise above the clouds, I will be like the Most High" (Is. 14, 13–14). The "high mountain" is a people puffed up with pride; the "high mountains" are all the individuals puffed up with pride. Joined together, they make the mountain, i.e., the devil's body. [...] For even if the Lord's body, i.e., the church, is called a mountain, the individuals who make up the church are also called mountains, as it is written: "by him was I made king on Zion, his holy mountain, proclaiming his decrees" (Psalm. 2, 6–7).⁵⁵

Similar ideas are echoed also in Augustine's exegetical homilies. When the preacher develops the idea of mountains and valleys, he identifies these *ualles* with the humble people⁵⁶ and puts them in opposition to the proud whom he calls *montes*.

Clearly the mountains intended by the psalm must be different: mountains worthy of our love, lofty mountains, preachers of the truth, whether they be angels or apostles or prophets.⁵⁷

In his *Exposition of Psalm 125*, Augustine warns the faithful against dangerous mountains, i.e., against false preachers of God's word, naming them concretely:

Think of Donatus, and how remarkable he was! And then Maximianus: there is a splendid character for you! Then there was someone else called Photinus: what a great man! And what about Arius? He was undoubtedly important. I have listed all these mountains, but be wary, for they cause shipwrecks. You see them emitting beams of light in the way of inflammatory exhortations, and some fire is kindled from them. If you are piloting your boat and darkness has overtaken you (the obscurity of this life, I mean), do not let them

dominationes idolorum et daemoniorum? Nonne ille lapis creuit et factus est mons magnus et impleuit uniuersum orbem terrarum? Transl.: WSA I/14, 35. See also Aug. *In euang. Ioh.* 4, 4 (CCSL 36, 32).

⁵³ Cf. Aug. *In Psalm.* 101, 1, 1 (CCSL 40, 1425–1426).

⁵⁴ Cf. Aug. *In Psalm.* 57, 9 (CCSL 39, 716).

⁵⁵ Tycon. *Reg.* VII, 118–119: 'Sedebo in monte alto super montes altos in Aquilonem, ascendam super nubes, ero similis Altissimo. Mons altus' *populus est superbus; 'montes alti' singuli quique superbi, qui adunati montem faciunt, id est corpus diaboli. [...] Nam et si corpus Domini id est Ecclesia mons dicitur, et singuli qui Ecclesiam faciunt montes, sicut scriptum est: 'Ego autem constitutus sum rex ab eo super Sion montem sanctum eius adnuntians imperia eius.'*

⁵⁶ Cf. Aug. *In Psalm.* 124, 4.6 (CSEL 95/3, 151.155).

⁵⁷ Aug. *In Psalm.* 124, 4 (CSEL 95/3, 150–151): *Alii sunt ergo montes amabiles, montes excelsi, praedicatores ueritatis, siue angeli, siue apostoli, siue prophetae.* Transl.: WSA III/20, 59.

deceive you into setting your course in their direction. You will hit the rocks. Disastrous wrecks occur there.⁵⁸

These are the schismatics and heretics who broke away from the unity of the church. The one who wants to be called good and just should then come to the church and bear good fruit in the Catholic peace, “because there isn’t really any fruit where it is not accompanied by patient tolerance.”⁵⁹ The one who comes in and becomes a Catholic will be good, not making himself good, but hoping to be made so by God.⁶⁰

When defending the idea of the church universality, both authors put emphasis mostly on one phenomenon, closely connected with the present topic, that is the Christian charity (*caritas*), love of God and of our neighbours which should be manifested not only by our words but also by our actions. In this respect, they both draw their ideas and inspiration on the First Epistle of Saint John which is hugely cited in their works.

In his *Rule VI* Tyconius says:

And again: “anyone who says that he loves God and hates his brother is a liar” (1 Ioh. 4, 20). For if he does love God as he says, let him show it by his works. Let him cling to God (cf. Psalm. 73, 28). Let him love God in his brother. If he believes in Christ incarnate, let him stop hating the members of Christ.⁶¹

Similarly, in the tenth homily on the First Epistle of John Augustine states:

He was speaking shortly before of brotherly love, and he said, “How will he who does not love his brother, whom he sees, be able to love God, whom he does not see?” (1 Ioh. 4, 20). But, if you love your brother, perhaps you love your brother and don’t love Christ? How can that be, when you love Christ’s members? When you love Christ’s members, then, you love Christ; when you love Christ, you love the Son of God; when you love the Son of God, you also love his Father. Love, then, cannot be separated. Choose for yourself what to love; other things come to you as a result.⁶²

⁵⁸ Aug. *In Psalm.* 124, 5 (CSEL 95/3, 153–154): *Qualis fuit ille Donatus! Qualis est Maximianus! Et nescio quis Photinus, qualis fuit! Et ille Arius qualis fuit! Omnes istos montes nominaui, sed naufragos. Videtis quia lucet de illis aliqua flamma sermonis, et aliquis de ipsis ignis accenditur. Si nauigatis in ligno, et noctem patimini, id est, caliginem huius uitae; non uos fallant, nec dirigatis illuc nauim: Ibi sunt saxa, ibi naufragia magna fiunt.* Transl.: WSA III/20, 61. See also Aug. *In euang. Ioh.* 1, 3 (CCSL 36, 2).

⁵⁹ Aug. *Serm.* 47, 17 (CCSL 41, 589): *quia et fructus non est, ubi non est cum tolerantia.* Transl.: WSA III/2, 311.

⁶⁰ Cf. Aug. *Serm.* 47, 18 (CCSL 41, 589–590).

⁶¹ Tycon. *Reg.* VI, 112–113: *Et iterum: ‘Qui dixerit quoniam diligit Deum, et fratrem suum odit, mendax est.’ Si enim ut dicit diligit Deum, doceat operibus, adhaereat Deo, diligit Deum in fratre. Si credit Verbum carnem factum, quid persequitur Verbum in carne? Si credit quod dixit Dominus: ‘Quamdiu fecistis uni ex istis fratribus meis minimis in me credentibus, mihi fecistis’, non operetur malo Christo in carne, id est in seruis eius, quoniam Dominus et Ecclesia una caro est.*

⁶² Aug. *In epist. Ioh.* 10, 3 (BA 76, 404): *Dicebat paulo ante de dilectione fraterna et ait: ‘Qui non diligit fratrem quem uidet, Deum quem non uidet quomodo poterit diligere?’ Si autem diligis fratrem, forte fratrem diligis et Christum non diligis? Quomodo quando membra Christi diligis? Cum ergo membra Christi diligis, Christum diligis; cum Christum diligis, Filium Dei diligis; cum Filium Dei diligis, et Patrem diligis. Non potest ergo separari dilectio. Elige tibi quid diligas; sequuntur te cetera.* Transl.: WSA I/14, 148.

Conclusion

The idea of the universal church presented in the above-discussed works of both African authors is so to speak the “red thread” spreading throughout all *Expositions of Psalms* 119–133 and through the *Commentaries on John’s Gospel* and *on the First Epistle of John*, but finds its place also in Tyconius’s *Book of Rules*. In the selected texts I have observed a certain predilection for a particular set of scriptural quotations used both as an argument and as an illustration to support Augustine’s and Tyconius’s thought concerning the universality of the church. There are undoubtedly many more examples of the kind elucidating this topic to be found by both the authors, but I hope that the ones pointed out here might suffice to support my argumentation. Apparently, there is a great number of biblical passages and images occurring in the works of both African authors not only in close link with the topic of the church universality, which is however predominant, but also with regard to other themes connected with it. Despite the fact that we have no direct proofs about the inspiration sources of Augustine’s anti-Donatist preaching between the years 406–407, the similarities in the use of scriptural citations used by both authors have led me to a conclusion that Tyconius’s *Book of Rules* might have stood at the origin of Augustine’s inspiration and argumentation. By saying so, I do not, however, insist on a direct influence of Tyconius on Augustine’s teaching on the *ecclesia permixta* and on the ecclesiastical tolerance since the bishop of Hippo, unlike Tyconius, does not see the church as a twofold body, rather he understands it as a mixture in which the good and the bad are in time mixed in together. This might be also the reason why Augustine does not use, to support his argumentation concerning the tolerance of the bad in the church, the scriptural passage from Cant. 1, 5. By doing so he clearly distinguishes himself from the teaching of Tyconius based on his understanding of the twofold body of the Lord.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- AMBROSIUS, *Expositio psalmi CXVIII*. In: *Sancti Ambrosii opera. Pars V*. [= CSEL 62]. Rec. M. Petschenig. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1913.
- AUGUSTINE, *Expositions of the Psalms 1–32* [= WSA III/15]. Ed. J. E. Rotelle. Transl. and notes M. Boulding. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2000.
- AUGUSTINE, *Expositions of the Psalms 33–50* [= WSA III/16]. Ed. J. E. Rotelle. Transl. and notes M. Boulding. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2000.
- AUGUSTINE, *Expositions of the Psalms 51–72* [= WSA III/17]. Ed. J. E. Rotelle. Transl. and notes M. Boulding. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2001.
- AUGUSTINE, *Expositions of the Psalms 73–98* [= WSA III/18]. Ed. J. E. Rotelle. Transl. and notes M. Boulding. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2002.
- AUGUSTINE, *Expositions of the Psalms 99–120* [= WSA III/19]. Transl. and notes M. Boulding. Ed. B. Ramsey. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2003.
- AUGUSTINE, *Expositions of the Psalms 121–150* [= WSA III/20]. Transl. and notes M. Boulding. Ed. B. Ramsey. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2004.
- AUGUSTINE, *Homilies on the First epistle of John* [= WSA III/14]. Introd., transl. and notes B. Ramsey. Ed. D. E. Doyle, T. Martin. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2008.

- AUGUSTINE, *Homilies on the Gospel of John (1–40)* [= WSA III/12]. Transl. E. Hill. Ed. A. D. Fitzgerald. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2009.
- AUGUSTINE, *Letters 1–99* [= WSA II/1]. Transl. and notes R. J. Teske. Ed. J. E. Rotelle. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2001.
- AUGUSTINE, *Letters 100–155* [= WSA II/2]. Transl. and notes R. J. Teske. Ed. B. Ramsey. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2003.
- AUGUSTINE, *Letters 156–210* [= WSA II/3]. Transl. and notes R. J. Teske. Ed. B. Ramsey. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2004.
- AUGUSTINE, *Letters 211–270, 1*–29** [= WSA II/4]. Transl. and notes R. J. Teske. Ed. B. Ramsey. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 2005.
- AUGUSTINE, *Teaching Christianity* [= WSA I/11]. Transl. and notes E. Hill. Ed. J. E. Rotelle. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 1996.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Contra epistolam Parmeniani*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Sect. VII. Scripta contra Donatistas. Pars I. Psalmus contra partem Donati. Contra epistolam Parmeniani libri III. De baptismo libri VII* [= CSEL 51]. Rec. M. Petschenig. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1908, 19–141.
- AUGUSTINUS, *De doctrina christiana*. In: *Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars IV, 1. De doctrina christiana. De vera religione* [= CSEL 32]. Rec. J. Martin. Turnholti: Brepols, 1962, 1–167.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Enarrationes in Psalmos 119–133*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Enarrationes in Psalmos 101–150. Pars 3.* [= CSEL 95/3]. Ed. F. Gori. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Enarrationes in Psalmos 134–140*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Enarrationes in Psalmos 101–150. Pars 4.* [= CSEL 95/4]. Ed. F. Gori. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2002.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Enarrationes in Psalmos 141–150*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Enarrationes in Psalmos 101–150. Pars 5.* [= CSEL 95/5]. Ed. F. Gori. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Enarrationes in Psalmos I–L*. In: *Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars X, 1.* [= CSEL 38]. Textum ed. curavit E. Dekkers et J. Fraipont. Turnholti: Brepols, 1956.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Enarrationes in Psalmos LI–C*. In: *Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars X, 2.* [= CSEL 39]. Textum ed. curavit E. Dekkers et J. Fraipont. Turnholti: Brepols, 1956.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Enarrationes in Psalmos CI–CL*. In: *Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars X, 3.* [= CSEL 40]. Textum ed. curavit E. Dekkers et J. Fraipont. Turnholti: Brepols, 1956.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Epistulae I–XXX*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Sect. II. Epistulae. Pars I. Praefatio.* [= CSEL 34, 1]. Rec. et comm. crit. instruxit A. Goldbacher. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1895.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Epistulae XXXI–CXXIII*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Sect. II. Epistulae. Pars II.* [= CSEL 34, 2]. Rec. et comm. crit. instruxit A. Goldbacher. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1898.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Epistulae CXXIV–CLXXXIV A*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Sect. II. Epistulae. Pars III.* [= CSEL 44]. Rec. et comm. crit. instruxit A. Goldbacher. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1904.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Epistulae CLXXXV–CCLXX*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Sect. II. Epistulae. Pars IV.* [= CSEL 57]. Rec. et comm. crit. instruxit A. Goldbacher. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1911.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Epistulae. Praefatio editoris et indices*. In: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Sect. II. Epistulae. Pars V.* [= CSEL 58]. Rec. et comm. crit. instruxit A. Goldbacher. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1923.
- AUGUSTINUS, *In Iohannis epistolam ad Parthos tractatus decem. Homélies sur la première épître de saint Jean*. [= BA 76]. Trad. de J. Lemouzy. Introd. et notes D. Dideberg. Paris: Institut d'Études augustiniennes, 2008.
- AUGUSTINUS, *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus CXXIV*. In: *Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars VIII.* [= CSEL 36]. Textum ed. curavit R. Willems. Turnholti: Brepols, 1954.
- AUGUSTINUS, *Sermones de Vetere Testamento*. In: *Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars XI, 1.* [= CSEL 41]. Rec. C. Lambot. Turnholti: Brepols, 1961.
- PAULINUS Nolanus, *Epistulae*. In: *S. Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani opera. Pars I.* [= CSEL 29]. Rec. et comm. critico instruxit G. de Hartel. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1894.
- TYCONIUS, *Le livre des règles* [= Sources chrétiennes 488]. Introd., trad. et notes par J.-M. Vercruysse. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- TYCONIUS, *The Book of Rules*. Transl. with an introd. and notes by W. S. Babcock. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989.

Secondary sources

- ANDOKOVÁ, M., 2013. *Rečnícke umenie sv. Augustína v kázňach k stupňovým žalmom* [The art of rhetoric in St. Augustine's homilies on the psalms of degrees]. Bratislava: IRIS.
- ANDOKOVÁ, M., 2011. Tolera infirmitatem, si desideras perfectionem. The notion of tolerantia in relation to Christian perfection in Augustine's *Sermones ad populum*. In: A. Brent, T. Khomych, O. Vakula, M. Vinzent (eds.), *Studia Patristica* 51. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 115–132.
- BA = *Bibliothèque augustinienne. Les oeuvres de saint Augustin*. Paris, 1937–.
- BABCOCK, W. S., 1989. See: Tyconius, *The Book of Rules* (in: 1. Primary sources).
- BERROUARD, M.-F., 1971. La date des Tractatus I–LIV in Iohannis Evangelium de saint Augustin. *Recherches augustinienes* 7, 105–168.
- BOCHET, I., 1997. Note complémentaire 17: Le 'Liber Regularum' de Tyconius et sa présentation par Augustin. In: *La doctrine chrétienne. De doctrina christiana* [= BA 11/2]. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 562–581.
- BRIGHT, P. (ed.), 1986a. *Augustine and the Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne.
- BRIGHT, P., 1986b. The Preponderating Influence of Augustine. A Study of the Epitomes of the Book of Rules of the Donatist Tyconius. In: Bright 1986a: 109–128.
- BRIGHT, P., 1988. *The Book of Rules of Tyconius. Its Purpose and Inner Logic*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- CAZIER, P., 1992. Tyconius et l'Apocalypse dans la crise donatiste. *Graphè* 1, 105–129.
- CHADWICK, H., 1989. Tyconius and Augustine. In: Ch. Kannengiesser, P. Bright, W. H. Wuellner (eds.), *A Conflict of Christian Hermeneutics in Roman North Africa. Tyconius and Augustine*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 49–55.
- CCSL = *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina*. Turnholti: Brepols, 1953–.
- CSEL = *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Wien, 1866–.
- DULAEY, M., 1991. Tyconius. In: *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 15. Paris: Beauchesne, 1349–1356.
- FIEDROWICZ, M., 1997. *Psalmus vox Totius Christi. Studien zu Augustins "Enarrationes in Psalmos"*. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder.
- GAETA, G., 1985. Nera e bella. L'esegesi antica di Cantico 1,5–6. *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 2, 115–123.
- HARMLESS, W., 1995. *Augustine and the catechumenate*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- KANNENGIESSER, Ch., 1986. Augustine and Tyconius. A Conflict of Christian Hermeneutics in Roman Africa. In: Bright 1986a: 149–177.
- KANNENGIESSER, Ch., 2002. Tyconius of Carthage, the Earliest Latin Theoretician of Biblical Hermeneutics. The Current Debate. In: M. Maritano (ed.), *Historiam Perscrutari. Miscellanea di studi offerti al prof. Ottorino Pasquato*. Roma: Ed. Las, 297–311.
- KUGLER, R. A., 1986. Tyconius's Mystic Rules and the Rules of Augustine. In: Bright 1986a: 129–148.
- LA Bonnardièrre, A.-M., 1965. *Recherches de chronologie augustinienne*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.
- LANCEL, S., 1999. *Saint Augustin*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard.
- LICHNER, M., 2011. *Le rôle de la tolerantia à l'intérieur de l'Église selon Saint Augustin*. Dissertation. Centre Sèvres – Faculté J su tes de Paris.
- POQUE, S., 1975. L'expression de l'anabase plotinienne dans la pr dication de saint Augustin et ses sources. *Recherches augustinienes* 10, 187–215.
- RATZINGER, J., 1956. Beobachtungen zum Kirchenbegriff des Tyconius im *Liber regularum*. *Revue d' tudes augustinienes et patristiques* 2, 173–185.
- VERCRUYSE, J.-M., 2004. See: Tyconius, *Le livre des r gles* (in: 1. Primary sources).
- WEBER, R. (ed.), 1953. *Psalterium Romanum. Le Psautier romain et les autres anciens psautiers latins* [= Collectanea Biblica Latina 10]. Roma: Abbaye Saint J r me.
- WSA = *The Works of Saint Augustine. A translation for the 21st century*. Hyde Park, New York: New City Press, 1990–.

Shrnutí

Verš z *Písně písní* „Černá jsem, a přece půvabná“, citovaný u Tyconia v *Pravidle* II jeho knihy *Liber regularum*, představuje slavnou pasáž, kterou je možno považovat za základ jeho koncepce dvojité církve (*ecclesia bipertita*). Africký donatistický laický teolog se proslavil v první řadě svými sedmi pravidly interpretace Písma a zároveň svou neochvějnou kritikou donatistů, kteří popírali univerzalitu církve a omezovali ji výlučně na území severní Afriky. Cílem této studie je prozkoumat, do jaké míry se Tyconiovo chápání vztahu dobrých a zlých v církvi promítá do Augustinova učení o *ecclesia permixta* a o církevní toleranci v době jeho polemiky s donatisty. Zároveň si klademe otázku, zda četba *Liber regularum* mohla být zdrojem Augustinova výběru biblických textů, které jako kazatel komentoval na přelomu let 406–407. I při zběžném čtení jsou totiž patrné určité paralely v používání stejných biblických textů u obou autorů. Jejich srovnání ukazuje, že i když Augustinus od Tyconia a jeho biblické hermeneutiky zachovával odstup, přesto jej v době kontroverze s donatisty hojně cituje a ve své argumentaci přebírá z jeho díla biblické obrazy často citované doslovně. Zásadní výjimku představuje rozdílný způsob použití biblického citátu *fusca sum et decora* u obou autorů, který potvrzuje jejich rozdílné chápání *ecclesia bipertita* a *ecclesia permixta*.

**THE PRESENTATION AND FUNCTIONS OF SELECTED
BATHING SCENES IN NONNOS' *DIONYSIACA****

ANNA MARIA LASEK (Poznań)

ABSTRACT

The *Dionysiaca* by Nonnos of Panopolis includes many episodes from everyday life of Greek mythological characters. Among other things related to issues of this kind, Nonnos mentions the bathing scenes of male, and in particular of female characters. For an instance, the author mentions the new-born Dionysus who is being bathed. Also, there are numerous scenes depicting females taking a bath (e.g. Artemis, Nicaea, Semele, Persephone). As for male bathing scenes, it is Morpheus' bath that is especially worth-noting. The article, after having given a general division of the bathing scenes included in the *Dionysiaca*, analyses their composition and meaning in the context of the poem. It mostly focuses on the activities related to taking a bath and the importance of hygiene and nakedness. The conclusion demonstrates the most important differences between Nonnos and Homer in regard to the descriptions of bathing scenes.

Key words: Nonnos of Panopolis; *Dionysiaca*; Bathing Scenes; Late Greek Epic Poetry

The *Dionysiaca* by Nonnos¹ of Panopolis² consists of 48 books, being the most ample and the last great *epos* of ancient Greek literature. It describes Dionysos' life starting from his birth, continuing through his struggles with the Indians, and ending with his apotheosis. Since in Nonnos' *epos* there can be found almost all well- and lesser-known myths, it is sometimes referred to as a compendium of mythological knowledge.³ The mythical world as depicted in the *Dionysiaca* includes many episodes from everyday life, among them being scenes of bathing⁴ male and, in particular, female characters of the poem.

* The previous version of this paper was presented at the conference *Czystość i brud. Higiena w starożytności* [Cleanliness and Dirt. Hygiene in Antiquity], in the Collegium Medicum of Ludwik Rydygier, Bydgoszcz, 12–13 september 2013.

¹ On Nonnos see Accorinti (2013).

² The Greek text is quoted from the Budé edition.

³ Riemschneider (1957: 69): "Es ist nicht so, daß Nonnos mit vielem Wissen prunken will. Was er an Sagengut beibringt, wußte wohl damals jedes Kind! Aber die Art und Weise, mit der die Dinge miteinander verknüpft werden, ist reizvoll und neu."

⁴ Regarding the role and character of water in *Dionysiaca* see Newbold (2001) and Kröll (2013: 71–74; 89–90); Kröll's article generally discusses the water and swimming in the *Dionysiaca* regarding the problem of the composition of the *epos* (2013: esp. 89–90). She emphasized the importance of swimming and water (2013: 72–73) and presents swimming competition between Dionysos and Ampelos

Characteristics of bathing scenes in the *Dionysiaca*

The bathing scenes in the *Dionysiaca* include, among other things, a mention of a missed customary bath of a new-born child⁵ (Nonn. *D.* IX, 25–26), scenes of bathing after a battle (VI, 4; XL, 234–236), hunting (XV, 5–7; XV, 244–255), a sport competition (X, 380–382), or the sacrifice of an animal (VII, 166). Also, Nonnos mentions the necessity of taking a refreshing bath after a hot day (V, 483–486; V, 601–609), work (V, 601–609), or before planned intimate intercourse (XXXIII, 155–199). Being familiar with the anatomy of the human body, the author is perfectly able to depict it, as is confirmed by his detailed descriptions of female bodies⁶ as well as warriors' injuries.⁷ Such descriptions together with those referring to various diseases⁸ and pathological conditions, as well as mentions of drugs⁹ and medical treatment in general, show that Nonnos was intensely interested in medicine.¹⁰

While reading the *Dionysiaca*, one cannot stop oneself from having the impression that Nonnos displays a particular predilection for erotic descriptions of men, women, and goddesses caught in taking a bath. These bathing scenes seem to serve as mostly a pretext for a presentation of the beauty of the human body.¹¹ It must be stressed, though, that the scenes in question are for the most part of a voyeuristic nature and the victims of the voyeurs' activities¹² are those female characters who happen to take a bath. Not infrequently, their physical beauty being exposed during the hygienic activity becomes

and between Karpus and Kalamos. She indicates also the possible sources of the author of the *Dionysiaca* regarding swimming of Dionysos and water (2013: 90–96).

⁵ In the *Dionysiaca* there can also be found a description of an advanced infant care, see Tsoucalas, Tsoucalas (2012). On infant bathing and general care see Sor. *Gynaec.* II, 20. For a discussion on Soranus' prescriptions see French (2004: esp. 58–59 [the subchapter *Care of the Newborn after Delivery*]). In Nonn. *D.* XXV, 488–494 there is a mention of infant bathing put in an entirely different context.

⁶ See the descriptions of Europe's body: I, 344–351; women's body in Homeric comparison: I, 525–534; Semele's: VII, 256–279; one of Bacchantes: XXXV, 21–36; Beroë's: XLII, 449–455; Artemis': XLVIII, 335–355. Obviously, these descriptions have an erotic subtext. See also Newbold (1998).

⁷ These descriptions are sometimes associated with wartime medicine. Miguélez-Cavero (2008: 249) gives a list of descriptions of wounds, injuries, and their equivalents in Homer: "D. 17.357–74 and 29.103, 264–75 should be compared with Il. 4.212–19; 5.401–2 = 900–1; 11.844–8; 15.390–4."

⁸ Issues like that are a focus of my forthcoming paper. As for now, it will suffice to mention X, 4–84; XVII, 357–375 etc.

⁹ *Pharmakon* means mostly wine (used to relieve one from grief; e.g. VII, 56; XVI, 3), as well as love (e.g. VI, 364; XI, 359). As for the medicine in Nonnos, see the commentaries on Nonn. *Paraphrasis s. Evangelii Ioannei* 5 and on *Dionysiaca* XXIX, 264–275 in Agosti (2003: 396), and Agosti (2004: 318–319). Excellent descriptions of methods of curing wounds that include cleaning, removal of poisoned arrows, application of herbs and incantations are contained in XVII, 357–375; XXIX, 87–103; XXIX, 153; XXIX, 264. In the poem, mention is also made of a mythical plant that can bring the dead back to life, see XXXV, 53–77. Moreover, Nonnos knows Brahmins who are considered by him to be the king's advisers. These sages possess the art of healing (XXIV, 164; XXXVI, 344; XXIX, 357–359). So when Morpheus, the Indian chieftain, is injured during a battle, the Brahmins cure him, relieving him of pain with the use of "the art of Apollo".

¹⁰ Sinko (1954: 257) points out to the description of Athamas' insanity (X, 4–84). His condition is attributed to a brain disease (X, 25–26). Some of his symptoms might indicate epilepsy. For commentary on this description see Gigli Piccardi (2003: 678–681). On medicine in Panopolis and medical descriptions in the *Dionysiaca* see Miguélez-Cavero (2008: 248–249).

¹¹ However, in the poem, mentions are also made of washing one's body with no such pretext, see e.g. the aforementioned scene IX, 25–26 in which a bath in water following delivery is missing.

¹² The sense of sight and the activity of watching are an extraordinarily important aspect of the *Dionysiaca* as has been observed by Agosti (2006: 358–359): "Le *Dionisiache* di Nonno sono il trionfo dello

a prelude to a passionate love¹³ as is the case in the episode of Semele bathing and its aftermath (see VII, 256–279).

General division of the bathing scenes

According to Winkler,¹⁴ the voyeuristic scenes in the *Dionysiaca* can be divided into two general categories and the criterion of the division is a situation in which the scenes in question take place. Beside the aforementioned bathing scenes,¹⁵ the first category includes scenes in which the description is focused on the body parts exposed by the breeze blowing up light clothes (I, 128–135; XVII, 217–224; XXXV, 103–108). The second category includes various bathing scenes in which a naked body can be seen. In my treatment I will not limit the discussion to the latter type of scenes, but I will also attempt to investigate various passages relating to those kinds of hygienic activities that are related to washing oneself and that can be found in the *mare magnum* of the *Dionysiaca*. To demonstrate the great diversity of bathing scenes that can be found in Nonnos' *epos*, I have chosen the scenes containing women, men, and a child. I will start from the description of a bathing child and then discuss selected scenes of women and men taking a bath.

Bathing of an infant

The mention of bathing an infant is a part of the adventures of new-born Dionysos¹⁶ (IX, 25–26). In the description of the vicissitudes of Semele's young son, the most unusual feature is that he had not been bathed right after his delivery. Supposedly, this act of negligence was due to Hera's vindictiveness, who, as is well known, hated the illegitimate children of her husband. In order to avoid her anger, the new-born Dionysos was hurriedly taken away from Zeus and handed over to Lamos' daughters who took care of him. See IX, 25–30:¹⁷

sguardo, specie di quello curioso, ammiccante, seducente. Il poeta è interessato alla *reazione* di chi guarda, che perlopiù si tramuta in ammirata stupefazione.”

Also, interesting comments on watching and sight can be found in Lovatt (2013). Persistent looks and peeking at the beauty of the human body is a frequently discussed phenomenon in the *Dionysiaca*. For more on these issues together with the analysis of the voyeuristic passages see Winkler (1974: passim). On the episode about Aura's rape, which will not be investigated here, see Schmiel (1993).

¹³ Friedländer (1931: 45–46): “Die Sinnlichkeit. An Stelle des Natürlichen tritt das Lüsterne. Man hat den Eindruck einer Zeit, die statt der Nacktheit nur noch die Entblößung kennt. Viele Szenen, wo ein Gott eine Jungfrau belauscht. Der Wind hebt ihr Gewand, oder im Wasser sieht der Lauscher die *ἀντυγα μαζών*, *ἀντυγα μηρών*, *ὄργια κόλπου*.”

¹⁴ Winkler (1974: passim). The penchant for peeping (*scopophilia*) finds its detailed discussion in Newbold (2008: 71): “The theme of scopophilia in Nonnus is illustrated by 26 voyeur or quasi-voyeuristic episodes. Their content provides an *aperçu* into the questions raised above” and Newbold (1998).

¹⁵ Winkler (1974: 4): “The voyeur's view is usually set up in one of two ways: either the person viewed is bathing in a stream or her clothes are light and wind-blown.”

¹⁶ Scenes of the god taking a bath were an iconographic theme e.g. in the form of a mosaic, see Bowersock (2006: 38–43) and Kröll (2013: 92–93; 98). About the problem of the first bath of Dionysos and its comparison to the first bath of Christ, see Jaccottet (2011) – *non vidi*.

¹⁷ Καί μιν ἀχρτλώτοιο διαῖσσοντα λοχείης
πήχεϊ κούρον ἄδακρυν ἐκούφισε σύγγονος Ἑρμῆς.

Thus Hermes carried upon his arm the little brother who had passed through one birth without a bath, and lay now without a tear, a baby with a good pair of horns like the Moon. He gave him in charge of the daughters of Lamos, river nymphs – the son of Zeus, the vine-planter. They received Bacchos into their arms.¹⁸

In antiquity, it was a custom to bath a child right after its delivery.¹⁹ However, from the above text it follows that Dionysos' delivery was not followed by his bath.²⁰ So the fact that blood and vernix are not washed off from his body should be treated as an unusual situation and may testify to Hermes' haste.

Females taking a bath

Child characters do not appear often in the *Dionysiaca*, so it is no wonder that the most frequently described hygienic treatments that can be found there are baths taken by adults. These usual and apparently trivial everyday activities serve as a pretext to demonstrate the beauty of the human body, and as a literary device used by the poet to create an erotic tension that is additionally increased by the fact that the poet leaves some of the details to the imagination of his recipient. The first one of the many bathing scenes that appear in the *Dionysiaca* shows an adult person who is taking a bath to refresh and wash herself (see V, 287–551). The passage contains a very famous scene in which young Actaeon is watching Artemis taking a bath.²¹ This excellent hunter, who, during a hunt could easily stalk game while still remaining unseen and unheard, climbed a tree to watch the goddess taking a bath in the river. However, his presence caught the eye of the nymph whom the goddess was accompanied by. See V, 304–315:²²

Καὶ βρέφος εὐκεράοιο φυῆς Ἴνδαλμα Σελήνης
ᾧπασε θυγατέρεσσι Λάμου ποταμῆισι Νύμφαις,
παῖδα Διὸς κομέειν σταφυληκόμων. Αἱ δὲ λαβοῦσαι
Βάκχον ἐπηχύναντο.

¹⁸ Translation by Rouse (1940a: 307).

¹⁹ It was a usual conduct in antiquity. See Chrétien (1985: 102 *com. ad loc.*) – she mentions other baths of divine infants which are: Zeus (Call. *Iov.* 15–17) and Apollo (*h. Hom. Ap.* 120–125.; Call. *Del.* 6); Wolf (2004: 153: “*Sobald ein Kind das Licht der Welt erblickt hatte, wuschen es die Frauen, wurde es in Windeln gewickelt und gestillt* (Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 5; vgl. Eur. *Ion* 1492f.)”).

²⁰ Gigli Piccardi (2003: 638–639 *com. ad loc.*) observes that Dionysos' fiery nature was not familiar with water, and Dionysos himself flashes like a lightning (in this meaning διαίσσουσα II, 194) or flickers like a falling star (Arist. *Cael.* 395a 32). However, Chrétien (1985: 102) observes that in this passage Nonnos is in opposition to the tradition when he replaces the cleansing water with a thunderbolt that cleanses the mother as well as the child.

²¹ This scene is presented in the *Dionysiaca* twice, the second description coming from Actaeon himself (V, 476–491). See also Winkler (1974: 4–5). In addition, this scene has been described by Call. *Lav. Pall.* 109–116 and Ov. *Met.* III, 138–252. The composition of the scene and in particular the attention drawn to the act of going into water now fast and now slowly suggest, in scholars' opinion, that there may be some reminiscences of the water mimes in the *Dionysiaca*. See Gigli Piccardi (2003: 418); D'Ippolito (1962: 6–14).

²² λουομένης ἐνόησεν ὅλον δέμας Ἰοχαιρίας,
θητήρ δ' ἀκόρητος ἀθήητοιο θαίνης
ἀγνὸν ἀνυμφεύτοιο δέμας διεμέτρεε κούρης
ἀγχιφανής. Καὶ τὸν μὲν, ἀνείμονος εἶδος ἀνάσσης
ὄμματι λαθριδίῳ δεδοκημένον ὄμματι λοξῷ
Νηϊὰς ἀκρήδεμνος ἀπόπροθεν ἔδρακε Νύμφη·

[...] he had seen the whole body of the Archeress bathing; and gazing greedily on the goddess that none may see, he surveyed inch by inch the holy body of the unwedded virgin close at hand. A Naiad nymph unveiled espied him from afar with a sidelong look, as he stared with stolen glances on the unclothed shape of her queen, and shrieked in horror, telling her queen the wild daring of a lovesick man. Artemis half revealed caught up her dress and encircling shawl, and covered her modest breasts with the maiden zone in shame, and sank with gliding limbs into the water, until by little and little all her form was hidden.²³

In the description of the goddess' bath our attention is drawn to the fact that there are no details in it, although usually, for erotic reasons, the descriptions of bathing women in Nonnos' work are provided with numerous details (e.g. VII, 256–279). In the above quoted passage, there are no details relating to the goddess' appearance, which might be explained by the fact that naked Artemis should not be looked at. All we can infer from the text of the *Dionysiaca* is that the hunter had seen the goddess' naked body, and consequently, he was severely punished for that (V, 300–335).²⁴ By having left the more detailed aspects of the goddess' look to his recipient's imagination, the author creates an air of erotic tension. The recipient's imagination as well as his/her curiosity will be satisfied to some extent, but not until the last book of the poem where the poet mentions the goddess' bath taken at a hot day. But even there the goddess is hiding her beauty from the unwanted looks as she comes out of the water wearing her clothes. See XLVIII, 335–340:²⁵

She in the midday heat still guarded her maiden modesty in the river, moving through the water with cautious step, and lifting her tunic little by little from foot to head with the edge touching the surface, keeping the two feet and thighs close together and hiding her body as she bathed the whole by degrees.²⁶

Her beauty is described by Aura,²⁷ who while watching her, emphasises the goddess' sexual attractiveness using the following words (XLVIII, 351–356):²⁸

ταρβαλήη δ' ὀλόλυξεν, ἣ δ' ἡγγειλεν ἀνάσση
ἀνδρὸς ἔρωμανέος θράσος ἄγριον. Ἡ μίφανής δὲ
Ἄρτεμις ἀρπάξασα σὺν εἵματι κυκλάδα μίτρην
παρθενίῳ ζωστήρι σαόφρονας ἔσκεπε μαζούς,
καὶ διεροῖς μελέεσσιν ἔσω δύνουσα ρέεθρων
αἰδμένη κατὰ βαιὸν ὅλον δέμας ἔκρυψε κούρη.

²³ Translation by Rouse (1940a: 191).

²⁴ A more detailed analysis of the abovementioned episode can be found in Newbold (2008: 71–73), where the author claims that Actaeon saw only a part of the goddess' body, see also Gigli Piccardi (2003: 416–421 *com. ad loc.*).

²⁵ Ἡ δὲ μεσημβρίζουσα σέβας φιλοπάρθενον αἰδοῦς
ἐν προχοαῖς ἐφύλαξε, διερπύζουσα ῥοάων
ἴχνεσι φειδομένοισι, καὶ ἐκ ποδὸς ἄχρι καρῆνου
ἀκροβαφῇ κατὰ βαιὸν ἀναστείλασα χιτῶνα,
ἀμφιπερισφίγγουσα πόδας διδυμάονι μηρῷ
κρυπτόμενον μετρηδὸν ὅλον δέμας ἔκλυσε κούρη.

²⁶ Translation by Rouse (1940c: 449).

²⁷ In the further part of her speech, Aura claims to be more beautiful than Artemis. This brings on her a terrible punishment because she is raped by Dionysos. See Schmiel (1993).

²⁸ Ἄρτεμι, μοῦνον ἔχεις φιλοπάρθενον οὖνομα κούρης,
ὅττι διὰ στέρνων κεχαλασμένον ἄντυγα θηλῆς

Artemis, you only have the name of a virgin maid, because your rounded breasts are full and soft a woman's breasts like the Paphian, not a man's like Athena, and your cheeks shed a rosy radiance ! Well, since you have a body like that desirous goddess, why not be queen of marriage as well as Cythereia [...]?²⁹

Another scene depicting a beautiful woman taking a bath after the toils of hunting can be found in Book 15, where we read about Hymnos' love madness (XV, 169–422). This young oxherd fell unhappily in love with the huntress Nicaea who rejected him with disdain. Nonetheless, bewitched Hymnos watched her while she was busy with her everyday activities, and observed her with pleasure when sweaty and tired with a long hunt she was taking a bath³⁰ (XV, 244–254):³¹

So the young man, cherishing under his heart the wound of love, whether near or whether far, kept his mind on the girl: how she drew the arrow for a shot against the mountain bear; how she fastened hand on the lion's neck, circling about it her two arms in betraying noose; how again, after toil and sweat, she washed her in the flow of a brook, half-showing, ever more careful of her kirtle. When, the breeze would shake it and lift it up to the mid-nipple, and shoot out the flower of the beauty laid bare. Keeping this in memory, he conjured again the sweet winds, to raise the deep-folded robe.³²

This image does not appear as a direct observation but as a memory of a scene that was seen a long time before. The evoked image contains Hymnos' hidden dreams of seeing his chosen one during her bath once again.³³ As rightly pointed out by Gonnelli,³⁴ the bathing scene in question has been presented very succinctly, which may be due to the fact that it does not anticipate events so tragic as Artemis' bath was for Actaeon. It must be added, though, that the consequences of falling in love with a huntress are tragic for

θῆλυν ἔχεις Παφίης, οὐκ ἄρσενα μαζὸν Ἀθήνης,
καὶ ροδέους σπινθήρας οἰστεύουσι παρειαί.
Ἀλλὰ δέμας μεθέπουσα ποθοβλήτοιο θεαίνης
καὶ σὺ γάμων βασίλευε σὺν ἄβροκόμῳ Κυthereίη [...]

²⁹ Translation by Rouse (1940c: 449).

³⁰ The motif of desire to see her bathing obsessively recurs in XV, 270–272 as has been correctly noticed by Gerlaud (1994: 59).

³¹ Καὶ νέος, ἀμφιέπων ὑποκάρδιον ἔλκος Ἑρώτων,
ἐγγυὺς ἑὼν καὶ νόσφιν ἑὼν ἐμνώετο κούρης,
πῶς βέλος εἰς σκοπὸν εἴλκεν ὀρειάδος ἀντίον ἄρκτου,
πῶς δὲ λεοντείῃ παλάμην ἐσφίγξατο χειρὶ
δίζυγα γυρῶσασα βραχίονα μάρτυρι δεσμῷ,
πῶς πάλιν ἰδρώουσα λοέσσατο χεῦματι πηγῆς
ἡμιφανῆς, καὶ μᾶλλον αἰεὶ μμνήσκετο πέπλου,
ὅππότε μιν δονέων καὶ ἐς ὀμφαλὸν ἄχρις αἰείρων
γυμνώσας χροὸς ἄνθος ἀνηκόντιζεν ἀήτης·
κείνου μνήστιν ἔχων γλυκεράς ἰκέτευεν ἀέλλας,
ὄφρα πάλιν βαθύκολπον ἀναστείλωσι χιτῶνα.

³² Translation by Rouse (1940a: 519).

³³ Actually, the scenes of growing passion aroused by seeing a nude or semi-nude person are a topos in the *Dionysiaca*, see Schulze (1968: 7). His desire has been emphasised by the adverb πάλιν. The word πάλιν might suggest that the bath described here is merely a recollection of Hymnos who once saw Nicaea bathing. Some interesting deliberations on this scene can be found in Gerlaud (1994: 58–59).

³⁴ Gonnelli (2003: 207).

both Actaeon (punished with death) and Hymnos (dying by own wish), as they both die a violent death.

In the investigated episode, Hymnos' love remains unrequited,³⁵ as the huntress rejects him, so the poor oxherd asks Nicaea to kill him (XV, 316–341). The cruel girl grants his wish and ends his life³⁶ by shooting him with a bow and arrow into his throat³⁷ (XV, 363–369). Her deed was severely punished by Eros, the god of love, who made Dionysos, the god of wine, see beautiful Nicaea while she was taking a bath (XVI, 3–13). This moment becomes the beginning of Dionysos' fascination for the young huntress (XVI, 14–147). Nicaea rejects his advances, too, and flees him (XVI, 148–181). One day, when she is tired and thirsty, she falls asleep drunk after having drunk from a river whose water had been changed into wine (XVI, 250–262). During her sleep, she is approached by Dionysos, who steals her virginity against her will (XVI, 263–291), and then the oxherd, once neglected by her, appears mocking her (XVI, 292–305).

Of crucial importance for the development of the action of the poem is the scene in which we see the bathing Semele, Dionysos' mother (VII, 184–279). In this passage she is making a sacrifice of a goat in Zeus' honour. During the process, she got splashed with the blood of the animal and then went to the nearby Asopos River to wash herself. And that was where she was spotted by Zeus, unable to satisfy his eyes' cravings for the charms of the young Cadmos' daughter. Consumed by love, he seduced her and, as a consequence, he gave up his divine duties to spend more time with his beloved one in Thebes. See VII, 166–174 and 184–189;³⁸

Now the maiden went forth from the city to kindle the altar of Zeus Lord of Lightning. She stood by the victims and sprinkled her bosom with the blood; her body was drenched with

³⁵ Scholars observe correctly that the topics and characters (unhappy love, Daphne's transformation) recalled by Hymnos are related to the bucolic tradition. See Gerlaud (1994: 62–67); Schulze (1968: 19: "Die folgenden Verse erinnern in Aufbau und Stimmung an Theokrit und die Klagegesänge des Bion und Moschos."). A detailed analysis of the text with regard to its dependence on literary sources is offered by Tissoni (1999: 220–229).

³⁶ Riemschneider (1957: 64) claims that Theocritus' proverbial expression "it must be sweet to die by your hand", as it is conceived of by Nicaea, should be viewed as an example a particular mannerist humour, see also Gonnelli (2003: 218–219).

³⁷ Hymnos' name might be a personification of a song. Therefore, it should be assumed that the very description of the young man is symbolic to some extent because Hymnos died after he had been wounded in his throat with an arrow. See: Gonnelli (2003: 212–219); Lasek (2009: 76–77; 88–89; 95–96).

³⁸ Ἐνθεν ἔβη πρὸ πόλῃος, ὅπως Διὶ βωμὸν ἀνάψῃ,
ἀστεροπῆς μεδέοντι· παρισταμένη δὲ θυγαῖς
αἵματι κόλπον ἔδευσε, φόνῳ δ' ἑρραίνετο κούρη·
καὶ πλοκάμους ἐδίηναν ἀφειδέες αἵματος ὅλκοι,
καὶ βοέαις λιβάδεσσιν ἐπορφύροντο χιτῶνες.
Καὶ δρόμον ἰθύνουσα βαθυσχοῖν παρὰ ποίῃ
γείτονος Ἀσωποῖο μετέστιχε πάτριον ὕδωρ
παρθένος αἰολόπεπλος, ἵνα σμήξειε ῥέεθρος
στικτὰ πολυρραθάμιγγι δεδευμένα φάρεα λύθρῳ
[...] Κεῖθι δέμας φαίδρυνε, σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι δὲ γυμνῇ
χεῖρας ἐρετμώσασα δι' ὕδατος ἔτρεχε κούρη.
Καὶ κεφαλὴν ἀδιάντον ἐκούφισεν ἰδμονι τέχνῃ
ὕψι τιτανομένην ὑπὲρ οἴδματος, ἄχρι κομάων
ὕγροβαφῆς, καὶ στέρνον ἐπιστορέσασα ῥέεθρῳ
ποσσὶν ἀμοιβαιοῖσιν ὀπίστρον ὥθεεν ὕδωρ.

blood, plentiful streams of blood soaked her hair, her clothes were crimsoned with drops from the bull. Then with robes discoloured she made her way along the meadow deep in rushes, beside Asopos the river of her birthplace, and plunged in his waters to wash clean the garments which had been drenched and marked by the showers of blood. (...) There the maiden cleansed her body, and naked with her attendants moved through the water with paddling hands; she kept her head stretched well above the stream unwetted, by the art she knew so well, under water to the hair and no farther, breasting the current and treading the water back with alternate feet.³⁹

Zeus often falls in love with mortal woman whom he happens to see while she is taking a bath (it can be even claimed that this is a literary motif that Nonnos willingly makes use of).⁴⁰ Another woman whom Zeus fell in love with is the bathing Persephone (V, 601–608):⁴¹

Once in the scorching steam of thirsty heat, the girl would cease the loomtoiling labours of her shuttle at midday to shun the tread of the parching season, and wipe the running sweat from her face; she loosed the modest bodice which held her breast so tight, and moistened her skin with a refreshing bath, floating in the cool running stream, and left behind her threads fixt on the loom of Pallas.⁴²

The necessity to wash oneself from dirt after a tiring day serves as a pretext to show Persephone's bath. In the discussed description, a strong emphasis has been put on the refreshing function of the bath taken during a hot day. Indirectly, the emphasis relates also to a pleasure given to a fatigued body by ablutions in a cool spring. As is the case with all the bathing scenes that have been discussed so far, Persephone's bath is taking place in a river, too. The receiver's attention is drawn to the bared charms of the bathing virgin by means of the description of her taking off her clothes before going into the stream (V, 604–606). And this is when she gets spotted by the Olympians' king (V, 609). Gazing upon her naked body makes Zeus immediately burn with desire⁴³ (VI, 610–621).

The close similarity of the scenes of Persephone's and Artemis' baths is remarkable. In both abovementioned passages, the ablutions for hygienic purposes are merely a pretext to show the beauty and the nakedness of the young women. Their nude bodies become

³⁹ Translation by Rouse (1940a: 257–259).

⁴⁰ Many bathing scenes in the *Dionysiaca* are listed by Chuvín (1992a: 183; 2003: 448), among which the following ones can be found: the descriptions of: Artemis' bath seen by Actaeon (V, 476–491); Bacchos' bath (X, 141–174); Ampelos and Bacchos swimming in the Paktolos river (XI, 7–55); Clymene's bath (XXXVIII, 108–129); Artemis peeked at by Aura (XLVIII, 302–375). Also, there is a mention of a naked girl taking a bath in XL, 319–323. See also Gigli Piccardi (2003: 448 *com. ad loc.*).

⁴¹ Καί ποτε διψαλέοιο πυραυγί καύματος ἀτμῶ
καρφαλέης φεύγουσα μεσημβρινὸν ἵχνιον Ὀρης
κερκίδος ἰστοπόνων καμάτων ἀμπαύετο κούρη·
καὶ διερούς ἰδρώτας ἀποσμῆξασα προσώπου,
σφιγγομένην στέρνοισι σαόφρονα λύσατο μέτρην·
καὶ χροά λυσιπόννοισι καθικμαίνουσα λοετροῖς
πηγαίῳ πεφόρητο καταψύχοντι ῥέεθρῳ,
νήματα καλλεῖψασα πεπαρμένα Παλλάδος ἰστῶ.

⁴² Translation by Rouse (1940a: 211).

⁴³ It could be an ironic picture of Zeus, who despite of being All-seeing, gets excited by seeing a particular naked body. More on ironic picture of Zeus see Kuhlmann (1999).

a direct cause of Zeus' burning desire (VI, 610–621; VII, 256–279). In both cases, the bath becomes for him a beginning of an erotic fascination that leads to the conception and birth (VI, 155–168) of Zagreus, the first Dionysos, as well as the second Dionysos, the Semele's son (VIII, 6–33; VIII, 396–406). As is correctly pointed out by Chuvin (1992b: 78), the similarity of these scenes is highlighted even more clearly by means of the repetition nearly of the whole verse in V, 609 and VII, 190.

Males taking a bath

It is worth noting that in the *Dionysiaca* there also appear bathing male characters. It will suffice to mention Dionysos taking a bath in a scorching hot summer day to refresh himself and to wash the dirt off his body (X, 139–144), or the young satyr Ampelo (X, 380–382) who is taking a bath in a river after athletic competition⁴⁴ to wash himself from dust and sweat. The aforementioned description serves most of all to draw our attention to the extraordinary beauty of the boy that is emphasised by the mention of the nice radiance emanating from his sweaty skin.

In comparison to the abovementioned descriptions, the scene of Morrheus' bath stands out in regard to its length (XXXV, 145; XXXV, 155–204). We see him as at the explicit Chalkomedes' request he is taking a bath after the battle (XXXV, 111–127). His bath is a preparation for a long-expected intimate meeting with his beloved one (XXXV, 185–203).⁴⁵

Then Morrheus left his coat uncared-for on the seashore, glowing with sweet anxieties. Naked he bathed: the cool sea cleansed his body, but the Paphian's tiny dart was hot within him. In the waters he prayed to Erythraian Aphrodite of India, for he had learnt that Cypri is the daughter of the sea; but he came out still black from his bath, for his body was as nature had made it grow, and the brine changed not the man's body or his colour, itself red though

⁴⁴ Gigli Piccardi (2003: 724), *com. ad loc.* is right to observe that in comparison to the Homeric model (Hom. Il. XXIII, 739) in the *Dionysiaca* the bathing scene taking place after a sporting competition includes an additionally emphasised erotic element.

⁴⁵ ἄγχι δὲ πόντου
καλλείψας ἀκόμιστον ἐπ' αἰγιαλοῖο χιτῶνα
θαλπόμενος γλυκερῇσι μεληδόσι λούσατο Μορρεῦς,
γυμνὸς ἑὸν· ψυχρῇ δὲ δέμας φαίδρυνε θαλάσση,
θερμὸν ἔχων Παφίης ὀλίγον βέλος· ἐν δὲ ρέεθροις
Ἰνδῶν ἰκέτευεν Ἐρυθραίην Ἀφροδίτην,
εἰσαῖων, ὅτι Κύπρις ἀπόσπορός ἐστι θαλάσσης·
λουσάμενος δ' ἀνέβαινε μέλας πάλιν· εἶχε δὲ μορφήν,
ὥς φύσις ἐβλάστησε, καὶ ἀνέρος οὐ δέμας ἄλλη,
οὐ χροὴν μετὰμειψεν, ἐρευνθαλέη περ ἑοῦσα.
καὶ κενεῇ χροῖα λούσεν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι· χιόνεος γὰρ
ἡμερόεις μενέαινε φανήμεναι ἄζυγι κούρη·
καὶ λινέφ' ἐκόσμησε δέμας χιονώδεϊ πέπλῳ,
οἷον ἔσω θώρηκος αἰεὶ φορέουσι μαχηταί.
ἰσταμένη δ' ἄφθογγος ἐπ' ἡόνος εἶχε σιωπὴν
Χαλκομέδῃ δολόεσσα· μεταστρεφθεῖσα δὲ κούρη
Μορρέος ἀχλαίναιο σαόφρονος εἶλκεν ὀπωπᾶς,
ἀσκεπὲς αἰδομένη δέμας ἀνέρος· εἰσιδέειν γὰρ
ἄζετο θῆλυς ἑοῦσα λελουμένον ἄρσενά κούρη.

it was. So he washed his skin in a vain hope ; for he had wished to become snow-white, and so desirable to the virgin maid. He dressed himself in a snowy linen robe, such as soldiers always wear inside the mailcoat.

Chalcomede stood on the shore in silence without a word, full of her scheme. She turned aside from Morrheus unclad, withdrawing her modest looks, ashamed before the uncovered body of a man; for the girl was abashed being a woman to look on a man after the bath.⁴⁶

As has been observed, this scene of Morrheus' bath undoubtedly alludes to the ritual prenuptial bath.⁴⁷ Morrheus is dreaming of the moment of meeting his beloved one while he is taking a bath, however, the tryst that he planned ends up in a failure. Unhappy and deceived by his misleading dream that promised him the Bacchante's reciprocity, the warrior-lover puts on new linen clothes and goes to embrace his beloved one. However, his attempt to hug her fails as he is scared off by a snake guarding the girl's virginity (XXXV, 202–222). This is not surprising for the reader, who knows that Chalcomede was faking her love for the Indian chieftain (XXXV, 111–138). Morrheus as a character is depicted with humour. We see him burning with desire and trying to cool himself in the sea. Also not without humorous elements is his longing to whiten his skin by means of ablutions, which might make him more attractive to his beloved one.⁴⁸ By concentrating many comic events, the poet makes the scene resemble a comic farce.⁴⁹

Process of taking a bath

The above discussed scenes allow us to at least partially reconstruct the process of taking a bath by the characters depicted in the *Dionysiaca*. First, they often take off their clothes to take a bath – usually in a natural water body – and afterwards they put their clothes back on. These activities (getting dressed is mundane, everyday activity with no erotic significance) are not always mentioned *expressis verbis* in the *epos*. Their presence, however, can be deduced from the context. Moreover, in many bathing scenes the emphasis is put on the pleasure evoked by a bath. Stressing the refreshing effect of the bath taken after work, or a hot day proves that it is a pleasant experience.

Hygiene and nakedness

From the descriptions included in the *Dionysiaca* it follows that the hygiene of the shameful body parts requires special conditions. Anyone washing their body always wants to be secluded from the opposite sex' eyes.

⁴⁶ Translation by Rouse (1940b: 533–535).

⁴⁷ This scene's similarity to the prenuptial bath is mentioned by Agosti (2004: 580; the new revised edition of this book [2013] was not available to me); Gerlaud (2005: 20; 2006: 12–13).

⁴⁸ Agosti (2004: 580–582 *com. ad loc.*) stresses the abovementioned humoristic aspects and refers to the extensive tradition of the ancient proverb about whitening a dark-skinned person. In Agosti (2004: 467), the analysed scene is compared to the Odysseus' bath during his visit to the Phaeacians.

⁴⁹ Gerlaud (2006: 15) mentions the comic potential of some scenes that are derived from the love story of Chalcomede and Morrheus.

A young and attractive⁵⁰ individual risks exposing herself to sexual assault of which examples are the abovementioned rapes and seductions of the women (e.g. Semele, Nicaea) that were seen in bath by the male gods burning with desire. Let us notice then that the bathing scenes in Nonnos' work have an ambiguous meaning. On the one hand, a bath is a pleasant and necessary element of everyday activities, on the other, it can expose one's naked body to the dangers of lascivious looks and assaults.

Although the descriptions of baths in Nonnos do not always have an erotic aspect (e.g. IX, 26–27) and are understood here as emphasising the beauty of the human body and stressing the sensual aspect of the bath⁵¹, it must be admitted that the poet's wish to describe the beauty of the human body as well as the desire evoked by it seems to be a dominant, if not the only, cause for including the bathing scenes in the poem.

Another interesting aspect of the scenes that have been discussed above is the fact that nakedness – regardless of the admiration for the beauty of the human body – is not always treated in an unambiguously positive way. In many passages of the *Dionysiaca*, nakedness negatively affects not only a person who is being naked but also a voyeur. Let us recall the hunter Actaeon whose death was a result of his curiosity. Obviously, the bad consequences of voyeurism can be avoided by the gods thanks to their divine power.⁵² The most ambiguous value of seeing even the partially naked body that can be seen during a bath can be found in those episodes that are crucial moments in the poem having a particular meaning for its composition.⁵³

Although the healthful properties of bathing are merely a marginal aspect of the bathing scenes included in the poem, they still testify to the author's awareness regarding the necessity of maintaining one's personal hygiene. In particular, he emphasised the importance of good hygiene during hot days, after sport competitions, hunting, battle and before intimate intercourse.

Conclusion: crucial differences between Nonnos' and Homer's bathing scenes

Let us observe that Nonnos does not mention anything like bath oil or warm water which can be useful during a bath.⁵⁴ There is also no mention of sanitary equipment like bathtubs,⁵⁵ which were well-known to Homer.⁵⁶ Another feature of the bathing scenes

⁵⁰ It is worth noting that in the *Dionysiaca*, only exceptionally are mentions of ugly individuals made in the context of bathing. In this respect, Aion's bath is particularly interesting (XLI, 176–184). This bath allows him to cyclically regain his youth. See Lackeit (1916: 90).

⁵¹ Gigli Piccardi (2003: 448).

⁵² Newbold (2008: 77): "Gods who peep are powerful enough to escape dire consequences, although Zeus has to be wary of Hera finding out. Less fortunate was the shepherd Hymnus, who does not see the huntress, Nicaea, bathing naked (though he fantasises about it, and does see her bathing clothed) but does see her naked white, and rosy thighs and neck as the wind blows her robe and hair as she chases prey and he follows. He scans her as a divine voyeur would: insatiately, unseen (λαθών), love-mad, passionately, furtively (15.220–254)."

⁵³ These are the scenes with Ampelos, Semele, Persephone, Nicaea, and Actaeon.

⁵⁴ Hom. *Od.* VIII, 449–457. See also Yegül (1995: 6).

⁵⁵ In Homer, the only bath taking place in a river is strongly emphasised, see Hom. *Od.* VI, 216.

⁵⁶ It is worth adding that in the Nonnos' poem there is no trace of the knowledge of the Roman hygienic tradition (for which see Ashenburg 2009: 19–44). It can be assumed that the author consciously

included in the *Dionysiaca* that distinguishes Nonnos' poem from its Homeric model⁵⁷ is the fact that Nonnos' characters take a bath alone, while in Homer the heroes are often aided by others, e.g. their servants, during this activity.⁵⁸ In my opinion, the absence of servants and bathing equipment in the bathing scenes in Nonnos⁵⁹ can be explained by his attempt to archaize and at the same time to make credible the mythological world depicted in his poem and existing long before the Trojan war.⁶⁰

It should be added that in Homer⁶¹ a bath is an activity that accompanies the rituals of transition, that is, those moments in human life in which a new stage begins⁶² (in the tradition of many peoples, the Greeks included,⁶³ delivery, weddings, and funerals⁶⁴ were accompanied by a bath). The traces of this tradition can also be spotted in the *Dionysiaca*, where we find a mention of a prenuptial bath. Besides this, a bath is often a beginning of love and desire, and, as a consequence, it leads to impregnation. After all, it was the passion evoked by seeing Semele's naked body in the bath that was the starting point for Dionysos' life, who is the main character of the poem.

REFERENCES

- ACCORINTI, D., 2013. Nonnos. In: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 25. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1107–1026.
- AGOSTI, G., 2003. Nonno di Panopoli, *Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni, Canto quinto*. Introd., ed. critica, trad. e commento a cura di G. Agosti. Firenze: Università di Firenze, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità "G. Pasquali".
- AGOSTI, G., 2004. Nonno di Panopoli, *Le Dionisiache. Vol. III. Canti XXV–XXXIX*. Introd., trad. e commento di G. Agosti. Milano: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.
- AGOSTI, G., 2006. Immagini e poesia nella Tarda Antichità. Per uno studio dell'estetica visuale della poesia greca fra III e IV sec d. C. In: L. Cristani (ed.), *Incontri Triestini di Filologia Classica IV (2004–2005)*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste, 351–374.
- ASHENBURG, K., 2009. *Historia brudu* [The Dirt on Clean. An Unsanitized History]. Transl. A. Górška. Warszawa: Bellona.

decided not to mention the technological developments of his civilisation although he must have known equipment like tripod and cauldron (Hom. *Od.* XIII, 13), or basin (XIX, 467–470) that were used in bath. See Segal (2007: 12).

⁵⁷ On bath and its meaning in Homer see Segal (2007: 11–14), and Ashenburg (2009: 19–22).

⁵⁸ In Homer, an individual taking a bath was helped by other people: Hom. *Od.* VI, 211–246. In this description Odysseus does not want to be assisted during his bath due to his shyness (VI, 220–222), and this fact is very clearly stressed in the epos. In other circumstances, Odysseus and other heroes were glad to be assisted during their bath, see. Hom. *Od.* III, 48–51; VIII, 449–457; X, 358–367; XIX, 343–357.

⁵⁹ It may be that Nonnos felt that mentioning any everyday utensils would ruin the erotic air of his bathing scenes.

⁶⁰ On hygiene in the *Iliad* see e.g. Hector's warm bath XXII, 440–446. A typical bath is described in Hom. *Od.* VIII, 449–457.

⁶¹ See Segal (2007: 11–14), and Ashenburg (2009: 19–22).

⁶² Segal (2007: 11–14), and Ashenburg (2009: 23). Helen is offering a bath to Odysseus (Hom. *Od.* IV, 242–56); thanks to Athena, Odysseus' appearance changes after he has taken a bath (VI, 230–5 = XXIII, 157–162); as a result, Nausicaa falls in love with him. A rejuvenating process of bath is described once again in XXIV, 365–371 where it refers to Laertes.

⁶³ Segal (2007: 11–12).

⁶⁴ Segal (2007: 11).

- BOWERSOCK, G. W., 2006. *Mosaics as History. The Near East from Late Antiquity to Islam*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- CHRÉTIEN, G. (ed.), 1985. Nonnos de Panopolis, *Les Dionysiaques. Tome IV. Chants IX–X*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- CHUVIN, P. (ed.), 1992a. Nonnos de Panopolis, *Les Dionysiaques. Tome II. Chants III–V*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- CHUVIN, P. (ed.), 1992b. Nonnos de Panopolis, *Les Dionysiaques. Tome III. Chants VI–VIII*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- FRENCH, V., 2004. Midwives and Maternity Care in the Roman World. In: E. R. van Teijlingen, W. Lowis, P. McCaffery, M. Porter (eds.), *Midwifery and the Medicalization of Childbirth. Comparative Perspectives*. New York: Maureen Porter Nova Publishers, 54–62.
- FRIEDLÄNDER, P., 1931. Vorklassisch und Nachklassisch. In: W. Jaeger (ed.), *Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike*. Leipzig/Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 33–46.
- GERLAUD, B. (ed.), 1994. Nonnos de Panopolis, *Les Dionysiaques. Tome VI. Chants XIV–XVII*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- GERLAUD, B. (ed.), 2005. Nonnos de Panopolis, *Les Dionysiaques. Tome XI. Chants XXXIII–XXXIV*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- GERLAUD, B. (ed.), 2006. Nonnos de Panopolis, *Les Dionysiaques. Tome XII. Chants XXXV–XXXVI*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- GIGLI PICCARDI, D. (ed.), 2003. Nonno di Panopoli, *Le Dionisiache. Vol. I. Canti I–XII*. Milano: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.
- GONNELLI, F. (ed.), 2003. Nonno di Panopoli, *Le Dionisiache. Vol. II. Canti XIII–XXIV*. Milano: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.
- D'IPPOLITO, G., 1962. Draconzio, Nonno e gli "idromini". In: *Atene e Roma* 7, 1–14.
- JACCOTTET, A.-F., 2011. Du baptême de Dionysos à l'initiation du Christ. Langage iconographique et identité religieuse. In: N. Belayche, J.-D. Dubois (eds.), *Loiseau et le poisson*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 203–225.
- KRÖLL, N., 2013. Schwimmen mit Dionysos. Wasser und Badeszenen als Kompositionselemente in den Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis. *Wiener Studien* 126, 67–100.
- KUHLMANN, P., 1999. Zeus in den Dionysiaka des Nonnos. Die Demontage einer epischen Gotterfigur. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 142, 392–417.
- LACKEIT, C., 1916. *Aion. Zeit und Ewigkeit in Sprache und Religion der Griechen. Erster Teil: Sprache*. Königsherg: Hartung'sche Buchdruckerei.
- LASEK, A. M., 2009. *Nonnos' Spiel mit den Gattungen in den Dionysiaka*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo poznańskiego towarzystwa przyjaciół nauk.
- LOVATT, H., 2013. *The Epic Gaze. Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MIGUÉLEZ-CAVERO, L., 2008. *Poems in Context. Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- NEWBOLD, R. F., 1998. Fear of sex in Nonnus' Dionysiaka. *Electronic Antiquity*. Volume 4, Number 2. April 1998. <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/ElAnt/V4N2/newbold.html> [access at 20 January 2014].
- NEWBOLD, R. F., 2001. The Character and Content of Water in Nonnus and Claudian. *Ramus* 30, 169–189.
- NEWBOLD, R. F., 2008. Curiosity and Exposure in Nonnus. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 48, 71–94.
- RIEMSCHEIDER, M., 1957. Der Stil des Nonnos. In: J. Irmscher (ed.), *Aus der byzantinischen Arbeit der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* [= Berliner byzantinische Arbeiten, Bd. 5]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 46–70.
- ROUSE, W. H. D., 1940a. Nonnos, *Dionysiaka*. With an English translation by W. H. D. Rouse. *I. Books I–XV*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press / London: William Heinemann.
- ROUSE, W. H. D., 1940b. Nonnos, *Dionysiaka*. With an English translation by W. H. D. Rouse. *II. Books XV–XXXV*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press / London: William Heinemann.
- ROUSE, W. H. D., 1940c. Nonnos, *Dionysiaka*. With an English translation by W. H. D. Rouse. *III. Books XXXVI–XLVIII*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press / London: William Heinemann.
- SCHMIEL, R., 1993. The Story of Aura (Nonnos Dionysiaka 48. 238–978). *Hermes* 121, 470–483.

- SCHULZE, J. F., 1968. Beobachtungen zu Hymnos und Nikaia bei Nonnos (Dion. 15,169–422). *Živa antika* 18, 3–32.
- SEGAL, Ch., 2007. Transition and Ritual in Odysseus Return. In: H. Bloom (ed.), *Homer's The Odyssey*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 5–22.
- SINKO, T., 1954. *Literatura grecka. Tom 3. Cz. 2* [Greek Literature. Tome 3. Part 2]. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich.
- TISSONI, F. (comm.), 1999. Nonno di Panopoli, *Le Dionisiache*, Vol. 2. *Canti 13–24*. Introd. di D. Del Corno, traduzione di M. Maletta, note di F. Tisconi. Milano: Milano Adelphi.
- TSOUCALAS, G., TSOUCALAS, I., 2012. The first mythological description of an incubator. *Iranian journal of pediatrics* 22, 142–143.
- WINKLER, J., 1974. *In Pursuit of the Nymphs. Comedy and Sex in Nonnos' Tales of Dionysus*. Dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.
- WOLF, R. H. W., 2004. *Mysterium Wasser. Eine Religionsgeschichte zum Wasser in Antike und Christentum*. Göttingen: V&R Unipress.
- YEGÜL, F., 1995. *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity*. New York/Cambridge, Mass./London: The MIT Press.

PŘEDSTAVENÍ A FUNKCE VYBRANÝCH SCÉN KOUPÁNÍ V NONNOVÝCH DIONÝSIÁKÁCH

Shrnutí

Dionýsiaka Nonna z Panopole obsahují řadu epizod z každodenního života postav řecké mytologie. Mezi jinými podobnými tématy u Nonna najdeme i scény koupele mužských a zejména ženských postav. Uvádí například scénu koupání novorozeného Dionýsa nebo četné popisy žen v lázni (např. Artemidy, Nikaie, Semelé nebo Persefoné). Z popisů mužských koupelí je nejzajímavější Morrheova. Článek nabízí obecnou typologii scén koupele v *Dionýsiákách*, rozebírá jejich stavbu a význam v kontextu celé básně. Zaměřuje se zejména na činnosti spojené s koupelí a na význam hygieny a nahoty. Závěrečná část ukazuje nejdůležitější rozdíly mezi líčením koupelí u Nonna a u Homéra.

MEDIAEVALIA ET RECENTIORA

**SICUT MEL DULCE
THE SWEETNESS AND BITTERNESS OF READING THE
BIBLE IN THE MIDDLE AGES***

LUCIE DOLEŽALOVÁ (Praha)

ABSTRACT

After overviewing the types of primary sources available for tracing pleasure of reading during the Middle Ages (theoretical discourses such as *artes poeticae* or medical treatises, texts themselves, paratexts such as *accessus ad auctores*, readers' responses, and other texts), the study concentrates on biblical exegesis, namely commentaries on two biblical passages, Ezech. 3, 3 and Apoc. 10, 9. They both present an image of eating a book/roll which is sweet in the mouth but turns bitter in the belly. The image seems to have troubled some exegetes and led to much varied explanations. As it is argued, the reason for this is that the image is in a contrast with the usual metaphor of reading as eating, in which the book might not be too sweet (too easily accessible) but makes one feel well, since it provides nourishment.

Key words: medieval Latin literature; medieval exegesis; Bible; pleasure; textual discourse; metaphor

Middle Ages are not a period where one would first look for pleasures. Besides the general gloominess, sicknesses, poor living conditions, etc., the usual generalization is that medieval people were subjected to the rigid Christian Church, which regarded pleasure as something negative. This would apply to the pleasure of reading as well. If there was any, it would be linked solely to lay vernacular, not to Latin writing. Such a view has, of course, been successfully challenged.¹ Thus, rather than arguing again here that there was textual pleasure in the Latin Middle Ages, I would like to overview the particular types of sources used in search for medieval concept of and attitudes to literary pleasure, and briefly consider what kind of information each of them offers, and in what ways their character shapes the results arrived at. The most substantial part of this contribution then concentrates on a particular biblical image, that of eating a book/a roll, which is sweet in the mouth but turns bitter in the belly (Ezech. 3, 3 and Apoc. 10, 9). As I would like to show, there was certain uneasiness about the image among medieval exegetes, which, however, did not have theological but purely literary grounds. Through this example,

* Research leading to this study was supported by two Charles University Research Development Programs: "Phenomenology and Semiotics" (PRVOUK 18) and "University Centre for the Study of Ancient and Medieval Intellectual Traditions," both undertaken at the Faculty of Humanities.

¹ Among many, some of which are referred to below, I recommend especially Ziolkowski (2007).

I wish to stress the importance of considering the rules and customs of the given textual discourse in any kind of historical enquiry.

Pleasure is here sometimes considered together with laughter, entertainment and fun. Although they are clearly not the same, it is not always easy to separate these concepts, and the primary metaphor eventually explored within this study may refer to all of them. I will restrict myself to selected Latin sources, and thus the resulting picture is only a partial one with no claims at grasping medieval textual pleasure as a whole.

The most frequently explored type of source in search for textual pleasure are theoretical discourses (*artes poeticae*, grammatical, ethical and medical treatises, monastic rules). They offer prescriptions and general advice, they set rules and warn against transgressing them. Yet, it can never be taken for granted that prescriptive and theoretical texts faithfully reflect the actual practice.

In addition to the treatment of the topic by Cicero, Quintilian, and especially by Augustine in his *De doctrina christiana* (discussed below), four lines from Horace's *Ars poetica* repeatedly quoted during the Middle Ages set the approach to the purpose of writing poetry:

*Aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae
aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere uitae* (Hor. *Ars* 333–334) and

*Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
lectorem delectando pariterque monendo* (Hor. *Ars* 343–344)²

Poets wish to either benefit or delight us, or, at one and the same time, to speak words that are both pleasing and useful for our lives.

He gets every vote who combines the useful with the pleasant, and who, at the same time he pleases the reader, also instructs him.³

The theoretical discussions of pleasure from reading are thus inseparably connected to discussions of use throughout the Middle Ages. The nature of this interrelation was treated most thoroughly by Suchomski (1975) who analysed the Christian attitudes towards laughter, ridicule and entertainment based on theoretical treatises on the topic (or on *artes poeticae*, or Christian ethics), showing the (now generally accepted as obvious) distancing of the Church from them.⁴ Robertson (1962) claimed that medieval pleasure from reading was conceived as merely the “first step”: the literary meaning (which might have been funny or pleasurable) was necessarily followed by a deeper, allegorical or anagogical, interpretation, which showed the Christian how to behave well. But recent views are different: for example, Hunt (1979) concludes his inspection of literary atti-

² A less frequent commonplace from Horace linked to this topic is: *Quamquam ridentem dicere verum / quid vetat?* “What does prohibit the one laughing to say the truth?” (Hor. *Sat.* I, 1, 24–25).

³ Translated by Leon Golden.

⁴ Further studies have been carried out concentrating specifically on the monastic environment. Prohibitions of entertainment in monastic rules and sermons are quoted most frequently in this context and pioneer articles in this respect are Le Goff (1990); Resnick (1987); or Porter (1976). These examples are only suggestive, there is a vast recent literature on laughter and humour in the Middle Ages – subjects closely related to, although not identical with textual pleasure.

tudes to pleasure and instruction in the 12th and the 13th centuries: "... there was much literature written for no purpose beyond the provision of *delectatio*, which was felt to be entirely justifiable." Olson (1982) claims the same: there *was* literature designed for pure entertainment. Using medical treatises which stress the positive effect a happy mind has on preserving one's health, Olson shows that the pleasure actually *is* use.⁵

Tracing pleasure directly in the medieval texts which should or could provide it themselves is methodologically also questionable since it is clear that what seems entertaining now did not necessarily seem so to the medieval audience and vice versa. Thus, the texts "surrounding" such texts (paratexts and metatexts) are usually analysed instead. On the one hand, there are *accessus ad auctores* (learned introductions to authors following given rhetorical patterns) and, on the other hand, the authors' prologues, prefaces, and dedicatory letters. Both these types tell the reader how to approach a text – in the former case it is an explanation of a teacher (another reader/recipient of the text), in the latter it is the author himself who attempts to control reception of his or her work.⁶

Within the usual *accessus* structure, it is the parts called *intentio auctoris* (the author's intention) and *utilitas libri* (the use of the book) where *delectatio* can be and sometimes is mentioned.⁷ Rand (1929: 252) claims:

The comments are not always what we should expect, that is, if we cling to the widely disseminated idea ... that the medieval reader, spiritually sharpened by a training in allegory, heard nothing but the mystical overtones in Ovid's works, such as the Art of Love. How disappointing to find that the *intentio scribentis* in the *Amores*, according to one of these commentators of the 12th century is – *delectare*! Only this and nothing more. What a vista is opened by these few words – a vista into the mediaeval mind!

However, his is not a typical example.⁸ *Delectatio* has to be searched for in the *accessus*, and when it does appear, it is a legitimate purpose or use of the book but rarely the only one: the ethical dimension is almost never omitted from the discussion.⁹

⁵ This becomes especially important at the time of the plague – and Olson's main example and subject of analysis is, not surprisingly, the *Decameron*. For further analysis of love of books, among other aspects as a place of refuge, see Cerquiglini-Toulet (1993), who concentrates on Old French literature.

⁶ Thanks to a great number of such texts, it is possible to claim, for example, that medieval *fabula* was a literary type providing, as a rule, pleasure and entertainment. *Fabula* has been studied extensively in this context, since already Macrobius defines it as pleasure and teaching, and the 12th century school of Chartres stresses this characteristic of the type. See, for example, Dronke (1985).

⁷ For a more detailed analysis, see Meyer (1997).

⁸ For further information on *accessus ad auctores* see, for example, Minnis (1984); Minnis, Scott, Wallace (1988); Quain (1945); Huygens (1970); Hunt (1948); Suerbaum (2000); Zinn (1997).

⁹ For example, the *accessus* to Ovid's *Heroides* found in the manuscript 95 of Bancroft Library at the University of California (on f. 60r): "... it belongs to ethics since in this book it is spoken of good and bad morals. Or otherwise: His subject-matter in this work are young Roman girls. *The use is the pleasure itself* and to turn everyone away from illicit and shameful love. The intention of all poets is either to please or to be useful. Thence Horace ..." (... *quia ethice supponitur, scilicet loquendo de bonis moribus et de malis in hoc libro. Vel aliter: Materia eius est in hoc opere iuvenes puelle romane. Utilitas ipsa delectatio et ab illicito et turpi amore omnes revocando. Intentio omnium poetarum est aut delectare aut prodesse. Unde Horatius* ...). See Hexter (2002: 227; the English translation is mine). Or, *accessus* Aviani from the end of the 12th century: "His intention is to please us with stories and to provide use in correction of the morals. His use is the pleasure over the poems and the correction of the morals" (the whole passage reads: *Et fuit romanus civis quem rogavit quidam Theodosius nobilis romanus ut scriberet sibi aliquas fabulas, in quibus delectaretur. Cuius petitioni Avianus satisfaciens*

The authors themselves frequently promise their work will provide pleasure for the reader. This is, again, however, rarely mentioned without the inseparable note on the use of the text.¹⁰ A nice example is the *Cena Cypriani* (Cyprian's Feast), an amusing opuscle featuring biblical characters at a strange wedding party, originating probably from the 4th century C.E.¹¹ Since the text itself is quite obscure, two of its medieval re-writers each included an explanation in their introductions. Raban Maur (c. 776-c. 856?, abbot of Fulda and later archbishop of Mainz), in his dedication to King Lothar writes that the text would both please him (*quod delectabile foret*) and sharpen his intellect (*acumen sensus vestri acueret*), that it will bring him joy and use (*ad iocunditatem et utilia*).¹² John the Deacon of Rome (also known as Hymmonides, c. 825–880) wrote a prologue to the *Cena Cypriani* in verse, which describes in detail the entertainment the following text will provide.¹³ But in his epilogue he says also: "... take from the verses the dogmas you like ... Observe the table set up with great variety while you read new dogmas together with the old law."¹⁴ Thus, although John the Deacon's attempted control over the reception

scripsit ei quasdam fabulas, in quibus non solum valuit delectari, verum etiam alegoricum sensum in singulis notare ... intencio eius est delectare nos in fabulis et prodesse in correctione morum. Utilitas eius est delectatio poematis et correctio morum. Ethice subponitur, quia tractat de correctione morum). See Huygens (1953).

¹⁰ For a discussion of the concept of *utilitas* and its different types by Dominicans, see Nadeau (1997).

¹¹ See, for example, Modesto (1992); Casaretto (2002); Doležalová (2007).

¹² Modesto (1992: 132).

¹³ The whole passage reads (Modesto 1992: 200):
*Quique cupitis saltantem me Iohannem cernere,
 Nunc cantantem auditote, iocantem attendite:
 Satiram ludam percurrrens divino sub plasmate,
 Quo Codri findatur venter. Vos, amici, plaudite.
 Riserat qua Cyprianus post Felicem Mineum,
 Talamum Logiae septem qui dotavit artibus,
 Sub pampineis vinetis, sub racemis mollibus,
 Vetera novis commiscens scriba prudentissimus.
 Hac ludat papa Romanus in albis pascalibus,
 Quando venit coronatus scolae prior cornibus,
 Ut Silenus cum asello derisus cantantibus,
 Quo sacerdotalis lusus designet misterium.
 Hanc exhibeat convivis imperator Karolus,
 In miraculis gavisus, prodigus in vestibus,
 Quando victor coronatur triumphatis gentibus,
 Ut imperialis iocus instruat exercitum.
 Video ridere, certet quam scurra Crescentius,
 Ut cachinnis dissolvatur, torqueatur rictibus;
 Sed prius pedens crepabit tussiendo vetulus,
 Quam regat linguam condensis balbus in nominibus.
 Ad cenam venite cuncti Cypriani martiris,
 Rhetoris et papae clari Libicae Cartaginis,
 Quam sophista verax lusit divinis miraculis,
 Non satiricis commentis, non comoedi fabulis.*

¹⁴ The whole passage reads (Modesto 1992: 200):
*Ludere me libuit; ludentem papa Iohannes
 Accipe; ridere, si placet, ipse potes.
 Tristia lassatis dum currunt secula tegnis,
 Suscipe de rithmis dogmata grata tibi,
 Quis laetus poteris spectacula cernere festis,
 Iam variis monstris dissimulata nimis.
 Aspice depictam multo variamine mensam,*

of his work abounds in entertainment, laughter, amusement, and pleasure, it does not altogether neglect the use.

There is another type of source which is not much explored in this context because it is very rare: the readers' responses. A marginal note in a Latin manuscript recording its reader's pleasure over the text is extremely rare, while there are frequent notes praising the use of a text.¹⁵

Finally, pleasure from reading can appear in texts which have completely other agenda. These, again, have not been much analyzed for this purpose simply because they are difficult to find when one is looking for them. A charming example, and one that points to the intricacies of textual pleasure, is, in my opinion, *Dialogus Everardi et Ratii*.¹⁶ It is a very vivid dialogue written by Everard of Ypres presenting the doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers. Before the debate itself begins, Ratius¹⁷ advises Everard not to study too much because, as Galenus says, studies are unhealthy: all affections of the soul except joy (*gaudium*) make one dry. Everard (quoting the familiar Horace passage: "Poets wish to either benefit or delight us ...") replies that the affection which belongs to study provides joy for the soul and thus it does not make one dry. And if, according to Galenus, nothing is more drying than study, be it the most joyful kind, then even joy makes one dry. Ratius insists: "I knew I should speak to you carefully, because you are a pettifogger and always ready to oppose. But I say that the study itself as a vehement application of the soul is something completely different than the joy which follows from it. Study surely makes one drier than pleasure can make one wet again." Everard opposes: "What you now say about studying, you could apply also to the Acts of the Apostles where we read: 'And the apostles departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name' [Act. 5, 41], and the apostles 'rejoicing in tribulation' [Rom. 12, 12], and the psalmist about what the monks should do: 'how I love thy law! It [is] my meditation all the day' [Psalm. 118 (119), 97]. Here you have joy from reproaches, joy from troubles. Love is the sister of happiness from the long law of divine meditation. What shall I say? Do the flagellation, distress, meditation make one dry? And if they do,

*Dum nova cum veteri dogmata iure legis.
Fac relegat Balbus Crescentius ista vietus:
Qui risum poterit stringere, marmor erit.
Temporibus musam mutat sine labe poeta:
Nunc hilarem populum musa iocosa beat.*

¹⁵ For example, Ms. Oxford, Trinity College 34 (early 12th century, Kingswood Abbey) ends with the first book of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* and at the end, there is a note: *secundum require quia valde utilis est* ("ask for the second [book] because it is very useful"). The only sign indirectly indicating a reader's pleasure I found in a manuscript so far is in Ms. Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale, E III 5 (15th century, Cyprian's works), where, in John the Deacon's epilogue to *Cena Cypriani* mentioned above, the clause *riserat qua Cyprianus* (Cyprian laughed over this) is replaced by *riserat qua Marcianus* (Marcian laughed over this). The manuscript was written by Marco Balbo, so perhaps the scribe refers to himself having laughed over the *cena*. However, the codex was given on September 19, 1467 to the cardinal of San Marco – another possible *Marcianus* – in Florence (cf. Monti 1994: 265), and thus the change could have been just "wishful thinking" – anticipating the reaction of the future reader.

¹⁶ There is only one surviving ms. Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, 259, ff. 229v–240v. First, excerpts from the dialogue were published by Leclercq, then the whole was edited by Nicholas Haring in 1953. For more information, see Leclercq (1952); Haring (1953); Haring (1955); and Marenbon (2000).

¹⁷ He is a fictional character and his name is, of course, symbolic. He comes from Athens, has a sister called Sophia, servants Byrria and Davus, uncle Sosias; in the end, he says: *Satisfaciat ad hoc Ratius tuus, immo ratio tua* ("Your Ratius, or rather your reason, shall be content with this").

do they also oppose ethics or threat with sickness because of it? What do you think?" After this, Ratiuss suggests changing the topic.¹⁸

This passage brings into the picture an omnipresent feature of medieval Christian writing: a paradox, a contradiction in terms. Insisting, as Everard persuasively does, that pleasure may come from pain and suffering, not only makes Ratiuss give up the argument, but it also successfully problematizes and hints to the complexity of the concept of pleasure.¹⁹

One specific source was neglected here so far: biblical exegesis. It combines characteristics of all the types mentioned above: it is a theoretical discourse, it is a paratext ("surrounding" another text like the *accessus* and prologues), it is a kind of a reader's response, and, also, a type of text having quite other agenda than discussing the concept of pleasure.

The most influential theoretical stance on reading the Bible is the complex and much discussed Augustine's distinction between use and enjoyment (*uti* and *frui*) within *De doctrina christiana*.²⁰ In the same text, Augustine speaks both of toil and pleasure accompanying reading the Bible. The toil relates to its obscure passages,²¹ the pleasure to encountering beautiful metaphors.²²

¹⁸ The whole passage reads (see Haring 1953: 285):

Ratiuss: Nam ut noster in Tegni ait Galienus: omnis animi affectio praeter gaudium desiccatur. Euerardus: Aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere uitae. Et haec affectio quae adiacet tali studio parit gaudium animo. Ideo non desiccatur. Cum itaque sim monachus et non poeta tamen prodesse uellem si possem uel mihi. Ideo quae placet mihi delectari in iocunda consuetudine et gaudere in dicendo idonea regularis uitae. At si secundum Galienum nihil amplius studium licet sit iocundissimum est quam desiccaturum igitur et ipsum gaudium desiccatur. Ratiuss: Sciebam oportere me loqui tibi circumspecte qui cauillator semper es ad opponendum paratus. Dico itaque quod aliud est studium, id est uehemens animi applicatio ad aliquid agendum aliud quod inde sequitur gaudium. Plus uero illud desiccatur quam istud delectando humectetur.

Euerardus: Quid nos implicas soluendo de studio quod potius soluas in familiari facto apostolorum de quibus legitur: ibant apostoli gaudentes a concilio quia digni habiti sunt pro Christo contumeliam pati [Act. 5, 41]. Et illud apostoli: in tribulatione gaudentes [Rom. 12, 12]. Et illud psalmistae quod monachorum debet esse: quomodo dilexi legem tuam domine tota die meditatio mea est [Psalm. 118, 97]. Ecce gaudium ex contumelia, gaudium ex tribulatione. Dilectio est soror laetitiae ex diuturna legis diuinae meditatione. Quid dicam? Desiccant ista scilicet flagellatio, tribulatio, meditatio? Et si desiccant et minantur ethicam uel morbum desistendum propter hoc? Quid censes?

Ratiuss: Non mihi consilium nimis morari circa patulum orbem et tibi quaerenti patentem [Hor. Ars 132]. Sed potius ediscaris mihi quid cogitabas adeo intente iam pridem me superueniente.

¹⁹ This multifaceted subject cannot be explored within this paper. See, e.g., Nagy (2000).

²⁰ For a clear explanation with ample further bibliography, see Chadwick (2004: col. 70–75).

²¹ E.g. Aug. *Doctr. christ.* II, 6 (translation J. F. Shaw): *Sed multis et multiplicibus obscuritatibus et ambiguitatibus decipiuntur, qui temere legunt, aliud pro alio sentientes, quibusdam autem locis, quid uel falso suspicentur, non inueniunt: ita obscure dicta quaedam densissimam caliginem obducunt. Quod totum prouisum esse diuinitus non dubito ad edomandam labore superbiam et intellectum a fastidio reuocandum, cui facile inuestigata plerumque uilescunt.* ("But hasty and careless readers are led astray by many and manifold obscurities and ambiguities, substituting one meaning for another; and in some places they cannot hit upon even a fair interpretation. Some of the expressions are so obscure as to shroud the meaning in the thickest darkness. And I do not doubt that all this was divinely arranged for the purpose of subduing pride by toil, and of preventing a feeling of satiety in the intellect, which generally holds in small esteem what is discovered without difficulty.")

²² E.g. Aug. *Doctr. christ.* II, 6 (translation J. F. Shaw): *Et tamen nescio quomodo suauius intueor sanctos, cum eos quasi dentes ecclesiae uideo praecidere ab erroribus homines atque in eius corpus emollita quasi demorsos mansosque transferre. Oues etiam iucundissime agnosco detonsas oneribus saecularibus tamquam uelleribus positas et ascendentes de lauacro, id est de baptismo, creare omnes gemonibus, duo praecepta dilectionis, et nullam esse ab isto sancto fructu sterilem uideo.* ("And yet, I don't know why, I feel greater pleasure in contemplating holy men, when I view them as the teeth of the Church,

There is undoubtedly pleasure in meditating on the Bible,²³ as well as the ultimate pleasure in the afterlife resulting from following its precepts in one's life. In this way, pleasure is the ultimate goal, a desired result of reading the Bible. But the actual activity of reading it may be quite different.

In Late Antiquity, the Church Fathers had hard time defending the language of the Bible which strongly contrasted with beautifully written Classical pieces that were an integral part of education and thus formed the literary taste of the elite at the time. On the one hand, Jerome and others developed the claim that also the Hebrew Bible was originally written in verse, but it was not transferred into Latin because rather its contents were presented adequately.²⁴ On the other hand, the style of the Greek New Testament was obviously not a high one. Thus, the claim was made that God chose to speak in this simple way deliberately, refusing to mislead and falsely charm with formal beauty but speaking the truth. The real jewel is hidden in an ugly shell and thus is not recognised by everyone. Elaborate style obscures the truth; the true message is incompatible with the artifice of rhetorical figures.²⁵

Although Augustine's treatment of the topic in *De doctrina christiana* is somewhat different, this usual image of encountering the Scripture and Christianity persists throughout the Middle Ages: Bible is something that is difficult and bitter at the beginning but sweet in the end. Examples are numerous, such as Hugh of St Victor's *De archa Noe*:

The difference between the love of this world and love of God is that the love of this world seems at the beginning sweet but has a bitter end, while the love of God begins by bitterness but its ends are full of sweetness. The Gospel shows this to us in a most beautiful simile when speaking of the wedding of our bridegroom: "Everybody offers first the good wine and when the guests are drunk then the one which is worse. But you were serving the good wine up to now." Every man serves first the good wine, because he feels in the pleasure it provides some false sweetness, but after the rage of bad desire makes the mind drunk, then he offers what is worse, and the thorn of conscience, which previously falsely pleased the mind, now tortures it even harder. But our bridegroom offers the good wine after he has prepared the mind, which he previously let become bitter by remorse of troubles, to be filled with the sweetness of his love. Thus, after the taste of bitterness, the sweetest cup of love would be drunk even more eagerly.²⁶

tearing men away from their errors, and bringing them into the Church's body, with all their harshness softened down, just as if they had been torn off and masticated by the teeth. It is with the greatest pleasure, too, that I recognize them under the figure of sheep that have been shorn, laying down the burdens of the world like fleeces, and coming up from the washing, i.e., from baptism, and all bearing twins, i.e., the twin commandments of love, and none among them barren in that holy fruit.")

²³ Actually, the most frequently quoted biblical passage linked to pleasure is line 4 from Psalm 76 (77): *Memor fui dei et delectatus sum* ("I remembered God and rejoiced"; in the King James Bible this is, however, translated "I remembered God and was troubled"). Thus, the pleasure is directly linked to the memory of God, the pleasure of participating in a bigger framework of creation, the pleasure of meditation.

²⁴ Cf. Kugel (1981: 135–170 [chapter "Biblical Poetry and the Church"]).

²⁵ Jerome's dream is cited most frequently in this context (Hier. *Epist.* 22, 30).

²⁶ *Inter amorem huius mundi et amorem Dei hec est differentia, quod huius mundi amor in principio dulcis esse uidetur, sed finem habet amarum, amor uero Dei ab amaritudine incipit, sed ultima eius dulcedine plena sunt. Quod pulcherrima similitudine euangelicus sermo nobis ostendit, cum de sponsi nostri nuptiis decantaret dicens: 'Omnis homo primum bonum uinum ponit, et cum inebriati fuerint, tunc id quod deterius est. Tu autem seruasti bonum uinum usque adhuc.' Omnis namque homo (id est*

The image of sweetness and bitterness is here related to the feeling of love, but it is even more frequently linked to reading. Throughout the Middle Ages, many authors or commentators present their texts as a delicacy to eat, which will both taste good (be pleasurable) and provide nutrition (be useful). The authors often stress that they had to sweeten the food so that the young eat it more willingly, or that they provide a good selection of different types of food, so that one does not have to eat too much (does not have to go through huge volumes) and get a stomachache.²⁷ This basic parallel of reading/listening and eating is further developed in various directions (the food might be a bit difficult to swallow, might require thorough chewing, might not look so good but be actually very tasty etc.).²⁸ Also the exegetes of the Bible explored this metaphor in many ways.

Yet, there is an image that presents an opposite version of the metaphor. It is found in the Bible itself, in two corresponding passages: Ezech. 3, 3 in the Old Testament and

carnalis) primum bonum uinum ponit, quia in sua delectatione falsam quandam dulcedinem sentit, sed postquam furor mali desiderii mentem inebriauerit, tunc id quod deterius est propinat, quia spina conscientie superueniens mentem, quam prius falso delectabat, grauiter cruciat. Sed sponsus noster postremo uinum bonum porrigit, dum mentem, quam sui dulcedine amoris replere disponit, quadam prius tribulationum compunctione amaricari sinit, ut post gustum amaritudinis audius bibatur suauissimum poculum caritatis (PL 176, col. 619; my translation). The critical edition, Sicard (2001), was not available to me.

- ²⁷ For example, Petrus Alfonsi, in the prologue to his *Clericalis disciplina* speaks about “softening and sweetening” his text so that it would stick to one’s memory more easily. The whole passage reads (see Hermes 1970: 1–2): *Fragilem etiam hominis esse consideravi complexionem: quae ne taedium incurrat, quasi provehendo paucis et paucis instruenda est; duritiae quoque eius recordatus, ut facilius retineat, quodammodo necessario mollienda et dulcificanda est; quia et obliuiosa est, multis indiget quae oblitorum faciant recordari*. Or, Egidius of Rome writes in his preface to his version of Peter Riga’s *Aurora* (PL 212, col. 20) that he hopes his work lets one drink more and more easily from the Bible. He also uses Horace – mixing the sweet and the useful:

*Utile cum dulci studio miscere satagi,
Quando haec inclusi mystica lege metri.
Ex se res quod ametur habet. Modulatio praestat,
Ut magis e facili possit in aure bibi.
Nil aequo cupio, quantum ut sit fructus in istis,
Mentem lectoris aedificasse mei.
Res ideo tractare sacras post illa reducor,
Quae quondam ex animo forte fuere leui.
Sicque decebat, nisi tot jam ante negotia lusi ...*

The above-mentioned Everard of Ypres wrote also *Summula decretalium quaestionum* – a dialogue on Gratian’s Decree providing simple answers. In the epilogue to it, he explores the metaphor between reading/learning and eating in a charming way (see Haring 1955: 145): ... *Nos itaque, more agrestium sub ficu nostra et sub frondosa minus quam vinifera sublatitantes vinea, fructus eius in quiete comedemus nec vicinos aliquos invitabimus, timentes ingratorum ingratitudinem. Et minus caritate abundantes, refectioni esurientium hunc botrum non exponere pro certo proposuimus. Si qui tamen esurient Gratiani scientiae quaestionum fuerint passi, volentes assumere formam discendi ad vineam nostram accesserint, non vineolam nostram proponemus nec eos intro admitteremus uvas conculcaturos vel ramos confracturos ... propter quod fere triennio in Gratiani pomerio laboratur: folia cum pomis quandoque immaturis colliguntur, quibus foliis ipsa tecta vix inveniuntur. Hic statim habebis, rejectis foliis, ficus praeparatoriorum quantum ad morum approbationem; secundo uvas iudiciorum; tertio maturitatem omnium pomorum sacramentalium, si forte gratis tibi collatis grates velis dignas recompensare ... Cum igitur gratia benigni Jesu ... quam si gloriosissimi decretistae assistentes mense VII ferculis pomorum a frondosa arbore Gratiani decerptorum et salsamento diversarum summularum Johannis, Rufini et aliorum conditorum ventrem suum implerent.*

- ²⁸ This topic is worthy of an indepth separate study. The use of this metaphor was sketched by Curtius (1953: 358) who provides a number of textual evidence and stresses the importance of the biblical images, especially Adam and Eve’s tasting the forbidden fruit and the Last Supper. There are several short specific studies but a more general comparative enquiry is still missing.

Apoc. 10, 9 in the New. In both of them, a text is devoured, that is, ruminated on and incorporated.²⁹ The passages seem to differ from each other: Ezekiel is given a roll and it is sweet as honey (*sicut mel dulce*) in his mouth.³⁰ John is given a book and it is sweet as honey in his mouth but turns bitter in his belly.³¹ This discrepancy would be strange in such situation when the New Testament obviously refers to the Old, and it is indeed only a seeming one: also Ezekiel becomes eventually bitter – first he is told that now he should go and preach, and at the end he says *abii amarus* (I went away embittered).³² Thus, it is not as obvious as it is in John's case that his bitterness was caused by the devoured roll.

There is a significant difference in exegesis of the two passages: this part of Ezekiel is used and explained frequently but the bitterness Ezekiel experiences is often neglected.³³ In his commentary to Ezekiel, Jerome elaborates on the sweetness of "eating" the Scriptures and links it to Psalm 118 (119), 103: *Quam dulcia gutturi meo eloquia tua, super mel ori meo* ("How sweet are thy words unto my taste, sweeter than honey to my mouth")³⁴ and Psalm 18 (19), 11: *iudicia domini uera ... desiderabilia super aurum et lapidem pretiosum multum, et dulciora super mel et favum* ("the judgments of the Lord [are] true ... more to be desired than gold and precious stone and sweeter than honey and the honeycomb"),³⁵ and he also puts it into connection to Samson finding the honey in the mouth of the lion.³⁶ But he does not comment on Ezekiel's bitterness.³⁷ He is then further quoted and these biblical references reappear together.³⁸

²⁹ For a discussion of the book eating, see Gellrich (1985: chapter 1).

³⁰ Ezech. 3, 1–4: *et dixit ad me: fili hominis quodcumque inveneris, comede. comede volumen istud et vadens loquere ad filios Israel. Et aperui os meum et cibavit me volumine illo. Et dixit ad me: fili hominis venter tuus comedet et viscera tua complebuntur volumine isto quod ego do tibi. Et comedi illud et factum est in ore meo sicut mel dulce. Et dixit ad me: fili hominis vade ad domum Israel et loqueris verba mea ad eos.*

³¹ Apoc. 10, 9–11: *et abii ad angelum dicens ei ut daret mihi: librum et dicit mihi: accipe et devora illum et faciet amaricare ventrem tuum sed in ore tuo erit dulce tamquam mel. Et accipi librum de manu angeli et devoravi eum et erat in ore meo tamquam mel dulce et cum devorassem eum amaricatus est venter meus. Et dicunt mihi: oportet te iterum prophetare populis et gentibus et linguis et regibus multis.*

³² Ezech. 3, 14: *spiritus quoque levavit me et adsumpsit me et abii amarus in indignatione spiritus mei manus enim Domini erat mecum confortans me.*

³³ It is, however, not always so. For example, Helinand of Froidmont (c. 1160–after 1229) in one of his sermons says that the eating of Ezekiel was bitter as is the eating of all the Jews who just chew on the shell of the literary meaning of the Scripture never getting to the marrow of the spirit. So what wonder is it that they are always so bloodless and pale when they are nourished by such food? This interpretation, of course, neglects that John's eating is the same. See *Sermo III In natali Domini II Ad clericos* (PL 212, col. 503).

³⁴ Cassiod. *In psalm.* 118, 103 (PL 70, col. 870–871), on the other hand, when exposing this line of the Psalm, comments on the word *gutturi* – saying that the taste is normally felt on the palate but the speech of the Lord is sweet rather when it is swallowed. He also distinguishes between honey and honeycomb: honey is the Old Testament, honeycomb the New one, because although they are both sweet, the taste of the honeycomb is sweeter, as it is more condensed due to its novelty. By the honey we can also understand the open teaching of wisdom, by the honeycomb that one which turns out to be hidden in deep cellules.

³⁵ On the sweetness of reading in the Psalms, see Ohly (1989), who also describes the semantic field of sweetness in medieval mysticism including reading.

³⁶ Hier. *In Ezech.* 3, 3 (PL 25, col. 35–36).

³⁷ Hier. *In Ezech.* 3, 3 (PL 25, col. 36).

³⁸ The image is used also in other contexts, for example Peter of Celle (Petrus Cellensis, died 1183), in his *Sermo XXXVIII In Coena Domini V*, links the Ezekiel passage to the sweetness of accepting the Eucharist: *Et comedi illud, et factum est in ore meo tamquam mel dulce. Eucharistia dulcis super mel et favum ori meo. Laetum, securum, magis acutum reddit me hostia sancta, hostia pura, hostia*

The Revelation passage is, on the other hand, rarely evoked outside Revelation commentaries proper, and even within them little space is usually given to it.³⁹ In *Glossa ordinaria* (a selection of patristic exegesis, which became the basic starting point for later exegetes), there is nothing on this verse, Joachim of Fiore (c. 1130–1202) never comments on it in his *Enchiridion on the Apocalypse*, nor does Geoffrey of Auxerre (c. 1120–c. 1195) ever choose it for one of his Apocalypsis sermons.⁴⁰ The reason is, in my opinion, certain uneasiness about the passage. On the one hand, the original unproblematic meaning was probably just simply that the prophecy of Ezekiel and the Revelation are written in a pleasant language and include interesting stories but their content is bitter since they narrate sad events to come. Once one understands that it tells of future, the sweet becomes bitter.

On the other hand, the image it presents clashes with the implications of the well-established metaphor of reading as eating. Good text as food was to be either both tasting and nourishing, or possibly not so pleasing to the tongue at first but most useful to the body. The Revelation image is striking because it reverses the usual order: this book is first sweet but then turns bitter. Furthermore, the bitterness cannot be so easily placed aside here as from the corresponding Ezekiel image. Interpretations openly admitting the bitter outcome of “eating” the book – that is, interpreting it as something that only seems to be sweet in the mouth but does not provide nourishment – are based on identifying the book as the *Liber vitae*, which announces sorrowful ends (see below). Such an understanding is impossible in the other substantial part of the Christian tradition, where both the roll of Ezekiel and the book of John are interpreted as referring to the whole Scripture, to the whole Christian teaching.

Thus, in this case, while the sweetness of the book (the pleasure it provides) is natural,⁴¹ it is its bitterness that becomes a challenge for the exegetes. Gradually, two basic

immaculata, quoties a me percepta fuerit (PL 202, col. 761). The eventual bitterness is, again, not part of the picture here.

³⁹ Among the rare occasions when it appears elsewhere is *De cella vinaria per allegoriam accepta pro Ecclesia* (On the vinecellar allegorically representing the Church) by an anonymous 12th-century author (but ascribed to Hugh of St Victor) where this Apocalypse passage is used to state that there is bitterness in Scripture as there is always bitterness in too much knowledge (*Sermo XLV* [PL 177, col. 1021]).

⁴⁰ Gibbons (2000).

⁴¹ References to the sweetness of the Scripture are found in non-exegetical texts, too. For example, Zeno of Verona (4th-century bishop; but the authorship of the sermons attributed to him has been questioned for example by François Dolbeau) invites the newly baptized Christians for a big feast where different biblical characters will serve them different types of delicacies: *Post devotissime completa expiationis sacrae casta ieiunia, post clarissimae noctis suo sole dulces vigilias, post lactei fontis lavacro vitali in spem immortalitatis animas pullulantes, ex quo qui eratis aetate diversi, diversi natione, subito germani fratres, subito una geniti emersistis infantes, hortor vos nativitatis tantae festa laeto celebrare convivio, sed non illo, in quo diversis epulis intrumentorum lenocinio saporis de summa certantibus obrutum pectus saepe crudis atque acidis vomitibus inurgetur, in quo musti vestri dulcedo saecularis vini pridiani exhalante foetore corrumpitur, sed caelesti prandio, honesto, puro, salubri atque perpetuo, quod, ut saturi semper ac felices esse possitis, esurienter accipite. Pater familias panem vinumque pretiosum vobis ex usibus suis sua de mensa largitur. Tres pueri unanimes legumina inferunt primi, quibus, ut scitus sapor, salem sapientiae aspergunt. Oleum Christus infundit ...* [here comes the list of the biblical characters and the food they offer] *Haec, fratres, si quis libenter crediderit, largiores adhuc escas inveniet, quibus si diligens fuerit, semper et se et alios bonis omnibus satiabit per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum* (Löfstedt 1971: 71–72 [sermon 1, 24]). There is, of course, no mention of any subsequent bitterness in the belly. Or, Galand of Reigny (12th century) in the 48th proverb of his *Libellus*

solutions emerge:⁴² either the book, that is the Scripture, is sweet for the just ones and bitter for the unjust,⁴³ or the Scripture is pleasant to read or to listen to but difficult or bitter to apply in life. The two interpretations often appear together as two possible options,⁴⁴ for example by Caesarius of Arles (c. 470–542):

“And then he told me: take and eat it,” that is, put it into your intestines and write it down to the width of your heart. “And it will make your belly bitter but in your mouth it will be as sweet as honey,” that is, when you perceive [it], you will delight in the sweetness of divine speech, but you will feel bitterness when you start to preach and do what you had understood, as it is written: for the words of your lips I have taken hard paths [Psalm. 16 (17), 4]. And in another way, he says it will be sweet as honey in your mouth and bitterness in your belly: the mouth means good and spiritual Christians; the belly means the carnal and voluptuous ones. Thence it is that when the word of God is preached, it is sweet to the spiritual ones, while to the carnal ones, whose god is their belly according to the Apostle, it seems bitter and troublesome.⁴⁵

A more elaborate version is found by Ambrose Autpert (died 778 or 779) and also by Haimo, who is dependent on Ambrose, just adds many more examples of sweet and bitter passages from the Bible.⁴⁶ Ambrose first explains that to eat the book means to place it

proverbiorum speaks of the Scripture as of food which, the more frequently tasted, the more pleasing. He dwells on the simile for some time specifying the types of food (see Châtillon, Dumontier, Grégois 1998: 98): *Est cibus quem quanto frequentius et uberius quis comederit, tanto magis ei placebit; quo vero rarius accipitur, eo cicius fastiditur. Diuini seruitii exercitium cibus est et refectio religiosorum. Cibi uero huius assiduitas auget deuotionem, raritas parit fastidium. Hic cibus cum inuicem diligimus, panis est; cum spiritu feruemus, uinum; cum Dei dulcedinem aliquatenus gustamus, fauus; cum sicut adipe et pinguedine anima nostra repletur, carnes; cum celestia contemplamur, altitia; cum de procellosis seculi fluctibus ad nos uenientes recipimus, pisces; cum eis sancte rudimenta institutionis tradimus, lac; cum spem illis peruolant ad sublimia contemplanda damus, oia.*

⁴² In the following discussion, no attempt to draw a chronological line of development is made – it is only a preliminary typology.

⁴³ This solution in a condensed form is found also in the interlinear Apocalypse commentary in ms. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. Lat. 21 (from the end of the 11th century), f. 11r: *in ecclesia est dulce quasi mel uerbum predicationis, quibusdam uoluptuosis et ventri deditis amarum.*

⁴⁴ This is a normal feature of medieval exegesis – the authors offer more possibilities which are sometimes contrasting and incompatible. Various parallel explanations are offered also, e.g., by an English theologian Thomas of Chobham (end 12th–beg. 13th century) in his *Summa de commendatione et extirpatione virtutum* 1, 576: *Quomodo enim habet uerbum Dei dulcedinem in ore et amaritudinem in ventre? Preterea dicit Ysaïas xvi: venter meus ad Moab quasi cythara sonabit. Sed sonus cytharae dulcis est. Ergo dulcedo est in ventre. Quomodo ergo amaritudo? Sed potest ad hoc dici quod uerbum Dei dulce et amarum est. Dulce enim est in auditu sermonis, sed amarum in inopportunitate operationis. Vel dulce est in promissionibus, sed amarum in commitationibus. Vel dulce est perfectis et bonis, amarum est his quorum deus venter est, ut Phil. III. Est autem differentia inter cibum materiale et cibum spirituale, quia cibus materialis non facit corpus vivere in eternum, sed cibus spiritualis dat vitam eternam.*

⁴⁵ Caes. Arel. In apoc. 8 (English translation is mine): *‘Et tunc dixit mihi: accipe et comede illum,’ id est, tuis visceribus pande, et describe in latitudine cordis. ‘Et faciet amaricare ventrem tuum, sed in ore tuo erit dulce ut mel’: id est, cum perceperis, oblectaberis eloquii diuini dulcedine; sed amaritudinem senties, cum praedicare et operari coeperis quod intellexeris, sicut scriptum est: propter uerba labiorum tuorum ego custodivi vias duras. Et aliter, erit, inquit, in ore tuo dulce ut mel, et in ventre tuo amaritudo: in ore intelleguntur boni et spirituales christiani, in ventre carnales et luxoriosi. Inde est quod, cum uerbum dei praedicatur, spiritalibus dulce est; carnalibus uero, quorum secundum apostolum deus venter est, amarum videtur et asperum.*

⁴⁶ Haimo Halberstat. *Expositio in Apocalypsin* III, 10 (PL 117, col. 1065–1066).

in one's intestines. The Holy Scripture is sometimes food, other times drink. It is food in its more obscure aspects which cannot be understood without elucidating. Whatever is explained in order to be understood is as if it was ruminated on in order to be swallowed. In its clearer aspects the Scripture is drink, since we swallow drink without chewing. So we drink the plain and obvious parts which we manage to understand even without explanation.⁴⁷ About the eventual bitterness ("and it will embitter your belly but it will be as sweet as honey in your mind"), Ambrose says:

As it is usual in mystical writings, the order of the words seems to be reversed, because food is first taken into mouth and after it proceeds to the inner parts of the belly. But at the end it is changed when it is said: "And I accepted the little book from the hand of the Angel and I devoured it and it was in my mouth as sweet as honey ..." The predication comes out of the mouth, the excrements exit from the belly. And who else should be represented by the mouth of the Church, if not those who meditate on the law of the Lord day and night? [...] And who should be represented by the belly if not those dedicated to carnal earthly pleasures? [...] To those to whom the earthly pleasures are sweet, the God's precepts are bitter. What is bitterer to them than when the Lord orders: You shall not desire the wife of your neighbour, nor his house, nor his field, nor his servant ...⁴⁸

⁴⁷ The whole passage reads (Ambr. Autpertus *Expositio in Apocalypsin* V, 10): *Acceptum libellum deuorare, est Scripturarum intelligentiam in secretis recondere uisceribus. Sancta autem Scriptura aliquando cibus, aliquando uero potus est. In rebus enim obscurioribus, quae intellegi nullatenus possunt nisi enodentur, cibus est. Quicquid enim exponitur ut intellegatur, quasi manditur ut gluttatur. In rebus uero apertioribus, potus est. Potum enim non mandendo gluttimus. Apertiora ergo ac manifesta bibimus, quae etiam non exposita intellegere ualemus. Quamquam autem sancti praedicatores in Iohannis persona iam tunc reuelata intellegent de Domino Scripturarum sacramenta, tamen quia adhuc ea quae in ipso manifestata claruerant, qualiter ad eum pertinerent, expositione indigebant, nequaquam eidem Iohanni de sacro aperto que libello dicitur: Accipe et bibe, sed: Accipe et deuora. Ac si apertius diceretur: Pertracta et intellege, id est, prius mande, et tunc deglutti. Quod sanctos Ecclesiae tractatores postmodum diligenter fecisse quis ignoret? Quorum uolumina omnino tot non sumus qui legamus.*

⁴⁸ The whole passage reads (Ambr. Autpertus *Expositio in Apocalypsin* V, 10): *Ex ore igitur praedicatio emanat, de uentre uero stercora exeunt. Et qui alii per os Ecclesiae nisi hi figurantur, qui in lege Domini die ac nocte meditantur, nisi hi qui cum Psalmista dicere probantur: Quam dulcia faucibus meis eloquia tua, Domine; super mel et fauam ori meo? Qui uero per uentrem, nisi carnales terrenis uoluptatibus dediti, de quibus nimirum electi dicunt: Adhesit in terra uenter noster? Venter etenim in terra adheret, cum carnales quibuslibet terrenis cupiditatibus inhiant. In terra uenter adheret, cum reprobi peccatorum sordibus tamquam in uolutabro luti semetipsos coinquinant. Ex quorum uidelicet numero plures inueniuntur, qui ea quae sancti praedicatores edisserunt, acuto subtilitatis ingenio percipiant. Tamquam enim per os in uentrem cibus mansus descendit, cum per sanctos Ecclesiae praedicatores diuinarum Scripturarum notitia ad eos quoque peruenit, qui terrenis cupiditatibus dediti carnaliter uiuunt. Vnde et traictus liber qui in ore tamquam mel fit dulcis, in uentre amarescit. His etenim quibus terrena uoluptates dulcescunt, percepta eloquia Dei amarescunt. Quid enim illis amarius, quam quod iubet Dominus: 'Non concupisces uxorem proximi tui, non domum, non agrum, non seruum, non ancillam, non bouem, non asinum, et uniuerfa quae illius sunt?' Quid illis amarius, quam quod monet Apostolus Paulus: 'Tempus si reliquum est modicum est; superest ut qui habent uxores, tamquam non habentes sint, et qui emunt, tamquam non possidentes, et qui utuntur hoc mundo, tamquam non utantur?' Quid illis amarius, quam quod caelestis Magister dicit: 'Qui non odit patrem aut matrem et uxorem et filios et fratres et sorores, adhuc autem et animam suam, non potest meus esse discipulus?' Et rursum: 'Si quis uult post me uenire, abneget semetipsum, et tollat crucem suam cotidie, et sequatur me. Qui enim uoluerit animam suam saluam facere perdet illam.' Rursum que: 'Qui non baiulat crucem suam cotidie et uenit post me, non est me dignus.' Quid illis amarius, quam quod idem admonet Dominus: 'Intrate per angustam portam, quia multi, dico uobis, quaerent intrare, et non poterunt.'*

Ambrose provides many more examples of the bitter precepts but then proceeds to the other option:

It is, however, possible to refer by both the mouth and the belly to one and the same mind of a man. Where is the food sweet or bitter if not in one's mouth? Where are the God's words sweet or bitter if not in mind? And thus in certain way the things which please the mind seem sweet and those which trouble it seem bitter. The consumed book which is presented as sweet as honey in the mouth and bitter in the belly, is such as if it was said: And the pleased spirit rejoiced in the sweet things, and grieves lamenting about the troublesome. And the Holy Scripture surely means both the mouth and the belly, that is, the interior parts of the heart, the secrets of the mind, where the God's speech is sweet or bitter.

Then he gives supporting evidence for this interpretation from the Bible and shows how Paul and Moses were disappointed (bitter) when their doctrine was not received warmly by their brothers, concluding: "So the holy words are to one preacher both sweet and bitter, when the same person is both pleased by the precepts and sad that they are hated by many." He ends, as is usual in exegesis of this passage, by quoting the biblical passages which are sweet to read and those which are bitter.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ The whole passage reads (Ambr. *Autpertus Expositio in Apocalypsin* V, 10): *Potest autem per os simul et uentrem, una eadem que mens hominis designari. Vbi namque dulces uel amari sunt cibi, nisi in ore? Vbi dulcia uel amara Dei eloquia, nisi in mente? Ac sic quodammodo in his quae animam oblectant, dulcia, in his uero quae adfligunt, amara occurrunt. Quod ergo et in ore tamquam mel dulcis, et in uentre amarus liber comestus fuisse perhibetur, tale est, quale si diceretur: Et in his quae suauia erant, animus delectatus gaudebat, et in his quae aspera, gemens maerebat. Et certe Scriptura sacra et os et uentrem plerumque unum esse designat, id est, cordis interiora, mentis secreta, ubi uel dulcia uel amara fiunt Dei eloquia. Nisi enim per os interiora cordis signarentur, nequaquam Psalmista de reprobis diceret: In corde et corde locuti sunt mala. Et nisi per uentrem mentis secreta figurarentur, nequaquam Hieremias Propheta uentrem se dolere dixisset: 'Ventrem meum, ait, uentrem meum doleo.' Quod quia de spiritali uentre loqueretur, ipse aperuit dicens: Sensus cordis mei conturbati sunt. Neque enim ad salutem populi pertinebat, si Propheta uentrem se corporeum dolere praedicaret. Sed uentrem doluit, quia mentis adflictionem sensit. In ore igitur praedicantis tamquam dulcis fit liber, quia nimirum mens eius uel in his quae secreto legit, uel in his quae publice aliis praedicat, delectatur. Sed citius in uentre amaescit, quia proculdubio cum eandem praedicationem uidet a plurimis contemni, eiusdem mentis adflictionem sentit. Hinc est quod beatus Paulus Euangelii dulcedine oblectatus, cum eandem mellifluam suauitatem cerneret a Iudaeis repelli, tactus dolore cordis, ait: 'Tristitia est mihi magna et continuus dolor cordis meo; optabam ipse ego anathema esse a Christo pro fratribus meis, qui sunt cognati mei secundum carnem, qui sunt Israhelitae.' [Rom. 9, 2–4] Hinc Moyses cum videret legem per se datam ab eadem incredula nationem despici, totus in maerorem conversus se quae domino humiliter prosternens, dicebat: 'Si dimittis eis hanc noxam, dimitte; sin autem, dele me de libro in quo me scripsisti.' Quasi enim sacra eloquia uni eodem que praedicatori et dulcia et amara sunt, cum unus idemque et delectatur in illis, quia iussa sunt, et contristatur, quia a multis contempta. Vel certe acceptus liber et comestus in uentre fit amarus, cum doctor Ecclesiae ipsa sua locutione quosdam paenitentes atque conuersos aspiciens, mentis affectu illis coniungitur, quatenus iuxta egregium Praedicationem doleat cum dolentibus, fletque cum flentibus. Vel certe liber acceptus in ore tamquam mel fit dulcis, cum legentibus uel audientibus nobis gaudia uitae in eo promittuntur. Amarus uero in uentre, cum carnalibus nostris desideriis austera in illo opponuntur praecepta, per quae ad aeternam dulcedinem peruenitur. Tamquam mel in ore fit dulcis, cum in eo uel legimus uel audimus: Fulgebunt iusti sicut sol in regno Patris eorum. In uentre autem fit amarus, cum in eodem uel legimus uel audimus: 'Nisi efficiamini sicut paruuli, non intrabitis in regnum caelorum. Quasi mel in ore fit dulcis, cum in eo scriptum legimus uel audimus: 'Nunc filii Dei sumus, et nondum apparuit quid erimus.' Scimus autem quoniam cum apparuerit, similes ei erimus, quoniam uidebimus eum sicuti est. Amarus uero in uentre, cum inibi proponitur: 'Qui dicit se in Christo manere, debet sicut ille ambulauit et ipse ambulare.' In ore tamquam mel dulcis fuerat Apostolis, cum audirent: 'In regeneratione cum sederit Filius hominis in maiestate sua, sedebitis et uos super thronos*

The possibility that it is one and the same person who experiences the sweetness and the bitterness can perhaps be divided into three sub-solutions:

a) When Christians see what is required from them (like to leave all their riches and follow Christ, or even just to keep the Decalogue), they feel bitterness. This interpretation, offered also by Beatus of Liébana (c. 730–800), a Spanish monk and theologian, in his popular Apocalypse commentary (written in 776 and revised in 784 and 786) is dependent on Gregory the Great's (c. 540–604) homily to Ezekiel, where he, commenting on this passage, stresses that the Scripture is sweet only when it is also lived – only those can speak really sweetly of God who learnt to truly love him in their “intestins”.⁵⁰ Also Anselm of Laon (1050–1117) in his short commentary says that the bitterness is due to the fact that it is difficult to put the sweet Scriptures into practice.⁵¹ Bruno of Segni (Bruno Astensis, 1049–1123) commenting on this passage says: “To whom the exposition of the prophets and the Gospels would not be sweet for reading and listening? But is it the same with putting it into practice?” And he quotes Matthew 19, 21, where Christ said to his listener that he should go and sell all he had and give it to the poor, adding: “This food was very bitter for him as it is said: ‘And he went away very sad because he had many possessions.’”⁵²

In the Middle Ages, such image of bitterness when faced with obstacles is not a frequent one – the obstacles are surely demanding and difficult but do not usually make Christians feel bitter outside the context of these Apocalypse commentaries. They rather happily keep the precepts in order to get to heaven.

b) Christians feel bitter because they have to undergo persecution in this world. Also this solution is based on the Ezekiel passage where the prophet becomes bitter when he

duodecim, iudicantes duodecim tribus Israhel.’ In uentre autem amarus, cum illis idem Filius hominis proponeret: ‘Qui uult in uobis esse maior, fiat omnium seruus.’ An non tamquam mel dulcis fuerat liber iste in ore filiorum Zebedei, cum audita gloria regni futuri, interueniente matre, a Domino postularent, ut unus a dextris eius, alius a sinistris in regno illius sedere debuissent? Sed uideamus quemadmodum ilico eis in amaritudinem fuit conuersus. Ait enim illis: ‘Potestis bibere calicem quem ego bibiturus sum?’ Cui cum responderent: Possumus, continuo subiecit: Calicem quidem meum bibetis, sedere autem ad dexteram meam uel sinistram, non est meum dare uobis, sed quibus paratum est a Patre meo. Tamquam eis aliis uerbis diceret: Bene quidem liber in ore dulcis fuit de audita gloria regni, sed necesse est ut in uentre amarescat, exaudita poena martyrii.

⁵⁰ Greg. M. In Ezech. I, 10, 13: *Liber qui uiscera repleuit dulcis in ore sicut mel factus est, quia ipsi de omnipotente domino sciunt suauiter loqui, qui hunc didicerint in cordis sui uisceribus ueraciter amare. In eius quippe ore scriptura sacra dulcis est, cuius uitae uiscera mandatis illius replentur, quia ei suauis est ad loquendum, cui interius impressa ad uiuendum fuerit. Nam sermo dulcedinem non habet, quem uita reproba intra conscientiam remordet. Unde necesse est ut qui uerbum dei loquitur prius studeat qualiter uiuat, ut post ex uita colligat quae et qualiter dicat.* It is quoted also, e.g., by Raban Maur in his commentary to Ezekiel (PL 110, col. 495–1084), or by Hildebert of Lavardin (c. 1056–1133) who encourages his brothers to offer useful, pleasing and sweet preaching, so that their “sheep” would listen to their voice with willingness. He never mentions the bitterness (PL 171, col. 760–761).

⁵¹ Anselmus Laudunensis *Ennarationes in Apocalypsin* 10 (PL 162, col. 1538–1539): ... ‘et faciet amari-care ventrem tuum,’ quia grave est carni implere divina praecepta. Per ventrem, qui est mollis et fragilis, accipit carnem. ‘Sed in ore tuo erit dulce tanquam mel,’ id est praedicando et cogitando.

⁵² Bruno Astensis *Expositio in Apocalypsim* 10 (PL 165, col. 660): *Cui enim prophetarum evangeliorum-que expositio ad legendum et audiendum dulcis non sit? Sed nunquid similiter ad faciendum? Libenter Salvatoris uerba ille audierat, cui post caetera Dominus ait: ‘Adhuc tibi unum deest; vade, et vende omnia quae habes, et da pauperibus, et sequere me, et habebis thesauros in coelis’ [Matth. 19, 21]. Cui quam amarus cibus iste inventus fuerit, demonstratur, cum subditur: ‘Et tristis abiit, quia multas habebat possessiones.’*

is sent to preach to unfriendly nations. This appears, for example, by Bede the Venerable (673–735).

The preaching activity itself, however, can be included in the commentaries on both sides: Bede says that while you perceive, you delight in the sweetness of the divine speech, but you feel the bitterness when you begin to preach and put into practice what you have understood. Thus Ezekiel departs bitter because he has to preach the Gospel, which is sweet by the love but bitter by the persecutions awaiting him.⁵³ But for example Anselm of Laon (1050–1117) claims preaching and meditating on the Scripture is sweet (preaching, after all, is having the word of God in mouth), it is the living out the precepts which is demanding and thus bitter.⁵⁴ The context is, of course different – Ezekiel’s preaching carries with it the unpleasant persecution, while Anselm stresses that thinking and speaking of things may still be far from actually putting them into practice.⁵⁵

Rupert of Deutz (Rupertus Tuitiensis, c. 1075–1130) gives a more general explanation where he states that the promises of the future are sweet but this present world is bitter, if not because of persecution then because of the exile anyway.⁵⁶ The sweetness now, while it is lived in this world, is accompanied by a lot of bitterness. There are always enemies. John knew that if he devours the book, he will encounter a lot of bitterness (he quotes 2 Tim 3, 12: “All who want to live piously will suffer persecution”).

The bitterness of Christians when persecuted is, however, not a well-established image either: saints and Fathers are more frequently described as looking forward and happily accepting the crown of martyrdom. This discrepancy is explicitly dealt with by Johannes Petri Olivi (1248–1298) in his commentary to the Apocalypse, where he states that however sweet the contemplation of the future passions might be to the mind, in reality it nevertheless includes sighs of pain and sufferings of the spirit. He says there is nothing strange if according to different aspects one should feel both sweet and bitter, because also the passion of Christ, as far as it is triumphant and prosperous for us, is sweet to us, but as far as it tortures our belly by compassion, it is bitter to us.⁵⁷

⁵³ Beda Venerabilis, *Explanatio Apoc.* II, 10: *Cum perceperis, oblectaberis divini eloquii dulcedine, sed amaritudinem senties, cum praedicare et operari coeperis quod intellexeris. Vel certe juxta Ezechielem intelligendum, qui cum librum se devorasse diceret, adjecit, Et abii amarus in indignatione spiritus mei. Et dixit mihi: Oportet te iterum prophetare populis et gentibus. Quid liber comestus, et amaritudini mista dulcedo significaret, exprimit, quod, videlicet, ereptus exsilio, gentibus esset Evangelium praedicaturus, amore quidem dulce, sed tolerandis persecutionibus amarum.*

⁵⁴ Anselmus Laudunensis *Ennarationes in Apocalypsin* 10 (PL 162, col. 1539): *... in ore tuo erit dulce tamquam mel, id est praedicando et cogitando ... grave est enim nostrae carni jejunaere et caetera quae praecipuntur.*

⁵⁵ Seeing the preaching activity in a new light seems to be connected to the changed context: at the times when Jews and then early Christians were persecuted, already the speaking of the doctrine put one in danger but once Christianity became an established religion, preaching, although praiseworthy, does not present such a value any more. It becomes gradually connected to persuasion instead, and the contrast between only speaking and also actually doing is often pointed out.

⁵⁶ Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* XXVII: “... it is sweet in the mouth as honey because of the hope of eternal joy, even if the bitterness of persecution is missing it makes the belly bitter because of the present exile” (*Libri autem saepe dicti intelligentia nunc quidem cum sit in ore dulcis tamquam mel pro spe gaudii sempiterni etiam si persecutionis amaritudo desit pro re tamen praesentis exsilio uentrem amaricare facit*).

⁵⁷ *Huius autem libri contemplatio est dulcis ori, id est spirituali gustui. Facit tamen amaricari ventrem quia ducit ad amaritudinem laboris et passionis. Quamvis enim preclara contemplatio futurarum passionum sit suavis menti, in experientia tamen laboris est gemitus et afflictio spiritus. Nihil etiam inconveniens si secundum diversos respectus sit simul dulcis et amarus, sicut et Christi passio inquantum triumphalis et*

c) Finally, it is suggested that it is bitter to hear the horrible punishments waiting for the unjust. For example, Berengaudus (9th century) states that we can understand the mouth as the heart of the apostles and the belly as the memory of sinners. Sweet is the promise of the eternal life, but as the mind goes from the upper things to the lower ones – that is, from the contemplation of the heavenly home to its own sins and the punishments which the unjust will suffer for their sins, then what was previously sweet becomes bitter.⁵⁸

But, again, although the message of the New Testament is loving one's neighbor, the bitterness about how the unjust will suffer in hell is not an established image – just think of *De spectaculis* where Tertullian persuades Christians to give up worldly shows because much more exciting shows are waiting for them after the Last Judgment, that is, the sufferings of the unjust, which he proceeds to describe almost too vividly.⁵⁹ It almost seems that rather the pleasure in watching the unjust in hell is one of the well established Christian pleasures. Origen's claim that because God is good, everyone will be saved in the end, was condemned by council of 553. In the *Elucidarium* by Honorius Augustodunensis (first half of the 12th century), a text extremely popular surviving in over 300 medieval manuscripts, the confused pupil asks his master whether the just would not feel unhappy seeing the unjust suffer so much but the master replies that, on the contrary, they will be much pleased; they would feel against God if they were not.⁶⁰

nobis salubris est nobis dulcis; inquantum tamen nostra viscera per compassionem transfigit, est nobis amara (edition by Sylvain Piron being prepared for publication).

⁵⁸ Interestingly, he associates the bitterness with the feeling about one's body: by the belly we can understand the mortal flesh. The book becomes bitter because saintly men, the more they plunge into meditation over Scriptures, the sweeter is the meditation on their minds, and the more bitter they feel about their bodies, inflicting it with starvation, vigils, abstinence and other sufferings. The whole passage reads (Berengaudus, *Expositio super septem visiones libri apocalypsis* 10, 9–10 [PL 17, col. 866]): *Et abii ad angelum, dicens ei ut daret mihi librum. Abierunt apostoli ad Christum, ut ab eo doctrina divinarum Scripturarum instruerentur. Et dixit mihi: Accipe, et devora illum, et faciet amaricare ventrem tuum, sed in ore tuo erit dulce tamquam mel. Et cum devorasset eum, amaricatus est venter meus. Per os in quo sapores discernuntur corda apostolorum intelligere possumus: per ventrem autem in quo omnes spurcitiae commorantur corporis, memoriam peccatorum intelligere debemus. Liber igitur dum devoraretur, ut mel dulce fuisse dicitur; quia divina Scriptura dum in mente revolvitur, vitamque aeternam mandata Dei custodientibus repromittit, dulcis ut mel in corde efficitur: cum vero mentem a superioribus ad inferiora, id est, a contemplatione coelestis patriae ad peccata sua intuenda deducit, poenasque quas impii pro peccatis suis passuri sunt, ostendit, quae antea fuerat dulcis in demonstratione coelestis gloriae, amara efficitur in peccatorum ostensione. Possumus etiam hoc de Joanne proprie intelligere, qui antequam Evangelium scriberet, Pathmos in exilium ductus est: sed quia propter absentiam ejus haeretici Ecclesiam Dei invaserant, post reversionem suam de exilio ad eorum blasphemias destruendas compulsus est Evangelium scribere. Praecepit igitur vox divina Joanni, ut iret ad angelum, et acciperet ab eo librum; quia Spiritus sanctus hoc Joanni inspirando suasit, ut iret ad Christum non passibus corporis, sed passibus mentis, ad considerandam divinitatis ejus potentiam atque cum Patre aequalitatem, ut de divinitate ejus libellum omnibus fidelibus salutiferum posset conscribere. Devoravit vero Joannes librum, cum scientiam Evangelii quod postea scriptis, plenissime accepit. Liber itaque dum devoraretur, dulcedinem mellis ori exhibuit; quia divina Scriptura quanto amplius in corde ruminatur, tanto salubriorem dulcedinem menti exhibet. Possumus autem per ventrem, in quo escae putrescunt, carnem hanc mortalem intelligere. Liber igitur qui in ore dulcis fuit, amaritudinem ventri generavit; quia sancti viri quanto amplius in meditatione divinarum Scripturarum dediti sunt, quantoque eorum meditatio dulcior fit in mente, tanto majorem amaritudinem carni suae exhibent, affligendo videlicet eam jejuniis, vigiliis, abstinencia, caeterisque cruciatibus, quibus caro atteritur.*

⁵⁹ See Weeber (1988).

⁶⁰ Honorius Augustodun. *Elucidarium* III, 5 (PL 172, col. 1161): *Discipulus: Non dolebunt justi cum eos viderint ita torqueri? Magister: Non; licet pater videat filium, aut filius patrem in poena; aut filia*

Thus, none of the solutions (if they can be separated so, since these options are not so clear-cut, and are, obviously, interconnected) draws on an established tradition or evokes a familiar image. In addition, they all place the sweetness and the bitterness on the same level – either they say that to some the book is sweet, to others it is bitter, or that some aspects of eating the book are sweet, others are bitter. The idea behind is that taste is felt in the mouth, so the sweetness and bitterness are two equal alternatives.⁶¹ But this does not quite reflect the biblical text, where the sweetness is felt in the mouth, and the bitterness in the belly, which would normally mean that on the surface the book is pleasing but its contents are not profitable, it does not make the body stronger but rather weaker.

These biblical passages both work with the well-established parallel between reading and eating. Within the imagery, reading is not a simple activity, it is not only *linked to* understanding, accepting knowledge, meditating, preaching, putting knowledge into practice and ethics, it *includes* all these activities.⁶² Exactly because reading is such a complex activity, it can be both sweet and bitter at the same time – sweet in some of its aspects and bitter in others, as has been shown in the discussion. Yet, while the bitterness of the Scriptures presents a problem for the exegetes and is either avoided or interpreted in non-standard ways, there is no hesitation that Scripture is pleasant to hear, to read and/or to preach about. When facing the statement that Scripture is sweet and bitter, it was clearly much easier for the exegetes to explain its sweetness than its bitterness.

This should not lead us to make hasty conclusions about the way the Bible was read but rather to consider the conventions of the literary type used for the analysis. Biblical exegesis is not merely very specific intertextual source but it formed a crucial platform for intellectual exchange during the Middle Ages. The formulation of the ideas within this type (as well as other literary types) is influenced by literary conventions and topoi. In this particular case, the two biblical passages, although easy to understand with a common sense, go against the usual metaphoric commonplace of encountering the Scriptures as “first bitter, then sweet” and it is impossible to apply on them the well-established and developed imagery of reading as eating without having to conclude that the Scriptures are useless. Thus, the uneasiness the exegetes feel over these passages is rather due to literary conventions than to the actual contents. This situation points back at the beginning: using a particular source for analysing a certain subject, one has to be aware of the inner rules of the source type, since their influence on the handling of the subject may be surprisingly substantial.

matrem, aut mater filiam ibi conspiciat, aut vir uxorem, aut uxor virum; non solum non dolent, sed ita est eis delectabile hoc videre, sicut nobis cum videmus pisces in gurgite ludere, ut dicitur: 'Laetabitur justus, cum viderit vindictam peccatorum' [Psalm. 57, 11].

⁶¹ See, e.g., Ambr. Autpertus *Expositio in Apocalypsin* V, 10: “It is possible to designate by both the mouth and the belly one mind of a man. Because where is the food sweet or bitter if not in one’s mouth? ... And the Holy Scripture surely designates both the mouth and the belly, that is, the inner parts of the heart, the secrets of the mind, where the God’s words become either sweet or bitter” (*potest autem per os simul et ventrem una eadem mens homini designari. Ubi namque dulces uel amari sunt cibi, nisi in ore? ... Et certe Scriptura sacra et os et uentrem plerumque unum esse designat, id est, cordis interiora, mentis secreta, ubi uel dulcia uel amara fiunt Dei eloquia*).

⁶² This was shown very well by Carruthers (1990: 167 and *passim*).

REFERENCES

- CARRUTHERS, M. J., 1990. *The Book of Memory. A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* [= Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CASARETTO, F. M., 2002. Contaminazioni escatologiche di cornice per un modulo letterario. Dalla metafora al testo, dal 'banchetto' alla 'Cena di Cipriano'. *Studi medievali* 43, 535–623.
- CERQUIGLINI-TOULET, J., 1993. *La couleur de la mélancolie. La fréquentation des livres au XIV^e siècle 1300–1415* [= Collection Brèves Littérature]. Paris: Hatier.
- CHADWICK, H., 2004. Frui – uti. In: C. Mayer et al. (eds.), *Augustinus-Lexikon* 3. Basel: Schwabe.
- CHÂTILLON, J., DUMONTIER, M., GRÉLOIS, A. (eds.), 1998. *Galand de Reigny, Petit livre de proverbes* [= Sources Chrétiennes 436]. Paris: Cerf.
- CURTIUS, E. R., 1953. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- DOLEŽALOVÁ, L., 2007. *Reception and Its Varieties. Reading, Re-Writing, and Understanding Cena Cypriani in the Middle Ages*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- DRONKE, P., 1985. *Fabula. Explorations into the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism*. Leiden: Brill.
- GELLRICH, J. M., 1985. *The Idea of the Book in the Middle Ages. Language Theory, Mythology and Fiction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- GIBBONS, J. (tr.), 2000. *Geoffrey of Auxerre on the Apocalypse*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications.
- HARING, N. M., 1953. A Latin Dialogue on the Doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers. *Mediaeval Studies* 15, 243–289.
- HARING, N. M., 1955. The Cistercian Everard of Ypres and His Appraisal of the Conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers. *Mediaeval Studies* 17, 143–172.
- HERMES, E. (ed.), 1970. *The Disciplina Clericalis of Petrus Alfonsi*. Berkely/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- HEXTER, R., 2002. Narrative and an Absolutely Fabulous Commentary on Ovid's *Heroides*. In: C. D. Lanham (ed.), *Latin Grammar and Rhetoric from Classical Theory to Medieval Practice*. London/New York: Continuum, 212–238.
- HUNT, R. W., 1948. The Introductions to the Artes in the Twelfth Century. In: *Studia mediaevalia in honorem admodum reverendi patris Raymundi Josephi Martin, ordinis praedicatorum s. theologiae magistri LXXum natalem diem agentis*. Brugis: De Tempel, 85–112.
- HUNT, T., 1979. Prodesse et delectare. Metaphors of Pleasure and Instruction in Old French. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Bulletin de la Société néophilologique de Helsinki* 80, 17–35.
- HUYGENS, R. B. C., 1953. Accessus ad auctores. *Latomus* 12, 296–311.
- HUYGENS, R. B. C. (ed.), 1970. *Accessus ad auctores. Bernard d'Utrecht. Conrad d'Hirsau*. Leiden: Brill.
- KUGEL, J. L., 1981. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- LE Goff, J., 1990. Le rire dans les règles monastiques du Haut Moyen Age. In: M. Sot (ed.), *Haut Moyen Âge. Culture, éducation et société. Etudes offertes à Pierre Riché*. La Garenne-Colombes: Editions Publidix, 93–103.
- LECLERCQ, J., 1952. Textes sur St. Bernard et Gilbert de la Porée. *Mediaeval Studies* 14, 116–127.
- LÖFSTEDT, B. (ed.), 1971. *Zenonis Veronensis Tractatus* [= Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 22]. Turnhout: Brepols.
- MARENBON, J., 2000. *Aristotelian Logic, Platonism, and the Context of Early Medieval Philosophy in the West*. Aldershot: Variorum.
- MEYER, H., 1997. *Intentio auctoris, utilitas libri*. Wirkungsabsicht und Nutzen literarischer Werke nach Accessus-Prologen des 11. bis 13. Jahrhunderts. *Frühmittelalterliche Studien. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung der Universität Münster* 31, 390–413.
- MINNIS, A. J., 1984. *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Scolar Press.
- MINNIS, A. J., SCOTT, A. B., WALLACE, D. (eds.), 1988. *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c.1100–c.1375. The Commentary Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MODESTO, Ch., 1992. *Studien zur Cena Cypriani und zu deren Rezeption* [= Classica Monacensia 3]. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- MONTI, C. M., 1994. La famiglia Pomposiana di Cipriano. In: Gi. Billanovich (ed.), *Pomposia monasterium modo in Italia primum. La biblioteca di Pomposa* [= Medioevo e umanesimo 86]. Padova: Antenore, 213–271.

- NADEAU, A., 1997. Faire oeuvre utile. Notes sur le vocabulaire de quelques prologues dominicains du XIIIe siècle. In: S. Lusignan, M. Paulmier-Foucart (eds.), *Lector et compiler. Vincent de Beauvais, frère prêcheur. Un intellectuel et son milieu au XIIIe siècle* [= Rencontres à Royaumont 9]. Grâne: Editions Créaphis, 77–96.
- NAGY, P., 2000. *Le don des larmes au moyen âge. Un instrument spirituel en quête d'institution, Ve-XIIIe siècle*. Paris: A. Michel.
- OHLY, F., 1989. *Süße Nägel der Passion*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner.
- OLSON, G., 1982. *Literature as Recreation in Later Middle Ages*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- PORTER, L. C., 1976. Le rire au moyen âge. *L'Esprit Créateur* 16, 5–15.
- PL = *Patrologiae cursus completus ... ecclesiae Latinae ...*, 1–221. Paris: Migne, 1844–1864.
- QUAIN, E. A., 1945. The Medieval Accessus ad auctores. *Traditio* 3, 215–264.
- RAND, E. K., 1929. The Classics in the Thirteenth Century. *Speculum* 4, 249–269.
- RESNICK, I. M., 1987. 'Risus monasticus'. Laughter and Medieval Monastic Culture. *La Revue Bénédictine* 97, 90–100.
- ROBERTSON, D. W., 1962. *A Preface to Chaucer*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (reprint 1967).
- SICARD, P. (ed.), 2001. *Hugonis de Sancto Victore De archa Noe. Libellus de formatione arche* [= Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 176–176 A]. Turnhout: Brepols.
- SUCHOMSKI, J., 1975. 'Delectatio' und 'utilitas'. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis mittelalterlicher komischer Literatur. Bern/München: Francke Verlag.
- SUERBAUM, A., 2000. Litterae et mores. Zur Textgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Avian-Kommentare. In: K. Grubmüller (ed.), *Schulliteratur im späten Mittelalter*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 383–434.
- WEEBER, K.-W. (ed.), 1988. Tertullianus, *De spectaculis*. Über die Spiele. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- ZINN, G. A., 1997. Hugh of St. Victor's *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris* as an Accessus Treatise for the Study of the Bible. *Traditio* 52, 111–134.
- ZIOLKOWSKI, J., 2007. *Fairy Tales from Before the Fairy Tales. The Medieval Latin Past of Wonderful Lies*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

SICUT MEL DULCE

SLADKOST A HOŘKOST ČTENÍ BIBLÉ VE STŘEDOVĚKU

Shrnutí

Po přehledu možných typů primárních zdrojů, ze kterých se můžeme dozvědět něco o potěšení z četby ve středověku (teoretická pojednání jako *artes poeticae*, gramatiky nebo medicínské traktáty, paratexty, doklady recepce textů a samotné texty) se studie zaměřuje na žánr biblické exegese, konkrétně na výklady dvou pasáží, Ezech. 3, 3 a Apoc. 10, 9. Obě představují obraz požívání knihy, která je sladká v ústech, ale v břiše zhořkne. Tento obraz některé středověké komentátory zarážel a vedl k velmi různorodým interpretacím. Autorka se pokouší dokázat, že hlavním důvodem jejich rozpaků bylo, že obvyklá středověká metafora, která srovnávala četbu s jezením, byla opačná: kniha nemusí být „sladká“ v ústech (snadno přístupná), ale udělá člověku dobře v těle, protože jej nasytí.

**FROM SANCTULUS TO SACER
SUGGESTED TYPOLOGY OF JESUIT SCHOOL
PLAYS FEATURING ST. JOHN OF NEPOMUK IN THE
BOHEMIAN PROVINCE***

ALENA BOČKOVÁ (Praha)

ABSTRACT

The study analyses a thematic corpus of plays on St. John of Nepomuk, more specifically dramatic texts written in the Bohemian province in the first half of the 18th century. Based on the treatment of the biographical narrative it divides these dramatic works into four types according to the portrayal of the saint: John as a little boy, as a young man, as a priest and martyr and lastly as a saint.

While the plays have the same subject matter, which they loosely adapt and develop, they differ in terms of content and language, depending on the age and level of the actors. As a didactic part of the curriculum of Jesuit colleges, these texts would improve the rhetorical capability of the students but also support their moral and religious instruction.

Key words: St. John of Nepomuk; Jesuit drama; school production; first half of the 18th century; Bohemian province; Baroque legendistics

Research concerning Jesuit school plays in the Bohemian lands has not reached its zenith, despite more than a century of tradition and a recent renewal of interest.¹ Even the research of primary sources is not at its end, so that it can be presumed there will be more discoveries of synopses, individual plays and convolutes that will radically change our view of this type of theatrical production. At any rate, even with the current state of knowledge it is safe to declare that one of the thematic bodies common to many Jesuit colleges is – not surprisingly, given the contemporary character the topic had in the day – drama concerning an important Czech Baroque saint and patron of the Bohemian

* This paper was created with the financial support of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR), as a part of postdoctoral project no. 13-23261P. The topic of the article draws from a paper *The Protagonist as a Role Model: Jesuit School Plays featuring St. John of Nepomuk* read at the international conference *Theatrum mundi: Latin Drama in Renaissance Europe*, held by the *Society of Neo-Latin Studies & Centre for Early Modern Studies* on September 12–14, 2013 in Oxford. My thanks to the co-authors of *Saint John of Nepomuk on Jesuit School Stage* Kateřina Bobková-Valentová, Magdaléna Jacková and Martin Bažil, for fruitful discussions and observations vital to this article.

¹ For more on Jesuit drama, see Port (1968), Scherl (2010), Bobková-Valentová, Jacková (2010), Jacková (2011). In the European context this phenomenon has been treated most recently in “Central and Eastern European Countries”, section “Bohemia” in the synthesis by Bloemendal, Norland (2013: 639–642).

lands, St. John of Nepomuk.² This study will particularly examine all preserved complete texts, while taking into account an additional corpus of synopses of Jesuit school plays written in colleges within the Bohemian province in the first half of the 18th century. Thanks to the popularity of the topic the number of plays that have survived to this day provides a relevant specimen for examination with essential informative value. The main goal of this article is to establish a typology of the plays based on comparative analysis of the treatment of the story and its protagonist, who would serve as a role model to the students of Jesuit colleges.

Jesuit educational system, as postulated in the set of rules *Ratio studiorum* (1599),³ had a prominent position within the region in the time after the Battle of Bílá Hora and influenced the operation of other schools of the same type in Bohemia. The learning model was quite unified both in lower and higher education; Jesuit colleges in the Bohemian lands were organized into six classes with a high number of pupils. Theatrical productions were an indispensable part of the curriculum, be it regular exercises (*exercitationes*) and declamations (*declamationes*) or more official performances – originally rehearsed as the school celebrations of the end of the school year, later as presentations of the college's individual classes that were held from May to the beginning of July.⁴ We will focus specifically on this last subtype of Jesuit school drama, mostly written by the class teachers.⁵

Most plays concerned with John of Nepomuk were produced in 1729, i.e. the year of the Saint's canonization; nevertheless, texts were also produced both in the decade before this date and in the years after it.⁶ The oldest record of a stage production of a Jesuit school play on John of Nepomuk dates already from 1689 and comes from Prague's Clementinum college.⁷ The text of the play has, however, not been preserved. The first preserved text of a synopsis (a periocha in the form of printed programme, which contains a brief summary of the play) was produced in the same college in 1701.⁸

Textual Corpus

This paper focuses specifically on a collection of complete manuscripts of Nepomucene plays, written and produced in 1720s and 1730s in colleges in Nové Město in Prague and in Uherské Hradiště, a town in South Moravia. The manuscripts are stored

² For the historical personality of John of Pomuk, the rise of his cult and his beatification (1721) and canonization (1729) see Polc (1993), Ryněš (1972), Stejskal (1921–1922), Vlnas (2013).

³ See its modern edition in Lukács (1986: 357–454).

⁴ More on Jesuit school system, theatrical elements in class and the typology of the school dramatic productions in more detail in Bobková-Valentová (2006: 86–103), also concerning theatre incorporated into the curriculum in Jacková (2011: 31–58).

⁵ Their names can be found in the catalogues of persons, exceptionally even included in the text. Sometimes, thanks to the comparison of the scribe's hand with his manuscript of the Fourth Vow, the text of the play can be identified as an autograph.

⁶ For a complete inventory of the Nepomucene plays, see Kraus (1918). In comparison with foreign inventories of the repertory of the Jesuit theatre it is obvious that the Nepomucene topic was far more typical for the Czech territory, judging by the higher number of preserved dramatic works. Three bilingual Latin-German synopses (1708 Eichstätt, 1710 Straubing, 1719 Amberg) are cited in Szarota (1979: 1275–1298 texts of synopses, 1776–1782 commentaries on plays).

⁷ See Kraus (1918: 71), who refers to Menčík's (1895: 180) inventory.

⁸ Cf. below Bernardus Pannagl's drama *Divus Joannes Nepomucenus invictus Christi Martyr*.

in Czech National Archives (more specifically in the Old Manipulation and Jesuitica funds).⁹ The preservation of a similar body of dramatic texts in their entirety is unique within the European context, which makes information acquired by their analysis all the more exceptional.¹⁰ An entire text is usually necessary for detailed analysis; unfortunately, from the vast body of Jesuit school dramas, only very few plays have survived to this day in their complete form. For comparative reasons, we shall enlarge the corpus with the synopses of ten additional Nepomucene plays,¹¹ which will help to illustrate the suggested typology. Still, the form of a synopsis (a brief summary of the plot, individual scenes and non-narrative parts of the play) only allows us to reconstruct the general way in which the topic was treated, or at best the play's structure – while not giving many clues about its specifics.

For clarity's sake, a chronological list of discussed plays and synopses follows below, stating the title of the work, its author, the class he taught,¹² place and year of production and the form in which the play was preserved (i.e. full manuscript and/or a printed synopsis).

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus invictus Christi Martyr, in silentio secreti confessionis et in spe publicae canonizationis gloriosus.

Bernardus Pannagl, rhetoric, Prague – Clementinum, 1701, synopsis.

Vox clamantis Mariae amantis echo.

Joannes Tiller, lowest grammar, Prague – Nové Město, 1724, text.

Gratia indeptae rea gratiae.

Joannes Tiller, middle grammar, Prague – Clementinum, 1725, synopsis.

Unio sexaginta elegantiarum.

Joannes Pelletius, rhetoric, Prague – Nové Město, 1725, synopsis.

Nobilissima sapientis lectio Vanitas vanitatum.

Joannes Tiller, syntax, Prague – Clementinum, 1726, synopsis.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus patiendo Martyr gloriosissimus.

Joannes Winkler, middle grammar, Uherské Hradiště, 1729, text.

Angelus ad aras Divus Joannes Nepomucenus.

Antonius Machek, rudimentistae, Prague – Nové Město, 1729, text and synopsis.

⁹ NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, 999; NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-446, 447, box 175, 176.

¹⁰ A complete critical edition of hitherto unpublished Jesuit school plays on St. John of Nepomuk, including introductions, mirror translation into Czech, critical apparatus, commentaries, annotations and indexes has been prepared by an interdisciplinary board of scholars (Kateřina Bobková-Valentová, Alena Bočková, Magdaléna Jacková, Martin Bažil, Eva Pauerová, Jan Zdichynec, Zdeněk Žalud). The monography, entitled *Saint John of Nepomuk on Jesuit School Stage*, is the first of a series of publications entitled *Theatrum Neolatinum: Latinské divadlo v českých zemích* [Latin Theatre in the Bohemian Lands], which will introduce commonly inaccessible texts of Baroque dramatic works to both scholars and wider audience. More on this editorial project in Bočková, Zdichynec (2010).

¹¹ These synopses (together with others) are preserved in the convolute NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39.

¹² The terminology of individual classes in Jesuit colleges largely differs also in the titles of the plays. For clarity's sake, we use the terms lowest grammar (which was commonly divided into *rudimentistae* and *principistae*), middle grammar (commonly only called grammar), highest grammar (also known as *syntax*), poetic and rhetoric. For the division of classes in Jesuit colleges, see Bobková-Valentová (2006: 55–57).

Sacratior Gratiarum trias.

Carolus Walhoffen, middle grammar, Opole, 1729, synopsis.

Pietas spectata per ignes et aquas.

Joannes Braun, highest grammar, Opole, 1729, synopsis.

Supremi honores sacerrimis exuviis Divi Joannis Nepomuceni peracti.

Josephus Werner, poetic and rhetoric, Opole, 1729, synopsis.

Gloriosus Divi Joannis Nepomuceni pro sigillo poenitentiae agon.

Joannes Winkler, highest grammar, Klatovy, 1730, synopsis.

Pharos famae naufragantis Divus Joannes Nepomucenus.

Antonius Machek, lowest grammar, Prague – Nové Město, 1730, synopsis.

Vindex duliae Divus Joannes Nepomucenus.

Antonius Machek, syntax, Prague – Nové Město, 1731, text.

Mysterium a seculis tacitum, lingua incorrupta sacramentalis merces silentii.

Antonius Jenisch, whole school, Uherské Hradiště, 1732, text and synopsis.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus, tenera in aetate virtutis et scientiae illustris idea.

Joannes Rirenschopff, middle grammar, Prague – Nové Město, 1734, text and synopsis.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus laurea Martyr gloriose coronatus.

Antonius Sindt, rhetoric, Prague – Malá Strana, 1748, synopsis.

This article shall focus on the manner in which the Saint's life story was treated in individual plays. We will analyse the motives and historical events the teachers/playwrights chose from the Nepomucene tradition, and infer to what degree they employed their own fantasy in the creation of their story. We will specify the degree of alteration the Saint's biography was subjected to in the teachers' attempts to make the play more suitable for the age of their pupils, and how this influenced the language of their dramatic works.

While the storylines are mostly products of the authors' fantasy, the main source of inspiration for most of them remains Bohuslaus Balbinus' legend, *Vita Beati Joannis Nepomuceni*. This accomplished work of Nepomucene legendistics appeared – among others – in the Bollandist Antwerp collection *Acta Sanctorum* of 1680,¹³ which served as a basis for the canonization process and ultimately established the official text of the legend. In 1682, Balbinus reprinted the text in *Bohemia Sancta*, the fourth tome of his *Miscellanea* – this time without editorial adjustments and Bollandist notes.¹⁴

Apart from these two sources, authors also cite the canonization documents or rather their summaries (*Summaria*) – Balbinus' legend formed part of those as well, although their basis was a complete description of the beatification and canonization process.¹⁵ In most plays from the chosen corpus, however, the Nepomucene legend is not treated as a historically accurate biography. More often, the playwrights would choose a single anecdote or period in the Saint's life (his childhood, studies, or martyrdom and death), which they subjected to their own dramatic treatment. Some of the teachers quote their

¹³ Balbinus (1680: 667–680).

¹⁴ Balbinus (1682: 94–113).

¹⁵ *Acta utriusque processus*.

source in the *argumentum* to their play,¹⁶ where they also specify the topic and provide a brief summary of the narrative. Interestingly, some of them also emphasise their own creative input (as in the formulation *Ex vita S. Joannis Nepomuceni, argumento accessit Poësis*).¹⁷

Type One: John as a Little Boy

This category comprises plays written for the youngest college pupils (lowest or middle grammar classes). John is portrayed as a little boy – a peer of the children who would act in the play, and his perfect behaviour is an example for them to follow. The authors either draw from some episodes from the Nepomucene legends (baby John's recovery from a serious illness after the intervention of Virgin Mary, his ardent service as altar boy in the Cistercian monastery in Zelená Hora and so forth) – but some prefer to construe the plot on the basis on their own fictional storyline. The plays are set in surroundings the children would find familiar (school, home, church, forest, grove) and the plot is – with alternate success – adapted to their vision of the world (including competition among boys, small tussles, envy of the elder's affection but also friendship and support). Apart from the young protagonists, adults (spiritual guides, teachers) also appear in the play; sometimes, John's father makes an appearance on stage – a feature exclusive to this category of plays.

An example of a play that shows St. John of Nepomuk as a little boy is *Angelus ad aras Divus Joannes Nepomucenus* (Angel at the Altar, St. John of Nepomuk).¹⁸ It was written for the lowest college grade (*rudimentistae*) in 1729 by their teacher Antonius Machek. The manuscript is an autograph of the teacher,¹⁹ which was far from common in similar dramatic works. Rather remarkably, the text contains recitatives, arias and choruses; fully texted musical passages appear very rarely in this type of texts. Together with the play itself, a printed synopsis in Latin and Czech has been preserved, containing brief summaries of individual scenes.²⁰

In the prefatory *argumentum*, the author refers to Bohuslaus Balbinus. However – as was the custom at the time – he does not quote Balbinus accurately and in the second part adapts the plot to his own needs. From the whole Nepomucene legend, he chooses a motive from the Saint's childhood: as soon as John learned to speak, he would study the acolyte rules to be able to assist during Mass.²¹ This subject is transformed by Machek

¹⁶ *Argumentum* is a type of a prefatory summary, in which the author described the plot and occasionally also quoted the source of his chosen subject matter. Before the teachers could start writing the play itself, they had to have the *argumentum* approved by their superiors – see Bobková-Valentová (2006: 98).

¹⁷ See *Gratia indeptae rea gratiae*, *argumentum*.

¹⁸ NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 330r–337v. More on this play in Bobková, Bočková (2004: 955–974), Jacková (2011: 199–203).

¹⁹ The handwriting of the manuscript of the play is identical to the one of author's handwritten Fourth Vow (*Professi quatuor votorum*. ARSI, sign. Germ. 45, f. 304r, 305r).

²⁰ NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 329r–329v.

²¹ *Angelus ad aras*, *argumentum*: *Joannes ut primum fari per aetatem potuit, formulam Sacrificio divino ministrandi exacte perdidit. Eaque in usum deducta, ex oppidulo patrio ad Matris Divinae aedem sub Auroram quotidie excurrens, sedulam angelico ministerio addixit operam. Ex P. Balbino, l. IV., Miscel.*

into a story of a devoted boy called John (frequently referred to as *parvulus*), who burns with desire to be an altar boy. His main adversaries are older boys (*aemuli*), depicted as lazy, spiteful, nagging and greedy. They only serve at Mass because they receive small gifts afterwards, and have no intention to be robbed of these by little John. They ridicule him as *sanctulus* and incessantly plot against him. Unable to agree among themselves, they end up fighting in the climax scene in the vestry. When caught, they show appropriate penitence and when John puts in a word, they all begin to serve at Mass together. With the help of additional minor characters (lazy classmates, unsuccessful beggars, idle altar boys and so forth) the author then produces more anecdotes, which serve to highlight John's good qualities, such as diligence, compassion, generosity, pity etc.

The storyline is not very complicated, just a sequence of loosely connected episodes. John moves on to overcome various obstacles and impediments and to reach his dream through his zeal. The story is set in Nepomuk and its surroundings; the individual segments take place in the street, at school, at home, in church and so on. There are no allegoric characters, no long monologues or declamation; the storyline is dynamic and full of action, enhanced by lively dialogue. Short rejoinders resemble realistic dialogue; fast alternation of characters gives the sensation of overlapping. Other language devices are also adapted to the age of the spectators: the text abounds with diminutives²² or repetition of typical collocations and phrases – by use of which the students would unconsciously learn suitable phrases for Latin translation.²³ Apart from practicing the phrases already discussed in class, the teacher would introduce new ones to prepare the ground for further language study. Simplicity and comprehensibility observed the age of the boys for whom the play was intended. The key intention of this simple play was to introduce John of Nepomuk as an exemplary altar boy and to highlight his angelic qualities. The boys would play their own peers, and would therefore get a clear example, moral instruction and certainly also amusement.

Another play drawing from John's childhood is *Vox clamantis Mariae amantis echo* (The Voice of the Caller as an Echo of the Loving Mary),²⁴ created as soon as 1724 by Joannes Tiller for the students of the *infima grammatices classis* of the college of Nové Město in Prague. The text does not contain an *argumentum* or a reference to a particular source. It draws from Balbinus' legend, however, in the motive of John being born to infertile parents after their prayers to the Virgin,²⁵ and also in its strong emphasis on reverence to Virgin Mary. The text is atypical in that it does not contain an *argumentum*, prologue, epilogue or chorus, although the play probably contained them original-

Cf. Balbinus (1682: 95–96): *Puer Joannes, ut primum fari per aetatem potuit, formulam Sacrificio divino ministrandi exacte perdidit, eaque in usum deducta, nullo postea impellente, quotidie cum prima Aurora ex oppido ad Cisterciense coenobium decurrere, omnibus ex ordine, quotquot Sacra facerent, Sacerdotibus ad aram servire consuetudinem sibi fecit [...].*

²² *Servulus, parvulus, praemiola, chartula, latrunculus, misellus.*

²³ E.g. collocations comprising parts of the body: *pedem inferre, pedem tenere, manu tenere, manum inferre, fesso pede, curta aure, ignato pedi, tardato pede* etc.

²⁴ NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 299v–308v.

²⁵ *Vox clamantis*, v. 50–55: *Adhuc enim / Nihilum fuisti, jam suo tibi adfuit / Virgo favore, dum piam ferens opem, / Sterili parentum te dedit nasci thoro / Et singulari gratia natum fovet / Fovitque semper.* Cf. Balbinus (1680: 669): *Parentes oppidani et mediae fortunae fuerunt, pietate magis quam genere et opibus illustres. Pietatis hoc indicium est, quod aetate jam senecta, cum prole omni carerent, precibus et votis fuis ad Dei Matrem [...] impetrarint filium.*

ly. Remarkable scenic notes scribbled on the margins of the text inform us about stage action and movement of actors, e.g. *Venit Rosilus* (Enter Rosilus) or *Eripit pignus* (Takes the gift). These are far from common in this genre. At the end of the manuscript below the text of the play is a crossed-out signature *M. Joannes Tiller*.

The main plot partly resembles the play we have discussed earlier. John gets a medallion with the likeness of Virgin Mary from his protector *Mariophilus* (admirer of Mary). John's peer *Rosilus* is envious of both the gift and *Mariophilus'* affection. *Rosilus*, supported by other boys, tries to think of a way to get the medallion for himself. After he steals it from John, they are confronted by a band of robbers in the woods and lose it. One of the robbers, however, regrets the deed and hangs the medallion on the branch of a tree, where it is subsequently discovered by John. The culprit confesses and repents, which allows the play to end in conciliation and universal celebration of Virgin Mary. Here as well, John shows unshakeable faith and ardent religiosity, and his deep affection for Virgin Mary is emphasized. In opposition to the specific setting of the other play, this one is set in an indefinable landscape, where nature idyll blends with worship of Mary; the author follows the traditional symbolic pattern when he mentions various flowers to underscore, with their beauty, the beauty of the Virgin.²⁶ The natural motive is also implied in the speaking names of the boys – *Rosilus*, *Narcissulus*, *Florilus* (derived from “rose”, “narcissus”, “flora”), or characters such as *Genius florum*, *Faunullus* and so forth.

In comparison to the previous work, *Vox clamantis* is shorter and more modest in terms of characters and action. Dynamic scenes alternate with lyrical sequences, where nature descriptions prevail; the language of these poetic sections is metaphoric and figurative.²⁷ To express their love for the Virgin, the characters use the language of the love poems of the time;²⁸ their relationship to Mary is often referred to as *gratia* (usually in the sense of “grace, kindness, affection”, but also “thanks”, “gracefulness” and “forgiveness”).²⁹ Deep devotion to the Virgin shown by not only John but also his adversaries was intended to set the example to the little protagonists. The foes in *Angelus ad aras* are driven mainly by greed and hatred towards John. In *Vox clamantis*, other boys envy John the affection he receives; only at the end do they understand that envy needs to be replaced by shared affection towards the Virgin, which leads to more Marian celebrations. That is also the main educative goal Tiller intended for his play.

²⁶ *Vox clamantis*, v. 154–161: *Semper suo / Candore pulchram Virginem casto albicans / Narcissus ornet. Cedat pulchrum decus tulipae venustas / Tuque, praecelsa nitens submissione viola, Virgineis caput / Substerne plantis! Caeteri, qvotqvot tulit / Faecunda tellus flosculos, qvotqvot feret, / Florete et almae Numinis Matri inclytos / Cedite in honores!*

²⁷ *Vox clamantis*, v. 143–149: *Floridos inter sinus / Florens perenna! Spiret hic sibi leves / Favonius auras et vagus frondem increpet / Teneroque lusu gramini illudat, fragrans / Florum venustas distrahat oculos, odor / Nares amaene mulceat, amusas manus / Flos purpurascens basiet et ornet caput.*

²⁸ *Vox clamantis*, v. 12–15: *Mellita svaves basia infigunt tuis / Charites labellis, purpurascens rosae / Rubea venustas, lilii candens nitor / Pulchre decoras pulchrius pingunt genas*; v. 163–168: *Dulcis Maria! Flosculos qvot fert humus, / Tot ex amanti corcula effundat sinu! / Caelo qvot ardent stellulae, Virgo, Tui / Tot sint amoris linqvulae! Qvotqvot mare / Vastum recenset guttulas, tot sint, Tuo / Praestet decori gemmulas!*

²⁹ More on the concept of *gratia* in Bobková-Valentová, Bočková, Bažil (2011: 252, 257). The notion of *gratia* at the same time alludes to the original meaning of the name John (“God is gracious” or “Gracious gift of God”) – see more in Bobková-Valentová, Bočková, Jacková (in print: Introduction to *Vox clamantis*). Another allusion to John's name is the very title *Vox clamantis*, in which the Baroque symbolism aligns John of Nepomuk with John the Baptist.

A plot of *Gratia indeptae rea gratiae* (Grace Indebted to Grace Received)³⁰ also draws from John's childhood. It was written by Joannes Tiller one year after *Vox clamantis* (1725) for the middle grammar class (*media classis grammatices*) of the Clementinum college in Prague. The text has only been preserved in the form of a synopsis; according to the *argumentum* it draws from Balbinus' remark that John recovered from a serious illness after his parents dedicated him to Virgin Mary who was revered in the Nepomuk area.³¹ This incident triggers the plot of the play: John, grateful to his kind Protectress, takes a pilgrimage to the altar of the Virgin to dedicate his life to her and present her with his likeness to express his thanks. Similarly to his previous play, Tiller uses the name *Mariophilus* and a related flower name *Florinus*. The boys wish to prepare a smooth way for John's pilgrimage, free of obstacles and sprinkled with flowers; however, he considers the easy path errant and takes the thorny way right into the forest, where he is attacked by a robbers' band. John seeks asylum in a cave, where he decorates Mary's portrait with flowers and hangs his likeness, asking for protection. *Florinus* finds John's portrait in the cave, considers him dead and writes an epitaph for him. The plot gets more complicated when John finds his own grave. At the end, after many peripeties, all meet at the Virgin's altar and extol Mary together.

There are obvious parallels in the plots of both Tiller's plays, be it the nature descriptions, the motive of the portrait, the robbers or the character of *Mariophilus*. In the second play, however, John's adversaries are not his peers: he has to overcome the difficulties of a journey,³² which can foreshadow his future hardships that will eventually lead to a martyred death. The character of John's father is introduced, grieving over the loss of his son but at the same time hoping that the Virgin will protect him. The chief common motive of the plays is the concept of *gratia*, which symbolises – given the etymology of his name – John himself,³³ but also the grace of God that cured him, and also the Virgin, Mother of Grace (*Mater Gratiarum*). In the non-narrative parts, a personified character of *Gratia* appears on stage. In this play, too, students should imitate John's deep devotion to Mary, his piety, bravery and courage to take the complicated path – and, last but not least, the friendship between the boys that set out to find John. Unfortunately, the specifics of the stage production cannot be derived from the text of the synopsis.

The common features of the plays in the first category are a simple fictional plot, where narrative passages surpass the lyrical descriptions and there are next to none allegorical characters. Language and stylistics are to some extent adapted for the students of lower grades. The protagonists are close to the pupils both in age and behaviour, which makes it easy to identify with them and learn from the story, thus fulfilling the primary didactic purpose of these plays.

³⁰ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 58.

³¹ *Gratia indeptae rea gratiae*, argumentum: *In primo aetatis vere deflorescentem invaletudine Joannem pii parentes Beatissimae Virgini ad Nepomucum beneficiis florentissimae devoverunt. Votum secundavit eventus, ex quo Joannes Sospitatri Clementissimae gratum se stitit peregrinus. Ex vita S. Joan. Nep. argumento accessit poësis.* Cf. Balbinus (1680: 669): *Nam cum puellus Joannes in gravissimum incidisset morbum, voto ad ejusdem Divae Virginis simulacrum a parentibus edito et promissis in aetatem reliquam pro filio obsequiis, protinus surrexit incolumis.*

³² The motive of *bivium*, in which the comfortable path leads to abomination and the thorny path to salvation, is typical for numerous plays. Cf. Jacková (2011: 132–138).

³³ See note 29.

Type Two: John as a Young Man

The plays in this category build continuously on the preceding group. Their expected audience are slightly older boys (middle and highest grammar classes). Here, John appears as a student or a young teacher – still quite close in age to the actors. If the authors draw from the legendist tradition in the creation of their story, they almost always choose John's experience as a humanities student in Žatec. The drama takes place in a generic school (Jesuit college); a new element introduced in this category is the nobleman's court. Among the actors there would be students from higher social strata, for whom the Jesuit college was a step in preparation for their future career in politics or clergy. Together with the realistic characters of John, his classmates and noblemen, allegorical characters are also present in these plays.

An example of the above-mentioned type is a play by Joannes Rirenschopff *Divus Joannes Nepomucenus, tenera in aetate virtutis et scientiae illustris idea* (St. John of Nepomuk, Since his Youth Famous as an Example of Virtue and Scholarship),³⁴ written in 1734 for the students of middle grammar (*media classis grammatica*). The text does not contain an *argumentum*, prologue, epilogue or chorus. However, the contents of these parts of the drama have been preserved in the form of a printed synopsis in Latin.³⁵ The synopsis also contains a table of characters (*clavis personarum*), which, while incomplete, supplies Latin translation or character description to the names of the main characters (mostly Greek by origin), thus enhancing the spectators' understanding. The dramatist does not quote his source but the play could have been inspired by the mention of John's studies in Balbinus' legend, according to which the Saint showed immense diligence, talent and loquacity.³⁶

In this play, John of Nepomuk appears already as a student at the verge of adolescence. The plot displays allegorical elements (speaking names, an imaginary group of John's enemies, complex imagery of Hell), which overlap with realistic action of characters including John's classmates. Nevertheless, reflexive passages, prayers and monologues (including inner monologues) continuously prevail over narration; the performance is not based on dramatic action. Two sets of characters interact in the play: *Theolater* (referred to in the synopsis as *Religio*, Religious Reverence) and his aids *Eusebius* (who represents *Pietas*, Piety), *Philotheus* (*Amor Divinus*, Divine Love) and *Palladius* (*Genius Scientiae*, Science Personified) appear as defenders of piety, morality and education, which lead young people to prudent life. Their adversaries are *Philocosmus* (*Amor Mundi*, Worldly Love) and his courtiers *Eleutherius* (*Libertas*, Liberty), *Cosmogenes* and *Vanophilus* (who are not mentioned in the *clavis personarum* but their names show they are lovers of worldliness and vanity), who tempt young people to be idle and enjoy the pleasures of life.³⁷ With

³⁴ NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 86r–93v.

³⁵ NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 82r–82v.

³⁶ Balbinus (1682: 669): *Erat ei, cum dulci et rosea quadam ac pudibunda pietate, acre, vividum et igneum quoddam ingenium; cui ut parentes crescendi darent copiam, Zatecium ad celebres ea tempestate Latinitatis scholas miserunt. Hic prima Latinae grammaticae elementa ac reliquas annis sequentibus humaniores disciplinas egregio profectu et rara ingenii commendatione percepit.*

³⁷ Jacková (2011: 106–107) classifies similar dramatic works as constructed on the *psychomachia* principle. See also Szarota (1979: 45–47), who uses the term *Dramen mit Konfliktstrukturen*.

manifold decoys they try to win John, who unwaveringly resists and returns to school. Here, the play climaxes in a competition where John triumphs over his classmates in both virtue and erudition and becomes a credit to the whole school.

John of Nepomuk is introduced here as a role model for youth, an example to be followed in every respect, as the second part of the play's title suggests (*idea imitationi studiosae juventuti propositus* – the example of virtue and scholarship, presented to youth to be imitated ardently). The main emphasis is not only on John's fervent faith, a common trait of all Nepomucene drama, but here specifically on discipline and diligence in one's studies and on the value of education as such. Much more than in other comparable plays, the text employs mythological imagery and similes or images from antiquity.³⁸ It would almost seem that the teacher meant to use the play as a supporting didactic devise for the revision of subjects discussed in class, and also to revive both common and less frequent motives taken from ancient mythology.³⁹

In Tiller's third play, written in 1726, an older character of the Saint is introduced – by now he has become a spiritual teacher and advisor. The text was written for the *syntaxis* (highest grammar class) of Prague Clementinum college and bears the title *Nobilissima sapientis lectio Vanitas vanitatum* (The Most Noble Lesson from a Wise Person: Vanity of Vanities).⁴⁰ The text has only survived in the form of a synopsis. Judging by the *argumentum*, the plot draws from an anecdote mentioned in the canonization protocols, but there is no evident direct connection to a particular part of the Nepomucene legend.

The allegorical characters of Vanity (*Vanitas*), Virtue (*Virtus*) and Youth (*Adolescentia*) appear in the prologue and chorus but they have no bearing on the dramatic action. At the court of noble youth Adolphus, his advisor *Philocosmus* shows him merry life in pleasure and mundane vanity. John, as a dextrous teacher of holy life (*vitae sanctioris magister dexterrimus*), tries to find a way to save Adolphus. When Adolphus and his courtiers go hunting, they meet John, who shows them the vanity of their deeds on the example of a beautiful apple ridden with worms (among others). He persuades the young nobleman to prefer heavenly immortality to the shortcuts of vanity. Step by step, he unmasks the volatility of life and worldly fame and manages to convert Adolphus to accept the rules of holy life. John thus vanquishes *Philocosmus*, makes him leave Adolphus' court and stays with the young man as his counsellor.

Tiller's play is again mostly set in the natural environment of a forest, which is seen as an opposition to Adolphus' court. Once more, the author employs names with floral associations (*Florillus*, *Narcissus*) and allegorical characters such as *Pomona* etc. Similarly to the above-discussed play by Rirenschopf, the chief villain is a lover of the world and tempter *Philocosmus*; this time, however, he is not fighting for John's soul but battles

³⁸ Cf. e.g. the series of allusions to wealth and luxury (Croesus, Midas, the treasures of Argolia, abundance on the Erythrean shore, the palace of Nero, the gardens of Lucullus) or examples of faithful friendships from ancient mythology and literature (Achates and Aeneas, Pylades and Orestes, Nisus and Euryalus); also the imagery of the underworld and infernal torture, and so forth.

³⁹ See *Divus Joannes Nepomucenus*, v. 53–57: *Inimica votis nubila recedunt procul, / Propinat ubi Fortuna Craeseas opes / Cornuque fundit divite Argolicas suis / Profusa gazas, ubi quid aut Arabs legit / Erythraeum ad aeqvor, in sinum large influit*; v. 128–130: *Aeneam Achates citius et Orestem prius / Pylades relinqvet, Nysus Euryalum prius, / Qvam vos amatos deseram comites mihi*.

⁴⁰ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 65.

with John over the soul of young Adolphus. In this story, John is no longer a peer of the students who would perform the play, but rather an ideal image of their teacher,⁴¹ who shows them the way, protects them from the traps of sinful life and leads them to proper piety and faith. On the other hand, the actors could relate to the young and noble Adolphus, who is able to overcome the temptations of *Philocosmus* and find his way back to rightful life under John's guidance.

The second category of Nepomucene school plays presents more thoughtfully wrought and more serious storylines; both examples are based on the principle of *psychomachia*. In comparison to the first type, more non-narrative elements are employed (monologues, prayers, inner thoughts); the plays contain an allegorical level and their symbolism becomes more complicated. The main goal of the teachers was to introduce to their students the clash of contradictory sets of values, to stress the vanity and transience of the world in contrast to spiritual life and to show the right way, marked by the effort to be virtuous and by desire for wisdom and education.

Type Three: John as Priest and Martyr

The third category of plays follows the legendist frame of the Nepomucene story most closely and puts most stress on the firm character of the protagonist as the principal cause of his glorious martyred death. The historical topic enables the author to build a dramatic plot full of twists with a rapid sequence of events that would be compelling for the audience. The plays are composed for the students of middle and highest grammar but surprisingly seem simpler in terms of structure and narrative than the preceding category. The setting is determined by the topic – the action takes place at the royal court for the most part, and apart from the protagonists (John, King Wenceslas and Queen Johanna) an important role is attributed to the courtiers and their intrigue. This feature is once again aimed at the noblemen among the students and is supposed to show the traps typical for the life of the aristocratic families.

A dramatic work that treats the life of John of Nepomuk as a chronological sequence of events without employing complicated allegories is *Divus Joannes Nepomucenus patiendo Martyr gloriosissimus* (St. John of Nepomuk, through his Suffering the Most Glorious Martyr).⁴² Composed in 1729 by Joannes Winkler for middle grammar students in Uherské Hradiště, it alludes directly to Balbinus' legend in the *argumentum*.⁴³ John of

⁴¹ Nevertheless, the teachers of lower college grades were at the verge of adolescence themselves and could still be looking for the right way in life (in the grammar classes, the teachers would be graduates of the three-year course in philosophy; they taught grammar classes before entering theological faculty). Cf. Bobková-Valentová (2006: 62–63).

⁴² NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-446, box 175, f. 56r–66v.

⁴³ *Divus Joannes Martyr, argumentum: Veritatis fideique integerrimus cultor D. Joannes Nepomucenus subinde ab Joanna (Pietatem substituimus) conscientiae electus arbiter; dum sacrosanctum confessionis sigillum Wenceslao perurgente violare renuit, ad hoc violandum prius fortunae bonis, minis, tandem et catastis sollicitus. Neque illis corruptus, nec istis etiam deterritus, manibus pedibusque victus, ex ponte Prageno in subjectum flumen Moldavae dejicitur. Cont. Bolan., 16. Maji, T. 3. Cf. Balbinus (1682: 670): Regina, Wenceslai quotidianis sceleribus offensa, cum nullum amplius ex rebus humanis solatium caperet neque per mariti suspiciosos oculos capere posset, crudelitatem ejus perhorrescens (maxime quod etiam mensam dapesque regias, caedibus procerum et sanguine respergere pro deliciis et bellariis*

Nepomuk, the confessor of Queen Johanna, refuses to share her confession with her husband King Wenceslas. The King summons him to a feast, tries to persuade John with flattery, promises, money, and in the end – threats and torture. John does not waver, choosing a martyr death instead. At night he is thrown from the Prague Bridge and drowned. The play ends in a lamentation over John's death and the fate of the Czech lands, and holds John as an example to the whole world – for even if he could save his life he preferred death to a life stained by sin.

The play's structure alternates lively dialogue between Queen Johanna, King Wenceslas and the courtiers with lengthy monologues of the protagonists, which sometimes stretch to the length of the entire scene. Comic relief is provided by the characters of the cooks preparing a feast. A fairly unusual element is the incorporation of the Queen into the drama, as Jesuit school plays – for obvious reasons – would normally not employ female characters.⁴⁴ Here, however, the author substitutes the Queen by allegorical *Pietas* (Piety), as implied in the *argumentum* (*Pietatem substituimus*). There are no other allegorical characters in the play; the dramatization merely adapts the narrative of the Nepomucene legend. The author often quotes or paraphrases Balbinus' text – both in the prosaic summaries of individual scenes and in the versed text of the play.⁴⁵ In contrast to Balbinus, the playwright more accentuates King Wenceslas as a cruel and ruthless tyrant – a probable reference to Seneca's tyrants with their characteristic untamed passions.⁴⁶ As a result, the students had an opportunity to recall a highly fashionable Nepomucene story (the play being staged only two days after Nepomuk's canonization⁴⁷), but also – unwittingly – to absorb ancient dramatic tradition, commonly used by Jesuit school drama.

An identical plot transferred into an allegorical plane can be found in the printed synopsis of *Gloriosus Divi Joannis Nepomuceni pro sigillo poenitentiae agon* (The Famous Fight of St. John of Nepomuk for the Seal of Confession).⁴⁸ The remarkable similarity of both plays is not surprising, given that the latter was written for the highest grammar students (referred to as *suprema classis* in the text) of the Klatovy college by the same author, Joannes Winkler. The historical characters are replaced by personified character qualities – Queen Johanna transformed into *Pietas* (Piety), King Wenceslas into *Desidia* (Laziness), John of Nepomuk into *Sanctitas* (Holiness). Piety, disgusted by crowned Laziness, finds consolation in heavenly guidance and the saintly judge of conscience, Holiness. Sinful Curiosity (*Curiositas*) urges Laziness to find out what Piety said in her confession and invites Holiness to the royal court. When Laziness cannot bring Holiness

habebat), quod tutissimum videbatur, omnem mundi amorem abjicere unique se Deo totam (quantum vita conjugalis sineret) donare constituit.

⁴⁴ Jacková (2011: 48).

⁴⁵ See *Divus Joannes Martyr*, the opening of Scene 12: *D. Joannes sacramentum Regi prodere indignum ratus, temptis ultimate minis terroribusque regiis, tandem toto animo sacrilegium aversatur*. Cf. Balbinus (1682: 672): *B. Joannes, indignum ratus ea de re toties obtundi, non verbis, sed toto capite et severo vultu sacrilegium aversatus est*. For the versed parts, see e.g. *Divus Joannes Martyr*, v. 470: *Mysta, moriendum tibi est*; cf. Balbinus (1682: 672): *Audi, inquit, Sacerdos, moriendum tibi est [...]*.

⁴⁶ The word *furor* is frequently repeated in the text – see e.g. *Divus Joannes Martyr*, v. 105–106: *Furor ne Regem traxit in rabiem, scelus / Qvod cumulet effrons scelere?*; v. 162–163: *Regis furorem exasperas, isthoc nisi / Pandas secretum*; v. 165: *Urgebit autem Caesaris posthac furor*. For the notion of wrath in Seneca's tragedies as a model for Jesuit playwrights, see Pauerová (2014).

⁴⁷ Zemek (2001: 140).

⁴⁸ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 59.

to talk, he decides to bury it in the waves; in the water element, Holiness acquires the laurel crown of victory.

The moral of both plays is identical: John of Nepomuk unshakably defends the Seal of Confession, even for the price of torture and death. The plots are analogous; in *Gloriosus agon*, however, Winkler elaborates on the courtiers' roles and completes the plot with an excursus on the Saint's pilgrimage to Stará Boleslav,⁴⁹ thus emphasising his reverence to Virgin Mary. It cannot be deduced from the synopsis whether this is an identical historical extract whose protagonists merely wear the allegorical cloaks this time, or whether the author used allegory and symbolism more pronouncedly (as the dedication to older students would suggest).

Judging from a preserved synopsis, the play *Divus Joannes Nepomucenus laurea Martyr gloriose coronatus* (Saint John of Nepomuk, the Martyr Gloriously Crowned with Laurel),⁵⁰ written for the rhetoric class of the college of Malá Strana in Prague by Antonius Sindt as late as 1748, puts even more stress on courtly intrigue. Here, the courtiers instill in the King's mind a suspicion of the Queen's intended adultery. The well-known chain of events then leads to John's death.

Type Four: John as a Saint

This category of Nepomucene drama mostly contains allegorical plays. John is no longer the protagonist: he has been replaced by his own worshippers, who fight for the promotion of his cult or prepare the celebration of his canonization. The stories are set in various environments, commonly employ allegorical characters and personified qualities and the authors almost completely break away from the legend and give more space to their own creative fantasy. The main objective of these plays is to pay tribute to the Saint, fortify the reverence to him and show how his fame is spreading both at home and in the neighbouring countries.

By its division into two parts, historical and allegorical, the play by Bernardus Pannagl, *Divus Joannes Nepomucenus invictus Christi Martyr, in silentio secreti confessionis et in spe publicae canonizationis gloriosus* (St. John of Nepomuk, the Invincible Martyr of Christ, Glorious in his Silence Regarding the Seal of Confession and his Hope of the Public Canonization)⁵¹ stands between the third and fourth category. It was produced by the rhetoric class (*facultas oratoria*) of the Clementinum college in Prague as soon as 1701, making this the oldest preserved synopsis of a play on the Saint.⁵² A far more elaborate rendition of the story is offered than in the case of Winkler. Pannagl divides the plot into two parts: the first one, *Joannes in silentio* (John in Silence), depicts last

⁴⁹ Cf. Balbinus (1682: 672): *Paucis post diebus B. Joannes Boleslaviam ad antiquissimam totius Bohemiae Divinae Matris effigiem [...], quae eo loci religiosissime colitur, iter suscipit.*

⁵⁰ Křižovnická knihovna [Library of the Crusaders of the Red Star], sign. XVIII G 10, vol. 9, adl. 63.

⁵¹ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 11.

⁵² John of Nepomuk was referred to as "Saint" and "Blessed" long before his official beatification (1721) and canonization (1729). The longstanding reverence shown to the saint was in fact the basis of one of the articles in the canonization process. See also the titles of Balbinus' legend in printed (and thus censor-approved) works: *De Beato Joanne Nepomuceno* (Balbinus 1680); *Vita Sancti Joannis Nepomuceni* (Balbinus 1682).

days of John's life and his martyred death. The situation at the royal court incorporates the important element of scheming and sly courtiers trying to find their way into royal affection. The second part, *Joannes in spe* (John in Hope), shows *Impietas* (Impiety) and *Mendacium* (Falsehood) losing a battle with Heaven over John's memory. After the battle, *Fama* (Fame) and *Virtus* (Virtue) spread John's fame at home and abroad. The story, apart from showing John as a role model for priests and confessors, strives to emulate his cult and recommend him to Rome as a suitable candidate for canonization.

The play is declamative, constructed with shrewd argumentation and formed by disputes of individual characters. Apart from moral instruction, students would practise their rhetorical skills and dignified presentation on stage. Pannagl considered his text to be very good – so much so that he incorporated its revised version into his collection of exemplary school plays and declamations *Musa Panagaea*, which only came into print in 1729.⁵³ The exemplary printed version of the text is somewhat different from the original drama written for a single performance by a school class. Unfortunately, it is impossible to identify specific textual shifts, as the original version only survived in the form of a synopsis.

A similar composition can be found in the synopsis of *Pietas spectata per ignes et aquas* (Piety Tested by Fire and Water),⁵⁴ performed in 1729 by the highest grammar class in Opole. Its author, Joannes Braun, divided the story into two parts, one historical (*pars historica*) and the other allegorical (*pars idealis*). After a traditionally narrated plot in the first part there follows a parable on the rivers of Bohemia. These pass the news of John's martyred death to the Roman Tiber, whose task it is to spread John's fame throughout the world.

Vindex duliae Divus Joannes Nepomucenus (St. John of Nepomuk as an Advocate of the Veneration of Saints)⁵⁵ is an example of an entirely allegorical dramatic work. It was written for the syntax class of the Nové Město college in 1731 by the author of the above-mentioned play *Angelus ad aras*, Antonius Machek. This text, as well, is Machek's autograph – verified not only by the identical handwriting but also by textual affinities. For instance, four verses of the introductory monologue in the first scene are identical.⁵⁶ In both cases, the monologue is a buoyant, ardent prayer replete with poetic images; in the first play, however, this is a prayer of little John to God, while in the second play John's worshipper prays to John himself. Textual parallels between both texts continue.⁵⁷ *Vindex duliae* nevertheless represents a considerable content shift in comparison with *Angelus ad aras*. The allegorical story takes place after the Saint's death; its protagonist is one of

⁵³ Pannagl (1729: 9–79).

⁵⁴ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 114.

⁵⁵ NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 999, f. 585r–592v.

⁵⁶ Cf. *Angelus ad aras*, v. 50–54: *Vos aestuanter mentis accensae faces, / Ardete, jube caelici exurant fibras / Pectoris amores. Quaeque concessa est mihi / Animi facultas, omnis adamati Dei / Sit haec odoris victima cremanda ignibus;* and *Vindex duliae*, v. 1–5: *Vos aestuantes cordis accensi faces, / Ardete, jube dulici exurant fibras / Pectoris amores. Quaeque concessa est mihi / Animi facultas, cuncta Joannis sacro / Esto dicata cultui.*

⁵⁷ Cf. *Angelus ad aras*, v. 68–70: *Ah, quantum sacri / Amoris ardet ignibus pectus meum! / O, si daretur; and Vindex duliae*, v. 13–15: *O Nepomuci gloria, ah, quantum Tui / Amoris ardet ignibus pectus meum. / O, si daretur!; Angelus ad aras*, v. 509–510: *Tace, ne tu mihi impingas scelus. / Dudum probatum; and Vindex duliae*, v. 181–182: *Ignoro scelus. / Dudum probatum.*

John's worshippers (*Joanneus cultor*), who strives to promote the cult of the Saint. Again, there are two opposing camps: *Haeresis* (Heresy) and *Iconoclasta* (Iconoclast) refuse the worship of John as idolatry, arguing that reverence only pertains to God. Their arguments are refuted by *Religio* (Religion) and *Dulius* (Worshipper of Saints), who point out that adoration of saints does not necessarily diminish veneration of God. They are supported by additional allegorical characters (*Bohemia, Hesperia, Ungaria, Germania*), who represent countries where the Nepomucene cult was spreading at the time. Two characters, *Androdilus* and *Scrupulosus latriae zelotes* (Scrupulous Worshipper of God) undergo a conversion. Initially, they take Heresy's side – the name of the latter underscores the dogmatic conviction that real faith means exclusively worship of God. *Androdilus* starts to doubt this and is incarcerated for his doubts by Heresy. After a prayer to the Saint, he manages to escape. Later, *Scrupulosus* changes his mind as well, after veneration of the Saint helps to cure him from an illness.

The plot is more complicated than in *Angelus ad aras*, which was written for younger pupils. *Vindex duliae* is also more elaborate rhetorically and puts more emphasis on monologues. The play is modelled after a real case of the attempt to damage the tomb of John of Nepomuk. The incident happened during the so-called Calvinist cleansing of the cathedral in 1619, which was initiated by Abraham Scultetus, the pastor of Frederick I, King of Bohemia. Scultetus was probably the model for the main servant of Heresy (called *Minister* or *Pastor* in the play).⁵⁸ The attempt to damage the tomb and the punishment to the offenders forms a climax of the work and the moral instruction leading from it is strongly emphasised by the author already in the *argumentum*.⁵⁹ In the scene of the punishment of the blasphemers John himself appears in the drama, protects his grave and punishes the offenders by death or paralysis (*Vindex* in the title consequently meaning, apart from “advocate” or “defender”, also “vindicator”). John, however, does not appear on stage as a real or allegorical character; his role is one of an intercessor, advocate or defender. The play, with its argumentation in favour of the adoration of saints, was possibly a veiled polemic with non-Catholic Christianity. It was probably intended to lead the students to contemplate both physical and metaphysical meaning of the concept of sanctity.

A play that stands out from the corpus in terms of length, subject matter and purpose is *Mysterium a seculis tacitum, lingua incorrupta sacramentalis merces silentii* (A Mystery Kept Secret for Ages, Uncorrupted Language as a Reward for Keeping the Holy Silence of Confession).⁶⁰ It was created in 1732 by rhetoric teacher Antonius Jenisch. The work is rather exceptional genre-wise because it served as a representative performance of the entire college in Uherské Hradiště on the occasion of the festive opening of its new

⁵⁸ This notion is further expanded by uniting the character of Heresy with Calvinism and the Iconoclast with Frederick I – see more in Bobková-Valentová, Bočková, Jacková (in print: Introduction to *Vindex duliae*).

⁵⁹ See *Vindex duliae*, *argumentum*: *Deum in Sanctis honorari velle docet perenne prodigium illud, quo nemo inultus abijt, qui sanctitatem Beati Joannis Nepomuceni aliquo facto laedere vel sepulchrum violare praesumpserit. Ex Act. Canoniz. Cf. Acta utriusque processus (1722: 24): Perenne prae alijs recensetur prodigium illud, divinae sic elargiente bonitate, ut nemo inultus abeat, qui sanctitatem Beati Joannis Nepomuceni aliquo facto laedere vel sepulchrum violare praesumpserit.*

⁶⁰ NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-447, box 176, f. 54r–69v.

assembly hall, renewed after the damaging fire of the previous year. Two copies of a printed Latin synopsis have been preserved with the manuscript of the play.⁶¹

Personified arts and sciences (*Polyhistor*, *Philologus*, *Mythosophus* etc.) appear in the manifold story. Under the guidance of *Athenarchos* and *Thalia*, they prepare a festive opening of a new theatre. *Mythosophus* has to choose a patron for the new theatre and suggests *Harpocratus*, the god of silence. *Hagiophylactus* opposes: the theatre should not be dedicated to pagan idols. He lets *Philologus* make his choice; *Philologus*, under the guidance of *Eudoxus*, *Eusebius* and *Polyhistor*, picks none other than John of Nepomuk. Later, the artists arrange a magnificent decoration in the foyer of the theatre, dominated by the picture of the intact tongue of the Saint. Even *Mythosophus*, pagan at first, is converted in favour of the silent Saint and has John's statue erected by the sacred spring in front of the theatre. Comic relief is provided by the funny antics of a couple of servants, *Musellus* and *Fusculus*, whose scenes are a pleasant refreshment in the compact and manifold allegorical narrative.

The most significant motive of this drama is the tongue, which is perceived at once as the Saint's relic but also as the symbol of speech – as opposed to silence (especially the particular silence leading to the Saint's death). Another crucial motive is the defence of reputation or goodwill, which was attributed to the Saint.⁶² The play relates directly to the canonization celebration that took place in Prague, particularly the festive decoration in front of Prague's St. Vitus cathedral.⁶³ The fact that the play was intended to represent the college as a whole is demonstrated by higher standard of language and stylistics. As a capable rhetoric teacher, Jenisch uses a broad scope of forms of expression and rhetorical phrases. The significance of the play is both in the veneration of the Saint who is emulated as the patron of the new theatre but also in the association of piety and education, to which all didactic efforts of the Jesuit teachers were pointed.

From the corpus of plays analysed in this article, four more synopses belong in this category. In Joannes Pelletius' melodrama called *Unio sexaginta elegantiarum* (A Pearl of Thousand Beauties),⁶⁴ composed in 1725 for the rhetoric class of the Prague – Nové Město college, Bohemian lands are trying to get John (as a pearl of thousand beauties) fitted in the papal ring, i.e. canonized.

The canonization celebration itself is the topic of *Sacratior Gratiarum trias* (The Holiest Trinity of Graces),⁶⁵ written by Carol Walhoffen in 1729 for the middle grammar class of the Opole college. The main conflict here is between John's supporters (Innocence, Silence and Love) getting ready for his canonization, and his staunch opponents (Conflict, Envy, Libel and Pride). Both Vatican and Lateran appear as actual characters in the play and fight over the honour to host the canonization.

In the same year, Josephus Werner wrote for the joint classes of poetic and rhetoric in Opole a play entitled *Supremi honores sacerrimis exuviis Divi Joannis Nepomuceni*

⁶¹ NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-447, box 176, f. 52r–53v; NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 60.

⁶² For a detailed thematic analysis, see Bobková-Valentová, Bočková, Jacková (in print: Introduction to *Mysterium a seculis tacitum*).

⁶³ Especially the southern part of the decoration, *Tempus tacendi*, focused on silence and was dedicated to the reverence to the Saint's tongue. An image of the god of silence, *Harpocratus*, appeared at the sides of the upper part of the illusive architecture.

⁶⁴ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 40, adl. 32.

⁶⁵ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 78.

peracti (The Utmost Honours Paid to Holy Relics of St. John of Nepomuk).⁶⁶ Planets and celestial bodies appear in the allegorical plot; they are preparing the celebration of John's martyred death. Each planet decorates the Saint with a typical element (Jupiter brings lightning, Mars gives him a sword, Venus – here under the name of Aurora – provides the sky at dawn, Mercur confirms his good reputation, Saturn brings the golden age of John's admirers). The Sun provides rays to shine as a halo around the Saint's head and Luna reclines at his feet, which love Mary so strongly. Together they create a monument to the Nepomucene fame.

In the last play, written in 1730 for the lowest grammar class in the college of Prague – Nové Město, called *Pharos famae naufragantis Divus Joannes Nepomucenus* (Lighthouse of the Drowning Reputation, St. John of Nepomuk),⁶⁷ Antonius Machek created a character of John's love (*Joanneus affectus*). This character liberates the unjustly incarcerated Innocent Reputation (*Innocentiae fama*), defends it against Libel (*Calumnia*), Lie (*Mendacium*) and Envy (*Invidia*) – thus restoring both freedom and reputation to the Offender (*Reatus*).

The main purpose of this article was to introduce the complete manuscripts and a complementary choice of synopses to provide a better overview of the whole textual corpus of this type of plays (in the Bohemian province, 16 texts and synopses of Jesuit school plays on John of Nepomuk have been discovered so far). Even given that the preserved sample is arbitrary, it can be quantitatively assumed that the plays most commonly portrayed John of Nepomuk as a saint and recounted the spreading of his cult, posthumous tributes and heavenly glory (six plays in total). This is understandable, given that these were all written around the time of Nepomuk's canonization; it also brought the authors a larger creative freedom when dealing with the topic of their choice, whose treatment frequently remained in the allegorical plane. The most famous motive of the legendist story, i.e. the conflict of John as confessor with King Wenceslas, which is highly suitable for dramatic treatment, is the subject of three dramas in our corpus. Their most remarkable feature is the involvement of more characters, courtiers in particular, and their interaction with the protagonists (John, Wenceslas and Johanna). The evolution of a broad scope of courtly intrigue is not firmly based in the Nepomucene legendist tradition and brings a contemporary element to the texts. Two more plays complement the historical narrative with allegory, focusing on the Saint's posthumous glory. Five times in total the playwrights have chosen the story from John's childhood or youth – mostly in plays intended for younger pupils. The dramatization only slightly draws from the legend, as the Nepomucene tradition does not mention this time in the Saint's life in much detail. This enables the teachers to create a lively story in the settings familiar to the students. These playwrights concentrate both on peer interaction (both friendly and competitive), but also on the adult influence on the formation of a young person (with adults in the role of teachers, spiritual advisors but also villains who try to lead the boys astray).

⁶⁶ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 113.

⁶⁷ NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 82.

Conclusion

Our overview shows that while the Nepomucene plays draw from the same material (which they freely develop), they differ to some extent both in form and content, depending on the age and level of the students/actors. For the pupils of the lower grades the teachers strived to find a story that would be close to them, an anecdote based on action with little or none allegories and personifications. In the simple, uncomplicated narrative, John of Nepomuk is introduced as a little boy (a dedicated altar-boy or an ardent admirer of Virgin Mary), who sets an example worth following to the little actors. This type of plays is dynamic and action-based and often contains humorous or frivolous elements.

Older students would, with the help of a more serious treatment of the topic, master clever phrases and practice ornamental rhetorical expression. In a complex narrative with allegorical elements, John of Nepomuk is portrayed as a young man who favours virtue and diligent study, or as a teacher who leads young men from worldliness and vanity to the path of eternal salvation. In the traditional rendition of the legend, he becomes a priest who unwaveringly defends the Seal of Confession and even dies a martyred death for it. These more elaborate plays furthermore combine the historical and allegorical plane to describe the spreading of Nepomuk's posthumous glory.

For the students of higher grades the teachers would create elaborate allegorical dramatic pieces, which defended the cult of the Saint and showed the ways in which it was spread and developed. Apart from basic qualities such as piety, faith and virtue, they also stress wisdom and education. In those non-linear stories, full of personifications and symbols, actors needed to learn long Latin monologues by heart and to assume an elegant and dignified stage presence. The authors do not limit themselves to recounting of a story; a refined rhetorical form and manifold treatment gain prominence and use a broad scope of motives and various symbolic meanings.

This division, however, cannot be applied generally. Among the plays for the middle grammar classes, for instance, we find on one hand a rather complicated allegorical tale of John as a student, who resists worldly temptations and the decoys of *Philocosmus* (*Divus Joannes Nepomucenus, tenera in aetate virtutis et scientiae illustris idea*), as well as a simple chronological depiction of John's role as a confessor of Queen Johanna, free from allegorical implications (*Divus Joannes Nepomucenus patiendō Martyr gloriosissimus*). A complicated allegorical piece *Pharos famae naufragantis* fits the division drawn in this article even less. This play was in fact intended for the lowest grammatical class and is weaved around the motive of St. John of Nepomuk as a defender of reputation. Its specifics, however, are difficult to reconstruct from the synopsis.

In most cases, the teachers tried to adapt the topic and the stage production to the age and language abilities of their wards. The dramatic works were not only didactic in that they developed the stage skills of the students but also supported their moral and religious instruction. In spite of the fact that writing these plays was one of the teachers' duties, they displayed considerable creativity in adapting the subject matter to the varying age of the students. Both in terms of language and content, the authors successfully accentuated the elements that could apply to their pupils and the skills they wanted them to develop.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations of archives

ARSI = Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu

NA ČR = Národní archiv České republiky [Czech National Archives]

NK ČR = Národní knihovna České republiky [Czech National Library]

JS = Jesuitica fund

SM = Stará manipulace [Old Manipulation] fund

Manuscript sources

Angelus ad aras Divus Joannes Nepomucenus. Pro theatro exhibitus a rudimentistis Neopragensibus 1729, 27.

Maji. NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 330r–337v.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus patiendo Martyr gloriosissimus. A media classe grammatices Hradistii cothurnum induta pro scena exhibitus anno 1729, die 21. Martii. NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-446, box 175, f. 56r–66v.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus tenera in aetate virtutis et scientiae illustris idea, imitationi studiosae juventuti propositus. Agente pro theatro academica mediae classis grammaticae juventute Pragae ad S. Ignatium anno 1734. NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 86r–93v.

Mysterium a seculis tacitum, lingua incorrupta sacramentalis merces silentii. Anno 1732. NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-447, box 176, f. 54r–69v.

Professi quatuor votorum. ARSI, sign. Germ. 45, f. 304r, 305r.

Vindex dulciae Divus Joannes Nepomucenus. Pro theatro exhibitus ab academica syntaxi Neo-Pragae 1731, 21.

Maji. NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 999, f. 585r–592v.

Vox clamantis, Mariae amantis echo sive Sanetus Joannes Nepomucenus, qvondam dilectus a Matre pulchrae dilectionis, eidem tenerrima dilectione correspondens. Hodie in theatro propositus ab infima grammatices classe Neo-Pragae 1724. NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 299v–308v.

Printed sources

Acta utriusque processus = Acta utriusque processus in causa canonisationis Beati Joannis Nepomuceni Martyris super fama sanctitatis, virtutum et miraculorum, uti et super casu excepto seu cultu publico, huic Beato ab immemorabili tempore ante bullam Urbani VIII. Pontif. Max. exhibito, Pragae constructa, Romae examinata et secuta beatificatione approbata. Viennae ¹1721. Viennae ²1722. Veronae ³1725.

Angelus ad aras Divus Joannes Nepomucenus. Pro theatro exhibitus a rudimentistis Neopragensibus anno 1729. *Anjel při oltáři Svatý Jan Nepomucký*. Na lešení školním představený od mladeže první školy v Praze u sv. Ignatia léta 1729 [Angel at the Altar, St. John of Nepomuk. Performed on the School Stage by the Students of the First School at St. Ignatius in Prague, 1729 AD]. NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 329r–329v.

BALBINUS, B., 1680. De Beato Joanne Nepomuceno, ecclesiae metropol. Pragensis S. Viti Canonico, Presb., Martyre Pragae et Nepomuci in Bohemia. In: G. Henschenius, D. Papebrochius (eds.), *Acta Sanctorum*. Tom. III. Maji. Die XVI. Antverpiae, 667–680.

BALBINUS, B., 1682. § LIX. Vita Sancti Joannis Nepomuceni. In: B. Balbinus, *Miscellanea historica Regni Bohemiae decadis I., liber IV. hagiographicus seu Bohemia Sancta*. Pragae, 94–113.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus invictus Christi Martyr, in silentio secreti confessionis et in spe publicae canonizationis gloriosus. Actione theatri honoratus ab Illustrissima, Perillustri, Nobili ac Ingenua juventute facultatis oratoriae in collegio academico Soc. Jesu Pragae ad S. Clementem anno 1701, mense Majo. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 11.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus tenera in aetate virtutis et scientiae illustris idea, imitationi studiosae juventuti propositus. Agente pro theatro Perillustri, Nobili, Ingenua et academica mediae classis grammaticae juventute Pragae ad S. Ignatium anno 1734, mense ..., die ... NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 82r–v.

Divus Joannes Nepomucenus virescente inter undas laurea Martyr gloriose coronatus. Dramate exhibitus a rhetorica Micropragena 1748. Křižovnická knihovna [Library of the Crusaders of the Red Star], sign. XVIII G 10, vol. 9, adl. 63.

- Gloriosus Divi Joannis Nepomuceni pro sigillo poenitentiae agon, venerationi Sancti Protomartyris scenice adumbratus.* Anno ab apothoeisI DeCvrsqVe soLennIVM eIVs IVbILo, agente pro theatro Perillustri, Nobili ac Ingenua supremae classis juventute Glattoviae, die ..., mense Majo. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 59.
- Gratia indeptae rea gratiae ad tribunal Matris Gratiarum votivo absoluta, debito in Sancto Joanne Nepomuceno quondam recuperatae sospitatis ergo ad beneficas Mariae aras ex voto peregrino.* Hodie in theatrum assumpto ab Illustrissima, Perillustri, Praenobili, Nobili ac Ingenua mediae classis grammatices juventute Praeae ad S. Clementem anno 1725, mense Majo, die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 58.
- Mysterium a seculis tacitum, lingua incorrupta sacramentalis merces silentii. Revelatum in magni confessionis sigilli Protomartyre Sancto Joanne Nepomuceno celebratum comica panegyri anno a DIVI passlone sUpra treCentos qVInqVagessImo, saCrae Vero apotheosIs tertIo.* Quo Musis Hradistiensibus e veteri in novam digressis scenam magno huic sacramentalis consilii et iudicii Angelo eadem vocali cordis et oris lingua dicabat, dedicabat, devovebat ligata et obligata universae gymnadis eloquentia. NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-447 box 176, f. 52r–53v.; NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 60.
- Nobilissima sapientis lectio Vanitas vanitatum, ex libro aeternae veritatis desumpta et pro fundameto Coelestis in terra occupationis Adolpho, illustri stirpis avitae surculo, per Sacratorem Magistrum Joannem Nepomucenum quondam recitata.* Hodie in theatro repetita agente Celsissima, Illustrissima, Perillustri, Praenobili, Nobili et Ingenua syntaxi Pragenae ad S. Clementem anno 1726, mense ..., die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 65.
- PANNAGL, B., 1729. *Musa Panagaea, diversa cum thematum, tum carminum genera pererrans, poëticen docentibus in subsidium, discentibus in prolium proposita.* Praeae.
- Pharos famae naufragantis Divus Joannes Nepomucenus.* Pro theatro exhibitus ab infima classe grammaticae Neo-Praeae anno 1730, mense ..., die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 82.
- Pietas spectata per ignes et aquas, historico-ideali dramate honorI et VenerationI DIVI Ioannis NepoMVCenI affeCtVose proposIta* a Perillustri, Praenobili ac Ingenua supremae grammatices classe Oppolii, mense Junio, die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 114.
- Sacratior Gratiarum trias sive Santus Joannes Nepomucenus in basilica Lateranensi D. Joanni Baptistae et Evangelistae sacra gratioso litigio Sanctorum fastis adscriptus.* Scenice celebratus a Perillustri, Nobili, Praenobili ac Ingenua juventute mediae classis grammaticae Oppolii anno 1729, die ..., mense ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 78.
- Supremi honores sacerrimis exuviis Divi Joannis Nepomuceni ad festivas stellarum faces devoto planetarum studio peracti.* Oratoriae et poëticae facultatis opera in scenam dati Oppolii in gymnasio Societatis Jesu anno 1729. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 113.
- Unio sexaginta elegantiarum Paraquariam nactus Nepomuci, istum olim Wenceslaus Piger in Albim et Moldavam projecit, pia Bohemia in sacrarium Beati Viti coniecit, eundem subinde decurente anno jubilaee coronatus Bohemorum leo annulo Piscatoris inserendum in Urbe Romana proposuit.* Super Unione hoc melodrama offerendum patrio spectatori composuit et pro theatro exposuit academica rhetorica gymnasii Societatis Jesu Neo-Praeae 1725, mense Junio, die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 40, adl. 32.

Secondary sources

- BLOEMENDAL, J., NORLAND, H. B. (eds.), 2013. *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- BOBKOVÁ, K., BOČKOVÁ, A., 2004. Antonín Machek – Angelus ad aras D. Joannes Nepomucenus. Jezuitská školská hra k oslavě sv. Jana Nepomuckého [Antonín Machek – Angelus ad aras D. Joannes Nepomucenus. Jesuit School Play in Celebration of St. John of Nepomuk]. In: *Barokní Praha – Barokní Čechie 1620–1740. Sborník příspěvků z vědecké konference o fenoménu baroka v Čechách* [Baroque Prague – Baroque Bohemia 1620–1740. Proceedings from the Conference on the Baroque Phenomena in Bohemia]. Praha: Archiv hl. m. Prahy/Scriptorium, 955–974.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., 2006. *Každodenní život učitele a žáka jezuitského gymnázia* [Everyday Life of a Teacher and Student of a Jesuit Grammar School]. Praha: Karolinum.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., BOČKOVÁ, A., BAŽIL, M., 2011. Bodnutí laskavosti. Elegie na rozloučenou studenta klatovské rétoriky Tomáše Bodla [A Sting of Kindness. A Farewell Elegy of Tomáš Bodl, Rhetoric Student in Klatovy]. In: J. Förster, P. Kitzler, V. Petrbok, H. Svatošová (eds.), *Musarum socius jinak též Malý Slavospis ku cti Martina Svatoše* [Musarum Socius, or, Small Eulogy in Honour of Martin Svatoš]. Praha: Kabinet pro klasická studia, Filosofický ústav AV ČR, 231–266.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., BOČKOVÁ, A., JACKOVÁ, M. (eds.), in print. *Sv. Jan Nepomucký na jezuitských školních scénách* [St. John of Nepomuk on Jesuit School Stage].

- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., JACKOVÁ, M., 2010. Úvod do kapitoly: Jesuitské divadlo v Čechách. / Einleitung in das Kapitel: Jesuitentheater in Böhmen. In: Čemus 2010: 895–908.
- BOČKOVÁ, A., ZDICHYNEC, J., 2010. Der heilige Nepomuk auf der Jesuitenbühne – ein Editionsprojekt. In: Čemus 2010: 947–962.
- ČEMUS, P. et al. (ed.), 2010. *Bohemia Jesuitica 1556–2006*. Praha: Karolinum.
- ČORNEJOVÁ, I., 2002. *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo. Jezuité v Čechách* [Society of Jesus. Jesuits in Bohemia]. Praha: Hart.
- JACKOVÁ, M., 2011. *Divadlo jako škola ctnosti a zbožnosti. Jezuitské školské drama v Praze v první polovině 18. století* [Theatre as School of Virtue and Piety. Jesuit School Drama in the First Half of 18th Century]. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.
- KRAUS, A., 1918. *Husitství v literatuře, zejména německé*. II. *Husitství v literatuře barokní a osvícenské* [Hussites in Literature, Particularly in Germany. II. Hussites in Baroque and Enlightenment Literature]. Praha: Česká akademie.
- LUKÁCS, L. (ed.), 1986. *Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Jesu (1586, 1591, 1599)* [Monumenta paedagogica Societatis Jesu V.]. Romae: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu.
- MENČÍK, F., 1895. *Příspěvky k dějinám českého divadla* [Contributions to the History of Czech Theatre]. Praha: Česká akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění.
- PAUEROVÁ, E., 2014. Senekovo pojetí hněvu v díle jezuitského dramatika Karla Kolčavy [Seneca's Conception of Anger in the Work of Jesuit Playwright Karel Kolčava]. *Cornova* 4, 31–39.
- POLC, J. V., 1993. *Svatý Jan Nepomucký* [St. John of Nepomuk]. Praha: Zvon.
- PORT, J., 1968. Divadlo řádových škol a náboženských bratrstev [Theatre of Religious Educational Institutes and Religious Brotherhoods]. In: F. Černý (ed.), *Dějiny českého divadla I* [History of Czech Theatre I]. Praha: Academia, 167–196.
- RYNEŠ, V., 1972. *Svatý Jan Nepomucký*. II. *Úcta* [St. John of Nepomuk. II. Reverence]. Řím: Křesťanská akademie.
- SCHERL, A., 2010. Zur Geschichte der Erforschung des Jesuitentheaters in der böhmischen Ordensprovinz. In: Čemus 2010: 909–915.
- STEJSKAL, F. X., 1921–1922. *Svatý Jan Nepomucký, I–II* [St. John of Nepomuk, I–II]. Praha: Dědictví sv. J. Nepomuckého.
- SZAROTA, E. M., 1979. *Das Jesuitendrama im deutschen Sprachgebiet. Eine Periochen-Edition. Texte und Kommentare. Band 1. Vita humana und Transzendenz. Teil 2*. München: W. Fink.
- VLNAS, V., 2013. *Jan Nepomucký, česká legenda* [John of Nepomuk, the Czech Legend]. Praha: Paseka.
- ZEMEK, M., 2001. Dějiny jezuitské koleje v Uherském Hradišti [History of the Jesuit College in Uherské Hradiště]. In: *Kniha o Redutě* [Book of Reduta]. Uherské Hradiště: Ottobre 12, 5–238.

OD SANCTULUS K SACER

JEZUITSKÉ ŠKOLSKÉ HRY O JANU NEPOMUCKÉM Z ČESKÉ PROVINCE – NÁVRH TYPOLOGIE

Shrnutí

Studie se zabývá analýzou tematicky uceleného korpusu her o sv. Janu Nepomuckém, konkrétně latinskými texty pocházejícími z kolejí české provincie z 1. pol. 18. stol. Zkoumá způsob ztvárnění příběhu a hry rozděluje do čtyř typů podle pojetí hlavního hrdiny: Jan jako malý chlapec, Jan jako mladík, Jan jako kněz a mučedník, Jan jako světec.

Ačkoliv hry vycházejí ze stejné látky, kterou dále volně rozvádějí, alespoň rámcově se liší po stránce obsahové i jazykové podle studijní úrovně a věku herců. Jako didaktická součást výuky rozvíjely hry řečnické schopnosti studentů a podporovaly jejich mravní i náboženskou výchovu.

**SAINT FRANCIS XAVIER ON JESUIT SCHOOL STAGES
OF THE BOHEMIAN PROVINCE***

KATEŘINA BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, MAGDALÉNA JACKOVÁ
(Praha)

ABSTRACT

The study deals with Jesuit school dramas from Bohemian lands, whose protagonist is St. Francis Xavier. Four complete texts and thirteen plays preserved only in form of synopsis are analysed primarily from the point of view of most frequent motives, known also from biographies of Xavier and from fine arts.

The analysis shows that in Xaverian plays from the *Provincia Bohemia SJ* appear both the themes and motives well known from the surviving production of other lands, and the adaptations less usual or unsupported. The synopses and texts therefore prove that many Jesuits were able to deal with the frequently treated theme such as the life of Francis Xavier, handled almost always in an exclusively allegorical way, newly and originally.

Key words: St. Francis Xavier; Jesuit saints; Jesuit theatre; neolatin drama; school theatre; Bohemian lands; Nicolaus Avancini (1612–1686); Arnoldus Engel (1620–1690)

Jesuits school theatre in the Bohemian Province¹ had a number of common features with the production of the Society of Jesus schools in other provinces of the German assistance.² The theatre operation followed similar rules, the only language used on the stage was Latin, not national languages as we can see e.g. in Spain,³ the actors spoke mostly in verse. There were also common sources of themes treated in the forms of handbooks of preaching (M. Pexenfelder, L. Beyerlink),⁴ collections of legends (L. Surius and his adaptation by P. Ribadeniera)⁵ and historical syntheses (especially C. Baronio and his followers).⁶ Like in Bavaria or Rhineland, also on the stages of the Bohemian Province

* This paper was created with the financial support of the Czech Science Foundation (GA ČR), as a part of postdoctoral project no. P406/12/P823 and with the institutional support of the Institut of History AS CR (HÚ AV ČR) RVO: 67985963. The shorter Czech version of this paper was published in Štěpánek, P. (ed.), *Svatý František Xaverský a jezuitská kultura v českých zemích*. Olomouc 2014, s. 45–58.

¹ The Bohemian province was separated from the Austrian one in 1623. It included Jesuit institutions in Bohemia, Moravia and till 1755 even in Silesia.

² *Assistentia Germaniae* was one of the five assistancies of the Jesuit order and belonged until the mid-18th century the whole of Transalpine Europe from the Netherlands to Lithuania and also Mission province of Russia.

³ See e.g. Menéndez Peláez (1995).

⁴ Beyerlinck (1631); Pexenfelder (1747).

⁵ *Historiae Sanctorum* (1675); Ribadeneira (1630).

⁶ *Annales Ecclesiastici* (1623).

came alive a story of three Japanese brothers determined to devote themselves for their parents, there flared a faithful friendship of Asmund and Asvic or quarrelled love and justice in the heart of prince Lideric.⁷ Playwrights used identical forms based on the same theoretical basis. Printers typeset indistinguishable, often bilingual programmes called synopses or periochas. From the researcher's point of view another common feature is the fact that majority of the production is irretrievably lost and the known part is supported mainly by the mentioned synopses, not by complete texts.⁸

Besides, the development of school theatre in our lands had some specific traits. From the point of view of applying theatre in the school operation and also the possible extent of its influence on participants, the most important thing was an annual performance made by each class in the grammar school. This practice, which was also applied by Austrian Province, was asserting itself in Bohemian lands already from the 1670s on and at the turn of the century can be documented and regarded as established even in small schools.⁹ Survival of a rather big number of plays destined to individual classes is thus extremely important for monitoring this phenomenon. With respect to the topics it seems that some of them spread in Bohemian Province with some delay and it made them last there longer. Following this tendency is, however, determined by preserved material and can therefore be defined only as hypothetical.¹⁰

The corpus of survived textual materials covering mainly the period between 1650 and 1760 contains about 2500 so far known synopses and almost 300 mainly handwritten texts. While the synopses document at least fragmentarily events in the whole province, the collection of texts covers production of only one school over a short course of time (Klodsco, Prague – Nové Město, Český Krumlov, Uherské Hradiště, Olomouc)¹¹ or the work of one author (Arnoldus Engel, Carolus Kolczawa, Bernardus Pannagl, Wenceslaus Lachatsch).¹² As for the time point of view, the synopses, texts and other reports best document the situation between 1726 and 1740. Thanks only to this period can we make conclusions on the shape of the Jesuit school repertoire more relevant.¹³

In the given corpus we find more than fifty plays concerning a particular member of the Society of Jesus, when majority of them was written to glorify the saints of the religious order. One play deals with Petrus Faber (*Impressus scientiae degustatae Amor*)¹⁴ and as very remarkable can be considered a staging of a play about Augustinus Strobach,

⁷ Bobková-Valentová (2010a: 931–934).

⁸ Szarota (1979–1987).

⁹ Bobková-Valentová, Jacková (2010).

¹⁰ Jacková (2011a).

¹¹ For an overview of plays from Český Krumlov see Jordan (1916). For more information about plays from the college in Prague – Nové Město and Uherské Hradiště, see Jacková (2011), Zemek (2001: 116–155) and Bobková-Valentová (2006).

¹² For more information about Kolczawa, see Ryba (1926) or *Theater in Böhmen* (2013: 328–329 [s.v. Karl Kolczawa by M. Jacková]); for Engel, see Jacková (2006; 2011b), *Theater in Böhmen* (2013: 6–8 [s.v. Arnoldus Angelus by M. Jacková]); for Pannagl, see Svatoš (2004); for Lachatsch, see Jacková (2012).

¹³ Overviews of preserved synopses for Prague Jesuit houses and their analyses: Bobková-Valentová (2003), Jacková (2011a: 223–253).

¹⁴ *Impressus scientiae degustatae Amor*, in Petro Fabro insolitus ad palaestram ingenii magnetismus, ferream patris in adverso proposito mentem respuens, luci theatriali propositus a media classe grammatices collegii S[ocietatis] J[esu] Hradiští Anno M. DCC.XXXIX. Mense Junio, Die ... NA ČR JS, sign. IIIo-447, box 176/1, f. 643r/v (synopsis), 644r–654v (full text).

a missionary and martyr from Bohemian Province, presented by the students of highest grammar class in his native town of Jihlava in 1731 (*Fructus missionis apostolicae*).¹⁵

If we look at the given plays only from the statistical point of view, we find out that Saint Francis Xavier was the most frequent guest on school stages from the rank of Jesuit saints. He remained, however, such a star, only till the end of the 70s in the 17th century when the students performed to his tribute at least 11 plays. In the 18th century the theme of Xavier apparently recedes – we have only five documented plays.¹⁶ Similar tendencies can be observed also with the plays of Saint Ignatius, as we have only two documented dramas that celebrate the founder of the Society of Jesus, both from the 18th century.¹⁷ The reason for this retreat was replacement by other Jesuit saints mostly connected with their canonization. In connection with canonisation of Francis Borgia we do not notice any significant breakthrough: from canonization year 1671 we know a play of a gymnasium in Brno and from year 1677 we know a performance of rhetoric class from Olomouc. Another play on Francis Borgia is not verifiably staged till spring in 1732 in Prague – Nové Město.¹⁸ Canonization of Saint Aloysius Gonzaga and Stanislaus Kostka in 1727, however, caused a staging explosion. Solely in the year of canonization there were, apart from four canonisation celebrations, which school youth also participated in, three so far known plays on Aloysius and two on Stanislaus.¹⁹ Although the aspect of

¹⁵ *Fructus missionis apostolicae*, pretiosa mors Venerabilis Patris Augustini Strobach e Societate Jesu, in Marianis insulis missionarii a barbaris in odium fidei christianae trucidati, a suprema classe grammatices in gymnasio Soc[ietatis] Jesu Iglaviae exhibitus anno 1731. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 87 (synopsis).

¹⁶ For an overview of plays on Saint Francis Xavier see the appendix.

¹⁷ *Tres modi humilitatis, consummatae virtutis compendium a magno Asceseos magistro Divo Ignati de Loyola, Societatis Jesu fundatore, orbi ad admirationem, religiosae animae ad imitationem propositi, ... anno 1730, mense Martis, die 30.* NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 61 (synopsis); *Monumentum filialis observantiae*, Divo Ignatio de Lojola minimae Societatis Jesu parenti maximo in debitae gratitudinis eucharisticon ... anno 1743, mense Novembri, die 26. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 19, adl. 73 (synopsis). ATKr, sign. 2554, pp. 209–210d, 211–214 (synopsis).

¹⁸ *Sancti Francisci Borgiae in virtutis stadio ad honorem et gloriam immortalem vitae cursus, dedicatus ... a caesareo regioque gymnasio Societatis Jesu Brunae anno M.DC.LXXI. mense Septembri, die 15.* NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 91; SK, sign. AB VIII 38, adl. 21 (synopsis); *Franciscus Borgiae Candiae dux, Catalauniae prorex, Lombaiae marchio, imperatricis Isabellae aulae praefectus, superatis gloriose mundi machinationibus Societatem Jesu ingressus, ab eloquentia Julio-Montana ... repraesentatus anno 1677, 14. Decembris.* NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 34 (synopsis); *Sanctus Franciscus Borgiae caducitatem ex putri Augustae cadavere mundanorum deliciarum relegens, ex aula Caroli V. ad aulam Iesu Christi imperatoris transiens.* NK ČR, sign. 52 A 40, adl. 87 (synopsis); NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 999, f. 426r–439r (full text).

¹⁹ *Castilionensis in carne sine carne Angelus S. Aloysius Gonzaga, Clementis X. elogio innocentia vitae et principatus contemptu clarissimus, Benedicti XIII. decreto adolescentibus praesertim venerandus atque imitandus, propositus in theatro a Micro-Pragena ... suprema grammatices classe, anno 1727, mense Junio, die ...* NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 56 (Latin synopsis); *Ein eingefleischter Engel, Der heilige Aloysius Gonzaga nach Ausslage Clementis des X. von unschuldigem Lebens-Wandel und Verachtung des Ihm zulanglichen Fürstenthums höchst verwunderlich; nach Zeugnis aber Benedicti des XIII. der Jugend besonders zu einem Beyspiel. Heut auf öffentlicher Schau-Bühne vorgebildet von einer diesem ihrem Schutz-Patron gantz ergebenen 4ten Schul in der Königl. Kleinern Stadt Prag. Im Jahr 1727. den Junii.* NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 95 (German synopsis); *Aequissime honoris vindiciae veterem sui contemptum devotissime ulciscens in Aloysium et principem Castilioni humilem SJ ... SOA Treboň/ČK, fund Velkostatek Český Krumlov, sign. I 3Sa3 (synopsis); S. Aloysius Gonzaga, gloriosus de mundo victor, abdicto in memoriam fratrem Marchionatis iure calcatisque honorum titulis in veram filiorum Dei libertatem vocatus, ab ...* NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-472, f. 126r–142v (full text); *Innocentia propriae humilitatis arbitrio culpae rea, ad aequissimum Sacrae Rotae tribunal solito examinata ritu, suffragante virtutum omnium testimonio immunis a reatu declarata, sive Stanislavus*

preservation plays its part, we must attribute this fact to other reasons. First it is necessary to remind the fact that both the young saints were patrons of grammar classes – lower classes in gymnasium – and their story was a suitable example for shaping students who were their age. What is more, treating their lives, especially the moments of rejecting secular things and deciding for the Society of Jesus took hold already in the second half of the 17th century on Jesuit stages all over Europe. The oldest play on Gonzaga (1656) that was documented in Bohemian lands, is built on the motif of his purity,²⁰ while the other two (1685, 1715) deal with the efforts of Aloysius's father Ferdinand to turn away his son from his desire to become a Jesuit and his steely determination.²¹ The basic motif of plays on Stanislaus is his flee from home;²² in one play, Stanislaus is compared with his brother Paul;²³ only one allegorical play takes us to the heavenly court deciding on Kostka's sanctity.²⁴ Another canonization of a Jesuit, John Francis Regis, took place at the end of 1737 and at the end of the school year his apostolic eagerness was celebrated

Kostka, proprio quidem arbitrio peccatorum reus, sedis vero apostolicae sententia divorum fastis adscriptus hodieque ... pro theatro assumptus a ... mediae grammaticae classis juventute, Pragae ad S. Clementem, anno 1727, mense [Aprili], die [24]. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 67 (synopsis); *Gloriosus in fuga Olympionices* sive Divus Stanislaus Kostka, calcatis mundi blanditiis, superatis Pauli fratris calumniis felicitiora vocationis suae decurrens Olympia in scenam datus. NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-472, f. 144r–150v (full text).

²⁰ D.O.M.A. *Liliata Beati Aloysii Gonzagae virginitas* seu drama de Beati Aloysii Gonzagae puritate feliciter conservata, quod Pragae ad Sanctum Clementem suprema classis grammaticae exhibuit ... [1656], NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 2 (synopsis).

²¹ *Homo proponit, Deus disponit*, sive Aloysius, quem parentes militiae destinarunt, Deus ad religionem vocavit, in scenam datus ab academica juventute supremae grammaticae classis, Pragae ad S. Clem[entem] 1685, mense Augusto, die [22]. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 61 (synopsis); *Aloysius a Deo et Deipara ad religionem vocatus*, innocentis fortitudine de gemino, naturali in parentes et propinquos, supernae vocationi reluctantae affectu victor, in ejusdem Beati tutelaris sui venerationem dramatice repraesentatus a cliente suprema classe grammaticae academici gymnasii Societatis Jesu Micro Pragae, anno 1715, mense Majo, die ... *Aloysius von Gott und der Mutter Gottes in geistlichen Stand beruffen*, besieget mit unschuldiger Stärcke. Die Natürliche gegen seinen Eltern und Anverwandten, dem himmlischen Beruff aber widerspenstige Zuneygung ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 19, adl. 31 (Latin-German synopsis).

²² *Libertas filiorum Dei*, excussa mundi captivitate fugiendo victrix, sive B. Stanislaus Kostka, per spinas et domesticae patientiae senticeta e mundi laqueis in caelum religiosum gloriose profugus, in aeternum gratitudinis monimentum actione dramatica propositus. SK, sign. CQ VIII 5, adl. 53 (synopsis); *Gloriosus in fuga Olympionices*, see note 19; *Fuga nobili Polono trames* ad victoriam. In theatrum inducta a suprema classe grammaticae, in collegio Societatis Jesu Hradistii anno 1737, Mense Die. NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-447 box 176/1, f. 258r–269v (full text); *Sacrum Victoriae genus fugiendo obtentum a Sancto Stanislao*. illustrissima stirpe inter Polonos sato, a Virgine Deipara ad fugam saeculi vocato, Romae post emensa fugae incommoda sub signa Christi adoptato, ludo theatri adumbratum, agente ingenua mediae classis grammaticae juventute, Glacii 1743, mense Majo. Seltsamer Sieges-Krantz in der Flucht erreicht von dem Heiligen Stanislaus einem Hoch-Adelichen Pohnischen Jüngling und siegreichen Welt-Flüchtling. anheunt auf öffentlicher Schau-Bühne vorgestellt von einer der Jugend und ehrbefflenen Jugend der dritten Schul in dem Collegio der Gesellschaft Jesu zu Glatz in dem Jahr 1743, den ... Tag des Monaths May. ATKr, sign. 2554, pp. 201–202, 203–204, 205–206 (synopsis); S. *Stanislaus Kostka in fuga victor* [1745]. NA ČR, SM, sign. J 20/17/18, box 998, f. 114r–126v (full text); the synopsis published in Mikovec (1851: 162).

²³ *Rara est concordia fratrum* seu Stanislaus et Paulus Kostka, germani fratres nobilitate pares, genio et moribus quondam dispaes, a tenerioribus rudimentistorum Musis Glacii in scenam dati anni 1689, die 12 Augusti. ATKr, sign. 2554, pp. 27–28 (synopsis); BUWr, sign. Akc 1949 KN 125 f. 168v–174r (full text).

²⁴ *Innocentia propriae humilitatis*, see note 19.

by at least five classes from different colleges.²⁵ His story was, however, put on stage by rudimentists (i. e. students of the lowest class) from the college in Prague – Malá Strana sooner, already in 1717.²⁶

Plays

Out of seventeen obviously documented plays on saint Francis Xavier produced in the Bohemian Province, only four complete texts, in which the Saint appears, have been preserved. In the case of undated play *Tres juvenum in provincias abeuntium morum et vitae praefecti* from Český Krumlov (no. 17),²⁷ he shows up really very briefly. Xavier appears here as a guard of young men voyaging at sea. His character is dumb and it is even possible it was solely an emblem or picture.

Francis's life is not the topic even in the youngest of those plays, *Sol in India orientali* (no. 14) when Xavier assumes the part of Xaverian Eagerness, which protects the Youth from the temptations of the World and his companions. Like in the above mentioned play

²⁵ *Heroa in juventute virtus* sive S. Joannes Franciscus Regis adhuc juvenis regi saeculorum in minima Jesu Societate vivere eligens, olim sui et mundi magnanimus victor factus, hodie vero pro theatro propositus a devotis eidem clientibus rudimentistis Reginae-Hradecii anno 1738, mense Junio, die ... Udatná v mladosti ctnost nebo S. Jan František Regis, v mladým věku Králi Neskončenému, v nejmenším Tovaryšstvu Ježíšovu živobyť volcí, od ctitelů jeho malé školy Králo-Hradecké na divadle představený ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 40, adl. 132 (Latin-Czech synopsis); *Imago secundi saeculi Societatis Jesu, vivum Salvatoris ectypum Sanctus Joannes Franciscus Regis, e Societate Jesu per Galliam Narbonensem et omnem Occitaniam missionarius apostolicus, Societate Jesu annum saecularem primum 1640 festive celebrante ad superos evocatus; a pontificibus maximis Clemente XI. Beatorum fastis, Clemente XII. solenni apotheosi Sanctis adlectus, publicae venerationi et imitationi orbi orthodoxo propositus, sub ipsa apotheoseos sacrae solennia a facultate oratoria in academico Societatis Jesu collegio Pragae ad S. Clementem comice praesentatus anno M.DCC.XXXVIII, mense Julio, die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 40, adl. 134 (synopsis); *Lamentum poenitentis innocentiae*, olim ab innocenter reo Joanne Francesco Regis in gaudium caute loquentium productum, hodie honori ac venerationi ejusdem recens in syllabum Sanctorum relati a facultate poetica voce et gestu reproductum Hradistii anno 1738, mense Junio, die 18. NA ČR, JS, sign. IIIo-447 box 176/1, f. 366r–382r (full text); *Olympia honorum apostolica Occitaneae palestra*, in qua, cum adversus depascentes lilium Gallicanum colubros Joannes Franciscus Regis S. I. victoriose decertaverit, a Sanctissimo Domino nostro Clemente divina providentia papa XIImo Sanctorum gloria coronatur atque sub ipsa sacrae apotehoseos solennia ludis Apollinaribus celebratur. SOA Třeboň/ČK, fund Velkostatek Český Krumlov, 3S a3 (full text and Latin-German synopsis); *Heroica virtus solenni apotheosi consecrata*, seu B. Joannes Franciscus Regis, zelosus in regno Galliae e Societate Jesu missionarius, Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Papae Clementis XII. oraculo Sanctorum catalogo novissime adscriptus, sub mythico schemate praeclari herois Persei a Jove ob egregia facinora inter sidera translati comico et melico dramate exhibita, agente pro theatro Illustrissima gymnade collegii Societatis Jesu Glogoviae anno aerae christianae MDCCXXXVIII die ... Julii. ATKr, sign. 2554, pp. 181–184 (synopsis); Erstem Jahrhundert dess Breslauer Collegii In Isaac jenr reichlichen Frucht dess hunderten Jahrs dess in das Land Chanaan wandernden Grossen Seelen-Eyferers Abraham vorgebildet; mit feyerlicher Begängnuss dess von IhroPäpstl- Heiligkeit zur schuldig Clemente XII. in die Zahl der Heiligen jüngst-übersetzten Heiligen Joannis Francisci Regis gecrönet ... zur schuldigst-handbarer Gedächtnuss gegenwärtiges Schau-Spiel auf öffentlicher Schau-Bühne gewiedmet hat. Von einer Hoch-adlichen, Hoch und Wohlgebohrenen. Lehr- und Sitzen-befleissenen Jugend aller Schulen dess Academischen Collegii in Breslasu vorgestellt in Jahr 1738, den ... Augusti. ATKr, sign. 2554, pp. 185–186j (synopsis).*

²⁶ *Rudimenta apostolica* seu B. Joannes Franciscus Regis, a teneris Divinae gloriae zelotes, in drama graegorianum assumptus a rudimentistis academicis Micro-Pragae mense Martio, Die ..., Anno 1717. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 19, adl. 38, SK, sign. CJ V 160, adl. 33 (synopsis).

²⁷ Numbers in parentheses refer to the table in the appendix.

from Český Krumlov, Francis Xavier is even here presented as a protector and patron of youth.

The subject of play *Novi Indiarum Phaebi ortus* (no. 13) is on the contrary Xavier's missionary work in the East. This short play, or to be more accurate an exercise, has only three scenes and apart from Xavier there are only allegorical characters. At the beginning India learns that a new sun rose to her salvation and expresses craving for his coming. Xavier rejoices in his happy arrival in India in a long monologue, and promises India to be absolutely devoted. In the last scene India brought by the "rays of newly arisen Phoebus" to a better life cheerfully runs towards the Genius of the Society of Jesus and pays tribute to him.

Xaverian missionary activity is also the content of the oldest and simultaneously most extensive of the preserved plays, *Nox orientis per solem Hesperium, Franciscum ... Xaverium ... discussa* (no. 3). Its author, Arnoldus Engel (1620–1690), left six theatre plays behind ready to be published, but he never succeeded in putting them through.

Nox orientis resembles in many aspects perhaps the most renowned Jesuit play on Francis Xavier, *Zelus sive Franciscus Xaverius, Indiarum Apostolus*,²⁸ written by a famous playwright Nicolaus Avancini, first staged in 1640 in Vienna.²⁹ A detailed comparison of both the texts goes beyond the possibilities of this study. Therefore we will try at least to show some motifs occurring also in other Xaverian plays, which means they can be considered typical³⁰ to a certain extent. The motifs of light and darkness play significant roles in these plays: Xavier is often compared to the sun that comes untraditionally from the West and has to scatter the pagan darkness, which rules in the East, using his glow – this means Christian faith. This idea is reflected in a range of titles. Xavier is also called a Western Sun, which will disperse the Eastern Night (*Nox Orientis per solem Hesperium, Franciscum ... Xaverium ... discussa*), new Phoebus of India (*Novi Indiarum Phaebi ortus*) or Sun, which died the other day in Eastern India (*Sol in India orientali, olim gloriosa morte occiduus, in novis Indiis oriens inocciduus, sanctus Franciscus Xaverius, ambiguo juventuti ab Eo, qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos pro eligenda via salutis in lucem et ducem coelitus datus*). As the title shows in the last-mentioned case Xavier is the Sun not only for India but also for the young to whom he illuminates the way.

²⁸ Avancini (1675: 1–101).

²⁹ For more information about this play, see e.g. Valentin (2001: 526–533).

³⁰ When analysing the motifs of the play the authors of this study limited only to some possible sources and based their analyses mainly on the *Bulla Canonizationis* and two most renowned Saint's biographies, which are also the most quoted in plays and synopses: Bartolus (1666) and Tursellinus (1596). We leave aside the very important texts from the book *Imago primi saeculi Societatis Jesu a provincia Flandro-Belgica eiusdem Societatis repraesentata*. Ed. Johannes Bolland, Jean de Tollenaere et alii. Antverpiae: ex officina Plantiniana Balthazaris Moreti, 1640. We also took into consideration released graphic conversion of canonization decoration of church Il Gesù in Rome (Regnartius 1623) and one of their analyses (Iturriaga Elorza 1994). As an example of artistic portrayal of Xavier's life we chose a cycle of 35 lunettes by Jesuit painter Hermann Schmidt in the hall of Prague Klementinum (further only Klementinum cycle); for more details see Nevimová (2002). As an example of emblematic and symbolic elaborations we chose the collection *Divus Franciscus Xaverius, magnus Indiarum Apostolus* (1663) made by Olomouc Bachelors of Philosophy, with symbols invented by A. M. Lublinsky. See Zelenková (2011: 68–71), Dolejší (2013: 64–215). For a brief insight in Xaverian problematic, see also the introductory study in Andrlé, Fidlerová (2010: 5–34).

Eastern countries represented by allegorical characters of India, Japan, East etc. are usually depicted as if immersed into darkness, both in real and figurative meanings, i.e. darkness of mind and spirit. These kinds of darkness often find a metaphorical expression in sleep (Eastern countries sleep and it is necessary to wake them up from their dreams); India is described as being blind, staggering and weak in *Novi Indiarum Phaebi ortus*. The first two mentioned characteristics can also be connected with the darkness India is surrounded by.

Darkness the East is emerged in reflects also on his face and dark complexion in general. In *Nox orientis* the Eastern countries are represented on a comical level by a character named Aethiops, Indus or Maurus in turns, i.e. a man of dark complexion. In the first act Indus walks out of the globe suspended in the middle of the scene and resting on the shoulders of Idolatry. The Faith holds up a mirror to him and Indus discovers the abomination of his face symbolizing the darkness of paganism, of course, and looks for someone to wash the dirt off. Not even called Hercules can cope with this task and Indus learns his face can be cleaned only by the “river from heaven” (*ab axe rivus*), this means by Xavier (it is an anagram from *Xaverius* as well as an allusion to baptism).³¹ Indus appears in the play several times later: in a comic interlude he looks for help with Bacchus, who instead of washing him makes him drunk; Indus is put on Francis’s shoulder before he sets off to India, which expresses the difficulty of work awaiting him there – Engel found the inspiration for the scene undoubtedly in Xavier’s narrations about his repeating dream, which we find in both the principal biographies of the Saint. Xavier is said to have dreamt several times of having to carry an Indian man on his shoulders who was so heavy that the sleeper was woken up by his tiredness (Tursellinus) or woke up others by his moaning (Bartolus).³² In the epilogue Indus shows up with his face cleaned, which he is grateful for to Xavier. India speaks of her black complexion also in *Novi Indiarum Phaebi ortus* and apart from the others she asks the Genius of the Society of Jesus (*Genius Societatis*) not to disdain her since even a dark face can cover pure-white mind.

The Eastern countries suffer badly their situation and in fact long for a new Sun. Xavier shares this wish, too, usually after an allegorical character (often Eagerness) ignites his heart or hits him with an arrow and ignites his desire to go on a missionary journey to the East. In Avancini’s play this “fire” is ignited by the character called *Zelus Divinae gloriae*, which means eagerness when spreading the God’s fame. In Engel’s play Francis is gradually hit with three arrows, and this event is connected with the motif of fight for Xavier between East and West. Angel of India (*Angelus Indiarum*), Genius of Saint Ignatius from Loyola (*Genius Ignatii*) and God’s love (*Amor Divinus*), sent by The God’s Providence (*Providentia Divina*) to Paris to bring Xavier,³³ must fight for Xavier twice: first with different “suitors” (*proci*), who are deputies of the pagan world and at the same time of different secular affairs (e.g. Pallas – education, Cupido – secular love, Mars – war glory). This “fight” is decided by Divine Love, which strikes Xavier with an arrow and ignites love for God in his heart.

³¹ See Libertinus (1673: appendix, Imago V).

³² Bartolus (1666: 6); Tursellinus (1596: 47); *Divus Franciscus Xaverius, magnus Indiarum Apostolus* (I.); Dolejší (2013: 88–90, 138–140, 177–179); Zelenková (2011: 69).

³³ In Avancini (1675) these envoys are Wishes of the East (*Desideria Orientis*).

Engel probably based also this scene on what was written about Xavier by his biographers. Bartolus and Tursellinus mention the fact that before Francis turned into a perfect Christian he had to overcome his ambition and desire for the mundane fame. Spiritual and even austere way of life lead by Ignatius of Loyola was in the beginning met with laughter. It was only Ignatius's patience with which he bore these attacks and his persistent persuading him that made Xavier transform himself. The presented scene from Engel's play is hopefully an allegorical adaptation of this fact.

Another "battle" takes places over sleeping Xavier, when the Angel of India wants to hit him with his shot, while the Angel of Europe and other characters stop him from doing that since they say Francis belongs to them. Archangel Michael decides the dispute in favour of Asia. The Angel of India is thus allowed to send his arrow into Francis's heart and inspire him with the desire to go to the East. The third arrow, thrown by the Eagerness (*Zelus*), ignites the eagerness in his heart.

Xavier's voyage to India is in Avancini's play a content of the fourth act; in Engel's play it is a content of choir between the 2nd and 3rd acts. In both the cases it is, to a certain extent, matter of allegorical and supernatural characters: storm, in which Xavier almost dies, in *Zelus sive Franciscus Xaverius*, it is Idolatry (*Idololatria*) who, being afraid of losing his power, starts the storm, in which Xavier almost dies; he has a narrow escape thanks to an Angel's help. In *Nox orientis* Xavier is accompanied by Faith (*Fides*) and Eagerness. Xavier himself has a wordless role in this scene; his journey is described by the choir of Sirens and Tritons, and in the end also Faith and Eagerness speak. Neither Avancini nor Engel forgot another popular motif, i.e. a crab, which brings Xavier a crucifix lost in waves. Bartolus depicts this story in his biography.³⁴ According to him the story happened when Xavier was staying in India, while both the playwrights connect it already to his voyage to Asia – probably due to emphases put on its symbolic character. In the play of the first author it is Piety (*Pietas*) that takes on the appearance of a crab, while Tritons are sitting on other crabs singing a praising song. Engel first lets Neptune go on the crabs having a sign of cross on their backs, while a bit later one of the crabs emerges from the sea waves bringing a crucifix to Xavier.

Avancini pursues Francis's missionary activity only in the 5th act and in the choir preceding it (the biggest space is given to bringing a group of children to religion).³⁵ Engel depicts Xavier's stay in India and Japan in the 3rd and 4th acts. Both in Avancini's play and in *Nox orientis* there are allegorical and mythological characters in these parts. Xavier is still accompanied by Faith and Eagerness, allegorical characters represent India and Japan, repudiated demons and Pagan deities lament their fate. Engel included into his play a scene in which demons try to prevent Xavier from praying – they raise his arms, disturb him by discordant singing, make noises, whip him etc.

³⁴ Bartolus (1666: 92–93); Regnartius (1623: no. 6); Klementinum cycle, no. 26 (Nevímová 2002: 226); *Divus Franciscus Xaverius, magnus Indiarum Apostolus* (VI.); Dolejší (2013: 98–99, 154–156, 197–200); Zelenková (2011: 70).

³⁵ For the motif of catechization of children, see e.g. Tursellinus (1596: 156). Klementinum cycle depicts not only teaching catechism (no. 13; see Nevímová 2002: 225), but also other episodes of destroying models by children (no. 15) and children's mission to spread faith and evict evil spirits (no. 14). *Divus Franciscus Xaverius, magnus Indiarum Apostolus* (1663: IX.); Dolejší (2013: 101–103, 163–165, 209–211); Zelenková (2011: 71).

There are, however, almost “realistic” passages too, for example two scenes in which Engel treats the story of Peter Vellius, a Portuguese trader, who Xavier asked for dowry for a young girl who was otherwise under a threat of becoming a prostitute.³⁶ Since Vellius did not want to interrupt playing chess, he gave Francis the key to the safe to take the needed money himself. Francis took only three hundred florins to Vellius's surprise since he intended to give away to the poor much more. As a reward for his generosity Xavier disclosed how he will know his last day has come in future – it will be in the moment when his wine turns bitter. This moment came in no long time and Vellius had, thanks to Francis's prophecy, time to arrange his last matters and leave this world in peace. This episode appeared in the Bohemian Province apart from *Nox orientis* at least in one another play in which it even became its main theme (see more details on this play later). In other countries it can be found e.g. in a big play on the founders of the Society of Jesus performed in Ingolstadt in 1622.³⁷ Engel chose it for his drama probably because of the motif of generosity. The care of the poor is actually one of the leitmotifs in his play. Xavier on several places disproves the local doctrine that the poor and women will not go to heaven – e.g. it is this question that represents one of the principal points in his dispute with Buddhist priests.

Engel, unlike Avancini, captures in his play even Francis's death, which comes in the choir between the 4th and 5th acts. The 5th act takes places after Xavier's death. It is again an allegorical part in which Virtue, Honour and Immortality play the main roles.

Synopses

We get a far more modest idea of building the plot and the way of work with particular motives in plays documented only by synopses. Despite this fact eleven surviving prints testify the enormous variety of attitudes of individual authors. First, we will pay attention to a set of synopses from 1656–1679, which is somewhat more compact.

The oldest play *Medicus Neapoleos* (no. 1) shown in Klementinum in 1656 celebrates in an allegorical way Xavier as a saviour of Naples in the times of plague and through its theme it points at ranking of Saint Francis Xavier among so called plague patrons.³⁸ Despite the fact the synopsis does not refer to the source of the subject and in the main Xaverian legends we look for it vainly, it was not about depicting an unknown miracle.³⁹ It is shown e.g. by the students who also treated the subject in Landsberg in 1676⁴⁰ and who brought on stage real players of the story about miraculous effect of the picture of Xavier and the oil lamp burning in front of it. The synopsis of Prague performance indicates a simpler allegorical portrayal of the motif of a town, which does not care about

³⁶ Bartolus (1666: 267–270), Tursellinus (1596: 382–384).

³⁷ *Comödie unnd Triumph von den Heiligen Ignatio de Loyola Stifter deß Ordens der Societas Iesu; und Francisco Xaverio. bemelter Societet Priester; der Indianer und Japonen Apostel.* In: Szarota 1979–1987: III/2, 1229–1271 (text), 2017–2021 (commentary).

³⁸ For more details see Černý, Havlík (2008: 92–95).

³⁹ See Libertinus (1673: 103–108 [Elogium XXXI. Xaverius saevissimam Pestem Neapolitanam et praesagit et fugat.]

⁴⁰ *S. Franciscus Xaverius Neapoli Prodigii Clarus.* In: Szarota 1979–1987: I/2, 1229–1271 (text), 1766–1767 (commentary).

warning of the saint picture, stays in its wickedness, and is punished by plague. It is only sorrow and pleas for God and Saint Francis, which bring Life, Health, Joy and others back to the town.

Allegorical, emblematic or symbolic ways of interpretation of celebrating the Saint were after all used by majority of the authors; nevertheless, each of them chose a different topic. Three of them concentrated on particular virtues or cleric merits. The play *Amplius Labor et Dolor* (no. 2) works with the basic attribute of the Saint – a cross and develops mainly two known motives. It is the moment of igniting the Saint's heart with arrows of the God's love between scenes devoted to Xavier's journey leading to the faithful respect for the Christ's cross.⁴¹ The third part, where the main role is besides the cross played also by water, develops a miraculous comeback of the Cross from the sea deep.⁴² Like in Engel's play there are Neptune and other sea Gods who appear on the stage, and who are disturbed by the presence of the cross in their realm. There is, of course, also a crab bringing the cross out on the shore.

Deep spiritual convergence and mutual brotherly love which led to the soul unity of Xavier and Saint Ignatius, the founder of the Society of Jesus, is one of often emphasised moments of the Saint's legend, especially with respect to its formation function. It is no wonder its celebration became a basis for a play *Novus Castor et Pollux* (no. 4) which also reminds of both the men's significance in spreading salvation in the whole world and their mutual heavenly triumph in the form of canonization. Comparison to Gemini was not used only with the founder of the Society of Jesus; it can be encountered also with Aloysius Gonzaga and Stanislaus Kostka.⁴³

⁴¹ One of the frequent iconographic types of Francis's portrayals is a praying Saint with a torn robe, sometimes with flames on the chest or burning heart, other time completed with a quote *Satis est, Domine, satis est*. To know more of Saint Francis iconography see e.g. Oswald (2002). Klementinum cycle, no. 16 (Nevimová, 2002: 225); Regnartius (1623: no. 3) – description: *In Coelestium gaudiorum affluentia: "Satis est, Domine, satis est!", repetit in laboribus et cruciatibus pro Christo "Non satis, Domine, non satis"; Divus Franciscus Xaverius, magnus Indiarum Apostolus* (II., III.); Dolejší (2013: 90–95, 141–147, 180–188); Zelenková (2011: 69).

⁴² See note 34; other miracles of the Saint connected with this element are also treated, i.e. transformation of salty water into sweat water (e.g. *Bulla Canonizationis*; Regnartius 1623: no. 4), or saving a ship in a sea storm (Klementinum cycle, no. 12 – *Navigans ad Indos*; there is a similar interpretation of picture 5 by Regnartius 1623, whose description not even the corresponding extract in the *Bulla Canonizationis* speaks of calming down the storm).

⁴³ The scene appears e.g. in two plays written on the occasion of canonization: *Novi in coelis Gemini unius foecundae matris partu editi nexuque fraterno foederati, novissima per Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Benedicti XIII. oraculum apotheosi in ecclesiae triumphantis zodiaco stationem adepti ac mutuis splendoribus sese irradiantes, S. Aloysius Gonzaga et S. Stanislaus Kostka, curioso coelestium speculatori et siderum supra omnem mundum elevatorum scrutatori oculo, ad contemplandum, amandum, honorandum, ab universa Triurbis Pragensis militante Societate Jesu in publico triumphali processu, die 24. mensis Augusti anno 1727 devote adornato propositi*. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 19, adl. 107 (synopsis); *Intaminatis fulget honoribus stelligeros spargens radios laeto aethere virtus*. In exorto solennis apotheosis novo iubare gemino coeli sidere, Divo Aloysio de Gonzaga e ducibus Mantuae, Castilionis principe terreni principatus contemptu clarissimo juvene, humili facto subinde Jesu socio ejusdemque Societatis Sancto scholastico nec non in Divo Stanislao Kostka, in juvenilibus annis adultae virtutis et canonizatae sanctitatis Societatis Jesu illustri novitio per eorundem Divorum fastis adscriptorum sacra solemnia, a Boëmae provinciae Jesu Societate universali jubilo adornata conformiter ad illud Dan. 12. *Fulgebunt quasi splendor firmamenti et quasi stellae in perpetuas aeternitates*: accinente Seneca: *Locum virtus habet inter astra*. Sub Geminorum Castoris et Pollucis schemate a ducale collegio Societatis Jesu Oppaviae, cothurno como- et melo dramatico celebrata, agente pro

The author of play *S. Franciscus Xaverius Admirabilis* (no. 5) shows the Saint's victory over Mart, Fortune (*Fortuna*) and Death (*Mors*). The first and third of them show very well-known and often artistically treated miracles: repelling foes of Christians by calling a lightning from the heaven⁴⁴ and reviving a noble young man.⁴⁵ In the second scene we find a little peculiar narration on a dice player who won back everything he had lost thanks to a prayer to Saint Francis.⁴⁶

Francis Xavier was, however, glorified mainly as a missionary of the East, while the authors sometimes invented original and complicated allegories. Although majority of plays concerns Xavier's activity in India, we also get twice to China. The Saint desired to christianize China but he did not live to realize the journey to the country.⁴⁷ We have then something to do with the Saint's afterlife activity.⁴⁸ The play *China Xaveriani Zeli meta* (no. 9) depicts seven heads of an awful hydra that Xavier wants to free China from, but unsuccessfully. From the structural point of view the play seems to be very simple, its plot is divided into eight scenes, while paganism is depicted in seven of them: *Idololatria* (= Idolatry), *Mania* (= giving feasts to the dead), *Metempsychosis* (= moving of the souls), *Barbaries* (= barbarism – here illustrated by selling children into slavery), *Parricidium* (= murders in the family), *Autochiria* (= suicide) and *Autarkeia* (= self-satisfaction, which brings along cruelty towards foreigners). In the last scene Xavier himself wants to set off in the fight with Hydra. He can, however, hear the well-known: *Non plus ultra*.⁴⁹

The second play, *Opus Posthumum* (no. 8), starts with Xavier's death, which is according to the prologue represented by "shipwreck" of the Saint's voyage to China,⁵⁰ which is entrusted to Xavier's protection in the heavens. In another scene of the play comes an interesting turnabout and we return from the heavenly spheres to reality of the second half of the 16th century, when China entirely closed to business trade contacts with Europe. This also meant closing a gate for Christianization in the country. Jesuits, however, did not stop with their missionary work and used another way, mainly spreading of European sciences, among which Mathematics had an extraordinary post. It is also the main character of this allegorical play.

Depicting Chinese interest in European Mathematics, which thanks to Saint Francis's intercession also brings Christianization success, and intrigues of Chinese Mathematics

theatro ejusdem gymnadis illustrissima juventute anno aerae Christianae ut supra, Kalendas Septembres. NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 117 (synopsis).

⁴⁴ The motif appears in different variations: Xavier protects freshly baptized people with his bare hands (*Bulla Canonizationis*; Regnartius 1623: no. 11) or with the sign of cross (on the 22nd lunette of the Klementinum cycle), next to the Saint appears a huge black figure, which does not startle the enemies: Bartolus (1666: 55–56). To learn more about Xavier's activity by Travencorids and their protection see also Tursellinus (1596: 161–162)

⁴⁵ Reviving the young man who had already been carried away to be buried (Regnartius 1623: no. 15, in some legends connected to the reviving of a young man who died of plague); reviving a young man who died of plague in Malacca (Bartolus 1666: 258, Tursellinus 1596: 138).

⁴⁶ The synopsis points at a biography of the Saint that is for the time indefinable.

⁴⁷ To learn more about the plans of the journeys to China see e.g. Tursellinus (1596: 371–387, 410–431).

⁴⁸ See Libertinus (1673: 85–89); *Divus Franciscus Xaverius, magnus Indiarum Apostolus* (X.), Dolejší (2013: 103–105, 166–168, 212–214), Zelenková (2011: 71).

⁴⁹ Puns including connection *non plus ultra* / *plus ultra* are frequent not only in the Xaverian, but generally in the Jesuit emblematic and would need a more detailed analysis, which we now leave aside.

⁵⁰ The synopsis expresses that, among others, in the pun: *ille in Chinam adspirans, in portu Sanciano ab omnibus desertus beate exspirat*.

towards its enemy, which are finally foiled by the Saint, is a clear picture of alternating success of the Jesuit's activity in the country. It was e.g. Matteus Ricci's (1552–1610) work, appreciated by both the parties up to now, that was replaced by expulsion of Jesuits from the country.⁵¹

Authors of the Jesuit plays were not afraid to use typological parallels with Antique mythology remote even for us. In play *Schoeneida praemia cursus* (no. 10) India could become Atalanta and Francis could become Hippomenes. Golden apples – Venus's gift, which caused that mythical Atalanta was delayed in running and lost the race – are not here a trick leading to humiliation but they are a symbol of gifts coming from the tree of life with which Francis wants to convince India. The struggle in running symbolises hardships endured by Francis; and Atalanta, which famously knocked down a boar in the hunt, represents India triumphing over Idolatry.

Although this conception can seem too courageous, one of Jesuit playwrights went even further. In his play *Laureola Martyrii* (no. 11) he told the story of the Queen Jepetias whose only son is blind and unable to rein. That is the reason why, after a distressful way, his cousin sits on the throne instead of him. Prologue, epilogue and the key of characters in the synopsis inform us that Xavier is the competent ruler and the people of India are the blind son.

As an interesting pun can also be regarded a play called *Hercules Asiaticus* (no. 7) performed at the end of school year 1671/72 by poets from Olomouc. In ten couples one missionary merit of Francis is always introduced as prothesis and a kind of summary of work of poets in the particular month is introduced as apothesis. Connection with Hercules's work is rather free and is clearly voiced only in the overture. The parallel itself between Xavier and Hercules is not the invention of the playwright. Among emblems connected with Francis we can see Hercules carrying a heavenly arch representing a Saint taking on the burden of Christianization of the East.⁵² Considering the way the play was built it seems the author worked with a hyperbole and wit especially when creating parallels between Francis's deeds and study devotion of the pupils of poetics. The April couple, in which *prothesis* represents Xavier who had to endure a range of hardships threatening his life (arrows shooting, attack by stones, shipwrecking), can serve as a proof. *Apothesis* is symbolized by penetrating through mysteries of poetical treatment of Antique mythology (*poetarum docta deliria*), represented by Ovidius's *Metamorphoses* and *Mythology* of Italian humanist Natalis Comes.⁵³ The synopsis includes also a witty epilogue on Xavier's death and its "rescheduling" from real December (3rd December) to September, which is the last month, i.e. December of the school year: September dies together with Xavier and the whole performance exhales together with him.

Although this play can be considered unique, other authors used different ways of approaching the school environment. The most frequent is setting the story into childhood of the Saint or right in the time of his school attendance. There is no preserved

⁵¹ Andreotti (2007: 13–82).

⁵² See note 32; Libertinus (1673: 23 [Elogium VII. Xaverii Indophori Somnium]): ... *ergo novus Orientis Atlas* ...

⁵³ *Hercules Asiaticus: Pro Aprili, poetarum docta deliria, Metamorphosis Nasonis, Mythologia Natalis, Proteus, omnia demum phantasmata dedicuntur*; Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae sive explicationum fabularum libri X*. Venetiae, 1567.

text of this kind among Xaverian plays, and from other plays on Jesuit Saints, it was used only in the play *Litterae amoris proximi admoniculum* that took partly place in the first year of Ignatius's later studies at the grammar school.⁵⁴ The second tool was using notions and procedures from the discussed school subject, as we can see in play *Problema syntacticum*, by which the fourth-grade grammar students from Olomouc honoured Aloysius Gonzaga.⁵⁵

While all the above analysed plays were perhaps prepared by the students of poetics, whose patron used to be Francis Xavier, for the festive awarding the best students at the end of the school year, performance *Jucundus homo* (no. 6) served also another purpose. Grammar school pupils from Jihlava honoured with the performance the Imperial Couple on behalf of school and town on 29th September 1667. The play narrates the already mentioned story of a Portuguese merchant Peter Vellius. One of the allegorical prologue figures distinguishes the overjoyed person who is spoken about in psalm 111. The author divides the play into nine scenes, which are in the synopsis started by passages from the fifth to tenth verse of the relevant psalm. Individual episodes from Vellius's story are then outlined as a proof that the psalm words can be applied to this very man. The synopsis, however, does not say if this interconnection was scenically performed – either by using a choir or allegorical characters appearing in the prologue or by scenographic tools, e.g. placing the written tapes or emblem on the stage – or whether relating the story to the psalm was explained only in the synopsis. The plot line itself contains all the episodes of the story: giving money to Xavier; the Saint's double prophecy; triple forecasted shipwrecking and repeated growing rich of Vellius; presage of death after wine turns bitter; his preparation for "good" death and leaving for the other life. Many allegorical characters (*Castitas* – Purity, *Fama* – Reputation, *Amicitia* – Friendship, *Felicitas* – Fortune) apart from the real basic ones (Xaverius, Vellius and his friends) come on the stage. Not knowing the whole text of the play we are not able to evaluate their participation in the development of the plot, not even the way of their mutual interaction. The only obvious thing is the message of the play involving both the usual moral of the play, i.e. acclaim of Vellius's generosity (a present to Xavier), faith in God (trust in the change of adverse fate when shipwrecking), careful preparations for death, and the particular updating in which *Jucundus homo* Petrus Vellius sets an example of the correct behaviour of the rich and powerful.

There are only two synopses from Klementinum and one from Klodsko, which complete the base of documented plays in the 18th century. A complex allegory *Pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis* (no. 12) played by fourth-grade grammar school students in 1710 presents Xavier as a creator of peace in the East. India is convulsing in wars and disputes caused by idolatry and Francis comes as an Angel of Peace (*Angelus Pacis*) who strides in the mountains, while one of his feet is on the sea and the other one on the dry

⁵⁴ *Litterae amoris proximi admoniculum* seu D. Ignatius de Lojola, animarum juvandarum amore ad Dei majorem gloriam litterarum rudimenta auspicatus, comice repraesentatus a rudimentistis academici gymnasii Soc[ietatis]. Jesu Neo-Pragae, Anno 1678. die 21. Augusti. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 87 (synopsis).

⁵⁵ *Problema syntacticum*: An bene convenient et in una sede morentur Majestas et Amor, scenice in B. Aloysii Gonzagae, marchionis Castilionensis, sancta in Societate Jesu vocatione propositum et discussum ab ... supremae classis grammatices juventute, Olomucii, anno Domini M.DC.LXIX., X. Julii. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 96 (synopsis).

land.⁵⁶ The supposed author Fabianus Vesely is not, however, the creator of this scene (image), he only constructed its scenic appearance, which we find rather chaotic. He knew the image of Xavier as an striding Angel in the sense of the mentioned apocalyptic quotation from the work of Antonius Vieriſ who built ten speeches over the same verse in the second part of his *Xaverius dormiens*.⁵⁷ The Vesely's drama is divided into three acts and twenty-four scenes of the most various character, from portraying particular war conflicts, known from biographies (downfall of Malacca), to allegorical scenes commenting on the affairs or portraying Francis's mental states. There also appears the renowned dream in which Xavier is carrying a "weighty Pagan" on his back, here designated as *Aetiopus*. It is interesting to see the use of the motif of the Sun, which does not rise in the West, nor does it chase away the night of the East this time but is the contrary of the crescent of the Mohammedan Moon.

The synopsis of the play *Armata arrogantia* (no. 15), written for students of the highest grammar class in Kłodsko, shows an unsuccessful assault on Malacca in October 1547. The author introduces us to the endangered port to show Xavier's prediction of the attack, his appeals to defence and his credit of the miraculous victory. Scenes taking place in Malacca alternate with those from the camp of invaders, whose main protagonist is an ambitious commander Bajaja Soora. These events are described in most of Xaverian legends; however, the author of *Armata arrogantia* refers in the argument to Xavier's biography by an Italian Jesuit Joseph Massei, which is quite surprising. This biography was translated into German in the early 18th century and available also in Bohemian province, but Latin version is unknown.⁵⁸ Then, *Armata arrogantia* is the first synopsis, in which an author uses a vernacular text as a source of inspiration. Trying to find out reasons for the choice of this topic, we can speculate about the influence of the ongoing War of the Austrian Succession; the play was performed just a few weeks before the decisive Prussian-Austrian battles in the summer 1744.

The youngest synopses come from 1745 and were printed for a more-part exercise, whose author is a famous and well-experienced professor of rhetoric – Ferdinand Silberman.⁵⁹ The first copy called *Franciscus Xaverius primum salutaribus Ignatii de Loyola consiliis repugnans* (no. 16) dates back to May 1745 and includes, besides the argumentum referring to the particular part of Tursellini's biography,⁶⁰ only contents of seven scenes in which Francis rejects Ignatius's advice. The first leaf of the second print in 1745 is identical from the points of view of content, but its form is different. The second leaf, however, shows two other parts of the play, which culminate with Francis's decision to lead a devoted life. Existence of two synopses clearly points at showing the play or its parts on different dates and different occasions. While the first part, which is just one third of the whole play, could serve as a monthly exercise, the second one was perhaps

⁵⁶ *Pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis* (argumentum): *Xaverius sit Angelus ille, qui posuit pedem suum dexterum super mare, sinistrum autem super terram*. Cf. Apoc. 10, 2.

⁵⁷ Vieriſ 1701. The synopsis refers rather surprisingly to the part of the eleventh speech in which counting the length of journeys in India (Vieriſ 1701: 391–392 [Sermo undecimus De anniversario S. Xaverii festo die, § II, no. 408]) by Francis is discussed. Majority of speeches (2–9) of the particular collection are based on the same apocalyptic quote.

⁵⁸ Massei (1714: 139–152).

⁵⁹ *Theater in Böhmen* (2013: 637–639 [s.v. Ferdinand Silberman by M. Jacková]).

⁶⁰ Tursellinus (1596: 10–12).

played as a festive performance of rhetoricians at the end of the school year, which was already moved from September to July at the time. It is, of course, a question whether they did not show the whole piece in the second performance. As an evidence for that could serve the fact that the whole synopsis was reprinted, which is not usual by other plays divided into two performances.⁶¹ Reasons for including the contents of the first part could be at the same time merely typographic.

Before we try, on the basis of the above analysed text corpuses and synopses, to pronounce several more general theses on the way of treating Xaverian theme in the Jesuit dramatic work in the Bohemian Province, let us come back to its structure and informative value. First it is necessary to raise a question about relations between the preserved collection, at least in terms of number of plays, and the real theatre production on Saint Francis Xavier in Bohemian lands. The answer is very difficult and we can try to find it mainly in annual reports of individual colleges bearing in mind, however, that from the 1690s there is less and less information about school theatre.⁶² In spite of that we can prove, on the basis of Ferdinand Menčík's research carried out in the Viennese collection *Litterae Annuae*,⁶³ that Xavier entered the scene of one of the Province's schools in the period between 1658 and 1687 almost every year. For the given thirty years there are 21 documented performances, while three of them can be safely supported by rather representative text or synopsis for those days,⁶⁴ and apart from that we know 8 other pieces from synopses. From this point of view the collection of synopses seems rather representative for this period. It is, however, necessary to say it includes production in Prague and Olomouc, about which we have no records in annual reports. In this connection there might be further interesting information coming from the studies of the surviving diaries of rectors of Klementinum and Olomouc College, which was at the moment refrained from due to the extent of the study.

If we follow themes of the documented plays, we will surely find a base in majority of them in Tursellinus's or Bartolus's biographies, be it mentioned or not. Did the authors have to look for the source of inspiration in this way? Both the files, undoubtedly in several languages and different textual adaptations, were certainly easily available to all the authors.⁶⁵ It is, however, necessary to suppose that knowledge of not only

⁶¹ From Silberman's exercise for rhetoric from 1731 *Cosmophilus* and Paleczek's one year older Ignatius play for humanisties *Tres modi humilitatis* we know the synopsis of only the second part, which was perhaps the longer one.

⁶² The annual reports survived mainly in three collections, in the Roman Jesuit Archives, the Austrian National Library and the Czech National Library. To learn more on their appearances and origin, see Bobková-Valentová (2010).

⁶³ Menčík (1895).

⁶⁴ Menčík (1895: 109, 122) finds evidence for staging Engel's *Nox Orientis* in Cheb and two performances on Peter Vellius in Jihlava shown allegedly in 1677 (documented in synopsis) and 1678, when the piece is described as a melodrama.

⁶⁵ See e. g. [Georgius Ferus] *Swatey Swatého Diwy a Zákraky schwáleného Obcowánj Žiwot Ignacya Logoli Rządu Towarystwa Gména Geżjssowego Zakladatele. Od Petra Rybadeneyry, Učedlnjka a Towaryse geho, hodnowěrně sepsaney, a neyprw w Czesstině wydaney*. Praha, 1617; [anon.], *Philo-Xaverii Pietas hebdomadaria in S. Patronum Franciscum Xaverium, Indiarum Apostolum e Societate Jesu, ad beatum ex hac mortali vita transitum a Deo per ejusdem intercessionem, et imitationem impetrandum. Romae primum Superiorum permissu Anno M.DC.LXII. Italice, deinde Latine reddita, et denuo recussa*. Graecii, 1662. Vilnae, 1715; [Georg Kastel], *Vita Sancti Francisci Xaverii e Societate Jesu, Indiarum Apostoli et thumaturgi compendio descripta. Promo Mediolani Italice, tum Graecij Latine in lucem edita, Nunc denuo honori ejusdem Divi, Auspicij et munificentia Sancto Addictorum plurimum aucta et recussa*.

basic moments of the Xaverian legend and ways of its iconographic and emblematic development belonged to the basic formation educative stint of each Jesuit. There is no doubt they heard a countless number of exhortation and sermons about the Saint, they many times prayed various Xaverian religious services, in privacy they often reflected on Francis's life, and they may have desired to follow him in his missionary journeys. Their knowledge and imagination could surely have been supported by the decoration of Jesuit temples where was also the Saint's altar with pictures from his life or at least his *vera effigies*, and by colleges whose refectories, libraries and halls often served to portraying whole cycles from the life of saints of order. In connection with the theatre it is necessary to emphasize the role of the Klementinum cycle,⁶⁶ which majority of Bohemian Jesuits became familiar with when studying philosophy or theology.

We can divide themes and motifs treated on the stages of Jesuit schools into three groups. The first one is formed by generally known themes, often dealt with in arts and used in emblematic. These are mainly events, attitudes and miracles enumerated in the *Bulla Canonizationis*, which waited to see their visualisation in the picture decoration of church Il Gesu during canonization. It is not surprising the most frequent motif of this kind is a crab carrying a cross (*Nox orientis*, *Amplius amor et dolor*) although it was not easy to put it on the stage. There are other miracles connected with the cross and mentioned in the bull or pictures, i.e. transformation of salty water into sweet water, calming down of the storm and a blind person starting to see, they get on the stage rather sporadically. Francis's carrying a cross related to the motif of gratitude for the surplus of heavenly gifts and eternal desire to suffer for the Christ is the main theme of *Amplius labor et dolor* and April scene from play *Hercules Asiaticus*. The second plentifully used story is Xavier's help in the fight, most frequently represented also in the *Bulla Canonizationis*, which is reminded by chasing away the army of pagans endangering the Christian village. It appears in two plays: *Franciscus Xaverius Admirabilis* and *Hercules Asiaticus*. From other often iconographically treated motives we find a disputation with Buddhist priests only in Engel's play, and the scene of baptism of Pagan Kings so popular in our lands appear merely marginally.

The second group form themes that are quite popular in plays but do not occur in the *Bulla Canonizationis*. This group includes e. g. Xavier's dream of carrying an Indian person (*Nox orientis*, *Pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis*, *Hercules Asiaticus*) or the episode of Xavier's refusal of Ignatius's advice on how to lead a pious life and later the Saint's awakening (*Franciscus Xaverius ... repugnans*, *Nox orientis*) which found their place even in the artistic adaptation.⁶⁷ We have to include here the story of Peter Vellius who has, as it seems, a strange destiny. He did not become very popular in the visual art; in the Bohemian environment we know only Heinsch's picture that portrays Xavier asking Vellius for money.⁶⁸ Nevertheless this story became a favourite example as shows

Pragae, 1667; or Georgius Iwanek, *Vince te ipsum, Magnum magnorum Dei sanctorum Ignatii de Loyola Societatis Jesu fundatoris et Francisci Xaverii de eadem Societate Indiarum Apostoli, ad magnam vitae sancitatem conducens axioma*. Neo-Pragae, 1693.

⁶⁶ Nevímová (2002: 219). The pictures were according to the author created most probably in the middle of the 1660s.

⁶⁷ Klementinum cycle, no. 4.

⁶⁸ The picture does not show Vellius playing chess, like in plays, but during the feast. More about the work: Šroněk (2006: 42–45).

e.g. the fact it was ranked among a range of German language handbooks including a collection of legends by Martin of Kochem.⁶⁹

It was very popular to compare Xavier and Hercules. We find this comparison not only in play *Hercules Asiaticus*, which is based directly on this parallel, but also in Arnold Engel's work. Francis carrying an Indian person like Hercules/Atlas holding the heavenly arch is depicted even in the first of symbols in collection *Divus Franciscus Xaverius magnus Indiarum Apostolus*.

The last third group is formed by adaptations, which can be regarded unusual or quite original. We can rank here especially the play on Christianization achievements of Mathematics in China (*China Xaveriani Zeli meta*) or a typological parallel on India/Atalanta and Xavier/Hippomenes (*Schoeneida praemia cursus*). Application of Vieri's panegyric in play *Pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis* is also unusual.

The performed analysis shows that in Xaverian plays in the setting of the Bohemian province appear both the themes and motives well known from the surviving production of German lands (e.g. Naples plague, motif of Francis bringing peace to India), and the adaptations less usual or unsupported (a Chinese hydra, a parallel to Atalanta). The synopses and texts therefore prove that many Jesuits were able to deal with the frequently treated theme such as the life of Francis Xavier, handled almost always in an exclusively allegorical way, newly and originally. A further research and attempts to broaden the known corpus of texts can therefore extend our knowledge of the work of Jesuit playwrights with well-known themes.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations of archives

ATKr = Archiwum Prowincji Polski Południowej Towarzystwa Jezusowego [Archives of South Poland Province], Kraków

JS = Jesuitica fund

NA ČR = Národní archiv České republiky [Czech National Archives]

NK ČR = Národní knihovna České republiky [Czech National Library]

SK = Knihovna Královské kanonie premonstrátů na Strahově [Library of Royal Canonry of Premonstratensians at Strahov]

SM = Stará manipulace [Old Manipulation] fund

SOA Třeboň/ČK = Státní oblastní archiv v Třeboni, pobočka Český Krumlov [State District Archives Třeboň, Branch Český Krumlov]

VKOL = Vědecká knihovna Olomouc [Research Library Olomouc]

⁶⁹ Andreas Strobl, *Der Anderte Theil Oder Zusatz Deß Geistlichen KartenSpills: In welchem Die [...]*. Saltzburg, 1696: no. 108, pp. 115–119 (*Der letzte nicht der letzte Stich*); Martin Prugger, *Lehr- und Exempel-Buch für die Krancke und Sterbende, wie auch für die [...]*. Augsburg, 1730: pp. 46–47; Reginbald Perckmayr, *Geschicht- und Predig-Buch. I. Von denen Heiligen Gottes, Welche [...]*. Augsburg, 1737: T. 3, pp. 621–622; Dominicus Wenz, *Lehrreiches Exempelbuch [...] ein nützlicher Zeitvertreib als ein Haus- und Les-Buch*. Augsburg, 1757: pp. 576–579 (*Ein und dreyssigste Begebenheit, Ein reicher, mithin aber gewissenhafter Kaufmann läßt vor seinem End für sich ein Seel-Amt halten, und stirbt gleich darauf seeliglich*); Martin von Kochem, *Verbesserte Legend der Heiligen*. Augsburg, 1769: col. 1185–1186.

Manuscript sources

Engel, A., *Nox Orientis per solem Hesperium Franciscum Magnum cognomento Xaverium Sacrae Romanae Ecclesiae nuncium apostolicum discussa*, sub auspiciis Mecaenatis Protonotarii Apostolici Reverendissimi, Amplissimi, atque Doctissimi Domini D. Joannis Francisci Braun a Braunthal ... in lucem data ab Illustri, Generoso, Praenobili, Patritia et Ingenua juventute gymnasii Societatis Jesu M.DC.L.VIII. SK, sign. DE IV 13, f. 110v–170r, BT IV 95/2; NK ČR, sign. XI E 8/3.

Novi Indiarum Phaebi ortus seu S. Francisci Xaverii in Indiam adventus Indis qvam proficiuus pro debita erga Patronum suum scholarem observantia primo exercitio hebdomadario propositus a poëtis Crumloviensibus anno 1710 die 1^a Februarii. SOA Třeboň / ČK, Velkostatek Český Krumlov fund, sign. I 3 Sa 4, f. 114r–121r.

Sol in India orientali olim gloriosa morte occiduus, in novis Indiis oriens inocciduus, Sanctus Franciscus Xaverius, ambigue iuventuti ab eo, qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos, pro eligenda via salutis in lucem et ducem coelitus datus, Agente Perillustri Nobili, Praenobili ac Ingenua mediae classis grammatices juventute gymnasii Academici Societatis Jesu Neo-Pragae 1740, mense Majo, die ... NA ČR, SM, J-20-17/18, box 999, f. 677r–688v.

Tres juvenum in provinciis abeuntium morum et vitae praefecti: S. Josephus in terra, S. Xaverius in mari, S. Angelus Custos in conversatione. SOA Třeboň / ČK, Velkostatek Český Krumlov fund, sign. I 3 Sa 4, without pagination.

Printed sources

Amplius Labor et Dolor sive Crucis amor S. Francisci Xaverii a patientia probatus et praemiatus atque honori Tutelarisi sui a clientibus poëtis Iuliomontanis in scenam datus Decembris die 11. M. DC. LVIII. NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 3.

Annales Ecclesiastici, 1623 = *Annales Ecclesiastici ex XII tomis Caesaris Baronii*, [...] in epitomen redacti [...]. Moguntiae.

Armata arrogantia olim opitulante Divo Xaverio humiliter exarmata; hodie in venerationem Ejusdem urbis Patroni a suprema classe grammatices collegii Societatis Jesu Glacii in scenam data anno aerae christianae 1744, mense Junio, die // Starct bewaffneter Heydnischer Hochmuth durch des Heiligen Francisci Xaverii demüthiges Gebett, Rath und Antrid vn den obsiegenden Waffen Christlicher Demuthm siegreich ertwaffnet und erniedrigeet ... ATKr, sign. 2554, pp. 255–258.

Avancini, N., 1675. *Poesis dramatica. Pars II. Coloniae Agrippinae*.

Bartolus, D., 1666. *De vita et gestis S. Francisci Xaverii, e Societate Iesu Indiarum apostoli libri quatuor*. Lugduni. Beyerlinck, L., 1631. *Magnum theatrum vitae humanae, hoc est rerum divinarum humanarumque syntagma catholicum, historicum et dogmaticum*. Coloniae Agrippinae.

Bulla Canonizationis = Urbani VII. Pontificis Maximi Bulla Canonizationis Beati Francisci Xaverii celebrante per Gregorium XV. In: *Monumenta Xaveriana, ex autographis vel ex antiquioribus exemplis collecta. Tomus secundus. Scripta varia de sancto Francisco Xaverio*. Matriti: Gabriel Lopez del Horno, 1912, 704–724.

China Xaveriani Zeli meta = China amplissimum in oriente imperium Xaveriani Zeli meta ab academica humanitatis facultate in theatro repraesentata Neo-Pragae 1677. 9 Decembris. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 86.

Divus Franciscus Xaverius, magnus Indiarum Apostolus in symbolica decade in honorem annorum decem in Indiis exantlatorum adumbratus et epigrammatum centuria expressus nec non illustrissimis, magnificis, perillustribus, generosis, nobilibus, reverendis, religiosis ac eruditis dominis, artium liberalium et philosophiae neobaccalaureis cum in aula universitatis Olomucensis, promotore R. P. Martino Lassota Societatis Iesu, artium liberalium et philosophiae doctore, ejusdemque professore ordinario primam philosophiae lauream capessenter dicitus ac consecratus ab illustrissima, magnifica, perillustri, generosa, nobili, decade totaque facultate academicae poëseos in eadem universitate studiosa, anno M.DC.LXIII., mense Majo, die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 B 49, adl. 8; VKOL, sign. 33.330, SKC VI 102/14.

Franciscus Xaverius primum salutaribus Ignatii de Lojola consiliis repugnans ... Tandem generosa sui victoria de se ipso gloriose triumphans, seque propagandae Divinae Gloriam, et animarum saluti procurandae ex asse consecrans; a facultate oratoria Vetro-Pragae, in Academico Societatis Jesu Collegio ad S. Clementem dramatice repraesentatus ... 1745. VKOL, sign. 42.272, 42.251.

Hercules Asiaticus. D. Xaverius decennialibus in oriente laboribus gloriosus, cui obsequii ergo decem mensium scholasticos labores, academici poetae Neo-Pragenses, comice D. D. C. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 83.

Historiae Sanctorum, 1675 = *Historiae Sanctorum omnium nationum, ordinum et temporum ex probatis R. P. F. Laurentii Surii Carthusiani* [...]. Coloniae Agrippinae.

Jucundus homo Petrus Vellius latrunculis ludens S. Francisci Xaverii interventione et ejusdem vaticinio "miserescens, commodans et disponens sermones suos in iudicio" ad thema psalmi CXI. sub auspiciis Augustissimi Imperatoris Leopoldi I. Ungariae et Bohemiae Regis etc. et Augustissimae Margaritae Hispaniarum Infantis ex munificentia Amplissimi senatus Iglaviensis in scenam datus ab Illustrissima, Perillustri, Generosa, Nobili et Ingenua juventute in caesareo regioque gymnasio Societatis Jesu Iglaviae. NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 13.

Laureola Martyrii D. Francisci Xaverii in symbolica Daphniphori corona adumbrata et in scenam data a poësi academica Pragensi ad S. Clementem. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 65; SK, sign. AB VIII 38, adl. 28.

Libertinus, C., 1673. *Divus Franciscus Xaverius e Societate Jesu, orientis Apostolus, Orbis utriusque Thaumaturgus, elogii illustratus* a Carolo Libertino, ejusdem Societ[atis] Sacerdote. Vetero-Pragae: Typis Georgii Czernoch.

Massei, J., 1714. Lebens-Begriff Dess Heiligen Francisci Xaverii, Auss der Gesellschaft Jesu, Grossen Indianer Apostels und Wunderthätigen Pest-Patrons [...]. Negs.

Medicus Neapoleos = MeDICVs NeapoLeos, sive SanCtVs FrancIsCVs XaVler, NeapoLIs Lve pestifera oppressae eXCeLLentIssIMVs patronVs a poetis academicis Pragensibus in scenam datus XIX. Calend. Januarii. NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 1.

Novus Castor et Pollux = NoVVs Castor et PoLLVX IgnatIVs LoyoLa et FranCIsCVs XaVerIVs genVINI et gerManI e SoCietate IesV fratres, cor unum et anima una, toti orbi salutare, relati inter sidera; in scenam dati ab Illustrissima, Perillustri, Generosa, Nobili ac Ingenua humanitate Micro-Pragensi. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 78.

Opus posthumum Sancti Francisci Xaverii magni Indiarum Apostoli gravissimis pro fide catholica laboribus consummati; China nimirum illustrata, fidei christianae lumine, sacris ejusdem Divi auspiciis in acceptis relata, ab Illustrissima, Perillustri, Nobili ac Ingenua poësi Micro-Pragae editum, mense Decembri, die ..., M.DC.LXXVII. NK ČR, sign. 52 C 21, adl. 72.

Pexenfelder, M., 1747. *Florus Biblicus et Concionator historicus*, I–II. Augustae Videlicorum.

Pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis et praedicantis pacem Isai. 52. v. 7. A detriumphato theomachae gentilitatis fastu gloriosi; a foecundato propriis vestigiis Indiae deserto speciosi; pulchri a pacis olea propagatae; nunc theatralem cothurnum induti seu magni orbis alterius Apostoli, mundi utriusque thaumaturgi Divi Francisci Xaverii pedes super emensos, apostolico aequae ac pacifico gressu, Indiae, Japoniae ac totius pene Orientis montes, speciosi. Nunc sacratione Poesi in publicum spectaculum pro theatro producti, agente Illustrissima, Perillustri, Nobili ac Ingenua supremae classis grammaticae juventute academica Universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae, Pragae ad Sanctum Clementem anno 1710 mense ... die ... NK ČR, sign. 52 A 39, adl. 21.

Regnartius, V., 1623. *S. Francisci Xaverii, Indiarum Apostoli Societatis Iesu, quaedam miracula a Valeriano Regnartio delineata et sculpta*. Romae.

Ribadeneira, P., 1630. *Vita sanctorum seu vitae et res gestae sanctorum ex probatis scriptoribus selectae* [...]. Coloniae Agrippinae.

S. Franciscus Xaverius Admirabilis, drama scenicum exhibitum ab academica poësi Olomucii anno et die ut infra. NK ČR, sign. 52 B 44, adl. 104.

Schoeneida praemia cursus (Ovidius Epistola 15 Heroidum) in Atalanta Schoenei regis filia, Hippomenis industria parta sive India Orientis filia speciosorum evangelizantis pedum D. Francisci Xaverii cursus decennalis merces, in theatro repraesentata ab academica humanitate Neo-Pragae anno MDCLXXIX, mense Februario, die 7. *Atalanta odplata běhu Hyppamenesova aneb Indyje* ... SK, sign. AB VIII 38, adl. 37.

Tursellinus, H., 1596. *De vita Francisci Xaverii, qui primus e Societate Iesu in Indiam et Japoniam evangelium inexit libri sex*. Antverpiae.

Vierius, A., 1701. *Xaverius Dormiens et Xaverius Experrectus. Dormiens in tribus panegiricis* [...]. Augustae Videlicorum/Dillingae/Francifurti.

Secondary sources

ANDREOTTI, G., 2007. *Matteo Ricci. Jezuita v Číně* [Matteo Ricci. The Jesuit in China]. Olomouc: Refugium Velehrad-Roma.

- ANDRLE, J., FIDLEROVÁ, A. (eds.), 2010. *Františku Nebeský, vyslanče přesmořský. Podoby úcty k sv. Františku v českých textech 17. a 18. století* [Francis Celestial, Envoy Transoceanical. The Forms of the Cult of Saint Francis Xavier in the Czech Texts of the 17th and 18th Century]. Příbram: Pistorius & Olšanská.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., 2003. Jezuitské školské divadlo v pražské klementinské koleji ve 20. letech 18. století [Jesuit school theater in Prague Clementinum college in the 20 years of the 18th century]. *Pražský sborník historický* 32, 148–157.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., 2006. Literární činnost jezuitských gymnaziálních učitelů určená škole (na příkladu uherskohradištského gymnázia ve 30. letech 18. století) [Writings of jesuit grammar-school teachers for educational purposes (on the example of Uherské Hradiště grammar-school in the 1730s)]. *Studia commeniiana et historica* 36, no. 75–76, 179–186.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., 2010a. Das Bild des Herrschers auf der Jesuitenbühne. In: Čemus 2010: 925–935.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., 2010b. Litterae annuae Provinciae Bohemiae (1623–1755). *Folia Historica Bohemica* 25/1, 23–49.
- BOBKOVÁ-VALENTOVÁ, K., JACKOVÁ, M., 2010. Úvod do kapitoly: Jezuitské divadlo v Čechách. / Einleitung in das Kapitel: Jesuitentheater in Böhmen. In: Čemus 2010: 895–908.
- ČEMUS, P. et al. (eds.), 2010. *Bohemia Jesuitica 1556–2006*. Praha: Karolinum.
- ČERNÝ, K., HAVLÍK, J. M., 2008. *Jezuité a mor* [The jesuits and black death]. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- DOLEJŠÍ, K., 2013. „Naše zvědavé století se chce bavit novotou a nenadálou krásou.“ *Symboly ilustrované barokní tisky olomouckých jezuitů* [“Our curious century wants to enjoy novelty and unexpected beauty.” Symbolic illustrations in baroque prints of the Olomouc Jesuits]. The PhD thesis. Masarykova Univerzita Brno, Filozofická fakulta, Seminář dějin umění. http://is.muni.cz/th/12930/ff_d [18 August 2014].
- ITURRIAGA ELORZA, J., 1994. Hechos prodigiosos atribuidos a San Francisco Javier en unos grabados del siglo XVII. *Príncipe de Viana* 203, 467–511.
- JACKOVÁ, M., 2006. Arnold Engel a jeho tři tragédie pro zakončení školního roku na jezuitských gymnáziích [Arnold Engel and his three tragedies for the closing festival of the school year at Jesuit College]. *Divadelní revue* 17, no. 2, 14–20.
- JACKOVÁ, M., 2011a. *Divadlo jako škola ctnosti a zbožnosti. Jezuitské školské drama v Praze v první polovině 18. století* [Theatre as School of Virtue and Piety. Jesuit School Drama in the First Half of 18th Century]. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.
- JACKOVÁ, M., 2011b. The Mirror of Virtue, the Miracle of Eloquence, the Oracle of Wisdom. Jesuit plays about St. Catherine of Alexandria. In: *Czech theatre review 1989–2009. Selected articles on Czech theatre from the journal Divadelní revue*. Praha: Institut umění – Divadelní ústav, 9–23.
- JACKOVÁ, M., 2012. Mezi duchovním a světským. Jezuitské školské drama v Praze kolem poloviny 18. století [Between the spiritual and the secular (Jesuit school drama in Prague round the mid-18th century)]. *Cornova* 2, 49–64.
- JORDAN, R., 1916. Dramatische Strebungen der Jesuiten in Krumau. *Mitteilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 54, 141–189.
- MENČÍK, F., 1895. *Príspevky k dějinám českého divadla* [Contributions to the History of Czech Theatre]. Praha: Česká akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění.
- MENÉNDEZ PELÁEZ, J., 1995. *Los jesuitas y el teatro en el siglo de oro*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo.
- MÍKOVEC, F. B., 1851. Historické drobnosti (Staré české divadlo). *Lumír* 20th March 1851, 162.
- NEVÍMOVÁ, P., 2002. Cyklus nástěnných maleb na chodbách pražského Klementina [The cycle of wall paintings in the corridors of Clementinum College in Prague]. In: A. Pazderová (ed.), *Pocta Josefu Kollmanovi. Sborník k životnímu jubileu*. Praha: Státní ústřední archiv v Praze, 214–222.
- OSWALD, M. C., 2002. Die Entstehung einer Ikonographie des Franz Xaver im Kontext seiner kultischen Verehrung in den Jahren von 1552 bis 1640. In: R. Haub, J. Oswald (eds.), *Franz Xaver – Patron der Missionen. Festschrift zum 450. Todestag*. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 66–78.
- RYBA, B., 1926. Literární činnost Karla Kolčavy [Writing of jesuit Karel Kolčava]. *Časopis Matice moravské* 50, 434–565.
- SVATOŠ, M., 2004. Bernardus Pannagl. In: *Slovník latinských spisovatelů* [Dictionary of Latin writers]. Praha: Leda, 441–442.

- SZAROTA, E. M., 1979–1987. *Das Jesuitendrama im deutschen Sprachgebiet. Eine Periochen-Edition. Texte und Kommentare* I/1–III/2. *Indices* IV. München: W. Fink.
- ŠRONĚK, M., 2006. *Jan Jiří Heinsch. Malíř barokní zbožnosti* [Jan Jiří Heinsch. Painter of Baroque Piety]. Praha: Národní galerie.
- Theater in Böhmen*, 2013 = *Theater in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts. Ein Lexikon*. Hrsg. von A. Jakubcová u. M. J. Pernerstorfer. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften / Praha: Institut umění – Divadelní ústav, 2013.
- VALENTIN, J.-M., 2001. *Les jésuites et le théâtre (1554–1680)*. Paris: Éditions Desjonquères.
- ZELENKOVÁ, P., 2011. *Martin Antonín Lublinský jako inventor grafických listů. Pohled do středoevropské barokní grafiky druhé poloviny 17. století* [Martin Anton Lublinský (1636–1690) as a designer of prints. Views into Central European Baroque graphics of the latter half of the 17th century]. Praha: Národní galerie.
- ZEMEK, M., 2001. *Dějiny jezuitské koleje v Uherském Hradišti* [History of the Jesuit College in Uherské Hradiště]. In: *Kniha o Redutě* [Book of Reduta]. Uherské Hradiště: Ottobro 12, 5–238.

SV. FRANTIŠEK XAVERSKÝ NA ŠKOLNÍCH SCÉNÁCH JEZUITSKÉ ČESKÉ PROVINCE

Shrnutí

Studie se zabývá jezuitskými školskými dramaty z českých zemí, jejichž protagonistou je sv. František Xaverský. Čtyři kompletní texty a 13 her dochovaných jen ve formě synopse rozebírá především z hlediska proměn nejčastějších motivů, které se kromě divadelních her objevují také ve světcových životopisech a ve výtvarném umění.

Provedený rozbor ukazuje, že v prostředí české řádové provincie se v xaveriánských hrách objevují jak náměty dobře známé z jiných zemí, tak motivy méně obvyklé či nedoložené. Synopse i texty také dokazují, že i tak často zpracovávané téma jako je život Františka Xaverského, pojímané navíc téměř výlučně alegoricky, dokázali mnozí jezuité uchopit nově a neotřele.

APPENDIX

The list of Xaverian plays – texts and synopses

1		<i>Medicus Neapoleos</i>	14. 12. 1656	Prague – Klementinum	humanities	synopsis
2		<i>Amplius Labor et Dolor</i>	11. 12. 1658	Olomouc	humanities	synopsis
3	Arnoldus Engel / Angelus	<i>Nox Orientis</i>	1658	Cheb	all school	full text – 3 manuscripts
4		<i>Novus Castor et Pollux</i>	1659	Prague – Malá Strana	humanities	synopsis
5	[Franciscus Kamperger]	<i>S. Franciscus Xaverius Admirabilis</i>	1661	Olomouc	humanities	synopsis
6	[Joannes Coratinus ?]	<i>Jucundus homo</i>	1667	Jihlava	all school	synopsis
7	[Guilielmus Dworsky]	<i>Hercules Asiaticus.</i>	1672	Prague – Nové Město	humanities	synopsis
8		<i>Opus posthumum</i>	?. 12. 1677	Prague – Malá Strana	humanities	synopsis
9		<i>China Xaveriani Zeli meta</i>	9. 12. 1677	Prague – Nové Město	humanities	synopsis
10	[Henricus Richter]	<i>Schoeneida praemia cursus</i>	7. 2. 1679	Prague – Nové Město	humanities	synopsis
11		<i>Laureola Martyrii</i>	16??	Prague – Klementinum	humanities	2 synopses
12	[Fabianus Vesely]	<i>Pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis</i>	1710	Prague – Klementinum	highest grammar class	synopsis
13	[Tobias Streit]	<i>Novi Indiarum Phaebi ortus</i>	1. 2. 1710	Český Krumlov	humanities	full text – manuscript
14	[Sigismundus Pospischil]	<i>Sol in India</i>	?. 5. 1740	Prague – Nové Město	middle grammar class	full text – manuscript
15	[Josephus Swartz]	<i>Armata arrogantia</i>	?. 6. 1744	Klodska	highest grammar class	synopsis
16	[Ferdinandus Silberman]	<i>Franciscus Xaverius primum salutaribus Ignatii de Lojola consiliis repugnans</i>	spring, 1745	Prague – Klementinum	rhetoric	two different synopses
17		<i>Tres juvenum praefecti</i>	17??	[Český Krumlov]		full text – manuscript

EXISTIMATIONES LIBRORUM

Petr Kitzler, *Athletae Christi. Raně křesťanská hagiografie mezi nápodobou a adaptací* [*Athletae Christi. Early Christian Hagiography between Imitation and Adaptation*]. Praha: Filosofia, 2012, 232 p. ISBN 978-80-7007-380-3

Research, in humanities in particular, does not progress evenly but in leaps. The year 2012 brought one such significant advance in research into *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, one of the first Latin language texts with Christian content. After years of being mainly covered in articles (and infrequently at that, as shown under the relevant heading in the annotated bibliography *Chronica Tertulliana et Cyprianea*, published annually in *Révue des Études Augustiniennes et patristiques*), three publications dedicated to this work appeared, two of them published by Oxford University Press. A monograph by Thomas J. Heffernan¹ that aspires to become “the definitive work on the subject”² offers an extensive overview of the current state of research complemented by the author’s own hypotheses, the Latin text, a new translation into English as well as in-depth commentary. Proceedings from the conference held in 2007 at Humboldt University in Berlin (ed. Jan N. Bremmer and Marco Formisano)³ contain – in addition to the text of *Passio* and its English translation – nineteen studies which bring fresh points of view on the text, its interpretations and context, in particular the phenomenon of martyrdom and the social and religious history of early Christianity.

Athletae Christi. Raně křesťanská hagiografie mezi nápodobou a adaptací [Athletae Christi. Early Christian Hagiography between Imitation and Adaptation] by Petr Kitzler⁴ stays somewhat in the shadow of these publications. Partly to blame is the fact that it was written in Czech and published in Prague (and not by the prestigious Oxford University Press). A contributing factor is its humble title from which only few would guess a detailed study of a major topic covered in neither of the publications above: Late Antiquity reception and reinterpretations of *Passio* which is not even mentioned in the title.

The book has two parts. The first one, “*Fortissimi martyres: Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis* as a pre-text” (21–85), is dedicated to the text itself. The first three chapters deal with genre context, structure, style and related historical-philological questions (dating, authorship, variants of the text). Kitzler establishes *status quaestionum* from secondary sources including latest publications and his main contribution is the accessible arrangement of all available information, as well as his critical approach.⁵ Some passages, however, venture outside the sphere of a critical research overview and present Kitzler’s own observations, e.g. when he draws attention to unique stylistic elements in *Passio* that later become part of the inventory of martyrological literature (34f.).

The most original is Chapter 4, “*Passio Perpetuae* and its innovative features” (61–85) which, coming closest to the promise expressed by the title of Part I, develops Kitzler’s hypothesis about potentially subversive features of *Passio* and becomes the point of departure for his enquiry into the reception of *Passio* in the second part of the study. According to this hypothesis, the subversive potential of *Passio* rests in the tension between two

¹ Thomas J. Heffernan, *The Passion of Perpetua and Felicity*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

² Sarah Klitenic Wear, rev. “Thomas J. Heffernan, *The Passion of Perpetua and Felicity*”. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2013.01.58. <http://www.bmcreview.org/2013/01/20130158.html> [last viewed 15 March 2014].

³ Jan N. Bremmer, Marco Formisano (eds.), *Perpetua’s Passions. Multidisciplinary Approaches to the Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

⁴ Also PhD thesis, Faculty of Arts of Charles University, Prague.

⁵ Regrettably, Heffernan’s study was not available to Kitzler before his text was submitted for publication.

factors. On the one hand, there is the authority the text assumes, in particular in passages by the anonymous editor, by emphasizing the authenticity of Perpetua's and Satur's testimony. On the other hand, the text addresses, in the light of the social norms of the period, certain social categories, especially gender (role of the woman in society and in relation to men, typical traits of femininity, authority of the father within family) and ecclesiastical hierarchies (hierarchy of formal authority of clergy and informal authority of martyrs) in a non-standard manner.

The second part of the book, "From *exemplum fidei* to *admirandum, non imitandum: Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis* and its later interpreters" (89–151), addresses the central theme of the study: the reception of *Passio* from its creation up to the fifth century. The focus is on investigation into strategies employed in individual instances to neutralize features identified as subversive in Part I. The history of the reception of *Passio* in Antiquity is divided into five chapters. In an original move, justified by the nature of the primary material and chosen method, Kitzler treats the editorial stratum of *Passio* as its first critical reception (89–96). This approach makes for a more sensitive distinction between the individual layers ("voices") than is usual in secondary literature. It also helps to deal with the issue of perception of events and their description in the contemporary context. The following chapters justify this approach and demonstrate that the editor's reinter-pretative efforts launch a discernible trend continued in Tertullian (97–100) and other martyrological texts throughout the third century (101–108).

The most acute observations are set out in two extensive chapters on St. Augustine and his followers (109–131) and the relationship between *Passio* and *Acta Perpetuae* (132–151). Especially convincing is Kitzler's initial argument that changing historical circumstances in the fourth century and then again in the fifth century necessitated reevaluation of the entire cult of martyrdom, of which *Passio* was one of the most important texts (109–111 and 140–151). The chapter dedicated to the variety of reinterpretations of the story of Perpetua by St. Augustine and his followers includes a coherent analysis the ways in which the meaning of the original text was manipulated. Particularly insightful is Kitzler's observation that St. Augustine diversifies his strategies depending on his audiences (115–126, *passim*). This required brilliant rhetorical skills unattained in similar texts written by St. Augustine's followers. The importance of this chapter is enhanced by the fact that Kitzler is the first to cover material discovered in the past two decades, including *Sermo 282auc.* discovered in Erfurt as late as in 2007, and offers a comprehensive reading. The chapter devoted to *Acta Perpetuae* places well-known material into the context of reception history which opens space for a more plastic interpretation of its departures from *Passio* and their motivation. Among other things, the chapter provides further arguments for previously suggested dating of *Acta* to the mid-fifth century, in the wake of St. Augustine's systematic reinterpretation of *Passio*.

The study as a whole offers a complex and coherent outline of the history of the reception of *Passio* until the end of Antiquity and brings forward our understanding of this hitherto little researched theme. It is to be hoped that its planned translation into English⁶ will soon reach a wider audience, making a significant contribution to knowledge of subject.

Martin Bažil

⁶ Petr Kitzler, *From Passio Perpetuae to Acta Perpetuae. Recontextualizing a Martyr Story in the Literature of the Early Church* [= Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 127]. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.

At present there are no unified edition rules how to publish Latin early modern times texts. The most elaborate rules of our country are based on long-standing philological practice with Jan Amos Komenský's texts created for purposes of critical edition of his complete work *Johannis Amos Comenii Opera omnia*.⁷ Certain general instructions for editing are also mentioned e.g. in the publication supervised by Jan Štoviček which focuses mainly on Czech historical sources but devotes very little space to texts in different languages.⁸ More detailed and systematically processed advice can be found in Martin Svatoš' internal material created for purposes of planned edition series *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum recentioris aevi*.⁹

This problematic is given far more space abroad. In German countries newer studies follow the obsolete rules of Johann Schultze.¹⁰ These are mainly compilations of colloquiums dealing both with editing problematic and text-critical approaches, presenting particular advice more than rules or guidelines.¹¹ The latest contributions to contemporary edition practise can be found in compilation *Vom Nutzen des Edierens*.¹² Publication *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* presents extensive and clearly divided bibliography focused on neo-Latin and touching critical editions.¹³

The main range of problems the editor of early modern times Latin works has to cope with is distinguishing vocalic and consonantal sounds *u/v* or *i/j*, distribution of graphemes for a long vowel *ae/oe/e*, volatile writing of *i/y* (in words of Greek or Latin origin),

⁷ These rules have not been published so far, they are available only in the form of internal material for editing purposes. Professor Bohumil Ryba treated first rules and their final shape was created by Julie Nováková – cf. J. Nováková, *Edičně textologická pravidla pro vydávání latinských spisů J. A. Komenského* [Text-editorial rules for publishing Latin works of J. A. Komenský]. Typescript. A brief introduction to these rules is provided by M. Steiner, "Kritische Editionen des komplexen Werkes J. A. Komenskýs". *Acta Comeniana* 9 (33), 1991, 175–188; *idem*, "Ediční pravidla pro vydávání latinských spisů J. A. Komenského" [Editorial rules for publishing Latin works of J. A. Komenský]. *Folia philologica* 122, 1999, 232–240.

⁸ I. Štoviček et alii, *Zásady vydávání novověkých historických pramenů z období od počátku 16. století do současnosti* [Rules for Publishing Historical Sources of Modern Times from the Beginning of the 16th Century up to now]. Praha: Archivní správa Ministerstva vnitra ČR, 2002, 62–64.

⁹ M. Svatoš, *Doporučení pro vydávání latinských pramenů v ediční řadě Fontes rerum Bohemicarum recentioris aevi (FRBRAE)* [Advice for Publishing Latin Sources in the Series of Edition FRBRAE]. Typescript. We dealt with development tendencies in detail when creating text-editorial rule in the chapter "Přehled vývoje a současná ediční praxe pro vydávání latinských spisů" [Overview of Development and Contemporary Editing Practice for Publishing Latin Works]. In: A. Bočková, *Historia S. Joannis Nepomuceni z roku 1729 a její dobové překlady* [Historia S. Joannis Nepomuceni of 1729 and its Period Translations]. PhD thesis. Praha: FF UK, 2010, 173–178.

¹⁰ J. Schultze, "Richtlinien für die äußere Textgestaltung bei Herausgabe von Quellen zur neueren deutschen Geschichte". Last time in: W. Heinemeyer (ed.), *Richtlinien für die Edition landesgeschichtlicher Quellen*. Marburg/Köln, 1978, 25–36.

¹¹ L. Mundt, H.-G. Roloff, U. Seelbach (eds.), *Probleme der Edition von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit. Beiträge zur Arbeitstagung der Kommission für die Edition von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992.

¹² B. Merta, A. Sommerlechner, H. Weigl (eds.), *Vom Nutzen des Edierens. Akten des internationalen Kongresses zum 150-jährigen Bestehen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*. Wien, 3.–5. Juni 2004. Wien/München: Oldenbourg, 2005.

¹³ "Chap. V. Texts and Editions. 3. Critical Editions". In: J. Ijsewijn, D. Sacré, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II. Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions*. 2nd ed. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1998, 460–478.

simplifying consonant clusters or on the contrary doubling consonants, using stresses, or rather marks distinguishing homonymy of words implying the length, contracted forms and endings of two different forms.¹ An independent chapter in edition practice is on writing capitals, which is characterized by a considerable volatility, except a significantly bigger use of majuscules. This proves that the visual aspect and compactness of the text was not so emphasised in the past as today and the practice of authors (but also printers, pressmen and typesetters) often differed. There are significant changes usually in punctuation that was originally based on rhythmical structure of the speech. It does not abide syntactic-logical aspects but rather principles of natural division of the speech by exhalation pauses into more or less individual semantic sections. Last but not least the editor solves the shape of numeric data, itemizing abbreviations (either common siglum or palaeographic abbreviations and ligatures), boundaries of words in the text and formal division into paragraphs enabling easier orientation in the text.

A lively discussion about edition approaches in our environment last started during the workshop *Problémy stanovení a aplikace edičních zásad při vydávání rukopisu J. P. Cerroniho Scriptores Regni Bohemiae* [Problems of Defining and Application of Edition Rules on the Occasion of Publishing Manuscript of J. P. Cerroni – Scriptores Regni Bohemiae], held by the Cabinet for classical studies of Philosophical Institute of Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic on May 30th 2012. The tumultuous discussion over applied transcription rules showed that specialists' opinions on this issue differ both with respect to their focus (linguistic, literary, and historical) and with respect to the language of the edited text (Latin, German, Czech). It is therefore obvious it is impossible to set uniform edition rules, and when publishing Latin texts it is necessary to take into consideration their genre, time of origin, provenance and other specifics of the work. The editor, however, should bear in mind the recipient and through the work try to simplify perception and comprehension of the work. It is not about a violent classicizing of Latin or useless changes in orthography but mainly about formal adjustments, which should not influence the sound side of the text. The main postulate of transcription rules is preserving all period individual peculiarities and on the contrary replacing older graphic conventions – not closely connected with the language aspect with today's conventions.

Kateřina Bobková-Valentová, a researcher from Historical Institute, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic discharged this task very successfully. She prepared the first out of three planned edition volumes making consuetudinary of German Assistance provinces accessible as a specific kind of normative sources. It is about regulations and instructions adjusting everyday life of Jesuit communities of the Order enabling an insight into the inner life in the houses of the Order, both in practical and spiritual matters. They capture both basic rules valid in the whole region and existing provincial differences reflecting certain local customs.²

A collection of customs is usually divided into three content units. The first part includes regulations for operation of the house of the Order (*Ordo domesticus*); this means a colourful range of everyday activities and practical instructions involving e.g.

¹ E.g. adverb *hic* compared to pronoun *hic*, adverb *pòst* compared to preposition *post*, contracted forms *amásse* instead of *amavisse*, doublet endings *deúm* instead of *deorum* or *experièrè* instead of *experieris*, but also the real word accent before enclitics (*meritóque*).

² E.g. differences in eating or clothing styles due to climate conditions.

regulations regarding times of getting up and going to bed, regular praying or reading by the table. It does not lack an overview of Jesuit duties in spiritual administration of the community itself and believer's community. Other parts are focused mainly on relaxing in the hall of residence or in the country. A significant space is given to the rules connected with peregrination of the Order, i.e. receiving guests, paying travelling costs or acquiring suitable clothes for a journey, packing luggage and ways of transport. Other regulations concern the ill and dead. An exceptionally interesting part is a set of instructions for eating and a detailed diet sheet for ordinary days and holidays including particular courses and their ingredients (*Ratio ciborum*). Such a description provides us with a unique insight into Jesuits' eating habits in the given province.

The second part is made by practical regulations for operating schools (*Ordo scholarum*). They deal with grammar schools of the Order, but also with academies, organizing a school year including specifying the term of academic disputations, shape of school and theatre events and declamations, determine the schedule of a school day, contents of education, they set rules for displaying the best student works, accepting to higher classes, and define dates of holidays.³ The last part is devoted to ensuring the church operation (*Consuetudines templi*). We can find here not only rules concerning mass services, listening to confessions, leading sermons or exhortations but also practical instructions about times of opening and closing the church, its cleaning, lighting and way of using bells. Another part is formed by detailed instructions for funeral ceremonies.

Regarding the fact a huge amount of these sources have been preserved, Kateřina Valentová decided to present in her project some of typical representatives and offer users both a representative sample of consuetudinaries for all the provinces and detailed compilations for individual halls of residence of the Czech Province. As a base of provincial rules she considers consuetudinary texts preserved in the Roman General Curia Archive (*Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu*) in the collection *Consuetudines Assistentiae Germaniae*.⁴ The edition structure is based on development of German Assistance. This is the reason why she includes in the first volume of this series three sets of the Rhine Province from the 1620s which basically present three versions of the same text. For this reason she technically merge them together – the common text is interrupted by three-column structuring in the parts the versions differ. The editor provided in this rather unusual way, which may not look quite clear, a functional and simple solution. She did not excessively load the critical apparatus with a large quantity of different reading neither did she unnecessarily publish a full version of three similar texts. It is followed by consuetudinary of the Flemish-Belgian Province marked and approved by the general of the Order in 1628. It is completed by orders (*Ordinationes*) created on the basis of annual reports of provincials and general church visitations adjusting wording of an older perhaps unsuitable collection. The most extensive consuetudinary is customs of the Gaul-Belgian Province from 1640. They include a schematic overview of rules concerning operation of the house of the Order, spiritual administration and school activity

³ E.g. main holidays were put for the end of a school year (which in Jesuit schools ended in autumn).

⁴ The compilation was preserved in two manuscripts: *Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu*, Germ. 128 and *Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu*, Germ. 129, while the first has a character of an official text which probably originated as a transcription of texts of another manuscript which originally need not have had the character of a convolute.

organized according to the most important days of the church year. Texts of customs do not include a similar table calendar.

Consuetudinary of Upper German Province originated in 1627–1628. It, apart from usual parts, attaches to the spiritual activity of community members also a regulation concerning Marian Congregation, whose set of customs' incorporation is not usual. The customs text is based on two manuscripts and that is why it is divided into two columns where the versions differ. The set of Austrian Province customs comes from the 1630s and its structure corresponds to the deep-rooted practice. Most space is devoted to regulations about inner life of the community of the Order. On the contrary, school rules are treated very briefly with a reference to *Ratio studiorum*. The last consuetudinary included in the edition is the one of the Czech Province⁵ from 1628. Parts focused on hall of residence life and spiritual administration are very short and ignore a number of topics. The more interesting are instructions for schools which except usual and also very short *Consuetudines scholarum* include also *Consuetudines academiae*. We find in them passages on academic offices and ranks, graduation ceremonies or e.g. descriptions of deans' clothes, other dignitaries and graduating students. Including this chapter testifies for significance the university education in the Czech Province had. It also reflects period disputes on controlling the Charles University between Jesuits and cardinal Harrach. After edition of particular consuetudinary are filed journals of Father Generals or rather their parts containing amending remarks or objections to original versions of the rules. The selected sample of set of customs convincingly shows that the generals flexibly made allowances for local peculiarities and needs of individual provinces although the Jesuit Order was centrally controlled by the fellowship.

The reviewed publication is traditionally started by an edition remark⁶ in which the author gives a qualified codicological and palaeographical description of manuscript sources and tries to affiliate them on the basis of comparing textual changes (corrections, deletions and interlinear notes) or mistakes made when copying. She convincingly explains the choice of the basic text but in its edition also allows for other so far found manuscripts of consuetudinary made accessible, when each represents another phase in the process of their origin, codification and use. The part devoted to the rules of edition is elaborated in a very detailed and clear way. On the basis of studies of the existing literature devoted to transcription of Latin texts the editor set elaborated edition rules which enable the reader to perceive the Latin text to the greatest possible extent, however, respect its specifics coming from the time and place of origin and mainly its character. She clearly summarizes used formal and transcription adjustments and focuses mainly on problematic parts such as abbreviations, majuscule and punctuation. She essentially endeavours to unify these issues since high volatility typical of Latin text coming from early modern times can be disruptive for today's recipients and draw their attention from the informative contents to questions on sense of different orthography. In reality, however, these variants did not bear any meaning-making element. The editor preserves unusual words, of course (*charitas*, *linqua*, *quum*), and keeps their differences from classical spelling when writing long vowels

⁵ The Czech Province separated from the Austrian one in 1623.

⁶ Pp. 11–24.

ae/oe/e, doubled consonants and does not interfere into writing *i/y*.⁷ Only the distribution of character *i/j* which in manuscript differentiates majuscule (*J*) from minuscule (*i*), both working as a vowel and a consonant, can seem debatable. The editor decided to use grapheme *i* in all positions,⁸ only in proper names she preserves *J* in the consonant position.⁹

In the following chapters of an omnibus title *Uniformity versus adaptability*¹⁰ the author describes principal phases of individual consuetudinary development on the basis of preserved sources. She focuses on their inception, gradual changes, process of approvals and incorporation into the whole context of Jesuit normative sources. Collection of customs was usually formed by provincials, judged and commented by the province assistant, the final approbation was given by the general of the Society of Jesus. The process of their originating is supported by Kateřina Valentová with quotations from other archive sources (regulations and correspondence from the general church, circular journal, visitation reports, regulations of the Order, constitution and establishment of general congregation etc.). By comparing individual texts and research of other sources she is trying to answer questions how the general church intervened in the text of consuetudinary submitted by the province and whether the approbated text stored in the general church in Rome and text used in the province differ and how much the preserved consuetudinary texts correspond to the shape of the original common rule.

These studies bring erudite characteristic of the presented source, which none of Czech scholars has dealt with so profoundly. The author's researches follow a detailed consuetudinary analysis, which she presented already in her first monograph *Everyday Life of a Teacher and Student of a Jesuit Grammar School*.¹¹ Her conclusions prove enormous scope of research range and her excellent knowledge of the Jesuit subject. The only thing to consider is perhaps ordering these chapters with crucial information and placing them after a detailed palaeographic description of manuscripts and edition note. The reader unfamiliar with this kind of source waits quite long for the basic information on the type of edited texts, their contents focus and function they had within the rules of the Jesuit Order.

The core of edition is created by already mentioned consuetudinary texts provided with apt critical and subject notes. They are both placed right under the Latin text, which we consider a successful technical and reader-friendly solution since it is not necessary to browse when looking for particular legends. The editor records different text variations and infrequent emendation in the textual-critical notes. In the explanatory commentary she includes an accurate identification of directly or indirectly in the text quoted rules and regulations¹² of the Order which the relevant customs are based on. She also com-

⁷ In the mentioned issues she keeps even volatility which does not make understanding the sense difficult (*coena/caena, poenitentia/paenitentia, scaena/scena, saecularis/secularis; litania/lytania, hiems/hyems*).

⁸ *In, eius, obiiiciunt, Coadiutor, Maius.*

⁹ *Jesus, Joannes, Julius, dies Jovis*, probably not thoroughly *Ianitor* (p. 118).

¹⁰ "Jezuitské domácí řády zvané Consuetudines, jejich vznik a podoba" [Jesuit Home Orders Called Consuetudines, their Origin and Shape] (pp. 25–30), "Provincie versus generalát" [Province Versus General Church] (pp. 31–37), "Struktura a obsah vydávaných konsvetudinářů" [Structure and Contents of Issued Consuetudinaries] (pp. 38–46).

¹¹ K. Bobková-Valentová, *Každodenní život učitele a žáka jezuitského gymnázia* [Everyday Life of a Teacher and Student of a Jesuit Grammar School]. Praha: Karolinum, 2006, 21–51.

¹² Especially *Ratio studiorum, Epistulae Generalium, Regulae Societatis Iesu, Decreta Congregationis, Ordinationes, Observationes Provincialium, Approbationes, Constitutiones* etc.

pletes entire bibliographical data of works the rules refer to.¹³ The notes are consistently in Latin, which increases the edition's universality and enables also foreign recipients to use it for their research. The edition is completed by usual indices (abbreviations, personal, place and subject index). The user's comfort is, however, enhanced by a detailed index of chapters and paragraphs of edited consuetudinaries, which simplifies the reader's orientation in the text and moreover provides them with a clear comparison of individual texts' contents. The description of manuscripts and scribe's hands is suitably illustrated in the pictorial addendum. It should be added the author is preparing the second edition volume for publication involving extensive consuetudinaries of Lithuanian and Polish Provinces gradually created before 1650,¹⁴ the collection of customs for the English Province from the 1630s and the Upper Rhine consuetudinary from 1704. The editor is planning to include in the last volume restored consuetudinary for the Czech Province together with visitation's regulations and relevant correspondence.

In conclusion let us return to the reviewed work. It is a pity this edition lacks space for translating the Latin source into the Czech language. The publication would certainly reach a higher number of recipients and have a broader reader's reception. It can be a topic to consider especially in a planned third volume which will speak about collections of the Czech Province customs. For the audience from abroad it would be on the contrary interesting to replace the too brief English resume¹⁵ with a complete English translation of introductory chapters. A higher number of typing errors and inconsistencies on the formal side¹⁶ go to the detriment of publication's professionalism; it makes a disturbing impression on the reader and mainly points at not too thorough editorial work. In spite of these minor admonitions the presented publication showing a specific kind of normative sources, is a significant contribution to the research on the Jesuit Order, life in the houses of the Order and history of everyday life from the perspective of order communities.

Alena Bočková

¹³ E.g. recommendation for reading at common dining or compulsory literature for individual Grammar School classes or reference to *Catechism* of Petr Canisius, *De imitatione Christi* of Thomas à Kempis etc.

¹⁴ It is interesting they also use national language except Latin.

¹⁵ Little more than four text pages (261–265).

¹⁶ In stating pagination or foliation, size of manuscripts, note word wrapping (p. 233), disunity and different forms of titles (*Flando-Belgicae*, *Gallobelgicae*, pp. 40–41, but *Gallo-Belgicae*, from p. 99), majuscule in the text headings (*anno/Anno* from p. 188) and others.

Daniel Škoviera, Miloslav Okál – Prvý slovenský profesor klasickej filológie
[Miloslav Okál – The First Slovak Professor of Classical Philology]. Comenius University of Bratislava and Faculty of Philosophy and Arts of Trnava University in Trnava, 2013, 278 p. ISBN 978-80-223-3455-6

In the year 2013 the specialized reading public received a new publication written by the Slovak classical philologist Prof. Daniel Škoviera, in which the author focuses on the life career and works of the first Slovak professor of classical philology Miloslav Okál. Formerly, Škoviera himself used to be his student and later on also his colleague in the Department of classical languages of Comenius University in Bratislava.

As the author suggests in his preface (p. 9), the aim of the book is to complete what could not be written in the English article entitled “Miloslav Okál: The Coryphaeus of Slovak Philologists”, *Classical Bulletin* 68/1, 1992, 3–7, initiated by an American Slovakian and classical philologist Ladislav Bolchazy. Although this text took into consideration mostly the needs of a foreign public, it was, however, the first endeavour to explain, in a more complex way, the role professor Okál played in the disciplines regarding the classical antiquity in Slovakia. The third volume of Trnava book series *Sambucus* comprised several articles devoted to professor Okál and his oeuvre (D. Škoviera, E. Juríková (ed.), *Sambucus III*. Trnava: Filozofická fakulta Trnavskej univerzity, 2008; M. Slošiarová, “Preklady Miloslava Okála v zbierkach Archívu literatúry a umenia Slovenskej národnej knižnice v Martine”, pp. 98–108, D. Škoviera, “Miloslav Okál ako kritik prekladu”, pp. 109–125, J. Kordoš, “Klasický filológ v úlohe prekladateľa”, pp. 205–207), which find their continuation in the present monograph written by Daniel Škoviera.

In the title of the book itself the “primacy” is highlighted. In fact, it is by no means an accident because it was precisely this word, reflecting different areas of Miloslav Okál’s professional activity, that played a significant role in his actions. First and foremost, Okál was the first Slovakian to obtain the title of a professor of classical philology. Secondly, Okál was the first translator of the first work that documentedly originated in the territory of nowadays Slovakia. In fact, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius recorded at the end of the first book of his *Meditations*, the philosophical diary, that he had written it by the River Hron (lat. *Granus*). This happened probably in the year 174 AD. Moreover, Okál liked the texts of the Diary and he was pleased to cite from them even longer passages. Thirdly, Okál was the first who brought to Slovak readers a complete translation of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* – premier oeuvre of European literature and at the same time a masterpiece of ancient Greek poetry. And finally, the fourth and less noticeable Okál’s primacy in Slovakia is in that he made Neo-Latin studies an organic part of the research in the field of classical antiquity.

The above-mentioned monograph is systematically divided into altogether six compact parts to which precedes the author’s foreword (pp. 9–12). In the first chapter of the book (pp. 13–61) which is clearly divided into several sections, Daniel Škoviera pays particular attention to Miloslav Okál’s life career. He draws the moments of Okál’s childhood through his university studies, and subsequently his first years as a secondary-school lecturer. Further in this chapter he concentrates on the rudiments of Okál’s university career up to the years when he became the head of the Department of Classical Languages and, finally, he depicts Okál’s last years of his academic career as professor emeritus.

The four following chapters of the book are monothematically devoted to the periods of Miloslav Okál's professional career from author's various points of view, namely "Okál as a teacher" (chapter II, pp. 62–73), "Okál and ancient philosophy" (chapter III, pp. 74–89), "Okál and Aristophanes" (chapter IV, pp. 90–105), "Okál and Neo-Latin studies" (chapter V, pp. 106–128), and "Okál and the art of translating" (chapter VI, pp. 129–166). Chapter six is then divided into three subchapters: "Okál as a translator", "Okál as a theoretician of translation" and "Okál and the history of the Slovak translation". The titles of the chapters themselves, forming the monograph's core, show to the reader how rich professor Miloslav Okál's literary work had been.

The last part of the monograph proposes for illustration extracts of selected texts from Miloslav Okál's entire oeuvre (pp. 167–212). Then the bibliography follows (pp. 213–220) and 30 subsequent pages offer a thoroughly elaborated list of Okál's publications (pp. 221–251) mentioned year after year from the beginnings of his professional activity (1940, when the first two of his reviews appeared) up to the year 2012 (reeditions of Seneca's *Letters to Lucilius* and Aristotle's *On the heavens / On generation and corruption*). The compilers of this list of publications (L. Karabi and D. Škoviera) strictly distinguish between Okál's book publications, reviews, translations and encyclopaedic entries. The list is completed by discourses with Okál, jubilee articles and obituaries. At the end of the book, the index of names follows (pp. 252–265) and on the last pages of the monograph readers can also find several interesting and valuable photographs documenting both Okál's private and professional life.

An important circumstance that preceded the redaction of this book is the fact that Okál was a central figure in the field of Slovak classical philology since the end of the World War II to the end of 1980s. Thus, indeed, it is not possible to deal with the history of knowledge of antiquity in Slovakia, analyse it or even evaluate, without taking into account the philologist Okál and his professional activity. The monograph portrays not only his personal contribution to the development of classical studies in Slovakia but at the same time provides a deep insight into the period of the communist ideology which considerably affected not only his personal life and professional career but also the lives of his colleagues, students and antipodes. Since during his lifetime Slovakia formed a common state together with the Czech countries and since Okál had very vivid contacts with his colleagues to the west of the Morava River, this book becomes then an unthinkable part of the history of philology also in Bohemia and Moravia.

Marcela Andoková

Βενετία Αποστολίδου, Τραύμα και μνήμη. Η πεζογραφία των πολιτικών προσφύγων [Trauma and Memory. The Fiction of Political Exiles]. Αθήνα: Πόλις, 2010, 164 p. ISBN 978-960-435-274-6

“For me, the happy year of 1968 was brought to an untimely end by the August disaster; with my notes left behind in Prague I found myself in another part of the world not knowing the language or any proper occupation and my world was collapsing ... it was then that I began to write *Honzlová*. I finished the novel in three months, isolated from the New World, cut off from home but still in it as if I wanted to get my own way and bring Prague back on that piece of paper,” says Zdena Salivarová about her novel *Honzlová*.¹⁷ For the present and future generations she managed to faithfully grasp and bind into a living shape what was happening under the regime, the building of socialism. Still in Prague she started to write the novel containing stark autobiographic features to finish it speedily in Toronto where she emigrated with her husband Josef Škvorecký in 1968. Together in 1971 they founded the publishing house Sixty-Eight Publishers (68P)¹⁸ there to offer a platform to so-called Czechoslovak banned writers.

Venetia Apostolidou has tried to grasp, arrange and review a similar experience with Greek exile literature in her monograph entitled *Τραύμα και μνήμη. Η πεζογραφία των πολιτικών προσφύγων* [Trauma and Memory. The Fiction of Political Exiles],¹⁹ although from the opposite ideological side. This is literature of Greek writers of the Left who fled to socialist countries during the Civil War in 1948. Greek political refugees form a rather compact leftist group in the countries of the communist bloc whose destinies have been systematically explored only in the last decade²⁰ when both time and society have become ripe and the wound of disillusion has healed.

In 2011, Apostolidou was awarded the State Award in Essays and Criticism for her book (Κρατικό Βραβείο Δοκιμίου-Κριτικής). In the Czech Lands she introduced the book during her visit of the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in winter of 2013 just as the Department of Modern Greek Philology celebrated 65 years since its foundation. It should be emphasized at this point that the department was founded at the impetus of mass arrivals of Greek refugees to the then-Czechoslovakia in order to prepare teachers for the Greek children, who came in their thousands. Thus, it was almost a symbolic meeting.

In *Trauma and Memory* Apostolidou presents an in-depth summary of literary work by the political refugees: their publishing, editorial and writing activities with a particular emphasis on the relation to resistance and civil war; she explores and evaluates their life in exile, in the countries of real socialism as well as life following the painful return. However, she does not conclude her book with the return but continues with the present

¹⁷ Zdena Salivarová, *Honzlová*. Praha: Art-Servis, 1990, cover.

¹⁸ For the list of edited books see <http://www.slovníkceskeliteratury.cz/showContent.jsp?docId=1634>.

¹⁹ A list of authors: Theodosios Pieridis, 10 books; Alexis Parnis (Sotiris Leonidakis), 9 books; Menelaos Loundemis, 7 books; Apostolos Spilios, 6 books; Elli Alexiou, 5 books; Petros Anteos, 5 books; Dimos Rendis, 5 books; Mitsos Alexandropoulos, 4 books; Kostas Bosis (Pournaras), 4 books; Giorgos Sevastikoglou, 4 books; Nikos Akritidis, 3 books; Giorgos Grivas, 3 books; Dimitris Chatzis, 3 books; Takis Adamos, 2 books; Melpo Axioti, 1 book; Alki Zei, 1 book; Foula Chatzidali, 1 book. Cf. Apostolidou, p. 42.

²⁰ Civil Wars Study Group, Thessaloniki & Fondation pour la Mémoire de la Shoah.

work: four authors who place the heroes of their latest novels into the period of the Civil War and exile and more than 60 years after the events try to vent the traumatic experience of their nation on paper (Giorgos Prassas, Elena Chouzouri, Marlena Politopoulou and Alexis Parnis).¹

In the first chapter Apostolidou sums up exile literature, in which the Greek experience with the Civil War often intersects sharply with real socialism of the new home in which the leading ideology also embodies the ideals they had fought and laid their lives for. She describes unusual conditions, under which the authors wrote: a limited readership, a lack of suitable information on literary trends and events in the rest of Europe, a feeling of being cut off from home, fear of straying from the party leadership, a need to confirm their own national identity and its (in)compatibility with the rules of Marxism-Leninism. In a sensitive way, however with all the eloquence, she leaves aside the simple fact that aesthetic requirements cannot be applied to many of the works. She asks for a special approach to this literature of strict ideological norms redeemed by the Civil War, jail and exile. The following four chapters, divided chronologically, deal with authors who write about resistance, the Civil War, exile and repatriation and literature of later date. The book concludes with a summary chapter about the special place of political refugee literature in Greek literature, connected one way or the other with the war.

It follows from Apostolidou's precise and absorbing narrative that in the course of time a pressing need arose for the refugees to come to terms with the consequences of the traumatic experience and harmonize them with history. This happens in spite of the fact that it is not yet possible, at least for the time being, to go beyond the limits imposed by Greek society, which determine what should be remembered, what should be published and how. It is also for these reasons, one can say, that Greek society finds itself at an early stage of interpreting its own history as compared, for instance, with German society (cf. Schlink's short stories).² There still prevails a tendency to create a collective story which is deceptive to a certain point, to correct collective memory in order to portray the painful reality in a positive light and assign all the guilt to the adversary. There has not yet appeared a demand to review the decision of the party leadership to transfer thousands of Greek citizens, especially children, far beyond the borders of Greece.

Apostolidou's book represents – as complex as possible – a part of Greek literary history: It unveils a new perspective on a situation in communist countries entirely unheard of for Czech readers who have had their share of experience with one-party rule themselves.

Pavĺína Šípová

¹ Γιώργος Πρασάς, "... καιέτσι, έκλεισε ο κύκλος". Νεφέλη 2009; Έλενα Χουζούρη, Πατρίδα από βαμβάκι. Κέδρος 2009; Αλέξης Πάρνης, Η οδύσσεια των διδύμων. Εκδόσεις Καστανιώτη 2009; Μαρλένα Πολιτοπούλου, Η μνήμη της πολιορκίας. Μεταίχμιο 2009.

² In English, Bernhard Schlink, *Flights of Love*. The original title: *Liebesfluchten. Geschichten*. Zürich: Diogenes Verlag, 2000.

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE
PHILOLOGICA 2/2015
GRAECOLATINA PRAGENSIA XXV

Editors: Martin Bažil, Ján Bakyta
Cover and layout by Kateřina Řezáčová
Published by Charles University in Prague
Karolinum Press, Ovocný trh 3–5, 116 36 Praha 1
<http://www.karolinum.cz>
Prague 2015
Typeset by DTP Karolinum Press
Printed by Karolinum Press
ISSN 0567-8269
MK ČR E 18597

Distributed by Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague,
2 Jan Palach Sq., 116 38 Praha 1, Czech Republic
(books@ff.cuni.cz)